



## Buy First Class Used Equipment!

Next to rental, Riwal is also your partner for purchasing aerial work platforms or telehandlers. We are official dealer in selected countries for renowned brands such as JLG, Genie, Teupen and Holland Lift. In addition, Riwal is continuously renewing its fleet and therefore we have an excellent offer of used equipment for sale straight from our rental fleet. Quality machines from respected manufacturers that have been well maintained, following and exceeding the manufacturer's maintenance instructions. In total, we currently have approximately 1300 used machines available for sale! All machines are in rental ready condition, straight from our well maintained rental fleet & we have the maintenance history available.



### GENIE-GTH3512

Country: France  
YOM: 2007

Price starts at € 23,575,-



### GENIE-GS5390RT

Country: Denmark  
YOM: 2008

Price starts at € 31,625,-



### TEUPEN-23T

Country: Benelux  
YOM: 2008

Price starts at € 43,125,-



### MANITOU-2150MRT

Country: Benelux  
YOM: 2007

Price starts at € 77,625,-



### MANITOU-2540MRT

Country: Benelux  
YOM: 2006

Pricing on request!



### MANITOU-2150MRT

Country: Benelux  
YOM: 2007

Price starts at € 77,625,-



### JLG-660SJ

Country: Denmark  
YOM: 2006

Price starts at € 32,200,-



### JLG-660SJ

Country: Denmark  
YOM: 2006

Price starts at € 32,200,-



### HAULOTTE-C12

Country: Spain  
YOM: 2007

Price starts at € 6,700,-



### GENIE-GS5390RT

Country: France  
YOM: 2006

Price starts at € 23,000,-



### GENIE-Z34/22N

Country: Denmark  
YOM: 2007

Price starts at € 16,960,-



### HAULOTTE-H23TPX

Country: Great Britain  
YOM: 2008

Price starts at € 28,690,-



### HAULOTTE-C10DX

Country: Great Britain  
YOM: 2007

Price starts at € 11,645,-



### HOLLAND LIFT-X105EL16

Country: Benelux  
YOM: 2008

Price starts at € 15,235,-

For any inquiries or questions regarding aerial work platforms, telehandlers and forklifts, please contact us:

phone: +31 (0)88 - 618 18 11

email: [sales@riwal.com](mailto:sales@riwal.com)

[www.riwal.com](http://www.riwal.com)

**Above all. Riwal**

# Letters



**Dear Leigh,**

This month's Cranes & Access editorial is frankly rubbish. Talking about Mark Industries and Simon in respect of the telescopic crane market? Going on at such length about Versalift as though they are such a big brand in the company of others. And to suggest that 'changes in dominant shares only have one direction - down' What twaddle. Of course in time everything goes down but many dominant companies remain market leaders after 50 years or more - Cat, Deere, Boeing, etc.

An editorial such as this undermines your excellent overall efforts.

**Stuart Anderson**

Chortsey Bar Associates

*We would and did disagree with Mr Anderson and responded that Mark and Simon were being cited as strong market leaders in our market (cranes and access equipment) that have since vanished, along with crane companies such as Lorain. As to our comment on a dominant market share only going down, this might be a question of definition rather than disagreement - given that dominant market positions tend to attract the attention of market regulators and usually requires sell offs or occasionally break up - see AT&T. We would also cite Boeing as an example of our point in that it was dominant and becoming more so - today it probably has a 30 to 40 percent share of the commercial airline market, with Airbus - a company that did not exist when Boeing at arguably at its strongest - outselling it in some years. The editorial was making the point of how hard it can be to protect a strong or dominant market share and how fast the situation can change.*

*Ed*

**Dear Sir**

I loved the letter and picture of the old American 5299 crawler crane from 1971 - this was a great crane and similar to one I operated myself for many years before moving onto a bigger rig and then into management. It would be nice if more companies did this with their old cranes. While old trucks are increasingly being renovated and put on show there are very few people out there doing the same for old cranes. I would like to see more coverage of old/historic cranes in your excellent publication.

