Appendix C.
Statistical Methodology

THE SCREENING PHASE AND THE MAIL LIST MODEL

The 1997 Census of Agriculture featured a pre-census screening phase that surveyed selected records, by mail or telephone, for presence or absence of agricultural activity. Records selected for screening had a low probability of qualifying as farms. All records responding to the screener and reporting no agricultural activity were removed from the census mail list. Eliminating nonfarm records from the mail list reduced respondent burden and data collection costs.

The screening phase included nearly 500,000 records. Records were selected for screening using one of the following criteria:

1) Records on selected agriculture specialty lists that had no other list source,

2) Records identified by a mail list model as having a low probability of being a farm.

A mail list model predicted the probability that an addressee on the 1997 preliminary census mail list operated a farm. The model defined groups based on combinations of characteristics such as source(s) of the mail list record, expected value of agricultural production, and geographic location. Farm proportions were estimated for these groups by calculating the proportion of 1992 census respondent records that were farms which exhibited the characteristics defined by the group. This proportion, also called the in-scope rate, provided an estimate of the probability that an addressee in the group operated a farm.

Each address record on the 1997 preliminary census 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. Records with a farm probability of approximately 30 percent or less were selected for screening, along with records included on selected agriculture specialty lists as noted above.

Before screening, the preliminary census mail list consisted of 3,314,790 records. There were 478,298 records selected for screening. Of these, 125,570 records were determined to be nonfarms as a result of the screening phase and were removed. These records were removed from the final census mail list. The remaining 3,189,220 records received census report forms.

CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

All name and address records on the final census mail list were designated to receive a 1997 Census of Agriculture report form. Two different types of census report forms, sample and nonsample, were used to collect data. Sections 1 through 20 and 28 through 32 of the sample form were identical to sections on the nonsample census form. Sample form sections 21 through 27 contained additional questions on usage of fertilizers and chemicals, farm production expenditures, value of machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, farm-related income, and hired workers. There were 11 regional versions of the nonsample form and 13 regional versions of the sample form with listings of crops varying by region. These 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. Mail list records were selected into the sample with certainty if they (1) were expected to have large total value of agricultural products sold or large acreage, (2) were multi-unit operations (i.e., separate farms producing under one company organization), (3) were in a county with less than 100 farms in 1992, or (4) had other special characteristics. Farms with special characteristics were abnormal farms, such as institutional farms, experimental and research farms, and Indian reservations. Mail list records in counties containing 100 to 199 farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 2; records in counties containing 200 to 299 farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 4; and records in counties containing 300 or more farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 6. The remaining mail list records not chosen to receive the sample form received the nonsample census form. This differential sampling scheme was used to provide reliable data for the sample sections of the report form for all counties.

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

The census of agriculture complex edit and imputation system is an automated computerized system that performed the following functions:

- Ensured reasonable relationships between/among data items, values for various sizes of farms, combinations of commodities, and economic interactions.

- Ensured necessary consistencies were present (there were more than 70 distinct consistency requirements).

- Ensured climatic, geographic, legal, and physical constraints were met.

The system performed these and similar functions for more than 900 data key codes for sample records and approximately 850 data key codes for nonsample records.

For the 1997 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 for that record 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 fixed 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 was 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 Classifications 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 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 the same 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. An edit run usually consisted of 10,000 or more records.

After the initial computer edit, all keyed reports not meeting the census farm definition were reviewed to ensure that the data had been keyed correctly. Edit referrals were generated for 17 percent of the reports included as farms; they were reviewed for keying accuracy and 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 re-edited.

CENSUS ESTIMATION

The 1997 Census of Agriculture used two types of statistical estimation procedures to account for whole farm nonresponse and sample data collection. The procedures were necessary because some farm operators did not respond to the census despite numerous attempts to contact them, and estimates for certain data items were based on a sample of farm operators rather than a full enumeration.

Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

Whole farm nonresponse to the census occurred when a response was never received for a record. If the record was a large farm, as defined by value of production or acreage, or a unique farm operation, intensive telephone or personal followup was conducted during census processing to obtain a response. If these attempts failed, either the NASS survey database, the census historic database, or other more current sources were used to impute data for the record.

During mail list development, the State Statistical Offices (SSOs), in an effort to reduce respondent burden, identified records that participated in multiple NASS surveys and/or situations where there were special reporting relationships between an enumerator and a respondent. These records were referred to as tagged records. The SSOs had full responsibility for the data collection for these records, including imputation of data for the record if a response was not obtainable.

Whole farm nonresponse that occurred within the remaining universe of records was accounted for by a statistical weighting procedure. The weights of the responding farms were adjusted to account for farms that did not respond. The information needed for this process was obtained from the 1997 Nonresponse Survey. The SSOs conducted the nonresponse survey using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (Blaise-CATI) or personal enumeration when telephone contact was not possible. Alaska and Rhode

Island were not eligible for the survey because all nonrespondents were subject to extensive followup. In these cases, data were collected by telephone or other methods. The nonresponse survey collected information from a sample of census nonrespondents to determine farm status and estimate the proportion of farms in the nonresponse universe. The information was then used to estimate the number of nonresponding farm operations by State and county.

The 1997 Nonresponse Survey consisted of a stratified systematic sample of the nonresponse records within each State. The sample was selected near the end of the census follow-up operations. Five strata were defined to be homogeneous on probability of farm status and were based on screener status, total value produced, and list source(s) of the mail list record.

Based on survey results, estimates of the proportion of census nonrespondents operating farms were made for each stratum in the State. The estimates were applied to the total number of census nonrespondents in that stratum, providing a State estimate of the number of census nonrespondents that operated farms. The number of census nonrespondents that operated farms was then derived for each county by stratum. This estimation procedure assumed that the distribution of farms in a stratum by county was the same for census nonrespondents as for census respondents.

Within each stratum in a county, a noninteger nonresponse weight was calculated and assigned to each eligible respondent farm record. Census respondent farms that were designated as large farms or tagged records or as farms that exhibited "rare" commodities were ineligible to represent nonrespondent farms and were excluded from the nonresponse weighting procedure. These records were assigned nonresponse weights of 1.0.

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, divided by the number of eligible census respondent farms. Stratum controls were established to ensure that this weight never exceeded 2.0. For the published tabulations of the complete count items, the noninteger nonresponse weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight of either 1 or 2 for each record. For the sample count items, the noninteger nonresponse weight was used in the calculation of the final sample weight.

Table A quantifies the effect of the nonresponse estimation procedure on selected census data items. The percentages in this table are 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 this table do not reflect the effect of item nonresponse to individual census data items. The effect of this item nonresponse is discussed in the "Census Nonsampling Error" section.

Sample Estimation

Sample data estimation determined the population totals that would have resulted from a complete census for the items in sections 21 through 27 of the sample form. The estimates were obtained from a weighting procedure that assigned 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.

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 were multiplied by 6.

The noninteger sample weight is calculated for each respondent sample farm by multiplying the noninteger nonrespondent weight by the sampling factor. For published tabulations of the sample count items, the noninteger sample weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight for each record. For certainty farms, the sampling factor equals 1 so the sample weight is just equal to the nonresponse weight. Sampling factor calculation for non-certainty farms is described below.

Within a county, the weighting procedure for non-certainty farms was performed in three steps using three variables. The first variable contained eight 1997 total value of agricultural production (TVP) groups. The second and third variables, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code and farm acreage, contained two groups. The three sets of groups were:

TVP	SIC	Acres
$1 to $999	01, 08 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 classified the sample records into 32 mutually exclusive initial strata formed by the three variable groups. The total and sample farm counts were expanded to account for nonresponse. Each cell containing sample farm records was assigned an initial sample factor equal to the ratio of the total farm count to the sample farm count. This factor was approximately equal to the inverse of the probability of selecting a farm for the census sample.

The second step in the estimation procedure combined, when necessary, the 32 initial strata to increase the reliability of the weighting procedure. Any stratum that contained less than 10 sample farms or had a factor greater than twice the mail sample rate was collapsed with another stratum. The mail sample rate was either 2, 4, or 6,

depending on whether the county had a 1 in 2, 1 in 4, or 1 in 6 sample selection rate. The collapsing occurred within the 32 initial 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 final strata and used to calculate final sample factors.

The final step calculated the noninteger sample weight as the product of the final sampling factor and the noninteger nonresponse weight. As described previously, the noninteger sample weight for each record is randomly rounded to an integer weight which is used in published tabulations. For example, if the final weight for a farm was 7.2, then the record would be rounded to either 7 or 8.

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

The sample for the 1997 Census of Agriculture was only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. In this context, "sample" refers to the sample for both the nonresponse survey and the selection of farms to receive sample forms.

The standard error, or sampling error, of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples. It is a measure of precision - that is, how well an estimate from a particular sample approximates the true population parameter. The percent relative standard error of an estimate is defined as the standard error of the estimate divided by the value of the estimate, then multiplied by 100. The true population parameter can be defined or conceptualized several different ways. One way is to think of the true population parameter as the average result of all possible samples (selected using a given sample design). A second way is to think of the true population parameter as the figure obtained from carrying out a complete enumeration of the population.

If all possible samples were selected, each of the samples surveyed under essentially the same conditions, and an estimate and its standard error 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 true population parameter.

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 true population parameter.

The following example illustrates the computations necessary to produce a confidence statement 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 0.1 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 true population parameter. 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. All farm operators were asked the complete count items. 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.

Only a sample of farm operators were asked the sample count items. These items appeared only in sections 21 through 27 of the sample 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, farm-related income, and hired workers.

Variability in the estimates of complete count items was due only to the nonresponse survey estimation procedure. With regard to the estimates of sample count items, variability was due to both the nonresponse survey estimation procedure and the census sample selection and estimation procedure. Therefore, variability in the sample count item estimates tends to be larger than the variability in the complete count item estimates. Percent relative standard error is a common measure of variability.

Table B provides the generalized reliability estimates of the estimated number of farms in a county that reported complete count and sample count items. The top half of the table shows the percent relative standard errors for estimated number of farms in a county that reported a complete count item, and the bottom half relates to sample count items. These reliability estimates are derived from regression equations. Separate regression equations were used to produce each section of table B. 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 the appropriate counties in the State. 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 1992 Census of Agriculture, variability in sample count

item estimates came only from nonresponse survey estimation procedures. The estimated relative standard error for a sample count item in these counties may be obtained using the first part of table B.

Use caution when referring to the "Sample Count Item" section of table B to make inferences on counties. Some counties may have been sampled at the rate of 1 in 2 or 1 in 4, but the reliability estimates shown were computed using only data from counties sampled at the rate of 1 in 6. Therefore, the reliability estimates shown would likely be overstated (or conservative) if the county was actually sampled at a higher rate.

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 standard error for percent change in State totals from 1992 to 1997. 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 1997 and the 1992 estimate for that characteristic to the 1992 estimate. This ratio is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent change. The standard error of a percent change estimate 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 the (1) total number of farms, (2) number of large farms included with certainty, (3) size classifications of the farms sampled, (4) amount of nonresponse, (5) general agricultural characteristics, and (6) specific characteristic being measured.

The farm counts and related estimates displayed in tables A through F relate to unadjusted census totals. These totals are the same as the "Census total" displayed in the first column of table G (which will be discussed later in this appendix).

For most of the tables in this appendix, and also many of the tables throughout the publication, there is a footnote that reads "Data are based on a sample of farms." The table entries that this footnote relate to are estimates of totals. To illustrate, suppose that the entry "other farm-related income" is shown with this footnote and has some number of farms given. This number given would represent an estimated total number of farms with "other farm-related income," based on the farms that were in the sample. This number should not be interpreted as the number of farms in the sample that have "other farm-related income."

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts is 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. Nonsampling errors arise from many sources, including respondent or enumerator error or incorrect data keying, editing, or imputing for missing data. These nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Nonsampling error due to mail list incompleteness and duplication as well as misclassification of records on the mail list is called coverage error. The section titled "Coverage Evaluation" discusses the evaluation studies conducted to measure the extent of this error in the census.

Respondent and Enumerator Error

Incorrect or incomplete responses to the census report form or to the questions posed by an enumerator can introduce error into the census data. To reduce reporting error, detailed instructions for completing the report form were provided to each respondent. Questions were phrased as clearly as possible based on previous tests of the report form. In addition, each respondent's answers were checked for completeness and consistency by the complex edit and imputation system.

Item Nonresponse

As information flowed from data collection to tabulation, various types of item nonresponses were identified on the census report forms. Nonresponse to particular questions on the census report form that logically should have been present created a type of nonsampling error in both complete count and sample count data. In this case, information from a similar farm was used to impute for these missing data items. The resulting data may have been biased if the characteristics of the nonreporting respondents were different from those of reporting respondents for those items.

Processing Error

All phases of processing for each census report form were potential sources for the introduction of nonsampling error. An automated check-in recorded that the report had been returned and excluded from further followup mailings. Approximately one-third of the mail returns were reviewed to resolve questions dealing with multiple reports, respondent remarks, or no reported data. The remaining mail returns (about two-thirds) were batched and sent directly to data keying, along with some of the reviewed cases containing farm data. Keyed records were transmitted, formatted, and run through the complex edit and imputation system. About one-fifth of all forms edited were clerically reviewed for inconsistencies, omissions, or questionable values. While reviewing these forms, the edit review staff determined if the action taken by the computer edit and imputation system was correct. Edited records were tabulated to the county level. Each county was reviewed and, when necessary, individual records were corrected prior to publication.

Developing accurate processing methods is complicated by the complex structure of agriculture. Among the complexities are the many places to be included, the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the continuing changes in the relationship of operators to the farm operated, the expiration of leases and the initiation or renewal of leases, the problem of obtaining a complete list of agriculture operations, the difficulty of contacting and identifying some types of contractor/contractee relationships, the operator's absence from the farm during the data collection period, and the operator's opinion that part or all of the operation does not qualify and should not be included in the census. During data collection and processing of the census, all operations underwent a number of quality control checks to ensure as accurate an application as possible.

COVERAGE EVALUATION

Coverage Overview

The primary objectives of the census of agriculture are to accurately count U.S. farms, measure commodity production and sales, and measure demographic characteristics of farm operators. Since 1945, an evaluation of census coverage has been conducted for each census of agriculture to provide estimates of the completeness of census farm counts. These results help to identify problems and focus improvements for future censuses.

According to coverage evaluation results, the past five censuses of agriculture included an average of 92 percent of U.S. farms and 98 percent of agriculture production. Complete enumeration of agricultural operations satisfying the farm definition of $1,000 or more in agricultural sales is complicated by the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the multiplicity of names used for an operation, the number of operations in which an operator participates, and the difficulty in classifying those operations just around the $1,000 sales range. In 1997, extensive efforts were made to compile as complete and accurate a mail list as possible, while reducing the duplication and number of nonfarm operations on the list.

The 1997 coverage evaluation program was designed to measure four components of error in the census farm counts. These components include:

1. Undercount due to farms Not on the Mail List (NML)

2. Overcount due to farms Duplicated or enumerated more than once (DUP)

3. Undercount due to farms Incorrectly Classified as nonfarms (ICU)

4. Overcount due to nonfarms Incorrectly Classified as farms (ICO).

The first component, mail list undercount, is by far the largest component of coverage error. Duplication, though occurring far less frequently, can involve larger farms and have a larger impact on acreage and sales estimates. The last two components involve the misclassification of either farms or nonfarms. Misclassification can arise from errors in either reporting or processing the data.

Table G - Coverage Estimates - illustrates the effect of coverage adjustments on census farm counts by demographic characteristics, land in farms, and total value of sales. The coverage total is defined as the net difference between undercounted and overcounted farms. The adjusted census total is the sum of the census total and the net coverage total. The relative standard error is shown for the final census coverage adjusted number. This number will be similar to the relative standard error for the census number, except when the coverage total is negative or close to zero. The coverage adjustment percentage shows the coverage total as a percentage of total census adjusted farms for that characteristic.

The 1997 Census of Agriculture is the first census to include all four components of coverage error in table G. Previous publications only included the coverage error component due to farms not on the mail list (NML). Because of this, caution should be taken when comparing coverage estimates from table G with previous years. In addition, the coverage total is a negative number for some characteristics. This means that the number of farms overcounted for this characteristic was greater than the number of farms undercounted.

Area Frame Surveys to Measure Mail List Undercoverage

Names and addresses collected in the 1997 June Agricultural Survey and 1997 Fall Area Survey were used to estimate the undercount due to farms not on the census mail list (NML). These names were matched to the census mail list, and those that did not match were contacted by telephone or person. The enumerator verified whether the operation had reported in the census, and if not, a census of agriculture report form was completed.

The percentage of farms missed in the census varies considerably by State. In general, farms not on the mail list tended to be small in acreage, production, and sales of agricultural products. Farm operations could be missed for various reasons, including the possibility that the operation started after the mail list was developed, the operation may be so small as not to appear in any agriculture-related source lists, or the operation may have been falsely classified as a nonfarm prior to mailout.

Classification Error Survey to Measure Three Types of Coverage Error

The remaining three types of coverage error were measured by the Classification Error Survey. This survey was used to estimate the number of farms counted more than once (DUP), the number of farms misclassified as nonfarms (ICU), and the number of nonfarms misclassified as farms (ICO). A sample of census of agriculture respondents was selected for reinterview to determine their farm/nonfarm status and collect information to identify

potential duplication. The farm classification from this interview was compared with the classification on the census of agriculture report form. Any differences between these two classifications were reconciled to determine the true farm status. Each operation was reviewed for duplication by matching the additional information received from the reinterview (landlords, tenants, other names, etc.) to the list of census respondents. Potential duplication was reviewed and discrepancies reconciled.

In general, the classification error rate is higher for small farms close to the $1,000 agricultural sales requirement. This rate is also higher for farms with small acreage (less than 49 acres), higher for tenant farms than for full- or part-owner farms, and higher for farms where farming is not the operator's principal occupation.

