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#### Abstract

This report presents State-level corn production cost and return estimates for the 1991 production year, along with coefficients of variation for each cost item. Per-acre costs are highly variable among States due to differences in production practices, inputs, and type and size of machines used in corn production. Total per-acre economic costs varied from $\$ 231$ in South Dakota to $\$ 381$ in Colorado. Corn yields varied significantly, from about 82 bushels in Ohio to 147 bushels per planted acre in Colorado. Methods used to develop the State-level production costs and refurns for 1991 are the same as those used to develop regionat and U.S. weighted averages published in the Economic Indicators of the Farm Sector: Costs of Production, 1991--Major Field Crops \& Livestock and Dairy. State-level estimates should be used for general discussion onfy, because statistical reliability diminishes for estimates below the regional and U.S. levels due to sample size. Coefficients of variation included in this report are an indicator of the statistical reliability of each estimate.
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Mir B. Ali<br>William D. McBride

## Introduction

Corn is grown on more U.S. farms than any other crop. The value of corn production was $\$ 17.8$ billion in 1991, ranking it first among all crops.

In 1991, corn for all purposes was planted on 76 miltion acres, up 2 percent from the 1990 acreage of 74.2 million acres. The area harvested for grain was 68.8 million acres, up by 3 percent from 1990 . Production totaled 7.5 bilhon bushels, about 6 percent below the 1990 crop. The U.S. average yield was about 109 bushels per harvested acre, down 10 bushels from 1990. Yields were lower in 1991 than in 1990 in most major corn-producing States. Dry weather during the summer months caused the lower productiors. The drought affected some States more than others. The States most affected were Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, and Pennsylvania. These States received less than half of their normal summer rainfall. Drought-related losses in Pennsylvania equaled 41 percent of the corn crop from 1990 to 1991, with average yield dropping from 113 to 75 bushels per acre. Ohio lost nearly 22 percent, with yield dropping from 121 to 96 bushels per acre and Indiana lost nearly 30 percent, with yield dropping from 129 to 92 bushels per acre in the drought year.

Corn planting was slowed by rains early in the season, but by June 2, planting progress was 92 percent complete in the 17 major producing States, 5 points ahead of the previous year, but 3 points behind the historic average. Dry weather became a concern for Corn Belt growers during June as an expansive region from Kansas to Pennsylvania received less than half of its normal rainfall. As a result, many corn fields in the eastern Corn Belt were stressed by drought conditions. The corn crop was aided by good maturing and harvesting weather during the fall months. By November 1,93 percent of the crop was harvested (Crop Production, 1992).

This report summarizes the 1991 production cost data for 10 corn-producing States. Production costs and returns along with coefficients of variation (C.V.) by State are given in tables 1 to 10 . Statistical reliability of the State-level corn production cost estimates is summarized in table 11. Also included are selected farm characteristics and production practices (app. table 1), quantities of selected inputs (app. table 2), and average machine use in the production of corn (app. tables 3-12).

## Background

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service (USDA, ERS) annually estimates production costs and returns of major field crops (USDA, ERS, 1994). The estimates are calculated on a per-planted-acre basis and include both operator and landord costs and returns. Costs are included only for the acreage planted with the intention of being harvested for grain. Custs and returns presented in this report exclude the direct effects of Government programs where possible so that policymakers may be informed as to production costs and returns in the absence of programs. Exclusion of all effects of Government programs, such as indirect effects on input prices, is not possible. Effects of Government programs on corn production costs and returns were considered at the U.S. and regional levels (for details refer to McBride).

Cost-of-production estimates reflect average production practices, yields, and prices paid and received by farmers. Per-acre costs vary widely among farmers due to differences in inputs and type and size of machinery used. This variabiiity means that costs and returns for individual farmers may differ considerably from average estimates presented in this report. Consequently, users should understand the objectives and procedures of the ERS estimates. Also, note that while the differerices between costs and returns determine the profitability of a given enterprise, they are not an adequate measure of the weil-being of farms producing more than one commodity.

## Structure of Accounts

The State-level per-acre production cost estimates included in this report conform to the current ERS definitions and structure of accounts. Production cost and return estimates are presented in the form of a commodity account that lists gross value of production, variable cash expenses, fixed cash expenses, economic costs, and two measures of returns.

Value of production is estimated by multiplying the harvest-period price times planted-acre yield. Harvest-period prices, rather than season-average prices, are used since using season-average prices reflects marketing fa-:- ; like storage (Agricultural Prices, June 1992). Marketing is not a production cost, so storage costs are not included. Harvest-period prices and yields are specified at the State level. Payments from Government farm programs, such as deficiency and disaster payments, are excluded from gross value of production.

Variable cash expenses are those incurred only if production takes place. Expense items included in this category are seed, fertilizers, chemicals, custom operations and technical services, hired labor, fuel, electricity, lubrication, repairs, purchased irrigation water, and commercial drying. Costs of farm drying are reflected in cost estimates for fuel, repairs, andi replacement.

Fixed expenses must be paid regardless of whether or not a crop is produced. Fixed expenses include general farm overhead, taxes, insurance, and interest on loans. Overhead costs consist of expenses for utilities (excluding water and electricity for irrigation), farm shop and office equipment and supplies, accounting and legal fees, blanket insurance policies, fence maintenance and repairs, motor vehicle registration, chemicals applied to maintain farm roads and ditches, and any other general expenses attributable to the entire farm business. Taxes are only on real estate and personal property and do not include Federal or State income taxes. Insurance is only for trop and livestock insurance other than Federal crop insurance and the farm share of motor vehicle liability and blanket insurance policies. Interest expenses include finance charges and service fees for loans on machinery, the farm share of motor vehicles, purchases of inputs, land contracts, morgages, and any other loans secured by real estate.

Economic costs are long-term costs that reflect the production situation as if the operation fully owned all production inputs. An opportunity cost is calculated for all capital inputs and land, whether owned, rented, or financed. Economic costs include variable cash expenses, general farm overhead, taxes and insurance, capital replacement, an imputed cost of capital invested in the production process, unpaid labor, and land. Capital replacement cost represents a portion of the value of the machinery and equipment used up during the year in the production of a crop, plus an additional cost required to bring these items up to the same level of quality that they wers at the beginning of the period.

Opportunity costs are imputed from values of capital, land, and unpaid labor in alternative uses. The cost of operating capital is the expense of carrying input expenses from the time they are used until harvest. ERS imputes this cost at the 6 -month U.S. Treasury bill rate, which was 5.44 percent in 1991. The cost of having capital invested in farm machinery and equipment (nonland capital) is measured using the longrun rate of return to agricultural production assets from current income, which was 3.55 percent. ERS values land in cost-of-production accounts at its rental value. The land rental rates are a composite of share (valued at the havest-period price) and cash rental rates for a particular crop, minus real estate taxes that already have been included in other taxes and the value of
inputs supplied by the landlord. ERS imputes the value of unpaid labor (hired labor is a variable cash expense) at the wage rate for agricultural workers. Additional value of unpaid labor, such as for management and entrepreneurial skill, is treated as a residual return.

Two returns are included in each account. Gross value of production less cash expenses is the net cash return that measures the shortrun cash-flow position. Gross value of production less economic costs is the residual returns to management and risk that measures the longrun position of the enterprise.

## Data Sources

Production cost estimates are based on information obtained from the Farm Costs and Returns Survey (FCRS). The FCRS is a multiframe, stratified survey conducted annually by ERS and USDA's National Agricultural Statistics Service (USDA, NASS). Each year there are multiple versions of the FCRS: an in-depth, whole-farm version, and commodity cost-of-production (COP) versions. While all versions have questions about whole-farm expenses and income, each COF version gathers detailed information about input use, field operations, and production costs of a particular crop. Because of survey costs, USDA cannot undertake detailed surveys of every commodity each year. Thus, the FCRS covers each commodity about every 4 years. In nonsurvey years, production practices and technology are assumed to remain constant with the survey year. Costs are updated with price and yield data from the whole-farm version of the FCRS, ERS and NASS publications, and other data sources.

Corn production data were collected on the 1991 FCRS completed during February and March 1992. The corn version of the 1991 FCRS contained questions on the organization and financial structure of the entire farming operation, as well as questions about production practices and operating expenses that were specific to the corn enterprise. Nineteen corn-producing States were included in the 1991 FCRS corn sample. The 708 respondents to the corn version of the 1991 FCRS represented 423,405 farms that planted corn on 71.5 million acres. The primary intent of the survey was to generate U.S. and regional average cost of production estimates. Therefore, most nationat- and regionai-level estimates are statistically reliable. Appendix table 1 presents estimates for 10 corn-producing States that have sufficient sample size to provide State-level estimates. Statistical reliability of these estimates is also examined.

## Estimation Procedures

Procedures used to derive an estimate for a particular component of costs or returns are constrained by available data. Four general approaches were used to estimate the production costs: direct costing, allocation of whole-farm costs, valuing of input quantities, and indirect costing (fig. 1).

Direct costing is achieved by simply summarizing survey responses to questions about the amount paid for each item on a particular crop. This method is best suited for estimating components of variable costs such as seed, fertilizers, chemicals, custom operations, commercial drying, hired labor, purchased irrigation water, and technical services.

Indirect costing involves the combination of survey information and engineering formulas. Detailed information is collected on the survey regarding the machinery complement used in production. The data collected include hours of machine use, acreage covered, type and size of machine, and type of fuel used. This information is used to support equations of technical relationships that describe fuel consumption, repair requirements, and replacement costs. Engineering formulas are modified to reflect technological advances as they occur.

Allocating whole-farm expenses occurs for inputs that are not specifically associated with production of a commodity. For example, expenses for overhead items, interest, taxes, and insurance cannot be directly attrïuted to the production of an individual farm commodity. Survey data on production, along
with secondary price data, are used to determine each farm's total value of production. Expenses incurred by the whole-farm for a particular input are then allocated to an enterprise based on the enterprise's share of the operation's total value of production.

Valuing quantities of inputs requires survey data of the physical quantities of inputs used in production. This approach is used for unpaid labor. Costs are estimated by multiplying survey input quantities by State-level prices.

Componenis of economic costs including operating capital, noniand capital, and land are estimated using a combination of these approaches. Operating capital cost is the sum of variable expenses times the 6 -month Treasury bill rate. Nonland capital is the average machinery value times the longrun rate of return to farm-sector assets. Land cost includes a combination of cash rental rates and landlords' net returns from share rental arrangements.

