Haul & Load Improving Existing Operations Volvo Construction Equipment



Improving Processes. Instilling Expertise.

Course Agenda

- Purpose and Goal
- A Test
- Where's the money??
- Practical cost improvement "today"
- Practical cost improvement for "tomorrow"
- Conclusion



Haul & Load – What can you affect today

Course Purpose

- Offer quick hitting ideas to improve productivity or lower costs of your current mobile fleet
- Important This is an open <u>dialogue</u> not a lecture.

Goal

 Take home at least three ideas for basic but significant cost/process improvement in your operations.











Producer Price Indices (PPI)

A Test

Source: US Dept of Labor

QUARRY ACADEMY

Observations

- Cost control
 - = **business viability** in this market
 - = competitive advantage in a recovering market?
- Operationally
 - What can you control
 - What is beyond your control

Focus for Today

- Actions to improve cost/ton?
 - Change what you do
 - Change how you do it
 - Change what you use to do it





O & O Definition = "Owe and Owe"?

- Ownership and Operating costs
 - Ownership = Cost of capital or asset, depreciation "Fixed"
 - Operating = Cost of operating the asset "Variable"





O & O Definition = "Owe and Owe"?

- Ownership and Operating costs
 - Ownership = Cost of capital or asset, depreciation "Fixed"
 - Operating = Cost of operating the asset "Variable"





Practical Approaches - TODAY

- Success Stories real, tangible cost reduction via:
 - Operator improvement
 - Evaluating data
 - Fleet benchmarking





Example #1 – 5 x wheel loaders

- Cost improvement desired
- Action Taken Leveraged the dealer as a resource
 - Reviewed the machine and data history



Example #1 – 5 x wheel loaders

Average fuel consumption per hour



Example #1 – 5 x wheel loaders

- One machine = 1.2 gal/hour more → \$7,800 more cost /year
 - Over 5 years \rightarrow \$39,000.
- Next Actions Taken with dealer
 - Checked machine and operating conditions
 - Provided operator training

What Changed?

- Training work **with** the machine, not against it. Outcomes:
 - High torque at low RPM engine, load-sensing hydraulics
 → Noise/smoke don't equal production.
 - Better bucket loading while burning less fuel.
 - Utilize differential locks to reduce tire spin.
- \rightarrow Reduced consumption to the fleet average, with no loss in productivity.



Example #2 – 5 x wheel loaders

- Compost producer in NC
- Operator training provided as part of continuous improvement
- **<u>Before</u>** Operator Training
 - Average fuel consumption
 - Average tire life
- After Operator Training
 - Average fuel consumption
 - Average tire life (est.)

- 6.3 gal/hr2,000 hr per set.
- 4.7 gal/hr (1.6 gal/hr savings)
- 4,000 hr per set.

• Fuel Savings per fleet

up to \$52,000 per year

(1.6 gal/hr x 5 units x 2,000 hr x \$3.25/gal)

 \rightarrow Plus additional savings from improved tire life. . .



Wheel Loader – Example #2 – compost producer in NC What changed?

- Old "pedal-to-the-metal" mentality:
 - Expensive in fuel and noise, but also tire life, component life.
- Onboard data
 - Targeted the training
 - Validated the improvement
 - Quantified the improvement.



Onboard Data

Idle time and Engine speed

What is a typical idle time (%) in a day, for a loader? What engine RPM range is used?

• Idle time – can be 30-55% on smaller sites.

... Waiting on trucks, smoke breaks, lunch, shift change ... it adds up.



Onboard Data

- What else affects fuel consumption?
- Working at excessive engine RPMs
 - "Pedal-to-the-metal" mentality can be counter-productive.
 - Utilize auto-idle functions to save a lot of fuel (an available function ...)
 - Engine auto-shutdown (another available function)



Onboard Data

Last questions:

- Idling a big deal?
- Operator incentives?



Example #3 - 3 x 25t Excavators

• Working with grapples in a recycling yard - busy jobsite

3 shift operation, remote-monitoring showed **30% idle time**

In consultation with his dealer, the owner made an **incentive plan** for his operators for any fuel savings over a 90 day period.

• Results:

15% reduction in idle time

 \rightarrow saved 3 gal/machine/day \rightarrow 810 gallons saved over the test period.

