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## Executive Summary

The economic impacts of the environmental horticulture industry in Florida in 2005 were evaluated and compared with results from previous studies done for 1997 and 2000. Telephone and internet surveys were conducted with over 800 industry firms, including wholesale nurseries, landscape services and horticultural retailers.

Based on expanded survey results and other secondary data, total industry sales in 2005 were estimated at $\$ 15.24$ billion $(\mathrm{Bn})$. Total industry output amounted to $\$ 10.39 \mathrm{Bn}$, with $\$ 3.01 \mathrm{Bn}$ for wholesale nurseries, $\$ 5.25 \mathrm{Bn}$ for landscape services, and $\$ 2.13 \mathrm{Bn}$ for horticultural retailers, which reflects the average gross margin on retail sales. Direct employment in the industry was 190,000 fulltime jobs, plus nearly 104,000 temporary, part-time or seasonal jobs.

Economic impacts were estimated with multipliers from a regional input-output model for Florida developed using the Implan software. Multiplier effects capture activity in other sectors of the Florida economy in the industry supply chain (indirect effects) and spending by employee households (induced impacts). Total employment impacts were 319,000 fulltime and part-time/seasonal jobs, including 24,000 jobs created in other sectors of the Florida economy. Total value added impacts of \$8.65 Bn included \$5.19 Bn in labor income for employee wages, salaries, and business owner (proprietor) income. Fiscal impacts included $\$ 549$ million (Mn) in indirect business taxes paid to local, state, and federal governments. Since the previous study for the year 2000, total employment impacts increased by 131,000 jobs, or an average annual compound rate of 11.1 percent, while output impacts increased by $\$ 2.4 \mathrm{Bn}$, or 4.2 percent annually.

Estimates of industry sales, employment and economic impacts were developed separately for all 67 Florida counties and nine regions anchored by the major metropolitan areas, based on their share of total statewide direct employment. Total employment impacts were highest in the counties of Miami-Dade ( 40,837 jobs), Palm Beach $(23,776)$, Orange $(21,733)$, Hillsborough $(20,410)$, Broward $(18,157)$, Duval $(11,768)$, Volusia ( 10,454 ), Pinellas $(10,208)$, Lee $(10,162)$, Lake $(9,814)$, Polk $(9,532)$, Collier $(9,030)$, and Seminole (9,031). Regional employment impacts were highest in the Miami-Ft Lauderdale region ( 95,202 jobs), followed by Orlando (86,157), Tampa-St. Petersburg (37,711), Sarasota-Bradenton (35,541), Jacksonville $(22,580)$, Tallahassee $(13,515)$, Gainesville $(12,315)$, Pensacola $(11,839)$, and Panama City $(3,713)$.

Nursery growers reported managing a total area of 82,440 acres in container, field and greenhouse production systems. About $\$ 1.27 \mathrm{Bn}$ or 42 percent of nursery sales were to markets outside the state, including other southeast states (14\%), the northeast (12\%), midwest (8\%), west (6\%), Canada (1\%) and other foreign countries ( $1 \%$ ). The most important plant products were shrubs, representing $\$ 578 \mathrm{Mn}$ or 19 percent of sales, followed by tropical foliage ( $\$ 437 \mathrm{Mn}, 17 \%$ ), deciduous trees ( $\$ 389 \mathrm{Mn}, 15 \%$ ), turfgrass ( $\$ 307 \mathrm{Mn}$, $10 \%$ ), liners ( $\$ 297 \mathrm{Mn}, 10 \%$ ), potted flowering plants ( $\$ 281 \mathrm{Mn}, 9 \%$ ) and palms ( $\$ 220 \mathrm{Mn}, 7 \%$ ). Deciduous, evergreen and flowering trees together represented $\$ 670 \mathrm{Mn}$ or 22 percent of nursery sales. Florida native plants represented about 11 percent of nursery sales. In the landscape services sector, 47 percent of sales were for landscape installation, 30 percent for landscape maintenance, 10 percent for design (landscape architecture), and 14 percent for other services. In the horticultural retailing sector, 40 percent of sales were for live plants, 31 percent for horticultural supplies, 11 percent for hard goods, and 19 percent for miscellaneous other goods.

Finally, the study evaluated the impacts on the horticulture industry from eight named hurricanes that struck Florida during 2004 and 2005. Some 79 percent of surveyed firms were adversely impacted by at least one hurricane. Total damages and losses due to hurricanes were estimated at $\$ 2.12$ billion, including product (crop) losses of $\$ 1.05 \mathrm{Bn}$, structural damages of $\$ 465 \mathrm{Mn}$ and cleanup costs of $\$ 605 \mathrm{Mn}$. Product losses of at least $\$ 100,000$ were sustained by 22 percent of firms, while structural damages and cleanup costs of this level were suffered by 12 percent and 8 percent of firms, respectively. Nearly half (48\%) of firms had their business interrupted for 3 weeks or more.

Keywords: Florida, environmental horticulture, economic impact, multipliers, output, employment, value added, Implan, economic region, wholesale plant nurseries, landscape services, horticultural retailers, marketing, hurricanes.
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## Introduction: The Florida Environmental Horticulture Industry

The environmental horticulture or "Green" industry encompasses a wide range of businesses, including wholesale nursery and greenhouse producers, lawn and garden supplies and equipment manufacturing and wholesale trade, landscape design, installation and maintenance services, lawn and garden stores, and other retail establishments selling plants and related lawn and garden goods. In terms of overall industry value, Florida is a leading state, ranked second only to California in the U.S. According to a recent study ${ }^{1}$ for 2002, Florida's Green industry had total employment impacts of 147,795 jobs, output impacts of $\$ 10.0$ billion (Bn) and value added impacts of $\$ 7.1 \mathrm{Bn}$. These results represented significant increases in Florida since previous studies done for 1997 and $2000^{2}$.

Nursery plants are one of the largest agricultural commodity groups in Florida, along with fruits, vegetables and forest products ${ }^{3}$. According to the Census of Agriculture for 2002, the state of Florida had over 4,500 commercial nursery and greenhouse farms, with production area of 119,000 acres in the open, and 361 million square feet under glass or other protective cover, total sales of $\$ 1.82 \mathrm{Bn}$, and capital assets in land, buildings and equipment averaging $\$ 610,000$ per farm ${ }^{4}$. According to official USDA time series statistics ${ }^{5}$, Florida nursery and greenhouse sales over the past decade have grown by 25 percent in inflationadjusted terms, representing a compound annual growth rate of 2.5 percent (Figure 1).

The present study was undertaken to evaluate the economic impacts of the environmental horticulture industry in Florida for 2005, using methods similar to those employed in previous studies in order to facilitate comparisons of growth over time.

Figure 1. Value of Florida nursery and greenhouse crops, 1995-2004.


[^0]
## Methods

## Survey Design and Implementation

Estimation of the economic value of Florida's environmental horticultural industry was based upon information obtained from telephone and internet surveys of nursery producers, landscape service firms or horticultural retailers conducted in late 2005 and early 2006. Information was collected on annual sales, employment, types of goods or services offered, state and regional trade, types of customers or market outlets, marketing practices used, and threats to the industry. All survey information concerned business results for 2005. Information on annual sales was collected in terms of ranges of values, to avoid disclosure of sensitive data. As a special issue for this survey, information was gathered on the effects of hurricanes in 2004-05, in terms of crop losses, building and equipment damages, repair/cleanup costs, and length of business interruption. In addition, information was collected on production area, and credit/finance needs for the nursery sector. Several open-ended questions were presented to gather statements by respondents in their own words regarding the impacts of their business and issues in the industry.

An internet survey of the members of the Florida Nursery, Growers and Landscape Association (FNGLA) was conducted from Dec. 1, 2005 to Jan. 23, 2006. Each FNGLA member firm was assigned to the appropriate survey group based on their primary activity. FNGLA members were contacted by email, and provided with an electronic link to the online survey. A reminder message was sent to firms that had not responded to the survey after the first two weeks. Respondents were able to return to the survey to finish or modify answers until the survey was closed. The internet survey was conducted using an online service that automatically administers the survey, tracks respondents and records responses (www.SurveyMonkey.com).

A separate telephone survey of the general business population was conducted during March and April, 2006. The telephone interviews were done under subcontract by the University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research, using a computer-assisted system to dial telephone numbers, generate questions in the proper sequence, and record respondents' answers, as well as information on interview time/date and the disposition of all calls. Firms contacted for this survey were drawn in random order from the population lists. A copy of the telephone survey questionnaire is provided in the Appendix. All firms participating in the survey were qualified as having produced or sold ornamental plants, landscape services or horticultural goods in 2005, and the individual respondent was qualified as being knowledgeable about the general business practices and management of the company. In some cases, when a qualified respondent was not available, the interviewers arranged to call back at another time. FNGLA member firms that had previously responded to the internet survey were excluded from the telephone survey to avoid duplication.

Listings of firms for the telephone survey were obtained from a variety of sources. For nurseries and horticultural retailers, a list of firms was obtained from the Florida Department of Agriculture, Division of Plant Industry. All firms in Florida that produce or sell plant products are legally required to register with this agency. The eligible population of nursery firms was considered to be those firms which were indicated as "wholesale" or "wholesale and retail" operations, and had plant inventory of at least 1,000 units. A listing of Florida landscape services businesses was obtained from a Dun and Bradstreet database, in which firms were selected based on their Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes for landscape counseling and planning (0781), lawn and garden services (0782), and ornamental shrub and tree services (0783). The list of firms for both surveys included 4,477 nurseries, 7,359 retailers (stock dealers) and 8,440 landscape services firms. For the internet survey, a total of 907 FNGLA member firms were targeted.

A total of 838 firms responded to the surveys, including 434 nurseries, 191 landscape service firms, and 213 horticultural retailers (Table 1). Responses to the internet survey were received from 250 firms, while 588 firms responded to the telephone surveys. A total of 6,917 telephone calls were attempted for the survey, of which 8.5 percent were completed or partially completed, 11.8 percent were refused, 22.5 percent had no answer, busy signal, answering machine, technical problems, or a qualified respondent was not available (Table 2). Some 57.2 percent of firms called were disqualified for the survey due to non-working numbers, fax lines, number changed, no eligible respondent, etc.

Table 1. Number of survey respondents by industry sector and Florida county.

| County | Nursery | Landscape | Retail | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alachua | 13 | 5 | 5 | 23 |
| Bay | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Brevard | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Broward | 21 | 13 | 12 | 46 |
| Calhoun | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Charlotte | 3 | 1 |  | 4 |
| Citrus | 4 | 1 | 4 | 9 |
| Clay | 4 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| Collier | 7 | 2 | 1 | 10 |
| Columbia | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| De Soto | 3 | 1 |  | 4 |
| Dixie |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| Duval | 7 | 10 | 8 | 25 |
| Escambia | 1 | 4 | 6 | 11 |
| Flagler |  | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Gadsden | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |
| Glades | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Hamilton | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Hardee | 4 | 1 |  | 5 |
| Hendry | 1 |  | 2 | 3 |
| Hernando | 4 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| Highlands | 11 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| Hillsborough | 23 | 6 | 14 | 43 |
| Indian River | 3 |  | 1 | 4 |
| Jackson |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Jefferson | 5 |  | 2 | 7 |
| Lafayette | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Lake | 25 | 3 | 12 | 40 |
| Lee | 3 | 5 | 7 | 15 |
| Leon | 3 | 1 | 4 | 8 |
| Levy | 3 |  | 1 | 4 |
| Madison | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Manatee | 8 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| Marion | 14 | 6 | 7 | 27 |
| Martin | 5 |  | 1 | 6 |
| Miami-Dade | 77 | 8 | 13 | 98 |
| Monroe | 4 | 6 |  | 10 |
| Nassau |  | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Okaloosa | 1 | 1 | 7 | 9 |
| Okeechobee | 4 | 1 |  | 5 |
| Orange | 51 | 16 | 7 | 74 |
| Osceola | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Palm Beach | 39 | 25 | 14 | 78 |
| Pasco | 5 | 3 | 7 | 15 |
| Pinellas | 4 | 14 | 15 | 33 |
| Polk | 14 | 6 | 4 | 24 |
| Putnam | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Santa Rosa | 2 |  | 3 | 5 |
| Sarasota | 5 | 12 | 7 | 24 |
| Seminole | 7 | 7 | 14 | 28 |
| St. Johns | 4 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| St. Lucie | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| Sumter | 5 |  |  | 5 |
| Suwannee | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Volusia | 10 | 7 | 6 | 23 |
| Walton |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Out of state or county not available | 8 | 3 | 3 | 14 |
| Grand Total | 434 | 191 | 213 | 838 |

