Staff Papers Series

Staff Paper P82-3

February 1982

Potato Production and Storage Cost Estimates for Minnesota in 1982

Fred J. Benson



Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics

University of Minnesota
Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Potato Production and Storage Cost Estimates for Minnesota in 1982

by

Fred J. Benson

Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics University of Minnesota St. Paul, Minnesota

February 1982

Paper presented at the Ontario Horticultural Crops Conference, February 16-18, 1982, Toronto, Ontario.

INTRODUCTION

In 1980, Minnesota ranked ninth in terms of income from potato production. This is typical over the years. Most of Minnesota's potato production is in the northwest part of the state commonly referred to as the Red River Valley. The Red River marks the border between Minnesota and North Dakota, so potato production also takes place in the western part of the Red River Valley in North Dakota. The Red River Valley as a potato production region is second only to the western region.

Minnesota typically devotes 70,000 to 80,000 of its 30 million acres of farm land to potatoes (about 0.3%). Cash receipts from potato production is typically about 1% of the state's total cash receipts from farm marketings, depending on the year and potato prices.

Discussion of Budget Information

This section will discuss the crop production estimates which are shown in Appendix Tables 1 through 5. These budgets are developed for the Red River Valley in Minnesota. The reader should keep in mind that these budgets are projections and are subject to the many variables and uncertainties that can take place before and while the 1982 potato crop is produced and marketed. The yields used in the budgets are estimated using previous production records and the expectations of the farmers who provided their production information to me.

Expected Prices: The hardest variable to estimate is that of price. These budgets are set up as production budgets. They do not contain storage costs. Therefore, the price used in the budgets is an expected harvest price. This allows the grower to separate the decision of what to grow from that of when and how to market.

Mid-winter projections of cash market prices for the 1982 crop are highly conjectural. The crop isn't planted. Acreage and yield are unknown. Demand for many crops depends heavily on foreign markets. An individual's planting decisions should consider both the level of price expectations and the degree of confidence in those price expectations. Government programs limit the downside price risk on wheat and feedgrains, and somewhat limit the upside price possibilities as well. All of these variables must be considered and analyzed as best as possible to estimate the resulting impact on potato production acreage and expected prices.

Supply for the 1982 potato crop marketing year will consist of carryover stocks plus production.

The estimated stocks of potatoes in Minnesota as of January 1, 1982 was 8.1 million cwt. or 61% of production (see Table 1). This is 16% above January 1, 1981 but 15% below January 1, 1980. According to the Minnesota Agricultural Statistics Service report, disappearance during December, 1981 totaled 1.0 million cwt. which was 29% less than one year ago when 1.4 million cwt. were moved. The estimate of stocks by type show 22% red, 48% white, and 30% russet.

Stocks of potatoes in the North Dakota-Minnesota Red River Valley area are estimated at 18.0 million cwt. which is 33% above one year ago and 5% above two years ago. Total disappearance during December, 1981 totaled 3.0 million cwt. compared to 2.5 million cwt. in 1980. Stocks by type are estimated at 25% red, 63% white, and 12% russet.

U.S. potato stocks are up from a year earlier. Estimated potato stocks in the 15 major fall states as of January 1, 1982 are 160 million cwt., 9% above January 1 a year ago but 9% less than on January 1, 1980. Of the total stocks on hand in the 11 major states, 73% are russets, 23% whites and 4% reds.

Estimated holdings in the three eastern states total 24.8 million cwt., 10% greater than a year earlier but 16% below January 1, 1980. Stocks in Maine, at 18.0 million cwt., are up 10% from a year ago. In the six central states estimated stocks are 33.9 million cwt., 30% greater than a year earlier and 1% above January 1, 1980. North Dakota's stocks are 37% above a year ago while Minnesota and Wisconsin are up 16% and 44%, respectively. Holdings in the six western states total 101 million cwt., 3% more than on January 1, 1981 but 10% below two years ago. Idaho's stocks are estimated at 51.0 million cwt., 4% less than a year earlier. Holdings in Washington and Oregon are up 14% and 12%, respectively, compared with January 1, 1981.

The price forecasts used in the budgets are to provide a benchmark with which to assess harvest price potential as the season unfolds. They are built on crop carryover estimates in December 1981, on possible planted acreage and an estimate of crop yield. As planting time approaches, growers will refine these price estimates and compare the expected net returns from potatoes with other pricing alternatives and other crop production possibilities.

