# PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS OF ESTABLISHING AND OPERATING AN EIGHT ACRE (GROWING SPACE) CONTAINER NURSERY IN U.S.D.A. PLANT HARDINESS ZONES FIVE AND SIX 

## BY

Reed D. Taylor, Harold H. Kneen, David E. Hahn, Elton M. Smith*

Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210
*Associate Professor, Graduate Student, and Professor, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, and Professor, Dept. of Horticulture, respectively. Mr. Kneen is presently Director of Marketing at Studebaker Nurseries, Inc., New Carlisle, Ohio.

# PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS OF ESTABLISHING AND OPERATING AN EIGHT ACRE (GROWING SPACE) CONTAINER NURSERY IN U.S.D.A. PLANT HARDINESS ZONES FIVE AND SIX 

## By

Reed D. Taylor, Harold H. Kneen, David E. Hahn, Elton M. Smith*

## INTRODUCTION

To make more informed decisions as to whether to enter, leave, or expand container production, nurserymen require production, marketing and financial information. In this paper, a cost model for production of crops representing five categories of container-grown production schemes in U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness zones five and six is provided. Physical coefficients are included so the information can be readily updated and so individual nurserymen can use the model as a standard against which to compare their own operations or planned operations. Information derived should provide a basis for decision-making for those evaluating the profitability of establishing a new container nursery,

[^0]expanding an existing container nursery, or shifting from field production to container production.

Production costs models have been developed for several species of plants in the Southera and North Central regions of the U.S. $(1,3,4,5,5,7,8,9,10,11)$. Most of these models, while providing excellent information for individual species, did not attempt to develop comprehensive models for complete nursery operations. Taylor, et at., developed comprehensive models applicatle to U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones 5 and 6 for both Container- and Field-grown crops representing, in each case, five categories of production schemes and two sizes of nurseries (12,13). Badenhop and Phillips (2) developed a similiar study for field-grown crops in U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones 7 and 8 also representing five categories of field-grown production schemes and two sizes of nurseries. The purpose of this paper is to report on the smaller container model developed by Taylor, et. al., for U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones 5 and 6. The comprehensive model reported only for U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zone 6. Subsequent discussions with horticulturists and agricultural economists indicated that the model was also appropriate for Zone 5. This paper therefore reports the results as applicable to both Zones.

OBJECTIVES
The general objective of this paper is to present the resources and costs associated with the establishment and operation of a model nursery, including the delineation of representative container production systems. Specific objectives were to:

1. Model a series of production systems that would accomodate a majority of the species of plants being container-grown in U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones 5 and 5.
2. Analyze the important species of plants commonly grown in containers in U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones 5 and 6 and assign each of them to one of five designated groups based on similarities of growing and production requirements.
3. Choose one species from each group as representative of the group for detailed cost analysis.
4. Design physical facilities including land areas, land improvements, irrigation systems, buildings, machine and equipment components.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

In the study, a model firm was synthesized using the conceptual framework of economic engineexing wherein the 'best proven practice' was included in the model. It was synthesized based on the Columbus, Ohio area. The complete synthesis included developing an appropriate production cycle; schematic drawings of the physical layout, including buildings and irrigation system; lists of equipment and other items; a complete sequence by month and year of nursery operational steps beginning with the purchase of plant liners and ending with loading the finished product for wholesale distribution; and budgets for fixed and variable costs (12).

Data for this study were obtained from wholesale nurseries and nursery suppliers in the North Central region during 1982. If specific items were required (i.e. depth of the well), coefficients were based on the Columbus, Ohio area. The basic goals in synthesizing the production facilities (see Figure 1) were to minimize labor expenses, flow and movement of plant material and equipment, water runoff, and initial investment, and to maximize the number of salable plants and allow future expansion.

Production System
The production system chosen for the five groups of plants represented in this analysis consists of utilizing two or three year old bareroot liners to produce a salable plant within two growing seasons. These 6-7" liners are transplanted directly into two gallon (8-1/2" x 8") copolymer containers during the month of May. Approximately $10 \%$ of the
crop will be sold during the fall of the second growing season (approximately 18 months), 15\% during March and 50\% during April after the second growing season (approximately 22-23 months), and 25\% during May after the second growing season (24 months). May is a pexiod when clean-up sales are being made and new plants started. This production system saves transplanting as the plants are sold in the same two gallon containers in which they were started.

Physical Plant and Equipment

## Assumptions

Assumptions about the physical facilities and equipment can greatly affect its cost and thereby cost per annual salable plant. The authors included all items a nursery would typically require, thus the physical plant is probably more elaborate than many nurserymen would require. A nurseryman can easily eliminate or reduce items as required. However, it would require substantial effort to do the analysis on his own if they were not included. Some specific assumptions that add substantially to a "stripped down" facility are as follows:

Scale of Nursery Operation. It was assumed the model nursery would be self sufficient. Most containerized nurseries also have field production with buildings, machinery and equipment being shared between operations. Shared facilities would significantly reduce costs associated with the container operation.

