



Ain Shams University
Faculty of Engineering

Multi-Criteria Facility Layout

Thesis

By

Moshira Essam El-Deen Shedeed

MSc. Mechanical Engineering (Production)

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of

Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering

Supervised By

Prof. Dr. Salah El-Din Zaky Abdel Barr

Assoc. Prof. Nahid Hussein Afia Abd Halim

Cairo 2013

Examiners Committee

The undersigned certify that they have read and recommend to the Faculty of Engineering Ain Shams University for acceptance a thesis entitled “Multi-Criteria Facility Layout”, submitted by Moshira Essam El-Deen Shedeed, in partial fulfillment of requirement for the degree of Philosophy of Doctorate in Mechanical Engineering.

Name

Signature

Prof. Dr. Amin Mohamed Kamel El Kharbotly

Professor of Production Engineering

Faculty of Engineering- Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Ibrahim El-Sayed Osman

Professor in Mechanical Engineering

Faculty of Engineering in Helwam – Helwan University

Dr. Nahid Hussein Afia Abd Halim

Associate Professor of Production Engineering

Faculty of Engineering- Ain Shams University

Information about the Researcher

Name: Moshira Essam El-Deen Shedeed

Degree: B.Sc in Mechanical Engineering

Department of Design and Production Engineering

Faculty of Engineering – Ain Shams University, June 1998.

MSc in Mechanical Engineering

Department of Design and Production Engineering

Faculty of Engineering – Ain Shams University, June 2004.

Employment:

1998-2000

Design Engineer in the Egyptian-Italian Engineering and Construction Co.
(EGITALEC).

2000-till now

Design Engineer in Engineering for the Petroleum and Process Industries
(Enppi).

Statement

This thesis is submitted in the partial fulfillment of Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering, to Ain Shams University.

The author carried out the work included in this thesis, and no part of this thesis has been submitted for a degree or qualification at any other university.

Signature

Moshira Essam El- Deen Shedeed

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my gratitude to the late Prof. Dr. Salah El-Din Zaky Abdel Barr, sadly passed away shortly before the completion of this work.

I would like to thank Associate Prof. Nahid Afia for her experience, patience and supervision.

I am also grateful to my family especially my grandmother and my sister Ghada Shedeed for their continuous support.

I should mention my late uncles Yousseif Shedeed and Mohamed El- Houssary whom I wish they were sharing this moment with me.

Multi-Criteria Facility Layout

By

Moshira Essam El- Deen Shedeed

Department of Design and Production Engineering

Faculty of Engineering

Ain Shams University

ABSTRACT

Facility layout problem is about arranging departments within the factory to achieve the desired product quantity and quality. The majority of previous research work has tackled the problem in terms of one objective. Few researches have considered Multi-Objective Facility Layout Problem. In this work, Material Handling Cost (MHC) and Closeness Rating (CR) represent quantitative and qualitative objectives respectively, these objectives are combined together into single objective function to solve multi-criteria facility layout problem. This thesis develops Genetic Algorithm to address Multi-Objective Facility Layout Problem (MOFLP). The developed heuristic algorithm introduces a new normalization technique with the use of objectives relative weights. It applies new crossover operator, modified selection behavior of Roulette-wheel, and dynamic crossover and mutation probabilities with only fixed upper values. The proposed model is evaluated through performing set of experimental runs. The evaluation process is divided into two categories. The first category is evaluating the model in terms of single-objective facility layout problem. The second one is evaluating the model in terms of multi-objective facility layout problem. The

later one is divided into two phases. First phase is based on using created closeness rating data for number of facilities up to 30. In this phase, the model output is verified against single objective facility layout problem results considering these results as the reference for how far each objective deviates from its best solution. Second phase is based on using available benchmark instances for facility numbers up to 20. In this case the proposed model output is compared to recent published results.

For single-objective facility layout, the results reveal that the proposed algorithm is capable of obtaining the best known benchmark published solutions for number of facilities up to 24. Furthermore it achieves best known material handling cost for 24 departments arranged in 30 locations. For multi-objective facility layout, first phase results reveal that the proposed algorithm is capable of obtaining solutions, which deviate between 0 and 15% maximum from its respective single objective best solution for number of facilities up to 30. Second phase results outperform or achieve the published solutions for number of facilities up to 20.

Key Words: Facility layout Problem; Genetic Algorithm; Multi Objective Facility Layout Problem; Quadratic Assignment Problem; Material Handling Cost; Closeness Rating.

