

University of Michigan Center For Ergonomics

Energy Expenditure Prediction Program™ Version 2.0

The Center for Ergonomics at the University of Michigan College of Engineering has developed programs for analyzing manual materials-handling tasks. These programs are in use at over 2000 U.S. and international sites by ergonomists, engineers, loss-control specialists, physical and occupational therapists, researchers, and others who evaluate and design jobs.

Installation

To install the Energy Expenditure Prediction Program insert the CD, open it, and read the install.txt file if necessary. Be sure to be signed on to the windows system as an administrator. To start the installation run the EEPP application file (EEPP.exe) and follow the directions. More information is found in the install.txt file.

Problems?

Please check our web site: <http://www.engin.umich.edu/dept/ioe/ENGEXP/> or contact:

University of Michigan
Office of Technology Transfer
3003 South State Street, Suite 2071
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1280

Tel: (734) 936-0435

Fax: (734) 936-1330

email: um-software@umich.edu

What is the Energy Expenditure Prediction Program (EEPP)?

The Energy Expenditure Prediction Program™ (EEPP) is a software tool to estimate energy expenditure rates for materials handling tasks to help assure worker safety and health.

EEPP is based on the assumption that a job can be divided into simple tasks (activity elements) and that the average metabolic energy rate of the job can be predicted

by knowing the energy expenditure of the simple tasks and the time duration of the task. The EEPP software is a user-friendly tool. It is more accurate than selecting values from a standard table and is more feasible and less costly than laboratory techniques involving measurement of oxygen consumption. It is useful in designing new jobs, comparing one job to another, and improving an existing job by identifying the particular tasks that require excess energy expenditure. The EEPP software provides an objective rate to gauge fatigue, which can also be compared with NIOSH guidelines.

Why should you use the EEPP?

The EEPP software -

- is easy to understand and apply to your materials handling jobs,
- is non-technical in operation,
- provides objective values to gauge worker safety, make comparisons, and design improvements,
- is less expensive and often more feasible than laboratory techniques,
- is more accurate than pulling standard energy expenditure values from published tabular data, and
- provides a summary value to compare with NIOSH guidelines.

Background Information

The University of Michigan's Energy Expenditure Prediction Program™ (EEPP) predicts metabolic energy expenditure rates by summing up the energy requirements of small, well-defined work tasks that comprise the entire job. The resulting estimate is much more precise than a single table value depicting an entire job, and the required job analysis procedure is accordingly more tedious, but computerization (e.g. EEPP) has made this type of analysis feasible. This method allows energy expenditure analysis of existing jobs as well as simulated, non-existent jobs. This ability to simulate workplaces is important in the job design process. This method also identifies specific work tasks that contribute heavily to an overall high job energy expenditure rate, which facilitates job redesign activities.

The metabolic prediction model (Garg et al., 1978) is based on the assumption that a job can be divided into tasks or activity elements. The energy expenditure requirements for each task can be added together to determine the energy expenditure of the entire job. The energy expenditures of the tasks are calculated using prediction equations derived from empirical data. The information for each task needed to compute these energy requirements include: force exerted, distance moved, frequency, task posture, lifting technique for lifting tasks, and the time needed to perform the tasks. Gender and body weight, two worker factors, are also needed. The average metabolic energy expenditure rate for the job is then predicted as the average (over time) of the sum

of the energy requirements of the individual tasks, plus the energy required to maintain various body postures. The prediction model is described by the following equation:

$$E_{\text{job}} = E_{\text{basal}} + S(E_{\text{taskj}} / T_{\text{taskj}})$$

where:

E_{job} = average energy expenditure rate of the job (Kcal/min)

E_{basal} = metabolic energy expenditure rate necessary to maintain basal metabolism and posture (Kcal/min)

E_{taskj} = net metabolic energy expenditure of the j^{th} task in steady state (Kcal)

T_{taskj} = time duration of the j^{th} task (min.)

As the equation shows, the energy expenditure prediction model has two basic components.

- (1) Energy expenditure necessary to maintain non-work related body energy requirements, and
- (2) Net energy requirements of the various work tasks.

The first component depends upon the energy required for posture maintenance. The energy requirement is a function of gender, body weight, and body posture. The model can accommodate three different body postures: standing, standing bent over and sitting.

The second component is the net metabolic energy expenditures for the various tasks that comprise the entire job. The model accommodates many different work tasks, including both static and dynamic work. The prediction of the energy expenditure of the separate tasks is a function of various factors, as was previously mentioned. Much of the data needed for this methodology can be collected from industrial engineering time and motion studies or from predetermined time systems. Niebel (1982) provides further information.

