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ABSTRACT

The steam coal trade boomed following the doubling of crude oil
prices in 1979. The world was caught unprepared for the steep
price climb in oil, and it was equally unprepared for the rapid
increase in the coal trade. With two of the major world producers,
Australia and Poland, unable to respond to the increased demand,
the United States was able to gain a share of the increased coal
trade. However the US was unable to respond quickly due to its
limited coal transshipment facilities and its lack of large vessel
capacity at its ports. The combination of increased coal demand
and limited port facilities led to the planning of large scale
port facility construction at many ports. The decisionmaking
difficulties that followed has not yet been resolved because no
agreement can be reached about where to employ the limited
government resources available for port improvements.

This thesis develops a model of the entire export coal
transportation network from the mine at the origin to the utility
at the destination, to address the question of whether and where
to dredge. By modeling the entire network, changes in any link
can be examined to determine its impact on the network as a whole.
In this study the impact of port dredging is investigated by
modeling improvements at Baltimore, Hampton Roads, and Mobile.
The result of the study is the clear indication that dredging
Baltimore alone is the best option available now at low export
coal volume, and that the benefits of dredging will increase as
the volume of export steam coal increases. This solution is
robust in that the changing of rail and vessel costs in a sensitivity
analysis does not affect the solution materially. The US will
still be the high-cost producer, but the dredging of Baltimore
will improve the ability of the US steam coal producers to compete
on the world market.
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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

When the oil price rise occurred in 1979, the entire world, and the US in particular, was unprepared for it in many ways. Plans had not been made to deal with such a crisis, and the reactions of many nations were quick and not well thought out. Many nations attempted to turn to coal as an alternate energy source, and a boom was begun in the world coal trade. However, two major coal exporters, Poland and Australia, were experiencing labor problems and were not available to help fill the increased demand for coal. In their absence the US was able to play an important role in the coal trade between 1979 and 1981.

However the US was not prepared to export the quantities of coal demanded in the time required because of inadequate port and transshipment facilities. Forecasts of the continuing boom in the coal trade, with an important role for the US, fostered plans for large-scale increases in the US port facilities to relieve the long lines of ships at US ports waiting to load coal. Every port had plans to join the coal trade, and the planned projects to increase coal transshipment facilities amounted to a capacity of three times the median forecast of the demand for US coal overseas. Thus began the political battle to gain government approval and funding of these new port construction and improvement projects.

In the event, the demand for coal did not keep pace with the forecasts. An oil glut appeared, and the price of oil fell. Where
there had been a great rush to change from oil energy to coal, the rush was slowed as the price differential narrowed between the two competing energy sources. In the US the export coal demand leveled off and then dropped. Some claimed that if the price of US coal could be lowered through cheaper, more efficient transportation, US exporters could increase their market share in the world markets. Thus there was still an effort made to improve the port facilities by dredging and by increasing the capacity of transshipment facilities.

The purpose of this study, and specifically of this computer model, is to build a model to evaluate the impact of the transportation system on the US export coal trade. By modeling the entire export coal transportation network from the mine at the origin to the final user at the destination, the effect of changes on any element of the system can be studied. Several important questions can be explored using this model. What effect will port dredging have on the delivered cost of coal? Which are the best ports to dredge economically and to what capacity should they be dredged? What policy of port and user fees should the government employ to recover their investments in dredging, assuming that the dredging is funded by the government? What effect will railroad deregulation have on the delivered cost of coal?

All of these questions concern only the initiatives taken to improve US coal exports. The important question is not so much the delivered cost of coal by itself, but how that delivered cost
compares with the competition. The US is now the high-cost producer of coal for export by a wide margin. It is highly unlikely that transportation improvements alone can change that fact. However the US has other advantages in the coal trade such as relatively stable labor-management relations and an excess capacity of production over domestic use. If the US cannot compete on price alone, can a price decrease combined with these other advantages be sufficient to improve the US market share? This qualitative question probably does not have a definitive answer that can be derived solely by a quantitative model. However the model can provide information on the ability of US exporters to trim the price differential with the competition, and it can provide the means to investigate different options of how to decrease the delivered cost.

The study in this thesis revolved around the dredging of ports on the US east and Gulf coasts to gain economies of scale on the ocean transportation links of the coal network. Dredging at the ports of Baltimore, Hampton Roads, and Mobile was modeled to determine the impact on the delivered costs of a ton of coal. Dredging of these ports was studied singly, in pairs, and all together to find the best possible combination. Each scenario was studied for a low volume of 32 million tons per year and for a high volume of 64 million tons per year of steam coal exports.

The delivered costs in this study ranged from $52 - $81, except for the costs to Madrid which were about $15 higher from every US source due to the very long and expensive foreign rail link from the port.
of Cadiz. The table of typical link costs (Table 1) shows that the mine production costs are the largest portion of the final cost by a large margin (58%). However the next most costly links are the US rail and the vessel links, each representing about 9% of the total delivered cost. The foreign rail link carried a relatively high cost as well (8%), but the remaining links did not individually contribute a large proportion of the total costs. It is important to note that the US port costs, which reflect the government user fees, only contribute about 3% of the total cost.

The only option which made any impact on the lowest deliverable cost of coal was to dredge the port of Baltimore. This result was fairly robust in that in every scenario in which Baltimore was dredged, the cost of coal to Central Europe was lowered by an average of $2 per ton. The sensitivity of this solution to the amount of sulfur in the coal and to the use of railroad prices as opposed to costs was also examined. In both cases the advantage of dredging Baltimore was lessened, but it was still an improvement over the present export coal network with respect to delivered cost. When Hampton Roads and Mobile were dredged, they too decreased the cost of coal delivered to Europe through those deeper ports, but that cost was not as low as the delivered cost to Europe through other ports in the same scenario. As such these ports would not capture the trade from the shallower ports. While dredging these ports would improve local conditions, it would not improve system performance and cannot be justified economically.
## TYPICAL LINK COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>PER CENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINE</td>
<td>26 - 42</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUCK</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIL</td>
<td>5 - 29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSSHIP</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORT</td>
<td>0 - 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VESSEL</td>
<td>5 - 17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN PORT</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN TRANSSHIP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN RAIL</td>
<td>4 - 16 (31)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>52 - 81 (96)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Costs in $/ Short Ton

**TABLE 1**
When the port of Baltimore was dredged in scenario 2, the vessel costs to Central Europe were reduced by $4 per ton, on average, while the port fee was raised from zero ($0) to $1. A 50% cost recovery by the government was used to calculate the port fees, which means that there is some subsidy to shippers contained in the dredging. When Hampton Roads was dredged in scenario 3, the vessel costs were reduced by $2, and the port fees increased from $0 to $1. For Mobile the respective figures were a $4 cost decrease and an increase of $2 in the port fee. These figures for the port fees are almost the same as those predicted by the US House of Representatives in 1982. A full set of link costs for scenarios 1 and 2 are listed in Appendix C, as are the vessel costs both with and without dredging. One can readily see that the advantage of dredging Hampton Roads is almost totally negated by the rise in the port fees. At Mobile the relative advantage of dredging is about $3 per ton, but the costs of the railroad network from the coal producing areas to Mobile are very high. Because of these rail costs, coal shipped through Mobile is still not competitive even when the port is dredged. Only at Baltimore, where there is a low-cost railroad network to the port, does the cost of the vessel link fall enough to overcome the rise in the port fees and allow the delivered cost of coal to be reduced.

Table 2 shows the dredging costs of each dredging option and the results of the one year savings on the total transportation system. From this table it is clear that only Baltimore presents a viable
**PORT DREDGING COSTS and SAVINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORT</th>
<th>DREDGING COSTS</th>
<th>RUN COSTS</th>
<th>1 - YEAR SAVINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASE (32 mtpy)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALTIMORE</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPTON ROADS</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT &amp; HR</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR &amp; MOB</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT &amp; MOB</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL THREE</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BASE II (64 mtpy) | 0 | 4191 | - |
| BALTIMORE        | 302 | 4142 | 49 |
| HAMPTON ROADS    | 480 | 4175 | 16 |
| MOBILE           | 407 | 4176 | 15 |
| BALT & HR        | 782 | 4131 | 60 |
| HR & MOB         | 887 | 4160 | 31 |
| BALT & MOB       | 709 | 4127 | 64 |
| ALL THREE        | 1189 | 4116 | 75 |

All Figures in $ Millions

**TABLE 2**
alternative on a cost basis. In the case of Baltimore, there is a capital subsidy of $151 million based on the 50% recovery of the dredging costs which is not included in the cost column. The interest on the $302 million investment at any interest rate less than 8% is less than the $24 million in yearly savings from this option. This relationship does not hold for either of the other ports studied in this thesis. The reader should note that as the volume increases, the financial advantage of dredging Baltimore also increases. The options in which Baltimore is dredged with another port appear to be feasible as well, but the effect on the savings is merely additive from the cases of dredging the individual ports. From this point of view, the additional dredging would only serve to reduce the relative savings which could be realized by dredging Baltimore alone.

Another important result of this study was to identify the Great Lakes port of Ashtabula, and possibly others on the Lakes, as an important export facility to small foreign ports where the advantages of large vessels cannot be employed. Being located close to the Pennsylvania and West Virginia coal fields allows coal shipped through Ashtabula to incur only small railroad transport costs, and thus to compete with those ports which are further from the coal fields. Based on this study, an investigation should be done in the longer term to determine whether the transshipment facilities at Ashtabula should be increased to gain more of this trade to small foreign ports. Dredging is not practical because of
the limitations imposed by the St. Lawrence Seaway, but increased transshipment facilities may allow Ashtabula to increase throughput and to compete for increased coal exports.

The dredging of Baltimore and increasing the transshipment facilities at Ashtabula will lower the cost of coal delivered overseas, but it will not lower that cost enough to compete directly on cost with South Africa or Poland. The advantage of these improvements, then, is a relative advantage. It does improve the US ability to compete on cost, but whether this improvement is good enough is unclear. The question of whether to make these improvements will have to be based on different criteria than just the delivered cost of coal to foreign markets.
2. THE US POSITION IN THE WORLD COAL MARKET

In the late 1970's and early 1980's, the world experienced an energy crisis in the form of a doubling of the price of crude oil by the OPEC countries. This was the second such energy crisis in less than 10 years, and it gave rise to strong fears that the price of oil might continue to climb at a rapid rate. In order to lessen their dependence on oil, many nations sought other forms of energy such as coal and nuclear. The coal energy was available sooner than was the nuclear, and the export market for steam coal exploded. Between 1979 and 1981 the US exports of steam coal jumped from 2.3 million tons to 30.0 million tons. This tremendous increase in coal exports caught the US unprepared, especially in the area of port loading facilities, and it sparked a great interest in building new facilities to support this export surge.

Prior to 1979 the majority of the coal exported by the US was metallurgical coal which was used in the making of coke for the steel industry. The majority of this coal was shipped from northern and central Appalachia to a few steel producing areas which were near large ports. This trade was well developed, and the exports were rising gradually in the late 1970's. The export steam coal trade at that time was mainly with eastern Canada, and there was a very small overseas component. With the OPEC oil price rise in 1979, steam coal exports rose to the level of
metallurgical coal and promised to surpass it. However there was already a competitive environment in the world coal market, and the US exporters did not enter that environment with many advantages.

2.1 EXPORTERS

The main exporters of steam coal are South Africa, Australia, Poland, Canada, and the US. Until 1979 most of the steam coal trade was between neighboring countries, but the explosion in demand ended that and caused greatly increased shipments by the ocean trading lanes. This should have increased competition tremendously, but several of the exporters faced serious production and transportation problems in 1979. This opened the door for higher-cost producers to enter the export coal market. Since 1981 there has been a weakening in the demand for coal on the world market as the price of oil dropped, and as some of the traditional coal exporters controlled their problems and resumed exporting.

South Africa has a strong infrastructure in place for exporting coal, and an exceptionally strong position in the European market as the low-cost producer. Coal is the main source of energy in South Africa, and it is maintained at a below-market price internally by the government. The South Africans export coal to
subsidize their internal needs and to gain hard-currency foreign exchange. The government strictly controls exports by linking export licenses to internal production at the subsidized prices, and by controlling the transportation system including the railroads and the ports. The government extracts very high user fees for the use of its transportation facilities, but the extremely low production costs still enable the South Africans to deliver coal to Europe cheaper than any other exporter.

The racial tension in South Africa causes many would-be importers to limit their imports because of the possibility of a shutdown at the mines. In fact there are several nations, such as Sweden, who will not trade with South Africa at all because of their racial discrimination policies. At the same time the South Africans tend to limit their own exports, and to allow higher-cost producers to gain market share. By letting someone else set the market clearing price, they are able to charge just below that price and make very high profits on the difference. The government encourages this behavior strongly with its export license control. South Africa should be able to maintain its strong position in the European market barring any racial/labor problems.

Poland is the only exporting nation which can challenge the South African delivered price of coal to Western Europe. When the last oil crisis hit in 1979, Poland was not in a position to export coal because of the labor unrest over their union Solidarity and the ensuing martial law which destroyed the union. The Poles had
been a major supplier to Western Europe before that period, and they have regained some of their position since 1982. Proximity is a major advantage of Poland in this market, with the resulting low transportation costs. The Polish economy is centrally directed, and the coal industry and the transportation network are very tightly controlled. The instability of the labor-government relations is still just below the surface, and it weighs heavily on importers. However, many of the importers are also creditors of Poland, and they are anxious for the Polish economy to regain its health so that the Poles can repay their debts. With its price position and the feelings of its creditors, Poland is in a position to be a force in the European coal market.

The Australian coal industry is able to compete in both the European and the Pacific markets, but it is in the Pacific Ocean area that they are the low-cost producer. Australia's big advantages in the Pacific are proximity and rich coal seams near their major ports. Here, as in South Africa, the government extracts heavy user fees from users of the railroads and ports. In addition the Australian government has discouraged outside investment by mandating that at least 50% of any foreign investments in Australia be financed in Australia. This law has slowed the development of their coal industry along with the rest of their economy. This deliberate policy of slow development has allowed higher-cost producers to capture some of the market in the Pacific. And, as with South Africa in Europe, it has allowed the
Australians to gain high economic rents by pricing just below their higher-priced competitors.

The Australians are not viewed as a highly reliable trading partner because of the strength of their unions. Especially in their port workers' unions, a strike by a small number of workers is able to close down large segments of the transportation infrastructure. In fact such a strike occurred in 1979 when the boom in the world coal trade began. This strike allowed other exporters, especially the US and Canada, to enter the Pacific markets. Though Australia has regained much of its market, it is still viewed warily by importing nations.

The other major coal exporter, other than the US, is Canada. Its exports come mainly from western Canada and flow to Pacific Ocean markets. Eastern Canada imports coal from the eastern coal fields of the US. The Canadian fields are located in the Canadian Rocky Mountains, and many of the seams are very hard to work and to transport from because of the terrain. The port of Vancouver is prepared to export large amounts of coal, and a transportation infrastructure is in place and improving. This will give Canada the ability to export increasing amounts of coal, though it will remain one of the high-cost producers.

There are many other nations which mine coal, but most do not mine enough to fill domestic requirements and are net importers. China, Columbia, and India are recognized as potential exporters in the future, but all will require extensive investment before
that will occur. In each case not only do the coal mines have to be developed, but the transportation infrastructure of railroads and ports also will have to be constructed to support exports.

The Soviet Union contains almost half of the world's known coal reserves, but most of it is located in economically and climatically inaccessible areas. Those reserves which are in the western portions of the country have been seriously depleted to the point where they cannot support large scale exports. The Soviet Union will probably continue to export small amounts to other Eastern European countries, but it will not be a major force in the world market.

2.2 IMPORTERS

The major importers in the coal market are the nations of Western Europe and the Pacific rim countries, especially Japan. Most of these countries also lack supplies of oil, and they are very sensitive to price rises in their energy sources. When the OPEC nations doubled the price of oil in 1979, these importing nations immediately began to look for alternate sources of energy. Coal trade on the world market recorded the tremendous increases as a result.

Prior to 1979 the majority of coal traded on the world market was metallurgical coal used in coke production in the steel industry.
This trade tended to be concentrated in a few areas such as the Ruhr area of Germany and the Taranto area of Italy. When steam coal became a force in international trade, the nature of the trading changed. Steam coal is used predominantly to produce heat for electric power. The demand for such energy is very widespread, touching every continent and almost every nation in the world. Because steam coal is less valuable than metallurgical coal, the cost of transportation represents a much greater share of the final cost. This necessitates shipping more directly to the final user, further complicating the trading of steam coal.

Many nations are trying to gain economies of scale by building port facilities capable of handling large vessels. France is one of these nations, and it is currently increasing its facilities at Dunkirk, Le Havre, and Marseille. With large port facilities comes concentration of imports and increased internal transportation costs to deliver the coal to widely dispersed final users. France has a highly centralized economy, and the import of coal is handled by one agency. Such an organization should allow France to order large quantities at good prices. The French have also determined that diversification of suppliers is in their best interest, and they have set a limit on the quantity of coal that they will import from any one supplier. France is attacking the import of coal and oil in a different way as well, by vastly increasing its use of nuclear energy. If all the nuclear development that France is planning becomes reality, that country
may become an atypical coal user with more use by general industry than by the electric utilities. It is projected that France will remain a net importer of coal, with a stable market size.

West Germany and the United Kingdom both mine a good deal of coal within their own borders, but both are still net importers. In both countries internal production is subsidized, and there are import limits which also support local production. The importing organizations are decentralized in both nations, although in Great Britain there is a Central Electric Generating Board which operates nearly all the generating capacity in England and Wales. Neither West Germany nor the United Kingdom has any major coal port facilities which can handle large coal vessels. Interestingly, they both utilize the port of Rotterdam, Netherlands, and transship their coal by barge to gain economies of scale for the ocean transport costs. Both countries are projected to increase their imports of steam coal in future years.

Japan is the largest importer of coal in the Pacific area, and its imports are forecast to rise swiftly as they try to reduce their dependence on imported oil. Japan is a maritime trading nation, and it has many large ports capable of handling supercolliers. Being an island nation with vast coast lines compared to its land area, the inland transportation is less important to Japan than is the ocean transportation. The use of large vessels to capture the economies of scale, then, is very important to gaining exports to Japan.
Most other importers are characterized by small demand quantities, scattered locations, and small port facilities. Such importers are numerous in Europe, northern Africa, and the Pacific rim. In the aggregate they constitute a considerable market, but it is a market which is difficult to categorize and to supply efficiently. Transportation costs will tend to be higher to these nations because of the limitations of their transportation infrastructure. These nations also tend to be Third World or poorer nations with highly volatile economies. The future exports to these countries is uncertain, but there is potential for them to be significant.
2.3 US COAL INDUSTRY

The coal mining industry in the US is very heterogeneous, but it can be broken into two main coal producing regions. The Appalachian coal fields have long been mined for domestic coal consumption, and they are currently supplying the majority of the export coal trade. These fields range from Pennsylvania and West Virginia in the north to Alabama in the south, and they export coal through ports on the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes. The western coal fields are much newer, and they employ more surface mining than do the Appalachian fields. One of the driving influences in these western fields is the increasing use of imported coal by the Pacific rim countries, and the possibilities of exporting there through the west coast ports of the US.

The Appalachian fields range in size from family owned mines to large corporation owned mines. About half of the production there comes from relatively small mines causing consolidation for shipment to be an issue. The Appalachian coal is characterized by a high heat content and a high sulfur content. The first characteristic is beneficial since the higher heat content reduces the quantity of coal which must be transported to meet user needs, and reduces the impact of the transportation costs. Sulfur, however, is a pollutant, and a maximum allowable level is often specified in contracts. Excess sulfur can require users to
install costly scrubbers on their plants to meet environmental standards, and many importers are not willing to make that investment.

The United Mine Workers Union is very strong in Appalachia, and most of the large mines are of the deep shaft variety. Both of these factors tend to keep extraction costs high. The labor-management relations in the US are seen to be among the most reliable in the world, however, because they are predictable. Coal importers can be quite certain that there will be no major labor problems unless a contract is nearing its expiration. These times are well defined, and importers can make arrangements well in advance to avoid potential problems.

The transportation infrastructure supporting the Appalachian coal mines was created to support the domestic coal markets. It is well established, and it can be fairly efficient. The system has some slack capacity, and it is capable of meeting some increased demands. For the typical mine the links in the transportation system are mine production, minemouth to tipple, tipple to port, transshipment at port, ocean voyage by vessel, and the reverse links at the importing end. These elements will be discussed in more detail following a brief discussion of the western coal fields.

The western coal fields have not been developed for as long nor to the extent of the Appalachian fields, and they tend to produce coal at a lower cost. Their sulfur content is also lower, but the
western coals tend to have lower heat content. They are located far from the western ports and require a long domestic transportation link. For these reasons, western coal tends to cost more per unit of heat when delivered in Europe than does Appalachian coal, although there has been some evidence that western coal can compete in the Pacific markets as the high-cost producer. Another disadvantage of western coal is the relatively underdeveloped transportation network in the coal region. Whereas in Appalachia nearly every mine is within 10 miles of a tipple, in western areas this density has not yet been established. This causes the movement from the mine to the tipple to be relatively expensive (either by truck or by rail due to construction costs), and it causes sharp increases in the total transportation costs. The ability of the western coal region to compete in the Pacific should improve as these fields are developed and as the transportation network is improved.

2.4 US COAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Once coal is removed from the ground, it must be transported to an ocean port and loaded on a vessel for export. This section will describe this system in the US as a series of links. In general these links include movement from the mine to a long-haul loading site, long-haul transport to a port, transshipment from
the long-haul carrier to the vessel, and the voyage of the vessel to the foreign port. At that end the sequence is reversed for delivery to the final user. In addition to these links there is some cost for extraction, and there may be charges by the government for the use of facilities such as the locks and dams on a river system or user fees for port facilities. This description is very general since there may be more than one means of transporting the coal over a given link. The choices are generally limited by the location of the mine and the available modes as much as by price differences.

The first link in this transportation system, from the mine mouth to the tipple, is often the most expensive on a per-mile basis of the entire system. This distance is generally as short as possible and is often accomplished by truck. Trucking coal is very expensive, which is why mine operators try to keep the distance short. Producers suggest that increasing the capacity of trucks by allowing larger trucks or more trailers on trucks may be a way to keep line-haul modes competitive. The argument is that larger capacity trucks will allow operators more flexibility in the tipple they choose and cause price competition among the line-haul carriers. In the absence of increased truck user fees and if there are additional tipples close to individual mines, this may be possible. Some of the larger mine operators are able to reduce the cost of this link by constructing conveyors to the tipple or by inducing the line-haul carriers to extend service to
the mine. In an industry where half the volume is produced by small operators, these alternate means are clearly the exceptions rather than the rule.

There are two efficient line-haul vehicles for coal - rail and barge. The choice between the two is dependent more on mine location than it is on price. Both modes stress the same characteristics to gain their economies - long distance haul of bulk quantities by a small crew. The barge traffic from Appalachia terminates mainly in New Orleans and Mobile. It usually consists of several large barges lashed together into one unit and propelled by a single river tugboat. Rates are generally quoted by the ton or by the barge.

Coal trains rarely carry any other cargo. In fact there is a good deal of specialized equipment being developed to haul coal, from special types of cars to cars made from special materials. The basic rate to transport coal is by the car, but multiple car shipments and unit trains may bring reduced rates to the shipper. With railroad deregulation there has also been a move to contract rates. By signing a long-term contract, the shipper can get reduced rates and improved service. The railroad gets a fixed shipment amount which allows it to standardize operations and to reduce its operating costs.

Once the coal arrives at the port it must be offloaded from the line-haul vehicle and loaded on the vessel. This may be a one step operation of direct transfer, but more likely it will entail
some storage or inventory between the two functions. This transfer step is called transshipment. When the boom hit the US in 1979, there were not enough transshipment facilities in the country. The result was long queues of ships awaiting loading. Being the high-cost producer, the US exporters could not afford the extra cost of demurrage, or vessel wait time in the ports. Many ports immediately planned and began construction of new facilities to reduce demurrage. By some estimates the amount of planned capacity is three times the median of the forecast demand for US export coal.

There has been a lot written about the importance of vessel size on the delivered price of coal. On a per-ton basis, there is no doubt that larger vessels are much more cost efficient. However, the US currently has no capability on the east coast to load ships of over 100,000 deadweight tons. All of our major competitors have this capability, and many of the importers, especially the large importers, have this capability as well. The lack of superports clearly impacts on the delivered price of coal, and there have been proposals to dredge almost every major east coast port to gain this capability. The question is now political because almost all the proposals require funding by the Federal Government. Every port wants the business that increased capacity and large vessel economies would bring.

The Federal Government is also exploring ways to recapture their investment in dredging by imposing user fees at the ports. What
form should these fees take, and who will they affect? Will they negate the advantages gained by dredging the harbors? Given the decision to dredge certain ports with a particular user fee policy, there will be gainers and losers from the present environment, and the political battle to be a gainer will be fierce.

The transportation system is nearly the same at the foreign end of the ocean shipment. There is another transshipment facility to move the coal from the vessel to the vehicle for inland movement. There may be port fees and user charges. Inland transportation may be either train or barge depending on location, and there will probably be another short-haul movement by truck to the final user. There are two major differences between the US side and the foreign side transportation systems. First the US has no influence over the operation of the foreign system, and, hence, cannot improve that system to increase the efficiency of the US coal exports. Second much less is known about the foreign system in the way of rates and fees. The latter factor is important in the estimates of the delivered price of US coal, and it must be kept in mind as a limitation of the results obtained.
3. COMPUTER MODEL

The approach that I have taken to determine the impact of changes in the transportation system on the delivered cost of coal is to model the system as a network. This network is composed of all the links from the mining of the coal at the origin to its arrival at the destination utility (see Figures 1 & 2). By modeling the entire network, great flexibility is given to the user to change any transportation link in order to determine its impact on the system as a whole.

Once the network is established with the construction of the individual links and link costs, this model will develop the least costly paths from every origin to every destination. This is accomplished with a flow-dependent shortest-path algorithm which allows the link costs per ton to vary as the flow on the link changes. Once the equilibrium link flows and costs are established, the model uses a so-called transshipment algorithm to determine the best origin from which each destination should buy coal to minimize its total cost, assuming constant link costs.

The remainder of this chapter will describe these two algorithms. First the flow-dependent algorithm will be presented. I will briefly describe how the algorithm works, what inputs are required of the user, and what outputs the user will receive. The same treatment will then be given to the transshipment algorithm.
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FIGURE 1
### Export Coal Transportation Network
**in Foreign Countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Transship</th>
<th>Rail</th>
<th>Utility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tempere</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apeldoorn</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Power Station</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrakesh</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2**
3.1 FLOW-DEPENDENT SHORTEST-PATH ALGORITHM

The purpose of the flow-dependent algorithm is to find the lowest cost path from every origin mine to every destination utility over a network on which the link costs change with changes in the link flows. The lowest cost paths are found using a variant of the shortest path algorithm from Horowitz and Sahni (2). Their algorithm has been expanded in this model to generate the lowest cost path for every origin-to-destination (O-D) pair.

As an example of the lowest cost shortest path algorithm, consider the network in figure 3. This network has an origin at node 1 and a destination at node 4. There are two paths from node 1 to node 4, and there are a total of four links which have constant costs as described on figure 3. The flow traveling from node 1 to node 4 will begin its search for the cheapest path at node 1. The shortest path algorithm keeps an array of the cost from the origin called a labeling array. The value for the origin is zero (0), and the value for any other node is the cost from the origin along the lowest cost path to that other node. When the network in figure 3 is initially inspected, the label for node 4 equals 4, and the label for node 2 equals 1. On the next search, which is done from node 2, the label for node 3 is assigned a value of 2. Finally on the search from node 3, the lowest cost path to node 4 is identified, and the label is changed to a value of 3. While
Example of the Shortest-Path Algorithm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONODE</th>
<th>DNODE</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3
the search for the shortest path is in progress, the path to each node along the shortest path is retained by means of an array of the predecessor for each node investigated. The predecessor of a node A is that node from which node A is reached when using the shortest path from the origin. When the destination is reached, the entire shortest path can be traced back to the origin by means of this predecessor array.

