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Most Significant Factors Contributing to Current Pressures

1) Exchange Rate – 25% higher than 4 years ago, likely to remain strong through 2004-5

2) Slow recovery in foreign economies, especially the Pacific Rim, but not strong enough to overcome exchange rate gains.

3) Energy Prices
Most Significant Factors Contributing to Current Pressures

4) Global production of crop—now approaching 5 good years in a row

5) Policy Changes
   – Budget Pressure
   – FAIR Act
   – Budget in 2001 versus 2002/Surpluses

6) Potential new acreage in Brazil
Macroeconomic assumptions underlying the FAPRI baseline were pulled from Standard and Poor’s DRI in December 2000.

The Euro is projected to strengthen relative to the dollar, reaching $0.90 by 2007.

All other factors equal, the stronger Euro makes the EU less competitive in world markets.

Crude oil prices averaged $29 per barrel in 2000, about 50% higher than the levels of the previous decade.

Lower prices are projected over the baseline period, with a low of $22 projected for 2005. Although lower than 2000, prices still remain high relative to the 1990s.

After expanding by 5% in 2000, growth in the U.S. economy is expected to slow in 2001. Longer term, U.S. real GDP growth averages 3.5% per year.

Growth in world real GDP is projected to range between 3 and 4%.
Projected Consequences--Without Additional Government Support

• Negative for the majority of the crop sector
  – Price recovery not likely until mid-decade for all crops except soybeans

• Positive for the majority of the livestock industry

• Positive for consumers and food prices
**Beef production** is projected to decline by over 600 million pounds in 2001. Beef production remains below 26 billion pounds through 2003.

**Beef cows** are projected to increase by 200 thousand head during 2001. During the next increasing phase of the cattle cycle, beef cows increase to 36 million head.

**Cattle prices** have increased substantially since 1998. In 2001, Nebraska direct fed steer prices are projected to average $74.49 per cwt.

**Oklahoma feeder steer prices** are projected to average over $95 per cwt. for the next three years. These prices would be moderated if feed costs were to increase over the low levels seen in the baseline.

With the decline in domestic beef supplies, **per capita beef consumption** is projected to decline by over 2 pounds per person in 2001.

**Demand** for beef has been positive the last two years. If demand were to return to the weak levels seen during much of the 1980s and 1990s, the projections for industry growth would be muted.
• Barrow and gilt prices are projected to average $40.60 per cwt. in 2001 after averaging near $45 per cwt. in 2000. Barrow and gilt prices average between $39 per cwt. and $46 per cwt. over the baseline.

• Packing capacity constraints in 2002 are expected to result in barrow and gilt prices that rival those seen in 1998.

• The pork breeding herd is projected to continue the long term decline as productivity increases continue to cause total pork supplies to increase.

• By the end of December 2002, pork breeding inventories are projected to fall below 6 million head.

• Hog slaughter is projected to reach a record level in 2002 of over 103 million head.

• Additional processing capacity will be necessary to slaughter the 105.5 million head projected in 2006.
Absent weather problems, supplies will continue to pressure *crop prices* below their recent historical levels. In many cases, prices for 2000-02 will average 20% below the 1995-99 level.

The outlook for *livestock prices* is mixed. Weakness is expected in hog and milk prices, while cattle prices will continue to show strength over the next two years.

*Pork processing capacity* constraints in the hog industry will likely lead to hog prices returning to the levels seen in late 1998 by 2002.

Longer term, additional processing capacity will need to be found to accommodate the supply of hogs projected in this baseline.

*Demand for beef* has been positive for the past two years. An additional pound of beef has been consumed above what prices and income would have suggested.

Any events, like BSE scares in the U.S., could curtail much of the demand growth seen the last couple of years.
With the exception of beef and dairy, 1999 commodity prices came in substantially lower than historical averages. Prices of the 5 major crops are all expected to average below the loan rate for the 2000 marketing year.

Assuming normal yields, only a modest recovery is anticipated for the 2000-02 period. Soybean prices are expected to average below the 1999 level in the 2000-02 period. Loan rates will continue to play a significant role in a producer's income.

Strengthening is expected in beef and pork prices as beef production falls and pork levels off.

