Appendix C.
Statistical Methodology

THE SCREENING PHASE AND THE MAIL LIST MODEL

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

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

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

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

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

Each address record on the 1997 preliminary census mail list was assigned to a model group by matching record characteristics to model group characteristics. Records belonging to the groups with the highest farm probability were those more likely to be farms. Records with a farm probability of approximately 30 percent or less were selected for screening, along with records included on selected agriculture specialty lists as noted above.

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

CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

All name and address records on the final census mail list were designated to receive a 1997 Census of Agriculture report form. Two different types of census report forms, sample and nonsample, were used to collect data. Sections 1 through 20 and 28 through 32 of the sample form were identical to sections on the nonsample census form. Sample form sections 21 through 27 contained additional questions on usage of fertilizers and chemicals, farm production expenditures, value of machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, farm-related income, and hired workers. There were 11 regional versions of the nonsample form and 13 regional versions of the sample form with listings of crops varying by region. These different forms were used to reduce the response burden of the census, while providing reliable information on a large number of data items.

The sample form was mailed to all mail list records in Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island and to a sample of records in other States selected from the final mail list. Mail list records were selected into the sample with certainty if they (1) were expected to have large total value of agricultural products sold or large acreage, (2) were multi-unit operations (i.e., separate farms producing under one company organization), (3) were in a county with less than 100 farms in 1992, or (4) had other special characteristics. Farms with special characteristics were abnormal farms, such as institutional farms, experimental and research farms, and Indian reservations. Mail list records in counties containing 100 to 199 farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 2; records in counties containing 200 to 299 farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 4; and records in counties containing 300 or more farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 6. The remaining mail list records not chosen to receive the sample form received the nonsample census form. This differential sampling scheme was used to provide reliable data for the sample sections of the report form for all counties.

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

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

- Ensured reasonable relationships between/among data items, values for various sizes of farms, combinations of commodities, and economic interactions.
- Ensured necessary consistencies were present (there were more than 70 distinct consistency requirements).
- Ensured climatic, geographic, legal, and physical constraints were met.

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

For the 1997 Census of Agriculture, as in previous censuses, all reported data were keyed and then edited by computer. The edits were used to determine whether the reports met the minimum criteria to be counted as farms in the census. The complex edit and imputation system provided the basis for deciding to accept, impute (supply), delete, or alter the reported value for each data record item.

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

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

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

Each execution of the computer edit consisted of records from only one State sorted by reported State and county. For a given execution of the edit, the stored entries in the various matrices were retained in memory only until a succeeding record having acceptable characteristics for the same sections of the report form was processed by the computer. Then the acceptable responses of the succeeding operation replaced those previously stored. When a record processed through the edit had unreported or unacceptable data, the record was assigned the last acceptable ratio or response from an operation with a similar set of characteristics. Once each execution of the computer edit for a State was completed, the possible imputation variables were reset to the default values and relationships for subsequent executions. An edit run usually consisted of 10,000 or more records.

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

CENSUS ESTIMATION

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

Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sample Estimation

Sample data estimation determined the population totals that would have resulted from a complete census for the items in sections 21 through 27 of the sample form. The estimates were obtained from a weighting procedure that assigned a weight to each respondent record containing sample items. For any given county, a sample item total was estimated by multiplying the data items for each farm in the county by the corresponding sample weight and summing over all sample records.

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

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

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

TVP	SIC	Acres
$1 to $999	01, 08 All crops	1 to 69
$1,000 to $2,499	02 All livestock	70 or more
$2,500 to $4,999		
$5,000 to $9,999		
$10,000 to $24,999		
$25,000 to $49,999		
$50,000 to $99,999		
$100,000 or more		

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

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

depending on whether the county had a 1 in 2, 1 in 4, or 1 in 6 sample selection rate. The collapsing occurred within the 32 initial strata according to a specified collapsing pattern. After the collapsing process was completed, new total farm counts and sample farm counts were computed from each final strata and used to calculate final sample factors.

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

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

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

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

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

1. Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.65 standard errors below the estimate to 1.65 standard errors above the estimate would include the true population parameter.
2. Approximately 95 percent of the intervals from 1.96 standard errors below the estimate to 1.96 standard errors above the estimate would include the true population parameter.

