5-1950

Study of Producer Marketing of Fruits and Vegetables on the Growers' Market in Salt Lake City, Utah

John D. Baker Jr.
Utah State University

STUDY OF PRODUCER MARKETING OF FRUITS AND VEGETABLES ON THE GROWERS' MARKET IN SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

by

John D. Baker Jr.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Agricultural Economics

1950

UTAH STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE
Logan, Utah

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is indebted to Dr. V. L. Israelsen, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Utah State Agricultural College, who directed and supervised this study; to Dr. Ellis W. Lamborn for his work on the analysis of data on the International Business Machines; to Lucile Bartholomew for her help with some of the analysis; and to Fae R. Baker and La Rue B. Barfuss for their efficient efforts in the typing of this thesis.

John D. Baker Jr.

Logan, Utah
January 27, 1950

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX OF TABLES

Tables - Continued — Page

Tables - Continued — Page

APPENDIX

SUMMARY

The Growers' Market Company in Salt Lake City was established in its present form in 1919. It developed out of the need of growers and produce dealers and has served an important function in providing a market place where buyers and sellers of fruits and vegetables can be brought together in an orderly fashion to transact business.

During the four months period of this study it was estimated that over 10,000 tons of fresh fruits and vegetables valued at about $960,000 were sold over the market platforms. This represents over 25 per cent of the requirements of fruits and vegetables for the population of Salt Lake City for one year.

The principal production areas are close to the market, most of the produce coming from within a 20 mile radius. Growers in Salt Lake and Davis counties account for 85 per cent of the produce sold on the platforms. About 35 per cent of the production of fresh fruits and vegetables of these two counties are sold through the Growers' Market outlet.

Volume of produce by weight on the market increased almost week by week from June sixth on through most of September which was the high month. Mondays and Thursdays were the most important market days by weight and value. On these days the largest number and the heaviest loads were delivered. These were the days on which truckers did their buying on the market.

The average load for the season was a little less than one and one-half tons and was valued at around $130. The loads in June were the lightest in weight, about 1700 pounds, but brought the highest value of the season for any month which was about $148. September loads averaged 3,200 pounds worth $127. The larger loads by weight took longer to sell but the pounds sold per hour increased four to ten times in favor of the larger over the smaller loads. Selling time for the more valuable loads did not increase as it did for increase by weight. The value of produce sold per hour was about seven times as high for the most valuable loads as for the cheapest loads. There appeared to be some relationship between the distance traveled and load size. The heavier and more valuable loads were brought the greater distances to market.

Market costs incurred by the growers in using the market platforms amounted to slightly over $200 per grower for the season. Cost of transportation and containers averaged about $380 per grower for the season. Containers were a very large item of the cost of marketing. For farmers it was about 42 per cent of the total cost, including grower market cost, transportation and containers. It was a much higher percentage for farmer-commission-men amounting to 69 per cent. Since the price of containers is a fairly fixed cost, a larger percentage of the selling price for low quality produce would be for containers.

One-third of the produce sold on the platforms was purchased by wholesalers, one-fourth by truckers, a little less than one-fifth by chain stores and the balance by city retailers, peddlers, platform retailers and consumers. Daily renters, as a type of seller, sold mostly to wholesalers and truckers. Farmers sold largely to wholesalers and farmer-commission-men sold the largest percentage of their produce to the chain stores and lesser percentages to wholesalers and truckers. Wholesalers redistributed about two-thirds of the produce they bought to independent retailers in the city and about 15 per cent to truckers. It is estimated that about 64 per cent of the produce sold on the platform remained for consumption in the city.

With relatively uniform consumption demands made by a fairly fixed population for the short period of time of this study, the principal price determining factor for local produce was the volume of produce offered for sale. This was influenced by the weather and in-shipments of produce from other states before and during the season for Utah produce.

The number of growers utilizing the platforms has decreased from about 250 to about 68 during the past 10 years. Part of this difference is accounted for by consolidation of loads. The number of buyers has decreased also. The operations of truckers and wholesalers on the other hand has increased. Improvements in transportation, higher costs and scarcity of labor, along with changes in the wholesaling system, (all of which have been intensified by war conditions), have been the

major causes of these changes.

The major criticism of grower activities, by wholesalers and the writer, is the poor quality, grading and packaging of the produce they bring to market. Another major criticism of the market, offered by wholesalers and growers alike is the company practice of allowing growers who are selling largely to wholesalers and market retailers to operate side by side.

STUDY OF PRODUCER MARKETING OF FRUITS AND VEGETABLES ON THE GROWERS' MARKET IN SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

INTRODUCTION

The Growers' Market Company in Salt Lake City is a fruit and vegetable marketing and distribution point serving Salt Lake City and the adjacent intermountain area. In the four months from June 1 to September 30, 1949, Utah farmers marketed over 10,000 tons of fruits and vegetables valued at about $960,000 through the market platform on this market. This is important, not only to the producer but to the consumer, for it supplies over 25 per cent of the fruit and vegetables requirement for a city of 190,000 population 1/ for one year.

Marketing occupies an important position in modern life. Measured in terms of the consumer's dollar spent for food during June, July, August and September 1949, marketing processes take about 53 cents of the retail dollar. 2/ Marketing activities are varied and numerous and it is impossible to study in detail more than a small portion of these diverse activities at one time. The segment of marketing chosen for this thesis is the description and analysis of the marketing activities of fruit and vegetable growers on the platforms of the Growers' Market Company in Salt Lake City.

1/ Letter from Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce, January 16, 1950

2/ Bureau of Agricultural Economics, The Marketing and Transportation Situation, December 1949, p. 2

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study are: (1) to present a description and analysis of grower marketing activities on the Salt Lake Growers' Market; (2) to provide a more complete description and understanding of the processes, principles, and trends of the marketing of fruits and vegetables in this area, and (3) to ultimately increase the farm income of producers. These facts when more completely understood, should aid the improvement of the marketing system and also serve as a basis for future marketing research.

SCOPE

The material in this thesis deals specifically with two principal considerations: (1) the activities of the growers who operate over the platforms of the Growers' Market Company; (2) a few of the conditions and practices connected with the marketing of fruits and vegetables which affect these growers. A short history and a description of the facilities and functions of the market company is presented as background material to give more complete understanding of the operation of the market. Apparent trends in the marketing process and possible reasons for them are pointed out.

It is outside the scope of this study to deal with detailed activities of marketing agencies other than the growers themselves such as wholesalers, truckers, transportation agencies or other buyers. Their activities and the trend of these activities will be discussed only incidentally and then only

as they directly affect the interests and the marketing activities of the growers. Likewise, the activities of those stall renters who retail to consumers on the market platforms are not discussed or analyzed in any detail. Their place and function is mentioned only incidentally.

According to the rules of the market out of state products are not sold on the platforms and, therefore, they are automatically excluded from this study.

No attempt is made to follow fruit and vegetable distribution to the consumer. The study is limited to the point where it is known to which groups of buyers the grower has sold his produce, with the exception that some analysis is made of the per cent of produce remaining for consumption in Salt Lake City.

In excluding these things it is recognized that the activities of all excluded groups are of upmost and vital importance to the grower and to others in marketing, but time, space, and the necessity of taking but a small segment of the field at one time necessitates these limitations.

IMPORTANCE OF PROBLEM AND JUSTIFICATION

It has already been stated that marketing and distribution is important in our scheme of living. It should be added that the problems in the field appear to be without limit and we find many of them baffling and not well understood. Often crops are not harvested because of inadequate price, while other people within transportation distances are in dire need of this same produce.

One of Utah's problems in the area bordering the West Wasatch front particularly around Salt Lake City is the small size of farm with accompanying need for intensification and need for increasing farm income on these farms. The following table points out the small size of farms in terms of acres harvested. It should be noted that by far the largest proportion of the farms harvested less than ten acres of crops, and this group accounts for one-third to one-half of the farms listed for the counties in the table.

Table 1. Number of farms harvesting certain acreages of crops in the State of Utah and in Davis, Salt Lake, Utah, and Weber Counties in 1945, excluding larger acreages. 1/

Acres Harvested	Farms				
	State	Davis	Salt Lake	Utah	Weber
1-9	5,956	483	1,486	1,439	695
10-19	3,220	233	434	589	309
All others	14,731	625	772	1,515	837
Total	23,907	1,341	2,692	3,543	1,841

Such small sized farms make it necessary for farmers to produce intensively and attempt to get the largest possible share they can of the consumers' dollar. This would be possible if the farmers performed some of the marketing functions ordinarily turned over to marketing agencies, and were able to take some advantage of the economies that might be made in the

1/ U.S. Census of Agriculture. Vol. 1 part 31. Utah and Nevada. 1945. pp. 18, 19, 21, 23 County Table I.

improvement of the marketing system. Use of the growers' market allows them to perform some of these marketing functions.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

One study of the market was made by Reynolds I. Nowell in 1927, entitled, "A Study of the Salt Lake Growers' Market Company". In it is a description of the organization of the company, the needs which gave rise to it, and a history of the changes that had occurred in its organization up to 1927. Most of his study was a description of the organization and costs of the Growers' Market Company with only a brief description of farmers activities on the market platform. 1/

A booklet written by Bess Longhurst Snow, a former employee of the Growers' Market Company, was published April 20, 1934. It is entitled "The Growers' Market Company" and gives the history, organization, and functions of the market up to that time. 2/

V. H. Nicholson, in his Regional studies of Western New York markets which include Buffalo, Syracuse, Menands, and Rochester, provided an example of analysis and prodedure which has been helpful in guiding this study. Dr. Nicholson generously provided schedules used in his New York study from which suggestions were taken in making schedules for the Salt Lake study. 3/

1/ Nowell, Reynolds I., A Study of the Salt Lake Growers' Market Company. A thesis submitted to the United States Civil Service Examiner at Logan, Utah, December 14, 1927.

2/ Snow, Bess Longhurst, The Growers' Market Company. April 20, 1934.

3/ Nicholson, V.H., Regional Characteristics of the Rochester Public Market. Department of Agricultural Economics, New York State College of Agricultural Economics, Ithaca, New York. A.E. 420. March, 1943.

