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## General Information

The Agricultural Finance Databook 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. When the current issue went to press, data from the survey of terms of bank lending were available for the first quarter of 2001; the other data generally were available through the fourth quarter of 2000.

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

The Databook 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 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.
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## SOURCES OF DATA:

These data on the farm loans of $\$ 1000$ or more 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 348 commercial banks. A subset of 250 banks was asked for information regarding agricultural lending, and about 150 typically reported at least one farm loan.

Since August of 1989, the data have been drawn from a redesigned sample of 250 banks that is no longer part of the broader survey. In the redesigned sample, banks are stratified according to their volume of farm lending; previously, they had been stratified according to the volume of business loans. However, the sample data always have been expanded into national estimates for all commercial banks, and these estimates necessarily exhibit variability due to sampling error. The estimates are sensitive to the occasional appearance of very large loans in the sample. In addition, the breakdown of national estimates into those for large banks and small banks may have been affected somewhat by the new sampling procedures that were implemented in August 1989; apparent shifts in the data as of that date should be treated with caution.

Beginning with the May 1997 survey, data on the assessment by the lender of the risk associated with each loan, the next date that the rate of interest could be adjusted, whether the loan was callable by the bank, and whether the borrower could prepay the loan without penalty began to be collected. Over time, the data on the lender's perception of the riskiness of farm loans should help provide a better picture of the effect of fluctuations in the creditworthiness of farm borrowers as either farm financial conditions or the broader economic environment changes. The new data on loan repricing dates, callability of the loan, and the existence of prepayment penalties should help to refine estimates of the duration of farm loans made by commercial banks.

Tables I.H. 1 through 1.H. 6 contain most of the new data, while the other tables in section I attempt to show estimates that are comparable to those that have been presented for a number of years. However, for several quarters while the new survey was being designed, banks that left the survey panel were not replaced immediately, because new replacement banks would soon have been forced to revise their newly-instituted reporting procedures when the new survey form went into effect. As a result, the size of the survey panel dwindled through early 1997, and with the May 1997 survey, an unusually-large number of new reporters (about 25) were added. While this does not affect the validity of the May survey information, it likely introduced sampling error, especially when the May survey results are compared with those of previous quarters.

The format and the information contained in the tables are likely to change over time as more of the new survey information is acquired.

## SECTION I: (CONTINUED)

More detailed results from each quarterly survey previously were published in Statistical Release E.2A, "Survey of Terms of Bank Lending to Farmers". Beginning in February, 1992, the more detailed results are included at the end of this section of the Databook, and the E2.A has been discontinued. Starting with the August 1986 survey, farm loans secured by real estate are included in the data shown in the table of detailed results, whereas such loans are excluded from the tabulations in Tables I.A through I.G and the summary charts.

Beginning in November 1991, several survey statistics are estimated for each of ten farm production regions as defined by the USDA. These statistics, which are presented in table I.I, should be treated with some caution. Although an effort was made to choose a good regional mix of banks for the panel, the panel never has been stratified by region. Consequently, the survey results are less precise for each region than for the totals for the nation.

## RECENT DEVELOPMENTS:

In the February 2001 survey, the estimated number of non-real-estate farm loans made by banks was below the estimated level of one year earlier, continuing the gradual downward trend that seems to have begun around 1994. The average size of loans in the February survey was towards the middle of the range seen in recent years. The estimated volume of farm loans remained near the lows over the past decade. Relative to one year earlier, the declines in the volume of loans outstanding largely reflected lower volumes of loans for operating expenses.

In the February survey, the average maturity of farm non-real-estate loans widened considerably, with the sharpest increases coming for farm machinery loans, although maturities for all types of loans except those for feeder livestock registered an increase. In February, the average effective rate of interest on non-real-estate farm loans was almost a full percentage point lower than the reading in the previous quarter. The percentage of loans that were made with a rate of interest that floats was 67.7 percent in February, roughly in line with the average for the past year.

Relative to the previous quarter, the weighted average risk rating (line 5 of Tables I.H. 1 through I.H.6) fell more than 80 basis points in the February survey. The weighted average repricing interval (line 4 of the tables) fell below 5 months in November. The percentage of the volume of loans that were to purchase or improve farm real estate (line 23) increased to 5.41 percent, while the proportion of the volume of loans that were to finance the production of feeder livestock fell by more than half to 5.7 percent. The proportion of farm loans that were secured (the sum of lines 25 and 26) drifted down to about 92 percent, and the type of collateral shifted a bit towards farm real estate.

When broken out by the riskiness of the loan (Tables I.H. 4 through I.H.6), a bit more than a third of the estimated volume of loans was rated "moderate". Weighted-average rates of interest fell for all risk categories, although the decline in rates tended to be larger at the riskier end of the spectrum.

Weighted average rates of interest fell in almost all farm production regions, although the magnitude of the declines varied considerably. The largest declines, roughly 1-1/2 percentage points, came in the Northeast, the Southeast, and the Southern Plains. By contrast, reported rates in the Lake States fell only 0.2 percentage point, and rates increased 0.3 percentage point in the Delta States.

Chart 1
Results from the Survey of Terms of Bank Lending to Farmers


Chart 2




ESTIMATES FROM THE QUARTERLY SAMPLE SURVEY OF BANK NON-REAL-ESTATE LOANS TO FARMERS TABLE I.A

NUMBER OF LOANS MADE (MILLIONS)

|  | BY PURPOSE OF LOAN |  |  |  |  |  | BY SIZE OF <br> LOAN $(\$ 1,000 \mathrm{~s})$ |  |  |  | BY SIZEOF BANK |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALL } \\ \text { LOANS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FEEDER } \\ & \text { LIVE-- } \\ & \text { STOCK } \end{aligned}$ | OTHER <br> LIVESTOCK | OTHER CURRENT OPERATING EXPENSES | $\begin{gathered} \text { FARM } \\ \text { MACHINERY } \\ \text { AND } \\ \text { EQUIPMENT } \end{gathered}$ | OTHER | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ \text { to } \\ 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 99 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ | LARGE | OTHER |
| ANNUAL NUMBER OF LOANS MADE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1989 | 2.60 | 0.30 | 0.20 | 1.73 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 1.67 | 0.52 | 0.31 | 0.09 | 0.36 | 2.23 |
| 1990. | 2.63 | 0.32 | 0.24 | 1.69 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 1.70 | 0.49 | 0.35 | 0.09 | 0.44 | 2.20 |
| 1991. | 2.60 | 0.35 | 0.23 | 1.64 | 0.17 | 0.21 | 1.66 | 0.51 | 0.32 | 0.10 | 0.50 | 2.10 |
| 1992. | 2.69 | 0.35 | 0.25 | 1.67 | 0.18 | 0.24 | 1.67 | 0.54 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.51 | 2.18 |
| 1993. | 2.70 | 0.36 | 0.27 | 1.62 | 0.18 | 0.27 | 1.65 | 0.56 | 0.37 | 0.12 | 0.55 | 2.15 |
| 1994. | 2.53 | 0.28 | 0.23 | 1.56 | 0.18 | 0.27 | 1.55 | 0.51 | 0.35 | 0.12 | 0.54 | 1.98 |
| 1995. | 2.49 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 1.48 | 0.17 | 0.39 | 1.45 | 0.57 | 0.36 | 0.12 | 0.66 | 1.83 |
| 1996. | 2.22 | 0.18 | 0.17 | 1.38 | 0.14 | 0.36 | 1.33 | 0.48 | 0.31 | 0.11 | 0.53 | 1.69 |
| 1997. | 2.27 | 0.19 | 0.20 | 1.40 | 0.15 | 0.33 | 1.32 | 0.50 | 0.34 | 0.11 | 0.46 | 1.82 |
| 1998. | 2.10 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 1.39 | 0.17 | 0.22 | 1.20 | 0.45 | 0.33 | 0.12 | 0.39 | 1.71 |
| 1999. | 1.96 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 1.32 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 1.09 | 0.44 | 0.32 | 0.11 | 0.40 | 1.56 |
| 2000. | 1.91 | 0.11 | 0.17 | 1.30 | 0.13 | 0.19 | 1.09 | 0.44 | 0.28 | 0.10 | 0.57 | 1.34 |

