

Re: 'Lord Help Me' Project

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Access/microsoft.public.access.tablesdbdesign/2006-10/msg00246.html>

- *From:* "BruceM" <bamoob@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 16 Oct 2006 07:30:32 -0400
-

Glad to learn I helped, but I have to admit I don't quite see how I managed to do that.

If the total on the main form is correct if you navigate away from the record, then back to it, it may be as simple as requerying the main form.

Good luck with your project.

"laura reid" <laurareid@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message <news:0BDD8D6C-297F-4327-AFD7-1D35297B40D0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Bruce,

Oh joy!!! I changed the db format to have 3 separate columns to catch the different amount types. Whether right or wrong, I have the damn thing working now the way I want and my forms work correctly (for the most part) as well. I do have a couple glitches involving the record navigation buttons and the total field on the mainform not updating whenever the totals in the subform are changed, but I'll post those issues on the forms community. Thanks for your help or I wouldn't have made it this far!

Laura

"BruceM" wrote:

A few more thoughts inline.

"laura reid" <laurareid@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message <news:F9ACDB71-C882-45F2-8C48-959643CB7E57@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

David, thanks for the tip reference the date. This is exactly what I was trying to do, however I was entering the expression in the wrong

Re: 'Lord Help Me' Project

property.

Bruce,

I have come too far to quit now, and actually I'm only stuck on one piece (although big piece) of the puzzle; dealing with subforms, and even that's not quite the problem as I can get those designed so the right records are matching. The problem lies with the fact that not all the fields are filling in when I add a new record to the subform. I think this has to do with the fact that my main and subform are based off different queries vs actual tables.

With what do you expect to fill in the fields in a new subform record?

If

it is with existing information, are you copying it to the subform record?

In a one-to-many relationship, with a form-subform user interface, the main

form and subform are based on the related tables (or queries based on those tables).

I will process and practice what you advise, and see if I can

trouble

shoot

more. I agree with your idea of creating separate fields for the 3

different

amt categories (rqmt, valrqmt & funded) and had originally set it up

this

way

AND had everything working...but the date. I was advised to change

this

structure and that's when my problems started. Not saying the advice

was

Re: 'Lord Help Me' Project

wrong, just that I didn't know how to make the data give me what I wanted in that kind of structure.

I can't say that I fully understand your situation, and I certainly don't know what you were previously advised (or if that advice was based on a mistaken or incomplete understanding of your situation), but if a requirement includes a date field you can filter the records according to the date (all dates from the current year, all dates within the past twelve months, etc.).

I'm not clear on your guidance for the relationships though. (I may have mistated in my original post). I have created the relationship of tblRequirements to the other tables through the use of foreign keys. I called this my main table because it's the table that hold each individual transaction. If you think of your checkbook, it's the "transaction description" column. All the data (fields) in this table are unique except where I've used foreign keys to tie the transaction to a certain account line, subcommand, command, program, function etc.

To use your checkbook analogy, the line items would probably be on the many side of a relationship. Let's say you have two checking accounts. Account1 can contain or be associated with many transactions, as can Account2, but the reverse is not true: a transaction would not be associated with more than one account. When the bank sends you a statement it contains only the transactions associated with your account. Your transactions are not associated with other accounts, even though you may sometimes wish they were. One account / many transactions, but not the reverse. You may be saying that each requirement ("transaction description") may contain any number of entries (for instance, AmountReceived may arrive in several installments), in which case a related table may well be the way to

Re: 'Lord Help Me' Project

handle that. . However, if AmountRequested and AmountReceived are separate records it may be difficult to perform the necessary comparisons.

Is that clear as mud?

Appreciate your help.
Laura

"laura reid" wrote:

First, thanks for helping me put this in bite size pieces. 2d, I apologize in advance if my 'db lingo' is incorrect.

Database Purpose: Our office (Military command) has a \$99M budget that funds payroll, various contracts, and office daily operations (to include training, travel and supply expenses). This budget used to be captured on a spreadsheet that had rows for each office followed by rows for the fund category (ie contract, payroll, supply, travel) and then columns to show the initial funding startpoint amount, a remarks column, a column for funding changes (increases/decreases) and a remarks changes column, and a total column. Then with each successive year, the columns were recreated and the old ones hidden.

I've successfully recreated this into a relational database with the

Re: 'Lord Help Me' Project

following tables to capture unique information.

Definitions:

Requirement – \$ amount the office says is required perform a certain function at 100% with bells and whistles.

ValRqmt – \$ amount that has been validated by leadership to say "no you can't have have \$50,000 for all your travel needs, eliminate conferences and you can have \$40,000"

Funded – \$ amount that usually matches Val Rqmt, but not always. This is the amount that can actually be afforded, based on what we receive from our higher headquarters.

