



# AGRICULTURAL FINANCE DATABOOK

Second Quarter 1990

Guide to internal tables of contents and notes on sources	<u>Page</u>
Farm debt outstanding, major lending institutions	3
Amount and characteristics of farm loans made by commercial banks	6
Selected statistics from the quarterly reports of condition of commercial	15
banks	25

Division of Research and Statistics Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System Washington, D.C. 20551

Nicholas A. Walraven and John Rosine

#### General Information

The <u>Agricultural Finance Databook</u> is a compilation of various data on current developments in agricultural finance. Large portions of the data come from regular surveys conducted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or Federal Reserve Banks. Other portions of the data come from the quarterly call report data of commercial banks or from the reports of other financial institutions involved in agricultural lending. At the end of June, when this publication went to press, data from the survey of terms of bank lending were available for the second quarter of 1990; the other data generally were available only through the first quarter.

Parts or all of the <u>Agricultural Finance Databook</u> may be copied and distributed freely. Any redistribution of selected parts of the <u>Databook</u> should be accompanied by the "contents" pages at the beginning of the corresponding section, together with the front cover identifying the <u>Databook</u> and date of issue, and this page providing subscription information. Remaining substantive questions may be addressed to Nicholas Walraven or John Rosine at the address shown on the cover.

The <u>Databook</u> is furnished on a complimentary basis to college and university teachers, libraries of educational institutions, government departments and agencies, and public libraries. Others should enclose the annual subscription fee of \$5.00.

New subscriptions to the  $\underline{\text{Databook}}$  (Statistical Release E.15) may be entered by sending a mailing address (including zip code) to:

Publications Services, Mail Stop 138 Federal Reserve Board Washington, D.C. 20551

Notice of change of address also should be sent to Publications Services. A copy of the back cover showing the old address should be included.

SECTION I: FARM DEBT OUTSTANDING (including farm households)

TABLES:

Debt held by institutional lenders	Page	
I.A Quarterly estimates	 4	

#### SOURCES OF DATA:

The sources of the data in this section are: quarterly reports of condition, all insured commercial banks; the quarterly information statements of the Farm Credit System; "Gross Flow of Mortgage Loans in the United States," American Council of Life Insurance; and "Report 616," Farmers Home Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture. The farm debt series on a USDA basis is from the Economic Research Service. The data are not seasonally adjusted.

The quarterly data shown here for commercial banks, life insurance companies, and the Farmers Home Administration are virtually the same as those reported annually in the USDA accounts that include the debt of farm households (as well as the debt of farm businesses). By contrast, the numbers shown here for the Farm Credit System differ somewhat from those shown in the USDA accounts, owing to adjustments by the USDA to allow for loans that are not for agricultural purposes.

#### Recent developments:

The volume of outstanding farm loans held by the major institutional lenders continued to trend gradually lower in the first quarter of 1990; in total, these loans were down 2 percent from the level of a year earlier, similar to the year-to-year rate of decline that was evident in the second half of 1989. In the first quarter, a seasonal paydown of nonreal estate debt trimmed the loans outstanding at commercial banks by \$1-1/2 billion, and declines in the volume of outstandings also were reported by the Farm Credit System and the Farmers Home Administration. Relative to a year earlier, the reduction in outstanding loans was concentrated in the loans held by the Farmers Home Administration, which has been resolving loan problems that had accumulated through the 1980s.

[Note: At the end of June, when this issue of the Databook went to press, a first-quarter figure on the loans held by life insurance companies was not available; it has been assumed in these estimates that the December 1989 figure carried over into March of 1990.]

TABLE I.A

FARM DEBT OUTSTANDING: DATA REPORTED BY THE MAJOR FARM LENDING INSTITUTIONS

(END OF QUARTER)

				-		AL ESTATE	DEBT				NONREAL ES	TATE DEB	T		MEMO:
		TOTAL		TOTAL	INSURED COMMERCIAL BANKS	FARM CREDIT SYSTEM	LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES	FARMERS HOME ADMINIS- TRATION		TOTAL	INSURED COMMERCIAL BANKS	FARM CREDIT SYSTEM	FARMERS HOME ADMINIS- TRATION		FARM DEBT HELD BY MAJO FARM LENDING INSTITUTIONS USDA BASI
	I. <b>A</b> 1	AMOUNT,	END OF	QUARTER,	BILLIONS OF	DOLLARS								Ù.	
1987 <u>Q</u> 1	1	126.9	1	71.3	13.1	37.5	10.4	10.3	1	55.6	28.8	10.4	16.4		
Q2	1	128.1		70.4	13.8	36.0	10.4	10.2	i	57.7	30.4		16.4	- 1	***
Q3	1	126.8	1	69.4	14.1	35.1	10.1	10.1	i	57.4	30.6	10.6	16.6		***
Q4	1	123.8	1	68.8	14.5	34.3	9.9	10.1	i	55.1	29.0	10.5	16.3	1	***
									'	33.1	29.0	9.9	16.1	ı	121.9
1988 Q1	- 1	121.4	1	67.9	14.7	33.6	9.7	10.0	1	53.4	28.1				
Q2	1	124.1	1	67.7	15.2	33.0	9.6	9.9	- 1	56.4	30.3	9.5	15.9	1	***
Q3	1	124.2	- 1	67.8	15.3	33.0	9.6	9.8	;	56.4		10.1	16.0	- 1	***
Q4	1	120.6	ĺ	66.9	15.4	32.2	9.7	9.6	;	53.8	30.8	9.8	15.8	1	***
								J. 0		33.6	29.8	9.3	14.7	- 1	118.5
L989 Q1	1	118.1	1	65.8	15.8	31.1	9.4	9.6		52.3	28.4				
Q2	1	121.0	1	65.7	16.3	30.6	9.3	9.4	- 1	55.3		9.3	14.6	1	***
Q3	- 1	121.7	1	65.6	16.5	30.5	9.3	9.3		56.2	30.7	10.0	14.6	1	***
Q4	1	118.3	1	65.1	16.6	30.2	9.5	8.7	1	53.2	31.5	10.2	14.4	1	***
						–		0.7	,	33.2	30.8	10.0	12.4	1	***
L990 Q1	1	116.0	1	64.8	16.8	29.9	9.5	8.6	,	51.2	22.2				
					م. ا دو			0.0	'	31.2	29.3	9.7	12.1	ŀ	***
	I.A2	PERCENT	AGE OF T	OTAL SPE	CIFIED DEBT,	END OF	QUARTER								
007 01						······································									
.987 Q1	!	***	!	100.0	18.4	52.5	14.6	14.4	1	100.0	51.8	18.8	29.5		***
Q2	!	***	!	100.0	19.6	51.2	14.7	14.5	ı	100.0	52.7	18.5	28.8	!	***
Q3	!	***		100.0	20.3	50.6	14.5	14.5	- 1	100.0	53.4	18.3	28.3	!	***
Q4	ł	***	Í	100.0	21.0	49.9	14.4	14.6	1	100.0	52.7	18.0	29.2	!	***
000 01		***										10.0	23.2	,	***
988 Q1			!	100.0	21.7	49.4	14.2	14.7	1	100.0	52.6	17.7	29.7		***
Q2	1	***	!	100.0	22.4	48.8	14.1	14.7	i	100.0	53.6	17.9	28.4	!	
Q3	!	***	!	100.0	22.6	48.7	14.1	14.5	Ī	100.0	54.6	17.4	28.0	!	***
Q4	1	***	ŀ	100.0	23.1	48.1	14.5	14.4	i	100.0	55.4	17.2		!	***
000 01									•			+1.2	27.3	I	***
989 Q1	!	***	1	100.0	24.0	47.2	14.3	14.5	1	100.0	54.3	17.8	07.0		
Q2	!	***	1	100.0	24.8	46.6	14.2	14.4	i	100.0	55.5	17.8	27.9	!	***
Q3	ļ	***		100.0	25.2	46.5	14.1	14.2	i	100.0	56.1	18.2	26.4	1	***
Q4	ł	***	1	100.0	25.6	46.4	14.7	13.4	i	100.0	57.9	18.2	25.7 23.3	!	***
									•		37.5	10.0	23.3	ŀ	***
999 91															
990 Q1	1	***	1	100.0	25.8	46.1	14.7	13.3	1	100.0	57.3	19.0	23.7		***

#### TABLES:

Estimat	es from the quarterly survey of nonreal estate farm loans	Page
II.A	Amount	8
II.B	Number	9
II.C	Average size	10
II.D	Average maturity	11
II.E	Average effective interest rate	12
II.F	Percentage of loans with a floating interest rate	13
II.G	Distribution of farm loans by effective interest rate	14

#### SOURCES OF DATA:

These data on the farm loans made by commercial banks are derived from quarterly sample surveys conducted by the Federal Reserve System during the first full week of the second month of each quarter. Data obtained from the sample are expanded into national estimates for all commercial banks, which are shown in the following tables.

Before August 1989, the farm loan survey was part of a broader survey of the terms of lending by a sample of 340 commercial banks. A subset of 250 banks was asked for information regarding agricultural lending, and about 150 typically reported at least one farm loan.

Beginning in August of 1989, the data are being drawn from a new, redesigned sample of 250 banks that is no longer part of the broader survey. In choosing the new sample, banks are stratified according to their volume of farm lending; previously, they had been stratified according to the volume of total loans. As before, however, the sample data are being expanded into national estimates for all commercial banks. In the August 1989 survey, about 200 banks reported at least one farm loan, and the number of sample loans totaled about 4500, more than twice the number typically reported in the previous quarterly surveys.

The new panel of farm banks also was chosen so that the regional mix of sample banks corresponds roughly to the geographic distribution of outstanding farm loans; over time, as more experience is gained with the new sample, it may become possible to examine regional differences in the terms of agricultural lending.

In both the previous survey and the new one, the national estimates exhibit variability due to sampling error. This variability is particularly evident in data on average maturity, which are greatly affected by the

TABLE I.B

FARM DEBT OUTSTANDING: DATA REPORTED BY THE MAJOR FARM LENDING INSTITUTIONS

						RE2	L ESTATE	DEBT				NONREAL ES	TATE DEB	T		MEMO: FARM DEBT
			TOTAL		TOTAL	INSURED COMMERCIAL BANKS	FARM CREDIT SYSTEM	LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES	FARMERS HOME ADMINIS- TRATION		TOTAL	INSURED COMMERCIAL BANKS	FARM CREDIT SYSTEM	FARMERS HOME ADMINIS- TRATION		HELD BY MAJO FARM LENDING INSTITUTIONS USDA BASI
		I.B1	PERCENT CI	HANGE	FROM PRE	VIOUS QUARTE	ZR.									
1987 g	21	1	-4.3	i	-2.8	3.5	-4.7	-5.0	-0.8	I	-6.1	-7.7	-9.9	-0.4	ı	***
9	22	1	1.0	1	-1.3	5.2	-3.9	-0.7	-0.8	1	3.9	5.7	2.2	1.6	4	***
2	23	1	-1.0	1	-1.4	2.1	-2.4	-2.6	-1.2	1	-0.5	0.7	-1.2	-2.2	١	***
9	24	1	-2.4	1	-0.9	2.4	-2.2	-1.8	0.0	1	-4.1	-5.2	-5.6	-1.1	1	***
1988 Q	21	1	-2.0	1	-1.2	1.9	-2.3	-2.4	-1.1	1	-2.9	-3.2	-4.5	-1.4	1	***
_	22	1	2.3	ı	-0.3	3.0	-1.5	-0.8	-0.4	1	5.6	7.6	6.8	1.1	- 1	***
Q	23	i	0.0	- 1	0.1	1.2	-0.0	0.1	-1.0	1	-0.1	1.7	-3.1	-1.5	- 1	***
2	24	ı	-2.9	1	-1.4	0.5	-2.6	0.8	-2.5	1	-4.6	-3.1	-5.7	-6.9	ı	***
L989 Q	21	ı	-2.1	i	-1.5	2.7	-3.5	-2.7	-0.4	1	-2.8	-4.7	0.3	-0.7	1	***
Q	22	1	2.4	1	-0.2	3.0	-1.4	-0.9	-1.2	1	5.8	8.2	7.5	-0.0	i	***
	23	1	0.6	I	-0.2	1.2	-0.5	-0.6	-1.2	1	1.6	2.5	2.6	-1.0	- 1	***
٥	24	1	-2.8	I	-0.7	0.9	-0.8	3.0	-6.8	1	-5.3	-2.2	-2.1	-14.4	1	***
1990 Q	21	1	-1.9	1	-0.4	0.7	-1.1	0.0	-0.9	ı	-3.7	-4.7	-3.2	-1.8	١	***
		I.B2	PERCENTAGE	CHAN	ge from	SAME QUARTER	OF PREV	TOUS YEAR								
1987 Q	1	1	***	1	***	***	***	***	***	,	***	***	***	***		***
_	22	i	***	i	***	***	***	***	***	i	***	***	***	***	- 1	***
Q	3	i	***	ĺ	***	***	***	***	***	i	***	***	***	***	i	***
Q	24	ı	-6.5	ŧ	-6.2	13.9	-12.6	-9.9	-2.7	i	-7.0	-6.9	-14.1	-2.1	i	-6.3
.988 Q	21	ı	-4.3	1	-4.7	12.1	-10.4	-7.4	-3.0	1	-3.8	-2.3	-9.1	-3.1	1	***
Q	22	İ	-3.1	1	-3.8	9.6	-8.2	-7.4	-2.6	i	-2.2	-0.5	-4.9	-3.6	i	***
Q	3	- 1	-2.1	- 1	-2.3	8.6	-5.9	-4.8	-2.3	i	-1.8	0.4	-6.7	-2.9	i	***
Q	24	ı	-2.6	1	-2.8	6.7	-6.3	-2.3	-4.7	i	-2.4	2.6	-6.8	-8.6	i	-2.8
.989 Q	21	1	-2.7	ı	-3.0	7.5	-7.5	-2.6	-4.1	1	-2.2	1.0	-2.0	-8.0	1	***
Q	22	1	-2.6	į	-3.0	7.6	-7.3	-2.8	-4.9	i	-2.0	1.5	-1.5	-9.0	i	***
Q	3	1	-2.0	1	-3.3	7.6	-7.8	-3.4	-5.1	i	-0.4	2.4	4.4	-8.6	i	***
Q	∤4	1	-1.9	1	-2.6	8.0	-6.0	-1.2	-9.3	i	-1.1	3.3	8.3	-15.9	i	***
	1		-1.8	1	-1.5	5.9	-3.6	1.5	-9.8							***

Digitized for FRASER
http://fraser.stlouisfed.org/
Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

5

#### SECTION II: (CONTINUED)

occasional appearance of loans with a maturity of about 20 years. In addition, the breakdown of national estimates into those for large banks and small banks may be affected somewhat by the new sampling procedures that were implemented in August 1989; apparent shifts in the data as of that date therefore should be treated with caution.

