

National Library of Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Ottawa, Canada K1A 0N4 Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Service des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur 'e droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A Study of Optimal Location: Competitiveness of the Alberta Cattle Feeding Industry with U.S. Regions

BY Duncan McKinnon

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science

IN

Agricultural Economics

Department of Rural Economy

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 1991



National Library of Canada Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Service des thèses canadiennes

Canadian Theses Service

Ottawa, Canada K1A 0N4

> The author has granted an irrevocable nonexclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

> The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-70196-X



UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR:	Duncan McKinnon
TITLE OF THESIS:	A Study of Optimal Location:
	Competitiveness of the Alberta Cattle
	Feeding Industry with U.S. Regions.

DEGREE:

Master of Science

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: Fall 1991

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Duncan WEK

Duncan McKinnon #535 Michener Park Edmonton, Alberta T6H-4M5

Date Jul, 19.71

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled A Study of Optimal Location: Competitiveness of the Alberta Cattle Feeding Industry with U.S. Regions submitted by Duncan McKinnon in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the cegree of Master of Science in Agricultural Economics.

A les in

M.L.Lerohl, Supervisor

V

A.W. Anderson au Sauer

G. Mathison

Date: July 19.91

ABSTRACT

This study examines optimal location of cattle feeding among Alberta and the northwest U.S.. Optimal location is based on comparative advantage (reflected in lower cost) in the production of resources such as feeds and feeders, and final product of boxed beef. Transportation costs of resources and final product also influence optimal location.

A spatial equilibrium model is developed to determine optimal location among seven regions. It is a linear programming cost minimization model that applies to 1988. A production function for transforming intermediate resources into final product (boxed beef) is used and regional demand for boxed beef is specified.

Alberta beef supply and disposition for 1988 is recreated with various policy simulations then applied to this base model. Results indicate Alberta can be competitive with U.S. regions in feeding and processing cattle. Competitiveness of Alberta's cattle feeding industry is strengthened by the policy simulations.

Comparison of actual 1988 cattle feeding patterns to "optimal" feeding patterns indicated by the model leads to inferences. Significant feeding impacts appear to arise from removal of (or alterations to) the current method of paying the Crow Benefit. The Alberta cattle sector shows considerable sensitivity to this policy through its impact on barley price. Study models indicate the Alberta cattle feeding and processing industry would expand with Crow rate removal.

Secondly, should Pacific Rim demand for high quality beef increase, both Alberta regions would increase exports by shipping through the west coast port of Vancouver. Exports to the Pacific Rim would displace beef shipments from Alberta to eastern Canada.

Depreciation of the value of the Canadian dollar in 1988 would also have led to increased activity in the Alberta cattle sector. Alberta imported more feeders from the U.S. as value added cattle feeding and processing activities increased in Alberta. The additional boxed beef was shipped south to the U.S.

Acknowledgements

Many people deserve recognition for their contribution to the completion of this project. Dr. Bill Phillips initiated my involvement in the study and gave encouragement throughout. My advisor, Dr. M.L. Lerohl, provided direction to my research. He successfully steered me clear of most dead ends and guided me toward productive research. Numerous times he kept me from complicating the issues. His patience while I got on track contributed immensely to completion of the project. Thanks Mel.

Professor A.W. Anderson gave invaluable assistance with the mathematical programming sections of the project. Several times work was stalled until Professor Anderson got a chance to look at it. Perhaps more important than the programming help, thanks Wayne for laughing at my jokes.

Dr. Len Bauer deserves recognition for giving me opportunities throughout my graduate program. Your fine wit was appreciated Dr. Bauer. Dr. Gary Mathison, thanks for providing the animal science knowledge. To both of you, thanks for being on my committee.

Jim Copeland, thanks for timely tips in the computer room. Barb Johnson, thanks for research assistance and advise.

Alberta Agriculture staff provided assistance with data collection. In particular, thanks to Rob Bateman and Barb Gabruch. Darcy Willis at Alberta Agriculture provided the conditions that allowed the project to develop. Challenging conversation with Darcy helped focus this study. Dedication

To my wife

Sheila,

and our children

Hannah, Grant and Zane.

Your sacrifice and patience has allowed me to finish.

Table of Contents

1.1 Background 1 1.1.1 Competitiveness Issues 1 1.1.2 King and Schrader Paper 4 1.1.3 Objectives and Organization of the Study 5 1.2 Trade Theory 6 1.2.1 Comparative Advantage/Gains from Trade 6 1.2.2 Price Equilibrium In Spatially Separated Markets 10 2 SPATIAL EQUILIBRIUM THEORY 14 2.1 Introduction 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 17 2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 23 2.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.5.1 Linear enogramming 25 2.5.1 Linear enogramming 25 2.6 Spatial Programming 25 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2.1 Requonal Demarcation 41 3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 45 3.3.2.3 Roughages 45 3.3.4.1 Feee	1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1.2 Objectives and Organization of the Study 5 1.2 Trade Theory 6 1.2.1 Comparative Advantage/Gains from Trade 6 1.2.2 Price Equilibrium 10 2 SPATIAL EQUILIBRIUM THEORY 14 2.1 Introduction 16 2.2.2 Modern Location Theory 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 16 2.2.2 Modern Location Theory 16 2.3.5 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.5.1 Linear grogramming 25 2.5.1 Linear grogramming 25 2.6 Spatial Example of Samuelson Formulation 27 2.6 Spatial Example of Samuelson Formulation 27 2.6 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 46 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44	1.1 Background	
1.1.2 Objectives and Organization of the Study 5 1.2 Trade Theory 6 1.2.1 Comparative Advantage/Gains from Trade 6 1.2.2 Price Equilibrium 10 2 SPATIAL EQUILIBRIUM THEORY 14 2.1 Introduction 16 2.2.2 Modern Location Theory 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 16 2.2.2 Modern Location Theory 16 2.3.5 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.5.1 Linear grogramming 25 2.5.1 Linear grogramming 25 2.6 Spatial Example of Samuelson Formulation 27 2.6 Spatial Example of Samuelson Formulation 27 2.6 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 46 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44	1.1.1 Competitiveness Issues.	1
2 SPATIAL EQUILIBRIUM THEORY 14 2.1 Introduction 14 2.2 Location Theory 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 17 2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 23 2.5.1 Astronometric exagramming 25 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 46 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 51 3.3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 57 <	1.1.2 King and Schrader Paper	
2 SPATIAL EQUILIBRIUM THEORY 14 2.1 Introduction 14 2.2 Location Theory 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 17 2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 23 2.5.1 Astronometric exagramming 25 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 46 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 51 3.3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 57 <	1.1.3 Objectives and Organization of the Study	
2 SPATIAL EQUILIBRIUM THEORY 14 2.1 Introduction 14 2.2 Location Theory 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 17 2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 23 2.5.1 Astronometric exagramming 25 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 46 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 51 3.3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 57 <	1.2 Trade Theory	
2 SPATIAL EQUILIBRIUM THEORY 14 2.1 Introduction 14 2.2 Location Theory 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 17 2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 23 2.5.1 Astronometric exagramming 25 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 46 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 51 3.3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 57 <	1.2.1 Comparative Advantage/Gains from Trade	
2 SPATIAL EQUILIBRIUM THEORY 14 2.1 Introduction 14 2.2 Location Theory 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 17 2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 23 2.5.1 Astronometric exagramming 25 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 46 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 51 3.3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 57 <	1.2.2 Price Equilibrium	
2 SPATIAL EQUILIBRIUM THEORY 14 2.1 Introduction 14 2.2 Location Theory 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 17 2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 23 2.5.1 Astronometric exagramming 25 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.6.1 Lizaitations 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 46 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 51 3.3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 57 <	1.2.2.1 Price Equilibrium In Spatially Separated M	arkets 10
2.1 Introduction 14 2.2 Location Theory 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 17 2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 23 2.4.2 Model Solution 23 2.5.4 Assumptions 23 2.5.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.6.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.6.6 Spatial Example of Gamuelson Formulation 27 2.6.1 Lightstreet Cogramming 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 32 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 51 3.3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues<		
2.1 Introduction 14 2.2 Location Theory 16 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 17 2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 23 2.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.5.1 Linest and programming 25 2.6.5 Mathematical Programming 26 2.6.6 Spatial Example of Samuelson Formulation 27 2.6.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 45 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 45 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 51 3.3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1.1 Grading Issu	2 SPATIAL EQUILIBRIUM THEORY	
2.2 Location Theory 10 2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory 16 2.2.2 Modern Location Theory 17 2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 22 2.4.2 Model Solution 23 2.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.5.1 Linest of Daramming 25 2.5.1 Linest of Daramming 25 2.6.1 Linitations 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 46 3.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4 Production Process 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 53 3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.5.7 Transfer Costs 53	2.1 Introduction	
2.2.2 Modern Location Theory 17 2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 23 2.4.2 Model Solution 23 2.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.5.1 Linear grogramming 25 2.6.1 Linitations 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.3 Roughages 46 3.3.4 Production Process 49 3.3.4 Production Process 49 3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.5.5 Transfer Costs 51 3.5.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.5.7 Tansfer Costs 51 3.5.8 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.5.7 Tansfer Costs 51 3.5.8 Regional Beef Demand 57 <tr< td=""><td>2.2 Location Theory</td><td></td></tr<>	2.2 Location Theory	
2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 22 2.4.2 Model Solution 23 2.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.5.1 Linear group ramming 25 2.6 Spatial Example of Samuelson 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 45 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 53 3.3.6 Regional Beet Demand 57 3.3.7 Beet Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 A Model 1 66	2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory	10
2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework 20 2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation 21 2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation 22 2.4.1 Assumptions 22 2.4.2 Model Solution 23 2.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.5.1 Linear group ramming 25 2.6 Spatial Example of Samuelson 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 45 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 53 3.3.6 Regional Beet Demand 57 3.3.7 Beet Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 A Model 1 66	2.2.2 Modern Location Theory	
2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation222.4.1 Assumptions232.4.2 Model Solution232.5 Mathematical Programming252.5.1 Linear Forgramming252.6 Spatier ExactAvium Model Evaluation272.6.1 Linitations292.7 Summary303 THE MODEL323.1 Introduction323.2 Notation and Mathematical Model363.3 Data Requirements413.3.1 Regional Demarcation413.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle443.3.2.2 Concentrates463.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost473.3.4 Production Process493.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion513.5.5 Transfer Costs513.5.6 Regional Beef Demand573.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed524 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS624.1 Introduction624.1.1 Grading Issues644.2 Results66	2.2 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework	
2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation222.4.1 Assumptions232.4.2 Model Solution232.5 Mathematical Programming252.5.1 Linear Forgramming252.6 Spatier ExactAvium Model Evaluation272.6.1 Linitations292.7 Summary303 THE MODEL323.1 Introduction323.2 Notation and Mathematical Model363.3 Data Requirements413.3.1 Regional Demarcation413.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle443.3.2.2 Concentrates463.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost473.3.4 Production Process493.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion513.5.5 Transfer Costs513.5.6 Regional Beef Demand573.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed524 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS624.1 Introduction624.1.1 Grading Issues644.2 Results66	2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation	
2.4.1 Assumptions 23 2.4.2 Model Solution 23 2.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.6 Spatial Expendence of Gramming 25 2.6.1 Linitations 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.3 Roughages 46 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs 51 3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beet Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66	2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation	
2.4.2 Model Solution 25 2.5 Mathematical Programming 25 2.6 Spatial Exectivity Model Evaluation 27 2.6.1 Liantations 29 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 46 3.3.3.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.3 Roughages 46 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs 51 3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66 <td>2 A 1 Accumptions</td> <td></td>	2 A 1 Accumptions	
2.5 Mathematical Programming232.5.1 Linear Orgramming252.6 Sparing Excelorium Model Evaluation272.6.1 Linitations292.7 Summary303 THE MODEL323.1 Introduction323.2 Notation and Mathematical Model363.3 Data Requirements413.3.1 Regional Demarcation413.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply443.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle443.3.2.3 Roughages463.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost473.3.4 Production Process493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion513.5.5 Transfer Costs513.5.6 Regional Beef Demand573.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed584 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS624.1 Introduction624.1 Model 166		
2.5.1 Linear programming272.6 Spatial Equilation Model Evaluation272.6.1 Linitations292.7 Summary303 THE MODEL323.1 Introduction323.2 Notation and Mathematical Model363.3 Data Requirements413.3.1 Regional Demarcation413.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply443.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle453.3.2.3 Roughages463.3.4 Ireduction Process493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion513.3.5.5 Transfer Costs533.3.6 Regional Beef Demand573.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed584 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS624.1 Introduction624.1.1 Grading Issues664.2 Results66	2.5 Mothematical Decaramping	<i>L</i> J
2.6.1 Liantarisons 30 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 45 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 45 3.3.2.3 Roughages 46 3.3.4 Production Process 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beet Demand 57 3.3.7 Beet Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 66 4.2 Results 66	2.5.1 Linest stogramming	
2.6.1 Liantarisons 30 2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 45 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 45 3.3.2.3 Roughages 46 3.3.4 Production Process 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beet Demand 57 3.3.7 Beet Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 66 4.2 Results 66	2.6 Spatial Equilibrium Model Evaluation	
2.7 Summary 30 3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 45 3.3.3.1 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4 Production Process 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.5 Transfer Costs 51 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 64 4.2 Results 66		
3 THE MODEL 32 3.1 Introduction 32 3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 36 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 45 3.3.3.1 Itermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.3 Roughages 46 3.3.4 Production Process 47 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs 51 3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 64 4.2 Results 66	2.7 Summary	
3.1 Introduction363.2 Notation and Mathematical Model363.3 Data Requirements413.3.1 Regional Demarcation413.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply443.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle443.3.2.2 Concentrates453.3.2.3 Roughages463.3.4 Production Process493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.5 Transfer Costs513.5.5 Transfer Costs533.3.6 Regional Beet Demand573.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed584 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS624.1 Introduction624.1.1 Grading Issues644.2 Results66		
3.1 Introduction363.2 Notation and Mathematical Model363.3 Data Requirements413.3.1 Regional Demarcation413.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply443.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle443.3.2.2 Concentrates453.3.2.3 Roughages463.3.4 Production Process493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.5 Transfer Costs513.5.5 Transfer Costs533.3.6 Regional Beet Demand573.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed584 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS624.1 Introduction624.1.1 Grading Issues644.2 Results66	3 THE MODEL	
3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model 41 3.3 Data Requirements 41 3.3.1 Regional Demarcation 41 3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply 44 3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle 44 3.3.2.2 Concentrates 45 3.3.2.3 Roughages 46 3.3.4 Production Process 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs 51 3.3.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.2 Results 66	0.1 Internation	
3.3 Data Requirements413.3.1 Regional Demarcation413.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply443.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle443.3.2.2 Concentrates453.3.2.3 Roughages463.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost473.3.4 Production Process493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.5 Transfer Costs513.5.5 Transfer Costs533.3.6 Regional Beef Demand573.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed584 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS624.1 Introduction624.1.1 Grading Issues644.2 Results66	2 2 Nighter and Mathematical Madel	
3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply443.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle453.3.2.2 Concentrates453.3.2.3 Roughages463.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost473.3.4 Production Process493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs513.5.5 Transfer Costs533.3.6 Regional Beef Demand573.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed584 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS624.1 Introduction624.1.1 Grading Issues644.2 Results66	3.3 Data Requirements	
3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply443.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle453.3.2.2 Concentrates453.3.2.3 Roughages463.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost473.3.4 Production Process493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs513.5.5 Transfer Costs533.3.6 Regional Beef Demand573.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed584 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS624.1 Introduction624.1.1 Grading Issues644.2 Results66	3.3.1 Regional Demarcation	
3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle473.3.2.2 Concentrates453.3.2.3 Roughages463.3.2.3 Roughages463.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost473.3.4 Production Process493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs513.5.5 Transfer Costs533.3.6 Regional Beef Demand573.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed584 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS624.1 Introduction624.1.1 Grading Issues644.2 Results66	3 3 7 Intermediate Product Subbly	
3.3.2.2 Concentrates 43 3.3.2.3 Roughages 46 3.3.2.3 Roughages 47 3.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost 47 3.3.4 Production Process 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs 51 3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66	2 2 2 1 Feeder Cattle	······································
3.3.2.3 Roughages403.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost473.3.4 Production Process493.3.4.1 Feed Conversion493.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs513.5.5 Transfer Costs533.3.6 Regional Beef Demand573.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed584 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS624.1 Introduction624.1.1 Grading Issues644.2 Results66	2.2.2.2 Concentrates	
3.3.4 Production Process 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs 51 3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66	3.3.2.3 Roughages	
3.3.4 Production Process 49 3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs 51 3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66	3.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost	
3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion 49 3.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs 51 3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66	2.2.4 Production Process	·····································
3.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs 51 3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66	2 2 4 1 East Conversion	47
3.5.5 Transfer Costs 53 3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand 57 3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed 58 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66	2.2.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs	JI
3.3.7 Beet Other Than Fed 62 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66	3 5 5 Transfer Costs	
3.3.7 Beet Other Than Fed 62 4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS 62 4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66	3 3 6 Regional Beef Demand	
4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS	3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed	
4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66 4.2.1 Model 1 66		
4.1 Introduction 62 4.1.1 Grading Issues 64 4.2 Results 66 4.2.1 Model 1 66		(A
4.1.1 Grading Issues	4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS	
4.2 Results	A 1 I - to duction	
A 2 1 Model 1 00	4.1 Introduction	
4.2.2 Model 2	4.1 Introduction 4.1.1 Grading Issues	
	 4.1 Introduction	

	72
4.2.3 Model 3 4.2.4 Model 4	74
4.2.4 Model 4	76
4.2.4 Model 4 4.2.5 Model 5	70
4.2.6 Summary of Results	19
	80
5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	00
5.1 Recommendations for Further Study	88
6 BIBLIOGRAPHY	90
0 BIBLIOOKAPH I	
7 APPENDICES	95
 7 APPENDICES 7.1 Appendix A (Feed Data Methodology) 7.2 Appendix B (Feeder Data Methodology) 7.3 Appendix C (MTS Base Model Results) 	95
7.1 Appendix A (Feed Data Methodology)	99
7.2 Appendix B (Feeder Data Methology)	102
7.3 Appendix C (MTS Base Model Results)	102

Table of Tables

Table 1: Model Notation.	37
Table 2. Linear Programming Example of a Two Region Model	40
Table 3: Regional Feeder Placements	44
Table 3: Regional Feeder Placements	46
Table 5: Regional Availability of Feed Roughages	47
Table 6. Intermediate Product Cost	40
T 11 7 New East/Decosing Costs	הר
Table 8. Distance in Miles Between Regional Central Points	22
Toble Xa: Reet Transfer COSIS	20
Table 8b. Feeder Transfer Costs	20
Table 8c. Feed Concentrate Transfer Costs	- 20
Table 8d. Feed Roughage Transfer Costs	57
Table 9: Regional Reef Demand for 1988	. 38 -
Table 10: Degional Non-fed Beef Supplies	. 39
Table 11. Equilibrium Reef Market	. 01
Table 12. Actual and Model 1 Beef Supply and Disposition	. 00
Table 13. Model 1 Beef Production and Product Snipments	. 02
Table 14. Model 2 Beef Production and Product Shipments	. / 1
Table 15: Model 3 Beef Production and Product Shipments	. 13
Table 16: Model 4 Beef Production and Product Shipments	. /5
Table 17. Model 5 Beef Production and Product Shipments	. /ð
Table 19. Summary of Results	. 17
Table A1. Concentrate Availability in Tonnes	. 95
Table A2. Roughage Availability in Tonnes	90
Table A3. Livestock Feeding Rates	フィ
Table A4. NET Energy of Various Feedstuffs	98
Table B1. U.S. Placement Methodology	100
Table B2: Alberta Placement Methodology	101

Table of Figures

Figure 1: Price Equilibrium in Spatially Separated Markets	19 42
--	----------

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Competitiveness Issues.

Competitiveness of Alberta beef internationally is important to many sectors of the Alberta economy including the government and the cattle industry. The cattle industry needs to know its competitiveness to make long-run plans. Assume, for example, statutory rates were altered or removed (adjusted) on grain exported from the prairies. Would excess supply of feed grain in Alberta translate into a reduction in Alberta livestock producer feed conversion costs? How would this impact on optimum feedlot location in north-western U.S. and Alberta? The answer would help clarify Alberta's competitive position in the cattle sector. If statutory grain rates are adjusted, feed grain shipment out of the province to eastern Canada could drop off. This should stimulate Alberta's feeding industry at the expense of eastern Canada's cattle feeding industry. Indirect effects of such a policy change may mean eastern U.S. states will draw beef supplies more from western states leaving open for Alberta the possibility of increased exports south to the California area.

Local government is also concerned with competitiveness of the Alberta cattle industry. Policies implemented by itself and others will impact on this competitiveness. Who are the gainers and losers of policy changes? What are the anticipated effects of various policy shocks on the cattle industry? Adjustment to

the Crow Benefit Program¹ is one example of impending policy change. Implications of Crow Rate removal on Alberta's cattle feeding industry are examined in this study. Non-harmonized beef grading between Alberta and the U.S. influences trade patterns. Beef inspection problems hinder flow of Alberta beef south. Scrutiny and possibly adjustment faces these regulatory issues. Implications of changes to regulatory issues in the beef sector are of significance to the entire Alberta economy.

Livestock trade between Alberta and the U.S. currently enjoys freer movement than many other agricultural commodities. Alberta's competitiveness in this sector is a sensitive issue as trade surges in livestock products affect the domestic industry more with free trade than with restricted trade. Cattle trade (live and processed) between Alberta and U.S. is of note. In 1988, Alberta exported 226,426 live cattle to the U.S., of which 98 percent were slaughter cattle. In 1989, the pattern was similar with about 95 percent being slaughter cattle. The loss to Alberta of value-added beef processing is disconcerting. This study attempts to identify factors critical to these cattle movements.

Alberta-U.S. trade in beef for 1988 indicates Alberta exported about ten times as much beef to the U.S. as was imported (45 million lbs versus 4 million lbs.). While the direction of these flows is encouraging, the quantity is not large. Alberta produced 800 million lbs of beef in 1988 of which approximately 25 percent (220 million lbs) was consumed in Alberta. Over 400 million pounds

¹ Statutory grain rates on export of prairie grains are those set out in the federal **Western Grain Transportation Act.** They are alternately referred to in this paper as the Crow Benefit Program.

was exported to Ontario and further east. The fact that Alberta can ship beef to eastern Canada competitively (considering the distance and resulting high transportation cost), opens for inquiry the issue of moving beef a lesser distance to the south.

In a study of competitiveness issues in the U.S. beef sector (Johnson et al., 1989), it was predicted there would be increased worldwide demand for beef in the coming years due to rising incomes and improved policy coordination between countries. It is believed that this increased consumption will be met by imports from countries holding a competitive edge in beef production. Recent investment in new slaughter facilities in Alberta indicates a readiness to participate in this anticipated expansion of beef demand. Other measures also suggest Alberta can produce beef competitively.

First, for primary agriculture production such as cattle feeding or fluid milk production, production can be either feed source oriented or market oriented. A study done in the early sixties (King 1961) shows that fluid milk production would be located near consuming centers but that feedlot cattle would be feed source oriented. If Alberta has an abundance of cattle feeds (concentrates and roughages), feedlot cattle production in Alberta may be competitive with the highly developed U.S. cattle feeding areas.

Secondly, the U.S. is a major world importer of high quality beef as opposed to range-fed beef. This distinction between types of beef is important. Several countries (notably Australia, Argentina, Brazil and New Zealand) export range-fed beef. Range-fed beef imported into the U.S. is usually processed fur-

ther, as are imports of European beef which often come from dairy cattle culls. Range-fed beef and beef from cull cattle is not competitive with the high quality beef that is produced in Alberta and demanded in the U.S.

Finally, Alberta's competitiveness in beef production is enhanced further by the low incidence of cattle disease in our temperate climate. North American imports of beef from Africa, Asia, South America and parts of Europe are restricted because of the prevalence of disease (primarily foot-and-mouth) in these countries.

1.1.2 King and Schrader Paper

The model used in this study follows one developed by King and Schrader (1963). King and Schrader make a distinction between general and partial equilibrium models: Determination of optimal production of an agricultural commodity in a general equilibrium framework depends on regional comparative advantage in producing that product in relation to production of all other agriculture products in the region. In the King and Schrader study the model takes regional production of all other livestock products as given and therefore undertakes a partial equilibrium analysis of feedlot location assuming as given the location of all other livestock production.

The King and Schrader paper had four objectives in mind:

1) "to present a framework for the analysis of interregional competition for the case where a) both intermediate products, such as feed and feeders, and product may be shipped among regions and b) where alternative production activities are specified for conversion of intermediate products into the final product; 2) to apply the model to the analysis of the location of cattle feeding operations in the United States; 3) to determine the effect on location of modify-

ing assumptions of the model as to nonfeed costs and feeding efficiency; 4) and to appraise the possible effect of other factors such as economies of scale in feedlot location."(King and Schrader, 332)

The primary purpose of their study was to "...provide quantification of the effect of factors influencing location of feedlot facilities." (King and Schrader, 332). Determined simultaneously in their model, along with feedlot location, were final product (beef) and factor (concentrates, roughages, and feeder cattle) shipment patterns, as well as beef prices that would result from perfectly competitive behavior.

1.1.3 Objectives and Organization of the Study

The objective of the present study is to estimate the optimal regional location of cattle feeding in Alberta and the north-west states.² In carrying out this objective, the model also determines optimal feeder shipments depending on various domestic and trade policies, exchange rates and demand scenarios. The study also indicates sensitivity of feeder shipment patterns to the above major variables.

A cost minimization, spatial equilibrium model is used to generate results. The model minimizes cost of intermediate products, transportation costs, non-feed costs and processing costs. A production function relating quantity of intermediate product required per unit of final product is specified as are regional demand functions for boxed beef. The methodology used has several parallels

² The eleven north-west states included in the study are: California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, N. Dakota, Oregon, S. Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

with the King and Schrader study although the present study is modified in several ways. The beef production function and the demand function used in this paper are clear examples of modifications.

Is Aiberta competitive with the north-west states in feeding and processing cattle? This model is not designed to deliver an unequivocal yes or no but to indicate optimal feeding and processing location given certain assumptions. By definition, the model abstracts from reality. For that reason not all factors impinging on equilibrium location are included. The model does deliver a framework that can be useful in analysis providing the user is fully aware of its assumptions and the resulting simplicity of the solution.

Organization of the study is in 7 chapters. The first provides background to the issue of competitiveness of the beef producing sector in Alberta. It also provides a brief introduction to the relevant trade theory. Chapter 2 introduces Spatial Equilibrium theory and discusses its connection to the study. In chapter 3 the study model is examined as are data requirements and methodology. In chapter 4 results and variations of the base model are presented. Chapters 5, 6, and 7 indicate, respectively, conclusions, bibliography, and appendices.

1.2 Trade Theory

1.2.1 Comparative Advantage/Gains from Trade

The basis for trade between countries or regions is comparative advantage.³ Gains arising from comparative advantage occur when a country exports goods it can produce at lower cost than other countries and imports goods that others can produce at lower cost. Two distinct lines of reasoning have resulted in the comparative advantage concept.

The Ricardian explanation of comparative advantage implied that all value was rooted in labor. Relative technical efficiencies (ie. economies of scale)⁴ were believed to create comparative advantage. When Ricardo conceived this notion, transfer of technical information between regions and countries was limited and the theory was appropriate. Currently, however, it is more reasonable to assume technical information can be transferred very quickly (in many cases instantaneously) and another explanation for comparative advantage is required.⁵ The Heckscher-Ohlin concept is that comparative advantage arises from regional availability of fixed factors of production such as land and primary inputs. This concept is applied in the present study.

³ The law of comparative advantage states that even if one nation has an absolute disadvantage compared to the other nation (or is less efficient than the other nation) in the production of both commodities there may still be grounds for trade. The first nation should specialize in production of the good for which its absolute disadvantage is smaller (the good of its comparative advantage) and import the good in which its absolute disadvantage is greater.(Salvatore 1990)

⁴ Economies of Scale refers to technical efficiencies (expansion of output in response to expansion of all factors in fixed proportions); Economies of Size refers more to cost advantages that may be realized by following the Least Cost Expansion Path.

⁵ Differences in size between Alberta and U.S. cattle sectors may be due less to technological advantages than to different demand conditions. The U.S. market is ten times as large as the Alberta market. This allows distinct economies of size advantages for U.S. cattle feeders.

Unless a nation or region has unused resources, production of one good must be foregone to produce another good. This involves rearranging the resource use patterns. Comparative advantage requires examination of the opportunity cost of producing additional units of a particular good in terms of amounts of another good that must be foregone (Houck 1986). Comparative advantage theory then compares these opportunity costs with prices of the goods on the international market. Trading decisions will be based on this comparison. For example, a good will be exported if the international price of the good is greater than the opportunity cost of producing it domestically. Imports require the international price to be lower than domestic opportunity costs of producing the good. Efficiency is improved by the release of resources from the production of goods that can be imported at a lower cost.

Comparative advantage in the production of a commodity leads to specialization and increased utilization of the particular abilities and resources that region/country posesses. Specialization brings change in economic structure and increased investment in sectors that have a comparative advantage in production of a good, and contraction of costly sectors. The capansion in efficient sectors leads to increased input demands which leads to expansion in other sectors of the economy as resources move from less efficient sectors to expanding sectors.

A region may also choose to specialize production for reasons other than comparative or absolute advantage. If it has few feasible alternatives, production of a commodity may occur by default. A second region with absolute advantage in production of that commodity may then find a better use for its

"more versatile" resources and utilize them in the production of alternate goods. In such a situation, the first region has the comparative advantage in production of that particular commodity.

For agriculture, the basic resources of land quality, land availability and climate define the feasible alternatives of production. Actual use of these resources depends on the markets for a particular commodity and for alternate commodities, on the location of urban centers of population, on tastes and preferences of individuals and on transfer costs from producing areas to markets (Bressler and King 1970).

Trade resulting from comparative advantage and specialization means buyers have access to goods that are not available or are prohibitively expensive. Trade for lower priced foreign goods effectively raises the real income of domestic consumers--their dollar buys more. Distribution of these "gains from trade" are not even, however. The country as a whole gains from trade but all individuals do not benefit. This leads to protective measures being taken by virtually all participants in the market.⁶

1.2.2 Price Equilibrium

Competitive price equilibrium allocates scarce resources and hence directs economic activity. On the production side, product prices affect factor prices and allocate scarce resources among alternative uses. On the consumption

⁶ Protective measures are taken because benefits of additional trade are thinly and widely spread over an entire population, but costs and hardships are paid by relatively few who are often able to organize and effectively voice their opposition.

side, factor prices are income. The interaction of income with commodity prices in the competitive market allocates goods and services among consumers (Bressler and King 1970).

Markets are said to facilitate the creation of place, time and ownership utility. In equilibrium there is one price for each good with a particular place, time and ownership utility. In a single market, price equilibrium occurs when price is reached where quantity supplied exactly equals quantity demanded.

In the present study, although there are several regions used, they are interconnected by trade and therefore constitute a single market. The uniqueness of place utility is the only difference between price in two separate regions. What the transfer activity does is to change the place utility of the commodity in the single market. What results is one *multiple price* market where price differences are due entirely to differences in place utility. Practically speaking, there may be other reasons for the price difference. The following section illustrates price equilibrium in geographically separated regions, and how price adjusts to account for transfer cost between regions.

1.2.2.1 Price Equilibrium In Spatially Separated Markets

Modern spatial equilibrium models originate in the theory of trade between spatially separated regions. The following explanation (based on Bressler and King 1970) illustrates the mechanism for determining price equilibrium between regions.

Examining price equilibrium between two regions requires a single commodity to be traded. Assume supply and demand curves are given in the two regions. With no trade, price equilibrium is determined in isolation in each region. With trade opened between two regions, call them region X and region Y, traders will equalize price through arbitrage⁷. They will lower price in, say, region X and raise price in region Y. Arbitrage will continue until price in region X equals price in region Y and a combined equilibrium price is reached between the two regions.

To this point no transportation costs are included. This allows price to be exactly equalized between regions. More realistically, prices between regions would approach equalization until they differ by the transfer cost. This can be shown graphically by adjusting upwards the supply and demand curves in the exporting region by an amount t, indicating the extra cost to region Y of delivering its product to the market in region X. This is done in Fig 1. Now, a horizontal line such as c'c''c' through the diagram indicates a combined equilibrium price that differs by the transportation cost between region Y and region X, with price in region Y being less than price in region X by the amount t.

⁷ Arbitrage is transactions designed to make a profit from inconsistent prices.

Figure 1. Price Equilibrium in Spatially Separated Markets

```
Figure 1 has been removed due to copyright restrictions.
```

Source: Bressler and King 1970, 90.

The relationship between transfer cost and trade flows can be illustrated by another curve that measures the *vertical* difference between the excess supply curves⁸. Fig 2 represents the situation.⁹ Drawing $ES_x - ES_y$, transfer cost can be read off the vertical axis with the height of t representing transfer cost. Extending a line up and down from the intersection of t with the new curve, off the horizontal axis can be read the reduction in trade volume, (Oh - Oh'), resulting from transfer costs; and from where the line crosses the excess supply curves, the equilibrium prices in each region, Px and Py, that will differ by transfer cost.

⁸ Excess supply curves are the horizontal difference between supply and demand in the corresponding regions.

⁹ Figure 2 is another way of expressing what is said in Figure 1. It is included to give another perspective on price equilibrium. Figure 2 also plays a role in describing transformation of the spatial equilibrium problem from a descriptive to an optimizing framework in section 2.3.

Figure 2. Price Equilibrium in Spatially Separated Markets (Alternate Representation)

Figure 2 has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Source: Bressler and King 1970, 91.



2 SPATIAL EQUILIBRIUM THEORY

2.1 Introduction

Neoclassical economic analysis does not explicitly consider the effects of spatial relationships:

"Even the theory of international economics, duly incorporated into neoclassical analysis, finds itself in a paradoxical position: it denies the existence of space, yet it attempts to explain comparative advantage, a doctrine which cannot be properly interpreted without taking the cost of transportation into account." (Lefeber 1958, 1)

Since these words were written, considerable progress has been made toward incorporating spatial variables in economic equilibrium models. Development of mathematical programming techniques and improved computational abilities of computers in the last thirty years have led to considerable empirical work in this area.

The purpose of this section is to identify the theory of spatial equilibrium and illustrate how it is made operational in empirical studies. To accomplish this task, the chapter is broken into five parts. The first introduces location theory as discussed by Weinschenck et al. (1969). The second part is centered on Samuelson (1952). His paper makes the connection between theoretical problem and operational solution and explains the descriptive to optimizing transformation required for analysis. In the third part an example of an optimizing problem is given from Judge and Wallace (1958).

The Judge and Wallace solution algorithm is examined because it illustrates the component parts necessary to solve a spatial equilibrium model. With current computer technology, problem solution does not require the time and effort needed in 1958. Modern solution algorithms require less pre-solution computation before using the mathematical programming framework. The fourth part is based on Chiang (1984). It illustrates the mathematical background and techniques used in linear programming. A progression is made from the more general non-linear programming to linear programming to display the setting of linear programming. The final part provides an evaluation of spatial equilibrium models from Bawden (1964).

2.2 Location Theory

Since Ricardo, economists have been aware of the necessity of including space in economic reasoning. Progress in the area has been slow, however, and only recently is space included in a theory of general economic equilibrium. The difference between traditional and modern location theory lies in the ability to make the models operational. Modern theory has made great strides toward achieving this goal by building on the framework set up by traditional location theorists.

2.2.1 Traditional Location Theory

Traditional theory was concerned with problems involving optimal location of a firm; optimal production at a given location; exchange of goods and factors between locations, and; the difference in prices and factor earnings between locations. As noted by Weinschenck et al. (1969), all four of these problems are "...only different aspects of the major problem of the general spatial equilibrium of production." (Weinschenck et al. 1969, 1).

Agriculture location theory began with J.H. von Thunen (Von Thunen, 1966). His descriptive spatial equilibrium problem was as follows:

> "Imagine a very large town, at the center of a fertile plain which is crossed by no navigable river or canal. Throughout the plain the soil is capable of cultivation and of the same fertility. Far from the town, the plain turns into an uncultivated wilderness which cuts off all communication between this State and the outside world.

> There are no other towns on the plain. The central town must therefore supply the rural areas with all manufactured products, and in return it will obtain all its provisions from the surrounding countryside.... The problem we want to solve is this: What pattern of cultivation will take shape in these conditions?; and how far will the

farming system of the different districts be affected by their distance from the Town?" (Weinschenck et al. 1969, 4)

Intent only on determining the influence of different distances from the market on types of land use, keeping all other factors constant, von Thunen demonstrated that two spatial conditions are necessary for a good to be produced: 1) The inner boundary (with respect to the market) of production of a good must be closer to the market than the intersection of the boundary of production of this good with all other goods that generate a lower rent. Similarly, 2) The outer boundary (with respect to the market) of production of a good must be farther from the market than the intersection of the boundary of production of this good with all other goods that generate a lower rent. Similarly, 2) words, as distance from the market increases, rent per unit land decreases.

Von Thunen's descriptive model was a first step toward explicitly including space when determining an economic equilibrium. After von Thunen, location factors were generalized by other traditional location theorists. They considered different production functions, introduced economies and diseconomies of scale and looked at other location factors that affect production. These include geographical conditions, stage of economic development and personality of the farm operator (Weinschenck et al. 1969, 13).

2.2.2 Modern Location Theory

While traditional location theory focused on description and hence delivered primarily explanatory models, modern spatial equilibrium theory has become committed to making the models more operational. This is accomplished by

incorporating implicitly into the supply and demand functions and transportation costs for a good, the many explicit location factors of traditional models. These composites are modelled rather than individually modelling many implicit location factors (see Figure 3). A further development of modern spatial equilibrium theory is the use of a discrete number of points rather than allowing space to change continuously. Relations between prices and supply, prices and demand, and the dependence of transportation costs on the direction of product flows are handled easier if a finite number of regions are used.

(Weinschenck et al. 1969, 15).

Figure 3: Components of location definitions.

.

Figure 3 has been removed due to copyright restrictions.

Note: Taken from Weinschenck et. al. 1969, 14.

-

•

2.3 From Descriptive to Optimizing Framework

Samuelson (1952) formalizes the descriptive problem in the following way:

"...we are given at each of two or more localities a domestic demand and supply curve for a given product (e.g., wheat) in terms of its market price at that locality. We are also given constant transport costs (shipping, insurance, duties, etc.) for carrying one unit of the product between any two of the specified localities. What then will be the final competitive equilibrium of prices in all the markets, of amounts supplied and demanded at each place, and of exports and imports?"(Samuelson 1952, 284).

Behind the scenes in this descriptive problem we assume an almost infinite number of atomistic competitors operate to maximize their own personal welfare. They take no **conscious** account of the principle of mathematical maximization. Yet, this perfect competition does lead to efficient allocation and use of resources.

The difficulty has been in describing how this intuitive maximization situation can be transformed to a framework that can be solved by mathematical maximization techniques. Samuelson (1952) illustrates how an area under the net excess supply and demand curves describes a combined social pay-off of two or more regions. In Figure 2 (see chapter 1) the area under the $ES_x - ES_y$ curve and bounded by the vertical and horizontal axis is this social pay-off of (in this case) both markets. Transformation to an optimizing problem involves maximizing this social pay-off area net of transport cost.