SUMMARY OF THE Ph.D. THESIS

“Multi-Criteria Facility Layout”

By

Moshira Essam El-Deen Shedeed

Over the last few years solving Multi-Objective Facility Layout Problem (MOFLP) has received attention. The challenges in solving MOFLP are problem formulations and then developing or selecting the capable tool to solve it. In terms of problem formulation most of researchers have developed the Quadratic Assignment Problem (QAP) formulation to combine qualitative and quantitative objectives of Facility Layout Problem (FLP) into single objective criterion. This approach suffers from main drawbacks in view of dealing with the different measurement units of each objective and the dominance of objective with higher value relative to the other. In addition to the suitability of the normalization technique used to convert quantitative and qualitative objectives into comparable units. To overcome the above mentioned drawbacks, only recently researchers have developed approach to find a set of Pareto optimal layout solutions optimizing both quantitative and qualitative objectives. Yet objectives normalization approach is still used up till now. Many efforts are exerted to solve FLP optimally. However as the problem is NP hard and has combinatorial nature, reaching the optimal solution is not an easy task. Thus efforts are diverted to heuristic techniques and algorithms, opting to reach near optimal solutions. In order to solve such problem different types of algorithms are used, such as Genetic Algorithm (GA), Ant Colony Optimization (ACO), Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO),

and Artificial Neural Network (ANN), Simulated Annealing (SA), and Tabu Search (TS).

The aim of this research is to develop a heuristic algorithm to solve MOFLP in terms of Material Handling Cost (MHC) as a quantitative objective and Closeness Rating (CR) as a qualitative objective. Using GA as a tool for solving FLP is based on that GA is powerful optimization technique, GA is good at dealing with huge search spaces and navigating through them looking for optimal combinations of solutions. The model develops new technique for objective normalization, this technique avoids previous models normalization techniques drawback. In addition to applying new crossover operator, modifying the selection behavior of Roulette-Wheel and using dynamic crossover and mutation probabilities with only fixed upper values.

GA proposed model for solving MOFLP is tested using the available benchmark problems. The evaluation process is divided into two categories. First category is evaluating the proposed model in terms of single objective FLP. Second category is evaluating the proposed model in terms of MOFLP dealing simultaneously with MHC as quantitative objective and CR as qualitative objective. It is worth mentioning that the aims to solve single-objective FLP are determining the GA parameters and single-objective best values, in order to be adopted in solving MOFLP.

The proposed model results with respect to single FLP is capable of obtaining the best known values and it achieves the new best-found material handling cost for 24 departments allocated in thirty locations. Only exception is in the case of 30 departments, where it fails to achieve the best known result by a slight margin. In terms of MOFLP, the model results which

divided into two phases show that the proposed model is capable of finding a set of solutions that minimizes material handling cost and maximizes closeness rating score simultaneously throughout the evolutionary process. First phase results deviate between 0 and 15% maximum from its respective single objective best solution for number of facilities up to 30, since these are the best achievable in case of single and multi-objective FLP. Second phase results outperform or achieve the published solutions for number of facilities up to 20. The proposed GA model for solving MOFLP is simple but proven to be effective.

List of Tables

Table 3.1 Designer Input for First Stage “Minimizing MHC”	32
Table 3.2 Designer Input for First Stage “Maximizing CR”	32
Table 3.3 Designer Input for Second Stage	33
Table 4.1 Proposed Model GA Parameters	36
Table 4.2 Fifteen Dept. Single Objective FLP	37
Table 4.3 Twenty Dept. Single Objective FLP	41
Table 4.4 Twenty Four Dept. Single Objective FLP	45
Table 4.5 Proposed GA Output for Single Objective FLP	47
Table 4.6 Comparison for Single Objective FLP	48
Table 4.7 Proposed GA Output against Exact Solutions[37][40]	48
Table 4.8 Proposed Model concluded Layouts for Single FLP	49
Table 4.9 Closeness Relationship Values.....	51
Table 4.10 Adopted Closeness Relationship	52
Table 4.11 Fifteen Dept. MOFLP	54
Table 4.12 Twenty Dept. MOFLP.....	59
Table 4.13 Thirty Dept. MOFLP	64
Table 4.14 Proposed Model Output for MOFLP (First Phase)	70
Table 4.15 Proposed Model concluded Layouts for MOFLP (First Phase) ...	71
Table 4.16 12 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.8$ & $W_2=0.2$)	82
Table 4.17 12 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.7$ & $W_2=0.3$)	85
Table 4.18 12 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.2$ & $W_2=0.8$)	90
Table 4.19 15 Dept. ($W_1=0$ & $W_2=1$).....	94
Table 4.20 15 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.6$ & $W_2=0.4$)	96
Table 4.21 15 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.5$ & $W_2=0.5$)	100
Table 4.22 15 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.4$ & $W_2=0.6$)	105

Table 4.23 20 Dept. ($W_1=0$ & $W_2=1$)	110
Table 4.24 20 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.6$ & $W_2=0.4$)	113
Table 4.25 20 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.3$ & $W_2=0.7$)	118
Table 4.26 20 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.1$ & $W_2=0.9$)	123
Table 4.27 12 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.8$ & $W_2=0.2$)	128
Table 4.28 12 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.5$ & $W_2=0.5$)	131
Table 4.29 12 Dept. MOFLP ($W_1=0.2$ & $W_2=0.8$)	134
Table 4.30 12 Dept. Comparison with Sahin [29]	142
Table 4.31 Proposed Layouts for MOFLP (12 Dept. Second Phase)	144
Table 4.32 15 Dept. Comparison with (Sahin [29])	149
Table 4.33 Proposed Layouts for MOFLP (15 Dept. Second Phase)	151
Table 4.34 20 Dept. Comparison with Sahin [29]	156
Table 4.35 Proposed Layouts for MOFLP (20 Dept. Second Phase)	158
Table 4.36 12 Dept. Comparison with Sahin [29] & Singh et al. [30]	163
Table 4.37 Proposed Layouts for MOFLP (12 Dept. Second Phase)	165
Table 4.38 20 Dept. Comparison with Shouman et al. [28]	168
Table 4.39 Proposed Model Output for MOFLP (Second Phase)	169

