Appendix C.
Statistical Methodology

MAIL LIST MODEL

Classification analysis was performed to predict the probability that an addressee on the 1992 mail list operated a farm, and thereby separated the preliminary mail list into probable farm and probable nonfarm classes. The analysis was used to reduce the preliminary census mail list of 3.78 million records to a final mail list size of 3.55 million records. All 3.55 million addresses on the final mail list received a census of agriculture report form.

Records from the 1987 final census mail list were used to build a 1992 prediction model for the 1992 analysis. Classification and Regression Trees (CART) software analyzed characteristics of known 1987 farm and nonfarm operations to determine which were most useful in predicting farm and nonfarm classes. Record characteristics such as the source of the mail list record, number of source lists on which the record appeared, expected value of agricultural sales, and geographic location were used to separate mail list records into model groups. (Sources included the previous agriculture census mail list, the Internal Revenue Service administrative records, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and special commodity lists.) The proportion of 1987 census farm records in each model group was calculated to provide an estimate of the probability that an addressee in the group operated a farm.

After the model groups were defined, each address record on the 1992 preliminary mail list was assigned to a model group by matching record characteristics to model group characteristics. Records belonging to the groups with the highest farm probability were those more likely to be farms according to the classification tree methodology. The model, followed by analyst reviews, was used to remove 229,700 records from the preliminary mail list (those in model groups with the lowest farm probability), and thereby designated the 3.55 million records with the highest farm probability to receive the census report form. This procedure was used to obtain a more complete census enumeration of farm operations without excessive respondent burden and data collection cost.

CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

Each of the 3.55 million name and address records on the census mail list was designated to receive one of three different types of census report forms. The three forms were the nonsample form, the screener form, and the sample form. Sections 1 through 20 and 27 through 32 of the sample form are identical to sections on the nonsample form. The sample form, sections 21 through 26, contains additional questions on usage of fertilizers and chemicals, farm production expenditures, value of machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income. The screener form is identical to the nonsample form with questions added in section 1 to allow quick identification of nonfarm addresses. These three different forms were used to reduce the response burden of the census, while providing reliable information on a large number of data items.

The sample form was mailed to all mail list records in Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island, and to a sample of records in other States selected from the final mail list. Addresses were selected into the sample with certainty (1) if they were expected to have large total value of agricultural products sold or large acreage, (2) if they were multiunit operations (i.e., separate farms in more than one location), (3) if they had other special characteristics, or (4) if they were in a county with less than 100 farms in 1987. Other addresses in counties containing 100 to 199 farms in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 2, and other addresses in counties containing 200 farms or more in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 6. This differential sampling scheme was used to provide reliable data for the sample sections of the report form for all counties. When a nonsample large farm was identified during processing, a supplemental form that contained the additional sample data inquiries was mailed.

To determine which mail list records would receive the screener form, all mail list records not designated for the sample were sorted by model group farm probability as specified by the mail list model. The 412,000 mail list records in the model groups with the lowest probability of being farms and with an expected total value of agricultural product sales less than $25,000 were designated to receive the screener report form. The remaining mail list records received the nonsample report form.

CENSUS ESTIMATION

The 1992 Census of Agriculture used two types of statistical estimation procedures. These estimation procedures accounted for nonresponse to the data collection and for the sample data collection. These procedures are necessary because some farm operators never respond to

the census despite numerous attempts to contact them, and the estimates for the sample data are based on a sample of farm operators rather than a full enumeration.

Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

A statistical estimation procedure was used to account for nonrespondent farm operators to the census. We excluded large and unique farm operations that received intensive telephone followup during census processing, assuming complete response from them. A stratified systematic sample of remaining census nonrespondents were contacted by enumerators using a computer-assisted telephone interview system. Five sample strata were defined based on expected value of sales, previous census status, and whether the record was identified by the mail list model to receive the screener report form. The nonresponse survey telephone interview was designed to provide sufficient information to determine the farm status of each record.

In situations where the nonresponse survey case could not be contacted, the contact person refused to cooperate, or when no phone number could be obtained, a screener report form was sent by certified mail.

Estimates of the proportion of census nonrespondents that operated farms were made for each stratum in the State using survey results and applied to the total number of census nonrespondents in that stratum. The number of census nonrespondents that operated farms for each county by stratum was then derived. This estimation procedure is based on the assumption that the distribution of farms in a stratum by county is the same for census nonrespondents as for census respondents.

Certain census respondent farms which exhibited ''rare'' commodities were designated as ''ineligible'' to represent census nonrespondent farms and were excluded from the nonresponse weighting operation. The procedure explained below was performed with only the eligible respondent cases: Within each stratum in a county, a noninteger nonresponse weight was calculated and assigned to each eligible respondent farm record. The noninteger nonresponse weight is the ratio of the sum of the estimated number of nonrespondent farms from the nonresponse survey and the number of eligible census respondent farms to the number of eligible census respondent farms. Stratum controls were established to ensure that this weight was never greater than 2.0. The noninteger nonresponse weight was used in the calculation of the final weight for the sample items. The noninteger nonresponse weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight of either 1 or 2 for each record for tabulating the complete count items for publication.

Table A quantifies the effect of the nonresponse estimation procedure on selected census data items. The percentages in these tables are the percents of the census values contributed by nonresponse estimation. These indicate the potential for bias in published figures resulting from nonresponse to the census. The estimates provided in these tables do not reflect the effect of item nonresponse to individual census data items. The effect of item nonresponse is discussed in the Census Nonsampling Error section.

Table A. **Percent of State Totals Contributed by Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation: 1992**

Item		Percent of total
Farms	number	15.8
Land in farms	acres	.5
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1]	$1,000	2.0
Market value of agricultural products sold	$1,000	1.5
Harvested cropland	acres	2.6
Corn for grain or seed	acres	–
Wheat for grain	acres	3.2
Livestock and poultry inventory:		
Cattle and calves	number	1.9
Hogs and pigs	number	11.7
Hens and pullets of laying age	number	37.6

[1]Data are based on a sample of farms.

Sample Estimation

Sample data estimates the population totals that would have resulted from a complete census for the items in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. The estimates were obtained from a ratio estimation procedure that resulted in the assignment of a weight to each respondent record containing sample items. For any given county, a sample item total was estimated by multiplying the data items for each farm in the county by the corresponding sample weight and summing over all sample records in the county.

Each respondent sample farm was assigned a sample weight for use in producing estimates for all sample items. For example, if the weight given to a sample farm had the value 6, all sample data items reported by that farm would be multiplied by 6. The weight assigned to a sample certainty farm was 1.

Other than certainty farms, within a county, the ratio estimation procedure for farms was performed in three steps using three variables. The first variable contained eight 1992 total value of agricultural production (TVP) groups. Both the second and third variables, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code and farm acreage, contained two groups. The three sets of groups were as follows:

TVP	SIC	Acres
$1 to $999	01 All crops	1 to 69
$1,000 to $2,499	02 All livestock	70 or more
$2,500 to $4,999		
$5,000 to $9,999		
$10,000 to $24,999		
$25,000 to $49,999		
$50,000 to $99,999		
$100,000 or more		

The first step in the estimation procedure was to classify the sample records into 32 mutually exclusive initial post strata formed by the three sets of groups. The total and sample farm counts were expanded to account for nonresponse. Each cell containing sample farm records was assigned an initial sample weight equal to the ratio of the total farm count to the sample farm count. This weight was approximately equal to the inverse of the probability of selecting a farm for the census sample.

The second step in the estimation procedure was to combine, if necessary, the 32 initial post strata to increase the reliability of the ratio estimation procedure. Any stratum that contained less than 10 sample farms after nonresponse adjustment or had a weight greater than two times the mail sample rate was collapsed with another stratum. The mail sample rate was either 2 or 6, depending on whether the county had a 1 in 2 or 1 in 6 sample selection rate. The collapsing occurred within the initial 32 post strata according to a specified collapsing pattern. After the collapsing process was completed, new total farm counts and sample farm counts were computed from each of the final post strata and were used to calculate final sample weights.

The final step consisted of assigning the noninteger final post stratum weight to the sample farm records in each post stratum. The weight is the ratio of total farm count to sample farm count in each final post stratum. The noninteger sample weight, the product of the noninteger final post stratum weight and the nonresponse weight, was randomly rounded to an integer weight for tabulation. If, for example, the final weight for the farms in a particular post stratum was 7.2, then 0.2 or one-fifth of the sample farms in this post stratum were randomly assigned a weight of 8 and the remaining four-fifths received a weight of 7.

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

The sample for the 1992 Census of Agriculture is only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. Sample refers to the sample for both the nonresponse survey and the selection of farms to receive the sample report forms. Estimates derived from all the possible samples would differ from each other only by random variation.

The standard error or sampling error of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples and thus is a measure of the precision with which an estimate from a particular sample approximates the average result of all possible samples. The percent relative standard error of an estimate is defined as 100 times the standard error of the estimate divided by the value of the estimate.

If all possible samples were selected, each of the samples were surveyed under essentially the same conditions, and an estimate and its standard error were calculated from each sample, then:

1. Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.65 standard errors below the estimate to 1.65 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.

2. Approximately 95 percent of the intervals from 1.96 standard errors below the estimate to 1.96 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.

The following example illustrates the computations necessary for producing a confidence interval for an estimate. Assume that the estimate of number of farms for a State is 94,382 and the relative standard error of the estimate is .1 percent (0.001). Multiplying 94,382 by 0.001 yields 94, the standard error; therefore, a 90-percent confidence interval is 94,227 to 94,537 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.65 x 94). If corresponding confidence intervals were constructed for all possible samples of the same size and design, approximately 90 percent of these intervals would contain the figure obtained from a complete enumeration. Similarly, a 95-percent confidence interval is 94,198 to 94,566 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.96 x 94).

