



The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

For Check Out Only!

Market Factors

OF NORTH DAKOTA

Durum Wheat

Shipments

JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

DAVID C. NELSON

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE
FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA

IN COOPERATION WITH
NORTH DAKOTA STATE WHEAT COMMISSION
BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA

FOREWORD

This publication represents a continuation of research into the factors affecting the marketing of North Dakota wheat. It illustrates the consistently high quality of North Dakota durum. The study was made possible through financial assistance grants from the North Dakota State Wheat Commission. Reports published under this cooperative arrangement are:

1. Wheat Statistics for North Dakota, Agricultural Economics Report No. 20, August, 1961.
2. Protein Content of North Dakota Wheat, North Dakota Farm Research, March-April, 1962.
3. Market Factors of North Dakota Hard Red Spring Wheat, Agricultural Economics Report No. 21, April, 1962.
4. North Dakota Hard Red Spring Wheat Shipments, North Dakota Farm Research, September-October, 1962.
5. Durum Market Factors, 1962, North Dakota Farm Research, January-February, 1963.
6. Quality Factors of North Dakota Durum Shipments, 1960, 1961, 1962, Agricultural Economics Report No. 26, January, 1963.
7. Durum Data, Agricultural Economics Report No. 27, February, 1963.
8. Market Factors of North Dakota Hard Red Spring Wheat, 1962 Shipments, Agricultural Economics Report No. 28, February, 1963.
9. Market Factors of North Dakota Hard Red Spring Wheat, 1963 Shipments, Agricultural Economics Report No. 33, March, 1964.
10. Market Factors of North Dakota Durum Wheat, 1963 Shipments with Comparisons, Agricultural Economics Report No. 34, April, 1964.
11. Quality of Commodity Credit Corporation Wheat in North Dakota Country Warehouses and Subterminals, North Dakota Farm Research, May-June, 1964.
12. Movement of North Dakota Grain by Truck, October-November, 1963, North Dakota Farm Research, July-August, 1964.
13. Economic Implications of the Wheat Sedimentation Test on the North Dakota Economy, Clinton D. Kurtz, unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics, North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota, October, 1964.
14. Market Factors of North Dakota Durum Wheat Shipments, July-December, 1964, Agricultural Economics Report No. 42, June, 1965.
15. Market Factors of North Dakota Hard Red Spring Wheat Shipments, July-December, 1964, Agricultural Economics Report No. 43, June, 1965.
16. Trends in Shipping Grain by Motor Carrier From North Dakota Origins, 1956-57 Through 1963-64, Bulletin No. 462, December, 1965.
17. Addendum to Bulletin No. 462, Agricultural Economics Report No. 44, January, 1966.

North Dakota State Wheat Commission

Tom Ridley, Chairman, Langdon
M. H. Gifford, Gardner
Robert Huffman, Regent
Lloyd Jones, Palermo

James Sampson, Lawton
Floyd Poyzer, Amenia
Steve Reimers, Carrington

Paul E. R. Abrahamson, Administrator, Bismarck
Melvin G. Maier, Asst. Administrator, Bismarck

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express their appreciation to the following individuals and organizations for their cooperation and assistance. This report would not have been possible without their help.

Mr. Thomas Brown, Grain Inspection Department, Grand Forks, North Dakota
Mr. W. G. Coulter, Tri-State Laboratories, Grand Forks, North Dakota
Mr. A. J. Kittleson, Union Laboratories, Minot, North Dakota
Mr. Donald Sathe, Sathe Laboratories, Jamestown, North Dakota
Mr. Ed. Matchey, Grain Inspection, Inc., Jamestown, North Dakota
Mr. James Thom, Minot Grain Inspection, Minot, North Dakota
North Dakota Grain Inspection Service, Fargo, North Dakota
Great Northern Railway Company, Minot, North Dakota
Soo Line Railway Company, Minot, North Dakota.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
Objectives	1
Procedure	1
Findings	2
TEST WEIGHT	5
MOISTURE CONTENT	5
PROTEIN CONTENT	7
OTHER GRADE FACTORS	7
DOCKAGE	7
APPENDIX A: Official Grade Standards for Durum Wheat	11
APPENDIX B: Additional Data on Durum Shipments	13

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlots Included in the 10 Per Cent Sample Survey, By Grade, July-December, 1965 and 1964, and August-October, 1963, 1962, 1961, and 1960	3
2 Average Value and Range of Bushel Weights of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Shipments, By Area, July-December, 1965 and 1964, and August-October, 1963, 1962, 1961, and 1960	4
3 Average Value and Range of Moisture Content of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Shipments, By Area, July-December, 1965 and 1964, and August-October, 1963, 1962, 1961, and 1960	6
4 Average Value and Ranges for Protein Content of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Shipments, By Area, July-December, 1965 and 1964, and August-October, 1963, 1962, 1961, and 1960	8
5 Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples Determining the Grade by Various Grading Factors for Total Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Leaving North Dakota Origins by Grade, July-December, 1965	9

MARKET FACTORS OF NORTH DAKOTA DURUM WHEAT SHIPMENTS

JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

David C. Nelson¹

The 1965 North Dakota production figures for durum wheat represent another successful year for the North Dakota durum grower. The estimated 1,938,000 harvested acres produced some 61,047,000 bushels of durum wheat for a 31.5 bushel per acre average.² This exceeds the 1964 production of 57,942,000 bushels and 29.0 bushels per acre. It also exceeds the 1962 average of 31 bushels per acre. The 1950-59 ten-year averages were 1,466,000 harvested acres which produced 19,088,000 bushels for 13 bushels per acre. The 1965 crop represents a 25 per cent increase in harvested acres and a 320 per cent increase in production over the 1950-59 average.

Objectives

The major objective of this report is to provide information regarding the relative importance of each of several grading factors for durum wheat harvested in 1965. The randomly selected sample drawn from records of carloads of durum leaving the state represents the total amount of durum wheat shipped from the state during the period July 1 - December 31, 1965. The analysis is made by origin and grade, which indicate the characteristics of durum originating in the various production areas in North Dakota. The 1965 crop profile is presented by the following categories: source, quality of the total crop and of each particular area, and the relative importance of each of the grading factors including protein in determining the overall quality of the crop.

Procedure

As in the five previous years an approximate 10 per cent sample of all carlot shipments held for inspection at the Grand Forks inspection point is included in this study. Like the report of the 1964 movement,³ this analysis includes samples from the Minot and Jamestown inspection points. These points were not included in the 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963 reports. This report, like the 1964 report and unlike the four previous reports, includes the period July 1 through December 31. The four previous reports included the period August 1 through October 31.

All factors of the carlot sample listed on the inspection record were recorded, including the protein content and the origin of the sample by crop reporting district and county. This information was tabulated and analyzed in the following format for each of the quality factors existing in the sample (Appendix

¹Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, Fargo, North Dakota.

²Statistical Reporting Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Fargo, North Dakota.

³Nelson, David C. and Fred R. Taylor, Market Factors of North Dakota Durum Wheat Shipments, July-December, 1964, Agricultural Economics Report No. 42, Department of Agricultural Economics, North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota, June, 1961.

Tables B-1 through B-25). They are as follow:

1. The percentage distribution and number of carlots falling within specified ranges of various quality factors by grade for the entire sample.
2. Number of carlots falling within specified ranges of various quality factors by crop reporting districts included in the sample area and the percentage distribution of carlots within these ranges for the 1965 sample and the 1964, 1963, 1962, 1961, and 1960 samples for comparison.
3. Number of carlots falling within specified ranges of various quality factors by grade for the crop reporting districts.

Information found in the Appendix also includes the average values and range of test weight, moisture, and protein by county and grade for the crop reporting districts in the sample.

Findings

The origin of the 1965 carlot samples is shown in Figure 1. The sample includes part of eight of the nine North Dakota crop reporting districts. No samples were developed from the Southwest District (CRD No. 7).⁴

The 1965 durum carlot survey yielded 430 samples. This is slightly less than the 455 samples of the 1964 movement, but far more than the 199 in 1963, 269 in 1962, 217 in 1961, and 181 in 1960 (Table 1). In general, the sample quality was better than the 1964 sample, but lower than the four previous years. About 91 per cent graded Hard Amber Durum as compared with 88 per cent in 1964. This compares with 98, 91, 97, and 90 per cent for 1963, 1962, 1961, and 1960 years, respectively. The amount falling within the No. 1 HAD category is substantially greater than in 1964. As a per cent of the total nearly twice as much fell within this category as in the previous year, 12.6 versus 6.6 per cent in 1964. The per cent falling within the No. 2 HAD category is also greater than in 1964. About 52 per cent of the 1965 sample fell within these two categories which is roughly nine percentage points greater than in 1964. This is considerably less than the proportion which fell within these two categories in 1963, 1962, 1961, and 1960, however. These two categories account for approximately 97, 87, 96, and 89 per cent for the latter years, respectively. About 8 per cent of the 1965 sample fell within the Amber Durum category which is slightly less than the 9 per cent in the 1964 sample. Only one per cent of the 1965 sample graded durum as compared to nearly 3 per cent in 1964.

Approximately 61 per cent of the total sample originated in the central and eastern crop reporting districts (Table 2). The remainder was shipped from the western districts, about 34 per cent of total originating in the Northwest

⁴Includes Golden Valley, Billings, Stark, Slope, Hettinger, Bowman, and Adams counties.

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOTS INCLUDED IN THE 10 PER CENT SAMPLE SURVEY, BY GRADE,
JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 AND 1964, AND AUGUST - OCTOBER, 1963, 1962, 1961, AND 1960

Grade	1965			1964			1963			1962			1961			1960		
	Car- lots	Per Cent		Car- lots	Per Cent		Car- lots	Per Cent		Car- lots	Per Cent		Car- lots	Per Cent		Car- lots	Per Cent	
No. 1 HAD	54	12.6		30	6.6		43	21.6		100	37.2		107	49.3		84	46.3	
No. 2 HAD	168	39.0		166	36.6		108	54.2		73	27.1		45	20.7		14	7.7	
No. 3 HAD	112	26.0		132	29.1		42	21.2		61	22.7		56	25.7		63	34.8	
No. 4 HAD	41	9.5		61	13.4		2	1.0		7	2.6		3	1.4		2	1.1	
No. 5 HAD	16	3.7		10	2.2		1	0.5		4	1.5		--	--		--	--	
S. G. HAD	--	--		--	--		--	--		1	0.4		--	--		1	0.6	
No. 1 AD	--	--		3	0.7		1	0.5		5	1.8		--	--		2	1.1	
No. 2 AD	5	1.2		11	2.4		1	0.5		4	1.5		1	0.5		4	2.2	
No. 3 AD	7	1.6		11	2.4		--	--		9	3.3		2	0.9		8	4.4	
No. 4 AD	12	2.8		11	2.4		1	0.5		1	0.4		--	--		1	0.6	
No. 5 AD	11	2.6		6	1.3		--	--		--	--		1	0.5		1	0.6	
S. G. AD	--	--		1	0.2		--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	
No. 1 Durum	--	--		1	0.2		--	--		1	0.4		--	--		--	--	
No. 2 Durum	--	--		4	0.9		--	--		2	0.7		1	0.5		--	--	
No. 3 Durum	--	--		2	0.4		--	--		1	0.4		1	0.5		--	--	
No. 4 Durum	2	0.5		2	0.4		--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	
No. 5 Durum	2	0.5		2	0.4		--	--		--	--		--	--		--	--	
S. G. Durum	--	--		2	0.4		--	--		--	--		--	--		1	0.6	
Total All Durum	430	100.0		455	100.0		199	100.0		269	100.0		217	100.0		181	100.0	




Figure 1. Counties included in 1965 sample of carlots inspected at North Dakota hold points.




Figure 2. North Dakota Crop Reporting Districts.

