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#### Abstract

A computerived model of the transportation system for shipment of nuclear fuel cycle materials is required to investigate the effects on fleet size, fleet composition and efficiency of fleet utilization resulting from changes in a variety of physical and regulatory factors, including shipping requirements, security regulations, work rules, maintenance requirements, and vehicle capacities. Such a model has been developed which provides a capability for complete sizing requirements studies of a combined aircraft and truck fleet. This report presents the results of a series of sensitivity studies performed using this model. These studies include the effects of the intinerary optimization criteria, work rules, and maintenance policies. These results demonstrate the effectiveness and versatility of the model for investigating the effects of a wide variety of physical and regulatory factors on the transportation fleet.


A vital part of the system for safeguarding special nuclear material used in the nuclear fuel cycle is the system used to transport this material. This transportation system is affected by a variety of factors including the amount of material to be shipped, the carrying capacities of the transport vehicles, security regulations, personnel work rules, and vehicle maintenance policies. In order to analyze the effects of these and other factors on the size, composition and efficiency of the transportation system, a realistic computerized model of the system is required. This model must include all the major features of this transportation network, including the shipment schedule for the nuclear material, different transportation modes (e. g., trucks and aircraft), requirements for security escort vehicles, different maintenance requirements for trucks and escort vehicles, personnel assignment policies, and provisions for convoying trucks and escort vehicles.

Reference 1 outlines an overall plan for the development of this model. This development plan provides for a sequence of ver sions as described in Table 1.1. Each version is itself useful for a rational set of analyses. Furthermore, proceeding from one version to the next involves only refinements and/or additional modules rather than wholesale changes to previously developed code.

TRNSM 1 provides for complete sizing of all types of transport unit elements ${ }^{*}$ for a single mode (trucking), using a fixed-fleet

The types of transport unit elements considered in this document include truck trailers, truck tractors, escort vehicles, aircraft, and crews to man these vehicles.

Table 1.1 Sequential Model Development

| COMPONENT <br> FEATURES | TRNSM 1 | TRNSM 2 | TRNSM 3 | TRNSM 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Modes | One | Two | Several | Several |
| Transport Unit Elem. nts | Several | Several | Several | Several |
| Convoying | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Maintenance Policies | Nearest Base | Nearest Base | Home Base and <br> Nearest Base | Home Base and Nearest Base |
| Sizing <br> Options | Fixed-Fleet Only | Fixed-Fleet and <br> Non-Fixed Fleet | Fixed-Fleet and Non-Fixed-Fleet | Fixed-Fleet and Non-Fixed-Fleet |
| Special <br> Input/Output Options | None | None | None | Automated <br> Sensitivity <br> Analysis |

[^0]$-1$
oriented approach in which it is necessary to iterate on the fleet size to find the required number of each type of transport unit element.

TRNSM 2 incorporates a non-fixed-fleet approach to sizing in which no iterations on fleet size are reçuired. The capability for considering an aircraft mode in addition to the trucking mode is included.

TRNSM 3 will extend the model to handle several modes (i.e., rail and water in addition to trucks and aircraft), convoying, and a home base maintenance policy.

TRNSM 4 will extend input and output options to simplify sensitivity analyses, i.e., provide for a succession of model runs and subsequent graphical displays.

Technical details of the TRNSM 2 model are presented in Reference 2. Other documents concerned with this model are the Programmer's Guide [3] a.ad the User's Manual [4]. This report documents the results of sensitivity studies that have been made with the TRNSM 2 model. These studies demonstrate the effectiveness and versatility of the model for investigating the effects of a variety of physical and regulatory factors on the required fleet size, fleet composition and efficiency with which the transportation fleet is utilized.

Section 2 of this report presents a brief description of this TRNSM 2 model and summarizes its capabilities. Reference 2 contains a complete discussion of technical details on the algorithms used in this computerized model. The results of the sensitivity studies are then presented and discussed in Section 3. Appendix A summarizes the symbols which specify the base locations in the two sample shipment schedules used in the sensitivity studies. The sample schedules themselves are given in Appendices B and C.

This section presents a general description of the TRNSM 2 model and a summary of its capabilities. The TRNSM 1 model is not discussed separately since all of its capabilities are included in TRNSM 2. The reader should consult Reference 2 for the complete technical details of this model.

### 2.1 General Description

A simplified flow diagram for the model of the transportation system is shown in Figure 2.1. The input which drives the model is the shipment schedule for the nuclear fuel cycle materials. Each individual shipment is specified by its origin base, destination base, earliest departure time, latest arrival time, material type, quantity of material, and any prespecified trans $\Gamma$ station requirements for that shipment (e.g., must be shipped in a specified truck-trailer type). There are two options available in TRNSM 2 for the generation of itineraries: fixed-fleet and non-fixed-fleet. The TRNSM 1 model used only the fixed-fleet approach in which the fleet size for a given transport unit element type is varied until the minimum fleet size is found which satisfies the service requirements. In order to provide a set of representative initial conditions, the shipment schedule is expanded to include a "warm-up" period at the beginning to establish these initial conditions. The non-fixed-fleet itinerary construction process, which is included in TRNSM 2, requires neither a warm-up period nor a search process on the fleet size. The resulting computer run times are about one-third those obtained with the fixedfleet approach. For this reason, the preferred option is the non-fixedfleet approach.

(Fleet size, itineraries, itinerary statistics, transport unit elements assigned to specific shipments)

Figure 2.1. Simplified flow diagram for TRNSM 2.

The augmented shipment schedule is partitioned by mode, i. e., each shipment is assigned to either the truck mode or aircraft mode. Then the schedule is further partitioned by aircraft type for the aircraft mode and by trailer type for the truck mode.

The partitioned shipment schedule is combined with work rules (e.g., no working at bases on weekends) to generate the service requirements for aircraft and truck trailers. One set of service requirements is generated for each aircraft and truck trailer type, e. g., if three trailer types are being considered, three separate sets of service requirements are generated.

The itineraries for the desired types of transport unit elements are then generated. The basic process used in itinerary cons truction is to first check to find all possible pairs of services which can be sequentially handled by one transport unit element (e.g., one truck). Temporal and maintenance feasibility tests are employed to find these candidate linkings which are then ranked according to an optimization criterion alled the linking value function. This quantity is a linear combination of (1) added deadhead time in the linking, (2) added idle time in the linking, (3) loss of flexibility in the composite service compared to the flexibility in the two liniked services, and (4) the lengths of the two services being linked. This linking value function is discussed in more detail in Section 2.2.4. The linking with the smallest linking value is then selected. This pair of linked services is now viewed as one composite service which is added to the list of required services while the two original services are deleted. This process is repeated until no further linkings are feasible.

In the fixed fleet option, the generation of these itineraries requires that iterations be performed on the fleet size until the minimum number is found which satisfies the service requirements. An
efficient search technique [2] has been developed to speed this process of finding the minimum fleet size. In the non-fixed-fleet option, the fleet size is autoratically determined by a self-linking process in which the required services toward the end of the planning horizon are linked to services at the beginning of the planning interval. This results in a set of closed chains of linked services which specifies the fleet size and the itineraries.

The process for the sequential generation of itineraries for the types of transport unit elements under consideration is illustrated by the example shown in Figure 2.2. Note that the itineraries for the aircraft are generated first. These aircraft itineraries then impose additional service requirements on the truck trailers because of the need to transport the shipments between the bases and airfields. Next the truck trailer itineraries are generated. The aircraft itineraries also levy requirements for the assignment of aircraft crews, while the truck trailer itineraries levy requirements on several lower level transport unit elements. For example, on both active and deadhead itinerary legs, each trailer must be pulled by a truck tractor. In addition, on active trailer itinerary legs, escort vehicles must be assigned. The service requirements imposed by the aircraft and trailer itineraries on lower level transport unit elements are extracted and the itineraries for these transport unit elements are generated. These new itineraries, in turn, levy service requirements on other lower level transport unit elements, e.g., crews. This process of sequentially generating itineraries and extracting services continues until the itineraries for all the desired transport unit element types have been considered. It is important to emphasize that the user of the model specifies what types of transport unit elements are to be considered and in what order the resulting itineraries are to be generated.

## EXAMPLE OF SERUENTIAL GENERATION OF ITINERARIES



Figure 2.2 Example of sequential generation of itineraries and required services.

Outputs provided by the model are the required number of each transport unit element type, detailed itineraries for each transport unit element, statistics on the itineraries (e.g., percent of total distance travelled in active service), and the assignments of specific transport unit elemeats to each shipment.

### 2.2 Capabilities of the TRNSM 2 Model

In this section, the general capabilities of the TRNSM 2 model are discussed.

### 2.2.1 Types of Transport Unit Elements

The TRNSM 2 model is designed to provide an effective sizing capability for combined aircraft and truck fleets to be used to transport material for the nuclear fuel cycle. Up to nine types of transport unit elements can be designated for each of the two available modes. For the truck mode, three of these designations are reserved for types of truck trailers, while the remainder can be used to designate specific types of truck tractors, escort vehicles and crews. Similarly, for the aircraft mode, three of the nine transport unit element designations are used for specific aircraft types. Table 2. 1 summarizes the numerical designations currently assigned to the various types of transport unit elements.

As was discussed in Section 2.1, the user of TRNSM 2 specifies the order in which the different types of transport unit elements are to be considered. For example, a sequence might be aircraft type 1 (21), truck trailer type 1 (11), truck trailer type 2 (12), truck tractors (15), escort vehicles (16), and truck/escort crews (17). It is also possible to require that two or more types of transport unit elements (e.g., truck trailers and tractors) alwasys remain together as a unit. This is accomplished by specifying for the combined unit

Table 2.1 Numerical designations of transport unit elements.

| NUMBER | TRANSPORT UNIT ELEMENT |
| :---: | :---: |
| 11 | Truck Trailer Type 1 |
| 12 | Truck Trailer Type 2 |
| 13 | Truck Trailer Type 3 |
| 14 | (Unassigned) |
| 15 | Truck Tractors |
| 16 | Escurt Vehicles |
| 17 | Truck/Escort Vehicle Crews |
| 18 | (Unassigned) |
| 19 | (Unassigned) |
| 21 | Aircraft Type 1 |
| 22 | Aircraft Type 2 |
| 23 | Aircraft Type 3 |
| 24 | (Undesignated) |
| 25 | (Undesignated) |
| 26 | (Undesignated) |
| 27 | Aircraft Crews |
| 28 | Aircraft Guards |
| 29 | (Undesignated) |

the mi ngent maintenance requirements from those of the individual units. . nple, consider the case in which truck tractors and trailers are reguired to remain together as a combined unit. Assume that an individual trailer requires a 4 day maintenance stop before $40,232 \mathrm{~km}(25,000 \mathrm{mi}$.) has been traveled since the last maintenance, whereas an individual tractor requires a 2 day maintenance stop before $12,824 \mathrm{~km}(8,000 \mathrm{mi}$.) has been traveled without maintenance. Thus, the combined trailer/tractor combination requires a 4 day maintenance stop (the trailer requirement) before $12,874 \mathrm{~km}$ has been exceeded (the tractor requirement).

### 2.2.2 Maintenance Procedures

This section summarizes the maintenance procedures and options which are included in the model for both vehicles, including air craft, and personnel.

### 2.2.2.1 Vehicle Maintenance Procedures

Vehicles require maintenance when either a specific time period has elapsed or the vehicle has traveled a specific distance since the last maintenance. The TRNSM 2 model allows both these time and distance maintenance criteria to be specified. The vehicle must return to a base for maintenance before either of these limits is exceeded.

TRNSM 2 provides for a nearest-base maintenance policy, i.e., each vehicle proceeds to the nearest maintenance base when maintenance is required. There are a number of difficulties in providing for a home-base maintenance policy in which each vehicle must return to its home base for maintenance. Because of these difficulties, which are discussed in Reference 2, an option for specifying a home-base
maintenance policy is not included in TRNSM 2, but will be included in a later version of the model.

### 2.2.2.2 Personnel Maintenance Policies

Generally, there is an upper limit on the maximum amount of time that drivers, guards and aircraft crews can spend on duty without a rest break at home base. Thus the criterion on which crew rest breaks are determined in the TRNSM 2 model is the total time without such a break, which cannot exceed a specified amount.

It is mandatory that personnel be returned to their home bases for these rest breaks so that a home-base maintenance policy is required for the crews and guards. If there is only a single crew home base, no difficulties arise. With multiple home bases, however, many of the same difficulties arise as occur with a home-base maintenance policy for vehicles. In TRNSM 2, a home-base policy for crews is approximated by a nearest-base maintenance policy. This approximation seems reasonable because the time required for a crew to travel to and from the nearest crew home base should be representative of the time it takes to travel to and from the actual home base, possibly via conmercial airline. The implications of a home-base maintenance policy are discussed in more detail in Reference 2.

### 2.2.3 Work Rules

Work rules for personnel located at bases and travelin; on the road can affect the fleet size and the resultant itineraries, as is shown in the sensitivity studies discussed in Section 3, 4.

Specific quantities that can be designated by the user of the TRNSM 2 computer model are the length of the working day in hours at bases and on the road.

The user is also able to specify whether or not loading and unloading trailers and aircraft is permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. Similar restrictions can be imposed for traveling with a load on weckends and holidays. However, the model presently has no provision to prohibit an empty trailer or aircraft from traveling on weekends and holidays.

### 2.2.4 Itinerary Optimization Criteria

Itineraries are generated by linking together services to form composite services which are thennselves then used in the linking process. At each step, the feasible linkings are ranked in a candidate linking list according to an optimization criterion which is called a "linking value function." The linking with the best linking value is selected, saved to be used as part of an itinerary, and then deleted from the candidate linking list.

The linking value function is a linear combination of:
(1) added idle time in the linking
(2) added deadhead time in the linking
(3) loss of flexibility in the composite service compared to the flexibility in the two linked services
(4) length (in time) of the first service to be linked
(5) length (in time) of the second service to be linked.

The first two criteria penalize added deadhead and idle time, both of which are undesirable from the viewpoint of efficient fleet utilization. The loss of flexibility penalty term is also very important in the generation of efficient itir. aries. By retaining as much flexibility as possible in the composite services as the linking process proceeds, more feasible linkings are available for consideration
toward the end of the linking process. This wider choice of feasibie linkings potentially allows further redu tion of idle and deadhead time, resulting in a more efficient set of itinerries. The importance of this penalty term on loss of flexibility is illustrated by the examples discussed in Section 3.1. The last two terms in the linking va.ue function which penalize the length of the two individual services in the candidate linking are included to force balanced itineraries to be generated.

The user of the TRNSM 2 model is able to control the itinerary generation process by specifying the weightings to be placed on each of these penalty factors in the linking value function. The effects on the fleet size and resulting itineraries due to changes in these weightings are discussed in detail in Section 3.1.

### 2.2.5 Fleet Sizing Capabilities

The TRNSM 2 model is basically designed as a tool to study the fleet size required to handle shipments of the nuciear fuel cycle materials. The driving input which probably has the greatest effect on the fleet size is the shipment schedule. Within the shipment schedule itself, the flexibility in possible shipping dates has a major impact on the fleet size. The fleet size is also affected by the maintenance procedures, the work rules, and the linking value function, all of which are controlled by the user.

When the fixed-fleet option for fleet sizing is selected, the initial conditions for the transport unit elements must be specified. To reduce the effect of arbitrary selection of initial conditions on fleet size, provision is made for a warm-up period to be attached to the beginning of the schedule to establish reasonable initial conditions. The shipments in this warm-up period are ob:ained by taking all the shipments in a specified interval of the original schedule. The length
of the warm-up period and the portion of the original schedule from which the warm-up shipments are extracted are under the control of the user. At the start of the warm-up period, the transport unit elements are randomly distributed among the maintenance bases with random amounts of accumulated use, i. e., distance traveled and time since last maintenance. The randomization of the initial values of the accumulative use variables is provided to avoid the situation in which all the individual transport unit elements require maintenance at about the same time. This, in turn, allows a shorter warm-up period to be used to generate representative initial conditions. Transport unit element usage statistics are not collected during the warmup period, but only for the actual shipment schedule. This warm-up period is not required when the non-fixed fleet sizing option is selected.

The user is also able to specify the desired planning horizon. This option could be used when it is not necessary to use the complete shipment schedule for sizing studies. Specification of a planning horizon causes the model to ignore those shipments with earliest shipping dates after the planning horizon date.

## EXANIPLE SENSITIVITY STUDIES

This section presents the resulis of a number of example sensitivity studies to demonstrate the effectiveness and versatility of the TRNSM 2 model. These studies, which are based on sample shipment schedules, examine the effects on fleet size and the characteristics of the resulting itineraries due to variations in the linking value penalties, the planning horizon, maintenance rules, vehicle speed, ioading/unloading time, vehicle capacity, warm-up time in the fixedfleet sizing mode, escort assignment rules, and rules for assignment of shipments to the aircraft mode. In addition, an example of sequentially scheduling all transport unit elements is presented.

