## Plow Blade Optimization

This project was conducted in cooperation with ODOT and FHWA. The researchers would like to thank the members of ODOT's Technical Liaison Committee: Mr. Doug Riffle and Mr. Brian Olson. As well as ODOT's Statewide Planning and Research team: Ms. Vicky Fout, Ms. Jill Martindale, Ms. Cynthia Jones, Mr. Scott Phinney, and Ms. Kelly Nye.







Objective:

Determine a usage strategy based on safe, efficient, and cost effective methods for changing and purchasing plow blades.





Survey



## Surveys

- In-State 81 of 88 Ohio counties responded
- Determine current practices:
  - Blade section lengths,
  - Cover or stacked blades,
  - Blade materials,
  - Plow shoes,
  - Plow guards,
  - Trip edges,
  - Counter balances, and
  - Pavement type.

#### District \_\_\_\_\_ County\_\_\_\_ Name Date

- What plowing systems are used in your county? (please check all that apply)

   Front o Wing o Underbody o Tow plow
- 2.) How many lane-miles do you maintain?
- 3.) Do you pre-wet your salt? o Yes o No
- 4.) How many hours before a storm do you anti-ice?
- 5.) Do you use any kind of tripping mechanism? o Yes o No
- 6.) Do you use carbide inserts? o Yes o No
- 7.) Do you use plow shoes? o Yes o No
- Do you use plow guards?
   Yes
   No
- 9.) Do your plow systems have counter-balances on them? o Yes o No
- 10.) If yes, how often are they adjusted?
- 11.) What kind of counter-balance are used? o Spring o Hydraulic
- 12.) Do you use full length plow blades? o Yes o No
- 13.) Do you use partial length plow blades? o Yes o No
- 14.) Do you use a cover plow blade to cover the joint? o Yes o No
- 15.) What types of materials are the plow blades in your county? (please check all that apply)

   Polymer
   Rubber
   Steel
   Other\_\_\_\_\_
- 16.) What kind of road surface types are in your county? (please check all that apply) o Concrete o Asphalt o Chipseal
- 17.) Do you use different plow blades for different types of road surfaces? o Yes o No
- 18.) Do you use different plow blades in different weather conditions? o Yes o No
- 19.) Do you notice a difference in life span with different types of plow blades? o Yes o No
- 20.) If yes, please explain.

21.) What are the lengths (in feet) of plow blades used in your county? \_\_\_\_\_\_

#### 22.) What manufactures of plow blades do you use? (please list all)

- 23.) How many times a season do you change plow blades?
- 24.) How many people are needed to change plow blades?
- 25.) On average, how long does it take to change blades on one plowing system?
- 26.) Where does plow blade changing occur within your county? (please check all that apply) o County Garage o Outposts
- 27.) Which direction is the head of the bolts on the plow blades?o Facing the Fronto Facing the back
- 28.) Do you have any safety protocol for changing plow blades? o Yes o No
- 29.) If yes, please explain.
- 30.) Do you have a training program for changing plow blades? o Yes o No
- 31.) If yes, please explain.
- 32.) On average, how many injuries do you experience from changing plow blades in a season?
- 33.) What tools and equipment do you use to change plow blades?
- 34.) What are your biggest safety concerns when changing plow blades? \_\_\_\_\_\_
- 35.) Are there any plow blades that you would like to have considered for evaluation?...

## Survey Results – Blade Lengths and Counterbalances





#### Types of Counterbalances Being Used in each District

## Survey Results – Additional Blade Equipment



Survey Results – Safety



# Project Setting and Data Collection Methodology



### Project Setting

- D3 Medina County
- D4 Summit County
- D5 Fairfield County
- D10 Washington County
- D11 Columbiana County
- D12 Lake County



Show and Ice Fractices, Match 2011

County	Blades(*) (**)	Counterbalance	Snowfall (in.)
Medina	Steel, Carbide (Existing)**	Spring	30 - 60
Summit	Steel, JOMA (Spring)*, PolarFlex (Spring)*	Spring	40 - 80
Fairfield	Steel, Winter XL Classic (Hydraulic)*	Hydraulic	20 - 30
Washington	Steel, JOMA (Spring)*	Spring, Hydraulic	<20-30
Columbiana	Steel, Winter XL Classic (Hydraulic*, Existing**)	Spring, Hydraulic	20 - 40
Lake	Steel, PolarFlex (Spring*, Existing**)	Spring	60 - 100

Note: (\*) Indicates the type of counterbalance that should be on the truck the specific blade type is placed on. (\*\*) Indicates the blade type is currently being used in the county.