Coverage Estimation

The adjusted census total, T, is estimated as the census farm count, C, plus undercount and minus overcount adjustments. Undercount includes 1) farms not on the mail list (NML) and 2) farms incorrectly classified as nonfarms (ICU). Overcount includes 3) nonfarms incorrectly classified as farms (ICO) and 4) farms duplicated in the census (DUP). Altogether, the adjusted census total is:

$$T = C + (NML + ICU) - (ICO + DUP).$$

In some States, estimates of misclassification of farms owned by operators having rare demographic characteristics were based on particularly small sample sizes. Where such small sample sizes occurred, a form of small area estimation was used in which data from similar States contributed to that State's estimates. In these cases, the coverage totals are weighted totals of the direct State estimate and the direct estimate from the region. Direct estimates were used to the largest extent possible, based on the amount of survey cases available for the particular item being estimated.

Table A. **Percent of State Totals Contributed by Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation: 1997**

Item	Percent of total	Item	Percent of total
Farms .... number..	11.5	Corn for grain or seed .... acres..	2.1
Land in farms .... acres..	5.4	Wheat for grain .... acres..	2.6
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1] .... $1,000..	4.6	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold .... $1,000..	1.6	Cattle and calves .... number..	2.8
Harvested cropland.. acres..	3.2	Hogs and pigs .... number..	2.1
		Layers 20 weeks old and older .... number..	.2

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

Table B. **Reliability Estimates for Number of Farms in a County Reporting a Complete Count Item or Sample Count Item: 1997**

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM		SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:		Number of farms reporting:	
25	5.6	25	41.4
50	3.7	50	29.1
75	2.9	75	23.6
100	2.3	100	20.3
150	1.6	150	16.4
200	1.0	200	14.0
300	.9	300	11.1
500	.7	500	8.1
750	.5	750	6.1
1,000...	.5	1,000...	4.7
1,500...	.4	1,500...	2.8
2,000...	.3	2,000...	.7

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1997

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			**FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]**		
Farms ....number..	74 126	.6	Total farm production expenses ....farms..	74 128	.5
Land in farms ....acres..	27 698 779	.3	$1,000..	16 817 253	.1
Average size of farm ....acres..	374	.7	Average per farm ....dollars..	226 868	.6
			Livestock and poultry purchased ....farms..	10 957	1.8
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			$1,000..	759 223	.4
			Feed for livestock and poultry ....farms..	20 385	1.2
			$1,000..	2 588 982	.2
Total sales (see text) ....farms..	74 126	.6	Commercially mixed formula feeds ....farms..	10 530	1.8
$1,000..	23 032 259	.1	$1,000..	1 483 026	.2
Average per farm ....dollars..	310 718	.6	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ....farms..	22 653	1.2
Farms by value of sales:			$1,000..	526 323	.4
Less than $1,000 (see text) ....farms..	12 874	.7	Commercial fertilizer ....farms..	42 312	.8
$1,000..	2 086	.9	$1,000..	746 325	.4
$1,000 to $2,499 ....farms..	6 599	.7	Agricultural chemicals ....farms..	44 327	.8
$1,000..	10 809	.7	$1,000..	957 006	.4
$2,500 to $4,999 ....farms..	6 516	.7	Petroleum products ....farms..	63 187	.6
$1,000..	23 103	.7	$1,000..	488 226	.4
$5,000 to $9,999 ....farms..	6 498	.7	Electricity ....farms..	52 395	.7
$1,000..	45 609	.7	$1,000..	526 592	.4
$10,000 to $19,999 ....farms..	6 529	.8	Hired farm labor ....farms..	36 450	.9
$1,000..	91 712	.8	$1,000..	3 392 577	.2
$20,000 to $24,999 ....farms..	2 092	1.0	Contract labor ....farms..	25 571	1.1
$1,000..	46 066	1.0	$1,000..	1 386 159	.5
$25,000 to $39,999 ....farms..	4 552	.9	Repair and maintenance ....farms..	56 574	.7
$1,000..	142 823	.9	$1,000..	777 097	.3
$40,000 to $49,999 ....farms..	2 195	1.1	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ....farms..	25 794	1.1
$1,000..	96 770	1.1	$1,000..	595 872	.7
$50,000 to $99,999 ....farms..	6 544	1.0	Interest ....farms..	26 987	1.1
$1,000..	462 939	1.0	$1,000..	958 431	.4
$100,000 to $249,999 ....farms..	7 580	1.0	Secured by real estate ....farms..	19 137	1.3
$1,000..	1 200 983	1.0	$1,000..	598 151	.6
$250,000 to $499,999 ....farms..	4 243	.6	Not secured by real estate ....farms..	13 275	1.4
$1,000..	1 497 072	.5	$1,000..	360 280	.4
$500,000 or more....................farms..	7 904	–	Cash rent ....farms..	13 317	1.6
$1,000..	19 412 286	–	$1,000..	554 077	.6
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Property taxes...................................farms..	66 656	.6
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops.....farms..	47 155	.6	$1,000..	360 348	.6
$1,000..	17 033 714	.1	All other farm production expenses ....farms..	68 046	.6
Grains.......................................farms..	4 812	.7	$1,000..	2 200 014	.2
$1,000..	831 652	.4			
Corn for grain ....farms..	907	.8	**NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)[1]**		
$1,000..	123 404	.4			
Wheat...................................farms..	2 049	.6			
$1,000..	167 978	.2	All farms...number..	74 129	.5
Soybeans................................farms..	–	–	$1,000..	6 118 086	.3
$1,000..	–	–	Average per farm ....dollars..	82 533	.6
Sorghum for grain ....farms..	74	2.4	Farms with net gains[2] ....number..	39 401	.8
$1,000..	2 193	1.7	$1,000..	6 704 802	.2
Barley....................................farms..	515	1.1	Average net gain ....dollars..	170 168	.8
$1,000..	20 749	.6	Farms with net losses ....number..	34 728	.9
Oats ....farms..	141	2.1	$1,000..	586 716	.9
$1,000..	2 831	1.9	Average net loss...............................dollars..	16 895	1.2
Other grains ....farms..	2 726	.8			
$1,000..	514 498	.5	**GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME**		
Cotton and cottonseed ....farms..	1 832	.4			
$1,000..	1 035 607	.1			
Tobacco ....farms..	–	–	Government payments ....farms..	6 540	.6
$1,000..	–	–	$1,000..	121 951	.7
Hay, silage, and field seeds ....farms..	6 172	.6	Other farm-related income[1] ....farms..	13 274	1.8
$1,000..	816 502	.2	$1,000..	278 544	1.7
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ....farms..	4 488	.6	Customwork and other agricultural services ....farms..	4 261	3.2
$1,000..	4 019 298	(L)	$1,000..	117 494	3.0
Fruits, nuts, and berries ....farms..	33 004	.6	Gross cash rent or share payments ....farms..	4 594	3.1
$1,000..	7 822 769	.2	$1,000..	110 240	2.5
Nursery and greenhouse crops ....farms..	4 988	.8	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ....farms..	668	8.7
$1,000..	2 210 574	.1	$1,000..	7 951	8.9
Other crops ....farms..	951	.7	Other farm-related income sources.................farms..	5 598	2.7
$1,000..	297 312	.2	$1,000..	42 858	2.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products ....farms..	22 931	.5			
$1,000..	5 998 545	.1	**COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS**		
Poultry and poultry products...................farms..	1 922	.8			
$1,000..	1 181 156	(L)			
Dairy products...............................farms..	2 218	.2	Total ....farms..	1 079	1.1
$1,000..	3 177 770	(L)	$1,000..	97 172	.9
Cattle and calves ....farms..	16 007	.5			
$1,000..	1 411 055	.2			
Hogs and pigs...............................farms..	1 193	1.0			
$1,000..	38 753	.5			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ....farms..	2 735	.8			
$1,000..	49 142	.3			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text).......................................farms..	5 276	.7			
$1,000..	140 670	.7			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ....farms..	5 901	.7			
$1,000..	73 179	.5			

See footnotes at end of table.

[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..	62 269	.6
acres..	10 803 804	.3
Harvested cropland ... farms..	55 590	.6
acres..	8 543 159	.2
Farms by acres harvested:		
1 to 9 acres ... farms..	20 878	.6
acres..	72 420	.6
10 to 19 acres ... farms..	7 419	.8
acres..	103 033	.8
20 to 29 acres ... farms..	4 250	.9
acres..	96 893	.9
30 to 49 acres ... farms..	5 307	.9
acres..	198 825	.9
50 to 99 acres ... farms..	5 441	.9
acres..	378 650	.9
100 to 199 acres ... farms..	4 249	.8
acres..	588 236	.8
200 to 499 acres ... farms..	4 195	.6
acres..	1 305 181	.6
500 to 999 acres ... farms..	2 069	.3
acres..	1 454 722	.3
1,000 acres or more ... farms..	1 782	—
acres..	4 345 199	—
Cropland:		
Pasture or grazing only ... farms..	10 400	.6
acres..	1 246 009	.7
Other cropland ... farms..	9 621	.6
acres..	1 014 636	.7
Total woodland ... farms..	4 097	.7
acres..	1 116 052	1.0
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured... farms..	12 055	.6
acres..	14 384 908	.4
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. ... farms..	37 239	.5
acres..	1 394 015	.7
Irrigated land ... farms..	55 920	.6
acres..	8 712 893	.2
Acres irrigated:		
1 to 9 acres ... farms..	20 874	.6
acres..	74 803	.6
10 to 49 acres ... farms..	17 212	.7
acres..	401 943	.8
50 to 99 acres ... farms..	5 461	.9
acres..	379 287	.9
100 to 199 acres ... farms..	4 268	.8
acres..	590 577	.8
200 to 499 acres ... farms..	4 228	.6
acres..	1 314 649	.6
500 to 999 acres ... farms..	2 072	.3
acres..	1 454 759	.3
1,000 acres or more ... farms..	1 805	.1
acres..	4 496 875	.1
Harvested cropland irrigated ... farms..	50 407	.6
acres..	7 979 387	.2
Pasture and other land irrigated ... farms..	8 422	.6
acres..	733 506	.7
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ... farms..	973	1.1
acres..	226 522	2.1
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]		
Estimated market value of land and buildings ... farms..	74 129	.5
$1,000..	69 768 007	.5
Average per farm ... dollars..	941 170	.8
Average per acre ... dollars..	2 605	1.2
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ... farms..	74 084	.5
$1,000..	5 155 473	.7
Average per farm ... dollars..	69 590	.9
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]		
Commercial fertilizer ... farms..	41 776	.8
acres on which used..	7 215 345	.5

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
TENURE OF OPERATOR		
All operators ... farms..	74 126	.6
acres..	27 698 779	.3
Full owners ... farms..	53 878	.6
acres..	9 927 607	.5
Part owners ... farms..	10 888	.5
acres..	12 569 006	.4
Tenants ... farms..	9 360	.7
acres..	5 202 166	.5
OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
Land owned ... farms..	65 056	.5
acres..	16 794 849	.4
Owned land in farms ... farms..	64 766	.5
acres..	14 624 553	.4
Land rented or leased from others ... farms..	20 413	.6
acres..	13 481 109	.4
landlords..	47 568	.5
Rented or leased land in farms ... farms..	20 248	.6
acres..	13 074 226	.4
Land rented or leased to others ... farms..	6 662	.7
acres..	2 577 179	1.1
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Operators by place of residence:		
On farm operated ...	47 963	.5
Not on farm operated ...	20 908	.8
Not reported ...	5 255	.5
Operators by principal occupation:		
Farming ...	39 267	.5
Other ...	34 859	.6
Operators by days worked off farm:		
Any ...	37 919	.6
200 days or more ...	24 012	.6
Operators by sex:		
Male ... farms..	64 062	.5
acres..	25 910 406	.3
Female ... farms..	10 064	.7
acres..	1 788 373	1.1
Average age of operator ... years..	56.5	.8
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ... farms..	56 755	.5
acres..	14 131 870	.4
Partnership ... farms..	10 813	.9
acres..	7 653 858	.5
Corporation:		
Family held ... farms..	4 473	.7
acres..	4 362 264	.3
More than 10 stockholders ... farms..	177	1.7
10 or less stockholders ... farms..	4 296	.7
Other than family held ... farms..	779	1.1
acres..	859 406	.3
More than 10 stockholders ... farms..	126	2.1
10 or less stockholders ... farms..	653	1.2
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ... farms..	1 306	1.1
acres..	691 381	.9
HIRED FARM LABOR[1]		
Hired workers by days worked:		
150 days or more ... farms..	20 221	1.1
workers..	186 358	.5
Less than 150 days ... farms..	31 516	1.0
workers..	362 907	1.1
INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Farm-related injuries:		
Operator and family members ... farms..	500	1.3
number..	641	1.3
Hired workers ... farms..	2 575	.4
number..	6 829	.2
Farm-related deaths:		
Operator and family members ... farms..	15	—
number..	17	—
Hired workers ... farms..	20	—
number..	27	—

See footnotes at end of table.

Table C. **Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1997**—Con.

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

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE				**LIVESTOCK**			
				Cattle and calves inventory	farms..	17 335	.5
					number..	4 968 679	.2
				Beef cows	farms..	12 158	.6
					number..	890 805	.5
1 to 9 acres	farms..	20 662	.7	Milk cows	farms..	2 650	.4
	acres..	78 543	.6		number..	1 403 217	(L)
10 to 49 acres	farms..	24 250	.7	Cattle and calves sold	farms..	16 007	.5
	acres..	569 509	.7		number..	3 107 562	.2
50 to 69 acres	farms..	3 732	.8		$1,000..	1 411 055	.2
	acres..	214 449	.8	Hogs and pigs inventory	farms..	1 593	1.0
70 to 99 acres	farms..	3 784	.8		number..	212 088	.4
	acres..	309 317	.8	Hogs and pigs sold	farms..	1 193	1.0
100 to 139 acres	farms..	3 224	.8		number..	373 352	.5
	acres..	370 632	.8		$1,000..	38 753	.5
				Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms..	3 014	.7
					number..	784 041	.2
				Sheep and lambs sold	farms..	2 510	.8
140 to 179 acres	farms..	2 548	.8		number..	562 989	.3
	acres..	399 634	.8				
180 to 219 acres	farms..	1 660	.8	Horses and ponies inventory	farms..	13 015	.6
	acres..	328 001	.9		number..	113 110	.9
220 to 259 acres	farms..	1 283	.9	Horses and ponies sold	farms..	3 209	.8
	acres..	305 487	.9		number..	12 072	2.1
260 to 499 acres	farms..	4 327	.6				
	acres..	1 555 779	.6	**POULTRY**			
500 to 999 acres	farms..	3 572	.5				
	acres..	2 490 762	.5	Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	farms..	2 731	.8
					number..	34 149 987	.2
				Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms..	2 670	.8
					number..	30 312 145	.1
1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms..	2 439	.6	Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms..	240	1.6
	acres..	3 332 547	.6		number..	237 723 294	.1
2,000 acres or more	farms..	2 645	.6				
	acres..	17 744 119	.3	**SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED**			
				Corn for grain or seed	farms..	958	.7
					acres..	256 292	.4
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM					bushels..	42 230 303	.4
				Corn for silage or green chop	farms..	1 985	.5
					acres..	314 357	.3
					tons, green..	7 451 051	.3
				Wheat for grain	farms..	2 065	.6
					acres..	581 071	.3
					bushels..	42 372 177	.3
				Barley for grain	farms..	574	1.0
					acres..	129 549	.7
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	farms..	3 029	1.0		bushels..	7 475 447	.7
	acres..	1 642 529	.7	Rice	farms..	1 544	1.1
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)	farms..	3 348	.7		acres..	514 081	.7
	acres..	1 842 290	.2		cwt..	41 457 650	.7
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)	farms..	35 422	.6	Cotton	farms..	1 833	.4
	acres..	4 146 829	.3		acres..	1 036 316	.1
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)	farms..	4 285	.8		bales..	2 543 194	.1
	acres..	194 708	.9	Dry edible beans, excluding dry limas	farms..	413	1.1
Other crop farming (1119)	farms..	4 712	.6		acres..	60 153	.6
	acres..	3 505 269	.3		cwt..	1 173 449	.6
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)	farms..	11 840	.6	Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	farms..	304	1.4
	acres..	14 138 336	.5		acres..	43 503	.3
Cattle feedlots (112112)	farms..	528	1.4		cwt..	15 518 994	.3
	acres..	276 135	2.5	Sugar beets for sugar	farms..	449	.7
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)	farms..	2 122	.2		acres..	103 611	.3
	acres..	745 777	.2		tons..	2 924 151	.3
Hog and pig farming (1122)	farms..	522	1.5	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms..	8 636	.5
	acres..	21 688	5.9		acres..	1 698 773	.3
Poultry and egg production (1123)	farms..	1 046	.9		tons, dry..	8 344 564	.2
	acres..	68 765	1.5	Alfalfa hay	farms..	4 267	.6
Sheep and goat farming (1124)	farms..	1 533	.9		acres..	944 056	.3
	acres..	744 643	.5		tons, dry..	6 115 571	.2
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)	farms..	5 739	.8	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms..	4 490	.6
	acres..	371 810	1.5		acres..	1 209 259	(L)
				Land in orchards	farms..	38 747	.6
					acres..	2 582 084	.3

[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.