Reduced max engine RPM and utilized the auto-idle feature

 \rightarrow saved 5 gal/machine/day \rightarrow 1350 gallons saved over the test period.

• Total = 2,160 gallons saved over 90 days

→ \$7,020 saved (\$3.25/gal)

 \rightarrow extrapolate to 1 year = \$28,080.

 \rightarrow extrapolate to 5 yrs = \$140,400.



A. Conclusions - Training

• Expensive technology isn't necessary to save fuel

Optimize operator performance, TODAY

 \rightarrow continuous training, monitor data and evaluate.

 \rightarrow a little training \$ can save a lot \$\$ in fuel.

Review you operations, TODAY

 \rightarrow change how you do things.

 \rightarrow empower operators to save.

- In these 3 examples, the savings potential <u>per unit</u> over 5 years:
 - Ex #1 \$39,000 saved per unit
 - Ex #2 \$52,000 saved per unit
 - Ex #3 \$46,800 saved per unit.

...in fuel alone. Plus benefit to tires ...

• How does this compare to your annual training budget??



Existing Equipment

- What about older equipment
 - No on-board data?
 - No capital budget?

• "Old fashioned" improvement

- Manual time studies
- Idle time, fuel usage, cycle times, travel times over a day

• Observe and try new things

- Minimum throttle required to get the material
- Is the operator utilizing all gears or just holding 2nd gear
- Are the bucket & tires appropriate for the job.
- Re-measure idle times, cycle times, fuel usage, and travel times.



Existing Equipment – Example #4

Re-Handling or Yard/Load-Out: a unique application
 Switch to a re-handling bucket: 7%+ efficiency measured





- **Tire** type/upkeep Review with your tire dealer:
 - Do you run L4's or even L5's on your re-handling loader? L3's probably save \$!
 - Tire pressures, specs and compounds?
 - \rightarrow 5% fuel efficiency gain is realistic



Existing Equipment – Example #4

- Optimize machine for the current job
- Ex: Re-handling

+12% efficiency possible with the right bucket and tires

(if 6.6 gph \rightarrow that's \$5000+ saved / year)

+ Intangibles: visibility, spillage





Tires Briefly

L2:

- When good traction is important.
- Sandy road with few/no sharp stones
- Load/carry, material handling.

L3:

- All types of load/carry.
- Stable roads, higher speeds.

L4:

- Digging aggressive material
- When cut protection is needed.
- Ex: handling blasted rock.

L5:

- Digging extremely difficult material.
- Low travel range and speed.
- Ex: Toughest quarries and mining.







Increasing tread depth, also increasing weight and reducing TMPH!







B. Conclusions - Existing Equipment

- Specifications Tires and bucket make a difference
 - \rightarrow Use the latest/best bucket design for your application
 - \rightarrow Use the best-suited tire for today's operations
 - Better performance is possible at a lower cost.
 - longer tire life, less expensive, less fuel all in one
- Applications Same loader digging in the pit and for re-handling?
 - How often is it digging vs. re-handling?
 - L5 vs. L4 vs. L3 tires = \$\$\$\$



Example #5 – Truck Loading





Example #5 – Truck Loading



As shown on video

Max Production (approx) *

- 20 trucks / hour
- 709 tons hour
- * 30 second spot time.

If spot time = 15 seconds? Max Production (approx)

- 23 trucks / hour
- 815 tons hour
 - 15% improvement

+106 ton/hr x 8 hr = 848 tons / day = \$____?





Example #5 – Truck Loading



15 second spot time <20 second cycles





Example #6 – Loading Practice





Example #6 – Loading Practice

Use Gravity

- Uphill grade at the dump can assist deceleration and backup, reducing braking.
- Avoid sharp turns before grade to keep momentum and minimize braking.

+ fuel efficiency- brake wear





Example #7 – Hauler Drive Mode



- Is 6x6 mode always needed?
 - \rightarrow in quarries 6x4 is often sufficient

- + fuel efficiency
- + tire life
- + drive train life



Example #7 – Hauler Drive Mode



Haul & Load – What you can affect today

Final Conclusions

- Operator training it's worth it!
- Optimize machines to suit your current applications
 - Buckets
 - Tires
- Optimize operations
 - Traffic patterns
 - Match drive mode to conditions





Course Purpose

- Long(er) term ideas to significantly change your operation to maintain future competitiveness.
- Important This is an open <u>dialogue</u> not a lecture.

