

## CASE 6.2, Farm Management

### a. Identify verbally the components of a linear programming model for this problem.

- Objective
  - i. Net income from the livestock
  - ii. Net income from the crops
  - iii. Remains from the investment
  - iv. Value of livestock
  - v. Income from working on a neighboring farm
  - vi. Living expenses, \$40,000
- Variables
  - i.  $x_1$ : acreage for soybeans,  $x_2$ : acreage for corn,  $x_3$ : acreage for wheat;
  - ii.  $y_1$ : number of new cows,  $y_2$ : number of new hens
  - iii.  $z_1$ : working time for neighbor in W/Sp,  $z_2$ : working time for neighbor in Su/F
- Constraints
  - i. Acre amount, 640
  - ii. Person-hours, 4000 in W/Sp, 4500 in Su/F
  - iii. Investment fund, \$20,000
  - iv. Chicken house limit, 5,000 hens
  - v. Cow barn limits, 42 cows
  - vi. Acre of corn for each cow, 1
  - vii. Acre of wheat for each hen, 0.05

### b. Formulate this model.

- Objective function
$$(30 + y_1) \times 850 + (2000 + y_2) \times 4.25 + 70x_1 + 60x_2 + 40x_3 + 20000 - 1500y_1 - 3y_2 + (35000 + 1500y_1) \times 0.9 + (5000 + 3y_2) \times 0.75 + 5z_1 + 5.5z_2 - 40000$$
- Constraints
$$2(30 + y_1) + x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \leq 640$$
$$10(30 + y_1)6 + 0.05(2000 + y_2)6 + x_1 + 0.9x_2 + 0.6x_3 + z_1 = 4000$$
$$10(30 + y_1)6 + 0.05(2000 + y_2)6 + 1.4x_1 + 1.2x_2 + 0.7x_3 + z_2 = 4500$$
$$1500y_1 + 3y_2 \leq 20000$$
$$2000 + y_2 \leq 5000$$
$$30 + y_1 \leq 42$$
$$x_2 \geq 30 + y_1$$
$$x_3 \geq 0.05(2000 + y_2)$$

*all  $x, y, z$  non negative*

### c. Obtain an optimal solution.

The best estimation of the family's monetary worth at the end of the coming year is 99367. See details in the attached GAMS solution screenshot.

```

                LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL
---- VAR TOT          -INF  99367.000   +INF      .
    TOT  income

---- VAR X  acre of each grain

                LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL
soybean      .    450.000   +INF      .
corn         .    30.000   +INF      .
wheat        .   100.000   +INF      .

---- VAR Z  hours working for neighbor

                LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL
WS           .   1063.000   +INF      .
SF           .   1364.000   +INF      .

---- VAR Y  number of new purchased livestock

                LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL
cow          .          .   +INF   -53.000
hen          .          .   +INF   -0.858

```

- d. Find the allowable range to stay optimal for the net value per acre planted for each of the three crops.

From sensitivity analysis results of GAMS, the allowable range is, soybean net income is from 61.6 to inf, corn net income is from -inf to 68.4, wheat net income is from -inf to 64.15.

VARIABLE NAME	LOWER	CURRENT	UPPER
-----	-----	-----	-----
TOT	-INF	1	+INF
X(soybean)	61.6	70	+INF
X(corn)	-INF	60	68.4
X(wheat)	-INF	40	64.15
Z (WS)	-INF	5	62.3
Z (SF)	-INF	5.5	40
Y (cow)	-INF	700	+INF
Y (hen)	-INF	3.5	+INF

- e. Find optimal solution under each scenario after making the necessary adjustments to part b.

```

                LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL
---- VAR TOT          -INF  67859.550   +INF      .
    TOT  income

---- VAR X  acre of each grain

                LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL
soybean      .          .   +INF   -22.700
corn         .    42.000   +INF      .
wheat        .   105.000   +INF      .

---- VAR Z  hours working for neighbor

                LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL
WS           .    749.200   +INF      .
SF           .   1226.100   +INF      .

---- VAR Y  number of new purchased livestock

                LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL
cow          .    12.000   +INF   43.900
hen          .   100.000   +INF    0.007

```

Figure 1: Drought Scenario, optimal value is 67859

```

---- VAR TOT          -INF  74019.650   +INF

    TOT  income

---- VAR X  acre of each grain

            LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

soybean    .           .           +INF      -6.600
corn       .         451.000       +INF      .
wheat      .         105.000       +INF      .

---- VAR Z  hours working for neighbor

            LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

WS         .         381.100       +INF      .
SF         .         735.300       +INF      .

---- VAR Y  number of new purchased livestock

            LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

cow        .          12.000       +INF      52.200
hen        .          100.000       +INF      0.062

```

Figure 2: Flood Scenario, optimal value is 74019

```

---- VAR TOT          -INF  88767.000   +INF

    TOT  income

---- VAR X  acre of each grain

            LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

soybean    .         450.000       +INF      .
corn       .          30.000       +INF      .
wheat      .         100.000       +INF      .

---- VAR Z  hours working for neighbor

            LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

WS         .        1063.000       +INF      .
SF         .        1364.000       +INF      .

---- VAR Y  number of new purchased livestock

            LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

cow        .           .           +INF      -13.000
hen        .           .           +INF      -0.358

