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..	11.4	Corn for grain or seed ..... acres..	3.4
Land in farms ..... acres..	6.3	Wheat for grain ..... acres..	4.1
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1] ..... $1,000..	7.7	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold ..... $1,000..	2.5	Cattle and calves..... number..	5.4
Harvested cropland..... acres..	4.8	Hogs and pigs ..... number..	2.4
		Layers 20 weeks old and older..... number..	1.7

[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	5.8	25	40.4
50	3.8	50	27.7
75	2.8	75	21.9
100	2.1	100	18.3
150	1.1	150	13.9
200	.9	200	11.0
300	.8	300	6.9
500	.6	500	5.4
750	.5	750	4.4
1,000.....	.4	1,000.....	3.8
1,500.....	.3	1,500.....	3.1
2,000.....	(X)	2,000.....	(X)

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)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS		
Farms ..... number..	12 084	.8
Land in farms ..... acres..	2 154 875	.6
Average size of farm ..... acres..	178	1.0
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) ..... farms..	12 084	.8
$1,000..	1 312 086	.3
Average per farm ..... dollars..	108 580	.9
Farms by value of sales:		
Less than $1,000 (see text) ..... farms..	1 748	1.2
$1,000..	393	1.6
$1,000 to $2,499 ..... farms..	1 349	1.3
$1,000..	2 211	1.3
$2,500 to $4,999 ..... farms..	1 365	1.3
$1,000..	4 876	1.3
$5,000 to $9,999 ..... farms..	1 551	1.3
$1,000..	10 947	1.3
$10,000 to $19,999 ..... farms..	1 292	1.4
$1,000..	18 240	1.4
$20,000 to $24,999 ..... farms..	376	2.1
$1,000..	8 312	2.1
$25,000 to $39,999 ..... farms..	666	1.7
$1,000..	20 806	1.7
$40,000 to $49,999 ..... farms..	286	2.0
$1,000..	12 638	2.1
$50,000 to $99,999 ..... farms..	854	1.6
$1,000..	60 828	1.6
$100,000 to $249,999 ..... farms..	1 223	1.2
$1,000..	200 719	1.2
$250,000 to $499,999 ..... farms..	721	–
$1,000..	257 240	–
$500,000 or more ..... farms..	653	–
$1,000..	714 877	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	7 568	.9
$1,000..	458 719	.4
Grains ..... farms..	4 469	.9
$1,000..	245 721	.5
Corn for grain ..... farms..	2 713	.9
$1,000..	97 630	.5
Wheat ..... farms..	2 305	.9
$1,000..	39 052	.5
Soybeans ..... farms..	3 195	.9
$1,000..	100 579	.5
Sorghum for grain ..... farms..	220	1.7
$1,000..	2 020	1.4
Barley ..... farms..	616	1.1
$1,000..	5 751	.8
Oats ..... farms..	137	2.5
$1,000..	190	2.8
Other grains ..... farms..	132	1.8
$1,000..	499	3.3
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms..	–	–
$1,000..	–	–
Tobacco ..... farms..	710	1.3
$1,000..	19 857	1.2
Hay, silage, and field seeds ..... farms..	2 379	1.0
$1,000..	15 950	1.1
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms..	950	1.2
$1,000..	41 679	.6
Fruits, nuts, and berries ..... farms..	395	1.6
$1,000..	12 153	1.5
Nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	1 009	1.3
$1,000..	120 007	.4
Other crops ..... farms..	164	2.2
$1,000..	3 353	2.6
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms..	6 386	.8
$1,000..	853 367	.3
Poultry and poultry products ..... farms..	1 401	.8
$1,000..	568 987	.2
Dairy products ..... farms..	963	.9
$1,000..	174 946	.5
Cattle and calves ..... farms..	4 111	.9
$1,000..	57 115	.8
Hogs and pigs ..... farms..	495	1.4
$1,000..	14 025	1.1
Sheep, lambs, and wool ..... farms..	544	1.5
$1,000..	1 137	1.7
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ..... farms..	1 032	1.3
$1,000..	37 157	.8
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms..	1 133	1.2
$1,000..	8 667	1.1

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses ..... farms..	12 109	.9
$1,000..	1 123 200	.6
Average per farm ..... dollars..	92 757	1.0
Livestock and poultry purchased ..... farms..	3 714	2.7
$1,000..	129 432	.9
Feed for livestock and poultry ..... farms..	6 112	1.9
$1,000..	435 279	.8
Commercially mixed formula feeds ..... farms..	4 501	2.4
$1,000..	406 673	.8
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ..... farms..	6 893	1.7
$1,000..	35 862	1.3
Commercial fertilizer ..... farms..	7 745	1.6
$1,000..	58 488	1.4
Agricultural chemicals ..... farms..	6 851	1.7
$1,000..	38 516	1.7
Petroleum products ..... farms..	11 311	1.0
$1,000..	33 726	1.1
Electricity ..... farms..	8 246	1.6
$1,000..	17 729	1.3
Hired farm labor ..... farms..	4 814	2.3
$1,000..	102 425	1.1
Contract labor ..... farms..	1 045	5.8
$1,000..	5 685	3.2
Repair and maintenance ..... farms..	10 455	1.2
$1,000..	60 624	1.3
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ..... farms..	4 036	2.7
$1,000..	13 376	2.8
Interest ..... farms..	4 219	2.3
$1,000..	45 896	1.7
Secured by real estate ..... farms..	2 880	3.0
$1,000..	30 699	2.2
Not secured by real estate ..... farms..	2 364	3.1
$1,000..	15 197	2.0
Cash rent ..... farms..	3 133	2.9
$1,000..	36 106	2.0
Property taxes ..... farms..	11 088	1.0
$1,000..	23 776	1.8
All other farm production expenses ..... farms..	10 879	1.1
$1,000..	86 280	1.1
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)[1]		
All farms ..... number..	12 109	.9
$1,000..	172 948	2.0
Average per farm ..... dollars..	14 283	2.2
Farms with net gains[2] ..... number..	5 711	1.9
$1,000..	264 091	1.1
Average net gain ..... dollars..	46 242	2.2
Farms with net losses ..... number..	6 398	1.8
$1,000..	91 143	1.8
Average net loss ..... dollars..	14 246	2.5
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments ..... farms..	2 673	.9
$1,000..	14 330	.6
Other farm-related income[1] ..... farms..	3 559	3.1
$1,000..	17 124	4.9
Customwork and other agricultural services ..... farms..	872	6.3
$1,000..	6 731	7.3
Gross cash rent or share payments ..... farms..	1 129	6.5
$1,000..	4 828	11.6
Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ..... farms..	456	10.3
$1,000..	2 507	11.9
Other farm-related income sources ..... farms..	1 970	4.1
$1,000..	3 058	5.2
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total ..... farms..	194	1.8
$1,000..	6 263	.4