Cropping Costs and Cash Flow Expenses: The per acre costs (shown in the budgets) are developed on the basis of commercial production. Field performance rates are also indicated for the machine sizes given. Field operations are assumed to be done in a timely fashion. Cash flow expenses of field operations include diesel fuel, plus an allowance for lubrication and use-related repairs. Performance rates include discounts for the usual efficiency factors which account for turing time at the ends and other delays in field performance.

Table 1

•	
and Stocks	
and	
i, Production,	
Yie10	
Acreage,	
Potatoes:	
Fall Po	
Dakot	
North	
and	
Minnesota	

			1	1981 Crop	1	Jan. 1, 1981	January 1,	, 1982
Area	Color	State	Harvested Acreage	Yield (Cwt.)	Production (000 Cwt.)	Stocks 1980 Crop (000 Cwt.)	Stocks 1981 Crop (000 Cwt.)	Percent of Total
	Red	Minnesota North Dakota Valley	11,500 28,800 40,300	170 164 166	1,960 4,730 6,690	980 2,314 3,294	1,280 3,175 4,455	22 26 25
Red	White	Minnesota North Dakota Valley	32,500 77,000 109,500	163 178 173	5,290 13,685 18,975	3,200 5,251 8,451	3,820 7,500 11,320	66 61 63
Valley	Russet	Minnesota North Dakota Valley	5,000 9,200 14,200	167 186 179	835 1,710 2,545	420 1,335 1,755	700 1,525 2,225	12 13 12
	Total	Minnesota North Dakota Valley	49,000 115,000 164,000	165 175 172	8,085 20,125 28,210	4,600 8,900 13,500	5,800 12,200 18,000	32 68 100
State	Red White Russet Total	Minnesota	16,000 36,000 18,000 70,000	168 158 274 190	2,690 5,686 4,924 13,300	1,410 3,530 2,060 7,000	1,780 3,890 2,430 8,100	22 48 30 100

Source: Minnesota Agricultural Statistics Service, January 1982.

Machinery costs are included as "machinery function costs" — that is, the average total costs, on an annual basis, for the tractor and machine (overhead and operating) including operating labor to work one acre. The machines are assumed fully-utilized on the farm. For each machine, the figure under the "UNITS OF APPLIC" column indicates how many times it is used on one acre. The "QUANTITY" column is the time, in hours, required per acre—hours per acre. The figure in the "PRICE" column is the total cost to operate the tractor plus the machine, including labor, for one hour. The "TOTAL AMOUNT" column is the result of multiplying the first three columns together. The "CASH COSTS" column for a machine is the estimated value of fuel, oil and repairs for the tractor and/or implement. Labor costs are not included in cash costs.

Purchased Seed, Fertilizer and Chemicals: Other cost items indicate the number of units and the cost per unit. Quantities and rates indicated in the budgets are based upon recommended practices. Adjustments to individual farm conditions from these recommendations may be necessary. For instance, soil tests and fertilizer carryover from 1981 may suggest different fertilizer recommendations. Potassium and phosphate levels are approximately equal to removals adjusted for the availability of naturally available fertilizer ingredients in the soils.

Herbicide carryover considerations must be considered in terms of which crops are feasible on individual fields. Weed problems must also be considered. Specific chemicals used as herbicides and insecticides were grouped to attain a per acre cost.

<u>Cash Expense Per Acre:</u> Cash expenses are those costs associated specifically with the crop being considered and are incurred only with the production of that crop.

Costs indicated in the budgets are based on recommended practices for a good producer. Adjustments to individual farm conditions may be necessary with varying fertility situations, chemical use, and planting practices.

Cash costs estimate the out-of-pocket cash operating expenses and include estimates for fuel, oil, repairs, fertilizer, seed, chemicals, and land taxes. These costs are basic to any analysis of short-term adjustments to increase profitability.

In the short-run each grower seeks to maximize his returns over cash costs. This in turn provides the greatest amount towards fixed assets, family living expenses and hired labor.

Land and Other Overhead Costs: The actual 1982 cash cost of land will vary greatly among individual operators due to varying land rental arrangements and land finance structures.

The land values used in the budgets are based on recent relationships between land prices and cash rents in Minnesota. The ratio of rent to current land value is estimated between 3.5 and 4.5%. Such a ratio for cropland suggests that land renting for \$75 per acre would sell for \$1,667 to \$2,142 per acre. In the budgets a cash rent of \$75 per acre was used with a land value of \$1,667 per acre.