METHODOLOGY

Four separate steps were used in obtaining the data used in this study. The first was the securing of a sample of the volume which passed over the market platforms of the Growers' Market. Since there are no gates or other practical means of checking the loads in and out, it was necessary to count the loads and make check lists of their contents on selected days throughout the season. The market was not so large nor the study so long that this could not be done quite easily. The loads were counted two consecutive days of each week for seventeen weeks, beginning June 6, 1949, and finishing with the week ending October 1. Monday and Tuesday, then Wednesday and Thursday, and finally Friday and Saturday were used in that order one week after another. During these days at the market notes were made of the quality, packaging, selling operations, buyers, and other items of interest to the study. Prices, except for Saturdays, were collected by the market-master for newspaper publication, and these prices were used in the study. Saturday prices were not collected because no trading took place for the general public on Saturday evening or Sunday, which is the time the quotations would normally appear in the newspapers. The Saturday prices on commodities were collected by the persons counting the loads. In the event a price necessary to the study was missed, the average of the preceding and following days prices were used if these appeared to be reasonable. On some minor commodities a price had to be assumed. Topped beets and topped turnips had a price estimated for the

season. Other crops with estimates for part of the season were beet greens, mustard greens, swiss chard, dill and leek. The assumptions for these prices have been checked with a wholesale produce company and two grocery stores. With the exception of swiss chard the total value of the produce of the above listed crops for the season would not exceed $400.00. Swiss chard would have a season value of about $500.00. Where crops had price by variety and the variety was not shown on the record, an average price for that commodity for that day was used.

The produce accounted for on these days may be slightly less than 100 per cent of the total volume of each day because of loads which may have come in later and loads or parts of loads which may have been missed. The error, however, has been considered slight enough to disregard and the universe is considered to be covered on these days.

A second method of collection of data was a survey of growers who were operating on the market platform. This schedule used obtained data on the crops grown, size of loads, value of loads, distances traveled, value of produce sold on the market, and estimates of the percentage sold to various kinds of buyers, and other data pertinent to the study. These were put on punch cards and the major part of the mechanics of analysis was accomplished on the International Business Machines. After analysis of data it was determined that a much larger sample had been taken than was expected of the regular market operators accounting for about 75 per cent of the universe for that group of operators. This was desirable since these regular market

attenders were the ones in which the most interest was placed. A larger sample than was obtained was desired of the growers who rented by the day on the market and were therefore, present irregularly, but it could not be obtained at the time the survey was made. This group of daily renters is important to the market since they account for approximately one-half the produce sold on the market platform. It is estimated that about 6 per cent of the universe of this group is included which means that only very general conclusions can be drawn because of the nature of the data. This producer survey was accomplished the first part of September and covered grower activities on the market during the three preceding months of June, July, and August. 1/ No attempt was made to reconcile figures obtained in the survey with data obtained by count on the market platform because it was only possible to sample a certain part of the growers as was pointed out above.

A group of operators on the market was excluded from the sampling partly because of the non-cooperation of some of them and partly because their operations were not typical of the average growers. This group accounted for a considerable portion of the volume of the market even though they were few

---

1/ The estimate of 75 per cent was arrived at by taking the difference from the total loads expanded from actual count on the market and the numbers of tickets which were sold by the market-master to farmers renting by the day, during the season and dividing this into the total number of loads that persons in the survey had reported they brought to market. The estimate of six per cent is obtained by dividing the number of tickets sold, by the number of times it is estimated (15) each operator came to market during the season and dividing this into the number of individuals in the sample.

in number. Only one of the group is thought to be a grower. This will not affect the validity of the data used in this thesis because this study is primarily composed of the growers on the platforms and not the large commission-men and wholesalers. All of them either buy produce from farmers or bring produce directly from the farmer to sell on commission. The number of farmers they represent on the market is not known but the estimate of the writer would put the number between fifty and sixty different growers.

Another short schedule was taken to the wholesale houses because it was apparent that they purchased the largest percentage of the produce brought into the market area and that most of the fruits and vegetables distributed in the city passed through these establishments. The questions asked dealt with the volume of Utah produce they handled during the months of June, July, August, the methods of buying it, and the channels it took when it left the wholesale houses. The size of this sample is considered to be slightly over fifty per cent of the wholesale houses in the market area. September was excluded from the time period because the month had not yet passed when the survey was made.

An informal method of interview was used to obtain some of the data. Market officials and older growers and market operators were interviewed about changes in buyers and sellers, size of the market, market practices, and other pertinent information. The ideas expressed in answer to the questions

were consistent and parallel the existing written evidence and existing facts today. They have been used in this thesis in the discussion of market changes and trends.

DEFINITIONS

Certain terminology used throughout this thesis needs explanation and clarification.

Platform: refers to the market platforms upon which the growers exhibit and market their produce.

Market or Market Area: refers to the area where the platforms are located plus all the wholesale houses and other produce establishments which are located around the edge of the platform area.

Wholesaler: refers to not only regular wholesale establishments, but local jobbers who buy on the market for distribution. Shippers are not included in this group.

Definitions of types of sellers and types of buyers on the market are included in the parts of this thesis discussing the activities of these groups. Explanations of other terminology are given at the time they are discussed.

HISTORY, ORGANIZATION AND FACILITIES OF THE GROWERS' MARKET

History

The Growers' Market Company arose as a result of acute problems confronting growers in years past. Fruit and vegetable growers surrounding Salt Lake City in the 1890's became so numerous that it was necessary to have a trading center or place of exchange where buyers and producers could meet. At the same time the cut-throat and destructive competition between growers in marketing the produce gave rise to a need of cooperation and regulation.

Between the years of 1890 and 1910 produce was sold on the streets of Salt Lake City with the growers being forced, year after year from one street to another as various business organizations would object or as the market would interfere with other public activities. In 1910 the city withdrew the privilege of marketing on the streets thus forcing the growers either to use privately built facilities as a market place or to provide a place of their own. The result was that grower leaders met and finally established a company in 1911 known as the Salt Lake Market Gardeners' and Fruit Growers' Association which name was later changed to Growers' Exchange. This company was able to find some facilities but they were never adequate to meet the needs.

It was not until 1919 that a fully adequate marketing area was obtainable between Fourth and Fifth South Street and West Temple and First West Street. The entire center section of the

block was obtained excluding only a few business houses on two sides of the block. A new company was organized for the purpose of functioning only as a market. This company was established as a corporation with all the growers who participated on the market holding stock in the company. Stock was also sold to other interests. Under the guidance of David F. Smith as manager, this company has constructed building and facilities and has operated the market successfully up to the present time. In June, 1949, Mr. Smith retired as acting manager and his place was taken by Mr. Douglas Roberts.

In 1939 between 300 and 400 growers utilized the Growers' Market Company to dispose of their produce under apparently very satisfactory arrangements. Producers and buyers were numerous and a large volume of local produce was sold over the platforms.

The period following 1940 brought many changes to the market due to the war activity with its accompanying gas shortage, labor shortage, and higher prices. At the same time the further development of refrigerated truck service added to these changes. One of the more obvious changes is in the number of operators which utilize the market. During this past season an average of sixty-eight loads per day were counted on the days sampled. More people than this attended the market because the same ones did not come every day, but this represents a reduction over the former number. Today, however, one seller on the market may represent several growers who send their produce rather than come themselves. The present market also has fewer buyers

operating on the market platforms than in former years. Estimates of numbers using the market platform are present under a discussion of sellers on the market.

Present Functioning of the Market

The present Growers' Market consists of two platforms running east and west almost the entire length of the block and having 126 stalls each. Platforms can be boarded and stoves installed for winter use and are utilized by about fifteen to twenty growers in the winter season selling root vegetables and other fruits and vegetables which can be stored.

Around the edge of the area where the platforms are located the Growers' Market Company has constructed buildings for the use of produce houses and various organizations affiliated with the Growers' Market Company. Most of these buildings are three-story structures with a basement. At the present time nineteen separate wholesalers, or wholesale and shipping companies handling produce have rented space in these buildings surrounding the market. In addition there are at least three produce dealers who have facilities in the surrounding area that do not rent directly from the company but who operate on the market. There are at least five persons who operate as wholesalers or jobbers without building facilities by utilizing railroad cars and trucks. Many, if not all of these, would rent facilities were they available.

In addition to the wholesalers there are other businesses located at the Growers' Market. A produce supply company handles

boxes, insectides, spray equipment and other supplies required by farmers. A restaurant and a service station operate for the use of the people on the market. There are a number of offices, some of which are rented to wholesalers and shippers. One office is used by Western Union and one by the Growers' Market Company itself. There is some space rented out to businesses having no connection with produce marketing, and some homes in the area are also owned by the Growers' Market Company.

Market Regulation

The board of directors and management set the rules of the market and the fees that are charged for the use of stalls. The fees vary, being higher for non-stockholders than for stockholders, and are also higher for those selling the produce of other growers rather than, or in addition to, their own produce.

From May 1 until September 30, except for Sunday when no specific time is set, the opening time of the market is 6 a.m., at which time buyers are allowed on the platforms to buy the produce. The time set after October 1, is 6:30 a.m. each weekday morning. Matters of traffic regulation, ethics in business transactions, and conduct are all influenced by the company regulations.

There are various Salt Lake City ordinances and State Government regulations which affect the Growers' Market. At the present time one man is employed full time by the city to enforce various regulati ns on the market. The City Board of Health requires cleanliness in the wholesale houses and the market area. The

wholesale houses are inspected by a city inspector once a month to insure compliance with city sanitation regulations. The Department of Weight and Measures requires the use of accurate scales by those on the market selling to consumers and requires that containers be filled to standard weights as a protection to the public. Farmers selling to wholesalers are not required to have standard scales.

The collection of city and state licenses is an important part of the city government regulation. However, growers are required to pay only a small fee of fifty cents a year in order to market their produce.

The actual operation of the market company is normally carried on by seven persons including a market-master or manager, secretary, two night watchmen, two janitors, and a member of the police force to direct traffic. In addition Mr. Smith, the former manager and present chairman of the Board of Directors, spends a great deal of the time directing and supervising the activities of the market.

PRODUCE ON THE MARKET

During the seventeen week period from June 6, to October 1, 1949, an estimated 10,237 tons of fruits and vegetables, valued at $956,000, passed over the market platform. In addition an estimated 6,279 tons of produce, valued at $579,000, were delivered directly to the wholesale houses without passing over the market platform. 1/ This does not include deliveries that were made directly to retail establishments, or deliveries to the wholesale houses by growers who do not use the market platforms. This makes a total of 16,516 tons, valued at approximately $1,535,000 wholesale price, growers delivered into the market area. Segregated into fruits and vegetables there were about 2,307 tons of fruit valued at $406,000 and 7,629 tons of vegetables, valued at $550,000, sold over the market platform.