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)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			
Total cropland	farms	10 702	.8
	acres	1 613 497	.6
Harvested cropland	farms	9 474	.8
	acres	1 382 035	.5
Farms by acres harvested:			
1 to 9 acres	farms	2 052	1.1
	acres	8 605	1.2
10 to 19 acres	farms	1 341	1.2
	acres	17 717	1.2
20 to 29 acres	farms	890	1.4
	acres	20 548	1.4
30 to 49 acres	farms	1 008	1.3
	acres	37 602	1.3
50 to 99 acres	farms	1 301	1.2
	acres	88 948	1.3
100 to 199 acres	farms	1 213	1.3
	acres	166 924	1.3
200 to 499 acres	farms	999	1.1
	acres	304 683	1.1
500 to 999 acres	farms	402	.9
	acres	276 086	.8
1,000 acres or more	farms	268	–
	acres	460 922	–
Cropland:			
Pasture or grazing only	farms	4 617	.9
	acres	148 667	1.0
Other cropland	farms	2 747	1.0
	acres	82 795	1.1
Total woodland	farms	6 534	.9
	acres	335 977	.9
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms	2 369	.9
	acres	96 460	1.0
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms	8 221	.8
	acres	108 941	.9
Irrigated land	farms	1 154	1.2
	acres	68 588	.9
Acres irrigated:			
1 to 9 acres	farms	658	1.5
	acres	1 690	1.7
10 to 49 acres	farms	240	2.0
	acres	5 197	2.0
50 to 99 acres	farms	69	3.2
	acres	5 129	3.3
100 to 199 acres	farms	85	2.2
	acres	11 576	2.2
200 to 499 acres	farms	70	1.8
	acres	20 131	1.9
500 to 999 acres	farms	25	1.3
	acres	16 382	1.4
1,000 acres or more	farms	7	–
	acres	8 483	–
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms	1 130	1.2
	acres	68 042	.9
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms	55	4.2
	acres	546	4.0
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms	605	1.4
	acres	25 507	2.0
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]			
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms	12 109	.9
	$1,000	6 824 698	1.5
Average per farm	dollars	563 605	1.7
Average per acre	dollars	3 176	2.0
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]			
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms	12 106	.9
	$1,000	728 486	1.5
Average per farm	dollars	60 176	1.7
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]			
Commercial fertilizer	farms	7 680	1.6
	acres on which used	1 132 052	1.5
TENURE OF OPERATOR			
All operators	farms	12 084	.8
	acres	2 154 875	.6
Full owners	farms	7 576	.9
	acres	723 916	.9
Part owners	farms	3 179	.8
	acres	1 138 048	.5
Tenants	farms	1 329	1.3
	acres	292 911	1.0
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			
Land owned	farms	10 790	.8
	acres	1 307 862	.7
Owned land in farms	farms	10 755	.8
	acres	1 188 733	.7
Land rented or leased from others	farms	4 543	.9
	acres	975 894	.5
	landlords	14 915	.7
Rented or leased land in farms	farms	4 508	.9
	acres	966 142	.5
Land rented or leased to others	farms	1 798	1.1
	acres	128 881	1.5
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
Operators by place of residence:			
On farm operated		9 175	.8
Not on farm operated		1 923	1.2
Not reported		986	.9
Operators by principal occupation:			
Farming		6 235	.8
Other		5 849	1.0
Operators by days worked off farm:			
Any		6 362	.9
200 days or more		4 317	1.0
Operators by sex:			
Male	farms	10 694	.8
	acres	2 051 885	.6
Female	farms	1 390	1.2
	acres	102 990	1.7
Average age of operator	years	55.2	1.2
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION			
Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms	10 229	.8
	acres	1 482 680	.6
Partnership	farms	994	1.4
	acres	336 763	1.0
Corporation:			
Family held	farms	706	1.4
	acres	292 251	.7
More than 10 stockholders	farms	13	–
10 or less stockholders	farms	693	1.4
Other than family held	farms	65	3.8
	acres	8 802	4.8
More than 10 stockholders	farms	7	9.9
10 or less stockholders	farms	58	4.0
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms	90	3.1
	acres	34 379	1.9
HIRED FARM LABOR[1]			
Hired workers by days worked:			
150 days or more	farms	2 233	3.4
	workers	6 225	1.7
Less than 150 days	farms	4 116	2.6
	workers	14 987	2.7
INJURIES AND DEATHS			
Farm-related injuries:			
Operator and family members	farms	100	2.9
	number	112	2.9
Hired workers	farms	89	2.2
	number	166	1.9
Farm-related deaths:			
Operator and family members	farms	2	–
	number	(D)	(D)
Hired workers	farms	1	–
	number	(D)	(D)

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)
FARMS BY SIZE			
1 to 9 acres	farms	1 407	1.2
	acres	6 556	1.2
10 to 49 acres	farms	3 828	1.0
	acres	95 563	1.0
50 to 69 acres	farms	979	1.3
	acres	56 921	1.3
70 to 99 acres	farms	984	1.3
	acres	81 563	1.3
100 to 139 acres	farms	1 090	1.2
	acres	127 084	1.2
140 to 179 acres	farms	772	1.4
	acres	121 114	1.4
180 to 219 acres	farms	531	1.5
	acres	105 019	1.5
220 to 259 acres	farms	434	1.7
	acres	103 259	1.7
260 to 499 acres	farms	1 073	1.2
	acres	377 592	1.1
500 to 999 acres	farms	617	1.1
	acres	422 996	1.0
1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms	274	–
	acres	368 163	–
2,000 acres or more	farms	95	–
	acres	289 045	–
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM			
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	farms	2 701	1.1
	acres	1 003 387	.7
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)	farms	504	1.6
	acres	71 955	1.0
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)	farms	226	2.2
	acres	22 372	1.5
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)	farms	821	1.4
	acres	44 228	1.5
Other crop farming (1119)	farms	1 887	1.1
	acres	196 314	1.2
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)	farms	1 867	1.1
	acres	222 244	1.2
Cattle feedlots (112112)	farms	356	1.8
	acres	34 559	2.4
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)	farms	889	1.0
	acres	294 733	.7
Hog and pig farming (1122)	farms	173	2.1
	acres	19 975	1.3
Poultry and egg production (1123)	farms	1 091	.7
	acres	160 551	.3
Sheep and goat farming (1124)	farms	289	2.1
	acres	11 690	2.6
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)	farms	1 280	1.3
	acres	72 867	1.9
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	4 444	.8
	number	261 324	.6
Beef cows	farms	2 726	1.0
	number	50 619	1.1
Milk cows	farms	1 091	.9
	number	84 953	.6
Cattle and calves sold	farms	4 111	.9
	number	136 747	.7
	$1,000	57 115	.8
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	584	1.3
	number	80 850	1.1
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	495	1.4
	number	149 472	1.0
	$1,000	14 025	1.1
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms	616	1.4
	number	21 985	1.5
Sheep and lambs sold	farms	497	1.5
	number	14 667	1.6
Horses and ponies inventory	farms	2 572	1.1
	number	22 533	1.3
Horses and ponies sold	farms	639	1.6
	number	2 518	1.9
POULTRY			
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	farms	637	1.4
	number	4 639 682	1.2
Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms	618	1.4
	number	4 120 639	.4
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	997	.7
	number	256 926 521	.3
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED			
Corn for grain or seed	farms	3 554	.9
	acres	405 451	.5
	bushels	36 823 284	.5
Corn for silage or green chop	farms	1 404	1.0
	acres	93 117	.7
	tons, green	865 641	.7
Wheat for grain	farms	2 339	.9
	acres	199 351	.5
	bushels	12 711 370	.5
Barley for grain	farms	972	.9
	acres	47 405	.7
	bushels	3 489 722	.7
Oats for grain	farms	460	1.4
	acres	5 611	1.4
	bushels	302 370	1.5
Tobacco	farms	711	1.3
	acres	7 939	1.2
	pounds	11 987 083	1.3
Soybeans for beans	farms	3 226	.9
	acres	509 683	.5
	bushels	15 171 466	.5
Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	farms	126	2.5
	acres	2 219	.3
	cwt	523 810	.2
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	5 223	.8
	acres	223 014	.8
	tons, dry	450 781	.8
Alfalfa hay	farms	1 956	.9
	acres	54 137	.9
	tons, dry	138 627	1.0
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	951	1.2
	acres	35 958	.8
Land in orchards	farms	422	1.7
	acres	5 251	1.7

[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)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS		
Farms ..... number..	6 071	.9
Land in farms ..... acres..	1 789 295	.6
Average size of farm ..... acres..	295	1.0
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) ..... farms..	6 071	.9
$1,000..	1 293 660	.3
Average per farm ..... dollars..	213 088	.9
Farms by value of sales:		
$10,000 to $19,999 ..... farms..	1 292	1.3
$1,000..	18 240	1.3
$20,000 to $24,999 ..... farms..	376	2.0
$1,000..	8 312	2.0
$25,000 to $39,999 ..... farms..	666	1.7
$1,000..	20 806	1.7
$40,000 to $49,999 ..... farms..	286	2.0
$1,000..	12 638	2.0
$50,000 to $99,999 ..... farms..	854	1.5
$1,000..	60 828	1.6
$100,000 to $249,999 ..... farms..	1 223	1.2
$1,000..	200 719	1.2
$250,000 to $499,999 ..... farms..	721	–
$1,000..	257 240	–
$500,000 or more ..... farms..	653	–
$1,000..	714 877	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	4 560	.9
$1,000..	448 131	.4
Grains ..... farms..	3 334	.9
$1,000..	241 789	.4
Corn for grain ..... farms..	2 165	.9
$1,000..	96 238	.5
Wheat ..... farms..	2 030	.9
$1,000..	38 514	.5
Soybeans ..... farms..	2 628	.9
$1,000..	98 799	.5
Sorghum for grain ..... farms..	191	1.5
$1,000..	1 922	1.3
Barley ..... farms..	563	1.1
$1,000..	5 674	.8
Oats ..... farms..	89	2.8
$1,000..	155	3.1
Other grains ..... farms..	119	1.6
$1,000..	488	3.1
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms..	–	–
$1,000..	–	–
Tobacco ..... farms..	487	1.4
$1,000..	18 816	1.2
Hay, silage, and field seeds ..... farms..	1 119	1.2
$1,000..	12 937	1.2
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms..	654	1.3
$1,000..	40 870	.6
Fruits, nuts, and berries ..... farms..	215	1.9
$1,000..	11 849	1.5
Nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	576	1.4
$1,000..	118 580	.4
Other crops ..... farms..	111	2.5
$1,000..	3 290	2.6
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms..	3 671	.8
$1,000..	845 529	.3
Poultry and poultry products ..... farms..	1 176	.8
$1,000..	568 821	.2
Dairy products ..... farms..	953	.9
$1,000..	174 926	.5
Cattle and calves ..... farms..	2 248	.9
$1,000..	51 696	.8
Hogs and pigs ..... farms..	331	1.6
$1,000..	13 679	1.1
Sheep, lambs, and wool ..... farms..	153	2.1
$1,000..	619	2.2
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ..... farms..	431	1.6
$1,000..	35 788	.8
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms..	568	1.4
$1,000..	7 803	1.1

