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#### Abstract

: An improved heuristic approach is planned and experimented for plant layout optimization. One of the alternatives to find out optimum solution in the area of plant layout could be achieved by trying different shapes and arrangement in plant layout location. The various shapes and sizes and its analysis is discussed in the paper. The idea of this alternative of placing departments in other than rectangular shapes are experimented and analyzed. It is not discussed in such logic before. It is novel idea which is being incorporated and set up a new scope for the researchers to look for this dimension of incorporation in optimization of plant layout. Traditional approach of plant layout optimization considers rectangular shapes. In this paper the emphasis is given to hexagonal shape instead of rectangular. Heuristic approach is experimented Honeycomb way. We know that a Hexagon has six sides and it can accommodate six departments near it.


1. Introduction: To achieve maximum closeness rating the various orientation of hexagonal shape are discussed. The data is taken from the case study and incorporated accordingly. Let us assume that we have one hexagon of area 50 sq mt , then clearly 2 hexagons will give area 100 sq-mt this arrangement has highest TCR rating with the maximum TCR department and also can accommodate more number of departments with the highest TCR department. There are only 2 cases possible in this discussion. In Case 1 there are 2 sides occupies and by plotting the graph we got the value of CD as 2 and this is even less than obtained from the accepted arrangement.
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In Case 2 one side is occupied and Centroid distance measured is 3.8 , which is behind acceptable value. The following data is considered from the industry for experimenting and validating the result.
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## 2. Data table:

| Department Name | Size | No. of Hexagons |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. Furnace | 100 | 2 |
| 2. Hot rolling | 50 | 1 |
| 3. Shearing | 50 | 1 |
| 4. Cold rolling | 50 | 1 |
| 5. Circle machining | 50 | 1 |
| 6. Annealing | 50 | 1 |
| 7. Pressing | 50 | 1 |
| 8. Lathe machine | 250 | 5 |
| 9. Collar cutting m/c | 50 | 1 |
| 10. Semi finished storage | 200 | 4 |
| 11. Finishing | 50 | 1 |
| 12. Chemical Finishing | 100 | 2 |
| 13. Dispatch | 100 | 2 |
| 14. Scrap | 150 | 3 |
| 15. Raw Material | 100 | 2 |

### 3.0 Algorithm Logic for designing New Facility

Step 1 - Estimate the TCR for each department.

Step 2 - Select department with maximum TCR. Place the selected in the centre for department $[i=1$ to $n]$ Select an department to be placed, place the selected in the layout end for.


Step 3 - Selection rules Choose the next activity having largest number of A, E,I,O,U,X, etc] relationships with the
department already in the layout. Supplement above procedure with TCR for choosing first department and breaking ties.

Step 4 - Placement rules
Contiguity Rule: If an activity is represented by more than one unit area hexagon, every unit area hexagon must share at least one edge with at least one unit area representing the activity.


Example: D5:- 1 Hexagon D6:- 2
Hexagon
3.1 Placement Combinations alternatives:

| 2 | $\square$ | $\infty$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | $\triangle X X$ | $00$ | $3$ | $0$ | $0$ |
| 3 | $\bigcirc$ | $0$ |  |  |  |
| 4 | $\triangle X X X$ | 00 |  |  |  |
| 4 |  | $0$ |  |  |  |
| 4 | $0$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |

5

Connectedness Rule: The perimeter of an department must be a closed loop that is

EXISTING:-

always in contact with some edge of some unit area hexagon representing the activity.


Open loop


Closed loop

Determining possible shapes becomes non trivial for department more than 5 unit hexagon and some shapes bizarre configuration. Therefore additional rules are used.

Enclosed Void Rule: No department contains an enclosed void.

## 4. Placement Sequence of the departments with Honeycomb shape and its comparison:

The logic of CORELAP is used and experimented to find out placement location with both the shapes and it is shown as below:

PLACEMENT SEQUENCE - 6


Department 6 has the maximum TCR value hence it is placed in the middle of the the area so that it is able to arrange maximum departments near it.

