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A 12.9 million ton citrus crop is likely this year, moderately below last season's record crop. Most of the decline is expected to take place in Florida, especially in the production of oranges. Relatively large supplies of most processed citrus products are on hand to meet the apparently increasing demand. Non-citrus output in 1973 was more than a fourth larger than the short crop of 1972, accounting for the larger supplies of most fresh, frozen, and dried noncitrus products during the 1973/74 marketing season. However, canned non-citrus items remain in short supply.

During the remainder of the 1973/74 marketing season, prices of most fruits at all levels are expected to remain higher than a year ago. Grower prices continue to increase. January's index of prices received by farmers for fruit at $130(1967=100)$ was 10 percent above a year ago, and 7 percent higher than in December 1973, reflecting strong domestic and foreign demand for fresh and processed fruit, and the reduced supplies of canned non-citrus products.

Average retail prices for most fruit are expected to advance at least until the 1974 season begins. In addition to strong product demand, the higher prices to consumers will reflect higher raw product costs paid by processors this season, and increased processing and marketing costs.

The Nation's orange crop is currently forecast at 205.5 million boxes ( 8.9 million tons), 8 percent below the 1972/73 crop, but 8 percent above 2 years ago and the second largest on record. An estimated 157 million boxes will come from Florida, 7 percent below last season's record output. California's orange output at 38 million boxes is 10 percent below last year's level. . .due to a one fourth smaller Valencia crop. . .while Navel production is expected to increase 12 percent. Texas and Arizona expect smaller supplies. On-tree grower returns for U.S. oranges in January were moderately higher than a year ago, and will remain relatively high in view of the smaller crop and continued strong demand for frozen orange juice concentrate and chilled juice.

Although production prospects for grapefruit have declined from record levels, the U.S. crop is large. . now estimated at 64.6 million boxes, nearly as much as last season. Domestic movement of fresh
grapefruit this season through early February was moderately below last year's pace, while export demand continued strong.

Prospective lemon supplies are 18 percent below last season's record volume. Total fresh lemon shipments through early February were about the same as last season, while sales for processing use were down sharply. To date, shipping point prices have been substantially above last year's level, and are expected to continue so.

Storage stocks of fresh apples are almost one-fifth more than a year ago reflecting the record harvest in Washington. Despite the larger supply, average U.S. prices to growers for apples for fresh use have been well above year-earlier levels reflecting strong fresh market and processor demand. Prices will continue strong for the remainder of the season. Shipping point prices for fresh pears have been below yearearlier levels and the large supply is likely to keep prices below year-earlier levels for the rest of the marketing season.

The 1973/74 pack of canned non-citrus fruit is largely complete and is moderately larger than the preceding season's volume. However, because of the nearly depleted carryover at the beginning of the
season and good domestic and foreign movement, the supply of most canned non-citrus items will continue tight at least until the new packing season gets underway. As a result, wholesale prices for most canned non-citrus fruits have been advancing this season and in January 1974, the BLS wholesale price index of canned fruit stood at 135.1 (1967=100), up 13 percent from a year ago. The domestic market will undoubtedly remain firm, with some advance in retail prices likely during the months ahead.

Storage holdings of frozen deciduous fruits and berries on February 1 were slightly above the yearearlier volume, mainly because of increases for blueberries, peaches, and strawberries. As a result of the considerably larger pack, supplies of dried fruits are up moderately to substantially from a year ago. Reflecting strong domestic and foreign demand, wholesale raisin prices have been advancing and are likely to continue so.

Production of all major domestic tree nuts is larger. Crops of pecans, walnuts, and filberts registered substantial gains, while almond production increased only moderately. Demand so far this season has been good and grower prices for walnuts, almonds, and filberts, are generally higher.

## RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND OUTLOOK

## FRESH CITRUS

The U.S. citrus crop for the $1973 / 74$ season is estimated at 12.9 million tons, 7 percent below last season but up 6 percent from $1971 / 72$. Most of the decline is expected to take place in Florida, especially in the production of oranges.

## Oranges

## Moderately Smaller Crop

The Nation's 1973/74 orange crop is now expected to total 205.5 million boxes or 8.9 million tons. While this season's expected output is 8 percent below the $1972 / 73$ crop, it is still 8 percent above 2 years ago and the second largest output on record. . if current forecasts are realized. Early, midseason and Navel varieties account for 111.1 million boxes, about 3 percent less than a year ago. The Valencia crop is forecast at 94.4 million boxes, nearly 14 percent below last season.

Florida's orange crop, forecast at 157 million boxes, is 7 percent below last season's record output but nearly 15 percent above 1971/72. Early and midseason varieties, at 85 million boxes, are down 6 percent, and Valencias (accounting for the remaining 72 million boxes) are down from 79.7 million boxes in 1972/73. The January 1 Florida production forecast was 3 million boxes lower than the December 1 forecast since dry weather earlier in the season
resulted in smaller sizes and a higher droppage rate than expected earlier. The February 1 estimate was held at the January level. Citrus trees and current fruit crop were considered in excellent condition at the end of January.

Current prospects show California's orange output of 38 million boxes is 10 percent below last year's level while Texas prospects of a 7.0 million box orange crop is slightly less than in $1972 / 73$. The decline in California output is due entirely to the one-fourth smaller Valencia crop as Navel and miscellaneous varieties are expected to increase 12 percent.

During the 1972/73 season, fresh utilization of Florida oranges increased by a million boxes to a little over 12 million boxes, about 7 percent of the State's total orange crop. The increase in Florida's fresh utilization was due in part to last season's freezedamaged crop in California, where most oranges are produced for the fresh market. California's fresh utilization in $1972 / 73$ was 24.6 million boxes, nearly 60 percent of their total orange crop, compared to 27.4 million boxes or 63 percent in 1971/72.

## Grower Prices Moderately Higher

This season's fresh orange shipments from Florida through early February were one-tenth below yearearlier levels. Domestic shipments were down about 13 percent reflecting the smaller crop this season and
the independent truckers strike during late Januaryearly February. Shipments out of Florida are dependent mainly on truckers and many packinghouses shut down during the strike. Only a few did any packing and that was on a limited basis for export.

Florida's on-tree returns for all early and midseason varieties are expected to average above the $1972 / 73$ season's estimated $\$ 1.30$ per box, which was onethird less than the previous season. So far this season, Florida's f.o.b. prices for fresh fruit and delivered-in prices for processing of early and midseason varieties have averaged moderately above year-earlier levels. Prices this season are expected to remain moderately above year earlier levels due to the smaller orange crop, good export prospects, and firm demand for processed orange products.

Despite the larger Navel crop, fresh shipments from California and Arizona through early February were down substantially from year-earlier levels. Average f.o.b. prices were moderately higher this season through early February. With the remaining Navel crop to be harvested in early February considerably larger than a year ago, f.o.b. prices are expected to average near last year's level.

## Exports Increase

Export shipments of oranges from Florida, California, and Arizona so far this season have increased substantially. By early February shipments were threefourths above year-earlier levels. Exports of fresh oranges during the 1972/73 season totaled nearly 300,000 tons, 7 percent below the previous season. Canada remained the principal market, accounting for nearly half the total exported.

Fresh orange imports were higher during 1973 and totaled 60,873 tons, compared with 54,835 tons in 1972. Mexico provided the greatest share, 82 percent compared to 84 percent in 1972, while Israel's share increased in 1973 to 16 percent of the total volume imported.

## Grapefruit

Although production prospects have declined from what would have been record levels, the U.S. grapefruit crop is still large. The current crop estimate at 64.6 million boxes for 1973/74 is nearly as much as last season and slightly above 2 seasons ago.
Nearly three-fourths of the U.S. grapefruit crop will be produced in Florida. As of February 1, the Florida crop is forecast at 46 million boxes. The current forecast has been reduced from earlier estimates since a smaller fruit size is projected based upon a measurement survey conducted during December
1973. Production at 11.5 million boxes in Texas is only 3 percent below 1972/73 levels.

Domestic movement of fresh grapefruit so far this season has been moderately below last year's pace. Fresh unloads in 41 major markets since the beginning of the season to early February were down about 11 percent. Unloads of Florida grapefruit declined 12 percent. Processed utilization of last season's total Florida grapefruit crop amounted to 28.4 million boxes, or nearly two-thirds of the crop. Total fresh utilization of the Florida crop may be higher than usual this season if export prospects remain good and less fruit is available from Texas for fresh markets.

Even though fresh grapefruit shipments from Texas through early February were slightly higher this season compared to a year earlier, deliveries to processing plants were up considerably as a result of the freezing temperatures in December. The delivered-in tonnage to processing plants through early February was nearly $2 \frac{1}{2}$ times greater than for the same perioc' last season.

Since November, shipping point prices of Florida grapefruit remained relatively stable through late January at levels near a year ago. In early February prices declined to levels slightly below a year ago. F.o.b. prices in Texas were higher than last season until late in December. As a result of freezing temperatures in December, which caused deterioration and hastened the picking rate, fresh shipments from Texas increased substantially during most of January, causing f.o.b. prices in Texas to fall below year-ago levels.

The delivered-in price for grapefruit used for processing has averaged below year-ago levels in Florida and Texas, and is likely to continue so as more Texas fruit is diverted from fresh use into processing. Fresh grapefruit prices should hold at year-earlier levels or increase slightly if less fruit is available from Texas for the fresh market.

## Export Outlook Good

Exports of fresh grapefruit continue strong in spite of the recent fuel crisis and some problems concerning the quality of fruit upon reaching the destination. Reports indicated that careless handling of exported fruit early in the season resulted in some waste and decay. However, industry spokesmen are still optimistic regarding exports of fresh grapefruit as long as high quality fruit is shipped and maintained.

During the first 4 months of the current season, September-December, fresh exports were 1.2 million boxes, 3 percent above the same period in 1972. Interest in U.S. grapefruit continues strong in Japan, a major importer since 1971/72.

## Lemons

## U.S. Lemon Crop Down Substantially

Prospects in California and Arizona point to a 1973/74 crop of 18.2 million boxes or 692 thousand tons, 18 percent below last year's record high, but 9 percent above 1971/72 output. California's indicated production at 15 million boxes is down 15 percent from last year's level. The Arizona crop is now forecast at 3.2 million boxes, 30 percent below last season.

This season's domestic shipments of fresh lemons through early "ebruary were slightly above year-ago levels, while export shipments were slightly below. However, sales of lemons for processing use are down substantially reflecting the smaller crop. To date, shipping point prices have been substantially above last year's level, and are likely to continue so the remainder of this season, because of the smaller crop and firm domestic and foreign demand.
The following figure illustrates the relationship between U.S. lemon production, utilization, and prices. As shown, fresh use of lemons in the domestic market has been relatively stable since the 1964/65
season, but fresh export sales expanded significantly to 5.7 million boxes during 1972/73. Year to year changes in production cause processed utilization to vary greatly. In spite of the record crop in 1972/73, the season average price for lemons was firm at $\$ 4.60$ per box (packinghouse-door returns), down slightly from $\$ 4.81$ a year earlier.

## Other Citrus

Florida's tangelo production at 4.2 million boxes is record large, and 20 percent above last season. Heavy movement was completed by February 1 with over 80 percent of the crop harvested. Slightly smaller crops of tangerines and temple oranges are now indicated. Florida's estimated 3.1 million boxes of tangerines total slightly larger than $1972 / 73$, with harvest 90 percent complete by February 1. However, California and Arizona expected a substantially smaller tangerine crop this season.

Shipments of temple oranges were substantially below year-ago levels through early February and approaching their season peak, while shipping point prices were moderately below year-ago levels.


## PROCESSED CITRUS

More oranges were used for processing so far this season. In Florida, 55.1 million boxes of oranges were processed by early February compared to 46.3 million boxes for the same period last season, since most fruit is reaching maturity earlier than last season. Grapefruit processing began at a relatively slow pace in Florida, but with deteriorating quality was
gaining rapidly in Texas. Lemon processing is not likely to come up to last season's level because of the smaller crop this season. Supplies of most processed citrus products are relatively large and adequate to meet the apparent increasing demand for these items.

## Frozen Concentrates

With a smaller 1973/74 Florida orange crop and lower juice yield per box projected, this season's total
pack of frozen concentrated orange juice (FCOJ) will be smaller than in 1972/73. The season average FCOJ yield is projected at 1.30 gallons of 45 -degree Brix concentrate per 90 -pound box, compared to last year's yield of 1.33 gallons.
Although the season's pack is expected to be lower, the pack this season through February 9 totaled 55.5 million gallons, one-fifth larger than a year ago. The pack to date is larger because harvest of early and midseason varieties is increasing rapidly, with most fruit reaching maturity earlier than last season.
With the heavier pack so far this season, plus a record carryover at the beginning of the season, processor stocks of FCOJ on February 9 were 76.4 million gallons, two-thirds above a year earlier. These levels of current stocks are not considered burdensome since increased product is needed to serve an expanded market.
F.o.b. prices of FCOJ (unadvertised brands, Florida canneries) remained constant since September at $\$ 1.88$ per dozen 6 -ounce cans. Total product movement reported by processors through February 9 was up 4 percent, an indication of continued strong demand for this product. The relatively stable U.S. retail price for FCOJ in December was 25.5 cents per 6-ounce can, up only 2 percent from a year ago. Exports of FCOJ for the first 2 months of the marketing season were 1.5 million gallons, 6 percent more than the same period last season.
In spite of the current level of available supply of FCOJ, continued increases in movement may result in higher f.o.b. cannery list prices in view of the smaller pack projected for the entire season.
At the beginning of this season, carryover stocks of frozen concentrated grapefruit juice (FCGJ) in Florida were 3.6 million gallons, 27 percent above year-earlier levels. For the first 2 months of the 1973/74 marketing season 1.7 million gallons of FCGJ were packed, nearly one-fifth below a year ago.

Total movement at 1 million gallons, on the other hand, was running 15 percent behind the same period of last season. Processor stocks of FCGJ on February 9 totaled 4.3 million gallons, substantially above a year ago.

## Canned Products

The aggreg ate early-season pack (October through February 9, 1974) of canned Florida citrus products at 15.7 million cases ( $24 / 2$ 's) was down 8 percent from the same period a year ago. A 23 percent decline in canned grapefruit juice was chiefly responsible. Early season movement of canned citrus items was down slightly. Despite a 10 percent larger carryover at the beginning of the season, stocks of all canned citrus products on hand February 9 at 11.8 million cases were slightly less than year-earlier levels. Available supplies of canned grapefruit juice were sharply below a year ago, but those of canned orange juice were considerably larger.
Despite the substantially larger stocks on hand, canned single-strength orange juice prices advanced from $\$ 4.00$ to $\$ 4.25$ (a dozen 46 -oz. cans, f.o.b. Florida canneries) in mid-January. The price is now 15 percent above a year ago. On the other hand, f.o.b. prices of canned single-strength grapefruit juice have been stable at $\$ 4.25$ ( $12 / 46$-ounces, Florida canneries) since last September, but 20 cents below a year ago. However, in view of the current stocks on hand, 30 percent smaller than a year ago, f.o.b. prices of canned single-strength grapefruit juice may rise. With a relatively smaller citrus crop for the 1973/74 season in prospect, the total supply of canned citrus products is likely to be smaller than a year ago.

## Chilled Products

Florida's pack of chilled citrus products was nearly 62 million gallons by February 9, up about 5 percent from a year earlier. Total movement of these products was also higher for this season through February 9 at about 57 million gallons compared to 53 million gallons last season. Processors' stocks were down slightly at 18.2 million gallons.

Chilled orange juice, the leading chilled citrus product, appears to be gaining in terms of consumer acceptance. The quantity of the product taken continues to grow. The total pack through February 9 was 50.8 million gallons, compared to 47.6 million gallons a year ago. The pack from fresh oranges was 34.4 million gallons, up 10 percent from this period

Floridia oranges used for frozen concentrate

| Crop year | Fiorida orange and Temple production | Used for frozen concentrates |  | Yield per box | Frozen concentrate orange juice pack ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Million boxes | Million boxes ${ }^{2}$ | Percent | Gallons | Million gallons |
| 1968/69 | 134.2 | 92.1 | 68.6 | 1.13 | 103.8 |
| 1969/70 | 142.9 | 100.7 | 70.5 | 1.24 | 124.9 |
| 1970/71 | 147.3 | 103.5 | 70.3 | 1.21 | 125.2 |
| 1971/72 | 142.3 | 104.4 | 73.4 | 1.29 | 134.2 |
| 1972/73 | 174.8 | 132.2 | 75.6 | 1.33 | 176.1 |
| 1973/74. | 162.0 |  |  | 1.30 |  |

[^0]the previous year. Movement this season was 8 percent larger through February 9 at 48.3 million gallons while processors' stocks at 12.5 million gallons were slightly larger than last year. In December, the U.S. average retail price of chilled orange juice was 48.6 cents per quart, up from 47.6 cents a year earlier.

Chilled grapefruit juice stocks on February 9 were 3.2 million gallons, well below the 4.2 million gallons last year. Product movement was 5.9 million gallons, 6 percent higher than the same period last season. While the total pack to date was the same as last year, the pack from fresh fruit is down moderately reflecting a larger volume of reprocessed product.

## FRESH NON-CITRUS

Utilized non-citrus fruit production during 1973 was over one fourth more than the small crop of 1972 and 2 percent above the relatively large production of 1971. Production of most deciduous fruit crops was above 1972 levels. The nearly two-thirds larger grape crop, representing almost two-fifths of all non-citrus tonnage harvested, contributed significantly to the total gain in non-citrus fruit production. Excluding grapes, other non-citrus production was only up 12 percent.
Although non-citrus production was substantially larger, most grower prices for fresh fruit remained firm to moderately above year-earlier levels, reflecting strong domestic and foreign demand. Consequently, the total value of 1973 production for deciduous fruits and berries at $\$ 1.9$ billion increased over 40 percent from 1972 and was 60 percent above 1971.

## Apples

## Crop Up Slightly

The 1973 utilized commercial apple crop is estimated at 6.1 billion pounds, 3 percent above 1972
but still 4 percent below 1971. The larger crop was due to higher production in the Western States, with Washington State producing a record crop of 1.8 billion pounds, up 29 percent from 1972. Production was down moderately in the Eastern States and considerably in the Central States, especially in Michigan, where production was down two-fifths.

Compared with 1972, regional production and changes were as follows: Eastern States, 2.4 billion pounds, down 5 percent; Central States, 0.9 billion pounds, down 32 percent; and Western States, 2.8 billion pounds, up 34 percent. With the sharp increase in Washington apple production, the Western States accounted for almost half of the U.S. apple crop, up from 36 percent in 1972. New York and Michigan contributed heavily to the decreases in both Eastern and Central States.

By individual varieties, the Red Delicious is still the leader. Production increased 23 percent and accounted for 35 percent of the total apple production compared with 29 percent last season. This chiefly reflected the substantially larger crop in Washington. The share from Golden Delicious remained at 1972's level of 16 percent of the total. Rome Beauty replaced McIntosh as the third leading variety in 1973. The table below provides some detail.

## Stocks Up Substantially

Reflecting a larger crop, cold storage holdings of fresh apples on February 1 totaled 1.6 billion pounds, up almost a fifth from a year earlier. As expected, stocks in the Western States contributed most of the increase, while those in the Midwest were generally smaller. In Washington, cold storage holdings of approximately 0.9 billion pounds were up one-third. About 60 percent of the February stocks were in controlled-atmosphere storage, compared with almost 55 percent a year earlier.

