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## I. INTRODUCTION

## A. BACKGROUND

The Farm Level Data Base (FLDB) is currently being developed by Agriculture Canada in cooperation with Statistics Canada, provincial governments, universities and national marketing organizations to fill data gaps in Canada's current agriculture statistics system and provide decision-makers with improved farm level information on which to base policy and program decisions. It is intended that the FLDB will have 4 components, including:

- A whole farm database;
- A benchmark farm/cost of production database;
- A farm input price database;
- A standardization component to ensure greater data consistency and comparability.

The FLDB will be used to:

- Analyze the potential impacts on farm incomes and industry competitiveness of proposed policy and program changes;
- Design programs;
- Evaluate program impacts and effectiveness;
- Monitor the financial health of the industry on an on-going basis.
B. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to conduct a cost of production study of fresh vegetable farms in the Fraser Valley based upon the survey of 25 farms, for incorporation into the Benchmark Farm/Cost of Production Component of the FLDB. Some of the specific objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To utilize and modify the existing Farm Business Analysis Program for cow-calf farm businesses, and to prepare a survey questionnaire to obtain fresh vegetable production costs from producers in the Fraser Valley.
2. To conduct a survey of a maximum of 25 fresh vegetable farms in the Fraser Valley.
3. To provide a copy of the original data collected on hard copy and diskette.
4. To prepare summarized consolidated financial statements from the information received.
5. To write and present a summary of findings from the consolidated financial statements.

## C. METHOD OF STUDY

The study was conducted in 4 phases. A detailed description of steps involved in each phase is provided in the following paragraphs:

1. Phase I

We first met with the Steering Committee, composed of David Culver of Agriculture Canada and Lorne Owen of the British Columbia Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (BCMAFF), to clarify the scope and desired outputs of the study. In order to become more familiar with the characteristics and structure of the B.C. fresh vegetable sector, we then met with Wayne Odermatt, BCMAFF Regional Fresh Vegetable Specialist and conducted a detailed review of published statistics and surveys on the industry.

Based on the above steps and on a review of leading fresh vegetable crops in the Fraser Valley, it was decided that the seven crops to be analyzed for the purposes of this study would consist of the following:

- Lettuce (iceberg)
- Broccoli
- Green Cabbage
- Carrots (Topped)
- Onions
- Celery
- Potatoes

In order to provide greater consistency and comparability in the sample, the population to be sampled for the purposes of this study was then defined as:

- Farms which generated at least $\$ 150,000$ in revenues from the 1991 crop season.
- Farms which generated at least $75 \%$ of their sales revenues from the sale of fresh vegetables. The purpose of this criteria was to reduce the likelihood that the operating results of a farm would be unduly affected by the nature of other (non-vegetable) operations.
- Farms which generated at least $50 \%$ of their revenues for the sale of the fresh vegetables (excluding potatoes) targeted in the survey. Potatoes farms which did not generate a significant proportion of their revenues from other types of fresh vegetables were not targeted because they are usually significantly different from other fresh vegetable farms, which would have limited the comparability of the data collected. In addition, the sample of farms to be surveyed was structured so as to ensure that cost of production data for a minimum of five targeted crops was obtained from at least three farms, in order to protect the confidentiality of the responses provided by respondents.

As part of this phase, we also spoke with Roger Keay, BCMAFF Farm'Management Specialist, to familiarize ourselves with the Farm Business Analysis Program used by BCMAFF. With input from Agriculture Canada and BCMAFF, we then modified the template of the program to make it suitable for the collection and analysis of vegetable cost of production data, reviewed the questionnaires used by other provinces to collect vegetable cost of production data and prepared a study framework detailing the methodology to be used as well as a draft questionnaire for approval by the Steering Committee.

In the second phase, the approved draft questionnaire was pre-tested on 2 vegetable farms in the Fraser Valley in order to ensure that it was easy to understand and would provide the information desired. Based on the comments received, a final questionnaire was developed, approved by the Steering Committee, and submitted to the Access to Information and Privacy (ATIP) Division of Statistics Canada to obtain a registration number.

## 3. Phase III

In the third phase, we met with Chuck Amor, General Manager of the B.C. Vegetable Marketing Commission, to develop a population list of Fraser Valley vegetable farms believed to meet the eligibility requirements. From this population list, a sample of 50 farms was selected randomly using a random number generator. A letter outlining the purpose, nature and benefits of the study was then mailed to these 50 farms, along with supporting letters from Agriculture Canada, BCMAFF and the B.C. Vegetable Marketing Commission. The mailing was followed up with a telephone call to each farm, to ascertain their willingness to participate in the study and ensure that they met the minimum requirements for the study. The farms were then surveyed in the order assigned by the random number generator until the required number of respondents was achieved. The information collected from the 25 farms which agreed to participate in the survey was then organized and entered in the template format as specified by the Steering Committee, and a number of simple and cross-tabulations were undertaken to prepare consolidated statements at the farm level and cost of production analyses on the selected crops.

## 4. Phase IV

In the fourth and final phase, after validation and computerization of original data, we then prepared summarized consolidated financial statements and wrote a summary of findings from the consolidated financial statements for circulation to the Steering Committee. This report represents the output of the 4th phase of the study. In addition, we have prepared and distributed customized reports to all farmers participating in the study, comparing the financial performance of their operation to the average for all 25 farms responding.

## D. STRUCTURE OF REPORT

Our observations and findings are organized into 5 chapters. Chapter II provides a profile of the farms participating in the survey in terms of their major characteristics and of the overall representativity of the sample. Chapter III presents composite income statements and balance sheets for the 25 operations surveyed, while Chapter IV provides an analysis of various production, activity, profitability, liquidity and leverage ratios. The final chapter provides a detailed enterprise analysis for each of the 7 crops targeted in this study.

## II. PROFILE OF RESPONDENT ORGANIZATIONS

This chapter provides a profile of the 25 farms responding to the survey, in terms of their major characteristics and the level of representativity of the sample vis-a-vis the total population of fresh vegetable farms in the Lower Mainland.

## A. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE 25 FARMS SURVEYED

The major characteristics of the 25 farms surveyed in terms of ownership structure, business history, production acreage, revenues and owner's compensation are summarized in the following paragraphs.

## 1. Ownership Structure

As indicated in the table below, a large majority of the 25 farms surveyed were incorporated companies $\mathbf{( 7 2 . 0 \%})$ or sole proprietorships $(20.0 \%)$. The relatively high proportion of incorporated companies in the sample may have been induced by the requirement that farms have sales of at least $\$ 150,000$ to be included in the sample. Presumably, the greater the sales, the greater the likelihood that the farm is incorporated.

OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE OF FARMS SURVEYED

| Ownership Structure | Number of <br> Respondents | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Incorporated Company | 18 | $720 \%$ |
| Sole Proprietorship | 5 | 20.0 |
| Partnership | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{8.0}$ |
| Total | 25 | 100.0 |

For farms organized as corporations or partnerships, the average number of shareholders or partners was 2.45 (very often comprised of husband and wife) and ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 6 .

## 2. Business History

As indicated below, the majority ( $60.0 \%$ ) of the farms surveyed were started or purchased by their current owners after 1970 . Only $16.0 \%$ of the farms were started or purchased by current owners before 1960 .

BUSINESS HISTORY OF FARMS SURVEYED

| When Started/Purchased by Current Owners | Number of <br> Respondents | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Before 1950 | 1 | $4.0 \%$ |
| $1950-1959$ | 3 | 12.0 |
| $1960-1969$ | 6 | 24.0 |
| $1970-1979$ | 6 | 24.0 |
| $1980-1989$ | $\underline{9}$ | $\underline{36.0}$ |
| Total | 25 | 100.0 |
| Average date: | 1973 |  |

The oldest farm in the sample was created or purchased in 1949 and the most recent was established or purchased in 1989. These results should, however, be taken with relative caution since many of the current owners took over previously existing farms from their parents or others.

## 3. Production Acreage

The total acreage of the 25 responding farms was 8,205 acres in 1991 (or an average of 328.2 acres per farm) and ranged from a low of 80 acres to a high of 1,500 acres. Of this total, however, only 2,521 acres ( $30.7 \%$ ) were owned by the responding farms, while the remaining 5,685 acres ( $69.3 \%$ ) were leased. For the land that was leased, the average annual rent per acre was about $\$ 204$, and ranged from a low of $\$ 120$ to a high of $\$ 250$. It is believed, however, that these figures under-estimate the proportion of land actually owned or controlled by the respondents, since, in a number of instances, it was quite obvious that at least some of the land was leased from inter-related companies and/or individuals.

Total production acreage, at 7,850 acres, represented about $95.7 \%$ of the total acreage for the 25 respondents, or an average of 314 acres per farm. Many of the 25 farms surveyed tended to be fairly specialized, with 16 farms ( $64.0 \%$ ) growing only one of the 7 crops selected for the purposes of this study.

Table 2.1 provides a breakdown of production acreage by crop in 1991. Overall, the 7 crops selected for the purposes of this study accounted for 3,466 acres or $44.2 \%$ of the total production acreage for the 25 farms. Leading crops included potatoes ( 1,669 acres or $21.3 \%$ of total production acreage), broccoli ( 1,124 acres and $14.3 \%$ ), iceberg lettuce ( 180 acres and $2.3 \%$ ), green cabbage and topped carrots ( 164 acres each and $2.1 \%$ ), onions ( 116 acres and $1.5 \%$ ) and celery ( 49 acres and $0.6 \%$ ). Other major crops outside of the 7 selected for the purposes of this study included corn, berries, beans, peas and turnip.

## 4. Cash Revenues

Total cash revenues generated by the 25 responding farms were $\$ 15.2$ million in 1991 (or an average of $\$ 609,994$ per farm). It should be noted that, due to difficulties in generating responses from 25 farms matching all the sample selection criteria, 2 of the farms included in our sample actually did not meet the minimum revenue criterion of $\$ 150,000$, with cash revenues of $\$ 66,000$ and $\$ 121,000$ respectively. Cash revenues per farm thus ranged from a low of $\$ 66,000$ to a high of $\$ 2.8$ million. As indicated below, $44.0 \%$ of the farms surveyed ( $84.0 \%$ ) had cash revenues of $\$ 250,000$ to $\$ 499,999$ and an additional $40.0 \%$ of farms had cash revenues in excess of $\$ 500,000$.