NUMBER OF LOANS MADE DURING FIRST FULL WEEK OF SECOND MONTH OF QUARTER, ANNUAL RATE

| 1998 | Q1. | I | 2.08 | , | 0.19 | 0.20 | 1.29 | 0.18 | 0.22 | I | 1.07 | 0.47 | 0.38 | 0.16 | 1 | 0.38 | 1.70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q2. | I | 2.51 | I | 0.12 | 0.22 | 1.72 | 0.22 | 0.24 | I | 1.44 | 0.58 | 0.37 | 0.12 |  | 0.47 | 2.04 |
|  | Q3. | 1 | 2.12 | 1 | 0.10 | 0.16 | 1.50 | 0.15 | 0.20 | I | 1.36 | 0.41 | 0.26 | 0.09 |  | 0.38 | 1.74 |
|  | Q4. | 1 | 1.70 | 1 | 0.17 | 0.14 | 1.05 | 0.14 | 0.20 | I | 0.94 | 0.36 | 0.30 | 0.11 | 1 | 0.33 | 1.37 |
| 1999 | Q1. | , | 1.93 |  | 0.20 | 0.18 | 1.17 | 0.17 | 0.20 | 1 | 0.96 | 0.45 | 0.36 | 0.15 | 1 | 0.39 | 1.54 |
|  | Q2. | 1 | 2.37 | 1 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 1.77 | 0.17 | 0.14 | 1 | 1.41 | 0.51 | 0.34 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.45 | 1.93 |
|  | Q3... | 1 | 2.05 | I | 0.07 | 0.13 | 1.47 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 1 | 1.25 | 0.44 | 0.29 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.44 | 1.61 |
|  | Q4... | 1 | 1.49 | 1 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.88 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 1 | 0.74 | 0.36 | 0.29 | 0.10 | 1 | 0.33 | 1.16 |
| 2000 | Q1. | , | 1.91 | I | 0.09 | 0.16 | 1.36 | 0.13 | 0.16 | 1 | 1.07 | 0.43 | 0.27 | 0.14 | I | 0.72 | 1.19 |
|  | Q2. | I | 2.27 | I | 0.12 | 0.19 | 1.56 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 1 | 1.28 | 0.54 | 0.33 | 0.11 | , | 0.53 | 1.74 |
|  | Q3. | I | 1.86 | 1 | 0.09 | 0.15 | 1.29 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 1 | 1.10 | 0.43 | 0.26 | 0.08 | , | 0.52 | 1.34 |
|  | Q4... | , | 1.59 | 1 | 0.14 | 0.19 | 0.96 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 1 | 0.90 | 0.35 | 0.26 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.51 | 1.08 |
| 2001 | Q1.. | 1 | 1.63 | 1 | 0.12 | 0.17 | 0.97 | 0.14 | 0.23 | 1 | 0.84 | 0.37 | 0.30 | 0.11 | 1 | 0.52 | 1.11 |



ANNUAL AVERAGE SIZE OF LOANS MADE

| 1988. | 21.8 | 34.1 | 40.6 | 16.7 | 13.9 | 34.7 | 3.7 | 14.8 | 45.2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1989 | 19.9 | 42.7 | 29.5 | 14.1 | 12.1 | 32.2 | 3.6 | 14.8 | 45.2 | 320.4 | 70.0 | 16.3 |
| 1990 | 28.4 | 69.7 | 22.7 | 15.7 | 11.9 | 34.2 | 3.6 3.6 | 14.7 | 45.9 | 272.1 | 53.7 | 14.4 |
| 1991 | 31.9 | 61.0 | 25.2 | 15.6 | 15.1 | 129.3 | 3.6 | 14.9 | 46.6 | 487.7 | 100.7 | 13.9 |
| 1992 | 31.2 | 68.2 | 26.9 | 14.7 | 15.9 | 108.7 | 3.6 3.7 | 14.9 | 46.6 45.9 | 539.9 468.2 | 107.0 | 13.9 |
| 1993 | 34.3 | 79.7 | 23.1 | 15.2 | 13.9 | 112.0 | 3.7 | 14.8 | 46.1 | 468.2 490.3 | 97.0 106.0 | 15.8 |
| 1994 | 33.9 33 | 60.3 | 27.6 | 16.3 | 17.5 | 123.6 | 3.7 | 14.6 | 47.1 | 4980.7 | 106.0 101.3 | 15.8 15.4 |
| 1995. | 33.8 39.2 | 49.7 59.0 | 26.7 | 18.5 | 15.6 | 93.6 95.6 | 3.7 | 14.7 | 44.9 | 451.3 | 101.3 84.0 | 15.4 15.7 |
| 1997. | 31.4 | 59.0 42.3 | 24.2 | 26.0 | 17.2 | 95.2 | 3.7 | 15.0 | 45.2 | 545.9 | 115.0 | 15.4 |
| 1998. | 32.4 | 41.5 | 24.3 | 18.2 | 28.1 | 97.2 127.9 | 3.8 3.7 | 14.9 | 45.8 | 385.3 | 92.0 | 16.3 |
| 1999. | 30.9 | 35.6 | 26.4 | 21.4 | 31.8 | 101.1 | 3.8 | 14.8 |  |  | 95.0 76.2 | 18.1 |
| 2000. | 26.3 | 43.3 | 26.0 | 21.3 | 29.3 | 48.5 | 3.8 3.9 | 14.8 | 46.8 45.3 | 322.1 258.4 | 76.2 44.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 19.3 \\ & 18.7 \end{aligned}$ |

average size of loans made during first full week of second month of quarter, annual rate


ESTIMATES FROM THE QUARTERLY SAMPLE SURVEY OF BANK NON-REAL-ESTATE LOANS TO FARMERS
AMOUNT OF LOANS MADE (BILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

|  |  | BY PURPOSE OF LOAN |  |  |  |  |  | BY SIZE OF <br> LOAN $(\$ 1,000 \mathrm{~s})$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BY SIZE } \\ & \text { OF BANK } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALL } \\ \text { LOANS } \end{gathered}$ | FEEDER <br> LIVE- <br> STOCK | OTHER LIVESTOCK | OTHER CURRENT OPERATING EXPENSES | FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT | OTHER | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ \text { to } \\ 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 99 \end{aligned}$ |  | LARGE | OTHER |
| ANNUAL AMOUNT OF LOANS MADE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1989. |  | 51.6 | 12.9 | 6.0 | 24.3 | 2.0 | 6.4 | 6.1 | 7.7 | 14.4 | 23.4 | 19.6 | 32.0 |
| 1990. |  | 74.7 | 22.0 | 5.5 | 26.6 | 2.3 | 18.3 | 6.1 | 7.3 | 15.9 | 45.3 | 44.2 | 30.5 |
| 1991. |  | 82.8 | 21.4 | 5.8 | 25.5 | 2.5 | 27.6 | 6.1 | 7.6 | 15.1 | 54.0 | 53.7 | 29.1 |
| 1992. |  | 83.7 | 23.6 | 6.7 | 24.6 | 2.9 | 26.0 | 6.2 | 8.0 | 16.8 | 52.8 | 49.4 | 34.3 |
| 1993. |  | 92.6 | 28.7 | 6.2 | 24.7 | 2.5 | 30.6 | 6.1 | 8.3 | 17.1 | 61.0 | 58.8 | 33.8 |
| 1994. |  | 85.7 | 16.8 | 6.4 | 25.4 | 3.2 | 33.9 | 5.8 | 7.4 | 16.5 | 56.0 | 55.1 | 30.6 |
| 1995. |  | 84.1 | 12.7 | 5.2 | 27.3 | 2.7 | 36.1 | 5.4 | 8.3 | 16.0 | 54.4 | 55.3 | 28.8 |
| 1996. |  | 87.3 | 10.6 | 4.0 | 35.9 | 2.4 | 34.5 | 5.0 | 7.1 | 13.9 | 61.3 | 61.2 | 26.1 |
| 1997. |  | 71.4 | 8.0 | 5.3 | 23.6 | 2.7 | 31.9 | 5.0 | 7.4 | 15.8 | 43.3 | 41.9 | 29.6 |
| 1998. |  | 68.0 | 6.1 | 4.4 | 25.2 | 4.9 | 27.5 | 4.5 | 6.7 | 14.9 | 41.9 | 37.0 | 31.1 |
| 1999. |  | 60.6 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 28.4 | 5.2 | 18.0 | 4.2 | 6.6 | 15.1 | 34.9 | 30.6 | 30.1 |
| 2000. |  | 50.2 | 4.8 | 4.5 | 27.6 | 3.9 | 9.3 | 4.2 | 6.5 | 12.6 | 26.8 | 25.1 | 25.0 |
| AMOUNT OF LOANS MADE dURING FIRST FULL WEEK OF SECOND MONTH OF QUARTER, ANNUAL RATE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | Q2.. | 70.30 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 29.5 | 5.4 | 25.6 | 5.4 | 8.4 | 17.4 | 39.2 | 37.7 | 32.6 |
|  | Q3... | 54.29 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 21.6 | 3.2 | 23.5 | 4.8 | 6.0 | 11.5 | 32.0 | 32.5 | 21.8 |
|  | Q4... | 68.73 | 8.8 | 4.1 | 19.7 | 3.8 | 32.3 | 3.6 | 5.5 | 13.2 | 46.4 | 40.0 | 28.7 |
| 1999 | Q1.. | 89.86 | 6.7 | 4.8 | 30.1 | 3.7 | 44.6 | 3.6 | 7.0 | 17.4 | 61.9 | 53.9 | 36.0 |
|  | Q2. . | 61.85 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 36.4 | 8.7 | 9.5 | 5.4 | 7.4 | 16.0 | 33.0 | 28.3 | 33.5 |
|  | Q3... | 43.91 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 25.0 | 5.1 | 8.4 | 4.6 | 6.4 | 13.2 | 19.7 | 20.8 | 23.1 |
|  | Q4... | 46.96 | 7.1 | 5.0 | 22.0 | 3.4 | 9.4 | 3.0 | 5.3 | 13.7 | 24.9 | 19.3 | 27.7 |
| 2000 | Q1. | 59.42 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 37.6 | 6.3 | 7.1 | 4.1 | 6.6 | 12.7 | 36.0 | 30.4 | 29.0 |
|  | Q2... | 57.44 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 31.5 | 4.1 | 12.7 | 5.1 | 7.9 | 15.1 | 29.3 | 27.2 | 30.2 |
|  | Q3... | 42.60 | 5.1 | 3.7 | 23.4 | 3.0 | 7.4 | 3.8 | 6.3 | 11.3 | 21.2 | 20.9 | 21.7 |
|  | Q4... | 41.24 | 5.8 | 5.1 | 17.8 | 2.3 | 10.2 | 3.7 | 5.3 | 11.4 | 20.8 | 22.0 | 19.3 |
| 2001 | Q1... | 54.27 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 23.7 | 4.7 | 18.0 | 3.3 | 5.7 | 13.9 | 31.4 | 28.4 | 25.8 |