The accuracy of this prediction procedure depends upon several factors, including:

- (1) The completeness and accuracy of the division of the job into tasks (the job analysis must be correct);
- (2) The availability of a prediction equation that precisely describes the task that has been identified;

(3) The accuracy of the task equation itself.

Program Inputs

Subject's gender and weight;
List of activity elements (e.g. lift, push, carry); and
Parameters specific to activity elements (e.g. frequency, weight of load, distance carried).

Program Outputs

Listing of activity elements with their corresponding energy expenditure;
Calculation of the total energy expenditure rate for the job in Kcal/minute or METS; and
Data can be viewed on screen, printed, or written to a file for later recall or for inclusion in a report.

Task Elements

Posture Tasks:

Standing
Standing bent
Sitting

Incremental Tasks:

Lifts or lowers:
Stoop - knees straight, back bent
Squat - knees bent, back straight
Semisquat - knees and back bent
Arm lift - Hands above 32 inches
One handed - Hands above 32 inches

Walks:
Level surface
Inclined surface

Carries or holds:
Arms length at sides
Against waist at sides

Pushes or pulls:
Horizontal direction
Forward direction

Hand work - General:
Light (writing)

Heavy (gear assembly)
Arm work - Lateral:
180 degrees - one or both hands
90 degrees - standing
90 degrees - sitting one or both hands
Arm work - Horizontal:
Standing
Sitting
Arm work - General:
Light one hand (filing metal)
Light both hands (planing wood)
Heavy one hand (hammering nails)
Heavy both hands (upholstering)

EEPP Example Application

The following job analysis presents an example illustrating the performance of the EEPP software.

Step 1: Determine task work elements.

The Paper and Supply Co. repackages cases of copy machine paper. Workers must carry the cases from a pallet to a worktable, remove the paper from the cases, and push the reams onto a conveyor. One work cycle, defined as the time to process an entire pallet of 20 cases stacked in 4 tiers, takes 6.8 minutes. Each case is 50 lbs. and is 10" high. The worker is male, weighs 130 lbs., and has a carry height of 33". The average time it takes him to walk 11 feet from the 35" high worktable to the 4" high pallet is 0.04 minutes. It takes 0.15 minutes to unload a case. A 12 lb. push force is necessary to move the paper the 16" across the table onto the conveyor.

Task work elements:

1. Walk to pallet
2. Lift case of paper from pallet
3. Carry to work table
4. Place case on worktable
5. Remove paper from case
6. Push paper onto conveyor

Step 2: Enter data into EEPP.

The following screenshot illustrates EEPP after the data has been entered.

The screenshot shows the EEPP software interface with the following data:

Task Information

General information:
 Task Title: Paper & Supply Task Duration (hrs.): 2.26666667 Cycle Duration (min.): 6.8
 Description: Re-pack Operation Automatic

Posture Information:
 Standing (%): 95 Standing Bent (%): 5 Sitting (%): 0

| No. | Type | Advanced | Frequency | Force | Ini. Pos. | Fin. Pos. | Time | Dist/Steps | Slope | Energy |
|-----|-----------|------------|-----------|-------|-----------|-----------|------|------------|-------|--------|
| 200 | Lower | Arm | 5.00 | 50.00 | 35.00 | 33.00 | | | | 0.09 |
| 201 | Lift | Stoop | 5.00 | 50.00 | 24.00 | 33.00 | | | | 0.77 |
| 202 | Lift | Semi-Squa | 5.00 | 50.00 | 14.00 | 33.00 | | | | 1.93 |
| 203 | Lift | Squat | 5.00 | 50.00 | 4.00 | 33.00 | | | | 3.43 |
| 300 | Carry | Loads | 20.00 | 50.00 | | | 0.04 | 11.00 | 0.00 | 6.41 |
| 400 | Lift | Arm | 20.00 | 50.00 | 33.00 | 35.00 | | | | 0.58 |
| 500 | Arm Work | General -- | 20.00 | | | | 0.15 | | | 6.60 |
| 600 | Push/Pull | Regular | 20.00 | 12.00 | 38.00 | | | 16.00 | | 1.24 |

Energy Summary

Total Posture Energy (KCAL): 9.72 Total Number of Cycles: 20.00
 Total Elements Energy (KCAL): 23.87 Total Task Energy (KCAL): 671.88
 Cycle Energy (KCAL/Cycle): 33.59 Task Energy Rate (KCAL/MIN.): 4.94

Help

Step 3: Perform the Analysis of Output and Job redesign.

A glance at the summary energy expenditure rate of 4.94 kcal/min at the bottom of the screenshot above alerts the safety engineer that the job is too fatiguing. It significantly exceeds the 3.5 kcal/min action limit guideline for an average 8-hour day set by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH).

