



<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a paper published in *International Journal of Forest Engineering*. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Jundén, L., Bergström, D., Servin, M., Bergsten, U. (2013)

Simulation of boom-corridor thinning using a double-crane system and different levels of automation.

International Journal of Forest Engineering, 2013(1)

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:umu:diva-68451>

1

2 **SIMULATION OF BOOM-CORRIDOR THINNING USING A DOUBLE-CRANE SYSTEM AND**
3 **DIFFERENT LEVELS OF AUTOMATION**

4

5

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 This study evaluates the productivity of a harvester equipped with a double crane system for thinning with
3 continuous felling and accumulation of whole small-diameter trees for bioenergy at different levels of
4 automation. The simulations were performed using a discrete event simulation tool that has been
5 developed recently and is specifically designed for simulations in forestry, incorporating spatial
6 awareness of the simulated world.

7 The study shows that introducing boom-corridor thinning with a semi-automatic double-crane system can
8 significantly increase the productivity compared to conventional thinning and harvesting. For the specific
9 harvester model used in this study, the modification that yielded the biggest productivity increase was
10 automating the release and placement of the harvested trees. Studies on the effects of implementing
11 automation for other forest machine operations could be analyzed using a similar approach.

12 **Keywords:** automation, early thinning, discrete event simulation, productivity, forest operations

13

1 INTRODUCTION

2 In the Fennoscandian countries, young stands are often harvested for energy purposes. In Sweden, the
3 annual harvesting potential from such stands amounts to about 20 TWh, if the tree biomass above ground
4 and stands up to a height of 15 m are included (Nordfjell et al. 2008). The thinning is normally performed
5 from below using a strip-road harvester-forwarder system, where harvesters are equipped with
6 conventional harvesting heads that have been modified to handle several trees in each crane cycle.

7 Trees between strip-roads are cut by single tree selection and then put in piles by the side of the strip-
8 road. Depending on the technology used, the trees can be bunched as whole trees, logs of different length
9 or roughly delimbed tree parts before being hauled by the forwarder to the roadside. Alternatively, the
10 forwarder can be equipped with a grapple-saw for bucking and loading. The development of heads with
11 multi-tree handling capacity, where trees are cut one-by-one until the cumulative capacity of the head
12 (MTH-one-by-one) is reached, makes it possible to increase the productivity by 40% compared to single-
13 tree handling (Belbo 2011, Sängstuvall et al. 2012). Today, such harvesting systems become profitable
14 when the harvested mean tree breast height diameter (dbh) exceeds 8 - 9cm (Di Fulvio et al. 2011).

15 A significant part of the biomass potential is, however, found in stands with a smaller average dbh and
16 therefore only a small part of the harvesting potential is currently exploited (cf. Nordfjell et al. 2008).

17 Development of cost-efficient harvesting technology and methods are therefore being encouraged in order
18 to meet some of the increasing demands for bioenergy.

19 By harvesting the trees with linear crane movements, for example in boom-corridors, the productivity of
20 the MTH-one-by-one handling head can be increased by between 16% and 44% compared to harvesting
21 by selection between strip-roads (Bergström et al. 2007, Bergström et al. 2010, Sängstuvall et al. 2012).

22 Further increases in productivity are limited by the fact that the harvesting head still needs to be
23 positioned and standing still at each tree position prior to cutting and mostly cuts one tree at a time. Using
24 technology able to harvest all the trees with, say, a 1m wide and 2m long swath in a single moment

1 (termed MTH-2m²) (i.e. area-based harvesting), the productivity can be increased by between 30% and
2 100% compared to selection harvesting between strip-roads using MTH-one-by-one (Bergström et al.
3 2007, Sängstuvall et al. 2012). The next step would then be to harvest a full corridor, for example 1 m
4 wide and 10 m long, in one single crane movement (termed MTH-corridor). Such technology would
5 increase the productivity by about 200% compared to harvesting with MTH-one-by-one with thinning by
6 selection between strip-roads (Bergström et al. 2007, Sängstuvall et al. 2012). Harvester heads that are
7 able to fell and accumulate all the trees in a boom-corridor are currently being developed. However, it is
8 important to analyze the potential of harvesting and thinning young dense stands using new machine
9 configurations (concepts) that significantly improve productivity (Forsberg & Wennberg 2011, Nordfjell
10 et al. 2011, Bergström et al. 2012).