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of $10,000 or More: 1997

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			**FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES**[1]		
			Total farm production expenses .... farms..	41 584	.6
			$1,000..	16 586 321	.1
Farms .... number..	41 639	.6	Average per farm .... dollars..	398 863	.6
Land in farms .... acres..	25 178 155	.3			
Average size of farm .... acres..	605	.7	Livestock and poultry purchased .... farms..	6 295	2.0
			$1,000..	748 428	.4
			Feed for livestock and poultry .... farms..	9 801	1.5
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			$1,000..	2 571 166	.2
			Commercially mixed formula feeds ...... farms..	5 760	2.1
			$1,000..	1 479 357	.2
Total sales (see text) .... farms..	41 639	.6	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees .... farms..	17 787	1.2
$1,000..	22 950 651	.1	$1,000..	521 549	.4
Average per farm .... dollars..	551 182	.6	Commercial fertilizer .... farms..	29 797	.9
			$1,000..	737 159	.4
Farms by value of sales:			Agricultural chemicals .... farms..	31 542	.8
$10,000 to $19,999 .... farms..	6 529	.7	$1,000..	946 114	.4
$1,000..	91 712	.8	Petroleum products .... farms..	38 246	.7
$20,000 to $24,999 .... farms..	2 092	1.0	$1,000..	475 442	.4
$1,000..	46 066	1.0			
$25,000 to $39,999 .... farms..	4 552	.9	Electricity .... farms..	34 764	.7
$1,000..	142 823	.9	$1,000..	514 709	.4
$40,000 to $49,999 .... farms..	2 195	1.1	Hired farm labor .... farms..	27 665	.9
$1,000..	96 770	1.1	$1,000..	3 382 825	.2
			Contract labor .... farms..	19 473	1.2
$50,000 to $99,999 .... farms..	6 544	1.0	$1,000..	1 375 267	.5
$1,000..	462 939	1.0	Repair and maintenance .... farms..	35 720	.7
$100,000 to $249,999 .... farms..	7 580	1.0	$1,000..	750 787	.3
$1,000..	1 200 983	1.0	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment .... farms..	20 266	1.1
$250,000 to $499,999 .... farms..	4 243	.6	$1,000..	591 380	.7
$1,000..	1 497 072	.5	Interest .... farms..	21 603	1.0
$500,000 or more .... farms..	7 904	–	$1,000..	937 435	.4
$1,000..	19 412 286	–	Secured by real estate .... farms..	14 859	1.4
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			$1,000..	579 426	.6
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops..... farms..	33 779	.7	Not secured by real estate .... farms..	11 605	1.4
$1,000..	16 989 129	.1	$1,000..	358 008	.4
Grains .... farms..	4 538	.6	Cash rent .... farms..	11 139	1.6
$1,000..	830 610	.4	$1,000..	551 036	.6
Corn for grain .... farms..	879	.7	Property taxes....................... farms..	36 751	.7
$1,000..	123 278	.4	$1,000..	310 461	.6
Wheat........................ farms..	1 958	.6	All other farm production expenses .... farms..	41 561	.6
$1,000..	167 654	.2	$1,000..	2 172 565	.2
Soybeans..................... farms..	–	–			
$1,000..	–	–	**NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)**[1]		
Sorghum for grain .... farms..	72	2.3			
$1,000..	(D)	(D)			
Barley .... farms..	451	1.1	All farms .... number..	41 585	.6
$1,000..	20 552	.6	$1,000..	6 267 013	.3
Oats .... farms..	122	2.1	Average per farm .... dollars..	150 704	.7
$1,000..	(D)	(D)			
Other grains .... farms..	2 642	.8	Farms with net gains[2] .... number..	33 141	.8
$1,000..	514 174	.5	$1,000..	6 692 903	.2
			Average net gain .... dollars..	201 952	.8
Cotton and cottonseed .... farms..	1 810	.4			
$1,000..	1 035 506	.1	Farms with net losses .... number..	8 444	2.1
Tobacco .... farms..	–	–	$1,000..	425 889	.9
$1,000..	–	–	Average net loss.................. dollars..	50 437	2.3
Hay, silage, and field seeds .... farms..	4 825	.6			
$1,000..	812 349	.2			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms..	3 678	.6	**GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME**		
$1,000..	4 016 562	(L)			
Fruits, nuts, and berries .... farms..	23 031	.7	Government payments .... farms..	5 499	.6
$1,000..	7 791 726	.2	$1,000..	115 040	.4
Nursery and greenhouse crops .... farms..	3 470	.8	Other farm-related income[1] .... farms..	9 147	1.9
$1,000..	2 205 312	.1	$1,000..	254 357	1.7
Other crops .... farms..	854	.7	Customwork and other agricultural services ..... farms..	3 046	3.5
$1,000..	297 065	.2	$1,000..	112 376	3.1
			Gross cash rent or share payments ...... farms..	2 729	3.7
Livestock, poultry, and their products .... farms..	11 275	.5	$1,000..	95 605	2.6
$1,000..	5 961 522	.1	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products .... farms..	316	11.6
Poultry and poultry products........... farms..	879	.9	$1,000..	5 334	12.4
$1,000..	1 180 162	(L)	Other farm-related income sources .... farms..	4 647	2.8
Dairy products...................... farms..	2 211	.2	$1,000..	41 043	2.2
$1,000..	3 177 764	(L)			
Cattle and calves .... farms..	8 748	.5			
$1,000..	1 387 070	.2	**COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS**		
Hogs and pigs...................... farms..	409	1.6			
$1,000..	37 500	.5			
Sheep, lambs, and wool .... farms..	869	1.0	Total .... farms..	1 068	1.1
$1,000..	46 829	.3	$1,000..	97 145	.9
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)............................. farms..	2 073	1.0			
$1,000..	132 197	.7			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) .... farms..	2 592	.8			
$1,000..	68 218	.5			

See footnotes at end of table.

[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..	37 363	.6
	acres..	10 078 431	.3
Harvested cropland	farms..	35 479	.6
	acres..	8 313 454	.2
Cropland:			
Pasture or grazing only	farms..	4 523	.7
	acres..	938 095	.8
Total woodland	farms..	1 852	.8
	acres..	829 340	1.1
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms..	6 024	.7
	acres..	13 147 171	.4
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms..	20 162	.6
	acres..	1 123 213	.7
Irrigated land	farms..	35 389	.6
	acres..	8 455 168	.2
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms..	33 558	.6
	acres..	7 812 447	.2
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms..	3 728	.7
	acres..	642 721	.7
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms..	551	1.3
	acres..	136 469	1.8
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]			
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms..	41 585	.6
	$1,000..	60 821 543	.5
Average per farm	dollars..	1 462 584	.8
Average per acre	dollars..	2 477	1.2
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]			
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms..	41 548	.6
	$1,000..	4 586 211	.7
Average per farm	dollars..	110 383	.9
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]			
Commercial fertilizer	farms..	29 649	.9
	acres on which used..	7 087 121	.5
TENURE OF OPERATOR			
All operators	farms..	41 639	.6
	acres..	25 178 155	.3
Full owners	farms..	26 209	.7
	acres..	8 432 268	.5
Part owners	farms..	8 439	.5
	acres..	11 911 169	.3
Tenants	farms..	6 991	.8
	acres..	4 834 718	.5
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			
Land owned	farms..	34 877	.6
	acres..	14 573 704	.4
Owned land in farms	farms..	34 648	.6
	acres..	12 903 614	.4
Land rented or leased from others	farms..	15 540	.6
	acres..	12 639 512	.4
	landlords..	39 893	.5
Rented or leased land in farms	farms..	15 430	.6
	acres..	12 274 541	.4
Land rented or leased to others	farms..	4 279	.7
	acres..	2 035 061	.9
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
Operators by place of residence:			
On farm operated		23 389	.6
Not on farm operated		15 078	.9
Not reported		3 172	.5
Operators by principal occupation:			
Farming		28 456	.6
Other		13 183	.8
Operators by days worked off farm:			
Any		17 604	.8
200 days or more		10 166	.8
Operators by sex:			
Male		37 587	.6
Female		4 052	.9
Average age of operator	years..	56.0	.9

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION			
Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms..	27 421	.6
	acres..	12 288 390	.4
Partnership	farms..	8 669	.9
	acres..	7 247 775	.5
Corporation:			
Family held	farms..	4 052	.7
	acres..	4 262 025	.3
More than 10 stockholders	farms..	165	1.7
10 or less stockholders	farms..	3 887	.7
Other than family held	farms..	683	1.1
	acres..	846 018	.3
More than 10 stockholders	farms..	116	2.0
10 or less stockholders	farms..	567	1.2
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms..	814	1.3
	acres..	533 947	1.0
HIRED FARM LABOR[1]			
Hired workers by days worked:			
150 days or more	farms..	18 248	1.1
	workers..	184 243	.5
Less than 150 days	farms..	22 941	1.0
	workers..	341 172	1.2
INJURIES AND DEATHS			
Farm-related injuries:			
Operator and family members	farms..	329	1.4
	number..	440	1.3
Hired workers	farms..	2 481	.4
	number..	6 708	.2
Farm-related deaths:			
Operator and family members	farms..	11	—
	number..	(D)	(D)
Hired workers	farms..	19	—
	number..	(D)	(D)
FARMS BY SIZE			
1 to 9 acres		4 983	.8
10 to 49 acres		13 380	.8
50 to 69 acres		2 672	.9
70 to 99 acres		2 794	.9
100 to 139 acres		2 415	.9
140 to 179 acres		1 851	.9
180 to 219 acres		1 293	.9
220 to 259 acres		1 033	.9
260 to 499 acres		3 516	.6
500 to 999 acres		3 038	.5
1,000 to 1,999 acres		2 195	.5
2,000 acres or more		2 469	.5
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM			
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)		2 334	1.0
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)		2 685	.6
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)		21 232	.7
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)		2 960	.9
Other crop farming (1119)		3 190	.7
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)		4 784	.7
Cattle feedlots (112112)		173	2.1
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)		2 118	.2
Hog and pig farming (1122)		130	2.7
Poultry and egg production (1123)		614	.9
Sheep and goat farming (1124)		250	1.7
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)		1 169	1.2
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms..	8 772	.5
	number..	4 789 281	.2
Beef cows	farms..	5 754	.7
	number..	805 086	.5
Milk cows	farms..	2 331	.3
	number..	1 402 472	(L)
Cattle and calves sold	farms..	8 748	.5
	number..	3 041 342	.2
	$1,000..	1 387 070	.2
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms..	488	1.5
	number..	202 447	.4
Hogs and pigs sold	farms..	409	1.6
	number..	360 111	.5
	$1,000..	37 500	.5
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms..	943	1.0
	number..	737 578	.2
Sheep and lambs sold	farms..	823	1.0
	number..	533 604	.3
Horses and ponies inventory	farms..	4 518	.7
	number..	45 161	1.2
Horses and ponies sold	farms..	1 158	1.2
	number..	7 895	3.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of $10,000 or More: 1997 —Con.

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY			**SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED**—Con.		
			Barley for grain .... farms..	491	1.0
			acres..	125 917	.7
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory			bushels..	7 386 563	.7
(see text) .... farms..	713	1.2	Rice.. farms..	1 525	1.1
number..	34 101 743	.2	acres..	513 750	.7
Layers 20 weeks old and older .... farms..	692	1.2	cwt..	41 435 539	.7
number..	30 270 482	.1	Cotton... farms..	1 811	.4
			acres..	1 035 920	.1
			bales..	2 542 825	.1
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .... farms..	157	1.6	Dry edible beans, excluding dry limas .... farms..	391	1.0
number..	237 707 902	.1	acres..	59 996	.6
			cwt..	1 171 425	.6
			Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes.................... farms..	252	1.4
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED			acres..	43 410	.3
			cwt..	15 505 055	.3
			Sugar beets for sugar .... farms..	440	.7
			acres..	103 544	.3
			tons..	2 922 739	.3
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
			silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .... farms..	6 282	.5
Corn for grain or seed .... farms..	923	.7	acres..	1 639 208	.3
acres..	255 758	.4	tons, dry..	8 233 761	.2
bushels..	42 178 689	.4	Alfalfa hay .... farms..	3 731	.5
Corn for silage or green chop......................... farms..	1 880	.5	acres..	932 543	.3
acres..	312 262	.3	tons, dry..	6 080 052	.2
tons, green..	7 419 017	.3	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) .... farms..	3 680	.6
Wheat for grain .... farms..	1 966	.6	acres..	1 208 217	(L)
acres..	578 114	.3	Land in orchards................................... farms..	22 902	.7
bushels..	42 254 428	.3	acres..	2 431 715	.3

[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.

Table E. Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1992 to 1997

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of $10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate
Farms .... number..	−4.6	1.0	3.1	1.1
Land in farms .... acres..	−4.4	.4	−2.4	.4
Average size of farm .... acres..	.3	1.1	−5.3	1.1
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1]:				
Average per farm .... dollars..	14.8	1.6	12.2	1.6
Average per acre .... dollars..	17.7	1.8	20.6	1.9
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1]:				
Average per farm .... dollars..	23.2	1.8	14.7	1.7
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	−3.8	1.2	27.9	1.9
10 to 49 acres	−7.0	1.1	1.7	1.4
50 to 179 acres	−4.3	.8	−1.6	.9
180 to 499 acres	−3.2	.8	−.1	.8
500 to 999 acres	−3.5	.8	−2.2	.7
1,000 to 1,999 acres	1.2	.9	4.7	.9
2,000 acres or more	2.2	.6	2.5	.6
Total cropland.. farms..	−3.3	1.0	3.3	1.2
acres..	3.1	.5	4.1	.4
Harvested cropland .... farms..	−2.1	1.0	3.7	1.2
acres..	10.1	.4	10.4	.4
Irrigated land .... farms..	−1.1	1.0	4.9	1.2
acres..	15.1	.4	15.6	.4
Market value of agricultural products sold .... $1,000..	35.1	.2	35.3	.2
Average per farm .... dollars..	41.5	1.5	31.3	1.5
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops .... $1,000..	45.0	.3	45.2	.3
Livestock, poultry, and their products.................................... $1,000..	13.1	.1	13.3	.1
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than $2,500	−14.2	.9	(X)	(X)
$2,500 to $4,999	−9.0	1.2	(X)	(X)
$5,000 to $9,999	−12.4	1.2	(X)	(X)
$10,000 to $24,999	−7.5	1.1	−7.5	1.1
$25,000 to $49,999	−2.2	1.3	−2.2	1.3
$50,000 to $99,999	2.9	1.7	2.9	1.7
$100,000 to $249,999	5.7	1.6	5.7	1.6
$250,000 to $499,999	6.8	.6	6.8	.6
$500,000 or more	18.4	−	18.4	−
Total farm production expenses[1] .... $1,000..	21.8	.7	22.4	.8
Average per farm .... dollars..	27.6	1.5	19.0	1.4
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text)[1] .... farms..	−4.6	1.1	2.9	1.2
$1,000..	92.4	.9	87.5	.9
Average per farm .... dollars..	101.6	2.5	82.3	2.3
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	−2.4	.9	1.8	1.0
Other	−6.9	1.1	6.0	1.5
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any..	−8.1	1.1	1.8	1.4
200 days or more....................................	−10.0	1.1	1.7	1.5
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory .... farms..	−9.2	.8	−2.8	.8
number..	5.7	.3	6.4	.2
Beef cows .... farms..	−7.2	1.0	2.3	1.1
number..	3.2	.7	4.8	.7
Milk cows.. farms..	−15.2	.5	−9.2	.4
number..	12.3	(L)	12.4	(L)
Cattle and calves sold... farms..	−7.0	.8	−2.3	.8
number..	3.8	.2	3.9	.2
Hogs and pigs inventory .... farms..	−28.3	1.1	−23.4	1.6
number..	−17.8	.5	−16.8	.5
Hogs and pigs sold .... farms..	−32.3	1.1	−29.0	1.6
number..	−22.4	.5	−21.8	.5
Sheep and lambs inventory .... farms..	−18.4	1.0	−12.9	1.3
number..	−8.8	.3	−7.0	.3
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) .... farms..	−24.0	1.1	−9.2	1.6
number..	2.7	.2	2.8	.2
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .... farms..	−19.5	1.9	−10.8	2.0
number..	5.6	.1	5.6	.1
Selected crops harvested:				
Wheat for grain .... farms..	−7.6	.8	−5.7	.8
acres..	2.1	.5	2.6	.4
bushels..	7.4	.4	7.7	.4
Barley for grain... farms..	−38.5	.9	−41.1	.8
acres..	−36.5	.6	−37.3	.6
bushels..	−38.6	.5	−38.7	.5
Rice .... farms..	−2.0	1.9	.3	1.9
acres..	28.1	1.6	28.7	1.6
cwt..	30.1	1.6	30.3	1.6
Cotton .... farms..	−22.0	.5	−21.1	.5
acres..	−2.8	.2	−2.8	.2
bales..	−8.9	.1	−8.9	.1
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc.				
(see text) .... farms..	−7.0	.8	−1.4	.9
acres..	10.9	.5	12.0	.5
tons, dry..	10.3	.4	10.8	.4
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) .... farms..	20.9	1.1	19.1	1.1
acres..	18.9	.1	19.0	.1
Land in orchards .... farms..	−3.8	1.0	4.5	1.2
acres..	15.0	.6	15.9	.6