## 1991 Corn Producition Costs and Returns

Per-acre costs of producing corn in 1991 at the U.S. level were nearly the same as in 1990 , mainly as a result of relatively stable prices paid for most production items (Agricultural Prices, June 1992). The average cash cost of producing corri in the United States was $\$ 183$ per acre (or $\$ 1.66$ per bushel) and economic cost was $\$ 293$ per acre (or $\$ 2.65$ per bushel). Production costs at the regional level varied greatly from 1990 due to dry weather affecting corn production in some regions more drastically than in others. Reduced corn yields in the Corn Belt resulted in lower per-acre costs for harvesting and drying. Conversely, improved yields in the Plains and Southeast increased per-acre production costs. For more details, refer to Economic Indicators of the Farm Sector: Costs of Production, 1991-Major Field Crops \& Livestock, and Dairy.

Per-acre gross returns varied among States due both to differences in yields and prices received. Variations in yields were due in part to weather patterns. Dry weather in many corn-producing States resulted in reduced corn yields in 1991. Ohio corn growers reported an expected yield of 132 bushels per acre, but harvested only 82 bushels $-a$ reduction in yield by about 40 percent. Average yield ranged from 82 bushels to 147 bushels per planted acre. Colorado corn farms reported the highest yield due primarity to irrigation. Harvest-month prices were generally higher in 1991 than 1990, ranging from $\$ 2.10$ to $\$ 2.41$ per bushel. Weather variations together with differences in crop prices translate into fluctuations in gross returns. Per-acre gross returns for the 1991-crop ranged from $\$ 184$ in Ohio to $\$ 348$ per acre in Colorado, sufficient to cover cash expenses oniy.

Variations in production costs among States were due to differences in tillage practices, type and amount of irrigation, quantities and prices of inputs, crop rotations, and several ofher production factors. More than 90 percent of corn growers in Illinois, lowa, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin planted corn on dryland acreage, while the majority of Colorado and Nebraska growers irrigaied sheir corn acreage. Michigan corn growers reported using no-tili on one-third of corn acres, in contrast to few acres in Wisconsin. A majority of corn growers planted corn after corn in Nebraska, Michigan, Colorado, and Wisconsin, while corn was most often planted after soybeans in other States. Wisconsin corn growers reported an inventory of dairy cattle, while beef cattle was predominant in Nebraska, South Dakota, and Colorado. About half of Iowa corn growers reported a hog inventory, highest among the States. Wisconsin corn growers were most concentrated in livestock production, as fewer corn acres were planted and nearly half of production was fed on-farm. In contrast, producers in llinois and Nebraska planted more corn acreage, but fed no more than 15 percent of farm production (see app. tables 1 and 2 for details on production characteristics and input use).

Variable cash costs ranged from $\$ 104$ in South Dakota to $\$ 195$ per planted acre in Colorado. On a per-bushel basis, costs ranged from $\$ 1.00$ in lowa to more than $\$ 1.50$ in Michigan and Ohio. Major variable cash items associated with corn production include seed, fertilizer, chemicals, and fuel. Together these costs comprised about three-fourths of the total variable cash costs. There was wide variations in per-acre expenses for these inputs among States. For example, per-acre seed expense
ranged from a low of $\$ 19$ in South Dakota so i high of $\$ 27$ in Colorado. Fuel expense varied from $\$ 11$ in Ohio to $\$ 40$ per acre in Colorado.

On average, one-third of the total variable cash costs were for fertilizers, ranging from $\$ 27$ to $\$ 62$ per acre. Fertilizer expense was above $\$ 50$ per acre in Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio, but less than $\$ 40$ in lowa, Minnesota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Greater input use, primarily nitrogen, was characteristic of the high-cost States. South Dakota corn growers had the lowest ferilizer cost because they fertilized fewer acres at lower application rates.

Chemical expenses ranged from $\$ 14$ in South Dakota to $\$ 28$ per acre in Indiana, with costs in most States around $\$ 20$. Differences in per-acre chemical expenses were due to type and amount of chemicals used and proportion of corn acres treated. All corn growers applied chemicals in lowa, Ohio, and Minnesota as compared to three-fourths of the corn growers in Nebraska. The percentage of farms using insecticides varied among States, ranging from less than 10 percent in Minnesota to about 50 percent in Neljraska.

Colorado and Nebraska corn farms had the highest fuel expense at around $\$ 40$ per acre, due primarily to irrigation-related expenses. Irrigated acreage resulted in the greatest use of diesel and electricity in these States. In contrast, most other States had fuel costs less than $\$ 15$ per acre.

South Dakota corn growers had the lowest variable cash costs because of relatively low seed, fertilizer, and chernical costs, reflecting the lower levels of input use. Colorado corn growers reported the highest variable cash costs due to relatively high seed, chernicals, fuel, and hired labor costs. Input use was high on Colorado farms because of extensive irrigated acreage.

Fixed cash costs ranged from $\$ 38$ to $\$ 62$ per planted acre. Corn growers in Nebraska had the highest fixed cash costs, while the lowest fixed costs were estimated for Indiana. The highest fixed costs in Nebraska were due to high interest and overhead expenses at $\$ 26$ and $\$ 14$ per acre, respectively.

Total cash costs were highest in Colorado and Nebraska, both above $\$ 225$ per planted acre, while in all other States, cash costs were less than $\$ 200$. Cash costs were lowest in South Dakota at $\$ 154$. Despite greater costs, Colorado farms, aiong with those in lowa, had the highest returns above cash costs at about $\$ 105$. Returns were highest in Colorado because of greater yields associated with irrigated corn, while in lowa per-bushel costs were lowest. Michigan and Ohio corn farms had the lowest returns, both less than $\$ 20$ per acre, refiecting the effects of drought on these States' yieids.

Total economic costs ranged from $\$ 231$ in South Dakota to $\$ 381$ per acre in Colorado. Capital replacement ranged between $\$ 20$ and $\$ 30$ in most States, but was more than $\$ 45$ in Colorado and Nebraska. Land cost was highest in llinois and lowa at more than $\$ 75$ per acre. Returns to management and risk, excluding the direct effect of Government programs, were negative in most States, ranging from minus $\$ 73$ in Ohio to plus $\$ 3$ per acre in Wisconsin.

## Statistical Reliability of Estimates

Production cost data presented in this report include an estimate of the coefficient of variation for each item. The coefficient of variation (C.V.) is a measure of relative dispersion indicating the variability of the estimated sample mean. It takes into account the variation in each cost item and also the variation in the expanded number of corn farms estimated from the sample. The coefficient of variation is defined as the standard deviation of the estimate divided by its mean and expressed as a percentage of the estimate. In general, the smaller the C.V. the greater the reliability of the estimate. Note that survey results can aiso be influenced by nonsampling errors which are not measurable nor known. Nonsampling errors can be introduced by enumerators, respondents, or survey design. Efforts were made to minimize the effect of nonsampling error, consisting of the training of enumerators, review, edit of survey data, and analysis of data for comparability and consistency.

Constructing confidence intervals around the mean is a method for examining the precision of the estimate. For example, the mean total cash costs of producing corn in Ohio is $\$ 174.57$ per acre with a coefficient of variation of 4.85 . The 95 -percent confidence interval for this estimate is $\$ 157.98$ to $\$ 191.16$ per acre. We are 95 -percent confident that this interval contains the true population mean of total cash costs for producing an acre of corn in Ohio. Among all States, confidence intervais tend to narrow, and thus reliability of estimates improve, as sample size increases (table 11).
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Figure I
Approaches used to estimate corn cost of production components

| Direct costing | Allocating whole-farm expenses | Valuing quantities of inputs | Indirect costing | Some combination of approaches |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -Seed <br> - Fertilizers <br> -Chemicals <br> - Custom operations <br> - Hired labor <br> - Purchased irrigation water <br> Technical services <br> - Commercial drying | - General farm overhead <br> - Interest <br> - Taxes and insurance | - Unpaid labor | - Fuel, lubrication, electricity <br> - Repairs <br> - Capital replacement <br> - Farm drying | - Operating capital <br> $\rightarrow$ Other nonland capital <br> -Land |


| Table fa-Colorado: Corn production cash costs and returns per planted acre with coefficients of variation, 1991 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Item | 1991 | c. |
|  | Dollars | Percent |
| Gross value of production: |  |  |
| Corn grain | 347.97 | กа |
| Total, gross value of production | 347.97 | na |
| Cash expenses: |  |  |
| Seed | 26.70 | 3.94 |
| Fertilizer | 52.29 | 6.50 |
| Chemicals | 20.05 | 15.09 |
| Custom operations | 16.14 | 22.85 |
| Fuel, lube, and electricity | 40.46 | 35.65 |
| Repairs | 16.96 | $8.4 \dagger$ |
| Mired tabor | 16.96 | 23.19 |
| Purchased irrigation water | 4.99 | 37.57 |
| Commercial drying | 0.26 | 63.85 |
| Total, variable cash expenses | 194.81 | 5.91 |
| General farm overhead | 14.20 | 22.27 |
| Taxes and insurance | 14.04 | 18.15 |
| Interest | 20.20 | 20.94 |
| Total, fixed cash expenses | 48.43 | 14.14 |
| Total, eash expenses | 243.24 | 6.16 |
| Gross value of production tess cash expenses | 104.73 | na |
| Harvest-period price (dollars per bushel) | 2.36 |  |
| Yield (bushels per planted acre) | 147.44 | 5.44 |



|  | Dollars | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross value of production: |  |  |
| Corn grain | 347.97 | na |
| Total, gross value of production | 347.97 | na |
| Economic (full-ownerstip) costs: |  |  |
| Variable cash expenses | 194.81 | 5.91 |
| Generat farm overhead | 14.20 | 22.27 |
| Taxes and insurance | 14.04 | 18.15 |
| Capital replacement | 46.55 | 9.38 |
| Operating capitat | 5.30 | 5.91 |
| Other nonland capital | 17.15 | 7.04 |
| Land | 63.48 | 7.93 |
| Unpaid labor | 25.76 | 14.11 |
| Total, economic (full-ownership) costs | 381.27 | 5.19 |
| Residual returns to management and risk | -33.30 | กа |
| Harvest-period price (dollars per bushel) | 2.36 | กа |
| Yield (bushels per planted acre) | 147.44 | 5.44 |

na $=$ Not applicable.

