AD NO. _____
DTC PROJECT NO. 8-CO-160-UXO-021
REPORT NO. ATC-9038

STANDARDIZED

UXO TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION SITE

OPEN FIELD SCORING RECORD NO. 492

SITE LOCATION:
U.S. ARMY ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND

DEMONSTRATOR:
SHAW ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
312 DIRECTOR'S DRIVE
KNOXSVILLE, TN 37923

TECHNOLOGY TYPE/PLATFORM:
MAGNETOMETER G858 SENSOR/PUSHCART

PREPARED BY:
U.S. ARMY ABERDEEN TEST CENTER
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD 21005-5059

JUNE 2005

Prepared for:
U.S. ARMY ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD 21010-5401

U.S. ARMY DEVELOPMENTAL TEST COMMAND
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND, MD 21005-5055

DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED, JUNE 2005.

DISPOSITION INSTRUCTIONS

Destroy this document when no longer needed. Do not return to the originator.

The use of trade names in this document does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial hardware or software. This document may not be cited for purposes of advertisement.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED *(From - To)*
June 2005	Final	9, 16, 18 and 19 December 2003

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
STANDARDIZED UXO TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION SITE OPEN FIELD SCORING RECORD NO. 492, (SHAW ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.)

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)
Overbay, Larry; Robitaille, George
The Standardized UXO Technology Demonstration Site Scoring Committee

5d. PROJECT NUMBER
8-CO-160-UXO-021

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
Commander
U.S. Army Aberdeen Test Center
ATTN: CSTE-STC-ATC-SL-E
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5059

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
ATC-9038

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
Commander
U.S. Army Environmental Center
ATTN: SFIM-AEC-ATT
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5401

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)
Same as Item 8

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Distribution unlimited.

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT
This scoring record documents the efforts of Shaw Environmental, Inc. to detect and discriminate inert unexploded ordnance (UXO) utilizing the APG Standardized UXO Technology Demonstration Site Open Field. Scoring Records have been coordinated by Larry Overbay and the Standardized UXO Technology Demonstration Site Scoring Committee. Organizations on the committee include, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program, the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, the Institute for Defense Analysis, the U.S. Army Environmental Center, and the U.S. Army Aberdeen Test Center.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
Shaw Environmental, Inc., UXO Standardized Technology Demonstration Site Program, Open Field UXO Mapper Magnetometer G858 Sensor/Pushcart

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER *(Include area code)*
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	UL		

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors:

Larry Overbay Jr.
Matthew Boutin
Military Environmental Technology Demonstration Center (METDC)
U.S. Army Aberdeen Test Center (ATC)
U.S. Army Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG)

Rick Fling
Christina McClung
Aberdeen Test and Support Services (ATSS)
Sverdrup Technology, Inc.
U.S. Army Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG)

Contributor:

George Robitaille
U.S. Army Environmental Center (AEC)
U.S. Army Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG)

(Page ii Blank)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
	SECTION 1. GENERAL INFORMATION	
1.1	BACKGROUND	1
1.2	SCORING OBJECTIVES	1
	1.2.1 Scoring Methodology	1
	1.2.2 Scoring Factors	3
1.3	STANDARD AND NONSTANDARD INERT ORDNANCE TARGETS	4
	SECTION 2. DEMONSTRATION	
2.1	DEMONSTRATOR INFORMATION	5
	2.1.1 Demonstrator Point of Contact (POC) and Address	5
	2.1.2 System Description	5
	2.1.3 Data Processing Description	7
	2.1.4 Data Submission Format	7
	2.1.5 Demonstrator Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC)	8
	2.1.6 Additional Records	9
2.2	APG SITE INFORMATION	10
	2.2.1 Location	10
	2.2.2 Soil Type	10
	2.2.3 Test Areas	10
	SECTION 3. FIELD DATA	
3.1	DATE OF FIELD ACTIVITIES	11
3.2	AREAS TESTED/NUMBER OF HOURS	11
3.3	TEST CONDITIONS	11
	3.3.1 Weather Conditions	11
	3.3.2 Field Conditions	11
	3.3.3 Soil Moisture	11
3.4	FIELD ACTIVITIES	12
	3.4.1 Setup/Mobilization	12
	3.4.2 Calibration	12
	3.4.3 Downtime Occasions	12
	3.4.4 Data Collection	12
	3.4.5 Demobilization	12
3.5	PROCESSING TIME	13
3.6	DEMONSTRATOR'S FIELD PERSONNEL	13
3.7	DEMONSTRATOR'S FIELD SURVEYING METHOD	13
3.8	SUMMARY OF DAILY LOGS	13

SECTION 4. TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS

		PAGE
4.1	ROC CURVES USING ALL ORDNANCE CATEGORIES	15
4.2	ROC CURVES USING ORDNANCE LARGER THAN 20 MM	16
4.3	PERFORMANCE SUMMARIES	18
4.4	EFFICIENCY, REJECTION RATES, AND TYPE CLASSIFICATION	19
4.5	LOCATION ACCURACY	20

SECTION 5. ON-SITE LABOR COSTS

SECTION 6. COMPARISON OF RESULTS TO BLIND GRID DEMONSTRATION

6.1	SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM BLIND GRID DEMONSTRATION	23
6.2	COMPARISON OF ROC CURVES USING ALL ORDNANCE CATEGORIES	23
6.3	COMPARISON OF ROC CURVES USING ORDNANCE LARGER THAN 20 MM	25
6.4	STATISTICAL COMPARISONS	26

SECTION 7. APPENDIXES

A	TERMS AND DEFINITIONS	A-1
B	DAILY WEATHER LOGS	B-1
C	SOIL MOISTURE	C-1
D	DAILY ACTIVITY LOGS	D-1
E	REFERENCES	E-1
F	ABBREVIATIONS	F-1
G	DISTRIBUTION LIST	G-1

SECTION 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Technologies under development for the detection and discrimination of unexploded ordnance (UXO) require testing so that their performance can be characterized. To that end, Standardized Test Sites have been developed at Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), Maryland and U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground (YPG), Arizona. These test sites provide a diversity of geology, climate, terrain, and weather as well as diversity in ordnance and clutter. Testing at these sites is independently administered and analyzed by the government for the purposes of characterizing technologies, tracking performance with system development, comparing performance of different systems, and comparing performance in different environments.

The Standardized UXO Technology Demonstration Site Program is a multi-agency program spearheaded by the U.S. Army Environmental Center (AEC). The U.S. Army Aberdeen Test Center (ATC) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Engineering Research and Development Center (ERDC) provide programmatic support. The program is being funded and supported by the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP), the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) and the Army Environmental Quality Technology Program (EQT).

1.2 SCORING OBJECTIVES

The objective in the Standardized UXO Technology Demonstration Site Program is to evaluate the detection and discrimination capabilities of a given technology under various field and soil conditions. Inert munitions and clutter items are positioned in various orientations and depths in the ground.

The evaluation objectives are as follows:

a. To determine detection and discrimination effectiveness under realistic scenarios that vary targets, geology, clutter, topography, and vegetation.

b. To determine cost, time, and manpower requirements to operate the technology.

c. To determine demonstrator's ability to analyze survey data in a timely manner and provide prioritized "Target Lists" with associated confidence levels.

d. To provide independent site management to enable the collection of high quality, ground-truth, geo-referenced data for post-demonstration analysis.

1.2.1 Scoring Methodology

a. The scoring of the demonstrator's performance is conducted in two stages. These two stages are termed the RESPONSE STAGE and DISCRIMINATION STAGE. For both stages, the probability of detection (P_d) and the false alarms are reported as receiver-operating

characteristic (ROC) curves. False alarms are divided into those anomalies that correspond to emplaced clutter items, measuring the probability of false positive (P_{fp}), and those that do not correspond to any known item, termed background alarms.

b. The RESPONSE STAGE scoring evaluates the ability of the system to detect emplaced targets without regard to ability to discriminate ordnance from other anomalies. For the blind grid RESPONSE STAGE, the demonstrator provides the scoring committee with a target response from each and every grid square along with a noise level below which target responses are deemed insufficient to warrant further investigation. This list is generated with minimal processing and, since a value is provided for every grid square, will include signals both above and below the system noise level.

c. The DISCRIMINATION STAGE evaluates the demonstrator's ability to correctly identify ordnance as such and to reject clutter. For the blind grid DISCRIMINATION STAGE, the demonstrator provides the scoring committee with the output of the algorithms applied in the discrimination-stage processing for each grid square. The values in this list are prioritized based on the demonstrator's determination that a grid square is likely to contain ordnance. Thus, higher output values are indicative of higher confidence that an ordnance item is present at the specified location. For digital signal processing, priority ranking is based on algorithm output. For other discrimination approaches, priority ranking is based on human (subjective) judgment. The demonstrator also specifies the threshold in the prioritized ranking that provides optimum performance, (i.e. that is expected to retain all detected ordnance and rejects the maximum amount of clutter).

d. The demonstrator is also scored on EFFICIENCY and REJECTION RATIO, which measures the effectiveness of the discrimination stage processing. The goal of discrimination is to retain the greatest number of ordnance detections from the anomaly list, while rejecting the maximum number of anomalies arising from non-ordnance items. EFFICIENCY measures the fraction of detected ordnance retained after discrimination, while the REJECTION RATIO measures the fraction of false alarms rejected. Both measures are defined relative to performance at the demonstrator-supplied level below which all responses are considered noise, i.e., the maximum ordnance detectable by the sensor and its accompanying false positive rate or background alarm rate.

e. Based on configuration of the ground truth at the standardized sites and the defined scoring methodology, there exists the possibility of having anomalies within overlapping halos and/or multiple anomalies within halos. In these cases, the following scoring logic is implemented:

(1) In situations where multiple anomalies exist within a single R_{halo}, the anomaly with the strongest response or highest ranking will be assigned to that particular ground truth item.

(2) For overlapping R_{halo} situations, ordnance has precedence over clutter. The anomaly with the strongest response or highest ranking that is closest to the center of a particular ground truth item gets assigned to that item. Remaining anomalies are retained until all matching is complete.

(3) Anomalies located within any R_{halo} that do not get associated with a particular ground truth item are thrown out and are not considered in the analysis.

f. All scoring factors are generated utilizing the Standardized UXO Probability and Plot Program, version 3.1.1.

1.2.2 Scoring Factors

Factors to be measured and evaluated as part of this demonstration include:

a. Response Stage ROC curves:

(1) Probability of Detection (P_d^{res}).

(2) Probability of False Positive (P_{fp}^{res}).

(3) Background Alarm Rate (BAR^{res}) or Probability of Background Alarm (P_{BA}^{res}).

b. Discrimination Stage ROC curves:

(1) Probability of Detection (P_d^{disc}).

(2) Probability of False Positive (P_{fp}^{disc}).

(3) Background Alarm Rate (BAR^{disc}) or Probability of Background Alarm (P_{BA}^{disc}).

c. Metrics:

(1) Efficiency (E).

(2) False Positive Rejection Rate (R_{fp}).

(3) Background Alarm Rejection Rate (R_{BA}).

d. Other:

(1) Probability of Detection by Size and Depth.

(2) Classification by type (i.e., 20-, 40-, 105-mm, etc.).

(3) Location accuracy.

(4) Equipment setup, calibration time and corresponding man-hour requirements.

(5) Survey time and corresponding man-hour requirements.

(6) Reacquisition/resurvey time and man-hour requirements (if any).

(7) Downtime due to system malfunctions and maintenance requirements.

1.3 STANDARD AND NONSTANDARD INERT ORDNANCE TARGETS

The standard and nonstandard ordnance items emplaced in the test areas are listed in Table 1. Standardized targets are members of a set of specific ordnance items that have identical properties to all other items in the set (caliber, configuration, size, weight, aspect ratio, material, filler, magnetic remanence, and nomenclature). Nonstandard targets are inert ordnance items having properties that differ from those in the set of standardized targets.

