

# THE EFFECT OF MINERAL SUPPLEMENTATION ON THE COLOR AND MYOGLOBIN CONCENTRATION OF PORK MUSCLE

Thesis for the Degree of M. S. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY Wayne Edward Henry 1959 .



,

# 

# 

- · · ·

వర్షకాల సౌకర్యం కార్యాలు ఉంది. సౌకర్యం సౌకర్యం యాండి సార్థించింది. సౌకర్యం ప్రతి ప్రతి సౌకర్యం సౌకర్యం సౌకర్యం ప్రతి ప

1 Strate Concerns

1 - 1 - 1 - North State - Stat

# THE EFFECT OF MINERAL SUPPLEMENTATION ON THE COLOR AND MYOGLOBIN CONCENTRATION OF PORK MUSCLE

.

By

Wayne Edward Henry

AN ABSTRACT

Submitted to the College of Agriculture Michigan State University of Agriculture and Applied Science in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Animal Husbandry

**1**959

atter Approved:

.

المائية المحمد المح المحمد المحمد

and the second second

1 . . . **.** 

### ABSTRACT

Two trials were conducted using 36 purebred Hampshire and 44 crossbred hogs to determine the effects of breed, and zinc, iron, and copper supplementation on color and myoglobin content of pork muscle using sections of the <u>Longissimus dorsi</u>. Surface color measurements were made by use of Munsell spinning disks and myoglobin values were determined spectrophotometrically.

Analysis of variance indicated no significant effect of mineral supplementation upon myoglobin concentration of the <u>Longissimus dorsi</u>. (Trial I. F = 0.30; Trial II, F = 0.45). In addition, non-significant relationships were found upon comparing breed to the myoglobin concentration of fresh sample (F = 0.42) and myoglobin concentration on fatfree, moisture-free basis (F = 2.62). The latter comparison was found to be approaching significance.

By use of the correlation coefficient, highly significant relationship was found between index of fading and myoglobin concentration (r = -0.69) indicating the feasibility of using the Munsell spinning disks as a method of predicting myoglobin content of pork muscle. Nonsignificant correlation coefficients were obtained upon comparing index of fading with ether extract (0.21) and total moisture (-0.16). Correlation coefficients obtained upon comparing myoglobin concentration to ether extract and total moisture were non-significant (-0.29 and -0.13, respectively). The results indicated a very low relationship between fat and moisture content of pork muscle and its color as measured spectrophotometrically or by disk colorimetry.

# 

# and the part of the state of the

ŕ

# N 1 1

LANDER DE LA DESTRUCTURE MELANE ANDER DE LA DESTRUCTURE MELANE SCRUCTURE DE LA DESTRUCTURE FRANK DE LA DESTRUCTURE

· · · ·

# THE EFFECT OF MINERAL SUPPLEMENTATION ON THE COLOR AND MYOGLOBIN CONCENTRATION OF PORK MUSCLE

By

Wayne Edward Henry

A THESIS

Submitted to the College of Agriculture Michigan State University of Agriculture and Applied Science in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Animal Husbandry

1959

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

> The author wishes to express his sincere thanks and appreciation to L. J. Bratzler, Professor of Animal Husbandry, for his continuous guidance, unfailing interest and encouragement during the course of this study. His inspiration and help will always be appreciated.

Sincere thanks and acknowledgment are due to Dr. A. M. Pearson and Dr. R. J. Deans for their assistance in killing and cutting the animals in this experiment, to Mrs. Dora Spooner for her aid in the statistical analysis and to Mrs. Beatrice Eichelberger for typing this manuscript.

Above all, the author wishes to express his gratitude to his wife, Bonnie, for her encouragement, sacrifices, understanding, and aid in making this manuscript possible.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page
I	INTRO	DUCTION	1
II	REVIE	W OF LITERATURE	2
	A.	Color of Fresh Muscle Tissue	2
	B.	Color Measurements	4
	C.	Factors Affecting Color of Muscle Tissue	7
111	EXPER	IMENTAL PROCEDURE	11
	A.	Source of Animals	11
	B.	Sampling Procedure	13
	C.	Color Measurements	14
	D.	Myoglobin Determination	14
	E.	Fat and Moisture Determination	17
	F.	Statistical Analysis	17
IV	RESUL	TS AND DISCUSSION	19
	A.	Preliminary Studies	<b>19</b>
	B∙	Relationship of Spinning Disks With Fat, Moisture, and Myoglobin Content	20
	C.	Effect of Zinc, Iron, and Copper Supplementation on Myoglobin Concentration. Trial I	24
	D.	Effect of Zinc and Copper Supplementation of Calcium Levels of 0.55 and 1.31 Percent. Trial II	27
	E.	Effect of Breed on Myoglobin Concentration	29
۷	SUMMA	RY AND CONCLUSIONS	32

VI	BIBLIOGRAPHY	•	•	•	•	•	٠	٠	٠	•	٠	•	٠	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	٠	•	33
VII	APPENDIX	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	37

Page

### INTRODUCTION

Desirable color of lean meat, although it does not affect the nutritive value, is recognized and demanded by the consumer. Wilson <u>et al.</u> (1959) stated that the ideal color of fresh pork is greyishpink. Largelere <u>et al.</u> (1956), in a consumer preference study, found that  $61_{\bullet}8$  percent of the dark colored pork chops were selected over greyish-pink pork chops.

Myoglobin, the pigment primarily responsible for meat color, is affected by many factors. Such factors as age, pH, breed, species, exercise, and the ration fed have been found to influence the concentration of myoglobin in the muscle. Bray <u>et al.</u> (1959) found that the supplementation of copper and iron in veal calf rations had a significant effect on the color and myoglobin content present of the muscle.

"Two-toned" hams and off-colored pork is a problem which has confronted the meat packer and retailer for years. Therefore, if a method could be found to produce a desirable and uniform color of fresh lean meat, one of the problems of merchandising could be eliminated.

The objectives of this investigation were to determine the effect of mineral supplementation of swine rations upon the color and myoglobin content of pork muscle. Surface color studies were made and the concentration of muscle pigment was determined spectrophotometrically. Moisture and fat contents were determined in order to study their relationship to surface color and myoglobin concentration.

-1-

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### A. Color of Fresh Muscle Tissue

Hoagland (1915), Brooks (1933) and Lavers (1948), stated that the red color of lean meat was due to oxyhemoglobin. Brooks (1937) reported that the color of lean meat was due primarily to the myoglobin present within the muscle fibers. In the same paper, Brooks reported the presence of hemoglobin in muscle fiber, but in quantities too small to have any significant effect on color. In 1932, Theorell (1947) isolated and crystallized the muscle pigment, myoglobin. Morgan (1936) confirmed Theorell's findings by crystallizing myoglobin from horse heart. Hill (1933) observed spectrophotometrically that there was a difference between myoglobin and hemoglobin. Hill also pointed out that myoglobin had a greater affinity for oxygen than did hemoglobin.

Schweigert (1956) stated that myoglobin is a conjugated protein that contains a heme moiety (iron-containing porphyrin compound) attached to a globin molecule. Its function in the live animal is to accept oxygen from the hemoglobin of the blood for use in oxidative, energy-yielding reactions within the cell. Hawk <u>et al.</u> (1954) reported that myoglobin has a higher affinity for oxygen than has hemoglobin. Thus, the intracellular pigment (myoglobin) may be fully oxygenated at lower oxygen tensions than the blood pigment (hemoglobin). The relative amounts of hemoglobin and oxyhemoglobin (oxygenated hemoglobin) present in blood will depend upon the concentration of oxygen present, which in turn is proportional to the oxygen tension (Henry's Law). Henry's law states that the dissociation of oxyhemoglobin per unit lowering of oxygen tension is greater at a low tension than at a high tension. Poel (1949) stated that myoglobin exists in the muscle as a distinct pigment and because of its high affinity for oxygen, may act as a store of oxygen for use in muscle contraction. Schweigert (1954) reported that the heme portion of the porphyrin compound gives rise to the color of myoglobin. However, the color of heme is modified considerably by the attachment of the protein globin and other colorless constituents.

Lewis (1954), using electrophoretic separation, reported that muscle pigment contains two compounds. He suggested that twenty percent of the muscle pigment was a hemoprotein. Husaini <u>et al.</u> (1950), extracting total pigment from beef muscle, found that ninety to minetyfive percent was myoglobin. Craig <u>et al.</u> (1956) found thirty-five percent of total muscle pigment to be hemoglobin and sixty-five percent to be myoglobin. Broumand (1953) concluded that the bright red color of beef is due to the presence of 90 to 100 percent oxymyoglobin and 10 to 0 percent metmyoglobin.

Currently, the opinion of many meat workers is that the myoglobin of fresh muscle tissue, which is purplish in color, exists in the reduced state. Upon exposure to air, the myoglobin becomes exygenated, giving the desirable bright red color. However, upon extended exposure to air, the myoglobin is oxidized to metmyoglobin, which is

-3-

(1956), the effect of nutrition and age on color of beef muscle. The Hunter Color and Color Difference Meter is a tristimulus colorimeter that measures color on three scales, brightness, redness, and yellowness, which are read directly from the instrument.

Kennedy <u>et al.</u> (1926), in studying the identity of myoglobin, used a Bausch and Lomb spectrophotometer for color measurements. Bull <u>et al.</u> (1942) determined the color of beef muscle by use of a spectrophotometer. Hall <u>et al.</u> (1944) used color paddles to study dark-cutting cattle.

