Improving Capital Investment Decisions by Increasing the Fidelity of Return on Capital Employed



Abstract

ABF Freight is one of the largest LTL motor companies and provides service to 98% of U.S. cities in all 50 states. ABF Freight is interested in determining the quality of their capital equipment investments by estimating how these investments will perform over time in terms of expenses incurred and effect on the overall financial performance of the company. The company measures the value of an investment by calculating its Return on Capital Employed (ROCE) which is a ratio that represents how efficiently a company turns a profit on its invested capital.

This project focuses on increasing the fidelity of the ROCE calculation using simulation to project a range of possibilities for a given piece of equipment through its useful life. Our team has developed an Excel-based decision support tool that allows an analyst to compare various investment scenarios before proceeding in making an equipment purchase. Statistical distributions are used to model key inputs in the ROCE calculation that enables our tool to project confidence intervals representing possible financial return from the investment over time. The decision support tool gives analysts a better understanding for potential behavior of their equipment purchases before moving forward with a large-scale capital investment.

Introduction

In their 2017 annual report, ArcBest operated with \$793.5 million in revenue equipment, and since 2012 has invested over \$200 million in revenue generating equipment. The process of carrying out a financial analysis for capital investment begins with identifying a need on both the finance and operations divisions. The company currently measures the value of investment by comparing the Return on Capital Employed (ROCE) to the company wide hurdle rate. If ROCE is less than the hurdle rate, the investment is not considered further. ROCE is a ratio that represents how efficiently a company turns a profit using the capital it has invested in. The equation to calculate ROCE is simply the Earnings Before Interest and Taxes (EBIT) divided by the Cost of Capital Employed.



Swim Lane Diagram of Investment Decision Making Process



Return on Capital Employed Equation Break-Down

Team: Austin Knabe, Kyle Kraichely, Sydney R. Motes, Theo Munoz, Josselyn Terrazas Industry Contacts: Kirby Clark, Jacob Huffstetler

Modeling

An Access database with life-to-date expenses for ABF trailers was provided that included over 18,000 pieces of equipment. These expenses comprised primarily of maintenance costs including tires, repairs, fluids, etc. This scatterplot was presented to our industry partners and faculty advisor, and we came to the consensus that the best way to model the operational expenses would be to subset the data in year intervals. Using Minitab statistical software, histograms were plotted and fit with Lognormal distributions to each of the year intervals.



The parameters' associated with a lognormal distribution are Location and Scale which are an analogous to the mean and standard deviation parameters of the Normal distribution. The next step in creating the model was to plot each of these parameters against time as they change through each year interval. Once the parameters were plotted, power curves were fit in order to build a function of these values over time.



Results

Our team implemented the operational expense analysis into a decision support tool that simulates ROCE of a given investment over a given time horizon. The tool utilizes a series of user inputs that populate into Free Cash Flow Templates. A spreadsheet simulation approach is used to construct confidence the ROCE in each year. The results are displayed to the user comparing a specific investment scenario to the "Do Nothing" alternative and the Weighted Average Cost of Capital.



ROCE Simulator Tool Process Map

The team also modeled yard equipment and straight truck operational expenses. Histograms of the yearly intervals were constructed in order to determine which type of distribution would be best in modeling the operational expenses. Based on visualization, a normal distribution would be valid in modeling each yearly interval. We then conducted normality tests on each interval before moving forward. Taking a similar approach to our trailer expense model, we plotted the parameters ($\mu \& \sigma$) for the normal distributions against time.



our decision support tool. The small difference in comparing both values was deemed insignificant by our industry contacts. We followed the same methodology to validate cost models for all equipment types.