Site. Land modification costs could be reduced if the nursery were located on gravelly or sandy soil with good
natural drainage. Locating near a river ox other natural water source could reduce or eliminate the need for a well.

Expansion. Expansion potential was provided for. It became obvious very quickly in the analysis that buildings, machinery and equipment needed for an efficient operation were adequate for a much larger system. A significant stumbling block to expansion, if just an adequate system were provided, would be in the irrigation components. For this reason, a larger irrigation pump, larger well casing diameter, and larger in-ground water mains were provided.

Machinery and Equipment. Purchase of new machinery and equipment was assumed for the model nursery. Many nurserymen may choose to buy used equipment, rent equipment or time-share some expensive items with other nurseries.

## General

A model facility was synthesized for the nursery (340,000 sq ft of growing area, Fig 1). Specific components for the nursery are itemized in Table 2. Discussion on the components can be found in $5-103$ Regional Bulletin 301 (13).

Enterprise Mix
We assumed that our model nursery would produce a diverse line of nursery stock, each having a two year production cycle. Commonly grown nursery stock was divided into five cultural groups. While not all inclusive, the groups do permit a range of per unit costs to be developed as they relate to input costs and cultural factors. For analytical purposes, we assumed that each cultural group would occupy 20\% of the growing area (i.e. 68,000 sq ft per
group). The operation would be comprised of 198,745 plants in full production. Annual sales capacity would be 95,650 plants. For detailed analysis, one specific plant from each group was chosen as representative of the group. While it is recognized that other plants from each category would have somewhat different requirements, it was felt that the requirements would not vary significantly in cost from the representative plant. The five groups, with some of their cultural characteristics are listed below:

Group Plant

I SPREADING EVERGREENS
Juniperus chinensis
(varieties)
Juniperus horizontalis
(varieties)
Thuja occ. woodwardi

## II SPREADING DECIDUOUS SHRUBS

Berberis t. 'Crimson Pygmy'
Cotoneaster apiculata
Cotoneaster horizontalis
Cotoneaster dammerii
Euonymus fortunei
III SLOW GROWING EVERGREENS
Taxus (species)
Buxus (species)

Hardwood bark medium, minimal overwinter structure, 12-15" salable plants Hardwood bark medium, maximum overwinter structure, 12-15" salable plants.

Pinebark medium, minimal overwinter structure, 12-15" salable plants.

IV UPRIGHT DECIDUOUS SHRUBS
Euonymus alatus compacta
Viburaum (species)
Weigela
Forsythia
Liqustrum vicaryi
$V$ BROADLEAF EVERGREEN
Rhododendron
Piexis
Pyracantha

Hardwood bark medium, minimal overwinter structure, 18-24" salable plants.

Pinebark medium, maximum overwinter structure, 15-18" salable plants.

Production Cost Budgets
Costs were established for all factors of production including management and invested capital. In economic terms, costs associated with factors of production inputted by owner/operators are often referred to as 'opportunity costs' or the income these factors could have received if they were employed elsewhere. Fox example, owners could usually be employed as managers at other nurseries, and money invested in land, buildings, irrigation systems, and equipment could have earned interest if it had been placed in financial institutions.

Capital requirements per salable plant capacity by spacing and size of nursery were first established (Table 1). Second, capital requirements for establishing the nurseries were determined (Table 2). Third, annual fixed costs were calculated (Table 3). Fourth, variable costs were determined (Table 4). Fifth, summaries were made for fixed and variable
costs for each of the plant groups (Tables 5 and 6). This allowed cost comparisons based on cultural group.

Most nurseries use cash rather than accrual accounting procedures. For this reason, the analyses were completed on a "cash" basis.

Annual fixed costs are presented in Table 3. Most of these derived costs were based on the physical plant and equipment discussed previously. These costs were grouped into five categories: land and land improvements, buildings, machinery and equipment, general overhead, and opportunity cost of capital for general overhead, insurance and taxes. Fixed costs for land and land improvements, buildings, and machinery and equipment were composed of depreciation, interest, insurance, and taxes. To determine annual fixed costs per cultural group, total annual fixed costs were simply divided by five.

Variable costs include all cost factors that vary with the quantity of plants being grown at one point in time. For example, the number of liners required for spring planting depends upon the quantity of plants management desires to have in inventory plus production losses. A loss factor of 5\% was assumed with $21 / 2 \%$ being taken in the first production year and $21 / 2 \%$ in the second. Variable costs were subdivided into the following categories: materials, machinery and equipment, labor, and interest on operating capital (Table 4).

After all cost factors were determined, they were summarized based upon cost per salable plant by group and size of nursery (Table 6).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Capital Investment Requirements
Capital investment requirements for establishing container nursexies were itemized under three broad divisions: land and improvements, buildings, and machinery and equipment (Tables 2). Each was further divided into several components. The nursery required $\$ 592,921$ in investment. Land and land improvements represented $34 \%$ or $\$ 202,941$ of the investment, buildings $35 \%$ or $\$ 206,243$, and machinery and equipment $31 \%$ or $\$ 183,737$.