More detailed results from each quarterly survey are published in Table 5 of Statistical Release E.2, "Survey of Terms of Bank Lending," for which a mailing list is maintained by Publications Services, Mail Stop 138, Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D.C., 20551. Starting with the August 1986 survey, farm loans secured by real estate are included in the data shown in Statistical Release E.2, whereas such loans are excluded from the tabulations presented here.

#### RECENT DEVELOPMENTS:

In the second week of May 1990, the average effective rate of interest on commercial banks' nonreal estate loans to farmers (Table II.E) was 11.8 percent, the same as in the February survey, and down roughly a full percentage point from the level reported in the May 1989 survey. The decline in rates over the last year has been apparent for all types of farm loans and at both large banks and small banks.

Other results from the quarterly surveys are presented in Tables II.A through II.D and in Table II.F. The May 1990 survey showed a small dip in the amount of nonreal estate farm loans made by commercial banks (table II.E). Although the quarterly data tend to be quite volatile, this amount was near the upper end of the range of recent quarters. The range of interest rates on loans that were in the survey tightened in May (table II.G).

#### AMOUNT OF LOANS MADE (BILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

					L	BY SI DAN (\$	ZE OF 1,000s	)			SIZE					
		ALL LOANS		FEEDER LIVE- STOCK	OTHER LIVESTOCK	OTHER CURRENT OPERATING EXPENSES	FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT	OTHER		1 to 9	10 to 24	25 to 99	100 and over		LARGE	ОТНЕ
					ANNUAL AMOU	NT OF LOANS	MADE									
1978	ı	46.5		13.4	3.9	16.9	4.2	7.6	<u> </u>	8.4	8.9	13.6	15.7		12.3	34.2
1979	1	52.7	ı	16.8	4.9	18.7	4.2	8.0	i	8.7	8.5	17.3	18.2	1	11.1	41.6
1980	1	60.0	1	16.1	4.6	24.1	4.8	10.1	i	8.5	9.7	18.1	23.8	1	11.1	48.1
1981		61.1	1	12.7	4.3	27.3	4.7	11.4	i	8.3	9.5	18.0	25.3	1	12.8	48.3
1982	1	66.0	1	13.6	4.5	28.1	5.4	13.4	i	7.9	9.8	18.2	30.0	1	21.7	44.3
1983	1	67.3	1	12.1	5.9	31.1	6.1	11.9	i	8.4	9.0	17.5	32.4	1	18.6	48.7
1984	-	60.8	- 1	10.7	6.5	26.5	4.4	12.2	i	8.9	7.8	17.6	26.5	1	15.8	45.0
1985	1	52.1	ŀ	8.6	5.2	22.6	4.4	11.3	i	7.2	7.4	13.5	24.0	1	14.9	37.3
1986	ı	48.5	ł	10.4	4.5	23.2	2.4	8.0	i	6.0	6.9	13.2	22.3	1	12.6	35.9
1987	1	49.6	1	13.2	3.4	22.5	2.3	8.3	i	5.7	6.8	12.6	24.5	i	17.1	32.5
1988	1	48.2	1	10.0	4.6	24.3	1.9	7.4	i	5.2	6.4	12.9	23.7	1	15.9	32.3
1989	1	51.6	1	12.9	6.0	24.3	2.0	6.4	i	6.1	7.7	14.4	23.4	1	19.6	32.0
		P	MOUNT	OF LOANS	MADE DURIN	G FIRST FUL	L WEEK OF S	ECOND MON	TH OF	QUARTI	ER, AN	NUAL R	ATE		****	
1988 Q2	1	50.7		12.1	3.3	25.2	2.1	8.0	ı	6.7	<i>-</i>	10.0	0.4. 1			
Q3	1	53.6	İ	7.2	4.7	32.1	1.9	7.7	1	6.7 5.4	6.9 7.7	12.9 13.3	24.1	!	18.4	32.3
Q4	1	38.1	1	10.7	5.4	14.7	1.1	6.1	1	3.4	4.9		27.2	!	15.9	37.7
			•				***	0.1	ı	3.1	4.9	10.8	18.7	1	14.1	24.0
1989 Q1	1	41.2		11.7	3.1	19.1	1.8	5.4		4.8	E C	10.0	00.7			
Q2	İ	62.7	i	11.8	5.2	35.8	1.8	8.1	!		5.6	10.0	20.7	l	17.0	24.2
Q3	1	47.7	i	11.4	5.7	22.3	2.5	5.8	!	7.4	9.3	15.6	30.4	!	18.8	43.9
Q4	ı	54.8	i	16.8	10.0	20.0	1.7	6.3	i i	6.7	8.0	14.8	18.2	!	18.4	29.4
			•			20.0	1. /	0.3	I	5.6	7.6	17.2	24.4	1	24.2	30.6
1990 Q1	ı	62.1	1	18.4	7.3	24.6	3.3	0 5		<b>.</b> .						
Q2	i	59.9	i	15.9	3.5	23.9	2.2	8.5 14.4	!	5.3 6.8		16.9 13.6	33.3	1	29 <b>.4</b>	32.6
Q2													31.4		33.2	26.7

ESTIMATES FROM THE QUARTERLY SAMPLE SURVEY OF BANK NONREAL ESTATE LOANS TO FARMERS TABLE II.B NUMBER OF LOANS MADE (MILLIONS)

					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						BY SI					SIZE
					BY P	URPOSE OF L	OAN			L	OAN (\$	1,000s	;)		OF	BANK
		ALL LOANS		FEEDER LIVE- STOCK	OTHER LIVESTOCK	OTHER CURRENT OPERATING EXPENSES	FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT	OTHER		1 to 9	10 to 24	25 to 99	100 and over		LARGE	ОТНЕ
				ANNUA	L NUMBER OF	LOANS MADE										
1978		3.35	1	0.60	0.32	1.60	0.43	0.39	ı	2.36	0.60	0.33	0.06	1	0.19	3.15
1979	i	3.42	i	0.52	0.31	1.75	0.43	0.41	I	2.37	0.59	0.37	0.08	1	0.18	3.24
1980	i	3.40	i	0.50	0.29	1.76	0.45	0.39	ı	2.23	0.66	0.41	0.10	1	0.18	3.22
1981	i	3.39	i	0.39	0.26	2.01	0.38	0.34	I	2.23	0.65	0.41	0.10	1	0.17	3.21
1982	i	3.30	i	0.33	0.26	2.06	0.30	0.35	Í	2.14	0.67	0.40	0.09	1	0.22	3.08
1983	i	3.41	i	0.37	0.32	2.00	0.39	0.32	I	2.32	0.60	0.38	0.11	ı	0.20	3.21
1984	i	3.44	i	0.34	0.29	2.06	0.35	0.35	1	2.42	0.53	0.40	0.09	1	0.18	3.26
1985	i	2.96	i	0.34	0.23	1.77	0.36	0.27	1	2.06	0.51	0.30	0.09	1	0.18	2.78
1986	i	2.55	i	0.30	0.17	1.66	0.17	0.24	I	1.71	0.46	0.29	0.08	1	0.20	2.34
1987	ì	2.38	i	0.39	0.13	1.54	0.14	0.19	1	1.57	0.46	0.27	0.08	1	0.20	2.18
1988	i	2.21	i	0.29	0.11	1.45	0.14	0.21	I	1.42	0.43	0.28	0.07	1	0.23	1.99
1989	i	2.60	i	0.30	0.20	1.73	0.16	0.20		1.67	0.52	0.31	0.09	 	0.36	2.23
		ī	NUMBER	OF LOANS	MADE DURIN	IG FIRST FUI	L WEEK OF S	ECOND MON	TH OI	F QUARI	ER, AN	NUAL F	RATE			
1988 Q2		2.66	1	0.26	0.13	1.87	0.18	0.23	1	1.81	0.48	0.29	0.08	1	0.24	2.42
Q3	1	2.37	i	0.28	0.11	1.60	0.13	0.25		1.49	0.51	0.31	0.06	ļ.	0.26	2.11
Q4	i	1.64	i	0.33	0.09	1.00	0.09	0.12	1	1.02	0.33	0.22	0.06	I	0.18	1.46
1989 Q1	1	2.01	ı	0.24	0.12	1.31	0.16	0.17	1	1.33	0.38	0.23	0.07	!	0.21	1.80
Q2	i	3.13	1	0.28	0.22	2.25	0.15	0.24	ı	2.06	0.64	0.32	0.11	!	0.33	2.80
Q3	i	2.78	Ì	0.26	0.19	1.95	0.19	0.20	ł	1.84	0.55	0.32	0.07	ļ	0.48	2.02
	i	2.47	İ	0.44	0.29	1.40	0.15	0.19	1	1.47	0.52	0.39	0.09	I	0.45	2.02
Q4										1 40	0.42	0.36	0.10	1	0.40	1.9
Q4 1990 Q1	ı	2.37	1	0.30	0.23	1.38	0.25	0.20	l	1.48	0.56	0.31		;	0.52	2.29

ESTIMATES FROM THE QUARTERLY SAMPLE SURVEY OF BANK NONREAL ESTATE LOANS TO FARMERS TABLE II.C

AVERAGE SIZE OF LOANS MADE (THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

					BY P	URPOSE OF L			I		ZE OF 1,000s	)			SIZE BANK	
		ALL LOANS		FEEDER LIVE- STOCK	OTHER LIVESTOCK	OTHER CURRENT OPERATING EXPENSES	FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT	OTHER		1 to 9	10 to 24	25 to 99	100 and over		LARGE	ОТНЕ
File				ANNUZ	AL AVERAGE S	IZE OF LOAN	S MADE									
1978		13.9	l	22.3	12.4	10.6	9.8	19.6		3.6	14.9	41.4	246	1	63.4	10.9
1979	1	15.4	1	32.4	15.9	10.7	9.8	19.4	1	3.7	14.4	46.7	220	i	61.5	12.8
1980	1	17.7	1	32.3	15.8	13.7	10.7	25.8	1	3.8	14.7	43.9	239	i	66.3	14.9
1981	1	18.0	1	32.6	16.6	13.6	12.3	33.8	1	3.7	14.7	43.5	255	i	73.0	15.0
1982	1	20.0	1	41.5	17.5	13.6	17.6	38.9	1	3.7	14.6	46.1	326	i	97.8	14.4
1983	- 1	19.7	1	32.5	18.2	15.5	15.6	37.1	1	3.6	14.8	46.3	294	i	92.0	15.2
1984	1	17.7	1	31.8	21.9	12.9	12.5	34.8	1	3.7	14.7	43.8	291	i	88.1	13.8
1985	- 1	17.6	1	25.7	22.5	12.8	12.4	42.1	1	3.5	14.4	45.5	255	i	82.0	13.4
1986	1	19.0	1	35.0	25.8	14.0	13.6	32.9	i	3.5	14.9	44.9	280	i	62.0	15.3
1987	1	20.8	1	33.8	26.3	14.6	16.1	44.6	i	3.6	14.7	46.5	320	i	85.5	14.9
1988	1	21.8	1	34.1	40.6	16.7	13.9	34.7	i	3.7	14.8	45.2	320	i	70.0	16.3
1989	1	19.9	1	42.7	29.5	14.1	12.1	32.2	ĺ	3.6	14.7	45.9	272	Ì	53.7	14.4
		AVE	ERAGE	SIZE OF I	OANS MADE D	URING FIRST	FULL WEEK	OF SECOND	MONT	н ог о	UARTER	, ANNU	AL RATE	Ε		
1988 Q2	1	19.1	1	46.6	26.2	13.5	12.2	34.8	1	3.7	14.5	44.8	301	ı	75.3	13.4
Q3		22.6	1	25.8	44.1	20.1	14.4	30.6	i	3.7	15.1	42.3	454	1	61.2	17.9
Q4	1	23.2	1	32.6	59.3	14.6	12.3	50.0	i	3.6	14.5	48.7	288	1	80.0	16.4
1989 Q1	I	20.5	1	49.1	25.5	14.5	11.0	32.0	1	3.6	15.1	43.4	296	1	80.9	13.5
Q2	i	20.1	1	42.7	24.4	15.9	12.3	34.0	i		14.6	48.5	275	1	57.8	15.7
Q3	1	17.2	1	44.2	30.0	11.4	13.6	29.2	i	3.6	14.5	46.5	252	ŀ	38.5	12.7
Q4	1	22.2	I	38.3	34.5	14.3	11.0	33.4	i	3.8	14.8	44.5	266	1	54.0	15.2
1990 Q1 Q2	1	26.2 21.3	1	61.2	32.0	17.7	13.0	42.0	1	3.6	15.3	47.5	324	1	73.8	16.6