11 A further increase in productivity would come from equipping a harvester with two cranes, for felling and
12 accumulating trees in boom-corridors simultaneously on each side of the strip-road (Bergström 2009).
13 Such technology would require the machine operator to handle two cranes at the same time. In practice it
14 would most likely be too difficult if every individual operation of each crane needed to be fully controlled
15 by the operator. However, technology for semi-autonomous shared control of cranes has been
16 demonstrated (Hansson & Servin 2010) and this enables a human operator to control several independent
17 work tasks simultaneously. The productivity of such a machine would be affected by factors such as the
18 type of head used (e.g. MTH-one-by-one, MTH-2m² or MTH-corridor), the felling and accumulation
19 speed and the capacity of the crane heads. Furthermore, the degree of implementation of shared
20 controls/automation, i.e., to what extent an entire crane work cycle is controlled by the operator, would
21 also be an important factor. For example, the selection of corridor position (trees to be harvested) and
22 steering of the crane during felling and accumulation could be performed by the operator while the
23 bunching and re-positioning of the crane to the next corridor to be harvested is computer-controlled and
24 thus done automatically. The computer controls the operation until all the trees in one corridor are
25 harvested and bunched at the side of the strip-road. Depending on whether the operator or the computer is

1 in control, the time requirements for the work tasks may also differ, since operations have varying levels
2 of complexity. The times of the tasks when using two cranes, including the crane waiting time due to the
3 operator being occupied with the other crane, is best analyzed using discrete event simulations (cf.
4 Cassandras & Lafortune 1999). There are several studies where harvester work has been simulated and
5 where models and data on harvesters performing different work tasks have been described (Eliasson
6 1999, Eliasson & Lagesson 1999, Wang et al. 2005, Bergström et al. 2007, Belbo 2011, Sängstuvall et al.
7 2012). Thus, it is possible to analyze the effects of using a double-crane system using simulations.

8 The objective of this study was to analyze the effects on harvester productivity when using a double-crane
9 system, with continuous felling and accumulation of trees, at different levels of shared control in
10 comparison to a one-crane system with a boom-corridor thinning head or a conventional head.

11

12 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

13 The simulations were performed using a discrete event simulation tool that has been developed recently,
14 specifically designed for simulations of forestry models and incorporating spatial awareness of the
15 simulation entities (Jundén 2011). The tool is based on the Python library SimPy, with plotting using
16 Matplotlib and calculations and programming in Python.


17 A high level of abstraction was chosen since the simulations were mostly intended to simulate a machine,
18 not yet in existence. Obviously, the mechanical details of such a machine could not be specified but a
19 proposed method of working could be investigated and evaluated. The semi-autonomous process was
20 identified as being critical to model correctly.

21 The spatial information about the trees was taken from research by Bredberg (1972) where the trees for
22 several stands suitable for thinning had been carefully measured in areas of 25 m × 40 m. Tree position,

1 dbh, stem mass and volume were all given. Six suitable, young, stands were chosen on the basis of the
2 stands' average tree sizes, densities and species distribution, with different clustering of trees (Table 1).

3 Two different harvesters were simulated: one equipped with one crane and another equipped with two
4 cranes, see Figure 1. Furthermore, two different cutting heads were simulated: a conventional head
5 (Conv) and a hypothetical boom-corridor head (BC), resulting in four different machine configurations.
6 Figure 1 shows a sketch of the multi-arm harvester concept. Since the different working methods mostly
7 affect the harvester, the forwarder part of the harvesting system was omitted. Five different automation
8 configurations (A - E), with different degree of automation, were modeled (Table 2). The one crane
9 machine concept, 1-Conv and 1-BC, were only simulated with configuration A, i.e. no automation, since
10 no queuing situation ever occurs when using only one crane. The two crane machine concepts were all
11 simulated with configurations A - E. These variations resulted in a total of 12 different machine
12 configurations. As the simulation is stochastic, 20 simulations were performed for each configuration. and
13 95% confidence intervals were calculated for the comparison of machine concepts and configurations.
14 Each simulation includes three or four entities, depending on the number of cranes: the vehicle, the crane
15 head(s) and the operator (working algorithms in Tables 3-6).