## Market Strong

Fresh apple movement so far this season has been running substantially above a year ago. Shipments

Apple production by leading varieties and State, 1973-74

| Leading varieties | U.S. production | Percentage of U.S. total apple production | Leading producing States | State production as percentage of U.S. production by variety |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Million pounds | Percent |  | Percent |
| Delicious | 2121.7 | 35 | Washington | 54 |
| Golden Delicious | 939.6 | 15 | Washington | 47 |
| Rome Beauty | 496.8 | 8 | New York. | 18 |
| Mcl ntosh . . . | 481.0 | 8 | New York | 48 |
| Jonathan | 363.7 | 6 | Michigan | 32 |
| York Imperial | 315.7 | 5 | Pennsylvania . . . . . | 36 |
| Total | 4718.5 | 78 |  |  |

Apple cold storage holdings at end of month

| Month | 1971 |  |  | 1972 |  |  | 1973 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Regular | C. A. | Total | Regular | C. A. | Total | Regular | C.A. | Total |
|  | Billion pounds | Billion pounds | Billion pounds | Billion pounds | Billion pounds | Billion pounds | Billion pounds | Billion pounds | Billion pounds |
| Jan. | . 82 | . 75 | 1.57 | . 80 | . 81 | 1.61 | . 52 | . 81 | 1.33 |
| Feb. | . 50 | . 67 | 1.17 | . 46 | . 72 | 1.18 | . 27 | . 70 | . 97 |
| Mar. | . 26 | . 51 | . 77 | . 22 | . 56 | . 78 | . 14 | . 42 | . 56 |
| Apr. . | . 14 | . 33 | . 47 | . 11 | . 37 | . 48 | . 07 | . 27 | . 34 |
| May | . 08 | . 16 | . 24 | . 06 | . 17 | . 23 | . 04 | . 10 | . 14 |
| June | . 04 | . 04 | . 08 | . 04 | . 04 | . 08 | . 17 | . 29 | . 46 |
| July . . | . 18 | . 08 | . 26 | . 25 | . 06 | . 31 | . 05 | . 04 | . 09 |
| Aug. . | . 12 | . 02 | . 14 | . 15 | . 02 | . 17 | . 15 | . 01 | . 16 |
| Sept. | . 64 | . 17 | . 81 | . 74 | . 21 | . 95 | 1.08 | . 28 | 1.36 |
| Oct. | 1.99 | . 77 | 2.76 | 1.64 | . 80 | 2.44 | 2.10 | . 84 | 2.94 |
| Nov. . . | 1.74 | . 82 | 2.56 | 1.37 | . 85 | 2.22 | 1.66 | . 88 | 2.54 |
| Dec. . . . . | 1.26 | . 83 | 2.09 | . 89 | . 85 | 1.74 | 1.16 | . 91 | 2.07 |

C.A. Controlled atmosphere.
from Washington where most of the apples are for fresh use ran nearly 14 percent larger through early February. However, from the beginning of the season to date, most fresh apple prices have been considerably higher than a year earlier. In January, the U.S. average price received by growers for fresh use was 10.4 cents per pound, one-fifth above a year ago. On the other hand, shipping point prices for Red Delicious at Yakima Valley, Washington, for carton tray pack, extra fancy, 125's and larger in early February were $\$ 5.62$ compared with $\$ 6.85$ a year ago.
Although the period of heavy movement of apples to processors is over, some usage by canners will continue into late winter and early spring. As reported earlier, prices paid by processors have
averaged considerably above a year ago. In the East, where a very large proportion of apples is for processing use, prices of apples for processing use were reported more than double a year ago. For the remainder of the marketing season, continued strong domestic and foreign demand, smaller inventories of processed apple products, and a smaller U.S. citrus crop may cause apple prices to remain higher than a year ago even though fresh apple stocks are large. The U.S. season average price to growers for the 1973 apple crop (for all uses) has been estimated at 8.5 cents per pound, about one-third above 1972 prices. Total value of the U.S. commercial crop is therefore estimated at $\$ 512$ million compared with $\$ 378$ million in 1972.


## Exports Strong

U.S. exports of fresh apples during July-December 1973 at approximately 96.2 million pounds were 44 percent above a year ago. The increase resulted from gains to Canada, the best customer for our apples, and to other areas outside Europe, including Mexico. Canada and areas outside Europe accounted for more than two-thirds of our apple exports in 1972/73, and for the first 6 months of this season, they accounted for 91 percent of our apple exports. Our apple exports to Europe so far this season were down substantially as preliminary data indicate the 1973 apple production in Europe recovered from the small crop in 1972. Thus, our apple exports to such historically prominent markets as the United Kingdom and West Germany are likely to decline from last season.
During July-December, U.S. imports of fresh apples totaled about 33 million pounds, down onethird from a year earlier. As usual, most imports came from Canada.

## Pears

## Total Crop Up Substantially from 1972

Total utilized production of pears in 1973 was 716,240 tons, almost 18 percent larger than the small 1972 crop, but only slightly above 2 years ago. The larger crop in the West was chiefly responsible for the increase, while the pear crop in the East and Michigan was smaller. About 678,200 tons, or 95 percent of the U.S. crop, were grown in the Pacific Coast States. Total 1973 utilized production in these States was onefifth above 1972, with Oregon registering the largest gain over 1972's small crop.
Utilized production of Bartletts in the Pacific Coast States during 1973 totaled 510,000 tons, 17 percent larger than the short 1972 crop. Utilized production of other varieties, normally accounting for one-fifth of the pear crop, was 37 percent above last year's small crop.

## Stocks Much Larger

The increased harvest of winter pears in the Pacific Northwest last fall has resulted in much larger storage stocks. Cold storage stocks of fresh pears on February 1, 1974, at 91.2 million pounds, were 46 percent above a year ago. Essentially all the holdings were fall and winter varieties in the Pacific Coast States. D'Anjou was the leading variety held in storage followed by Bosc.

Shipments of fresh pears through early February were moderately above a year ago. Opening f.o.b. prices for D'Anjou at Yakima, Wash., were substantially above year-earlier levels, but have been declining to levels below a year ago. In earlyFebruary, prices for U.S. No. 1 D'Anjou pears were reported at $\$ 6.55$ per box, f.o.b. Yakima. This
contrasts with $\$ 7.05$ a year ago. With domestic supplies up sharply, prices will likely continue below year-earlier levels the rest of the marketing season. The U.S. season average prices to growers for the 1973 fresh pear crop has been tentatively estimated at $\$ 167$ per ton, about 5 percent below 1972. But average grower prices for pears for processing use (except dried) are estimated at $\$ 121$ per ton in 1973 compared with $\$ 113$ in 1972.

## Exports Sharply Larger

U.S. exports of fresh pears during July-December 1973 were about 1.5 million bushels, more than twothirds larger than in the same months of 1972. Canada is still the principal importer of our pears, with an increase of onehalf from last season. Exports to Europe, although relatively smaller in volume, are almost one and onehalf times more than a year earlier despite the moderately smaller 1973 pear crop in the major exporting countries of France and Italy. But the crop in the United Kingdom, an important market for U.S. pears, was down approximately onefifth from a year ago. Fresh pears exported to other parts of the world also increased sharply, up 70 percent from 1972.

## Grapes

## 1973 Crop Up Sharply

Last season's U.S. utilized production of grapes was estimated at 4.2 million tons, the second largest crop on record and the highest production since the 4.4 million tons of 1965.

California's output of 3.9 million tons was almost threefourths above the 1972 frost-damaged crop and onetenth above 1971. The increase was spread through all varietal groups. Utilized production of table varieties, at 537,000 tons, almost doubled that of a year ago, and represented 14 percent of the California's grape crop. Wine varieties at $1,022,000$ tons were up almost two-thirds and accounted for 26 percent of the crop. Output of raisin varieties, at $2,353,000$ tons, showed an increase of three-fourths and represented 60 percent of the California crop. As the utilization of raisin varieties for wine continues to increase, less than half the output of raisin varieties ( 967,000 tons) went into raisin production. Crushing for wine accounted for more than 50 percent of total raisin variety tonnage. The remainder was used fresh or canned.

About 2.5 million tons of the 1973 California grape crop were crushed for wine through late January, up sharply from a year ago. Fresh grape shipments from California totaled over 22,000 carlot equivalents through early February, up 16 percent from a year earlier.

## Grower Prices Lower

Due to the large crop, preliminary estimates place the average value of the 1973 California grape crop at $\$ 156$ per ton, down from $\$ 161$ per ton in 1972. Grower prices averaged lower for all varieties, with the exception of dried raisin varieties which were quoted at $\$ 700$ vs. $\$ 560$ per ton a year earlier. In early February, shipping point prices for Emperor f.o.b. Bakersfield, Calif., were reported at $\$ 5.00$ per $23-$ pound lug. This was considerably below the $\$ 6.25$ (25pound lug) quoted for the extremely light supplies on hand in early February 1973. Fresh prices are expected to continue low for the remainder of the season in view of the larger February 1 stock, mostly Emperor, almost double a year ago.

## Strawberries

## Crop Up in 1973

U.S. commercial strawberry production totaled 477 million pounds in 1973, up 4 percent from the 1972 small crop, but still 8 percent below 2 years ago. The increase was recorded on a reduced acreage. The biggest gain in output was made in California last season, while most other States had smaller crops than in 1972. The larger California crop reflected both larger harvested acreage and improved yields, with average yield per acre up 8 percent from a year ago. California, continuing to increase its share of U.S. strawberry production, accounted for two-thirds of the 1973 crop. On the other hand, smaller crops were reported in Oregon and Washington, due to inadequate snow cover during freezing periods in the winter. Strawberry production from both States fell approximately onetenth.
U.S. commercial production for the fresh market was down slightly from a year ago, while processing usage increased almost one-fifth. About two-thirds of the 1973 crop went to the fresh market. Grower prices for both fresh and processed uses averaged above a year earlier, $\$ 27.60$ per cwt. in 1973 compared with \$24 in 1972.

Current indications are that the 1974 Florida winter strawberry crop is in excellent condition following the cold snaps of December. Early picking has started, with peak production about mid-March.

Florida's winter crop normally accounts for less than 5 percent of U.S. production. The current estimate is for a harvest of 1,300 acres, down 100 acres from a year earlier. However, by the beginning of February unloads of fresh strawberries from Florida in major U.S. markets were considerably larger than a year ago, while unloads from Mexico were only slightly larger. Although opening foob. prices for Florida strawberries were slightly above the high levels of a year ago, early-February shipping point prices for Florida strawberries, 12-pint flat,
various varieties were $\$ 4.00$ compared to $\$ 4.68$ last year. Prices will continue to decline seasonally with increased volume.

## Fresh Imports Down, While Frozen Imports Up

U.S. imports of fresh strawberries during 1973, mainly from Mexico, were about 38.9 million pounds, one tenth below 1972. This has been the continuation of a decline since the record high of 51.3 million pounds in 1971. However, U.S. imports of frozen strawberries, also mainly from Mexico, were record large at 113.7 million pounds, one-third above 1972. The following table shows U.S. imports of fresh and frozen strawberries during the past 5 seasons.

| January-December | Fresh | Frozen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Million pounds | Million pounds |
| 1969 | 46.5 | 93.0 |
| 1970 | 51.1 | 109.7 |
| 1971 | 51.3 | 84.6 |
| 1972 | 43.2 | 85.2 |
| 1973 | 38.9 | 113.7 |

## PROCESSED NON-CITRUS

As a result of the substantial increase in the Nation's production of non-citrus fruit during the 1973 season, nearly all the completed packs are running slightly to moderately above the 1972/73 output. However, because of the nearly depleted carryover at the beginning of the 1973/74 season plus good domestic and foreign demand, a tight supply situation for most processed non-citrus items will continue at least until the new pack season gets underway.

While new lists vary slightly from packer to packer, prices have all been raised, reflecting higher raw product costs, smaller supplies, and increased processing costs. The domestic market will undoubtedly remain firm, with some advance likely in retail prices during the months ahead.

## Canned

## Moderate Increase in 1973/74 Pack

Although the packing season is not completed, data available so far indicate that the 1973/74 U.S. pack of canned non-citrus fruit will be moderately larger than the reduced output of the preceding season. Complete packs of the leading canned fruit items reported to date are above a year ago ex cept tart cherries and mixed fruit. The packs of these individual fruits are shown in table 12.

Despite the smaller apple crop from Eastern and Central regions, canning of both apple slices and applesauce was running moderately above a year ago through the first of the year. Although the bulk of apple canning was completed by January 1, commercial canning for these items will continue through the spring and final pack data will not be available until September. However, because of the nearly depleted carryover of the canned apple items at the beginning of the season, processors in the Central and Eastern States have been in active competition for available apple supplies in all regions including the West. Thus, with substantially larger cold storage holdings of apples, total pack of canned apple items for this season is likely to be above last season.

Packing of canned pineapple continues through spring; in early winter the 1973/74 pack was running behind a year ago.

## Supplies Generally Tight

Despite the return to a more typical crop situation in 1973 and generally larger pack of non-citrus, the supply of most canned non-citrus items for the remainder of the season will be tight reflecting the nearly depleted carryover and slightly larger shipments so far this season. For canned non-citrus items available data indicate January 1,1974, stocks were more than onefifth below a year ago. (table 12).
Supplies of fruit cocktail available for the remainder of the season were at a new low. Cling peach stocks were al so light as shipments to domestic and foreign markets continue strong. Canned pear supplies as of January 1 were more than a fifth smaller despite an 8 percent larger pack. The inventory of canned tart cherries on January 1 was particularly tight because of the reduced pack resulting from a sharply smaller crop, but stocks of canned sweet cherries were near year-earlier levels. However, the inventories of canned apricots and purple plums at the beginning of the year were larger than a year ago.
The canning season for apple products and pineapples is still in progress. Total supply of canned apple products to January 1 (carryover plus pack to Jan.1) was moderately below a year ago due to the nearly depleted carryover. With shipments to January 1 running 9 percent above last season, January 1 stocks of canned applesauce and apple slices were down 19 and 16 percent, respectively, from a year ago. Canned pineapple stocks on January 1 were also smaller, one third below a year ago.
F.o.b. prices for individual canned fruits have largely reflected the changed supply situation. Prices for most items have been advancing this season as the smaller supply prospects have become more evident. The BLS index of wholesale canned fruit prices peaked at $122.2(1967=100)$ in June 1973. It
declined slightly in July, but has been advancing since August, reaching the record high of 135.1 in January. That was 13 percent above a year ago. Average monthly wholesale prices for the major canned fruits reported to date by BLS are shown in table 16. With substantially smaller stocks of most canned fruits on hand, wholesale prices are likely to continue to advance during the months ahead.

## Exports Show Mixed Picture

Led by substantial increases in canned fruit cocktail and pineapples, U.S. aggregate exports of canned non-citrus fruit during June-December 1973 were slightly above those of the comparable period of 1972. Western Europe took 3.2 million cases (equiv. 24/2 $1 / 2$ 's), over 60 percent of total exports. . .about the same as a year ago. Canada and other parts of the world shared in the increases. Total exports of canned peaches were about the same as last year, as the decrease in shipments to Europe offset increases to Canada and other countries. Some canned fruit exports which decreased so far this season were apricots, cherries, and pears. However, with the tight world supply situation for certain canned fruit items, export prospects are good, assuming the fuel situation does not cause severe recession abroad nor interrupt international shipping, and U.S. supplies are available.
U.S. exports of canned fruit, June-December

| Item | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Million <br> pounds | Million <br> pounds | Million <br> pounds |
| Apricots ....... | 2.3 | 5.4 | 3.7 |
| Cherries ...... | 1.8 | 23.1 | 12.8 |
| Peaches....... | 75.4 | 90.5 | 89.4 |
| Pears ........ | 4.8 | 8.0 | 6.3 |
| Pineapple ...... | 36.5 | 48.8 | 58.0 |
| Fruit cocktail ... | 44.1 | 59.5 | 68.2 |

## Frozen

The total supply of frozen non-citrus fruits and berries in cold storage February 1 was slightly above the year-earlier volume. Largest increases were recorded for blueberries, peaches, and strawberries.
Strawberries are the leading frozen fruit. Storage stocks on February 1 were up almost one-fifth from a year ago reflecting increased imports of frozen fruit from Mexico. The Mexican pack continues to be heavier than usual for this time of the year due mainly to a shortage of trucks to bring fresh products to market. However, despite the large supply, wholesale prices for frozen strawberries advanced during 1973, and at $\$ 3.85$ per doz. 10 oz. packages in January, were 14 percent above the year-earlier level.

Stocks of frozen peaches on February 1 were 62 percent above the sharply reduced stocks of a year ago, and frozen apple stocks were also larger, even with a substantially smaller crop in the East. With the packing season still in progress, the total season supply of frozen apples will likely be larger than a year ago. Frozen blueberry holdings were almost 55 percent larger than a year earlier.
The frozen tart cherry pack was substantially smaller in 1973 and disappearance has also been smaller. Cold storage stocks were 45 percent below the February 1, 1973 volume.

Frozen fruit cold storage holdings

| Commodity | February 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 |
|  | $1,000$ pounds | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { pounds } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { pounds } \end{aligned}$ |
| Apples | 76,241 | 67,464 | 71,703 |
| Apricots | 8,082 | 9,494 | 9,369 |
| Cherries | 87,035 | 81,176 | 44,500 |
| Grapes | 4,698 | 4,899 | 4,672 |
| Peaches | 43,328 | 25,792 | 41,663 |
| Blackberries | 13,412 | 11,799 | 7,780 |
| Blueberries | 21,731 | 20,689 | 32,076 |
| Boysenberries | 3,257 | 2,869 | 2,989 |
| Raspberries, black | 1,202 | 864 | 1,234 |
| Raspberries, red | 11,429 | 10,465 | 13,759 |
| Strawberries | 135,908 | 92,704 | 108,739 |
| Other fruits and berries | 136,229 | 152,739 | 145,803 |
| Total | 542,552 | 480,954 | 484,287 |

## Dried

U.S. dried fruit production in 1973/74 for three principal fruits-raisins, prunes, and figs-was sharply above last season's limited output. Total raisin output for 1973 is estimated at 215,000 tons (dried basis), more than double a year ago. Production of California dried prunes was also sharply larger in 1973, with output estimated at 203,000 tons (dried basis) compared with only 77,000 tons in 1972. At 11,700 tons, dried fig output was 7 percent more than in 1972 but more than one-tenth less than in 1971.
Although carryover stocks of raisins into the 1973/74 marketing season were negligible, total supplies are larger. Total raisin shipments through the end of January 1974 were running almost threefifths larger as packers were busy attempting to fill the market pipelines. Domestic shipments were up over 40 percent. During the first 5 months of the current season more than 26,980 tons were exported, over one and onehalf times last season. The foreign crop of raisins in major producing areas has been estimated almost one fourth smaller than a year ago.
U.S. export prospects will continue bright assuming no severe recession abroad.

Reflecting strong domestic and foreign demand, raisin prices have increased substantially. In January the average wholesale price of raisins was record high at $\$ 12.12$ per case ( $24 / 15$ oz.), representing an increase of over one-fourth from a year earlier. The 1973 season average price received by growers has been estimated at $\$ 700$ per ton (dried basis processing plant door), up one fourth from the preceding season. The farm value for the raisin crop totaled $\$ 1505$ million compared with $\$ 58.8$ million in 1972.

Although large volumes of prunes have moved into domestic and export markets, the remaining supply at the end of 1973 was still heavy at 123,000 tons (processed condition) almost double that of a year ago. During the first 5 months through December, shipments to domestic markets were running 30 percent larger than a year ago, while nearly 35,000 tons were exported, almost twice as much as a year ago. However, in an effort to relieve the burdensome supply of prunes, the USDA recently made surplus removal purchases of dried prunes for distribution through needy family programs.

In spite of a large supply, the average wholesale price of prunes has been steady at $\$ 9.60$ per case ( $24 / 1$ pound) since December 1972. But the average grower price for 1973 has been estimated at $\$ 471$ per ton (dried basis), down 12 percent from the previous season.

## TREE NUTS

Estimated production of 4 major domestic tree nuts at 443,800 tons in 1973 is 29 percent above the small crop of a year ago.

The 1973 California almond production is estimated at 133,000 tons (in-shell basis), up 6 percent from a year ago. After a brief interruption in 1972, production thus has resumed the upward trend in line with a steady long-term trend in bearing acreage. Domestic demand is generally good as most shellers have committed just about all of this season's available supply. Export shipments have been slackening even though the major almond producing countries in Europe have shown substantially smaller production in 1973. During the first 5 months (August-December) exports of shelled almonds were 4 percent below a year ago. Consequently, total export sales for this season are likely to account for a smaller share of the current crop than last season. The U.S. season average price to growers for the 1973 almond crop has been estimated at $\$ 1,500$ per ton, almost double that of a year ago.

The 1973 production of pecans is estimated at 129,950 tons, 42 percent more than in 1972 and 5 percent above 1971. As a result of the substantially larger production, cold storage holdings of both
shelled pecans and in-shell pecans on February 1 were considerably above year-earlier levels. The preliminary estimate of season-average price to growers is 38.6 cents per pound compared with 42.4 cents last season.
U.S. production of walnuts in 1973 is listed at 168,900 tons, up 45 percent from the small crop in
1972. Demand so far this season has been good and season-average price to growers is tentatively estimated at $\$ 580$ per ton, up slightly from a year ago. Filbert output has been set at 11,950 tons in 1973,up almost onefifth from last year. The season-average price to growers is estimated at $\$ 630$ per ton compared with $\$ 508$ last season.

