A company that produces yogurt has plants in four locations: 1) Preston, Idaho 2) New Ulm, Minnesota 3) Carthage, Texas 4) Coalwood, West Virginia. The annual capacity of each plant to produce yogurt is 10,300, 12,400, 11,300, and 12,700 tons, respectively. To cover demand, the company wants to ship 7,700 tons to a distribution center in Modesto, California, 6,200 to South Bend, Indiana, 10,200 to Talladega, Alabama, and 8,400 to Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania. The per ton distribution costs from each plant to each distribution center are given in the table below:

H 1 1 01 ' '				1 11 11 1	1 1 .
Table: Shipping	cost per ton	plant capacii	tv in tone	and distribution	center demand in tons
rabic. ompping	cost per ton,	pram capaci	ty mi toms	, and distribution	cerrer derirand in tons

	Californi			Pennsylvani	
Plants	a	Indiana	Alabama	a	Capacity
Idaho	\$160	\$300	\$360	\$380	10,300
Minnesota	\$380	\$120	\$220	\$200	12,400
Texas	\$360	\$180	\$100	\$240	11,300
West Virginia	\$520	\$100	\$80	\$60	12,700
Requirement		_			_
s	7,700	6,200	10,200	8,400	

In addition to choosing how much yogurt to ship from each plant to each distribution center, the company may also choose which plants to operate. The fixed cost of operating each plant are \$500,000 for the Idaho plant, \$450,000 for the Minnesota plant, \$380,000 for the Texas plant, and \$350,000 for the West Virginia plant.

Use the GOMP to determine your objective function, decision variables, constraints, and optimal decisions. Which plants should the company operate, and how many tons of yogurt should be shipped from each plant to each distribution center if the company's goal is to minimize the combined distribution and fixed operating costs? What is the combined cost under the optimal solution?

Objective Function:

- Minimize total costs
- Total Cost = fixed costs + operating/shipping costs
 - Total Cost =
 500,000*FI +450,000*FM + 380,000*FT + 350,000*FWV +
 160*IC + 300*II + 360*IA + 380*IP +
 380*MC + 120*MI + 220*MA + 200*MP +
 360*TC + 180*TI + 100*TA + 240*TP +
 520*WVC + 100*WVI + 80*WVA + 60*WVP

Decision Variables:

- Fixed Site Cost for Idaho/Minnesota/Texas/West Virginia
 - o FI, FM, FT, FWV
- Shipping Cost for Idaho To California/Indiana/Alabama/Pennsylvania
 - o IC, II, IA, IP
- Shipping Cost for Minnesota To California/Indiana/Alabama/Pennsylvania
 - o MC, MI, MA, MP
- Shipping Cost for Texas- To California/Indiana/Alabama/Pennsylvania
 - o TC, TI, TA, TP
- Shipping Cost for West Virginia- To California/Indiana/Alabama/Pennsylvania
 - o WVC, WVI, WVA, WVP

Constraints:

- Idaho Capacity:
 - \circ IC + II + IA + IP <= 10,300
- Minnesota Capacity:
 - \circ MC + MI + MA + MP <= 12,400
- Texas Capacity:
 - \circ TC + TI + TA + TP <= 11,300
- West Virginia Capacity:
 - \circ WVC + WVI + WVA + WVP <= 12,700
- California Demand:
 - \circ IC + MC + TC + WVC >= 7,700
- Indiana Demand:
 - \circ II + MI + TI + WVI >= 6,200
- Alabama Demand:
 - \circ IA + MA + TA + WVA >= 10,200
- Pennsylvania Demand:
 - $\circ IP + MP + TP + WVP >= 8,400$
- Fixed Site Costs are Binary:
 - FI, FM, FT, FWV as binary (0,1)
- Linking Constraints for Site and Usage (M = 1,000,000,000,000,000):
 - Idaho:
 - $\blacksquare IC + II + IA + IP \le M*FI$
 - Minnesota:
 - $\blacksquare MC + MI + MA + MP \le M*FM$
 - o Texas:
 - \blacksquare TC + TI + TA + TP <= M*FT
 - O West Virginia:
 - $WVC + WVI + WVA + WVP \le M*FWV$

Solution:

- Optimal Combined Cost: \$4,854,000
- What Plants Should the Company Operate:
 - o Idaho, Texas, and West Virginia
- Distribution Amounts:
 - o Idaho:
 - California: IC 7700
 - Indiana: II 800
 - o Texas:
 - Indiana: TI 1100
 - Alabama: TA 10200
 - o West Virginia:
 - Indiana: WVI 4300
 - Pennsylvania: WVP 8400