|  | 1991 | c.v. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dotlars | Percent |
| Gross value of production: |  |  |
| Corn grain | 347.97 | na |
| Total, gross value of production | 347.97 | na |
| Cash expenses: |  |  |
| Seed | 26.70 | 3.94 |
| Fertilizer | 52.29 | 6.50 |
| Chemicals | 20.05 | 15.09 |
| Custom operations | 16.14 | 22.85 |
| Fuel, lube, and electricity | 40.46 | 15.65 |
| Repairs | 16.96 | 8.41 |
| Hired labor | 16.96 | 23.19 |
| Purchased irrigation water | 4.99 | 37.57 |
| Cormercial drying | 0.26 | 63.85 |
| Total, variable cash expenses | 194.81 | 5.91 |
| General farm overhead | 14.20 | 22.27 |
| Taxes and insurance | 14.04 | 18.15 |
| interest | 20.20 | 20.94 |
| Total, fixed cash expenses | 48.43 | 14.14 |
| Total, cash expenses | 243.24 | 6.16 |
| Gross value of production less cash expenses | 104.73 | na |
| Harvest-period price (doltars per bushel) Yield (bushels per planted acre) | $\begin{array}{r} 2.36 \\ 147.44 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 5.44 |

Table ib-Colorado: Corn production economic costs and returns per planted acre with coefficients of variation, 1991


|  | Doltars | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross value of production: |  |  |
| Corn grain | 347.97 | na |
| Total, gross value of production | 347.97 | na |
| Economic (full-ownership) costs: |  |  |
| Variable cash expenses | 194.81 | 5.91 |
| General farm overhead | 14.20 | 22.27 |
| Taxes and insurance | \$4.04 | 18.15 |
| Capital replacement | 46.55 | 9.38 |
| Operating capital | 5.30 | 5.91 |
| Other nonland capital | 17.15 | 7.04 |
| Land | 63.48 | 7.93 |
| Unpaid I ${ }^{\text {abor }}$ | 25.76 | 14.11 |
| Total, economic (full-ownership) costs | 381.27 | 5.19 |
| Residual retirns to management and risk | -33.30 | na |
|  |  |  |
| Harvest-period price (dollars per bushel) | 2.36 | na |
| Yield (bushels per planted acre) | 147.44 | 5.44 |



Table 2b-Illinois: Corn production eonomic costs and returns per planted acre with coefficients of variation, 1991

Item 199\% C.V.

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |





| I tem | $1991$ | C.V. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dollars | Percent |
| Gross value of production: <br> Corn grain <br> Total, gross value of production | $\begin{aligned} & 208.67 \\ & 208.67 \end{aligned}$ | na |
| Cash expenses: |  |  |
| Seed | 21.34 | 1.99 |
| Fertilizer | 61.88 | 11.13 |
| Chemicals | 20.97 | 4.96 |
| Fustom operazions | 4.07 | 15.45 |
| Fliet, lube, and etectricity | 14.95 | 15.50 |
| Repairs | 12.24 | 3.34 |
| Purchased irrigation water | 6.10 | 55.06 |
| Cormercial irrigation water | 0.00 | na |
| Commercial drying | 2.35 | 39.42 |
| Total, varisble cash expenses | 143.91 | 3.68 |
| General farm overhead | 9.56 | 16.27 |
| Taxes and insurance | 28.33 | 7.54 |
| Interest fixed cash expenses | 16.86 | 36.79 |
| Total, fixed cash expenses | 54.75 | 10.46 |
| Total, cash expenses | 198.66 | 5.33 |
| Gross value of production less cash expenses | $10.01$ | กa |
| Harvest-period price (dollars per bushel) rield (bushels per planted acre) | $\begin{array}{r} 2.28 \\ 91.52 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { na } \\ 6.52 \end{array}$ |

Table 5b-Michigan: Corn production economic costs and returns per planted acre with coefficients of variation, 1991



na $=$ Not applicable.


| 1 tem | 1991 | c.v. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dollars | Percent |
| Gross value of production: |  |  |
| corn grain |  |  |
| Total, gross value of production | 30.85 | na |
| Cash expenses: |  |  |
| Seed | 24.32 | 7.59 |
| Fertilizer | 14.88 | 16.51 |
| Chemitals | '22.78 | 11.29 |
| custom operations Fuel, lube, and electricity | 5.75 | 27.60 |
| Repairs | 38.56 | 13.70 |
| Hired labor | 17.37 | 7.51 |
| Purchased irrigation water | 8.42 | 37.59 |
| Commercial drying | 1.84 | 38.34 |
| Total, variable cash expenses | 165.80 | 75.04 9.57 |
| General farm overhead | 14.01 |  |
| Taxes and insurance | 21.53 | 12.00 |
| interest | 26.28 | 31.64 |
| Total, fixed cash expenses | 61.82 | 16.50 |
| Total, cash expenses | 227.62 | 9.00 |
| Gross value of production tess cash expenses | 75.23 | na |
| Harvest-period price (doltars per bushel) |  |  |
| Yield (bushels per planted acre) | 132.25 | 4.23 |

Table 7b-Hebraska: Corn production economic costs and returns per planted acre with coefficients of variation, 1991

c.v.


|  | Dollars | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross value of production: |  |  |
| Corn grain | 302.85 |  |
| Total, gross value of production | 302.85 | na |
| Etonomic (full-ownership) costs: |  |  |
| Variable cast expenses | 165.80 | 9.57 |
| General farm overheac | 14.01 | 26.28 |
| Taxes and insurance | 21.53 | 12.00 |
| Operating capital | 45.48 | 8.90 |
| Other nonland capital | 4.51 | 9.57 |
| Cther nontand capital land | 15.87 | 8.41 |
| Unpaid labor | 56.38 | 9.14 |
| Total, economic (full-ownership) costs | 22.56 346.13 | 13.78 6.35 |
| Residual returns to management and risk | -43.28 | na |
| Harvest-period price (dollars per bushel) Yield (bushels per planted acre) | $\begin{array}{r} 2.29 \\ 132.25 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { na } \\ 4.23 \end{array}$ |


na $=$ Not applicable.

| Item | 1991 | C.V. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dollars | Percent |
| Gross value of production: |  |  |
| Cern grain | 193.90 | na |
| Total, gross value of production | 193.90 | no |
| Cosh expenses: |  |  |
| Seed | 21.86 | 11.96 |
| Fertilizer | 53.65 | 11.35 |
| Chemicals | 21.03 | 9.55 |
| Custom operations | 4.79 | 33.28 |
| Fuel, lube, and electricity | 11.05 | 13.38 |
| Repairs | 12.24 | 10.51 |
| Hired labor | 8.93 | 24.72 |
| Purchased irrigation water | 0.00 | na |
| Commercial drying | 1.19 | 87.30 |
| Total, variable cash expenses | 134.74 | 6.01 |
| General farm overbead | 6.51 | 24.74 |
| Taxes and insurance | 11.88 | 5.26 |
| Interest | 21.44 | 43.93 |
| Total, fixed cash expenses | 39.83 | 21.38 |
| Total, cash expenses | 174.57 | 4.85 |
| Gross value of production less cash expenses | 19.32 | na |
|  | $=10=$ | $==$ |
| Harvest-period price (dotlars per bushel) Yield (bushels per planted acre) | 2.37 81.81 | na 8.42 |

Table 8b-Ohio: Corn production economic costs and returns per planted acre with coefficients of variation, 1991

| Item 1991 C.V. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dollars | Percent |
| Gross value of production: |  |  |
| Corn grain | 193.90 | na |
| Total, gross value of production | 193.90 | na |
| Economic (full-ownership) rosts: |  |  |
| Variable cash expenses | 134.74 | 6.01 |
| General farm overhead | 6.51 | 24.74 |
| Taxes and insuramice | 11.89 | 5.26 |
| Capital replacement | 22.16 | 9.79 |
| Operating capital | 3.66 | 6.01 |
| Other nonland capital | 7.95 | 5.57 |
| Land | 64.61 | 7.09 |
| Unpaid labor | 15.18 | 11.63 |
| Total, economic (full-awnership) costs | 266.70 | 5.55 |
| Residual returns to management and risk | -72.80 |  |
| Harvest-period price (dollars per bushel) | 2.37 | na |
| Yield (bushels per planted acre) | 81.81 | 8.42 |

 na $=$ Not applicable.

|  | 1991 | c.v. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Qollars | Percent |
| Gross value of production: |  |  |
| Corn grain | 196.30 | na |
| Total, gross value of production | 196.30 | na |
| Cash expenses: |  |  |
| Seed | 19.41 | 12.84 |
| Fertilizer | 26.57 | 13.18 |
| Chemicals | 14.49 | 19.29 |
| Custom operations | 4.00 | 25.18 |
| Fuel, lube, and electricity | 18.59 | 38.38 |
| Repairs | 14.06 | 12.35 |
| Hired labor | 4.77 | 62.53 |
| Purchased irrisation water | 1.99 | 72.22 |
| Commertiat drying | 0.04 | 36.11 |
| Total, variable cash expenses | 103.92 | 15.38 |
| General farm overhead | 13.41 | 58.40 |
| Taxes and insurance | 16.87 | 39.77 |
| Interest | 20.08 | 48.68 |
| Total, fixed cash expenses | 50.37 | 48.07 |
| Total, cash expenses | 154.29 | 25.11 |
| Gross value of production less cash expenses <br>  | $42.01$ | па |
| Harvest-period price (dollars per bushel) Yield (bushels per planted acre) | $\begin{array}{r} 2.10 \\ 93.48 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { na } \\ 14.62 \end{array}$ |

Table 9b-*South Dakota: Corn production economic costs and returns per planted acre with coefficients of variation, 1991


|  | Dollars | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross value of production: |  |  |
| Corn grain | 196.30 | na |
| Total, gross value of production | 196.30 | na |
| Economic (full-ownership) costs: |  |  |
| Variable cask expenses | 103.92 | 15.38 |
| General farm overhead | 13.41 | 58.40 |
| Taxes and insurance | 16.87 | 39.77 |
| Capital replacement | 30.61 | 27.37 |
| Operating capital | 2.83 | 15.38 |
| Other nont and copital | 9.92 | 18.17 |
| Land | 39.89 | 11.02 |
| Unpaid labor | 13.16 | 17.53 |
| Total, economic (full-ownership) costs | 230.61 | 19.00 |
| Residual returns to management and risk | -34.31 | na |
| Harvest-period price (dollars per bushel) Yield (bushels per planted acre) | 2.10 93.48 | na 14.62 |


na $=$ Nit appl icable.