Disk colorimetry was developed in the laboratories of the United States Department of Agriculture for close tolerance measurements of color and for facilitating the observation of numerous samples (Nickerson, 1946). The Munsell renotations of hue, value, and chroma were applied to the data. The Munsell color system is commonly used with the spinning disks, as well as with other systems for naming different colors. Mackintosh (1932), in a study on dark-cutting beef, used the spinning disks in measuring the color of muscle tissue. He classified the color of beef muscle in terms of the percentage of red and black of the spinning disks used. Mackintosh et al. (1935), in another study of dark-cutting beef, explained the effect of finish on color. They found significant correlation coefficients of .610 and .685 between finish and brilliance (value), and between finish and chroma, respectively. In this study, Mackintosh et al. converted the percentages of red, yellow, black and white obtained from the spinning disks to Munsell renotations of hue, value and chroma. They suggested

-5-

findings in that no difference in myoglobin concentrations was found between exercised and unexercised beef steers. Craig <u>et al.</u> (1958) stated that the differences in color of lean were due to varying amounts of fat and moisture rather than the difference in pigment concentration. In contrast to these findings, Shenk <u>et al.</u> (1934), in a study of pasture versus dry lot fed cattle, reported that increased myoglobin concentration cannot be due to nutritional causes but may be explained by pasture fed animals having more exercise and hence a higher myoglobin content. Ginger <u>et al.</u> (1954) stated that the variation in muscle color may be attributed to differences in amount of exercise, however, they pointed out that it did not explain the variations observed within a particular muscle. According to Lawrie (1950), myoglobin increases with age and exercise. He concluded that activity is the fundamental factor responsible for controlling the amount of pigment found in any muscle.

Lawrie (1950) reported that pork muscle can vary in color and still have the same myoglobin content. He observed that muscles appear much darker at the pH 7.0 than at pH 6.3. Briskey (1958b), studying exercised hogs versus unexercised hogs, found that exercise increased pH and produced a darker color. However, the difference in myoglobin concentration between the control and treated lots was not significant. This is in agreement with Rongey (1958) who found that exercise was associated with a slight increase in pH which resulted darker colored ham muscle. However, Jacobson et al. (1956) stated

-8-

that color variations could not be explained on the basis of pH. Briskey et al. (1958c), in a later study, observed the effect of exercise and high sucrose rations on the chemical characteristics of pork ham muscle. The <u>gluteus medius</u> (outer ham muscle) was studied. Exhaustive exercise with normal rations were found to produce dark muscles, whereas high sucrose rations and no exercise produced muscles that were pale in color. The basal ration (no exercise) and high sucrose ration (exhaustive exercise) produced muscles which were similar in color. Muscle color was determined by the Hunter Color and Color Difference Meter. The average L values were 37.85, 39.45, 39.75, and 40.18 for the basal ration plus exercise, high sucrose ration plus exercise, basal ration, and high sucrose ration respectively. The higher the L values the lighter the color. Myoglobin concentration was determined but no significant differences were found between treatments.

Wilson <u>et al</u>. (1959) in a study of "two-toned" hams, postulated that the concentration of myoglobin and the degree of "two-toning" are heritable characteristics. The degree of "two-toning" was observed to be more closely related to the amount of myoglobin in the dark muscles than the amount of myoglobin in the light muscles.

According to Niedermeier et al. (1959), iron and copper supplementation greatly influence the color and myoglobin concentration of veal muscle. It was also pointed out that an iron deficient ration would reduce the muscle myoglobin concentration. Bray et al. (1959) have shown that iron and copper supplementation has a definite effect

-9-

on the color and amount of myoglobin in veal muscle. Calves were fed a basal ration supplemented with 240 mg. of iron as ferric pyrophosphate and 7 mg. of copper as copper sulfate per day. It was found that the iron and copper-supplemented animals had a significantly larger quantity of myoglobin, or 0.54 mg. per gram of lean tissue. The authors hypothesized that the increased iron intake accounted for a greater production of myoglobin. In the same study it was observed that the animals having the highest quantity of myoglobin produced a darker colored muscle as indicated by the Hunter Color and Color Difference Meter. The dark and light samples had an average L value of 29.47 and 27.3, respectively. A significant correlation coefficient of -0.91 was found between the myoglobin concentrations and L values.

In view of the studies reviewed above, the present study was initiated to determine what effect, if any, mineral supplementation of swine rations would have on the color of pork muscle. The observations were made by use of Munsell spinning disks and spectrophotometric estimations of myoglobin.

#### EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

#### A. Source of Animals

Animals used in this study were obtained from an experiment at Michigan State University designed to determine the relationship of sinc, iron and copper supplementation to the incidence of parakeratosis in swime. Previous workers (Bray <u>et al.</u>, 1959) have indicated a possible relationship existing between high level mineral supplementation and the color and myoglobin content of muscle tissue. Therefore, this study was conducted to determine the effect of supplementing swime rations with zinc, iron and copper at various levels of calcium on the color and myoglobin content of pork muscle. After the initial parakeratosis experiment was concluded, the animals were fed to approximately 200 lbs., slaughtered, and physical and chemical determinations made. In addition, since animals of known breeding were used, it was possible to study the possible affect of breed on color.

Two separate trials involving a total of 80 pigs were conducted. Trial I consisted of 35 purebred Hampshire hogs and Trial II consisted of 43 crossbred hogs of known breeding. Two additional animals were used in the study of the relationship between myoglobin and color.

The basic ration was a typical fattening ration consisting of corn, soybean meal, meat and bone scraps, fish meal, alfalfa meal, limestone, dicalcium phosphate, iodized salt, B-vitamin mix, A and D concentrate,  $B_{12}$ , and Aurofac 10.

-11-

## C. Color Measurements

Munsell spinning disks were used to determine the surface color of the lean meat, and hue, value, and chroma renotations were calculated. Essentially the same technique was employed as described by Voegeli (1952) and Saffle (1958). A sample consisting of a 2 cm. slice of the <u>Longissimus dorsi</u>, taken at the 10th rib, was placed in a Cryovac bag and then placed in a 36-38°F. cooler. Color measurements were taken at the end of two hours. The average Munsell renotations for each of the lots were calculated as described by Saffle (1958).

For evaluation of desirable pork muscle color, a pork loin sample was selected by members of the Michigan State Animal Husbandry department. The sample had a renotation of 4.3YR 4.9/3.6 which was considered as an "ideal" pork color. This color was considered as the standard for calculating the index of fading by the formula of Nickerson (1946).

### D. Myoglobin Determination

The quantitative determination of myoglobin as outlined by Ginger et al. (1954) was used in this study with the exception of a few modifications. The method used in its entirety follows.

Duplicate 25 gram aliquots of the ground sample were minsed in a Waring Blender for two minutes with 100 ml. of cold distilled water. This was contrary to the procedure of Ginger <u>et al</u>. (1954) of overnight extraction in a refrigerator by mixing 10 grams of ground meat

-14-

with 10 ml. of water. After blending, the solution was transferred to a 250 ml. centrifuge bottle and centrifuged for 20 minutes at 2500 revolutions per minute. All centrifugation was carried out at temperatures of 34 to 38°F.

The supernatant was then filtered through cotton which retained some of the fat that had risen to the top of the solution. After filtering, the red supernatant was adjusted to pH 7.0 with 1 N sodium hydroxide. Foreign proteins were precipitated by the addition of 0.25 volumes of saturated basic lead acetate. Lead acetate was added at room temperature because at lower temperatures the protein precipitation is incomplete and at high temperatures (38°C.), the myoglobin will also precipitate (Schweigert, 1954). The lead acetate solution was allowed to stand for 20 minutes to allow complete precipitation of the foreign proteins, followed by 20 mintues of centrifugation (2500 rpms). The resulting supernatant was brought to pH 6.6 and the phosphate concentration to 3 M by the addition of mono and dibasic potassium phosphate in the solid form. The phosphates facilitate the precipitation of hemoglobin, leaving myoglobin in solution (Ginger et al., 1954). Following the third centrifugation of 20 minutes, the supernatant was filtered through Whatman number 41H filter paper into a 50 ml. volumetric flask. Two milliliters of the solution were removed by a volumetric pipette and potassium ferricyanide and sodium cyanide were added to the filtrate to final concentrations of 0.6 mM and 0.8 mM per liter, respectively. The potassium ferricyanide oxidizes all of the myoglobin into metmyoglobin; and the sodium cyanide

-15-

# E. Fat and Moisture Determination

Approximately 5 gram duplicate samples were taken from the ground <u>Longissimus dorsi</u>, placed in disposable aluminum dishes and dried at 100°C. for 24 hours for moisture determination. Ether extract was determined from the same samples used in moisture analysis. The fat was extracted with anhydrous ether for 4 hours in a Goldfish Fat Extractor. All samples were weighed to the nearest .0001 gram. Formulae for calculating the percent moisture and fat were as follows:

wt. of dried sample X 100 = % moisture

wt. of ether extract X 100 = % fat
wt. of fresh sample

### F. Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis of data included means, analysis of variance, standard error of estimate, simple correlation coefficients, and predicting formulae.

