

AD-A122 045

COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE MODES OF DATA INPUT TO THE
PESTICIDE INFORMATIO. (U) CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING
RESEARCH LAB (ARMY) CHAMPAIGN IL M MESSENGER ET AL.
OCT 82 CERL-TR-N-137

1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 6/6

NL

END

*

construction
engineering
research
laboratory




United States Army
Corps of Engineers
... Serving the Army
... Serving the Nation

TECHNICAL REPORT N-137
October 1982

12

COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE MODES OF DATA INPUT
TO THE PESTICIDE INFORMATION RETRIEVAL SYSTEM

AD A 122 045



by
M. Messenger
R. Webster
T. Brown

DTIC
ELECTE
DEC 3 1982
A



DTIC FILE CO

82 12 03 015

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

The contents of this report are not to be used for advertising, publication, or promotional purposes. Citation of trade names does not constitute an official indorsement or approval of the use of such commercial products. The findings of this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

**DESTROY THIS REPORT WHEN IT IS NO LONGER NEEDED
DO NOT RETURN IT TO THE ORIGINATOR**

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER CERL-TR-N-137	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD A12201	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE MODES OF DATA INPUT TO THE PESTICIDE INFORMATION RETRIEVAL SYSTEM	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED FINAL	
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
7. AUTHOR(s) M. He M. Messenger R. Webster T. Brown	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. ARMY CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING RESEARCH LAB. P.O. Box 4005 Champaign, IL 61820	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 4A762720A896-A-034	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE October 1982	
	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 26	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	
	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) Copies are obtainable from the National Technical Information Service Springfield, VA 22161		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) pest control management information systems Pesticide Information Retrieval System		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The pilot Pesticide Information Retrieval System (PEST) -- a Component of the Environmental Technical Information System -- was initially developed for Headquarters U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command to perform keyword searches over a database created from each installation's Pest Control Reports (DD Form 1532). The system can summarize this data by pesticide used, pest, date, installation, location, and several other parameters to produce summary reports containing information on the amount of active ingredient used. Before PEST can be used in the field, an efficient method must be developed.		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED


SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

CONF

cont'd
~~UNCLASSIFIED~~

~~SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)~~

for entering all pesticide application data collected daily at each installation into the system database. This report explores three feasible methods of entering data into this system on a production basis and provides time/cost estimates for these methods. The three methods evaluated were interactive data input, optical mark reading from the installations, and optical mark reading from a central location. It was found that all three methods would reduce the number of steps in the current recordkeeping procedure and that all would reduce the level of error. The scanning at a central location method is the most efficient method, but also the most expensive.



11
UNCLASSIFIED

~~SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)~~

FOREWORD

This work was performed for the Assistant Chief of Engineers under Project 4A762720A896, "Environmental Quality for Construction and Operation of Military Facilities"; Task A, "Installation Environmental Management Strategy"; Work Unit 034, "Hazardous Materials Management System." The work was performed by the Environmental Division (EN) of the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory. LTC Dennis Gilson, DAEN-ZCE, was the Technical Monitor. Mr. Ben Spencer of TRADOC provided advice and assistance.

Dr. R. K. Jain is Chief of EN. COL Louis J. Circeo is Commander and Director of CERL, and Dr. L. R. Shaffer is Technical Director.

Accession for	
NTIS (GPO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	<input type="checkbox"/>
By _____	
Distribution _____	
Availability _____	
Dist	_____
A	_____



CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
DD FORM 1473	1
FOREWORD	3
1 INTRODUCTION.....	5
Background	
Purpose	
Approach	
Mode of Technology Transfer	
2 CURRENT RECORDKEEPING PROCEDURES.....	8
3 INTERACTIVE DATA INPUT.....	10
4 OPTICAL MARK READING.....	14
Individual Installation	
Central Location	
5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	19
APPENDIX A: Pocket Guide for Pest Information Retrieval System	25
APPENDIX B: Valid Terms for Pesticide Data Records	21
APPENDIX C: Sample Interactive Add Data Session	23
APPENDIX D: Cost of Experimental Use of Optical Mark Reader at a Central Location	26

DISTRIBUTION

**COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE MODES
OF DATA INPUT TO THE PESTICIDE
INFORMATION RETRIEVAL SYSTEM**

1 INTRODUCTION

Background

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act regulates Army pest control operations. AR 420-76¹ implements the provisions of this Act for the Army. The Pest Management Program set forth in this regulation is part of the real property maintenance activities carried out at all Army installations and activities.

The objectives of the Army's Pesticide Management Program are:

1. To develop, start, and maintain safe and effective pest control programs at each Army installation.
2. To maintain and protect the health, environmental quality, aesthetic values, and ecological balance of the military community.
3. To retain and improve operating personnel competence and skill through periodic testing and training.
4. To prevent medical or economic pests from being introduced or spread into the United States, its territories, or possessions by Army operations.

Carrying out the Pest Management Program involves preparing several types of reports. These include the daily and monthly reports on pest management activities required by AR 420-76.

Every pest management operation on an installation is recorded on DD Form 1532-1, the daily report, or on a local form. The information on these forms must be summarized to prepare the required monthly reports; this summarization task is time-consuming and expensive.