Table 10b-Wisconsin: Corn production economic costs and returns per planted acre with coefficients of variation, 1991


Dollars Percent
Gross value of production:
Corn grainn na
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Total, gross value of production } & 258.56 & \text { na } \\ & 258.56 & \text { na }\end{array}$
Economic (full-ownership) costs:
$\begin{array}{lrr}\text { Variable cash expenses } & 139.61 & 8.60 \\ \text { General farm overhead } & 10.80 & 8.69\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { General farm overhead } & 10.80 & 29.69 \\ \text { Taxes and insurance } & 22.81 & 3.90\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Capital replacement } & 22.21 & 3.92\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lrr}\text { Operating capital } & 19.87 & 14.87\end{array}$
other nonland capital
$3.80 \quad 8.60$

Land
$8.35 \quad 7.28$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Unpaid labor } & 25.35 & 13.53 \\ & 25.21 & 17.03\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lrr}\text { Total, economic (full-ownership) costs } & 255.20 & 17.03 \\ & 25.07\end{array}$
Residual returns to management and risk
3.37 па

Yield (bushels per planted acre) bushel) $\quad 2.24 \quad 115.43 \quad \mathrm{na}$

na $=$ Not applicable.

Table 11 - Statistical reliabitity of $r$ n prodution cost estimates, by state, 199 ?

| State | Samplesize | 95 percent confidence interval |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Casit costs |  |  | Esonomic costs |  |  |
|  |  | Lower bound | Mean | Upper bound | Loner bound | Mean | Upper bound |
|  | Dollars_per planted acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coloracio | 30 | 213.87 | 243.24 | 272.61 | 342.49 | 381.27 | 420.05 |
| llaingis | 85 | 170.20 | 180.83 | 191.46 | 284.12 | 299.93 | 315.74 |
| Indiana | 60 | 163.84 | 181.37 | 198.90 | 272.69 | 307.57 | 342.05 |
| Iowa | 74 | 148.71 | 161.74 | 174.77 | 289.75 | 286.58 | 303.43 |
| Michigan | 43 | 177.91 | 198.66 | 219.41 | 255.87 | 271.97 | 288.07 |
| Minnesota | 55 | 145.08 | 158.91 | 172.74 | 245.24 | 268.62 | 292.00 |
| Nebraska | 49 | 187.47 | 227.62 | 267.77 | 303.05 | 346.13 | 389.21 |
| Ohio | 51 | 157.98 | 174.57 | 191.16 | 237.69 | 266.70 | 295.71 |
| South Dakota | 36 | 78.36 | 154.29 | 230.22 | 144.73 | 230.69 | 316.49 |
| discons in | 55 | 154.48 | 185.41 | 216.34 | 234.84 | 255.20 | 275.56 |

Apjendix table 1--Characteristics of FCRS corn farms, by State, 1991

| Item | Unit | Colorado | Illinois | Indiana | Iowa | Michigan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Share of corn-FCRS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample size | number | 30 | 85 | 60 | 74 | 43 |
| All farms | percent | * | 16 | 8 | 25 | 4 |
| Total corn production | percent | * | 18 | 9 | 24 | * |
| Acreage ard yields: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total operated acreage | acres | 2,858 | 525 | 468 | 401 | 475 |
| Corn planted | acres | 203 | 205 | 198 | 155 | 181 |
| Corn harvested for grain | acres | 195 | 204 | 195 | 153 | 160 |
| Corn yield | actual bu/ac | 147 | 108 | 109 | 120 | 92 |
| Corn yield | expected bu/ac | 162 | 139 | 137 | 134 | 114 |
| Corn acreage-tenure: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent owned | percent of acres | 64 | 31 | 41 | 32 | 39 |
| Percent cash rented | percent of acres. | 22 | 10 | 23 | 42 | 56 |
| Percent share rented | percent of acres | 14 | 57 | 36 | 26 |  |
| Corn acreage-use: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| lrrigated | percent of acres | 95 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 9 |
| Oryland | percent of acres | 5 | 100 | 92 | 100 | 91 |
| No-till | percent of acres | 8 | 16 | 6 | 10 | 32 |
| Crop previously on corn acres: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn | percent of farms | 65 | 22 | 38 | 30 | 62 |
| Soybeans | percent of farms | 0 | 65 | 51 | 61 | 16 |
| Wheat | percent of farms | 10 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 5 |
| Oats | percent of farms | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sorghum | percent of farms | * | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Sugarbeets | percent of farms | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Alfalfa | percent of farms | 8 | * | * | * | * |
| Other hay | percent of farms | 0 | * | * | 0 | 5 |
| Other | percent of farms | 6 | 0 | 0 | * | 9 |
| Livestock inventory: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beef cattle | percent of farms | 79 | 41 | 38 | 51 | 24 |
| Dairy cattle | percent of farms | * | 6 | 7 | 9 | 49 |
| Hogs | percent of farms | 5 | 25 | 35 | 45 | 21 |
| Poultry | percent of farms | 5 | 5 | 6 | * | 9 |
| Sheep | percent of farms | 15 | * | 5 | 12 | 0 |
| Other livestock | percent of farms | 5 | 8 | * | * | 7 |
| Corn for farm use | percent of production | 25 | 12 | 21 | 24 | 28 |
| See footnotes at end of |  |  |  |  | Continued-- |  |

Appendix table 1--Characteristics of FCRS corn farms, by State, 1991--continued

| 1tem | Unit Mir | Minnesota | Nebraska | Ohio | South Dakota | Wisconsin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sitare of corn-FCRS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample size | number | 55 | 49 | 51 | 36 | 55 |
| All farms | percent | 14 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 11 |
| Total corn production | percent | 11 | 16 | 5 | 5 | $7$ |
| Acreage and yields: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total operated acreage | acres | 391 | 1,323 | 434 | 1,175 | 358 |
| Corn planted | acres | 138 | 265 | 163 | 241 | 103 |
| Corn harvested for grain | acres | 128 | 257 | 151 | 234 | 93 |
| Corn yield | actual bu/ac | 114 | . 132 | 82 | 93 | 115 |
| Corn yield | expected bu/ac | 130 | 135 | 132 | 100 | 129 |
| Corn acreage-tenure: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent owned | percent of acres | 50 | 40 | 39 | 60 | 58 |
| Percent cash rented | percent of acres | 38 | 27 | 36 | 21 | 42 |
| Percent share rented | percent of acres | 12 | 33 | 26 | 19 | 0 |
| Corn acreage-use: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated | percent of acres | * | 76 | 0 | 29 | 5 |
| Oryland | percent of acres | 99 | 24 | 100 | 71 | 95 |
|  | percent of acres | 5 | 22 | 10 | 16 |  |
| Crop previously on corn acres: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corn | percent of farms | 24 | 69 | 28 | 29 | 61 |
| Soybeans | percent of farms | 65 | 18 | 46 | 31 | 61 |
| Wheat | percent of farms | * | 6 | 9 | 16 | 0 |
| Oats | percent of farms | 6 | * | * | 16 | 0 |
| Sorghum | percent of farms | 0 | * | 0 | 8 | * |
| Sugarbeets | percent of farms | 0 | * | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Alfalfa | percent of farms | * | 6 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Other hay | percent of farms | * | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | percent of farms | 0 | * | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Livestock inventory: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beef cattle | percent of farms | 36 | 78 | 31 | 64 | 38 |
| Dairy cattle | percent of farms | 35 | * | 31 | 12 | 78 |
| Hogs | percent of farms | 29 | 28 | 11 | 38 | 17 |
| Poultry | percent of farms | * | 12 | 12 | 6 | 15 |
| Other livestock | percent of farms percent of farms | * | 12 | $\begin{array}{r}7 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 8 12 | 5 0 |
| Corn for farm use | percent of production | ก 28 | 15 | 16 | 26 | 48 |

[^1]Appendix table 2--input use of FCRS corn farms, by State, 1991

| Item | Unit | Colorado | Illinois | Inciana | Iowa | Michigan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seed: Rate-total | seeds/acre | 30,955 | 25,384 | 24,827 | 25,150 | 25,275 |
| Fertilizer use: Any fertilizer Nitrogen Phosphorus Posassium time Manure | percent of farms percent of farms percent of farms percent of farms percent of farms percent of farms | 98 98 80 28 0 17 | 99 99 95 92 18 15 | 99 96 96 96 24 21 | 100 100 88 84 11 22 | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 100 \\ 100 \\ 100 \\ 10 \\ 55 \end{array}$ |
| Fertilizer use: <br> Nitrogen <br> Phosphorus <br> Potassium <br> Lime <br> Manure | Los/acre Ibs/acre Ibs/acre tons/acre tons/acre | 126 28 12 0 1.87 | 456 78 90 0.24 0.24 | 143 64 108 0.17 0.23 | 119 47 49 0.14 0.70 | $\begin{array}{r} 127 \\ 47 \\ 63 \\ 0.34 \\ 1.67 \end{array}$ |
| Chenical use: Any chemicals Herbicides Insecticides | percent of farms percent of farms percent of farms | 92 88 43 | 100 94 43 | $\begin{aligned} & 93 \\ & 93 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 100 \\ 31 \end{array}$ | 90 90 26 |
| Herbicide treatments Insecticide treatments | times-over <br> times-over | $\begin{aligned} & 1.16 \\ & 0.53 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.36 \\ & 0.22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.02 \\ & 0.24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.54 \\ & 0.19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.45 \\ & 0.27 \end{aligned}$ |
| Custom operations: Any custom operations land prep/cultivation Planting Fert/chem application Harvesting | percent of farms percent of farms percent of farms percent of farms percent of farms | 87 22 7 65 35 | $\begin{array}{r} 86 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 84 \\ 17 \end{array}$ | 79 8 8 78 24 | 80 5 7 78 21 | 31 $*$ $*$ 29 7 |
| Fuel use: Diesel Gasoline LP gas Hatural gas Electricity | gallons per acre gallons per acre gallons per acre 1000 cubic feet per acre kilowatt hours per acre | 8.36 3.93 0.00 0.17 388.72 | 4.46 3.51 2.11 0.06 12.37 | $\begin{array}{r} 5.11 \\ 3.56 \\ 2.12 \\ 0.01 \\ 28.20 \end{array}$ | 4.44 3.41 4.67 0.00 5.33 | $\begin{array}{r} 6.90 \\ 3.10 \\ 3.18 \\ 0.05 \\ 10.66 \end{array}$ |
| Drying use: <br> Dried <br> Comercially dried <br> Farm dried <br> Moisture removed | percent of production percent of production percent of production percentage points | $\begin{array}{rr} n & 13 \\ n & * \\ n & 11 \\ & 0.80 \end{array}$ | 50 12 38 2.23 | $\begin{array}{r} 46 \\ 14 \\ 31 \\ 2.49 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 65 \\ 18 \\ 47 \\ 3.82 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 61 \\ 13 \\ 48 \\ 2.66 \end{array}$ |
| frigation use: lrrigation water | inches per acre | 8.83 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.38 |
| Labor use: Unpaid labor | hours per acre | 4.16 | 3.67 | 3.85 | 4.47 | $\begin{array}{r} 4.97 \\ \text { tinued-- } \end{array}$ |