Often the shortest path algorithm is run on a network with fixed link costs, but the flow-dependent algorithm better describes how the link costs behave on a real network. In this algorithm, as the amount of coal shipped on a link changes, the cost of shipping a ton of coal on that link also changes, usually increasing as the amount of flow increases. This is because increased flow usually leads to congestion and delay. However some links will experience economies of scale, and their average costs will decrease with an increase in flow. For example, transshipment facilities can load coal on larger ships more efficiently than on smaller ships since there is less non-productive time of docking and undocking. The result is lower average costs at transshipment facilities which handle larger vessels.

Since the shortest path algorithm runs only for fixed link costs and the link costs change with the link flow, some method must be employed to combine the changing costs and the fixed cost algorithm. This method is called the Convex Combinations Method by Sheffi (6). It is an iterative process whereby the shortest
path algorithm is employed with fixed link costs in successive iterations. Between iterations the link costs are changed to reflect the new flow pattern on the network. In order to avoid oscillating between two extreme solutions, the flow pattern from all previous iterations is combined in a weighted average to form the new flow pattern. This process will continue either a specified number of iterations or until the change in the flow pattern is sufficiently small to meet the user's requirements. At this point the network is said to be in equilibrium.

One assumption in this model is that the link flows and costs will converge to equilibrium. Sheffi proves that this is true when the network is convex. The network will definitely be convex, and hence will converge, when every link exhibits the normal behavior of congestion and diseconomies of scale. Convergence is less certain when some links exhibit economies of scale since the cost functions on those links are concave. If the impact of the concave links is small, the system will probably be convex overall and so converge. This has been the experience in test networks to this point.

3.1.1 INPUTS BY THE USER

In order for the user to run the flow-dependent algorithm, he must input information about the network, the link costs and the amount
of flow. In addition there are two control variables which the user can change from their default values if he desires. These variables are all input through a series of menus, described in Appendix B. This section summarizes the key items.

The network over which the flow-dependent algorithm is run is a directed network of links. Each link carries flow in only one direction, although opposite links to portray two-directional flows are allowed. Each link connects a head node (onode) and a tail node (dnode) which designates the direction of flow (see Figure 3). The user enters this network structure as part of the input menus. Care must be taken so that the dnode from one menu becomes the onode in the menu for the next link. This will insure that the network is connected from origin to destination.

The input for the link costs is entered indirectly by the user in terms of more basic components. The user will enter, for instance, the type of track and signal system for a railroad link and the length of the link, and the input program will compute from internal tables the parameters of the link cost equation,

\[ \text{COST} = C_0 + C_1 \times (\text{FLOW})^{C_2} \]

This equation holds for every link in the network, each having different parameters, \( C_0, C_1, \) and \( C_2, \) based on the user inputs. The parameters will remain constant throughout the execution of the algorithm, and the cost will vary only with the flow. See Appendix B for a more complete discussion of the cost parameters.

The flow inputs by the user are origin and destination specific.
An entry is required for the flow from each origin mine region to each destination utility country, although zero flow entries are accepted and are the default. The algorithm will then distribute these flows to the links along the lowest cost O-D paths. Some of the links will appear on more than one O-D path, and those flows will be combined to determine the link cost.

The control parameters which determine the accuracy of the equilibrium are an optional input for the user. The first of these parameters is the number of iterations, which determines the number of updates in the link flows based on new link costs. The default value is 2 iterations, but the algorithm always executes one more iteration as it generates its output so that three iterations are actually performed when the default is used. The network which I used to test the export coal system consisted of 98 nodes and 191 links. On that network, the flow-dependent algorithm written in UCSD Fortran takes about 7-8 minutes per iteration on an Apple II. The user can change the number of iterations by changing the entry for iterations on the parameter menu during his input of data.

The second control parameter is a measure of the degree of convergence desired by the user, and it is called the convergence criterion on the parameter input menu. The algorithm uses a root mean square convergence test with a value called TOTAL. TOTAL is computed as a measure of the consistency of the flows between successive iterations. At each iteration the flow on each link is
compared with the link flow from the previous iteration. The difference is squared and then these values are summed over all the links. The square root of this sum is divided by the total flow on all the links of the network, resulting in TOTAL. This value is compared to the convergence criterion at each iteration to decide if the network is in equilibrium. The flow-dependent algorithm will terminate at the first exit criterion it meets, if either the number of iterations is completed or the value of TOTAL is less than the convergence criterion.

3.1.2 FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM OUTPUTS

Once the input has been entered and the flow-dependent algorithm has been executed, the user is interested in output. The output from the flow-dependent algorithm is a matrix of path costs for every O-D pair and a listing of all the links giving their costs and flows.

The O-D cost matrix is output from the flow-dependent algorithm proper. The algorithm executes for only one origin at a time, and the output to the O-D matrix is written for the one origin to every destination before the algorithm proceeds to the next origin. The costs entered are the path costs from the origin mine to the destination utility, but the matrix does not describe the individual links in the paths or the path routes. (These are
obtained as described below. See Appendix D, Figure 4.4.1C for an example.)

The link outputs of cost and flow follow immediately after the O-D cost matrix. This output gives the onode and dnode of every link in the network together with the link costs and flows. Every link in the network is listed whether there is flow on the link or not. Many links will have zero flow which means that they are not on the lowest-cost path of any O-D pair.

To determine the path for an individual O-D pair, there is a special subroutine. This subroutine uses the same shortest path algorithm, but it is executed only after the equilibrium link costs have been determined. After the link output from both the flow-dependent and the transshipment algorithms, the user will be prompted on the screen whether he wishes to examine the path for a specific O-D pair. If he answers 'y', the screen will prompt him for the origin and then the destination he desires. The user will enter the node number of the origin mine and the destination utility at the keyboard. The values will appear both on the screen and on the printout. The output from this routine will include the origin number, the destination number, the path cost, and the node number for every intermediate node in order. This single path routine will repeat as many times as the user desires until he answers 'n' when asked if he has another path to investigate.
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3.2 TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM

Given a directed, capacitated network with supplies at the origins and demands at the destinations, the transshipment algorithm will determine the flow pattern which results in the lowest system cost. The main task of the transshipment algorithm is to determine the O-D flow pattern across the network of links. This is valuable to the importers since it identifies their cheapest source of supply. It is also useful for US policy purposes, because it simulates what might happen as a consequence of possible changes in the US transportation network such as dredging of harbors and the deregulation of the railroads.

The transshipment algorithm is a derivative of linear programming. The transshipment algorithm works over a network of links. Thus not only is the cheapest source of supply identified for each destination, but the path from that supplier to the destination is also determined.

As with many linear programming formulations, the transshipment algorithm assumes that the link costs do not vary with the amount of flow on the link. The transshipment algorithm is run after the flow-dependent algorithm in order to take advantage of the equilibrium link costs which are an output of the flow-dependent algorithm. If the link flows on the transshipment algorithm are not much different than those on the flow-dependent algorithm, the fixed link costs assumption is probably acceptable. If there is a
great difference in the flows, there may also be a great difference in some of the link costs based on those link flows. The fixed costs assumption may not be valid in that case. In that case, the user must decide whether the flow pattern used by the flow-dependent algorithm is a good model of the actual flows of export steam coal. If the pattern is not a good model, the user must change the flow pattern appropriately. If the flow pattern is correct, the transshipment algorithm results suggest that there is a better solution available to the utilities about where to buy their coal. The user must understand that the transshipment algorithm leads to a system solution which may not be the best solution for each individual participant. This will be explained more fully in section 3.3.

3.2.1 INPUTS BY USER

The types of inputs required by the transshipment algorithm are the same as for the flow-dependent algorithm. The transshipment algorithm requires information about the network structure, the link costs, and the O-D flows. Although some of the inputs are slightly different than for the flow-dependent algorithm. These variables are entered on the same set of menus described in Appendix B.

The network structure of links and nodes is the same for the
transshipment algorithm as it was for the flow-dependent algorithm. However in addition to specifying the links, each link must be given a capacity which is the maximum amount of flow it can handle. The transshipment algorithm will assign all the the flow up to capacity to the lowest cost links. To ensure that the flow does not exceed that which the link can handle, the user will set the link capacity in the input menu as he enters the link into the network. The capacity should be set at the point where the link begins to experience unreasonable cost increases due to congestion for links with diseconomies of scale. For links with economies of scale the capacity should be set at the practical capacity of the link, for example, the practical capacity of the transshipment equipment at a port.

The link costs required by the transshipment algorithm are fixed costs on each link. At present these costs are the output equilibrium link costs from the flow-dependent algorithm. The formulation of these costs has already been described, and the use of these costs simplifies the data collection task to only the basic cost components and not to the final shipper costs themselves. However, if the flows generated by the transshipment algorithm are much different than the equilibrium flows from the flow-dependent algorithm, these costs will be suspect. If the user wishes to enter his own fixed costs, he is able to do so by entering his costs in the input menu in the column following the destination node for each link. These entries take precedence.
over other cost inputs and will remain fixed throughout the program.

The origin to destination flow pattern is the output of the transshipment algorithm. Therefore the algorithm ignores the O-D flow matrix input by the user for the flow-dependent algorithm. The requirements for the transshipment algorithm are only the supply available at each origin mine and the demand required at each destination utility. There is no requirement for the sum of the supplies to equal the sum of the demands. The user enters these supplies and demands on the menus when he enters the mine production links and the foreign utility links. For the mine production links the production rate should be entered as the annual production in millions of tons. Similarly the rate of use of the foreign utility should be entered in millions of tons on the foreign utility menu.

3.2.2 TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM OUTPUT

After the transshipment algorithm has been run, the output gives the flow pattern which minimizes the system cost when each utility is able to buy coal from any supplier. When the flow pattern is plotted on the network, the best source of supply for each utility is determined along with the overall flow pattern.

The output itself includes a listing of all the links which form
the basis, or solution set, of the transshipment algorithm. This will include at least one link to every node in the network, although some of these links will carry zero flow. Links at capacity are listed separately at the end of the basis solution, and are separately labeled. If there are no capacitated links in the network, there will be a message to the user to so inform him. If the total supply and total demand quantities are not equal, there will be some flow assigned to so-called artificial links which form the initial solution to the transshipment algorithm. These links are identified by one node which is not in the user's network and the other node which is a supply or demand node. These links should be ignored when the solution is applied to the network diagram.

There will be no link cost outputs since the costs are constant and the same as were output for the flow-dependent algorithm. The paths of the O-D flows are also not output in the transshipment algorithm. Immediately following this algorithm output, the user will be prompted about investigating individual O-D flows. This path routine has already been discussed, and it is important to remember that the path routine is written for the shortest path without considering link capacities. When it is run it will indicate the lowest-cost path for the O-D flow, but that path may not be possible, given the link capacities and the interactions of different O-D flows. The single path routine will, however, indicate the desired path for an O-D flow, and it can be useful to
investigate which links suffer congestion and what adjustments are made to those links.

3.3 ALGORITHM COMPARISONS

Both of the algorithms used in this program have strengths and weaknesses in determining the optimum flow pattern for the network. The two algorithms use different criteria to arrive at a solution. The flow-dependent algorithm computes the shortest path between the origin and the destination. As such it looks for a solution from the user's point of view. The transshipment algorithm computes the solution from a system point of view while determining the best supplier for each utility demand.

The strength of the flow-dependent algorithm is that it models the link costs in a dynamic setting where they change based on the link flow. This is the way most link costs really work, and it provides a dynamic solution. The other advantage of the flow-dependent algorithm is that a solution from the user point of view is the one most common in the free market. Every participant is trying to minimize his own costs, and there is little concern for the good of other network users. The biggest weakness of the flow-dependent algorithm is that the O-D flows must be predicted or modeled prior to running the algorithm, and that they are fixed outside the model. The market does not play a role in choosing
the best supplier for each destination in the algorithm.

The transshipment algorithm complements the flow-dependent algorithm nicely by casting its greatest strength on the weakness of the flow-dependent algorithm. In the transshipment algorithm, the source of supply for each utility demand is determined by the algorithm. In many cases this sourcing may differ from the flow pattern input to the flow-dependent algorithm. Of course with some of the importing nations limiting the amount of coal they will import from any one supplier, the flow-dependent algorithm may model reality without resulting in the most efficient flow pattern. In fact the user will notice that the total system cost of the transshipment algorithm is always lower than the total system cost of the flow-dependent algorithm.

The weaknesses of the transshipment algorithm are that the link costs are fixed and that the system solution can only be achieved with central direction. The fixed link costs are a weakness because real-world transportation network link costs are not fixed and constant. As has been explained, the approximation of fixed link costs may be reasonable if the link flows are not much different in the transshipment algorithm than in the flow-dependent algorithm. The idea of the central direction is foreign to a free market, and it usually does not serve the individual to best advantage. In a system solution, some users give up a little of his own advantage, usually in the form of higher personal cost, to make the system as a whole more
efficient. It is plain to see that many users will have an
incentive to change their path choices to gain better individual
results. The individual will be better off in that manner, but
the system will suffer. In a free market, the system solution is
rarely seen.

As an example of the difference between the system and the user
solutions, consider the network in figure 4. The five links serve
one origin-to-destination pair, and they form three paths. Assume
that a total of 6 flow units must travel from node 1 to node 4.
The two solutions are given below figure 4, detailing the link
flows and costs, the path costs and the total flow-cost units of
each solution. Note that the quantity of flow-cost units and the
path costs are lower in the system solution than in the user
solution. One would think that the system solution is the one
which the network would exhibit. However, the system solution is
unstable because there is an incentive for an individual flow unit
to move from path 1 or path 2 to path 3 to reduce its individual
cost. The unit which moves would have a path cost of 81, which is
lower than the 83 on the original path in the system solution, but
in so doing the cost on the other path would increase to 93. The
cost on his original path would fall to 82. At this point, one
unit would move from the other original path, which had become the
high cost path at 93, to path 3, and the user solution would be
attained. In this case every user would be worse off than if each
had accepted the system solution. The problem is that in a free
Comparison of User and System Solutions

```
UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>ONODE</th>
<th>DNODE</th>
<th>COST (X = flow)</th>
<th>PATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10X</td>
<td>1 - 2 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50 + X</td>
<td>1 - 3 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 + X</td>
<td>1 - 2 - 3 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 + X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USER SOLUTION