TABLE 1. INERT ORDNANCE TARGETS

Standard Type	Nonstandard (NS)
20-mm Projectile M55	20-mm Projectile M55
	20-mm Projectile M97
40-mm Grenades M385	40-mm Grenades M385
40-mm Projectile MKII Bodies	40-mm Projectile M813
BDU-28 Submunition	
BLU-26 Submunition	
M42 Submunition	
57-mm Projectile APC M86	
60-mm Mortar M49A3	60-mm Mortar (JPG)
	60-mm Mortar M49
2.75-inch Rocket M230	2.75-inch Rocket M230
	2.75-inch Rocket XM229
MK 118 ROCKEYE	
81-mm Mortar M374	81-mm Mortar (JPG)
	81-mm Mortar M374
105-mm HEAT Rounds M456	
105-mm Projectile M60	105-mm Projectile M60
155-mm Projectile M483A1	155-mm Projectile M483A
	500-lb Bomb

JPG = Jefferson Proving Ground
HEAT = high-explosive antitank

SECTION 2. DEMONSTRATION

2.1 DEMONSTRATOR INFORMATION

2.1.1 Demonstrator Point of Contact (POC) and Address

POC: John E. Foley, PHD.
(865)-690-3211
jack.foley@shawgrp.com

Address: 312 Director's Drive
Knoxsville, TN 37923

2.1.2 System Description (provided by demonstrator)

Shaw's geophysical mapping technology is an engineered combination of off-the-shelf geophysical sensors, innovative navigation technologies, a flexible/configurable deployment system, and customized data acquisition software. For this demonstration a G858 magnetometer configuration has been selected. The Shaw UXO Mapper has both hardware and software components:

Hardware:

System hardware consists of four integrated components; 1) G858 magnetometer sensors, 2) Shaw's composite-material cart survey system, 3) the Leica TPS1100 dual laser robotic total station (RTS), and 4) the Crossbow solid state gyro. Shaw's UXO Mapper was engineered as a mapping device that can be customized to adapt to a wide range of conditions seen on UXO sites. Customizations available for survey optimization include the number, spacing, and height of the sensors; the number of wheels (2 or 4) and wheel diameter; the forward sensor distances (relative to the wheel base), and handle configuration (to push, pull or tow the system) allowing the flexibility to customize the configuration of the equipment to respond to local site conditions and maximize data quality.

For navigation, the Shaw UXO Mapper uses Robotic Total Station (RTS) technology. The Leica TSP1100 RTS is a motorized robotic total station that uses automatic target recognition to track the location of the prism and has a highly accurate distance/azimuth measurement system to produce $\pm$ 5 mm +2 ppm accuracy, which translates to 0.25 inches (3D) at distances of up to 1400 feet.

Software:

The Shaw UXO Mapper has three software components. First, customized RTS firmware is used to track the roving prism. Developed specifically for Shaw's UXO mapping applications, this firmware allows for rapid collection of data to 4 hertz and outputs solutions to the base station and rover units. The firmware enables the user to optimize prism-tracking parameters for rapid recovery of lock if obstructed by trees during a survey. Second, Shaw's data control

software determines precise time synchronization between the RTS and sensor time bases, ensuring accurate collection of all data. Third, Shaw's software for data merging accommodates various sensor navigation geometries used during data collection and provides a robust framework to spatially configure sensors relative to each other and with respect to the prism location. Additionally, this software allows RTS and sensor data to be merged in either a straightforward interpolation mode (for open areas) or in hybrid switching mode that alternates to "dead reckoning" for the brief periods when the RTS is obstructed in the woods.

Shaw Cart System:

The composite and fiberglass cart system deploys magnetometers, gradiometers, or electromagnetic (EM) sensors. The device has been modified to replace the standard configuration of the EM61 cart system. This adaptation is critical to collection of high fidelity data, as the operator has enhanced control of the sensor in terms of sensor orientation.

The RTS tracks a prism mounted on the Shaw cart system in open and wooded conditions. The device tracks the prism to the centimeter level in three dimensions at a rate of up to 4 Hz. The RTS and modified deployment system allows collection of the high density, high fidelity data needed for improved UXO detection and discrimination. Shaw's cart system allows for rapid collection of high-fidelity data from the magnetometer and EM sensors.



Figure 1. Shaw UXO Mapper (G858 Magnetometer Array Configuration).

2.1.3 Data Processing Description (provided by demonstrator)

Shaw's standard data processing includes data leveling, statistical data assessment, grid generation, and customized data filtering to accentuate target signatures. Shaw uses software from the sensor manufacturers, in-house software, and Geosoft's Oasis Montaj and UX-Detect Software and MATLAB to complete all tasks. Collected field data are downloaded from the data acquisition system as American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII) XYZ files. Custom Shaw software is used to download the data and for initial review, generation of summary statistics, and conversion data formats, gridding and analysis. All activities will be documented on the Data Processing Log. The initial steps taken in the data processing flow include:

Initial Review of Collected Data: Validate that data fall within prescribed recording ranges, establish number of points collected, data density, and time-on/time-off.

Statistical Analysis: Review XYZ statistics describing survey coordinates and sensor values, etc.
Data Leveling: Based on the initial review and statistics, and calibration data as well as diurnal variations magnetic data are adjusted.

Data Cataloging: All data are stored in Oracle database for subsequent review and analysis.

Data Gridding: XYZ data are interpolated using Geosoft onto 0.25-foot grid and reviewed by a geophysicist.

Data Filtering: After assessment, data filters are applied to enhance target signatures by reducing the effects of high frequency and/or low frequency noise sources.

Target Detection: Shaw's automated "region growing" techniques are used initially detect targets. Next, a geophysicist visually detects targets and reviews auto-detections.

Target Analysis: Magnetic data are analyzed with separate methods to define target parameters. All target data (raw data, processed data, and analysis parameters) are stored within the Oracle database and analyzed in MATLAB via a linked database connection.

Magnetic Analysis: Each target is modeled with an induced dipole model where a least squares fit is made to the data. This produces estimates of target location, depth, azimuth, dip, magnetic moment and effective diameter. Dipole "misfit" surfaces are analyzed to produce measure is fit quality and to identify elongate and/or compound targets.

Shaw's target detection and analysis methods for the magnetic data form the basis of our target discrimination process.

2.1.4 Data Submission Format

Data were submitted for scoring in accordance with data submission protocols outlined in the Standardized UXO Technology Demonstration Site Handbook. These submitted data are not included in this report in order to protect ground truth information.

2.1.5 Demonstrator Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC) (provided by demonstrator)

Quality Control for geophysical mapping is ensured through utilization of qualified staff, adherence to standard procedures, and full documentation. The following procedures and logs are used to maximize standardization, repeatability, and control of mapping activities:

- Calibration - Geophysical instruments used for geophysical mapping will be field-tested daily to ensure that they are operating properly. The site geophysicist will establish standard verification procedures and will be provided in the submitted Work Plans. The function of each geophysical instrument will be checked according to the manufacturer's specifications upon daily checkout by the survey teams. The site geophysicist is responsible for the assessment of instrument functionality and will review and sign each Equipment Verification Log prior to deployment in the field.

- Data Processing Log - All data from the field are run through a standard data processing procedure. This procedure is the same for all data and is tracked with the Data Processing Log. This log documents all coordinate transformations, visual data-quality checks, statistical data-quality checks, survey-coverage statistics, interpolation parameters, etc.

- Crew Deployment Log - This log defines the location of each geophysical survey crew on a daily basis. The log tracks crewmembers, equipment, and expected area to be surveyed. Attached to this daily log are maps of the areas to be surveyed containing the coordinates of benchmarks in the areas as well as the coordinate of each quadrant corner.

- Field Activity Log - This log is filled out by each crew chief and details all activities of the survey. This is a daily log and contains observations about crew performance, sensor performance, site conditions, and weather changes.

- Equipment Verification Log - This log documents the daily calibration of each field instrument. Daily calibration procedures are executed for each geophysical and navigational instrument. The sensor system is brought to a calibration area before each survey day starts and the background magnetic field and the magnetic field signal from a reference target is measured and recorded.

- Data Control Log - Kept in the office trailer, this log tracks all data flowing in from the field and out of the office. Data include all geophysical field data, sensor verification data (via Equipment Verification Logs), all field notes from Field Activity Logs, and all RTS quadrant coordinate data.

- Data Analysis Log - All data reduction, processing and analysis steps are documented through this form. Each log is checked by the project geophysicist for completeness and adherence to pre-defined procedures,

- Target Reanalysis – All targets analyzed as part of the project will be subject to review by the project geophysicist. Additionally, a minimum of 10 percent of all targets will be reanalyzed by a separate geophysicist to ensure data quality.

Quality assurance measures the Quality Control activities described above. To ensure complete and continuous area coverage, the magnetometer will be collected in 6-foot swaths. Since the magnetometer sensors are 1.5 feet apart, the effective line spacing will be 1.5 feet. Deviations from the line spacing are anticipated where obstructions such as trees exist. Maps of the traverses will be plotted and obstructions verified.

Additionally, standardization procedures implemented on a site-specific basis to maximize efficiency and to adjust to logistical and schedule requirements. The procedure below shall be utilized at the site to define the spatial accuracy of the data, check the sample-rate selection as well as the repeatability of the sensor readings:

1. A 50-foot-long straight-line transect will be established with the positions of the endpoints and midpoint logged via RTS. Wherever possible the traverse line will be oriented North to South.

2. Each survey system (sensor and navigation unit) used to collect data will be operated over the transect each day following these steps:

- An operator will log "background" data along the traverse, first heading north from the southern endpoint, and then returning south from the northern endpoint.
- A metallic target such as a trailer-hitch ball or pin flag shall be placed over the midpoint.
- The operator will log data along the same path, first traveling north, then returning south.
- The operator will log data along the same path, first traveling north at a slow pace, then returning south at a significantly more rapid pace.

3. All data lines will be downloaded and provided to the site geophysicist for review. These data will be examined to determine the repeatability of the anomaly amplitude and the repeatability of the positional location of the amplitude peak.

2.1.6 Additional Records

The following record(s) by this vendor can be accessed via the Internet as MicroSoft Word documents at www.uxotestsites.org. The Blind Grid counterpart to this report is Scoring Record No. 198.

2.2 APG SITE INFORMATION

2.2.1 Location

The APG Standardized Test Site is located within a secured range area of the Aberdeen Area. The Aberdeen Area of APG is located approximately 30 miles northeast of Baltimore at the northern end of the Chesapeake Bay. The Standardized Test Site encompasses 17 acres of upland and lowland flats, woods and wetlands.

2.2.2 Soil Type

According to the soils survey conducted for the entire area of APG in 1998, the test site consists primarily of Elkton Series type soil (ref 2). The Elkton Series consist of very deep, slowly permeable, poorly drained soils. These soils formed in silty aeolin sediments and the underlying loamy alluvial and marine sediments. They are on upland and lowland flats and in depressions of the Mid-Atlantic Coastal Plain. Slopes range from 0 to 2 percent.

ERDC conducted a site-specific analysis in May of 2002 (ref 3). The results basically matched the soil survey mentioned above. Seventy percent of the samples taken were classified as silty loam. The majority (77 percent) of the soil samples had a measured water content between 15- and 30-percent with the water content decreasing slightly with depth.

For more details concerning the soil properties at the APG test site, go to www.uxotestsites.org on the web to view the entire soils description report.

2.2.3 Test Areas

A description of the test site areas at APG is included in Table 2.

TABLE 2. TEST SITE AREAS

Area	Description
Calibration Grid	Contains 14 standard ordnance items buried in six positions at various angles and depths to allow demonstrator to calibrate their equipment.
Blind Test Grid	Contains 400 grid cells in a 0.2-hectare (0.5 acre) site. The center of each grid cell contains ordnance, clutter or nothing.
Open Field	A 4-hectare (10-acre) site containing open areas, dips, ruts and obstructions that challenge platform systems or hand held detectors. The challenges include a gravel road, wet areas and trees. The vegetation height varies from 15 to 25 cm.

SECTION 3. FIELD DATA

3.1 DATE OF FIELD ACTIVITIES (9, 16, 18 and 19 December 2003)

3.2 AREAS TESTED/NUMBER OF HOURS

Areas tested and total number of hours operated at each site are summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3. AREAS TESTED AND NUMBER OF HOURS

Area	Number of Hours
Calibration Lanes	2.00
Blind Grid	14.33

3.3 TEST CONDITIONS

3.3.1 Weather Conditions

An APG weather station located approximately one mile west of the test site was used to record average temperature and precipitation on a half hour basis for each day of operation. The temperatures listed in Table 4 represent the average temperature during field operations from 0700 to 1700 hours while precipitation data represents a daily total amount of rainfall. Hourly weather logs used to generate this summary are provided in Appendix B.

TABLE 4. TEMPERATURE/PRECIPITATION DATA SUMMARY

Date, 2003	Average Temperature, °F	Total Daily Precipitation, in.
December 9	33.68	0.12
December 16	40.21	0.00
December 18	34.33	0.00
December 19	33.94	0.00

3.3.2 Field Conditions

Shaw surveyed the Open field with the MAG G858 on 9, 16, 18 and 19 December 2003. The Open field was muddy and frozen in areas due to rain and snow events occurring before and during testing.