CASH REVENUES OF FARMS SURVEYED

| Cash Revenues | Respondents |  | Cash Revenues |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Amount | \% |
| Less than \$250,000 | 4 | 16.0\% | \$636,324 | 4.2\% |
| \$250,000-\$500,000 | 11 | 44.0\% | 4,069,786 | 26.7 |
| Over \$500,000 | 10 | 40.0 | 10,543,740 | 69.1 |
| Total | 25 | 100.0 | 15,249,850 | 100.0 |
| Average: |  |  | \$609,994 |  |

Vegetable crop sales, at $\$ 13.0$ million, represented about $85.7 \%$ of total cash revenues for the 25 respondents, or an average of $\$ 521,146$ per farm. Overall, as indicated in Table 2.1, the 7 crops selected for the purposes of this study accounted for $\$ 7.5$ million or $49.0 \%$ of total cash revenues for the 25 farms. Leading crops included potatoes ( $\$ 2.9$ million or $18.8 \%$ of total cash revenues), broccoli ( $\$ 1.9$ million and $12.7 \%$ ), topped carrots ( $\$ 740,460$ and $4.8 \%$ ), green cabbage ( $\$ 638,780$ and $4.2 \%$ ), iceberg lettuce ( $\$ 598,140$ and $3.9 \%$ ), and onions ( $\$ 546,480$ and $3.6 \%$ ). Celery only represented revenues of $\$ 164,540$, or $1.1 \%$ of total cash revenues for the 25 farms.

## 5. Compensation

General Managers or owners of the 25 farms surveyed drew an average of $\$ 20,663$ in total compensation in 1991, including about $\$ 11,901$ in wages and salaries, and $\$ 8,762$ in dividends. Of the 23 farmers providing a response, $6 \mathbf{( 2 6 . 1 \%}$ ) did not draw any compensation whatsoever, while the compensation drawn by the 17 others ranged from a low of $\$ 7,000$ to a high of $\$ 71,000$. Not surprisingly, many respondents ( $82.6 \%$ ) believed that their individual compensation was somewhat disproportionate with the amount of time and effort required. On average, respondents indicated that they would have to offer a compensation package of $\$ 50,500$ or more to find and retain an individual to perform similar duties.

Similarly, the families of the general managers or owners of the 25 farms surveyed drew an average of $\$ 31,046$ in total compensation in 1991, including about $\$ 26,346$ in wages and salaries, and $\$ 4,700$ in dividends. Of the 23 farmers providing a response, 6 ( $26.1 \%$ ) indicated that family members did not draw any compensation whatsoever, while the compensation drawn by family members of the other 17 farmers ranged from a low of $\$ 6,000$ to a high of $\$ 94,000$. Here:again, many respondents ( $86.7 \%$ ) believed that family members were underpaid for the amount of time and effort put in. On average, it was estimated that the work for which family members were paid $\$ 31,046$, would have cost a minimum of $\$ 96,194$ if performed by others.

## B. REPRESENTATIVITY OF THE SAMPLE

The representativity of the sample is discussed in the following paragraphs, in terms of level of industry coverage, level of coverage by crop, and possible bias introduced by the criteria used in the sample selection process.

## 1. Level of Industry Coverage

According to the Horticultural Statistics published by the B.C. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (BCMAFF), about 9,304 acres were devoted to the production of fresh vegetables in the Lower Mainland in 1990, and fresh vegetables sales that year were about $\$ 27.8$ million (net of marketing agency handling charges). By comparison, the 25 farms in our sample had a total production acreage of 7,850 acres in 1991 (mostly devoted to the production of fresh vegetables), and total fresh vegetable sales for these 25 farms were about $\$ 13.0$ million in 1991 (net of marketing agency handling charges). Assuming that sales and acreage remained fairly stable between 1990 and 1991, it can thus be estimated that the 25 farms in our sample represent between $42.8 \%$ (sales) and $84.4 \%$ (acreage) of the total population of fresh vegetable farms in the Lower Mainland.

## 2. Level of Coverage by Crop

One of the key objectives of the study was to ensure that cost of production data would be obtained for a minimum of 5 of the 7 targeted crops, from at least 3 farms for each crop. The study was more than successful in meeting this objective, since information was gathered on all 7 crops from a minimum of 4 farms for each crop, as.indicated in Table 2.1.

The level of coverage varied substantially by crop, from a minimum of about $20 \%$ to a maximum of about $60 \%$ of the total population of fresh vegetable farms in the Lower Mainland growing each of these crops. The level of coverage was highest for broccoli ( $55.5 \%$ of total sales and $76.5 \%$ of total acreage for this crop in the Lower Mainland) and topped carrots ( $51.2 \%$ and $60.7 \%$ ), followed by potatoes ( $40.4 \%$ and $53.0 \%$ ) and green cabbage ( $39.3 \%$ and $39.0 \%$ ). The level of coverage was comparatively lower for onions ( $26.3 \%$ and $38.4 \%$ ), lettuce ( $23.4 \%$ and $35.3 \%$ ) and celery ( $15.4 \%$ and $22.3 \%$ ).

While the sample selection procedures and criteria were designed to provide greater consistency and comparability of the data, it could be argued that the results may be slightly biased towards larger operations to the extent that the study was targeted at farms with revenues of $\$ 150,000$ or more, and that these farms may enjoy some economies of scale not available to smaller operations. However, the potential for such a bias is believed to be minimal, for the following reasons:

- On average, respondents growing green cabbage, topped carrots, onions and celery devoted less than 25 acres to each of these crops. As a result, it appears highly unlikely that they benefitted from substantial economies of scale for these crops in terms of seeds, fertilizer, chemicals, etc.
- While respondents growing iceberg lettuce and potatoes devoted on average 36 acres and 93 acres to these crops respectively, statistics obtained from the B.C. Vegetable Marketing Commission suggest that these figures are reflective of the size of Lower Mainland farms specializing in these crops. For example, according to the 1991 grower intentions developed by the Commission, a total of 17 Lower Mainland growers intended to devote a total of 541 acres to iceberg lettuce in 1991, or an average of 31.8 acres per farm. Similarly, a total of about 70 Lower Mainland growers intended to devote a total of 4,788 acres to potatoes in 1991, or an average of 68.4 acres per farm.
- Given the limited number of broccoli growers in the Lower Mainland, the respondents in our sample, which represent over $75 \%$ of the total acreage for this crop in the Lower Mainland, are believed to be highly representative of this segment of the fresh vegetable industry.


## III. COMPOSITE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Of the 25 farms surveyed for the purposes of this study, only 24 were able or willing to provide a complete set of financial statements. Based on the detailed information provided by these 24 farms, we developed a composite income statement and balance sheet for fresh vegetable farms in the Fraser Valley. A detailed description of these statements and of the methodology used in preparing them is provided in this chapter.

## A. INCOME STATEMENT

In order to prepare a composite income statement for vegetable farms in the Fraser Valley, the income statements provided by the 24 respondents were adjusted and restated on an accrual basis in order to provide a more accurate depiction of revenues and expenses actually incurred during the 1991 crop season. As part of this process, the value of production for each farm was computed by adjusting cash revenues to reflect changes in inventory and accounts receivable. Similarly, accrued expenses were computed by adjusting cash expenses to reflect changes in inventory and in accounts payable.

Using this methodology, the average value of production per farm was estimated at $\$ 637,313$ in 1991 , yielding an average net income before tax of $\$ 18,179$, or $2.9 \%$ of sales. As indicated in Table 3.1, leading sources of expenses included contract labour ( $32.6 \%$ of sales), fertilizer ( $8.1 \%$ of sales), land taxes $(7.8 \%$ ) and other labour and management salaries ( $7.1 \%$ of sales). A description of the major accounts of the composite income statement is provided below.

## a. Value of Production (Net of Co-op Handling Charges)

For the purposes of this study, revenues were broken down into vegetable crop sales, other crop sales, livestock sales, government receipts, other farm income and non-farm income. As indicated in Table 3.1, the value of production averaged $\$ 637,313$ per farm in 1991, and ranged from $\$ 68,500$ to $\$ 2,944,680$. Vegetable crop sales, which were recorded net of co-op handling charges (since none of the farmers surveyed were able to provide estimates of gross vegetable revenues), accounted for $85.2 \%$ of this total, or $\$ 542,963$. Other leading sources of revenues included other crops $(\$ 41,309$ or $6.5 \%$ of total revenues) and livestock ( $2.6 \%$ ). Non-farm income such as interest on investments represented only $1.9 \%$ of total revenues.
b. Direct Expenses (Net of Co-op Handling Charges)

For the purposes of this study, direct expenses were defined as those expenses which are used directly by a farm enterprise and do not have to be allocated. As such, they include seeds and plants, fertilizer, pest control and chemicals, contract labour, irrigation water and power, fuel and lube, machinery repair and maintenance, cartons and packaging, washing and grading, as well as various other items such as marketing costs and livestock supplies and expenses. Co-op handling charges were not included in our analysis since none of the farmers were able to provide an estimate of their magnitude. With these considerations in mind, the total direct expenses for the 24 responding farms averaged $\$ 426,735$ in 1991 ( $67.0 \%$ of total revenues), and ranged from $\$ 62,300$ to $\$ 1,584,870$, allowing for an average gross profit of $\$ 210,578$ ( $33.0 \%$ of sales). Major sources of direct expenses are summarized below:

## - Contract Labour

For the purposes of this study, contract labour comprised all contract and hired labour. As indicated in Table 3.1, the 24 responding farms spent an average of $\$ 207,911$ in wages and salaries and benefits for contract labour in 1991 ( $32.6 \%$ of total revenues and $48.7 \%$ of total direct expenses).

- Fertilizer

As indicated in Table 3.1, fertilizers were the second largest direct expense, averaging $\$ 51,565$ per farm ( $8.1 \%$ of total revenues and $12.1 \%$ of total direct expenses).