```

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FLOW</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>FLOW*COST</th>
<th>FLOW</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>FLOW*COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SYSTEM SOLUTION

```

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATH</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4
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economy there is no central directing authority to convince the users that they would be better off with the system solution.

The flow-dependent algorithm works from the user solution point of view, and in the above case would have reached the less efficient solution. The transshipment algorithm employs the system solution point of view. It is important to understand and to remember the points of view taken by the two solutions when comparing the results. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of both solutions will allow the user to understand the network and to interpret the solutions.
CHAPTER 4 - METHODOLOGY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE RUNS

The purpose of this study is to determine the impacts of changes in the network cost structure on the delivered cost of coal in foreign markets. The network, consisting of the links described in Chapter two, will remain the same throughout this study. In order to measure the impacts of changes, two things are necessary. First a benchmark or common base is required against which all alternatives can be measured. Second some means of implementing the changes to the link costs must be established.

The network to be modeled is drawn as Figures 1 and 2. The two figures depict the US and foreign transportation networks, respectively, over which coal is shipped. Not present in the two figures are the vessel links which connect every US port with every foreign port. The types of links are not labeled, but they are described in detail in chapter two. In order from the origin mine to the destination utility the links traversed are: mine production, truck to the tipple, railroad to the port, transshipment at port, port user fees, vessel voyage, foreign port fees, foreign transshipment, foreign rail, and the utility consumption. The only exceptions are three barge links, one in the US (link 27-28) and two in Europe (links 67-77 and 67-78). The cost structures for all links are described in Appendix B.

As is clear from the figures, several of the links leave no options for shipments which reach their onode. The production links,
the truck links, the transshipment links on both shores, both port
links, and the utility links are specific functions performed at a
specific location with no practical choice in how to perform them.
Every foreign port can be reached from every US port, insuring the
connectivity of every origin mine and every destination utility.
The US rail network and, to a lesser extent, the foreign rail
network, also present some path choice to the flow of coal. This
is not to say that the other links do not influence the path
choice of the coal. On the contrary, coal must pass over every
type of link, and every link will impact on the final delivered
cost of the coal.

The US transportation network is modeled to include all the main
facilities in the eastern region of the US. All the major eastern
railroads are represented, and the ports include the major
exporters of coal on the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, and
the Great Lakes. Only the Appalachian coal fields are represented
in this model because they are presently the major exporters from
the US. On the foreign side, all the major markets are included
in Europe and Japan, along with several of the smaller markets to
capture the effect of vessel size on the overall network. There
has been a generic foreign port created which represents a small
port of 31 foot draft to compete directly with the large ports.
The small port close to the utility can then be an option to the
large port with a long rail haul. The structure of this network
will not change throughout this analysis. The links will remain
as they are, and connectivity will be maintained. The cost structure of several links will change, and it will be this change which will be measured to determine its impact on the network.

4.1 METHODOLOGY

The benchmark for this analysis will be the network as described with the physical limitations as they now exist. The capacities of the links will be the present physical capacities. The links modeled will be the ones presently in use, and no attempt will be made to forecast new facilities. The cost structure will be the present costs obtainable from the available data, and the origin-to-destination flows will be modeled on those of 1982. A summary of the data input for the base case is found in Appendix B.

From this benchmark the network will be changed to study the impact on the delivered cost of coal. The specific topics to be studied are changes in the port capacities in terms of the size of ship they can handle and changes in the volume of US exports. The first set of changes modeled will be the port dredging, and this will be done with all other factors held constant. The ports considered for dredging will be Baltimore, Hampton Roads, and Mobile, and they will be considered singly, in pairs, and all together. Once they are all modeled for the present 32 million
tons per year of export steam coal volume, they will be modeled again with the export volume doubled to 64 million tons per year. Each change in the network will be measured against the base case for the volume of export flow.

4.2 BASE CASE

The presently configured transportation network with the costs and O-D flows from 1982 will form the base case or benchmark against which all changes will be measured. This benchmark network is still essentially as it was in 1982, but some of the costs have changed and the O-D flows are not exactly the same. However, within the limits of current data this scenario is a good starting point for this investigation.

Only the Appalachian coal fields are modeled here, but they export nearly all the coal being shipped from the US. I have modeled the Appalachian region as six subregions ranging from Pennsylvania to Alabama. As explained in Appendix B, there are four cost groups for coal production, and I have assigned a group to each of these six subregions. This arrangement models the effects of both location and sulfur content which, with the heat content, contribute the most to the cost of coal. High sulfur coal has a sulfur content of 1.6% or higher, and low sulfur coal has 1.5% or less. The input data from Appendix B shows the exact
inputs for this scenario. The supply of coal available for export shows a greater supply from northern Appalachia than from the southern fields in keeping with present export levels. These coal subregions are constant throughout the study with the exception of the available supply which doubles when the export volume doubles.

The truck links are modeled very simply and given relatively little importance in the network. The distances are short in keeping with the network in Appalachian fields. No attempt is made to model alternate means of moving the coal to the tipple such as conveyors or extensions of the railroad lines to the mines.

The rail network is the first set of links which offer the flow of coal some path choice. Because of the high interchange costs relative to linehaul costs, the rail network in this model is based on single railroad links with no interline connections. There is some circuity added to the links because of this no-interchange modeling in the network, but it models all the major lines to the ports in a simple and straightforward manner. Railroad costs as opposed to prices are used in this network initially. Alternate routes by different railroads are modeled to several of the ports to reflect the competition in the rail network. The northern Appalachian fields have a much stronger rail network to both the Atlantic and the Great Lakes ports than do the southern fields to the Atlantic and the Gulf ports. This reflects the current configuration of the major rail
lines in the Eastern US. One rail link (#17-27) connects the Tennessee coal fields to the several river ports which provide barge service to New Orleans. The barge traffic is not modeled in depth, and only this one representative path is provided as an option to shippers.

At each port two links are used to model the two functions of loading vessels and recapturing the investments made at the port. The first function is termed transshipment, and it includes the process of accepting the coal from the rail cars or the barges, storing the coal, and loading the coal on the vessels. In this model only the vessel loading costs are used, and no attempt is made to model different types of transshipment equipment or the inventory costs.

The port link is in place to model the investments made in the ports in the form of capital improvements, such as dredging harbors and channels, and of maintenance expenses such as silt removal. The fees are based on a 50% recovery of the investments by the government, and are inversely related to the total volume of shipping through the port. In the base scenario, only maintenance costs are considered since no dredging or other capital improvements are in place. The Great Lakes ports of Toledo and Ashtabula receive a $2 per ton fee to reflect the tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway. The initial port depths and the maximum vessel capacities are listed on the input menu in Appendix B. The costs to maintain the port of New Orleans are divided
between the facilities serving the rail connections and those serving the barge connections since both benefit from that maintenance, and each facility has to contribute its share to those maintenance costs.

The vessel links are the most numerous of the transportation network, and they reflect the fact that the open water can be traversed in any direction without restriction. The vessel distances are in nautical miles, and they represent the direct route between the ports concerned. Routes to Japan from Toledo and Ashtabula use the Panama Canal, but all other vessel links to Japan travel via the Cape of Good Hope because of the vessel size involved. The shipment size and draft reflect the capacity of the smaller port on the vessel link. At New Orleans the land and river facilities are modeled with the same capacities and travel distances.

The ports on the foreign end of the transportation network are treated similar to those on the US end, but the costs through those ports have been estimated and fixed. The ports chosen for the model cover a range of sizes from quite small, such as Cadiz and Casablanca, to very large, such as Rotterdam. Most of the major importing nations of the world are included such as France, Germany, Great Britian, and Japan. In addition some smaller nations are included in the model as well, such as Morocco and Finland. The generic port could be any small port in any of the nations involved. It was included to compete directly with the
very large ports, and it is always located much closer to the final user than the larger port. This allows the shipper the option of more direct shipments though at the cost of economies of scale on the vessel link. The foreign transportation network is not meant to include all possible destinations or routes, but it gives a representative sample of the options available and the routes to be taken in the export of US steam coal.

The foreign transshipment facilities are modeled in a manner similar to the foreign ports with fixed costs. No attempt is made to reflect the type of equipment present, but the link inputs on the input menu can be used to compute facility costs based on the type of operation. These links are included to model the real network, and to reflect the total costs of the network on the delivered cost of coal.

Only representative rail links have been included in the foreign transportation system, but these links have been chosen to include the choice between the generic port and the larger ports where that choice makes sense. The distances are in miles, and they are the only input which affects the link costs. Therefore the very short distances from the generic port contrast sharply with the longer rail distances from the larger ports. The difference in costs can be used to balance the larger vessel costs to the smaller ports.

The foreign utilities were chosen more for their representative locations than as individual utilities. Each utility is given the
demand for the entire country that it represents, and it is meant only as a first estimate of the cost to the importing nation. Certainly the costs will vary within the nations based on the exact locations of the using facilities. But the utilities chosen represent a cross-section of the final users of US export steam coal and the various demand rates with which each is associated.

Overall the transportation network reflects a wide range of options about routing, shipment size and origin for the export of steam coal. Limitations by importing nations such as maximum imports from any one supplier have not been built into the model, but such limits could be incorporated in the form of link capacities on the proper links. The network is flexible both in its initial configuration and in its ability to adapt to reflect changes in the cost structures of capacities of any of the links.

4.3 CHANGES FROM THE BASE CASE

There were two type of major changes from the benchmark transportation network investigated in this study. The effect of dredging of US ports was the focus of the study, and the effect of a doubling of the export volume was also studied. Dredging of the ports of Baltimore, Hampton Roads, and Mobile was investigated to determine if the ability to load larger vessels would affect the delivered cost of coal in overseas markets. The cost of dredging
was included in the recomputed port investment and maintenance costs, and it was included to determine if such an increase would offset the positive effects of larger vessels.

The study was completed in two series of eight scenarios each. The first series was performed to contrast with the benchmark network described above, and the second series contrasted with the benchmark network when it was carrying twice the O-D flows. In each series the three ports were modeled as dredged singly, in pairs, and all three together to investigate the varying impacts of those actions. Appendix D includes a listing of the resulting flow patterns and the O-D cost matrices.

When a port is dredged in this model, the costs on two links are changed. The beneficial change is on the vessel links from that port to every foreign port which can service vessels larger than the original capacity of the US port. For instance, when Baltimore is dredged to accept vessels of 110,000 tons rather than 61,000 tons, every link to a foreign port which can handle vessels over 61,000 tons is affected. Since the vessel costs decrease as the vessel size increases, this effect is positive. The negative effect of dredging is recovering the capital costs of the initial dredging and the increase in the maintenance costs at the ports. These costs are specific to the US port dredged and are spread over the total coal tonnage that moves through that dredged port. One can see, then, that dredging has a negative effect on shipments to smaller ports from the dredged port since they must
pay the port fees without the potential for cost savings on the vessel link. But there is potential for cost savings to larger ports where the gains on the vessel link may outweigh the additional cost on the port link.

The remainder of the transportation network is unchanged by the port dredging. The port of Baltimore is modeled as dredged to handle 110,000 ton vessels, Hampton Roads to handle 150,000 ton vessels, and Mobile to handle 110,000 ton vessels. The effect of this dredging on the vessel link costs is reflected in the tables of Appendix C.
4.4 CASE STUDIES

The 16 runs will now be described individually. The flow diagrams for these runs are found in Appendix D, and they show the changing flow patterns based on the dredging in the scenario. The diagrams show that the flow of coal generally shifts to a dredged port, but the origin-to-destination cost matrices, which are also in Appendix D, shows that the cost of the delivered coal is not always greatly affected.

4.4.1 BENCHMARK SCENARIO

Almost all the export coal is delivered from the northern Appalachian coal mines. Coal is cheapest to every destination from Southwest Pennsylvania, and almost all of that coal is shipped through the Great Lakes ports of Toledo and Ashtabula. Hampton Roads is the US port which handles the largest share of the US exports, shipping all the coal which is available from the Central West Virginia coal mines. All the southern coal originates in the Alabama fields and is exported through the port of Savannah.

The base case flows in the model differ a good deal from the actual flows as indicated in Table 3. Two factors that may contribute to this variance are: 1) export coal to Canada is not
**PORT FLOWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORT</th>
<th>1980 ACTUAL FLOWS</th>
<th>MODEL PREDICTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOLEDO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHTABULA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILADELPHIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALTIMORE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPTON ROADS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVANNAH</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW ORLEANS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Figures in Millions of Tons per Year

Data for Base Case (Scenario 1)

**TABLE 3**
included in the model but is in the actual flow data, and 2) there are uncertainties in rail costs, and 3) some companies own transshipment facilities at some locations which they use even in the face of a cost disadvantage. The first factor explains a large part of the difference in the total volumes. The two other factors together suggest that coal may be exported more cheaply through the Great Lakes ports than through the east coast ports, but that semi-fixed East Coast investments and the 3 month freeze-up may offset that advantage. Later iterations will show that coal from Pennsylvania which goes through the Great Lakes ports in the base case, goes through Baltimore when that port is dredged. It may also be that the capacity limitations at the Great Lakes ports force the same shift in flows in actual practice. The port of Hampton Roads ships most of the metallurgical coal exported from the US, but this flow is not included in the model since the model is only concerned with export steam coal. The export of the metallurgical coal may draw steam coal to Hampton Roads as well by allowing economies of scale. The southern flow from Alabama to Savannah can only be explained as a result of the railroad costs, and again in part from the lack of other limitations on other ports by other commodities. The use of only single-line rail links in this model explains why the cost of coal service to Mobile from the coal fields in northern Alabama are so high, whereas there is a direct connection to Savannah. (In fact, though, the interline
rates to Mobile are comparable to single-line rates, but were not included in this model.)

At the foreign end of the network, the generic port receives almost a third of the coal, favoring the small ports close to the destinations. Rotterdam also received a large share of the imports to Europe, and then transshipped it to all of its possible destinations. Only at the Thames Power Station was there a conflict between the large port of Rotterdam and the generic port. Here the rail link from the generic port carried a capacity flow of 2 mtpy (which may be too low), and which leads one to believe that the small port was more efficient and less costly than the larger port to that destination.

On the vessel links, the larger US ports of Hampton Roads and Savannah shipped to Rotterdam, and Hampton Roads also shipped to Marseille. Baltimore shipped to Hamburg. The smaller US ports of Toledo and Ashtabula shipped to the smaller foreign ports of Helsinke, Cadiz, Casablanca, and the generic port. Thus the large US ports took advantage of their larger vessel capacities to handle the flows where large vessels were an advantage, but the smaller ports were able to capture the remainder of the exports and in places to compete favorably with the larger ports by shipping more directly. The flow diagrams for the base case in Appendix C reflect the link costs for all the links except the US rail and the vessel links. These link costs are tabularized to aid the reader, also in Appendix C.
4.4.2 DREDGE BALTIMORE

The flow diagram portrays a tremendous change in the flows from the benchmark when Baltimore is dredged. The flow through Baltimore jumps from 2 million tons per year (mtpy) to 17 mtpy which is its capacity. These flows are drawn from the Great Lakes ports and from Hampton Roads. Also affected are the origin regions of the coal as Central Pennsylvania's exports rise to capacity at the expense of Central West Virginia. Also of significance is the fact that the delivered cost of coal to the Central European destinations of Hanover, Apeldoorn, Frankfurt, Thames Power Station, and Lyons are decreased by $1 - $4 per ton. At the same time he delivered cost to the smaller importers such as Tempere, Madrid, and Marrakesh rose by about $2 per ton for coal from Central Pennsylvania. These cost changes are quite significant since they are changes from the lowest delivered costs in the benchmark scenario. The costs to Central Europe reflect very favorably on the impact of dredging Baltimore, and the rising costs are of little significance since Baltimore does not have the transshipment capacity to handle that flow in addition to the flow to the larger ports.

The foreign transportation network showed only one change from the benchmark. Rotterdam became the foreign port for all the coal
delivered to the Thames Power Station suggesting that the advantage of the generic port over Rotterdam in the base case was a slim one, and that it was overcome by the economies of scale gained in dredging Baltimore. The other vessel routings remained essentially unchanged with the larger US ports shipping to the larger foreign ports. Ashtabula's exports are reduced to 3 mtpy because all the remaining coal from Pennsylvania is shipped through Baltimore. Savannah's trading partners are changed to smaller foreign ports to compensate for the reductions on the Great Lakes. Baltimore, as the largest US port, captured the trade with Rotterdam and Marseille, but that was the only shift from the base case.

4.4.3 DREDGE HAMPTON ROADS

The flow pattern when Hampton Roads is dredged to handle 150,000 ton vessels is exactly the same as the benchmark flows. Hampton Roads is unable to capture coal flows from any other coal producing region than Central West Virginia, and thus it has only a limited impact on the export of steam coal. The rail network from other producing regions to Hampton Roads is only slightly more expensive than the link taken from Central West Virginia to Hampton Roads, but the other areas are so much closer to the other ports that the rail costs to those other ports are low enough to
not be affected by the reduced vessel costs through Hampton Roads. The delivered cost of coal from Central West Virginia to those destinations serviced by ports of 150,000 ton capacity or more is reduced by about $1 per ton, but this affects only Apeldoorn, Frankfurt, and the Thames Power Station, which transship in Rotterdam, and Lyons which transships in Marseille. The Thames Power Station is forced to receive coal from the generic port as well as through Rotterdam because the production of export coal from Central West Virginia is at capacity of 10 mtpy. The costs of coal from Central West Virginia to Central Europe, though reduced, are not the lowest available to those destinations. The lowest coal costs continue to be for Pennsylvania coal which is transshipped through the Great Lakes ports. The utilities in those locations would have an incentive to try to receive their coal from other US sources even though this would in reduce the system efficiency. Dredging Hampton Roads appears to not be a favorable option.

4.4.4 DREDGE MOBILE

Dredging Mobile to handle 110,000 ton vessels increases the flow of coal through that port from zero to 5 mtpy which is the capacity of the Tennessee coal producing region for export. These flows cause reductions in several other producing regions.
including Central Pennsylvania and Central West Virginia. The exports handled by Mobile were handled by Hampton Roads and Toledo in the benchmark scenario. As with the dredging of Hampton Roads, the delivered cost of coal shipped through Mobile in this scenario is reduced significantly on shipments to other large ports. In this case the reduction is about $4 per ton, but the coal starts from such a high base cost that even this large reduction is unable to match that of coal from other producing regions, such as Central Pennsylvania and Central West Virginia, shipped through smaller ports.

Dredging Mobile would appear to benefit only Mobile and not US coal exports in general.

4.4.5 DREDGE BALTIMORE and HAMPTON ROADS

The flow pattern when both Baltimore and Hampton Roads are dredged is quite different than any case previously. The positive effects of dredging Baltimore are still apparent in the costs of coal delivered to Central Europe, but the flow of coal through Baltimore to Rotterdam is cut in half when Hampton Roads is dredged as well. However the difference in Baltimore's shipments to Rotterdam is handled by the Great Lakes ports of Toledo and Ashtabula. Hampton Roads still cannot draw coal from any producing region other than Central West Virginia, but what it
does ship is cheap enough to compete with Pennsylvania coal through Baltimore. What happens is that Baltimore and Hampton Roads have too much combined capacity to handle the flow to the large foreign ports, and they do not compete well with the Lakes ports on shipments to smaller foreign ports.

4.4.6 DREDGE HAMPTON ROADS and MOBILE

The ports of Hampton Roads and Mobile draw coal from different producing regions, but they do not ship enough coal to supply the all of the utilities' demands which could flow through the large foreign ports. Because each port only draws from one coal producing region, its impact on the export system is limited. Coal through both ports goes to the larger foreign ports of Rotterdam and Marseille and in each case the dredging reduces the delivered cost of that coal significantly. But in neither case is the cost of the delivered coal as low as that from other US sources.

The Great Lakes ports, especially Ashtabula, continue to be economical ports of departure for US coal to foreign destinations serviced by small ports. Ashtabula is operated at capacity in this scenario, and the coal is shipped from there to Helsinki, Casablanca, and the generic port. Toledo ships to the generic port as well. The Great Lakes ports are able to capture the
traffic to the smaller foreign ports where the benefits of large vessels cannot be realized.

4.4.7 DREDGE BALTIMORE and MOBILE

In this scenario the ability of the port of Baltimore, when dredged, to draw coal from more than one producing region is of major importance. Mobile handles no export coal even though it is dredged to handle 110,000 ton vessels and though that ability reduces the delivered cost by up to $4 per ton on coal delivered to Europe through Mobile. Baltimore is able to draw enough coal from the two Pennsylvania coal regions to handle the shipments to the large foreign ports. The combination of reduced vessel link costs and low rail costs due to proximity to the coal fields gives Baltimore this ability. Hampton Roads shipped some coal to Rotterdam which was surprising based on the results of run 2, and Ashtabula continued to function at capacity to the small foreign ports. Savannah also shipped to smaller ports which was a change from previous scenarios when it had shipped to larger ports such as Rotterdam.

Coal through Baltimore to Central Europe continued to be cheaper when the port was dredged. Coal to Hanover was reduced by $1 per ton, to Apeldoorn by $3, to Frankfurt by $3, to the Thames Power Station by $1, and to Lyons by $3 per ton. Coal shipped through the smaller foreign ports from Baltimore rose in cost by about $2
per ton. But these shipments were more expensive than the shipments to the larger ports, and Baltimore's transshipment capacity could not handle that combined amount of flow. Therefore only the cost decreases to Europe would be realized, and the dredging of Baltimore appears to be beneficial.

4.4.8 DREDGE BALTIMORE, HAMPTON ROADS and MOBILE

This scenario results in exactly the same flow pattern as scenario 5 when only Baltimore and Hampton Roads were dredged. The flow to Rotterdam marks the only advantageous flow through Hampton Roads over the flow to a similar destination through Baltimore. Baltimore handles the large vessel flows to Marseille and Hamburg, and the remainder of the flow to Rotterdam. Ashtabula again handles flow at capacity to the port of Helsinki and the generic port. Savannah handles the remainder of the exports, serving Casablanca, Cadiz, and the generic port.

Costs through Baltimore to Central Europe again are decreased as the port is dredged. In every case of this dredging, the costs per ton to Hanover are reduced from $56 to $55, to Apeldoorn from $60 to $57, to Frankfurt from $54 to $51, to Thames Power Station from $52 to $51, and to Lyons from $65 to $62. Regardless of what is happening to any other port, these cost reductions are realized for coal shipped through Baltimore, and that port draws