Census items were classified as either complete count or sample count items. Complete count items were asked of all farm operators. Examples of complete count items were land in farms, harvested cropland, livestock inventory and sales, crop acreage, quantities harvested and crop sales, land use, irrigation, government loans and payments, conservation acreage, type of organization, and operator characteristics.

Sample count items were asked only of a sample of farm operators. These items appeared only in sections 21 through 26 of the sample report form. Sample count items were included under the following section headings: commercial fertilizers, chemicals, production expenses, farm machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income.

Variability, measured as percent relative standard error, in the estimates of complete count items is due only to the nonresponse survey estimation procedure. Variability in the estimates of sample count items is due to both the nonresponse survey estimation procedure and the census sample selection and estimation procedure. Thus, variability in the sample count item estimates tends to be larger than the variability in the complete count item estimates.

Table B provides the generalized reliability estimates of the estimated number of farms in a county reporting complete count and sample count items. The top half of the table shows the percent relative standard error for estimated number of farms in a county reporting a complete count item and the bottom half a sample count item. These are derived from regression equations. Separate regression equations were used for complete count items and sample count items. Each regression equation was fit with the estimated number of farms in a county reporting an item as the independent variable and the relative variance of that estimate as the dependent variable for all counties in the State. For sample count items, only data

from counties sampled at a rate of 1 in 6 are used in the estimation of the regression equation.

Table B. **Reliability Estimates for Number of Farms in a County Reporting a Complete Count Item or Sample Count Item: 1992**

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	5.4
50	2.9
75	1.1
100	.9
150	.8
200	.7
300	.5
500	.4
750	.3
1,000	(X)
1,500	(X)
2,000	(X)
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	28.3
50	22.0
75	19.5
100	18.1
150	16.6
200	15.8
300	15.0
500	14.2
750	13.9
1,000	(X)
1,500	(X)
2,000	(X)

To illustrate the use of this table, assume that the estimate of the number of farms reporting hogs and pigs for a particular county, as given in county table 15, is 89. Since hogs and pigs is a complete count data item, refer to the first part of table B and use the estimated percent relative standard error of the estimate from the row with farm count equal to or just less than the estimated number of farms, 89. For this example, the percent relative standard error of the estimate comes from the row for 75 farms reporting. For sample count items, follow the same procedure using the second part of table B. For counties with fewer than 100 farms in the 1987 Census of Agriculture, variability in sample count item estimates comes only from nonresponse survey estimation procedures; thus, the estimated relative standard error for a sample count item in these counties may be obtained using the first part of table B.

Table C presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms, and table D presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms with sales of $10,000 or more.

Table E presents the percent standard error for percent change in State totals from 1987 to 1992. The general purpose of the percent change estimate is to provide a relative measure of the difference in a characteristic between censuses. The relative change for a given characteristic is defined as the ratio of the difference of the 1992 and the 1987 estimate for that characteristic to the 1987 estimate. This ratio is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent change. The percent standard error of a percent change estimate, then, is the standard error of the ratio multiplied by 100.

Table F presents the percent relative standard error for State and county totals for selected data items. The percent relative standard error of the estimate for the same item differs among counties in the State. Reasons for this are differences among counties in (1) the total number of farms, (2) the number of large farms included with certainty, (3) the size classifications of the farms sampled, (4) the amount of nonresponse, (5) the general agricultural characteristics, and (6) the specific characteristic being measured.

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts are affected jointly by sampling errors, described in the previous section, and nonsampling errors. Extensive efforts were made to compile a complete and accurate mail list for the census, to design an understandable report form with instructions, and to minimize processing errors through the use of quality control measures on specific operations. Nonsampling errors arise from incompleteness of the census mail list, duplication in the mail list, incorrect data reporting, errors in editing of reported data, and errors in imputation for missing data. These specific nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Evaluation studies will be conducted to measure the extent of certain nonsampling errors such as coverage error and classification error.

Census Coverage

The main objective of the census of agriculture is to obtain a complete and accurate enumeration of U.S. farms with accurate data on all aspects of the agricultural operation. However, the high cost and availability of resources for enumeration place restrictions on feasible data collection methodologies. The past six agriculture censuses have been conducted by mail enumeration with telephone contact for selected nonrespondents. The completeness of such an enumeration thus depends to a large extent on the coverage of farm operations by the census mail list.

The past five censuses of agriculture have included approximately 91 percent of farms in the United States and approximately 96 percent of agriculture production. Complete enumeration of agricultural operations satisfying the farm definition of $1,000 or more in agricultural sales is complicated by fluctuations in agricultural operations qualifying for enumeration, the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the multiplicity of names used

by an operation, the number of operations in which an operator participates, the accuracy of data reporting, and other factors. A new mail list is compiled for each census because no current single list of agricultural operations is comprehensive.

An evaluation of census coverage has been conducted for each census of agriculture since 1945. The evaluation provides estimates of the completeness of census farm count and major census data items. In addition, the evaluation helps to identify problems in the census enumeration and provide information that can form the basis for improvements. The results of the 1992 Coverage Evaluation program will be published in volume 2, Subject Series (Part 2): Coverage Evaluation.

The evaluation of coverage for the 1992 census was designed to measure four components of error in the census mail list and in farm classification. Mail list error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms not on the census mail list (undercount) and a measurement of farms enumerated more than once in the census (overcount). Classification error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms classified as nonfarms in the census (undercount) and of nonfarms classified as farms in the census (overcount). Classification error arises from reporting and processing errors. Mail list undercount dominates all coverage errors. Net coverage error is defined as the difference between undercounted and overcounted farms. Measurements of these errors, as well as a description of the complete coverage program, will be available in the Coverage Evaluation report.

Mail List Coverage

A major problem with mail enumeration for the census of agriculture is the difficulty encountered in compiling a complete mail list. The percentage of farms included on the census mail list varies considerably by State. Several reasons have contributed to farm operator names not being included on the census mail list—the operation may have been started after the mail list was developed, the operation may be so small as not to appear in any of the agriculture-related source lists used in compiling the census list, or the operation may have been falsely classified as a nonfarm prior to mailout. A large proportion of the farms not included on the mail list are small in both acres and sales of agricultural products.

The 1992 Census of Agriculture Coverage Evaluation used the area segment sample of the 1992 June Agricultural Survey (JAS) of the National Agricultural Statistical Service (NASS) to estimate farms not on the census mail list. The Census Bureau contracted with NASS to augment the JAS data collection. The survey data collected by NASS will be protected under the confidentiality of title 13, U.S. Code. These JAS survey records were matched to the census mail list. Records that did not match were mailed a census of agriculture report form to estimate mail list coverage. Estimates of farms not on the census mail list are computed using a capture-recapture dual frame estimator which will be described in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Table G provides coverage evaluation estimates for one component of coverage error associated with the census of agriculture; that is, the error due to farms not on the census mail list. Also provided are estimates of selected characteristics of farms not on the mail list, estimates of characteristics of farms not on the mail list as a percentage of total farms in the State, and the percent relative standard error associated with each estimate. The estimate of total farms in the State is based on census farm count plus the estimated number of farms not on the census mail list. This estimate of total farms in the State was not adjusted for the components of error associated with classification and list duplication error. Estimates of these errors will be made at the regional, rather than the State level, and will be provided in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Respondent and Enumerator Error

Incorrect or incomplete responses to the mailed census report form or to the questions posed by a telephone enumerator introduce error into the census data. Such incorrect information can lead, in some cases, to incorrect classification of farms. This type of reporting error is measured by the Classification Error Survey discussed later in this section. To reduce all types of reporting error, detailed instructions for completing the report form were provided to each addressee. Questions were phrased as clearly as possible based on tests of the census report form and each respondent's answers were checked for completeness and consistency.

Item Nonresponse

As information flows from data collection to tabulation, various types of item nonresponses are identified on the report forms. Nonresponse to particular questions on the report form that logically should be present may create a type of nonsampling error in both complete count and sample count data. When information from reporting farms is used to edit or impute for item nonresponse, the data may be biased due to characteristics of the nonreporting respondents differing from those reporting the item. Any attempt to correct the data items may not completely reflect this difference either at the element level (individual farm operation) or on the average.

Processing Error

All phases of processing for each report form are sources for the introduction of nonsampling error. The processing of the report forms includes clerical screening for farm activity, computerized check-in of report forms and follow-up of nonrespondents, keying and transmittal of

completed report forms, computerized editing of inconsistent and missing data, review and correction of individual records referred from the computer edit, review and correction of tabulated data, and electronic data processing. These operations undergo a number of quality control checks to ensure as accurate an application as possible, yet some errors are not detected and corrected.

Classification Error

An evaluation study of classification errors was conducted in the 1992 Census of Agriculture as part of the census coverage evaluation program. A sample of census mail list respondents was selected, and these addresses were reenumerated to determine whether they were a farm or nonfarm. A farm status determination was made based on the evaluation report form and compared with the census farm status which was based on the data reported on the report form. Differences in status were reconciled.

In past censuses, the proportion of farms undercounted due to classification errors was higher for farms with small values of sales. For the 1987 census, the classification error rate was higher for (1) farms with small values of sales, (2) farms with a small number of acres, (3) full-owner farms than part-owner or tenant farms, (4) operators with principal occupation other than farming, and (5) males than females. Results from the 1992 Classification Error Survey will be published in the Coverage Evaluation report.

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

The Census of Agriculture Complex Edit and Imputation System performs the following functions:

- Ensuring reasonable relationships between/among data items, values for various sizes of farms, and combinations of commodities.
- Ensuring necessary consistencies are present. There are more than 70 distinct consistency requirements.
- Ensuring geographic, legal, and physical constraints are met.