PROPOSED:-


PLACEMENT SEQUENCE - 6


EXISTING:-


## PROPOSED:-



EXISTING:-


PROPOSED:-


PLACEMENT SEQUENCE $\mathbf{= 6 - 5 - 7}$


- D7 has max. CR with D5 \& D6.
- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}(6)+\mathrm{E}(5) \rightarrow 9$
- Centroid Distance $\rightarrow(7,6)=3.55 \mathrm{~m}$
$(7,5)=3.7 \mathrm{~m}$
- D6 can still accommodate 4 more D.


## PLACEMENT SEQUENCE - 6-5-7-4

EXISTING:-


PROPOSED:-


## EXISTING:-

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SR } \\ & \text { NO } \end{aligned}$ | DEPARTMENT | OEPARTMENT RELATIONSMIP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Summagr |  |  |  |  | TCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | A | E | 1 | 0 | U |  |
| 1 | FURNACE |  | $A$ | U | U | u | U | E | U | U | 1 | $\cup$ | U | U |  | E | 1 | 2 | 2 | $\cdots$ | 9 | 14 |
| 2 | HOT ROLLING | A |  | A | E | 1 | O | U | U | O | U | $\square$ | E | U | $\square$ | U | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 18 |
| 9 | SMEARENG | U | A |  | A | O | A | U | 1 | U | - | $\bigcirc$ | U | 1 | $\cup$ | U | 3 | - | 3 | 2 | 6 | 20 |
| 4 | COLDROLL | U | E | A | - | A | E | 1 | U | U | U | L | 4 | U | $\cup$ | U | 2 | 3 | 1 | - | 8 | 18 |
| 5 | CIRCLEM/C | U | I | 0 | A | - | A | E | U | 1 | U | 1 | U | 0 | E | U | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 22 |
| 6 | ANNEALING | u | 0 | A | E | A | . | A | u | E | I | $\square$ | E | U | E | U | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 27 |
| 7 | PREESING | L | $\square$ | $\square$ | E | E | A | A | A | 1 | 4 | $\checkmark$ | O | U | $\square$ | $u$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 19 |
| 8 | LATREM/C | U | u | A | U | U | U | A | - | A | U | U | E | u | - | U | 2 | 1. | 1 | 1 | 9 | 14 |
| 9 | CUTTINGM/C | U | - | U | U | 1 | E | 1 | A | - | A | E | U | U | U | U | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 19 |
| 10 | SEMFINESHED STORAGE | 1 | u | 1 | u | U | 1 | U | U | A | - | A | u | U | 1 | 0 | 2 | - | 4 | - | 8 | 16 |
| 11 | Finishing | U | U | - | E | 0 | U | U | v | E | A | - | A | 1 | $u$ | U | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | 7 | 18 |
| 12 | CHEMICAL FINISHING | U | E | U | U | 1 | $E$ | - | $\tau$ | U | 0 | A | - | 0 | U | 0 | 1 | 3 | - | 2 | 8 | 15 |
| 13 | DSPATCH | $u$ | E | 1 | U | U | U | U | $v$ | $u$ | U | 1 | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ | $E$ | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 10 |
| 14 | SCRAP | 1 | U | U | U | - | E | U | - | 1 | 1 | U | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 9 |
| 15 | Raw MATEPAL | E | U | 0 | U | U | U | U | U | U | 0 | 0 | U | E | - | - | - | 2 | - | 1 | 11 | 7 |

## PROPOSED:-



## PLACEMENT SEQUENCE - 6-5-7-4



- D4 has highest score with D5,6 \&7.
- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}(6)+\mathrm{E}(5) \rightarrow 9$
- Centroid Distance $\rightarrow(4,5) \rightarrow 3.49 \mathrm{~m}$ $(4,6) \rightarrow 3.6 \mathrm{~m}$ $(4,7) \rightarrow 6.26 \mathrm{~m}$

PLACEMENT SEQUENCE : 6-5-7-4-3


- D4 has highest score with D5,6 \&7.
- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}(6)+\mathrm{E}(5) \rightarrow 9$
- Centroid Distance $\rightarrow(4,5) \rightarrow 3.24 \mathrm{~m}$
$(4,6) \rightarrow 3.16 \mathrm{~m}$
$(4,7) \rightarrow 5.3 \mathrm{~m}$

PLACEMENT SEQUENCE


- D3 now has max. CR with D4 \& D6.
- $C R \rightarrow A(4)+A(6)=10$
- Centroid Distance $\rightarrow(3,4)=5.33 \mathrm{~m}$
$(3,6)=4.03 \mathrm{~m}$
$(3,5)=7.4 \mathrm{~m}$
- Cumulative $\mathrm{CR}=33$

PLACEMENT SEQUENCE : 6-5-7-4-3

-D3 now has max. CR with D4 \& D6.