Table 2. Disposition of telephone survey calls.

| Call Discposition | Total All <br> Groups | Wholesale <br> Nurseries | Landscapers | Retailers |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Complete | 587 | Number of calls |  |  |
| Partial Complete | 3 | 257 | 126 | 204 |
| Strong Refusal | 77 | 23 | 25 | 39 |
| Soft Refusal | 737 | 186 | 190 | 361 |
| Answer Machine, Message | 373 | 112 | 194 | 67 |
| Language Unable | 72 | 52 | 5 | 15 |
| Busy | 128 | 35 | 40 | 53 |
| No Answer | 600 | 175 | 232 | 193 |
| Technical Phone Problems | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Cell Phone | 16 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| Callback, Respondent Not Selected | 272 | 61 | 87 | 124 |
| Callback, Respondent Selected | 91 | 15 | 13 | 63 |
| Total Qualified | 2,960 | 921 | 917 | 1,122 |
| Respondent Never Available* | 29 | 6 | 17 | 6 |
| Phys/Mentally Unable* | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Misc Unable* | 9 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| Non-working Number* | 845 | 166 | 405 | 274 |
| Disconnected Number* | 687 | 111 | 425 | 151 |
| Number Changed* | 33 | 8 | 16 | 9 |
| Business/Government/Other Org* | 10 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| No Eligible Respondent* | 1,124 | 234 | 452 | 438 |
| Answer Machine, No Message* | 1,061 | 289 | 504 | 268 |
| Fax/Data Line* | 154 | 28 | 97 | 29 |
| Institution* | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Total Disqualified | 3,957 | 851 | 1,924 | 1,182 |
| Total Attempted | 6,917 | 1,772 | 2,841 | 2,304 |
| Percent Qualified | $42.8 \%$ | $52.0 \%$ | $32.3 \%$ | $48.7 \%$ |

* Disqualifying reason


## Survey Data and Economic Impact Analysis

Analysis of the survey data was carried out with spreadsheet software (Microsoft Excel). Descriptive statistics were computed for each survey variable, including the mean (average), standard error, number of respondents, and sum of sample values. The value of sales for each firm was estimated at the midpoint value of the range selected (Table 10), unless a specific value was reported. Sales of specific products or services by industry firms, and sales by market segment or region, were estimated as a percentage of total sales for each industry sector. The total value of sales and employment in each industry sector were estimated based on the following formula: $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}} / \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{i}} * \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}} * \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{i}}$, where $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is estimated sales or employment in sector i (nursery, landscape, or retail), $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the survey sample sales or employment reported, $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the number of firms that reported sales or employment, $P_{i}$ is the population of firms, and $Q_{i}$ is the percentage of firms qualified for the telephone survey according to the disposition of calls (Table 2). Survey sample numbers and expansion factors for each industry sector are shown in Table 3. Expansion factors for the nursery sector were computed separately by firm size class, based upon the Florida Division of Plant Industry inventory numbers: small ( 1,000 to 5,000 plant units), medium ( 5,001 to 50,000 units), large ( 50,001 to 500,000 units), and very large (over 500,000 units). Sales expansion factors were 5.5 for nurseries, 18.6 for landscape firms, and 30.6 for retail firms, while employment expansion factors were 4.6, 14.9 and 18.6, respectively.

Table 3. Survey sample size and expansion factors.

| Industry Sector | Population of Firms in Florida | Number Firms Surveyed |  |  | Percent of Firms Qualified (telelphone survey) | Firms Reporting Sales | Sales <br> Expansion Factor | Firms Reporting Employment | Employ- <br> ment <br> Expansion Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Internet | Telephone | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nurseries | 4,477 | 176 | 258 | 434 | 52.0\% | 78.6\% | 5.5 | 94.7\% | 4.6 |
| Landscape | 8,467 | 65 | 126 | 191 | 32.3\% | 77.0\% | 18.6 | 96.3\% | 14.9 |
| Retailers | 7,359 | 9 | 204 | 213 | 48.7\% | 54.9\% | 30.6 | 90.6\% | 18.6 |
| Total | 20,303 | 250 | 588 | 838 | 42.8\% | 72.2\% |  | 94.0\% |  |

Economic impacts were estimated using a regional input-out model and social accounting matrix developed using the IMPLAN Pro software and the associated databases for Florida (2003) licensed from MIG, Inc. ${ }^{6}$ The IMPLAN databases consist of a set of socioeconomic accounts which describe the structure of the US economy in terms of transactions between households, governments, and 509 industry sectors classified on the basis of the primary commodity or service produced, according to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). The databases also describe local or regional economies in terms of industry output, value added, employment, imports and exports. A variety of statistical sources are used to construct these databases, including the annual and 5-year economic censuses conducted by the US Commerce Department and US Bureau of Labor Statistics. IMPLAN uses a matrix inversion procedure to develop economic multipliers which reflect the direct, indirect and induced impacts of specified changes in output or employment for any given industrial sector. Indirect impacts result from changes in economic activity of other industrial sectors which supply goods or services to the sector being evaluated. Induced impacts are the result of personal consumption expenditures by industry employees. The total economic impact is the sum of direct, indirect and induced impacts.

An IMPLAN model for Florida was constructed with all social accounts included, and all parameters set at default values. Economic multipliers for output (revenue), employment, value added, labor income, and indirect business taxes were compiled for each sector of the horticulture industry in Florida (Table 4).

Table 4. Economic multipliers for the environmental horticultural industry sectors in Florida.

| Multiplier/Effect |  | Greenhouse <br> and nursery <br> production | Services to <br> buildings and <br> dwellings <br> (Landscape) | Building <br> material and <br> garden <br> supply stores <br> (Retailers) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Output (sales revenue or | Direct | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| gross margin on sales) | Indirect | 0.027 | 0.413 | 0.212 |
| Induced | 1.358 | 1.193 | 1.405 |  |
| Employment (jobs per | Direct | 11.9 | 19.2 | 14.9 |
| million dollars output) | Indirect | 0.4 | 4.6 | 1.9 |
| Induced | 14.6 | 13.0 | 15.7 |  |
| Value Added (personal | Direct | 0.959 | 0.515 | 0.778 |
| and business net income) | Indirect | 0.018 | 0.260 | 0.127 |
| Labor Income (employee | Direct | 0.842 | 0.750 | 0.898 |
| salaries and wages, | Indirect | 0.377 | 0.410 | 0.463 |
| business owner profits) | Induced | 0.551 | 0.162 | 0.078 |
|  | Direct | 0.014 | 0.481 | 0.593 |
| Indirect Business Taxes | Indirect | 0.001 | 0.018 | 0.145 |
|  | Induced | 0.065 | 0.060 | 0.009 |
| Sorce Impa | 0.067 |  |  |  |

Source: Implan state data for Florida, 2003 (MIG, Inc., Stillwater, MN, Jan. 2006).

[^1]The multipliers capture overall effects of economic activity in the horticulture industry, including activity in the supply chain by vendors selling inputs to the industry (indirect effects), and the spending by industry employees (induced effects). The magnitude of the multipliers represents the strength of linkages in the regional economy to other sectors and institutions, and the share of total inputs provided to industry firms by other businesses within the region. Economic impacts of each sector of the horticultural industry were calculated using the direct effects multiplier on local or in-state sales, and the indirect and induced effects multipliers on non-local or out-of-state sales according to the following formula:

$$
\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{i}} \times \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{i}} \times\left[\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{ij}}+\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}} \times\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{ij}}+\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{ij}}\right)\right] ;
$$

where $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ is total impact for measures ( j ) of output, employment, value added, labor income, or indirect business taxes, in each sector ( $\mathrm{i}=$ nursery, landscape or retail),
$\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is industry sales in sector i ,
$\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the proportion of industry sales exported or shipped outside Florida by sector i ,
$\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ is the direct effects multiplier for measure j in sector i ,
$B_{i j}$ is the indirect effects multiplier for measure $j$ in sector $i$,
$\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ is the induced effects multiplier for measure j in sector i ,
$\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the gross margin on sales for retailers (retail sector only).
Non-local (export) sales were treated differently because they bring "new" money into the local economy to expand economic activity ${ }^{7}$. Total employment impacts were estimated from survey data for the direct effects, and from multipliers for the indirect and induced effects. Output of the retail sector was taken as the gross margin on sales estimated using the Annual Benchmark Report for Retail Trade (US Commerce Dept., 2005).

County and regional economic impacts were estimated from totals for the state of Florida, based on the share of statewide direct employment reported to the Florida Department of Labor for the first three quarters of 2005 (Table 5). The sector "Services to buildings" included landscaping services, while the sectors "Lawn and garden stores, "building material and supplies stores", and "florists" represented horticultural retailers. In some cases where employment was not reported for small counties due to nondisclosure rules, these amounts were estimated at the statewide average employment per firm.

Table 5. Reported employment and wages in environmental horticulture, by Florida County, Jan-Sep., 2005.

| County | Number <br> Firms Reporting | Employment (jobs) |  |  |  |  |  | Total Wages Paid (\$1000) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Greenhouse and nursery production | Services to buildings (incl. <br> landscape services) | Lawn and garden stores $\qquad$ | Building material and supplies stores | Florists | All Selected Sectors |  |
| Alachua | 271 | 216 | 1,301 | 192 | 773 | 93 | 2,575 | 44,681 |
| Baker | 29 | na | 45 | 16 | 28 | na | 89 | 920 |
| Bay | 217 | na | 1,138 | 50 | 837 | 57 | 2,082 | 34,858 |
| Bradford | 25 | na | 36 | na | 50 | na | 86 | 1,738 |
| Brevard | 689 | 76 | 2,671 | 190 | 2,633 | 157 | 5,727 | 104,082 |
| Broward | 2,358 | 467 | 12,172 | 326 | 6,861 | 464 | 20,291 | 357,142 |
| Calhoun | 11 | na | 12 | na | 39 | na | 51 | 930 |
| Charlotte | 224 | 52 | 657 | 61 | 765 | 56 | 1,592 | 29,038 |
| Citrus | 172 | 29 | 618 | 27 | 578 | 31 | 1,282 | 21,388 |
| Clay | 199 | na | 664 | 99 | 850 | 43 | 1,656 | 26,105 |
| Collier | 785 | 459 | 3,826 | 200 | 2,152 | 155 | 6,792 | 147,052 |
| Columbia | 44 | na | 170 | 35 | 228 | 14 | 447 | 7,923 |
| Desoto | 38 | 154 | 62 | 42 | 39 | na | 297 | 6,907 |
| Dixie | 8 | na | na | na | 46 | na | 46 | 311 |
| Duval | 1,161 | 247 | 7,785 | 219 | 4,161 | 269 | 12,682 | 231,921 |
| Escambia | 319 | na | 1,510 | 193 | 1,543 | 108 | 3,354 | 61,355 |
| Flagler | 150 | 192 | 660 | 38 | 423 | 30 | 1,343 | 24,807 |
| Franklin | 16 | na | 9 | na | 79 | 8 | 96 | 1,756 |
| Gadsden | 44 | 1,304 | 276 | na | 57 | na | 1,637 | 33,579 |
| Gilchrist | 18 | na | 28 | na | 41 | na | 70 | 1,096 |

