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#### Abstract

CROMAX simulates crosscut-first, then rip operations as commonly practiced in furniture manufacture. This program calculates cutting yields from individual boards based on board size and defect location. Such information can be useful in predicting yield from various grades and grade mixes thereby allowing for better management decisions in the rough mill.

The computer program CROMAX was written in ASCII FORTRAN on the University of Wisconsin's UNIVAC 1100/80 computer. The complete program listing is included as an appendix.
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## Introduction

## Determining Cutting Yield

Knowledge of the cutting yields attainable from a given lumber grade is vital to such basic rough mill decisions as ordering raw material and measuring mill performance. However, traditional methods of acquiring this information may be inadequate in light of present high production costs and low product demand. Mill studies are expensive, and valid only for the study day's conditions. Historical records may be biased by changes in within-grade lumber quality among suppliers, or over time, or by changes in cutting bills.

General cut-up models, such as CROMAX, can predict attainable cutting yields without upsetting mill production and can be run for a variety of cutting bills. Use of information from computer simulation models which determine cutting yields offers great benefits to mill operators. An example is the Rough Mill Improvement Program, developed by Huber and Harsh ( $3,4,5$ ), ${ }^{2}$ which offers dimension plants a tool to determine the lowest cost mix of rough lumber grades for a given cutting bill.

Computer-derived cutting yields can also be used as a measure of mill performance, comparing actual mill yield to the highest theoretical yield. This gives the manager a standard which is not influenced by normal variations in production or raw material. To derive this highest theoretical yield, some sort of computer simulation is necessary. The computer program CROMAX was designed to simulate the crosscut-first operation in order to calculate, within the model's constraints, an optimal cutting yield from a given board. CROMAX calculates yield based upon the submitted cutting bill, the value of each size cutting, and the size and location of defects (e.g. knots, splits, checks, etc.) within the board.

[^0]Determining the cutting yield from a given board requires (1) accurate description of the unique characteristics of the board-board width, board length, and defect location (e.g. knots, splits), (2) awareness of mill requirements as presented by the cutting bill and, the most difficult to attain, (3) ability to make the best crosscut decision followed by an equally good rip decision.

At first glance, obtaining an accurate description of a board would seem a simple task; the board itself is available to the crosscut operator. What better description would one need? However, lighting, viewing position, and speed of the line may hinder the operator's ability to see the whole board and its defects. Technological improvements to automatically measure the board and locate defects and types of defects would be a great asset in making an accurate picture of the board available to an operator or a computer. In lieu of such technology, board descriptions as used in this study have been hand tallied. Without automatic defect detection equipment, current decision models have no immediate real time on-line possibilities. The hand recording of board data (dimension and defect information) has been used as a method of acquiring this information since the early 1960's $(1,7,8)$. The method used for recording this board information was described by Lucas (6) in 1973. Each board is depicted as a rectangle with an $X-Y$ grid superimposed over it. (The grid origin is at the lower left corner of the board.) Defect locations are read from the grid and tallied (fig. 1).


Figure 1.-Boards being tallied for defects. (122 719)

To obtain the best cutting yield from a given board, the operator or computer must be supplied information on the quantity of each dimension cutting required to meet mill demand. Thus each cutting takes on a relative valuecuttings which are easy to come by, such as narrow, short cuttings, take on a lesser value, while those which are more difficult to recover, such as wide, long cuttings, have a higher value. It is very important that the computer model be able to incorporate information on the relative value of each cutting dimension to determine the best available cutting yield of a given grade. Therefore, models which only look at the surface area of cuttings as a measure of yield neglect the real possibility that higher valued cuttings are being sacrificed to attain greater surface area.

Once the board data and value of the cuttings have been supplied, the board must be crosscut, then ripped, in such a way as to get the highest total value of cuttings from the board. The decision of where to crosscut is the most difficult decision since the crosscuts could be placed anywhere within the board, limited only by the cutting lengths. In contrast, the location of rip lines is dictated by the crosscut boundaries, the cutting widths required, the location of defects, and the width of the board. Once the crosscut decision for cutting one piece has been made, the yield of the rest of the board is affected. A bad decision may sacrifice overall yield from the board to recover one or two good cuttings.

## Program Background

The CROMAX program is a further development in the Forest Products Laboratory's ongoing research program for developing computer models to improve yield in secondary wood processing.

The first of these models was the YIELD program developed in 1966 by Wodzinski and Hahm (9), which has been used in several cutting yield studies $(1,7,8)$. While a great improvement over manual efforts to calculate optimal cutting yields, the program suffered several limitations which prevented it from realistically modeling existing cut-up operations and made it obsolete by today's standards.