The following formulae used in analyzing these data are in accordance with Snedecor (1958):

Analysis of variance

 $\xi x^2 - (\xi x)^2 = \text{Total sum of squares}$ 

$$\frac{(\xi I_1)^2 + (\xi I_2)^2 + \dots (\xi I_N)^2 - (\xi I_N)^2}{N_n} = \frac{(\xi I_N)^2}{N} = Between treatment}$$

Total sum of squares - between treatment sum of squares = Error

Correlation coefficient

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{T}}^{\mathbf{n}} = \xi \mathbf{X} \mathbf{Y} - (\underline{\xi \mathbf{X}})(\underline{\xi \mathbf{Y}}) \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{\left(\xi \mathbf{X}^{2} - (\underline{\xi \mathbf{X}})^{2}\right) \mathbf{X} \left(\xi \mathbf{Y}^{2} - (\underline{\xi \mathbf{Y}})^{2}\right)}$$

Slope of regression line

$$B = \frac{\xi xY - (\xi X)(\xi Y)}{N}$$
$$\frac{\xi X^2 - (\xi X)^2}{N}$$

$$A = \overline{Y} - B\overline{X}$$

Standard error of estimate  

$$\sigma_e = \sqrt{\frac{\xi Y^2 - A\xi Y - B\xi XY}{N-2}}$$

$$\frac{Predicting \ formula}{\widehat{Y} = A + B \ (X)}$$

Standard deviation of B (slope of line)

$$\mathcal{S}_{B} = \frac{\mathcal{S}_{e}}{\sqrt{\xi x^{2} - (\xi x)^{2}}}$$

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

# A. Preliminary Studies

Several preliminary studies were conducted in order to become familiar with myoglobin determination and the use of the Munsell spinning disks. Color renotations and myoglobin concentrations were determined on pork muscle using sections of the <u>Longissimus dorsi</u>. The technique and apparatus used were as outlined by Voegeli (1952) and Saffle (1958). The preliminary studies indicated that a thorough understanding of the three-dimensional concept of color was necessary to make rapid and accurate measurements of fresh lean tissue. The three color qualities, hue, value, and chroma, are defined by Munsell (1916) as follows:

- Hus is the quality by which we distinguish one color from another, as a red from a yellow, a green, a blue, or a purple.
- Value is the quality by which we distinguish a light color from a dark one.
- Chroma is the quality by which we distinguish a strong color from a weak one.

The three dimensional concept of color required the operator using the Munsell spinning disk apparatus to make three distinct comparisons when matching a sample. the disk mixture from darker than the sample to lighter than the sample. In order to facilitate the use of whole units of disk area in calculating renotation values, it was decided to use the lighter readings for purposes of standardization.

A method of expressing color differences is useful in many cases. Several workers have derived formulae for expressing small color differences, however, Nickerson's (1946) index of fading, which is based upon the Munsell scale of hue, value, and chroma is applicable for expressing color tolerance, color fading, etc. The formula is as follows:

> I (index of fading) =  $\frac{C}{5}$  (2 $\Delta$ H) + 6 $\Delta$ V + 3 $\Delta$ C C = chroma of sample

 $\triangle$  H = difference in hue between sample and standard

 $\triangle$  V = difference in value between sample and standard

 $\triangle$  C = difference in chroma between sample and standard

Butler (1953b) indicated that there is a slight error in the application of this formula. The formula assumes that at a chroma of 5, a one unit change in value has the same effect on the overall color as do two units change in chroma or three units change in hue.

Myoglobin determination is a time consuming and tedious procedure. Therefore, if disk colorimetry could be applied as a suitable method for estimating muscle pigment concentration, studies involving myoglobin content of muscle tissue would be markedly accelerated. Upon comparing myoglobin, fat, and moisture content and index of fading of all samples studied, the following relationships were found: index of fading versus myoglobin content produced the highly significant correlation coefficient of -0.69 (Figure I) which supports the concept of myoglobin being highly associated with muscle tissue color. Although over one-half of the variability  $(1-r^2)$  between the two methods was unaccounted for, the predicting formula of Y = 1.01 - .023 (X) appears to be a useful estimator for predicting myoglobin content from disk colorimetry readings of fresh pork loin muscle.

Comparing the fat content with index of fading and myoglobin concentration, the low and insignificant correlation coefficients of 0.21 and -0.29, respectively, were obtained, indicating that little relationships exist between fat content and muscle color. Such appears to be true whether color is measured as a surface phenomenom by disk colorimetry or as total myoglobin content determined spectrophotometrically.

The effect of moisture content upon index of fading and myoglobin was found to be low and in a negative direction as indicated by the non-significant correlation coefficients of -0.16 and -0.13, respectively. The slight effect upon color due to variations in fat and moisture content appears to be somewhat of a lightening effect (increase in value) with an increase in fat, and a slight darkening of muscle color (decrease in value) with an increase in moisture (Appendix Tables A and B). The usual high relationship between fat

-22-

and moisture content was found as indicated by the highly significant correlation coefficient of -0.88.

These findings are not in accordance with Craig <u>et al.</u> (1958), who indicated that differences in color of lean meat were due to varying amounts of fat and moisture rather than differences in pigment concentration. However, the results of the present study would indicate that color differences cannot be explained on the basis of fat and moisture concentration.

# C. Effect of Zinc, Iron, and Copper Supplementation on Myoglobin Concentration. Trial I.

Hyoglobin values and levels of mineral supplementation are presented in Table III. It will be noted that greater variations exists between animals than between treatments. The loin eyes of animals receiving iron or iron plus zinc (treatments II & III) contained slightly more myoglobin (3.55 mg./g.) than did those of animals receiving zinc, copper, or copper plus zinc (3.52, 3.44, and 3.27 mg./g., respectively). However, analysis of variance indicated no significant differences between treatments (Table IV). The results of this experiment are not in agreement with Bray <u>et al</u>. (1959) who indicated that supplementation of iron and copper to veal calf rations increases myoglobin concentration. In their work, 240 mg. iron and 7 mg. of copper were fed daily per animal. In the present study, minerals were mixed into the ration prior to feeding, and estimation of mineral intake per animal was based on daily feed consumption. maturity than veal calves that are dressed at about the same weight. Myoglobin concentration increases with age and maturity, therefore, at the degree of maturity of the hogs studied the treatment difference in myoglobin content may have been minimized.

# D. Effect of Zinc and Copper Supplementation of Calcium Levels of 0.55 and 1.31 Percent. Trial II.

In Trial II the average daily mineral intake per animal was: 114 mg. of sinc, 295 mg. of copper, 104 mg. of sinc and 218 mg. of copper for treatments I, II, III, and IV, respectively. As indicated in Table V, there is little variation between treatments. However, the loin eyes from the control animals generally contained less myoglobin per gram than did those of treated animals. These data (Trial II) are very similar to Trial I in that copper or zinc had little effect on total myoglobin concentration. In addition, greater variation was observed between animals within treatments than between treatments. Analysis of variance (Table VI) indicates no significant differences between treatments.

# TABLE V

CONCENTRATION OF MYOGLOBIN OF PORK LONGISSIMUS DORSI HUSCLE. TRIAL II

Animal		Anima1	
Number	Myog <b>lobin</b>	Number	Myoglobin
	(mg./g.)		(mg./g.)
#Contro1		###Treatment	II
<b>**X-33-4</b>	3.46	<b>X-33-3</b>	4.24
<b>X-61-8</b>	3.74	<b>X-</b> 59 <b>-3</b>	5.03
<b>X-</b> 60-9	3.71	<b>X-62-5</b>	2.88
<b>X-58-10</b>	3.34	<b>X-33-9</b>	4.64
<b>X-</b> 59 <b>-6</b>	3.65	<b>L</b> -61-7	3.02
<b>X-</b> 37 <b>-</b> 11	4.13	<b>X-</b> 65 <b>-1</b>	3.19
<b>X-66-1</b>	3.09	<b>X-35-4</b>	3.99
<b>X-61-11</b>	2.31	<b>X-34-12</b>	3.84
X-77-1	3.93	<b>X-61-5</b>	2.73
<b>X-36-6</b>	3.82	<b>X-60-7</b>	4.07
1	Av. 3.52	A	v. 3.76
Treatment	I	Treatment	III
<b>X-61-1</b>	4.09	X-33-10	3.69
X-59-9	4.76	X-61-4	2.47
X-33-1	3.46	X-59-4	3.60
X-58-9	3,65	<b>X-</b> 59 <b>-8</b>	3.99
<b>X-</b> 33-2	3,02	X-39-3	4.03
<b>X-58-1</b>	3.54	<b>X-61-1</b>	3.52
X-77-2	4.16	X-58-4	3.44
X-64-1	3.71	X-34-7	4.31
X-33-1	4.54	X-66-10	2.90
<b>X-62-3</b>	3.43	A	v. 3.56
1	Av. 3.84	_	
		Treatment	_
		X-59-2	4.02
		X-33-5	2.96
		X-61-2	4.66
		X-34-11	3.12
			v. 3.69
	ed only .55% calci	um	
<pre>= crossbred reatment I</pre>	hogs - Zinc 75 ppm + .5	5% calcium	
	- Copper 125 ppm		
	[ - Zinc 75 ppm +		

Treatment III - Zinc 75 ppm + 1.31% calcium Treatment IV - Copper 125 ppm + 1.31% calcium

#### TABLE VI

Source of Variance	Degr <b>ees of</b> Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Total	42	15.78		
Between Treatments	4	•71	•178	#.45 N.S.
Within Treatments	38	15.07	•397	

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MYOGLOBIN VALUES. TRIAL II

**\*N.S.** indicates non-significance of the variance ratio, F, at the 0.05 level.

### E. Effect of Breed on Myoglobin Concentration.

Wilson et al. (1959) postulated that the concentration of myoglobin found within a particular muscle may be a heritable characteristic. Studying the light and dark colored muscles of "two-toned" hams from three breeds of hogs (Poland China, Duroc, and Chester White), a distinct difference in myoglobin concentration of the dark muscles was noted between breeds. The Poland China had the highest myoglobin content with 2.35 mg./g., followed by the Duroc with 1.80 mg./g. and the Chester White with 1.58 mg./g. of fresh muscle tissue. However, the differences between breeds in myoglobin concentration of the lighter muscles were found to be non-significant.

Table VII summarizes the myoglobin content of the Longissimus dorsi muscles from the breeds of hogs represented in this study.

