

8

KKS has styles of PL & DORAL that are less impacted than others  
 Where problem is, is not  
 When was problem first seen

No indication that filters are problems

Test method needs to be evaluated - Fates in mfg, especially those used more, are having problems.

Pat 1. WL 11 vs CL 85

11% 5% DIET

Pat 2. Isolate WP production vs TV - CL 100 & WL 100

3. Study difference between PL & DORAL

Focus is HCD

Everything shows a neg slope x: CPB products

Some of Pat's pre-perf products are running into problems  
 w/ ↑ dil'n @ a time w/ ↓ draft.

4. Evaluate MORE draft (MORE L+100)

LEB 5. Competitive Audit data - see if competi. & also

6. Characterize blends w/o CRES

w/o BPU - NO CRES, UTI

w/ G19

Note: Cindy Davis - ↑ fines, draft ↑

8% - 28% → 134 to 143 mm

• Blend H609 (LHNM)  
 H611 (CAMEL U,  
 PL Blend H624

Data - both  
 HCD - both

Audit Filling Cap - actual

Audit particle size  $\pm 1/2$

either FATE - actual draft

either size - both

To look for a shift

Bill + Lisa

7. Old DIET vs New DIET - various incl. in B3

8. a) Compare Blend H609 w/ itself - configuration

b) H609 to H611 - difference of DIET

Pat 9. CAMEL 70 - Rod draft; 1/2 BPU

10. Time span - 1/95 to current

GLE { H609  
 CAMEL Wides  
 Hogs  
 Jumbo } FF

H611  
 CL 85

MORE 120

WL 85

V100