Appendix table 2--Input use of FCRS corn tarms, by State, 1999-- Continued

| Item | Unit | Minnesota | Nebraska | Ohio | South Dakota | Wisconsin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seed: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate-total | seeds/acre | 26,804 | 26,546 | 26.185 | 22,115 | 26,310 |
| Fertitizer use: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any fertilizer | percent of farms | 97 | 90 | 100 | 79 | 100 |
| Mitrogen | percent of farms | 95 | 84 | 100 | 83 | 97 |
| Phosphorus | percent of farms | 83 | 59 | 100 | 64 | 97 |
| Potassitm | percent of farins | 80 | 23 | 97 | 45 | 97 |
| Lime | percent of farms | * | 0 | 9 | 0 | 5. |
| Manure | percent of farms | 50 | 19 | 4.6 | 11 | 73 |
| Fertilizer use: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nitrogen | lbs/acre | 79 | 142 | 122 | 68 | 107 |
| Phosphorus | lbs/acre | 55 | 23 | 59 | 26 | 45 |
| Potassium | lbs/acre | 57 | 3 | 91 | 11 | 63 |
| Lime | tons/acre | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.06 |
| Manure | tons/acre | 1.35 | 0.67 | 0.81 | 0.16 | 4.47 |
| Chemical use: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any chemicals | percent of farms. | 98 | 86 | 97 | 92 | 96 |
| Herbicides | percent of farms | 98 | 75 | 97 | 92 | 89 |
| Insetricides | percent of farms | 8 | 54 | 21 | 17 | 18 |
| Herbicide treatments | times-over | 1.63 | 1.05 | 1.25 | 1.40 | 1.54 |
| Insecticide treatments | times-over | 0.08 | 0.86 | 0.22 | 0.28 | 0.14 |
| Custom operations: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Any custom operations | percent of farms | 60 | 54 | 70 | 60 | 65 |
| Land prep/cultivation | percent of farms | 5 | * | 0 | * | 6 |
| planting | percent of farms | * | * | 0 | 9 | 7 |
| Fert/chem application | percent of farms | 55 | 52 | $6 ?$ | 50 | 60 |
| Harvesting | percent of farms | 15 | * | 23 | 25 | 46 |
| Fuel use: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diesel | gatlons per acre | 4.72 | 97.89 | 4.50 | 6.11 | 7.62 |
| Gasoline | gallons per acre | 2.88 | 4.47 | 2.62 | 3.05 | 2.55 |
| LP gas | gallons per acre | 4.28 | 3.56 | 3.65 | 4.90 | 1.96 |
| Natural gas | 1000 cubic feet per acre | 0.00 | 1.61 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.10 |
| Electricity | kilowatt hours per acre | 27.85 | 96.75 | 9.77 | 86.11 | 68.88 |
| Drying use: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dried | percent of production | 72 | 34 | 69 | 54 | 55 |
| Commercially dried | percent of production | 14 | 23 | 12 | * | 8 |
| Farm dried | percent of procuction | 58 | 11 | 57 | 53 | 47 |
| Moisture removed | percentage points | 4.15 | 0.89 | 1.68 | 2.47 | 0.89 |
| Irrigation use: irrigation water | inches per acre | 0.03 | 6.94 | 0.00 | 2.92 | 0.13 |
| Labor use: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unpaid labor | hours per acre | 3.96 | 3.94 | 2.60 | 2.58 | 4.99 |

$\star$ = Less than 5 percent.
Note: Data may not add due to rounding.

Appendix table 3-Colorado corn: Average machinery use per planted acre; 1991

| Machinery Ti | Times-over | Width | Tractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Feett | Horsepower |
| Chisel plow | 0.70 | 20 | 768 |
| Coulter-chisel plaw | 0.18 | 24 | 182 |
| Disk plow | 0.06 | 12 | 175 |
| Holdboard plow, regular | 0.05 | 5 | 134 |
| Mol dboard plow, two-way | 0.33 | 6 | 163 |
| Stuble-mulch plow | 0.06 | 30 | 272 |
| Subsoil chisel plow | 0.28 | 17 | 162 |
| Disk chisel (mutch tiller) | 0.40 | 23 | 160 |
| Offiset disk, heovy duty | 0.31 | 16 | 146 |
| Offset disk, light duty | 0.04 | 18 | 145 |
| One-way (disk tiller) | 0.04 | 19 | 161 |
| Tandein disk, plowing | 0.02 | 18 | 153 |
| tandem disk, regular | 0.55 | 20 | 147 |
| Field cultivator | 0.82 | 19 | 137 |
| Furron-out cultivator | 0.37 | 14 | 94 |
| Rotery hoe | 0.05 | 19 | 92 |
| Row cultivator | 0.13 | 19 | 121 |
| Rolling cultivator | 0.05 | 20 | 160 |
| Duckfoot cultivator | 0.44 | 17 | 123 |
| Marker (cultivator) | 0.01 | 20 | 80 |
| Field conditioner (scratcher) | 0.02 | 20 | 90 |
| Culti-mulcher (roller) | 0.12 | 17 | 151 |
| Spike, tooth harrow | 0.01 | 22 | 100 |
| Spring tooth harrow | 0.09 | 22 | 193 |
| Culti-packer (pulverizer) | 0.20 | 20 | 153 |
| Roller packer attachnent | 0.08 | 10 | 70 |
| Mulch treader | 0.13 | 14 | 123 |
| Soil finisher | 0.02 | 24 | 150 |
| Fertilizer attachment to implement | 0.37 | 22 | 23 |
| Manure spreader | 0.06 | 20 | 112 |
| Fertilizer spreader, self-propelled | 0.02 | 15 | 453 |
| Anhydrous applicator, tractor | 0.24 | 21 | 153 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, tractor | 0.08 | 17 | 132 |
| Liquid fertilizer applicator, tractor | or 0.05 | 28 | 91 |
| Anhydrous applicator, trailer | 0.13 | 21 | 77 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, trailer | 0.02 | 15 | 70 |
| Liquid fertilizer applicator, trailer | er 0.02 | 32 | 15 |
| Chemical attachment to implement | 0.34 | 17 | 15 |
| Chemical applicator, self-propelled | 0.03 | 40 | 4 |
| Chemical applicator, tractor | 0.65 | 22 | 44 |
| Chemical applicator, traiter | 0.07 | 41 | 127 |
| Bed-shaper planter | 0.22 | 15 | 134 |
| Lister-bedder planter | 0.02 | 15 | 135 |
| Planter (no-till), 6 row | 0.02 | 20 | 160 |
| Planter (regular), 8 row | 0.56 | 19 | 141 |
| Planter (air-delivery), 6 гон | 0.11 | 10 | 114 |
| Planter (ridge till), 6 row | 0.01 | 16 | 95 |
| Combine, self-propelled, hillside | 0.24 | 16 | -- |
| Combine, self-propelled, 2WD | 0.44 | 15 | 135 |
| Ditcher (vee or rotary) | 0.01 | 15 | 135 |
| Float | 0.14 | 16 | 160 |
| Land plane-leveler | 0.14 | 19 | 131 |
| Laser planer | 0.02 | 24 | 245 |
| Shredder, flail | 0.01 | 8 | 135 |
| Stalk shredder | 0.04 | 15 | 136 |

Machine operations listed are not in sequence.
Machines used in custom field operations are excluded.
Machines ore repeated because they ore different in size or pulled by tractors of different size (horsepower).
.- = Indicates machines are self-powered or pulled by truck.
Wideh = Indicates the swath or width of the area covered by the machine, which is not necessarily the structural width of tive machine.
Times-over $=$ Total acres covered in an operation divided by planted acres of the crop. Note that hours per acre given for land forming equipment such as backhoe, disk border maker, ditcher, ditch closer, levee plow disk, rear-mounted blade, and quarter drain machines.

Source: 1991 farm rosts and Returns Survey, USDA.

Appendix table 4--Illinois corn: Average machinery use per planted acre, 1991

| Machinery | Times-over | Width | Tractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Feet | Horsepower |
| Chisel plow | 0.16 | 11 | 153 |
| Coulter-chisel plow | 0.09 | 12 | 160 |
| Deep rípper-subsoiler | 0.04 | 15 | 273 |
| Disk plow | 0.02 | 12 | 125 |
| Moldroard plow, regular | 0.10 | 6 | 134 |
| Subsoil chisel plow | 0.04 | 13 | 170 |
| Disk chisel (mulch tiller) | 0.05 | 14 | 144 |
| Cffiset disk, heavy duty | 0.03 | 21 | 144 |
| One-way (disk tiller) | 0.03 | 24 | 185 |
| Single disk | 0.01 | 21 | 170 |
| Tandem disk, plowing | 0.09 | 20 | 141 |
| Tandem disk, regular | 0.41 | 18 | 126 |
| Field cultivator | 0.73 | 23 | 145 |
| Rotary hoe | 0.04 | 18 | 113 |
| Row cultivator | 0.42 | 16 | 99 |
| Duckfoot cultivator | 0.07 | 22 | 163 |
| Finishing karrow | 0.01 | 17 | 88 |
| Flex-tine harrow (coil) | 0.06 | 22 | -- |
| Spike tooth herrou | 0.03 | 22 | 111 |
| Culti-packer (pulverizer) | 0.01 | 18 | 188 |
| tendall, do-all | 0.09 | 20 | 190 |
| Soil finisher | 0.04 | 23 | 175 |
| Fertilizer attachment to implement | 0.08 | 20 | 59 |
| Manure spreader | 0.01 | 16 | 90 |
| Fertidizer spreader, trailer | 0.02 | 40 | 150 |
| Anhydrous applicator, tractor | 0.17 | 22 | 144 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, tractor | 0.13 | 34 | 97 |
| Anhydrous applicator, trailer | 0.26 | 23 | 146 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, trailer | 0.22 | 40 | 101 |
| Liquid fertilizer applicator, trailer | 0.06 | 27 | 134 |
| Chemical attachment to implement | 0.30 | 18 | 21 |
| Chemical applicator, self-propetled | 0.02 | 60 | .. |
| Chemicai applicator, tractor | 0.27 | 30 | 162 |
| Chemical applicator, trailer | 0.30 | 31 | 115 |
| Planter (no-tili), 6 row | 0.20 | 17 | 98 |
| Planter (reguiar), 8 гон | 0.51 | 17 | 97 |
| Planter (ajr-delivery), 6 row | 0.27 | 21 | 111 |
| Conbine, self-propelled, hiltside | 0.04 | 11 | , |
| Combine, self-prcpelled, 2WD | 0.75 | 12 | - |
| Combine, seli-propelled, 4WD | 0.11 | 22 | -- |
| Corn picker | 0.01 | 5 | 69 |
| Rotary mower | 0.01 | 15 | 138 |
| Grain/hay wagon | 0.08 | 28 | 64 |
| Shredder, flail | 0.01 | 15 | 125 |
| Shredder, rotary | 0.01 | 10 | 100 |
| Gravity wagon | 0.37 | 27 | 105 |

Machine operations listed are not in sequence.
Machines used in custom field operations are excluded.
Machines are repeated because they are different in size or pulled by tractors of different size
(horsepower).
-- = Indicates machines are self-powered or pulted by truck.
Width = Indicates the swath or width of the area covered by the machine, which is not necessarily the structural width of the machine.
Jimes-over = Total acres covered in an operation divided by planted acres of the crop. Note that hours per acre given for land forming equipment such as backhoe, disk border maker, ditcher, ditch closer, levee plow disk, rear-mounted blade, and quarter drain machines.