By examination of Table VII, it can be seen that when myoglobin is expressed in mg./g. of fresh muscle tissue, there is less difference between breed means than when myoglobin is expressed on a moisturecance at the (p = .05) level. However, the F - ratio of 2.62 approaches significance.

### TABLE IX

ANALYSIS OF MYOGLOBIN CONCENTRATION BETWEEN BREEDS (Fat-free, Moisture-free Basis)

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Total	77	<b>26,94</b>		
Breeds	1	•89	<b>• 89</b>	#2.62 N.S.
Error	76	26.05	•34	

#N.S. - non-significant at p = .05 level.

Although no significant difference in myoglobin concentration was found between breeds, the data suggest that there may be a relationship between breeds and the amount of muscle pigment present within the muscle. An F - ratio of 3.96 is required for significance. It is recognized, however, that variations in myoglobin content are found within breeds as well as between breeds. Therefore, in order to draw any valid conclusions, additional studies would be required.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The levels of zinc, iron and copper used to supplement swime rations in this study had no significant effect upon myoglobin concentration of the <u>Longissimus dorsi</u> muscle. In addition, the effect of breed upon myoglobin concentration of pork muscle on both fresh tissue basis and fat-free, moisture-free basis, was found to be nonsignificant. However, on the fat-free, moisture-free basis, the relationship between myoglobin content and breed approached significance, indicating that a sufficiently strong relationship exists between breed and myoglobin content to warrant further investigation.

A highly significant relationship was found between the index of fading and myoglobin concentration. From this, it may be concluded that disk colorimetry might be used as a method for estimating myoglobin content of pork muscle.

The effect of fat and total moisture content upon color renotations and myoglobin concentrations was found to be non-significant. This indicates that little relationship exists between the fat and moisture content of pork muscle and its color, whether it be measured as a surface phenomenom by disk colorimetry, or, as a pigment concentration by spectrophotometry.

-32-

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bray, R. W., Rupnow, E. H., Hanning, F. M., Allen, N. N. and Niedermeier, R. P. 1959. Effect of Feeding Methods on Veal Production and Carcass Quality. II. Carcass Grades, Liver, Hide, Specific Gravity, Yield and Chemical Analysis of the Muscle. J. of An. Sci. 18:732-737.
- Briskey, E. J., Bray, R. W., Hoekstra, W. G., Grummer, R. H. and Phillips, P. H. 1959a. The Chemical and Physical Characteristics of Various Pork Ham Muscle Classes. J. of An. Sci. 18:146-152.
- Briskey, E. J., Bray, R. W., Hoekstra, W. G., Grummer, R. H. and Phillips, P. H. 1959b. The Effect of Various Levels of Exercise in Altering the Chemical and Physical Characteristics of Certain Pork Ham Muscles. J. of An. Sci. 18:153-157.
- Briskey, E. J., Bray, R. W., Hoekstra, W. G., Grummer, R. H. and Phillips, P. H. 1959c. The Effect of Exhaustive Exercise and High Sucrose Regimen on Certain Chemical and Physical Pork Ham Muscle Characteristics. J. of An. Sci. 18:173-177.
- Brooks, John. 1933. The Effect of Carbon Dioxide on the Colour Changes or Bloom of Lean Meat. Journal of the Society of Chemical Industry. 52:17-19.
- Brooks, John. 1937. Color of Meat. Food Research. 3:75-77.
- Broumand, H. 1953. The Development of a Spectrophotometric Method for Estimation of the Pigmented Compounds of Meat. Ph.D. Thesis. Rutgers Univ.
- Bull, Sleeter and Rusk, H. P. 1942. Effect of Exercise on Quality of Beef. Illinois Agr. Expt. Sta. Bull. 488:107-120.
- Butler, O. D., Bratzler, L. J. and Mallmann, W. L. 1953a. The Effect of Bacteria on the Color of Prepackaged Retail Beef Cuts. Food Tech. 7:397-400.
- Butler, O. D. 1953b. Some Causes and Measurements of Color Changes in Fresh Retail Meat Cuts. Ph. D. Thesis. Michigan State Univ.
- Craig, H. B., Blumer, T. N. and Barrick, E. R. 1959. Effect of Several Combinations of Grass and Grain in the Ration of Beef Steers on the Color Characteristics of Lean and Fat. J. of An. Sci. 18:241-248.

- Mackintosh, D. L. and Hall, J. L. 1935. Some Factors Related to Color of Meat. Am. Soc. An. Prod. Proc. 281-286.
- Millikan, G. A. 1939. Muscle Hemoglobin. Physiol. Reviews. 19: 503-523.
- Mitchell, H. H. and Hamilton, T. S. 1933. Effect of Long-Continued Exercise Upon the Chemical Composition of the Muscle and Other Tissues of Cattle. J. Agr. Res. 46:917-944.
- Morgan, V. E. 1936. Studies on Myoglobin I. The Solubility of Myoglobin in Concentrated Ammonium Sulfate Solutions. J. Biol. Chem. 112:557-563.
- Munsell, A. H. 1916. A Color Notation. 5th Ed. Baltimore, Md.
- Nickerson, Dorothy. 1946. Color Measurement and Its Application to the Grading of Agricultural Products. U.S.D.A. Publication 580.
- Niedermeier, R. P., Allen, N. N., Lance, R. D., Rupnow, E. H. and Bray, R. W. 1959. Effect of Feeding Methods on Veal Production and Carcass Quality. I. Rate of Gain, Stomach Capacity, Vitamin A, Iron and Hemoglobin Values. J. of An. Sci. 18:726-731.
- Poel, W. E. 1949. Effect of Anoxic Anoxia on Myoglobin Concentrations in Striated Muscle. Am. J. Physiol. 156:44-51.
- Rongey, E. H. 1958. Color Stability and Uniformity of Cured Hams. M.S. Thesis. Univ. of Missouri.
- Saffle, R. L. and Bratzler, L. J. 1959. The Effect of Fatness on Some Processing and Palatability Characteristics of Pork Carcasses. Food Tech. 13:236-239.
- Schweigert, B. S. 1954. Quantitative Chemical Measurements of Myoglobin. Proc. Seventh An. Reciprocal Meat Conf. 77-80.
- Schweigert, B. S. 1956. Chemistry of Meat Pigments. Proc. of the Eighth Res. Conf. of A.M.I.F. 61-65.
- Shenk, J. H., Hall, J. L. and King, H. H. 1934. Spectrophotometric Characteristics of Hemoglobin. I. Beef Blood and Muscle Hemoglobin. J. Bio. Chem. 105:741-752.
- Snedecor, G. W. 1957. <u>Statistical Methods</u>. 5th Ed. The Iowa State College Press, Ames, Iowa.

Theorell, H. 1932. Kristellinisches Myoglobin. Biochem. 272:1-7.

- Theorell, H. and DeDuve, E. 1947. The Crystalline Human Myoglobin in Heart Muscle and Urine. Arch. Biochem., 12:113-124.
- Townsend, W. E. 1958a. Effect of Temperature, Storage Conditions and Light on the Color of Pre-packaged Frozen Meat. Ph.D. Thesis. Michigan State Univ.
- Townsend, W. E. and Bratzler, L. J. 1958b. Effect of Storage Conditions on the Color of Frozen Packaged Retail Beef Cuts. Food Tech. 12:663-666
- Voegeli, M. M. 1952. The Measurement of Fresh Beef Muscle Color Changes by Disk Colorimetry. Ph. D. Thesis. Michigan State Univ.
- Wilson, G. D., Ginger, I. D., Schweigert, B. S. and Aunan, W. J. 1959. A Study of the Variations of Myoglobin Concentration in "Two-Toned" Hams. (In Press)
- Winkler, C. A. 1939. Colour of Meat. I. Apparatus for its Measurement and Relation Between pH and Colour. Can. J. Research. 17:1-7.