16 The functionality and size of the BC head were based on Forsberg and Wennberg (2011) (Table 7). The
17 BC head(s) are able to fell and accumulate trees along the corridor with a continuous movement of the
18 crane. The Conv head cuts one tree at a time and carries it back to the machine. The time usage functions
19 for these were taken from Sängstuvall et al. (2012), see Table 8.



1

Figure 1. The double-crane harvester concept simulated with the limits for the stochastic strip-road (vertical dashed lines).

2

3 The simulated harvester moved along a preset strip-road in the y-direction starting at a point that was
 4 randomly set from the continuous interval $x \in [9, 16]$, which limits are shown as dashed lines in Figure 1.
 5 This random point on the x-axis, corresponding to the middle of the strip-road, is the only stochastic
 6 element in the simulation. The used measurements by Bredberg (1972) have a resolution of 0.1m, which
 7 means that some pairs of the random x-values resulted in identical road and corridor shapes. However,
 8 since x is a continuous random number, the distances to the trees from the main road were unique for
 9 every simulation.

10 The working method for the BC head was boom-corridor thinning i.e., the trees were cut with linear crane
 11 movements where the width and length of the corridor were equal to the width of the head and the
 12 maximum reach of the crane respectively (cf. Bergström et al. 2007, Sängstuvall et al. 2012). The strip-
 13 road was also harvested in this manner i.e. continuously as the machine moved along it. The conventional
 14 head harvested one tree at a time and could only carry one tree. Although multi-tree harvesting heads

1 exist, this work pattern was chosen for simplicity. When the harvester with two cranes cut trees in the
2 strip-road, only one of the cranes was used and the other one was left idle beside the machine.

3 It is reasonable to assume that a geometrical work pattern is easiest to automate in comparison to a strictly
4 selective work method, since it does not require any artificial intelligence to control the crane. In the case
5 of double-cranes, each crane had its own side of the strip-road when harvesting the corridors, which
6 resulted in a queuing situation if one side had more trees suitable for harvest than the other. If the crane
7 head had reached its storage capacity, the crane moved back to the machine, left the trees next to it and
8 then continued into the same corridor again, harvesting the remaining trees.

9 The location of the corridors was determined by the algorithm in Table 6. This algorithm mimics the
10 decisions that a driver would make, that is, it maximizes the number of trees that can be harvested in the
11 corridor. The width of the corridors was set to 2 m when simulating the use of a conventional crane head.
12 The maximum number of corridors per stop and side of the strip-road was set to five for the BC head and
13 three for the Conv head, to compensate for the narrower corridors used by the BC head. Standard
14 polygon-circle collision detection was used for determining whether trees were inside the corridor or not
15 (Ericson 2005). The corridor algorithm (Table 6) also shows how the machine movement was handled
16 (row 11). By moving to the same y-value as the corridor furthest away in the driving direction, good
17 corridors were achieved with mostly non-harvested interiors, although some corridor overlaps was
18 inevitable. The simulations were performed with a thinning intensity of around 40 - 50% of the total
19 number of trees in the stand, varying slightly between the stands and head types since the width of the
20 corridors were different for the different heads.

21 The machine operator was modeled as a resource, i.e. something that the tasks have to queue for (working
22 algorithm in Table 5). This resulted in a convenient model for studying the different automation steps.
23 The operator working steps were categorized (Table 8). The automation was varied in four different parts
24 of the work flow, resulting in a total of 16 possible configurations, five of which were chosen for further
25 analyses (Table 2). The times for the different tasks are given by the simple linear equation:

1
$$t = C + \frac{x}{v} \tag{1}$$

2 where C is a constant, v is the velocity of the task and x is the quantity that the task depends on (Table 8).