Source: 1991 Farm Costs and Returns Survey, USDA.

Appendix table 5-lindiana corn: Average machinery use per planted acre, 1991

| Machinery $T$ | Times-aver | Width | Tractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nuber | Feet | Horseponer |
| Chisel plow | 0.20 | 11 | 155 |
| Coulter-chisel plow | 0.17 | 9 | 159 |
| Deep ripper-subsoiler | 0.01 | 12 | 200 |
| Motdooard plow, regular | 0.08 | 6 | 98 |
| Disk chisel (mulch tiller) | 0.22 | 11 | 164 |
| 0 ffset disk, heavy duty | 0.08 | 14 | 109 |
| One-way (disk tiller) | 0.01 | 13 | 90 |
| Single disk | 0.01 | 12 | 65 |
| Tanden disk, plowing | 0.28 | 19 | 163 |
| Tandem disk, regular | 0.44 | 19 | 140 |
| Paraplow | 0.01 | 10 | 123 |
| Field cultivator | 0.53 | 21 | 149 |
| Row cultivator | 0.40 | 19 | 114 |
| Rolling cultivator | 0.08 | 29 | 19 |
| Duckfoot cultivator | 0.05 | 15 | 121 |
| Field conditioner (scratcher) | 0.10 | 30 | 300 |
| Culti-multher (roller) | 0.01 | 14 | 90 |
| Landald, do-alt | 0.03 | 24 | 180 |
| Fertilizer attachment to implement | 0.50 | 17 | 14 |
| Manure spreader | 0.02 | 18 | 70 |
| Fertilizer spreader, self-propelled | 0.10 | 23 | -- |
| fertilizer spreader, trailer | 0.06 | 32 | 195 |
| Anhydrous applicator, tractor | 0.16 | 23 | 152 |
| Ory fertilizer spreader, tractor | 0.01 | 60 | 140 |
| Liquid fertilizer applicator, tractor | r 0.12 | 35 | 180 |
| Anhydrous applicator, trailer | 0.49 | 21 | 127 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, trailer | 0.09 | 29 | 91 |
| Liquid fertilizer applicator, traiter | r 0.03 | 16 | 128 |
| Chemical attachment to implement | 0.27 | 20 | 7 |
| Chemical applicator, self-propelled | 0.07 | 23 | -- |
| Chemical applicator, self-propelled | 0.02 | 30 | -* |
| Chemical applicator, tractor | 0.06 | 32 | 136 |
| Chemical applicator, trailer | 0.38 | 39 | 102 |
| Planter (no-till), 6 row | 0.15 | 16 | 110 |
| Planter (regular), 8 row | 0.77 | 17 | 88 |
| Planter (air-delivery), 6 row | 0.07 | 13 | 94 |
| Combine, self-propelled, hillside | 0.07 | 13 | -- |
| Combine, self-propelled, 2wd | 0.54 | 12 | ** |
| Combine, self-propelted, 4ND | 0.27 | 10 | -- |
| Stalk shredder | 0.01 | 13 | 110 |
| Gravity wagon | 0.41 | 30 | 102 |

Machine operations listed are not in sequence.
Machines used in custom field operations are excluded.
Machines are repeated because they are different in size or pulled by tractors of different size (horsepower).
-- = Indicates machines are self-powered or pulled by truck.
Width = Indicates the swath or widih of the area covered by the machine, which is not necessarily the structural width of the machine.
Times-over $=$ Total acres covered in an operation divided by planted acres of the crop. Note that hours per acre given for land forming equipment such as backhoe, disk border maker, ditcher, ditch closer, levee plow disk, rear-mounted blade, and quarter drain machines.

Source: 1991 Farm Costs and Returns Survey, USDA.

Appendix table 6*-Iowa corn: Average machinery use per planted acre, 1991

| Wachinery | Times-over | Width | Tractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Feet | Horsepower |
| Chisel plow | 0.16 | 12 | 157 |
| Coulter-chisel plow | 0.04 | 11 | 162 |
| Disk plow | 0.01 | 18 | 350 |
| Moldboard plow, regular | 0.06 | 6 | 127 |
| Subsoil chisel plow | 0.01 | 16 | 250 |
| Disk chisel (mulch tiller) | 0.07 | 14 | 151 |
| Single disk | 0.03 | 20 | 135 |
| Tandem disk, plowing | 0.03 | 19 | 127 |
| tandem disk, regular | 0.47 | 19 | 124 |
| Field cultivator | 0.79 | 24 | 153 |
| Rotary hoe | 0.11 | 19 | 101 |
| Row cultivator | 0.64 | 17 | 111 |
| Rolling cultivator | 0.02 | 10 | 80 |
| Ouckfoot cultivator | 0.06 | 31 | 170 |
| Field conditioner (scratcher) | 0.03 | 20 | 118 |
| Spike tooth harrow | 0.05 | 21 | 90 |
| landall, do-all | 0.04 | 18 | 155 |
| Soil finisher | 0.01 | 15 | 120 |
| Fertilizer attachment to implement | 0.24 | 21 | -- |
| Manure spreader | 0.07 | 20 | 110 |
| Anhydrous applicator, tractor | 0.25 | 26 | 150 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, tractor | 0.05 | 43 | 108 |
| Anhyorous applicator, trailer | 0.28 | 26 | 134 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, trailer | 0.17 | 41 | 112 |
| Liquid fertilizer applicator, trailer | 0.03 | 40 | 120 |
| Chemical attachment to implement | 0.46 | 23 | 5 |
| Chemical applicator, self-propelled | 0.13 | 40 | -- |
| Chemical applicator, tractor | 0.26 | 31 | 109 |
| Chemital applicator, trailer | 0.26 | 33 | 91 |
| Planter (no-till), 6 row | 0.12 | 21 | 118 |
| Planter (regular), 8 row | 0.58 | 17 | 104 |
| Planter (air-delivery), 6 ron | 0.29 | 21 | 108 |
| Combine, self-propelled, hillside | 0.06 | 10 | -- |
| Combine, self-propelled, 2wo | 0.81 | 12 | -- |
| Corn picker | 0.01 | 5 | 73 |
| Grain/hay wagon | 0.10 | 24 | 111 |
| Shredder, flail | 0.02 | 15 | 145 |
| Stalk shredder | 0.04 | 12 | 132 |
| Gravity wagon | 0.71 | 31 | 117 |

Machine operations tisted are not in sequence.
Machines used in custon field operations are excluded.
Machines are repeated because they are different in size or pulled by tractors of different size (horseposer).

* = Indicates machines are self-powered or pulled by truck.

Width $=$ Indicates the swath or width of the area covered by the machine, which is not necessarily the structural width of the machine.
Times-over $=$ Total acres covered in an operation divided by planted acres of the crop. Note that hours per acre given for land forming equipment such as backhoe, disk border maker, ditcher, ditch closer, levee plow disk, rear-mounted blade, and quarter drain machines.

Source: 1991 Farm Costs and Returns Survey, usDA.

Appendix table 7--Michisan corn: Average machinery use per planted acre, 1991

| Machinery $T$ | Times-over | Width | Trattor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Feet | Horseponer |
| Chisel plow | 0.11 | 12 | 147 |
| Coulter-chisel plow | 0.22 | 13 | 173 |
| Moldboard plow, regular | 0.21 | 6 | 113 |
| Disk chisel (mulch tiller) | 0.02 | 11 | 108 |
| offset disk, heavy duty | 0.09 | 13 | 93 |
| offset disk, light duty | 0.01 | 15 | 116 |
| Tandem disk, plowing | 0.10 | 27 | 200 |
| Tandern disk, regular | 0.54 | 17 | 122 |
| field cuitivator | 0.19 | 18 | 106 |
| Rotary hoe | 0.09 | 14 | 73 |
| Row cultivator | 0.16 | 13 | 67 |
| Duckfoot cultivator | 0.03 | 13 | 82 |
| Culti-mulcher (rolter) | 0.02 | 15 | 123 |
| Spike tooth harrow | 0.01 | 16 | $\cdots$ |
| Spring tooth harrow | 0.07 | 17 | 96 |
| Bedder (disk) | 0.01 | 30 | 140 |
| Cutti-packer (puiverizer) | 0.02 | 13 | 146 |
| Roller packer attachment | 0.05 | 20 | 146 |
| Landall, do-all | 0.03 | 16 | 225 |
| Fertilizer attachment to implement | 0.47 | 15 | ** |
| Manure spreader | 0.18 | 18 | 84 |
| Anhydrous applicator, tractor | 0.13 | 16 | 119 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, tractor | 0.01 | 19 | 58 +53 |
| Anhydrous applicator, trailer | 0.39 | 23 | 753 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, trailer | 0.10 | 29 | 92 |
| Liquid fertilizer applicator, trailer | er 0.03 | 24 | 115 |
| Chemical attachment to implement | 0.55 | 22 | 11 |
| Chemical apolicator, tractor | 0.05 | 25 | 81 |
| Chemical applicator, trailer | 0.51 | 27 | 55 |
| Planter (no-till), 6 row | 0.32 | 14 | 112 |
| Planter (regutar), 8 row | 0.66 | 14 | 86 |
| Planter (aír-delivery), 6 гон | 0.02 | 16 | 90 |
| Planter (ridge-till), 6 row | 0.01 | 10 | 150 |
| Combine, self-propelled, hillside | 0.01 | 10 | $\cdots$ |
| Combine, self-propelled, 2WD | 0.67 | 11 | $\cdots$ |
| Combine, self-propelled, 400 | 0.14 | 14 | 86 |
| Corn picker | 0.05 | 4 | 86 |
| Front end loader | 0.04 | 21 | 108 |
| Grain/hay wagon | 0.01 | 27 | 30 |
| Hay wagon | 0.01 | 20 | 50 |
| Stalk shredder | 0.01 | 6 | 83 |
| Gravity wagon | 0.32 | 25 | 71 |

Machine operations listed are not in sequence.
Machines used in custom field operations ar'e excluded.
Machines are repeated because they are difterent in size or puiled by tractors of different size
(horsepower).
-- = Indicates machines are self-powered or pulled by truck.
Width = Indicates the swath or width of the area covered by the machine, which is not necessarily the structural width of the machine.
Times-over $=$ Total acres covered in an operation divided by planted acres of the crop. Hote that hours per acre given for land forming equipment such as backhoe, disk border maker, ditcher, ditch closer, levee plow disk, rear-mounted blade, and quarter drain machines.

