### Transportation Cost & Tariff Optimization in the Specialty Tire and Wheels Industry

**Capstone Presentation** 

Kristin Pedersen Brian O'Donnell SCMr 2019

May 21, 2019



# **Company Overview**



Carlstar Group Brands





| BLACK<br>ROCK | UNIQUE |
|---------------|--------|
|               | TP     |
|               |        |

IT Supply Chain

## The Carlstar Group

- Leader in the specialty tire and wheel industry
- Global footprint in North America, Europe, Asia
- Headquartered in Franklin, TN

## Products







**Flat-free** 





Tubes

## **Distribution Channels**

- OEM
- Aftermarket

# **Current Events**



A China Oscan Chinarias Company container is lifted up at Hutchican International container next

With the dramatic changes in both US tariffs and transportation costs, the Carlstar Group is redefining how they plan, store, ship, and order inventory. How should the company evaluate changing transportation routes and methods for cost optimization?



## Agenda

- Opportunity & Objective
- Methodology
- Scenarios
- Model Results
- Key Takeaways



# **Opportunity and Objective**

Products flow along multiple paths from manufacturing to customer:

- 4 Manufacturing Sites (3 US, 1 China)
- 11 Distribution Centers (8 US, 2 Canada, 1 Europe)
- Dozens of shipping ports
- Hundreds of end customer demand points
- Differing shipping methods (FEU/TEU, FTL/LTL, etc.) \_\_\_\_

Flows impacted by changing tariff and transportation rates

#### **Research Objective**

- Further optimize how Carlstar ships products to minimize costs
- Create a model that can to enhance Carlstar's transportation decision-making
- Identify potential cost savings from implementing change



## Agenda

- Opportunity & Objective
- Methodology
- Scenarios
- Model Results
- Key Takeaways



# **Data Segmentation and Analysis**

Product flows were segmented by five primary market segments:





Agriculture & Construction (AGC)

Powersports (POW)



High Speed Trailers (HST)



Outdoor Power Equipment (OPE)



Automotive & Styled Wheels (STW)

In-scope analysis includes:

- Four primary manufacturing locations: Aiken, SC; Jackson, TN; Clinton, TN and Meizhou, China (~86% of total products manufactured)
- Finished goods -- excludes assembly
- 2018 US and Canada demand -- excludes Europe
- Minimum customer demand (by 3-digit ZIP) of at least 12 Full Truck Load (FTL) equivalents received per year (~89% of demand)



# In-Scope Supply Chain Network



### Indices:

- i: MFG index (3 US, 1 China)
- j: DC index (5 US, 2 Canada)
- k: customers (192 modeled)
- m: Market Segment (AGC, HSP, OPE, POW, STW)

### <u>Tariffs:</u>

b: 10% unit cost ∀ x where i = China, j = US for all MFG (China) to DC (US)
c: 10% unit cost ∀ z where i = China, j = US for all MFG (China) to Customer(US) Transportation:

r: MFG to DC: Actuals \$ used t: MFG to Customer: Actuals \$ for ocean freight, \$/mile for Drayage, in FTL/FCL units s: DC to Cust: \$/mile

### Handling cost:

 h: 10% Unit cost for all DC to Cust by DC

### Parameter:

 d: demand by customer, market segment, MFG origin

### Variables:

- **x**: product shipped MFG to DC
- y: product shipped DC to customer (optimized)
- **z:** product shipped MFG to customer, Integer (optimized)

MIT Supply Chain

Objective function: Minimize total transportation, tariff, and handling costs

# $\sum_{m} \sum_{i} \sum_{j} r_{ijkm} x_{ijkm} + \sum_{m} \sum_{j} \sum_{k} s_{kjm} y_{jkm} + \sum_{m} \sum_{i} \sum_{k} t_{ikm} z_{ikm} + \sum_{i} \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \sum_{m} b_{ijm} * x_{ijm} + \sum_{i} \sum_{k} \sum_{m} c_{ikm} * x_{ikm} + \sum_{m} \sum_{j} h_{jm} * y_{jkm} \text{ Holding Cost}$

<u>Constraints:</u>  $\sum_{i} z_{ikm} + \sum_{j} y_{jkm} \ge d_{km}$ Shipments from MFG and DC to customer must be greater than demand  $\sum_{i} x_{ijm} \ge \sum_{k} y_{jkm}$ DC inbound shipments must be greater than outbound  $x,y,z \ge 0, z$ : integer All product flows greater than 0