# APPENDIX A

# DATA COLLECTED FROM TRIAL I (Purebred Hampshire Hogs)

Inimal       Hyoglobins       Munsell       Index of C         Number       Moisture       Fat       Content       Content       Remotation       Fading         Lot 1       (2)       (2)       (mg./g.)       (mg./g.)       Fading       Fading         H=81_2       75.29       1.63       919       3.98       5.6 TH       5.5/3.0       9.7         H=87-2       74.85       1.03       .728       3.02       8.6 TH       6.0/2.5       14.2         H=86-6       74.28       2.13       .867       3.68       5.6 TH       5.5/3.0       9.7         H=87-2       74.85       1.03       .728       3.02       8.6 TH       5.6/2.8       9.0         H=80-7       73.07       4.90       .844       3.83       7.5 TH       5.4/2.8       9.0         H=80-7       74.35       2.17       .793       3.20       6.9 TH       5.5/2.8       8.7         Mean       73.62       3.20       .515       3.52       6.3 TH       5.6/2.8       9.8         H=87-6       75.45       1.89       .718       3.17       7.2 TH       5.6/2.5       10.1         H=86-5       75.50       1.82       1	-				16		
$ \begin{array}{c} (\%) & (\%) & (\mbox{$$$$$$$$$} & ($$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$		No.i etamo	₽- <b>▲</b>				
Lot 1 H-83-3 71.28 5.86 .816 3.57 7.9 YR 5.5/3.0 9.7 H-81-2 75.29 1.63 .919 3.98 5.6 YR 5.5/3.0 7.0 H-87-2 74.85 1.03 .728 3.02 8.6 YR 6.0/2.5 14.2 H-86-6 74.28 2.13 .867 3.68 5.4 YR 5.2/2.7 5.7 H-82-4 73.07 4.90 .844 3.83 7.5 YR 5.4/2.8 9.0 H-80-7 74.35 2.17 .793 3.38 5.8 YR 5.3/3.0 6.6 H-87-4 72.26 4.70 .737 3.20 6.9 YR 5.5/2.9 8.7 Hean 73.62 4.70 .737 3.20 6.9 YR 5.5/2.9 8.7 Hean 73.62 4.70 .737 3.20 6.9 YR 5.8/2.5 10.1 H-86-2 75.73 1.09 .760 3.28 5.9 YR 5.8/2.5 10.1 H-86-5 75.50 1.62 1.041 4.59 5.0 YR 5.8/2.5 10.1 H-86-5 75.50 1.62 1.041 4.59 5.0 YR 5.8/2.5 9.4 H-80-9 72.82 6.18 .611 2.91 6.8 YR 5.6/2.6 9.8 H-81-4 74.96 2.62 1.849 3.79 7.0 YR 5.4/3.3 7.5 Mean 74.89 2.72 .796 3.55 6.4 YR 5.6/2.7 9.3 Lot 3 H-83-5 75.04 1.47 .924 3.93 6.7 YR 5.8/2.5 11.1 H-84-3 73.26 4.21 .840 3.73 6.3 YR 5.0/3.0 4.8 H-81-4 74.96 2.62 1.840 3.73 6.3 YR 5.0/3.0 4.8 H-81-4 74.69 2.72 .796 3.55 7.4 YR 5.8/2.7 9.3 Lot 3 H-83-5 75.04 1.47 .924 3.93 6.7 YR 5.8/2.5 11.1 H-84-3 73.26 4.21 .840 3.73 6.3 YR 5.0/3.0 4.8 H-87-1 75.10 .93 .872 3.64 8.2 YR 5.8/2.7 12.6 H-80-6 74.59 1.63 .779 3.28 5.1 YR 5.2/2.7 5.4 H-80-7 74.68 2.862 3.55 7.4 YR 5.8/2.7 12.6 H-80-6 74.59 1.63 .779 3.28 5.1 YR 5.2/2.7 11.7 H-86-8 74.60 2.21 .826 3.56 8.6 YR 5.7/2.7 11.7 H-86-8 74.60 2.21 .826 3.56 8.6 YR 5.4/3.1 9.8 Hean 74.08 2.88 .826 3.55 7.4 YR 5.7/2.9 9.6 Lot 4 H-86-4 75.34 .76 .802 3.36 8.0 YR 5.7/2.5 11.8 H-87-1 75.17 .34 1.230 5.02 3.9 YR 5.1/3.1 -3.4 H-86-8 74.60 2.21 .826 3.56 8.6 YR 5.4/3.1 9.8 Hean 74.08 2.88 .826 3.55 7.4 YR 5.6/2.8 11.2 H-86-8 74.60 2.21 .826 3.56 8.6 YR 5.4/3.1 9.8 Hean 74.08 2.88 .826 3.55 7.4 YR 5.6/2.8 11.2 H-86-4 75.34 .76 .802 3.36 8.0 YR 5.7/2.5 11.8 Hean 74.08 2.88 .826 3.55 7.4 YR 5.6/2.8 11.2 H-86-4 75.34 .76 .802 3.36 8.0 YR 5.7/2.5 11.8 Hean 74.08 2.88 .826 3.55 7.4 YR 5.2/2.9 15.3 Hean 74.64 1.47 .733 3.35 8.4 YR 6.3/2.9 15.3 He3-4 73.78 3.07 .723 3.12 8.4 YR 6.3/2.9 15.3	NUMDET					keno tation	rading
H-81-2 75.29 1.63 .919 3.98 5.6 YE 5.5/3.0 7.0 H-87-2 74.85 1.03 .728 3.02 8.6 YE 5.0/2.5 14.2 H-86-6 74.28 2.13 .867 3.66 5.4 YE 5.2/2.7 5.7 H-80-7 74.35 2.17 .793 3.38 5.8 YE 5.3/2.8 9.0 H-87-4 72.26 4.70 .737 3.20 6.9 YE 5.5/2.9 8.7 Mean 73.62 3.20 .815 3.52 6.8 YE 5.5/2.9 8.7 Mean 73.62 3.20 .815 3.52 6.8 YE 5.5/2.8 9.8 H-87-6 75.45 1.89 .718 3.17 7.2 YE 5.6/2.8 9.8 H-86-2 75.73 1.09 .760 3.28 5.9 YE 5.8/2.5 10.1 H-86-5 75.50 1.82 1.0041 4.59 5.0 YE 5.8/2.5 9.4 H-80-9 72.82 6.18 .611 2.91 6.8 YE 5.6/2.6 9.8 H-81-4 74.96 2.62 $+.849$ 3.79 7.0 YE 5.8/2.6 9.8 H-81-4 74.96 2.62 $+.849$ 3.79 7.0 YE 5.8/2.5 9.4 H-83-5 75.04 1.47 .924 3.93 6.7 YE 5.8/2.5 11.1 H-84-3 73.26 4.21 .840 3.73 6.3 YE 5.0/3.0 4.8 H-83-6 77.51 1.63 2.72 .796 3.55 6.4 YE 5.8/2.7 9.3 Lot 3 H-83-6 73.64 4.54 .751 3.44 8.5 YE 5.8/2.7 9.3 Lot 3 H-85-2 73.64 4.54 .751 3.44 8.5 YE 5.8/2.7 12.6 H-87-1 75.10 .93 .872 3.64 8.2 YE 5.7/2.7 5.4 H-87-1 75.10 .93 .872 3.64 8.2 YE 5.7/2.7 11.7 H-86-8 74.60 2.21 .826 3.55 7.4 YE 5.8/2.7 12.6 H-87-1 75.10 .93 .872 3.64 8.2 YE 5.7/2.7 11.7 H-86-8 74.60 2.21 .826 3.55 7.4 YE 5.8/2.9 11.9 H-87-1 75.10 .93 .872 3.64 8.2 YE 5.7/2.7 11.7 H-86-8 74.60 2.21 .826 3.55 7.4 YE 5.8/2.9 11.9 Hean 74.08 2.68 .826 3.55 7.4 YE 5.8/2.9 11.9 Hean 74.08 2.68 .826 3.55 7.4 YE 5.7/2.9 9.6 Hean 74.68 2.68 .826 3.55 7.4 YE 5.7/2.9 11.9 Hean 74.08 2.68 .826 3.55 7.4 YE 5.7/2.9 11.9 Hean 74.08 2.68 .826 3.55 7.4 YE 5.7/2.9 11.8 Hean 74.08 2.68 .826 3.55 7.4 YE 5.7/2.9 11.8 Hean 74.08 2.68 .826 3.55 7.4 YE 5.7/2.9 11.8 Hean 74.08 2.68 .826 3.50 2.9 YE 5.7/2.9 11.8 Hean 74.08 2.68 .826 3.55 7.4 YE 5.7/2.9 11.8 Hean 74.08 2.68 .638 2.88 6.4 YE 5.0/3.4 10.3 Hean 74.08 2.68 .638 2.88 6.4 YE 5.0/3.4 10.3 Hean 74.64 1.47 .793 3.35 8.4 YE 5.8/2.9 11.8 He3-4 73.78 3.07 .723 3.12 8.4 YE 5.3/3.4 5.6 He3-4 73.78 3.07 .723 3.12 8.4 YE 5.3/3.0 4.51	Lot 1	(%)	(%)	(≖8•/8•)	(mg•/g•)		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							
Mean $\overline{73.62}$ $\overline{3.20}$ $\overline{.815}$ $\overline{3.52}$ $\overline{6.8}$ $\overline{YE}$ $\overline{5.7/2.8}$ $\overline{8.7}$ Lot 2H=87-6 $75.45$ $1.89$ $.718$ $3.17$ $7.2$ $YE$ $5.6/2.8$ $9.8$ H=86-2 $75.73$ $1.09$ $.760$ $3.28$ $5.9$ $YE$ $5.8/2.5$ $10.1$ H=86-2 $75.73$ $1.09$ $.760$ $3.28$ $5.9$ $YE$ $5.8/2.5$ $9.4$ H=80-9 $72.62$ $6.18$ $.611$ $2.91$ $6.8$ $YE$ $5.6/2.6$ $9.8$ H=81-4 $74.96$ $2.62$ $849$ $3.79$ $7.0$ $YE$ $5.4/3.3$ $7.5$ Mean $74.89$ $2.72$ $796$ $3.55$ $6.4$ $YE$ $5.6/2.7$ $9.3$ Lot 3H=83-5 $75.04$ $1.47$ $.924$ $3.93$ $6.7$ $YE$ $5.8/2.5$ $11.1$ H=84-3 $73.26$ $4.21$ $.840$ $3.73$ $6.3$ $YE$ $5.0/3.0$ $4.8$ H=81-6 $72.32$ $3.78$ $.788$ $3.30$ $7.6$ $YE$ $5.9/2.9$ $11.9$ H=85-2 $73.64$ $4.54$ $.751$ $3.44$ $8.5$ $YE$ $5.2/2.7$ $5.4$ H=87-1 $75.10$ $.93$ $.872$ $3.64$ $8.2$ $YE$ $5.7/2.7$ $11.7$ H=86-4 $74.08$ $2.68$ $.826$ $3.55$ $7.4$ $YE$ $5.7/2.5$ $11.6$ H=87-9 $75.17$ $.34$ $1.230$ $5.02$ $3.9$ <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>							
Lot 2 H-87-6 75.45 1.89 .718 3.17 7.2 YR 5.6/2.8 9.8 H-86-2 75.73 1.09 .760 3.28 5.9 YR 5.8/2.5 10.1 H-86-5 75.50 1.82 1.041 4.59 5.0 YR 5.8/2.5 9.4 H-80-9 72.82 6.18 .611 2.91 6.8 YR 5.6/2.6 9.8 H-81-4 74.96 2.62 1.989 3.79 7.0 YR 5.4/3.3 7.5 Mean 74.89 2.72 .796 3.55 $6.4$ YR 5.6/2.7 9.3 Lot 3 H-83-5 75.04 1.47 .924 3.93 6.7 YR 5.8/2.5 11.1 H-84-3 73.26 4.21 .840 3.73 6.3 YR 5.0/3.0 4.8 H-81-6 72.32 3.78 .788 3.30 7.6 YR 5.8/2.9 11.9 H-85-2 73.64 4.54 .751 3.44 8.5 YR 5.8/2.7 12.6 H-80-6 74.59 1.63 .779 3.28 5.1 YR 5.2/2.7 5.4 H-87-1 75.10 .93 .872 3.64 3.25 7.4 YR 5.7/2.7 11.7 H-86-8 74.60 2.21 .826 3.56 8.6 YR 5.4/3.1 9.8 Mean 74.08 2.68 .826 3.55 7.4 YR 5.7/2.5 11.8 H-87-1 75.10 .93 .872 3.64 4.24 1.23 Mean 74.08 2.68 .826 3.55 7.4 YR 5.7/2.9 1.39 Hean 74.08 2.68 .826 3.55 7.4 YR 5.7/2.9 1.39 H-85-7 7.5 1.4 1.47 .924 4.54 .50 3.55 7.5 1.4 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5							8.7