TABLE 2. AVERAGE VALUE AND RANGE OF BUSHEL WEIGHTS OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT SHIPMENTS, BY AREA, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 AND 1964, AND AUGUST - OCTOBER, 1963, 1962, 1961, AND 1960

Year and Area	Total Number of Shipments	Bushel Weight, Pounds	
		Average	Range
<u>1965</u>			
Northwest	148	60.1	54.0-63.5
North Central	86	58.7	55.0-62.3
Northeast	102	59.9	54.5-63.0
West Central	21	59.6	57.0-62.0
Central	38	59.3	53.5-61.3
East Central	24	60.5	57.0-63.0
South Central	4	61.8	61.2-62.2
Southeast	7	59.3	58.6-60.7
Total	430	59.9	53.5-63.5
<u>1964</u>			
Northwest	81	60.5	54.2-63.0
North Central	95	58.5	53.6-62.5
Northeast	199	57.4	54.0-62.3
West Central	3	58.1	57.5-58.5
Central	40	59.0	56.7-62.3
East Central	28	60.4	56.7-62.7
Southwest	1	59.1	-- --
South Central	5	59.1	56.5-60.7
Southeast	3	59.4	58.1-59.7
Total	455	58.5	53.6-63.0
<u>1963</u>			
Northwest	14	58.7	54.3-61.5
North Central	57	59.1	56.5-62.0
Northeast	126	59.3	55.0-62.0
East Central	2	59.2	58.7-59.6
Total	199	59.2	54.3-62.0
<u>1962</u>			
Northwest	20	61.5	60.0-63.0
North Central	78	60.6	57.0-63.2
Northeast	171	59.6	54.7-62.7
Total	269	60.0	54.7-63.2
<u>1961</u>			
Northwest	10	61.1	58.5-62.0
North Central	37	61.3	58.0-62.5
Northeast	170	61.5	58.5-63.3
Total	217	61.4	58.0-63.3
<u>1960</u>			
Northwest	21	60.0	58.5-62.0
North Central	52	60.9	58.0-62.5
Northeast	108	60.8	58.5-63.3
Total	181	60.6	58.0-63.3

District alone. This is a significant departure from normal origins for durum in North Dakota. Traditionally, the northeastern and north central part of the state originates the greatest proportion. In 1965 for the first time more of the sample originated in the Northwest District with the Northeast District ranking second with about 24 per cent as compared to 44 per cent in 1964. The North Central District supplied about 20 per cent in 1965 and 21 per cent in 1964.

TEST WEIGHT

The average test weight for the 1965 carlot sample was higher than the 1964 and 1963 samples but lower than the three previous years (Table 2). This probably explains the increase in the proportion grading No. 1 HAD in 1965 relative to 1964 and yet lower than other years. The total sample average bushel weights by districts ranged from 53.5 to 63.5 pounds, which yielded an average total crop weight of 59.9 pounds per bushel. The highest average test weight was found in the few samples originating in the South Central District. In those districts which supply major portions of the total the East Central and the Northwest District samples were highest, 60.5 and 60.1 pounds per bushel, respectively. The lowest average test weight per bushel was found in the samples originating in the North Central District, 58.7 pounds. These results are consistent with the analysis of the 1964 samples, but inconsistent with the test weight results of former years. Examination of the county data (Appendix Table B-2) indicates that the highest test weights originated in the East Central counties, Steele, Barnes, and Traill, and in the Northwest counties, Divide, Burke, and Williams. The highest average test weight originated in Pembina county, 62.5 pounds per bushel.

Test weight appeared a less important determinant of grade in the 1965 sample than in the 1964 sample (Table 5). Total defects is still more important than test weight, given the existing grading system. Test weight determined the grade of only 123 or 28.6 per cent of the 430 carlots in the 1965 sample and 133 carlots or 29.2 per cent in the 1964 sample. Total defects was a more important determinant in the 1965 sample than in 1964. This factor determined the grade of 331 carlots or 77 per cent in 1965 and 273 carlots or 60 per cent in 1964.

More detailed analysis of the distribution of carlots by test weight criteria is found in Appendix Tables B-2 through B-6.

MOISTURE CONTENT

The average moisture content of the 1965 total carlot sample was lower than the 1964 average and yet was exceeded only by the 1962 sample in the previous years (Table 3). The 9.1 to 16.0 per cent range was nearly as high as the 1964 range of 9.1 to 16.5 per cent. It is matched in former years only in 1961 when the range was 8.6 to 15.5 per cent. The highest average moisture content was found in the samples originating in the Northeast and South Central Districts, 12.2 per cent. The lowest average was found in the Southeast District. By counties the highest average moisture content was found in the Northeast counties, Cavalier and Towner, 13.2 per cent (Appendix Table B-2). The lowest was found in Barnes County in the East Central District.

TABLE 3. AVERAGE VALUE AND RANGE OF MOISTURE CONTENT OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT SHIPMENTS, BY AREA, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 AND 1964, AND AUGUST - OCTOBER, 1963, 1962, 1961, AND 1960

Year and Area	Total Number of Shipments	Moisture Content, Per Cent	
		Average	Range
<u>1965</u>			
Northwest	148	11.8	9.1-15.0
North Central	86	12.0	10.1-14.9
Northeast	102	12.2	10.0-16.0
West Central	21	11.5	10.4-13.3
Central	38	11.5	10.0-14.8
East Central	24	11.5	9.4-15.5
South Central	4	12.2	10.5-13.3
Southeast	7	11.2	9.8-12.4
Total	430	11.7	9.1-16.0
<u>1964</u>			
Northwest	81	11.7	9.9-14.3
North Central	95	12.3	10.5-16.5
Northeast	199	12.4	10.0-14.5
West Central	3	11.8	11.3-12.6
Central	40	11.9	10.5-14.0
East Central	28	11.6	9.1-13.5
Southwest	1	11.0	-- --
South Central	5	11.9	11.2-12.4
Southeast	3	11.5	11.1-11.9
Total	455	12.1	9.1-16.5
<u>1963</u>			
Northwest	14	11.6	10.3-12.7
North Central	57	11.2	9.2-13.5
Northeast	126	11.3	9.6-13.4
East Central	2	10.4	10.1-10.7
Total	199	11.3	9.2-13.5
<u>1962</u>			
Northwest	20	11.6	10.0-12.7
North Central	78	11.8	10.0-14.3
Northeast	171	12.7	10.7-15.0
Total	269	12.4	10.0-15.0
<u>1961</u>			
Northwest	10	9.8	8.9-11.4
North Central	37	10.5	8.6-12.0
Northeast	170	11.2	8.8-15.5
Total	217	11.0	8.6-15.5
<u>1960</u>			
Northwest	21	10.8	9.0-12.2
North Central	52	11.2	9.4-13.0
Northeast	108	11.8	10.6-13.7
Total	181	11.5	9.0-13.7

Slightly more than one-half of the total sample (52.4 per cent) had a moisture content greater than 12.0 per cent (Appendix Table B-7). About 47 per cent fell within the 10.0-11.9 percentage range, which is about the same as the 1964 sample.

PROTEIN CONTENT

The average protein content of the 1965 carlot sample of 13.6 per cent was lower than four of the five previous years (Table 4). Only the 13.1 per cent of 1962 was lower. Considering only those crop reporting districts from which a large number of samples originated (excludes South Central and Southeast) the highest average protein appeared in the Central District, 14.2 per cent. The next closest were the samples from the West Central and the Northwest District, where the average protein was 13.6 and 13.5 per cent, respectively. The lowest protein levels were found in those samples originating in the East Central and North Central Districts, 13.4 per cent in both cases.

Only about 22 per cent of the total sample fell within the 14.0 to 14.4 per cent protein range (Appendix Table B-10). This is just slightly less than the 1964 sample. About 38 per cent of the 1965 sample tested 14.0 per cent protein or better, while about 46 per cent of the 1964 sample fell above this point.

OTHER GRADE FACTORS

The other grade factors considered here are total damage, foreign material, shrunken and broken kernels, total defects, and contracting classes. Of these several criteria, total defects played the most important role in grade determination within the three subclasses of durum wheat (Table 5). Total defects was the final determinant of 77 per cent of the sample. Another important factor was shrunken and broken kernels. This grading factor determined the grade in about 23 per cent of the total carlots. This is about the same as in the 1964 sample when shrunken and broken factors determined the grade of about 24 per cent of the sample.

Considerably more information of greater detail is available in Appendix Tables B-13 through B-22 concerning each of the several specific grading factors included in Table 5.

DOCKAGE

Although the dockage present in a lot of wheat is not a factor affecting the grade of that lot, it is of importance in determining the weight of the shipment (in this sense it does affect the test weight). Excess percentages of dockage therefore represent negative returns to producers and processors.

Fifty-seven per cent of the total 1965 sample had less than one per cent dockage (Appendix Table B-23). This compares to the 1964 sample which showed 55.5 per cent with less than one per cent dockage. About 85 per cent of the 1965 sample had less than 2 per cent dockage while about 91 per cent of the 1964 sample had less than 2 per cent dockage.

TABLE 4. AVERAGE VALUE AND RANGES FOR PROTEIN CONTENT OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT SHIPMENTS, BY AREA, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 AND 1964, AND AUGUST - OCTOBER, 1963, 1962, 1961, AND 1960

Year and Area	Total Number of Shipments	Protein Content, Per Cent	
		Average	Range
<u>1965</u>			
Northwest	148	13.5	11.8-15.6
North Central	86	13.4	11.6-15.1
Northeast	102	12.9	11.0-15.3
West Central	21	13.6	12.0-15.0
Central	38	14.2	12.5-16.7
East Central	24	13.4	11.0-15.8
South Central	4	13.5	12.6-14.6
Southeast	7	14.5	13.7-14.8
Total	430	13.6	11.0-16.7
<u>1964</u>			
Northwest	81	13.8	11.9-16.8
North Central	95	13.5	11.5-15.5
Northeast	199	13.6	12.0-16.6
West Central	3	14.6	13.9-15.7
Central	40	14.3	13.1-15.5
East Central	28	13.1	12.5-14.1
Southwest	1	15.0	-- --
South Central	5	13.3	12.6-14.2
Southeast	3	13.2	-- --
Total	455	13.7	11.5-16.8
<u>1963</u>			
Northwest	14	14.1	12.7-16.5
North Central	57	14.6	12.0-16.3
Northeast	126	14.2	11.4-16.0
East Central	2	14.0	-- --
Total	199	14.3	11.4-16.0
<u>1962</u>			
Northwest	20	13.6	12.2-15.5
North Central	78	13.3	11.3-16.0
Northeast	171	12.9	11.4-15.0
Total	269	13.1	11.3-16.0
<u>1961</u>			
Northwest	10	16.2	15.2-17.2
North Central	37	15.0	13.6-16.7
Northeast	170	14.9	10.2-16.3
Total	217	15.0	10.2-17.2
<u>1960</u>			
Northwest	21	15.8	13.4-17.2
North Central	52	15.0	13.0-16.9
Northeast	108	14.3	11.5-16.6
Total	181	14.7	11.5-17.2

TABLE 5. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES DETERMINING THE GRADE BY VARIOUS GRADING FACTORS FOR TOTAL CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT LEAVING NORTH DAKOTA ORIGINS BY GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade & Percentage Distribution	Grading Factors								No. of Samples**
	Not Applicable*	Test Weight	Total Damage	Shrunken and Broken	Foreign Material	Total Defects	Wheat of Other Classes	Other Grains	
No. 1 HAD	54	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	54
Per Cent	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
No. 2 HAD	--	71	6	88	3	149	1	--	168
Per Cent	0.0	59.5	3.6	52.4	1.8	88.7	0.6	0.0	
No. 3 HAD	--	36	12	10	5	97	--	--	112
Per Cent	0.0	32.1	10.7	8.9	4.5	86.6	0.0	0.0	
No. 4 HAD	--	6	13	--	--	36	4	--	41
Per Cent	0.0	14.6	31.7	0.0	0.0	87.8	9.8	0.0	16
No. 5 HAD	--	--	10	--	2	13	--	--	
Per Cent	0.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	12.5	81.2	0.0	0.0	
No. 2 AD	--	2	1	1	--	3	--	--	5
Per Cent	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	
No. 3 AD	--	5	1	1	--	7	--	--	7
Per Cent	0.0	71.4	14.3	14.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
No. 4 AD	--	1	5	--	--	11	1	--	12
Per Cent	0.0	8.3	41.7	0.0	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	
No. 5 AD	--	1	11	--	--	11	--	--	11
Per Cent	0.0	9.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
No. 4 Durum	--	--	2	--	--	2	--	--	2
Per Cent	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	
No. 5 Durum	--	1	2	--	--	2	--	--	2
Per Cent	0.0	50.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	

(continued)

TABLE 5. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES DETERMINING THE GRADE BY VARIOUS GRADING FACTORS FOR TOTAL CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT LEAVING NORTH DAKOTA ORIGINS BY GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade & Per- centage Distribution	Grading Factors								No. of Samples**
	Not Applicable*	Test Weight	Total Damage	Shrunken and Broken	Foreign Material	Total Defects	Wheat of Other Classes	Other Grains	
ALL GRADES	54	123	63	100.0	10	331	6	--	430
Per Cent	12.6	28.6	14.6	23.2	2.3	77.0	1.4	0.0	

*Sample grade determination can be made on the basis of factors other than grading factors.