3.3.3 Soil Moisture

Three soil probes were placed at various locations within the site to capture soil moisture data: Calibration, Mogul, and Wooded areas. Measurements were collected in percent moisture and were taken twice daily (morning and afternoon) from five different soil depths (1 to 6 in., 6 to 12 in., 12 to 24 in., 24 to 36 in., and 36 to 48 in.) from each probe. Soil moisture logs are included in Appendix C.

3.4 FIELD ACTIVITIES

3.4.1 Setup/Mobilization

These activities included initial mobilization and daily equipment preparation and break down. A three-person crew took 2 hours and 4 minutes to perform the initial setup and mobilization. There was 1-hour and 55 minutes of daily equipment preparation and end of the day equipment break down lasted 1-hour and 45 minutes.

3.4.2 Calibration

Shaw spent a total of 2 hours in the calibration lanes, 25 minutes of which was spent collecting data and 5 minutes performing a calibration exercise. An additional 30 minutes was spent calibrating in the Open Field area.

3.4.3 Downtime Occasions

Occasions of downtime are grouped into five categories: equipment/data checks or equipment maintenance, equipment failure and repair, weather, Demonstration Site issues, or breaks/lunch. All downtime is included for the purposes of calculating labor costs (section 5) except for downtime due to Demonstration Site issues. Demonstration Site issues, while noted in the Daily Log, are considered non-chargeable downtime for the purposes of calculating labor costs and are not discussed. Breaks and lunches are discussed in this section and billed to the total Site Survey area.

3.4.3.1 Equipment/data checks, maintenance. Equipment data checks and maintenance activities accounted for 25 minutes of site usage time. These activities included changing out batteries and routine data checks to ensure the data was being properly recorded/collected. Shaw spent an additional 40 minutes for breaks and lunches.

3.4.3.2 Equipment failure or repair. No time was needed to resolve equipment failures that occurred while surveying the Open Field.

3.4.3.3 Weather. No weather delays occurred during the survey.

3.4.4 Data Collection

Shaw spent a total time of 14 hours and 20 minutes in the Open Field area, 9 hours and 35 minutes of which was spent collecting data.

3.4.5 Demobilization

The Shaw crew went on to conducted a full demonstration of the site. Therefore, demobilization did not occur until 19 December 2003. On that day, it took the crew 2 hours and 40 minutes to break down and pack up their equipment.

3.5 PROCESSING TIME

Shaw submitted the raw data from the demonstration activities on the last day of the demonstration, as required. The scoring submittal data was also provided within the required 30-day timeframe.

3.6 DEMONSTRATOR'S FIELD PERSONNEL

Kent Boler; Project Geophysicist
Raul Fonda; Site Geophysicist
Jeremy Flemmer; Staff Geophysicist
Jeff Livingston; Field technician

3.7 DEMONSTRATOR'S FIELD SURVEYING METHOD

Shaw started surveying the Open field in the northeast portion and surveyed in an east/west direction. One lane was surveyed and then the demonstrator returned to the beginning of the next lane until completion. Shaw tried to survey the drier areas of the site first and then moved on to the saturated areas.

3.8 SUMMARY OF DAILY LOGS

Daily logs capture all field activities during this demonstration and are located in Appendix D. Activities pertinent to this specific demonstration are indicated in highlighted text.

(Page 14 Blank)

SECTION 4. TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS

4.1 ROC CURVES USING ALL ORDNANCE CATEGORIES

Figure 2 shows the probability of detection for the response stage (P_d^{res}) and the discrimination stage (P_d^{disc}) versus their respective probability of false positive. Figure 3 shows both probabilities plotted against their respective background alarm rate. Both figures use horizontal lines to illustrate the performance of the demonstrator at two demonstrator-specified points: at the system noise level for the response stage, representing the point below which targets are not considered detectable, and at the demonstrator's recommended threshold level for the discrimination stage, defining the subset of targets the demonstrator would recommend digging based on discrimination. Note that all points have been rounded to protect the ground truth.

The overall ground truth is composed of ferrous and non-ferrous anomalies. Due to limitations of the magnetometer, the non-ferrous items cannot be detected. Therefore, the ROC curves presented in this section are based on the subset of the ground truth that is solely made up of ferrous anomalies.




Figure 2. MAG G858 pushcart open field probability of detection for response and discrimination stages versus their respective probability of false positive over all ordnance categories combined.




Figure 3. MAG G858 pushcart open field probability of detection for response and discrimination stages versus their respective background alarm rate over all ordnance categories combined.

4.2 ROC CURVES USING ORDNANCE LARGER THAN 20 MM

Figure 4 shows the probability of detection for the response stage (P_d^{res}) and the discrimination stage (P_d^{disc}) versus their respective probability of false positive when only targets larger than 20 mm are scored. Figure 5 shows both probabilities plotted against their respective probability of background alarm. Both figures use horizontal lines to illustrate the performance of the demonstrator at two demonstrator-specified points: at the system noise level for the response stage, representing the point below which targets are not considered detectable, and at the demonstrator's recommended threshold level for the discrimination stage, defining the subset of targets the demonstrator would recommend digging based on discrimination. Note that all points have been rounded to protect the ground truth.




Figure 4. MAG G858 pushcart open field probability of detection for response and discrimination stages versus their respective probability of false positive for all ordnance larger than 20 mm.




Figure 5. MAG G858 pushcart open field probability of detection for response and discrimination stages versus their respective background alarm rate for all ordnance larger than 20 mm.

4.3 PERFORMANCE SUMMARIES

Results for the Open Field test, broken out by size, depth and nonstandard ordnance, are presented in Tables 5a and 5b (for cost results, see section 5). Results by size and depth include both standard and nonstandard ordnance. The results by size show how well the demonstrator did at detecting/discriminating ordnance of a certain caliber range (see app A for size definitions). The results are relative to the number of ordnances emplaced. Depth is measured from the geometeric center of anomolies.

The RESPONSE STAGE results are derived from the list of anomalies above the demonstrator-provided noise level. The results for the DISCRIMINATION STAGE are derived from the demonstrator's recommended threshold for optimizing UXO field cleanup by minimizing false digs and maximizing ordnance recovery. The lower 90-percent confidence limit on probability of detection and probability of false positive was calculated assuming that the number of detections and false positives are binomially distributed random variables. All results in Tables 5a and 5b have been rounded to protect the ground truth. However, lower confidence limits were calculated using actual results.

The overall ground truth is composed of ferrous and non-ferrous anomalies. Due to limitations of the magnetometer, the non-ferrous items cannot be detected. Therefore, the summary presented in Table 5a exhibits results based on the subset of the ground truth that is solely the ferrous anomalies. Table 5b exhibits results based on the full ground truth. All other tables presented in this section are based on scoring against the ferrous only ground truth. The response stage noise level and recommended discrimination stage threshold values are provided by the demonstrator.

TABLE 5a. SUMMARY OF OPEN FIELD RESULTS (FERROUS ONLY)

Metric	Overall	Standard	Nonstandard	By Size			By Depth, m		
				Small	Medium	Large	< 0.3	0.3 to <1	>= 1
RESPONSE STAGE									
P_d	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.15	0.20	0.35	0.20	0.30	0.15
P_d Low 90% Conf	0.19	0.18	0.17	0.09	0.16	0.28	0.13	0.23	0.10
P_d Upper 90% Conf	0.25	0.26	0.27	0.19	0.26	0.44	0.23	0.35	0.24
P_{fp}	0.15	-	-	-	-	-	0.15	0.15	0.20
P_{fp} Low 90% Conf	0.15	-	-	-	-	-	0.14	0.15	0.07
P_{fp} Upper 90% Conf	0.18	-	-	-	-	-	0.18	0.20	0.37
BAR	0.35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DISCRIMINATION STAGE									
P_d	0.20	0.20	0.15	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.15	0.25	0.10
P_d Low 90% Conf	0.26	0.17	0.13	0.07	0.15	0.24	0.13	0.22	0.05
P_d Upper 90% Conf	0.22	0.25	0.23	0.15	0.25	0.39	0.22	0.33	0.17
P_{fp}	0.15	-	-	-	-	-	0.15	0.15	0.20
P_{fp} Low 90% Conf	0.14	-	-	-	-	-	0.13	0.14	0.07
P_{fp} Upper 90% Conf	0.17	-	-	-	-	-	0.17	0.19	0.37
BAR	0.25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Response Stage Noise Level: -25.00
Recommended Discrimination Stage Threshold: 6.95

TABLE 5b. SUMMARY OF OPEN FIELD RESULTS (FULL GROUND TRUTH)

Metric	Overall	Standard	Nonstandard	By Size			By Depth, m		
				Small	Medium	Large	< 0.3	0.3 to <1	>= 1
RESPONSE STAGE									
P_d	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.10	0.20	0.35	0.15	0.30	0.15
P_d Low 90% Conf	0.17	0.17	0.15	0.08	0.16	0.28	0.11	0.23	0.10
P_d Upper 90% Conf	0.23	0.24	0.24	0.15	0.26	0.44	0.19	0.34	0.23
P_{fp}	0.15	-	-	-	-	-	0.15	0.15	0.20
P_{fp} Low 90% Conf	0.15	-	-	-	-	-	0.13	0.14	0.07
P_{fp} Upper 90% Conf	0.18	-	-	-	-	-	0.18	0.19	0.37
BAR	0.35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DISCRIMINATION STAGE									
P_d	0.15	0.20	0.15	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.15	0.25	0.10
P_d Low 90% Conf	0.15	0.15	0.12	0.06	0.15	0.24	0.11	0.20	0.05
P_d Upper 90% Conf	0.20	0.23	0.20	0.12	0.25	0.39	0.18	0.31	0.16
P_{fp}	0.15	-	-	-	-	-	0.15	0.15	0.20
P_{fp} Low 90% Conf	0.14	-	-	-	-	-	0.12	0.14	0.07
P_{fp} Upper 90% Conf	0.17	-	-	-	-	-	0.17	0.18	0.37
BAR	0.25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Response Stage Noise Level: -25.00.
Recommended Discrimination Stage Threshold 6.95

Note: The recommended discrimination stage threshold values are provided by the demonstrator.

4.4 EFFICIENCY, REJECTION RATES, AND TYPE CLASSIFICATION

Efficiency and rejection rates are calculated to quantify the discrimination ability at specific points of interest on the ROC curve: (1) at the point where no decrease in P_d is suffered (i.e., the efficiency is by definition equal to one) and (2) at the operator selected threshold. These values are reported in Table 6.

TABLE 6. EFFICIENCY AND REJECTION RATES

	Efficiency (E)	False Positive Rejection Rate	Background Alarm Rejection Rate
At Operating Point	0.89	0.05	0.39
With No Loss of P_d	1.00	0.01	0.02

At the demonstrator's recommended setting, the ordnance items that were detected and correctly discriminated were further scored on whether their correct type could be identified (table 7). Correct type examples include "20-mm projectile, 105-mm HEAT Projectile, and 2.75-inch Rocket". A list of the standard type declaration required for each ordnance item was provided to demonstrators prior to testing. For example, the standard type for the three example items are 20mmP, 105H, and 2.75in, respectively.

TABLE 7. CORRECT TYPE CLASSIFICATION OF TARGETS CORRECTLY DISCRIMINATED AS UXO

Size	Percentage Correct
Small	N/A
Medium	N/A
Large	N/A
Overall	N/A

Note: The demonstrator did not attempt to provide type classification.

4.5 LOCATION ACCURACY

The mean location error and standard deviations appear in Table 8. These calculations are based on average missed depth for ordnance correctly identified in the discrimination stage. Depths are measured from the closest point of the ordnance to the surface. For the Blind Grid, only depth errors are calculated, since (X, Y) positions are known to be the centers of each grid square.

TABLE 8. MEAN LOCATION ERROR AND STANDARD DEVIATION (M)

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Northing	-0.02	0.29
Easting	0.07	0.30
Depth	N/A	N/A

Note: The demonstrator did not attempt to declare depth of detection.

SECTION 5. ON-SITE LABOR COSTS

A standardized estimate for labor costs associated with this effort was calculated as follows: the first person at the test site was designated "supervisor", the second person was designated "data analyst", and the third and following personnel were considered "field support". Standardized hourly labor rates were charged by title: supervisor at $95.00/hour, data analyst at $57.00/hour, and field support at $28.50/hour.

Government representatives monitored on-site activity. All on-site activities were grouped into one of ten categories: initial setup/mobilization, daily setup/stop, calibration, collecting data, downtime due to break/lunch, downtime due to equipment failure, downtime due to equipment/data checks or maintenance, downtime due to weather, downtime due to demonstration site issue, or demobilization. See Appendix D for the daily activity log. See section 3.4 for a summary of field activities.