- $C R \rightarrow A(4)+A(6)=10$
- Centroid Distance $\rightarrow(3,4)=3.49 \mathrm{~m}$
$(3,6)=3.49 \mathrm{~m}$
$(3,5)=6 \mathrm{~m}$
- Cumulative $\mathrm{CR}=33$

PLACEMENT SEQUENCE -> 6-5-7-4-3-2

## EXISTING:-

| SR | DEPARTMENT | DEPARTMENT RELATIONSHIP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SUMMARY |  |  |  |  | TCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | A | E | 1 | 0 | U |  |
| 1 | furnace | - | A | U | U | $\cup$ | 0 | $t$ | U | $u$ | 1 | U | U | U | 1 | E | 1 | 2 | 2 | - | 9 | 14 |
| 2 | MOTROLLING | A |  | A | $t$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | U | 0 | U | U | E | U | U | U | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 18 |
| 3 | SHEARING | U | A | - | A | 0 | A | U | 1 | U | 1 | 0 | U | 1 | U | U | 3 | - | 3 | 2 | 6 | 20 |
| 4 | COLDROLL | U | E | A | - | A | E | 1 | U | U | U | E | $u$ | $u$ | U | U | 2 | 3 | 1 | - | 8 | 18 |
| 5 | CIRCLEM/C | U | I | C | A | - | A | E | $u$ | 1 | U | 1 | 4 | 0 | E | U | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 22 |
| 6 | ANNEALING | U | $\bigcirc$ | A | ¢ | A | - | A | U | E | 1 | U | E | U | E | U | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1. | 5 | 27 |
| 7 | PRESSING | $t$ | U | U | 1 | $t$ | A | - | a | 1 | U | U | 0 | U | U | U | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 19 |
| 8 | LATREM/C | U | $\cup$ | A | U | $\cup$ | $U$ | A | - | A | U | U | E | $u$ | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 14 |
| 9 | CUTTINGM/C | U | 0 | U | U | 1 | E | 1 | A | - | A | E | U | $u$ | U | U | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 19 |
| 10 | SEMFINSHED STORAGE | 1 | U | 1 | U | U | 1 | U | U | A | - | A | U | U | 1 | U | 2 | - | 4 | - | 8 | 16 |
| 11 | FINISMING | $\checkmark$ | U | 0 | $t$ | $\cup$ | 0 | 0 | U | t | A | $\cdots$ | A | 1 | $\cup$ | U | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | 7 | 18 |
| 12 | Chemical FINISHING | U | E | U | U | 1 | E | 0 | E | 0 | U | A | - | 0 | U | 0 | 1 | 3 | - | 2 | 8 | 15 |
| 13 | DISPATCH | $\checkmark$ | E | 1 | $\cup$ | $u$ | $v$ | $\cup$ | U | $u$ | U | 1 | 0 | - | 0 | \% | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 10 |
| 14 | SCRAP | 1 | U | U | $v$ | 0 | E | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | U | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 9 |
| 15 | RAW MATERAL | E | U | U | U | U | U | 0 | U | U | U | U | U | E | 0 | - | - | 2 | - | 1 | 11 | 7 |



- D2 now has max. CR with D3 \& D4.
- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}(4)+\mathrm{E}(3)=9$
- Centroid Distance $\rightarrow(2,3)=2.94 \mathrm{~m}$
$(2,4)=4.02 \mathrm{~m}$
$(2,5)=7.05 \mathrm{~m}$
$(2,6)=4.75 \mathrm{~m}$
$(2,7)=8 \mathrm{~m}$


## PROPOSED:-



-D2 now has max. CR with D3 \& D4.

- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}(4)+\mathrm{E}(3)=9$
- Centroid Distance $\rightarrow(2,3)=3.6 \mathrm{~m}$ $(2,4)=3.49 \mathrm{~m},(2,5)=6.99 \mathrm{~m}$ $(2,6)=6.17 \mathrm{~m},(2,7)=8 \mathrm{~m}$ -Cumulative $\mathrm{CR}=42$


## EXISTING:-



PLACEMENT SEQUENCE - 6-5-7-4-3-2-8

-D8 now has max. CR with D7 \& D3.

- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}(7)+\mathrm{I}(3)=8$
- Centroid Distance $\rightarrow(7,8)=6.35 \mathrm{~m}$
$(3,8)=2.33 \mathrm{~m}$

PROPOSED:-

| SR | department | OEPARTMENT RELATIONSHP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Summak |  |  |  |  | TCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 4 | E | 1 | o | U |  |
| 1 | furmact |  | A | 0 | U | U | 0 | E |  | $\checkmark$ | 1 | U | U | U | 1 | t | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 9 | 14 |
| 2 | HOTROLLING | A | - | A | $\varepsilon$ | - | - | U |  | - | u | U | E | U | U | U | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 7 | 18 |
| 3 | SHEARING | U | A | $\cdots$ | A | - | A | $u$ |  | u | 1 | - | u | 1 | $u$ | U | 3 |  | 3 | 2 | 6 | 20 |
| 4 | COLOROLL | U | E | A | . | A | E | 1 |  | U | U | E | U | U | $u$ | $\cup$ | 2 | 3 | 1 |  | 8 | 18 |
| 5 | CIRCLEM/C | 0 | 1 | - | A | - | A | E |  | 1 | U | 1 | $\checkmark$ | 0 | E | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 22 |
| 6 | ANNEALIMG. | U | 0 | A | 1 | A | - | A |  | $\underline{1}$ | 1 | $u$ | E | $u$ | E | $\cup$ | 3 | 4. | 1. | 1. | 5 | 27 |
| 7 | Pressing | E | $u$ | U | 1 | E | A | - | A | 1 | u | u | - | u | U | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 19 |
| 8 | LATHEMMC | $u$ | $u$ | A | u | U | u | A |  | A | u | U | E | u | 0 | $u$ | 2 | 1. | 1 | 1 | 9 | 14 |
| 9 | Cutminam/C | 4 | 0 | $u$ | U | 1 | E | - |  | , | A | E | U | $u$ | $\cup$ | $u$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 19 |
| 10 | SEMIFINESHED STORAGE | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | U | 1 | 0 |  | A | - | A | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | - | 4 |  | 8 | 16 |
| 11 | finishing | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $t$ | $\checkmark$ | 0 | 0 |  | $t$ | A | - | A | 1 | $u$ | $\checkmark$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | 18 |
| 12 | Chtmical FINISHING | u | t | u | U | 1 | \& | - |  | U | u | A | - | - | u | $\checkmark$ | 1 | 3 | - | 2 | ${ }^{8}$ | 15 |
| 13 | DISPATCH | u | $\varepsilon$ | 1 | U | U | U | $u$ |  | U | U | 1 | - | - | 0 | $\varepsilon$ | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 10 |
| 14 | SCEAP | 1 | $u$ | $u$ | $u$ | - | £ | $u$ |  | + | 1 | U | U | - | - | - | $\div$ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 9 |
| 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RAW } \\ & \text { MATERLAL } \end{aligned}$ | E | 0 | 0 | 0 | U | U | 0 |  | 0 | U | U | U | E | - | - | $\div$ | 2 | - | 1 | 11 | 7 |

PLACEMENT SEQUENCE - 6-5-7-4-3-2-8

-D8 now has max. CR with D7 \& D3.

- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}(7)+\mathrm{I}(3)=8$
- Centroid Distance $\rightarrow(7,8)=5.62 \mathrm{~m}$
$(3,8)=8.47 \mathrm{~m}$
- Cumulative CR = 50


PLACEMENT SEQUENCE - 6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9

-D9 has A relation with D8, E with D6, I
with 7 and O with 2 .

- CR $\rightarrow$ I(7) + A(8) $=8$
- Centroid Distance $\rightarrow(9,8)=11.81 \mathrm{~m}$
$(9,6)=8.18 \mathrm{~m},(9,5)=5.16 \mathrm{~m}$
$(9,7)=5.49 \mathrm{~m}$
-Cumulative CR $=58$


PLACEMENT SEQUENCE - 6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9
-D9 could be placed with D6 in this case improving the TCR
rating .

- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}(6)+\mathrm{A}(8)=9$
- Centroid Distance
$\rightarrow(9,8)=5.06 \mathrm{~m}$
$(9,6)=3.55 \mathrm{~m}$
$(9,5)=7.04 \mathrm{~m},(9,7)=6$

-Cumulative CR = 59
PLACEMENT SEQUENCE - 6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9-12

-D 12 now has max. CR with D 8 \& D2.
- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}(2)+\mathrm{E}(8)=8$
(It has A relation with 11 but cannot be placed with it as it is not placed)
- Cumulative $\mathrm{CR}=64$



PLACEMENT SEQUENCE -6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9-10-12-11

-D11 had A rating with D12 but still it could not be placed with it which was required. It gave max. CR with $4 \& 5$.

- $C R \rightarrow E(4)+I(5)=7$
-Cumulative $\mathrm{CR}=71$


PLACEMENT SEQUENCE -6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9-10-1
-D1 is placed with
D2 \& D10.
${ }^{\bullet} \mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}(2)+\mathrm{I}(10)=8$

- Cumulative $\mathrm{CR}=73$



## EXISTING:-



PLACEMENT SEQUENCE -6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9-12-11-10


- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}(9)+\mathrm{A}(11)=10$
- Cumulative $\mathrm{CR}=81$


PLACEMENT SEQUENCE -6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9-10-1-11


- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}(10)+\mathrm{E}(9)=9$
-In Corelap method 11 was arranged with D4 \& D5 with CR =7 .
-Cumulative CR $\rightarrow 82$

January - February 2020
ISSN: 0193-4120 Page No. 7785-7799


PLACEMENT SEQUENCE -6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9-12-11-
10-1-14


- D14 is placed with D10 \& 1
- $C R \rightarrow I(1)+I(10)=6$
- Cumulative $\mathrm{CR}=92$


## PROPOSED:-



PLACEMENT SEQUENCE -6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9-
10-1-11-12-14

- D14 is placed with

D5 \& 1

- $C R \rightarrow I(1)+E(5)=$

7

- Cumulative $\mathrm{CR}=$

98


EXISTING:-


PLACEMENT SEQUENCE -6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9-12-11-10-1-14-15


- D15 is placed with D12 \& 1
- $C R \rightarrow E(1)=4$
- Cumulative $\mathrm{CR}=96$

PLACEMENT SEQUENCE -6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9-
10-1-11-12-14-15

- D15 is placed with D14 \& 1
- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}(1)+\mathrm{O}(14)=6$
- Cumulative $\mathrm{CR}=$

104


PLACEMENT SEQUENCE -6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9-12-11-10-1-14-15-13

-D13 is placed with D14 \& 1 \& 15

- $\mathrm{CR} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}(15)+0(14)=6$
- Cumulative CR = 102

PROPOSED:-

| SR | DEPARTMENT | DEgARTMENT RELATIONSHP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SUMMASY |  |  |  |  | TCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | A | E | 1 | 0 | U |  |
| 1 | PURNACE | - | A | U | U | U | U | E | U | $U$ | 1 | U | $\cup$ | U | 1 | E | 1 | 2 | 2 | - | 9 | 14 |
| 2 | HOT ROLLING | A | - | A | E | 1 | 0 | U | U | 0 | $u$ | U | E | U | U | U | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 18 |
| 3 | SHEASENG | U | A | . | A | 0 | A | 4 | 1 | $U$ | 1 | 0 | U | 1 | 4 | U | 3 | - | 3 | 2 | 6 | 20 |
| 4 | COLDROLL | U | E | A | - | A | E | 1 | U | U | U | E | U | U | U | U | 2 | 3 | 1 | . | 8 | 18 |
| 5 | CIRCLEM/C | U | 1 | 0 | A | - | A | $t$ | U | 1 | U | 1 | U | 0 | $t$ | U | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 22 |
| 6 | ANNEALING | U | 0 | A | E | A | - | A | U | E | 1 | U | E | U | E | U | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 27 |
| 7 | PRESSING | E | U | U | 1 | E | A | - | A | 1 | U | U | 0 | U | U | U | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 19 |
| 8 | LATHEM/C | U | U | A | U | $U$ | $U$ | A | - | A | U | U | E | U | 0 | U | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 14 |
| 9 | CUTTNGM/C | 4 | 0 | U | U | 1 | E | 1 | A | - | A | E | 4 | U | 4 | U | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 19 |
| 10 | SEMFINISHED STORAGE | 1 | U | 1 | U | U | 1 | U | U | A | - | A | U | U | 1 | U | 2 | - | 4 | - | 8 | 16 |
| 11 | FNISHING | U | U | 0 | E | U | U | U | U | E | A | - | A |  | U | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | - | 7 | 18 |
| 12 | CHEMICAL Finishing | 0 | E | 0 | U | 1 | E | 0 | E | U | U | A | - | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | - | 2 | 8 | 15 |
| 13 | DISPATCH | $u$ | E | 1 | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | E | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 10 |
| 14 | SCRAP | 1 | U | 0 | U | 0 | E | U | 0 | 1 | 1 | U | U | 0 | - | 0 | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 9 |
| 15 | RAW MATERIAL | E | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | E | 0 | $\cdots$ | - | 2 | - | $\frac{1}{1}$ | 11 | 7 |