In examining the results of these sensitivity studies, it should be remembered that the TRNSM 2 model does not minimize the fleet size. Because of the extremely high dimensionality of the problem, such a fleet size minimization routine based on optimization techniques is computationally not feasible. Instead the TRNSM 2 model attemp's to compute the smallest adequate fleet size by choosing the best possible service linkings as measured by the linking value function. Experience has shown that there is a relatively large range of linking value penalties which results in efficient itineraries with either a minimum fleet size or one very close to minimum. Although it is not possible to definitely establish whether or not the minimum fleet size has been achieved, examination of the detailed itineraries often provides an indication of how close the fleet size is to the minimum.

Two sample shipment schedules are used in these studies. Schedule 1 is a relatively small schedule consisti.g of 152 shipments with starting dates distributed over a period of 90 days. Schedule 2 consists of 682 shipments with starting dates distributed
over a period of 180 days. However, to conselve computer resources, most of the studies with this larger sciedule were accomplished using a reduced planning horizon of 90 days. These sample shipment schedules are presented in Appendices B and C.

Since there are a large number of parameters used in the TRNSM 2 model, a set of baseline parameters were selected to be used in these studies. The sensitivity studies were carried out by varying one or two of these parameters at a time. These baseline parameters are summarized in Table 3.1. The linking value penalties of idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 were selected because previous experience in developing the model demonstrated that this choice tends to produce a set of efficient itineraries with a fleet size at or close to minimum.

Most of the sensitivity studies discussed below use the nonfixed fleet sizing mode and are based on trailers and tractors traveling together as a single unit. Such trailer/tractor combinations are assumed to require a four day maintenance stop before 12,874 km has beai traveled since the previous maintenance stop. Figures 3.1 and 3. ? depict these baseline trailer/tractor itineraries and the resu.'ing itinerary statistics for schedules 1 and 2 , respectively. In these a.a subsequent figures which show itineraries, the various types of services are depicted as follows:
> $M$ = Maintenance stop

$($ BLANK $)=$ Idle
Often part of one active, deadhead or maintenance leg appears at the end of one itinerary with the other part at the start of the next itinerary. In this case the data on this leg is included only in the statistics for the earlier itinerary.

## Table 3.1

Baseline parameters for sensitivity studies (used for both Schedules 1 and 2)

Sizing mode - non fixed fleet
Planning horizon - 90 days
Road distance $=1.1 \times$ great circle disiance
Length of duty day (at base and on the road) - 24 hours
Weekend/holiday loading/unloading restrictions - none
Weekend/holiday travel restrictions - none
Average truck velocity - 55 kph
Truck loading time - 2 hours
Truck unloading time - 2 hours
Truck trailer capacities
Fue: type 1-12 containers
Fuel type 2-7 containers
Fuel type 3-16 containers
Truck maintenance policy - nearest maintenance base
Truck maintenance base location - Youngsville (HNC)
Mavimum time between maintenance
Trailers 180 days, tractors 180 days
Trailers/tractors together 180 days
Maximum distance between maintenance
Trailers $40,232 \mathrm{k}^{\star} \mathrm{A}(25,000 \mathrm{mi}$ ) , Tractors $12,874 \mathrm{~km}(8,000 \mathrm{mi}$ )
Trailers/tractors together $12,874 \mathrm{~km}(8,000 \mathrm{mi})$
Length of maintenance stop
Trailer 4 days, tractors 2 days
Trailers /tractors together 4 days
Linking value penalties: : dle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , total time 0 .

|  | W ${ }^{10}$ | 20 |  | $30 \quad 40$ | 50.50 | -420 | 50 | -W- ${ }^{80}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| * | - | - | M | -W- | - | W |  |  |
| , | $M$ |  | Activ |  |  | $\mathcal{W V}=M$ | $\qquad$ <br> intenance Stop | -W |
|  | truck | км | км | км | days in | days | percent p | percent |
|  | number | total | active | deadhead | maint. | tDLE | кmactive d | days idle |
|  | 1 | ${ }^{33,468}$ | 13,411 | 20,057 | 16 | ${ }^{43}$ | 40.1 | 47.8 |
|  | 2 | 41,550 | 13,710 | 27,840 | - $16^{16}$ | 31 | 33.0 | 34.4 |
|  | 3 | 41,832 | 17, 127 | 24, 705 | 16 | 33 | 40.9 | 36.7 |
|  | total | [16,851 | 44.249 | 72.602 | 48 | 108 | - | - |
|  | ave. | 38.250 | 14.749 | 24,201 | 16 | 36 | 37.2 | 40 |

Figure 3.1. Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries for baseline parameters. Linking value penalties: idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0,1 and total time 0 .

An important measure of efficiency of a set of itineraries is the percent of total distance traveled on active service, i.e., when the trailer/tractor is loaded. For Schedule 1 , the small schedule, 37.9 percent of the total distance traveled is on active service, whereas with the larger schedule $2,63.6$ percent of this total distance is on active service. This dramatic difference is caused by the greater average density of 3.50 shipments per day during the first 90 days for schedule 2 , as compared to 1.69 shipments per day for schedule 1 . The greater density of shipments allows a larger choice of possible service linkings which, in turn, allows selection of those with relatively little deadhead travel required. In general, it can be expected that this percentage of total distance traveled on active service will increase $s$ the average shipment density increases.

| DAYS | 0 | 20 | 40 | 60 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## NUMBER




Figure 3.2 Schedule 2 trailer-tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0.

## 3. 1 Effects of Linking Value Penalties

Since the linking value penalties are critical to the generation of good itineraries, an extensive number of runs were maia to investigate the effects of variations in the linking value penalties. We first discuss the effects of the linking value penalties on trailer/ tractor itine raries for both schedules 1 and 2 . Then we briefly investigate the effects of linking value penalties for tractor itineraries when trailers and tractors are sequentially scheduled.

### 3.1.1 Trailer/Tractor Itineraries

Table 3.2 summarizes the effects on fleet size and itinerary statistics for schedule 1 due to variations in the linking value penalties. The individual itineraries and their statistics are given in Figures 3.1 and 3.3 through 3.13.

Note that a fleet size of 3 is obtained in all but four situations: 1) when the flexibility loss penalty is small, but non-zero, relative to the idle and deadhead penalties, and the deadhead penalty is considerably larger than the idle; 2) when the flexibility loss penalty is about equal to the idle and deadhead penalties; 3) when there is no flexibility loss penalty; and 4) when a penalty for total time is included. The percent of total distance traveled on active service generally tends to increase as the deadhead penalty is increased relative to the idle penalty, as should be expected. An increase in the flexibility loss penalty tends to increase the deadhead distance traveled since now the linkings are chosen with more emphasis on flexibility loss. This, in turn, decreases the percent of total distance traveled on active service.

An important observation from these results is that the itineraries are relatively insensitive to rather large changes in the

Table 3.2 Results of sensitivity study on linking value penalties for Schedule 1, trailers/tractors together.

| $\begin{gathered} \text { IDLE } \\ \text { MENALIY } \end{gathered}$ | DEADHEAD PLNALIY | FIEX LOSS 'とNALIY | $\begin{gathered} \text { TIME } \\ \text { NENALTY } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FTEE:T } \\ & \text { SILK. } \end{aligned}$ | total. <br> KM | PW:HGENT KM ACTIVE | PEHCFTAT <br> DAYS IDLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 1 | U. 1 | 0 | 3 | 116,85 \| | 37.9 | 40, i |
| 5 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 3 | 116, 851 | 37.9 | 40. 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 3 | 116.851 | 37.9 | 40. 1 |
| 1 | 1 | Q. 1 | 0 | 3 | 114,965 | 38.5 | 42. 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 3 | 110.688 | 40.0 | 44.8 |
| 1 | 10 | 0.1 | 0 | 4 | 105, 310 | 42.0 | 59.7 |
| 2 | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 3 | 110, 388 | 40.0 | 44. 8 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 154.920 | 28.6 | 23.5 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 155,474 | 28. 5 | 23. 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 155, 125 | 28.5 | 42.5 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 143,503 | 30.8 | 31.1 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 114, 100 | 38. 8 | 55.6 |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 111, 703 | 39.6 | 57.2 |
| 10 | 1 | 0.1 | 10 | 4 | 143, 963 | 30.7 | 44.9 |



Figure 3. 3 Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 10 , flexibility loss 1 , and total time 0 ; and idle 1 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 and total time 0 .


Figure 3.4 Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 1 , deadhead 2 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .


Figure 3.5 Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 1 , deadhead 10 , flexibility loss 0.1 and total time 0 .


Figure 3.6 Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 2 , deadhead 2 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SA:S } \\ & \text { YR: CK } \end{aligned}$ | 010 | 20 | 3 | 40 | 50 |  | 080 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NE:3ER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $:$ | MW |  |  |  |  | - |  | WW | COM |
| : | $M$ | $M$ | $M$ |  |  | $W$ |  | $1$ |  |
| 1 | $V-M W$ |  | $1$ |  | W | - | M | Wh |  |
|  | TRUCK | KM | KM | KM | DAYS : | DAYS | PERCENT | PERCENT |  |
|  | NUMBER | TOTAL | ACTIVE | DEADHEAD | MAISI. | IDLE | KM ACTIVE | DAYS IDLE |  |
|  | 1 | 36,642 | 11.235 | 25,407 | 16 | 43 | 30.7 | 47. 8 |  |
|  | 2 | 55,430 | 14,773 | 40,657 | 24 | 12 | 26.7 | 13.4 |  |
|  | 1 | 62,348 | 18.240 | 44,608 | 24 | 3 | 29.0 | 8.9 |  |
|  | TOTAL | 154,920 | 44,249 | $110.67 ?$ | 64 | 63 | - | - |  |
|  | AVE. | 51.640 | 14,750 | 36.891 | 21 | 21 | 28.6 | 23.5 |  |

Figure 3. 7. Schedule 1 trailer/tractoritineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 1 and total time 0 .


Figure 3.8. Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 2 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 1 and total time 0.


Figure 3.9. Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 1 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 1 , and total time 0 .

| DAYS | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | So | 60 | 70 | 80 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



Figure 3.10. Schedule 1 traller/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 1 , deadhead 2 , flexibility loss 1 , and total time 0.


Figure 3.11. Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 1 , deadlead 2 , flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .


Figure 3.12. Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 2 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .


Figure 3.13. Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 and total time 0.
idle linking value penalty. For example, with a deadhead penalty of 1 and a flexibility loss penalty of 0.1 identical itineraries are generated with idle penalties of 10,5 and 2 . The reason for this is that, due to the large amount of flexibility in the shipment schedule, there are a large number of possible linkings with zero idle time. These linkings, which are generally the first to be selected, are independent of the idle penalty. There is, however, greater sensitivity to changes in the deadhead and flexibility loss penalties.

Table 3.3 summarizes the statistics of the study of the effect of the linking value penalties on the itineraries for schedule 2 . The detailed itineraries and their statistics are given by Figures 3.2 and 3. 14 through 3.24 . The results are very similar to those obtained with schedule 1. A fleet size of 12 is generally obtained (13 in one case) for a flexibility loss penalty of 0.1 as long as the deadhead penalty does not exceed 5 with the idle penalty set at 1 .

### 3.1.2 Tractor Itineraries to Cover Trailer Service Requirements

When trailer itineraries are generated to cover the shipping service requirements, these itineraries levy service requirements for truck tractors to pull the trailers. In the resulting trailer service requirements for tractors there is no flexibility since all the original flexibility in the shipment schedule was used in the generation of the trailer itineraries. In the development of the model, preliminary runs indicated that in this situation a tractor tends to be assigned to one trailer itinerary until either the tractor or the trailer goes to maintenance. This assignment of tractors to cover trailer itineraries is relatively insensitive to the linking value penalties on idle and deadhead time.

Table 3. 3. Results of sensitivity study on linking value penalties for Schedule 2, trailers/tractors together, 90 days planning horizon.

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { IDLE } \\ \text { PENALTY } \end{gathered}$ | DEADHEAD PENALTY | FLEX LOSS PENALTY | TIME <br> PENALTY | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FLEET } \\ & \text { SIZE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { KM } \end{aligned}$ | PERCENT KM ACTIVE | PERCENT DAYS IDLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 12 | 733,416 | 62.8 | 20.0 |
|  | 10 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 12 | 702, 198 | 65.6 | 23.7 |
|  | 5 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 12 | 725,698 | 63.5 | 21.3 |
| $\omega$ | 2 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 13 | 710,804 | 64.8 | 28.6 |
| $\bigcirc$ | 1 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 12 | 742,962 | 62.0 | 19.3 |
|  | 1 | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 12 | 698,399 | 66.0 | 23.9 |
|  | 1 | 5 | 0.1 | 0 | 16 | 667,342 | 69.1 | 45.7 |
|  | 1 | 10 | 0.1 | 0 | 15 | 651,954 | 70.7 | 43.2 |
|  | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 820,746 | 56.1 | 16.4 |
|  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 711,479 | 64.8 | 36.9 |
|  | 10 | 1 | 0.1 | 10 | 16 | 883, 816 | 52.1 | 25.? |
| - -1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 700,616 | 65.8 | 28.3 |
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Figure 3.14. Schedule 2 trailer/tractoritineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 20, deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .
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Figure 3.15. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 5 , deadhead 1 , flexibil loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .
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Figure 3.16. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 2 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .
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| TRUCK | KM | KM | KM | DAYS IN | DAYS | PERCENT | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER | TOTAL | ACTIVE | DEADHEAD | PAINT. | IDLE | KM ACTIVE | DAYS IDLE |

Figure 3.17. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 1 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0.
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Figure 3.18. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries wifi linking value penalty coefficients idle 1 , deadhead 2 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .
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Figure 3.19. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 1 , deadhead 5 , flexibility loss 0.1 and total time 0 .
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Figure 3.20. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 1 , deadhead 10 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .
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Figure 3.21 Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 1 and total time 0.

DAYS
TRUCK
NUMBER

TRUCK KM KM KM DAYS IN DAYS PERCENT PERCE:T NUMBER TOTAL ACTIVE DEADHEAD MAINS. IDLE KM ACTIVE DAYS:ZLE

| 1 | 55,102 | 37,442 | 17,660 | 16 | 29 | 68.0 | 32.2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 71,362 | 39,873 | 31,489 | 28 | 2 | 55.9 | 2.2 |
| 3 | 23,994 | 19,821 | 4,173 | 8 | 61 | 82.6 | 67.6 |
| 4 | 53,049 | 33,640 | 19,409 | 20 | 29 | 63.4 | 32.2 |
| 5 | 23,229 | 16,948 | 6,281 | 8 | 60 | 73.0 | 66.7 |
| 6 | 48,210 | 30,171 | 18,039 | 20 | 32 | 62.6 | 35.6 |
| 7 | 43,442 | 33,317 | 10,125 | 16 | 42 | 76.7 | 46.7 |
| 8 | 69,886 | 45,695 | 24,191 | 24 | 5 | 65.4 | 5.6 |
| 9 | 43,879 | 23,227 | 20,652 | 16 | 35 | 52.9 | 38.9 |
| 10 | 54,326 | 38,772 | 15,554 | 16 | 29 | 71.4 | 32.2 |
| 11 | 42,899 | 24,483 | 18,416 | 16 | 38 | 57.1 | 42.2 |
| 12 | 44,846 | 28,252 | 16,594 | 20 | 33 | 63.01 | 36.7 |
| 13 | 55,730 | 38,653 | 17,077 | 16 | 28 | 69.4 | 31.1 |
| 14 | 31,389 | 20,625 | 10,764 | 12 | 49 | 65.7 | 54.2 |
| 15 | 50,130 | 29,844 | 20,286 | 24 | 25 | 59.4 | 27.9 |
| TOTAL | 711,479 | 460,767 | 250,712 | 260 | 499 | - | 3 |

Figure 3.22. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 2 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .
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Figure 3.23. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 1 , deadhead 2 , flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .
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Figure 3.24. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 10 .

In order to investigate the sensitivity of the tractor itineraries to the linking value penalties, tractor itineraries for schedule 2 were generated to cover trailer service requirements for two choices of linking value penalties on the tractors. Figure 3.25 shows the trailer itineraries and their statistics. In generating these trailer itineraries, a tv.o day maintenance stop was required before $40,232 \mathrm{~km}$ were traveled. The linking value pe:alties used for these trailer itineraries are idle 10, deadhead 1, flexibility loss 0.1 , and time 0 . Note that due to the less stringent maintenance requirements, the fleet size is reduced to 8 compared to 12 for the traileri'iractor itineraries discussed in Section 3.1.1.

For the tractors, a two day maintenanse stop is required before $12,874 \mathrm{~km}$ is traveled since the previous maintenace stop. The flexibility loss and total time penalties were set to zero. The following two combinations of idle and deadhead penalties were investigated: 1) idle 2 and deadhead 1 , and 2) idle 1 and deadhead 2. These tractor itineraries are shown in Figures 3.26 and 3.27 for these two sets of linking value penalties while Table 3.4 summarizes the resulting statistics. In Figure 3.26, the specific trailer (from Figure 3.25) being pulled on each tractor leg is indicated. Note that, in general, during the course of the 90 day scheduline period, each tractor pulls many different trailers. These variations in linking value penalties have little effect on the tractor fleet size.