AVERAGE MATURITY OF LOANS MADE (MONTHS)

|  | BY PURPOSE OF LOAN |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} \hline \text { BY } & \text { SIZE OF } \\ \text { LOAN } & (\$ 1,000 \mathrm{~s}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline \text { BY SIZE } \\ \text { OF BANK } \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ALL } \\ & \text { LOANS } \end{aligned}$ | FEEDER LIVESTOCK | OTHER LIVESTOCK | $\begin{gathered} \text { OTHER } \\ \text { CURRENT } \\ \text { OPERATING } \\ \text { EXPENSESS } \end{gathered}$ | FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT | OTHER | 1 to 9 | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 99 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ | LARGE | OTHER |
| ANNUAL AVERAGE MATURITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1989. | 8.1 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 7.2 | 18.7 | 11.8 | 7.4 | 8.3 | 9.3 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 8.2 |
| 1990. | 7.5 | 6.0 | 8.8 | 7.5 | 21.9 | 6.4 | 7.4 | 9.2 | 11.9 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 10.2 |
| 1991. | 7.3 | 6.7 | 8.5 | 7.2 | 24.6 | 5.3 | 7.7 | 8.3 | 10.6 | 5.8 | 5.2 | 9.6 |
| 1992. | 8.9 | 6.1 | 9.5 | 8.6 | 20.1 | 9.4 | 8.3 | 9.7 | 11.1 | 7.2 | 6.4 | 10.1 |
| 1993. | ${ }_{10}^{9.2}$ | 7.3 | 9.6 | 8.3 | 30.4 | 9.4 | 8.5 | 10.0 | 11.1 | 7.4 | 6.4 | 10.4 |
| 1994. | 10.3 | 7.6 | 9.8 | 8.6 | 36.6 | 9.4 | 8.6 | 11.6 | 13.5 | 7.2 | 5.8 | 12.6 |
| 1995. | 9.9 | 8.7 | 9.9 | 8.5 | 26.5 | 10.0 | 9.0 | 10.8 | 12.1 | 8.2 | 7.3 | 11.4 |
| 1997. | 9.9 | 9.8 | 11.0 | 10.7 | 39.4 | 9.2 | 8.6 | 10.5 | 12.1 | 7.3 | 6.4 | 12.3 |
| 1998. | 9.8 | 8.0 | 10.3 | 9.9 | 27.5 | 6.8 | 8.8 | 11.3 | 12.4 | 8.8 | 7.6 | 12.8 |
| 1999. | 11.5 | 8.0 | 11.0 | 11.3 | 20.1 | 10.5 | 9.8 | 11.2 | 12.4 | 11.4 | 6.8 | 13.2 |
| 2000. | 11.2 | 8.0 | 10.8 | 9.5 | 22.4 | 13.2 | 9.7 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 11.4 | 10.0 | 13.8 12.3 |

MATURITY OF LOANS MADE DURING FIRST FULL WEEK OF SECOND MONTH OF QUARTER, ANNUAL RATE

| 1998 | Q2... | ! | 10.4 | 1 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 10.4 | 33.1 | 6.6 |  | 9.8 | 11.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q3... | I | 9.6 | I | 7.2 | 13.1 | 9.9 | 21.7 | 7.6 |  | 8.8 | 11.5 | 13.8 | 8.8 9.0 |  | 6.8 7.2 | 14.5 13.2 |
|  | Q4... | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 31.5 | 5.2 | 1 | 7.6 | 8.9 | 11.4 | 7.5 | 1 | 5.9 | 11.7 |
| 1999 | Q1... | I | 9.2 | 1 | 8.3 | 12.8 | 11.2 | 28.0 | 6.1 | 1 | 10.1 | 11.9 | 10.9 | 8.4 | I | 7.0 | 12.6 |
|  | Q2... | I | 14.4 | 1 | 8.8 | 12.0 | 14.2 | 13.9 | 18.8 | I | 9.9 | 11.3 | 14.7 | 15.7 | 1 | 9.9 | 18.0 |
|  | Q3... | I | 12.0 |  | 6.9 | 7.3 | 9.3 | 22.3 | 17.1 | , | 9.4 | 10.4 | 11.1 | 13.8 | 1 | 12.3 | 18.8 |
|  | Q4... | 1 | 11.5 | , | 7.7 | 10.9 | 8.7 | 24.1 | 16.9 | 1 | 9.7 | 11.1 | 12.9 | 11.1 | 1 | 10.8 | 11.9 |
| 2000 | Q1... | 1 | 11.2 | I | 9.0 | 10.4 | 10.0 | 17.4 | 14.1 | , | 9.8 | 12.0 | 10.9 | 11.4 | I | 8.2 |  |
|  | Q2... | I | 11.6 | 1 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 10.1 | 22.3 | 13.4 | I | 10.8 | 11.9 | 11.7 | 11.6 |  | 11.2 | 11.9 |
|  | Q3... | I | 11.1 | 1 | 6.7 | 14.8 | 9.1 | 30.7 | 10.2 | I | 9.0 | 11.2 | 10.2 | 11.9 |  | 10.3 | 11.8 |
|  | Q4... | 1 | 10.6 | 1 | 7.2 | 9.7 | 7.9 | 25.8 | 14.5 | 1 | 8.9 | 10.5 | 11.5 | 10.5 | 1 | 10.9 | 10.4 |
| 2001 | Q1... | 1 | 18.7 | 1 | 8.7 | 18.6 | 12.4 | 30.6 | 25.9 | 1 | 9.9 | 13.3 | 13.5 | 23.0 | I | 19.6 | 17.8 |

ESTIMATES FROM THE QUARTERLY SAMPLE SURVEY OF BANK NON-REAL-ESTATE LOANS TO FARMERS TABLE I.E

AVERAGE EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE ON LOANS MADE

|  | BY PURPOSE OF LOAN |  |  |  |  |  | BY SIZE OF <br> LOAN  <br> $(\$ 1,000 s)$  |  |  |  | BY SIZEOF BANK |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALL } \\ \text { LOANS } \end{gathered}$ | FEEDER <br> LIVE- <br> STOCK | OTHER <br> LIVESTOCK | OTHER CURRENT OPERATING EXPENSES | FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT | OTHER | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ \text { to } \\ 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 99 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{array}$ | LARGE | OTHER |
| ANNUAL AVERAGE INTEREST RATE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1989. | 12.5 | 12.3 | 12.4 | 12.6 | 12.8 | 12.3 | 12.8 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 12.2 | 12.1 | 12.7 |
| 1990. | 11.4 | 11.5 | 12.0 | 11.7 | 12.3 | 10.7 | 12.5 | 12.4 | 12.1 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 12.3 |
| 1991. | 9.8 | 10.2 | 11.0 | 10.4 | 11.3 | 8.6 | 11.5 | 11.2 | 10.7 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 11.3 |
| 1992 | 7.8 | 8.2 | 8.6 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 6.3 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 9.4 |
| 1993 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.7 | 6.2 | 9.0 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 8.7 |
| 1994 | 7.8 | 8.3 | 8.0 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 7.0 | 9.1 | 8.8 | 8.6 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 8.8 |
| 1995 | 9.5 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 10.0 | 10.3 | 8.8 | 10.6 | 10.5 | 10.3 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 10.4 |
| 1996 | 8.4 | 8.8 | 9.5 | 8.6 | 9.7 | 8.0 | 10.2 | 10.1 | 9.8 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 10.0 |
| 1997. | 9.2 | 9.6 | 9.8 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 8.5 | 10.2 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 10.0 |
| 1998. | 9.0 | 9.4 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 9.3 | 8.0 | 10.1 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 9.8 |
| 1999 | 8.7 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 7.6 | 9.7 | 9.5 | 9.3 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 9.4 |
| 2000. | 9.7 | 9.8 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 10.1 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 10.2 |

AVERAGE RATE ON LOANS MADE DURING FIRST FULL WEEK OF SECOND MONTH OF QUARTER, ANNUAL RATE

| 1998 | Q2. |  | 9.2 | , | 9.6 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 9.5 | 8.3 | I | 10.1 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 8.6 |  | 8.5 | 9.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q3... | I | 9.0 | 1 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 9.7 | 8.3 | I | 10.1 | 10.1 | 9.7 | 8.4 |  | 8.5 | 9.9 |
|  | Q4. |  | 8.5 | 1 | 9.1 | 9.0 | 9.3 | 9.0 | 7.7 | 1 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 9.3 | 8.1 |  | 7.9 | 9.4 |
| 1999 | Q1... |  | 8.2 | , | 9.1 | 9.1 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 7.2 | \| | 9.7 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 7.7 |  | 7.4 | 9.4 |
|  | Q2. | 1 | 8.8 | 1 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 8.2 | 7.9 | I | 9.5 | 9.4 | 9.2 | 8.3 |  | 8.1 | 9.3 |
|  | Q3. | 1 | 9.0 | 1 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 8.5 | I | 9.7 | 9.6 | 9.4 | 8.4 |  | 8.4 | 9.6 |
|  | Q4. |  | 9.2 | 1 | 9.3 | 9.2 | 9.4 | 9.4 | 8.6 | I | 9.9 | 9.7 | 9.4 | 8.8 |  | 8.7 | 9.5 |
| 2000 | Q1. |  | 9.2 | 1 | 9.2 | 9.3 | 9.5 | 8.0 | 9.2 | 1 | 9.8 | 9.7 | 9.5 | 9.0 |  | 8.7 | 9.8 |
|  | Q2. |  | 9.7 | 1 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 10.1 | 9.2 | 1 | 10.3 | 10.1 | 10.0 | 9.4 |  | 9.4 | 10.1 |
|  | Q3.. |  | 10.2 | 1 | 10.4 | 10.2 | 10.3 | 10.1 | 9.6 | 1 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 10.4 | 9.8 |  | 9.7 | 10.6 |
|  | Q4... |  | 10.0 | 1 | 10.0 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 9.4 | 1 | 10.6 | 10.5 | 10.3 | 9.7 |  | 9.7 | 10.5 |
| 2001 | Q1. |  | 9.1 | 1 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.2 | 8.3 | I | 10.1 | 9.8 | 9.6 | 8.7 | 1 | 8.5 | 9.8 |


