

# Economic Analysis of the Farmers Union Farm Bill Proposal

Richard D. Taylor  
Won W. Koo



Department of Agribusiness and Applied Economics  
Center for Agricultural Policy and Trade Studies  
North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota 58105-5636

## Acknowledgments

The authors extend appreciation to Dr. George Flaskerud, Mr. Andy Swenson, and Mr. Jeremy Mattson for their constructive comments and suggestions. Special thanks go to Ms. Norma Ackerson, who helped to prepare the manuscript.

The research was conducted under a research grant by North Dakota Farmers Union.

We would be happy to provide a single copy of this publication free of charge. You can address your inquiry to: Carol Jensen, Department of Agribusiness and Applied Economics, North Dakota State University, PO Box 5636, Fargo, ND 58105-5636, (Ph. 701-231-7441, Fax (701-231-7400), (e-mail: [cjensen@ndsuxt.nodak.edu](mailto:cjensen@ndsuxt.nodak.edu)) . This publication is also available electronically at this web site: <http://agecon.lib.umn.edu/>

NDSU is an equal opportunity institution.

### NOTICE:

The analyses and views reported in this paper are those of the author(s). They are not necessarily endorsed by the Department of Agribusiness and Applied Economics or by North Dakota State University.

North Dakota State University is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Information on other titles in this series may be obtained from: Department of Agribusiness and Applied Economics, North Dakota State University, P.O. Box 5636, Fargo, ND 58105. Telephone: 701-231-7441, Fax: 701-231-7400, or e-mail: [cjensen@ndsuxt.nodak.edu](mailto:cjensen@ndsuxt.nodak.edu).

Copyright © 2001 by Richard D. Taylor and Won W. Koo All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables .....	ii
Abstract .....	iii
Highlights .....	iv
Introduction .....	1
Assumptions and the Farmers Union Farm Bill Proposal .....	1
Data .....	2
Research Method .....	6
Results .....	9
North Dakota Representative Farm .....	12
Summary .....	15
References .....	17
Appendix Tables .....	18

## List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	North Dakota Forecasted Crop Prices ..... 2
2	North Dakota Prices Under the Farmers Union Price Scenario ..... 2
3	USDA’s Estimated Full Cost of Production for Program Crops in North Dakota ..... 3
4	Proposed Loans under Farmers Union Farm Bill Proposal for Each Sales Category ... 4
5	Governmental Support for Various Program Crops ..... 5
6	North Dakota Forecasted Crop Yields ..... 6
7	Number of North Dakota Farms, Total Sales, and Farm Size by Sales Category, 1997 ..... 7
8	North Dakota Crop Mix for North Dakota Farms by Sales Category ..... 8
9	Total Program Crop Sales and Government Subsidies under Alternative Farm Bill Options Over Five Years, 2003-2007, per North Dakota Farms, by Various Sales Categories ..... 10
10	Total Program Crops Receipts under Alternative Farm Bill Options, 2003-2007 by Various Sales Categories ..... 11
11	Average Total Return per Acre for North Dakota Farms under the Farmers Union Proposal Over the 5 Year Life of the Farm Bill ..... 12
12	State Average Net Farm Income for North Dakota Representative Farms by Size Under Alternative Scenarios ..... 13
13	State Average Debt-to-asset Ratios for North Dakota Representative Farms by Size under Alternative Scenarios ..... 14
14	North Dakota Land Values by Regions under Alternative Scenarios ..... 14
15	North Dakota Cash Rents by Region under Alternative Scenarios ..... 15

## **Abstract**

The lack of a safety net for farm income in the FAIR Act has become evident in recent years because of the necessity of federal legislation each year, 1998-2001, to support farm income. In recent years, U.S. agriculture has experienced a rapid loss of mid-size family farms. The number of small-size farms has increased substantially and the number of large farms has increased slowly. The Farmers Union Farm Bill Proposal is a targeted plan which utilizes varying loan rates based on the USDA's full cost of production for program crops and a Farmer Owned Reserve (FOR). The proposed loan rates decrease as the value of the crop loans increase. The FOR is targeted towards a Limited Renewable Energy Reserve and a Humanitarian Assistance Reserve.

The objectives of the study were to develop a distribution of farms in North Dakota by size and estimate the statewide government cost of the Farmers Union Proposal under the baseline and Farmers Union price scenario and compare it to the continuation of the FAIR Act.

**Key words:** Farm Bill, Targeting, Government Agricultural Spending, North Dakota Representative Farms

## Highlights

Producers will acquire loans on crops with higher levels of support first to take advantage of the higher loan rate categories. It is important to remember that the large farms still receive the highest loan rate level on the first \$100,000 of loan value, 85% of the full cost of production, 80% for the next \$150,000, 70% for the next \$250,000, and 60% for the remaining loan value. A potential problem is that producers may switch to crops with higher per acre support since loan rates differ among crops. Smaller producers who do not reach production levels that trigger a reduction in loan rates, may have more incentive to switch to higher supported crops than larger farms.

Under the Farmers Union Farm Bill Proposal, most farms receive greater returns than under the continuation of the FAIR Act. Farms with sales less than \$50,000 would receive 20% more revenue from the Farmers Union Proposal than with a continuation of the FAIR Act. Farms with sales between \$50,000 and \$100,000 would receive 19% more revenue. Larger farms (\$100,000 to \$250,000) would receive 13% more revenue while the largest farms (more than \$500,000) would receive 4.5% less return with the Farmers Union Proposal.

The Farmers Union Proposal was evaluated with and without the targeting feature. Targeting had no effect on the smaller size farm. Farms with sales between \$100,000 and \$250,000 receive 3.6% less return with the targeting feature. Farms with sales between \$250,000 and \$500,000 receive 6.3% less, and farms with sales over \$500,000 receive 14.5% less. Small farms in the RRV and NC, with sales less than \$100,000, would have a \$19 per acre advantage over the farms with sales greater than \$500,000. In the SC, the advantage is \$24 per acre, and in the West it is \$11 per acre. Per acre return for farms in the \$100,000 to \$250,000 category is \$2 less in the RRV, \$4 less in the NC, \$8 less in the SC, and \$1 less in the West, compared to farms with sales less than \$100,000.

The program crop sales under the Farmers Union price scenario with the Farmer Owned Reserve are not much different than the baseline scenario. The main reason is that even though the crop prices are higher, especially early in the forecast period, they are not above the loan rates. Therefore, the higher market prices are offset by lower government spending.

Under the Farmers Union Proposal, farms in North Dakota will receive \$12.37 billion dollars in revenue from program crops over the 5 years of the farm bill. If the FAIR Act was continued, total return for program crops would be \$11.39 billion dollars over the 5 years of the farm bill. Government spending under the FAIR Act in North Dakota would be \$1.67 billion dollars over 5 years, and government spending under the Farmers Union Proposal would be \$2.97 billion dollars. If the Farmer Owned Reserve was implemented and if it was successful in raising market prices, government spending in North Dakota would be about \$1.86 billion over the 5 years of the farm bill, 37% lower than the Farmers Union Proposal without the Farmer Owned Reserve.

The North Dakota Representative Farm Model shows that the Farmers Union proposal provides higher net farm incomes, lower debt-to-asset ratios, higher land values, and higher cash rents for all representative farms in the state.

# **Economic Analysis of the Farmers Union Farm Bill Proposal**

**Richard Taylor<sup>1</sup>  
Won W. Koo**

## **Introduction**

In 1996, the U.S. Congress passed the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act (FAIR Act). The FAIR Act was based on a number of assumptions concerning world population and income growth, reduction in world-wide trade restrictions, increased production efficiency, and increasing export competition. As history has shown, prices have fallen from \$4.71 per bushel for spring wheat in North Dakota in 1996 to \$2.85 in 2000. Corn prices have fallen from \$3.16 to \$1.59 in the same time period (NASS).

The lack of a safety net for farm income in the FAIR Act has become evident because of emergency legislation each year, 1998-2001, to support farm income. In 1996, total government spending in North Dakota was \$353 million; in 2000 it increased to \$1.170 billion while crop receipts decreased from \$2.9 billion in 1996 to \$2.1 billion in 2000. Government spending was 9.3% of total cash receipts in North Dakota in 1996. It grew to 30.3% in 2000 (NASS).

Over the past 10 years, U.S. agriculture has experienced a rapid loss of mid-size family farms (19%). The number of small size farms has increased substantially (17%) and the number of large farms has increased slowly (8%) in the last 10 years (NASS). The targeting feature, higher loan rates for smaller farms, of the Farmers Union Proposal addresses this phenomenon.

The Farmers Union Farm Bill Proposal is a targeted plan which utilizes varying loan rates based on the USDA's full cost of production for program crops and a Farmer Owned Reserve (FOR). The proposed loan rates decrease as the value of the crop loans increase. The FOR is targeted towards a Limited Renewable Energy Reserve and a Humanitarian Assistance Reserve.

This study evaluates benefits distribution of the targeted farm bill option and estimates government costs of the program compared to the FAIR Act Baseline spending estimated by Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute (FAPRI). Specifically, the study focuses on (1) developing a distribution of farms in North Dakota by size and estimate the statewide government cost of the Farmers Union Proposal under the baseline price scenario and compare it to the continuation of the FAIR Act, (2) estimating the effects of the targeting feature on the various size farms, (3) estimating the government cost and effects on North Dakota farms under a Farmers Union price scenario when a FOR is implemented, and (4) evaluating the effect on North Dakota farmers using the North Dakota Representative Farm Model.

## **Assumptions and the Farmers Union Farm Bill Proposal**

Several assumptions were made for the study. Crop mixes and farm size remained unchanged, and loan rates increased during the forecast period following the USDA's full cost of

---

<sup>1</sup>The authors are research associate and professor, respectively, in the Department of Agribusiness and Applied Economics, North Dakota State University, Fargo. Koo is also Director of the Center for Agricultural Policy and Trade Studies.

production. Also crop yields followed the same trend lines that were used for the North Dakota Representative Farm Model (Koo, Taylor, and Swenson).

