



Management Science

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
<http://pubsonline.informs.org>

Note on Level-Debt-Service Municipal Bidding

To cite this article:

(1966) Note on Level-Debt-Service Municipal Bidding. Management Science 13(3):291-293. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.13.3.291>

Full terms and conditions of use: <https://pubsonline.informs.org/Publications/Librarians-Portal/PubsOnLine-Terms-and-Conditions>

This article may be used only for the purposes of research, teaching, and/or private study. Commercial use or systematic downloading (by robots or other automatic processes) is prohibited without explicit Publisher approval, unless otherwise noted. For more information, contact permissions@informs.org.

The Publisher does not warrant or guarantee the article's accuracy, completeness, merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, or non-infringement. Descriptions of, or references to, products or publications, or inclusion of an advertisement in this article, neither constitutes nor implies a guarantee, endorsement, or support of claims made of that product, publication, or service.

© 1966 INFORMS

Please scroll down for article—it is on subsequent pages



With 12,500 members from nearly 90 countries, INFORMS is the largest international association of operations research (O.R.) and analytics professionals and students. INFORMS provides unique networking and learning opportunities for individual professionals, and organizations of all types and sizes, to better understand and use O.R. and analytics tools and methods to transform strategic visions and achieve better outcomes. For more information on INFORMS, its publications, membership, or meetings visit <http://www.informs.org>

idea not often fully understood, an example may help to give us a firmer grasp of it.

Consider a proposed investment with the following sequence of cash flows:

Year-end	0	1	2
Cash Flow	-\$10	\$40	-\$40

The large cash outflow at the end of the project's life may be interpreted as a negative salvage value. The project balances of this investment are all zero or negative if the assumed rate of return is at least 300 percent, which is $r_{\min}$ for the project. However, although a rate of 300 percent would turn this investment into a pure investment, 300 percent is not the IRR of the investment, because $S_2(300\%)$ equals $-\$40$, not zero. Since $S_n(r_{\min}) < 0$, there is some rate $r^* < r_{\min}$ which will equate $S_n(r^*)$ to zero. Solving the equation $-\$10 + \$40/(1+r^*) - \$40/(1+r^*)^2 = 0$, one obtains a unique rate of 100 percent for r^* , the IRR of the investment. If project balances are compounded at r^* of 100 percent, $S_0(100\%) = -\$10$, but $S_1(100\%) = \$20$. Hence, the project is a mixed investment. This example illustrates that the existence of a unique IRR does not imply that the project is necessarily a pure investment.

References

1. TEICHROEW, D., ROBICHEK, A. A. AND MONTALBANO, M., "An analysis of criteria for investment and financing decisions under certainty", *Management Science*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (November 1965), pp. 151-179.
2. —, "Mathematical analysis of rates of return under certainty", *Management Science*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (January 1965), pp. 395-403.

JAMES C. T. MAO
University of Michigan

Note on Level-Debt-Service Municipal Bidding

Cohen and Hammer [1] have shown that under certain conditions the problem of selecting a coupon-principal schedule, when bidding on a new issue of municipal bonds with a level-debt-service constraint, is a linear programming problem. A similar result was independently obtained by the present author, and is presented here, using the same definitions and notations as [1].

The principal difference between [1] and the present paper is that here we have prejudged, to a certain extent, the form of the optimal solution. The judgments are in accord with the experience of market professionals and lead to a linear programming problem with $2n + 3$ constraints as opposed to the $n^2 + 2$ in [1] (both problems involve $2n$ variables, n being the number of yearly maturities).