H-87-675.451.89.7183.177.2 IR 5.6/2.89.8H-36-275.731.09.7603.285.9 IR 5.8/2.510.1H-86-575.501.821.0414.595.0 IR 5.8/2.59.4H-80-972.826.13.6112.916.8 IR 5.6/2.69.8H-81-474.962.628493.797.0 IR 5.4/3.37.5Mean74.892.727963.556.4 IR 5.6/2.79.3Lot 3H-83-575.041.47.9243.936.7 IR 5.8/2.511.1H-84-373.264.21.8403.736.3 IR 5.0/3.04.8H-81-672.323.78.7883.307.6 IR 5.8/2.712.6H-80-674.591.63.7793.285.1 IR 5.8/2.712.6H-80-775.10.93.8723.648.2 IR 5.7/2.711.7H-86-874.602.21.8263.568.6 IR 5.4/3.19.8Mean74.082.68.8263.557.4 IR 5.7/2.511.8H-87-175.10.93.8723.648.2 IR 5.4/3.19.8Mean74.602.28.8263.557.4 IR 5.7/2.511.8H-87-975.17.341.2305.023.9 IR 5.1/3.1-3.4H-86-874.602.68.8263.557.4 IR 5.6/2.811.2H-86-7.75.5.606.6582.886.4 IR 6.0/3.410.3<	Mean	73 <b>.</b> 62	3.20	<b>•815</b>	3.52	6.8 YR 5.5/2.8	8.7
H-86-275.731.09.7603.285.9 YR5.8/2.510.1H-86-575.501.821.0414.595.0 YR5.8/2.59.4H-80-972.826.18.6112.916.8 YR5.6/2.69.8H-81-474.962.62.8493.797.0 YR5.4/3.37.5Mean74.892.72.7963.556.4 YR5.6/2.79.3Lot 3H-83-575.041.47.9243.936.7 YR5.8/2.511.1H-84-373.264.21.8403.736.3 YR5.0/3.04.8H-81-672.323.78.7883.307.6 YR5.8/2.712.6H-85-273.644.54.7513.448.5 YR5.8/2.712.6H-87-175.10.93.8723.648.2 YR5.7/2.75.4H-86-874.602.21.8263.557.4 YR5.4/3.19.8Mean74.082.68.8263.557.4 YR5.7/2.511.8H-86-874.602.21.8263.557.4 YR5.7/2.511.8H-86-475.34.76.8023.368.0 YR5.1/3.1-3.4H-80-574.851.45.8403.548.4 YR6.0/3.410.3H-80-574.851.45.8403.548.4 YR6.0/3.410.3H-81-174.641.45.7323.216.2 YR <td< td=""><td>Lot 2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Lot 2						
H-86-575.501.821.0414.595.0 YR5.8/2.59.4H-80-972.826.18.6112.916.8 YR5.6/2.69.8H-81-474.962.62	H-87-6	75.45	1.89	•718	3.17		9.8
H=80-972.826.18.6112.916.8 YR 5.6/2.69.8H=81-474.962.62.8493.797.0 YR 5.4/3.37.5Mean74.892.72.7963.556.4 YR 5.6/2.79.3Lot 3H=83-575.041.47.9243.936.7 YR 5.8/2.511.1H=84-373.264.21.8403.736.3 YR 5.0/3.04.8H=81-672.323.78.7883.307.6 YR 5.8/2.712.6H=85-273.644.54.7513.448.5 YR 5.8/2.712.6H=85-273.644.54.7513.448.5 YR 5.8/2.712.6H=85-874.602.21.8263.55.64 YR 5.7/2.711.7H=86-874.602.21.8263.55.7.4 YR 5.7/2.711.7H=86-874.602.21.8263.55.7.4 YR 5.7/2.99.8Mean74.082.68.8263.557.4 YR 5.7/2.911.8H=87-975.17.341.2305.023.9 YR 5.1/3.1-3.4H=80-574.851.45.8403.548.4 YR 6.0/3.410.3H=80-574.851.45.8403.548.4 YR 6.3/2.911.8H=81-174.841.47.7933.358.4 YR 6.3/2.911.8H=84-572.554.67.7323.216.2 YR 5.3/3.45.6H=83-473.783.07.7233.128.4 YR 6.3/2.915	H <b>-86-2</b>	75 <b>.73</b>	1.09	•760	3.28		10.1
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<b>H-86-5</b>	75 <b>.50</b>	1.82	1.041	4.59		9.4
Mean $74.89$ $2.72$ $.796$ $3.55$ $6.4$ YR $5.6/2.7$ $9.3$ Lot 3H=83-5 $75.04$ $1.47$ $.924$ $3.93$ $6.7$ YR $5.8/2.5$ $11.1$ H=84-3 $73.26$ $4.21$ $.840$ $3.73$ $6.3$ YR $5.0/3.0$ $4.8$ H=81-6 $72.32$ $3.78$ $.788$ $3.30$ $7.6$ YR $5.9/2.9$ $11.9$ H=85-2 $73.64$ $4.54$ $.751$ $3.44$ $8.5$ YR $5.8/2.7$ $12.6$ H=80-6 $74.59$ $1.63$ $.779$ $3.28$ $5.1$ YR $5.7/2.7$ $11.7$ H=86-8 $74.60$ $2.21$ $.826$ $3.56$ $8.6$ YR $5.4/3.1$ $9.8$ Mean $74.08$ $2.68$ $.826$ $3.55$ $7.4$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ H=86-4 $75.34$ $.76$ $.802$ $3.36$ $8.0$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ H=86-4 $75.34$ $.76$ $.802$ $3.36$ $8.0$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ H=80-5 $74.85$ $1.45$ $.840$ $3.54$ $8.4$ YR $6.0/3.4$ $10.3$ H=80-5 $74.85$ $1.45$ $.840$ $3.54$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H=81-1 $74.84$ $1.47$ $.793$ $3.35$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H=83-4 $73.78$ $3.07$ $.723$ $3.12$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $15.3$ H=82-1 $74.45$ $1.16$ $.746$ $3.06$ $4.7$ YR $5.2/3.0$ $4.1$	H-80-9	72.82	6.18		2.91		9.8
Mean $74.89$ $2.72$ $.796$ $3.55$ $6.4$ YR $5.6/2.7$ $9.3$ Lot 3H=83-5 $75.04$ $1.47$ $.924$ $3.93$ $6.7$ YR $5.8/2.5$ $11.1$ H=84-3 $73.26$ $4.21$ $.840$ $3.73$ $6.3$ YR $5.0/3.0$ $4.8$ H=81-6 $72.32$ $3.78$ $.788$ $3.30$ $7.6$ YR $5.9/2.9$ $11.9$ H=85-2 $73.64$ $4.54$ $.751$ $3.44$ $8.5$ YR $5.8/2.7$ $12.6$ H=80-6 $74.59$ $1.63$ $.779$ $3.28$ $5.1$ YR $5.8/2.7$ $12.6$ H=86-8 $74.60$ $2.21$ $.826$ $3.56$ $8.6$ YR $5.7/2.7$ $11.7$ H=86-8 $74.60$ $2.21$ $.826$ $3.55$ $7.4$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ Hean $74.08$ $2.68$ $.826$ $3.55$ $7.4$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ H=80-3 $71.05$ $6.08$ $658$ $2.88$ $6.4$ YR $6.0/3.4$ $10.3$ H=80-5 $74.85$ $1.45$ $.840$ $3.54$ $8.4$ YR $5.6/2.8$ $11.2$ H=81-1 $74.84$ $1.47$ $.793$ $3.35$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H=83-4 $73.78$ $3.07$ $.723$ $3.12$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H=82-1 $74.45$ $1.16$ $.746$ $3.06$ $4.7$ YR $5.2/3.0$ $4.1$	H-81-4						7.5
H-83-575.041.47.9243.936.7 YR 5.8/2.511.1H-84-373.264.21.8403.736.3 YR 5.0/3.04.8H-81-672.323.78.7883.307.6 YR 5.9/2.911.9H-85-273.644.54.7513.448.5 YR 5.8/2.712.6H-80-674.591.63.7793.285.1 YR 5.2/2.75.4H-87-175.10.93.8723.648.2 YR 5.7/2.711.7H-86-874.602.21.8263.568.6 YR 5.4/3.19.8Mean74.082.68.8263.557.4 YR 5.7/2.99.6Lot 4H-86-475.34.76.8023.368.0 YR 5.7/2.511.8H-87-975.17.341.2305.023.9 YR 5.1/3.1-3.4H-80-574.851.45.8403.548.4 YR 6.0/3.410.3H-80-574.851.45.8403.548.4 YR 5.6/2.811.2H-81-174.841.47.7933.358.4 YR 6.3/2.911.8H-84-572.554.67.7323.216.2 YR 5.3/3.45.6H-83-473.783.07.7233.128.4 YR 6.3/2.915.3H-82-174.451.16.7463.064.7 YR 5.2/3.04.1	Mean	74.89	2.72	•796	3.55	6.4 YR 5.6/2.7	9.3
H-84-3       73.26       4.21       .840 $3.73$ $6.3$ YR $5.0/3.0$ $4.8$ H-81-6       72.32 $3.78$ .788 $3.30$ $7.6$ YR $5.9/2.9$ $11.9$ H-85-2 $73.64$ $4.54$ .751 $3.44$ $8.5$ YR $5.8/2.7$ $12.6$ H-80-6 $74.59$ $1.63$ .779 $3.28$ $5.1$ YR $5.2/2.7$ $5.4$ H-87-1 $75.10$ .93       .872 $3.64$ $8.2$ YR $5.7/2.7$ $11.7$ H-86-8 $74.60$ $2.21$ .826 $3.56$ $8.6$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ Mean $74.08$ $2.68$ .826 $3.55$ $7.4$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ H-87-9 $75.17$ .34 $1.230$ $5.02$ $3.9$ YR $5.1/3.1$ $-3.4$ H-80-3 $71.05$ $6.08$ .658 $2.88$ $6.4$ YR $6.0/3.4$ $10.3$ H-80-5 $74.85$ $1.45$ .840 $3.54$ $8.4$ YR $5.6/2.8$ $11.2$ H-81-1 $74.84$ $1.47$ .793 $3.35$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H-8	Lot 3						
H-84-3       73.26       4.21       .840 $3.73$ 6.3 YR 5.0/3.0       4.8         H-81-6       72.32 $3.78$ .788 $3.30$ 7.6 YR 5.9/2.9       11.9         H-85-2       73.64       4.54       .751 $3.44$ 8.5 YR 5.8/2.7       12.6         H-80-6       74.59       1.63       .779 $3.28$ $5.1$ YR $5.2/2.7$ $5.4$ H-87-1       75.10       .93       .872 $3.64$ $8.2$ YR $5.7/2.7$ $11.7$ H-86-8       74.60       2.21       .826 $3.56$ $8.6$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ Mean       74.08       2.68       .826 $3.55$ $7.4$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ H-87-9       75.17       .34 $1.230$ $5.02$ $3.9$ YR $5.1/3.1$ $-3.4$ H-80-3       71.05 $6.08$ .658 $2.88$ $6.4$ YR $6.0/3.4$ $10.3$ H-80-5       74.85 $1.45$ .840 $3.54$ $8.4$ YR $5.6/2.8$ $11.2$ H-81-1       74.84 $1.47$ .793 $3.35$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H-84-5       72.55 $4.6$	H-83-5	75.04	1.47	924	3.93	6.7 YR 5.8/2.5	11.1