Average land taxes are estimated at .6% of the current market value of land. The net return for land is 3.9% of current market value. The land tax estimates are included in the cash expense category, and the net return to land is included as the overhead cost (called "land charge").

Labor is considered an overhead cost in the production process. This is the case with both operator and family labor and full-time hired labor. Special labor hired seasonally for a specific crop should be considered a cash cost. The budgets in the appendix tables assume the use of operator and family labor.

<u>Crop Loss Cost (Insurance):</u> The calculated crop loss cost can be viewed as either the cash expense of carrying crop insurance or the discount in returns necessary to make fair comparisons between crops under conditions where crop insurance is not carried.

Interest on Cash Expense: It is assumed that cash flow crop expenses are borrowed to grow the crop. The average time this money is on loan until harvest is six months. Interest costs are calculated accordingly using a 16% annual rate.

The column "CASH COSTS" estimates the out-of-pocket cash operating expenses incurred on one acre of the indicated crop. The cash costs include estimates for fuel, oil, repairs, fertilizers, seed, chemicals and crop insurance. These costs as mentioned earlier, are basic to any analysis of short-term adjustments to increase profitability in the farming operation.

Costs not Included: The budgets are developed on an industry cost format. The total costs indicated are all costs, cash and otherwise, required to plant, produce, harvest and haul the crop to storage. Storage costs are not included. This allows the producer to separate the marketing costs associated with different marketing strategies from the production costs. No charge is included for general farm overhead.

The returns over total costs shown are the total returns minus the indicated total costs. The total costs include: land, labor, machinery and other specific costs as listed in the budget. The total cost figure does not include other total farm overhead charges such as farm organization dues, use of the pickup truck, building and storage cost (except machinery housing which is included in machine cost) or the labor and fuel used for off-field purposes. The returns over cash costs allow the budget user to estimate his return over cash costs which goes to pay for land, labor, machinery and management.

Fuel and Labor Needed

At the bottom of each budget is an estimate of fuel use per acre in diesel fuel equivalents. Multiply this figure by 1.39 to estimate gasoline equivalents if gasoline powered tractors are used. Also included are the amount of hours and value of actual field labor, and the portion of annual machinery overhead and operating expenses charged to the budget.

Credit: If credit is limiting, a grower may need to consider crops with lower cash cost requirements and crops that have a high degree of assurance of enough cash return to cover the cash expense incurred. Some crops are more resistant to drought than others—others may be more disease resistant. It is necessary to consider the net cash flow if yields are less than planned. Estimates are given in the line "RETURNS OVER CASH COSTS" and include the value if attaining the listed returns, a 20% reduction in returns, and a 50% reduction in returns. Reduction in returns may occur because of changes in either/or both price and yield.

Other "Givens": Most growers want as high a return over cash costs in a given year as safety in maintaining their cash flow or liquidity position will allow. As the cropping season approaches, the available moisture, labor, machine capacity and past cropping history must be taken as given. Diversification may be necessary for some to decrease risk and/or give the highest return in the face of their particular set of "givens".

Long-Run Considerations: The crops showing the greatest return over cash expenses in a given year may or may not be the most profitable in the long-run. When due consideration is made for the differences in machinery overhead costs, in disease and pest buildup risks and in soil erosion considerations associated with one sequence of crops versus another, there will be situations where long-term profitability may not necessarily be the same as that associated with providing the best cash flow position and the best short-run profitability for a given set of resources of land, labor and machinery.

Using the Budget Information for Decision-Making

The main purpose of a budget is for planning. And at this time of the year a grower must decide what and how much (acreage) to grow. In the Red River Valley of Minnesota the most predominant crop is wheat. Another important crop is sugarbeets. Both of these crops can be substituted for potatoes. In Table 2, I have provided a shortcut analysis of the potato budgets, as shown in Appendix Tables 1 through 5, and compared them with the 1982 budgets for wheat and sugarbeets for the Red River Valley in Minnesota.

