Bi-objective facility expansion and relayout considering monuments

SADAN KULTUREL-KONAK[1,*], ALICE E. SMITH[2] and BRYAN A. NORMAN[3]

QUERY SHEET

Q1: Au: What is QAP?
Q2: Au: What are $w_1 f_1 + w_2 f_2$).
Q3: Au: Only a single page article if not cited in text-delete.
Q4: Au: Not cited in text-delete?
Q5: Au: Not cited in text-delete?
Q6: Au: Not cited in text-delete?
Q7: Au: Publishers publication city & state.
Q8: Au: Publishers publication city & state if not cited in text-delete?
Q9: Au: Any idea of the conference dates if not cited in the text delete.
Q10: Au: Not cited in the text-delete?
Q11: Au: Not cited in the text-delete?
Q12: Au: Publishers publication city & state.
Q13: Au: Publisher publication city & state.

Bi-objective facility expansion and relayout considering monuments

SADAN KULTUREL-KONAK[1,*], ALICE E. SMITH[2] and BRYAN A. NORMAN[3]

[1] *Management Information Systems, Penn State-Berks, Tulpehocken Road, P.O. Box 7009, Reading, PA 19610, USA*
E-mail: sadan@psu.edu
[2] *Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Auburn University, 206 Dunstan Hall, Auburn University,*
AL 36849-5346, USA
E-mail: aesmith@eng.auburn.edu
[3] *Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Pittsburgh, 1048 Benedum Hall, Pittsburgh, PA 15261, USA*
E-mail: banorman@pitt.edu

In this paper, the unequal area facility expansion and relayout problem is studied. The facility relayout problem is important since both manufacturing and service entities must modify their layouts over time when their operational characteristics change. A bi-objective approach is proposed to solve the relayout problem for cases of both a fixed facility area and an expanded facility area. Material handling costs and relayout costs are minimized using a tabu search meta-heuristic optimizer. This heuristic randomly alternates the objective function between the two objectives of the problem in each step and, by doing so, eliminates the difficulty of weighting and scaling the two objectives. The approach is flexible in handling various aspects of the problem such as stationary portions of departments (i.e., monuments), addition of new departments, and changes in existing department and facility areas. Computational experiments show that the bi-objective tabu search approach is effective and tractable. The use of the Pareto front of designs is demonstrated by showing a few approaches to analyzing the trade-offs between initial costs (relayout cost) and ongoing expenses (material handling costs).

1. Introduction

Most of the literature on facility layout focuses on greenfield design, which is the design of a new facility without the influence or constraint of an existing facility. In practice, however, the Facility Relayout Problem (FRLP) is more common than a greenfield design since both service and manufacturing industries operate in highly volatile environments that motivate redesign of their layouts. Although the greenfield design problem and the FRLP have common characteristics, the FRLP requires additional constraints and objectives. This paper considers several of the most significant aspects of the FRLP, namely fixed portions of departments, departmental area changes, expansion of the bounding facility and the two primary cost objectives: (i) relayout costs; and (ii) material handling costs.

In the FRLP, it may be impossible to relocate certain pieces of equipment and machinery such as large presses, furnaces, and painting units. In the literature, such stationary equipment is usually assumed to consume an entire department at a corner of the facility (Bozer *et al.*, 1994; Meller and Gau, 1996; Meller and Bozer, 1997). In the area of dynamic (multi-period) Facility Layout Problems (FLPs), Kouvelis *et al.* (1992) assumed that a fixed piece of equipment (i.e., a fixed department) was not allowed to change its location during the planning periods. In this paper, a fixed piece of equipment is called a "monument", and a flexible approach is used to handle departments with monuments so that only the monument portion of the department remains stationary. Thus, if a department contains a large, difficult to move machine but also contains several smaller machines or workbenches that can be readily moved, the proposed method only requires that the large machine be kept at its current location. The rest of the department can be moved as long as the new department location still contains the large machine. In addition, monuments are not limited to a certain location within the facility such as corners or edges of the layout.

Facility relayout is usually considered because of changes in the material flow pattern or modification of departments, such as the addition of new departments or changes in the sizes of the existing ones. Therefore, the FRLP can be modeled in two distinct categories: (i) relayout within

---

*Corresponding author

65 an existing area; and (ii) relayout with expansion. The approach in this paper can readily accommodate either with a few simple assumptions related to the format of the expansion.

The solution technique is a Tabu Search (TS) that has 70 been modified to consider two objectives. Specifically, both material handling costs and relayout costs are minimized, and the TS procedure finds the Pareto front (i.e., the set of non-dominated solutions) with respect to both objectives. The problem is formulated as an unequal-area lay-75 out problem with rectangular departments within a rectangular facility; this alone is a substantial relaxation over most of the previous relayout papers, which assumed interchangeable departments (i.e., a quadratic assignment problem formulation).

80 2. Relevant literature

2.1. *The dynamic FLP*

The Dynamic FLP (DFLP) considers flows over multiple time periods in an environment in which material flow between departments changes over time. The FRLP is a spe-85 cial case of the DFLP with two restrictions: (i) the first time period is the present and has a specified layout; and (ii) there are only two time periods (a similar idea is postulated by Lacksonen (1994)). A comprehensive survey on DFLP algorithms can be found in Balakrishnan and Cheng 90 (1998). Rosenblatt (1986) first dealt with the dynamic nature of the FLP by assuming a deterministic environment in which product demands were known for each period. The major goal was to decide the layout for each period given the from-to flow matrices for each period. Follow-95 ing this original paper other techniques have been developed to solve the problem either optimally or heuristically. The optimal solution methods proposed by Montreuil and Venkatadri (1991), Balakrishnan *et al.* (1992), Montreuil and Laforge (1992), Urban (1992, 1998), and Lacksonen 100 and Enscore (1993) are only able to solve relatively small instances. The heuristic approaches by Urban (1993), Conway and Venkataramanan (1994), Kaku and Mazzola (1997), Yang and Peters (1998), Kochhar and Heragu (1999), Balakrishnan and Cheng (2000), Balakrishnan *et al.* (2000), 105 and Baykasoglu and Gindy (2001) include a steepest-descent pairwise-interchange procedure, a construction procedure, and meta-heuristics, such as Genetic Algorithms (GAs), TS, and simulated annealing.

2.2. *TS*

110 Tabu search is a meta-heuristic optimization method with its current form being suggested by Glover (1989, 1990). TS is an effective heuristic method that has been used to solve combinatorial optimization problems with large and complex search spaces in the areas of scheduling, telecommuni-115 cations, transportation, routing, network design, graph theory, manufacturing, financial analysis, and constraint satisfaction. Comprehensive material about TS can be found in Glover *et al.* (1993) and Glover and Laguna (1997). TS is used to solve the FLP problem because of the existence 120 of non-linearities in the objective function and/or the constraint set, the strong and consistent neighborhood structure of the block layout and the necessity to use a global, rather than local, optimizer. TS guides a local (neighborhood) search procedure to find a global or near-global optimum. Therefore, TS with its local search property is an 125 appropriate optimization tool to search neighborhoods efficiently. Kaku and Mazzola (1997) used a TS approach to solve the DFLP. Their TS heuristic is a two-stage procedure. In the first stage, a number of different starting solutions are generated using a diversification strategy to 130 ensure that different regions of the search space are explored. Then, a modified TS procedure is applied to each solution, and the starting solutions providing the best solutions are selected for use in the second stage. In the second stage, neighborhoods around the best solutions found in 135 the first stage are searched more intensively. At the end of the second stage, the best solution obtained for the problem is the final solution found by the TS heuristic. They used an objective function that summed the material handling costs and costs of moving the department. They did not 140 consider altering either the departmental or facility areas, nor did they consider fixed portions (monuments) in the redesign. Chiang (2001) provides a Windows® based (i.e., implemented using Microsoft Visual Basic) visual facility design system that uses TS as the search engine. The pur-145 pose of embedding a graphical user interface with a search engine is to provide layout designers with a user-friendly environment to facilitate user interaction and thereby improve the design process. Since locations and shapes of the departments are assumed to be more flexible than in a classic 150 QAP formulation, two type of moves, namely interchange and move (i.e., insertion) transitions, are considered to better cover the search space. (For more information about the neighborhood definitions, see Chiang (2001). The approach requires a long computational time because of the 155 complex nature of the problem and the low compilation rate of Visual Basic. However, with the advent of faster computers in recent years, it should be possible to use this embedded algorithm to solve large problems in a reasonable time. 160

The relayout problem involves two objectives: (i) minimizing material handling costs; and (ii) minimizing the relayout costs. These are difficult to scale and weight relative to one another. One is an ongoing, operational cost whereas the other is an initial capital cost. Identifying the 165 Pareto front (that is, the set of non-dominated designs) is of value to the decision maker in this case. Therefore, the technique of alternating objective functions which was devised and studied by Kulturel-Konak *et al.* (2006) was used. 170

Expansion →

Fig. 1. Overlap of the locations of department 1 after relayout.