Source: 1991 Farm Costs and Returns Survey, USDA.

Appendix table B-Minnesota corn: Average machinery use per planted асге, 1991

| Hachinery $T$ | Times-over | Width | Tractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nunber | Feet | Horseponer |
| Chisel plow | 0.31 | 13 | 152 |
| Coulter-chisel plow | 0.09 | 12 | 122 |
| Deep ripper-subsoiler | 0.13 | 30 | 275 |
| Disk plaw | 0.02 | 16 | 170 |
| Moldooard plow, regutar | 0.24 | 6 | 103 |
| Disk chisel (mulch tiller) | 0.02 | 11 | 150 |
| Offset disk, heavy duty | 0.02 | 16 | 108 |
| Single disk | 0.01 | 14 | 80 |
| Tandem disk, plowing | 0.01 | 15 | 90 |
| Tandem disk, regular | 0.36 | 17 | 92 |
| Field cultivator | 1.08 | 23 | 143 |
| Rotary hoe | 0.11 | 19 | 100 |
| Row cultivator | 0.86 | 19 | 107 |
| Rolling cultivator | 0.01 | 5 | 27 |
| Field tonditioner (scratcher) | 0.01 | 18 | 80 |
| Finishing harrow | 0.02 | 20 | 135 |
| Flex-tine harrow | 0.01 | 24 | 129 |
| Multi-weeder | 0.04 | 20 | 95 |
| Spike tooth harrou | 0.02 | 18 | 65 |
| Spring tooth harrow | 0.10 | 24 | 30 |
| fertilizer attachment to imple.mit | 0.61 | 16 | -- |
| Manure spreader | 0.09 | 33 | 88 |
| Anhydrous applicator, tractor | 0.12 | 25 | 121 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, tractor | 0.03 | 23 | 67 |
| Anhydrous applicator, trailer | 0.05 | 22 | 89 |
| Dry fertitizer spreader, traiter | 0.17 | 39 | 100 |
| Liquid fertilizer applitator, trailer | er 0.13 | 23 | 140 |
| Chemical attachment to implement | 0.35 | 19 | 6 |
| Chemical applicator, tractor | 0.27 | 32 | 95 |
| Chemical applicator, trailer | 0.59 | 31 | 68 |
| Planter (no-till), 6 row | 0.01 | 15 | 110 |
| Planter (regular), 8 row | 0.65 | 16 | 89 |
| Planter (air-delivery), 6 row | 0.28 | 22 | 110 |
| Planter (ridge-till), 6 row | 0.04 | 20 | 130 |
| Combine, self-propelled, hilliside | 0.03 | 8 | $\cdots$ |
| Conbine, self-propelled, 2 WD | 0.78 | 12 | $\cdots$ |
| Corn picker | 0.05 | 5 | 68 |
| Grain/hay wagon | 0.27 | 24 | 72 |
| Hay wagon | 0.03 | 8 | 75 |
| Stalk shredder | 0.02 | 14 | 101 |
| Gravity wagen | 0.57 | 28 | 97 |

Machine operations ifsted are not in sequence.
Machines used in custom field operations are excluded.
Machines are repeated because they are different in size or pulled by tractors of different size (horsepower).
-- = Indicates machines are self-powered or pulted by trutk.
Width = Indicates the swath or width of the area covered by the machine, which is not necessarily the structural shidth of the machine.
Times-over $=$ Iotal acres covered in an operation divided by planted acres of the crop. Note that hours per acre given for land forming equipment such as backhoe, disk border maker, ditcher, ditch closer, levee plon disk, rear-mounted blade, and quarter arain machines.

Source: 1991 Farm Costs and Returns Survey, USDA.

Appendix table 9--Nebraska corn: Average machinery use per pianted acre, 1991

| Machinery | Times-over | Width | Tractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nunber | Feet | Horsepower |
| Chisel plow | 0.03 | 12 | 121 |
| Moldiboard plow, regular | 0.02 | 6 | 112 |
| Subsoil chisel ploy | 0.12 | 20 | 174 |
| Disk chisel (mulch tiller) | 0.03 | 15 | 181 |
| offiset disk, heavy duty | 0.15 | 22 | 170 |
| Tardem disk, regular | 1.04 | 21 | 139 |
| Field cultivator | 0.66 | 19 | 112 |
| Furrow-out cultivator | 0.14 | 45 | 129 |
| Rotary hoe | 0.09 | 16 | 100 |
| Row euttivator | 0.41 | 14 | 105 |
| Rolling cultivator | 0.20 | 14 | 116 |
| Duckfoot cultivator | 0.19 | 19 | 147 |
| Fietd conditioner (scratcher) | 0.03 | 18 | 160 |
| Rod weeder | 0.03 | 36 | 90 |
| Spring tooth harrow | 0.01 | 30 | 115 |
| Seented roller | 0.01 | 18 | 125 |
| culti-packer (putverizer) | 0.01 | 15 | 135 |
| fertilizer attachment to implement | 0.51 | 17 | 39 |
| Manure spreader | 0.03 | 8 | 95 |
| Fertilizer spreader, self-propelled | 0.06 | 18 | 111 |
| Anhydrous applicator, tractor | 0.33 | 22 | 111 |
| Anhydrous applicator, traiter | 0.08 | 25 | 146 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, traiter | 0.17 | 34 | 119 |
| Liquid fertilizer applicator, trailer | er 0.09 | 19 | 85 |
| Chemical attachment to implement. | 0.37 | 16 | -- |
| Chemical applicator, self-propelled | 0.03 | 55 | 75 |
| Chemical applitator, tractor | 0.45 | 21 | 75 |
| Chemical applicator, trailer | 0.09 | 39 | 122 |
| Planter (no-till), 6 row | 0.21 | 18 | 120 |
| Planter (regular), 8 row | 0.46 | 14 | 97 |
| Planter (air-del ivery), 6 row | 0.27 | 19 | 134 |
| Planter (ridge till), 6 row | 0.05 | 16 | 134 |
| Combine, self-propelled, hiltside | 0.95 | 14 | - |
| Contine, self-propelled, 2wo | 0.78 | 14 |  |
| Corn picker | 0.02 0.10 | 14 | 68 110 |
| Ditcher (vee or rotary) Grain/hay wagon | 0.10 0.03 | 14 14 | 110 48 |
| Shredder, flail | 0.13 | 16 | 132 |
| Shredder, rotary | 0.01 | 9 | 61 |
| Stalk shredder | 0.09 | 17 | 134 |
| Gravity wagon | 0.05 | 29 | 111 |

Machine operations listed are not in sequence.
Machines used in custom field operations are excluded. (horseponer).
-- = Indicates machines are self-potered or pulled by truck.
Width = Indicates the swath or width of the area covered by the machine, which is not necessarily the structural width of the machine.
limes-over $=$ total acres covered in an operation divided by planted acres of the crop. Note that hours per acre given for land forming equipment such as backhoe, disk border maker, ditcher, ditch closer, levee plow disk, rear-mounted blade, and quarter drain machines.

Source: 1991 Farm Costs and Returns Survey, USDA.

Appendix table 10--Chio corn: Average machinery use per pianted acre, 1991

| Machinery | Times-over | Width | Tractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chisel plow | Mumber | Feet | Horseponer |
|  | 0.13 | 19 |  |
| Coutter-chisel plow | 0.25 | 12 | 226 |
| Deep ripper-subsoiler | 0.05 | 15 | 256 |
| Ofacoard plou, regular | 0.26 | 6 | 110 |
| Single disk, light duty | 0.05 | 11 | 69 |
| tandem disk, regular | 0.06 | 13 | 100 |
| Field cultivator | 0.12 | 13 | 98 |
| Rotary hoe | 0.98 | 24 | 158 |
| Row cultivator | 0.42 | 19 | 92 |
| Duckfoot cuttivator | 0.02 | 16 | 106 |
| Field conditioner (scratcher) | 0.01 | 24 | 160 |
| Multi-weeder | 0.01 | 14 | 85 |
| culti-multher (raller) Spring tooth harroue | 0.04 | 12 | 95 |
| Culti-packer (pulverizer) | 0.05 | 13 12 | 27 |
| Landall, do-atil | 0.10 | 28 | 278 |
| Fertilizer attachment to implement | 0.39 | 22 | 238 30 |
| Manure spreader | 0.04 | 13 | 104 |
| Antydrous applicator, tractor | 0.16 | 26 | 155 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, tractor | 0.02 | 32 | 90 |
| Anhydrous applicator, trailer, tractor | 0.03 0.38 | 12 |  |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, traiter | 0.38 0.13 | 20 | 101 |
| tiquid fertilizer applicator, traiter | 0.04 | 23 | 83 |
| Chemical attachment to implement | 0.60 | 26 | 28 |
| Chemical applicator, truck | 0.07 | 40 |  |
| Chemical applicator, tratior | 0.10 | 26 | 69 |
| Lister-bedier planter | 0.17 0.01 | 38 4 15 | 70 |
| Planter (no-till), 6 row | 0.49 | 17 | 105 |
| Planter (regular), 8 row | 0.46 | 12 | 107 69 |
| Planter (air-delivery), 6 row | 0.05 | 20 | 86 |
| Conbine, self-propelled, hitlside | 0.10 | 15 |  |
| Combine, self-propelled, 2.6 | 0.49 | 11 | - |
| Conbine, self-propelled, 4W0 | 0.24 | 15 | - |
| Corn picker | 0.04 | 5 | 79 |
| Gravity wagon | 0.80 | 32 | 71 |

Machine operations tisted are not in sequence.
Machines used in custom field operations are excluded.
Machines are repeated because they are different in size or pulled by tractors of different size
(horsepower).
$\because=$ Indicates machines are self-powered or pulled by truck.
Width = Indicates the swath or width of the area covered by the machine, which is not necessarily the structural width of the machine.
rimes-over = rotal acres covered in an operation divided by planted acres of the crop. Note that hours per acre given for land forming equipment such as backhoe, disk border maker, ditcher, ditch closer, levee plow disk, rear-mounted blade, and quarter drain machines.
Source: 1991 Farm Costs and Returns Survey, USDA.