The standardized cost estimate associated with the labor needed to perform the field activities is presented in Table 9. Note that calibration time includes time spent in the Calibration Lanes as well as field calibrations. "Site survey time" includes daily setup/stop time, collecting data, breaks/lunch, downtime due to equipment/data checks or maintenance, downtime due to failure, and downtime due to weather.

TABLE 9. ON-SITE LABOR COSTS

	No. People	Hourly Wage	Hours	Cost
Initial Setup				
Supervisor	1	$95.00	2.07	$196.65
Data Analyst	1	57.00	2.07	117.98
Field Support	1	28.50	2.07	58.99
SubTotal				**$373.62**
Calibration				
Supervisor	1	$95.00	2.50	$237.50
Data Analyst	1	57.00	2.50	142.50
Field Support	2	28.50	2.50	142.50
SubTotal				**$522.50**
Site Survey				
Supervisor	1	$95.00	14.33	$1,361.35
Data Analyst	1	57.00	14.33	816.81
Field Support	2	28.50	14.33	816.81
SubTotal				**$2,994.97**

See notes at end of table.

TABLE 9 (CONT'D)

	No. People	Hourly Wage	Hours	Cost
Demobilization				
Supervisor	1	$95.00	2.66	$252.70
Data Analyst	1	57.00	2.66	151.62
Field Support	2	28.50	2.66	151.62
Subtotal				**$555.94**
Total				**$4,447.03**

Notes: Calibration time includes time spent in the Calibration Lanes as well as calibration before each data run.

Site Survey time includes daily setup/stop time, collecting data, breaks/lunch, downtime due to system maintenance, failure, and weather.

SECTION 6. COMPARISON OF RESULTS TO BLIND GRID DEMONSTRATION (BASED ON FERROUS ONLY GROUND TRUTH)

6.1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM BLIND GRID DEMONSTRATION

Table 10 shows the results from the Blind Grid survey conducted prior to surveying the Open Field during the same site visit in December of 2004. Due to the system utilizing magnetometer type sensors, all results presented in the following section have been based on performance scoring against the ferrous only ground truth anomalies. For more details on the Blind Grid survey results reference section 2.1.6.

TABLE 10. SUMMARY OF BLIND GRID MAG ONLY RESULTS FOR THE MAG G858 (FERROUS ONLY)

Metric	Overall	Standard	Nonstandard	By Size			By Depth, m		
				Small	Medium	Large	< 0.3	0.3 to <1	>= 1
RESPONSE STAGE									
P_d	0.80	0.80	0.75	0.65	0.85	0.90	0.70	0.80	0.85
P_d Low 90% Conf	0.71	0.70	0.62	0.52	0.76	0.66	0.59	0.69	0.64
P_d Upper 90% Conf	0.85	0.88	0.87	0.77	0.94	0.99	0.83	0.91	0.96
P_{fp}	0.95	-	-	-	-	-	0.95	0.90	1.00
P_{fp} Low 90% Conf	0.88	-	-	-	-	-	0.86	0.82	0.63
P_{fp} Upper 90% Conf	0.96	-	-	-	-	-	0.98	0.96	1.00
P_{ba}	0.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DISCRIMINATION STAGE									
P_d	0.40	0.45	0.30	0.25	0.50	0.60	0.40	0.50	0.25
P_d Low 90% Conf	0.32	0.34	0.20	0.14	0.36	0.35	0.26	0.36	0.09
P_d Upper 90% Conf	0.48	0.55	0.47	0.37	0.61	0.81	0.52	0.64	0.44
P_{fp}	0.55	-	-	-	-	-	0.50	0.60	0.60
P_{fp} Low 90% Conf	0.49	-	-	-	-	-	0.41	0.51	0.25
P_{fp} Upper 90% Conf	0.63	-	-	-	-	-	0.61	0.72	0.89
P_{ba}	0.10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

6.2 COMPARISON OF ROC CURVES USING ALL ORDNANCE CATEGORIES

Figure 6 shows P_d^{res} versus the respective P_{fp} over all ordnance categories. Figure 7 shows P_d^{disc} versus their respective P_{fp} over all ordnance categories. Figure 7 uses horizontal lines to illustrate the performance of the demonstrator at the recommended discrimination threshold levels, defining the subset of targets the demonstrator would recommend digging based on discrimination. The ROC curves in this section are a sole reflection of the MAG only survey.




Figure 6. MAG G858 pushcart P_d^{res} stages versus the respective P_{fp} over all ordnance categories combined.




Figure 7. MAG G858 pushcart P_d^{disc} versus the respective P_{fp} over all ordnance categories combined.

6.3 COMPARISON OF ROC CURVES USING ORDNANCE LARGER THAN 20 MM

Figure 8 shows the P_d^{res} versus the respective probability of P_{fp} over ordnance larger than 20 mm. Figure 9 shows P_d^{disc} versus the respective P_{fp} over ordnance larger than 20 mm. Figure 9 uses horizontal lines to illustrate the performance of the demonstrator at the recommended discrimination threshold levels, defining the subset of targets the demonstrator would recommend digging based on discrimination.




Figure 8. MAG G858 pushcart P_d^{res} versus the respective P_{fp} for ordnance larger than 20 mm.




Figure 9. MAG G858 pushcart P_d^{disc} versus the respective P_{fp} for ordnance larger than 20 mm.

6.4 STATISTICAL COMPARISONS

Statistical Chi-square significance tests were used to compare results between the Blind Grid and Open Field scenarios. The intent of the comparison is to determine if the feature introduced in each scenario has a degrading effect on the performance of the sensor system. However, any modifications in the UXO sensor system during the test, like changes in the processing or changes in the selection of the operating threshold, will also contribute to performance differences.

The Chi-square test for comparison between ratios was used at a significance level of 0.05 to compare Blind Grid to Open Field with regard to P_d^{res}, P_d^{disc}, P_{fp}^{res} and P_{fp}^{disc}, Efficiency and Rejection Rate. These results are presented in Table 11. A detailed explanation and example of the Chi-square application is located in Appendix A.

TABLE 11. CHI-SQUARE RESULTS - BLIND GRID VERSUS OPEN FIELD

Metric	Small	Medium	Large	Overall
P_d^{res}	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
P_d^{disc}	Not Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Significant
P_{fp}^{res}	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Significant
P_{fp}^{disc}	-	-	-	Significant
Efficiency	-	-	-	Significant
Rejection rate	-	-	-	Significant

(Page 28 Blank)

SECTION 7. APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A. TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

GENERAL DEFINITIONS

Anomaly: Location of a system response deemed to warrant further investigation by the demonstrator for consideration as an emplaced ordnance item.

Detection: An anomaly location that is within R_{halo} of an emplaced ordnance item.

Emplaced Ordnance: An ordnance item buried by the government at a specified location in the test site.

Emplaced Clutter: A clutter item (i.e., non-ordnance item) buried by the government at a specified location in the test site.

R_{halo}: A pre-determined radius about the periphery of an emplaced item (clutter or ordnance) within which a location identified by the demonstrator as being of interest is considered to be a response from that item. If multiple declarations lie within R_{halo} of any item (clutter or ordnance), the declaration with the highest signal output within the R_{halo} will be utilized. For the purpose of this program, a circular halo 0.5 meters in radius will be placed around the center of the object for all clutter and ordnance items less than 0.6 meters in length. When ordnance items are longer than 0.6 meters, the halo becomes an ellipse where the minor axis remains 1 meter and the major axis is equal to the length of the ordnance plus 1 meter.

Small Ordnance: Caliber of ordnance less than or equal to 40 mm (includes 20-mm projectile, 40-mm projectile, submunitions BLU-26, BLU-63, and M42).

Medium Ordnance: Caliber of ordnance greater than 40 mm and less than or equal to 81 mm (includes 57-mm projectile, 60-mm mortar, 2.75 in. Rocket, MK118 Rockeye, 81-mm mortar).

Large Ordnance: Caliber of ordnance greater than 81 mm (includes 105-mm HEAT, 105-mm projectile, 155-mm projectile, 500-pound bomb).

Shallow: Items buried less than 0.3 meter below ground surface.

Medium: Items buried greater than or equal to 0.3 meter and less than 1 meter below ground surface.

Deep: Items buried greater than or equal to 1 meter below ground surface.

Response Stage Noise Level: The level that represents the point below which anomalies are not considered detectable. Demonstrators are required to provide the recommended noise level for the Blind Grid test area.

Discrimination Stage Threshold: The demonstrator selected threshold level that they believe provides optimum performance of the system by retaining all detectable ordnance and rejecting the maximum amount of clutter. This level defines the subset of anomalies the demonstrator would recommend digging based on discrimination.

Binomially Distributed Random Variable: A random variable of the type which has only two possible outcomes, say success and failure, is repeated for n independent trials with the probability p of success and the probability 1-p of failure being the same for each trial. The number of successes x observed in the n trials is an estimate of p and is considered to be a binomially distributed random variable.

RESPONSE AND DISCRIMINATION STAGE DATA

The scoring of the demonstrator's performance is conducted in two stages. These two stages are termed the RESPONSE STAGE and DISCRIMINATION STAGE. For both stages, the probability of detection (P_d) and the false alarms are reported as receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves. False alarms are divided into those anomalies that correspond to emplaced clutter items, measuring the probability of false positive (P_{fp}) and those that do not correspond to any known item, termed background alarms.

The RESPONSE STAGE scoring evaluates the ability of the system to detect emplaced targets without regard to ability to discriminate ordnance from other anomalies. For the RESPONSE STAGE, the demonstrator provides the scoring committee with the location and signal strength of all anomalies that the demonstrator has deemed sufficient to warrant further investigation and/or processing as potential emplaced ordnance items. This list is generated with minimal processing (e.g., this list will include all signals above the system noise threshold). As such, it represents the most inclusive list of anomalies.

The DISCRIMINATION STAGE evaluates the demonstrator's ability to correctly identify ordnance as such, and to reject clutter. For the same locations as in the RESPONSE STAGE anomaly list, the DISCRIMINATION STAGE list contains the output of the algorithms applied in the discrimination-stage processing. This list is prioritized based on the demonstrator's determination that an anomaly location is likely to contain ordnance. Thus, higher output values are indicative of higher confidence that an ordnance item is present at the specified location. For electronic signal processing, priority ranking is based on algorithm output. For other systems, priority ranking is based on human judgment. The demonstrator also selects the threshold that the demonstrator believes will provide "optimum" system performance, (i.e., that retains all the detected ordnance and rejects the maximum amount of clutter).

Note: The two lists provided by the demonstrator contain identical numbers of potential target locations. They differ only in the priority ranking of the declarations.

RESPONSE STAGE DEFINITIONS

Response Stage Probability of Detection (P_d^{res}): P_d^{res} = (No. of response-stage detections)/ (No. of emplaced ordnance in the test site).

Response Stage False Positive (fp^{res}): An anomaly location that is within R_{halo} of an emplaced clutter item.

Response Stage Probability of False Positive (P_{fp}^{res}): P_{fp}^{res} = (No. of response-stage false positives)/(No. of emplaced clutter items).

Response Stage Background Alarm (ba^{res}): An anomaly in a blind grid cell that contains neither emplaced ordnance nor an emplaced clutter item. An anomaly location in the open field or scenarios that is outside R_{halo} of any emplaced ordnance or emplaced clutter item.

Response Stage Probability of Background Alarm (P_{ba}^{res}): Blind Grid only: P_{ba}^{res} = (No. of response-stage background alarms)/(No. of empty grid locations).

Response Stage Background Alarm Rate (BAR^{res}): Open Field only: BAR^{res} = (No. of response-stage background alarms)/(arbitrary constant).

Note that the quantities P_d^{res}, P_{fp}^{res}, P_{ba}^{res}, and BAR^{res} are functions of t^{res}, the threshold applied to the response-stage signal strength. These quantities can therefore be written as $P_d^{res}(t^{res})$, $P_{fp}^{res}(t^{res})$, $P_{ba}^{res}(t^{res})$, and $BAR^{res}(t^{res})$.

DISCRIMINATION STAGE DEFINITIONS

Discrimination: The application of a signal processing algorithm or human judgment to response-stage data that discriminates ordnance from clutter. Discrimination should identify anomalies that the demonstrator has high confidence correspond to ordnance, as well as those that the demonstrator has high confidence correspond to nonordnance or background returns. The former should be ranked with highest priority and the latter with lowest.

Discrimination Stage Probability of Detection (P_d^{disc}): P_d^{disc} = (No. of discrimination-stage detections)/(No. of emplaced ordnance in the test site).

Discrimination Stage False Positive (fp^{disc}): An anomaly location that is within R_{halo} of an emplaced clutter item.

Discrimination Stage Probability of False Positive (P_{fp}^{disc}): P_{fp}^{disc} = (No. of discrimination stage false positives)/(No. of emplaced clutter items).