- $\quad$ Seeds and Plants

Seeds and plants were the third largest source of direct expense and averaged a cost of $\$ 33,464$ per farm ( $5.3 \%$ of total revenues and $7.8 \%$ of total direct expenses). These figures should, however, be taken with relative caution since a number of
farms (particularly potato farms) grow their own seeds, thereby reducing the amount of recorded seed and plant expense.

- Pest Control and Chemicals

The average farm spent $\$ 28,402$ or a mere $4.5 \%$ of total revenues and $6.7 \%$ of total direct expenses on pest control and chemicals in 1991.

- Machinery Repair and Maintenance

The average farm spent $\$ 27,642$ or $4.3 \%$ of total revenues and $6.4 \%$ of total direct expenses on machinery repair and maintenance.

- Cartons and Packaging

Cartons and packaging averaged a cost of $\$ 26,091$ per farm or $4.1 \%$ of total revenues and $6.1 \%$ of total direct expenses. These figures should, however, be taken with relative caution since cartons and packaging are typically covered by the co-op handling charges which, as explained above, were not included in our analysis. As a result, the amounts shown here for cartons and packaging only reflect expenses incurred for sales to clients other than the co-op or marketing agencies.

- Fuel and Lube

Fuel and lube was a relatively minor source of direct expense and represented an average cost per farm of $\$ 19,577$, equal to $3.1 \%$ of total revenues and $4.6 \%$ of total direct expenses.

- Other Direct Expenses

Other direct expenses included irrigation water and power, washing and grading, livestock supplies and expenses and other marketing and direct costs. Altogether,
they represented an average of $\$ 32,084$ per farm, or $5.0 \%$ of total revenues and $7.5 \%$ of total direct expenses. Here again, these figures should be taken with relative caution since washing and grading is typically covered by the co-op handling charges which, as explained above, were not included in our analysis. As a result, the amounts shown here for washing and grading only reflect expenses incurred for sales to clients other than the co-op or marketing agencies. Furthermore, the cost of irrigation water and power is likely an under-estimate. Indeed, most of the farms surveyed are using tractor-mounted and/or powered type of irrigation equipment, thus showing very low expense amounts for irrigation water and power.

## c. Indirect Expenses

For the purposes of this study, indirect expenses were defined as general and administrative expenses and included land taxes and rent, labour and management salaries, legal and accounting, insurance and licenses, utilities, interest and bank charges, miscellaneous, and depreciation. The average total indirect expense per farm was $\$ 192,400$ in 1991 ( $30.2 \%$ of total revenues), and ranged from a low of $\$ 28,000$ to a high of $\$ 646,700$. Major sources of indirect expenses were as follows:

- Land Rent

The average farm spent $\$ 49,845$ on land rent in 1991, equal to $7.8 \%$ of total revenues and $31.2 \%$ of total indirect expenses. Since the average farm rented about 227 acres of land, the average rent per acre of land can thus be estimated at about $\$ 220$, which is consistent with, albeit slightly higher than, the actual weighed average rent per acre presented in Chapter I (\$204).

- Labour and Management Wages and Salaries

This category included all wages and salaries, except those paid to contract and hired labour. As indicated in Table 3.1, labour and management wages and salaries averaged $\$ 45,093$ per farm, or $7.1 \%$ of total revenues and $28.3 \%$ of total indirect expenses. It is to be noted that the amount of wages and salaries included in this
category does not necessarily provide an accurate measurement of actual management compensation since it ignores any dividends paid to the farmer and/or his family. As indicated in Chapter I, the 25 farmers in our sample and their family drew an average of $\$ 13,462$ in dividends in addition to their wages and salaries reported on the income statement.

- Depreciation

Depreciation averaged $\$ 32,869$ per farm in 1991, equal to $5.2 \%$ of total revenues and $17.1 \%$ of total indirect expenses.

- Interest

Total interest and bank charges averaged $\$ 17,070$ per farm in 1991 ( $2.7 \%$ of total revenues and $10.7 \%$ of total indirect expenses), including $\$ 9,524$ for operating interest and service charges and $\$ 7,546$ for interest on term loans.

- Insurance and Licenses

The average farm spent $\$ 7,722$ on insurance and licenses in 1991 , equal to $1.2 \%$ of total revenues and $4.8 \%$ of total indirect expenses.

Utilities

Utilities averaged $\$ 7,586$ per farm in 1991 , or $1.2 \%$ of total revenues and $4.8 \%$ of total indirect expenses.

- Land Taxes

Land taxes averaged $\$ 6,065$ per farm in 1991, or $1.0 \%$ of total revenues and $3.8 \%$ of total indirect expenses.

## - Other Indirect Expenses

Other direct expenses included legal and accounting and miscellaneous. Altogether, they represented an average of $\$ 26,149$ per farm, or $4.1 \%$ of total revenues and $16.4 \%$ of total indirect expenses.

## d. Net Income Before Tax

The average net income before tax for the 24 farms surveyed was $\$ 18,179$ ( $2.9 \%$ of total revenues), and ranged from a loss of $(\$ 78,410)$ to a profit of $\$ 238,440$. In other words, the average farm generated a net income of 2.9 cents per every dollar of revenue (value of production), while the remaining 97.1 cents were used to cover operating and fixed expenses. It should be noted that $\mathbf{4 4 . 4 \%}$ of the farms surveyed experienced a loss in 1991 (average loss of $\$ 32,406$, equal to $4.8 \%$ of total revenues for these farms). An additional $27.8 \%$ of farms generated a profit before tax of less than $\$ 50,000$ in 1991 (average of $\$ 30,937$ or $5.5 \%$ of total revenues), while the remaining $27.8 \%$ generated a net income before tax of $\$ 50,000$ or more (average of $\$ 97,145$ or $9.4 \%$ of total revenues). Based on the survey results, there was no obvious correlation between the size of the farm and the net income generated.

## B. BALANCE SHEET

In order to prepare a composite balance sheet for vegetable farms in the Fraser Valley, balance sheets were obtained from the 18 incorporated farms in our sample and balance sheets for the remaining 7 farms were developed during the interview process. A description of the major accounts of the composite balance sheet is provided below.

## 1. Asset Structure

For the purposes of this study, assets were broken down into current and intermediate and fixed assets, and were entered at fair market value, which was defined as the price at which the asset could be sold, given a reasonable time period. As shown in Table 3.2, today's fresh vegetable farms require substantial capital investments, and total assets averaged about $\$ 1.96$ million per farm. Land was by far the largest and most
valuable asset ( $\$ 1.31$ million or $67.2 \%$ of total assets), followed by tractors, trucks and other farm equipment (\$276,657 and 14.0\%) and houses and cars (\$176,782 and 9.0\%).

## a. Current Assets

Current assets consist of cash on hand, accounts receivable and inventories. Total current assets for the 24 responding farms averaged $\$ 172,971$ in 1991 ( $8.8 \%$ of total assets).

- Cash on Hand

As indicated in Table 3.2, cash on hand averaged $\$ 61,184$ per farm or $3.1 \%$ of total assets and $35.4 \%$ of total current assets.

- Accounts Receivable

Accounts receivable (mostly composed of accounts receivable from the trade) averaged $\$ 75,295$ per farm and accounted for an average of $3.8 \%$ of total assets and $43.5 \%$ of total current assets.

- Inventory

As indicated in Table 3.2, total inventories (mostly composed of crop, seeds and fertilizer inventory) for the 24 responding farms averaged $\$ 36,492$ in 1991, or $1.9 \%$ of total assets and $21.1 \%$ of total current assets. As a rule, these inventory figures should be used with relative caution due to the fact that many farms did not value inventories on their balance sheets, and were only able to provide a best estimate.
b. Intermediate and Fixed Assets

Intermediate and fixed assets consist of general farm equipment, tractors and trucks, houses and cars and investments in land. Total intermediate and fixed assets for the 24 responding farms averaged $\$ 1.78$ million in 1991 , or $91.2 \%$ of total assets (at market value).

As indicated in Figure 3.2, the market value of land averaged $\$ 1.31$ million per farm or $67.2 \%$ of total assets and $73.7 \%$ of total intermediate and fixed assets. Based on the information supplied by the respondents, these figures translate into an average market value of $\$ 12,313$ per acre of land owned by the 25 farms.

- Houses and Cars

The market value of houses and cars averaged $\$ 176,782$ per farm or $9.0 \%$ of total assets and $9.9 \%$ of total intermediate and fixed assets.

- Tractors and Trucks

As indicated in Table 3.2, the market value of tractors and trucks averaged \$147,532 per farm or $7.5 \%$ of total assets and $8.3 \%$ of total intermediate and fixed assets.

- General Farm Equipment

General farm equipment consist primarily of general tillage equipment, planters, sprayers and harvesters and irrigation equipment. General farm equipment for the 24 responding farms averaged $\$ 129,125$ in 1991 , or $6.6 \%$ of total assets and $7.2 \%$ of total intermediate and fixed assets.

## 2. Financial Structure

The following paragraphs provide a description of the financial structure of the 25 fresh vegetable farms surveyed and of the manner in which their assets are financed. For the purposes of this study, liabilities were broken down into current and intermediate and long-term liabilities. As shown in Table 3.2, about $\$ 379,769$ of the average farm's $\$ 1.96$ million in total assets (19.0\%) was financed by debt capital in 1991 , while the remaining $81.0 \%$ was financed by the owner's equity. In other words, the sector had a leverage factor (ratio of total debt to total assets) of $19.0 \%$.

Current liabilities as defined for the purposes of this study included accounts payable and working capital or operating loans. Current liabilities averaged $\$ 78,826$ per farm in 1991 , or $4.0 \%$ of total assets and $20.8 \%$ of total liabilities. Accounts payable and operating loans averaged $\$ 38,381$ and $\$ 40,444$ per farm respectively.
b. Intermediate and Long-Term Liabilities

Intermediate and long-term liabilities consist of equipment loans, land loans and mortgages, ALDA loans and shareholder's loans. For the purposes of this study, loans payable consist of intermediate and long-term debt minus the current maturities of such debts, which we have included in "current liabilities". Intermediate and long-term liabilities averaged $\$ 300,943$ per farm in 1991 , or $15.4 \%$ of total assets and $\mathbf{7 9 . 2 \%}$ of total liabilities.