To make performance of this task more efficient, the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (CERL) developed the Pest Information Retrieval System (PEST), an automated system which stores information from DD Form 1532 in a computer database and retrieves these records as needed. (Appendix A provides a pocket users guide for the PEST system.) The system is a component of the Hazardous Materials Management System.*

The system is being evaluated for eventual use in the Department of Defense (DOD) by U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM), U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), U.S. Army Defense Acquisition and Readiness Command

¹ Pest Management Program, AR 420-76 (Department of the Army, 15 December 1980).

* An experimental profile of the Environmental Technical Information System.

(DARCOM), and Army Environmental Hygiene Agency (AEHA). Before the PEST system is used in the field, an efficient method must be developed for entering all pesticide application data collected daily at each installation into the system database.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to assess the technical feasibility and cost-effectiveness of alternative modes of entering data into the Pesticide Information Retrieval System.

Approach

First, the current flow of information was defined. Data entry methods were then evaluated for conformance with specific criteria developed on the basis of personnel limitations and the need to speed up information transfer and reduce transcription errors. Based on these criteria, three modes of data entry were chosen for assessment: interactive data input from the field directly into the system database, optical mark reading from the installations, and optical mark reading from a central location.

Mode of Technology Transfer

It is recommended that the information in this report be disseminated in accordance with techniques for computer systems defined in AR 18-1, Army Automation Management. The document implementing this system will be an appendix to AR 420-76 or DA PAM 420-76. Current pilot development is being developed in accordance with AR 70-1, Army Research, Development, and Acquisition. Following review and establishment of a Proponent Agency, further system development and deployment will be in accordance with AR 18-1.

2 CURRENT RECORDKEEPING PROCEDURES

The flow of pesticide application data from installation to end users was defined through discussions with TRADOC personnel, for whom the system was initially developed, and several installation entomologists. Figure 1 shows the current system of recording and summarizing the data, which was developed by the Navy and is used throughout the Armed Forces.² Daily reports are completed on a local form by personnel who apply the pesticides as they do the work. The installation entomologist manually reduces these reports into the monthly Pest Control Report (DD 1532). This report is then typed and mailed to the end users: USAEHA, installation HQ, installation MEDAC, HQ MACOM, and the Armed Forces Pest Management Board.

This procedure requires three manual data transformations: (1) creation of the daily reports from work orders by the applicator, (2) consolidation of the daily reports into a monthly summary by the entomologist, and (3) typing of the monthly summary by clerical personnel outside of the entomology office. At each step, standard terms (see Appendix B) must be used to describe the pest control activities. Reports received by CERL for entry into the pilot PEST system often contain incorrect terms or are missing data. One major reason for this problem is that many of the standard valid terms have been arbitrarily assigned and do not bear any immediately apparent relationship to the pests, pesticides, and operations they describe. Once an incorrect term has been entered on a daily report, it is hard to reconstruct what actually occurred. In the final data-handling step, personnel who are unfamiliar with the valid terms and pesticide application procedures must transcribe the handwritten summary.

This process requires 6 to 8 weeks before initial delivery of the monthly summary to the end users. After examining the reports, they may then return them to the installation for clarification, correction, or completion. As a result, the monthly summary may take up to 3 to 6 months to be completed.

Based on identified problems, four criteria were defined for evaluating alternative modes of entering data into the system.

1. Initial data collection must be done in installation entomology operations at current staffing levels.
2. Consolidation of steps in the information flow is desirable, and additional steps are not permissible.
3. Information should be available to the end users more quickly than it is now.
4. The number of times data is transformed manually should be decreased or eliminated, if possible, to reduce transcription errors.

Three modes of data entry were selected to assess their conformance to these criteria: interactive input directly into the PEST system database,

² Pest Management Report Terms, NAVFACINST 6250.3 Series (Department of the Navy, October 1981).

optical mark reading from the installations, and optical mark reading from a central location. Chapters 3 and 4 describe and evaluate these methods and provide an estimate of the costs of using them.

3 INTERACTIVE DATA INPUT

With an interactive data input system, the daily and monthly reports would be handwritten in the entomology office; then the monthly report would be typed directly into the PEST system database via a computer terminal through a WATS line. At this point, the information would be directly available to the end users through the PEST program. Figure 2 illustrates the information flow using interactive data input. This method is technically feasible and has been used at CERL to enter data into the pilot PEST system.

One major advantage of this method is that the PEST program can check the data as it is input to make sure that only valid terms are entered. CERL has developed a data input routine for entering monthly reports into the pilot PEST program. This routine, called "add data," prompts the user for each piece of information (called a field) contained in the monthly report.

The first field of this routine (field 0) is an accession number which is automatically assigned by the computer for a specific record* so there is no prompt. Field 1, the year and month, is passed to add data when the routine is called. (See the example interactive add data session in Appendix C.) Field 2, the installation name, and field 16, the UIC code, are requested once for each installation. These three fields remain the same for all of the installation's subsequent monthly reports. The add data routine automatically inserts the accession number, date, installation name, and UIC code for the rest of the monthly report entries.

