

Technical Report No. 103
BOTANICAL SPECIES OF PLANTS EATEN AND INTAKE
OF CATTLE AND SHEEP GRAZING
SHORTGRASS PRAIRIE

R. W. Rice and M. Vavra
Animal Science Division
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

GRASSLAND BIOME
U.S. International Biological Program
December 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Title Page	i
Table of Contents	ii
Abstract	iii
Introduction	1
Procedure	1
Animals	1
Sample Processing	2
Results	3
Animal Management Phase I	3
Botanical Composition of the Diet	3
Dietary Nutrient Content	9
Utilization and Intake	9
Winter Samples	12
Phase II	14
Summary	15
Literature Cited	16
Appendix I	17

ABSTRACT

Esophageal fistulated heifers were used to obtain samples of the diets of light and heavy use pastures. Esophageal fistulated heifers and sheep were used to collect dietary samples on the herbivore diet pastures. Grasses made up a major portion of the diet in 1970. They were relatively more important than in 1969. This was probably due to a reduced availability of forbs because of 1970 precipitation. Blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*) was the most important grass eaten. Other grasses of importance were western wheatgrass (*Agropyron smithii*), red threeawn (*Aristida longiseta*) and needle-and-thread (*Stipa comata*). The sedge, *Carex heliophila*, was also important. Forbs were less prominent in the diets of cattle on the light use pasture in 1970 than in 1969. Environmental limitations due to precipitation may have reduced the availability of forbs to cattle. Scarlet globemallow (*Sphaeralcea coccinea*) was again the most important forb and was apparently a preferred forb. Many other forbs were noticed in the diet, but were not of continued individual importance. Shrubs were a very minor component of the diet. Dietary crude protein was adequate throughout the summer. Dry matter digestibility declined through the season and was lower in July and August on the heavy use pasture. Dry matter intake and digestible energy intake increased seasonally. The intake per animal was lower in the heavy use pasture. Winter samples were collected in December of 1969. These indicate that winter diets include a much greater proportion of the half shrub fringed sagewort (*Artemisia frigida*) in the light use treatment, whereas shrubby plants on the heavy use pasture were not nearly as important. The thistle (*Cirsium undulatum*) was evidently eaten in unusual quantity in the heavy use pasture at the time winter samples were obtained.

INTRODUCTION

The major means for entry of humans into the food chain of grasslands is through the domestic herbivores. Conversion of grazing lands into meat for humans which is highly nutritious is an essential function of domestic herbivores. Through this conversion of fibrous materials which are not utilizable by humans, grasslands become an important entry for humans into the grasslands ecosystem. The purpose of the large herbivore studies is to determine their impact on the ecosystem so that the grassland resource can be managed efficiently without environmental degradation to the long-term benefit of man.

PROCEDURE

Animals

The project during 1970 had two phases. In phase I, esophageal fistulae were established in yearling heifers. These heifers, four to each treatment, were randomly allotted to either the light use pasture or the heavy use pasture. They were included with the normal heifers, who acted as grazers on the two pastures. After a month adjustment period, the heifers were used for collection of esophageal dietary samples and for total fecal collections.

Esophageal collections were obtained twice each week during the months of June, July, and August. A 24-hour fecal collection with fecal bags was obtained once each week. A winter dietary sample was obtained during December.

Diet samples were obtained both in the morning and in the afternoon. The best success with sampling was after the once-a-day late morning watering period which was established because of the project relating water intake to

dry matter intake on the pastures. The animals were weighed biweekly and watered once daily.

In phase II, two heifers and four yearling wether sheep with esophageal fistulae were used to sample the herbivore study pastures. These pastures were also the site of dietary studies with antelope and bison. This phase of the large herbivore studies was designed to establish the dietary relationships in the context of grasslands. Extrapolation to the larger study area will be possible since cattle diet studies were common to both areas.