The high cost of computer usage at the time necessitated the use of shortcuts which minimized computer time, but which at the same time led to finding less than optimal yields. YIELD searches for the largest clear area between defects and places the longest, widest cutting possible in it. This area is blocked out, and the next largest clear area found and filled, and so on. Given a choice of two cuttings with equal surface areas, the program is biased to the longer cutting. This frequently leads to a situation where the program chooses a long cutting and a very short one over two of medium-length, which in total may be more valuable to the plant.

A mixture of crosscut-first and rip-first operations on different boards results by placing the cuttings in the clear area, then fitting the kerfs around the cuttings. Since most plants are set up for one or the other, either rip-first or crosscut-first, the YIELD program did not accurately model either operation, although it was biased toward the crosscut first.

Efforts to more realistically model the industry led to the development of the OPTYLD program (2), which modeled rip-first operations. The CROMAX program was developed from OPTYLD as the need for a crosscut-first model was recognized.

## The Model CROMAX

The CROMAX computer program is the first step in the development of computer models of crosscut-first operations which will be suitable for planning and decisionmaking. CROMAX processes an unlimited number of boards, one board at a time. It retains no memory of previous boards or their solutions. The program represents a board as a rectangle superimposed on a Cartesian coordinate system with the lower left corner at the origin. The description of the board is stored in a binary matrix with each cell of the matrix set to either 1 to represent a defect or 0 (zero) no defect. A sample board is shown in figure 2. Before starting the crosscutting process, the ends of the board are trimmed off. The amount trimmed off each board is specified at run-time and is constant for all boards in the run. CROMAX requires specification of all allowable lengths and widths of cuttings. Cutting yields are generated by repeatedly going through all possible combinations of cutting lengths that will fit within the board.

After the ends of the board are trimmed off, the process of generating cutting-yield solutions is begun. The first solution begins at the left end of the board. Crosscuts are placed such that the distance between two crosscuts is equal to the shortest allowable cutting length. Such an area, where the distance between two crosscuts meets or exceeds the shortest allowable cutting length, will be referred to as a section. Each section is ripped to yield the highest value of cuttings. Figure 3 shows this first combination. The value of the cuttings is summed and stored as total cutting value. No defects are allowed within a cutting.

The next series of cutting yields is obtained by maintaining the same section lengths but varying the location of the beginning of the sections. Defects may lie within some of the sections. Defect coordinates of the board are shown in table 1. If a defect ends within the section, an alternative solution is generated by moving the beginning of the section to the end of the defect. Figures 4 through 8 show the first five alternative solutions to the first crosscutting solution. Positions of crosscut lines are moved first at the right end of the board and gradually to the left. Figure 4 shows the first alternative to figure 3. The beginning crosscut of the 11 th cutting length section in figure 3 is relocated to the end of the defect which ends at the $X$ coordinate 428 in figure 4. The next alternative (fig. 5) moves the crosscut to the end of the defect ending at the $X$ coordinate 438 . For each of these alternatives no other cutting length section to the left is affected. Since crosscuts had been made at $X$ coordinate 416 in the original crosscutting solution, the alternative involving this defect has already been calculated. The next defect ends at $X$ coordinate 353 , so a crosscut is placed at this location for alternative 3 (fig. 6). The two sections to the right of 394 must then be moved; this results in the loss of three cuttings from the two previous solutions. Alternative 4 moves the crosscut to 339 (fig. 7). While this alternative picks up another cutting over the previous solution, the cuttings are narrower, plus no cuttings can be made from the area of 380-420. Alternative 5 places a crosscut at 318 (fig. 8). This results in the same number of cuttings as in the previous alternative, but some of the cuttings made here are wider.

Once the location of a section is moved, all section locations to the right must also be moved to accommodate this change. The sections in the new location are then ripped again and the value of cuttings obtained is summed. Their total is compared with the previous high total cutting value. If the new total is higher than the previous high total, the new total replaces the old. All alternative locations of cutting sections are tried and their values compared with the old high value. After the alternatives to the cutting length solution combination have been tried, the next cutting length solution is tried, then its alternates. In this way, all cutting length combinations and alternates are tried.

After all solutions have been tried, the best solution is printed and the next board is read. The best solution for the sample board is shown in figure 9 and table 2.

## Program Description

Computer program CROMAX is divided into 11 modulesthe main program, 9 subroutines, and 1 function. A flowchart illustrating the basic structure of the program is shown in figure 10. Table 3 lists these modules and their respective entry points. The complete CROMAX program is presented in. appendix A.