PLACEMENT SEQUENCE -6-5-7-4-3-2-8-9-12-


## 5. Corelap v/s Honeycomb and their values:

## Corelap v/s Honeycomb

TOTAL CLOSENESS RATING :102 TOTAL CLOSENESS RATING :110

6.0. Previous and Present Relationship's chart and its Centroid distance achieved is shown below:

| Previous Relationship Chart's Centroid Distance:- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Previous Centroid Distance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| coordinates | Depts | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | Total |
| 10.2,5.5 | 1 | - | 2.6 | . | . | . | 10.47 | . | - | 13.29 | . | - | - | 7.35 | 6.91 | 40.62 |
| 10.3,8.1 | 2 |  | - | 4.97 | 4.02 | 5.99 | . | . | 12.18 | . | . | 7.6 | - | . | . | 39.51 |
| 8.6,10.5 | 3 |  |  | - | 5.32 | 7.09 | . | 2.67 | . | 13.04 | 10.79 | - | 9.15 | - | - | 52.08 |
| 13.9,9.9 | 4 |  |  |  | . | 1.95 | 5.26 | - | - | - | 8.33 | - | . | - | - | 18.67 |
| 15.71,26 | 5 |  |  |  |  | 3.6 | 3.11 | . | 5.16 | - | 4.11 | - | 9.9 | 6.45 | - | 32.34 |
| 12.1,12.5 | 6 |  |  |  |  | - | 3.3 | - | 7.49 | 9.4 | . | 10.5 | - | 8.15 | - | 38.84 |
| 14,15.2 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | . | 6.35 | 5.49 | . | - | 13.5 | $\cdot$ | - | $\cdot$ | 25.35 |
| 8,13.1 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 11.81 | - | $\cdot$ | 7.49 | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | 19.3 |
| 19,4,16.2 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 4.25 | 5.4 | - | - | - | - | 9.65 |
| 21.5,12.5 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 2.7 | - | - | 7.29 | - | 9.99 |
| 19,4,10.8 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 16.96 | 9.74 | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | 26.7 |
| 27,7.8 | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 12.04 | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | 12.04 |
| 13.7,2.9 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 5.17 | 10.24 | 15.A1 |
| 17.5,6.4 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 14.24 | 14.24 |
| 3.5,3.8 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 354.74 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Present Relationship Chart's Centroid Distance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | sent Reld | ionstipc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depts | 1 | , | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | ${ }^{14}$ | 15 | Total |
| 1 | - | 4.59 | . | - | - | - | 13.3 | - | - | 5.3 | - | - | - | 7.56 | 3.8 | 34.55 |
| 2 |  | . | 3.6 | 3.5 | 7 | 6.17 | . | . | 7.3 | . | . | 12.6 |  | . |  | 40.17 |
| 3 |  |  | . | 3.49 | 6 | 3.5 | . | 8.47 | - | 4.86 | 6.17 | - | 10.12 | - | - | 42.61 |
| 4 |  |  |  | . | 3.49 | 3.6 | 6.26 | - | . | - | 9.37 | - | . | . | . | 22.72 |
| 5 |  |  |  |  | . | 35 | 3.7 | - | 7.04 | . | 10.5 | - | 10. | 6.26 | - | 4.19 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  | . | 232 | . | 5.69 | 788 | - | 3.91 | . | 11.12 | . | 31.5 |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | 5.16 | 6 | . | . | 11.12 | . | . | . | 22.58 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 4.71 | . | . | 7 | - | 13.6 | . | 25.31 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | 5.6 | 3.4 | . | . | . | - | 9 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | 4.9 | - |  | 10 | $\cdot$ | 14.9 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | 3.17 | 124 | . | . | 15.57 |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 19 | . | - | 19 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | 4.71 | 6.4 | 11.11 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | 7. | 7. |
| 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 338.82 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