Land improvement costs, including the pond, were between 5 and 6 times as expensive as the land itself (Table 2). These expenses would be necessary in 'normal' U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones 5 and 6 areas to provide drainage, water storage, and a good work area in times of inclement weather.

Building needs included a simple office layout, a potting shed for nursery stock receipt and storage, machinery shop for repairs and storage, and polyhouses for overwintering.

An important consideration for managers in most industries is determination of investment per unit of production capacity. For container nurseries this indicator would be the capital requirement per-salable-plant capacity. This indicator was determined for each of the five groups of plants (Table 1). To determine this figure it was necessary to determine how many salable plants would be produced annually for each group in its allocated $20 \%$ of the growing
space. This value ranged from a low of 13,050 for Group $V$ (Rhododendron) to 25,600 for Group I (Juniperus). The number of plants grown per unit of space directly relates to the capital requirements per-salable-plant. These costs differentiated by plant group were: $\$ 4.63$ for group I (Juniperus), $\$ 5.72$ for Group II (Cotoneaster), $\$ 5.90$ for Group III (Taxus), $\$ 7.33$ for Group IV (Viburnum) and $\$ 9.09$ for Group $V$ (Rhododendron). The average for all groups was \$6. 20 .

Examination of the data indicate higher investment costs per unit of salable plant capacity would incur as container nursery size is decreased. This would be caused by spreading the cost of fixed items such as buildings, equipment, and machinexy over fewer units. Conversely, lower costs per unit of salable plant capacity would be realized for container nurseries larger than those analyzed as the costs of fixed items would be spread over more units.

Individual nurserymen could, of course, incur somewhat different costs than those presented. Individual costs would depend upon variables such as production cycle chosen, labor productivity, and ability to bargain with suppliers. The nurseryman also may choose not to provide for future expansion, choose land that would require minimum drainage modifications, reduce optimal growing/overwintering space requirements, or operate used equipment. This analysis assumed average soil conditions, expansion capacity, optimal spacing configurations, new buildings, equipwent and machinery.

Annual Costs
Fixed costs associated with capital investment including depreciation, interest, insurance and taxes were $\$ 139,680$ per year. In addition there was $\$ 95,025$ allocated for general overhead and $\$ 7,885$ for interest on general overhead, insurance and taxes resulting in a total of $\$ 242,590$ total £ixed costs for the nursexy (Table 3). These costs were divided equally between the five plant groups with each group receiving an assessment of $\$ 48,517$ (Table 5).

On a per-salable-plant basis, there was a considerable difference in fixed costs when they were differentiated by plant group (Table 6). They were: $\$ 1.90$ for group I (Juniperus), \$2.34 for group II (Cotoneaster), \$2.42 for group III (Taxus), $\$ 3.00$ for group IV (Viburnum), and $\$ 3.72$ for group $V$ (Rhododendron). The average over all groups was \$2.53. Annual fixed costs for group $V$ were more than double those for group I. These costs were proportionate to the number of salable plants pex annum produced in allocated space. Fixed costs as a percentage of total costs ranged from 42\% to 51\% and averaged 46\% for the five groups (Table 6).

Nurserymen having established facilities might well consider annual fixed costs to be lower than those reported here. This is especially true if they calculate depreciation and repairs on the original value of land improvements, buildings, machinery and equipment and if they place a low value on their own management input. Good management, for planning purposes, however, dictates computing depreciation
and repairs on replacement value rather than on original cost. It also dictates placing a value on managerial time that would be comparable to salaries paid in competitive firms.

Variable costs are detailed in Table 4. Total variable costs by plant group were $\$ 66,584$ for group $I$ (Juniperus), \$55,865 for group II (Cotoneaster), $\$ 63,544$ for group III (Taxus), $\$ 46,038$ for group IV (Viburnum), and $\$ 47,358$ for group $V$ (Rhododendron). Total for all groups was 9279,389 (Table 5). The difference in total annual variable costs between groups is primarily accounted for by the number of plants in the group. The fewer the plants, the fewer the containers, soil mixture, liners, labor to move containers, etc. On a per-salable-plant basis, the group costs were practically reversed (Table 6). Variable costs by plant were $\$ 2.60$ for group $I, \$ 2.70$ for group II, $\$ 3.16$ for group III, $\$ 2.84$ for group IV, and $\$ 3.63$ for group $V$ and averaged $\$ 2.93$ for all groups. In groups with fewer plants, greater costs were incurred on a per plant basis for polyethylene film, chemicals, machinery, equipment, and labor. Other variable costs that changed substantially between groups were the cost of liners and for groups II (Cotoneaster) and $V$
(Rhododendron) the addition of thermal blankets for overwintering protection. Variable costs for the small nursery ranged from $49 \%$ to $58 \%$ of total costs and averaged 54\% for all groups (Table 6).

