



The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

Papers downloaded from AgEcon Search may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.

No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.

The Development of a Weather-based Crop Disaster Program

Eric Belasco
Montana State University

2016 SCC-76 Conference
Pensacola, FL
March 19, 2016.

Motivation

- Recent efforts to provide disaster programs have been implemented through FSA (LFP, LIP, ELAP, NAP).
- Past efforts to provide area products have been unpopular.
- Crop disaster program may still provide safety net at a substantially lower cost.
 - Insurance to guard against only systemic drought risk.
 - Monitoring and administrative cost reduction.
 - Indemnity payments made earlier to reduce timing inefficiencies.

Outline

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Data
- 3 Yield Regressions
- 4 Disaster Program Efficiency
- 5 Concluding Remarks




Past Studies

- Weather and yields fitted to examine impacts of predicted climate change (Deschenes and Greenstone, 2007; Schlenker, Hanemann, and Fisher, 2006; Schlenker and Roberts, 2009).
- Fitted relationship to examine the impact from drought on yields (Westcott and Jewison, 2013; Yu and Babcock, 2010).
- Use weather outcomes to inform yield distributions (Cai et al., 2014; Rejesus, et al., 2015).
- Comparison of “free area insurance” versus individual insurance policies (Paulson and Babcock, 2009).

Weather and Yield Data

- Weather station data collected through NOAA's Daily Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) dataset.
 - Data are aggregated to the county level.
 - For counties with less than 3 stations, nearest stations are used.
- County-level detrended yields.
- Top 5 corn production states: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, and Nebraska.

Summary plots for weather and production variables for McClean County, Illinois, 1950-2014



Yield Regression

The following indices were computed for the county, agricultural district, and state:

$$IP_{Git} = GDD_{Git} * (-PRCP_{Git})$$

$$IS_{Git} = GDD_{Git} - PRCP_{Git}$$

where

$$GDD_{dit} = \max \left(\frac{T_{min} + T_{max}}{2} - 50, 0 \right)$$

$$GDD_{Git} = \max \left[\frac{\left(\sum_{d=1}^D GDD_{dit} \right) - \text{mean}(GDD_{Gi})}{\text{std}(GDD_{Gi})}, 0 \right]$$

$$PRCP_{Git} = \min \left[\frac{\left(\sum_{d=1}^D PRCP_{dit} \right) - \text{mean}(PRCP_{di})}{\text{std}(PRCP_{di})}, 0 \right]$$

for G =two-month time period, i =county, d =day, t =year.

Yield Regression


$$Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 IS_{Git} + \beta_2 IS_{Git}^2 + \beta_3 IP_{Git} + \beta_4 IP_{it} + \beta_5 IP_{it}^2 + \beta_6 IP_{At} + \beta_7 IP_{At}^2 + \beta_8 IP_{St} + \beta_9 IP_{St}^2 + \epsilon_{it}$$

- Y_{it} is the standardized yield deviations for county i in year t .
- Regressions run separately by state.
- $i = \text{county}$, $A = \text{Agricultural district}$, $S = \text{State}$.

Regression Results, by State, 1980-2015 (Dependent Variable: Standardized Yields)

	Illinois (n=79)			Indiana (n=66)			Iowa (n=99)				
	Parameter	Standard		Parameter	Standard		Parameter	Standard			
	Estimate	Error	T-stat		Estimate	Error	T-stat		Estimate	Error	T-stat
Intercept	0.392	0.034	11.557 ***	0.336	0.036	9.365 ***	0.011	0.030	0.385		
IS_AM	1.237	0.105	11.807 ***	1.633	0.114	14.314 ***	0.873	0.092	9.468 ***		
IS_AM^2	-0.838	0.089	-9.413 ***	-1.137	0.092	-12.344 ***	-0.380	0.068	-5.605 ***		
IS_JJ	-0.955	0.092	-10.347 ***	-0.633	0.054	-11.625 ***					
IS_JJ^2	0.324	0.070	4.601 ***				-0.104	0.046	-2.282 *		
IS_AS	-0.579	0.085	-6.792 ***	-0.527	0.056	-9.469 ***					
IS_AS^2	0.105	0.047	2.214 *				-0.337	0.030	-11.108 ***		
IP_AM	1.490	0.227	6.554 ***	1.888	0.251	7.520 ***	0.341	0.197	1.731 .		
IP_JJ	-1.326	0.184	-7.200 ***	-0.725	0.124	-5.842 ***	-1.349	0.216	-6.235 ***		
IP_AS				0.841	0.138	6.098 ***	0.836	0.172	4.870 ***		
IP	0.774	0.150	5.156 ***	0.356	0.096	3.713 ***	0.963	0.196	4.924 ***		
IP^2	-0.240	0.055	-4.349 ***				-0.267	0.064	-4.196 ***		
IPD	-2.097	0.286	-7.342 ***	-2.851	0.379	-7.528 ***	-3.028	0.436	-6.944 ***		
IPD^2	1.186	0.178	6.678 ***	2.515	0.336	7.488 ***	1.269	0.367	3.457 ***		
IPS	3.552	0.568	6.259 ***	5.603	0.685	8.180 ***	3.842	0.969	3.966 ***		
IPS^2	-9.574	0.923	-10.369 ***	-13.921	1.244	-11.194 ***	-3.602	1.186	-3.037 **		
Adjusted R^2	0.439			0.400			0.188				