Description – gives a title text description of what the requirement is buying

Here are my tables & fields:

Requirements (Main table that holds the 'many' side of the relationship)

Description – txt

Amount – number field

Year – date

RqmtRmks – txt to provide short info on the amounts entered (used for historical purposes and document decision making)

ValRmks – s/a

FunRmks – s/a

WorkYears – number (tells how many people can be funded for payroll)

Rqmts ID – PK

CmdID – FK

SubCmdID – FK

ObjClassID – FK

Re: 'Lord Help Me' Project

AcctID – FK
AuditID – FK
PriorityID – FK
FunctionID – FK
AmountID – FK

Naturally each of the FKs above has their own tables (that provide the one side of the relationship) with descriptions provided below. (Note, some of these tables could/should probably be combined, but since I wasn't sure, I just broke everything out)

Command Table – contains only 3 records for the 3 commands we're responsible for.

SubCommand Table – each of the above 3 commands have separate offices (some up to 12)

ObjClass Table– defines up to 12 different main funding categories, ie pay, travel, supplies etc.

Acct Tble – provides the customer accounting information

AuditTable – describes the change to the funded amt field. There are 6 options to choose from to document a change (baseline/increase/decrease/reprogram/unfund/transfer)

PriorityTable – each requirement description is either a level 1, 2 or 3 priority

Function Table – describes what mission function the requirement supports.

Anount Table – 3 records only to describes if the amount is a Requirement, Validated Requirement or Funded amount.

I then built a base 'budget query' that sums

Re: 'Lord Help Me' Project

and groups with the only
change
being how the amount field is captured. I
know Rqmt and Val Rqmt
amounts
will not change throughout out the year, but
Funded will. So in my
query
I
added three additional columns (one for each
amount type) with the
following
expression:

Requested:

```
Sum(If([amtaction]="requested",[amount],0))
```

It's this query that I use as an underlying
base for additional
queries/forms/reports. The only field that is
missing is the date
field
because the date is a mm/dd/yyyy auto fill
field and it messes up when
I
group. I really only need the date field to
capture the year, not the
mm/dd
but I don't know how to do this as an
autofill.

So I'll stop here and ask if this design sounds
acceptable?

Thanks

Laura

"laura reid" wrote:

I am SO lost. I started out
on something I thought
would be easy
and
have
dug myself into a hole of no
return. I promise if I can get
this
program to
work, I'll stick to what I
know and leave the
programming to the

Re: 'Lord Help Me' Project

experts.

I'm in charge of building and tracking our command's budget and converted an old spreadsheet that had columns out to infinity into a relational database.

There are other tables that contain account code information, office/unit information etc, but the main table captures requirements, validated requirements, and amount funded. Originally, I had three sep. columns to capture this data and had my reports, queries, subforms, etc...all working fine, but realized I had a problem when it came time to switch into the new year and start over, but still retain prior year info for historical purposes. After extensive posting on this community site I was later advised my design was flawed and the best way was to have one column called amount and then another called amount type where I would choose [rqmt, valrqmt, or funded]. So I've done this and recreated my reports, relationships, forms

Re: 'Lord Help Me' Project

etc...but now I can't get a
critical form to operate and
I'm so down
in
the
weeds that I don't even
know where to start
explaining it.

My goal is to create a form
(audit trail) that let's me
capture
funding
changes that occur through
out the year, thus increasing
the number
of
records to the main table.
While the amounts for Rqmt
and valrqmt
will not
change, funding amts will
change based on budget
increases/decreases
or
reprogramming actions. So
in theory, I'd like a main
form that
identifies
the unit, and accting
information, and then a
subforms in datasheet
view
showing the requirement
description along with the
amount funded as
a
startpoint. In the subform I
would then be able to add
additional
records by
duplicating the requirement
description and either
increasing or
decreasing
the funded amount and
attach a remark.

Then through the awesome
magic of automation, the
other fields in

Re: 'Lord Help Me' Project

the
record
would automatically
populate with the fields in
the main form. See
that's
not too much to ask, is it?

I have created a query off
the maintable that
'restructures' my
database so
I have 3 columns titled
(guess??) [rqmts],
[valrqmts] and [funded].
This is
my main query I use to
create other queries that sum
the amounts and
group my
info in a variety of ways.
And this is where I get stuck
because
when
I add
a record that changes the
fund amount, it never makes
it back to the
main
table correctly because I
never enter in the amt type.
The field
doesn't
exist in my query and if I
put it in, it messes up my
groupings.

So my design is still flawed
(i just don't understand how)
and I
think
I
have too many tables, but I
tried to keep info grouped to
avoid a
lot
of
duplication.

And now I'm rambling...so
if anyone out there has an

Re: 'Lord Help Me' Project

urge to do a
random act
of kindness, I'm a willing
(and somewhat able)
recipient.

Thanks!
Laura