

7 Economic Considerations in Disaster Management

Derrell Peel and J C. Hobbs

Objective

- **Review strategies for weathering disasters and understand potential financial repercussions expected.**

Oklahoma's weather contributes significantly to agricultural production risk. Most Oklahoma beef producers are impacted by drought one or more times in a 10-year period. Typically, the lack of forage (scarcity coupled with the high price of hay in some years) forces producers to rethink production, marketing and management plans. The financial repercussions of one or more years of drought on an individual farm operation depend on its initial financial position, its historical performance and its stage in the business life cycle (start-up, growing or mature) as well as the financial demands placed on the farm by the family.

Farms with no debt are best positioned to weather financial adversity, as they can draw on savings or unused credit to pay for unexpected expenses and support the family through low-income years. The risk of continued operation during poor income years is that owner equity may be eroded unless the investment horizon is sufficiently long to recoup losses. Prolonged periods of low prices, high costs and/or low yields might be expected to prompt some older producers with no debt to choose retirement, perhaps liquidating some assets to generate retirement income.

Farms that have been profitable may be able to continue operations through several low return years. Lenders may be willing to provide credit to help with cash flow problems or the producers may have sufficient savings or off-farm income to survive. Debt levels may rise and loan repayment will place greater demands on future income; or savings will fall, consequently generating less investment income in the future. Until the operation returns to a profitable status, owner equity will decline.

The operations most vulnerable to high costs or low prices and low yields are the most highly leveraged farms, often with younger operators. For these producers, one or more years of low returns can jeopardize the operation as the need to generate cash for loan repayment and family living expenses is greater than for comparably sized operations with less debt. These producers may contemplate partial or

complete liquidation of the cow herd and, sometimes, the farm or ranch.

Financial stress dictates a reassessment of farm goals and priorities. Goals might include protecting owner equity, minimizing losses, staying in production agriculture regardless of the cost to owner equity or orderly liquidation of assets. With changing economic circumstances, the risk environment changes, as does the operator's ability to tolerate risk, both personally and financially. New constraints—for instance, limits on borrowing imposed by a lender—must be recognized. Goals that earlier seemed reasonable may no longer be feasible or may conflict with each other. Once goals and priorities have been reassessed, the operator is prepared to develop a plan for dealing with financial stress.



Prolonged drought leads to serious financial and production consequences.

Table 7.1. Repercussions of management strategies.

<i>Options for change</i>	<i>Cash flow</i>	<i>Profitability</i>	<i>Solvency</i>	<i>Tax</i>
Buy feed or hay.	Increases outflows.	Decreases profitability.	If result is negative net farm income, owner equity will decrease.	More deductible expenses, less income, less income tax. ^a
Rent additional pasture.	Increases outflows.	Decreases profitability.	If result is negative net farm income, owner equity will decrease.	More deductible expenses, less income, less income tax. ^a
Extra culling, partial cow herd liquidation.	Increases inflows.	Minimizes loss if reduced feed and interest expenses offset any loss on cull cows sold.	Minimize loss if reduced feed and interest expenses offset any loss on cull cows sold.	More taxable income. Some gains can be postponed using one of two elections.
Adjust family withdrawals.	Decreases outflows.	No impact on farm profitability.	Retain more farm earnings, increase owner equity. May be temporary effect if only postponing the withdrawals.	No impact on farm income tax. Could reduce itemized deductions.
Adjust farm withdrawals (e.g. postpone capital purchases).	Decreases outflows.	May increase profitability in short run, decrease in long run.	Retain more farm earnings, increase owner equity. May be temporary effect if only postponing the withdrawals.	Fewer deductible expenses, more income tax, but more after-tax profit.
Control costs.	Decreases outflows.	Increase profitability if no loss in production.	If profitable, increase owner equity.	Fewer deductible expenses, more income tax, but more after-tax profit.
Increase returns.	Increases inflows.	Increase profitability.	Increase owner equity.	More income, more income tax, more after-tax profit.
Change enterprise mix.	Depends on enterprise selected. Cash flow plan for alternative enterprise should be evaluated.	Depends on enterprise selected. Increase if enterprise is profitable and complementary.	Increase if enterprise is profitable and complementary.	More net income, more income tax, more after-tax profit.
Change asset ownership: Renting. Leasing. Sale/leaseback.	Increases inflow in short run if assets are sold. In long run, decreases outflows if cost of custom hire, renting or leasing is less than fixed ownership costs, including loan payments.	Increases profitability if cost of custom hire, renting or leasing is less than ownership and operating costs.	Retains earnings, owner equity increases if cost of custom hire, renting or leasing is less than ownership and operating costs.	Recapture of depreciation taxed at ordinary income tax rates. Capital gain is taxed at current capital gain tax rates. (Refer to IRS publication 225 for the current tax rate).
Supplemental income.	Increases inflows.	Possible decline in farm productivity leading to decreased profitability.	If off-farm income offsets farm losses and is invested in farm, increased solvency.	More taxable income, more tax, but greater after-tax cash flow.
Debt rescheduling.	Decreases outflows.	Less interest expense in short run will increase profit in short run, decrease profits in years to which repayment is shifted.	Likely to increase solvency in short run, may decrease it in future years if business does not increase profitability.	Less deductible interest expense, more income, more tax (if not operating at a loss). More after-tax profit in early years, less in later years.
Debt restructuring.	Decreases outflows, but tarnished reputation regarding repayment.	Increases profitability.	Improves potential to remain solvent.	More taxable income unless insolvent or bankrupt.
Investment by outsiders.	Increases inflows.	Increases profitability if invested wisely.	May increase solvency.	More recordkeeping. Repayment of principal not deductible. More tax when investors repaid.
Complete liquidation.	Increases inflows.	N/A	N/A	Recapture of depreciation taxed at ordinary income tax rates. Capital gain is taxed at current capital gain tax rates. (Refer to IRS publication 225 for the current tax rate).