2.3.1 Samuelson's Net Social Pay-off Formulation

According to Samuelson, social pay-off for a region will be the area under the region's excess supply or demand curve.¹⁰ Once all regional social pay-offs are determined by integration, they can be summed and total transport costs sub-tracted to arrive at a net social pay-off for all regions (Samuelson 1952, 291).

$$NSP = \sum_{i=1}^{n} S_i(E_i) - \sum_{i < j} t_{ij}(E_{ij})$$

Where: NSP is net social pay-off; $S_i(E_i)$ indicates social pay-off in region i is a function of exports in region i; i < j is a notational requirement to preclude double counting the transportation rates¹¹, and $t_{ij}(E_{ij})$ refers to transport costs between any two regions being a function of exports.

At this point the descriptive problem is now a maximum problem awaiting solution. As Samuelson says, "...this maximum problem can be solved by trial and error or by a systematic procedure of varying shipments in the direction of increasing social pay-off." (Samuelson 1952, 292).

¹⁰ Social pay-off for a region is the sum of individual consumer surplus for the region.

¹¹ Otherwise we could have region 1 shipping to region 2 and region 2 shipping to region 1, which is a double counting of the same rate (in other words, back-hauling). This way we utilize only rates above OR below the diagonal of the transportation matrix.

One such systematic procedure is to use linear programming, which is maximization of a linear expression subject to a set of linear constraints. If total exports of each region were known but not the destination, the destination corresponding to the minimum transportation costs could be found.

2.4 Operational Example of Samuelson Formulation

Samuelson's transformation from descriptive to optimizing framework renders the problem operational. Mathematical programming techniques can be used to derive solution, once the excess supply and excess demand have been identified. These solutions deliver information that is useful to decision makers at government and industry levels. Using comparative statics,¹² the models can be used to determine consequences of changes in: transportation costs; domestic and foreign regulatory issues¹³; the level and distribution of regional demand and macroeconomic policies such as exchange rates.

2.4.1 Assumptions

Solution of the spatial equilibrium problem using mathematical programming techniques requires the following simplifying assumptions be met:

1. each region is represented by a single point in terms of supply and demand.

¹² Comparative statics is analyzing the impact of changing the model parameters. This is done by comparing the original equilibrium with the equilibrium after changing the parameters. In chapter 4, for example, models 2 thru 5 relate to the base model (model 1) through comparative statics.

¹³ In this study regulatory issues refer to beef inspection and grading concerns arising between Canada and the U.S.

- 2. regional demand can be represented by known linear demand functions and supplies are taken as predetermined for the given time period.
- 3. all regions are connected by transportation costs that are independent of direction or volume and flows of product among regions is unhampered by governmental or other interference.
- 4. the product is homogenous.
- 5. consumers are indifferent as to the source of the product.
- 6. factors affecting consumption other than price are considered predetermined.
- 7. exports and imports outside the model boundaries are negligible.
- 8. total production equals total consumption for any time period.
- 9. production and consumption of product can take place in all regions and product consumed locally requires no transportation.
- 10. there can be no negative shipments.
- 11. due to the maximum profit assumption there can be no cross-hauling (Judge and Wallace, 1958).

In empirical applications many of these assumptions can be relaxed or modi-

fied as the situation dictates. For example, assumption's number 7 and 8 are

easily adjusted to fit supply and demand conditions within the model.

2.4.2 Model Solution

In the typical spatial equilibrium model, two components require determination: 1) equilibrium prices, consumption, and surplus or deficits for all regions, and; 2) minimum cost flows among all regions. Judge and Wallace (1958), illustrate that only the second of these can be solved by linear programming, Advancements in computing capabilities have meant that the entire problem can now be solved using linear programming. If demand and supply functions (or assumptions concerning them) are specified for regions, the linear programming framework will solve for both components. Solution of the first component can be determined without any algebra by using statistical data. If data are not available, demand schedules are derived and used to estimate regional prices, consumption, and surplus or deficits for all regions. Judge and Wallace (1958) give a detailed explanation of the first solution component using demand estimation techniques.

With surplus and deficit regions known and quantities of excess supply and demand known for each region, determining minimum cost flows of a commodity is a straight forward application of the linear programming transportation problem. This is represented as follows (Judge and Wallace 1958, 808):

MINIMIZE $\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{ij}C_{ij}$ subject to: $\sum_{j=1}^{m} X_{ij} = \alpha_i; \quad i = 1, ..., n$ $\sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{ij} = b_j; \quad j = 1, ..., m$ $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} b_j,$ and $X_{ij} \ge \text{Ofor all} i, j$

Where X_{ij} are commodity shipments, C_{ij} are transportation costs of commodity shipments, α_i equals total excess supply of region *i* and *b_j* equals total excess demand of region *j*.
2.5 Mathematical Programming

The linear programming framework developed in the late 40's and early 50's and utilized by Samuelson (1952) in solving spatial equilibrium problems, is part of a broader framework called mathematical programming. Linear programming is actually a subset of non-linear programming, which is a subset of mathematical programming. Dynamic, recursive and geometric programming are also subsets of mathematical programming.

2.5.1 Linear programming

The linear programming procedure will provide normative answers to problems involving choice of optimum location of production of a commodity, or optimum distribution routes of a commodity. A "normative answer" is provided by comparison of actual location or distribution with model location or distribution results.

In the present study linear programming is used to derive an optimal allocation scenario given the study specific assumptions indicated in chapter 3. This normative solution is then compared to actual allocation for policy analysis. Other solution procedures, for example regression analysis, are based on historical time series allocation data and describe actual allocation decisions made, not optimal allocation decisions with assumptions of perfect competition, perfect knowledge etc. Hence, they give no "yardstick for measurement" as does the linear programming technique. Heady and Candler (1958) classify several uses of the linear programming framework, among which they include it's ability "...to specify spatial equilibrium patterns in the flow of agriculture products, to indicate optimum interregional patterns of resource use and product specialization in agriculture, and to solve related types of problems." (Heady and Candler 1958, 1).

They go on to say that "In solving a farm policy question, the problem may be one of determining which agriculture region should produce a quantity of a particular commodity consistent with a given level of demand." (Heady and Candler 1958, 3). These comments apply directly to the objectives stated at the beginning of this study and show the logic of using linear programming methods for solution of the present problem.

All linear programming problems involve: 1) a linear objective function, 2) two types of constraints: those that express special conditions of the problem; and non-negativity requirements, 3) as well as choice variables. The choice variables make up the linear objective function and each one indicates the level of some operation, called an activity or process.(Dorfman, Samuelson, and Solow 1958).

Whatever the objective when solving a problem, if there is only one method (process) of reaching the objective, there is no need for linear programming. The linear programming problem is choosing the optimal process. That explains the choice variables in the objective function. Also, a linear programming problem does not exist if resources are unlimited. Resource limitations

are the constraint component of the linear programming set up. In the current study, constraints are composed of supplies and demands of beef and factor inputs at regional producing and consuming centers.

According to Chiang (1984), the n-variable linear minimization program in general notation is expressed in the following way:

Minimize
$$C = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j x_j$$

subject to $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_{ij} x_j \ge r_i$ ($i = 1, 2, ..., m$)
and $x_j \ge 0$ ($j = 1, 2, ..., n$)

Where X_i are the choice variables, c_i are given constant coefficients, as are α_{ii} . The r_i represent requirements.

2.6 Spatial Equilibrium Model Evaluation

An economic spatial equilibrium model is any model with space explicitly considered. These models involve one or more commodities (primary, intermediate and/or final goods), and are able to determine optimal equilibrium location, level of production and consumption and optimal shipping patterns between regions.

According to Bawden (1964), the multitude of spatial equilibrium models can be categorized into standard equilibrium models and activity analysis models. Standard equilibrium models use typical supply and demand functions. Activity analysis models let demand functions determine regional consumption but, rather than using supply functions, require production functions to determine different production levels and therefore costs. In Figure 3, definition 2 defines an activity analysis model and definition 3 refers to a standard equilibrium model.

To reiterate, the main difference between standard equilibrium models and activity analysis models is in the treatment of supply. Activity analysis models generate their own supply relationships while standard equilibrium models use explicit supply functions as derived from production functions.

Both types of spatial models provide: 1) efficient shipping patterns, regional production and resource allocation; 2) forecasts of shipping patterns, regional production and resource allocation, regional consumption, prices, storage requirements; 3) as well as effects of changes in exogenous variables such as government intervention upon the model.

All of this information is useful for policy makers in both government and industry groups, individual entrepreneurs and consumers (Bawden 1964, 1374). Some of the information is handled better by standard equilibrium models and some better by activity analysis models. In general, activity analysis models provide the best results in the long run and standard equilibrium models the best results in the short run. This is primarily because in standard equilibrium models the supply functions are usually estimated by regression analysis which are more useful for short run predictions since "... producer inertia, short run inflexibility, and inadequate knowledge of changing conditions are likely better reflected in supply functions estimated by regression analysis." (Bawden 1964, 1376). Regression

equations do not perform as well for long run prediction, hence the production function approach of the activity analysis models can more accurately capture the long run adjustment process.

For short run activity analysis models, regional resources are assumed fixed as are processing facilities. Transportation costs are given for all mobile commodities, be they resources, intermediate goods or final products. Assuming profit maximization or cost minimization, the models yield optimal organization of production, consumption and shipment of commodities (factor, intermediate goods, or final product).

2.6.1 Limitations

Limitations of spatial models pertain to two areas in particular; data requirements, and the aggregation problem.

The aggregation problem arises from the assumption of regions being represented by a single point rather than a continuum of points. To make this conclusion, it must be assumed that regions represented by a single point represent homogeneity of all exogenous factors defining a region (Weinschenck et al. 1969). This may be unrealistic--transportation costs within a region that are assumed to be equal or zero is an example of the implications of this assumption. The practical problem becomes one of finding an adequate breakdown of regions that will minimize the error resulting from this problem. Hence, care should be taken in defining regions. Data requirements are difficult to fulfill for spatial equilibrium models. For activity analysis models, data must allow determination of existing and potential activities for the region. Determination of variable production costs is required. For example, non-feed feedlot costs or processing costs. Input-output relationships for the final product must be known and, for the present study, feed conversion efficiencies and input-input ratios are also necessary.

Problems arise because countries often do not provide data for the desired regions, or data are not collected at a regional level. Another drawback is that current data collected may not use the same methodology for collection as previously collected data.

Spatial equilibrium models solved by linear programming techniques are static. This can be a drawback. Solution of spatial equilibrium models by dynamic programming would overcome this problem.

2.7 Summary

This chapter attempts an overview of spatial equilibrium theory. It outlines the foundations of spatial equilibrium theory as they have arisen from traditional location theory; and highlights more recent applications as practitioners endeavor to integrate spatial considerations into general equilibrium theory. It's application to the partial equilibrium model used in this study is of equal relevance.

From an initial descriptive problem, spatial equilibrium theory has evolved substantially to the point where, as an optimizing model, significant numbers of empirical studies have been done--in virtually all sectors of the economy. The theory of spatial equilibrium as made operational by mathematical programming techniques currently holds a prominent position in economic analysis. Results generated have the potential to be invaluable as an input to the decision making process; government and industry groups alike are sensitive to empirical results. The potential benefits from this type of model will increase as they continue to evolve and as data limitations are overcome.

.

3 THE MODEL

3.1 Introduction

Optimal location of feedlots among regions depends on many complex relationships. Demand for various final products has an impact. If demand is for hamburger that can be supplied by imports or cull dairy cows, feedlot location may be different than if the predominant demand is for high quality beef. Production possibilities for feeds may also influence feedlot location. Since cattle production is feed source oriented, regional availability of basic factors such as land and favorable climate may determine feed production functions and therefore the feasibility of cattle production. Transfer costs linking all regions spatially will also have an influence. Cattle producers will seek markets in major consumption centers and prohibitive transfer costs would eliminate profitability.

In the present study, two Alberta regions are separated from five U.S. regions by an international border. This can also affect optimal feedlot location as trade barriers and protection measures utilized by each nation are brought to bear. It also permits assessing impacts on the livestock sector of various trade and policy scenarios such as differing grading regulations and the effect of exchange rates.

This study of regional location of cattle feeding is a partial equilibrium analysis since it does not examine the effects of cattle feedlot location on other sectors. Hogs, poultry, and the dairy industry, for example, consume the same feeds as cattle, but constraining effects on these sectors of feed consumption by feeder cattle is not considered. Further, the model is static with optimal feeding location determined for 1988. Model results can be compared with actual 1988 results for policy analysis.

Each of the seven regions is represented by a single point for purposes of determining transfer costs. Regional demand is at these points and regional supply of fed and non-fed boxed beef is available at an assumed distance from these points for consumption in the home region or for shipment to other regions as required by regional demands.

Available at each of the seven points are given quantities of fixed factors (land, labor and capital) to support the cattle industry. Mobile intermediate products (feeder cattle, roughages and concentrates), that can be used to produce fed beef in the region or can be shipped to another region for use in fed beef production are also available at the regional points.

Regional demand functions for beef in the King and Schrader study are specified as a function of price, population, and per capita income. In the present study regional demand is per capita boxed beef consumption multiplied by regional population. The model is based on annual data and therefore abstracts from seasonal demand conditions (barbecues), or seasonal availability of feed and feeder cattle.

A fixed production function is utilized, although the framework exists to use alternative production processes to convert intermediate products into a final product (see King and Schrader 1963, 350). In models containing a production function (activity analysis models), product supply is endogenous. Supply of beef in the present model, therefore, is determined in the model by considering a joint equilibrium for the intermediate product and the final product. Regional quantities of fed-beef production depends on the cost (interregional transfer cost, intermediate product cost, non-feed cost, and processing cost)¹⁴ of regional production.

Transfer functions are given which specify unit cost of interregional shipping of intermediate products of concentrate, roughage and feeder cattle; and unit cost of inter and intra regional shipments of final product of boxed beef. Cattle are assumed slaughtered 50 miles from consuming centers to derive intraregional meat transfer costs. Feeds and feeders are assumed available at the feedlots. Slaughter weight cattle are not shipped in this model. Slaughter plants are assumed located at feedlot locations.

Regional supply of non-fed beef is taken as given at estimated levels with that supply being independent of feeding operations. Non-fed beef was considered a direct substitute for fed beef in most model runs, however in one model (section 4.2) a distinction is made between fed and non-fed beef to test this assumption.

One advantage of the linear programming framework is that subsequent inclusion of factors affecting equilibrium can be done by adding new constraints or integrating the sterial into existing constraints. Grading differences between Alberta and U.S. regulators are currently an issue. They are addressed in this study (section 4.1.1) by reducing factor inputs to fed-beef production in Alberta as a proxy for grade differences. These can be allowed to vary between U.S. and

¹⁴ Non-feed costs are incurred in the feedlot and processing costs refer to the packing sector. These are dealt with in section 3.3.4.2.

Alberta regions. Border inspection concerns can be added as some form of "risk premium" to transportation rates on product crossing the international border between Alberta and the U.S. The anticipated effect on Alberta livestock production of statutory rate removal for grains destined for export (Crow rate removal) can be simulated by adjusting price on concentrates fed in the two Alberta regions.

Since the next part of this chapter illustrates the mathematical model and notation used, this may be the time to draw parallels between this model and the underlying theory (linear programming and spatial equilibrium) developed in chapter 2. The objective function of this model is designed to minimize intermediate factor costs, transportation costs between spatially separated regions, nonfeed costs and processing costs of beef production. The minimization is subject to constraints on the choice variables. These constraints are the regional resource availability and regional demand for boxed beef. The problem becomes one of determining the optimal level of use of the choice variables. In other words determining the process that will satisfy the resource constraints while minimizing cost. Such an outcome will describe optimal shipments of intermediate factors of feeder cattle, concentrates and roughages, as well as optimal regional location of cattle feeding given the assumptions noted above.

3.2 Notation and Mathematical Model

Notation used in the model is indicated in Table 1. Explanation of variables is as follows: Quantities available of the intermediate products of feeder cattle, concentrate feed, roughages and of non-fed beef¹⁵ are taken as predetermined for 1988. Quantities of fed beef produced in each region will be derived from a fixed production function with parameters constant for U.S. regions and constant for Alberta regions. Total quantity of intermediate product used in fed beef production for each region is determined in the model as equilibrium between supply and demand is reached.¹⁶Total beef demanded in each region is predetermined by the fixed demand assumption.

Units of intermediate and final product quantities shipped from region i to region j are: numbers for feeder cattle, '000Mcal for concentrates and roughages, and '000lbs for boxed beef. Transfer costs for final and intermediate products are in dollars per unit (indicated above) per shipment distance. The "Input use" notation is included to allow costing of feeders and concentrates for sensitivity analysis. FC indicates feeder use and BC refers to barley use (corn use in U.S. regions). Input costs per unit available are: CDN\$ per animal for feeders and CDN\$ per tonne for the concentrate. Barley price per tonne is used to represent Alberta concentrate costs and corn price per tonne represents U.S. concentrate costs. Exports in the model go to either New York or Toronto, and Vancouver is given a fixed

¹⁵ A description of non-fed beef is taken up in section 3.3.7.

¹⁶ Amounts of intermediate product required per unit final product is predetermined by the fixed production function.

demand moderately higher than actual Alberta exports to British Columbia for 1988. Non-feed costs and processing costs are CDN\$ per thousand pounds of boxed beef produced.

Model Notation										
Item	Fedr.Ctl.	Conc.	Ruff.	Fed.Bf.	Nfed.Bf.	Totl.Bf.				
* Q avail in reg i.	W,	Yi	Z,		Χ,					
* Q prod in reg i.		1		V_{a}						
* Q used/demnd in reg i.	W'	Y	Ζ'			DM'				
* Q shpd from i to j.	W _{ij}	Y _{ij}	Z .,			X_{ij}				
* Trnsfr cost/unit.	t ^w _{ij}	t_{ij}^{y}	t_{ij}^z			$t_{ij}^{\mathbf{x}}$				
* Input use.	FC,	BC,								
* Input cost/unit.	C	C								
* Exports.						EX				
* Non-feed/prcssng csts.				q_{i}						

Table 1. Model Notation

Note: Based on notation in King and Schrader 1963, 341.

The objective is to determine the optimal regional location of cattle feeding and final and intermediate product shipment patterns that would result from perfectly competitive behavior under the assumptions of the model indicated above. To accomplish the objective, the linear programming framework will minimize transportation cost of final and intermediate product, non-feed and processing costs, cost of feeders and cost of concentrates:

$$\sum_{i} \sum_{j} \chi_{ij} t_{ij}^{\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{i} \sum_{j} W_{ij} t_{ij}^{\mathbf{w}} + \sum_{i} \sum_{j} Y_{ij} t_{ij}^{\mathbf{y}} + \sum_{i} \sum_{j} Z_{ij} t_{ij}^{\mathbf{z}}$$
$$+ \sum_{i} V_{i1} q_{i} + \sum_{i} W^{i} C_{i}^{\mathbf{w}} + \sum_{i} Y^{i} C_{i}^{\mathbf{y}}$$

Subject to:17

1) Shipments of beef from any region to itself and to all other regions must equal the nonfed beef available in the region plus beef produced in the region:

$$\sum_{i} X_{ij} = X_i + V_{il}$$

2) Amounts of intermediate products used in any region must be less than or equal to amounts available in the region plus in-shipments minus out-shipments:

$$0 \leq W^{i} \leq W_{i} + \sum_{j} W_{ji} - \sum_{j} W_{ij}$$
$$0 \leq Y^{i} \leq Y_{i} + \sum_{j} Y_{ji} - \sum_{j} Y_{ij}$$
$$0 \leq Z^{i} \leq Z_{i} + \sum_{j} Z_{ji} - \sum_{j} Z_{ij}$$

3) Supply of beef to a particular region, including shipments from that region to itself will be equal to regional demand:

¹⁷ Based on notation used in King and Schrader, 341.

$$DM^{i} = \sum_{j} X_{ji}$$

39

where *j* includes *i*

4) Two export points are included in the model to accomodate the excess supply of beef.

$$EX \le \sum_{i} X_{iox}$$

where i = 1,2,...,6.

A two region example of the model in the linear programming framework is shown in Table 2.

٦																		ר
-	Z 61	0 - 1 61										רק ו						
	Z 16	-110																
	Y 61	- l ^y 61							-1 		4							
	Y 16	- { ^y ₁₆						· · · · ·	4	۔ 	-				<u>.</u>			
del	11/ 61	- l ^w		,		F	-1											
Two Region Model	11/16	$-t_{16}^{w}$			-1		-1											
egio	1/ 61	$-q_1 - q_6$		1		`	۰ <u>/۱</u>			×	λ.			2				_
VO R	1				1/1				~				N					1
4	cc,	- C &	-							•	• T •							1063
Table 2. Example of	BC,	- C 1							-1.4									
Table Xample	FCo	- C &					ц 1	н					<u>.</u>		•			
		- C €																
Programming	Xon	-t x 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		ы										<u></u>				
prog	X 66	- t x 66		Ч												н		
Linear	X 61			Ъ							_							
Lin	X ₁ v																н	
		(x 16	1													н		
	X 11 X 16	- l ^x ₁₁ -	-1						·						1			
		GM	X 1 =	X 6 =	∧i 0	<u>ار</u> ا	^I 0	√, ≥>	∧i 0	۲ _. ۲	^I 0	Y, 6 ≥	< 1 Z	Z 6 2	$DM^{1} =$	DM°=	$EX \leq$	

5 5117J Note: Based on notation in

40

3.3 Data Requirements

Data requirements for the model are extensive. Needed are: the regional availability and price of intermediate products required to produce final product; the production process for conversion of intermediate products into final product; the regional demand for beef; transfer costs for intermediate products and final product; and regional availability of non-fed beef. As noted above (section 3.2) several assumptions separate this study from King and Schrader (1963). The inclusion of intermediate product price in this model allows sensitivity analysis of hypothesized changes to statutory grain rates in Alberta.

A need to minimize data requirements for the beef production process resulted in simplifying the process to a single fixed production function applying to all regions. Additional research at a later date could add realism by providing quantification of alternative production processes that would accomodate input substitution in the production function.

3.3.1 Regional Demarcation

The seven regions used in this model are grouped into two regions in the province of Alberta and five regions encompassing eleven north-western U.S. states. For the Alberta regions, Alberta Agriculture Production Branch (Alberta Agriculture 1990) lists three cattle production areas in the province. Demarcation based on this study or one using alternate regional breakdowns would have been acceptable. It was felt, however, that two regions could provide conclusions as valid as three or four regions and, further, use of two regions allows some pooling of available resources in Alberta in order to compete with massive U.S. resource supplies. Alberta regions are by census divisions (C.D.).

For the US regions, boundaries are designed to include one USDA feeding state¹⁸ in each region and to keep the regions geographically homogenous. States marked with an asterisk are feeding states. The central points are located close to the center of the region and are on primary transportation routes. Regions and central points are shown in Figure's 4 and 5.

REGIONS	AREA INCLUDED	CENTRAL POINT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Alta C.D. 7-14 & 16-19 Alta C.D. 1-6 & 15 Washington*, Oregon Idaho*, Montana S. Dakota*, N. Dakota, Wyoming Colorado*, Utah California*, Nevada	Edmonton, Alberta Calgary, Alberta Spokane, Washington Twin Falls, Idaho Rapid City, S. Dakota Denver, Colorado Bishop, California

Figure 4. Regions and Central Points Used in the Model

Note: Adapted from King and Schrader (1963). Note: * indicates feeding state.

¹⁸ USDA NASS ASB Statistical bulletin No. 798 gives feeder cattle data for the "13 major feeding States" in the U.S. In this study it was determined to have one of these major feeding States in each of the five U.S. regions used.



Figure 5. Regions and Central Points Used in the Model

3.3.2 Intermediate Product Supply

3.3.2.1 Feeder Cattle

Methodology for estimating feeder cattle supplies varies between Alberta regions and the US regions.¹⁹ For the US, a "placements to number on feed"²⁰ ratio was calculated for feeding states. This ratio was then used to estimate placements for non-feeding states.

In Alberta, calf inventory numbers for July 1, 1987 were converted into placement numbers for 1988. While imports would be included in the US placement numbers, they must be added to the Alberta calf inventory numbers. The placements resulting are indicated in Table 3.

 teu a aucoresoneto nos							
Region	Estimated Placements (#'s)						
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	701,616 688,384 726,778 878,600 939,208 2,437,741 946,681						
Total	7,319,008						

TABLE 3.Estimated Placements for 1988 by Region

Note: Based on notation in King and Schrader (1963).

¹⁹ See Appendix B for preliminary data tables and methodology used for US and Alberta regions.

^{20 &}quot;Placements" refers to the number of cattle placed on feed during the period Oct 1, 1987 to Sept 30, 1988. "Number on feed" indicates number of cattle on feed Jan 1, 1988.

3.3.2.2 Concentrates

Regional use of concentrate feed for livestock other than feeder cattle is assumed predetermined for the year beginning "fall 1987". All concentrates are converted to net energy in Mcal/tonne²¹ and are seen as perfectly substitutable on these terms. Regional supply is taken as production plus imports plus beginning stocks, and regional use other than for feeder cattle is amounts fed to other livestock²² plus exports plus industrial, food and seed uses. The difference between these two amounts is the supply variable used to feed feeder cattle. Regions 3 and 7 indicate a negative amount available to feed cattle. This indicates imports from other regions are necessary to satisfy feed requirements for other than feeder cattle before feeder requirements can be taken care of. As noted by King and Schrader (1963), this implies that other uses have first claim on feed supplies and may bias equilibrium feedlot location toward feed source. Concentrate availability is summarized in table 4.

²¹ Mcal refers to million calories of net energy with the values specific for feeder cattle.

²² Feeding rates for livestock for both concentrates and roughages were required to calculate amounts "Fed to livestock other than beef cattle". These rates, along with concentrate and roughage data methodology are included in Appendix A.

TABLE 4.
Regional Availability of Feed Concentrates Expressed in '000 Mcal
(For the year beginning "fall 1987")

		and a set of the set o	
Region	Available for all livestock	Fed to livestock other than beef cattle	Available to feed cattle
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	7,274,340 4,268,790 2,887,737 19,551,965 24,590,131 7,595,824 2,821,246	1,608,860 3,697,943 11,031,999 7,110,619 2,180,205	5,071,329 2,659,930 (810,205) 8,519,966 17,479,512 5,415,619 (12,260,774)
TOTAL	68,990,034	42,914,657	26,075,377

Note: Based on notation in King and Schrader 1963, 341.

3.3.2.3 Roughages

Regional amounts of roughages are determined in much the same way as the concentrates. Calculation is simpler since roughages do not have the same number of alternative uses as do concentrates, (for example industrial and food uses do not apply to roughages).²³

Included in the roughage category are silages. The high moisture content of these feeds translates to expensive per unit (1000Mcal net energy per tonne as fed) shipping costs and precludes interregional shipments. As a result, they are allowed as feed in region of origin only.

²³ The roughages included are not an exhaustive list. There are possibly other regional specific feeds that are used in the feedlot (sugar beet tops in southern Alberta) and these could be included for sake of completeness.

TABLE 5.
Regional Availability of Feed Roughages Expressed in '000 Mcal
(For the year beginning "fall 1987")

Region	Available for all livestock	Fed to livestock other than feeder cattle	Available to feed cattle
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	4,902,603 2,123,767 4,821,408 8,275,305 12,248,749 5,914,152 9,416,392	1,259,474761,6392,337,4284,572,0204,323,0801,946,0604,915,581	3,643,130 1,362,128 2,483,980 3,703,285 7,925,669 3,968,092 4,500,811
Total	47,702,376	20,115,282	27,587,094

Note: Based on notation in King and Schrader 1963, 341.

3.3.3 Intermediate Product Cost

Feeder cattle and feed costs amount to approximately 85 percent of feedlot production costs with non-feed costs being a portion of the other 15 percent (Barkema and Drabenstott 1990, 59). As such, cost of the intermediate products of feeder cattle and concentrates are included in the mathematical model in their own column.²⁴ Separation of feeder and feed costs allows assessment of various policy scenarios that may affect the cattle sector through costs of these inputs. The particular concern here is with impending configure to the Crow rate on statutory grains for export. It is assumed by source (Alberta Agri-

²⁴ Roughage costs are not isolated in this study. The assumption is, consequently, that roughage costs are the same in U.S. and Alberta regions. Actual average hay prices in 1988 were about 50 percent higher in the U.S. than in Alberta (USDA ERS FDS-318, May 1991 and Alberta Agriculture, Agriculture Statistics Yearbook - 1988). Had roughage costs been isolated, they would have helped to skew cattle feeding toward Alberta regions.

culture 1990: Freedom To Choose) that removal of (or alterations to) the Crow will lead to reduced feed grain prices in western Canada as export markets for prairie grains shrink. This should stimulate the livestock sector through lower input costs. Analysis of effects of differing concentrate costs on optimum feeding location is undertaken in chapter 4.

Alberta feeder cattle and concentrate cost data for 1988 were taken from (Canfax 1988). Average cost for a 650 lb steer in Alberta was \$637.00. Concentrate cost in Alberta uses barley price as a proxy. Price in June 1988 at the feedlot for barley was (approximately) \$90.00/tonne in southern Alberta and \$85/tonne in northern Alberta. The Crow benefit offset payment in 1988 was \$13/tonne. The base model, therefore, (section 4.2.1) uses barley price of \$77/tonne and \$72/tonne in the two Alberta regions.

U.S. costs for corn in 1988 are from (USDA 1990 Nov., 38). Corn #2 yellow, Central Illinois was \$3.16 CDN/bu or \$124.40/tonne. Feeder costs are from (USDA 1989 Feb., 22). Average price in 1988 for 600-700 lb feeder steers in Kansas City was \$618.00CDN Table 6 indicates these costs with feeder costs per pound and Alberta concentrate cost being approximate.

Intermediate i rouder cost							
	Alberta	U.S.					
Feeders	\$.98/lb	\$1.03/lb					
Concentrates	\$75.00/t	124.00/t					

Table 6.Intermediate Product Cost

Source: Data from references.

3.3.4 Production Process

3.3.4.1 Feed Conversion

The production process for feeders has been simplified relative to the King and Schrader study. Alternate production processes are not allowed, nor is input substitution. The following assumptions were made: Feeder animals in Alberta reach the feedlot at 295 kg (650 lbs) and are sold at 480 kg (1050 lbs). In the U.S. they go on feed at 275 kg (600 lbs) and are slaughtered at 500 kg (1100 lbs). The distinction is due primarily to U.S. feedlot operators feeding animals for a different grading system than Alberta feedlot operators.

In this study, model assumptions dictate that the feeder animal requires 14.5 Mcal per day of Net energy.²⁵ With an assumed concentrate to roughage ratio of 80/20, 11.6 Mcal per day must come from concentrates and 2.9 Mcal per day will come from the roughages. Multiplying these feed amounts by appropriate length of stay gives feed consumption per animal per feeding period.

According to USDA (1988), U.S. feeders are on feed for 180 days. With gain per period at 500 lbs this is 2.8 lbs gain per day. In Alberta, (Canfax

²⁵ As mentioned in the conclusion (section 5.1), the assumption that U.S. feeders and Alberta feeders have the same energy requirements is not entirely correct. U.S. feeders are fed to a heavier weight and they require more energy per day for that reason. This is an area where further work could improve specification of the production process.

1988) assumes yearling feeders are on feed for 143 days (average stay for heifers and steers). At 400 lbs gain per period this is also 2.8 lbs gain per day.

The fixed production function in general form is:

$$V_{ii} = f(W^i, Y^i, Z^i)$$

With the assumptions stated above this works out to be for Alberta regions;

 $480 kg V_{il} = 295 kg W^{i} + 1659 M cal Y^{i} + 415 M cal Z^{i}$

Assuming a dressing percentage from live to carcass to boxed in Alberta of $(.585)(.65)^{26} = .380$, gives;

 $182.4kgV_{il} = 295kgW^{i} + 1659McalY^{i} + 415McalZ^{i}$

Standardizing this to 1000 lbs of beef we obtain, for Alberta;

 $1000 \, lb \, sV_{il} = 2.49 \, W^{i} + 4131 \, Mca \, lY^{i} + 1033 \, Mca \, lZ^{i}$

For U.S. regions 3 thru 7, the production function is;

 $500 kgV_{il} = 275 kgW^{i} + 2088 McalY^{i} + 522 McalZ^{i}$

Assuming a dressing percentage from live to carcass to boxed in U.S. regions of (.63)(.755) = .476, we get;

 $238.0 kgV_{il} = 275 kgW^{i} + 2088 McalY^{i} + 522 McalZ^{i}$

Standardizing this to 1000 lbs of beef we obtain, for the U.S.;

 $1000 lbsV_{il} = 1.91 W^{i} + 3988 M calY^{i} + 997 M calZ^{i}$

The main difference between Alberta and U.S. production functions is in the dressing percentages. Animals in Alberta are trimmed leaner than in

²⁶ The dressing percentages; (.585)(.65) for Alberta and (.63)(.755) for U.S. regions were obtained from, respectivly, Cargill personnel at High River and Livestock and Poultry Situation and Outlook Report. Aug 1990, 30-31.

the U.S. to reflect differences in consumer tastes. This results in considerably more feeder required (2.49) in Alberta than in the U.S. (1.91) to produce 1000 lbs of boxed beef.

3.3.4.2 Non-feed and Processing Costs

In this study, non-feed costs and processing costs are calculated on a per unit basis (1000 lbs boxed beef) and entered in the linear programming framework as the objective row value for the fed beef production activity. Non-feed costs in Alberta and U.S. regions are feedlot costs that include similar entries such as: vet and medicine, livestock hauling, marketing charges, death loss and overhead. Processing costs are packing plant slaughter costs only; fabrication costs were not identified and consequently are assumed identical between Alberta and U.S. regions. Processing costs are from a 1984 study (Dawson Dau, 1984) and reflect 1983 data. They can, however, be taken to reflect 1988 processing costs since the ratio between Alberta and U.S. proccssing costs varied little between 1983 and 1988 (Geitz 1991).

NON-FEED COSTS:

For Alberta, non-feed costs are derived from (Canfax 1988) where the average non-feed costs for 1988 for steers and heifers in at 650lbs, out at 1050lbs and on feed for approximately 143 days is 101.55/feeder/period. In Alberta it takes 2.49 feeders to produce 1000lbs of boxed beef. Non-feed costs for Alberta regions, therefore, are 101.55(2.49) = 252.86/1000lbs boxed beef produced.

US non-feed cost data is from (USDA 1989 LPS-35, 56). For animals in at 600lbs, out at 1100lbs, and on feed for 180 days, non-feed costs are given as 10.21/cwt of liveweight sold. Assuming slaughter weight of 1100 lbs leads to 10.21(11) = 112.31(US)/feeder/period. Converting to Canadian currency, 112.31(1.2309) = 138.24/animal/period. In the U.S., 1.91 feeders are required to produce 1000 lbs of boxed beef. U.S. non-feed costs then are taken to be 138.24(1.91) = 264.04(CDN)/1000lbs boxed beef produced.

The longer feeding period in the U.S. leads to higher non-feed costs than in Alberta. This difference has been reduced somewhat by the smaller amount of feeder needed to produce 1000 lbs of boxed beef in the U.S.

PROCESSING COSTS:

Processing costs in Alberta are biased upwards by labor costs that are higher than in the U.S. Costs of labor for processing are documented by Dawson Dau (1984). They claim that the major share of the difference between Alberta and U.S. processing costs is due to wages and salaries. The Dawson Dau study has processing costs for comparable size U.S. and Alberta plants (90 head per hour), and for a larger U.S. plant (300 head per hour). In this study the Alberta processing costs are compared with the similar size U.S. plant. Costs are indicated in Table 7.

)n	n-Feed/Processing Costs per luvulds Boxed								
	Costs/1000lbs boxed beef	Alberta	U.S.						
	Non-feed Processing	252.86 75.37	264.04 52.43						
	Total	328.23	316.47						

Table 7.Non-Feed/Processing Costs per 1000lbs Boxed Beef

Source: Data from references.

3.3.5 Transfer Costs

All transfer costs were derived with the help of Alberta Agriculture staff, the Trimac Trucking Model (TTM), and industry quotes. While such rates cannot be assured accurate they are thought to be representative and to be proportionally correct. Rates assume one way hauls only, no backhauls are included. Description of individual interregional product rates follows.

BEEF:

Rates for beef shipments contain the following assumptions: Trucks carry 45000 lbs of boxed beef except for shipments within Alberta where an industry quote indicated 48000 lbs. The procedure was to take the rate per mile/truck obtained from TTM, multiplied by shipment mileage to get cost of truck load from region i to region j. This amount was divided by 45 or 48 to get cost per 1000lb unit of boxed beef.

FEEDERS:

Feeder rates are again derived from the TTM combined with several industry quotes (Alberta and U.S.) to give rates per mile/truck. This rate is multiplied

by shipment mileage and divided by 70^{27} (average number of 600-700lb feeders in a possum bellied livestock carrier) to get a rate per unit (1 feeder) of feeder cattle.

CONCENTRATES:

Rates used for concentrate shipments were boxed beef rates less 2-5 cents per mile depending on length of haul. Short hauls take off less per mile than longer hauls. This rate multiplied by mileage gives a total truck cost. Total truck cost is divided by 30 (on average 30,000 Mcal of concentrates on 45000lb load) to get cost per unit (1000Mcal) of shipping concentrate.

ROUGHAGES:

Roughage shipments are assumed to not cross the international border. Therefore we have Alberta rates and U.S. rates. Silage is assumed not hauled out of the region. Industry sources indicated 17 tonnes of roughage could be hauled on a flatbed truck. No industry quotes were available for rates so the TTM was used to estimate rates. The estimating procedure was to take rate per mile per truck multiplied by trip mileage divided by 14.3 (on average 14,300 Mcal of roughage on a 17 tonne load) to get the rate per 1000 Mcal unit of roughage. The U.S. rates are derived from Alberta rates.

²⁷ The number of feeders per truck were obtained from an industry quote (Agriculture Canada 1991).

Distances used in calculating transfer costs are from regional central points. Mileages between central points are shown in the Table 8 in miles. Table's 8a thru 8d indicate transfer costs for boxed beef, feeders, concentrates and roughages.

Dis	Distance in Miles Between Regional Central Points										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7				
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Van Tor NY	180 600 960 1005 1275 1500 740 2090	435 780 860 1100 1320 600 2110	515 850 1100 935 385	790 690 540 2355	390 1170 1690	960 1780	n/a				

 TABLE 8.

 Distance in Miles Between Regional Central Points

Source: Mileages are from Alberta Agriculture, Transportation Section.

Beet Transfer Costs/1000lds Boxed Beet									
	· 1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
$\frac{1}{2}$	1.90 5.86	1.90	22.25 17.26	35.11 27.84	34.68 30.61	44.41 37.85	48.08 42.73		
23	21.89	16.72	1,20 1.90 17.17	1.90	50.01	57.05	42.75		
4 5	34.60 35.80	27.65 31.36	28.33	26.33	1.90	1.00			
6 7	45.69 48.90	39.16 43.33	29.33 31.17	23.00 18.00	15.60 31.20	1.90 32.00	1.90		
Van Tor	24.07 78.38	19.75 79.13	14.11						
NY				62.67	45.07	47.47	n/a		

Table 8a.Beef Transfer Costs/1000lbs Boxed Beef

Source: Rates derived from the Trimac Trucking Model, industry quotes, and Alberta Agriculture staff.

Feeder Transfer Costs/Animal								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	0.00 5.73 24.50 40.62 41.68 55.54 61.24	28.97 38.11	23.83 12.22 0.00 16.19 34.61 44.79 38.27	27.84 0.00 32.16 28.09	39.44 36.52 0.00 12.26 47.64	53.18 41.61 0.00 39.09	59.43 55.45 0.00	

Table 8b.