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses ..... farms..	6 089	1.0
$1,000..	1 060 380	.6
Average per farm ..... dollars..	174 147	1.1
Livestock and poultry purchased ..... farms..	2 485	2.6
$1,000..	113 297	1.0
Feed for livestock and poultry ..... farms..	3 526	2.0
$1,000..	431 498	.8
Commercially mixed formula feeds ..... farms..	2 957	2.2
$1,000..	404 843	.8
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ..... farms..	4 540	1.6
$1,000..	34 760	1.4
Commercial fertilizer ..... farms..	4 679	1.5
$1,000..	56 130	1.5
Agricultural chemicals ..... farms..	4 439	1.6
$1,000..	37 272	1.7
Petroleum products ..... farms..	5 869	1.1
$1,000..	30 133	1.1
Electricity ..... farms..	4 889	1.6
$1,000..	15 946	1.3
Hired farm labor ..... farms..	3 501	2.2
$1,000..	98 979	1.2
Contract labor ..... farms..	745	6.1
$1,000..	5 320	3.2
Repair and maintenance ..... farms..	5 727	1.2
$1,000..	52 268	1.3
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ..... farms..	2 759	2.6
$1,000..	12 466	3.5
Interest ..... farms..	3 276	2.2
$1,000..	41 836	1.5
Secured by real estate ..... farms..	2 140	2.9
$1,000..	27 041	1.9
Not secured by real estate ..... farms..	2 031	3.1
$1,000..	14 796	2.0
Cash rent ..... farms..	2 522	2.7
$1,000..	35 217	1.9
Property taxes ..... farms..	5 404	1.3
$1,000..	14 615	2.0
All other farm production expenses ..... farms..	6 082	1.0
$1,000..	80 644	1.1
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)[1]		
All farms ..... number..	6 089	1.0
$1,000..	216 889	1.5
Average per farm ..... dollars..	35 620	1.8
Farms with net gains[2] ..... number..	4 322	1.8
$1,000..	261 225	1.1
Average net gain ..... dollars..	60 441	2.1
Farms with net losses ..... number..	1 767	3.9
$1,000..	44 335	2.8
Average net loss ..... dollars..	25 091	4.8
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments ..... farms..	2 015	.9
$1,000..	13 071	.5
Other farm-related income[1] ..... farms..	2 207	3.3
$1,000..	13 387	5.4
Customwork and other agricultural services ..... farms..	676	6.4
$1,000..	6 103	7.5
Gross cash rent or share payments ..... farms..	525	8.4
$1,000..	2 744	16.0
Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ..... farms..	235	14.0
$1,000..	1 783	13.3
Other farm-related income sources ..... farms..	1 394	4.3
$1,000..	2 758	5.7
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total ..... farms..	179	1.7
$1,000..	6 238	.4

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)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			
Total cropland	farms	5 402	.9
	acres	1 434 207	.5
Harvested cropland	farms	5 161	.9
	acres	1 288 347	.5
Cropland:			
Pasture or grazing only	farms	2 032	1.0
	acres	92 362	1.1
Total woodland	farms	3 296	.9
	acres	217 933	.9
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms	1 126	1.0
	acres	66 784	1.1
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms	4 167	.9
	acres	70 371	1.0
Irrigated land	farms	875	1.2
	acres	67 510	.9
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms	868	1.2
	acres	67 106	.9
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms	27	5.2
	acres	404	5.1
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms	289	1.5
	acres	11 770	2.2
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]			
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms	6 089	1.0
	$1,000	5 021 327	1.7
Average per farm	dollars	824 655	1.9
Average per acre	dollars	2 846	2.1
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]			
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms	6 088	1.0
	$1,000	574 511	1.6
Average per farm	dollars	94 368	1.9
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]			
Commercial fertilizer	farms	4 667	1.5
	acres on which used	1 075 678	1.5
TENURE OF OPERATOR			
All operators	farms	6 071	.9
	acres	1 789 295	.6
Full owners	farms	2 893	1.0
	acres	451 543	.9
Part owners	farms	2 279	.8
	acres	1 066 106	.5
Tenants	farms	899	1.3
	acres	271 646	.9
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			
Land owned	farms	5 194	.8
	acres	939 166	.7
Owned land in farms	farms	5 172	.8
	acres	876 769	.7
Land rented or leased from others	farms	3 192	.9
	acres	919 564	.5
	landlords	12 701	.7
Rented or leased land in farms	farms	3 178	.9
	acres	912 526	.5
Land rented or leased to others	farms	830	1.2
	acres	69 435	1.6
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
Operators by place of residence:			
On farm operated		4 412	.9
Not on farm operated		1 022	1.4
Not reported		637	.8
Operators by principal occupation:			
Farming		4 350	.8
Other		1 721	1.2
Operators by days worked off farm:			
Any		2 425	1.1
200 days or more		1 388	1.2
Operators by sex:			
Male		5 618	.9
Female		453	1.6
Average age of operator	years	54.0	1.2

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION			
Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms	4 714	.9
	acres	1 169 986	.6
Partnership	farms	715	1.4
	acres	309 003	.9
Corporation:			
Family held	farms	556	1.2
	acres	274 394	.6
More than 10 stockholders	farms	11	–
10 or less stockholders	farms	545	1.2
Other than family held	farms	39	4.2
	acres	6 720	5.0
More than 10 stockholders	farms	1	–
10 or less stockholders	farms	38	4.3
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms	47	3.7
	acres	29 192	1.4
HIRED FARM LABOR[1]			
Hired workers by days worked:			
150 days or more	farms	1 838	3.3
	workers	5 719	1.7
Less than 150 days	farms	2 843	2.7
	workers	12 287	2.7
INJURIES AND DEATHS			
Farm-related injuries:			
Operator and family members	farms	66	3.1
	number	75	3.2
Hired workers	farms	78	2.0
	number	155	1.8
Farm-related deaths:			
Operator and family members	farms	1	–
	number	(D)	(D)
Hired workers	farms	1	–
	number	(D)	(D)
FARMS BY SIZE			
1 to 9 acres		552	1.5
10 to 49 acres		952	1.1
50 to 69 acres		312	1.8
70 to 99 acres		437	1.6
100 to 139 acres		632	1.3
140 to 179 acres		524	1.6
180 to 219 acres		409	1.5
220 to 259 acres		352	1.8
260 to 499 acres		944	1.2
500 to 999 acres		592	1.0
1,000 to 1,999 acres		272	–
2,000 acres or more		93	–
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM			
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)		1 677	1.1
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)		288	1.8
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)		72	3.2
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)		448	1.6
Other crop farming (1119)		720	1.3
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)		440	1.6
Cattle feedlots (112112)		118	2.7
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)		885	.9
Hog and pig farming (1122)		95	2.5
Poultry and egg production (1123)		1 036	.7
Sheep and goat farming (1124)		27	5.8
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)		265	1.9
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	2 288	.9
	number	225 109	.6
Beef cows	farms	1 107	1.2
	number	33 076	1.3
Milk cows	farms	1 004	.9
	number	84 690	.6
Cattle and calves sold	farms	2 248	.9
	number	122 233	.7
	$1,000	51 696	.8
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	370	1.5
	number	78 025	1.1
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	331	1.6
	number	145 736	1.1
	$1,000	13 679	1.1
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms	185	1.9
	number	9 913	2.1
Sheep and lambs sold	farms	139	2.2
	number	7 914	2.0
Horses and ponies inventory	farms	740	1.3
	number	8 670	1.9
Horses and ponies sold	farms	268	2.0
	number	1 791	2.3

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)
POULTRY			
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	farms	262	1.7
	number	4 629 329	1.2
Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms	253	1.7
	number	4 111 984	.4
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	976	.7
	number	256 925 193	.3
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED			
Corn for grain or seed	farms	2 741	.9
	acres	395 005	.5
	bushels	36 177 236	.5
Corn for silage or green chop	farms	1 196	1.0
	acres	90 091	.7
	tons, green	836 038	.7
Wheat for grain	farms	2 046	.9
	acres	195 101	.5
	bushels	12 513 950	.5
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED—Con.			
Barley for grain	farms	893	.9
	acres	46 444	.7
	bushels	3 444 337	.7
Oats for grain	farms	304	1.5
	acres	4 438	1.5
	bushels	252 711	1.6
Tobacco	farms	488	1.4
	acres	7 249	1.3
	pounds	11 225 357	1.3
Soybeans for beans	farms	2 644	.9
	acres	497 191	.5
	bushels	14 883 015	.5
Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	farms	84	2.7
	acres	2 176	.2
	cwt	520 598	.2
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	2 572	.9
	acres	163 586	.9
	tons, dry	362 104	.8
Alfalfa hay	farms	1 329	1.0
	acres	44 882	.9
	tons, dry	121 645	1.0
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	655	1.3
	acres	34 976	.8
Land in orchards	farms	163	2.2
	acres	4 344	2.0

