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# "The California Nursery Industry, 2002-2003: Value, Growth and Economic Impacts" by Hoy ${ }^{\text {Carman }}{ }^{1}$ 

## INTRODUCTION

The California nursery and floral industry is the largest in the United States, accounting for 22.2 percent of total 2002 U.S. receipts for nursery and floral production (USDA, 2003). The total value of California nursery and floral products grew from $\$ 1.90$ billion in 1992-1993 to $\$ 3.31$ billion in 2002-2003 (an increase of 74 percent). During the same time period, total California agricultural output grew from $\$ 21.77$ billion to $\$ 30.64$ billion (an increase of 40.7 percent). As a result, the nursery and floral share of California agricultural production grew from 8.7 to 10.8 percent while many other commodities remained stable or decreased. Within the state, total 2002 production of nursery products placed the nursery industry in third place ( $\$ 2.57$ billion) and the floral industry in 11th place (almost $\$ 730$ million) among all California agricultural industries. When floral and nursery production are combined (\$3.31 billion), the industry ranks second among all California agricultural products, following the dairy industry, which was in first place with production value of $\$ 3.79$ billion in 2002 and it ranks ahead of the third place value of all grapes at $\$ 3.16$ billion. Commodities among the top ten in California that rank below floral and nursery products in terms of 2002-2003 value of production include (4) all cattle and calves, (5) lettuce, (6) almonds, (7) oranges, (8) alfalfa hay, (9) strawberries, and (10) cotton lint. ${ }^{2}$

Nursery and floral production is spread throughout California but is concentrated in the Southern and Central coastal counties. There were 11 counties with over $\$ 100$ million in nursery, flower and foliage production for 2002-2003. Coastal counties included in the top 11 include San Diego, Ventura, Orange, Monterey, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and San Mateo. There were only two Central Valley counties, San Joaquin and Kern, with production of more than $\$ 100$ million of nursery and floral products. Note that nine of the 11 counties with over $\$ 100$ million of nursery and floral production increased 2002-2003 value of production over the previous year. Two counties, Ventura and Santa Clara, had decreases. In contrast to most of California agricultural production, nursery and floral production is located in California's most populated counties. Almost 65 percent of California's 2003 population lived in the 11 counties with over $\$ 100$ million of nursery and floral production (Appendix Table 3).

California is the largest single market for lawn and garden products in the United States, accounting for 9.4 to 10.4 percent of total annual U.S. sales since 1997. The majority of California's nursery and floral products is sold to California consumers. Based on secondary sources, total 2002 California retail lawn and garden sales were estimated at $\$ 8.958$ billion and florist sales were almost $\$ 1.00$ billion for total estimated retail lawn, garden and floral product sales of over $\$ 9.95$ billion. The gross margin (retail sales minus cost of goods sold) on these sales was estimated at over $\$ 3.7$ billion.

The economic impacts of the nursery industry and lawn and garden retailing in California are dramatic and far-reaching. Overall, nursery and floral production and lawn and garden retailing contributed over $\$ 10.49$ billion to 2002 California output and were responsible for 171,571 jobs. Total value added attributed to California nursery and floral production and lawn and garden retailing was $\$ 8.1$ billion, while the labor income impact was almost $\$ 5.0$ billion.

[^0]This report assembles the latest available statistics on the value, growth and economic impacts of the nursery industry and lawn and garden retailing in California. ${ }^{3}$ Changes in the value of production for the nursery industry relative to California's total agricultural output are shown over time. Data on production by county and crops produced are also presented. Also included are data on retail sales and estimated margins. A regional economic model is used to trace the direct, indirect and induced multiplier effects of California nursery and floral production and lawn and garden retailing through the California economy.

Figure 1. California Nursery and Floral Product Sales, Farm Value, and as a Percent of Total California Agriculture


## Growth of the California Nursery Industry

As noted, production of the California nursery and floriculture industry has grown significantly over time, both in relation to other states and to the rest of California agriculture. Total U.S. cash receipts from floriculture and nursery crops grew from $\$ 9.853$ billion in 1994 to $\$ 13.796$ billion in 2002 (Table 1, USDA, 2003). ${ }^{4}$ At the same time, California's share of U.S. grower cash receipts from floriculture and nursery crops grew from 20.2 percent in 1994 to 22.2 percent in 2002 (Table 3, USDA, 2003). California's 2002 share was almost double that of the next largest state, Florida, with 11.8 percent of U.S. grower sales. Other states in the top five included Texas ( 9.7 percent), North Carolina ( 6.1 percent) and Oregon (5.1 percent).

[^1]The value of floral products has remained rather stable over the last decade, while nursery products have increased. The total value of California nursery and floral products grew from $\$ 1.75$ billion in 1989 to $\$ 3.31$ billion in 2002 (an overall increase of 89 percent). The growth over time is shown in Figure 1. Total output dipped slightly from 1991 to 1992 and then grew steadily from $\$ 1.938$ billion in 1992. Total output increased 70.8 percent from 1992 through 2002 while real output (total revenue adjusted for price changes measured by the consumer price index) increased 35.8 percent. Also shown in Figure 1 is the nursery and floriculture industry's annual share of total California agricultural production. Note that nursery and floriculture's share of total agricultural output increased from 1989 through 1991, dropped to 8.3 percent in 1993, and then steadily increased to 10.8 percent of total California agricultural output in 2002. Total California agricultural output grew steadily from $\$ 21.77$ billion in 1992 to $\$ 30.636$ billion in 2002, with the only pause in year-to-year growth occurring in 1998. However, the 11-year growth of 40.7 percent for total agricultural output was less than the nursery growth of 70.8 percent, resulting in an increased share of total output for the nursery industry (Appendix Table 2).