Total costs are the summation of fixed and variable costs. They were $\$ 115,101$ for group I (Juniperus), $\$ 104,382$

```
for group II (Cotoneaster), $112,061 for group III (Taxus),
$94,555 for group IV (Viburnum), and $95,875 for group V
(Rhododendron). For all groups they totaled $521,974 (Table
5). On a per-salable-plant basis they were $4.50 for group
I, $5.04 for group II, $5.58 for group III, $5.84 for group
IV, and $7.35 for group V and averaged $5.46 for all groups
(Table 6).
```


## SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Total annual costs per salable plant differentiated by species ranged from $\$ 4.50$ to $\$ 7.35$ and averaged $\$ 5.46$ for all species. Fixed costs per salable plant ranged from $\$ 1.90$ to $\$ 3.72$ and averaged $\$ 2.53$. Fixed costs as a percentage of total costs ranged from $42 \%$ to $51 \%$ and averaged $46 \%$. Variable costs per salable plant showed substantial differences among plant species. They ranged from $\$ 2.60$ to $\$ 3.63$ and averaged \$2.93. Major differences among species affecting variable costs were spacing requirements, cost of liners and overwintering requirements. Variable costs as a percentage of total costs ranged from 49\% to 58\% and averaged 54\%.

## Implications

A comparison of total annual costs of producing plants with prices in U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zone Five and Six producers' wholesale catalogs would undoubtedly show, in a great many cases, selling prices lower than total annual costs. In fact, if one were to add costs of selling, very few producers would presently be charging enough to cover all costs let alone profits. How then can producers continue to operate? The answer lies in how producers both experience and compute costs. We have used the economic and accounting method which includes both explicit and implicit costs. Explicit costs are those that are paid directly and easily determined, e.g. cost of liners, soil media, fertilizers, labor, etc. Implicit costs are those that are more difficult to determine
such as the cost of equity capital and managerial capacities. The way these costs are determined varies significantly from firm to firm. Well established nurseries are usually very accurate in determining explicit costs, but often do not consider all implicit costs. They base their costs on "cash flow" and profit and loss on "tax accounting". These established nurseries, may have purchased land at low cost, be working with depreciated equipment and may be assigning low if any value to their management; in this case determined costs would be at a much lower level than presented in this paper. Also, as pointed out earlier, careful site selection could significantly reduce fixed (overhead) costs. However, if one were to start a new container nursery, in a "normal" U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zone Five or Six site, costs would probably be very close to those presented here.

For the industry, selling nursery products for below "accounting costs" implies that well established nurseries, operating essentially debt free, would have strong staying power whereas those who have just started or are heavily in debt may not be able to survive, especially if they are relying on their container operation to meet all overhead expenses. Second, starting a container nursery in U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zone Five or Six would probably not prove profitable unless items like buildings, equipment, machinery, management, etc., could be shared with other enterprises or unless selling prices of nursery products in the zone increased substantially. At current prices for nursery
products, this study shows that the return on investment for establishing new, independently operating, container nurseries in U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zone Five or Six would be marginal if not negative.

## LITERATURE CITED

1. Aylsworth, James and J.B. Gartner. 1972. The Seven Costs of Ornamental Production. Amer. Nurseryman, 135: (2): 116-122.
2. Badenhop, M.B., and T.D. Phillips and S-103 Technical Committee. 1985. Costs of Establishing and Operating Field Nurseries Differentiated by Size of Firm and Species of Plant in USDA Climatic Zones 7 and 8. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 311.
3. Badenhop, M.B., T.D. Phillips and S-103 Technical Committee. 1983. Cost of Producing and Marketing Container-Grown Woody Landscape Plants: The Pfitzer Juniper. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 299.
4. Badenhop, M.B. and S-103 Technical Committee. 1979. Factors Affecting Southern Regional Production Advantages for Juniperus chinensis 'Pfitzeriana'. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 237.
5. Badenhop, M.B. and S-103 Technical Committee. 1979. actors Affecting Southern Regional Production Advantages for Kurume Azaleas. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 241.
6. Badenhop, M. B. and S-103 Technical Committee. 1980. Cost of Producing and Marketing a Shade Tree: The Pin Oak. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 244.
7. Badenhop, M.B. and S-103 Technical Committee. 1980. Factors Affecting Production Costs and Returns for Flowering Dogwood. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 246.
8. Coutu, A.J. and S-103 Technical Committee. 1982. Nursery Management and Production Cost: Burford Holly Ilex Cornuta 'Burfordii'. Southern Coop. Sex. Bull. 274.
9. Crafton, Vicky W., Travis D. Phillips, and Thomas M. Blessington. 1982. Costs of Producing Woody Ornamental Plants Agri. Econ. Res. Rep. 137, Mississippi Agr. and For. Exp. Sta.
10. Kneen, Harold H. 1981. Comparison of Costs for Producing Containerized and Field Grown Juniperus chinensis 'Pfitzeriana' in USDA Climatic Zones 6 and 7. M.S. Thesis, The Ohio State Univ., Columbus.
11. Powers, Edward W. 1978. An Analysis of Production Costs for Containerized Nursery Products. M.S. Thesis, The Ohio State Univ., Columbus.
12. Taylox, Reed D., Harold H. Kneen, David E. Hahn, Elton M. Smith and S-103 Technical Committee. 1983. Costs of Establishing and Operating Container Nurseries Differentiated by Size in U.S.D.A. Climatic Zone Six. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 301.
13. Taylor, Reed D., Harold H. Kneen, Elton M. Smith, David E. Hahn, Stanley Uchida, and S-103 Technical Committee. 1985. Costs of Establishing and Operating Field Nurseries Differentiated by Size and Species of Plant in U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones Five and Six. Southern Coop. Ser. Bull. 315.