The following example illustrates the computations necessary to produce a confidence statement for an estimate. Assume that the estimate of number of farms for a State is 94,382 and the relative standard error of the estimate is 0.1 percent (0.001). Multiplying 94,382 by 0.001 yields 94, the standard error; therefore, a 90-percent confidence interval is 94,227 to 94,537 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.65 x 94). If corresponding confidence intervals were constructed for all possible samples of the same size and design, approximately 90 percent of these intervals would contain the true population parameter. Similarly, a 95-percent confidence interval is 94,198 to 94,566 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.96 x 94).

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

Only a sample of farm operators were asked the sample count items. These items appeared only in sections 21 through 27 of the sample form. Sample count items were included under the following section headings: commercial fertilizers, chemicals, production expenses, farm machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, farm-related income, and hired workers.

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

Table B provides the generalized reliability estimates of the estimated number of farms in a county that reported complete count and sample count items. The top half of the table shows the percent relative standard errors for estimated number of farms in a county that reported a complete count item, and the bottom half relates to sample count items. These reliability estimates are derived from regression equations. Separate regression equations were used to produce each section of table B. Each regression equation was fit with the estimated number of farms in a county reporting an item as the independent variable and the relative variance of that estimate as the dependent variable for the appropriate counties in the State. To illustrate the use of this table, assume that the estimate of the number of farms reporting hogs and pigs for a particular county, as given in county table 15, is 89. Since hogs and pigs is a complete count data item, refer to the first part of table B and use the estimated percent relative standard error of the estimate from the row with farm count equal to or just less than the estimated number of farms, 89. For this example, the percent relative standard error of the estimate comes from the row for 75 farms reporting. For sample count items, follow the same procedure using the second part of table B. For counties with fewer than 100 farms in the 1992 Census of Agriculture, variability in sample count

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

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

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

Table E presents the standard error for percent change in State totals from 1992 to 1997. The general purpose of the percent change estimate is to provide a relative measure of the difference in a characteristic between censuses. The relative change for a given characteristic is defined as the ratio of the difference of the 1997 and the 1992 estimate for that characteristic to the 1992 estimate. This ratio is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent change. The standard error of a percent change estimate is the standard error of the ratio multiplied by 100.

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

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

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

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts is affected jointly by sampling errors (described in the previous section) and nonsampling errors. Extensive efforts were made to compile a complete and accurate mail list for the census, to design an understandable report form with instructions, and to minimize processing errors through the use of quality control measures. Nonsampling errors arise from many sources, including respondent or enumerator error or incorrect data keying, editing, or imputing for missing data. These nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Nonsampling error due to mail list incompleteness and duplication as well as misclassification of records on the mail list is called coverage error. The section titled ''Coverage Evaluation'' discusses the evaluation studies conducted to measure the extent of this error in the census.

Respondent and Enumerator Error

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

Item Nonresponse

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

Processing Error

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

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

COVERAGE EVALUATION

Coverage Overview

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

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

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

1. Undercount due to farms Not on the Mail List (NML)
2. Overcount due to farms Duplicated or enumerated more than once (DUP)
3. Undercount due to farms Incorrectly Classified as nonfarms (ICU)
4. Overcount due to nonfarms Incorrectly Classified as farms (ICO).

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

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

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

Area Frame Surveys to Measure Mail List Undercoverage

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

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

Classification Error Survey to Measure Three Types of Coverage Error

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

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

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

Coverage Estimation

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

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

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

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

Item	Percent of total	Item	Percent of total
Farms ..... number	11.5	Corn for grain or seed ..... acres	1.0
Land in farms ..... acres	2.5	Wheat for grain ..... acres	2.4
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1] $1,000	4.8	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold $1,000	1.1	Cattle and calves ..... number	2.8
Harvested cropland ..... acres	3.3	Hogs and pigs ..... number	4.1
		Layers 20 weeks old and older ..... number	.1