County	Counterbalance	Blade 1	Blade 2	Blade 3	Blade 4
Medina	Spring	Standard	XL Classic	PolarFlex	Middle Guard
Summit	Spring	Standard	XL Classic	Carbide	No Counterbalance
Lake	Spring	Standard	XL Classic	Carbide	Middle Guard
Fairfield	Hydraulic	Standard	PolarFlex	Carbide	Double Stacked
Washington	Hydraulic	Standard	PolarFlex	Double Stacked	No Counterbalance

Note: "Middle Guard" refers to a standard blade configuration with an additional straight edge guard placed in the middle of the blade. "No Counterbalance" refers to a standard blade configuration with no counterbalance used over the course of the season. "Double Stacked" refers to a setup having two full standard steel blades with straight edge guards on each end.



DVR - Installed under seat



Front facing camera

#### Blade measurement locations

### Results



- 6000+ hours of video data over two years
- Over 90% capture rate
- Measurement Sheets





A) Plow in "Down" Position, Utilized



B) Plow in "Up" Position, not Utilized









B) Time Plowed Per County





#### A) Distance Plowed Per County





C) Distance Plowed by Blade TypeD) Time Plowed by Blade TypeNote: "No Counterbalance" is a standard blade on a truck without a counterbalance.



C) Average Plowing Speed Per County D) Average Plowing Speed by Blade Type Note: "No Counterbalance" is a standard blade on a truck without a counterbalance.

## Pavement Type and Bridge Joints – Year Two



		Number of	Percent
County	Blade	Joints	Concrete
Fairfield	Carbide - Single	2386	3.6%
Fairfield	Carbide - Double	4518	3.99%
Fairfield	Double Stack	11076	2.13%
Fairfield	Standard	18	0.03%
Fairfield	PolarFlex	10032	2%
Lake	Carbide - Single	0	0%
Lake	Carbide - Double	664	0.14%
Lake	Middle Guard	1316	0.56%
Lake	Standard	8902	2.34%
Lake	XL Classic	12526	25.67%
Medina	Middle Guard	2860	0.83%
Medina	PolarFlex	808	0.44%
Medina	Standard	1038	0.72%
Medina	XL Classic	760	0.75%
Summit	Carbide - Double	526	1.34%
Summit	No Counterbalance	8334	7.65%
Summit	XL Classic	268	0.18%
Washington	Double Stack	1624	1.4%
Washington	No Counterbalance	0	0%
Washington	PolarFlex	0	0%
Washington	Standard	844	0.46%

Note: The number of joints is calculated by counting the number of concrete segments plowed and multiplying by two. This method assumes that each concrete segment is a bridge deck with two joints at each end. "No Counterbalance" is a standard blade on a truck with no counterbalance.

## Blade Measurements Results



# Wear per Mile Plowing



Wear per Mile - Year Two



• Using video data and blade measurement sheets, the wear per mile may be calculated.