Sample Processing

Dietary samples were put into air tight plastic bags and frozen. For analyses, the bags were thawed, mixed, and divided into two portions. One portion was used for the preparation of microscopic slides according to the procedure of R. M. Hansen. These slides were sent to Fort Collins where they were analyzed for botanical composition by microscopic characteristics (R. M. Hansen 1969).

The second portion was dried in a forced air oven at 60°C, ground through a 40 mesh screen, and analyzed for ash, nitrogen, gross energy and acid detergent fiber, cellulose, and lignin (Van Soest 1968). *In vitro* dry matter digestibility was determined (Tilley and Terry 1963) and *in vivo* digestion estimated by a regression equation established from known *in vivo* samples (Rice, personal communication).

Fecal samples were weighed, sampled, and analyzed for botanical species, ash, moisture, nitrogen, and gross energy as above.

RESULTS

Animal Management Phase I

It was theoretically possible to collect a total of 32 samples per treatment per month. However, sampling failure occurred due to a number of reasons so that 10-14 total samples were usable for analyses during each month. Reasons for failure to sample were:

- (i) Contamination with regurgitated material.
- (ii) Animal refusal to eat.
- (iii) Inadequate amount of sample.
- (iv) Failure or damage of equipment.
- (v) Animals not in condition for sampling.

Heifers were used instead of steers in 1970 due to animal management problems when steers and heifers were mixed together during the previous year. It is more difficult to collect fecal samples from heifers since their anatomy makes separation of urine and feces a problem. In order to separate feces and urine excretions, a deflector designed for use with restrained animals was modified and fit to the grazing heifers used in this study. This deflector was successful. It would also be possible to collect urine quantitatively with this deflector if a suitable container could be developed to hold the urine. Urinary collections were attempted with the use of bags constructed of truck tire inner tubing. Losses of urine were common with this bag due to tearing or separation of the collection hose and bag, or leakage of urine from the bag when the animals lay down.

Botanical Composition of the Diet

The botanical species identified in the esophageal samples are listed in Table 1. There were fewer species found in 1970 than in 1969. This was

Table 1. Weight percent of plants in esophageal samples of heifers grazing the light and heavy use pastures in 1970.

Scientific Name	Grazing Treatment	June		July		August	
		Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.
<i>Agropyron smithii</i>	Heavy	7.2 (2.8) ^{a/}	14	4.8 (1.7)	14	6.3 (2.8)	3
	Light	2.3 (0.3)	10	6.3 (0.7)	10	3.0 (3.0)	2
<i>Aristida longiseta</i>	Heavy	8.7 (3.0)	14	8.7 (2.9)	14	7.3 (2.1)	3
	Light	1.7 (0.3)	10	4.4 (0.6)	10	3.8 (0.9)	2
<i>Bouteloua gracilis</i>	Heavy	42.4 (4.3)	14	41.2 (6.9)	14	33.1 (11.7)	3
	Light	29.7 (3.2)	10	44.6 (1.8)	10	24.4 (5.2)	2
<i>Carex</i> sp.	Heavy	17.2 (2.3)	14	13.6 (5.9)	14	9.0 (6.2)	3
	Light	9.6 (0.7)	10	13.5 (0.7)	10	22.8 (21.8)	2
<i>Chrysopsis villosa</i>	Heavy	0.4 (0.37)	14	19.1 (7.2)	14	0.4 (0.4)	3
	Light	0 (0)	10	2.2 (0.5)	10	17.6 (7.0)	2
<i>Festuca octoflora</i>	Heavy	3.8 (1.9)	14	.1 (0.5)	14	.2 (0.2)	3
	Light	2.7 (0.5)	10	.4 (0.1)	10	0	2
<i>Sphaeralcea coccinea</i>	Heavy	3.8 (0.7)	14	7.9 (2.0)	14	0 0	3
	Light	2.1 (0.3)	10	12.0 (1.2)	10	2.5 (1.4)	2

Table 1. (Continued)