7. Department sequence and closeness rating achieved is shown as below:

| Department | Sequence | CR Previous |  | Sequence | CR New |  | $A=5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 13_14_2_12_15 | 12 |  | 15_14_2_10_13 | 15 |  | $\mathrm{E}=4$ |
| 2 | 1 3_8.4.14 | 14 |  | 1 10_3_4_14 | 14 |  | $\mathrm{I}=3$ |
| 3 | 2_4_6_8 | 18 |  | 2_4_6_9_10 | 18 |  | $\mathrm{O}=2$ |
| 4 | 2_3_5_6_11_14 | 22 |  | 2_3_5_6_14 | 18 |  | $\mathbf{U}=0$ |
| 5 | 4_6_7_9_11_10 | 20 |  | 4_6_7_14 | 18 |  |  |
| 6 | 3_4_5_7_8 | 19 |  | 3_4_5_7_8_9 | 23 |  |  |
| 7 | 5_688910 | 17 |  | 5.6.8 | 14 |  |  |
| 8 | 3_6_7_12_9 | 17 |  | 7_6_9_11_12 | 14 |  |  |
| 9 | 7_10 | 8 |  | 3_10_11_8_6 | 18 |  |  |
| 10 | 14_11_9 | 13 |  | 3_9_11 | 13 |  |  |
| 11 | 4_5_10_14 | 11 |  | 10_12_8_9 | 14 |  |  |
| 12 | 1_8_15 | 4 |  | 10_11_8 | 9 |  |  |
| 13 | 15_1_14 | 6 |  | 15_14 | 6 |  |  |
| 14 | 13_1_2_4_11_10 | 8 |  | 15_13_1_2_4_5 | 11 |  |  |
| 15 | 13_1_12 | 8 |  | 1.14_13 | 10 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ERV=197 |  |  | ERV=215 |  |  |

ERV= End Relationship value, CR= closeness Rating
8. Comparison of Pentagonal and Hexagonal shapes and its outcome is

## Shown as below:




not desired.
No inter- angular problem and no void spaces



9. Comparison of values and experimentation is done using Technomatix Plant Layout Simulation tool. The results are obtained and discussed:


The average distance traveled by the worker comes out to be 268.3 m .


The average travel distance of worker by Honeycomb Model comes out to be 210.3 m which is considerably low.

## 10. Results:

In this paper it has been experimented with the various algorithms for plant layout optimization. These algorithms include CRAFT, ALDEP and CORELAP. After the implementation of all these algorithms the results are as follows:
10.1 Result outcome with CRAFT:

|  | Initial | Final |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Distance | 182 | 162.32 |
| Cost Travelling | 16,244 | 14,488 |


| Total <br> Savings/Batch | 1,756 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Daily Savings | 7,024 |
| Monthly Savings | $1,82,624$ |
| Yearly Savings | $21,91,488$ |

### 10.2 Comparison of distance with ALDEP, CORELAP and honeycomb shape as option:

| Algorithm | ALDEP | CORELAP | Honeycomb |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Closeness Rating(TCR) | 96 | 102 | 110 |
| End Relationship Value | - | 197 | 215 |
| Centroid Distance | - | 354 m | 338 m |
| Avg. Travelled Distance <br> (by worker per batch) from Simulation | - | 268 m | 210 m |

## 11. CONCLUSION:

The end relationship value obtained by CORELAP was 197 while that obtained by Honeycomb method is 215.

- The centroid distance for CORELAP was estimated to be 354.74 .
- The centroid distance for Honeycomb method is 338.82
- TCR value from Corelap was found to be 102 and with Honeycomb method it is 110 .
- Simulation shows the average travel distance by worker to be 268 and 210 for corelap and honeycomb model respectively.
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