- Land Loans/Mortgages

As indicated in Figure 3.2, land loans/mortgages averaged $\$ 158,488$ per farm or $8.1 \%$ of total assets and $41.7 \%$ of total liabilities.

- Shareholder's Loans

Shareholder's loans averaged $\$ 124,333$ per farm or $6.4 \%$ of total assets and 32.7.\% of total liabilities. Although every effort was made to identify non-interest bearing shareholder's loans (which were entered as equity), these results may still slightly over-estimate actual "real" shareholder's loans, i.e. those with a stated schedule of interest and repayment.
c. Equity

Equity is defined as total assets minus total liabilities, or the actual value of the owner's share of the assets, as opposed to lenders' claims. Total equity for the 24 responding firms averaged $\$ 1.58$
million, or $80.6 \%$ of total assets. In other words, owners would be left with an average of $\$ 1.58$ million if their assets were sold at fair market value and all the debt was repaid with the proceeds.

## IV. RATIO ANALYSIS

Ratios are useful tools of financial statement analysis because they conveniently summarize data in a form that is more easily understood, interpreted and compared. For the purposes of this study, we will distinguish between 4 different types of ratios:

- Production and activity ratios;
- Profitability ratios;
- Liquidity ratios;
- Leverage ratios.

It should however be noted that a ratio is not a meaningful number in itself and only becomes really useful by comparison. For example, the ratios for the fresh vegetable farms in the Fraser Valley will become a lot more meaningful when they can be computed for several years and compared over time to see if the sector is improving or deteriorating. Similarly, the ratios for the fresh vegetable farms in the Fraser Valley could also be compared to those of other regions in the same industry. Unfortunately, there is currently very little information available on the financial structure and performance of fresh vegetable farms in other parts of North America.

## A. PRODUCTION AND ACTIVITY RATIOS

Production and activity ratios provide an indication of how effectively a firm is utilizing its resources. For our purposes, we have measured activity using production yields per acre, the fixed asset turnover and total asset turnover ratios as described below:

## 1. Production Yields

Based on the responses provided by the 25 farms surveyed, average production yields per acre were developed for each of the 7 crops targeted in this study, as follows:

- Iceberg Lettuce: 697 cases per acre
- Broccoli: 3.0 tonnes per acre
- Green Cabbage: 18.3 tonnes per acre
- Topped Carrots: 27.7 tonnes per acre
- Onions: 21.0 tonnes per acre
- Celery: 708 cases per acre
- Potatoes: 13.7 tonnes per acre

These production yields are relatively consistent with those found in a number of recently published studies and statistics, such as the "Planning for Profit" guidelines published by the B.C. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (BCMAFF).

## 2. Fixed Asset Turnover

For the purposes of this study, the fixed asset turnover ratio was calculated by dividing total sales by the investment in intermediate and fixed assets. The ratio shows how effectively the operation is using its fixed assets. However, it should be noted that the ratio will vary depending upon the extent to which the operation leases, rather than owns, its fixed assets (especially land). In addition, the ratio should be interpreted with relative caution since all intermediate and fixed assets were entered at fair market value, which can be extremely subjective. With these considerations in mind, the average fixed asset turnover ratio for the 25 farms in our sample was 0.36 in 1991. In other words, it would take on average about 2.78 years of revenues based on current sales to equal the value of the fixed assets used by each farm.

## 3. Total Asset Turnover

For the purposes of this study, the total asset turnover ratio was calculated by dividing total sales by the market value of all assets. The ratio shows how effectively the operation is using its assets. As was the case for the fixed asset turnover ratio, this ratio will vary depending upon the extent to which the operation leases, rather than owns, its fixed assets, and should be interpreted with relative caution since assets were entered at fair market value. With these considerations in mind, the total asset turnover ratio for the sector was 0.33 in 1991. In other words, it would take on average about 3.03 years of revenues based on current sales to equal the value of all the assets used by each farm.

## B. PROFITABILITY RATIOS

Profitability ratios provide an indication of the relative financial returns of an operation. For our purposes, we have measured profitability using the contribution margin, return on sales (before and after interest), return on total assets, and return on equity ratios as described below:

## 1. Contribution Margin

The contribution margin is calculated by dividing sales less direct expenses by sales. This ratio provides an indication of how effectively the operation is employing its factors of production including contract labour, seeds and plants, fertilizer and chemicals, and machinery. It also provides an indication of how sensitive net income is to variations in the level of sales. As indicated in Table 4.1, the contribution margin averaged $33.0 \%$ for the 25 farms surveyed in the 1991 crop season, which is believed to be fairly high given the labourintensive nature of the fresh vegetable industry.

## 2. Return on Sales (before and after interest)

Return on sales is calculated by dividing net income before tax (either before or after interest) by total sales. The ratio reflects both the contribution margin of the operation and its ability to control fixed and indirect expenses. As indicated in Table 4.1, the return on sales before interest averaged $5.5 \%$ for the sector in 1991, while the return on sales after interest averaged $2.9 \%$.

## 3. Return on Total Assets

Return on assets is calculated by dividing net income (before interest and taxes) by total assets. The ratio expresses the pre-tax return on total assets and measures the effectiveness of the operation in employing its resources. As indicated in Table 4.1, the return on assets for the 25 farms in our sample averaged $1.8 \%$ in 1991.

## 4. Return on Equity

Return on equity is calculated by dividing net income before tax by total equity. This ratio expresses the rate of return on the capital employed. While it can serve as an indicator of financial performance, it should be used carefully. For example, a high return, normally associated with effective management, could indicate an undercapitalized firm or a policy of not retaining profits in the business. As indicated in Table 4.1, the return on equity for the 25 farms in our sample averaged $1.2 \%$ in 1991, which is relatively low in consideration of the fact that farmers and their families earned an average of only $\$ 20,663$ and $\$ 31,046$ respectively in 1991 , including $\$ 8,762$ and $\$ 4,700$ respectively in dividends, for work that would have cost about $\$ 50,000$ and $\$ 95,000$ respectively if performed by others with no vested interest in the farm. Based on this information, actual pre-tax return on equity after payment of dividends to the farmers and their families for work performed averages only $0.3 \%$ or $\$ 4,717$ per farm.

## C. LIOUIDITY RATIOS

Liquidity ratios provide an indication of an operation's ability to meet its financial obligations. For our purposes, we have measured liquidity using the current ratio, which is computed by dividing current assets by current liabilities. Current assets normally include cash, accounts receivable, and inventory. Current liabilities consist of accounts payable, short-term notes, current maturities of long-term debt, accrued income taxes, and other accrued expenses (most notably, wages). For our purposes, we have defined current liabilities as accounts payable and working capital loans.

As indicated in Table 4.1, the current ratio for all respondents was 2.19 in 1991. A ratio greater than 2 is usually considered as a positive indication of a firm's liquidity and financial position.

## D. LEVERAGE RATIOS

Leverage ratios measure the funds supplied by owners to the funds provided by the firm's creditors (such as banks and suppliers). For our purposes, we have measured leverage using the debt to equity ratio, the times interest earned ratio, the debt per acre ratio, the total asset per acre ratio and the depreciable assets per acre ratio, as described below.

## 1. Debt-Equity Ratio

The debt to equity ratio is calculated by dividing the total liabilities of the operation by the total equity. This ratio provides an indication of the percentage of total funds provided by creditors relative to that provided by the owners, as well as an indication of a firm's ability to take on additional debt. As indicated in Table 4.1, the debt to equity ratio for the sector was $24.1 \%$ in 1991, which would tend to suggest that farms in our sample are not highly leveraged and have a relatively good flexibility for future borrowing.

## 2. Debt per Production Acre

The debt per production acre ratio. is calculated by dividing the total liabilities of the operation by the total number of production acres. This ratio provides a measure of the risk of the farm related to the earning capacity of an acre. The higher the debt per acre, the more difficult it will be to continue meeting the obligations of the farm. As indicated in Table 4.1, total debt averaged $\$ 1,209$ per production acre for the 25 farms surveyed.

## 3. Total Assets per Production Acre

The total assets per production acre ratio is calculated by dividing the total assets (less house and cars) of the operation by the total number of production acres. This ratio provides a measure of the amount of money invested per acre. As indicated in Table 4.1, total assets per production acre averaged $\$ 5,671$ for the 25 farms surveyed.

## 4. Depréciable Assets per Production Acre

The depreciable assets per production acre ratio is calculated by dividing the depreciable assets (i.e. total assets minus land) of the operation by the total number of production acres. This provides a measure of the amount of money invested per acre in assets which are losing value and will need replacement at some point in time in the future. The higher the value, the more depreciation expense which will have to be covered per acre. As indicated in Table 4.1, total depreciable assets per production acre averaged $\$ 1,495$ for the 25 farms surveyed.

The times interest earned ratio is computed by dividing net income before interest and taxes by the interest expense. This ratio is a measure of an operation's ability to meet interest payments. As indicated in Table 4.1, the times interest earned ratio for the 25 farms surveyed was 2.06 in 1991, which is not surprising given their low debt ratio, and which confirms their ability to both meet interest payments and take on additional debt.

## V. ENTERPRISE ANALYSIS

Based on the production and financial information provided by the 25 respondents, we developed detailed enterprise analyses for each of the 7 crops targeted for the purposes of this study. In particular, we worked with respondents to obtain a breakdown of revenues and direct costs by crop, and the allocated direct costs were then analyzed to develop a composite cost of production and gross margin analysis for each crop (indirect expenses were not allocated). As was the case for the composite statements presented in Chapter III, all revenues were recorded net of co-op handling charges (since none of the farmers surveyed were able to provide estimates of gross vegetable revenues), and co-op handling charges were thus not included in our analysis of direct expenses. As a result, the amounts shown for cartons and packaging, and washing and grading (which are typically covered by the co-op handling charges) only reflect expenses incurred for sales to clients other than the co-op or marketing agencies. Each crop was also analyzed in terms of total production and production sold, as well as in terms of inputs such as seeds, fertilizer and contract labour. This chapter summarizes our major findings with respect to each of the 7 crops targeted in the study.