Table 1.
California Production of Nursery, Flowers, and Foliage in 2001 and 2002 Top 15 Counties With 2002 Share of State Total

| County | 2001 Value of <br> Production <br> $\mathbf{( \$ 1 , 0 0 0 )}$ | 2002 Value of <br> Production <br> $\mathbf{( \$ 1 , 0 0 0 )}$ | 2002 Share of <br> State Total <br> $\mathbf{( \% )}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Top 11 Counties | 855,139 |  |  |
| San Diego | 218,833 | 879,126 | 26.56 |
| Orange | 178,564 | 232,096 | 7.01 |
| Monterey | 223,368 | 218,679 | 6.61 |
| Ventura | 138,371 | 183,045 | 6.47 |
| Riverside | 172,046 | 177,117 | 5.53 |
| Los Angeles | 131,419 | 149,263 | 5.35 |
| Santa Barbara | 136,613 | 144,035 | 4.51 |
| San Mateo | 150,265 | 122,755 | 4.35 |
| Santa Clara | 99,224 | 119,072 | 3.71 |
| San Joaquin | 114,599 | 115,383 | 3.60 |
| Kern | 91,128 | 97,377 | 3.49 |
| San Luis Obispo | 68,960 | 85,889 | 2.94 |
| Stanislaus | 65,175 | 70,463 | 2.59 |
| Tulare | 75,025 | 61,004 | 2.13 |
| Santa Cruz | $\mathbf{2 , 7 1 8 , 7 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 8 6 9 , 5 7 8}$ | 1.84 |
| Top 15 County Total | $\mathbf{4 5 2 , 3 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 0 , 5 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 6 . 6 9}$ |
| Rest of State | $\mathbf{1 3 . 3 1}$ |  |  |

Source: California Agricultural Statistics Service, Summary of County Agricultural Commissioners' Reports, 2002, 2003.

## Location of Production

Nursery products and/or flowers and foliage are produced in 55 of California's 58 counties but production tends to be concentrated in Central Coast and South Coast counties. ${ }^{5}$ There were 11 counties with over $\$ 100$ million in nursery, flower and foliage production in 2002 (Figure 3). Seven of the 11 counties border the Pacific Ocean and Santa Clara County has a coastal type climate. Note that San Joaquin and Kern counties are the only Central Valley counties in the top 11. As shown in Table 1, San Diego County dominates the industry with over 26.5 percent of total production. The next five counties, Orange, Monterey, Ventura, Riverside and Los Angeles combine for 30.97 percent of total California production. The remaining five counties account for 19.66 percent of production. As shown, the 11 counties with production over $\$ 100$ million, accounted for over $\$ 2.55$ billion ( $77.19 \%$ ) of California's 2002 nursery, flower and foliage production. There were nine California counties with population exceeding 1 million persons in 2003. Five of these counties (Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, Santa Clara, and Riverside) were among the largest nursery and flower producers (Appendix Table 3). The 11 largest nursery and flower producing counties accounted for almost 65 percent of California's 2002 population.

There were four counties with nursery, flower and foliage production in the range of $\$ 50$ to $\$ 100$ million. These four counties, San Luis Obispo, Stanislaus, Tulare and Santa Cruz accounted for 9.50 percent of total 2002 production. Overall, 15 counties produced 86.69 percent of California's total 2002 nursery, flower and foliage crops. Among these top 15 counties, nursery and floral crops were number one in value of production in San Diego, Orange, Los Angeles, Santa Clara and San Mateo counties.

Nursery, flower and foliage crops are very important agricultural products for several California counties that are not among the 15 largest value producers discussed above. For example, nursery crops are listed as the number one commodity in terms of gross value of production for five counties that are not included in the top 15. These counties include Alameda ( $\$ 14.2 \mathrm{mil}$ ), Contra Costa ( $\$ 35.4 \mathrm{mil}$ ), Del Norte ( $\$ 12.9 \mathrm{mil}$ ), Humboldt ( $\$ 35.3 \mathrm{mil}$ ), and Solano ( $\$ 38.8 \mathrm{mil}$ ).

## Crops Produced

California nursery, flower and foliage producers market a tremendous variety of plant materials ranging from cut flowers, potted flowering plants, flower seeds, bedding and garden plants, bulbs, and ornamentals to fruit and nut trees and strawberry plants. Buyers include consumers, landscape contractors, institutions, and agricultural producers. The most recent data available indicate that the gross value of plant materials produced by the California nursery, flower and foliage industry in 20022003 totaled over $\$ 3.3$ billion. Values for the various categories of nursery products are shown in Table 2. Note that the value of cut flowers and cut greens increased 1.7 percent from 2001-2002 to 2002-2003, while flower seeds and Christmas trees both decreased. For nursery products, significant year-to-year increases in the value of (1) bulbs, corm, roots and tubers, (2) bedding plants, (3) rose plants, (4) woody, deciduous and evergreen ornamentals, (5) herbaceous perennials, and (6) turf and sod, were much greater than the decreases in other products, providing a 4.8 percent year-to-year increase for all nursery products.

[^2]Table 2.
Wholesale Value of California Nursery Products by Major Categories 2001-2002 and 2002-2003

| Floral Products | 2001/2002 Value | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2 / 2 0 0 3}$ Value |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Cut Flowers and Cut Greens | $\$ 359,810,600$ | $365,944,700$ |
| Flower Seeds | $6,074,100$ | $4,775,700$ |
| Christmas Trees | $10,304,900$ | $9,636,300$ |
| Floral Products Total | $\mathbf{3 7 6 , 1 8 9 , 6 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 8 0 , 3 5 6 , 7 0 0}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Nursery Products |  |  |
| Potted Plants and Flowering Foliage | $\$ 631,386,400$ | $628,212,900$ |
| Bulbs, Corm, Roots and Tubers | $35,712,300$ | $38,961,600$ |
| Flowering Propagative Materials | $75,700,800$ | $71,976,600$ |
| Bedding Plants | $480,438,100$ | $509,310,000$ |
| Rose Plants | $54,062,000$ | $61,047,000$ |
| Woody, Deciduous and Evergreen Ornamentals | $823,255,600$ | $941,488,700$ |
| Herbaceous Perennials | $36,175,500$ | $39,134,900$ |
| Turf and Sod | $56,724,700$ | $74,853,100$ |
| Nursery Stock Other Than Ornamentals | $598,606,600$ | $561,484,100$ |
| Nursery Products Total | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 7 9 2 , 0 6 2 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 9 2 6 , 4 6 8 , 9 0 0}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 1 6 8 , 2 5 1 , 6 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 3 0 6 , 8 2 5 , 6 0 0}$ |

Source: California Department of Food and Agriculture. Value of Nursery Products, Fiscal Year 2002/2003. CDFA Nursery Program, Nursery Advisory No. 8-2003, September 25, 2003.