The system must perform these and similar functions for 900 data keycodes for sample records and 850 data keycodes for nonsample records.

For the 1992 Census of Agriculture, as in previous censuses, all reported data were keyed and then edited by computer. The edits were used to determine whether the reports met the minimum criteria to be counted as farms in the census. The complex edit and imputation system provided the basis for deciding to accept, impute (supply), delete, or alter the reported value for each data record item.

Whenever possible, edit imputations, deletions, and changes were based on component or related data on the respondent's report form. For some items, such as operator characteristics, data from the previous census were used when available. Values for other missing or unacceptable reported data items were calculated based on reported quantities and known price parameters.

When these and similar methods were not available and values had to be supplied, the imputation process used information reported for another farm operation in a geographically adjacent area with characteristics similar to those of the farm operation with incomplete data. For example, a farm operation that reported acres of corn harvested, but did not report quantity of corn harvested, was assigned the same bushels of corn per acre harvested as that of the last nearby farm with similar characteristics that reported acceptable yields during that particular execution of the computer edit. The imputation for missing items in each section of the report form was conducted separately; thus, assigned values for one operation could come from more than one respondent.

Prior to the imputation operation, a set of default values and relationships were assigned to the possible imputation variables. The relationships and values varied depending on the item being imputed. For example, different default values were assigned for several standard industrial classification and total value of sales categories when imputing hired farm labor expenses. These values and item relationships for the possible imputation variables were stored in the computer in a series of matrices.

Each execution of the computer edit consisted of records from only one State. The computer records were sorted by reported State and county. For a given execution of the edit, the stored entries in the various matrices were retained in memory only until a succeeding record having acceptable characteristics for some sections of the report form was processed by the computer. Then the acceptable responses of the succeeding operation replaced those previously stored. When a record processed through the edit had unreported or unacceptable data, the record was assigned the last acceptable ratio or response from an operation with a similar set of characteristics. Once each execution of the computer edit for a State was completed, the possible imputation variables were reset to the default values and relationships for subsequent executions.

After the initial computer edit, keyed reports not meeting the census farm definition were reviewed to ensure that the data were keyed correctly. Edit referrals were generated for about 25 percent of the reports included as farms; they were reviewed for keying accuracy to ensure that the computer edit actions were correct. If the results of the computer edit were not acceptable, corrections were made and the record was reedited.

Table C. **Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992**

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS		
Farms ---- number	2 890	1.2
Land in farms ---- acres	9 263 684	(L)
Average size of farm ---- acres	3 205	1.2
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) ---- farms	2 890	1.2
$1,000	288 139	.1
Average per farm ---- dollars	99 702	1.2
Farms by value of sales:		
Less than $1,000 (see text) ---- farms	506	2.4
$1,000	96	3.5
$1,000 to $2,499 ---- farms	356	2.8
$1,000	595	2.8
$2,500 to $4,999 ---- farms	305	2.5
$1,000	1 094	2.5
$5,000 to $9,999 ---- farms	352	2.1
$1,000	2 472	2.1
$10,000 to $19,999 ---- farms	289	2.0
$1,000	4 053	2.0
$20,000 to $24,999 ---- farms	86	3.4
$1,000	1 909	3.4
$25,000 to $39,999 ---- farms	171	2.4
$1,000	5 275	2.5
$40,000 to $49,999 ---- farms	79	2.9
$1,000	3 541	2.9
$50,000 to $99,999 ---- farms	264	1.3
$1,000	18 595	1.2
$100,000 to $249,999 ---- farms	260	–
$1,000	41 201	–
$250,000 to $499,999 ---- farms	106	–
$1,000	37 451	–
$500,000 or more ---- farms	116	–
$1,000	171 858	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ---- farms	1 059	1.2
$1,000	79 957	.3
Grains ---- farms	84	2.2
$1,000	2 969	.7
Corn for grain ---- farms	–	–
$1,000	–	–
Wheat ---- farms	57	2.3
$1,000	2 356	.8
Soybeans ---- farms	–	–
$1,000	–	–
Sorghum for grain ---- farms	–	–
$1,000	–	–
Barley ---- farms	24	3.8
$1,000	559	.3
Oats ---- farms	11	9.6
$1,000	50	13.3
Other grains ---- farms	4	11.2
$1,000	4	4.1
Cotton and cottonseed ---- farms	–	–
$1,000	–	–
Tobacco ---- farms	–	–
$1,000	–	–
Hay, silage, and field seeds ---- farms	977	1.2
$1,000	51 724	.4
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ---- farms	28	5.1
$1,000	3 369	.5
Fruits, nuts, and berries ---- farms	25	6.1
$1,000	188	1.4
Nursery and greenhouse crops ---- farms	44	4.7
$1,000	8 054	.7
Other crops ---- farms	12	5.0
$1,000	13 653	(L)
Livestock, poultry, and their products ---- farms	2 028	1.1
$1,000	208 182	.1
Poultry and poultry products ---- farms	102	3.8
$1,000	354	8.4
Dairy products ---- farms	71	2.2
$1,000	43 942	.1
Cattle and calves ---- farms	1 538	1.0
$1,000	151 631	.1
Hogs and pigs ---- farms	102	3.3
$1,000	2 193	1.1
Sheep, lambs, and wool ---- farms	335	2.0
$1,000	6 449	.2
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ---- farms	542	2.0
$1,000	3 613	1.3
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ---- farms	184	2.9
$1,000	450	2.8

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses ---- farms	2 890	1.0
$1,000	247 113	.5
Average per farm ---- dollars	85 506	1.1
Livestock and poultry purchased ---- farms	1 040	4.6
$1,000	33 238	.7
Feed for livestock and poultry ---- farms	1 832	2.7
$1,000	49 970	.6
Commercially mixed formula feeds ---- farms	680	5.7
$1,000	6 794	.9
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ---- farms	607	5.5
$1,000	3 191	1.5
Commercial fertilizer ---- farms	770	5.2
$1,000	6 930	1.7
Agricultural chemicals ---- farms	644	5.3
$1,000	3 949	1.0
Petroleum products ---- farms	2 678	1.3
$1,000	14 154	1.0
Electricity ---- farms	2 064	2.3
$1,000	11 539	1.2
Hired farm labor ---- farms	1 143	3.5
$1,000	31 652	.8
Contract labor ---- farms	521	6.3
$1,000	3 672	4.1
Repair and maintenance ---- farms	2 363	1.9
$1,000	16 378	1.2
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ---- farms	791	4.8
$1,000	5 031	4.3
Interest expense ---- farms	1 113	4.0
$1,000	18 621	1.7
Secured by real estate ---- farms	858	4.8
$1,000	13 753	2.2
Not secured by real estate ---- farms	511	5.3
$1,000	4 868	1.1
Cash rent ---- farms	491	7.2
$1,000	5 842	4.2
Property taxes ---- farms	2 674	1.4
$1,000	7 475	2.1
All other farm production expenses ---- farms	2 664	1.5
$1,000	35 471	.8
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) [1]		
All farms ---- number	2 891	1.0
$1,000	40 728	2.4
Average per farm ---- dollars	14 088	2.6
Farms with net gains [2] ---- number	1 182	3.3
$1,000	56 878	1.2
Average net gain ---- dollars	48 120	3.5
Farms with net losses ---- number	1 709	2.5
$1,000	16 150	3.6
Average net loss ---- dollars	9 450	4.4
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments ---- farms	434	1.1
$1,000	5 074	.4
Other farm-related income [1] ---- farms	501	7.2
$1,000	4 531	6.7
Customwork and other agricultural services ---- farms	198	12.3
$1,000	2 174	10.4
Gross cash rent or share payments ---- farms	260	10.2
$1,000	1 846	9.9
Forest products and Christmas trees ---- farms	1	–
$1,000	(D)	(D)
Other farm-related income sources ---- farms	92	19.5
$1,000	(D)	(D)
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total ---- farms	8	10.6
$1,000	45	11.0

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 1
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table C. **Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992** —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE		
Total cropland — farms	2 255	1.1
acres	840 364	.3
Harvested cropland — farms	1 753	1.0
acres	408 568	.3
Farms by acres harvested:		
1 to 9 acres — farms	221	3.0
acres	1 046	3.2
10 to 19 acres — farms	185	2.8
acres	2 433	2.9
20 to 29 acres — farms	147	3.1
acres	3 364	3.1
30 to 49 acres — farms	207	2.4
acres	7 632	2.4
50 to 99 acres — farms	261	1.9
acres	17 911	1.9
100 to 199 acres — farms	243	1.6
acres	31 850	1.6
200 to 499 acres — farms	292	.8
acres	89 219	.7
500 to 999 acres — farms	122	.4
acres	80 493	.3
1,000 acres or more — farms	75	–
acres	174 620	–
Cropland:		
Pasture or grazing only — farms	1 128	1.2
acres	264 041	.5
Other cropland — farms	898	1.1
acres	167 755	.5
Total woodland — farms	84	3.1
acres	18 275	1.5
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured — farms	1 024	1.1
acres	8 105 815	(L)
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. — farms	1 731	1.3
acres	299 230	.3
Irrigated land — farms	2 151	1.0
acres	556 172	.3
Acres irrigated:		
1 to 9 acres — farms	326	2.7
acres	1 462	2.8
10 to 49 acres — farms	649	1.7
acres	15 861	1.8
50 to 99 acres — farms	292	2.0
acres	19 714	2.0
100 to 199 acres — farms	283	1.7
acres	37 177	1.7
200 to 499 acres — farms	324	.9
acres	98 471	.8
500 to 999 acres — farms	148	.7
acres	97 106	.6
1,000 acres or more — farms	129	–
acres	286 381	–
Harvested cropland irrigated — farms	1 753	1.0
acres	408 568	.3
Pasture and other land irrigated — farms	845	1.3
acres	147 604	.4
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:		
Diverted under annual commodity programs — farms	30	3.1
acres	637	.9
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs — farms	34	4.0
acres	6 855	2.7
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS [1]		
Estimated market value of land and buildings — farms	2 891	1.0
$1,000	2 347 322	1.2
Average per farm — dollars	811 941	1.6
Average per acre — dollars	252	1.3
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT [1]		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment — farms	2 869	1.0
$1,000	172 887	1.6
Average per farm — dollars	60 260	1.9
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS [1]		
Commercial fertilizer — farms	757	5.2
acres on which used	161 188	2.8