Making the decision of what to grow in the upcoming year is a short-run planning situation which looks at maximizing the returns over cash costs for the total farming operation. Of course this is subject to constraints

1982 Budget Comparisons of Wheat, Sugarbeets and Potatoes for the Red River Valley in Minnesota on a Per Acre Basis Table 2

Crop	Wheat	Sugarbeets	Round White Seed	Russet	Round White Processing	Russet Processing	Tablestock
Yield	45 bu.	17 ton	150 cwt.	140 cwt.	165 cwt.	145 cwt.	155 cwt.
Price	\$3.75	\$26.00	\$5.50	\$5.50	\$3.50	\$3.85	\$3.75
Returns	169	442	¥06 <i>L</i>	735*	578	558	581
Cash Costs	89	163	404	394	325	288	332
Returns-Cash Costs	101	279	386	341	253	270	249
80% Returns-Cash Costs	67	191	228	194	137	159	133
50% Returns-Cash Costs	16	58	6-	-27	-36	6-	-42
Net Returns	6	75	147	107	26	50	24

for specifics. See Appendix Tables 1 and 2 * Includes the sale of jumbos and "Bs" at other prices.

such as land suitability, input availability, sufficient machinery capacity, adequate operating capital, etc. In the long-run the grower must look at covering all of his costs, which means adequate payment to his fixed factors of production (land, labor, capital and management). Also when considering a new crop or a change in production practices, the grower should make his analysis on the expected long-run net returns.

1982 Storage Costs

In order to estimate potato storage costs, I have used a 48,000 cwt. four bin house with refrigeration and other needed equipment for potato handling. The breakdown of costs is shown in Table 3. Annual overhead costs on this storage unit are estimated to be \$55,441. The operating costs are calculated separately for seed and processing potatoes. Using processing potatoes as an example, the estimated total cost per cwt. into storage is \$1.99, but the cost per cwt. of potatoes marketed after a 10% shrink is \$2.21.

Total Costs with Marketing from Storage

I find it easiest to estimate total costs by converting all costs to a per cwt. marketed basis. This then correctly consideres the shrinkage which occurs in storage. The budgets indicate yields available for sale at harvest or yield going into storage. The resulting breakeven price for tablestock potatoes (Appendix Table 4) is \$3.59 per cwt. However, if the 155 cwt. of potatoes goes into storage and incurs a 10% shrink, there are only 139.5 cwt. left for sale from that acre. Production expenses were \$557.00, so the production expenses per cwt. marketed after shrink are now \$3.99. The storage costs of \$2.21 per cwt. now indicate the total costs per cwt. to be \$6.20.

A breakeven analysis has to consider the shrink factors. I have used 10% in calculations but this can vary considerably. In order to adjust for the shrink factor, you must divide the costs before shrink by one minus the shrink factor (1-.10). Table 4 shows the breakeven price for the various potato production budgets when marketing out of storage and incurring shrinkage. These are the total costs or the prices that would be needed to breakeven given the stated assumptions on production and storage costs and shrinkage.

In Retrospect

In this analysis, I have estimated the cash operating costs and the overhead costs separately. The cash operating costs for each crop can be expected to be very close to what every grower can expect. These will be very consistent from farm-to-farm as they are itemized in the budgets.

Table 3
1982 Estimated Potato Storage Costs

12,000 Cwt. Bin (48,000 Cwt. House) Stored 6 Months New Cost/Cwt. \$5.00

<u>Item</u>	Total	Annual	Annual
	Cost	Percent	Cost
Building (4 bin) 20 years	\$240,000	17.17	\$41,208
Refrigeration - 20 years	10,000	17.17	1,717
Equipment (Bobcat Pilers, etc.) 10 years	47,000	26.63	12,516
Total annual overhead costs			\$55,441

Annual Operating Costs

Seed		Processing
Electricity 46,286 KWH @ .0525	\$ 2,430	Electricity 85,714 KWH @ .0525 \$ 4,500
Telephone	2,000	Telephone 2,000
Insurance 48,000 x \$7.00 x .015	5,040	Insurance 48,000 x \$5.00 x .015 3,600
Labor 5 men 300 hrs @ \$5.20/hr 2 hrs/day @ \$5.20 (150 day	7,800 s) 1,560	Labor 4 men 300 hrs @ \$5.20/hr 6,240 2 hrs/day @ \$5.20 (150 days) 1,560
Office Supplies	1,000	Office Supplies 1,000
Interest on Inventory 43,200 x \$7.00 x .08	24,192	Interest on Inventory 43,200 x \$5.00 x .08 17,280
Disinfectant	500	Disinfectant 300
Total Operating Cost Total Annual Cost	44,522 99,963	Total Operating Cost 39,840 Total Annual Cost 95,281
Total Cost/Cwt. Stored	2.08	Total Cost/Cwt. Stored 1.99
Total Cost/Cwt. Marketed 10% Shrink	2.31	Total Cost/Cwt. Marketed 10% Shrink 2.21