[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	–7.3	1.3	–7.1	1.3
Land in farms ..... acres	–3.1	.9	–2.9	.9
Average size of farm ..... acres	4.1	1.7	4.6	1.7
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1]:				
Average per farm ..... dollars	11.9	2.9	11.5	3.2
Average per acre ..... dollars	9.1	3.2	8.5	3.5
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1]:				
Average per farm ..... dollars	19.0	3.0	13.5	3.2
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	–9.8	1.6	–10.5	1.8
10 to 49 acres	–3.8	1.6	.2	1.7
50 to 179 acres	–10.1	1.1	–8.7	1.3
180 to 499 acres	–9.5	1.2	–10.9	1.3
500 to 999 acres	–3.7	1.5	–4.1	1.4
1,000 to 1,999 acres	3.0	–	3.0	–
2,000 acres or more	11.8	–	9.4	–
Total cropland ..... farms	–7.8	1.3	–8.1	1.3
acres	–3.0	.8	–2.4	.8
Harvested cropland ..... farms	–9.3	1.2	–8.0	1.3
acres	–1.1	.8	–.6	.8
Irrigated land ..... farms	8.6	1.8	7.4	1.7
acres	20.5	1.5	20.7	1.5
Market value of agricultural products sold $1,000	12.2	.5	12.6	.5
Average per farm ..... dollars	21.1	1.7	21.2	1.7
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops $1,000	18.2	.7	19.1	.7
Livestock, poultry, and their products $1,000	9.2	.5	9.5	.5
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than $2,500	–2.1	1.6	(X)	(X)
$2,500 to $4,999	–16.9	1.7	(X)	(X)
$5,000 to $9,999	–8.7	1.8	(X)	(X)
$10,000 to $24,999	–8.5	1.7	–8.5	1.6
$25,000 to $49,999	–13.1	1.8	–13.1	1.8
$50,000 to $99,999	–5.5	2.2	–5.5	2.1
$100,000 to $249,999	–14.8	1.5	–14.8	1.5
$250,000 to $499,999	–9.1	–	–9.1	–
$500,000 or more	35.8	–	35.8	–
Total farm production expenses[1] $1,000	15.3	1.2	13.9	1.3
Average per farm ..... dollars	24.1	2.0	23.0	2.1
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text)[1] ..... farms	–7.1	1.3	–7.4	1.4
$1,000	–7.1	2.8	3.6	2.5
Average per farm ..... dollars	–	3.3	11.9	3.2
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	–10.7	1.1	–6.6	1.2
Other	–3.4	1.6	–8.1	1.6
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	–5.7	1.5	–6.7	1.6
200 days or more	–5.4	1.6	–5.3	1.7
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory ..... farms	–10.7	1.2	–10.6	1.3
number	–7.7	.9	–7.1	.9
Beef cows ..... farms	–6.7	1.5	–1.2	1.8
number	–2.0	1.6	1.8	1.9
Milk cows ..... farms	–17.9	1.2	–17.8	1.2
number	–10.3	.8	–10.4	.8
Cattle and calves sold ..... farms	–9.5	1.2	–10.0	1.3
number	2.3	1.1	3.2	1.1
Hogs and pigs inventory ..... farms	–35.8	1.3	–36.2	1.4
number	–44.4	.8	–44.3	.8
Hogs and pigs sold ..... farms	–41.3	1.2	–42.5	1.3
number	–48.3	.8	–48.4	.8
Sheep and lambs inventory ..... farms	.8	2.2	–6.1	2.8
number	–13.1	1.9	–28.0	2.0
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) ..... farms	–24.1	1.6	–23.4	2.0
number	8.7	1.5	8.8	1.5
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold ..... farms	–10.1	.9	–10.3	.9
number	–.1	.4	–.1	.4
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed ..... farms	–23.3	1.1	–21.1	1.1
acres	–10.7	.7	–10.2	.7
bushels	–30.0	.5	–29.6	.5
Wheat for grain ..... farms	–15.7	1.2	–13.0	1.2
acres	6.0	1.0	6.9	.9
bushels	24.2	1.1	25.0	1.1
Barley for grain ..... farms	–24.7	1.1	–21.9	1.1
acres	–24.8	.8	–24.3	.8
bushels	–17.7	.8	–17.1	.8
Tobacco ..... farms	–25.2	1.5	–16.0	1.9
acres	–6.3	2.0	.9	2.2
pounds	1.6	2.2	8.0	2.4
Soybeans for beans ..... farms	–11.9	1.2	–8.2	1.3
acres	1.3	.8	2.3	.8
bushels	–6.5	.7	–5.7	.7
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) ..... farms	–5.6	1.3	–5.1	1.4
acres	.4	1.3	–.2	1.4
tons, dry	–17.4	1.0	–19.0	1.0
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) ..... farms	–18.5	1.5	–8.0	1.7
acres	–1.0	1.2	1.0	1.2

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

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

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm[1]		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1]	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	**12 084**	**.8**	**2 154 875**	**.6**	**178**	**1.0**	**563 605**	**1.7**	**728 486**	**1.5**
Allegany	239	.8	41 928	1.8	175	1.9	263 026	8.6	7 511	9.7
Anne Arundel	412	.9	34 679	1.9	84	2.1	531 542	10.6	17 971	11.6
Baltimore	781	.9	75 795	1.2	97	1.5	456 780	7.1	37 976	4.1
Calvert	349	.9	33 450	2.1	96	2.3	375 264	14.4	11 185	8.4
Caroline	525	.8	111 316	.9	212	1.2	500 487	4.0	50 074	5.4
Carroll	1 041	.7	160 180	.7	154	1.0	568 327	5.0	60 938	5.6
Cecil	464	.9	85 702	1.3	185	1.5	682 622	4.4	26 210	6.9
Charles	410	1.1	55 928	1.8	136	2.0	437 104	9.6	13 273	7.9
Dorchester	297	1.0	122 928	.9	414	1.3	862 174	5.3	30 203	2.9
Frederick	1 304	1.0	215 927	.8	166	1.3	625 965	3.8	78 585	3.3
Garrett	649	.9	107 695	1.1	166	1.4	248 904	5.4	29 827	9.3
Harford	651	.8	94 112	.9	145	1.2	613 280	5.7	34 760	5.8
Howard	318	.9	39 846	1.4	125	1.6	691 409	10.2	16 157	4.3
Kent	314	.9	117 526	.8	374	1.2	1 051 419	4.2	32 460	5.4
Montgomery	526	1.0	77 266	1.0	147	1.4	659 337	9.2	28 979	12.2
Prince George's	473	.9	47 572	1.4	101	1.7	491 286	9.8	16 276	12.6
Queen Anne's	419	.8	167 957	.7	401	1.1	1 206 022	3.9	48 362	4.9
St. Mary's	621	.9	71 890	1.4	116	1.7	275 499	5.1	23 857	7.7
Somerset	288	.8	54 823	1.2	190	1.4	410 812	3.3	18 715	3.9
Talbot	240	.7	109 572	.7	457	1.0	1 414 152	8.0	28 494	12.3
Washington	768	.8	126 292	.9	164	1.2	454 364	4.7	52 110	4.4
Wicomico	580	.8	90 656	1.4	156	1.6	405 688	6.1	35 582	3.3
Worcester	415	.9	111 835	1.0	269	1.3	505 280	2.2	28 982	2.2

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)
Maryland	**60 176**	**1.7**	**1 312 086**	**.3**	**108 580**	**.9**	**12 109**	**.9**	**1 123 200**	**.6**
Allegany	31 039	9.8	3 322	3.1	13 899	3.2	242	1.3	3 185	20.5
Anne Arundel	43 618	11.6	12 621	1.5	30 635	1.7	412	1.1	10 449	9.8
Baltimore	48 562	4.3	51 179	.7	65 530	1.1	782	1.0	38 501	3.1
Calvert	32 049	8.5	7 704	1.5	22 075	1.8	349	1.1	5 109	9.8
Caroline	95 017	5.5	95 120	.4	181 181	.9	527	1.0	88 472	1.7
Carroll	58 369	5.6	71 272	.5	68 465	.9	1 044	.8	61 215	2.4
Cecil	56 487	7.0	59 052	.5	127 267	1.0	464	1.1	50 294	1.4
Charles	32 294	8.0	10 816	2.1	26 381	2.4	411	1.4	8 109	8.2
Dorchester	102 038	3.2	82 391	.3	277 411	1.0	298	1.3	69 980	1.0
Frederick	60 219	3.5	101 660	.5	77 960	1.1	1 306	1.0	90 820	1.3
Garrett	45 888	9.4	20 997	1.3	32 353	1.6	650	1.1	19 658	6.0
Harford	53 231	5.9	38 807	.7	59 612	1.1	653	1.0	29 799	3.5
Howard	50 649	4.5	19 610	.6	61 667	1.1	319	1.1	16 144	4.6
Kent	103 047	5.5	60 957	.4	194 131	1.0	315	1.1	55 535	2.2
Montgomery	55 094	12.2	28 563	.7	54 303	1.2	526	1.2	23 958	3.0
Prince George's	34 337	12.6	18 708	1.0	39 553	1.4	474	1.0	13 538	5.6
Queen Anne's	115 148	5.0	68 736	.4	164 047	.9	420	.9	57 637	1.7
St. Mary's	38 356	7.8	21 056	1.3	33 906	1.6	622	1.1	13 899	3.0
Somerset	64 982	4.0	96 532	.3	335 182	.9	288	1.0	97 724	1.0
Talbot	118 231	12.4	48 530	.5	202 208	.9	241	1.2	39 538	3.6
Washington	67 675	4.5	60 604	.8	78 912	1.1	770	1.0	50 569	2.7
Wicomico	61 243	3.5	186 294	.3	321 197	.9	581	1.1	160 364	1.1
Worcester	69 835	2.5	147 553	.3	355 548	.9	415	1.2	118 702	.9