Source: Rates derived from the Trimac Trucking Model, industry quotes, and Alberta Agriculture staff.

Feed Concentrate Transfer Costs/TobolyCar							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 2	0.00 9.26	0.00	32.66 25.51	51.29 40.73			69.29 62.30
3 4	*	*	0.00 25.41	0.00			
5 6	*	*	41.65 42.53			0.00	
7	*	*	45.82	26.64	45.63	46.72	0.00

Table 8c. centrate Transfer Costs/1000Mcal 10---

Source: Rates derived from the Trimac Trucking Model, industry quotes, and Alberta Agriculture staff. * Barley shipments are not permitted to cross the international border to comply with CWB export regulations.

	Fee	ed Roug	ghage Tra	ansfer (Costs/100	00Mcal	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$\frac{1}{2}$	0.00 24.80	0.00					
3	*	*	0.00	-			
4	*	*	54.02	0.00			
5	*	*	89.16	82.87	0.00	ļ	
6	*	*	115.39	72.38	40.91	0.00	
7	*	*	98.08	56.64	122.73	100.70	0.00

Table 8d.

Source: Rates derived from the Trimac Trucking Model, industry quotes, and Alberta Agriculture staff. Roughages are not permitted to cross the international border. *

3.3.6 Regional Beef Demand

July 1, 1988 regional population and 1988 annual per capita beef consumption data are used as a proxy for beef demand. For the US, per capita consumption in 1988 was 102.3lbs carcass weight or 77.2lbs of boxed beef.

Total beef demanded per region is per capita consumption multiplied by regional population. Assuming the above per capita consumption of boxed beef for the U.S. and Canada, regional beef demand is indicated in Table 9.

Regional beer Demand for 1966							
Region	Population July1/88	Per capita Consumption (lbs)	Rgn'l Dmnd for Boxed Beef (lbs)				
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1,376,000 $1,01^{\circ},000$ 7,415,000 1,808,000 1,859,000 4,991,000 29,368,000	77 77 77 77 77 77	$\begin{array}{r} 105,952,000\\ 78,463,000\\ 570,955,000\\ 139,216,000\\ 143,143,000\\ 384,307,000\\ 2,261,336,000\end{array}$				
Total	47,836,000		3,683,372,000				

Table 9.Regional Beef Demand for 1988

Source: Alberta population data are from Alberta Statistical Review Q1 1990, and U.S. population data are from Statistical Abstract of the U.S. 1989. Per capita consumption data are from Agriculture Canada: Handbook of Food Expenditures, Prices and Consumption 1990, 282.

3.3.7 Beef Other Than Fed

Non-fed beef for 1988 includes beef from cull dairy animals, beef cows and heifers, bulls, calves and other cattle as well as imports of beef. For the US regions, sources used were USDA (1989, Cattle) and USDA (1989, Agriculture Statistics Handbook). The process for determination of the non-fed beef supply variable involved subtracting regional fed cattle marketed from total marketings as indicated in USDA (1989, Agriculture Statistics Handbook, Table 399). This number plus calves marketed per region plus imports of meat equals the supply variable. Meat imports for U.S. regions was per capita imported meat consumption multiplied by regional population.²⁸ Non-fed

²⁸ Per capita imported meat consumption was 9.78lbs (total U.S. beef imports multiplied by U.S. population).

cattle marketed were converted to lbs of boxed beef by multiplying by average U.S. live weight of 1125lbs and then by the dressing percentage of (.63)(.755). For U.S. calves the conversions used were 251lbs and $(.56)(.755).^{29}$

For Alberta regions, total slaughter numbers of cattle and calves are taken from Alberta Agriculture (1989, Agriculture Statistics Yearbook). Fed cattle slaughter of steers and heifers was subtracted from total slaughter numbers to leave a difference of 170,407 animals which was taken as non-fed beef. For Alberta an average live weight of 1150lbs for cattle and 418.8lbs for calves was used. Dressing percentages used for Alberta cattle was (.585)(.65) and for Alberta calves (.52)(.65).

Alberta imported 1,925 tonnes of beef in 1988 (1.77lbs per capita). These amounts of non-fed beef are apportioned among Alberta regions according to shares of regional slaughter. The regional supply of non-fed beef is indicated in Table 10.

Regional Aun-red beer supplies for 1960								
Region	Non-fed cattle marketed (#)	Calves marketed (#)	Meat Imports (lbs)	Non-fed beef (lbs)				
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	$\begin{array}{r} 60,068\\110,339\\309,200\\914,600\\1,869,200\\539,200\\1,006,100\end{array}$	935,000 1,081,000 231,000	72,518,700 17,682,240 18,181,020 48,811,980	1,133,120,369 361,855,637				
Total	4,808,707	2,903,326	448,652,130	3,313,485,525				

Table 10.Regional Non-Fed Beef Supplies for 1988

Source: Study results.

²⁹ These live weights are from (USDA 1989, Agriculture Statistics Handbook). The cattle slaughter weight of 1125 lbs is heavier than fed cattle slaughter weight presumably because bulls, dairy animals, etc. are included.

Table 11 shows beef demanded per region and supplied by fed³⁰ and non-fed sources. The surplus must be shipped outside the regions to enable demand supply equilibrium. This results in the addition of export points in the model, Vancouver, Toronto, and New York. These points are demand centers only, they contribute no supply.

³⁰ Total fed beef produced in Table 11 assumes all feeders are fed and slaughtered in their respective home regions. This is a type of "status quo" fed beef production. If all feeders were shipped to U.S. regions for feeding, total fed beef produced would be 7319008/1.91 = 3.831,941,000 lbs. If all beef was produced in Alberta there would be 7319008/2.49 = 2,939,360,000 lbs.
Table 11.Equilibrium Beef Market for 1988

Region	Beef demanded ('000 lbs)		Nonfed beef available ('000 lbs)	surplus/ (deficit) ('000 lbs)							
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	$105,952 \\78.463 \\570,955 \\139,216 \\143,143 \\384,307 \\2,261,336$	380,220 459,697 491,404 1,275,441	361,856	926,796 1,481,381							
Total	3,683.372	3,656,972	3,313,484	3,287,084							

Source: Study results.

61

4 MODEL VARIATIONS AND RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

Five variations of the model are used to illustrate cattle feeding allocations.³¹ Models differ from each other by barley cost, exchange rate used, export destination allowed, and by proportion of fed-beef consumption required per region. Barley cost is \$72-\$77/tonne in the base model and models 3, 4 and 5. In model 2 (with removal of the Alberta Crow Benefit Offset Payment), barley price is \$85-\$90/tonne. In both cases the lower price is in region 1 and the higher price is in region 2. The barley cost difference between the base model and model 2 is intended to simulate effects of Crow Benefit rate removal on optimum location of cattle feeding. Crow rate removal would lower grain prices in Alberta and make cattle feeding more cost effective.

In model 5 a distinction is made between fed and non-fed beef. Forcing consumption to be one-half fed beef was attempted since an optimum allocation without this restriction may leave some regions consuming no fed beef and others with no non-fed beef. That would be unrealistic. The restriction was accomplished by two distinct runs of the model. One run was with regional demand halved and intermediate products and the production function removed from the model. The

³¹ Actual 1988 regional marketings for Alberta are Alberta slaughter cattle marketings plus B.C. and Saskatchewan exports to Alberta of slaughter cattle. The data is from Ab. Ag. Stats. Yearbook, Ab. and B.C. Brand Inspection data and the Sask Cattle Marketing Report. They are apportioned according to a chart in (Alberta Agriculture 1990). Actual marketings for U.S. regions are from (USDA 1989. Cattle, Final Estimates, 37-40).

result was a simple transportation model that gave the optimum allocation of non-fed beef. The second run again halved regional demand but this time it removed availability of non-fed beef.

Beef shipments from Alberta to the U.S. experience resistance at border crossings. USDA inspectors use several methods to slow down shipments. U.S. inspectors discover bone fragments, grease, hair or bruises on the product that Canadian inspectors cannot detect. Determining per unit cost of this harassment is arbitrary but some indicators are available. One rejection at the border requires inspection of the following 15 shipments, and each inspection costs the packer at least \$450 (The Edmonton Journal, Saturday, June 9, 1990. D8). Some Alberta beef processors have stopped beef shipments to the U.S. altogether, and one Alberta processor indicated that "we are basically out of business in the U.S." (Alberta Agriculture Trade Policy Secretariat staff). In this study the cost is accounted for by doubling transportation rates on beef shipments from Alberta to the U.S. regions.

The inclusion of "X" in Table's 13 through 17 refers to the two export regions used, Toronto and New York. Regions 1 and 2 can export to Toronto and regions 4, 5 and 6 can export to New York. Region 3 can export a limited amount to Vancouver ("V" in the Tables) as can the two Alberta regions. Region 7 does not export because it is a beef deficit area (see Table 11). Export regions are included since the model requires demand to equal supply and we have excess supply of boxed beef if all or even most feeder cattle are fed and marketed.

Demand at "X" is set high enough to force the model to feed nearly all feeders. Further, demand at "X" assumes all feeders are fed and marketed in the region of their availability. This is an arbitrary setting since, for example, if all U.S. feeders were shipped to Alberta regions where more animals are required to produce a given amount of beef (1.91 in the U.S. and 2.49 in Alberta), it would not be possible to satisfy the demand at "X". In the present case, however, there are enough surplus feeders in the model that this in not a major concern.

The possibility for interregional roughage shipment was allowed for but under no circumstances did roughage move across regional borders. The cost per unit of energy to ship these bulky products apparently precludes long shipments.

4.1.1 Grading Issues

Alberta beef is given a 20 percent price premium over U.S. beef. This was done to simulate a consumer preference for Alberta lean beef over the heavier U.S. product. In the U.S. there is currently a 12 cent per pound price premium (Canadian Meat Council 1990) for Choice beef over Select beef. Select beef is comparable to Alberta lean beef. In Canada this preference is reversed with the price premium going to the leaner Alberta product.

The price premium in Canada for Grade A1, A2 over the heavier A3 is approximately 10 percent (Agriculture Canada 1988). In this study, the 10 percent price premium is used, plus an extra 10 percent to account for intangible factors such as Canadian consumer allegiance to Canadian grading standards with which they are familiar.

No-roll beef, an ungraded U.S. product comparable to U.S. Select, is competing with Alberta lean beef in the eastern Canadian market where grade labelling is not mandatory. This product is popular with wholesalers since it is comparable with the leaner U.S. Select but less expensive. Canadian meat packers, on the other hand, consider the no-roll product to be inferior and of inconsistent quality. If no-roll is inferior, this is added justification for the price premium on Alberta lean beef.

Worldwide the trend is toward leaner meat although at this time it appears to be a niche market. The Japanese are said to prefer a leaner alternative to U.S.D.A. Choice beef (Canadian Meat Council 1990, 23) and results of this study indicate Alberta is in good position to exploit this market.³² ³³ Current consumer trends in the U.S. also indicate a move towards leaner more convenient beef products (Barkema and Drabenstott 1990).

The price premium is made operational by reducing quantities of intermediate product required to produce one unit (1000 lbs) of boxed beef in Alberta. The 20 percent price premium leads to intermediate products being reduced by a factor of: (1/1.20) = .833. This is essentially indicating that a smaller quantity of Alberta beef is equivalent in value to a larger quantity of U.S. beef.

³² See Model 3 where Alberta regions 1 and 2 ship 736 million pounds of beef to Vancouver for export.

³³ Å major benefit of the proposed reciprocal grading is that it would allow Alberta packers to compete head to head with U.S. packers for a larger share of the Japanese markets where U.S.D.A. grades are currently recognized by Japanese cattle buyers.

4.2 Results

This section provides results of the various models and sensitivity analysis of relevant variables. At the end of the section is a table (Table 18) that provides a summary of results for the two Alberta regions.

4.2.1 Model 1

Model 1 is the base model. It is intended to duplicate the actual supply and disposition of Alberta beef in 1988. It has barley cost at \$72/tonne in region 1 and \$77/tonne in region 2.³⁴ Table 12 indicates differences between actual and Model 1 supply and disposition.

	and the second se	the second rest of the second re
	Actual S & D Mln lbs	Model 1 S & D Mln lbs
Alta Production Alta Consumption Exports to BC Exports to E. Can Exports to US	798 220 116 416 46	750 184 150 402 14

Table 12.Actual and Model 1 1988 Beef Supply and Disposition

Source: Alberta Agriculture, Statistics Branch publications and model results.

Looking at Table 13, the number of cattle marketed in this model (ie. 993 thousand in region 1) is related to production of fed beef by the coefficients in

³⁴ Barley price at the feedlot in Alberta in 1988 varied from \$64/tonne early in the year to \$120/tonne in the winter months with northern Alberta feedlots paying \$5/tonne less (Alberta Agriculture Market Analysis staff). An average of \$90/tonne was selected for region 2 and the \$13/tonne Crow benefit offset payment was applied, resulting in the \$72-\$77 price range.

the production function. Region 1 produced 479 million pounds of fed beef. At 2.074 feeders/1000 pounds boxed beef this is 993 thousand feeders. Number of cattle marketed in Alberta in model 1 are greater than actual marketings by about 300,000 head. This is due partly to exports of slaughter weight cattle (216,000 in 1988) and partly to differences between coefficients in the actual and model production functions.

Results of the base model indicate more cattle being fed and processed in northern Alberta (Red Deer and north) than in southern Alberta. This is reverse to actual and would be attributable to quantities of resources available there as well as lower transport costs to key export points. For example, per unit shipping costs to Toronto are less from region 1 than from region 2 (see Table 8a). This would skew Alberta production to the north with exports to Toronto originating there.³⁵

Non-fed beef production in Table 13 represents predetermined regional supply of dairy culls, imports of manufacturing beef etc. Total regional production is fed plus non-fed beef. Predetermined regional demand is subtracted from total production to arrive at regional surplus/deficits with deficits indicated by brackets.

Model equilibrium is accomplished by shipments of inputs and boxed beef from surplus to deficit regions. These movements are indicated in the lower portion of Table 13.

³⁵ In reality, economies of size and infrastructure in southern Alberta preclude the Alberta feeding allocation indicated by the base model. In the near future, northern Alberta will not likely feed and process more cattle than southern Alberta.

Region 1 supplies itself and eastern Canada while region 2 supplies itself, ships limited amounts to region 3, and supplies total demand at Vancouver. Region 3 and 7 ship 1,444 thousand feeders to region 4 for feeding. Table 13 also indicates that region 4 ships concentrate to regions 3 and 7 which are deficit in concentrate (see Table 4).

Sensitivity analysis indicates that if barley cost in region 1 dropped by 3 percent barley use would increase by 15 percent. At that point region 1 would begin shipping boxed beef to region 2. In region 2, if barley price dropped by 1 percent, barley use would increase by 75 percent and region 2 would begin exporting boxed beef.

Non-feed/processing costs in the two Alberta regions show sensitivity similar to barley cost with a 1 percent decline in these costs in region 1 leading to a 15 percent increase in region 1 fed beef production. A 1 percent decline in nonfeed/processing costs in region 2 results in a 75 percent increase in fed beef production in the region. This result emphasizes the sensitivity of the southern Alberta cattle sector to economies of size. Size increases in the Alberta cattle industry would lower non-feed/processing costs and dramatically (according to this model) improve competitiveness of Alberta's cattle industry.

				_				_			
Region	Actual Cattle Mktd	Model 1 Cattle Mktd	FedBeef Prod'n	E	nFed Beef rod'n		'otal rod'n	De	Beef emand		plus
	Ths hd	Ths hd	Minlbs	M	Inlbs	Μ	llnibs		linibs	MI	nlbs
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 V X	440 660 728 825 945 2,501 904	993 398 2,323 940 2,439	479 192 1,216 492 1,277		29 51 265 606 1,133 362 867		508 243 265 1,822 1,625 1,639 867		106 78 571 139 143 384 2,261 150 3,137	(1	402 165 (306) 1,683 1,482 1,255 1,394) (150) 3,137)
Total	7,003	7,093	3,656	5	3,313		6,969		6,969		0
Product From Region	To	Beef	Feeder To Region	1	Feeder		Conc To Regio		Conc		
		Minlb	s		Ths he	d			Min M	cal	
1	1 X	10 40									ļ
2	2 3 V		8 1 4 0		2	91					
3	3	26	5 4		7	27					
4	3 4 7	29 13 1,39	6				37	i		506 106	
5	5 X	14 1,48					<u> </u>		ļ		
6	6 X	38 1,25									
7	7	80	57 4		7	717	<u>' </u>				J

Table 13.Model 1 Beef Production and Product Shipments

Source: Derived from LP model 1 solution.

69

.

4.2.2 Model 2

In model 2, barley cost is raised by \$13/tonne (amount of 1988 Alberta Crow Benefit Offset Payment) to \$85/tonne in region 1 and \$90/tonne in region 2. This is done to simulate the effect of Crow Benefit grain rates on Alberta livestock producers. Existence of the Crow Benefit opens potential export markets for prairie grains and increases domestic market price for Board grains by up to \$26 per tonne (Alberta Agriculture 1990: Freedom To Choose). This model imitates the 1988 situation if Crow Benefit monies were disbursed via the pay the railways approach and the ACBOP was not made.

Table 14 indicates results. Fed beef production in Alberta decreases to 338 million pounds from 671 million pounds. Southern Alberta (Region 2) experienced the most decline as beef feeding disappears altogether. All southern Alberta feeders are shipped south to U.S. feedlots. Exports to eastern Canada decline to 84 million pounds from 402 million pounds, and exports to region 3 (Washington-Oregon) cease. Alberta maintains the Vancouver market with most beef originating in region 1 (99 million pounds).

This model is also very sensitive to changes in the cost of barley. In region 1 a decrease of 8 percent in barley price would result in a 95 percent increase in barley use as region 1 increases feeding. At that point region 1 would begin importing feeders from region 2. In region 2, a 4 percent decline in non-feed/processing costs would initiate feeding in southern Alberta as fed beef production increased to 99 million pounds.

	Table 14	
Model 2 Beef Pr	roduction and Proc	luct Shipments
	No. Fed	

Region	Actual Cattle Mktd	Model 2 Cattle Mktd	FedBeef Prod'n	NonFed Beef Prod'n	Total Prod'n		Beef emand	Su	rplus
	Ths hd	Ths hd	Minibs	Mlnibs	Minibs	N	llnlbs	M	nlbs
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 V X	440 660 728 825 945 2,501 904	701 0 2,351 1,547 2,439	338 0 1,231 810 1,277	29 31 265 606 1,133 362 867	1,837 1,943		106 78 571 139 143 384 2,261 150 3,137	1	261 (27) (306) 1,698 1,800 1,255 (,394) (150) 3,137)
Total	7,003	7,038	3,656	3,313	6,969		6,969		0
Product From Region	То	ALL Beef Q	Feeders To Region	Feeder	rs Con Regio		Conc Q	:	
		Minibs		Ths h	d		Mln M	cal	
1	1 2 V X	106 78 99 84	5						
2	v	51	45	1 5	26 62				
3	3	265	5 4	7	27				
4	3 4 7	306 136 1,394	5		37			506 106	
5	5 X	143 1,800							
6	6 X	384 1,254							
7	7	86	7 4	6	507		1		

Source: Derived from LP model 2 solution.

71

4.2.3 Model 3

In model 3, the fixed demand at Vancouver was increased from 150 million pounds to 1,000 million pounds. This was done to explore Alberta's position had there been a substantial export market to Japan. The results are not surprising given comparative distances between Alberta and major U.S. feeding regions to Vancouver. Alberta dominates the export market to the Pacific Rim as indicated in Table 15. Regions 1 and 2 export 736 million pounds of boxed beef to Vancouver with southern Alberta benefitting the most.

Exports to the Pacific Rim are at the expense of eastern Canada as specification of the Japanese market alters total Alberta production but does not diminish it. Shipments of beef east from Alberta disappear under this scenario. Presumably, the eastern Canadian market would be supplied by eastern and midwest U.S. regions that are closer.

Region 3 supplies the remaining Vancouver demand of 265 million pounds. If a Pacific coast U.S. export point were included, however, results may be different as relative distances from Alberta and U.S. regions to the export point changed. Region 4 in particular would be able to export through Washington or California to the Pacific Rim.

Sensitivity analysis on this model indicates that a 1 percent decrease in nonfeed/processing costs in region 2 would increase production by over 20 per-

cent. At that point region 2 begins importing feeders from the U.S.	5 A 1
percent decrease in barley cost in region 2 has a similar effe	arley use
would increase by over 20 percent with feeders again impo	m the U.S.

 Table 15

 Model 3 Beef Production and Product Shipments

					=				_	
Region	Actual Cattle Mktd	Model 3 Cattle Mktd	FedBeef Prod'n	NonFed Beef Prod'n	T	otal od'n	De	Beef emand		rplus
	Ths hd	Ths hd	Minlbs	Minibs	М	Inibs	Ν	ilnibs	M	Inlbs
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 V X	440 660 728 825 945 2,501 904	701 689 2,324 940 2,439	338 332 1,217 492 1,277			367 383 265 1,823 1,625 1,639 867		106 78 571 139 143 384 2,261 1,000 2,287		261 305 (306) 1,684 1,482 1,255 1,394) 1,000) 2,287)
Total	7.003	7.093	3,656	3,31	3	6,969		6,969		0
Product From Region	To	n Q	Feeder To Regior	$1 \qquad Q$		Conc To Regio		Conc Q		
		Minibs	;	Ths I	id			Mln M	cal	
1		1 35	5							
2	V	.38	3							
3	v	26	5 4		727					
4	3 4 7	29 13 1,39	6			3 7		8,	506 106	
5	1 2 5 X						<u>.</u>			
6	3 6 X	27 38 97	34							
7	7	86	57 4		/17	'				1

Source: Derived from LP model 3 solution.

4.2.4 Model 4

In this model, a 10 percent depreciation of the Canadian dollar is hypothesized. The depreciation is introduced to the model by increasing all costs of U.S. origin by 10 percent. Alberta cattle feeders would pay more for U.S. intermediate products brought into Alberta but fed beef production in Alberta would be relatively less expensive. Other than depreciation, model 4 is equivalent to the base model.

As Table 16 indicates, depreciation of the Canadian dollar increased Alberta fed beef production to 962 million pounds from 671 million pounds in the base model. Southern Alberta (region 2) fed 1,004 thousand cattle as opposed to 398 thousand cattle fed in southern Alberta in base model 1. Southern Alberta imports an additional 659 thousand feeders from region 3 as it's own feeders move north to region 1.

Apparently, the advantage southern Alberta producers realized due to relatively lower production costs than U.S. regions outweighs the increased cost of importing the feeders. This enables them to import resources and export value added products as region 2 ships 306 million pounds of boxed beef back to region 3. In this model if non-feed/processing costs in region 2 declined by 1 percent, fed beef production would increase by 30 percent and region 2 would begin shipping beef to eastern Canada. The same outcome would result if barley cost in region 2 fell by 1 percent.

Region	Actual Cattle Mktd	Model 4 Cattle Mktd	FedBeef Prod'n	NonFed Beef Prod'n	Total Prod'n	Beef Demand	Surplu	s
	Ths hd	Ths hd	Minibs	Mlnlbs	Minibs	Minibs	Minib	5
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 V	440 660 728 825 945 2,501	991 1,004 1,767 940 2,439	478 484 925 492 1,277	29 51 265 606 1,133 362	1,639	571 139 143 384	(300 1,39 1,48 1,25	57 5) 22 55
7 V X	904			867	867	2,261 150 3,137	(15	0)
Total	7,003	7,141	3,656	3,313	6,969	6,969		0
Product From Region	To	Beef	Feeder: To Region	Feeder	rs Con Regi	Cone	2	
		Minibs	5	Ths he	d	Mln M	cal	
1	1 X	10 40						
2	2 3 V	7 30 15	6	2'	91			
3	3	26	5 2	6	59			
4	47	13 1,39			37	8,	506 ,106	
5	5 X	14 1,48						
6	6 X	38 1,25						
7	7	86	57 4	8	391]	

 Table 16

 Model 4 Beef Production and Product Shipments

Source: Derived from LP model 4 solution.

4.2.5 Model 5

Model 5 makes a distinction between fed and non-fed beef. This is done to force regional consumption to be one-half fed beef and one-half non-fed beef. Since intraregional shipping is always lower cost than interregional shipping, regional consumption is always met first by internal supplies of beef. In some cases this may be all non-fed beef. Model 5 makes the distinction to ensure each region consumes some fed beef.

Total Alberta fed beef production of 671 million pounds in this model is the same as in the base model. Region 1 consumes 53 million pounds of fed beef and region 2 consumes 39 million pounds of fed beef. Region 2 ships 24 million pounds of non-fed (manufacturing) beef to region 1 and 267 million pounds of fed beef to the Washington-Oregon area (region 3).

Location of fed beef production in this model can be compared to base model location with the only distinction between model specification being quality of beef consumed. The present specification is more realistic than in the base model where quality of meat consumed is not known. Fed beef production is more evenly distributed between Alberta regions in this model than in the base model although total production is the same.

As Table 17 indicates, this model specification also results in location of beef production in Alberta being equivalent to location of beef production when Japan is the primary export market (model 3). That bodes well for the south-

ern Alberta cattle industry as it authenticates Alberta's comparative advantage in producing beef for export to the Pacific Rim. With the Japanese market closed, as it is in this model, fed beef exports resume to eastern Canada with region 1 shipping 236 million pounds.

Sensitivity analysis indicates this allocation is fairly stable for region 2. A 7 percent decrease in non-feed/processing costs would induce only a 3 percent increase in region 2 fed be of production as feeders began to move south from region 1. Fluctuations in barley cost have a similar effect. A 10 percent decrease in barley cost leads to only a 3 percent increase in barley use in region 2.

	Actual Cattle	Model 5 Cattle	FedBeef	E	nFed Beef od'n	T	otal od'n	Be Dem		Su	rpius	
Region	Mktd Ths hd	Mktd Ths hd	Prod'n Mlnlbs		Inlbs		nlbs	Mir			Inlbs	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 V X	1 ns nd 440 660 728 825 945 2,501 904	701 689 2,326 940 2,437	338 332 1,218 492 1,276	141	29 51 265 606 1,133 362 867		367 383 265 1,824 1,625 1,638 867	2	106 78 571 139 143 384 2,261 150 3,137	(261 305 (306) 1,685 1,482 1,254 1,394) (150) 3,137)	
Total	7,003	7,093	3,656		3,313	<u> </u>	6,969		5,969		0	<u> </u>
Product From Region	To	Beef	NONFE Beef Q	D	Feede To Regio		Feed Q		Con To Regio	1	Con Q	c
<u>-</u>		Minibs	Minibs	5			Ths	hd			Min M	Ical
1	1 2 V X	53 39 10 236		29								
2	1 2 3 V	267 65		24 27								
3	3 V			190 75	4			727	· · ·			
4	2 3 4 7 X	11 70 1,13		12 96 70 263 166					37		8	506 3,10ວັ
5	5 X	7 42	1 1.	72 ,062			<u> </u>		 			
6	6 X	19 1,08		192 170	j							
7	7	<u> </u>		867			<u>i</u>	722	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	

 Table 17

 Model 5 Beef Production and Product Shipments

Source: Derived from LP model 5 solution.

4.2.6 Summary of Results

Table 18 summarizes results of Model's 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 for the two Alberta regions. A description of the fed beef production for the two Alberta regions is given. Also, beef shipments and quantity shipped; and feeder shipments and quantity shipped are given for the two Alberta regions under each model scenario.

			the second s						
Model #	Significant Change From Base	Region 1 Fed Beef Prod 9	Region 2 Fed Beef Prod'n	Beef From Region	B ce f To Region	Quantity	Feeders From Region	Feeders To Region	Quantity
		Minibs	Minibs			Minibs			Ths hd
1	Base Model	479	192	1	1 2 3 V	10o 402 78 14 150	2	1	291
2	Increased Brly Price	701	U	1 2	l v x v	106 78 99 84 51		4 5	126 562
3	Increased X to Japan	338	332	1 2		15 353 383	1		
4	Depreciation of CDN \$	478	484	1	1 X 2 3 V	106 402 78 306 150	2	1	291 659
5	Fed/Non-fed Distinction	338	332	1	1 2 V X 1 2 3 V	82 39 10 236 24 25 26 30	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		

 Table 18

 Summary of Results for Alberta Regions

Source: Derived from Table's 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17.

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Linear Programming approach used in this study stresses the importance of considering raw resources used in the makeup of final product. It indicates that Alberta has an abundance of these intermediate products necessary for a successful cattle industry, and suggests that Alberta is competitive in producing high quality fed beef.

The location of feedlots is determined by a spatial equilibrium model that minimizes cost of concentrates, cost of feeders, non-feed costs, processing costs, and transportation costs of intermediate and final products. Production functions that relate quantities of intermediate products required per unit of final product are specified, as are regional demand functions for boxed beef.

Several basic assumptions of the model can be summarized:36

- 1. The model is static and the results apply to the 1988 calendar year.
- Feeder cattle are assumed to be of uniform quality and weigh 600 pounds in U.S. regions and 650 pounds in the Alberta regions.
- Feeds within the concentrate group and within the roughage group are considered perfect substitutes for each other. Supply of these feeds is predetermined and therefore inelastic for the study period.
- Non-feed costs for the feedlots relate to an average size feedlot (commercial and farmer owned feedlots), and processing costs do not include fabrication to boxed beef.
- The production function used to relate intermediate inputs to boxed beef output is fixed for Alberta regions and fixed for U.S. regions.
- 6. Regional supply of non-fed beef is predetermined and assumed indistinguishable from fed beef except for model 5. It is available to satisfy demand in the home region or for shipment to other regions.
- The demand function used combines per-capita boxed beef consumption and regional population. No prices or per capita incomes are used.
- Each region is represented by a single point that represents demand and supply.
- Processing plants are assumed located at feedlots since slaughter animals are not shipped in this study.

³⁶ These assumptions are derived from (King and Schrader, 1963) since the model used in this study is analogous to their study.

In all the models used in this study, transportation rates on boxed beef moving south from Alberta are doubled and a 20 percent price premium is placed on Alberta beef. These specifications were necessary to calibrate the base model. Non-feed feedlot costs and processing costs used in the model are representative of actual costs.

Results of the base model indicate beef shipments similar to actual 1988 Alberta beef shipments. Actual Alberta beef shipments to the U.S. were 46 million pounds and the base model indicated shipments of 14 million pounds. Actual Alberta beef shipments to eastern Canada were 416 million pounds and the base model indicated 402 million pounds. The proximity of Alberta to the west ceast leads the cost minimization model to ship as much beef there as allowed by model specifications. Shipments to the decast are limited to 150 million pounds. In reality, shipments to the decast coast are limited by demand as actual shipments to B.C. were 116 million pounds. When demand at Vancous er is artificially increased (as in model 3) Alberta regions benefit more than U.S. regions. The precondition for Alberta to benefit from increased demand would be (hypothetically), increased Japanese demand for Alberta lean beef.

In model 2, specifications and assumptions are identical to model 1 except concerning barley cost which is raised in accordance with effects of the Crow Benefit on Alberta livestock feeds. As suggested in section 4.2.2, model results are very sensitive to barley cost. Results indicate that when barley cost increases, cattle feeding in southern Alberta is suspended as feeders are shipped south. The loss of feeding is a direct consequence of higher barley costs. According to model 2 results, viability of the southern Alberta cattle sector is contingent upon removal of or alterations to the

Crow Benefit. The Alberta Crow Benefit Offset Program (ACBOP) maintained a feasible cattle feeding industry in southern Alberta in 1988 by reducing barley cost by the amount of the Crow Benefit distortion.

Model 3 introduced a hypothetical scenario in which Japanese demand is for lean high quality beef. Alberta beef meets these requirements and appears able to expand production and exports, given the particular assumptions and specifications of the model (the critical assumption being continuance of the ACBOP on barley). Alberta would export 620 million pounds to Japan (736 Mln to B.C. less 116 Mln Vancouver demand) under this scenario, and southern Alberta has the most to gain.

Model 4 represents an equilibrium scenario with the Canadian dollar worth 10 percent less in 1988 than was actually the case. Other specifications as to costs and regional demand are unchanged from the base model. Results with this assumption indicate a feedlot allocation significantly different from the base model. Total annual production in Alberta is 291 million pounds higher than the 671 million pounds in the base model. The destination of this additional production (U.S. region 3) indicates that Alberta could export to the U.S. with a lower valued Canadian Iollar. The pattern of feeding in Alberta is reversed with a lower Canadian dollar. Southern Alberta does the majority of feeding as opposed to the base model where northern Alberta had the lions share. Southern Alberta fed an extra 659 thousand feeders that were imported from the Idaho-Montana area. Apparently the relatively lower production costs and therefore greater margin for Alberta cattle feeders allows movement of these animals.

In model 5, specification of regional demand as including fed and non-fed beef is the only change from base model specifications. This restriction is realistic. It differentiates between high quality fed beef and manufacturing beef from culled dairy animals and old cows or bulls. This consumption constraint leads to location of Alberta fed beef production in this model being the same as location in model 3 (the "Japan scenario"). This appears to strengthen the case for Alberta's comparative advantage in export to the Pacific Rim. It indicates that location of Alberta fed beef production in this model such that location of production in this model appears more logical than production in the base model since it is evenly distributed throughout Alberta.

Total Alberta production of fed beef in model 5 (670 million pounds) is the same as production in the base model but regional allocation of this production is changed. Region 2 markets considerably more cattle in model 5 than in model 1. Total Alberta exports to eastern Canada are down from base model exports east. Southern Alberta exports to the U.S. are considerably higher than actual exports of 46 million pounds, and base model exports of 14 million pounds. Southern Alberta exports 267 million pounds of high quality lean Alberta beef to the Washington-Oregon area (region 3) wher the construction is made between fed and non-fed beef.

Region 3 and region 7 did not feed cattle in any model specification. This is due in part to these regions having a concentrate deficit (see Table 4) that must be eliminated prior to feeding cattle. A more thorough analysis of feed availability may change this result. California, for example, has considerable feed in the form of silage from irrigated crops that could affect concentrate availability. Southern Alberta also would have similar products that are not included in this analysis.

As noted in section 4.1, modifications were necessary to achieve the base model (ie. price premium and alteration to shipping rates). Firstly, the doubling of transportation rates for Alberta beef exported to the U.S. may seem unnecessarily harsh. However, any adjustments made to these rates would be speculation. Actual cost of shipping final and intermediate products across the border is difficult to model. Criticisms of the TTM arise because, as a model, it does not accurately represent adhoc situations such as the inspection problems encountered here. That some adjustment is required to compensate for aggravation to the Alberta cattle sector is well documented, and reports of border inspection delays are continually before us. When the cost of having one truck inspected is identified (section 4.1), a doubling of transportation rates does not appear unreasonable.

Secondly, absence of a reciprocal grading arrangement between Alberta and U.S. makes cross border hauls of boxed beef more complicated. This lack of harmonized grading led to the price premium discussed in section 4.1.1. U.S. no-roll beef, discounted in the U.S., is competing in Canada ungraded, and overfat cattle that would be discounted in Alberta can receive a price premium in U.S.. Depending on relative prices, it sometimes pays producers in both countries to produce these respective products for export. That confounds analysis of optimal allocation based on comparative advantage of factors of production as opposed to technological or regulatory advantages.

With the current grading scenario, Alberta product is perceived as inferior in the U.S. and U.S. Choice beef is generally acknowledged as inferior to A1 in Alberta. As

long as grading regulations in the two countries remain unharmonized, penetration of Alberta boxed beef into the U.S. market may be restricted primarily to supplying feeders to the relatively more efficient U.S. feeding and packing industry.

For their part, industry analysts in the U.S. are aware of the need to market leaner beef. Explaining how the cattle industry must cut costs to remain competitive with other meats in the retail market, analysts note that; "The future of the cattle industry depends on whether it can lower it's costs while satisfying the consumer's demand for leaner, more convenient beef proc'ucts." (Barkema and Drabenstott 1990, 49). Alberta already has the product consumers demand and may be positioned to establish markets before retooling on the U.S. cattle industry is complete.

At this time, the future of Alberta's cattle feeding and processing industry appears to lie in production of a high quality lean product for domestic and export markets that is differentiated from the heavier U.S. product. Alberta lean beef is a superior product appropriate to current consumer trends. If Alberta is to be successful internationally with beef exports, this quality difference must be emphasized. Some price premium is legitimate, the question is how much.

A third reason for difficulty in getting the model to feed in Alberta without adjustments is the size difference in the cattle sectors between Alberta and U.S. regions. In the U.S., three packers (Conagra, IBP, Excel) control the market that supplies 250 million people. The 4 largest companies have 70 percent of U.S. slaughter. In 1988, the 5 U.S. regions in this study had 245 slaughtering plants compared to a handful in Alberta, and 90 percent of U.S. slaughter took place in plants handling greater than 50,000 animals per year (American Meat Institute, 1989). In Canada there are sev-

eral packers (XL Foods, Burns, Lakeside-Centennial, Cargill Foods, etc.) for 25 million. Economies of size in the U.S. packing sector lead to efficiencies that cannot presently be achieved in Alberta.

A final factor that predisposes cattle feeding away from Alberta relates to isolation. As the model is set up, the two Alberta regions are geographically separated from U.S. regions. This means transportation of final product out of Alberta and of intermediate product into Alberta is more costly than interregional product movement between adjacent U.S. regions. Demand in the U.S. regions dwarfs Alberta demand and this tends to skew cattle feeding and processing toward these areas where transportation costs are lower.

Conclusions drawn from this study pertain more to trends in production and product movement than to specific cattle feeding allocations indicated in the various models. For purposes of this study, policy implications arising from these location trends focus on the Crow Benefit. Of special interest is the sensitivity of study models to barley cost and the reflection of this result on Canadian grain transportation policy. This study concurs with the notion that the Alberta livestock sector would realize positive welfare gains from removal of or alterations to the Crow Benefit.

Second, future welfare of the Alberta cattle sector may depend on expanding Pacific Rim markets. Alberta appears able to take advantage of increased Japanese demand if it can compete with the dominant U.S. sector. Sensitivity of the models to non-feed and processing costs suggests Alberta would benefit from size increases in the livestock sector. Alterations to the Crow Benefit could leave a void in Alberta's agricul-

ture sector as the export grain industry diminished. This would create an opportunity for the livestock sector to expand and capture economies of size presently possible only in the U.S. industry.

Third, north and north-central Alberta appear able to competitively ship beef to eastern Canada as well as to the Pacific Rim countries. Diversification of beef packing in the province may be warranted given the abundance of resources and raw materials available in this region. Again, alterations to the Crow Benefit could possibly hasten the diversification process.

Finally, results of model 4 illustrate the importance of Canada's monetary policy on the Alberta livestock sector. Alberta experienced a simulated 43 percent increase in fed beef production with a lower Canadian dollar. The increased production was made possible by 659 thousand imported U.S. feeders. Virtually all of the increased fed beef production was shipped back to the U.S. market.

For Alberta to source U.S. feeders, competitiveness in feeding and processing cattle in Alberta must improve. Model 4 indicates substantial in shipments of U.S. feeder cattle are a possibility if Canada had a lower valued dollar. More generally, sensitivity analysis indicates competitiveness in fed beef production in Alberta would improve with relatively lower production costs. Lower production costs can be achieved by lower barley costs, size increases in the Alberta cattle sector, or changes in exchange rates. Reduced barley costs and size increases may be possible with alterations to the Crow Benefit.

5.1 Recommendations for Further Study

Further study of Alberta's cattle industry could focus on the impact of economies of size on Alberta's competitiveness. Economies of size are not directly addressed in this study although they do play a major role. Larger U.S. feedlots and processors are able to reduce per unit costs because of their larger size. Structural change presently occuring in the U.S. industry, including vertical integration of the beef subsectors, allows cost savings in procurement and marketing.