[^2]| County | Number <br> Firms <br> Reporting | Employment (jobs) |  |  |  |  |  | Total Wages Paid (\$1000) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Greenhouse and nursery production | Services to buildings (incl. landscape services) | Lawn <br> and garden stores | Building material and supplies stores | Florists | All <br> Selected <br> Sectors |  |
| Glades | 9 | na | 22 | na | na | na | 22 | 373 |
| Gulf | 14 | na | 29 | na | 34 | na | 64 | 1,483 |
| Hamilton | 9 | na | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| Hardee | 37 | 213 | 62 | 37 | na | na | 313 | 5,881 |
| Hendry | 44 | na | 147 | 19 | 137 | 14 | 317 | 4,421 |
| Hernando | 206 | 68 | 951 | 46 | 551 | 48 | 1,664 | 28,334 |
| Highlands | 152 | 326 | 390 | 90 | 362 | 75 | 1,243 | 20,818 |
| Hillsborough | 1,383 | 1,706 | 10,069 | 358 | 5,061 | 248 | 17,443 | 326,358 |
| Holmes | 13 | na | 39 | na | 34 | na | 73 | 800 |
| Indian River | 274 | na | 1,137 | 62 | 801 | 74 | 2,074 | 42,965 |
| Jackson | 46 | 47 | 74 | 22 | 277 | 9 | 428 | 7,190 |
| Jefferson | 24 | 146 | 26 | 37 | 26 | na | 234 | 3,851 |
| Lafayette | 7 | na | na | 64 | na | na | 64 | 1,218 |
| Lake | 428 | 1,194 | 1,827 | 218 | 2,077 | 116 | 5,433 | 106,890 |
| Lee | 1,078 | 963 | 4,547 | 181 | 3,959 | 155 | 9,805 | 212,704 |
| Leon | 306 | na | 2,142 | 226 | 1,119 | 76 | 3,562 | 56,061 |
| Levy | 39 | 78 | 58 | 18 | 68 | 7 | 228 | 3,834 |
| Liberty | 3 | na | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| Madison | 18 | 61 | 12 | 24 | 66 | na | 163 | 2,308 |
| Manatee | 488 | 577 | 2,176 | 77 | 1,206 | 83 | 4,118 | 76,332 |
| Marion | 382 | 179 | 1,248 | 171 | 1,271 | 78 | 2,947 | 50,930 |
| Martin | 333 | 445 | 1,642 | 30 | 1,108 | 62 | 3,286 | 64,361 |
| Miami-Dade | 2,325 | 5,104 | 12,647 | 765 | 7,129 | 848 | 26,493 | 482,658 |
| Monroe | 166 | na | 436 | 7 | 446 | 24 | 913 | 18,092 |
| Nassau | 89 | na | 449 | 14 | 297 | 14 | 774 | 12,296 |
| Okaloosa | 275 | na | 1,252 | 67 | 1,090 | 133 | 2,542 | 40,874 |
| Okeechobee | 46 | 60 | 235 | 19 | 51 | na | 364 | 7,560 |
| Orange | 1,469 | 2,899 | 12,030 | 254 | 4,610 | 308 | 20,101 | 387,907 |
| Osceola | 306 | 224 | 1,706 | 69 | 840 | 38 | 2,876 | 49,388 |
| Palm Beach | 2,262 | 1,684 | 12,993 | 411 | 5,191 | 337 | 20,616 | 378,839 |
| Pasco | 502 | 178 | 2,412 | 112 | 1,406 | 84 | 4,191 | 77,614 |
| Pinellas | 1,264 | 55 | 6,061 | 222 | 3,764 | 253 | 10,355 | 184,506 |
| Polk | 619 | 510 | 2,826 | 241 | 2,659 | 147 | 6,383 | 117,836 |
| Putnam | 92 | 268 | 210 | 18 | 363 | 39 | 899 | 13,708 |
| St Johns | 213 | 138 | 864 | 165 | 583 | 29 | 1,779 | 35,381 |
| St Lucie | 340 | 166 | 1,438 | 137 | 1,001 | 53 | 2,795 | 58,253 |
| Santa Rosa | 166 | 72 | 712 | 33 | 746 | 47 | 1,610 | 25,764 |
| Sarasota | 853 | 111 | 3,916 | 181 | 1,882 | 145 | 6,236 | 120,652 |
| Seminole | 655 | 266 | 3,958 | 214 | 3,006 | 103 | 7,546 | 153,403 |
| Sumter | 54 | 218 | 116 | 19 | 149 | 24 | 527 | 9,198 |
| Suwannee | 50 | 40 | 123 | 51 | 136 | 13 | 363 | 5,912 |
| Taylor | 23 | na | 60 | na | 64 | 14 | 138 | 1,762 |
| Union | 10 | na | 36 | na | 12 | na | 48 | 375 |
| Volusia | 801 | 2,061 | 2,441 | 151 | 2,349 | 149 | 7,151 | 126,733 |
| Wakulla | 21 | na | 90 | na | 68 | na | 158 | 2,074 |
| Walton | 91 | na | 458 | 43 | 182 | 33 | 715 | 13,288 |
| Washington | 16 | 13 | 32 | na | na | na | 45 | 658 |
| Total | 24,775 | 23,260 | 127,744 | 6,562 | 78,363 | 5,367 | 241,295 | 4,479,435 |

Source: Florida Agency for Workforce Innovation, Labor Market Statistics, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages Program (QCEW), Tallahassee, FL. "na" indicates data not available due to nondisclosure rules.

## Survey Results

## Longevity of Industry Firms

Most firms surveyed were generally mature businesses, with about 40 to 45 percent of all firms having been in business for 20 years or more, and another 15 to 30 percent that had 11 to 19 years business experience (Figure 2). About 20 percent of nursery and retail firms had been in business for one to five years.

Figure 2. Years in business reported by survey respondents.


## Production Area Managed

A majority of growers with greenhouses or shadehouse had small production areas (less than 10,000 sq.ft.), while a few had very large areas over 1 million square feet (Figure 3). For container or field production areas, 3 and 4 percent of respondents reported having more than 100 acres, while 36 percent and 31 percent of respondents reported having less than 5 acres of production area, respectively (Figure 4). Total production area reported by survey respondents was 82,440 acres, including 57,843 acres for container production, 23,608 acres for field production, and 989 acres ( 43.1 million square feet) for greenhouses or shadehouses (Table 6).

Figure 3. Greenhouse or shadehouse area reported by survey respondents.


Figure 4. Container and field nursery area reported by survey respondents.


Table 6. Nursery production area reported.

| Type Growing Area | Acres |
| :--- | ---: |
| Container | 57,843 |
| Field | 23,608 |
| Greenhouse/Shadehouse | 989 |
| Total | 82,440 |

## Employment

Direct employment in 2005 reported by surveyed firms totaled 22,494 persons, including 7,811 employees in nurseries, 5,541 in landscape services, and 9,142 by horticultural retailers, with 15,900 (65\%) as full time employees, and 6,594 (35\%) as part-time, temporary or seasonal employees (Table 7). Part-time employment was reported by 81 percent of nurseries, 78 percent of landscape firms and 88 percent of retailers. The sample employment figures reported by survey respondents were used to estimate total employment in the industry according to the expansion factors discussed under methods. Total industry employment was estimated at 294,179 jobs, including 190,384 fulltime and 103,794 part-time, with 33,435 for nurseries, 87,914 for landscape services and 171,830 for retailers. These employment figures are significantly higher than the number of employees reported to the Florida Department of Labor for purposes of unemployment compensation because self-employed persons are not required to report employment and payroll to the government.

Table 7. Employment in the Florida environmental horticulture industry, 2005

| Industry Sector | Employment Reported by Survey |  | Total Industry Employment |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Fulltime | Part-time | Total | Fulltime | Part-time | Total |
| Nursery production | 6,230 | 1,581 | 7,811 | 25,659 | 8,776 | 33,435 |
| Landscape services | 4,004 | 1,537 | 5,541 | 59,513 | 28,402 | 87,914 |
| Horticultural retailing | 5,666 | 3,476 | 9,142 | 105,212 | 66,617 | 171,830 |
| Total | 15,900 | 6,594 | 22,494 | 190,384 | 103,795 | 294,179 |

* Estimated based on survey expansion factors (see methods).


## Sales of Environmental Horticultural Products and Services

Information on annual sales was reported by 79 percent of nurseries, 77 percent of landscape firms, and 55 percent of retailers surveyed. Respondents who reported annual sales of less than $\$ 500,000$ represented 42 percent of nurseries, 38 percent of landscape firms, and 32 percent of retailers surveyed, while those with annual sales exceeding $\$ 10$ million (Mn) were 1.6, 2.5 and 3.3 percent, respectively (Figure 5)

Total annual sales for each industry sector were estimated based on this number of respondents reporting annual sales in each class, and assuming sales equal to the midpoint value of the range, together with expansion factors, as discussed under methods. Sales reported by survey respondents were $\$ 1.05$ billion (Bn). Total industry sales were estimated at $\$ 15.24 \mathrm{Bn}$, including $\$ 3.01 \mathrm{Bn}$ by nurseries, $\$ 5.25 \mathrm{Bn}$ by landscape service firms, and $\$ 6.97$ Bn by horticultural retailers (Table 8 ). In the nursery sector, secondary data on sales of turfgrass and cut foliage (ferns) were included in these estimated sales.
Figure 5. Distribution of respondents by annual sales class


Table 8. Sales reported by survey respondents and estimated total industry sales, 2005.

| Industry Sector | Total Sales <br> Reported <br> (Mn \$) | Total <br> Industry <br> Sales <br> (Mn \$)* |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Nursery production | 543.3 | $3,007.2$ |
| Landscape services | 282.7 | $5,254.8$ |
| Horticultural retailing | 227.6 | $6,970.6$ |
| Total | $1,053.5$ | $15,236.5$ |

* Estimated based on survey sample expansion factors (see methods).

Sales of industry firms were compiled by market region, including international, national, state, and local. The local area was defined as the city or county in which the business was located, or within a 50 mile radius. For nurseries, 32 percent of total sales were to local markets, 26 percent were to other areas within Florida, 14 percent were to other southeast U.S. states, 12 percent to northeast states, 8 percent to the midwest, 6 percent to western states, and 1 percent each to Canada and to other foreign countries (Figure 6). Thus, 42 percent of nursery sales were to markets outside the state and 58 percent were within Florida. For foliage growers specifically, 13 percent of total sales were to local markets, 12 percent were to other areas within Florida, 13 percent were to other southeast U.S. states, 30 percent to northeast states, 18 percent to the midwest, 9 percent to western states, 4 percent to Canada, and 1 percent to other foreign countries. For retailers and landscapers, most sales were to local or state markets, 99 percent and 88 percent, respectively.

Figure 6. Distribution of nursery sales by market region.


Sales of specific types of horticultural products and services are detailed in Figure 7 and Table 9. For nursery producers, the largest-selling product types were shrubs ( $\$ 578 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), representing 19 percent of total grower sales, followed by tropical foliage ( $\$ 437 \mathrm{Mn}, 15 \%$ ), deciduous trees ( $\$ 389 \mathrm{Mn}, 13 \%$ ), turfgrass ( $\$ 307$ $\mathrm{Mn}, 10 \%$ ), liners ( $\$ 297 \mathrm{Mn}, 10 \%$ ), and potted flowering plants ( $\$ 281 \mathrm{Mn}, 9 \%$ ). Total sales of trees, including deciduous, evergreen and flowering trees amounted to $\$ 670 \mathrm{Mn}$ or 22 percent of grower sales. Palms were a major Florida specialty product, valued at $\$ 220 \mathrm{Mn}$, representing 7 percent of grower sales. Sales of miscellaneous other unspecified plant types amounted to 2 percent. Sales of turfgrass sod valued at $\$ 307 \mathrm{Mn}$ and sales of cut flowers/foliage (ferns) valued at $\$ 96 \mathrm{Mn}$, were taken from separate sources ${ }^{8}$ because these were not reported in this survey. Sales of plants native to the State of Florida were valued at $\$ 316 \mathrm{Mn}$ or 11 percent of total grower sales.
Figure 7. Plant product sales by growers.


[^3]Foliage, Floriculture and Cut Greens. Florida Agricultural Statistics Service, USDA, Orlando, May 2005.

For the landscape services sector, landscape installation represented sales of $\$ 2.45 \mathrm{Bn}$, or 47 percent of total industry sales, while landscape maintenance represents $\$ 1.58 \mathrm{Bn}$ or 30 percent, landscape design was 10 percent and miscellaneous other landscape services were 14 percent.

Sales by horticultural retailers included plants valued at $\$ 2.75 \mathrm{Bn}$ or 40 percent of total sales, lawn and garden supplies such as fertilizers and chemicals valued at $\$ 2.14 \mathrm{Bn}$ (31\%), horticultural hard goods such as tools and equipment values at $\$ 762 \mathrm{Mn}(11 \%)$, and miscellaneous other horticultural goods valued at $\$ 1.31$ Bn (19\%).