Table 1- Fruit and edible tree nuts: Utilized production and value, United States, crop year 1971, 1972, and 1973

| Commodity | Utilized production |  |  | Value of production |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Crop year |  |  | Crop year |  |  |
|  | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 ${ }^{1}$ | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 ${ }^{1}$ |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { tons } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { dollars } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { dollars } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1,000 } \\ & \text { dollars } \end{aligned}$ |
| NONCITRUS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apples, commercial | 3,040 | 2,935 | 3,028 | 299,121 | 377,670 | 511,874 |
| Apricots, 3 States | 150 | 127 | 158 | 14,035 | 17,701 | 25,809 |
| Avocados, 2 States ${ }^{2}$ | 45 | 89 | n.a. | 31,218 | 44,153 | n.a. |
| Bananas, Hawaii | 3 | 3 | 4 | 680 | 720 | 778 |
| Bushberries, 2 States | 34 | 31 | 22 | 12,258 | 17,925 | 20,183 |
| Cherries, sweet | 140 | 85 | 153 | 44,215 | 36,582 | 55,503 |
| Cherries, tart | 139 | 135 | 88 | 27.689 | 22.279 | 33,103 |
| Cranberries | ${ }^{4} 82$ | 99 | 104 | 24,405 | 26,035 | n.a. |
| Dates, California | 19 | 16 | 20 | 3,110 | 2,652 | 3,518 |
| Figs, California | 45 | 36 | 40 | 3,959 | 5,121 | 8,436 |
| Grapes.. | 3,997 | 2,570 | 4.218 | 381,620 | 423,132 | 671,235 |
| Nectarines | 69 | 86 | 87 | 10,695 | 15,222 | 22,098 |
| Olives, California | 55 | 24 | 73 | 8,140 | 10,043 | 26,062 |
| Papayas, Hawaii | 10 | 13 | 16 | 2,736 | 3,423 | 4,235 |
| Peaches | 1,370 | 1,148 | 1,226 | 166,568 | 160,383 | 204,349 |
| Pears | 707 | 608 | 716 | 66,768 | 84,357 | 101,173 |
| Persimmons | 1 | 2 | 2 | 151 | 467 | 688 |
| Plums, California | 101 | 96 | 97 | 23,129 | 23,808 | 31,137 |
| Pomegranates | 3 | 4 | 4 | 410 | 460 | 638 |
| Prunes, California | 393 | 215 | 589 | 37.597 | 41,195 | 95,613 |
| Prunes and plums, other States | 65 | 42 | 65 | 5,770 | 7,228 | 9,796 |
| Strawberries | 260 | 229 | 239 | 117,005 | 109,765 | 131,592 |
| Total noncitrus. | 10,728 | 8,603 | 10,949 | 1,281,279 | 1,430,321 | n.a. |
| CITRUS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oranges | 8,222 | 8,237 | 9,739 | 465,109 | 549,136 | 564,402 |
| Tangerines | 233 | 221 | 223 | 18,374 | 22,767 | 20,621 |
| Grapefruit | 2,472 | 2,623 | 2,663 | 145,287 | 185,586 | 178,672 |
| Lemons | 625 | 634 | 844 | 82,226 | 80,266 | 102,230 |
| Limes, Fiorida | 35 | 44 | 44 | 4,136 | 6,039 | 6,908 |
| Tangelos, Fiorida | 122 | 176 | 158 | 5,643 | 10,959 | 8,225 |
| Temples, Florida | 225 | 239 | 230 | 13,900 | 15,317 | 14,280 |
| Total citrus. | 11,934 | 12,174 | 13,901 | 734,675 | 870,070 | 895,338 |
| TREE NUTS: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Almonds, California | 134 | 125 | 133 | 87,100 | 98,125 | 199,500 |
| Filberts, 2 States ... | 11 | 10 | 12 | 4.708 | 5,157 | 7,531 |
| Macadamia nuts, Hawaii | 7 | 7 | 6 | 3,569 | 3,055 | 2,639 |
| Pecans | 124 | 92 | 130 | 81,518 | 77,636 | 100,256 |
| Walnuts, ? States | 136 | 117 | 169 | 57.106 | 65,854 | 97,917 |
| Total tree nuts | 412 | ${ }^{4} 351$ | 450 | 234,001 | 249,827 | 407,843 |
| Total all fruits and nuts | 23,074 | ${ }^{4} 21,128$ | 25,300 | 2,249,955 | 2,550,218 | n.a. |

'Preliminary. ${ }^{2} 1971$ indicates $1971 / 72$ crop. ${ }^{3} 1971$ indicates $1970 / 71$ crop. ${ }^{4}$ Due to rounding, totals are not identical in table 3.
n.a.-Data not available temporarily.

Table 2- Citrus fruit: Production, 1971/72, 1972/73 and indicated 1973/74

| Crop and State |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $1971 / 72$ | $1972 / 73$ |
|  | 1,000 | 1,000 |

[^1]Lemons-76 Ibs.; Limes-80 lbs.; Tangelos-90 lbs.; Tangerines-California and Arizona, 75 lbs.; Florida, 95 lbs.; and Temples-90 lbs. ${ }^{3}$ Navel and Miscellaneous varieties in California and Arizona. Early and Midseason varieties in Florida and Texas, including small quantities of tangerines in Texas.
Table 3.-Fruit and edible tree nuts: Utilized production by States, United States, 1972

Table 3.-Fruit and edible tree nuts: L'titized production, by States, United States, 1972-Continued

| State | Citrus fruits ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Total all fruits |  | Tree nuts |  |  |  | Total all fruits all tree nuts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Oranges | $\underset{\substack{\text { Grape- } \\ \text { fruit }}}{ }$ | Lemons | Other ${ }^{4}$ | Total |  | Ouantity | Percent of U.S. | Pecans | Other ${ }^{5}$ | Total |  | Ouantity | Percen of U.S. |
|  |  |  |  |  | Ouantity | Percent of U.S. |  |  |  |  | Ouantity | Percent of U.S. |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { tons } \end{aligned}$ | Percent |
| Maine | - | -- | -- | --- | -- | $\cdots$ | 37.5 | 0.2 | ... | .-- | -- | $\cdots$ | 37.5 | 0.2 |
| N.H. | .-. | -- | -- | -- | -- | --- | 27.9 | . 1 | ... | ... | ... | -- | 27.9 | . 1 |
| vi. | - | - | -- | --- | -- | --- | 20.3 | . 1 | .-. | ... | ... | ..- | 20.3 | . 1 |
| Mass. | - | - | .-- | - | -- | .-- | 88.3 | (6) | --- | --- | ... | ... | 88.3 | (6) |
| ${ }^{\text {R.I. }}$. | -.. | $\cdots$ | -- | --- | -- | --- | 1.7 | $\left({ }^{6}\right)$ | -.- | --- | ... | ... | 1.7 | (6) |
| Conn. | - | $\cdots$ | .-. | $\cdots$ | -.- | $\cdots$ | 18.2 | . 1 | ... | --- | ... | --- | 18.2 | . 1 |
| N.Y. | -- | --- | -- | --- | - | .-- | 535.7 | 2.6 | ... | --- | ... | ... | 535.7 | 2.5 |
| N.J. | -- | .- | - | --- | -- | --- | 69.2 | . 3 | ... | .-- | ... | -- | 69.2 | . 3 |
| Pa. | .- | - | .-. | --- | -- | --- | 289.4 | 1.4 | --- | ... | ..- | --- | 289.4 | 1.4 |
| Ohio | -.- | - | ..- | --- | -- | .-- | 83.2 | . 4 | .-. | ..- | ... | ... | 83.2 | . 4 |
| Ind. . | -- | -- | -- | $\cdots$ | -- | $\cdots$ | 38.9 | . 2 | $\cdots$ | -- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 38.9 | . 2 |
| III.... | $\cdots$ | -- | .-- | $\cdots$ | ... | ..- | 58.0 | .$^{3}$ | ... | -- | ... | -- | 58.0 | . 3 |
| Mich. | - | -- | -- | --- | --- | -- | 605.1 | 2.9 | --- | $\cdots$ | --- | -.. | 605.1 | 2.9 |
| Wis... | -- | -- | .-- | -- | -- | ... | 74.1 | . 4 | -.. | --- | ... | --- | 74.1 | . 4 |
| Minn. | - | -. | ... | -- | -- | -- | 13.0 | , ${ }^{1}$ | $\cdots$ | ..- | -- | ..- | 13.0 | 1 |
| lowa | - | ... | -- | --- | -- | -- | 6.6 | $\left({ }^{6}\right)$ | --- | ... | .-. | ..- | 6.6 | $\left({ }^{6}\right)$ |
| Mo. | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 44.7 | (6) | --- | -- | $\cdots$ | .-- | 44.7 | ( ${ }^{2}$ |
| Del. | --- | --- | -- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 6.8 6.0 | ${ }^{6}{ }^{6}$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 6.8 6.0 |  |
| Md ........ | -- | -- | -- | ... | -.. | .-- | 40.0 | ${ }^{2}$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | 40.0 | . 2 |
| va. | --- | -- | .- | -- | .- | .-- | 2218 | 1.1 | --- | $\cdots$ | --- | ... | 221.8 | 1.0 |
| w. Va. | -- | -.- | ..- | -- | -. | $\cdots$ | 114.0 | . 5 | $\cdots$ | -- | $\cdots$ | --- | 114.0 | . 5 |
| N.C. | - | -- | -- | $\cdots$ | ... | --- | 138.2 | . 7 | 0.2 | $\cdots$ | 0.2 | 0.1 | 138.4 | . 7 |
| s.c. . | -- | --- | -- | $\cdots$ | ... | --- | 126.4 | . 6 | 1 | ... | . 1 | $\left({ }^{6}\right)$ | 126.5 | . 6 |
| Ga. | - | - | -- | $\cdots$ | -. | $\ldots$ | 95.0 | . 4 | 24.0 | $\cdots$ | 24.0 | 6.8 | 119.0 | . 6 |
| Fia | 6,165.0 | 1,998.0 | -- | 611.0 | 8.774 .0 | 72.1 | 8.802 .7 | 42.4 | 3.2 | --- | 3.2 | . 9 | 8,805.9 | 41.7 |
| ${ }_{\text {Krann }}^{\text {Kenn. }}$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ...- | $\cdots$ | -- | .-. | 10.8 10.1 | (6) | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | .-. | $\cdots$ | 10.8 10.1 | (6) |
| Ala. . | --- | -- | - | $\cdots$ | -- | -- | 12.0 | (1) | 10.0 | $\cdots$ | 10.0 | 2.8 | 10.1 22.0 | ? |
| Miss. | --- | --- | - | -.. | .-. | ... | 8.5 | ( ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 3.5 | --- | 3.5 | 1.0 | 12.0 | . |
| Ark. | --- | $\cdots$ | - | $\cdots$ | ..- | -- | 36.4 |  | . 9 | ... | . 9 | . 3 | 37.3 | . 2 |
| La. | -- | --- | - | - | -- | --- | 7.1 | $\left({ }^{6}\right)$ | 6.0 | $\cdots$ | 6.0 | 1.7 | 13.1 | - 1 |
| ${ }_{\text {Okla }}$ | $\stackrel{-}{-}$ | - | $\cdots$ | --- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 4.3 | $\left({ }^{6}\right)$ | 2.1 | $\cdots$ | 2.1 | . 6 | 6.4 | $\left({ }^{6}\right)$ |
| Texas ...... | 261.0 | 368.0 | -. | --. | 629.0 | 5.2 | 643.9 | 3.1 | 37.5 | --- | 37.5 | 10.7 | 681.4 | 3.2 |
| Mont. ...... | - | -- | ..- | $\ldots$ | -- | -.. | 1.2 | ( ${ }^{6}$ | -- | -- | -- | .-- | 1.2 | $\left({ }^{6}\right)$ |
| Idaho .... Colo. | - | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | -- | $\cdots$ | 34.5 | . 2 | --- | --- | -- | --- | 34.5 | . 2 |
| Colo. <br> N. Mex | -- | -- | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 12.5 1.0 | ( ${ }^{\text {( }}$ ) | 4.1 | ...- | 4.1 | 1.2 | 12.5 5.1 | $\left({ }^{(6)}\right.$ |
| Ariz. | 183.8 | 81.3 | 117.0 | 21.4 | 403.5 | 3.3 | 417.1 | 2.0 | $\stackrel{-}{\text {-. }}$ | .-- | - | $\stackrel{-}{-}$ | 417.1 | 2.0 |
| Utah ........ |  | - | -- | --- | -- | ..- | 3.6 | $\left({ }^{6}\right)$ | --- | -- | --- | ... | 3.6 | $\left({ }^{6}\right)$ |
| Wash. | $\cdots$ | --- | -- | -- | $\cdots$ | -- | 987.0 | 4.8 | .-- | 0.6 | . 6 | . 2 | 987.6 | 4.7 |
| Ore........ | - | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | - | --- | 2494 | 1.2 | $\cdots$ | 10.4 | 10.4 | 3.0 | 259.8 | 1.2 |
| Calit. . | 1,627.0 | 175.7 | 517.0 | 47.3 | 2,367.0 | 19.4 | 6,758.3 | 32.5 | .-- | 241.0 | 241.0 | 68.8 | 6,999.3 | 33.1 |
| Hawaı ....... | -- | $\cdots$ | -- | -- | -- | -- | 15.9 | . 1 | ..- | 6.6 | 6.6 | 1.9 | 22.5 | . 1 |
| u.s | 8,236.8 | 2,623.0 | 634.0 | 679.7 | 12,173.5 | 100.0 | 20,776.3 | 100.0 | 91.6 | 258.6 | 350.2 | 100.0 | 21,126.5 | 100.0 |

[^2]Table 4-Fruit and edible tree nuts: Value of production, by States, United States, 1972

Table 4-Fruit and edible tree nuts: Value of production by States, United States, $1972^{1}$-Continued

| State | Citrus fruits ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Total all fruits |  | Tree nuts |  |  |  | Total of all fruit and tree nuts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Oranges | Grapefruit | Lamons | Other ${ }^{4}$ | Total |  | Value | Percent of U.S. | Pecans | Other ${ }^{5}$ | Total |  | Value | Percent of U.S. |
|  |  |  |  |  | Valua | Percent of U.S. |  |  |  |  | Value | Parcent of U.S. |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { dollars } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { doflars } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.000 \\ \text { dollars } \end{gathered}$ | $1.000$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,000 \\ \text { dollars } \end{array}$ | Percent | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { doflars } \end{gathered}$ | Percent | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { dollars } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,000 \\ \text { dollars } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { dollars } \end{gathered}$ | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { dolfars } \end{aligned}$ | Percent |
| Maine ........ | -- | $\cdots$ | - | - | -- | -- | 7.283 | 0.3 | -- | ..- | -- | -- | 7.283 | 0.3 |
| N.H. ........ | - | - | -- | .- | -- | - | 5,438 | . 2 | ... | .-- | ... | ... | 5,438 | . 2 |
| Vt. . | - | -- | - | - | ..- | -. | 3.756 | . 2 | .- | ... | - | .- | 3,756 | . 1 |
| Mass. . . . . . . | - | $\cdots$ | - | -- | -- | -- | 19.667 | . 9 | .-- | .-. | - | ... | 19,667 | . 8 |
| R.1. ........ | - | -. | -- | -- | - | - | 342 | (6) | -- | ..- | $\cdots$ | .- | 342 | $\left({ }^{6}\right)$ |
| Conn. ...... | - | -- | -- | -. | -- | - | 3,851 | . 2 | -- | ... | -. | ... | 3.851 | . 2 |
| -N.Y. .... | - | - | - | - | ... | - | 71,799 | 3.1 | .-. | .-- | - | .-- | 71.799 | 2.8 |
| N.」. . . . . . | - | -- | -- | - | -- | -- | 15,046 | . 7 | .- | .- | - | ... | 15,046 | . 6 |
| Pa.......... | - | -. | -- | - | ... | -- | 42,165 | 1.8 | -- | ... | -- | ... | 42,165 | 1.7 |
| Ohio ........ | - | - | $\cdots$ | -- | -- | - | 14,102 | . 6 | ... | --- | -- | .-. | 14,102 | . 6 |
| Ind. . . . . . . . . | - | - | - | - | -- | -- | 6.332 | . 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6.322 | . 2 |
| III. | - | - | -- | - | - | -- | 9.292 | . 4 | -- | ... | .-. | -- | 9,292 | . 4 |
| Mich. . . . . . . | - | - | - | - | -- | -- | 73.427 | 3.2 | ..- | ... | -- | .- | 73.427 | 2.9 |
| Wis. . . . . . . . | - | - | -- | - | - | - | 16,898 | . 7 | .-- | ..- | ... | -- | 16,898 | . 7 |
| Minn. | - | - | - | $\cdots$ | -- | - | 2,353 | . 1 | ... | .- | -- | .-. | 2,353 | . 1 |
| lowa | - | - | - | -- | $\ldots$ | -- | 1.463 | . 1 | ... | ..- | ..- | -- | 1.463 | . 1 |
| Mo. . . . . | - | .-. | - | - | - | $\ldots$ | 9,655 | 4 | ... | -. | -- | .- | 9,655 | 4 |
| Kans. | - | - | - | - | -- | - | 811 | (6) | $\ldots$ | ... | - | - | 811 | (6) |
| Del. ...... | -- | - | - | - | - | -- | 794 | (6) | ... | ... | - | - | 794 | (6) |
| Md. . . . . . . | -- | -- | -- | - | ... | -.. | 6,854 | . 3 | ... | ... | -- | -- | 6.854 | . 3 |
| va. ......... | - | -- | -- | -- | - | -- | 26,616 | 1.2 | -- | ... | -.. | --- | 26,616 | 1.0 |
| W. Va. ........ | - | - | - | -- | $\cdots$ | -- | 13,782 | . 6 | ... | .- | -- | $\cdots$ | 13.782 | . 5 |
| N.C. | - | - | - | - | - | -- | 15,117 | . 7 | 188 | ... | 188 | 0.1 | 15,305 | . 6 |
| s.c. | - | - | - | $\cdots$ | - | - | 25,520 | 1.1 | 41 | -- | 41 | (6) | 25,561 | 1.0 |
| Ga. | - | - | $\cdots$ | - | $\cdots$ | -- | 16,853 | . 7 | 21,600 | ... | 21.600 | 8.6 | 38.453 | 1.5 |
| Fla. ..... | 402.738 | 142.753 | - | 47.195 | 592,686 | 68.1 | 605,009 | 26.3 | 2,656 | - | 2.656 | 1.1 | 607,665 | 23.8 |
| Ky. .... | -- | -- | - | -- | -- | -- | 2,239 | . 1 | -- | ... | -- | 1. | 2,239 | . 1 |
| Tenn. .... | - | - | -- | - | - | -- | 1,974 | . 1 | $\cdots$ | ... | $\cdots$ | ... | 1,974 | . 1 |
| Als. ..... | -- | - | - | ... | -- | - | 2.688 | . 1 | 8,390 | -- | 8,390 | 3.4 | 11,078 | . 4 |
| Miss. ........ | - | - | - | --- | - | -- | 1,989 | . 1 | 2,800 | .-- | 2,800 | 1,1 | 4.789 | . 2 |
| Ark. ........ | - | - | - | - | -- | -- | 6,270 | . 3 | 747 | -- | 747 | . 3 | 7,017 |  |
| La. ........ | - | - | -- | -- | - | - | 2,927 | . 1 | 4.425 | ... | 4,425 | 1.8 | 7.352 | . 3 |
| Okla..... | 12,00 | - | - | ... | $\bar{\square}$ | 3 | 1,051 | . 1 | 1,716 | -- | 1,716 | 1.8 | 2.767 | . 1 |
| Texas | 12,006 | 20,332 | -- | -- | 32,338 | 3.7 | 35,794 | 1.6 | 30,780 | - | 30,780 | 12.3 | 66,574 | 2.6 |
| Mont. | - | -. | - | - | 32,338 | .-. | 574 | (6) | -- | ... | -- | ... | 574 | (6) |
| Idaho .... | - | -- | - | -- | - | - | 6,874 | . 3 | -- | -- | -. | ..- | 6,874 | . 3 |
| Colo. . . . . | -- | -- | - | -- | -- | -- | 3.149 | . 1 | ... | ..- | - | ... | 3,149 | . 1 |
| N. Mex. . . | -- | $\cdots$ | -- | -- | $\cdots$ | -- | 200 | (i) | 4,293 | ... | 4,293 | 1.7 | 4,493 | . 2 |
| Ariz. ... | 31,234 | 5,309 | 11,858 | 2.759 | 31,160 | 3.6 | 38,708 | 1.7 | - | $\cdots$ | 4.29 | 1. | 38,708 | 1.5 |
| Unah | - | - | - | -- | , | -- | 731 | (6) | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | -. | -- | 731 | (6) |
| Wash. .... | $\cdots$ | -- | - | -- | - | -- | 173,396 | 7.5 | -- | 280 | 280 | . 1 | 173.676 | 6.8 |
| Ore. | - | $\ldots$ | -- | $\cdots$ | - | -- | 57,088 | 2.5 | .- | 5.307 | 5,307 | 2.1 | 62,395 | 2.4 |
| Calif. | 123.158 | 17,192 | 68,408 | 5,128 | 213.886 | 24.6 | 946,381 | 41.1 | - | 163,549 | 163,549 | 65.5 | 1,109.930 | 43.5 |
| Hanaii . . . . | - | - | - | -- | -- | - | 4.143 | . 2 | ... | 3,055 | 3.055 | 1.2 | 7.198 | . 3 |
| US... | 549,136 | 185,586 | 80,266 | 55,082 | 870.070 | 100.0 | 2,300,391 | 100.0 | 77,636 | 172.191 | 249,827 | 100.0 | 2,550,218 | 100.0 |

