

under stubble cane, etc., varies according to the particular needs and desires of an individual grower as he adjusts his acreage in keeping with allowable quotas and other production constraints.

For the purpose of this analysis the operation under consideration is assumed to be a going concern. Thus, land development costs and the time value of money incurred in such development are not treated here. However, such costs will be reflected in the market value of the land.²

Table 1.—Land use distribution on simulated 640-acre sugarcane farm in south Florida, 1971.

Land use	Acres	Distribution
	No.	Percent
Land in roads, ditches and canals	70	11.00
Land lying fallow for seed cane	13	2.00
Land lying fallow for plant cane	136	21.25
Land under plant cane to be used for seed	13	2.00
Land under plant cane	136	21.25
Land under first stubble cane	136	21.25
Land under second stubble cane	136	21.25
Total	640	100.00

Equipment

The machinery requirements assumed in this analysis were chosen not only on the basis of their ability to get the job done in a realistic time span, but also to reflect to a large degree the type of equipment found on the sugarcane farms in south Florida.

Moreover, to enhance efficiency, it was assumed that all harvesting equipment was owned by a six member growers' cooperative with each member assumed to be identical in farm size (640 acres). This assumption allows such equipment to be utilized much more fully, thus resulting in decreased cost per unit. For example, the number of hours a particular piece of equipment is used is six times greater than if only one individual grower owns it. Therefore, the fixed cost per hour is one-sixth the cost of what it would have been for individual ownership.

Production Level

The rate of sugarcane production assumed for the purpose of this analysis is based on production statistics for the 1968-69 production processing year. The rate, while above the average, is not considered to be unrealistic and may serve as a goal for individual growers with production figures below this.

The rate assumed was derived through plotting a frequency distribution, utilizing 1968-69 grower statistics, of production levels. The weighted average production level (34.7 tons per acre), as well as the dispersion about the weighted average, was computed. Then

²See Tables 5 and 6.