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

1997 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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)
California	**74 126**	**.6**	**27 698 779**	**.3**	**374**	**.7**	**941 170**	**.8**	**5 155 473**	**.7**
Alameda	458	.7	258 070	2.0	563	2.1	758 002	9.3	15 923	16.3
Alpine	12	2.1	3 942	1.3	329	2.5	802 095	6.4	194	2.9
Amador	360	.4	204 398	1.8	568	1.9	755 690	10.3	7 675	17.1
Butte	1 942	.6	404 166	1.2	208	1.3	753 624	2.9	141 105	5.0
Calaveras	457	.5	245 116	2.2	536	2.3	721 871	6.5	9 015	7.5
Colusa	810	.9	430 958	1.1	532	1.4	1 304 919	2.5	101 539	5.7
Contra Costa	587	.6	147 859	2.5	252	2.5	1 045 731	4.2	16 925	5.9
Del Norte	66	.4	13 303	2.2	202	2.3	701 511	3.5	4 561	1.3
El Dorado	763	.5	102 726	2.3	135	2.4	363 109	6.8	14 486	6.9
Fresno	6 592	.5	1 881 418	.4	285	.7	971 219	1.1	510 791	2.1
Glenn	1 189	.6	482 583	1.0	406	1.1	799 171	6.5	100 101	4.7
Humboldt	792	.5	584 538	1.4	738	1.5	705 164	3.6	26 030	5.2
Imperial	557	.7	489 726	.3	879	.8	2 613 686	1.4	108 170	2.2
Inyo	82	.6	198 658	1.0	2 423	1.2	1 974 816	3.4	3 139	4.4
Kern	1 997	.6	2 851 462	.5	1 428	.8	2 162 200	1.4	377 506	2.1
Kings	1 079	.4	656 968	.3	609	.5	1 602 391	1.5	160 130	5.5
Lake	776	.5	138 482	2.9	178	3.0	449 808	5.8	24 117	8.8
Lassen	365	.5	453 826	1.5	1 243	1.6	936 556	7.6	28 750	18.6
Los Angeles	1 226	.9	130 838	3.8	107	3.9	506 798	4.1	47 847	5.4
Madera	1 673	.7	641 546	1.0	383	1.2	1 157 462	1.9	126 562	2.8
Marin	276	.5	149 663	2.0	542	2.1	1 315 183	7.0	12 267	7.9
Mariposa	252	.3	198 230	2.5	787	2.5	598 417	9.9	7 647	12.8
Mendocino	1 092	.5	638 566	1.6	585	1.7	929 682	3.9	49 868	5.8
Merced	2 831	.5	881 696	.7	311	.9	950 554	1.2	271 521	2.3
Modoc	440	.5	662 927	1.0	1 507	1.1	1 055 148	15.0	48 197	6.4
Mono	63	.6	68 813	4.0	1 092	4.1	1 118 638	4.4	4 246	3.1
Monterey	1 209	.6	1 544 064	1.0	1 277	1.1	2 685 180	3.1	272 918	1.7
Napa	1 318	.6	212 401	2.8	161	2.8	1 536 908	4.0	68 293	5.8
Nevada	412	.4	62 772	4.7	152	4.7	296 733	9.9	9 544	12.3
Orange	349	.7	58 113	1.2	167	1.4	870 788	2.6	31 371	10.5
Placer	997	.4	139 597	2.9	140	2.9	566 590	6.5	29 616	8.8
Plumas	117	.7	108 896	4.3	931	4.3	993 642	7.7	4 647	8.4
Riverside	3 048	.6	509 031	.7	167	.9	749 295	3.2	191 360	4.6
Sacramento	1 288	.6	308 035	1.6	239	1.7	718 329	4.2	67 102	3.3
San Benito	562	.6	511 571	1.9	910	1.9	1 124 449	6.2	30 915	5.2
San Bernardino	1 455	.6	924 015	.3	635	.7	469 606	6.3	91 728	2.9
San Diego	5 925	.5	474 901	1.3	80	1.4	406 654	2.0	137 518	6.8
San Francisco	9	1.7	21	12.0	2	12.1	109 646	9.8	221	4.4
San Joaquin	3 862	.5	808 838	.8	209	.9	1 016 793	1.4	315 114	2.6
San Luis Obispo	1 916	.5	1 301 889	1.0	679	1.1	1 045 953	3.6	93 893	4.7
San Mateo	240	.5	44 588	6.0	186	6.0	808 201	4.5	16 666	3.0
Santa Barbara	1 451	.7	817 068	1.2	563	1.4	1 378 216	2.6	118 365	5.7
Santa Clara	985	.7	318 654	3.0	324	3.1	605 714	6.6	49 350	4.0
Santa Cruz	722	.9	71 115	4.7	98	4.7	572 820	4.2	48 156	5.9
Shasta	850	.5	316 743	2.3	373	2.3	419 564	6.4	19 110	6.0
Sierra	47	.3	46 359	3.0	986	3.0	1 094 861	3.2	1 788	4.2
Siskiyou	733	.6	628 745	1.3	858	1.4	1 069 954	7.3	53 263	4.8
Solano	795	.5	362 102	.9	455	1.0	1 223 786	5.9	65 516	6.9
Sonoma	2 745	.5	570 804	1.4	208	1.4	1 025 359	2.9	128 776	3.5
Stanislaus	4 009	.5	732 736	1.2	183	1.3	778 684	2.2	246 415	2.7
Sutter	1 314	.8	348 349	.7	265	1.0	1 203 478	2.4	151 681	4.3
Tehama	1 362	.5	885 426	1.0	650	1.1	772 234	2.9	53 465	4.9
Trinity	116	.4	118 252	2.2	1 019	2.2	413 223	10.8	2 762	8.6
Tulare	5 446	.6	1 309 525	.7	240	.9	834 562	1.3	368 825	2.2
Tuolumne	264	.6	152 355	3.4	577	3.4	736 048	11.3	5 948	7.5
Ventura	2 214	.6	346 279	2.1	156	2.2	882 695	3.6	102 258	3.0
Yolo	923	.5	536 595	.9	581	1.0	1 420 403	3.5	116 190	3.9
Yuba	706	.6	208 462	1.6	295	1.7	763 082	2.1	44 387	5.2

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)
California	**69 590**	**.9**	**23 032 259**	**.1**	**310 718**	**.6**	**74 128**	**.5**	**16 817 253**	**.1**
Alameda	34 766	16.4	41 905	1.0	91 496	1.2	458	1.0	29 774	1.6
Alpine	16 125	5.5	307	13.2	25 588	13.4	12	4.7	230	4.4
Amador	21 319	17.1	21 137	.7	58 713	.8	360	.9	17 460	7.2
Butte	72 622	5.1	286 227	.4	147 388	.7	1 943	.6	208 977	1.4
Calaveras	19 726	7.6	9 841	1.7	21 535	1.8	457	.8	9 047	4.1
Colusa	125 202	5.8	276 538	.4	341 405	1.0	811	1.1	203 331	1.4
Contra Costa	28 833	6.0	67 068	.5	114 256	.8	587	.8	49 858	2.1
Del Norte	69 110	3.3	20 797	.2	315 112	.5	66	3.0	15 568	.3
El Dorado	19 010	6.9	13 479	1.9	17 666	1.9	762	.7	10 622	3.9

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm[1] Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Market value of agricultural products sold Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farm production expenses[1] Total farm production expenses Farms Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Fresno	77 557	2.1	2 772 785	.1	420 629	.5	6 591	.5	2 133 341	.3
Glenn	85 192	4.8	228 221	.5	191 944	.8	1 190	.7	171 948	1.8
Humboldt	32 825	5.2	75 475	.5	95 297	.7	793	.7	58 254	2.9
Imperial	194 551	2.4	850 351	.1	1 526 662	.7	556	1.0	630 623	.4
Inyo	38 279	5.4	5 038	3.0	61 444	3.0	82	3.1	3 446	2.6
Kern	189 226	2.2	1 968 513	.1	985 735	.6	1 996	.7	1 509 960	.2
Kings	148 406	5.6	693 677	.1	642 889	.4	1 080	.5	555 783	.3
Lake	31 039	8.8	40 366	1.0	52 018	1.1	777	.7	26 870	2.8
Lassen	78 768	18.6	26 399	1.0	72 325	1.1	365	.8	20 152	5.2
Los Angeles	38 995	5.5	237 665	.3	193 854	.9	1 227	.9	164 052	1.0
Madera	75 695	2.9	627 210	.2	374 901	.7	1 672	.7	462 516	.7
Marin	44 284	7.9	53 879	.4	195 212	.6	277	1.0	45 263	1.1
Mariposa	30 345	12.8	5 615	1.9	22 284	1.9	252	.8	5 885	8.4
Mendocino	45 625	5.8	116 859	.5	107 014	.7	1 093	.6	70 508	2.4
Merced	95 876	2.3	1 273 475	.1	449 832	.5	2 833	.6	978 088	.4
Modoc	109 538	6.5	63 797	.6	144 993	.8	440	.9	49 488	3.6
Mono	67 396	4.5	6 502	1.9	103 208	2.0	63	3.3	5 225	2.5
Monterey	225 926	1.8	1 749 747	(L)	1 447 268	.6	1 208	.6	1 133 263	.2
Napa	51 855	5.9	238 696	.4	181 104	.8	1 316	.7	144 299	1.9
Nevada	23 164	12.3	3 974	2.1	9 647	2.2	412	.8	3 897	7.7
Orange	89 889	10.6	228 881	.2	655 818	.7	349	1.1	127 311	1.2
Placer	29 705	8.8	36 985	1.0	37 097	1.1	997	.6	32 123	3.8
Plumas	39 718	8.6	23 125	.6	197 650	.9	117	1.9	8 255	1.5
Riverside	62 823	4.6	1 047 525	.1	343 676	.6	3 046	.7	777 302	.4
Sacramento	52 098	3.3	218 023	.3	169 272	.6	1 288	.6	178 109	1.0
San Benito	55 010	5.3	156 707	.3	278 838	.7	562	.8	112 587	1.0
San Bernardino	63 087	3.0	617 833	.1	424 628	.6	1 454	.7	493 097	.5
San Diego	23 210	6.8	632 731	.2	106 790	.6	5 925	.5	413 937	.7
San Francisco	24 606	9.2	880	9.1	97 753	9.3	9	8.0	698	8.6
San Joaquin	81 593	2.7	1 179 706	.2	305 465	.6	3 862	.6	834 755	.5
San Luis Obispo	49 030	4.7	312 950	.3	163 335	.6	1 915	.6	223 755	.9
San Mateo	69 444	3.1	138 669	.2	577 787	.5	240	.9	99 947	.6
Santa Barbara	81 575	5.7	659 741	.1	454 680	.7	1 451	.7	441 132	.5
Santa Clara	50 101	4.1	188 485	.3	191 355	.8	985	.9	122 805	.8
Santa Cruz	66 698	6.0	247 815	.3	343 234	1.0	722	.9	173 019	.9
Shasta	22 456	6.1	31 349	1.0	36 881	1.2	851	.7	23 652	7.2
Sierra	38 048	5.0	1 304	2.5	27 755	2.6	47	2.8	1 348	3.0
Siskiyou	72 565	4.8	74 244	.7	101 288	.9	734	.7	56 669	4.4
Solano	82 514	6.9	161 418	.3	203 042	.6	795	.7	127 189	1.5
Sonoma	46 913	3.5	463 616	.2	168 895	.5	2 745	.5	328 185	.8
Stanislaus	61 481	2.7	1 208 524	.1	301 453	.5	4 009	.5	933 172	.4
Sutter	115 435	4.4	279 653	.4	212 826	.9	1 314	.7	218 019	1.2
Tehama	39 255	4.9	107 102	.5	78 636	.7	1 362	.7	80 743	2.0
Trinity	23 814	8.9	1 797	1.9	15 494	1.9	116	2.1	2 280	6.9
Tulare	67 936	2.3	1 921 381	.2	352 806	.6	5 448	.6	1 388 770	.4
Tuolumne	22 529	7.6	19 177	1.1	72 640	1.3	264	1.3	20 243	3.5
Ventura	46 187	3.0	845 613	.2	381 939	.6	2 214	.6	535 342	.5
Yolo	126 020	4.0	344 894	.2	373 666	.6	922	.6	258 916	1.1
Yuba	62 960	5.3	106 587	.5	150 972	.7	706	.8	86 167	1.5

Farm production expenses[1]—Con.

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased Farms Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Feed for livestock and poultry Farms Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees Farms Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
California	**10 957**	**1.8**	**759 223**	**.4**	**20 385**	**1.2**	**2 588 982**	**.2**	**22 653**	**1.2**	**526 323**	**.4**
Alameda	93	19.6	3 218	4.8	227	11.0	2 389	13.5	82	19.5	1 567	7.1
Alpine	5	6.5	(D)	(D)	10	4.0	69	4.6	1	32.7	(D)	(D)
Amador	100	21.1	4 061	4.3	192	12.3	1 820	12.6	58	26.8	283	15.1
Butte	168	17.2	1 400	18.5	465	9.0	2 872	34.6	807	5.5	6 711	3.0
Calaveras	164	13.6	891	17.2	342	6.4	2 612	7.7	61	26.7	16	38.1
Colusa	103	19.8	1 447	14.6	145	15.4	1 257	12.2	530	4.9	12 440	5.5
Contra Costa	107	16.9	907	29.3	235	10.4	5 354	2.4	114	17.2	2 248	1.0
Del Norte	29	4.7	372	.9	48	3.7	3 384	.2	10	8.0	24	1.4
El Dorado	157	17.2	473	32.6	361	9.0	1 352	9.2	173	13.8	376	12.8
Fresno	473	6.7	188 092	.1	944	4.5	326 492	.3	1 753	3.8	38 025	1.7
Glenn	218	11.2	6 591	4.3	385	8.6	15 889	8.4	499	6.3	5 038	4.6
Humboldt	254	11.6	4 124	5.1	490	6.8	15 686	6.9	183	13.8	(D)	(D)
Imperial	75	18.3	101 489	.1	92	18.3	82 998	.7	347	7.7	20 621	1.2
Inyo	25	5.1	359	2.2	47	4.2	554	2.0	14	6.3	23	17.9
Kern	310	12.3	26 835	.9	557	7.0	66 249	1.2	801	5.1	39 287	.4
Kings	255	8.6	17 305	.5	330	7.7	154 313	.4	528	5.9	12 865	4.4
Lake	38	35.7	184	6.1	155	18.2	416	16.5	170	14.4	363	12.0
Lassen	114	19.1	762	22.3	199	11.8	1 170	16.6	83	24.0	256	17.3
Los Angeles	191	15.3	1 710	14.3	338	9.8	5 789	6.5	344	9.0	18 271	3.8

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

Table F. **Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997**—Con.

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

	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	
Geographic area	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)
Madera	212	13.4	9 336	5.3	428	8.1	69 618	.6	372	8.1	6 090	3.1
Marin	94	11.9	4 006	4.2	207	4.4	21 323	1.5	55	18.6	116	30.0
Mariposa..............	90	14.0	1 223	20.3	182	7.0	1 060	7.7	26	29.6	4	58.9
Mendocino	222	12.1	3 484	10.8	427	8.0	2 373	5.2	302	9.3	1 231	7.5
Merced	553	7.1	55 038	2.0	952	4.8	329 553	.5	1 228	4.0	12 854	2.7
Modoc	134	16.7	2 184	5.4	189	13.2	3 016	5.9	203	10.1	1 781	8.8
Mono	24	5.7	374	5.0	36	4.4	494	4.5	13	5.3	95	1.5
Monterey	190	13.1	5 702	7.8	293	9.3	6 456	1.9	643	4.7	51 567	.5
Napa	57	26.6	818	13.7	145	16.0	995	12.6	381	9.4	4 680	10.7
Nevada	114	19.3	274	23.8	217	11.3	524	17.9	64	27.5	30	50.9
Orange	15	59.0	232	9.5	31	37.7	327	20.2	189	9.2	8 865	2.1
Placer	226	12.6	1 524	8.7	619	5.0	4 038	3.4	203	10.6	1 577	30.1
Plumas	49	9.7	(D)	(D)	68	6.4	430	15.3	22	18.1	147	7.0
Riverside.............	356	9.0	44 381	1.4	710	5.5	211 714	.2	560	7.8	18 230	1.0
Sacramento	257	13.3	9 991	8.4	602	6.9	40 794	5.5	484	7.5	5 830	2.7
San Benito	125	17.5	3 208	20.2	181	14.3	5 879	6.0	189	13.9	5 600	1.8
San Bernardino	441	7.8	41 105	2.2	629	6.0	253 357	.2	255	11.7	4 216	6.0
San Diego	321	10.6	7 742	3.5	555	7.6	41 088	1.5	1 027	6.3	25 735	3.3
San Francisco	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	12.1	(D)	(D)
San Joaquin...........	492	6.4	23 625	3.9	805	5.4	134 337	.7	1 573	4.0	26 007	.9
San Luis Obispo	426	9.0	6 863	8.1	817	5.4	4 660	5.7	626	6.8	20 095	1.4
San Mateo	24	54.5	123	56.6	84	26.5	330	27.8	109	20.1	15 295	.4
Santa Barbara	201	12.6	8 344	8.9	329	10.0	8 652	3.7	499	7.7	32 247	1.8
Santa Clara	131	19.0	1 520	10.9	252	11.4	6 492	4.5	309	10.6	9 661	2.0
Santa Cruz	70	30.8	1 786	1.9	113	24.7	2 443	8.8	277	10.5	13 096	1.0
Shasta................	251	12.5	1 254	21.9	534	5.4	2 656	10.6	166	15.9	433	40.2
Sierra................	16	4.3	165	2.4	27	3.6	164	1.9	6	8.0	7	13.3
Siskiyou	220	13.9	3 629	26.9	385	8.1	3 717	7.9	254	12.4	1 821	12.6
Solano................	105	18.4	7 755	1.4	279	8.7	6 262	12.8	297	9.6	4 609	8.5
Sonoma	484	8.7	10 104	3.1	911	4.7	69 037	2.2	821	6.4	6 690	4.9
Stanislaus.............	790	6.1	69 349	.8	1 288	3.6	311 105	.6	1 215	4.7	14 710	.9
Sutter	43	35.7	1 141	30.8	135	17.8	1 601	4.1	627	6.0	8 215	2.4
Tehama................	280	12.5	6 400	10.9	600	6.5	9 085	7.6	197	14.4	997	8.7
Trinity	48	10.1	133	10.8	67	5.8	294	8.2	27	19.2	23	33.9
Tulare	588	7.0	57 649	.9	941	5.2	323 423	.1	1 487	4.3	13 513	2.5
Tuolumne	95	13.4	1 509	4.5	198	6.0	11 125	1.4	21	28.4	5	8.3
Ventura...............	78	24.7	1 462	20.8	178	15.6	3 459	9.3	634	6.7	29 777	1.8
Yolo	130	17.9	2 439	24.2	140	16.2	1 977	20.5	461	6.5	14 664	4.5
Yuba	126	17.9	1 008	17.0	269	8.5	4 455	2.0	268	8.7	1 902	4.9