**The total number of samples does not always equal the summation of the number of carloads found in each category. Any particular carload can be graded initially by any one specific grading factor (generally test weight); however, the weighting of other grading factors (especially total defects) may push it into a lower grade.

APPENDIX A
OFFICIAL GRADE STANDARDS FOR DURUM WHEAT

APPENDIX TABLE A-1. GRADE REQUIREMENTS FOR DURUM WHEAT

Grade Number	Minimum Test Weight (Lbs. Per Bu.)	Maximum Percentage Limits of					
		Defects and Foreign Material				Wheat of Other Classes	
		Kernel Damage***		Shrunken & Broken	Total* Defects	Contrasting Classes**	Total Class Admixture
		Heat	Total				
1	60.0	0.1	2.0	0.5	3.0	0.5	3.0
2	58.0	0.2	4.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	5.0
3	56.0	0.5	7.0	2.0	8.0	2.0	10.0
4	54.0	1.0	10.0	3.0	12.0	10.0	10.0
5	51.0	3.0	15.0	5.0	20.0	10.0	10.0

Sample: Not meeting above requirements, containing stones, musty, sour, heating, with objectionable commercial odor other than smut and garlic, excessively smutty, or of otherwise distinctly low quality.

*Total Defects: Sum of total damage, foreign material, shrunken and broken kernels (new factor).

**Contrasting Classes: All other classes.

***Damaged Kernels: Heat damaged, sprouted, frosted, diseased, moldy, badly ground and weather (or otherwise materially) damaged kernels and pieces of kernels including other grains.

APPENDIX B

ADDITIONAL DATA ON DURUM SHIPMENTS

APPENDIX B - LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
B-1	Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlots Included in 10 Per Cent Sample Survey, By Grade and Crop Reporting District, July - December, 1965, and Comparisons for 1964, 1963, 1962, 1961, and 1960	16
B-2	Average Values and Ranges for Protein Content, Bushel Weight, and Moisture of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat, By Crop Reporting District and County, July - December, 1965	17
B-3	Average Values and Ranges for Protein Content, Bushel Weight, and Moisture of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat, By Grade and Crop Reporting District, July - December, 1965	19
B-4	Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Grades Falling Within One Pound Bushel Weight Ranges for the Entire Sample Area, July - December, 1965	22
B-5	Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Falling Within One Pound Bushel Weight Ranges, By Crop Reporting District, July - December, 1965, With Comparisons. . .	23
B-6	Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Grades Falling Within One Pound Bushel Weight Ranges, By Crop Reporting District and Grade, July - December, 1965	24
B-7	Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlots of Durum Wheat Grades Falling Within 0.5 Per Cent Moisture Ranges for the Entire Sample Area, July - December, 1965	28
B-8	Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Falling Within 0.5 Per Cent Moisture Content Ranges, By Crop Reporting District, July - December, 1965, With Comparisons	29
B-9	Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Grades Falling Within 0.5 Per Cent Moisture Content Ranges, By Crop Reporting District and Grade, July - December, 1965	30
B-10	Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Grades Falling Within 0.5 Per Cent Protein Ranges for the Entire Sample Area, July - December, 1965	33
B-11	Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Falling Within 0.5 Per Cent Protein Ranges, By Crop Reporting District, July - December, 1965, With Comparisons.	34
B-12	Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Grades Falling Within 0.5 Per Cent Protein Ranges, By Crop Reporting District and Grade, July - December, 1965	35
B-13	Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Grades Falling Within One Per Cent Damage Ranges for the Entire Sample Area, July - December, 1965	38

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
B-14 Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Falling Within One Per Cent Damage Ranges, By Crop Reporting District, July - December, 1965, With Comparisons.	39
B-15 Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Falling Within One Per Cent Damage Ranges, By Crop Reporting District and Grade, July - December, 1965	40
B-16 Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Grades Falling Within One Per Cent Shrunken and Broken Ranges for the Entire Sample Area, July - December, 1965	43
B-17 Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Falling Within One Per Cent Shrunken and Broken Ranges, By Crop Reporting District, July - December, 1965, With Comparisons .	44
B-18 Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Falling Within One Per Cent Shrunken and Broken Ranges, By Crop Reporting District and Grade, July - December, 1965	45
B-19 Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Grades Falling Within 0.5 Per Cent Foreign Material Ranges for the Entire Sample Area, By Grade, July - December, 1965	49
B-20 Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Falling Within 0.5 Per Cent Foreign Material Ranges, By Crop Reporting District, July - December, 1965, With Comparisons.	50
B-21 Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Falling Within 0.5 Per Cent Foreign Material Ranges, By Crop Reporting District and Grade, July - December, 1965	51
B-22 Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlots of Durum Wheat Falling Within One Per Cent Total Defect Range for the Entire Sample Area, By Grade, July - December, 1965	58
B-23 Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Grades Falling Within 0.5 Per Cent Dockage Ranges for the Entire Sample Area, July - December, 1965	56
B-24 Percentage Distribution and Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Falling Within 0.5 Per Cent Dockage Ranges, By Crop Reporting District, July - December, 1965, With Comparisons.	57
B-25 Number of Carlot Samples of Durum Wheat Falling Within One Per Cent Dockage Ranges, By Crop Reporting District and Grade, July - December, 1965	58

APPENDIX TABLE B-1. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOTS INCLUDED IN 10 PER CENT SAMPLE SURVEY, BY GRADE AND CROP REPORTING DISTRICT, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965, AND COMPARISONS FOR 1964, 1963, 1962, 1961, AND 1960

Grade	1965										1964		1963		1962		1961		1960		
	NW	NC	NE	WC	C	Area		SE	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent	Total	Per Cent			
						EC	SW														
No. 1 HAD	27	4	11	2	2	5	—	1	54	12.6	30	6.6	43	21.6	100	37.2	107	49.3	84	46.3	
No. 2 HAD	63	30	42	9	17	4	—	3	168	39.0	166	36.6	108	54.2	73	27.1	45	20.7	14	7.7	
No. 3 HAD	32	34	20	4	14	5	—	1	112	26.0	132	29.1	42	21.2	61	22.7	56	25.7	63	34.8	
No. 4 HAD	10	10	10	3	2	4	—	1	41	9.5	61	13.4	2	1.0	7	2.6	3	1.4	2	1.1	
No. 5 HAD	4	2	9	1	—	—	—	—	16	3.7	10	2.2	1	0.5	4	1.5	—	—	—	—	
S. G. HAD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	0.4	—	—	1	0.6	
No. 1 AD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	0.7	1	0.5	5	1.8	—	—	2	1.1	
No. 2 AD	1	—	1	—	1	2	—	—	5	1.2	11	2.4	1	0.5	4	1.5	1	0.5	4	2.2	
No. 3 AD	4	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	7	1.6	11	2.4	—	—	9	3.3	2	0.9	8	4.4	
No. 4 AD	4	2	4	2	—	—	—	—	12	2.8	11	2.4	1	0.5	1	0.4	—	—	1	0.6	
No. 5 AD	2	1	4	—	1	3	—	—	11	2.6	6	1.3	—	—	—	—	1	0.5	1	0.6	
S. G. AD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
No. 1 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	0.2	—	—	1	0.4	—	—	—	—	
No. 2 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	0.9	—	—	2	0.7	1	0.5	—	—	
No. 3 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	0.4	—	—	1	0.4	1	0.5	—	—	
No. 4 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	0.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
No. 5 Durum	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	0.5	2	0.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
S. G. Durum	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	2	0.5	2	0.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	0.6	
AREA TOTAL	148	86	102	21	38	24	—	4	7	430	100.0	455	100.0	199	100.0	269	100.0	217	100.0	181	100.0

APPENDIX TABLE B-2. AVERAGE VALUES AND RANGES FOR PROTEIN CONTENT, BUSHEL WEIGHT, AND MOISTURE OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND COUNTY, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

District and County	Protein Content, %		Bushel Weight, lb.		Moisture Content, %		No. of Carlots
	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	
Burke	13.1	12.8 - 13.4	61.2	60.0 - 62.3	11.3	10.6 - 12.0	2
Divide	13.6	11.8 - 15.1	61.5	59.5 - 63.5	11.8	9.1 - 13.5	5
Mountrail	13.8	12.1 - 15.6	60.0	56.7 - 62.5	11.5	9.3 - 14.8	38
Renville	13.2	12.5 - 14.6	57.5	54.0 - 60.0	12.7	11.9 - 14.7	10
Ward	13.4	12.2 - 15.3	59.3	56.0 - 63.0	12.2	10.2 - 15.0	74
Williams	13.9	12.3 - 15.6	60.9	59.2 - 62.6	11.6	9.8 - 13.5	19
NORTHWEST	13.5	11.8 - 15.6	60.1	54.0 - 63.5	11.8	9.1 - 15.0	148
Benson	13.9	12.8 - 15.1	58.8	56.0 - 60.7	12.0	10.4 - 13.5	33
Bottineau	13.5	12.2 - 14.5	58.0	55.2 - 60.0	12.6	10.1 - 14.9	28
McHenry	13.6	12.4 - 15.1	60.1	57.6 - 62.3	10.7	10.4 - 13.4	8
Pierce	13.6	13.0 - 14.6	58.9	55.0 - 61.0	12.1	10.4 - 13.4	8
Rolette	12.5	11.6 - 14.0	57.5	55.5 - 61.0	12.8	11.5 - 14.7	9
NORTH CENTRAL	13.4	11.6 - 15.1	58.7	55.0 - 62.3	12.0	10.1 - 14.9	86
Cavalier	13.1	12.0 - 14.7	56.8	54.5 - 58.9	13.2	11.1 - 16.0	13
Grand Forks	12.9	12.0 - 14.0	61.3	58.0 - 63.0	11.6	11.0 - 13.0	11
Nelson	13.1	12.4 - 14.3	61.1	59.0 - 63.0	11.6	10.7 - 12.4	13
Pembina	11.3	11.0 - 11.6	62.5	62.2 - 62.7	12.2	11.8 - 12.5	3
Ramsey	13.9	12.3 - 14.7	59.1	54.6 - 61.8	11.7	10.0 - 12.6	30
Towner	13.5	12.0 - 15.3	57.4	55.5 - 60.5	13.2	11.0 - 16.0	30
Walsh	12.2	12.0 - 12.3	61.3	60.0 - 62.6	11.9	11.0 - 12.7	2
NORTHEAST	12.9	11.0 - 15.3	59.9	54.5 - 63.0	12.2	10.0 - 16.0	102
Dunn	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
McKenzie	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
McLean	13.6	12.0 - 15.0	59.6	57.0 - 62.0	11.5	10.4 - 13.3	21
Mercer	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Oliver	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
WEST CENTRAL	13.6	12.0 - 15.0	59.6	57.0 - 62.0	11.5	10.4 - 13.3	21