### U.S. Commodity Prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat, per Bu</td>
<td>$3.42</td>
<td>$3.01</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$3.44</td>
<td>$2.48</td>
<td>$2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn, per Bu</td>
<td>$2.62</td>
<td>$2.12</td>
<td>$2.49</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>$1.82</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans, per Bu</td>
<td>$6.10</td>
<td>$5.90</td>
<td>$5.95</td>
<td>$6.28</td>
<td>$4.63</td>
<td>$4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton, per Lb</td>
<td>$0.59</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$0.64</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice, per Cwt</td>
<td>$8.02</td>
<td>$6.39</td>
<td>$7.48</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
<td>$6.11</td>
<td>$6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum, per Bu</td>
<td>$2.34</td>
<td>$1.91</td>
<td>$2.35</td>
<td>$1.91</td>
<td>$1.57</td>
<td>$1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Steers, per Cwt</td>
<td>$63.99</td>
<td>$69.83</td>
<td>$72.20</td>
<td>$64.28</td>
<td>$65.56</td>
<td>$73.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;G, per Cwt</td>
<td>$51.21</td>
<td>$51.97</td>
<td>$46.29</td>
<td>$48.52</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$39.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Milk, per Cwt</td>
<td>$13.44</td>
<td>$12.91</td>
<td>$12.80</td>
<td>$14.51</td>
<td>$14.38</td>
<td>$12.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Overall Economic Viability for Representative Crop, Dairy, and Livestock Farms 2001-2005

- Feed Grains: 13 Poor
- Wheat: 6 Moderate
- Cotton: 7 Good
- Rice: 6 Poor
- Dairy: 14 Poor
- Beef: 3 Poor
- Hogs: 3 Poor

Categories: Good, Moderate, Poor
General Assumptions

- Analysis incorporates the provisions that address loan rates and direct payments for grains, cotton and oilseeds (excluding peanuts) as well as an increase in the CRP enrollment cap.
- The analysis does not include any proposed changes to other conservation programs, other crops, dairy, trade programs, research, nutrition, and rural development.
## Loan Rates, Fixed Payments & Target Prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Loan Rates</th>
<th>Fixed Payments</th>
<th>Target Prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>$2.58</td>
<td>$0.53</td>
<td>$4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>$1.89</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>Relative market prices w/corn</td>
<td>$1.89</td>
<td>$0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>Relative market prices w/corn</td>
<td>Same as baseline w/max of $1.65</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>Relative market prices w/corn</td>
<td>Same as baseline w/max of $1.21</td>
<td>$0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>$0.5192</td>
<td>$0.0667</td>
<td>$0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>$2.35</td>
<td>$10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans</td>
<td>$5.26</td>
<td>$0.42</td>
<td>$5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Oilseeds</td>
<td>$9.30</td>
<td>$0.74</td>
<td>$10.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fixed & Counter-cyclical Payments (CCPs)

- CCPs = Target Price - Fixed Payment
  - (higher of farm price or loan rate)
- CCPs and fixed payments are paid on program yield on 85% of base acres.
- Current flexibility rules apply. Payments are not tied to the current production decision.
- Determining the base acreage?
Determining Base Acreage

- Estimates are based on county data.
- Decision to update based on expected program benefits where each county is treated as a farm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>AMTA 2002</th>
<th>H.R. 2646</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflowers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>211.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>265.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FARM Assistance Database
Analysis of Option to Switch Base Acres

- **Cotton**: 90 producers would keep existing base, 85 would benefit from updating base.
- **Wheat**: 70 producers would keep existing base, 60 would benefit from updating base.
- **Sorghum**: 50 producers would keep existing base, 45 would benefit from updating base.
- **Corn**: 30 producers would keep existing base, 25 would benefit from updating base.
- **Rice**: 10 producers would keep existing base, 5 would benefit from updating base.
- **Soybeans**: 5 producers would keep existing base, 2 would benefit from updating base.
- **Diversified**: 20 producers would keep existing base, 10 would benefit from updating base.

Legend:
- Yellow: No. of Producers Who Would Keep Existing Base
- Blue: No. of Producers Who Benefit from Updating Base
FARM Assistance Database
Analysis of Option to Switch Base Acres

Payments per Farm for Current Base
Payments per Farm for Optional Base
Impacts on Production & Price

• Marginal increases in grain and cotton area with oilseed area declining from baseline levels.
• Total planted area increases by less than 1%.
• Changes in crop prices reflect shifts in acreage
  – Grain prices fall by 2-4 cents/bu
  – Soybean prices rise by 4 cents/bu
  – Cotton prices fall by less than 1 cent/lb
• H.R. 2646 increases farm income by an average of $4.5 billion above baseline levels.
• For the 1996-00 period, farm income averaged $47.4 billion.
• The 2001 assistance package would add $4.7 billion to 2001 farm income.
Possible WTO Implications?

• If the CCP is classified as “non-product-specific Amber box,” then our analysis suggests spending under H.R. 2646 has a 36.5% chance of exceeding the AMS cap of $19.1 billion for the 2002 crop.