3. Problem statement

The FRLP studied in this paper is defined as follows. Given an existing layout (Π_B: the partition "Before" relayout) and a new flow matrix, a new layout (Π_A: the partition "After" relayout) will be devised to minimize material handling costs and relayout costs and to accommodate the addition of new departments and/or modify the areas and locations of existing departments. For instance, in Fig. 1, for a ten-department problem, the current layout and the modified layout after rearranging the locations of the existing departments and adding two new departments (departments 11 and 12) are given. In this example, to accommodate the additional space requirements for the new departments, the building is expanded one way in the horizontal direction. Some pieces of equipment are assumed to be fixed, and these are called monuments. Since the monuments cannot be relocated, the departments with monuments can only be partially moved. In Fig. 1, the monument portions are shown with black solid rectangles in departments 1 and 6. As seen in Π_A, although department 1 has been slightly repositioned, it still retains its monument in the original location. (The dashed rectangle in Π_A shows the location of department 1 before relayout.)

A comprehensive general model for the FRLP is given in Montreuil and Laforge (1992). The FRLP studied in this paper is as follows. Given a maximum allowable aspect ratio for each department and the locations of monuments (i.e., the departments with monuments can only be moved such that they still contain the locations of their monuments), the objective is to minimize both material handling costs and relayout costs:

> min (the material handling cost of (Equation (1))
>> and relayout cost ($\sum_{i=1}^{N}$ Equation (7)),
>> subject to
>> maximum aspect ratio of the departments (Equation (8)),
>> monuments (Equations (10)–(13)).

3.1. *Material handling costs*

The material handling costs are calculated as: **205**

$$MHC(\Pi) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} f_{ij} c_{ij} d_{ij}(\Pi), \qquad (1)$$

where f_{ij} is the flow volume between departments i and j, c_{ij} is the unit handling and transport cost between departments i and j, N is the total number of departments and $d_{ij}(\Pi)$ is the distance (using a pre-specified metric) between departments i and j in partition Π. Since the whole region **210** is partitioned into departments, a specific layout is called "partition Π".

3.2. *Relayout cost*

As stated in Section 1, departments as well as the entire facility are assumed to be rectangular. It is also assumed **215** that the cost of relocating a department is a function of the percent overlap between the old and new locations of the department. If the new and old locations do not overlap, then a fixed cost is used regardless of how far the new location is from the old one. The rationale underlying this assumption **220** derives from the following consideration. Once the decision is made to move a machine or fixture, the distance that it will be moved can be ignored since the majority of the cost comes from disassembling and re-assembling the machine and its material handling system. One can think of the over- **225** lap metric as a surrogate for the number of machines (or fixtures) moved, where departmental area is assumed to be correlated with number of items to move.

To determine the overlap between the new and old locations of a department, the coordinates of the upper-right **230** and lower-left corners of a department are used. The following notation is used to represent the location of the departments.

$(x_i^{BL}, y_i^{BL}) = $ coordinates of the lower-left corner
of department i before relayout;

$(x_i^{BU}, y_i^{BU}) = $ coordinates of the upper-right corner of
department i before relayout;

$(x_i^{\text{AL}}, y_i^{\text{AL}})$ = coordinates of the lower-left corner
    of department i after relayout;

$(x_i^{\text{AU}}, y_i^{\text{AU}})$ = coordinates of the upper-right corner
    of department i after relayout;

$(x_i^{\text{OL}}, y_i^{\text{OL}})$ = coordinates of the lower-left corner
    of overlap area of department i;

$(x_i^{\text{OU}}, y_i^{\text{OU}})$ = coordinates of the upper-right corner
    of overlap area of department i.

Given the locations of department i before and after re-layout, the corner coordinates of the overlap area can be found using the following equations:

$$x_i^{\text{OL}} = \max\left\{x_i^{\text{BL}}, x_i^{\text{AL}}\right\}, \tag{2}$$

$$y_i^{\text{OL}} = \max\left\{y_i^{\text{BL}}, y_i^{\text{AL}}\right\}, \tag{3}$$

$$x_i^{\text{OU}} = \min\left\{x_i^{\text{BU}}, x_i^{\text{AU}}\right\}, \tag{4}$$

$$y_i^{\text{OU}} = \min\left\{y_i^{\text{BU}}, y_i^{\text{AU}}\right\}. \tag{5}$$

Then, the area of the overlap corresponding to department i, O_i, is calculated as follows:

$$O_i = \left(x_i^{\text{OU}} - x_i^{\text{OL}}\right) \times \left(y_i^{\text{OU}} - y_i^{\text{OL}}\right). \tag{6}$$

Then, the relayout cost of department i, RC_i, is given as:

$$RC_i = rc_i \times (Area_i - O_i), \tag{7}$$

where $Area_i$ is the area of department i before relayout and rc_i is the fixed relayout cost of department i per unit square area moved. In Equation (7), if a department is moved and the new and old locations of the department overlap 80% or more, it is assumed that 20% of the total RC is incurred. In Fig. 1, Π_A shows the location of department 1 before (dashed lines) and after (solid lines) relayout. The overlap area, O_i, is shown with shading.

3.3. *Infeasibilities*

The proposed methodology considers two types of infeasibility: (i) department shape infeasibility; and (ii) monument infeasibility. Each of these is described in more detail below.

3.3.1. *Shape infeasibility*

The aspect ratio for department i is used to constrain its shape and is defined as $\alpha_i = \max\{l_i, w_i\} / \min\{l_i, w_i\}$, where l_i and w_i are the length and width of department i, respectively. The smaller the aspect ratio, the more constrained the problem. For each department i, the following inequality must hold:

$$\alpha_i \leq \alpha. \tag{8}$$

Therefore, the degree of shape feasibility violation of department i can be calculated as follows:

$$\max\{\alpha_i - \alpha, 0\}, \tag{9}$$

where α is the pre-defined maximum allowable aspect ratio.

3.3.2. *Monument infeasibility*

A monument, which is assumed to be rectangular, is represented by the coordinates of its upper-right and lower-left corners, $(x_i^{\text{FU}}, y_i^{\text{FU}})$ and $(x_i^{\text{FL}}, y_i^{\text{FL}})$, respectively. A layout is feasible with respect to the departments with monuments if each of those departments includes its corresponding monument. In other words, the following four conditions must be satisfied for a department i with a monument for this department to be *monument feasible*:

$$x_i^{\text{AL}} \leq x_i^{\text{FU}} \leq x_i^{\text{AU}}, \tag{10}$$

$$x_i^{\text{AL}} \leq x_i^{\text{FL}} \leq x_i^{\text{AU}}, \tag{11}$$

$$y_i^{\text{AL}} \leq y_i^{\text{FU}} \leq y_i^{\text{AU}}, \tag{12}$$

$$y_i^{\text{AL}} \leq y_i^{\text{FL}} \leq y_i^{\text{AU}}, \tag{13}$$

The degree of monument feasibility violation of a department i with a monument, θ_i, can be calculated as follows:

$$\theta_i = \max\left\{x_i^{\text{AL}} - x_i^{\text{FL}}, x_i^{\text{FU}} - x_i^{\text{AU}}, 0\right\}$$
$$+ \max\left\{y_i^{\text{AL}} - y_i^{\text{FL}}, y_i^{\text{FU}} - y_i^{\text{AU}}, 0\right\} \tag{14}$$

Equation (13) calculates the minimal amount that department i must be moved in the x and y directions to include the corresponding monument. Figure 2 shows an example of monument infeasibility.