Comparison With Consumption Estimates

A clearer idea of the meaning of the volume of this produce is obtained when comparison is made of estimated amounts consumed at the retail level with the amounts sold on the platform. In Table 2 the average annual consumption of various groups of, or specific kinds of, fresh fruits and vegetables, as reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, are compared to produce sold on the Growers' Market

1/ This estimate of additional produce was based on the percentage (62 per cent) that produce sold on the market platform, was of total produce reported by groups. This would not represent the total of all deliveries to wholesalers since growers, besides those on the market, sold direct to the wholesalers.

Platform. 2/ Pounds of various groups of produce sold over the platform, was divided by 190,000, the estimated population of Salt Lake City. 3/

This comparison shows that the farmers on the platform provide over 25 per cent of the estimated consumption requirements of fresh fruits and vegetables for the population of Salt Lake City for one year. This would actually represent a higher per cent if consumption figures were available for the summer months covered in this study.

2/ Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Consumption of Food in The United States, 1909-48. Miscellaneous Publication No. 691. August, 1949. pp. 114-16.

3/ Letter, January 16, 1950. Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce Information Service. Estimate of population.

Table 2. Comparison of consumption estimates of fresh fruits and vegetable weights of produce sold on market platforms on per capita basis for Salt Lake City, June 1 to September 30, 1949. 1/

	Estimated Consumption Per Capita For Year	Weight Sold On Platform Per Capita	Per Cent Weight of Consumption
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds
Fruits and Vegetables 2/	293.6	81.8	27.6
Fruits:			
Total	80.8	24.3	30.1
Apples	31.2	2.9	9.4
Other Fruits	49.6	21.4	43.2
Vegetables:			
Total 2/	212.8	57.5	27.3
Yellow, Green, and Leafy	90.3	17.8	19.7
Other Fresh Vegetables	68.1	21.9	32.1
Potatoes	100.4	25.9	25.8
Melons	31.4	9.8	31.2
Tomatoes	23.0	8.03	34.8

1/ Citrus fruits excluded.
2/ Potatoes excluded.

Loads, Volume, and Value Compared on Different Days of the Week

Certain days of the week become more important as market days than others. Table 3 points out that Mondays and Thursdays are the most important market days considering both value and weight of produce. These are the days that the truckers who haul produce out of the city to distant points in and out of the state buy on the market. Not only do the truckers increase the volume sold for these days, but the increased number of buyers makes more buyer competition which improves trading and increases the speed at which produce sells.

Table 3. Per cent of total volume sold each day of the week on Growers' Market platform, averaged from June 6, to September 30, 1949.

Day of Week	Per Cent of Total Weight	Per Cent of Total Value
Total	100.00	100.00
Monday	22.09	21.6
Tuesday	15.43	16.59
Wednesday	13.94	15.88
Thursday	18.84	18.49
Friday	15.39	14.09
Saturday	14.32	13.35

Monday accounts for about 22 per cent of the total volume by weight while Thursday accounts for about 19 per cent. Value figures are slightly different because of price differences.

In the breakdown of loads and load size it was calculated that the average load counted on the platform weighed about 2,790 pounds and had an average value of $130. The figures in Table 4 indicate that the heaviest loads came in on Mondays, having an average of about 3,390 pounds or slightly over one and one-half tons, while all the others were close to the 2,500 - 2,750 pound range. As would be expected from size, the Monday loads were the most valuable, being worth on the average around $150, while the nearest other day was Tuesday with $138. per load. The value of loads got progressively less valuable as the week went on. Sundays are not included since they are not regular trading days.

Considering number of loads per week, Mondays and Thursdays were by far the most important, having an average of close to 80 loads each, while all the others were less than 70.

Table 4. Average number, size and value of loads and cents per pound for produce sold on different days of the week. Growers' Market Platform from June 1 to September 30, 1949.

Days of Week	Average Number of Loads Per Day	Average Value Per Load	Average Pounds Per Load	Cents Per Pound
Mondays	78.0	$154.10	3,389	4.6
Tuesdays	67.2	137.50	2,749	5.0
Wednesdays	66.7	132.60	2,502	5.3
Thursdays	81.3	126.50	2,772	4.6
Fridays	68.4	114.70	2,692	4.2
Saturdays	69.2	107.40	2,476	4.3

This points out that an increased number of growers attended the market on these days.

Average price received for produce did not reflect the usual brisk trading of Mondays and Thursdays, but dropped as would be expected with increased volume. The figures in Table 4 indicate that the highest price per pound of produce was on Wednesday with Tuesday being a close second, both being 5 cents or more per pound. Mondays and Thursdays dropped to around four and one-half cents per pound and Fridays and Saturdays were still a little lower. A reason for the large price variance between Wednesdays and the last two days of the week, which amounted to about 20 per cent, might be the fact that wholesalers and other produce dealers did not like to carry produce over the week-end and therefore bought less on these last days of the week. This would account for at least part of this variation.

Comparison of Volume by Month

Comparison of volume and value of produce by months shows the trend of use of the market platform during the season. Table 5 shows that the weight was greatest for the month of September which accounted for more than 34 per cent of the total for the four months. June had less than 10 per cent of the total.

Comparison of the four months according to value shows smaller variation because of compensating prices. September and July are the high months, each being about 28 per cent

of the total value for the season.

Average high price per pound early in the season cannot be entirely accounted for on the basis of a higher price level, for produce. Early in the season some produce such as strawberries and cherries, which have a high value per pound, are on the market while later in the season cabbage, squash, cantaloupes, and similar products which are cheaper per pound are on the market.

The increase of price in September over August was caused by the heavy fruit season and the scarcity of some vegetables which were beginning to go out of season.

Table 5. Per cent of total weight, value and average price per pound of produce sold each month on Growers' Market platform for period June 1, through September, 1949. 1/

Month	Per Cent of Total Weight	Per Cent Of Total Value	Average Price per Pound
June	9.7	18.2	8.9
July	24.4	28.2	5.5
August	31.6	24.9	3.7
September	34.3	28.7	4.0

1/ Produce was not counted during week of May 30, to June 4. Volume was light at this time of year but it might raise the percentage for the month of June slightly.

Although not included in the study, it is an apparent fact that the amount of produce on the market decreases after September.

Packaging

Produce offered for sale on the Growers' Market showed great variety and little standardization in packaging. For example, the most used container for snap beans was the burlap bag filled until it was two-thirds to three-fourths full, holding about 45 pounds. Other containers used for snap beans were lettuce crates, celery crates, cantaloupe crates, lugs, bushel baskets and one-half bushel baskets.

Size of containers also varied with the season. Earlier in the season produce came to market in smaller containers such as the lug or case, while later in the season, bushels and crates were more in use. The best example during the season was tomatoes for which lugs were used early, with bushel boxes and bushel baskets being used later.

Produce of higher quality tended to be sent to market in the smaller containers. Peaches, for example, were sometimes packed in very small cases holding 10 to 12 pounds and containing only a few of the very largest and best quality peaches. Poor produce was often put in the larger containers. Ungraded poor quality tomatoes and peaches as well as some other produce came in bushel baskets. This did not always hold true. Snap beans of better quality, often were brought to market in crates.

Although there were some smaller dealers who brought well-packed produce to market and used standard containers, generally, the larger commission men and growers tended to

have the most standardization in their containers and packaging. They used larger containers only when those containers did not indicate low quality produce. Seldom was a bushel of tomatoes seen among the produce of the larger sellers. Only one of the larger sellers dealing in general fruits and vegetables had a brand name, which he put on certain packaged produce such as celery hearts. Nearly all potato sellers had their brand or name on their potato bags. Out of state brands were supposed to be removed from used crates.

Containers for some kinds of produce were quite standard. The containers which are standard and used consistently for certain produce are listed below. 5/

Product	Container
Asparagus	Asparagus Box
Cucumbers	½ Bushel Lugs
Lettuce	Lettuce Crates
Onion, Dry	50# Bags
Potatoes	100# Bags
Squash	½ Bushel Lugs
Tomatoes	½ Bushel Lugs Bushel Baskets

Although certain standard containers were used on the market for other vegetables, their use was not a consistent practice on the market.

5/ All containers and weights of these containers for all produce are listed in the Appendix.

Quality of Produce on the Market

Great variety in quality of produce is found on the market. This is perhaps, understandable and to be expected with the variety of growers producing for the market, and the variety of buyers who are catering to many different sections of the city and classes of people.

It was observed that many operators specialize in a certain quality of produce, some the poorer quality, others only the best. Some others had great variety in the quality of produce they handled. Similarly, certain buyers were looking for a certain quality of produce. A few buyers wanted the cheaper produce which they expected to get at bargain prices while others would accept only the best and were willing to pay a premium to obtain it.

However, except for a few mistakes made in pricing by the farmers, the better quality produce brought the highest prices and sold the quickest. On good days the high quality produce would be sold the first few minutes of trading while the poorer quality would stand on the platform for many hours waiting for a buyer, or to be sold out piecemeal or at a very low price.

Notes were kept of sales of some of the higher and lower quality produce. Table 6 is an example of price according to quality. Such a comparison could be made for almost any good trading day during the season.

Table 6. Selling price of high and low quality produce compared to standard price. Growers' Market Platform June 25, 1949.

Commodity	Description	Grade	Selling Price	Day's Quotation
Beans, Snap Yellow	Large, Well-Colored	Ex.	$ .12	11-12 cents
Beans, Snap Green	Large, Uniform	Ex.	.13	11-13 cents
Cucumbers	Uniform, Without Blemish	Ex.	3.00	$2.75-$3.00
Cherries	Large Sized	Ex.	.14	9-14 cents
Cherries	Medium Sized	Good	.10	9-14 cents
Beets, Bunched	Non-Uniform	Poor	.40	40-45 cents
Strawberries	Small	Poor	1.75	$2.00-$3.75

PRODUCTION AREAS

Salt Lake, Davis, Utah, and Weber Counties, which are the closest counties to the market, produce most of the fruits and vegetables that cross the platform of the Growers' Market. Occasionally, loads of early fruit come in from Southern Utah, or loads of a single crop come from some other county, but most of these are delivered directly to wholesale houses instead of being sold on the market platform, and no effort was made to record this produce. The importance of the local counties in supplying the market is shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Per cent of value of produce and growers supplying produce on the Growers' Market platform by counties. June 1 to August 31, 1949.

