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Executive Summary

Term limits, which impose a statutory maximum on the number of years a farmer may receive a Farm Service Agency (FSA) direct operating loan (DOL), have not appeared to have had a major impact on FSA's loan portfolio over the past two decades, though there are some areas of concern arising. Term limits stipulate that an eligible applicant must have a DOL obligated in 6 or fewer calendar years. The years need not be consecutive and multiple loans received during a year count only against 1 year of loan eligibility. The eligible applicant is able to close an additional DOL in the 7th year. The limitation does not apply to beginning farmers through their first 10 years of farming. Waivers that allow an additional 2 years of eligibility are provided on a case-by-case basis, if borrowers continue to meet all other eligibility criteria. Youth loans and microloans to beginning farmers and veterans are exempt and do not count against the limitation.

Key findings are:

In calendar 2018 and 2019, an additional 886 farm businesses reached the DOL term limit. This includes 365 farm businesses in 2018 and 521 in 2019 and brings the total number of farm borrowers reaching term limits since their inception in 1993 to 8,140.

Term-limited borrowers represented 5.1 percent of total DOL borrowers with a positive loan balance at the end of 2019. This reflects the importance of DOLs as a temporary credit source. Nearly half of DOL borrowers over the last 25 years received a DOL in only 1 year and over 80 percent were recipients of DOLs for 3 years or less.

There is no indication that term limits have hastened farm exits. Over 75 percent of farm borrowers who have reached term limits since their implementation in 1993 were still active in farming through 2019 as indicated by eligibility to vote in the most recent county office committee elections. Most borrowers reaching term limits since 2012 remain active borrowers with a positive loan balance and may participate in non-DOL credit programs, including direct farm ownership, emergency, and guaranteed loans. Also, term-limited borrowers unable to make scheduled payments are eligible for loan restructuring.

Term limits have had a greater impact on crop farms than livestock farms. This was especially true among direct cotton borrowers with 27 percent using 5 or more years of eligibility by 2019. Likewise, 23 percent of all corn-soybean direct borrowers had used 5 or more years of eligibility by 2019.

Term limits have a greater impact in regions more dependent on FSA credit where overall incomes are lower and farms smaller. Combined, the Appalachia and Northern Plain regions represented 28 percent of all DOL borrowers but held 35 percent of all term-limited borrowers at the end of 2019.
Introduction

This report was undertaken in fulfillment of requirements specified in Section 5104 of the Agricultural Act of 2014, which amended the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (ConAct) and requires an annual report on term limits for direct operating loans (see Appendix 1). As directed by the statute, this report documents the number and characteristics of DOL borrowers who have reached their term limits.

Term limits impose a statutory limit on the number of years that a farm borrower may receive loan funds through programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Term limits apply to both the entity and underlying individuals who are obligated as co-borrowers. This includes the spouse of married borrowers as well as legal partners. FSA uses the term 'borrower case' to refer to the borrowing individual or entity listed on the promissory note.

Subsequent legislation exempted all guaranteed loans from term limits. Microloans made to veterans and beginning farmers are also exempt from term limits. Moreover, the limitation does not apply if a borrower’s farm is subject to the jurisdiction of an Indian tribe. FSA can obligate, in certain circumstances, DOLs to borrowers beyond their term limit. For example, waivers are granted to qualified beginning farmers through their 10th year of farming. Non-beginning farmers may receive a 2-year waiver, provided the operation is viable, the borrower has or will complete financial training, and commercial credit is unavailable.

Farm Economic Outlook Remains Tenuous

Background on farm economic conditions helps provide context for the analysis of term limit data. USDA’s Economic Research Service (ERS) forecasts net farm income to increase $9.8 billion (11.7 percent) to $93.6 billion in 2019, after increasing in both 2017 and 2018. In inflation-adjusted 2020 dollars, net farm income is forecast to increase $8.4 billion (9.6 percent) from 2018. If realized, in inflation-adjusted terms, net farm income in 2019 would be 31.5 percent below its peak of $139.1 billion in 2013 but 3.9 percent above its 2000-2018 average ($91.6 billion). Much of the expected increase is attributable to direct government payments from Federal crop insurance indemnities, Market Facilitation Program payments, and other programs, which combined are projected to exceed $23 billion in 2019.