## 3.2

Effects of Length of Planning Horizon
Schedule number 2 was used to generate trailer/tractor itineraries for planning horizons of $80,90,130$ and 180 days. The

| DAYS | 0 | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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| TRAILER | KM | KM | KM | SAYS 4N | DAYS | PERCENT | PEPCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER | TOTAL | ACTIVE | DEADHEAD | MAINT. | IDLE | KM ACTIVE | DAYS IDLE |
| 1 | 34,929 | 64.313 | 20.616 | 4 | 12 | 75.7 | 13.9 |
| 2 | 99,174 | 64,819 | 34.355 | 6 | 0 | 65.4 | : |
| 3 | 99,536 | 59.701 | 39.835 | 8 | 1 | 60.0 | 1.1 |
| 4 | 79.163 | 53.618 | 25,545 | 4 | 21 | 57.7 | 22.3 |
| 5 | 84.391 | 54,421 | 29.970 | 6 | 12 | 64.5 | 12.3 |
| 6 | 70.759 | 39.817 | 30.942 | 4 | 28 | 56.3 | 31.3 |
| 7 | 94,717 | 67.893 | 26.17 | 6 | 3 | 71.7 | 2.3 |
| 8 | 79.234 | 56, 184 | 23.050 | 4 | 19 | 71.0 | 21.1 |
| TOTAL | 691,905 | 460.767 | 231.138 | 42 | 101 | -- | ** |
| $A v G$. | 86,488 | 57.596 | 28,892 | 5 | 13 | 66.6 | 14.1 |

Figure 3.25. Schedule 2 trailer itineraries with linking value penalty coefficients idle 10, deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .
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TRACTOR KM KM DAYSIN DAYS PERCE:NT PERCE::

NUMBER TOTAL ACTIVE DEADHEAD MAINT. IDLE KMACTIVE DAYSIE:E

| 1 | 12,794 | 8,294 | 4,500 | 2 | 77 | 64.8 | 85.6 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 65,980 | 58,089 | 7,891 | 10 | 28 | 88.0 | 31.1 |
| 3 | 74,935 | 59,017 | 15,918 | 12 | 15 | 78.8 | 16.7 |
| 4 | 72,289 | 57,851 | 14,438 | 16 | 14 | 80.0 | 15.6 |
| 5 | 82,930 | 77,551 | 5,379 | 12 | 8 | 93.5 | 8.9 |
| 6 | 58,004 | 44,255 | 13,749 | 12 | 34 | 76.3 | 37.8 |
| 7 | 50,112 | 35,438 | 14,674 | 8 | 40 | 70.7 | 44.4 |
| 8 | 59,284 | 49,412 | 9,872 | 10 | 32 | 83.3 | 35.6 |
| 9 | 67,385 | 60,944 | 6,440 | 12 | 21 | 90.4 | 23.3 |
| 10 | 58,252 | 49,894 | 11,358 | 12 | 28 | 85.7 | 31.1 |
| 11 | 51,616 | 36,008 | 15,608 | 8 | 42 | 69.8 | 46.7 |
| 12 | 73,613 | 61,963 | 11,650 | 14 | 15 | 84.2 | 16.7 |
| 13 | 56,920 | 47,482 | 9,438 | 10 | 35 | 83.4 | 38.9 |
| 14 | 60,065 | 48,706 | 11,359 | 12 | 27 | 81.0 | 30.0 |
| TOTAL | 844,182 | 691,905 | 152,277 | 150 | 418 | -9 | -9 |

Figure 3.26. Schedule 2 tractor itineraries scheduled to cover trailer itine raries shown in Figure 3.25 with linking value penalty coefficients idle 2, deadhead 1, flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .
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Figure 3.27. Schedule 2 tractor itineraries scheduled to cover trailer itineraries shown in Figure 3.25 with linking value penalty coefficients idle 1, deadhead 2, flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .

## Table 3. 4. Summary of tractor itinerary statistics when tractors are assigned to cover service requirements generated by trailer itineraries

| Idle Penalty | 2 | 1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Deadhead Penalty | 1 | 2 |
| Fleet Size | 14 | 15 |
| Total KM | 844,182 | 847,456 |
| KM Active * | 691,905 | 691,905 |
| KM Deadhead | 152,277 | 155,551 |
| Tractor Days Active | 577 | 577 |
| Tractor Days Deadhead | 115 | 118 |
| Tractor Days Idle | 418 | 507 |
| Tractor Days in | 150 | 148 |
| Maintenance |  | 81.6 |
| Percent KM Active * | 82.0 | 37.6 |
| Percent Tractor | 33.2 |  |

* Active service for a tractor is defined to be when the tractor is pulling a trailer regardless of whether or not the trailer is loaded.
individual itineraries and their statistics are depicted in Figures 3.2 and 3.28 through 3.30 . Table 3.5 compares the significant statistics obtained for these itineraries. Note that the total distance and time variables increase with an increase in the planning horizon, as expected. The most interesting atatistic in this table is the variation in the fleet size with changes in the planning horizon. For the 80 days planning horizon, the fleet size is 13 vehicles, for the 90 and 130 day horizons it is 12 , and for the full schedule it is 18 vehicles. The main reason for this variance is that the average density of scheduled shipments (in shipments per day) is not uniform over the entire 180 day schedule. For the first 80 days this density is 3.63 shipments per day. From day 80 through day 90 , there are only 25 shipments for a density of 2.5 reducing the shipment density to 3.50 for the first 90 days. There are 128 shipments between day 90 and day 130 for a shipment density 3.20 resulting in a density for the first 130 days of 3.40 . However, from day 130 through day 180 , there are 239 shipments for a density of 4.78 and an average density over the entire 180 days of 3.79 . This increased shipping density over the last 50 days caused the increase in fleet size to 18 for the 180 day planning horizon from the lower values of 12 and $13 \mathrm{ob}-$ tained with the smaller planning horizons.

This investigation shows that the fleet size is bascially controlled by the portion of the shipping schedule which has the highest shipping density. The length of the planning horizon has little effect on the resulting fleet size.

## 3. 3 Effects of Maintenance Parameters

The parameters which define the maintenance rules for the vehicles affect the fleet size and the characteristics of the itineraries. The specific parameters which are investigated in this section
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Figure 3.28. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries for 80 day planning horizon with linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .


| TRUCK | KM | KM | KM | DAYS IN | DAYS | PERCENT | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMEER | TOTAL | ACTIVE | DEADHEAD | MAINT. | IDLE | KM ACTIVE | DAYS IDLE |
| 1 | 48,199 | 29.237 | 18,962 | 16 | 74 | 60.7 | 56.9 |
| 2 | 77.217 | 47,163 | 30.054 | 28 | 39 | 61.1 | 30.0 |
| 3 | 78.797 | 49.532 | 29.265 | 28 | 37 | 62.9 | 28.5 |
| 4 | 114,872 | 71,485 | 43.387 | 36 | 1 | 62.2 | 0 |
| 5 | 91,509 | 56.202 | 35,307 | 32 | 23 | 61.4 | 17.7 |
| 6 | 100.015 | 64.708 | 35,307 | 32 | 14 | 64.7 | 10.8 |
| 7 | 40,321 | 23,816 | 16,505 | 20 | 75 | 59.1 | 57.7 |
| 8 | 88.405 | 59.040 | 29,365 | 28 | 30 | 65.7 | 23.1 |
| 9 | 58,084 | 32,713 | 25,371 | 24 | 58 | 56.3 | 44.6 |
| 10 | 100,272 | 63.039 | 37,233 | 36 | 10 | 62.9 | 7.7 |
| 11 | 109,348 | 66,893 | 42,455 | 36 | 3 | 61.2 | 2.3 |
| 12 | 107.723 | 75,462 | 32,261 | $\therefore 7$ | 0 | 70.1 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 1,014,763 | 639.291 | 375,473 | 35.6 | 361 | * | - |
| AVE. | 94,563 | 53.274 | 31,289 | 30 | 30 | 63.0 | 23.2 |

Figure 3.29. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries for 130 day planning horizor with linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1, flexibility loss 0.1 and total time 0 .
IKUCK
SUBER

| TR $\because C K$ | KM | KM | KM | DAYS IN | DAYS | PERCENT | PERCEN: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NL:SBER | TOTAL | ACtive | DEADHEAD | Maint. | IDLE | KM ACTIVE | DAYS IDLE |
| 1 | 8,799 | 3,769 | 5.030 | 4 | 169 | 42.8 | 93.9 |
| 2 | 17,598 | 7.537 | 10,061 | 8 | 158 | 42.8 | 87.3 |
| 3 | 25,377 | 14.806 | 10.571 | 8 | 152 | 58.3 | 84.4 |
| : | 139,724 | 78,327 | 61,400 | 52 | 15 | 56.1 | 8.3 |
| इ | 52,439 | 30,916 | 21.523 | 16 | 121 | 59.0 | 67.2 |
| 5 | 125,967 | 85,703 | 40,264 | 44 | 36 | 68.0 | 18.9 |
| 1 | 149,423 | 95.766 | 53,657 | 52 | 5 | 64.1 | 2.8 |
| $?$ | 43,462 | 22,453 | 21.009 | 20 | 124 | 51.7 | 68.9 |
| 7 | 16.019 | 9,735 | 6,284 | 4 | 165 | 60.8 | 91.7 |
| :7 | 126.214 | 79,184 | 47,030 | 48 | 23 | 62.7 | 15.6 |
| $1:$ | 150,793 | 105,152 | 45,641 | 52 | 0 | 69.7 | 0 |
| 12 | 34,529 | 18,184 | 16,345 | 12 | 138 | 52.7 | 76.7 |
| :3 | 150,856 | 96,329 | 54,527 | 48 | 7 | 63.9 | 3.9 |
| 1 | 133,083 | 86,164 | 46,919 | 48 | 24 | 64.7 | 13.3 |
| 15 | 89,891 | 52,420 | 37.471 | 32 | 71 | 58.3 | 39.4 |
| 15 | 92,973 | 54, 126 | 38.247 | 36 | 66 | 58.9 | 36.7 |
| 17 | 137,164 | 77.014 | 60,150 | 52 | 15 | 56.1 | 8.3 |
| 19 | 152,104 | 93,004 | 59,100 | 52 | 1 | 61.2 | 0.6 |
| rc:in | 1,646.419 | i.011,190 | 635.229 | 588 | 1.291 | * | * |
| z | 91.467 | 56.177 | 35.290 | 33 | 72 | 51.4 | 39. |

Figure 3. 30. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries for 180 day planning horizon with linking value penalty coetficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .

Table 3.5 Effects of planning horizon on trailer/tractor itineraries for Schedule 2. Linking value penalties: idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and time 0.

Planning Horizon

| (Days) | 80 | 90 | 130 | 180 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| No. of Shipments | 290 | 315 | 443 | 682 |
| Fleet Size | 13 | 12 | 12 | 18 |
| KM Total | 674,477 | 702,198 | $1,614,763$ | $1,646,419$ |
| KM Active | 434,096 | 460,767 | 639,291 | $1,011,190$ |
| KM Deadhead | 240,381 | 241,431 | 375,473 | 635,290 |
| Truck Days in <br> Maintenance | 232 | 240 |  |  |
| Truck Days Idle | 249 | 256 | 356 | 588 |
| \% KM Active | 64.4 | 65.6 | 361 | 1,291 |
| \% Days Idle | 23.9 | 23.7 | 63.0 | 61.4 |
| Average Number of |  |  | 23.2 | 39.9 |
| Shipments per <br> Day over Total <br> Planning Interval | 3.63 | 3.50 |  | 3.41 |

using sample schedule 2 are the maximum distance which can be travelled between maintenance stops, the length of each maintenance stop, and the number and location of maintenance bases.

### 3.3.1 Maximum Distance between Maintenance Stops

Table 3.6 presents a comparison of the statistics of trailer/ tractor itineraries, where a four day maintenance stop is required before $12,874 \mathrm{~km}$ have been travelled since the previous maintenance stop, and trailer itineraries where a four day maintenance stop is required before $40,232 \mathrm{~km}$ have been travelled since the previous maintenance stop. The itineraries and their statistics for these two cases are given in Figures 3.2 and 3.31, respectively. The two most significant statistics in comparing these two cases are the fleet sizes and the deadhead dista e travelled (from $241,431 \mathrm{~km}$ to $227,112 \mathrm{~km}$, a 14 percent decrease). The larger deadhead distance obtained with the $12,874 \mathrm{~km}$ maintenance criterion is due to the more frequent requirement for deadhead travel to and from the maintenance base.

### 3.3.2 Length of Stay in Maintenance

Table 3. 7 presents a comparison of trailer itinerary statistics for lengths of stay in maintenance of 2 and 4 days. The corresponding itineraries and the detailed statistics are presented in Figures 3.25 and 3.31 , respectively. The difference between a 2 and a 4 day maintenance stop is not enough to make a significant difference in the itinerary statistics except for the number of truck days in maintenance. Although increasing this length of stay in maintenance from 2 to 4 days increases the fleet size from 8 to 9 ,
Table 3.6 Effect of maximum allowable distance which can be travelled between maintenance stops on trailer and trailer/tractor itineraries for Schedule 2 with a 4 day length of stay in maintenance. Linking value penalty coefficients are idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and time 0 .
Trailer/Tractor ..... Trailer
Maximum Distance between Maintenance Stops $12,874 \mathrm{~km}$ ..... $40,232 \mathrm{~km}$
Length of Maintenance Stop (Days) ..... 4 ..... 4
Fleet Size ..... 12 ..... 9
Total KM ..... 702,198 ..... 687,880
KM Active ..... 460,767460, 767
KM Deadhead ..... 241,431 ..... 227,112
Truck Days Active ..... 402 ..... 402
Truck Days Deadhead ..... 182 ..... 172
Truck Days Idle ..... 256 ..... 156
Truck Days in Maint. ..... 240 ..... 80
Percent KM Active ..... 65.6 ..... 67.0
Percent Days Idle 23.7 ..... 19.3
TRAILER
NUMBER

|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 W |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tfather | KM | KM | KM | days in | DAYS | percent | percent |
| NL:ABER | total | ACtive | deadhead | maint. | IDLE | KM active | days idle |
| 1 | 21.610 | 13,763 | 7,847 | 0 | 12 | 63.7 | 80.0 |
| 2 | 93.037 | 59.394 | 33,643 | 12 | 2 | 63.8 | 2.2 |
| 3 | 75,079 | 51.076 | 24.003 | 8 | 18 | 68.0 | 20.0 |
| : | 92.625 | 61,095 | 31,530 | 8 | 3 | 66.0 | 3.3 |
| 5 | 96.285 | 62,984 | 33,301 | 12 | 0 | 65.4 | 0 |
| 5 | 75,930 | 49,049 | 26,881 | 12 | 13 | 64.6 | 14.4 |
| 7 | 90.531 | 68.697 | 21.834 | 12 | 1 | 75.9 | 3.3 |
| 3 | 78,347 | 53,489 | 24,858 | 8 | 17 | 68.3 | 18.9 |
| , | 64,436 | 41,220 | 23.216 | 8 | 28 | 64.0 | 31.1 |
| TC:AL | 687,880 | $460.767$ | $227.112$ | $30$ | $156$ |  |  |
| ave. | 76,431 | $51.196$ | $25.235$ | $9$ | $17$ | 67.0 | 19.3 |

Figure 3. 31. Schedule 2 trailer itineraries with 4 day maintenance stop required before $40,232 \mathrm{~km}$ have been exceeded. Linking value penalty coefficients are idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .

| Table 3.7 Effect of length of stay in maintenance on trailer |  |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | itineraries for Schedule 2 . Maximum allowable |
|  | distance between maintenance stops is $40,232 \mathrm{~km}$ |
| and linking value penalty coefficients are idle 10, |  |
|  | deadhead 1, flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0. |


| Length of Maintenance <br> Stay (Days) | 2 | 4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Fleet Size | 8 | 9 |
| Total KM | 691,905 | 687,880 |
| KM Active | 460,767 | 460,767 |
| KM Deadhead | 231,138 | 227,112 |
| Truck Days Active | 402 | 402 |
| Truck Days Deadhead | 175 | 172 |
| Truck Days Idle | 42 | 156 |
| Truck Days in Maint. | 66.6 | 80 |
| Percent KM Active | 14.1 | 67.0 |
| Percent Days Idle |  | 19.3 |

this increase is not significant. As can be seen from Figure 3. 31 (for the 4 day maintenance stop) it is almost possible to combine itineraries 1 and 9 into a single itinerary to reduce the fleet size to 8. It is possible that variations in other itinerary parameters, su $h$ as the linking value penalty coefficients, would reduce this fleet size to 8 trailers, which is probably the minimum value.