Figure 1: Schematic Drawing of an Eight Acre (Growing Space) Container Nursery, U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones Five and Six.

A. Polyhouse structure, $200^{\circ} \mathrm{x} 20^{\circ}$
$\mathrm{A}^{\prime}$. Polyhouse structure, $100^{\prime} \mathrm{x} 20^{\prime}$
B. Supply shed, machinery shed, machine shop, $40^{\prime} \times 100^{\prime}$
C. Office, $20^{\circ} \mathrm{x} 20^{\prime}$
D. Restrooms, $20^{\circ} \mathrm{x} 20^{\prime}$
E. Pump house, $10^{\prime} \mathrm{x}$ 10'

Drainage Tile, $30^{\prime \prime}$ :.-... Watermain $8{ }^{\prime \prime}$ PVC : Watermain, 6" PVC
Watermain, 4" PVC


Scale

F. Pond, $80^{\prime} \mathrm{x}$ 120', $14^{\prime}$ deep
G. Shipping area, 4 semi truckloads

```
Total Acreage = 765' x 970' = 742,050 sq. ft. = 17.04 acres
Total Polyhouse Acreage = 52.5 eq. (20' x 200') = 210.000 sq. ft. = 4.82 acres
Total Growing Space = = %7.5 eq.(20' x 200')=350,000 sq. ft. = % 8.03 acres
```

TABLE 1.--Capacity in Number of Plants and Capital Required per Salable Plant Capacity by Spacing for an Eight Acrek (Growin Space) Container Nursery, U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones Five and Six, 1982.

| Group | Growing Cycle Spacing |  |  |  | Production factors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Growing Season On-center (inch) | First <br> Year <br> OyerWinterang (inch) | Second Growing Season On-center (anch) | Second <br> Year <br> Over- <br> Wintering <br> (inch) | Total Plants in Production (units) | Salable Plants per Year (units) | Capital Requirements per Salable Plant Capacit (dollars) |
| 1-Juniperus | 9 | 9 | 15 | 12 | 53,120 | 25,600 | 4.63 |
| II - Cotoneaster | 12 | 9 | 15 | 15 | 43,095 | 20,730 | 5.72 |
| III - Taxus | 9 | 9 | 18 | 15 | 41,750 | 20,085 | 5.90 |
| IV - Viburnum | 12 | 12 | 21 | 15 | 33,655 | 16,185 | 7.33 |
| $V$ - Rhododendron | 12 | 12 | 18 | 18 | 27,125 | 13,050 | 9.09 |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  | = $=2=0$ | = $=$ = |

KTotal Nursery - 17.04 acres, $340,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of growing $5 p a c e, 204,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of polyhouse space. Each group of plants would occupy 20 percent of the growing ( $60,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ ) and polyhouse ( $40,800 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ ) space.

TABLE 2.-Capital Requirements for an Eight Acrek (Growing Space) Nursery, U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones Five and Six, 1982.