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
TENURE OF OPERATOR		
All operators — farms	2 890	1.2
acres	9 263 684	(L)
Full owners — farms	2 110	1.3
acres	3 293 002	.1
Part owners — farms	509	1.3
acres	5 586 779	(L)
Tenants — farms	271	1.9
acres	383 903	.2
OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
Land owned — farms	2 630	1.2
acres	5 517 799	.1
Owned land in farms — farms	2 619	1.2
acres	5 002 493	.1
Land rented or leased from others — farms	784	1.2
acres	4 278 635	(L)
landlords	1 241	1.3
Rented or leased land in farms — farms	780	1.2
acres	4 261 191	(L)
Land rented or leased to others — farms	213	2.2
acres	532 750	.5
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Operators by place of residence:		
On farm operated	2 204	1.2
Not on farm operated	493	1.7
Not reported	193	2.1
Operators by principal occupation:		
Farming	1 656	.9
Other	1 234	1.8
Operators by days worked off farm:		
Any	1 518	1.6
200 days or more	910	1.9
Operators by sex:		
Male — farms	2 540	1.1
acres	8 990 170	(L)
Female — farms	350	2.1
acres	273 514	.3
Average age of operator — years	54.2	1.6
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Individual or family (sole proprietorship) — farms	2 269	1.3
acres	3 238 951	.1
Partnership — farms	323	1.6
acres	1 261 389	.1
Corporation:		
Family held — farms	193	1.1
acres	2 973 442	(L)
More than 10 stockholders — farms	14	–
10 or less stockholders — farms	179	1.2
Other than family held — farms	28	4.3
acres	366 033	.1
More than 10 stockholders — farms	9	8.5
10 or less stockholders — farms	19	4.9
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. — farms	77	2.8
acres	1 423 869	(L)
HIRED FARM LABOR		
Hired workers by days worked:		
150 days or more — farms	676	3.8
workers	2 312	1.2
Less than 150 days — farms	937	4.2
workers	3 446	3.0
INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Farm-related injuries:		
Operator and family members — farms	39	4.0
number	48	3.8
Hired workers — farms	93	1.1
number	256	.4
Farm-related deaths:		
Operator and family members — farms	–	–
number	–	–
Hired workers — farms	1	–
number	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 2
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table C. **Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992** —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE			
1 to 9 acres	farms	445	2.4
	acres	1 540	2.7
10 to 49 acres	farms	680	2.0
	acres	16 642	2.1
50 to 69 acres	farms	115	3.4
	acres	6 748	3.4
70 to 99 acres	farms	180	2.7
	acres	14 733	2.7
100 to 139 acres	farms	135	3.0
	acres	15 306	3.0
140 to 179 acres	farms	169	2.6
	acres	26 592	2.6
180 to 219 acres	farms	86	3.5
	acres	17 071	3.5
220 to 259 acres	farms	61	3.7
	acres	14 466	3.7
260 to 499 acres	farms	284	1.7
	acres	100 465	1.7
500 to 999 acres	farms	238	1.5
	acres	161 072	1.5
1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms	175	–
	acres	238 335	–
2,000 acres or more	farms	322	–
	acres	8 650 714	–
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION			
Cash grains (011)	farms	10	10.6
	acres	6 023	6.0
Field crops, except cash grains (013)	farms	695	1.3
	acres	481 088	.4
Vegetables and melons (016)	farms	16	7.2
	acres	2 579	3.3
Fruits and tree nuts (017)	farms	39	5.6
	acres	1 957	5.9
Horticultural specialties (018)	farms	36	5.1
	acres	8 014	.9
General farms, primarily crop (019)	farms	63	4.3
	acres	18 887	1.0
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021)	farms	1 451	1.1
	acres	8 467 110	(L)
Dairy farms (024)	farms	57	1.9
	acres	17 389	.4
Poultry and eggs (025)	farms	35	6.4
	acres	5 297	8.0
Animal specialties (027)	farms	444	2.4
	acres	29 858	2.8
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029)	farms	44	5.0
	acres	225 482	.3
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	1 652	1.0
	number	523 305	.2
Beef cows	farms	1 330	1.0
	number	265 690	.2
Milk cows	farms	208	1.6
	number	21 769	.1
Cattle and calves sold	farms	1 538	1.0
	number	317 233	.2
	$1,000	151 631	.1
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	154	2.8
	number	7 636	3.3
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	102	3.3
	number	23 746	1.4
	$1,000	2 193	1.1
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms	360	2.0
	number	122 188	.2
Sheep and lambs sold	farms	308	2.0
	number	115 336	.2
Horses and ponies inventory	farms	1 459	1.3
	number	13 347	1.1
Horses and ponies sold	farms	430	2.0
	number	1 711	1.8
POULTRY			
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory	farms	250	2.5
	number	14 826	14.4
Hens and pullets of laying age	farms	246	2.5
	number	14 289	14.9
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	7	12.6
	number	200	13.0
CROPS HARVESTED			
Wheat for grain	farms	57	2.3
	acres	9 968	1.0
	bushels	719 200	.8
Barley for grain	farms	36	3.0
	acres	4 613	.5
	bushels	423 411	.2
Irish potatoes	farms	12	5.0
	acres	8 111	(L)
	cwt	3 035 277	(L)
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	1 638	1.0
	acres	380 959	.3
	tons, dry	1 082 233	.3
Alfalfa hay	farms	1 333	1.0
	acres	227 977	.4
	tons, dry	860 428	.4
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	28	5.1
	acres	1 145	1.7
Land in orchards	farms	68	4.2
	acres	476	1.8

[1]Data are based on a sample of farms.
[2]Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than $1,000.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 3
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of $10,000 or More: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS		
Farms — number	1 371	.8
Land in farms — acres	8 337 556	(L)
Average size of farm — acres	6 081	.8
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) — farms	1 371	.8
$1,000	283 882	.1
Average per farm — dollars	207 062	.8
Farms by value of sales:		
$10,000 to $19,999 — farms	289	2.0
$1,000	4 053	2.0
$20,000 to $24,999 — farms	86	3.4
$1,000	1 909	3.4
$25,000 to $39,999 — farms	171	2.4
$1,000	5 275	2.5
$40,000 to $49,999 — farms	79	2.9
$1,000	3 541	2.9
$50,000 to $99,999 — farms	264	1.3
$1,000	18 595	1.2
$100,000 to $249,999 — farms	260	–
$1,000	41 201	–
$250,000 to $499,999 — farms	106	–
$1,000	37 451	–
$500,000 or more — farms	116	–
$1,000	171 858	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops — farms	657	1.0
$1,000	78 639	.3
Grains — farms	68	1.7
$1,000	2 929	.6
Corn for grain — farms	–	–
$1,000	–	–
Wheat — farms	51	1.8
$1,000	2 335	.8
Soybeans — farms	–	–
$1,000	–	–
Sorghum for grain — farms	–	–
$1,000	–	–
Barley — farms	19	2.5
$1,000	(D)	(D)
Oats — farms	6	10.1
$1,000	(D)	(D)
Other grains — farms	2	–
$1,000	(D)	(D)
Cotton and cottonseed — farms	–	–
$1,000	–	–
Tobacco — farms	–	–
$1,000	–	–
Hay, silage, and field seeds — farms	621	1.0
$1,000	50 541	.4
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons — farms	19	4.5
$1,000	3 348	.5
Fruits, nuts, and berries — farms	6	4.2
$1,000	166	(L)
Nursery and greenhouse crops — farms	29	5.1
$1,000	8 002	.7
Other crops — farms	12	5.0
$1,000	13 653	(L)
Livestock, poultry, and their products — farms	1 083	.8
$1,000	205 243	.1
Poultry and poultry products — farms	17	6.7
$1,000	286	10.3
Dairy products — farms	64	1.6
$1,000	43 932	.1
Cattle and calves — farms	1 017	.8
$1,000	149 808	.1
Hogs and pigs — farms	43	3.9
$1,000	2 118	1.1
Sheep, lambs, and wool — farms	136	1.8
$1,000	6 269	.1
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) — farms	196	1.8
$1,000	2 830	1.4
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) — farms	46	3.9
$1,000	295	3.3