## 3. 3. 3 Location and Number of Mainterance Bases

The effects on trailer/tractor itineraries of the location and number of maintenance bases are summarized in "'able 3,8. The specific cases considered are a single maintenance base at Youngsville, NC, (HNC), a single maintenance base at Joplin, MO (JCP), and two maintenance bases at Yorrgsville and Joplin with a nearest base maintenance policy. The corresponding itineraries and their statistics are given in Figures 3.2, 3. 32, and 3.33, respectively.

As can be seen from Table 3.8 , these variations in the location and number of maintenance bases have negligible effect on the fleet size and the itinerary statistics. The difference in the fleet size of 11 obtained with the single maintenance base at Jopiin, and 12 obtained for the other two cases is not significant since it is likely that the minimum fleet size is 11 in all cases. Examination of the individual itineraries in Figures 3.2 and 3.33 shows that, with some rearrangerment of itinerary segments, it is probably possible to reduce the fle st size from 12 to 11 for these two cases.
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TRUCK KM KM KM DAYSIV DAYS PERCENT PERCE:T NUMBER TOTAL ACTIVE DEADHEAD MAINT. IDLE KMACTIVE DAYS IDLE

| 1 | 44,070 | 28,602 | 15,468 | 16 | 39 | 64.9 | 43.3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 67,578 | 45,040 | 22,538 | 24 | 7 | 66.6 | 7.8 |
| 3 | 52,531 | 33,170 | 19,362 | 16 | 31 | 63.1 | 3.4 |
| $:$ | 75,238 | 47,711 | 27,527 | 28 | 0 | 63.3 | 0 |
| 5 | 76,286 | 46,035 | 30,251 | 28 | 0 | 60.3 | 0 |
| 5 | 67,619 | 36,719 | 30,900 | 28 | 7 | 54.3 | 7.8 |
| 7 | 78,302 | 50,812 | 27,490 | 24 | 0 | 64.9 | 0 |
| 3 | 71,246 | 44,160 | 27,086 | 24 | 5 | 62.0 | 5.6 |
| 3 | 65,498 | 43,180 | 22,318 | 24 | 10 | 65.9 | 11.1 |
| 72 | 61,542 | 37,596 | 23,946 | 20 | 19 | 61.1 | 21.1 |
| 71 | 75,383 | 47,741 | 27,642 | 28 | 1 | 63.3 | 1.1 |
| TOTAL | 735,294 | 460,767 | 274,527 | 260 | 120 | -1 | -12.2 |

Figure 3. 32. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with a single maintenance base at Joplin, MO (JCP). Linking value penalty coefficients are idle 10, 'eadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0.


| TRUCK | KM | KM | KM | DAYS IN | DAYS | PERCENT | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER | total | ACTIVE | DEADHEAD | MAINT. | IDLE | KM ACTIVE | DAYS IDLE |
| 1 | 36,856 | 23,659 | 13,197 | 12 | 43 | 64.2 | 47.8 |
| 2 | 64,212 | 43,088 | 21,124 | 16 | 22 | 67.1 | 24.4 |
| 3 | 49,019 | 26,929 | 22,090 | 20 | 32 | 54.9 | 35.6 |
| 4 | 65,547 | 38.419 | 27.128 | 24 | 10 | 58.6 | 11.1 |
| 5 | 73,585 | 45.935 | 27.650 | 24 | 4 | 62.4 | 4.4 |
| 6 | 73.370 | 46.273 | 27,097 | 28 | 3 | 63.1 | 3.3 |
| 7 | 75,896 | 45.299 | 30.597 | 28 | 0 | 59.7 | 0 |
| 8 | 16.883 | 11.585 | 5.298 | 4 | 74 | 68.6 | 82.2 |
| 9 | 66.994 | 44,291 | 22.503 | 24 | 9 | 66.4 | 10.0 |
| 10 | 54. 555 | 34,061 | 20,494 | 20 | 26 | 62.4 | 28.9 |
| 11 | 72,133 | 47,560 | 24,573 | 24 | 6 | 68.9 | 6.7 |
| 12 | 74,734 | 53,467 | 21,267 | 24 | 1 | 71.5 | 1.1 |
| total | 723.785 | 460,767 | 263.018 | 248 | 231 | *** | *** |
| $A \vee G$. | 60.315 | 38,397 | 21,918 | 21 | 19 | 63.7 | 21.4 |

Figure 3.33. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with a nearest base maintenance policy, and maintenance bases at Youngsville, NC, (HNC) and Joplin, MO, (JOP). Linking value penalty coefficients are idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .

Table 3.8. Effects of number and location of maintenance bases on tractor/trailer itineraries for Schedule 2. Linking value penalties are idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0.

| Maintenance Bases | HNC | JOP | HNC and JOP |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fleet Size | 12 | 11 | 12 |
| Total KM | 702,198 | 735,294 | 723,785 |
| KM Active | 460,767 | 460,767 | 460,767 |
| KM Deadhead | 241,431 | 274,527 | 263,018 |
| Truck Days Active | 402 | 402 | 402 |
| Truck. Days Deadhead | 183 | 208 | 199 |
| Truck Days Idle | 256 | 120 | 231 |
| Truck Days in Maint. | 240 | 260 | 248 |
| Percent KM Active | 65.6 | 62.7 | 63.7 |
| Percent Days Idle | 23.7 | 12.2 | 21.4 |
| No. HNC Maint. Stops | 60 | 0 | 23 |
| No. JOP Maint. Stops | 0 | 65 | 39 |

### 3.4 Effects of Work Rules

The work rules which were investigated with the TRNSM 2 model were the length of the work day and the length of the work week at the bases.

### 3.4.1 Leng' $n$ of Work Day at Bases

Table 3.9 shows the effects of reducing the length of the work day at bases from 24 hours to 16 hours. The corresponding itineraries and their statistics are given in Figures 3.2 and 3. 34, respectively. As can be seen from this table, this decrease in the length of the work day has negligible effect on the itineraries. As was discussed in Section 3.3.3, the difference in fleet size of 12 with a 24 hour work day and 11 with a 16 hour work day is not significant with the TRNSM 2 model.

The reason that this decrease in the length of the work day has so little effect is that most of the time the vehicles are traveling on the road, with relatively little active time at the bases. This, therefore, results in the itinerary statistics being insensitive to a decrease in the length of the work day from 24 to 16 hours.

### 3.4.2 Length of Work Week at Bases

The effects of reducing the length of the work week at bases from 7 to 6 days on trailer/tractor itineraries is shown in Table 3.10. The corresponding itineraries and their statistics are given in Figures 3.2 and 3.35, respectively. Note that a 91 day planning horizon is used for the 6 day work week case since the non-fined fleet algorithm requires that the planning horizon be a multiple of 7 when weekend loading or travel restrictions are imposed. This

# Table 3.9 Effect of length of duty day at bases on trailer/ tractor itineraries for Schedule 2. Length of duty day on the road is 24 hours. Linking value penalty coefficients are idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 . 

Length of Duty Days at Bases (Hrs.) ..... 16 ..... 24
Fleet Size ..... 11 ..... 12
Total KM 697,974 ..... 702,198
KM Active 460,767 ..... 460, 767
KM Deadhead 237,207 ..... 241,431
Truck Days Active ..... 428 ..... 402
Truck Days Deadhead ..... 180 ..... 183
Truck Days Idle ..... 138 ..... 256
Truck Days in Maint. ..... 244 ..... 240
Percent KM Active 66.0 ..... 65.6
Percent Days Idle14.023.6
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| 1 | 12,867 | 10,132 | 2,735 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 59,468 | 45,015 | 14,453 |
| 3 | 76,004 | 49,361 | 26,643 |
| 4 | 70,696 | 45,531 | 25,165 |
| 5 | 66,742 | 37,272 | 29,469 |
| 6 | 72,890 | 47,630 | 25,260 |
| 7 | 75,085 | 48,729 | 26,355 |
| 3 | 69,539 | 47,279 | 22,260 |
| 9 | 68,233 | 45,917 | 22,316 |
| 10 | 56,376 | 37,082 | 19,294 |
| 11 | 70,076 | 46,819 | 23,257 |
|  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL | 697,974 | 460,767 | 237,207 |
| AVO. | 63,452 | 41,888 | 21,564 |


| 4 | 75 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 20 | 19 |
| 24 | 0 |
| 24 | 3 |
| 24 | 11 |
| 28 | 0 |
| 28 | 1 |
| 24 | 0 |
| 24 | 5 |
| 20 | 19 |
| 24 | 5 |
| 244 | 138 |
| 22 | 13 |


| 78.7 | 83.3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 75.7 | 21.1 |
| 64.9 | 0 |
| 64.4 | 3.3 |
| 55.8 | 12.2 |
| 65.3 | 0 |
| 64.9 | 1.1 |
| 68.0 | 0 |
| 67.3 | 5.6 |
| 65.8 | 2.1 |
| 66.8 | 5.6 |
|  |  |
| 6 | -0 |
| 66.0 | 14.0 |

Figure 3.34. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with 16 hour working day at bases and linking value penalty coefficients idle 10, deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .
Table 3.10 Effect of length of work week at bases on trailer/tractor itineraries for Schesfule 2. Length of work week on the road is 7 days. Linking value penalty coefficients are idfe 10 , deadhead 1 , f'exibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .
Length of Work Week
at Bases (Days) 67
Planning Horizon (Days) ..... $\$ 1$ ..... 90
Fleet Size ..... 18 ..... 12
Total KM ..... 852,543 ..... 702,198
KM Active474, 358460,767
KM Deadhead378, 185241,431
Truck Days Active ..... 413 ..... 402
Truck Days Deadhead ..... 287 ..... 183
Truck Days Idle ..... 630 ..... 256
Truck Days in Maint. ..... 308 ..... 240
Percent KM Active ..... 55.6 ..... 65.6
Percent Days Idle ..... 38.5 ..... 23.7


Figuie 3. 35. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with 6 day work week at bases and linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 and total time 0 .
addition of one day to the planning horizon results in the addition of 8 more shipments to the shipping schedule.

The main effect of this decrease in the length of the work week at the bases is a significant increase in fleet size from 12 to 18. With the work week on the road maintained at 7 days, the heavy idle penalty of 10 compared to the deadhead penalty of 1 tends to force the trucks to deadhead between two active services on the nonworking day at the base, rather than spending this day idling it a base awaiting a shipment.

### 3.5 Effects of Truck Related Parameters

The truck related parameters investigated were average truck speed, loading/unloading time, and truck capacity.

### 3.5.1 Truck Speed

Table 3.11 shows the effects on trailer/tractor itineraries of a reduction in ave rage truck speed from 55 kph to 45 kph . The corresponding itineraries and their statistics are given in Figures 3.2 and 3.36 .

This reduction in truck speed increases the total truck days required to be spent on active service from 402 to 475 . This, in turn, increases the required fleet size from 12 to 14 .

### 3.5.2 Loading/Unloading Time

The effects of increasing the times for loading and unloading the trailers from 2 hours to 4 hours is shown in Table 3.12. The itineraries and itinerary statistics for these two cases are presented in Figures 3.2 and 3.37, respectively.
Table 3.11 Comparison of results of 45 kph and 55 kph average speeds on trailer/tractor itineraries with penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and time 0 .

55 kph

Fleet Size
Total KM
KM Active
460, 767
241, 431
402
183
256
287
Truck Days Idle
Truck Days in Maint. 240256
Truck Days in Maint. 240256
Percent KM Active
65.6
64.2
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23.7
22.7
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Figure 3. 36. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with truck speed of 45 kph and linking value penalty coeificients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .

Table 3. 12 Comparison of results of 4 hour and 2 hour loading/ unloading time for trailer/tractor itineraries with penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and time 0 .
2 hour loading /
unloading time hour loading/
unloading time

Fleet Size
Total KM
KM Active
460, 767
460, 767
KM Deadhead
241, 431
249,582
Truck Days Active 402 454

| Truck Days Deadhead 183 | 189 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Truck Days Idle 256 103

Truck Days in Maint. 240 244

Percent KM Active 65.6 64.9

Percent Days Idle
23. 7
10.4
DAYS
0

TRUCK

## NUMBER




Figure 3.37. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with 4 hour loading/unloading times and linking value penalty coefficients ide 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .

The main effect of increasing these times is an increase in total active truck days since the loading and unloading functions are considered active service. The fleet size decrease from 12 to 11 is not significant.

### 3.5.3 Reduced Truck Capacity

In the process of operating on the shipment schedule to derive th. service requirements for truck trailers, trailer/tractor combinations, or aircraft, the size of each shipment is compared to the capacity of the transport unit element to determine the num ber of elements required to handle that shipment. This required number of vehicles is then associated with the shipment and used in the linking process.

The process of linking of services which require different numbers of vehicles is best illustrated by a simple example. Assume services numbers 1 and 2 each require one truck, whereas service 3 requires two trucks. Further assume that the linking of services 1 and 3 is feasible and has the best linking value. This linking is then selected. Let the resulting combined service be labeled number 4. The number of trucks required for this combined service is one, the lowest value of the two original services. Since not all of service 3 is included in combined service 4 , the original service 3 is retained in the list of required services, but with the required number of vehicles reduced to one. Next assume that the linking of service 2 and 3 is feasible and has the best linking value. This linking is now selected and the resulting composite service which requires one truck, is labeled number 5 . Thus part of the original service 3 is included in combined service 4 and part in combined service 5 .

Each of the two shipment schedules used to study the characteristics of the TRNSM 2 model consists of single truckload shipments. This can be seen by comparing the shipment sizes in the sample schedules given in Appendices B and C with the truck trailer capacities given in Table 3.1. Note that for each fuel type the capacity equals the shipment size.

In order to investigate the effect of reduced truck capacity, the truck capacity for fuel type 3 was reduced from 16 containers to 8 containers, so that each shipment of fuel type 3 now requires two trucks. The capacities for fuel types 1 and 2 were kept the same. The resulting itineraries and itinerary statistics for this case are given in Figure 3.38 while Table 3.13 compares these itinerary statistics with the statistics for the baseline case with the truck capacity of 16 containers for fuel type 3 . This reduction in capacity increases the required distance to be travelled on active service by 35 percent, and increases the fleet size from 12 to 16 trucks.

## 3. 6 Effects of Rules for Assignment of Transport Unit Elements

The fleet sizes for the various types of transport unit elements are dependent on the rules used to assign them to cover reowised services. In this section, the results of varying the rules for assignment of escort vehicles to cover services imposed by truck itineraries are first examined. Then the effects on aircraft and truck itineraries produced by varying the rul for assignment of aircraft to handle shipments are investigated.

### 3.6.1 Escort Assignment Rules

To study the effect of escort assignment rules, two cases were considered. First escort vehicles were assigned according to

TRUCK
NUMBER


| TRUCK | $K M$ | $K M$ | $K M$ | DAYS LN | DAYS PERCENT PERCENT |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| NUMBER TOTAL ACTIVE DEADHEAD MAINZ. IDLE KM ACTIVE DAYS IDLE |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 3. 38. Schedule 2 trailer/tractor itineraries with truck capacity for fuel type 3 reduced from 16 containers to 8 containers so that two trucks are required to handle each shipment of fuel type 3. Linking value penalty coefficients are idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 and total time 0.

Table 3.13. Comparison of effects of reduced truck capacity for fuel type 3 on trailer/tractor itineraries with penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 . The truck capacities for fuel types 1 and 2 are retained at 12 and 7 containers, respectively, so that one truck is required for a shipment of fuel type 1 or 2 .
Truck Capacity for
Fuel Type 3 ..... 168
No. of Trucks Required
for One Shipment of Fuel
Type 3 ..... 1
Fleet Size ..... 12 ..... 16
Total KM ..... 702,198 ..... 981,718
KM Active 460, 767 ..... 595,624
KM Deadhead 241,431 ..... 386,094
Truck Days Active ..... 402 ..... 531
Truck Days Deadhead ..... 183 ..... 293
Truck Days Idle ..... 256 ..... 252
Truck Days in Maint. ..... 240 ..... 364
Percent KM Active ..... 65.6 ..... 60.7
Percent Days Idle ..... 23. 717.5
the rule that escorts are always required to accompany trucks when they are travelling. Then escort vehicles were assigned using the rule that such a vehicle must accompany each truck only while the truck is travelling with a load of nuclear materials. The maintenance parameters used for the escort vehicles were a two day maintenance stop being required before $12,874 \mathrm{~km}$ had been travelled since the previous maintenance.

The truck itineraries used to determine the service requirements for the escort vehicles are shown in Figure 3.2, while the resulting escort vehicle itineraries and statistics for the two csses are given in Figures 3.39 and 3.40, respectively. The statistics for the escort vehicle itineraries are summarized in Table 3. 14. The fleet size is comparable in both cases while the total distance that must be travelled by the escort vehicles is greater when both active and deadhead truck itinerary legs must be covered than when only active must be covered.