In addition to the notation in [1], we define d_t as the difference in debt service (principal and interest) between years t and $t + 1$. By this definition

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_t &= A_t + \sum_{j=t}^L c_j A_j - A_{t+1} - \sum_{j=t+1}^L c_j A_j \\
 &= A_t + c_t A_t - A_{t+1} \quad t = F, F+1, \dots, L-1.
 \end{aligned}$$

The form of the solution is prejudged in that it is assumed

$$\sum_{t=F}^L (\alpha_t + \beta_t c_t) A_t = A + \pi,$$

i.e., the optimal coupon-amount schedule will involve no payment of premium. In addition, we assume

$$d_t \geq 0 \quad t = F, F+1, \dots, L-1.$$

The objective function then becomes

$$(1) \quad \text{Minimize } NIC = \sum_{t=F}^L t A_t c_t,$$

as in [1], the coupon,¹ production, and amount constraints are written

$$(2) \quad c_t^l \leq c_t \leq c_t^u \quad t = F, \dots, L$$

$$(3) \quad \sum_{t=F}^L (\alpha_t + \beta_t c_t) A_t = A + \pi$$

$$(4) \quad \sum_{t=F}^L A_t = A.$$

The level debt restriction, however, takes on the form

$$(5) \quad \sum_{t=F}^{L-1} d_t \leq D.$$

From the definition of d_t , one has

$$(6) \quad c_t A_t = d_t - A_t + A_{t+1} \quad t = F, \dots, L-1,$$

and if we adopt the convention that $A_{L+1} = 0$, the above is true for $t = L$. Substituting (6), the problem becomes linear, i.e., choose A_t, d_t ($t = F, \dots, L$) to

$$(1') \quad \text{Minimize } \sum_{t=F}^L t d_t - F A_F$$

subject to

$$(2') \quad A_t(1 + c_t^l) \leq d_t + A_{t+1} \leq A_t(1 + c_t^u), \quad t = F, \dots, L$$

$$(3') \quad \sum_{t=F}^L (\gamma_t A_t + \beta_t d_t) = A + \pi$$

$$(4') \quad \sum_{t=F}^L A_t = A$$

$$(5') \quad \sum_{t=F}^{L-1} d_t \leq D \quad d_t \geq 0, A_t \geq 0, t = F, \dots, L,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \gamma_t &= \alpha_t - \beta_t + \beta_{t+1} & t = F, \dots, L-1 \\
 &= \alpha_t - \beta_t & t = L.
 \end{aligned}$$

As in [1], F, L, π, D , and the $c_t^l, c_t^u, \gamma_t, \beta_t$ are given. The A_t of the optimal

¹ This note uses the notation c_t^l and c_t^u in place of the under- and overbars, respectively, used in [1].

solution give the principal amount schedule, and the coupons are determined by (6). A completely general formulation of the problem of using the above conventions would have

$$\sum_{t=F}^L (\alpha_t + \beta_t c_t) A_t \geq A + \pi$$

with the objective function modified as follows:

$$\text{Minimize } \sum_{t=F}^L t A_t c_t + \{A + \pi - \sum_{t=F}^L (\alpha_t + \beta_t c_t) A_t\}.$$

In addition, the d_t would be unrestricted in sign and the level debt constraint would be replaced by the following inequalities:

$$-D \leq \sum_{t=i}^j d_t \leq D \quad \text{for } i, j = F, F+1, \dots, L, \text{ and } i \leq j.$$

The optimal solution to the simplified formulation is obviously a feasible solution (satisfies constraints) to the more general problem. It remains to state a sufficiency test to insure that the solution is also optimal for the general problem.

The author wishes to acknowledge the help of Dr. Daniel H. Wagner, who called his attention to this problem, and Mr. Herbert F. Ayres, Operations Research Officer of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York, who supplied helpful criticism.

Reference

1. COHEN, KALMAN J. AND HAMMER, FREDERICK S., "Optimal Level Debt Schedules for Municipal Bonds," *Management Science*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (November 1966).

EDWARD P. LOANE

Daniel H. Wagner, Associates
Paoli, Pennsylvania

Copyright 1966, by INFORMS, all rights reserved. Copyright of Management Science is the property of INFORMS: Institute for Operations Research and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.