Table 4

Breakeven Prices for the Various Potato Production
Budgets When Marketed out of Storage*

	Round White Seed	Russet Seed	Round White Processing	Russet Processing	Tablestock Potatoes
Cwt./Acre	150	140	165	145	155
Total Cost	\$643	\$628	\$552	\$509	\$557
Cost/Cwt.	\$ 4.29	\$ 4.49	\$ 3.34	\$ 3.51	\$ 3.59
Storage Cost/Cwt.	\$ 2.08	\$ 2.08	\$ 1.99	\$ 1.99	\$ 1.99
Total Cost/Cwt. Produced	\$ 6.37	\$ 6.57	\$ 5.33	\$ 5.50	\$ 5.58
Shrinkage Percent	10	10	10	10	10
Total Cost/Cwt. Marketed	\$ 7.08	\$ 7.30	\$ 5.92	\$ 6.11	\$ 6.20

^{*} After 10% shrinkage in storage.

The biggest variations will come in the area of estimated overhead costs. The estimates for overhead costs are what I would expect to be average for the industry. However, from farm to farm there will be wide variations in overhead costs due to the individual grower's situation and debt load. For example, the young farmer starting out is probably facing cash rent payments and/or principal and interest payments on purchased land and high machinery expenditures. Growers with higher debt loads and high repayment rates may find the returns over listed cash operating costs insufficient to meet scheduled debt repayments.

On the other hand, the established grower with his land paid for and most machinery and equipment paid for will find the returns over cash operating costs to be more than adequate to meet his cash debt payments and family living expenses. It is the function of management to constantly be striving to get the farm overhead costs down within reason so that the debt load can be reduced to the point where all the factors of production (land, labor, capital and management) could expect a normal return. Management of the overhead costs is as important as the management devoted to the production and marketing functions.

		·

APPENDIX TABLES

·		
•		
,		

01 15 82

(7)		SEED				
	UNITS OR APPLIC.	QUANTI	TY	PRICE	TOTAL AMOUNT	CASH COSTS
RETURNS						
ROUND CERT. SEED JUMBOS POT. B SIZED ROUND		130.000 10.000 10.000	CWI.		715.00 20.00 55.00	
TOTAL RETURNS		-			790.00	
PLANTIN	G COSTS					
FIELD CULTIVATOR 28 SPRINGTOOTH DRAG 48 ROUND FOUND SEED POT SEED TREATMENT POT. SEED CUTTING POTATO ROW MARKER 4R POTATO PLANTER 4 ROW HEAVY TRUCK FERTILI	3	.033 18.000 18.000 18.000 .201 .261	CWT.	49.262 63.571 7.000 .450 .300 57.859 82.128 57.966	3.63 2.10 126.00 8.10 5.40 11.62 21.44 45.39	1.39 .31 126.00 8.10 5.40 2.98 6.08 27.31
ANHYDROUS AMMONIA NITROGEN PHOSPHORUS P205 POTASSIUM K20 ANHYDROUS APPLICATOR	- -	50.000 25.000 100.000 60.000	LBS.	.130 .220 .220 .100 54.727	6.50 5.50 22.00 6.00 6.14	6.50 5.50 22.00 6.00 1.69
SPRAYIN	G COSTS					
AERIAL APPLICATION INSECTICIDE FUNGICIDE VINE KILLER	5 2 4 2	3.500 21.000 3.500 12.000	ACRE	1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000	17.50 42.00 14.00 24.00	17.50 42.00 14.00 24.00
CULTIVA POTATO CULT. 4 ROW ROUGEING	TION 4	.163 5.000	HR/A	25.272 1.000	16.50 5.00	5.92 5.00
HARVEST	COST	b. m. m.	www. 6.6.	0- t		
POTATO HRVSTR. 2 ROW HEAVY TRUCK DISK 21 FT FIELD CULTIVATOR 28	3	.402 .098	HR/A HR/A HR/A		33.60 69.91 5.32 3.63	7.37 42.06 1.47 1.39
				.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	3	
OTHER C LAND CHARGE LAND TAXES FIELD + DISEASE TEST PROMOTION TAXES CROP INSURANCE INTEREST ON CASH COST		1667.000 1667.000 1.000 150.000 790.000 404.488		.039 .006 10.000 .030 .025 .080	4.50 19.75	10.00 10.00 4.50
TOTAL COSTS					642.91	404.49
RETURNS OVER TOTAL CO RETURNS OVER CASH COS RETURNS OVER CASH COS RETURNS OVER CASH COS	TS TS 20 PC	T RETURNS T RETURNS	REDUC	TION TION	147.09 385.51 227.51 -9.49	
CASH COSTS/ACRE MACHINE OWNERSHIP COS	404.4 T/A 91.7	9 MACH 1 FUEL		ERATING CRE (GAL		97.99 32.01
CASH COST 3 LABOR HOURS	15.76 1 1.94	.68 2		24.50 4 0		