Scientific Name	Grazing Treatment	June		July		August	
		Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.
<i>Stipa comata</i>	Heavy	4.5 (4.5)	14	0.47 (0.3)	14	0	3
	Light	40.9 (3.7)	10	1.0 (0.3)	10	0	2
Total grasses	Heavy	87.0 (2.1)	14	65.3 (6.9)	14	57.3 (13.2)	3
	Light	87.4 (1.5)	10	72.1 (1.6)	10	56.4 (25.5)	2
Total forbs	Heavy	12.4 (2.0)	14	32.1 (8.6)	14	42.7 (13.2)	3
	Light	11.5 (1.5)	10	26.7 (1.7)	10	43.2 (25.9)	2

^{a/} Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

probably due to the difference in precipitation during the two years. The amount of rain during 1970 was much less during the growing season, and many of the annual forbs were not established or grew in very small amounts so that they were effectively eliminated from dietary consideration by the animal. The measurement of availability of different plants in the pastures is essential before preference for plant species can be established.

The weight percent of various plant taxa in the diet during the summer are also shown in Table 1. Grasses made up a major portion of the diet in both light and heavy treatments. The amount of grass declined through the summer. There was not a large difference in grass percent in light and heavy pastures, although there tended to be less grass in the diet of the heifers in the heavy use pasture in July than in the light use pasture. All precipitation in 1970 was lower, and the response in terms of forb growth and availability for grazing appeared to be much less.

The major grasses making up the diet were blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*), western wheatgrass (*Agropyron smithii*), needle-and-thread (*Stipa comata*), red threeawn (*Aristida longiseta*), and six weeks fescue (*Festuca octoflora*). The proportion of the grass-like sun sedge (*Carex heliophila*), was also important. Buffalograss (*Buchloe dactyloides*) was present in most samples but was never observed in an amount exceeding 3% of the total diet. Blue grama was by far the most important grass. It made up an average of 38.9% of the diet in the heavy use pasture and 29.6% of the diet in the light use pasture. Blue grama was greatest during July, followed by August and June. The amount of blue grama in the diet was considerably more than that found in 1969.

The second most important grass was red threeawn. The grass was especially important in the heavy use pasture. It made up an average of

8.2% overall in the heavy use pasture and 3.3% in the light use pasture. Red threeawn was important only during the month of June of 1969 in the heavy use pasture.

Western wheatgrass was eaten in moderate amounts throughout the summer in both heavy and light use pastures (average 6.1% in heavy pastures and 3.9% in light pastures. More was eaten in the heavy use pasture in June and August and less in July.

Needle-and-thread grass was of considerable importance in the light use pasture in June (40.9%). During the balance of the season in the heavy use pasture, it was a minor component of the diet. Apparently, this species was palatable only for a limited period during the early growing season and was actively sought out early, then neglected, either due to a lack of availability or to a change in desirability to cattle. This grass was of minor importance during 1969.

The other grass which was found in appreciable amounts was six weeks fescue. It appeared at a level of about 3% of the diet during June and was found in trace amounts during July and August. The growth characteristics of this forage, rapid development to maturity, apparently affect its availability and palatability to grazing cattle. It was not important in the 1969 grazing study.

The weight percent of sun sedge was relatively high in both treatments. It occurred in a fairly constant amount in both treatments (heavy 13.3% and light 15.3%). This forage was apparently eaten when available and was fairly palatable throughout the season. In 1969, the amount of this plant declined as the season progressed.

The weight percent of total forbs in both light and heavy treatments increased as the summer grazing season progressed. The amount of forbs in

the diet was not different according to treatment. The amount of forbs grazed throughout the grazing season was considerably less in the light grazed treatment than in 1969; this difference did not vary appreciably in the heavy treatment. This relationship indicates that certain forbs are preferred by cattle and that they will select them if given the opportunity. Forbs in 1970 were suppressed by the environment, thereby reducing the availability in the light grazed treatment, whereas in the heavy grazed treatment the incidence of favored forbs was reduced due to grazing pressure and not due to the effects of environmental differences, especially moisture availability.