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-2. AVERAGE VALUES AND RANGES FOR PROTEIN CONTENT, BUSHEL WEIGHT, AND MOISTURE OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND COUNTY, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

District and County	Protein Content, %		Bushel Weight, lb.		Moisture Content, %		No. of Carlots
	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	
Eddy	14.5	14.3 - 14.6	59.9	59.6 - 60.2	10.7	10.4 - 11.0	2
Foster	14.0	13.5 - 14.7	59.3	58.2 - 60.0	11.6	11.2 - 12.4	3
Kidder	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Sheridan	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Stutsman	14.0	13.0 - 14.5	59.3	57.0 - 61.3	11.9	10.4 - 12.7	11
Wells	14.1	12.5 - 16.7	58.5	53.5 - 60.7	12.0	10.0 - 14.8	22
CENTRAL	14.2	12.5 - 16.7	59.3	53.5 - 61.3	11.5	10.0 - 14.8	38
Barnes	13.9	13.4 - 14.7	60.9	60.0 - 61.6	10.3	9.4 - 11.0	4
Cass	13.3	12.2 - 14.8	59.8	57.0 - 61.0	11.2	10.7 - 11.7	7
Griggs	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Steele	14.0	12.1 - 15.8	61.2	59.0 - 62.6	12.3	11.4 - 13.7	4
Trail	12.4	11.0 - 13.4	60.2	58.0 - 63.0	12.1	9.6 - 15.5	9
EAST CENTRAL	13.4	11.0 - 15.8	60.5	57.0 - 63.0	11.5	9.4 - 15.5	24
Adams	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Billings	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Bowman	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Golden Valley	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Hettinger	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Slope	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Stark	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
SOUTHWEST	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Burleigh	12.6	-----	62.2	-----	13.3	-----	1
Emmons	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Grant	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
Morton	14.3	13.6 - 14.6	61.4	61.2 - 61.7	11.1	10.5 - 11.7	3
Sioux	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---
SOUTH CENTRAL	13.5	12.6 - 14.6	61.8	61.2 - 62.2	12.2	10.5 - 13.3	4
SOUTHEAST	14.5	13.7 - 14.8	59.3	58.6 - 60.7	11.2	9.8 - 12.4	7

APPENDIX TABLE B-3. AVERAGE VALUES AND RANGES FOR PROTEIN CONTENT, BUSHEL WEIGHT, AND MOISTURE OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT, BY GRADE AND CROP REPORTING DISTRICT, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Protein Content, %		Bushel Weight, lb.		Moisture Content, %		No. of Carlots
	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	
NORTHWEST DISTRICT							
No. 1 HAD	13.6	11.8 - 15.1	61.4	60.0 - 63.3	11.6	9.1 - 13.5	27
No. 2 HAD	13.7	12.3 - 15.6	60.0	58.2 - 62.3	11.7	9.8 - 14.2	63
No. 3 HAD	13.8	12.2 - 15.3	59.1	57.0 - 63.0	12.2	9.3 - 15.0	32
No. 4 HAD	13.8	13.0 - 14.8	58.2	56.3 - 61.2	12.5	10.7 - 14.5	10
No. 5 HAD	13.7	12.3 - 14.8	58.1	57.2 - 60.0	11.8	10.2 - 12.7	4
No. 2 AD	12.3	-----	59.7	-----	13.5	-----	1
No. 3 AD	13.4	12.1 - 14.5	57.2	57.0 - 57.6	13.4	12.7 - 13.5	4
No. 4 AD	13.0	12.5 - 13.5	56.5	56.0 - 57.3	12.9	12.3 - 13.5	4
No. 5 AD	13.2	13.0 - 13.4	55.0	54.0 - 56.0	12.1	12.0 - 12.2	2
No. 4 Durum	13.2	-----	56.2	-----	14.7	-----	1
ALL GRADES	13.4	12.1 - 15.6	58.1	54.0 - 63.3	12.6	9.1 - 15.0	148

NORTH CENTRAL DISTRICT							
No. 1 HAD	13.3	12.4 - 13.3	60.8	60.0 - 62.3	12.3	11.0 - 13.4	4
No. 2 HAD	13.3	11.6 - 15.1	59.7	58.0 - 61.1	11.3	10.1 - 13.5	30
No. 3 HAD	13.8	12.2 - 15.1	58.2	56.0 - 61.1	12.3	10.6 - 14.5	34
No. 4 HAD	13.2	11.5 - 14.1	56.7	55.3 - 58.0	13.2	12.0 - 14.7	10
No. 5 HAD	13.5	13.4 - 13.5	55.1	55.0 - 55.2	13.2	13.2 - 13.4	2
No. 3 AD	13.4	12.8 - 14.0	58.0	56.7 - 59.2	13.6	12.3 - 14.9	2
No. 4 AD	12.8	12.5 - 13.0	58.3	58.2 - 58.3	12.1	11.5 - 12.7	2
No. 5 AD	14.0	-----	56.0	-----	13.0	-----	1
No. 4 Durum	12.8	-----	56.2	-----	13.0	-----	1
ALL GRADES	13.3	11.5 - 15.1	57.7	55.0 - 62.3	12.7	10.1 - 14.9	86

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-3. AVERAGE VALUES AND RANGES FOR PROTEIN CONTENT, BUSHEL WEIGHT, AND MOISTURE OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT, BY GRADE AND CROP REPORTING DISTRICT, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Grade	Protein Content, %		Bushel Weight, lb.		Moisture Content, %		No. of Carlots
	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	
NORTHEAST DISTRICT							
No. 1 HAD	12.8	11.0 - 14.0	61.9	60.0 - 63.0	11.6	10.7 - 12.3	11
No. 2 HAD	13.7	11.6 - 15.3	61.7	58.0 - 62.8	11.2	10.0 - 13.4	42
No. 3 HAD	13.6	12.0 - 14.7	58.0	57.0 - 61.0	12.6	10.5 - 16.0	20
No. 4 HAD	13.1	12.0 - 14.3	56.7	54.5 - 59.0	13.0	11.6 - 16.0	10
No. 5 HAD	13.5	12.5 - 14.7	56.2	54.6 - 58.0	13.3	12.0 - 14.9	9
No. 2 AD	12.7	-----	59.0	-----	12.4	-----	1
No. 4 AD	13.1	12.6 - 13.5	56.1	54.7 - 57.0	14.1	13.5 - 14.9	4
No. 5 AD	12.9	12.3 - 13.2	56.3	55.5 - 57.0	13.9	12.2 - 14.9	4
No. 5 Durum	13.0	-----	58.0	-----	13.0	-----	1
ALL GRADES	13.2	11.0 - 15.3	58.2	54.5 - 63.0	12.8	10.0 - 16.0	102
WEST CENTRAL DISTRICT							
No. 1 HAD	13.6	13.2 - 14.0	60.6	60.0 - 61.2	12.2	11.7 - 12.6	2
No. 2 HAD	13.3	12.8 - 14.4	60.3	56.6 - 62.0	11.7	10.4 - 12.8	9
No. 3 HAD	13.4	12.9 - 14.0	58.9	57.6 - 60.5	12.4	11.6 - 13.3	4
No. 4 HAD	13.7	13.4 - 13.9	58.0	57.0 - 59.0	12.5	12.1 - 13.0	3
No. 5 HAD	14.2	-----	59.1	-----	10.7	-----	1
No. 4 AD	13.5	12.0 - 15.0	59.4	58.0 - 60.8	12.7	12.5 - 12.8	2
ALL GRADES	13.6	12.0 15.0	59.4	56.6 - 62.0	12.0	10.4 - 13.3	21
CENTRAL DISTRICT							
No. 1 HAD	13.3	12.5 - 14.0	60.4	60.0 - 60.7	11.8	11.5 - 12.1	2
No. 2 HAD	14.3	13.3 - 16.7	59.6	58.2 - 60.7	11.4	10.0 - 12.7	17
No. 3 HAD	14.1	13.2 - 14.8	58.6	56.0 - 60.6	11.4	11.1 - 13.0	14
No. 4 HAD	14.5	14.0 - 15.0	58.3	57.2 - 59.3	12.2	12.0 - 12.4	2
No. 2 AD	13.0	-----	60.2	-----	11.8	-----	1
No. 5 AD	14.4	-----	53.2	-----	13.5	-----	1
No. 5 Durum	12.6	-----	53.5	-----	14.8	-----	1
ALL GRADES	13.7	12.5 - 16.7	57.7	56.0 - 60.7	12.4	10.0 - 13.0	38

(continued)

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-3. AVERAGE VALUES AND RANGES FOR PROTEIN CONTENT, BUSHEL WEIGHT, AND MOISTURE OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT, BY GRADE AND CROP REPORTING DISTRICT, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Grade	Protein Content, %		Bushel Weight, lb.		Moisture Content, %		No. of Carlots
	Average	Range	Average	Range	Average	Range	
EAST CENTRAL DISTRICT							
No. 1 HAD	13.5	11.0 - 15.8	62.0	61.3 - 63.0	11.8	9.6 - 13.7	5
No. 2 HAD	13.2	12.7 - 13.5	61.2	60.2 - 62.0	10.5	9.4 - 11.4	4
No. 3 HAD	13.6	12.1 - 14.7	60.5	59.9 - 61.2	11.0	10.5 - 11.3	5
No. 4 HAD	12.2	12.0 - 12.4	59.6	57.5 - 61.5	12.0	10.5 - 13.5	4
No. 2 AD	12.8	12.7 - 12.8	60.2	60.3 - 61.0	11.2	10.8 - 11.5	2
No. 3 AD	12.8	-----	61.0	-----	10.7	-----	1
No. 5 AD	13.6	12.6 - 14.8	57.0	56.0 - 58.0	13.6	11.7 - 15.5	3
ALL GRADES	13.1	11.0 - 15.8	60.2	56.0 - 63.0	11.5	9.4 - 15.5	24
SOUTHWEST DISTRICT							
NONE							
SOUTH CENTRAL DISTRICT							
No. 1 HAD	13.6	12.6 - 14.6	61.7	61.2 - 62.2	10.9	10.5 - 13.3	2
No. 3 HAD	14.6	-----	61.7	-----	11.1	-----	1
No. 4 HAD	13.6	-----	61.3	-----	11.7	-----	1
ALL GRADES	13.9	12.6 - 14.6	61.6	61.2 - 62.2	11.2	10.5 - 13.3	4
SOUTHEAST DISTRICT							
No. 1 HAD	16.5	-----	60.0	-----	11.5	-----	1
No. 2 HAD	14.2	13.7 - 14.8	59.5	58.7 - 60.7	11.9	11.1 - 12.4	3
No. 3 HAD	14.4	13.9 - 14.8	58.9	58.6 - 59.2	10.4	9.8 - 11.9	2
No. 4 HAD	14.1	-----	59.0	-----	10.9	-----	1
ALL GRADES	14.8	13.7 - 16.5	59.4	58.6 - 60.7	11.2	9.8 - 12.4	7

APPENDIX TABLE B-4. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM GRADES FALLING WITHIN ONE POUND BUSHEL WEIGHT RANGES FOR THE ENTIRE SAMPLE AREA, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Bushel Weight, Pounds											Total
	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	17	21	8	7	54
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	1	--	25	47	52	31	12	--	168
No. 3 HAD	--	--	1	11	24	26	21	20	8	--	1	112
No. 4 HAD	--	1	5	8	8	7	8	2	2	--	--	41
No. 5 HAD	--	2	4	2	1	4	2	--	1	--	--	16
S. G. HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 1 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	1	--	--	5
No. 3 AD	--	--	--	4	1	--	1	1	--	--	--	7
No. 4 AD	--	1	--	6	1	3	--	1	--	--	--	12
No. 5 AD	1	1	1	5	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	11
S. G. AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 1 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 2 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 3 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 5 Durum	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	2
S. G. Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AREA TOTAL	2	5	11	39	39	66	81	95	64	20	8	430
Percentage Distribution	0.5	1.2	2.6	9.1	9.1	15.2	18.8	22.1	14.9	4.6	1.9	100.0