---

1 A farm borrower may be an individual, partnership, or legal entity. Term limits apply to both the entity and underlying individuals who are obligated as co-borrowers. This includes the spouse of married borrowers as well as legal partners. FSA uses the term ‘borrower case’ to refer to the borrowing individual or entity listed on the promissory note.

2 The ConAct states that an applicant is eligible for a direct operating loan if the applicant received a DOL in 6 or fewer years. The regulations (7 CFR 764.232), which were implemented in 1993, state that an applicant is not eligible if the applicant has closed a DOL in 7 or more years. The net impact of these provisions is that a borrower has 6 full years of eligibility for direct operating loans before reaching the term limit. In accordance with language in the ConAct, this report considers term limits to have been met at the end of 6 full years of receiving DOLs.

3 ERS farm income forecast as of February 2020.
Profit margins for most commodities remain tight with prices at or near break-even levels. Large carryover stocks for corn and soybeans, combined with reduced exports for corn and modest gains for soybean exports, are expected to limit the upside price potential. Despite a strong start to export sales in 2019 and the highest forecast exports in several years, cotton prices have been weighed down by very large supplies and fallout from the trade war with China. Similarly, wheat prices are down, despite an increase in exports, given record global supplies and record global ending stocks. While expanding demand for tree nuts and many fruits have facilitated profitability, these types of operations represent only a small share of U.S. farm production and FSA lending.

The overall outlook for the livestock sector has improved from earlier years. U.S. beef and pork prices have been buoyed by expectations of increased exports of U.S. pork and beef to offset the impact of African Swine Fever on worldwide supplies. Likewise, African Swine Fever is expected to increase global demand for poultry, although U.S. export gains were small in 2019 and prices softened over the year. The all-milk price rose in 2019 on a tighter supply-demand situation. Though margins are expected to be positive, some dairy producers will continue to face financial stress.

Five consecutive years of tight profit margins have had a negative impact on farmers’ financial situations. For most producers, working capital has declined, leaving them more reliant on borrowed capital. Farm sector debt is near the peak levels of the late 1970s and early 1980s. Among farms with at least $100,000 in annual sales, the share facing financial stress (having a low repayment capacity or low levels of solvency) has increased since 2012.4

Other sources provide similar evidence. The Minnesota Center for Financial Management found median farm income for Minnesota farmers in 2018 to be the lowest in 23 years with major indicators down (liquidity, net worth, profitability, coverage ratios). Federal Reserve Bank surveys indicate a continuation of low farm liquidity, increasing bank delinquencies, and greater demand for farm loans. Alongside historically low levels of liquidity, loan performance at agricultural banks has declined.

So far, strong equity positions, stable farm real estate markets, government payments, and bank liquidity have provided farmers with the tools to weather financial adversity without relying more heavily on USDA credit programs. However, a continuation of working capital erosion will likely impose greater stress on both lenders and borrowers, possibly resulting in an enhanced role for both direct and guaranteed FSA credit programs in upcoming years. If the farm economy deteriorates, the term limit period may be insufficient to overcome temporary financial hardships for some types of borrowers.

---

Overall Credit Quality Has Not Deteriorated

Despite reduced farm incomes, there has not been an increase in demand for direct or guaranteed loans except for direct farm ownership loans. Both direct operating loan obligations and direct loan applications received have been trending downward since 2016 (figure 1). The increase noted for direct farm ownership loan obligations has primarily been a consequence of increased loan size limits. For guaranteed loans, obligations and applications have also trended downward since 2016 (figure 2). While there have been increases in borrower defaults for both direct and guaranteed operating credit, these have, thus far, been modest (figure 3). Neither has there been a widespread deterioration of credit quality among commercial banks or the Farm Credit System. Through the 3rd quarter of 2019, loan defaults for farm nonreal estate credit were below 2.5 percent at commercial banks and 1 percent for the Farm Credit System (Ag Finance Databook; Farm Credit Funding Corporation).

There have been no other indicators of stress in FSA’s loan portfolio. The average loan classification score has remained stable and there have not been increases in losses, loans restructured, or accounts flagged for bankruptcy or foreclosure. Borrowers appear to be holding their loans longer, however, as indicated by a 2 percent increase in borrower caseload in 2019.