Table 5.-Fruit and edible tree nuts: Season average prices per unit received by growers, 1971, 1972 and $1973^{1}$

| Commodity | Unit | 1971 | 1972 | $1973{ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Dollars | Dollars | Dollars |
| NONCITRUS: ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Apples, commercial | Lb. | . 0492 | . 0643 | . 0850 |
| Apricots, 3 States | Ton | 93.80 | 139.00 | 164.00 |
| Avocados, 2 States ${ }^{3}$ | Ton | 689.00 | 498.00 | n.a. |
| Bananas, Hawaii | Lb. | . 116 | . 120 | . 107 |
| Bushberries, 2 States. | Lb. | . 181 | . 288 | . 457 |
| Cherrles, sweet | Ton | 316.00 | 385.00 | 362.00 |
| Cherrles, tart . | Ton | 139.00 | 165.00 | 375.00 |
| Cranberrles. | Bbl. | ${ }^{4} 14.90$ | ${ }^{4} 13.20$ | n.a. |
| Dates, California | Ton | 162.00 | 170.00 | 175.00 |
| Figs, Callfornia . | Ton | 87.60 | 143.00 | 214.00 |
| Grapes . . . | Ton | 95.50 | 165.00 | 159.00 |
| Nectarines . | Ton | 155.00 | 177.00 | 254.00 |
| Olives, California | Ton | 148.00 | 415.00 | 358.00 |
| Papayas, Hawail . | Lb. | . 132 | . 133 | . 130 |
| Peaches . . . . | Lb. | . 0608 | . 0698 | . 0830 |
| Pears .. | Ton | 94.40 | 139.00 | 141.00 |
| Persimmons | Ton | 126.00 | 228.00 | 372.00 |
| Plums, California | Ton | 229.00 | 248.00 | 321.00 |
| Pomegranates | Ton | 128.00 | 121.00 | 168.00 |
| Prunes, Californla | Ton | 287.00 | 535.00 | 471.00 |
| Prunes and Plums, other States | Ton | 88.80 | 173.00 | 150.00 |
| Strawberries. | Lb. | . 267 | . 271 | . 310 |
| CITRUS: ${ }^{6}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Oranges . . | Box | 2.45 | 2.87 | 2.52 |
| Tangerines | Box | 3.51 | 4.53 | 4.02 |
| Grapefruit | Box | 2.40 | 2.89 | 2.74 |
| Lemons | Box | 5.00 | 4.81 | 4.60 |
| Limes. | Box | 4.70 | 5.49 | 6.28 |
| Tangelos | Box | 2.09 | 2.81 | 2.35 |
| Temples | Box | 2.78 | 2.89 | 2.80 |
| TREE NUTS: |  |  |  |  |
| Almonds, Callfornia |  | 650.00 | 785.00 | $1,500.00$ |
| Filberts, 2 States | Ton | 414.00 | 508.00 | $630.00$ |
| Macadamla nuts, Hawall. | Lb. | . 247 | . 233 | . 240 |
| Peacans, all. | Lb. | . 330 | . 424 | . 386 |
| Improved | Lb. | . 354 | . 461 | . 435 |
| Native and seediling | Lb. | . 297 | . 389 | . 312 |
| Walnuts, 2 States . . . . . . . . . . | Ton | 419.00 | 564.00 | 580.00 |

[^3]barreli is based on utlized cranberrles. ${ }^{5}$ Equivalent packinghouse door returns per box for all uses. ${ }^{6} 1971$ indicates 1970/71 crop.
n.a.-Data not avallable temporarlly.

Table 6-Citrus fruits: Production and utilization, United States, crops of 1971/72 and 1972/73 ${ }^{1}$

| Crop and season | Production | Utilization |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fresh | Processed |
|  | 1,000 tons | 1,000 tons | 1,000 tons |
| Oranges: |  |  |  |
| 1971/72 | 8,237 | 1,727 | 6,510 |
| 1972/73. | 9,721 | 1,719 | 8,002 |
| Tangerines: $\square$ |  |  |  |
| 1971/72. | 221 | 149 | 72 |
| 1972/73. | 208 | 134 | 74 |
| Grapefruit: |  |  |  |
| 1971/72. | 2,623 | -1,088 | 1.535 |
| 1972/73. | 2,663 | 1,103 | 1,560 |
| Lemons: |  |  |  |
| 1971/72. | 634 | 365 | 269 |
| 1972/73. | 844 | 420 | 424 |
| Limes: |  |  |  |
| 1971/72. | 44 | 19 | 25 |
| 1972/73. | 44 | 21 | 23 |
| Tangetos: |  |  |  |
| 1971/72. | 176 | 86 | 90 |
| 1972/73. | 158 | 77 | 81 |
| Temples: |  |  |  |
| 1971/72 | 239 | 81 | 158 |
| 1972/73. | 230 | 111 | 119 |
| Total citrus fruits: |  |  |  |
| 1971/72. | 12,174 | 3,515 | 8,659 |
| 1972/73. | 13,868 | 3,585 | 10,283 |

${ }^{1} 1972 / 73$ preliminary.
Source: October 1973 citrus production and utilization report, SRS, USDA.

Table 7-Citrus, processed, Florida crops of 1971/72 and 1972/73

| Crop and season | Frozen concentrate | Chilled products |  | Other processed | Total processed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Juice | Sections and salads |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { boxes }^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { boxes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { boxes }^{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,000 \\ \text { bo.res }{ }^{1} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,000 \\ & \text { boxes }^{1} \end{aligned}$ |
| Oranges: ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1971/72 | 104,399 | 19.509 | 535 | 7,726 | 132,169 |
| 1972/73 | 132,210 | 20.465 | 654 | 8,949 | 162,278 |
| Tangerines: $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1971/72. | 961 | --- | --- | 11 | 972 |
| 1972/73 | 961 | --- | - - | 21 | 982 |
| Grapefruit: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1971/72 | 8,725 | 3,206 | 994 | 17.036 | 29.961 |
| 1972/73 | 8,212 | 2,908 | 1,209 | 16,025 | 28,354 |

[^4]Table 8-Apples, commercial crop' : Utilized production, 1971, 1972, and preliminary 1973

| State and area | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | State and area | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Million pounds | Million pounds | Million pounds |  | Million pounds | Million pounds | Million pounds |
| Maine | 92.0 | 75.0 | 55.0 | Wisconsin | 65.0 | 65.0 | 50.0 |
| New Hampshire | 65.0 | 55.0 | 44.0 | Minnesota | 23.5 | 26.0 | 20.0 |
| Vermont | 40.7 | 40.6 | 28.0 | lowa | 10.6 | 13.3 | 10.4 |
| Massachusetts | 105.0 | 91.0 | 76.0 | Missouri | 56.2 | 60.0 | 51.0 |
| Rhode Island | 4.0 | 3.2 | 4.0 | Kansas | 15.0 | 12.0 | 15.0 |
| Connecticut | 45.2 | 30.0 | 30.0 |  |  |  |  |
| New York | 925.0 | 770.0 | 720.0 | N. Central | 1,213.3 | 1,216.3 | 832.4 |
| New Jersey | 110.0 | 88.0 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Pennsylvania . . . . . | 505.0 | 400.0 | 410.0 | Kentucky | 19.4 | 14.1 | 9.9 |
|  |  |  |  | Tennessee | 9.4 | 9.2 | 2.6 |
|  | 1,891.9 | 1,552.8 | 1,467.0 | Arkansas | 9.6 | 8.6 | 6.0 |
| Delaware | 12.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | S. Central | 38.4 | 31.9 | 18.5 |
| Maryland | 69.0 | 66.0 | 66.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Virginia | 480.0 | 420.0 | 400.0 | Total Central | 1,251.7 | 1,248.2 | 850.9 |
| West Virginia | 250.0 | 215.0 | 225.0 |  |  |  |  |
| North Carolina | 185.0 | 245.0 | 210.0 | Idaho | 90.6 | 50.0 | 130.0 |
| South Carolina | 15.0 | 20.0 | 17.0 | Colorado | 74.0 | 11.0 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |  | New Mexico | 12.0 | 2.0 | 40.0 |
| S. Atlantic | 1,011.0 | 977.0 | 930.0 | Utah | 25.0 | 4.0 | 54.0 |
|  |  |  |  | Washington | 1,200.0 | 1,390.0 | 1,800.0 |
| Total Eastern | 2,902.9 | 2,529.8 | 2,397.0 | Oregon | 125.0 | 105.0 | 175.0 |
|  |  |  |  | California | 400.0 | 530.0 | 510.0 |
| Ohio | 150.0 | 135.0 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Indiana | 90.0 | 75.0 | 63.0 | Western | 1,926.0 | 2,092.0 | 2,809.0 |
| lllinois | 103.0 | 100.0 | 83.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Michigan | 700.0 | 730.0 | 440.0 | United States | 6,080.6 | 5,870.0 | 6,056.9 |

'In orchards of 100 or more bearing trees.

Table 9-Apples, commercial crop' : Production by varieties, United States, 1971, 1972, and indicated 1973

| Variety | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | Variety | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Million pounds | Million pounds | Million pounds |  | Million pounds | Million pounds | Million pounds |
| Summer: |  |  |  | Winter, cont'd.: |  |  |  |
| Gravenstein | 83.6 | 107.2 | 87.5 | Golden Delicious | 801.7 | 922.2 | 939.6 |
| Other summer | 100.4 | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | Mcintosh | 769.8 | 656.7 | 481.0 |
| Total | 184.0 | ( ${ }^{2}$ ) | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | Northern Spy | 122.2 | 115.0 | 78.4 |
|  |  |  |  | R.I. Greening | 170.5 | 121.9 | 68.0 |
| Fall: |  |  |  | Rome Beauty | 539.2 | 459.8 | 496.8 |
| Grimes Golden | 31.6 | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | ( ${ }^{2}$ ) | Stayman | 287.4 | 222.2 | 222.2 |
| Jonathan .... | 402.6 | 3€2.5 | 363.7 | Winesap | 166.1 | 162.3 | 163.7 |
| Wealthy . | 38.2 | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | Yellow Newton | 146.3 | 153.4 | 169.5 |
| Other fall | 76.5 | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | York Imperial | 360.4 | 273.9 | 315.7 |
| Total | 548.9 | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | Other winter | 241.3 | ( ${ }^{2}$ ) | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ |
|  |  |  |  | Total | 5,638.2 | 4,942.8 | 5,180.4 |
| Winter: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baldwin | 48.9 | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | Other | - | 468.8 | 431.4 |
| Ben Davis and Gano | 15.2 | ${ }^{2}$ ) | $\left({ }^{2}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Cortland | 180.2 | 125.9 | 123.8 | Total all varieties | 6,371.1 | 5,881.3 | 6,063.0 |
| Delicious | 1,789.0 | 1,729.5 | 2,121.7 |  |  |  |  |

[^5]Table 10-Pears: Utilized production by States and Pacific Coast variety composition, 1971, 1972, and indicated 1973

| State | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | Pacific Coast | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tons | Tons | Tons |  | Tons | Tons | Tons |
| Connecticut | 1,630 | 2,000 | 1,500 | Washington: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Bartlett | 112,000 | 99,000 | 122,000 |
| New York | 18,000 | 18,500 | 12,600 | Other | 53,400 | 54,000 | 61,900 |
| Pennsylvania | 3,400 | 2,950 | 1,800 | Total | 165,400 | 153,000 | 183,900 |
| Michigan | 18,500 | 22,500 | 9,500 | Oregon: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Bartlett | 83,000 | 51,000 | 71,000 |
| Idaho | 2,300 | 800 | 1,300 | Other | 96,000 | 59,000 | 96,000 |
| Colorado | 5,490 | 2,780 | 5,510 | Total | 179,000 | 110,000 | 167,000 |
| Utah | 4,200 | 200 | 5,830 | California: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Bartlett | 301,000 | 286,000 | 317,000 |
| Washington . | 165,400 | 153,000 | 183,900 | Other | 8,000 | 9,600 | 10,300 |
| Oregon | 179,000 | 110,000 | 167,000 | Total | 309,000 | 295,600 | 327,300 |
| California | 309,000 | 295,600 | 327,300 | 3 States: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Bartlett | 496,000 | 436,000 | 510,000 |
|  |  |  |  | Other | 157,400 | 122,600 | 168,200 |
| United States | 706,920 | 608,330 | 716,240 | Total | 653,400 | 558,600 | 678,200 |

Table 11.-Canned fruit juice: Pack and stocks, 1972/73 and earlier seasons

${ }^{1}$ Canners' stocks of citrus juices are Florida only. ${ }^{2}$ December 1 stocks. ${ }^{3}$ Florida only. ${ }^{4}$ Excludes reconstituted juice.
n.a.-Data not reported.

Table 12.-Canned noncitrus fruit: Canners' stocks, packs, supplies, and shipments, current season, with comparisons

| Item and season' | Carryin | Pack | Total supply | Shipments to January 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { January } 1 \\ \text { stocks } \end{gathered}$ | Total season shipments | Carryout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1,000 equivalent cases 24 No. $2^{1 / 2}$ 's |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total-13 items: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 25,323 | 113,041 | 138,364 | 60,451 | 68,919 | 104,028 | 34,336 |
| 1970/71 | 32,013 | 92,719 | 124,732 | 52,017 | 64,859 | 95,034 | 29,698 |
| 1971/72 | 29,698 | 92,133 | 121,831 | 51,281 | 61,242 | 94,433 | 27,398 |
| 1972/73 | 27,398 | 82,180 | 109,578 | 53,503 | 49,043 | 93,543 | 16,035 |
| 1973/74 | 16,035 |  |  | 55,810 | 38,963 |  |  |
| Apples: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 1,238 | 2,877 | 4,115 | 1,005 | 2,415 | 2,698 | 1,417 |
| 1970/71 | 1,417 | 2,090 | 3,507 | 1,032 | 2,161 | 2,476 | 1,031 |
| 1971/72 | 1,031 | 2,358 | 3,389 | 1,110 | 1,582 | 2,672 | 717 |
| 1972/73 | 717 | 2,161 | 2,878 | 1,091 | 982 | 2,588 | 290 |
| 1973/74 | 290 |  |  | 1,042 | 829 |  |  |
| Applesauce: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 2,693 | 16,758 | 19,451 | 5,272 | 11,193 | 15,281 | 4,170 |
| 1970/71 | 4,170 | 14,131 | 18,301 | 5,541 | 10,705 | 15,211 | 3,090 |
| 1971/72 | 3,090 | 15,148 | 18,238 | 5,548 | 9,402 | 14,911 | 3.327 |
| 1972/73 | 3,327 | 11,942 | 15,269 | 4,963 | 8,166 | 13,954 | 1,315 |
| 1973/74 | 1,315 |  |  | 5,536 | 6,613 |  |  |
| Apricots: ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 1,037 | 5,543 | 6,580 | 2,783 | 3,797 | 4,175 | 2,405 |
| 1970/71 | ${ }^{3} 2,067$ | 3,766 | 5,833 | 2,569 | 3,264 | 4,137 | 1,696 |
| 1971/72 | 1,696 | 3,262 | 4,958 | 3,071 | 1,887 | 4,397 | 561 |
| 1972/73 | 561 | 3,041 | 3,602 | 2,194 | 1,408 | 3,304 | 298 |
| 1973/74 | 298 | 4,094 | 4,392 | 2,618 | 1,774 |  |  |
| Cherries, RSP: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 100 | 1,505 | 1,605 | 920 | 665 | 1,453 | 152 |
| 1970/71 | 152 | 978 | 1,130 | 558 | 572 | 1,028 | 102 |
| 1971/72 | 102 | 1.041 | 1,143 | 480 | 663 | 900 | 243 |
| 1972/73 | 243 | 1,299 | 1,542 | 1,171 | 371 | 1,533 | 9 |
| 1973/74 | 9 | 579 | 588 | 505 | 83 |  |  |
| Cherries, sweet: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70. |  | 947 | 1,059 | 472 | 587 | 707 | 352 |
| 1970/71. | ${ }^{3} 330$ | 663 | 993 | 372 | 621 | 608 | 385 |
| 1971/72 | 385 | 536 | 921 | 373 | 548 | 606 | 315 |
| 1972/73 | 315 | 393 | 708 | 335 | 373 | 518 | 190 |
| 1973/74 | 190 | 503 | 693 | 351 | 342 |  |  |
| Fruit cocktail: ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 3,316 | 16,686 | 20,002 | 9,171 | 10,831 | 15,935 | 4,067 |
| 1970/71 | ${ }^{3} 3,426$ | 13,081 | 16,507 | 7,345 | 9,162 | 13.054 | 3,453 |
| 1971/72 | 3,453 | 13,334 | 16,787 | 6,994 | 9.793 | 12,451 | 4,336 |
| 1972/73 | 4,336 | 11,855 | 16,191 | 7,620 | 8,571 | 13,856 | 2,335 |
| 1973/74 ... | 2,335 | 13,384 | 15,719 | 9,108 | 6,611 |  |  |

See footnotes at end of table.
-Continued

Table 12.-Canned noncitrus fruit: Canners' stocks, packs, supplies, and shipments, current season, with comparisons-Continued

| Item and season' | Carryin | Pack | Total supply | Shipments to January 1 | January 1 stocks | Total season shipments | Carryout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.000 equivalent cases $24 \mathrm{No} .2^{1 / 2}{ }^{\text {'s }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fruits for salad: ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70. | 230 | 788 | 1,018 | 375 | 643 | 678 | 340 |
| 1970/71 | ${ }^{3} 299$ | 658 | 957 | 439 | 518 | 737 | 220 |
| 1971/72 | 220 | 784 | 1,004 | 392 | 612 | 779 | 225 |
| 1972/73 | 225 | 724 | 949 | 396 | 553 | 737 | 212 |
| 1973/74 | 212 | 799 | 1,011 | 483 | 528 |  |  |
| Mixed fruits: ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 162 | 728 | 890 | 471 | 419 | 628 | 262 |
| 1970/71 | 262 | 548 | 810 | 532 | 278 | 652 | 158 |
| 1971/72 | 158 | 695 | 853 | 583 | 270 | 739 | 114 |
| 1972/73 | 114 | 752 | 866 | 581 | 285 | 767 | 99 |
| 1973/74 | 99 | 736 | 835 | 599 | 236 |  |  |
| Peaches, Calif. clings: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70. | 5,637 | 31,479 | 37,116 | 19,810 | 17,306 | 28,788 | 8,328 |
| 1970/71 | ${ }^{3} 7,375$ | 24,878 | 32,253 | 14,855 | 17,398 | 25,490 | 6,763 |
| 1971/72 | 6,763 | 21,839 | 28,602 | 13,623 | 14,979 | 24,712 | 3,890 |
| 1972/73 | 3,890 | 21,233 | 25,123 | 15,505 | 9,618 | 23,532 | 1,591 |
| 1973/74 | 1,591 | 21,615 | 23,206 | 15,314 | 7,852 |  |  |
| Peaches, U.S. freestone: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 1,899 | 6,060 | 7,959 | 3,965 | 3,994 | 5,940 | 2,019 |
| 1970/71 | ${ }^{3} 1,797$ | 4,663 | 6,460 | 3,434 | 3,026 | 5,266 | 1,194 |
| 1971/72 | 1.194 | 3,923 | 5,117 | 2,460 | 2,657 | 4,174 | 943 |
| 1972/73 | 943 | 2,783 | 3,726 | 2,438 | 1,288 | 3,530 | 196 |
| 1973/74 | 196 | 2,899 | 3,095 | 1,938 | 1,157 |  |  |
| Pears: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 2,784 | 10,590 | 13,374 | 5,456 | 7,918 | 10,384 | 2,990 |
| 1970/71 | 2,990 | 8,610 | 11,600 | 4,427 | 7,173 | 8,231 | 3,369 |
| 1971/72 | 3,369 | 10,309 | 13,678 | 5,670 | 8,008 | 9,990 | 3,688 |
| 1972/73 | 3,688 | 9,063 | 12,751 | 5,535 | 7,216 | 10,320 | 2,431 |
| 1973/74 | 2,431 | 9,813 | 12,244 | 6,608 | 5,636 |  |  |
| Pineapple: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 5,864 | 16,871 | 22,735 | 9,776 | 7,666 | 15,818 | 6,917 |
| 1970/71 | ${ }^{3} 6,811$ | 17,813 | 24,624 | 10,035 | 9,102 | 16,837 | 7,787 |
| 1971/72 | 7.787 | 17,705 | 25,492 | 10,135 | 10,034 | 16,829 | 8,663 |
| 1972/73 | 8,663 | 16,540 | 25,203 | 11,205 | 9,911 | 18,191 | 7,012 |
| 1973/74 | 7,012 |  |  | 11,044 | 6,608 |  |  |
| Purple plums, U.S.: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70. | 251 | 2,209 | 2,460 | 975 | 1,485 | 1,543 | 917 |
| 1970/71 | 917 | 840 | 1,757 | 878 | 879 | 1,307 | 450 |
| 1971/72 | 450 | 1,199 | 1,649 | 842 | 807 | 1,273 | 376 |
| 1972/73 | 376 | 394 | 770 | 469 | 301 | 713 | 57 |
| 1973/74 | 57 | 1,261 | 1,318 | 664 | 654 |  |  |