## A. ICEBERG LETTUCE

The results of our enterprise analysis as they pertain to iceberg lettuce are summarized in the following paragraphs.

## 1. Production Analysis

As indicated in Table 5.1, the 5 farms in our sample growing iceberg lettuce devoted a total of 180 acres to this crop in 1991 (average of 36.0 acres per farm), and iceberg lettuce production acreage per farm ranged from a low of 5 acres to a high of 67 acres. Total production for the 5 farms was 125,393 cases, which represented an average of 697 cases per acre. Total production sold averaged 662 cases per acre, or $95.0 \%$ of total production.

## 2. Enterprise Analysis

Total value of production per acre for iceberg lettuce averaged $\$ 3,323$ (net of co-op charges), allowing for an average gross margin per acre of $\$ 1,195$ (or $36.0 \%$ of the value of production). As indicated in Table 5.1,
contract labour was by far the largest source of direct expenses ( $\$ 1,082$ per acre or $32.6 \%$ of sales), followed by seeds and plants (\$269 and 8.1\%), cartons and packaging (\$235 and 7.1\%) and fertilizer (\$187 and 5.6\%).

## 3. Input Analysis

As indicated in Table 5.1, the farms in our sample used an average of about 80,000 seeds and 442 kilograms of fertilizer per production acre of iceberg lettuce. Contract labour represented a total of 250 hours per acre, at an average hourly rate of $\$ 6.77$.

## B. BROCCOLI

The results of our enterprise analysis as they pertain to broccoli are summarized in the following paragraphs.

## 1. Production Analysis

As indicated in Table 5.2, the 4 farms in our sample growing broccoli devoted a total of 1,124 acres to this crop in 1991 (an average of 281.0 acres per farm), and broccoli production acreage per farm ranged from a low of 74 acres to a high of 600 acres. Total production for the 4 farms was 3,321 tonnes, or an average of 3.0 tonnes per acre. Spoilage was again minimal and total production sold averaged 2.8 tonnes per acre, or $95.5 \%$ of total production.

## 2. Enterprise Analysis

Based on the responses provided by the 4 farms in our sample, the average value of production for broccoli was $\$ 1,818$ per acre (net of co-op charges), allowing for an average gross margin of about $\$ 349$ per acre (or $19.2 \%$ of the value of production). As indicated in Table 5.2, leading sources of direct expenses included contract labour ( $\$ 796$ per acre or $43.8 \%$ of sales), cartons and packaging ( $\$ 201$ and $11.1 \%$ ), fertilizer ( $\$ 137$ and $7.5 \%$ ), seeds and plants ( $\$ 99$ and $5.4 \%$ ), and pest control and chemicals ( $\$ 90$ and $4.9 \%$ ).

## 3. Input Analysis

As indicated in Table 5.2, the 4 farms in our sample used an average of about 0.13 kilograms of seeds and 281 kilograms of fertilizer per production acre devoted to broccoli. Contract labour represented a total of 132 hours per acre, at an average of $\$ 6.00$ per hour.

## C. GREEN CABBAGE

The results of our enterprise analysis as they pertain to green cabbage are summarized in the following paragraphs.

## 1. Production Analysis

As indicated in Table 5.3, the total production acreage devoted by the 8 farms in our sample to green cabbage was 164 acres in 1991 (or an average of 20.5 acres per farm), and ranged from a low of 2 acres to a high of 70 acres. Total production for the 8 farms was 3,006 tonnes, or an average of 18.3 tonnes per acre. Total production sold averaged 15.7 tonnes per acre and represented about $85.8 \%$ of total production.

## 2. Enterprise Analysis

Total average value of production per acre was $\$ 3,934$ (net of co-op charges), and average gross margin per acre was $\$ 1,303$ per acre (or $33.1 \%$ of the value of production). Contract labour was by far the largest single direct expense ( $\$ 1,661$ per acre or $42.2 \%$ of sales), followed by seeds and plants ( $\$ 311$ and $7.9 \%$ ), fertilizer ( $\$ 220$ and $5.6 \%$ ), pest control and chemicals ( $\$ 156$ and $4.0 \%$ ), and fuel and lube ( $\$ 123$ and 3.1\%).

## 3. Input Analysis

As indicated in Table 5.3, the farms in our sample used an average of about 21,000 plants and 487 kilograms of fertilizer per production acre devoted to green cabbage. Contract labour represented a total of 255 hours per acre, at an average of rate of $\$ 6.49$ per hour.

## D. TOPPED CARROTS

The results of our enterprise analysis as they pertain to topped carrots are summarized in the following paragraphs.

## 1. Production Analysis

As indicated in Table 5.4, the 7 farms growing topped carrots in our sample devoted a total of 164 acres to this crop in 1991 (or an average of 23.4 acres per farm), and topped carrots production acreage per farm ranged from a low of 12 acres to a high of 42 acres. Total production averaged 27.7 tonnes per acre. However, spoilage was quite significant and total production sold averaged only 20.9 tonnes per acre, or $75.4 \%$ of total production.

## 2. Enterprise Analysis

Total average value of production was $\$ 4,579$ per acre (net of co-op charges), allowing for a relatively high gross margin per acre of $\$ 3,033$ (or $66.2 \%$ of the value of production). Major direct expenses included contract labour ( $\$ 428$ per acre or $9.4 \%$ of sales), fertilizer ( $\$ 229$ and $5.0 \%$ ), seeds and plants ( $\$ 210$ and $4.6 \%$ ), and pest control and chemicals (\$208 and 4.5\%).

## 3. Input Analysis

Farms in our sample used an average of about 637,000 seeds and 476 kilograms of fertilizer per production acre devoted to topped carrots. Contract labour represented a total of 44 hours per acre, at an average of hourly wage rate of $\$ 8.29$.

## E. ONIONS

The results of our enterprise analysis as they pertain to onions are summarized in the following paragraphs.

## 1. Production Analysis

The 6 farms growing onions in our sample devoted a total of 116 acres to this crop in 1991 (or an average of 19.3 acres per farm), and onion production acreage per farm ranged from a low of 13 acres to a high of 36 acres. Total production averaged 21.0 tonnes per acre, and total production sold averaged 18.0 tonnes per acre (about $86.0 \%$ of total production).

## 2. Enterprise Analysis

Total average value of production per acre was $\$ 4,839$ per acre (net of co-op charges), and the average gross margin per acre was relatively high, at $\$ 3,042$ ( $62.9 \%$ of the value of production). As indicated in Table 5.5, leading sources of direct expenses included contract labour ( $\$ 505$ per acre or $10.4 \%$ of sales), pest control and chemicals (\$333 and 6.9\%), fertilizer (\$274 and 5.7\%), and seeds and plants (\$229 and 4.7\%).

## 3. Input Analysis

Farms in our sample used an average of about 345,000 seeds and 436 kilograms of fertilizer per production acre devoted to onions. Contract labour represented a total of 63 hours per acre, at an average of $\$ 6.37$ per hour.

## F. CELERY

The results of our enterprise analysis as they pertain to celery are summarized in the following paragraphs.

1. Production Analysis

As indicated in Table 5.6, the total production acreage devoted by the 5 farms in our sample to celery was 49 acres in 1991 (or an average of 9.8 acres per farm), and ranged from a low of 5 acres to a high of 18 acres. Total production for 4 of the 5 farms in our sample was 28,309 cases, or an average of 708 cases per acre. Due to high levels of spoilage, total production sold averaged only 450 cases per acre, or $63.6 \%$ of total production.

## 2. Enterprise Analysis

Based on the responses provided by 4 of the 5 farms in our sample, the average value of production for celery was about $\$ 3,355$ per acre (net of co-op charges), allowing for a relatively modest gross margin of $\$ 674$ per acre ( $20.1 \%$ of the value of production). Contract labour was by far the largest single direct expense (\$1,286 or $38.3 \%$ of sales), followed by seeds and plants ( $\$ 546$ and $16.3 \%$ ), fertilizer ( $\$ 304$ and $9.1 \%$ ) and pest control and chemicals ( $\$ 251$ and $7.5 \%$ ).

## 3. Input Analysis

Farms in our sample used an average of about 28,000 plants and 500 kilograms of fertilizer per production acre devoted to celery. None of the farmers surveyed were able to provide an estimate of the number of hours of contract labour per production acre. However, based on a cost of $\$ 1,286$ per acre and an hourly wage rate of about $\$ 6.50$, contract labour per acre can be estimated at about 198 hours per acre.

## G. POTATOES

The results of our enterprise analysis as they pertain to potatoes are summarized in the following paragraphs.

## 1. Production Analysis

As indicated in Table 5.7, the 18 farms in our sample growing potatoes dedicated a total of 1,669 acres to this crop in 1991 (or an average of 92.7 acres per farm), and potato production acreage per farm ranged from a low of 2 acres to a high of 200 acres. Total production averaged 13.7 tonnes per acre. Crop spoilage was minimal and total production sold averaged 12.4 tonnes per acre, or $90.3 \%$ of total production.

## 2. Enterprise Analysis

Based on the responses provided by 17 of the 18 farms in our sample, the average value of production for potatoes was about $\$ 1,789$ per acre (net of co-op charges), and the average gross margin per acre was relatively high at $\$ 693$ ( $38.7 \%$ of the value of production). Leading direct expenses included contract labour
(\$385 per acre or $21.5 \%$ of sales), fertilizer (\$198 and 11.1\%), seeds and plants (\$142 and 7.9\%), machinery repair and maintenance ( $\$ 133$ and $7.4 \%$ ) and pest control and chemicals ( $\$ 122$ and $6.8 \%$ ).