An important consideration in analyzing these escort vehicle itineraries is the linking value penalty coefficients that were used. In both cases, penalty coefficients of 1 were used for idle and deadhead time, while values of 0 were used for flexibility loss and total time. In contrast, the truck itineraries used penalty coefficients of idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 . If the same penalty coefficients were used for the escort vehicle itineraries as were used for the trucks, it can be expected that the resulting escort itineraries would closely follow the truck itineraries, the reby producing an escort vehicle fleet size which is comparable to the truck fleet size.

## ESCOPT

NUMEER


| ESCORT KM | KM | KM | DAYSIN | DAYS PERCENT PERCENT |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | ---: |
| NUMBER TOTAL ACTVE DEADHEAD MAINT. IDLE KM ACTIVE DAYSIDLE |  |  |  |  |


| 1 | 59.982 | 51, 014 | 8,968 | 19 | 32 | 85.0 | 35.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 71.388 | 66.165 | 5,223 | 12 | 18 | 92.7 | 29.0 |
| 3 | 76,451 | 70,154 | 6297 | 14 | 12 | 91.8 | 13.3 |
| 4 | 48,999 | 41,392 | 7,607 | 8 | 45 | 34.5 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 72.922 | 68,847 | 4.075 | 16 | 15 | 94.4 | 16.7 |
| 5 | 66.927 | 53,843 | 3,034 | 14 | 19 | 95.4 | 21.1 |
| 7 | 80,649 | 79,923 | 1, "26 | 14 | 7 | 97.9 | 7.3 |
| 9 | 61.752 | 55,469 | 6283 | 14 | 26 | 89.8 | 28.9 |
| 9 | 55,990 | 51,343 | 7.647 | 10 | 35 | 91.7 | 38.9 |
| 12 | 50,307 | 46,063 | $\therefore .244$ | 8 | 41 | 91.6 | 45.6 |
| 11 | 69,368 | 65,494 | 3,874 | 14 | 13 | 94.4 | 20.0 |
| 12 | 63,509 | 59,325 | 4,184 | 14 | 25 | 93.4 | 27.8 |
| ${ }^{+3}$ | 12.149 | 7,665 | 4,434 | 2 | 77 | 63.1 | 35.6 |
| $\because=A L$ | 790.395 | 725,698 | 64,697 | 150 | 369 | -* | -* |
| AVC. | 50,800 | 55,823 | 4.977 | 12 | 28 | 91.8 | 31.5 |

Figure 3.39. Schedule 2 escort vehicle itineraries required to cover trailer/tractor itineraries shown in Figure 3.2 with assignment rule that escorts are required for both active and deadhead truck itinerary legs. Escort linking value penalties are idle 1 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .

| DAYS | 0 | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

ESCORT
NUMBER


| ESCORT | KM | KM | KM | DAYS IN | DAYS | PERCENT | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER | TOTAL | ACTIVE | DEADHEAD | MAINT. | IDLE | KM ACTIVE | DAYS IDLE |
| 1 | 18,671 | 10,304 | 8,367 | 4 | 12 | $35.2$ | $30.0$ $42.2$ |
| 2 | 53,683 | 34,304 | 19,379 | 12 | 38 29 | $63.9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.2 \\ & 32.2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3 | 53, 229 | 35,881 | 22.343 | 12 | 29 | 61.5 76.3 | 46.7 |
| 4 | 50,395 | 38.442 | 11,953 | 8 | 42 | 68.3 | 31.1 |
| 5 | 58,949 | 40.266 | 18.683 | 12 | 28 | \%8.3 | 311 |
| 6 | 21,358 | 15,525 | 5.333 | ${ }_{12}^{2}$ | 24 | 63.9 | 26.7 |
| 7 | 61,710 | 39,448 | 22.262 | 12 | 18 | 63.9 58.3 | 20.0 |
| 3 | 70,733 | 41.258 | 29,475 | 14 | 18 | 58.3 55.6 | 31.1 |
| 9 | 60.516 | 33,631 | 26,355 | 12 | 28 | 35.6 54.9 | 31.1 83,3 |
| 10 | 16,970 | 9,319 | 7,651 | ? | 75 | 54.7 | 30.0 |
| 11 | 61,475 | 32,695 | 28,780 | 12 | 27 | 53.2 67.0 | 27.8 |
| 12 | 66.027 | 44,209 | 21.818 | 10 | 18 | 53.7 | 20.0 |
| 13 | 66,567 | 35,715 | 30,852 | 16 | 18 14 | 67.1 | 15.6 |
| 14 | 74,152 | 49.768 | 24,384 | 12 | 14 | 67.1 | 15.6 |
| TOTAL | 739,439 | 460.767 | 278,672 | 136 | 511 | --* | $\cdots$ |
| AvG . | 52.817 | 32.912 | 19,905 | 10 | 37 | 62.3 | 40.6 |

Figure 3.40. Schedule 2 escort vehicle itine raries required to cover trailer/tractor itineraries shown in Figure 3.2 with assignment rule that escorts are required only for active truck itinerary legs. Escort linking value penalties are idle 1 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .

# Table 3.14 Comparison of escort vehicle itineraries for rules when 1) escort vehicle required only for active trailer/tractor itinerary leg and 2) escort vehicle required for both active and deadhead trailer/tractor itinerary leg. 

Active and
Active Legs Only Deadhead Legs

Escort Fleet Size
Total KM
KM Active
KM Deadhead

Escort Days Active
Escort Days Deadhead
Escort Days Idle
Escort Days in Maint. ..... 136
Percent KM Active 62.3 ..... 91.8
.
Percent KM Deadhead

13

511 369150

739,439
460, 767
725,698
278,672
64,697
402
602
$211 \quad 49$ 150
31.5

### 3.6.2 Aircraft Assignment Rules

Aircraft anc trailer/tractors were sequentially scheduled under two sets of rules for the assignment of shipments to the aircraft mode. In one case, a shipment was assigned to the aircraft mode whenever the truck travel time for that shipment exceeded 8 hours. In the other case, this travel time parameter was increased to 16 hours. Table 3. 15 summarizes the overall statistics for these two cases, while the detailed aircraft itineraries and the itinerary statistics for both the aircraft and trailer/tractors are given in Figures 3.41 and 3.42 . The resulting trailer/tractor itineraries are not pictorially presented, as was done in other sensitivity studies, because these itineraries generally consist of short periods of active and deadhead service, usually with just one active service, separated hy idle periods. This type of itinerary is very difficult to depict in the same manner as was done previously.

With the 8 hour truck travel time criterion, 275 shipments are handled by the aircraft mode while 40 are handled solely by the truck mode. However, each shipment handled by the aircraft mode imposes two service requirements for trucks to transport the material to and from the airfields. Thus there are a total of 590 truck service requirements. An additional factor is that each truck service requirement imposed by an aircraft itinerary has no flexibility in departure date which results in relatively inefficient truck itineraries obtained from the process of linking services. For this 8 hour truck travel time case, the aircraft fleet size is 5 and the truck fleet size is 17 . Note that only 1.5 percent of the total truck distance travelled is on active service. This low figure results from the fact that, for a truck service from a base to a nearby airfield, zero distance between the base and airfield was assumed for simplicity.
Table 3.15 Effects of rules for assignment of aircraft to a shipment on aircraft and trailer/tractor itiner- aries for Schedule 2.
Maximum Allowable Travel
Time via Truck (Hours) ..... 8 ..... 16
Shipments by Aircraft ..... 275 ..... 190
Aircraft Fleet Size ..... 5 ..... 4
Total A/C KM ..... 804, 874 ..... 700,233
A/C Active KM449, 118392, 795
A/C Deadhead KM ..... 335, 756 ..... 307, 438
A/C Days Active ..... 309 ..... 220
A/C Days Deadhead ..... 27 ..... 23
A/C Days Idle 114 ..... 117
Percent A/C KM Active ..... 55.8 ..... 56.1
Percent A/C Days Idle 25.3 ..... 32. 5
Shipments by Truck Only ..... 40 ..... 125
Total Required Truck ..... 590 ..... 505
Services
Truck Fleet Size ..... 17 ..... 16
Total Truck KM 792,423 ..... 727,421
Truck Active KM. 11,648 ..... 67,972
Truck Deadhead KM 780, 775 ..... 659,449
Truck Days Active ..... 35 ..... 87
Truck Days Deadhead ..... 592 ..... 500
Truck Days Idle ..... 588 ..... 561
Truck Days in Maint. ..... 316 ..... 292
Percent Truck KM Active 1.5 ..... 9.3Percent Truck Days Idle38.439.0

a) Aircraft itinerary and itinerary statistics.

| TRUCK | KM | KM | KM | DAYS IN | DAYS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER | TOTAL | ACTIVE | DEADHEAD | MAINT. | IDLE | KM ACTIVE DAYS IDLE |

Figure 3.41. Schedule 2 aircraft itineraries and statistics, with associated truck itinerary statistics, for assignme'ic of aircraft and trucks using the rule that a shipr ent is assigned to the aircraft mode if truck driving time exceeds 8 hours. Linking value penalties for both transport unit elements are idle 10, deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .

| DAYS | 0 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 40 | 70 | 80 | 90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AHCKAFT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NUMBER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | - |  | $\square$ |  |  | - | - | - |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | - |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  | - |
|  | AIRCRAFT | $\mathbf{K M}$ | KM | $\mathbf{K M}$ | DAYS | PERCENT | PERCENT |  |  |
|  | NUMBER | TOTAL | ACTTVE | DEADHEAD | 1DLE | KM ACTIVE | DAYS IDLE |  |  |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 55.8 | 48.9 |  |  |
|  | 2 | $236,838$ | $126,485$ | $110.353$ | 1 | 53.4 | 1.1 |  |  |
|  | 3 | $191,363$ | $107,762$ | $83,602$ | 28 | 59.4 | 31.1 |  |  |
|  | 4 | 121,614 | 14,569 | 4?,045 | 44 | 61.3 | 48.9 |  |  |
|  | TOTAL | 700,233 | 392. 195 | 307, 438 | 117 | **** | * |  |  |
|  | AVG. | 175,050 | 98.199 | 16,859 | 29 | 56.1 | 32.5 |  |  |

a) Aircraft itine rary and itinerary statistics.


| 1 | 19.927 | 0 | 19,927 | 8 | 68 | 0 | 75.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 58,941 | 7,437 | 51,503 | 28 | 12 | 12.6 | 13.3 |
| 3 | 59.042 | 9.814 | 49,228 | 24 | 21 | 16.6 | 23.3 |
| , | 55,223 | 6,785 | 48,438 | 20 | 22 | 12.3 | 24.6 |
| 5 | 45,382 | 6,262 | 39, 120 | 20 | 33 | 13.8 | 36.7 |
| 6 | 42,462 | 1.578 | 40.884 | 16 | 41 | 3.7 | 45.6 |
| 7 | 21.028 | 0 | 21.028 | 8 | 66 | 0 | 73.1 |
| 8 | 36,258 | 863 | 35,395 | 16 | 45 | 2.4 | 50.6 |
| 9 | 45,897 | 750 | 45,147 | 20 | 36 | 1.6 | 40.6 |
| 10 | 61,731 | 17,818 | 43.913 | 24 | 11 | 28.9 | 12.2 |
| 11 | 53,451 | 2,847 | 50,604 | 24 | 25 | 5.3 | 27.2 |
| 12 | 55.456 | 6.188 | 49.268 | 20 | 26 | 11.2 | 37.6 |
| 13 | 43,943 | 920 | 43,022 | 20 | 34 | 2.1 | 17, 2 |
| 14 | 65,404 | 1,869 | 63,535 | 20 | 16 | 2.9 | 16. |
| 15 | 63.277 | 4,840 | 58,436 | 24 | 5 | 7.6 | 102.: |
| 16 | c | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 |  |
| TOTAL | 127.421 | 6? 9772 | 659,449 | 292 | 561 | $\cdots$ | ---* |
| AVG. | 45,464 | 4,248 | 41,216 | 18 | 35.1 | 9.3 | 39.1 |

b) Truck itinerary statistics.

Figure 3.42 . Schedule 2 aircraft itineraries and statistics, with associated truck itinerary statistics, for assignment of aircraft and trucks using the rule that a shipment is assigned to the aircraft mode if truck driving time exceeds 16 hours. Linking value penalties for both transport unit elements are idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .

For such a service only loading and unloading time comprised active service.

With the 16 hour truck travel time criterion for selection of the aircraft mode, the aircraft fleet size is 4 , the truck fleet size is 16 , and the percentage of total distance travelled on active service increased to 9.3 percent. This increased percentage for active service resulted from the larger number of shipments serviced only by truck, which all require non-zero active travel distance, and the fewer number of truck service requirements imposed by aircraft itineraries. The reduced aircraft fleet size results from the smaller number of shipments handled by aircraft, while the reduced truck fleet size is caused by the reduced total truck service requirements of 505 services compared with 590 for the 8 hour case.

An interesting feature of the truck itineraries in each case is that there is one itinerary that consists of exactly one service between a base and its local airfield. The lack of flexibility in this service, which was imposed by an aircraft itinerary, probably prevented its being included in another itinerary. If these shipments could have been advanced or delayed by a short period, it is likely that these services could have been accommodated in another itinerary, thereby reducing each of the truck fleet sizes by one.

## 3. 7 Effects of Warm-up Period in Fixed-Fleet Sizing Mode

The TRNSM 2 model was exercized using the fixed-fleet sizing mode with Schedule 1 to generate trailer/tractor itineraries using warm-up periods of 15 and 30 days to generate representative initial conditions for the scheduling period. Table 3.16 summarizes the overall statistics for these two cases, while the detailed itineraries and their statistics are presented in Figures 3,43 and 3, 44.
Table 3.16 Effect of wasm-up period on Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries generated by using the fixed-fleet sizing mode with linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .
Varm-up Period (Days) ..... 15 ..... 30
Fleet Size ..... 3 ..... 3
Total KM 111,005 ..... 107, 705
KM Active 44,249 ..... 44, 249
KM Deadhead 66,756 ..... 63,456
Truck Days Active ..... 59 ..... 59
Truck Days Deadhead ..... 51 ..... 48
Truck Days Idle ..... 127 ..... 132
Truck Days in Maint. ..... 36 ..... 36
Percent KM Active ..... 39.9 ..... 41.1
Percent Days Idle ..... 46.748. 9


Figure 3.43. Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries using fixed fleet sizing mode with a 15 day warm-up period and linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .


Figure 3.44. Schedule 1 trailer/tractor itineraries using fixed fleet sizing mode with a 30 day warm-up period and linking value penalty coefficients idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 and total time 0.

While the warm-up period does affect the specific itineraries which are produced, it does not appear to have any significant effect on fleet size or the overall itinerary statistics.

### 3.8 Example of Sequential Scheduling of All Transport Unit Elements

To demonstrate the capability of the TRNSM 2 model to sequentially generate itineraries for a large number of transport unit element types, Schedule 1 was used to sequentially generate itineraries for aircraft, truck trailers, truck tractors, escort vehicles, truck tractor/escort crews, and aircraft crews. The resulting detailed itintrary statistics a re given in Table 3, 17.

The aircraft mode was selected if truck driving time exceeded 16 hours. This resulted in a total of 6 services being handled by aircraft for a fleet size of 1 with the aircraft being idle 97. 1 percent of the time.

The iruck trailers require a two day maintenance stop at least every $40,232 \mathrm{~km}$. The total number of services required to be handled by truck trailers is 158,12 of these imposed by the aircraft itinerary. The resulting fleet size is 5 , with three of the itineraries being very short. Itinerary 1 handled four services, itinerary 3 handles three, and itinerary 5 handles only one service, all of which are imposed by the aircraft itinerary and, therefore, have zeroflexibility. As discus sed in Section 3.6.2, this lack of flexibility results in the construction of inefficient itineraries.

Truck tractors require a four day maintenance stop at least every $12,874 \mathrm{~km}$. A fleet size of 5 truck tractors is required to handle the service imposed by the five truck trailer itineraries. These tractor itineraries are more evenly balanced than the trailer itineraries, with only itinerary 1 with three active services being very short.

Table 3.17 Detailed itinerary statistics for the sequential scheduling of aircraft, truck trailers, truck tractors, escort vehicles, tractor/escort crews, and aircraft crews using Schedule 1 with the non-fixed fleet mode.

## a) Aircraft

Linking value penalties: idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time 0 .