In further studies similar to this one, the production function used should be modified to allow input substitution. When input substitution in the production function is allowed, per unit costs will also fall. Input substitution leads to an efficient Least Cost Expansion Path for processors that cannot be obtained with the production function used in this study. The current production function requires expansion along a factor beam. This does not allow cost savings that result from substituting lower cost inputs.

Another adjustment that could be made in further study would be to allow two types of beef in the demand function; a lean product and a heavier marbled product. If two types of beef were allowed, the fed beef production functions could be specified more explicitly. This would overcome a limitation of the present study where it has been assumed that daily energy needs for U.S. cattle are the same as for Alberta cattle. U.S. consumers have a preference for more marbling than Alberta consumers. In Alberta, the premium beef grade is leaner than the U.S. premium beef grade. Separation of demand may lead to more realistic feeding

location as beef for the Alberta consumer would efficiently originate in Alberta. Harmonized grading between the two countries should further rationalize feeding location and improve efficiency.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, Michael. 1991. Alberta Agriculture Trade Statistician. Personal conversation spring 1991.

Agriculture Canada. 1988. Canada Livestock and Meat Trade Report. (various issues).

- Agriculture Canada 1991. Personal conversation with Dr. Rouget of Ag. Can. Edmonton, concerning number of feeders per truck.
- Alberta Agriculture 1990. The Location of Cattle Production in Alberta. Production Economics Branch, Economic Services Division, Alberta Agriculture. Nov 5, 1990.
- Alberta Agriculture 1990. Grain Handling and Transportation: Freedom To Choose. August 1990.
- Alberta Agriculture, Statistics Branch. 1988. Alberta's Agricultural Exports 1988, Alberta Agriculture, Edmonton Alberta.
- Alberta Agriculture, Statistics Branch. 1988. Agricultural Statistics Yearbook-1988, Alberta Agriculture, Edmonton Alberta.

Alberta Report. 1991. "Survival of the Biggest". (May 13, 1991 issue)

Allen, Roy., Claudia Dodge and Andrew Schmitz. 1983. "Voluntary Export Restraints as Protection Policy: The U.S. Beef Case." American Journal of Agricultural Economics. May. Vol 65: Page?

American Meat Institute. 1989. "Meatfacts" 1989 Edition.

- Anderson, A. W. 1991. Professor of Agriculture Engineering, University of Alberta. Personal conversation spring 1991.
- Barkema, Alan D. and Drabenstott, Mark. 1990. "A Crossroads for the Cattle Industry" *Economic Review*, *Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City*. Nov/Dec 1990, 47-66.

- Bawden, D. Lee. 1964. "An Evaluation of Alternative Spatial Models." Journal of Farm Economics, 46(5): 1372-1379. December
- Bressler, R.G., and King, R.A. 1970. Markets, Prices and Interregional Trade, John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Canadian Meat Council, 1990. Reciprocal Grading of North American Beef, Issues and Impacts. Final Report. Prepared by Deloitte & Touche Edmonton, Alberta.
- Canfax Trends West 1988. Canfax Trends West has data on cost of gain for feeder cattle costs in Canfax Trends West costing model.
- Chen, Peter Y., and Michele Veeman. 1989. Demand for Meat in Canada: Model Specification and Structural Change. University of Alberta, Department of Rural Economy, Staff Paper 89-11.
- Chiang, Alpha C. 1984. Fundamental Methods of Mathematical Economics, Third Edition McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Dawson, Dau and Associates. 1984. A Review of the Past and Current State of the Alberta Beef Processing Industry and Implications for the Future. Prepared for: Alberta Agriculture, January 1984.
- Dorfman, Robert., Paul A. Samuelson, and Robert M. Solow. 1958 Linear Programming and Economic Analysis. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc New York.
- Dunlop, D. 1989. Economic Assessment of Grain Price Pooling on Alberta Farm Returns and Grain System Costs. Unpublished M.Sc. thesis, University of Alberta.
- Edmonton Journal, The. 1990. "U.S. meat inspectors accused of harassment." in the Saturday, June 9, 1990 edition.
- Enke, Stephen. 1951. "Equilibrium Among Spatially Separated Markets: Solution by Electric Analogue." *Econometrica*, 19(1):40-47.
- Fox, Karl A. 1953. "A Spatial Equilibrium Model of The Livestock-Feed Economy In The United States." *Econometrica*. Volume 21: 547-566.

- Fox, Karl A. and R.C. Taeuber. 1955. "Spatial Equilibrium Models of the Livestock Feed Economy" in, *American Economic Review* 45(4): 584-608.
- Geitz, Ron. 1991. Alberta Agriculture Livestock Market Analyst. Personal conversation spring 1991.
- Goodwin, J. W., and J. R. Crow. 1973. "Optimal Regional Locations of Beef Production and Processing Enter₁-rises." Okla. St. Univ. Agr. Exp. Bull. 707.
- Heady, Earl O., and Wilfred Candler. 1960. Linear Programming Methods. The Iowa State University Press, Ames Iowa, U.S.A.
- Holloway, Garth J., and Ellen W. Goddard. 1988. An Approach to Examining Relative Efficiency in the Canadian Livestock Slaughtering Industry. *Canadian Jour*nal of Agricultural Economics 36: 207-220.
- Houck, James P. 1986. *Elements of Agricultural Trade Policies*. Macmillan Publishing Company, New York.
- Johnson, Gale D., John M. Connor, Timothy Josling, Andrew Schmitz, G. Edward Schuh. 1989. "Competitive Issues in The Beef Sector: Can Beef Compete In The 1990's?" Humphrey Institute Report No 1. Oct 1989. Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs. University of Minnesota.
- Judge, George G. 1956. "Competitive Position of the Connecticut Poultry Industry. (No 7, A Spatial Equilibrium Model for Eggs.)" *Storrs Agricultural Experiment Station. College of Agriculture*, University of Connecticut. Storrs, Connecticut, January. Bul 318.
- Judge, G.G., and Wallace, T.D. 1958. "Estimation of Spatial Price Equilibrium Models". Journal of Farm Economics. Nov, Vol XL, Number 4: 801-820.
- Judge G.G. and Wallace T.D. 1959. "Methodological Development and Annual Spatial Analysis of The Beef Marketing Sector" Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin T-78, Stillwater, Oklahoma, June.
- Judge G.G., J. Havlicek, and R.L. Rizek. 1965. "An Interregional Model: Its Formulation and Application to The Livestock Industry." *Agricultural Economics Research*, Vol 17: 1-9.

- King, Gordon A. 1961 Regional Supply and Distribution of Feed, 1957-58. Berkeley, Giannini Found. Agr. Econ. Res. Rept. 248.
- King, G. A., and L. F. Schrader. 1963. "Regional Location of Cattle Feeding-A Spatial Equilibrium Analysis" in *Hilgardia* 34: 331-416.
- Lavoie, Claude. 1984. Appendix-"Competitive Position of the Canadian Meat Packing and Processing Industry." Agriculture Canada, Food Market Commentary Vol 6. No. 4. December.
- Lefeber, Louis. 1958. Allocation in Space; Production, Transport and Industrial Location. North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Lerohl, M. L. 1991. Professor in Rural Economics, University of Alberta. Personal conversation spring 1991.
- Mathison, Gary 1991. Professor in Animal Science, University of Alberta. Personal Conversation January 1991.
- Samuelson, Paul A. 1952. "Spatial Price Equilibrium and Linear Programming". The American Economic Review, Mar, 42: 283-303.
- Sarwar, Ghulam and Glenn Fox. 1990. "Some Alternative Methods of Paying The Crow Benefit: An Outline of Six Proposals." *The George Morris Center. Discussion Paper Series*. Discussion Paper DP90/01 May.
- Von Thunen, Johann Heinrich 1966. von Thunen's Isolated State An English edition of Der Isolierte Staat; translated by Carla M. Wartenberg, edited with an introduction by Peter Hall. Pergamon Press Oxford.
- Takayama, Takashi and George G. Judge. 1971. Spatial and Temporal Price and Allocation Models. North-Holland Publishing Company: Amsterdam.
- University of Manitoba Transport Institute (UMTI). 1989. Proceedings of a Conference on Review of the WGTA. Winnipeg, Manitoba.

USDA 1990. Feed Situation and Outlook Report, FdS-316. Nov 90, 38.

- USDA 1989. Livestock and Poultry Situation and Outlook Report, Feb 1989, 22. USDA ERS LPS-33.
- USDA 1989. Agriculture Statistics 1989 yearbook.
- USDA 1989. Cattle, Final Estimates 1984-88. USDA, NASS, ASB. Statistical Bulletin Number 798.
- USDA 1989. Livestock and Poultry Situation and Outlook Report, May 1989, p56. USDA ERS LPS-35.
- USDA 1988. Livestock and Poultry Situation and Outlook Report, Aug 1988. USDA ERS LPS-31.
- U.S.I.T.C. 1987. "The Competitive Position of Canadian Live Cattle and Beef in U.S. Markets." USEPC Publication 1996. July.
- Wallace T.D. and G.G. Judge 1959. "Application of Spatial Analysis to Quarterly Models and Particular Problems Within The Beef Marketing System" Oklahoma State University Technical Bulletin T-79 December.
- Weinschenck, G., W Henrichsmeyer and F. Aldinger. 1969. "The Theory of Spatial Equilibrium and Optimal Location in Agriculture: A Survey." In Review of Marketing and Agricultural Economics. C.D. Throsby (ed). 37,1 (March):3-70.
- Willis, Darcy. 1991. Senior Trade Analyst at Alberta Agriculture. Personal conversation fall 1990 and spring 1991.

7 APPENDICES

7.1 Appendix A (Feed Data Methodology)

Concentrate and roughage availability was determined by first gathering regional quantities available (in tonnes), of various feedstuffs. Availability for all livestock is taken as production + imports + beginning year stocks - [ending stock + exports + seed and industrial use]. Regional feed availability for all livestock, feeding rates used and net energy of feeds are given in the Tables below.

¢	('000 tonnes)											
Region	wheat	oats	barley	rye	corn	sorghum	Total					
$\frac{1}{2}$	414 723 -	1178 182 134	3548 1959 1185	33 78 -	- 592	-	5173 2942 1911					
45	-	108 1633	1433 4286	-	8042 9064	2501 599	12084 15582					
6 7	-	75 52	617 486	-	3520 1142	412 70	4624 1750					
Total	1137	3362	13514	111	22360	3582	44066					

Table A1.Concentrate Availability (fall 1987)('000 tonnes)

Note: Based on Tables used by King and Schrader, 1963.

		('UUU tonnes)	
Region	tame hay	processed alfalfa	greenfeed cereal	silage cereal (barley)
1 2	6042 2122	33	- 22	- 171
3	5182 9690	-	-	-
5	12795	-	-	-
6 7	5703 9421	-	-	-
Total	50955	33	22	171

Table A2.Roughage Availability (fall 1987)('000 tonnes)

96

Table A2.Roughage Availability "fall 1987" (continued)('000 tonnes)

Region	silage hay	silage corn	silage sorghum	fodder corn	Total
$ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \end{array} $	17	79 1560 958 4391 2991 4387	- 109 331 245 76	165	6075 2576 6742 10757 17517 8939 13884
, Total	17	14366	L	165	66490

Note: Based on Tables used by King and Schrader, 1963.
Table A3. Livestock Feeding Rates (average)

Livestock Type	Concentrates (tonne/year)	Roughages (tonne/year)
Cattle and Calves: bulls > 500lbs milk cows > 500lbs dairy heifers > 500lbs beef cows > 500lbs beef heifers for breeding > 500lbs backgrounding steers > 500lbs Hogs: breeding stock 6 mos and over all other pigs (pig crop)	$0.1 \\ 2 \\ 0.6 \\ 0.1 \\ 0.2 \\ 0.4 \\ 1 \\ 0.7$	1.5 4.7 2.7 1 1 1 1 -
Sheep: one year and older	0.02	.250
Poultry: chicken for meat turkey laying hens/pullets	0.0204 0.0622 0.0336	

Note: laying hens/pullets and pullets of less than laying age have been combined to give concentrate use for "one bird/year".
Note: Feeding rates were obtained from U of A Animal Science professors and Alberta Agriculture staff.
Note: Based on Tables used by King and Schrader, 1963.

97

Table A4.NET Energy of Various Feedstuffs(with the values specific for feeder cattle)

Feedstuff Type	NET Energy/tonne (DM basis)	NET Energy/tonne (Mcal as fed)
CONCENTRATES wheat oats barley rye corn sorghum	1700 Mcal 1400 Mcal 1600 Mcal 1600 Mcal 1900 Mcal 1600 Mcal	1530 1260 1440 1440 1710 1440
ROUGHAGES tame hay processed alfalfa greenfeed cereal silage cereal (barley) silage hay silage corn fodder corn silage sorghum	900 Mcal 900 Mcal 900 Mcal 900 Mcal 900 Mcal 1000 Mcal 1100 Mcal 900 Mcal	810 810 810 360 360 400 550 360

Note: Based on Tables used by King and Schrader, 1963.

98

7.2 Appendix B (Feeder Data Methodology)

For the US regions, feeder cattle numbers were estimated using (USDA 1989, Cattle, Final Estimates 1984-88, NASS ASB #798), and (USDA 1989, Agricultural Statistics Yearbook 1989). For the five feeding states; California, Colorado, Idaho, South Dakota and Washington, feeder cattle placements and number on feed data are available. The other six states have data for the number on feed only. The average ratio of placements to number on feed for the feeding states is (2.64). Applying this ratio to the other six states gives estimated placements for each US region. This methodology assumes that for every animal on feed Jan 1/1988, 2.64 animals will be placed on feed during the year Oct1/87 to Sept 30/88. Results are indicated in Appendix Table B1.³⁷

³⁷ Not indicated by Table B1 (but considered in final totals used) is the fact that included in U.S. placement numbers are a category called "other dissappearance". These animals are not marketed in the region and so must be taken off the regional placements used in this study. The assumption is that they are shipped east to Kansa and Nebraska as slaughter animals. This involved 669,000 animals.

Region	State	Placements (Q4/87-Q3/88)	# on feed Jan 1/88	autio 1	Estimated Placements
3	Washington Oregon	497000	198000 95000	2.51 Avg 2.64	497000 250800 747800
4	Idaho Montana	608000	195000 110000	3.12 Avg 2.64	
5	S.Dakota N. Dakota Wyoming	695000	300000 45000 100000	2.32 Avg 2.64 Avg 2.64	
6	Colorado Utah	2450000	940000 45000	2.61 Avg 2.64	
7	California Nevada	1160000	435000 28000	2.66 Avg 2.64	1
Total		5410000	2491000		6525520

Table B1 US Placement Methodo

Note: Derived from data collection.

In Alberta, methodology to determine supply of feeder cattle is based on calf numbers July 1/87. Alberta Agriculture Statistics Branch has these numbers broken out by census division in a publication called: **Cattle Numbers #2, December 6, 1988**. Of the total number of calves on July 1/87, (1,280,000), 90% (1,152,000) are assumed spring calves. Of this, one-half (576,000) are assumed steers and onehalf are heifers. Of the heifers, 48% (289,000), are for slaughter. This gives a total of 856,000 animals on July 1/87 targeted for eventual slaughter. Of these 856,000, 30% (257,000), are assumed overwintered and 70% (599,000), go straight to finishing pens to finish in spring of 88 while the 30% are pastured in spring of 88 and finished in fall 88. Of the calf inventory, 60% were located in region 1 and 40% were located in region 2.

Imports of feeders to Alberta would not be included in this methodology so must be calculated separately. In 1988, Alberta imported 533,000 cattle (Alberta Agriculture, 1988 Alberta's Agricultural Exports) that are assumed feeders (Adam 1991). They were apportioned among the four regions according to shares of regional slaughter data found in (Alberta Agriculture, 1990. The Location of Cattle Production in Alberta). For 1988, region 1 had 35.2% of slaughter volume, and region 2 had 64.8%. These amounts were added to domestic feeders to get Alberta placements as in Appendix Table B2.

Region	Imports	Calf #s July 1/87	Placements
1	(.352)533000	(.60)856000	701625
2	(.648)533000	(.40)856000	688384
Total			1389862

Table B2.Alberta Placement Methodology

Source: Derived from data collection.

7.3 Appendix C (MTS Base Model Results)

The first section of this appendix contains an abbreviated copy of the MTS printout results for the base model. The base model was an attempt to recreate actual 1988 supply and disposition of Alberta beef. The second section of this appendix contains an abbreviated copy of the MTS printout results for Model 2. The only distinction between model 2 and the base model is the increase in barley price.

Base Model MTS Results



1	0	5
---	---	---

	TLEFEES			
- TTT -		- 21.23	#FEFATA3	1 6
#34	7			
# 34		-21 17	HT 874743	
8 27				
#37		*. •		1. •
	MTEIM126	-10 11		
837	TL278487	1.4		
	MASIMITE	-26.11		
	TLB/84	1.		
142	MARINES 4	+27.84		1.0
	11078493	1.9		
	MATIMIT	-17 17	SF BFATA4	1
	TLOFROOJ	1.0		
843	MAXIMITE	-1.88	SPSFAVA-	1.0
844	71.078404			
1		-28.33		1.0
398	MAEIMIZE	1.9		
143	TLEFRONS			1.0
244	MAS10122	-23.00		
	TL BF# 404	1.0		
1 247	MAXIMIZE	-18		
1 147	TL6P2007	1.0		
3 344	MAX14176	-62.67		
1 144	TLEFRONT	9.4		
1 851	MARIMEZE	-34.88	WF8FATAS	1 •
251	TLEFEDDI			
	MAXIMITE	- 20 . 5 1		
	TLOFGOD7	1.4		
113		-28.23	MPBPATAS	1
	11470483			
#53	MATIMIZE	-26.23		1.4
114	71878984	1.9		
114		1.10		1.0
	MALIMIIC			
	TLEFROBS	. 15 60		1 9
	MAIIMIZE			
256	TLAFBOOA			1.0
257	WATIMIZE .	-31,20		•.•
857	16848987	1.0		
	MATIMIZE	-45.07		
383	TLOFOCI	1.0		
	MAX10111	-44 41	47874741	10
	TLEFE GO 1	1.0		
862	NACIMIZE	- 27 . 45		1.0
1 142	TLEFECT	1.		
1	MATIMETE	- 19, 33	RLGLTAVE	1.0
	TLOPERS3	1.0		
	MATIMITE	-23.00	WFEFATAS	1.0
	TL 878 084	1.0		
1 844	MAXIMIZE	- 15 . 60		1.4
	TL 878 085	1.0		
		1.00		1.0
	MATIMIZE			
	TLEPAQUE	1.4	#FOFATAS	1.0
2.67	MARIMLIE	-33.00		
1 887	TLSFRGE7	1.0		1.9
	MAX14122	-47.47		• • •
868	TLOFEODE	1.0		1.0
871	MARIMIZE	-48.95	BFBFAVA7	
1 271	TL#F###1	1.0		
873	MATIMITE	-42.72	HFBFAVA7	1,0
1 172	TLOFROD2	1.0		
1 273	MARIMIZE	-31.17_	MPRFAVA7	1.0

C2

•

Trip Trip Trip Trip				
Image: Status Image: Status Image: Status Image: Status Image: Status				
TATEWOOD 1.0 TATEWOOD 1.1.0 TATEWOOD 1.0 TATEWOOD TATEWOOD TATEWOOD TATEWOOD <th>E113</th> <th></th> <th></th>	E113			
WALKING -11.30 WFFAUXT 1.4 TATTON TATTON TATTON TATTON TATTON TATTON WFFAUXT 1.4 TATTON TATTON WFFAUXT 1.4 TATTON TATTON WFFAUXT 1.0 TATTON PECTATAT 1.0 PECTATAT TATTON TATTON PECTATAT 1.0 TATTON TATTON TATTON 1.0 TATTON TATTON TATTON 1.0 TATTON TATTON TATTON 1.0 TATTON TATTON TATTON 1.0				
Transmit Tar mark to the second			MTAFAVAT L.G	
Initiality -is WYANAY 1.4 INANAY 1.0 WYANAY 1.0 INANAY 1.0 WYANAY 1.0 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
Itarianis I.e Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itarianis Itariani Itarianis Itarianis			MFGFAYA7 1.4	
Image: Provide the second se				
PC: PC: TATA PC: TATA PC: PC: TATA PC: TATA <th< th=""><th></th><th>MAXIMIZE -1.90</th><th>WF#F4VA7 1.6</th></th<>		MAXIMIZE -1.90	WF#F4VA7 1.6	
PC: PC:TRAIL 1.3 PC: PC:TRAIL 1.4 PC:TRAIL 1.4 PC: PC:TRAIL 1.4 PC:TRAIL PC:TRAIL PC: PC:TRAIL PC:TRAIL PC:TRAIL PC:TRAIL PC:TRAIL PC: PC:TRAIL PC:TRAIL PC:TRAIL PC:TRAIL <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>				
res mainting res re			PECTAVAL TI.U	
rc3 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc3 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc4 rc5 rc4 rc4 r			PETAVA2 -1.0	
rcs rcs <th rcs<="" th="" tr<=""><th></th><th></th><th></th></th>	<th></th> <th></th> <th></th>			
FCS FCTTALS 1.0 FCS FCTTALS FCTTALS FCS FCTTALS FCTTALS FCS FCTTALS FCTTALS FCS FCTTALS FCTTALS FCS FCTTALS<			FOLTATA3 +1.9	
CC PACTALL -1.0 PCG PCGTRAIT 1.0 PCGTRAIT PCGTRAIT 1.0 PCGTRAIT 1.0 PCGTRAIT PCGTRAIT PCGTRAIT 1.0 PCGTRAIT PCGTRAIT PCGTRAIT 1.0 PCGTRAIT PCGTRAIT PCGTRAIT PCGTRAIT				
Pics Mainize -eif, ei Pectaval -1.0 Pics Mainize -eif Pectaval -eif Pics Mainize -eif Pectaval -eif Pics Mainize -eif Pectaval -eif -eif Pics Mainize -eif Pectaval -eif -eif Pics Mainize -eif Pectaval -eif -eif Pics Could at the Dectaval -eif -eif Could at the Dectaval -eif -eif Could at the Declava			FRCTAVA4 -1.0	
res res <th res<="" th="" tr<=""><th></th><th></th><th>PRTTATAL -1.0</th></th>	<th></th> <th></th> <th>PRTTATAL -1.0</th>			PRTTATAL -1.0
FCG MAXIMIZE				
FC MCTOALS 1.0 FCT MAILMIZ -647.04 -1.0 FCT FCTALT 1.4 -00 FCT FCTALT 1.4 -00 FCT FCTALT 1.4 -00 FCT FCTALT 1.4 -00 FCT FCTALT -1.4 -00 FCT FCTALT -1.7 -00 FCT FCTALT -1.4 -00 FCT FCTALT -1.4 -00 FCT FCTALT -1.4 -00 FCCC FCTALT -1.4 -1.5 FCCC FCTALT -1.4 -1.5 FCCC FCTALT -1.6 -1.5 FCCC FCTALT -1.6 -1.6		MAX1M127 -617.94	FOCTAVAS -1.4	
PCT MAINING PECTANA PECTANA PCT PCTAAT -1.0 PCT PCTAAT -1.45 PCT PCTAAT -1.45 PCT PCTAAT -1.35 PCT PCTATAT -1.35 PCTATAT -12.40 PCTATAT PCTATAT -13.40 PCTATAT PCTATAT -13.40 PCTATAT PCTATAT -13.40 PCTATAT PCTATAT -33.53 PPFAVAT PCTATAT -34.41 -4.43 PCTATAT -34.41 -4.43 PCTATAT -34.42 <				
ci matchizz -72.00 CBMCAVA1 -1.45 ci Cimitation -77.00 CBMCAVA2 -1.45 ci matchizz -1.70 CBMCAVA2 -1.45 ci Cimitation -77.00 CBMCAVA2 -1.45 ci Cimitation -1.20 CBMCAVA2 -1.45 ci Cimitation -1.30 CBMCAVA2 -1.30 ci Cimitation -1.30 CBMCAVA2 -1.00 vi Camitation -1.00 CBMCAVA2 -1.00 vi Camitation -1.30 CBMCAVA2 -1.00 vi Camitation -1.00 CBMCAVA2 -1.00 vi Camitation -1.00 CBMCAVA2 -1.00 vi Camitatine -1.00 CBMCAVA2			P82744A7 -1.0	
CONCRAMITE - 17 OO CONCRAMA - 1 55 CC CONCRAMITE - 174 .40 CONCRAMA - 1 55 CC CONCRAMA - 0 4 .A0 CONCRAMA - 1 55 CC CONCRAMA - 0 4 .A0 CONCRAMA - 1 55 CC CONCRAMA - 0 4 .A0 CONCRAMA - 1 55 CC CONCRAMA - 0 4 .A0 CONCRAMA - 1 55 CC CONCRAMA - 1 0 CONCRAMA - 1 0 CC CONCRAMA - 1 0 CONCRAMA - 1 0 VII MARIMITE - 173 .63 WFFAVAI - 1 0 VII MARIMITE - 173 .63 WFFAVAI - 1 0 VII MARIMITE - 173 .63 WFFAVAI - 1 0 VII MARIMITE - 173 .63 WFFAVAI - 1 0 VII MARIMITE - 131 .47 MFFAVAI - 1.0 VII MARIMITE - 131 .0 CONCRAVAI - 1.0 VII			and and a second s	
icity ist of the second s				
CC CC CC CC CC V1 CC CC CC CC CC V1 CC CC CC CC CC CC V1 CC CC CC CC CC			EGMEANA2 -1.45	
CC0 MAXIMUTE .124.40 COULAVAA -155 CC1 COULALA 0 COULAVAA -155 CC2 CULALA 0 CULAVAA -155 CC3 CULALA 0 CULAVAA -155 CC4 CULALA 0 CULAVAA -155 CC5 CULALA 0 CULAVAA 1.0 CC4 CULAVAA 2.01 CULAVAA 2.430 CC5 CULAVAA 2.01 CULAVAA 2.430 V1 CULAVAA 2.01 CULAVAA 2.430 V21 CULAVAA 2.01 CULAVAA 2.430 V31 CULAVAA 2.01 CULAVAA 2.430 V31 CULAVAA 2.01 CULAVAA 2.00 V31 CULAVAA 2.01 CULAVAA 2.00 V31 CULAVAA 1.0 CULAVAA 2.00 V41 FOCTAVAA 1.0 CULAVAA 3.00 V41 FOCTAVAA 1.0 CULAVAA 3.00 V41 CULAVAA				
CC4 CONCERAL I CONCERAL I SI CC4 MAXINIZE -1124 AD CONCERAS -1.53 CONCERAS -1.53 CONCERAS -1.53 CC4 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CC4 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 V1 CONCERAS -2.074 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 V31 MAXIMIZE -316.4 MERTARA -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 V31 MAXIMIZE -316.47 MERTARA -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 V31 MUTTARA -3.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 V31 MUTTARA -3.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 V31 MUTTARA -3.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 V31 MUTTARA -3.0 MERTARA -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 V31 MUTTARA -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0 CONCERAS -1.0			COMILAVA4 -1 SS	
CCG CCGCCA CDUCAVAS -1.81 CCG CDUCAVAS 1.0 CDUCAVAS -1.81 CCG CDUCAVAS 1.0 CDUCAVAS -1.0 V11 POCTAVAS 2.41 TUTA TUTA V21 MATIMIZE -773.83 WFFAVAS -1.0 V21 MATIMIZE -770.33 CBUCAVAS 2.438 V21 MATIMIZE -770.33 CBUCAVAS 2.438 V21 MATIMIZE -710.33 CBUCAVAS 2.438 V21 MATIMIZE -710.43 CBUCAVAS 2.438 V31 MATIMIZE -316.47 MFFAVAS -1.0 V31 MATIMIZE -316.47 MFFAVAS -1.0 V31 MUFFAVAS 1.61 COUCAVAS 2.84A V41 FDCTAVAS 1.81 COUCAVAS 2.84A V41 FDCTAVAS 1.0 COUCAVAS 2.84A V41 FDCTAVAS 1.0 COUCAVAS 2.84A		CONCEAL4 1 0		
CC6 MARINIZE -124 40 CDUCAVAE -1.38 CC6 CDUCAVAE -1.38 WEFAAL -1.0 V11 MARINIZE -273.83 WEFAAL -1.0 V11 PCTAVAE 2 CDUCAVAE 3.438 V11 MARINIZE -273.83 WEFAAL -1.0 V11 PCTAVAE 2 CDUCAVE 2.10 V11 PCTAVAE 2.074 CEMCAVE 2.1.0 V31 MARINIZE -373.83 WEFAAL -1.0 V31 MUTAVAE 2.001 CEMCAVE 3.000 V31 MUTAVE 3.00.47 WEFAAL -1.0 V31 PCTAVAE 1.01 CEMCAVE 3.000 V31 PCTAVE 3.01.01 CEMCAVE 3.000 V41 MUTAVE 3.010 CEMCAVE 3.000 V41				
CCC CONCRAFS 1.0 V11 MARINIZE -73.63 MTSFAVA1 1.0 V11 RUFFAVA1 2.43 MTSFAVA1 1.0 V21 MARINIZE -773.63 MTSFAVA3 2.43 V21 MARINIZE -713.63 MTSFAVA3 2.43 V21 MARINIZE -715.63 MTSFAVA3 2.43 V21 MARINIZE -316.47 MTSFAVA3 -1.0 V31 MARFAVA3 .61 CONCAVA3 2.43 V31 MARFAVA3 .61 CONCAVA3 2.43 V31 MARFAVA3 .61 CONCAVA3 3.44 V31 RUFFAVA3 .87 MTSFAVA4 -1.0 V31 RUFFAVA3 .87 MTSFAVA4 -1.0 V31 RUFFAVA3 .87 MTSFAVA4 -1.0 V41 FOCTAVA4 1.81 CONCAVA4 3.84 V41 RUFFAVA4 1.0 CONCAVA4 3.84 V41 RUFFAVA4 1.0 CONCAVA4 3.84 V41 RUFFAVA4 <		CBUCEALS 1 0	CDWC4 WAR -1 58	
interval -273.83 WEFAVAL 1.0 vit RUFFAVAL -1.0 -1.0 vit RUFFAVAL				
vii POCTAVAI 2.01 CBUCAVAI 3.438 vii AUFAVAI 1.61 PBFAVA2 -1.0 vii AUFAVAI 1.61 PBFAVA2 -1.0 vii AUFAVAI 1.61 PBFAVA3 -1.0 vii AUFAVA3 1.61 CBUCAVA3 2.438 vii AUFAVA3 1.61 CBUCAVA3 3.648 vii AUFAVA3 1.81 CBUCAVA3 3.848 vii AUFAVA3 1.87 PBFAVA4 -1.0 vii AUFAVA3 1.87 PBFAVA4 -1.0 vii AUFAVA4 1.87 GUCAVA4 3.848 vii PBCTAVA5 1.80 CBUCAVA4 3.848 vii PBCTAVA6 1.80 CBUCAVA4 3.848 vii PBCTAVA6 1.0 CBUCAVA4 3.848 vii <th></th> <th></th> <th>HYSPAVAL -1 0</th>			HYSPAVAL -1 0	
V11 AUFFAVA1 141 V21 MATHIZE 731.43 WFFAVA2 1.0 V21 PECTAVA2 2.014 CHECAVA2 1.0 V31 MATHIZE -316.47 WFFAVA3 1.0 V41 RUFFAVA4 1.01 CONCAV4 3.84 V41 RUFFAVA4 1.01 CONCAV4 3.84 V41 RUFFAVA4 1.01 CONCAV4 3.84 V41 RUFFAVA5 1.01 CONCAVA4 3.84 V41 RUFFAVA5 1.01 CONCAVA4 3.84 V41 RUFFAVA5 1.01 CONCAVA4 3.84 V41 RUFFAVA5 1.0 </th <th></th> <th></th> <th>CONCAVA1 3.438</th>			CONCAVA1 3.438	
vii rotinest 7.072 Curcava 2.4.38 vii matimize -316.47 mssava 3.1.0 vii matimize -316.47 mssava 3.1.0 vii rotinest 3.01 Curcava 3.3.04 vii matimize -316.47 mssava 3.1.0 vii rotinest 3.01 Curcava 3.3.04 viii Ruffaire 3.01 Curcava 3.3.04 viii Ruffaire 3.01 Curcava 3.0				
vii AUTRANZ .441 vii AUTRANZ .441 vii FCCTANZ 1.81.47 HFFAVAL vii FCCTANZ 1.81.47 GUEZAVAL 1.84 vii GUEZAVAL 1.84 GUEZAVAL 1.84 vii GUEZAVAL 1.87 GUEZAVAL 1.84 vii MARINIZE -318.47 GUEZAVAL 1.84 vii MARINIZE -318.47 GUEZAVAL 1.84 vii MARINIZE -318.47 MFDFAVAL 1.0 vii MARINIZE -318.47 MFDFAVAL 1.84 vii MARINIZE -316.47 MFDFAVAL 1.0 vii MARINIZE -317.67 GPERAVAL 1.0 viii RUFFAVAL 1.0 GUEZAVAL 1.00 viii MARINIZE -5.73 POCTAVAL 1.0 viii MARINIZE -1.08 POCTAVAL 1.0 viii MARINIZE -1.08 POCTAVAL <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
v31 MAININE -316.47 MEFAVA3 -1.0 v31 RUFFAVA3 107 CONCAVA3 1.844 v31 RUFFAVA3 107 MEFAVA3 -1.0 v41 RUFFAVA3 1.01 CONCAVA 3.844 v41 PDCTAVA4 1.01 CONCAVA 3.844 v41 PDCTAVA4 1.01 CONCAVA 3.844 v41 RUFFAVA4 1.04 1 v51 RUFFAVA4 1.04 1 v51 RUFFAVA4 1.0 1.0 v51 RUFFAVA4 1.0 1.0 v51 RUFFAVA4 1.0 1.0 v51 RUFFAVA3 1.0 1.0 v53 RDCTAVA3 1.0 1.0 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
v31 r0cTava3 1.61 CONCAVA3 3.844 v31 AUFAVA3 187 NTSFAVA4 1.0 v41 RUFF#VA4 187 NTSFAVA4 1.0 v51 POCTAVA5 1.0 CONCGVA4 3.844 v51 RUFF#VA5 1.0 CONCGVA4 3.844 v51 RUFF#VA5 1.0 CONCGVA4 3.844 v51 RUFF#VA5 1.0 CONCGVA4 3.844 v61 RUFF#VA5 1.0 CONCGVA4 3.844 v71 PUCFAVA5 .97 VEFAVA5 1.0 v71 RUFF#VA5 1.0 VEFAVA5 1.0 v12 POCTAV3 1.0 VEFAVA5 1.0 v13 FOCT			MFRFATA3 -1.0	
vii AUFFAVA3 187 NPFAVA4 -1.0 vii NDITATA 184.47 NPFAVA4 -1.0 vai PDCTAVA4 1.81 3.84 vai PDCTAVA4 1.87 MPFAVA4 1.0 vai PDCTAVA4 1.87 MPFAVA4 1.0 vai RUFFAVA4 1.87 MPFAVA4 1.0 vai RUFFAVA4 1.87 MPFAVA4 1.0 vai MARINIZE -316.47 MPFAVA4 1.0 vai MARINIZE -317.47 MPFAVA5 -10 vai RUFFAVA5 100 Conc(AvA7 1.0 vai MARINIZE -108 POCTAVA1 1.0 vi3 MARINIZE -108 POCTAVA1 1.0 vi3 MARINIZE <th></th> <th></th> <th>CONCAVA3 3.944</th>			CONCAVA3 3.944	
val val <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
voi tuppertail 187 voi tuppertail 186 voi tuppertail 186 voi tuppertail 186 voi tuppertail 186 voi tuppertail 187 voi tuppertail 197 voi tuppertail 197 voi tuppertail 197 voi tuppertail 10 voi tuppertail 10				
VS1 MARINIZE -316.47 #P0PATAS -1.0 VS1 POCTATAS 1.010 CONCATAS 2.014 VS1 RUPPATAS -307 SPETATAS -1.0 VS1 RUPPATAS -307 SPETATAS -1.0 VS1 RUPPATAS -307 SPETATAS -1.0 VS1 RUPPATAS -307 CONCATAS 2.040 VS1 RUPPATAS -307 SPETATS -1.0 V71 RUPPATAS 1.010 CONCATAS 2.040 V71 RUPPATAS 1.07 FOCTASS -1.08 V12 MARINIZE -1.73 FOCTASS 1.0 V13 FOCTASS -1.08 FOCTASS -1.08 V13 FOCTASS -1.08 FOCTASS -1.08 V13 MARINIZE -0.012 FOCTASS -1.08			COBCATA4 3.566	
VS1 POCTAVAS 1,510 CORCAVAS 3,884 VS1 RUFFAVAS 897 FFPRAVAS -10 V61 HARIMITE -317.47 FFPRAVAS -10 V61 RUFFAVAS .500 CORCAVAS 3.844 V61 RUFFAVAS .677 HUBARAY -1.0 V71 RUFFAVAS 1.07 CORCAVAS 2.804 V71 RUFFAVAS .673 POCTAVAS 1.0 V12 RUFFAVAS -10 POCTAVAS 1.0 W13 MOCTAVAS -1.08 POCTAVAS 1.0 W13 POCTAVAS -1.08 POCTAVAS 1.0			#F0F4746 -1.0	
vs1 tuppavas .987 vs1 mainize .37.47 Grøpavas .10 vs1 mainize .37.47 Grøpavas .10 vs1 poctavas 1.910 Cuucevas 3.944 vs1 Ruppavas .897 .10 v71 Ruppavas .910 Cuucevas .10 v71 Ruppavas .907 .100 Cuucevas .104 v71 Ruppavas .907 .9064 .100 Cuucevas .9064 v12 Matemize .73.7 .9064 .00 .00 .00 v13 Matemize .74.80 Poctavas 1.00 .00 .00 w13 Poctavas .1.08 .00 .00 .00 .00 w13 Matemize .00.82 Poctavas 1.0 .00 .00				
v61 MARINIZE -317.47 () () () () () () () () () () () () () (
vii buffatai .897 vii buffatai .897 vii buffatai .897 vii buffatai .96.47 vii buffatai .96.47 vii buffatai .971 vii buffatai .973 vii foctatai .981 vii foctatai .981 vii foctatai .981 vii foctatai .981		MAEINIJE -317.47		
v71 MAXEMIZE -316.67 M/974/87 *1.0 v71 Pactava7 1.010 Concentrat 7 2.864 v71 Ruppava7 .857 v12 Maxemize *1.0 w12 Pactava2 *1.0 w13 Maxemize 70.50 Pactava1 1.0 w13 Pactava3 *1.08 w13 Pactava3 *1.08 w14 Maximize *0.52 Pactava1 1.0	1		C00C27AL 3.848	
V71 PBCTAVAT 1.00 V71 RUFFATAT .80 V71 RUFFATAT .87 V12 MAEMIZE .73 V12 MAEMIZE .74.50 V13 MAEMIZE .74.50 V13 FDCTATA3 -1.05 V13 FDCTATA3 -1.05 V14 MAEMIZE .0				
VII RUFFAVAT .857 VII RUFFAVAT .857 VI2 RAEINIZE .5 73 FOCTAVAL 1.0 VI3 RAEINIZE .72.50 FOCTAVAL 1.0 VI3 FOCTAVAJ -1.05 VI3 FOCTAVAJ -1.05 VI4 RAEINIZE .40.52 FOCTAVAL 1.0				
W12 MAEMIZE -5.73 FOCTAVAL 1.0 W12 FOCTAVA2 -1 0 W13 MAEMIZE -24.50 FOCTAVAL 1.0 W13 FOCTAVA3 -1.05 W14 MAEMIZE -40.52 FOCTAVAL 1.0				
W12 FDCTAVA2 -1 0 W13 MAEHATE -74.50 FDCTAVA1 1.0 W13 FDCTAVA3 -1.08 W14 MAEHATE -40.52 FDCTAVA1 1.0			FOCTATAL 1.0	
W14 MATINIZE -40.67 FOCTAVAL 1.0			FOCTATAL 1.0	
			POCTAVAL 1.0	
	·			