While there are no widespread indications of stress, financial difficulties are affecting some groups more than others. Small and mid-size family farms are more susceptible to lower incomes and tend to be more reliant on FSA credit. A combination of Agricultural Resource Management Survey and FSA loan data indicated that as of December 2017, over 18 percent of all medium-sized farms had a direct or guaranteed loan (figure 4). The share of farms utilizing FSA credit has been increasing since 2014. Also, there is a great deal of regional disparity in dependence on FSA credit programs: FSA serves a larger share of farms in regions which are economically challenged, such as Appalachia, the Mississippi Delta, and Indian Country (figure 5).

DOL Term Limits Affect a Small Share of Borrowers

In 2018, a total of 365 borrower cases reached the DOL term limit followed by 521 cases in 2019 (table 1). A borrower was determined to have met the term limit at the end of the 6th year in which they received DOL funds. The year in which the term limit was reached was the last year

---

5 The Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (the 2018 Farm Bill) increased direct farm ownership loan size limits from $300,000 to $600,000 and the direct operating loan size from $300,000 to $400,000.
6 The most recent ARMs data available to make this calculation are from 2017.
7 A borrower case represents the entity which is obligating the loan. It can be an individual, partnership, family corporation, or LLC. It includes all co-borrowers who may also sign the promissory note.
8 While a borrower may receive a loan in the following (7th) year, only about half do. A likely explanation is that farmers may be saving the last year of eligibility as a risk management tool. Considering term limits to have been met at 6 years was judged to provide a more accurate estimate of the number of farmers adversely affected.
in which DOL funds were received. For example, if a borrower receives funds for 7 years, the term limit would have been considered to have been met in the 7th year and not the 6th year.\(^9\)

This brings the total number of borrower cases reaching term limits since inception to 8,140 (table 1). The share of current borrowers reaching term limits is 3.9 percent of the total direct borrower caseload and 5.1 percent of the DOL borrower caseload. On average over the past 12 years, 402 cases reach term limits each year. From 2014 through 2019, over 2,600 additional direct borrowers have reached term limits, which represents an increase over historical norms (figure 6). This includes about 250 borrowers who, as of calendar year 2020, would have been considered a beginning farmer. Beginning farmers meeting all relevant eligibility criteria receive a waiver and can receive a DOL during their first 10 years of farming. After 10 years of farming, they are no longer considered beginning farmers and therefore no longer qualify for this waiver. Further, microloans to beginning farmers and veterans as well as youth loans do not count against term limits. Historically, these types of loans have represented about 30 percent of all DOL obligations.

Despite being unable to receive additional DOL loan funds, many term-limited borrowers have continued as FSA borrowers. Over 42 percent (3,441/8,140) of borrowers reaching term limits in 2019 were still active borrowers with a direct operating loan, farm ownership loan, or an emergency loan as of year-end 2019 (table 1). Most of those reaching term limits have remained active in farming. Over the past 5 years, over 75 percent of borrowers reaching the term limit were still active in farming as indicated by eligibility to vote in county office committee elections.\(^10\) After adjusting for deceased borrowers,\(^11\) only about 12 percent of those that reached their term limits have exited farming (100 minus (6,740 COC eligible voters/ (8,140-473))).

**DOLs Used Primarily as a Temporary Credit Source**

A majority of DOL borrowers use FSA only as a temporary source of credit. Nearly half (48.1 percent) of all non-exempt DOL borrowers (since 1993) received DOL funds for only 1 year (figure 7). Less than 1 in 5 non-exempt borrowers have received DOL funds in 4 or more years. The number of years in which borrowers rely on FSA direct loans varies by region (figure 8) and production specialization.

While term-limited borrowers are spread throughout the U.S., there are localities with a greater density of term-limited borrowers. Specifically, the Red River Valley, eastern Nebraska and the Dakotas, the Texas High Plains, and Appalachia are examples of areas with a greater concentration of term-limited borrowers (figure 8). Years of DOL eligibility use varies from

\(^9\) This results in revisions to totals from earlier years. Changes in beginning farmer status also result in a revision of earlier estimates. For example, a farmer receiving his or her 6\(^{th}\) loan in 2016 may have still been eligible in 2018 as a beginning farmer and not considered in the term limit totals. But, if they aged past the beginning farmer classification in 2019, the earlier 2016 estimates of term-limited borrowers would have been adjusted.

\(^10\) An eligible voter in an FSA county office committee election includes an individual or legal entity which participates or cooperates in any FSA program that is provided for by law.