		Re	placeme	ent ROC	EVD
26.0%					
24.0%			-		
22.0%		/			
20.0%		1 1			
18.0%	1				
16.0%	11			•••••	
12.0%	///				
10.0%	//		111111		
8.0%		111111			
6.0%		•••••			
4.0%					
2.0%					
0.0%					
	2	3	4 5	6 /	8
1	-				
1		——— Rep	olace Max ——	- Replace Min	——— Re
1 Replaceme	ent Sin	Rep DN nulation	olace Max —— Max •···· Statistics	 Replace Min DN Min 	Re
1 Replacemo	ent Sin	Rep DN DN	Max	 Replace Min DN Min 	Re
1 Replacemo	ent Sin	mulation Year 1	Max Max Statistics Year 2	 Replace Min DN Min Year 3 	Re Di
1 Ceplacem ample Averag	ent Sin	mulation Year 1 10.0%	Max Max Statistics Year 2 14.4%	Replace Min • DN Min Year 3 17.6%	Pear Year 19.65
1 Replacemo ample Averag Iedian	ent Sin	Rep DN nulation Year 1 10.0% 9.9%	Statistics Year 2 14.4% 14.3%	 Replace Min DN Min Year 3 17.6% 17.4% 	Pear 19.64 19.44
1 Replaceme ample Averag Iedian tandard Devi	ent Sin ge ation	Rep DN Nulation Year 1 10.0% 9.9% 0.5%	Max Max Statistics Year 2 14.4% 14.3% 0.8%	 Replace Min DN Min Year 3 17.6% 17.4% 0% 	Year 19.63 19.49 1.1%
1 Replacemo ample Averag Iedian tandard Devi ange	ent Sin ge ation	Rep DN Nulation Year 1 10.0% 9.9% 0.5% 2.6%	Vear 2 14.4% 14.3% 0.8% 4.4%	 Replace Min DN Min Year 3 17.6% 17.4% 1.0% 5.3% 	Year 19.65 19.49 1.1% 5.5%
1 Replaceme ample Averag ledian tandard Devi ange linimum	ent Sin ge ation	Rep DN Nulation Year 1 10.0% 9.9% 0.5% 2.6% 9.1%	Vear 2 14.4% 14.3% 0.8% 4.4% 12.9%	Replace Min DN Min Year 3 17.6% 17.4% 1.0% 5.3% 15.7%	Vear 19.69 19.49 1.1% 5.5% 17.69
1 Replacemo ample Averag Iedian tandard Devi ange Iinimum Iaximum	ent Sin ge ation	Rep DN Nulation Year 1 10.0% 9.9% 0.5% 2.6% 9.1% 11.7%	Vear 2 14.4% 14.3% 0.8% 4.4% 12.9% 17.3%	 Replace Min DN Min Year 3 17.6% 17.4% 1.0% 5.3% 15.7% 21.0% 	Year 19.69 19.49 1.1% 5.5% 17.69 23.19
1 Replacemo ample Averag ledian tandard Devi ange linimum laximum lum. Replicat	ent Sin ge ation	Rep DN Nulation Year 1 10.0% 9.9% 0.5% 2.6% 9.1% 11.7% 100	Vear 2 14.4% 14.3% 0.8% 4.4% 12.9% 17.3% 100	 Replace Min DN Min Year 3 17.6% 17.4% 1.0% 5.3% 15.7% 21.0% 100 	Pear 19.69 19.49 1.19 5.59 17.69 23.19 100
1 Replacemo ample Averag ledian tandard Devi ange linimum laximum lum. Replicat	ent Sin ge ation	Rep DN Prear 1 10.0% 9.9% 0.5% 2.6% 9.1% 11.7% 100 0.025	Aax	Replace Min DN Min Year 3 17.6% 17.4% 1.0% 5.3% 15.7% 21.0% 100 0.025	Re Vear 19.69 19.49 1.19 5.59 17.69 23.19 100 0.02
ample Average ledian tandard Devi ange linimum laximum lum. Replicat lpha -value(Alpha	ent Sin ge ation ions /2,n-1)	Rep DN DN DN DN DN DN DN DN DN DN	Aax	Replace Min DN Min Year 3 17.6% 17.4% 1.0% 5.3% 15.7% 21.0% 100 0.025 2.28	Vear 19.69 19.49 1.19 5.59 17.69 23.19 100 0.02 2.28
ample Averag Replacemo Iedian tandard Devi ange linimum laximum lum. Replicat Ipha -value(Alpha I Half-Width	ent Sin ge ation ions /2,n-1)	Rep DN Anulation Year 1 10.0% 9.9% 0.5% 2.6% 9.1% 11.7% 100 0.025 2.28 0.1%	Max Max Statistics Year 2 14.4% 14.3% 0.8% 4.4% 12.9% 17.3% 100 0.025 2.28 0.2%	Replace Min DN Min Year 3 17.6% 17.4% 1.0% 5.3% 15.7% 21.0% 100 0.025 2.28 0.2%	Vear 19.69 19.49 1.19 5.59 17.69 23.19 100 0.02 2.28 0.29
ample Average Aedian tandard Devi ange Ainimum Iaximum Ium. Replicat Ipha -value(Alpha I Half-Width L-Confidence	ent Sin ge ation ions /2,n-1) e Interval	Rep DN Nulation Year 1 10.0% 9.9% 0.5% 2.6% 9.1% 11.7% 100 0.025 2.28 0.1% 9.9%	Max Max Statistics Year 2 14.4% 14.3% 0.8% 4.4% 12.9% 17.3% 100 0.025 2.28 0.2% 14.2%	Replace Min DN Min Year 3 17.6% 17.4% 1.0% 5.3% 15.7% 21.0% 100 0.025 2.28 0.2% 17.3%	Pear 19.69 19.49 1.19 5.59 17.69 23.19 100 0.02 2.28 0.29 19.35







Special Thanks to:

Kirby Clark & Jacob Huffstetler – ABF Freight

University of Arkansas Department of Industrial Engineering Faculty & Staff Dr. Haitao Liao - University of Arkansas Industrial Engineering Dr. Aswath Damodaran – NYU Stern School of Business