The Farmers Union Farm Bill Proposal is a targeted plan which utilizes varying loan rates based on the USDA’s full cost of production for program crops. For the first \$100,000 of loan value, the loan rate is 85% of the full cost of production. The next \$150,000 of loan value is priced at 80% of the full cost of production, and the next \$250,000 of loan value is priced at 70% of the full cost of production. Loan value over \$500,000 is priced at 60% of the full cost of production. The Farmers Union Farm Bill Proposal also contains a provision for a FOR for humanitarian and energy reserves.

### Data

Table 1 shows North Dakota baseline crop prices for 2000 through 2010 based on FAPRI’s forecasted prices. FAPRI forecasts increasing prices throughout the time period. FAPRI forecasts an increase of 24% in the price of spring wheat, 36% for durum wheat, 27% for corn, and 29% for soybeans.

<b>Table 1. North Dakota Forecasted Crop Prices</b>							
	S.Wht	D.Wht	Barley	Sunflowers	Corn	Soybeans	Canola
	-----\$/bushels-----			\$/cwt	--\$/bushels--		\$/cwt
2000	2.57	2.35	1.70	6.56	1.57	4.14	6.55
2001	2.78	2.66	1.84	6.30	1.73	3.94	6.55
2002	2.81	2.70	1.89	6.49	1.78	3.97	6.61
2003	2.93	2.87	1.93	6.86	1.82	4.09	6.85
2004	3.01	2.99	1.97	7.35	1.85	4.27	7.22
2005	3.07	3.08	2.02	7.79	1.91	4.42	7.53
2006	3.15	3.20	2.07	8.18	1.96	4.55	7.79
2007	3.24	3.33	2.10	8.63	2.02	4.71	8.13
2008	3.29	3.40	2.15	9.09	2.07	4.88	8.46
2009	3.36	3.50	2.20	9.42	2.12	4.98	8.67
2010	3.45	3.63	2.28	9.73	2.19	5.07	8.85

<b>Table 2. North Dakota Prices Under the Farmers Union Price Scenario</b>							
	S.Wht	D.Wht	Barley	Sunflowers	Corn	Soybeans	Canola
	-----\$/bushels-----			\$/cwt	--\$/bushels--		\$/cwt
2003	4.00	3.92	2.43	9.27	2.42	5.52	9.25
2004	3.79	3.77	2.28	9.43	2.23	5.48	9.26
2005	3.47	3.48	2.10	9.70	2.25	5.51	9.38
2006	3.33	3.38	1.97	9.38	1.84	5.22	8.94
2007	3.27	3.36	1.93	9.59	1.81	5.24	9.03



Table 2 shows the North Dakota crop prices after the implementation of the Farmers Union FOR. It is assumed that the FOR is begun in 2003, delaying any price reaction until then. The price is substantially higher early in the forecast period as the reserve is being organized. The price differences decrease later in the forecast period.

Table 3 shows the USDA’s full cost of production over the time period for the various program crops. The full cost of production includes a charge for labor, management, and land. The values are inflated each year using a three-year rolling average cost of production. USDA estimates a 13% increase in the full cost of production from 2001 to 2010.

<b>Table 3. USDA’s Estimated Full Cost of Production for Program Crops in North Dakota</b>							
	S.Wht	D.Wht	Barley	Sunflowers	Corn	Soybeans	Canola
	-----\$/bushels-----			\$/cwt	--\$/bushels--		\$/cwt
2000	4.84	4.84	2.61	11.72	3.00	6.63	11.72
2001	4.95	4.95	2.67	11.99	3.07	6.78	11.99
2002	5.01	5.01	2.70	12.12	3.10	6.86	12.12
2003	5.06	5.06	2.73	12.25	3.14	6.93	12.25
2004	5.09	5.09	2.75	12.34	3.16	6.98	12.34
2005	5.15	5.15	2.78	12.48	3.20	7.06	12.48
2006	5.23	5.23	2.82	12.66	3.24	7.16	12.66
2007	5.31	5.31	2.86	12.85	3.29	7.27	12.85
2008	5.39	5.39	2.91	13.06	3.34	7.39	13.06
2009	5.48	5.48	2.96	13.28	3.40	7.51	13.28
2010	5.58	5.58	3.01	13.51	3.46	7.64	13.51

Table 4 shows the Farmers Union Proposal loan rates based of the USDA’s full cost of production and the total value of sales. The loan rate is 85% of the USDA’s full cost of production for the first \$100,000 of loan value, the loan rate is 80% for the next \$150,000, 70% for the next \$250,000, and 60% for anything over \$500,000. The bold numbers indicate where the proposed loan rates fall below the estimated baseline market prices. It is at that point where a producer no longer receives any governmental support.

<b>Table 4. Proposed Loans under Farmers Union Farm Bill Proposal for Each Sales Category</b>							
	S.Wht	D.Wht	Barley	Sunflowers	Corn	Soybeans	Canola
	-----\$/bushels-----			\$/cwt	--\$/bushels--		\$/cwt
<b>First \$100,000 Loan Value, 85% of Cost of Production (Bold Values Indicate Baseline Market Price)</b>							
2000	4.11	4.11	2.22	9.96	2.55	5.64	9.96
2001	4.21	4.21	2.27	10.19	2.61	5.76	10.19
2002	4.25	4.25	2.29	10.30	2.64	5.83	10.30
2003	4.30	4.30	2.32	10.41	2.66	5.89	10.41
2004	4.33	4.33	2.34	10.49	2.68	5.93	10.49
2005	4.38	4.38	2.36	10.61	2.72	6.00	10.61
2006	4.44	4.44	2.40	10.76	2.75	6.09	10.76
2007	4.51	4.51	2.43	10.92	2.80	6.18	10.92
2008	4.58	4.58	2.47	11.10	2.84	6.28	11.10
2009	4.66	4.66	2.51	11.28	2.89	6.38	11.28
2010	4.74	4.74	2.56	11.48	2.94	6.50	11.48
<b>Next \$150,000 of Loan Value, 80% of Cost of Production (Bold Values Indicate Baseline Market Price)</b>							
2000	3.87	3.87	2.09	9.38	2.40	5.30	9.38
2001	3.96	3.96	2.14	9.59	2.46	5.43	9.59
2002	4.00	4.00	2.16	9.70	2.48	5.49	9.70
2003	4.05	4.05	2.18	9.80	2.51	5.54	9.80
2004	4.08	4.08	2.20	9.87	2.53	5.58	9.87
2005	4.12	4.12	2.22	9.99	2.56	5.65	9.99
2006	4.18	4.18	2.25	10.13	2.59	5.73	10.13
2007	4.24	4.24	2.29	10.28	2.63	5.81	10.28
2008	4.31	4.31	2.33	10.45	2.67	5.91	10.45
2009	4.39	4.39	2.37	10.62	2.72	6.01	10.62
2010	4.46	4.46	2.41	10.81	2.77	6.11	10.81
<b>Next \$250,000 of Loan Value, 70% of Cost of Production (Bold Values Indicate Baseline Market Price)</b>							
2000	3.39	3.39	1.83	8.20	2.10	4.64	8.20
2001	3.47	3.47	1.87	8.39	2.15	4.75	8.39
2002	3.50	3.50	<b>1.89</b>	8.48	2.17	4.80	8.48
2003	3.54	3.54	<b>1.93</b>	8.57	2.19	4.85	8.57
2004	3.57	3.57	<b>1.97</b>	8.64	2.21	4.89	8.64
2005	3.61	3.61	<b>2.02</b>	8.74	2.24	4.94	8.74
2006	3.66	3.66	<b>2.07</b>	8.86	2.27	5.01	8.86
2007	3.71	3.71	<b>2.10</b>	8.99	2.30	5.09	8.99
2008	3.77	3.77	<b>2.15</b>	9.14	2.34	5.17	9.14
2009	3.84	3.84	<b>2.20</b>	<b>9.42</b>	2.38	5.26	9.29
2010	3.91	3.91	<b>2.28</b>	<b>9.73</b>	2.42	5.35	9.46
<b>Next \$500,000 of Loan Value, 60% of Cost of Production (Bold Values Indicate Baseline Market Price)</b>							
2000	2.90	2.90	1.57	7.03	1.80	3.98	7.03
2001	2.97	2.97	<b>1.84</b>	7.19	1.84	4.07	7.19
2002	3.00	3.00	<b>1.89</b>	7.27	1.86	4.11	7.27
2003	3.03	3.03	<b>1.93</b>	7.35	1.88	4.16	7.35
2004	3.06	3.06	<b>1.97</b>	7.40	1.89	<b>4.27</b>	7.40
2005	3.09	3.09	<b>2.02</b>	<b>7.79</b>	1.92	<b>4.42</b>	<b>7.53</b>
2006	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>8.18</b>	1.94	<b>4.55</b>	<b>7.79</b>
2007	<b>3.24</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>8.63</b>	1.97	<b>4.71</b>	<b>8.13</b>
2008	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>9.09</b>	2.01	<b>4.88</b>	<b>8.46</b>
2009	<b>3.36</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>9.42</b>	2.04	<b>4.98</b>	<b>8.67</b>
2010	<b>3.45</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>2.28</b>	<b>9.73</b>	2.07	<b>5.07</b>	<b>8.85</b>

Table 5 shows the percent of governmental support for 2000 at the 85% loan level. This is important because producers will acquire loans on crops with higher levels of support to take advantage of the higher loan rate categories. It is important to remember that the large farms still receive the highest loan rate level on the first \$100,000 of loan value, 85% of the full cost of production, and so forth. Producers will put durum and spring wheat under loan first, followed by canola and sunflowers, and then soybeans, corn, and barley to maximize their receipts of governmental subsidies under the program. A potential problem is that producers may switch to crops with a higher per acre support. For example, spring wheat yielding 35 bushels with support at \$1.53/bushel would give producers a support per acre of \$53.55. Corn, on the other hand, yielding 95 bushels with support of \$0.66 per bushel would result in a support of \$62.70 per acre. Producers, therefore, may switch to higher supported crops if production conditions of the crop is allowable.