The importance of scarlet globemallow (*Sphaeralcea coccinea*) to the total forbs noted in 1969 was again reinforced in 1970. This forb is apparently sought actively by cattle and is usually used more heavily in July than in June or August. The same pattern of use was exhibited during both 1969 and 1970. The 1970 levels of usage were much lower than in 1969, and this was probably due to moisture limitation on its availability. When available, it appears to be sought out by cattle.

The only other forb of importance during 1970 was hairy goldaster (*Chrysopsis villosa*). This forb was important in July in the heavy use pasture and in August in the light use pasture. Many other forbs were noticed in the esophageal samples (Table 1), but these were of minor or momentary importance to the diets of cattle. The decrease observed in the occurrence of forbs in the diet of cattle in 1970 as compared to 1969 was probably due to a reduced availability of this type of plant as a result of a smaller amount of precipitation.

Dietary Nutrient Content

The crude protein content of esophageal samples was adequate in all cases for the cattle in this study (Table 2). It averaged about 11% for the grazing season with protein values slightly lower on the heavy vs. light grazing treatment and slightly lower in August than in June or July. The protein values were slightly lower for June and July than in 1969 but were as high in August. The limitation of these pastures to productivity of heifers would not be protein at these levels in the diet.

The gross energy values of esophageal samples did not vary appreciably according to season or intensity of use (Table 2). Similar gross energy values were obtained for the dry fecal material (Table 3). Analyses for crude fiber, cellulose, and lignin are not yet available.

Utilization and Intake

Dry matter digestibility was lower for the July and August samples in the heavy use pasture. In contrast, they remained at a relatively high level throughout the summer on the light use pasture (Table 2). This illustrates the ability of cattle to select a digestible diet when the opportunity for selection is not limited by grazing pressure. The digestibility of the diet in June was similar for both treatments. On the heavy use pasture, the cattle selected diets as digestible as those on the light use pasture when grazing pressure and advancing maturity had not limited selection opportunity.

The daily digestible energy intakes of the esophageal heifers indicate a response to the grazing treatment and to season (Table 4). The animals on the heavy use pasture ate more digestible energy than those on the light use pasture in June. However, in July and August the digestible energy intake

Table 2. Chemical analysis of esophageal fistula samples.

Analysis	Grazing Treatment	June		July		August	
		Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.
Crude protein	Heavy	11.6 (1.2) ^{b/}	11 ^{a/}	10.7 (1.3)	19	9.9 (1.8)	9
	Light	11.8 (1.9)	3	11.7 (1.6)	9	10.1 (2.4)	5
Gross energy (kcal/gm D.M.)	Heavy	3.8 (0.3)	19	3.8 (0.5)	24	3.9 (0.3)	12
	Light	3.8 (0.3)	4	4.1 (0.3)	16	4.0 (0.2)	9
Percent dry matter	Heavy	64.8 (7.4)		58.4 (9.8)		52.2 (7.1)	
	Light	63.5 (6.3)		64.6 (5.3)		61.2 (4.9)	

^{a/} Refers to number of samples analyzed to date.
^{b/} Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

Table 3. Gross energy of fecal samples (kcal/gm D. M.).

	June	July	August
Heavy	3.4	3.7	3.7
Light	3.5	3.9	3.8

Table 4. Daily intake.

Daily Intake	Grazing Treatment	June	July	August	
Digestible energy (kcal/head)	Heavy	7832.4	5740.5	7485.3	$\bar{x} = 7019.0$
	Light	6320.9	10,497.0	11,537.8	$\bar{x} = 9451.9$
Dry matter (kg/225 kg animal)	Heavy	2.8 (1.4) ^{a/}	2.8 (0.7)	3.3 (0.7)	$\bar{x} = 2.97$
	Light	2.5 (0.5)	4.0 (0.2)	4.6 (0.6)	

^{a/} Numbers in parentheses are standard errors.