1	0	6
-	v	v

	MARINITE -41 64	
w15	FOCTATAL -1 04	
w14	MAR10128 -58.54	FOCTAVAL 1 6
w16	PACTAVAS -1.04	
W17	MAE1ME2E -61 24	FOCTAVAL 1 0
w17	FOCTATA7 -1 08	FBCTAVA1 -1 0
w2 :	MAEIN128 -5 73	FUCTAVE! I V
w2 1	FBCTAVA2 5.0 Maximize -20 45	FBCTATA7 1.+
w23	FBCTAVA3 -1 04	
W23 W24	MAXIMIZE -34 97	FOCTAVAS 1.4
w14	FRCTATA4 -1.04	
w25	MARIN124 -34 11	FUETAVA2 1.0
w25	FOCTATAS -1.08	
W26	MAEIN12E -44.17	PRETAVAL 1.4
W26	FBCTAVA8 -1.48	
#27	MAXIMIZE - 54 74	FACTAVAZ I B
W2 T	FOCTAFAT -1 06	
W31	MAXIMIZE -23.43	POCTAVAL
w31	FECTAVAS I .	
w37	MAE1HIZE -12.22	PBCTAVA2 - \$2
433	75CTA7A3 1.6 Maiimiik -16 18	FBCTAVA3 1 .
w34	FOCTAVAS -1 0	
w34 w35	MAE 10176 -24 61	FOCTAVA3 1.0
435	FOCTAVAS -3 0	
w34	MAEIMIZE +44 78	FOCTAVA3 1 4
	FOCT4446 -1 0	
-37	MAJIMEZE -36 37	FOCTAVA3 1.0
w37	FOCTAVAT -1 0	
was	MAX14112 -38.75	POCTAVAL 92
weit	FOCTAVAS 1 0	FOCTAVA2 \$2
w42	MAXIMIZE -27 84 Foctaves 1 0	
w42 w43	MARIMIZE -16.18	FOCTAVA3 +1.0
	POCTAVAA 1 0	
	MAXIMIZE -32.16	FOCTAVA4 1 0
	FOCTAVAS -1.0	
	MARINITE -28 01	POCTATA4 1 G
	POCTAVAS +1 0	
wa7	MAX1412E -16 \$7	FOCTAVA4 1 G
W47	PECTAVAT -1 0	
	MAXIMIZE -38.44	FOCTAVAL - 91
	FOCTAVAS 1 0 Makimize -36 57	FOCTAVA2 - 92
w\$2 w\$2	MAEIM111 -36 82 FDCTAVAS 1 0	
w\$3	MAE1M128 -34.41	FOCTAVA3 -1.0
	FOCTATAS 1 0	-
	MARIMIZE -37.14	POCTAVA4 -1 0
	FOCTAVAS 1.0	
w66	MAT1M12E -12.26	FOCTAVAS 1.0
w56	FOCTAVAS -1.0	
wr57	MARIMIZE -47 64	FOCTAVAS 1 0
-57	FOCTAVAT -1 0	POCTAVA1 #2
wet	MARIMIZE -53.16 Foctavas 1 0	
	FOCTAVAS 1 0 Maximize +41.51	POCTAVA3 13
	FOCTAVAS 1.0	
w63	MARIMIZE -44.79	FDCTAVA3 -1.0
w63	FOCTAVAS 1.0	

CЗ

WEL MAXIMIZE -II.03 FBCTAVA4 -I.0 WEL PDCTAVA8 I.0 PDCTAVA8 -I.0 WES MAXIMIZE -IZ.12 FBCTAVAS -I.0 WES PDCTAVAS I.0 PDCTAVAS -I.0 WES PDCTAVAS I.0 PDCTAVAS -I.0 WES PDCTAVAS I.0 PDCTAVAS I.0 WES PDCTAVAS -I.0 PDCTAVAS I.0 WES PDCTAVAS -I.0 PDCTAVAS I.0	
WEG PDCTAVAS 1.0 WES MARIMIZE -12,23 PDCTAVAS -1,0 WES PDCTAVAS 1.0 WET MARIMIZE -38.00 PDCTAVAS 1.0 WET PDCTAVAT 1.0	
WES MARIMIZE +1.2.33 FBCTAVAS +1.0 WES FDCTAVAS 1.0 0	
WES FOCTAVES 1.0 WE7 MAXIMIZE -38.00 FOCTAVAS 1.0 WE7 FOCTAVAT +1.0	
WET MAXIMITE -38.00 FOLTAVAS 1.0	1
WG7 FOCTAVAT +1.0	
A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	
W71 WAXIM122 -58.43 FOCTAVA182	1
WT1 FDCTAVAT 1.0	1
W77 MAXIMIZE *55.45 FOCTAVA2 * .82	
WT2 POCTAVAT 1.0	1
W73 MATIMIZE -38.27 FOCTAVA3 -1.0	
	4
ита махимите -16.07 Ростачая -1.0 итя ростачая 1.0	1
WTS MAXINIZE -47.44 FOCTAVAS +1.0	
W75 FDCTAVAT 1.0	1
W76 HARTMIZE +28.05 FOCTAVAS +1.4	l l
W76 FDCT4VA7 1 P	1
Y12 MAXIMIZE -1.26 CONCAVA1 1.0	1
V12 CONCAVAT +1,0	1
721 MAXIMIZE -5.26 CONCAVAT -1.0	1
Y21 CD#CAYAZ I 0 Y41 MAZIMIZE -51.29 CONCAYAI -1.0	
Y41 MAXIMIZE -51.29 CONCAVAI -1.0 Y41 CONCAVAA 1.0	
Y42 MAXIMIZE 40.73 CONCAVA2 -1.0	
VAZ CONCAVAS 1 0	
V43 MAXIMIZE -25 41 CONCAVA3 +1.0	1
TA3 CONCAVA4 1 0	
448 MAXIMIZE -38.71 CONCAVA4 1.0	
vis concavas -1 0 Vas maximize -34 04 concavas 1.€	
746 COUCAYAG -1 0 727 maimize -26 6a Concayaa 1.0	
¥47 CGWCAYA7 +1.0	
751 MAX14122 -50.61 CORCAVA1 -1.4	
VSI CONCAVAS 1 0	
V52 MAKIMIZE -64.81 CONCAVA2 -1.0	
VS2 CONCAVAS 1 O	
Y63 MARINIZE -43.65 CONCAVA3 +1.0	
753 COUCAVA5 1 0 754 Marimize -36.71 CCUCAVA4 -1.0	
YSG MAXIMIZE -38.71 CCHCAVAG -1.0 YSG CONCAVAS 1.0	
TS6 MAINTE -23.14 COUCAVAS 1.0	
YSE CONCEVER -1.0	
V57 MARIMIZE -45.63 CONCAVAS 1.0	
757 CONCAVA7 -1 0	
161 MAXIMITE -64 78 CONCAVA1 -1.0	
Y81 CONCAVAS 1.4 Te3 Marinize -65.65 Concava2 ~1.0	
162 CONCAVAS 1.0 V63 MAXIMIZE -42,63 CONCAVA3 -1.0	
484 MARIMIZE -34 04 CONCAVAG -1.0	
YEA COMCAVAS 1.0	
VES MAXIMIZE -23.14 CONCATAS -1 0	
145 CONCAVAS 1.0	
VET MARINIZE -46.72 CONCAVAS 1.0	
767 CD4CA747 -1.0 317 Max141126 -24.30 RUFFAVA1 1.9	
212 RUFF4VA2 -1.0	

	1	0	7
--	---	---	---

		AUFFALL I O	
	AUFFAVAT 1.0		
1 1 1 1	MAXIM128 -14 02	8 <i>077</i> 4743 1 #	
1 111	SUFFAVA4 -1.0		
1 224		BUFFAVA3 1 4	
1 114	## ###### ############################		
1 1 1 5	MARIMIZE -118 25	EUFFAYA3 (*	
230	RUFFATAL -1.+		
1 117	MA	RUFFAVA3 1 P	
1 117	#¥FFAVA7 *1.#		
243	MAESMIZE -84.02	RUFFAYA3 -1 *	
243	EVPPAVAL 1.0		
1 145	MASINIZE -01.67	RUFFATR4 1 4	
1 245	ENFFAVAS -1.0		
1 244	0LASI0128 -72.38	BUFFATA4 1 D	
1 1 4 4	AUFFAVAL -1.0	AUFFEREN 1 G	
247	MAX10132E -64,84	EUPPERAL 1 G	
1 247	R#FFATA7 -1.4	BUFFAVA3 -1 8	
763	MARINIZE -49.16	NUPPERED	
183	EUFFATAS 1.4	AUFFAVAS -1 B	
284	MAX1M128 -61.47		
284	RUPPATES 1.0	BUFFAVAS 1 0	
1 288	MAESMITE -40.81		
786	BUPPATAL -1.4	BUFFATAS 1 0	
257	MATIM122 -122 73		
1 187	BUPPAVAT -1 0	BUFFAVA3 -1 0	
267	MAX 10412E -116.20		
243	AUFFATAL 1.8	BUFFAVA4 -1 0	
264	MAEIMITE -72 30		
200	EUFFAVAL 1.0	BUFFAVAS -1 0	
1 244			
24%	#UPPAVA4 1.8 Maximily -100 76	CUPFAVAL 1 0	
267			
1 247		0 1 - CAVAVUS	
273			
1 273		BUFFATA4 -1 G	
274			
274	BUFFAVAT 1.0 MASIMIZE -122 73	# UPPAVAL - 1 0	
276	RUFFAVA7 1 2		
575	MATIMITE	BUFFAVAS -1 C	
174	AUFFAVAT 1.0		
274	MAXIMIZE -33.33	RUFFAVA3 -1 0	
1 1 2 2 2	REILAVAS 1.0		
\$23	MAEIMERE -33.33	BUFFAVA4 -1 0	
544	REILATAS 1.4		
	MASINIZE -33.33	RUFFAVAS -1 0	
	ASTLAVAL 1.0		
	MARIN128 -33.33	RUPPAVAL -1 G	
	ASILAVAS 1.4		
177	MAE [0128 -33.33	RUFFATAT -1 0	
1 177	REILAVAT 1.4		
8.45			
	#F#FAVA1 29#18.0		
	#FEFAVA3 264718		
8951	BPBPATAS 113312		-
RHST	HFEFAVAT 467434		
	PECTEALS TOTELS		
8.053	PACTBALZ 848384		
8451	FOCTBALS 734774		
		-	
		C	•

a#51	FORTHALS TRAITE			
		C4		
		PBCTAVAL 0.0		
ANST	PETRALE STREAD	FOCTAVAL D.O		
8 # 5 1 8 # 5 1	FECTEAL6 2437741.0	FDCTAVAT 0.0		
	POCTUALT SANGAL.	CONCAVAL 0.0 Concavaz 0.0		
E#11	CONCOAL1			
	FANCATAS -685161.9	CONCAVAS 0.0 Concavas 0.0		,
0.851	CBECSALA 12084000.0 CBECSALS 15582000.0	CBHCAVAS 0.0		
R#\$1 24\$1	CONCOALS 4628400.0	RUPPAVA1 3143130.0		,
RHS1	CONCAVAT -8101577.0 RUPPOVAZ 1362127.0	RUFFAVA3 2053644.6		
8451	BWFFAVA4 3393867.0	RUFFATAS 5715000.0 RUFFATAT 2724641.0		
		RUFFAVA7 3734841.4 Reilava4 368718.4		
8451	RESLAVAS 121140.0 RESLAVAS 1210688.0	REILAVAS 1048304.0		
8451	351LAVA7 768974 9	YL8FROD1 105852 0 TL8FROD3 570885 0		•
RM51 8451	TLEFROD2 74453.6 TLEFROD4 136716.0	TLOFRODS 143143.0		
& HS 1	TLEFROB6 304307.0	TLOFRODY 2261336.0 TLUFRODE 3137084 0		
	TLEFR464 184640.0	Iteration and the second		
REDATA				
1			•	
1				
1				
1				
1				
1				
1				
i				
1				
1				
1				
!				
1				
1				
1				
1				
1				
·				

....

- -

•

	EXECUTOR.	MP57160 V2	-418								
		#12	x 1 3	214		K 14	* 1 7	£ 1 ¥	• • • • • •		
AIIMIIE Fefavai	1.80000	5,86000- 1,00000	43.74000- 1.00000	69.20000- 1.00000	71,40000- 1 00000	1 00000 -	17 20000- t.00000	34 07000- 1.00000	MATINII NFEFAVAI TLEFEGDI		
LEFROOI	1.00000	1.00000	:	:					TLOFADD		
L878002 L878003	:		1.00000		-				ILSFR		
LEFEOD4				1.00000				•	TL87290		
			•	•	1 00000	1.00000					
LEFRODE	•	•	-	•		1.00000	1.00004		TLEFROD		
LEFRODT	•		:				•	1.00000	*		
							·				

			109					
7 ****** 7 # 34*** 7 *****	121 1 4000 1 4000 1 4000	*23 84000 84000	473 33 44000 4 00000 4.00000	1. ueeee	*35 *3 73000 *	234 74 33000- 1 00800 1,00800	E27 A6 86000 1.00000 1.00000	2 / Haringe Haringe Haringe Tidradi Tidradi Tidradi Tidradi Tidradi Tidradi Tidradi Tidradi Tidradi Tidradi Tidradi Tidradi

C6

LIF L31 L31 L33 L33 L34 L34 L36 L36 MAXIMILY 12.75640- 12.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 17.35000- 1.00000 1	3 Maximiz Rfsfava Rfsfava Tlsfrod
	NFSFAVA
p*p*xx1 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.07000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.07000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.07000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.07000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.07000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.07000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.07000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000	WFEFAVA
LEFRODZ 1,00060	TLEFROD
LEF8004 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000 1.00000	TLEFROU
	TL#FR00 TL#FR00
	TLEFROD
	TLEFROO
	TLEFROD

				110					
	E RECUTER	HPE7368 V7	-112				PACE	•• •••••	
	437	*3*		**7	**3	***	***	***	•
MAEIN121 NFRFAVA3	3: 17000-	14 11000-	36 11080-	27 44840-	17 17444	1	14 33***	13	
			1 00000	1 0000g			1		
TL 878082				1 00000					1.078893 7.078983
TL						1			
TL 878484									TLOFADDA
		1							*******
]
r									
1									

Ċ٦

	- EXECUTOR.	H#17366 V3	-110		PACE	18			
	847		X61		263	264	***		1 . I
ATINI 20 Fefavaa	15.00000- 1.00000 '	62.67000-	34.68600+	30 61000-	24.33000-	24: 33040-	1.50000-	18 60000-	
LEFRODI			1.00000	1.00000	1.00000		1.00000	1 00000	HF BFAVAL
LEFRODZ	•	·	1.00000	1 00000	•				TL Q/4001 TL Q/4002
LSFROD3		•	•		1.00003				118/803
LAFROOL		:	:		:	1 99409	1 80000		11878004 71878006
LEFRODT								1 00000	TL 878 006
LEFEODE	1.00000	1.00000	:		:			•	71078087 71878083

111

	TTECTTE	HPE7360 FT	·HIS				PAGE		
				5 Ø B					▲ 1 1
	31 20000-	45 47448-		37 45444.	29 33000-	23	15 68000-	1.00000-	
FATAL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00800	1	
				1.00000				•	TLSFR892
F4483			•		1.00000	1	:	:	TLEFRORA
78824			:				1.00000	1.44044	TLOFADD
72986		•						1.44644	TLUTRON
	1	1	•					•	TLEFRON
		•							
									<u>`</u>

C8

EXECUTOR								
	***	871	#72	- 273	H 74	175	276	7
11 40000-	47.47000-	44.05000-	42.13000-	31.17000-	18.0000-	31.20000-	32.00000-	MAXIMIIE
1.00064	1.00000				1 00000	1.00000	1.00000	#FEFAVAT
		1.000.00	1.00000					TLEFROD
			1.00000			•	•	TLEFRODI TLEFRODI
	÷	-	-	1 00000	. •	•		TLBFRODA
		•				1.00000		TLEFEODI
	•						1.00000	TLEFROOD
	•					•	•	TLEFROD: TLEFROD
	1.00000					•	• •	
	1 00000 1 00000	32	1 00000 - 1 00000 - 48.0000- 1.00000 - 1 00000 - 1.00000 1.00000 - 1.00000 1.00000	1 00005	1 00005	1 00005	1 00000 1 0	1 000000 1 000000

.



C9

	EXECUTOR .	HP17360 V1			*********				
			CC 4	CC 5	CCG	***	¥21	*31	• • • • •
	72.00000.	77.00000-	124.40000-	124.40000-	134,40000-	273.53000-	273.63090-	310.47000-	MARIMITE
BPAVA1							1.00000-	•	BFSFAVAZ
BPAVAZ			•	•		•		1.00000.	NFRFAVAS
SFAVA2		•	•	•			•	1.000801	FOCTAVAL
CTAVAI			•	•	•	7.07400	2 07400		FOCTAVAZ
CTAVA2		•		•		•	2.07400	1.01000	FOCTAVAS
CTAVA3		•	-	•		3 43600	•		CONCAVAL
NCAVAL	1.45000-	•	•			3.43600	•	•	CONCOALI
RCBALI	1.00000	•	•	-		•	3.43600	•	CONCAVAZ
ICAVA3		1.45000-	•	•		•	3.43600	•	CONCEALS
NCBAL2		1.00000	-	•	•		•	3	CONCAVAS
HCAVA3			•			•	•		CONCAVAS
NCAVAS			1.51000-	•		-	•	•	CONCEALS
NCBAL4			1.00000	•			•	•	
HCAVAS				1.55000+		•	•	•	CONCAVAL
CRALS	-			1.00000	•		•	•	CONCEALS
AVAS				-	1.55000-				CONCAVAS
REDALS					1,00000				CONCOALS
FFAVAI									AUFFAVAL
FFAVAZ									RUFFATAS
FFAVAS								85700	8 UFFAVA3

				1 L .					
rt		*1 :	~	* 7 1		***			
	318 47964-	316 470Ca.	317 47000-	315.47600+	5 73440-	24.50000	40.52900-	41 84000-	MATIMIZE .
	1	1 00064-					-	-	HTBFATAS
I STOFATAS			1 40441.	1 00800-	1.0000	1.00000	1	1.0000	EFBFAVA7 FBCTAVA1
						1.04000-			POCTAVAZ POCTAVAZ
				:	•				FOCTAVAS
POCTAVAS				1				•	POCTAVAT
CONCASA	2.24400					:	•	•	CONCAVA4 Concavas
CONCAVAS		3 44666	3 98544	3 \$4400				:	CONCAVAS
COUCAVET BUTTATA	. 59740	19700				•		-	RUFFAVAS RUFFAVAS
24774748 24774748 24774747							2		AUFFAVAT

C 10

56.76090- HA 	11) AEIMIZE DCTAVA1
1.90000 70	
1,90000 70	
	DETAVAZ
#5	EAVATS
	BCTAVAS
	OCTAVAS
	DCTAVAS
	DETAVAT

***	w34		*34	421	-
12.22000-	16 18080-	34.63098-	44 75000-	34.27488*	31
12000	1.00000-	1	1.00047	1	
•		1 00000-	1 20000-		

	EXECUTOR .		-#12				FACE		
		w45	w+ 6	w47 .	-	W1 2		***	43 . 4
35101526	W43 16.18000+	32.16000-	24.01000-	16.17000-	39.44006- .82880-	36.52000-	34.81000-	32 16800-	MAX1MIIE /0074441 /0074443
CTAVA1	•	:					1.00000-		* 8CTAVA3
CTAVAS	1.00000-	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.0000	1.00000	1 80044- 1 80894	POCTAVAS
CTAVAS	:	1.00000-	1.00000-	1.60000+	•				FOLTAVAT
DCTAVA7		•	•	1.00000	•	•			

....

.....

.....

-

CALCUTAN

13 A1000-82008-

.....

w3 1

		##\$7386 43	-918				PACE	24 - 817143	
			-					w5 7	14 1
#451#128 F#CT4441	12 26000-	47.44050-	53.14000- .57000-	41,61000-	44 78860-	28.0000-	12.26000-	35.0000-	POCTAVAS POCTAVAS
FBCTAVA3			:		1.00000-	:	-	:	FOCTAVAS
FRCTAVA4	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				1.00000-	1	•	POCTAVAS
PECTAVAL	1.00000	1	1	1.0000	1.00000	1.00000		1.00000	PRETAVAS
F. CT & VA7		1.0000-	-	•				1,0000-	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,

115

C12

: : :

ETECUTER.	HP57360 42	-1416	•			PACE	E - 817145	
w71	-12	619	W74		476	*12	721	**
63.43000-	86.46880-	34.27000-	16.27000-	47.54090-	39.08000-	2.26000-	8,25000-	MAZIMIZE FBCTAVAT
. 12909 -		•	-	•	•	•		FOCTAVAZ
	. 53000-		-	•	•			FOCTAVAS
		1.00000-		•	-	•		VOCTAVAS VOCTAVAS
			1.00000-	•	•	•		POCTAVAS
		-		1,00000-	•	•		FOCTAVAL
			•	•		•	•	
	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00060	1.00000		. •	FOCTAVA7
					•	1.0000		CONCAVAL
						1.00000-	1.00000	CONCAVA2
		W71 W72 60 43000- 66 4600- 82000- 657000- 1 00000 1 00000	W75 W72 U73 60 43000- 56 4500- 34 27000- 82000- 53000- 1 40000- 1 00000 1 40000 1 00000	W71 W72 W73 W74 60 43000- 56 45000- 34 27000- 16 27000- 52000- 57000- 1 88000- 1 80000- 1 88000- 1 80000 1 80000 1 80000	W71 W72 W73 W74 W76 60 43000- 56.45000- 36.27000- 16.87000- 47.84000-	W71 W72 W73 W74 W76 W76 60 43000- 56.45000- 36.27000- 16.87000- 47.84000- 39.08000- 82000- 62000- 1.00000- 1.00000- 1.00000- 1.00000- 1 66000- 1.00000- 1.00000- 1.00000- 1.00000-	w71 w72 w73 w74 w76 w76 w76 v76 v76 <thv76< th=""> <thv76< th=""> <thv76< th=""></thv76<></thv76<></thv76<>	w71 w72 w73 w74 w74 w74 v12 v21 60 43000- 16 43000- 47 84000- 38 9.0000- 8 26000- 1 26000- 1 26000- 1 26000- 1 26000- 1 26000- 1 26000- 1 26000-

	ELECUTON.	MPS/368 VS	- 4 3	***				18 - 11/142	-\
	74) 11,78000-	742 40. 13000 -	25	34 71000-	34 84000-	35.64900-		44 11000-	
CONCAVA1 CONCAVA3 CONCAVA3 CONCAVA3 CONCAVA4 CONCAVA5	1	1.00000	1 80000- 1 90800	1 45000 1.00000	1 86488		1 00000	1	CONCAVA) CONCAVA) CONCAVA) CONCAVA) CONCAVA)
CONCAVAS CONCAVAS	•				1 88808-	1			CORCAVAS
L				C 13					

CIZ

	ETECUTOR .	MP\$/360 V2	MIO				FACE	11 · · · • 17143	
	**3	¥64	*16	* 6 7	- 461	¥6.2	¥63	¥84	• • • • • •
	41.65000-	34.71000-	23.14000-	45.63000-	64.75000-	65.45000-	42.63000-	24.04000-	MATINIZE
NCAVAI					1.00000-				CONCAVAI
BCAVA2	•	-				1.96060-			CONCAVAJ
ECAVA3	1.00000-	:					1.44600-		CO=C14¥3
RCAVAS	1.00000	1.00000-						1,00000-	CONCAVAS
	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000					CORCAVAS
BCAVAS			1.00000-		1.00000	1	1.00000	1,00000	CONCAVAS
RCAVA6	•	•		1 00000-			•	-	CONCAVAT
RCAVA7	•		-		·		-		

A M = (A A A A = (A A A A = (A A A A A = (A A A A A A A A = (A A A A A A A A A A			110 217 24. 40000- 	231 24.0000- 1.0000- 1.0000-	274 54 07800- 7 00000- 7 00000-	235 45 - 18000 - 1 - 00040 1 - 00040 1 - 00040 1 - 00040		237 4. 00000 1. 00000 1. 00000	4
	EXECUYON 243 64.02000- 1.00000- 1.00000	HP1/310 V 241 42.47000- 1.00000 1.00000-		247 56.54000- 1.00000 1.00000	Z53 55 16000- 1.00000- 1.00000	284 42.47000- 1.00000 	FACE 265 40 . 8 1000 -	23 - \$1/74 257 122.73088- 1.88000 1.08080-	18 ^{1.} Max imize Ruffavas Ruffavas Ruffavas Ruffavas
			·						

AIIMIZE UPPAVA3 UPPAVA6 UPPAVA6 UPPAVA6 UPPAVA7	263 316 32800- 1 00000- 1 00000-	WF\$7366 ¥3-4 764 77.36809- 1.66669- 1.66669-	765 40,91060- - 1.00000- 1.00000	257 100, 10000- 1, 00000 1, 00000	I73 1.0000- 1.0000- 1.00000	274 56.64000- 1.00000-	276 276 122.73000- 1.00000- 1.00000-	276 100 70000 1.00000 1.00000	24 4 4 7 4 4 4 7 4 4 4 7 4 4 4 7 7 4 4 4 7 7 4 4 4 7 7 4 4 4 7 7 4
									<u></u>
				= 15			вати		
	833	. HFE7360 47 544		= 15	£17		PALE		
MAX 1N12E				364 -	33.33000-	21014.000	**************************************		
MAI 10176 BFEFAVA1 RFEFAVA3 FFFAVA3	\$23	544	1-H10 555	364 -	33.33000-	21614.000 56533.000 264716.00	MATIMIZE BF8FAJAI BF8FAJAZ BF8FAJAZ		
MAX 1417E HFEFAVA HFEFAVA2 HFEFAVA2 HFEFAVA3 HFEFAVA3	\$23	544	1-H10 555	364 -	33.33000-	21614.000 50533.000 264716.00 605315.00 1122120.0	441 M 18 4787444 4787444 4787444 4787444 4787444 4787444 4787444		
MAIINIIE BFEFAVAI GFBFAVAI GFBFAVAI GFBFAVAI GFBFAVAI	\$23	544	1-H10 555	364 -	33.33000- - -	21614.000 26633.000 264716.00 162316.00 1122120.0 321856.00 667626.00 701616.00	441 M 18 476 F A VA 476 F A VA 2 476 F A VA 3 70 C T F A 1		
MAX IN12E BF 8F4VA1 BF 8F4VA2 BF 8F4VA2 BF 8F4VA3 BF 8F4VA3 BF 8F4VA3 BF 8F4VA3 FOCTBAL2	513 33,33000-	544	1-H10 555	364 -	33.33000- - -	21014.000 50632.000 506216.00 112120.0 281466.00 667626.00 701618.00 684264.00 726774.00	HATIMIIE UPSFAVA1 UPSFAVA2 UPSFAVA2 NFSFAVA2 UPSFAVA2 UPSFAVA4 FSCTBAL3 FSCTBAL3		
MAX IN12E MF8FAVA2 MF8FAVA2 MF8FAVA2 MF8FAVA3 MF8FAV3 MF8FA	513 33,33000-	544	1-H10 555	364 -	33.33000- - -	71014.000 50633.000 504716.00 5112120.0 3112120.0 51145.00 701410.00 701410.00 73640.00 638204.00 638204.00	WATIMIJE UPJFAVAJ WPJFAVAJ WPJFAVAJ WPJFAVAJ WPJFAVAJ WPJFAVAJ PJETBALJ PDETBALJ PDETBALJ		
WAX IN12E #F8FAVA2 #F8FAVA2 #F8FAVA2 #F8FAVA3 #F8FAV3 #F	513 33,33000-	544	1-H10 555	364 -	33.33000- - -	71014.000 50633.000 504716.00 5112120.0 32146.00 701616.00 701616.00 726774.00 635204.00 631204.00 3437741.0	WAT JM 1 18 WF 0F A VA1 WF 0F A VA3 WF 0F A VA3 F0 CT 0 A L3 F0 CT 0 A L4 F0 CT 0 A L		
MAXINJIE PEFAVAI PEFAVAI PEFAVAI PEFAVAI PEFAVAI PEFAVAI PETALI PETALI PETALI PETALI PETALI PETALI PETALI CONCOLI	513 33,33000-	544	1-H10 555	364 -	33.33400-	71014.000 10431.000 11431.00 11312.00 11312.00 113212.00 113212.00 113212.00 113212.00 11320.00 11431.00 133204.00 133204.00 133205.00 1431000.00 143200.00	WAT JM 1 16 H F F A VAS W F A VAS		
MAXINJIE PEFAVAI PEFAVAI PEFAVAI PEFAVAI PEFAVAI PEFAVAI PETALI PECTALI PECTALI PECTALI CONCOALI CONCOALI CONCOALI	513 33,33000-	544	1-H10 555	364 -	33.33000- - -	71014.000 101710.000 101710.000 101710.000 101710.00 101710.00 101710.00 101710.00 101710.00 101700.00 1017000.00 1017000.00 1017000.00 1017000.00 1017000.00 10040000 1004000 1004000 1004000 1004000 1004000 1004000 1004000 1004000 1004000 1004000 1004000 1004000 100400 100400 10040000 10040000 10040000000000	WAT JM11 WF4FAVA3 WF4FAVA3 WF4FAVA3 WF4FAVA4 WF4FAVA4 WF4FAVA4 F46T4A13 F66T4A13 F66T4A14 F66T4A14 F66T4A14 C60C4A13 C00C4A14 C00C4A14 C00C4A14		
MAXINIZE FFFA4A1 FFFA4A1 FFFA4A1 FFFA4A FFFA4A FFFA4A FFFA4A FFFTA4 FFFTFTA4 FFFTFTA4 FFFTFTA4 FFFTFTA4 FFFTFTA4 FFFTFTA4 FFFTFTFTA4 FFFTFTFTFTA4 FFFTFTFTFTFTFTFTFTFTFTFTFTFTFTFTFTFTFT	513 33,33000-	544	1-H10 555	364 -	33.33400-	$\begin{array}{c} 710014.000\\ 60631.000\\ 106310.000\\ 112120.0\\ 112120.0\\ 112120.0\\ 112120.0\\ 112120.0\\ 112120.0\\ 11210.0\\ 101000\\ 10000\\ $	WAT JM 1 IE W STAAA W STAAA STAAA STAAAA STAAAA STAAAA STAAAAA STAAAAA STAAAAAA STAAAAAA STAAAAAAAAAA		
MATINIE F F AVA1 F F AVA2 F F F F AVA2 F F F F AVA2 F F F F F AVA2 F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F	533	544	1-H10 555	364 -	33.33400-	$\begin{array}{c} 710014.000\\ 740033.000\\ 740031.000\\ 740031.000\\ 740031.000\\ 74103.000\\ 74103.000\\ 74103.000\\ 74103.000\\ 74003.000\\ 74003.000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 740000\\ 7400\\ 74000\\ 74000\\ 74000\\ 7400\\$	WAT JM 1 24 H JF A VAS W JF A VAS M JF A VAS CONCOLS CONCO		
MATINIZE F F AVA F AVA F F	523 33.33000-	544	1-410	164 33.3300-	33.33400-	$\begin{array}{c} 210.44.000\\ 54633.000\\ 244114.00\\ 12145$	WAT JM 1 16 JF JF AVAA WF JF AVAA FOCT WALS FOCT WALS F		
MAIINII F F AVAA F C T BAL F C T BAL	523 33.33000-	144 33.33000-	1-410	164 33.33000- 	33,33000-	71014.000 100171.000 10111.0000 10111.0000 10111.0000 10111.0000 10111.	MATIMIT UFFAVA1 UFFAVA3 WFFAVA3 WFFAVA3 WFFAVA3 WFFAVA3 WFFAVA3 WFFAVA3 WFFAVA3 FDCT0AL1 FDCT0AL1 FDCT0AL1 FDCT0AL3 FDCT0AL3 FDCT0AL3 FDCT0AL3 CONCCAL3 CONCAL3 CONCA		
WAIINIIE FFF74VA1 FFF74VA3 FFF74VA3 FFF74VA3 FFF74VA3 FFF74VA3 FFF74VA5 FFF74A5 FFF74A5 FFF74A5 FFF74A5 FFF7445 FFF7445 CONCOA15 CO	513 33 . 33000-	544 33.33000- 	1-410	164 33.3300- 	33.33400-	7.6.6.6. 7.6.7.6. 7.6.7.7.6. 7.6.7.7.6. 7.6.7.7.6. 7.7.7.7.6. 7.7.7.6. 7.7.7.7.6. 7.7.7.7.6. 7.7.7.7.6. 7.7.7.7.6. 7.7.7.7.6. 7.7.7.7.7.6. 7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7.7	MATIMIT FFFA4A FFFA4A FFFA4A FFFA4A FFFA4A FFFA4A FFFA4A FFFA4A FFFA4A FFFAAA FFFAAA FFFAAA FFFAAA FFFAAA CONCBALS		
WAIINIZE #FEFAVA1 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #ECTUAL5 #ETUAL5 #	533 33.33000-	1 . 00000 -	1-HIO 1 \$8 33.33000- 	164 33.33000-	33,33000-	$\begin{array}{c} 78 & 14. \\ 74 &$	WAT IM 11 WF JF AVA1 WF JF AVA2 WF JF AVA2 FD CT GAL2 FD CT G		(43
	523 33 . 33000-	144 33.33000- 	1-410	1. gcoco -	1. 00000	$\begin{array}{c} 78 + 14.000\\ 64 + 14.000\\ 74 + 14.000\\ 74 + 14.000\\ 74 + 14.000\\ 74 + 14.000\\ 74 + 14.00\\ 74 + $	MAIIMIIE WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI FOCTGALI FOCTGALI FOCTGALI FOCTGALI CONCGA		
WAT INITE F F 7442 F F F 7442 F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F	533 33.33000-	144 33.33000- 	1-HIO 1 \$8 33.33000- 	104 13.33000- 	1. 20000	710014.000 1001710.00 1112120.0 1112120.0 1112120.0 1112120.0 1112120.0 1112120.0 1112120.0 1112120.0 111210.0 1112000.0 111000.0 110	MATIMIT UF JF AVA1 UF JF AVA2 WF JF AVA2 FDC TGAL2 FDC		
MATINIE F F AVA1 F F AVA2 F F F F AVA2 F F F F AVA2 F F F F F AVA2 F F F F F F F F AVA2 F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F	533 33.33000-	144 33.33000- 	1-410	364 33.33000- 	1. 20000	$\begin{array}{c} 73 \\ \hline 74 \hline 74$	WAT IM118 WFGFAVA1 WFGFAVA3 WFGFAVA3 WFGFAVA4 WFGFAVA4 WFGFAVA4 WFGFAVA4 FGCTGAL3 FGCTGAL3 FGCTGAL4 FGCTGAL4 FGCTGAL4 CONCG		
	513 33.33000-	144 33.33000- 	1-410	164 33.33000-	1. 20000	$\begin{array}{c} 78 + 14.000\\ 64 + 14.000\\ 74 + 14.000$	WAI IMII UF JF AVA3 WF JF AVA3 WF JF AVA3 WF JF AVA3 WF JF AVA4 WF JF AVA4 WF JF AVA4 WF JF AVA4 FD CT GAL3 FD CT GAL3 FD CT GAL4 FD CT GA		
WAIINIZE #FEFAVA1 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FEFAVA5 #FETAL2 #FETAL2 #FETAL5 #FETAL5 #ECTAL5 #ET	533 33.33000-	1,00000	1-410	1 00000-	1. 20000	710014,000 1000000000000000000000000000000000	MAIIMIIE WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI WFFFAVAI FOLTBALI FOL		

					119					
			N9 57328 47	- 41.6				••	-···	
		CUTE								
•••••										
				SLACE ACTIVITY	LOWER LIMIT.		DUAL ACTIVITY			
		- ·				2 C + E	1.00000			
	MAX1=128		7746277383.#7*	7744277283.02	28016.0004	23014.0000	1832.87611*			
÷	HFEFATAL		32418 44444	•	10033.0000	10632 00000	1822 94726-			
		E 🗣	60633.00000	-	284716.04440	264716	1864 48726-			
-	HFBFAVA3		364716.00000	•			1448.21724*			
	# 787 4744		444315.04444	• •	1132120.00000	1133120.00000	1466,2881!*			
	WPSFAVAL	6.0	1133170 00000		351555.00000	361455.90009	1483 86611-			
7	H/E/AVA6		341854.00403				1445.31726-			
	HFEFATA7		#4 1836 . 00004	-	****	•				
•	POCTATAL	UL.	701010 00000		****	701618 40044	32 49099-			
1.0	FUCTOAL 1				u p n d		26.44085			
11	FBCTBAL2				RONE	618384 . 86660	A14 77000.			
12	FECTAVAS					726776 60000	78000-			
	FOCTOALS	W.C.	726776		HONE HANE	/20//2 00000	634.91600-			
	POCTAVA4				8045	474600.00000	16 17000-			
14	PECTRAL4	UL.	476668 88888			••••••	643 64657-			
	PRETAVAL					131208.60000	25 10457-			
1.	POCTOALS		#35364 80080		4042		642.06644-			
	FRCTAVAS	UL.				2437741.00000	24.12646*			
2.0	POCTRALS		1437741 00000				617 94000-			
21	POCTAVA7	UL		230007.31365		846651.00009				
22	PSCTEAL7		716673.66615	230001.31202		-	48 68517-			
23	CONCAVAI			4034564.62347		\$173000.00000				
34	CONCOAL 1		\$134436.37663		*****		\$3,10345-			
25	CONCAVAJ		454537 47855	7447362 12144		2943000,00000				
24	CONCEAL 2					505861.00000-	105 66806-			
27	CONCEVA3				****		60 21604-			
14	CONCAVA4			3389846.37828	****	12084000.0000				
2.0					NO					
30	CONCAVAS		1265176.66740	14316421,3126	HOHE	15582000.0000	40.75406-			
34	CONCAVAS				N G N E	4626000.00000				
33	CONCRALS		3243407.16370	1242182.83630	NONE	A 105177 .00000-	108 33806-			
34	CONCAVA7		8103917 00000-			3443130.00009				
11	BUFFAVAI		411850 50760	3231176.48220	NONE	1362127.00000				
	BUFFATA2		146013.45093	1197033.14907	HORE	2052440.00000				
17	AUFFAVA3			2051540.00000	abac	3313567.00000				
	BUFFAVA4		1212066.66560	2181440.33480	HONE	6715000.00000				
	RUFFAVAS		480756 74136	\$224743.35864 1646312.72408	HONE	2914788.00000				
44	BUFFAVAS		1272478.27882	3734881.00000	NOME	3734661 00000				
	EUFFAVAT			474140.00000		424140.00000				
43	REILAVA3		•	309716 80000	NONE	308714.00000				
43	BSILAVA		•	1210648.00000	3404	1210668.00000				
44	ASILAVA			1041304.00000	*****	1041304.00000				
45				765130.00000		765130 66000				
44	REILAVAT				105152.00000	105952.00000	1434.47611			
47	TLEFEOD				7\$463.50000	74463.80000	1424 44726			
	TLEFRODI TLEFRODI				\$70355.00000	\$70155.00000	1866.36775			