County	Per Cent of Produce Value	Per Cent of Growers
Salt Lake	42.5	36.9
Davis	42.6	42.6
Utah	7.8	12.3
Weber	7.2	4.6

Salt Lake and Davis Counties, the closest counties to the market, produce about 85 per cent of the produce which supplies the market. In this area are sections of land suited to various types of vegetable and fruit production. Bench land bordering the mountains is particularly adapted to fruit production, one of the best sections being in Utah County and

another north of Salt Lake City in Bountiful and Farmington of Davis County. In Murray, just south of Salt Lake City, is found a section of fertile land operated largely by Italian farmers which is well adapted to production of lettuce, cauliflower, tomatoes, and other truck garden crops. Many other small production centers are located in these two counties.

Produce coming to the market from the more distant counties and communities usually consists of one or a few crops per load. A large proportion of the potatoes came from Clearfield in North Davis County and from Plain City in Weber County. A large volume of berries and other fruit came from Utah County in the area north of Provo.

In order to compare the importance of the produce marketed on the Growers' Market platform to the production of fruits and vegetables in these counties, 1945 census figures are used which are expressed in terms of dollars. (Table 8.)

According to these figures about 35 per cent of the value of fruits and vegetables reported by the census as sold in Davis and Salt Lake Counties goes to the platform. Yearly variations in production, especially of fruit, will vary this percentage but it is still an important portion of the fruit and vegetable production of these two counties.

Table 8. Total value of fruit and vegetables sold in Salt Lake and Davis Counties, according to census data for 1945 compared with platform sales, June 6 to September 30, 1949. 1/ 2/

	Value of Fruits Sold 3/	Value of Vegetables Sold	Total Fruits and Vegetables
Total Davis and Salt Lake Counties 4/	707,140	2,080,692	2,787,832
Value of Produce Sold on Platform From Salt Lake and Davis 4/	429,528	531,415	960,943
Per Cent Platform Sales are of Total	60.7	25.5	34.5

1/ U.S. Census of Agriculture. Vol. 1. Part 31. Utah and Nevada 1945. pp. 42-45.
2/ Corrections made for difference in price level. June, July, August, and September 1949 index was 80.4 per cent of 1945 index for fruit and 82.6 per cent for truck crops.
3/ Nuts are included in census data.
4/ Potatoes are excluded.

ANALYSIS OF SELLERS AND SELLING OPERATIONS ON THE MARKET

Definitions of Types of Sellers

On the market platform there are five types of sellers. The marketing activities of the first two, Farmers and Farmer Commission men, are analysed and discussed to considerable length in the following sections. The analysis about commission-men and daily renters are presented more briefly because of less adequate data. Market retailers are entirely excluded from this study. The definition of these sellers is as follows.

Farmers are those regular stall renters who sell on this market, only the produce they raise on their farms.

Farmer-Commission-Men are farmers who have branched out from their farming operation and pick up the produce of their neighbors to bring to the market for sale. They may do this on a commission basis or they may buy outright from the farmer.

Commission-Men are operators on the market who raise none of the produce they sell but obtain it by going to various farms with their trucks and buy the produce outright or bring it in to sell on commission. Some of the larger sellers on the market platform were in this class. Four of the sellers had two or more trucks each which came to market with the largest loads on the platform. Each of them would handle five or ten times the produce of the average farmer. Their business might, in many respects, be compared to the business done by the regular wholesale houses. No attempt was made

to analyze these operators since most of them were non-cooperative.

Daily Renters are a group of operators who rent stalls by the day paying only for the day of actual use. For the most part these are truckers or growers who either bring in one product great distances, have a shorter season crop which will soon go off the market, or are small operators who only desire to come to the market occasionally. No detailed analysis was made of this group of operators.

Market Retailers are a class of operators on the market platform who sell to the consumers. None of them are farmers. It is with this group that city ordinances have been enforced more vigorously during the past year. Their men are often called curb-marketers.

Number of Sellers

By expansion from sampling data it was determined that 258 different individual farmers sold on the market. Of these 68 1/ were regular renters by the month and the additional 190 2/ were renters by the day who were either non-stockholders

---

1/ Computed by working the following proportion:

$$\frac{\text{Number of Growers Interviewed}}{x} = \frac{\text{Loads Growers Interviewed Brought to Market}}{\text{Total Loads by Regular Renters (Total Loads--Tickets Sold)}}$$

Note: Tickets were sold by the market-master to seller who rented by the day.

2/ Computed by assuming that a renter by day might attend the market 15 times during the season and divide this into the total number of tickets the market-master sold to daily renters during the season.

or whose produce covered such a short or infrequent season that it was unprofitable for them to rent by the month. Early in the season when the drawing was held for stall position, there were 141 stalls drawn according to the list of names copied from Growers' Market Company records, which represented 129 different individuals after eliminating apparent duplication of stalls by the same individual or family. Of these 129, 15 were counted who were not farmers, but were market retailers or wholesalers who did not grow their own product but dealt entirely with produce bought on the market or purchased on the farms for resale. This leaves a balance of 114 growers who had drawn for stalls. Many of these relinquished their stalls later in the season while some of these stalls were taken up by new operators.

The average number of loads counted on the market per day was 67.9. Of this it is estimated that about one-half belonged to regular renters. 3/

The drawing is held for stall position because of the desirability of some stalls above others on the platform, so each stockholder is given an equal chance to obtain one of the more desirable stalls. After the drawing growers may trade stalls among themselves and premiums are often paid by some market operators for the better stalls. Market retailers and some of the commission-men desire stalls closest to the east end of the platform nearest the entrance that the

3/ Regular renters refers to those renting by the month.

consumers usually use. Potato dealers were grouped together farther down the platform. Often regular stall renters would trade in order to get away from an operator who dealt in low quality produce or whom they did not trust.

These above figures show radical changes since 1939. In that year an estimate by the market-master put the number of growers using the market at 250 to 300.

Eight of the older market sellers were interviewed as to number of people on the market in various past years, and all were in agreement for many years prior to 1940, the daily attendance at the market was between 200 and 300 farmers. Stories were repeatedly told of peak days when farmers had to double up on stalls and display their produce on the ground at the end of the platform. In those years there were 300 stalls on the market.

This change in number from about 200 to 300 down to 68 market attenders has been brought about by changes induced by the war, changes in wholesale business, prosperity of the farmers, and other reasons which are discussed in greater detail in the chapter on Market Trends.

Activities of Various Types of Sellers

Whereas prior to 1940, the operators on the market brought their own product and sold it on the market themselves, the situation is much different today. Many farmers prefer to send their produce with neighboring farmers or with commission-men who take the produce to the market and sell it for them.

Four of the largest operators on the market were disinclined to cooperate so the figures quoted in this part of the thesis will be more representative of the grower who elected to sell his own produce.

Table 9 gives indications of differences between the operations of the various sellers. Farmer-Commission-Men apparently had loads which averages larger in value than those of the Farmers and attended the market one day a week more on the average throughout the season. It will be noted that the value of produce sold on the market does not agree with the average value of load multiplied by the average loads per week.

Table 9. Principle types of sellers compared as to value and frequency of load, value of produce marketed, and miles from market, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

	Average Value of Load	Loads Per Week			Average Value of Produce Per Seller	Average Miles From Market
		June	July	Aug.		
Farmers	$144	2.2	3.6	4.1	$3,670	13
Farmer-Commission-Men	160	4.3	4.7	5.3	16,544	22.6
Commission-Men	90	1.5	3.0	3.0	5,250	4.0
Daily Renters 1/	97	.1	2.9	3.7	2,700	24.1

1/ Daily operators who had not started on the market before September 1, are excluded because of inadequate information.

Data for this table were compiled from farmer estimates

and the value of loads is an item that is extremely variable on the market and therefore, difficult for farmers to estimate accurately. It is apparent that their load values are over-estimated while those of Farmer-Commission-Men are probably underestimated.

Comparison of the value of produce handled per seller suggests an important difference. The Farmer-Commission-Men handle over four times the value of products that Farmers handle. The reason, of course, is that the Farmer-Commission-Men handle the produce of several farmers which gives them the volume for larger loads and more frequent trips to market.

The Commission-Men in this table are a few of the smaller ones. Also the number of daily renters in the sample is too small for accurate prediction and it is thought that those sampled are the ones who attended the market most regularly.

The greater distance from market that the Farmer-Commission-Men, as compared with farmers, traveled, 23 miles as compared to 13, suggests that farmers the greater distance from market, are more prone to send their produce in with someone else than to come with it themselves. The average distance for daily renters is still greater, which would be expected for this type of operator.

It will be noted that the Farmer-Commission-Men took much longer to sell their produce on the market than the Farmers. In Table 10 is shown the fact that most of the Farmers sold their load in less than four and one-half hours while none

of the Farmer-Commission-Men were able to sell out in less than that time. The reason, perhaps, is that the Farmer-Commission-Men specialize more in their selling and try to wait for better sales on the market than the Farmers, who for the most part, are interested in disposing of their produce as soon as possible in order to get back to work on their farms. There were a few farmers observed by the writer, who spent a great deal of their time on the market however. With larger volume and greater variety of sources, the Farmer-Commission-Men might also obtain some lower quality produce which would take longer to sell.

Table 10. Hours spent on the market compared as to the number of various types of sellers. Salt Lake Growers' Market, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Hours Spent on Market	Farmers	Farmer-Commission-Men	Daily Renters
0 - 3.4	11	--	3
3.5-4.4	15	--	2
4.5-6.4	12	3	6
6.5 --	3	4	3

Size and Value of Loads Compared to Time Required for Sale

Length of time the seller was on the market was calculated from the time he arrived, which was usually sometime before 6 a.m., and the time he left to go home. Part of that time was spent arranging produce on the platform and the rest

was spent selling or waiting for buyers. On the average it took longer to sell the larger loads than it did the smaller loads, but the pounds sold per hours were much greater for the larger loads, Table 11. The large poundage per hour and drop in hours taken to sell loads over 10,000 pounds happens because this group contains Farmer-Commission-Men and Commission-Men who specialized in potatoes and whose loads were very large.

Table 11. Size of loads compared as to hours required for sale, Salt Lake Growers' Market platform, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Weight Pounds	Average Hours	Approximate Pounds Per Hour 1/	Number of Growers
0-1,999	3.6	276	10
2,000-3,999	4.6	553	20
4,000-5,999	5.1	989	7
6,000-10,000	8.2	978	5
Over 10,000	5.7	2,105	3

1/ Midpoint of class interval used for calculation.