<b>Table 5. Governmental Support for Various Program Crops</b>							
	S. Wht	D. Wht	Corn	Soybeans	Barley	Canola	Sunflowers
Percent support at 85% of cost	59%	59%	35%	36%	35%	51%	51%

Table 6 shows the forecasted yields for the 6 program crops included in this study. Yields listed for 2000 were the average yields for the farms in the North Dakota Farm and Ranch Business Management Annual Reports. In some regions, crop yields in 2000 were higher than the forecasted yields. The regions within the state are described in *2001 North Dakota Agricultural Outlook: Representative Farms 2001-2010*.

<b>Table 6. North Dakota Forecasted Crop Yields</b>										
	S. Wht	Barley	Sun-flowers	Corn	Soy-beans	S. Wht	D.Wht	Barley	Sun-flowers	Canola
	<b>RED RIVER VALLEY</b>					<b>NORTH CENTRAL</b>				
	--bushels--		pounds	--bushels--		-----bushels-----			----pounds-----	
2000	46.3	59.4	1463.0	113.8	34.0	31.2	27.4	52.2	1239.0	1390.0
2001	41.0	62.2	1405.1	114.9	33.2	31.2	32.0	54.9	1381.2	1397.0
2002	40.2	58.2	1402.2	114.7	32.7	31.3	31.3	54.9	1387.3	1403.9
2003	40.6	59.6	1423.6	115.0	33.0	31.0	30.4	53.4	1336.0	1411.0
2004	40.8	59.3	1410.5	115.1	33.2	31.3	29.9	53.7	1318.9	1418.0
2005	41.0	59.6	1413.3	115.1	33.2	31.4	30.8	54.2	1345.6	1425.1
2006	41.0	59.7	1409.8	115.2	33.3	31.5	31.0	54.5	1354.5	1432.2
2007	41.0	59.7	1411.4	115.3	33.3	31.5	30.9	54.3	1345.6	1439.4
2008	41.1	59.8	1411.9	115.3	33.4	31.6	30.9	54.3	1342.6	1446.6
2009	41.2	59.9	1411.5	115.4	33.5	31.7	31.1	54.5	1344.8	1453.8
2010	41.2	60.0	1411.8	115.5	33.5	31.7	31.2	54.6	1345.5	1461.1
	<b>SOUTH CENTRAL</b>					<b>WEST</b>				
	S. Wht	D.Wht	Barley	Sunflowers		Corn	Soy-beans	S. Wht	D.Wht	Barley
	-----bushels-----			pounds		-----bushels-----				
2000	36.3	29.3	57.2	1452.7		111.8	33.0	32.2	29.1	52.3
2001	32.0	30.2	56.2	1345.4		109.1	32.4	28.6	29.4	44.3
2002	30.4	27.7	54.7	1342.2		109.6	32.7	27.6	29.1	45.3
2003	31.1	29.3	56.2	1380.3		110.4	32.9	28.6	29.4	45.9
2004	31.4	28.9	55.9	1356.2		110.8	33.1	28.5	29.4	45.4
2005	31.7	29.4	56.3	1360.9		110.5	33.1	28.7	29.5	45.7
2006	31.6	29.4	56.3	1354.4		110.4	33.1	28.7	29.6	45.7
2007	31.6	29.4	56.3	1357.3		110.6	33.2	28.8	29.7	45.8
2008	31.7	29.5	56.5	1358.3		110.7	33.3	28.9	29.7	45.9
2009	31.8	29.6	56.5	1357.5		110.8	33.3	29.0	29.8	45.9
2010	31.9	29.6	56.6	1357.9		110.8	33.4	29.0	29.9	46.0

**Research Method**

A distribution of farms in North Dakota was developed to estimate the impact of the Farmers Union Proposal on the state compared to the continuation of the FAIR Act. The number of farms in each sales category were obtained from the *1997 Census of Agriculture*. The *Census of Agriculture* includes all commodity sales, livestock, hay, program crops, and speciality crops. Receipts from livestock, hay, and speciality crops were removed from the total sales leaving just program crops. Data from the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) were used to estimate commodity sales that were not affected by the farm bill. Table 7 shows the number of farms in North Dakota by regions and size categories. There were 30,504 farms in the state according to the *Census of Agriculture* in 1997. The distribution of farms by region differs substantially. The regions used are the same as in the North Dakota Representative Farm Model: Red River Valley (RRV), North Central region (NC), South Central region (SC), and the West region.

<b>Table 7. Number of North Dakota Farms, Total Sales, and Farm Size by Sales Category, 1997</b>						
	Total	< 50	50-100	100-250	250-500	+500
<b>Number of farms</b>						
RRV	4,692	1,868	656	1,132	653	383
NC	6,987	3,771	1,327	1,450	361	78
SC	9,717	5,359	1,641	1,939	610	168
West	9,108	5,508	1,717	1,481	323	79
<b>Total market sales of program crops (\$1,000)</b>						
RRV	405,129	12,641	23,096	90,639	109,279	169,475
NC	447,489	49,389	77,815	181,534	97,616	41,135
SC	539,606	50,986	73,632	188,141	127,282	99,565
West	308,007	46,424	63,554	114,923	55,029	28,076
<b>Average market sales without livestock, hay or specialty crops (\$1,000/farm)</b>						
RRV	86.34	6.77	35.21	80.07	167.35	442.49
NC	64.05	13.10	58.64	125.20	270.40	527.37
SC	55.53	9.51	44.87	97.03	208.66	592.65
West	33.82	8.43	37.01	77.60	170.37	355.40
<b>Total acres farmed (1,000 acres)</b>						
RRV	3,298	103	188	738	890	1,380
NC	4,691	518	816	1,903	1,023	431
SC	5,214	493	712	1,818	1,230	962
West	3,396	512	701	1,267	607	310
<b>Average Harvested acres of program crops (acre/farm)</b>						
RRV		55	287	652	1,362	3,602
NC		137	615	1,312	2,834	5,528
SC		92	434	938	2,016	5,727
West		93	408	856	1,879	3,919
<b>Source: 1997 Census of Agriculture</b>						

Table 7 shows the total market sales for the program crops for North Dakota farms by regions and sales categories after livestock, hay, and specialty crops were removed. The largest sales by region were in the over \$500,000 category (+500) for the RRV, and the \$100,000 to \$250,000 category (100-250) for the NC, SC, and West. In the RRV, specialty crops such as potatoes, sugarbeets, and dry edible beans amounted to about 52% of total sales. Nonprogram crops and livestock amounted to 19% in the NC region, 38% in the SC region, and 49% in the West. Farms with sales greater than \$500,000 have the most land in the RRV. In the other regions, farms in the \$100,000 to \$250,000 category have the most land. Farms in the NC and SC

tend to be larger than those in other regions because a larger portion of total sales in the RRV and West are nonprogram commodities.

<b>Table 8. North Dakota Crop Mix for North Dakota Farms by Sales Category</b>							
	S. Wht	D. Wht	Barley	Sun- flowers	Corn	Soybeans	Canola
	-----acres-----						
<b>RRV</b>							
<50	22.4	0.0	0.7	0.0	6.3	25.6	0.0
50-100	116.8	0.0	3.8	0.0	33.0	132.9	0.0
100-250	243.3	0.0	13.8	7.6	85.4	301.7	0.0
250-500	508.5	0.0	28.8	15.9	178.5	630.6	0.0
+500	1119.7	0.0	95.3	74.1	732.8	1580.2	0.0
<b>NC</b>							
<50	17.3	43.8	23.7	8.4	0.0	0.0	44.1
50-100	77.6	196.0	106.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	197.5
100-250	285.0	335.2	207.5	80.1	0.0	0.0	404.5
250-500	615.6	723.9	448.1	173.0	0.0	0.0	873.7
+500	1016.7	1649.4	760.7	503.1	0.0	0.0	1597.8
<b>SC</b>							
<50	38.0	1.3	14.2	11.9	15.6	10.9	0.0
50-100	179.4	6.3	66.9	56.2	73.6	51.2	0.0
100-250	423.0	40.9	163.1	157.7	52.3	100.7	0.0
250-500	909.6	88.0	350.8	339.0	112.4	216.5	0.0
+500	2691.1	148.5	1034.9	912.2	326.5	613.6	0.0
<b>WEST</b>							
<50	40.7	36.0	16.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
50-100	178.8	157.9	71.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
100-250	395.2	361.0	99.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
250-500	867.7	792.7	218.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
+500	1873.4	1668.8	376.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 8 shows the crop mix that was used to estimate program crop production. The crop mix was obtained from the North Dakota Representative Farm Model. Soybeans were the largest crop in the RRV followed by spring wheat and corn. In the NC region, durum wheat was the largest crop followed by canola and spring wheat. Spring wheat was the largest crop in the SC followed by barley and sunflowers. In the West, spring wheat was the largest crop followed by durum wheat and barley.

Total production from program crops was calculated by multiplying harvested acres of each crop by estimated yields. Government loans were taken on that production if the loan rate was higher than market price. The first \$100,000 of loan value was priced at 85% of the USDA's

full cost of production, the next \$150,000 of loan value was priced at 80% of the USDA's full cost of production, the next \$250,000 of loan value was priced at 70% of the full cost of production, and the remaining production was priced at 60% of the full cost of production.

## Results

The results of the baseline scenario are listed in the Appendix tables. The estimated total program crop sales under various scenarios for 2003-2007 are shown in Table 9 for comparison purposes. Under the Farmers Union Proposal most farms receive greater returns than under the continuation of the FAIR Act. Farms with sales over \$250,000 in the NC and farms with sales over \$500,000 in the RRV and the SC would receive less returns with the Farmers Union Proposal than with the continuation of the FAIR Act. All other farms would receive more revenue from program crops. Farms with sales less than \$50,000 would receive 20% more revenue from the Farmers Union Proposal than with a continuation of the FAIR Act. Farms with sales between \$50,000 and \$100,000 would receive 19% more revenue. Larger farms (\$100,000 to \$250,000) would receive 13% more revenue, while the largest farms (more than \$500,000) would receive 4.5% less return with the Farmers Union Proposal than with the continuation of the FAIR Act over the 5-year period of the new farm bill.