^a Net operating loss = no tax paid. Farming net operating losses can be carried back two years or five years, as well as forward to 20 years.

Discussion of a variety of strategies to cope with disaster, using drought as an example, follows. The repercussions — cash flow, profitability, solvency and tax (applying the tax rules applicable for 2020) — of strategies are summarized in Table 7.1.

Early Drought Planning is Important

Producers have the most ability to minimize the adverse impacts of drought by making plans early when drought conditions begin to develop. Every drought is different in terms of timing, severity and specific conditions that affect how the drought will impact a cattle operation. Long before the drought reaches a point where drastic measures must be taken, a producer should develop contingency plans to guide decisions if the drought persists and worsens. This plan should include early evaluation of available pasture, hay and other feed resources; types of production adjustments that may be possible and, finally, a priority list of cattle classes that would guide the order in which cattle would be liquidated if necessary. Consideration of production and marketing alternatives that may be part of drought response become part of the broader financial evaluation of the short- and long-term impacts of drought on the operation.

Buying Feed or Hay

Producers' immediate reaction to a lack of pasture for cows is to begin buying feed or hay. Whether this decision makes sense economically depends on whether the expected forage shortage is predicted to be short in duration, as well as the financial position of the operator and the profitability of the enterprise. For the historically profitable producer, buying feed or hay for more days than usual will reduce the income earned per cow. These producers may be able to afford to feed the cow for several months before incurring a loss. Producers earning low returns in normal years will have a shorter time frame in which they can afford to buy additional feed or forage for the cow before eliminating potential profit. A producer who has not been profitable historically must decide how much equity they are willing to lose to feed the cows. If other enterprises are sufficiently profitable or enough off-farm income is earned, purchasing feed for cows may be feasible, though not necessarily profitable. However, buying feed or

hay for more months than usual will mean that equity will build up less quickly or, in the case of a loss, equity will erode more quickly. Whether it is feed or hay purchased, clearly the incentive is to minimize waste, for example by feeding hay in rings with solid sides at the bottom.

Rarely is drought accompanied by low nonforage feed prices, allowing producers to evaluate the possibility of using concentrates to feed cows. It is possible to reduce forage use by 70% to 80% by limit-feeding some grain to cows. Given the cost of purchasing and hauling hay, limit-feeding grain may reduce the cost of winter-feeding by 25% to 40%. In most cases, a limit-feeding program for cows will require some changes in cow management, may increase labor for feeding and may require additional feedbunks. These considerations will temper the feasibility of this alternative in some operations.