Discrimination Stage Background Alarm (ba^{disc}): An anomaly in a blind grid cell that contains neither emplaced ordnance nor an emplaced clutter item. An anomaly location in the open field or scenarios that is outside R_{halo} of any emplaced ordnance or emplaced clutter item.

Discrimination Stage Probability of Background Alarm (P_{ba}^{disc}): P_{ba}^{disc} = (No. of discrimination-stage background alarms)/(No. of empty grid locations).

Discrimination Stage Background Alarm Rate (BAR^{disc}): BAR^{disc} = (No. of discrimination-stage background alarms)/(arbitrary constant).

Note that the quantities P_d^{disc}, P_{fp}^{disc}, P_{ba}^{disc}, and BAR^{disc} are functions of t^{disc}, the threshold applied to the discrimination-stage signal strength. These quantities can therefore be written as $P_d^{disc}(t^{disc})$, $P_{fp}^{disc}(t^{disc})$, $P_{ba}^{disc}(t^{disc})$, and $BAR^{disc}(t^{disc})$.

RECEIVER-OPERATING CHARACERISTIC (ROC) CURVES

ROC curves at both the response and discrimination stages can be constructed based on the above definitions. The ROC curves plot the relationship between P_d versus P_{fp} and P_d versus BAR or P_{ba} as the threshold applied to the signal strength is varied from its minimum (t_{min}) to its maximum (t_{max}) value.[1] Figure A-1 shows how P_d versus P_{fp} and P_d versus BAR are combined into ROC curves. Note that the "res" and "disc" superscripts have been suppressed from all the variables for clarity.




Figure A-1. ROC curves for open field testing. Each curve applies to both the response and discrimination stages.

[1]Strictly speaking, ROC curves plot the P_d versus P_{ba} over a pre-determined and fixed number of detection opportunities (some of the opportunities are located over ordnance and others are located over clutter or blank spots). In an open field scenario, each system suppresses its signal strength reports until some bare-minimum signal response is received by the system. Consequently, the open field ROC curves do not have information from low signal-output locations, and, furthermore, different contractors report their signals over a different set of locations on the ground. These ROC curves are thus not true to the strict definition of ROC curves as defined in textbooks on detection theory. Note, however, that the ROC curves obtained in the Blind Grid test sites are true ROC curves.

METRICS TO CHARACTERIZE THE DISCRIMINATION STAGE

The demonstrator is also scored on efficiency and rejection ratio, which measure the effectiveness of the discrimination stage processing. The goal of discrimination is to retain the greatest number of ordnance detections from the anomaly list, while rejecting the maximum number of anomalies arising from nonordnance items. The efficiency measures the amount of detected ordnance retained by the discrimination, while the rejection ratio measures the fraction of false alarms rejected. Both measures are defined relative to the entire response list, i.e., the maximum ordnance detectable by the sensor and its accompanying false positive rate or background alarm rate.

Efficiency (E): $E = P_d^{disc}(t^{disc})/P_d^{res}(t_{min}^{res})$; Measures (at a threshold of interest), the degree to which the maximum theoretical detection performance of the sensor system (as determined by the response stage tmin) is preserved after application of discrimination techniques. Efficiency is a number between 0 and 1. An efficiency of 1 implies that all of the ordnance initially detected in the response stage was retained at the specified threshold in the discrimination stage, t^{disc}.

False Positive Rejection Rate (R_{fp}): $R_{fp} = 1 - [P_{fp}^{disc}(t^{disc})/P_{fp}^{res}(t_{min}^{res})]$; Measures (at a threshold of interest), the degree to which the sensor system's false positive performance is improved over the maximum false positive performance (as determined by the response stage tmin). The rejection rate is a number between 0 and 1. A rejection rate of 1 implies that all emplaced clutter initially detected in the response stage were correctly rejected at the specified threshold in the discrimination stage.

Background Alarm Rejection Rate (R_{ba}):

Blind Grid: $R_{ba} = 1 - [P_{ba}^{disc}(t^{disc})/P_{ba}^{res}(t_{min}^{res})]$.
Open Field: $R_{ba} = 1 - [BAR^{disc}(t^{disc})/BAR^{res}(t_{min}^{res})])$.

Measures the degree to which the discrimination stage correctly rejects background alarms initially detected in the response stage. The rejection rate is a number between 0 and 1. A rejection rate of 1 implies that all background alarms initially detected in the response stage were rejected at the specified threshold in the discrimination stage.

CHI-SQUARE COMPARISON EXPLANATION:

The Chi-square test for differences in probabilities (or 2 x 2 contingency table) is used to analyze two samples drawn from two different populations to see if both populations have the same or different proportions of elements in a certain category. More specifically, two random samples are drawn, one from each population, to test the null hypothesis that the probability of event A (some specified event) is the same for both populations (ref 3).

A 2 x 2 contingency table is used in the Standardized UXO Technology Demonstration Site Program to determine if there is reason to believe that the proportion of ordnance correctly detected/discriminated by demonstrator X's system is significantly degraded by the more challenging terrain feature introduced. The test statistic of the 2 x 2 contingency table is the

Chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom. Since an association between the more challenging terrain feature and relatively degraded performance is sought, a one-sided test is performed. A significance level of 0.05 is chosen which sets a critical decision limit of 2.71 from the Chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom. It is a critical decision limit because if the test statistic calculated from the data exceeds this value, the two proportions tested will be considered significantly different. If the test statistic calculated from the data is less than this value, the two proportions tested will be considered not significantly different.

An exception must be applied when either a 0 or 100 percent success rate occurs in the sample data. The Chi-square test cannot be used in these instances. Instead, Fischer's test is used and the critical decision limit for one-sided tests is the chosen significance level, which in this case is 0.05. With Fischer's test, if the test statistic is less than the critical value, the proportions are considered to be significantly different.

Standardized UXO Technology Demonstration Site examples, where blind grid results are compared to those from the open field and open field results are compared to those from one of the scenarios, follow. It should be noted that a significant result does not prove a cause and effect relationship exists between the two populations of interest; however, it does serve as a tool to indicate that one data set has experienced a degradation in system performance at a large enough level than can be accounted for merely by chance or random variation. Note also that a result that is not significant indicates that there is not enough evidence to declare that anything more than chance or random variation within the same population is at work between the two data sets being compared.

Demonstrator X achieves the following overall results after surveying each of the three progressively more difficult areas using the same system (results indicate the number of ordnance detected divided by the number of ordnance emplaced):

	Blind Grid	Open Field	Moguls
P_d^{res}	100/100 = 1.0	8/10 = .80	20/33 = .61
P_d^{disc}	80/100 = 0.80	6/10 = .60	8/33 = .24

P_d^{res}: BLIND GRID versus OPEN FIELD. Using the example data above to compare probabilities of detection in the response stage, all 100 ordnance out of 100 emplaced ordnance items were detected in the blind grid while 8 ordnance out of 10 emplaced were detected in the open field. Fischer's test must be used since a 100 percent success rate occurs in the data. Fischer's test uses the four input values to calculate a test statistic of 0.0075 that is compared against the critical value of 0.05. Since the test statistic is less than the critical value, the smaller response stage detection rate (0.80) is considered to be significantly less at the 0.05 level of significance. While a significant result does not prove a cause and effect relationship exists between the change in survey area and degradation in performance, it does indicate that the detection ability of demonstrator X's system seems to have been degraded in the open field relative to results from the blind grid using the same system.

P_d^{disc}: BLIND GRID versus OPEN FIELD. Using the example data above to compare probabilities of detection in the discrimination stage, 80 out of 100 emplaced ordnance items were correctly discriminated as ordnance in blind grid testing while 6 ordnance out of 10 emplaced were correctly discriminated as such in open field-testing. Those four values are used to calculate a test statistic of 1.12. Since the test statistic is less than the critical value of 2.71, the two discrimination stage detection rates are considered to be not significantly different at the 0.05 level of significance.

P_d^{res}: OPEN FIELD versus MOGULS. Using the example data above to compare probabilities of detection in the response stage, 8 out of 10 and 20 out of 33 are used to calculate a test statistic of 0.56. Since the test statistic is less than the critical value of 2.71, the two response stage detection rates are considered to be not significantly different at the 0.05 level of significance.

P_d^{disc}: OPEN FIELD versus MOGULS. Using the example data above to compare probabilities of detection in the discrimination stage, 6 out of 10 and 8 out of 33 are used to calculate a test statistic of 2.98. Since the test statistic is greater than the critical value of 2.71, the smaller discrimination stage detection rate is considered to be significantly less at the 0.05 level of significance. While a significant result does not prove a cause and effect relationship exists between the change in survey area and degradation in performance, it does indicate that the ability of demonstrator X to correctly discriminate seems to have been degraded by the mogul terrain relative to results from the flat open field using the same system.

(Page A-8 Blank)

APPENDIX B. DAILY WEATHER LOGS

TABLE B-1. WEATHER LOG

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/08/2003 00:00	25.5	26.6	23.4	67.98	0.00
12/08/2003 01:00	24.1	25.8	19.8	68.56	0.00
12/08/2003 02:00	22.2	25.3	18.9	69.82	0.00
12/08/2003 03:00	22.2	23.4	19.5	69.89	0.00
12/08/2003 04:00	22.7	24.0	20.6	69.22	0.00
12/08/2003 05:00	21.8	22.5	20.6	74.53	0.00
12/08/2003 06:00	18.4	21.6	16.1	83.00	0.00
12/08/2003 0700	19.9	21.9	18.4	80.10	0.00
12/08/2003 0800	20.0	22.5	17.3	82.70	0.00
12/08/2003 0900	22.7	25.6	20.8	77.17	0.00
12/08/2003 1000	29.3	32.9	24.6	63.19	0.00
12/08/2003 1100	33.4	34.8	32.3	51.95	0.00
12/08/2003 1200	35.2	35.8	34.3	48.01	0.00
12/08/2003 1300	36.6	37.6	35.4	46.40	0.00
12/08/2003 1400	37.8	38.7	37.1	44.89	0.00
12/08/2003 1500	38.2	38.7	37.7	42.75	0.00
12/08/2003 1600	38.1	38.7	37.1	42.23	0.00
12/08/2003 1700	36.9	37.5	36.2	46.32	0.00
12/08/2003 1800	35.9	36.5	35.2	49.55	0.00
12/08/2003 1900	34.5	35.5	32.0	52.73	0.00
12/08/2003 2000	31.3	32.2	30.6	69.34	0.00
12/08/2003 2300	31.5	32.3	30.8	67.20	0.00
12/08/2003 2200	30.0	31.4	28.7	72.94	0.00
12/08/2003 2300	28.6	29.9	27.2	79.13	0.00

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/09/2003 00:00	27.1	28.4	26.0	82.90	0.00
12/09/2003 01:00	26.0	26.6	25.3	84.80	0.00
12/09/2003 02:00	25.0	25.9	24.4	86.20	0.00
12/09/2003 03:00	25.6	26.4	25.1	86.70	0.00
12/09/2003 04:00	24.5	26.0	23.3	86.90	0.00
12/09/2003 05:00	23.0	24.2	21.4	90.60	0.00
12/09/2003 06:00	22.4	23.5	21.2	94.90	0.00
12/09/2003 07:00	24.1	25.3	22.7	93.00	0.00
12/09/2003 08:00	25.5	26.8	25.0	91.80	0.00
12/09/2003 09:00	28.9	31.6	26.4	86.60	0.00
12/09/2003 10:00	32.3	34.3	30.5	76.66	0.00
12/09/2003 11:00	34.5	35.6	33.8	70.21	0.00
12/09/2003 12;00	35.7	36.9	35.0	65.98	0.00
12/09/2003 13;00	37.9	38.8	36.7	60.19	0.02
12/09/2003 14:00	37.9	38.8	37.1	60.14	0.05
12/09/2003 15:00	38.4	39.3	38.0	57.57	0.02
12/09/2003 16:00	38.4	39.3	37.4	56.83	0.01
12/09/2003 17:00	36.9	37.6	36.1	64.81	0.00
12/09/2000 18:00	36.8	37.3	36.2	70.68	0.00
12/09/2003 19:00	37.1	37.6	36.4	74.73	0.00
12/09/2003 20:00	37.0	37.3	36.6	76.81	0.01
12/09/2003 21:00	36.9	37.4	36.3	73.92	0.00
12/09/2003 22:00	37.0	37.4	36.4	73.60	0.00
12/09/2003 23:00	36.8	37.4	36.3	78.46	0.01

TABLE B-1 (CONT'D)