**Ian Stevens**

Detroit

Dear Sir,

This is my true and honest account of how not to buy a bespoke Unimog/Palfinger crane set-up for delivery in the UK.

In January 2015 I approached a Mercedes Unimog dealer in the UK to supply a new Unimog U530 with a Palfinger PK27002 SH-E & PJ060B fly-jib, winch and personnel basket. After various discussions regarding crane and sub-frame suppliers, it was decided that myself and the Unimog dealer travel to Austria and Germany to see what was on offer. We had constructive talks with two companies, FMG in Austria and Werner in Germany. FMG could offer a crane and sub-frame package that would operate to the cranes maximum lift and radius capacity throughout 360-degrees, while Werner could only offer the maximum lift at maximum radius over 230 degrees.

After many emails to each company regarding crane duties, it was decided that the 360-degree option would be the more beneficial. The order was placed and the machine was delivered to the UK late September 2015. There was one immediate problem in that that the leg deployment measuring wires were positioned outside of the leg structure in a position where they could be tampered with and would be prone to damage. FMG said this was the only place they could be installed, as there was no room to fit the sensors and wires within the leg structures. My Unimog dealer came up with a plan to rectify the issue and put his idea to FMG. The following day FMG came up with their own plan, and my Unimog dealer carried out the work to their instructions.

On taking delivery in late November 2015 it was noticed that the rear axle weight was too heavy. After many emails to and from FMG, we were told there was no way that it could be overweight as their calculation was correct. Their calculation was based on a Unimog chassis with a 7,200kg front axle and a 9,000kg rear axle maximum or GVW of 15,500kg. The calculation based on that axle weight gave the Unimog with crane & sub-frame fitted an approximate rear axle weight of 8,267kg, well within the 9,000kg allowed. After discussions with my Unimog dealer it was decided to upgrade the chassis to 7,500kg front and 9,500kg rear axle - 16,500kg GVW, thus allowing me to add further implements on the front and rear. This should have given me the original payload of 733kg + the additional 500kg = 1,233kg payload with the increased rear axle variant.

The delivered machine had a rear axle weight of 9,800kg! making it an illegal vehicle on any road in any country, and no spare capacity to carry any lifting equipment, personnel basket or the various implements this machine was designed to use. When questioned on the calculation, FMG's response was 'their calculation had no guarantee and was subject to a 5% variation'. Small variations can be expected, but it ended up with 19%, which is far from acceptable.

Both myself and Unimog dealer had the machine weighed at different locations, and informed FMG, but they were adamant that their calculation was correct. They came to the UK in January 2016 to try and sort out the lifting capacity of the crane (separate issue), and the machine was

*Continued on page 79*

# CONFIDENCE AT ITS HIGHEST LEVEL



Working at height?

We have the solution

Discover the KLUBB range of vehicle-mounted aerial platforms. Made in France.

The KLUBB range consists of five models, each shaped by 15 years of industry experience and expertise.

We meet the needs of all professionals working at height. From electrical maintenance to high-level pruning, our aerial platforms provide both excellent range and flexibility.

Contact our team of experts for advice on which KLUBB model is best for your needs.

Contact us:

[contact@klubb.com](mailto:contact@klubb.com)

Tel: +33(0)1.60.05.38.68

# KLUBB

[www.klubb.com](http://www.klubb.com)

Visit us at Bauma 2016, April 11-17  
Outdoor areas  
FS.1105/5 & FN.1022/1



weighed with four individual weigh pads one under each wheel with an FMG representative in attendance, and it was overweight. At this point FMG asked my Unimog dealer to carry out some modifications, which he declined and the machine was transported back to Austria. When it arrived at FMG's workshop it was weighed again, and remarkably it was underweight!

At this point FMG offered to do some modifications and issue a compromise contract! which was reluctantly agreed to as the machine needed to be out working. This included a change to the back body to fully aluminium, shorten the rear stabiliser legs by 120mm, removing 20 litres of hydraulic oil while adding 650kg ballast to the front. All these modifications were offered even though it supposedly underweight and not a problem!