Fleet Size $=1$ Aircraft

| KM <br> Total | KM <br> Active | KM <br> Deadhead | Days <br> Active | Days <br> Idle | Percent KM Active | Percent <br> Days Idle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21,870 | 9,877 | 11,993 | 2 | 87 | 45.2 | 97.1 |
| b) Truck Trailers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Linking value penalties: idle 10 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0.1 , and total time $=0$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Trailer No. | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{KM} \\ \text { Total } \end{array}$ | KM <br> Active | KM <br> Deadhead | Days in Maint. | Days <br> Idle | Percent KM Active | Percent <br> Days Idle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 9,131 | $0^{*}$ | 9,131 | $0^{*}$ | 83 | $0^{*}$ | 92.2 |
| 2 | 40,731 | 16,115 | 24,616 | 4 | 45 | 39.6 | 50.0 |
| 3 | 2,315 | 0 | 2,315 | 0* | 88 | $0^{*}$ | 97.8 |
| 4 | 54,887 | 18,257 |  | 4 | 30 | 33. 3 | $33.3{ }^{3}$ |
| 5 | $0^{*}$ | 0* | $0^{*}$ | 0 * | 90 | $0^{*}$ | $100^{*}$ |
| Total | 107,064 | 34,372 | 72,692 | 8 | 336 | ---- | --- |
| Avg. | 21,412 | 6,874 | 14,538 | 2 | 67 | 32.1 | 74.7 |

* These figures result from the fact that TRNSM 2 assumes zero distance to be travelled between bases and airfields. All he services in itineraries 1, 3 and 5 are of this type.

Table 3.17 (cont'd)

## c) Truck Tractors

Linking value penalties: idle 1 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .

Fleet size $=5$ truck tractors

| Tractor | KM | KM |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | Total | KM <br> Active | Days in <br> Deadhead <br> Maint. | Days <br> Idle | Percent <br> KM Active** | Percent <br> Days Idl |  |
| 1 | 9,728 | 3,007 | 6,721 | 0 | 84 | 30.9 | 93.3 |
| 2 | 33,207 | 25,298 | 7,909 | 20 | 38 | 76.2 | 42.2 |
| 3 | 21,561 | 18,107 | 3,454 | 8 | 62 | 84.0 | 68.9 |
| 4 | 36,582 | 29,508 | 7.074 | 16 | 39 | 80.7 | 43.3 |
| 5 | 34,988 | 31,144 | 3,844 | 12 | 44 | 89.0 | 48.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 136,067 | 107,064 | 29,003 | 56 | 266 | .- | .- |
| Ave. | 27,214 | 21,413 | 5,801 | 11 | 53 | 78.7 | 59.2 |

* Active service for a tractor is cafined to occur anytime the tractor is pulling a trailer, whether loaded or empty.
d) Escort Vehicles

Linking value penalties: idle 1 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .

Fleet size $=7$ escort vehicles

| Escort | KM | KM | KM | Days in | Days | Percent | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nuraber | Total | Active | Deadhead |  |  |  |  |
| Maint. | Idle | KMActive | Days Idle |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 520 | 118 | 402 | 0 | 89 | 22.7 | 98.9 |
| 2 | 15,215 | 4,342 | 10,873 | 4 | 70 | 28.5 | 77.8 |
| 3 | 33,048 | 10,717 | 22,331 | 16 | 43 | 32.4 | 47.8 |
| 4 | 1,439 | $-0-$ | 1,439 | 0 | 87 | $-0-$ | 96.7 |
| 5 | 10,123 | 614 | 9,509 | 4 | 81 | 6.1 | 90.0 |
| 6 | 25,087 | 11,249 | 13,838 | 8 | 55 | 44.8 | 61.1 |
| 7 | 31,970 | 7,332 | 24,638 | 16 | 43 | 22.9 | 47.8 |
| Total | 117,403 | 34,372 | 83,031 | 48 | 468 | -2 | --- |
| Ave. | 16,772 | 4,910 | 11,862 | 7 | 67 | 29.3 | 74.3 |

Table 3. 17 (conclude ${ }^{\text {a }}$ )
e) Truck Tractor/Escort Crews

Linking value penalties: idle 1 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .

Crew size $=12$ crews

| Crew <br> Number | KM <br> Total | KM <br> Active | KM <br> Deadhead | Break <br> Days | Days <br> Idle | Percent <br> KM Active | Percent <br> Days Idl |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| 1 | 8,252 | 6,841 | 1,411 | 0 | 85 | 82.9 | 94.4 |
| 2 | 41,690 | 36,895 | 4,795 | 14 | 36 | 88.5 | 40.0 |
| 3 | 45,320 | 41,157 | 4,163 | 28 | 26 | 90.8 | 28.9 |
| 4 | 23,317 | 18,947 | 4,370 | 7 | 59 | 81.3 | 65.6 |
| 5 | 48,508 | 45,339 | 31,169 | 28 | 18 | 93.5 | 20.0 |
| 6 | 10,940 | 3,745 | 7,195 | 14 | 68 | 34.2 | 75.6 |
| 7 | 9,674 | 6,264 | 3,410 | 0 | 76 | 64.8 | 84.4 |
| 8 | 32,320 | 30,320 | 2,000 | 28 | 37 | 93.8 | 41.1 |
| 9 | 16,228 | 15,440 | 788 | 7 | 61 | 95.1 | 67.8 |
| 10 | 3,682 | 1,841 | 1,841 | 7 | 80 | 50.0 | 88.9 |
| 11 | 1,044 | 213 | 832 | 7 | 82 | 20.4 | 91.1 |
| 12 | 49,302 | 46,468 | 2,833 | 21 | 22 | 94.2 | 24.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 290,277 | 253,469 | 36,808 | 161 | 650 | .-- | .-- |
| Ave. | 24,189 | 21,122 | 3,067 | 13 | 54 | 87.3 | 60.2 |

## f) Aircraft Crews

Linking value penalties: idle 1 , deadhead 1 , flexibility loss 0 , and total time 0 .

Crew size $=1$ crew

| KM | KM | KM |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | Active | Deadhead | Break <br> Days | Days <br> Idle | Percent <br> KM Active | Percent <br> Days Idle |
| 32,122 | 21,870 | 10,252 | 14 | 73 | 68.1 | 68.4 |

The maintenance parameters used for the escort vehicles were the same as for the truck tractors, i.e., a four day maintenance stop is required before $12,874 \mathrm{~km}$ had been travelled since the previous maintenance. The rule used to assign escort vehicles is that an escort must accompany a loaded trailer, but not an empty one. An escort fleet size of 7 resulted with three bǐz-t itineraries, itineraries 1,4 and 5 , which respectively contained one, one, and four active services.

In assigning crews to truck tractors and escort vehicles, a 7 day rest break was required before 30 days had been exceeded since the previous break. A total of 12 crews was required. Crew numbers $1,6,7,10$, and 11 were used for only a relatively short period, roughly between day 80 and day 90 in the schedule. The percentage of total distance travelled by the crews on active duty with tractors (full and empty) and escort vehicles is 87.3 percent.

Finally aircraft crews were assigned tc cover the single aircraft itinerary using the same rest break rules as for tractor/ escort crews. Only one aircraft crew was required to man the single aircraft. It turned out that the aircraft itinerary had a convenient idle period between day 53 and day 81 which is when the aircraft crew required a rest break.

## REFERENCES

1. Anderson, G. M. and Payne, H. J., "Development of a Transport Network Model for the NRC Physical Protection Project," ORINCON Technical Report OC-R-77-9964-1, August 24, 1977.
2. Anderson, G. M., "A Computerized Transportation Model for the NRC Physical Protection Project, Versions I and II, " O. INCON Technical Report OC-R-77-87-9964-3, February 23, 1978.
3. Woo, C. W. and Anderson, G. M. , "Programmer's Manual for TRNSM $4,{ }^{\prime \prime}$ ORINCON Tehcnical Report OC-R-77-87-9964-6, January 15, 1979.
4. Woo, C. W., and Anderson, C. M., "User's Manual for TRNSM2," ORINCON Technical Repcrt OC-R-77-87-9964-5, January 15, 1979.

## APPENDIX A

Definition of Symbols Specifying Base Locations in Sample Shipment Schedules.

| Symbol | Base Location |
| :--- | :--- |
| JOH | Ervin, TN |
| HNT | Nashville, TN |
| DJI | Morris, IL |
| TMI | Harrisburg, PA |
| SWV | Williamsburg, VA |
| BFD | Decatur, AL |
| OAS | Anderson, SC |
| CNC | Charlotte, NC |
| FDA | Dthan, AL |
| CSJ | Pottstown, MI |
| LPP | Barnwell, SC |
| BSC | Fremont, OH |
| DBO | Miami, FL |
| TPF | Ashtabula, OH |
| PAO | Hazleton, PA |
| SHP | Port Huron, MI |
| GPH | Oswego, NY |
| NMP | Riverhead, NY |
| JNY | Chattanooga, TN |
| SCT | Blair NB |
| FCN | Ocala, FL |
| CRF | Rockford, IL |
| BRI | Baton Rouge, LA |
| BRL | Bourne, MA |
| PPM | Clinton, IA |
| QCI | Oceanside, CA |
| SOC | Catskill, NY |
| GCC | Sumter, SC |
| SSS | Joplin, MO |
| JOP | Youngsville, NC |
| HNC | Leechburg, PA |
| LBP |  |

Sym: ol
0 OCO
FLP
WPW
ENC
BVP
VIVN
HTF
NCV
WAW
ZWI
TPO
BHA
PSN
AUG
DSM
IPP
STX
PVA
SLF
LSI
MDM
SNJ
CMO
MHI
KKW
HMG
SNY
WNO
TRN
GGM
CRI
PIM
KGB
DCC
ZCO
BFO
WCK

## Base Lecation

Cimarion, OK
Lancaster, PA
Pasco, WA
Wilmington, NC
Rochester, PA
West Valley, NY
H-rtford. CT
Charlottesville, VA
Aberdeen, WA
Waukegan, IL
Kelso, WA
Huntville, AL
Statesville, NC
Augusta, GA
Des Moines, LA
Peekskill, NY
Victoria, TX
Phoenix, AR
Okeechobee, FL
La Salle, IL
Midland, MI
Deepwater, NJ
Columbia, MO
Madison, IN
Jonesville, WI
McRae, GA
Patchoque, NY
New Orleans, LA
Toms River, NJ
Vicksburg, MI
Newport, RI
Red Wing, MN
Green Bay, WI
San Luis Obispo, CA
Cincinnati, OH
Tulsa, OK
Emporia, KS

| Symbol | Base Location |
| :--- | :--- |
| CHE | Spartanburg, SC |
| CAM | Annapolis, MD |
| CPT | Hillsboro, TX |
| SNH | Portsmouth, NH |
| HBC | Eureka, CA |
| WBT | Crossville, TN |
| HCO | Middletown, CN |
| SBW | Bellingham, WA |
| ACR | Cedar Rapids, IA |
| ARA | Russellville, AK |
| ARZ | Blythe, CA |
| LCW | La Cross, WI |
| MNL | New London, CN |
| FWR | Willow Run, MI |
| MSM | St. Cloud, MI |
| TNW | Nelson, WI |
| PBW | Manitowoc, WI |
| CNB | Nebraska City, NB |
| ANJ | Atlantic City, NJ |

## APPENDIX B

## Sample Shipment Schedule 1

This appendix lists the short sample shipment schedule that was employed in the sensitivity studies. The definitions of the three letter symbols used to denote the base locations are given in Appendix A.

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 1

| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \text { m } \\ & \text { m } \\ & \text { ב } \\ & \tilde{K} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & { }_{i}^{2} \\ & \frac{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \sum_{2}^{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JOH | HNT | 1 | 22 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 30 |
| DJI | DJI | 1 | 8 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 43 |
| DJI | DJI | 2 | 9 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 42 |
| TMI | SWV | 3 | 24 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| JOH | JOH | 3 | 10 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 39 |
| JOH | HNT | 4 | 25 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 17 |
| TMI | TMI | 4 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 45 |
| DJI | DJI | 5 | 12 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 41 |
| JOH | BFD | 6 | 27 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 4 |
| JOH | HNT | 8 | 29 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 21 |
| OAS | CNC | 8 | 29 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 24 |
| OAS | CNC | 8 | 29 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 25 |
| OAS | FDA | 9 | 30 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 15 |
| JOH | HNT | 9 | 30 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 16 |
| DJI | CSJ | 10 | 31 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 13 |
| TMI | LPP | 11 | 32 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 31 |
| TMI | TMI | 11 | 18 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 46 |
| TMI | SWV | 12 | 33 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 2 |
| BSC | BSC | 12 | 19 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 35 |
| OAS | OAS | 12 | 19 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 37 |
| OAS | OAS | 12 | 19 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 38 |
| TMI | LPP | 13 | 34 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 29 |
| JOH | BFD | 14 | 35 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 8 |
| ${ }^{\text {TMI }}$ | TMI | 14 | 35 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 11 |
| TMI | LPP | 14 | 35 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 28 |
| DJI | DJI | 15 | 22 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 44 |
| TMI | TMI | 16 | 37 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 10 |
| JOH | HNT | 16 | 37 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 23 |
| TMI | LPP | 18 | 39 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 30 |
| JOH | BFD | 21 | 42 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 7 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 1 (CONT'D)


## SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDUJ 1 (CONT'D)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { d } \\ & \text { m } \\ & \text { m } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \tilde{\sim} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 岃 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TMI | SHP | 39 | 60 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 77 |
| TMI | NMP | 40 | 61 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 53 |
| BSC | BSC | 40 | 47 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 84 |
| TMI | TMI | 40 | 47 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 94 |
| TMI | PAO | 41 | 62 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 65 |
| TMI | JNY | 41 | 62 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 82 |
| OAS | SCT | 42 | 63 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 57 |
| TMI | PAO | 44 | 65 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 68 |
| DJI | FCN | 44 | 65 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 81 |
| TMI | JNY | 45 | 66 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 83 |
| BSC | TPF | 47 | 68 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 47 |
| TMI | NMP | 46 | 67 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 50 |
| OAS | CNC | 46 | 67 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 58 |
| TMI | SHP | 46 | 67 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 73 |
| BSC | BSC | 46 | 53 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 86 |
| BSC | CRF | 47 | 68 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 54 |
| OAS | CNC | 48 | 69 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 59 |
| TMI | SHP | 48 | 69 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 74 |
| TMI | NMP | 49 | 70 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 51 |
| TMI | NMP | 49 | 70 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 52 |
| TMI | SHP | 49 | 70 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 76 |
| JOH | JOH | 49 | 56 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 89 |
| OAS | SCT | 50 | 71 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 56 |
| BSC | BSC | 50 | 57 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 85 |
| BSC | CRF | 51 | 72 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 55 |
| TMI | TMI | 52 | 59 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 95 |
| TMI | SHP | 54 | 75 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 78 |
| JOH | JOH | 54 | 61 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 91 |
| TMI | PAO | 55 | 76 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 62 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OAS | CNC | 55 | 76 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 72 |
| OAS | OAS | 55 | 62 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 87 |
| DJI | DJI | 56 | 77 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 60 |
| TMI | PAO | 56 | 77 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 63 |
| JOH | JOH | 56 | 63 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 90 |
| TMI | PAO | 57 | 78 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 64 |
| DJI | GPH | 57 | 78 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 70 |
| TMI | SHP | 57 | 78 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 75 |
| TMI | NMP | 58 | 79 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 49 |
| DJI | FCN | 58 | 79 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 80 |
| TMI | PAO | 59 | 80 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 124 |
| TMI | PAC | 59 | 80 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 129 |
| DJI | R [.I | 60 | 81 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 106 |
| OAS | BRL | 61 | 82 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 134 |
| OAS | FDA | 61 | 82 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 99 |
| DJI | BRI | 61 | 82 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 105 |
| BSC | BSC | 61 | 68 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 137 |
| BSC | BSC | 61 | 68 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 140 |
| OAS | OAS | 61 | 68 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 142 |
| OAS | OAS | 61 | 68 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 144 |
| TMI | PAO | 62 | 83 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 130 |
| DJI | GPH | 62 | 83 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 132 |
| BSC | BSC | 62 | 69 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 139 |
| JOH | JOH | 62 | 69 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 145 |
| TMI | PAO | 64 | 85 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 125 |
| OAS | OAS | 64 | 71 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 143 |
| TMI | PPM | 65 | 86 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 111 |
| DJI | QCI | 65 | 86 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 117 |
| DJI | DJI | 66 | 73 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 150 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 1 (CONT'D)


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OAS | SCT | 84 | 105 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 101 |
| DJI | QCI | 84 | 105 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 115 |
| OAS | OAS | 84 | 91 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 141 |
| BSC | SSS | 85 | 106 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 104 |
| DJI | DJI | 85 | 91 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 149 |
| OAS | SCT | 87 | 108 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 102 |
| DJI | QCI | 87 | 108 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 118 |
| OAS | BRL | 88 | 109 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 133 |
| DJI | DJI | 88 | 95 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 151 |

## APPENDIX C

## Sample Shipment Schedule 2

This appendix lists the long sample sche ployed in the sensitivity studies. The definitivas of the three letter symbols used to denote the base locations are given in Appendix A.