## Marketing Channels

The distribution of California floral and nursery product sales varies by product. A survey of California flower growers conducted in 2000 found that 59 percent of California produced flowers were sold in California, 40 percent were shipped to other states and 1 percent was exported to other countries (Prince and Prince). The spatial distribution of California nursery product sales, based on industry estimates, is approximately 79 percent in California, 20 percent shipped to other states, and 1 percent exported to other countries.

## Retail Sales

Several sources were utilized to develop the best possible estimates for this study. Partial data on retail floral and nursery product sales in California are available from government statistics. There are private data collection efforts and consultant reports that include retail sales that we will utilize and reference where appropriate.

The California State Board of Equalization publishes sales data by type of retail outlet but not by product line. There are annual retail sales data for florists and farm and garden supply stores, two types of stores that tend to specialize in floral and nursery products. There are also aggregate sales data for large multi-product retailers such as food stores, hardware stores, and general merchandise stores, but it is not possible to determine the share of floral and nursery product sales. Lacking more detailed retail data, industry members have developed their own rules-of-thumb for estimating total retail sales. One such estimate has simply doubled the reported sales for florists (based on the growing importance of

Table 3.
Statewide Taxable Sales by California Retail Florists and Farm and Garden Supply Stores, 1997 - 2002

| YEAR | FLORISTS | FARM and GARDEN | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1997 | 816,185 | 1,936,173 | 2,752,358 |
| 1998 | 843,978 | 1,967,564 | 2,811,542 |
| 1999 | 921,774 | 1,961,504 | 2,883,278 |
| 2000 | 983,396 | 2,060,713 | 3,042,436 |
| 2001 | 988,022 | 2,059,040 | 3,047,062 |
| 2002 | 998,781 | 2,135,472 | 3,134,253 |

Source: California State Board of Equalization.
flower sales by supermarkets) and farm and garden stores (based on the growth in floral and nursery sales by large retailers such as Home Depot, Lowe's, Wal-Mart, Target, Price-Costco, and others that are not included). Retail sales reported by California florists and farm and garden supply stores for the five-year period 1997 through 2002 are shown in Table 3. Note that combined sales for the two types of stores shown in Table 3 increased from $\$ 2.75$ billion in 1997 to over $\$ 3.13$ billion in 2002 . There were 5,474 sales tax permits for retail florists on July 1, 2002, up from 5,338 sales tax permits for July 1, 2001. The number of permits for farm and garden stores also increased from 3,711 on July 1, 2001 to 3,834 on July 1, 2002.

Table 4
Estimated Annual U.S. and California Lawn and Garden Retail Sales, 1997-2002

| YEAR | UNITED STATES | CALIFORNIA | CALIFORNIA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -------------------million dollars----------------- \% of U.S. |  |  |
| 1997 | 76,500 | 7,896 | 10.32 |
| 1998 | 79,100 | 8,154 | 10.31 |
| 1999 | 81,700 | 8,422 | 10.31 |
| 2000 | 84,600 | 8,798 | 10.40 |
| 2001 | 88,400 | 9,193 | 10.40 |
| 2002 | 94,900 | 8,958 | 9.44 |

Source: Nursery Retailer, Feb./March or March/April Issues, 1998-2003.
The Nursery Retailer publishes estimates of annual lawn and garden retail sales by state and also has an annual ranking of America's 100 largest nursery retailers. California is the largest single market for lawn and garden products in the United States, accounting for 9.4 to 10.4 percent of total annual sales since 1997 (Table 4). Estimated 2002 California lawn and garden sales totaled $\$ 8.958$ billion out of the U.S. total of $\$ 94.9$ billion (Morey, p. 57). For the total U.S., the estimated total sales composition for the product lines carried by lawn and garden stores were: green goods, 40.0 percent; equipment and tools, 23.3 percent; chemicals and fertilizers, 16.9 percent; and lawn furniture, accessories and tree trim, 19.8 percent (Morey, p. 53).

## Market Shares

The location of consumer purchases of floral and nursery products have changed significantly over time in response to changes in the structure of retailing, competition in local markets and growing consumer demand. Greenidge, in a 1995 Nursery Retailer article (p. 52), listed three major lawn and garden products distribution channels with estimated 1994 market shares. The channels and shares were hardware/hardlines with 20.8 percent; garden centers/nurseries with 39.1 percent; and mass marketers/chain stores with 40.1 percent of the total market. ${ }^{6}$ In 2002, only eight years later, the growth of "big box" home centers such as Home Depot and Lowe's in the hardware category had increased its share to 47.8 percent of the total market. The independent sector's share (garden centers, nurseries, and farm stores) decreased slightly to 38.1 percent; and, warehouse clubs, chain stores and mass merchandisers share (Wal-Mart and K-mart are the largest) plunged to 14.1 percent (Morey, 2003, p. 56). These changes in market share, while dramatic, are not surprising given the rapid growth in numbers of big box stores and typical sales of lawn, garden and nursery items in these stores. National data for example, estimate 2002 lawn and garden sales in the average Home Depot store at $\$ 5.0$ million annually while sales in the average Lowe's store averaged $\$ 5.1$ million annually (Morey, Morey and Morey, 2003).

Retail florists are not included in the store types or total sales figures reported in Table 4. In addition, Nursery Retailers' independent sector (garden centers, nurseries, and farm stores) as discussed above undoubtedly includes more retailers than counted by the California State Board of Equalization in the farm and garden supply store category shown in Table 3. Retail florists have faced competition and loss of market share to other store types, especially supermarkets. We do not have market share data over time but we do have estimates of 2001 California floral market shares by type of retail outlet provided to us by The American Floral Endowment (AFE).