|  |  | BY PURPOSE OF LOAN |  |  |  |  | BY SIZE OF <br> LOAN $(\$ 1,000 \mathrm{~s})$ |  |  |  | BY SIZEOF BANK |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { ALL } \\ \text { LOANS } \end{gathered}$ | FEEDER <br> LIVE- <br> STOCK | $\begin{gathered} \text { OTHER } \\ \text { LIVESTOCK } \end{gathered}$ | OTHER CURRENT OPERATING EXPENSES | FARM MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT | OTHER | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ \text { to } \\ 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 99 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ | LARGE | OTHER |
| ANNUAL PERCENTAGE OF LOANS MADE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1989 | 61.0 | 71.4 | 40.0 | 59.7 | 32.9 | 73.6 | 50.4 | 49.6 | 58.5 | 69.1 | 83.6 | 47.2 |
| 1990. | 65.2 | 76.8 | 61.6 | 68.3 | 40.0 | 51.2 | 53.6 | 59.2 | 66.0 | 67.5 | 69.4 | 59.3 |
| 1991. | 65.1 | 81.5 | 69.3 | 68.8 | 40.6 | 50.3 | 52.0 | 59.0 | 64.0 | 67.8 | 70.0 | 56.1 |
| 1992. | 71.7 | 78.5 | 63.5 | 66.3 | 47.8 | 75.3 | 57.3 | 59.1 | 61.2 | 78.6 | 82.9 | 55.5 |
| 1993 | 76.7 | 84.6 | 70.0 | 70.3 | 48.2 | 78.1 | 60.1 | 61.0 | 64.5 | 83.9 | 86.9 | 58.9 |
| 1994. | 75.1 | 82.9 | 74.3 | 72.3 | 51.6 | 75.7 | 58.6 | 59.8 | 70.4 | 80.2 | 83.7 | 59.7 |
| 1995. | 73.8 | 83.9 | 75.9 | 73.0 | 53.1 | 72.2 | 61.7 | 63.9 | 73.6 | 76.7 | 79.9 | 62.3 |
| 1996. | 63.1 | 58.1 | 71.2 | 67.3 | 32.9 | 61.4 | 60.6 | 61.5 | 69.1 | 62.2 | 65.4 | 57.9 |
| 1997. | 65.8 | 66.4 | 73.2 | 67.8 | 49.9 | 64.3 | 60.1 | 58.0 | 68.0 | 67.0 | 71.4 | 57.9 |
| 1998. | 54.4 | 55.0 | 59.4 | 68.5 | 46.7 | 42.0 | 57.6 | 54.8 | 62.7 | 51.1 | 57.1 | 51.3 |
| 1999. | 60.7 | 45.6 | 66.0 | 68.6 | 58.2 | 52.0 | 52.6 | 54.6 | 60.2 | 63.1 | 70.8 | 50.5 |
| 2000. | 66.9 | 57.3 | 60.7 | 67.0 | 62.2 | 76.7 | 53.4 | 54.6 | 61.8 | 74.5 | 82.5 | 51.4 |

AVERAGE PERCENTAGE DURING FIRST FULL WEEK OF SECOND MONTH OF QUARTER

| 1997 | Q4... | 1 | 58.5 | 1 | 55.4 | 78.0 | 73.4 | 54.5 | 48.0 | 1 | 61.6 | 57.7 | 72.2 | 54.2 | 1 | 57.2 | 60.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1998 | Q1. | I | 56.6 |  | 59.4 | 56.6 | 70.2 | 58.1 | 41.2 | I | 60.5 | 56.7 | 67.0 | 52.6 | 1 | 53.9 | 59.1 |
|  | Q2.. | I | 54.6 |  | 76.2 | 60.1 | 68.1 | 48.2 | 34.9 | ; | 58.0 | 50.5 | 61.9 | 51.7 | ; | 57.6 | 51.1 |
|  | Q3... | , | 54.7 | , | 51.6 | 54.2 | 67.1 | 28.3 | 47.4 | , | 55.7 | 57.7 | 59.3 | 52.4 | , | 61.9 | 44.1 |
|  | Q4... | I | 51.6 | I | 39.9 | 66.2 | 68.0 | 38.9 | 44.4 | 1 | 56.4 | 55.9 | 60.8 | 48.1 | , | 55.8 | 45.7 |
| 1999 | Q1.. | I | 46.4 | , | 50.2 | 65.2 | 63.6 | 33.9 | 33.2 | I | 47.0 | 50.4 | 55.0 | 43.5 | 1 | 43.4 | 50.8 |
|  | Q2... | I | 73.7 | 1 | 66.6 | 72.5 | 72.6 | 75.5 | 79.2 | I | 57.6 | 58.8 | 66.2 | 83.3 |  | 91.5 | 58.6 |
|  | Q3... | I | 70.2 | I | 44.6 | 69.1 | 71.5 | 48.8 | 86.3 | I | 50.2 | 51.4 | 62.3 | 86.4 | , | 94.3 | 48.6 |
|  | Q4... | I | 62.3 | I | 31.2 | 59.9 | 65.4 | 54.1 | 82.6 | I | 54.2 | 58.0 | 57.9 | 66.5 | 1 | 91.8 | 41.7 |
| 2000 | Q1. | I | 63.0 | I | 46.4 | 69.2 | 59.4 | 80.6 | 70.8 | I | 51.8 | 52.4 | 53.0 | 69.7 | 1 | 65.2 | 60.7 |
|  | Q2... | I | 68.3 | I | 51.0 | 57.8 | 69.7 | 57.6 | 78.4 | I | 53.0 | 54.7 | 61.8 | 78.0 | , | 88.4 | 50.2 |
|  | Q3... | 1 | 71.0 | 1 | 60.0 | 59.5 | 78.9 | 38.6 | 72.9 | I | 57.3 | 57.9 | 67.8 | 79.2 | I | 89.9 | 52.9 |
|  | Q4... | 1 | 66.5 | I | 66.8 | 56.2 | 62.8 | 51.0 | 81.6 | 1 | 51.6 | 53.2 | 65.7 | 73.1 | 1 | 91.9 | 37.6 |
| 2001 | Q1... | 1 | 67.7 | 1 | 64.7 | 73.7 | 73.4 | 50.8 | 63.9 | 1 | 60.0 | 60.4 | 66.4 | 70.4 | 1 | 76.2 | 58.4 |



1. Percentage distribution of the estimated total dollar amount of non-real-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 percent because of rounding.

* Indicates less than .5 percent.

TABLE I.H. 1
SURVEY OF TERMS OF BANK LENDING MADE DURING FEBRUARY 5-9, 2001
Loans to farmers


SURVEY OF TERMS OF BANK LENDING MADE DURING FEBRUARY 5-9, 2001 Loans to farmers


SURVEY OF TERMS OF BANK LENDING MADE DURING FEBRUARY 5-9, 2001
Loans to farmers

|  | Size class of loans (thousands) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | all sizes | \$1-9 | \$10-24 | \$25-49 | \$50-99 | \$100-249 | \$250 and over |
| OTHER BANKS ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Amount of loans (thousands) | 472,792 | 38,388 | 64, 571 | 72,509 | 90,189 | 125,528 | 81,607 |
| 2 Number of loans | 18,465 | 9,688 | 4,215 | 2,110 | 1,349 | 919 | 183 |
| 3 Weighted average maturity (months) ${ }^{1}$ | 36.99 | 11.52 | 17.68 | 15.51 | 37.33 | 36.50 | 83.71 |
| 4 Weighted average repricing interval (months) ${ }^{2}$ | 12.74 | 6.74 | 11.39 | 6.77 | 10.45 | 13.97 | 22.56 |
| 5 Weighted average risk rating ${ }^{3}$ | 2.40 | 2.59 | 2.45 | 2.59 | 2.29 | 2.27 | 2.39 |
| 6 Weighted average interest rate (percent)4 | 9.85 | 10.30 | 9.97 | 10.01 | 9.55 | 9.62 | 10.08 |
| 7 Standard error ${ }^{5}$ | 0.12 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.20 | 0.22 | 0.29 | 0.56 |
| 8 Interquartile Range ${ }^{6}$ <br> a.75th Percentile <br> b. 25 th Percentile | 10.52 9.11 | 10.78 9.75 | 10.51 9.43 | 10.61 9.42 | 10.20 8.72 | 10.34 8.59 | 10.75 8.50 |
| b. 25 th Percentile By purpose of loan |  | 9.75 | 9.43 | 9.42 | 8.72 | 8.59 | 8.50 |
| 9 Feeder livestock | 10.21 | 9.91 | 10.07 | 10.42 | 10.04 | 10.27 | - |
| 10 Other livestock | 10.30 | 10.91 | 10.57 | 10.67 | 9.89 | 10.62 | 9.96 |
| 11 Other current operating expenses | 10.04 | 10.13 | 10.03 | 9.94 | 9.48 | 9.87 | 10.82 |
| 12 Farm machinery and equipment | 9.35 | 10.33 | 9.41 | 9.84 | 9.46 | 8.85 | . 82 |
| 13 Farm real estate | 9.23 | 8.85 | 9.35 | 9.40 | 9.10 | 9.08 | 9.96 |
| 14 Other | 9.24 | 11.27 | 9.94 | 9.75 | 8.78 | 9.78 | 8.50 |
| Percentage of the amount of loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 With floating rates | 56.65 | 46.40 | 44.54 | 55.61 | 54.00 | 53.13 | 80.34 |
| 16 Made under commitment | 38.17 | 38.54 | 44.04 | 45.49 | 13.91 | 43.32 | 45.76 |
| 17 Callable | 17.54 | 21.59 | 27.62 | 25.65 | 19.09 | 16.73 | - |
| 18 Subject to prepayment penalty By purpose of the loan | 1.47 | 3.73 | 8.57 | , | 1 | 16. | - |
| 19 By purpose of the loan | 6.92 | 5.59 | 8.97 | 15.39 | 7.59 | 5.38 | - |
| 20 Other livestock | 12.23 | 15.10 | 14.84 | 7.10 | 21.12 | 7.25 | 11.22 |
| 21 Other current operating expenses | 49.37 | 59.71 | 44.70 | 52.81 | 47.91 | 43.07 | 56.43 |
| 22 Farm machinery and equipment | 11.72 | 12.08 | 18.30 | 12.83 | 9.42 | 16.85 | - - |
| 23 Farm real estate | 10.01 | 1.89 | 3.96 | 5.85 | 11.41 | 18.92 | 7.03 |
| 24 Other of | 30.13 | 9.92 | 15.13 | 14.50 | 15.93 | 22.16 | 53.61 |
| 25 By type of collateral | 16.57 | 2.92 | 3.96 | 10.36 | 9.45 | 18.92 | 42.73 |
| 26 Other | 74.14 | 90.12 | 91.14 | 77.85 | 84.87 | 75.48 | 35.99 |