The remaining 12 fields change from record to record. As each piece of data is input, the program checks it against lists of valid terms. If an invalid term is typed in, the add data program sends an error message to the user, telling him/her that the term is not on the list of acceptable terms; it also gives the user the option of entering another word, or entering the original invalid term. If he/she chooses to enter an invalid term, it will be written into a special file, along with the accession number of the record to which it was added. These files must be examined periodically to determine which terms should be added to the lists of valid terms and which should be sent back to the entomologist for clarification. This gives the system greater flexibility.

Discussions with installation entomologists have revealed several problems with this approach. Generally, no one on the entomology staff has the typing skills needed for data input; therefore, the data must be entered by clerical personnel unfamiliar with pesticide application procedures and valid terms. The typing itself would take about 1 hour per month per installation; however, this is a mixed blessing, because the people involved would not be familiar with data input procedures and would have to relearn them every month (e.g., logging in the terminal, calling up the add data routine, checking invalid terms, etc.). Depending on the number of errors in the handwritten reports, a lot of time could be spent conferring with the entomology staff to correct them. Another drawback is that a good-quality telephone line, which is needed to communicate with the computer, is not available at DA

* A record is a complete set of 17 fields and represents one line of information on the Pest Control Report (DD 1532).




Figure 2. Interactive data input from each installation.

installations. Finally, even though the add_data program flags invalid terms, the chance to introduce errors into the database is not completely eliminated. This is because the monthly report is still produced by manually summarizing the daily reports.

Table 1 summarizes the equipment, labor, and estimated costs associated with using interactive data input. Production of the manual monthly summary requires an estimated 8 hours of labor per month per installation, and input of the final correct monthly report into the system database requires 4 hours of labor per month per installation. The cost of procuring terminals for each installation and the five end users has been included; however, the appropriate type of terminal is already available at most TRADOC, FORSCOM, and DARCOM installations, as well as by the five end users, and would not have to be purchased. The interactive data input method can be used with current staffing levels; however, the level of skill required to use this method will be higher.

Table 1

Cost Comparison: * Alternative Methods of Data Input

METHOD OF DATA INPUT	HOURS/MONTH	LABOR TYPE	EQUIPMENT/MATERIALS	CAPITAL, \$	ESTIMATED COST RECURRING, \$/YEAR
Interactive data input from installation	100 hours at \$9/hour**	Clerical GS-03	30 terminals @ \$700 25 phone lines @ \$75	\$21,000 terminals 1,875 phone lines <u>\$22,875 total</u>	\$10,800 data input 33,600 monthly summary <u>\$44,400/year total</u>
	200 hours at \$14/hour	Assist. Entomologist MGS			
Scanner input from installation	50 hours at \$9/hour	Clerical GS-03	7000 forms/month @ \$27.15/1000 25 scanners @ \$12,500 25 modems @ \$1,000 25 phone lines @ \$75 5 terminals @ \$700	\$187,500 scanners 25,000 modems 1,875 phones 3,500 terminals <u>\$217,875 total</u>	\$ 5,400 labor 2,538 forms <u>\$7,938/year total</u>
	15 hours at \$9/hour	Clerical GS-03	7000 forms/month @ \$27.15/1000 1 scanner @ \$12,500 1 modem @ \$1000 1 phone line @ \$75 5 terminals @ \$700	\$ 12,500 scanner 1,000 modem 75 phone 3,500 terminals <u>\$ 17,075 total</u>	\$ 1,620 labor 2,538 forms <u>\$ 4,158/year total</u>

* Based on 25 installations.

** Administrative and operating overheads included.

4 OPTICAL MARK READING

Optical mark readers (also called optical scanners) transform a series of pencil marks on a predesigned form into computerized information. This type of device is used to read standardized test answer sheets. Figure 3 shows an example scanner form proposed by the Navy for collecting pesticide application data. This form must be designed in conjunction with the scanner manufacturer.


The scanner itself is similar in appearance and operation to a "table top" copying machine. About 500 forms per hour can be read by the smallest scanner available. The forms can be input either manually or automatically. The scanner can be hardwired to the computer, or accessed through a modem over commercial phone lines. This equipment is commercially available and has been used in a wide variety of applications. There are two ways of using optical mark reading to enter data into PEST: either through individual scanners at each installation or through one scanner at a central location.

Individual Installation

Figure 4 shows the information flow resulting if optical mark reading is used at each installation. Pesticide application personnel would mark the daily report directly on scanner forms by pesticide application personnel as the work was completed. A scanner form with carbon copy would replace the local daily report forms now used. The carbons would be kept in the entomology shop, and the originals would be sent periodically to the scanner location, where they would be scanned directly into the PEST database. The PEST program would produce the current monthly summary (DD 1532) at the end of the month; the summary would be available on-line to all end users.

This mode of data input would avoid one of the biggest pitfalls of both the interactive data input and the current recordkeeping procedures; i.e., there would be no manual transformation or summarization of the data. The pesticide applicator would be forced to mark one of the valid terms on the scanner form; this would greatly reduce the amount of incorrect data entered into the system database, as well as the amount of time spent identifying and correcting such errors. Missing data would still be a problem; however, the scanner can be programmed to check all forms for completeness and reject those that are not complete. This is done by printing a message on the form and directing it to a separate output hopper. Furthermore, this system avoids using the mail to transmit the data. Thus, the monthly summary would be available to end users much more quickly, and the labor now used to produce the monthly summary would no longer be needed.