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses — farms	1 335	2.2
$1,000	236 243	.5
Average per farm — dollars	176 961	2.3
Livestock and poultry purchased — farms	606	4.4
$1,000	32 415	.6
Feed for livestock and poultry — farms	911	3.6
$1,000	48 509	.7
Commercially mixed formula feeds — farms	322	7.6
$1,000	6 548	.7
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees — farms	423	4.4
$1,000	3 110	1.4
Commercial fertilizer — farms	533	5.5
$1,000	6 785	1.7
Agricultural chemicals — farms	432	4.7
$1,000	3 866	.9
Petroleum products — farms	1 310	2.3
$1,000	12 947	1.0
Electricity — farms	1 092	2.7
$1,000	11 075	1.3
Hired farm labor — farms	811	3.3
$1,000	31 345	.8
Contract labor — farms	324	5.9
$1,000	3 555	4.2
Repair and maintenance — farms	1 257	2.5
$1,000	14 642	.9
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment — farms	457	4.3
$1,000	4 736	4.4
Interest expense — farms	695	3.4
$1,000	17 507	1.6
Secured by real estate — farms	529	4.2
$1,000	12 795	2.2
Not secured by real estate — farms	380	3.8
$1,000	4 713	.9
Cash rent — farms	323	7.6
$1,000	5 482	1.7
Property taxes — farms	1 251	2.5
$1,000	5 896	2.2
All other farm production expenses — farms	1 335	2.2
$1,000	34 373	.8
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) [1]		
All farms — number	1 335	2.2
$1,000	46 971	1.7
Average per farm — dollars	35 184	2.8
Farms with net gains [2] — number	878	3.4
$1,000	56 307	1.2
Average net gain — dollars	64 131	3.6
Farms with net losses — number	457	5.8
$1,000	9 337	2.7
Average net loss — dollars	20 430	6.4
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments — farms	345	1.0
$1,000	4 806	.3
Other farm-related income [1] — farms	292	7.4
$1,000	3 707	7.5
Customwork and other agricultural services — farms	127	11.0
$1,000	1 928	11.0
Gross cash rent or share payments — farms	138	12.1
$1,000	1 445	11.7
Forest products and Christmas trees — farms	1	–
$1,000	(D)	(D)
Other farm-related income sources — farms	52	18.8
$1,000	(D)	(D)
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total — farms	5	9.3
$1,000	34	5.5

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 4
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of $10,000 or More: 1992—Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			
Total cropland	farms	1 228	.8
	acres	773 390	.3
Harvested cropland	farms	1 092	.8
	acres	391 133	.2
Cropland:			
Pasture or grazing only	farms	598	1.0
	acres	232 143	.4
Total woodland	farms	42	2.2
	acres	16 442	1.5
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms	610	.7
	acres	7 268 449	(L)
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms	743	1.0
	acres	279 275	.2
Irrigated land	farms	1 194	.8
	acres	517 683	.2
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms	1 092	.8
	acres	391 133	.2
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms	403	1.2
	acres	126 550	.4
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:			
Diverted under annual commodity programs	farms	26	2.5
	acres	619	.7
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms	29	3.5
	acres	6 327	2.0
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS [1]			
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms	1 335	2.2
	$1,000	1 901 500	1.1
Average per farm	dollars	1 424 345	2.5
Average per acre	dollars	227	1.2
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT [1]			
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms	1 333	2.2
	$1,000	143 427	1.3
Average per farm	dollars	107 597	2.6
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]			
Commercial fertilizer	farms	530	5.5
	acres on which used	156 710	2.8
TENURE OF OPERATOR			
All operators	farms	1 371	.8
	acres	8 337 556	(L)
Full owners	farms	882	.9
	acres	2 976 966	.1
Part owners	farms	334	1.0
	acres	5 000 653	(L)
Tenants	farms	155	1.7
	acres	359 937	.2
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			
Land owned	farms	1 223	.8
	acres	5 138 095	.1
Owned land in farms	farms	1 216	.8
	acres	4 675 360	(L)
Land rented or leased from others	farms	492	.9
	acres	3 678 742	(L)
	landlords	850	1.3
Rented or leased land in farms	farms	489	.9
	acres	3 662 196	(L)
Land rented or leased to others	farms	96	2.4
	acres	479 281	.4
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
Operators by place of residence:			
On farm operated		1 013	.8
Not on farm operated		248	1.7
Not reported		110	1.7
Operators by principal occupation:			
Farming		1 091	.7
Other		280	1.9
Operators by days worked off farm:			
Any		501	1.3
200 days or more		224	2.1
Operators by sex:			
Male		1 271	.8
Female		100	2.3
Average age of operator	years	54.9	1.1

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION			
Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms	920	1.0
	acres	3 021 580	.1
Partnership	farms	233	1.5
	acres	1 231 428	.1
Corporation:			
Family held	farms	164	.9
	acres	2 492 201	(L)
More than 10 stockholders	farms	13	–
10 or less stockholders	farms	151	1.0
Other than family held	farms	16	4.2
	acres	345 848	.1
More than 10 stockholders	farms	7	6.5
10 or less stockholders	farms	9	5.6
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms	38	2.8
	acres	1 246 499	(L)
HIRED FARM LABOR			
Hired workers by days worked:			
150 days or more	farms	594	2.8
	workers	2 224	.8
Less than 150 days	farms	619	4.1
	workers	2 865	2.4
INJURIES AND DEATHS			
Farm-related injuries:			
Operator and family members	farms	27	3.9
	number	36	3.9
Hired workers	farms	90	1.0
	number	253	.4
Farm-related deaths:			
Operator and family members	farms	–	–
	number	–	–
Hired workers	farms	1	–
	number	(D)	(D)
FARMS BY SIZE			
1 to 9 acres		40	4.8
10 to 49 acres		89	3.6
50 to 69 acres		39	5.1
70 to 99 acres		69	3.7
100 to 139 acres		70	3.8
140 to 179 acres		95	2.9
180 to 219 acres		57	3.9
220 to 259 acres		42	4.0
260 to 499 acres		208	1.7
500 to 999 acres		197	1.4
1,000 to 1,999 acres		163	–
2,000 acres or more		302	–
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION			
Cash grains (011)		5	10.0
Field crops, except cash grains (013)		398	1.3
Vegetables and melons (016)		9	6.8
Fruits and tree nuts (017)		3	–
Horticultural specialties (018)		23	5.7
General farms, primarily crop (019)		6	6.9
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021)		829	.8
Dairy farms (024)		54	1.3
Poultry and eggs (025)		3	16.4
Animal specialties (027)		32	5.8
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029)		9	9.4
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	1 011	.8
	number	508 302	.2
Beef cows	farms	873	.8
	number	258 208	.2
Milk cows	farms	156	1.3
	number	21 672	.1
Cattle and calves sold	farms	1 017	.8
	number	312 537	.2
	$1,000	149 808	.1
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	59	3.2
	number	6 600	3.6
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	43	3.9
	number	22 885	1.4
	$1,000	2 118	1.1
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms	144	1.7
	number	117 855	.1
Sheep and lambs sold	farms	131	1.7
	number	112 467	.1
Horses and ponies inventory	farms	614	1.0
	number	7 839	.9
Horses and ponies sold	farms	175	1.9
	number	1 186	2.1

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 5
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table D. **Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of $10,000 or More: 1992**—Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY			
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory	farms	67	2.7
	number	10 710	19.8
Hens and pullets of laying age	farms	67	2.7
	number	10 487	20.3
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	1	35.0
	number	(D)	(D)
CROPS HARVESTED			
Wheat for grain	farms	51	1.8
	acres	9 787	1.0
	bushels	710 880	.8
Barley for grain	farms	31	2.5
	acres	4 509	.4
	bushels	417 643	.2
Irish potatoes	farms	12	5.0
	acres	8 111	(L)
	cwt	3 035 277	(L)
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	1 055	.8
	acres	364 149	.3
	tons, dry	1 044 722	.3
Alfalfa hay	farms	848	.8
	acres	216 016	.4
	tons, dry	830 430	.4
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	19	4.5
	acres	1 128	1.7
Land in orchards	farms	14	6.8
	acres	184	.8

[1]Data are based on a sample of farms.
[2]Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than $1,000.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 6
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table E. **Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1987 to 1992**

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item		All farms		Farms with sales of $10,000 or more	
		Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate
Farms	number	–4.5	1.4	–7.2	1.0
Land in farms	acres	–7.3	.3	–10.2	.3
Average size of farm	acres	–2.9	1.4	–3.3	1.1
Estimated market value of land and buildings [1]:					
Average per farm	dollars	8.3	2.4	6.9	2.9
Average per acre	dollars	11.0	1.9	7.6	1.6
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment [1]:					
Average per farm	dollars	14.8	3.2	16.9	3.8
Farms by size:					
1 to 9 acres		–22.5	2.4	–38.5	3.9
10 to 49 acres		1.3	2.6	–19.8	3.9
50 to 179 acres		4.4	2.4	–3.9	2.6
180 to 499 acres		–4.9	2.1	–12.0	2.0
500 to 999 acres		–10.9	1.8	–7.5	1.8
1,000 to 1,999 acres		13.6	–	14.8	–
2,000 acres or more		–3.6	.2	–3.5	.1
Total cropland	farms	–2.7	1.3	–6.6	1.0
	acres	4.7	.5	4.6	.4
Harvested cropland	farms	–7.0	1.2	–10.6	.9
	acres	–22.3	.3	–23.0	.3
Irrigated land	farms	–3.2	1.3	–8.7	1.0
	acres	–28.6	.2	–28.5	.2
Market value of agricultural products sold	$1,000	15.0	.2	15.4	.2
Average per farm	dollars	20.5	1.7	24.3	1.3
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	$1,000	5.6	.4	5.7	.4
Livestock, poultry, and their products	$1,000	19.1	.2	19.6	.2
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than $2,500		.1	1.9	(X)	(X)
$2,500 to $4,999		–13.6	2.9	(X)	(X)
$5,000 to $9,999		4.8	3.1	(X)	(X)
$10,000 to $24,999		–14.2	2.1	–14.2	2.1
$25,000 to $49,999		–10.1	2.4	–10.1	2.4
$50,000 to $99,999		2.3	2.0	2.3	2.0
$100,000 to $249,999		–11.0	–	–11.0	–
$250,000 to $499,999		–13.8	–	–13.8	–
$500,000 or more		30.3	–	30.3	–
Total farm production expenses [1]	$1,000	18.3	1.4	19.2	2.7
Average per farm	dollars	24.0	2.0	31.0	3.2
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) [1]	farms	–4.6	1.3	–9.1	2.1
	$1,000	–5.2	3.5	–4.5	2.3
Average per farm	dollars	–.7	3.9	5.0	3.5
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming		–1.1	1.2	–8.4	.9
Other		–8.7	2.0	–2.1	2.6
Operators by days worked off farm:					
Any		–8.2	4.8	–10.4	4.6
200 days or more		–12.7	4.7	–14.2	4.7
Livestock and poultry:					
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	–9.2	1.2	–7.7	1.0
	number	–9.1	.2	–8.9	.2
Beef cows	farms	–7.5	1.2	–5.0	1.1
	number	–12.9	.2	–12.7	.2
Milk cows	farms	–24.1	1.7	–22.0	1.4
	number	23.4	.3	23.8	.3
Cattle and calves sold	farms	–11.3	1.1	–7.5	1.0
	number	4.5	.2	4.9	.2
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	3.4	4.1	–10.6	4.3
	number	–53.7	1.8	–57.9	1.8
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	–20.3	3.5	–21.8	4.2
	number	–10.1	1.6	–10.1	1.6
Sheep and lambs inventory	farms	–8.4	2.3	–17.2	2.0
	number	22.5	.5	25.5	.4
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory	farms	–37.0	1.9	–51.4	1.6
	number	–18.7	14.1	–9.3	22.1
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	–30.0	12.1	–	–
	number	–61.9	8.4	–	(D)
Selected crops harvested:					
Wheat for grain	farms	–50.0	1.5	–51.4	1.3
	acres	–33.8	.9	–34.0	.9
	bushels	–34.4	.8	–34.5	.8
Barley for grain	farms	–68.7	1.2	–68.4	1.0
	acres	–49.6	.5	–49.2	.5
	bushels	–41.6	.5	–41.1	.5
Irish potatoes	farms	20.0	8.5	33.3	6.7
	acres	8.1	(L)	(D)	(D)
	cwt	18.5	(L)	(D)	(D)
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	–7.0	1.2	–10.4	.9
	acres	–20.5	.3	–21.2	.3
	tons, dry	–11.6	.4	–11.9	.4