If the quantities of hay or feed purchased are such that losses are generated, owner equity is decreased. Still, this may be a reasonable strategy if the cows are highly valued seedstock that cannot easily be replaced when circumstances change or if the investment horizon is sufficiently long so losses can be recouped. Buying feed or hay is a flexible strategy because it may be bought on an as-needed basis and excess purchases can be stored for future use.

More feed and hay purchases mean more deductible expenses, hence less income tax to be paid at the end of the year. Of course, if a loss is expected, no income tax will be owed anyway. However, if a net operating loss is incurred, it may be carried back to generate a refund of taxes paid or carried forward to reduce future taxable income. Refer to the "Tax Considerations" section later in this chapter for more detailed information about net operating losses.

Renting Additional Pasture

For the profitable producer, renting additional pasture (if it is available) will reduce the income earned per cow and could result in losses to the enterprise. Again, it may be a reasonable strategy if the cows are highly valued seedstock that cannot easily be replaced when circumstances change or if the investment horizon is sufficiently long that the losses can be recouped. Renting additional pasture is a longer term, fixed commitment compared to buying feed or hay. Whether it is cost efficient depends on the lease price and the quantity and quality of forage relative to grain and hay. If several additional acres must be rented per cow, potential profits can quickly disappear. (See: OSU Extension fact sheets AGEC-208, *Evaluating Options for Change*; AGEC-237, *Farm and Ranch Stress Test*; AGEC-239, *IFMAPS: A Partner in Farm Financial Planning*; AGEC-788, *Tax Consequences of Weather Related Sale of Livestock*; and OSU Extension current report CR-216, *Oklahoma Pasture Rental Rates*.)

A producer who has not been profitable historically must decide how much equity they are willing to lose to pasture the cows if this is the strategy chosen. If other enterprises are sufficiently profitable or enough off-farm income is earned, losses may be feasible. However, with the additional pasture costs, as with additional hay or feed costs, equity will be eroded more quickly than in the past.



Controlling hay costs is the key to controlling cow-calf production costs.

The tax repercussions of renting additional pasture are the same as those with purchasing hay or grain. Additional expenses reduce current taxable income and after-tax income (or increase the net operating loss).

Calf or Cow Sales

Producers may consider any one of the following or a combination of several alternatives for selling calves or cows to reduce forage use and stretch limited forage supplies. Producers facing the most severe forage shortages may consider weaning calves early to reduce the nutritional needs. Selling lighter-than-usual calves in a down market can result in catastrophic reductions in revenue unless calf-retained ownership is possible. The viability of this strategy depends on available calf management and marketing alternatives.

Normal but earlier rates of culling or additional culling, either early or at the normal time, will further reduce forage demands on the ranch and reduce the need for purchased grain or hay. Cows should be evaluated first for physical and reproductive soundness and productivity. Beyond that, producers may consider additional culling of some older cows. When the cattle industry is in liquidation mode, extra culling is consistent with market signals. Strategically, by culling older cows during a drought when the industry is liquidating cows and replacing them with young cows in the coming months (depending on how fast forages



While not an ideal solution, selling cows during a drought may prevent losses.

Table 7.2. Cow-calf analysis: sell cows now or later.^a

Increase in cow value needed to justify waiting to sell	Sale date		
	Three months	One year	One year with land rented out
4% opportunity cost on funds			
No losses			
Losses = \$1/cow/day	107	426	576
Losses = \$2/cow/day	199	792	942
6% opportunity cost on funds			
No losses			
Losses = \$1/cow/day	115	456	606
Losses = \$2/cow/day	207	822	927

^a Assumes 100-cow herd and current net sales value of \$1,500 per cow on average.

recover), producers will be well positioned to maximize calf production and sales when prices are at cyclical peaks. A producer must not keep more cows than can be maintained in good body condition. Otherwise, poor calf crops and poor herd reproductive performance may later compound the cost of a drought.

The key to deciding how much to cull should be driven by an evaluation of remaining forage resources and the ability to purchase additional feed. Producers are averse to selling cows at very low prices or perhaps even high prices, if market signals suggest the need for herd growth. However, selling more cows than usual generates cash that can be used to feed the remainder, and if enough are sold, proceeds can be applied to operating debt, which will lower interest expenses. Partial herd liquidations provide time flexibility in rebuilding the forage base. For both the historically profitable producer and the cash-strapped one, culling extra cows will minimize the losses to equity incurred by operating at a loss.