The AFE collects detailed data on retail flower sales from a national consumer panel and uses this panel data to develop timely detailed sales estimates for use by its subscribing members. Sales data are collected for three major types of flower products; cut flowers, flowering and greenhouse plants, and

Table 5.
Estimated Market Shares of Various Retail Store Types for Sales of Flower Products in California, 2001

| Flower Product | Florist <br> Shop | Garden Center | Discount Chain | Home <br> Imprmnt/ <br> Hardware | Supermarket | Warehouse/ Price Club | Other <br> Store |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut Flowers | 47.4 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 25.9 | 8.3 | 16.9 |
| Flowering and Greenhouse Plants | 12.7 | 19.0 | 6.7 | 20.9 | 20.5 | 3.4 | 16.8 |
| Outdoor Garden/Bedding | 0.7 | 39.5 | 7.8 | 37.4 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 11.6 |

Source: From sales estimates provided by The American Floral Endowment, Glen Carbon, IL.

[^3]outdoor garden and bedding plants. These three floral product categories accounted for 43,23 , and 32 percent, respectively, of estimated total 2001 California retail flower sales. The importance of the various retailers varies significantly by flower product category.

The dominant outlets for cut flowers were florist shops with a 47.4 percent market share, followed by supermarkets with a 25.9 percent share (Table 5). Home improvement/hardware stores, supermarkets and garden centers each retailed about one-fifth shares of flowering and greenhouse plants. Garden centers and home improvement/hardware stores had the dominant market shares for outdoor garden and bedding plants in California.

## Retail Margins

Gross profit margins (sales revenue minus cost of goods sold) vary across retail store types and among stores within a given type because of factors such as firm size, location, services provided, product mix, product perishability, and competitive conditions. Estimates of gross margins are an essential component for deriving estimated economic contributions of California's floral and nursery industry. Estimated gross margins and 2002 retail sales are shown in Table 6. Gross margins range from a low of 30 percent for the largest volume retailers (hardware/home centers) to a high of 50 percent for retail florists. Note that these are estimated averages for the categories, with individual stores within a category ranging above and below the estimate. The weighted average retail gross margin is 37.5 percent. Total 2002 California retail lawn and garden sales were estimated at $\$ 8.958$ billion and florists sales were almost $\$ 1.00$ billion for total estimated retail lawn, garden and floral product sales of almost $\$ 10.0$ billion (Table 6).

Table 6.
Estimated Percentage Gross Margin for Floral and Nursery Products by Retail Store Type, Estimated Total Floral and Nursery Sales and Total Margin, California, 2002

| Retail Store Type | Gross Margin | 2002 Retail Sales | Total Margin |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\%$ | \$ million | \$ million |
| Hardware/home centers | 30.0 | $4,281.924$ | $1,284.5772$ |
| Independent farm/garden | 45.0 | $3,412.998$ | $1,535.8491$ |
| Chain/warehouse | 33.0 | $1,263.078$ | 416.8157 |
| Florists | 50.0 | 998.781 | 499.3905 |
| TOTAL | 37.5 | $9,956.781$ | $3,736.6325$ |

Source: Gross margin estimates provided by members of California Association of Nurseries and Garden Centers; retail sales estimates are from Nursery Retailer and California State Board of Equalization (Tables 3 and 4).

## ESTIMATED ECONOMIC IMPACTS

California's floral and nursery sector is closely intertwined with other sectors of the state's economy, and changes in flower and nursery production have ripple effects throughout the state. Each dollar earned in the floral and nursery sector stimulates economic activity in the form of jobs, income and output. The effects of changes in floral and nursery production on total economic activity are estimated through multipliers developed from input-output models. For this study, we use the IMPLAN system developed by the U.S. Forest Service/U.S. Department of Agriculture to estimate economic input-output
models for individual California counties and the state. ${ }^{7}$ The input-output models provide detailed economic multipliers for greenhouse/nursery production and retailing as well as all other sectors of the California economy. A brief description of the IMPLAN system is included as Appendix Table 4.

## Economic Multipliers

An IMPLAN model of the California economy was constructed. IMPLAN multipliers for California nursery production and retailing estimate three components of total change for the State. The estimated multipliers for California nursery production and lawn and garden retailing are in Table 7. The direct effects are for the initial change in nursery production or retailing; the indirect effects are changes in inter-industry transactions as supplying industries respond to increased demands from nursery production or retailing; and, induced effects are for changes in local spending that result from income changes in the directly and indirectly affected industry sectors. The sum of direct, indirect and induced effects is the total effects multiplier. We estimate Type SAM multipliers for output, employment, valueadded and labor income.

Table 7.
Estimated IMPLAN Multipliers for California Nursery Industry

| Type/Sector | Direct <br> Effects | Indirect <br> Effects | Induced <br> Effects | Total <br> Effects |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OUTPUT |  |  |  |  |
| Nursery | 1.0000 | 0.1646 | 0.3407 | 1.5053 |
| Retail | 1.0000 | 0.0999 | 0.3760 | 1.4759 |
| EMPLOYMENT (jobs/\$mil) |  |  |  |  |
| Nursery | 19.9723 | 2.1496 | 3.4478 | 25.5696 |
| Retail | 18.4669 | 1.0159 | 3.8046 | 23.2874 |
| VALUE ADDED |  |  |  |  |
| Nursery | 0.8084 | 0.1029 | 0.2120 | 1.1232 |
| Retail | 0.8816 | 0.0626 | 0.2339 | 1.1781 |
| LABOR INCOME |  |  |  |  |
| Nursery | 0.4752 | 0.0657 | 0.1318 | 0.6727 |
| Retail | 0.5551 | 0.0393 | 0.1455 | 0.7399 |

Source: Minnesota IMPLAN Group (MIG), Inc., Stillwater, MN, 2003.
Lindall and Olson describe the IMPLAN multipliers (pg. 13-15). Type SAM multipliers are the direct, indirect, and induced effects where the induced effect is based on information in the social account matrix. This relationship accounts for social security and income tax leakage, institution savings, and commuting. Interpretation of the tabled multipliers follows:

- Output multipliers relate the changes in sales to final demand by one industry (nursery or retail) to total changes in output (gross sales) by all industries within the local area. An industry output multiplier of 1.50 would indicate that a change in sales to final demand of $\$ 1.00$ by the industry in question would result in a total change in local output of $\$ 1.50$.