APPENDIX TABLE B-5. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE POUND BUSHEL WEIGHT RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965, WITH COMPARISONS

Crop Reporting District	Bushel Weight, Pounds													Total
	50	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63		
Northwest	--	--	1	--	12	10	22	26	37	30	5	5	148	
North Central	--	--	--	5	12	10	17	19	15	7	1	--	86	
Northeast	--	--	4	6	12	11	14	14	16	12	11	2	102	
West Central	--	--	--	--	--	2	4	4	8	2	1	--	21	
Central	--	2	--	--	2	3	6	13	11	1	--	--	38	
East Central	--	--	--	--	1	2	1	2	6	9	2	1	24	
Southwest	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
South Central	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	3	--	--	4	
Southeast	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	3	2	--	--	--	7	
Total	--	2	5	11	39	39	66	81	95	64	20	8	430	
Percentage Distribution-1965	--	0.5	1.2	2.6	9.1	9.1	15.2	18.8	22.1	14.9	4.6	1.9	100.0	
Percentage Distribution-1964	--	--	0.9	3.3	8.0	10.1	18.9	19.8	19.8	13.6	4.9	0.7	100.0	
Percentage Distribution-1963	--	--	1.0	0.5	3.0	6.5	26.2	32.2	21.6	6.5	2.5	--	100.0	
Percentage Distribution-1962	0.7	--	--	0.4	2.2	2.6	6.3	14.9	34.2	20.1	17.1	1.5	100.0	
Percentage Distribution-1961	--	--	--	--	--	0.5	0.9	1.4	9.3	32.2	47.9	7.8	100.0	
Percentage Distribution-1960	--	--	--	--	--	--	2.2	7.2	34.3	38.1	17.1	1.1	100.0	

APPENDIX TABLE B-6. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN ONE POUND BUSHEL WEIGHT RANGES,
BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Bushel Weight, Pounds											Total
	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	
NORTHWEST DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	9	11	3	4	27
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	9	18	18	16	2	--	63
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	--	6	10	4	9	2	--	1	32
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	4	--	2	3	--	1	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	--	--	--	--	2	1	--	1	--	--	--	4
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
No. 3 AD	--	--	--	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 AD	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	--	1	--	9	13	22	26	37	30	5	5	148
NORTH CENTRAL DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	1	--	4
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	5	12	8	5	--	--	30
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	6	9	7	6	5	1	--	--	34
No. 4 HAD	--	--	3	3	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 3 AD	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	--	--	5	12	10	17	19	15	7	1	--	86
NORTHEAST DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	4	3	2	11
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	6	9	12	7	8	--	42
No. 3 HAD	--	--	1	3	6	4	3	2	1	--	--	20

(continued)

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-6. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN ONE POUND BUSHEL WEIGHT RANGES,
BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Bushel Weight, Pounds											Total
	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	
NORTHWEST DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	9	11	3	4	27
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	9	18	18	16	2	--	63
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	--	6	10	4	9	2	--	1	32
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	4	--	2	3	--	1	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	--	--	--	--	2	1	--	1	--	--	--	4
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
No. 3 AD	--	--	--	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 AD	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	--	1	--	9	13	22	26	37	30	5	5	148
NORTH CENTRAL DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	1	--	4
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	5	12	8	5	--	--	30
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	6	9	7	6	5	1	--	--	34
No. 4 HAD	--	--	3	3	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 3 AD	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	--	--	5	12	10	17	19	15	7	1	--	86
NORTHEAST DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	4	3	2	11
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	6	9	12	7	8	--	42
No. 3 HAD	--	--	1	3	6	4	3	2	1	--	--	20

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-6. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN ONE POUND BUSHEL WEIGHT RANGES,
BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Grade	Bushel Weight, Pounds											Total
	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	
No. 4 HAD	--	1	2	2	3	1	1	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	--	2	2	2	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	9
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 AD	--	1	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 AD	--	--	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	--	4	6	12	11	14	14	16	12	11	2	102
WEST CENTRAL DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	2
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	5	1	1	--	9
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	4
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	3
No. 5 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	2
TOTAL	--	--	--	--	2	4	4	8	2	1	--	21
CENTRAL DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	2
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	3	6	7	1	--	--	17
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	2	2	3	6	1	--	--	--	14
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	2
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
No. 5 AD	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 5 Durum	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	2	--	--	2	3	6	13	11	1	--	--	38
EAST CENTRAL DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	1	1	5
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	1	--	4
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	2	--	--	5

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-6. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN ONE POUND BUSHEL WEIGHT RANGES,
BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Grade	Bushel Weight, Pounds											Total
	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	1	1	--	--	4
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	2
No. 3 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	3
TOTAL	--	--	--	1	2	1	2	6	9	2	1	24
SOUTHWEST DISTRICT												
NONE												
SOUTH CENTRAL DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	2
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
TOTAL	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	3	--	--	4
SOUTHEAST DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	--	--	--	3
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	--	--	--	--	--	2	3	2	--	--	--	7

APPENDIX TABLE B-7. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOTS OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT MOISTURE RANGES FOR THE ENTIRE SAMPLE AREA, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

		Moisture Content, Per Cent																		Total
Grade		9.0	9.5	10.0	10.5	11.0	11.5	12.0	12.5	13.0	13.5	14.0	14.5	15.0	15.5	16.0	16.5	16.9		
		to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to		
9.4	9.9	10.4	10.9	11.4	11.9	12.4	12.9	13.4	13.9	14.4	14.9	15.4	15.9	16.4	16.9	16.9	16.9	Total		
No. 1 HAD	1	1	6	19	12	4	6	3	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	54		
No. 2 HAD	1	2	17	42	17	39	16	6	4	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	168		
No. 3 HAD	1	1	8	22	17	16	13	18	8	3	2	1	--	1	--	--	--	112		
No. 4 HAD	--	--	3	2	4	7	7	5	6	2	4	--	--	1	--	--	--	41		
No. 5 HAD	--	--	1	1	2	3	1	5	2	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	16		
S. G. HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		
No. 1 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		
No. 2 AD	--	--	1	--	2	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5		
No. 3 AD	--	--	1	--	--	1	1	--	2	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	7		
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	--	1	1	4	1	3	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	12		
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	--	1	2	--	2	3	--	2	--	2	--	1	--	--	11		
S. G. AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		
No. 1 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		
No. 2 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		
No. 3 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	2		
No. 5 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	2		
S. G. Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		
AREA TOTAL	3	4	24	37	85	56	74	48	42	31	8	14	1	1	2	--	--	430		
Percentage Distribution	0.7	0.9	5.6	8.6	19.8	13.0	17.2	11.2	9.8	7.2	1.8	3.3	0.2	0.2	0.5	--	--	100.0		

APPENDIX TABLE B-8. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT MOISTURE CONTENT RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965, WITH COMPARISONS

Crop Reporting District	Moisture Content, Per Cent																	
	8.5 to	9.0 to	9.5 to	10.0 to	10.5 to	11.0 to	11.5 to	12.0 to	12.5 to	13.0 to	13.5 to	14.0 to	14.5 to	15.0 to	15.5 to	16.0 to	16.5 to	
	8.9	9.4	9.9	10.4	10.9	11.4	11.9	12.4	12.9	13.4	13.9	14.4	14.9	15.4	15.9	16.4	16.9	
Northwest	--	2	2	10	13	30	20	27	13	11	13	2	4	1	--	--	--	148
North Central	--	--	--	4	5	14	10	16	13	14	5	2	3	--	--	--	--	86
Northeast	--	--	--	3	8	22	11	14	10	13	9	4	6	--	--	2	--	102
West Central	--	--	--	2	2	1	4	3	7	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	21
Central	--	--	--	4	1	8	6	12	3	2	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	38
East Central	--	1	1	1	6	7	2	--	2	--	3	--	--	--	1	--	--	24
Southwest	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
South Central	--	--	--	--	1	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
Southeast	--	--	1	--	1	1	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	7
TOTAL	--	3	4	24	37	85	56	74	48	42	31	8	14	1	1	2	--	430
Percentage Distribution 1965	--	0.7	0.9	5.6	8.6	19.8	13.0	17.2	11.2	9.8	7.2	1.8	3.3	0.2	0.2	0.5	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1964	--	0.2	0.4	2.7	9.9	16.9	18.0	13.0	15.4	12.1	7.5	3.3	0.4	--	--	--	0.2	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1963	--	1.0	3.5	15.1	15.1	24.6	19.1	13.1	5.5	2.5	0.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1962	--	--	--	2.2	3.7	13.4	10.0	21.9	17.2	14.1	11.5	5.2	0.4	0.4	--	--	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1961	1.4	2.3	6.0	20.2	12.9	22.1	13.8	14.3	3.2	2.8	--	0.5	--	--	0.5	--	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1960	--	1.1	2.2	5.5	7.7	26.5	21.0	26.0	6.1	3.3	0.6	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.0

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-9. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT MOISTURE CONTENT RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Moisture Content, Per Cent																Total
	9.0 to 9.4	9.5 to 9.9	10.0 to 10.4	10.5 to 10.9	11.0 to 11.4	11.5 to 11.9	12.0 to 12.4	12.5 to 12.9	13.0 to 13.4	13.5 to 13.9	14.0 to 14.4	14.5 to 14.9	15.0 to 15.4	15.5 to 15.9	16.0 to 16.4	16.5 to 16.9	
	NORTHWEST DISTRICT																
No. 1 HAD	1	--	--	4	11	4	1	4	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	27
No. 2 HAD	--	2	8	8	14	4	15	4	4	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	63
No. 3 HAD	1	--	1	--	4	8	6	1	4	4	1	1	1	--	--	--	32
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	--	1	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	--	--	1	--	--	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 3 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	2	--	1	--	--	--	--	4
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	2	2	10	13	30	19	27	13	11	13	3	4	1	--	--	--	148
NORTH CENTRAL DISTRICT																	
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 2 HAD	--	--	4	1	8	6	6	2	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	30
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	4	5	2	7	7	6	2	--	1	--	--	--	--	34
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	3	1	1	2	1	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 3 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	--	--	4	5	14	10	16	13	14	5	2	3	--	--	--	--	86

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-9. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT MOISTURE CONTENT RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

		Moisture Content, Per Cent																	
		9.0 to 9.4	9.5 to 9.9	10.0 to 10.4	10.5 to 10.9	11.0 to 11.4	11.5 to 11.9	12.0 to 12.4	12.5 to 12.9	13.0 to 13.4	13.5 to 13.9	14.0 to 14.4	14.5 to 14.9	15.0 to 15.4	15.5 to 15.9	16.0 to 16.4	16.5 to 16.9	Total	
Grade		9.4	9.9	10.4	10.9	11.4	11.9	12.4	12.9	13.4	13.9	14.4	14.9	15.4	15.9	16.4	16.9	Total	
NORTHEAST DISTRICT																			
No. 1	HAD	--	--	--	1	4	4	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11	
No. 2	HAD	--	--	3	5	13	5	7	8	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	42	
No. 3	HAD	--	--	--	2	5	1	1	1	5	2	2	--	--	--	1	--	20	
No. 4	HAD	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	2	2	--	2	--	--	1	--	10	
No. 5	HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	3	2	1	1	--	--	--	--	9	
No. 2	AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	
No. 4	AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	1	--	--	--	--	4	
No. 5	AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	2	--	--	--	--	4	
No. 5	Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	
TOTAL		--	--	3	8	22	11	14	10	13	9	4	6	--	--	2	--	102	
WEST CENTRAL DISTRICT																			
No. 1	HAD	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
No. 2	HAD	--	--	2	1	1	1	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	9	
No. 3	HAD	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	
No. 4	HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	
No. 5	HAD	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	
No. 4	AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
TOTAL		--	--	2	2	1	4	3	7	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	21	
CENTRAL DISTRICT																			
No. 1	HAD	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
No. 2	HAD	--	--	4	1	4	1	6	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	17	
No. 3	HAD	--	--	--	--	4	3	3	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	14	
No. 4	HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	