| Item | Description | Unit | Useful Life (years) | Quantity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost per } \\ & \text { Unit } \\ & \text { (dollars) } \end{aligned}$ | Total Cost (dollars) | Percent of Total Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land + Improvements | Unimproved land Grading, tiling, graveling, pond | Acre | 20 | 17.04 | 1,850 | 31,524 171,417 | 5 29 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{202,941}$ | $\overline{34}$ |
| Buildings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office and restrooms Potting and packing shed | $20^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}$ cement block <br> $40^{\prime} \times 50^{\prime}$ steel pole | $s q \mathrm{ft}$ | 20 | 800 | 28 | 22,400 | 4 |
|  | insulated | 59 ft | 20 | 2000 | 18 | 36,000 | 6 |
| Machinery storage, shop | $40^{\prime} \times 50^{\prime}$ steel pole insulated | sq ft | 20 | 2000 | 18 | 36,000 | 6 |
| Polyhouse structures | $200^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}$ pipe frame | each | 10 | 51 | 2,193 | 111,843 | 19 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{206,243}$ | $\overline{35}$ |
| Machinery and Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tractor, 60 HP | 60 HP , gas fuel with front end loader | each | 10 | 1 | 16,000 | 16,000 | 3 |
| Tractor, 28 HP | 28 HP , gas fuel | each | 10 | 2 | 6,025 | 12,050 | 2 |
| Manure spreader | 130 bu capacity | each | 10 | 1 | 2,135 | 2,135 | ** |
| Wagon | 4 wheel, self steering | each | 10 | 2 | 2,300 | 4,600 | 1 |
| Irrigation pump/well | 75 HP electric pump | each | 20 | 1 | 40,085 | 40,085 | 7 |
| Inground irrigation system | PUC pipe/valves |  | 20 |  | 38,801 | 38,801 | 7 |
| Above ground irrigation system | PUC pipe/sprinklers |  | 5 |  | 19,383 | 19,383 | 3 |
| Fertilizer injector | 200 gal | each | 5 | 1 | 6,500 | 6,500 | 1 |
| Airblast sprayer | 300 gal , on trailer | each | 7 | 1 | 6,955 | 6,955 | 1 |
| Cyclone spreader | Hand operated | each |  | 1 | 40 | 40 | ** |
| Forklift | 3000 lb lift exterior wheels | each | 10 | 1 | 24,000 | 24,000 | 4 |
| Truck | 1/2 ton pick-up | each | 5 | 1 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 1 |
| Pallets | Hooden | each | 2 | 349 | 12 | 4,188 | 1 |
| Handtools | Miscellaneous |  | 5 |  | 1,000 | 1,000 | ** |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  |  | $\overline{183,737}$ | 31 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | =-x= $=$ = | = $=$ = |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | 592,921 | 100 |

*17.04 acres, $340,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ growing space, $204,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of polyhouse space.
**Less than half of $1 \%$.

TABLE 3. Annual Fixed Casts (Dollars) for an Eight Acrek (Growing Space) Container Nursery, U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones Five and Six, 1982

| Iten | Description | Depreciationk | Interestkth | Insurance and Taxes | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land | Unimproved land |  | 4,739 | 631 | 5,370 |
| + Improverents | Grading, tiling, graveling, pond | 8,571 | 25,713 | 3,428 | 37,712 |
| Subtotal |  | 8,571 | 30,452 | $\overline{4,059}$ | $\overline{43,082}$ |
| Buildings |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office and restreoms | $20^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}$ | 1,120 | 3,360 | 568 | 5,048 |
| Potting and packing shed | $40^{\prime} \times 50^{\prime}$ | 1,800 | 5,400 | 913 | 8,113 |
| Machinery storage and shop | $40^{\prime} \times 50^{\prime}$ | 1,800 | 5,400 | 913 | 8,113 |
| Polyhouse structures | $200^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}$ | 10,066 | 16,777 | 2,835 | 29,678 |
| Subtotal |  | $\overline{14,786}$ | $\overline{30,937}$ | $\overline{5,229}$ | $\overline{50,952}$ |
| Machinery and Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tractor, 60 HP | 60 HP , gas fuel w/front-end loader | 1,440 | 2,400 | 73 | 3,913 |
| Tractor, 28 HP | 28 HP , gas fuel | 1,085 | 1,808 | 55 | 2,948 |
| Manure spreader | 130 bu capacity | 192 | 320 | 10 | 522 |
| Wagon . | 4-wheel | 414 | 690 | 21 | 1,125 |
| Irrigation pump/well | 75 HP , electric pump | 1,804 | 6,013 | 182 | 7,999 |
| Inground irrigation system | PVC pipe/sprinklers | 1,940 | 5,820 | 176 | 7,936 |
| Above ground irrigation system | PVC pipe/sprinklers | 3,489 | 2,908 | 88 | 6,485 |
| Fertilizer injector | 200 gal injector | 1,170 | 975 | 30 | 2,175 |
| Airblast sprayer | 300 gal , on trailer | 894 | 1,043 | 36 | 1,973 |
| Forklift | 3,000 lb lift, exterior-use wheels | 2,160 | 3,600 | 109 | 5,869 |
| Truck | 1/2 ton pickup | 1,440 | 1,200 | 36 | 2,676 |
| Pallets | Hooden | 1,047 | 628 |  | 1,675 |
| Handtoels | Miscellaneous | 200 | 150 |  | 350 |
| Subtotal |  | $\overline{17,275}$ | $\overline{27,555}$ | $\overline{816}$ | $\overline{45,646}$ |

General Overhead

| Utilities | Telephone, electric, gas heat | 5,325 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Licenses and bonds |  | 375 |
| General repairs and maintenance | Buildings, grounds | 6,140 |
| Advertising and printing |  | 1,050 |
| Insurance, personnel | Workmen's comp., FICA, heal th, unemp. | 19,060 |
| Travel and other |  | 1,500 |
| Professional fees |  | 75 |
| Adninistrative and Management | Clerical, operator, supervisory, labor and office supplies | 60,500 |
| Miscellaneous |  | 1,000 |
| Subtotal |  | $\overline{95,025}$ |
| Interest on General Querhead, Insurance, and Taxes | Compounded at 15\% per annum for 6 months | 7,885 |
| Total Annual Fixed Costs |  | 242,590 | *17.04 acres, $340,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ growing space, $204,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of polyhouse space.