I visited FMG in Austria many times last year, and sent many emails regarding the weights, as I was concerned. This concern stems from owning and operating a Unimog U400 with Palfinger crane at maximum GVW for the last 14 years. FMG told me there would be no problem with weight - there is a problem, and FMG cannot and will not give me what was originally ordered. I then travelled to FMG in February to discuss the compromise agreement, whereby they would remove weight from the rear (approx. 260kg, and add a 650kg ballast weight to the front). I made my feelings known at this meeting that I had now lost the ability to mount the small winch that was originally ordered to the rear of the Unimog, as a bigger one was needed at the front to replace the 650kg ballast weight. It has also compromised any other add-on implements I had planned for this machine. It was then verbally agreed that FMG would supply and fit a front mounted winch which could be operated at the front and rear of the Unimog, free of charge for all the lost earnings and inconvenience caused thus far. This was accepted by myself and handshakes all round.

The following morning - back in the UK - I received an email saying 'after careful consideration the winch would not be supplied by FMG free of charge'.

FMG has no morals and zero customer service skills so beware, get it in writing, but to be honest that probably wouldn't be worth the paper it is written on, a bit like the calculation!

FMG have now carried out the modifications to address the overweight issue, and told the UK dealer to collect the machine. Their problem, their modification, and the UK dealer has to arrange collection at no cost to FMG. This company is not worth doing business with, find another.

Unfortunately, this is not the end of the saga, as the original and compromise contracts both stated that the crane will lift 330kg at 25.4

metres throughout 360-degrees. This cannot be achieved, maximum capacity is somewhere near 286kg, but this has yet to be verified. In hindsight, the genuine 230-degrees alternative from Werner at 286kg would have been better. This is not a Palfinger problem, but an FMG statement to obtain the order.

So if anyone is thinking about putting this kind of equipment together, might I suggest you do your own investigations before being well and truly turned over. There are two well-known companies that carry out this work, FMG Fahrzeugbau-Maschinebau Austria or Werner GmbH Forst- und Industrietechnik, Germany - with hindsight the order should have been placed with Werner.

It would cost too much money to pursue FMG through the legal system, and they know that. To date, lost earnings and loan repayments equate to approximately £57,000.00, plus an additional over of £20,000.00 for a heavier winch at the front - total unexpected expenditure £62,000.00 including transport expenses.

One other quite important issue that arose after initial delivery, was to do with the Unimog itself. As the Unimog was delivered with a 9,500kg rear axle variant, you have virtually zero options for tyres. If you plan to use your Unimog on paved, rock, sand, gravel or harder surfaces, then there may be no problem, but should you venture into anything that's slightly damp/wet and muddy you're going to get stuck. The tyres offered by Mercedes were Michelin XZL 395/85 R20 or XZL 445/65 R22.5, neither of which have an aggressive enough tread pattern for operating in fields. I opted for the 395's as they were slightly the more aggressive of the two. Unfortunately, there was very little known about each tyre, and nobody that's used them to consult with. So what you have is probably the greatest 4x4 off-road vehicle on the planet, that can't do what I required of it, or from personal experience what I know it is capable of. This is based on my very short personal experience, albeit with an overweight rear axle. This is a work in progress with my UK dealer.

Foot Note

As of March 2016 it is still not working, so a very big mistake to commission something from someone who promises everything, but delivers nothing like what was ordered. Buyers beware

**Jerry North**

Director

JMN Construction Ltd

Chandlers Ford, Hants



**Gary Kennedy 1954-2016**  
**Gary Kennedy, sales office manager at RaycoWylie in the UK, died suddenly on January 29th while on a diving holiday in Egypt. He was just 61.**

Kennedy worked with Wylie and Rayco Wylie for almost 30 years, having joined the crane overload indicator manufacturer following a two year contract with Tarmac as an electrical supervisor where he managed a team supporting the

concrete pouring and track laying phase on the Channel Tunnel.

Prior to that he had spent almost 10 years with Balfour Beatty Construction as an electrician working on large job sites, including the Dungeness Power Station.