Value of load and time to sell does not show as pronounced a relationship as does weight. Table 12 shows that it takes slightly longer to sell the more valuable loads than it does the cheaper ones, but the dollar sales per hour show great advantage to the larger loads. The $200 to $299 loads sold about four times as much per hour as the smallest group, and the largest group was over seven times as much per hour.

Table 12. Value of load compared as to time required for sale, Salt Lake Growers' Market platform, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Value of Load Dollars	Average Hours To Sell	Approximate Dollar Sales Per Hour 1/	Number of Growers
0-99	4.9	$10.20	28
100-199	4.7	31.91	11
200-299	5.9	41.61	6
300 & Over	5.1	78.41	5

1/ Midpoint of class interval used for calculation.

Table 13. Hours spent on the market compared as to average load, value and total value of sales according to time spent. Salt Lake Growers' Market platform, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Hours	Average Value of Load Sold in this time range	Value of Produce Sold in this time range
0-3.9	$42	$ 44,289
4-4.9	145	81,908
5-5.9	116	84,447
6-6.9	114	127,797
7-7.9	122	34,017
8-9.9	85	12,139
10 & Over	115	14,807
Unknown	60	8,137

When the data is rearranged according to class intervals of time, (Table 13) it still shows nothing in favor of the loads of smaller value in terms of selling time except for the loads which took less than three and one-half hours to sell. Thus Table 13 points out that most of the produce sold on the market was sold between 4 and 7 hours of selling time.

Size of Load and Distances from Market

On the average the larger loads were transported the greater distances to market. In Table 14 the direct relationship between size of load, distance and value is shown. The bulk of the produce on the market came in loads between 3,500 to 5,500 pounds at the average distance of about 15.8 miles. The distance between 12 and 18 miles contains most of the production area for regular Farmers on the market. This distance accounts for about 75 per cent of the total produce brought in by these producers.

Table 14. Sizes of load compared as to distance traveled, and value of load on the Growers' Market, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Size of Load Pounds	Average Miles From Market	Average Value of Load	Value of Produce in Each Group
0-1,499	9.1	$ 27	$16,808
1,500-3,499	15.2	99	33,617
3,500-4,999	15.8	114	84,175
5,000-8,499	17.5	188	63,232
8,500 & Over	43.3	212	46,690

Distance from Market and Value of Load

Loads sorted on the basis of distance from market showed a slight relationship between distance and the value of load. This relationship appeared, however, only in the larger groupings. (Table 15.) There was great variation within the groups. This was because some closer production areas raised crops adapted more to larger loads than other areas just a little more distant.

Table 15. Distance from market compared as to value of load. Salt Lake Growers' Market. June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Distance (Miles)	Value of Load	Number In Sample
0-14	$ 89	48
15-29	127	9
30-	130	13

Years Operators Have Been on the Market

Market sellers in the farmer survey were asked how many years they had sold produce on the market. Over half of those contacted had been on the market for over 29 years and a few had dealt on the market in its various locations for over 50 years.

Years on the market seemed to bear no apparent relationship to the important factors in the study such as total value of produce delivered to the market, size of load or frequency

of load.

Description of Selling

Methods of selling vary with the inclinations of the individual operators. Many farmers coming to market prefer to sell out as quickly as possible and leave early for home. These farmers will sell largely to the wholesale houses and the truckers. Others desire to sit on the platform and sell out in smaller quantities and attempt to obtain a better price.

On days when the market is slow and there are few buyers the farmers are faced with the problem of disposing of their produce. Bargains are often made with some of the peddlers while some of the Commission-Men or Market Retailers will take the produce at a reduced price. Many of these farmers refuse to bargain at these low prices and either take the produce home and bring it back the next day or leave it on the platform, over night, which can be done by paying a night fee of 50 cents. This extra day's wait for sale materially reduces the quality. For this reason a few try to find sale elsewhere for their pproduce when the market is slow. Regardless of method of disposal, farmers are hurt by the slow days and the lack of buyer competition.

On the market the farmers, and more particularly other market sellers, learn many tricks of the trade. Dishonest and shady dealings are prohibited as much as possible but some take place. Many unprohibited practices are tried.

Often every reasonable means of speech and conduct are used to give an impression of scarcity of products in order to get buyers to buy. Such practices were sometimes effective when used by some of the larger operators on the market.

On the market there were slow days and slow products. Some days, because of the weather, events going on in the city, activities of wholesale houses, or other reasons, produce did not sell well, and even on some good brisk trading days certain products would be slow to move. Many explanations could be given for specific instances and will be discussed under price determination on the market. However, the farmer who brought high quality produce to the market and had established a reputation for fair and honest dealing was generally able to dispose of his produce quickly and obtain a good price for it.

Cost of Marketing

This is not intended to be a complete cost analysis, but merely a tabulation and an average of the major cost items in connection with marketing on the Growers' Market.

Certain costs of operating on the Growers' Market would not be incurred if other methods of marketing were used. Principally, these are labor of the operator and the people he hires in arranging and handling the produce on the market and making the sale, plus the stall rent which he pays. Only a very few Farmers hire help on the market while the Commission-Men and Farmer-Commission-Men use more. The labor itself

ranged from school children paid 35 cents per hour to regular hired labor paid one dollar an hour.

The stall rents were $10 a month to the Farmers and $32.50 to anyone that sold anything beside his own produce. Fees by the day are $1 for stockholders who sell their own produce and $1.25 for non-stockholders. All others who sell anything but their own produce, whether stockholder or non-stockholder, are required to pay $1.50. All night fees are 50 cents. An example of averages of these costs for Farmers and Farmer-Commission-Men is given in Table 16.

In addition there are certain other costs which would have to be paid regardless of the method of marketing. These would be transportation and labor in connection with transportation, the cost of containers, and the cost of packaging and preparation for market. No attempt was made to collect data on the cost of preparation of the product for market because of the wide range of products and methods, but data were collected of time spent traveling, miles traveled and the cost of containers. An approximation of these costs is given in Table 17.

Containers constitute a heavy cost in the marketing of fruits and vegetables. Wartime prices for containers are still in use and in many cases represent a very large per cent of the total cost of marketing the fruits or vegetables. New containers for the cheaper commodities often cost about as much as the commodity itself. (Table 18).

Table 16. Approximate direct selling costs, for labor and stall use incurred by Farmers and Farmer-Commission-Men on Salt Lake Growers' Market, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Kind of Operators	Labor Costs				Stall Costs	Total
	Operator's Labor		Hired Labor			
	Hrs. on Mkt. 1/	Value @$1.00 per hr.	Total Hrs. per Season	Value @$.78 Per hr. 2/		
Farmers	173	173	--	--	$30.00	$203.00
Farmer-Comm.-Men	386	386	118.5	$92.43	$97.50	$575.93

1/ Obtained by multiplying average hours per operator per day by 72 (Approximate market day in three months) by per cent of the times spent on the market.
2/ Average price paid by sellers in Market other than Farmers.

Table 17. Certain costs of marketing, excluding Growers' Market cost, incurred by growers selling on the Salt Lake Growers' Market platform, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Kind of Operators	Average Miles Traveled 1/	Cost per Mile 2/	Total Mileage Cost	Value of Containers Used	Total Travel Hours	Value Travel Time	Total
Farmers	997	$.10	$99.70	$ 246	38	38	$ 383.70
Farmer-Comm.-Men	2,609	.13	339.17	2,294	132	132	2,765.17

1/ Computed as follows: Market days of season times average distance traveled times per cent of time attending the market.
2/ Value estimated by writer from cost data supplied by a local transportation agency.

Table 18. Container costs compared with prices of selected products, Salt Lake Growers' Market, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Commodity	Container	Approx. cost. New.	Average Unweighted Selling Price 1/	Container Per Cent of Commodity	Lowest Season Selling Price 1/	Container Per Cent of Commodity
Apricots	Lugs	$.30	$.55	54.5%	$.32	93.8%
Cantaloupes	Crates	.40	1.40	28.6%	.60	66.7%
Lettuce	Crates	.30	2.06	14.6%	.70	42.9%

1/ Price of container excluded.

BUYERS TO WHOM MARKET OPERATORS SOLD

Types of Buyers

The buyers on the market are an important half of the trading operation because practically all the produce sold passes through their hands. It is also through their bids that the demands of consumers are expressed on the market.

For the purposes of this study the buyers on the market platform were divided into seven groups as follows:

Wholesalers are buyers who rent produce houses around the platform area or in the vicinity of the market and who buy produce on the market platform and from other sources. They resell to truckers as well as resell and deliver to independent grocery stores in the city.

Truckers refer to out of town truckers who buy produce on the platform and from wholesale houses for delivery outside the city. Many of them go into neighboring states. Most of them do their buying on Monday and Thursday each week.

Chain Stores refer to the central buying agency of the various grocery store systems.

City Retailers are the independent grocers who do their own buying directly from the producer on the market platform.

Market Retailers are those who buy produce from growers and then resell it to consumers on the market platform.

Peddlers buy on the market for door-to-door selling in or close to the city.

Consumers frequent the market to do their buying. A

small portion of the produce goes to them.

Produce Sold to Various Buyers

Data from the sample of market operators questioned at the market, show that wholesalers bought over one-third of the produce that came into the market area (Table 19). It should be pointed out that most of this produce did not cross the platform because many wholesalers ordered from farmers and had them deliver direct to their place of business either before the regular trading began in the morning or later during the day.

Table 19. Per cent of produce sold by platform sellers to various buyers. Salt Lake Growers' Market June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Type of Buyers	Per Cent of Produce
Wholesalers	35.2
Truckers	26.2
Chain Stores	17.4
City Retailers	7.2
Peddlers	6.8
Platform Retailers	5.9
Consumers	1.3

Chain stores accounted for the purchase of a little less than one-fifth of the produce which came into the market. Slightly over 38 per cent of the total produce was reported

as being delivered direct to the place of business of wholesalers and chain stores rather than being bought on the platform. This does not represent all the produce wholesale houses and chain stores bought directly, but only that portion which producers patronizing the Growers' Market platform delivered to these establishments.

Sales to Buyers According to Nationality of Seller

Individuals of Northern European extraction sold over 30 per cent of their produce to wholesalers, a little over 25 per cent to truckers, and about 21 per cent to chain stores. This nationality group is by far the largest on the market platform. (Table 20).