This option is attractive with respect to speed and ease of use; however, it would be expensive to implement. The scanners cost \$12,500 apiece for manual feed or \$25,000 apiece for automatic feed. In addition, each installation would need modems to connect the scanners to the computer as well as dedicated phone lines. Use of micro-computers at the installation level would eliminate the need for modems; however, conversion of the existing software to operate on various types of micro-computer hardware would also require investigation.



Personnel: _____

Time for task: _____

Equipment/materials: Seen forms _____

2 hours per month } At each institution
 optical scanner }
 modem }
 dedicated phone line }

Figure 4. Optical mark reading at each installation.

Since scanner input into PEST has not yet been tried, it should be evaluated at several installations. The cost of such an experiment is outlined in Appendix D. The cost of this option (see Table 1) could be reduced somewhat if the scanner could be used for other jobs besides inputting pesticide application data. While definition of other uses is beyond the scope of this study, its feasibility should be investigated. This would also be particularly useful for other installation-specific database development.

Central Location

Figure 5 shows the flow of information if optical mark reading at a central location is used. Although this option would cost much less than installing a scanner at each installation, it would require using the mail to send data. However, the monthly summary would still be produced by the computer and available to the end users much more quickly than with interactive data input. Only one scanner, one modem, and one dedicated phone line would be needed. Again, no manual transformation of the data would be needed; this would greatly reduce errors and the amount of missing information in the database. Labor costs would also be less than if scanners were used at each installation; this is because set-up and relearning time would be less for one scanner and one operator. Table 1 shows the costs of this alternative.




Figure 5. Optical mark reading at a central location.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report has assessed the technical feasibility and cost-effectiveness of three modes of data entry for the Pesticide Information Retrieval System: interactive data input, optical mark reading from the installations, and optical mark reading from a central location. For a given installation, the most suitable mode would require consideration of the following factors:

1. Initial data collection can be done in installation entomology operations at current staffing levels for all three methods of data entry.

2. All three methods of data entry would reduce the number of steps in the current recordkeeping procedure (Chapters 3, 4).

3. Both the interactive and scanner methods of data input require better-quality commercial telephone lines that do not run through a central switchboard. The feasibility of installing such lines at DA installations must be determined and implemented before use of this type of technology is considered.

4. The level of error that can be tolerated in the database must be determined. Optical mark reading allows very little error into the database and requires the least amount of human "troubleshooting." Interactive data input also decreases errors, but at the expense of a great deal of human intervention. The current method of recordkeeping allows a great deal of error, much of which is essentially uncorrectable, because due to the time lags between initial data collection and reduction, personnel forget what entries were made.

5. How quickly the monthly report must be available to the end users, and at what expense, is a major deciding factor in choosing a data input method. Scanning at each installation is the quickest method available, but is also the most expensive. Scanning at a central location provides the data quickly and at a reasonable price; it also requires less labor than the other two methods.

6. The skill needed at the installation level is much greater for interactive data input than for scanner input. Whether this skill exists remains to be determined by experimental use of interactive data input at several installations. Hardware and software are available and in-place for this experiment.

It is recommended that both interactive and scanner input be experimentally evaluated at the installation level before a method of data input is chosen. Scanner input into PEST should be evaluated at several installations to determine its advantages and costs.

POCKET GUIDE FOR PEST INFORMATION RETRIEVAL SYSTEM

POCKET PEST (ETIS Pest Information Retrieval System)

Fields

Each field is one kind of information available from the system. You can see the values in each field with the "show" command. Searchable fields can be used with the "find" command.

- accession# - system identifier for the data from a single operation.
- date - date the pesticide operation was performed; e-g., 80/01
- installation - where the operation was performed
- pest - target organism
- sex# - adult or immature
- operation - mode of pesticide application
- units_treated - units used to express size of operation
- terrain - type of area treated
- pesticide - name of pesticide used
- formulation - form the pesticide was used in
- amount_fern - gallons, pounds, or ounces
- final_conc# - concentration applied
- rate_lbs# - pounds applied per unit area
- rate_g# -
- conc# - stock pesticide, standard materials, or granular supplied
- min_hours# - min-hours spent in application
- id# - installation identifier
- * Not a searchable field

Commands

- "show <field name>" - lists all the possible values for the field.
- "show records" - lists all the database records which have been found.
- "show fields" - lists the field names.
- "find <value>" - gets all instances of the value. <value> is for any searchable field.
- "and <value>" - narrows the records found to those including <value>.
- "or <value>" - adds to the records found to those including <value>.
- "except <value>" - excludes the records containing <value>.
- "lost all" or "list <field names>" - lists values of data records at terminal
- "display" or "display <filenames>" - writes the records found either to the terminal or to a file.
- "save <filenames>" - saves the results of your search for later use with the "restore" command.
- "restore <filenames>" - retrieves the results of a previous search.
- "help <commandname>" - provides on-line information about the command.
- "end", "quit", "bye" ends your PEST session.