The targeting feature of the Farmers Union Proposal is evident in the table by comparing the total revenue under the Farmers Union Proposal with and without the targeting feature. There is no effect on the smaller size farm (sales less than \$100,000). Farms with sales between \$100,000 and \$250,000 receive 3.6% less return because of the targeting feature. Farms with sales between \$250,000 and \$500,000 receive 6.3% less, and farms with sales over \$500,000 receive 14.5% less.

The program crop sales under the Farmers Union price scenario with the FOR are not much different than the baseline scenario. The main reason is that even though the crop prices are higher, especially early in the forecast period, they are not above the loan rates. Therefore, the higher market prices are offset by lower government spending.

Table 10 shows total program crop receipts under alternative Farm Bill options at the state level. At the state level, farms with sales in the \$100,000 to \$250,000 category have the greatest aggregate revenue. The combined revenue from RRV farms in the over \$500,000 category is greater than from other categories within the RRV. Under the Farmers Union Proposal, farms in North Dakota will receive \$12.37 billion dollars in revenue from program crops over the 5 years of the farm bill. If the Farmers Union Proposal did not have the targeting feature, total revenue would be 5% larger, or \$13.0 billion dollars. If the FAIR Act was continued, total return for program crops would be \$11.39 billion dollars over the 5 years of the farm bill. Government spending under the FAIR Act in North Dakota would be \$1.66 billion dollars, and government spending under the Farmers Union Proposal would be \$2.97 billion dollars, or 79.9% higher. If the FOR was implemented and if it was successful in raising market prices, government spending in North Dakota would be about \$1.86 billion over the 5 years of the farm bill or 11.4% higher than under the continuation of the FAIR Act.

**Table 9. Average Program Crop Sales and Government Subsidies per North Dakota Farm, under Alternative Farm Bill Options Over Five Years, 2003-2007, by Various Sales Categories**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST
	-----dollars-----			
<b>Farmers Union Proposal with the targeted plan</b>				
<50	56,143	95,957	79,528	57,772
50-100	292,080	429,628	375,066	253,713
100-250	659,057	893,689	707,496	534,761
250-500	1,333,484	1,814,770	1,459,771	1,138,920
+500	3,336,839	3,344,015	3,848,762	2,213,153
<b>Farmers Union Proposal without the targeted plan</b>				
<50	56,143	95,957	79,528	57,772
50-100	292,080	429,628	375,066	253,713
100-250	720,459	918,284	720,459	536,933
250-500	1,398,226	1,983,352	1,549,317	1,178,836
+500	3,854,659	3,866,529	4,408,283	2,466,369
<b>Farmers Union Proposal with the targeted and Farmer Owned Reserve Plan</b>				
<50	56,143	95,957	79,528	57,772
50-100	292,080	429,628	375,066	253,713
100-250	659,057	893,888	707,636	534,761
250-500	1,335,669	1,817,200	1,462,989	1,140,704
+500	3,351,838	3,358,802	3,864,896	2,227,119
<b>FAIR Act</b>				
<50	46,403	85,485	63,086	45,863
50-100	243,658	387,470	299,237	202,605
100-250	552,564	860,614	601,147	453,673
250-500	1,244,748	1,990,925	1,386,073	1,085,209
+500	3,383,233	3,762,266	3,998,897	2,201,111
<b>Crop Sales under the FAIR Act</b>				
<50	40,253	69,962	57,780	41,882
50-100	209,415	313,243	272,499	183,929
100-250	480,290	667,408	527,850	385,096
250-500	1,003,825	1,441,499	1,135,119	845,478
+500	2,765,272	2,802,993	3,232,047	1,762,446
<b>Government Payments under the FAIR Act</b>				
<50	6,149	15,523	5,306	3,981
50-100	31,992	69,501	25,024	17,483
100-250	84,627	226,019	85,831	80,303
250-500	151,057	417,294	157,624	150,560
+500	448,253	869,349	555,816	317,934



**Table 10. Total Program Crops Receipts under Alternative Farm Bill Options, 2003-2007, by\_Various Sales Categories**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST	STATE
-----1,000 dollars-----					
<b>Farmers Union Proposal with the targeted plan</b>					
<50	104,875	361,852	426,189	318,209	1,211,125
50-100	191,604	570,116	615,483	435,625	1,812,828
100-250	746,053	1,295,849	1,371,834	791,981	4,205,717
250-500	870,765	655,132	890,460	367,871	2,784,228
+500	1,278,009	260,833	646,592	174,839	2,360,274
Total	3,191,306	3,143,782	3,950,559	2,088,525	12,374,172
<b>Farmers Union Proposal without the targeted plan</b>					
<50	104,875	361,852	426,189	318,209	1,211,125
50-100	191,604	570,116	615,483	435,625	1,812,828
100-250	815,559	1,331,511	1,396,970	795,197	4,339,238
250-500	913,042	715,990	945,083	380,764	2,954,879
+500	1,476,334	301,589	740,592	194,843	2,713,358
Total	3,501,414	3,281,059	4,124,317	2,124,638	13,031,428
<b>Farmers Union Proposal with the targeted and Farmer Owned Reserve Plan</b>					
<50	104,875	361,852	426,189	318,209	1,211,125
50-100	191,604	570,116	615,483	435,625	1,812,828
100-250	746,053	1,296,138	1,372,105	791,981	4,206,277
250-500	872,192	656,009	892,423	368,447	2,789,072
+500	1,283,754	261,987	649,303	175,942	2,370,986
Total	3,198,478	3,146,102	3,955,185	2,090,204	12,389,969
<b>FAIR Act</b>					
<50	86,680	322,364	338,077	252,613	999,735
50-100	159,839	514,172	491,048	347,872	1,512,932
100-250	625,502	1,247,890	1,165,625	671,889	3,710,906
250-500	812,820	718,724	845,504	350,523	2,727,571
+500	1,295,778	293,457	671,815	173,888	2,434,937
Total	2,980,621	3,096,607	3,512,069	1,796,785	11,386,082
<b>Crop Sales under the FAIR Act</b>					
<50	75,193	263,827	309,642	230,686	879,348
50-100	137,376	415,673	447,170	315,807	1,316,027
100-250	543,688	967,742	1,023,500	570,327	3,105,257
250-500	655,498	520,381	692,423	273,089	2,141,391
+500	1,059,099	218,633	542,984	139,233	1,959,950
Total	2,470,854	2,386,257	3,015,719	1,529,143	9,401,972
<b>Government Payments under the FAIR Act</b>					
<50	11,487	58,537	28,435	21,928	120,387
50-100	20,987	92,228	41,065	30,019	184,299
100-250	81,815	280,148	142,124	101,562	605,649
250-500	98,640	150,643	96,150	48,631	394,064
+500	171,681	67,809	93,377	25,117	357,984
Total	384,610	649,365	401,152	227,256	1,662,383

Table 11 shows the per acre return for program crops for North Dakota farms. Because of the targeting feature of the plan, small farms have an advantage in per acre returns which could offset cost efficiency larger farms have from economies of size. Small farms in the RRV and NC, with sales less than \$100,000, would have a \$19 per acre advantage over the farms with sales greater than \$500,000. In the SC, the advantage is \$24 per acre and in the West it is \$11 per acre. Per acre return for farms in the \$100,000 to \$250,000 category is \$2 less in the RRV, \$4 less in the NC, \$8 less in the SC, and \$1 less in the West compared to smaller farms.

<b>Table 11. Average Total Return per Acre for North Dakota Farms under the Farmers Union Proposal Over the 5-Year Life of the Farm Bill</b>					
	RRV	NC	SC	WEST	STATE
	-----dollars/acre-----				
<50	204	140	173	124	160
50-100	204	140	173	124	160
100-250	202	136	165	125	157
250-500	196	128	158	121	151
+500	185	121	149	113	142

### **North Dakota Representative Farm**

The effects on North Dakota representative farms of the various alternative scenarios were evaluated using the North Dakota Representative Farm Model. Three alternatives were evaluated: the Farmers Union Proposal with targeting, the Farmers Union Proposal without targeting, and the continuation of the FAIR Act. Table 12 shows the state average net farm income for the representative farms by size. Descriptions of the representative farms can be found in *2001 North Dakota Agricultural Outlook: Representative Farms 2001-2010*.

The Farmers Union Proposal with targeting provides higher net farm income for all farms regardless of size. Net farm income for the large size farm decreases from \$100 thousand in 2003 to \$93 thousand in 2007 under the Farmers Union Proposal and increases from \$81 thousand in 2003 to \$90 thousand in 2007 under the FAIR Act. Net income for the medium size farm is in the \$66 to \$69 thousand range for the Farmers Union Proposal and \$48 to \$54 thousand for the FAIR Act. The net income for the small size farm is about \$33 thousand under the Farmers Union Proposal and varies between \$24 and \$26 thousand for the FAIR Act

Removing the targeting feature of the Farmers Union Proposal would increase net income for the large farms between \$55 thousand and \$63 thousand. The net income for the medium size farm would increase between \$9.5 thousand and \$12 thousand, and net income for the small size farm is about \$2.5 thousand more per year. Net farm income for the large size farm averages about \$12 thousand, or 13%, higher under the Farmers Union Proposal with targeting when compared to the FAIR Act. Net farm income for the medium size farm averages about \$16 thousand, or 30% higher under the Farmers Union Proposal. The net farm income for the small size farm is \$8.5 thousand, or 35% higher under the Farmers Union Proposal.