C16

FACE

41

UMBER		AT	ACTIVITY	SLACE ACTIVITY	LOWER LIMIT.	UPPER LIMIT.	DUAL ACTIVITY
	11878984 71878986 71878986 71878987 71878987 71878987		136214.0000 143143.0000 364347.00000 2261336.00000 160000.00000 3137044.00000	-	136216.0000 143143.0000 364307.0000 2261326.0000 16000.0000 2137046.0000	136216.00000 143142.00000 366307.00000 2261336.00000 150000.00000 ND45	1451,11726 1465,14631 1465,74611 1467,21726 1452,65726 1811,35611

119

--

	COLUMN	87	ACT14177	IMPUT COST		UPPER LIMIT.	AEDUCED CAST	
			101152.00000			-0-1	-	
17	x 13 x 13		:	1 55000- 43 78000-			3 34443-	
4 2	214		•	69 70000-		45-12	10.38888- 81.08888-	
	1 · L		:	71 68908- 51,31089-		464 L 294 L	36.3500#- 54.5700#-	
47	# 17 # FV		:	17 80000- 74 07000-		*****	63.65666+ 6.34685+	
	# 1 # # 2 1	45 L L	401521.87424	76 36860-		4040	3 43118-	
4.6	#22	* 5	78463 50000	1 90000-			1 01110-	
67 66	¥23 ¥24	4.8 L L	13018.13310	33,44080- 15 26008-			37 13000-	
70	221 274			67 73000- 76 33000-			27 44118- 16 48118-	
71	# 2 7 # 2 ¥	L L 8 S		86 66000- 15 75000-			41 38800-	
73	# 2 K			71 13000-			72116-	
74	831			17 26000 ·			51 48115- 48 5000-	
76	¥33 #34	85 LL	264716.00000	1 80000- 17 17000-		***** *****	30 44000-	
74	131 731			24 33000-			24 63115-	
	#37			31 17000-		=042 =071	36 03116- 38 04050-	
6 I 8 2	# 3 V # 4 L		•	14 11000-		*****	25 88080- 42 41111-	
* 3	E47 543	5 5 S	282322 \$6710	27 84000- 17 17000-			42 31000-	
	244		136216 00000	1 90000-		-040		
47	242 246			26 33000- 23.00000-		-0-1	7 34118- 8 43115-	
44	247 242	45	1393510 00000	14 00000- 52 67000-			\$3115-	
90	251 852	ii ii		34 \$4000-		****	14 01000- 17 04115-	
\$2	253			38.33000-			38 22686-	
13	256 252	85	143143,00000	1.33000-		****	41 49885-	
	256 257		•	15.5000+			16 10000- 10,76565-	
17	212	85 	1441706.93718	45.07000-			13 43090-	
	#62	Ē.	:	37.45000-		NONE	44	
100	244 244			21.31000- 23.00000-		# 0 % £ # 0 # £	26 . 82645 - 35 . 76645 -	
103	265 265	81	384307 00000	15 80000-			11,30000-	
104	267	i.		32 00000-		wong	24	
		EECUYS	18. HP3/360 V	CI	7		F168 83	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
NU-sta	E). COL UMN			-110		PPER LIMIT.	FACE 43	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
105	. COLUMN Kex X71	. AT		-HIO IMPUT COST 47.41000- 48.08000-		M G N E	-REDUCED COST. 78.52118-	• 117183
105 107 106	. COLUMN KEX X71 X72 X73	. AT 85 LL LL	ACTIVITY	-Wio 		a Che M Che M Che	.REGUCEO COST. 78.52118- 73.20000- 20.10000-	· • • • 7 • 43
105 105 107 106	. COLUMN KEX X71 X72 X73 X74	. AT 85 LL LL LL	ACTIVITY 1263463.16848	-Hio imPut COST 47.41000- 48.08000- 42.73000- 11.17800- 18.00000-		10 1 2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	.REGUCEG COST. 76.62118- 73.30400- 30.10400- 37.30400-	- 11713
101 107 104 103 110 111	- COLUMN KEX X71 X71 X73 X74 X75 X76	. AT 85 LL LL LL LL		-++io 			.REGUCEO COST. 78.52118- 73.20000- 20.10000-	
105 107 108 102 110 111 112 112	. COLUMN Kek X71 X72 X73 X74 X75 X76 X76 X77 X76	. AT 85 LL LL LL LL	447822, 60060 70161, 00060	47.4100 47.41000 48.01000 42.73000 11.17000 14.00000 13.20000		1 CHE 4 CHE 4 CHE 10 CHE 11 CHE 11 CHE	.REGUCEG COST. 74 43118- 73 34444- 30 19040- 37 30400- 37 30400- 24 33118-	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
101 107 104 103 110 111 112	. COLUMN K&K X71 X72 X74 X74 X75 X76 X77 K76 X77 K76 X77 K76	. AT 85 LL LL LL LL LL LL 85	467822, 60000 701616, 00000 701616, 00000 78784, 00000				.REGUCEG COST. 74 43118- 73 34444- 30 19040- 37 30400- 37 30400- 24 33118-	· • •17743
105 105 105 108 108 108 108 110 111 112 112 112 114 115 114	. COLUMN KGK X71 X72 X73 X74 X75 X76 X77 K76 X77 K76 X77 K76 X77 K76 X77 K76 X77 K76 X77 K76 X77 K76 X77 K76 X77 X76 X77 X76 X76 X76 X77 X76 X77 X77	. AT 85 11 11 11 11 15 85 85 85	467826 00000 701616 00000 727878 0000 727878 0000 72878 0000	- 410 	LOWER LIMIT,	4 0 kg 40 kg 5 kg 40 kg	.REGUCEG COST. 74 43118- 73 34444- 30 19040- 37 30400- 37 30400- 24 33118-	· • •••743
105 105 103 108 103 110 111 112 113 113 114 115 114	. COLUMN KGK 271 172 173 174 175 174 175 176 177 176 177 176 176 176 176 176 176	- AT 	447524 0000 701618 0000 701618 0000 71674 0000 718774 0000 87976 0000 1437741 00000	-WIG 	LOWER LIMIT,		.REGUCEG COST. 74 43118- 73 34444- 30 19040- 37 30400- 37 30400- 24 33118-	
105 107 105 103 113 113 113 114 115 114 115 114 115 120	. COLUMN X&X X71 X73 X73 X74 X75 X76 X76 X77 FC3 FC3 FC3 FC3 FC4 FC6 FC6 FC7 FC7	AT E\$ LL LL LL UL UL UL UL UL E\$ E\$ E\$ E\$ E\$ E\$ E\$ E\$ E\$ E\$	447572.0000 701615.00000 701615.00000 701615.00000 718778.00000 813780 813780	-WIG 47,47006- 48,01006- 42,71000- 14,71000- 14,00000- 1,00000- 1,00000- 1,00000- 417,00000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,94000- 417,9400-	LOWER LIMIT,		.REGUCEG COST. 74 43118- 73 34444- 30 19040- 37 30400- 37 30400- 24 33118-	· • •17143
105 105 107 104 100 110 111 112 114 115 114 115 114 115	. COLUMN KEK 171 172 173 174 174 174 174 174 174 174 174 174 174	. AT 	447814 . 0000 701616 . 00000 701616 . 00000 74874 . 00000 74874 . 00000 718774 . 00000 713774 . 00000 713774 . 00000 713774 . 00000 713774 . 00000	- 14 PUT COIT 47.47000- 48.08000- 41.77000- 11.77000- 12.0000- 12.0000- 12.0000- 13.0000- 17.8000- 417.8400- 417.84000- 417.8400- 417.8400- 417.8400- 417.8400- 41	LOWER LIMIT,		.REGUCEG COST. 74 43118- 73 30400- 30 10000- 34 30000- 34 33118- 31 43118-	· • •17743
105 107 108 108 110 111 112 114 115 114 115 116 115 120 121 122 123	. COLUMN KEK 171 172 173 174 174 174 174 174 174 174 174 174 174	. AT 	467828,0000 701618,0000 701618,0000 71878,0000 71878,0000 71878,0000 71878,0000 71878,0000 717741,00000 717741,00000 717741,00000 717741,00000 717741,00000 717741,00000 71774,000000 71774,000000 71774,000000 71774,0000000000000000000000000000000000	- 1 HPUT COIT 47.41000- 48.08000- 41.17000- 11.17000- 13.00000- 12.00000- 13.00000- 13.00000- 417.00000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.9400- 417.9400			.REGUCEG COST. 74 83118- 73 30408- 73 19000- 74 33118- 74 33118-	- 1 17113
105, 107, 108, 108, 119, 111, 111, 114, 115, 114, 115, 114, 115, 114, 115, 114, 115, 114, 115, 114, 115, 114, 115, 114, 115, 114, 115, 114, 114	. CD L UMH K & K X 7 1 X	47 45 LL LL LL LL LL LL LL LL LL L	467826.0000 701616.0000 73878.00000 73878.00000 73878.0000000000000000000000000000000000	- 1 HPUT COST 41.41000- 44.01000- 41.173000- 11.17000- 11.20000- 12.20000- 12.20000- 13.20000- 13.0000- 417.0000- 417.94000- 417.94000- 417.94000- 417.94000- 124.00000- 124.0000- 125.0000-	LOwer Listit,		.REGUCEG COST. 74 43118- 73 30400- 30 10000- 34 30000- 34 33118- 31 43118-	- 117113
105, 104, 104, 114, 114, 114, 115, 114, 115, 114, 115, 114, 114	- CD L UMH K & K X 7 1 X 7 1 X 7 2 X 7 7 X 7 4 X 7 7 X	AT ES LL LL LL LL LL LL LL ES ES ES ES ES ES ES ES ES ES	447512 00000 701615 00000 701615 00000 718774 00000 473670 00000 717774 00000 717774 00000 717774 00000 717774 00000 717774 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 71745 000000000000000000000000000000000000	- HIG 	LOWER LINIT.		.REGUCEG COST. 74 83118- 73 30408- 73 19000- 74 33118- 74 33118-	- 117143
105 107 104 104 110 112 112 112 112 112 122 122 122 122	- CD L UMH X & K 3 7 3 3 4 7 3 3 7 3 4 7 3 4 7 3 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7	47 ES LL LL LL LL LL LL LL LL ES ES ES ES ES ES ES ES ES ES	44 191 4448 44 192 444 135 345 2 14448 135 345 2 1448 135 345 2 1448 144 45 2 144	- 1 HPUT COIT 47.47000- 48.08000- 13.71000- 14.00000- 14.00000- 12.0000- 12.0000- 13.0000- 13.0000- 13.0000- 13.0000- 13.8000- 413.8000- 413.8000- 413.8000- 124.4000-	LOWER LIMIT,		REGUCEG COST. 74 43118- 73 30400- 30 10000- 34 33418- 31 43118-	- 1 17743
105 107 108 108 110 112 112 112 115 115 115 120 122 122 122 122 122 122 122 122 122	- CD L UMH X & K X 71 I X 72 X X 74 X 76 X 77 F C 1 F C 2 F C 2 F C 2 F C 2 F C 2 F C 4 F C 6 F C 6 F C 6 F C 6 F C 6 F C 7 K	A T S LL L	447512 00000 701615 00000 701615 00000 718774 00000 473670 00000 717774 00000 717774 00000 717774 00000 717774 00000 717774 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 717745 00000 71745 000000000000000000000000000000000000	- 147 4100 - 147 41000 - 4 04000 - 4 04000 - 4 04000 - 4 04000 - 4 04000 - 4 04000 - 1 17000 - 1 04000 - 1 040000 - 1 040000 - 1 040000 - 1 040000 - 1 040000 - 1 040000 -			REGUCEG COST. 78.83118- 70.19000- 37.30000- 38.33118- 31.83118-	. 117113
105. 107. 108. 100. 111. 111. 111. 111. 111. 111	. COLUMN KAR X71 X72 X74 X74 X76 FC2 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4	A T S LL L	447972. 00000 701615. 00000 701615. 00000 738778. 000000 738778. 000000 738778. 000000 738778. 000000 738778. 0000000000000000000000000000000000	- HIG IMPUT COIT 47, 41000- 48, 01000- 12, 71000- 14, 71000- 14, 00000- 1, 10000- 1, 00000- 1, 00000- 417, 00000- 417, 84000- 417, 84000- 417, 84000- 71, 00000- 71, 0000- 71, 00000- 71, 0000- 71, 0000-			REQUEED COST. 78.53118- 73.3000- 30.0000- 31.0000- 31.03118- 31.03118- 	- 117743
1054 1071 1081 1112 1114 1114 1114 1114 1114 1114 11	. COLUMN KAR X71 X72 X74 X74 X74 FC2 FC4 FC5 FC4 FC5 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4		447872 0000 701615 00000 701615 00000 701615 00000 718774 00000 417460 00000 718774 00000 718745 000000 718745 000000 718745 000000000 718745 000000000000000000000000000000000000	- 1 HPUT COST 47.47000- 48.08000- 41.17000- 11.77000- 11.77000- 11.80000- 11.80000- 12.00000- 13.00000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 12.00000- 72.00000- 72.00000- 72.00000- 73.80000- 12.40000- 12.40000- 12.40000- 12.40000- 12.40000- 13.4000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.400- 14.4000-			REGUCEG COST. 76 83118- 73 38680- 30 10000- 31 30000- 34 33118- 31 83118-	- 817743
106 107 104 104 110 111 112 112 114 116 114 116 114 116 120 121 122 123 123 124 126 126 127 123 123 124 135	- CB L UMH K & K 3.72 3.72 4.73 4.74 4.75 4.76 4.77 4.76 4.76 4.76 4.76 4.76 4.77 4.76 4.76 4.77 4.76 4.77 4.76 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.777 4.7777 4.7777 4.77777 4.7777777777	A T SILLL LUX EXS ESS ESS ESS ESS ESS ESS ESS ESS ES	447872 0000 701615 00000 701615 00000 701615 00000 718774 00000 417460 00000 718774 00000 718745 000000 718745 000000 718745 000000000 718745 000000000000000000000000000000000000	- I UPUT COIT 47.47000- 48.08000- 49.77000- 14.00000- 14.00000- 11.20000- 12.00000- 12.00000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 124.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.1000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.10000- 4.1000- 4.	LOWER LIMIT,		REGUCEG COST. 78 83118- 73 38480- 30 18000- 31 30000- 34 33118- 31 83118-	- 117743
10647 1004 10080 111123 1111111111111111111111111111111	- CB L UMH X & K 373 373 373 373 373 373 373 373 475 475 475 475 475 475 475 475 475 475	47 48 LL LL LL LL LL LL LL LL LL L	447972. 00000 701615. 00000 701615. 00000 738778. 00000 748778. 00000 748778. 00000 748778. 00000 748778. 00000 748778. 00000000 748778. 000000 748778. 0000000 748778. 0000000000000000000000000000000000	- ILPPUT COIT 47.47000- 48.08000- 41.71000- 14.10000- 14.00000- 12.00000- 12.00000- 13.00000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 417.80000- 71.00000- 72.0000- 72.00000- 72.00000- 72.0000-	LOWER LIMIT,		REGUCEG COST. 74 83118- 73 30400- 37 30400- 34 33118- 31 83118- 4 3118- 55 14718- 55 14718-	. 11/113
1064 107 108 1111111111111111111111111111111	. COLUMN KAR X71 X72 X74 X76 FC2 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC5 FC6 FC7 BC2 FC6 FC7 BC2 FC6 FC7 C6 FC7 C6 FC7 FC7 FC6 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC6 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC6 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7 FC7	. AT LL L LL LL		- HIG 	LOWER LINIT.		REQUICED COST. 78.53118- 73.30000- 37.20000- 24.33118- 31.03118- 	
10667 10667 10687 11081 111122 1111111 1112 11111 11122 1124 112224 11244 112444 112444 11244 11244 11244 11244 11	- COLUMN K& K 371 X72 X74 X74 X76 X76 FC3 FC4 FC4 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6		44 7872 60000 70 612 60000 71 612 60000 71 617 6000 71 617 60000 71 617 6000 71 60000 71 617 60000 71 617 60000 71 617 600000000000000000000000000000000	- 1490 - 14904 COST 47.41000- 48.01800- 48.01800- 48.01800- 14.01900- 14.0000- 11.0000- 13.0000- 437.00000- 437.00000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 124.40000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 4.10000- 14.40000- 14.40000- 15.1	LOWER LIMIT,		REQUICED COST. 78 83118- 73 38080- 31 80000- 32 30000- 31 83118- 31 83118- 51 83118- 51 83118- 51 83118- 51 83118- 51 84000- 51 80000- 51 8000- 51 8000- 5	
	- COLUMN K&K I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	AT 45 LLL LLL LLL 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45	447832 00000 701618 00000 71677 0000 71877 00000 71877 00000 71877 00000 71877 00000 71877 00000 71877 00000 71877 0000 71880 00000 71880 0000 71880 00000 71880 00000 7188000 7188000 71880000000000	- I HPUT COST 47.47000- 48.08000- 41.77000- 11.77000- 11.77000- 11.77000- 11.77000- 12.00000- 13.00000- 617.80000- 617.80000- 617.80000- 617.80000- 617.80000- 617.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 14.7000- 14.7000- 14.7000- 14.7000- 14.7000- 14.7000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 14.80000- 17.8000- 14.8000- 14.8000-	LOWER LIMIT,		REQUICED COST. 78 33118- 73 38080- 31 30000- 32 30000- 31 33118- 31 33118- 4 43118- 4 40000- 14 4000- 14 40	- 117743
	- COLUMN K&K 3773 X774 X776 X776 YCL YCL YCL YCC YCC YCC YCC YCC YCC YCC	AT 45 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	447834 0000 701618 00000 701618 00000 703346 00000 718346 00000 718346 00000 718340 00000 717741 00000 717741 00000 717741 00000 717741 00000 717741 00000 718403 0000 718403 0000 718400 7185000 7185000 7185000 7185000000000000000000000000000000000000	- I UPUT COIT 47.47000- 48.08000- 49.77000- 11.7000- 11.7000- 12.0000- 12.0000- 13.0000- 40.70000- 40.70000- 40.70000- 40.70000- 40.70000- 40.70000- 40.70000- 40.70000- 40.7000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 124.6000- 14.4000- 14.	LOWER LIMIT.		REQUICED COST. 78 83118- 73 38080- 32 39000- 34 33118- 31 83118- 55 14718- 55 14718- 56 14718- 56 14718- 57 14718- 58 1485- 58 1	. 11/113
$\begin{array}{c} 1006.5\\ 1006.5\\ 1100.5\\ 1111.5\\$. COLUMN K&R X71 X72 X74 X74 X76 FC2 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC7 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4	AT 45 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	447578 60000 767678 60000 76678 60000 714774 60000 473450 60000 473450 60000 473450 60000 473450 60000 2437741 60000 716473 64615 114431 73783 44445 6774 124431 74 64740 3243507 16370 1215733 66716 41456 6744 41456 6744 1276304 14845	- HIG 	LOWER LIMIT.		REQUICED COST. 78 83118- 73 30600- 32 30600- 34 83118- 31 83118- 51 83118- 51 83118- 51 83118- 51 83118- 51 83118- 51 8318- 51 8335- 51 84335- 52 785- 53 785- 54 785- 55 785- 55 785- 55 785- 55 785- 55 785-	- 117143
$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\$. COLUMN K&K X72 X72 X74 X74 X76 FC2 FC4 FC4 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6		447972 00000 701612 00000 701612 00000 718774 00000	- I HPUT COST 47.41000- 48.01800- 48.01800- 48.01800- 48.017000- 14.0000- 11.20000- 13.0000- 13.0000- 437.00000- 437.00000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 124.4000- 124.40	LOWER LIMIT.		REQUICED COST. 78 83118- 73 3000- 32 30000- 31 83118- 31 83118- 51 8331- 52 85876- 53 85876- 54 85876- 55 85876	
	- COLUMN K&K 1772 1775 1776 1777 177		447828 00000 7487828 00000 718774 00000 718774 00000 718774 00000 7187748 00000 7187748 00000 7187748 00000 718478 00000 718478 00000 718478 00000 718478 00000 718478 00000 718478 00000 718478 00000 718478 00000	- I HPUT COST 47.47000- 48.08000- 48.0800- 41.77000- 11.77000- 11.77000- 11.77000- 12.00000- 12.00000- 13.00000- 617.80000- 617.80000- 617.80000- 617.80000- 617.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.80000- 124.8	LOWER LIMIT,		REQUICED COST. 78 83118- 73 38080- 31 80000- 32 30000- 31 83118- 31 83118- 4 183118- 5 183118- 5 183118- 5 183118- 5 18318- 5 18331- 5 18351- 5 18351- 5 18351- 5 18351- 5 18351- 5 18351- 5 18351-	- 1 17743
	. COLUMN K&R RT1 RT1 RT1 RT1 RT1 RT1 RT1 FC2 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC5 FC5 FC5 FC6 FC7 RC4 FC7 FC4 FC4 FC5 FC6 FC7 RC4 FC7 RC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC4 FC5 FC4 FC5 FC4 FC4 FC5 FC4 FC5 FC5 FC5 FC5 FC5 FC5 FC5 FC5 FC5 FC5		447838 00000 701618 00000 701618 00000 701618 00000 70178 0000 71890 00000 71890 00000 71890 00000 7187741 00000 71643 0000 71643 0000 71645 0000 71650 0000 7165000 7165000 7165000 7165000 7165000 71750000000000000000000000000000000	- I UPUT COST 47.47000- 48.08000- 48.0800- 48.07000- 11.7000- 11.7000- 12.0000- 12.0000- 41.78000- 417.8000- 417.8000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 14.4000-	LOWER LIMIT.		REQUICED COST. 78. 33118- 73. 30000- 37. 20000- 31. 03118- 31. 03118- 31. 03118- 	
	. COLUMN K&K 1772 X74 X74 X76 FC3 FC4 FC5 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6		447374 00000 447374 00000 701614 00000 701614 00000 716774 00000 717774 00000 717774 00000 717774 00000 717774 00000 717741 00000 716774 00000 716774 00000 716774 00000 716774 00000 1715733 56710 417446 3720 1715733 56710 41743 0000 776774 00000	- HIG - IMPUT COST 47.41000- 48.01000- 48.01000- 14.0000- 11.0000- 13.0000- 13.0000- 437.0000- 437.0000- 437.0000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 17.00000- 17.00000- 17.00000- 17.00000- 17.10000- 17.10000- 17.10000- 17.10000- 17.10000- 17.10000- 17.1000- 18.0000-	LOWER LIMIT.		REQUICED COST. 78 83118- 73 30600- 32 30600- 34 33118- 31 83118- 31 83118- 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	
	. COLUMN K&K X72 X74 X74 X76 FC2 FC4 FC5 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6 FC6		44 7872 60000 70 612 60000 71 612 60000 71 612 60000 71 617 6000 12 12 732 60000 12 12 732 70000 12 12 732 70000 12 12 732 70000 12 12 732 70000 12 12 732 70000000 12 12 732 70000 12 12 732 700000 12 12 732 70000 12 72 774 8000000 12 72 6774 8000000 12 72 6774 80000000 12 72 6774 80000000 12 72 6774 800000000000000000000000000000000000	- I UPUT COST 47.47000- 48.08000- 48.0800- 48.07000- 11.7000- 11.7000- 12.0000- 12.0000- 41.78000- 417.8000- 417.8000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 417.84000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 124.4000- 14.4000-	LOWER LIMIT.		REQUICED COST. 78 83118- 73 30600- 32 30600- 33 1818- 31 83118- 31 83118- 51 8318- 51 8338- 51 8338- 51 8438- 51 8458- 51 845	

ł



Model 2 MTS Results



		124	
134	MARIMIZE - 28 33 TLBFN006 1 0	EFERAND 1 0	
834	MARINEZE +31.17 TL848007 1.0	uf 878783 1 0	
137	WARIN128 -14.11 TLEFEORT 1.0	1787ATA3 1 0	
141	MATIMIZE -35 11 TLAFA001 1.0	2/2/2/24 1 0	
141	MAS14122 +27.64 TLUFRODZ 1.0	WFBFATA4 1 0	
143	MASIMIZE -17.17 TLEFROD3 1.0	4/874744 1 0	1
843 844	MAX199122 ~ 1.90	WF BF AV A 4 1.0	
141	MAXIMIZE +28.33	MLBLAVAG I C	
245	MAX1412E -23.00	#F8FATA4 1 0	
147	TLEFRORE 1.0 MAEIM12E -18.00	. WFOTATAL 1 0	
847	TL87R687 1.0 MAE1M12E -62.67	MFGFATAA 1 Q	
242	TLOPRODE T O Maximize - 34.60	WFRFATAS 1 D	
157	11878401 1.0 MARIMIZE +30 61	MP87AVA5 1 0	
852	TLEFROD7 1.0 MAXIMIZE -28.33	MPEFAVAS I G	
253	TLBPROD3 1 0 Marinize - 76,33	NFRFAVAS 1 0	
254	TLEFRODA L.C Maximize -1.90	NFRFATAL 1 0	
255	TLSFRODS 1 0 Maximize -11 60	W/ 8/ 4VAS 1 0	
854	TLEFRODA 1 - Marimize -31 20	HTETAVAS 1 0	
257	TLEFRODT 1 0 Masimize -45 0;	###FAVA\$ 1.0	
212	TLEFRODE 1 0 MAEIMIZE -44 41	NFEFATAS 1 0	
161	TLBFRODI 1 0 Max1m174 -37 81	NFEFATAS 1 G	
x62 x63	TLEFRODZ 1 0 MAXIMIZE - 29 33	MP872426 1.0	
243	TLEFROD3 1 0 Matimize -23 00	WFSTAVAG 1 0	
¥64 265	TLBFROB4 1.0 MAEIN12E -15.60	#F #7 # Y # & 1 0	
188	TESTRODS 1.0 MAEIMIJE -1.50	WP 3 * 4 × 4 6 1 0	
244 244	TLEFROLL 1 0 MAINIZE -32.00	WP8F4VA6 1 0	
267	TLEFA007 1.0 MARINIZE -47.47	WF 87 AV A & S	
161 261	TLEFEODE 1.0	WF87AVA7 1.9	
171	TL#F#401 1.0	NFEFAVA7 1.0	
172	MAXIMIZE -42.73 TLBFR002 1.0 MAXIMIZE -31 17	MFBFAVA7 1.0	
173	MAXIMIZE -31 17	(20	
¥73 274 274 275 275	YLEFRÖDZ 1.0 MARIMIZZ -10.00 TLOFROD4 1.0 MARIMIZZ -31.20 YLEFROD5 1.0	WF8F4747 1.0 WF8F4747 1.0	
274 274 275 275 275 275	MAXIMIIX -16.00 Tleprod4 1.0 Maximiix -31.30 Yleprod5- 1.0 MaximixX -33.00 Tleprod5 1.0	NF8FAVAT (.0 NF8FAVAT 1.0	
274 274 275 275 275 275 275 275	MAX(MIZZ -10.00 TLBFR000 1.0 MAXIMIZ -31.20 TL8FR005 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -32.00 TL8FR006 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -1.90 TL8FR007 1.0	47674447 1.0 47674447 1.0 47674447 1.0	
274 274 275 275 275 275	MAK(MIZZ -18.00 TLE74084 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -21.30 YLE74085 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -32.00 YLE74085 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -1.90 TLE74087 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -637.00 PDCT84.1 1.0	NF6FAVA7 1.0 NF6FAVA7 1.0 NF6FAVA7 1.0 FOCTAVA1 -1.0	
574 574 575 575 575 577 705 705 705 705 705 705	MAIGHIZE -18.00 TLEFROB 1.0 MAIHIZE -30.20 TAIHIZE -30.20 TAIHIZE -30.00 TLEFRODE 1.0 MAIHIZE -1.90 TLEFRODE 1.0 MAIHIZE -1.90 TLEFRODT 1.0 MAIHIZE -637.00 FORTMAIZE -637.00	NF&FAVA7 1.0 NF&FAVA7 1.0 NF&FAVA7 1.0 FOCTAVA1 -1.0 FOCTAVA2 -1.0	
574 575 575 575 575 577 761 761 762 762 762 762	MAX(MIZZ -10.00 TLEF065 1.0 MAX(MIZZ -31.00 TLEF065 1.0 MAX(MIZZ -32.00 TLEF065 1.0 MAX(MIZZ -10.0 MAX(MIZZ -637.00 MAX(MIZZ -637.00 MAX(MIZZ -637.00 MAX(MIZZ -617.44	NF&FAVA7 1.0 NF&FAVA7 1.0 NF&FAVA7 1.0 FOCTAVA1 -1.0 FOCTAVA2 -1.0 FOCTAVA3 -1.0	
174 174 175 176 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAX(HIIZ -10.00 TLEFAD64 1.0 MAX(HIIZ -31.20 TLEFAD54 1.0 MAX(HIIZ -30.00 TAX(HIIZ -1.00 TAX(HIIZ -1.00 TAX(HIIZ -0.07,00 FACTAAL1 1.0 FACTAAL3 1.0 FACTAAL3 1.0 MAX(HIIZ -017.00 FACTAAL3 1.0 MAX(HIIZ -017.00 FACTAAL3 1.0 MAX(HIIZ -017.00 FACTAAL3 1.0	WP6FAVA7 1.0 MP6FAVA7 1.0 MP6FAVA7 1.0 POCTAVA1 -1.0 FDCTAVA3 -1.0 FDCTAVA4 -1.0 FDCTAVA4 -1.0	
174 174 175 176 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAX(MITZ -10.00 TLEFAD64 1.0 MAXIMITZ -31.20 TLEFAD54 1.0 MAXIMITZ -31.00 TAIFMOD7 1.0 TAIFMOD7 1.0 MAXIMITZ -13.00 FOCTMALT 1.0 FOCTMALT 1.0 MAXIMITZ -637.00 FOCTMALT 1.0 MAXIMITZ -637.00 MAXIMITZ	WP6FAVA7 1.0 MP6FAVA7 1.0 MP6FAVA7 1.0 POCTAVA1 -1.0 POCTAVA3 -1.0 POCTAVA4 -1.0 POCTAVA4 -1.0 POCTAVA4 -1.0 POCTAVA4 -1.0	
174 174 175 175 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAI(HIZE -18.00 TLEFROBS 1.0 MAI(HILE -31.20 TLEFROBS 1.0 MAI(HIZE -32.00 TLEFROBS 1.0 MAI(HIZE -1.30 MAI(HIZE -637.00 MAI(HIZE -637.00 MAI(HIZE -617.84 FOCTBALS 1.0 MAI(HIZE -617.84 FOCTBALS 1.0 MAI(HIZE -617.84	WP0FAVA7 1.0 WP0FAVA7 1.0 WP0FAVA7 1.0 P0CTAVA1 -1.0 P0CTAVA3 -1.0 P0CTAVA5 -1.0 P0CTAVA5 -1.0 P0CTAVA4 -1.0	
174 174 1776 1777 1777 1777 1777 1777 17	MAX(MIIZ -10.00 TLEFADD6 1.0 MAX(MIIZ -31.20 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD7 1.0 TLEFADD7 1.0 TLEFADD7 1.0 TLEFADD7 1.0 MAX(MIIZ -617.84 FOCTAAL1 1.0 MAX(MIIZ -617.84 FOCTAAL2 1.0 MAX(MIIZ -617.84 FOCTAAL3 1.0 MAX(MIIZ -617.84 FOCTAAL3 1.0 MAX(MIIZ -617.84 TLEFADD7 1.0 MAX(MIIZ -617.84	WP6FAVA7 1.0 MP6FAVA7 1.0 MP6FAVA7 1.0 POCTAVA1 -1.0 POCTAVA3 -1.0 POCTAVA4 -1.0 POCTAVA4 -1.0 POCTAVA4 -1.0 POCTAVA4 -1.0	
174 174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177	MAX(MITZ -10.00 TLEFADD6 1.0 MAXIMIT -31.20 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAXIMIT -31.20 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 FOLTAL1 1.0 FOLTAL1 1.0 FOLTAL1 1.0 MAXIMITZ -637.00 FOLTAL3 1.0 MAXIMITZ -617.90 MAXIMITZ -617.94 FOLTAL5 1.0 MAXIMITZ -617.94 FOLTAL5 1.0 MAXIMITZ -617.94 FOLTAL5 1.0 MAXIMITZ -617.94	WP0FAVA7 1.0 WP0FAVA7 1.0 WP0FAVA7 1.0 P0CTAVA1 -1.0 P0CTAVA3 -1.0 P0CTAVA5 -1.0 P0CTAVA5 -1.0 P0CTAVA4 -1.0	
174 174 174 175 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAX(MIZZ -10.00 TLEFAGES 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -31.20 TLEFAGES 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -31.00 TAIFMIZZ -30.00 TAIFMIZZ -100 FOLTALI 1.0 FOLTALI 1.0 FOLTALI 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -617.00 FOLTALI 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -617.40 FOLTALI 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -617.41 FOLTALI 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -617.40 MAXIMIZZ -617.94 FOLTALI 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -617.94 FOLTALI 1.0 MAXIMIZZ -610.00 MAXIMIZZ -610.00 MAXIMIZZ -60.00 MAXIMIZZ -60.00	WP0FAVA7 1.0 WP0FAVA7 1.0 WP0FAVA7 1.0 P0CTAVA1 -1.0 P0CTAVA3 -1.0 P0CTAVA4 -1.0 P0CTAVA5 -1.0 P0CTAVA5 -1.0 P0CTAVA5 -1.0 P0CTAVA5 -1.0 P0CTAVA5 -1.0	
174 174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177	MAX(MITZ -12.00 TLEFAD64 1.0 MAXIMITZ -31.20 TLEFAD54 1.0 MAXIMITZ -31.00 MAXIMITZ -10.00 TASIMOT 1.0 MAXIMITZ -10.00 FOCTAAL1 1.0 FOCTAAL3 1.0 MAXIMITZ -617.00 FOCTAAL3 1.0 MAXIMITZ -617.04 FOCTAAL3 1.0 MAXIMITZ -617.94 FOCTAAL3 1.0 MAXIMITZ -617.94 FOCTAAL4 1.0 MAXIMITZ -617.94 FOCTAAL5 1.0 MAXIMITZ -610.00 MAXIMITZ -60.00 MAXIMITZ -120.00 MAXIMITZ -120.00 MAXIMITZ -120.00 MAXIMITZ 1.00 MAXIMITZ -120.00 MAXIMITZ -120.00 MAXIMITZ 1.00 MAXIMITZ 1.00 MAXIMITZ 1.00 MAXIMITZ 1.00 MAXIMITZ -120.00 MAXIMITZ 1.00 MAXIMITZ 1.00	WP0FAVA7 1.0 WP0FAVA7 1.0 MP0FAVA7 1.0 PD0TAVA1 -1.0 PD0TAVA2 -1.0 P00TAVA3 -1.0 P00TAVA4 -1.0 P00TAVA5 -1.0 P00TAVA5 -1.0 P00TAVA5 -1.0 P00TAVA5 -1.0 C0WCAVA5 -1.0	
174 174 174 175 176 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAX(MITZ -12.00 TLEFROB 1.0 MAXIMITZ -31.20 TLEFROBT 1.0 MAXIMITZ -31.00 TLEFRODT 1.00 MAXIMITZ -13.00 TLEFRODT 1.0 MAXIMITZ -13.00 FOCTGAL1 1.0 MAXIMITZ -637.00 FOCTGAL3 1.0 MAXIMITZ -637.00 MAXIMITZ -637.00 MAXIMITZ -637.00 MAXIMITZ -10.0 MAXIMITZ -10.0 MAXIMITZ -10.0 MAXIMITZ -10.0 MAXIMITZ -65.00 CONCEALT 1.0 MAXIMITZ -134.0 CONCEALT 1.0 MAXIMITZ 1.04 MAXIMITZ -134.0 CONCEALT 1.0 MAXIMITZ -134.0 CONCEALT 1.0 MAXIMITZ -134.0 CONCEALT 1.0 MAXIMITZ -134.0	WP6FAVA7 1.0 MP6FAVA7 1.0 MP6FAVA7 1.0 POCTAVA1 -1.0 POCTAVA3 -1.0 POCTAVA3 -1.0 POCTAVA4 -1.0 POCTAVA5 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.45 CONCAVA2 -1.45	
	MAX (MITZ - 110.00 TLEFROB 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 130.20 TLEFRODE 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 132.00 TLEFRODE 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 132.00 TLEFRODE 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 1.90 TLEFRODE 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 1.90 MAX (MITZ - 1.90 MAX (MITZ - 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 1.74 FOCTALS 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 1.0 MAX (MITZ	WF0FAVA7 1.0 MF0FAVA7 1.0 MF0FAVA7 1.0 F0CTAVA1 -1.0 F0CTAVA2 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.5	
	MAX (MITZ - 10.00 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 21.20 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 23.00 TLEFADE 1.0 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 1.90 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 437.00 POCTALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 617.84 POCTALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 617.94 POCTALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 617.94 POCTALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 617.94 POCTALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 10.00 CONCALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 10.00 CONCALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 10.00 CONCALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 124.40 CONCALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 124.40 CONCALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 134.40 CONCALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 124.40 CONCALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 123.40 CONCALI 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 133.40 CONCALI 1.0 CONCALI 1.	WF0FAVA7 1.0 MF0FAVA7 1.0 MF0FAVA7 1.0 FDCTAVA1 -1.0 FDCTAVA2 -1.0 FDCTAVA3 -1.0 FDCTAVA4 -1.0 FDCTAVA5 -1.0 FDCTAVA5 -1.0 FDCTAVA5 -1.0 FDCTAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA7 -1.45 COUCAVA4 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA6 -1.55 FUTAVA1 -1.0	
174 174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177	MAX (MITZ - 11. 00 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 31.20 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 31.20 TLEFADE 1.0 TLEFADE 1.0 TLEFADE 1.0 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 637.00 FOCTAAL 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 637.00 FOCTAAL 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 637.00 FOCTAAL 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 617.94 FOCTAAL 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 617.94 FOCTAAL 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 617.94 FOCTAAL 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 124.00 COCCAAL 1.0 MAX (MITZ - 124.00 MAX (MITZ - 12	WF0FAVA7 1.0 MF0FAVA7 1.0 MF0FAVA7 1.0 F0CTAVA1 -1.0 F0CTAVA2 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.45 CONCAVA4 -1.55 CONCAVA5 -1.55 CONCAVA6 -1.55 CONCAVA6 -1.0 SCONCAVA1 -1.0 SCONCAVA1 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.0	
174 174 174 175 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAXIMIZE -11.00 TLEFADD4 1.0 MAXIMIZE -31.20 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAXIMIZE -31.30 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAXIMIZE -1.90 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAXIMIZE -637.00 PATIMIZE -637.00 PATIMIZE -637.00 PATIMIZE -637.00 PATIMIZE -637.00 MAXIMIZE -637.00 MAXIMIZE -617.94 POCTAL1 1.0 MAXIMIZE -617.94 MAXIMIZE -61.94 MAXIMIZE -61.94 MAXIMIZE -10 00 COUCGAL5 1.0 MAXIMIZE -134.40 COUCGAL5 1.0 MAXIMIZE -134.40 COUCGAL5 1.0 MAXIMIZE -134.40 MAXIMIZE -134.40 MAXIMIZE -134.40 MAXIMIZE -134.40 MAXIMIZE -737.53 POCTAAL1 2.014 MAXIMIZE -733.53 POCTAAL2 2.014	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 F0CTAVA1 -1.0 F0CTAVA2 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA3 -1.45 COUCAVA4 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 NFWAVA1 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.55 NFWAVA1 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.55 NFWAVA1 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.55 NFWAVA1 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.55	
174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAX (M122 - 12.00 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (M122 - 23.00 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617.44 FOCTAAL2 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617.84 FOCTAAL2 1.0 MAX (M122 - 10 CONCEAL5 1.0 MAX (M122 - 124.40 CONCEAL6 1.0 MAX (M122 - 125.53 FOCTAVAZ 2.074 SUF7AVAZ 2.054	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 F0CTAVA1 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA1 -1.45 COUCAVA1 -1.45 COUCAVA4 -1.55 COUCAVA4 -1.55 COUCAVA4 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA4 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.0 WF0FAVA2 -1.0	
174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAX (M132 - 12.00 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (M132 - 31.20 TLEFADE 1.0 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617.84 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617.94 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (M122 - 10.00 CONCEALS 1.0 MAX (M122 - 10.00 CONCEALS 1.0 MAX (M122 - 10.00 CONCEALS 1.0 MAX (M122 - 10.00 CONCEALS 1.0 MAX (M122 - 10.40 CONCEALS 1.0 MAX (M122 - 273 S3 FOCTAVAS 1.0 MAX (M122 - 218.07)	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 FDCTAVA1 -1.0 FDCTAVA2 -1.0 FDCTAVA3 -1.0 FDCTAVA4 -1.0 FDCTAVA5 -1.0 FDCTAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA4 -1.0 FDCTAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA7 -1.45 COUCAVA7 -1.45 COUCAVA4 -1.55 WF0FAVA1 -1.5 WF0FAVA1 -1.0 COUCAVA4 -1.55 WF0FAVA2 -1.0 COUCAVA4 -1.0 COUCAVA2 -1.0 COUCAVA2 -1.0 COUCAVA2 -1.0 COUCAVA2 -1.0	
174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAIGHIZE -11.00 TLEFADD4 1.0 MAIFHIZE -231.20 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAIFHIZE -231.20 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAIFHIZE -1.90 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAIFHIZE -1.90 TAFFADD5 1.0 MAIFHIZE -1.90 MAIFHIZE -1.90 MAIFHIZE -617.94 MAIFHIZE -617.94 MAIFHIZE -617.94 MAIFHIZE -617.94 MAIFHIZE -617.94 MAIFHIZE -10 MAIFHIZE -124.00 COUCHALS 1.0 MAIFHIZE -124.00 MAIFHIZE -124.00 MAIFHIZE -125.53 MAIFHIZE -223.53 MOUTAVAZ 2.651 MAIFHIZE -235.074 MUFFAVAZ .451.01 MAIFHIZE -216.47 MAIFHIZE -146.47	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 PDCTAVA1 -1.0 PDCTAVA2 -1.0 PDCTAVA3 -1.0 PDCTAVA3 -1.0 PDCTAVA4 -1.0 PDCTAVA5 -1.0 PDCTAVA5 -1.0 PDCTAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA4 -1.0 PDCTAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA4 -1.45 COUCAVA5 -1.45 COUCAVA6 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.54 WF0FAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 WF0FAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0	
174 174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177	MAX (M122 - 11. 00 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (M122 - 31. 20 TLEFADE 1.0 MAX (M122 - 31. 20 TLEFADE 1.0 TLEFADE 1.0 TLEFADE 1.0 TLEFADE 1.0 TATION 1.0 MAX (M122 - 637. 00 FOCTAAL 1.0 MAX (M122 - 637. 00 FOCTAAL 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617. 84 FOCTAAL 1.0 MAX (M122 - 10 00 COUCEAL 1.0 MAX (M122 - 10 00 MAX (M122 - 10	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 F0CTAVA1 -1.0 F0CTAVA2 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.45 CONCAVA2 -1.45 CONCAVA4 -1.55 CONCAVA5 -1.55 CONCAVA5 -1.0 KP0FAVA2 -1.0 CONCAVA5 -1.33 WF0FAVA2 -1.0 CONCAVA5 -1.0 <	
174 174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177	MAX (MITZ -11.00 TLEFADD4 1.0 MAX (MITZ -31.20 TLEFADD5 -1.0 MAX (MITZ -31.20 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAX (MITZ -1.90 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAX (MITZ -637.00 PATIMATZ -637.00 PATIMATZ -637.00 PATIMATZ -637.00 PATIMATZ -637.00 PATIMATZ -637.00 PATIMATZ -637.00 PATIMATZ -637.00 MAX (MITZ -637.00 COUCGALS 1.0 MAX (MITZ -100 00 COUCGALS 1.0 MAX (MITZ -100 00	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 PDCTAVA1 -1.0 PDCTAVA2 -1.0 PDCTAVA3 -1.0 PDCTAVA3 -1.0 PDCTAVA4 -1.0 PDCTAVA5 -1.0 PDCTAVA5 -1.0 PDCTAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA4 -1.0 PDCTAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA4 -1.45 COUCAVA5 -1.45 COUCAVA6 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.54 WF0FAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.55 WF0FAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.55 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0 COUCAVA5 -1.0	
174 174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177	MAXIMIZE -12.00 TLEFADDS 1.0 MAXIMIZE -31.20 TLEFADDS 1.0 TLEFADDS 1.0 TLEFADS 1.0 TLEFADS 1.0 MAXIMIZE -617.94 TOTTALS 1.0 MAXIMIZE -617.94 TOTTALS 1.0 MAXIMIZE -617.94 TOTTALS 1.0 MAXIMIZE -617.94 TLEFADS 1.0 MAXIMIZE -610.00 COUCEALS 1.0 MAXIMIZE -124.40 COUCEALS 1.0 MAXIMIZE -273.53 TUTFAVA3 .811.47 POTTAVA3 1.81.47 POTTAVA3 1.81.47 POTTAVA3 1.81 MAXIMIZE -314.47 POTTAVA3 .837 MAXIMIZE -314.47 POTTAVA3 .837 MAXIMIZE -314.67 POTTAVA3 .837 MAXIMIZE -314.07 POTTAVAS .837 MAXIMIZE -314.07 POTTAVAS .837 MAXIMIZE -314.07 POTTAVAS .837 MAXIMIZE .314.77 POTTAVAS .377 POTTAVAS .37	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA6 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 COUCAVA1 -1.43 COUCAVA1 -1.43 COUCAVA5 -1.53 COUCAVA5 -1.53 COUCAVA5 -1.53 VF0FAVA2 -1.0 COUCAVA3 -1.0	
174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAIGHIZE -118.00 TLEFRODE 1.0 MAIGHIZE -130.20 TLEFRODE 1.0 MAIGHIZE -33.00 TLEFRODE 1.0 MAIGHIZE -1.90 TLEFRODE 1.0 MAIGHIZE -1.90 TCETALIZE -1.90 TCETALIZE -637.00 FORTAALIZE -637.00 FORTAALIZE -637.00 MAIGHIZE -617.94 FORTAALIZE -617.94 FORTAALIZE -10 MAIGHIZE -617.94 FORTAALIZE -10 MAIGHIZE -10 MAIGHIZE -10 MAIGHIZE -10 CONCOALI 1.0 MAIGHIZE -124.0 CONCOALI 1.0 MAIGHIZE -273.53 FORTAALIZE -318.47 FORTAALI -318.47 FORTAALI -310.47 FORTAALI -310.47	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 COMCAVA7 -1.0 COMCAVA7 -1.0 COMCAVA7 -1.45 COMCAVA7 -1.45 COMCAVA7 -1.45 COMCAVA8 -1.55 MF0FAVA6 -1.55 MF0FAVA2 -1.0 COMCAVA7 3.434 MF0FAVA8 -1.0 COMCAVA8 3.845 MF0FAVA8 -1.0 COMCAVA4 3.846	
174 174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177	MAX (M122 - 11. 00 TLEFADD4 1.0 MAX (M122 - 31. 20 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAX (M122 - 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TATINIZ - 1.0 MAX (M122	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 POCTAVA1 -1.0 POCTAVA2 -1.0 POCTAVA3 -1.0 POCTAVA4 -1.0 POCTAVA5 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.45 CONCAVA5 -1.55 CONCAVA5 -1.55 CONCAVA5 -1.0 CONCAVA5 -1.0 <t< td=""><td></td></t<>	
174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAX (M122 - 11. 00 TLEFADD4 1.0 MAX (M122 - 31. 20 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAX (M122 - 31. 20 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAX (M122 - 1.9 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAX (M122 - 1637.00 FOCTAAL1 1.0 MAX (M122 - 637.00 FOCTAAL1 1.0 MAX (M122 - 637.00 FOCTAAL1 1.0 MAX (M122 - 637.00 FOCTAAL1 1.0 MAX (M122 - 637.00 FOCTAAL1 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617.84 FOCTAAL1 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617.84 FOCTAAL5 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617.84 FOCTAAL5 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617.84 FOCTAAL5 1.0 MAX (M122 - 10 00 COUCAAL5 1.0 MAX (M122 - 303.43) FUTTAVA2 2.801 MAX (M122 - 316.47) FUTTAVA2 .301 CUTAVA3 1.01 CUTAVA3 .01 0 CUTAVA3 .01 0 CU	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 F0CTAVA1 -1.0 F0CTAVA2 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.45 CONCAVA1 -1.45 CONCAVA1 -1.55 CONCAVA1 -1.55 CONCAVA1 -1.0 CONCAVA2 -1.0 CONCAVA3 -1.0 CONCAVA3 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.0 <t< td=""><td></td></t<>	
174 174 174 174 177 177 177 177 177 177	MAXIMIZE -11.00 TLEFADD4 1.0 MAXIMIZE -31.20 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAXIMIZE -31.20 TLEFADD5 1.0 MAXIMIZE -1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TLEFADD5 1.0 TAITAGE TLEFADD5 1.0 TAITAGE T	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 F0CTAVA2 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.45 CONCAVA1 -1.45 CONCAVA1 -1.55 CONCAVA1 -1.55 CONCAVA1 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.0 CONCAVA2 -1.0 <t< td=""><td></td></t<>	
	MAX (M122 - 11. 00 TLEFADDE 1.0 MAX (M122 - 23. 00 TLEFADDE 1.3 TLEFADDE 1.3 TLEFADDE 1.3 TLEFADDE 1.3 TLEFADDE 1.3 TLEFADDE 1.3 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 TLEFADDE 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617. 84 FOCTMAL2 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617. 84 FOCTMAL3 1.0 MAX (M122 - 617. 94 FOCTMAL5 1.0 MAX (M122 - 10 00 CONCOLS 1.0 MAX (M122 - 12 40 MAX (M122 - 13 53 FOCTAVA1 2.074 MAX (M122 - 13 53 47 FOCTAVA3 1.81 MAX (M122 - 31 47 FOCTAVA4 1.81 MAX (M122 - 31 47 FOCTAVA4 1.81 MAX (M122 - 31 47 MAX (M122 - 31 47 MAX (M122 - 31 47 MAX (M122 - 31 47 MAX (M122 - 31 47 FOCTAVA4 1.81 MAX (M122 - 31 47 FOCTAVA4 1.81 MAX (M122 - 31 47 MAX (M1	WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 WF0FAVA7 1.0 F0CTAVA1 -1.0 F0CTAVA2 -1.0 F0CTAVA3 -1.0 F0CTAVA4 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA5 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 F0CTAVA7 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.45 CONCAVA1 -1.45 CONCAVA1 -1.55 CONCAVA1 -1.55 CONCAVA1 -1.0 CONCAVA2 -1.0 CONCAVA3 -1.0 CONCAVA3 -1.0 CONCAVA1 -1.0 <t< td=""><td></td></t<>	