01 15 82

(10)		SEED				
	UNITS OR APPLIC.	TINAUP	TY	PRICE	TOTAL	CASH COSTS
RETURNS						•
RUSSET CERT. SEED JUMBOS POT. B-SIZED RUSSET		120.000 10.000 10.000	CWT.	5.500 2.000 5.500		
TOTAL RETURNS					735.00	
PI.ANTTI	NG COSTS					
FIELD CULTIVATOR 28 SPRINGTOOTH DRAG 48 RUSSET FOUND SEED POT SEED TREATMENT POT. SEED CUTTING POTATO ROW MARKER 4R POTATO PLANTER 4 ROW HEAVY TRUCK FERTIL	3	18.000 18.000 18.000 .201 .261	HR/A CWT. CWT. CWT	6.500 .450 .300	2.10 117.00 8.10 5.40 11.62 21.44	6.08
ANHYDROUS AMMONIA		75.000			9.75	
NITROGEN PHOSPHORUS P205 POTASSIUM K20 ANHYDROUS APPLICATOR		25.000 100.000 100.000 .112	LBS.	.220 .220 .100 54.727	10.00	5.50 22.00 10.00 1.69
	IG COSTS					
AERIAL APPLICATION INSECTICIDE FUNGICIDE VINE KILLER	5 2 4 2	3.500 21.000 3.500 8.750		1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000	42.00	42.00 14.00
CULTIVA		100	**** **		40.07	1. 1. 1.
POTATO CULT. 4 ROW ROUGEING	3	5.000		25.272 1.000	12.37 5.00	4.44 5.00
HARVEST POTATO HRVSTR. 2 ROW HEAVY TRUCK DISK 21 FT FIELD CULTIVATOR 28	3	.402 .098	HR/A HR/A HR/A	54.187	33.60 69.91 5.32 3.63	
OTHER C	'Agre	•		-		-
LAND CHARGE LAND TAXES FIELD + DISEASE TEST PROMOTION TAXES CROP INSURANCE INTEREST ON CASH COST		1667.000 1667.000 1.000 140.000 735.000 394.457	ACRE	.039 .006 10.000 .030 .025 .080	10.00 10.00 4.20 18.38	
TOTAL COSTS	,				628.05	394.46
RETURNS OVER TOTAL CO RETURNS OVER CASH COS RETURNS OVER CASH COS	TS 20 PC				106.95 340.54 193.54 -26.96	
CASH COSTS/ACRE MACHINE OWNERSHIP COS	394.40 T/A 89.9	6 MACE 5 FUEL	IINE OP . USE/A	ERATING CRE (GAL	COSTS/A	96.51 31.27
THRU CASH COST 3 LABOR HOURS LABOR VALUE	1.94	9.44 52 •51 2		24.20 3	TOTAL 94.46 5.17 28.71	

