

EXAMINING SHARE LEASE AGREEMENTS FOR COTTON OPERATIONS IN THE TEXAS PANHANDLE UNDER CHANGING MARKET CONDITIONS

DeDe Jones

Texas A&M University Extension

Amarillo, TX

Nicole Gueck

Texas A&M University Extension

College Park, TX

Abstract

Cotton producers on the Texas High Plains often incorporate rented land into their farming operations. Rental arrangements between landowners and producers can have a significant effect on farm risk and profitability. The most common type of cotton lease agreement on the Texas High Plains is a 25% or 33% crop share, with the landlord paying a portion of expenses, and receiving a corresponding portion of crop receipts and government payments. Typical expenses shared are fertilizer, chemicals, irrigation, and/or harvest. Technological changes over the past few years such as an increase in genetically engineered seed and a rise in conservation tillage adoption may necessitate new lease negotiations. However, rental arrangements often seem unresponsive to changes in production practices, and are generally slow to evolve.

Little data exist concerning the crop share percentage that achieves a fair and equitable rental arrangement for both the landlord and the producer. This analysis determines the optimal share arrangement for cotton operators and landlords in the Texas High Plains. It also decides whether this result is affected by changing market environments. The analysis examines the Net Returns above Variable Costs for the landlord and producer in five alternative share arrangements currently being used or considered in the region. Results are determined at the whole farm level assuming a mix of irrigated and dryland cotton crops. The analysis is first developed as a predominately irrigated farm and then as a predominately dryland farm. Results are analyzed in two significantly different market environments: 2005 (low prices and low input costs) and 2008 (higher prices and higher input costs).

Introduction

The Texas High Plains region (AgriLife Extension District 1) produces a sizeable amount of Texas cotton. Crop share lease agreements are a typical practice in this area. A crop share lease is characterized by the landowner and operator each sharing in the cost of growing the crop. In return, crop receipts are shared by both parties based on predetermined percentages. Most share leases are based upon what is customary for the area. Crop share agreements for cotton in the Texas High Plains typically involve a 33% or a 25% lease. The expenses shared differ greatly, and are based on negotiations between landlord and tenant. This study determines the profit maximizing share agreement for both landlords and tenants producing irrigated cotton in the Texas High Plains.

Materials and Methods

2009 Irrigated Cotton budgets for AgriLife Extension District 1 were entered into an Excel Spreadsheet. A sample 2009 budget for Roundup Ready Flex cotton can be seen in Table 1. Different lease agreements were simulated, assuming both a 33% lease and a 25% lease with various expenses shared. Simulated scenarios are shown in Table 2. The optimal lease was determined when the percentage of unshared expenses was equal to the percentage of total expenses, and when both parties received a similar return on investment.

Results and Discussion

The 33% lease agreement shows a distinct advantage for the landlord in most scenarios. The 25% lease agreement appears to be slightly more equitable. However, the landlord should share at least four production expenses in order for the return on investment to be comparable between both parties. The optimal scenario under a 33% lease (Scenario 5) and the optimal scenario under a 25% lease (Scenario 8) both involve sharing more expenses than is traditional for the Texas High Plains region. Renegotiation of existing leases may be necessary.

Table 1 Estimated Costs and Returns per Acre
 2009 Beltwide Cotton Conferences, San Antonio, Texas, January 5-8, 2009
Roundup Ready Flex Cotton, Sprinkler Irrigated
Projected for 2009

| Total Budget | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---------|----------|-----------------|
| | Quantity | Unit | Price | Amount |
| Income | | | | |
| Cotton Lint | 1100.00 | lbs | \$0.56 | \$616.00 |
| Cotton Seed | 0.83 | ton | \$235.00 | \$195.05 |
| Total Income | | | | \$811.05 |
| Direct Expenses | | | | |
| Seed | 0.22 | bags | \$280.00 | \$61.60 |
| Insecticide + appl | 1.00 | acre | \$13.44 | \$13.44 |
| Herbicide | 1.00 | acre | \$31.36 | \$31.36 |
| Harvest Aid/Growth Reg + appl | 0.75 | acre | \$28.00 | \$21.00 |
| Fertilizer | 125.80 | lbs | \$0.63 | \$79.25 |
| Custom | | | | |
| fert application | 1.00 | acre | \$5.00 | \$5.00 |
| crop consultant | 1.00 | acre | \$7.50 | \$7.50 |
| strip and module | 11.00 | cwt | \$9.50 | \$104.50 |
| ginning - cotton | 40.48 | cwt | \$2.75 | \$111.32 |
| Crop Insurance | 1.00 | acre | \$28.00 | \$28.00 |
| Boll Weevil Assessment | 1.00 | acre | \$12.00 | \$12.00 |
| Operator Labor | 1.04 | hours | \$10.60 | \$11.02 |
| Hand Labor | 0.19 | hours | \$10.60 | \$2.02 |
| Irrigation Labor | 0.77 | hours | \$10.60 | \$8.14 |
| Diesel Fuel - Tractors | 2.77 | gallons | \$2.53 | \$7.00 |
| Gasoline - Engines | 3.52 | gallons | \$2.46 | \$8.65 |
| Natural Gas - Pivot | 12.00 | mcf | \$7.75 | \$93.00 |
| Repair & Maintenance | | | | |
| Implements & Tractors | 1.00 | acre | \$14.55 | \$14.55 |
| Center Pivot | 12.00 | acre | \$2.03 | \$24.36 |
| Interest-operating capital | 1.00 | acre | \$15.77 | \$15.77 |
| Total Direct Expenses | | | | \$659.50 |
| Returns Above Direct Expenses | | | | \$151.55 |
| Fixed Expenses | | | | |
| Implements & Tractors | 1.00 | acre | \$22.37 | \$22.37 |
| Center Pivot | 1.00 | acre | \$33.60 | \$33.60 |
| Land | 1.00 | acre | \$60.00 | \$60.00 |
| Total Fixed Expenses | | | | \$115.97 |
| Total Expenses | | | | \$775.47 |
| Returns Above Total Expenses | | | | \$35.58 |
| % Return on Investment | | | | 4.59% |

Table 2. Simulated Lease Agreement Scenarios with Various Expenses Shared

| Scenario 1 | | Scenario 2 | | Scenario 3 | | Scenario 4 | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Landlord Share % | | | | | | | |
| 33% | | 33% | | 33% | | 33% | |
| Input Costs Shared | | | | | | | |
| Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation Seed | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation Seed | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation Harvest | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation Harvest | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Seed Harvest | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Seed Harvest | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Seed Harvest |

| Scenario 6 | | Scenario 7 | | Scenario 8 | | Scenario 9 | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Landlord Share % | | | | | | | |
| 25% | | 25% | | 25% | | 25% | |
| Input Costs Shared | | | | | | | |
| Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation Seed | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation Seed | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation Seed | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation Harvest | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation Harvest | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Seed Harvest | Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Seed Harvest |

| Scenario 5 |
|--|
| |
| 33% |
| |
| Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation Seed Harvest |

| Scenario 10 |
|--|
| |
| 25% |
| |
| Fertilizer Chemicals/Application Irrigation Seed Harvest |