		125	
		FBCTAVA1 1 0	
	17 PECTAVA7 - 3.98	POCTAVAL 1 • Poctaval -1 •	
· · · ·		POCTAVAZ I A	
	23 PACTAVA3 -1.44		
11 •	74 PACTAVAS -1 46	/BCTAVA2 1 •	
	-14 FOCTAVAS -1.08	FRCTAVA2 1.0	
	426 PACTAVAS -1.04 427 MALIMIZE -66.76	FBCTAVA3 1.0	
11.	27 PBCTAVAT -1.48 W21 MAEIMIZE -23.83	FBCTAVA1	
		FOCTAVA2 ·. \$7	
- i •		FOCTAVAS 1 0	
	W34 PECTAVA4 -1.0 W36 MAZIMIZE -34.61	FDCTAVA3 1 0	
1 1	W35 FECTAVAS -1.0 W36 , MAETM128 -44,78	FOCTAVES 1 0	
1	W36 " POCTAVA6 -1.0 W37 MARIMIZE -38.33	FOCTAVA3 I O	
	W31 FOCTATA7 -1 0 W41 MARINITE -31.75	POCTAVAL - 92	
1 .	Wet FOCTAVA4 1 0 Wez Marinize - 27,84 May Portava4 1 0	FOCTAVAZ - 92	
	WAT MARINIZE -14.18	FOCIAVA3 -1 C	
1	W43 POCTAVAG 1 G W45 MAKIMIZE -33,16 W65 POCTAVAS -1 G	FOCTAVA4 1.9	
1	WAS MARINISE -34 08 WAS POCTAVAS -1.0	FOCTAVAS 1 0	
1	W47 MAEINIZE -18.87 W47 FOCTAVAT -1.0	FOCTAVAS 1.0	1 I
	WEI MARIMIZE -35 44	FOCTATA1 +.92	
	WS2 MARIMIZE -36 57	FOCTAVA2	
	WES MARINISE - 34.61 HET FOCTAVAS 1.9	PDCTAVA) -1 0	
	WES MARINITE -22.16 MES POLIAVAS 1.0	FDCTAVA4 +1.0	
1	WSS MAEININE -12,36 WSS FOLTAVAS -1.0	PDCTAVAS 1.0	
	WST MARINIZE -41.66 WST POCTAVAT -1.0	POCTATAS 1 0	
	WES POCTAVAS 1.9	PDCTAVA192 PDCTAVA292	
	W67 MAXIMIZE -41.61 W67 FOLTAVAS 5.0 MAXIMIZE -44.70	FOCTAVAJ +1.0	
L	W63 MARIMIZE -44.78 W63 FOCTAVAS 1.8		
		C21	
	WET HATTHITE -78.00 WAS POLIAVAS 1.0	VECTAVA4 -1.0	
	WES - MAXIMIZE -12.26	POCTAVAE -1.9	
	WET PECTAVAT -1.0	POCTAVAS 1.0	
	W71 MAXIMIZE -68.43 W71 FDCTAVA7 1.0	FOCTAVA182 Foctava282	
	WT1 HATINIZE -51.45 W72 FOCTAVAT 1.0	POCTATIO	
	W73 MARIMIZE -36.27 W73 POCTAVA7 1.0	POCTAVA4 -1.0	
	W74 NATINIZE -16.97 W74 FDCTAVA7 6.0 W75 NATINIZE -47.64	POCTAVAS -1.0	
	WTS POCTAVAT 1.0	POCTAVAS -1.4	
	W76 NAXIMIJE -38,08 W79 PDCTAVA7 1.0 V12 NAXIMIJE -8,36	CONCAVA1 1.0	
	V12 CONCAVA2 -1 0 V21 MAXIMIZE -8,26	CONCAVA1 +1.0	
	121 CONCATA2 1.0 141 MARINIZE -11.28	CUNCAVA1 -1.0	
1	VAI CONCAVA4 1.0 VAZ MAXIMIZE -40.73	CORCAVAZ -1.0	
	742 CONCAVA4 1 0 743 MAKIMS26 - 28 41	CONCATAD -1 0	1
1	VA3 CONCAVA4 5.0 VAS NASINIZE *38.71	CONCAVA4 1.0	
	445 CONCAVAS -1.0 746 MAEIMIZE -34.04	CD4CAVA4 1.0	
	446 CONCAVA6 -1,0 747 NAX1MEZE -26,64	CONCAVA4 1.0	
	747 CONCAVAT ~1.0 751 MAXIMIZE ~50.61	CORCAVA) -1.0	
	YSI CONCAVAS 1.0 YS2 MAXIMIZE -44 81	CDNCAVA2 +1.0	
	752 CONCATAS 1.0 753 MARIMIZE -41.65	CONCAVA3 -1.9	
	783 CONCAVAS 1.0 784 MAXIMIZE -38.71	CONCAVA4 -1.0	
	754 CONCAVAS 1.0 756 MARIMIZE -23 14	CONCATAS 1.0	
	VS6 CONCAVA6 -1.0 YS7 MAX1M12E -45 83	CONCAVAS 1.0	
	VST CORCAVAT -1.0 VST MAXIMIZE -84.79	CONCAVAL -1	
	TE1 CONCAVAE 1.0 V52 MAXIMIIX -55.45 V52 CONCAVAS 1.0	CONC.1442 -1.0	l t
1	163 MARIMIZE 42.83	CONCAVA3 -1.0	
	764 MALIMIZE -34.94	CONCAVA4 -1.0	
1	Y64 CONCATAS 1.0 Y65 MARIMIZE -23.14 Y65 CONCATAS 1.0	CünCav41 -1.0	ĺ
	768 CONCAVAS 1.0 V67 MARIM128 -46.72 767 CONCAVA7 -1.0	. CONCAVAS 1.0	
	167 CONCAVA7 11.0 217 MAXIMIZE 24.40 213 RUFFAVA2 11.0	<i>AUFFATAL 1.0</i>	
L	ALL RUTTATES -1.		

				•	26	1					
		· · ····						1.0	BUFFAVA2 MARIMITE	121	1
Image:						•	RUPPAVAS 1	- 85 . 15	MAX 1 M 3 X E	134	
								-115.39	MAXIMIZE RUFFAVAS	236	
Image: Second							-	-96.00	EUFFAVA7	237	
Image: Second	1							1.0	RUFFAVA4	243	
Image: State of the state o	1							-1.0	AUFFATAS MAKIMIZE	245	
	1						RUFFAVA4 1	-85.84	MAEIMIZE	244	
1 1	ļ							-48,18 1.0	MAJIMIZZ RUFFAVAS	163	
International (1,0, 3) Events (1,0) Internation (1,0, 3) Events (1,0)	i							3	MAXIMLIT RUFFATAS	284	
iiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii	i							-1.0	RUFFATAS	266	1
Image: Strategy of the strategy						- 1 . 0	AUFFAVAS	-1.0	HUPPAVAT Matimizt	257	
International constraints International constraints International constraints International constraints International constraints International constraints International constraints </th <th>į</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>- 1 . 0</th> <th>RUPPAVA4</th> <th>-72.34</th> <th>MATIMIZE</th> <th>264</th> <th></th>	į					- 1 . 0	RUPPAVA4	-72.34	MATIMIZE	264	
101 NUTANG -11.0 101 NUTANG -10.0 101 NUTANG -10.0 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>-40.91</th> <th>MAXIMIZE</th> <th>265</th> <th></th>								-40.91	MAXIMIZE	265	
133 100 41 100 41 133 100 41 100 70 133 100 70 100 70 133 100 70 100 70 133 100 70 100 70 133 100 70 100 70 133 100 70 100 70 133 100 70 100 70 133 100 70 100 70 133 100 70 100 70 133 100 70 100 70 133 100 70 100 70 133 100 70 100 70 134 100 70 100 70 134 100 70 100 70 134 100 70 100 70 134 100 70 100 70 134 100 70 100 70 134 100 70 100 70 134 100 70 100 70 134 100 70 100 70 134 100 70 100 70 135 100 70 100 70 134 100 70 100 70 135 100 70 100 70								-1.0	RUFFAVAT	247	
111 WUTANS 1:0 EUTANAS -: 0 111 WUTANAS 1:0 WUTANAS 1:0 111 WUTANAS 1:0 WUTANAS 1:0 111 WUTANAS 1:0 WUTANAS 0:0 111 WUTANAS 0:0 WUTANAS 0:0 111 WUTANAS 0:0 WUTANAS 0:0								1.0	RUFFAVA7	273	İ
100 MUTANAN 1.0 100	i					-10		1.0	RUFFAVAT	274	İ
133 MATURIZE -33.23 BUFFAVA3 -1.0 133 MUFFAVA3 -1.0 144 MATURIZE -33.33 MUFFAVA3 10.0 145 MATURIZE -33.33 MUFFAVA3 0.0 145 MATURIZE -33.33 MUFFAVA3 0.0 146 MATURIZE -33.03 MUFFAVA3 0.0 147 MATURIZE -33.03 MUFFAVA3 0.0 147 MATURIZE -33.03 MUFFAVA3 0.0 147 MUFFAVA3 10.0 MUFFAVA3 0.0 147 MUFFAVA3 10.0 MUFFAVA3 0.0								-100.70	MASIMIZE	176	
344 MARTHIZE -32,33 AUFAVAA -1.0 344 MARTHIZE -32,33 AUFAVAA -1.0 344 MARTHIZE -32,33 AUFAVAA -1.0 344 MARTHIZE -32,33 AUFAVAA -1.0 344 MARTHIZE -10,33 -10,444 -10,444	1							+23,73	HATIMIZE REILAVAJ	\$ 3 3	
Image: State in the state								-13.33	MATIMIZE RSILAVA4	544	1
1000 100 100 1011								1.0	NSILAVAS	\$ \$ \$	
MIS UPPRAVAL 21014.0 UPPRAVAL 0013.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 21111.0 UPPRAVAL 11111.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 11111.0 UPPRAVAL 11111.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 1111.0 UPPRAVAL 11111.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 1111.0 UPPRAVAL 11110.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 10111.0 UPPRAVAL 0.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 10111.0 UPPRAVAL 0.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 10111.0 UPPRAVAL 0.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 1011.0 UPPRAVAL 0.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 1011.0 UPPRAVAL 0.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 1010.0 UPPRAVAL 0.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 10100.0 UPPRAVAL 0.0 MISL UPPRAVAL 1	1							-33.33	85168786 MAX1MIZE	586	
$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} $						\$9633.0				\$77 R#\$	1
$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} $			-			606311.0 361856.0	HF BF AVAL	2 264716.0 6 1133126.0	NP BFAVA3	RHS1	1
RHS1 FOCTBALS TISTIA.0 FOCTAVAL 0.0 CZZ RHS1 FOCTBALS TISTIA.0 FOCTAVAL 0.0 RHS1 FOCTBALS TATATO.0 FOCTAVAL 0.0 RHS1 CONCAVAL TATATO.0 FOCTAVAL 0.0 RHS1 CONCAVAL TATATO.0 FOCTAVAL 0.0 RHS1 CONCAVAL TATATO.0 CONCAVAL 0.0 RHS1 CONCAVAL TATATO.0 CONCAVAL 0.0 RHS1 CONCAVAL TATATO.0 CONCAVAL 0.0 RHS1 CONCAVAL TATATOTO.0 CUNCAVAL 0.0 RHS1 CONCAVAL TATATOTO.0 RUFFAVAL 10.0 RHS1]					e.e	FDCTAVAI	7 467426.0	HPBPAVAT FOCTBAL	8 H S 1 4 H S 1	
BHC1 FOCYBAL4 XYA400.0 FOCYAVAN 0.0 BHS1 FOCTBAL5 212704.0 FOCTAVAN 0.0 BHS1 FOCTBAL5 212704.0 FOCTAVAN 0.0 RHS1 CONCAVAN 0.0 CONCAVAN 0.0 RHS1 CONCAVAN 0.0 CONCAVAN 0.0 RHS1 CONCBAL4 100000.0 CONCAVAN 0.0 RHS1 CONCBAL4 1581000.0 CONCAVAN 0.0 RHS1 CONCBAL4 1581000.0 CONCAVAN 0.0 RHS1 CONCBAL4 1581000.0 RUFFAVA1 3642130.0 RHS1 CUNCAVAN 1314000.0 RUFFAVA2 313461.0 RHS1 RUFFAVA2 213147.0 RUFFAVA3 313461.0 RHS1 RUFFAVA2 21314						0.0	FOCTAVA4			R451	1
ensi POCTAALS 13200.0 POCTAALS 0.0 ensi POCTAALS 233741.0 POCTAALS 0.0 ensi POCTAALS 233741.0 COCTAALS 0.0 ensi POCTAALS 233741.0 COCTAALS 0.0 ensi POCTAALS 2300.0 COCCAALS 0.0 ensi CONCAALS 124200.0 CONCAALS 0.0 ensi CONCAALS 130881.0 CONCAALS 0.0 ensi CONCAALS 130880.0 CONCAALS 0.0 ensi CONCAALS 13043130.0 0 0 ensi CONCAALS 1343130.0 0 0 ensi CONCAALS 1343130.0 0 0 ensi CONCAALS 13187.0 EUFFAVAS 31058480.0 0 ensi EUFFAVAS 131387.0 EUFFAVAS 313481.0 0 ensi EUFFAVAS 1314843 1043704.0 0 0 ensi ESILAVAS 121480.0 RELEAVAS 0 0 ensi					22						
					1	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 343130.0 105840.0 6715000.0 3734441.0 308714.0 1048304.0 105802.0 370565.0 143143.0 2261336.0	POCTAVAS POCTAVAT CONCAVAS CONCAVAS CONCAVAS CONCAVAS CONCAVAS RUFFAV	1 121206.0 2 243741.0 7 141621.0 7 141621.0 8 14521.0 1 150180.0 3 -501821.0 4 120400.0 4 421600.0 1 131327.0 1 131327.0 1 131327.0 1 131327.0 1 131327.0 1 131327.0 1 131327.0 1 131327.0 1 131327.0 1 131327.0 1 131326.0 1 13132.0 1 13132.0 1 13132.0 1 13132.0 1 13132.0 1 13132.0 1 13132.0 1 13132.0 1 13132.0 1 13132.0 1 13132.0 1 13133.0	POCTURAL POCTURAL CONCTURAL CONCERAL CO		

t

÷

		TAT						34	
		184							
			Ion numets .	80					
	•• =:••								
	. saut		ACT14174	Defines as					
	W#C118#4L	77	444434.30-						
•	23 TEA # 13								
							i		
		TUTOR	LIF5/180 V2-		_23		PACE		3
		20786							3
					·		.GUAL ACTIVITY		3
	1 - 18W5	4 7 [°]	ACT IVITV	416	LOWER LIMIT. ugue		.DUAL ACTIVITV 1.80000 1832-07152-		3
ign4€2R 1 2	1 - 1003	47 . 45 20	457 14174 7764684984.38- 28014.8669	ATO	LOWER LIMIT. HENE 25014.00000 60622.00000	NOME 25018.0000 50633.00000	. DUAL ACTIVITY 1.00000 1632.07162* 1638.28152-	31 . 81714	3
I UNA E E R	1 - 2003 	47 85 20 24 20		ATO	LOWER LIWIT. 15014.00000 5022.0000 241716.0000 241716.0000	NOME 25016.60000 50533.68000 264715.68000 606315.00000	.0041 &CTIVITY 1.00000 1432.47142- 1436.29152- 1664.48726- 1644.21726-	23 - 81713	3
1 (J14 E E R 1 2	4 • 2003 ••• 2007 ••• br>••• •••	47 85 80 80 80 80 80 80	467 14174 776 406 656 . 30- 280 14 .0000 646 31 .0000 646 31 .0000 646 31 .0000	ATO	LOWER LIMIT. KORE 15016.0000 54012.00000 24016.0000 64315.00000 41315.00000	NOME 21018.0000 50533.0000 264718.0000 605315.0000 1133120.0000 26166.0000	.004L &CT141T4 i.00000 122.09162. 123.12152. 1444.46726. 1446.21726. 1465.21726. 1465.28152.	33 81713	3
1 (J14 E E R 1 2	I - 2003. 	AT 5000000000000000000000000000000000000	427 14174 776 408 4854 .30- 28014 .0000 84533 .0000 284716 .0000 645318 .0000	ATO	LOWER LIMIT. 5014.00000 5022.00000 241716.00000 241716.00000 131145.00000 131145.00000 14145.00000	NOME 24016.00000 50633.00000 264716.00000 406315.00000 1123120.00000 361856.00000 361856.00000 857625.0000	.DUAL &CTIVITY 1.00000 1422.47183. 1434.28183. 1444.28173. 1445.28173. 1445.38152. 1445.33780. 644.33780.		3
I (MEER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 6 9		AT 8000000000000000000000000000000000000	467 14177 7764684854.30- 28018.8000 54633.8000 744716.8000 645318.8000 1132120.0000 1132120.0000	ATO	LOWER LIWIT. 1014.0000 5023.0000 241716.0000 40317.0000 113170.0000 24186.00000 24186.00000 24186.0000 24186.00000 24186.00000	NOME 21018.0000 50533.0000 264718.0000 605315.0000 1133120.0000 26166.0000	.DUAL ACTIVITY 1.00000 1432.47182- 1434.28733- 1644.4733- 1645.3173- 1645.3173- 1645.3173- 1645.3173- 1645.3173- 11.2328- 615.72280-		3
I GNAEER 1 2 3 4 5 5 5 7 6 1 1 1 1 1		4 5000040LLL	TT44084854.30- 2014.0000 6431.0000 13216.0000 13216.0000 14318.0000 34145.0000 34145.0000 701616.0000	ATO	LOWER LIMIT. MGBE 25014.0000 54022.0000 241716.0000 44318.0000 44318.0000 44382.00000 44382.00000 44382.00000 44382.00000 44382.000000000000000000000000000000000000	NOME 24016.00000 50633.00000 264716.00000 406315.00000 1123120.00000 361856.00000 361856.00000 857625.0000	.004L &CTJVITV 1.00000 1431.07153- 1484.08730- 1484.381730- 1485.381730- 1485.31738- 1485.31738- 61.31738- 61.32780- 15.73780- 16.73780- 10.73780-	23 - 81713	3
IUMEER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 6 9 10 11 12 12	1 - 2005 	A 8182888401111	776668856.39- 30016.0000 266316.0000 264716.0000 264716.0000 26166.0000 36166.0000 701616.0000 662266.0000	ATO	Lower Limit. 1014.0000 1021.0000 1021.0000 1031.0000 1031.0000 1031.0000 1031.0000 1031.0000 1000	NOME 74014.0000 50632.00000 744718.0000 604718.0000 112120.0000 113120.0000 04184.0000 047426.0000 047426.0000 047426.0000 047426.0000	.BUAL ACTIVITY 1.00000 1432.07162- 1444.40718- 1444.40728- 1445.30152- 1445.31728- 1445.31728- 14.32748- 17.3274		3
IUMEER 1 2 4 5 5 6 7 6 10 10 11 12 12 12 12	1 - 2003 	ム タマルマシーキャレンシン		ATO	LOWER LIMIT. MARE 3014.0000 1022.0000 20116.0000 00311.0000 103120.0000 20126.00000 20126.00000 20126.00000 20126.0000 20126.0000 20126.00	HONE 74016.0000 50531.0000 744716.0000 744716.0000 7137120.0000 361866.0000 067626.0000 701616.8000 644344.0000	.0041 ACTIVITY 1.00000 1.231.03113- 1.44.23113- 1.44.2173- 1.44.3173- 1.445.3173- 1.445.3173- 1.455.3173- 1.457.3174- 1.73240- 1.73240- 1.7300- 1.7400- 1.47000- 1.4700- 1.4700- 1.4700-		3
1 gmt ER 1 2 3 4 5 5 7 6 14 11 12 13 14 16 16	1 - 2003 207. 	A STREADD LLLLLLLLL	776668556 . 38- 19018. 8868 66231. 8000 244716. 8000 244716. 8000 64238. 8000 64718. 8000 64718. 8000 648384. 8000 724778. 8800 64000 576800. 8000	ATO	LOWER LIWIT. KGRE 25014.0000 54022.0000 241716.0000 442115.0000 443115.0000 44121.00000 44121.	W0#E 74018.0000 6633.0000 744718.0000 744718.0000 7418.0000 7418.0000 7418.0000 7418.0000 7418.0000 7474.0000 7474.0000 7474.0000 7474.0000	.0041 &CT19177 1.00000 1432.0718- 1434.473- 1444.273- 1445.32173- 1445.32172- 1445.31720- 615.7240- 616.73240- 616.73240- 634.81000- 143.37280- 23.4328- 25.4528- 25.4528- 25.4528- 25.4528- 25.4528-	31 . 81713	3
1 UM EER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4 6 14 14 15 16 16 17 14 15 16 17 14 15 16 16 16 17 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	4 - 2007 MARINIZE GYGYAYAZ GYGYAYAZ GYGYAYAZ GYGYAYAZ GYGYAYAZ GYGYAYAZ GYGYAYAZ GYGYAYAZ YOCTAALA YOCTAALA YOCTAALA	A STREAMAUNOUNUUU		ATO	LOWER LIWIT. BOIL 00000 10012 00000 10012 00000 10011 00000 10011 00000 100000 1000000	NOME 70018.0000 6633.0000 744718.0000 713120.0000 713120.0000 713120.0000 71418.0000 701618.0000 74414.0000 74474.0000 74774.0000 74400.0000 73470.0000	.BUAL &CTIVITY 1.80000 1237.97182- 1444.4738- 1444.48738- 1444.48738- 1442.81132- 1442.81132- 1442.81122- 1442.31728- 173788- 173788- 173789- 14.77000- 15.77000-	38 . 81714	3
IUMEER 1 2 3 4 6 6 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		▲ ●日日日の日の日の日日の日日の日日の日日の日日の日日日日日日日日日日日日日日	AETIVITY 774.608.651.35- 30014.0000 10014.0000 10012.0000 10012.0000 10012.0000 1012.0000 1012.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.00000	#15 SLACK 4CTIVITY 7764066884.30	LOWER LIMIT. BORT LIMIT. 15014.00000 54023.00000 241716.00000 243716.00000 243716.00000 24126.00000 24126.00000 24126.00000 24126.00000 24126.0000 24126.0000 2002 00000 0000 00000 0000 00000 0000 00000 00000 0000	NOME 70018.0000 6633.0000 74718.0000 713120.0000 713120.0000 713120.0000 84344.0000 71618.0000 744776.0000 74776.0000 74776.0000 74776.0000 743774.0000	.5044. &CTJVITV 1.00006 1432.07152- 1444.48738- 1444.48738- 1445.38172- 1445.38172- 1442.8172- 1442.3872- 1442.3274- 14.37240- 14.77	<u></u>	3
IUMEER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 4 6 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 3 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		A 8222288888888888888888888888888888888		ATO	Lower Limit. - Lower Limit. - Make - 2014.0000 - 2017.0000 - 2017.0000 - 2017.0000 - 2010 - 2010 - 2000 - 20	W0#E 70018.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 100000	.BUAL &CTIVITY 1.00000 1212.07152- 1414.07152- 1444.48735- 1444.48735- 1442.08152- 1442.08152- 1442.08152- 1443.1728- 64.28746- 172700- 16.77200- 16.77200- 16.9700- 16.9700- 16.37336- 23.5734- 23.5734- 23.5734-		3
IUMEER 1 2 3 4 5 5 6 7 7 6 6 1 6 1 6 1 6 1 1 6 1 1 6 1 7 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2			AETIVITY 774.608.651.35- 30014.0000 10014.0000 10012.0000 10012.0000 10012.0000 1012.0000 1012.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.0000 1014.00000	HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 7764066884.30	LOWER LIMIT. KGBE 25014.00000 5022.00000 24116.00000 24116.00000 21145.00000 21145.00000 21145.00000 21145.00000 20145.00000 20145.0000 20145.0000 20145.00000 20145.00000	W0#E 73018.0000 16313.0000 16313.0000 16313.0000 16313.0000 16313.0000 16314.0000 16314.0000 16314.0000 16324.0000 173774.0000 1726776.0000 173774.0000 173774.0000 173774.0000 173774.0000 173700.00000	.BUAL ACTIVITY 1.00000 127.07182- 1464.40788- 1464.1778- 1464.21778- 1464.21778- 1464.31778- 1465.21778- 1465.21778- 145.2288- 15.2288- 15.2288- 15.2288- 16.37280- 16.47280- 16.87000- 16.87000- 16.87780- 28.42388- 29.42388- 21.42388	<u></u>	3
IUNIEER 1 2 3 4 5 6 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			AETIVITY 774.608.651.35- 30014.0006 3014.0006 66331.0006 7416.0006 7416.0006 741716.0006 741716.0006 741717.0006 741717.0006 741717.0006 741717.0006 741717.0006 741717.0006 741717.0006 741717.0006 741717.0006 741717.0006 741717.10006 741718.0006 741718.0006	HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 7784064884.30	LOWER LIWIT. MGRE 25014.0000 54023.00000 241716.00000 241716.00000 241716.00000 241712.00000 24181.00000 24181.00000 24181.00000 24181.00000 24181.00000 24181.00000 24181.00000 24181.00000 24181	WD#E 70018.0000 6633.0000 74718.0000 7184.0000 7184.0000 7184.0000 7184.0000 7184.0000 724778.0000 724778.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 73444.0000 73450.0000 73444.0000 73500.0000 74548.000	.BUAL ACTIVITY 1.00000 127.07182- 1444.4738- 1444.4738- 1444.4738- 1444.4738- 1442.48172- 1442.48172- 1442.1738- 147.7248- 17378- 147.7248- 17700- 14.77	31 . 81714	3
Ignite R 1 2 3 4 5 5 6 10 10 10 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14				HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 77840668844.30 	LOWER LIWIT. BG 14.0000 14.0000 24.116.0000 24.116.0000 24.116.0000 24.126.00000 24.126.0000 24.126.0000 24.126.0000 24.126.0	NOME 70018.0000 6633.0000 74718.0000 713120.0000 713120.0000 713120.0000 713120.0000 71418.0000 71518.0000 71618.0000 726774.0000 736774.0000 73774.0000 737741.0000 737741.0000 737741.0000 737741.0000 7437741.0000 7437741.0000 7437741.0000 7437741.0000 7437741.0000 7437741.0000	.BUAL ACTIVITY 1.00000 127.07182- 1464.40786- 1464.41738- 1464.21738- 1464.31738- 1464.31738- 1465.21738- 1465.21738- 14.2288- 14.2288- 14.2288- 14.127380- 14.172	23 . 81713	3
Ignite R 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 6 10 10 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14			AETIVITY 7764084554.30- 20018.0000 20018.0000 244716.0000 244716.0000 244784.0000 244786.0000 726776.0000 247741.0000 60000 247741.0000 60000 247741.0000 60000 247741.0000 60000 247741.0000 60163 60200 2427741.0000	HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 77840648844 30 	Lower Liwit. 	W0#E 70018.0000 1018.000	.BUAL ACTIVITY 1.00000 127.07182- 1444.4738- 1444.4738- 1444.4738- 1444.4738- 1442.48172- 1442.48172- 1442.1738- 147.7248- 17378- 147.7248- 17700- 14.77		3
IUMAEER 92 33 4 4 7 4 4 4 4 10 11 12 12 14 14 15 15 16 16 17 17 20 21 21 22 22 23 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24		人 東京東京東京地域はいのいいいいかいののマレクション		HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 77840668844.30 	Lewen Limit. MGME 26014.0000 26116.0000 26116.0000 26126.0000 261626.0000 261626.0000 261626.0000 261626.0000 261626.0000 2016 00000 00000 00000 0000 00000 0000 0000 0000 0000 0000 0	W0#E 70018.0000 60316.0000 10316.0000 10317.0000 10317.0000 10317.0000 10317.0000 10317.0000 10317.0000 10317.0000 10317.0000 10317.0000 10317.0000 10320.0000 10320.0000 10320.0000 10300.0000 11300.0000 11300.0000 11300.0000 11300.0000 11300.0000 11300.0000 11418.0000	.BUAL ACTIVITY 1.00000 127.07182- 1464.40786- 1464.41738- 1464.21738- 1464.31738- 1464.31738- 1465.21738- 1465.21738- 14.2288- 14.2288- 14.2288- 14.127380- 14.172	<u></u>	3
I UMAGEN 9 3 3 4 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 4 6 6 7 4 6 6 7 4 6 6 7 4 6 6 7 4 6 6 7 4 6 6 7 4 6 6 7 4 6 6 7 4 6 6 7 4 6 6 7 4 6 6 7 4 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 6 7 7 6 7 7 7 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7		A #2#2#################################		HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 7764066884.30 338111 44414 4374048 44105 2942000 80000 3384148 51807 1349868 4853 1343142 43836	LOWER LIWIT. KGRE 25014.0000 54023.0000 241716.0000 241716.0000 241716.0000 241716.0000 24182.	WD#E 70018.0000 24018.0000 241718.0000 241718.0000 24184.0000 24184.0000 24184.0000 24184.0000 24184.0000 24184.0000 24184.0000 24184.0000 24174.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.0000 24374.000000 24374.000000 24374.00000000000000000000000000000000000	.BUAL ACTIVITY 1.00000 1422.07182- 1444.40720- 1445.201720- 1445.201720- 1445.201720- 1445.201720- 1445.201720- 14.20200- 14.20200- 14.27200-		3
IUMEER 1 2 3 4 4 7 4 6 7 4 6 10 10 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12		A 8000000000000000000000000000000000000		HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 77840658844.30 	LOWER LIWIT. BG 14.0000 50321.0000 243716.0000 243716.0000 243716.0000 24372.0000 24326.00000 24326.0000 24326.0000 24326.0000 24326.00000	WD#E 70018.0000 66331.0000 74718.0000 6431.0000 7184.0000 7184.0000 7184.0000 7184.0000 74778.0000 74778.0000 724778.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 724774.0000 74541.0000 74541.0000 74541.0000 74541.0000 74541.0000 74541.0000 74541.0000 74541.0000 7441.0000 7441.0000 7441.0000 744.0000 744.0000 744.0000 744.0000 744.0000	. BUAL & & CT 1 ¥ 1 T ¥ 1. 00000 1427. 07182- 1444. 40728- 1444. 41728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 145. 21728- 1		3
United R 7 7 8 8 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10				HIS SLACK ACTIVITY T7840668884.30 239111 44414 4370609 44105 2942000 80000 3384140 51807 13498688 81853 1343182 8363 2381641 31884 138327 80000	Lewer Liwit. Hower Liwit. 15014.00000 20010.00000 200115.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.0000 20125.0000 20125.0000 20125.0000 200	W0#E 70012.0000 1012.0000 1012.0000 1012.0000 1012.0000 1012.0000 1012.0000 1012.0000 1012.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 1011.0000 112.0000	.BUAL ACTIVITY 1.00000 1422.07182- 1444.40720- 1445.201720- 1445.201720- 1445.201720- 1445.201720- 1445.201720- 14.20200- 14.20200- 14.27200-	<u>31</u>	3
United R 7 7 8 8 8 9 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10				HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 7764064844.30 338414 44105 2942000.0000 3364140.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494486.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 13494888.81807 1349488888888888888888888888888888888888	LOWER LIMIT. KGRE 2014.0000 5022100000 24116.00000 24120.0000 24120.0000 24120.0000 24120.0000 24120.0000 24120.0000 200	upat Too 10. 00000 10010 100000	. BUAL & & CT 1 ¥ 1 T ¥ 1. 00000 1427. 07182- 1444. 40728- 1444. 41728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 145. 21728- 1		3
		A ####################################	AETIVITY 7744088554 2014	HIS SLACK ACTIVITY T764065884.30 	LOWER LIWIT. KGRE 25014.0000 54022.0000 241716.0000 241716.0000 241716.0000 241716.0000 241716.0000 24182.00000 24182.0000 24182.00000 24182.00000 24182.00000 2	wome Too 14.0000 Too 1414.0000 Too 1411.0000 Too 1412.0000 Too 1412.0000 Too 1412.0000 Too 1412.0000 Too 1412.0000 Too 1412.0000 Too 1412.00000 Too 1414.00000 Too 1414.00000 Too 1414.00000 Too 1414.00000 Too 1414.000000	. BUAL & & CT 1 ¥ 1 T ¥ 1. 00000 1427. 07182- 1444. 40728- 1444. 41728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 1445. 21728- 145. 21728- 1		3
				HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 77840658844.30 	LOWER LIWIT. KGRE 25014.0000 54023.0000 241716.0000 241716.0000 241716.0000 24182.0	word 100000 </td <td>-DUAL ACTIVITY I. 00000 1422.07182- 1444.40728- 1445.201728- 1445.201728- 1445.201728- 1445.201728- 1445.201728- 145.20288- 145.</td> <td></td> <td>3</td>	-DUAL ACTIVITY I. 00000 1422.07182- 1444.40728- 1445.201728- 1445.201728- 1445.201728- 1445.201728- 1445.201728- 145.20288- 145.		3
				HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 776406884.30 239414.44414 4374069.44104 2942000.0000 3364146.51807 1349465.4863 1349465.8865 1349465.8865 1349465.8865 1349465.8865 1349465.8865 1349465.8865 1349465.8865 1349465 1349465 1349465 134965	Lewer Liwit. Hower Liwit. 15014.00000 20010.00000 200115.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.00000 20125.0000 20125.0000 20125.0000 20125.0000 200	W0#E 70018.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10108.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10118.0000 10118.00000 10118.00000 10118.00000 10118.00000 10118.00000 10118.00000 10118.00000 10118.00000 10118.000000 10118.000000 10118.000000 10118.000000	.BUAL & CT J VI II V 1.00000 1212.07182- 1444.4718- 1444.4718- 1444.4718- 1444.4718- 1444.4718- 1442.48172- 1442.48172- 1442.48172- 1442.48172- 1442.48172- 1442.48172- 1442.48172- 1442.4718- 1728-	<u>38</u> <u>847</u> 13	3
1000 CCR 1 2 2 2 4 4 5 4 6 5 4 6 6 6 1 1 2 1 2 4 6 6 7 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2		A ####################################		HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 7764064844.30 	LOWER LIMIT. KGRE 35014.00000 54023.00000 241716.00000 241716.00000 24182.00000 24182.00000 24182.0000 24182.0000 24182.0000 24182.0000 24182.0000 20	W0#E T0011.0000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.000000 1011.000000 1011.000000 1011.000000 1011.000000 1011.0000000	.BUAL & & CT J VI TI I. 00000 1212.07182- 1440.40738- 1440.40738- 1440.3172- 1442.40738- 1442.40738- 1442.40738- 1442.40738- 1442.40738- 1440.20788-		3
				HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 776406884.30 239414.44414 4374069.44104 2942000.0000 3364146.51807 1349465.4863 1349465.8865 1349465.8865 1349465.8865 1349465.8865 1349465.8865 1349465.8865 1349465 1349465 1349465 1349	LOWER LIMIT. KGRE 2014.0000 5022116.0000 24116.0000 24116.0000 241210.0000 24122.0000 24122.0000 20	upat 10011.0000 10011.0000 10011.0000 10011.0000 10011.0000 10011.0000 10011.0000 10011.0000 10011.0000 10011.0000 10011.0000 10011.0000 10010.00000 10010.00000 10010.00000 10010	.BUAL & CTIVITY 1.00000 1212.07182- 1464.40781- 1464.40781- 1464.3178- 1		3
				HIS SLACK ACTIVITY 7764064844.30 	L. L. MERE LIMIT. MERE 75014.0000 54023.00000 74116.00000 75110.00000 75110.00000 40121.00000 40121.00000 40121.00000 40121.00000 40121.0000 40121.0000 40121.00000 40121.00	W0#E T0011.0000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.00000 1011.000000 1011.000000 1011.000000 1011.000000 1011.000000 1011.0000000	.BUAL ACTIVITY 1.00000 1232.07152- 1464.40726- 1465.201736- 1465.201736- 1465.31778- 1465.31778- 1465.31778- 1465.31778- 147.2000- 147.2000- 14.77240- 14.77240- 14.77240- 14.77240- 14.77240- 14.77240- 15.77240- 14.77240- 15.77240- 1		3