of the light use cattle was greater than those on the heavy use treatment. Intake on the heavy use pasture was especially limited in July. The intake was higher in August, probably in response to late July and early August precipitation. Cattle on the light use pastures increased their intake seasonally. The same relationships were noted in the dry matter intakes of the esophageal cattle (Table 4). The intakes of the animals were lower than expected for these types of cattle. The weight changes observed in these cattle reflect the effect of the low intakes. Animals on the light use pasture were able to maintain a small gain throughout the grazing season, whereas those on the heavy use treatment lost weight in June and July and made a small gain in August (Table 5). It should be recalled that these animals were fistulated and handled intensively throughout the summer and could not be expected to respond to the same degree as normal animals with respect to weight gain and intake. However, normal animals would be expected to follow the same pattern of response to the fistulates. Intact animals on the same grazing treatments were able to make a moderate gain on the heavy use pasture and a reasonably good gain on the light use pasture (Dyck and Bement 1971). It is proposed that future intake estimations will be accomplished with intact heifers.

Winter Samples

Dietary samples were collected on the heavy and light use pastures in December of 1969. The number of species present in the winter diets of cattle was less than that observed in the summer (Table 6). During the winter, many species were not present on the pastures or were unacceptable to the animals. Three grasses, one half-shrub, two forbs, and one sedge

Table 5. Weight changes (kg) for heifers (summer 1970).

	Animal No.	June	July	August
Heavy	78	+0.5	+3.1	+3.2
	88	-21.8	+7.3	+15.9
	73	-3.2	-7.7	+8.2
	98	-2.3	-4.1	+8.6
Light	31	-2.3	+5.5	+55.0
	27	0	+6.8	+11.3
	10	+18.1	-1.8	+14.1
	684	-5.4	-3.2	+20.5

Table 6. Proportion (% frequency) of selected individual species in esophageal samples (January 1970).

	Heavy	Light
Red threeawn	3.3	3.4
Blue grama	25.5	51.5
<i>Carex</i> sp.	3.3	15.5
Total grassland grasslike plants	32.8	73.9
Fringed sagewort	11.0	21.4
Wavyleaf thistle (<i>Cirsium undulatum</i>)	29.3	1.7
Scarlet globemallow	1.4	2.1
Unknown forbs	24.1	0
Total forbs and shrubs	67.2	26.1

were noted in the diets of cattle grazing on the heavy and light use pastures. It is interesting that the same species were consumed in both pastures.

Blue grama was the predominant grass consumed in both pastures. The high incidence of wavyleaf thistle consumed in the heavy use pasture may be overestimated due to sampling techniques. Animals were allowed to graze from 30-45 minutes with collection bags on. If an animal found a thistle plant during the collection time, almost the entire period would be taken in consuming this plant. Also, a 24% incidence of unknown forbs was recorded for the heavy use diets.

Thistle parts were rather coarse and required extended maceration by a Waring blender to obtain parts small enough to spread on slides. Other forbs present may have been subdivided so finely that identification was not possible. Therefore, a large quantity of unidentified forbs was present.

Grasses were much more important in the heavy use pasture diets (Table 6). The cattle on the light use pasture ate mostly grass and the half-shrub, fringed sagewort, whereas the cattle in the heavy use pasture ate equivalent amounts of grasses and forbs and a lesser amount of fringed sagewort. The effects of summer grazing pressure appear to make important limitations on the type of winter diets consumed.

Phase II

A limited sampling with cattle and sheep on the small diet pastures was accomplished in 1970. More extensive sampling was not possible for several reasons:

- (i) Priorities for sampling by other herbivore groups.
- (ii) Lack of time and labor for more sampling.

- (iii) Limitations on use of pastures due to the level of use desired on these areas.
- (iv) Maintenance of fistula problems with esophageally fistulated cattle.

There were dietary samples collected during each month of the summer. These samples were prepared for botanical and chemical analyses. These analyses have not been finished at this date.

SUMMARY

Grazing intensity affected the proportion of botanical species eaten, the nitrogen content of the diet, the digestibility of the diet, and the intake of dry matter and digestible energy of cattle. These differences were reflected in lower gain per animal on the heavy use pasture. Heavy grazing limited the ability of cattle to select as high a quality diet, or to eat as much as those on lightly grazed pastures.