[^4]- Labor income and employment multipliers relate the change in direct production to changes in labor income and employment within the local economy. For example, a labor income multiplier for a direct industry change of 1.75 indicates that a $\$ 1.00$ change in output in the direct industry will produce an employment income change of $\$ 1.75$ in the local economy. Similarly, an employment multiplier of 25.0 indicates that 25 jobs are created for each one million dollars of output by the industry.
- Value added multipliers are interpreted the same as labor income and employment multipliers. They relate changes in sales in the industry experiencing the direct effect to total changes in value added for the local economy. Value added includes employee compensation, proprietary income, other property type income, and indirect business taxes.


## Estimated Economic Impacts

The economic multipliers in Table 7 are combined with floral and nursery sales at the producer level and lawn, garden and floral retail gross margins to estimate total contributions of the industry to the California economy. Procedures and important assumptions used to estimate economic impacts follow. First, the direct effects multipliers of 1.0 for nursery and retail output are applied to the total 2002 wholesale value of California nursery products and gross margins for lawn and garden retailing. The total effects multiplier, which includes the indirect and induced output multipliers, is applied to the direct output to obtain total output. Second, the direct effects for employment, value added, and labor income are all derived from the direct output values.

Estimated total economic impacts of California flower and nursery production and lawn and garden retailing are shown in Table 8. Note that the direct output effects, from Table 3 and Table 7, total $\$ 7.04$

Table 8.
Estimated Direct and Total Economic Effects of California Flower and Nursery Production and Lawn and Garden Retailing, 2002

| Type/Sector | Direct Effects | Total Effects |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OUTPUT (\$ million) |  |  |
| Nursery | 3,306.8256 | 4,977.7646 |
| Retail | 3,736.6325 | 5,514.8959 |
| Total | 7,043.4581 | 10,492.6605 |
| EMPLOYMENT (jobs) |  |  |
| Nursery | 66,045 | 84,554 |
| Retail | 69,004 | 87,016 |
| Total | 135,049 | 171,571 |
| VALUE ADDED (\$million) |  |  |
| Nursery | 2,673.2378 | 3,714.22651 |
| Retail | 3,294.2152 | 4,402.12675 |
| Total | 5,967.4530 | 8,116.35326 |
| LABOR INCOME (\$million) |  |  |
| Nursery | 1,571.4035 | 2,224.50158 |
| Retail | 2,074.2047 | 2,764.73439 |
| Total | 3,645.6082 | 4,989.23597 |

billion. The indirect and induced economic multiplier effects expand the total California output effect to $\$ 10.49$ billion. Based on reported input-output relationships, flower and nursery production generates a total of 84,554 jobs in California while lawn and garden retailing add another 87,016 jobs for a combined total of 171,571 California jobs. The estimated payroll for the two sectors totaled almost $\$ 4.99$ billion, with $\$ 2.2$ billion from floral and nursery production and almost $\$ 2.8$ billion from lawn and garden retailing. Total value added for the two sectors was just over $\$ 8.1$ billion with over $\$ 3.7$ billion from floral and nursery production and a little over $\$ 4.4$ billion from lawn and garden retailing. The difference between total effects and direct effects for each row in Table 8 is the sum of indirect and induced effects.

## CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The California nursery and floral industry has demonstrated significant growth during the last two decades in both real terms and relative to all of California agriculture. Dimensions of this growth include expansion in the number and average size of farms producing nursery and floral products, a three-fold increase in crop revenues, and growth to 10.8 percent of the total value of California agricultural output. Recent growth of output has come primarily from nursery production. The flower industry, and cut flowers in particular, have faced significant competition from imports from Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico and the Netherlands.

Data for the nursery and floral industries are typically reported separately. Annual County Agricultural Commissioners' reports have ranked the nursery industry in third place among all California commodities, in terms of value of production, since 1994 with the flower industry ranking from $8^{\text {th }}$ to $11^{\text {th }}$ place. Recently, the combined nursery and floral industries have ranked second among all California agricultural products. At the national level, California's nursery and flower industry leads the nation with Florida in a distant second place.

Nursery and flower production is located in 55 of California's 58 counties. As noted, nursery and flower production tends to be concentrated in coastal counties ranging from San Mateo County in the north to San Diego County in the south. Fifteen counties account for over 86 percent of total production. Nursery and flower production was the number one agricultural product in terms of value of production in 10 counties, with values ranging from over $\$ 879$ million in San Diego County to almost $\$ 13$ million in Del Norte County in 2002. The location of many nursery and flower producers in the most urbanized areas of California is a distinguishing feature of the industry. These producers are close to many of their customers, helping them deliver quality product and minimize distribution costs.

The large, growing and economically important nursery and flower production sector is accompanied by a large and growing retail sector. California is the largest single market for lawn and garden products in the United States, with 2002 retail sales estimated at almost $\$ 10.0$ billion. The combined effects of nursery and flower production and lawn and garden retailing on the California economy are huge.

The total economic impacts of California flower and nursery production and lawn and garden retailing were estimated at over $\$ 10.49$ billion in 2002. Based on reported input-output relationships, flower and nursery production generates a total of 84,554 jobs in California while lawn and garden retailing add another 87,016 jobs for a combined total of 171,571 California jobs. This was 1.18 percent of total California employment in 2002. The estimated payroll for the two sectors totaled almost $\$ 5.0$ billion, with $\$ 2.2$ billion from floral and nursery production and almost $\$ 2.8$ billion from lawn and garden
retailing. Total value added for the two sectors was just over $\$ 8.1$ billion with $\$ 3.7$ billion from floral and nursery production and a little over $\$ 4.4$ billion from lawn and garden retailing.