ESTIMATES FROM THE QUARTERLY SAMPLE SURVEY OF BANK NONREAL ESTATE LOANS TO FARMERS TABLE II.D

#### AVERAGE MATURITY OF LOANS MADE (MONTHS)

									PR		BY SI	ZE OF			BY	SIZE
					BY P	URPOSE OF L	OAN			L	O <b>AN</b> (\$	1,000s	)		OF	BANK
		ALL LOANS		FEEDER LIVE- STOCK	OTHER LIVESTOCK	OTHER CURRENT OPERATING EXPENSES	FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT	OTHER		1 to 9	10 to 24	25 to 99	100 and over		LARGE	OTHE
					ANNUAL AVER	AGE MATURIT	Ϋ́Υ									
1978	ı	8.3	ı	5.9	6.4	6.8	18.1	10.5	ı	7.9	8.6	9.2	7.6	ı	7.0	8.7
1979	1	7.1	1	5.9	6.8	6.0	14.2	8.7	1	7.7	8.3	7.8	5.5	١	5.3	7.6
1980	1	7.2	1	6.2	7.1	6.6	13.5	6.7	1	6.8	7.0	7.1	7.6	- 1	6.6	7.3
1981	1	6.0	- 1	5.5	6.5	5.6	11.1	5.2	1	6.2	6.4	6.0	5.8	ı	5.4	6.2
1982	1	6.5	1	5.1	7.0	7.1	8.4	5.4	1	6.0	7.0	6.6	6.4	1	6.0	6.7
1983	1	8.9	1	5.5	8.1	10.4	10.6	7.8	1	7.0	8.1	8.1	10.0	1	6.1	9.9
1984	1	7.7	1	5.0	6.6	7.8	12.6	8.1	1	7.0	7.5	7.7	8.0	1	7.0	7.9
1985	i	8.0	1	6.1	7.8	7.3	13.4	8.8	1	6.7	7.7	9.1	7.9	t	6.9	8.4
1986	1	8.0	1	5.8	6.3	7.6	21.0	8.8	1	6.8	8.0	9.8	7.1	1	5.5	8.8
1987	i	8.4	1	5.5	7.7	7.6	22.8	12.1	1	7.5	8.1	9.3	8.3	i	5.9	9.3
1988	i	8.7	i	6.4	4.7	8.5	19.8	10.9	i	7.1	9.2	10.2	7.7	1	8.1	8.8
1989	Ì	8.1	I	6.8	7.4	7.2	18.7	11.8	l	7.4	8.3	9.3	7.1	1	7.8	8.2
		1	<b>1AT</b> UR I	TY OF LOA	INS MADE DUP	ING FIRST F	ULL WEEK OF	SECOND N	MONTH	OF QUA	RTER,	ANNUAI	RATE			
1988 Q2		8.4	1	6.0	6.3	8.0	22.6	8.6	1	7.8	12.4	10.0	5.7	I	6.5	9.0
Q3	i	7.0	i	7.2	3.7	6.4	8.8	11.2	1	6.1	6.4	7.3	7.2	1	7.0	7.0
Q4	i	7.2	i	6.2	3.9	7.0	32.4	7.4	1	6.1	8.0	9.5	5.5	I	5.1	8.0
1989 Q1	1	9.7	ı	7.4	6.6	8.7	21.4	15.7	1	8.4	10.4	12.3	7.0	1	6.8	10.7
Q2	1	7.9	1	6.2	6.8	7.3	18.5	11.2	ı	8.0	8.8	9.5	6.3	Į.	8.8	7.7
Q3	- 1	7.9	1	6.5	8.3	6.1	17.8	13.3	- 1	6.5	7.7	8.1	8.5	!	8.3	7.7
Q4	l	7.5	1	7.0	7.4	6.8	17.4	8.1	1	6.8	6.8	8.5	7.1	ı	7.2	7.6
1990 Q1	I	10.8	1	6.3	8.5	11.6	23.7	11.9	ļ	8.3	10.2		7.6 8.3	1	6.8 8.2	13.0 11.3
Q2	1	10.0	1	6.2	10.6	9.7	19.2	11.8	1	8.7	10.7	12.6	8.3	í	0.2	11.3

ESTIMATES FROM THE QUARTERLY SAMPLE SURVEY OF BANK NONREAL ESTATE LOANS TO FARMERS TABLE II.E

#### AVERAGE EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE ON LOANS MADE

					BY P	URPOSE OF L	OAN			I	BY SI OAN (\$	ZE OF 1,000s	3)			SIZE BANK
		ALL LOANS		FEEDER LIVE- STOCK	OTHER LIVESTOCK	OTHER CURRENT OPERATING EXPENSES	FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT	OTHER		1 to 9	10 to 24	25 to 99	100 and over		LARGE	ОТНЕ
				ANNUA	L AVERAGE I	NTEREST RAT	E						***************************************			
.978	1	9.6	l	9.7	9.8	9.5	9.6	9.7	I	9.4	9.4	9.5	9.9	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10.2	9.4
.979	- 1	11.9	1	12.1	11.7	11.8	11.2	12.1	i	11.1	11.4	11.5	12.8	1	13.6	11.4
980	1	15.2	1	15.6	14.6	15.3	14.4	15.3	i	14.7	14.7	14.9	15.9	i	16.2	15.0
981	1	18.5	1	18.6	18.4	18.4	17.9	18.6	i	18.0	18.2	18.2	18.9	i	19.8	18.1
982		16.7	1	15.9	16.3	16.9	17.1	16.9	i	17.0	16.8	17.0	16.4	i	16.1	17.0
983	í	13.5	1	13.6	13.8	13.5	14.3	12.8	i	14.2	14.1	14.0	13.0		12.1	14.1
984	1	14.1	1	13.7	14.3	14.2	14.6	14.0	i	14.6	14.3	14.3	13.7		13.1	14.4
985	1	12.8	!	12.5	12.7	13.0	13.7	12.1	i	13.7	13.2	13.2	12.1	1	11.2	13.4
986	- 1	11.5	1	11.1	11.9	11.5	12.2	11.2	i	12.4	12.0	11.8	10.8		9.6	12.1
.987	.	10.6	1	10.7	10.2	10.8	11.5	9.5	i	11.6	11.3	11.1	9.9	1	9.2	11.3
988	1	11.2	ı	10.9	11.9	11.2	11.7	10.7	i	11.7	11.6	11.4	10.8	1	10.2	11.6
989	ı	12.5	1	12.3	12.4	12.6	12.8	12.3	i	12.8	12.7		12.2	İ	12.1	12.7
		AVERAGI	E RATE	ON LOANS	MADE DURIN	G FIRST FUL	L WEEK OF SE	ECOND MON	TH OF	? QUART	ER, AN	NUAL R	ATE			
988 Q2	1	10.7	1	10.5	10.6	10.9	11.3	10.2		11 6	11 4	11.0	10.4			
Q3	1	11.5	ı	11.2	12.3	11.5	11.6	11.0	1	11.5 11.8			10.1	!	9.7	11.3
Q4		11.6	i	11.6	11.7	11.6	12.1	11.3	1			11.6	11.3	!	10.7	11.8
	-		•				12.1		ı	12.1	11.9	12.0	11.1	I	11.1	11.8
989 Q1	1	12.3	1	12.2	12.2	12.4	12.5	12.1		10 F	10.0	10.0				
Q2	i	12.9	i	12.9	12.8	12.9	13.2	12.1	i		12.3			1	12.1	12.4
Q3	i	12.5	i	12.0	12.6	12.7	12.9	12.8	!	13.1		13.2	12.7		12.8	13.0
Q4	i	12.1	i	12.2	12.2	12.0	12.4	12.2	!	13.0		12.6	12.0	I	12.0	12.8
-	•		•			12.0	14.4	14.1	ı	12.7	12.5	12.3	11.8	1	11.6	12.5
		11.8	1	11.4	11.7	12.1	12.2	11 -		10 1						
990 Q1																
990 Q1 Q2	i i	11.8	!	11.4	12.2	12.0	12.4	11.5 11.5	1	12.6	12.4 12.3	12.2	11.3	- 1	11.2	12.3

ESTIMATES FROM THE QUARTERLY SAMPLE SURVEY OF BANK NONREAL ESTATE LOANS TO FARMERS TABLE II.F

#### PERCENTAGE OF LOANS MADE WITH A FLOATING INTEREST RATE

					BY P	URPOSE OF I			L	BY SI OAN (\$	ZE OF 1,000s	)			SIZE BANK	
		ALL LOANS		FEEDER LIVE- STOCK	OTHER LIVESTOCK	OTHER CURRENT OPERATING EXPENSES	FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT	OTHER		1 to 9	10 to 24	25 to 99	100 and over		LARGE	OTHER
				ANNUA	L PERCENTAG	E OF LOANS	MADE									
1978		17.3		18.9	19.7	14.4	2.1	28.4	1	1.6	3.1	7.8	41.9	i	62.2	1.1
1979	;	16.7	i	16.5	17.1	15.8	7.3	23.8	1	3.1	6.2	9.7	34.7	1	66.4	3.4
1980	1	21.5	1	19.8	17.7	21.0	11.2	32.7	1	6.9	12.1	12.9	37.2	1	74.6	8.4
1981	1	29.0	1	33.3	21.6	31.5	14.9	28.5	1	15.5	17.7	21.7	42.9	1	80.0	15.5
1982	1	39.2	;	47.8	30.2	43.0	15.5	31.4	1	24.3	25.6	29.7	53.4	1	65.6	26.3
1983		43.1		47.8	28.7	48.1	17.6	44.3	1	25.6	29.1	34.9	55.9	ı	77.7	29.9
	1	38.9	1	41.2	32.3	41.7	24.3	39.5	i	23.8	31.3	29.0	52.7	1	71.1	27.6
1984	1	45.3	1	61.4	44.9	43.0	19.6	47.3	i	27.6	31.5	42.0	56.6	1	77.1	32.6
1985	1	53.4		60.5	34.8	57.2	30.9	50.6	i	40.6	41.8	48.2	63.7	1	71.9	47.0
1986	!		!	51.6	69.6	62.1	55.5	62.1	i	48.5	45.6	54.4	68.5	1	77.6	49.9
1987	!	59.5		65.3	39.5	63.8	54.9	63.2	i	49.3	51.5	60.8	67.0	1	79.1	52.6
1988	!	61.4	l I	71.4	40.0	59.7	32.9	73.6	i	50.4	49.6	58.5	69.1	1	83.6	47.2
1989	i 	61.0		/1.4	40.0								· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
		AVI	ERAGE	PERCENTAC	E DURING F	RST FULL WE	EEK OF SECON	D MONTH	OF QU	ARTER						
1988 Q2	1	60.9	-	61.8	46.7	63.3	58.7	58.7	1	56.7	51.5	61.4	64.6	ı	76.1	52.3
Q3	i	62.2	i	64.8	64.4	62.3	36.5	64.5	ı	42.6	47.0	49.1	76.9	1	80.6	54.5
Q4	i	62.9	ì	61.8	17.4	78.4	68.1	66.8	1	51.3	53.2	60.5	69.1	1	74.8	55.9
Ž	1	02.5	ı		-											
1989 Q1	1	68.8	1	82.9	30.0	67.4	40.1	75.6	1	45.8	52.4	69.4	78.3	I	88.6	55.0
Q2	!	51.6	1	66.0	18.2	49.7	26.9	66.0	- 1	56.3	45.9	50.6	52.7	1	80.3	39.3
Q2	1	65.7	1	69.5	46.2	69.5	30.7	78.3	i	51.9	58.2	63.9	75.6	1	87.1	52.3
	1	61.8	i I	68.5	51.0	59.1	35.1	77.2	- 1	44.5	42.9	54.6	76.8	ı	80.1	47.4
Q4	ı	61.0	1	00.5	31.0											
1000 01		71 6		70 3	47.5	73.0	41.7	85.3	ļ	50.2	57.8	69.6	78.8	- 1	85.0	59.5
1990 Q1	!	71.6	l '	78.3 77.5	50.4	73.0	47.1	84.2	i	55.7	63.2	65.2	85.7	1	88.0	58.0
Q2	1	74.6	- 1	11.5	30.4	13.0			•							