Table 20. Per cent of sales to various buyers by extraction of sellers. Salt Lake Growers' Market, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Extraction of Sellers	Wholesalers	Truckers	Chain Stores	City Retailers	Peddlers	Platform Retailers	Consumers
Northern European	32.4	26.2	21.1	6.9	7.1	6.4	1.0
Italian	56.7	35.8	1.9	1.3	3.1	.4	.8
Greek	20.5	22.7	16.9	10.1	20.0	6.3	3.4
Japanese	59.4	6.7	6.0	15.1	4.3	8.6	—
Chinese	23.6	48.4	—	17.8	10.2	—	—
Average	35.2	26.2	17.4	7.2	6.8	5.9	1.3

Persons of Italian extraction sold largely to wholesalers and to truckers, these groups of buyers taking over

90 per cent of the produce sold by the Italians. The Italians, however, were not in the group of daily renters which ordinarily sell to these same buyers. No nationality data were obtained on daily renters on the market.

Another interesting fact is that Greek operators sold more than twice as much of their produce to peddlers than did any other nationality group on the market. This figure of 20 per cent represents a little less than three times as much as the average.

Sales by Types of Sellers

In comparing the selling operations of different types of sellers on the market, it is observed that farmers and daily renters sold much more to the wholesalers than farmer-commission-men, (Table 21).

Table 21. Per cent of types of produce sold by various types of sellers to various buyers. Salt Lake Growers' Market, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Kind of Sellers	Buyers: Wholesalers	Truckers	Chain Stores	City Retailers	Peddlers	Platform Retailers	Consumers
Farmers	42.0	26.0	7.9	8.8	8.1	6.0	1.2
Daily Renters	1/49.2	42.2	—	2.1	.9	4.1	1.5
Farmer-Commission Men	20.4	19.5	37.0	7.5	7.5	7.0	1.4

1/ There are only eight in the sample which is a very small portion of the universe for this type of seller.

Again it should be pointed out that four of the larger commission-men are not included in this study and therefore, this group is more representative of the average farmer. Those who rented by the day, sold a larger proportion of their produce to truckers than the other groups indicating that they were the ones who utilized the market more on Mondays and Thursdays.

PRICE DETERMINATION

General Description

The great variety of products on the market together with the numerous factors which influence price, provide very complicated but interesting material for investigation which is considered to be outside the limits of this study. However, a general description of prices and price influencing factors is helpful in understanding the mechanics of market operations.

The variation in prices was different during the season for different products. Minor crops and crops which were less perishable showed the least variation in price. Garlic, for example, early in the season was priced 30 cents a pound but soon dropped to 25 cents at which price it remained for the duration of the season. Early Yellow Spanish Onions coming on to the market in August had a price range of from $1.50 to $1.75 per fifty pounds. They soon dropped to $1.25 to $1.50 and stayed between $1.25 to $1.60 for the rest of the season.

Crops which were more perishable, or more difficult to grow because of intolerancies to variation in climatic conditions, or had a tendency to come on to the market in extremely heavy supply at one time, tended to have greatest variation in price. Lettuce, as an example, varied from $1.00 a crate to $5.50 a crate, and red raspberries varied from $2.50 to $4.00 a case during the season.

Factors Affecting Price

Generally, the most important cause of variation in the price of crops in which local production is important was their supply upon the market platform. Conditions and events, which cause variations in the above rule, at times over-shadow the importance of the above fact, particularly in the minds of the operators who are dealing in the particular crops affected. These conditions which cause variations however, do become important in price making.

One of the greatest leveling factors in price variation is the development of modern refrigerated transportation. This makes it possible to bring even the most perishable product into the Salt Lake Market from regions such as California, Washington, Oregon, Texas and other points. When the price of certain commodities becomes high, due to short supply or heavy demand, some of the wholesale houses, will buy the product out of state and ship it into the market in order to take advantage of the large price difference. Traveling time is only about eighteen to twenty-four hours from California and the large size of trucks make it possible to secure rather large volumes of the more valuable produce. Such shipments, whether coming by truck or rail, have a very noticeable depressing effect upon the speed of sales for that particular commodity on the market platform and the price for which it will sell. Among the commodities most affected by such shipments were berries, lettuce, cant-

aloupes, tomatoes, and corn. Thus the supply situation might be altered in a matter of hours to a considerable extent.

Weather and climatic conditions influence growth and maturity of the various crops and have a noticeable and important effect upon the volume and quality of produce which comes to the market. Danger of frost towards the end of the season make the sellers anxious to get all the produce they possibly can on to the market platforms before it freezes.

The demand for a product does not remain uniform from day to day nor throughout the season in spite of the fact that generally prosperity exists. People working on the market generally did not think that consumers were buying as readily as they did the few years previous.

Changes in the marketing system and facilities seems to have had an effect upon demand. Produce shipments into the state, before Utah produce is ready for market, apparently takes the edge of the appetite for the earliest Utah produce and correspondingly will reduce the price for which early Utah produce can be sold. Formerly it was extremely important to get produce on to the early market. Although the early season price averages higher now than the average season price, there are indications that this difference has been reduced and therefore, the importance of the early produce is decreased. No study was made to determine if production of early market produce is still profitable.

Weather has an effect upon demand. Although there are

no quanitative figures for proof, it was observed that on the hottest days of summer there was a very noticeable and decided decrease in buying activities on the market resulting in several rather slow days. The general explanation given by operators was that it was too hot for women to cook on those days. As weather affected the general market sales and price, it would affect the selling of certain specific commodities even more.

There was a tendency also for the demand of a commodity to lag behind the actual season of supply for those fruits and vegetables which are used most for canning purposes. Many consumers evidently leave their canning until late in the season either because they have forgotten what season is best for buying fruit, or think that they can get good fruit later in the season for less money. Many of them miss the season of heaviest supply so are unable to get good buys on their fruits. There are continual requests by growers for better market information so consumers will know when to buy. However, care and caution must be exercised in this regard because of the variable conditions on the market.

WHOLESALE ESTIMATES OF PRODUCE SOLD

Because of the large volume handled by wholesale houses which operate in immediate proximity to the platforms, the management of about one-half of them were interviewed to obtain data on the redistribution of the Utah products whihh they purchased. This data cannot be compared directly with other volume and value figures because it is not known what per cent of the total universe of products sold is represented. However, the wholesalers who were interviewed are thought to handle something over one-half of the total produce passing through wholesale channels. These houses reported they handled $551,750 of Utah produce during the three months period. Methods of purchase are listed in Table 22.

Table 22. Estimates of about one-half of the total number of wholesalers as to amount of Utah produce handled and method of purchase. Salt Lake Growers' Market, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Method of Purchase	Value	Per Cent of Total
Total	$551,750.00	100.00
Contact of Farmers on Market Platform	227,237.50	41.2
Contact of Other Farmers Direct	252,400.00	45.7
Purchased on Farm	63,851.50	11.6
Other Means 1/	8,275.00	1.5

1/ Principally brokers and shippers.

In distribution the wholesale houses sold about 65 per cent of the produce to independent retailers in the city and about 15 per cent to out of town truckers. The remaining 20 per cent was divided among the other channels of distribution. Table 23 shows this distribution. It will be noted that chain stores bought only a small amount from wholesalers. Chain stores evidently do most of their buying directly from farmers rather than from the wholesalers. Table 19 indicated that growers on the market platform sold about 17 per cent of their produce to chain stores.

Table 23. Distribution of Utah produce by wholesale houses according to types of buyers, Salt Lake Growers' Market, June 1 to August 31, 1949.

Buyers	Per Cent of Total	Amounts Sold
Total	100.00	$551,750.00
Independent City Retailers	64.9	358,085.00
Out of Town Truckers	15.3	84,600.00
Chain Stores	6.4	35,592.50
Hotel and Restaurants	5.6	31,170.00
Other Wholesalers	4.4	24,422.50
Peddlers	3.2	17,880.00

About 36 per cent of the produce sold by growers who sell on the market platform, and 18 per cent of the Utah produce sold by wholesalers leaves the city. 1/

1/ The basis of the following calculation of percentage of produce sold which leaves the city is based on percentages in tables 19 and 25, and the assumption of one-fifth of produce sold to some sources leaving the city is based on the fact truckers take out of town slightly over one-fifth of produce sold by farmers and slightly less than one-fifth sold by wholesalers.

Per cent leaving city of produce sold by wholesalers to chain stores. It is assumed that one-fifth leave the city. .064 times .2	1.3
Per cent of produce leaving city bought by other wholesalers. It is assumed that one-fifth of this leaves the city. .044 times .2	.9
Per cent of produce sold by wholesaler to out of town truckers.	15.3
Estimated total per cent of produce sold by wholesalers which leaves the city.	17.5
Per cent of produce which farmers sell to wholesalers which leaves the city. .352 times .175	6.2
Per cent leaving city of produce sold by farmer to chain stores. It is assumed that one-fifth leaves the city. .174 times .2	3.5
Per cent of produce sold to truckers by farmers.	26.2
Estimated per cent of total produce sold by growers who use the market platform that leaves the city.	35.9 or 36 per cent

MARKET TRENDS

Trends in fruit and vegetable marketing at the Salt Lake Growers' Market are shown when descriptions of past years, as written in various publications and related by older market operators, are compared to present conditions.

A few obvious changes are in evidence. First is the greatly reduced number of operators selling on the platform. An average of 68 operators were in attendance during the opening hours of trading. This number is only about one-fourth the 250 to 300 that attended the market ten years ago.

Another trend is larger load sizes now than formerly. Most of the operators interviewed believed there was much less volume crossing the platform now than ten years ago. Market officials felt that taking the market as a whole, there was not a great deal of difference in volume now as compared to a number of years ago. The facts seem to bear out changes in methods of marketing and in marketing system rather than in volume of fruits and vegetables going into distribution channels in Salt Lake City. Evidently more farmers are selling directly to the wholesale houses, to chain stores, or to other sources rather taking the time to display their produce for competitive bidding.

Today there are fewer buyers dealing with the farmer. Farmers interviewed stated that independent grocers prior to 1940 took a large proportion of the produce sold by farmers on the platform. Now these city retailers buy only about

7 per cent of the produce from farmers, Table 19, and 65 per cent of Utah produce sold by wholesalers, Table 23. The balance must be out of state produce or produce delivered by the farmer to the store. There is also thought to be a decreased number of peddlers than before and during the war. The importance of the activities of truckers and wholesalers have continued upward.