## Main Program

The main program (MAIN) serves as the input/output center of the program as well as coordinating the processing of the board. Figure 11 describes MAIN. When the program is begun, the run-time options are read. These options control the decisionmaking capabilities of CROMAX throughout the run. The trimming options specify the amount to be trimmed off each end of the board. All allowable cutting lengths and cutting widths must be specified. Table 4 lists these decisionmaking run-time options.

Supplying a table of weighted values for cuttings of different dimensions is optional. If a table is not supplied, the total yield of a crosscutting decision is obtained by summing the surface area of the cuttings available. If a table is used, the total yield of a crosscutting decision is obtained by summing the value (surface area times weight factor) of the cuttings available. The use and derivation of the weighted value table (table 5) is discussed in appendix B.

CROMAX builds a table of the best rip width combinations for a given clear area. This table is built upon and used by all boards within the sample. After the run-time, decisionmaking options are read, WINTL (an entry of WFIND) is called to initialize the possible best rip width combinations for a given clear area.

CROMAX then reads the board information and translates the board into a packed binary matrix where each bit corresponds to the $1 / 4$-inch coordinate grid on the board. A value of 1 is assigned to each grid within a defect while a 0 is assigned to each grid within a clear area. The board is rejected if its length or width exceed the allowable board dimensions. The maximum number of cutting length sections within the board is then found. Yield and cutting length section combinations are then initialized and the first cutting length section combination is generated.
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Figure 2.-Sample enoard. Crossed out boxes represent defects (areas silled with $1 /$ s in binary
matrix) and remaining areas are clear (filled with O's in matrix). All values are in $1 / 4$-inch units. (ML83 5126)

Figure 2.-Sample board. Crossed out boxes represent defects. (areas filled with 1/'s in binary
matrix) and remaining areas are clear (filled with O's in matrix). All values are in 14-inch units. (ML83 5126) Figure 2.-Sample board. Crossed out boxes represent defects (areas filled with 1's in binary
matrix) and remaining areas are clear (filled with O's in matrix). All values are in 1/4-inch units. (ML83 5126)



Each cutting length section is checked to see if its yield has been calculated before. This is done by calling HOLD. If it has been calculated, its yield is retrieved. The section is also checked by ALTER to see how many defects end within its bounds. These defect coordinates form the alternatives to the cutting length combination which will be attempted; for each defect ending within the section, the beginning of the section is moved to the end of the defect. Subsequent sections are positioned accordingly. CROMAX then calls SAW to cut up all sections that have not yet been calculated. The yields attained from the sections are tallied and totaled, and compared with the previous maximum yield. If the current solution is higher, it and the present combination of cutting lengths are reassigned to be the maximum yield combination. The next alternative position for the cutting length combination is then generated and processed as above. This is repeated for all alternative positions for the cutting length combination. After all alternative positions have been tried, the next cutting length combination is generated and the above cycle is repeated. The coordinates of the cuttings and sawkerfs are not stored, so after all combinations have been calculated, the combination giving the highest yield is rerun and its result printed. The next board is then read. The program stops after all boards have been read and processed.

## Subroutine SAW

Subroutine SAW is described by the flowchart in figure 12. Subroutine SAW scans for clear areas within a given cutting length section. When first entered, SAW initializes the yield of the section to zero. If the length of the section exceeds the smallest possible cutting length (this could only occur after the first combination), RANGE is called to set the boundaries of any salvage cuttings. SAW scans the section first by length and then by width in search of defect areas. If a defect is found, the scanning process is stopped and any clear area tested to see if it meets the minimal width. If it does, RIP is called to rip the section. If the whole cutting length section is found to be free of defects, RIP is called to rip the section into cuttings. The whole section is processed in this way; then, if areas remain which have not been utilized, TRIMIT (an entry of RANGE) is called to locate and salvage cuttings. SAW then returns to MAIN.

## Subroutine RANGE

Subroutine RANGE contains three routines involved in the salvage cutting process-RANGETRIMIT, and STORE. RANGE itself simply initializes to zero the number of actual cuttings found. Entry STORE stores the number of actual cuttings found by RIP and CUTUP. The major routine in RANGE (fig. 13) is TRIMIT, which finds the combination of salvage cuttings giving the highest yield.