(5)		PROCE	POTING			
	UNITS OR APPLIC.	QUANTI	ry	PRICE	TOTAL	CASH COSTS
RETURNȘ						
ROUND WHITE POT.		165.000	CWI.	3.500	577.50	
TOTAL RETURNS					577.50	
PLAN FIELD CULTIVATOR 2	TING COSTS	.074	HR/A	110.262	3.63	1.39
SPRINGTOOTH DRAG 4				63.571		•31
ROUND CERT SEED	•	15.000		5.500		82.50
POT SEED TREATMENT		15.000		-450	6.75	6.75
POT. SEED CUTTING	•	15.000		-300	4.50	4.50
POTATO ROW MARKER			HR/A	57.859	11.62 21.44	2.98 6.08
POTATO PLANTER 4 R HEAVY TRUCK			HR/A HR/A			27.31
	ILIZER 3	•201	IIII/A	21.300	73.33	21.01
NITROGEN		25.000	LBS.	.220	5.50	5.50
ANHYDROUS AMMONIA		75.000		.130	9.75	
PHOSPHORUS P205		100.000				22.00
POTASSIUM K20		60.000	LBS. HR/A	.100		6.00
ANHYDROUS APPLICAT	OR	•112	HH/A	54.727	6.14	1.69
SPRA	YING COSTS					
AERIAL APPLICATION		3.500	ACRE	1.000	14.00	14.00
INSECTICIDE	•	35.000		1.000		
FUNGICIDE	4	3.500		1.000		14.00
SPROUT INHIB & APP		12.000		1.000	12.00	12.00
OUT III	FUATION					
POTATO CULT. 4 ROW	EVATION 4	163	HR/A	25.272	16.50	5.92
TOTATO COLLEG 4 NOW	.	•103	***** 25	274412	.0150	J.,
HARV	est cost					
POTATO HRVSTR. 2 R		.402	HR/A	83.651 57.966	33.60	7.37
HEAVY TRUCK	3					42.06
DISK 21 FT	,		HR/A	54.187 49.262		1.47 1.39
FIELD CULTIVATOR 2	•	.014	nn/ A	49.202	3.03	1.03
OTHE	R COSTS				·	
LAND CHARGE	-	1667.000		.039		
LAND TAXES		1667.000		.006	10.00	10.00
PROMOTION TAXES		165.000		•030	4.95	4.95
PROMOTION TAXES CROP INSURANCE INTEREST ON CASH CO	2000	577.500		-025	26 00	
INTEREST ON CASH C	7212	324.930		•000	20.00	
TOTAL COSTS					551.58	324.94
RETURNS OVER TOTAL	andere e				25.82	
PATURNS OVER TOTAL	70313 70213				252.56	
RETURNS OVER CASH (RETURNS OVER CASH (RETURNS OVER CASH (COSTS 20 PC	T RETURNS	S REDU	CTION	137.06	
RETURNS OVER CASH	COSTS 50 PC	T RETURNS	REDU	CTION	-36.19	
)			0000011	07 00
CASH COSTS/ACRE MACHINE OWNERSHIP (324.9	4 MACE	TICE (DERALING	COSTS/A	32.01
TOTAL COST PER CWT	DOILH AIOL	ji topi	. UOE/	AUND (UAL		J. • • · ·
THI	RU PLANT GR	OWING HAR	RVEST	OTHER	TOTAL	
CASH COST	251.76	5.92 52	2.30	14.95 3	24.94	
LABOR HOURS LABOR VALUE	1.94	.68 2	2.72	0	5.34	
LABOR VALUE	11.12	3.53 11	1.94	0	29.59	

SOIL AREA 12	RUS	SSET POTA PROCESSI		٠	C	1 15 82
	ITS OR	QUANTI	ΓY	PRICE		
RETURNS	PPLIC.				INUOMA	Costs
U.S.NO.1 RUSSET		145.000	CWI	3.850	558.25	
TOTAL RETURNS					558.25	
PLANTING FIELD CULTIVATOR 28 SPRINGTOOTH DRAG 48 RUSSET CERT SEED POT SEED TREATMENT	COSTS			63.571 5.000	3.63 2.10 55.00 4.95	1.39 .31 55.00 4.95
POT. SEED CUTTING POTATO ROW MARKER 4R POTATO PLANTER 4 ROW HEAVY TRUCK FERTILIZE	3	.261	HR/A	82.128	21.44	2.98 6.08
NITROGEN ANHYDROUS AMMONIA PHOSPHORUS P205 POTASSIUM K20 ANHYDROUS APPLICATOR		25.000 75.000 100.000 100.000 .112	LBS.	.130 .220 .100	9.75 22.00 10.00	9.75 22.00 10.00
SPRAYING	COSTS					
AERIAL APPLICATION INSECTICIDE FUNGICIDE	5 ⁻ 4	3.500 35.000 3.500		1.000 1.000 1.000	17.50 35.00 14.00	• •
POTATO CULT. 4 ROW	ON 3	.163	HR/A	25.272	12.37	4.44
HARVEST CO POTATO HRVSTR. 2 ROW HEAVY TRUCK DISK 21 FT FIELD CULTIVATOR 28	ost _.	.402 .098	HR/A HR/A HR/A HR/A	57.966 54.187	69.91	1.47
OTHER COST	rs					
LAND CHARGE LAND TAXES PROMOTION TAXES CROP INSURANCE INTEREST ON CASH COSTS		1667.000 1667.000 145.000 558.250 287.857		.039 .006 .030 .025 .080	13.96	10.00 4.35
TOTAL COSTS					508.51	287.86
RETURNS OVER TOTAL COSTS RETURNS OVER CASH COSTS RETURNS OVER CASH COSTS RETURNS OVER CASH COSTS	20 PC				49.74 270.39 158.74 -8.73	
CASH COSTS/ACRE MACHINE OWNERSHIP COST/A TOTAL COST PER CWT		5 FUEL		PERATING ACRE (GAL		96.51 31.27
CASH COST 216. LABOR HOURS 1.	.76 .94	.51 2	VEST 1.30 1.72 1.94	14.35 28 0	TOTAL 87.86 5.17 28.71	