If partial or complete liquidation of the cow herd is being considered, a question that arises is with respect to timing: When should the cows be sold? Table 7.2 summarizes the increase in cow value needed to justify postponing cow sales. The analysis is based on a 100-cow herd, net sales value of \$1,500 per cow. Additional net earnings from renting out land or not leasing land of \$15,000 per year are included for later sale dates. In this scenario, if a \$90 financial loss per cow is anticipated because of drought (\$1.00 per cow per day), the cow's value would have to increase \$167 or more to justify waiting three months to sell the cow with a 4% opportunity cost on sales proceeds. Potential tax repercussions are not included. It is important to remember that as long as the decision makes economic sense, the tax issues can be managed. A spreadsheet to evaluate whether to sell cows now or later is at beefextension.com.

Adjust Family or Farm Withdrawals

Producers should be sure that their expectations with respect to the farm's ability to generate income are realistic. Curbing family living expenses frees up cash to be used for cow maintenance. Developing a budget, living within it and minimizing nonessential spending may allow producers to pay down high interest loans and credit card debts, reducing

future cash obligations for loan repayment. Keeping good records is the first step in understanding family living expenses and identifying ways to control them. Inexpensive software can be a valuable tool in this process (see agecon.okstate.edu/quicken for an example).

Postponing major expenditures or purchases, such as a new vehicle or other similar items, may increase future demands on farm income. Reduction of family withdrawals could reduce itemized deductions if the reduction comes in items such as charitable contributions or medical expenses. However, most farmers' standard deduction is higher than their itemized deductions.

Likewise, delaying farm capital purchases, for example, new machinery, equipment or vehicles and postponing improvements are obvious strategies to preserve cash for cow maintenance. As with postponing family living expenses, the repercussion may be a greater demand on farm income in future years. Even though producers may be able to write off part of the costs of asset purchases, purchases should not be motivated by potential tax benefits. The cash required to make new vehicle payments will pay for substantial repairs on an owned vehicle. Costs of ownership for some items on a per acre or per head basis also may exceed the cost of renting or leasing it.

Control Costs

Periods of financial stress are a good time to do an internal audit of the operation. Are inputs being purchased as cheaply as possible, for instance, is feed bought in bulk rather than in sacks? Producers should look most closely at high cost items—often interest, machinery, rent, feed, fertilizer and labor. Some costs may be relatively fixed; others may be negotiable. Some costs may be reduced by substituting comparable but less expensive inputs, for instance, adjusting feed rations to utilize low-priced grains. Others might be reduced by using inputs more efficiently, such as feeding hay in rings to minimize waste. Controlling costs will reduce deductible expenses, but increase after-tax profits. Again, knowing your costs and having the ability to summarize them early is very helpful in assessing alternative strategies.

Increase Returns

Improving marketing and production practices can increase farm returns. Having a deliberate marketing plan, lowering costs while holding production level (or lowering costs more than any decrease in income) and utilizing all assets that have income potential are keys to maximizing profits. Perhaps range or timberland could be leased for hunting. Underutilized machinery and equipment could be leased out or used for custom farming.

If grain is relatively inexpensive, it may be beneficial to consider confined feeding of cull cows for 30 days to 60 days before marketing. Although this requires additional feed, the payoff may be quite high. With cheap grain, feeding some concentrate feed (with minimal hay) to cull cows may significantly enhance the value of those cull cows, especially if they are thin because of drought-related

pasture conditions. In addition to having more pounds to sell, feeding cull cows may increase their price because of increased dressing percentage or an increase in quality grade.

The feasibility of retained stocker programs is driven largely by the relationship between calf and feeder cattle prices. It is a characteristic of the cattle industry that when prices are high in absolute terms, calf prices tend to be relatively higher than feeder prices. Similarly, when prices decrease, calf prices tend to fall relatively more than feeder prices. Thus, at low prices, the value of stocker gain is higher than at high prices.

In the absence of forages typically used for grazing stocker cattle, producers can consider limit-feeding calves using concentrate diets in confinement or semi-confinement. Calves can be program fed to gain a target rate, probably about 2 pounds per day, depending on calf size and marketing intentions. This type of backgrounding program requires some changes in management. Producers should evaluate implications for production and health management of the cattle, additional labor requirements and the possible need for additional facilities and equipment for the confinement-feeding program. Moreover, retained ownership exposes the producer to additional market risk so price risk management should be an integral part of the retained ownership program.

