## CIS\*2460 Assignment 3

## **Question 1**

```
(a) See appended design section.
(b) The following are the outputs of running my program for 1, 5, 100, and 1000 days.
overkill@overkill:~/code/CIS2460/A3$ ./Q1 1
Running for 1 days!
>> average teller queue size (= average wait in minutes): 0.000000
>> average cashier queue size (= average wait in minutes): 0.168750
>> Cashier queues were bigger than teller queues.
>> probability of getting an idle teller: 1.000000
>> probability of getting an idle cashier: 0.443750
>> Total customers 36
overkill@overkill:~/code/CIS2460/A3$ ./Q1 5
Running for 5 days!
>> average teller queue size (= average wait in minutes): 0.000000
>> average cashier queue size (= average wait in minutes): 0.164583
>> Cashier queues were bigger than teller queues.
>> probability of getting an idle teller: 0.990000
>> probability of getting an idle cashier: 0.553333
>> Total customers 190
overkill@overkill:~/code/CIS2460/A3$ ./Q1 100
Running for 100 days!
>> average teller queue size (= average wait in minutes): 0.000812
>> average cashier queue size (= average wait in minutes): 0.152708
>> Cashier queues were bigger than teller queues.
>> probability of getting an idle teller: 0.992750
>> probability of getting an idle cashier: 0.561354
>> Total customers 3818
overkill@overkill:~/code/CIS2460/A3$ ./Q1 1000
Running for 1000 days!
>> average teller queue size (= average wait in minutes): 0.000877
>> average cashier queue size (= average wait in minutes): 0.167212
>> Cashier queues were bigger than teller queues.
>> probability of getting an idle teller: 0.991652
>> probability of getting an idle cashier: 0.563875
>> Total customers 38579
For further investigation, feel free to compile and run the programs for yourself. The instructions to do
so are in the readme.txt file.
Ouestion 2
(a) See appended design section.
```

(b) I ran my program for 1000 days:

```
overkill@overkill:~/code/CIS2460/A3$ ./Q2 1000 Running for 1000 days!
```

```
>> average wait for customers who got help on the floor: 0.014123
>> average wait for customers who just wanted to be cashed out: 0.010321
>> average wait for both types of customers: 0.024444
>> probability of an idle teller: 0.871725
>> Total customers 38421
```

- i. Comparing the results, it becomes clear that the overall wait time in the redesigned system is much more effective.
- ii. The average wait time for a customer who wants to buy an expensive item is greater in the redesgned simulation. However this is just a tradeoff of getting rid of the customer queue.
- iii. The average wait time for those who want to buy items off the floor is strongly reduced in the redesign. This is a result of having three tellers to wait for instead of a single cashier.
- iv. The average idle time for a teller has decreased, which means they are being more effectively utilized. In the first design, they were very underutilized, meaning a drop in productivity. This redesign increased productivity by having them idle less. Yet, the idle time is still pretty high. The simulation could probably afford to remove one more teller without having overwhelming demand.

## **Ouestion 3**

```
(a) See (b)
(b)
overkill@overkill:~/code/CIS2460/A3$ ./Q3 90
>> Running for 90 days... (may take a bit to run events)

>> min time = 0.253000
>> max time = 3.233700
>> average time = 0.861872
>> berth 1 usage: 0.539472
>> crane 1 usage: 0.580500
>> berth 2 usage: 0.324834
>> crane 2 usage: 0.580460
>> total ships 107
```

The "expected" usages are calculated from the average of usage over all days of the simulation. See appended design section for design details of this simulation and others.

## **Design Information**

Below are the designs I used to implement my simulations. Sorry for the poor scan quality, but I think the text should be legible provided you zoom in a bit with your PDF viewer. Of course, a good way to check implementation details is also the source code.