Geographic area	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.									
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	**3 714**	**2.7**	**129 432**	**.9**	**6 112**	**1.9**	**435 279**	**.8**	**6 893**	**1.7**	**35 862**	**1.3**
Allegany	58	20.8	333	39.5	129	12.7	547	36.2	81	17.5	78	14.4
Anne Arundel	43	30.1	420	5.8	140	17.9	740	34.4	222	7.5	597	14.3
Baltimore	242	12.0	1 831	5.5	320	9.4	3 368	7.4	304	7.1	2 842	7.7
Calvert	43	29.3	96	10.1	97	18.6	228	28.5	230	9.6	333	10.4
Caroline	155	7.6	5 859	3.3	208	7.4	46 356	2.9	424	3.4	2 217	9.2
Carroll	326	10.1	4 192	3.8	626	6.3	17 150	5.4	517	6.5	2 524	4.4
Cecil	117	17.8	4 810	.7	207	11.9	15 380	.7	259	8.7	1 891	2.4
Charles	98	22.1	355	33.9	142	16.2	309	31.2	243	7.4	492	13.2
Dorchester	100	9.6	11 893	.9	108	10.7	26 572	3.1	241	4.1	2 030	2.2

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	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Frederick	446	8.0	8 227	6.2	894	4.2	29 584	1.7	825	4.2	2 445	3.9
Garrett	221	11.7	2 145	24.0	401	5.9	6 024	10.3	344	7.2	404	12.3
Harford	201	13.5	3 289	6.5	423	6.5	4 041	8.8	323	7.4	1 413	6.3
Howard	75	17.0	1 198	38.1	150	8.7	1 677	3.6	111	13.4	1 243	6.5
Kent	47	19.1	1 270	.9	103	14.4	14 647	3.4	256	3.9	2 905	3.7
Montgomery	94	21.0	1 120	6.9	238	12.6	2 292	10.2	211	11.5	2 241	2.4
Prince George's	62	30.3	586	57.3	135	16.2	901	16.3	257	10.5	886	7.6
Queen Anne's	84	11.0	2 504	3.6	127	8.3	13 843	.5	327	4.3	3 175	2.9
St. Mary's	155	14.8	673	17.0	232	11.1	720	10.5	418	6.5	845	5.9
Somerset	175	6.5	24 339	.5	188	.8	54 581	1.2	117	12.1	881	3.6
Talbot	60	17.6	2 498	6.5	73	15.1	17 916	7.1	163	6.9	1 444	7.4
Washington	281	9.7	3 675	13.4	508	4.7	16 914	5.5	515	4.7	1 531	4.5
Wicomico	357	4.0	27 649	.8	377	4.3	93 008	1.5	294	7.2	1 874	6.7
Worcester	274	1.2	20 471	.5	286	3.9	68 483	1.2	211	3.4	1 571	1.3

Geographic area	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	**7 745**	**1.6**	**58 488**	**1.4**	**6 851**	**1.7**	**38 516**	**1.7**	**11 311**	**1.0**	**33 726**	**1.1**
Allegany	108	12.4	193	12.8	50	22.4	57	7.3	220	5.3	194	15.3
Anne Arundel	271	7.4	983	11.8	202	9.1	701	18.1	396	2.8	696	14.0
Baltimore	367	6.9	2 207	9.3	357	7.2	1 919	10.4	705	2.8	2 067	4.3
Calvert	275	6.1	579	15.7	259	5.7	258	14.9	327	3.4	369	10.5
Caroline	397	4.3	4 326	3.8	402	4.0	3 105	3.7	491	2.7	2 233	3.1
Carroll	619	6.0	3 539	5.8	496	7.3	2 297	5.8	946	2.5	2 513	4.8
Cecil	290	8.0	2 391	3.6	294	6.2	1 571	5.5	446	2.1	1 605	2.9
Charles	305	6.4	1 092	10.6	275	6.8	734	17.9	374	4.0	665	13.9
Dorchester	222	6.1	4 503	2.8	236	4.2	3 484	5.7	277	3.6	1 960	2.8
Frederick	876	4.2	5 001	3.4	763	4.8	2 783	3.7	1 264	1.4	2 906	2.9
Garrett	435	5.4	1 121	6.5	268	8.4	289	9.9	620	2.1	772	7.1
Harford	375	7.5	2 921	7.5	335	8.4	1 631	9.0	598	3.5	1 266	5.8
Howard	183	9.1	1 000	18.1	140	10.4	575	13.6	269	3.9	844	3.7
Kent	240	5.0	4 438	6.3	225	5.9	2 614	6.4	308	2.0	1 840	3.8
Montgomery	278	9.1	1 606	5.2	225	11.0	1 248	9.9	507	2.5	1 101	6.8
Prince George's	304	8.9	780	15.1	225	11.8	586	6.9	473	1.0	660	4.7
Queen Anne's	336	4.2	7 068	3.7	331	3.6	4 137	5.0	388	2.6	2 266	3.1
St. Mary's	535	3.7	1 817	5.8	466	4.3	891	5.5	616	1.5	1 155	4.5
Somerset	143	11.0	1 051	6.7	148	8.9	1 273	4.9	259	3.7	1 615	2.2
Talbot	190	5.9	3 769	6.4	182	6.6	1 846	7.8	219	4.1	1 053	3.4
Washington	547	4.4	3 152	6.6	503	4.6	1 876	5.6	747	1.7	1 653	3.4
Wicomico	278	6.0	2 382	6.7	282	6.9	2 294	11.3	498	4.3	2 335	4.5
Worcester	171	9.4	2 568	1.3	187	9.1	2 349	1.9	363	3.4	1 960	1.6

Geographic area	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	**8 246**	**1.6**	**17 729**	**1.3**	**4 814**	**2.3**	**102 425**	**1.1**	**1 045**	**5.8**	**5 685**	**3.2**
Allegany	122	11.2	82	23.3	59	22.4	256	15.3	7	52.1	10	45.1
Anne Arundel	277	8.4	268	14.7	137	15.1	1 816	16.1	39	39.3	131	26.4
Baltimore	500	5.5	847	4.8	291	7.8	10 113	5.2	61	24.7	339	6.8
Calvert	185	13.9	77	16.9	171	12.4	765	16.4	17	39.0	28	8.0
Caroline	390	4.8	1 232	4.1	206	8.7	5 294	6.3	68	19.0	442	6.2
Carroll	712	4.9	1 305	5.2	384	8.3	6 577	5.1	76	24.9	614	2.6
Cecil	285	8.2	933	3.8	126	14.4	7 759	2.1	17	30.9	579	.5
Charles	226	11.5	168	14.1	157	13.1	850	13.7	39	33.2	86	40.3
Dorchester	202	6.5	924	1.3	146	6.2	3 773	.9	30	21.8	233	.6
Frederick	876	4.6	1 834	2.9	533	6.3	9 315	3.0	108	17.7	312	7.6
Garrett	555	2.6	566	10.1	213	10.3	1 583	20.3	41	33.4	77	24.9
Harford	446	6.4	552	7.6	254	10.0	4 042	5.9	61	23.4	198	19.0
Howard	242	6.7	397	7.0	96	13.7	3 590	1.4	31	29.5	123	19.7
Kent	223	7.7	758	7.9	127	12.5	10 099	1.1	38	24.3	154	6.1
Montgomery	337	8.7	526	7.8	230	12.1	4 920	4.3	53	32.5	297	14.4
Prince George's	264	9.1	287	8.7	173	13.2	3 548	6.6	55	32.2	98	26.3
Queen Anne's	305	5.0	718	3.7	210	8.9	6 277	6.0	40	25.8	217	10.4
St. Mary's	343	8.3	285	5.1	284	9.5	1 914	5.7	42	31.2	300	39.3
Somerset	236	6.1	1 251	3.1	119	11.7	1 918	1.4	52	21.0	273	.9

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	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Talbot	176	7.4	451	5.1	95	11.1	2 021	2.3	21	32.3	145	5.1
Washington	549	4.1	1 193	3.7	347	7.1	3 770	6.5	44	25.2	314	1.2
Wicomico	459	5.0	1 815	5.7	276	9.1	8 707	3.3	75	17.4	571	16.8
Worcester	336	6.7	1 258	1.9	180	10.5	3 520	2.0	30	–	145	–