[1]Data are based on a sample of farms.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 7
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table F. **Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992**

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm [1]		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment [1]	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**2 890**	**1.2**	**9 263 684**	**–**	**3 205**	**1.2**	**811 941**	**1.6**	**172 887**	**1.6**
Churchill	529	1.3	268 043	.3	507	1.4	467 576	5.9	27 321	6.3
Clark	223	1.9	82 100	.8	368	2.1	743 374	2.9	5 731	5.8
Douglas	172	1.0	79 635	.6	463	1.2	735 785	8.8	9 705	7.2
Elko	360	1.1	3 149 788	(L)	8 749	1.1	1 265 544	3.0	21 801	3.8
Esmeralda	23	–	1 949 420	–	84 757	–	5 689 668	–	3 678	–
Eureka	79	.5	235 826	.2	2 985	.5	694 213	2.3	7 321	2.0
Humboldt	200	2.2	738 041	.1	3 690	2.2	877 718	3.5	19 327	3.0
Lander	72	1.2	494 304	.1	6 865	1.2	1 631 257	3.3	5 758	2.3
Lincoln	122	1.3	48 968	1.6	401	2.1	361 190	4.4	7 370	4.0
Lyon	323	1.0	189 223	.3	586	1.0	699 724	5.3	25 340	5.0
Mineral	37	1.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1 299	7.0
Nye	155	1.2	140 380	.4	906	1.3	459 005	3.4	9 030	4.0
Pershing	128	1.9	624 606	.1	4 880	1.9	958 686	3.0	11 170	2.8
Storey	6	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	243	–
Washoe	313	1.5	710 618	.1	2 270	1.5	568 901	6.8	11 018	6.5
White Pine	120	.8	231 758	.2	1 931	.8	621 324	4.4	6 030	2.7
Carson City (IC)	28	1.1	5 361	.2	191	1.1	292 997	5.2	744	2.7

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm [1]		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses [1]			
							Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**60 260**	**1.9**	**288 139**	**.1**	**99 702**	**1.2**	**2 890**	**1.0**	**247 113**	**.5**
Churchill	51 548	6.4	30 948	.4	58 503	1.4	530	1.1	25 222	1.8
Clark	25 702	6.2	18 828	.2	84 432	1.9	223	2.0	16 451	.6
Douglas	56 422	7.3	11 519	.5	66 973	1.2	172	1.1	10 293	1.4
Elko	61 411	4.1	50 852	.2	141 256	1.1	360	1.0	42 795	1.5
Esmeralda	159 929	–	5 047	–	219 414	–	23	–	4 018	–
Eureka	92 671	3.0	8 198	.4	103 774	.6	79	2.2	6 656	.9
Humboldt	96 634	3.7	45 772	.1	228 858	2.2	200	2.0	37 272	.5
Lander	79 975	4.0	7 968	.6	110 664	1.4	72	3.3	7 006	.6
Lincoln	61 419	4.8	6 680	.8	54 754	1.5	122	2.2	5 527	2.4
Lyon	81 480	5.6	36 197	.2	112 064	1.0	323	1.0	31 704	2.1
Mineral	38 215	9.1	2 859	.8	77 261	1.7	37	5.5	2 660	1.3
Nye	58 259	4.5	13 788	.4	88 958	1.3	155	2.0	10 135	1.2
Pershing	87 264	3.6	25 224	.2	197 064	1.9	128	2.2	24 527	.8
Storey	40 500	–	72	–	12 023	–	6	–	63	–
Washoe	35 200	6.7	14 741	.5	47 094	1.6	313	1.8	14 779	2.6
White Pine	50 249	3.2	8 687	.4	72 390	.8	119	1.7	7 195	1.9
Carson City (IC)	26 588	5.4	759	3.0	27 118	3.2	28	4.6	811	3.9

Geographic area	Farm production expenses [1]—Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**1 040**	**4.6**	**33 238**	**.7**	**1 832**	**2.7**	**49 970**	**.6**	**607**	**5.5**	**3 191**	**1.5**
Churchill	167	15.6	2 447	3.1	277	10.1	8 283	.8	120	15.1	95	13.3
Clark	54	26.6	1 301	6.5	116	13.4	5 352	1.0	27	30.4	81	3.5
Douglas	57	22.2	1 947	2.3	150	7.1	2 552	3.2	25	23.7	76	4.7
Elko	168	7.4	4 582	1.1	306	3.5	9 382	2.4	45	17.7	116	2.9
Esmeralda	6	–	(D)	(D)	10	–	245	–	12	–	57	–
Eureka	32	2.1	196	.2	41	2.7	703	.5	31	3.7	97	2.2
Humboldt	85	7.0	2 861	2.6	114	5.5	3 797	.6	67	9.0	826	.7
Lander	32	3.8	493	.7	49	3.8	1 468	.4	19	6.0	33	7.7
Lincoln	45	13.1	464	14.2	89	5.7	391	5.0	34	14.6	53	6.1
Lyon	77	23.8	4 510	1.2	145	15.0	5 179	2.1	74	22.7	352	12.1
Mineral	12	9.0	(D)	(D)	14	7.3	(D)	(D)	11	9.6	(D)	(D)
Nye	42	12.9	447	5.9	92	5.4	3 435	1.0	41	13.1	167	4.5
Pershing	58	9.4	(D)	(D)	71	7.6	5 717	.6	16	23.7	(D)	(D)
Storey	1	–	(D)	(D)	3	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Washoe	132	17.8	1 342	7.3	257	6.6	1 787	6.9	40	34.1	(D)	(D)
White Pine	56	9.1	710	1.4	75	6.8	1 135	1.7	45	10.0	70	13.2
Carson City (IC)	16	5.9	107	11.3	23	5.3	227	2.9	–	–	–	–

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 8
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table F. **Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992** —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses [1]—Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**770**	**5.2**	**6 930**	**1.7**	**644**	**5.3**	**3 949**	**1.0**	**2 678**	**1.3**	**14 154**	**1.0**
Churchill	152	14.5	166	10.9	102	16.1	81	8.9	502	2.8	1 374	5.1
Clark	55	23.9	96	6.3	34	29.4	24	6.1	204	4.6	311	3.8
Douglas	31	26.3	93	10.0	41	23.5	54	11.0	165	3.8	589	3.4
Elko	98	11.0	1 433	6.9	46	20.3	83	4.4	325	2.4	2 625	1.2
Esmeralda	11	–	111	–	12	–	58	–	23	–	258	–
Eureka	45	2.6	388	1.5	37	3.1	287	1.4	76	2.2	468	1.4
Humboldt	65	7.5	2 447	.3	45	8.3	1 617	.6	186	3.1	2 040	1.1
Lander	21	5.3	253	1.9	15	6.2	41	2.2	68	3.2	711	.9
Lincoln	31	14.9	132	2.0	23	17.0	76	5.5	113	3.7	619	3.5
Lyon	71	16.7	680	7.3	119	16.5	560	5.5	279	4.9	1 955	4.0
Mineral	13	9.5	(D)	(D)	7	11.0	5	12.1	33	5.8	103	3.0
Nye	49	11.5	232	8.2	46	11.2	89	13.0	141	2.5	577	4.6
Pershing	26	15.2	173	5.7	47	9.1	582	2.6	118	3.3	864	1.8
Storey	1	–	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)	6	–	6	–
Washoe	67	32.3	448	6.5	30	32.9	311	.9	303	2.8	1 075	7.2
White Pine	33	13.9	204	3.4	35	12.1	79	6.1	113	2.7	552	2.7
Carson City (IC)	1	–	(D)	(D)	3	–	(D)	(D)	23	5.1	28	5.2