Sample PEST Session

1. Log into ETIS, XPR subystem.
2. Start PEST by choosing PEST from the XPR menu.
3. "show fields" - to see the available fields.
4. "show installation" - to see the installation names.
5. "findmice" - to get all the records for mice.
6. "or rats" - to add the records for rats.
7. "and fort dix" - to get all records for rats and mice abatement at Fort Dix.
8. "except strychnine" - to get all records for rats and mice at Fort Dix except those where strychnine was used.
9. "display" - to see the records at the terminal.
10. "display dixfile" - to write the records to file "dixfile".
11. "bye" - to leave PEST.

APPENDIX B:

VALID TERMS FOR PESTICIDE DATA RECORDS

Installations

carlisle barracks
fort a. p. hill
fort belvoir
fort benjamin harrison
fort benning
fort bliss
fort chaffee
fort dix
fort eustis
fort gordon
fort hamilton
fort knox
fort leavenworth
fort lee
fort leonard wood
fort mclellan
fort pickett
fort rucker
fort sill
usa support detachment

Pest

algae
allveg
ants
aquaticwds
bats
bdldweeds
bedbugs
beetlespp
birds
brgirdsec
brush
carpentant
centipedes
culicoids
dampwatern
drywatern
earwigs
fibfabpst

filthflies
fireants
fleas
foodpests
fungiwd
grassyweed
grdsqrls
jpbeetles
leafchewer
lice
marinebor
mice
mites
mosquitoes
wxbdlbrush
wxgrabdlvd
nematodes
oldhousebr

ornplntdis
psychoda
rats
roaches
rodentsoth
rootpests
sapsuckers
scorpions
similiids

slvrscoid
snailslugs
spiders
stomoxys
subterms
tabanid
ticks
turfdie
urticating
wob

Operations

atmosfum
barrier
chambar
clearing
dgair
dgband
dgpdeq
diptrlumb
ditching
engdinsur
exbait
exresidtr
extrap
fogging
gtreatmt
hydratill
inbait
intrap
meddinsur
misting
omcontrol

palldiptr
pinstaltr
pileinpltr
pocinstaltr
poleinpltr
receptreat
residtr
sanitfill
soilfum
spair
spctr
sphand
sppdeq
stinpltr
strucfum
sursoiltr
systemapp
trlumbinst
trnsoiltr
vacuumfum

Bldg/terrain

acf
brq
dew
exc
fhh
gfg
grh
hol
isp
ind
ken
ldf
mos
off
opd
opg

opx
rch
rec
res
rrc
sip
spw
tgc
tre
trv
ugs
utl
wat
waw
whs

Pesticides

1080
245t
24d
abata
aldrin
allethrin
alumphos
amitrole
amuste
anticoag
arsenicorg
aspon
astrazine
attractant
avitrol
bacthuring
balan
baygon
bensulide
bhc
bnomyl
bromacil
cacn
cadmate
captan
carbaryl
cbisulfide
chlordan
chroneb
cirobenzil
coppersulf
crboxide
creosote
cyclohexin
daconil
dalapon
dechlorvos
ddt
daxon
diazinon

dieldrin
difolatan
dimethoate
dinitrocom
dioxat
diquat
dithane
diuron
dyston
dursban
duswetsulf
dyrene
endothall
fenthion
ferbam
fnuron
folpet
hcn
heptachlor
herboil
karathane
kelthane
kepone
koban
kromad
ldarsenate
linesulfur
lindane
m22
malathion
maneb
mhc
mba
mcb
mcm
mcbromide
mesuroi
metaldhyde
milkyspore
minoils
mirex

miscoil
mleichydra
monuron
mot
mthoxychlor
naclmollus
naled
napenta
nicotina
nonypenta
norbromide
orepellent
organsulf
pegel
pentawr
picloram
pon
prisgreen
prometone
pyrethrum
repellant
resmethrin
ronnel
rotenone
requill
solicaaero
simzine
slvex
sodiumfld
starlicide
strychnine
sulfurylfl
tandex
tbe
tca
thiram
sectran
zineb
znph

Formulations

bqt
bts
dus
gai
gan
lfu
odp

olp
pog
efu
ein
sus

UIC Codes*

W01569
W01777
W05170
W13355
W13777
W18351
W20491
W21478
W29997
W2LPAA
W34201
W36352
W39220
W40801
W42116
W48083
W51062
W51281
W51359
W51459
W51484

units treated

ac
ea
mcf
mlf
msf
sy

amount_form

ga
lb
oz

*UIC numbers are unique installation identifiers. For example W48083 is Fort Bliss. An installation may have more than one UIC code.