H-85-273.644.54.7513.448.5 YR 5.8/2.712.6H-80-674.591.63.7793.285.1 YR 5.2/2.75.4H-87-175.10.93.8723.648.2 YR 5.7/2.711.7H-86-874.602.21.8263.568.6 YR 5.4/3.19.8Mean74.082.68.8263.557.4 YR 5.7/2.99.6Lot 4Item 1.230H-86-475.34.76.8023.368.0 YR 5.7/2.511.8H-87-975.17.341.2305.023.9 YR 5.1/3.1-3.4H-80-371.056.08.6582.886.4 YR 6.0/3.410.3H-80-574.851.45.8403.548.4 YR 5.6/2.811.2H-81-174.841.47.7933.358.4 YR 6.3/2.911.8H-84-572.554.67.7323.216.2 YR 5.3/3.45.6H-83-473.783.07.7233.128.4 YR 6.3/2.915.3H-82-174.451.16.7463.064.7 YR 5.2/3.04.1		73.26	4.21	<b>.84</b> 0	3.73	6.3 YR 5.0/3.0	4.8
H-80-674.591.63.7793.285.1 YR 5.2/2.75.4H-87-175.10.93.8723.648.2 YR 5.7/2.711.7H-86-8 $74.60$ 2.21.8263.568.6 YR 5.4/3.19.8Mean $74.08$ 2.68.8263.55 $7.4$ YR 5.7/2.99.6Lot 4H-86-475.34.76.8023.368.0 YR 5.7/2.511.8H-87-975.17.341.2305.023.9 YR 5.1/3.1-3.4H-80-371.056.08.6582.886.4 YR 6.0/3.410.3H-80-574.851.45.8403.548.4 YR 5.6/2.811.2H-81-174.841.47.7933.358.4 YR 6.3/2.911.8H-84-572.554.67.7323.216.2 YR 5.3/3.45.6H-83-473.783.07.7233.128.4 YR 6.3/2.915.3H-82-174.451.16.7463.064.7 YR 5.2/3.04.1	H-81-6	72,32	3.78	<b>•788</b>	3,30	7.6 YR 5.9/2.9	11.9
H-87-175.10.93.8723.648.2 YR 5.7/2.711.7H-86-8 $74.60$ $2.21$ .826 $3.56$ $3.64$ $8.2$ YR $5.7/2.7$ $11.7$ Mean $74.08$ $2.68$ .826 $3.55$ $7.4$ YR $5.7/2.9$ $9.8$ Lot 4H-86-4 $75.34$ .76.802 $3.36$ $8.0$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ H-87-9 $75.17$ .34 $1.230$ $5.02$ $3.9$ YR $5.1/3.1$ $-3.4$ H-80-3 $71.05$ $6.08$ .658 $2.88$ $6.4$ YR $6.0/3.4$ $10.3$ H-80-5 $74.85$ $1.45$ .840 $3.54$ $8.4$ YR $5.6/2.8$ $11.2$ H-81-1 $74.84$ $1.47$ .793 $3.35$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H-84-5 $72.55$ $4.67$ .732 $3.21$ $6.2$ YR $5.3/3.4$ $5.6$ H-83-4 $73.78$ $3.07$ .723 $3.12$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $15.3$ H-82-1 $74.45$ $1.16$ .746 $3.06$ $4.7$ YR $5.2/3.0$ $4.1$	H <b>-85-2</b>	73.64	4.54	•751	3.44	8.5 YR 5.8/2.7	12.6
H-86-8 Mean $74.60$ $74.08$ $2.21$ $2.68$ $.826$ $.826$ $3.56$ $3.55$ $8.6$ YR $5.4/3.1$ $7.4$ YR $5.7/2.9$ $9.8$ $9.6$ Lot 4H-86-4 $75.34$ $.75.17$ $.34$ $.76$ $.802$ $8.0$ $.608$ $8.0$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $.9.8$ $11.8$ $.9.8$ H-87-9 $75.17$ $.34$ $.34$ $1.230$ $5.02$ $.9.8$ $3.9$ YR $5.1/3.1$ $.9.4$ $-3.4$ $10.3$ H-80-3 $71.05$ $.6.08$ $.658$ $6.4$ YR $6.0/3.4$ $10.3$ $10.3$ $11.2$ H-80-5 $74.85$ $1.45$ $.840$ $3.54$ $.8.4$ YR $5.6/2.8$ $11.2$ H-81-1 $74.84$ $1.47$ $.793$ $3.35$ $.8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H-84-5 $72.55$ $4.67$ $.723$ $3.12$ $.8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $15.3$ H-83-4 $73.78$ $3.07$ $.723$ $3.12$ $.8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $.15.3$	H <b>-80-6</b>	74.59	1.63	•779	3 <b>.</b> 28		5 <b>.4</b>
Mean $74.08$ $2.68$ $.826$ $3.55$ $7.4$ YR $5.7/2.9$ $9.6$ Lot 4H-86-4 $75.34$ $.76$ $.802$ $3.36$ $8.0$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ H-87-9 $75.17$ $.34$ $1.230$ $5.02$ $3.9$ YR $5.1/3.1$ $-3.4$ H-80-3 $71.05$ $6.08$ $.658$ $2.88$ $6.4$ YR $6.0/3.4$ $10.3$ H-80-5 $74.85$ $1.45$ $.840$ $3.54$ $8.4$ YR $5.6/2.8$ $11.2$ H-81-1 $74.84$ $1.47$ $.793$ $3.35$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H-84-5 $72.55$ $4.67$ $.732$ $3.21$ $6.2$ YR $5.3/3.4$ $5.6$ H-83-4 $73.78$ $3.07$ $.723$ $3.12$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $15.3$ H-82-1 $74.45$ $1.16$ $.746$ $3.06$ $4.7$ YR $5.2/3.0$ $4.1$	H <b>-87-1</b>	75.10	•93	<b>.</b> 872	3.64		11.7
Lot 4 H-86-4 75.34 .76 .802 3.36 8.0 YR 5.7/2.5 11.8 H-87-9 75.17 .34 1.230 5.02 3.9 YR 5.1/3.1 -3.4 H-80-3 71.05 6.08 .658 2.88 6.4 YR 6.0/3.4 10.3 H-80-5 74.85 1.45 .840 3.54 8.4 YR 5.6/2.8 11.2 H-81-1 74.84 1.47 .793 3.35 8.4 YR 6.3/2.9 11.8 H-84-5 72.55 4.67 .732 3.21 6.2 YR 5.3/3.4 5.6 H-83-4 73.78 3.07 .723 3.12 8.4 YR 6.3/2.9 15.3 H-82-1 74.45 1.16 .746 3.06 4.7 YR 5.2/3.0 4.1	H-86-8						
H-86-475.34.76.802 $3.36$ $8.0$ YR $5.7/2.5$ $11.8$ H-87-975.17.34 $1.230$ $5.02$ $3.9$ YR $5.1/3.1$ $-3.4$ H-80-371.05 $6.08$ .658 $2.88$ $6.4$ YR $6.0/3.4$ $10.3$ H-80-574.85 $1.45$ .840 $3.54$ $8.4$ YR $5.6/2.8$ $11.2$ H-81-174.84 $1.47$ .793 $3.35$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H-84-572.55 $4.67$ .732 $3.21$ $6.2$ YR $5.3/3.4$ $5.6$ H-83-473.78 $3.07$ .723 $3.12$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $15.3$ H-82-174.45 $1.16$ .746 $3.06$ $4.7$ YR $5.2/3.0$ $4.1$	Mean	74.08	2,68	.826	3.55	7.4 YR 5.7/2.9	9.6
H-87-9 $75.17$ $.34$ $1.230$ $5.02$ $3.9$ YR $5.1/3.1$ $-3.4$ H-80-3 $71.05$ $6.08$ $.658$ $2.88$ $6.4$ YR $6.0/3.4$ $10.3$ H-80-5 $74.85$ $1.45$ $.840$ $3.54$ $8.4$ YR $5.6/2.8$ $11.2$ H-81-1 $74.84$ $1.47$ $.793$ $3.35$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H-84-5 $72.55$ $4.67$ $.732$ $3.21$ $6.2$ YR $5.3/3.4$ $5.6$ H-83-4 $73.78$ $3.07$ $.723$ $3.12$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $15.3$ H-82-1 $74.45$ $1.16$ $.746$ $3.06$ $4.7$ YR $5.2/3.0$ $4.1$	Lot 4						
H-87-9 $75.17$ $.34$ $1.230$ $5.02$ $3.9$ YR $5.1/3.1$ $-3.4$ H-80-3 $71.05$ $6.08$ $.658$ $2.88$ $6.4$ YR $6.0/3.4$ $10.3$ H-80-5 $74.85$ $1.45$ $.840$ $3.54$ $8.4$ YR $5.6/2.8$ $11.2$ H-81-1 $74.84$ $1.47$ $.793$ $3.35$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H-84-5 $72.55$ $4.67$ $.732$ $3.21$ $6.2$ YR $5.3/3.4$ $5.6$ H-83-4 $73.78$ $3.07$ $.723$ $3.12$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $15.3$ H-82-1 $74.45$ $1.16$ $.746$ $3.06$ $4.7$ YR $5.2/3.0$ $4.1$	H <b>-86-4</b>	75.34	.76	<b>802</b>	3.36		11.8
H-80-3 $71.05$ $6.08$ $.658$ $2.88$ $6.4$ YR $6.0/3.4$ $10.3$ H-80-5 $74.85$ $1.45$ $.840$ $3.54$ $8.4$ YR $5.6/2.8$ $11.2$ H-81-1 $74.84$ $1.47$ $.793$ $3.35$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $11.8$ H-84-5 $72.55$ $4.67$ $.732$ $3.21$ $6.2$ YR $5.3/3.4$ $5.6$ H-83-4 $73.78$ $3.07$ $.723$ $3.12$ $8.4$ YR $6.3/2.9$ $15.3$ H-82-1 $74.45$ $1.16$ $.746$ $3.06$ $4.7$ YR $5.2/3.0$ $4.1$	H-87-9	75 <b>.17</b>		1.230	5 <b>.02</b>	3.9 YR 5.1/3.1	
H-81-1       74.84       1.47       .793       3.35       8.4 YR 6.3/2.9       11.8         H-84-5       72.55       4.67       .732       3.21       6.2 YR 5.3/3.4       5.6         H-83-4       73.78       3.07       .723       3.12       8.4 YR 6.3/2.9       15.3         H-82-1       74.45       1.16       .746       3.06       4.7 YR 5.2/3.0       4.1	H <b>-80-3</b>	71.05	6.08	<b>●</b> 65 <b>8</b>	<b>2</b> •88	6.4  YR  6.0/3.4	
H-84-5       72.55       4.67       .732       3.21       6.2 YR 5.3/3.4       5.6         H-83-4       73.78       3.07       .723       3.12       8.4 YR 6.3/2.9       15.3         H-82-1       74.45       1.16       .746       3.06       4.7 YR 5.2/3.0       4.1							
H-83-4 73.78 3.07 .723 3.12 8.4 YR 6.3/2.9 15.3 H-82-1 74.45 1.16 .746 3.06 4.7 YR 5.2/3.0 4.1			-				
H-82-1 74.45 1.16 .746 3.06 4.7 YR 5.2/3.0 4.1							
Mean 74.00 2.37 .816 3.44 6.8 YR 5.6/3.0 8.3							
	Mean	74.00	2.37	.816	3.44	6.8 YR 5.6/3.0	8.3