Table II.G

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NONREAL ESTATE FARM LOANS MADE BY BANKS, BY EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE

Effective interest	<b> </b> 					M	ay							
rate (percent)	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
All loans	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Under 6.0	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		
6.0 to 6.9	7	-	-	_	-	_	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_
7.0 to 7.9	6	-	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	1	1	1	_	_
8.0 to 8.9	43	35	4	-	_	_	_	_	_	6	11	10	_	_
9.0 to 9.9	40	48	14	-	1	_	1	_	5	12	21	20	_	1
10.0 to 10.9	3	11	32	-	-	_	6	_	7	11	23	27	5	1 8
l1.0 to ll.9	1	6	22	-	-	_	7	1	11	33	22	23	8	33
l2.0 to 12.9	-	-	12	1	1	-	28	12	24	22	19	15	39	39
l3.0 to 13.9	-	-	10	4	1	-	31	26	31	13	3	3	34	14
l4.0 to 14.9	-	-	5	9	1	-	15	36	13	2	_	_	8	5
l5.0 to 15.9	-	_	1	7	10	2	10	21	7	_	_	_	4	- -
l6.0 to 16.9	-	-	_	11	22	12	-	2	1	_	_	_	1	_
l7.0 to 17.9	-	-	-	35	19	45	1	_	_	-	_	_	_	_
18.0 to 18.9	-	-	_	18	21	29	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
19.0 to 19.9	-		_	9	10	9	_	_	1	_	_	_	_	_
20.0 to 20.9	-	-	_	3	10	1	1	_	-	_		_	_	_
21.0 to 21.9	-	-	-	1	4	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
22.0 to 22.9	-		_	1	2	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
23.0 to 23.9	-	-	-	-	1	-	_	-	_	_		_	_	_
24.0 to 24.9	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
25.0 and over	-	-	_	-	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	-

<sup>1.</sup> Percentage distribution of the estimated total dollar amount of nonreal estate farm loans of \$1,000 or more made by insured commercial banks during the week covered by the survey, which is the first full business week of the month specified.

Data are estimates from the Federal Reserve survey of terms of bank lending to farmers. Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

SECTION III: SELECTED STATISTICS FROM THE QUARTERLY REPORTS OF CONDITION OF COMMERCIAL BANKS

TABLES:	<u>P</u> :	age
Commerci	al banks:	
III.A	Estimated delinquent nonreal estate farm loans at insured commercial banks	
III.B	Estimated net charge-offs of nonreal estate farm loans at insured commercial banks	18
Agricult	ural banks:	
III.C	Distribution of agricultural banks by ratio of nonperforming loans to total loans	19
III.D	Distribution of agricultural banks by ratio of net charge-offs to total loans	20
III.E	Distribution of agricultural banks by ratio of nonperforming loans to total capital	21
III.F	Distribution of agricultural banks by rate of return to equity	22
III.G	Loan-deposit ratios at agricultural banks	
III.H	Failures of agricultural banks	24

#### SOURCES OF DATA:

The data in tables III.A through III.G are prepared using data from the quarterly reports of condition and income for commercial banks. The observations for the first quarter of 1990 are preliminary. Delinquencies and charge-offs of nonreal estate farm loans for the nation as a whole (table III.A and table III.B) are estimated from reports of banks that hold more than 90 percent of total nonreal estate farm loans. Banks that do not report delinquencies of agricultural loans are assumed to have the same delinquency rates as those that report.

Examination of total lending at banks that have a high exposure to agricultural loans provides an alternative perspective on the agricultural lending situation. Agricultural banks in table III.C through table III.H are those that have a proportion of farm loans (real estate plus nonreal estate) to total loans that is greater than the unweighted average at all banks. The preliminary estimate of this average was 15.63 percent in March of 1990.

Failures of banks (table III.H) are obtained from news releases of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, with agricultural banks defined, as above, by the amount of farm loans relative to total loans that they hold.

#### Recent Developments:

The amount of problem farm nonreal estate loans was slightly smaller in March of 1990 than it was a year earlier, reflecting, primarily, a decline in nonaccrual loans (table III.A). The decline in the level of nonaccrual loans appears to have flattened out last year, and it may be that the current levels are roughly in line with normal business operations. Total net charge-offs (table III.B) were slightly negative for the nation in Q1, as net recoveries in California, Iowa, and Nebraska more than offset net charge-offs in Illinois, Texas, and Washington. Most other states had small positive net chargeoffs.

According to a variety of indicators, the financial performance of agricultural banks improved further during the first quarter. Only about one in ten agricultural banks had nonperforming loans that amounted to more than 5 percent of total loans (table III.C), and the proportion of banks that had large amounts of net charge-offs fell as well (table III.D). Data through the first quarter suggest that agricultural banks are earning returns at about the same rate as in the first quarter of the past several years (table III.F). The ratio of loans to deposits at agricultural banks (table III.G) remains at a relatively low level, indicating that agricultural banks, on average, have had ample funds to lend to farmers. Fewer agricultural banks have failed thus far in 1990 than in the first half of any year since 1983 (table III.H).

### ESTIMATED DELINQUENT FARM NONREAL ESTATE LOANS INSURED COMMERCIAL BANKS

MARCH 31

				BIL	LIONS OF DOL	LARS			A.S	PERCENTAC	E OF OU	TSTANDING FA	RM PRODUCT	ION LOANS	
					NONPERFORMIN	IG						NONPERFORMIN	īG		-
		TOTAL	PAST DUE 30 TO 89 DAYS ACCRUING	TOTAL	PAST DUE 90 DAYS ACCRUING	NON- ACCRUAL	MEMO: RESTRUCTURED LOANS IN COMPLIANCE		TOTAL	PAST DUE 30 TO 89 DAYS ACCRUING	TOTAL	PAST DUE 90 DAYS ACCRUING	NON- ACCRUAL	MEMO: RESTRUCTURED LOANS IN COMPLIANCE	
1984		3,1	1.0	2.1	0.7	1.4	NA		. 8.0	2.6	5.4	1.8	3.6	NA	ı
1985	i	3.8	1.3	2.5	0.7	1.8	NA	1	10.1	3.5	6.6	1.8	4.8	NA	1
1986	i	4.7	1.4	3.3	0.8	2.5	NA	1	14.0	4.2	9.8	2.3	7.5	NA	1
1987	i	3.0	0.8	2.2	0.5	1.7	0.4	1	10.4	2.7	7.7	1.6	6.1	1.5	1
1988	i	2.0	0.5	1.5	0.3	1.2	0.5	1	7.1	2.0	5.2	1.0	4.2	1.7	1
1989	i	1.6	0.5	1.0	0.2	0.8	0.5	- 1	5.5	1.9	3.5	0.6	2.9	1.6	1
1990	i	1.4	0.6	0.8	0.2	0.6	0.4	I	4.8	2.1	2.7	0.7	2.0	1.3	1
1987 Q1	1	3.0	0.8	2.2	0.5	1.7	0.4	1	10.4	2.7	7.7	1.6	6.1	1.5	1
Q2	1	2.5	0.4	2.0	0.4	1.6	0.5	1	8.1	1.3	6.7	1.3	5.4	1.6	1
Q3	1	2.1	0.3	1.8	0.3	1.5	0.5	1	6.7	1.0	5.7	0.9	4.8	1.6	
Q4	1	1.9	0.5	1.4	0.2	1.2	0.5	!	6.5	1.7	4.8	0.7	4.2	1.7	l
1988 Q1	ı	2.0	0.5	1.5	0.3	1.2	0.5	ı	7.1	2.0	5.2	1.0	4.2	1.7	1
Q2	1	1.7	0.3	1.3	0.2	1.1	0.5	l	5.5	1.0	4.5	0.7	3.7	1.7	1
Q3	1	1.5	0.3	1.2	0.2	1.0	0.5	1	4.9	0.9	4.0	0.6	3.4	1.6	-
Q <b>4</b>	1	1.4	0.4	1.0	0.1	0.9	0.5	I	4.5	1.2	3.3	0.5	2.9	1.6	I
1989 Q1	1	1.6	0.5	1.0	0.2	0.8	0.5	ı	5.5	1.9	3.5	0.6	2.9	1.6	!
Q2	1	1.4	0.4	1.0	0.2	0.8	0.5	1	4.4	1.3	3.2	0.6	2.6	1.5	1
Q3	i	1.2	0.3	0.9	0.2	0.7	0.4	1	3.8	1.1	2.7	0.5	2.2	1.4	1
Q4	į	1.1	0.4	0.7	0.1	0.6	0.4	1	3.7	1.3	2.3	0.5	1.9	1.4	-
1990 Q1	i	1.4	0.6	··-8	0.2	0.6	0.4	1	4.8	2.1	2.7	0.7	2.0	1.3	1

Data are estimates of the national totals for farm nonreal estate loans. After 1984, estimates are based on reports from banks that hold more than 90 percent of such loans. Earlier, only large banks that held about one-fourth of such loans reported nonaccrual and renegotiated farm loans; for other banks, estimates of delinquent farm loans are based on a study of delinquent total loans at these banks.

TABLE III.B

## ESTIMATED NET CHARGE-OFFS OF NONREAL ESTATE FARM LOANS INSURED COMMERCIAL BANKS\*

				ATED AMOU NS OF DOI				CHARGE-OFF OF SUCH L				
		ANNUAL TOTAL	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	ANNUAL TOTAL	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
1985 1986 1987 1988 1989		1300 1195 503 128 91 **	200 235 173 28 10 -5	320 360 133 39 26 **	255 230 57 24 15 **	525 370 140 37 40 **	3.28 3.38 1.61 0.44 0.29	0.51 0.66 0.55 0.10 0.03 -0.02	0.84 1.07 0.46 0.14 0.09	0.64 0.67 0.19 0.10 0.05	1.34 1.10 0.46 0.12 0.13	

\*Pata are estimates of the national charge-offs of farm nonreal estate loans based on reports from banks that hold more than 90 percent of the outstanding national volume of such loans. Additional uncertainty of the estimates arises because small banks report only charge-offs of 'agricultural' loans as defined by each bank for its internal purposes. Banks first reported these data on the March 1984 Report of Income.

\*\*No data.

#### NONPERFORMING LOANS AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL LOANS

				2.0	5.0	10.0	15.0	20.0	
		TOTAL	UNDER 2.0	TO 4.9	TO 9.9	TO 14.9	TO 19.9	<b>AN</b> D OVER	
		TOTAL		4.5	9.9	14.5	13.3	OVER	
1984	ı	100.0	46.9	33.1	15.5	3.3	0.7	0.5	. 1
1985	ı	100.0	38.4	33.7	19.9	5.2	1.9	1.0	1
1986	1	100.0	31.6	32.0	24.2	7.5	3.0	1.8	1
1987	1	100.0	35.9	32.7	21.4	6.8	2.3	1.0	1
1988	ı	100.0	49.1	30.8	15.7	3.2	0.9	0.4	1
1989	1	100.0	57.6	29.3	10.6	1.9	0.4	0.2	1
1990	1	100.0	61.9	26.8	9.2	1.5	0.5	0.2	1
	1.4								
1987 Q1	1	100.0	35.9	32.7	21.4	6.8	2.3	1.0	1
Q2	İ	100.0	39.6	33.5	19.3	5.1	1.7	0.8	1
Q3	ĺ	100.0	43.0	33.0	17.0	4.9	1.3	0.5	1
Q4	1	100.0	50.3	30.6	14.4	3.3	0.9	0.3	1
1988 Q1	ı	100.0	49.1	30.8	15.7	3.2	0.9	0.4	1
Q2	i	100.0	51.7	31.9	13.1	2.4	0.6	0.3	
Q3	1	100.0	54.0	31.3	12.0	2.1	0.4	0.3	1
Q4	I	100.0	59.0	28.9	9.7	1.9	0.4	0.2	1
1989 Q1	ı	100.0	57.6	29.3	10.6	1.9	0.4	0.2	1
Q2	1	100.0	60.1	29.3	8.3	1.5	0.6	0.2	
Q3	1	100.0	61.7	27.6	8.5	1.6	0.4	0.2	
Q4	I	100.0	65.8	25.1	7.6	1.2	0.2	0.1	I
1990 Q1	1	100.0	61.9	26.8	9.2	1.5	0.5	0.2	1

<sup>\*</sup> Nonperforming loans are loans in nonaccrual status or past due 90 days or more. Renegotiated or restructured loans in compliance with the modified terms are not included. Agricultural banks are defined in the introduction to section III.