[^6]Table 13.-Frozen concentrated orange and grapefruit juice: Florida stocks, packs, supplies and shipments, current season with comparisons

| Item and season | Carry in | Pack | Imports | Total supply | Shipments to January 1 | January 1 stocks | Total season shipments | Carryout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Million gallons | Million gallons | Million gallons | Million gallons | Million gallons | Million gallons | Million gallons | Million gallons |
| Orange: ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 17.4 | 124.9 | 1.5 | 143.8 | 7.3 | 23.5 | 117.2 | 26.6 |
| 1970/71 | 26.6 | 125.2 | 8.5 | 160.3 | 9.9 | 32.5 | 137.7 | 22.6 |
| 1971/72 | 22.6 | 134.2 | 11.7 | 168.5 | 11.3 | 24.5 | 140.5 | 28.0 |
| 1972/73 | 28.0 | 176.1 | 4.1 | 208.2 | 10.7 | 31.2 | 159.8 | 48.4 |
| 1973/74 | 48.4 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a. | 11.4 | 55.2 |  |  |
| Grapefruit: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969/70 | 1.4 | 4.3 | --- | 5.7 | . 4 | 1.5 | 5.2 | . 5 |
| 1970/71 | . 5 | 6.9 | --- | 7.4 | . 4 | 1.4 | 6.3 | 1.1 |
| 1971/72 | 1.1 | 8.8 | -.. | 9.9 | . 6 | 1.7 | 7.1 | 2.8 |
| 1972/73 | 2.8 | 8.7 | --- | 11.5 | . 4 | 3.6 | 7.9 | 3.6 |
| 1973/74 | 3.6 | п.a. | --. | n.a. | . 4 | 4.3 |  |  |

${ }^{1} 45^{\circ}$ Brix in gallons including concentrated orange juice for Source: Prepared from reports of Florida Canners Association. manufacture.

Table 14.-Selected fresh citrus fruit prices, f.o.b. packed fresh, by months, 1970-74

| Year | Jan. | Feb. | Mar. | Apr. | May | June | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dollars per box | Dollars per box | Dollars per box | Dollars per box | Dollars per box | Dollars per box | Dollars per box | Dollars per box | Dollars per box | Dollars per box | Dollars per box | Dollars per box |
| ORANGES Florida: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 4.00 | 4.55 | 4.13 | 3.75 | 3.90 | 4.10 | --- | -.- | --. | 4.10 | 3.75 | 3.80 |
| 1971 | 3.90 | 4.85 | 4.65 | 4.60 | 5.05 | 5.60 | --- | --- | -.. | 8.10 | 5.40 | 5.30 |
| 1972 | 4.85 | 5.10 | 4.85 | 4.60 | 4.80 | 5.30 | 6.30 | -.- | -.- | 6.50 | 4.40 | 4.30 |
| 1973 | 4.65 | 4.70 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.55 | 4.90 | 5.00 | --- | -.- | ... | ... | 5.30 |
| 1974 | 5.10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 3.60 | 3.90 | 3.70 | 3.40 | 3.45 | 3.50 | -.- | --- | 4.70 | 3.90 | 3.40 | 3.40 |
| 1971 | 3.35 | 3.50 | 3.70 | 3.65 | 3.80 | 4.20 | -.. | --. | --- | 4.85 | 3.85 | 4.10 |
| 1972 | 4.20 | 4.40 | 4.60 | 4.20 | --- | -. - | --- | --. | -.- | 5.10 | 4.20 | 4.30 |
| 1973 | 4.00 | 3.70 | 4.10 | 4.40 | 4.00 | --- | --- | --- | -. | 5.30 | 4.80 | 4.40 |
| 1974 | 3.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 5.05 | 5.10 | 4.79 | 4.80 | 5.10 | 5.30 | 5.00 | --. | --. | -.. | 9.10 | 6.50 |
| 1971 | 5.70 | 5.50 | 6.80 | 5.90 | 5.00 | 5.80 | 6.20 | --- | -.- | -.. | 9.60 | 7.60 |
| 1972 | 6.20 | 4.65 | 4.90 | 4.90 | 4.80 | 5.00 | 5.20 | - . | --. | -.- | 6.40 | 6.20 |
| 1973 | 7.50 | 7.29 | 6.56 | 7.00 | 7.25 | 5.90 | 6.25 | - | --. | -.- | ... | 6.70 |
| 1974 | 7.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| California: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 5.74 | 5.71 | 5.51 | 5.41 | 5.22 | 5.59 | 5.60 | 5.66 | 6.52 | 7.94 | 7.30 | 6.40 |
| 1971 | 6.60 | 6.70 | 6.60 | 6.54 | 6.62 | 6.10 | 5.90 | 6.10 | 6.20 | 6.50 | 7.02 | 6.76 |
| 1972 | 6.20 | 6.10 | 5.94 | 5.89 | 5.71 | 5.62 | 6.04 | 6.18 | 6.34 | 5.70 | 4.42 | 4.84 |
| 1973 | 7.00 | 7.20 | 7.30 | 7.84 | 7.05 | 6.40 | 6.30 | -.- | 6.75 | 8.20 | 6.65 | 7.45 |
| 1974 | 7.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GRAPEFRUIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 4.50 | 4.51 | 4.61 | 4.84 | 5.68 | -.. | -- | - - | - . | 4.97 | 4.09 | 4.03 |
| 1971 | 4.18 | 4.73 | 5.05 | 5.45 | 6.45 | --. | -.- | ... | ... | 6.07 | 5.35 | 5.41 |
| 1972 | 5.23 | 5.35 | 5.07 | 5.38 | 6.03 | 6.21 | --. | -.- | --- | 7.56 | 5.27 | 5.52 |
| 1973 | 5.25 | 5.29 | 5.37 | 5.36 | 5.88 | 6.17 | -.- | -.- | -. | 6.05 | 5.60 | 5.49 |
| 1974 | 5.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 4.15 | 4.00 | 3.95 | 4.20 | 4.65 | 4.70 | -. | --- | --. | 4.70 | 3.80 | 3.50 |
| 1971 | 3.55 | 3.80 | 4.05 | 4.40 | 5.20 | 5.00 | --- | -.. | -. - | 7.10 | 4.70 | 4.60 |
| 1972 | 4.50 | 4.40 | 4.80 | 4.70 | ... | ... | --. | --- | -.- | 8.68 | 6.20 | 5.60 |
| 1973 | 5.20 | 4.90 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.45 | - - | -- | -•- | - - | -. - | 6.40 | 5.70 |
| 1974 | 4.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEMONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 8.70 | 8.90 | -.- | --- | --- | --- | -. | -.- | 10.90 | 10.80 | 9.20 | 8.40 |
| 1971 | 8.40 | 6.70 | --. | --- | --- | - . | --. | -.- | .-. | 10.50 | 9.80 | 8.60 |
| 1972 | 8.60 | 8.50 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 9.80 | 9.40 | 9.50 |
| 1973 | 9.50 | 10.10 | - | --- | -.- | -.- | --- | --- | -- | 14.70 | 12.60 | 11.70 |
| 1974 | 11.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| California: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970. | 9.02 | 9.10 | 7.92 | 7.88 | 7.92 | 7.90 | 8.32 | 9.24 | 9.76 | 8.72 | 9.00 | 9.10 |
| 1971 | 9.80 | 9.70 | 9.80 | 10.30 | 10.00 | 9.90 | 9.40 | 8.75 | 9.21 | 9.01 | 9.34 | 9.33 |
| 1972 | 9.65 | 9.88 | 9.98 | 9.97 | 10.07 | 9.72 | 10.24 | 10.10 | 10.30 | 10.70 | 9.70 | 10.80 |
| 1973 | 11.10 | 10.80 | 9.80 | 9.20 | 8.80 | 9.50 | 9.10 | 11.50 | 17.00 | 13.90 | 12.90 | 11.50 |
| 1974. | 12.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^7]Table 15.-Fruit, fresh: Average retail prices, selected cities, United States, by months, 1969-74

| Year | Jan. | Feb. | Mar. | Apr. | May | June | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents |
| Apples (pound): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969 | 23.0 | 23.6 | 24.3 | 24.7 | 25.3 | 27.3 | 28.4 | 28.1 | 25.7 | 19.4 | 18.5 | 19.0 |
| 1970 | 19.6 | 19.8 | 20.4 | 20.7 | 21.9 | 24.3 | 26.0 | 26.6 | 25.1 | 19.6 | 19.2 | 19.9 |
| 1971 | 21.0 | 21.7 | 22.5 | 23.5 | 24.1 | 25.4 | 27.9 | 28.5 | 25.7 | 20.9 | 20.2 | 21.0 |
| 1972 | 21.6 | 22.3 | 22.7 | 23.1 | 24.7 | 26.6 | 28.4 | 29.3 | 27.4 | 22.9 | 22.9 | 23.8 |
| 1973 | 24.6 | 25.5 | 26.2 | 27.9 | 30.3 | 34.4 | 37.0 | 35.0 | 32.2 | 28.6 | 29.6 | 30.8 |
| 1974 | 31.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bananas (pound): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969 | 15.5 | 15.8 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 16.1 | 15.8 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 16.6 | 16.8 | 15.7 | 15.6 |
| 1970 | 15.7 | 16.1 | 17.0 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 17.0 | 15.4 | 15.7 | 15.4 | 16.3 | 14.7 | 13.6 |
| 1971 | 13.9 | 14.9 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 14.7 | 14.4 | 15.1 | 15.5 | 15.3 | 15.8 | 14.6 | 14.3 |
| 1972 | 14.4 | 15.6 | 15.3 | 17.0 | 16.2 | 16.9 | 16.3 | 15.6 | 15.9 | 15.7 | 15.5 | 15.1 |
| 1973 | 15.1 | 15.7 | 15.1 | 16.6 | 15.6 | 17.1 | 17.6 | 18.3 | 17.2 | 17.3 | 16.7 | 15.6 |
| 1974 | 16.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oranges (dozen): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969........ | 83.0 | 82.7 | 82.9 | 82.5 | 82.4 | 81.9 | 83.5 | 86.6 | 86.2 | 86.1 | 86.4 | 81.6 |
| 1970 | 78.7 | 80.6 | 81.2 | 79.2 | 80.1 | 83.6 | 87.8 | 90.5 | 91.9 | 99.0 | 94.5 | 89.7 |
| 1971 | 83.9 | 86.8 | 87.7 | 87.5 | 91.2 | 93.8 | 96.5 | 101.5 | 103.7 | 102.9 | 99.8 | 96.3 |
| 1972 | 92.9 | 91.7 | 91.2 | 88.2 | 88.7 | 92.7 | 95.4 | 101.3 | 100.6 | 100.9 | 97.0 | 90.0 |
| 1973 | 97.1 | 97.0 | 99.8 | 101.7 | 103.2 | 101.5 | 101.5 | 110.6 | 110.6 | 118.2 | 116.4 | 106.2 |
| 1974 | 104.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grapefruit (each) : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969.......... | 14.0 | 13.9 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 13.5 | 14.1 | 15.3 | 19.1 | 20.2 | 18.0 | 14.4 | 13.9 |
| 1970 | 14.1 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 14.9 | 15.7 | 18.6 | 21.1 | 20.9 | 20.4 | 18.6 | 14.6 | 13.9 |
| 1971 | 13.8 | 14.3 | 14.6 | 15.9 | 16.6 | 20.2 | 22.7 | 23.8 | 23.2 | 20.8 | 17.1 | 16.3 |
| 1972 | 16.3 | 16.3 | 16.7 | 16.4 | 17.7 | 19.5 | 20.5 | 24.2 | 24.6 | 25.2 | 18.4 | 17.5 |
| 1973 | 17.2 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 17.3 | 17.8 | 19.5 | 21.8 | 25.0 | 24.3 | 25.3 | 18.9 | 18.1 |
| 1974 | 18.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lemons (pound): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969 | 27.0 | 28.3 | 28.2 | 28.3 | 28.1 | 28.5 | 28.6 | 29.5 | 29.5 | 30.8 | 31.3 | 31.8 |
| 1970 | 31.6 | 31.1 | 31.5 | 31.0 | 30.9 | 30.3 | 29.9 | 30.6 | 31.2 | 32.1 | 32.5 | 31.9 |
| 1971 | 31.9 | 32.4 | 32.5 | 32.8 | 32.9 | 32.9 | 33.2 | 32.8 | 32.7 | 33.1 | 33.4 | 33.8 |
| 1972 | 34.1 | 34.5 | 34.6 | 34.6 | 34.6 | 34.4 | 33.7 | 34.6 | 35.1 | 35.6 | 35.1 | 35.1 |
| 1973 | 34.8 | 35.8 | 36.4 | 36.6 | 36.5 | 35.8 | 36.2 | 37.7 | 42.9 | 43.3 | 42.2 | 42.1 |
| 1974. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grapes (pound): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969 | -.- | -.- | -.. | -•• | --. | --- | 47.7 | 37.0 | 34.9 | 36.2 | 38.8 | --- |
| 1970 | --- | -. - | -- - | -- - | -- - | --. | -- | 46.0 | 38.2 | 42.2 | 44.0 |  |
| 1971 | -. - | . . - | -. - | ... | .-. | -.. | ... | 59.1 | 41.9 | 41.6 | 48.1 | ... |
| 1972. | -.- | - | --- | -.- | --- | -•• | -- | 52.1 | 51.1 | 58.8 | 57.6 | -.. |
| 1973. | ... | -. - | -. - | -. - | -. - | --- | -. - | 54.6 | 48.6 | 55.1 | 59.0 | . . - |
| 1974. | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strawberries (pint): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1969.... . . . . | -. | -.- | --- | 47.1 | 38.5 | 40.2 | - - | - | -. | -.- | -•• | -• |
| 1970. | -. - | -. . | . . . |  | 39.9 | 41.5 | --. | ... | - | ... | ... | ... |
| 1971 | -.. | ..- | -.. | -. . | 44.3 | 41.9 | - - | --- | ... | . . . | ... | ... |
| 1972. | -.. | -.. | -.. | * | 41.8 | 46.5 | - | -.. | --. | -•- | .. - | . . - |
| 1973. | -. | . . - | -. - | -. - | 48.2 | 51.1 | .-. | ... | -•• | -.. | - | -•• |
| 1974. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

Table 16. - Selected wholesale canned fruit and fruit juice prices, by months, 1970-74

| Year | Jan. | Feb. | Mar. | Apr. | May | June | July | Aug. | Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dollars per dozen | Dollars per dozen | Dollars per dozen | Dollars per dozen | Dollars per dozen | Dollars per dozen | Dollars per dozen | Dollars per dozen | Dollars per dozen | Dollars per dozen | Dollars per dozen | Dollars per dozen |
| CANNED FRUIT: Applesauce (No. 303 can): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 1,696 | 1,688 | 1,678 | 1,672 | 1,672 | 1,672 | 1,651 | 1,643 | 1,660 | 1,660 | 1,660 | 1,668 |
| 1971 | 1,668 | 1,688 | 1,660 | 1,680 | 1,688 | 1,712 | 1,712 | 1,757 | 1,729 | 1,729 | 1,729 | 1,847 |
| 1972 | 1,843 | 1,827 | 1,835 | 1,835 | 1,855 | 1,855 | 1,855 | 1,855 | 1,855 | 1,868 | 1,932 | 1,939 |
| 1973 | 1,974 | 2,006 | 2,006 | 2,006 | 2,047 | 2,047 | 2,018 | 2,047 | 2,059 | 2,607 | 2,607 | 2,681 |
| 1974 | 2,687 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fruit cocktail (No. $2^{1 / 2}$ can): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 .... | 3,549 | 3,500 | 3,451 | 3,468 | 3,498 | 3,553 | 3,680 | 3.827 | 4,021 | 4,021 | 4,021 | 4,086 |
| 1971 | 4,086 | 4,086 | 4,086 | 4,086 | 4,056 | 4,164 | 4,110 | 4,110 | 4,126 | 4,126 | 4,126 | 4,165 |
| 1972 | 4,136 | 4,200 | 4,274 | 4,253 | 4,253 | 4,253 | 4,253 | 4,268 | 4,292 | 4,323 | 4,397 | 4,433 |
| 1973 | 4,477 | 4,477 | 4,477 | 4,477 | 4,501 | 4,501 | 4,501 | 4,571 | 4,685 | 4,720 | 4,720 | 4,727 |
| 1974 | 4,806 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peaches: <br> (No. $2^{1 / 2}$ can): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 2,923 | 2,923 | 2,987 | 3,018 | 3,067 | 3,067 | 3,067 | 3,067 | 3,135 | 3,135 | 3,199 | 3,199 |
| 1971 | 3,199 | 3,199 | 3,170 | 3,170 | 3,165 | 3,243 | 3,272 | 3,243 | 3,243 | 3,243 | 3,243 | 3,272 |
| 1972 | 3,243 | 3,258 | 3,361 | 3,355 | 3,355 | 3,384 | 3,374 | 3,428 | 3,389 | 3,405 | 3,457 | 3,486 |
| 1973 | 3,511 | 3,511 | 3,513 | 3,513 | 3,585 | 3,585 | 3,585 | 3,720 | 3,767 | 3,872 | 3,872 | 3,921 |
| 1974 | 4,069 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pears: <br> (No. $2^{1 / 2}$ can): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 3,848 | 3,883 | 3,883 | 3,960 | 4,022 | 4,120 | 4,146 | 4,251 | 4,380 | 4,449 | 4,362 | 4,414 |
| 1971 | 4,501 | 4,501 | 4,501 | 4,501 | 4,476 | 4,555 | 4,555 | 4,542 | 4,308 | 4,308 | 4,308 | 4,308 |
| 1972 | 4,308 | 4,240 | 4,280 | 4,382 | 4,423 | 4,545 | 4,545 | 4,582 | 4,582 | 4,698 | 4,698 | 4,698 |
| 1973 | 4,726 | 4,728 | 4,769 | 4,891 | 4,891 | 4,862 | 4,891 | 4,905 | 4,904 | 4,904 | 4,904 | 5,017 |
| 1974 | 5,078 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CANNED JUICE: Apple |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (32-oz. bottle): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 | 2,482 | 2,842 | 2,813 | 2,862 | 2,862 | 2,862 | 2,862 | 2.862 | 2,862 | 2,845 | 2,845 | 2,845 |
| 1971 | 2,845 | 2,845 | 2,845 | 2,894 | 2,894 | 2,956 | 2,956 | 2,956 | 2,956 | 2,952 | 2,952 | 3,014 |
| 1972 | 3,014 | 3,014 | 3,038 | 3,038 | 3,085 | 3,085 | 3,085 | 3,085 | 3,085 | 3,195 | 3,232 | 3,317 |
| 1973 | 3,413 | 3,511 | 3,511 | 3,560 | 3,560 | 3,633 | 3,560 | 3,633 | 3,799 | 4,479 | 4,479 | 5,070 |
| 1974 | 5,070 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Orange: <br> (No. 3 can): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 . . | 3,349. | 3,554 | 3,368 | 3,368 | 3,466 | 3,486 | 3,398 | 3,417 | 3,417 | 3,417 | 3,417 | 3,124 |
| 1971 | 3,124 | 3,515 | 3,613 | 3,868 | 3,868 | 4,083 | 4,093 | 4,093 | 4,093 | 4,093 | 4,093 | 4,250 |
| 1972 | 4,250 | 4,250 | 4,289 | 4,171 | 4,162 | 4,162 | 4,162 | 4,162 | 4,162 | 4,113 | 4,113 | 4,142 |
| 1973 | 4,020 | 3,873 | 3,946 | 4,137 | 4,162 | 4,101 | 4,101 | 4,101 | 4,101 | 4,162 | 4,162 | 4,162 |
| 1974 | 4,162 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grapefruit <br> (No. 3 can): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970... | 4,000 | 4,024 | 4,245 | 4,318 | 4,367 | 4,424 | 4,603 | 4,619 | 4,619 | 4,619 | 4,570 | 4,023 |
| 1971 | 3,893 | 3,974 | 3,999 | 4,342 | 4,374 | 4,611 | 4,684 | 4,758 | 4,758 | 4,758 | 4,758 | 4,782 |
| 1972 | 4,782 | 4,652 | 4,391 | 4,391 | 4,329 | 4,329 | 4,4 36 | 4,486 | 4,525 | 4,525 | 4,525 | 4,588 |
| 1973 | 4,588 | 4,588 | 4,588 | 4,133 | 3,996 | 3,947 | 3,898 | 3,898 | 3,898 | 4,045 | 4,290 | 4,290 |
| 1974 | 4,343 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.
NOTE: Commas in this table should be read as periods.