List of Figures

Figure 3.1 Proposed Model Flowchart	22
Figure 3.2 Layout Permutation Encoding	24
Figure 3.3 Position Crossover Example	28
Figure 3.4 Inverted Position Crossover Example.....	29
Figure 3.5 Swap Mutation Example.....	31
Figure 4.1 Fifteen Dept. Single Objective Results	39
Figure 4.2 15 Dept. Facility Layout (<i>Single</i>).....	40
Figure 4.3 Twenty Dept. Single Objective Results	43
Figure 4.4 20 Dept. Facility Layout (<i>Single</i>).....	44
Figure 4.5 Twenty Four Dept. Single Objective Results	46
Figure 4.6 24 Dept. Facility Layout (<i>Single</i>).....	46
Figure 4.7 15 Dept. Min Norm & Max CR Cases.....	55
Figure 4.8 15 Dept. Facility Layout Min Norm & Max CR Cases	56
Figure 4.9 Fifteen Departments Min MHC Case	57
Figure 4.10 15 Dept. Facility Layout (Min MHC Case)	57
Figure 4.11 Twenty Dept. Min Norm & Min MHC Cases	60
Figure 4.12 20 Dept. Facility Layout (Min Norm &Min MHC Cases)	61
Figure 4.13 Twenty Dept. Max CR Case	62
Figure 4.14 Facility Layout for 20 Dept. Max CR Case	63
Figure 4.15 Thirty Dept. Min Norm & Min MHC Cases.....	66
Figure 4.16 Facility Layout for 30 Dept. (Min Norm &Min MHC Cases)....	66
Figure 4.17 Thirty Dept. Max CR Case	68
Figure 4.18 30 Dept. Facility Layout (Max CR Case)	68
Figure 4.19 MOFLP “MHC & CR” vs. SFLP (Min Norm, First Phase)	72
Figure 4.20 MOFLP “MHC & CR” vs. SFLP (Min MHC)	74

Figure 4.21 MOFLP “MHC & CR” vs. SFLP (Max CR First Phase)	76
Figure 4.22 12 Dept. Min Norm & MHC ($W_1=0.8&W_2=0.2$)	83
Figure 4.23 12 Dept. Layout for Min Norm & MHC ($W_1=0.8&W_2=0.2$)	84
Figure 4.24 12 Dept. Min Norm ($W_1=0.7&W_2=0.3$)	86
Figure 4.25 12 Dept. Layout Min Norm ($W_1=0.7&W_2=0.3$)	87
Figure 4.26 12 Dept. Min MHC ($W_1=0.7&W_2=0.3$)	88
Figure 4.27 12 Dept. Min MHC ($W_1=0.7$) Layout	88
Figure 4.28 12 Dept. Min Norm ($W_1=0.2&W_2=0.8$)	91
Figure 4.29 12 Dept. Layout Min Norm ($W_1=0.2&W_2=0.8$)	92
Figure 4.30 12 Dept. Min MHC ($W_1=0.2&W_2=0.8$)	93
Figure 4.31 12 Dept. Layout Min MHC ($W_1=0.2&W_2=0.8$)	93
Figure 4.32 15 Dept. ($W_2=1$)	95
Figure 4.33 15 Dept. Layout for Max CR ($W_2=1$)	95
Figure 4.34 15 Dept. Min Norm & MHC ($W_1=0.6&W_2=0.4$)	98
Figure 4.35 15 Dept. Layout for Min Norm & MHC ($W_1=0.6&W_2=0.4$) ...	98
Figure 4.36 15 Dept. Min Norm ($W_1=0.5&W_2=0.5$)	101
Figure 4.37 15 Dept. Layout for Min Norm ($W_1=0.5&W_2=0.5$)	102
Figure 4.38 15 Dept. Min MHC ($W_1=0.5&W_2=0.5$)	103
Figure 4.39 15 Dept. Layout for Min MHC ($W_1=0.5&W_2=0.5$)	103
Figure 4.40 15 Dept. Min Norm ($W_1=0.4&W_2=0.6$)	106
Figure 4.41 15 Dept. Layout for Min Norm ($W_1=0.4&W_2=0.6$)	107
Figure 4.42 15 Dept. Min MHC ($W_1=0.4&W_2=0.6$)	108
Figure 4.43 15 Dept. Layout for Min MHC ($W_1=0.4&W_2=0.6$)	109
Figure 4.44 20 Dept. ($W_1=0&W_2=1$)	111
Figure 4.45 Layout for 20 Dept. ($W_1=0&W_2=1$)	111
Figure 4.46 20 Dept. Min Norm ($W_1=0.6&W_2=0.4$)	114