(continued)

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-10. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT PROTEIN RANGES FOR ENTIRE SAMPLE AREA, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Protein Range, Per Cent													Total
	11.0 to 11.4	11.5 to 11.9	12.0 to 12.4	12.5 to 12.9	13.0 to 13.4	13.5 to 13.9	14.0 to 14.4	14.5 to 14.9	15.0 to 15.4	15.5 to 15.9	16.0 to 16.4	16.5 to 16.9		
No. 1 HAD	3	1	4	6	13	11	6	4	4	--	--	2	54	
No. 2 HAD	--	2	6	19	34	38	39	19	7	4	--	--	168	
No. 3 HAD	--	--	9	7	26	16	34	16	4	--	--	--	112	
No. 4 HAD	--	1	6	3	10	11	6	3	1	--	--	--	41	
No. 5 HAD	--	--	1	1	7	1	4	2	--	--	--	--	16	
S. G. HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 1 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 2 AD	--	--	1	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	
No. 3 AD	--	--	1	3	--	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	7	
No. 4 AD	--	--	1	3	5	2	--	--	1	--	--	--	12	
No. 5 AD	--	--	1	2	5	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	11	
S. G. AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 1 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 2 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 3 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
No. 5 Durum	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
S. G. Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
AREA TOTAL	3	4	30	49	103	79	93	46	17	4	--	2	430	
Percentage Distribution	0.7	0.9	7.0	11.4	24.0	18.3	21.6	10.7	4.0	0.9	--	0.5	100.0	

APPENDIX TABLE B-11. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT PROTEIN RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965, WITH COMPARISONS

Crop Reporting District	Protein Range, Per Cent														Total
	11.0 to 11.4	11.5 to 11.9	12.0 to 12.4	12.5 to 12.9	13.0 to 13.4	13.5 to 13.9	14.0 to 14.4	14.5 to 14.9	15.0 to 15.4	15.5 to 15.9	16.0 to 16.4	16.5 to 16.9	17.0 to 17.4		
Northwest	--	1	10	17	38	33	19	16	12	2	--	--	--	148	
North Central	--	2	3	8	21	17	27	6	2	--	--	--	--	86	
Northeast	2	1	11	13	29	16	18	11	1	--	--	--	--	102	
West Central	--	--	1	2	7	4	6	--	1	--	--	--	--	21	
Central	--	--	--	2	4	5	18	6	1	1	--	1	--	38	
East Central	1	--	5	6	4	3	1	3	--	1	--	--	--	24	
Southwest	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
South Central	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	4	
Southeast	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	2	--	--	--	1	--	7	
TOTAL	3	4	30	49	103	79	93	46	17	4	--	2	--	430	
Percentage Distribution 1965	0.7	0.9	7.0	11.4	24.0	18.3	21.6	10.7	4.0	0.9	--	0.5	--	100.0	
Percentage Distribution 1964	0.2	1.7	2.7	12.0	20.6	16.9	23.5	12.5	7.8	1.5	0.2	0.4	--	100.0	
Percentage Distribution 1963	0.5	--	1.5	4.5	8.0	13.1	31.7	19.6	12.6	5.0	3.0	0.5	--	100.0	
Percentage Distribution 1962	0.7	4.5	14.5	21.6	33.5	12.3	6.7	3.7	1.8	--	0.7	--	--	100.0	
Percentage Distribution 1961*	--	--	0.5	--	1.4	2.8	11.4	21.2	38.2	15.2	7.4	0.9	0.5	100.0	
Percentage Distribution 1960	--	1.1	1.1	1.6	10.6	9.4	13.3	18.8	24.3	9.4	3.3	5.5	1.6	100.0	

*0.5 per cent fell within the 10.0 - 10.4 per cent range.

APPENDIX TABLE B-12. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT PROTEIN RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Protein Range, Per Cent													Total
	11.0 to 11.4	11.5 to 11.9	12.0 to 12.4	12.5 to 12.9	13.0 to 13.4	13.5 to 13.9	14.0 to 14.4	14.5 to 14.9	15.0 to 15.4	15.5 to 15.9	16.0 to 16.4	16.5 to 16.9		
	NORTHWEST DISTRICT													
No. 1 HAD	--	1	2	1	7	7	3	2	4	--	--	--	27	
No. 2 HAD	--	--	2	11	11	16	11	5	5	2	--	--	63	
No. 3 HAD	--	--	3	3	11	5	3	4	3	--	--	--	32	
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	3	4	--	3	--	--	--	--	10	
No. 5 HAD	--	--	1	--	1	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	4	
No. 2 AD	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	
No. 3 AD	--	--	1	1	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	4	
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	1	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	
TOTAL	--	1	10	17	38	33	19	16	12	2	--	--	148	
NORTH CENTRAL DISTRICT														
No. 1 HAD	--	--	1	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	
No. 2 HAD	--	1	--	2	8	6	8	4	1	--	--	--	30	
No. 3 HAD	--	--	2	1	7	5	16	2	1	--	--	--	34	
No. 4 HAD	--	1	--	2	1	5	1	--	--	--	--	--	10	
No. 5 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
No. 3 AD	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	2	
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	
TOTAL	--	2	3	8	21	17	27	6	2	--	--	--	86	

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-12. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT PROTEIN RANGES,
BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Grade	Protein Range, Per Cent													Total
	11.0	11.5	12.0	12.5	13.0	13.5	14.0	14.5	15.0	15.5	16.0	16.5		
	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to		
11.4	11.9	12.4	12.9	13.4	13.9	14.4	14.9	15.4	15.9	16.4	16.9			
NORTHEAST DISTRICT														
No. 1 HAD	2	--	1	2	2	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	11	
No. 2 HAD	--	1	4	4	8	9	10	5	1	--	--	--	42	
No. 3 HAD	--	--	3	2	4	3	3	5	--	--	--	--	20	
No. 4 HAD	--	--	2	1	5	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	10	
No. 5 HAD	--	--	--	1	5	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	9	
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	1	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	
No. 5 AD	--	--	1	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	
No. 5 Durum	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	
TOTAL	2	1	11	13	29	16	18	11	1	--	--	--	102	
WEST CENTRAL DISTRICT														
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	2	
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	1	4	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	9	
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	4	
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	
No. 5 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	
No. 4 AD	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	2	
TOTAL	--	--	1	2	7	4	6	--	1	--	--	--	21	
CENTRAL DISTRICT														
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	2	
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	4	6	4	--	1	--	1	17	
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	--	2	1	9	2	--	--	--	--	14	
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	2	
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-12. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT PROTEIN RANGES,
BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Protein Range, Per Cent															Total
Grade	11.0 to 11.4	11.5 to 11.9	12.0 to 12.4	12.5 to 12.9	13.0 to 13.4	13.5 to 13.9	14.0 to 14.4	14.5 to 14.9	15.0 to 15.4	15.5 to 15.9	16.0 to 16.4	16.5 to 16.9			
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1		
No. 5 Durum	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1		
TOTAL	--	--	--	2	4	5	18	6	1	1	--	1	38		
EAST CENTRAL DISTRICT															
No. 1 HAD	1	--	--	1	--	1	--	1	--	1	--	--	5		
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	1	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	4		
No. 3 HAD	--	--	1	--	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	5		
No. 4 HAD	--	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4		
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2		
No. 3 AD	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1		
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	3		
TOTAL	1	--	5	6	4	3	1	3	--	1	--	--	24		
SOUTHWEST DISTRICT															
NONE															
SOUTH CENTRAL DISTRICT															
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	2		
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1		
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1		
TOTAL	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	2	--	--	--	--	4		
SOUTHEAST DISTRICT															
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1		
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	3		
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	2		
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1		
TOTAL	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	2	--	--	--	1	7		

APPENDIX TABLE B-13. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT DAMAGE RANGES FOR THE ENTIRE SAMPLE AREA, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	Damage Range, Per Cent																Total
		0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	12.0	13.0	14.0	18.0	
		to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	
No. 1 HAD	47	6	1	14	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	54
No. 2 HAD	74	50	27	26	16	11	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	168
No. 3 HAD	19	15	19	1	2	4	5	4	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	112
No. 4 HAD	2	2	—	—	—	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	41
No. 5 HAD	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	2	—	3	1	4	—	16
S. G. HAD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 1 AD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 2 AD	2	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
No. 3 AD	1	—	3	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7
No. 4 AD	1	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	2	3	2	—	—	3	2	2	—	12
No. 5 AD	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	11
S. G. AD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 1 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 2 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 3 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 4 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
No. 5 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	2
S. G. Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
AREA TOTAL	148	75	51	42	21	20	15	6	10	11	6	3	5	6	3	8	—	430
Percentage Distribution	34.4	17.4	11.9	9.8	4.9	4.6	3.5	1.4	2.3	2.5	1.4	0.7	1.2	1.4	0.7	1.9	—	100.0

¹Content of damaged kernels unknown. This grade requirement did not determine the grade, therefore was not listed as a grading factor on the inspection certificate.

APPENDIX TABLE B-14. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT DAMAGE RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965, WITH COMPARISONS

Crop Reporting District	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	Damage Range, Per Cent																Total
		0.0 to 0.9	1.0 to 1.9	2.0 to 2.9	3.0 to 3.9	4.0 to 4.9	5.0 to 5.9	6.0 to 6.9	7.0 to 7.9	8.0 to 8.9	9.0 to 9.9	10.0 to 10.9	11.0 to 11.9	12.0 to 12.9	13.0 to 13.9	14.0 to 14.9	18.0 to 18.9	24.0 to 24.9
Northwest	91	12	9	8	5	5	7	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	—	—	—	148
North Central	15	19	9	12	10	7	2	—	3	4	2	—	2	—	—	1	—	86
Northeast	18	18	17	11	3	7	3	1	5	4	2	1	1	3	3	5	—	102
West Central	8	3	3	1	1	—	1	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	21
Central	12	14	4	5	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	38
East Central	2	7	6	3	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	24
Southwest	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Central	1	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4
Southeast	1	—	2	2	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7
TOTAL	148	75	51	42	21	20	15	6	10	11	6	3	5	6	3	8	—	430
Percentage Distribution 1965	34.4	17.4	11.9	9.8	4.9	4.6	3.5	1.4	2.3	2.5	1.4	0.7	1.2	1.4	0.7	1.9	—	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1964	39.8	18.0	16.3	7.9	4.0	3.1	1.6	1.3	2.2	2.0	1.6	0.4	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.2	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1963	81.4	—	—	3.5	3.5	5.1	3.5	1.0	1.5	—	—	0.5	—	—	—	—	—	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1962	86.7	—	0.4	3.7	1.8	1.8	0.4	0.4	1.5	0.7	—	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.4	—	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1961	82.9	0.5	—	4.2	6.9	1.8	1.8	0.5	0.9	—	—	—	—	—	0.5	—	—	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1960	94.4	—	—	1.6	1.1	0.6	1.1	—	—	—	—	—	0.6	—	—	0.6	—	100.0

¹Content of damaged kernels unknown. This grade requirement did not determine the grade, therefore was not listed as a grading factor on the inspection certificate.