Table 9. Sales of specific types of environmental horticultural products and services

| Sector and Product/Service | Value <br> Reported <br> (Mn \$) | Expanded <br> Value <br> (Mn. \$) | Percent <br> of Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Nurseries | 115.7 | 578.7 | $19.2 \%$ |
| Shrubs | 87.5 | 437.5 | $14.6 \%$ |
| Tropical foliage | 77.7 | 388.9 | $12.9 \%$ |
| Deciduous trees | na | 307.0 | $10.2 \%$ |
| Turfgrass* | 59.4 | 297.0 | $9.9 \%$ |
| Liners | 56.1 | 280.9 | $9.3 \%$ |
| Potted flowering plants | 44.0 | 219.9 | $7.3 \%$ |
| Palms | 29.4 | 147.2 | $4.9 \%$ |
| Evergreen trees | 26.6 | 133.3 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Flowering trees | na | 96.2 | $3.2 \%$ |
| Cut flowers/foliage (ferns)* | 13.2 | 66.2 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Ground covers | 10.8 | 54.2 | $1.8 \%$ |
| Other plants | 521.9 | $3,007.2$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total | 55.0 | 316.9 | $10.5 \%$ |
| Native plants |  |  |  |
| Landscape Services | 123.5 | $2,452.3$ | $46.6 \%$ |
| Landscape installation | 79.7 | $1,582.9$ | $30.1 \%$ |
| Landscape maintenance | 25.6 | 509.2 | $9.7 \%$ |
| Landscape design | 36.0 | 714.0 | $13.6 \%$ |
| Other landscape service | 264.8 | $5,258.5$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |
|  | Retailers | 52.9 | $2,752.5$ |
| Live plants | $39.5 \%$ |  |  |
| Lawn and garden supplies | 41.2 | $2,144.2$ | $30.8 \%$ |
| Horticultural hard goods | 14.6 | 761.8 | $10.9 \%$ |
| Other retail goods | 25.2 | $1,312.3$ | $18.8 \%$ |
| Total | 134.0 | $6,970.9$ | $100 \%$ |

* Values for turfgrass and cut flower/foliage were taken from secondary sources.


## Market Channels and Practices for Horticultural Products

Sales of Florida horticultural products and services to different types of customers are summarized in Figures 8 through 10. For nurseries, the most important customers were other growers, representing 22 percent of total sales, re-wholesalers or brokers (21\%), and landscape contractors (19\%) (Figure 8). Also important were mass merchandise stores (9\%), independent retail garden centers (7\%), and interiorscapers (6\%). For landscape firms, the most important customer segments were governments (29\%), homeowners (24\%), builders and developers ( $23 \%$ ), commercial establishments (12\%) and apartments and condominiums (9\%) (Figure 9). For horticultural retailers the dominant market was homeowners, representing 63 percent of total sales, followed by apartments and condominiums (15\%), and commercial establishments (9\%) (Figure 10).

Figure 8. Distribution of nursery product sales by type of customer.


Figure 9. Distribution of landscape service sales by type of customer.


Figure 10. Distribution of retail horticultural product sales by type of customer.


When nursery respondents were asked to indicate which type of market outlets are expanding, nearly 71 percent answered that "other growers" were a growing market, followed by rewholesalers (52\%), landscape contractors (47\%), interiorscapers (25\%), and landscape maintenance firms at 24 percent (Figure 11). It is apparent that the marketing of ornamental plants through brokers and other growers is becoming more developed in the industry, and that demand from landscape professionals is also strong, while demand from retailers is growing more slowly. For foliage growers specifically, a similar pattern was observed, with a somewhat higher percentage of respondents indicating that all of the top-ranked markets were expanding.

Figure 11. Markets for nursery products identified as expanding by survey respondents.


Marketing practices reported by survey respondents are summarized in Figure 12. The most commonly reported practices for nurseries were personal selling (57\%), trade shows (38\%), charitable contributions and civic events (37\%), and trade magazines (33\%). For landscapers, the most frequently cited practices were personal selling (49\%), civic event and charitable contributions (35\%), print media (31\%), and internet websites (26\%). Retailers reported generally higher use of most marketing practices, including charitable contributions and civic events (67\%), print media (54\%), internet websites (54\%), promotions (46\%) personal selling (43\%) and direct mail (41\%).

Figure 12. Marketing practices used by firms surveyed.


## Impacts of Hurricanes on the Environmental Horticulture Industry in 2004 and 2005

The state of Florida was struck by an unprecedented series of eight major hurricanes during the 2004 and 2005 seasons. These storms did tremendous damage to infrastructure, and caused large losses of products for sale and to business activity throughout the state's economy, particularly the agricultural sector. Nearly 79 percent of survey firms in the environmental horticulture industry indicated that they were impacted by at least one of these hurricanes, including 83 percent of nurseries, 67 percent of landscape firms, and 82 percent of horticultural retailers. The largest percentages of all firms were affected by hurricanes Frances (53\%), Jeanne (44\%), Charley (43\%), and Wilma (42\%) (Figure 13).

Figure 13. Industry firms directly affected by named hurricanes in 2004 and 2005.


Survey respondents were asked to report losses of products (crops), structural damages, cleanup costs, and length of business interruption, either as a specific value or within a range of values offered. Losses of products for sale valued at $\$ 100,000$ or more were reported by 22 percent of all firms, while losses of at least $\$ 1$ million were reported by 4 percent of firms, including 7 percent of nurseries (Figure 14). Structural damages of at least $\$ 100,000$ were sustained by 12 percent of firms (Figure 15). Cleanup costs of at least $\$ 100,000$ were reported by 8 percent of firms (Figure 16). Nearly half ( $49 \%$ ) of firms had their business interrupted for 3 weeks or more (Figure 17).

This information reported by respondents was used to estimate total damages for the entire population of industry firms. Actual losses incurred were assumed to be at the midpoint of the range of values selected. Estimated total damages due to the hurricanes during 2004 and 2005 amounted to $\$ 2.12 \mathrm{Bn}$ including product losses of $\$ 1.05 \mathrm{Bn}$, structural damages of $\$ 465 \mathrm{Mn}$ and cleanup costs of $\$ 605 \mathrm{Mn}$ (Table 10). Total losses were $\$ 964 \mathrm{Mn}$ for nurseries, $\$ 675 \mathrm{Mn}$ for landscape firms and $\$ 482 \mathrm{Mn}$ for retailers.
Table 10. Estimated total losses due to hurricanes in 2004 and 2005.

| Type Loss | Nursery | Landscape | Retail | All Sectors |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Million dollars |  |  |  |
| Product (crop) Losses | 659.5 | 273.1 | 117.8 | $1,050.4$ |
| Structural Damage | 183.3 | 61.2 | 220.6 | 465.4 |
| Cleanup Costs | 121.5 | 340.5 | 143.3 | 605.3 |
| Total | 964.3 | 674.8 | 481.8 | $2,120.9$ |

Figure 14. Distribution of product (crop) losses due to hurricanes in 2004 and 2005.


Figure 15. Distribution of structural damages due to hurricanes in 2004 and 2005.


Figure 16. Distribution of cleanup costs due to hurricanes in 2004 and 2005.


Figure 17. Distribution of total length of business interruption due to hurricanes in 2004 and 2005.


## Issues and Threats to the Environmental Horticulture Industry

Survey respondents were asked to rate possible threats facing the environmental horticulture industry in Florida in terms of "not important", "somewhat important" or "very important". Threats that were rated as "very important" by a majority of respondents were "increasing costs of production" ( $61 \%$ ), "drought, water availability and water use restrictions" (57\%), and "increasing energy costs" (53\%). In addition, "low prices for products" was cited as an important concern of nurseries and retailers, "lack of professionalism" was cited by landscape firms (57\%), and "market power of retail chains" was cited by retailers (Figure 18).

Figure 18. Issues rated as "very important" by survey respondents.


## Financial Borrowing Characteristics and Needs for Wholesale Nurseries

The financial needs of wholesale nurseries were assessed in this study at the request of the funding partners, and results are summarized in Table 11. Some 41 percent of respondents indicated that they do use credit from financial institutions. Among the reasons considered by managers for choosing a particular financial lender, the most often cited reason was "competitive interest rates", cited by 83 percent of respondents, followed by "convenient/flexible repayment terms" (47\%). Nearly two thirds (63\%) of respondents indicated that they were "very satisfied" with their current lender, 23 percent were "somewhat satisfied", and only 4 percent were "very dissatisfied" or "somewhat dissatisfied".

Respondents were also asked about their anticipated credit needs over the next year. Nearly half ( $42 \%$ ) of firms expected their credit needs to remain the same as the previous year, while 26 percent expected an increased need for credit and 30 percent expected a decreased need for credit. Among the firms reporting credit needs to increase, an increase of 20 percent or more was expected by 40 percent of respondents, while a similar percentage of respondents expected credit needs to decrease by this amount. When asked about their use of electronic banking, 53 percent of respondents indicated that they do use electronic banking and 42 percent did not. Finally, in regard to the issue of electronic applications for loans, 28 percent said they would be interested and 68 percent said they would not be interested.

Table 11. Financial borrowing characteristics and credit needs of nurseries.

|  | Number Respondents | Percent of Nursery Respondents |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Does Company Borrow Credit? |  |  |
| Yes | 185 | 40.7\% |
| No | 221 | 48.7\% |
| Don't know/Refused | 48 | 10.6\% |
| Factors for Selecting a Lender |  |  |
| Competitive interest rates | 154 | 83.2\% |
| Convenient/flexible repayment terms | 87 | 47.0\% |
| Knowledge of the industry | 63 | 34.1\% |
| Operates like a cooperative | 34 | 18.4\% |
| Long term or personal relationship with representative | 55 | 29.7\% |
| Other reason | 8 | 4.3\% |
| Satisfaction with Lender |  |  |
| Very satisfied | 117 | 63.2\% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 42 | 22.7\% |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 7 | 3.8\% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 5 | 2.7\% |
| Very dissatisfied | 2 | 1.1\% |
| Change in Credit Needs Expected Next Year |  |  |
| Increase | 47 | 26.4\% |
| 1-5\% | 5 | 10.6\% |
| 6-10\% | 4 | 8.5\% |
| 11-15\% | 7 | 14.9\% |
| 16-19\% | 8 | 17.0\% |
| 20\% or more | 19 | 40.4\% |
| Decrease | 53 | 29.8\% |
| 1-5\% | 4 | 7.5\% |
| 6-10\% | 11 | 20.8\% |
| 11-15\% | 3 | 5.7\% |
| 16-19\% | 3 | 5.7\% |
| 20\% or more | 21 | 39.6\% |
| Remain same | 76 | 42.7\% |
| Don't know/Refused | 2 | 1.1\% |
| Consider Electronic Banking |  |  |
| Yes | 99 | 53.5\% |
| No | 78 | 42.2\% |
| Don't know/Refused | 3 | 1.6\% |
| Consider Loan Application on Internet |  |  |
| Yes | 51 | 27.6\% |
| No | 126 | 68.1\% |
| Don't know/Refused | 3 | 1.6\% |

## Economic Impact Results

## State Impacts

The economic impacts of the environmental horticulture industry in Florida were estimated using the Implan input-output regional modeling system, together with survey results for sales, employment, and regional market flows (see Methods). For the nursery and landscape sectors direct output represents industry sales, but for the retail sector, output was calculated as the gross margin on sales ( $30.5 \%$ ). Indirect and induced impacts on nonlocal output (export sales) were calculated using Implan multipliers for Florida (2003).

The total output or revenue impact of the industry in 2005 was estimated at $\$ 12.64$ billion (Bn), including $\$ 10.39 \mathrm{Bn}$ in direct output impacts of industry sales, plus $\$ 100 \mathrm{Mn}$ in indirect impacts from allied firms that supply inputs to the horticulture sectors, and $\$ 2.15 \mathrm{Bn}$ in induced impacts associated with consumer spending by industry employee households (Table 12). Total output impacts were $\$ 4.77 \mathrm{Bn}$ for nurseries, $\$ 5.27 \mathrm{Bn}$ for landscape services firms, and $\$ 2.60 \mathrm{Bn}$ for horticultural retailers. Nurseries had significant indirect and induced impacts associated with the large nonlocal sales.

The total employment impact of the environmental horticulture industry was estimated at 318,573 jobs, including both fulltime and part-time/seasonal, with 53,551 for nurseries, 88,073 for landscape services, and 176,949 for horticultural retailers (Table 12).