<b>Table 12. State Average Net Farm Income for North Dakota Representative Farms by Size under Various Alternative Scenarios</b>			
	Large	Medium	Small
-----dollars-----			
<b>Farmers Union Proposal with Targeting</b>			
2003	100,151	66,340	33,002
2004	98,359	67,228	33,107
2005	99,571	68,632	33,441
2006	99,046	68,722	33,868
2007	93,498	67,324	33,431
<b>Farmers Union Proposal without Targeting</b>			
2003	161,456	78,751	35,425
2004	160,301	79,683	35,533
2005	161,080	80,433	35,997
2006	158,475	79,208	36,054
2007	148,760	76,776	35,279
<b>FAIR Act</b>			
2003	80,790	48,024	23,703
2004	83,234	50,381	24,390
2005	87,605	52,595	24,698
2006	90,818	53,826	25,356
2007	90,072	54,394	25,827

Debt-to-asset ratios fall under the Farmers Union Proposal for all farms (Table 13). The debt-to-asset ratio for the small size farm falls from 0.567 to 0.543. However, the debt-to-asset ratios for the large and medium size farms fall much slower than those of the small size farms. The additional net income for all farms strengthens their financial position. The debt-to-asset ratios under the FAIR Act increase for all size farms.

<b>Table 13 State Average Debt-to-asset Ratios for North Dakota Representative Farms by Size under Alternative Scenarios</b>			
	Large	Medium	Small
<b>Farmers Union Proposal with Targeting</b>			
2003	0.354	0.438	0.567
2004	0.341	0.425	0.550
2005	0.333	0.413	0.545
2006	0.327	0.405	0.544
2007	0.328	0.407	0.543
<b>FAIR Act</b>			
2003	0.367	0.456	0.587
2004	0.368	0.458	0.592
2005	0.369	0.459	0.596
2006	0.370	0.462	0.598
2007	0.371	0.463	0.601

Better returns under the Farmers Union Proposal results in higher land values than those under the continuation of the FAIR Act. Land values across the state increase \$36/acre because of the increased net farm income provided by the Farmers Union Proposal. Land value increases the most in the SC region (Table 14). Cash rents also increase under the Farmers Union Proposal (Table 15). Across the state, cash rents increase an average of \$2.61 per acre.

<b>Table 14. North Dakota Land Values by Regions under Alternative Scenarios</b>					
	RRV	NC	SC	WEST	State Avg
-----dollars per acre-----					
<b>Farmers Union Proposal with Targeting</b>					
2003	672	437	370	346	456
2004	679	461	386	361	472
2005	690	474	424	381	492
2006	699	486	453	397	509
2007	705	497	466	420	522
<b>FAIR Act</b>					
2003	672	437	370	346	456
2004	666	447	380	354	462
2005	669	453	386	361	467
2006	671	459	399	374	476
2007	672	467	416	388	486

<b>Table 15. North Dakota Cash Rents by Regions under Alternative Scenarios</b>					
	RRV	NC	SC	WEST	State Avg
-----dollars per acre-----					
<b>Farmers Union Proposal with Targeting</b>					
2003	50.75	32.67	30.25	24.99	34.67
2004	51.25	33.94	31.17	25.87	35.56
2005	52.11	34.44	33.35	26.65	36.64
2006	52.75	34.76	34.70	27.07	37.32
2007	53.17	35.05	34.71	27.93	37.72
<b>FAIR Act</b>					
2003	50.75	32.67	30.25	24.99	34.67
2004	50.33	32.96	30.70	25.26	34.81
2005	50.55	32.93	30.41	25.11	34.75
2006	50.69	32.88	30.63	25.35	34.89
2007	50.76	33.00	31.08	25.62	35.11

**Summary**

In 1996, Congress passed the FAIR Act which was based on a number of assumptions which, as history has shown, did not develop. As a result, prices have fallen substantially since 1996. The lack of a safety net for farm income in the FAIR Act has become evident in recent years because of the large increase in emergency government support to agriculture.

In recent years, U.S. agriculture has experienced a rapid loss of mid-size family farms but the number of small size farms and large size farms have increased. The targeting feature, higher loan rates for smaller farms, of the Farmers Union Proposal would address this phenomenon.

The Farmers Union Proposal is a targeted plan which utilizes various loan rates. Loan rates are determined from the USDA’s full cost of production for program crops. Targeted loan rates are triggered by the total dollar amount of loan participation of a farm. The FOR is directed towards a Limited Renewable Energy Reserve and a Humanitarian Assistance Reserve.

The objectives of the study were to develop a distribution of farms in North Dakota by size and estimate the statewide cost of the Farmers Union Proposal and compare it to the continuation of the FAIR Act under a baseline price scenario and a scenario using Farmers Union estimated market prices after the introduction of the FOR. The North Dakota Representative Farm Model was used to estimate the effects of the Farmers Union proposal on North Dakota farms.

A distribution of farms in North Dakota was developed to estimate the impact of the Farmers Union Proposal on the state compared to the continuation of the FAIR Act. The *Census of Agriculture* includes all commodity sales, livestock, hay, program crops, and specialty crops. Receipts from livestock, hay, and specialty crops were removed from the total sales leaving just program crops. About 71.4% of North Dakota farms would be unaffected by the targeting feature of the Farmers Union Proposal.

Under the Farmers Union Proposal, most farms receive greater returns than under the continuation of the FAIR Act. Farms with sales over \$250,000 in the NC and farms with sales over \$500,000 in the RRV and the SC would receive less returns with the Farmers Union Proposal than the continuation of the FAIR Act. Farms with sales less than \$50,000 would receive 20% more revenue from the Farmers Union Proposal than with a continuation of the FAIR Act. Farms with sales between \$50,000 and \$100,000 would receive 19% more revenue. Larger farms (\$100,000 to \$250,000) would receive 13% more while the largest farms (more than \$500,000) would receive 4.5% less return with the Farmers Union Proposal than with the continuation of the FAIR Act over the 5-year period of the new farm bill.

Small farms, with the Farmers Union Proposal, would have a per acre return advantage over larger farms. That advantage could be as large as \$24 per acre. Middle-size family farms have a per acre advantage between \$12 and \$17 over the largest farms.

Program crop revenue under the Farmers Union price scenario with the FOR are not much different than under the baseline scenario. The main reason is that even though the crop prices are higher, especially early in the forecast period, they are not above the loan rates. Therefore, the higher market prices are offset by lower government spending.

Under the Farmers Union Proposal, farms in North Dakota would receive \$9.4 billion in program crop sales, plus \$2.97 billion in government spending, for a total revenue of \$12.37 billion over the 5 years of the farm bill. If the FAIR Act was continued total revenue from program crops would be \$11.39 billion over the 5 years; \$9.72 from crop sales and \$1.67 billion from government payments. If the FOR was implemented and if it was successful in raising market prices, government spending under the Farmers Union Proposal in North Dakota would be about \$1.86 billion over the 5 years of the farm bill.

The Farmers Union Proposal provides higher net farm income for all representative farms regardless of size. Net farm income for the large size farm increases 13% under the Farmers Union Proposal when compared to the FAIR Act. Net farm income for the medium size farm increases 30%, and net farm income for the small size farm increases 35% under the Farmers Union proposal. Debt-to-asset ratios fall under the Farmers Union Proposal for all farms and land values and cash rent increase under the Farmers Union Proposal.

## References

Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute. *FAPRI 2001 U.S. and World Agricultural Outlook*. Iowa State University. Ames, Iowa.

Koo, W. Won, Richard Taylor, and Andrew L. Swenson. *2001 North Dakota Agricultural Outlook: Representative Farms 2001-2010*. Forthcoming.

National Farmers Union. Statement of Mr. Leland Swenson, President, National Farmers Union to the House Agriculture Committee. March 14, 2001.

North Dakota Agricultural Statistics Service. *North Dakota Agricultural Statistics 2001*. Fargo, North Dakota.

North Dakota State Board for Vocational and Technical Education. *North Dakota Farm and Ranch Business Management, Annual Report 2000*. North Dakota State University. Fargo, North Dakota.

United States Department of Agriculture. National Agricultural Statistics Service. *1997 Census of Agriculture, North Dakota State and County Data. Volume 1, Geographic Area Series, Part 34*. Washington, DC.

# **Appendix Tables**



**Appendix Table 1. Total Sales Under The Farmers Union Proposal**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST
	-----dollars-----			
<b>Less than \$50,000 in Sales</b>				
2000	10,719	16,850	13,343	9,504
2001	10,772	18,576	15,215	10,984
2002	10,734	18,700	15,090	10,926
2003	10,930	18,614	15,513	11,287
2004	11,059	18,714	15,657	11,323
2005	11,206	19,188	15,904	11,538
2006	11,387	19,570	16,097	11,713
2007	11,561	19,871	16,357	11,911
2008	11,781	20,223	16,665	12,139
2009	11,994	20,649	16,971	12,368
2010	12,226	21,082	17,289	12,611
<b>Sales between \$50,000-\$100,000</b>				
2000	55,764	75,443	62,927	41,739
2001	56,043	83,173	71,758	48,237
2002	55,843	83,725	71,168	47,983
2003	56,861	83,341	73,160	49,567
2004	57,532	83,789	73,842	49,727
2005	58,298	85,911	75,005	50,672
2006	59,241	87,621	75,915	51,440
2007	60,147	88,967	77,143	52,307
2008	61,292	90,545	78,595	53,311
2009	62,401	92,452	80,039	54,314
2010	63,607	94,389	81,538	55,385
<b>Sales between \$100,000-\$250,000</b>				
2000	86,285	178,873	137,082	104,613
2001	126,704	172,713	136,114	102,101
2002	126,303	174,041	134,013	101,376
2003	128,494	173,459	138,150	104,572
2004	129,908	174,695	139,201	104,939
2005	131,546	178,696	141,587	106,812
2006	133,577	182,035	143,194	108,359
2007	135,533	184,803	145,365	110,080
2008	137,989	188,012	148,058	112,077
2009	140,372	191,804	150,688	114,090
2010	142,970	195,680	153,433	116,224
<b>Sales between \$250,000-\$500,000</b>				
2000	260,280	386,338	294,789	229,678
2001	257,357	351,580	281,449	217,133
2002	256,623	354,196	277,497	215,542
2003	260,630	352,726	285,281	222,558
2004	263,215	355,209	287,258	223,364
2005	266,212	362,995	291,952	227,475
2006	269,925	369,304	295,355	230,872
2007	273,502	374,536	299,924	234,651
2008	277,994	380,601	305,615	239,035
2009	282,352	390,584	317,284	243,454
2010	287,103	398,571	323,187	248,140
<b>Sales Greater than \$500,000</b>				
2000	740,281	768,644	900,762	480,535
2001	627,258	632,407	705,347	423,319
2002	626,224	646,044	709,195	420,039
2003	635,493	643,164	730,765	433,017
2004	661,583	646,307	750,884	434,540
2005	669,839	673,198	779,210	442,074
2006	680,019	685,720	788,021	448,305
2007	689,906	695,626	799,882	455,218
2008	702,102	707,271	814,624	463,246
2009	714,032	721,251	845,472	471,354
2010	727,056	735,491	860,791	479,933