3 The harvester and crane model mainly follows Eliasson's (1999) work, where the maximum crane reach
4 was set to 11 m. The time taken to move a crane is the maximum of the radial movement and the angular
5 movement. With linear movements, this results in a slight modification of equation (1):

6
$$t_{crane} = C + \max\left(\frac{\theta}{\omega}, \frac{r}{v_r}\right) \tag{2}$$

7 Where ω is the angular velocity and v_r is the velocity in the radial direction of the crane, θ is the angular
8 movement and r is the radial movement (Table 8). The cranes were limited by the mass, diameter and
9 height of the trees (Table 7).

10

11

12

13

14

15


16

17

18

19

1 **RESULTS**




2

3 *Figure 2. Simulated productivity for the different machine types and automation configurations (A - E) (see Table 2) and six different stands (1 - 6) with 95% confidence intervals. 1a/2a means one or two arms, BC is boom-corridor head and Conv is the conventional crane head.*


3

4 The results from each simulation are data sets of the elapsed times for the different tasks and of the
 5 number of harvested trees for the given stands. Productivity, defined as cut trees per hour, was computed
 6 from these data sets. The biggest increase of productivity was due to addition of automatic release of the
 7 trees (configuration C) (Figures 2 and 3). For the BC head, the productivity was increased by about 40%
 8 with full automation and two cranes compared to the standard case of one crane and no automation.



1 *Figure 3. Simulated productivity for the different machine types and automation configurations (A - E)*
 2 *(see Table 2) with a 95% confidence interval. Mean absolute value and productivity relative to the*
 3 *1aConv head, over the six stands are shown.*

4 The operator is either idle or actively working. As expected, the activity ratio (working time in relation to
 5 total time) decreased as the level of automation increased (A - E, Figure 4) and in configuration E, the
 6 driver was practically idle except when the vehicle was moving.
 7



1
 2 *Figure 4. Work time of the machine “operator” in relation to total machine work time (operator activity*
 3 *ratio).*

4 **DISCUSSION**

5 As the level of automation of forest machines increases, the double-crane model will clearly be beneficial
 6 for thinning operations. For the maximum automation level E, the simulation shows a productivity
 7 increase of 40% for the double-crane with a BC head compared to a single-crane fitted with a BC head.
 8 This should be compared with the theoretical maximum of 100% increase, which would be the case if the
 9 cranes worked completely independent and the machine movements between stop points were infinitely
 10 fast. The single-crane Conv head harvester showed a corresponding productivity increase of up to 20%
 11 with two arms compared to one arm, which is lower than for the BC-head. The reason for this is the
 12 number of corridors per side. If the head on one side finishes before the other it has to wait until the other
 13 side is finished and the machine has moved to the next stop point, then the crane work can start again.
 14 With the given stands and limits for the heads, one side had fewer corridors than the other quite often.

1 Thus, waiting times have a larger impact on productivity for the conventional head than for the BC head
2 due to the difference in speed between the heads.

3 The double-crane has 160% higher productivity with a BC head than with the single-crane Conv head.
4 Comparing Conv and BC heads is not completely relevant, however, as multi-tree handling heads are
5 currently available and thus the simulated Conv head does not represent state of the art in today's
6 technology.

7 One observation is that as automation increases, the gain from it decreases. The activity ratio for the
8 different configurations (Figure 4) gives a hint as to the reasons for this behavior. Steps D and E do not
9 increase productivity that much since automation does not increase the speed of the processes, it just
10 gives the driver a rest. Since the driver is already often resting in configuration C, automating more
11 processes only increases productivity in the cases that the driver is busy when the task "arrives". This
12 phenomenon can be studied in more detail by considering more than the five automation configurations
13 considered in this study. In the most automated configuration, when the driver rarely works at all, the step
14 from that machine to a robot is not a big one and, because of this, configuration E will probably never be
15 implemented. It should, of course, also be remembered that for many years to come, a driver will be
16 needed to move the machine between different harvesting positions. The positive results of different
17 automation steps also indicate that automation development does not have to occur for all tasks at once.
18 Single steps will increase productivity and it will be up to producers and customers to decide what
19 concepts that will be economically viable to develop.