\(^11\) Of the 8,140 cumulative borrowers reaching term limits, about 6 percent (473/8,140) passed away since reaching their respective term limit.
2.23 years in the Southern Plains to 2.9 years in the Northern Plains (figure 9). Term-limited borrowers are more heavily concentrated in the Northeast, Lake States, Corn Belt, and Northern Plains as indicated by the share of U.S. term-limited borrowers exceeding the share of all U.S. DOL borrowers (figure 10). While the Appalachia and Northern Plains regions represented 28 percent (13% + 15%) of all DOL borrowers, for example, these regions represented 35 percent (19% +16%) of all term-limited borrowers at the end of 2019. The Northern Plain and the Lake States had a relatively large share of borrowers who had used 5 or more years of loan eligibility, suggesting that they will continue to experience greater impacts from term limits.

Regional dependence on DOLs may be a function of the predominant types of agriculture. Grain and oilseed producers, common in the Northern Plains, Lake States, and Corn Belt, are more dependent on DOLs and more likely to be impacted by term limits. Nearly a quarter of corn-soybean farmers had used 5 or more years of eligibility or reached term limits compared to 12.4 percent for beef producers and 5.4 percent for poultry producers (figure 11). Nearly 27 percent of all cotton borrowers had received 5 or more years of DOL assistance, likely explaining the cluster of term-limited borrowers in Texas and the coastal Carolinas.

**Term-Limited Borrowers Not Necessarily More Financially Stressed**

In many ways, borrowers reaching term limits are like other direct borrowers (table 2). Indeed, the debt-to-asset ratio for term-limited borrowers is lower than for those who are not term-limited and the liquidity ratio is similar. The share of term-limited borrowers receiving write-offs or restructuring does not differ significantly from all other DOL borrowers. Of all borrowers receiving DOLs since 1993, 12.4 percent of term-limited borrowers have had either a direct loan write-off or guaranteed loan loss claim since reaching the term limit compared to 11.7 percent for all other DOL borrowers (figure 12). Also, the share of borrowers receiving loan restructuring under primary loan servicing differed by only 0.6 percent between term-limited and other borrowers.

Term-limited borrowers operate larger farms, though they tend to be less efficient than other borrowers. In 2019, borrowers reaching term limits had nearly $306,000 in gross revenue compared to $153,500 for all other borrowers receiving DOLs (table 3). In terms of total assets, term-limited borrowers operated farms that were twice as large, with the value of total assets for term-limited borrowers at $1.015 million compared to just over $455,000 for other borrowers. The net income ratio for term-limited borrowers has been less than for other borrowers, though both are in the “cautionary but acceptable” range of 10 to 20 percent.

**Summary**

DOL term limits do not appear to be having a large impact on current farm borrowers. Since their inception in 1993, only 8,140 borrowers have reached term limits. While the number reached on an annual basis has been increasing, the total reflects 5 percent of current borrowers. This is primarily because DOLs have mostly been used as a temporary credit source with most borrowers receiving new DOLs for 3 years or less. However, if market conditions in agriculture...
worsen and producers significantly increase their use of FSA credit programs, term limits may have a greater impact on the ability of producers to obtain needed credit.
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Appendix 1. Text of Legislation from Section 5104 of the Agricultural Act of 2014