## 3. Input Analysis

As indicated in Table 5.7, the farms in our sample used an average of about 711 kilograms of seeds and 442 kilograms of fertilizer per production acre devoted to potatoes. Contract labour represented a total of 53 hours per acre, at an average of hourly wage rate of \$7.47.
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COMPOSITE INCOME STATEMENT (VALUE OF PRODUCTION), 1991 CROP SEASON

|  | Number of Farms Responding | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cash | Inventory | Account | Value of |  |
| Revenue: |  | Sales | Change | Receivables | Production |  |
| Vegetable Crop Sales | 24 | 522,509 | 2,284 | 18,170 | 542,963 | 85.2\% |
| Other Crop Sales | 24 | 39,114 | 4 | 2,192 | 41,310 | 6.5\% |
| Livestock Sales | 24 | 16,408 |  | 23 | 16,431 | 2.6\% |
| Government Receipts | 24 | 3,241 | ---- | 2,950 | 6,191 | 1.0\% |
| Other Farmincome | 24 | 16,313 | ---- | 1,696 | 18,009 | 2.8\% |
| Non-Farmincome | 25 | 12,409 | ---- | 0 | 12,409 | 1.9\% |
|  |  | 609,994 | 2,288 | 25,031 | 637,313 | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Cash | Inventory | Account | Acrued |  |
| Direct Expenses: |  | Expenses | Change | Payable | Expense |  |
| Seeds \& Plants | 24 | 33,005 | 129 | 330 | 33,464 | 5.3\% |
| Fertilizer | 24 | 49,903 | 152 | 1,510 | 51,565 | 8.1\% |
| Pest Control \& Chemicals | 24 | 28,039 | (39) | 402 | 28,402 | 4.5\% |
| Contract Labour | 24 | 199,712 | ---- | 8,199 | 207,911 | 32.6\% |
| Irrigation Water \& Power | 24 | 1,073 | ---- | (25) | 1,048 | 0.2\% |
| Fuel \& Lube | 24 | 18,660 | 83 | 834 | 19,577 | 3.1\% |
| Machinery Repair \& Maintenance | 24 | 26,379 | ---- | 1,263 | 27,642 | 4.3\% |
| Cartons \& Packaging | 24 | 28,082 | (165) | $(1,826)$ | 26,091 | 4.1\% |
| Washing \& Grading | 24 | 0 | ---- | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Other Marketing Costs | 24 | 2,619 | ---- | (393) | 2,226 | 0.3\% |
| Livestock Supplies \& Expenses | 24 | 10,560 | $(2,083)$ | (7) | 8,470 | 1.3\% |
| Othe Direct Expenses | 24 | 19,615 | 155 | 569 | 20,339 | 3.2\% |
|  |  | 417,647 | $(1,768)$ | 10,856 | 426,735 | 67.0\% |
| Gross Margin |  | 192,347 | 4,056 | 14,175 | 210,578 | 33.0\% |
| Indirect Expenses: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Taxes | 24 | 6,065 | ---- | ---- | 6,065 | 1.0\% |
| Land Rent | 24 | 49,845 | ---- | ---- | 49,845 | 7.8\% |
| Labour | 24 | 45,093 | ---- | ---- | 45,093 | 7.1\% |
| Legal \& Accounting | 24 | 4,754 | ---- | ---- | 4.754 | 0.7\% |
| Insurance \& Licenses | 24 | 7,722 | ------ | ---- | 7.722 | 1.2\% |
| Utilities | 24 | 7,586 |  | ---- | 7.586 | 1.2\% |
| Operating Interest \& Service Charges | 24 | 9,525 | ---- |  | 9,525 | 1.5\% |
| Intereston Term Loans | 24 | 7,546 | --- | ---- | 7,546 | 1.2\% |
| Miscellaneous | 24 | $\begin{array}{r} 21,395 \\ 32,869 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ----- |  | 21,395 | 3.4\% |
| Depreciation | 18 |  |  |  | 32,869 | 5.2\% |
|  |  | 192,400 | ---- | ---- | 192,400 | 30.2\% |
| NetIncome Before Tars |  | (53) | 4,056 | 14,175 | 18,179 | 2.9\% |

COMPOSITE BALANCE SHEET, 1991 CROP SEASON
AVERAGE PER FARM.

| Number of Farms Responding |  | Dollars | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Assets } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Assets: |  |  |  |
| Cash | 24 | 61,184 | 3.1\% |
| Accounts Receivable | 24 | 75,295 | 3.8\% |
| Inventory | 24 | 36,492 | 1.9\% |
|  |  | 172,971 | 8.8\% |
| Intermediate \& Fixed Assets (Market Value): |  |  |  |
| General Farm Equipment | 21 | 129,125 | 6.6\% |
| Tractors \& Trucks | 22 | 147,532 | 7.5\% |
| Houses \& Cars | 17 | 176,782 | 9.0\% |
| Land | 22 | 1,315,000 | 67.2\% |
| Other | 24 | 16,032 | 0.8\% |
|  |  | 1,784,471 | 91.2\% |
| Total Assets |  | 1,957,442 | 100.0\% |


| Current Liabilities: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accounts Payable | 24 | 38,381 | 2.0\% |
| Operating Loan | 25 | 40,444 | 2.1\% |
|  |  | 78,826 | 4.0\% |
| Intermediate \& Long Term Liabilities: |  |  |  |
| Equipment Loan | 25 | 13,015 | 0.7\% |
| Land Loan/Mortgage | 25 | 158,488 | 8.1\% |
| ALDA | 25 | 3,839 | 0.2\% |
| Shareholder's Loan | 25 | 124,333 | 6.4\% |
| Other | 25 | 1,268 | 0.1\% |
|  |  | 300,943 | 15.4\% |
| Owner's Equity |  | 1,577,673 | 80.6\% |
| Total Liabilities \& Owner's Equity |  | 1,957,442 | 100.0\% |

Total Liabilities \& Owner's Equity
Table 4.1
RATIO ANALYSIS, 1991 CROP SEASON
AVERAGE PER FARM.

Table 5.1


| Production Analysis | Number of Farms Responding |  |  |  | Total | Average per Acre |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acres in Production | 5 |  |  |  | 180 | ---- |
| Total Production (Cases) | 5 |  |  |  | 125,393 | 696.6 |
| Production Sold (Cases) | 5 |  |  |  | 119,163 | 662.0 |
| Production Sold as \% of Total |  |  |  |  | 95.0\% | - |
| Enterprise Analysis | Number of Farms Responding | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | \% of of Value of Production |
| Revenue: |  | Cash <br> Sales | Inventory Change | Account Receivables | Value of Production |  |
| Value of Production | 4 | 3,323 | 0 | 0 | 3,323 | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Cash | Inventory | Account | Accued |  |
| Direct Expenses: |  | Expenses | Change | Payable | Expense |  |
| Seeds \& Plants | 4 | 270 | (2) | 0 | 269 | 8.1\% |
| Fertilizer | 4 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 5.6\% |
| Pest Control \& Chemicals | 4 | 131 | (2) | 0 | 129 | 3.9\% |
| Contract Labour | 4 | 1,085 | ---- | (3) | 1,082 | 32.6\% |
| Irrigation Water \& Power | 4 | 2 | --- | 0 | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Fuel \& Lube | 4 | 99 | (4) | (8) | 87 | 2.6\% |
| Machinery Repair \& Maintenance | 4 | 118 | ---- | (1) | 117 | 3.5\% |
| Cartons \& Packaging | 3 | 257 | (3) | (19) | 236 | 7.1\% |
| Washing \& Grading | 3 | 0 | ---- | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Other Marketing Costs | 4 | 2 | ---- | 0 | 2 | 0.1\% |
| Other Direct Expenses | 4 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0.6\% |
|  |  | 2,172 | (11) | (30) | 2,131 | 64.1\% |
| Gross Margin |  | 1,152 | 11 | 30 | 1,192 | 35.9\% |

[^0]Table 5.2


| Production Analysis | Number of Farms Responding |  |  |  | Total | Average per Acre |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acres in Production | 4 |  |  |  | 1.124 | ---- |
| Total Production (Tonnes) | 4 |  |  |  | 3,321 | 3.0 |
| Production Sold (Tonnes) | 4 |  |  |  | 3,171 | 2.8 |
| Production Sold as \% of Total |  |  |  |  | 95.5\% | ---- |
| Enterprise Analysis | Number of Farms Responding | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | \% of <br> of Value of Production |
| Revenue: | 4 | Cash <br> Sales <br> 1,719 | Inventory Change | - Account Receivables 98 | Value of Production | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Cash | Inventory | Account Payable | Accrued <br> Expense |  |
| Direct Expenses: |  | Expenses |  |  | Expense |  |
| Seeds \& Plants | 4 | 95 | 1 | 3 | 99 | 5.4\% |
| Fertilizer | 4 | 136 | 1 | (0) | 137 | 7.5\% |
| Pest Control \& Chemicals | 4 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 4.9\% |
| Contract Labour | 4 | 766 | -- | 29 | 796 | 43.8\% |
| Irrigation Water \& Power | 4 | 0 | ---- | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Fuel \& Lube | 4 | 54 | 1 | 7 | 61 | 3.4\% |
| Machinery Repair \& Maintenance | 4 | 79 |  | 5 | 84 | 4.6\% |
| Cattons \& Packaging | 4 | 216 | 0 | (15) | 201 | 11.1\% |
| Washing \& Grading | 4 | 0 | ---- | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Other Marketing Costs | 4 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Other Direct Expenses | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
|  |  | 1,436 | 3 | 29 | 1.468 | 80.8\% |
| Gross Margin |  | 283 | (3) | 69 | 349 | 19.2\% |
| Input Analysis | Number <br> of Farms |  |  |  |  | Amount |
| Number of Seeds per Acre | 4 |  |  |  |  | 0.13 |
| Fertilizer per Acre (kg) | 4 |  |  |  |  | 280.8 |
| Contract Labour (Hours per Acre) | 4 |  |  |  |  | 132 |
| Contract Labour (\$ per Hour) | 4 |  |  |  |  | \$6.00 |