SURVEY OF TERMS OF BANK LENDING MADE DURING FEBRUARY 5-9, 2001
Loans to farmers

|  | All | Risk Rating |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Minimal | Low | Moderate | Acceptable | Special | Not Rated | Not | Reported |
| ALL BANKS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Amount of loans (thousands) | 1,220,545 | 119,791 | 130,584 | 473,045 | 256,274 | 63,950 | 67,858 |  | 109,043 |
| 2 Number of loans | 35,460 | 3,625 | 5,515 | 14,896 | 4,525 | 1,239 | 1,446 |  | 4,213 |
| 3 Weighted average maturity (months) ${ }^{1}$ | 26.29 | 23.40 | 50.53 | 25.87 | 20.82 | 40.98 | 10.67 |  | 16.14 |
| 4 Weighted average repricing interval (months) ${ }^{2}$ | 8.96 | 7.57 | 20.12 | 6.15 | 12.69 | 0.47 | 2.49 |  | 9.31 |
| 5 Weighted average risk rating ${ }^{3}$ | 3.01 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 2. |  | 9.31 |
| 6 Weighted average interest rate (percent) 4 | 9.17 | 9.32 | 9.62 | 9.47 | 8.21 | 9.43 | 8.85 |  | 9.52 |
| 7 Standard error ${ }^{5}$ | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.09 | 0.13 | 0.34 | 0.17 | 0.23 |  | 0.47 |
| 8 Interquartile Range ${ }^{6}$ <br> a.75th Percentile <br> b. 25 th Percentile | 9.96 8.50 | 10.75 | 9.96 | 10.20 | 9.11 | 9.92 8.84 | 9.65 |  | 10.20 |
| b.25th Percentile By purpose of loan | 8.50 | 8.50 | 9.15 | 8.72 | 6.63 | 8.84 | 7.84 |  | 8.59 |
| 9 Feeder livestock | 9.57 | 10.02 | 9.55 | 9.19 | 9.12 | 9.53 | 11.18 |  | 9.60 |
| 10 Other livestock | 9.67 | 9.20 | 9.87 | 10.16 | 8.56 | 8.87 | + 9.61 |  | 9.90 |
| 11 Other current operating expenses | 9.62 | 9.85 | 9.64 | 9.74 | 9.28 | 9.53 | 9.07 |  | 9.37 |
| 12 Farm machinery and equipment | 9.20 | 8.81 | 9.67 | 9.71 | 8.25 | 8.80 | 9.43 |  | 9.17 |
| 13 Farm real estate | 9.07 | 8.22 | 9.44 | 9.13 | 8.93 | 7.51 | 8.99 |  | 9.70 |
| 14 Other | 8.34 | 3.39 | 8.92 | 8.87 | 7.66 | 9.76 | 8.29 |  | 9.94 |
| Percentage of the amount of loans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 With floating rates | 66.82 | 64.28 | 67.22 | 69.94 | 59.23 | 95.72 | 86.90 |  | 43.97 |
| 16 Made under commitment | 68.28 | 57.86 | 59.78 | 59.95 | 93.54 | 98.41 | 75.01 |  | 44.83 |
| 17 Callable | 17.41 | 11.87 | 29.26 | 18.20 | 8.71 | 3.95 | 9.17 |  | 39.42 |
| 18 Subject to prepayment penalty | 1.40 | 0.01 | 0.33 | 1.69 | 1.04 | 9.04 | 0.38 |  | 39. |
| 19 By purpose of the loan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 Feeder livestock | 5.70 | 10.24 | 7.98 | 4.07 | 4.08 | 3.33 | 6.15 |  | 9.88 |
| 20 Other livestock | 8.06 | 4.25 | 13.57 | 8.26 | 7.36 | 1.83 | 8.65 |  | 9.68 |
| 21 Other current operating expenses | 43.17 | 62.86 | 56.87 | 46.77 | 23.35 | 36.88 | 33.46 |  | 45.75 |
| 22 Farm machinery and equipment | 7.54 | 13.03 | 7.84 | 7.01 | 5.49 | 5.65 | 0.50 |  | 13.76 |
| 23 Farm real estate | 5.41 | 4.76 | 9.57 | 6.58 | 0.68 | 7.33 | 0.62 |  | 8.98 |
| 24 Other | 30.13 | 4.84 | 4.16 | 27.30 | 59.03 | 44.98 | 50.61 |  | 11.95 |
| 25 By type of collateral |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 Farm real estate | 14.79 | 4.46 | 25.15 | 20.19 | 7.38 | 19.96 | 4.57 |  | 11.01 |
| 26 Other | 77.03 | 67.23 | 67.40 | 74.61 | 90.19 | 69.71 | 70.55 |  | 87.26 |

Footnotes are at the end of table I.H


TABLE I.H. 6
SURVEY OF TERMS OF BANK LENDING MADE DURING FEBRUARY 5-9, 2001
Loans to farmers


## NOTES TO TABLE I.H

The Survey of Terms of Bank Lending to Farmers collects data on gross loan extensions made during the first full business week in the mid-month of each quarter by a sample of 250 banks of all sizes. The sample data are blown up to estimate the lending terms at all insured agricultural banks during that week. The estimated terms of bank lending are not intended for use in collecting the terms of loans extended over the entire quarter or those residing in the portfolios of banks. Loans of less than $\$ 1,000$ are excluded from the survey.

1. Average maturities are weighted by loan size and exclude loans with no stated maturity.
2. The repricing interval measures the period from the date the loan is made until it first may be repriced. For floating-rate loans that are subject to repricing at any time--such as many prime-based loans--the repricing interval is zero. For floating rate loans that have a scheduled repricing interval, the interval measures the number of days between the date the loan is made and the date on which it is next scheduled to reprice. For loans having rates that remain fixed until the loan matures (fixed-rate loans), the interval measures the number of days between the date the loan is made and the date on which it matures. Loans that reprice daily are assumed to reprice on the business day after they are made.
3. A complete description of these risk rating categories is available from the Banking and Money Market Statistics Section, mail stop 81, the Federal Reserve Board, Washington, DC 20551. The category "Moderate Risk" includes the average loan, under average economic conditions, at the typical lender. The weighted-average risk ratings are calculated by assigning a value of " 1 " to minimal risk loans; "2" to low risk loans; "3" to moderate risk loans; "4" to acceptable risk loans; and "5" to special mention and classified loans. These values are weighted by loan amount and exclude loans with no risk rating. Some of the loans are not rated for risk.
4. Effective (compounded) annual interest rates are calculated from the stated rate and other terms of the loans and weighted by loan size.
5. The chances are about two out of three that the average rate shown would differ by less than this amount from the average rate that would be found by a complete survey of lending at all banks.
6. The interquartile range shows the interest rate range that encompasses the middle 50 percent of the total dollar amount of loans made.
7. Among banks reporting loans to farmers, most "large banks" (survey strata 1 and 2) had over \$25 million in farm loans, most "other banks" (survey strata 3 to 5 ) had farm loans below $\$ 25$ million.