Many contributing factors have effected these changes. The war brought about many new practices and intensified many trends that may have been underwary. Shortage of gasoline and labor made it necessary for farmers to either combine their loads cooperatively, sell their produce to someone who came to the farm to buy, or send it to the market with someone to sell on commission. With war and postwar prosperity there was less need for farmers to try to pinch the last penny from the price of their produce. Many market officials feel that if and when harder times come for the farmer, more of them will attend the market with their own produce in order to try to get as much as possible for it.

It is the opinion of the writer that an agricultural depression will bring many more local farmers back to the market to sell their own produce but this backward movement is not likely to equal the number of operators ten years ago. The development of the wholesaling system with direct buying combined with present convenience of refrigerated transportation will probably prevent complete return

to the old system.

The war had a similar effect upon the buyer on the market. War prosperity and regulation tended to make them cut corners and depend upon distribution of fruits and vegetables by wholesalers and jobbers. Such a practice has been a boost to the wholesale businesses and postwar prosperity has brought little change in the situation. The determination of whether or not these trends represent a more economical method of marketing has not been attempted in this thesis. However, this writer thinks the service rendered by wholesalers in being able to deliver a complete line of produce to the doors of retail establishments is a routine which is not likely to cease and although a few more buyers will return to the market, it is unlikely that there will be as many as in former years.

The use of the Growers' Market platform by farmers for selling should and will undoubtedly continue to be important in the marketing of fruits and vegetables in Salt Lake City. It is one of the most effective means a small producer has of taking over the functions of some middle-men and performing more of the marketing processes himself. Performing these functions adds to income in cases where the growers time would not be fully utilized otherwise. It may be that specialization of production and marketing is the most economical use of land and labor but until the small farms can be consolidated this will not be possible.

CRITICISMS AND SUGGESTIONS OFFERED BY WHOLESALERS AND GROWERS

Wholesalers and growers included in the survey were asked if they had criticisms of the market or suggestions for its improvement.

From wholesalers the most universal criticism was the poor grading, packaging, and quality of produce sold on the market platform. One wholesaler felt it was because growers were too small and thought that the larger growers brought in the better produce. Another considered the market a dumping ground for ungraded or off-grade produce. In talking of quality a third expressed the opinion that produce generally was brought to the platform too ripe, which limited its use to immediate local use and made it impossible to ship. Potato and tomato packing and quality were mentioned specifically as being very poor. One dealer considered cabbage and onion grade and quality to be good. It was pointed out that too often old containers were used which gave no chance of a neat appearing pack.

A frequent criticism from growers and wholesalers alike was the market practice of allowing the growers on the market and the market retailers to sell side by side on the market platform. It was felt that these should be separated as to location and some suggested different market fees for the two groups.

Most of the growers and wholesalers would like to have a larger market area. Present space is inadequate for the

movement and unloading of the present day trucks. At the present time the hours for unloading have to be limited so that trading on the platform can take place early in the morning.

Criticism by a wholesaler was made of the lack of co-operation among growers selling on the platform. The idea was expressed that the growers could accomplish more if they would cooperate rather than compete so much on the market. It was pointed out that at times the growers practically give produce away on the market. A suggestion was made that growers might be able to pro-rate their produce on heavy days.

In the opinion of the writer extensive cooperation in the regulation of the amount of produce sold or to prevent dumping is impractical on a free market of this kind where growers from anywhere in the state are allowed to bring produce for sale. Cooperative efforts in keeping buyer activity competitive and plentiful, and in supplying the quality and pack of produce desired by those to whom growers sell, would be important, possible and of more value to the growers.

Other suggestions are listed below. Most of these came from only one individual and may be personal grievances.

Toilet facilities are not up to a high standard.

The market area is not kept as sanitary as it should be. (In general the market area was kept in good condition as observed by the writer.)

The opening hour of 6 a.m. should be enforced.

There should be better market information for the

public.

The method of drawing for stall position is unfair.

Charging truckers to load hurts business on the market platform. (It is a market practice to charge truckers a fee for the privilege of using the market platform for loading their trucks.)

CONCLUSIONS

The Growers' Market Company has been an important asset to growers and to produce dealers in Salt Lake City and throughout the intermountain area. It has aided consumers, because the facilities it has provided has brought about systematic and economical distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables and has allowed for changes and improvements in the system of marketing.

Although the market platforms occupy a relatively less important position as an outlet for the produce of local farmers than appears to have been the case in the past, it is still extremely important to them as has been shown by the figures on volume and value that have been quoted in this study. Because of the small size of the average farm in this area, which requires that operators use every possible means to increase farm income by highly intensive cultivation, and because of the natural inclination and desire of many farmers to market their own produce, this market will continue to play an important role in the marketing and distribution of fruits and vegetables in this area. Its use will probably increase in times of depression as farmers find themselves in need of every possible additional bit of income and as unemployment increases and labor becomes cheaper. On the other side it will probably decrease in times of prosperity as has happened during the war and postwar and postwar period.

The changes which have been brought about by improvements

of refrigerated transportation, by the specialized distribution system developed by produce dealers, and by the trucking system out of the Salt Lake Market are all changes which will likely remain and be improved upon because of the economies they make possible and the service they render.

It might be possible for farmers to carry further the trend started during the war and consolidate more of the loads which they send to the market and thereby make savings in transportation costs and in the labor which each operator ordinarily spends in marketing his own produce. Many farmers bring very small loads, and as has been pointed out, the time taken to sell the larger loads is only slightly more than that required for the smaller loads and sales per hour increase greatly with the larger loads.

The wholesalers function as a central agency in concentrating the products from the farmer and in getting the highest possible price for them from the various buyers, but these agencies do not directly represent or work for the profit of farmers. Wholesalers and chain stores like to buy direct from farmers where they have less competition with each other. Such a system is economical from the standpoint of economy of marketing as a whole, which is the reason it will remain as a marketing institution, but from the standpoint of the grower more is needed. Growers who have dealt on the market and do have the time to market their own produce seem to think it is more profitable for them to sell their own produce rather than transport it directly to wholesalers or

chain stores or to sell it on the farm. Certainly the buyer competition would be much greater if all or even most of the farmers sold their produce on the platform.

Perhaps one of the very things that will bring more efficiency to produce institutions around the Salt Lake Market is the threat and knowledge that if they do not operate efficiently, give service and deal fairly with both the grocer to whom they sell and the farmer from whom they buy, there can be a swing back to the use of the platform by both farmers and independent retailers. This fact in itself makes the market platform an asset not only to the farmers who deal on it but indirectly to all other farmers who sell fresh fruits and vegetables in Salt Lake City.

A helpful change would be to divide the market into a retail and a wholesale section so that wholesalers, truckers, and others who buy in large quantities would know where the sellers specializing in this type of trade would be located. At the same time the consumers would know where the retail section was located and would find there the producers or operators who desire and are willing to spend more of their time on the market selling.

This separation would give opportunity for a better retail market. Better facilities might develop into a year round trade with greater consumer patronage thus offering a more direct route to the consumer in which growers might participate and benefit. If good trade and storage facilities were developed it might absorb some of the produce on the

slow days on the market.

The producers could help themselves most by improving the grading and packaging of the produce they bring to market. Each individual could help himself by establishing a reputation for fair and honest dealings. If produce were graded uniformly and were put into standard containers so that buyers would know what they were buying, the trading would be greatly facilitated on the market and the produce would compete much better with out-of-state produce. It might be well to eliminate some of the poorer quality produce but this cannot be made a general rule because there is some place for trade in lower quality produce in the city, but it should be graded so that it can be distinguished. People who sell should bring produce in at the stage of maturity at which the wholesalers and truckers or other buyers to whom they cater can use it best.

Getting the producers to improve their grading and packaging is one of the major problems of anyone seeking improvement of marketing for these growers. The Growers' Market Company might institute a program of publication and advertisement showing the advantage of better grading and packaging. There are undoubtedly many wholesalers who would be interested in giving support to such a program because it would be to their advantage to be able to buy the kind of produce they need for redistribution and for sale. Possible uses for the poorer quality produce might be sought in order to try to raise the general quality of produce sold on the

platform. Government agencies or observers can make suggestion but the real heart and force of improvement must come from grower leaders, the market company and other institutions which are the hub of the system.

The future will undoubtedly bring many changes which cannot be foreseen nor anticipated at the present time, but the future of the Growers' Market Company and its use as an important cog in the system of marketing in the area which it now serves seems to be well assured for years to come.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Net weight of produce in various containers. Growers Market platform, Salt Lake City, June 1 to September 30, 1949. 1/

Commodity	Container	Net Weight Pounds
Asparagus	Asparagus box	30
Peas and Beans	Burlap bag	45
	Crate	45
	Bushel	30
	Lug	15
	½ Bushel basket	15
Cabbage	Crate	80
Carrots,		
Bunches	Crate	50
Topped	Mesh bag	50
	Bushel	50
Lettuce	Lettuce Crate	75
Peppers	Crate	41
	Bushel	25
	Lug	13
Leafy vegetables	Crate	29
Beet greens		
Endive		
Mustard greens		
Parsley		
Romaine		
Spinach		
Swiss Chard		
Beets,		
Bunches	Crate	50
Topped	Crate	78
	Bushel	52
	Lug	26
Cauliflower	Crate	50
Celery	Crate	70
Corn	Burlap bag	75
	Corn crate	75
	Dozen ears	9½
Cucumbers	Lug	24

Table 1. Continued

Commodity	Container	Net Weight Pounds
Dill	Crate	29
Egg Plant	Crate	54
	Bushel	33
	Lug	25
Garlic	Lug	25
Leek	Dozen Bunch	10
Okra	Lug	20
Onions,		
Dry	Mesh bag	50
Green	Lug	25
	Crate	50
	Dozen bunch	5
Radishes	Crate	50
	Dozen bunch	5
Squash	Lug	25
Turnips,		
Bunch	Dozen bunch	17
Topped	Bushel	50
	Lug	25
Potatoes	Potato bag	100
Tomatoes	Bushel	53
	Lug	27
Cantaloupes	Crate	60
Watermelon	Each	25
Apples	Bushel	50
Peaches	Lug	25
Pears	Bushel	48
Apricots	Lug	25
Grapes	½ Bushel bakket	25
Plums & Prunes	½ Bushel basket	25

Table 1. Continued.

Commodity	Container	Net Weight Pounds
Berries & Currants	Case	9
Cherries	Lug	25
	Shipping case	16
	Display & small ship. case	12

1/ Includes potatoes.