4. The Bi-objective TS algorithm

The layout is represented by using the flexible bay construct of Tate and Smith (1996) with a variable length string encoding, which concatenates a permutation of the department order and the bay break position. A boustrophedon ordering of the departments is used. (Boustrophedon is a reading/writing style that alternates direction every line.) The flexible bay structure is a continuous layout representation allowing the departments to be located only in parallel bays


Fig. 2. Monument infeasibility.

with varying widths. The width of a bay depends on the to-
tal area of the departments in the bay. A bay is bounded
by straight aisles on both sides, and departments are not
allowed to span over multiple bays. Meller (1997, p. 229)
290 mentioned that "In many manufacturing facilities, the fa-
cility layout is based on a parallel bay design, where material
moves primarily within the bays and inter-bay movement is
handled via an inter-bay material handling system at one (or
both) end(s) of the bays". Examples of such facilities arise in
295 the context of heavy manufacturing; e.g., steel production,
bridge crane manufacturing, and in retail environments.

Since an initial layout exists in the FRLP, the bi-objective
TS algorithm starts with this initial layout rather than start-
ing with a random layout. If new departments are to be
300 added to the initial layout, a new bay is added as the last
bay, and the new departments are placed in this bay. The al-
gorithm uniformly and randomly uses either material han-
dling cost (MHC) or relayout cost (RC) as the objective
to select the best candidate solution in each move, that is,
305 with $p = 0.5$. Instead of a single most feasible solution, all
non-dominated solutions are kept on the non-dominated
solutions list, which is updated each time a new solution is
found. Two objective functions are used. The first is based
on the MHC and the second is based on the RC:

$$F = MHC(\Pi_A) + (MHC_{ND\_worst} - MHC_{all})$$
$$\times \left(\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \max(0, \; \alpha_i - \alpha)}{NFT_\alpha} \right)^k + \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \theta_i}{NFT_\theta} \right)^k \right), \quad (15)$$

$$F = RC(\Pi_A, \; \Pi_B) + (RC_{ND\_worst} - RC_{all})$$
$$\times \left(\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \max(0, \; \alpha_i - \alpha)}{NFT_\alpha} \right)^k + \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \theta_i}{NFT_\theta} \right)^k \right). \quad (16)$$

310 In Equation (15), $MHC(\Pi_A)$ is the material handling
cost of layout Π_A. In Equation (16), $RC(\Pi_B, \Pi_A)$ is the
relayout cost of changing from layout Π_B to layout Π_A.
The last part of each objective function corresponds to a
penalty function for infeasibility. The penalty function has
315 two parts: one for shape infeasibility and one for monument
infeasibility. In this paper, the penalty functions use the no-
tion of Near-Feasibility Threshold (NFT). NFT was first
defined by Smith and Tate (1993) and then improved by Coit
et al. (1996) in their work on penalty functions for GAs and
320 Kulturel-Konak *et al.* (2004) for TS. Solutions are penal-
ized according to their distance from feasibility as follows.
Within the NFT region, infeasible solutions are penalized
relatively lightly whereas beyond the NFT region, a heavy
penalty is applied. The NFT for shape infeasibility (NFT_α)
325 and for monument infeasibility (NFT_θ) are updated accord-
ing to the feasibility ratio of the recent moves kept in the
tabu list as described in Kulturel-Konak *et al.* (2004). The
NFT is dynamically updated based on the recent search his-
tory stored in the tabu list and the state of the current move
330 as follows. If most of the recent moves have been feasible,
which indicates that the search is either in the feasible region

or close to it, the NFT value is increased and a high value
of the NFT decreases the penalty applied. Therefore, explo-
ration of infeasible solutions is encouraged and as a result,
the search is directed towards the boundary of feasible and 335
infeasible solutions with the expectation that optimal so-
lutions reside near the boundary of the feasible region. If
most of the recent moves have been infeasible, the search
is either in the infeasible region or close to it. Therefore,
the NFT value is decreased to increase the penalty applied. 340
As a result, feasible solutions and infeasible solutions with
lower levels of infeasibility become more attractive, which
moves the search towards the feasible region.

When updating NFT_α, only shape infeasibility is con-
sidered. Likewise, for NFT_θ, only monument infeasibility 345
is used. The exponent is a user-defined severity parameter
amplifying the behavior of the ratio in parenthesis, and it
k is set to two, which results in a Euclidean distance metric
between the infeasible solution and feasibility. The method
is not sensitive to the value of this exponent, however. The 350
definitions of the terms in the multiplier of each penalty
function are as follows:

$$MHC_{ND\_worst} = \text{the worst } MHC \text{ in the non-dominated}$$
$$\text{solutions list;}$$
$$MHC_{all} = \text{the best } MHC \text{ found so far;}$$
$$RC_{ND\_worst} = \text{the worst } RC \text{ in the non-dominated}$$
$$\text{solutions list;}$$
$$RC_{all} = \text{the best } RC \text{ found so far.}$$

A swap move is used to produce candidate solutions. The
swap operator exchanges the positions of department pair
$[i, j]$ in the department permutation array for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ 355
and $j = (i + 1), \ldots, N$. The best permutation after exhaus-
tively applying the swap move is chosen, and the swap move
is applied to all department pairs regardless of whether
or not a department has a monument. It is impossible to
visit all possible solutions of the problem by using only the 360
swap move without altering the bay structure of a solution.
Therefore, bay break moves are considered after the swap
operator is complete. In a bay move, combinations of bay
break positions for the same, one less and one more bay
breaks of the best candidate swap move are investigated. If 365
the best candidate is infeasible, all possible bay break com-
binations are considered. However, if the best candidate is
feasible in terms of both aspect ratio and monuments, only
feasible bay break combinations are considered.

The tabu list includes the pair of departments swapped 370
to produce the best candidate solution and the bay struc-
ture of the related solution. Therefore, a department pair is
not allowed to be swapped while it is on the tabu list unless
the bay structure is different. A dynamic length tabu list is
used, which varies every 20 iterations according to a uni- 375
form distribution ranging between eight and 15. The stop-
ping criterion is defined as the maximum number of itera-
tions conducted without updating the list of non-dominated
solutions and is set to 1000. The TS reported here is not

380 sensitive to either the exact tabu list size or the termination criterion.

A diversification scheme based on restart is used. If the list of non-dominated solutions has not been updated in the last (stopping criterion/4) moves, one of the non-385 dominated solutions found during the search is randomly selected as the new current solution, the tabu list is reset to empty, and the search restarts from this solution. Experiments show that this diversification scheme improves performance by exploring a wide Pareto front. Pareto fronts 390 found without diversification were too narrow.

The detailed steps of the algorithm are described below.

Step 0. Read the existing layout as the initial layout and assign it to the currentsolution. Initialize the tabu list and the non-dominated solutions list to empty. 395 If the current solution is feasible, add it to the non-dominated solutions list.

Step 1. Randomly choose either Equation (15) or Equation (16) as the fitness function to evaluate candidate solutions.

400 *Step 2.* Search the neighborhood of all possible *swap* moves for the department permutation of the currentsolution. Compare each feasible candidate solution with the current non-dominated solutions list using MHC and RC as follows. If a candidate solution 405 dominates some current non-dominated solutions, remove these dominated solutions from the non-dominated solutions list and add the candidate to the non-dominated solutions list. If a candidate solution is not dominated by any current non-410 dominated solution, simply add this candidate solution to the non-dominated solutions list. Choose the non-tabu (or if it is tabu, but it dominates any solution in non-dominated solutions list) candidatesolution with the best objective as the best candidate 415 solution.

Step 3. For the departmental sequence of the best candidate solution chosen in Step 2, investigate all possible bay break positions by using the same, one less, and one more bay breaks of the best candidate. (If 420 the best candidate solution is feasible, consider only feasible arrangements.) Compare candidate solutions to the best candidate solution using the fitness function selected in Step 1 and update the best candidate solution if needed. In addition, each time 425 a feasible candidate solution is found, compare it with the current non-dominated solutions list and update this list as defined in Step 2. To increase efficiency, Step 3 is performed once in every ten swap moves.

430 *Step 4.* (*Diversification*) If the list of the non-dominated solutions has not been updated in the last (stopping criterion/4) moves, randomly choose one of the current non-dominated solutions and assign it to the current solution, reset the tabu list to empty and return to Step 1. 435

Step 5. Enter the solution selected by Steps 2 and 3 on the tabu list and set the current solution equal to the best candidate solution. Check the stopping criterion and if it is not satisfied, return to Step 1.