APPENDIX TABLE B-15. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT DAMAGE RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Not Listed as a Grading Factor	Damage Range, Per Cent																		Total
		0.0 to	1.0 to	2.0 to	3.0 to	4.0 to	5.0 to	6.0 to	7.0 to	8.0 to	9.0 to	10.0 to	11.0 to	12.0 to	13.0 to	14.0 to	18.0 to	24.0 to		
		0.9	1.9	2.9	3.9	4.9	5.9	6.9	7.9	8.9	9.9	10.9	11.9	12.9	13.9	14.9	18.9	24.9		
NORTHWEST DISTRICT																				
No. 1 HAD	27	8	5	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	27	
No. 2 HAD	48	4	3	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	63	
No. 3 HAD	11	—	—	4	2	2	3	1	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	32	
No. 4 HAD	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	10	
No. 5 HAD	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	
No. 2 AD	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	
No. 3 AD	1	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	
No. 4 AD	—	—	—	—	1	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	
No. 5 AD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	2	
No. 4 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	
ALL GRADES	91	12	9	8	5	5	7	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	—	—	—	—	148	
NORTH CENTRAL DISTRICT																				
No. 1 HAD	4	16	2	2	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	
No. 2 HAD	8	3	6	10	2	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30	
No. 3 HAD	3	—	—	9	2	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	34	
No. 4 HAD	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	3	2	2	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	10	
No. 5 HAD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	
No. 3 AD	—	—	1	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	
No. 4 AD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	
No. 5 AD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	
No. 4 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	
ALL GRADES	15	19	9	12	10	7	2	—	3	4	2	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	86	
NORTHEAST DISTRICT																				
No. 1 HAD	10	16	1	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	
No. 2 HAD	7	3	12	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	42	
No. 3 HAD	—	—	3	—	7	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	
No. 4 HAD	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	2	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	
No. 5 HAD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	1	2	1	3	—	—	9	

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-15. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT DAMAGE RANGES BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Grade	Not Listed as a Grading Factor	Damage Range, Per Cent																Total
		0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	12.0	13.0	14.0	18.0	
		to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	
No. 2 AD	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
No. 4 AD	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	1	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	4
No. 5 AD	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	2	1	---	4
No. 5 Durum	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1
ALL GRADES	18	19	16	11	3	7	3	1	5	4	2	1	1	3	3	5	---	102
WEST CENTRAL DISTRICT																		
No. 1 HAD	1	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2
No. 2 HAD	5	2	1	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	9
No. 3 HAD	---	---	---	1	---	---	1	2	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	4
No. 4 HAD	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	3
No. 5 HAD	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
No. 4 AD	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2
ALL GRADES	8	3	3	1	1	---	1	2	---	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	21
CENTRAL DISTRICT																		
No. 1 HAD	2	---	2	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2
No. 2 HAD	6	4	2	3	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	17
No. 3 HAD	4	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	14
No. 4 HAD	---	1	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2
No. 2 AD	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1
No. 5 AD	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1	---	1
No. 5 Durum	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
ALL GRADES	12	14	4	5	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2	---	38
EAST CENTRAL DISTRICT																		
No. 1 HAD	1	4	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	5
No. 2 HAD	---	3	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	4
No. 3 HAD	1	1	2	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	5
No. 4 HAD	---	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	4
No. 2 AD	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2
No. 3 AD	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	1
No. 5 AD	---	---	1	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	3
ALL GRADES	2	7	6	3	1	1	---	1	---	---	---	1	1	1	---	---	---	24

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-15. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT DAMAGE RANGES BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

		Damage Range, Per Cent																	
Grade	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	12.0	13.0	14.0	18.0	24.0	Total
		to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	
		0.9	1.9	2.9	3.9	4.9	5.9	6.9	7.9	8.9	9.9	10.9	11.9	12.9	13.9	14.9	18.9	24.9	
SOUTHWEST DISTRICT																			
NONE																			
SOUTH CENTRAL DISTRICT																			
No. 1 HAD	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
No. 3 HAD	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
No. 4 HAD	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
ALL GRADES	1	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4
SOUTHEAST DISTRICT																			
No. 1 HAD	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
No. 2 HAD	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
No. 3 HAD	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
No. 4 HAD	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
ALL GRADES	1	—	2	2	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7

¹Content of damaged kernels unknown. This grade requirement did not determine the grade, therefore was not listed as a grading factor on the inspection certificate.

APPENDIX TABLE B-16. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT SHRUNKEN AND BROKEN RANGES FOR THE ENTIRE SAMPLE AREA, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Shrunk and Broken Range, Per Cent														
Grade	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	Total	
		to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to		
		0.9	1.9	2.9	3.9	4.9	5.9	6.9	7.9	8.9	9.9	10.9		
No. 1 HAD	29	--	4	20	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	54	
No. 2 HAD	26	1	4	44	68	25	--	--	--	--	--	--	168	
No. 3 HAD	1	2	1	26	43	27	11	--	1	--	--	--	112	
No. 4 HAD	1	--	5	15	15	3	1	1	--	--	--	--	41	
No. 5 HAD	--	--	1	7	6	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	16	
S. G. HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 1 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 2 AD	2	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	
No. 3 AD	1	--	1	1	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	7	
No. 4 AD	--	--	2	5	3	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	12	
No. 5 AD	1	--	--	4	5	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	11	
S. G. AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 1 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 2 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 3 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
No. 5 Durum	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
S. G. Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
AREA TOTAL	61	3	19	126	146	60	12	1	2	--	--	--	430	
Percentage Distribution	14.2	0.7	4.4	29.3	33.9	14.0	2.8	0.2	0.5	--	--	--	100.0	

¹Content of shrunken and broken kernels unknown. This grade requirement did not determine the grade, therefore was not listed as a grading factor on the inspection certificate.

APPENDIX TABLE B-17. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT SHRUNKEN AND BROKEN RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965, WITH COMPARISONS

		Shrunk and Broken Range, Per Cent															
Crop Reporting District	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	0.0 to 0.9	1.0 to 1.9	2.0 to 2.9	3.0 to 3.9	4.0 to 4.9	5.0 to 5.9	6.0 to 6.9	7.0 to 7.9	8.0 to 8.9	9.0 to 9.9	10.0 to 10.9	11.0 to 11.9	12.0 to 12.9	13.0 to 13.9	14.0 to 14.9	Total
		36	1	6	39	36	24	5	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	148
Northwest	6	1	5	18	41	13	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	86
North Central	16	--	6	33	41	5	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	102
Northeast	2	1	--	10	4	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	21
West Central	1	--	--	10	4	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	38
Central	--	--	1	10	5	6	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	24
East Central	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Southwest	--	--	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
South Central	--	--	--	5	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
Southeast	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	7
TOTAL	61	3	19	126	146	60	12	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	430
Percentage Distribution-1965	14.2	0.7	4.4	29.3	33.9	14.0	2.8	0.2	0.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution-1964	26.6	0.4	3.5	21.6	27.0	15.8	3.5	1.6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution-1963	92.0	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.5	2.5	3.0	0.5	1.0	0.5	--	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution-1962	74.7	--	--	--	--	--	0.7	--	1.1	8.6	5.3	5.9	0.7	2.3	0.7	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution-1961	77.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.5	6.0	8.3	1.8	2.8	1.8	0.5	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution-1960	51.9	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.6	0.6	7.7	12.6	14.4	5.5	5.0	0.6	1.1	100.0

¹Content of shrunken and broken kernels unknown. This grade requirement did not determine the grade, therefore was not listed as a grading factor on the inspection certificate.

APPENDIX TABLE B-18. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT SHRUNKEN AND BROKEN RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Shrunken and Broken Range, Per Cent												
Grade	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	10.0
		to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to
		0.9	1.9	2.9	3.9	4.9	5.9	6.9	7.9	8.9	9.9	10.9
NORTHWEST DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	13	--	2	11	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 2 HAD	19	1	2	10	18	13	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 3 HAD	1	--	--	11	7	7	5	--	1	--	--	--
No. 4 HAD	--	--	1	3	3	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 5 HAD	1	--	1	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 2 AD	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 3 AD	1	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	1	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	36	1	6	39	36	24	5	--	1	--	--	148
NORTH CENTRAL DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 2 HAD	2	--	1	9	15	3	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 3 HAD	--	1	--	4	19	9	1	--	--	--	--	--
No. 4 HAD	--	--	2	3	3	1	--	1	--	--	--	--
No. 5 HAD	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 3 AD	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 4 AD	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 4 Durum	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL	6	1	5	18	41	13	1	1	--	--	--	86

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-18. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT SHRUNKEN AND BROKEN RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Shrunken and Broken Range, Per Cent													
Grade	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	Shrunken and Broken Range, Per Cent											
		0.0 to	1.0 to	2.0 to	3.0 to	4.0 to	5.0 to	6.0 to	7.0 to	8.0 to	9.0 to	10.0 to	Total
		0.9	1.9	2.9	3.9	4.9	5.9	6.9	7.9	8.9	9.9	10.9	
NORTHEAST DISTRICT													
No. 1 HAD	10	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11
No. 2 HAD	4	--	1	13	23	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	42
No. 3 HAD	--	--	1	5	10	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	20
No. 4 HAD	--	--	1	5	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	--	--	--	5	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	9
No. 2 AD	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 AD	--	--	1	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 AD	1	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 Durum	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	16	--	6	33	41	5	1	--	--	--	--	--	102
WEST CENTRAL DISTRICT													
No. 1 HAD	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 2 HAD	1	--	--	4	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	9
No. 3 HAD	--	1	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
No. 5 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 AD	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
TOTAL	2	1	--	10	4	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	21
CENTRAL DISTRICT													
No. 1 HAD	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	4	9	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	17
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	4	5	2	3	--	--	--	--	--	14
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-18. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT SHRUNKEN AND BROKEN RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Shrunken and Broken Range, Per Cent												
Grade	Not Listed as a Grading Factor	Shrunken and Broken Range, Per Cent										
		0.0 to	1.0 to	2.0 to	3.0 to	4.0 to	5.0 to	6.0 to	7.0 to	8.0 to	9.0 to	10.0 to
		0.9	1.9	2.9	3.9	4.9	5.9	6.9	7.9	8.9	9.9	10.9
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 5 Durum	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	1	--	--	10	17	6	4	--	--	--	--	38
EAST CENTRAL DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5
No. 2 HAD	--	--	--	1	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	4	1	--	--	--	--	5
No. 4 HAD	--	--	1	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 2 AD	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 3 AD	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	3
TOTAL	--	--	1	10	5	6	1	--	1	--	--	24
SOUTHWEST DISTRICT												
NONE												
SOUTH CENTRAL DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 HAD	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	--	--	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	4

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-18. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT SHRUNKEN AND BROKEN RANGES, BY CRCP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Shrunken and Broken Range, Per Cent													
Grade	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	Total
		to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	to	
		0.9	1.9	2.9	3.9	4.9	5.9	6.9	7.9	8.9	9.9	10.9	
SOUTHEAST DISTRICT													
No. 1 HAD	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 2 HAD	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
No. 3 HAD	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 HAD	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	--	--	5	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	7

¹Content of shrunkened and broken kernels is unknown. This grade requirement did not determine the grade, therefore was not listed as a grading factor on the inspection certificate.

APPENDIX TABLE B-19. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT FOREIGN MATERIAL RANGES FOR THE ENTIRE SAMPLE AREA, BY GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Not Listed as a 1 Grading Factor	Foreign Material Range, Per Cent												Total
		0.0 to	0.5 to	1.0 to	1.5 to	2.0 to	2.5 to	3.0 to	3.5 to	4.0 to	4.5 to	5.0 to		
		0.4	0.9	1.4	1.9	2.4	2.9	3.4	3.9	4.4	4.9	5.4		
No. 1 HAD	33	19	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	54	
No. 2 HAD	19	116	28	3	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	168	
No. 3 HAD	2	73	22	7	4	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	112	
No. 4 HAD	--	33	7	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	41	
No. 5 HAD	1	12	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	16	
S. G. HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 1 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 2 AD	2	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	
No. 3 AD	1	5	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	7	
No. 4 AD	2	8	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	12	
No. 5 AD	--	9	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	11	
S. G. AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 1 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 2 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 3 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
No. 4 Durum	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
No. 5 Durum	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	
S. G. Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	
AREA TOTAL	60	280	65	13	4	4	1	1	--	2	--	--	430	
Percentage Distribution	14.0	65.2	15.1	3.0	0.9	0.9	0.2	0.2	--	0.5	--	--	--	

¹Content of foreign material unknown. This grade requirement did not determine the grade, therefore was not listed as a grading factor on the inspection certificate.