Table 2. Summary of weight and value of produce on Salt Lake Growers' Market platform on selected days, June 6 to September 30, 1949 inclusive

Date and Day of Week	No. of Loads	Total Fruits and Vegetables		Total Fruits		Total Vegetables 1/	
		Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars
June 6 Mon.	21	61,272	$ 7,549.10	17,793	$5,436.75	43,479	$2,112.35
June 7 Tue.	36	66,918	8,338.94	20,754	5,765.00	46,164	2,573.94
June 15 Wed.	49	87,678	7,921.82	27,627	5,301.13	60,051	2,620.69
June 16 Thu.	55	69,903	6,254.78	17,987	4,144.63	51,916	2,110.15
June 24 Fri.	41	62,387	4,641.63	18,166	2,456.07	44,221	2,185.50
June 25 Sat.	38	71,638	4,182.12	10,143	2,029.88	61,495	2,152.20
June 27 Mon.	51	99,679	7,886.06	22,730	4,524.25	76,949	3,361.80
June 28 Tue.	48	95,738	7,978.06	42,391	5,526.40	53,347	2,451.66
July 6 Wed.	60	124,105	10,363.09	53,787	7,075.50	70,318	3,287.53
July 7 Thu.	71	200,459	11,897.28	77,807	7,344.94	123,452	4,552.34
July 15 Fri.	63	177,202	8,466.00	73,000	5,026.16	104,202	3,439.84
July 16 Sat.	71	147,555	9,659.28	46,029	5,942.00	101,526	3,717.28
July 18 Mon.	86	272,973	13,213.58	55,286	4,846.40	217,687	8,367.18
July 19 Tue.	81	238,528	10,398.37	59,715	5,202.67	178,813	5,195.70
July 27 Wed.	78	165,753	9,663.74	29,252	3,510.30	136,500	6,153.44
July 28 Thu.	75	217,080	10,756.70	32,528	3,503.50	184,552	7,265.20
Aug. 5 Fri.	61	177,696	7,840.58	12,884	1,591.89	164,812	6,248.69
Aug. 6 Sat.	64	161,932	6,589.06	10,871	1,013.76	151,061	5,575.30
Aug. 8 Mon.	89	291,085	11,885.92	34,248	2,491.43	256,837	9,394.49
Aug. 9 Tue.	67	212,712	9,342.98	19,548	2,159.27	193,164	7,183.71
Aug. 17 Wed.	72	218,753	9,049.30	29,914	2,770.07	188,839	6,279.23
Aug. 18 Thu.	86	302,508	11,280.43	44,237	3,172.70	258,271	8,107.73
Aug. 26 Fri.	75	256,530	7,993.25	8,867	1,023.35	247,663	6,969.90
Aug. 27 Sat.	73	215,817	6,844.84	11,618	1,116.26	204,199	5,728.58
Aug. 29 Mon.	97	417,106	13,784.83	42,417	3,349.12	374,689	10,435.71
Aug. 30 Tue.	66	244,937	8,907.38	25,706	2,238.44	219,231	6,668.94
Sep. 7 Wed.	72	233,607	9,062.27	65,786	3,441.76	167,821	5,620.51
Sep. 8 Thu.	100	362,089	12,992.12	109,805	6,030.20	252,284	6,961.92
Sep. 16 Fri.	82	247,009	10,279.77	72,295	4,287.99	174,714	5,991.78
Sep. 17 Sat.	80	259,632	9,877.18	75,248	3,784.93	184,384	6,092.25
Sep. 19 Mon.	100	443,738	17,797.55	151,761	7,766.48	291,977	10,031.07
Sept. 20 Tue.	81	248,840	10,449.49	103,129	5,188.69	145,711	5,260.80
Sep. 28 Wed.	53	170,964	6,958.72	43,180	2,467.41	127,785	4,491.31
Sep. 29 Thu.	75	200,731	8,552.41	72,560	3,823.08	128,171	4,729.33

Table 2 Continued.

Date and Day of the Week	Green Leafy and Yellow Vegetables		Other Vegetables		Potatoes	
	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars
June 6 Mon.	33,732	$1,250.10	9,747	$ 862.25		
June 7 Tue.	34,716	1,543.34	11,448	1,030.60		
June 15 Wed.	42,417	1,486.87	17,634	1,133.82		
June 16 Thu.	37,995	1,142.14	13,721	950.01	200	$ 18.00
June 24 Fri.	33,490	1,329.63	9,131	775.93	1,600	80.00
June 25 Sat.	51,250	1,491.69	10,220	659.61	25	.94
June 27 Mon.	51,917	1,735.33	15,882	1,098.73	9,150	527.75
June 28 Tue.	37,831	1,372.23	11,716	926.87	3,800	152.56
July 6 Wed.	23,981	1,133.50	22,037	1,381.78	24,300	772.25
July 7 Thu.	55,388	1,779.00	26,364	1,596.93	41,700	1,176.41
July 15 Fri.	35,500	1,159.80	38,331	1,452.57	29,750	735.47
July 16 Sat.	35,403	1,217.20	45,399	1,735.08	20,400	717.00
July 18 Mon.	59,512	2,014.48	62,695	3,742.66	93,880	2,378.36
July 19 Tue.	47,257	1,410.05	55,503	1,767.19	75,000	1,877.28
July 27 Wed.	23,194	1,690.79	29,891	2,172.95	80,500	1,819.90
July 28 Thu.	39,505	1,679.52	33,024	1,968.05	105,300	2,372.63
Aug. 5 Fri.	21,684	1,093.01	49,615	1,823.93	67,200	1,284.50
Aug. 6 Sat.	18,905	915.28	60,816	2,334.15	52,200	1,052.37
Aug. 8 Mon.	36,078	1,645.84	63,507	3,104.68	104,500	1,953.35
Aug. 9 Tue.	17,083	881.54	60,909	2,347.97	55,100	1,020.70
Aug. 17 Wed.	20,978	1,201.90	33,021	1,494.13	82,400	1,414.60
Aug. 18 Thu.	18,861	902.92	52,620	2,346.16	115,900	1,912.35
Aug. 26 Fri.	16,272	842.43	74,731	2,751.10	69,300	1,143.45
Aug. 27 Sat.	23,527	1,316.18	44,909	1,665.15	67,900	1,188.25
Aug. 29 Mon.	33,957	1,749.83	59,749	2,632.85	140,700	2,410.90
Aug. 30 Tue.	28,104	1,479.01	50,295	2,154.37	57,400	1,025.88
Sep. 7 Wed.	25,841	1,370.62	44,242	3,324.13	24,600	463.20
Sep. 8 Thu.	33,954	1,503.79	56,409	2,220.82	84,800	1,641.91
Sep. 16 Fri.	25,928	1,304.28	41,664	1,982.40	46,000	942.80
Sep. 17 Sat.	22,769	1,107.95	46,937	2,130.41	57,600	1,261.89
Sep. 19 Mon.	63,862	1,912.64	92,318	4,297.60	54,300	1,192.27
Sep. 20 Tue.	27,911	1,368.03	53,921	2,168.34	13,800	310.24
Sep. 28 Wed.	29,426	1,174.33	34,314	1,617.48	39,400	848.06
Sep. 29 Thu.	20,515	987.37	52,426	2,107.66	24,000	518.00

Table 2 Continued.

Date and Day of Week	Apples		Tomatoes		Melons	
	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars	Pounds	Dollars
July 6 Wed.	50	$ 1.50				
July 7 Thu.	- -	- -				
July 15 Fri.	4,775	238.75	621	$ 92.00		
July 16 Sat.	4,975	248.75	324	48.00		
July 18 Mon.	3,700	165.76	1,600	231.68		
July 19 Tue.	2,725	150.42	1,053	141.18		
July 27 Wed.	7,775	321.80	2,916	469.80		
July 28 Thu.	7,525	386.25	6,723	1,245.00		
Aug. 5 Fri.	5,500	260.63	20,493	1,707.75	5,820	$ 339.50
Aug. 6 Sat.	6,000	232.76	16,200	1,200.00	2,940	73.50
Aug. 8 Mon.	14,350	728.10	40,932	2,001.12	11,820	689.50
Aug. 9 Tue.	6,100	305.00	47,412	2,195.00	12,660	738.50
Aug. 17 Wed.	5,175	231.99	25,940	954.00	26,500	1,214.60
Aug. 18 Thu.	4,550	204.06	40,230	1,668.80	30,660	1,277.50
Aug. 26 Fri.	1,700	103.56	45,300	1,088.18	42,060	1,144.74
Aug. 27 Sat.	2,500	125.00	24,363	807.00	43,500	752.00
Aug. 29 Mon.	10,700	676.44	54,963	1,491.27	85,320	2,150.86
Aug. 30 Tue.	1,900	104.50	25,382	648.08	58,050	1,361.60
Sep. 7 Wed.	1,300	78.00	22,218	574.72	50,920	887.84
Sep. 8 Thu.	8,850	486.81	26,821	721.68	50,300	866.72
Sep. 16 Fri.	2,700	155.52	18,302	756.05	42,820	1,006.25
Sep. 17 Sat.	10,550	572.17	12,398	547.50	44,680	1,044.50
Sep. 19 Mon.	17,201	1,013.56	36,397	1,512.18	45,100	1,116.38
Sep. 20 Tue.	13,125	769.14	15,379	585.34	34,700	828.85
Sep. 28 Wed.	13,875	660.45	8,244	451.44	16,400	400.00
Sep. 29 Thu.	27,900	1,332.26	14,550	703.80	16,680	412.50

1/ Potatoes included.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bureau of Agricultural Economics, The Agricultural Situation, November, 1949.

2. Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Consumption of Food in the United States, 1909-48, Miscellaneous Publication No. 691, August, 1949.

3. Bureau of Agricultural Economics, The Marketing and Transportation Situation, December, 1949.

4. Nicholson, V. H., Regional Characteristics of the Rochester Public Market, Department of Agricultural Economics, New York State College of Agriculture, Ithaca, New York, A.E. 420, March, 1943.

5. Nowell, Reynolds I., A Study of the Salt Lake Growers' Market Company, A thesis submitted to the United States Civil Service Examiner at Logan, Utah, December 14, 1927.

6. Snow, Bess Longhurst, The Growers' Market Company, April 20, 1934.

7. U. S. Census of Agriculture, Vol. 1, Part 31, Utah and Nevada, 1945.