TABLE III.D DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL BANKS BY RELATIVE NET CHARGE-OFFS\*

	TOTAL	UNDER 0.10	0.10 TO 0.49	0.50 TO 0.99	1.00 TO 2.49	2.50 TO 4.99	5.00 AND OVER	
.983	100.0	25.2	28.2	20.5	18.6	5.5	2.1	
.984	100.0	18.5	23.6	20.0	23.9	9.2	4.8	
985	100.0	10.6	14.5	18.0	30.2	16.1	10.5	
986	100.0	9.7	13.4	15.5	30.7	18.0	12.6	
987	100.0	19.4	20.6	18.5	25.4	11.0	5.1	
988	100.0	31.8	25.7	17.2	17.3	5.8	2.2	
989	100.0	36.0	28.1	16.5	14.1	3.9	1.4	
	DIST	RIBUTION BY Y	EAR-TO-DATE	CHARGEOFFS A	S A PERCENTA	GE OF TOTAL	LOANS	
988 Q1	100.0	71.2	18.9	5.4	3 5	0.7	0.3	******
988 Q1   Q2	100.0		18.9 23.6	5.4 10.7	3.5	0.7	0.3	
988 Q1   Q2   Q3		71.2 55.2 46.0	23.6	10.7	7.8	2.1	0.7	
Q2	100.0	55.2	23.6 25.3	10.7 13.3	7.8 10.7	2.1 3.6	0.7 1.3	
Q2   Q3   Q4	100.0 100.0	55.2 46.0	23.6	10.7	7.8	2.1	0.7	
Q2   Q3   Q4	100.0 100.0	55.2 46.0	23.6 25.3 25.7	10.7 13.3 17.2	7.8 10.7 17.3	2.1 3.6 5.8	0.7 1.3 2.2	
Q2   Q3   Q4	100.0 100.0 100.0	55.2 46.0 31.8 75.6	23.6 25.3 25.7 17.3	10.7 13.3 17.2	7.8 10.7 17.3	2.1 3.6 5.8 0.4	0.7 1.3 2.2	4
Q3   Q4   989 Q1	100.0 100.0 100.0	55.2 46.0 31.8 75.6 59.9	23.6 25.3 25.7 17.3 24.7	10.7 13.3 17.2 3.7 8.0	7.8 10.7 17.3 2.9 5.6	2.1 3.6 5.8 0.4 1.5	0.7 1.3 2.2 0.2 0.4	
Q2   Q3   Q4	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	55.2 46.0 31.8 75.6 59.9 50.6	23.6 25.3 25.7 17.3 24.7 26.0	10.7 13.3 17.2 3.7 8.0 12.0	7.8 10.7 17.3 2.9 5.6 8.7	2.1 3.6 5.8 0.4 1.5 2.1	0.7 1.3 2.2 0.2 0.4 0.7	
989 Q1   Q2   Q2   Q2	100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0	55.2 46.0 31.8 75.6 59.9	23.6 25.3 25.7 17.3 24.7	10.7 13.3 17.2 3.7 8.0	7.8 10.7 17.3 2.9 5.6	2.1 3.6 5.8 0.4 1.5	0.7 1.3 2.2 0.2 0.4	***************************************

<sup>\*</sup> Net charge-offs are charge-offs less recoveries for all loans (both agricultural and nonagricultural) during the period indicated. Agricultural banks are defined in the introduction to section III.

TABLE III.E

#### DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL BANKS BY RATIO OF NONPERFORMING LOANS TO TOTAL CAPITAL\*

#### NONPERFORMING LOANS AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CAPITAL

				25	50	75	100	125	150	175	200	
			UNDER	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO	TO	AND	
		ALL BANKS	25	49	74	99	124	149	174	199	OVER***	
1984	1	100.0	76.5	16.1	4.4	1.6	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.2	1
1985		100.0	68.7	19.4	6.4	2.4	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.6	i
1986	1	100.0	64.7	20.5	7.2	3.4	1.7	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.8	İ
1987	1	100.0	71.3	17.3	5.9	2.4	1.1	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.7	1
1988	1	100.0	81.2	12.3	3.3	1.3	0.7	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.5	1
1989		100.0	87.0	8.5	2.2	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.3	1
1990	1	100.0	89.0	8.1	1.6	0.6	0.3	**	0.1	0.1	0.2	<u> </u>
1988 Q1	ı	100.0	81.2	12.3	3.3	1.3	0.7	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.5	ł
Q2	1	100.0	84.4	10.5	2.8	1.0	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.4	1
Q3	i	100.0	85.4	10.0	2.4	1.0	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	1
Q4	i	100.0	87.5	8.4	2.1	0.7	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	1
1989 Q1	ı	100.0	87.0	8.5	2.2	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.3	1
Q2	1	100.0	88.6	7.9	1.7	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.4	!
Q3	1	100.0	89.2	7.6	1.6	0.6	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	!
Q4	1	100.0	90.1	7.6	1.1	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	ı
1990 Q1	i	100.0	89.0	8.1	1.6	0.6	0.3	**	0.1	0.1	0.2	1

<sup>\*</sup> Total primary and secondary capital items that are available at the end of the period specified. Agricultural banks are defined in the introduction to section III.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Less than 0.05 percent.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Includes banks with negative capital.

TABLE III.F

DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL BANKS BY RATE OF RETURN TO EQUITY\*

		N	NET INCOME OF AVERAGE (PERCENTAGE	EQU	ITY	AT B	ANK				AVERAGE OF RET TO EQU	TURN	RATE OF RET TO ASS	TURN	NET CHARG AS PERCE OF TOTAL	NTAGE	AVERA CAPITAL (PERCE	RATIO	
		ALL BANKS	NEGATIVE	0 TO 4	5 TO 9	10 TO 14	15 TO 19	20 TO 24	25 AND OVER		AGRI- CULTURAL BANKS	OTHER SMALL BANKS	AGRI- CULTURAL BANKS	OTHER SMALL BANKS	AGRI- CULTURAL BANKS	OTHER SMALL BANKS	AGRI- CULTURAL BANKS	OTHER SMALL BANKS	
1978 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989		100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	1 1 1 2 4 7 13 18 19 13 9 5	3 2 2 3 5 7 9 11 14 13 9 7	14 8 9 12 15 18 23 22 27 31 30 29	46 36 33 33 36 36 36 33 28 31 36 38	28 38 35 32 28 24 15 13 9 12 14	6 12 14 13 11 7 3 3 2 2 3 4	1 3 5 6 4 2 1 1 1 1 2 3		14 15 16 15 14 11 8 6 5 8 10	13 14 14 13 12 12 12 11 8 8 9	1.1 1.2 1.3 1.2 1.1 1.0 0.7 0.5 0.4 0.7 0.9	0.9 1.0 1.0 0.9 0.9 0.8 0.8 0.6 0.7	0.2 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.9 1.2 2.1 2.3 1.3 0.7	0.3 0.4 0.4 0.6 0.7 0.6 0.8 1.1 0.9	8.9 9.0 9.2 9.3 9.4 9.5 9.6 9.5 9.9	8.3 8.5 8.6 8.6 8.5 8.4 8.5 8.4 8.9	
1988 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4		* * * * * *	* * * * * *	** ** **	** ** **	** ** **	** ** **	** ** **	** ** **		3 5 8 10	2 5 7 9	0.3 0.5 0.8 0.9	0.2 0.4 0.6 0.7	0.1 0.3 0.5 0.7	0.2 0.5 0.5 0.7	10.0 10.1 10.3 9.9	8.9 8.8 8.9 8.8	1
1989 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	     	* * * * * *	* * * * * *	** ** **	** ** **	* * * * * *	* * * * * *	* * * * * *	* * * * * *	     	3 6 9 11	3 6 8 10	0.3 0.6 0.9 1.0	0.3 0.4 0.7 0.8	0.1 0.2 0.3 0.6	0.1 0.3 0.4 0.7	10.2 10.4 10.4 10.1	8.9 9.1 9.1 9.0	     
1990 Q1	ŧ	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	I	3	3	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	10.2	9.0	ł

<sup>\*</sup>Quarterly rates of return and charge-offs are year-to-date measures, not at an annual rate; therefore, the estimates are not comparable to data for the entire year. Agricultural banks are defined in the introduction to section III.

\*\* Total primary and secondary capital (items that are available at the end of the period specified) as a percentage of total assets.

MARCH 31

	υ.	.s.	CL	EVELAND		ATLANTA	сн	ICAGO	ST.	LOUIS		I <b>NNE-</b> POLIS		NSAS	DA	LLAS		SAN ANCISCO	AVERAGE FARM LOAN RATIO
	NUMBER OF BANKS	LOANS TO DEPOSITS	NUMBE OF BANKS	R LOANS TO DEPOSITS	NUME OF BANK	TO	NUMBER OF BANKS	LOANS TO DEPOSITS	NUMBEF OF BANKS	TO DEPOSITS	NUMBEI OF BANKS	R LOANS TO DEPOSITS	NUMBER OF BANKS	LOANS TO DEPOSITS	number of banks	TO DEPOSITS	NUMEER OF BANKS		
1985 1986	4953 4830 4644	0.592 0.555 0.515	130   130   117	0.600 0.579 0.594	22	5 0.590 7 0.573	1258   1236   1192	0.578 0.524 0.490	586   573   556	0.551 0.527 0.509 0.527	887   870   845	0.637 0.587 0.520 0.521	1394   1358   1300	0.590 0.545 0.487 0.503	351   357   372	0.582 0.573 0.538 0.518	58   59   56	0.712 0.694 0.659 0.643	16.65   15.93   15.68
1988 1989	4478 4317 4177	0.526 0.537 0.536	103   92   81	0.623 0.648 0.648	15	9 0.600	1152   1100   1037	0.504 0.535 0.541	773   487	0.548	803   773   756	0.521 0.540 0.557	1271	0.508 0.497	381   396   398	0.479	62   62   54	0.624 0.622	15.63
1988 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	4478 4474 4474 4344	0.526 0.541 0.541 0.538	103   101   97   96	0.623 0.651 0.660 0.637	15   16   16	0.607 0.607	1152   1147   1147   1111	0.504 0.526 0.526 0.529	520   533   533   500	0.527 0.546 0.546 0.549	803   801   801   778	0.521 0.552 0.552 0.532	1271   1257   1257   1239	0.503 0.503 0.503 0.512	381   380   380   392	0.518 0.519 0.519 0.506	59   61   61   62	0.643 0.669 0.669 0.637	15.51   16.04   16.12   15.72
1989 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	4317 4321 4321 4181	0.537 0.557 0.557 0.544	92   94   94	0.648 0.665 0.665 0.641	14   16   16	0.604 0.604	1100   1085   1085   1055	0.535 0.555 0.555 0.548	773   499   499   477	0.548 0.569 0.569 0.558	773   778   778   758	0.540 0.575 0.575 0.552	1229   1223   1223   1196	0.508 0.514 0.514 0.511	396   391   391   393	0.479 0.495 0.495 0.481	62   62   62   57	0.624 0.682 0.682 0.637	15.47   16.00   16.17   15.87
1990 Q1	4177	0.536	81	0.648	15	0.592	1037	0.541	487	0.549	756	0.557	1191	0.497	398	0.468	54	0.622	15.63

<sup>\*</sup>The loan-deposit ratio is defined as total loans divided by total deposits. Agricultural banks are defined in the introduction to section III.

TABLE III.H

FAILURES OF AGRICULTURAL BANKS\*

MARCH 31

		N	UMBER OF FAIL	URES	
	Q1	Q2**	Q3	Q4	ANNUAL TOTAL
1982	2	3	3	3	11
1983	1	1	2	3	7
1984	3	7	10	12	32
1985	12	21	17	18	68
1986	14	14	21	16	65
1987	22	19	12	16	69
1988	11	6	12	7	36
1989	5	7	5	5	22
1990	3	4	**	**	**

<sup>\*</sup>Data exclude banks assisted to prevent failure. Industrial banks and mutual savings banks also are excluded. Agricultural banks are defined in the introduction to section III.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Failures for the second quarter of 1990 are not final.

SECTION IV: FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF FARM CREDIT CONDITIONS AND FARM LAND VALUES

TABLES:	Page	
IV.A IV.B IV.C IV.D IV.E	Nonreal estate lending experience	

#### SOURCES OF DATA:

Data are from quarterly surveys of agricultural credit conditions at commercial banks conducted at the end of each quarter by five Federal Reserve Banks. Each of these banks issues a more detailed quarterly report on its survey results, available from its Research Department at the address given below. The five surveys differ in subject matter covered (as is evident in the tables), wording of basically similar questions, and type of banks covered. Most of the differences in wording are reflected in the use of different column headings on the two pages of each table. The states included in each district are indicated in the table headings; states that fall only partly within a given district are marked with asterisks. Important differences in the type of banks surveyed are noted below.

Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, Box 834, Chicago, Illinois, 60690

The sample includes member banks at which farm loans represented 25 percent or more of total loans as of June 1972 (a 10 percent standard is used for banks in the state of Michigan). The sample has undergone periodic review and has included roughly 900 banks in recent quarters.

Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Federal Reserve P.O. Station, Kansas City Missouri 64198

The sample chosen originally in 1976 consisted of 188 banks selected from among banks at which farm loans constituted 50 percent or more of total loans, with appropriate representation of all farm areas. In recent quarters, the sample has included about 150 banks.

#### Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480

Before 1987, the sample provided a cross-section of banks of all sizes that were engaged in farm lending. Members of the Upper Midwest Agricultural Credit Council formed the core of the survey panel. Beginning in 1987, the sample was redrawn to include only banks at which farm loans represented 25 percent or more of total loans. Currently the sample includes 325 banks and in recent quarters the rate of responses has averaged roughly 50 percent.

#### Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Station K, Dallas, Texas 75222

The sample is stratified regionally and includes banks at which farm loans are relatively important or which hold a major portion of bank loans in their region. The sample was enlarged in the first quarter of 1985 and was redrawn in the second quarter of 1989. About 300 banks have been responding to the survey in recent quarters.

#### Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia 23261

The sample selected in 1975 consisted of 43 banks of all sizes. Banks with the larger amounts of farm loans were sampled more heavily.

#### RECENT DEVELOPMENTS:

The Reserve Banks' surveys of agricultural credit conditions in the first quarter of 1990 generally showed little change from the trends evident in previous quarters. The demand for farm loans at commercial banks (Tables IV.A and IV.B) is increasing in most of the agricultural regions covered by the surveys, and further gains in loan demand generally were anticipated in the second quarter, largely for the financing of farm machinery and farm operations.

Banks continue to have ample funds available for farm lending. Loan-to-deposit ratios in the first quarter were little changed from those of a year earlier in most districts, and in all districts, a large share of the bankers surveyed continue to characterize the ratios as being lower than desired. Similarly, the proportion of respondents who said that fund availability is either greater than a year ago or greater than normal remains quite high. Few banks say that they have reduced or refused a farm loan because of a shortage of loanable funds.

#### Section IV: (continued)

Although loan repayment rates (Table IV.A) have slowed a bit in some regions over the past year, they have improved in other regions, and the overall picture remains one in which repayment problems are relatively limited. Similarly, the demand for loan renewals and extensions has moved up a little in some regions, but still is quite low by historical standards.

The Reserve Bank surveys indicate that the interest rates on farm loans (Table IV.D) edged down further in the first quarter of 1990. In general, the first-quarter rates were about 1/2 to 3/4 percentage point below those reported a year earlier.

Land prices, on average, still appear to be trending up according to the Reserve Bank surveys, although there are marked regional differences. In the Chicago and Kansas City districts, the very rapid increases of previous years have given way to a more moderate rate of increase recently. A moderate year-to-year uptrend also is evident in the Minneapolis district, while large year-to-year gains are being maintained in the Richmond district. In the Dallas district, the price trend looks relatively flat, on balance. These patterns generally are consistent with those reported in the USDA's latest annual survey of land prices, the main exception being that the USDA figures show a stronger price trend in the states of the Minneapolis District. (The USDA data cover the period from February 1, 1989, to January 1, 1990; this period differs from any of the periods covered in Table IV.E.)

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS AT COMMERCIAL BANKS TABLE IV.A

## FARM NONREAL ESTATE LENDING EXPERIENCE COMPARED WITH A YEAR EARLIER (PERCENTAGE OF BANKS REPORTING)

			DEMA	ND FOR	LOANS		FUND	AVAILA	BILITY		LOAN 1	REPAYME	NT RATE		RENEWAL	S OR EX	TENSIONS		COLLA	TERAL F	REQUIRE
			LOWER	SAME	HIGHE	₹	LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHE
		IV.A1	SEVE	NTH (CI	HICAGO)	FEDERAL	RESER	VE DIST	RICT ( IL	*, IN	*, IO,	MI*, V	VI* ) AGR	ICULT	TRAL BANK	s					
1988	01	1	26	46	28		5	53	42	l	2	52	46	1	43	53	4	1	0	73	27
1300	Q2	i	21	45	34	i	7	60	34	1	11	64	25	i	25	64	11	1	0	74	25
	Q3	i	18	45	37	i	9	66	24	ŀ	22	68	10	i	14	63	23	ı	0	77	22
	Q4	i	15	43	42	ì	5	67	28	ı	29	54	17	ı	14	57	28	i	1	78	22
999	Q1	1	11	39	50	1	11	63	26	1	27	62	11	1	11	61	28	ı	0	73	26
. 303	Q2	<u> </u>	11	41	49	i	15	63	22	i	18	72	10	i	11	68	21	1	1	79	20
	Q3	1	13	50	37	i	13	65	22	i	12	70	18	i	15	70	15	- 1	0	81	18
	Q4	i	17	48	35	i	6	64	30	i	11	54	34	i	28	59	12	ı	1	83	16
L9 <b>9</b> 0	Q1	1	15	45	40	1	6	63	31	ı	10	59	31	ı	29	61	11	ı	1	81	18
		IV.A2	TENT	H (KAN:	SAS CIT	Y) FEDER	RAL RES	ERVE DI	STRICT (	CO, K	s, Mo*	, NE, N	M*, OK,	WY) A	RICULTUR	AL BANK	:s				
988	01		31	48	21	1	10	50	40	ı	7	58	36		29	64	7		1	57	42
	Q2	i	22	61	17	i	7	57	36	i	5	64	30	i	29	67	4	- 1	0	66	34
	Q3	i	22	60	18	i	9	59	32	i	5	63	32	Ĺ	26	66	7	- 1	1	69	29
	Q4	i	22	52	26	İ	5	60	36	1	4	60	36	1	27	67	6	1	1	75	25
989	Q1	ı	17	56	27	ı	4	63	33	i	3	67	29	1	25	71	4	. 1	1	72	27
	02	i	15	56	28	i	10	63	27	i	9	71	20	i	13	78	9	ı	0	75	25
	Q3	i	11	53	36	i	10	64	26	i	14	70	16	i	11	78	11	1	0	80	20
	Q4	i	11	53	36	i	9	63	28	i	21	63	16	i	11	65	24	ı	1	82	16
L <b>99</b> 0	Q1	1	13	55	32	ı	7	66	27	ı	14	67	19	1	13	72	15	1	1	80	19
		IV.A3	ELEVE	ENTH (I	DALLAS)	FEDERAL	RESER	VE DIST	RICT ( LA	*, NM	*, TX	)									
988	01	ı	30	44	26	ı	8	48	44	1	13	56	31	1	32	52	16	1	0	44	56
	Q2	i	27	50	23	i	6	55	39	i	10	62	28	i	30	55	15	i	Ō	43	57
	Q3	i	21	46	32	į	12	55	33	i	13	61	26	İ	27	58	15	i	0	46	54
	Q4	i	21	49	30	i	8	50	42	i	11	60	30	i	31	56	13	i	0	51	49
989	Q1	ı	25	47	27	1	5	51	44	1	10	68	22	1	27	64	9	1	0	54	46
	Q2	i	28	47	26	i	8	55	37	i	15	68	17	i	18	66	16	i	Ö	56	44
	Q3	i	20	52	28	i	10	57	33	i	15	71	14	i	17	65	18	i	ŏ	61	39
	Q4	i	20	54	26	i	5	61	33	i	23	61	16	·i	16	61	23	i	ō	57	43
.990	Q1	i	16	54	30	ł	7	60	33	1	22	68	10	ı	13	65	22	1	0	59	41

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS AT COMMERCIAL BANKS TABLE IV.A

## FARM NONREAL ESTATE LENDING EXPERIENCE COMPARED WITH NORMAL CONDITIONS (PERCENTAGE OF BANKS REPORTING)

			DEMAN	D FOR	LOANS		FUND	AVAILA	BILITY		LOAN F	EPAYME	NT RATE		RENEWAL	S OR EX	TENSIONS		COLLA	ERAL I	REQUIRE
			LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHE
		IV.A4	NINTH	(MINN	EAPOLIS)	FEDER!	AL RESE	RVE DI	STRICT	MI*,	MN, MT,	ND, S	D, WI* )				-				
1988	01	1	20	66	14	1	***	***	***	i	5	68	28		19	70	10				
	Q2	- 1	16	66	18	į	***	***	***	i	5	81	14	- 1	10	83	12 8	!	***	***	***
	<b>Ω3</b>	1	12	67	21	i	***	***	***	i	29	61	10	-	8	81	11	!		***	***
	Q4	I	18	69	12	i	***	***	***	i	19	65	16	i	13	77	10	i	***	***	***
1989	Q1	1	14	64	22	1	***	***	***	1	13	75	12		16	71	13		***	***	***
	Q2	i	4	70	26	i	***	***	***	i	17	82	1	i	20	71	9	- !	***	***	
	Q3	ı	6	75	20	i	***	***	***	i	16	80	5	- 1	12	81	7	!	***	***	***
	Q4	ı	5	85	10	İ	***	***	***	i	22	70	8	i	9	80	11	i	***	***	***
1990	Q1	I	4	78	18	ı	***	***	***	1	25	70	5	ı	12	68	20	ı	***	***	* ***
		IV.A5	FIFTH	(RICH	MOND) FEI	ERAL R	ESERVE	DISTR	ICT ( MD	, NC,	SC, VA,	WV* )									
L988	Q1	1	19	73	8	1	12	65	23		4										
	Q2	i	18	71	11	;	4	75	23 21	į	0	89	8 7	!	8	92	0	1	4	64	32
	Q3	i	18	64	18	i	0	77	23		5	93 82	14	!	11	89	0	- 1	0	62	39
	Q4	i	21	68	11	i	4	82	14	1	1	71	25	l i	18 21	77	5	!	5	68	27
	_	•				•	•	V2	7.7	1	7	11	25	1	21	75	4	ı	0	75	25
1989	Q1	1	21	66	14	1	14	72	14	1	3	83	14		28	69	3		•		
	Q2	ı	14	69	17	i	10	76	14	i	Ô	89	11		14	82	3	!	0	69	31
	Q3	1	19	67	15	i	12	65	23		4	82	15	-	19	78	4	!	0 4	71	29
	Q4	ı	19	69	12	i	4	64	32	i	4	77	19	i	15	81	4	1	4	85 84	12 12
.990	Q1	1	21	68	11	1	11	68	21	1	11	79	11	,	18	79	4		4	74	22

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS AT COMMERCIAL BANKS TABLE IV.B

## FARM NONREAL ESTATE LOAN VOLUME EXPECTED DURING THE NEXT QUARTER, COMPARED WITH VOLUME OF LOANS MADE A YEAR EARLIER (PERCENTAGE OF BANKS REPORTING)

		LC	MED CAM																					
			MEK SAM	E HIGHER	L	OWER	SAME H	IGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHE
	Τ.	V.B1	SEVENT	H (CHICAGO	) FEDI	ERAL	RESERVI	E DISTR	ICT	(IL*,	IN*,	IO, MI*,	, WI	[*) AGR	ICULT	JRAL BANI	(S			<del></del>				
1988 Q1		1	9 52	29	1 2	28	58	14	1	18	76	6	1	27	68	4	1	21	50	30	<u>·</u>	11	36	53
Q2		1 2	8 48	24	4	46	46	8	i	30	64	6	i	51	41	8	i	20	47	33		52	39	9
Q3		1	.8 48	34	3	30	56	14	1	18	76	6	ĺ	42	43	15	i	13	42	44	i	37	45	18
Q4		i	8 45	47	:	16	70	13	1	14	77	9	- 1	33	57	10	i	5	31	64	i	17	50	33
1989 Q1		ı	9 40	51	1 2	25	62	13	ı	15	78	7		33	59	8		6	28	66		1.4	40	2.7
Q2		•	.0 53	37		22	69	9	i	13	80	7	i	28	65	6	1	9	46	66 45	1	14 15	49	37
Q3		•	6 57	27	•	21	67	12	i	14	78	8	i	19	62	20		20	57	24	1	9 15	58 45	27
24		•	2 51		•	13	70	17	i	11	77	11	i	25	63	11	i	13	45	43		8	38	46 54
19 <b>9</b> 0 Q1		1	.2 50	38	1 2	20	60	20	ı	13	77	11	ı	23	71	6	ı	13	46	41	ı	6	41	53
***************************************	I	V.B2	ELEVEN	TH (DALLAS	) FEDE	ERAL	RESERVI	E DISTR	ICT	(LA*,	NM*,	TX*)										~		
1988 Q1		1 2	3 57	20	1 2	28	53	19	1	22	71	7	1	20	74	6	1	15	58	27		27	49	24
Q2		1 2	0 62	18	1 4	26	58	16	i	22	72	7	i	31	60	و	i	16	56	28	- 1	25	52	23
Q3		1 2	0 61	19	1 2	24	54	22	i	21	72	6	i	18	71	11	i	20	50	30		28	51	22
Q4		1	5 66	20	1 2	23	57	20	İ	16	79	5	i	15	76	9	i	14	52	33	i	19	58	23
1989 Q1		1 2	2 55	23	1 2	29	53	17	1	16	80	4	1	19	76	5	,	16	54	31		10	<b>63</b>	
Q2		1 2	4 52	24	•	31	55	14	i	18	76	5	i	24	71	5	1	16	54	30	1	19 25	61 58	20 17
Q3		1 1	8 66	16	1 2	23	59	18	i	20	75	5	í	21	70	9	i	15	63	22	i	22	58 64	
Q4		1	5 59	25	į a	23	65	12	i	12	82	6	i	17	76	7	i	12	54	3 <b>4</b>	1	24	63	14 13
1990 Q1		1	7 59	25	1 2	22	62	16	1	19	76	5	ı	17	80	3	ı	11	58	31	i	20	62	17
	I	V.B3	FIFTH	(RICHMOND)	FEDER	RAL F	RESERVE	DISTRI	CT (	MD, NO	c, sc	, VA, WV	۲)											
1988 Q1		1	2 85	4	1 1	13	83	4	1	36	64	0		30	65	4		10	7.6		•			
Q2			2 74	4		15	81	4	i	30	67	4	1	30	59	11	1	12 11	76 75	12	!	20	56	24
Q3		1	5 70	15	i	6	89	6	i	21	68	11	i	25	60	15	1	10	15 67	14	į	21	64	14
Q4		1	0 80	10	İ	9	87	4	i	32	68	0	i	24	68	8	i	11	71	24 18	 	18 14	55 68	27 18
1989 Q1		1	8 77	15	1 3	21	79	0	ı	26	74	0		0.3	77	•					•			
Q2		1 1		21	•	L2	85	4	1	2 <b>6</b> 2 <b>4</b>		0	i	23	77	0	ı	10	69	21	1	10	66	24
Q3		•	4 64	12	•	L2 L7	83	0	1	44	76 57	0	!	24	76	0	ļ	3	72	24	- 1	10	69	21
Q4	i	•	2 64	24	, ,	9	87	4	1	21	57 79	0	l I	20 17	64 83	16 0	1	11 8	70 65	19 27		26 15	63	11
1990 Q1	i	I 2	3 65	12		20	80	0		28	72	0	'	24	72	4		15	67	19	1	15 19	62 67	23 15