Geographic area	Farm production expenses [1]—Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**2 064**	**2.3**	**11 539**	**1.2**	**1 143**	**3.5**	**31 652**	**.8**	**521**	**6.3**	**3 672**	**4.1**
Churchill	416	6.0	463	2.4	180	9.9	2 937	1.7	100	20.2	255	25.4
Clark	150	10.1	335	4.0	55	20.2	1 787	.4	36	25.8	93	4.5
Douglas	141	7.7	260	7.4	66	14.2	1 173	.5	19	38.1	43	13.1
Elko	255	5.0	1 071	1.1	152	7.2	6 175	2.5	67	11.3	440	.8
Esmeralda	19	–	500	–	14	–	548	–	9	–	148	–
Eureka	69	2.4	913	1.7	46	2.5	642	.7	27	3.5	106	3.1
Humboldt	168	3.2	3 598	1.5	89	4.8	5 534	(L)	45	6.4	1 655	.1
Lander	47	3.7	405	1.9	35	2.6	954	.6	18	3.9	59	.6
Lincoln	64	9.5	705	2.9	52	9.0	738	2.3	18	19.4	57	1.5
Lyon	249	4.7	1 395	5.9	139	14.4	4 459	3.2	59	21.2	406	33.2
Mineral	20	7.1	87	.7	15	7.3	(D)	(D)	6	12.9	(D)	(D)
Nye	98	6.6	503	5.5	56	8.9	1 569	1.1	36	12.5	92	7.9
Pershing	74	7.2	322	16.7	57	7.1	1 567	.9	19	17.9	48	26.8
Storey	5	–	2	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Washoe	170	13.5	394	11.0	118	17.0	2 011	5.8	39	39.3	(D)	(D)
White Pine	97	4.2	540	10.4	57	9.4	1 143	2.1	21	13.3	80	5.6
Carson City (IC)	22	5.1	46	.8	11	5.4	194	3.0	2	–	(D)	(D)

Geographic area	Farm production expenses [1]—Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest expense			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**2 363**	**1.9**	**16 378**	**1.2**	**791**	**4.8**	**5 031**	**4.3**	**1 113**	**4.0**	**18 621**	**1.7**
Churchill	426	5.6	1 736	7.7	265	10.1	767	10.0	200	13.2	1 764	8.4
Clark	121	12.8	758	5.4	42	28.9	93	21.8	85	16.4	922	4.2
Douglas	136	8.3	1 000	2.0	37	22.1	153	2.1	33	24.7	609	6.4
Elko	317	3.2	2 471	2.2	76	12.7	779	.8	157	8.9	3 736	4.1
Esmeralda	22	–	358	–	9	–	63	–	14	–	382	–
Eureka	72	2.2	663	1.5	30	3.7	408	1.3	49	2.6	606	1.6
Humboldt	180	3.2	2 193	1.6	53	10.1	664	7.1	82	5.9	2 916	1.9
Lander	59	3.4	502	1.3	25	4.3	271	2.2	39	4.1	418	1.3
Lincoln	92	4.8	719	2.9	16	25.1	47	6.6	45	11.2	509	4.1
Lyon	286	4.1	2 317	3.4	106	14.2	910	21.2	130	16.0	2 737	6.9
Mineral	26	6.4	190	2.0	14	8.2	(D)	(D)	12	9.6	182	2.3
Nye	126	4.0	649	3.3	27	15.2	67	12.8	55	9.1	768	4.6
Pershing	114	3.9	970	3.9	31	14.0	97	6.6	82	7.0	1 059	4.6
Storey	5	–	4	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	(D)	(D)
Washoe	253	6.6	1 246	5.5	24	27.8	467	.2	75	18.7	1 549	4.1
White Pine	106	3.9	538	3.1	32	9.8	215	6.2	51	10.0	449	6.7
Carson City (IC)	22	5.2	64	3.3	4	10.9	(D)	(D)	2	21.8	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 9
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table F. **Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992** —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Farm production expenses [1]—Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**491**	**7.2**	**5 842**	**4.2**	**2 674**	**1.4**	**7 475**	**2.1**	**2 664**	**1.5**	**35 471**	**.8**
Churchill	85	25.3	351	9.7	512	2.3	1 554	5.4	457	5.0	2 947	3.2
Clark	22	38.7	223	.6	214	3.0	201	7.6	195	6.0	4 874	.4
Douglas	16	37.1	141	2.5	164	3.8	374	4.1	158	5.6	1 230	2.1
Elko	75	12.3	1 465	4.8	321	3.4	989	2.1	353	1.3	7 447	2.8
Esmeralda	5	–	(D)	(D)	21	–	97	–	23	–	460	–
Eureka	8	6.1	76	2.4	76	2.2	183	1.1	76	2.2	921	1.1
Humboldt	31	8.7	807	5.5	191	2.6	698	1.0	190	2.5	5 620	.5
Lander	15	5.2	172	2.2	67	3.4	206	1.1	66	3.3	1 020	.8
Lincoln	28	17.2	104	6.7	111	3.8	171	4.5	107	4.2	742	2.7
Lyon	53	30.7	958	23.8	306	2.7	1 341	6.9	311	2.4	3 946	2.2
Mineral	6	14.4	23	17.7	34	5.6	47	4.6	33	5.9	233	2.0
Nye	12	18.8	182	8.9	140	3.3	244	3.7	141	3.4	1 116	1.5
Pershing	25	15.5	434	3.3	116	3.4	565	3.7	125	2.9	1 618	2.2
Storey	–	–	–	–	6	–	13	–	6	–	5	–
Washoe	81	19.2	246	6.5	268	6.3	529	14.6	278	5.6	2 096	5.3
White Pine	27	12.7	138	3.7	100	3.5	231	2.4	119	1.7	1 112	1.3
Carson City (IC)	2	–	(D)	(D)	27	4.8	29	4.1	26	4.8	85	5.3

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) [1]				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**2 891**	**1.0**	**40 728**	**2.4**	**2 255**	**1.1**	**840 364**	**.3**	**1 753**	**1.0**	**408 568**	**.3**
Churchill	530	1.1	4 803	9.7	474	1.4	56 921	.9	381	1.5	29 089	1.0
Clark	223	2.0	1 915	6.5	123	2.7	9 198	4.7	95	3.2	5 470	4.6
Douglas	172	1.1	1 178	21.0	123	1.6	31 098	1.0	83	2.1	16 790	1.3
Elko	360	1.0	8 775	3.1	276	1.3	243 402	.4	202	1.3	103 658	.2
Esmeralda	23	–	1 028	–	20	–	14 490	–	19	–	9 836	–
Eureka	79	2.2	1 542	1.1	66	1.0	(D)	(D)	59	1.1	21 410	.7
Humboldt	200	2.0	8 427	1.7	164	1.8	(D)	(D)	134	1.6	73 105	.3
Lander	72	3.3	962	2.7	57	1.8	(D)	(D)	49	2.0	21 548	.8
Lincoln	122	2.2	1 261	6.8	110	1.5	26 087	2.3	87	2.2	14 170	1.6
Lyon	323	1.0	4 976	11.4	270	1.2	(D)	(D)	219	1.3	44 852	.5
Mineral	37	5.5	198	7.3	35	1.9	(D)	(D)	34	2.1	3 224	2.4
Nye	155	2.0	3 906	5.3	136	1.5	(D)	(D)	106	2.0	11 076	1.5
Pershing	128	2.2	537	27.4	99	1.6	49 603	.9	83	2.0	20 513	1.2
Storey	6	–	(D)	(D)	5	–	(D)	(D)	3	–	(D)	(D)
Washoe	313	1.8	–181	(H)	189	2.0	41 174	1.5	109	2.7	14 988	1.0
White Pine	120	1.7	1 442	4.0	99	1.3	(D)	(D)	86	1.7	17 975	.8
Carson City (IC)	28	4.6	(D)	(D)	9	3.3	1 366	.2	4	–	(D)	(D)