Table 17.-Fruit, processed: Average retail prices, selected cities, United States, by months, 1969-74


Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

Table 18.- Fresh fruit: Retail price, marketing margin, and grower and packer return per pound, sold in New York City, indicated months, 1972 and 1973

| Commodity \& season | Retail price (cents) | Marketing margin |  | Grower and packer return ${ }^{1}$ (f.o.b. shipping point price) ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cents | Percentage of retail price | Cents | Percentage of retail price |
| Apples, Eastern Delicious | - |  |  |  |  |
| November 1973 | 29.2 | 14.3 | 49 | 14.9 | 51 |
| October 1973 | 30.8 | 14.4 | 47 | 16.4 | 53 |
| November 1972 | 22.9 | 8.6 | 38 | 14.3 | 62 |
| Apples, Eastern McIntosh |  |  |  |  |  |
| November 1973 | 34.0 | 15.9 | 47 | 18.1 | 53 |
| October 1973 | $\left({ }^{3}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{3}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{3}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{3}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{3}\right)$ |
| November 1972 | 26.9 | 16.4 | 61 | 10.5 | 39 |
| Apples, Western Delicious |  |  |  |  |  |
| November 1973 | 39.3 | 24.4 | 62 | 14.9 | 38 |
| October 1973 | 42.0 | 24.6 | 59 | 17.4 | 41 |
| November 1972 | 36.8 | 21.0 | 57 | 15.8 | 43 |
| Lemons, Western |  |  |  |  |  |
| November 1973 | 38.8 | 23.9 | 62 | 14.9 | 38 |
| October 1973 | 41.8 | 22.5 | 54 | 19.3 | 46 |
| November 1972 | 35.8 | 23.6 | 66 | 12.2 | 34 |
| Oranges, California Valencia |  |  |  |  |  |
| November 1973 | 26.6 | 17.2 | 65 | 9.4 | 35 |
| October 1973 | 26.4 | 15.5 | 59 | 10.9 | 41 |
| November 1972 | 25.3 | 17.5 | 69 | 7.8 | 31 |
| Oranges, Florida |  |  |  |  |  |
| November 1973 | 20.0 | 13.2 | 66 | 6.8 | 34 |
| October 1973 | $\left({ }^{3}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{3}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{3}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{3}\right)$ | $\left({ }^{3}\right)$ |
| November 1972 | 16.9 | 11.5 | 68 | 5.4 | 32 |

[^8]Apples, Eastern Delicious-New York State; Apples, Eastern McIntosh-New York State; Apples Western Delicious-Washington; Lemons-California. ${ }^{3}$ Not prices in October.

# PRICES, COSTS AND MARGINS OF FLORIDA ORANGES-FRESH AND PROCESSED 

by<br>Alfred J. Burns and Joseph C. Podany


#### Abstract

Of retail sales in Chicago and New York City, Florida orange growers in 1965/66-1972/73 received a greater return from fresh oranges than from oranges processed into frozen concentrated orange juice. However, the grower's share of the retail value was larger for frozen concentrated orange juice than from an equivalent quantity of fresh oranges. Florida growers have maintained their share of the consumer dollar for frozen concentrated orange juice during the past 8 years. However, their share for fresh oranges has declined slightly.


Key Words: Oranges, fresh, frozen concentrate, retail price, costs, margins, grower returns.

## INTRODUCTION

With the introduction of frozen concentrated orange juice in the mid-1940's, per capita consumption began to shift from fresh oranges to frozen concentrate. Declining per capita consumption of fresh oranges apparently leveled off during the past decade while use of frozen concentrate continued to increase. The average person consumed about 15 pounds of fresh oranges and almost 20 pounds of frozen concentrated orange juice (single strength equivalent) in 1972.

Florida's orange production increased sharply during the past decade. An increasingly larger share of the crop was processed, mostly into frozen concentrated orange juice. In 1972/73 Florida produced 169.7 million boxes of oranges, 79 percent of the U.S. crop. That season 93 percent of Florida's crop was processed and 7 percent moved fresh.

This article discusses and compares prices, costs, margins, and grower returns for Florida oranges and frozen concentrated orange juice sold in Chicago and New York City. Data used are from a continuing costs and margins project on fruits and vegetables.

## FRESH ORANGES

## Procedures

Florida fresh oranges were priced at two levels-f.o.b. shipping point and retail. Retail prices
were collected monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in a sample of retail stores on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of the first week of the month containing a Tuesday. The f.o.b. shipping point price used is an average of daily prices for the week preceding the retail pricing week. Weekly average shipping point prices are reported by the Grower's Administrative Committee, based on prices compiled by Florida Citrus Mutual. Monthly retail and shipping point prices are weighted by monthly carlot unloads of Florida oranges in Chicago and New York City to obtain season average price (Season: Nov.-May).

The retail value of a box of fresh oranges is the return to the retailer for salable oranges (retail price minus 3 percent allowance for losses during the marketing process). Transportation costs are based on rail rates from Lakeland, Fla. to Chicago and New York City. Picking, hauling, packing and selling costs are reported by the Florida Agricultural Experiment Station. Grower returns (on-tree) are derived from shipping point price by deducting picking, hauling, packing and selling costs. The wholesale and retail margin is derived by deducting the shipping point price plus transportation costs from the retail value. This margin represents payment for wholesaling (assembly and warehousing), intra-city transportation, and retailing.

## Marketing Cost Up-Grower Returns Down

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated the average retail price of Florida oranges in Chicago and New York City to be 16.0 cents per pound in 1972/73 or 0.1 cent per pound higher than in 1963/64 (table 1). The supply of Florida oranges sold fresh was 5 percent smaller in 1972/73 than in 1963/64 (Fig.1). In the intervening seasons, fresh supplies were considerably larger and retail prices were lower, particularly during 1964/65-1967/68 seasons. Retail price in 1966/67 was one third lower and supplies were 39 percent larger than in 1963/64.

Retail price changes were responsive to changes in fresh orange suppliesin 6 of 8 season (Fig.1). Reduced supplies resulted in higher prices in 3 seasons, and increased supplies resulted in lower prices in 3 seasons. Both supply and price in 1969/70 remained


Figure 1
essentially unchanged from a year earlier. Increased supplies in 1970/71 and 1972/73 did not result in lower prices.

The retail value of a box of Florida oranges sold in Chicago and New York City averaged $\$ 13.94$ in 1972/73, 8 cents higher than in 1963/64 (Fig. 2, table 1). The wholesale and retail margin, transportation costs, and picking, hauling, packing, and selling costs all increased by a larger amount during the period. Consequently, Florida grower returns trended downward. Grower returns averaged $\$ 1.97$ per box in 1972/73-less than half of the very high returns received in 1963/64. Growers received less than $\$ 2$ per box in 5 of the last 8 seasons. In 1966/67, they received only 88 cents per box, which represented only 10 percentof the retail value in Chicago and New York City. In 7 of the last 8 seasons the grower's share was less than 20 percent of the retail value.

A simple trend line fitted to the data in table 1 indicates that the retail value of Florida oranges sold in Chicago and New York City increased an average of 22 cents per box per year since 1963/64. During the same period, the wholesale and retail margin increased 17 cents per box per year; rail transportation costs went up 8 cents; picking, hauling, packing, and selling costs rose 9 cents; and grower returns declined 12 cents.

The market shares of the retail value going for the wholesale and retail margin, transportation costs, and picking, hauling, packing and selling costs each increased on the average slightly over one-third of a percentage point per year during the 10 years. The grower share declined slightly over 1 percentage point per year. For the 10 years the wholesale and retail margin averaged 52 percent of the retail value,


Figure 2

Table 1.-Florida Oranges: Seasonal average prices, margins, costs and returns, average Chicago and New York City ${ }^{\prime}$

| Season | Retail price per pound | Retail value per box ${ }^{2}$ | Wholesale and retail margin |  | Transportation costs ${ }^{3}$ |  | Picking, hauling, packing and selling costs ${ }^{4}$ |  | Derived grower returns ${ }^{5}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Per box | Percentage of retail value | Per box | Percentage of retail value | Per box | Percentage of retail value | Per box | Percentage of retail value |
|  | Cents | Dollars | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent |
| 1963/64 | 15.9 | 13.86 | 6.48 | 47 | 1.18 | 9 | 1.99 | 14 | 4.21 | 30 |
| 1964/65 | 13.1 | 11.39 | 5.74 | 50 | 1.18 | 10 | 1.99 | 18 | 2.48 | 22 |
| 1965/66 | 12.1 | 10.51 | 5.74 | 55 | 1.18 | 11 | 2.07 | 20 | 1.52 | 14 |
| 1966/67 | 10.5 | 9.19 | 4.94 | 54 | 1.32 | 14 | 2.05 | 22 | . 88 | 10 |
| 1967/68 | 12.9 | 11.31 | 5.20 | 46 | 1.32 | 12 | 2.24 | 20 | 2.55 | 22 |
| 1968/69 | 13.8 | 12.07 | 6.22 | 52 | 1.39 | 11 | 2.34 | 19 | 2.12 | 18 |
| 1969/70 | 13.8 | 12.07 | 6.62 | 55 | 1.53 | 12 | 2.50 | 21 | 1.42 | 12 |
| 1970/71 | 14.2 | 12.39 | 6.52 | 52 | 1.73 | 14 | 2.56 | 21 | 1.58 | 13 |
| 1971/72 | 15.9 | 13.86 | 7.13 | 52 | 1.83 | 13 | 2.66 | 19 | 2.24 | 16 |
| 1972/73 ${ }^{6}$ | 16.0 | 13.94 | 7.43 | 53 | 1.80 | 13 | 2.74 | 20 | 1.97 | 14 |

'7-month weighted average (Nov.-May) for all sizes and varieties of oranges, not including Temples. 90 pounds net weight per box. ${ }^{2}$ Returns to retailer for salable oranges (3-percent allowance for loss incurred during marketing process).
${ }^{3}$ Rail charges from Lakeland, Florida. ${ }^{4}$ Spurlock, A.H., Costs of Picking and Hauling Florida Citrus Fruits, $1971 / 72$ Season, Agr.

Econ. Rpt. 42; and Spurlock, A.H., Costs of Packing and Selling Florida Fresh Citrus Fruits, 1971/72 Season, Agr. Econ. Rpt. 43, Fia. Agr. Expt. Sta. (Also similar reports for earlier years.) ${ }^{5}$ Derived by deducting picking, hauling, packing, and selling costs from shipping pint phice. ${ }^{6}$ Preliminary.
rail transportation costs 12 percent, picking, hauling, packing and selling costs 19 percent, and grower returns 17 percent.

## FROZEN CONCENTRATED ORANGE JUICE

## Procedures

Frozen concentrated orange juice was priced at three levels-delivered-in (delivered processing plant door), processor (f.o.b. processing plant), and retail. Quarterly retail prices used were collected by BLS. Processor price is f.o.b. Florida processing plants as reported in the American Institute of Food Distribution's "Report on Food Markets" for the first week of the month in which retail prices are collected. Delivered-in price is a computed return for the quantity of oranges required to process $12 / 6-\mathrm{oz}$. cans of frozen concentrated orange juice-based on seasonal average per box price paid by processors for oranges used for frozen concentrated orange juice and seasonal average yield of juice from the oranges processed. Average prices paid by processors and average yield of juice per box for oranges processed into frozen concentrated orange juice are reported by the Florida Canners Association. Reported pices are for priced fruit and do not include processor payment for non-priced fruit included in participation plans or cooperative marketing agreements. The retail value of frozen concentrated orange juice is simply the retail price (no allowance is made for losses during marketing). Simple averages are made of quarterly retail prices, processor prices and delivered-in price to obtain seasonal average prices (Season: Dec.-Nov.).

Wholesale and retail margin for frozen concentrated orange juice is the difference between the retail price and the processor price. This margin includes payment for transportation from the processor to the consuming city, wholesaling or brokerage, intra-city transporation, and retailing. The processor margin is the difference between the processor price and the delivered-in price. It is the amount paid for processing, warehousing, and selling the orange juice. Thegrower return (on-tree) is derived by deducting picking and hauling costs from the delivered-in price.

## Marketing Cost Up-Market Shares Unchanged

The retail price of frozen concentrated orange juice in Chicago and New York City, as estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, averaged 26 cents per 6oz. can in 1972/73, 15 percent more than in 1965/66 (table 2). The supply (carryover plus pack) of frozen concentrated orange juice in retail size cans increased 88 percent in this period (Fig. 3). Supplies increased rather sharply after 1967/68. However, retail price of frozen concentrated orange juicedid not decline after the 1967/68 season. In fact, during 4 of the last 5 seasons retail price increased, apparently reflecting a rapidly increasing demand.
The retail value of a dozen 6 -oz cans of frozen concentrated orange juice in Chicago and New York City averaged $\$ 3.12$ in 1972/73, 15 percent greater than in 1965/66 (Fig. 4, table 2). The wholesale and retail margin also increased 15 percent, to $\$ 1.30$ per dozen. The processor margin increased 39 percent and picking and hauling costs increased 46 percent.

## frozen orange juice concentrate SUPPLY AND PRICE



Figure 3

Returns to Florida growers for the oranges required to yield a dozen cans of frozen concentrated orange juice dropped from 80 cents in $1965 / 66$ to 66 cents in 1972/73. Grower returns fluctuated yearly from a high of 97 cents to a low of 35 cents.
The retail value of frozen concentrated orange juice increased an average of 8 cents per dozen 6 -oz. cans per year in 1965/66-1972/73. During the same period the wholesale and retail margin increased 4 cents per dozen can per year. The processor margin went up 1 cent, picking and hauling costs rose 2 cents, and the grower return rose 1 cent.

The market shares or percentage of the retail value going to growers and other market factors did not show any significant trend over the period. For the 8 seasons the wholesale and retail margin averaged 40
percent of the retail value, the processor margin 23 percent, picking and hauling costs 12 percent, and grower returns 25 percent.

## CONSUMERS PAY MORE FOR FRESH ORANGES THAN PROCESSED

The increased consumption of frozen concentrated orange juice intensifies the need for comparing prices, marketing margins, and grower returns for frozen concentrate with fresh oranges. Comparative data for an equivalent quantity of fresh oranges and frozen concentrate sold in Chicago and New York City during 1965/66-1972/73 are presented in table 3. These data are for 24 -ounce orange juice equivalents-that is, a $6-\mathrm{oz}$. can of frozen concentrate and an equivalent quantity of fresh oranges required to yield 24 ounces of juice to the consumer.

Chicago and New York City consumers paid more for an equivalent quantity of juice from fresh oranges than for frozen concentrate during 1965/66-1972/73, and Florida growers received higher returns for fresh oranges in most seasons. Total marketing margins were also much higher for fresh oranges than for frozen concentrate.

Retail prices in both Chicago and New York City were higher for fresh oranges in each of the 8 seasons. Fresh orange prices in Chicago ranged from onethird higher to more than double frozen concentrate prices. In New York City, they were more than double frozen concentrate prices in most seasons. Retail prices increased during the period for both fresh oranges and frozen concentrate, but they increased faster for fresh oranges.

The total marketing margin for fresh oranges in


Figure 4

Table 2.-Frozen concentrated orange juice: Seasonal average prices, margins, costs, and returns, average Chicago and New York City ${ }^{\prime}$

| Season | Retail price Per 6-oz can | Retail value per dozen can | Wholesale and retail margin ${ }^{2}$ |  | Processor margin |  | Picking and hauling costs ${ }^{3}$ |  | Derived grower returns ${ }^{4}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Per dozen cans | Percentage of retail value | Per dozen cans | Percentage of retail value | Per dozen cans | Percentage of retail value | Per dozen cans | Percentage of retail value |
|  | Cents | Dollars | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent |
| 1965/66 | 22.7 | 2.72 | 1.10 | 40 | . 56 | 21 | . 26 | 10 | . 80 | 29 |
| 1966/67 | 19.0 | 2.28 | . 89 | 39 | . 80 | 35 | . 24 | 11 | . 35 | 15 |
| 1967/68 | 21.2 | 2.54 | . 89 | 35 | . 58 | 23 | . 28 | 11 | . 79 | 31 |
| 1968/69 | 24.8 | 2.98 | 1.17 | 39 | . 49 | 16 | . 35 | 12 | . 97 | 33 |
| 1969/70 | 22.8 | 2.74 | 1.19 | 44 | . 61 | 22 | . 34 | 12 | . 60 | 22 |
| 1970/71 | 23.3 | 2.80 | 1.16 | 41 | . 69 | 25 | . 36 | 13 | . 59 | 21 |
| 1971/72. | 24.9 | 2.99 | 1.11 | 37 | . 65 | 22 | . 37 | 12 | . 86 | 29 |
| $1972 / 73^{5}$ | 26.0 | 3.12 | 1.30 | 42 | . 78 | 25 | . 38 | 12 | . 66 | 21 |

[^9]New York City was more than double that for frozen concentrate in each of the 8 seasons and in Chicago it was nearly double in 6 of the 8 seasons. The marketing margin for fresh oranges increased sharply during 1965/66-1972/73, but for frozen concentrate, the marketing margin increased only slightly.

Grower returns were higher for fresh oranges in 7 of the 8 seasons. However, grower returns for fresh oranges were only 10 to 14 percent higher than for frozen concentrate in 3 of the seasons.

In dividing up the Chicago and New York City consumer's orange juice dollar, the grower's share was larger for frozen concentrate in every season. Also, the grower's share was highly variable for both frozen concentrate and fresh oranges. It ranged from 14 to 35 percent of the consumer's dollar for frozen
concentrate and from 9 to 25 percent for fresh oranges.
The share of the consumer's dollar going for the marketing margin was larger for fresh oranges in every season, ranging from 75 to 91 percent. The wholesale and retail margin was the largest component of the total marketing margin for fresh oranges. This margin represents payments for wholsaling, intra-city transportation, and retailing. It averaged about 50 percent of the consumer's dollar in Chicago and slightly over 50 percent in New York City. The wholesale and retail margin was also the largest component for frozen concentrate, taking slightly under 40 percent of the consumer's dollar in New York City and a little over 40 percent in Chicago. The wholesale and retail margin for frozen concentrate represents payment for transportation from the processing plant, wholesaling, and retailing.

Table 3.-Retail prices, marketing margins, and grower returns for 24 ounces of single-strength juice equivalents, fresh oranges, and frozen concentrate sold in Chicago and New York City.