additional flows to itself. Baltimore cannot handle all of the exports to destinations where the costs are reduced because of capacity restraints. However in this scenario, Baltimore does not export at its capacity because of competition from Hampton Roads. Again Mobile does not handle any export coal even though it is dredged, indicating that it should not be dredged if any other port is dredged.
4.4.9 BASE CASE AT 64 MTPY

This scenario is the base case for the second set of eight runs where the export volume is doubled to 64 mtpy. The network structure is returned to its original state, and all the US ports are modeled at their present capacities. There are two major differences between this case and the benchmark scenario in addition to the total volume. First the foreign network is nearly at capacity once the foreign port links are reached. Second the production costs are much higher when the output is doubled than in the original case.

When the export quantity was doubled to 64 mtpy, the utility demands were not uniformly doubled to obtain larger demands across the range of destinations. Instead the coal destination forecast for 1985 from the Appalachian Regional Commission report (11) was used. Under that forecast, demand in Japan would jump from 3 mtpy to 11 mtpy, demand in France went from 5 to 6 mtpy, in Germany from 6 to 16 mtpy, and in Great Britain from 4 to 16 mtpy. In recent years the actual demands have lagged the forecasted demands, and these figures may be a little different than actual flows. However they do reflect a geographical distribution which is a reasonable approximation.

The first thing that is obvious from the flow diagrams is that the larger quantity of flow is spread across more producing regions and shipped through more ports than were the benchmark flows.
This impression is valid; however, the flow quantities still show that 75% of the export coal comes from the northern Appalachian coal fields. The flow pattern in the US shows a broadened base from which the flows are generated, incorporating five of the six producing areas.

Hampton Roads still commands the largest throughput of any US port by handling all the flow produced by the Central West Virginia coal mines. That flow of 20 mtpy is almost a third of the total exports. The Great Lakes ports of Ashtabula and Toledo still supply the majority of the coal to small foreign ports. Philadelphia has gained a small share of the export trade under this scenario of doubled volumes, which it ships to Hamburg. In the south Mobile handles the entire 10 mtpy available from the Tennessee coal fields and ships it to the Japanese port of Nagoya. Savannah picks up the remainder of the flow which comes from Alabama, and it ships to Rotterdam.

On the foreign side, nearly every link is in use to fill the utility demands. However some of the previous flow rules still remain constant. Rotterdam received 22 mtpy which is over a third of the total volume exported from the US. The generic port is filled to capacity reflecting the continuing ability of the small port to compete close to the utility to compete with the large port at a greater distance from the utility. One major change is observed in the shipments to Rome. In all previous scenarios the path was through the generic port, but in this scenario the port
of Tarranto was used for the entire flow quantity. This quantity was increased from 3 mtpy to 5 mtpy which may indicate that the change was due more to the generic port being at capacity the a change in the economics of Tarranto. This may indicate that the generic port in the model should have been given more capacity because there are many "generic" ports.

The ports connected by vessel links continue to display the larger port-to-larger port and smaller port-to-smaller port pattern. The flow from Hampton Roads goes mainly to Rotterdam (15 mtpy) with the rest to Marseille. Savannah fills the remaining demand through Rotterdam. Baltimore ships to Marseille and Tarranto, and Mobile ships to Nagoya in 61,000 ton vessels via the Cape of Good Hope. Although the costs have increased sharply across the board, the flow patterns have not changed much at all. The biggest difference is the broadening of the flows to accomodate the increased demands, and this broadening occurred at both ends of the transportation network. This scenario will serve as the benchmark for the second series of runs.

4.4.10 DREDGE BALTIMORE

When the port of Baltimore is dredged, the flow pattern is changed a great deal from the benchmark to reflect the low cost possibilities of that port. Although the same five coal producing
regions still export coal, there is a shift from Tennessee and Central West Virginia to Central Pennsylvania. This is due to the ability of Baltimore to draw coal from the two Pennsylvania producing regions and to influence the balance of coal exports from the US. Baltimore captures the trade to Nagoya, Japan and to Marseille, as well as the majority of the shipments to Rotterdam. The exports through Hampton Roads are diminished and split between Hamburg, Rotterdam, and Tarranto. Ashtabula continues to ship at capacity to the generic port, and Savannah and Mobile split the traffic to the remaining small foreign ports.

At the foreign end the flow pattern does not change from the base case except in the origin ports for the vessel links. Once the coal reaches the foreign ports the flow pattern and the quantities are exactly the same as the base case.

Dredging Baltimore has a strong downward pull on the delivered costs to Central Europe, but, unlike the lower volume scenario, it does not cause the costs to rise to the smaller ports on coal from Central Pennsylvania. The cost reductions affect both Pennsylvania producing regions, and they range from $1 to $4 per ton. Because the cost reductions affect two producing regions and are measured from the lowest costs in the base case, they have a strong impact on the flow pattern of the delivered coal. Again it is the ability of Baltimore to draw coal from two producing regions which allows that port to strongly influence both the flow pattern and the delivered cost of coal.
4.4.11 DREDGE HAMPTON ROADS

The flow pattern shows that the increased volume works in the favor of Hampton Roads when that port is dredged. For the first time the port is able to draw coal from a Pennsylvania coal field and to significantly change the flow pattern. From the northern coal fields, the coal flows either to Hampton Roads or to a Great Lakes port. This is a significant change in direction, and it shows that Hampton Roads' importance will increase as the volume of US export coal increases. In the south the flow pattern reverted back to that of the base case with the Tennessee coal fields again producing at capacity.

Hampton Roads ships coal only to the major ports of Rotterdam, Nagoya, and Taranto. Savannah and Mobile ship to the other major ports of Hamburg and Marseille, while the Great Lakes ports continue to handle the flow to all the smaller foreign ports. The flow pattern once the coal reaches the foreign ports was again exactly the same as in the base case.

The delivered cost of coal to Central Europe was only slightly lower with the dredging of Hampton Roads than in the benchmark. However dredging the port did not affect the lowest deliverable costs of US coal. The lowest costs could be obtained by shipping Southwest Pennsylvania coal through the port of
Ashtabula. Almost certainly the short rail haul is the key to that connection since Ashtabula is a very small port and cannot compete on the vessel link.

4.4.12 DREDGE MOBILE

There is no difference in the flow pattern in the US when Mobile is dredged in this scenario and when it is not dredged in the benchmark scenario. Not only are all the same links used, but the quantities are within 8 mtpy of being exactly the same on the US network. With the dredging, the flows from Mobile are split between Rotterdam, Tarranto and Nagoya rather than all going to Nagoya. This causes the shifting of flows on several vessel links and results in an increase of flow from Toledo at the expense of flows from Baltimore. This is because dredging Mobile changes the total costs of delivered coal through that port relative to the delivered costs through other US ports, and it forces the US ports to shift the foreign ports to which they ship accordingly. Hampton Roads continues to provide the majority of the coal to Rotterdam, and it ships to Marseille as well. Baltimore ships only to Nagoya while Toledo ships to Cadiz and the generic port. Ashtabula ships to the small ports of Helsinki and Casablanca. Again the foreign flow pattern is unchanged from the base case.
Dredging Mobile causes a significant decrease in cost for coal shipped from Alabama to Central Europe, averaging $4 per ton. However, these costs started from a base of more than $10 per ton greater than the costs from Pennsylvania, and the $4 does not change that relationship very much. Also Mobile failed to attract any more coal in this scenario than it did in the base case. The impact of the dredging is a local impact and not very important to the total export system.

4.4.13 DREDGE BALTIMORE and HAMPTON ROADS

Dredging Baltimore and Hampton Roads together appears to be a compromise from dredging either one of them separately. Baltimore is no longer able to replace flows from Central West Virginia through Hampton Roads with flows from Central Pennsylvania through Baltimore. And Hampton Roads loses its ability to draw flow from Southwest Pennsylvania. From the base case, the spread out flow among the northern ports is more concentrated, predominantly at the two dredged ports. Toledo and Ashtabula continue to ship to the generic port and the other small ports, but almost two thirds of all US exports flow through Baltimore and Hampton Roads, split almost in half. Baltimore ships to Rotterdam and Marseille, and Hampton Roads ships to Nagoya, Tarranto and Rotterdam. Savannah and Mobile are left with only small foreign ports to
which to ship.

Delivered costs to Central Europe fall for all three northern producing areas by the same amounts as when the respective US ports were dredged separately. Since these areas have the lowest costs initially, these reductions increase the differences.

4.4.14 DREDGE HAMPTON ROADS and MOBILE

The flow diagram for this scenario is exactly the same as for dredging Mobile by itself and as for the benchmark. In fact the flows within the US transportation network are exactly the same as the base case. With the foreign network also being exactly the same as in the base case, only the routing of some of the vessel links are different. The flow from Hampton Roads to Rotterdam is reduced from 15 mtpy to 5 mtpy, and the remaining 15 mtpy of Hampton Roads' total export volume of 20 mtpy is split between Nagoya (10 mtpy) and Tarranto. Mobile ships to Marseille and Rotterdam. Savannah and Baltimore also ship to Rotterdam. Toledo and Ashtabula split the small ports as they did in the base case, and Philadelphia regains the trade with Hamburg.

On the delivered costs, again improvements are made on shipments through the dredged ports. Of the two ports, costs are reduced more on shipments through Mobile than through Hampton Roads, and coal from Tennessee can now be delivered cheaper than coal from
Central West Virginia to Central Europe. But neither can be delivered as cheaply as can coal from Southwest Pennsylvania through the Great Lakes ports in this scenario. Overall there is very little impact from the dredging in this scenario over the base case, and it indicates no advantage to dredging Mobile if Hampton Roads is dredged.

4.4.15 DREDGE BALTIMORE and MOBILE

Baltimore ships almost half of all coal exported from the US in this scenario, and the dredging of Mobile allows it to ship all the available coal from the Tennessee coal mines which it was not able to do when Baltimore was dredged by itself. This improvement at Mobile comes mainly at the expense of flow through Hampton Roads. Baltimore captures the entire 22 mtpy shipped to Rotterdam as well as shipments to Marseille and Nagoya. Mobile ships to Tarranto and Nagoya. Hampton Roads retains the remaining shipments to Marseille and Hamburg. Savannah, Ashtabula, and Toledo again handle the trade with the small foreign ports. Again the transportation network at the foreign end remains as it was in the base case.

Southwest Pennsylvania coal shipped through Baltimore continues to have the best delivered cost available in Central Europe. This cost is reduced by the same $1 to $3 per ton from the base case
when Baltimore is dredged. Mobile continues to reduce the cost of delivered coal more than the other dredged ports, but even with these reductions the cost of Tennessee coal in Central Europe is $10 to $12 per ton higher than coal from Pennsylvania.

4.4.16 DREDGE BALTIMORE, HAMPTON ROADS and MOBILE

This flow pattern and the previous one look exactly alike, but the dredging of Hampton Roads has changed the flow quantities. Baltimore is reduced from one half of US exports to one third, and Hampton Roads captures all of the change. At the same time the amount of coal from Central Pennsylvania was reduced by 9 mtpy, and that from Central West Virginia is increased by the same amount. Baltimore exported all of its coal to Rotterdam, and Mobile supplied the remainder there. Mobile also supplied coal to Hamburg and Marseille. Hampton Roads shipped to Tarranto and Nagoya. Helsinki, Cadiz, Casablanca, and the generic port continued to be supplied by Toledo, Ashtabula and Savannah.

The effects of dredging all three ports were reflected in the delivered costs of the coal. It is interesting to note that the influence of the ports extends only to one or two coal producing regions, and that the influence of the port on delivered costs is constant regardless of the combination of ports being dredged. In keeping with that reasoning, coal shipped from Southwest
Pennsylvania through the port of Baltimore when it is dredged continues to be the least expensive option to Central Europe.

4.5 SUMMARY of the RUNS

Two results appear to be consistent over the 16 runs to this point. First dredging any port has a positive impact only on the coal which moves through that port to foreign ports which are large enough to accommodate the larger vessels which the dredged port can handle. Second, throughout all the runs, Ashtabula consistently shipped at capacity to the smaller foreign ports which could not benefit from the dredging of US ports. The first result is one I do not find surprising, but the second one I had not expected.

Ashtabula, Ohio is located quite close to the Southwest Pennsylvania coal fields and within only a slightly longer distance of the Central Pennsylvania and Central West Virginia coal mines. The ships which call on the port are limited to 26,000 tons by the St. Lawrence Seaway, and the only port fees modeled were the tolls for using the Seaway. Ashtabula, then, appears to be well positioned to continue to serve the smaller foreign ports. The only limitation on Ashtabula in this model is its transshipment capacity which is only 7 mtpy. In actuality, Ashtabula is limited by the freezing of the Seaway to service for
only 9 months of the year. Within the scope of that limitation, it would be a good port for which to examine improved transshipment facilities without increasing the vessel size.

On the matter of dredging among the ports modeled, only Baltimore showed a clear advantage over the whole range of options studied. Baltimore was the only port which could change the lowest delivered cost of the coal to Europe. Baltimore was also the only port which could draw coal through its facilities from more than one coal producing region over the whole range of options investigated. This suggests that there are more conditions under which dredging Baltimore will have a major impact than for any other option. For that reason Baltimore should be the first port considered for dredging.

Several other factors are stable during the 16 runs. The foreign flows took on one pattern during the base case and another pattern when the export volume was doubled. However in each case the flow pattern was remarkably stable over the series of eight runs. This consistency of the foreign network held even when larger economies of scale were available as the US ports were dredged. There was only one change in the foreign flow pattern was that the flow to the Thames Power Station through the generic port vanished as soon as the first US port was dredged, and that flow only went back to the generic port when any US port was dredged and did not have the capacity to fill the demand through Rotterdam (run 3). Aside from this one change from a small port to a larger port, the dredging
did not change the type of markets served by the US ports. Larger US ports consistently shipped to larger foreign ports, and the smaller US ports consistently shipped to the smaller foreign ports. The dredging seemed only to change the relative advantage of the larger US ports in their competition with each other.

Another strong consistency was the US coal producing areas which were able to export coal. The two Pennsylvania regions and Central West Virginia always exported the majority of the coal, with Southwest Pennsylvania being the most consistent. Alabama was able to ship coal consistently through Savannah during the high volume export series, and the Tennessee coal fields were usually able to export coal through Mobile when that port was dredged.

All of these consistencies are interesting, but the impact of dredging Baltimore and the ability of Ashtabula to consistently ship coal to small foreign ports are the most important results obtained. Baltimore makes its impact because it is able to attract coal from two producing regions, and therefore it can gain the economies of scale provided by the larger vessels. This ability, and the fact that it was shipping low cost Pennsylvania coal, allow Baltimore to reduce the cost of coal delivered in Europe. Foreign ports which cannot benefit from the dredging of US ports took advantage of Ashtabula's proximity to the Pennsylvania coal fields which kept the rail costs low. This allowed Ashtabula to dominate these routes under any dredging
4.6 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Two additional scenarios were executed to test the ability of Baltimore to change the flow pattern and lower the delivered cost of US coal under different circumstances. The first additional condition was a surcharge on the cost of high sulfur coal because of the potential cost of scrubbing equipment which may be required if that coal is used. The second condition was to use railroad prices rather than costs for the US railroads and to alter the vessel link costs to reflect a diminishing return to scale from the dredging of the ports. The link costs used in this sensitivity analysis are found in Appendix C. The results of these additional scenarios are outlined below.

4.6.1 SULFUR SURCHARGE

When the sulfur surcharge of $4 per ton was added to the mine production costs of high sulfur coal, the flow pattern with no ports dredged was very similar to the base case in the original study. Hampton Roads carried the capacity flow of 10 mtpy from the Central West Virginia coal mines and shipped it to Marseille.
and Rotterdam. Toledo also exported 10 mtpy from Central Pennsylvania, and it shipped it all to the generic port.

Ashtabula exported at its capacity of 7 mtpy to Helsinki, Hamburg, Marrakesh and Cadiz. In addition Philadelphia exported 3 mtpy as the available coal from all three northern producing regions was exported. It is interesting to note that the Great Lakes ports continue to carry a heavy share of the exports. It is also interesting that, with the increased production costs, the small foreign ports, including the generic port, handle a large share of the coal.

When the same production costs were used in a scenario with the port of Baltimore dredged, the flow pattern was changed drastically. Baltimore increased its exports from zero to 13 mtpy at the expense of Toledo and Philadelphia whose flows both went to zero. Ashtabula still shipped at its capacity. The dredging of Baltimore increased the shipments to Rotterdam from 9 mtpy to 12 mtpy as the economies of scale overcame the advantages of the generic port. The cost of coal in Europe was initially higher in these scenarios than in the base case, as is to be expected. But the effect of dredging Baltimore is to lower the cost by $2 to Hamburg, by $4 to Apeldoorn, Frankfurt and Lyons, and by $2 to the Thames Power Station. The cost of the coal from Baltimore through the smaller ports rose by about $2 per ton as in the low volume case when Baltimore was dredged in the original series of runs.

The result of this experiment is to reinforce the conclusion that
dredging Baltimore has an important impact on the flow pattern of US export coal and on its delivered cost. Also of interest is the fact that Ashtabula continued to ship at capacity in both cases presented here. When Baltimore was dredged, Ashtabula's source became Central Pennsylvania rather than Southwest Pennsylvania as in previous scenarios, but it was still competitive enough to retain the trade with the smaller foreign ports.

4.6.2 RAILROAD PRICES and NEW VESSEL RATES

In this scenario with a new cost structure for the vessel links and railroad prices rather than costs, the immediate impact is to favor the port of Baltimore over the port of Hampton Roads. In the original base case Baltimore handled very little export coal, but even without dredging it is exporting almost one third of the total volume in this scenario. The Great Lakes ports together are shipping almost one half of the total exports which is consistent with previous results. The flow diagram shows that the coal exported through Toledo originates in Central West Virginia which had previously shipped through Hampton Roads. These changes in the flow are because of the change from rail costs to rail prices. This change caused coal from Central West Virginia to be less expensive to Toledo than coal from Central Pennsylvania. The relative rail rates of coal from Pennsylvania
and West Virginia to Baltimore and Hampton Roads remain unchanged. Baltimore ships all the coal originating in Southwest Pennsylvania which is consistent, but Ashtabula ships the coal exported from Central Pennsylvania which is a change from the original cases. With Toledo receiving its export coal from Central West Virginia and Baltimore receiving its coal from Southwest Pennsylvania, Ashtabula must receive its coal from Central Pennsylvania even though the rail price from Southwest Pennsylvania to Ashtabula is less than the price from Central Pennsylvania to Ashtabula. The relative advantage is with Baltimore because of the economies of scale due to dredging. In the south, Savannah ships the total exports available from Alabama which is also consistent with previous runs of the model. The foreign imports continue to go mainly to Rotterdam and to the generic port, with each of them handling almost one third of the total volume. It is interesting to note that neither of those ports is at capacity in this scenario.

When the port of Baltimore is dredged under these conditions, it is still able to influence the flow pattern and the delivered cost of US coal exports. Although Baltimore handled a higher than previous export volume without dredging, it is still able to attract more coal when it is dredged. This new coal comes from Central West Virginia, and it marks the first time that Baltimore has shipped coal from that region. Hampton Roads ships no coal in this scenario, and the volume through Toledo is also diminished.
Ashtabula's export volume remains unchanged at its capacity of 7 mtpy as it continues to be the US port of choice for the small foreign ports. At the foreign end, Rotterdam receives coal at its capacity from Baltimore, and it captures the entire volume of shipments to the Thames Power Station. This increase in the flow to Rotterdam is at the expense of the generic port, and it reflects that the economies of scale gained through dredging Baltimore are sufficient to overcome the short rail haul advantage of the smaller port.

The delivered cost of the coal is also affected on shipments through Baltimore, but not as much as with the original vessel cost structure. By allowing for the diminishing returns to scale of dredging, the cost fell by only $1 to $2 per ton when delivered to Central Europe. Coupled with the fact that the base cost is higher in this scenario, the impact of the cost reductions is lessened.

4.6.3 CONCLUSIONS

The sensitivity analysis done here bears out the ideas that dredging Baltimore has positive effects on the export of US steam coal and that the port of Ashtabula should be examined to determine the impact of increasing its transshipment capacity. Both of these ports continued to exert a strong influence on the
flow pattern and, in Baltimore's case, on the delivered cost of US coal in foreign markets.
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5. COMPUTER ISSUES

The transportation network model was written using the FORTRAN 77 programming language and for the APPLE II computer. The screen handler input routine was written by John Uppgren for the same computer but using the PASCAL programming language. The use of these tools suggests several issues of which the user should beware. The different languages for the input and network routines will not hamper the usability of the product, but it does have implications for the maintenance and expansion of the program. The speed of execution of both the screen handler input routine and the network algorithm is slow, and the user must be aware of how he impacts on that speed. Finally the program takes the APPLE computer to the limit of its usable memory, and the user must know how large a network the computer will handle.

5.1 PROGRAM MAINTENANCE

The network algorithm and the input routine were written in different languages. The output of the input routine has been written to the diskette in such a manner that the FORTRAN program reads it as if it had written it. For the user, then, there will be no problem because of the different languages. In fact the user never has to know that they are different.
Every program, however, requires maintenance to keep it current. This program also has areas in which expansion is possible which are outlined below in section 5.4. It will take knowledge of both languages to perform these tasks. Both of the programs are written in a structured format in an attempt to improve understanding of the algorithms and to isolate problem areas. This structure should help as the programs are maintained, and it should allow expansion by replacing subroutines rather than by extensive rewriting of the algorithms.

5.2 PROGRAM SPEED

Speed of execution is a concern to every user, and this program is not fast. The input routine for the network tested in this thesis required 17 screens to input the 191 links. The parameter data and the origin-to-destination flows also had to be input. Unfortunately the input routine was not written to maintain the data on those screens and to use it again if there were no changes between runs. This means that all 17 screens have to be reviewed for each run, even if there are only minor changes. This process is time consuming.

The network algorithm is also quite slow, but the user has some control over that portion of the program. Two of the inputs on the parameter menu are the number of iterations and the
convergence criterion. By setting these values appropriately, the user can limit the run time of the network algorithm. For the network used here, each iteration took about 7-8 minutes to run. The user should remember that the program always executes one more iteration than is set on the parameter menu. The default setting for the iterations is 2 which caused the algorithm to execute 3 iterations and to run for about 22 minutes for this network.

The user also sets the convergence criterion which can cause the algorithm to stop before the programmed number of iterations is performed. If the user is satisfied with a higher level of variability in the network flows from equilibrium, he can increase the magnitude of the convergence criterion from its default of .02. This will cause the algorithm to stop before the number of iterations which was set if the proper level of convergence is met or surpassed.

Of course if the user changes the size of the network he will also change the running time of the algorithm. The execution time appears to be slightly more than a linear proportion to the size of the network. An earlier network of 47 nodes and 100 links took about 3 minutes per iteration to run. Therefore, when the size of the network was doubled, the run time was increased by a factor of about 2.5.
5.3 COMPUTER MEMORY

The biggest problem with this program that the user will encounter is the limited internal memory of the APPLE computer. A look at the source code for the network algorithm will reveal that the array lengths have been sized differently according to their purpose. Those used for input data are longer than those used in the manipulation of the algorithm. This is possible since the sorting routine packs the necessary data into the leading portions of the arrays. What this means to the user is that the available memory space has been maximized. The largest network which can currently be run with this program is one where the number of links plus the number of supply nodes (origins) plus the number of demand nodes (destinations) is no greater than 215. In the present network that number is 207.

There are a couple of ways in which the user memory can be better utilized. At the present time the limitation on the network is the length of the manipulation arrays which count the number of network links. These arrays can be lengthened and the input arrays shortened if the user uses the numbering system of numbering his supply nodes starting at 1 and his demand nodes immediately following his supply nodes. This numbering system will aid the formation of the initial solution of the transshipment algorithm and increase the amount of usable memory.
space. This will add about 20 links to the maximum network size, and that will approach the very limits of the internal memory of the computer.