APPENDIX TABLE B-20. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT FOREIGN MATERIAL RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965, WITH COMPARISONS

Crop Reporting District	Not Listed as a 1 Grading Factor	Foreign Material Range, Per Cent											Total
		0.0 to 0.4	0.5 to 0.9	1.0 to 1.4	1.5 to 1.9	2.0 to 2.4	2.5 to 2.9	3.0 to 3.4	3.5 to 3.9	4.0 to 4.4	4.5 to 4.9	5.0 to 5.4	
		Factor											
Northwest	28	90	18	8	2	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	148
North Central	8	59	15	--	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	86
Northeast	16	72	11	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	102
West Central	3	16	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	21
Central	1	21	14	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	38
East Central	3	14	4	2	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	24
Southwest	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
South Central	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
Southeast	1	4	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	7
TOTAL	60	280	65	13	4	4	1	1	--	2	--	--	430
Percentage Distribution 1965	14.0	65.2	15.1	3.0	0.9	0.9	0.2	0.2	--	0.5	--	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1964	32.2	56.0	8.0	1.8	0.9	1.1	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1963	96.5	--	0.5	1.0	1.5	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.5	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1962	93.8	0.7	1.1	2.2	1.8	0.4	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1961	78.8	0.5	13.8	5.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	--	--	--	--	--	100.0
Percentage Distribution 1960	96.7	--	1.1	1.6	--	0.6	--	--	--	--	--	--	100.0

¹Content of foreign material unknown. This grade requirement did not determine the grade, therefore was not listed as a grading factor on the inspection certificate.

APPENDIX TABLE B-21. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT FOREIGN MATERIAL RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	Foreign Material Range, Per Cent											Total
		0.0 to	0.5 to	1.0 to	1.5 to	2.0 to	2.5 to	3.0 to	3.5 to	4.0 to	4.5 to	5.0 to	
		0.4	0.9	1.4	1.9	2.4	2.9	3.4	3.9	4.4	4.9	5.4	
NORTHWEST DISTRICT													
No. 1 HAD	14	12	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	27
No. 2 HAD	10	38	11	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	63
No. 3 HAD	1	19	5	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	32
No. 4 HAD	--	9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 2 AD	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 3 AD	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 4 AD	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 AD	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 Durum	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	28	90	18	8	2	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	148
NORTH CENTRAL DISTRICT													
No. 1 HAD	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 2 HAD	3	22	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	30
No. 3 HAD	1	24	5	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	34
No. 4 HAD	--	8	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 3 AD	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 AD	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 5 AD	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 Durum	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	8	59	15	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	86

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-21. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT FOREIGN MATERIAL RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, - JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Foreign Material Range, Per Cent													
Grade	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	Foreign Material Range, Per Cent											
		0.0 to	0.5 to	1.0 to	1.5 to	2.0 to	2.5 to	3.0 to	3.5 to	4.0 to	4.5 to	5.0 to	Total
		0.4	0.9	1.4	1.9	2.4	2.9	3.4	3.9	4.4	4.9	5.4	
NORTHEAST DISTRICT													
No. 1 HAD	10	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11
No. 2 HAD	3	32	6	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	42
No. 3 HAD	--	15	4	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	20
No. 4 HAD	--	9	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	1	7	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	9
No. 2 AD	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 AD	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 AD	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 Durum	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	16	72	11	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	102
WEST CENTRAL DISTRICT													
No. 1 HAD	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 2 HAD	2	7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	9
No. 3 HAD	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 4 HAD	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
No. 5 HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
No. 4 AD	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
TOTAL	3	16	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	21
CENTRAL DISTRICT													
No. 1 HAD	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 2 HAD	--	11	6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	17
No. 3 HAD	--	7	5	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	14
No. 4 HAD	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 2 AD	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-21. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT FOREIGN MATERIAL RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Foreign Material Range, Per Cent												
Grade	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	Foreign Material Range, Per Cent										
		0.0 to	0.5 to	1.0 to	1.5 to	2.0 to	2.5 to	3.0 to	3.5 to	4.0 to	4.5 to	5.0 to
		0.4	0.9	1.4	1.9	2.4	2.9	3.4	3.9	4.4	4.9	5.4
No. 5 AD	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 5 Durum	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	1	21	14	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	38
EAST CENTRAL DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	2	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5
No. 2 HAD	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 3 HAD	--	2	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5
No. 4 HAD	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 2 AD	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 3 AD	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 5 AD	--	1	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	3
TOTAL	3	14	4	2	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	24
SOUTHWEST DISTRICT												
NONE												
SOUTH CENTRAL DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 3 HAD	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 HAD	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
SOUTHEAST DISTRICT												
No. 1 HAD	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 2 HAD	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-21. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT FOREIGN MATERIAL RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Grade	Not Listed as a Grading ¹ Factor	Foreign Material Range, Per Cent											Total
		0.0	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	
		to 0.4	to 0.9	to 1.4	to 1.9	to 2.4	to 2.9	to 3.4	to 3.9	to 4.4	to 4.9	to 5.4	
No. 3 HAD	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 HAD	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	1	4	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	7

¹Content of foreign material unknown. This grade requirement did not determine grade, therefore was not listed as a grading factor on the inspection certificate.

APPENDIX TABLE B-22. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOTS OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT TOTAL DEFECT RANGE FOR THE ENTIRE SAMPLE AREA BY GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Not Listed as a Grading Factor	Total Defects, Per Cent ¹																		Total
		1.1 to 2.0	2.1 to 3.0	3.1 to 4.0	4.1 to 5.0	5.1 to 6.0	6.1 to 7.0	7.1 to 8.0	8.1 to 9.0	9.1 to 10.0	10.1 to 11.0	11.1 to 12.0	12.1 to 13.0	13.1 to 14.0	14.1 to 15.0	15.1 to 16.0	16.1 to 17.0	17.1 to 18.0	18.1 to 19.0	
No. 1 HAD	29	1	22	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	54
No. 2 HAD	14	1	3	59	87	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	168
No. 3 HAD	2	1	2	4	9	23	25	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	112
No. 4 HAD	1	—	—	1	1	3	1	8	—	—	10	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	41
No. 5 HAD	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	2	4	1	1	5	—	16
S. G. HAD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 1 AD	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 2 AD	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
No. 3 AD	2	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7
No. 4 AD	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	3	2	—	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12
No. 5 AD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	4	1	1	1	11
S. G. AD	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 1 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 2 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 3 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No. 4 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
No. 5 Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	2
S. G. Durum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
AREA TOTAL	50	4	27	68	100	49	30	27	13	11	14	10	2	3	6	6	2	7	1	430
Percentage Distribution	11.6	0.9	6.3	15.8	23.2	11.4	7.0	6.3	3.0	2.6	3.3	2.3	0.5	0.7	1.4	1.4	0.5	1.6	0.2	100.0

¹Categories 19.1 and greater are not included because of lack of space and no entries in those categories.

²Content of damaged kernels unknown. This grade requirement did not determine the grade, therefore was not listed as a grading factor on the inspection certificate.

APPENDIX TABLE B-23. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT GRADES FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT DOCKAGE RANGES FOR THE ENTIRE SAMPLE AREA, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Grade	Dockage, Per Cent															Total
	0.0 to 0.4	0.5 to 0.9	1.0 to 1.4	1.5 to 1.9	2.0 to 2.4	2.5 to 2.9	3.0 to 3.4	3.5 to 3.9	4.0 to 4.4	4.5 to 4.9	5.0 to 5.4	5.5 to 5.9	6.0 to 6.4	6.5 to 6.9	7.0 to 7.4	
No. 1 HAD	19	13	9	2	2	5	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	54
No. 2 HAD	48	51	38	6	7	2	6	2	3	2	2	--	1	--	--	168
No. 3 HAD	20	40	29	7	6	2	5	2	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	112
No. 4 HAD	6	16	7	4	5	1	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	41
No. 5 HAD	3	6	3	1	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	16
S. G. HAD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 1 AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 2 AD	2	1	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5
No. 3 AD	3	2	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	7
No. 4 AD	3	6	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	12
No. 5 AD	2	2	2	4	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11
S. G. AD	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 1 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 2 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 3 Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No. 4 Durum	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 5 Durum	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
S. G. Durum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
AREA TOTAL	106	139	94	26	22	13	12	5	4	4	4	--	1	--	--	430
Percentage Distribution	24.7	32.3	21.9	6.1	5.1	3.0	2.8	1.2	0.9	0.9	0.9	--	0.2	--	--	--

APPENDIX TABLE B-24. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION AND NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN 0.5 PER CENT DOCKAGE RANGES, BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965, WITH COMPARISONS

[illegible]

APPENDIX TABLE B-25. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT DOCKAGE RANGES,
BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965

Dockage, Per Cent																											
Grade	0.0 to 0.4		0.5 to 0.9		1.0 to 1.4		1.5 to 1.9		2.0 to 2.4		2.5 to 2.9		3.0 to 3.4		3.5 to 3.9		4.0 to 4.4		4.5 to 4.9		5.0 to 5.4		5.5 to 5.9		6.0 to 6.4		Total
NORTHWEST DISTRICT																											
No. 1 HAD	7	7	7	1	2	1	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	27
No. 2 HAD	9	26	16	1	5	--	2	1	1	5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	63
No. 3 HAD	3	14	12	1	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	32
No. 4 HAD	2	3	2	2	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	2	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 2 AD	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 3 AD	3	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 4 AD	1	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 Durum	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	27	54	40	8	8	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	148
NORTH CENTRAL DISTRICT																											
No. 1 HAD	1	1	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 2 HAD	7	9	6	1	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	3	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	30
No. 3 HAD	6	10	7	1	3	2	3	--	--	2	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	34
No. 4 HAD	--	3	3	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 3 AD	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 4 AD	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 5 AD	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 Durum	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	16	27	17	4	4	6	6	2	2	4	2	2	--	--	--	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	86
NORTHEAST DISTRICT																											
No. 1 HAD	2	4	2	1	--	1	--	1	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	11
No. 2 HAD	11	7	16	4	1	--	1	1	1	1	--	1	1	1	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	42
No. 3 HAD	1	10	4	3	1	--	1	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	20

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE B-25. NUMBER OF CARLOT SAMPLES OF DURUM WHEAT FALLING WITHIN ONE PER CENT DOCKAGE RANGES,
BY CROP REPORTING DISTRICT AND GRADE, JULY - DECEMBER, 1965 (continued)

Dockage, Per Cent														
Grade	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.5	6.0	Total
	to 0.4	to 0.9	to 1.4	to 1.9	to 2.4	to 2.9	to 3.4	to 3.9	to 4.4	to 4.9	to 5.4	to 5.9	to 6.4	
No. 4 HAD	--	6	1	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	10
No. 5 HAD	--	4	3	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	9
No. 2 AD	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 AD	1	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 AD	1	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 5 Durum	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	17	34	30	8	6	2	2	2	1	--	--	--	--	102
WEST CENTRAL DISTRICT														
No. 1 HAD	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 2 HAD	4	5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	9
No. 3 HAD	1	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
No. 4 HAD	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
No. 5 HAD	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 4 AD	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
TOTAL	7	13	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	21
CENTRAL DISTRICT														
No. 1 HAD	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 2 HAD	11	3	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	17
No. 3 HAD	6	3	2	1	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	14
No. 4 HAD	--	1	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
No. 2 AD	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 5 AD	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
No. 5 Durum	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
TOTAL	18	8	2	3	2	2	1	--	1	--	1	--	--	38

(continued)