	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
Geographic area	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)
California	**42 312**	**.8**	**746 325**	**.4**	**44 327**	**.8**	**957 006**	**.4**	**63 187**	**.6**	**488 226**	**.4**
Alameda	123	17.3	775	5.1	192	13.7	984	6.7	363	6.5	1 068	4.2
Alpine	–	–	–	–	3	11.6	(D)	(D)	7	3.4	11	3.5
Amador	100	21.4	238	23.5	145	16.3	408	20.1	325	3.7	444	21.4
Butte	1 365	3.2	17 039	3.7	1 277	3.7	20 124	5.0	1 608	2.5	8 382	4.1
Calaveras	45	29.7	96	17.3	134	17.4	167	34.9	385	4.9	495	9.4
Colusa................	621	3.3	18 986	2.7	611	3.7	18 464	3.8	772	2.3	10 237	2.3
Contra Costa	160	14.0	1 577	4.3	247	9.3	1 721	13.2	499	3.8	2 023	2.1
Del Norte	29	4.4	413	.5	10	6.4	862	.1	60	3.1	335	.9
El Dorado	284	10.7	147	20.4	396	7.4	397	14.0	687	3.0	521	8.5
Fresno................	4 453	1.8	102 758	.5	5 320	1.1	166 245	.6	5 837	1.1	61 952	.7
Glenn.................	854	3.8	15 434	3.5	839	3.8	13 000	3.5	1 106	1.9	7 426	4.3
Humboldt	193	12.9	471	10.4	98	23.2	239	4.9	716	2.9	1 865	5.4
Imperial..............	433	4.4	41 487	1.3	388	6.3	32 082	1.0	533	2.4	16 979	1.8
Inyo	24	5.2	103	8.3	25	5.6	29	10.5	76	3.2	169	3.7
Kern..................	1 194	3.5	83 448	.6	1 312	3.4	128 147	.5	1 759	2.2	42 886	1.1
Kings	657	4.1	28 303	1.5	692	3.4	47 065	.9	920	3.0	20 317	.7
Lake..................	338	9.7	1 054	5.4	349	9.2	2 094	6.9	693	2.5	1 023	4.7
Lassen	124	16.3	1 083	18.7	66	29.0	930	14.4	349	1.9	1 314	5.8
Los Angeles	520	6.0	4 688	2.0	493	6.7	3 561	3.5	981	3.3	5 646	4.2
Madera	978	4.2	20 988	1.6	1 221	2.5	30 786	1.6	1 343	2.9	11 983	2.0
Marin	45	20.5	48	5.7	60	15.8	96	16.5	241	4.1	1 125	3.9
Mariposa..............	21	32.6	11	51.6	56	19.7	43	45.8	233	3.6	389	12.3
Mendocino	424	6.8	1 492	3.7	481	6.5	2 576	4.4	967	2.3	2 377	6.2
Merced	1 797	2.7	35 687	2.1	1 919	2.4	37 871	1.5	2 436	1.8	25 314	2.5
Modoc	260	7.9	4 327	5.7	194	10.5	3 664	8.2	420	2.8	2 305	4.9
Mono	19	5.4	117	5.0	18	5.6	45	9.3	61	3.4	397	4.4
Monterey	783	3.7	57 440	.4	750	4.4	73 251	.3	1 130	1.6	35 792	.4
Napa	835	4.6	3 511	10.9	1 004	3.3	6 770	5.2	1 118	2.9	3 272	4.4
Nevada	83	23.0	58	12.3	94	19.8	52	25.0	345	4.7	230	16.3

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	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)
Orange	234	7.1	4 465	2.9	198	9.6	3 825	2.6	293	4.0	4 772	2.4
Placer	296	9.0	1 955	9.5	285	10.4	1 782	15.6	818	3.3	1 430	7.9
Plumas	17	16.7	339	1.2	15	16.6	265	1.7	110	3.5	335	5.6
Riverside	1 606	3.6	25 876	1.2	1 703	3.5	26 402	1.8	2 412	2.1	14 402	1.9
Sacramento	609	6.4	8 856	6.9	597	7.1	8 386	2.9	1 040	2.5	6 243	4.1
San Benito	205	12.9	3 961	3.9	294	9.6	5 740	1.2	488	3.6	3 889	2.7
San Bernardino	447	8.6	1 466	11.1	481	7.6	2 633	8.7	1 147	2.9	5 663	1.6
San Diego	4 137	2.0	10 664	2.4	3 099	2.8	10 197	4.2	4 372	1.7	16 991	2.4
San Francisco	6	9.2	5	9.3	1	–	(D)	(D)	6	8.1	18	2.0
San Joaquin	2 526	2.3	36 991	1.2	2 841	1.9	46 832	1.3	3 336	1.6	24 467	1.8
San Luis Obispo	790	5.0	9 598	2.8	822	5.3	9 037	1.8	1 716	1.7	7 381	1.9
San Mateo	88	20.5	2 137	4.7	64	19.3	1 076	4.5	216	6.4	3 089	2.8
Santa Barbara	792	5.6	22 485	1.1	742	6.0	21 764	.8	1 249	2.5	12 243	1.6
Santa Clara	436	8.3	3 004	2.6	542	7.2	2 499	2.4	856	3.2	4 710	4.8
Santa Cruz	392	6.9	7 012	.7	431	7.6	6 631	1.9	662	3.2	5 780	4.4
Shasta	293	10.5	557	13.7	237	12.3	234	8.7	753	2.9	1 267	13.0
Sierra	7	6.5	6	8.7	7	8.1	13	13.1	45	2.8	111	2.7
Siskiyou	338	8.3	3 776	9.2	220	12.7	2 573	8.1	688	2.7	3 231	5.0
Solano	326	7.9	6 895	1.5	444	6.6	7 971	3.0	710	2.6	5 665	2.3
Sonoma	1 265	3.9	7 301	3.5	1 428	3.4	8 245	5.3	2 379	1.9	8 050	2.1
Stanislaus	2 494	2.3	27 460	2.1	2 619	2.1	37 368	2.6	3 499	1.4	18 635	1.8
Sutter	1 006	3.3	19 825	2.5	1 057	2.8	20 330	3.5	1 250	1.8	10 807	2.4
Tehama	652	6.0	3 854	6.2	659	5.9	4 576	5.8	1 196	2.4	3 654	7.1
Trinity	40	13.9	36	33.8	23	19.0	7	27.8	110	3.1	187	6.5
Tulare	3 799	1.9	46 155	1.6	4 372	1.5	80 058	1.5	4 469	1.6	31 081	1.5
Tuolumne	31	26.7	27	53.0	50	17.7	88	54.2	235	4.1	380	7.3
Ventura	1 680	2.9	20 640	1.9	1 670	2.6	27 740	1.8	1 688	2.6	11 712	2.0
Yolo	595	4.8	23 726	3.0	651	4.4	20 784	3.7	865	2.1	12 102	2.0
Yuba	443	5.2	5 475	3.7	381	6.2	8 274	4.1	609	3.3	3 653	2.9

Farm production expenses[1]—Con.

Geographic area	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)
California	**52 395**	**.7**	**526 592**	**.4**	**36 450**	**.9**	**3 392 577**	**.2**	**25 571**	**1.1**	**1 386 159**	**.5**
Alameda	311	8.3	598	10.0	123	16.6	7 379	2.5	55	25.0	503	35.8
Alpine	6	5.8	5	5.2	5	2.3	46	5.6	5	4.7	(D)	(D)
Amador	197	11.4	214	13.5	128	17.2	2 259	20.2	102	20.9	790	27.0
Butte	1 468	3.0	8 298	3.6	842	5.5	47 700	2.4	483	8.8	11 590	4.6
Calaveras	301	7.1	177	9.4	124	16.2	561	23.3	69	21.7	115	31.0
Colusa	513	6.7	6 120	2.8	447	7.5	41 506	2.4	277	11.2	8 279	2.7
Contra Costa	417	5.4	1 319	4.4	186	11.0	12 149	1.7	155	14.1	5 079	7.7
Del Norte	43	3.7	495	.5	32	4.0	5 579	.1	5	11.8	12	15.1
El Dorado	434	7.9	364	15.1	253	11.1	1 790	7.8	129	18.7	191	14.7
Fresno	5 428	1.4	49 838	.9	3 922	2.0	306 565	.6	3 609	2.2	210 180	1.2
Glenn	790	4.7	6 477	2.6	640	5.0	27 266	3.8	381	9.1	7 310	13.1
Humboldt	484	6.8	2 162	7.1	279	10.0	8 690	3.8	67	24.1	185	32.1
Imperial	410	6.1	8 865	4.7	354	7.7	76 614	1.6	249	9.6	60 549	1.3
Inyo	44	3.9	69	5.9	31	4.3	740	2.8	9	7.4	12	11.4
Kern	1 622	2.6	63 373	.7	1 163	3.7	310 445	.4	971	3.6	181 884	.6
Kings	930	2.9	13 981	.9	609	5.3	68 728	.7	386	7.5	19 475	3.2
Lake	468	6.2	1 081	6.6	390	8.1	7 354	2.8	297	9.9	2 043	7.5
Lassen	249	8.7	912	13.1	116	13.1	4 225	5.3	37	29.7	407	25.8
Los Angeles	704	5.2	4 725	1.4	438	7.4	64 160	.9	172	15.3	7 079	4.3
Madera	1 490	1.8	22 838	1.1	930	4.3	77 784	1.4	876	4.4	54 492	3.3
Marin	208	6.0	1 003	3.3	144	8.0	5 869	1.5	75	14.7	449	3.3
Mariposa	158	8.8	122	11.7	61	15.3	227	32.4	36	27.7	23	28.4
Mendocino	706	4.5	1 954	7.5	461	6.4	23 221	4.7	260	12.2	3 914	9.5
Merced	2 251	2.1	27 959	1.4	1 577	3.1	138 064	.8	977	5.1	34 516	3.0
Modoc	362	5.0	1 709	9.2	206	10.2	6 169	9.2	88	20.9	883	25.1
Mono	44	3.8	428	2.2	26	4.8	580	3.5	15	5.8	177	3.6
Monterey	921	3.4	36 549	.4	794	3.5	348 053	.4	467	6.3	158 200	.2
Napa	916	4.2	2 491	6.9	767	5.2	44 032	3.5	712	5.1	21 329	4.5
Nevada	193	12.4	138	18.7	98	23.3	264	23.0	34	34.0	43	39.6
Orange	197	10.1	1 793	4.9	187	11.3	50 239	1.7	92	20.0	8 131	4.1
Placer	662	4.7	1 326	11.7	240	11.1	6 161	19.7	104	17.6	730	5.4
Plumas	74	7.4	204	1.6	32	12.7	973	1.8	8	32.6	139	5.2
Riverside	1 861	3.4	22 478	1.7	1 428	4.2	128 522	.7	1 074	5.3	57 687	3.3
Sacramento	1 072	3.2	5 607	2.1	506	7.8	29 439	1.8	301	11.7	10 138	1.4
San Benito	352	7.7	6 292	3.2	212	10.1	31 125	1.3	95	18.1	14 115	1.7
San Bernardino	900	4.6	11 818	2.6	690	5.5	54 775	2.5	292	11.7	7 144	6.8
San Diego	2 946	2.9	11 694	3.5	2 715	3.2	129 775	1.1	1 695	4.8	26 715	2.7
San Francisco	8	7.8	12	4.3	4	12.1	245	8.4	1	–	(D)	(D)
San Joaquin	3 069	2.1	26 653	1.6	2 048	3.2	161 754	.9	1 619	3.9	58 784	3.4

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

Table F. **Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997**—Con.

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

Farm production expenses[1]—Con.

Geographic area	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)
San Luis Obispo	1 229	3.9	8 152	1.9	766	5.7	59 902	1.2	487	8.4	25 326	2.0
San Mateo	180	10.8	1 937	2.6	140	15.8	45 873	.2	29	38.7	545	8.4
Santa Barbara	878	4.7	16 425	.9	959	4.6	149 129	.8	432	7.5	42 892	1.6
Santa Clara	660	5.0	4 762	2.1	494	7.7	43 215	1.1	146	17.8	5 330	5.1
Santa Cruz	492	6.1	4 056	2.1	434	7.2	66 512	1.6	191	11.1	10 869	2.1
Shasta	435	6.7	927	10.1	279	10.2	4 097	6.1	94	22.5	2 327	5.3
Sierra................	30	3.5	52	11.4	16	4.4	85	4.7	7	6.5	11	9.8
Siskiyou	521	6.5	3 737	10.7	259	10.5	11 309	3.9	123	17.8	529	7.5
Solano...............	541	5.2	4 951	4.0	370	7.3	29 643	1.0	281	9.3	7 235	3.2
Sonoma	1 974	2.6	6 818	2.3	1 421	3.5	82 834	2.1	737	6.6	23 688	6.2
Stanislaus............	2 877	2.3	22 197	1.8	1 848	3.4	137 374	.9	1 412	4.4	40 458	3.5
Sutter	1 037	3.5	7 186	2.7	831	4.7	44 567	2.6	459	8.4	14 241	2.7
Tehama...............	1 006	3.9	3 203	6.1	503	7.8	14 940	5.0	396	9.9	3 796	11.4
Trinity	64	8.7	28	15.0	32	15.7	476	14.3	17	25.1	42	8.3
Tulare	4 644	1.4	51 043	1.1	2 850	2.8	192 328	1.1	2 972	2.7	157 555	1.8
Tuolumne	157	8.0	350	18.4	67	18.2	1 622	12.8	43	23.5	506	17.5
Ventura	1 280	3.7	26 455	1.1	1 261	4.1	203 278	.9	1 013	5.3	52 602	2.5
Yolo.................	695	4.6	8 561	2.0	457	5.8	55 209	1.2	328	9.3	20 719	1.8
Yuba	486	5.4	3 608	7.8	255	9.0	19 152	1.6	125	15.9	4 187	9.6

Farm production expenses[1]—Con.

Geographic area	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest			
	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)
California	**56 574**	**.7**	**777 097**	**.3**	**25 794**	**1.1**	**595 872**	**.7**	**26 987**	**1.1**	**958 431**	**.4**
Alameda	332	7.4	1 727	5.5	94	22.3	766	3.9	101	21.2	1 196	9.8
Alpine	11	5.1	10	3.7	–	–	–	–	3	–	(D)	(D)
Amador	283	7.0	790	11.5	87	24.1	501	6.5	79	23.9	1 672	4.4
Butte	1 399	3.5	10 625	3.6	792	5.9	16 688	8.5	684	6.3	14 670	5.6
Calaveras	365	5.1	657	10.7	81	19.9	87	39.2	84	17.2	333	18.3
Colusa...............	644	4.9	13 434	1.8	492	5.7	14 228	7.8	455	7.5	10 257	3.2
Contra Costa	438	4.8	2 791	3.5	133	13.8	1 783	22.4	158	12.8	2 615	7.6
Del Norte	50	3.4	1 239	.4	14	6.5	35	2.1	22	4.8	834	.9
El Dorado	581	4.6	1 096	8.0	116	18.8	170	39.0	263	12.4	954	15.5
Fresno...............	5 330	1.4	89 665	.8	3 115	2.7	105 571	.7	3 097	2.6	131 131	1.1
Glenn................	942	3.1	10 249	4.9	483	7.4	9 899	8.5	511	6.8	13 038	6.5
Humboldt	644	3.8	3 081	5.3	153	15.8	(D)	(D)	269	11.0	2 664	9.9
Imperial	418	6.7	26 994	1.0	346	6.3	24 654	1.9	396	6.1	20 396	2.0
Inyo	63	3.5	245	6.8	8	8.9	42	1.6	22	5.9	105	8.4
Kern.................	1 574	3.1	65 981	.6	899	4.3	68 563	1.0	1 074	4.6	121 375	.5
Kings	847	3.9	28 370	1.7	559	4.9	24 751	2.2	570	4.7	31 894	1.0
Lake.................	560	4.8	2 504	8.0	296	10.2	595	10.4	167	15.5	2 341	9.3
Lassen	276	7.9	1 816	16.3	122	16.9	513	27.7	141	16.5	1 122	17.4
Los Angeles	848	4.5	7 673	3.4	153	15.2	2 248	2.4	183	10.7	4 918	2.7
Madera	1 259	3.4	19 278	1.8	707	5.5	19 481	3.4	810	5.4	33 162	3.2
Marin	247	4.2	2 328	2.7	79	11.1	414	2.0	89	11.8	1 253	4.0
Mariposa.............	194	6.0	383	12.9	21	36.8	23	36.9	83	15.2	476	17.5
Mendocino	816	3.8	4 765	3.4	292	10.8	1 635	8.4	340	9.5	5 177	5.0
Merced	2 361	2.0	40 781	1.3	1 607	3.3	39 516	4.1	1 478	3.3	55 874	1.4
Modoc	402	3.1	3 379	11.6	211	9.8	2 617	3.7	236	9.2	4 426	7.1
Mono	59	3.4	501	4.0	15	6.1	102	3.0	28	4.5	605	2.5
Monterey	993	2.7	57 784	.4	451	6.3	23 373	.3	582	4.8	49 112	.6
Napa	978	3.8	8 503	5.0	405	9.0	4 501	7.8	330	9.8	12 978	6.2
Nevada	312	7.1	394	11.5	69	24.7	44	39.2	52	26.4	230	21.4
Orange	263	6.1	3 115	5.6	75	20.8	1 006	18.0	94	18.8	3 948	6.8
Placer	728	4.4	1 988	7.9	119	17.8	1 222	17.8	231	12.0	1 543	10.9
Plumas	87	6.0	426	7.2	28	14.7	424	2.1	39	12.3	548	8.9
Riverside.............	2 048	3.1	29 180	1.5	612	7.6	15 748	4.5	888	6.0	37 751	1.8
Sacramento	1 051	3.6	9 462	2.2	471	8.9	4 915	2.7	453	8.3	9 336	4.1
San Benito	401	6.4	6 332	4.7	171	14.2	3 858	2.9	183	11.6	4 201	5.4
San Bernardino	1 100	3.2	15 224	1.6	265	12.3	3 293	1.4	465	7.8	24 212	1.1
San Diego	3 571	2.4	17 258	2.3	809	7.3	4 109	5.3	1 199	5.5	22 158	4.0
San Francisco	6	8.1	14	7.7	1	20.4	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)
San Joaquin	3 122	1.9	42 008	1.2	1 890	3.3	40 534	2.2	1 666	3.9	55 182	1.4
San Luis Obispo	1 506	2.7	12 533	3.1	472	8.1	2 864	4.3	516	7.6	10 842	5.3
San Mateo	215	5.9	5 503	2.0	35	40.9	251	8.6	38	16.6	1 911	.9
Santa Barbara	1 144	3.5	16 728	1.8	402	9.9	5 098	1.3	428	7.8	15 662	2.8
Santa Clara	679	5.7	7 266	3.1	300	12.1	1 189	3.4	155	14.7	3 478	7.6
Santa Cruz	624	3.7	9 893	1.8	175	13.3	5 982	1.2	160	11.9	4 462	3.3
Shasta...............	604	5.1	1 766	10.7	145	15.4	337	22.8	254	12.5	2 158	16.4
Sierra...............	37	3.0	140	3.9	4	12.1	6	17.9	20	4.0	224	5.7
Siskiyou	614	3.8	4 449	5.8	214	12.9	1 738	28.7	284	10.0	4 054	5.6
Solano..............	621	4.0	9 307	2.3	291	9.2	5 841	4.7	268	7.5	7 378	6.8
Sonoma	2 238	2.2	17 390	2.1	781	6.5	5 777	8.1	804	5.6	18 119	3.4

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. **Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997**—Con.