Table 1.-Board data for sample board No. 130 (fig. 2)

| Grade 2C |  | Number of defects $=14$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coordinates |  |  |  |
| Lower Y | Lower X | Upper Y | Upper X |
| BOARD |  |  |  |
| 1 | 6 | 49 | 488 |
| DEFECTS |  |  |  |
| 1 | 6 | 3 | 146 |
| 35 | 6 | 37 | 14 |
| 35 | 90 | 49 | 105 |
| 23 | 146 | 28 | 168 |
| 17 | 168 | 27 | 196 |
| 18 | 196 | 25 | 214 |
| 11 | 318 | 24 | 339 |
| 14 | 339 | 15 | 353 |
| 15 | 401 | 25 | 416 |
| 1 | 416 | 20 | 428 |
| 29 | 416 | 49 | 438 |
| 1 | 428 | 3 | 488 |
| 29 | 438 | 34 | 488 |

Note: All values are in 1/4-inch units.

Table 2.-Best cutting solution for sample board (fig. 2)


Table 3.-Subprograms and entries of CROMAX

| Subprogram <br> name | Subprogram <br> type | Additional <br> entries |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| MAIN | Main program | - |
| SAW | Subroutine | - |
| RANGE | Subroutine | TRIMIT, STORE |
| RIP | Subroutine | - |
| AMEND | Subroutine | - |
| ALTER | Subroutine | REVISE |
| CUTUP | Subroutine | - |
| HOLD | Subroutine | INTL, REMEM |
| WFIND | Subroutine | WINTL |
| TSTORE | Subroutine | TINTL, RETREV |
| VALUE | Function | - |

Table 4.-Run-time options

| Option name | Option action | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Card } \\ \text { format }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Trimming* | Any nonnegative integer | $5 \mathrm{X}, \mathrm{IL}$ |
| Maximization | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Any nonnegative integer where if } \\ \text { equal to: } \\ 0 \text { means maximize on surface } \\ \text { area } \\ \text { not } 0 \text { means maximize on value }\end{array}$ | 6X, I1 |
| VALUE TABLE (present only if value maximized) |  |  |$]$

* Values are in 1/4-inch units.
** Values are in inches.

On entry to TRIMIT, the areas defining potential salvageable areas are found. A potential salvageable area is defined as the area between cuttings already obtained or between a cutting and the edge of the board. These areas are tested to see if they meet minimum width criteria for a cutting. If the area fails this test, it is ignored. All the potential salvageable pieces are checked to eliminate duplicates. TRIMIT then attempts to cut up the salvageable area. For each salvage area, TRIMIT attempts to cut it up first by cutting the length back and then by ripping the piece narrower. The solution of each of these processes is saved by calling TSTORE. After all possible salvage cuttings have been found, RETREV (an entry of TSTORE) is called to retrieve the yield of each cutting. The best (highest yielding) combination of cuttings is chosen.

## Subroutine RIP

Subroutine RIP (fig. 14) rips the clear area found in SAW. Upon entry, RIP calls WFIND to find the best combination of cutting widths in that area. For each width RIP calls CUTUP to saw the cuttings. If the area is salvageable (that is, its length exceeds the minimum cutting length), RIP calls STORE (an entry of RANGE) to store the coordinates of the cutting.

## Subroutine AMEND

Because only yield per section, not the coordinates of the cuttings within the section, is stored, it is necessary to rerun the maximum combination to determine cutting and sawkerf coordinates. This is the purpose of AMEND (fig. 15). AMEND is called from MAIN after all combinations have been tried and the maximum yield has been found. AMEND takes each cutting length section, defines its bounds, and calls SAW to cut up the section. The coordinates and dimensions of the cuttings and saw of the cut lines are then available to be included in the program output.

## Subroutine ALTER

Subroutine ALTER (fig. 16) has two entry points - ALTER and REVISE. The purpose of ALTER is to find any possible alternatives within the cutting length combination. Alternatives consist of changing the beginning of the cutting length section so that the section begins at the end of a defect lying within the original section.

ALTER looks at the given bounds of the cutting length section and tests each defect to see if its end lies within the section's bounds. If such a defect is found, ALTER checks to see if that alternative has already been found. If it has not, the upper X coordinate of the defect is stored. The next defect is then tried. After all defects have been checked, ALTER next returns to MAIN.

Entry REVISE retrieves the $X$ coordinate for a given alternate combination.

## Subroutine CUTUP

Using the coordinates sent to it, subroutine CUTUP (fig. 17) defines the cutting and adds the value of the cutting to the section yield total.