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS AT COMMERCIAL BANKS TABLE IV.B (CONTINUED)

## EXPECTED DEMAND FOR FARM LOAMS DURING NEXT QUARTER, COMPARED WITH NORMAL DEMAND (PERCENTAGE OF BANKS REPORTING)

			SH	ORT-TE	RM		INTER	MEDIAT	E-TERM			DE	BT FYT	ENSION	
			NONREAL	ESTAT	E LOANS		NONREAL							ANCING	
		:	LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHE	₹		LOWER	SAM	E HIGHE	R
		IV.B4	NINTH	(MINN	EAPOLIS)	FEDERAL	RESERVI	E DIST	RICT (	MI*,	MN,	MT, N	D, SD,	WI*)	T
1987 Q1.		1	19	65	16	1	21	63	16		1	4	71	25	
Q2.		i	23	72	5	i	25	71	3		! i	13	78	25 9	i i
Q3.		i	23	71	6	i	20	72	8		i	14	80	6	
Ω4.		ı	19	70	10	i	17	74	9		i	18	73	9	i
1988 Q1.		ı	13	74	13	ı	14	75	12			15	80	6	
Q2.		İ	11	65	24	i		65	14		1	12	61	26	! !
Q3.			13	69	18	i		69	7			7	68	25	
Q4.	• •	1	11	56	32	i	12	80	8		i	7	82	11	i
1989 Q1.		1	6	64	30	i	5	80	14		ı	10	82	9	
Q2.		1	3	82	16	i		82	7		ì	11	83	6	1
<b>Ω3</b> .		1	7	81	13	i		80	10		i	7	81	12	1
Q4.	• •	1	3	82	16	i		78	16	İ	i	2	88	10	i
1990 Q1.		1	0	80	19	1	4	86	10	ı	l	5	81	13	1

TABLE IV.C

AVERAGE LOAN-TO-DEPOSIT RATIO AND OTHER INDICATORS OF RELATIVE CREDIT AVAILABILITY (PERCENTAGE OF BANKS REPORTING)

		1	AVERAGE LOAN-TO-		T.OAN /	DEPOSIT F	PATTO IS		REFUSED OR REDUCED A	ACTIVELY				NUMBER	OF FARM	LOAN	REFERR	ALS TO		
		•	DEPOSIT						FARM LOAN	SEEKING		CC	RRESPON	DENT B	ANKS		N	ONBANK	AGENCI	ES
			RATIO, END OF		LOWER	AT	HIGHER		BECAUSE OF A SHORTAGE	NEW FARM				PARED					PARED	
		I	QUARTER PERCENT		THAN DESIRED	DESIRED LEVEL	THAN DESIRED		OF LOANABLE FUNDS	LOAN ACCOUNTS		NONE		SAME	HIGHER		NONE		EAR EAR SAME	HIGHE?
		IV.C1	SEVENTH	(CHIC	CAGO) FEDI	ERAL RESE	RVE DISTR	ICT	( IL*, IN*, IC	, MI*, WI*	AGF	ICULTUF	CAL BANK	s						····
1988	Q3	1	54	ı	67	25	8	ı	***	***	1	***	***	***	***	ļ	***	***	***	***
	Q4	1	53	1	72	20	8	1	***	***	1	***	***	***	***	ı	***	***	***	***
1989	Q1	1	54	1	68	22	11	ı	***	***	1	***	***	***	***	ı	***	***	***	***
	Q2	1	56	1	66	22	12	1	***	***	İ	***	***	***	***	ı	***	***	***	***
	Q3	ļ	57 56	!	62 65	28 26	10 9		*** ***	***	!	***	***	***	***	ļ	***	***	***	***
	Q4	ı	36	i	65	26	9	1	~~~		1		~~~		^^^	ı	^^^	~~~	~~~	~~~
1990	Q1	1	55	l	67	25	7	i	***	***	ı	***	***	***	***	I	***	***	***	***
		IV.C2	TENTH (I	KANSAS	CITY) F	EDERAL RE	SERVE DIS	TRICT	C (CO, KS, MO	*, NE, NM*	OK,	WY) AG	RICULTU	RAL BA	NKS					
1988	Q3	ı	50	ı	77	9	14	ı	5	59	1	76	26	70	5	ı	66	25	69	6
1988	Q3 Q4	1	50 49	l	77 79	9 10	14 10		5 3	59 67	   	76 72	26 20	70 72	5 7		66 66	25 17	69 75	6 8
	Q4	1		1							! !		20					17		8
			49	! ! !	79	10	10	   	3	67	1	72		72	7		66		75	
	Q4 Q1		49 49	1	79 81	10 12 7 7	10 8	       	3	67 71		72 75	20 23	72 70	7 7		66 65	17 21	75 67	8 11
	Q1 Q2	       	49 49 51	       	79 81 82	10 12 7	10 8 11	       	3 3 2	67 71 69	]       	72 75 78	20 23 25	72 70 75	7 7 1		66 65 65	17 21 21	75 67 75	8 11 4
1989	Q1 Q1 Q2 Q3	         	49 49 51 51	! ! ! !	79 81 82 79	10 12 7 7	10 8 11 14		3 2 4	67 71 69 70	1 1 1 1	72 75 78 78	20 23 25 21	72 70 75 75	7 7 1 4		66 65 65 74	17 21 21 21	75 67 75 73	8 11 4 6
1989	Q1 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	             	49 49 51 51 51	         	79 81 82 79 79	10 12 7 7 7 9	10 8 11 14 14	         	3 2 4 5	67 71 69 70 67	! ! ! !	72 75 78 78 76	20 23 25 21 18	72 70 75 75 76	7 7 1 4 6	       	66 65 65 74 72	17 21 21 21 19	75 67 75 73 75	8 11 4 6 6
1989	Q1 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	                   	49 49 51 51 51	               	79 81 82 79 79	10 12 7 7 7 9	10 8 11 14 14	         	3 2 4 5	67 71 69 70 67	!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	72 75 78 78 76	20 23 25 21 18	72 70 75 75 76	7 7 1 4 6		66 65 65 74 72	17 21 21 21 19	75 67 75 73 75	8 11 4 6 6
1989	Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	                     	49 49 51 51 51 50 ELEVENTE	                   	79 81 82 79 79 81 MAS) FEDE	10 12 7 7 7 9 ERAL RESE	10 8 11 14 14 10 RVE DISTR	         	3 2 4 5 4 LA, NM*, TX)	67 71 69 70 67 71	1 1 1	72 75 78 78 76 74	20 23 25 21 18 15	72 70 75 75 76 78	7 7 1 4 6		66 65 65 74 72 67	17 21 21 21 19 15	75 67 75 73 75 74	8 11 4 6 6 11
1989 1990 1988	Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1	                   	49 49 51 51 50  ELEVENTE 52 49	                 	79 81 82 79 79 81 LLAS) FEDE	10 12 7 7 7 9 ERAL RESE	10 8 11 14 14 10 RVE DISTR	         	3 2 4 5 4 LA, NM*, TX)	67 71 69 70 67 71	! ! !	72 75 78 78 76 74	20 23 25 21 18 15	72 70 75 75 76 78	7 7 1 4 6 7 7		66 65 65 74 72 67	17 21 21 21 19 15	75 67 75 73 75 74	8 11 4 6 6 11
1989 1990 1988	Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q3 Q1	                   	49 49 51 51 50 ELEVENTE 52 49 46 48	                     	79 81 82 79 81 LAS) FEDE *** ***	10 12 7 7 7 9 ERAL RESE *** ***	10 8 11 14 14 10  RVE DISTR  *** ***	         	3 3 2 4 5 4 LA, NM*, TX) 5 4 1 3	67 71 69 70 67 71  *** *** ***	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	72 75 78 78 76 74 *** ***	20 23 25 21 18 15 20 21 12 18	72 70 75 75 76 78 70 71 79 75	7 7 1 4 6 7 10 8 8 7		66 65 65 74 72 67 ***	17 21 21 21 19 15 17 25 15 18	75 67 75 73 75 74	11 4 6 6 11 11 8 9 6
1989 1990 1988	Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q1 Q1 Q1 Q2 Q2 Q2	                   	49 49 51 51 50 ELEVENTE 52 49 46 48 49	                         	79 81 82 79 79 81 LAS) FEDE	10 12 7 7 7 9 ERAL RESE *** *** ***	10  8 11 14 14 10  RVE DISTR  ***  ***  ***	         	3 3 2 4 5 4 LA, NM*, TX) 5 4 1 3 4	67 71 69 70 67 71 *** *** ***		72 75 78 78 76 74 *** ***	20 23 25 21 18 15 20 21 12 18 16	72 70 75 75 76 78 70 71 79 75 72	7 7 1 4 6 7 10 8 8 7 12		66 65 65 74 72 67 *** ***	17 21 21 21 19 15 	75 67 75 73 75 74 72 68 75 75 80	11 4 6 6 11 11 8 9 6 9
1989 1990 1988	Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q3 Q1	                     	49 49 51 51 50 ELEVENTE 52 49 46 48	                                   	79 81 82 79 81 LAS) FEDE *** ***	10 12 7 7 7 9 ERAL RESE *** ***	10 8 11 14 14 10  RVE DISTR  *** ***	         	3 3 2 4 5 4 LA, NM*, TX) 5 4 1 3	67 71 69 70 67 71  *** *** ***		72 75 78 78 76 74 *** ***	20 23 25 21 18 15 20 21 12 18	72 70 75 75 76 78 70 71 79 75	7 7 1 4 6 7 10 8 8 7		66 65 65 74 72 67 *** ***	17 21 21 21 19 15 17 25 15 18	75 67 75 73 75 74 72 68 75 75	11 4 6 6 11 11 8 9 6

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS AT COMMERCIAL BANKS TABLE IV.C

AVERAGE LOAN-TO-DEPOSIT RATIO AND OTHER INDICATORS OF RELATIVE CREDIT AVAILABILITY (PERCENTAGE OF BANKS REPORTING)

		1	averagi Loan-To-	-	LOAN/	DEPOSIT	RATIO IS		REFUSED OR REDUCED A	ACTIVELY				NUMBER	OF FARM	LOAN	REFER	CALS TO		
			DEPOSIT	r					FARM LOAN BECAUSE OF	SEEKING NEW		CC	PRESPON	DENT E	BANKS		ì	ONBANK	AGENC:	IES
			END OF QUARTER		Lower Than	AT DESIRED	HIGHER		A SHORTAGE	FARM				PARED				CON	PARED	WITH
			PERCENT	X	DESIRED		THAN DESIRED		OF LOANABLE FUNDS	LOAN ACCOUNTS		NONE	NOR LOWER	MAL NU Same	MBER HIGHER		NONE	NOF LOWER	dal no Same	
		IV.C4	NINTH	(MINNE	POLIS) F	EDERAL RI	ESERVE DIS	TRICT	( MI*, MN, M	T, ND, SD,	WI*)								SAPIE.	nighe
													<del></del>							
1988	Q3	ı	53	1	58	39	3	1	3	***	- 1	34	8	57	1		30	9	60	1
	Q4	1	51	1	57	39	4	I	3	***	i	33	6	61	ō	i	34	5	57	3
1989	Q1	ı	50	1	56	41	3	ı	6	***	1	34	10	55	1		34	8	56	2
	Q2	1	53	I	54	45	1	i	3	***	i	35	5	59	ō	i	31	6	61	2
	Q3	1	55	1	43	52	5	1	3	***	İ	34	5	59	2	i	32	6	57	5
	Q4	ı	55	1	43	48	9	1	3	***	1	34	4	60	3	i	29	3	63	5
1990	Q1	1	52	1	49	47	4	I	3	***	i	32	3	63	2	ı	30	2	63	4
		IV.C5	FIFTH	(RICHMO	ND) FEDE	RAL RESER	RVE DISTRIC	T ( 1	MD, NC, SC, V	A, WV*)			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						<del></del>	
1988	Q3	1	79	ı	5	67	29	ſ	0	59		91	0	10	0		70			
	Q4	i	78	i	11	61	29	i	4	67	i	78	ō	22	ŏ	i	60	0 0	30 <b>4</b> 0	0 0
1989	Q1	ı	80	1	14	50	36	ı	7	55	1	77	4	19	0		60	0	36	4
	Q2	i	79	1	10	62	28	ı	3	66	İ	82	4	15	0	i	64	4	32	0
	<b>Q3</b>	1	80	1	22	56	22	1	4	63	1	84	4	12	0	i	71	8	21	ŏ
	Q4	I	76	ŀ	32	56	12	1	0	69	ı	73	4	23	0	İ	62	12	27	ō
1990	Q1	ı	76	1	32	57	11	ı	0	68	,	84	4	12	0	,	65	8	27	0