Table I.I
Survey of Terms of Bank Lending to Farmers, (selected quarters)


* NE is Northeast, LS is Lake States, CB is Cornbelt, NP is Northern Plains, AP is Appalachia, SE is Southeast, DL is Delta States, SP is Southern Plains,

MN is Mountain States, and PA is Pacific.
Standard errors are in parentheses below the more recent estimates. Standard errors are calculated from 100 replications of a bootstrap procedure $r$ (resargpling of banks) in each region.
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## SOURCES OF DATA:

The data in tables II.A through II.H are prepared using data from the quarterly reports of condition and income for commercial banks. Delinquencies and charge-offs of non-real-estate farm loans for the nation as a whole (table II.B and table II.C) are estimated from reports of banks that hold more than 90 percent of total non-real-estate farm loans. The incomplete coverage arises because banks with less than $\$ 300$ million in assets have been excused from some reporting requirements. First, these smaller banks report delinquencies and charge-offs of "agricultural loans" according to the particular bank's own definition, which may include loans that are secured by farm real estate. Furthermore, small banks that hold less than 5 percent of total loans as farm production loans are not required to report any information regarding delinquencies or charge-offs of "agricultural loans." In constructing the data presented in the tables, banks that are not required to report these data are assumed to have the same delinquency rates as those that do report. In 1991, banks began to report delinquencies of loans that are secured by farm real estate. These data, which are shown in tables II.D and II.E, are reported by all banks, regardless of the size of the institution or the relative amounts of farm loans that they hold. Because "agricultural loans" and loans secured by farm real estate may overlap for some small banks, it is unclear whether it is proper to add the data in table II.B to its counterpart in table II.D to obtain total agricultural delinquencies. A similar caveat applies to the data concerning charge-offs in tables II.C and II.E.

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 II.D through table II.I 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 estimate of this average was 15.1 percent in December of 2000.

Information on failed banks (table II.I) is obtained from news releases of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, with agricultural banks broken out in our tabulation according to the definition stated in the previous paragraph.

## SECTION II: (continued)

## Recent Developments:

Loans outstanding: In the fourth quarter of 2000, the total volume of farm loans increased 1.0 percent, despite a typical seasonal pattern of year-end declines. The fourth quarter increase brought the yearly change in the total volume of farm loans to 6.4 percent, the fastest yearly growth since 1998. Much of the pickup in outstanding loan volume came from a surge of non-real-estate loans; growth of loans secured by farm real estate posted a second consecutive quarter of slow growth.

Problem loans: In December 2000, the level of problem non real estate loans, either in levels or as a percent of loans outstanding, was about the same as the year-end readings of the past four years or so. Rates of delinquency of farm real estate loans also were in line with previous quarters. Charge-offs of both types of farm loans remained somewhat elevated compared with most of the 1990s. Only a touch more than 2 percent of agricultural banks reported a level of nonperforming loans that was greater than 5 percent of total loans, a level of difficulty on a par with the lows last seen in 1994.

Performance of agricultural banks: The average rate of return on assets at agricultural banks was 1.2 percent in 2000, the same rate of profitability as has been seen for most of the past decade. The capital ratio for agricultural banks edged up a couple of tenths over the course of the year, as banks apparently worked to rebuild the capital cushion towards the 11 percent range that prevailed for several years prior to the declines that began in 1999. Relative to the previous year, the ratio of loans to deposits at agricultural banks continued to increase, and on December 31, the ratio stood at 75.1 percent, roughly 3 percentage points higher than in 1999.

Failures of agricultural banks: There were no failures of agricultural banks through the first quarter of 2001, and none failed in 2000. Given the growing capital cushions and low level of problem loans of most agricultural banks, the number of failures seems likely to remain fairly small in coming quarters.



Data are estimates of the national totals for farm non-real-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 II.C
ESTIMATED NET CHARGE-OFFS OF NON-REAL-ESTATE FARM LOANS INSURED COMMERCIAL BANKS*


* Data are estimates of the national charge-offs of farm non-real-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.

TABLE II.D


All commercial banks began to report these data in 1991.

TABLE II.E
NET CHARGE-OFFS OF REAL ESTATE FARM LOANS INSURED COMMERCIAL BANKS*


TABLE II.F
DISTRIBUTION OF AGRICULTURAL BANKS BY THE SHARE OF THEIR LOANS THAT ARE NONPERFORMING*


[^1]

QUARTERLIY


[^2]TABLE II.H
AVERAGE LOAN-DEPOSIT RATIOS AT AGRICULTURAL BANKS IN SELECTED FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICTS*

DECEMBER 31

|  |  | U.S. |  | CLEVELAND |  | ATLANTA |  | CHICAGO |  | ST. LOUIS |  | MINNEAPOLIS |  | KANSAS CITY |  | DALLAS |  | SAN <br> FRANCISCO |  | MINIMUM FARM LOAN RATIO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NUMBER OF BANKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOANS } \\ \text { TO } \\ \text { DEPOSITS } \end{gathered}$ | NUMBER OF BANKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOANS } \\ \text { TO } \\ \text { DEPOSITS } \end{gathered}$ | NUMBER OF BANKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOANS } \\ \text { TO } \\ \text { DEPOSITS } \end{gathered}$ | NUMBER OF <br> BANKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOANS } \\ \text { TO } \\ \text { DEPOSITS } \end{gathered}$ | NUMBER OF <br> BANKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOANS } \\ \text { TO } \\ \text { DEPOSITS } \end{gathered}$ | NUMBER OF <br> BANKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOANS } \\ \text { TO } \\ \text { DEPOSITS } \end{gathered}$ | NUMBER OF <br> BANKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOANS } \\ \text { TO } \\ \text { DEPOSITS } \end{gathered}$ | NUMBER OF <br> BANKS | $\begin{gathered} \text { LOANS } \\ \text { TO } \\ \text { DEPOSITS } \end{gathered}$ | ```NUMBER OF BANKS``` | LOANS TO DEPOSITS |  |
| 1995 |  | 3352 | 0.639 | 53 | 0.720 | 118 | 0.657 | 816 | 0.652 | 375 | 0.651 | 619 | 0.682 | 959 | 0.634 | 344 | 0.489 | 53 | 0.740 | 16.83 |
| 1996 |  | 3239 | 0.656 | 49 | 0.771 | 113 | 0.684 | 795 | 0.680 | 363 | 0.663 | 609 | 0.699 | 928 | 0.643 | 313 | 0.491 | 52 | 0.735 | 16.45 |
| 1997 |  | 3101 | 0.685 | 45 | 0.747 | 113 | 0.704 | 759 | 0.719 | 346 | 0.698 | 574 | 0.725 | 890 | 0.680 | 312 | 0.523 | 49 | 0.661 | 16.44 |
| 1998 |  | 2968 | 0.683 | 40 | 0.763 | 99 | 0.709 | 733 | 0.711 | 321 | 0.693 | 558 | 0.715 | 868 | 0.681 | 289 | 0.529 | 48 | 0.660 | 16.34 |
| 1999 |  | 2866 | 0.718 | 41 | 0.849 | 93 | 0.738 | 715 | 0.750 | 300 | 0.718 | 538 | 0.738 | 838 | 0.715 | 277 | 0.564 | 48 | 0.724 | 15.67 |
| 2000 |  | 2767 | 0.751 | 39 | 0.859 | 92 | 0.766 | 693 | 0.776 | 293 | 0.748 | 519 | 0.760 | 796 | 0.760 | 269 | 0.619 | 50 | 0.741 | 15.08 |
| 1998 | Q1.. | 3058 | 0.686 | 45 | 0.761 | 109 | 0.713 | 740 | 0.724 | 328 | 0.691 | 570 | 0.727 | 886 | 0.683 | 314 | 0.511 | 50 | 0.662 | 16.32 |
|  | Q2. | 3065 | 0.717 | 46 | 0.769 | 110 | 0.736 | 737 | 0.746 | 341 | 0.725 | 570 | 0.769 | 889 | 0.713 | 306 | 0.540 | 49 | 0.709 | 16.81 |
|  | Q3.. | 3036 | 0.724 | 46 | 0.786 | 109 | 0.751 | 733 | 0.750 | 341 | 0.734 | 569 | 0.768 | 880 | 0.721 | 294 | 0.549 | 49 | 0.704 | 16.78 |
|  | Q4... | 2968 | 0.683 | 40 | 0.763 | 99 | 0.709 | 733 | 0.711 | 321 | 0.693 | 558 | 0.715 | 868 | 0.681 | 289 | 0.529 | 48 | 0.660 | 16.34 |
| 1999 | Q1... | 2957 | 0.689 | 42 | 0.793 | 100 | 0.719 | 720 | 0.719 | 317 | 0.688 | 550 | 0.723 | 868 | 0.684 | 297 | 0.532 | 48 | 0.692 | 16.04 |
|  | Q2.. | 2872 | 0.718 | 41 | 0.849 | 93 | 0.738 | 716 | 0.750 | 302 | 0.719 | 539 | 0.738 | 838 | 0.715 | 279 | 0.566 | 48 | 0.724 | 16.26 |
|  | Q3.. | 2918 | 0.735 | 44 | 0.844 | 106 | 0.746 | 716 | 0.765 | 319 | 0.745 | 547 | 0.775 | 846 | 0.721 | 275 | 0.567 | 51 | 0.737 | 16.23 |
|  | Q4... | 2866 | 0.718 | 41 | 0.849 | 93 | 0.738 | 715 | 0.750 | 300 | 0.718 | 538 | 0.738 | 838 | 0.715 | 277 | 0.564 | 48 | 0.724 | 15.67 |
| 2000 | Q1.. | 2842 | 0.726 | 41 | 0.865 | 97 | 0.748 | 705 | 0.757 | 288 | 0.714 | 536 | 0.757 | 831 | 0.719 | 278 | 0.571 | 50 | 0.743 | 15.28 |
|  | Q2. | 2834 | 0.764 | 43 | 0.886 | 96 | 0.784 | 707 | 0.790 | 306 | 0.757 | 529 | 0.799 | 814 | 0.755 | 268 | 0.614 | 54 | 0.778 | 15.36 |
|  | Q3. | 2790 | 0.766 | 42 | 0.880 | 93 | 0.797 | 698 | 0.796 | 306 | 0.768 | 523 | 0.791 | 796 | 0.761 | 261 | 0.613 | 54 | 0.764 | 15.36 |
|  | Q4. | 2767 | 0.751 | 39 | 0.859 | 92 | 0.766 | 693 | 0.776 | 293 | 0.748 | 519 | 0.760 | 796 | 0.760 | 269 | 0.619 | 50 | 0.741 | 15.08 | that shown in the last column, as described in the introduction to section II.