1965/66-1972/73'

| Season | Retail price | Marketing margins |  |  |  |  | Grower returns ${ }^{6}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Wholesale and retail margin ${ }^{2}$ | Transportation costs ${ }^{3}$ | Packing costs or processor margin ${ }^{4}$ | Picking and hauling costs ${ }^{5}$ | Total margin |  |
|  | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents | Cents |
|  |  |  |  | resh orang |  |  |  |
| Chicago: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1965/66 | 37.1 | 18.9 | 4.3 | 5.8 | 2.3 | 31.3 | 5.8 |
| 1966/67 | 27.7 | 12.9 | 4.2 | 5.3 | 2.0 | 24.4 | 3.3 |
| 1967/68 | 36.2 | 15.0 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 2.4 | 27.2 | 9.0 |
| 1968/69 | 44.2 | 20.0 | 5.3 | 6.9 | 2.9 | 35.1 | 9.1 |
| 1969/70 | 39.9 | 19.4 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 2.9 | 34.2 | 5.7 |
| 1970/71 | 43.6 | 21.4 | 5.9 | 7.1 | 3.1 | 37.5 | 6.1 |
| 1971/72. | 54.1 | 29.8 | 5.7 | 6.8 | 3.2 | 45.5 | 8.6 |
| $1972 / 73^{7}$ | 53.2 | 29.0 | 6.0 | 7.1 | 3.4 | 45.5 | 7.7 |
|  | Frozen concentrate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1965/66. | 23.7 | 10.2 | $\binom{8}{8}$ | 4.7 | 2.2 | 17.1 | 6.6 |
| 1966/67. | 20.4 | 8.8 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 6.7 | 2.0 | 17.5 | 2.9 |
| 1967/68 | 22.2 | 8.5 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 4.8 | 2.3 | 15.6 | 6.6 |
| 1968/69 | 26.2 | 11.1 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 4.1 | 2.9 | 18.1 | 8.1 |
| 1969/70 | 23.5 | 10.6 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 5.1 | 2.8 | 18.5 | 5.0 |
| 1970/71. | 24.0 | 10.3 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 5.8 | 3.0 | 19.1 | 4.9 |
| 1971/72. | 25.1 | 9.4 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 5.4 | 3.1 | 17.9 | 7.2 |
| 1972/73 ${ }^{7}$ | 27.2 | 12.0 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 6.5 | 3.4 | 21.9 | 5.3 |
|  | Fresh oranges |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N.Y. City: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1965/66. | 42.1 | 23.3 | 4.7 | 5.8 | 2.3 | 36.1 | 6.0 |
| 1966/67. | 34.4 | 19.2 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 2.0 | 31.3 | 3.1 |
| 1967/68. | 41.3 | 19.4 | 4.8 | 5.6 | 2.4 | 32.2 | 9.1 |
| 1968/69. | 52.4 | 27.6 | 6.0 | 6.9 | 2.9 | 43.3 | 8.9 |
| 1969/70. | 48.2 | 26.9 | 6.1 | 6.8 | 2.9 | 42.7 | 5.5 |
| 1970/71 | 50.6 | 27.0 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 3.1 | 44.3 | 6.3 |
| $1972 / 73^{7}$ | 52.1 | 26.7 | 6.9 | 6.8 | 3.2 | 43.6 | 8.5 |
|  | 53.9 | 28.6 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 3.4 | 46.2 | 7.6 |
|  | Frozen concentrate |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1965/66 | 21.7 | 8.2 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 4.7 | 2.2 | 15.1 | 6.6 |
| 1966/67. | 17.7 | 6.2 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 6.6 | 2.0 | 14.8 | 2.9 |
| 1967/68. | 20.3 | 6.6 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 4.8 | 2.3 | 13.7 | 6.6 |
| 1968/69 | 23.4 | 8.3 | $\binom{8}{8}$ | 4.1 | 2.9 | 15.3 | 8.1 |
| 1969/70. | 22.0 | 9.1 | $\left({ }^{8}\right.$ ) | 5.1 | 2.8 | 17.0 | 5.0 |
| 1970/71 | 22.6 | 8.9 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 5.8 | 3.0 | 17.7 | 4.7 |
| 1971/72 | 24.7 | 9.0 | $\left({ }^{8}\right.$ ) | 5.4 | 3.1 | 17.5 | 7.2 |
| 1972/73 ${ }^{7}$. | 24.8 | 9.6 | $\left({ }^{8}\right)$ | 6.5 | 3.4 | 19.5 | 5.3 |

'Marketing season: fresh, Nov.-May; frozen concentrate, Dec. Nov. ${ }^{2}$ Fresh: retail price minus city delivered price. Includes wholesaling, intracity transportation, and retailing. Processed: retail price minus processor f.o.b. price. Includes all transportation, wholesaling, and retailing. ${ }^{3}$ Rail charges from Lakeland, Fla. ${ }^{4}$ Fresh: Spurlock, A.H., Costs of Packing and Selling Florida Fresh Citrus Fruits, 1971/72 Season, Ag. Econ. Rpt. 43, Fla. Agr. Expt. Sta., Feb. 1973. Processed: processor
f.o.b. price minus raw product price paid by processor. ${ }^{5}$ Spurlock, A.H., Costs of Picking and Jauling Florida Citrus Fruits, 1971/72 Season, Ag. Econ. Rpt. 42, Fla. Agr. Expt. Sta., Feb. 1973. ${ }^{6}$ Returns to Florida growers for seasonal average quantity of oranges required to yield 24 -ounces of single-strength juice to consumer. ${ }^{7}$ Preliminary. ${ }^{8}$ Included in wholesale-retail margin.

# THE U.S. ORANGE ECONOMY: DEMAND AND SUPPLY PROSPECTS 1973/74 TO 1984/85 ${ }^{1}$ 

by<br>Jim L. Matthews, Abner W. Womack and Ben W. Huang ${ }^{2}$


#### Abstract

Conditional market forecasts for the period 1973/74 to 1984/85 are formulated on the basis of an economic-statistical model. Such a formulation provides a basis for exploring some future alternatives for the U.S. orange economy.


Key Words: Oranges, forecasts, projections, models, annual, demand, supply, Florida, California.

Continued rapid growth in the production of oranges in the United States, and Florida in particular, has led to relatively low grower prices despite a sharp increase in demand for frozen orange concentrate. Some slowdown in output is anticipated in the immediate years ahead because of the current reduction in new plantings of orange trees.(3) However, future average yields per acre are expected to rise more rapidly as the large tree plantings in the 1960's approach maturity.(3) Consequently, growers are concerned over whether demand expansion can keep pace with expected supply expansion and maintain reasonable net grower returns. In contrast, others are concerned that a shortage of orange concentrate may develop in the next few years. If so, prices for orange products could increase substantially from current levels.

To examine the above concerns more closely, we developed an economic-statistical model to project future farm and retail prices, production in the major producing regions, and domestic usage in the fresh and processed outlets. The relationships in the model draw heavily from results of previous studies and a

[^10]knowledge of significant changes in structure and behavior in the orange industry over the past two decades. (4), (5), (7), (8), (9), (10)

Some of the basic features of the model are presented in the next section. Some evidence of the model's ability to forecast is discussed as are the necessary assumptions required to make forecasts and projections. The projections for 1973/74 to 1984/85 for key price and quantity variables are given. Finally, some future alternatives are examined.

## THE MODEL

Two major blocks of equations for integrating supply and demand into a computer simulation model provide the basic analytical framework. The key relationships in the supply block are the equations for estimating bearing orange acreage in Florida and in Central and Southern California. ${ }^{3}$ The basic specifications of these equations draw on concepts of supply response for perennial crops discussed previously by French and Matthews. (4) The major factors thought to influence estimated bearing acreage are: (1) expected long-run producer profit, (2) expected short-run profit, (3) the age distribution of existing groves, (4) expected profit from alternative land uses, and (5) severe freezes such as the one in 1962. Expected profitability of orange

[^11]production, as indicated at the lower left of figure 1 , is formulated on the basis of recent past production costs and on-tree returns for oranges. ${ }^{4}$ Because of the time required for growers to acquire new nursery stock and implement new investment decisions, current year prices do not materially influence acreage. Since yields are not strongly related to current year prices, supply can be treated independent of the current year demand. Yields are influenced mostly by weather and the age distribution of trees and are treated as given in computer simulations.
The second major block of equations describes how farm and retail prices and fresh and processed usage are determined in a very aggregative fashion, given an estimated or known quantity of orange supplies. The key equations for estimating prices and usage are: (1) retail demand equation for all processed oranges in the United States, (2) retail demand equation for fresh oranges, (3) derived demand by packers for fresh oranges in Florida, (4) derived demand by packers for fresh oranges in California, (5) derived demand by processors for all processed oranges in Florida, (6) derived demand by processors for all processed oranges in California, (7) allocation of oranges to fresh and processed usage based on the principle of equal net marginal returns in each outlet, (8) a stock adjustment equation for processed oranges, and (9) a number of market clearing identity relationships.

The basic factors identified as influencing the retail consumption for all processed oranges are: (1) consumer disposable income, (2) retail price of oranges, (3) retail price of grapefruit, (4) retail price of milk, and (5) shifts in tastes and preference over time. The estimated direct price elasticity of demand of -0.73 and the income elasticity of demand of 0.97 for all processed oranges is reasonably consistent with findings reported by Myers in 1969.(7) Retail prices for processed orange products were determined jointly with current consumption and inventory decisions by processors which required the estimation of a stock adjustment relationship.

Empirical results for fresh demand suggest that retail prices for fresh oranges are primarily influenced by per capita usage, consumer disposable incomes and consumer tastes. Some slight influence was found from consumption of apples and bananas and the relationship was complementary. An estimated direct price flexibility at retail of 0.83 for fresh usage appears reasonable.

Results of estimating demand at the farm level for fresh and processed oranges in Florida and California suggest that farm level prices are strongly related to retail prices, wage rates and volume of

[^12]sales. The negative coefficient on wages is consistent with the notion that processors and packers will reduce their demand for raw oranges as labor and other production costs rise. For processed oranges, prices at the farm level were also strongly influenced by processor stocks carried into the new marketing year.
The allocation of oranges to fresh and processed outlets in California and Florida is determined by equating marginal net returns. The derived result is referred to as the market allocation equations in the model. This technique was first described by Waugh, Burtis and Wolf in 1934 to show how producers can maximize net returns.(10) Success in achieving such an allocation is dependent on grower cooperation and a good knowledge of demand relationships. Results of applying such derived equations in California over the period $1954 / 55$ to $1968 / 69$ were highly satisfactory. However, application of this allocation rule in Florida led to an over-estimation in the model for fresh sales and consequently too little for the processed outlet. Direct estimation of a Florida allocation equation proved unsuccessful. However, by observing the difference between the model and actual results over the past 15 years, the difference was found to be closely related to total output. This information was used to adjust the allocation equation in Florida to achieve reasonably good results in historical simulation.

Once farm prices are determined in the demand block of equations, they are used as input to the supply block in the derivation of grower profit expectations. These, in turn, influence investment decisions related to removals or new plantings of orange groves. (See figure 1).

## VALIDATION OF THE MODEL

A simple but highly useful test of a dynamic economic forecasting model is to see how well it estimates for years beyond the sample period. Our equations were based on sample data from 1954/55 to 1968/69. This leaves the period from 1968/69 to 1972/73 to compare model estimates of prices, usage and production with reported values for these variables.

Since there is a sequential or recursive relationship between estimates of orange supply and demand variables, estimates of regional supplies are developed for a starting set of values for lagged prices of oranges. Total regional supplies are then used as input to the demand block of equations to generate retail and farm prices and estimates of usage in processed and fresh marketing channels in the United States. Farm prices generated in the demand block are then used in the next round to revise expected grower returns and start a new round of estimates. Thus, once the model is given some initial starting set of values for prices, future price and
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Figure 1
production adjustments are determined by the model. Since values for external factors affecting demand and supply are known-such as consumer income, population, price of competing products, juice yields, grower yields per acre and grower costs-forecasts over the 1968/69 to 1972/73 period are expected to be better than forecasts generated for $1973 / 74$ and beyond. However, the model must provide reasonable estimates over the 1968/69 to 1972/73 period if some credibility is to be placed in it.

Estimates generated by the model are shown in table 1 with comparisons to reported values for prices, usage and production. Equations which were felt to be weak based on the 1968/69 to 1972/73 estimates were: (1) the bearing acreage equation for Southern California, (2) the equation for stock adjustment of processed oranges, and (3) export demand relationships for fresh and processed oranges.
The bearing acreage equation for Southern California underestimated acreage because of the strong downtrend in this area during the sample period. Holding Southern California acreage at a constant level of 75,000 acres provided better estimates. The stock adjustment equation for processed oranges failed to capture a significant rise in reported stocks in 1971/72 and 1972/73. As a consequence, an adjustment in the intercept was made beginning in 1971/72 which increased stocks by 3 pounds per capita. Export equations for fresh and processed oranges were deleted. Therefore, exports are treated as given in the market clearing identity equations.

On the whole, the forecasting performance of the model, given the above corrections, was quite satisfactory. Consequently, it should provide a reasonable basis for estimating future changes in the orange economy. Further investigations of export demand and stock adjustment behavior could be beneficial to the overall performance of the existing model system.

## PROJECTION ASSUMPTIONS

A basic assumption in developing projections based on an economic-statistical model is that economic behavior by producers, processors, consumers and other participants has been reasonably well approximated by the model. This was partially demonstrated in the previous section. Secondly, it is generally assumed that the behavior embodied in the model will continue into the future. This assumption, of course, weakens as the projection period is lengthened. In addition, assumptions or estimates about values of factors external to the orange economy but included in the relationships must be made. This includes such factors as consumer disposable incomes, population, inflation rates, price and usage of competing items, wage rates and cost of other inputs such as fertilizer. Finally, a
number of factors that characterize the production and marketing processes of the orange industry must take on assumed or given values. These include such things as juice yields, orange yields per acre in California and Florida, net exports of processed oranges, net exports of fresh oranges and Section 32 purchased by the Department of Agriculture for distribution to schools.
Assumed or externally estimated values for all of the fixed or exogenous values are summarized in table 2. Some of the values for these variables are based on recent past trends. For variables such as consumer disposable income and population, projections by other analysts were utilized. Yields for Florida are projected to rise more rapidly than in the 1950's and 1960's because of a higher proportion of older bearing trees expected in the 1970's. Weather conditions which have significant effects on yields are assumed to be normal; consequently, future yields projected in this anal ysis do not reflect the variation experienced in the 1950's and 1960's.

Forecasting or projecting possible future changes in any industry is hazardous at best. For oranges, periodic freezes compound the difficulty of deriving estimates with which one feels comfortable. Years with abnormally bad weather can alter substantially the timing of changes in prices and output. Unexpected changes in export markets or in domestic demand can also significantly influence the future course of events. Future population pressures, real estate developments and land use policies are all longer term unknowns in projecting orange acreage. Nevertheless decision makers at all levels of the marketing system must make current decisions based on some sets of future expected outcomes.

## MODEL FORECASTS AND PROJECTIONS, 1973/74 to 1984/85

Projections based on a statistical-economic model simply offer one additional piece of evidence about future prospects based on an explicit set of underlying assumptions. These assumptions were outlined in the previous section and should be kept in mind in interpreting model projections.

The significant findings or indications based on the current model are:

1. Bearing acreage is expected to continue to decline slightly in Florida through 1975/76 and then recover to the high 1970/71 levels by 1980/81. Rapid growth in bearing acreage would likely occur in the early 1980's with acreage approaching the 800,000 acre level in Florida.
2. For the period $1974 / 75$ to $1979 / 80$, significant increases in prices are expected as strong demand expansion continues for orange concentrate while per capita supplies
Table 1.--Model estimates vs reported values for acreage, production, usage and prices of

| Endogenous variables | Unit | Letter code | Program code | 1968/69 |  | 1969/70 |  | 1970/71 |  | 1971/72 |  | 1972/73 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | : Reported: | Model | : Reported: | Model | :Reported: | Model | :Reported | Mode 1 | :Reported ${ }^{1}$ | Mode 1 |
| : | : |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida | 1,000 acres | AFO | : Y(1) | 621.5 | 622.7 | 657.9 | 678.0 | 690.3 | 690.1 | 646.2 | 648.4 | 641.9 | 639.7 |
| Central California | 1,000 acres | ACCO | : Y(8) | 102.5 | 103.6 | 112.3 | 108.0 | 114.7 | 115.3 | 121.2 | 119.5 |  | 117.4 |
| : | : |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Production (per capita) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fresh use |  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida : | Pounds | QFFO' | : Y(16) | 6.96 | 5.75 | 7.18 | 7.92 | 7.13 | 7.25 | 5.67 | 5.50 | 6.34 | 7.15 |
| California : | Pounds | QCFO' | : Y(17) | 9.93 | 9.97 | 9.86 | 9.07 | 9.45 | 8.85 | 9.96 | 10.03 | 8.87 | 8.67 |
| Other | Pounds | Q0FO' | : Y(36) | 2.22 | 1.45 | 1.97 | 1.73 | 1.86 | 1.73 | 1.87 | 1.62 | 2.35 | 1.85 |
| Processed use $\quad$ : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida : | Pounds | QFPOU ' | : Y(13) | : 53.70 | 55.05 | 56.59 | 57.73 | 57.76 | 57.54 | 56.35 | 56.66 | 69.26 | 68.11 |
| California : | Pounds : | QCPO' | : Y(19) | : 6.76 | 7.01 | 4.65 | 5.18 | 4.32 | 4.81 | 5.80 | 5.83 | 6.13 | 7.34 |
| Other | Pounds | QOPO' | : Y(35) | 1.79 | 1.54 | 1.63 | 1.66 | 2.18 | 1.68 | 2.43 | 1.68 | 2.67 | 2.09 |
| : | : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| : | ! |  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consumption (per capita):Frash |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fresh Processed | Pounds Pounds | CFO' CPO' | : Y(22) | : 16.56 $: 49.09$ | 14.62 48.62 | 16.54 53.50 | 16.25 56.14 | 16.34 55.86 | 15.73 57.59 | 14.82 57.69 | 14.48 58.86 | 16.81 63.61 | $\begin{aligned} & 14.87 \\ & 64.34 \end{aligned}$ |
| Prices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farm $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fresh use }\end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida : | Dol./box | PFFO | : Y(9) | : 2.19 | 2.42 | 1.60 | 1.84 | 2.01 | 1.96 | 2.55 | 2.33 | 2.16 | 2.00 |
| California | Dol./box | PCFO | : Y(12) | 2.63 | 2.93 | 2.97 | 2.94 | 3.33 | 3.30 | 2.82 | 3.08 | 3.76 | 3.37 |
| Processed use : $\quad$ : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida | Dol./box | PFPO PCPO |  | 1.64 .01 | 1.79 .02 | 1.09 .20 | .75 -.07 |  | 1.13 .04 | 1.99 .10 | 1.87 -.26 | 1.38 -.23 | 1.20 -.66 |
| California All uses | Dol./box | PCPO | $: Y(30)$ | . 01 | . 02 | . 20 | -. 07 | . 09 | . 04 | . 10 | -. 26 |  |  |
| FloridaCalifornia | Dol./box | PFO | : Y(2) | 1.70 | 1.85 | 1.15 | . 88 | 1.48 | 1.23 | 2.04 | 1.91 | 1.45 | 1.27 |
|  | Dol./box : | PCO | : Y(6) | 1.57 | 1.73 | 2.09 | 1.84 | 2.31 | 2.15 | 1.82 | 1.86 | 2.13 | 1.52 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fresh Frozen concentrate : | Cent/dozen Cent/6 oz. can | PRFO | : Y(10) | 83.8 24.1 | 85.7 24.2 | 86.4 22.5 | 85.1 20.7 | 94.3 23.4 | 90.3 22.4 | 94.2 25.0 | 98.5 23.4 | 105.3 25.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 102.7 \\ 24.3 \end{array}$ |
| Ending stocks | Pounds | ESPO' | : Y(26) | 10.13 | 11.84 | 11.08 | 11.90 | 9.92 | 8.94 | 14.19 | 11.73 | 21.79 | 18.13 |
|  | : |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^13]Table 2.--Summary of data for fixed or exogenous variables, 1972/73 to 1984/85