Value added is an important measure of an industry's contribution to a regional economy that represents the difference between sales revenues and the cost of purchased inputs, and includes the value of employee wages and benefits, owner's compensation, dividends, capital outlays and business taxes paid. The total value added impact of Florida's horticulture industry was $\$ 8.65 \mathrm{Bn}$, including $\$ 3.98 \mathrm{Bn}$ by nurseries, $\$ 2.72$ Bn by landscape services and $\$ 1.95$ Bn by retailers (Table 12). Total labor income impacts, which are a subset of value added, were $\$ 5.19 \mathrm{Bn}$. The impact on indirect business taxes paid to state and local governments was $\$ 549 \mathrm{Mn}$.
Table 12. Summary of economic impacts of the environmental horticulture industry in Florida, 2005.

| Industry <br> Sector | Direct Output (Mn\$) | Non- <br> Local <br> Output <br> (Mn\$) | Indirect <br> Output <br> Impact <br> (Mn\$) | Induced <br> Output <br> Impact <br> (Mn\$) | Total <br> Output <br> Impact <br> (Mn\$) | Employment Impact (jobs) | Value <br> Added <br> Impact <br> (Mn\$) | Labor <br> Income <br> Impact <br> (Mn\$) | Indirect <br> Business <br> Tax <br> Impact <br> (Mn\$) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nursery \& Greenhouse | 3,007.9 | 1,270.4 | 34.7 | 1,725.4 | 4,768.0 | 53,551 | 3,977.9 | 1,847.9 | 125.4 |
| Landscape Services | 5,258.5 | 9.0 | 3.7 | 10.7 | 5,273.0 | 88,073 | 2,718.2 | 2,161.1 | 93.2 |
| Horticultural Retailers | 2,126.0 | 290.6 | 61.6 | 408.1 | 2,595.9 | 176,949 | 1,951.7 | 1,180.3 | 330.2 |
| Total | 10,391.8 | 1,570.5 | 100.1 | 2,145.0 | 12,636.9 | 318,573 | 8,647.8 | 5,189.3 | 548.8 |

## Comparison with Previous Studies for 1997 and 2000

In this section, the economic impacts of the Florida environmental horticulture industry in 2005 are compared with results from previous studies for 1997 and 2000 (Table 13). These three studies were all conducted using similar, though not identical methods. All values are expressed in 2005 dollars. Total industry sales increased from $\$ 8.35 \mathrm{Bn}$ in 1997 to $\$ 15.24 \mathrm{Bn}$ in 2005, which represents a 7.8 percent average annual compound growth rate during the 8 year period. Growth in sales during the 2000-05 period was slightly lower at 6.5 percent annually, suggesting that industry growth may be slowing. Sales growth was highest for the retail sector (11.1\%), followed by landscape services (6.5\%) and nurseries (4.2\%). The total output impact increased from $\$ 8.17 \mathrm{Bn}$ in 1997 to $\$ 12.64 \mathrm{Bn}$ in 2005, representing an average annual growth rate of 5.6 percent. Total employment impacts more than doubled between 1997 and 2005, from 158 to 318 thousand jobs, growing 9.2 percent annually. This large increase was mainly driven by the retail sector, while employment in the landscape sector was essentially flat. Total value added impacts increased from $\$ 5.97$ to $\$ 8.65 \mathrm{Bn}$, or 4.7 percent annually, as charted in Figure 19.

Figure 19. Trend in value added impacts of the Florida environmental horticulture industry, 1997 to 2005.


Table 13. Economic impacts of the Florida environmental horticulture industry in 1997, 2000 and 2005.

| Impact / Sector | 2005 | 2000* | 1997* | Average Annual Compound Growth Rate 1997-2005 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sales (million \$) | 15,237 | 11,120 | 8,353 | 7.8\% |
| Production (nursery \& greenhouse) | 3,007 | 2,526 | 2,164 | 4.2\% |
| Landscape Services | 5,259 | 3,491 | 3,185 | 6.5\% |
| Retail/Trade | 6,971 | 5,103 | 3,005 | 11.1\% |
| Direct Output (million \$) | 10,392 | 7,735 | 6,424 | 6.2\% |
| Production (nursery \& greenhouse) | 3,007 | 2,526 | 2,164 | 4.2\% |
| Landscape Services | 5,259 | 3,491 | 3,185 | 6.5\% |
| Retail/Trade | 2,126 | 1,718 | 1,075 | 8.9\% |
| Output Impacts (million \$) | 12,637 | 10,285 | 8,173 | 5.6\% |
| Production (nursery \& greenhouse) | 4,768 | 3,901 | 3,145 | 5.3\% |
| Landscape Services | 5,273 | 3,810 | 3,350 | 5.8\% |
| Retail/Trade | 2,596 | 2,574 | 1,678 | 5.6\% |
| Value Added Impacts (million \$) | 8,648 | 7,184 | 5,973 | 4.7\% |
| Production (nursery \& greenhouse) | 3,978 | 2,826 | 2,238 | 7.5\% |
| Landscape Services | 2,718 | 2,391 | 2,502 | 1.0\% |
| Retail/Trade | 1,952 | 1,968 | 1,234 | 5.9\% |
| Labor Income Impacts (million \$) | 5,189 | 4,622 | 3,931 | 3.5\% |
| Production (nursery \& greenhouse) | 1,848 | 1,805 | 1,208 | 5.5\% |
| Landscape Services | 2,161 | 1,592 | 1,931 | 1.4\% |
| Retail/Trade | 1,180 | 1,227 | 792 | 5.1\% |
| Indirect Business Tax Impacts (million \$) | 549 | 519 | 356 | 5.6\% |
| Production (nursery \& greenhouse) | 125 | 101 | 67 | 8.1\% |
| Landscape Services | 93 | 106 | 91 | 0.4\% |
| Retail/Trade | 330 | 312 | 198 | 6.6\% |
| Employment Impacts (jobs) | 318,573 | 187,860 | 157,950 | 9.2\% |
| Production (nursery \& greenhouse) | 53,551 | 54,288 | 44,892 | 2.2\% |
| Landscape Services | 88,073 | 64,282 | 89,517 | -0.4\% |
| Retail/Trade | 176,949 | 69,290 | 23,541 | 28.7\% |

## Regional and County Economic Impacts

Economic impacts of the Florida environmental horticulture industry in 2005 were estimated for individual counties by allocating total statewide impacts in relation to county-level direct employment reported by the Florida Department of Labor (see Methods section). County level impacts are summarized in Tables 14 and 15 and Figure 20. Total industry sales exceeded a billion dollars in the counties of Miami-Dade ( $\$ 1.98 \mathrm{Bn}$ ), Palm Beach ( $\$ 1.18 \mathrm{Bn}$ ), Orange ( $\$ 1.14 \mathrm{Bn}$ ) and Hillsborough ( $\$ 1.01 \mathrm{Bn}$ ). Total output impacts were highest in the counties of Miami-Dade ( $\$ 1.87 \mathrm{Bn}$ ), Orange ( $\$ 1.19 \mathrm{Bn}$ ), Palm Beach ( $\$ 1.04 \mathrm{Bn}$ ), Hillsborough (\$905 Mn), Broward (\$725 Mn), Volusia (\$582 Mn), Duval (\$457 Mn), Lee (\$455 Mn), Lake ( $\$ 405 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), Pinellas ( $\$ 348 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), Collier ( $\$ 330 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), Polk ( $\$ 315 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), and Seminole ( $\$ 301 \mathrm{Mn}$ ). Total employment impacts were highest in the same counties, but in a slightly different order: Miami-Dade (40,837 jobs), Palm Beach (23,776), Orange (21,733), Hillsborough (20,410), Broward (18,157), Duval $(11,768)$, Volusia $(10,454)$, Pinellas $(10,208)$, Lee $(10,162)$, Lake $(9,814)$, Polk $(9,532)$, Collier $(9,030)$, and Seminole $(9,031)$, as shown in Figure 20. Value added impacts in the top six counties were: Miami-Dade ( $\$ 1.37 \mathrm{Bn}$ ), Orange ( $\$ 825 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), Palm Beach ( $\$ 684 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), Hillsborough ( $\$ 610 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), Volusia ( $\$ 448 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), and Broward ( $\$ 434$ Mn ).

In the nursery sector, county level employment impacts were greatest in Miami-Dade (11,741 jobs), Orange $(6,668)$, Volusia $(4,740)$, Hillsborough $(3,925)$, and Palm Beach $(3,873)$. In the landscape services sector, county level employment impacts were highest in Palm Beach ( 8,954 jobs), Miami-Dade ( 8,716 ), Broward $(8,388)$, Orange $(8,290)$, and Hillsborough $(6,939)$. In the horticultural retailing sector county-level employment impacts were highest in Miami-Dade (20,380 jobs), Palm Beach $(10,949)$, Hillsborough $(9,546)$, Broward $(8,694)$, and Orange $(6,776)$.

Figure 20. Employment impacts of the environmental horticulture industry in the top 20 Florida counties, 2005.


Table 14. Sales and output impacts of the environmental horticulture industry in Florida counties, 2005.

| County | Sales (million \$) |  |  |  | Output Impact (million \$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nursery | Landscape | Retail | All Sectors | Nursery | Landscape | Retail | All Sectors |
| Alachua | 27.9 | 53.5 | 201.5 | 283.0 | 44.3 | 53.7 | 75.0 | 173.0 |
| Baker | 0.3 | 1.9 | 16.8 | 18.9 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 6.3 | 8.6 |
| Bay | 0.1 | 46.8 | 52.8 | 99.8 | 0.2 | 46.9 | 19.7 | 66.8 |
| Bradford | 0.0 | 1.5 | 10.5 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 3.9 | 5.4 |
| Brevard | 9.8 | 109.9 | 199.8 | 319.5 | 15.6 | 110.2 | 74.4 | 200.2 |
| Broward | 60.4 | 500.8 | 342.5 | 903.7 | 95.7 | 502.2 | 127.5 | 725.5 |
| Calhoun | 0.1 | 0.5 | 10.5 | 11.1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 3.9 | 4.6 |
| Charlotte | 6.7 | 27.0 | 64.0 | 97.8 | 10.7 | 27.1 | 23.8 | 61.6 |
| Citrus | 3.7 | 25.4 | 28.7 | 57.8 | 5.8 | 25.5 | 10.7 | 42.0 |
| Clay | 0.2 | 27.3 | 103.9 | 131.4 | 0.3 | 27.4 | 38.7 | 66.4 |
| Collier | 59.3 | 157.4 | 210.3 | 427.0 | 94.1 | 157.8 | 78.3 | 330.2 |
| Columbia | 0.1 | 7.0 | 36.4 | 43.5 | 0.2 | 7.0 | 13.5 | 20.8 |
| DeSoto | 19.9 | 2.6 | 43.7 | 66.2 | 31.5 | 2.6 | 16.3 | 50.4 |
| Dixie | 0.1 | 0.5 | 4.5 | 5.1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 2.4 |
| Duval | 31.9 | 320.3 | 229.8 | 582.1 | 50.6 | 321.2 | 85.6 | 457.4 |
| Escambia | 0.1 | 62.1 | 202.9 | 265.1 | 0.2 | 62.3 | 75.6 | 138.0 |
| Flagler | 24.8 | 27.2 | 39.5 | 91.5 | 39.3 | 27.2 | 14.7 | 81.3 |
| Franklin | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Gadsden | 168.4 | 11.4 | 4.5 | 184.3 | 267.0 | 11.4 | 1.7 | 280.1 |
| Gilchrist | 0.1 | 1.2 | 9.0 | 10.2 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 3.3 | 4.6 |
| Glades | 0.1 | 0.9 | 4.5 | 5.5 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 2.7 |
| Gulf | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
| Hamilton | 0.1 | 1.1 | 4.5 | 5.6 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 2.9 |
| Hardee | 27.5 | 2.6 | 39.2 | 69.3 | 43.7 | 2.6 | 14.6 | 60.8 |
| Hendry | 0.1 | 6.1 | 19.9 | 26.1 | 0.2 | 6.1 | 7.4 | 13.7 |
| Hernando | 8.8 | 39.1 | 48.3 | 96.2 | 13.9 | 39.2 | 18.0 | 71.1 |
| Highlands | 42.1 | 16.1 | 94.5 | 152.6 | 66.8 | 16.1 | 35.2 | 118.1 |
| Hillsborough | 220.4 | 414.3 | 376.1 | 1,010.8 | 349.5 | 415.4 | 140.0 | 905.0 |
| Holmes | 0.0 | 1.6 | 9.0 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 5.0 |
| Indian River | 0.3 | 46.8 | 65.1 | 112.1 | 0.4 | 46.9 | 24.2 | 71.6 |
| Jackson | 6.0 | 3.0 | 23.4 | 32.5 | 9.5 | 3.1 | 8.7 | 21.3 |
| Jefferson | 18.8 | 1.1 | 38.5 | 58.3 | 29.8 | 1.1 | 14.3 | 45.2 |
| Lafayette | 0.1 | 0.6 | 67.5 | 68.2 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 25.1 | 25.8 |
| Lake | 154.3 | 75.2 | 228.8 | 458.3 | 244.6 | 75.4 | 85.2 | 405.2 |
| Lee | 124.4 | 187.1 | 189.6 | 501.1 | 197.2 | 187.6 | 70.6 | 455.5 |
| Leon | 0.1 | 88.1 | 237.2 | 325.4 | 0.2 | 88.4 | 88.3 | 176.9 |
| Levy | 10.0 | 2.4 | 18.9 | 31.3 | 15.9 | 2.4 | 7.0 | 25.3 |
| Liberty | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Madison | 7.8 | 0.5 | 25.2 | 33.5 | 12.4 | 0.5 | 9.4 | 22.3 |
| Manatee | 74.5 | 89.5 | 80.5 | 244.5 | 118.1 | 89.8 | 30.0 | 237.9 |
| Marion | 23.1 | 51.3 | 179.5 | 253.9 | 36.6 | 51.5 | 66.8 | 154.9 |
| Martin | 57.4 | 67.5 | 31.1 | 156.1 | 91.0 | 67.7 | 11.6 | 170.4 |
| Miami-Dade | 659.3 | 520.4 | 802.9 | 1,982.6 | 1,045.4 | 521.8 | 299.0 | 1,866.2 |
| Monroe | 0.1 | 18.0 | 7.3 | 25.4 | 0.1 | 18.0 | 2.7 | 20.8 |
| Nassau | 0.1 | 18.5 | 14.7 | 33.3 | 0.1 | 18.5 | 5.5 | 24.1 |
| Okaloosa | 0.1 | 51.5 | 70.3 | 121.9 | 0.1 | 51.7 | 26.2 | 77.9 |
| Okeechobee | 7.7 | 9.7 | 19.6 | 37.0 | 12.2 | 9.7 | 7.3 | 29.2 |
| Orange | 374.4 | 495.0 | 266.9 | 1,136.3 | 593.7 | 496.3 | 99.4 | 1,189.4 |
| Osceola | 28.9 | 70.2 | 72.1 | 171.1 | 45.8 | 70.4 | 26.8 | 143.0 |
| Palm Beach | 217.5 | 534.6 | 431.3 | 1,183.4 | 344.8 | 536.1 | 160.6 | 1,041.5 |
| Pasco | 23.0 | 99.2 | 117.5 | 239.7 | 36.4 | 99.5 | 43.8 | 179.7 |
| Pinellas | 7.1 | 249.4 | 232.6 | 489.1 | 11.3 | 250.1 | 86.6 | 348.0 |
| Polk | 65.9 | 116.3 | 252.6 | 434.8 | 104.5 | 116.6 | 94.1 | 315.1 |
| Putnam | 34.7 | 8.7 | 19.2 | 62.5 | 54.9 | 8.7 | 7.2 | 70.8 |
|  |  |  |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |


| County | Sales (million \$) |  |  |  | Output Impact (million \$) |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Nursery | Landscape | Retail | All Sectors | Nursery | Landscape | Retail | All Sectors |
| St. Johns | 17.8 | 35.6 | 173.5 | 226.8 | 28.2 | 35.7 | 64.6 | 128.4 |
| St. Lucie | 21.4 | 59.2 | 143.8 | 224.4 | 33.9 | 59.3 | 53.5 | 146.8 |
| Santa Rosa | 9.3 | 29.3 | 34.6 | 73.2 | 14.7 | 29.4 | 12.9 | 57.0 |
| Sarasota | 14.3 | 161.1 | 190.0 | 365.4 | 22.7 | 161.6 | 70.7 | 255.1 |
| Seminole | 34.3 | 162.9 | 224.2 | 421.4 | 54.4 | 163.3 | 83.5 | 301.2 |
| Sumter | 28.2 | 4.8 | 20.3 | 53.2 | 44.7 | 4.8 | 7.6 | 57.0 |
| Suwannee | 5.1 | 5.1 | 53.5 | 63.7 | 8.1 | 5.1 | 19.9 | 33.1 |
| Taylor | 0.1 | 2.5 | 9.0 | 11.6 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 6.1 |
| Union | 0.1 | 1.5 | 4.5 | 6.0 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 3.3 |
| Volusia | 266.2 | 100.4 | 158.8 | 525.4 | 422.0 | 100.7 | 59.1 | 581.9 |
| Wakulla | 0.1 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 8.3 | 0.1 | 3.7 | 1.7 | 5.5 |
| Walton | 0.1 | 18.8 | 45.1 | 64.0 | 0.1 | 18.9 | 16.8 | 35.8 |
| Washington | 1.6 | 1.3 | 9.0 | 12.0 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 3.3 | 7.3 |
| Total | 3,007 | 5,259 | 6,971 | 15,237 | $4,768.0$ | $5,273.0$ | $2,595.9$ | $12,636.9$ |

Table 15. Employment and value added impacts of the environmental horticulture industry in Florida counties, 2005.

| County | Employment Impact (jobs) |  |  |  | Value Added Impact (million \$) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nursery | Landscape | Retail | All Sectors | Nursery | Landscape | Retail | All Sectors |
| Alachua | 497 | 896 | 5,115 | 6,509 | 37.0 | 27.7 | 56.4 | 121.0 |
| Baker | 5 | 31 | 426 | 462 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 4.7 | 6.0 |
| Bay | 2 | 784 | 1,341 | 2,127 | 0.2 | 24.2 | 14.8 | 39.2 |
| Bradford | 0 | 25 | 266 | 291 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 3.7 |
| Brevard | 175 | 1,841 | 5,071 | 7,086 | 13.0 | 56.8 | 55.9 | 125.7 |
| Broward | 1,075 | 8,388 | 8,694 | 18,157 | 79.8 | 258.9 | 95.9 | 434.6 |
| Calhoun | 2 | 8 | 266 | 277 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 2.9 | 3.4 |
| Charlotte | 120 | 453 | 1,625 | 2,197 | 8.9 | 14.0 | 17.9 | 40.8 |
| Citrus | 66 | 426 | 728 | 1,219 | 4.9 | 13.1 | 8.0 | 26.0 |
| Clay | 3 | 458 | 2,637 | 3,098 | 0.2 | 14.1 | 29.1 | 43.5 |
| Collier | 1,056 | 2,636 | 5,337 | 9,030 | 78.5 | 81.4 | 58.9 | 218.7 |
| Columbia | 2 | 117 | 924 | 1,043 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 10.2 | 14.0 |
| DeSoto | 354 | 43 | 1,110 | 1,507 | 26.3 | 1.3 | 12.2 | 39.9 |
| Dixie | 2 | 8 | 114 | 125 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| Duval | 569 | 5,365 | 5,834 | 11,768 | 42.2 | 165.6 | 64.4 | 272.2 |
| Escambia | 2 | 1,040 | 5,151 | 6,193 | 0.2 | 32.1 | 56.8 | 89.1 |
| Flagler | 442 | 455 | 1,003 | 1,900 | 32.8 | 14.0 | 11.1 | 57.9 |
| Franklin | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Gadsden | 2,999 | 190 | 114 | 3,304 | 222.8 | 5.9 | 1.3 | 229.9 |
| Gilchrist | 1 | 20 | 228 | 249 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 2.5 | 3.2 |
| Glades | 1 | 15 | 114 | 131 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 1.8 |
| Gulf | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Hamilton | 1 | 18 | 114 | 133 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
| Hardee | 491 | 43 | 995 | 1,528 | 36.4 | 1.3 | 11.0 | 48.7 |
| Hendry | 2 | 102 | 506 | 610 | 0.2 | 3.1 | 5.6 | 8.9 |
| Hernando | 156 | 655 | 1,225 | 2,037 | 11.6 | 20.2 | 13.5 | 45.4 |
| Highlands | 750 | 269 | 2,398 | 3,417 | 55.7 | 8.3 | 26.4 | 90.5 |
| Hillsborough | 3,925 | 6,939 | 9,546 | 20,410 | 291.6 | 214.2 | 105.3 | 611.0 |
| Holmes | 0 | 27 | 228 | 255 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 3.3 |
| Indian River | 5 | 784 | 1,652 | 2,440 | 0.4 | 24.2 | 18.2 | 42.8 |
| Jackson | 107 | 51 | 595 | 753 | 7.9 | 1.6 | 6.6 | 16.1 |
| Jefferson | 335 | 18 | 977 | 1,329 | 24.9 | 0.5 | 10.8 | 36.2 |
| Lafayette | 1 | 10 | 1,714 | 1,725 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 18.9 | 19.3 |
| Lake | 2,747 | 1,259 | 5,808 | 9,814 | 204.1 | 38.9 | 64.1 | 307.0 |
| Lee | 2,215 | 3,133 | 4,813 | 10,162 | 164.6 | 96.7 | 53.1 | 314.4 |
| Leon | 2 | 1,476 | 6,021 | 7,499 | 0.2 | 45.6 | 66.4 | 112.1 |
| Levy | 179 | 40 | 480 | 698 | 13.3 | 1.2 | 5.3 | 19.8 |
| Liberty | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Madison | 139 | 8 | 639 | 787 | 10.3 | 0.3 | 7.1 | 17.6 |
| Manatee | 1,327 | 1,500 | 2,042 | 4,869 | 98.6 | 46.3 | 22.5 | 167.4 |
| Marion | 411 | 860 | 4,556 | 5,827 | 30.5 | 26.5 | 50.2 | 107.3 |
| Martin | 1,023 | 1,131 | 790 | 2,944 | 76.0 | 34.9 | 8.7 | 119.6 |
| Miami-Dade | 11,741 | 8,716 | 20,380 | 40,837 | 872.1 | 269.0 | 224.8 | 1,365.9 |
| Monroe | 1 | 301 | 186 | 488 | 0.1 | 9.3 | 2.1 | 11.4 |
| Nassau | 2 | 309 | 373 | 684 | 0.1 | 9.5 | 4.1 | 13.8 |
| Okaloosa | 1 | 863 | 1,785 | 2,649 | 0.1 | 26.6 | 19.7 | 46.4 |
| Okeechobee | 137 | 162 | 497 | 796 | 10.2 | 5.0 | 5.5 | 20.7 |
| Orange | 6,668 | 8,290 | 6,776 | 21,733 | 495.3 | 255.9 | 74.7 | 825.9 |
| Osceola | 514 | 1,175 | 1,829 | 3,519 | 38.2 | 36.3 | 20.2 | 94.6 |
| Palm Beach | 3,873 | 8,954 | 10,949 | 23,776 | 287.7 | 276.4 | 120.8 | 684.8 |
| Pasco | 409 | 1,662 | 2,984 | 5,055 | 30.4 | 51.3 | 32.9 | 114.6 |
| Pinellas | 127 | 4,177 | 5,905 | 10,208 | 9.4 | 128.9 | 65.1 | 203.4 |
| Polk | 1,173 | 1,948 | 6,412 | 9,532 | 87.1 | 60.1 | 70.7 | 218.0 |


| County | Employment Impact (jobs) |  |  |  | Value Added Impact (million \$) |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Nursery | Landscape | Retail | All Sectors | Nursery | Landscape | Retail | All Sectors |
| Putnam | 617 | 145 | 488 | 1,250 | 45.8 | 4.5 | 5.4 | 55.7 |
| St. Johns | 316 | 596 | 4,405 | 5,317 | 23.5 | 18.4 | 48.6 | 90.5 |
| St. Lucie | 381 | 991 | 3,650 | 5,022 | 28.3 | 30.6 | 40.3 | 99.2 |
| Santa Rosa | 165 | 491 | 879 | 1,535 | 12.3 | 15.1 | 9.7 | 37.1 |
| Sarasota | 255 | 2,699 | 4,822 | 7,776 | 19.0 | 83.3 | 53.2 | 155.4 |
| Seminole | 611 | 2,728 | 5,692 | 9,031 | 45.4 | 84.2 | 62.8 | 192.3 |
| Sumter | 501 | 80 | 515 | 1,097 | 37.3 | 2.5 | 5.7 | 45.4 |
| Suwannee | 91 | 85 | 1,359 | 1,535 | 6.8 | 2.6 | 15.0 | 24.4 |
| Taylor | 2 | 42 | 228 | 272 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 4.0 |
| Union | 1 | 25 | 114 | 140 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 2.1 |
| Volusia | 4,740 | 1,682 | 4,032 | 10,454 | 352.1 | 51.9 | 44.5 | 448.5 |
| Wakulla | 2 | 62 | 114 | 178 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 3.3 |
| Walton | 1 | 315 | 1,146 | 1,462 | 0.1 | 9.7 | 12.6 | 22.5 |
| Washington | 29 | 22 | 228 | 280 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 2.5 | 5.4 |
| Total | 53,551 | 88,073 | 176,949 | 318,573 | $3,977.9$ | $2,718.2$ | $1,951.7$ | $8,647.8$ |