Table 5.3
ENTERPRISE ANALYSIS - GREEN CABBAGE, 1991 CROP SEASON


| Production Analysis | Number of Farms Responding |  |  |  | Total | Average per Acre |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acres in Production | 8 |  |  |  | 164 | ---- |
| Total Production (Tonnes) | 8 |  |  |  | 3,006 | 18.3 |
| Production Sold (Tonnes) | 8 |  |  |  | 2,578 | 15.7 |
| Production Sold as \% of Total |  |  |  |  | 85.8\% | ---- |
| Enterprise Analysis | Number of Farms Responding | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | of Value of <br> Production |
| Revenue: |  | Cash <br> Sales | Inventory Change | Account Receivables | Value of Production 3,934 |  |
| Value of Production | 7 |  | 0 |  |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Cash | Inventory | Account | Accrued |  |
| Direct Expenses: |  | Expenses | Change | Payabl | Expense |  |
| Seeds \& Plants | 7 | 311 | 0 | 0 | - 311 | 7.9\% |
| Fertilizer | 7 | 220 | 0 | 0 | 220 | 5.6\% |
| Pest Control \& Chemicals | 7 | 156 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 4.0\% |
| Contract Labour | 7 | 1,678 | ---- | (17) | 1,661 | 42.2\% |
| Irrigation Water \& Power | 7 | 0 | ---- | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Fuel \& Lube | 7 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 3.1\% |
| Machinery Repair \& Maintenance | 7 | 103 |  | (2) | 101 | 2.6\% |
| Cattons \& Packaging | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Washing \& Grading | 7 | 0 | ---- | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Other Marketing Costs | 7 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% |
| Other Direct Expenses | 7 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 1.5\% |
| Total Direct Expenses |  | 2.649 | 0 | (18) | 2,631 | 66.9\% |
| Gross Margin |  | 1,246 | 0 | 57 | 1,303 | 33.1\% |
| Input Analysis | Number of Farms |  |  |  |  | Amount |
| Number of Plants per Acre | 6 |  |  |  |  | 20,894 |
| Fertilizer per Acre (kg) | 7 |  |  |  |  | 486.7 |
| Contract Labour (Hours per Acre) | 6 |  |  |  |  | 255 |
| Contract Labour (\$ per Hour) | 7 |  |  |  |  | \$6.49 |

Table 5.4


| Production Analysis | Number of Farms Responding |  |  |  | Total | Average per Acre |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acres in Production | 7 |  |  |  | 164 | ---- |
| Total Production (Tonnes) | 6 |  |  |  | 3,373 | 27.7 |
| Production Sold (Tonnes) | 6 |  |  |  | 2,544 | 20.9 |
| Production Sold as \% of Total |  |  |  |  | 75.4\% | ---- |
| Enterprise Analysis | Number of Farms Responding | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | of Value of Production |
|  |  | Cash | Inventory | Account | Value of |  |
| Revenue: |  | Sales | Change | -Receivables | Production |  |
| Value of Production | 6 | 4,515 | 36 | 28 | 4.579 | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Cash | Inventory | Account | Accrued |  |
| Direct Expenses: |  | Expenses | Change | Payabla | Expense |  |
| Seeds \& Plants | 6 | 210 | (0) | 0 | 210 | 4.6\% |
| Fertilizer | 5 | 229 | 0 | 0 | 229 | 5.0\% |
| Pest Control \& Chemicals | 5 | 208 | (0) | 0 | 208 | 4.5\% |
| Contract Labour | 5 | 448 | ---- | (19) | 428 | 9.4\% |
| Irrigation Water \& Power | 5 | 17 | ---- | (1) | 16 | 0.3\% |
| Fuel \& Lube | 5 | 117 | (1) | (2) | 113 | 2.5\% |
| Machinery Repair \& Maintenance | 5 | 148 | ---- | (2) | 146 | 3.2\% |
| Curtons \& Packaging | 5 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 1.7\% |
| Washing \& Grading | 6 | 0 | ---- | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Other Marketing Costs | 5 | 34 | ---- | (5) | 29 | 0.6\% |
| Other Direct Expenses | 5 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 1.9\% |
| Total Direct Expenses |  | 1,578 | (2) | (30) | 1.547 | 33.8\% |
| Gross Margin |  | 2,937 | 38 | 58 | 3,033 | 66.2\% |
| Input Analysis | Number of Farms |  |  |  |  | Amount |
| Number of Seeds per Acre | 6 |  |  |  |  | 636,669 |
| Fertilizer per Acre (kg) | 5 |  |  |  |  | 475.6 |
| Contract Labour (Hours per Acre) | 4 |  |  |  |  | 44 |
| Contract Labour (\$ per Mour) | 5 |  |  |  |  | \$8.29 |

Table 5.5
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[^1]Table 5.6



| Production Analysis | Number of Farms Responding |  |  |  | Total | Average per Acre |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acres in Production | 5 |  |  |  | 49 | ---- |
| Total Production (Cases) | 4 |  |  |  | 28,309 | 707.7 |
| Production Sold (Cases) | 4 |  |  |  | 18,000 | 450.0 |
| Production Sold as \% of Total |  |  |  |  | 63.6\% | ---- |
| Enterprise Analysis | Number <br> of Farms Responding | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | of Value of Production |
| Revenue: |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cash } \\ & \text { Sales } \end{aligned}$ | Inventory Change | Account Receivables | Value of Production |  |
| Value of Production | 4 | 3,358 | 0 | (3) | 3,355 | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Cash | Inventory | Account | Accrued |  |
| Direct Expenses: |  | Expenses | Change | Payable | Expense |  |
| Seeds \& Plants | 4 | 548 | (2) | 0 | 546 | 16.3\% |
| Fertilizer | 3 | 304 | 0 | 0 | 304 | 9.1\% |
| Pest Control \& Chemicals | 3 | 259 | (8) | 0 | 251 | 7.5\% |
| Contract Labour | - 3 | 1,292 |  | (6) | 1,286 | 38.3\% |
| Irrigation Water \& Power | 2 | 99 | ---- | (1) | 98 | 2.9\% |
| Fuel \& Lube | 3 | 103 | (2) | (4) | 96 | 2.9\% |
| Machinery Repair \& Maintenance | 3 | 82 | ---- | (1) | 81 | 2.4\% |
| Cartons \& Packaging | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Washing \& Grading | 4 | 0 | ---- | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Other Marketing Costs | 3 | 3 | ---- | 0 | 3 | 0.1\% |
| Other Direct Expenses | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0.4\% |
| Total Direct Expenses |  | 2,704 | (12) | (11) | 2,680 | 79.9\% |
| Gross Margin |  | 654 | 12 | 8 | 674 | 20.1\% |

[^2]$$
\text { Table } 5.7
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| Production Analysis | Number of Farms Responding |  |  |  | Total | Average per Acre |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acres in Production | 18 |  |  |  | 1，669 | －－－－ |
| Total Production（Tonnes） | 17 |  |  |  | 21，184 | 13.7 |
| Production Sold（Tonnes） | 17 |  |  |  | 19，122 | 12.4 |
| Production Sold as \％of Total |  |  |  |  | 90．3\％ | －－－－ |
| Enterprise Analysis | Number of Farms Responding | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | of Valu Production |
|  |  | Cash | Inventory | Account | Value of | $\because$ |
| Revenue： |  | Sales | Change | Receivables | Production |  |
| Value of Production | 17 | 1.730 | 19 | 39 | 1，789 | 100．0\％ |
|  |  | Cash | Inventory | Account | Accrued |  |
| Direct Expenses： |  | Expenses | Change | Payablo | Expense |  |
| Seeds \＆Plants | 17 | 141 | （0） | 1 | 142 | 7．9\％ |
| Fertilizer | 15 | 189 | 0 | 9 | 198 | 11．1\％ |
| Pest Control \＆Chemicals | 16 | 118 | （0） | 4 | 122 | 6．8\％ |
| Contract Labour | 16 | 375 | －－－－ | 11 | 385 | 21．5\％ |
| Irrigation Water \＆Power | 16 | 1 | －－－－ | （0） | 1 | 0．1\％ |
| Fuel \＆Lube | 16 | 87 | （0） | （1） | 86 | 4．8\％ |
| Machinery Repair \＆Maintenance | 16 | 127 | －－－－ | 6 | 133 | 7．4\％ |
| Cartons \＆Packaging | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0．4\％ |
| Washing \＆Grading | 17 | 0 | －－－－ | 0 | 0 | 0．0\％ |
| Other Marketing Costs | 16 | 15 |  | （3） | 12 | 0．7\％ |
| Other Direct Expenses | 16 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0．5\％ |
| Total Direct Expenses |  | 1，070 | （0） | 26 | 1，096 | 61．3\％ |
| Gross Margin |  | 660 | 20 | 13 | 693 | 38．7\％ |

[^3]
## APPENDIX I

SAMPLE CUSTOMIZED REPORT
ENTERPRISE ANALYSIS - POTATOES, 1991 CROP SEASON

ACREAGE ANALYSIS, 1991 CROP SEASON

NOSVヨS dOYO L66！＇SISN7VNV $\perp$ NヨWヨIV1S ヨWOONI HS甘O

| Dollars | $\%$ of Revenue | Number of Farms Responding | Average per Farm | Revenue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 455，012 | 85．1\％ | 25 | 522，509 | 85．7\％ |
| 0 | 0．0\％ | 25 | 39,114 | 6．4\％ |
| 0 | 0．0\％ | 25 | 16，408 | 2．7\％ |
| 26，155 | 4．9\％ | 25 | 3.241 | 0．5\％ |
| 0 | 0．0\％ | 25 | 16,313 | 2．7\％ |
| 53，488 | 10．0\％ | 25 | 12.409 | 2．0\％ |
| 534，655 | 100．0\％ |  | 609，994 | 100．0\％ |
| 10，865 | 2．0\％ | 24 | 33，005 | 5．4\％ |
| 35，420 | 6．6\％ | 24 | 49，903 | 8．2\％ |
| 23，189 | 4．3\％ | 24 | 28，039 | 4．6\％ |
| 140，634 | 26．3\％ | 25 | 199.712 | 32．7\％ |
| 0 | 0．0\％ | 24 | 1，073 | 0．2\％ |
| 13，425 | 2．5\％ | 24 | 18，660 | 3．1\％ |
| 24，661 | 4．6\％ | 24 | 26，379 | 4．3\％ |
| 0 | 0．0\％ | 24 | 28.082 | 4．6\％ |
| 0 | 0．0\％ | 24 | 0 | 0．0\％ |
| 0 | 0．0\％ | 24 | 2.619 | 0．4\％ |
| 0 | 0．0\％ | 24 | 10,561 | 1．7\％ |
| 0 | 0．0\％ | 24 | 19.615 | 3．2\％ |
| 248，194 | 46．4\％ |  | 417.646 | 68．5\％ |
| 286.461 | 53．6\％ |  | 192，348 | 31．5\％ |
| 11，944 | 2．2\％ | 24 | 6，065 | 1．0\％ |
| 18，910 | 3．5\％ | 24 | 49，845 | 8．2\％ |
| 42，385 | 7．9\％ | 24 | 45，093 | 7．4\％ |
| 5.578 | 1．0\％ | 24 | 4.754 | 0．8\％ |
| 4.404 | 0．8\％ | 24 | 7.722 | 1．3\％ |
| 1，688 | 0．3\％ | 24 | 7.586 | 1．2\％ |
| 135 | 0．0\％ | 24 | 9，524 | 1．6\％ |
| 0 | 0．0\％ | 24 | 7.546 | 1．2\％ |
| 32.525 | 6．1\％ | 24 | 21，395 | 3．5\％ |
| 117.569 | 22．0\％ |  | 159，531 | 26．2\％ |
| 168，892 | 31．6\％ |  | 32，817 | 5．4\％ |