| Exogenous variables | Unit $\quad \vdots$ | Letter code | Program code | 1968/69 | 1969/70 | 1970/71 | 1971/72 | 1972/73 | 1973/74 | 1974/75 | 1975/76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trend | $\vdots \quad \vdots$ | T' | : $x$ (1) | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Weather dummy | : | 01 | : $\times$ (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | . 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Orange yield -Southern California |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| California | :Box/acre | YSCO | : $\mathrm{x}(6)$ | 244 | 170 | 242 | 187 | 295 | 250 | 252 | 254 |
| Federal Land Bank interest rate | : Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wage rates in nondurable | :Percent | IFLB | : $x(7)$ | 7.82 | 8.68 | 7.86 | 7.42 | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.50 |
| goods industry | :001./hr. | WND | : $\times(9)$ | 2.91 | 3.08 | 3.26 | 3.47 | 3.68 | 3.83 | 3.98 | 4.14 |
| Implied juice yield |  | K | : X (10) | . 838 | . 924 | . 897 | . 965 | . 984 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Population, civilian | Billions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time trend | :Billions | POP | : $\begin{aligned} & x(11) \\ & : \times(12)\end{aligned}$ | .1991 69 | .2017 70 | .2042 71 | .2065 72 | .2081 73 | .2099 74 | .2117 75 | .2138 76 |
| Fertilizer cost | :1967=100 | FERT | : X (15) | 93 | 97 | 101 | 104 | 120 | 140 | 140 | 140 |
| Disposable personal income in Canada | : Dol. per cap. | IC' | : $\times$ (16) | 2.867 | 3,011 | 3,268 | 3,601 | 3,925 | 4,136 | 4,426 | 4,700 |
| Florida average land value and buildings, per acre | :Index | FRE' | : $x(17)$ | 316 | 352 | 373 | 395 | 418 | 444 | 470 | 499 |
| Orange yield - Florida | !80x/acre | YFO | : $\times$ ( 18 ) | 216 | 217 | 213 | 220 | 272 | 245 | 250 | 255 |
| Retail price of grapefruit | :Cent each : | PRGF | : $\times$ (19) | 15.2 | 16.9 | 1 B .3 | 19.4 | 20.0 | 20.5 | 21.0 | 21.5 |
| Government donations | :Lb. per cap. | DO' | : X ${ }^{\text {(21) }}$ | . 19 | . 83 | 1.29 | . 02 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| Oisposable personal income - U.S. | :001. per cap.: | I' | : $\times$ (22) | 3,130 | 3,376 | 3,603 | 3,816 | 4,184 | 4,479 | 4,744 | 5,042 |
| Farm real estate value in California | : 1967=100 | FRVC | : X $\times$ (25) | 109 | 110 | 109 | 112 | 115 | 121 | 127 | $\begin{array}{r}5,042 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| Growers cost - Central |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| California | :Dol./box : | GCCC | : X(27) | 1.48 | 1.92 | 1.96 | 2.01 | 2.05 | 2.08 | 2.13 | 2.14 |
| Low January temperature - | : 0 egrees F | HJ | $\vdots \times(28)$ | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 |
| Orange yield - Central | .Oegrees f |  | ${ }^{\text {: }} \times$ (28) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| California | :Box/acre | YCCO | : X ${ }^{\text {(29) }}$ | 258 | 237 | 165 | 248 | 190 | 195 | 198 | 204 |
| Net exports of processed oranges | :Pounds | EPO' | $\vdots \times(30)$ | . 93 | 3.16 | 2.17 | . 53 | 2.70 | 2.25 | 2.36 | 2.48 |
| Net exports of fresh oranges | :Pounds | EF0' | $\vdots \times(31)$ | 2.55 | 2.47 | 2.10 | 2.68 | 2.80 | 2.45 | 2.45 | 2.45 |
| Dummy | . P unds | 05 | : X(32) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dummy | : | 06 | : X ${ }^{(33)}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dummy |  | 07 | : $\times(34)$ | 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Consumption of apples | : Pounds | CFA' | : X(35) | 14.9 | 18.3 | 16.1 | 17.2 | 16.7 | 17.0 | 17.3 | 17.6 |
| Consumption of bananas | : Pounds | CPB' | : X ${ }^{(36)}$ | 17.9 | 17.6 | 18.2 | 18.1 | 18.0 | 18.1 | 18.2 | 18.3 |
| Retail price of milk | :Cents/qt. | PRMK | : X ${ }^{\text {(37) }}$ | 27.6 | 28.7 | 29.4 | 29.9 | 32.2 | 32.8 | 33.5 | 34.2 |
| Dummy | : | 08 | : $\mathrm{X}(3 \mathrm{3B})$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Dunmy | : | : ${ }^{9}$ | : $\times$ (39) | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 |

Table 2.--Sumnary of data for fixed or exogenous variables, 1972/73 to 1984/85

| Exogenous variables | Unit | Letter code | $\begin{gathered} \text { Program } \\ \text { code } \end{gathered}$ | 1976/77 | 1977/78 | 1978/79 | 1979/80 | 1980/81 | 1981/82 | 1982/83 | $\vdots$ (983/84 | 1984/85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trend | : | T' | $x(1)$ | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Weather durmy | : | 01 | X(2) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Orange yield - Southern California | :Box/acre | YSCO | X(6) | 256 | 258 | 260 | 262 | 264 | 266 | 268 | 270 | 272 |
| Federal Land Bank |  |  | $x(6)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| interest rate | : Percent | IFLB | $x(7)$ | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.50 | 7.50 |
| Wage rates in nondurable |  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| goods industry | :001./hr. | WNO | $x(9)$ | 4.31 | 4.48 | 4.66 | 4.84 | 5.04 | 5.24 | 5.45 | 5.67 | 5.89 |
| Implied juice yield |  | K | $x(10)$ | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Population, civilian July 1 | :Billions | POP | X(11) | . 2157 | . 2178 | . 2199 | . 2221 | . 2244 | . 2267 | . 2290 | . 2314 | . 2337 |
| Time trend |  | T | X(12) | . 77 | . 78 | 79 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 | 84 | 85 |
| Fertilizer cost | :1967=100 | FERT | X(15) | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 | 140 |
| Disposable personal income in Canada | :Ool. per cap. | IC' | X(16) | 4,982 | 5,280 | 5,597 | 5,933 | 6,277 | 6,641 | 7,026 | 7,434 | 7,873 |
| Florida average land value and buildings, per acre | : Index | FRE' | X(17) | 529 | 560 | 594 | 630 | 667 | 707 | 750 | 795 | 842 |
| Orange yield - Florida : | :Box/acre | YFO | X(18) | 260 | 265 | 270 | 275 | 279 | 282 | 284 | 285 | 285 |
| Retail price of grapefruit | Cent each | PRGF | X(19) | 22.0 | 22.5 | 23.0 | 23.5 | 24.0 | 24.5 | 25.0 | 25.5 | 26.0 |
| Government donations : | :Lb. per cap. | D0' | x(21) | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| Disposable personal income - U.S. | :Ool. per cap. | $1^{\prime}$ | X(22) | 5,359 | 5,692 | 6,043 | 6,409 | 6,781 | 7,177 | 7,597 | 8,040 | 8,512 |
| Farm real estate value in California | $\text { : } 1967=100$ | FRVC | X(25) | 140 | 147 | 154 | 162 | 170 | 178 | 187 | 196 | 206 |
| Growers cost - Central | - Dol /box | GCCC | X(27) | 2.18 | 2.22 | 2.23 | 2.26 | 2.29 | 2.32 | 2.35 | 2.38 | 2.41 |
| Low January temperature - |  |  | $: \times(28)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Porterville, California | : Degrees F | WJ | X(28) | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 28 |
| Orange yield - Central California | :80x/acre | YCCO | X(29) |  | 212 | 216 | 220 | 224 | 228 | 232 | 236 |  |
| Net exports of processed | :80x/acre |  | $x(29)$ | 208 |  |  | 220 | 224 | 228 |  |  |  |
| oranges | :Pounds | EPO' | X(30) | 2.60 | 2.73 | 2.87 | 3.01 | 3.16 | 3.32 | 3.49 | 3.66 | 3.84 |
| Net exports of fresh oranges | :Pounds | EFO' | X(31) | 2.45 | 2.45 | 2.45 | 2.45 | 2.45 | 2.45 | 2.45 | 2.45 | 2.45 |
| Oummy |  | 05 | : $\times$ (32) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oummy | . | 06 | : X 33 ) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ourmy |  | 07 | X(34) | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Consumption of apples | :Pounds | CFA' | X(35) | 17.9 | 18.2 | 18.5 | 18.8 | 19.1 | 19.4 | 19.7 | 20.0 | 20.3 |
| Consumption of bananas | : Pounds | CBN' | X(36) | 18.4 | 18.5 | 18.6 | 18.7 | 18.8 | 18.9 | 19.0 | 19.1 | 19.2 |
| Retail price of milk | :Cents/qt. | PRMK | X(37) | 34.9 | 35.6 | 36.3 | 37.0 | 37.7 | 38.5 | 39.3 | 40.0 | 40.8 |
| Oummy |  | 08 | $: \times(38)$ | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Oummy | : | $\mathrm{O}_{9}$ | X(39) | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 |
|  | : |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

are expected to remain steady. More rapid growth in supplies in the 1980's would be expected to dampen price increases.
3. Model estimates for grower prices in 1973/74 are lower than in 1972/73. The forecast is in the face of sharp increases in consumer incomes and the general price structure. However, prices in the first three months of 1973/74 were moderately higher. This price performance might be maintained for the rest of $1973 / 74$ should processors continue to carry significantly larger stocks than estimated by the model. This is a definite possibility in view of the projected increases in orange prices in 1974/75.
Table 3 presents a summary of forecasted and projected changes for prices, usage and supplies. Perhaps the item which one might question most is the rise in grower prices of processed oranges in Florida relative to prices of fresh oranges in California in 1984/85. This price strength in processed oranges is attributed largely to the high income elasticity of demand and the assumed change in the level of per capita disposable incomes. However, some tempering of the income effects at higher income levels in the 1980's may be more reasonable than continuing the linear extrapolation of income effects as was done in this analysis. Also, higher relative prices for orange concentrate could encourage additional competition from synthetics and other orange related drinks not explicitly considered in the present model framework.

## SOME FUTURE ALTERNATIVES

Assumptions about such factors as per capita consumer disposable incomes, wage rates, price of competing products, orange yields per acre and juice yields are required in developing the base set or "best guess" set of projections in the previous section These assumptions are shown in table 2. However, considerable additional insight may be gained by examining some alternative feasible values for
selected factors. The results of some computer simulations for selected alternatives are summarized in table 4.

This information can be utilized by the reader in making adjustments to the base forecast in the previous section. For example, Florida orange yields could average higher than the yields assumed in table 2. The current year effect if realized yields were 10 boxes per acre more would be a drop of about 1.5 cents per 6 -ounce can of frozen concentrate at retail. If the yield were to remain 10 boxes higher in later years than assumed, the effect of such a change would result in a decline of about 2 cents per 6 -ounce can after 2 years. In the long run, retail prices would average 1.35 cents lower than otherwise projected. For the estimated drop of 29 cents per box in the Florida on-tree prices, bearing acreage would then be expected to average 3,700 acres less in the following year. In the long run the effect of an increase of 10 boxes in yield would be a decline of 17,350 bearing acres in Florida and a slight decline of 150 acres in California. Effects of a 10 -box change in Florida orange yields on other prices and domestic usage can be found by reference to table 4.

Impacts of specified changes for exports of processed oranges (EPO'), per capita disposable income ( ${ }^{\prime}$ '), retail price of fluid milk (PRMK), juice yields (K), grower production costs in Florida (GCF), ending stocks of processed orange products (ESPO') and per capita purchases by the Department of Agriculture of orange products for distribution to schools (DO') can all be obtained from table 4. Note that changes in such variables as per capita exports of processed oranges (EPO') are shown in brackets. For EPO', the assumed change is a 2 -pound increase which is maintained over the entire projection period. Since the model is nearly linear, other incremental changes in EPO' can be computed by the reader by simply prorating other assumed changes with respect to the assumed 2-pound change. The effect on prices and output of oranges of an assumed increase of 4 pounds can be found by doubling the values shown in table 4 for the EPO' impacts.
Table 3.--Economic forecasts and projections for the U.S. orange economy,

| Endogenous variables | : Unit | Letter code |  | ! $1973 / 74$ | $\vdots$ <br> $\vdots$ <br> $\vdots$ | ! $\vdots$ $\vdots$ $\vdots$ | ! $1976 / 77$ | $\vdots$ $\vdots$ $\vdots$ | $\vdots$ <br> $\vdots$ <br> $\vdots$ | : 1979/80 | ! $\vdots$ $\vdots$ $\vdots$ | $\vdots$ $\vdots$ $\vdots$ $\vdots$ | ! | 1983/84 | 1984/85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | : $\quad$ : |  | ; |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bearing acreage | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida | :1,000 acres | Afo | : Y(1) : | : 642.1 | 631.1 | 631.9 | 640.6 | 650.0 | 657.6 | 670.4 | 685.3 | 707.0 | 730.0 | 752.8 | 776.2 |
| Central and Southern | 1 ,000 acres |  | ! ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ Y(1) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| California | :1,000 acres | ACO | Y(5) : | : 190.8 | 179.7 | 165.9 | 152.3 | 164.2 | 172.3 | 174.7 | 179.5 | 185.0 | 191.0 | 197.1 | 201.9 |
| Production (per capita) Fresh use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida | : Pounds | QFFO' : | $: Y(16):$ | : 7.34 | 5.72 9.29 | 5.12 8.80 | 5.09 8.38 | 5.22 8.83 | 5.28 9.19 | 5.29 9.34 | 5.26 9.58 | $\begin{aligned} & 5.28 \\ & 9.84 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.29 \\ 10.13 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5.19 \\ 10.41 \end{array}$ |  |
| California Other | : Pounds | OCFO' OOFO' | : Y Y 177$):$ Y $\mathrm{Y}(36):$ | : 9.75 | 9.29 1.85 | 8.80 1.85 | 8.38 1.92 | 8.83 2.00 | 9.19 2.07 | 9.34 2.14 | 9.58 2.20 | $\begin{aligned} & 9.84 \\ & 2.27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.13 \\ 2.34 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.41 \\ 2.39 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.61 \\ 2.44 \end{gathered}$ |
| Processed use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida | :Pounds | QFPOU': | : Y(13) : | : 60.11 | 61.35 | 62.71 | 64.40 | 65.95 | 67.39 | 69.42 | 71.42 | 73.87 | 76.20 | 78.25 | 80.22 |
| California | :Pounds | のCP0' | : Y(19): | : 5.02 | 4.75 | 4.38 | 3.88 | 4.34 | 4.63 | 4.70 | 4.86 | 5.06 | 5.27 | 5.50 | 5.71 |
| Other | : Pounds | Q0PO' : | : Y(35): | : 1.86 | 1.93 | 2.00 | 2.08 | 2.17 | 2.24 | 2.34 | 2.43 | 2.54 | 2.65 | 2.75 | 2.84 |
|  | : |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consumption (per capita) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fresh | : Pounds | CFO' | $Y(22):$ | : 16.57 | 14.41 | 13.32 | 12.94 | 13.60 | 14.09 | 14.31 | 14.59 | 14.94 | 15.30 | 15.54 | 15.57 |
| Processed | : Pounds | CPO' | Y(24): | : 68.24 | 65.38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 81.23 | 83.44 |
|  | : |  | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ending stocks (per capita) | : Pounds | ESPO' | : Y(26) | : 12.14 | 10.63 | 11.17 | 12.10 | 12.80 | 12.83 | 12.82 | 12.81 | 12.90 | 12.85 | 12.66 | 12.34 |
|  | : | - | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PricesFarmFresh use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fresh useFlorida |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| California | :001./box | PCFO | Y(12): | : 2.93 | 3.30 | 3.55 | 3.70 | 3.54 | 3.42 | 3.38 | 3.30 | 3.22 | 3.14 | 3.07 | 3.05 |
| Florida | :Dol./box | PFPO | Y(28) $\vdots$ | $\vdots .97$ | 2.14 | 2.66 | 2.79 | 2.74 | 2.75 | 2.83 | 2.91 | 2.97 | 3.04 | 3.17 | 3.39 |
|  | :Dol./box | PCPO | Y(30): | : -. 43 | . 06 | . 40 | . 59 | . 43 | . 30 | . 26 | . 18 | . 10 | . 01 | -. 06 | -. 06 |
| All uses | -Dol /box |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Florida | :Dol. /box | PFO | $Y(2)$ $Y(6)$ | : 1.06 | 2.16 2.20 | 2.65 2.50 | 2.78 2.72 | 2.73 | 2.73 2.37 | 2.81 2.33 | 2.88 2.25 | 2.94 2.16 | 3:00 | 3.13 1.99 | 3.34 1.96 |
| California :Dol./box |  | PCO | Y(6) : | 1.79 | 2.20 | 2.50 | 2.72 | 2.51 | 2.37 |  | 2.25 |  |  |  |  |
| Fresh Frozen concentrate | :Cent/doz. | PRFO | $Y(10) \vdots$ | : 101.6 | 113.8 | 122.7 | 129.4 | 132.7 | 136.8 | 142.1 | 147.4 | 152.8 | 158.5 | 165.0 | 172.7 |
|  | :Cent/6 oz can: | PRPO | $\vdots \mathrm{Y}(25)$ | : 22.78 | 28.29 | 32.25 | 34.42 | 35.17 | 35.96 | 37.14 | 38.33 | 39.56 | 40.85 | 42.42 | 44.59 |
|  | : | - | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | : | : | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4.--Oynamic impacts of assumed changes in exogenous demand and supply

Table 4.--Dynamic impacts of assumed changes in exogenous demand and supply - Continued -

Table 4. --Dynamic impacts of assumed changes in exogenous demand and supply
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1} 45^{\circ}$ Brix. ${ }^{2}$ Inciudes small quantities of tangelos and Murcotts.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The crop year begins with bloom of the first year andends with completion of harvest the following year. ${ }^{2}$ Net content of box varies. Approximate averages are as follows: Oranges-California and Arizona, 75 Ibs.; other States, 90 Ibs.; Grapefruit-California, Dersert Valleys, and Arizona, 64 lbs.; other California areas, 67 lbs.; Florida, 85 lbs . and Texas, 80 lbs ;

[^2]:    'Avacado $1972 / 73$ crop, bananas, bushberries, dates, figs, nectarınes, olives, papayas, persımmons, and pomegranates. ${ }^{2}$ Includes Georgia. ${ }^{3} 1971 / 72$ crop. ${ }^{4}$ Tangerines, limes, tangelos, and temples. ${ }^{5}$ Almonds, filberts,
    Macadamia nuts and walnuts, ${ }^{6}$ Less than 0.05 percent.

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ Preliminary. ${ }^{2}$ Fresh frult prices are equivalent returns at packinghouse door for Washington and Oregon, first dellvery point for California, and at point of first sale in all other States. Processing fruit prices for all States are equivalent returns at processing plant door. ${ }^{3} 1971$ indicates $1971 / 72$ crop. ${ }^{4}$ Price per

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Net weight per box: Oranges, 90 pounds; tangerines, 95 Source: October 1973 citrus production and utilization report, pounds; and grapefruit, 85 pounds. ${ }^{2}$ Includes tangelos, Temples, SRS, USDA. and honey tangerines.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Commercial crops refer to the total production of apples in orchards of 100 or more bearing trees. Data include small quantities of mature fruit not harvested and excess cullage of
    harvested fruit not included in data in table 8. ${ }^{2}$ Data not available for this variety individually but are included in "Other" category.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Season beginning September 1 for apples and applesauce, July 1 for RSP cherries, and June 1 for all other items. ${ }^{2}$ California only. ${ }^{3}$ 1970/71 canners' carryin excludes cyclamate packs.

[^7]:    Source: Statistical Reporting Service

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ For quantity of product equivalent to retail unit sold to consumers: Because of waste and spoilage during marketing, equivalent quantity exceeds retail unit. ${ }^{2}$ Production areas:

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Marketing Season: December-November. ${ }^{2}$ Includes transportation from processing plant to Chicago and New York City. ${ }^{3}$ Spurlock, A.H., Costs of Picking and Hauling Florida

    Expt. Sta., Feb. 1973. ${ }^{4}$ Returns to Florida growers for seasonal ${ }_{5}$ average quantity of oranges required to pack $12 / 6-\mathrm{oz}$. cans. ${ }^{5}$ Preliminary.

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ This is the second of two articles on the U.S. orange economy. The first developed a historical perspective of developments with respect to structural and behavioral changes. (6)
    ${ }^{2}$ Jim L. Matthews and Ben W. Huang are Agricultural Economists with the Economic Research Service. Abner W. Womack is a Mathematical Statistician with the Economic Research Service. The authors are especially indebted to Charlotte K. Tucker and Pearl L. Williams for their statistical support.

[^11]:    ${ }^{3}$ Statistical relationships used in the analysis and historical data series are available on request.

[^12]:    ${ }^{4}$ Grower prices and equivalent on-tree returns are used with the same meaning in this article.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ Preliminary.

[^14]:    The multiplier values shown in this table depend on the values for juice yields (K), population (POP), and orange yields in Florida and California given
    in table 2 for the period $1968 / 69$ to $1984 / 85$. See table 2 for exogenous variable identification.