Table 5.-Value weighting table. Both lengths and widths are upper bounds of the ranges

| Width Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 8 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 . 0}$ |
| $\underline{\ln .}$ | $-\cdots$ | - | - | - | $-\underline{l n}$. | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $-\cdots$ |
| 1.75 | 0.790 | 0.851 | 0.876 | 0.897 | 0.936 | 1.005 | 1.085 | 1.105 |
| 2.75 | .790 | .851 | .887 | .909 | .964 | 1.038 | 1.083 | 1.189 |
| 3.75 | .790 | .851 | .887 | .921 | .988 | 1.055 | 1.123 | 1.235 |
| 4.75 | .817 | .875 | .897 | .933 | 1.010 | 1.079 | 1.235 | 1.400 |

## Subroutine HOLD

Subroutine HOLD (fig. 18) has three entry points-HOLD, INTL, and REMEM. The purpose of the subroutine is to store the list of coordinates of the cutting length sections tried, and their corresponding yields. The purpose of entry HOLD is to check whether or not a given section has been calculated before. If it has, the yield for that section is retrieved.

Entry INTL simply initializes the number of sections calculated to zero. Entry REMEM stores the yield of a given cutting length section.

## Subroutine WFIND

Subroutine WFIND (fig. 19) has two entry points-WFIND and WINTL. WFIND builds the table of best rip width combinations per clear area. This table is used by all boards within the run. When first entered, WFIND checks to see if the best rip width combination for the given clear area has been calculated yet. If it has, the width combination is retrieved and WFIND returns. If the width combination has not been calculated before, it must be solved. WFIND generates the first width combination by ripping the entire clear area with the smallest width of cutting, taking as many rips as will fit in the area. The value of these cuttings is summed and stored. The next combination of cutting widths is then generated. The total value of the cuttings produced by this combination is then compared with the previous high value. If the current value is higher than the previous high, it becomes the new high value. This process of generating width combinations and testing the sum of the values of these cutting(s) is repeated until all width combinations have been generated. The final high yield and high combination are then stored with the clear area in the table of best width combinations. The rip width combination is then returned as a parameter of WFIND.

Entry WINTL initializes the number of clear areas tested to zero.

## Subroutine TSTORE and Function VALUE

Subroutine TSTORE (fig. 20) has three entry pointsTSTORE, TINTL, and RETREV. TSTORE is a storage location for possible salvage cuttings produced by TRIMIT. Entry TINTL initializes the number of salvage cuttings to zero. Entry TSTORE checks if the salvage cutting is already stored; if it is, TSTORE returns. If not, TSTORE stores the coordinates of the cutting. The value of the cutting is then added to the total value for the cutting process (additional crosscut or rip) from which the cutting was derived. TSTORE then returns. Entry RETREV decides which salvage process (additional crosscut or rip) produces the highest value of cuttings. RETREV then calls CUTUP to saw each of these cuttings and returns. The value of a cutting is determined by referencing the function VALUE (length, width). VALUE (fig. 21) computes the value of a cutting based upon the surface area of the cutting and the weighting factor derived from the value index table.

## Program Input

Input to run CROMAX consists of two types: (1) option cards, and (2) board data cards. The option cards list the decisionmaking options to be used while the board data cards describe the individual boards. Table 6 shows the input used to run CROMAX for the board in figures 2 to 9 .

## Options

Options available in CROMAX allow the user to alter the decisionmaking capabilities of the program. Table 4 lists the options and their respective formats. Briefly:

1. Trimming-The amount of wood trimmed off each end of the board is defined as trimming. CROMAX reads this value in quarter-inch units and trims each board back this amount; no decisions are made as to whether or not a particular board should be trimmed or if more or less wood should be taken off. The amount off is the same for all boards.
2. Maximization-Value of cutting vs. surface area of cutting. CROMAX has the capability of maximizing the yield decision based upon either the sum of the value of the cuttings, or the sum of the surface area of the cuttings. The latter simply maximizes surface area of cuttings alone. The value maximization determines the best cutting solution based upon the surface area of the cuttings and the weighted value. If the total value of cuttings is to be maximized, a value index table must be supplied, Cards are required for (a) the number of lengths and widths to define the table size, (b) the cutting widths to define the row dimension of the table, (c) the cutting lengths to define the columns of the table, and (d) four value cards, one for each width. Entries on this card represent the value index of the corresponding length position for that width. The value index table allows the user great freedom in selecting key cutting dimensions.

## Discussion

Table 6.-Input used to run sample board (fig. 2).
All coordinates are listed: Lower Y-Lower X;
Upper Y-Upper X. All values are In 1/4-inch units.