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/10/2003 00:00	36.6	37.0	36.2	79.93	0.00
12/10/2003 01:00	36.0	36.8	35.4	80.80	0.00
12/10/2003 02:00	35.0	36.1	34.4	84.80	0.00
12/10/2003 03:00	35.2	35.7	34.4	86.80	0.00
12/10/2003 04:00	34.7	35.2	34.2	86.90	0.00
12/10/2003 05:00	34.8	35.2	34.3	85.40	0.00
12/10/2003 06:00	34.2	34.8	33.7	85.20	0.00
12/10/2003 07:00	34.0	34.4	33.3	87.60	0.00
12/10/2003 08:00	34.0	35.3	33.3	90.30	0.00
12/10/2003 09:00	36.2	38.0	34.7	86.90	0.00
12/10/2003 1:0	38.6	39.3	37.5	85.20	0.01
12/10/2003 11:00	39.6	40.7	38.4	85.60	0.01
12/10/2003 12:00	42.0	42.8	40.5	83.10	0.01
12/10/2003 13:00	42.7	43.2	41.8	85.40	0.00
12/10/2003 14:00	43.1	43.7	42.5	87.10	0.01
12/10/2003 15:00	42.5	43.2	41.8	95.10	0.06
12/10/2003 16:00	42.1	42.9	41.6	98.10	0.1
12/10/2003 17:00	43.0	43.9	41.9	99.30	0.13
12/10/2003 18:00	45.9	48.3	43.0	99.60	0.02
12/10/2003 19:00	48.3	49.1	47.2	99.70	0.00
12/10/2003 2:0	48.4	51.7	47.3	99.80	0.00
12/10/2003 21:00	53.3	54.6	51.4	100.00	0.00
12/10/2003 22:00	52.8	53.8	52.1	99.70	0.00
12/10/2003 23:00	53.4	54.5	52.4	97.90	0.04

TABLE B-1 (CONT'D)

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/11/2003 00:00	53.5	54.6	52.4	96.20	0.02
12/11/2003 01:00	52.8	53.2	52.2	95.60	0.03
12/11/2003 02:00	52.7	53.4	51.5	96.60	0.05
12/11/2003 03:00	53.8	54.5	52.9	97.60	0.24
12/11/2003 04:00	55.8	56.8	53.8	96.20	0.12
12/11/2003 05:00	56.2	56.6	55.7	95.00	0.01
12/11/2003 06:00	56.7	57.5	56.0	96.60	0.02
12/11/2003 07:00	57.2	57.9	55.9	97.90	0.08
12/11/2003 08:00	54.2	56.4	52.3	92.80	0.00
12/11/2003 09:00	51.6	52.8	50.9	85.40	0.00
12/11/2003 10:00	51.6	52.4	51.1	81.30	0.00
12/11/2003 11:00	52.5	53.3	52.0	76.59	0.00
12/11/2003 12:00	53.1	53.6	52.4	71.52	0.00
12/11/2003 13:00	52.3	52.9	51.7	68.36	0.00
12/11/2003 14:00	53.4	54.4	52.2	62.99	0.00
12/11/2003 15:00	52.1	53.9	50.9	61.83	0.00
12/11/2003 16:00	50.5	51.2	49.7	62.27	0.00
12/11/2003 17:00	47.6	50.0	45.6	59.74	0.00
12/11/2003 18:00	44.5	46.0	43.4	58.79	0.00
12/11/2003 19:00	42.7	43.6	41.8	57.39	0.00
12/11/2003 20:00	41.8	42.7	41.2	58.06	0.00
12/11/2003 21:00	41.1	41.7	40.4	59.86	0.00
12/11/2003 22:00	40.6	41.1	39.8	59.69	0.00
12/11/2003 23:00	40.1	40.5	39.5	58.23	0.00

TABLE B-1 (CONT'D)

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/12/2003 00:00	39.3	39.9	38.6	57.36	0.00
12/12/2003 01:00	38.0	39.1	37.2	60.63	0.00
12/12/2003 02:00	37.5	38.0	37.0	61.25	0.00
12/12/2003 03:00	37.2	37.9	36.8	60.55	0.00
12/12/2003 04:00	36.8	37.3	36.3	60.49	0.00
12/12/2003 05:00	36.2	36.8	35.5	61.19	0.00
12/12/2003 06:00	35.8	36.3	35.5	61.66	0.00
12/12/2003 07:00	35.5	36.1	35.0	60.61	0.00
12/12/2003 08:00	35.4	36.2	34.8	59.84	0.00
12/12/2003 09:00	37.0	38.1	35.8	56.70	0.00
12/12/2003 10:00	38.5	39.1	37.6	50.57	0.00
12/12/2003 11:00	39.8	41.3	38.6	48.92	0.00
12/12/2003 12:00	40.7	41.3	40.0	47.40	0.00
12/12/2003 13:00	41.4	42.2	40.5	46.41	0.00
12/12/2003 14:00	42.3	42.9	41.6	44.78	0.00
12/12/2003 15:00	41.7	42.9	40.8	44.55	0.00
12/12/2003 16:00	41.3	42.3	40.2	47.05	0.00
12/12/2003 17:00	39.0	40.6	37.3	50.49	0.00
12/12/2003 18:00	36.9	37.6	36.2	54.02	0.00
12/12/2003 19:00	36.1	36.8	35.2	52.59	0.00
12/12/2003 20:00	35.0	35.5	34.4	54.16	0.00
12/12/2003 21:00	34.0	34.8	33.3	53.91	0.00
12/12/2003 22:00	32.6	33.7	31.7	56.92	0.00
12/12/2003 23:00	32.0	32.4	31.5	57.69	0.00

TABLE B-1 (CONT'D)

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/13/2003 00:00	31.4	31.8	30.8	59.22	0.00
12/13/2003 01:00	30.5	31.7	29.6	61.08	0.00
12/13/2003 02:00	30.4	31.0	29.6	57.84	0.00
12/13/2003 03:00	29.4	30.5	28.2	60.37	0.00
12/13/2003 04:00	28.0	29.0	27.5	65.52	0.00
12/13/2003 05:00	27.8	28.6	27.1	63.01	0.00
12/13/2003 06:00	28.8	29.5	27.6	57.42	0.00
12/13/2003 07:00	28.5	29.0	27.8	56.65	0.00
12/13/2003 08:00	28.3	29.4	27.6	56.65	0.00
12/13/2003 09:00	29.6	31.0	28.7	54.93	0.00
12/13/2003 10:00	31.8	32.6	30.6	51.47	0.00
12/13/2003 11:00	33.2	34.6	32.0	47.89	0.00
12/13/2003 12:00	34.5	35.5	33.3	43.81	0.00
12/13/2003 13:00	34.8	36.0	34.0	41.60	0.00
12/13/2003 14:00	35.4	36.2	34.6	41.27	0.00
12/13/2003 15:00	34.5	35.6	33.9	43.80	0.00
12/13/2003 16:00	34.1	34.5	33.7	45.53	0.00
12/13/2003 17:00	33.3	33.9	32.6	48.90	0.00
12/13/2003 18:00	32.9	33.3	32.5	50.74	0.00
12/13/2003 19:00	32.9	33.2	32.6	51.91	0.00
12/13/2003 20:00	32.7	33.0	32.4	53.17	0.00
12/13/2003 21:00	32.8	33.1	32.5	54.07	0.00
12/13/2003 22:00	33.4	33.9	32.7	54.07	0.00
12/13/2003 23:00	33.7	33.9	33.3	52.35	0.00

TABLE B-1 (CONT'D)

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/14/2003 00:00	33.6	33.9	32.8	51.54	0.00
12/14/2003 01:00	32.9	33.4	32.5	51.63	0.00
12/14/2003 02:00	33.1	33.7	32.6	50.62	0.00
12/14/2003 03:00	33.5	33.9	33.1	52.20	0.00
12/14/2003 04:00	33.8	34.2	33.3	53.68	0.00
12/14/2003 05:00	34.0	34.3	33.8	59.10	0.00
12/14/2003 06:00	33.5	34.3	31.8	70.21	0.00
12/14/2003 07:00	31.4	32.2	30.9	93.10	0.00
12/14/2003 08:00	31.5	32.2	30.9	98.90	0.00
12/14/2003 09:00	32.3	33.1	31.6	99.90	0.00
12/14/2003 10:00	33.5	34.4	32.8	100.00	0.00
12/14/2003 11:00	34.4	34.6	34.0	98.90	0.13
12/14/2003 12:00	35.0	35.5	34.4	98.50	0.18
12/14/2003 13:00	35.1	35.7	34.5	98.30	0.04
12/14/2003 14:00	35.9	36.7	35.4	98.80	0.09
12/14/2003 15:00	37.3	38.0	36.3	99.30	0.06
12/14/2003 16:00	38.9	40.0	37.6	99.40	0.09
12/14/2003 17:00	40.3	40.9	39.8	98.90	0.02
12/14/2003 18:00	41.2	42.2	40.5	97.70	0.01
12/14/2003 19:00	40.8	42.2	38.6	97.80	0.07
12/14/2003 20:00	37.2	38.8	36.3	96.60	0.01
12/14/2003 21:00	36.3	36.7	35.8	94.00	0.00
12/14/2003 22:00	36.0	36.4	35.7	93.80	0.00
12/14/2003 23:00	36.1	36.6	35.4	91.90	0.00

TABLE B-1 (CONT'D)

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/15/2003 00:00	35.4	35.8	34.8	89.70	0.00
12/15/2003 01:00	34.9	35.2	34.4	89.00	0.00
12/15/2003 02:00	34.1	34.9	33.8	87.70	0.00
12/15/2003 03:00	34.1	34.5	33.8	84.20	0.00
12/15/2003 04:00	34.5	35.6	33.9	81.50	0.00
12/15/2003 05:00	35.7	36.1	35.1	77.22	0.00
12/15/2003 06:00	35.7	36.2	35.1	78.37	0.00
12/15/2003 07:00	36.7	37.6	35.8	74.77	0.00
12/15/2003 08:00	38	38.6	37.2	73.68	0.00
12/15/2003 09:00	39.1	40.0	38.2	73.16	0.00
12/15/2003 10:00	40.1	40.7	39.6	71.01	0.00
12/15/2003 11:00	41.1	41.9	40.4	68.59	0.00
12/15/2003 12:00	41.5	41.9	41.2	63.75	0.00
12/15/2003 13:00	41.8	42.9	41.2	62.32	0.00
12/15/2003 14:00	42.6	43.3	42.2	58.05	0.00
12/15/2003 15:00	43.0	43.7	42.2	54.81	0.00
12/15/2003 16:00	42.4	43.7	41.7	54.73	0.00
12/15/2003 17:00	40.2	41.9	37.9	59.03	0.00
12/15/2003 18:00	37.7	38.5	36.7	64.99	0.00
12/15/2003 19:00	36.2	37.2	35.0	67.78	0.00
12/15/2003 20:00	34.8	35.7	33.4	70.31	0.00
12/15/2003 21:00	33.6	34.6	32.6	73.66	0.00
12/15/2003 22:00	32.7	33.3	32.0	76.44	0.00
12/15/2003 23:00	31.8	33.3	30.6	78.72	0.00

TABLE B-1 (CONT'D)

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/16/2003 00:00	31.3	32.9	28.1	78.91	0.00
12/16/2003 01:00	28.7	30.5	27.1	86.00	0.00
12/16/2003 02:00	27.8	28.9	26.8	90.40	0.00
12/16/2003 03:00	28.8	30.4	26.9	86.60	0.00
12/16/2003 04:00	28.2	30.4	26.4	88.10	0.00
12/16/2003 05:00	27.6	28.4	26.8	92.40	0.00
12/16/2003 06:00	26.3	27.1	25.7	95.20	0.00
12/16/2003 07:00	26.8	27.4	26.0	96.30	0.00
12/16/2003 08:00	26.6	27.8	25.4	95.60	0.00
12/16/2003 09:00	32.4	34.9	27.6	86.90	0.00
12/16/2003 10:00	37.2	39.1	34.8	82.30	0.00
12/16/2003 11:00	41.4	43.4	38.6	70.88	0.00
12/16/2003 12:00	43.5	44.1	42.9	66.20	0.00
12/16/2003 13:00	44.3	45.4	43.4	66.20	0.00
12/16/2003 14:00	46.1	47.6	45.0	65.15	0.00
12/16/2003 15:00	46.4	48.2	45.0	67.75	0.00
12/16/2003 16:00	49.8	51.3	47.8	58.74	0.00
12/16/2003 17:00	47.8	49.4	46.4	61.51	0.00
12/16/2003 18:00	46.3	47.0	45.5	66.63	0.00
12/16/2003 19:00	45.1	46.1	44.1	71.10	0.00
12/16/2003 20:00	43.7	44.6	43.1	77.83	0.00
12/16/2003 21:00	44.0	45.4	43.1	78.12	0.00
12/16/2003 22:00	46.3	48.4	45.1	75.89	0.00
12/16/2003 23:00	49.6	50.5	48.2	69.92	0.00