Appendix table 11--South Dakota corn: Average machinery use per planted acre, 1991

| Machinery | Times-over | Width | Tractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Feet | Horsepaner |
| Chisel ploy | 0.06 | 15 | 141 |
| Coulter-chisel plow | 0.02 | 19 | 328 |
| Moldboard plow, regular | 0.08 | 7 | 127 |
| Moldboard plow, two-way | 0.07 | 5 | 125 |
| Disk chisel (mulch tiller) | 0.01 | 24 | 200 |
| $0 f f$ set disk, heavy duty | 0.02 | 15 | 106 |
| Tandem disk, plowing | 0.01 | 21 | 106 |
| Tanden disk, regular | 0.76 | 22 | 156 |
| Field cultivator | 0.45 | 21 | 130 |
| Furrow-out cultivator | 0.16 | 15 | 125 |
| Rotary hoe | 0.08 | 27 | 103 |
| Row cuttivator | 1.18 | 16 | 114 |
| Rolling cultivator | 0.01 | 10 | 67 |
| Duckfoot cultivator | 0.54 | 34 | 273 |
| Flex-tine harrow | 0.13 | 29 | 67 |
| Spike tooth harrow | 0.01 | 17 | 24 |
| Spring tooth harrow | 0.01 | 16 | -- |
| Spike tooth barrow | 0.01 | 25 | 58 |
| Culti-packer (pulverizer) | 0.08 | 18 | 160 |
| Fertilizer attachment to implement | 0.36 | 21 | 2 |
| Manure spreader | 0.01 | 14 | 71 |
| Anhydrous applicator, tractor | 0.01 | 20 | 130 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, tractor | 0.08 | 39 | 84 |
| Anhydrous applicator, trailer | 0.22 | 34 | 205 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, trailer | 0.14 | 45 | 104 |
| Liquid fertilizer applicator, trailer | - 0.10 | 20 | 128 |
| Chemical attachment to implement | 0.36 | 20 | 6 |
| Chemical applicator, self-propelted | 0.08 | 55 | -- |
| Chemical applicator, truck skid | 0.06 | 48 | - |
| Chemical applicator, tractor | 0.38 | 33 | 83 |
| Chemical applicator, trailer | 0.16 | 38 | 121 |
| Planter (no-till), 6 row | 0.20 | 21 | 456 |
| Planter (regular), 8 row | 0.66 | 17 | 103 |
| Planter (air-delivery), 6 row | 0.12 | 17 | 97 |
| Combine, self-propelled, hitlside | 0.07 | 10 | -- |
| Combine, self-propelled, 2wD | 0.56 | 12 | -- |
| Combine, self-propelted, 4WD | 0.21 | 20 | - |
| Corn picker | 0.01 | 5 | 95 |
| Grain/hay wagon | 0.04 | 15 | 87 |
| Rock picker | 0.02 | 8 | 138 |
| Gravity wagon | 0.08 | 27 | 55 |

Machine operations listed are not in sequence.
Machines used in custom field operations are excluded.
Machines are repeated because they are different in size or pulled by tractors of different size (horsepower).
-- = Indicates machines are self-powered or pulled by truck.
Width $=$ indicates the swath or width of the area covered by the machine, which is not necessarily the structural width of the machine.
Times-over $=$ Total acres covered in an operation divided by planted acres of the crop. Note that hours per acre given for land forming equipment such as backhoe, disk border maker, ditcher, ditch closer, levee plow disk, rear-mounted blade, and quarter drain machines.

Source: 1991 Farm Costs and Returns Survey, USDA.

Apperdix table 12--Wisconsin corn: Average machinery use per planted acre, 1991

| Machinery | Times-over | Width | Tractor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nupber | Feet | Horsepower |
| Chisel plow | 0.23 | 12 | \% 147 |
| Coulter-chisel plow | 0.10 | 8 | 129 |
| Moldboard plow, regular | 0.48 | 6 | 120 |
| Subsoil chisel plow | 0.04 | 12 | 200 |
| Disk chisel (mulch tiller) | 0.03 | 9 | 104 |
| Offiset disk, heavy duty | 0.09 | 18 | 270 |
| Single disk | 0.02 | 16 | 89 |
| Tandem disk, plowing | 0.01 | 12 | 100 |
| Tandem disk, regular | 0.94 | 14 | 113 |
| Field cultivator | 0.93 | 13 | 117 |
| Rotary hoe | 0.04 | 22 | 135 |
| Row cultivator | 0.09 | 9 | 82 |
| Field conditioner (scratcher) Finjshing harrow | 0.27 | 24 | 140 |
| Rail, pipe, log, plank | 0.01 | 20 | 90 |
| Culti-mulcher (roller) | 0.01 | 15 | 65 |
| Spike tooth harrow | 0.09 | 12 | 85 |
| Spring tooth harrow | 0.18 | 19 | - 112 |
| Culti-packer (putverizer) | 0.06 | 13 | 121 |
| Roterra | 0.01 | 12 | 95 |
| Fertilizer attachment to implement | 0.67 | 12 | 9 |
| Manure spreader | 0.31 | 22 | 98 |
| Fertilizer spreader, trailer | 0.16 | 30 | 9 |
| Anhydrous applicator, tractor | 0.01 | 18 | 100 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, tractor | 0.30 | 33 | 184 |
| Anhydrous applicator, trailer | 0.05 | 19 | 88 |
| Dry fertilizer spreader, trailer | 0.16 | 38 | 86 |
| Chemical attachment to implement | 0.16 | 23 | 34 |
| Chemical applicator, truck | 0.11 | 46 | 34 |
| Chemical applicator, tractor | 0.10 | 21 | 149 |
| Chemical applicator, trailer | 0.29 | 28 | 66 |
| Planter (regular), 8 row | 0.80 | 10 | 90 |
| Planter (air-delivery), 6 row | 0.16 | 11 | 114 |
| Combine, self-propelled, zud | 0.12 | 9 |  |
| Combine, self-propel led, 460 | 0.40 | 15 | - |
| Combine | 0.01 | 5 | 73 |
| Corn picker | 0.12 | 4 | 97 |
| Grain/hay wagon | 0.03 | 15 | 62 |
| Hay wagon | 0.04 | 8 | 80 |
| Shredder, flail | 0.01 | 6 | 80 |
| Stalk shredder | 0.08 | 14 | 145 |
| Gravity wagon | 0.35 | 19 | 68 |

Machine operations listed are not in sequence.
Machines used in custom field operations are excluded.
Machines are repeated because they are different in size or pulled by tractors of different size
(horseponer)
-- = Indicates machines are selfopowered or pulled by truck.
Width $=$ Indicates the swath or width of the area covered by the machine, which is not necessarily the structural width of the machine.
Jimes-over $=$ Total acres covered in an operation divided by planted acres of the crop. Note that hours per acre given for land forming equipnent such as backhoe, disk border maker, ditcher, ditch closer, levee plow disk, rear-mounted blade, and quarter drain machines.

Source: 1991 farm Costs and Returns Survey, USDA.


Gross value of production, production costs, and net returns for corn are all higher when Govemment programs are taken into account in cost and retum estimates. A new report, Effects of Government Programs on Com Costs and Retums, 1991 and 1992, just released from USDA's Economic Research Service, examines the extent to which Government programs enhanced the profitability of com production in 1991 and 1992. It also identifies factors that most influenced corn costs and retums.

Including Govemment programs in cost and return estimates raised net returns after cash expenses by $\$ 24$ per planted acre in 1991. Greater yields and higher deficiency payments in 1992 added nearly $\$ 44$ to net cash retums. North Central and Plains com growers are most affected by Government programs since they participate to a much greater extent in the programs than growers in the Southeast and Northeast. Producer participation and annual price and yield conditions have the greatest influence on the extent to which Govemment programs enhance returns to com production.

To receive Government payments under any of the commodity income programs, producers must put some of their land into conserving-use acres and maintain those "set-aside" acres in specific ways. Farmers incur costs to meet these program requirements. Since 1973, Congress has required USDA to estimate costs and returns for major crops and daing. Costs and retums that include the direct effects of Government programs can be used to gauge the profitability of competing and alternative commodities. On the other hand, the direct effects of Govemment programs are excluded when costs and returns estimates are used to officially establish support levels.

USDA cost and return estimates have traditionally been used to inform policymakers about costs and returns without including the direct effects of Government programs. Cost and return estimates have deliberately excluded the direct effects of farm programs to avoid the escalating effect program benefits would have on production and program costs. For example, the cost of land is determined by the ability of land to generate in-
come. Because programs generate income for those who control land, programs increase the cost of land. Farm price and income supports established according to the higher costs would rise. As the cycle repeats, production and program costs would continually escalate. However, not all the effects of programs can be removed from cost and return estimates. Indirect effects result from the influence farm programs have on markets for production inputs, on the market value of commodities, and on producer behavior.

If enterprise cost and return estimates are to be used to examine the profitability of producing individual commodities, the direct effects of govemment programs must be included. Comparative analysis of net returns for competing and altemative crops and the financiai position of producers of these commodities required consideration of Government program effects. These effects are more critical for some commodities than others due to variations in program support levels and producer participation.

## To Order These Reports...

This information is excerpted from Effects of Government Programs on Com Costs and Returns, 1991 ance 1992, AlB-701, by William D. McBride. Simifar reports on other commodities have also been published: Effects of Governmert Programs on Rice Production Costs and Retums, 1988, AIB-597, by Michael Salassi, Mary Aheam, Mir Ali, and Robert Dismukes, and Effects of Government Programs on Sorghum Costs and Returns, 1990, AlB-689, by Nora L. Brooks. The cost is $\$ 7.50$ per report.

To order, dial 1-800-999-6779 (toll free in the Urited States and Canada) and ask for the report by title.

Please add 25 percent to foreign addresses (including Canada). Charge to VISA or MasterCard. Or send a check (made payable to ERS-NASS) to:

> ERS-NASS
> 341 Victory Drive
> Hemdon, VA 22070.
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[^0]:    U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service. Agricultural Prices, 1991

[^1]:    * $=$ Less than 5 percent.

    Note: Data may not add due to rounding.

