

CIVENG 3C03 Assignment 3

Raeed Hassan
hassam41

November 11, 2022

Question 1

The optimal solution to the provided LP solution was found using the Microsoft Excel Solver. The LP model setup in Excel can be seen in Figure 1. The optimal solution is found using the Excel Solver with Simplex LP Solving Method. The optimal solution is $[X_1 = 0, X_2 = 11.5, X_3 = 14.8, X_4 = 10.4]$ with Max $Z = 889.3$, as seen in Figure 2.

The acceptable range for the cost coefficients are:

$$-\infty \leq C_1 \leq 29.1$$

$$6.8 \leq C_2 \leq 86.4$$

$$33.17 \leq C_3 \leq \infty$$

$$-\infty \leq C_4 \leq 32.5$$

The acceptable range for the stipulations are:

$$153.33 \leq B_1 \leq 230$$

$$50.01 \leq B_2 \leq \infty$$

$$0 \leq B_3 \leq 35.33$$

$$33 \leq B_4 \leq 56.57$$

The Excel spreadsheet is included with the assignment submission as `question1.xlsx`.

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-----|----|------|----|------|---|-----|--|
| Variables | X1 | X2 | X3 | X4 | | | | | |
| Values | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Cost Coefficients | 25 | 15 | 40 | 12 | | | 0 | | |
| Struct Coeff | 3 | 4 | 4 | 7 | #1 | 0 <= | | 178 | |
| | 4.2 | 1.5 | 0 | 3.15 | | 0 <= | | 112 | |
| | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | 0 >= | | 23 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | | 0 >= | | 46 | |

Figure 1: Excel Solver Model

Objective Cell (Max)

| Cell | Name | Original Value | Final Value |
|--------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|
| \$J\$4 | Cost Coefficients | 0 | 889.3 |

Variable Cells

| Cell | Name | Original Value | Final Value | Integer |
|--------|-----------|----------------|-------------|---------|
| \$D\$3 | Values X1 | 0 | 0 | Contin |
| \$E\$3 | Values X2 | 0 | 11.5 | Contin |
| \$F\$3 | Values X3 | 0 | 14.8 | Contin |
| \$G\$3 | Values X4 | 0 | 10.4 | Contin |

Figure 2: Excel Solver Solution

| Variable Cells | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Cell | Name | Final Value | Reduced Cost | Objective Coefficient | Allowable Increase | Allowable Decrease |
| \$D\$3 | Values X1 | 0 | -4.1 | 25 | 4.1 | 1E+30 |
| \$E\$3 | Values X2 | 11.5 | 0 | 15 | 71.4 | 8.2 |
| \$F\$3 | Values X3 | 14.8 | 0 | 40 | 1E+30 | 6.83333333 |
| \$G\$3 | Values X4 | 10.4 | 0 | 12 | 20.5 | 1E+30 |

| Constraints | | | | | | |
|-------------|------|-------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Cell | Name | Final Value | Shadow Price | Constraint R.H. Side | Allowable Increase | Allowable Decrease |
| \$J\$6 | #1 | 178 | 21.6 | 178 | 52 | 24.6666667 |
| \$J\$7 | | 50.01 | 0 | 112 | 1E+30 | 61.99 |
| \$J\$8 | | 23 | -35.7 | 23 | 12.3333333 | 23 |
| \$J\$9 | | 46 | -46.4 | 46 | 10.5714286 | 13 |

Figure 3: Excel Solver Sensitivity

Question 2

The unbalanced transportation problem was solved using the MODI Method, with all iterations shown in Figures 4–6. The optimal solution can be seen in Figure 6.

- (a) The optimal allocation is shown in Table 1. As the demand exceeds supply, there is a shortage of 30m^3 for both locations B and C that must be fulfilled by external sources.