[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	5.9	25	41.7
50	3.7	50	29.1
75	2.5	75	23.4
100	1.6	100	20.0
150	1.3	150	15.9
200	1.2	200	13.3
300	1.0	300	10.2
500	.7	500	6.6
750	.6	750	3.8
1,000	.5	1,000	3.3
1,500	.4	1,500	2.7
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..	14 094	.5
Land in farms ..... acres..	45 787 108	.2
Average size of farm ..... acres..	3 249	.5
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) ..... farms..	14 094	.5
$1,000..	1 617 708	.1
Average per farm ..... dollars..	114 780	.5
Farms by value of sales:		
Less than $1,000 (see text) ..... farms..	3 092	.8
$1,000..	629	1.3
$1,000 to $2,499 ..... farms..	2 005	.9
$1,000..	3 282	1.0
$2,500 to $4,999 ..... farms..	1 811	.9
$1,000..	6 441	.9
$5,000 to $9,999 ..... farms..	1 710	.9
$1,000..	12 050	.9
$10,000 to $19,999 ..... farms..	1 339	1.0
$1,000..	18 871	1.0
$20,000 to $24,999 ..... farms..	416	1.6
$1,000..	9 191	1.6
$25,000 to $39,999 ..... farms..	740	1.2
$1,000..	23 216	1.2
$40,000 to $49,999 ..... farms..	359	1.5
$1,000..	16 058	1.5
$50,000 to $99,999 ..... farms..	896	.9
$1,000..	63 318	.9
$100,000 to $249,999 ..... farms..	847	.5
$1,000..	134 007	.4
$250,000 to $499,999 ..... farms..	394	–
$1,000..	137 983	–
$500,000 or more ..... farms..	485	–
$1,000..	1 192 662	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	4 957	.5
$1,000..	462 178	.1
Grains ..... farms..	1 023	.7
$1,000..	85 839	.2
Corn for grain ..... farms..	230	1.1
$1,000..	36 904	.2
Wheat ..... farms..	696	.8
$1,000..	26 645	.5
Soybeans ..... farms..	3	–
$1,000..	28	–
Sorghum for grain ..... farms..	461	1.0
$1,000..	16 236	.6
Barley ..... farms..	20	4.3
$1,000..	850	1.8
Oats ..... farms..	44	4.1
$1,000..	242	6.4
Other grains ..... farms..	77	2.6
$1,000..	4 933	.5
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms..	458	.9
$1,000..	38 956	.4
Tobacco ..... farms..	–	–
$1,000..	–	–
Hay, silage, and field seeds ..... farms..	2 926	.7
$1,000..	118 808	.3
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms..	524	1.1
$1,000..	88 776	.1
Fruits, nuts, and berries ..... farms..	1 114	.9
$1,000..	43 560	.4
Nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	245	2.0
$1,000..	48 409	.3
Other crops ..... farms..	117	1.8
$1,000..	37 830	.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms..	9 149	.5
$1,000..	1 155 530	.1
Poultry and poultry products ..... farms..	254	2.1
$1,000..	16 306	.3
Dairy products ..... farms..	182	1.0
$1,000..	463 423	(L)
Cattle and calves ..... farms..	8 094	.5
$1,000..	647 440	.1
Hogs and pigs ..... farms..	246	2.0
$1,000..	900	4.7
Sheep, lambs, and wool ..... farms..	840	1.1
$1,000..	16 997	.5
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ..... farms..	1 312	.9
$1,000..	10 463	1.2
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms..	873	1.2
$1,000..	3 819	1.3