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

## Origin Base



## Latest Arrival Day

Kịuenz lețamew

Designation
. aquan ${ }_{N}$ furuditys

| LBP | SWV | 15 | 36 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LBP | SWV | 15 | 36 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 |
| OCO | FLP | 21 | 42 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 3 |
| OCO | FLP | 21 | 42 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 4 |
| OCO | FLP | 21 | 42 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 5 |
| OCO | FLP | 21 | 42 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| OCO | FLP | 21 | 42 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 7 |
| OCO | FLP | 21 | 42 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 8 |
| WPW | BFD | 16 | 37 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 9 |
| WPW | BFD | 16 | 37 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 10 |
| WPW | BFD | 16 | 37 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 11 |
| WPW | BFD | 16 | 37 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 12 |
| WPW | BFD | 16 | 37 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 13 |
| WPW | BFD | 16 | 37 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 14 |
| BNC | CSJ | 1 | 22 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 15 |
| BNC | CSJ | 1 | 22 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 16 |
| WPW | BVP | 21 | 42 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 17 |
| WPW | BVP | 21 | 42 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 18 |
| WVN | CSJ | 5 | 26 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 19 |
| WVN | CSJ | 5 | 26 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 20 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HTF | CNC | 20 | 41 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 21 |
| HTE | CNC | 20 | 41 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 22 |
| JOH | JRL | 25 | 46 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 23 |
| JOH | BRL | 25 | 46 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 24 |
| JOH | BRL | 25 | 46 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 25 |
| JOH | BRL | 25 | 410 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 26 |
| JOH | BRL | 25 | 46 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 27 |
| HTF | NCV | 24 | 45 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 28 |
| HTF | NCV | 24 | 45 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 29 |
| BNC | CNC | 8 | 29 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 30 |
| BNC | CNC | 8 | 29 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 31 |
| HTF | PAO | 4 | 25 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 32 |
| HTF | PAO | 4 | 25 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 33 |
| HTF | PAO | 4 | 25 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 34 |
| HTF | PAO | 4 | 25 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 35 |
| HTF | PAC | 4 | 25 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 36 |
| HTF | PAO | 4 | 25 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 37 |
| HTF | PAO | 4 | 25 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 38 |
| WVN | FCN | 6 | 27 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 39 |
| WVN | FCN | 6 | 27 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 40 |
| BNC | WAW | 10 | 31 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 41 |
| BNC | W AW | 10 | 31 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 42 |
| HTF | TPF | 25 | 46 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 43 |
| HTF | TPF | 25 | 46 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 44 |
| WVN | OAS | 24 | 31 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 45 |
| WVN | LBP | 14 | 21 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 46 |
| WVN | JOH | 23 | 30 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 47 |
| BSC | OAS | 3 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 48 |
| BSC | OAS | 3 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 49 |
| BSC | JOH | 28 | 35 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 50 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

|  | Origin Lase |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Destination Base |
|  | Earliest Shipping Day |
|  | Latest Arrival Day |
| UNWWWLWLNNNNNNNNNNN | Material Type |
|  | Material Quantity |
| 000000000000000000000000000000 | Mode/Container Designation |
|  | Shipment Number |


| $\begin{gathered} \ddot{0} \\ \text { in } \\ \text { in } \\ 5 \\ =0 \\ i \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{L} \\ & \underset{H}{\pi} \\ & \frac{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \frac{\pi}{2} \\ & \sum_{2}^{\pi} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LBP | AUG | 20 | 41 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 81 |
| LBP | AUG | 20 | 41 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 82 |
| OAS | DSM | 20 | 41 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 83 |
| OAS | DSM | 20 | 41 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 84 |
| WVN | OCO | 24 | 31 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 85 |
| WVN | OCO | 24 | 31 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 86 |
| WVN | WVN | 10 | 17 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 87 |
| BSC | BNC | 21 | 28 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 88 |
| BSC | OCO | 19 | 26 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 89 |
| BSC | WPW | 23 | 30 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 90 |
| BSC | W PW | 23 | 30 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 91 |
| JOH | BNC | 16 | 23 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 92 |
| JOH | BNC | 16 | 23 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 93 |
| JOH | LBP | 9 | 16 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 94 |
| JOH | WPW | 17 | 24 | , | 7 | 0 | 95 |
| JOH | WPW | 17 | 24 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 96 |
| JOH | HTF | 6 | 13 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 97 |
| DJI | LBP | 26 | 33 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 98 |
| DJI | LBP | 26 | 33 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 99 |
| DJI | WVN | 30 | 37 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 100 |
| TMI | OCO | 25 | 32 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 101 |
| TMI | JOH | 29 | 36 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 102 |
| JOH | OAS | 47 | 68 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 103 |
| JOF: | OAS | 47 | 68 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 104 |
| OAS | NMP | 42 | 63 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 105 |
| OAS | NMP | 42 | 63 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 106 |
| OAS | NMP | 42 | 63 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 107 |
| OAS | NMP | 42 | 63 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 108 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{y} \\ & \text { m } \\ & \infty \\ & \Sigma \\ & \Sigma \\ & \tilde{L} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | Ked Sulddics featixet |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{y}{\hbar} \\ & \underset{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \underset{y}{\pi} \\ & \sum \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OAS | NMP | 42 | 63 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 109 |
| HTF | IPP | 34 | 55 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 110 |
| HTF | IPP | 34 | 55 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 111 |
| OAS | TMI | 41 | 62 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 112 |
| OAS | TMI | 41 | 62 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 113 |
| OCO | W PW | 45 | 66 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 114 |
| OCO | W PW | 45 | 66 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 115 |
| OCO | STX | 60 | 81 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 116 |
| OCO | STX | 60 | 81 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 117 |
| WPW | PPM | 54 | 75 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 118 |
| WPW | PPM | 54 | 75 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 119 |
| W PW | PPM | 54 | 75 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 1.0 |
| WPW | PPM | 54 | 75 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 121 |
| WPW | PFM | 54 | 75 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 122 |
| WPW | PFM | 54 | 75 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 123 |
| WPW | PPM | 54 | 75 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 124 |
| BNC | AUG | 38 | 59 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 125 |
| BNC | AUG | 38 | 59 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 126 |
| JOH | PVA | 50 | 71 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 127 |
| JOH | PVA | 50 | 71 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 128 |
| BNC | WPW | 33 | 54 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 129 |
| BNC | WPW | 33 | 54 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 130 |
| WVN | JOH | 41 | 48 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 131 |
| WVP | W PW | 46 | 53 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 132 |
| BSC | BNC | 53 | 60 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 133 |
| BSC | HTF | 47 | 54 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 134 |
| JOH | LBP | 47 | 54 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 135 |
| JOH | W PW | 51 | $\bigcirc 8$ | 1 | 7 | 0 | 136 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{y}{n} \\ & \underset{i}{\pi} \\ & \frac{\pi}{4} \\ & \frac{\pi}{2} \\ & \sum_{2}^{\pi} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JOH | W PW | 51 | 58 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 137 |
| JOHI | WVN | 42 | 49 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 138 |
| DJT | OCO | 38 | 45 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 139 |
| DJI | WVN | 46 | 53 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 140 |
| DJI | WVN | 46 | 53 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 141 |
| TMI | BNC | 39 | 46 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 142 |
| TMI | LBP | 43 | 50 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 143 |
| TMI | OCO | 55 | 62 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 144 |
| TMI | OCO | 55 | 62 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 145 |
| WPW | TPF | 55 | 76 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 146 |
| LBP | BNC | 42 | 63 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 147 |
| LBP | BNC | 42 | 63 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 148 |
| LBP | BNC | 42 | 63 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 149 |
| LBP | BNC | 42 | 63 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 150 |
| LBP | BNC | 42 | 63 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 151 |
| OAS | SLF | 59 | 80 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 152 |
| OAS | SLF | 59 | 8 . | 2 | 6 | 0 | 153 |
| WVN | BNC | 55 | 76 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 154 |
| WVN | BNC | 55 | 76 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 155 |
| WVN | BNC | 55 | 76 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 156 |
| WVN | BNC | 55 | 76 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 157 |
| WVN | BNC | 55 | 76 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 158 |
| BNC | LSI | 60 | 81 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 159 |
| BNC | LSI | 60 | 81 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 160 |
| BNC | LSI | 60 | 81 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 161 |
| BNC | LSI | 60 | 81 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 162 |
| BNC | LSI | 60 | 81 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 163 |
| BNC | LSI | 60 | 81 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 164 |
| LBP | SCT | 42 | 63 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 165 |


|  |  |  |  | $\underset{\underset{i}{\pi}}{\substack{\pi}}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LBP | SCT | 42 | 63 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 166 |
| JOH | HMG | 31 | 52 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 167 |
| JOH | HMG | 31 | 52 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 168 |
| JOH | HMG | 31 | 52 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 169 |
| JOH | HMG | 31 | 52 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 170 |
| JOH | HMG | 31 | 52 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 171 |
| JOH | MDM | 45 | 66 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 172 |
| JOH | MDM | 45 | 66 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 173 |
| JOH | MNL | 39 | 60 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 174 |
| JOH | MNL | 39 | 60 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 175 |
| WVN | SNJ | 33 | 54 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 176 |
| WVN | SNJ | 33 | 54 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 177 |
| WVN | SNJ | 33 | 54 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 178 |
| WVN | SNJ | 33 | 54 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 179 |
| WVN | SNJ | 33 | 54 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 180 |
| WVN | SNJ | 33 | 54 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 181 |
| LBP | CMO | 52 | 73 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 182 |
| LBP | CMO | [2 | 73 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 183 |
| OAS | MHI | 45 | 66 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 184 |
| OAS | MHI | 45 | 66 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 185 |
| OCO | KKW | 46 | 67 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 186 |
| OCO | KKW | 46 | 67 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 187 |
| WVN | OAS | 36 | 43 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 188 |
| WVN | OAS | 36 | 43 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 189 |
| WVN | LBP | 46 | 53 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 190 |
| WVN | OCO | 54 | 61 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 191 |
| WVN | OCO | 54 | 61 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 192 |
| BSC | W PW | 39 | 46 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 193 |
| BSC | WPW | 39 | 46 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 194 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

## Origin Base

Destination Base

Latest Arrival Day
Material Type
Material Quantity
Mode / Container
Designation
Shipment Number

195
5259
59
66
170
196
$\begin{array}{llllll}59 & 66 & 1 & 7 & 0 & 197\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}35 & 42 & 1 & 7 & 0 & 198\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}53 & 60 & 1 & 7 & 0 & 199\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}55 & 62 & 1 & 7 & 0 & 200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}45 & 52 & 1 & 7 & 0 & 201\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}46 & 53 & 1 & 7 & 0 & 202\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}46 & 53 & 1 & 7 & 0 & 203\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}80 & 101 & 2 & 6 & 0 & 204\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}79 & 100 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 205\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}79 & 100 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 206\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}79 & 100 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 207\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}79 & 100 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 208\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}79 & 100 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 209\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}78 & 99 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 210\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}78 & 99 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 211\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}78 & 99 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 212\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}78 & 99 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 213\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}78 & 99 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 214\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}78 & 99 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 215\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}65 & 86 & 2 & 6 & 0 & 216\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}65 & 86 & 2 & 6 & 0 & 217\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}81 & 102 & 2 & 6 & 0 & 218\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}81 & 102 & 2 & 6 & 0 & 219\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}78 & 99 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 220\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}78 & 99 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 221\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}78 & 99 & 3 & 16 & 0 & 222\end{array}$

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

|  | ${ }^{\text {aseg uoṭeutiseg }}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{H}{2} \\ & \pi \\ & \frac{\pi}{4} \\ & \sum_{i}^{\pi} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { a } \\ & \text { d } \\ & \frac{\pi}{d} \\ & \frac{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \frac{\pi}{u} \\ & \sum_{2}^{\pi} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WVN | SNY | 78 | 99 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| WVN | SNY | 78 | 99 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| W PW | WNO | 77 | 98 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| WPW | WNO | 77 | 98 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| WPW | TRN | 77 | 98 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| WPW | TRN | 77 | 98 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| HTF | SHP | 75 | 96 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| HTF | SHP | 75 | 96 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| HTF | SHP | 75 | 96 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| HTF | SHP | 75 | 96 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| HTF | SHP | 75 | 96 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| HTF | SHP | 75 | 96 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| HTF | SHP | 75 | 96 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| OCO | KKW | 79 | 100 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| OCO | KKW | 79 | 100 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| BNC | GGM | 70 | 91 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| BNC | GGM | 70 | 91 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| BNC | - GGM | 70 | 91 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| BNC | GGM | 70 | 91 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| BNC | GGM | 70 | 91 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| BNC | GGM | 70 | 91 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| BNC | GGM | 70 | 91 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| LBP | CRI | 77 | 98 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| LBP | CRI | 77 | 98 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| JOH | PSN | 85 | 106 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| JOH | PSN | 85 | 106 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| WPW | MDM | 75 | 96 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| WPW | MDM | 75 | 96 | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| WVN | OAS | 85 | 92 | 1 | 7 | 0 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{u} \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { m } \\ & \stackrel{5}{w} \\ & \tilde{L} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {Ked }} \text { 8uṭdd!̣yS } 7 \text { \&a!̣uet }$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{y}{2} \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \frac{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \sum_{\sum}^{\pi} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WVN | OAS | 85 | 92 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 252 |
| WVN | W PW | 69 | 76 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 253 |
| WVN | W PW | 69 | 76 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 254 |
| WVN | W PW | 69 | 76 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 255 |
| BSC | OAS | 64 | 71 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 256 |
| BSC | BNC | 71 | 78 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 257 |
| BSC | BNC | 71 | 78 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 258 |
| BSC | LBP | 67 | 74 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 259 |
| BSC | LBP | 67 | 74 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 260 |
| BSC | W PW | 64 | 71 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 261 |
| BSC | W PW | 64 | 71 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 262 |
| JOH | OCO | 63 | 70 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 263 |
| JOH | WVN | 71 | 78 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 264 |
| JOH | HTF | 63 | 70 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 265 |
| TMI | OAS | 68 | 75 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 266 |
| TMI | OAS | 68 | 75 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 267 |
| TMI | JOH | 82 | 89 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 268 |
| TMI | HTF | 83 | 90 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 269 |
| TMI | HTF | 83 | 90 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 270 |
| WPW | SOC | 89 | 110 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 271 |
| HTF | PIM | 66 | 87 | 2 | + | 0 | 272 |
| LNP | KGB | 67 | 88 | 2 | 1. | 0 | 273 |
| OCO | DCC | 85 | 106 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 274 |
| OCO | DCC | 85 | 106 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 275 |
| WPW | FDA | 67 | 88 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 276 |
| WPW | FDA | 67 | 88 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 277 |
| LBP | ZCO | 67 | 88 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 278 |
| LBP | zro | 67 | 88 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 279 |
| tBP | ZCO | 67 | 88 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 280 |



SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

|  |  | Earliest Shipping D |  |  |  | U E 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JOH | OCO | 90 | 97 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 309 |
| JOH | WVN | 75 | 82 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 310 |
| DJI | OCO | 77 | 84 | 1 | 7 | $\bigcirc$ | 311 |
| DJI | OCO | 77 | 84 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 312 |
| DJI | HTF | 80 | 87 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 313 |
| DJI | HTF | 80 | 87 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 314 |
| TMI | JOH | 69 | 76 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 315 |
| WVN | HCO | 101 | 122 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 316 |
| CAS | ZWI | 91 | 112 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 317 |
| OAS | ZWI | 91 | 112 | 2 |  | 0 | 318 |
| OCO | IPP | 120 | 141 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 319 |
| OCO | IPP | 122 | 141 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 320 |
| HTF | SSS | 105 | 126 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 321 |
| HTF | SSS | 105 | 126 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 322 |
| OCO | LSI | 98 | 119 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 323 |
| OCO | LSI | 98 | 119 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 324 |
| OCO | LSI | 98 | 119 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 325 |
| OCO | LSI | 98 | 119 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 326 |
| OCO | LSI | 98 | 119 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 327 |
| OCO | LSI | 98 | 119 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 328 |
| HTF | BVP | 93 | 114 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 329 |
| HTF | BVP | 93 | 114 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 330 |
| OAS | PVA | 114 | 135 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 331 |
| OAS | PVA | 114 | 135 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 332 |
| LBP | QCI | 98 | 119 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 333 |
| LBP | QCI | 98 | 119 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 334 |
| LBP | QCI | 98 | 119 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 335 |
| LBP | QCI | 98 | 119 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 336 |
| WPW | JNY | 98 | 119 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 337 |
| WPW | JNY | 98 | 119 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 338 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE $\leftharpoonup$


SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

|  |  | Earliest Shipping Day |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JOH | W PW | 117 | 138 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 368 |
| JOH | W PW | 117 | 138 | 3 | 16 | - 0 | 369 |
| JOH | W PW | 11\% | 138 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 370 |
| JOH | W PW | 117 | 138 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 371 |
| JOH | WPW | 117 | 138 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 372 |
| JOH | WPW | 117 | 138 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 373 |
| W PW | CPT | 106 | 127 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 374 |
| WPW | CPT | 106 | 127 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 375 |
| HTF | PAO | 106 | 127 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 376 |
| HTF | PAO | 106 | 127 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 377 |
| HTF | PAO | 106 | 127 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 378 |
| HTF | PAO | 106 | 127 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 379 |
| HTF | PAO | 106 | 127 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 380 |
| HTF | PAO | 106 | 127 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 381 |
| HTF | PAO | 106 | 127 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 382 |
| OAS | SNH | 101 | 122 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 383 |
| OAS | SNH | 101 | 122 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 384 |
| BNC | MHI | 91 | 112 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 385 |
| BNC | MHI | 91 | 112 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 386 |
| OAS | HNT | 115 | 136 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 387 |
| OAS | HNT | 115 | 136 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 388 |
| OAS | HNT | 115 | 136 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 389 |
| OAS | HNT | 115 | 136 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 390 |
| OAS | HNT | 115 | 136 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 391 |
| OAS | HNT | 115 | 136 |  | 16 | 0 | 392 |
| OAS | HNT | 115 | 136 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 393 |
| LBP | SNH | 117 | 138 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 394 |
| LBP | SNH | 117 | 138 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 395 |
| W PW | DBO | 109 | 130 | 2 | 6 | 0 |  |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \text { n } \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{4} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\alpha} \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{4} \\ & \sum_{2}^{\pi} \end{aligned}$ | 2 <br> $\frac{\pi}{3}$ <br> $\frac{\pi}{4}$ <br> $\frac{\pi}{4}$ <br> $\sum_{4}^{\pi}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W PW | DBO | 109 | 130 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 397 |
| WVN | ACR | 95 | 116 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 398 |
| WVN | ACR | 95 | 116 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 399 |
| OCO | sOC | 118 | 139 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 400 |
| OCO | SOC | 118 | 139 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 401 |
| WVN | BNC | 91 | 98 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 402 |
| WVN | BNC | 91 | 98 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 403 |
| WVN | LBP | 102 | 109 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 404 |
| WVN | WVN | 101 | 108 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 405 |
| WVN | WVN | 101 | 108 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 406 |
| BSC | OCO | 101 | 108 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 407 |
| BSC | OCO | 101 | 108 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 408 |
| BSC | OCO | 101 | 108 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 409 |
| BSC | JOH | 93 | 100 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 410 |
| BSC | JOH | 93 | 100 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 411 |
| JOH | HTF | 104 | 111 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 412 |
| DJI | OAS | 106 | 113 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 413 |
| DJI | BNC | 112 | 119 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 414 |
| DJI | LBP | 97 | 104 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 415 |
| DJI | WPW | 113 | 120 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 416 |
| TMI | OAS | 120 | 127 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 417 |
| TMI | W PW | 91 | 98 | 1 | ? | 0 | 418 |
| TMI | W PW | 91 | 98 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 419 |
| JOH | HBC | 135 | 156 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 420 |
| OAS | TMI | 124 | 145 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 421 |
| OAS | TMI | 124 | 145 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 422 |
| JOH | SNJ | 139 | 160 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 423 |
| JOH | SNJ | 139 | 160 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 424 |
| HTF | DBO | 132 | 153 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 425 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

| $\begin{gathered} \ddot{0} \\ \infty \\ \infty \\ \tilde{n} \\ \tilde{\sim} \\ \tilde{0} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | Kł!̣uen |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HTF | DBO | 132 | 153 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 426 |
| BNC | WBT | 124 | 145 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 427 |
| BNC | WBT | 124 | 145 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 428 |
| WVN | WBT | 141 | 152 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 429 |
| WVN | WBT | 141 | 162 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 430 |
| LBP | SLF | 122 | 143 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 431 |
| LBP | SLF | 122 | 143 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 432 |
| OCO | BRI | 132 | 153 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 433 |
| OCO | BRI | 132 | 153 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 434 |
| WVN | SBW | 146 | 167 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 435 |
| WVN | SBW | 146 | 167 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 436 |
| WVN | SBW | 146 | 167 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 437 |
| WVN | SBW | 146 | 167 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 438 |
| WVN | SBW | 146 | 167 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 439 |
| WVN | SBW | 146 | 167 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 440 |
| WVN | SBW | 146 | 167 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 441 |
| WVN | SBW | 146 | 167 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 442 |
| OCO | CHE | 134 | 155 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 443 |
| OCO | CHE | 134 | 155 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 444 |
| WVN | TPF | 136 | 157 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 445 |
| WVN | TPF | 136 | 157 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 446 |
| HTF | BVP | 150 | 171 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 447 |
| HTF | BVP | 150 | 171 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 448 |
| WVN | BNC | 123 | 130 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 44.0 |
| WVN | $\mathrm{JOH}^{+}$ | 123 | 130 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 450 |
| WVN | WVN | 139 | 146 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 451 |
| WVN | WVN | 139 | 146 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 452 |
| WVN | HTF | 135 | 142 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 453 |
| WVN | HTF | 135 | 142 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 454 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BSC | LBP | 135 | 142 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 455 |
| BSC | LBP | 135 | 142 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 456 |
| BSC | OCO | 145 | 152 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 457 |
| BSC | OCO | 145 | 152 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 458 |
| BSC | HTF | 145 | 152 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 459 |
| JOH | JOH | 122 | 129 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 460 |
| JOH | JOH | 122 | 129 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 461 |
| JOH | JOH | 122 | 129 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 462 |
| JOH | WPW | 146 | 153 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 463 |
| DJI | OAS | 134 | 141 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 464 |
| DJI | WPW | 146 | 153 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 465 |
| TMI | LBP | 142 | 149 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 466 |
| TMI | OCO | 137 | 144 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 467 |
| TMI | W PW | 16 | 156 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 468 |
| TMI | WVN | 122 | 129 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 469 |
| TMI | WVN | 122 | 129 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 470 |
| LBP | IPP | 134 | 155 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 471 |
| OCO | DJI | 150 | 171 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 472 |
| OCO | DJI | 150 | 171 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 473 |
| OCO | DJI | 150 | 171 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 474 |
| OCO | DJI | 150 | 171 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 475 |
| OCO | DJI | 150 | 171 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 476 |
| BNC | ACR | 148 | 169 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 477 |
| BNC | ACR | 148 | 169 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 478 |
| BNC | ACR | 148 | 169 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 479 |
| BNC | ARA | 127 | 148 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 480 |
| BNC | $\ldots \mathrm{A}$ | 127 | 148 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 481 |
| OAS | NC.V | 142 | 163 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 482 |
| OAS | NCV | 142 | 163 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 483 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { en } \\ & \text { m } \\ & \text { m } \\ & \frac{5}{5} \\ & \stackrel{0}{4} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & y \\ & \sum_{i}^{2} \\ & \frac{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \sum_{i}^{\pi} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OAS | BHA | 127 | 148 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 484 |
| OAS | BHA | 127 | 148 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 485 |
| BNC | GGM | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 486 |
| BNC | GGM | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 487 |
| BNC | GGM | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 488 |
| BNC | GGM | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 489 |
| BNC | GGM | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 490 |
| BNC | GGM | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 491 |
| BNC | GGM | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 492 |
| OCO | DJI | 150 | 171 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 493 |
| OCO | DJI | 150 | 171 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 494 |
| JOH | DJI | 140 | 161 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 495 |
| JOH | DJI | 140 | 161 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 496 |
| HTF | BFO | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 497 |
| HTF | BFO | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 498 |
| HTF | BFO | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 499 |
| HTF | BFO | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 500 |
| HTF | BFO | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 501 |
| HTF | BFO | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 502 |
| HTF | BFO | 149 | 170 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 503 |
| JOH | KKW | 146 | 167 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 504 |
| JOH | KKW | 146 | 147 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 505 |
| BNC | ARZ | 128 | 149 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 506 |
| BNC | ARZ | 128 | 149 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 507 |
| OAS | SNH | 145 | 166 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 508 |
| OAS | SNH | 145 | 166 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 509 |
| WVN | OCO | 128 | 135 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 510 |

## SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

|  |  | ${ }^{K e} e_{\mathrm{C}} 8 \mathrm{I}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{y}{2} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\omega} \\ & \frac{\pi}{2} \\ & \frac{\pi}{2} \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BSC | OAS | 136 | 143 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| BSC | WPW | 127 | 134 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| BSC | WVN | 136 | 143 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| BSC | WVN | 136 | 143 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| JOH | OAS | 133 | 140 |  | 7 | 0 |
| JOH | OAS | 133 | 140 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| JOH | LBP | 147 | 154 | , | 7 | 0 |
| JOH | LBP | 147 | 154 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| JOH | OCO | 143 | 150 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| JOH | OCO | 143 | 150 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| JOH | JOH | 140 | 147 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| JOH | WVN | 142 | 149 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| DJI | WVN | 142 | 149 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| DJI | LBP | 150 | 157 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| DJI | JOH | 138 | 145 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| DJI | JOH | 138 | 145 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| DJI | WPW | 134 | 141 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| DJI | WVN | 126 | 133 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| DJI | WVN | 126 | 133 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| TMI | BNC | 138 | 145 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| TMI | WVN | 138 | 145 | 1 | 7 |  |
| HTF | LCW | 179 | 200 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| WPW | MNL | 179 | 200 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| WPW | MNL | 179 | 200 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| WPW | MNL | 179 | 200 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| WPW | MNL | 179 | 200 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| LBP | QCI | 160 | 181 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| LBP | QCI | 160 | 181 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| LBP | QCI | 160 | 181 | 3 | 16 | 0 |
| $13 P$ | QCI | 160 | 181 | 3 | 16 | 0 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LBP | QCI | 160 | 181 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 541 |
| JOH | FLP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 542 |
| JOH | FLP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 543 |
| JOH | FLP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 544 |
| JOH | FLP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 545 |
| JOH | FLP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 546 |
| JOH | FLP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 547 |
| BNC | FDA | 175 | 196 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 548 |
| BNC | FDA | 175 | 196 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 549 |
| LBP | FWR | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 550 |
| LBP | FWR | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 551 |
| LBP | FWR | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 552 |
| LBP | FWR | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 553 |
| LBP | FWR | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 554 |
| LBP | FWR | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 555 |
| OCO | BRI | 170 | 191 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 556 |
| OCO | BRI | 170 | 191 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 557 |
| W PW | CMO | 172 | 193 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 558 |
| WPW | CMO | 172 | 193 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 559 |
| OAS | MSM | 159 | 130 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 560 |
| OAS | MSM | 159 | 180 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 561 |
| OAS | HNT | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 562 |
| OAS | HNT | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 563 |
| OAS | HNT | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 564 |
| OAS | HNT | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 565 |
| OAS | HNT | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 566 |
| OAS | HNT | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 567 |
| OAS | HNT | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 568 |
| WVN | GPP | 155 | 176 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 569 |
| WVN | GPH | 155 | 176 |  | 6 | 0 | 570 |


|  |  | Ked |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OCO | TNW | 169 | 190 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 571 |
| OCO | TNW | 169 | 190 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 572 |
| BNC | SLF | 167 | 188 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 573 |
| BNC | SLF | 167 | 188 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 574 |
| WVN | OAS | 172 | 179 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 575 |
| WVN | BNC | 152 | 159 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 576 |
| WVN | WPW | 179 | 186 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 577 |
| WVN | WPW | 179 | 186 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 578 |
| WVN | HTF | 155 | 162 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 579 |
| WVN | HTF | 155 | 162 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 580 |
| BSC | JOH | 174 | 181 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 581 |
| BSC | HTF | 164 | 171 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 582 |
| BSC | HTF | 164 | 171 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 583 |
| JOH | OAS | 180 | 187 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 584 |
| JOH | OAS | 180 | 187 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 585 |
| JOH | OAS | 180 | 187 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 586 |
| JOH | W PW | 176 | 183 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 587 |
| JOH | HTF | 176 | 183 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 588 |
| JOH | HTF | 176 | 183 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 589 |
| DJI | BNC | 167 | 174 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 590 |
| DJI | BNC | 167 | 174 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 591 |
| DJI | OCO | 157 | 164 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 592 |
| DJI | OCO | 157 | 164 | , | 7 | 0 | 593 |
| DJI | WPW | 151 | 158 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 594 |
| DJI | WPW | 151 | 158 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 595 |
| DJI | HTF | 168 | 175 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 596 |
| TMI | OAS | 180 | 187 | 1 | , | 0 | 597 |
| TMI | OAS | 180 | 187 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 598 |
| TMI | JOH | 156 | 163 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 599 |
| TMI | WPW | 153 | 160 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 600 |

SAMPLE SHIPMENT SCHEDULE 2


| TMI | WPW | 153 | 160 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 601 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TMI | WVN | 176 | 183 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 602 |
| TMI | HTF | 157 | 164 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 603 |
| OAS | NMP | 151 | 172 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 604 |
| OAS | NMP | 151 | 172 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 605 |
| OAS | NMP | 151 | 172 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 606 |
| OAS | NMP | 151 | 172 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 607 |
| HTF | MSM | 154 | 175 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 608 |
| HTF | MSM | 154 | 175 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 609 |
| HTF | MSM | 154 | 175 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 610 |
| OCO | QCI | 180 | 201 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 611 |
| OCO | QCI | 180 | 201 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 612 |
| OCO | QCI | 180 | 201 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 613 |
| OCO | QCI | 180 | 201 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 614 |
| OCO | QCI | 180 | 201 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 615 |
| JOH | PBW | 166 | 187 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 616 |
| WPW | CNB | 167 | 188 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 617 |
| WPW | CNB | 167 | 188 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 618 |
| WPW | CNB | 167 | 188 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 619 |
| WPW | CNB | 167 | 188 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 620 |
| WPW | CNB | 167 | 188 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 621 |
| LBP | DCC | 188 | 201 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 622 |
| LBP | DCC | 180 | 201 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 623 |
| JOH | STX | 168 | 189 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 624 |
| JOH | STX | 168 | 189 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 625 |
| WPW | SHP | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 626 |
| WPW | SHP | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 627 |
| WPW | SHP | 177 | 198 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 628 |
| WPW | SHP | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 629 |
| WPW | SHP | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 630 |


| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \text { n } \\ & \text { n } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \tilde{L} \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | ${ }^{K e_{G}} \text { Su!ddtus } 7 \text { soṭx }$ |  | 号 $\frac{\pi}{\pi}$ $\frac{\pi}{4}$ $\frac{\pi}{2}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W PW | SHP | 177 | 198 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 631 |
| WVN | NMP | 158 | 179 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 632 |
| WVN | NMP | 158 | 179 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 633 |
| OAS | LPP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 634 |
| OAS | LPP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 635 |
| OAS | LPP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 636 |
| OAS | LPP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 637 |
| OAS | LPP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 638 |
| OAS | LPP | 170 | 191 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 639 |
| WVN | SOC | 179 | 200 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 640 |
| WVN | SOC | 179 | 200 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 641 |
| OCO | W PW | 174 | 195 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 642 |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{OC}$ | W PW | 174 | 195 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 643 |
| BNC | BRL | 159 | 180 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 644 |
| BNC | BRL | 159 | 180 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 645 |
| BNC | BRL | 159 | 180 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 646 |
| BNC | BRL | 159 | 180 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 647 |
| BNC | BRL | 149 | 180 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 648 |
| BNC | BRL | 159 | 180 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 649 |
| W PW | HNT | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 650 |
| W PW | HNT | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 651 |
| WPW | HNT | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 652 |
| W PW | HNT | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 653 |
| WPW | HNT | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 654 |
| WPW | HNT | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 655 |
| W PW | HNT | 168 | 189 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 656 |
| HTF | HNC | 152 | 173 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 557 |
| HIF | HNC | 152 | 173 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 658 |
| JOH | ANJ | 165 | 186 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 659 |
| JOH | ANJ | 165 | '186 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 660 |


|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 2 \\ & \frac{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \frac{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \frac{\pi}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LBP | DJI | 154 | 175 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 661 |
| LBP | DJI | 154 | 175 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 662 |
| WVN | BNC | 158 | 165 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 663 |
| WVN | LBP | 167 | 174 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 664 |
| WVN | WVN | 152 | 159 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 665 |
| WVN | WVN | 152 | 159 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 666 |
| WVN | HTF | 171 | 178 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 667 |
| JOH | BNC | 173 | 180 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 668 |
| JOH | BNC | 173 | 180 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 669 |
| JOH | LBP | 154 | 161 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 670 |
| JOH | W PW | 175 | 182 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 671 |
| DJI | BNC | 157 | 164 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 672 |
| DJI | BNC | 157 | 164 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 673 |
| DJI | JOH | 177 | 184 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 674 |
| DJI | WPW | 156 | 163 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 675 |
| DJI | W PW | 156 | 163 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 676 |
| DJI | WVN | 174 | 181 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 677 |
| TMI | BNC | 170 | 177 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 678 |
| TMI | BNC | 170 | 177 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 679 |
| TMI | LBP | 178 | 185 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 680 |
| TMI | WVN | 180 | 187 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 681 |
| TMI | WVN | 180 | 187 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 682 |
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