A better solution is to transfer the entire program to a computer with more internal memory. This will have the immediate effect of allowing examination of larger networks, and it will probably improve the execution speed as well.

5.4 PROGRAM EXPANSION

There are several improvements planned for this program which will give the user more options in its use. One of the first will be to update the screen handler input routine so that the user only has to make those changes he desires and the remainder of the network is entered as it was. This will allow several runs to be done on a single network in a short time and will allow an in-depth study of individual link changes. The key to this improvement is that it will increase the speed of the input routine and make the program more usable.

It was mentioned previously that the input routine calculates the price of each link as well as the cost. A future improvement will allow the user to choose which value to pass to the network algorithm. This will give the user flexibility in the use of the input, and it can be used to measure the impact of several
different pricing options based on the same cost structure.

The final update of the algorithm envisioned at this time will allow the user to choose whether he wants to execute both the flow-dependent and the transshipment algorithms or just one of the two. The user may have a need for only one of these capabilities, and it is then a waste of his time to have to run both algorithms to get the results he desires. Once the user understands the purposes and the limitations of each algorithm, there is no reason that they cannot be separated in execution.


APPENDIX A  PROGRAM OPERATING INSTRUCTIONS

The operation of the coal network model is straightforward. Having the proper operating environment in the form of the proper hardware and peripherals is the most difficult task. Once this is accomplished, the operations are almost self-explanatory.

This coal network program is written in the Apple Fortran programming language with a menu-driven input routine which is written in the Apple Pascal programming language. To accommodate both languages, the Apple II or II Plus computer must be equipped with the UCSD Pascal operating system version II.1 and the Apple language card. The UCSD Pascal operating system converts the program into executable P-code and then uses the 6502 Assembler, which is a part of that operating system, to convert the assembly-language routine into machine-language code. The Apple Fortran language used is the American National Standard (ANSI) Subset of Fortran 77, and it is compatible with the UCSD Pascal operating system. The Apple computer must be configured to include upgraded random access memory to 64k, and it must allow the terminal to display 80 columns on the screen. A Videx Videoterm Board was used in the program development, and it is recommended for the 80 column display. The program configuration requires that at least two diskette drives be available with the Apple computer, and a printer is required for the network output.

Once the user has the proper hardware, the program is quite simple
to run. There are three program diskettes which include all the
operating instructions and files to retain the data. These three
diskettes are labeled COAL1:, COAL2:, and COAL3:. The user should then
boot up his system and insert COAL1: AND COAL2: into the diskette
drives. When the operating system command line appears, the user
should turn on the internal swapping by depressing the S-key and
responding Y (yes) to the prompt which follows. This swapping is
required to execute the network routine.

Execution is begun from the command line by typing X. The prompt
"Execute what program?" will appear, and the user should respond
by typing "COAL1:MAIN1". A carriage return will start the
program. From this point the coal network program will guide the
user through the required steps of network formation and data
input and through the execution of the network algorithms. When
the user finishes his input on the second vessel data screen and
desires to enter additional vessel link data, he will be prompted
to replace the COAL2: diskette with the COAL3: diskette. The
user must insure that the COAL1: diskette remains in the disk
drive throughout the entire operation, especially when this
replacement of COAL2: with COAL3: takes place. COAL1:
contains the program instructions, and it also collects the input data to
run the network algorithms.

After the user has entered all his data on the input menus, the
network routine will be executed. The user will immediately be
prompted about which algorithms he wishes to execute. The
flow-dependent algorithm will execute properly for any set of input using the guidelines of Appendix B. However the transshipment algorithm will only execute properly if fixed costs and capacities are entered for every link. The user is referred to Chapter 3 for a discussion of the two algorithms. If the user chooses the transshipment algorithm alone, he will be prompted again to insure that he has entered fixed costs for every link.

The network used in this thesis uses nearly all the internal memory of the Apple computer. This issue is discussed in detail in Chapter 5, and a list of the base case input menus is attached to Appendix B. The user must insure that the network he models will meet the required network size limitations, or the results obtained will be faulty.

When the user is first entering his data to the input menus, he should have a network diagram with him to insure the connectivity of the network. Without this connectivity, the algorithms will not produce an intelligent solution. Appendix B provides a guide to the input menus and the data required by each to properly run the program.

The menu-driven input routine makes this network program very simple to execute. If the user replies carefully to the prompts, he will have no trouble with any portion of the program.
APPENDIX B  LINK COST COEFFICIENTS - FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM

The key to the flow-dependent algorithm is the fact that the link costs change when the flows on the links change. In order to correctly identify the changes in those link costs, it is necessary to write an equation which accurately reflects the behavior of the link costs over a range of link flows. The basic link cost equation used in this model is \( \text{COST} = C_0 + C_1 \times (\text{FLOW})^{C_2} \). Here \( C_0 \) represents the fixed cost on the link, and \( C_1 \times (\text{FLOW})^{C_2} \) is the variable cost. The fixed cost is the cost per ton of using the link whether there is any flow on it or not.

The variable cost is that portion of the cost which is directly attributable to the flow on the link. Usually as the flow increases, the cost increases due to congestion and delay on the link. This is called diseconomy of scale. In this case the exponent, \( C_2 \), will be positive. However some links become more efficient as the flow increases, and the marginal costs decrease. These links exhibit economies of scale, and they are identified by negative exponents, \( (C_2 < 0) \). The magnitudes of the multiplier, \( C_1 \), and the exponent, \( C_2 \), reflect the steepness of the marginal cost curve on the link.

For each type of link, the cost coefficients have been computed differently to reflect those different components which influence the costs. The cost elements have been identified from several sources for the links at the US end of the transportation network. Data on the foreign transportation links is very scarce, and for many links...
estimates have been used where no data was available.

Examples of the menus onto which the user enters his input data are contained in this Appendix. The data entered on these menus is the data which was used in this thesis to establish the benchmark or base case flow pattern from which all changes were measured. There are more input variables listed on these menus than are required by the model as it is currently configured. These additional variables have been included on the input menus for possible future extensions of this model. Unless an input variable is specifically referenced in this Appendix, the variable is not used in the calculation of the link cost parameters.

The production costs for US coal vary with the region and with the heat and sulfur contents. Since bituminous coal is the predominant export steam coal, the heat content factor has been included in the regional figures for production costs. The Appalachian coal region has been divided into two sections, north and south, and each section has been divided into high sulfur and low sulfur. When the user enters the region and the sulfur content on the mine production menu, (see menu 1) the proper cost coefficients are registered for the production link as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>north-low</th>
<th>north-high</th>
<th>south-low</th>
<th>south-high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.0275</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINE</th>
<th>ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>PROD</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>PROD</th>
<th>PROD</th>
<th>PCNT</th>
<th>BTU</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>NODE</th>
<th>NODE</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>/ TON</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>SULF</th>
<th>TON</th>
<th>MINES</th>
<th>REGION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEN PENN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW PENN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENT WVA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOU WVA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MENU 1**
For the production links, the cost equations are linear with $C_2 = 1$ for all links. Calculation using these cost parameters results in link costs with units of dollars per ton. As an example, the Central Pennsylvania production region has 12 million tons of low sulfur coal available for export. $C_1$ is found by multiplying $0.086$ times 12, resulting in 1.032. Since $C_1$ must be an integer, it is rounded to 1. The link cost that results in the flow-dependent algorithm is

$$\text{COST} = 30 + 1 \times 7 = 37 \$/\text{ton}.$$  

Here the 7 is the link flow of 7 million tons per year on link 1-8.

The last link in the network, but the second set of links on the input menus, is the utility, and the link cost is based solely on the burn cost at the utility. This is a constant cost for each utility, but the data is very sketchy to support any particular set of numbers for these values. The fixed cost can be set by the user in the input menu, or the default of $2.00 can be used for the link. $C_1 = 0$ and $C_2 = 1$ for all of these utility links.

The link costs for the US truck links are based on mileage from the mine to the tipple and on the size of the truck used (see menu 3). These cost equations are also linear with $C_2 = 0$, and there is no fixed cost element so $C_0 = 0$ also. The equation for the multiplier, $C_1$, is

$$\text{Cost/Ton} = a + b \times \text{(distance)} / \text{(trucksize)}.$$  

The default values for the elements in this equation are $a = 0.50$ and $b = 1.50$. The user can change these values on the menu for parameters in the input routine. The trucksize has been fixed at 20 tons and is not a variable which the user can change, although changes in can be reflected in "b".
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOREIGN UTILITY INPUT FILE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITY</th>
<th>ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>RATE OF</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>BURN</th>
<th>SULF</th>
<th>LEAD</th>
<th>GENER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>USE</td>
<td>USE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>PREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPERE</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANOVER</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APELDOOR</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANKFUR</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAMES P</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADRID</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYONS</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROME</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRAKES</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYOTO</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MENU 2
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| TRUCK 1 | 7 | 13 | 12 | 1 |
| TRUCK 2 | 8 | 14 | 10 | 1 |
| TRUCK 3 | 9 | 15 | 10 | 1 |
| TRUCK 4 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 1 |
| TRUCK 5 | 11 | 17 | 10 | 1 |
| TRUCK 6 | 12 | 18 | 10 | 1 |

---

**MENU 3**
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The US rail links, like the production and truck links, exhibit diseconomies of scale, however, the marginal cost curves are not linear. Several factors are important in setting the cost of the rail links (see menu 4), among them: whether the charges are based on single cars or on unit trains; whether a single railroad handles the entire trip or there is an interchange; whether the link is single or double track and what type of signal system it has; what the density of total traffic on the link is; and how long the haul on the link is. All of these factors are input by the user on the rail link menu. The coefficients are taken from a series of cost vs volume graphs which are attached to this Appendix. To simplify the calculations, the downward sloping portions of the curves at very low volumes are ignored.

For barge links, no data was available for the variable costs, but there was data on the total cost of representative shipments, and those are used here. Those links are entered on the transshipment menu, which is described below, as fixed cost links with $C_1=0$ and $C_2=1$.

The transshipment link costs are also considered to be fixed across any volume, and again $C_1=0$ and $C_2=1$. The fixed cost is based on the type of storage facility - railcar or ground; whether the facility can process different types of coal, and whether the facility services rail-to-ship or ship-to-ship (see menu 7). The full equation is

$$\text{Cost/Ton} = a + b*(\text{storage type}) + c*(\text{processing}) + d*(\text{loading type}),$$

and the coefficients are entered in the parameter menu.

The US port link will be used to model the government usage fees as they recapture their investment for dredging and for operation and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>TRANS</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>VAR-</th>
<th>SERV</th>
<th>INTR</th>
<th>LINK:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>IANCE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>SIZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>NODE</th>
<th>NODE</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>VOL</th>
<th>QUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RR 16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>TRANS</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>VAR-</th>
<th>SERV</th>
<th>INTR</th>
<th>LINK:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 33</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 34</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 35</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 36</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR 37</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSHIPMENT</th>
<th>ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>LOADING NODE</th>
<th>VARI- NODE</th>
<th>STOR.</th>
<th>PROCES-</th>
<th>TSHIP</th>
<th>MOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>RATE</td>
<td>ANCE</td>
<td>METHOD</td>
<td>SING</td>
<td>SHIP OPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLEDO</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHTABUL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALTIMOR</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ROADS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVANNAH</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO LAND</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RIV</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARGE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maintenance costs at the port (see menu 8). The maintenance costs for the port are spread over the total volume of shipping in the port, but coal will bear 90% of the capital costs of the dredging. The payback of the construction costs will be annualized using a 12% APR over a 50-year term. This procedure is in keeping with the assumptions made by the US House of Representatives (11). A 50% recovery of the dredging investment is assumed in the model, and this means that some subsidy to the shippers is built into the model. The recovery percentage is set on the parameter menu which is explained below. This procedure will develop a total cost to be raised in port fees by the coal shippers on a yearly basis (C1). This amount will be divided \((C2-1)\) by the total tonnage of coal shipped through the dredged port to arrive at the per ton cost. For the Great Lakes ports there will be a fee of $2.00 per ton to reflect the St. Lawrence Seaway tolls. This toll will be entered as a fixed cost (C0), and there will be no additional charges due to the low maintenance costs at those ports.

The vessel link will be constant over all flows, and it will be determined based on the length of the voyage and the maximum ship size which can be used, limited by the smaller port (see menu 9). The cost equation into which these values are inserted is

\[
\text{Cost/Ton} = 749 + .065 \text{ NMIL} - .008 \text{ DWT.}
\]

This cost is given in cents per ton, and the equation is a regression analysis done by Lipfert.

The above linear regression equation works well for the size range of the ports currently found on the US east coast, but when these ports are dredged to handle 100,000 ton vessels, the vessel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORT</th>
<th>ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>LOADING</th>
<th>MAX SHIP</th>
<th>CAPT</th>
<th>OPER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>VAR.</td>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLEDO</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHTABUL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ROADS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVANNAH</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N ORLEAN</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RIVER</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MENU 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VESSEL</th>
<th>ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>SHIPMT</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>IANCE</td>
<td>SIZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL 1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL 2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL 3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL 4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL 5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL 6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL 7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL 8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL 9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH 1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH 2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH 3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH 4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH 5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH 6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VESSEL</td>
<td>ORIG</td>
<td>DEST</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>VAR-</td>
<td>SHIPMNT</td>
<td>LINK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH 7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH 8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASH 9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT 1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT 2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT 3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VESSEL</td>
<td>ORIG</td>
<td>DEST</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>SHIPMNT</td>
<td>LINK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>LANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT 4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT 5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT 6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT 7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT 8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALT 9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MENU 11
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VESSEL</th>
<th>ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>NODE</th>
<th>NODE</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LANCE</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>DIST</th>
<th>DRAFT</th>
<th>FLAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAV 1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4880</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV 2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4370</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV 3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3860</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV 4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3770</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV 5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4270</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV 6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4820</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV 7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV 8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15650</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV 9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4270</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB 1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5790</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB 2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5290</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB 3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4780</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB 4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4770</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB 5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5280</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB 6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5820</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

MENU 12
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VESSEL</th>
<th>ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>VANCE</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>DIST</th>
<th>DRAFT</th>
<th>FLAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOB 7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4730</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB 8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15600</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB 9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO L1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5840</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO L2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5330</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO L3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4830</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO L4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4830</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO L5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5330</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO L6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5880</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO L7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4790</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO L8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15650</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO L9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5350</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO R1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5840</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO R2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5330</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO R3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4830</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VESSEL</th>
<th>ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>VAR-</th>
<th>SHIPMNT</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>IANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO R4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO R5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO R6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO R7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO R8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO R9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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link costs become too small. The linear regression fails to consider the diminishing returns to scale of the dredging beyond that capacity.

In the sensitivity analysis, two runs were executed with vessel costs established using the equation

\[
\text{COST} = (12.50 + \text{distance} \times 0.006) \times (\text{vessel size} / 26)^{(-0.6)}.
\]

The distance is measured in nautical miles and the vessel size in thousands of deadweight tons, and the cost results in dollars per ton. This equation is not linear, and it takes into account the diminishing returns of increasing the port capacity. Both the original vessel link costs and these new vessel link costs are fixed costs between two ports. Tables with both sets of vessel link costs, each before and after dredging, are included in Appendix C.

The foreign port and the foreign transshipment link costs are both fixed costs because of inadequate data. For the foreign port fees, a fee schedule similar to the US fee schedule was used based on the channel depth of the port (see menu 15). In this way ports handling larger ships carry a lower fee per ton than ports which can only handle smaller ships. The foreign transshipment fee of $3.00 per ton for every port was taken from Lipfert (3) (see menu 16). This fixed fee acknowledges, as Lipfert stated, that there is a weakness in the network cost data but there is no better data available.

The foreign rail cost data is based on the European Rail Rates table in Lipert. These cost equations are linear (C2=1) and they have no fixed component (C0=0). The cost multiplier is given by Cost/Ton = 4.85 + 0.08*(distance). The distance is given
### FOREIGN PORT INPUT FILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORT</th>
<th>ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>LOADING</th>
<th>MAX SHIP</th>
<th>CAPT</th>
<th>OPER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>VAR.</td>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELSINKI</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMBURG</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTTERDM</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADIZ</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSEILL</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARRANTO</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASABLAN</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAGOYA</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERIC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHIPMENT ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>LOADING</th>
<th>VARI-</th>
<th>STOR.</th>
<th>PROCES-</th>
<th>SHIP</th>
<th>MOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>RATE</td>
<td>ANCE</td>
<td>METHOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELSINKI</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMBURG</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTTERDAM</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADIZ</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSEILL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARRANTO</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASABLAN</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAGOYA</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERIC</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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in miles and the cost is in dollars (see menu 17).

In order to enhance the usability of the input menus, the data has been simplified as much as possible by making the units on each link screen consistent for all inputs. All distances are entered in miles except the vessel voyage lengths which are in nautical miles. Volumes are entered in millions of tons per year for the production rates, the rail link volumes, transshipment rates, the total volume at the ports, and the rates of use at the utilities. The maximum ship size at the ports and the shipment size of the vessels are given in thousands of deadweight tons. On the parameter menu, all monetary coefficients are given in dollar values except c on the vessel menu which is too small to be given in dollars and is given in cents. The user should remember to enter any fixed cost he may desire to use in dollars per ton. These values will be assigned to C0, and C1=0 and C2=1 will be assigned for the other parameters.

In each link the cost coefficients are the values that are passed to the network algorithm to compute the link costs and the flow patterns. The prices are computed and stored in the input routine, and they are held there for possible use in future expansions of the model. In every case the costs are converted to cents when they are passed to the network algorithm so that they can be passed as integers. In the network algorithm they are manipulated in dollars and output in dollars. Both the input and the output, then, are in dollars which eliminates any data manipulation by the user.