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

	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest			
Geographic area	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)
Stanislaus.............	3 203	1.9	39 453	1.3	1 859	3.5	38 171	1.6	1 618	3.9	46 513	2.0
Sutter	1 118	2.8	17 198	3.3	676	5.6	12 615	6.0	602	6.5	16 499	4.0
Tehama................	996	3.6	5 960	3.5	374	10.9	2 261	20.0	494	8.4	6 332	7.6
Trinity	95	4.8	311	13.1	11	34.2	14	34.8	34	14.6	124	13.3
Tulare	4 260	1.8	52 812	1.3	2 548	3.1	47 623	2.0	2 485	3.0	92 798	1.4
Tuolumne	199	6.5	871	5.5	51	21.1	99	21.3	72	17.6	336	19.1
Ventura	1 519	3.4	19 903	2.6	564	7.6	9 932	12.0	594	6.9	20 546	2.7
Yolo.................	761	4.0	17 536	1.4	402	8.1	11 084	2.7	384	7.9	17 063	2.4
Yuba	538	4.8	6 028	4.2	249	8.7	6 708	8.6	251	10.0	6 229	5.6

	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
Geographic area	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)
California.....	**13 317**	**1.6**	**554 077**	**.6**	**66 656**	**.6**	**360 348**	**.6**	**68 046**	**.6**	**2 200 014**	**.2**
Alameda	135	14.8	1 600	5.5	417	3.4	1 035	13.4	402	4.3	4 968	3.0
Alpine	−	−	−	−	11	5.1	(D)	(D)	12	4.7	18	5.0
Amador	43	34.5	1 402	12.2	340	2.7	761	15.2	301	5.5	1 818	17.1
Butte	336	9.9	7 191	10.1	1 715	2.0	8 415	3.8	1 696	2.1	27 271	3.6
Calaveras	70	22.0	564	24.6	435	2.1	1 148	8.3	405	4.2	1 128	8.1
Colusa...............	246	11.1	13 355	5.0	671	3.6	4 375	3.7	794	1.8	28 947	2.6
Contra Costa	97	18.7	2 419	9.4	502	3.5	1 649	7.2	521	3.0	6 222	1.9
Del Norte	17	4.7	551	.5	60	3.2	248	1.3	62	3.1	1 186	.8
El Dorado	33	32.8	103	15.3	751	1.1	1 193	7.1	713	2.4	1 493	11.7
Fresno...............	1 324	4.4	57 474	1.2	5 974	1.0	38 431	1.2	6 307	.8	260 919	.5
Glenn................	293	9.9	9 667	6.5	1 017	3.0	4 191	2.9	1 135	1.5	20 474	2.7
Humboldt	252	11.2	3 272	11.0	750	2.0	1 323	7.8	713	3.0	8 760	4.1
Imperial	326	7.7	38 591	.7	386	6.7	5 055	2.7	547	1.9	73 247	.7
Inyo	33	5.4	278	4.8	71	3.2	159	3.1	73	3.1	558	2.9
Kern.................	493	6.4	42 278	1.3	1 798	1.7	29 541	1.3	1 874	1.7	239 669	.4
Kings	333	7.8	16 731	2.1	943	2.6	8 108	1.2	964	2.1	63 578	.6
Lake.................	37	37.5	225	7.9	757	1.4	1 508	5.7	652	3.5	4 083	2.7
Lassen	57	22.9	742	22.8	348	2.4	1 270	14.4	333	3.3	3 629	13.7
Los Angeles	246	11.6	4 519	9.1	1 039	2.8	3 292	6.6	1 120	2.2	25 777	1.1
Madera	219	11.0	9 865	3.4	1 592	1.3	12 629	2.0	1 599	1.4	64 187	1.8
Marin	110	10.0	1 677	8.6	218	5.1	781	10.4	266	2.7	4 775	2.2
Mariposa	49	21.9	330	21.5	240	2.6	452	10.3	239	2.9	1 119	17.2
Mendocino	186	15.1	2 744	9.0	992	2.4	3 850	6.3	970	2.5	9 716	3.3
Merced	672	5.8	27 772	2.7	2 553	1.4	17 569	1.4	2 617	1.3	99 719	.9
Modoc	133	14.4	3 594	11.7	400	3.7	2 468	10.5	420	2.5	6 966	5.1
Mono	16	6.1	162	8.2	54	3.5	261	4.7	59	3.4	887	3.4
Monterey	480	6.3	71 381	.9	930	3.2	19 832	1.0	1 117	1.8	138 770	.2
Napa	124	16.5	1 638	9.0	1 250	1.6	8 640	4.3	1 179	2.1	20 141	5.0
Nevada	46	34.4	64	52.3	378	4.3	767	14.0	348	5.7	783	15.4
Orange	98	18.0	2 618	1.5	265	5.1	1 714	9.2	324	2.8	32 260	.7
Placer	109	18.3	1 144	10.5	894	2.4	1 734	11.8	899	2.3	3 969	8.3
Plumas	20	21.8	(D)	(D)	94	5.5	254	8.2	99	3.6	1 331	2.5
Riverside.............	299	10.1	13 796	2.2	2 857	1.2	15 660	2.4	2 880	1.3	115 473	.8
Sacramento	241	12.8	6 922	12.3	1 106	3.1	3 671	4.6	1 126	2.7	18 519	1.9
San Benito	137	15.7	2 371	5.7	488	4.0	2 609	6.6	525	2.0	13 407	1.8
San Bernardino	229	9.7	7 893	1.7	1 286	2.1	4 725	3.5	1 322	2.0	55 574	1.6
San Diego............	329	10.2	7 379	4.6	5 509	1.0	16 178	2.9	5 276	1.2	66 253	1.6
San Francisco	4	8.2	(D)	(D)	6	8.1	(D)	(D)	9	8.0	212	22.8
San Joaquin	695	6.4	35 730	2.2	3 517	1.3	19 031	2.1	3 503	1.4	102 820	.9
San Luis Obispo	344	10.7	11 305	4.3	1 622	2.4	7 044	4.2	1 626	2.3	28 152	1.4
San Mateo	63	24.9	1 473	6.7	190	9.6	926	9.6	194	8.8	19 477	.6
Santa Barbara	336	9.0	17 695	2.1	1 222	2.5	7 963	5.1	1 387	1.7	63 807	1.0
Santa Clara	188	14.3	3 642	7.9	778	4.0	2 411	6.8	885	2.9	23 627	.9
Santa Cruz	163	14.3	5 110	4.0	579	4.5	2 577	11.6	645	3.1	26 812	2.8
Shasta	87	23.3	916	7.5	764	2.8	1 401	6.0	782	2.1	3 324	14.5
Sierra................	8	4.3	54	2.5	43	2.9	129	3.0	39	2.9	181	3.7
Siskiyou	184	14.3	3 348	16.0	683	2.1	2 157	6.6	682	3.0	6 598	7.0
Solano	182	13.7	6 151	6.1	708	2.9	2 992	5.1	710	2.2	14 535	3.0
Sonoma	401	9.2	8 781	3.3	2 479	1.5	11 590	6.0	2 419	1.6	43 759	2.2
Stanislaus............	790	5.9	23 555	2.4	3 651	1.2	16 532	2.1	3 846	1.0	90 290	.9
Sutter	346	9.0	10 081	8.0	1 165	2.3	7 920	4.1	1 211	2.2	25 795	2.8
Tehama...............	205	13.6	1 742	9.2	1 308	1.4	3 668	6.6	1 234	2.3	10 274	4.0
Trinity	8	32.0	10	30.5	109	3.2	250	7.4	104	3.4	346	5.6
Tulare	787	6.3	27 038	2.6	5 092	1.0	26 782	1.8	5 092	1.0	188 911	1.1
Tuolumne	67	20.0	1 118	39.9	235	4.1	552	12.7	225	4.8	1 656	7.3
Ventura	222	10.0	12 683	2.5	2 003	1.6	12 065	2.6	2 097	1.3	83 090	1.1
Yolo.................	255	10.8	18 540	4.7	783	3.4	5 303	8.4	834	2.5	29 209	1.5
Yuba	114	15.1	2 437	13.3	628	2.5	3 505	3.4	633	3.0	9 546	2.5

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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)
California	**74 129**	**.5**	**6 118 086**	**.3**	**62 269**	**.6**	**10 803 804**	**.3**	**55 590**	**.6**	**8 543 159**	**.2**
Alameda	458	1.0	10 306	8.9	278	1.5	41 553	3.1	177	2.1	12 628	2.4
Alpine	12	4.7	(D)	(D)	6	8.3	3 127	.4	2	25.0	(D)	(D)
Amador	360	.9	5 014	23.3	206	1.3	25 486	8.3	158	1.6	6 689	2.6
Butte	1 943	.6	82 989	3.7	1 750	.6	247 368	.7	1 646	.6	222 209	.7
Calaveras	457	.8	644	60.1	232	1.5	20 835	3.5	125	2.3	2 690	3.3
Colusa	811	1.1	69 987	4.4	759	.9	316 756	.7	722	1.0	287 630	.7
Contra Costa	587	.8	17 669	10.0	386	1.1	43 528	2.5	315	1.3	28 391	2.1
Del Norte	66	3.0	5 229	.7	44	2.5	8 039	2.6	32	3.5	3 373	3.5
El Dorado	762	.7	1 268	36.6	562	.8	12 646	2.7	447	1.0	4 275	1.8
Fresno	6 591	.5	628 900	.7	6 005	.6	1 250 984	.2	5 730	.6	1 157 357	.2
Glenn	1 190	.7	54 117	4.5	1 070	.7	255 968	.9	916	.8	212 848	.7
Humboldt	793	.7	17 700	10.5	570	.8	51 228	1.7	429	1.1	15 233	1.2
Imperial	556	1.0	216 254	.7	493	.9	459 386	.3	469	.9	433 119	.3
Inyo	82	3.1	1 593	5.9	44	2.6	(D)	(D)	28	4.0	2 944	9.9
Kern	1 996	.7	455 721	.7	1 522	.8	1 054 228	.2	1 360	.8	893 221	.2
Kings	1 080	.5	133 838	1.6	935	.5	526 132	.2	830	.6	445 537	.2
Lake	777	.7	9 043	9.1	703	.6	33 085	2.1	670	.7	20 811	1.3
Lassen	365	.8	7 335	18.8	300	.9	118 440	1.4	244	1.2	45 898	1.5
Los Angeles	1 227	.9	72 977	1.4	830	1.1	48 847	4.0	743	1.2	23 805	1.9
Madera	1 672	.7	157 630	2.1	1 400	.8	332 617	.4	1 262	.8	294 706	.4
Marin	277	1.0	7 820	5.2	156	1.6	28 043	4.2	96	2.4	5 776	1.9
Mariposa	252	.8	−77	(H)	111	1.8	9 066	4.2	58	2.9	420	6.0
Mendocino	1 093	.6	45 587	2.6	895	.6	66 316	1.6	765	.8	30 425	1.0
Merced	2 833	.6	293 785	1.4	2 485	.6	532 327	.4	2 219	.6	434 074	.3
Modoc	440	.9	11 249	10.0	385	.7	183 327	1.1	334	.9	117 505	.7
Mono	63	3.3	1 277	4.1	48	2.0	(D)	(D)	39	2.8	8 462	2.0
Monterey	1 208	.6	616 139	.3	980	.7	388 633	.9	841	.8	286 426	.2
Napa	1 317	.7	93 406	3.2	1 236	.7	74 511	1.4	1 178	.7	50 305	.6
Nevada	412	.8	−651	45.0	255	1.2	15 094	5.1	171	1.7	1 620	6.6
Orange	349	1.1	102 033	1.2	284	1.1	17 301	1.4	265	1.2	12 973	.6
Placer	997	.6	6 358	18.6	629	.8	62 284	2.4	388	1.2	28 431	1.9
Plumas	117	1.9	13 855	1.3	90	1.8	42 617	4.2	62	2.8	15 033	3.4
Riverside	3 046	.7	269 005	1.2	2 367	.7	279 806	.4	2 165	.7	245 446	.4
Sacramento	1 288	.6	40 833	5.6	986	.7	159 059	.9	688	1.0	120 220	.9
San Benito	562	.8	43 768	2.7	419	1.0	73 166	1.8	344	1.2	39 049	.8
San Bernardino	1 454	.7	124 459	1.9	982	.9	58 141	2.2	865	1.0	39 543	1.2
San Diego	5 925	.5	217 400	1.4	5 474	.5	112 974	1.3	5 302	.5	77 574	.9
San Francisco	9	8.0	(D)	(D)	9	1.7	(D)	(D)	9	1.7	(D)	(D)
San Joaquin	3 862	.6	338 271	1.3	3 552	.6	559 435	.3	3 262	.6	498 985	.3
San Luis Obispo	1 915	.6	81 663	2.8	1 511	.6	280 524	1.5	1 220	.8	105 237	.8
San Mateo	240	.9	36 889	2.0	182	1.1	14 736	4.8	153	1.5	6 046	3.4
Santa Barbara	1 451	.7	215 923	1.2	1 169	.8	157 213	1.0	1 047	.9	107 519	.5
Santa Clara	985	.9	62 327	1.4	756	1.0	31 643	1.9	673	1.1	23 127	1.4
Santa Cruz	722	.9	71 128	1.3	637	1.1	27 776	.8	605	1.1	22 229	.9
Shasta	851	.7	7 204	11.4	612	.9	59 487	2.7	401	1.2	22 659	2.5
Sierra	47	2.8	−43	36.7	37	1.4	14 677	3.1	24	2.9	3 861	4.7
Siskiyou	734	.7	16 389	8.2	618	.8	182 185	1.5	458	1.0	102 643	1.3
Solano	795	.7	34 301	3.6	651	.7	209 551	.8	555	.9	141 017	.5
Sonoma	2 745	.5	134 758	2.2	2 204	.6	144 544	.8	1 890	.6	80 771	.6
Stanislaus	4 009	.5	273 868	1.6	3 481	.5	381 601	.4	3 045	.6	315 978	.3
Sutter	1 314	.7	59 443	4.0	1 259	.8	297 107	.7	1 203	.8	266 399	.7
Tehama	1 362	.7	25 171	7.3	1 063	.7	127 019	1.4	831	.8	62 038	1.2
Trinity	116	2.1	−489	22.1	85	1.5	6 678	6.1	63	2.3	1 754	8.2
Tulare	5 448	.6	516 029	1.0	4 992	.6	703 295	.5	4 812	.6	639 578	.4
Tuolumne	264	1.3	−103	(H)	130	2.0	13 395	4.9	62	3.6	1 295	7.7
Ventura	2 214	.6	307 560	1.0	2 064	.6	132 124	1.2	2 019	.6	111 375	.6
Yolo	922	.6	84 274	5.1	832	.6	380 700	.4	747	.7	324 291	.3
Yuba	706	.8	18 803	5.6	548	.8	96 989	1.0	426	1.1	79 586	.9