The right hand column above indicates that it is more arduous to lift cases from the lower levels on the pallet. Carrying the cases to the workstation is also a high fatigue factor.

The safety engineer redesigns the job by installing an automatic pallet lift device that will eliminate the worker's need to bend when he lifts. With the new device, all cases can now be lifted at the same optimum height. The job is also changed by moving the pallet closer to the worktable. The worker's walk distance is reduced to 6 feet.

Data from the job changes are entered into the program resulting in the following screenshot:

The screenshot shows a software window titled "Task" with two tabs: "Task Information" (selected) and "Task Elements".

General information:
 Task Title: Paper & Supply Task Duration (hrs.): 2.26666667 Cycle Duration (min.): 6.8
 Description: Redesign of Re-pack Operation Automatic

Posture Information:
 Standing (%): 100 Standing Bent (%): 0 Sitting (%): 0

| No. | Type | Advanced | Frequency | Force | Ini. Pos. | Fin. Pos. | Time | Dist/Steps | Slope | Energy |
|-----|-----------|------------|-----------|-------|-----------|-----------|------|------------|-------|--------|
| 100 | Walk | On Flat or | 20.00 | | | | 0.02 | 6.00 | 0.00 | 1.64 |
| 200 | Lower | Arm | 20.00 | 50.00 | 35.00 | 33.00 | | | | 0.35 |
| 300 | Carry | Loads | 20.00 | 50.00 | | | 0.02 | 6.00 | 0.00 | 3.56 |
| 400 | Lift | Arm | 20.00 | 50.00 | 33.00 | 35.00 | | | | 0.58 |
| 500 | Arm Work | General -- | 20.00 | | | | 0.15 | | | 6.60 |
| 600 | Push/Pull | Regular | 20.00 | 12.00 | 38.00 | | | 16.00 | | 1.24 |

Energy Summary

Total Posture Energy (KCAL): 9.64 Total Number of Cycles: 20.00
 Total Elements Energy (KCAL): 13.97 Total Task Energy (KCAL): 472.11
 Cycle Energy (KCAL/Cycle): 23.61 Task Energy Rate (KCAL/MIN.): 3.47

Help

The energy expenditure rate has been reduced to an acceptable 3.47 kcal/min. Based upon NIOSH data, the safety engineer could expect 75% of women and 99% of men to be able to perform the job with only nominal risk. Administrative controls such as designated rest breaks would reduce the risk even further.

Selected References

- Alexander, D. The Practice and Management of Industrial Ergonomics. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1986.
- Armstrong, T., D. Chaffin, J. Faulkner, G. Herrin, R. Smith. "Static Work Elements and Circulatory Responses." Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J., 14(4):254-260, April, 1980.
- Astrand, P.O. and Rodahl. Textbook of Work Physiology - Physiological Basis of Exercise. McGraw-Hill book Co., New York, N.Y. , 1977.
- Basmajian, J.V. Muscles Alive. The Williams and Wilkins Co., Baltimore, Md. 1967.

- Bink, B. "The Physical Work Capacity in Relation to Working Time and Age." *Ergonomics*, 5(1):25-28, 1962.
- Bonjer, F. "Actual Energy Expenditure in Relation to the Physical Work Capacity." *Ergonomics*, 5(1):29-31, 1962.
- Brouha, L. *Physiology in Industry*. Pergamon Press, New York, 1960.
- Chaffin, D. "The Prediction of Physical Fatigue During Manual Labor." *Methods-Time-Measurement Journal*, 11(5):25-32, 1966.
- Chaffin, D. "Localized Muscle Fatigue - Definition and Measurement." *J. of Occupational Medicine*, 15(4):346-354, 1973.
- Chaffin, D. and Andersson, G. *Occupational Biomechanics*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, N.Y., 1984.
- Chaffin, D. and Woolley, C. "Energy Cost of Work and Rest." Notes from The University of Michigan Engineering Summer Conferences Occupational Ergonomics program, 1986.
- Durnin, J.V.G.A., and Passmore, R. *Energy, Work and Leisure*. Heinemann Books Ltd., London, 1967.
- Eastman Kodak Company. *Ergonomic Design for People at Work, Volume 2*. Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York, N.Y, 1986.
- Folkow, B. and E. Nerl. *Circulation*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Garg, A., D. Chaffin and G. Herrin. "Prediction of Metabolic Rates for Manual Materials Handling Jobs." *Am. Ind. Hyg. Assoc. J.*, 39(8):661-674, 1978.
- Hertig, B. *Ergonomics in Fundamentals of Industrial Hygiene*. National Safety Council, Chicago, Il, 1979.
- Konz, S. *Work Design: Industrial Ergonomics*. Grid Publishing, Columbus, OH, 1983.