Learning new marketing or management skills may require an investment in time and money. Again, more income may increase the amount of tax paid but also will increase after-tax cash and profits.

Change Enterprise Mix

A whole farm financial plan, complete with enterprise budgets, is a useful means of identifying farm profit centers. Knowing the relative contributions of different crops and livestock allows producers to redirect resources, for instance, labor or land, to profitable enterprises and away from less profitable enterprises. Producers may want to consider a new, promising enterprise if it fits with the rest of the farming operation and farm and family goals.

Reallocating resources can improve farm profitability, resulting in more taxable income. The impact on cash flow depends on changes in the levels of production of existing enterprises, whether capital assets are sold or purchased, and the added cash flow demands of the new enterprises.

Individual assistance in farm financial planning is available through the IFMAPS program (agecon.okstate.edu/ifmaps or 1-800-522-3755).

Change Asset Ownership

If loan payments are crippling cash flow, producers should evaluate the cost of leasing rather than owning assets, including land. While producers often feel they must own land to be farmers or ranchers, some enterprises will not generate the cash necessary to make principal and interest payments. Producers also should evaluate whether machinery and equipment is earning its keep, particularly on small operations. Older equipment that

is fully paid for and depreciated will not contribute to cash flow or profitability problems (unless repair costs and associated down time are very large). However, new machinery and equipment purchases can contribute to cash flow and profitability problems if the assets are held for a relatively short period of time and used on a small acreage. A financial lease is another alternative to owning machinery and equipment. Custom hiring also can be a reasonable alternative when equipment is expensive and used infrequently.

Selling underutilized assets generates cash, which may be needed to maintain cows in the short run. Remember, taxes must be paid on gains as they were with cull cows. Liquidation of capital assets and recapture of depreciation may increase income tax. This additional tax must be weighed against potential cost savings. In planning for the future, annual operating costs will be higher as cash will be needed to make lease payments or hire custom operators. New risks are introduced if assets are sold that make the producer dependent on the custom operator to complete tasks in a timely fashion.

Supplemental Income

Farm income can be supplemented through income from an off-farm job, such as custom work done for other farmers or a home-based business. Extra cash will help alleviate cash flow problems. Additional time away from the farm business could lead to a decline in productivity. Thus, the potential benefits of another job or business must be weighed against the costs.

Debt Rescheduling

Large interest and principal payments in a drought year can be devastating. If the farm has been historically profitable, lenders may be willing to reschedule the loan payments by changing the length of the loan. Rescheduling spreads the principal payments for a longer period of time, thus reducing the principal payments in the short term, but obligating the producer to repayment for more years. If financial conditions improve, the operator may be able to repay during the original time frame if no prepayment penalty is included in the renegotiated loan contract. If the inability to fully make principal and interest payments is caused by lack of profitability in addition to drought stress, then shortfalls will likely recur despite rescheduling.

Reducing interest expenses reduces deductible expenses, increases taxable income and increases after-tax profit in the short term. However, lengthening the repayment period means more total interest expenses during the long term and a reduction in profit in later years.

Debt Restructuring

A lender may be willing to write down either principal or interest if the repayment ability of the borrower is less than the scheduled payments or if the value of the loan collateral has declined to a level below the debt commitment. The lender's willingness and ability to negotiate will depend on both the borrower and lender's financial condition as

well as the regulations governing the lending institution. A permanent lowering of principal and interest obligations helps both cash flow and producer profitability (it does the opposite for the lending institution), but tarnishes the future business relationship. Forgiven debt is taxable income, unless the farmer is insolvent or in bankruptcy.

Investment from Outsiders

If the producer is willing to give up some share of ownership in the operation, an infusion of cash from outside can alleviate financial problems. An off-farm heir or another producer may be willing to provide cash to reduce indebtedness or pay bills in return for a share of the business; a lender might be willing to trade a debt obligation for an equity position in the operation. An equity infusion increases cash available and reduces financial risk by increasing the equity capital base. However, taking on additional partners means sharing future business returns or repaying in some other fashion, for instance, transferring ownership of specific assets. Repayment of principal to investors is not a deductible expense.

Complete Liquidation

If the financial situation of the farm or ranch is beyond repair, the best choice may be to end the business, salvaging any remaining equity. Recapture of depreciation is taxed at ordinary income tax rates. Capital gain (sale price greater than purchase price) is taxed at the current capital gain tax rates (refer to IRS Publication 225 for the current rates).