	UNITS OR APPLIC.	QUANTI	ry	PRICE	TOTAL AMOUNI	CASH COSTS
RETURNS						
ROUND RED POT.	·	155.000	CWT.	3.750	581.25	
TOTAL RETURNS					581.25	
PLANTING COSTS						
FIELD CULTIVATOR 28 SPRINGTOOTH DRAG 48			HR/A HR/A		3.63 2.10	1.39
ROUND CERT SEED		15.000	CWT.	5.500	82.50	82.50
POT SEED TREATMENT		15.000		.450	6.75	6.75
POT. SEED CUTTING		15.000		.300		4.50
POTATO ROW MARKER 4R			HR/A	57.859 82.128		2.98 6.08
POTATO PLANTER 4 ROW HEAVY TRUCK	3		HR/A		45.39	27.31
FERTIL		•201	*****	5,0500	.5.55	4,05
NITROGEN		25.000	LBS.	.220	5.50	5.50
ANHYDROUS AMMONIA		75.000		.130	9.75	9.75
PHOSPHORUS P205		100.000			22.00	22.00
POTASSIUM K20 ANHYDROUS APPLICATOR		60,000	HR/A		6.00 6.14	6.00 1.69
ANHIDROUS APPLICATOR		• 112	nn/ A	74.121	0.14	1.09
SPRAYI	NG COSTS					
AERIAL APPLICATION	5	3.500	ACRE			
INSECTICIDE	1-	35.000		1.000	35.00	35.00
FUNGICIDE VINE KILLER	4 2	3,500 8,750		1.000	14.00 17.50	14.00 17.50
ATME VITTOR	2	0.150		1.500	11.50	11150
CULTIVA	MOITA				•	
POTATO CULT. 4 ROW	3	•163	HR/A	25.272	12.37	4.44
HARVEST COST						
POTATO HRVSTR. 2 ROW	-		HR/A			7.37
HEAVY TRUCK	3		HR/A		69.91	42.06
DISK 21 FT FIELD CULTIVATOR 28			HR/A HR/A		5.32 3.63	1.47 1.39
FIELD CULITARIUM 20		.074	nn/ n	49.202	3.03	1.37
OTHER COSTS LAND CHARGE 1667.000 .039 65.01						
LAND TAXES		1667.000		.006	10.00	10.00
PROMOTION TAXES		155.000		.030	4.65	4.65
CROP INSURANCE INTEREST ON CASH COST		581.250		.025 .080	14.53	
INTEREST ON CASH COST	rs.	332.157		.080	26.57	
					FF6 22	222 46
TOTAL COSTS					550.93	332.16
RETURNS OVER TOTAL CO	STS				24.32	
RETURNS OVER CASH COS		-			249.09	
RETURNS OVER CASH COS	STS 20 PC	r RETURNS	REDU	CTION	132.84	
RETURNS OVER CASH COS	STS 50 PC	T RETURNS	REDU	CTION	-41.53	
CASH COSTS/ACRE	332.1	6 MACE	HINE O	PERAFING	COSTS/A	96.51
MACHINE OWNERSHIP COS	37.1 89.9 A\T	5 FUEL	. USE/	ACRE (GAL)	31.27
CASH COSTS/ACRE 332.16 MACHINE OPERATING COSTS/A 96.51 MACHINE OWNERSHIP COST/A 89.95 FUEL USE/ACRE (GAL) 31.27 TOTAL COST PER CWT. 3.59						
			RVEST	OTHER	TOTAL	

THRU PLANT GROWING HARVEST OTHER TOTAL CASH COST 260.76 4.44 52.30 14.65 332.16 LABOR HOURS 1.94 .51 2.72 0 5.17 LABOR VALUE 11.12 2.65 14.94 0 28.71