3. Number of cutting lengths and widths-The number of cutting lengths and the number of cutting widths must be specified.
4. Cutting lengths-The cutting lengths allowed (up to 10) are specified on this card.
5. Cutting widths-The cutting widths allowed (up to 10) are specified on this card.

Board Data
Boards are described as rectangles superimposed on an $X-Y$ grid, with the $X$ direction along the length of the board and $Y$ across its width. Defects are represented as rectangles within the board. Since a rectangle can be defined by two points, only the lower left coordinate and the upper right coordinate of the board or defect are specified. The order of the coordinates is lower $Y$ - lower $X$, then upper $Y$ - upper $X$. The input for the board in figure 2 is given in table 1.

The input for each board consists of three record types: (1) a header card defining the lumber grade, the board number, and the number of defects within the board, (2) a board coordinate card defining the coordinates of the board dimensions (lower left and upper right coordinates), and (3) a defect coordinate card for each defect within the board (up to the number specified on the header card) defining the coordinates of the defect (lower left and upper right coordinates). Data are arranged board after board; the sequence for input goes option cards, board 1, board 2, . . ., board n . . . until the end of file.

As automatic defect detection and use of computer controls within furniture and other rough mills increase, computer decisionmaking and modeling of these processes will become more and more important. It is hoped this paper will encourage others to investigate models for crosscut-first lumber processing.

The model and program CROMAX are the first generation of a computer program to simulate crosscut-first operations. The major objective was to develop the basic algorithms to maximize cutting yield; however, to do this CROMAX processes a very large number of different combinations of section lengths. The computing time involved in the process is prohibitive (frequently 5 minutes or more per 8 -foot board when run on a UNIVAC 1100/80); consequently yield studies such as performed by Schumann $(7,8)$ are not economically feasible. The authors are currently investigating algorithms which will decrease the number of combinations without sacrificing accuracy. Heuristics, which will allow CROMAX "to know" if a cutting decision is "good" or "bad" show the most promise.
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Figure 10.-General flowchart of computer program CROMAX. (ML83 5049)


Figure 11.-Flowchart of main program of computer program CROMAX. (ML83 5043)


Figure 12.-Flowchart of subroutine SAW.
(ML83 5042)


Figure 13.-Flowchart of subroutine RANGE. Entry points are RANGE, TRIMIT, and STORE. (ML83 5044)


Figure 13.-Flowchart of subroutine RANGE. Entry points are RANGE, TRIMIT and STORE. (Continued)(ML835044)


Figure 14.-Flowchart of subroutine RIP. (ML83 5041)


Figure 15.-Flowchart of subroutine AMEND. (ML83 5050)


Figure 16.-Flowchart of subroutine ALTER. Entry points are ALTER and REVISE. (ML83 5045)


Figure 17.-Flowchart of subroutine CUTUP. (ML83 5046)


Figure 18.-Flowchart of subroutine HOLD. Entry points are HOLD, INTL, and REMEM. (ML83 5047)


Figure 19.-Flowchart of subroutine WFIND. Entry points are WFIND and WINTL. (ML83 5048)


Figure 20.-Flowchart of subroutine TSTORE. Entry points are TSTORE, TINTL, and RETREV. (ML83 5051)


Figure 21.-Flowchart of function VALUE. (ML83 5040)
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Subroutine RANGE