5) **ANNUAL REPORT ON TERM LIMITS ON DIRECT OPERATING LOANS.**—
   (A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall prepare a report annually that describes—
   (i) the status of the direct operating loan program of the Department of Agriculture; and
   (ii) the impact of term limits on direct loan borrowers.
   (B) **DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.**—
   (i) **IN GENERAL.**—The report shall provide a demographic breakdown, on a State-by-State basis, of—
   (I) all direct loan borrowers; and
   (II) borrowers that have reached the eligibility limit for direct lending programs during the previous calendar year.
   (ii) **DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.**—The available demographic information shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of race or ethnicity, gender, age, type of farm or ranch, financial classification, number of years of indebtedness, veteran status, and other similar information, as determined by the Secretary.
   (C) **ADDITIONAL CONTENT.**—In addition to information described in subparagraph (B), the report shall provide—
   (i) a demographic analysis of the borrowers impacted by term limits;
   (ii) information on the conditions impacting the direct lending portfolio of the Department of Agriculture, including impacts by region and agriculture sector, and credit availability within those regions and sectors;
   (iii) information on the status of borrower operations impacted by term limits; and
   (iv) recommendations, if appropriate, to address any identifiable unmet credit needs.
   (D) **SUBMISSION.**—The Secretary shall—
   (i) annually submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a copy of the report; and
   (ii) make the report available to the public, including posting the report on the website of the Department of Agriculture.
Table 1. Selected characteristics of term-limited direct operating loan (DOL) borrowers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>With outstanding direct loan balance ≤ calendar year cumulative</th>
<th>With DOL balance only</th>
<th>Reaching term limits during calendar year - cumulative 2</th>
<th>Borrowers reaching term limits each calendar year</th>
<th>Eligible county office committee electors 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>3,441</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>8,140</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>6,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>2,358</td>
<td>7,619</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>6,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>7,254</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>5,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>6,873</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>5,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,737</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>6,399</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>4,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>5,929</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>4,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>5,528</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>3,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td>5,184</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>3,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>3,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>4,512</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>2,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>4,101</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>2,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>3,668</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>2,222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes direct farm ownership, operating, or emergency loan balance outstanding at calendar year end.
2 Number of current and past borrowers who have completed their 6 or more years of eligibility and have not received subsequent DOLs; excludes beginning farmers currently receiving a waiver.
3 Number of term-limited borrowers who are active producers and, therefore, eligible to vote in county office committee elections.

Sources: USDA-FSA OBFN database, December 31, 2019; USDA-FSA PLAS and County Office Committee Election Database, December 31st (2008 through 2019).
Table 2. Summary balance sheet and liquidity characteristics for term-limited direct operating loan borrowers at time of last obligation compared with all other borrowers receiving direct operating loans during that year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Term Limited</th>
<th>Not Term Limited</th>
<th>Term Limited</th>
<th>Not Term Limited</th>
<th>Term Limited</th>
<th>Not Term Limited</th>
<th>Term Limited</th>
<th>Not Term Limited</th>
<th>Term Limited</th>
<th>Not Term Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1,015,256</td>
<td>455,420</td>
<td>520,609</td>
<td>273,312</td>
<td>494,647</td>
<td>182,107</td>
<td>51.30%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>995,520</td>
<td>506,124</td>
<td>517,428</td>
<td>283,563</td>
<td>478,092</td>
<td>222,562</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>904,183</td>
<td>541,634</td>
<td>499,318</td>
<td>302,864</td>
<td>404,864</td>
<td>238,770</td>
<td>55.20%</td>
<td>55.90%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>856,648</td>
<td>547,798</td>
<td>459,486</td>
<td>318,804</td>
<td>397,162</td>
<td>228,995</td>
<td>53.60%</td>
<td>58.20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>834,120</td>
<td>499,333</td>
<td>445,369</td>
<td>280,550</td>
<td>388,751</td>
<td>218,783</td>
<td>53.40%</td>
<td>56.20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>816,370</td>
<td>454,428</td>
<td>433,106</td>
<td>254,199</td>
<td>383,264</td>
<td>200,229</td>
<td>53.10%</td>
<td>55.90%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>737,570</td>
<td>502,628</td>
<td>410,097</td>
<td>271,088</td>
<td>327,473</td>
<td>231,540</td>
<td>55.60%</td>
<td>53.90%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>834,190</td>
<td>446,817</td>
<td>460,617</td>
<td>238,502</td>
<td>373,572</td>
<td>208,316</td>
<td>55.20%</td>
<td>53.40%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>777,671</td>
<td>506,564</td>
<td>405,485</td>
<td>272,429</td>
<td>372,186</td>
<td>234,135</td>
<td>52.10%</td>
<td>53.80%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>721,795</td>
<td>561,719</td>
<td>416,636</td>
<td>304,121</td>
<td>305,159</td>
<td>257,598</td>
<td>57.70%</td>
<td>54.10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>734,598</td>
<td>564,686</td>
<td>401,839</td>
<td>295,650</td>
<td>332,759</td>
<td>269,036</td>
<td>54.70%</td>
<td>52.40%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>627,120</td>
<td>429,864</td>
<td>359,611</td>
<td>230,681</td>
<td>267,509</td>
<td>199,183</td>
<td>57.30%</td>
<td>53.70%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>573,183</td>
<td>411,792</td>
<td>335,422</td>
<td>226,697</td>
<td>237,761</td>
<td>185,095</td>
<td>58.50%</td>
<td>55.10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>568,620</td>
<td>408,702</td>
<td>324,737</td>
<td>229,960</td>
<td>243,883</td>
<td>178,742</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>56.30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>472,535</td>
<td>401,237</td>
<td>288,864</td>
<td>219,712</td>
<td>183,671</td>
<td>181,524</td>
<td>61.10%</td>
<td>54.80%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gross Revenue</th>
<th>Net Income</th>
<th>Net Income Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term Limited</td>
<td>Not Term Limited</td>
<td>Term Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>305,706</td>
<td>153,482</td>
<td>35,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>270,931</td>
<td>143,445</td>
<td>37,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>262,119</td>
<td>140,607</td>
<td>30,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>286,429</td>
<td>138,502</td>
<td>34,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>336,058</td>
<td>122,303</td>
<td>36,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>270,376</td>
<td>127,616</td>
<td>33,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>268,714</td>
<td>132,954</td>
<td>35,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>341,856</td>
<td>169,400</td>
<td>44,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>273,498</td>
<td>196,006</td>
<td>37,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>290,557</td>
<td>210,423</td>
<td>34,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>292,832</td>
<td>213,533</td>
<td>39,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>277,754</td>
<td>171,796</td>
<td>43,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>227,760</td>
<td>173,831</td>
<td>34,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>249,730</td>
<td>184,591</td>
<td>34,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>225,916</td>
<td>160,058</td>
<td>33,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Combined direct operating loan (DOL) and direct farm ownership (FO) loan obligations and number of applications received by fiscal year.