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)
California	**55 920**	**.6**	**8 712 893**	**.2**	**17 335**	**.5**	**4 968 679**	**.2**	**12 158**	**.6**	**890 805**	**.5**
Alameda	129	2.5	10 480	2.0	230	1.7	30 442	2.5	195	1.9	12 511	2.8
Alpine	6	8.3	2 925	.1	4	–	1 474	–	4	–	930	–
Amador	142	1.8	12 463	4.8	196	1.3	31 029	1.2	171	1.5	11 448	1.7
Butte	1 686	.6	223 690	.7	300	1.6	20 430	2.5	239	1.8	8 826	3.1
Calaveras	148	2.1	7 444	4.2	281	1.2	30 485	2.0	235	1.5	16 439	2.0
Colusa	723	1.0	276 562	.6	100	2.9	16 417	2.4	78	3.3	7 291	3.7
Contra Costa	289	1.4	30 416	2.0	170	2.1	27 351	2.8	138	2.4	(D)	(D)
Del Norte	24	4.1	6 323	1.8	45	1.8	10 060	1.5	32	2.9	1 462	5.0
El Dorado	448	1.0	4 738	1.9	227	1.6	9 890	2.7	181	1.8	4 988	2.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	Irrigated land Farms Number	Irrigated land Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Irrigated land Acres Number	Irrigated land Acres Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Cattle and calves inventory Farms Number	Cattle and calves inventory Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Cattle and calves inventory Total Number	Cattle and calves inventory Total Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Beef cows inventory Farms Number	Beef cows inventory Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Beef cows inventory Total Number	Beef cows inventory Total Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Fresno	5 810	.6	1 153 812	.2	786	1.1	301 760	.2	490	1.5	22 682	1.8
Glenn	1 025	.7	220 235	.7	381	1.3	67 138	1.0	244	1.8	18 668	1.9
Humboldt	301	1.4	17 630	1.0	501	.9	69 201	.9	340	1.2	21 815	1.6
Imperial	489	.8	437 896	.3	69	2.7	348 529	.1	21	6.5	(D)	(D)
Inyo	61	2.0	19 408	2.0	44	3.1	18 168	1.3	39	3.5	(D)	(D)
Kern	1 406	.8	912 584	.2	462	1.4	213 309	.5	348	1.6	43 404	1.4
Kings	892	.6	421 365	.2	334	1.1	207 295	.1	115	2.5	4 050	1.9
Lake	370	1.2	16 704	2.6	118	2.6	7 846	3.6	96	2.9	4 313	3.7
Lassen	245	1.2	67 540	1.4	219	1.4	56 036	1.5	198	1.5	28 821	1.5
Los Angeles	677	1.2	27 363	1.5	117	3.3	11 479	2.9	84	3.9	(D)	(D)
Madera	1 308	.8	308 599	.4	396	1.3	111 704	.7	278	1.7	25 167	1.5
Marin	63	3.3	777	3.4	159	1.6	46 716	1.2	111	2.1	9 572	2.8
Mariposa	70	2.6	2 722	11.6	171	1.1	21 277	2.1	144	1.3	9 958	2.6
Mendocino	586	1.0	24 716	1.0	389	1.2	36 498	1.5	320	1.4	(D)	(D)
Merced	2 411	.6	493 072	.4	907	.8	407 376	.3	474	1.4	39 956	1.2
Modoc	337	.9	159 219	.8	266	1.2	96 536	.8	232	1.3	48 219	.9
Mono	52	1.8	31 322	5.1	35	3.2	8 142	3.4	33	3.4	4 776	4.2
Monterey	771	.8	260 073	.1	377	1.4	113 409	1.1	320	1.6	37 025	1.5
Napa	994	.8	46 324	.7	128	2.7	10 240	4.9	110	2.9	(D)	(D)
Nevada	278	1.1	6 901	4.1	197	1.5	7 478	3.5	157	1.8	4 231	3.5
Orange	250	1.3	13 253	4.0	22	6.9	2 092	3.7	12	9.6	(D)	(D)
Placer	703	.7	34 754	1.9	483	1.0	24 854	2.3	411	1.1	(D)	(D)
Plumas	65	2.5	29 472	8.4	77	2.2	16 458	3.2	68	2.5	6 393	3.9
Riverside	2 204	.7	219 772	.3	353	1.5	204 968	.2	159	2.6	7 629	2.6
Sacramento	886	.8	122 550	1.0	501	1.2	69 362	1.3	349	1.5	17 457	2.5
San Benito	315	1.3	35 970	.7	246	1.6	56 841	1.8	185	1.9	23 589	1.9
San Bernardino	891	.9	40 961	1.2	324	1.1	326 075	.1	111	2.6	8 460	1.8
San Diego	5 133	.5	69 537	.8	288	1.8	26 493	1.4	184	2.3	7 945	2.6
San Francisco	7	7.3	18	14.2	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Joaquin	3 427	.6	519 021	.3	700	1.0	218 515	.5	423	1.5	27 174	1.8
San Luis Obispo	925	.9	60 573	.9	715	1.0	100 368	1.0	621	1.1	51 297	1.1
San Mateo	142	1.6	4 298	1.4	47	3.9	3 839	7.8	39	4.6	2 280	8.4
Santa Barbara	1 062	.9	104 272	.4	352	1.6	71 619	1.4	280	1.8	31 548	1.9
Santa Clara	558	1.2	18 731	.9	200	2.3	25 722	2.4	158	2.6	11 217	2.6
Santa Cruz	502	1.2	21 022	.8	63	4.3	5 340	9.1	51	4.8	(D)	(D)
Shasta	605	.9	38 863	3.1	486	1.0	37 758	2.3	400	1.2	18 378	2.4
Sierra	31	2.1	10 012	3.3	37	1.5	6 651	2.2	34	1.6	(D)	(D)
Siskiyou	556	.9	139 534	1.2	417	1.1	79 676	1.5	359	1.3	41 377	1.5
Solano	558	.9	161 621	.5	214	1.8	33 252	1.4	167	2.1	9 458	2.6
Sonoma	1 413	.7	57 181	.9	706	1.0	93 462	.8	441	1.4	15 502	2.4
Stanislaus	3 523	.5	359 427	.3	1 188	.8	409 326	.3	648	1.2	38 948	1.5
Sutter	1 199	.8	242 183	.7	125	2.7	12 660	3.2	103	3.0	(D)	(D)
Tehama	1 001	.7	85 571	1.1	559	1.1	85 270	1.0	431	1.3	40 153	1.1
Trinity	70	2.0	2 212	12.3	61	2.3	7 566	2.2	54	2.6	3 965	2.6
Tulare	4 809	.6	625 070	.4	858	1.0	634 017	.2	458	1.5	40 390	1.3
Tuolumne	120	2.1	3 499	6.9	166	1.5	17 579	4.3	148	1.7	(D)	(D)
Ventura	1 959	.6	110 951	.6	126	2.8	18 951	2.8	98	3.1	(D)	(D)
Yolo	709	.8	294 021	.3	148	2.3	18 963	1.7	115	2.7	7 224	2.4
Yuba	556	.8	85 241	.8	264	1.6	23 287	2.3	224	1.8	9 107	3.1

Livestock and poultry—Con.

Geographic area	Milk cows inventory Farms Number	Milk cows inventory Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Milk cows inventory Total Number	Milk cows inventory Total Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hogs and pigs inventory Farms Number	Hogs and pigs inventory Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hogs and pigs inventory Total Number	Hogs and pigs inventory Total Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Sheep and lambs inventory Farms Number	Sheep and lambs inventory Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Sheep and lambs inventory Total Number	Sheep and lambs inventory Total Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
California	**2 650**	**.4**	**1 403 217**	**(L)**	**1 593**	**1.0**	**212 088**	**.4**	**3 014**	**.7**	**784 041**	**.2**
Alameda	7	13.3	127	19.3	11	11.4	100	17.3	38	5.5	1 212	15.4
Alpine	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Amador	6	12.3	35	15.8	9	9.0	53	11.0	31	4.7	1 111	6.0
Butte	11	7.4	860	3.3	46	4.1	6 845	.9	86	3.1	2 229	5.1
Calaveras	4	17.0	6	18.3	24	6.1	104	10.2	44	4.5	1 454	6.6
Colusa	7	12.2	449	7.0	14	9.0	262	14.5	22	6.5	7 184	3.1
Contra Costa	5	10.7	(D)	(D)	15	8.8	81	14.8	19	6.9	286	9.9
Del Norte	9	6.3	3 628	.7	2	14.1	(D)	(D)	7	9.2	96	12.6
El Dorado	7	11.4	20	27.2	38	4.2	234	6.5	79	2.9	2 046	5.4
Fresno	128	1.6	77 143	.1	58	4.4	7 554	1.5	91	3.5	33 666	.4
Glenn	68	2.3	16 277	.4	14	7.9	1 717	20.6	69	3.7	8 123	5.2
Humboldt	133	1.7	18 962	.8	30	5.2	800	10.5	83	3.0	4 507	4.9
Imperial	2	–	(D)	(D)	11	12.1	224	16.7	20	3.6	165 774	(L)
Inyo	1	–	(D)	(D)	3	18.6	12	23.6	9	8.4	147	9.6
Kern	39	3.4	42 926	(L)	55	4.4	1 988	3.4	83	3.2	149 127	.1
Kings	154	.7	107 327	(L)	17	7.4	(D)	(D)	25	5.8	(D)	(D)
Lake	3	15.5	4	16.5	21	6.9	141	9.1	42	4.4	1 074	7.8
Lassen	15	6.8	38	13.9	24	5.5	351	8.5	34	4.8	2 107	3.1
Los Angeles	7	8.8	(D)	(D)	59	4.4	1 683	4.5	60	4.4	8 213	.8

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

Table F. **Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997**—Con.

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

	Livestock and poultry—Con.											
Geographic area	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)
Madera	62	1.7	26 880	.1	20	8.2	346	13.4	42	5.1	9 850	2.6
Marin	45	1.8	13 976	(L)	5	13.9	(D)	(D)	41	4.2	12 846	3.1
Mariposa	4	12.1	18	12.7	3	14.0	(D)	(D)	22	5.3	363	7.0
Mendocino	19	6.3	(D)	(D)	53	4.2	1 804	15.7	181	2.0	11 514	3.7
Merced	339	.6	187 717	(L)	61	3.9	7 906	1.3	66	3.9	14 534	.5
Modoc	15	7.2	144	14.6	14	8.3	106	15.8	38	4.6	10 480	3.0
Mono	–	–	–	–	2	13.8	(D)	(D)	8	6.6	7 481	.5
Monterey	12	4.6	3 842	.3	22	6.7	479	11.1	49	4.5	1 717	10.3
Napa	2	16.0	(D)	(D)	18	7.0	229	13.5	34	5.5	497	9.9
Nevada	6	12.9	8	15.0	15	6.4	101	12.1	48	3.9	1 212	11.8
Orange	1	–	(D)	(D)	4	18.3	(D)	(D)	7	14.1	82	29.1
Placer	10	8.6	(D)	(D)	45	4.2	325	8.4	114	2.4	3 149	6.5
Plumas	6	12.6	16	15.7	5	12.8	134	24.1	12	8.2	567	19.4
Riverside	119	1.4	113 719	(L)	84	3.6	2 080	9.0	80	3.5	33 155	.2
Sacramento	74	2.3	18 762	.2	64	3.8	1 575	7.7	86	3.3	4 239	2.9
San Benito	10	8.1	1 740	1.4	13	7.8	542	22.6	25	6.0	3 382	1.1
San Bernardino	187	.7	185 249	(L)	42	4.9	14 296	.8	52	4.1	16 861	.5
San Diego	27	4.9	4 942	.1	64	4.1	1 568	11.4	77	3.6	990	5.0
San Francisco	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Joaquin	164	1.0	86 148	.1	51	4.5	1 911	4.5	86	3.5	21 944	1.9
San Luis Obispo	17	7.2	674	2.7	61	4.0	1 008	9.9	96	3.1	21 132	1.4
San Mateo	5	15.1	8	14.9	6	12.1	48	7.2	5	13.9	104	15.5
Santa Barbara	12	6.7	3 448	.9	21	7.1	201	14.6	31	5.8	10 250	2.7
Santa Clara	9	9.8	1 337	.5	25	6.8	196	8.5	41	5.3	709	8.8
Santa Cruz	6	13.8	(D)	(D)	11	11.1	106	19.2	18	8.4	(D)	(D)
Shasta	25	5.8	516	1.4	43	4.6	273	11.8	65	3.8	1 417	5.6
Sierra	1	31.4	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)	2	17.0	(D)	(D)
Siskiyou	24	5.4	1 421	2.7	33	4.9	2 052	14.5	55	4.1	3 753	3.2
Solano	16	6.2	1 632	.7	22	7.2	164	12.4	85	3.0	57 032	.8
Sonoma	121	1.4	32 407	.2	67	3.7	1 039	8.1	287	1.7	21 314	2.1
Stanislaus	334	.7	155 083	.1	79	3.3	22 275	.8	82	3.2	2 552	5.8
Sutter	5	11.8	(D)	(D)	17	7.4	269	12.7	36	4.9	15 407	1.9
Tehama	63	2.9	6 763	.7	40	5.0	458	8.3	74	3.5	6 522	7.4
Trinity	6	9.8	7	11.4	10	6.5	59	8.6	13	6.6	157	7.3
Tulare	270	.6	277 922	(L)	46	4.7	116 390	.3	69	3.7	60 793	.2
Tuolumne	2	15.8	(D)	(D)	9	10.4	33	12.5	15	7.6	534	15.6
Ventura	1	33.1	(D)	(D)	12	8.5	(D)	(D)	23	6.7	290	12.5
Yolo	6	12.1	702	2.5	19	7.2	1 413	1.4	55	4.0	22 850	1.2
Yuba	19	6.9	2 750	.3	34	4.9	699	18.9	52	4.3	1 100	8.6

	Livestock and poultry—Con.							
Geographic area	Layers 20 weeks old and older 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)
California	**2 670**	**.8**	**30 312 145**	**.1**	**240**	**1.6**	**237 723 294**	**.1**
Alameda	26	6.9	346	8.6	3	20.4	(D)	(D)
Alpine	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Amador	15	7.3	150	8.8	–	–	–	–
Butte	62	3.7	2 422	6.0	6	12.0	(D)	(D)
Calaveras	31	4.9	504	5.8	5	14.0	365	16.8
Colusa	12	9.7	102	10.5	2	–	(D)	(D)
Contra Costa	29	5.7	323	8.7	1	29.0	(D)	(D)
Del Norte	5	15.1	45	15.1	1	20.4	(D)	(D)
El Dorado	75	3.0	1 608	4.9	1	35.8	(D)	(D)
Fresno	81	3.5	1 217 793	(L)	47	1.9	61 049 530	.1
Glenn	29	6.0	442	7.6	1	35.1	(D)	(D)
Humboldt	48	4.3	986	5.6	3	18.3	(D)	(D)
Imperial	7	13.6	98	14.2	–	–	–	–
Inyo	2	10.9	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Kern	72	3.9	(D)	(D)	3	18.7	74	27.6
Kings	19	7.4	(D)	(D)	9	3.9	12 772 400	(L)
Lake	49	4.0	9 654	.8	2	18.9	(D)	(D)
Lassen	22	6.2	318	7.4	1	24.8	(D)	(D)
Los Angeles	85	3.9	6 387	18.5	11	9.3	1 807 531	3.4
Madera	42	4.9	827	6.7	9	5.3	6 309 400	.9
Marin	10	10.5	235	16.4	1	34.7	(D)	(D)
Mariposa	21	4.8	494	6.5	1	19.8	(D)	(D)
Mendocino	70	3.5	3 473	21.2	–	–	(D)	(D)
Merced	68	3.6	2 931 165	(L)	11	5.7	(D)	(D)
Modoc	19	7.2	417	5.5	1	43.3	(D)	(D)
Mono	3	17.8	44	19.9	–	–	–	–
Monterey	31	6.0	3 875	1.6	5	15.7	825	22.1
Napa	41	5.0	881	9.8	3	11.5	(D)	(D)
Nevada	43	4.1	952	6.7	1	32.7	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	Layers 20 weeks old and older 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)
Orange	6	14.6	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Placer	94	2.7	3 722	15.7	8	8.3	(D)	(D)
Plumas	12	8.3	467	12.1	–	–	–	–
Riverside.............	147	2.5	8 427 233	(L)	2	22.6	(D)	(D)
Sacramento	95	3.2	1 625	5.6	10	9.5	(D)	(D)
San Benito	20	6.6	271	7.2	–	–	–	–
San Bernardino	79	3.2	3 855 018	.1	11	8.0	2 344 568	(L)
San Diego	177	2.3	3 652 662	.6	9	9.6	480 330	3.2
San Francisco	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Joaquin..........	81	3.4	3 841 708	(L)	17	5.5	1 874 516	2.0
San Luis Obispo	94	3.2	12 720	1.2	4	11.8	(D)	(D)
San Mateo	14	7.9	253	10.0	–	–	–	–
Santa Barbara	53	4.6	(D)	(D)	3	15.8	(D)	(D)
Santa Clara	40	5.0	(D)	(D)	2	26.4	(D)	(D)
Santa Cruz	33	5.8	(D)	(D)	2	21.1	(D)	(D)
Shasta..............	78	3.4	1 589	5.8	1	35.0	(D)	(D)
Sierra...............	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Siskiyou	35	4.6	950	10.4	–	–	–	–
Solano...............	49	4.4	37 119	12.4	5	13.4	1 070	17.0
Sonoma	127	2.6	1 097 616	(L)	9	6.8	10 322 406	(L)
Stanislaus............	107	2.6	3 902 930	(L)	9	4.5	(D)	(D)
Sutter	19	7.0	563	11.5	2	24.3	(D)	(D)
Tehama..............	59	3.7	1 005	4.4	2	27.5	(D)	(D)
Trinity	9	9.2	128	8.4	–	–	–	–
Tulare	79	3.6	21 608	3.7	9	8.9	(D)	(D)
Tuolumne	17	7.0	236	8.3	–	–	–	–
Ventura	57	4.1	(D)	(D)	2	27.4	(D)	(D)
Yolo	34	5.5	648	9.0	1	40.8	(D)	(D)
Yuba	37	5.1	679	8.1	4	17.5	(D)	(D)

Livestock and poultry—Con.