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses ..... farms..	14 075	.5
$1,000..	1 204 227	.3
Average per farm ..... dollars..	85 558	.6
Livestock and poultry purchased ..... farms..	4 419	2.6
$1,000..	221 246	.8
Feed for livestock and poultry ..... farms..	7 760	1.6
$1,000..	334 541	.3
Commercially mixed formula feeds ..... farms..	3 938	2.8
$1,000..	85 887	.6
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ..... farms..	3 313	3.1
$1,000..	20 014	1.3
Commercial fertilizer ..... farms..	4 793	2.4
$1,000..	34 563	2.5
Agricultural chemicals ..... farms..	3 315	3.0
$1,000..	18 085	1.5
Petroleum products ..... farms..	12 467	.8
$1,000..	49 544	.9
Electricity ..... farms..	7 045	1.7
$1,000..	30 598	1.5
Hired farm labor ..... farms..	5 226	2.3
$1,000..	140 862	.6
Contract labor ..... farms..	2 368	3.7
$1,000..	29 672	1.7
Repair and maintenance ..... farms..	10 582	1.1
$1,000..	55 600	1.2
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ..... farms..	2 993	3.3
$1,000..	18 436	2.4
Interest ..... farms..	4 808	2.2
$1,000..	78 791	1.2
Secured by real estate ..... farms..	3 340	3.0
$1,000..	44 938	1.7
Not secured by real estate ..... farms..	2 595	3.1
$1,000..	33 852	1.3
Cash rent ..... farms..	2 559	3.4
$1,000..	31 086	2.0
Property taxes ..... farms..	13 115	.7
$1,000..	17 764	1.3
All other farm production expenses ..... farms..	12 042	.9
$1,000..	123 425	.6
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)[1]		
All farms ..... number..	14 075	.5
$1,000..	410 261	.9
Average per farm ..... dollars..	29 148	1.0
Farms with net gains[2] ..... number..	6 533	1.7
$1,000..	467 311	.6
Average net gain ..... dollars..	71 531	1.8
Farms with net losses ..... number..	7 542	1.5
$1,000..	57 051	3.0
Average net loss ..... dollars..	7 564	3.4
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments ..... farms..	2 586	.6
$1,000..	29 524	.7
Other farm-related income[1] ..... farms..	2 008	4.3
$1,000..	19 066	5.5
Customwork and other agricultural services ..... farms..	823	7.0
$1,000..	9 047	7.9
Gross cash rent or share payments ..... farms..	813	7.4
$1,000..	7 560	9.6
Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ..... farms..	128	19.2
$1,000..	604	24.3
Other farm-related income sources ..... farms..	524	7.0
$1,000..	1 856	8.1
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total ..... farms..	163	1.5
$1,000..	4 938	.8

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	9 435	.5
	acres	2 179 428	.5
Harvested cropland	farms	7 008	.5
	acres	1 079 953	.3
Farms by acres harvested:			
1 to 9 acres	farms	2 658	.8
	acres	10 396	.9
10 to 19 acres	farms	954	1.2
	acres	12 326	1.2
20 to 29 acres	farms	534	1.5
	acres	12 161	1.5
30 to 49 acres	farms	581	1.4
	acres	21 344	1.4
50 to 99 acres	farms	618	1.3
	acres	42 459	1.3
100 to 199 acres	farms	508	1.3
	acres	69 350	1.3
200 to 499 acres	farms	564	.9
	acres	179 488	.9
500 to 999 acres	farms	349	.9
	acres	243 085	.9
1,000 acres or more	farms	242	–
	acres	489 344	–
Cropland:			
Pasture or grazing only	farms	4 029	.7
	acres	586 490	1.0
Other cropland	farms	2 453	.7
	acres	512 985	.9
Total woodland	farms	1 038	1.1
	acres	2 444 242	.4
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms	6 570	.5
	acres	40 737 445	.2
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms	5 952	.6
	acres	425 993	1.3
Irrigated land	farms	7 444	.5
	acres	804 616	.3
Acres irrigated:			
1 to 9 acres	farms	2 846	.8
	acres	11 636	.9
10 to 49 acres	farms	2 372	.8
	acres	53 288	.9
50 to 99 acres	farms	728	1.2
	acres	50 268	1.2
100 to 199 acres	farms	564	1.3
	acres	77 102	1.2
200 to 499 acres	farms	551	.9
	acres	173 178	.8
500 to 999 acres	farms	251	.7
	acres	172 044	.6
1,000 acres or more	farms	132	.4
	acres	267 100	.3
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms	6 210	.6
	acres	667 905	.3
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms	2 460	.8
	acres	136 711	1.0
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms	1 158	.9
	acres	428 448	1.1
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]			
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms	14 075	.5
	$1,000	8 801 195	1.4
Average per farm	dollars	625 307	1.5
Average per acre	dollars	195	1.6
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]			
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms	14 074	.5
	$1,000	619 915	1.8
Average per farm	dollars	44 047	1.8
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]			
Commercial fertilizer	farms	4 715	2.4
	acres on which used	724 160	2.4