5. Computational results 440

Three well-known test problems: (i) the ten-department problem of Van Camp *et al.* (1991) (that will be simply referred to as the Van Camp problem); (ii) the 14-department problem of Bazaraa (1975); and (iii) the 20-department problem of Armour and Buffa (1963) were used to develop 445 relayout problems. These problems divide a planar region into ten, 14, and 20 unequal-sized departments, respectively. The total facility area and the areas of the departments were taken directly from the published problems. A set of products with their routings among departments and production 450 volumes were defined. Additional test problem data along with the original problem data are given in Appendix A. In the Van Camp and Bazaraa problems, a new product was introduced and in the Armour-Buffa problem production was stopped on one current product, and in all three prob-455 lems the routings and the volumes of the existing products were changed. Tables A1–A7 for the Van Camp problem, Tables A8–A13 for the Bazaraa problem, and A14–A17 for the Armour-Buffa problem give the input data. The FRLP with expanded area includes the addition of three 460 new departments to the Van Camp problem and two new departments into the Bazaraa problem. Department 9 in the Van Camp problem, departments 3 and 4 in the Bazaraa problem, and departments 5, 19, and 20 in the Armour-Buffa problem were chosen to include monuments, and the 465 coordinates of the lower-left and the upper-right corners of the monuments are given in Tables A7, A13, and A17, respectively.

For the Van Camp problem, rc_i was taken to be \$1, for the Bazaraa problem \$20, and for the Armour-Buffa prob-470 lem \$250. If a department includes a monument, then these unit costs are doubled since relocating the movable portions of a department with a monument is more difficult than relocating a department without a monument. The problems were solved by considering positively correlated 475 product demands, since this case is more realistic, and the effect of the variance on the MHC is easy to see. The algorithm was coded in C and run using an Intel Pentium IV with a 2.2 GHz processor and 1 GB RAM. To gauge variability, ten different initial random seeds were used. It was 480 observed that the Pareto fronts found are almost identical.

5.1. *Problems using the existing facility area: Without and with department area changes*

First, the problems were solved with new demand flows and by using the existing departmental and whole facility 485

The facility expansion and relayout problem   7

(a)

(b)

(c)

Fig. 3. Pareto front of the Van Camp problem: (a) with the existing facility area and no departmental area change (TS finds all Pareto optimal solutions); (b) with the existing facility area and some departmental area changes; and (c) with expansion.

areas. Figures 3(a), 4, and 5, respectively, show the Pareto fronts for the Van Camp, Bazaraa, and Armour-Buffa problems. The non-convex Pareto front shape of Figs. 3(a) and 5 can be explained by the discrete structure and non-linear nature of the objectives of the problem. Rosenblatt and Sinuany-Stern (1986) study a discrete efficient frontier approach to the FLP. For an objective function of the type $(w_1 f_1 + w_2 f_2)$, they suggest two dominance rules which they


Fig. 4. Pareto front of the Bazaraa problem with the existing facility area and no departmental area change.

use in assigning the weights. However, this approach cannot be adopted here since the problem under study does not consider a weighted sum of the objectives. In the figures, the *MHC* of the initial (existing) layout (i.e., *RC* equal to zero) is shown with a large circle. The CPU time is 2.90 seconds for a single replication for Fig. 3(a), 5.82 seconds for Fig. 4, and 187.24 seconds for Fig. 5. Six diversifications were performed for the Van Camp problem, three for the Bazaraa problem, and seven for the Armour-Buffa problem. It is easy to notice that solutions can have a similar *MHC* while their *RC* is different. This can be explained by the assumption that a minimum of 20% of the total relayout cost is required even if a department changes its location less than this percentage. For both problems, the algorithm finds non-dominated solutions spread over a wide Pareto front. For the Bazaraa problem, since an aspect ratio of two is very constrained, the Pareto front consists of fewer solutions but is still spread over a wide range. It is clear that the layout with a zero relayout cost is the solution that corresponds to the left-end of the Pareto front. To test whether solutions at the right-end of the Pareto front (high *RC* and low *MHC*) represent the true right-end of the Pareto front, both problems are solved by defining a zero relayout cost for each department (i.e., as a single-objective problem to minimize *MHC*). In both instances, the single-objective TS


Fig. 5. Pareto front of the Armour-Buffa problem with the existing facility area and no departmental area change.

approach could not find solutions with a *MHC* lower than the solutions found by the TS approach. The Pareto set is given in ascending order of *RC* in Tables B1 for the Van Camp B2 for the Bazaraa, and B3 for the Armour-Buffa problems in Appendix B.

Although all three problems are very constrained and it is hard to find feasible solutions, the algorithm performs well in locating departments without violating shape and monument feasibility. Even if departments partially changed their locations and shapes, they retained their monuments at the correct location. An exhaustive enumeration algorithm was coded to generate all possible department permutations and all possible bay break positions for a given permutation. This algorithm was used to find the theoretical frontier of the non-dominated solutions for the Van Camp problem. As seen in Fig. 3(a), TS was able to find all theoretical non-dominated solutions. It took slightly longer than 36 hours to obtain these solutions using exhaustive enumeration whereas the TS ran in only a few seconds.

Then, the Van Camp problem was solved with new demand flows and the area changes of some departments using the existing facility area. (The area changes are given in Table A3.) Figure 3(b) shows the Pareto front for this case. There is no zero relayout cost design in this case since there are departmental area changes. Similar interpretations as those for Fig. 3(a) can be made about the results displayed in Fig. 3(b). The CPU time is 2.74 seconds for a single replication, and five diversifications was performed. The Pareto set is given in ascending order of *RC* in Table B4 in Appendix B. It is important to note that the method can handle departmental area changes without any change in the algorithm.

5.2. *Problems using an expanded facility area*

Then the Van Camp and Bazaraa problems with new demand flows and additional departments in an expanded area were considered. Figures 3(c) and 6 depict the Pareto fronts of both problems. The CPU time is 40.96 seconds for a single replication for Fig. 3(c) and 49.00 seconds for Fig. 6. In Figs. 3(c) and 6, the *MHC* of the initial (existing) layout (i.e., *RC* equal to zero) is shown with a large circle.


Fig. 6. Pareto front of the Bazaraa problem with expansion.

Seven diversifications were performed for the expanded Van Camp problem and eight for the expanded Bazaraa problem. Compared to Figs. 3(a) and 4, more non-dominated solutions distributed over a wider Pareto front are found. The reason for finding more solutions is the addition of new departments and introducing new interdepartmental flow relations, which enlarge the search space. Therefore, as expected, the larger search space results in more non-dominated solutions for these problems. The Pareto set is given in ascending order of *RC* in Tables B5 and B6 in Appendix B for the Van Camp and the Bazaraa problems, respectively. As with departmental area changes, the method can accommodate facility area changes without changing the underlying algorithm.

5.3. *Comparison with mixed integer non-linear programming*

The effectiveness of the TS approach was analyzed by attempting to solve the Bazaraa and Armour-Buffa problems using GAMS to solve the Mixed-Integer non-linear programming problems that result from modeling these relayout problems. GAMS was not able to improve the efficient frontier solutions found by the TS. In all cases GAMS terminated in 24 to 36 hours having exhausted the computer memory due to the size of the resulting branch-and-bound tree. This approach was also tested by seeding GAMS with efficient frontier solutions found by TS, however, GAMS was not able to improve them. While these experiments do not prove that the TS-identified Pareto fronts are truly optimal, they do provide additional evidence that the optimization by TS is: (i) necessary as the model cannot be solved exactly for larger problems; and (ii) effective in finding optimal or near-optimal solutions.

5.4. *Design decision making*

Most of the current research on multiobjective metaheuristics approaches as well as the TS concentrates on generating non-dominated solutions. In practice, the (human) decision-maker will need to select a single solution. This can be done using a multicriteria decision making approach (Keeney and Raiffa, 1993; Horn, 1997; Coello, 2000; Cvetkovic and Parmee, 2002). As an example, a preference approach similar to the one defined in Cvetkovic and Parmee (2002), which is adapted from the linguistic ranking methods of Chen *et al*. (1992, p. 265), is shown in Table 1.

The Pareto front of the Bazaraa problem using these relationships between the two objectives is marked in Fig. 4.

As another example, multiple and very different layouts can be in the Pareto set depending on the decision makers' preferences. Three layouts (the first one being the initial layout) from the Pareto set of the Van Camp problem are shown in Fig. 7(a–c). If the decision maker is willing to pay the upfront costs of relayout, the layout in Fig. 7(c) would

Table 1. The preference approach

Relation	Intended meaning
≫	Much more important
>	More important
~	Equally important
<	Less important
≪	Much less important

be chosen as it has the lower *MHC*. However, if the initial capital cost is the main issue, the layout in Fig. 7(a) or that in Fig. 7(b) would be preferred with a much lower *RC* but higher *MHC* over the operating life of the facility.