Plot of actual detrended versus predicted yields for McClean County, Illinois, 1980-2015



Model Fit Regression Summary Statistics, by State, 1980-2015

State	n	Adjusted R^2
Illinois	79	0.439
Indiana	66	0.400
Iowa	99	0.188
Minnesota	58	0.167
Nebraska	77	0.170
All States	379	0.202

Departures from Previous Efforts to Model Yields

Yu and Babcock (2010)

- $Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \alpha_i + \sum_{r=1}^R \gamma_r (CRD_r \times T) + \beta_1 DI_{it} + \beta_2 DIT_{it} + \beta_3 DI_{it}^2 + \beta_4 DIDIT_{it} + e_{it}$
- DI uses Cooling Degree Days
- Index constructed at county-level (similar results with ag. district model)

Westcott and Jewison (2013)

- $Y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 T + \beta_2 PlantProg_{midMay} + \beta_3 TEMP_{July} + \beta_4 PRCP_{July} + \beta_5 PRCP_{July}^2 + \beta_6 PRCP_{June} I(< .10) + e_t$
- Aggregates weighted by harvested corn acres.
- Data are used from 1988 - 2012.

Departures from Previous Efforts to Model Yields (cont.)

Schlenker and Roberts (2009)

- $y_{it} = \int_{low}^{high} g(h)\phi_{it}(h)dh + z_{it}\delta + c_i + e_{it}$
- Includes weather between March to August for corn/soybeans.
- Finely scaled data from PRISM (2.5 mile squared).
- Weather data are aggregated to county-level to match yield data.

Deschenes and Greenstone (2007)

- $V_{it} = \alpha_i + \alpha_t + \beta_1 X_{it} + \sum_h \theta_h f_h(\bar{W}_{hi}) + \alpha_i + e_{it}$
- Farmland values (V) is the variable of interest.
- Use PRISM weather data and aggregate to county level.
- Soil quality data are included.
- h includes linear and quadratic terms for $PRCP$ and $TEMP$ in January, April, July, and October.

Farm-level Simulation Methodology

- Use a simulation model based on Cooper (2010) and Cooper and Delbecq (2014).
 - County based model generates representative producer yields and prices.
 - Each run consists of 10,000 draws of price and yield deviates.
 - Generate county yields and add variability to obtain representative producer yields based on crop insurance county base rates.

Farm-level Performance

- Each state utilizes its unique regression results with county covariates.
- Individual historic and actual yields are simulated using simulation procedure from Cooper (2010) and Cooper and Delbecq (2014).
- Indemnities are received when predicted county-level yields are below county-level trigger.
- Weather program is compared to Revenue Protection at 75% coverage level.

Preliminary Results

- Effective premium under disaster program is \$19.53, relative to \$34.64 for RP.
- Disaster program reduces revenue CV by 16.9%, relative to 29.7% for RP.

Future Endeavors

- Deeper analysis of farm-level simulation results.
- Out-of-sample examination of model fit excluding counties and years.
- Extend analysis to include top producing states of soybeans, wheat, and cotton.
- Include estimated administrative cost of programs into analysis.

Thank you for your time.

Questions?

Eric J. Belasco

Department of Agricultural Economics and Economics

Montana State University

eric.belasco@montana.edu

(406) 994-3706