20 The operator model should be the most uncertain part of the study. The time constants in Table 8 have
21 been derived with no assumptions based on automation (cf. Sängstuvall et al. 2012). Automation can
22 change the time required for resting and making decisions, either positively or negatively, which has not
23 been considered in this study. The time constants used in the simulations should thus be verified in some
24 way, such as using a training simulator environment (cf. Brander et al. 2004). Capturing the exact
25 behavior of a human being is difficult but since the simulations were quite simple, e.g. we used just a

1 straight strip road, we believe that our model mimics relevant choices that a human operator would have
2 under the simulated conditions.

3 Another flaw with the used model is that in reality increased crane loads somewhat slows down the crane
4 movements, which is not captured by our simplified crane model. However, the loads considered in these
5 simulations are small, so the model should be accurate enough.

6 This study is a step towards rigorous sustainability analysis of early thinning to motivate investments in
7 the technology and to help determine what solutions to aim for. The automation techniques assumed in
8 this study are technically feasible but might be costly to adapt and use for forestry applications. The study
9 is limited to an isolated part of the early thinning process. A full analysis should also include different
10 harvesting systems with e.g., different degrees of on-site refining included such as bundling processes
11 integrated with the work of the harvesters.

12 **Conclusions**

13 The study shows that introducing boom-corridor thinning with a semi-automatic double-crane system
14 results in substantial increases in productivity when compared to conventional thinning and harvesting
15 operations. For the specific harvester model used here, the single largest productivity increase enabled by
16 the automation of a work task was as a result of the automatic release of trees. In the double-crane
17 simulations, two reasons for queuing were identified. One case was the operator's attention for manual
18 tasks and the other queuing situation was when one side of the strip road was finished before the other
19 and one crane head had to wait. If a double crane system is to be constructed, these waiting times will be
20 crucial for the productivity.

21 The productivity yields from automation diminish as the level of automation increases, which indicates
22 that the operator model is a close representation of reality. Studies on the effects of implementing
23 automation for other forest machine operations could be analyzed using a similar approach.

24

1 **LITERATURE CITED**

2 Belbo, H. 2011. Efficiency of accumulating felling heads and harvesting heads in mechanized thinning of
3 small diameter trees. *Linneaus University Press*, Doctoral thesis no. 2011:66.

4
5 Bergström, D. 2009. Techniques and systems for boom-corridor thinning in young dense forests. *Acta*
6 *Universitatis Agriculturae Sueciae*, Doctoral thesis no. 2009:87.

7
8 Bergström, D., Bergsten, U., Nordfjell, T. & Lundmark, T. 2007. Simulation of geometric thinning
9 systems and their time requirements for young forests. *Silva Fennica*, 41(1): 137-147.

10
11 Bergström, D., Bergsten, U. & Nordfjell, T. 2010. Comparison of boom-corridor thinning and thinning
12 from below harvesting methods in young dense Scots pine stands. *Silva Fennica*, 44(4): 669–679.

13
14 Bergström, D., Bergsten, U., Hörnlund, T. & Nordfjell, T. 2012. Continuous felling of small diameter
15 trees in boom-corridors with a prototype felling head. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, 27(5):
16 474-480.

17
18 Brander, M., Eriksson, D. & Löfgren, B. 2004. Automation of knuckleboom work can increase
19 productivity. Skogforsk. Results no. 4.

20
21 Bredberg, C-J. 1972. Type stands for the first thinning. Research Notes Nr 55. Department of operational
22 efficiency. Royal College of Forestry. Stockholm, Sweden. 42 p.

23
24 Cassandras, C.& Lafortune S. 1999. Introduction to discrete event systems. Kluwer Academic Publishers,
25 Dordrecht, ISBN: 0-7923-8609-4.