**Appendix Table 2. Total Sales under Market and Government Payments, Continuation of the FAIR Act**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST
	-----dollars-----			
<b>Less than \$50,000 in Sales</b>				
2000	10,719	16,850	13,343	9,504
2001	9,430	16,406	12,181	8,769
2002	8,735	16,272	11,598	8,342
2003	8,923	16,391	12,032	8,790
2004	9,122	16,689	12,319	8,945
2005	9,280	17,130	12,634	9,153
2006	9,448	17,468	12,893	9,369
2007	9,631	17,806	13,208	9,605
2008	9,854	18,228	13,535	9,791
2009	10,038	18,652	13,851	10,025
2010	10,243	19,131	14,216	10,333
<b>Sales between \$50,000-\$100,000</b>				
2000	37,791	49,308	48,938	31,975
2001	55,706	81,559	62,622	42,122
2002	48,955	74,119	57,431	38,540
2003	46,963	74,395	57,173	38,897
2004	47,925	75,669	58,438	39,521
2005	48,704	77,587	59,901	40,418
2006	49,535	79,186	61,107	41,356
2007	50,530	80,632	62,618	42,412
2008	51,376	81,854	63,922	43,059
2009	52,329	83,746	65,410	44,084
2010	53,396	85,886	67,129	45,436
<b>Sales between \$100,000-\$250,000</b>				
2000	86,285	106,230	96,120	66,284
2001	111,990	168,259	119,757	91,842
2002	103,908	166,242	110,875	84,183
2003	106,120	166,769	115,172	87,928
2004	108,539	169,124	117,642	89,032
2005	110,529	172,442	120,466	90,522
2006	112,578	174,852	122,604	92,180
2007	114,798	177,427	125,264	94,010
2008	117,504	181,197	128,347	95,584
2009	119,723	184,955	131,179	97,657
2010	122,203	189,244	134,489	100,384
<b>Sales between \$250,000-\$500,000</b>				
2000	180,339	229,441	206,703	145,527
2001	180,768	255,156	202,037	148,625
2002	180,426	258,380	200,141	148,245
2003	272,297	422,455	300,149	243,182
2004	248,097	384,583	275,006	216,511
2005	237,609	389,508	265,885	205,268
2006	241,106	394,526	269,689	208,149
2007	245,639	399,853	275,344	212,100
2008	249,920	404,103	280,515	214,161
2009	253,278	407,783	285,257	217,421
2010	256,959	412,992	290,831	221,938
<b>Sales greater that \$500,000</b>				
2000	490,063	441,790	590,166	302,861
2001	497,934	495,119	576,191	309,857
2002	498,622	501,190	570,889	308,619
2003	517,461	515,307	604,249	331,390
2004	786,546	862,962	935,936	518,494
2005	710,789	787,205	843,746	463,558
2006	678,908	793,723	801,292	440,244
2007	689,528	803,068	813,674	447,424
2008	700,399	810,219	826,318	451,362
2009	709,268	818,164	837,953	457,886
2010	720,000	827,105	852,921	467,576

**Appendix Table 3. Farmers Union Proposal, No Discount For Size**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST
-----dollars-----				
<b>Less than \$50,000 in Sales</b>				
2000	7,264	11,013	10,377	7,281
2001	10,772	18,576	15,215	10,984
2002	10,734	18,700	15,090	10,926
2003	10,930	18,614	15,513	11,287
2004	11,059	18,714	15,657	11,323
2005	11,206	19,188	15,904	11,538
2006	11,387	19,570	16,097	11,713
2007	11,561	19,871	16,357	11,911
2008	11,781	20,223	16,665	12,139
2009	11,994	20,649	16,971	12,368
2010	12,226	21,082	17,289	12,611
<b>Sales between \$50,000-\$100,000</b>				
2000	37,791	49,308	48,938	31,975
2001	56,043	83,173	71,758	48,237
2002	55,843	83,725	71,168	47,983
2003	56,861	83,341	73,160	49,567
2004	57,532	83,789	73,842	49,727
2005	58,298	85,911	75,005	50,672
2006	59,241	87,621	75,915	51,440
2007	60,147	88,967	77,143	52,307
2008	61,292	90,545	78,595	53,311
2009	62,401	92,452	80,039	54,314
2010	63,607	94,389	81,538	55,385
<b>Sales between \$100,000-\$250,000</b>				
2000	96,120	106,230	96,120	66,284
2001	138,370	177,255	138,370	102,232
2002	136,138	178,666	136,138	101,462
2003	140,533	178,049	140,533	104,858
2004	141,650	179,362	141,650	105,247
2005	144,185	183,613	144,185	107,237
2006	145,892	187,160	145,892	108,881
2007	148,199	190,101	148,199	110,709
2008	151,061	193,511	151,061	112,831
2009	153,855	197,539	153,855	114,970
2010	156,771	201,657	156,771	117,238
<b>Sales between \$250,000-\$500,000</b>				
2000	180,339	229,441	206,703	145,527
2001	268,304	382,844	297,558	224,451
2002	267,413	385,891	292,760	222,760
2003	272,279	384,558	302,211	230,215
2004	275,418	387,393	304,612	231,071
2005	279,056	396,575	310,063	235,439
2006	283,565	404,236	313,735	239,048
2007	287,908	410,589	318,696	243,063
2008	293,363	417,954	324,850	247,721
2009	298,655	426,654	330,858	252,416
2010	304,424	435,549	337,131	257,395
<b>Sales greater than \$500,000</b>				
2000	490,063	441,790	590,166	302,861
2001	739,447	748,561	846,573	469,825
2002	738,089	753,872	833,186	465,842
2003	751,109	750,054	859,626	481,600
2004	759,333	754,312	866,827	483,450
2005	769,163	773,241	882,298	492,598
2006	781,524	788,447	892,722	500,164
2007	793,529	800,475	906,810	508,558
2008	808,338	814,615	924,331	518,306
2009	822,824	831,590	941,467	528,151
2010	838,638	848,880	959,315	538,568

**Appendix Table 4. Total Sales at Market Price**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST
-----dollars-----				
<b>Less than \$50,000 in Sales</b>				
2000	7,264	11,013	10,377	7,281
2001	7,253	12,379	10,312	7,368
2002	7,233	12,527	10,309	7,375
2003	7,526	12,870	10,834	7,891
2004	7,815	13,380	11,192	8,100
2005	8,055	14,020	11,574	8,358
2006	8,296	14,576	11,898	8,622
2007	8,562	15,117	12,282	8,910
2008	8,806	15,592	12,628	9,110
2009	9,011	16,068	12,962	9,357
2010	9,237	16,599	13,345	9,679
<b>Sales between \$50,000-\$100,000</b>				
2000	37,791	49,308	48,938	31,975
2001	37,732	55,425	48,634	32,359
2002	37,630	56,087	48,619	32,390
2003	39,152	57,625	51,093	34,653
2004	40,656	59,906	52,784	35,573
2005	41,904	62,771	54,587	36,707
2006	43,162	65,259	56,111	37,866
2007	44,542	67,681	57,923	39,131
2008	45,815	69,811	59,556	40,007
2009	46,879	71,943	61,132	41,093
2010	48,055	74,320	62,936	42,505
<b>Sales between \$100,000-\$250,000</b>				
2000	86,285	106,230	96,120	66,284
2001	86,490	118,136	93,951	67,695
2002	86,326	119,629	93,069	67,522
2003	89,774	122,952	98,613	72,435
2004	93,204	127,937	102,077	74,469
2005	96,105	133,727	105,835	76,834
2006	99,013	138,848	108,851	79,314
2007	102,193	143,944	112,474	82,044
2008	105,152	148,383	115,813	83,857
2009	107,618	152,798	118,896	86,164
2010	110,340	157,730	122,452	89,121
<b>Sales between \$250,00-\$500,000</b>				
2000	180,339	229,441	206,703	145,527
2001	180,768	255,156	202,037	148,625
2002	180,426	258,380	200,141	148,245
2003	187,632	265,558	212,062	159,031
2004	194,801	276,324	219,511	163,497
2005	200,863	288,830	227,595	168,690
2006	206,942	299,889	234,079	174,133
2007	213,588	310,897	241,872	180,128
2008	219,772	320,484	249,052	184,109
2009	224,926	330,019	255,682	189,173
2010	230,616	340,673	263,328	195,666
<b>Sales greater than \$500,000</b>				
2000	490,063	441,790	590,166	302,861
2001	497,934	495,119	576,191	309,857
2002	498,622	501,190	570,889	308,619
2003	517,461	515,307	604,249	331,390
2004	536,329	536,108	625,340	340,821
2005	553,176	561,677	648,071	351,625
2006	570,044	583,984	666,277	363,011
2007	588,263	605,916	688,109	375,599
2008	605,232	624,896	708,289	383,847
2009	619,762	643,961	727,006	394,424
2010	635,866	665,098	748,633	407,922