Goal

• Take home at least one idea for process/equipment/ or method improvement study to be done at your site.





Example #8 – TEAMWORK with CEMENT





Purchasing Criteria

- Ongoing training
- Monitoring systems
- Specifications
 - Lockup transmissions
 - Net vs. gross HP
 - Boom suspension (ride control)
 - Buckets and tires
- Fuel saving features
 - Auto-idle function
 - Auto-shutdown function
 - Hi torque/low RPM engines
 - Load sensing hydraulics



vs gear pumps



1100-1350 rpm



Purchasing Criteria – All Equipment is not created equal

| • | Do you test? | Do the homework and compare! | |
|---|--------------|------------------------------|--|
|---|--------------|------------------------------|--|

| Pit Loading Test | Loader A | Loader B | Loader C | Loader D |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Grand total Tons | 7203.7 | 6341.9 | 6742.9 | 6662.1 |
| Tot. Avg. Tons/Hr. | 938.3 | 831.7 | 894.1 | 845.5 |
| Tot. gallons used | 115.5 | 123.2 | 150 | 180 |
| Tot. Tons/gal. | 62.4 | 51.5 | 45.0 | 37.0 |

- A little means a lot even for just one piece of equipment!
- Just fuel difference how much will you save with the increased tons/hr.?

| Gallons at 800 tons/hr. | 12.8 | 15.5 | 17.8 | 21.6 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Annual Difference | \$ 0 | \$16,286 | \$29,819 | \$52,728 |



Load & Carry

- Do you need trucks?
- Here's the traditional view.
- The goalposts are moving:
 - Breakeven closer to 650' (200m) due to technology advances.

Benefits

- Fewer mobile machines: less operators, less traffic.
- Lower investments
- More flexibility on ramp/hopper design







Load & Carry







Best Loading Solution

Alternatives

- 1. Wheel loader
- 2. Crawler excavator, backhoe
- 3. Crawler excavator, face shovel
- 4. Massive scale mining continuous miner, cable shovel, dragline





Best Loading Solution



| | Criteria | Wheel Loader | Backhoe Excavator | Face Shovel | | |
|----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------|-----|----------------|
| | Productivity | ΥY | YYY | ΥY | | |
| Direct Digging | | ΥY | YYY | ΥY | | |
| \rightarrow | Mobility | YYY | Y | Y | - | |
| \rightarrow | Flexibility | YYY | ΥY | | - | |
| | | load/carry, | hammer, | | | |
| | | coupler | ripper, coupler | | | |
| | Bucket Selection | YYY | YYY | Y | Key | Rating |
| | Selection/Boulder handling | ΥY | YYY | Y | | poor |
| | Truck Loading | side loading | side or rear | side loading | Y | fair |
| | Loading Level | pit floor | bench or floor | floor | YY | good/excellent |
| | Needing Support Machines | YYY | YYY | Y | YYY | exceptional |
| | Reach | ΥY | YYY | YY | | _ |
| | Capital Expense | ΥY | ΥY | Y | | |
| | Resale | YYY | YY | | | |
| | Running Costs | YY | YY | YY | | |
| QUARRY | Reliability | YYY | YYY | YY | | |

Benefits of Wheel Loaders

- Mobility
 - Possibility of load/carry on shorter distances (rule of thumb: up to 650ft)
 - Loading from different locations/depots to blend material
- Utility
 - Maintain roads, clean up loading area
- Additionally, with a quick coupler you can:
 - Do some odd or small jobs, for example clean around the conveyor
 - Use different buckets. The right bucket for the right purpose.
 - Easily switch to forks for block handling or material handling.