26

1 Clark, P. J. & Evans, F. C. 1954. Distance to nearest neighbor as a measure of spatial relationships in
2 populations. *Ecology*, 35: 445-453.

3

4 Di Fulvio, F., Bergström, D. & Nordfjell, T. 2011. Harvesting of fuel wood and/or pulpwood in early
5 thinnings, roadsides and on overgrown arable land. Swedish University of Agriculture Sciences.
6 Department of Forest Resource Management. Work report no. 343. (In Swedish with English abstract).

7

8 Eliasson, L. 1999. Simulation of thinning with a single-grip harvester. *Forest Science*, 45(1): 26-34.

9

10 Eliasson, L., & Lagesson, H. 1999. Simulation Study of a Single-grip Harvester in Thinning from Below
11 and Thinning from Above. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, 14(6): 589-595.

12

13 Ericson, C. 2005. Real time collision detection. Morgan Kaufmann, ISBN: 1558607323

14

15 Forsberg, J. & Wennberg, R. 2011. Teknikutveckling av aggregat för kontinuerligt ackumulerande skörd i
16 unga skogar. Luleå Tekniska Universitet, Examensarbete Maskinteknik. (In Swedish with English
17 abstract!)

18

19 Hansson, A. & Servin, M. 2010. Semi-autonomous shared control of large-scale manipulator arms.
20 *Control Engineering Practice*, 18(9): 1069-1076.

21

22 Jundén, L. 2011. Discrete event simulations in forest technology. Umeå University, Department of
23 Physics/Umit Research Lab. Master's thesis.

24

1 Nordfjell, T., Nilsson, P., Henningsson, M. & Wästerlund, I. 2008. Unutilized biomass resources in
2 Swedish young dense stands. Proceedings: World Bioenergy 2008, 27 -29 May, Jönköping, Sweden. pp:
3 323-325.
4
5 Nordfjell, T., Bergström, D., Wennberg, R., Forsberg, J. & Bergsten, U. 2011. Geometric thinning for
6 forest bioenergy. Proceedings: Austro2011/FORMEC'11: Pushing the boundaries with research and
7 innovation in forest engineering October 9 – 12, 2011, Graz and Rein – Austria.
8
9 Sängstuvall, L., Bergström, D., Lämås, T. & Nordfjell, T. 2012. Simulation of harvester productivity in
10 selective and boom-corridor thinning of young forests. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, 27(1):
11 56-73.
12
13 Wang, J. X., LeDoux, C. B. & Li, Y. X. (2005). Simulating cut-to-length harvesting operations in
14 Appalachian hardwoods. *International Journal of Forest Engineering*, 16(2): 11-27
15
16

1 **Tables**

2 *Table 1: Characteristics of the six different type stands from Bredberg (1972) used in simulations. Aggregation index is defined by Clark and Evans (1954) and is a measure of the clustering of the trees*

Stand name in literature (Bredberg 1972)	Stand notation in present study	Arithmetic mean diameter at breast height, standard deviation in parenthesis (cm)	Species distribution (pine/spruce/birch) (% of total number of trees)	Stand density (trees/ha)	Tree aggregation index
GA-102	1	10 (2.6)	95.6 / 3.2 / 1.3	1580	1.35
GA-103	2	8.8 (2.9)	97.0 / 0 / 3.0	2320	1.02
GA-105	3	10.8 (3.4)	97.8 / 0 / 2.2	1350	1.38
GA-210	4	7.6 (2.3)	100 / 0 / 0	2440	1.21
GA-304	5	9.9 (3.2)	88.2 / 4.2 / 7.6	2370	1.22
GA-403	6	8.8 (2.7)	100 / 0 / 0	2780	1.13

3

4

1 *Table 2. The five different automation configurations simulated with different work tasks*

Automated work task				
Configuration	Move arm outwards	Move arm inwards	Release trees	Cut trees
A	No	No	No	No
B	No	Yes	No	No
C	No	Yes	Yes	No
D	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
E	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

2
3 *Table 3. Working algorithm for the thinning machine*

Require: Information about the corridors and the strip roads, a list with the positions that will be visited along the strip road, *posList*, given from the corridor selection algorithm and access to the crane head(s).