**Appendix Table 5 Govt Payments under Continuation of FAIR Act**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST
	-----dollars-----			
<b>Less than \$50,000 in Sales</b>				
2000	3,455	5,837	2,966	2,223
2001	2,177	4,027	1,868	1,400
2002	1,501	3,745	1,289	966
2003	1,397	3,521	1,199	899
2004	1,307	3,309	1,127	845
2005	1,225	3,110	1,059	795
2006	1,151	2,893	996	747
2007	1,069	2,690	926	695
2008	1,048	2,636	907	681
2009	1,027	2,583	889	667
2010	1,006	2,532	871	654
<b>Sales between \$50,000-\$100,000</b>				
2000	17,974	26,134	13,988	9,764
2001	11,325	18,032	8,812	6,150
2002	7,811	16,770	6,080	4,244
2003	7,270	15,763	5,654	3,948
2004	6,800	14,817	5,314	3,712
2005	6,373	13,927	4,995	3,490
2006	5,988	12,951	4,695	3,281
2007	5,561	12,044	4,366	3,052
2008	5,450	11,803	4,278	2,991
2009	5,341	11,567	4,193	2,931
2010	5,234	11,335	4,109	2,873
<b>Sales between \$100,000-\$250,000</b>				
2000	40,509	72,643	40,962	38,329
2001	25,500	50,123	25,806	24,146
2002	17,582	46,614	17,806	16,661
2003	16,346	43,816	16,559	15,493
2004	15,335	41,186	15,565	14,563
2005	14,425	38,715	14,631	13,688
2006	13,565	36,004	13,753	12,866
2007	12,604	33,484	12,789	11,966
2008	12,352	32,814	12,534	11,727
2009	12,105	32,158	12,283	11,492
2010	11,863	31,514	12,037	11,263
<b>Sales between \$250,00-\$500,000</b>				
2000	84,665	156,897	88,087	84,151
2001	53,296	108,258	55,494	53,014
2002	36,747	100,678	38,291	36,578
2003	34,164	94,637	35,609	34,016
2004	32,050	88,956	33,473	31,972
2005	30,148	83,619	31,463	30,052
2006	28,351	77,763	29,575	28,248
2007	26,343	72,319	27,503	26,272
2008	25,816	70,873	26,953	25,746
2009	25,300	69,455	26,414	25,231
2010	24,794	68,066	25,886	24,727
<b>Sales greater than \$500,000</b>				
2000	250,217	326,854	310,596	177,673
2001	157,614	225,528	195,675	111,933
2002	108,864	209,739	135,015	77,233
2003	101,266	197,152	125,564	71,826
2004	95,168	185,323	118,029	67,515
2005	89,505	174,203	110,947	63,462
2006	84,134	162,006	104,288	59,654
2007	78,181	150,665	96,988	55,477
2008	76,617	147,651	95,048	54,367
2009	75,085	144,698	93,147	53,280
2010	73,583	141,804	91,284	52,214

**Appendix Table 6 Total Sales for North Dakota Farms for the Farmers Union Proposal**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST	State
<b>Less than \$50,000 in Sales</b>					
	-----1,000 dollars-----				
2000	20,023	63,541	71,504	52,349	207,417
2001	20,123	70,052	81,539	60,499	232,213
2002	20,051	70,517	80,868	60,180	231,617
2003	20,417	70,193	83,133	62,167	235,910
2004	20,658	70,571	83,908	62,368	237,503
2005	20,933	72,358	85,228	63,553	242,072
2006	21,271	73,798	86,263	64,517	245,848
2007	21,597	74,932	87,658	65,604	249,791
2008	22,008	76,261	89,308	66,863	254,440
2009	22,406	77,867	90,949	68,121	259,343
2010	22,839	79,499	92,653	69,464	264,454
<b>Sales between \$50,000-\$100,000</b>					
2000	36,581	100,112	103,263	71,666	311,622
2001	36,764	110,370	117,754	82,823	347,712
2002	36,633	111,104	116,786	82,386	346,909
2003	37,301	110,593	120,056	85,106	353,057
2004	37,741	111,188	121,175	85,381	355,485
2005	38,244	114,003	123,083	87,004	362,334
2006	38,862	116,272	124,576	88,323	368,034
2007	39,457	118,059	126,592	89,811	373,919
2008	40,208	120,153	128,975	91,534	380,870
2009	40,935	122,683	131,344	93,257	388,219
2010	41,726	125,254	133,805	95,096	395,881
<b>Sales between \$100,000-\$250,000</b>					
2000	97,674	259,366	265,802	154,932	777,774
2001	143,429	250,434	263,924	151,211	808,999
2002	142,975	252,359	259,852	150,138	805,324
2003	145,455	251,516	267,873	154,871	819,716
2004	147,056	253,308	269,910	155,415	825,688
2005	148,910	259,110	274,536	158,188	840,744
2006	151,209	263,950	277,652	160,479	853,291
2007	153,423	267,964	281,863	163,028	866,278
2008	156,203	272,618	287,085	165,986	881,893
2009	158,901	278,116	292,184	168,967	898,168
2010	161,842	283,736	297,507	172,128	915,213
<b>Sales between \$250,000-\$500,000</b>					
2000	169,963	139,468	179,821	74,186	563,438
2001	168,054	126,920	171,684	70,134	536,792
2002	167,575	127,865	169,273	69,620	534,333
2003	170,192	127,334	174,021	71,886	543,434
2004	171,880	128,231	175,227	72,147	547,484
2005	173,836	131,041	178,091	73,474	556,443
2006	176,261	133,319	180,167	74,572	564,318
2007	178,597	135,207	182,954	75,792	572,550
2008	181,530	137,397	186,425	77,208	582,561
2009	184,376	141,001	193,543	78,636	597,556
2010	187,478	143,884	197,144	80,149	608,656
<b>Sales greater than \$500,000</b>					
2000	283,528	59,954	151,328	37,962	532,772
2001	240,240	49,328	118,498	33,442	441,508
2002	239,844	50,391	119,145	33,183	442,563
2003	243,394	50,167	122,768	34,208	450,537
2004	253,386	50,412	126,149	34,329	464,275
2005	256,548	52,509	130,907	34,924	474,889
2006	260,447	53,486	132,388	35,416	481,737
2007	264,234	54,259	134,380	35,962	488,835
2008	268,905	55,167	136,857	36,596	497,525
2009	273,474	56,258	142,039	37,237	509,008
2010	278,462	57,368	144,613	37,915	518,358

**Appendix Table 7 Total North Dakota Sales With  
Continuation of FAIR Act**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST	State
	-----1,000 dollars-----				
<b>Less than \$50,000 in Sales</b>					
2000	20,023	63,541	71,504	52,349	207,417
2001	17,614	61,868	65,276	48,298	193,057
2002	16,316	61,363	62,154	45,947	185,781
2003	16,668	61,811	64,482	48,414	191,375
2004	17,039	62,935	66,018	49,271	195,264
2005	17,334	64,598	67,704	50,415	200,051
2006	17,648	65,872	69,095	51,607	204,222
2007	17,990	67,148	70,779	52,906	208,824
2008	18,407	68,739	72,536	53,928	213,610
2009	18,750	70,336	74,229	55,216	218,531
2010	19,134	72,143	76,184	56,913	224,374
<b>Sales between \$50,000-\$100,000</b>					
2000	24,791	65,432	80,308	54,902	225,433
2001	36,543	108,229	102,763	72,324	319,858
2002	32,115	98,355	94,244	66,174	290,888
2003	30,808	98,722	93,820	66,786	290,137
2004	31,439	100,413	95,897	67,858	295,607
2005	31,950	102,958	98,298	69,399	302,605
2006	32,495	105,080	100,276	71,008	308,859
2007	33,148	106,999	102,756	72,821	315,725
2008	33,703	108,621	104,896	73,932	321,152
2009	34,328	111,131	107,339	75,693	328,490
2010	35,028	113,971	110,159	78,014	337,172
<b>Sales between \$100,000-\$250,000</b>					
2000	97,674	154,034	186,377	98,167	536,252
2001	126,773	243,976	232,208	136,018	738,975
2002	117,624	241,052	214,986	124,675	698,337
2003	120,128	241,815	223,318	130,222	715,482
2004	122,866	245,229	228,108	131,856	728,059
2005	125,119	250,041	233,584	134,064	742,808
2006	127,438	253,535	237,728	136,518	755,220
2007	129,951	257,270	242,887	139,229	769,336
2008	133,015	262,735	248,865	141,560	786,175
2009	135,527	268,185	254,357	144,629	802,698
2010	138,334	274,405	260,775	148,669	822,182
<b>Sales between \$250,000-\$500,000</b>					
2000	117,761	82,828	126,089	47,005	373,683
2001	118,041	92,111	123,243	48,006	381,402
2002	117,818	93,275	122,086	47,883	381,063
2003	177,810	152,506	183,091	78,548	591,954
2004	162,008	138,834	167,754	69,933	538,528
2005	155,159	140,613	162,190	66,302	524,263
2006	157,442	142,424	164,510	67,232	531,608
2007	160,402	144,347	167,960	68,508	541,217
2008	163,198	145,881	171,114	69,174	549,367
2009	165,390	147,210	174,007	70,227	556,834
2010	167,794	149,090	177,407	71,686	565,977
<b>Sales greater than \$500,000</b>					
2000	187,694	34,460	99,148	23,926	345,228
2001	190,709	38,619	96,800	24,479	350,607
2002	190,972	39,093	95,909	24,381	350,355
2003	198,188	40,194	101,514	26,180	366,075
2004	301,247	67,311	157,237	40,961	566,757
2005	272,232	61,402	141,749	36,621	512,005
2006	260,022	61,910	134,617	34,779	491,329
2007	264,089	62,639	136,697	35,347	498,772
2008	268,253	63,197	138,822	35,658	505,929
2009	271,650	63,817	140,776	36,173	512,415
2010	275,760	64,514	143,291	36,939	520,503