Tax Considerations

It is important to review current tax laws that might come into play as producers make operating changes to minimize the negative impacts following drought. Current tax law provides several benefits to agricultural producers. Consult a tax professional to determine which provisions apply to you. For 2020, the maximum capital gains rate for sales of capital assets is 20% for married filing joint taxpayers with more than \$248,300 of taxable income; 15% for married filing joint taxpayers with more than \$40,000 and not more than \$248,300 of taxable income; and zero for married filing joint taxpayers with not more than \$40,000 of taxable income. The Section 179 Expense election amount that can be expensed in the 2020 tax year is \$1,040,000. In addition, the threshold for phasing out the Section 179 expense election is \$2,590,000. Therefore, if a farmer placed in service more than \$2,590,000 of qualified property in 2020, the amount allowed under Section 179 is reduced dollar for dollar. For tax years 2020 through 2022, 100%. Bonus depreciation is allowed for property placed in service during the tax year. The allowed percentage declines to 80% for 2023, 60% for 2024, 40% for 2025, 20% for 2026 and sunset beginning January 1, 2027.

Farmers can use either of two provisions to defer gain recognized on the sale of livestock sold on account of drought, flood or other weather-related conditions. Both apply only to weather-related sales of livestock in excess of normal business practice. The first allows farmers to defer

reporting the gain from the sale of any livestock for one year. The other provision allows farmers to postpone recognizing gain from dairy, draft or breeding livestock if like animals are purchased, to replace those sold, within two years of the end of the tax year of the drought sale. Poultry and livestock for sport purposes are not eligible for postponement of gain. Gain is postponed only for sales in excess of normal sales and is subject to other requirements (see IRS Publication 225). The new replacement livestock must be used for the same purpose as the livestock sold. Therefore, dairy cows must be replaced with dairy cows and beef cows replaced with beef cows. If the farmer normally culls or sells one-fifth of the herd each year, only the sales in excess of one-fifth qualify for postponement of gain. The farmer's tax basis in the replacement livestock equals the basis in the livestock sold, plus any amount invested in the replacement livestock that exceeds the proceeds from the sale. To qualify for the income deferral, there must be a Federal Disaster Declaration that caused the animals to be sold early. To postpone recognition of gain and allow the purchase of replacement animals, a producer must prove the weather-related condition that caused the sale of the excess animals.

Income averaging for farmers continues to be allowed. Farmers can elect to remove all or part of current farm income from total taxable income and spread it over the three preceding years. Tax would be based on the marginal rate effective in the last three years. The potential reduction in tax applies only to income tax and would not reduce self-employment tax in the current or prior years. Attempting to keep taxable income level through the years can maximize long-term after-tax profit. Because of the progressive nature of tax rates (higher taxable income is taxed at higher marginal tax rates), level taxable income reduces taxes paid.

The Net Operating Loss (NOL) carry-back period for farmers is maintained at two years and the NOL carry-forward rules allow the loss to be carried forward until it is reduced to zero subject to an annual limit of 80% of taxable income in a carryforward year. Farmers can waive the carryback of a farm loss and carry the loss forward to future years if the tax benefit is greater.

A larger-than-normal liquidation of capital assets may cause taxable income to increase if depreciation is recaptured. Decisions to liquidate or sell major assets may hinge on determination of the after-tax proceeds of such sales. Taxable proceeds equal the asset's sale price less its adjusted tax basis. Tax basis depends on how the asset was acquired: purchase, gift or inheritance. The donor's tax basis transfers to the donee for gifts, and the tax basis of inherited assets is generally the fair market value of the assets at the decedent's time of death. The tax basis of purchased capital assets is the purchase price (even if the money is borrowed). The adjusted basis is the purchase price less depreciation taken. Depreciation is a method of allocating the fixed cost of the purchase of a capital asset through its useful life. Depreciation for tax purposes is limited by the IRS specification of an asset's fixed useful life and fixed depreciation methods. One-half year of depreciation is allowed both in the year of purchase and the year of sale. While most farm assets are assigned a fixed life of five years

seven years, 10 years or 15 years, a special election (Section 179 Expense election) allows a current expense deduction of up to \$1.04 million of the cost of a purchased capital asset. In addition, Bonus depreciation allows for the write off of 100% of the purchase price as well. If assets, such as purchased breeding livestock, are sold for more than the adjusted basis, the gain due to depreciation recapture is taxed at ordinary income tax rates. Proceeds from sales of depreciable assets or land are eligible for capital gain tax rates only to the extent these assets are sold for more than the original purchase price. Thus, the net proceeds are a function of an asset's purchase and sale price, adjusted tax basis and depreciation taken, length of time the asset was owned, and the producer's (or business') tax bracket.