Table 1: Optimal Solution

| Route | Allocation |
|-------|------------|
| I-A | 45 |
| I-B | 75 |
| II-C | 120 |
| II-D | 135 |

- (b) The transportation cost corresponding to the solution obtained in part (a) is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Transportation Cost

| Route | Allocation | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
|------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| I-A | 45 | 9 | 405 |
| I-B | 75 | 10 | 750 |
| II-C | 120 | 6 | 720 |
| II-D | 135 | 3 | 405 |
| Total Cost | | | 2280 |

Figure 4: Initial Iteration

| Quarry | U_i | V_j | Location | | | | Available | Non-basic Cell | Improvement Index |
|--------|-------|-------|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|----------------|-------------------|
| | | | A | B | C | D | | | |
| I | 0 | | 9 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 120 | I-C | 7 |
| II | -2 | | 9 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 255 | I-D | 6 |
| III | -5 | | 12 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 60 | II-A | 5 |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | III-A | -4 |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | III-B | -5 |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | III-C | -3 |
| Demand | | | 45 | 105 | 150 | 135 | 435 | | |

Figure 5: First Iteration

| Quarry | U_i | V_j | Location | | | | Available | Non-basic Cell | Improvement Index |
|--------|-------|-------|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|----------------|-------------------|
| | | | A | B | C | D | | | |
| I | 0 | | 9 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 120 | I-C | 2 |
| II | -7 | | 9 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 255 | I-D | 1 |
| III | -10 | | 12 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 60 | II-A | 10 |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | III-A | 1 |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | II-B | 5 |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | III-C | -3 |
| Demand | | | 45 | 105 | 150 | 135 | 435 | | |

Figure 6: Second Iteration

| Quarry | U_i | V_j | Location | | | | Available | Non-basic Cell | Improvement Index |
|--------|-------|-------|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|----------------|-------------------|
| | | | A | B | C | D | | | |
| I | 0 | | 9 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 120 | I-C | 5 |
| II | -4 | | 9 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 255 | I-D | 4 |
| III | -10 | | 12 | 8 | 6 | 3 | 60 | II-A | 7 |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | III-A | 1 |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | II-B | 2 |
| | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 435 | III-D | 3 |
| Demand | | | 45 | 105 | 150 | 135 | 435 | | |

Question 3

The develop a plan for returning the four vehicles to the four local offices, we can identify the problem as an Assignment Problem and solve the problem using the Hungarian method. As the distances are not provided between each drop-off location and office, Google Maps was used to get these distances. The shortest distance for each route was used and rounded down to be an integer. The setup of the Hungarian method and initial two steps are shown in Figure 7. After the first two steps, optimality is not reached, therefore we find an improved solution in Figure 8 which we discover is an optimal solution. The optimal solution for returning the four vehicles to the four local offices is shown in Table 3.

Figure 7: Hungarian Method Setup

| Drop-off Location | Office Location | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------|---------|-----------|
| | Hamilton | Square One | Toronto | Kitchener |
| YYZ | 64 | 16 | 27 | 88 |
| BUF | 118 | 153 | 172 | 184 |
| YXU | 119 | 161 | 182 | 94 |
| Milton GO | 38 | 28 | 52 | 57 |

| Drop-off Location | Office Location | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------|---------|-----------|
| | Hamilton | Square One | Toronto | Kitchener |
| YYZ | 26 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| BUF | 80 | 137 | 145 | 127 |
| YXU | 81 | 145 | 155 | 37 |
| Milton GO | 0 | 12 | 25 | 0 |

| Drop-off Location | Office Location | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------|---------|-----------|
| | Hamilton | Square One | Toronto | Kitchener |
| YYZ | 26 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| BUF | 0 | 57 | 65 | 47 |
| YXU | 44 | 108 | 118 | 0 |
| Milton GO | 0 | 12 | 25 | 0 |

Figure 8: Hungarian Method Optimal Solution

| Drop-off Location | Office Location | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------|---------|-----------|
| | Hamilton | Square One | Toronto | Kitchener |
| YYZ | 38 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| BUF | 0 | 45 | 53 | 47 |
| YXU | 44 | 96 | 106 | 0 |
| Milton GO | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |

Table 3: Optimal Solution

| Drop-off Location | Return Location |
|-------------------|------------------|
| YYZ | Downtown Toronto |
| BUF | Hamilton |
| YXU | Kitchener |
| Milton GO | Square One |