• As prices increase over the projection period, probability of exceeding AMS cap declines.
Representative Farm Assumptions

• 44 Farms Analyzed under risk 2000-2006
  – 13 Feed grains/oilseeds
  – 10 Wheat
  – 11 Cotton
  – 10 Rice
• 20% term and 100% operating debt 2000
• Base acreage chosen to maximize benefit
• MPCI 50/100
• Baseline – 1996 FAIR ACT continued through 2006
  – Does not include MLA for 2001
• Provisions of H.R.2646 plus the 2001 MLA
• Payment Limits assumed nonrestrictive
Definition of Terms

• Net Cash Farm Income = Total Receipts including Govt. Payments minus all Cash Expenses
• Probability of a Cash Flow Deficit = Chance that net cash farm income is less than cash required for family living, taxes, principal payments and capital replacement
• Probability of Losing Real Net Worth = Chance that real net worth Dec 31, 2006 is less than beginning net worth Jan 1, 2000
### Table 2. Comparison of the H.R. 2646 Farm Bill to a Continuation of the 1996 Farm Bill for Representative Crop Farms, 2000-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cotton</th>
<th>Change in Net Cash Farm Income ($1,000)</th>
<th>% Change in Net Cash Farm Income</th>
<th>Change in Probability of a Deficit (% Points)</th>
<th>Change in Probability of Decreasing Net Worth (% Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TXSP3697</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXSP1682</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXRP2500</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>434.2%</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXBC1400</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXCB1720</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC2000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>226.5%</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC6000</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNC1675</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1185.5%</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNC3800</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>242.8%</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC3000</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC2640</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>940.5%</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TNC3800 CDF of Average Annual Net Cash Farm Income for Base and H.R.2646 Farm Bill, 2002-2006 ($1,000)
LAC2640 CDF of Average Annual Net Cash Farm Income for Base and H.R.2646 Farm Bill, 2002-2006 ($1,000)
Table 2. Comparison of the H.R. 2646 Farm Bill to a Continuation of the 1996 Farm Bill for Representative Crop Farms, 2000-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feed Grain Farms</th>
<th>Change in Net Cash Farm Income ($1,000)</th>
<th>% Change in Net Cash Farm Income (% Points)</th>
<th>Change in Probability of a Deficit (% Points)</th>
<th>Change in Probability of Decreasing Net Worth (% Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TXNP1600</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXNP6700</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>127.2%</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCG3300</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCG1700</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONG1400</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>169.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAG950</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAG2400</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG900</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG1300</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNG900</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>252.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNG2400</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG1500</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>255.0%</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG3500</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TNG900 CDF of Average Annual Net Cash Farm Income for Base and H.R.2646 Farm Bill, 2002-2006 ($1,000)
TNG2400 CDF of Average Annual Net Cash Farm Income for Base and H.R.2646 Farm Bill, 2002-2006 ($1,000)
SCG1500 CDF of Average Annual Net Cash Farm Income for Base and H.R.2646 Farm Bill, 2002-2006 ($1,000)
SCG3500 CDF of Average Annual Net Cash Farm Income for Base and H.R.2646 Farm Bill, 2002-2006 ($1,000)
Table 2. Comparison of the H.R. 2646 Farm Bill to a Continuation of the 1996 Farm Bill for Representative Crop Farms, 2000-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rice</th>
<th>Change in Net Cash Farm Income ($1,000)</th>
<th>% Change in Net Cash Farm Income (%)</th>
<th>Change in Probability of a Deficit (% Points)</th>
<th>Change in Probability of Decreasing Net Worth (% Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAR424</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1475.3%</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR2365</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1020.0%</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXR1553</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>569.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TXR3774</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>109.0%</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANR2500</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>405.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAR1200</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>744.7%</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOWR4000</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOER4000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSR4735</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>407.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARR3640</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARR3640 CDF of Average Annual Net Cash Farm Income for Base and H.R.2646 Farm Bill, 2002-2006 ($1,000)
Summary

• 13 of 44 crop farms retained current Base acres while 31 farms changed Base to their 1998-2001 average planted acres

• All crop farms benefit from H.R. 2646 Farm Program, relative to continuing the 1996 Farm Bill
  – Higher net cash farm incomes (44 of 44)
  – Lower probability of cash flow deficits (37 of 44)
  – Lower probability of decreasing net worth (40 of 44)
http://www.afpc.tamu.edu

The Agricultural and Food Policy Center
at Texas A&M University

The Agricultural and Food Policy Center (AFPC) conducts analyses of the impacts of government policy proposals and/or implementation procedures on farmers, agriculturalists, taxpayers, and consumers. Its primary constituency is the U.S. Congress, particularly the agricultural committees. The AFPC also conducts research and/or educational programs for government agencies, farm and agribusiness organizations, and agricultural leadership throughout Texas and the nation. Specific AFPC objectives include:

- Respond to legislative requests for analyses of agricultural and food policy options.
- Identify and define emerging agricultural, resource and food policy issues.
- Identify and clarify agricultural and food policy options.
- Analyze the impacts of changes in macroeconomic policy on agriculture.
- Develop educational programs and publications to explain the results of AFPC research and improve understanding of policy options and their consequences.
- Provide leadership in developing new scientific methods for analyzing public policy issues.
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