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE INTERACTIVE ADD_DATA SESSION

```
add_data 8109
Type 'quit' to exit
2 installation ? fort knox
3 pest ? filthfly
Sorry 'filthfly' is invalid.
Do you want to add it? no
3 pest ? filthflies
4 A or I ? A
5 operation ? exresidtr
6 no. of units & unit ? 12 msf
7 bldg/terrain ? ken
8 pesticide ? malathion
9 form ? eml
10 amount & unit ? 15 ga
11 final concentration ? 3
12 rate (lbs) ? none
13 rate(%) ? none
14 S,N or C ? S
15 man-hours ? 25
16 UIC code ? W21478
3 pest ? roaches
4 A or I ? A
5 operation ? residtr
6 no. of units & unit ? 214 msf
7 bldg/terrain ? res
8 pesticide ? diazinon
9 form ? eml
10 amount & unit ? 214 ga
11 final concentration ? 1
12 rate (lbs) ? none
13 rate (%) ? none
14 S,N or C ? S
15 man-hours ? 198
3 pest ? quit
Bye . . .
```

APPENDIX D

COST OF EXPERIMENTAL USE OF OPTICAL MARK READER
AT A CENTRAL LOCATION

	<u>6 months</u>	<u>12 months</u>
Rental of one scanner, \$740/month	\$ 4440	\$ 8880
Scanner forms, 1500/month (5 installations)	\$ 546	\$ 828
Mock-up of scanner form	\$ 285	\$ 285
Labor		
Installation and interfacing	\$ 500	\$ 500
Data input	\$ 216	\$ 432
TOTAL	\$ 5987	\$10925

GENL DISTRIBUTION

Chief of Engineers
 ATTN: Tech Monitor
 ATTN: DAEN-AGI-L (2)
 ATTN: DAEN-CCP
 ATTN: DAEN-CU
 ATTN: DAEN-CUE
 ATTN: DAEN-CUM-R
 ATTN: DAEN-CUO
 ATTN: DAEN-CUP
 ATTN: DAEN-HP
 ATTN: DAEN-HPC
 ATTN: DAEN-HPE
 ATTN: DAEN-HPO
 ATTN: DAEN-HPR-A
 ATTN: DAEN-SD
 ATTN: DAEN-SDC
 ATTN: DAEN-SDM
 ATTN: DAEN-SH
 ATTN: DAEN-ZC
 ATTN: DAEN-ZCH
 ATTN: DAEN-ZCI
 ATTN: DAEN-ZCH

FESA, ATTN: Library 22060

FESA, ATTN: DET III 79906

US Army Engineer Districts

ATTN: Library
 Alaska 99501
 Al Batin 09616
 Albuquerque 87103
 Baltimore 21203
 Buffalo 14207
 Charleston 29402
 Chicago 60604
 Detroit 48231
 Far East 96301
 Fort Worth 76102
 Galveston 77550
 Huntington 25721
 Jacksonville 32232
 Japan 96343
 Kansas City 64106
 Little Rock 72203
 Los Angeles 90053
 Louisville 40201
 Memphis 38103
 Mobile 36628
 Nashville 37202
 New Orleans 70160
 New York 10007
 Norfolk 23510
 Omaha 68102
 Philadelphia 19106
 Pittsburgh 15222
 Portland 97208
 Riyadh 09038
 Rock Island 61201
 Sacramento 95814
 San Francisco 94105
 Savannah 31402
 Seattle 98124
 St. Louis 63101
 St. Paul 55101
 Tulsa 74102
 Vicksburg 39180
 Walla Walla 99362
 Wilmington 28401

US Army Engineer Divisions

ATTN: Library
 Europe 09757
 Huntsville 35807
 Lower Mississippi Valley 39180
 Middle East 09038
 Middle East (Near) 22601
 Missouri River 68101
 New England 02134
 North Atlantic 10007
 North Central 60605
 North Pacific 97208
 Ohio River 43201
 Pacific Ocean 96858
 South Atlantic 30303
 South Pacific 94111
 Southwestern 75202

US Army Europe

HQ, 7th Army Training Command 09114
 ATTN: AETTO-DER (5)
 HQ, 7th Army CDCS/Engr. 09403
 ATTN: AEAEN-EN (4)
 V. Corps 09079
 ATTN: AETVDER (5)
 VII. Corps 09134
 ATTN: AETVDER (5)
 21st Support Command 09323
 ATTN: AEAEN (3)
 Berlin 09742
 ATTN: AEAEN-EN (2)
 Southern European Tech Force 09160
 ATTN: AEAEN-EN (3)
 Installation Support Activity 09403
 ATTN: AEAEN-EN

8th USA, Korea
 ATTN: EAFS (6) 96301
 ATTN: EAFS-Y 96350
 ATTN: EAFS-ID 96224
 ATTN: EAFS-AN 96200

8th USA, Korea
 ATTN: EAFS-H 96271
 ATTN: EAFS-P 96259
 ATTN: EAFS-T 96212

8th US Combined Forces Command 96301
 ATTN: EAFS-HHC-CFC/Engr

USA Japan (USARJ)
 Ch. PE Div, A/JEN-PE 96343
 Fac Engr (Hiroshima) 96343
 Fac Engr (Osaka) 96351

Rocky Mt. Area 80903

Area Engineer, AEDC-Area Office
 Arnold Air Force Station, TX 37389

Western Area Office, CE
 Vandenberg AFB, CA 93437

416th Engineer Command 60623
 ATTN: Facilities Engineer

US Military Academy 10996
 ATTN: Facilities Engineer
 ATTN: Dept of Geography &
 Computer Science
 ATTN: DSCPER/MAEN-A