(a)

Initial VanCamp problem layout
Encoding: 4 6 9 2 10 5 8 7 1 3 | 4 8 9

(b)

(c)

Fig. 7. Three alternative designs of the Pareto front of the Van Camp problem: (a) $RC = 0$ and $MHC = 28\,577.016$; (b) $RC = 170$ and $MHC = 27\,415.232$; and (c) $RC = 999.826$ and $MHC = 18\,817.596$.

6. Conclusions

Since facilities typically have long lifetimes and operational requirements change over time, the FRLP is a more common practical problem than a greenfield design. The main motivation in the FRLP studied in this paper is to consider unequal area redesign problems including fixed areas and expanded facilities with a flexible, effective and computationally tractable algorithm. In this study, stationary areas within departments, called monuments, which represent portions of departments or entire departments that cannot be moved, are allowed to be specified anywhere in the layout.

In the proposed method, the relayout problem is treated as a bi-objective problem, minimizing the material handling cost and the relayout cost, which are measured on different time and magnitude scales. Previous approaches weight these two objectives to solve the problem with a single objective (The TS could also optimize this problem using a single objective or more than two objectives with little change to the algorithm.) However, the method can efficiently find a set of non-dominated solutions for the problem, instead of a single solution, while not requiring the two objectives to be weighted. This eliminates problems of scaling and *a priori* assessment of relative importance. Computational experiments show encouraging evidence that the TS algorithm improves the layouts and adapts to the new production environment while still accommodating monuments.

Further utilization of the approach was shown by demonstrating a few approaches to choosing among those designs along the Pareto front. Basically, the decision maker will need to examine first costs (relayout costs) versus operating costs (material handling costs) to choose the best layout for the given situation. Considerations would include the expected lifetime of the facility design and the availability of initial capital funds.

References

Armour, G.C. and Buffa, E.S. (1963) A heuristic algorithm and simulation approach to relative location of facilities. *Management Science,* **9**(2), 294–309.

Balakrishnan, J. and Cheng, C.H. (1998) Dynamic layout algorithms: a state-of-the-art survey. *International Journal of Management Science,* **26**(4), 507–521.

Balakrishnan, J. and Cheng, C.H. (2000) Genetic search and the dynamic layout problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, **27**(6), 587–593.

Balakrishnan, J., Cheng, C.H. and Conway, D.G. (2000) An improved pair-wise exchange heuristic for the dynamic plant layout problem. *International Journal of Production Research,* **38**(12), 3067–3077.

665   Balakrishnan, J., Jacobs, F.R. and Venkataramanan, M.A. (1992) Solutions for the constrained dynamic facility layout problem. *European Journal of Operational Research,* **57**, 280–286.

Q3   Batta, R. (1987) Comments on the dynamics of plant layout. *Management Science,* **33**(8), 1065.

670   Baykasoglu, A. (2001a) Goal programming using multiple-objective tabu search. *Journal of the Operational Research Society,* **52**(11), 1359–1369.

Q4   Baykasoglu, A. (2001b) MOAPPS 1.0: Aggregate production planning using the multiple-objective tabu search. *International Journal of Production Research,* **39**(15), 3685–3702.

Q5 675   Baykasoglu, A. and Gindy, N. (2001) A simulated annealing algorithm for dynamic layout problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, **28**(14), 1403–1426.

Baykasoglu, A., Owen, S. and Gindy, N. (1999) A taboo search based approach to find the pareto optimal set in multiple objective optimisation. *Journal of Engineering Optimization*, **31**, 731–748.

680

Q6

Bazaraa, M.S. (1975) Computerized layout design: a branch and bound approach. *AIIE Transactions*, **7**(4), 432–438.

685   Bozer, Y.A., Meller, R.D. and Erlebacher, S.J. (1994) An improvement–type layout algorithm for single and multiple floor facilities. *Management Science*, **40**(7), 918–932.

Chen, S.-J., Hwang, C.-L. and Hwang, F.P. (1992) *Fuzzy Multiple Attribute Decision Making*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany.

690   Chiang, W.-C. (2001) Visual facility layout design system. *International Journal of Production Research*, **39**(9), 1811–1836.

Coello, C.A.C. (2000) Handling preferences in evolutionary multiobjective optimization: a survey, in *Proceedings of the Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, **1**, pp. 30–37.

Q7

695   Coit, D.W., Smith, A.E. and Tate, D.M. (1996) Adaptive penalty methods for genetic optimization of constrained combinatorial problems. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, **8**, 173–182.

Conway, D.G. and Venkataramanan, M.A. (1994) Genetic search and the dynamic facility layout problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, **21**(8), 955–960.

700

Cvetković, D. and Parmee, I.C. (2002) Preferences and their application in evolutionary multiobjective optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, **6**(1), 42–57.

Fourman, M.P. (1985) Compaction of symbolic layout using genetic algorithms, in *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Genetic Algorithms*. pp. 141–153.

705

Q8

Glover, F. (1989) Tabu search part I. *ORSA Journal on Computing*, **1**, 190–206.

Glover, F. (1990) Tabu search-part II. *ORSA Journal on Computing*, **2**, 4–32.

710

Glover, F. and Laguna, M. (1997) *Tabu Search*, Kluwer, Boston, MA.

Glover, F., Taillard, E. and de Werra, D. (1993) A user's guide to tabu search. *Annals of Operations Research*, **41**, 3–28.

Hansen, M.P. (1997) Tabu search for multiobjective optimization: MOTS, Presented at the *Multi-criteria Decision Making Conference*, Cape Town, South Africa.

715

Q9

Hansen, M.P. (2000) Tabu search for Multiobjective Combinatorial Optimization: TAMOCO. *Control and Cybernetics*, **29**(3), 799–818.

720   Hertz, A., Jaumard, B., Ibeiro, C.C. and Formosinho Filho, W.P. (1994) A multi-criteria tabu search approach to cell formation problems in group technology with multiple objectives. *Recherche Operationelle/ Operations Research*, **28**(3), 303–328.

Q10

Horn, J. (1997) Multi-criterion decision making. in *Handbook of Evolutionary Computation*, Bäck, T., Fogel, D, and Michalewicz, Z. (eds.), volume 1, IOP Publishing Ltd. and Oxford University Press, pp. F1.9:1–F1.9:15.

725

Jones, D.F., Mirrazavi, S.K. and Tamiz, M. (2002) Multi-objective meta heuristics: an overview of the current state-of-the-art. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **137**, 1–9.

Q11

Kaku, B.K. and Mazzola, J.B. (1997) A tabu search heuristic for the dynamic plant layout problem. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, **9**(4), 374–383.

730

Keeney, R.L. and Raiffa, H. (1993) *Decisions with Multiple Objectives: Preferences and Value Tradeoffs*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

735

Kochhar, J.S. and Heragu, S.S. (1999) Facility layout design in a changing environment. *International Journal of Production Research*, **37**(10), 2429–2446.

Kouvelis, P., Kuawarwala, A.A. and Gutierrez, G.J. (1992) Algorithms for robust single and multiple period layout planning for manufacturing systems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **63**, 287–303.

740

Kulturel-Konak, S., Norman, B.A., Coit, D.W. and Smith, A.E. (2004) Exploiting tabu search memory in constrained problems. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, **14**(3), 241–254.

745

Kulturel-Konak, S., Smith, A.E. and Norman, B.A. (2006) Multi-objective tabu search using a multinomial probability mass function. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **169**(3), 915–931.

Lacksonen, T.A. (1994) Static and dynamic layout problems with varying areas. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, **45**(1), 59–69.

750

Lacksonen, T.A. and Enscore, E.E. (1993) Quadratic assignment algorithms for the dynamic layout problem. *International Journal of Production Research*, **31**(3), 503–517.

755

Meller, R.D. (1997) The multi-bay manufacturing facility layout problem. *International Journal of Production Research*, **35**(5), 1229–1237.

Meller, R.D. and Bozer Y.A. (1997) Alternative approaches to solve the multi-floor facility layout problem. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, **16**(3), 192–203.

760

Meller, R.D. and Gau, K.-Y. (1996) Facility layout objective functions and robust layouts. *International Journal of Production Research*, **34**(9), 2727–2742.