MILP modeled in Excel with What's Best! Add-in

## Agenda

- Opportunity & Objective
- Methodology
- Scenarios
- Model Results
- Key Takeaways



Model run for each scenario. Sensitivity analysis required multiple runs for each scenario

Baseline

Optimal

Tariff Sensitivity

Transportation Cost Sensitivity

**Demand Sensitivity** 

Handling Cost Sensitivity



# Agenda

- Opportunity & Objective
- Methodology
- Scenarios
- Model Results
- Key Takeaways



## **Baseline vs Optimal Solution**

Optimal solution reduces transportation costs by 17% over current transportation flows

(based on model projected costs)

GEMENT

Increases direct to customer unit shipments



# **Tariff Sensitivity**

10% tariff rates: Chinese manufactured goods went through US based DCs15% tariff rates: Chinese manufactured goods went through Canadian DCs13% of Canadian customers received direct-to-customer shipments (80% by units)





# **Transportation Sensitivity**

GEMENT

Changes in optimal flows were not significant as transportation rates changed



- 17 -

# **Demand Sensitivity**

Significant seasonality only seen with OPE Market Segment

Increased OPE Demand did not materially influence optimal flow

Optimal solution is robust and does not need to change by season



MIT Supply Chain

- 18 -

# **Demand Sensitivity**



MIT Supply Chain

# Handling Cost Sensitivity

Optimal solution was significantly more efficient when handling costs were removed

As handling costs increased, switch to direct-to-customer increased significantly



MIT Supply Chain

# Agenda

- Opportunity & Objective
- Methodology
- Scenarios
- Model Results
- Key Takeaways



Savings of 17% possible with optimized routing

Optimal transportation flows are resilient to small outside changes

Shipping direct to customer can be cost-effective even at low-levels of utilization

Handling costs had strongest influence on optimal transportation flows

Tariffs of 15% or greater cause switch to direct-to-Canada DC shipments, but did not increase direct to customer shipments

### Next Round



Evaluate direct-to-customer shipments for all top 10% of customers by demand

Prepare for China MFG to Canadian DC shipments

Investigate true handling costs at each DC/market segment and re-run model for optimal solution



# **Future Opportunities for Research**

- Alternative Manufacturing Locations
  - Model constrained to 4 primary manufacturing locations
  - Reliance in Chinese manufacturing exposes company to tariff volatility
  - Investigate new manufacturing locations or a shift to more US production
- Broaden Data Scope
  - Granular analysis at the stock-keeping unit level or specific customer level
  - Investigate excluded elements (i.e. assembly, parcel shipments, customers receiving less than 12 FTLs, European demand, etc.)
- Supply Chain Optimization Software
  - Various enterprise technologies exist and could augment model



# Question?



• Not sure if we need this or not, so placing a reminder...



Objective-Minimize total transportation, tariff, and handling costs for US and Canadian Demand

$$\begin{split} & \sum_{m} \sum_{i} \sum_{j} r_{ijkm} x_{ijkm} + \sum_{m} \sum_{j} \sum_{k} s_{kjm} y_{jkm} + \sum_{m} \sum_{i} \sum_{k} t_{ikm} z_{ikm} + & \text{Transport } \$ \\ & \text{Tariff } \$ & \sum_{i} \sum_{k} \sum_{m} a_{ikm} * y_{ikm} + \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \sum_{m} b_{ijm} * x_{ijm} + \sum_{i} \sum_{k} \sum_{m} c_{ikm} * x_{ikm} + \\ & \sum_{m} \sum_{j} h_{jm} * y_{jkm} & \text{Holding Cost } \$ \end{split}$$

Variables:

- **x**: product shipped MFG to DC
- **y**: product shipped DC to customer
- z: product shipped MFG to customer

### Parameters:

- r: Transport cost MFG to DC
- **s**: Transport cost DC to customer
- t: transport cost MFG to customer
- a,b,c: import costs
- h: Handling costs



Constraints:

$$\overline{\sum_{i} z_{ikm} + \sum_{j} y_{jkm}} \ge d_{km}$$

Shipments from MFG and DC to customer must be greater than demand

$$\sum_{i} x_{ijm} \ge \sum_{k} y_{jkm}$$

DC inbound shipments must be greater than outbound

 $x,y,z \ge 0, z$ : integer All product flows greater than 0

MILP modeled in Excel with What's Best! Add-in