Benefits of Excavators

- Travel and Digging/Loading are separate modes
 - Faster load cycle times (swinging not traveling)
 - No/little undercarriage or tire wear during loading
- Handling variable material
 - Boulder handling, sorting
 - More reach
 - Better distribution of load in truck bed
- Bench management less traffic by trucks
- Ancillary Jobs
 - Hammer/breaker
 - Quick coupler allows ripper attachment, other buckets



Best Hauling Solution

Alternatives

- 1. Road trucks
- 2. Articulated dump trucks
- **3.** Rigid framed dump trucks
- 4. Mobile crusher/conveyor









2

2

Best Hauling Solution

| | • | 4 | 5 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------|
| | Criteria | Articulated Truck | Rigid Truck |
| | Power/Weight Ratio | ΥY | YYY |
| \rightarrow | Payload Capacity | ΥY | YYY |
| | Top Speed | YY * | YYY |
| | Gradeability | YYY | YY |
| | Traction | YYY | Y |
| | Visibility | ΥY | Y |
| | Flexibility | YYY | YY |
| | Seasonality | YYY | YY |
| \rightarrow | Variable roads | YYY | Y |
| | Loading Height | YYY | YY |
| | Transportability | YYY | Y |
| | Dimensions | YYY | Y |
| | Capital Expense | ΥY | Y |
| | Resale | YYY | Y |
| | Need Support Machines | YYY | Y |
| | Running Costs | YYY | ΥY |
| | Fuel Efficiency | YYY | YY |
| | Reliability | YYY | YYY |
| QUARRY - ACADEMY - | | | |



| Key Rating | | | | | |
|------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| | poor | | | | |
| Y | fair | | | | |
| ΥY | good/excellent | | | | |
| YYY | exceptional | | | | |

* FS greatly improves



Machine Size

- Does your fleet still match your current (and coming) production needs?
- TRENDS
 - Equipment continuously gets bigger, faster, more productive.
 - ... and more expensive.

• Has market demand followed the same pattern?





Machine Size – Optimal Wheel Loader Match

Wheel Loaders** L220 F Volvo L350F Cat 988H Cat 990H Cat 992H Std Either Either Either Boom Long Long 6.5 yd3 9.0 vd3 8.4 vd3 8.3 yd3 11.0 yd3; 14.0 yd3 Trucks 5.0 m3 6.9 m3 6.4 m3 6.3 m3 8.4 m3 10.7 m3 A35E 2.49 1.96 37.0 Ton 4.0 Pass 3.0 Pass 3.0 Pass 3.0 Pass 2.5 Pass 2.0 Pass 33.6 t A40E 4.90 3.53 3.81 43.0 Ton 5.0 Pass 3.5 Pass 3.8 Pass 4.0 Pass 3.0 Pass 2.3 Pass 39.0 t 40T Rigid 4.56 3.54 2.12 40.0 Ton 4.6 Pass 3.0 Pass 3.5 Pass 3.6 Pass 2.7 Pass 2.0 Pass 36.3 t 50T Rigid 5.70 4.46 2.65 50.0 Ton 5.7 Pass 4.0 Pass 4.0 Pass 4.5 Pass 3.4 Pass 2.6 Pass 45.4 t 60T Rigid 6.84 4.93 5.31 5.35 60.0 Ton 7.0 Pass 5.0 Pass 5.0 Pass 5.0 Pass 4.0 Pass 3.0 Pass 54.4t 70T Rigid 5.75 6.20 6,25 4.71 70.0 Ton 6.0 Pass 6.0 Pass 6.0 Pass 4.7 Pass 3.7 Pass 63.5 t 100T Rigid 5.29 100.0 Ton 11.0 Pass 5.0 Pass 7.0 Pass 90.7 t

2700 lb/cyd

** Maximum counterweight and pin-on spade bucket size assumed. Matching based on payload factor (body volume assumed to suit material density)