The important message that the nursery and flower industry should be delivering to policy makers, agricultural leaders and the general public at every available opportunity is that the industry is large, growing and economically important. In terms of total output, the California nursery industry is exceeded only by the dairy and grape industries, and when the nursery and flower industries are combined, their output is exceeded only by the dairy industry. Nursery and flower production exceeds the output of many large, well-known, and world-class California agricultural industries, including for example, lettuce, cattle, strawberries, tomatoes, almonds, cotton, chickens, oranges, broccoli, carrots, walnuts, avocados, celery, melons and peaches. Recently, over $\$ 1.08$ out of every $\$ 10$ of California agricultural gross sales was from nursery and flower products. And finally, more than one out of every hundred jobs in California during 2002 could be attributed to the direct and indirect impacts of California nursery production and retailing.
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## APPENDIX TABLES

Appendix Table 1.
California's Top 20 Commodities, With Value of Sales and Rank for 1999-2002

| Commodity | $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Value (\$ million) and Rank |  |  |  |
| Milk and Cream | $4,091(1)$ | $3,707(1)$ | $4,630(1)$ | $3,812(1)$ |
| Grapes, all | $2,656(2)$ | $2,829(2)$ | $2,651(2)$ | $2,579(2)$ |
| Nursery | $2,009(3)$ | $2,247(3)$ | $2,087(3)$ | $2,348(3)$ |
| Lettuce, all | $1,130(5)$ | $1,494(4)$ | $1,370(4)$ | $1,278(4)$ |
| Cattle and Calves | $1,223(4)$ | $1,218(5)$ | $1,352(5)$ | $1,229(5)$ |
| Almonds | $688(10)$ | $666(11)$ | $732(10)$ | $1,190(6)$ |
| Strawberries | $904(7)$ | $840(8)$ | $841(8)$ | $991(7)$ |
| Flowers | $776(8)$ | $931(7)$ | $998(7)$ | $949(8)$ |
| Tomatoes, all | $1,118(6)$ | $948(6)$ | $766(9)$ | $926(9)$ |
| Hay, all | $767(9)$ | $769(9)$ | $1,021(6)$ | $914(10)$ |
| Cotton, all | $672(11)$ | $720(10)$ | $658(11)$ | $623(11)$ |
| Oranges, all | $404(15)$ | $346(14)$ | $514(13)$ | $559(12)$ |
| Broccoli | $433(14)$ | $574(12)$ | $438(14)$ | $488(13)$ |
| Carrots, all | $434(13)$ | $322(17)$ | $434(15)$ | $460(14)$ |
| Chickens, all | $515(12)$ | $471(13)$ | $532(12)$ | $452(15)$ |
| Avocados | $327(16)$ | $340(15)$ | $316(17)$ | $358(16)$ |
| Pistachios |  |  |  | $336(17)$ |
| Potatoes, all |  |  |  | $307(18)$ |
| Walnuts | $251(19)$ | $296(18)$ | $342(16)$ | $305(19)$ |
| Lemons |  |  |  | $287(20)$ |

Source: CDFA Resource Directory, p. 30.
Note that annual commodity rankings in Table 1 are based on value of sales. Rankings based on the Summary of County Agricultural Commissioners' Reports published by CASS typically have some differences in rankings based on gross value of agricultural production, since estimated sales and estimated gross value of production differ, with the amount depending on the particular commodity. The annual ranking for flowers is usually higher in the sales ranking than in the gross value of production ranking.

Appendix Table 2.
Value $\mathbf{( \$ 1 , 0 0 0 )}$ of California Nursery, Flower and Foliage Production by County, 1993-2002