The winter samples also indicated that heavy summer grazing influenced opportunity of animals to select a quality diet.

The differences observed in dietary makeup and utilization between the two years studied indicate the influence of environmental differences from year to year on the grazing habits of cattle. It is essential that a study such as this be continued over a period of years and that information on detailed plant production and availability of individual plant species present under varying environments be available for the synthesis effort.

Necessary information for proper synthesis efforts must include production of plants by species, detailed site and vegetation maps, and grazing behavior of cattle as influenced by environment, season, and intensity of use. Further studies should be organized to provide this information.

LITERATURE CITED

- Dyck, G. W. and R. E. Bement. 1971. Herbage growth rate, forage intake, and forage quality in 1970 on heavily and lightly grazed blue grama pastures. U.S. IBP Grassland Biome Tech. Rep. No. 94. Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins. 15 p. (In process).
- Hansen, R. M. 1969. Personal communication. CSU, Dept. of Forestry and Wildlife. Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Rice, R. W. and M. Vavra. 1969. Botanical species of plants eaten and intake of steers grazing light, medium, and heavy use shortgrass range. U.S. IBP Grassland Biome Tech. Rep. No. 12. Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins. 18 p.
- Tilley, J. M. A. and R. A. Terry. 1963. A two-stage technique for the *in vitro* digestion of forage crops. J. British Grassland Soc. 18:104-111.
- Van Soest, P. J. 1968. Determination of lignon and cellulose in acid detergent fiber with permanganate. J. Ass. Offic. Agr. Chem. 51:780-785.

APPENDIX I

FIELD DATA

Data on large herbivore diets collected in 1970 at the Pawnee Site in connection with this study is Grassland Biome Data Set A2U601B. A description and listing of the data follow.

Data Description

The data are recorded in small subsets. For each subset a variable or number of fields are read from each of a variable number of slides. Data are then recorded with one header card per subset and a variable number of cards for information on species encountered, with up to nine species per card.

<u>Column</u>	<u>Contents</u>
	<u>Header Card</u>
1-2	Data type (17)
3-4	Site (11-Pawnee)
5-6	Number slides this subset
7-9	Number fields this subset
10-19	Investigator
43-44	Number slides this subset
45-46	Number fields per slide
64	Number data cards following this subset
66-67	Year
68-70	Subset number
71-72	Lab identifier

Species Cards

1-4	Genus/species
5-7	Number of fields in which this species was observed
8-11	Genus/species
12-14	Number of fields in which this species was observed

This scheme is repeated across the card until up to nine species are recorded.