Geographic area	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	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)
Maryland	**10 455**	**1.2**	**60 624**	**1.3**	**4 036**	**2.7**	**13 376**	**2.8**	**4 219**	**2.3**	**45 896**	**1.7**
Allegany	203	6.6	450	18.6	54	22.8	74	34.3	41	22.3	153	18.4
Anne Arundel	348	4.8	1 181	12.4	83	23.4	103	26.6	100	19.7	652	29.3
Baltimore	650	4.1	2 844	5.4	158	14.6	481	13.3	133	14.6	1 616	8.8
Calvert	263	6.4	524	13.1	73	24.9	129	10.4	75	18.3	333	26.1
Caroline	446	3.6	4 126	3.6	263	7.3	1 076	8.7	267	7.3	3 847	3.6
Carroll	907	2.6	4 897	7.8	227	12.1	767	8.0	316	10.6	2 713	5.5
Cecil	406	3.6	3 587	4.5	149	13.6	523	10.1	138	14.2	1 678	4.9
Charles	340	5.3	979	10.5	96	21.1	132	21.3	110	19.1	571	22.4
Dorchester	278	3.5	2 994	2.3	169	8.2	860	13.6	185	7.6	3 576	2.7
Frederick	1 221	2.1	6 485	4.4	545	6.7	1 245	7.8	424	6.8	5 189	5.2
Garrett	550	3.4	1 688	6.6	230	9.6	363	16.8	251	7.2	1 215	12.3
Harford	529	4.4	2 492	5.2	202	13.4	436	7.9	186	11.9	1 381	10.3
Howard	276	5.2	1 225	5.6	58	19.5	297	54.1	61	17.5	559	6.2
Kent	273	5.2	3 447	2.9	181	9.8	941	9.2	132	11.3	3 095	3.8
Montgomery	429	5.7	2 001	6.1	119	18.8	315	8.9	154	15.5	1 399	11.0
Prince George's	382	6.0	1 342	12.3	73	28.7	434	4.4	58	18.3	413	6.3
Queen Anne's	348	4.3	3 810	5.9	181	9.8	925	13.1	213	7.5	3 639	8.8
St. Mary's	524	4.3	1 474	6.7	163	15.8	242	9.3	180	13.4	901	11.9
Somerset	266	3.8	2 021	3.0	161	10.7	541	11.2	178	9.8	1 900	4.8
Talbot	221	3.8	1 873	3.9	86	13.5	447	13.0	99	12.1	1 544	7.8
Washington	679	2.9	4 134	4.5	317	7.8	1 152	12.9	331	6.9	2 293	7.4
Wicomico	528	3.4	3 815	4.6	238	9.5	905	8.5	367	6.8	4 503	5.6
Worcester	388	3.3	3 235	1.1	210	8.9	988	3.5	220	6.3	2 725	6.6

Geographic area	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	**3 133**	**2.9**	**36 106**	**2.0**	**11 088**	**1.0**	**23 776**	**1.8**	**10 879**	**1.1**	**86 280**	**1.1**
Allegany	37	20.2	78	23.2	235	3.0	242	11.3	180	6.9	439	33.5
Anne Arundel	86	20.5	453	13.3	367	3.9	809	14.2	368	4.4	898	11.1
Baltimore	151	14.2	1 728	10.5	727	2.3	1 702	5.9	675	3.7	4 599	3.7
Calvert	54	26.9	454	62.2	318	4.4	514	10.1	288	6.7	424	8.4
Caroline	153	9.9	2 120	7.6	488	2.1	969	4.8	482	2.6	5 272	2.9
Carroll	318	9.1	3 127	6.4	955	2.6	2 360	6.3	923	2.8	6 640	6.0
Cecil	146	11.8	1 580	6.5	442	2.5	1 237	6.2	406	3.8	4 771	2.9
Charles	86	19.6	278	11.8	372	3.9	626	9.7	369	4.0	771	10.2
Dorchester	143	11.1	2 406	3.1	290	1.3	792	5.3	291	2.6	3 979	1.7
Frederick	393	7.6	4 050	3.8	1 148	2.2	2 902	4.5	1 173	2.3	8 542	2.2
Garrett	146	13.8	529	25.8	614	2.4	631	6.0	578	3.1	2 250	13.1
Harford	152	12.7	1 827	7.8	623	1.9	1 304	7.6	569	4.3	3 007	5.1
Howard	23	–	328	–	302	2.8	949	10.8	294	3.8	2 139	1.8
Kent	74	12.8	1 997	3.9	277	4.1	800	8.4	291	3.4	6 534	4.4
Montgomery	136	15.6	1 268	13.3	501	2.7	1 443	11.6	459	4.6	2 181	7.6
Prince George's	98	20.1	416	6.2	407	5.3	749	12.4	395	5.3	1 852	12.4
Queen Anne's	128	11.8	3 385	4.5	370	3.5	1 079	7.0	389	2.6	4 594	2.5
St. Mary's	104	14.3	341	6.1	549	3.3	871	5.8	580	2.6	1 470	5.2
Somerset	106	17.3	1 066	3.6	278	3.0	506	4.0	269	3.7	4 507	1.0
Talbot	78	13.7	1 982	6.1	214	4.5	609	8.3	231	2.3	1 937	7.0
Washington	236	8.8	2 128	12.8	674	2.9	1 119	5.7	698	2.5	5 666	5.0
Wicomico	163	12.8	2 185	12.7	550	1.8	890	3.1	558	2.1	7 432	2.5
Worcester	122	12.6	2 381	3.5	387	3.5	673	3.5	413	1.2	6 376	1.0

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	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)
Maryland	**12 109**	**.9**	**172 948**	**2.0**	**10 702**	**.8**	**1 613 497**	**.6**	**9 474**	**.8**	**1 382 035**	**.5**
Allegany	242	1.3	130	(H)	226	1.0	19 669	2.4	201	1.2	11 202	2.6
Anne Arundel	412	1.1	3 628	19.5	364	1.1	23 227	2.1	313	1.3	16 891	2.4
Baltimore	782	1.0	13 436	8.0	665	1.0	54 361	1.3	538	1.2	42 430	1.4
Calvert	349	1.1	1 693	27.6	322	1.0	17 865	2.1	293	1.2	13 444	2.6
Caroline	527	1.0	4 452	11.4	462	.9	94 605	.9	435	1.0	91 067	1.0
Carroll	1 044	.8	10 903	14.7	946	.8	124 841	.8	837	.8	104 007	.8
Cecil	464	1.1	6 655	5.6	421	1.0	63 246	1.2	348	1.2	51 582	1.1
Charles	411	1.4	2 698	19.1	393	1.1	32 640	1.9	347	1.3	24 252	2.1
Dorchester	298	1.3	10 605	3.0	264	1.1	99 269	.7	252	1.2	95 190	.7
Frederick	1 306	1.0	10 171	9.8	1 206	1.0	171 259	.8	1 080	1.0	134 457	.8
Garrett	650	1.1	3 951	21.2	617	.9	53 915	1.1	568	1.0	38 372	1.2
Harford	653	1.0	8 912	7.3	586	.9	71 826	.9	480	1.0	55 280	1.0
Howard	319	1.1	2 775	12.5	263	1.2	30 609	1.5	213	1.5	23 535	1.6
Kent	315	1.1	4 268	13.3	300	1.0	97 863	.8	276	1.1	91 298	.8
Montgomery	526	1.2	3 385	13.1	447	1.1	60 510	1.0	363	1.3	46 768	1.1
Prince George's	474	1.0	4 894	12.4	439	1.0	27 618	1.8	395	1.1	19 948	2.2
Queen Anne's	420	.9	11 828	6.8	392	.9	145 575	.7	359	1.0	138 140	.7
St. Mary's	622	1.1	5 659	7.8	598	1.0	43 203	1.6	571	1.0	35 391	1.6
Somerset	288	1.0	–5 615	5.2	205	1.2	39 815	1.1	172	1.5	37 641	1.1
Talbot	241	1.2	7 146	3.8	219	.9	92 953	.7	202	1.1	89 373	.7
Washington	770	1.0	14 459	9.3	713	.8	94 845	.9	653	.9	75 901	.9
Wicomico	581	1.1	20 552	3.8	399	1.0	70 960	1.6	357	1.1	66 635	1.6
Worcester	415	1.2	26 364	.8	255	1.3	82 823	.9	221	1.4	79 231	.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)
Maryland	**1 154**	**1.2**	**68 588**	**.9**	**4 444**	**.8**	**261 324**	**.6**	**2 726**	**1.0**	**50 619**	**1.1**
Allegany	6	10.8	58	17.0	152	1.8	5 341	2.9	127	2.1	2 448	3.4
Anne Arundel	49	4.1	751	1.9	78	3.4	2 149	5.3	60	3.9	(D)	(D)
Baltimore	102	2.7	1 188	3.5	231	1.9	9 642	2.1	149	2.5	2 210	2.6
Calvert	25	5.8	335	2.6	90	3.0	1 550	3.6	72	3.4	(D)	(D)
Caroline	115	2.2	16 183	1.9	72	3.0	3 168	2.9	37	4.3	434	5.0
Carroll	56	3.5	1 119	3.2	527	1.1	30 584	1.2	304	1.5	5 575	3.0
Cecil	30	5.4	1 182	1.2	185	1.9	10 466	1.8	122	2.5	2 486	3.5
Charles	65	3.6	825	5.4	126	2.6	3 174	3.9	96	3.0	1 411	4.7
Dorchester	70	2.8	15 101	1.5	23	5.6	651	5.2	19	6.4	(D)	(D)
Frederick	57	3.9	530	8.6	778	1.1	65 359	.7	411	1.6	9 130	1.8
Garrett	10	9.0	63	18.4	468	1.1	24 895	1.1	291	1.6	4 555	1.9
Harford	46	4.2	590	4.6	311	1.4	17 433	1.3	203	1.9	3 705	2.2
Howard	36	4.7	763	1.5	139	2.0	6 321	1.8	105	2.5	1 967	2.8
Kent	29	4.3	5 343	1.1	62	2.7	8 388	1.4	20	5.9	478	4.1
Montgomery	64	3.6	1 206	6.2	161	2.2	8 543	2.4	109	2.9	2 523	3.4
Prince George's	56	3.6	405	3.8	96	3.0	3 109	2.7	78	3.3	(D)	(D)
Queen Anne's	56	3.3	8 387	2.3	73	2.8	5 559	1.3	37	4.3	939	2.8
St. Mary's	107	2.8	1 000	3.6	196	2.0	5 372	2.3	125	2.5	1 958	3.6
Somerset	18	5.3	1 179	3.3	36	4.0	1 916	2.8	31	4.2	851	3.4
Talbot	18	5.6	1 596	7.7	36	3.8	2 212	3.3	22	5.6	381	10.7
Washington	41	4.4	665	4.3	507	1.0	41 519	1.1	235	1.8	5 013	2.4
Wicomico	77	2.7	5 729	4.0	55	3.4	2 211	7.3	40	3.9	(D)	(D)
Worcester	21	5.5	4 390	3.1	42	4.0	1 762	6.3	33	4.9	(D)	(D)