.

# APPENDIX A (Continued)

Animal		E d	Myoglobina	Myoglobin <sup>b</sup>	Munsell Bonototion	Index of <sup>C</sup>
Number	Moisture (%)	Fat (%)	$\frac{\text{Content}}{(\text{mg}_{\bullet}/\text{g}_{\bullet})}$	$\frac{\text{Content}}{(\underline{m}g_{\bullet}/g_{\bullet})}$	Renotation	Fading
	(/•)	(/•)	( \mg • \ R • \	<b>∖=</b> 8•/ 8• /		
Lot 5						
H-83-9	73.83	3.09	.770	3.34	9.7 YR 6.0/2.8	14.0
H <b>-83-6</b>	74.44	2.34	.672	2.89	5.8 YR 5.3/3.0	6.0
H <b>-85-1</b>	73.48	3.96	•732	3.24	6.3 YR 5.2/2.9	6.2
H-84-6	75 <b>.16</b>	1.94	1.130	4.93	5.4 YR 5.1/3.1	4.1
H <b>-80-</b> 8	75,26	.44	•597	2.46	8.2 YR 5.1/2.7	11.7
H <b>-86-3</b>	73.88	3.24	.676	2.95	7.6 YR 5.6/3.0	10.0
H-80-2	74.30	1.60	<b>.849</b>	3.52	7.0 YR 5.4/3.0	8.0
H-87-8	73.20	3.63	<b>658</b>	2.84	6.4 YR 5.6/2.3	10.0
Mean	74.19	2.53	•760	3.27	7.1 YR 5.5/2.9	8.8
H-87-3 <sup>d</sup>	74.02	2.57	•672	2.87	7.9 YR 5.9/2.5	12.9

# Trial I - Continued

<sup>A</sup>Myoglobin expressed in mg./g. of fresh muscle tissue <sup>b</sup>Myoglobin expressed in mg./g. on a moisture-free, fat-free basis <sup>c</sup>Standard = Hue 4.3 Yellow-Red, Value 4.9, Chroma 3.6 <sup>d</sup>Unassigned animal used in computing correlation coefficients

Anima1			Myoglobin <sup>a</sup>	Myoglobin <sup>D</sup>	Munsel1	Index of <sup>C</sup>
Number	Moisture	Fat	Content	Content	Renotation	Fading
Number.					ACCOLATION	rauing
	(%)	(%)	$(mg_{\bullet}/g_{\bullet})$	(mg./g.)		
Lot 4						
<b>X-</b> 33 <b>-</b> 10	72.81	2,44	•914	3.69	4.3 YR 5.5/2.6	7.6
<b>X-61-4</b>	71.96	7.26	•513	2.47	9.4 YR 6.5/2.7	17.8
X-59-4	73.73	2.92	<b>.</b> 840	3.60	6.4 YR 6.0/3.2	12.1
<b>X-</b> 59 <b>-8</b>	73 <b>.</b> 59	1.85	•980	3.99	3.7 YR 4.9/3.7	
<b>X-</b> 39-3	72.47	6.94	<b>830</b>	4.03	5.7 YR 6.0/3.0	10.1
X-61-12	73.52	2.38	.849	3.52	6.9 YR 5.4/3.1	7.7
<b>X-58-4</b>	71.82	6.50	•746	3.44	7.6 YR 5.6/3.0	10.0
<b>X-34-7</b>	71.89	6.68	•924	4.31	5.2 YR 5.5/3.1	
<b>X-66-1</b> 0	73.77	3.72	•65 <b>3</b>	2.90	8.8 YR 6.0/3.2	
Mean	72.84	4.52	.805	3,56	6.8 YR 5.7/3.1	
Lot 5						
<b>X-</b> 59 <b>-2</b>	73.89	2,90	<b>.</b> 933	4.02	6.9 YR 5.6/2.5	7.7
X-33-5	74.30	1,95	.704	2.96	8.5 YR 5.7/2.7	
X-61-2	74.01	4.11	1.020	4.66	6.5 YR 5.5/2.8	8.5
X-34-11	71.65	7.43	.653	3.12	6.9 YR 5.6/3.2	8.7
Mean	73.46	4.10	.828	3.69	7.2 YR 5.7/2.8	9.2
X-58-3d	74.20	3.75	<b>.</b> 849	3.85	7.4 YR 5.5/3.1	9.2

<sup>a</sup>Myoglobin expressed in mg./g. of fresh muscle tissue <sup>b</sup>Myoglobin expressed in mg./g. on a moisture-free, fat-free basis <sup>c</sup>Standard - Hue 4.3 Yellow-Red, Value 4.9, Chroma 3.6 <sup>d</sup>Unassigned animal used in computing correlation coefficients ROOM USE ONLY