| COUNTY | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | \$1,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alameda | 31,873 | 34,641 | 28,933 | 25,211 | 25,215 | 17,421 | 19,058 | 14,049 | 15,108 | 14,229 |
| Amador | 22 | 30 | 33 | 48 | 130 | 174 | 209 | 216 | 241 | 191 |
| Butte | 6,351 | 6,400 | 7,437 | 4,485 | 5,350 | 3,610 | 6,400 | 5,961 | 8,555 | 7,178 |
| Calaveras | 585 | 856 | 864 | 883 | 896 | 740 | 597 | 452 | 543 | 545 |
| Colusa | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Contra Costa | 24,940 | 25,409 | 21,782 | 26,219 | 31,288 | 30,663 | 28,202 | 32,105 | 37,510 | 35,385 |
| Del Norte | 9,721 | 11,357 | 10,895 | 10,683 | 12,415 | 13,322 | 14,831 | 15,427 | 16,151 | 12,935 |
| El Dorado | 4,166 | 3,540 | 4,149 | 4,302 | 4,374 | 4,114 | 4,855 | 5,812 | 5,988 | 5,662 |
| Fresno | 21,294 | 23,945 | 16,211 | 16,847 | 36,837 | 29,576 | 32,531 | 28,905 | 32,014 | 32,407 |
| Glenn | 2,403 | 2,340 | 2,178 | 2,165 | 2,461 | 2,615 | 3,503 | 3,258 | 4,238 | 4,070 |
| Humbolt | 20,940 | 20,940 | 17,419 | 17,419 | 22,577 | 23,227 | 25,806 | 32,859 | 33,952 | 35,321 |
| Imperial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Inyo | 1,109 | 1,324 | 1,525 | 3,485 | 2,341 | 2,897 | 2,981 | 3,515 | 4,020 | 3,810 |
| Kern | 59,536 | 62,891 | 68,710 | 72,383 | 79,629 | 82,636 | 99,129 | 106,246 | 114,599 | 115,383 |
| Kings | 1,958 | 2,343 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lake | 332 | 326 | 6 | 12 | 408 | 408 | 408 | 408 | 3,120 | 3,241 |
| Lassen | 10,440 | 12,329 | 10,683 | 8,702 | 9,512 | 7,702 | 11,609 | 12,336 | 9,860 | 5,429 |
| Los Angeles | 147,068 | 153,625 | 156,909 | 166,086 | 172,577 | 186,660 | 180,790 | 170,185 | 172,046 | 177,117 |
| Madra | 3,855 | 3,160 | 3,470 | 5,324 | 4,541 | 15,128 | 30,200 | 37,500 | 24,543 | 18,271 |
| Marin | 1,199 | 1,000 | 556 | 576 | 547 | 683 | 708 | 814 | 675 | 725 |
| Mariposa | 93 | 95 | 100 | 108 | 108 | 99 | 136 | 152 | 147 | 150 |
| Mendocino | 2,123 | 2,296 | 2,510 | 3,092 | 3,117 | 2,685 | 2,620 | 2,550 | 2,790 | 3,267 |
| Merced | 14,603 | 14,923 | 14,093 | 14,265 | 15,833 | 19,007 | 23,747 | 21,758 | 22,233 | 21,991 |
| Modoc | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mono | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Monterey | 116,515 | 105,514 | 111,199 | 114,176 | 135,893 | 154,297 | 180,822 | 194,252 | 178,564 | 218,679 |
| Napa | 2,666 | 2,615 | 2,881 | 2,181 | 2,749 | 3,804 | 3,156 | 3,250 | 4,720 | 4,655 |
| Nevada | 509 | 522 | 639 | 564 | 752 | 594 | 633 | 515 | 334 | 346 |
| Orange | 117,405 | 127,988 | 132,780 | 143,537 | 165,727 | 168,387 | 200,966 | 214,877 | 218,833 | 232,096 |
| Placer | 7,825 | 7,825 | 8,856 | 9,513 | 10,245 | 10,797 | 12,090 | 11,505 | 12,854 | 15,080 |
| Plumas | 1,400 | 1,475 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Riverside | 47,551 | 79,537 | 71,169 | 81,943 | 82,827 | 94,549 | 90,377 | 107,520 | 138,371 | 183,074 |
| Sacramento | 16,643 | 9,910 | 9,582 | 15,745 | 15,969 | 17,933 | 17,113 | 26,408 | 28,968 | 26,378 |
| San Benito | 23,364 | 19,384 | 14,992 | 15,350 | 15,668 | 16,985 | 19,682 | 28,428 | 25,207 | 28,966 |
| San Bernardino | 21,517 | 22,915 | 21,906 | 22,890 | 23,303 | 21,718 | 26,458 | 29,502 | 34,617 | 42,438 |
| San Diego | 556,921 | 585,433 | 643,193 | 692,106 | 704,988 | 722,186 | 773,081 | 790,140 | 855,139 | 879,126 |
| San Fracisco | 530 | 475 | 564 | 702 | 482 | 447 | 759 | 727 | 913 | 613 |
| San Joaquin | 53,722 | 58,538 | 63,601 | 97,916 | 97,059 | 74,115 | 81,937 | 88,257 | 99,224 | 119,072 |
| San Luis Obispo | 39,301 | 44,585 | 49,607 | 55,546 | 65,188 | 70,155 | 85,149 | 89,168 | 91,128 | 97,377 |
| San Mateo | 164,707 | 165,401 | 161,611 | 169,657 | 171,854 | 142,460 | 142,842 | 154,756 | 136,613 | 144,035 |
| Santa Barbara | 86,755 | 78,753 | 95,244 | 122,857 | 139,849 | 130,038 | 135,042 | 150,669 | 126,846 | 149,263 |
| Santa Clara | 46,228 | 45,666 | 40,522 | 42,824 | 40,740 | 45,446 | 48,467 | 177,146 | 150,265 | 122,755 |
| Santa Cruz | 48,174 | 43,859 | 51,762 | 62,972 | 73,110 | 56,686 | 71,562 | 76,556 | 75,025 | 61,004 |
| Shasta | 8,229 | 9,622 | 9,502 | 8,865 | 8,674 | 8,462 | 9,534 | 8,212 | 8,830 | 8,757 |
| Sierra | 420 | 443 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Siskiyou | 6,566 | 7,939 | 9,962 | 14,526 | 16,722 | 17,844 | 20,695 | 25,076 | 30,789 | 26,151 |
| Solano | 14,512 | 17,345 | 19,715 | 22,348 | 24,078 | 26,408 | 28,978 | 35,045 | 37,668 | 38,781 |
| Sonoma | 29,297 | 28,797 | 30,996 | 33,078 | 27,427 | 27,836 | 23,133 | 33,272 | 30,069 | 26,067 |
| Stanislaus | 28,062 | 30,906 | 29,793 | 32,180 | 35,553 | 36,758 | 64,111 | 68,642 | 68,960 | 85,889 |
| Sutter | 8,888 | 9,116 | 10,129 | 7,502 | 11,839 | 9,891 | 11,819 | 8,025 | 9,387 | 8,929 |
| Tehama | 867 | 765 | 1,228 | 1,131 | 1,225 | 1,651 | 1,367 | 1,309 | 1,991 | 2,102 |
| Trinity | 32 | 32 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 37 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| Tulare | 22,255 | 24,176 | 28,524 | 43,399 | 51,823 | 65,306 | 69,682 | 72,730 | 65,175 | 70,463 |
| Tuolumne | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ventura | 105,417 | 111,230 | 108,387 | 124,123 | 138,808 | 162,063 | 180,624 | 204,828 | 223,368 | 214,245 |
| Yolo | 3,746 | 4,514 | 5,584 | 5,028 | 5,603 | 2,771 | 4,954 | 4,533 | 6,991 | 6,420 |
| Yuba | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Calculated | 1,944,635 | 2,029,050 | 2,102,426 | 2,324,989 | 2,498,346 | 2,532,991 | 2,793,385 | 3,099,888 | 3,169,214 | 3,310,100 |
| Total Reported | 1,944,632 | 2,029,646 | 2,102,425 | 2,324,650 | 2,498,345 | 2,547,817 | 2,793,384 | 3,096,592 | 3,169,213 | 3,310,099 |
| TOTAL CA AGRI | 23,697,420 | 24,373,778 | 24,947,169 | 26,260,004 | 28,048,589 | 26,950,521 | 28,647,905 | 29,349,616 | 29,717,181 | 30,635,532 |

Source: Summary of California Agricultural Commissioner's Reports.