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	**1 091**	**.9**	**84 953**	**.6**	**584**	**1.3**	**80 850**	**1.1**	**616**	**1.4**	**21 985**	**1.5**
Allegany	11	8.4	489	8.3	11	9.5	153	13.7	11	8.8	241	8.8
Anne Arundel	6	12.4	(D)	(D)	8	11.8	203	18.8	19	8.0	227	11.9
Baltimore	31	4.2	2 865	2.1	21	6.2	2 480	16.5	45	4.4	3 004	4.0
Calvert	2	24.8	(D)	(D)	14	7.7	120	10.9	15	6.4	177	7.8
Caroline	16	5.0	1 472	3.7	11	3.0	6 098	.3	11	8.1	244	16.5
Carroll	126	1.9	9 968	1.3	60	3.5	9 434	2.6	74	3.3	2 645	4.6
Cecil	40	3.6	3 239	2.0	20	6.1	4 198	1.0	26	5.3	1 469	5.4
Charles	9	10.2	108	24.2	33	5.5	1 553	5.6	21	6.2	391	6.7
Dorchester	2	20.7	(D)	(D)	10	6.8	2 529	.3	1	–	(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	Livestock and poultry—Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Frederick	256	1.4	28 197	.7	73	3.0	5 117	.7	92	3.3	3 297	4.8
Garrett	132	1.9	5 825	1.9	35	5.2	1 001	8.5	41	4.3	1 341	5.4
Harford	61	2.7	4 923	1.8	26	5.4	3 190	2.0	35	5.0	2 824	1.8
Howard	17	4.2	1 357	.1	17	7.1	1 254	1.3	40	4.7	477	6.6
Kent	36	3.0	4 198	1.5	7	10.1	(D)	(D)	12	8.5	769	3.9
Montgomery	26	4.4	1 930	2.1	17	7.6	666	7.7	34	5.4	905	7.7
Prince George's	7	11.9	(D)	(D)	18	6.9	934	7.4	19	6.5	761	4.8
Queen Anne's	22	4.1	1 745	1.5	14	5.7	959	6.4	9	11.3	567	7.5
St. Mary's	53	3.9	207	6.2	71	3.4	9 733	6.2	33	4.9	325	9.1
Somerset	4	12.4	65	3.8	11	8.4	2 080	2.5	2	24.5	(D)	(D)
Talbot	8	4.2	878	2.5	7	4.8	(D)	(D)	10	8.4	514	6.9
Washington	220	1.4	16 683	1.1	52	3.3	10 575	1.9	49	3.8	1 451	5.6
Wicomico	4	14.0	(D)	(D)	20	4.3	3 526	.8	13	8.3	310	17.3
Worcester	2	–	(D)	(D)	28	4.5	6 094	3.8	4	16.0	42	16.2

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.							
	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)
Maryland	**618**	**1.4**	**4 120 639**	**.4**	**997**	**.7**	**256 926 521**	**.3**
Allegany	17	7.3	387	10.7	–	–	–	–
Anne Arundel	17	6.3	698	8.1	–	–	–	–
Baltimore	44	4.6	997	5.6	2	25.0	(D)	(D)
Calvert	30	5.3	480	7.7	3	18.0	(D)	(D)
Caroline	7	12.1	47 836	11.8	138	1.4	34 951 281	.5
Carroll	57	3.5	754 867	(L)	2	11.7	(D)	(D)
Cecil	29	5.0	1 689 370	(L)	3	21.2	(D)	(D)
Charles	24	6.6	688	7.1	1	33.1	(D)	(D)
Dorchester	4	14.5	35 460	9.2	71	1.4	19 794 937	.8
Frederick	74	3.6	(D)	(D)	4	12.4	(D)	(D)
Garrett	50	3.9	2 636	7.6	5	12.0	(D)	(D)
Harford	31	5.5	439	7.6	3	15.6	(D)	(D)
Howard	18	6.7	604	10.0	3	12.2	93	10.9
Kent	9	9.8	(D)	(D)	12	2.7	3 585 800	.5
Montgomery	26	6.3	676	4.4	2	16.8	(D)	(D)
Prince George's	22	6.4	771	14.0	5	11.0	266 700	10.2
Queen Anne's	10	10.2	(D)	(D)	33	1.0	10 329 600	.4
St. Mary's	63	3.5	8 529	8.2	3	19.4	(D)	(D)
Somerset	7	11.7	48 140	12.5	150	1.3	42 167 603	.4
Talbot	1	31.4	(D)	(D)	35	2.4	12 046 400	.7
Washington	51	3.8	302 039	(L)	6	12.9	(D)	(D)
Wicomico	22	5.3	274 629	4.5	283	1.1	76 432 601	.8
Worcester	5	12.2	48 233	9.3	233	1.2	56 651 265	.7

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed						Wheat 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)
Maryland	**3 554**	**.9**	**405 451**	**.5**	**36 823 284**	**.5**	**2 339**	**.9**	**199 351**	**.5**	**12 711 370**	**.5**
Allegany	23	5.8	488	9.4	49 043	8.6	8	8.4	85	14.5	3 434	14.6
Anne Arundel	68	3.2	4 911	3.0	477 693	2.7	37	4.4	2 057	4.5	122 290	4.7
Baltimore	141	2.5	16 088	1.8	1 127 175	1.6	60	3.6	2 491	2.2	141 170	2.2
Calvert	77	2.9	3 554	4.1	381 195	3.8	48	3.5	2 456	4.0	154 819	4.3
Caroline	187	1.7	20 547	1.2	1 983 268	1.1	213	1.6	21 452	1.2	1 252 817	1.2
Carroll	324	1.3	29 160	1.0	1 716 870	.8	185	1.5	8 559	1.1	545 230	1.1
Cecil	170	1.9	19 570	1.4	1 664 552	1.3	95	2.6	6 639	1.8	436 288	2.0
Charles	110	2.7	5 859	2.9	534 310	3.3	60	3.6	3 442	3.2	191 663	3.2
Dorchester	122	2.0	19 014	1.0	2 547 349	1.0	132	1.7	18 185	.9	1 180 237	1.0
Frederick	261	1.8	15 986	1.3	1 145 448	1.1	249	1.7	11 075	1.4	677 177	1.2
Garrett	193	1.7	4 497	2.2	448 331	2.2	7	9.5	49	12.1	1 930	10.0
Harford	210	1.7	24 051	1.2	2 054 943	1.5	86	2.6	4 024	1.4	261 764	1.4
Howard	53	3.4	7 632	1.4	532 763	1.7	35	4.2	2 211	4.4	130 754	3.9
Kent	195	1.5	39 205	.9	2 581 070	1.1	142	1.8	15 214	1.4	1 086 701	1.5
Montgomery	58	3.0	12 097	1.2	927 217	.9	46	2.8	5 279	1.1	366 734	1.0
Prince George's	81	3.0	4 427	2.4	344 363	2.8	32	4.6	1 671	4.3	92 889	5.1
Queen Anne's	223	1.4	50 885	.8	4 590 071	.8	212	1.4	32 329	.9	2 193 763	.9
St. Mary's	200	2.0	7 523	2.4	809 799	2.4	119	2.6	6 472	2.6	370 372	2.3
Somerset	107	2.0	12 090	1.2	1 586 515	1.2	72	2.6	6 387	1.6	433 030	1.5