Source: USDA, FSA, Monthly Management Reports for September.
Figure 2. Guaranteed operating (OL) farm ownership (FO) loan obligations and number of applications received by fiscal year.

Source: USDA, FSA, Monthly Management Reports for September.
Figure 3. Share of direct operating (DOL), direct farm ownership (DFO), and guaranteed operating loan (GOL) borrowers in default by quarter, seasonally adjusted.

Source: USDA FSA R540 and Guaranteed Loan System (GLS) databases
Figure 4. Number of total direct and guaranteed borrowers (operating loan & real estate) as a share of total indebted farms, by USDA/ERS farm typology.

Share of Indebted Family-Size Farms Receiving Direct or Guaranteed Loans

- Small farms: $100,000 to $350,000 in sales or <$100,000 and primary occupation = farmer; excludes nonfamily entities and farms <$100,000 in sales with occupation not farmer.
- Medium-size farms: $350,000 to $1.0 million in sales.
- Large farms: Over $1.0 million in sales.

Source: USDA ARMS and FSA OBFN and GLS Databases
Figure 5. Ratio of the number of FSA direct and guaranteed (operating & real estate) borrowers to the number of indebted farms by FSA's county office committee area, December 31, 2017.

Figure 6. Number of direct operating loan (DOL) borrowers completing 6 years of eligibility, by calendar year.

Current Status of Borrowers Reaching DOL Term Limits by Year Limit Reached

Source: USDA FSA OBFN Database, December 31, 2019.
Figure 7. Distribution of all direct operating loan borrowers since 1993 by years of eligibility used.

Source: USDA FSA OBFN Database, November 1, 2019.

Figure 8. Location of term-limited direct operating borrowers, September 30, 2019.

Source: USDA FSA OBFN Database
Figure 9. Average years of direct operating loan eligibility used by USDA production region.

USDA Production Regions: Northeast: CN, DE, ME, MD, MA, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT; Lake States: MI, MN, WI; Corn Belt: IL, IN, IA, MO, OH; Northern Plains: KS, NE, ND, SD; Appalachian: KY, NC, TN, VA, WV; Southeast: AL, FL, GA, SC; Delta: AR, LA, MS; Southern Plains: OK, TX; Mountain: AZ, CO, ID, MT, NM, UT, WY; Pacific: CA, OR, WA

Source: USDA FSA OBFN Database, December 31, 2019
Figure 10. National distribution of total direct operating loan (DOL) borrowers, term-limited borrowers, and DOL borrowers using 5 years or more of eligibility, by USDA production region.

Source: FSA OBFN Database, December 2019
Figure 11. Term-limited direct operating loan (DOL) borrowers and borrowers using 5 or more years of eligibility as a share of total borrowers by farm production type.

Figure 12. Share of all direct operating loan (DOL) borrowers receiving debt write-offs, restructuring, or becoming deceased after receiving their latest DOL loan.