Engr. Studies Center 20315
 ATTN: Library

AMERC, ATTN: DUEMR-WE 02172

USA ABRCOM 61299
 ATTN: DRCIS-RI-1
 ATTN: DREAR-IS

DARCOM - Dir., Inst., & Svcs.
 ATTN: Facilities Engineer
 ABRADCOM 07801
 Aberdeen Proving Ground 21005
 Army Matl. and Mechanics Res. Ctr.
 Corpus Christi Army Depot 78419
 Harry Diamond Laboratories 20783
 Dugway Proving Ground 84022
 Jefferson Proving Ground 47250
 Fort Monmouth 07703
 Letterkenny Army Depot 17201
 Hatick S&D Ctr. 01760
 New Cumberland Army Depot 17070
 Pueblo Army Depot 81001
 Red River Army Depot 75301
 Redstone Arsenal 35809
 Rock Island Arsenal 61299
 Savannah Army Depot 61074
 Sharpe Army Depot 95331
 Seneca Army Depot 14541
 Tobyhanna Army Depot 18466
 Tooele Army Depot 84074
 Watervliet Arsenal 12189
 Yuma Proving Ground 85364
 White Sands Missile Range 88002

DLA ATTN: DLA-UI 22314

FORSCOM

FORSCOM Engineer, ATTN: AFEN-PE
 ATTN: Facilities Engineer
 Fort Buchanan 00934
 Fort Bragg 28307
 Fort Campbell 41223
 Fort Carson 80913
 Fort Devens 01433
 Fort Drum 13601
 Fort Hood 76344
 Fort Indiantown Gap 17003
 Fort Irwin 92311
 Fort San Houston 78234
 Fort Lewis 98433
 Fort McCoy 54636
 Fort McPherson 30330
 Fort George G. Meade 20755
 Fort Ord 93941
 Fort Polk 71459
 Fort Richardson 99505
 Fort Riley 66442
 Presidio of San Francisco 94129
 Fort Sheridan 60037
 Fort Stewart 31213
 Fort Wainwright 99703
 Vancouver B.C. 98660

EGC

ATTN: BELO-P 78234
 ATTN: Facilities Engineer
 Fitzsimons AMC 80240
 Walter Reed AMC 20012

ENSCOM - Ch, Instl. Div.
 ATTN: Facilities Engineer
 Arlington Hall Station (2) 22212
 Vint Hill Farm Station 22186

ENW

ATTN: Facilities Engineer
 Cameron Station 22314
 Fort Lesley J. McNair 20319
 Fort Myer 22211

ENEC

ATTN: ENEC-SA 20315
 ATTN: Facilities Engineer
 Oakland Army Base 94626
 Bayona NY 07002
 Sunny Point NY 28461

KARADCOM, ATTN: ENEMA-F 071160

TARCOM, Pac. Div. 40090

TRADOC

HQ, TRADOC, ATTN: ATEN-PE
 ATTN: Facilities Engineer
 Fort Belvoir 22060
 Fort Benning 31905
 Fort Bliss 79916
 Carlisle Barracks 17013
 Fort Chaffee 72902
 Fort Dix 08640
 Fort Huachuca 23604
 Fort Gordon 29905
 Fort Hamilton 11252
 Fort Benjamin Harrison 46216
 Fort Jackson 29207
 Fort Knox 40121
 Fort Leavenworth 66027
 Fort Lee 23801
 Fort McCallan 36205
 Fort Monroe 23651
 Fort Rucker 36362
 Fort Sill 73503
 Fort Leonard Wood 65473

TRADCOM, ATTN: STRAS-F 63120

USACC

ATTN: Facilities Engineer
 Fort Huachuca 85613
 Fort Ritchie 21719

WESTCOM

ATTN: Facilities Engineer
 Fort Shafter 96858

SHAPE 09055

ATTN: Survivability Section, CCB-OPS
 Infrastructure Branch, LANSA

HQ USEDCOM 09128

ATTN: ECI 4/7-LOE

Fort Belvoir, VA 22060

ATTN: ATEA-DTE-EN
 ATTN: ATEA-MCE-EN
 ATTN: ATEA-PE
 ATTN: Engr. Library
 ATTN: Canadian Liaison Office (2)
 ATTN: DMR Library

Cold Regions Research Engineering Lab 03755

ATTN: Library

ETL, ATTN: Library 22060

Waterways Experiment Station 39180

ATTN: Library

HQ, XVIII Airborne Corps and 28307

Ft. Bragg

ATTN: AFMA-PE-EN

Chanute AFB, IL 61868

3345 CES/WE, Stop 27

Horton AFB 92409

ATTN: AFVCE-EN/DEE

Tyndall AFB, FL 32403

AFVCE/Engineering & Service Lab

NAFPC

ATTN: AFVCE Liaison Office
 Atlantic Division 23511
 Chesapeake Division 20374
 Southern Division 29411
 Pacific Division 94860
 Northern Division 19112
 Western Division 64086
 ATTN: Sr. Tech. PAC-GST 22332
 ATTN: Asst. COM R&D, PAC-03 22332

WCEL 93041

ATTN: Library (Code LOSA)

Defense Technical Info. Center 22314

ATTN: DDA (12)