Geographic area	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
					Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Farms		Acres		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**2 151**	**1.0**	**556 172**	**.3**	**1 652**	**1.0**	**523 305**	**.2**	**1 330**	**1.0**	**265 690**	**.2**
Churchill	469	1.4	45 718	.8	353	1.4	47 088	.6	251	1.7	15 248	1.1
Clark	117	2.8	7 643	5.6	89	3.1	13 166	.8	55	4.3	1 475	3.0
Douglas	136	1.5	33 082	.8	91	2.2	21 699	1.2	77	2.4	10 012	1.4
Elko	235	1.4	126 677	.3	272	1.2	161 002	.2	250	1.3	95 475	.2
Esmeralda	19	–	14 198	–	11	–	8 137	–	11	–	5 559	–
Eureka	62	1.0	23 917	.7	42	2.1	14 940	.5	37	2.1	8 738	.5
Humboldt	154	1.8	88 146	.3	113	2.1	60 340	.3	99	2.2	(D)	(D)
Lander	56	1.8	26 633	.6	43	3.1	26 780	.4	36	3.4	18 290	.2
Lincoln	108	1.6	17 622	2.1	99	1.9	15 237	1.3	90	2.2	9 206	1.1
Lyon	262	1.2	67 356	.4	147	1.8	41 478	.3	107	1.9	12 847	.5
Mineral	35	2.0	4 246	1.8	14	7.7	(D)	(D)	11	9.2	713	9.5
Nye	130	1.6	18 068	1.0	64	2.8	18 429	.8	57	2.9	(D)	(D)
Pershing	90	1.8	27 333	.9	75	2.6	32 748	.5	57	2.8	10 475	.9
Storey	5	–	(D)	(D)	5	–	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)
Washoe	169	2.2	23 677	1.1	153	2.2	31 990	.9	122	2.6	17 523	1.0
White Pine	97	1.4	29 063	.5	69	2.1	24 001	.2	59	2.2	14 474	.3
Carson City (IC)	7	–	(D)	(D)	12	5.3	1 387	1.1	9	3.3	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 10
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table F. **Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992** —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry —Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**208**	**1.6**	**21 769**	**.1**	**154**	**2.8**	**7 636**	**3.3**	**360**	**2.0**	**122 188**	**.2**
Churchill	57	2.8	8 604	.2	19	6.6	241	3.5	37	5.3	662	6.4
Clark	8	8.5	6 234	(L)	13	10.0	(D)	(D)	18	9.9	430	14.0
Douglas	10	5.9	1 239	.1	9	8.5	68	3.2	34	4.5	964	4.6
Elko	43	3.1	103	3.2	18	7.2	678	12.9	66	3.5	56 424	.1
Esmeralda	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Eureka	5	7.2	10	10.8	2	17.5	(D)	(D)	10	6.6	(D)	(D)
Humboldt	13	5.3	(D)	(D)	10	9.5	301	11.2	22	7.2	1 961	2.3
Lander	7	11.3	16	7.1	6	14.8	100	28.6	13	6.4	10 395	.1
Lincoln	8	11.1	12	12.0	8	11.9	23	19.4	13	9.9	105	16.3
Lyon	15	4.6	2 735	.2	16	7.5	386	9.5	40	4.1	9 664	1.1
Mineral	2	24.5	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	3	19.7	168	22.6
Nye	10	5.7	(D)	(D)	16	7.8	308	15.9	10	7.2	561	4.7
Pershing	8	9.5	12	11.3	10	8.4	(D)	(D)	18	7.2	(D)	(D)
Storey	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Washoe	9	8.1	30	5.5	16	7.8	151	15.6	44	4.7	5 515	.9
White Pine	11	6.0	24	2.7	11	9.8	127	17.2	26	4.6	17 381	.3
Carson City (IC)	2	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	6	9.7	514	11.7

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry —Con.							
	Hens and pullets of laying age inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**246**	**2.5**	**14 289**	**14.9**	**7**	**12.6**	**200**	**13.0**
Churchill	34	5.5	738	9.9	–	–	–	–
Clark	24	8.2	460	15.6	–	–	–	–
Douglas	16	7.9	386	9.3	2	16.0	(D)	(D)
Elko	31	5.6	9 352	22.6	–	–	–	–
Esmeralda	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Eureka	7	6.5	82	7.2	–	–	–	–
Humboldt	19	6.4	422	6.4	–	–	–	–
Lander	8	11.9	228	12.8	1	35.0	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	16	8.8	281	11.4	–	–	–	–
Lyon	17	6.2	432	10.4	–	–	–	–
Mineral	2	24.5	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Nye	19	7.0	498	9.0	–	–	–	–
Pershing	12	8.9	220	13.2	–	–	–	–
Storey	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Washoe	32	6.0	1 014	20.2	3	19.1	125	18.1
White Pine	8	10.9	161	13.0	1	47.1	(D)	(D)
Carson City (IC)	1	30.0	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Wheat for grain						Barley for grain					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**57**	**2.3**	**9 968**	**1.0**	**719 200**	**.8**	**36**	**3.0**	**4 613**	**.5**	**423 411**	**.2**
Churchill	6	11.8	137	15.0	5 584	12.3	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Clark	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	8	10.5	347	2.8	31 130	2.1
Douglas	5	11.8	334	3.1	8 750	9.4	3	10.3	93	6.7	6 100	7.6
Elko	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Esmeralda	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Eureka	6	8.2	1 015	9.1	66 695	8.4	3	16.8	90	19.8	(D)	(D)
Humboldt	18	2.8	7 009	.3	519 275	.2	7	–	2 784	–	295 048	–
Lander	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lyon	15	3.3	681	1.2	46 367	.1	4	–	357	–	25 620	–
Mineral	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Nye	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Pershing	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Storey	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Washoe	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
White Pine	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	16.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Carson City (IC)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 11
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table F. **Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992** —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.											
	Irish potatoes						Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hundredweight	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Nevada	**12**	**5.0**	**8 111**	**–**	**3 035 277**	**–**	**1 638**	**1.0**	**380 959**	**.3**	**1 082 233**	**.3**
Churchill	–	–	–	–	–	–	373	1.5	29 368	1.0	94 373	.9
Clark	–	–	–	–	–	–	72	3.7	4 873	5.2	19 033	2.3
Douglas	–	–	–	–	–	–	81	2.1	16 530	1.3	43 772	1.1
Elko	–	–	–	–	–	–	202	1.3	104 310	.2	127 811	.5
Esmeralda	–	–	–	–	–	–	18	–	9 800	–	46 803	–
Eureka	1	36.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	58	1.0	20 542	.8	74 054	.7
Humboldt	7	–	7 547	–	2 797 577	–	124	1.8	51 921	.5	200 799	.6
Lander	–	–	–	–	–	–	45	2.2	22 710	.7	64 214	1.0
Lincoln	2	24.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	83	2.3	14 175	2.0	53 220	1.4
Lyon	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	209	1.3	43 331	.5	175 149	.6
Mineral	–	–	–	–	–	–	33	2.2	2 555	3.1	10 382	2.6
Nye	–	–	–	–	–	–	81	2.6	10 515	1.6	31 158	2.1
Pershing	–	–	–	–	–	–	74	2.3	17 975	1.4	48 452	1.9
Storey	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Washoe	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	98	2.8	14 055	1.3	37 577	1.5
White Pine	–	–	–	–	–	–	81	1.8	17 426	.8	51 386	.9
Carson City (IC)	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)

[1]Data are based on a sample of farms.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 12
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09

Table G. State Estimates of the Not on the Mail List Component of Farm Coverage Error: 1992

[Detail may not add to total due to rounding. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item	Census published farms		Not on mail list [1]		Percent not on mail list [1]	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (percent)	Standard error of percent
Farms ---- number	2 890	1.2	397	44.9	12.1	4.8
Land in farms ---- acres	9 263 684	–	76 458	52.7	.8	.4
Average size of farm ---- acres	3 205.4	1.2	192.8	44.3	(X)	(X)
Farms by size:						
Less than 10 acres	445	2.4	88	97.9	16.5	13.5
10 to 49 acres	680	2.0	96	87.2	12.4	9.5
Less than 50 acres	1 125	1.9	184	59.7	14.1	7.2
50 acres or more	1 765	.9	212	68.2	10.7	6.5
50 to 99 acres	295	2.3	–	(X)	–	(X)
100 to 179 acres	304	2.1	37	73.5	10.8	7.1
180 acres or more	1 166	.7	175	69.7	13.1	7.9
Harvested cropland ---- farms	1 753	1.0	305	50.8	14.8	6.4
acres	408 568	.3	30 254	51.4	6.9	3.3
Farms by value of sales:						
Less than $1,000	506	2.4	15	97.9	2.8	2.7
$1,000 to $2,499	356	2.8	–	(X)	–	(X)
Less than $2,500	862	2.3	15	97.9	1.7	1.6
$2,500 or more	2 028	.9	382	44.9	15.8	6.0
$2,500 to $9,999	657	1.9	298	51.2	31.2	11.0
$10,000 or more	1 371	.8	84	56.6	5.7	3.1
Market value of agricultural products sold ---- $1,000	288 139	.1	5 323	48.1	1.8	.9
Farms by standard industrial classification:						
Crops (01)	859	1.3	194	74.0	18.4	11.1
Livestock (02)	2 031	1.2	202	59.1	9.1	4.9
Farms by type of organization:						
Individual or family	2 269	1.3	397	44.9	14.9	5.7
Partnership or corporation	544	1.1	–	(X)	–	(X)
Other	77	2.8	–	(X)	–	(X)
Farms by tenure of operator:						
Full owners	2 110	1.3	202	71.1	8.7	5.7
Part owners and tenants	780	1.2	75	58.9	8.8	4.7
Part owners	509	1.3	60	68.9	10.6	6.5
Tenants	271	1.9	15	97.9	5.1	4.8
Operators by place of residence:						
On farm operated	2 204	1.2	240	62.3	9.8	5.5
Not on farm operated	493	1.7	–	(X)	–	(X)
Not reported	193	2.1	157	52.9	44.8	13.1
Operators by principal occupation:						
Farming	1 656	.9	163	67.2	9.0	5.5
Other	1 234	1.8	114	(H)	8.5	7.8
Operators by sex:						
Male	2 540	1.1	301	45.6	10.6	4.3
Female	350	2.1	96	79.1	21.5	13.3
Operators by race:						
White	2 753	1.2	274	64.2	9.0	5.3
Black and other races	137	2.9	3	(H)	2.4	2.4
Operators by years on present farm:						
4 years or less	438	2.0	141	85.0	24.4	15.7
5 years or more	2 002	1.1	99	87.8	4.7	3.9
Average years on present farm	16.5	1.6	4.9	27.8	(X)	(X)
Not reported	450	1.7	157	52.9	25.8	10.1
Average age of operator	54.2	1.6	47.6	10.1	(X)	(X)

Note: These estimates do not account for incorrectly classified farms or farms appearing more than once in the census and are subject to change in the 1992 Coverage Evaluation publication. See appendix C text for further explanation.

[1]Estimates are based on a sample survey conducted independently of census data collection.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_672 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 8/ 1/94 10:31 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_88.TIPS;1 * 7/29/94 06:30:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 13
TSF:TIPS92-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 UTF:TIPS93-06305568.DAT;1 7/29/94 06:31:14 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_88.DAT;3 7/29/94 06:32:09