**Appendix Table 8. Total North Dakota Sales With Farmers Union Proposal, No Discount for Size**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST	State
-----1,000 dollars-----					
<b>Less than \$50,000 in Sales</b>					
2000	13,569	41,530	55,609	40,104	150,812
2001	20,123	70,052	81,539	60,499	232,213
2002	20,051	70,517	80,868	60,180	231,617
2003	20,417	70,193	83,133	62,167	235,910
2004	20,658	70,571	83,908	62,368	237,503
2005	20,933	72,358	85,228	63,553	242,072
2006	21,271	73,798	86,263	64,517	245,848
2007	21,597	74,932	87,658	65,604	249,791
2008	22,008	76,261	89,308	66,863	254,440
2009	22,406	77,867	90,949	68,121	259,343
2010	22,839	79,499	92,653	69,464	264,454
<b>Sales between \$50,000-\$100,000</b>					
2000	24,791	65,432	80,308	54,902	225,433
2001	36,764	110,370	117,754	82,823	347,712
2002	36,633	111,104	116,786	82,386	346,909
2003	37,301	110,593	120,056	85,106	353,057
2004	37,741	111,188	121,175	85,381	355,485
2005	38,244	114,003	123,083	87,004	362,334
2006	38,862	116,272	124,576	88,323	368,034
2007	39,457	118,059	126,592	89,811	373,919
2008	40,208	120,153	128,975	91,534	380,870
2009	40,935	122,683	131,344	93,257	388,219
2010	41,726	125,254	133,805	95,096	395,881
<b>Sales between \$100,000-\$250,000</b>					
2000	108,808	154,034	186,377	98,167	547,386
2001	156,635	257,020	268,299	151,406	833,360
2002	154,108	259,066	263,972	150,266	827,412
2003	159,084	258,170	272,494	155,294	845,043
2004	160,347	260,074	274,659	155,872	850,952
2005	163,217	266,239	279,574	158,818	867,848
2006	165,150	271,382	282,885	161,253	880,669
2007	167,761	275,646	287,358	163,961	894,726
2008	171,001	280,591	292,907	167,103	911,602
2009	174,164	286,432	298,324	170,270	929,190
2010	177,465	292,403	303,980	173,629	947,477
<b>Sales between \$250,000-\$500,000</b>					
2000	117,761	82,828	126,089	47,005	373,683
2001	175,203	138,207	181,511	72,498	567,418
2002	174,621	139,307	178,583	71,952	564,463
2003	177,798	138,825	184,349	74,359	575,332
2004	179,848	139,849	185,813	74,636	580,146
2005	182,224	143,164	189,139	76,047	590,573
2006	185,168	145,929	191,378	77,213	599,688
2007	188,004	148,223	194,405	78,509	609,141
2008	191,566	150,881	198,158	80,014	620,620
2009	195,022	154,022	201,824	81,530	632,398
2010	198,789	157,233	205,650	83,139	644,810
<b>Sales greater than \$500,000</b>					
2000	187,694	34,460	99,148	23,926	345,228
2001	283,208	58,388	142,224	37,116	520,936
2002	282,688	58,802	139,975	36,802	518,267
2003	287,675	58,504	144,417	38,046	528,643
2004	290,825	58,836	145,627	38,193	533,480
2005	294,589	60,313	148,226	38,915	542,044
2006	299,324	61,499	149,977	39,513	550,313
2007	303,922	62,437	152,344	40,176	558,879
2008	309,594	63,540	155,288	40,946	569,367
2009	315,142	64,864	158,167	41,724	579,896
2010	321,199	66,213	161,165	42,547	591,123



**Appendix Table 9. Total Sales for North Dakota Farms with Market Price**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST	State
<b>Less than \$50,000 in Sales</b>					
	-----1,000 dollars-----				
2000	13,569	41,530	55,609	40,104	150,812
2001	13,548	46,681	55,263	40,585	156,077
2002	13,512	47,239	55,246	40,624	156,620
2003	14,058	48,535	58,057	43,462	164,112
2004	14,598	50,456	59,979	44,616	169,649
2005	15,046	52,868	62,027	46,038	175,980
2006	15,498	54,964	63,760	47,492	181,713
2007	15,993	57,004	65,818	49,078	187,894
2008	16,450	58,798	67,674	50,177	193,099
2009	16,832	60,594	69,465	51,540	198,430
2010	17,255	62,596	71,515	53,310	204,675
<b>Sales between \$50,000-\$100,000</b>					
2000	24,791	65,432	80,308	54,902	225,433
2001	24,752	73,548	79,808	55,560	233,669
2002	24,685	74,427	79,784	55,614	234,510
2003	25,684	76,469	83,843	59,499	245,495
2004	26,670	79,495	86,619	61,079	253,864
2005	27,489	83,297	89,577	63,026	263,388
2006	28,314	86,599	92,079	65,015	272,008
2007	29,219	89,813	95,052	67,188	281,272
2008	30,054	92,639	97,732	68,692	289,117
2009	30,752	95,469	100,318	70,557	297,096
2010	31,524	98,622	103,279	72,981	306,406
<b>Sales between \$100,000-\$250,000</b>					
2000	97,674	154,034	186,377	98,167	536,252
2001	97,907	171,298	182,171	100,257	551,632
2002	97,722	173,462	180,461	100,000	551,645
2003	101,624	178,281	191,210	107,276	578,391
2004	105,507	185,509	197,926	110,289	599,231
2005	108,790	193,905	205,215	113,792	621,701
2006	112,083	201,329	211,062	117,464	641,937
2007	115,683	208,719	218,088	121,507	663,997
2008	119,032	215,155	224,562	124,193	682,942
2009	121,824	221,557	230,540	127,609	701,530
2010	124,905	228,709	237,434	131,989	723,037
<b>Sales between \$250,000-\$500,000</b>					
2000	117,761	82,828	126,089	47,005	373,683
2001	118,041	92,111	123,243	48,006	381,402
2002	117,818	93,275	122,086	47,883	381,063
2003	122,523	95,866	129,358	51,367	399,115
2004	127,205	99,753	133,902	52,810	413,670
2005	131,163	104,268	138,833	54,487	428,751
2006	135,133	108,260	142,788	56,245	442,426
2007	139,473	112,234	147,542	58,181	457,430
2008	143,511	115,695	151,921	59,467	470,594
2009	146,877	119,137	155,966	61,103	483,083
2010	150,592	122,983	160,630	63,200	497,405
<b>Sales greater than \$500,000</b>					
2000	187,694	34,460	99,148	23,926	345,228
2001	190,709	38,619	96,800	24,479	350,607
2002	190,972	39,093	95,909	24,381	350,355
2003	198,188	40,194	101,514	26,180	366,075
2004	205,414	41,816	105,057	26,925	379,212
2005	211,866	43,811	108,876	27,778	392,331
2006	218,327	45,551	111,935	28,678	404,490
2007	225,305	47,261	115,602	29,672	417,841
2008	231,804	48,742	118,993	30,324	429,862
2009	237,369	50,229	122,137	31,160	440,894
2010	243,537	51,878	125,770	32,226	453,411

**Appendix Table 10. Total Government Payments for North Dakota Farms, Continuation of the FAIR Act**

	RRV	NC	SC	WEST	State
	-----1,000 dollars-----				
<b>Less than \$50,000</b>					
2000	6,454	22,012	15,895	12,246	56,606
2001	4,066	15,187	10,013	7,714	36,981
2002	2,805	14,124	6,909	5,323	29,161
2003	2,610	13,277	6,425	4,952	27,263
2004	2,442	12,479	6,039	4,655	25,615
2005	2,288	11,730	5,676	4,377	24,072
2006	2,150	10,908	5,335	4,115	22,508
2007	1,997	10,144	4,961	3,828	20,929
2008	1,957	9,941	4,862	3,752	20,511
2009	1,918	9,742	4,764	3,676	20,101
2010	1,879	9,547	4,669	3,603	19,698
<b>Sales between \$50,000-\$100,000</b>					
2000	11,791	34,680	22,955	16,764	86,190
2001	7,429	23,928	14,461	10,560	56,378
2002	5,124	22,253	9,977	7,287	44,642
2003	4,769	20,918	9,278	6,779	41,744
2004	4,461	19,662	8,721	6,373	39,217
2005	4,181	18,481	8,197	5,993	36,851
2006	3,928	17,186	7,705	5,634	34,452
2007	3,648	15,982	7,164	5,241	32,035
2008	3,575	15,662	7,021	5,136	31,394
2009	3,504	15,349	6,880	5,033	30,766
2010	3,434	15,042	6,743	4,932	30,151
<b>Sales between \$100,000-\$250,000</b>					
2000	45,856	105,332	79,425	56,765	287,378
2001	28,866	72,679	50,038	35,761	187,343
2002	19,903	67,590	34,525	24,674	146,692
2003	18,504	63,534	32,108	22,946	137,091
2004	17,359	59,720	30,181	21,567	128,828
2005	16,329	56,137	28,370	20,272	121,107
2006	15,355	52,206	26,667	19,055	113,283
2007	14,268	48,551	24,799	17,722	105,340
2008	13,983	47,580	24,303	17,368	103,233
2009	13,703	46,628	23,817	17,020	101,168
2010	13,429	45,696	23,340	16,680	99,145
<b>Sales between \$250,000-\$500,000</b>					
2000	55,286	56,640	53,733	27,181	192,840
2001	34,803	39,081	33,852	17,123	124,859
2002	23,996	36,345	23,357	11,815	95,513
2003	22,309	34,164	21,722	10,987	89,182
2004	20,929	32,113	20,418	10,327	83,787
2005	19,687	30,186	19,193	9,707	78,772
2006	18,513	28,073	18,041	9,124	73,751
2007	17,202	26,107	16,777	8,486	68,572
2008	16,858	25,585	16,441	8,316	67,201
2009	16,521	25,073	16,113	8,150	65,857
2010	16,190	24,572	15,790	7,987	64,540
<b>Sales greater than \$500,000</b>					
2000	95,833	25,495	52,180	14,036	187,544
2001	60,366	17,591	32,873	8,843	119,673
2002	41,695	16,360	22,683	6,101	86,839
2003	38,785	15,378	21,095	5,674	80,932
2004	36,449	14,455	19,829	5,334	76,067
2005	34,281	13,588	18,639	5,014	71,521
2006	32,223	12,636	17,520	4,713	67,093
2007	29,943	11,752	16,294	4,383	62,372
2008	29,344	11,517	15,968	4,295	61,124
2009	28,758	11,286	15,649	4,209	59,902
2010	28,182	11,061	15,336	4,125	58,704