Montreuil, B. and Laforge, A. (1992) Dynamic layout design given a scenario tree of probable futures. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **63**, 271–286.

765

Montreuil, B. and Venkatadri, U. (1991) Strategic interpolative design of dynamic manufacturing systems layouts. *Management Science*, **37**(6), 682–694.

Rosenblatt, M.J. (1986) The dynamics of plant layout. *Management Science*, **32**(1), 76–86.

770

Rosenblatt, M.J. and Sinuany-Stern, Z. (1986) A discrete efficient frontier approach to the plant layout problem. *Material Flow*, **3**, 277–281.

Schaffer, J.D. (1985) Multiple objective optimization with vector evaluated genetic algorithms, in *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Genetic Algorithms*, pp. 93–100.

775

Q12

Smith, A.E. and Tate, D.M. (1993) Genetic optimization using a penalty function, in *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Genetic Algorithms*, pp. 499–505.

780

Q13

Tate, D.M. and Smith, A.E. (1995) Unequal area facility layout using genetic search. *IIE Transactions*, **27**, 465–472.

Urban, T.L. (1992) Computational performance and efficiency of lower-bound procedures for the dynamic facility layout problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **57**, 271–279.

785

Urban, T.L. (1993) A heuristic for the dynamic facility layout problem. *IIE Transactions*, **25**(4), 57–63.

Urban, T.L. (1998) Solution procedures for the dynamic facility layout problem. *Annals of Operations Research*, **76**, 323–342.

Van Camp, D.J., Carter, M.V. and Vanelli, A. (1991) A nonlinear optimization approach for solving facility layout problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **57**, 174–189.

790

Yang, T. and Peters, B.A. (1998) Flexible machine layout design for dynamic and uncertain production environments. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **108**, 49–64.

795

Appendices

Appendix A

1. The Van Camp problem

Facility:

800 $W = 51$ m $\quad H = 25$ m $\quad$ Facility Area: $25 \times 51 = 1275$ m^2

Distances are *Rectilinear*.

Maximum aspect ratio is five.

805

Table A1. Departmental areas

	Department									
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*
Area (m^2)	238	112	160	80	120	80	60	85	221	119

Table A2. Estimated volumes and routings of products

Product	Mean	Routing
1	10	3-5-10
2	100	1-5-8-7
3	50	2-9-6-4
4	50	2-9-5-8-7

Table A3. Departmental area changes for relayout with the existing facility area

Dept.	Old area(m^2)	New area(m^2)	Change in area (m^2)
1	238	188	−50
7	60	80	+20
10	119	149	+30

Table A4. Estimated volumes and routings of products for relayout with the existing facility area

Product	Mean	Routing
1	20	3-5-7-9
2	75	3-5-8-10
3	100	1-2-5-6-4
4	50	1-2-5-7-8-10
5	150	5-7-4-9-10

Table A5. Additional departmental areas for relayout with expansion

New Dept.	Area (m^2)	Overall facility area (m^2)
11	110	$25 \times 51 = 1275$ (old)
12	90	$25 \times 61 = 1525$ (new)
13	50	

Table A6. Estimated volumes and routings of products for relayout with expansion

Product	Mean	Routing
1	20	3-5-7-11-9
2	75	3-5-8-10-12
3	100	1-6-4-13
4	50	2-5-8-10-7-11
5	150	5-13-7-9-10-12

Table A7. Locations of the monuments for relayout

Fixed dept.	Monument (x_i^{FL}, y_i^{FL}) (x_i^{FU}, y_i^{FU})
9	(10, 13) (18, 15)

2. The Bazaraa problem

Facility:

$W = 9$ blocks $\qquad H = 7$ blocks $\qquad$ Facility area: $7 \times 9 = 63$ block^2

Distances are *rectilinear*. $\quad$ Maximum aspect ratio is two. **810**

Table A8. Departmental areas

	Department													
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*
Area (block^2)	9	8	9	10	6	3	3	3	2	3	2	1	1	3

Table A9. Estimated volumes and routings of products

Product	Mean	Routing
1	100	2-8-9-1
2	150	3-8-9-11-12-6
3	50	7-10-13-6
4	100	5-9-12-4-1
5	100	6-8-5-4-11-10
6	120	4-13-12

Table A10. Estimated volumes and routings of products for re-layout with the existing facility area

Product	Mean	Routing
1	120	2-8-7-10
2	100	3-8-9-12-6
3	75	7-10-12-9-6
4	90	5-9-12-4-14-1-13-11
5	125	6-5-14-4-12-10
6	100	4-3-5-13-11-12
7	200	2-8-4-14-1

Table A11. Additional departmental areas for relayout with expansion

Dept.	Area (block^2)	Overall facility area (block^2)
15	6	$7 \times 9 = 63$ (old)
16	8	$7 \times 11 = 77$ (new)

Table A12. Routings and estimated volumes of products for re-layout with expansion

Product	Mean	Routing
1	120	2-8-7-1
2	100	3-8-11-12-6
3	75	7-10-15-12-9-6
4	90	5-9-12-4-16-13-1
5	125	6-5-4-16-12-10
6	100	4-3-5-13-11-12
7	200	2-15-4-16

Table A13. Locations of the monuments for relayout

Fixed dept.	Monument (x_i^{FL}, y_i^{FL}) (x_i^{FU}, y_i^{FU})
3	(5, 3.5) (6, 4.5)
4	(0, 0) (1, 2)

3. *The Armour-Buffa problem*

Facility:

$\overline{W = 3}$ $H = 2$ Facility area: $3 \times 2 = 6$.

815 Distances are *rectilinear*. Maximum aspect ratio is three times.

Table A14. Departmental areas

Dept.	Area	Dept.	Area	Dept.	Area	Dept.	Area
1	0.27	6	0.18	11	0.60	16	0.75
2	0.18	7	0.09	12	0.42	17	0.64
3	0.27	8	0.09	13	0.18	18	0.41
4	0.18	9	0.09	14	0.24	19	0.27
5	0.18	10	0.24	15	0.27	20	0.45

Table A15. Estimated volumes and routings of products

Product	Mean	Routing
1	100	1-3-7-8-16-19
2	25	7-8-2-9-11
3	50	4-5-12-13-15-17
4	40	6-7-1-10-14-15
5	125	18-12-7-8-11-13-17
6	10	3-8-9-10-12-15
7	50	5-6-2-3-8-19-20-15
8	50	2-4-10-17-19

Table A16. Estimated volumes and routings of products for relay-out with the existing facility area

Product	Mean	Routing
1	75	1-3-7-2-8-16-19
2	75	7-8-2-9-11-15-17
3	75	1-4-3-5-12-13-15-11-17
4	100	6-7-10-14-15-18
5	100	18-17-6-12-7-8-17
6	20	3-8-7-9-10-15-18
7	25	3-8-7-9-10-15-18-20

Table A17. Locations of the monuments for relayout

Fixed dept.	Monument (x_i^{FL}, y_i^{FL}) (x_i^{FU}, y_i^{FU})
5	(0.1, 0.05) (0.25, 0.25)
19	(1.2, 1.2) (1.4, 1.4)
20	(2.3, 1.5) (2.6, 1.9)

Appendix B

Table B1. Pareto set of the Van Camp problem with existing facility area and with no departmental area change

Solution	RC	MHC	Encoding
1	0.000	28 577.016	4 6 9 2 10 5 8 7 1 3 | 4 8 9
2	170.000	27 415.232	4 6 9 2 10 8 5 7 1 3 | 4 8 9
3	361.357	26 508.751	4 6 9 2 10 8 5 7 3 1 | 4 8
4	402.734	22 875.939	4 6 9 10 2 5 8 7 1 3 | 4 8 9
5	478.565	21 907.487	4 6 9 10 8 5 2 7 1 3 | 4 8 9
6	529.091	19 996.678	4 6 9 10 8 2 5 7 1 3 | 4 8 9
7	720.448	19 680.336	4 6 9 10 8 2 5 7 3 1 | 4 8
8	877.919	19 224.261	6 4 9 10 8 7 5 2 1 3 | 4 6 8
9	975.933	19 173.084	6 4 9 10 8 7 5 3 1 2 | 4 6 8
10	999.826	18 817.596	10 9 3 5 7 4 6 8 1 2 | 3 8

The facility expansion and relayout problem   13

Table B2. Pareto set of the Bazaraa problem with existing facility area and with no departmental area change