Economic impacts were also summarized by regions corresponding to functional economic areas, as defined by the US Bureau of Economic Analysis based on employee commuting patterns reported in the 2000 Census of population and housing ${ }^{9}$. A map of the regions is shown in Figure 21 and regional economic impacts are summarized in Table 16 and Figure 22. Output impacts were highest in the Miami-Ft Lauderdale region ( $\$ 4.09 \mathrm{Bn}$ ), followed by Orlando ( $\$ 3.65 \mathrm{Bn}$ ), Tampa-St. Petersburg ( $\$ 1.50 \mathrm{Bn}$ ), Sarasota-Bradenton ( $\$ 1.39 \mathrm{Bn}$ ), Jacksonville ( $\$ 756 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), Tallahassee ( $\$ 540 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), Pensacola ( $\$ 309 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), Gainesville ( $\$ 294 \mathrm{Mn}$ ) and Panama City ( $\$ 106 \mathrm{Mn}$ ). Regional employment impacts followed in a slightly different order: Miami-Ft Lauderdale ( 95,202 jobs), Orlando $(86,157)$ ), Tampa-St. Petersburg ( 37,711 ), Sarasota-Bradenton $(35,541)$, Jacksonville $(22,580)$, Tallahassee $(13,515)$, Gainesville $(12,315)$, Pensacola $(11,839)$, and Panama City $(3,713)$, as shown in Figure 22. Value added impacts exceeded $\$ 2 \mathrm{Bn}$ in the Miami-Ft. Lauderdale region ( $\$ 2.79 \mathrm{Bn}$ ) and Orlando region ( $\$ 2.59 \mathrm{Bn}$ ).

Figure 21. Map of economic regions of Florida.


[^4]Figure 22. Employment impacts of the environmental horticulture industry in Florida regions, 2005.


Table 16. Regional economic impacts of the environmental horticulture industry in Florida, 2005.

| Sector | Gainesville | Jacksonville | Miami- Fort Lauderdale | Orlando | Panama City | Pensacola | SarasotaBradenton | Tallahassee | Tampa-St. Petersburg | Total All Regions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sales (million \$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nursery | 43.6 | 84.9 | 1,024.2 | 1,083.1 | 7.9 | 9.5 | 299.2 | 195.4 | 259.3 | 3,007.2 |
| Landscape | 73.2 | 412.2 | 1,763.9 | 1,257.1 | 54.5 | 161.8 | 624.8 | 109.0 | 802.0 | 5,258.5 |
| Retail | 406.3 | 558.0 | 1,868.1 | 1,804.8 | 104.8 | 353.0 | 778.0 | 323.3 | 774.5 | 6,970.9 |
| All Sectors | 523.1 | 1,055.1 | 4,656.2 | 4,145.1 | 167.2 | 524.3 | 1,702.0 | 627.8 | 1,835.8 | 15,236.5 |
| Output Impact (million \$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nursery | 69.1 | 134.6 | 1,623.9 | 1,717.4 | 12.6 | 15.1 | 474.4 | 309.9 | 411.1 | 4,768.0 |
| Landscape | 73.4 | 413.3 | 1,768.8 | 1,260.6 | 54.7 | 162.2 | 626.5 | 109.3 | 804.2 | 5,273.0 |
| Retail | 151.3 | 207.8 | 695.7 | 672.1 | 39.0 | 131.4 | 289.7 | 120.4 | 288.4 | 2,595.9 |
| All Sectors | 293.8 | 755.7 | 4,088.4 | 3,650.1 | 106.2 | 308.7 | 1,390.6 | 539.7 | 1,503.7 | 12,636.9 |
| Value Added Impact (million\$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nursery | 57.7 | 112.3 | 1,354.8 | 1,432.8 | 10.5 | 12.6 | 395.8 | 258.5 | 343.0 | 3,977.9 |
| Landscape | 37.8 | 213.1 | 911.8 | 649.8 | 28.2 | 83.6 | 323.0 | 56.4 | 414.6 | 2,718.2 |
| Retail | 113.8 | 156.2 | 523.0 | 505.3 | 29.3 | 98.8 | 217.8 | 90.5 | 216.9 | 1,951.7 |
| All Sectors | 209.2 | 481.6 | 2,789.6 | 2,587.9 | 68.0 | 195.0 | 936.5 | 405.4 | 974.4 | 8,647.8 |
| Employment Impact (jobs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nursery | 776 | 1,512 | 18,239 | 19,288 | 141 | 170 | 5,328 | 3,481 | 4,617 | 53,551 |
| Landscape | 1,225 | 6,904 | 29,543 | 21,055 | 913 | 2,709 | 10,464 | 1,826 | 13,433 | 88,073 |
| Retail | 10,314 | 14,164 | 47,420 | 45,813 | 2,659 | 8,960 | 19,750 | 8,208 | 19,661 | 176,949 |
| All Sectors | 12,315 | 22,580 | 95,202 | 86,157 | 3,713 | 11,839 | 35,541 | 13,515 | 37,711 | 318,573 |

## Impacts on Allied Suppliers for Nursery Producers

The nursery and greenhouse industry purchases large volumes of supplies for production from allied vendors. The value of inputs to the nursery sector were estimated based on total sales for 2005, together with information on typical operating expenses ${ }^{10}$, as shown in Table 17. Total inputs purchased (excluding labor), were estimated at $\$ 821 \mathrm{Mn}$, which represented 27 percent of total sales ( 3.0 Bn ). The largest expense item was for plants and seeds ( $\$ 292 \mathrm{Mn}$ ), much of which was purchased from other nursery growers. Other expense items included $\$ 147 \mathrm{Mn}$ in growing containers, $\$ 101 \mathrm{Mn}$ in growing media, $\$ 82 \mathrm{Mn}$ in packaging materials, $\$ 81 \mathrm{Mn}$ in fertilizer/lime, and $\$ 65 \mathrm{Mn}$ in chemicals (pesticides, growth regulators, etc.), and \$53 Mn in miscellaneous other supplies.

Table 17. Estimated purchases of supplies by the nursery and greenhouse industry in Florida, 2005.

| Expense Item | Cost as <br> Percent of <br> Sales | Total <br> Purchases <br> $(\$ 1000)$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Plants and seeds | $9.7 \%$ | 292,372 |
| Containers | $4.9 \%$ | 147,095 |
| Growing media | $3.4 \%$ | 100,767 |
| Fertilizer and lime | $2.7 \%$ | 81,055 |
| Chemicals | $2.2 \%$ | 65,319 |
| Packaging | $2.7 \%$ | 81,510 |
| Other supplies | $1.8 \%$ | 53,115 |
| Total expenses | $27.3 \%$ | 821,232 |

## Conclusions

In this study, telephone and internet surveys were used to document industry sales and employment in 2005 for Florida nursery growers, landscape service firms and horticultural retailers, and a regional economic model was used to evaluate total economic impacts on the state's economy. This research demonstrated that the environmental horticulture industry in Florida has continued to grow rapidly during the period of 2000 through 2005, presumably driven by strong population growth and housing development. Growth was particularly strong for the retail sector. Industry sales and employment estimated from survey data were significantly higher than published values based on secondary statistics, due to better coverage of many small and undocumented firms. The nursery production sector has significant indirect and induced impacts on other sectors of the economy associated with sales of plant products to out-of-state markets that bring new money into the state. Total employment impacts of the environmental horticulture industry in Florida were significantly greater than for other major agricultural commodities such as forest products and fruits/vegetables, while total output and value added impacts were comparable. Unlike many other agricultural industries, economic activity in environmental horticulture in Florida tends to be concentrated in urban areas, close to the workforce and markets for landscape services and retail goods. The economic impacts of the environmental horticulture industry occurred in spite of the staggering product losses, structural damages, cleanup costs, and business interruption suffered from hurricanes in 2004 and 2005.

[^5]
## Appendix: Telephone Survey Questionnaire

Question HELLO. Hello, my name is $\qquad$ . I'm calling from the University of Florida. May I speak with an owner, manager or person in charge of the business at this office? INTERVIEWER: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE WITH SURVEY. IF ELIGIBLE RESPONDENT IS NOT AVAILABLE, ARRANGE A CALLBACK. PRESS CTRL/END TO TERMINATE CALL. Hello, this is $\qquad$ from the University of Florida. This is not a sales call. (NOTE TO INT: THIS CALL COULD BE A PARTIAL-COMPLETE) INTERVIEWER: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE SURVEY

Question INTRO. The University of Florida is conducting a 10 minute environmental horticulture industry survey sponsored by the Florida Nursery Growers and Landscape Association. Your participation is voluntary, you don't have to answer any question you don't want to, and all your answer will be confidential.
(INT: READ ANY OF THE FOLLOWING IF NEEDED: The purpose of this survey is to evaluate the economic impacts of the industry. We are collecting information on the types of products and services provided, annual sales, employment, regional trade, marketing channels, threats to the industry, and the effects of hurricanes. Your answers are confidential; only averages or totals for all survey respondents will be disclosed. It is important that you provide information so that your type of business is represented in the study.) (INT: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE)

Question CONSENT. Do you consent to participate in the survey?

1 Yes
2 No
Question EXIT. Thank you for your time. (INT: PRESS ANY KEY TO EXIT SURVEY. CODE AS EITHER A SOFT REFUSAL OR A STRONG REFUSAL BASED ON WHAT HAPPENED DURING THE CALL)

Question QUAL. Did this business produce and sell ornamental plants in 2005?

1 Yes
2 No
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question EXIT1. Today we are only interviewing businesses that produced and sold ornamental plants in 2005. Thank you for your time. INT: PRESS ANY KEY TO END THE SURVEY. THIS WILL BE AUTOCODED AS NO ELIGIBLE RESPONDENT)

Question QUALIF. Today we are only interviewing businesses that produced and sold ornamental plants in 2005. Thank you for your time. (INT: PRESS ANY

## KEY TO END THE SURVEY. THIS WILL BE AUTOCODED AS NO ELIGIBLE RESPONDENT)

Question POSITION. What is your position in this organization?

Owner
Manager
CEO, CFO or COO
Administrative assistant or company employee
Other (please specify)
Don't know
Refused
Question HOWLONG. How many years has this
company been in business?
(0-100)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question PRODUCT. What was the net area, in square feet, used by your business in 2005 for greenhouse or shadehouse production?