-
- 1: **while** not end of *posList* **do**
 - 2: Assign the main road to one of the crane heads and start harvest process
 - 3: Wait until all the trees between current position and *posList.next()* have been cleared
 - 4: Update position to *posList.next()*
 - 5: Assign the corridors connected to the current position to the crane heads and start harvesting process. If machine is equipped with two cranes, assign the corridors to the left to that side's head and vice versa.
 - 6: Wait until crane heads are done with the corridors
 - 7: **end while**
-

Table 4. Working algorithm for the crane heads

1

Require: Information about positions of machine and crane, time consumption of processes, weight and volume of surrounding trees.

- 1: Wait until corridor/strip road has been assigned
 - 2: **for** all reachable trees in corridor / strip road **do**
 - 3: **if** crane head will pass the capacity limit when harvesting tree **then**
 - 4: Return to machine, release the harvested trees on the ground
 - 5: **end if**
 - 6: Move crane to tree and harvest tree
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: Return to start position beside the machine, release harvested trees
-

2

Table 5. Working algorithm for the operator

3

Require: Task queue, *tQueue*, that is continuously filled with tasks that requires the operator's attention.

- 1: **while** not end of simulation **do**
 - 2: **if** no task in *tQueue* **then**
 - 3: wait until a task is queued
 - 4: **end if**
 - 5: Give access to the first process in *tQueue*
 - 6: Wait until process is finished
 - 7: **end while**
-

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Table 6. Working algorithm for the operator

1

Require: Crane length L , corridor width W , number of corridors per side n , start position pos .
corridor(pos , $side$, θ , L , W) class. Map limits $xlim$, $ylim$

```

1:   $\theta_{min} \leftarrow \frac{\pi}{4}$ 
2:   $\sigma \leftarrow \frac{\pi}{3n}$ 
3:  while  $pos.y \leq ylim$  do
4:    for  $side$  in  $[-1,1]$  do
5:      for  $i$  in  $[0,1,2,\dots,n]$  do
6:         $\alpha \leftarrow side \cdot \left( \theta_{min} + \frac{\pi - 2\theta_{min}}{n-1} i \right)$ 
7:         $c \leftarrow corridor(pos, side, \theta, L, W)$  for  $\theta \in [\alpha - \sigma, \alpha + \sigma]$ 
8:        Save the corridor with the most chopable trees
9:      end for
10:    end for
11:     $pos.y \leftarrow pos.y + \cos(\theta_{min})L$ 
12:  end while

```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Table 7. Properties of the crane heads used in simulations. Some values, marked with “-“, are not relevant.

1

Parameter	BC	Conv
Height (m)	2	-
Width (m)	1	-
Depth (m)	1.5	-
Mass (kg)	1000	-
Maximum cutting diameter d_{bh} (cm)	10	10
Maximum tree height (m)	10	10
Maximum cumulative tree mass (kg)	350	350
Tree storage capacity	-	1
Radial crane velocity, v_r (m/s)	2.5	2.5
Angular crane velocity, v_θ (Rad/s)	0.35	0.35

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Table 8. Time and automation information for different parts of the simulation. The time constant is the minimum time a specific task takes. Values from (Sängstuvall et al. 2012)

1

Task	Time constant (C)	Velocity (v)	Dependent quantity (x)
Move machine	5 s	1 m/s	Distance (m)
Move arm outwards	1.5 s	Equation (2)	Crane angle or radial distance (rad or m)
Move arm inwards after harvest	1.5 s	Equation (2)	Crane angle or radial distance (rad or m)
Cut a tree	3 s	0.08 m ² /s	Cross-sectional area of tree (m ²)
Place/ harvested trees at the side of the strip-road	10s	-	-
Switch operator focus between crane arms	3s	-	-

2

3