**Depreciation was estimated by dividing initial cost adjusted for salvage value, by the years of useful life.
*kkInterest costs were estimated by multiplying the initial value of land, building, equipment and machinery by the interest rate. $15 \%$ der annum.

TABLE 4.- Variable Costs (Dollars) for an Eight Acred (Growing Space) Container Nursery, U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones Five and Six, 1982.

| Item | Description | Unit | Cost per Unit | Quantity | Total Variable Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Materials |  |  |  |  |  |
| Container | \$2, $81 / 2^{\mathbf{2}} \times 8^{\prime \prime}$ copolymer propylene | each | 0.29 | 100,620.00 | 29,180 |
| Soil mixture | Pine bark, sand, nutrients (Taxus \& Rhododendron) | cu yd | 33.00 | 279.20 | 9,214 |
|  | Hardwood bark, sand, nutrients (Juniperus, Cotoneaster \& Virburnum) | cu yo | 31.00 | 526.08 | 16,308 |
| Liners | 2-year 6-7 ${ }^{\text {diner ( }}$ (Juniperus) | each | . 95 | 26,885,00 | 25,541 |
|  | 2-year 6-7 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ liner (Cotoneaster) | each | . 85 | 21,820.00 | 18,547 |
|  | 3-year 6-7 liner (Taxus) | each | 1.25 | 21,140.00 | 26,425 |
|  | 2-year 6-7" liner (Virburnum) | each | 1.00 | 17,040.00 | 17,040 |
|  | 2-year 6-7' liner (Rhadodendron) | each | 1.25 | 13,735.00 | 17,169 |
| Polyethylene film | 4 mil white, $32^{\prime} \times 225^{\prime}$ | each | 107.00 | 51.00 | 5,457 |
| Thermal blanket | 4-1/4' $89^{\prime \prime} \times 225^{\prime}$ per house (Cotoneaster \& Rhododendron) | each | 775.00 | 1/3(20.40) | 5,270 |
| Strip tags Chemicals | 5/8' $\times 7^{\prime \prime}$ plastic strip tag | each | . 02 | 95,650.00 | 1,913 |
|  | Oxadiazon 46 (Ronstar) (herbicide) | pound | . 90 | 1,460.00 | 1,314 |
|  | Benomyl 50 WP (Benlate) (fungicide) | pound | 10.00 | 30.00 | 300 |
|  | Demetron 6 (Meta-Systox-1) (insecticide) | ounces | . 71 | 260.00 | 185 |
|  | Cyhexatin 50WP (Kelthane) (miticide) | pound | 22.25 | 7.50 | 167 |
|  | Chlorothalonil 10M au ft (Termil) (fungicide) | canister | 1.90 | 301.00 | 572 |
|  | Lesco 3-4 по (20-6-12) +Fe (Taxus \& Rhododendron) | pound | 0.80 | 10,019.42 | 8,016 |
|  | Osmocote 8-9 mo (18-6-12) <br> (Juniperus, Cotoneaster \& Viburnum) | pound | . 86 | 9,731.60 | 8,369 |
|  | Urea 45-0-0 (fertilizer) | pound | . 13 | 13,142.00 | 1,708 |
|  | Glyphosate (Roundup) (herbicide) | quart | 16.60 | 14.00 | 232 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  | $\overline{192,927}$ |
| Machinery and Equipment |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tractor, 60 HP | hour | 15.85 | 133.00 | 2,108 |
|  | Tractor, 28 HP | hour | 4.92 | 517.00 | 2,544 |
|  | Manure spreader, 130 bu | hour | 1.58 | 43.00 | 68 |
|  | Wagon, 4-wheel | hour | 0.53 | 778.00 | 412 |
|  | Irrigation/well, pump 75 HP | hour | 6.65 | 735.00 | 4,888 |
|  | Inground irrigation system | hour | 1.54 | 735.00 | 1,132 |
|  | Above ground irrigation system | hour | 3.09 | 735.00 | 2,271 |
|  | Fertilizer injector | hour | 4.33 | 120.00 | 520 |
|  | Airblast sprayer | hout | 23.98 | 16.00 | 384 |
|  | Forklift | hour | 6.59 | 130.00 | 857 |
|  | 1/2 ton pick-up truck | hour | 8.51 | 375.00 | 3,191 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  | $\overline{18,375}$ |

Table 4 Cont.

| Item | Description | Unit | Cost per Unit | Quantity | Total Variatle Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labor |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Labor hours | hour | 5.15k* | 7,863.00 | 40,494 |
|  | Related labor hours | hour | 5.15 | 1,573.40 | 8,103 |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  | $\overline{48,597}$ |
| Interest Charge on Operating Capital | Computed at $15 \%$ on an annual basis for 6 months | percent | $\begin{aligned} & 7.5 \\ & (0.075) \end{aligned}$ | 259,899.00 | 19,492 |
|  |  |  |  |  | = = = = |
| Total Variable Costs |  |  |  |  | 279,391 |

$\star$ Total Nursery - 17.04 acres, $340,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of growing space, $204,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of polyhouse space.
*tAverage basic wage before withholding taxes and fringes $\$ 4.30$, taxes and fringes add $19.84 \%$ or $\$ 0.85$ for a total of $\$ 5.15$.