County	Blade Type	2013-2014 Winter Season Notes	Picture
Summit	JOMA	Lost driver-side curb guard on barrier wall drain. Still used plow without curb guard. Picture is of JOMA with missing a curb guard.	
Summit	PolarFlex	1/26/2014 Hit bridge expansion joint – middle section was bent to point of being unusable. Ordered new teeth for blade. New teeth install on 2/5/2014.	
Summit	PolarFlex	Hit monument box. Slightly bent middle section and trip edge. Still used plow. Went through three trip edges this season.	
Medina	Carbide	1/26/2014 Broke first carbide blade on bridge expansion.	N/A

## Blade Ratio

Blade Type	Average Total Wear (in)	Total Miles	Wear/Mile (in/mile)	Equivalent Standard Blade Ratio
Carbide	1.975	1709.2	1.16 E-03	1.7
JOMA	1.225	3060	4.00 E-04	5.0
PolarFlex	2.4375	5547	4.39 E-04	4.5
Standard	15.2	7666.6	1.98 E-03	1
XL Classic	0.95	3185.8	2.98 E-04	6.6



Note: Fairfield's double-stacked standard blade is an outlier to the data and is removed from the analysis; therefore, it is not presented in this table. In Year Two of this study, additional double-stacked blades are tested in order to determine a standard blade equivalence ratio, presented in Table 6.4.

	Average Total Wear	Total	Woor/Milo	Equivalent Standard Blade
Blade Type	(in)	Miles	(in/mile)	Ratio
Carbide - Single	3.00	917	3.27E-03	1.5
Carbide - Double	6.13	3733	1.64E-03	2.9
Double Stack	8.31	3278	2.54E-03	1.9
Middle Guard	8.00	3115	2.57E-03	1.9
No Counterbalance	5.75	986	5.83E-03	0.8
PolarFlex	1.94	3929	4.93E-04	9.4
Standard	16.94	3510	4.82E-03	1
XL Classic	1.63	2698	6.02E-04	7.7

Note: The average wear is determined from adding the wear of each measurement location over the entire season for each blade type, in each county, then averaging the wear across the blade. "No Counterbalance" is a standard blade on a truck with no counterbalance.



Year One

	Variables	Average	Standard Deviation	Source
÷	Carbide-Tipped Blade Capital Cost (\$)	796.4	90.8	ODOT
Cos	JOMA Blade Capital Cost (\$)	3361.8		Field Evaluation
ital	PolarFlex Blade Capital Cost (\$)	2466.0		Field Evaluation
Cap	Standard Blade Capital Cost (\$)	498.3	97.8	ODOT
	Winter XL Classic Blade Capital Cost (\$)	2980.0		Field Evaluation
t r	Hourly Labor Rate (\$/hour)	18	3	ODOT
Labo	Number of People to Change One Blade (unitless)	3	0.5	ODOT
<b>I</b>	Time to Change One Blade (hour)	0.75	0.25	ODOT
er st	Carbide-Tipped Blade Equivalence	1.7	0.5	Field Evaluation
dar e Co ctor iplie	JOMA Blade Equivalence	5	0.5	Field Evaluation
Stan Jade Fac Ault	PolarFlex Blade Equivalence	4.5	0.5	Field Evaluation
<u>~ a &lt;</u>	Winter XL Classic Blade Equivalence	6.6	0.5	Field Evaluation

Note: All data are provided by or approved by ODOT to reflect their current practices. Blade equivalencies are calculated from field data. The cost of standard and carbide blades are calculated using pricing from 201 to 2014.

Year Two

			Standard	
	Variables	Average	Deviation	Source
	Standard Blade Capital Cost (\$)	498.3	97.8	ODOT
÷	Double-Stacked Blade Capital Cost (\$)	704.2	149.7	ODOT
Cos	Carbide-Tipped Blade Capital Cost (\$)	796.4	90.8	ODOT
ital	Double-Stacked Carbide-Tipped Blade Capital Cost (\$)	1375.2	156.5	ODOT
Cap	Standard Blade with Middle Guard Capital Cost (\$)	607.0	110.5	ODOT
•	PolarFlex Blade Capital Cost (\$)	2466.0		Field Evaluation
	Winter XL Classic Blade Capital Cost (\$)	2980.0		Field Evaluation
r r	Hourly Labor Rate (\$/hour)	18	3	ODOT
.abo Cos	Number of People to Change One Blade (unitless)	3	0.5	ODOT
Ι	Time to Change One Blade (hour)	0.75	0.25	ODOT
÷	Carbide-Tipped Blade Equivalence	1.5	0.5	Field Evaluation
Cos lier	Carbide-Tipped Double Stacked Blade Equivalence	2.9	0.5	Field Evaluation
ade ltip]	Double Stacked Standard Blade Equivalence	1.9	0.5	Field Evaluation
d Bl Mu	Middle Guard Standard Blade Equivalence	1.9	0.5	Field Evaluation
dar ctor	No Counterbalance Standard Blade Equivalence	0.8	0.5	Field Evaluation
itan Fa	PolarFlex Blade Equivalence	9.4	0.5	Field Evaluation
	Winter XL Classic Blade Equivalence	7.7	0.5	Field Evaluation