Solution	RC	MHC	Encoding		
1	0.000	16 171.706	2 5 4 11 12 13 9 8 3 6 10 7 1 14	3 8 11	
2	120.000	14 452.623	2 5 4 11 12 13 9 8 3 6 10 7 14 1	3 8 11	
3	160.000	14 415.679	2 5 4 11 12 9 13 8 3 6 10 7 14 1	3 8 11	
4	240.000	13 660.262	2 5 4 11 12 13 9 8 3 6 14 1 10 7	3 8 11	
5	280.000	13 478.262	2 5 4 11 13 12 9 8 3 6 14 1 10 7	3 8 11	
6	300.000	13 419.734	2 5 4 11 12 13 9 8 3 14 6 1 10 7	3 8 11	
7	340.000	13 268.845	2 5 4 11 13 12 9 8 3 14 6 1 10 7	3 8 11	
8	985.411	12 729.807	6 14 4 8 12 9 13 11 5 3 2 7 10 1	3 8 11	

Table B3. Pareto set of the Armour-Buffa problem with existing facility area

Solution	RC	MHC	Encoding	
1	0.000	3364.494	16 4 6 5 1 2 9 10 14 15 19 8 7 3 12 13 17 20 11 18	4 9 14 17 20
2	90.000	3233.879	16 4 13 5 1 2 9 10 14 15 19 8 7 3 12 6 17 20 11 18	4 9 14 17 20
3	135.000	3192.018	16 13 4 5 1 2 9 10 14 15 19 8 7 3 12 6 17 20 11 18	4 9 14 17 20
4	180.000	3133.112	16 13 4 5 1 2 9 10 14 15 19 8 7 3 6 12 17 20 11 18	4 9 14 17 20
5	305.345	2989.327	16 4 3 5 1 2 9 10 14 15 19 8 7 6 12 13 17 20 11 18	4 9 14 17 20
6	383.140	2986.687	16 1 4 5 3 2 9 10 14 15 19 8 7 6 12 13 17 20 11 18	4 9 14 17 20
7	395.345	2942.875	16 4 3 5 1 2 9 10 14 13 19 8 7 6 12 17 15 20 11 18	4 9 14 17 20
8	443.027	2910.243	16 4 3 5 1 2 9 10 14 13 19 8 7 6 12 15 17 20 11 18	4 9 14 17 20
9	469.391	2850.044	16 4 3 5 1 2 9 10 14 13 19 8 7 6 12 17 15 20 11 18	4 9 14 17 20
10	547.186	2847.405	16 1 4 5 3 2 9 10 14 13 19 8 7 6 12 17 15 20 11 18	4 9 14 17 20
11	560.497	2787.040	16 4 3 5 1 2 10 14 9 19 8 7 6 12 13 17 20 15 11 18	4 8 13 16 20
12	562.058	2782.523	16 4 3 5 1 2 10 14 9 19 8 7 6 12 13 17 20 11 15 18	4 8 13 16 20
13	591.895	2781.382	16 3 4 5 1 2 10 14 9 19 8 7 6 12 13 17 20 11 15 18	4 8 13 16 20
14	645.808	2779.557	16 1 4 5 3 2 10 14 9 19 8 7 6 12 13 17 20 11 15 18	4 8 13 16 20
15	661.356	2744.479	16 4 3 5 1 2 10 14 19 8 9 7 6 12 13 17 20 15 11 18	4 7 13 16 20
16	671.974	2740.420	16 4 3 5 1 2 10 14 19 9 8 7 6 12 13 17 20 15 11 18	4 7 13 16 20
17	679.005	2699.873	16 4 3 5 1 10 14 9 19 8 2 7 6 12 13 17 20 15 11 18	4 7 13 16 20
18	680.566	2687.923	16 4 3 5 1 10 14 9 19 8 2 7 6 12 13 17 20 11 15 18	4 7 13 16 20
19	795.981	2682.708	16 4 3 5 2 1 10 14 19 9 8 7 6 12 17 13 20 15 11 18	4 7 13 16 20

Table B4. Pareto set of the Van Camp problem with existing facility area and with some departmental area changes

Solution	RC	MHC	Encoding	
1	50.000	28 826.833	4 6 9 2 10 5 8 7 1 3	4 8 9
2	220.000	27 853.619	4 6 9 2 10 8 5 7 1 3	4 8 9
3	337.868	27 706.359	4 6 9 2 10 7 8 5 1 3	4 5 9
4	391.400	26 766.496	4 6 9 8 10 5 2 7 1 3	4 8 9
5	464.114	25 072.624	4 6 9 8 10 2 5 7 1 3	4 8 9
6	542.012	23 832.851	4 9 10 2 6 5 8 7 1 3	3 8 9
7	549.224	23 748.993	4 9 10 6 2 5 8 7 1 3	3 8 9
8	569.535	23 333.522	10 9 4 6 2 5 8 7 1 3	3 8 9
9	607.818	21 978.815	4 9 10 2 8 5 6 7 1 3	3 8 9
10	615.480	21 120.193	4 9 10 8 2 5 6 7 1 3	3 8 9
11	674.778	20 520.613	4 9 10 8 2 5 7 6 1 3	3 8 9
12	871.274	20 429.762	10 9 4 6 7 5 2 8 1 3	3 8
13	899.970	20 188.196	9 8 10 2 7 5 4 6 1 3	3 8 9
14	916.322	19 864.114	9 8 10 2 5 7 6 4 1 3	3 8 9
15	928.105	19 102.007	9 8 10 2 5 7 4 6 1 3	3 8 9
16	1100.979	19 004.261	9 8 10 2 5 7 4 6 3 1	3 8
17	1159.345	18 581.410	9 10 8 7 4 6 5 3 2 1	3 5 7

Table B5. Pareto set of the Van Camp problem with expansion

Solution	RC	MHC	Encoding
1	0.000	44 460.031	4 6 9 2 10 5 8 7 1 3 13 11 12 | 4 8 9 10
2	38.095	42 231.456	4 6 9 2 10 5 8 7 1 3 13 11 12 | 4 8 9 11
3	97.600	39 256.934	4 6 9 2 10 5 8 7 13 1 3 11 12 | 4 8 10 11
4	158.711	38 184.598	4 6 9 2 10 5 8 7 13 1 12 3 11 | 4 8 10
5	207.600	38 000.934	4 6 9 2 10 5 8 7 13 1 12 11 3 | 4 8 10 12
6	221.157	37 902.437	4 6 9 2 10 5 8 13 7 1 3 11 12 | 4 8 10 11
7	227.400	37 714.885	4 6 9 2 10 5 13 7 1 3 11 8 12 | 4 8 9 10
8	236.296	37 156.637	4 6 9 2 10 5 8 7 13 1 12 3 11 | 4 8 11
9	257.432	35 205.938	4 6 9 2 10 5 13 7 1 8 3 11 12 | 4 8 10 11
10	270.000	34 762.831	4 6 9 2 10 5 8 7 13 11 12 3 1 | 4 8 11 12
11	300.118	34 435.194	4 6 9 2 7 13 8 5 10 1 3 12 11 | 4 6 9 10 11
12	300.900	34 429.669	4 6 9 2 10 5 7 13 1 8 3 11 12 | 4 8 10 11
13	331.600	33 558.189	4 6 9 2 11 5 13 7 1 3 12 10 8 | 4 8 9 10
14	347.951	33 021.898	4 6 9 2 8 5 13 7 1 10 3 11 12 | 4 8 10 11
15	380.831	32 990.315	4 6 9 2 10 7 13 5 8 1 3 12 11 | 4 7 9 10 11
16	391.212	32 264.978	4 6 9 2 11 5 13 7 1 3 8 10 12 | 4 8 9
17	395.951	32 118.053	4 6 9 2 8 5 7 13 1 10 3 11 12 | 4 8 10 11
18	409.062	32 081.398	4 6 9 2 8 5 13 7 1 10 12 3 11 | 4 8 10
19	414.800	30 678.685	4 6 9 2 10 5 13 7 11 8 12 3 1 | 4 8 11 12
20	458.269	30 029.269	4 6 9 2 10 5 7 13 11 8 12 3 1 | 4 8 11 12
21	510.418	29 110.633	4 6 9 2 10 7 8 13 5 12 11 3 1 | 4 8 10 12
22	570.342	28 999.856	4 6 9 2 10 7 13 12 11 8 5 3 1 | 4 6 8 11 12
23	636.303	28 030.837	4 6 9 2 7 13 5 8 10 12 11 1 3 | 4 6 10
24	676.776	27 856.689	10 8 9 12 11 5 13 7 1 3 4 6 2 | 4 8 9 10
25	699.156	26 487.168	10 9 11 7 12 8 5 13 1 3 4 6 2 | 3 5 8 9 10
26	770.681	26 026.442	8 10 9 12 7 11 5 13 1 3 4 6 2 | 4 6 8 9 10
27	782.192	25 896.595	8 10 9 12 11 7 5 13 1 3 4 6 2 | 4 8 9 10
28	798.737	25 267.670	3 9 2 10 8 5 12 11 7 13 4 6 1 | 3 5 7 11
29	855.452	25 168.190	8 9 10 12 7 11 5 13 1 3 4 6 2 | 4 6 8 9 10
30	889.556	24 228.368	10 9 11 7 12 8 5 13 4 6 2 3 1 | 3 5 8 11 12
31	914.015	23 961.126	11 9 10 12 7 4 13 5 8 2 6 3 1 | 3 5 9 11 12
32	1002.015	23 638.913	11 9 10 12 7 4 13 5 8 3 6 1 2 | 3 5 9 11
33	1014.969	22 423.449	11 12 10 9 7 13 4 5 8 2 6 3 1 | 2 5 9 11 12
34	1082.305	21 935.217	12 11 7 9 10 8 5 2 13 4 6 3 1 | 2 5 9 12
35	1162.211	21 823.194	11 2 12 10 9 7 5 8 13 4 6 3 1 | 2 5 7 9 12
36	1173.118	21 369.549	11 12 10 9 7 8 5 13 4 2 3 1 6 | 2 4 6 8 11
37	1184.936	21 147.796	11 12 10 9 7 8 5 13 4 6 3 2 1 | 2 4 6 8 11
38	1199.255	19 853.848	11 2 12 10 9 7 8 5 13 4 6 3 1 | 2 5 7 9 12
39	1217.922	19 752.506	11 2 12 10 9 7 8 5 13 4 3 1 6 | 2 5 7 9 11