## TABLE II.I

FAILURES OF AGRICULTURAL BANKS*

|  | NUMBER OF FAILURES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | ANNUAL TOTAL |
| 1990. | 3 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 17 |
| 1991. | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| 1992. | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 |
| 1993. | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| 1994. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1995. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1996. | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 1997. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1998. | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1999. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 2000. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2001. | 0 | ** | ** | ** | ** |

* 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 II.


## SECTION III: FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF FARM CREDIT CONDITIONS AND FARM LAND VALUES
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## SOURCES OF DATA:

Data are from quarterly surveys of agricultural credit conditions at commercial banks. These surveys are conducted at the end of each quarter by five Federal Reserve Banks. The size of the surveys differs considerably, as is noted in the information below. In addition, 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.

Beginning in 1994, the Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank revised its survey considerably. Many questions were changed and it was not always possible to match the data to the categories that we have shown in previous editions of the Databook. Whenever possible, we have tried to fit the data from the revised survey into the older format. Series that were discontinued show no data for the first quarter, while those that were added suddenly appear. When a significant break in the data occurred, we included the new data and added a footnote to highlight the changes.

Research departments at each of the five Reserve Banks issue more detailed quarterly reports on their survey results; these reports are available at the addresses given 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. The latest survey results were based on the responses of about 450 banks.

Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Federal Reserve P.O. Station, Kansas City Missouri 64198
The original sample chosen in 1976 had 181 banks selected from banks at which farm loans constituted 50 percent or more of total loans, with appropriate representation of all farm areas. The sample was redrawn and significantly expanded in 1987; roughly 300 banks responded to the latest survey.

## 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. As outlined above, the Minneapolis survey was changed considerably beginning in the first quarter of 1994. In recent surveys, about 130 banks responded.

Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, P.O. Box 655906, Dallas, Texas 75265-5906
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 . The results for the most recent quarter were based on the responses from about 200 respondents.

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

The number of agricultural banks in this district is much smaller than those of the other districts. When the survey was initiated in 1975, the sample consisted of 43 banks of all sizes; banks with larger amounts of farm loans were sampled more heavily. More recently, the sample has consisted of about 30 banks, roughly three-fourths of which typically respond to the quarterly surveys.

## RECENT DEVELOPMENTS:

Bankers responding to the surveys indicated that the demand for farm loans in the fourth quarter likely held up fairly in all the districts that report except Richmond. In general, fund availability seemed to have remained somewhat limited. Survey respondents noted a fairly typical incidence of renewals and extensions of loans through the end of 2000, and the proportion of bankers that reported higher collateral requirements also was pretty much in line with year-earlier levels.

Scanning through reported expectations for the first quarter of 2001, for most types of loans, few bankers reported diffusion indexes that seemed to indicate concerns about loan demand in the near future. Despite the high ratio of loans to deposits that was noted in section II, there appeared to be little change, on balance, in the proportion of bankers expressing concerns that their ratio of loans to deposits was higher than desired, although the proportion that reported refusing a loan because of a shortage of funds ticked up relative to the year-earlier reading in the Dallas, Minneapolis, and Richmond districts. None of the districts noted a significant bulge in referrals to other sources of funds.

Rates of interest that were reported in these Reserve bank surveys remained fairly high through the end of 2000. The declines in farm loan rates that were picked up in the last couple of Survey of Terms of Lending to Farmers (reported in section I of the Databook) likely will show through in the next set of surveys from the Reserve banks..

Relative to one year earlier, changes in the nominal price of farmland ranged from flat in the Richmond district to an 10 percent jump in nonirrigated farmland in the Minneapolis district. The price of "good farmland" was 6 percent higher than one year earlier in the Chicago district, which spans a large part of the Cornbelt, while nonirrigated farmland rose 2 percent over the year in the Dallas district.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS AT COMMERCIAL BANKS table III.A

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

| DEMA | FOR | LOANS | FUND | AVAILA | BILITY | LOAN F | REPAYME | I Rate | RENEWALS | OR E | EXTENSIONS | COLLAT | ERAL | REQUIRED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOWER | SAME | HIGHER | LOWER | SAME | HIGHER | LOWER | SAME | HIGHER | LOWER | SAME | HIGHER | LOWER | SAME | HIGHER |

III.A1 SEVENTH (CHICAGO) FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT ( IL*, IN*, IA, MI*, WI* ) AGRICULTURAL BANKS

| 1998 | Q4... | 1 | 20 | 47 | 34 | 6 | 66 | 28 | 51 | 42 | 7 | 7 | 45 | 48 | 0 | 75 | 25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1999 | Q1... | 1 | 19 | 42 | 39 | 8 | 65 | 27 | 63 | 35 | 2 | 4 | 39 | 57 | 0 | 69 | 31 |
|  | Q2... |  | 21 | 44 | 36 | 10 | 72 | 18 | 52 | 45 | 3 | 3 | 44 | 53 | 0 | 70 | 30 |
|  | Q3... |  | 22 | 46 | 32 | 17 | 71 | 12 | 41 | 55 | 4 | 3 | 53 | 44 | 0 | 74 | 26 |
|  | Q4... |  | 22 | 50 | 28 | 12 | 71 | 17 | 39 | 51 | 10 | 7 | 54 | 39 | 0 | 75 | 25 |
| 2000 | Q1... |  | 14 | 52 | 34 | 20 | 66 | 14 | 33 | 57 | 10 | 8 | 57 | 34 | 0 | 78 | 22 |
|  | Q2... |  | 23 | 45 | 32 | 35 | 54 | 11 | 31 | 66 | 3 | 5 | 60 | 35 | 0 | 79 | 21 |
|  | Q3... |  | 19 | 56 | 25 | 28 | 61 | 10 | 26 | 70 | 3 | 4 | 69 | 27 | 0 | 80 | 20 |
|  | Q4... |  | 20 | 54 | 26 | 21 | 66 | 13 | 27 | 65 | 8 | 7 | 68 | 25 | 1 | 78 | 21 |

III.A2 TENTH (RANSAS CITY) FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT ( CO, KS, MO*, NE, NM*, OK, WY) AGRICULTURAL BANKS

III.A3 ELEVENTH (DALLAS) FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT ( LA*, NM*, TX )


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

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

III.A5 FIFTH (RICHMOND) FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT ( MD, NC, SC, VA, WV* )

| 1998 | Q4... | 1 | 19 | 68 | 13 | 3 | 65 | 32 | 35 | 55 | 10 | 10 | 55 | 35 | 1 | 0 | 71 | 29 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1999 | Q1... | I | 41 | 59 | 0 | 3 | 69 | 28 | 24 | 76 | 0 | 7 | 72 | 21 | I | 0 | 68 | 32 |
|  | Q2... |  | 19 | 81 | 0 | 4 | 67 | 30 | 4 | 93 | 4 | 4 | 89 | 7 |  | 0 | 81 | 19 |
|  | Q3... |  | 26 | 63 | 11 | 11 | 66 | 23 | 26 | 71 | 3 | 3 | 71 | 26 | , | 0 | 77 | 23 |
|  | Q4... | 1 | 25 | 61 | 14 | 19 | 69 | 11 | 31 | 67 | 3 | 8 | 58 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 69 | 31 |
| 2000 | Q1... | I | 30 | 57 | 14 | 16 | 76 | 8 | 27 | 70 | 3 | 14 | 57 | 30 | I | 0 | 73 | 27 |
|  | Q2... |  | 22 | 68 | 11 | 19 |  | 11 | 22 | 73 | 5 | 0 | 78 | 22 |  | 0 | 78 | 22 |
|  | Q3... |  | 34 | 60 | 6 | 9 | 80 | 11 | 6 | 83 | 11 | 11 | 80 | 9 |  | 0 | 74 | 26 |
|  | Q4... |  | 21 | 75 | 4 | 4 | 92 | 4 | 13 | 79 | 8 | 9 | 87 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 67 | 33 |

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

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

III.B2 ELEEVENTH (DALLAS) FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT (LA*, NM*, TX)

| 1998 | Q4... | 26 | 49 | 25 | 34 | 53 | 13 | 15 | 78 | 6 | 17 | 68 | 14 | 23 | 49 | 28 | 40 | 50 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1999 | Q1. | 29 | 50 | 21 | 21 | 64 | 14 | 15 | 79 | 5 | 15 | 76 | 9 | 23 | 50 | 26 | 43 | 49 | 8 |
|  | Q2... | 24 | 61 | 16 | 20 | 64 | 16 | 17 | 71 | 6 | 15 | 68 | 17 | 19 | 56 | 25 | 26 | 61 | 13 |
|  | Q3... | 23 | 60 | 17 | 24 | 58 | 17 | 23 | 76 | 1 | 24 | 61 | 14 | 20 | 56 | 24 | 34 | 58 | 8 |
|  | 24... | 25 | 58 | 17 | 24 | 56 | 21 | 13 | 82 | 5 | 15 | 72 | 13 | 19 | 63 | 17 | 30 | 60 | 10 |
| 2000 | Q1... | 23 | 57 | 20 | 26 | 53 | 22 | 17 | 79 | 4 | 16 | 81 | 3 | 23 | 53 | 24 | 26 | 59 | 16 |
|  | Q2... | 18 | 60 | 22 | 25 | 56 | 19 | 21 | 77 | 2 | 19 | 71 | 11 | 18 | 58 | 25 | 26 | 57 | 17 |
|  | Q3... | 24 | 60 | 16 | 32 | 52 | 16 | 18 | 80 | 2 | 16 | 74 | 10 | 17 | 61 | 22 | 31 | 60 | 10 |
|  | Q4... | 20 | 57 | 23 | 15 | 65 | 20 | 15 | 78 | 2 | 16 | 78 | 6 | 14 | 55 | 31 | 29 | 55 | 16 |