| 1 |  | SUBROUTINE RANGE (PLX, PLY, PUX, PUY, SECT) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 |  | IMPLICIT INTEGER(A-Z) |
| 3 |  | LOGICAL BAD, TRIM, LAST. NOGOOD, LHOLE, TWICE, RIP |
| 4 |  | DIMENSION COORD ( 25,4 ) , $\operatorname{TPIECE}(25,4)$, $\mathrm{LCOM}(25)$ |
| 5 |  | CHARACTER*S NBOARD |
| 6 |  | COMTDN/ALL NBCARD, BAD, BDLX,BDLY, BDUX, BDUY |
| 7 |  | COIT10N/TS/BORRD (100.24) |
| 8 |  | COIMON TRANCUTS, SALUCUT (200, 4), LAST, PIECE (180,2). NP IECE |
| 9 |  | COITMON/MAFG/RIPCOM 2,25 ), XDUM1 $(25.2)$, XDUMR $(25.2)$ |
| 18 |  | COIT10N/14R/LENGTH (10), NLEN, WIDTH (10), NWID |
| 11 |  | DATA LX/1/.LY/2/.UX/3/.UY/4/ |
| 12 |  | $\mathrm{NP}=0$ |
| 13 |  | LMAX=RIPCOM (1, SECT) |
| 14 |  | IF (LAST)LMAX=RIPCOM 2 , SECT) |
| 15 |  | RETURN |
| 16 |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |
| 18 |  | ENTRY TRIMIT |
| 19 | C *** | CHECK IF POSSIBLE TRIM PIECES EXIST |
| 20 | C | LRITE (6,280) |
| 21 | 200 | FORMAT(25X. 'TRIMIT ENTERED') |
| 22 |  | LHOLE=. TRUE. |
| 23 |  | IF (NP.GT. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) UHOLE $=$. FALSE . |
| 24 |  | LIMIT=NP |
| 25 |  | IF (LHOLE) LIMIT $=1$ |
| 26 |  | TP=1 |
| 27 |  | DO 28 I=1,LIMIT |
| 28 |  | IF (BAD) GO TO 20 |
| 29 |  | TJICE=.FALSE. |
| 38 |  | TP IECE (TP, LX) =PLX |
| 31 |  | TPIECE (TP, UX) = PUX |
| 32 |  | IF (. NOT. LHOLE)GO TO 10 |
| 33 |  | $\operatorname{TPIECE}(T P, L Y)=$ BDLY |
| 34 |  | TPIECE (TP,UY) =BDUY |
| 35 |  | TP=TP +1 |
| 36 |  | G0 T0 28 |
| 37 | 10 | TPIECE (TP.LY) $=$ CQORD ( $\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{UY}$ ) +1 |
| 38 |  | IF (TPIECE (TP,LY).GT. BDUY)GO TO 19 |
| 39 | 15 | IF (I.LT.LIMIT) THEN |
| 40 |  | TPIECE (TP, UY) $=$ COORD ( $\mathrm{I}+1, \mathrm{LY})-1$ |
| 41 |  | ELSE |
| 42 |  | TPIECE (TP, UY) = BDUY |
| 43 |  | ENDIF |
| 44 | 17 | IF ( $(T P$ IECE (TP, UY)-TPIECE (TP,LY) ) .GE.WIDTH (1) ) TP=TP + 1 |
| 45 |  | IF (TP.LE.25)GO TO 19 |
| 46 |  | BAD $=$. TRUE. |
| 47 |  | URITE (6, 18) NBORRD |
| 48 | 18 | FORTAT (15X,20(1H*), OVERFLOW IN TRIMIT*, AS, 20 (1H*) ) |
| 49 |  | TP $=25$ |
| 50 |  | 60 T0 28 |
| 51 | 19 | IF (TUICE) 60 TC 20 |
| 52 |  | TWICE $=$. TRUE. |
| 53 |  | TPIECE (TP, UY) $=$ COORD $(\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{LY})-1$ |
| 54 |  | IF (TPIECE (TP,UY).LE.BDLY)GO TO 28 |
| 55 |  | IF (I.EQ.1) THEN |
| 56 |  | TPIEEE (TP,LY) = BDLY |
| 53 |  | ELSE |
| 58 |  | TPIECE (TP, LY) $=$ COORD $(1-1, \mathrm{UY})+1$ |
| 59 |  | ENDIF |
| 60 |  | TPIECE (TP, LX $)=$ PL $X$ |
| 61 |  | TPIECE (TP, UX = PUX |
| 62 |  | GO TO 17 |
| 63 | 20 | CONTINLE |
| 64 |  | IF (BGD) RETURN |
| 65 |  | TP=TP-1 |
| 56 |  | IF (TP.LE. 0 ) RETURN |
| 67 |  | IF (TP.LT.2)G0 TO 24 |
| 68. | C *** | MPKE SURE H'OO TP'S ARE DUPLICATED |
| 69 |  | TEST $=1$ |
|  | 179 | ICOPY-9 |
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## Appendix B: Use and Derivation of Value Weighting Table

The best decision on crosscutting a board is dependent not only upon what clear areas exist within the board but what types of cuttings are required for the end products. The highest yield of total surface area of cuttings may be attained by sawing the boards into short, narrow cuttings; however, if each of these cuttings require additional processing such as edge gluing or fingerjointing, the value of the decision is diminished by the additional steps required between initial crosscutting and a finished end product. The desirability as well as availability of types of cuttings must be considered in the decision. Cuttings which are easy to get, such as short and narrow cuttings, take on a relatively low value when weighting the value of cutting dimensions. Cuttings which are more difficult to recover such as long, wide cuttings take on a high value. Also, cuttings which have high demand may take on relatively high values. In summary, cuttings of different dimensions are available in different proportions and are required in different proportions. Since these proportions may not be the same, some weighting as to desirability of cuttings should be considered.