REVISED INGOME STATEMENT ANALYSIS (VALUE OF PRODUCTION), 1991 CROP SEASON

| Prepared For: | YOUR FARM |  |  | $\cdots$ | M. | ALL FARMS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bob |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars | \% of <br> Value of Production | Number of Farms Responding | Average per Farm | \% of Value of Production |
| Revenue: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cash } \\ & \text { Sales } \end{aligned}$ | Inventory Change | Account Recolvables | Value of Production |  |  |  |  |
| Vegetable Crop Sales | 455,012 | 0 | 103 | 455,115 | 88.3\% | 24 | 542,963 | 85.2\% |
| Other Crop Sales | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 24 | 41,309 | 6.5\% |
| Livestock Sales | 0 | ---- | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 24 | 16,431 | 2.6\% |
| Government Receipts | 26,155 | ---- | $(19,549)$ | 6,606 | 1.3\% | 24 | 6,192 | 1.0\% |
| Other Farm Income | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 24 | 18,009 | 2.8\% |
| Non- Farm Income | 53,488 | ---- | 0 | 53,488 | 10.4\% | 25 | 12.409 | 1.9\% |
|  | 534,655 | 0 | $(19,446)$ | 515,209 | 100.0\% |  | 637,313 | 100.0\% |
|  | Cash | Inventory | Account | Accrued |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |
| Direct Expenses: | Expenses | Change | Payable | Expense |  |  |  |  |
| Seeds \& Plants | 10.865 | 0 | 2,136 | 13,001 | 2.5\% | 24 | 33.464 | 5.3\% |
| Fertilizer | 35,420 | 0 | 2.136 | 37,556 | 7.3\% | 24 | 51,565 | 8.1\% |
| Pest Control \& Chemicals | 23,189 | 0 | 0 | 23.189 | 4.5\% | 24 | 28.402 | 4.5\% |
| Contract Labour | 140,634 |  | 21,888 | 162,522 | 31.5\% | 24 | 207,911 | 32.6\% |
| Irrigation Water \& Power | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 24 | 1.048 | 0.2\% |
| Fuel \& Lube | 13.425 | 0 | 0 | 13.425 | 2.6\% | 24 | 19,577 | 3.1\% |
| Machinery Repair \& Maintenance | 24.661 |  | 3,838 | 28,499 | 5.5\% | 24 | 27,642 | 4.3\% |
| Cartons \& Packaging | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 24 | 26,091 | 4.1\% |
| Washing \& Grading | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 24 | 2.226 | 0.0\% |
| Other Marketing Costs | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 24 | 2,226 8,471 | 0.3\% 1.3\% |
| Livestock Supplies \& Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 24 | 8,471 20,339 | 1.3\% $3.2 \%$ |
| Other Direct Expenses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 24 | 20,339 |  |
|  | 248,194 | 0 | 29,998 | 278,192 | 54.0\% |  | 426,735 | 67.0\% |
| Gross Margin |  |  |  | 237.017 | 46.0\% |  | 210,578 | 33.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Taxes | 11,944 | --- |  | 11.944 | 2.3\% | 24 | 49,845 | 7.8\% |
| Land Rent | 18,910 |  | ---- | 18,910 | 3.7\% | 24 | 45,093 | 7.1\% |
| Labour | 42,385 |  |  | 42,385 | 8.2\% | 24 | 45,093 | 7.1\% |
| Legal \& Accounting | 5,578 |  | ---- | 5,578 | 1.1\% | 24 | 4.754 | 0.7\% |
| Insurance \& Licenses | 4,404 |  |  | 4.404 | 0.9\% | 24 | 7.722 | 1.2\% |
| Utilities | 1.688 |  |  | 1,688 | 0.3\% | 24 | 7.586 | 1.2\% |
| Operating Interest \& Service Charges | 135 |  |  | 135 | 0.0\% | 24 | 9,524 | 1.5\% |
| Interest on Term Loans | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0.0\% | 24 | 7.546 | 1.2\% |
| Miscellaneous | 32,525 |  |  | 32,525 | 6.3\% | 24 | 21,395 | 3.4\% |
|  | 117,569 | ---- | ---- | 117,569 | 22.8\% |  | 159,531 | 25.0\% |
| Return Over Expenses |  |  |  | 119,448 | 23.2\% |  | 51,047 | 8.0\% |

baLANCE SHEET ANALYSIS, 1991 CROP SEASON

|  | Dollars | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Assets } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Number } \\ \text { of Farms } \\ \text { Responding } \end{array}$ | Average per Farm | $\begin{array}{r} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Assets } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Assets: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash | 370,647 | 11.5\% | 24 | 61.184 | 3.1\% |
| Accounts Receivable | 954 | 0.0\% | 24 | 75,295 | 3.8\% |
| Inventory | 4.000 | 0.1\% | 24 | 36,492 | 1.9\% |
|  | 375,601 | 11.6\% |  | 172,971 | 8.8\% |
| Intermediate \& Fixed Assets (Market Value): |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Farm Equipment | 91.705 | 2.8\% | 21 | 129,125 | 6.6\% |
| Tractors \& Trucks | 133,800 | 4.1\% | 22 | 147,532 | 7.5\% |
| Houses \& Cars | 1,800 | 0.1\% | 17 | 176,782 | 9.0\% |
| Land | 2,500,000 | 77.4\% | 22 | 1,315,000 | 67.2\% |
| Other | 128,947 | 4.0\% | 24 | 16,032 | 0.8\% |
|  | 2,856,252 | 88.4\% |  | 1,784,471 | 91.2\% |
| Total Assets | 3,231,853 | 100.0\% |  | 1,957.442 | 100.0\% |


| 24 | 38,381 | $2.0 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 25 | 40,444 | $2.1 \%$ |
|  | 78.826 | $4.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| 25 | 13,015 | $0.7 \%$ |
| 25 | 158,488 | $8.1 \%$ |
| 25 | 3,839 | $0.2 \%$ |
| 25 | 124,333 | $6.4 \%$ |
| 25 | 1.268 | $0.1 \%$ |
|  | 300,943 | $15.4 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | $1,577.673$ | $80.6 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


RATIO ANALYSIS, 1991 CROP SEASON

| Prepared For: | YOUR FARM | ALL F |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bob |  |  |  |
|  | Ratio | Number of Farms Responding | Average Ratio |
| Production \& Activity Ratios: |  |  |  |
| Production Yields per Acre: |  | 5 | 696.6 |
| Lettuce (Cases) |  | 4 | 3.0 |
| Broccoli (Tonnes) |  | 8 | 18.3 |
| Green Cabbage (Tonnes) |  | 6 | 27.7 |
| Carrots (Tonnes) |  | 5 | 21.0 |
| Onions (Tonnes) |  | 4 | 707.7 |
| Celery (Cases) | 16.6 | 17 | 13.7 |
| Potatoes (Tonnes) | 16.6 0.18 |  | 0.36 |
| Fixed Asset Turnover | 0.18 0.16 |  | 0.33 |
| Total Asset Turnover 0.16 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Contribution Margin | 46.0\% | . | 10.7\% |
| Return on Sales Before Interest | 23.2\% |  | 10.7\% |
| Return on Sales After Interest | 23.2\% |  | 8.0\% |
| Return on Total Assets (Before Interest) | 3.7\% |  | 3.5\% |
| Return on Equity |  |  |  |
| Liquidity Ratios: | 6.66 |  | 2.19 |
| Current Ratio 6.66 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Debt Equity Ratio |  |  | \$1,209 |
| Debt per Production Acre | $\$ 501$ $\$ 11.536$ |  | \$5,671 |
| Total Assets (Less House \& Car) per Production Acre | \$11.536 |  | \$1,495 |
| Depreciable Assets per Production Acre | $\$ 1,272$ 885.80 |  | 3.99 |
| Times Interest Earned | 885.80 |  |  |



ENTERPRISE ANALYSIS - BROCCOLI, 1991 CROP SEASON



20,894
486.7
255
$\mathbf{S 6 . 4 9}$
ENTERPRISE ANALYSIS - TOPPED CARROTS, 1991 CROP SEASON

ENTERPRISE ANALYSIS - ONIONS, 1991 CROP SEASON
Prepared For:
Bob


ALL FARMS
ENTERPRISE ANALYSIS - CELERY, 1991 CROP SEASON


## Canadắ


[^0]:    Input Analysis $\quad \begin{gathered}\text { Number } \\ \text { of Farms }\end{gathered}$
    Amount
    

[^1]:    Input Analysis $\begin{gathered}\text { Number } \\ \text { of Farms }\end{gathered}$
    of Farms Amount
    

[^2]:    Amount
    27,761
    500.3
    0
    웅

[^3]:    Number Amount
    of Farms
    

    Input Analysis
    Seeds per Acre（kg）
    Contract Labour（Hours per Acre）
    Contract Labour（\＄per Hour）