Geographic area	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)
California.....	**2 065**	**.6**	**581 071**	**.3**	**42 372 177**	**.3**	**574**	**1.0**	**129 549**	**.7**	**7 475 447**	**.7**
Alameda	4	8.7	2 290	.9	138 310	.1	4	19.4	245	22.9	13 149	28.0
Alpine	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Amador	1	22.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Butte	23	5.3	3 869	3.0	244 982	3.7	2	15.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Calaveras	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Colusa...............	137	2.0	37 879	1.7	2 973 764	1.7	3	–	310	–	12 250	–
Contra Costa	8	8.6	1 323	10.6	91 692	8.4	8	9.1	277	8.2	20 332	6.7
Del Norte	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
El Dorado	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Fresno...............	142	1.2	37 613	.6	2 953 596	.4	45	2.1	6 897	.4	512 384	.3
Glenn...............	108	2.3	17 362	2.2	1 335 264	2.0	7	9.4	1 500	12.7	73 672	13.8
Humboldt	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Imperial..............	211	1.3	78 548	.6	7 764 888	.5	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Inyo	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Kern................	202	1.0	60 270	.5	4 418 274	.5	35	2.6	13 085	.5	724 648	.5
Kings	112	1.5	71 415	.5	5 218 653	.5	21	3.2	11 735	1.7	514 430	.7
Lake................	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lassen	23	5.1	1 206	6.9	61 160	5.6	9	6.8	1 198	8.4	44 020	5.0
Los Angeles	2	35.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	11	8.6	888	12.2	23 014	6.9
Madera	50	3.0	16 017	.8	1 162 466	.7	4	8.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Marin	1	36.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mariposa.............	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mendocino	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	31.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Merced	54	1.9	11 413	.6	749 701	.7	26	3.8	4 623	2.3	355 540	1.6
Modoc	26	3.5	3 583	1.7	292 012	1.7	68	2.6	12 772	1.8	1 336 775	1.8
Mono	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Monterey	27	5.0	7 887	4.6	227 356	4.1	41	4.2	15 593	2.0	561 275	1.4
Napa	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Nevada	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Orange	2	30.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	3	16.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Placer	6	10.1	1 619	9.0	53 215	11.4	1	28.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Plumas	1	40.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Riverside.............	41	3.1	25 606	.8	875 811	.7	14	7.1	2 235	16.3	67 465	15.4
Sacramento	58	3.3	8 437	2.1	616 770	2.2	21	5.7	1 677	4.9	115 439	5.3
San Benito	6	7.1	319	1.7	23 295	1.6	6	12.0	600	17.0	16 849	14.2
San Bernardino	4	–	938	–	86 791	–	6	15.9	12	19.7	1 103	23.0
San Diego	3	14.1	3 142	7.7	61 622	8.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Francisco	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Joaquin	148	1.4	35 089	.6	2 726 917	.6	17	4.3	2 221	4.4	175 847	2.7

Selected crops harvested

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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

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)
San Luis Obispo	20	5.7	3 633	3.7	104 973	8.0	49	4.1	22 676	2.0	782 711	2.3
San Mateo	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	18.1	55	18.8	1 921	20.6
Santa Barbara	4	16.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	8	5.7	2 077	.9	156 671	.2
Santa Clara	3	16.1	300	9.4	9 473	11.6	1	32.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Santa Cruz	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Shasta	15	7.8	945	9.4	46 518	8.4	9	11.0	493	13.0	29 064	11.8
Sierra................	1	24.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Siskiyou	41	3.9	5 790	5.2	344 534	3.1	62	3.4	10 409	3.3	955 872	3.3
Solano	73	2.0	29 044	1.2	1 678 076	1.0	11	–	4 230	–	171 718	–
Sonoma	3	11.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Stanislaus.............	24	4.3	1 299	2.7	78 174	2.8	18	5.9	986	6.6	49 694	3.9
Sutter	106	2.4	20 440	1.9	1 572 402	1.6	2	17.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Tehama...............	35	4.7	6 413	4.2	331 438	5.5	4	14.4	465	16.2	21 250	18.5
Trinity	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Tulare	163	1.6	33 797	1.3	2 019 249	1.0	38	3.7	6 587	2.4	304 917	3.1
Tuolumne	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Ventura	3	14.7	320	8.3	3 332	11.0	5	12.9	831	13.8	46 920	12.6
Yolo	163	1.5	50 626	.5	3 979 268	.5	9	6.3	725	1.6	44 333	1.4
Yuba	10	6.9	964	3.9	54 278	3.2	–	–	–	–	–	–

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Rice						Cotton					
	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)	Bales	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
California	**1 544**	**1.1**	**514 081**	**.7**	**41 457 650**	**.7**	**1 833**	**.4**	**1 036 316**	**.1**	**2 543 194**	**.1**
Alameda	3	16.4	684	11.3	53 200	12.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Alpine	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Amador	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Butte	265	1.8	102 410	1.2	8 392 831	1.2	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Calaveras	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Colusa................	405	1.5	129 974	1.1	10 324 528	1.1	19	4.1	7 483	1.1	16 855	.6
Contra Costa	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Del Norte	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
El Dorado	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Fresno................	16	4.0	4 771	1.2	303 408	1.0	573	.5	348 003	.1	891 038	.1
Glenn.................	269	1.7	83 771	1.2	6 798 367	1.3	5	–	1 046	–	2 570	–
Humboldt	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Imperial	–	–	–	–	–	–	28	–	6 058	–	18 964	–
Inyo	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Kern.................	–	–	–	–	–	–	370	.9	265 462	.3	642 356	.2
Kings	–	–	–	–	–	–	250	1.1	196 108	.2	422 987	.2
Lake.................	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lassen	1	24.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Los Angeles	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Madera	3	15.8	353	13.7	29 600	12.9	97	2.0	36 806	.9	97 035	.8
Marin	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mariposa..............	1	19.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mendocino	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Merced	12	3.9	4 341	.1	327 010	.1	184	1.5	74 620	.4	205 550	.3
Modoc	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mono	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Monterey	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Napa	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Nevada	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Orange	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Placer	49	3.7	16 661	2.6	1 298 474	2.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Plumas	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Riverside..............	–	–	–	–	–	–	27	2.4	12 571	.3	40 213	.2
Sacramento	26	6.2	8 069	5.2	653 294	5.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Benito	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Bernardino	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	9.5	339	.8	1 018	.7
San Diego	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Francisco	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Joaquin	20	6.3	4 700	4.2	384 453	4.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Luis Obispo	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Mateo	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Santa Barbara	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Santa Clara	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Santa Cruz	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Shasta	1	30.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Sierra................	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Siskiyou	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Solano................	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Sonoma...............	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. **Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997**—Con.

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

	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Rice						Cotton					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
Geographic area	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)	Bales	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Stanislaus	16	7.4	2 564	10.2	198 803	10.4	3	–	(D)	(D)	7 101	–
Sutter	286	1.7	95 382	1.3	8 002 162	1.2	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Tehama	4	11.0	723	6.1	51 805	7.5	1	27.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Trinity	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Tulare	–	–	–	–	–	–	255	1.2	81 089	.5	186 253	.5
Tuolumne	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Ventura	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Yolo	60	3.1	26 332	1.6	2 005 143	1.6	13	–	4 057	–	10 319	–
Yuba	106	2.8	32 914	1.8	2 590 184	1.8	–	–	–	–	–	–

	Selected crops harvested—Con.									
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)						Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)			
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres	
Geographic area	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
California	**8 636**	**.5**	**1 698 773**	**.3**	**8 344 564**	**.2**	**4 490**	**.6**	**1 209 259**	**(L)**
Alameda	46	4.5	4 765	5.4	12 640	4.9	6	11.5	75	5.4
Alpine	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Amador	26	4.7	2 521	4.1	6 625	3.4	8	10.3	38	27.3
Butte	109	2.8	6 343	4.1	22 384	4.9	63	3.7	808	2.9
Calaveras	15	6.6	1 064	6.1	1 675	4.4	14	8.1	66	27.6
Colusa	72	3.0	10 400	2.4	49 391	2.7	65	2.8	28 589	.4
Contra Costa	56	3.7	8 113	3.2	32 093	2.3	33	5.0	7 781	.8
Del Norte	19	4.8	2 869	4.1	11 665	1.7	3	21.1	(D)	(D)
El Dorado	12	7.1	452	4.2	498	11.5	44	4.3	96	10.5
Fresno	446	1.1	91 949	.5	515 826	.5	613	1.0	175 454	.1
Glenn	196	1.9	26 433	1.5	126 602	1.3	18	6.2	497	4.6
Humboldt	244	1.5	14 197	1.2	40 851	1.1	64	3.8	348	8.0
Imperial	324	1.1	232 734	.3	1 421 250	.4	116	1.1	86 816	.1
Inyo	12	7.1	2 912	10.0	11 374	8.3	8	5.4	6	3.9
Kern	407	1.2	122 047	.5	790 892	.4	179	1.3	89 071	.2
Kings	330	1.2	58 776	.8	294 422	1.0	35	2.6	11 937	.1
Lake	79	3.2	5 100	4.1	10 293	5.9	30	5.4	45	10.3
Lassen	216	1.4	42 639	1.8	113 117	1.6	11	8.6	387	2.7
Los Angeles	44	5.1	9 730	4.0	50 798	4.5	73	3.7	4 846	1.1
Madera	166	1.7	38 980	.9	221 790	.5	33	4.2	7 070	.1
Marin	34	3.7	5 368	2.0	13 776	2.3	27	5.7	79	7.9
Mariposa	6	10.4	(D)	(D)	326	10.4	10	7.7	10	11.8
Mendocino	192	1.9	10 062	2.5	21 914	2.5	88	3.2	556	12.7
Merced	692	.9	140 744	.4	740 416	.3	156	1.8	32 561	.2
Modoc	284	1.1	87 119	.9	272 362	.9	12	6.7	2 557	3.0
Mono	34	3.3	8 160	2.0	32 915	2.2	5	10.3	254	11.8
Monterey	110	2.7	12 641	2.3	37 382	2.7	273	1.2	277 096	.1
Napa	37	4.9	2 616	5.9	6 610	5.4	32	5.8	83	12.7
Nevada	30	5.3	936	11.2	1 212	11.9	25	5.7	29	7.8
Orange	7	12.3	225	12.1	(D)	(D)	40	3.1	4 190	.2
Placer	56	3.7	4 687	6.6	9 849	6.9	21	6.7	82	12.1
Plumas	50	3.2	12 902	3.9	23 192	3.1	5	11.4	17	8.4
Riverside	186	1.9	90 926	.6	627 963	.4	149	2.2	38 041	.2
Sacramento	254	1.7	24 695	2.1	80 647	2.0	126	2.5	9 097	.6
San Benito	74	3.2	8 481	2.8	20 299	2.3	60	2.9	21 228	.3
San Bernardino	125	2.4	24 886	1.7	138 773	2.0	62	3.8	1 286	2.1
San Diego	73	3.6	4 869	6.7	6 540	5.7	159	2.3	6 938	.9
San Francisco	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	25.0	(D)	(D)
San Joaquin	544	1.1	82 799	.7	435 907	.6	300	1.3	72 715	.3
San Luis Obispo	226	1.9	20 647	2.1	48 605	1.9	219	1.9	28 869	.5
San Mateo	13	8.0	1 607	10.9	2 397	12.0	40	4.1	2 584	1.6
Santa Barbara	100	3.0	11 632	2.6	32 389	3.5	174	1.9	66 869	.1
Santa Clara	62	4.1	5 125	5.3	10 694	4.3	107	3.1	9 465	.7
Santa Cruz	11	10.8	300	15.2	543	16.6	72	3.3	13 769	.3
Shasta	189	2.0	13 363	3.6	41 670	4.1	37	5.2	99	8.8
Sierra	20	3.3	3 826	4.8	6 237	5.6	–	–	–	–
Siskiyou	355	1.2	74 565	1.6	274 867	1.5	28	5.0	753	1.9
Solano	133	2.1	31 294	1.2	172 377	1.0	52	2.8	15 499	.1
Sonoma	166	2.0	26 565	1.6	65 715	1.3	177	2.3	2 001	2.2
Stanislaus	633	1.0	79 731	.7	392 512	.6	101	2.2	42 087	.3
Sutter	98	3.1	10 441	4.1	51 756	5.1	68	2.6	21 841	.3
Tehama	149	2.4	12 069	3.1	36 301	3.8	28	5.6	186	3.8
Trinity	16	6.5	1 255	11.4	1 788	12.3	10	5.7	7	7.1
Tulare	587	1.1	139 588	.6	707 647	.5	127	2.1	6 699	.6
Tuolumne	14	7.8	875	10.8	927	18.6	5	11.6	3	19.0
Ventura	39	4.8	8 005	6.5	39 427	9.8	100	2.4	46 943	.3
Yolo	167	1.8	48 293	.6	239 600	.5	154	1.6	68 789	.1
Yuba	50	4.3	5 145	7.0	14 288	5.6	23	6.3	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested–Con.			
	Land in orchards			
	Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
California	**38 747**	**.6**	**2 582 084**	**.3**
Alameda	70	3.8	2 531	3.7
Alpine	–	–	–	–
Amador	117	2.0	3 307	2.0
Butte	1 215	.7	98 205	.6
Calaveras	78	3.1	1 136	5.3
Colusa	293	1.5	34 398	1.0
Contra Costa	208	1.8	6 594	1.6
Del Norte	–	–	–	–
El Dorado	312	1.3	3 095	2.3
Fresno	4 755	.6	445 144	.3
Glenn	506	1.2	47 835	1.0
Humboldt	88	3.1	443	9.1
Imperial	67	3.7	7 479	6.1
Inyo	8	10.9	39	12.3
Kern	860	1.0	297 840	.3
Kings	386	1.2	31 482	.7
Lake	581	.8	14 795	1.2
Lassen	8	9.6	58	7.7
Los Angeles	329	1.8	3 530	4.2
Madera	1 103	.9	179 586	.4
Marin	28	6.2	241	13.1
Mariposa	35	3.9	169	5.2
Mendocino	429	1.2	19 272	.8
Merced	1 387	.8	123 709	.7
Modoc	5	12.1	57	12.3
Mono	3	15.7	(D)	(D)
Monterey	175	2.1	47 063	.5
Napa	1 096	.8	47 950	.6
Nevada	79	2.8	416	3.8
Orange	90	3.0	2 811	1.2
Placer	225	1.7	3 348	1.9
Plumas	1	40.8	(D)	(D)
Riverside	1 718	.8	68 191	.7
Sacramento	230	1.8	17 851	.8
San Benito	211	1.8	8 431	2.0
San Bernardino	573	1.2	10 727	2.2
San Diego	4 452	.6	54 222	1.0
San Francisco	1	–	(D)	(D)
San Joaquin	2 549	.6	182 089	.5
San Luis Obispo	718	1.0	29 384	1.4
San Mateo	29	5.4	173	9.5
Santa Barbara	643	1.1	25 553	1.0
Santa Clara	376	1.5	5 103	2.7
Santa Cruz	280	1.8	4 473	3.4
Shasta	163	2.3	997	5.1
Sierra	3	13.9	26	24.0
Siskiyou	39	4.7	233	9.2
Solano	369	1.3	15 428	2.0
Sonoma	1 415	.7	50 301	.6
Stanislaus	2 340	.6	143 354	.5
Sutter	835	1.0	71 825	.8
Tehama	662	1.0	36 956	.8
Trinity	35	3.8	127	7.7
Tulare	4 182	.7	305 384	.5
Tuolumne	29	5.7	292	10.6
Ventura	1 691	.7	61 657	.7
Yolo	402	1.2	32 064	.9
Yuba	265	1.6	34 701	.8

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

Table G. **Coverage Estimates: 1997**

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

Item	Census total	Coverage total[1]	Adjusted census Total	Relative standard error (percent)	Coverage adjustment (percent)
Farms .... number..	74 126	13 847	87 973	3.2	15.7
Land in farms .... acres..	27 698 779	1 116 691	28 815 470	3.3	3.9
Average size of farm .... acres..	374	81	328	(X)	(X)
Farms by size of farm:					
Less than 10 acres	20 662	6 365	27 027	8.4	23.6
10 to 49 acres	24 250	4 718	28 968	3.5	16.3
50 to 179 acres	13 288	1 669	14 957	3.6	11.2
180 acres or more	15 926	1 095	17 021	2.8	6.4
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than $2,500	19 473	8 665	28 138	7.2	30.8
$2,500 to $9,999	13 014	1 602	14 616	4.6	11.0
$10,000 or more	41 639	3 580	45 219	2.0	7.9
Market value of agricultural products sold .... $1,000..	23 032 259	98 477	23 130 737	.5	.4
Farms by type of organization:					
Individual or family	56 755	13 395	70 150	4.0	19.1
Partnership, corporation, or other	17 371	452	17 823	2.5	2.5
Farms by tenure of operator:					
Full owners	53 878	9 853	63 731	3.3	15.5
Part owners	10 888	683	11 571	3.6	5.9
Tenants	9 360	3 311	12 671	7.8	26.1
Operators by place of residence:					
On farm operated	47 963	10 787	58 750	4.3	18.4
Not on farm operated	20 908	2 276	23 184	3.2	9.8
Not reported	5 255	784	6 039	6.6	13.0
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming	39 267	5 003	44 270	2.3	11.3
Other	34 859	8 844	43 703	5.6	20.2
Operators by sex:					
Male	64 062	10 671	74 733	3.2	14.3
Female	10 064	3 176	13 240	6.3	24.0
Operators by race:					
White	67 566	12 466	80 032	3.3	15.6
Black and other races	6 560	1 381	7 941	6.7	17.4
Operators by years on present farm:					
4 years or less	9 313	3 844	13 157	6.4	29.2
5 years or more	54 160	10 227	64 387	3.0	15.9
Not reported	10 653	−224	10 429	8.0	−2.1

[1] See text in Appendix C regarding coverage estimates.