64-72 Same as header card

BOGR	14ARLO	5AGSM	1CAHE	2						1	70	15	1
PCR	3BOGR	16ARLO	5AGSM	2CAHE	1SPCO	1				0	70	15	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	16	1
SPCO	1BOGR	16ARLO	4AGSM	1						1	70	16	1
STCO	1BOGR	15ARLO	4CAHE	1						0	70	16	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	17	1
BOGR	17AGSM	1ARLO	5CAHE	1						1	70	17	1
BOGR	15CAHE	4AGSM	3ARLO	3						0	70	17	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	18	1
STCO	2CAHE	2BOGR	17ARLO	1SPCO	2AGSM	1				1	70	18	1
AGSM	2BOGR	16KOSC	1CAHE	2ARLO	1					0	70	18	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	19	1
AGSM	12BOGR	8ARLO	2CAHE	2						2	70	19	1
BOGR	13AGSM	9OECO	1STCO	2SPCO	1ARLO	1				0	70	19	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	20	1
ARLO	13SPCO	2BOGR	3LARE	1ASTR	1CHNA	2				1	70	20	1
CAHE	2BOGR	4ARLO	11CHNA	2SPCO	3LARE	2				0	70	20	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	21	1
BOGR	19AGSM	2SPCO	2ARLO	1STCO	1					1	70	21	1
BOGR	16SPCO	3ARLO	3AGSM	1OECO	1STCO	1				0	70	21	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	22	1
BOGR	14AGSM	6ARFR	2CAHE	1ARLO	4					1	70	22	1
CAHE	2AGSM	2BOGR	17ARFR	1OECO	1ARLO	1				0	70	22	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	23	1
BOGR	7CAHE	4ERDI	7AGSM	2ARFR	2ARLO	2SPCO	1			1	70	23	1
ARLO	3CHVI	6BOGR	8CAHE	5ERDI	1PSTE	1				0	70	23	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	24	1
AGSM	2ARLO	4BOGR	12CAHE	2SPCR	3SPCO	2				1	70	24	1
BOGR	14ARLO	5CAHE	2AGSM	4SPCO	2					0	70	24	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	25	1
BOGR	16CAHE	4AGSM	7ARLO	3ERDI	2					1	70	25	1
BOGR	13AGSM	10CAHE	7ERDI	1						0	70	25	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	26	1
BOGR	16ARLO	6CAHE	2SPCR	2AGSM	1					1	70	26	1
CAHE	3BOGR	15AGSM	1ARLO	1						0	70	26	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	27	1
SPCO	1BOGR	14AGSM	8ARFR	1OECO	3SPCR	2				1	70	27	1
CAHE	5SPCR	2BOGR	8AGSM	4OECO	1					0	70	27	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	28	1
BOGR	19CAHE	5AGSM	3OECO	1ARLO	1ASTR	1SPCO	1SPCR	1		1	70	28	1
AGSM	5STCO	4BOGR	15LIPU	1OECO	2SPCO	1				0	70	28	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	29	1
BOGR	18AGSM	2CAHE	2LIPU	1SPCR	1OECO	1				1	70	29	1
BOGR	18ARLO	1SPCR	4AGSM	4CAHE	1					0	70	29	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	30	1
BOGR	16SPCR	3SPCO	1AGSM	2CAHE	1					1	70	30	1
BOGR	16STCO	1AGSM	3CAHE	1ARLO	1SPCO	1				0	70	30	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	31	1
BOGR	14ARLO	4SPCO	1CAHE	5AGSM	3SPCR	4				1	70	31	1
BOGR	17ARLO	3AGSM	2OECO	1STCO	1					0	70	31	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	32	1
BOGR	15AGSM	2SPCR	2CAHE	1OECO	1SPCO	1STCO	1			1	70	32	1
BOGR	19STCO	1SPCR	3							0	70	32	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	33	1

BOGR	13AGSM	5ARLO	5SPCR	1STCO	2CAHE	1				1	70	33	1
CAHE	5BOGR	14STCO	2ARLO	2AGSM	2SPCR	1				0	70	33	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	34	1
AGSM	9BOGR	12CAHE	3							1	70	34	1
AGSM	5BOGR	15LIPU	2CAHE	20ECO	1ARLO	1STCO	1			0	70	34	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	35	1
BOGR	11SPCR	2ARLO	7STCO	2AGSM	4					1	70	35	1
SPCR	18BOGR	11ARLO	7AGSM	3STCO	2CHVI	1				0	70	35	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	36	1
ARLO	5BOGR	14AGSM	3CAHE	4						1	70	36	1
BOGR	13ARLO	4AGSM	1CAHE	50ECO	2					0	70	36	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	37	1
ARFR	18BOGR	18CAHE	2SPCO	1						1	70	37	1
BOGR	17SPCO	10ECO	1AGSM	1CAHE	1					0	70	37	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	38	1
BOGR	14ARLO	2SPCR	1SPCO	1AGSM	1CAHE	1				1	70	38	1
AGSM	18BOGR	17CAHE	3SPCO	2ARLO	1					0	70	38	1
1711	2 40	RICE							220	2	70	39	1
AGSM	5BOGR	16CAHE	2ATCA	1STCO	10ECO	1SPCO	1			1	70	39	1
AGSM	8BOGR	130ECO	1STCO	1SPCO	1CAHE	2				0	70	39	1