Engineering Societies Library 10017

New York, NY

National Guard Bureau 20310

Installation Division

US Government Printing Office 22304

Receiving Section/Depository Copies (2)

EMS Team Distribution

Chief of Engineers
ATTN: DAEN-MPO-S
ATTN: DAEN-MPO-U
ATTN: DAEN-MPR
ATTN: DAEN-MPZ-A

US Army Engineer District
New York 10007
ATTN: Chief, NAEEN-E
ATTN: Chief, Design Br.
Pittsburgh 15222
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Philadelphia 19106
ATTN: Chief, NAEEN-E
Baltimore 21203
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Norfolk 23510
ATTN: Chief, NAEEN-R
Huntington 25721
ATTN: Chief, ORMED-P
Wilmington 28401
ATTN: Chief, SAEN-PP
ATTN: Chief, SAEN-PM
ATTN: Chief, SAEN-E
Charleston 29402
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Savannah 31402
ATTN: Chief, SASAS-L
Jacksonville 32232
ATTN: Env. Res. Br.
Nashville 37202
ATTN: Chief, ORMED-P
Memphis 38103
ATTN: Chief, LOMED-PR
Vicksburg 39100
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Louisville 40201
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
St. Paul 55101
ATTN: Chief, ED-ER
Chicago 60604
ATTN: Chief, NCCPD-ER
ATTN: Chief, NCCPE-PES
St. Louis 63101
ATTN: Chief, ED-B
Kansas City 64106
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Omaha 68102
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Little Rock 72203
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Tulsa 74102
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Fort Worth 76102
ATTN: Chief, SMFED-PR
ATTN: Chief, SMFED-F
Galveston 77550
ATTN: Chief, SMGAS-L
ATTN: Chief, SMGCO-M
Albuquerque 87103
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Los Angeles 90053
ATTN: Chief, SPLED-E
San Francisco 94105
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Sacramento 95814
ATTN: Chief, SPKED-D
Far East 96301
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Seattle 98124
ATTN: Chief, NPSEN-PL-WC
ATTN: Chief, NPSEN-PL-ER
ATTN: Chief, NPSEN-PL-SP
Walla Walla 99362
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
Alaska 99501
ATTN: Chief, NPASA-R

US Army Engineer Division
New England 02154
ATTN: Laboratory
ATTN: Chief, NEDED-E
South Atlantic 30303
ATTN: Chief, SAGEN-E

US Army Engineer Division
Nonesville 36807
ATTN: Chief, MWED-CS
ATTN: Chief, MWED-M
Lower Mississippi Valley 39100
ATTN: Chief, PA-R
Ohio River 48201
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
North Central 60806
ATTN: Chief, Engr. Planning Br.
Southeastern 78202
ATTN: Chief, SMCOS-S
South Pacific 94111
ATTN: Laboratory
Pacific Ocean 98808
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div
ATTN: Chief, POCED-P
North Pacific 97208
ATTN: Laboratory
ATTN: Chief, Engr Div

5th US Army 78234
ATTN: MCFB-LG-E

6th US Army 94129
ATTN: AFMC-EH

7th US Army 09407
ATTN: AETM-MRD-END

USA ARRADCOM
ATTN: DRBAR-LCA-OK

West Point, NY 10996
ATTN: Dept of Mechanics
ATTN: Library

Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060
ATTN: Learning Resources Center
ATTN: ATSE-TD-TL (2)
ATTN: British Liaison Officer (5)

Ft. Clayton Canal Zone 34004
ATTN: DFAE

Ft. Leavenworth, KS 66027
ATTN: ATZLCA-SA

Ft. Lee, VA 23801
ATTN: DRXMC-D (2)

Ft. McPherson, GA 30330
ATTN: AFEN-CD

Ft. Monroe, VA 23651
ATTN: ATEN-AD (3)
ATTN: ATEN-FE-E

Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005
ATTN: AMXHE

Naval Facilities Engr Command 22332
ATTN: Code O4

US Naval Oceanographic Office 39522
ATTN: Library

Port Hueneme, CA 93043
ATTN: Morell Library

Kirtland AFB, NM 87117
ATTN: DEP

Little Rock AFB 72076
ATTN: 314/DEEE

Patrick AFB, FL 32925
ATTN: XRQ

AF/RDXT
WASH DC 20330

Tinker AFB, OK 73145
2864 ADG/DEEE

Tyndall AFB, FL 32403
AFESC/PRT

Building Research Advisory Board 20414

Dept. of Transportation
Tallahassee, FL 32304

Dept. of Transportation Library 20690

Transportation Research Board 20414

Airports and Const. Services Dir.
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0M8

National Defense Headquarters
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0K2

Messenger, Mamette

Comparison of alternative modes of data input to the Pesticide Information Retrieval System / by M. Messenger, R. Webster, T. Brown.
-- Champaign, Ill: Construction Engineering Research Laboratory ;
available from NTIS, 1982.

26 p. (Technical report ; N-137)

1. Pest control - data processing. 2. Pesticide Information Retrieval System. I. Webster, Ronald Dwight. II. Brown, Terri A. III. Title. IV. Series : Technical report (Construction Engineering Research Laboratory) ; N-137.