III.B3 FIFTH (RICHMOND) FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT (MD, NC, SC, VA, WV*)

| 1998 | Q4... | 27 | 65 | 8 | 18 | 82 | 0 | 5 | 95 | 0 | 19 | 65 | 15 | 13 | 80 | 7 | 40 | 60 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1999 | Q1... | 30 | 65 | 4 | 13 | 87 | 0 | 25 | 75 | 0 | 26 | 65 | 9 | 33 | 56 | 11 | 45 | 55 | 0 |
|  | Q2... | 39 | 57 | 4 | 20 | 80 | 0 | 37 | 53 | 11 | 30 | 60 | 10 | 44 | 52 | 4 | 44 | 52 | 4 |
|  | Q3... | 42 | 45 | 13 | 26 | 74 | 0 | 35 | 65 | 0 | 40 | 48 | 12 | 29 | 56 | 15 | 49 | 49 | 3 |
|  | Q4... | 23 | 61 | 16 | 22 | 74 | 4 | 42 | 58 | 0 | 34 | 66 | 0 | 23 | 57 | 20 | 40 | 57 | 3 |
| 2000 | Q1... | 34 | 53 | 13 | 25 | 58 | 17 | 38 | 62 | 0 | 31 | 69 | 0 | 17 | 61 | 22 | 50 | 42 | 8 |
|  | Q2... | 24 | 68 | 9 | 13 | 88 | 0 | 30 | 70 | 0 | 19 | 67 | 15 | 19 | 76 | 5 | 43 | 51 | 5 |
|  | Q3... | 40 | 57 | 3 | 35 | 65 | 0 | 29 | 71 | 0 | 11 | 59 | 30 | 26 | 65 | 9 | 38 | 53 | 9 |
|  | Q4... | 19 | 71 | 10 | 13 | 80 | 7 | 25 | 75 | 0 | 13 | 69 | 19 | 14 | 77 | 9 | 30 | 70 | 0 |

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

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


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

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

III.C1 SEVENTH (CHICAGO) FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT ( IL*, IN*, IA, MI*, WI*) AGRICULTURAL BANKS

| 1999 | Q1... | 70 | 58 | 27 | 14 | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q2... | 72 | 49 | 35 | 15 | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |
|  | Q3... | 73 | 42 | 33 | 25 | ** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |
|  | Q4... | 73 | 47 | 32 | 21 | *** | * | ** | *** | *** | * | *** | ** | ** | *** |
| 2000 | Q1... | 73 | 44 | 35 | 21 | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |
|  | Q2... | 75 | 34 | 36 | 29 | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |
|  | Q3... | 77 | 35 | 32 | 33 | *** | *** | *** | *** | ** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |
|  | Q4... | 75 | 39 | 36 | 25 | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** | *** |

III.C2 TENTH (KANSAS CITY) FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT ( CO, KS, MO*, NE, NM*, OR, WY) AGRICULTURAL BANKS

| 1999 | Q1... | 66 | 61 | 7 | 26 | 2 | 66 | 79 | 5 | 91 | 4 | 67 | 4 | 81 | 15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q2... | 66 | 63 | 9 | 27 | 1 | 74 | 80 | 7 | 88 | 5 | 66 | 8 | 79 | 13 |
|  | Q3... | 68 | 59 | 10 | 32 | 3 | 72 | 80 | 6 | 90 | 4 | 71 | 7 | 84 | 9 |
|  | Q4... | 68 | 57 | 9 | 32 | 4 | 69 | 81 | 5 | 90 | 5 | 76 | 9 | 83 | 8 |
| 2000 | Q1... | 67 | 63 | 6 | 29 | 1 | 73 | 82 | 9 | 86 | 6 | 77 | 9 | 82 | 9 |
|  | Q2... | 70 | 51 | 8 | 41 | 3 | 73 | 81 | 9 | 85 | 6 | 75 | 9 | 85 | 6 |
|  | Q3... | 71 | 54 | 9 | 37 | 3 | 71 | 82 | 6 | 88 | 5 | 77 | 7 | 85 | 8 |
|  | Q4... | 71 | 50 | 8 | 41 | 1 | 73 | 81 | 6 | 90 | 4 | 75 | 4 | 87 | 9 |

III.C3 ELEVENTH (DALLAS) FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT ( LA*, NM*, TX)

| 1999 | Q1... | 51 | *** | *** | *** | 0 | *** | *** | 8 | 81 | 11 | *** | 8 | 72 | 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q2... | 51 | *** | *** | *** | 1 | *** | *** | 8 | 84 | 8 | *** | 7 | 75 | 18 |
|  | Q3... | 53 | *** | *** | *** | 1 | *** | *** | 12 | 78 | 10 | *** | 9 | 78 | 13 |
|  | Q4... | 52 | *** | *** | *** | 1 | *** | *** | 6 | 79 | 15 | *** | 7 | 77 | 16 |
| 2000 | Q1... | 51 | *** | *** | ** | 1 | *** | *** | 15 | 81 | 5 |  | 15 | 80 | 5 |
|  | Q2... | 55 | *** | *** | *** | 1 | *** | *** | 10 | 84 | 5 | *** | 9 | 82 | 9 |
|  | Q3... | 58 | *** | *** | *** | 1 | *** | *** | 15 | 77 | 8 | *** | 13 | 75 | 12 |
|  | Q4... | 55 | *** | *** | ** | 5 | *** | *** | 12 | 80 | 8 | *** | 13 | 73 | 14 |

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

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

| AVERAGE LOAN-TODEPOSIT RATIO, END OF QUARTER PERCENT | LOAN/DEPOSIT RATIO IS |  | REFUSED OR REDUCED A FARM LOAN BECAUSE OF | ACTIVELY <br> SEERING NEW <br> FARM | NUMBER OF FARM LOAN REFERRALS TO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CORRESPONDENT BANTS |  |  | NONBANK AgEnCIES |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LOWER AT | HIGHER | A SHORTAGE |  | COMPARED WITH NORMAL NUMBER |  |  | COMPARED WITH NORMAL NUMBER |  |  |  |
|  | THAN DESIRED | tHAN | Of Loanable |  |  |  |  | LOAN |
|  | DESIRED LEVEL | DESIRED | EUNDS | ACCOUNTS | NONE | LOWER | SAME HIGHER |  |  |  |  | NONE | LOWER | SAMES | HIGHER |


III.C5 FIFTH (RICHMOND) FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT ( MD, NC, SC, VA, WV*)

| 1999 | Q1... | 74 | 62 | 28 | 10 | 0 | 64 | 78 | 4 | 15 | 4 | 74 | 4 | 19 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q2... | 73 | 54 | 42 | 4 | 0 | 74 | 88 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 84 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
|  | Q3... | 74 | 46 | 46 | 9 | 0 | 66 | 88 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 76 | 3 | 12 | 9 |
|  | Q4... | 75 | 38 | 44 | 18 | 0 | 63 | 88 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 77 | 3 | 13 | 6 |
| 2000 | Q1... | 74 | 42 | 44 | 14 | 0 | 68 | 94 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 9 | 11 |
|  | Q2... | 75 | 39 | 47 | 14 | 3 | 66 | 77 | 6 | 13 | 3 | 69 | 3 | 16 | 13 |
|  | Q3... | 75 | 38 | 44 | 18 | 3 | 60 | 88 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 30 | 3 |
|  | Q4... | 77 | 39 | 43 | 17 | 4 | 67 | 75 | 5 | 20 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 20 | 0 |

+Beginning in 1994, Minneapolis omitted the response "none" for the number of referrals to either correspondent banks or nonbank
agencies. The column that has been added combines responses that formerly would have been reported as either "none" or "low".

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

INTEREST RATES ON FARM LOANS


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

## INTEREST RATES ON FARM LOANS

| MOST COMMON INTEREST RATE ON FARM LOANS <br> (AVERAGE, PERCENT) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FEEDER CATTLE LOANS | OTHER <br> OPERATING LOANS | INTER- <br> mediate <br> NONREAL <br> Estate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LONG-TERM } \\ & \text { REAL } \\ & \text { ESTATE } \\ & \text { LOANS } \end{aligned}$ |


III.D5 FIFTH (RICHMOND) FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT (MD, NC, SC, VA, WV*)


FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS AT COMMERCIAL BANKS TABLE III.E
trends in farm real estate values and loan volume


FEDERAL RESERVE BANK QUARTERLY SURVEYS OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CONDITIONS AT COMMERCIAL BANKS TABLE III.E (CONTINUED)
trends in farm real estate values and loan volume



[^0]:    Nicholas A. Walraven and James Hull

[^1]:    * 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 II.

[^2]:    * Agricultural and other banks are defined in the introduction to section II; small banks have less than 500 million dollars in assets.

    Total primary and secondary capital (items that are available at the end of the period specified) are measured as a percentage of total assets. quarterly data in the lower panel are cumulative through the end of the guarter indicated and, for periods of less than a year, are not comparable to the annual data in the upper panel.