#### INTEREST RATES ON FARM LOANS

			Mos	T COMMON IN (AVE	TEREST RA		M LOANS			A		D WITH	AVERAGE	RATES	DURING T IN THE CU NKS REPORT	RRENT			
			FEEDER	OTHER	SHORT- TERM	INTER- MEDIATE	LONG-TERM REAL	I	-	HORT-TE	RM E LOANS				TE-TERM TE LOANS			LONG-TE	ERM E LOANS
			Cattle Loans	OPERATING LOANS	NONREAL ESTATE	NONREAL ESTATE	ESTATE LOANS		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER
		IV.D1	SEVENT	H (CHICAGO)	FEDERAL	RESERVE D	ISTRICT (I	L*, IN*,	IO, MI	*, WI*)	AGRICUL	TURAL	BANKS						
1988	Q3	1	11.6	11.7	***	***	11.0	1	***	***	***	1	***	***	***	ı	***	***	***
	Q4	i	11.9	12.0	***	***	11.3	i	***	***	***	Ì	***	***	***	į	***	***	***
1989	Q1	1	12.5	12.5	***	***	11.7	1	***	***	***	1	***	***	***	ı	***	***	***
	Q2	1	12.4	12.4	***	***	11.5	1	***	***	***	1	***	***	***	1	***	***	***
	Q3	İ	12.1	12.2	***	***	11.3	i	***	***	***	ı	***	***	***	i	***	***	***
	Q4	İ	12.0	12.0	***	***	11.1	i	***	***	***	1	***	***	***	İ	***	***	***
1990	Q1	ı	11.9	11.9	***	***	11.1	1	***	***	***	1	***	***	***	1	***	***	***
		IV.D2	TENTH	(KANSAS CIT	Y) FEDERA	AL RESERVE	DISTRICT	(CO, KS,	MO*, N	E, NM*,	OK) AGR	ICULT	RAL BANK	s					
1988	Q3	1	11.9	11.8	***	11.9	11.4		***	***	***	1	***	***	***		***	***	***
	Q4	i	12.2	12.1	***	12.2	11.6	i	***	***	***	i	***	***	***	i	***	***	***
1989	Q1	ı	12.6	12.6	***	12.6	12.0	1	***	***	***	ı	***	***	***	ı	***	***	***
	Q2	İ	12.5	12.4	***	12.5	11.9	i	***	***	***	İ	***	***	***	i	***	***	***
	Q3	1	12.4	12.3	***	12.4	11.7	i	***	***	***	1	***	***	***	i	***	***	***
	Q4	į	12.3	12.1	***	12.2	11.6	İ	***	***	***	Ì	***	***	***	i	***	***	***
1990	Q1	ı	12.2	12.1	***	12.1	11.5	1	***	***	***	ı	***	***	***	1	***	***	***

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS AT COMMERCIAL BANKS TABLE IV.D

#### INTEREST RATES ON FARM LOANS

				(AVI	ERAGE, PEI	ATE ON FAR RCENT)	- DOMNO			•	COMPARE	D WITH	AVERAGE	RATES	DURING IN THE C	URRENT	XT QUARTER	ER	
			FEEDER CATTLE LOANS	OTHER OPERATING	SHORT- TERM NONREAL		Long-term Real Estate	I		SHORT-TI	erm Te loans		INTE NONRE	ERMEDIA:	re-term re loans			LONG-TI	erm E loans
				LOANS	ESTATE	ESTATE	LOANS		LOWER		HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHER		LOWER	SAME	HIGHE
		IV.D3	NINTH	(MINNEAPOLI	S) FEDERA	AL RESERVE	DISTRICT	(MI*, MN	, MT, N	D, SD,	WI*)						<del></del>		
1988	Q3	1	***	***	11.9	12.1	11 6										<del></del>		
	Q4	i	***	***	12.2	12.4	11.6	!	1	54	44	1	1	55	43	1	1	58	41
		•			12.2	12.4	11.7	ı	1	34	66	1	1	33	66	i	1	37	62
1989	Q1	ı	***	***	12.8	12.9	10.0		_							•	_	٠.	~~
	Q2	i	***	***	12.7		12.2	ı	7	29	63	ı	7	31	62	1	8	36	56
	Q3	i	***	***		12.9	12.1	I	43	55	2	- 1	42	54	3	i	42	56	1
	Q4	1	***	***	12.5	12.5	11.9	1	30	68	2	- 1	28	70	2	i	29	69	2
	₩4	1	^^^	***	12.4	12.3	11.7	1	49	50	1	i	44	56	ī	i	46	54	
1990	Q1	1	***	***	12.3	12.3	11.5		8	83	9		•		_	•		34	0
								•		05	,	1	8	80	12	1	8	80	11
		IV.D4	ELEVEN	TH (DALLAS)	FEDERAL	RESERVE DI	STRICT (LA	*, NM*,	TX)				***************************************						
1988	Q3	ı	12.4	12.6	***	12.6	12.4		***			·					·		
	Q4	ì	12.6	12.8	***	12.8		!		***	***	i	***	***	***	į	***	***	***
	_	•		12.0		12.0	12.5	i	***	***	***	1	***	***	***	1	***	***	***
1989	Q1	1	13.3	13.5	***	12 6		_											
	02	i	13.2	13.3	***	13.6	13.2	1	***	***	***	- 1	***	***	***	1	***	***	***
	Q3	;	13.0			13.3	12.9	ı	***	***	***	1	***	***	***	i	***	***	***
	Q4	;	12.9	13.0	***	13.1	12.7	1	***	***	***	- 1	***	***	***	i	***	***	***
	¥*	'	12.9	12.9	***	12.9	12.7	ı	***	***	***	İ	***	***	***	i	***	***	***
1990	Q1	I	12.7	12.8	***	12.9	12.6	1	***	***	***	ł	***	***	***	1	***	***	***
		IV.D5	FIFTH (	RICHMOND) F	EDERAL RE	ESERVE DIS	TRICT (MD,	NC, SC,	VA, WV	7*)							···		
988	Q3	1	11.5	11.4	***	11.0													
	Q4	- 1	12.1	12.0	***	11.8	11.6	!	***	***	***	1	***	***	***	1	***	***	***
		'		12.0	~ ~ *	12.3	12.1	I	***	***	***	ı	***	***	***	İ	***	***	***
.989 🦸	Q1	ł	12.8	12.7	***	12.9	12.7	ı	***	***	***		***						
•	Q2	1	12.6	12.5	***	12.6	12.5	1	***	***	***	!		***	***	1	***	***	***
Ç	Q3	i	11.9	12.3	***	12.4	12.3	1	***	***		!	***	***	***	1	***	***	***
-	_ Q4	i	12.2	12.1	***	12.4		!			***	ı	***	***	***	1	***	***	***
	_	•		14.1		12.2	11.8		***	***	***	1	***	***	***	1	***	***	***
9 <b>9</b> 0 ç	Q1	ı	12.0	12.0	***	12.1	12.0	ı	***	***	***	1	***	***	***		***	***	***

## FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS AT COMMERCIAL BANKS TABLE IV.E

#### TRENDS IN FARM REAL ESTATE VALUES AND LOAN VOLUME

							MAR	CET VALUE	OF GOO	D FARM	LAND	@DE	ND EXPECTED	DIM TWO		REAL 1	red trend	N VOLUME
					age cha Quarte		P	ercentage A year				T	HE NEXT QUAR RCENTAGE OF :	TER		COMPARI	THE NEXT ED TO YEAR CENTAGE OF	EARLIER
			ALL		IRRI-	RANCH- LAND		DRY-	IRRI- GATED	RANCH- LAND		DOWN	STABLE	UP		LOWER	SAME	HIGHE
	<del> </del>	IV.E1	SEVEN:	TH (C	HICAGO)	FEDERAL	RESERV	DISTRIC	(IL*,	IN*,	IO, MI	*, WI*)	AGRICULTURA	L BANKS				
1988	Q3	·····	3	***	***	***	1:		***	***		9	71	20	1	22	56	21
	Q4	I	3	***	***	***	1:	***	***	***	İ	2	69	29	i	14	60	25
1989	Q1	i	3	***	***	***	10	) ***	***	***	1	4	73	24	ı	15	56	30
	Q2	İ	1	***	***	***	i :	***	***	***	i	3	77	20	i	17	63	19
	Q3	1	2	***	***	***	1 8	***	***	***	i	1	67	32	i	11	65	24
	Q4	l	1	***	***	***	1 0	***	***	***	Ì	2	70	29	i	11	60	29
1990	Q1	1	3	***	***	***	1 5	***	***	***	1	2	71	28	1	6	66	28
		IV.E2	FIFTH	(RIC	HMOND)	FEDERAL 1	RESERVE	DISTRICT	(MD, N	C, SC,	VA, W	7*)	<del></del>					
1988	Q3	1	2	***	***	***	1 7	***	***	***	1	0	67	33	1	14	73	14
	Q4	1	3	***	***	***	j 5	***	***	***	i	Ö	75	25	i	19	73 78	4
1989	01	1	6	***	***	***	1 16	***	***	***		0	69	31				
	Q2	i	-0	***	***	***	1 11		***	***	1	0	69	31	1	22	70	7
	03	i	11	***	***	***	1 21		***	***	;	Ô	93	7	!	21	72	7
	04	i	-4	***	***	***	1 13		***	***	i	o	73	27	i	28 16	64 76	8 8
L <b>99</b> 0	Q1	1	14	***	***	***	21	***	***	***	i	4	68	29	1	23	69	8
		IV.E3	ELEVEN	TH (1	DALLAS)	FEDERAL	RESERVE	DISTRICT	(LA*,	NM*, 1	(X)						<del></del>	
000	Q3		***	-0						_		T						
	Q4	i		-0 -1	2 -3	-2 -4	**	-	9 6	-7 -8		***	***	***	-	31 23	59 <b>6</b> 1	10 16
										•	•				1		91	70
	Q1	!		-1	2	-2	**	-	5	-9	- 1	***	***	***	ł	25	65	10
	Q2	ļ	***	0	2	-1	**	•	3	-8	ı	***	***	***	İ	32	61	7
	Q3	!		-0	4	-0	**	•	5	-7	- 1	***	***	***	1	28	61	10
	Q4	ı	***	-1	-1	-1	**	* <b>-</b> 2	7	-4	1	***	***	***	1	26	65	9
							•				•				1	20	63	,

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS AT COMMERCIAL BANKS TABLE IV.E

#### TRENDS IN FARM REAL ESTATE VALUES AND LOAN VOLUME

								MARKET V	ALUE C	OF GOOD 1	FARMLANI							TED DEMAN	
					TAGE CHI					CHANGE EARLIE			THI	EXPECTED DE NEXT QUART CENTAGE OF E	ER		DURING COMPA	THE NEXT RED WITH ENTAGE OF	QUARTER, NORMAL
		•	ALL	DRY- LAND	IRRI- GATED	RANCH- LAND		ALL	DRY- LAND	IRRI- GATED	RANCH- LAND		DOWN	STABLE	UP		LOWER	SAME	HIGHE
		IV.E4	TEN	TH (KA	NSAS C	ITY) FEDI	ERAL	RESERVE	DISTR	ICT (CO,	KS, MO	*, NE,	, NM*,	OK, WY)					
1988	Q3	1	***	2	2	1		***	9	9	12		***	***	***				
	Q4	1	***	3	3	2	i	***	10	11	11	- 1	***	***	***	!	***	***	***
1000												•				1	~~~	***	***
1989	Q1	!	***	4	5	4	- 1	***	11	14	10	- 1	***	***	***	1	***	***	***
	Q2	!	***	1	1	2	- 1	***	10	11	10	1	***	***	***	i	***	***	***
	Q3	!	***	0	2	-0	į	***	8	11	8	1	***	***	***	i	***	***	***
	Q4	ı	***	2	1	5	ı	***	8	9	11	1	***	***	***	i	***	***	***
1990	Q1	1	***	2	1	-0	ı	***	5	5	7	ı	***	***	***	I	***	***	***
		IV.E5	NIN	H (MI	NNEAPOL	IS) FEDE	RAL	RESERVE	DISTR	ICT (MI*	, MN, M	r, ND,	SC, W	I*)		······································			
1988	Q3	1	***	-4	-7	-3		***	5	1	3		***	***	***				
	Q4	i	***	-2	5	-5	i	***	6	4	2	-	***	***	***	!	18 13	77	5
							•				_	•				1	13	70	18
	Q1		***	8	2	10	- 1	***	7	5	5	1	***	***	***	ı	10	74	15
	Q2	•	***	4	5	2	ı	***	6	4	3	1	***	***	***	i	9	85	6
	Q3	•	***	-4	-8	-1	1	***	6	3	5	1	***	***	***	i	4	75	21
	Q4	I	***	-2	8	-5	i	***	5	6	5	1	***	***	***	i	12	75 75	13