The value weighting table used by CROMAX is a matrix dimensioned four rows by eight columns. The rows correspond to upper limits of rip widths while the columns correspond to upper limits of cutting lengths. Each cell specifies the weighting value for a cutting of given dimensions. So if the data in table 5 were used, the weighting value of 0.921 would be assigned to any cutting with a length greater than 35.0 but less than 42.0 inches and a width greater than 2.75 but less than 3.75 inches. Thus, for a cutting of dimension $3.75 \times 40$ inches, and given value weighting from table 5 , CROMAX would calculate the value:

Value =
(weighting factor) X (length of cutting) X (width of cutting) 144
so substituting a cutting of dimension $3.75 \times 40.0$ inches and table 5 factor

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Value }=\frac{0.921 \times 40.0 \times 3.75}{144} \\
\text { Value }=0.959
\end{gathered}
$$

This value does not represent the dollar value of the cutting but rather the weighting factor to be used in comparisons with the weighting factor of other cuttings. The quantity is divided by 144 in order to make a conversion to square feet for convenience.

## Use of Value Weighting Table

The primary use of the value weighting table is to place a weighting factor on the desirability of a cutting. Without such a factor the program would be unable to discriminate between alternative decisions when surface areas were equal. For example, if surface area only of cuttings is considered, four 1.75 - by 9.00 -inch cuttings would have the same desirability as one $1.75-$ by 36.00 inches. A greater weighting factor on the 1.75 - by 36.00 -inch cutting would ensure that it would be chosen over the smaller cuttings. Using table 5, the sum of the values of the four 1.75 - by 9.00 -inch cuttings is 0.346 , while the value of a 1.75 - by 36.00 -inch cutting is 0.392 .

The value weighting table can also be used to insure recovery of certain size cuttings. This could be done by placing a very high value on the highly desirable dimensions while placing a very low or zero value on the other sizes. A weighting value of zero would still yield allowable cuttings since CROMAX never discards allowable cuttings, but these would be salvage cuttings saved intead of wasting clear wood.

## Derivation of a Value Weighting Table

Developing a value weighting table can be a major analysis in itself. The weighting factors are a function of the type of processes used in the mill operation (i.e., edge gluing or no edge gluing), the demand for cuttings of various dimensions, and the availability of the cuttings within the grade mix.
Since a purpose of running CROMAX is to determine the yield of cuttings within a lumber grade, it may seem recursive to use the same component in developing the weighting table. However, some experimental idea of how hard cuttings are to get should be conveyed within the table; if all cuttings occur at similar frequency, this factor may not be needed.

In developing the value weighting table, let $W$ be the $4 \times 8$ matrix of weighting factors where $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{i}}$, is the weighting factor for a cutting whose width is between width,--, to width, and whose length is between length,-, to length, ( $\mathrm{i} \leq 4$ and $\mathrm{j} \leq$ 8). If $i$ or $j$ is 1 , the lower bound is zero.
$D_{i j}$ is the demand for cutting ${ }_{i j}$. This may just be the number of pieces of that dimension needed (minus discards) for production. However, if edge gluing or fingerjointing is used, the value of the potential demand for the cutting being used in this process should be included.
$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ is the "difficulty" rating for the cutting-how "hard to get" the piece actually is in comparison to its demand. This could be a proportion rating where 1.0 would equal the most difficult piece or could be a general 1 to 10 scaling of difficulty. About any consistent schema would do.

Putting this information together, a reasonable equation for weighting factor would be:

$$
W_{l l}=H_{11} \times \frac{D_{\|}}{\sum_{k=1}^{4} \sum_{m=1}^{8} D_{k m}}
$$

Other alternative ways of developing a value weighting table exist. It would be possible also to develop a table based upon the actual dollar value of a finished end product and the cost of the components within the product. Such a method would give at least as good a result as the above method. Another method would be to translate the present cutting bill into a value weighting table and then use CROMAX to give feedback as to where surplus or deficiency exist between CROMAX projections and the cutting bill.

## U.S. Forest Products Laboratory.

CROMAX-A Crosscut-First Computer Simulation Program
to Determine Cutting Yields, by Pamela J. Giese and
Jeanne D. Danielson, Madison, Wis., FPL 1983.
39 p. (USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. FPL-38)
The program CROMAX was designed to simulate crosscut-first, then rip operations as commonly practiced in furniture manufacture. It also calculates cutting yields from individual boards based on board size and defect location.

Keywords: Crosscut, rip, cutting yields, defect location, lumber grades
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