Table B6. Pareto set of the Bazaraa problem with expansion

Solution	RC	MHC	Encoding
1	0.000	18 301.464	2 5 4 11 12 13 9 8 3 6 10 7 1 14 15 16 | 3 8 11 14
2	80.000	18 167.298	2 5 4 9 12 13 11 8 3 6 10 7 1 14 15 16 | 3 8 11 14
3	120.000	16 882.119	2 15 4 11 12 13 9 8 3 6 10 7 1 14 5 16 | 3 8 11 14
4	160.000	14 551.464	16 5 4 11 12 13 9 8 3 6 10 7 1 14 2 15 | 3 8 11 14
5	200.000	14 374.520	16 5 4 11 12 9 13 8 3 6 10 7 1 14 2 15 | 3 8 11 14
6	260.000	14 141.187	16 5 4 9 12 11 13 8 3 6 10 7 1 14 2 15 | 3 8 11 14
7	280.000	13 667.833	16 5 4 11 12 13 9 6 3 8 10 7 1 14 2 15 | 3 8 11 14
8	320.000	13 607.556	16 5 4 11 12 9 13 6 3 8 10 7 1 14 2 15 | 3 8 11 14
9	380.000	13 577.000	16 5 4 11 12 9 13 6 3 10 8 7 1 14 2 15 | 3 8 11 14
10	400.000	13 075.750	5 16 4 11 12 13 9 6 3 8 10 7 1 14 2 15 | 3 8 11 14
11	440.000	12 970.750	5 16 4 11 12 9 13 6 3 8 10 7 1 14 2 15 | 3 8 11 14
12	500.000	12 940.194	5 16 4 11 12 9 13 6 3 10 8 7 1 14 2 15 | 3 8 11 14
13	560.000	12 917.976	5 16 4 11 12 9 13 6 3 15 10 1 14 7 8 2 | 3 8 10 13
14	572.235	12 801.457	16 5 4 11 12 13 9 6 3 15 10 8 7 14 1 2 | 3 8 10 14
15	580.000	12 766.619	5 16 4 11 12 13 9 6 3 8 10 15 1 14 7 2 | 3 8 11 13
16	612.235	12 601.179	16 5 4 11 12 9 13 6 3 15 10 8 7 14 1 2 | 3 8 10 14
17	620.000	12 521.619	5 16 4 11 12 9 13 6 3 8 10 15 1 14 7 2 | 3 8 11 13
18	680.000	12 382.333	5 16 4 11 12 9 13 6 3 15 10 8 1 14 7 2 | 3 8 10 13
19	692.235	12 209.373	5 16 4 11 12 13 9 6 3 15 10 8 7 14 1 2 | 3 8 10 14
20	732.235	11 964.373	5 16 4 11 12 9 13 6 3 15 10 8 7 14 1 2 | 3 8 10 14

Biographies

Sadan Kulturel-Konak, is currently an Assistant Professor of Management Information Systems at Penn State Berks. She received her degrees in Industrial Engineering; B.S. from Gazi University, Turkey in 1993, M.S. from Middle East Technical University, Turkey in 1996 and from the University of Pittsburgh in 1999, and Ph.D. from Auburn University in 2002. Her research interests are in modeling and optimization of complex systems and robustness under uncertainty with applications to facility layout, reliability, and scheduling. She has published her research in *IIE Transactions*, *OR Letters*, *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, *International Journal of Production Research*, *European Journal of Operational Research*, and the *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing Computers*. She is a member of INFORMS, IIE, SWE, the Operations Research Society of Turkey, Alpha Phi Mu, and Phi Kappa Phi.

Alice E. Smith, is Professor and Chair of the Industrial and Systems Engineering Department at Auburn University. Previous to this position, she was on the faculty of the Department of Industrial Engineering at the University of Pittsburgh, which she joined in 1991 after 10 years of industrial experience with Southwestern Bell Corporation. She has degrees in engineering and business from Rice University, Saint Louis University and University of Missouri—Rolla. Her research in analysis, modeling and optimization of manufacturing processes and engineering design has been funded by NASA, the National Institute of Standards (NIST), Lockheed Martin, Adtranz (now Bombardier Transportation), the Ben Franklin Technology Center of Western Pennsylvania and the National Science Foundation (NSF), from which she was awarded a CAREER grant in 1995 and an ADVANCE Leadership grant in 2001. International research collaborations have been sponsored by the federal governments of Japan, Turkey, United Kingdom and the US. She has served as a principal investigator on over $3 million of sponsored research. She was named a Philpott-WestPoint Stevens Distinguished Professor in 2001 by the Auburn University College of Engineering. For outstanding achievements in research and scholarly activity she received the annual Senior Research Award of the College of Engineering at Auburn University in 2001 and the University of Pittsburgh School of Engineering Board of Visitors annual Faculty Award in 1996. She holds one US patent and several international patents and has authored over 50 publications in journals including articles in *IIE Transactions*, *IEEE Transactions on Reliability*, *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, *International Journal of Production Research*, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, *The Engineering Economist*, and *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*. She won the E. L. Grant Best Paper Award in 1999 and the William A. J. Golomski Best Paper Award in 2002. She holds editorial positions on *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, *Computers & Operations Research*, *International Journal of General Systems*, *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* and *IIE Transactions*. Five of her doctoral students have obtained tenure track positions at US universities and two of these are NSF CAREER awardees. She is a fellow of IIE, a senior member of IEEE and SWE, a member of Tau Beta Pi, INFORMS, NSBE and ASEE, and a Registered Professional Engineer in Industrial Engineering in Alabama and Pennsylvania.

Bryan A. Norman, is an Associate Professor of Industrial Engineering at the University of Pittsburgh. He received his Ph.D. degree in Industrial and Operations Engineering from the University of Michigan in 1995, where he was a National Science Foundation Fellowship holder, and has B.S.I.E. and M.S.I.E. degrees from the University of Oklahoma. His research interests primarily focus on the modeling of complex problems in manufacturing and production systems and applied optimization. His areas of application include scheduling, sequencing, job rotation, assembly line balancing, facility layout, material handling system design, network design and energy modeling. His research has been funded by several sources including the National Science Foundation and local industry. He has published his research in *IIE Transactions*, *Naval Research Logistics*, *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, *International Journal of Production Research*, *European Journal of Operational Research*, *Annals of Operations Research* and *Computers and Industrial Engineering*. He is a member of IIE and INFORMS.