```

Figure 3: Early Frost Scenario, optimal value is 88767

```

---- VAR TOT          -INF  66648.800   +INF

TOT  income

---- VAR X  acre of each grain

          LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

soybean   .           .          +INF    -27.700
corn      .        42.000      +INF      .
wheat     .       100.000      +INF      .

---- VAR Z  hours working for neighbor

          LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

WS        .        782.200      +INF      .
SF        .       1259.600      +INF      .

---- VAR Y  number of new purchased livestock

          LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

cow       .        12.000      +INF     38.900
hen       .           .          +INF    -0.493

```

Figure 4: Drought and early frost Scenario, optimal value is 66648

```

---- VAR TOT          -INF  69434.550   +INF

TOT  income

---- VAR X  acre of each grain

          LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

soybean   .           .          +INF    -2.700
corn      .        42.000      +INF      .
wheat     .       105.000      +INF      .

---- VAR Z  hours working for neighbor

          LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

WS        .        749.200      +INF      .
SF        .       1226.100      +INF      .

---- VAR Y  number of new purchased livestock

          LOWER      LEVEL      UPPER      MARGINAL

cow       .        12.000      +INF     68.900
hen       .       100.000      +INF      0.257

```

Figure 5: Flood and early frost Scenario, optimal value is 69434.55

- f. For the optimal solution under each of the 6 scenarios, calculate the monetary worth would be at the end of year if each of the other five scenarios occur instead. In your judgment, which solution provides the best balance between large monetary worth under good condition, and avoid large loss under adverse conditions.

Expected Scenario	Good	Drought	Flood	Early Frost	Drought and Early Frost	Flood and Early Frost
Soybean	450	0	0	450	0	0
Corn	30	42	451	30	42	42
Wheat	100	105	105	100	100	105
Cow	0	12	12	0	12	12
Hen	0	100	100	0	0	100
Hr in WS	1063	749	381	1063	782	749
Hr in SF	1364	1226	735.3	1364	1259	1226
Actual Scenario						
Good	99367	75208	95209.15	99367	75004.5	75208
Drought	57117	67858	57184.15	57117	67854.5	67858
Flood	70417	70378	74019.15	70417	70324.5	70378
Early Frost	88767	73318	85139.15	88767	73164.5	73318
Drought and Early Frost	53717	66598	53879.15	53717	66644.5	66598
Flood and Early Frost	67367	69433	68984.15	67367	69404.5	69433
Mean	72792	70465.5	72402.48333	72792	70399.5	70465.5
Same Prob Variance	17922.40916	3269.813068	15946.01444	17922.40916	3175.655838	3269.813068

From this results table, according to minimum variance, it is easily found that solution of drought and early frost provide the best balance.

**g. Modify the linear programming model to fit this new approach**

The difference is the change of net value for three corps, which means it is equal to the estimation according to the estimated weather condition. Then net value table is  
Soybean: 34; Corn: 27.5; Wheat: 20.75

**h. Repeat part c for this modified model**

```

---- VAR TOT          -INF  80537.000   +INF      .

      TOT  income

---- VAR X  acre of each grain

              LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL

soybean      .      414.000   +INF      .
corn         .       42.000   +INF      .
wheat        .     100.000   +INF      .

---- VAR Z  hours working for neighbor

              LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL

WS           .     368.200   +INF      .
SF           .     680.000   +INF      .

---- VAR Y  number of new purchased livestock

              LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL

cow          .      12.000   +INF    22.500
hen          .           .   +INF   -0.020

```

From this table, the family's monetary worth at the end of the coming year is 80537.

**i. Use a shadow price to analyze whether it would be worthwhile to obtain a bank loan with a 10% interest rate.**

```

              LOWER    LEVEL    UPPER    MARGINAL

---- EQU INVEST      -INF  18000.000 20000.000      .

      INVEST  money limit

```

Since the marginal (shadow price) is 0, which is less than 10%, it is not worthwhile to make a bank loan.

j. Sensitivity analysis for part h

VARIABLE NAME	LOWER	CURRENT	UPPER
-----	-----	-----	-----
TOT	-INF	1	+INF
X(soybean)	29.1	34	+INF
X(corn)	-INF	27.5	32.4
X(wheat)	-INF	20.75	28.15
Z(WS)	-INF	5	23.5
Z(SF)	-INF	5.5	16.07
Y(cow)	-INF	700	+INF
Y(hen)	-INF	3.5	+INF

Net values of soybean and corn should be estimated more precisely.

k. Describe one situation outside of farm management that fit this description.

Think about a multinational corporation, like Walmart, that import the merchandise from various nations, like China, India, and Thailand, etc. The different objective national condition and the relationship between the U.S. and the objective nation could affect the cost and profit of Walmart. Hence Walmart should decide how much good A should be imported from nation a, and how much good B should be imported from nation b, with consideration of the average of circumstance.