For every link the user has the option of overriding the built-in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTE</th>
<th>ORIG</th>
<th>DEST</th>
<th>TRANS</th>
<th>LINK VAR-</th>
<th>SERV</th>
<th>INTR</th>
<th>LINK:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>NODE</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>LANCE</td>
<td>TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR 1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR 2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR 3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR 4B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR 5B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR 6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR 7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR 8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR 9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFR14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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cost equations by entering his own link costs on the link menus. This will enter a fixed cost into the network for the given link. An example of that is the barge link (27-28) which is in the network that was used for this study.

A second option for the user is to change the parameters used to calculate the cost coefficients. These parameters are entered on the parameter menu at the start of the input routine (see menu 18). This is one of the methods used to change the relevant data from the base case for the runs in this study. Care must be taken because these parameters affect every link entered on the input screen which they control, and changes can have large-scale impacts. These changes, however, give the user a powerful tool for experimenting with the network and evaluating different combinations of changes on the links.
/ MODEL PARAMETER FILE \

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input File</th>
<th>Cost Parameters:</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Cost Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>A    B       C   D Multiplier C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Mine</td>
<td>0    1.100   0   0           1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>0.50 1.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Rail</td>
<td>5.00 1.100 4.00 .016 3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Transshipment</td>
<td>7.00 0 1.00 1.00 1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Port</td>
<td>0    0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>7.50 .0006 8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Port</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For. Transshipment</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Rail</td>
<td>4.85 .0800 4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of iterations: 2 | Move size number: 1 |
| Convergence criterion: .020 |

<p>| MENU 18 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG</th>
<th>DESTINATION NUMBER</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Railroad Coal Cost Functions for Eastern Region Single Car Shipments
(Single Track Lines)
Railroad Coal Cost Functions for Eastern Region Unit Trains
(Single Track Lines)

Cost (Mills per Ton-Mile)

Traffic Volume (Millions of Tons per Year)

- manual signal
- automatic block signal
- central traffic control
This Appendix contains a complete set of the link costs obtained in this study for the Base Case scenario (scenario 1) and for the scenario when Baltimore is dredged (scenario 2). The link costs for all links except the US rail links and the vessel links are displayed on network diagrams. The figure in the middle of the link which is underlined is the link cost, and the cost is in units of dollars per ton. For the rail link costs, the upper table of original rail link costs is for the Base Case, and the lower table shows the link costs from the scenario when Baltimore is dredged. The top table of original vessel link costs, similarly, displays the Base Case costs for all the vessel links. For scenario 2 when Baltimore is dredged, the costs for Baltimore (41) on the bottom must be substituted for the corresponding row of costs in the top table. All other vessel costs will remain the same as in the Base Case.

The last two pages of this Appendix show the rail prices and the new vessel link costs which were used in the second sensitivity analysis case (see section 4.6.2). The top table on each page refers to the base of the sensitivity analysis, and the bottom table displays the costs when Baltimore is dredged.
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Case Link Costs</th>
<th>($) Short Ton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Central Pennsylvania</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Southwest Pennsylvania</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Central West Virginia</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Southern West Virginia</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Tennessee</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Alabama</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Toledo</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ashtabula</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Philadelphia</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Baltimore</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hampton Roads</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Savannah</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Mobile</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 New Orleans (land)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 New Orleans (river)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

Base Case  Link Costs
## Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>Link Costs</th>
<th>($/Short Ton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Base Case</th>
<th>Link Costs</th>
<th>($/Short Ton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apeldoorn</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadiz</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Power Station</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarranto</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casablanca</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrakesh</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagoya</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

1 37 7 1 13
Central Pennsylvania

2 29 8 2 14
Southwest Pennsylvania

3 36 9 1 15
Central West Virginia

4 42 10 1 16
Southern West Virginia

5 26 11 2 17
Tennessee

6 29 12 1 18
Alabama

19 1 29 2 38
Toledo

20 1 30 2 39
Ashtabula

21 2 31 1 40
Philadelphia

22 1 32 1 41
Baltimore

23 1 33 0 42
Hampton Roads

24 2 34 1 43
Savannah

25 2 35 1 44
Mobile

26 2 36 1 45
New Orleans (land)

27

28 3 37 2 46
New Orleans (river)

Link Costs Dredging Baltimore

($/Short Ton)
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarranto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casablanca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrakesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagoya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tempere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apeldoorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thames Power Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marrakesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kyoto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## LINK COST MATRIX

**ORIGINAL RAIL LINK COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TO STATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FROM STATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO STATION</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario 2**
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## LINK COST MATRIX

### ORIGINAL VESSEL LINK COSTS WITHOUT DREDGING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM PORT</th>
<th>TO PORT 47</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ORIGINAL VESSEL LINK COSTS WITH DREDGING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM PORT</th>
<th>TO PORT 47</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LINK COST MATRIX

### MODIFIED RAIL LINK PRICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO STATION</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM STATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO STATION</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM STATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario 20**
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## LINK COST MATRIX

### MODIFIED VESSEL LINK COSTS WITHOUT DREDGING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO PORT</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM PORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MODIFIED VESSEL LINK COSTS WITH DREDGING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO PORT</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM PORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D  FLOW DIAGRAMS and O-D COST MATRICES

This Appendix contains the 20 sets of network diagrams showing the flow of export steam coal obtained by the model and the 20 cost matrices exhibiting the total path cost for each O-D pair. The cost matrix is output from the flow-dependent algorithm for every scenario, and the network diagrams show the flow patterns of the transshipment algorithm. The output for each scenario is presented in a set which consists of the transportation network in the US (labeled A), the transportation network in the foreign countries (labeled B), and the O-D cost matrix (labeled C.) The first 16 sets are numbered to correspond with the 16 scenarios of the initial study of this thesis. Sets 17-20 depict the flows and costs of the sensitivity analysis.
### ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.4.1C Base Case Path Costs

151
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

1. Central Pennsylvania
2. Southwest Pennsylvania
3. Central West Virginia
4. Southern West Virginia
5. Tennessee
6. Alabama

19. Toledo
20. Ashtabula
21. Philadelphia
22. Baltimore
23. Hampton Roads
24. Savannah
25. Mobile
26. New Orleans (land)
27. New Orleans (river)

4.4.2A Link Flows Dredging Baltimore
**ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2C Path Costs Dredging Baltimore
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

1. Central Pennsylvania
2. Southwest Pennsylvania
3. Central West Virginia
4. Southern West Virginia
5. Tennessee
6. Alabama

19. Toledo
20. Ashtabula
21. Philadelphia
22. Baltimore
23. Hampton Roads
24. Savannah
25. Mobile
26. New Orleans (land)
27. New Orleans (river)
28. New Orleans (river)
29. New Orleans (river)
30. New Orleans (river)
31. New Orleans (river)
32. New Orleans (river)
33. New Orleans (river)
34. New Orleans (river)
35. New Orleans (river)
36. New Orleans (river)
37. New Orleans (river)
38. New Orleans (river)
39. New Orleans (river)
40. New Orleans (river)
41. New Orleans (river)

4.4.3A Link Flows Dredging Hampton Roads
Export Coal Transportation Network in Foreign Countries

Helsinki
Hamburg
Rotterdam
Cadiz
Genoa
Marseille
Taranto
Casablanca
Nagoya
Tempere
Hanover
Apeldoorn
Frankfurt
Thames Power Station
Madrid
Lyons
Rome
Marrakesh
Kyoto

4.4.3B Link Flows Dredging Hampton Roads
### ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3C Path Costs Dredging Hampton Roads
Export Coal Transportation Network

in the United States

1. Central Pennsylvania
2. Southwest Pennsylvania
3. Central West Virginia
4. Southern West Virginia
5. Tennessee
6. Alabama

19. Toledo
20. Ashtabula
21. Philadelphia
22. Hampton Roads
23. Savannah
24. Mobile
25. New Orleans (land)
26. New Orleans (river)
27. 30
28. 37

4.4.4A Link Flows Dredging Mobile
Export Coal Transportation Network in Foreign Countries

47 Helsinki 56 65 74 Tempere
48 Hamburg 57 66 75 Hanover
49 Rotterdam 58 67 76 Apeldoorn
50 Cadiz 59 68 77 Frankfurt
55 Generic 64 73 78 Thames Power Station
51 Marseille 60 69 79 Madrid
52 Tarranto 61 70 80 Lyons
53 Casablanca 62 71 81 Rome
54 Nagoya 63 72 82 Narrakesh
55 Nagoya 63 72 83 Kyoto

4.4.4B Link Flows Dredging Mobile
ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4C Path Costs Dredging Mobile
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

Central Pennsylvania
Southwest Pennsylvania
Central West Virginia
Southern West Virginia
Tennessee
Alabama

4.4.5A Link Flows Dredging Baltimore and Hampton Roads
Export Coal Transportation Network in Foreign Countries

Helsinki 74 Tempere
Hamburg 75 Hanover
Rotterdam 76 Apeldoorn
Cadiz 77 Frankfurt
Generic 78 Thames Power Station
Marseille 79 Madrid
Tarranto 80 Lyons
Casablanca 81 Rome
Nagoya 82 Marrakesh

4.4.5B Link Flows Dredging Baltimore and Hampton Roads
### ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.5C Path Costs Dredging Baltimore and Hampton Roads
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

1. Central Pennsylvania
2. Southwest Pennsylvania
3. Central West Virginia
4. Southern West Virginia
5. Tennessee
6. Alabama
7. 13. 29. 38
8. 14. 20. 30. 39
9. 15. 21. 31. 40
10. 16. 22. 32. 41
11. 17. 23. 33. 42
12. 18. 24. 34. 43
19. 25. 35. 44
26. 36. 45
27. 28. 37. 46
29. Toledo
30. Ashtabula
31. Philadelphia
32. Hampton Roads
33. Savannah
34. Mobile
35. New Orleans (land)
36. New Orleans (river)

4.4.6A Link Flows Dredging Hampton Roads and Mobile
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

Helsinki
47 ➔ 56 ➔ 65 ➔ 74 ➔ Tempera
48 ➔ 57 ➔ 66 ➔ 75 ➔ Hanover
49 ➔ 58 ➔ 67 ➔ 76 ➔ Apeldoorn
50 ➔ 59 ➔ 68 ➔ 77 ➔ Frankfurt
51 ➔ 60 ➔ 69 ➔ 78 ➔ Thames Power Station
52 ➔ 61 ➔ 70 ➔
53 ➔ 62 ➔ 71 ➔
Casablanca
54 ➔ 63 ➔ 72 ➔
Nagoya
55 ➔ 64 ➔ 73 ➔
Generic
56 ➔ 65 ➔
66 ➔
57 ➔
58 ➔
59 ➔
60 ➔
61 ➔
62 ➔
63 ➔
64 ➔
65 ➔
66 ➔
67 ➔
68 ➔
69 ➔
70 ➔
71 ➔
72 ➔
73 ➔
74 ➔
75 ➔
76 ➔
77 ➔
78 ➔
79 ➔
80 ➔
81 ➔
82 ➔
83 ➔
84 ➔
85 ➔
86 ➔
87 ➔
88 ➔
89 ➔
90 ➔
91 ➔
92 ➔
93 ➔

4.4.6B Link Flows Dredging Hampton Roads and Mobile
### ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.6C Path Costs Dredging Hampton Roads and Mobile
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

- Helsinki
- Hamburg
- Rotterdam
- Cadiz
- Generic
- Marseille
- Tarranto
- Casablanca
- Nagoya
- Tempere
- Hanover
- Apeldoorn
- Frankfurt
- Thames Power Station
- Madrid
- Lyons
- Rome
- Marrakesh
- Tokyo

4.4.7B Link Flows Dredging Baltimore and Mobile
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.7C Path Costs Dredging Baltimore and Mobile
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

Helsinki
Hamburg
Rotterdam
Cadis
Generic
Marseilles
Tarranto
Casablanca
Nagoya

74 Tempere
75 Hanover
76 Apeldoorn
77 Frankfurt
78 Thames Power Station
79 Madrid
80 Lyons
81 Rome
82 Marrakesh
83 Kyoto

4.4.8B Link Flows Dredging Baltimore, Hampton Roads and Mobile
## ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.8C Path Costs: Dredging Baltimore, Hampton Roads and Mobile
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

1. Central Pennsylvania
2. Southwest Pennsylvania
3. Central West Virginia
4. Southern West Virginia
5. Tennessee
6. Alabama

7. Toledo
8. Ashtabula
9. Philadelphia
10. Baltimore
11. Hampton Roads
12. Savannah
13. Mobile
14. New Orleans (land)
15. New Orleans (river)

4.4.9A Link Flows Base Case Series II
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

47 Helsinki
48 Hamburg
49 Rotterdam
50 Cadiz
51 Marseille
52 Tarranto
53 Casablanca
54 Nagoya
55 Generic
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74 Tempere
75 Hanover
76 Apeldoorn
77 Frankfurt
78 Thames Power Station
79 Madrid
80 Lyons
81 Rome
82 Narrakesh
83 Kyoto

4.4.9B Link Flows Base Case Series II
## ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4.9C Path Costs Base Case Series II
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

Central Pennsylvania
Southwest Pennsylvania
Central West Virginia
Southern West Virginia
Tennessee
Alabama

1 7 13
2 8 14
3 9 15
4 10 16
5 11 17
6 12 18

96 20 30 39
21 31 40
94 23 33 42
95 24 34 43
98 25 35 44
26 36 45
28 37 46

New Orleans (river)
New Orleans (land)

4.4.10A Link Flows Dredging Baltimore
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

Helsinki
47

Hamburg
48

Rotterdam
49

Cadiz
50

Generic
51

Marseille
52

Tarranto
53

Casablanca
54

Nagoya
55

Tempere
74

Hanover
75

Apeldoorn
76

Frankfurt
77

Thames Power Station
78

Madrid
79

Lyons
80

Rome
81

Marrakesh
82

Kyoto
83

4.4.10B Link Flows Dredging Baltimore
ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.10C Path Costs Dredging Baltimore
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

1. Central Pennsylvania
2. Southwest Pennsylvania
3. Central West Virginia
4. Southern West Virginia
5. Tennessee
6. Alabama

19. Toledo
20. Ashtabula
21. Philadelphia
22. Hampton Roads
23. Baltimore
24. Savannah
25. Mobile
26. New Orleans (land)
27. New Orleans (river)
28. 37. 46.

4.4.11A Link Flows Dredging Hampton Roads
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

47 Helsinki
48 Hamburg
49 Rotterdam
50 Cadiz
51 Marseille
52 Tarranto
53 Casablanca
54 Nagoya

74 Tempere
75 Hanover
76 Apeldoorn
77 Frankfurt

78 Thames Power Station
79 Madrid
80 Lyons
81 Rome

82 Marrakesh
83 Kyoto

4.4.11B Link Flows Dredging Hampton Roads
## ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.11C Path Costs Dredging Hampton Roads
Export Coal Transportation Network in the United States

1. Central Pennsylvania
2. Southwest Pennsylvania
3. Central West Virginia
4. Southern West Virginia
5. Tennessee
6. Alabama
7. Manhattan
8. Ashtabula
9. Philadelphia
10. Baltimore
11. Hampton Roads
12. Savannah
13. Mobile
14. New Orleans (land)
15. New Orleans (river)
16. Toledo
17. Ashtabula
18. Savannah
19. Philadelphia
20. Baltimore
21. Hampton Roads
22. Savannah
23. Mobile
24. New Orleans (land)
25. New Orleans (river)
26. Mobile
27. New Orleans (river)
28. New Orleans (land)
29. Toledo
30. Ashtabula
31. Philadelphia
32. Baltimore
33. Hampton Roads
34. Savannah
35. Mobile
36. New Orleans (land)
37. New Orleans (river)
38. Toledo
39. Ashtabula
40. Philadelphia
41. Baltimore
42. Hampton Roads
43. Savannah
44. Mobile
45. New Orleans (land)
46. New Orleans (river)

4.4.12A Link Flows Dredging Mobile
Export Coal Transportation Network in Foreign Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadiz</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarranto</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casablanca</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagoya</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempere</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apeldoorn</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Power Station</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrakesh</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.12B Link Flows Dredging Mobile
### ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.12C Path Costs Dredging Mobile
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

- Central Pennsylvania
- Southwest Pennsylvania
- Central West Virginia
- Southern West Virginia
- Tennessee
- Alabama

1 7 11
2 8 14
3 9 15
4 10 16
5 11 17
6 12 18
19 29 38
20 30 39
21 31 40
22 32 41
23 33 42
24 34 43
25 35 44
26 36 45
27 37 46
28 37 46

4.4.13A Link Flows Dredging Baltimore and Hampton Roads
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

Helsinki
Hamburg
Rotterdam
Cadiz
Generic
Marseille
Taranto
Casablanca
Nagoya

Tempere
Hanover
Apeldoorn
Frankfurt
Thames Power Station
Madrid
Lyons
Rome
Marrakesh
Kyoto

4.4.13B Link Flows Dredging Baltimore and Hampton Roads
### ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.13C Path Costs Dredging Baltimore and Hampton Roads
Export Coal Transportation Network in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Central Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southwest Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Central West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Southern West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ashtabula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hampton Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>New Orleans (land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>New Orleans (river)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.14A  Link Flows Dredging Hampton Roads and Mobile
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

47 Helsinki
48 Hamburg
49 Rotterdam
50 Cadiz
55 Generic
51 Marseille
52 Tarranto
53 Casablanca
54 Nagoya
55 64 65
56 57 58
59 60 61
62 63 64
65 66 67
68 69 70
71 72 73
74 75 76
77 78 79
80 81 82
83 84 85
86 87 88
89 90 91
92 93

4.4.14B Link Flows Dredging Hampton Roads and Mobile
### ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4.14C Path Costs Dredging Hampton Roads and Mobile**
Export Coal Transportation Network in the United States

Central Pennsylvania

Southwest Pennsylvania

Central West Virginia

Southern West Virginia

Tennessee

Alabama

Toledo
Ashtabula
Philadelphia
Baltimore
Hampton Roads
Savannah
Mobile
New Orleans (land)
New Orleans (river)

4.4.15A Link Flows Dredging Baltimore and Mobile
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END
NAME
CODE
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

47  56  65  Tempere

Helsinki

48  57  66  75  85  Hanover

Hamburg

49  58  67  76  86  Apeldoorn

Rotterdam

50  59  68  77  87  Frankfurt

Cadiz

55  64  72  78  88  Thames Power Station

Generic

51  60  69  79  89  Madrid

Marseille

52  61  70  80  90  Lyons

Tarranto

53  62  71  81  91  Rome

Casablanca

54  63  72  82  92  Marrakesh

Nagoya

55  64  72  83  93  Kyoto

4.4.15B  Link Flows  Dredging Baltimore and Mobile
### ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.15C Path Costs Dredging Baltimore and Mobile
Export Coal Transportation Network

Helsinki - 75 Hanover
Hamburg - 76 Apeldoorn
Rotterdam - 77 Frankfurt
Cadiz - 78 Thames Power Station
Generic - 79 Madrid
Marseille - 80 Lyons
Tarranto - 81 Rome
Casablanca - 82 Marrakesh
Nagoya - 83 Kyoto

4.4.16B Link Flows Dredging Baltimore, Hampton Roads and Mobile
ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.16C Path Costs Dredging Baltimore, Hampton Roads and Mobile
Export Coal Transportation Network
in the United States

4.17A Link Flows Sulfur Penalty Base Case
Export Coal Transportation Network in Foreign Countries

47 Helsinki
48 Hamburg
49 Rotterdam
50 Cadiz
55 Generic
51 Marseille
52 Taranto
53 Casablanca
54 Nagoya

74 Tempere
75 Hanover
76 Apeldoorn
77 Frankfurt
78 Thames Power Station
79 Madrid
80 Lyons
81 Rome
82 Marrakesh
83 Kyoto

4.17B Link Flows Sulfur Penalty Base Case
### ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.17C Path Costs Sulfur Penalty Base Case
Export Coal Transportation Network in the United States

1. Central Pennsylvania
2. Southwest Pennsylvania
3. Central West Virginia
4. Southern West Virginia
5. Tennessee
6. Alabama

19. Toledo
20. Ashtabula
21. Philadelphia
22. Baltimore
23. Hampton Roads
24. Savannah
25. Mobile
26. New Orleans (land)
27. New Orleans (river)
28. New Orleans (river)
29. Toledo
30. Ashtabula
31. Philadelphia
32. Baltimore
33. Hampton Roads
34. Savannah
35. Mobile
36. New Orleans (land)
37. New Orleans (river)
38. Toledo
39. Ashtabula
40. Philadelphia
41. Baltimore
42. Hampton Roads
43. Savannah
44. Mobile
45. New Orleans (land)
46. New Orleans (river)

4.18A Link Flows Sulfur Penalty Dredging Baltimore
**ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.18C Path Costs Sulfur Penalty Dredging Baltimore
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

47 56 65 74 84
Helsinki

48 57 66 75 85
Hanover

49 58 67 76 86
Apeldoorn

50 59 68 77 87
Frankfurt

51 60 69 78 88
Thames Power Station

52 61 70 79 89
Madrid

53 62 71 80 90
Lyons

54 63 72 81 91
Rome

55 64 73 82 92
Harrakesh

56 65 74 83 93
Kyoto

4.19B Link Flows New Vessel & Rail Costs Base Case
### ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>.86</th>
<th>.87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.19C Path Costs: New Vessel & Rail Costs Base Case
Export Coal Transportation Network in the United States

1. Central Pennsylvania
2. Southwest Pennsylvania
3. Central West Virginia
4. Southern West Virginia
5. Tennessee
6. Alabama
7. Toledo
8. Ashtabula
9. Philadelphia
10. Baltimore
11. Hampton Roads
12. Savannah
13. Mobile
14. New Orleans (land)
15. New Orleans (river)

4.20A Link Flows New Vessel & Rail Costs Dredging Baltimore
Export Coal Transportation Network
in Foreign Countries

47 Helsinki 56 65 Tempere 74 84
48 Hamburg 57 66 Hanover 75 85
49 Rotterdam 58 67 Apeldoorn 76 86
50 Cadiz 59 68 Frankfurt 77 87
51 Marseille 60 69 Thames Power Station 78 88
52 Taranto 61 70 Madrid 79 89
53 Casablanca 62 71 Lyons 80 90
54 Nagoya 63 72 Marrakesh 81 92
55 Generic 64 71 Rome 82 93
56 70

4.20B Link Flows New Vessel & Rail Costs Dredging Baltimore
## ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MINES</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.20C Path Costs  New Vessel & Rail Costs  Dredging

Baltimore
APPENDIX E PROGRAM LISTINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN1</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN2</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN3</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINE</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ1</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORT3</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOST2</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETOUT</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGL3</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAIN1, MAIN2, and MAIN3 contain the instructions for the input routine and the calculations for the input values to the network algorithms. The reader is referred to Chapter 3 for a discussion of the network algorithms and their required inputs. The MAIN1 routine chains to the READ1 routine, and READ1 serves as the main program for the network algorithms. The flow-dependent algorithm is contained in LCOST2, and the transshipment algorithm is contained in TRANS. NETOUT provides output for both algorithms. SINGL3 examines the path from any one origin to any one destination, and is available to the user with either of the algorithms.
(*@S+,$N+*)
PROGRAM MAIN;

USES APPLESTUFF, CHAINSTUFF, (*@U SCREENPORT.CODE*) SCREENPORT,
   (*@U SCREEN.CODE*) SCREEN, (*@U JOHNSTUFF.CODE*)
   JOHNSTUFF;
   (*@ printer:* *)

VAR
   a,i,j,f,
   h, (* counter for link data *)
   iterate, moves, temp : integer;
   y : interactive;
   x,m : char;
   ftshipr, minepr : packed array[1..4] of real;
   trukpr : packed array[1..2] of real; (* parameter variables *)
   fprtpfr : real;
   tshipr, railpr : packed array[1..5] of real;
   frailpr, portpr, realpr : packed array[1..3] of real;
   converge : real;
   numlink : string;
   netonode, netdnode, netflag,
   netc0, netc1, netc2,
   netcap, netsup : packed array[1..250] of integer; (* link data variables *)

   minefil : packed array[1..16, 1..10] of integer;
   railfil : packed array[1..16, 1..12] of integer;

segment PROCEDURE PARAMOUT; (* loads parameters and writes them to file for use by main2 & main3 *)

var tsfile, ptfile, vtsfile, vptfile, ftsfile, frfile : file of real;

BEGIN
   mark(heap);
   loadform('coall:Param.form', hf, txtp, p, fcount, icount, ierr);
   for i := 1 to 4 do begin
      minepr[i] := p^.rval; p := p^.n; end;
   for i := 1 to 2 do begin
      trukpr[i] := p^.rval; p := p^.n; end;
   for i := 1 to 5 do begin
      railpr[i] := p^.rval; p := p^.n; end;
      rewrite(tsfile,'coall:tsfile.data');
   for i := 1 to 5 do begin
      tshipr[i] := p^.rval; tsfile := tshipr[i]; put(tsfile);
      p := p^.n; end; close(tsfile, lock);
   rewrite(ptfile,'coall:ptfile.data');
   for i := 1 to 3 do begin
      portpr[i] := p^.rval; ptfile := portpr[i]; put(ptfile);
      p := p^.n; end; close(ptfile, lock);

210
rewrite(vslfile,'coall:vslfile.data');
    for i := 1 to 3 do begin
      vslpr[i] := p^.rval; vslfile := vslpr[i]; put(vslfile);
p := p^.n; end; close(vslfile,lock);
rewrite(fptfile,'coall:fptfile.data');
    begin fprtp := p^.rval; fptfile := fprtp; put(fptfile);
p := p^.n; close(fptfile,lock); end;
rewrite(ftsfile,'coall:ftsfile.data');
    for i := 1 to 4 do begin
      ftspr[i] := p^.rval; ftsfile := ftspr[i]; put(ftsfile);
p := p^.n; end; close(ftsfile,lock);
rewrite(frfile,'coall:frfile.data');
    for i := 1 to 3 do begin
      frfilpr[i] := p^.rval; frfile := frfilpr[i]; put(frfile);
p := p^.n; end; close(frfile,lock);
iterate := p^.rval; p := p^.n;
moves := p^.rval; p := p^.n;
converge := p^.rval;
END; (* paramout *)

segment PROCEDURE PARAMS;            (* loads parameter screen *)
BEGIN
ff := 'coall:param.form';
showit;
saveit;
paramout;
draw;
END;

segment PROCEDURE MINE1;    (* calculates costs & price *)
BEGIN
i := 1;
while (minefil[i,1] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
  netonode[h] := minefil[i,1];
  netdnode[h] := minefil[i,2];
  netflag[h] := 1;
  if (minefil[i,7] <= 15) then begin (* low sulfur *)
    if (minefil[i,10] = 1) then begin (* region 1 *)
      netc0[h] := 3000;
      netc1[h] := ROUND(100 * 0.086 * minefil[i,6]);
      if (minefil[i,3] = 0) then minefil[i,3] := netc0[h] +
        netc1[h] * minefil[i,6]; end
    else begin (* region 3 *)
      netc0[h] := 3200;
    end
  end
END;
netcl1[h] := ROUND(100 * 0.5 * minefil[i,6]);
if (minefil[i,3] = 0) then minefil[i,3] := netc0[h] +
    netc1[h] * minefil[i,6]; end; end
else begin (* high sulfur *)
    if (minefil[i,10] = 2) then begin (* region 2 *)
        netc0[h] := 2900;
        netcl1[h] := ROUND(100 * 0.0275 * minefil[i,6]);
        if (minefil[i,3] = 0) then minefil[i,3] := netc0[h] +
            netc1[h] * minefil[i,6]; end; end
else begin (* region 4 *)
    netc0[h] := 2300;
    netcl1[h] := ROUND(100 * 0.35 * minefil[i,6]);
    if (minefil[i,3] = 0) then minefil[i,3] := netc0[h] +
        netc1[h] * minefil[i,6]; end; end;
    netc2[h] := ROUND(100 * minepr[4]);
    netcap[h] := 16383;
    netsup[h] := minefil[i,5];
    if (minefil[i,4] < 0) then minefil[i,4] := ROUND(minepr[1] +
    h := h + 1; i := i + 1; end;
end;