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	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed						Wheat 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)
Talbot	130	1.7	33 697	.8	2 737 665	1.0	115	1.8	21 038	.9	1 333 701	.8
Washington	281	1.4	15 821	1.1	1 162 460	1.2	181	1.6	6 264	1.6	334 288	1.6
Wicomico	180	1.6	21 995	1.8	2 703 167	1.8	125	2.1	11 136	1.9	696 728	2.0
Worcester	160	1.7	36 354	.9	4 718 017	.9	80	2.3	10 836	1.2	703 591	1.2

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Barley for grain						Tobacco					
	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)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	**972**	**.9**	**47 405**	**.7**	**3 489 722**	**.7**	**711**	**1.3**	**7 939**	**1.2**	**11 987 083**	**1.3**
Allegany	2	17.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Anne Arundel	4	–	230	–	19 700	–	85	3.0	763	3.6	1 113 535	3.3
Baltimore	32	4.5	1 524	2.8	114 301	3.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Calvert	8	8.1	262	11.4	20 966	10.2	147	2.0	1 657	1.9	2 083 983	2.2
Caroline	107	2.1	8 394	1.7	668 456	2.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Carroll	101	2.0	3 804	1.5	267 337	1.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Cecil	37	3.9	1 859	2.6	122 264	3.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Charles	4	8.4	156	3.9	7 493	5.0	114	2.6	1 550	2.7	2 179 044	2.8
Dorchester	61	2.5	5 564	1.0	404 462	.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Frederick	111	2.1	4 319	1.3	295 353	1.1	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Garrett	68	2.5	1 038	2.1	60 076	2.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Harford	34	3.7	960	2.5	65 070	2.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Howard	24	4.1	1 272	1.9	104 903	1.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Kent	40	3.1	2 292	1.8	190 392	1.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Montgomery	11	4.6	614	2.0	43 424	2.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Prince George's	–	–	–	–	–	–	94	2.8	791	3.6	1 091 872	3.5
Queen Anne's	49	2.9	4 389	2.5	359 303	1.9	2	26.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
St. Mary's	39	4.3	1 365	7.1	87 375	7.0	268	1.7	3 167	1.6	5 499 549	1.6
Somerset	16	5.1	753	3.3	65 096	3.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Talbot	27	3.4	2 577	1.6	212 630	1.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Washington	170	1.6	5 055	1.4	314 190	1.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Wicomico	24	4.6	845	5.8	57 417	4.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Worcester	3	11.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Soybeans for beans						Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	**3 226**	**.9**	**509 683**	**.5**	**15 171 466**	**.5**	**5 223**	**.8**	**223 014**	**.8**	**450 781**	**.8**
Allegany	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	177	1.5	10 063	2.8	15 714	3.0
Anne Arundel	64	3.2	5 156	2.7	177 156	2.4	131	2.4	3 810	5.3	5 439	4.2
Baltimore	70	3.3	9 072	1.7	283 619	1.3	300	1.7	8 603	2.2	18 053	2.4
Calvert	74	2.9	4 348	3.6	150 124	3.4	93	2.8	1 842	4.2	2 867	3.9
Caroline	314	1.3	49 631	1.1	1 401 976	1.2	100	2.7	2 266	2.6	5 589	3.3
Carroll	217	1.5	22 198	1.2	682 590	1.0	644	.9	27 343	1.3	51 096	1.4
Cecil	127	2.1	14 203	1.4	435 605	1.4	212	1.8	8 523	2.4	20 313	3.4
Charles	80	3.3	9 313	2.6	264 759	2.6	167	2.2	4 395	3.3	8 087	4.8
Dorchester	197	1.5	57 877	.8	1 917 424	.7	21	6.1	379	4.4	1 415	4.3
Frederick	229	1.8	24 508	1.5	587 165	1.5	890	1.1	50 090	1.2	103 702	1.2
Garrett	6	11.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	513	1.0	26 907	1.2	57 286	1.3
Harford	102	2.3	9 750	1.1	282 667	1.1	352	1.3	13 182	1.6	29 276	1.9
Howard	44	3.5	4 717	2.8	126 453	3.0	138	2.1	6 502	2.5	10 602	2.5
Kent	205	1.4	35 245	1.0	913 976	1.0	86	2.5	4 275	1.8	11 802	1.3
Montgomery	58	3.0	16 047	1.0	394 279	1.0	223	1.9	12 060	3.0	21 814	3.1
Prince George's	97	2.7	5 731	5.2	145 028	5.1	147	2.4	4 544	3.8	7 487	3.9
Queen Anne's	273	1.3	69 750	.9	2 294 823	.8	88	2.7	2 905	2.7	6 292	2.5
St. Mary's	199	2.0	15 827	2.2	485 417	2.1	231	1.8	4 611	2.4	8 938	2.4
Somerset	126	1.9	22 214	1.3	685 633	1.2	40	4.2	1 149	4.3	2 945	4.5
Talbot	153	1.5	48 075	1.0	1 401 024	1.2	26	4.6	1 160	4.3	2 962	5.3
Washington	187	1.6	11 147	1.3	396 135	1.2	524	1.0	25 120	1.1	50 324	1.2
Wicomico	236	1.4	34 489	1.6	917 758	1.5	78	2.8	2 192	5.6	5 914	8.8
Worcester	167	1.7	40 267	1.0	1 223 893	1.0	42	4.1	1 093	6.2	2 864	6.8

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	Selected crops harvested—Con.			
	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)			
	Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Maryland	**951**	**1.2**	**35 958**	**.8**
Allegany	8	8.4	110	8.9
Anne Arundel	53	4.0	716	2.8
Baltimore	82	3.2	2 455	3.5
Calvert	31	4.7	476	2.7
Caroline	82	2.7	6 758	2.3
Carroll	56	3.2	3 779	1.4
Cecil	22	6.6	102	6.8
Charles	44	4.8	426	8.8
Dorchester	73	2.8	8 148	1.1
Frederick	51	4.4	414	4.8
Garrett	20	5.9	83	11.3
Harford	46	4.2	691	7.5
Howard	26	5.5	243	6.7
Kent	11	7.1	1 265	1.2
Montgomery	37	4.8	832	5.7
Prince George's	63	3.4	1 851	1.2
Queen Anne's	34	4.3	2 512	3.6
St. Mary's	64	3.8	428	7.0
Somerset	18	6.3	830	3.4
Talbot	12	5.5	1 170	1.8
Washington	38	4.0	278	4.7
Wicomico	72	3.1	2 188	3.9
Worcester	8	11.2	204	8.6

[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		Coverage adjustment (percent)
			Total	Relative standard error (percent)	
Farms ..... number	12 084	906	12 990	2.7	7.0
Land in farms ..... acres	2 154 875	20 129	2 175 004	2.3	.9
Average size of farm ..... acres	178	22	167	(X)	(X)
Farms by size of farm:					
Less than 10 acres	1 407	196	1 603	12.4	12.2
10 to 49 acres	3 828	452	4 280	5.3	10.6
50 to 179 acres	3 825	191	4 016	4.4	4.8
180 acres or more	3 024	67	3 091	3.3	2.2
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than $2,500	3 097	735	3 832	8.3	19.2
$2,500 to $9,999	2 916	154	3 070	3.3	5.0
$10,000 or more	6 071	17	6 088	2.5	.3
Market value of agricultural products sold $1,000	1 312 086	–28 318	1 283 768	2.8	–2.2
Farms by type of organization:					
Individual or family	10 229	901	11 130	3.1	8.1
Partnership, corporation, or other	1 855	5	1 860	4.7	.3
Farms by tenure of operator:					
Full owners	7 576	606	8 182	3.8	7.4
Part owners	3 179	169	3 348	3.2	5.0
Tenants	1 329	131	1 460	7.3	9.0
Operators by place of residence:					
On farm operated	9 175	815	9 990	3.2	8.2
Not on farm operated	1 923	86	2 009	6.2	4.3
Not reported	986	5	991	6.5	.5
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming	6 235	245	6 480	2.0	3.8
Other	5 849	661	6 510	4.9	10.2
Operators by sex:					
Male	10 694	573	11 267	2.9	5.1
Female	1 390	333	1 723	9.1	19.3
Operators by race:					
White	11 837	828	12 665	2.8	6.5
Black and other races	247	78	325	6.8	24.0
Operators by years on present farm:					
4 years or less	1 176	299	1 475	13.0	20.3
5 years or more	8 856	615	9 471	2.9	6.5
Not reported	2 052	–8	2 044	7.0	–.4

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