For example, a breeding beef cow is purchased in 2020 for \$2,500, the IRS fixed life is five years and the method for calculation purposes is straight line. Depreciation for 2020 is \$250 as only one-half year of depreciation is allowed in the year of purchase. Depreciation for 2021 is \$500. If the cow is sold in 2022, her adjusted tax basis is \$1,750 (\$2,500 cost less \$750 of depreciation taken in 2020 and 2021). If the cow is sold for \$1,750, there is no gain or loss and no tax is owed, since the sale price equals the adjusted basis. If the cow is sold for \$2,000, a gain of \$250 (\$2,000 minus \$1,750) is recognized due to recapture of depreciation taken, and this gain is taxed at the farmer's ordinary income tax rate. If the cow is sold for \$3,000, the gain due to the \$750 of depreciation taken is taxed at ordinary income tax rates and the \$500 gain in excess of original purchase price (\$2,500 minus \$2,000) is treated as capital gain and is taxed at the appropriate capital gain tax rate.

When farmers turn over assets to creditors in lieu of repaying debt, voluntarily or not, a tax liability can result. To continue the above example, assume the original loan to purchase the \$2,500 cow has been refinanced and a total of \$1,900 is owed. The cow is turned over to the lender and sold for \$1,800, and the remainder of the debt is forgiven. The farmer is treated as if they sold the cow for \$1,800 and owes tax on \$50 of depreciation recapture which is taxed at ordinary income rates. In the view of the IRS, an \$1,800 cow has been traded for a \$100 reduction in debt, which is treated as taxable income to the farmer. Thus, \$150 of taxable income (\$50 of recaptured depreciation plus \$100 debt forgiveness) is generated though not a penny is received. In special cases, where the farmer is not solvent or is in bankruptcy, the debt forgiveness may not be taxable; however, there is no provision to escape the tax owed on the \$50 of depreciation recapture.

Conclusion

Almost annually, some Oklahoma producers experience financial stress due to drought. Adjustments may be needed in the farm plan or family spending to deal with this stress. Strategies to compensate for loss of forage may include purchasing feed or hay, renting additional pasture or selling livestock. To alleviate cash flow problems, producers may consider adjusting family or farm withdrawals, postponing

capital purchases, controlling costs, increasing returns, changing asset ownership or control agreements and supplementing income through custom work, an off-farm job or another business enterprise. Debt rescheduling, debt restructuring and investment by outsiders also are possibilities but require willing partners. If profitability has been an ongoing problem, changes in enterprise mix as well as production and financial management may be needed. The appropriate strategy or combination of strategies for farms with financial stress depends on both family and business factors. While the business financial position and historical performance are very important, the willingness and ability to change, the tolerance for risk both personally and financially, market conditions, potential tax liabilities and farm and family goals must also be considered.

References

- Doye, D. (2013) Evaluating Options for Change. Extension Fact Sheet AGEC-208, Cooperative Extension Service, Oklahoma State University. extension.okstate.edu
- Doye, D. (2013) Farm and Ranch Stress Test. Extension Fact Sheet AGEC-237, Cooperative Extension Service, Oklahoma State University. extension.okstate.edu
- Doye, D., (2015) IFMAPS, A Partner in Financial Planning. Extension Fact Sheet AGEC-239, Cooperative Extension Service, Oklahoma State University. extension.okstate.edu
- Doye, D. and R. Sahs (2015) Extension Current Report CR-216 Oklahoma Pasture Rental Rates. extension.okstate.edu
- Hobbs, J C., Tax Consequences of Weather Related Sale of Livestock. Extension Fact Sheet AGEC-788, Cooperative Extension Service, Oklahoma State University: extension.okstate.edu
- IRS Publication 225, Farmer's Tax Guide irs.gov/publications/p225/index.html