TABLE 5.-Sumary of Fixed, Variable and Total Costs (Dollars) of Doerating an Eight Acret (Growing Space) Container Nursery, U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones Five and Six, 1982.

| Iten | Group I <br> (Juniperus) | Group II <br> (Contoneaster) | Group III <br> (Taxus) | Group IV <br> (Viburnum) | Group V <br> (Rhadodendron) | Total |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

*17.04 Acres, $340,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of growing space, 204,000 sq ft of polyhouse space

TABLE 6. --Sumary of Fixed, Variable, and Total Costs (Dollars) per Salable Plant of Operating an Eight Acret (Growing Space) Container Nursery, U.S.D.A. Plant Hardiness Zones Five and Six, 1982.

|  | Group I (Juniperus) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Group II } \\ \text { (Cotoneaster) } \end{gathered}$ |  | Group III <br> (Taxus) |  | Group IV (Viburnum) |  | Group V(Rhododendron) |  | Average |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item | Cost per Salable Plant | Percent <br> of <br> Total <br> Cost | Cost per Salable Plant | Percent <br> of <br> Total <br> Cost | Cost per Salable Plant | Percent <br> of <br> Total <br> Cost | Cost per Salable Plant | Percent of Total Cost | Cost per Salable Plant | Percent of Total Cost | Cost <br> per <br> Salable <br> Plant | Percent of Total Cost |

Fixed cost Items

| Land and Improve- ments | . 34 | ( 8) | . 41 | ( 8) | . 43 | (8) | . 53 | ( 9) | . 66 | (9) | . 45 | ( 8) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Buildings | . 40 | (9) | . 49 | (10) | . 51 | (9) | . 63 | (11) | . 78 | (11) | . 53 | (10) |
| Machinery and Equipment | . 36 | (8) | . 44 | (8) | . 45 | (8) | . 56 | (9) | . 70 | (9) | . 48 | (9) |
| General Duerhead | . 74 | (16) | . 92 | (18) | . 95 | (17) | 1.18 | (20) | 1.46 | (20) | . 99 | (18) |
| Interest on General Overhead, Insurance, and Taxes | . 06 | (1) | . 08 | ( 2) | . 08 | (1) | . 10 | ( 2) | .12 | ( 2) | . 08 | ( 1) |
| Subtotal | $\overline{1.90}$ | (42) | $\overline{2.34}$ | $\overline{(46)}$ | $\overline{2.42}$ | $\overline{(43)}$ | $\overline{3.00}$ | $\overline{\text { (51) }}$ | $\overline{3.72}$ | $\overline{\text { (51) }}$ | $\overline{2.53}$ | $\overline{(46)}$ |
| Variable Cost Items Materials | 1.78 | (40) | 1.85 | (37) | 2.24 | (40) | 1.90 | (33) | 2.54 | (35) | 2.02 | (37) |
| Machinery and Equipment | . 15 | ( 3) | . 18 | ( 4) | . 18 | (3) | . 23 | ( 4) | . 28 | ( 4) | . 19 | ( 4) |
| Labor | . 49 | (11) | . 48 | ( 9) | . 52 | (10) | . 51 | ( 9) | . 56 | ( 7) | . 51 | (9) |
| Interest on Operating Capital | . 18 | ( 4) | . 19 | ( 4) | . 22 | ( 4) | . 20 | ( 3) | . 25 | (3) | . 21 | ( 4) |
| Subtotal | $\overline{2.60}$ | $\overline{(58)}$ | $\overline{2.70}$ | $\overline{(54)}$ | $\overline{3.16}$ | $\overline{(57)}$ | $\overline{2.84}$ | $\overline{(49)}$ | $\overline{3.63}$ | (49) | $\overline{2.93}$ | $\overline{(54)}$ |
|  | $=$ | = $=$ | $=$ | =ax | $=$ | $=\square$ | = $=$ | =a= | = $=$ | $=\square$ | = = $=$ | = $=$ = |
| Total Cost per Salable Plant | 4.50 | (100) | 5.04 | (100) | 5.58 | (100) | 5.84 | (100) |  | (100) | 5.46 | (100) |

$\star 17.04$ acres, $340,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of growing space, $204,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of polyhouse space


[^0]:    *Associate Professor, Graduate Student and Professor, Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, and Professor, Dept. of Horticulture, respectively. Mr. Kneen is presently Director of Marketing at Studebaker Nurseries, Inc., New Carlisle, Ohio.