1 None (not applicable)
2 Less than 10 thousand
310 to 49 thousand
450 to 99 thousand
5100 to 199 thousand
6200 to 499 thousand
7500 to 999 thousand
81 million or more
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question MILLION. Please specify amount to nearest one-tenth million sq.ft (INT: Read if needed: One million one hundred thousand square feet would be 1.1 million.)
(0.0-100.0)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question OPEN. What was the net area used, in acres, by your business in 2005 for open container plant production?
(0-10000)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question PRO. Which of the following products were sold by your company in 2005? (INT: READ LIST) Live plants
Horticultural supplies such as fertilizer, chemicals, seeds, pots and soil

Horticultural hard goods (tools, irrigation parts, lawnmowers, etc)

Other (please specify)
Don't know
Refused

Question SALES7. Next, I am going to ask you what percentage each of the products you selected made up your total sales last year. Your total percentage of ALL of the products should add up to 100 percent. (INT: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE)

Question PRO1. That's \% so far. What was the percentage of your total 2005 sales for
(0-100)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question OVER100G. The total of the percentages you gave is \%. Would you like to change any of your answers? (INT: If respondent says yes, go back and change any answers the respondent wants to change. If the respondent says no, press 1 to continue)

Question CUST2. Which of the following types of customers were your products sold to in 2005? (INT: READ LIST)

Homeowners
Apartments and condominiums
Commercial establishments (restaurants, hotels,
office buildings, etc.)
Governments
Landscapers, interiorscapers or lawn maintenance firms

Other retailers
Other type of customer (please specify)
Don't know
Refused
Question SALES8. Next, I am going to ask you what percentage each of the customer types you selected made up your total sales last year. Your total percentage of ALL of the customer types should add up to 100 percent. (INT: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE)

Question ZZ. That's \% so far. What was the percentage of your total 2005 sales to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (0-100) \\
& \text {-8 Don't know } \\
& \text {-9 Refused }
\end{aligned}
$$

Question OVER100H. The total of the percentages you gave is \%. Would you like to change any of your answers? (INT: If respondent says yes, go back and change any answers the respondent wants to change. If the respondent says no, press 1 to continue)

Question FIELD. What was the net area, in acres, used by your business in 2005 for field (in ground) plant production?
(0-10000)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question EMPLOYEE. How many permanent full-time employees were employed by your business in 2005,
including management and family members working in the business?
(0-999)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question PARTTIME. How many additional temporary or part-time employees were employed by your
business in 2005?
(0-999)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question RN. Which of the following services were
offered by your company in 2005?
Landscape design or consulting
Landscape installation
Landscape maintenance
Other service (please specify)
Don't know
Refused
Question SALES3. Next, I am going to ask you what percentage each of the services you selected made up your total sales last year. Your total percentage of ALL of the services should add up to 100 percent. (INT: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE)

Question AC. That's \% so far. What was the percentage of your total 2005 sales for (0-100)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question OVER100C. The total of the percentages you gave is \%. Would you like to change any of your answers? (INT: If respondent says yes, go back and change any answers the respondent wants to change. If the respondent says no, press 1 to continue)

Question CC. Which of the following types of customers were your products sold to in 2005? (INT:

## READ LIST)

Homeowners
Apartments and condominiums
Commercial establishments (restaurants, hotels, office buildings, etc.)

Governments
Builders or developers
Other landscapers or lawn maintenance firms
Other (please specify)
Don't know
Refused
Question SALES4. Next, I am going to ask you what percentage each of the customer types you selected made up your total sales last year. Your total percentage of ALL of the customer types should add up to 100 percent. (INT: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE)

Question JZ. That's \% so far. What was the percentage of your total 2005 sales to (0-100)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question OVER100D. The total of the percentages you gave is \%. Would you like to change any of your answers? (INT: If respondent says yes, go back and change any answers the respondent wants to change. If the respondent says no, press 1 to continue)

Question RM1. Which of the following geographic regions were your products sold to in 2005? (INT: READ LIST)

Local area - the city or county, or within a radius of 50 miles

Florida - but outside local area
Southeast states - except Fla
Other states
Foreign countries
Don't know
Refused
Question SALES6. Next, I am going to ask you what percentage each of the regions you selected made up your total sales last year. Your total percentage of ALL of the regions should add up to 100 percent. (INT: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE)

Question GR1. That's \% so far. What was the percentage of your total 2005 sales to
(0-100)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question OVER100F. The total of the percentages you gave is \%. Would you like to change any of your answers? (INT: If respondent says yes, go back and change any answers the respondent wants to change. If the respondent says no, press 1 to continue)

Question AD. Which of the following types of ornamental plants were grown or marketed by your company in 2005? (INT: READ LIST)

Deciduous shade trees
Shrubs
Flowering and fruit trees
Evergreen trees
Palms
Tropical foliage
Vines and ground covers
Potted flowering plants and bedding plants
Cut foliage or flowers
Propagating liners, cuttings, or plugs
Turfgrass
Other (please specify)
Don't know
Refused

Question SALES. Next, I am going to ask you what percentage each of the plants you selected made up your total sales last year. Your total percentage of ALL of the plants should add up to 100 percent. (INT: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE)

Question WM. That's \% so far. What was the percentage of your total 2005 sales for
(0-100)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question OVER100. The total of the percentages you gave is \%. Would you like to change any of your answers? (INT: If respondent says yes, go back and change any answers the respondent wants to change. If the respondent says no, press 1 to continue)

Question NATIVE. What percentage of your total sales in 2005 were Florida native plants, (defined as plants present in Florida prior to European settlement)?
(0-100)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question SERVICES. Which of the following services were offered by your company in 2005? (INT: READ CHOICES)

Contract growing
Delivery
Mail order
Horticultural consulting
Landscape design
Landscape installation
Landscape maintenance
Other service (please specify)
Don't know
Refused
Question JB. Which of the following types of
customers were your products sold to in 2005? (INT:
READ LIST)
Other growers
Re-wholesalers or brokers
Landscape contractors
Interiorscapers
Landscape maintenance firms
Independent retail garden centers
Mass merchandise stores
Home improvement centers
Supermarkets
Developers or property managers
Direct to the public
Other type of customer (please specify)
Don't know
Refused
Question SALES1. Next, I am going to ask you what percentage each of the customer types you selected made up your total sales last year. Your total percentage
of ALL of the customer types should add up to 100 percent. (INT: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE)

Question JD. That's \% so far. What was the percentage of your total 2005 sales to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (0-100) \\
& \text {-8 Don't know } \\
& \text {-9 Refused }
\end{aligned}
$$

Question OVER100A. The total of the percentages you gave is $\%$. Would you like to change any of your answers? (INT: If respondent says yes, go back and change any answers the respondent wants to change. If the respondent says no, press 1 to continue).

Question CUSTTYPE. Which of these customer types
do you consider to be expanding? (INT: READ LIST)
Other growers
Re-wholesalers or brokers
Landscape contractors
Interiorscapers
Landscape maintenance firms
Independent retail garden centers
Mass merchandise stores
Home improvement centers
Supermarkets
Developers or property managers
Direct to the public
Other type of customer (please specify)
Don't know
Refused
Question RM. Which of the following geographic regions were your products sold to in 2005? (INT:
READ LIST)
Local area - the city or county, or within a radius of
50 miles
Florida - but outside local area
Southeast states except Fla.
Northeast states
Midwest states
Western states
Canada
Other foreign countries (except Canada) (please specify)

Don't know
Refused
Question SALES2. Next, I am going to ask you what percentage each of the regions you selected made up your total sales last year. Your total percentage of ALL of the regions should add up to 100 percent. (INT:
PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE)
Question GR. That's \% so far. What was the percentage of your total 2005 sales to
(0-100)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question OVER100B. The total of the percentages you gave is \%. Would you like to change any of your answers? (INT: If respondent says yes, go back and change any answers the respondent wants to change. If the respondent says no, press 1 to continue).

Question PRACTICE. Which of the following marketing practices does your company use to sell
your products? (INT: READ CHOICES)
Personal selling by telephone or personal visit
Commissioned salesperson
Promotions such as price discounts or special services offered

Trade shows
Direct mail advertising
Trade magazine advertising
Printed advertising media for public such as
magazines,newspapers,brochures
Radio or television advertising
Computer website
Participation in civic events and making charitable contributions

Other practice (please specify)
Don't know
Refused
Question GROSS. What was your company's gross
sales in 2005?
1 less than \$100 thousand
2 \$100 to \$249 thousand
3 \$250 to \$499 thousand
4 \$500 to \$999 thousand
5 \$1 to \$2.4 million
6 \$2.5 to $\$ 4.9$ million
7 \$5 to $\$ 9.9$ million
$8 \$ 10$ to $\$ 14.9$ million
9 \$15 to $\$ 24.9$ million
10 \$25 million or more
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question GROSSM. Please specify amount to nearest \$1 million.
(25-100)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question THREATS. Rate the following threats facing your industry as either very important, somewhat important, or not important. (INT: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE)

Question DH. How important is this threat to your industry?

1 Very important
2 Somewhat important
3 Not important
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question PSKIP. How important is this threat to your industry?

1 Very important
2 Somewhat important
3 Not important
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question THREATS1. Rate the following threats facing your industry as either very important, somewhat important, or not important. (INT: PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE)

Question DH1. How important is this threat to your industry?

1 Very important
2 Somewhat important
3 Not important
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question HSKIP. How important is this threat to your industry?

1 Very important
2 Somewhat important
3 Not important
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question BORROW. Does your business borrow
money from financial lenders?
1 Yes
2 No
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question FINANCE. What are the financial institutions
you currently use for borrowing money for your business? You can tell me up to three names, and please give them in the order of importance.
(Most important)
(Second most important)
(Third most important)
Don't know
Refused

Question REASONS. Why did you choose your primary financial institution as your business lender?
(INT: READ CHOICES)
Competitive interest rates
Convenient or flexible repayment terms
Knowledge of the industry
Operates like a cooperative
Long term or personal relationship with lender
representative
Other (please specify)
Don't know
Refused

Question SATIS. How satisfied are you with your primary financial lender? (INT: READ LIST)

1 Very satisfied
2 Somewhat satisfied
3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4 Somewhat dissatisfied
5 Very dissatisfied
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question CREDIT. In the next year, do you expect your credit needs to increase, decrease or remain the same as the past year?

1 Increase
2 Decrease
3 Remain the same
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question CREDITCH. By what percentage do you expect your credit needs to change?
(0-100)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question BANKING. Do you currently use some type of electronic banking?

1 Yes
2 No
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question LOAN. Would you consider applying for a business loan electronically on the internet?

1 Yes
2 No
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question HURR. Did your company suffer any crop losses, structural damages cleanup costs, or business interruption due to hurricanes in 2004 or 2005?

1 Yes
2 No
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question HURR1. Which of the following named hurricanes affected your business? (INT: READ CHOICES)

Charley (Aug 2004)
Frances (Early Sep 2004)
Ivan (Mid Sep 2004)
Jeanne (Late Sep 2004)
Dennis (July 2005)
Katrina (Aug 2005)
Rita (Aug 2005)
Wilma (Oct 2005)
Don't know
Refused

Question HURR2004. How many hurricanes affected your business in 2004?
(0-4)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question HURR2005. How many hurricanes affected your business in 2005?
(0-4)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question HURR2. What was the approximate total value of ornamental crops lost due to the hurricane(s) in 2004 and 2005?

0 None (not applicable)
1 Less than \$1 thousand
2 \$1 to \$9 thousand
3 \$10 to \$99 thousand
4 \$100 to \$499 thousand
5 \$500 to \$999 thousand
$6 \$ 1$ million or more
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question HURRM1. Please specify amount to nearest one-tenth million dollars. (INT: Read if needed: One million one hundred thousand dollars would be 1.1 million.)
(0.0-100.0)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question HURR3. What was the approximate total value of structural damage due to the hurricane(s) in 2004 and 2005, including greenhouses, shadehouses, other buildings, irrigation systems and other equipment?

0 None (not applicable)
1 Less than $\$ 1$ thousand
2 \$1 to \$9 thousand
3 \$10 to \$99 thousand
4 \$100 to \$499 thousand
5 \$500 to \$999 thousand
6 \$1 million or more
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question HURRM2. Please specify amount to nearest one-tenth million dollars. (INT: Read if needed: One million one hundred thousand dollars would be 1.1 million.)
(0.0-100.0)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question HURR4. What was the approximate total value of cleanup costs due to the hurricane(s) in 2004 and 2005?

0 None (not applicable)
1 Less than $\$ 1$ thousand
2 \$1 to \$9 thousand
3 \$10 to \$99 thousand
4 \$100 to \$499 thousand
$5 \$ 500$ to $\$ 999$ thousand
$6 \$ 1$ million or more
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question HURRM3. Please specify amount to nearest one-tenth million dollars. (INT: Read if needed: One million one hundred thousand dollars would be 1.1 million.)
(0.0-100.0)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question HURR5. How long was your business
interrupted by the hurricanes in 2004 and 2005? (INT:
If the respondent gives an answer that does not fit one
of the categories, read the list)
1 Not at all
2 A few days
31 to 2 weeks
43 to 4 weeks
52 to 3 months
64 months or more
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused
Question ELSE. Do you have any additional comments about how your business affects the economy?

1 Has answer
2 No (none)
-8 Don't know
-9 Refused

Question THANKYOU. That is the end of the survey.
Thank you for your time and cooperation. (INT: PRESS
G TO END THE SURVEY. DO NOT PRESS CTRL END)
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