segment PROCEDURE MINES;
BEGIN
    // Code for MINES
END;

segment PROCEDURE UTILITY; (* writes values to an array
and computes costs *)
VAR utilfil : packed array[1..16,1..10] of integer;
BEGIN
    // Code for UTILITY
END;
for j := 1 to 10 do begin
    if p^ival < 0 then utilfill[i,j] := 0 else
        utilfill[i,j] := p^ival; p := p^n; end; end;
saveit;
i := 1;
while (utilfill[i,1] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
    netonode[h] := utilfill[i,1];
    netdnode[h] := utilfill[i,2];
    netflag[h] := 3;
    if (utilfill[i,3] = 0) then
        if utilfill[i,7] < 0 then utilfill[i,3] := 2 else
            utilfill[i,3] := utilfill[i,7];
    netc0[h] := utilfill[i,3] * 100;
    netc1[h] := 0; netc2[h] := 1;
    netcap[h] := 16383;
    netsup[h] := utilfill[i,6];
    if (utilfill[i,4] < 0) then utilfill[i,4] := 0;
    h := h + 1; i := i + 1; end;
draw;
END;

(* utility *)

segment PROCEDURE TRUCK;

(* writes to an array and computes costs *)

var trukfil : packed array[1..16,1..6] of integer;

BEGIN
    ff := 'coal2:truck.form';
    showit;
    for i := 1 to 15 do begin
        p := p^n;
        for j := 1 to 6 do begin
            if p^ival < 0 then trukfil[i,j] := 0 else
                trukfil[i,j] := p^ival; p := p^n; end; end;
saveit;
i := 1;
while (trukfil[i,1] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
    netonode[h] := trukfil[i,1];
    netdnode[h] := trukfil[i,2];
    netflag[h] := 2;
    if (trukfil[i,3] > 0) then netc0[h] := trukfil[i,3] * 100
    netc1[h] := 0; netc2[h] := 1;
    netcap[h] := 16383;
    netsup[h] := 0;
    if (trukfil[i,4] < 0) then trukfil[i,4] := trukfil[i,3];
    h := h + 1; i := i + 1; end;
draw;
END;
segment PROCEDURE RAIL2;
BEGIN
  netc2[h] := ROUND(railpr[5] * 100);
  netcap[h] := 16383;
  netsup[h] := 0;
END;

segment PROCEDURE RAIL1; (* computes rail costs for double track shipments *)
BEGIN
  (* double track *)
  if railfil[i,9] = 0 then begin (* single car shipment *)
    netc0[h] := (3 * railfil[i,5]);
    if (railfil[i,12] = 3) and (railfil[i,11] > 38) then netc1[h] := ROUND(1.6 * railfil[i,5]) else (* manual signal *)
      netc1[h] := 0;
    if (railfil[i,12] = 4) and (railfil[i,11] > 64) then netc1[h] := ROUND(0.94 * railfil[i,5]) else (* ABS *)
      netc1[h] := 0;
    if (railfil[i,12] = 5) and (railfil[i,11] > 102) then netc1[h] := ROUND(0.53 * railfil[i,5]) else (* CTC *)
      netc1[h] := 0; (* unit train shipment *)
  else begin (* unit train shipment *)
    netc0[h] := ROUND(1.6 * railfil[i,5]);
    if (railfil[i,12] = 3) and (railfil[i,11] > 40) then netc1[h] := ROUND(1.4 * railfil[i,5]) else (* manual signal *)
      netc1[h] := 0;
    if (railfil[i,12] = 4) and (railfil[i,11] > 64) then netc1[h] := ROUND(0.65 * railfil[i,5]) else (* ABS *)
      netc1[h] := 0;
    if (railfil[i,12] = 5) and (railfil[i,11] > 110) then netc1[h] := ROUND(0.53 * railfil[i,5]) else (* CTC *)
      netc1[h] := 0; (* unit train shipment *)
  end;
  if railfil[i,3] > 0 then begin
    netc0[h] := (railfil[i,3] * 100);
    netc1[h] := 0; end;
  rail2;
END; (* rail1 *)
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segment PROCEDURE RAIL; (* write values to an array and calculates costs for single track shipments *)

BEGIN
  showit;
  for i := 1 to 15 do begin
    p := p^n.n;
    for j := 1 to 12 do begin
      if p^n.ival < 0 then railfil[i,j] := 0 else
        railfil[i,j] := p^n.ival; p := p^n.n; end; end;
  saveit;
  i := 1;
  while (railfil[i,1] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
    netnode[h] := railfil[i,1];
    netdnode[h] := railfil[i,2];
    netflag[h] := 2;
    if (railfil[i,3] = 0) then begin
      if (railfil[i,12] < 3) then begin (* single track *)
        if railfil[i,9] = 0 then begin (* single car shipment *)
          netc0[h] := (3 * railfil[i,5]);
          if (railfil[i,12] = 0) and (railfil[i,11] > 12)
            then netc1[h] := ROUND(4.6 * railfil[i,5]) else
              netc1[h] := 0; (* manual signal *)
          if (railfil[i,12] = 1) and (railfil[i,11] > 18)
            then netc1[h] := ROUND(2.9 * railfil[i,5]) else
              netc1[h] := 0; (* ABS *)
          if (railfil[i,12] = 2) and (railfil[i,11] > 39)
            then netc1[h] := ROUND(1.5 * railfil[i,5]) else
              netc1[h] := 0; (* CTC *)
        end; (* single car shipment *)
      else begin (* unit train shipment *)
        netc0[h] := ROUND(1.6 * railfil[i,5]);
        if (railfil[i,12] = 0) and (railfil[i,11] > 12)
          then netc1[h] := ROUND(5.6 * railfil[i,5]) else
            netc1[h] := 0; (* manual signal *)
        if (railfil[i,12] = 1) and (railfil[i,11] > 19)
          then netc1[h] := ROUND(2.4 * railfil[i,5]) else
            netc1[h] := 0; (* ABS *)
        if (railfil[i,12] = 2) and (railfil[i,11] > 41)
          then netc1[h] := ROUND(1.3 * railfil[i,5]) else
            netc1[h] := 0; end; (* CTC *)
      end; (* unit train *)
    end; RAIL1; h := h + 1; i := i + 1; end;
  END;

END;

segment PROCEDURE GETRAIL; (* selects the rail screens *)

BEGIN
  ff := 'coal2:rail1.form'; rail; bottom; read(x);
  if (x = 'y') or (x = 'Y') then begin
ff := 'coal2:rail2.form'; rail; bottom; read(x);
if (x = 'y') or (x = 'Y') then begin
    ff := 'coal2:rail3.form'; rail; end; end;

segment PROCEDURE FINDIT; (* selects the proper screens *)
BEGIN
    draw;
    wipe; write('Get model parameter file? . . . '); beep; read(z);
    if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; params; end
    else begin setit; paramout; wipe; end;
    write('Get U. S. mine input file? . . . '); beep; read(z);
    if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; mines; end; wipe;
    write('Get utility input file? . . . '); beep; read(z);
    if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; utility; end; wipe;
    write('Get U. S. truck input file? . . . '); beep; read(z);
    if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; truck; end; wipe;
    write('Get U. S. rail input file? . . . '); beep; read(z);
    if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; getrail; end;
END;

segment PROCEDURE OUTPT1; (* writes values to a data file *)
var onefile, prfile : file of integer;
BEGIN
    rewrite(onefile, 'coal1:onefile.data');
    for j := 1 to h do begin
        onefile := netonode[j]; put(onefile);
        onefile := netdnode[j]; put(onefile);
        onefile := netflag[j]; put(onefile);
        onefile := netc0[j]; put(onefile);
        onefile := netc1[j]; put(onefile);
        onefile := netc2[j]; put(onefile);
        onefile := netsup[j]; put(onefile);
        close(onefile, lock);
    rewrite(prfile, 'coal1:prfile.data');
    prfile := iterate; put(prfile);
    prfile := moves; put(prfile);
    prfile := ROUND(converge * 100); put(prfile);
    close(prfile, lock);
END;
BEGIN

(* mainl *)

hf := 'dummy';
h := 1; swapon; FINDIT;
wipe; write('Computing link information ... please wait');
outptl;
swapoff;
istr(h,2,numlink);
setcval(numlink);
setchain('coall:main2');

END.
PROGRAM MAIN2;

USES APPLESTUFF, CHAINSTUFF, (*$U SCREENPORT.CODE*) SCREENPORT, (*$U SCREEN.CODE*) SCREEN, (*$U JOHNTUFF.CODE*)
JOHNTUFF;
(*1 printer:*)

VAR
a, i, j, h, k, temp : integer;
y : interactive;
x, z : char;
netonode, netdnode, netflag, netc1, netc2,
netcap, netsup : packed array[1..250] of INTEGER;
tshipr : packed array[1..5] of real;
portpr, vasprr : packed array[1..5] of real;
fprtpr : real;
big, form : boolean;
numlink : string;
twofile : file of integer;

segment PROCEDURE PARAMIN; (* reads in parameters *)

var tshipfil, ptfile, vslfile, fptfile : file of real;

BEGIN
reset(tshipfil, 'coal1: tship.form');
for i := 1 to 5 do begin
  tshipr[i] := tshipfil; get(tshipfil); end
reset(ptfile, 'coal1: ptfile.data');
for i := 1 to 3 do begin
  portpr[i] := ptfile; get(ptfile); end
reset(vslfile, 'coal1: vslfile.data');
for i := 1 to 3 do begin
  vasprr[i] := vslfile; get(vslfile); end
reset(fptfile, 'coal1: fptfile.data');
fprtpr := fptfile; close(fptfile, purge);
END;

segment PROCEDURE TSHIP; (* loads transshipment screen, writes to an array, calculates costs *)

var tshipfil : packed array[1..16, 1..10] of integer;

BEGIN
  ff := 'coal2: tship.form';
  showit;

218
for i := 1 to 15 do begin
  p := p^n.n;
  for j := 1 to 10 do begin
    if p^n.ival < 0 then tshipfil[i,j] := 0 else
      tshipfil[i,j] := p^n.ival; p := p^n.n; end; end;
  saveit;
  i := 1;
while (tshipfil[i,1] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
  netonode[h] := tshipfil[i,1];
  netdnode[h] := tshipfil[i,2];
  netflag[h] := 2;
  if (tshipfil[i,3] > 0) then netc0[h] := tshipfil[i,3] * 100
    else netc0[h] := round((tshipr[1] + (tshipr[2] * tshipfil[i,7]) +
    (tshipr[3] * tshipfil[i,8]) + (tshipr[4] * tshipfil[i,8])) * 100);
  netc1[h] := 0; netc2[h] := 1;
  netcap[h] := round(tshipfil[i,5] * tshipr[5]);
  netsup[h] := 0;
  if (tshipfil[i,4] < 0) then tshipfil[i,4] := tshipfil[i,3];
  h := h + 1; i := i + 1; end;
draw;
END;  (* tship *)

segment PROCEDURE PORT;  (* loads port screen, writes to
an array, calculates costs *)

var portfil : packed array[1..16,1..10] of integer;

BEGIN
  ff := 'coal2:port.form';
  showit;
  for i := 1 to 15 do begin
    p := p^n.n;
    for j := 1 to 10 do begin
      if p^n.ival < 0 then portfil[i,j] := 0 else
        portfil[i,j] := p^n.ival; p := p^n.n; end; end;
    saveit;
    i := 1;
  while (portfil[i,1] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
    netonode[h] := portfil[i,1];
    netdnode[h] := portfil[i,2];
    netflag[h] := 2;
    netc0[h] := 0;
    if (portfil[i,3] = 0) then portfil[i,3] := (9 * portfil[i,8] +
      (portfil[i,9] DIV portfil[i,10]) * 0.12);
    netc2[h] := round(100 * portpr[3]);
    netcap[h] := 16383;
    netsup[h] := 0;
if (portfill[i,4] < 0) then portfill[i,4] := round(portpr[1] + portpr[2])
    * portfill[i,3];
    h := h + 1; i := i + 1; end;
draw;
END; (* port *)

segment PROCEDURE VESSEL;
    (* loads vessel screen, writes to an array, calculates costs *)
var vesselfil : packed array[1..16,1..10] of integer;
BEGIN
    showit;
    for i := 1 to 15 do begin
        p := p^..n;
        for j := 1 to 10 do begin
            if p^..ival < 0 then vesselfil[i,j] := 0 else
                vesselfil[i,j] := p^..ival; p := p^..n; end; end;
saveit;
i := 1;
    while (vesselfil[i,1] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
        netonode[h] := vesselfil[i,1];
        netdnode[h] := vesselfil[i,2];
        netflag[h] := 2;
        if (vesselfil[i,3] = 0) then vesselfil[i,3] := round(vesselpr[1] + vesselpr[2])
        netc0[h] := round(vesselfil[i,3] * 100);
        netc1[h] := 0; netc2[h] := 1;
        netcap[h] := 16383;
        netsup[h] := 0;
        if (vesselfil[i,4] < 0) then vesselfil[i,4] := round(vesselpr[1] / 100 *
            vesselfil[i,3]);
        h := h + 1; i := i + 1; end;
END; (* vessel *)

segment PROCEDURE GETVSL;
    (* selects vessel screens *)
BEGIN
    ff := 'coal2:ves1.form'; vessel; bottom; read(x);
    if (x = 'y') or (x = 'Y') then begin
        ff := 'coal2:ves2.form'; vessel; bottom; read(x);
        if (x = 'y') or (x = 'Y') then begin
            gotoxy(0,23);
            write('Insert COAL3: diskette in place of COAL2: and press return.');
            beep; readln;
            ff := 'coal3:ves1.form'; vessel; bottom; read(x);
            if (x = 'y') or (x = 'Y') then begin
                ff := 'coal3:ves2.form'; vessel; bottom; read(x);
                if (x = 'y') or (x = 'Y') then begin
                    ff := 'coal3:ves4.form'; vessel; bottom; read(x);
                    if (x = 'y') or (x = 'Y') then begin
                        ...
                end;
            end;
        end;
    end;
end;
ff := 'coal3:vessel5.form'; vessel; bottom; read(x);
if (x = 'y') or (x = 'Y') then begin
  ff := 'coal3:vessel6.form'; vessel; end; end; end; end;

BEGIN
  draw;
END;

segment PROCEDURE FPOR;
(* loads foreign port screen, writes to an array, calculates costs *)

var fportfil : packed array[l..16,1..10] of integer;

BEGIN
  ff := 'coal3:fport.form';
  showit;
  for i := 1 to 15 do begin
    p := p.n;
    for j := 1 to 10 do begin
      if p.ival < 0 then fportfil[i,j] := 0 else
        fportfil[i,j] := p.ival; p := p.n; end; end;
  saveit;
  i := 1;
  while (fportfil[i,1] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
    netonode[h] := fportfil[i,1];
    netdnode[h] := fportfil[i,2];
    netflag[h] := 2;
    if (fportfil[i,3] = 0) then begin
      if fportfil[i,8] = 0 then fportfil[i,3] := 2 else
        fportfil[i,3] := (fportfil[i,8] + fportfil[i,9] DIV
        fportfil[i,10]); end;
    netcoor[h] := fround(fportfil[i,3] * 100);
    netcl[h] := 0;
    netc2[h] := 1;
    netcap[h] := 16383;
    netsup[h] := 0;
    if (fportfil[i,4] < 0) then fportfil[i,4] := fportfil[i,3];
    h := h + 1; i := i + 1; end;
  draw;
END;

segment PROCEDURE FINDIT;
(* selects proper screen *)

BEGIN
  write('Get U. S. transshipment input file? . . . '); beep; read(z);
  if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; tship; end; wipe;
  write('Get U. S. port input file? . . . '); beep; read(z);
  if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; port; end; wipe;
  write('Get vessel input file? . . . '); beep; read(z);
  if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; getvsl; end; wipe;
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write('Get foreign port input file? ...'); beep; read(z);
if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; fport; end; wipe;
END;

segment PROCEDURE OUTPT2;

(* writes data to files *)

var onefile : file of integer;
dumb : integer;
BEGIN
rewrite(twofile,'coall:twofile.data');
reset(onefile,'coall:onefile.data');
  for i := 1 to ((k - 1) * 8) do begin
    dumb := onefile';
    twofile' := dumb; put(twofile);
    get(onefile); end;
close(onefile,purge);
for j := 1 to (h - 1) do begin
  twofile' := netonode[j]; put(twofile);
  twofile' := netdnode[j]; put(twofile);
  twofile' := netflag[j]; put(twofile);
  twofile' := netc0[j]; put(twofile);
  twofile' := netc1[j]; put(twofile);
  twofile' := netc2[j]; put(twofile);
  twofile' := netcap[j]; put(twofile);
  twofile' := netsup[j]; put(twofile);
  close(twofile,lock);
END;
BEGIN
  (* main2 *)
  swapon;
  h := 1;
hf := 'dummy';
  paramin;
draw;
  FINDIT;
  getcval(numlink);
  int(numlink,big,form,k);
temp := (h + k) - 2;
  outpt2;
  istr(temp,3,numlink);
  setcval(numlink);
  swapoff;
  setchain('coall:main3');
END.
(*$S++, L-, N++*)

PROGRAM MAIN3;

USES APPLESTUFF, CHAINSTUFF, (*$U SCREENPORT.CODE*) SCREENPORT,
(*$U SCREEN.CODE*) SCREEN, (*$U JOHNSTUFF.CODE*)

JOHNSTUFF;

(* printer: *)

VAR

a, f, g, h, i, j, k : integer;

x, z : char;

ey : interactive;

ftshipr : packed array[1..4] of real; (* parameters from main1 *)

frailpr : packed array[1..3] of real;

netonode, netnode, netflag,

netc0, netc1, netc2, netcap, netsup : packed array[1..250] of integer;

gfile, netfile : file of integer;

numlink : string;

big, form : boolean;


segment PROCEDURE PARAMIN; (* reads in parameters *)

var

fptfile, ftsfile, frlfile : file of real;

BEGIN

reset(ftsfile, 'coall: ftsfile.data');

for i := 1 to 4 do begin

ftshipr[i] := ftsfile ^=; get(ftsfile); end;

reset(frlfile, 'coall: frlfile.data');

for i := 1 to 3 do begin

frailpr[i] := frlfile ^=; get(frlfile);

end;

END;

segment PROCEDURE FTSHIP; (* writes values to an array, calculates costs *)

var

ftshipfil : packed array[1..16, 1..10] of integer;

BEGIN

ff := 'coall: ftship.form';

showit;

for i := 1 to 15 do begin

p := p ^=; n;

for j := 1 to 10 do begin

if p ^=.ival < 0 then ftshipfil[i, j] := 0 else

ftshipfil[i, j] := p ^=.ival;

p := p ^=; n;

end;

end;

saveit;

i := 1;
while (ftshipfil[i,1] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
    netonode[h] := ftshipfil[i,1];
    netdnode[h] := ftshipfil[i,2];
    netflag[h] := 2;
    if (ftshipfil[i,3] > 0) then netc0[h] := ftshipfil[i,3] * 100
        else netc0[h] := round((ftship[1] + (ftship[2] * ftshipfil[i,7]) +
        (ftship[3] * ftshipfil[i,8])) * (ftshipfil[i,8]) * 100);
    netc1[h] := 0; netc2[h] := 1;
    netcap[h] := ftshipfil[i,5];
    netsup[h] := 0;
    if (ftshipfil[i,4] < 0) then ftshipfil[i,4] := ftshipfil[i,3];
    h := h + 1; i := i + 1; end;
end;
END; (* ftship *)

segment PROCEDURE FRAIL; (* writes values to an array, calculates costs *)

var frailfil : packed array[1..16,1..12] of integer;

BEGIN
    ff := 'coal3:fail.form';
    showit;
    for i := 1 to 15 do begin
        p := p^n;
        for j := 1 to 12 do begin
            if p^ival < 0 then frailfil[i,j] := 0 else
                frailfil[i,j] := p^ival; p := p^n; end; end;
    saveit;
    i := 1;
    while (frailfil[i,1] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
        netonode[h] := frailfil[i,1];
        netdnode[h] := frailfil[i,2];
        netflag[h] := 2;
        if (frailfil[i,3] = 0) then frailfil[i,3] := round((frailpr[1] +
        frailpr[2] * frailfil[i,5]) * 100);
        netc0[h] := frailfil[i,3];
        netc1[h] := 0;
        netc2[h] := 1;
        netcap[h] := 16383;
        netsup[h] := 0;
        if (frailfil[i,4] < 0) then frailfil[i,4] := round(frailfil[i,3]
            * frailpr[3]);
        h := h + 1; i := i + 1; end;
    end;
END; (* frail *)
segment PROCEDURE ODFILE;

(* loads o-d flow screen, stores values *)

var flwfile : file of integer;
  orig, dest : packed array[1..16] of integer;
  odfil : packed array[1..16,1..16] of integer;

BEGIN
  ff := 'coal3:odflow.form';
  showit;
  for i := 1 to 15 do begin
    if p^ival < 0 then dest[i] := 0 else dest[i] := p^ival; p := p^.n; end;
  for i := 1 to 15 do begin
    if p^ival < 0 then orig[i] := 0 else orig[i] := p^ival; p := p^.n; end;
    g := 0; i := 1; j := 1;
    while (orig[i] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
      while (dest[j] > 0) and (j < 16) do begin
        odfil[i,j] := p^ival; p := p^.n;
        g := g +1; j := j + 1; end; j := 1;
      i := i + 1; end;
    saveit;
    rewrite(gfile, 'coal:gfile.data'); (* gfile keeps the total # of flows *)
    gfile^ := g; put(gfile);
    gfile^ := (h + k) - 1; put(gfile);
    close(gfile,lock);

    i := 1; j := 1;
    rewrite(flwfile, 'coal:flwfile.data'); (* flwfile contains the flows *)
    while (orig[i] > 0) and (i < 16) do begin
      while (dest[j] > 0) and (j < 16) do begin
        flwfile^ := orig[i]; put(flwfile);
        flwfile^ := dest[j]; put(flwfile);
        flwfile^ := odfil[i,j]; put(flwfile); j := j +1; end; j := 1;
      i := i +1; end;
    close(flwfile,lock);
    draw;
  END;

segment PROCEDURE OUTPT2; (* writes network information *)

var twofile : file of integer;
  dumb : integer;
BEGIN
  rewrite(netfile,'coal1:netfile.data');
  reset(twofile,'coal1:twofile.data');
  for i := 1 to (k * 8) do begin
    dumb := twofile;
    netfile := dumb; put(netfile);
    get(twofile); end;
  close(twofile,purge);
  for j := 1 to (h - 1) do begin
    netfile := netonode[j]; put(netfile);
    netfile := netdnode[j]; put(netfile);
    netfile := netflag[j]; put(netfile);
    netfile := netc0[j]; put(netfile);
    netfile := netc1[j]; put(netfile);
    netfile := netc2[j]; put(netfile);
    netfile := netcap[j]; put(netfile);
    netfile := netsup[j]; put(netfile);
  close(netfile,lock);
END;

procedure test;forward;

segment PROCEDURE FINDIT; (* selects the proper screens *)

BEGIN
  write('Get foreign transshipment input file? . . .'); beep; read(z);
  if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; ftship; end; wipe;
  write('Get foreign rail input file? . . . '); beep; read(z);
  if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; frail; end; wipe;
  write('Get O - D flow file? . . . '); beep; read(z);
  if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wait; odfile; end; wipe;
  write('Run network algorithm? . . . '); beep; read(z);
  if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin wipe; outpt2; page(output);
    write('Computing network flows . . . output will follow');
    setchain('coal1:nwtk'); end
  else begin wipe; write('Exit program? . . . '); beep; read(z);
    if (z = 'Y') or (z = 'y') then begin outpt2; exit(findic); end
    else setchain('coal1:main'); end;
END; (* findit *)

procedure test;

var yoyo : integer;
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begin
  reset(netfile,'coall:netfile.data');
  for i := 1 to ((h + k)-1) do begin
    for j := 1 to 8 do begin
      yoyo := netfile'; write(y,yoyo,' ');
      get(netfile); end; writeln(y); end;
  close(netfile,lock);
  reset(gfile,'coall:gfile.data');
  yoyo := gfile'; writeln(y,' g = ',yoyo); get(gfile);
  yoyo := gfile'; writeln(y,' h = ',yoyo);
  close(gfile,lock);
end;

BEGIN
  (* main3 *)
  h := 1;
  swapon;
  rewrite(y,'printer:');
  hf := 'dummy';
  paramin;
  getcval(numlink);
  int(numlink,big,form,k);
  draw;
  FINDIT;
  test;
  swapoff;
  close(y);
END.
DEFINITIONS

INPUTS - THIS LIST INCLUDES ALL VALUES PASSED FROM THE INPUT SCREENS TO THE MAIN COAL NETWORK PROGRAM. IT ALSO INCLUDES THOSE VARIABLES WHICH ARE CHANGED TO THE PROPER TYPE DURING THE INPUT PROCESS.

1. ONODE - HEAD NODE OF ANY LINK IN THE NETWORK, INTEGER VALUE
2. DNODE - TAIL NODE OF ANY LINK IN THE NETWORK, INTEGER VALUE
3. FLAG - SIGNAL TO POSITION A LINK IN THE NETWORK, FLAG = 1 MEANS THE LINK CONTAINS AN ORIGIN, FLAG = 3 MEANS THE LINK CONTAINS A DESTINATION, FLAG = 2 STANDS FOR AN INTERMEDIATE LINK, INTEGER VALUE
4. C0 - FIXED PORTION OF LINK COST, INTEGER VALUE
5. C10 - MULTIPLIER IN LINK COST EQUATION AS RECEIVED FROM INPUT SCREEN, INTEGER VALUE FROM INPUT SCREEN
6. C1 - MULTIPLIER IN LINK COST EQUATION USED IN FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM, COMPUTED FROM INPUT VALUE C10, INTEGER VALUE
7. C20 - EXPONENT IN LINK COST EQUATION AS RECEIVED FROM INPUT SCREEN, INTEGER VALUE FROM INPUT SCREEN
8. C2 - EXPONENT IN LINK COST EQUATION USED IN FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM, COMPUTED FROM INPUT VALUE C20, REAL VALUE
9. CP - LINK CAPACITY, INTEGER VALUE
10. SUP - NODE SUPPLY OR DEMAND FROM INPUT SCREEN, ORIGINS HAVE SUPPLY, DESTINATIONS HAVE DEMAND, INTERMEDIATE NODES HAVE ZERO SUPPLY, NO REQUIREMENT FOR SUPPLY TO EQUAL DEMAND, INTEGER VALUE
11. ORIGIN - NETWORK ORIGIN, REPRESENTS A MINE, INTEGER VALUE
12. DESTIN - NETWORK DESTINATION, REPRESENTS A UTILITY, INTEGER VALUE
13. FLOWIN - ORIGIN TO DESTINATION FLOW BETWEEN A SPECIFIC O-D PAIR, USED IN FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM, NO RELATION TO SUP, INTEGER VALUE
14. ITER - CONTROL PARAMETER TO LIMIT THE NUMBER OF ITERATIONS OF LINK COST COMPUTATIONS, DEFAULT IS 2, INTEGER VALUE
15. MSNO - CONTROL PARAMETER TO LIMIT THE NUMBER OF ITERATIONS OF WEIGHTING FACTOR FOR FLOWS, DEFAULT IS 1, INTEGER VALUE
16. RES - CONTROL PARAMETER PASSED BY THE INPUT SCREEN TO THE CONVERGENCE CRITERION FOR THE FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM, INTEGER VALUE, DEFAULT IS 2
17. RESULT - CONTROL PARAMETER TO DETERMINE CONVERGENCE REQUIREMENTS, CHANGED DURING INPUT TO A REAL VALUE, DEFAULT IS 0.02
18. NLINK - NUMBER OF LINKS ENTERED BY THE USER, USED TO CONTROL THE INPUT OF THE NETWORK STRUCTURE, INTEGER VALUE
19. G - NUMBER OF ORIGIN-DESTINATION PAIRS ENTERED BY USER, USED TO CONTROL INPUT OF O-D FLOW MATRIX, INTEGER VALUE
VARIABLES - THESE ARE THE VARIABLES GENERATED BY THE ALGORITHMS IN THE SOLUTION OF THE NETWORK

1. FLOW - MEASURE OF LINK COAL VOLUME USED IN THE FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM, A BASIC OUTPUT OF THE NETWORK
2. ICOST - UNIT COST OF SHIPPING A TON OF COAL ON A LINK IN THE NETWORK, A BASIC OUTPUT OF THE FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM, USED AS THE FIXED LINK COSTS FOR THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM
3. TCFLOW - MEASURE OF THE TOTAL COST OF THE FINAL NETWORK FLOW PATTERN IN THE FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM
4. TCTRAN - MEASURE OF THE TOTAL COST OF THE FINAL NETWORK FLOW PATTERN IN THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM
5. S - NODE SUPPLY ARRAY USED IN THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM
6. X - MEASURE OF LINK FLOWS IN THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM WHEN THE LINK IS PROPERLY ORIENTED
7. CPX - MEASURE OF LINK FLOWS IN THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM WHEN THE LINK IS ORIENTED BACKWARDS
8. P - PREDECESSOR ARRAY IN THE FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM
9. PB - INDIVIDUAL O-D PATH FOUND FROM THE PREDECESSOR ARRAY IN THE FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM
10. PN - PREDECESSOR ARRAY IN THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM
11. L - ARRAY WHICH HOLDS THE LOWEST COST FROM A GIVEN ORIGIN TO THE NODE ALONG THE LOWEST-COST PATH IN FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM
12. SI - LABELING ARRAY TO DETERMINE WHICH NODES TO INVESTIGATE IN DETERMINING THE LOWEST-COST O-D PATHS IN FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM
13. H - ARRAY WHICH REPLACES THE ONODE ARRAY AND CONTAINS POINTERS TO THE DNODE ARRAY TO INDICATE THE DNODES FROM A GIVEN ONODE, USED IN TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM
14. D - DEPTH OF NODE IN SOLUTION TREE OF THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM
15. IT - PREORDER TRAVERSAL THREAD USED IN THE UPDATE OF THE SOLUTION TREE VARIABLES IN THE TRANSSHIPMENT
16. U - NODE POTENTIAL IN THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM, USED TO DETERMINE THE LINKS WHICH WILL ENTER AND LEAVE THE SOLUTION BASIS
17. TOTS - MEASURE OF THE TOTAL SUPPLY AVAILABLE FROM ALL SOURCES IN THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM
18. TOTD - MEASURE OF THE TOTAL DEMAND REQUIRED BY ALL DESTINATION UTILITIES IN THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM
PROGRAM READI
CHARACTER*1 CHOICE,ANS,YES,NO
INTEGER ONODE(300),DNODE(300),FLAG(300),ORIGIN(215),DESTIN(215),
- ITER,MSNO,MAXN,ARC,H(125),KNT,C20(215),PN(215),
- CPX(215),S(215),MAX,TOTS,TOTD,CP(300),X(215),
- ICODE(215),FLOWIN(215),FLOW(215),CO(300),C1(300),KEY,TCFLOW,
- RES,SUP(215),G,MLNK,NUM
REAL C2(300),RESULT,TOTAL

DATA YES,NO/'Y','N'/
DATA MAX,MAXN,NARC,TOTS,TOTD/16383,0,0,0,0/
OPEN(6,FILE='PRINTER:')
OPEN(32,FILE='COAL:NETFILE.DATA',FORM='UNFORMATTED')
OPEN(33,FILE='COAL:PRFILE.DTA',FORM='UNFORMATTED')
OPEN(31,FILE='COAL:GFILE.DATA',FORM='UNFORMATTED')
OPEN(38,FILE='COAL:FILE.DATA',FORM='UNFORMATTED')
REWIND(31)
REWIND(32)
REWIND(33)
REWIND(38)

WRITE(*,880)
880 FORMAT(//,2X,' WHICH ALGORITHMS DO YOU WISH TO EXECUTE? ',//,5X,
- ' ENTER',//,10X,'1 FOR FLOW-DEPENDENT ONLY',//,10X,
- '2 FOR TRANSSHIPMENT ONLY',//,10X,
- '3 FOR BOTH ALGORITHMS',//,5X,'MAKE YOUR SELECTION ',
- 'AND PRESS RETURN',//)
READ(*,881) NUM
881 FORMAT(BN,I2)

IF(NUM .EQ. 2) THEN
  WRITE(*,882)
882 FORMAT(//,5X,'HAVE YOU SET THE FIXED COSTS FOR EVERY LINK ?',
- 'DURING INPUT? ENTER Y OR N AND PRESS RETURN',//)
READ(*,883) ANS
883 FORMAT(A1)

IF(ANS .NE. YES) NUM = 3

ENDIF
C READ IN PARAMETERS. NLINK = NUMBER OF LINKS IN NETWORK, REQUIRED TO
C CONTROL NETWORK STRUCTURE INPUT. G = NUMBER OF O-D PAIRS, REQUIRED TO
C CONTROL O-D FLOW INPUT FOR THE FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM. ITER, MSNO,
C AND RES ARE CONVERGENT PARAMETERS IN THE FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM.

READ(31) G, NLINK
READ(33) ITER, MSNO, RES

C INPUT THE NETWORK STRUCTURE. ONODE IS THE HEAD NODE, DNODE IS THE TAIL
C NODE. FLAG DEFINES THE POSITION OF LINK IN THE NETWORK - FLAG = 1 FOR
C MINES, FLAG = 3 FOR UTILITIES, FLAG = 2 FOR ALL INTERMEDIATE LINKS. CO,
C C10, C20 ARE COST PARAMETERS FOR LINK COSTS. CP IS THE LINK CAPACITY.
C SUP IS THE AVAILABLE SUPPLY AT THE MINE OR THE DEMAND AT THE UTILITY.
C SUP = 0 FOR ALL INTERMEDIATE NODES.

DO 900 J2 = 1, NLINK
   READ(32) ONODE(J2)
   READ(32) DNODE(J2)
   READ(32) FLAG(J2)
   READ(32) CO(J2)
   CO(J2) = INT(C0(J2)/100 + .5)
   READ(32) C1(J2)
   C1(J2) = INT(C1(J2)/100 + .5)
   READ(32) C20(J2)
   C2(J2) = REAL(C20(J2)/100)
   READ(32) CP(J2)
   READ(32) SUP(J2)
900 CONTINUE

C READ IN THE O-D FLOW MATRIX. ORIGIN = MINE, DESTIN = UTILITY,
C FLOWIN = O-D FLOW. THERE MUST BE AN ENTRY FROM EVERY ORIGIN TO
C EVERY DESTINATION. ZERO FLOWS ARE ACCEPTABLE AND ARE THE DEFAULT.

DO 910 J3 = 1, G
   READ(38) ORIGIN(J3)
   READ(38) DESTIN(J3)
   READ(38) FLOWIN(J3)
910 CONTINUE

CLOSE(31, STATUS='DELETE')
CLOSE(32, STATUS='DELETE')
CLOSE(33, STATUS='DELETE')
CLOSE(38, STATUS='DELETE')
C INITIALIZE ALL VARIABLES AND ARRAYS.

KEY = 0
KNT = 0
NNODE = 0
RESULT = REAL(RES/100)
DO 901 KI=1,215
   S(KI) = 0
   H(KI) = 0
   IF(KI .GT. NLINK) THEN
      ONODE(KI) = 0
      FLAG(KI) = 0
      ICOST(KI) = 0
      C0(KI) = 0
      CI(KI) = 0
      C2(KI) = 1.0
      CP(KI) = MAX
   ENDIF
901 CONTINUE

C COUNT NUMBER OF NO. % IN REAL NETWORK (NNODE)
NNODE = MAX(0,NNODE,ONODE(KI),DNODE(KI))

901 CONTINUE

C ARTIFICIAL NODE IS DESIGNATED AS MAXN.
MAXN = NNODE + 1

DO 21 I = 1,NNODE
DO 22 J = 1,NLINK
   IF(FLAG(J) .EQ. 1 .AND. ONODE(J) .EQ. I) THEN
      S(I) = SUP(J)
   ELSEIF(FLAG(J) .EQ. 3 .AND. DNODE(J) .EQ. I) THEN
      S(I) = - SUP(J)
   ENDIF
22 CONTINUE

C COUNT NUMBER OF ARTIFICIAL LINKS
   IF(S(I) .NE. 0) KNT = KNT + 1
21 CONTINUE
DO 23 I2 = 1, NNODE
    II = NLINK + I2
    
    C FORM AND INITIALIZE ARTIFICIAL LINKS FROM SUPPLY NODES (ORIGINS).
    IF(S(I2) .GT. 0) THEN
        ONODE(II) = I2
        DNODE(II) = MAXN
        CO(II) = 0
        CI(II) = 0
        C2(II) = 1.0
        CP(II) = 10000
        TOTS = TOTS + S(I2)
        FLAG(II) = 10
    ENDIF
    
    C FORM AND INITIALIZE ARTIFICIAL LINKS TO DEMAND NODES (DESTINATIONS).
    ELSEIF (S(I2) .LT. 0) THEN
        ONODE(II) = MAXN
        DNODE(II) = I2
        CO(II) = MAX - 1
        CI(II) = 0
        C2(II) = 1.0
        CP(II) = 10000
        TOTD = TOTD - S(I2)
        FLAG(II) = 10
    ENDIF

23 CONTINUE

C TOTAL NUMBER OF LINKS = TOTAL REAL LINKS + TOTAL ARTIFICIAL LINKS.
NARC = NLINK + KNT

CALL SORT3 (ONODE, DNODE, CO, CI, C2, FLAG, NLINK, NARC, MAXN, H, CP)

IF(NUM .EQ. 1 .OR. NUM .EQ. 3) THEN
    CALL LCOST2 (ONODE, DNODE, ICOST, FLAG, NLINK, ORIGIN, DESTIN, FLOW,
                FLOWIN, CO, CI, C2, ITER, MSNO, RESULT, NARC, MAXN, KEY, TCFLOW, G)
    CALL NETOUT (ONODE, DNODE, ICOST, FLOW, PN, X, CPX, KEY, NARC, NNODE,
                 MAXN, TCFLOW, CP)
ENDIF

IF(NUM .EQ. 2 .OR. NUM .EQ. 3) THEN
    KEY = 2
    CALL TRANS (H, DNODE, X, CPX, PN, S, CP, MAX, MAXN, NARC, ICOST)