Key 3 - 4 Passes 5 - 6 Passes Passes Insufficient load height 2875 lb/cyd

| | Wheel Loaders** | | | | | |
|------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | L220F | Volvo L350F | | Cat 988H | Cat 990H | Cat 992H |
| Boom | Long | Std | Long | Either | Either | Either |
| | 6.5 yd3 | 9.0 yd3 | 8.4 yd3 | 8.3 yd3 | 11.0 yd3 | 14.0 yd3 |
| Trucks | 5.0 m3 | 6.9 m3 | 6.4 m3 | 6.3 m3 | 8.4 m3 | 10.7 m3 |
| A35E | 3.98 | 2.85 | 3.08 | 3.10 | 2.34 | 1.84 |
| 37.0 Ton | 4.0 Pass | 2.9 Pass | 3.0 Pass | 3.0 Pass | 2.3 Pass | 1.8 Pass |
| 33.6 t | | | | | | |
| A40E | 4.60 | | 3.57 | 3.60 | 2.72 | 2.14 |
| 43.0 Ton | 4.6 Pass | 3.0 Pass | 3.6 Pass | 3.6 Pass | 2.7 Pass | 2.0 Pass |
| 39.0 t | | | | | | |
| 40T Rigid | 4.28 | | | 3.35 | 2.53 | 1.99 |
| 40.0 Ton | 4.0 Pass | 3.0 Pass | 3.0 Pass | 3.4 Pass | 2.5 Pass | 2.0 Pass |
| 36.3 t | | | | | | |
| 50T Rigid | 5.35 | | | 4.19 | | 2.48 |
| 50.0 Ton | 5.0 Pass | 4.0 Pass | 4.0 Pass | 4.0 Pass | 3.0 Pass | 2.5 Pass |
| 45.4 t | | | | | | |
| 60T Rigid | 6.42 | 4.63 | 4.99 | 5.03 | 3.79 | 2,98 |
| 60.0 Ton | 6.0 Pasis | 4.6 Pass | 5.0 Pass | 5.0 Pass | 3.8 Pass | 3.0 Pass |
| 54.4 t | | | | | | |
| 70T Rigid | 7.49 | 5.40 | 5.82 | 5.87 | 4,43 | 3.48 |
| 70.0 Ton | 7.0 Pass | 5.0 Pass | 6.0 Pass | 6.0 Pass | 4.0 Pass | 3.5 Pass |
| 63.5 t | | | | | | |
| 100T Rigid | 10.70 | | 8.31 | 8.38 | 6.32 | 4.97 |
| 100.0 Ton | 11.0 Pass | 8.0 Pass | 8.0 Pass | 8.0 Pass | 6.0 Pass | 5.0 Pass |
| 90.7 t | | | | | | |

** Maximum counterweight and pin-on spade bucket size assumed. Matching based on payload factor (body volume assumed to suit material densitg).

Keg 3 - 4 Passes 5 - 6 Passes Passes Insufficient load height

Example #9 – HOW MANY PASSES?







Machine Costs

Estimated Hauler 0&0 Costs



Decisions Decisions???

- So many alternatives
 - Best site layout which routes, grades, turns, etc ...
 - Load & Carry vs. Load and haul
 - How many trucks, what size trucks
 - Excavator vs. Loader vs. Load and Carry
- How do you figure all out without years of study
- What if you want/need to change something

It's easy – site simulation study!

• Most Equipment Manufacturers have software to do this for you



- Create just about any scenario and mix that you want
- Adjust details in every aspect until it is tuned to your liking

| Site Simulation 3 | LOAD and HAUL | Тур | oe of Calculation Quick Esti | mate 🔽 |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| Example | | Loading Analysis | Lipment Fleet Comparison | Calculate |
| Fleet-1 | ►dit Add Copy Delete | Excavation Target 1000000.00 Lcy | | |
| Material IMST1 Granite | . b. W. | Loading Unit | | Count |
| Schedule | Edit Add Copy Delete | Hauler Type 1 | Edit Add Copy Delete | |
| [MST] 10 Hour Day - 50 Min hour | × 700 | [PRJ] VOLVO A40E FS | ~ | Auto 😂 |
| Haul Route | Edit Add Copy Delete | Hauler Type 2 | Edit Add Copy Delete | |
| [PRJ] Haul Cycle1 | Edit Add Copy Delete | None | Edit Add Copy Delete | 0 🗘 |
| | | None | <u>.</u> | 0 🗘 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |



Conclusions

- Don't presume yesterday's solution:
 - Performance, cost/value, and market demand ALL change.
 - Technology
 - Application
- Make informed decisions for your future mobile needs.
- Study different solutions.
- Challenge the status quo!





Haul & Load – Overall Conclusions

Today

- Find cost efficiencies, starting with fuel.
 - Leverage your operators and suppliers

Tomorrow

- Informed decisions in future planning.
 - Study different solutions
 - Again, leverage your suppliers.



Thank You! Questions?