TABLE B-1 (CONT'D)

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/17/2003 00:00	49.9	50.6	49.4	69.89	0.00
12/17/2003 01:00	50.9	51.6	50.2	69.16	0.00
12/17/2003 02:00	52.0	53.1	50.9	71.40	0.00
12/17/2003 03:00	51.5	53.0	50.8	74.87	0.00
12/17/2003 04:00	50.1	51.5	48.6	84.30	0.01
12/17/2003 05:00	47.2	48.6	46.4	94.40	0.09
12/17/2003 06:00	47.3	48.3	46.1	98.10	0.26
12/17/2003 07:00	47.9	48.3	47.6	98.70	0.26
12/17/2003 08:00	48.3	48.6	47.9	99.10	0.13
12/17/2003 09:00	48.8	49.5	48.3	99.30	0.04
12/17/2003 10:00	49.6	50.2	49.0	99.40	0.00
12/17/2003 11:00	48.8	49.2	48.4	99.40	0.00
12/17/2003 12:00	48.5	49.1	47.6	99.10	0.00
12/17/2003 13:00	46.6	48.0	43.7	93.60	0.08
12/17/2003 14:00	40.6	43.8	38.6	90.40	0.03
12/17/2003 15:00	37.6	38.9	35.7	93.00	0.03
12/17/2003 16:00	35.3	36.1	34.5	96.10	0.05
12/17/2003 17:00	36.1	36.7	35.1	89.20	0.00
12/17/2003 18:00	36.4	36.7	36.0	76.25	0.00
12/17/2003 19:00	35.8	36.4	35.1	66.21	0.00
12/17/2003 20:00	35.4	35.8	34.9	65.12	0.00
12/17/2003 21:00	33.9	35.1	32.8	62.58	0.00
12/17/2003 22:00	32.4	33.2	31.9	64.76	0.00
12/17/2003 23:00	32.2	32.6	31.8	63.78	0.00

TABLE B-1 (CONT'D)

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/18/2003 00:00	32.5	33.1	31.9	63.43	0.00
12/18/2003 01:00	32.5	33.1	31.9	64.09	0.00
12/18/2003 02:00	32.5	33.1	31.9	62.08	0.00
12/18/2003 03:00	31.9	32.6	31.3	64.02	0.00
12/18/2003 04:00	31.6	32.0	31.2	65.30	0.00
12/18/2003 05:00	32.0	32.4	31.5	63.12	0.00
12/18/2003 06:00	31.8	32.1	31.4	63.84	0.00
12/18/2003 07:00	31.7	32.4	31.1	63.07	0.00
12/18/2003 08:00	32.1	32.9	31.4	60.30	0.00
12/18/2003 09:00	33.1	33.8	32.4	58.52	0.00
12/18/2003 10:00	34.6	35.5	33.6	55.55	0.00
12/18/2003 11:00	34.8	35.7	34.3	54.04	0.00
12/18/2003 12:00	35.8	36.2	35.2	51.26	0.00
12/18/2003 13:00	36.3	37.3	35.2	49.63	0.00
12/18/2003 14:00	35.6	36.2	35.2	49.47	0.00
12/18/2003 15:00	35.0	35.5	34.5	51.00	0.00
12/18/2003 16:00	34.8	35.1	34.5	49.99	0.00
12/18/2003 17:00	33.8	35.0	32.6	52.86	0.00
12/18/2003 18:00	31.7	32.8	30.4	58.79	0.00
12/18/2003 19:00	31.0	31.9	30.1	60.54	0.00
12/18/2003 20:00	30.2	30.9	29.5	63.83	0.00
12/18/2003 21:00	30.1	30.9	29.4	61.92	0.00
12/18/2003 22:00	30.6	31.4	29.8	59.66	0.00
12/18/2003 23:00	30.7	31.2	30.1	59.11	0.00

TABLE B-1 (CONT'D)

Date & Time	Average Temperature, °F	Maximum Temperature,°F	Minimum Temperature, °F	Relative Humidity, %	Total Precipitation, in.
12/19/2003 00:00	30.6	31.2	29.9	59.41	0.00
12/19/2003 01:00	29.9	30.5	29.3	60.87	0.00
12/19/2003 02:00	29.7	30.4	29.0	62.55	0.00
12/19/2003 03:00	30.3	30.7	29.9	62.61	0.00
12/19/2003 04:00	30.3	30.7	29.9	63.29	0.00
12/19/2003 05:00	30.3	30.7	29.9	64.17	0.00
12/19/2003 06:00	30.4	30.8	30.0	64.72	0.00
12/19/2003 07:00	30.2	30.6	29.9	65.97	0.00
12/19/2003 08:00	30.5	31.2	30.0	66.19	0.00
12/19/2003 09:00	31.6	32.6	30.8	65.79	0.00
12/19/2003 10:00	33.2	34.4	32.1	65.26	0.00
12/19/2003 11:00	35.4	36.4	34.2	62.79	0.00
12/19/2003 12:00	36.0	37.2	35.0	62.30	0.00
12/19/2003 13:00	35.3	36.8	34.4	63.81	0.00
12/19/2003 14:00	35.8	36.7	35.0	60.84	0.00
12/19/2003 15:00	35.9	36.7	35.2	60.52	0.00
12/19/2003 16:00	35.4	36.1	34.8	61.37	0.00
12/19/2003 17:00	34.0	35.0	33.3	65.68	0.00
12/19/2003 18:00	32.4	33.7	31.2	70.30	0.00
12/19/2003 19:00	31.0	31.6	30.4	74.84	0.00
12/19/2003 20:00	30.8	31.2	30.5	77.28	0.00
12/19/2003 21:00	30.7	31.1	30.3	79.10	0.00
12/19/2003 22:00	30.3	30.8	29.9	81.00	0.00
12/19/2003 23:00	30.1	30.7	29.4	81.90	0.00

APPENDIX C. SOIL MOISTURE

Daily Soil Moisture Logs

Date: 8 December 2003
Times: No Readings (AM), 1400 hours

Probe Location	Layer, in.	AM Reading, %	PM Reading, %
Wet Area	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Wooded Area	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Open Area	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Calibration Lanes	0 to 6	No Readings	39.5
	6 to 12		36.3
	12 to 24		7.7
	24 to 36		5.6
	36 to 48		5.8
Blind Grid/Moguls	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		

Daily Soil Moisture Logs

Date: 9 December 2003
Times: 0800 hours, 1400 hours

Probe Location	Layer, in.	AM Reading, %	PM Reading, %
Wet Area	0 to 6	88.2	88.0
	6 to 12	78.3	78.7
	12 to 24	69.7	69.9
	24 to 36	52.8	53.3
	36 to 48	49.9	50.5
Wooded Area	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Open Area	0 to 6	23.8	23.6
	6 to 12	2.1	2.3
	12 to 24	39.3	40.1
	24 to 36	60.2	60.1
	36 to 48	56.3	56.1
Calibration Lanes	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Blind Grid/Moguls	0 to 6	3.9	3.8
	6 to 12	16.8	17.2
	12 to 24	39.2	39.8
	24 to 36	40.3	40.7
	36 to 48	41.8	41.9

Daily Soil Moisture Logs

Date: 10 December 2003
Times: 0900 hours, 1400 hours

Probe Location	Layer, in.	AM Reading, %	PM Reading, %
Wet Area	0 to 6	87.9	87.6
	6 to 12	78.5	79.1
	12 to 24	69.2	69.0
	24 to 36	53.2	53.8
	36 to 48	50.1	50.7
Wooded Area	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Open Area	0 to 6	23.2	22.9
	6 to 12	2.7	2.8
	12 to 24	39.2	39.5
	24 to 36	59.8	59.7
	36 to 48	56.2	56.0
Calibration Lanes	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Blind Grid/Moguls	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		

Daily Soil Moisture Logs

Date: 11 December 2003
Times: 0800 hours, 1415 hours

Probe Location	Layer, in.	AM Reading, %	PM Reading, %
Wet Area	0 to 6	86.8	86.8
	6 to 12	79.2	79.5
	12 to 24	69.8	69.2
	24 to 36	54.7	55.3
	36 to 48	50.9	51.3
Wooded Area	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Open Area	0 to 6	23.0	23.0
	6 to 12	2.9	3.1
	12 to 24	39.7	40.2
	24 to 36	60.1	60.3
	36 to 48	57.1	58.2
Calibration Lanes	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Blind Grid/Moguls	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		

Daily Soil Moisture Logs

Date: 12 December 2003
Times: 0800 hours, 1400 hours

Probe Location	Layer, in.	AM Reading, %	PM Reading, %
Wet Area	0 to 6	86.7	86.5
	6 to 12	79.8	79.5
	12 to 24	70.1	70.3
	24 to 36	55.2	55.8
	36 to 48	52.1	52.7
Wooded Area	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Open Area	0 to 6	23.8	23.7
	6 to 12	3.3	3.4
	12 to 24	39.2	39.7
	24 to 36	61.1	61.0
	36 to 48	57.3	57.9
Calibration Lanes	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Blind Grid/Moguls	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		

Daily Soil Moisture Logs

Date: 13 December 2003
Times: 0800 hours, 1400 hours

Probe Location	Layer, in.	AM Reading, %	PM Reading, %
Wet Area	0 to 6	88.2	88.0
	6 to 12	79.3	79.2
	12 to 24	70.3	70.2
	24 to 36	55.1	58.6
	36 to 48	52.3	52.7
Wooded Area	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Open Area	0 to 6	23.1	23.0
	6 to 12	3.6	3.8
	12 to 24	39.3	39.7
	24 to 36	61.8	61.6
	36 to 48	57.5	57.8
Calibration Lanes	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Blind Grid/Moguls	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		

Daily Soil Moisture Logs

Date: 15 December 2003
Times: 0800 hours, 1400 hours

Probe Location:	Layer, in.	AM Reading, %	PM Reading, %
Wet Area	0 to 6	88.7	88.6
	6 to 12	79.2	79.0
	12 to 24	70.5	70.7
	24 to 36	55.3	55.6
	36 to 48	52.3	52.4
Wooded Area	0 to 6	79.3	79.7
	6 to 12	68.3	69.7
	12 to 24	93.4	93.8
	24 to 36	67.6	68.2
	36 to 48	58.3	58.8
Open Area	0 to 6	23.2	23.2
	6 to 12	3.4	3.3
	12 to 24	39.2	39.5
	24 to 36	60.9	60.9
	36 to 48	58.1	58.3
Calibration Lanes	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Blind Grid/Moguls	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		

Daily Soil Moisture Logs

Date: 16 December 2003
Times: 0800 hours, 1400 hours

Probe Location:	Layer, in.	AM Reading, %	PM Reading, %
Wet Area	0 to 6	89.3	89.1
	6 to 12	79.5	79.4
	12 to 24	71.3	71.7
	24 to 36	55.7	55.9
	36 to 48	55.2	53.1
Wooded Area	0 to 6	79.9	80.0
	6 to 12	70.1	69.9
	12 to 24	94.3	94.7
	24 to 36	68.7	68.5
	36 to 48	58.9	58.8
Open Area	0 to 6	23.0	23.1
	6 to 12	3.9	3.8
	12 to 24	39.3	39.6
	24 to 36	61.2	61.7
	36 to 48	58.3	58.5
Calibration Lanes	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Blind Grid/Moguls	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		

Daily Soil Moisture Logs

Date: 18 December 2003
Times: 0800 hours, 1400 hours

Probe Location:	Layer, in.	AM Reading, %	PM Reading, %
Wet Area	0 to 6	89.3	89.2
	6 to 12	79.1	79.3
	12 to 24	69.5	69.7
	24 to 36	53.3	53.0
	36 to 48	50.5	50.7
Wooded Area	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Open Area	0 to 6	22.9	22.7
	6 to 12	4.3	4.1
	12 to 24	39.4	39.6
	24 to 36	61.4	61.3
	36 to 48	58.4	58.2
Calibration Lanes	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Blind Grid/Moguls	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		