Note: All data are provided by or approved by ODOT to reflect their current practices. Blade equivalencies are calculated from field data. The cost of standard and carbide blades (including double-stacked blades and additional middle guards) are calculated using pricing from 2012 to 2014.

Specialty Blade	Specialty Quantity	Specialty Cost	Standard Quantity	Standard Cost	Savings per Blade
Carbide Single	1	\$836	1.7	\$916	\$80
JOMA	1	\$3,402	5	\$2,695	(\$707)
PolarFlex	1	\$2,507	4.5	\$2,424	(\$83)
Standard	1	\$539	1	\$539	\$0
XL Classic	1	\$3,021	6.6	\$3,554	\$534

#### Year One

Note: The savings represents the cost savings per one specialty blade. Maintenance costs for blade changes are included in these costs.

#### Year Two

Specialty Blade	Specialty Quantity	Specialty Cost	Standard Quantity	Standard Cost	Savings per Blade
Carbide Single	1	\$836	1.5	\$807	(\$29)
Carbide Double	1	\$1,416	2.9	\$1,561	\$145
Double Stack	1	\$745	1.9	\$1,023	\$278
Middle Guard	1	\$648	1.9	\$1,023	\$375
No Counterbalance	1	\$539	0.8	\$432	(\$107)
PolarFlex	1	\$2,507	9.4	\$5,061	\$2,554
Standard	1	\$539	1	\$539	\$0
XL Classic	1	\$3,021	7.7	\$4,145	\$1,125

Note: The savings represents the cost savings associated with one specialty blade. Maintenance costs for blade changes are included in these costs. "No Counterbalance" is a standard blade on a truck with no counterbalance.

Year One & Two					Savings
	Specialty	Specialty	Standard	Standard	per
Specialty Blade	Quantity	Cost	Quantity	Cost	Blade
Carbide Single	1	\$836	1.5	\$807	(\$29)
PolarFlex	1	\$2,507	6.1	\$3,285	\$778
Standard	1	\$539	1	\$539	\$0
XL Classic	1	\$3,021	6.4	\$3,447	\$426

Note: The savings represents the cost savings associated with one specialty blade. Maintenance costs for blade changes are included in these costs.

0 1

**x** 7

Year One Data		Year Two Data			Year One and Two Data					
		Cost Savings when compared to Equivalent		Cost Savings when compared to Equivalent				Cost Savi when com to Equiva	ngs 1pared lent	
Blade	Rank	Standard Blades	Blade	Rank	Standard	Blades	Blade	Rank	Standard	Blades
XL Classic	1	\$534	PolarFlex		1	\$2,554	PolarFlex		1	\$778
Carbide Single	4	2 \$80	XL Classic	,	2	\$1,125	XL Classic		2	\$426
Standard		3    \$0	Middle Guard	,	3	\$375	Standard		3	\$0
PolarFlex	2	-\$83	Double Stack	4	4	\$278	Carbide Single		4	-\$29
JOMA	4	5 -\$707	Carbide Double	:	5	\$145				
			Standard		5	\$0				
			Carbide Single	,	7	-\$29				
			No Counterbalance		8	-\$107				

Note: A number 1 rank means the most cost savings per blade implemented in place of a standard blade. If a blade is below the standard blade rank, there is a cost associated with implementing that blade instead of a standard blade and will be denote with a negative sign on the cost.