٦.	2	ο

			41		BLACK ACTIVITY	- LOWER LEHET	UPPER LINIT	BUAL ACTIVITY	_
		1		131216,46000		143143 00000	131311 00000 143163 00000		
	57	TL 878005	20	1141336.00000		344307 00000 2361336 00000	226133L 40040	1466 44167 1467 21726	
TECHT	54			150000,00000 - 3131084,00000	- ·	150068.00888		1466.14163	
TECHT									
		•							
LINE CUITEL. LINE TYPES LINE TYPES CTION 2 - COLUMMS ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES UMBER COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE LINE TYPES LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE LINE TYPES LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE LINE TYPES LINE TYPES LINE TYPES LINE TYPES <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		1							
LINE CUITEL. LINE TYPES LINE TYPES CTION 2 - COLUMMS ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES UMBER COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE COLUMN. AT ACTIVITY LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE LINE TYPES LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE LINE TYPES LINE TYPES LINE TYPES ACC 1/- LINE TYPES LILE LINE TYPES LINE TYPES LINE TYPES LINE TYPES <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>									
LITECUTER: LITECUTER: LITECUTER: CTION 2 - COLUMMS ACC 1/2 - LITECUTER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. UMBER COLUMN. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOWER LIMIT. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOWER LIMIT. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOWER LIMIT. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. St Column. St Column. St III St Column. St Column. St Column. St IIII St Column. St Col									
LITECUTION LITECUTION <thlitecution< th=""> LITECUTION LITECUTI</thlitecution<>									
LITECUTION LITECUTION <thlitecution< th=""> LITECUTION LITECUTI</thlitecution<>									
LITECUTION LITECUTION <thlitecution< th=""> LITECUTION LITECUTI</thlitecution<>									
LITECUTOR LITECUTOR <thlitecutor< th=""> LITECUTOR <thlitecutor< th=""> LITECUTOR <thlitecutor< th=""> <thlitecutor< th=""> <thlit< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></thlit<></thlitecutor<></thlitecutor<></thlitecutor<></thlitecutor<>									
LITECUTOR LITECUTOR <thlitecutor< th=""> LITECUTOR <thlitecutor< th=""> LITECUTOR <thlitecutor< th=""> <thlitecutor< th=""> <thlit< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></thlit<></thlitecutor<></thlitecutor<></thlitecutor<></thlitecutor<>									
LITECUTER: LITECUTER: LITECUTER: CTION 2 - COLUMMS ACC 1/2 - LITECUTER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. UMBER COLUMN. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOWER LIMIT. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOWER LIMIT. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOWER LIMIT. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. St Column. St Column. St III St Column. St Column. St Column. St IIII St Column. St Col									
LITECUTER: LITECUTER: LITECUTER: CTION 2 - COLUMMS ACC 1/2 - LITECUTER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. UMBER COLUMN. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOTINITYLIMPER COST. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOWER LIMIT. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOWER LIMIT. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. ATLOWER LIMIT. LOWER LIMIT. MARCE COST. St III St Column. St Column. St Column. St III St Column. St Column. St Column. St IIII St Column. St Col									
LITECUTION LITECUTION <thlitecution< th=""> LITECUTION LITECUTI</thlitecution<>									
LICCUTCL LICCUTCL LICTION 2 - COLUMMS UMBER COLUMNS. AT ALCTIVITY									
LICCUTCL LICCUTCL LICTION 2 - COLUMMS UMBER COLUMNS. AT ALCTIVITY									
LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. CTION 2 - COLUMMS ACCOUNTS COLUMNS. ATCONTRY COSTLOWER LIMITUPPER LIMIT. ACCOUNTS UNABLE COLUMNS. ATCOTTUTTLOWER LIMITUPPER LIMITUPPER LIMIT									
LIKECUTOR. LIKETY S.C. TJMIG PACE LI LI CT100 J - COLUMMS ACTIVITY									
LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. CTION 2 - COLUMMS ACCOUNTS COLUMNS. ATCONTRY COSTLOWER LIMITUPPER LIMIT. ACCOUNTS UNABLE COLUMNS. ATCOTTUTTLOWER LIMITUPPER LIMITUPPER LIMIT									
LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. CTION 2 - COLUMMS ACCOUNTS COLUMNS. ATCONTRY COSTLOWER LIMITUPPER LIMIT. ACCOUNTS UNABLE COLUMNS. ATCOTTUTTLOWER LIMITUPPER LIMITUPPER LIMIT									
LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. CTION 2 - COLUMMS ACCOUNTS COLUMNS. ATCONTRY COSTLOWER LIMITUPPER LIMIT. ACCOUNTS UNABLE COLUMNS. ATCOTTUTTLOWER LIMITUPPER LIMITUPPER LIMIT									
LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. LITELUTER. CTION 2 - COLUMMS ACCOUNTS COLUMNS. ATCONTRY COSTLOWER LIMITUPPER LIMIT. ACCOUNTS UNABLE COLUMNS. ATCOTTUTTLOWER LIMITUPPER LIMITUPPER LIMIT									
THE LUTUR. THE LUT									- <u> </u>
UNNATE					<u></u>	C24	-		
1 0 10000 1.0000 10 1000 1.0000 1.0000 10 11 1.0000 0.000 1.0000 10 11 1.0000 0.000 0.000 1.0000 10 11 1.0000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 10 11 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 11 11 0.000 0.0		r	RECUT	58. HP57360	¥3-416	C24	-	FACE	at - s(/145
No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No.				58. HPS/380	¥7-416	C24	-		
11 11 <td< td=""><td></td><td>w 3 - 60LU</td><td>***</td><td></td><td></td><td>·</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>		w 3 - 60LU	***			·			
International and the second	UMB E 5	N 3 - COLU R .COLUMN 8 X11	MHS . AT 81			LOWER LINE	TUPPER LIMIT	REGUCED COXT.	
act act act act act act 43 Eis 65 43322 72469 74.2000- act 44 Eis 65 43322 72469 74.2000- act 46 Eis 65 723 LL 6.0000- act 74.000- 46 Fis 11 13.4400- act 74.000- act 74.000- 46 Fis LL 13.4400- act 74.000- act 74.000- 46 Fis LL 13.4400- act 74.000- act 74.000- 71 Eis LL 14.17000- act 74.000- act 74.000- 71 Eis Got 21.00000 1.0000- act 10.7000- act 10.7000- 71 Eis LL 17.17000- act 10.7000- act 10.7000- 71 Eis LL 17.17000- act 10.7000- act 10.7000- 74 Eis Got 21.00000 1.00000- act <td>UMB 8 5 5</td> <td>N 2 - GOLU R .COLUMN 6 X11 7 X12 6 X13</td> <td>- AT - ST - ST - ST - ST - ST - ST - ST - S</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>r uppen limit Nome Mome Nome</td> <td>##OUCED CDST. #.48426-</td> <td></td>	UMB 8 5 5	N 2 - GOLU R .COLUMN 6 X11 7 X12 6 X13	- AT - ST - ST - ST - ST - ST - ST - ST - S				r uppen limit Nome Mome Nome	##OUCED CDST. #.48426-	
iii iii iii iiii iiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii	UMBE 5 5 5 6	N 2 - COLUMN C _COLUMN C III 7 II 7 II 6 II 8 II 8 II 8 II 8 II 8 II 8 II 8	- AT 83 65 LL LL				I UPPER LIMIT Houe Houe Houe Houe Houe	4490240 COXT. 60 18438- 50 18438- 36 38000- 84 39000-	
Bit Cont Treeson Bit Treeson Cit	UMBE 5 5 6 6 6	N 3 - COLUMN 6 III 7 II2 4 II3 8 II4 0 II5 1 II6 2 II7	- 4T 85 85 LL LL LL LL			LOWER LIME	T	# 400CED CONT. # 40030- GO 10030- 1330- 417000- 42.0100-	
a. a. a. a. b.	9 M M U 5 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 7	N 3 - COLUMN C III C IIII C IIIII C IIII C IIII C IIIII C IIIIIIIII C IIIII C IIIIII C IIIIIIII C IIIIII C IIIIIII C IIIIII C IIIIIII C IIIIII C IIIIIII C IIIIII C IIIIIII C IIIIII C IIIIII C IIIIII C IIIIIII C IIIIIII C IIIIII C IIIIIII C IIIIII C IIIIIII C IIIIII C IIIIIII C IIIIII C IIIIIII C IIIIIIIIII	- AT 85 65 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11			LOWER LIM("		# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	
No. N	Umil C 2 2 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	N 3 - COLUMN 6 III 7 II2 6 II3 8 II3 8 II3 8 II3 8 II3 8 II3 8 II4 3 III	. 47 85 85 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11			LOWER LIME"		REBUCED CORT. 6 18438- 60 18438- 8 19000- 8 19000- 8 19000- 1 18000- 3 44438-	- a1 - s(7145
12 13 16023 18 16000 1000 71	U M B C 5 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	N 3 - COLUMN C .COLUMN C	- 47 95 45 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11			LOWER LIM("		##800CED CONT. 8.45436- 50 15436- 36.33608- 42.45437- .3608- .360421- 3.44431- 40.57431- 3.44430-	<u> </u>
74 X31 LL 32 26000- 0000 43 10000 74 X31 LL 17 12000- 0000 10000 10000 74 X33 LL 17 17000- 0000 10000 10000 76 X33 LL 17 17000- 0000 10000 10000 76 X37 LL 12 13000- 0000 10000 10000 76 X37 LL 11 11000- 0000 20 40000- 81 K37 LL 16 11000- 0000 20 40000- 81 K37 LL 27 41000- 0000 20 40000- 81 K37 LL 26 10 1000- 0000 20 10000- 82 K47 K5 126 20 20 1000- 0000 10000- 0000 10000- 10000 10000 10000 10000 10000 10000 10000 10000 10000 10000	U == 4 5 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	 B 2 - GOLUME COLUME COLUME T 11 T 12 T 13 T 14 T 14 T 15 T 14 T 15 T 17 T 18 <lit 18<="" li=""> T 18 T 18 T 18<!--</td--><td>- &T 85 65 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U</td><td>##800CED CONT. 8.48438- 60 1%438- 36.33600- 82.45438- 4.38608- 3.46438- 4.38608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608</td><td></td></lit>	- &T 85 65 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11				U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U	##800CED CONT. 8.48438- 60 1%438- 36.33600- 82.45438- 4.38608- 3.46438- 4.38608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608- 3.44438- 1.32608	
71 133 82 244746 80000 1.800000 100000 71 134 14 171000- 6000 30 18500- 76 734 14 24 17000- 6000 74 18500- 76 734 14 24 17000- 6000 74 18500- 76 734 14 31 17000- 6000 73 40000- 80 837 14 31 1000- 6000 27 45574- 81 14 37 44000- 6000 31 12574- 82 84 30 136278- 6000 31 12574- 83 84 30 136278- 6000 31 12574- 84 84 136218 80000 1 6000- 6000 84 84 136318 60000 1 60000- 6000 84 84 135318 60000 1 60000- 6000 84 84 133318 60000- 6000 1 60000- 84 84 133318 60000- 6000 1 60000- 85 84 <td></td> <td> B 2 - GOLUME COLUME T 11 T 12 T 13 T 14 T 15 T 17 T 16 T 17 T 16 T 17 T 16 T 17 T 17 T 17 T 18 <lit 18<="" li=""> T 18 T 18 T 18<td>••••• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •</td><td></td><td></td><td> LOWER LIME</td><td>Timit, Jorga Limit, Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan</td><td>4 4 6 9 / C 0 8 7 . 6 4 4 6 3 / C 6 8 8 6 0 - 6 8 8 6 0 - 6 8 7 0 0 - 8 2 6 8 4 3 0 - 6 1 8 0 0 - 8 2 6 8 4 3 0 - 1 8 0 0 0 - 3 4 4 3 0 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 3 0 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 -</td><td>a1 - 817143</td></lit></td>		 B 2 - GOLUME COLUME T 11 T 12 T 13 T 14 T 15 T 17 T 16 T 17 T 16 T 17 T 16 T 17 T 17 T 17 T 18 <lit 18<="" li=""> T 18 T 18 T 18<td>••••• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •</td><td></td><td></td><td> LOWER LIME</td><td>Timit, Jorga Limit, Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan</td><td>4 4 6 9 / C 0 8 7 . 6 4 4 6 3 / C 6 8 8 6 0 - 6 8 8 6 0 - 6 8 7 0 0 - 8 2 6 8 4 3 0 - 6 1 8 0 0 - 8 2 6 8 4 3 0 - 1 8 0 0 0 - 3 4 4 3 0 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 3 0 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 -</td><td>a1 - 817143</td></lit>	••••• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			LOWER LIME	Timit, Jorga Limit, Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan Joan	4 4 6 9 / C 0 8 7 . 6 4 4 6 3 / C 6 8 8 6 0 - 6 8 8 6 0 - 6 8 7 0 0 - 8 2 6 8 4 3 0 - 6 1 8 0 0 - 8 2 6 8 4 3 0 - 1 8 0 0 0 - 3 4 4 3 0 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 3 0 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 4 4 - 3 -	a1 - 817143
74 24 <td< td=""><td></td><td>x 2 - Column x - Column x - Column x 12 x 12 x 14 x 14 x 14 x 14 x 15 x 12 x 12</td><td>- AT 85 45 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td># 48 4 26- 50 380 38- 50 380 38- 50 380 38- 50 380 38- 51 380 38- 52 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 54 484 38- 54 484 38- 54 484 38- 54 484 38- 54 584 58- 54 584</td><td></td></td<>		x 2 - Column x - Column x - Column x 12 x 12 x 14 x 14 x 14 x 14 x 15 x 12	- AT 85 45 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11					# 48 4 26- 50 380 38- 50 380 38- 50 380 38- 50 380 38- 51 380 38- 52 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 53 484 38- 54 484 38- 54 484 38- 54 484 38- 54 484 38- 54 584 58- 54 584	
to t37 LL 31.17000- t00t 35.4000- t1 137 LL 14.1000- 00st 23.4000- t2 t4 LL 35.11000- 00st 43.517 t2 t4 LL 35.11000- 00st 43.557 t2 t4 LL 35.11000- 00st 43.557 t4 t4 13.0020- 00st 43.557 t4 t4 13.0020- 00st 17.17000- t5 t4 t3.1587- 00st 17.1700- t6 t4 13.0020- 00st 17.1700- t6 t4 13.0000- 00st 13.577- t6 t6 13.0000- 00st 13.577- t7 t5 15.158.0000 15.0000- 00st t7 t1 30.61000- 00st 13.577- t7 t1 30.61000- 00st 14.3574- t7 t1 30.6000- 00st 13.577- t7 t1 30.61000- 00st 13.577- t7 t1 30.6000- 00st 13.577- t7 t1 30.61000- 00st 13.0000-		w 2 - Column q - Column - Col	- AT - AT				T	# 48438- 60 18438- 60 18438- 82 38608- 82 88438- 18408- 384438- 18448- 384438- 384438- 384438- 384438- 384438- 38444- 383438- 383438- 383438- 383438- 383438- 383438- 383438- 383438- 383438- 383438- 38348-	
12 14 <		x 2 - Column q .Column q .Column q .tolumn .tolumn .tolumn	- # 1 # 5 # 5 ULU LU LU LU LU LU LU LU LU LU LU LU LU					ACOUCED CDIT. 8.48438- 60 18438- 84.17000- 84.17000- 84.17000- 18.000- 18.000- 18.000- 18.000- 19.000	
44 743 46 3062318.00000 100000- 40000 45 144 15 1218.0000 100000- 40000 46 14 14 24.33000- 6000 6000 47 46 11 21.00000- 6000 6000 47 46 11 23.0000- 6000 6000 48 141 11 23.0000- 6000 10.0000- 48 141 11 23.0000- 6000 10.0000- 48 141 11 23.0000- 6000 10.0000- 49 153 11 23.0000- 6000 10000 40 154 12.30000- 6000 60000 100000 41 15 23.000- 60000 60000 60000 42 154 13.0000- 60000 60000 60000 45 45 45.00000- 60000 100000 60000 45 45 13.0000- 60000 100000 100000 45 45.000000- <td></td> <td>x 2 - Column q .Column x 12 x 12 x 14 x 12 x 24 x 24 x 25 x 24 x 25 x 24 x 24 x 24 x 24 x 34 x 35 x 34 x 34</td> <td>- 81 85 85 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td># 200 CED CDIT. 8 484 38- 60 184 38- 84 17000- 84 17000- 84 17000- 184 28- 40 174 31- 40 174 31- 40 174 31- 40 174 31- 41 17600- 11 17600- 13 16574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 44 11574- 45</td> <td></td>		x 2 - Column q .Column x 12 x 12 x 14 x 12 x 24 x 24 x 25 x 24 x 25 x 24 x 24 x 24 x 24 x 34 x 35 x 34 x 34	- 81 85 85 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10					# 200 CED CDIT. 8 484 38- 60 184 38- 84 17000- 84 17000- 84 17000- 184 28- 40 174 31- 40 174 31- 40 174 31- 40 174 31- 41 17600- 11 17600- 13 16574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 43 11574- 44 11574- 45	
16 16 26 236000- 1000 73674- 47 16 13 236000- 1000 73674- 48 14 11 14 14374- 48 14 11 14 14374- 10 16 16 16000- 16 10 16 16 16 10 16 16 16 10 16 16 16 10 16 16 16 11 16 16 16 12 14 16 16 13 14 16 16 14 14 16 16 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 17 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 17 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 17 16 16 16 16 16 16	3 8 44 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	w 2 - Column q . Column q . Column q . Column q . II 7 . II 8 . II 9 . II 10 . II 11 . II 12 . II 13 . II 14 . III 15 . II 16 . II 17 . II 18 . III 19 . III 10 . III 11 . III 12 . III 13 . III 14 . III 15 . III 16 . III 17 . III 18 . III 19 . IIII 10 . IIII 11 . IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	- 85 45 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10					REBUCED CONT. 8. 48438- 60 18438- 84. 17000- 84. 17000- 82. 18438- 4. 12000- 3. 48438- 4. 12000- 3. 48438- 4. 12000- 3. 48438- 4. 12000- 3. 48438- 4. 12000- 3. 1	e1 - 817183
48 247 65 1333310 00000 16 00000 100000 48 247 11 27000 0000 10000 00000 40 12 12 12 10000 0000 10000 50 15 11 23000 0000 0000 10000 51 15 11 133000 0000 0000 0000 64 14343 00000 100000 0000 0000 64 14343 00000 100000 0000 0000 65 86 14343 00000 100000 0000 64 15 00000 100000 00000 00000 65 86 14343 00000 00000 00000 66 15 00000 100000 00000 00000 67 150 100000 00000 00000 00000 68 16 1100000 00000 00000 00000 68 16 1100000 00000 00000 1470000 68 16 11 100000 00000 00000 68 16 11 100000 00000		w 2 - Column q . Column q . Column q . Column q . Column q . In q <td>- 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 8</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td># # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #</td> <td>41 - 517143</td>	- 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 8					# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	41 - 517143
10 151 LL 34.8600- None 14.0500- 11 152 LL 30.8000- None 14.0500- 12 152 LL 32.3000- None 40.8712- 13 14.3100- None 10.071 40.5212- 14 14.3200- None 10000- None 15 LL 15.0000- None 10000- 16 15.0000- None 11.0000- 16 15.0000- None 11.0000- 16 15.0000- None 11.0000- 17 152 LL 15.0000- None 17 152 LL 31.0000- None 17 152 LL 31.0000- None 18 154 LL 31.0000- None 18 11 31.0000- None 14.7000- 18 11 31.0000- None 14.7000- 19 11 31.0000- None 14.7000- 19 11 31.0000- None 14.7000- 19 11 31.0000- None 14.7000-		w 2 - Column c . Column d . Column d . 11 7 . 12 4 . 13 0 . 14 0 . 14 1 . 14 2 . 17 3 . 14 4 . 13 4 . 17 4 . 17 4 . 17 4 . 17 4 . 17 4 . 17 4 . 17 4 . 17 4 . 17 5 . 17 4 . 17 5 . 17 10 . 12 11 . 12 12 . 17 13 . 17 14 . 13 15 . 13 16 . 13 17 . 13 18 . 14 19<	MH13 . AT . AT . AT . LL .LL .LL .LL .LL .LL .LL .					# 48 4 28- 6 48 4 28- 6 18 00 00- 10 18 00 00- 10 18 00 00- 10 18 00 00- 10 18 00-	
87 853 LL 24.33000- NUL 24.33000- 91 854 LL 35.0000- NUL 94 855 85 143.143 00000 1.80000- NUL 94 855 85 143.143 00000 1.80000- NUL 94 855 85 143.143 00000 1.80000- NUL 95 85 143 143 1.80000- NUL 96 85 105 13.20000- NUL 1.3000- 97 85 195 197.00000- NUNE 1.2000- 98 86 196 100 1.2000- NUNE 98 87 1.1 1.30000- NUNE 1.4200- 98 862 1.1 27.35000- NUNE 24.2000- 100 863 L 27.33000- NUNE 24.2624-		w 2 - Column q . Column q . Column q . Column q . II 7 . II 8 . II 9 . II 10 . II 11 . II 12 . II 13 . II 14 . II 15 . II 16 . II 17 . II 18 . II 19 . II 10 . II 11 . II 12 . II 13 . II 14 . III 15 . III 16 . III 17 . III 18 . III 19 . III 10 . III 11 . III 12 . III 13 . III 14 . III	MUS . AT . AT . BS . LL .LL .LL .LL .LL .LL .LL .L					# 48 4 28- 60 184 38- 10 184 38- 14 19000- 82 184 28- 14 19000- 14 19000- 14 19000- 14 19000- 14 194 08- 14 194 08-	
94 255 65 143,143,00000 1,800000- 00000 00000 16 16,0000- 00000 16,00000- 00000 16,00000- 00000 16,00000- 16,00000- 16,00000- 16,00000- 16,00000- 16,0000-		w 2 - Column q . Column . Col	MUS . AT . AT . LL . LLL . LL . LL			LOWER LIN() 		# 48438- 60 18438- 160 18438- 16 1848- 18 189- 18 189- 19 189-	21 - 817143
BE XE7 LL 31.20000- NOUL 1.2000 FT XE2 E2 178704.48662 45.67000- NOUL BE XE1 LL 44.61000- NOUL 73.42000- BE XE1 LL 37.85000- NOUL 62.0000- TO XE3 LL 20.33000- NOUL 23.27436- NO XE3 LL 72.30000- NOUL 24.66326-		w 2 - Column q . Column	MNS . ST . ST					# 48438- 60 18438- 60 18438- 82 38900- 82 88438- 93 84438- 94 8438- 94 8448- 94 8448	
86 761 LL - 44.41000- 001 1.2200- 86 761 LL - 37.85000- 0021 63.0000- 100 863 LL - 29.33000- 0021 24.5743- 101 864 LL - 21.30000- 0021 24.86434-		w 2 - Column q .Column x 11 7 x12 4 x13 7 x12 8 x14 9 x14 1 x16 1 x16 1 x16 1 x16 1 x16 1 x26 1 x21 6 x23 6 x23 6 x23 7 x27 7 x27 7 x23 6 x33 7 x33 8 x34 8 x34 8 x43 8 x43 8 x43 8 x43 8 x44 8 x44 8 x54 8 x54 8 x54	MNS . AT . AT					ACOUCCO CONT. 8.48438- 60 18438- 84.57000- 84.57000- 84.57000- 14.6700- 14.6731- 14.6731- 14.6731- 14.6731- 14.6731- 14.6731- 14.6731- 14.574-	
100 E63 CL		w 2 - Column q . Column v 11 7 x12 6 x13 7 x12 8 x14 1 x16 1 x16 1 x16 1 x16 1 x17 4 x17 6 x22 6 x23 6 x24 10 x24 11 x24 12 x27 13 x24 14 x37 15 x37 16 x37 17 x34 18 x31 19 x34 10 x37 12 x37 13 x43 14 x43 15 x43 16 x43 17 x54 18 x47						ACOUCED CDAT. 8.48438- 60 18438- 84.17000- 84.17000- 84.17000- 14.421- 40.17421- 40.17421- 40.17421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3421- 40.3414- 7.3314- 4.4344- 4.444- 4.444-	
15.60009		x 2 - Column x -						# 48 4 28- 6 48 4 28- 6 18 00 0- 10 18 00 0- 10 18 00 0- 10 18 00 0- 10 18 00 10	e1 - e 177743
102 265 LL 15.50000- WORE 103 266 25 364307.00000 1.90000- WORE 104 27 LL 32.00000- RORE 27 76428-		w 2 - Column q -						# 48 4 28- GC 184 38- GC 184 38- 16 184 38- 16 184 38- 16 1900- 8 2 184 28- 17 184 28- 18 1900- 18	
1 12 10.61000- NORE 10.0000- 12 123 11 24.33000- NORE 27.2241- 13 154 11 24.33000- NORE 20.000 14 155 05.143.0000- NORE 10.000- 14 155 05.143.0000- NORE 10.000- 14 155 05.143.0000- NORE 10.000- 15 13.0000- NORE 11.0000- 16 175 13.0000- NORE 11.0000- 16 175 05.0000- NORE 13.0430- 16 17.0000- NORE 13.0000- NORE 18 18.2 1. 37.0000- NORE 21.0000- 100 13.20000- NORE 21.00000- NORE		x 2 - Column x . Column . Col						REBUCED CONT. 8. 48438- 60 18438- 84. 17000- 84. 17000- 82. 18438- 4. 12000- 3. 48438- 4. 12000- 3. 48438- 4. 12000- 3. 48438- 4. 12000- 3. 48438- 4. 12000- 3. 1	
15 14 34.64000- UCHI 64.000- 15 14 36.4000- UCHI 60.000- 15 14 36.1000- UCHI 37.22416- 15 14 31.3000- UCHI 37.22416- 17 16 16.3000- UCHI 17.32416- 17 16 14.3100- UCHI 17.32416- 17 16 14.3000- UCHI 10.000- 16 16.000- UCHI 11.3000- UCHI 16 17.3000- UCHI 11.3000- UCHI 17 15 15 15.6000- UCHI 17 15 15 15.6000- UCHI 16 10.3000- UCHI 13.4200- 17 15 15 15.6000- UCHI 17 16 13.3000- UCHI 13.4200- 16 16 17.35000- UCHI 13.4200- 18 16 17.35000- UCHI 13.4200- 18 16 17.35000- UCHI 13.4200- 10 13.3000- UCHI 13.4200- 10 13.3000- UCHI 13.4200- 10		y 2 - Column q .Column	MH13 . AT 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95					# 48 4 28- 6 48 4 28- 6 18 00 00- 10 18 00 00- 10 18 00 00- 10 18 00 00- 10 18 00-	
13 154 11 24.33000- 1000 14 155 45.43.0000 1.0000- 10000 16 15.0000- 10000 10000 16 15.0000- 10000 10000 16 15.0000- 10000 10000 17 157 1130704.0000 10000 18 10 10000- 10000 18 10 10000- 10000 18 10 10000- 10000 18 162 1. 10.33000- 10000 180 162 1. 10.33000- 10000		x 2 - Column x . Column . Col	MHS . AT 85 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 65 6					A COUCED CONT. 8.48438- 60 18438- 84.17000- 84.17000- 84.17000- 14.421- 40.17431- 40.17431- 40.17431- 40.17431- 40.17431- 40.17431- 40.17431- 40.17431- 40.17431- 40.17440- 40.17431- 40.17440- 40.17431- 40.17440- 40.17440- 40.17431- 40.17440- 40.17440- 40.17431- 40.17440-	
16 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 17 15 10 10 10 10 17 15 15 15 1000- 10 16 16 10 10 10 17 15 15 1000- 10 16 16 10 10 10 16 10 10 10 10 16 10 10 10 10 100 10 10 10 10 100 10 10 10 10		x 2 - Column x - Column 7 x12 4 x13 7 x14 7 x14 8 x14 1 x16 2 x17 3 x17 4 x13 5 x21 6 x23 6 x23 6 x24 9 x26 70 x26 71 x37 72 x37 74 x37 75 x37 76 x37 77 x34 78 x37 79 x37 84 x43 84 x43 84 x43 84 x43 84 x44 84 x44 84 x43 84 x43 84 x43	MNS . AT . AT . BS . LL . LLL . LL . LL					REGUCED CONT. 8.48438- 60 18438- 84.53000- 84.57000- 82.58438- 4.38000- 344421- 40.57421- 11.7640- 8.33421- 4.35000- 3.44421- 4.35000- 3.44421- 4.35000- 3.44421- 4.3574- 3.57600- 3.57600- 3.57600- 3.57600- 3.57600- 3.5774-	41 - 817143
B8 R07 LL None 87 KS2 KL 10000- None 86 R61 LL 37.85000- None 81 R52 LL 37.85000- None 100 K53 LL 10.33000- None 101 K54 LL 12.33000- None		w 2 - Column q . Column	MNS . ST . ST			LOWER LIM (* 		# 48 4 28- GC 184 38- GC 184 38- 16 184 38- 16 184 38- 16 1900- 8 2 884 28- 4 2 884 28- 4 2 884 28- 4 3 80 48- 3 8 4 28- 4 3 80 48- 3 8 4 28- 4 3 8 4 28- 3 8 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	
86 R61 LL - 37.85000- NORE 62 90000- 88 R62 LL - 37.85000- NORE 25.87426- 100 R63 LL - 20.33000- NORE 24.84236-		w 2 - Column q .Column x 11 7 x12 4 x13 7 x12 8 x14 9 x14 1 x16 1 x16 1 x16 1 x16 1 x16 1 x26 1 x21 6 x23 6 x23 6 x23 7 x27 7 x27 7 x23 6 x33 7 x33 8 x34 8 x34 8 x43 8 x43 8 x43 8 x43 8 x44 8 x44 8 x54 8 x54 8 x54	MNS . AT . AT					# 48 8 28- 60 18 8 38- 10 18 4 19 10 18 4 28- 10 18 4 28-	
		w 2 - Column q . Column v 11 7 x12 6 x13 7 x12 8 x14 1 x16 1 x16 1 x16 1 x16 1 x17 4 x17 6 x22 6 x23 6 x24 10 x24 11 x24 12 x27 13 x24 14 x37 15 x37 16 x37 17 x34 18 x31 19 x34 10 x37 12 x37 13 x43 14 x43 15 x43 16 x43 17 x54 18 x47						# 484 38- 60 184 38- 36 18900- 82 18900- 82 18640- 30 1842- 4 18000- 30 141- 30 1421- 30	
		x 2 - Column x -						# 484 38- 60 184 38- 60 184 38- 34 38000- 82 38000- 3 38000- 3 38000- 3 384 38- 4 38000- 3 34 431- 4 32000- 3 4 320- 3 4 5874- 7 35874- 7	



I

i

ł

÷

---..... ····· -----Π -----ACT 1 + 1 T + INFUT COLT. LOWER LINIT UPPER LINIT NFUT COLT 12 73400-14 3840-72 34840-16 91400-16 61400-16 6400-16 7400-13 3100-33 31000-33 33000-33 3000-30 300 .REBUCED COST
 BUCED
 CHI

 121
 72000

 110
 21000

 72
 38000

 40
 61000

 100
 70000

 101
 313

 100
 70000

 103
 32000

 33
 33000

 33
 33000

 33
 33000 187 183 184 185 187 273 178 178 178 133 544 588 588 207 208 201 210 211 213 214 214 214 214 214 214 214 214 214 224 . . e ł C26 EXECUTOR. P\$1360 AT-HIO PACE . 15 ----17141 ----- 3MI 0.02 ITERATION NUMBER -... SNYERT CALLED TIME 0 07 BASIS ---- NO,OF ADWS ... 55 INVERSE -- NUCLEUS 0