Daily Soil Moisture Logs

Date: 19 December 2003
Times: 0800 hours, 1400 hours

Probe Location:	Layer, in.	AM Reading, %	PM Reading, %
Wet Area	0 to 6	88.3	88.1
	6 to 12	78.7	78.5
	12 to 24	69.8	70.1
	24 to 36	54.1	54.0
	36 to 48	50.7	50.8
Wooded Area	0 to 6	80.3	80.1
	6 to 12	70.2	70.3
	12 to 24	93.8	94.1
	24 to 36	68.9	69.2
	36 to 48	59.1	59.3
Open Area	0 to 6	22.5	22.3
	6 to 12	4.7	4.8
	12 to 24	39.0	39.0
	24 to 36	61.7	61.6
	36 to 48	58.6	58.8
Calibration Lanes	0 to 6	No Readings	No Readings
	6 to 12		
	12 to 24		
	24 to 36		
	36 to 48		
Blind Grid/Moguls	0 to 6	4.1	4.0
	6 to 12	17.1	17.2
	12 to 24	39.3	39.3
	24 to 36	41.5	41.7
	36 to 48	42.1	42.2

Date	No. of People	Area Tested	Status Start Time	Status Stop Time	Duration, min	Operational Status	Operational Status - Comments	Track Method	Track Method=Other Explain	Pattern	Field Conditions	
SHAW BASELINE MAGNETOMETER												
12/8/2003	3	CALIBRATION LANE	1315	1519	124	INITIAL MOBILIZATION	INITIAL MOBILIZATION	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	CALIBRATION LANE	1045	1215	90	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	CALIBRATION LANE	1215	1220	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	CALIBRATION LANE	1220	1245	25	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	BLIND TEST GRID	1245	1315	30	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	BLIND TEST GRID	1315	1345	30	EQUIPMENT FAILURE	LAPTOP FAILURE, REPLACED	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	BLIND TEST GRID	1345	1415	30	LUNCH/BREAK	LUNCH/BREAK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	BLIND TEST GRID	1415	1430	15	DOWNTIME MAINTENANCE CHECK	EQUIPMENT CHECK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	BLIND TEST GRID	1430	1435	5	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	1435	1600	85	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	1600	1645	45	DAILY START/STOP	END OF OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT BREAKDOWN	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/16/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1000	1055	55	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/16/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1055	1110	15	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/16/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1110	1155	45	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/16/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1155	1235	40	LUNCH/BREAK	LUNCH/BREAK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/16/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1235	1425	110	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/16/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1425	1440	15	DOWNTIME MAINTENANCE CHECK	EQUIPMENT CHECK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/16/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1440	1535	55	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY

Note: Activities pertinent to this specific demonstration are indicated in highlighted text.

Date	No. of People	Area Tested	Status Start Time	Status Stop Time	Duration, min	Operational Status	Operational Status - Comments	Track Method	Track Method=Other Explain	Pattern	Field Conditions	
12/16/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1535	1610	35	DAILY START/STOP	END OF OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT BREAKDOWN	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1230	1255	25	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1255	1300	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1300	1440	100	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1440	1450	10	DOWNTIME MAINTENANCE CHECK	EQUIPMENT CHECK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1450	1610	80	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1610	1615	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1615	1640	25	DAILY START/STOP	END OF OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT BREAKDOWN	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/19/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	0745	0820	35	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/19/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	0820	0825	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/19/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	0825	0845	20	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/19/2003	4	MOGUL AREA	0845	0925	40	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/19/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	0925	1045	80	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
BASELINE MAGNETOMETER 2 SENSORS												
12/19/2003	4	BLIND GRID	1045	1210	85	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP TWO MAG SENSOR	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/19/2003	4	BLIND GRID	1210	1225	15	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/19/2003	4	BLIND GRID	1225	1230	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/19/2003	4	WOODED AREA	1230	1345	75	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/19/2003	4	WOODED AREA	1345	1400	15	DEMO/ RANGE ISSUE	HAD TO RENEW BADGES	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY

Note: Activities pertinent to this specific demonstration are indicated in highlighted text.

Date	No. of People	Area Tested	Status Start Time	Status Stop Time	Duration, min	Operational Status	Operational Status - Comments	Track Method	Track Method=Other Explain	Pattern	Field Conditions	
12/19/2003	4	WOODED AREA	1400	1515	75	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/19/2003	4	WOODED AREA	1515	1520	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/19/2003	4	WOODED AREA	1520	1800	160	DEMOBILIZATION	DEMOBILIZATION	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
SHAW BASELINE EM61												
12/8/2003	3	CALIBRATION LANE	1315	1519	124	INITIAL MOBILIZATION	INITIAL MOBILIZATION	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/8/2003	3	CALIBRATION LANE	1519	1525	6	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/8/2003	3	CALIBRATION LANE	1525	1610	45	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/8/2003	3	CALIBRATION LANE	1610	1645	35	DAILY START/STOP	END OF OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT BREAKDOWN	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	BLIND TEST GRID	810	940	90	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	BLIND TEST GRID	940	945	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	BLIND TEST GRID	945	1040	55	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/9/2003	3	BLIND TEST GRID	1040	1045	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/10/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	745	845	60	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/10/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	845	850	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/10/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	850	1030	100	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/10/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	1030	1045	15	DOWNTIME MAINTENANCE CHECK	EQUIPMENT CHECK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/10/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	1045	1130	45	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/10/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	1130	1200	30	LUNCH/BREAK	LUNCH/BREAK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/10/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	1200	1230	30	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY

Note: Activities pertinent to this specific demonstration are indicated in highlighted text.

Date	No. of People	Area Tested	Status Start Time	Status Stop Time	Duration, min	Operational Status	Operational Status - Comments	Track Method	Track Method=Other Explain	Pattern	Field Conditions	
12/10/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	1230	1315	45	LUNCH/BREAK	LUNCH/BREAK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/10/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	1315	1400	45	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/10/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	1400	1425	25	EQUIPMENT FAILURE	RTS MALFUNCTION, RAIN	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/10/2003	3	OPEN FIELD	1425	1500	35	DAILY START/STOP	END OF OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT BREAKDOWN	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/11/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	810	840	30	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/11/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	840	845	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/11/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	845	1110	145	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/11/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1110	1115	5	DOWNTIME MAINTENANCE CHECK	CHANGE BATTERY	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/11/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1115	1125	10	DOWNTIME MAINTENANCE CHECK	DOWNLOAD DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/11/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1125	1155	30	LUNCH/BREAK	LUNCH/BREAK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/11/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1155	1340	105	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/11/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1340	1420	40	LUNCH/BREAK	LUNCH/BREAK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/11/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1420	1540	80	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/11/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1540	1545	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/11/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1545	1615	30	DAILY START/STOP	END OF OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT BREAKDOWN	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SNOW	MUDDY
12/12/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	740	815	35	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	RAIN	MUDDY
12/12/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	815	1005	110	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	RAIN	MUDDY
12/12/2003	4	OPEN FIELD	1005	1135	90	EQUIPMENT FAILURE	BAD CABLE, CHANGED OUT	LASER	NA	LINEAR	RAIN	MUDDY

Date	No. of People	Area Tested	Status Start Time	Status Stop Time	Duration, min	Operational Status	Operational Status Comments	Track Method	Track Method=Other Explain	Pattern	Field Conditions	
12/12/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1135	1210	35	LUNCH/BREAK	LUNCH/BREAK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	RAIN	MUDDY
12/12/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1210	1335	85	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	RAIN	MUDDY
12/12/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1335	1345	10	DOWNTIME MAINTENANCE CHECK	EQUIPMENT CHECK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	RAIN	MUDDY
12/12/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1345	1515	90	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	RAIN	MUDDY
12/12/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1515	1530	15	DOWNTIME MAINTENANCE CHECK	DATA CHECK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	RAIN	MUDDY
12/12/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1530	1545	15	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	RAIN	MUDDY
12/12/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1545	1550	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	RAIN	MUDDY
12/12/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1550	1615	25	DAILY START/STOP	END OF OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT BREAKDOWN	LASER	NA	LINEAR	RAIN	MUDDY
12/13/03	4	OPEN FIELD	730	810	40	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/13/03	4	OPEN FIELD	810	815	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/13/03	4	OPEN FIELD	815	950	95	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/13/03	4	OPEN FIELD	950	1140	110	DOWNTIME MAINTENANCE CHECK	DATA CHECK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/13/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1140	1245	65	LUNCH/BREAK	LUNCH/BREAK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/13/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1245	1430	105	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/13/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1430	1440	10	DOWNTIME MAINTENANCE CHECK	CHANGE BATTERY	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/13/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1440	1540	60	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/13/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1540	1545	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/13/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1545	1610	35	DAILY START/STOP	END OF OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT BREAKDOWN	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/15/03	4	OPEN FIELD	910	935	25	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/15/03	4	OPEN FIELD	935	940	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY

Date	No. of People	Area Tested	Status Start Time	Status Stop Time	Duration, min	Operational Status	Operational Status Comments	Track Method	Track Method=Other Explain	Pattern	Field Conditions	
12/15/03	4	OPEN FIELD	940	1115	95	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/15/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1115	1140	25	LUNCH/BREAK	LUNCH/BREAK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/15/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1140	1230	50	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, MOVE RTS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/15/03	4	OPEN FIELD	1230	1240	10	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/15/03	4	WOODED AREA	1240	1400	100	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/15/03	4	WOODED AREA	1400	1430	30	DOWNTIME MAINTENANCE CHECK	CHANGE BATTERY	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/15/03	4	WOODED AREA	1430	1545	75	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/15/03	4	WOODED AREA	1545	1605	20	DAILY START/STOP	END OF OPERATIONS, EQUIPMENT BREAKDOWN	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/16/03	4	WOODED AREA	730	840	70	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/16/03	4	WOODED AREA	840	935	55	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/16/03	4	WOODED AREA	935	950	15	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, MOVE RTS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/16/03	4	WOODED AREA	950	1000	10	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY
12/18/03	4	MOGUL AREA	730	830	60	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, BEGIN OF DAILY OPERATIONS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/03	4	MOGUL AREA	830	835	5	CALIBRATION	CALIBRATE USING TRAILER HITCH	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/03	4	MOGUL AREA	835	955	80	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/03	4	MOGUL AREA	955	1010	15	LUNCH/BREAK	LUNCH/BREAK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/03	4	MOGUL AREA	1010	1040	30	DAILY START/STOP	SET UP, MOVE RTS	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/03	4	MOGUL AREA	1040	1150	70	COLLECT DATA	COLLECT DATA	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/18/03	4	MOGUL AREA	1150	1230	40	LUNCH/BREAK	LUNCH/BREAK	LASER	NA	LINEAR	SUNNY	MUDDY
12/19/03	4	MOGUL AREA	1520	1800	160	DEMOBILIZATION	DEMOBILIZATION	LASER	NA	LINEAR	CLOUDY	MUDDY

APPENDIX E. REFERENCES

1. Standardized UXO Technology Demonstration Site Handbook, DTC Project No. 8-CO-160-000-473, Report No. ATC-8349, March 2002.

2. Aberdeen Proving Ground Soil Survey Report, October 1998.

3. Data Summary, UXO Standardized Test Site: APG Soils Description, May 2002.

4. Yuma Proving Ground Soil Survey Report, May 2003.

(Page E-2 Blank)

APPENDIX F. ABBREVIATIONS

AEC	=	U.S. Army Environmental Center
APG	=	Aberdeen Proving Ground
ASCII	=	American Standard Code for Information Interchange.
ATC	=	U.S. Army Aberdeen Test Center
EM	=	electromagnetic
EMI	=	electromagnetic interference
EMIS	=	Electromagnetic Induction Spectroscopy
ERDC	=	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Engineering Research and Development Center
ESTCP	=	Environmental Security Technology Certification Program
EQT	=	Army Environmental Quality Technology Program
GPS	=	Global Positioning System
JPG	=	Jefferson Proving Ground
POC	=	point of contact
QA	=	quality assurance
QC	=	quality control
ROC	=	receiver-operating characteristic
RTK	=	real time kinematic
RTS	=	Robotic Total Station
SERDP	=	Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program
UXO	=	unexploded ordnance
YPG	=	U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground

(Page F-2 Blank)

APPENDIX G. DISTRIBUTION LIST

DTC Project No.8-CO-160-UXO-021

Addressee	No. of Copies
Commander U.S. Army Environmental Center ATTN: SFIM-AEC-ATT (Mr. George Robitaille) Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010-5401	2
Shaw Environmental, Inc. ATTN: (John E. Foley, PHD.) 312 Director's Drive Knoxsville, TN 37923	1
SERDP/ESTCP ATTN: (Ms. Anne Andrews) 901 North Stuart Street, Suite 303 Arlington, VA 22203	1
Commander U.S. Army Aberdeen Test Center ATTN: CSTE-DTC-SL-E (Mr. Larry Overbay) (Library) CSTE-DTC-AT-CS-R Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5059	1 1 1
Defense Technical Information Center 8725 John J. Kingman Road, STE 0944 Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6218	2

Secondary distribution is controlled by Commander, U.S. Army Environmental Center, ATTN: SFIM-AEC-ATT.

(Page G-2 Blank)