    CALL NETOUT (ONODE, DNODE, ICOST, FLOW, PN, X, CPX, KEY, NARC, NNODE,
                 MAXN, TCFLOW, CP)
ENDIF
THE SINGL2 SUBROUTINE CAN DETERMINE THE TOTAL COST AND PATH TO
SHIP COAL FROM ONE ORIGIN TO ONE DESTINATION. THIS SUBROUTINE
WORKS WITH CONSTANT LINK COSTS, AND, THEREFORE, IT ONLY MAKES
SENSE TO USE IT AFTER EQUILIBRIUM HAS BEEN REACHED ON THE
NETWORK AS A WHOLE. THIS SUBROUTINE ASKS FOR THE SPECIFIC ORIGIN
AND THE SPECIFIC DESTINATION. IT PRINTS OUT THE THE ORIGIN THE
DESTINATION AND THE INTERMEDIATE NODES, AS WELL AS THE TOTAL
COST. THIS COST IS THE UNIT COST FOR A MILLION TONS OF COAL.

DO 1071 I=1,NARC
WRITE(*,1070)
WRITE(6,1070)

1070 FORMAT(/,2X,'DO YOU WISH TO EXAMINE ANY INDIVIDUAL ROUTES FROM
- A SINGLE ORIGIN TO A SINGLE DESTINATION (Y OR N)?',/)
READ(*,1080) CHOICE
1080 FORMAT(A1)
WRITE(6,1080) CHOICE
IF(CHOICE .NE. YES) GO TO 7
CALL SINGL3(ONODE,DNODE,ICOST FLAG,NLINC,NARC)
CONTINUE

STOP
END
C THIS SORT ROUTINE USES A HEAPSORT TO REARRANGE THE INPUT ELEMENTS
C IN-PLACE INTO NONDECREASING ORDER

SUBROUTINE SORT3 (ONODE,DNODE,CO,C1,C2,FLAG,NLINK,NARC,MAXN,H,CP)
   INTEGER F(300),T,FLAG(300),ONODE(300),DNODE(300),H(125),NARC,
           MAXN,CO(300),C1(300),D,E,CP(300)
   REAL C2(300),A
C COMBINE THE ONODE AND DNODE IN ORDER TO SORT TOGETHER
C REDESIGNATE UNUSED ONODES TO SEND TO END OF SORT ROUTINE
   IF(ONODE(L1) .EQ. 0) ONODE(L1) = MAXN + 1
   F(L1) = 200 * ( ONODE(L1) -100 ) + DNODE(L1)
   CONTINUE
C FIRST TRANSFORM THE ELEMENTS INTO A HEAP
   CALL HEAPIF(F,NARC,CO,C1,C2,FLAG,CP)
C INTERCHANGE THE NEW MAXIMUM WITH THE ELEMENT AT THE END OF THE TREE
   DO 40 I=300,2,-1
      T=F(I)
      F(I)=F(1)
      F(1)=T
      D=CO(I)
      CO(I)=CO(1)
      CO(1)=D
      E=C1(I)
      C1(I)=C1(1)
      C1(1)=E
      A=C2(I)
      C2(I)=C2(1)
      C2(1)=A
      INT2=FLAG(I)
      FLAG(I)=FLAG(1)
      FLAG(1)=INT2
      INT3 = CP(I)
      CP(I) = CP(1)
      CP(1) = INT3
C REFORM A SINGLE HEAP WITHOUT THE LAST ELEMENT MOVED IN EACH ITERATION
   CALL ADJUST(F,1,I-1,CO,C1,C2,FLAG,CP)
   CONTINUE
DO 5001 L2=1,300
   ONODE(L2) = INT(REAL(F(L2))/200) + 99
   DNODE(L2) = MOD(F(L2),200) + 200
5001 CONTINUE

   CALL FSTAR(ONODE,NARC,MAXN,H)
RETURN
END
C READJUST THE ELEMENTS OF THE NETWORK INPUT TO FORM A HEAP

SUBROUTINE HEAPIF(F,NARC,CO,C1,C2,FLAG,CP)
REAL C2(300)
INTEGER F(300),FLAG(300),CO(300),C1(300),NARC,CP(300)
DO 140 I=300/2,1,-1
    CALL ADJUST(F,I,300,CO,C1,C2,FLAG,CP)
140 CONTINUE
RETURN
END

C COMBINE TWO BINARY TREES INTO A SINGLE HEAP
SUBROUTINE ADJUST(F,I,NARC,CO,C1,C2,FLAG,CP)
REAL C2(215),AA
INTEGER F(215),I,J,N,ITEM,FLAG(215),CO(215),C1(215),NARC2,INT2,
     - NARC2,INT3,CP(215)
    J=I+2
ITEM = F(I)
DOG = CO(I)
EE = C1(I)
AA = C2(I)
INT2 = FLAG(I)
INT3 = CP(I)
C COMPARE LEFT AND RIGHT CHILDREN, POINT J TO THE LARGER CHILD
7 IF(J .LE. NARC2) THEN
   IF(J .LT. NARC2 .AND. F(J) .LT. F(J+1)) J=J+1
   IF(ITEM .GE. F(J)) THEN
      C POSITION FOUND FOR THE I-TH CHILD
      GOTO 15
   ELSE MOVE UP THE LARGER CHILD ONE LEVEL IN THE TREE
ELSE
   F(J/2) = F(J)
   CO(J/2) = CO(J)
   C1(J/2) = C1(J)
   C2(J/2) = C2(J)
   FLAG(J/2) = FLAG(J)
   CP(J/2) = CP(J)
   J=J*2
ENDIF
GOTO 7
ENDIF
15 F(J/2) = ITEM
CO(J/2) = DOG
C1(J/2) = EE
C2(J/2) = AA
FLAG(J/2) = INT2
CP(J/2) = INT3
RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE FSTAR(ONODE,NARC,MAXN,H)
INTEGER ONODE(300),NARC,MAXN,H(125)

J COUNTS LINKS; K COUNTS NODES
J=1
K=1
DO 100 KT=1,300
   IF(J .LE. NARC .OR. K .LE. MAXN) THEN
      IF(K .LT. ONODE(J)) THEN
         H(K) = J
         K = K + 1
      ELSEIF (K .EQ. ONODE(J)) THEN
         H(K) = J
         J = J + 1
         K = K + 1
      ELSE
         J = J + 1
      ENDIF
   ENDIF
100 CONTINUE

ADD A STOPPER TO H TO END CONSIDERATION OF THE ARTIFICIAL NODE
H(MAXN + 1) = NARC + 1
RETURN
END
C FLOW-DEPENDENT CODE DETERMINES THE LOWEST COST PATHS ON A NETWORK WHERE LINK COSTS CHANGE AS THE FLOW VARIES.

SUBROUTINE LCOST2(ONODE, DNODE, ICOST, FLAG, NLINK, ORIGIN, DESTIN, FLOW, 
-    FLOWIN, CO, C1, C2, ITER, MSNO, RESULT, NARC, MAXN, KEY, TCFLOW, C
INTEGER ONODE(300), DNODE(300), FLAG(300), ORIGIN(215), DESTIN(215), 
-    NLINK, ITER, MSNO, KEY, NARC, CO(300), C1(300), MAXN, TCFLOW, 
-    FLOW(215), FLOWIN(215), ICOST(215), FLOW1(215), FLOWS, DIFF, G
REAL RESULT, FLOWIN(215), ICOST(215), FLOW(215), FLOWS, DIFF, G

KEY = 0

C INITIALIZE THE LINK COSTS AS THE FIXED PORTION OF THOSE COSTS

DO 20 N=1, NARC
    ICOST(M) = CO(M)
    FLOW(M) = 0
20 CONTINUE

C INITIALIZE THE LINK FLOWS BASED ON THE INITIAL LINK COSTS
CALL MATRIX(ONODE, DNODE, ICOST, FLAG, NLINK, ORIGIN, DESTIN, FLOW, 
-    FLOWIN, RESULT, TOTAL, KEY, NARC, MAXN, TCFLOW, C)

DO 200 I=1, ITER
    DO 210 J=1, NARC

C SAVE LINK FLOWS FROM PREVIOUS ITERATIONS
    FLOW1(J) = FLOW(J)
    ICOST(J) = 0

C UPDATE LINK COSTS, PROTECTING AGAINST ZERO-FLOW LINKS
    IF(FLOW(J) .LE. 0) THEN
        ICOST(J) = CO(J)
    ELSE
        ICOST(J) = CO(J) + C1(J) * ((INT(REAL(FLOW(J)) ** C2(J))))
    ENDIF
    FLOW(J) = 0
210 CONTINUE

C CALCULATE NEW LINK FLOWS BASED ON UPDATED COSTS
CALL MATRIX(ONODE, DNODE, ICOST, FLAG, NLINK, ORIGIN, DESTIN, FLOW, 
-    FLOWIN, RESULT, TOTAL, KEY, NARC, MAXN, TCFLOW, C)

C FIND RELATIVE WEIGHTS OF FLOW AND FLOW1
CALL MSIZE(FLOW, FLOW1, ALPHA, CO, C1, C2, MSNO, HLINK, NARC)
DIFF = 0
FLOWS = 0

C CONVERGENCE TEST IS THE ROOT MEAN SQUARE OF THE FLOWS
DO 220 K=1,NARC

FLOW(K)=FLOW1(K) + (INT(ALPHA*(REAL(FLOW(K) - FLOW1(K)))))
DIFF = DIFF + (FLOW1(K) - FLOW(K))*(FLOW1(K) - FLOW(K))
FLOWS = FLOWS + FLOW(K)
220 CONTINUE

IF(DIFF .LT. 0) DIFF = 32000
IF(FLOWS .EQ. 0) FLOWS = 1

TOTAL = (SQRT(REAL(DIFF)))/(REAL(FLOWS))

IF(TOTAL .LE. RESULT) GOTO 300

200 CONTINUE

300 DO 250 N = 1,NARC

C UPDATE LINK COSTS FOR ONE MORE ITERATION ON OUTPUT
IF(FLOW(N) .LE. 0) THEN
    IOST(N) = CO(N)
ELSE
    ICOST(N) = CO(N) + C1(N)*(INT(REAL(FLOW(N))**C2(N)))
ENDIF
FLOW(N) = 0
250 CONTINUE

C KEY = 1 ALLOWS OUTPUT TO BE CALLED AT CONVERGENCE
KEY = 1

CALL MATRIX(ONODE, DNODE, ICOST, FLAG, NLINK, ORIGIN, DESTIN, FLOW, FLOWIN, RESULT, TOTAL, KEY, NARC, MAXN, TCFLOW, G)

RETURN
END

C GOLDEN SECTION METHOD IS USED TO FIND MOVE SIZE IN CONVEX
C COMBINATIONS PROCEDURE

SUBROUTINE MSIZE(FLOW,FLOW1,ALPHA,CO,C1,C2,MSNO,NLINK,NARC)
INTEGER MSNO,NLINK,NARC,FLOW(215),FLOW1(215),CO(300),C1(300)
REAL C2(300),XL,XR,ZL,ZR,R,A,B,ALPHA

A = 0.0
B = 1.0
R = 0.6180333
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C SET ITERATIONS COUNTER FROM INPUT
DO 10 N=1,MSNO

C INITIALIZE PARAMETERS
XL = (B-A)*(1-R) + A
XR = (B-A)*R + A
ZL = 0.0
ZR = 0.0

DO 7 I=1,NARC

C CALCULATE OBJECTIVE FUNCTION AT LEFT AND RIGHT INTERVAL POINTS
IF((FLOW1(I) + (INT((XL)*(REAL(FLOW(I) -
- FLOW1(I)))))) .NE. 0) THEN
ZL = ZL+(REAL(C1(I)))*((REAL(FLOW1(I))) +
- XL*(REAL(FLOW(I)-FLOW1(I))))**C2(I)
ENDIF

IF((FLOW1(I) + (INT((XR)*(REAL(FLOW(I) -
- FLOW1(I)))))) .NE. 0) THEN
ZR = ZR+(REAL(C1(I)))*((REAL(FLOW1(I))) +
- XR*(REAL(FLOW(I)-FLOW1(I))))**C2(I)
ENDIF
7 CONTINUE

C ELIMINATE INTERVAL FROM NEAREST END POINT TO POINT WITH HIGHER
C OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE
IF(ZL .LE. ZR) THEN
B = XR
ELSE
A = XL
ENDIF

IF( (B-A) .LE. 0.02 ) GOTO 30
10 CONTINUE

C COMPUTE WEIGHT FACTOR AS THE MIDPOINT OF THE REMAINING INTERVAL
30 ALPHA = (A + B)/2.

RETURN
END

C MATRIX USES REPEATED ITERATIONS OF A GREEDY ALGORITHM TO FIND THE
C LOWEST COST PATH COST BETWEEN EVERY O-D PAIR.

SUBROUTINE MATRIX (ONODE,DNODE,ICOST,FLAG,NLINK,ORIGIN,DESTIN,
- FLOW,FLOWIN,RESULT,TOTAL,KEY,NARC,MAXN,TCFLOW,G)
INTEGER ONODE(300),DNODE(300), FLAG(300),S(215),P(215),MINE(60),
- KUTIL(215),ORIGIN(215),DESTIN(215),KEY,NARC,FLOW(215),
- ICOST(215),L(215),FLOWIN(215),MAXN,TCFLOW,G
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K4 = 0
K3 = 1
TCFLOW = 0

C EACH ORIGIN IS EVALUATED INDIVIDUALLY BUT THE LOWEST COST PATH TO
C EVERY DESTINATION IS FOUND ON A SINGLE ITERATION.
C FIND THE ORIGIN TO BE EVALUATED; FLAG = 1
   DO 500 K=1,NARC
   IF(FLAG(K) .NE. 1) GOTO 500
   MINE(K3) = ONODE(K)

C CHECK THAT AN ORIGIN IS VISITED ONLY ONCE
   IF(K3 .NE. 1) THEN
      DO 801 KN=1,(K3-1)
      IF(MINE(K3) .EQ. MINE(KM)) GOTO 500
   801 CONTINUE
   ENDIF

C THE ARRAYS MUST BE REINITIALIZED FOR EACH ORIGIN
   DO 78 I=1,215
      S(I) = 0
      L(I) = 9999
      P(I) = 0
   78 CONTINUE

C INITIALIZE THE ARRAYS FOR THE ORIGIN NODE; L IS THE DISTANCE FROM
C THE ORIGIN ON THE LOWEST COST PATH, S IS A LABELING ARRAY OF NODES
C TO BE EVALUATED AS ONODES.
   L(MINE(K3)) = 0
   S(MINE(K3)) = 1
   K3 = K3 + 1

   DO 514 J=1,NARC
      IF(S(J) .NE. 0) THEN
         DO 519 KA=K3-1,NARC
         C FIND THE ONODE TO BE CONSIDERED, EVALUATE ALL DNODES OF LINKS FROM
         C THAT ONODE FOR THE LOWEST COST PATH TO THE DNODE BY ANY ROUTE
         IF(ONODE(KA) .EQ. J) THEN
            IF(L(DNODE(KA)) .GT. L(ONODE(KA)) + ICOST(KA)) THEN
            C UPDATE THE PATH COST AND PREDECESSOR ARRAYS IF LOWER COST PATH FOUND
            L(DNODE(KA)) = L(ONODE(KA)) + ICOST(KA)
            P(DNODE(KA)) = ONODE(KA)
            ENDIF
         519 CONTINUE
         C ENTER NEW DNODES IN THE LABELING ARRAY
         S(DNODE(KA)) = 1
      ENDIF
   514 CONTINUE

C REMOVE ONODE FROM LABELING ARRAY WHEN CONSIDERATION IS COMPLETED
   S(J) = 0
   ENDIF
   514 CONTINUE
C OUTPUT HEADING ONLY FOR LAST ITERATION OF FLOW UPDATES AND ONLY
C THE FIRST ORIGIN
    IF(K4 .EQ. 0 .AND. KEY .EQ. 1) THEN
        K1 = 0
        DO 8010 M = 1, NARC
    ENDIF
8010 CONTINUE

C DETERMINE ALL DESTINATIONS IN ORDER AND ONLY ONE TIME FOR HEADING
    IF(FLAG(M) .EQ. 3 .AND. P(DNODE(M)) .EQ. ONODE(M)) THEN
        K1 = K1 + 1
        KUTIL(K1) = DNODE(M)
    ENDIF

WRITE(*,2020)
WRITE(6,2020)
2020 FORMAT(12X,'ORIGIN TO DESTINATION COST MATRIX')

WRITE(*,2000) (KUTIL(M), M = 1, K1)
WRITE(6,2000) (KUTIL(M), M = 1, K1)
2000 FORMAT(16X,'UTILITIES',2016,12X)

WRITE(*,2010)
WRITE(6,2010)
2010 FORMAT('MINES')

IF(KEY .EQ. 1) THEN
    CALL OUTPUT(ONODE, DNODE, FLAG, NILINK, P, LMINE, K3, NARC)
ENDIF

C OUTPUT IS CALLED TO OUTPUT PATH COSTS IN MATRIX FORMAT
CALL OUTPUT(ONODE, DNODE, FLAG, NILINK, P, LMINE, K3, NARC)
ENDIF

C QSUM IS CALLED TO SUM THE FLOWS ON THE LINKS
CALL QSUM2(ONODE, DNODE, FLAG, NILINK, P, LMINE, K3, ORIGIN, DESTIN, FLOW, -
            FLOWIN, NARC, G)
500 CONTINUE

C TCFLOW REPRESENTS THE TOTAL SYSTEM COST OF THE EQUILIBRIUM FLOW PATTERN
    DO 750 L1 = 1, NARC
        TCFLOW = TCFLOW + (FLOW(L1) * ICOST(L1))
    750 CONTINUE
RETURN
END

C OUTPUT IS USED TO WRITE THE PATH COSTS IN MATRIX FORMAT
SUBROUTINE OUTPUT(ONODE, DNODE, FLAG, NILINK, P, LMINE, K3, NARC)
    INTEGER ONODE(300), DNODE(300), FLAG(300), P(215), LMINE(60), NARC,
        L(215), NUTIL(215)
DATA NUTIL/215*0/
K2 = 0

DO 600 N=1,NARC
C DETERMINE DESTINATIONS AND BE CERTAIN TO VISIT EACH DESTINATION ONLY
C ONCE FROM EACH ORIGIN.
   IF(FLAG(N) .EQ. 3 .AND. P(DNODE(N)) .EQ. ONODE(N)) THEN
      K2 = K2 + 1
      NUTIL(K2) = L(DNODE(N))
   ENDIF
600 CONTINUE

WRITE(*,700)MINE(K3-1),(NUTIL(N1),N1=1,K2)
WRITE(*,700)MNRE(K3-1),(NUTIL(N1),N1=1,K2)
700 FORMAT(I4,6X,24I6,/) RETURN
END

C QSUM2 IS USED TO SUM THE FLOWS ON THE LINKS AS THE LOWEST COST PATHS
C ARE FOUND IN EACH ITERATION.
SUBROUTINE QSUM2(ONODE,DNODE,FLAG,NLINK,P,MINE,K3,ORIGIN,DESTIN,
   FLOW,FLOWIN,NARC,G)
   INTEGER ONODE(300), DNODE(300), FLAG(300), NLINK,P(215),MINE(60)
   ,K3,PB(40),ORIGIN(215),DESTIN(215),NARC, FLOW(215),FLOWIN(215),G
DATA PB/40*0/

DO 800 N=1,NARC
   KOUNT = 1
   C DETERMINE THE PATH FROM THE DESTINATION TO THE ORIGIN USING THE
   C PREDECESSOR ARRAY
   IF(FLAG(N) .EQ. 3 .AND. P(DNODE(N)) .EQ. ONODE(N)) THEN
      K8 = K8 + 1
      PB(1) = DNODE(N)
   ENDIF
   DO 810 K=2,40
   C CHECK FOR THE PROPER ORIGIN TO END THE PATH
   IF(PB(K-1) .EQ. MINE(K3-1)) THEN
      DO 900 M= 1,(KOUNT-1)
      DO 920 I= 1,NARC
   C CHECK THAT THE LINK IS ON THE PATH
      IF(PB(M+1) .EQ. ONODE(I) .AND. PB(M).EQ.DNODE(I)) THEN
         DO 910 J= 1,G
   800 CONTINUE
   810 CONTINUE
   900 CONTINUE
   920 CONTINUE
   910 CONTINUE
   RETURN
END
C CHECK THAT THE PROPER O-D FLOW IS ASSIGNED TO THE LINK
    IF(ORIGIN(J).EQ.MINE(K3-1) .AND. DESTIN(J).EQ.
      DNODE(N)) THEN

C ASSIGN THE FLOW TO EACH LINK ON THE PATH
    FLOW(I) = FLOW(I) + FLOWIN(J)
    GOTO 900

   ENDIF
   CONTINUE

910    CONTINUE
920    CONTINUE
900    CONTINUE

GO TO 800
ELSE

PB(K) = PB(PB(K-1))
KOUNT = KOUNT + 1

ENDIF

810    CONTINUE
800    CONTINUE

RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE TRANS(H, DNODE, X, CPX, PN, S, CP, MAX, MAXN, NARC, ICOST)

C THIS SUBROUTINE CONTROLS THE TRANSSHIPMENT SEGMENT OF THE PROGRAM
C WHICH DETERMINES WHERE EACH UTILITY WILL BUY ITS COAL. IT TAKES
C AS INPUT, THE ROUTE STRUCTURE AND LINK COSTS AND FLOWS FROM THE
C FLOW DEPENDENT CODE CONTROLLED BY THE LCOST2 SUBROUTINE.

INTEGER H(125), DNODE(300), D(215), PN(215), IT(215), MAXN, PREV,
- NODEI, NODEJ, NODEC, NODED, INARC, PIVOT, IPIV, FPIV, TPIV, JOIN,
- HANG, NARC, ICOST(215), X(215), CPX(215), U(215), S(215), MAX, Z,
- CPX(300), ZBEST, FCHG

LOGICAL FEAS

FEAS = .FALSE.
Pivot = 0
IPIV = 0
FPIV = 0
TPIV = 0
FCHG = 0
NODEI = 0
NODEJ = 0

DO 50 J = 1, 215
  D(J) = 0
  PN(J) = 0
  IT(J) = 0
  X(J) = 0
  U(J) = MAX
  CPX(J) = 0
50 CONTINUE

C FORM THE INITIAL SOLUTION FROM ALL THE ARTIFICIAL LINKS.
CALL INIT(MAXN, D, U, PN, H, X, CPX, DNODE, IT, PREV, MAX, S)

DO 10 I = 1, 500
  IF(.NOT. FEAS) THEN

C CHOOSE LINK WHICH WILL MOST IMPROVE THE SOLUTION
CALL ARCIN(H, DNODE, ICOST, MAXN, CP, U, ZBEST, NODEI, NODEJ, INARC
  - FEAS, PIVOT)

  IF(.NOT. FEAS) THEN

C DETERMINE WHAT ACTION TO TAKE WHEN EACH NEW LINK IS ADDED TO THE
C SOLUTION
CALL ARCOUT(ZBEST, D, X, CPX, PN, NODEI, NODEJ, NODEC, NODED,
  - HANG, FCHG, U, IT, INARC, ICOST, CP, MAX, JOIN, H, DNODE,
  - IPIV, FPIV, TPIV)
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ENDIF
ELSE
   GOTO 20
ENDIF

10 CONTINUE
20 CONTINUE

WRITE(6,200) PIVOT,IPIV,FPIV,TPIV
200 FORMAT(/,' PIVOT = ',13,2X,' IPIV = ',13,2X,' FPIV = ',13,2X,
   \', TPIV = ',13)

RETURN
END

C THIS SUBROUTINE FORMS THE INITIAL SOLUTION FROM ALL THE ARTIFICIAL LINKS

SUBROUTINE INIT(MAXN,D,U,PN,H,X,CPX,DNODE,IT,PREV,MAX,S)
INTEGER D(215),PN(215),MAXN,PREV,IT(215),H(125),DNODE(300),NODE,
   \, S(215),X(215),CPX(215),MAX,U(215)

C INITIALIZE THE NODE LENGTH ARRAYS FOR THE ARTIFICIAL NODE WHICH IS
C THE ROOT OF THE SOLUTION TREE
D(MAXN) = 1
U(MAXN) = 0
PN(MAXN) = MAXN
PREV = MAXN

DO 20 I=1,MAXN
   IF(I .GE. MAXN) GOTO 30
   IF(S(I) .GT. 0) THEN
      X(I) = S(I)
      CPX(I) = MAX - S(I)
      D(I) = 2
      U(I) = 0
      PN(I) = MAXN
      IT(PREV) = I
      PREV = I
   ENDIF
20 CONTINUE
30 I = I - 1
   J = H(MAXN)
DO 40 K=1,MAXN
C FOR ALL THE LINKS FROM THE ARTIFICIAL NODE, CPX WILL CARRY THE FLOW
C INITIALIZE ALL THE NODE ARRAYS HERE
IF(J .LE. (H(MAXN + 1) - 1)) THEN
   NODE = DNODE(J)
   X(NODE) = MAX + S(NODE)
   CPX(NODE) = - S(NODE)
   D(NODE) = 2
   U(NODE) = MAX-1
   PN(NODE) = -MAXN
   IT(PREV) = NODE
   PREV = NODE
   J = J + 1
ELSE
   GOTO 50
ENDIF
40 CONTINUE
C COMPLETE PREORDER TRAVERSAL; RETURN TO THE ARTIFICIAL NODE.
50 IT(PREV) = MAXN
   RETURN
END

C THIS SUBROUTINE FINDS THE LINK WITH THE GREATEST DUAL INFEASIBILITY
C AND DESIGNATES THAT LINK AS THE CANDIDATE INCOMING LINK

SUBROUTINE ARCIN(H,DNODE,ICOST,MAXN,CP,U,ZBEST,NODEI,NDDEJ,INARC,
   FEAS,PIVOT)
   INTEGER MAXN,NODEI,NODEJ,H(125),DNODE(300),INARC,PIVOT,
   ICOST(215),ZU(215),ZBEST,CP(300),J,K
   LOGICAL FEAS
C ZBEST REGISTERS THE GREATEST DUAL INFEASIBILITY FROM NODEI WHICH IS
C BEING INVESTIGATED
   ZBEST = 0
   DO 110 I=1,MAXN
      IF(ZBEST .EQ. 0 .AND. I .LE. MAXN) THEN
         NODEI = MOD(NODEI,MAXN) + 1
         K = H(NODEI)
         DO 120 J = 1,500
            IF(K .LE. (H(NODEI + 1) - 1)) THEN
               Z = (U(DNODE(K)) - U(NODEI)) - ICOST(K)
               IF((CP(K) .GT. 0 .AND. Z .GT. IABS(ZBEST)) .OR.
                - (CP(K) .LT. 0 .AND.-Z .GT. IABS(ZBEST))) THEN
                  ZBEST = Z
                  NODEI = NODEJ
                  NODEJ = K
                ENDIF
            ELSE
               GOTO 110
            ENDIF
   110 CONTINUE
   RETURN
END
ZBEST = Z
INARC = K
ENDIF
K = K + 1
ELSE
GOTO 110
ENDIF
120 CONTINUE
ELSE
GOTO 130
ENDIF
110 CONTINUE
C IF ZBEST = 0 AT THIS POINT WE ARE FINISHED. NODEI-NODEJ DESIGNATE THE
C INCOMING ARC IF ZBEST IS NOT ZERO.
130 NODEJ = DNODE(INARC)

IF(ZBEST .EQ. 0) FEAS = .TRUE.

PIVOT = PIVOT + 1

RETURN
END

C ARCOOUT DETERMINES WHAT TO DO WHEN A LINK ENTERS THE SOLUTION

SUBROUTINE ARCOOUT(ZBEST,D,X,CPX,PN,NODEI,NODEJ,NODEC,NODED, - HANG,FCHG,U,IT,INARC,ICOST,CP,MAX,JOIN,H,DNODE,IPIV,FPIV, - TPIV)
INTEGER ANODE,BNODE,D(215),PN(215),NODEI,NODEJ,NODEC,NODED, - HANG,IT(215),INARC,JOIN,H(125),DNODE(300),IPIV,FPIV,TPIV, - ZBEST,FCHG,X(215),CPX(215),U(215),ICOST(215),CP(300),MAX

C DETERMINE IF EITHER NODE IS BEING REACHED FOR THE FIRST TIME.
IF(PN(NODEJ) .EQ. 0 .OR. PN(NODEI) .EQ. 0) THEN
C IF A NEW NODE IS REACHED, THE NODE ARRAYS MUST BE INITIALIZED.
CALL INODE(U,D,PN,X,CPX,IT,NODEJ,NODEI,INARC,ICOST,CP,MAX, - IPIV)
ELSE
C CHECK TO SEE WHICH SIDE OF THE TREE HOLDS THE FLOW. ANODE IS THE LEFT
C SIDE OF THE TREE WHERE X HOLDS THE FLOW. IF INCOMING LINK IS AT CAPACITY
C EXPECT A FLOW DECREASE; OTHERWISE A FLOW INCREASE.
IF(ZBEST .LT. 0) THEN
ANODE = NODEJ
BNODE = NODEI
ELSE
ANODE = NODEI
BNODE = NODEJ
ENDIF
FCHG = MAX

C SYNERGOSTICALLY ITERATE ANODE AND BNODE BACK TO THEIR JOIN, KEEPING TRACK
C OF THE MAX FLOWCHANGE AND THE SIDE OF THE TREE WHERE IT OCCURS.
DO 10 K=1,500
   IF( ANODE .NE. BNODE .AND. FCHG .GT. 0) THEN
      IF(D(ANODE) .GE. D(BNODE)) THEN
         IF(X(ANODE) .LT. FCHG) THEN
            FCHG = X(ANODE)
            NODEC = ANODE
         ENDIF
         ANODE = IABS(PN(ANODE))
      ENDIF
      IF(D(BNODE) .GT. D(ANODE)) THEN
         IF(CPX(BNODE) .LT. FCHG) THEN
            FCHG = CPX(BNODE)
            BNODE = IABS(PN(BNODE))
         ENDIF
      ELSE
         GOTO 101
      ENDIF
   ELSE
      GOTO 101
   ENDIF
10 CONTINUE

C IF MINIMUM FLOW OCCURS ON CPX SIDE, THEN HANGNODE = NODEJ; ELSE
C HANGNODE = NODEI
101 IF((ISIGN(1,ZBEST)*ISIGN(1,NODEC)) .GT. 0) THEN
   HANG = NODEJ
ELSE
   HANG = NODEI
ENDIF

C RESTORE PLUS SIGN TO NODEC; SAVE PREDECESSOR OF NODEC AND JOIN
NODEC = IABS(NODEC)
NODED = IABS(PN(NODEC))
JOIN = ANODE
   IF(FCHG .NE. 0) CALL FLOWUP(ZBEST,FCHG,CP,INARC,NODEI,JOIN,
      X,CPX,FPIV,PN,NODEJ)
   IF(IABS(FCHG) .LT. IABS(CP(INARC))) CALL TREEUP(PN,NODEC,
      H,DNODE,HANG,NODEI,NODEJ,ZBEST,INARC,FCHG,IT,D,X,
      TPIV,NODED,CPX,U)
ENDIF
RETURN
END
SUBROUTINE INODE(U,D,P,N,X,CPX,IT,NODEI,NODEJ,NINARC,ICOST,CP,MAX,
   - IPIV)
   INTEGER D(215),PN(215),IT(215),NODEI,NODEJ,NINARC,IPIV,
   - U(215),X(215),CPX(215),ICOST(215),CP(300),MAX

C WHEN NODE IS REACHED FOR THE FIRST TIME, THIS SUBROUTINE UPDATES THE
C NODE ARRAYS. LINK ENTERS A ZERO FLOW, AND SINCE NO BACKPATH EXISTS,
C THIS IS THE END OF THIS IMPROVEMENT CYCLE.
   IF(U(NODEI) .EQ. MAX) THEN
      D(NODEI) = D(NODEJ) + 1
      PN(NODEI) = NODEJ
      X(NODEI) = 0
      CPX(NODEI) = CP(NINARC)
      U(NODEI) = U(NODEJ) - ICOST(NINARC)
      IT(NODEI) = IT(NODEJ)
      IT(NODEJ) = NODEI
   ELSE
      D(NODEJ) = D(NODEI) + 1
      PN(NODEJ) = NODEI
      X(NODEJ) = CP(NINARC)
      CPX(NODEJ) = 0
      U(NODEJ) = U(NODEI) + ICOST(NINARC)
      IT(NODEJ) = IT(NODEI)
      IT(NODEI) = NODEJ
   ENDIF

   IPIV = IPIV + 1

RETURN
END

C FLOW IS UPDATED WHETHER THE LINK ENTERS THE SOLUTION OR NOT. IF LINK
C DOES NOT ENTER, THIS ENDS THE CYCLE. IF LINK DOES ENTER THE SOLUTION
C THEN TREEUP WILL BE CALLED TO UPDATE ALL THE NODE ARRAYS

SUBROUTINE FLOWUP(ZBEST,FCHG,CP,NINARC,NODEI,JOIN,X,CPX,FPIV,PN,
   - NODEJ)
   INTEGER NODE,NINARC,NODEI,DIR,JOIN,FPIV,PN(215),NODEJ,
   - ZBEST,CP(300),X(215),CPX(215),FCHG

C IF Z<0, THE LINK IS AT CAPACITY AND A FLOW REDUCTION WILL OCCUR TO
C ENTER THE BASIS. FLOWCHANGE WILL BE THE MINIMUM ALLOWED BY INCOMING
C LINK AND BACKPATH.
IF(ZBEST .LT. 0) THEN
    FCHG = MAX0(CP(INARC),(-FCHG))
ELSE
    FCHG = MIN0(CP(INARC),FCHG)
ENDIF

C IF FLOWCHANGE = CAPACITY, THE LINK WILL NOT ENTER THE BASIS. SIGN
C CHANGED ON CAPACITY AND FLOWS ARE UPDATED TO END CYCLE.

IF(FCHG .EQ. CP(INARC)) THEN
    CP(INARC) = - CP(INARC)
ENDIF

DIR = 1
NODE = NODEI

C ITERATE UP BOTH ARMS OF THE BACKPATH ADJUSTING FLOW.
DO 100 I=1,2
    DO 200 J=1,500
        IF(NODE .NE. JOIN) THEN
            X(NODE) = X(NODE) - (FCHG * DIR)
            CPX(NODE) = CPX(NODE) + (FCHG * DIR)
            NODE = IABS(PN(NODE))
        ELSE
            GOTO 300
        ENDIF
    200 CONTINUE
300 NODE = NODEJ
    DIR = -1
100 CONTINUE

FPIV = FPIV + 1

RETURN
END

SUBROUTINE TREEUP(PN, NODEC, H, DNODE, CP, HANG, NODEI, NODEJ,
                   ZBEST, INARC, FCHG, IT, D, X, TPIV, NODED, CPX, U)

C THIS SUBROUTINE IS THE MAJOR PART OF THE PIVOT, UPDATING THE
C NODE LENGTH ARRAYS X, CPX, D, U, PN, IT

INTEGER PN(215), H(125), IT(215), DNODE(300), D(215), FF, NR, NC, NT, LR,
       ORIG, DADJ, NODE, NODE2, NODEC, NODED, NODEI, NODEJ, HANG,
       INARC, LASTP, TPIV,
       CP(300), X(215), CPX(215), FLO, ZBEST, FCHG, LASTX, LASTC, U(215)
LOGICAL LAST
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C MARK THE OUTGOING LINK; FIND ITS ORIENTATION AND LOCATE ITS HEAD
IF(PN(NODEC) .GT. 0) THEN
  NODE = NODEC
  NODE2 = NODED
  FLO = X(NODEC)
ELSE
  NODE = NODED
  NODE2 = NODEC
  FLO = CPX(NODEC)
ENDIF

C ITERATE THROUGH DNODES UNTIL LINK IS FOUND
J = H(NODE)
DO 70 K=1,500
  IF(J .LE. (H(NODE + 1) - 1)) THEN
    IF(DNODE(J) .EQ. NODE2) THEN
      IF(no .EQ. IABS(CP(J))) THEN
        CP(J) = -IABS(CP(J))
      ELSEIF (FLO .EQ. 0) THEN
        CP(J) = IABS(CP(J))
      ELSE
        WRITE(6,71)NODEC,NODED,FLO,TPIV
      ENDIF
    ELSE
      GOTO 20
    ENDIF
  ELSE
    GOTO 20
  ENDIF
  J = J + 1
ENDIF
70 CONTINUE
20 CONTINUE

C CHECK ORIENTATION OF INCOMING LINK BY CHECKING ITS HANGNODE. THEN
C INITIALIZE THE PIVOT VARIABLES.

IF(HANG .EQ. NODEI) THEN
  PF = -NODEI
  NR = NODEJ
  ZBEST = -2BEST
ELSE
  PF = NODEJ
  NR = NODEI
ENDIF

C THERE ARE FOUR POSSIBLE COMBINATIONS OF LINK ORIENTATION AND FLOW
C DIRECTION. BY CHECKING SIGNS OF PF AND ZBEST THESE FOUR ARE CAPTURED.

IF(ZBEST .GT. 0) THEN
  LASTC = IABS(CP(INARC) - FCHG)
  LASTX = IABS(FCHG)
ELSE
   LASTC = IABS(FCHG)
   LASTX = IABS(CP(INARC) - FCHG)
ENDIF

C INITIALIZE THE REMAINING PIVOT TREE VARIABLES, KEEPING TRACK OF THREAD C FROM HANGNODE.
   NC = IABS(PF)
   LR = IT(NR)
   NT = LR
   DADJ = D(NC) - D(NR) - 1
   ORIG = IT(NC)
   NODE = NODED

C FIND NODE S.T. IT(NODE) = NODEC AND CHANGE ITS IT TO THAT OF THE LAST C RIGHR SUCCESSOR OF NODEC.
DO 80 M = 1,500
   IF(IT(NODE) .NE. NODEC) THEN
      NODE = IT(NODE)
   ELSE
      GOTO 81
   ENDIF
80 CONTINUE
81 LAST = .FALSE.

DO 90 M2 = 1,500
   IF(.NOT. LAST) THEN
      LAST = (NR .EQ. NODEC)
      IT(NC) = NR
      NC = NR
      DADJ = DADJ + 2
   DO 91 M3 = 1,500
      IF(IT(NC) .NE. LR) THEN
         NC = IT(NC)
         D(NC) = D(NC) + DADJ
         U(NC) = U(NC) + ZBEST
      ELSE
         GO TO 99
      ENDIF
91 CONTINUE
99 IF(D(NT) .GT. D(NR)) THEN
   IT(NC) = NT
   DO 92 M4 = 1,500
      IF(D(NT) .GT. D(NR)) THEN
         NC = NT
         NT = IT(NT)
         D(NC) = D(NC) + DADJ
         U(NC) = U(NC) + ZBEST
      ELSE
         GOTO 98
      ENDIF
92 CONTINUE
98 ENDIF
LR = NR
NR = IABS(PN(LR))
LASTP = PN(LR)
PN(LR) = PF
D(LR) = D(LR) + DADJ
U(LR) = U(LR) + ZBEST
PF = - ISIGN(LR, LASTP)

ELSE
GOTO 97
ENDIF

90 CONTINUE

C COMPLETE THREAD UPDATE; IF NO DEC’s THREAD PREDECESSOR IS THE HANGNODE,
C THEN ONLY ONE EXTRA CONNECTION NEEDS TO BE MADE; OTHERWISE BOTH NODES
C MUST BE CONNECTED.

97 IF(NODE .EQ. HANG) THEN
   IT(NC) = MT
ELSE
   IT(NC) = ORIG
   IT(NODE) = MT
ENDIF

C UPDATE X AND CPX ALONG THE PIVOT STEM, WHICH IS TURNED UPSIDE DOWN.
C THIS STEP IS MANIPULATING THESE FLOWS WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN UPDATED
C IN FLOWUP SO THAT THEY CORRESPOND TO CHANGES IN THE TREE.
NODE = LR
DO 100 L = 1,500
   IF(IABS(PN(NODE)) .NE. HANG) THEN
      X(NODE) = CPX(IABS(PN(NODE)))
      CPX(NODE) = X(IABS(PN(NODE)))
      NODE = IABS(PN(NODE))
   ELSE
      GOTO 101
   ENDIF
100 CONTINUE

C ENTER X AND CPX OF THE INCOMING LINK.
101 X(NODE) = LASTX
CPX(NODE) = LASTC
TPIV = TPIV + 1
RETURN
END
THIS SUBROUTINE IS USED TO OUTPUT THE LINK FLOW AND COST DATA FROM
BOTH THE FLOW-DEPENDENT AND THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHMS.

SUBROUTINE NETOUT(ONODE, DNODE, ICOST, FLOW, PN, X, CPX, KEY, NARC, NNODE,
                    MAXN, TCFLOW, CP)
  INTEGER PN(215), DNODE(300), NARC, ICOST(215), X(215), ONODE(300),
             FLOW(215), CPX(215), KEY, NNODE, MAXN, TCFLOW, CP(300), TCTRAN

KEY = 1 DESIGNATES THAT OUTPUT IS FROM THE FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM
K10 = 0

IF(KEY .EQ. 1) THEN
  WRITE THE HEADING, NOTE THAT THE OUTPUT INCLUDES THE FLOW AND THE COST
  FOR EVERY LINK IN THE NETWORK. THESE ARE THE EQUILIBRIUM FLOWS AND
  COSTS ON THE LINKS. THE PATH COSTS HAVE BEEN GIVEN ALREADY FROM MATRIX.

  WRITE(*,5)
  WRITE(6,5)
  5 FORMAT(//////,20X,'LINK FLOW & COST DATA',/,18X,
               '(FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM)',///,11X,'ORIGIN',7X,
               'DESTINATION',3X,'AMOUNT OF',9X,'LINK',/,12X,
               'NODE',11X,'MODE',9X,'FLOW',12X,'COST',///)

  DO 10 N = 1, NARC
  C OUTPUT IS GIVEN ONLY FOR THE REAL LINKS IN THE NETWORK. MAXN DESIGNATES
  C THE ARTIFICIAL NODE, AND LINKS TO THAT NODE ARE EXCLUDED.

  IF(ONODE(N) .NE. MAXN .AND. DNODE(N) .NE. MAXN) THEN
    WRITE(*,12) ONODE(N), DNODE(N), FLOW(N), ICOST(N)
    WRITE(6,12) ONODE(N), DNODE(N), FLOW(N), ICOST(N)
  12 Format(4115)
  ENDIF
  10 CONTINUE

TCFLOW IS THE TOTAL COST GIVEN BY THE FLOW-DEPENDENT EQUILIBRIUM FLOW
PATTERN.

  WRITE(*,11) TCFLOW
  WRITE(6,11) TCFLOW
  11 FORMAT(//////,7X,'FLOW-DEPENDENT ALGORITHM TOTAL COST = ',18,///)

ENDIF

TCTRAN = 0
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C KEY = 2 DESIGNATES THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM OUTPUT.

IF (KEY .EQ. 2) THEN

C FOR THE TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM, EVERY NODE IN THE SOLUTION INITIATES
C ONE LINK TO ITS PREDECESSOR. THESE ARE THE ONLY LINKS LISTED, AND ONLY
C THE FLOW IS GIVEN SINCE THE COST IS THE SAME AS THE FLOW-DEPENDENT
C LINK COSTS ABOVE.

WRITE(*,15)
WRITE(6,15)
15 FORMAT(///,20X,'LINK FLOW DATA',/,'TRANSSHIPMENT'
   - 'ALGORITHM',///,11X,'ORIGIN',7X,'DESTINATION',3X,
   - 'AMOUNT OF',/,'NODE','NODE',9X,'FLOW',//)

DO 50 I = 1,NARC

IF (PN(I) .GT. 0) THEN

C OUTPUT GIVEN IN THE SAME ONODE-DNODE-FLOW FORMAT AS FOR THE FLOW-
C DEPENDENT OUTPUT. IF PN(I) > 0, THE LINK IS ORIENTED AS DESIGNATED.
C IF PN(I) < 0, THE LINK IS THE BACKLINK OF THE NODE BEING EXAMINED.
C OUTPUT HAS BEEN WRITTEN TO SIMPLIFY ITS USE.

WRITE(*,20) I,PN(I),X(I)
WRITE(6,20) I,PN(I),X(I)

DO 90 K7 = 1,NARC

IF (I .EQ. ONODE(K7) .AND. PN(I) .EQ. DNODE(K7)) THEN
   TCTRAN = TCTRAN + ICOST(K7) * X(I)
ENDIF
90 CONTINUE

ELSEIF (PN(I) .LT. 0) THEN

WRITE(*,20) IABS(PN(I)),I,CPX(I)
WRITE(6,20) IABS(PN(I)),I,CPX(I)

DO 91 K8 = 1,NARC

IF (PN(I) .EQ. ONODE(K8) .AND. I .EQ. DNODE(K8)) THEN
   TCTRAN = TCTRAN + ICOST(K8) * CPX(I)
ENDIF
91 CONTINUE

ENDIF

20 FORMAT(3I15)
50 CONTINUE
DO 92 K9 = 1,NARC

IF(CP(K9) .EQ. -IABS(CP(K9))) THEN
  IF(K10 .EQ. 0) THEN
    WRITE(6,89)
  ENDIF
  FORMATT///,17X,'CAPACITATED LINKS')
ENDIF

IF(PN(K9) .EQ. 0) THEN
  TCTRAN = TCTRAN + ICOST(K9) * IABS(CP(K9))
ENDIF

WRITE(6,88) ONODE(K9),DNODE(K9),IABS(CP(K9))
FORMAT(3115)
K10 = K10 + 1

92 CONTINUE

IF(K10 .EQ. 0) THEN
  WRITE(6,87)
  FORMATT12X,'THERE ARE NO LINKS CARRYING FLOW AT CAPACITY')
ENDIF

WRITE(*,95) TCTRAN
WRITE(6,95) TCTRAN
FORMAT///,7X,'TRANSSHIPMENT ALGORITHM TOTAL COST = ',18,///)

ENDIF

RETURN
END
C THIS SUBROUTINE INVESTIGATES THE LOWEST COST PATH FROM ONE ORIGIN
C TO ON DESTINATION USING CONSTANT LINK COSTS.

SUBROUTINE SINGL3(ONODE, DNODE, ICOST, FLAG, NLINK, NARC)
INTEGER MINE, UTIL, ONODE(300), DNODE(300), FLAG(300), SI(215),
- P(215), PA(215), NARC, ICOST(215), L(215)

C INPUT BY USER IS REQUIRED. ORIGIN AND DESTINATION MUST AGREE WITH
C NETWORK STRUCTURE INPUT.

DATA SI, L, P, PA/215*0, 215*9999, 215*0, 215*0/
DATA MINE, UTIL/0, 0/
KOUNT = 1

WRITE(*,1030)
WRITE(6,1030)
1030 FORMAT(20X,'MINE OPTIONS',//,2X,'CHOOSE THE ORIGIN MINE FROM THE'
- ' LIST OF ORIGIN MINES ON THE FIRST MENU',//,8X,'(NOTE: FOR ANY'
- ' LINK WHERE FLAG = 1, THE ONODE REPRESENTS AN ORIGIN MINE)',//
- ' ENTER THE ONODE NUMBER OF YOUR CHOSEN MINE')
READ(*,1040) MINE
WRITE(6,1040) MINE
1040 FORMAT(BN,13)

WRITE(*,1050)
WRITE(6,1050)
1050 FORMAT(/,20X,'UTILITY DESTINATION CHOICES',//,2X,'CHOOSE THE '
- 'DESTINATION UTILITY FROM THE LIST ON THE LAST INPUT MENU',//
- ' (NOTE: FOR ANY LINK WHERE FLAG = 3, THE DNODE REPRESENTS'
- ' A DESTINATION UTILITY)',//,2X,'ENTER THE DNODE NUMBER OF '
- ' YOUR CHOSEN UTILITY')
READ(*,1060) UTIL
WRITE(6,1060) UTIL
1060 FORMAT(BN,13)

C THIS IS THE SAME GREEDY ALGORITHM AS USED IN MATRIX, BUT RUN ONLY ONCE
C HERE.

C L= PATH LENGTH TO A GIVEN NODE ON LOWEST COST PATH
C SI= LABEL VARIABLE - DESIGNATES NODES TO INVESTIGATE AS ONODES

L(MINE) = 0
SI(MINE) = 1
DO 19 J=1,NARC

C FIND NEXT NODE TO BE INVESTIGATED AS AN ONODE

IF(SI(J) .NE. 0) THEN
  DO 19 K=1,NARC

250
C INVESTIGATE ALL LINKS FROM THE NODE - UPDATE PATH COST AND PREDECESSOR C AS REQUIRED.

    IF (ONODE(K) .EQ. J) THEN
        IF (L(DNODE(K)) .GT. L(ONODE(K)) + I Cost(K)) THEN
            L(DNODE(K)) = L(ONODE(K)) + I Cost(K)
            P(DNODE(K)) = ONODE(K)
        ENDIF
    ENDIF

C DESIGNATE ALL DNODES REACHED AS POTENTIAL ONODES

    SI(DNODE(K)) = 1
    ENDF
19 CONTINUE
    SI(J) = 0
    ENDF
14 CONTINUE

C WHEN COST TO DESTINATION FOUND, RECONSTRUCT PATH BACK TO THE ORIGIN C USING PREDECESSOR ARRAY.

    PA(1) = P(UTIL)
    DO 205 K = 2, NARC
        IF (PA(K-1) .EQ. KINE1) THEN
            C OUTPUT PATH BY LINK AND GIVE TOTAL PATH COST.
            WRITE(*,200) MINE1, UTIL, L(UTIL), (PA(J), J = KOUNT-1, 1, -1)
            WRITE(6,200) MINE1, UTIL, L(UTIL), (PA(J), J = KOUNT-1, 1, -1)
            200 FORMAT('THE MINIMUM COST FROM MINE ', 13, ' TO UTILITY ',
                        13, 'IS ', 18, ' AND THE ROUTE PASSES THROUGH NODES ',
                        50(13, ', '))
        ELSE
            PA(K) = P(PA(K-1))
            KOUNT = KOUNT + 1
        ENDF
    205 CONTINUE

C IF NO PATH EXISTS, THE L VALUE WILL REMAIN AS INITIALIZED.

    IF (L(UTIL) .EQ. 9999) THEN
        WRITE(*,206) MINE1, UTIL
        WRITE(6,206) MINE1, UTIL
        206 FORMAT('THERE IS NO PATH FROM MINE ', 13, ' TO UTILITY ', 15)
    ENDF
2 RETURN
END