Appendix Table 3.
Population and Value of Nursery and Floral Production by County, California, 2002-2003

| COUNTY | POPULATION | VALUE OF NURSERY PRODUCT \$1,000 | COUNTY | POPULATION July 1, 2003 | VALUE OF NURSERY PRODUCT \$1,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALAMEDA | 1,495,400 | 14,229 | ORANGE | 3,001,300 | 232,096 |
| ALPINE | 1,210 | N/A | PLACER | 285,400 | 15,080 |
| AMADOR | 37,050 | 191 | PLUMAS | 21,150 | 0 |
| BUTTE | 212,400 | 7,178 | RIVERSIDE | 1,758,700 | 183,074 |
| CALAVERAS | 43,550 | 545 | SACRAMENTO | 1,331,500 | 26,378 |
| COLUSA | 20,000 | 0 | SAN BENITO | 56,600 | 28,966 |
| CONTRA COSTA | 1,003,800 | 35,385 | SAN BERNARDINO | 1,869,300 | 42,438 |
| DEL NORTE | 28,100 | 12,935 | SAN DIEGO | 2,989,300 | 879,126 |
| EL DORADO | 168,200 | 5,662 | SAN FRANCISCO | 786,900 | 613 |
| FRESNO | 855,400 | 32,407 | SAN JOAQUIN | 625,600 | 119,072 |
| GLENN | 27,600 | 4,070 | SAN LUIS OBISPO | 257,500 | 97,377 |
| HUMBOLDT | 129,400 | 35,321 | SAN MATEO | 712,800 | 144,035 |
| IMPERIAL | 153,600 | 0 | SANTA BARBARA | 412,100 | 149,263 |
| INYO | 18,550 | 3,810 | SANTA CLARA | 1,723,900 | 122,755 |
| KERN | 717,300 | 115,383 | SANTA CRUZ | 259,200 | 61,004 |
| KINGS | 138,700 | 0 | SHASTA | 175,500 | 8,757 |
| LAKE | 62,300 | 3,241 | SIERRA | 3,520 | 0 |
| LASSEN | 34,600 | 5,429 | SISKIYOU | 45,050 | 26,151 |
| LOS ANGELES | 10,047,300 | 177,117 | SOLANO | 416,500 | 38,781 |
| MADERA | 133,900 | 18,271 | SONOMA | 473,300 | 26,067 |
| MARIN | 250,300 | 725 | STANISLAUS | 489,400 | 85,889 |
| MARIPOSA | 17,850 | 150 | SUTTER | 84,900 | 8,929 |
| MENDOCINO | 89,100 | 3,267 | TEHAMA | 58,600 | 2,102 |
| MERCED | 230,600 | 21,991 | TRINITY | 13,550 | 32 |
| MODOC | 9,500 | 0 | TULARE | 392,900 | 70,463 |
| MONO | 13,400 | 0 | TUOLUMNE | 57,100 | 0 |
| MONTEREY | 418,800 | 218,679 | VENTURA | 799,200 | 214,245 |
| NAPA | 130,900 | 4,655 | YOLO | 183,500 | 6,420 |
| NEVADA | 96,900 | 346 | YUBA | 63,900 | 0 |
|  |  |  | STATE | 35,934,000 | 3,310,100 |

Source: Population data are from California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit. Nursery and Floral production from California Agricultural Statistics Service, Summary of County Agricultural Commissioners' Reports, 2003.

## Appendix Table 4. <br> The IMPLAN System

The following brief description of IMPLAN is from Mulkey and Hodges.
IMPLAN, an acronym for Impact Analyses and Planning, was originally developed by the U.S. Forest Service in cooperation with the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the U.S. Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management to assist in land and resource management planning. It is a computer software package that consists of procedures for estimating local input-output models and associated databases. Since 1993, the IMPLAN system has been developed under exclusive rights by the Minnesota Implan Group, Inc. which licenses and distributes the software to users, including universities, government agencies and private companies.

The economic data for IMPLAN comes from the system of national accounts for the United States based on data collected by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and other federal and state government agencies. Data are collected for 528 distinct producing industry sectors of the national economy corresponding to the Standard Industrial Categories (SICs). Industry sectors are classified on the basis of the primary commodity or service produced. Corresponding data sets are also produced for each county in the U.S., allowing analyses at the county level or for individual states. Data on the technological mix of inputs and levels of transactions between producing sectors are taken from detailed input-output tables of the national economy. National and county level data are the basis for IMPLAN calculations of input-output tables and multipliers for local areas.

The IMPLAN software package allows the estimation of the multiplier effects of changes in final demand for one industry on all other industries within a local economic area. Multipliers may be estimated of a single county, for groups of contiguous counties, for an entire state. The multipliers measure total changes in output, income, employment, or value added.

For a particular producing industry, multipliers estimate three components of total change within the local area:

- Direct effects represent the initial change in the industry in question.
- Indirect effects are changes in inter-industry transactions as supplying industries respond to increased demands from the directly affected industries.
- Induced effects reflect changes in local spending that result from income changes in the directly and indirectly affected industry sectors.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$. Research support was provided by a grant from California Polytechnic University Foundation of San Luis Obispo, California, with funding from the California Association of Nurseries and Garden Centers Endowment.
    2 These rankings, based on value of production, are from California Agricultural Statistics Service, Summary of County Agricultural Commissioners' Reports. They differ slightly from rankings based on sales shown in Appendix Table 1.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ This report uses 2002-2003 fiscal year data to update a more comprehensive study by Carman and Rodriguez that was based on 2001-2002 data series.
    ${ }^{4}$ Note that USDA reported cash receipts for the California nursery and floriculture industry are slightly less than the total value of California nursery and floral production reported by California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA). We use the CDFA data for the remainder of this report.

[^2]:    5 The gross value of nursery, flower, and foliage production by county is in Appendix Table 2. Note that the County Agricultural Commissioners' Reports do not include nursery and flower sales for seven counties that do have producers listed in the CDFA 2003 Directory: Nurserymen and Others Licensed to Sell Nursery Stock in California. These counties and the number of producers include Colusa (1), Imperial (10), Kings (2), Modoc (3), Plumas (3), Tuolumne (6), and Yuba (5).

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ Greenidge noted that garden centers, nurseries, and farm stores had about 60 percent of the market in 1980.

[^4]:    5 We use the IMPLAN PRO software licensed from MIG, Inc. and the associated databases for California. For a detailed description of the software and data see, Implan Professional Social Accounting and Impact Analysis Software User's Guide, Analysis Guide and Data Guide, 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Edition, 1997, MIG, Inc., Stillwater, MN. (http://www.implan.com)