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
TENURE OF OPERATOR			
All operators	farms	14 094	.5
	acres	45 787 108	.2
Full owners	farms	8 653	.6
	acres	15 462 750	.2
Part owners	farms	4 079	.6
	acres	26 677 298	.2
Tenants	farms	1 362	.9
	acres	3 647 060	.6
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			
Land owned	farms	12 804	.5
	acres	31 021 501	.2
Owned land in farms	farms	12 732	.5
	acres	29 740 851	.2
Land rented or leased from others	farms	5 534	.5
	acres	16 319 279	.2
	landlords	10 719	.6
Rented or leased land in farms	farms	5 441	.5
	acres	16 046 257	.2
Land rented or leased to others	farms	1 242	.9
	acres	1 553 672	1.8
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
Operators by place of residence:			
On farm operated		9 454	.5
Not on farm operated		3 754	.7
Not reported		886	.9
Operators by principal occupation:			
Farming		7 197	.5
Other		6 897	.6
Operators by days worked off farm:			
Any		7 506	.6
200 days or more		4 592	.7
Operators by sex:			
Male	farms	12 429	.5
	acres	42 585 512	.2
Female	farms	1 665	.9
	acres	3 201 596	.7
Average age of operator	years	56.5	.7
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION			
Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms	11 783	.5
	acres	20 874 338	.3
Partnership	farms	1 158	.9
	acres	7 257 592	.3
Corporation:			
Family held	farms	754	.9
	acres	7 718 939	.2
More than 10 stockholders	farms	21	3.7
10 or less stockholders	farms	733	.9
Other than family held	farms	94	3.0
	acres	1 109 003	.6
More than 10 stockholders	farms	4	11.2
10 or less stockholders	farms	90	3.0
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms	305	1.6
	acres	8 827 236	.1
HIRED FARM LABOR[1]			
Hired workers by days worked:			
150 days or more	farms	2 314	3.2
	workers	8 006	1.3
Less than 150 days	farms	4 505	2.6
	workers	16 936	2.1
INJURIES AND DEATHS			
Farm-related injuries:			
Operator and family members	farms	162	2.3
	number	190	2.4
Hired workers	farms	124	1.4
	number	234	1.6
Farm-related deaths:			
Operator and family members	farms	1	–
	number	(D)	(D)
Hired workers	farms	–	–
	number	–	–

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	2 594	.8
	acres	10 780	.9
10 to 49 acres	farms	2 618	.8
	acres	60 902	.9
50 to 69 acres	farms	474	1.6
	acres	26 903	1.6
70 to 99 acres	farms	569	1.4
	acres	46 320	1.4
100 to 139 acres	farms	497	1.5
	acres	57 380	1.5
140 to 179 acres	farms	623	1.3
	acres	98 669	1.3
180 to 219 acres	farms	307	1.8
	acres	60 485	1.8
220 to 259 acres	farms	259	2.0
	acres	61 934	2.0
260 to 499 acres	farms	1 155	1.0
	acres	417 637	1.0
500 to 999 acres	farms	1 232	.9
	acres	875 649	.9
1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms	1 111	1.0
	acres	1 574 849	1.0
2,000 acres or more	farms	2 655	.5
	acres	42 495 600	.2
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM			
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	farms	944	.9
	acres	1 101 698	.8
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)	farms	304	1.6
	acres	241 913	.4
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)	farms	1 192	.9
	acres	103 961	1.3
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)	farms	202	2.2
	acres	12 388	6.3
Other crop farming (1119)	farms	2 292	.7
	acres	2 492 790	.3
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)	farms	7 061	.5
	acres	37 287 050	.2
Cattle feedlots (112112)	farms	183	2.3
	acres	764 003	.9
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)	farms	164	1.0
	acres	214 328	1.8
Hog and pig farming (1122)	farms	87	3.4
	acres	10 844	13.9
Poultry and egg production (1123)	farms	94	3.4
	acres	14 527	11.4
Sheep and goat farming (1124)	farms	403	1.6
	acres	2 510 413	.4
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)	farms	1 168	1.1
	acres	1 033 193	1.0
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	8 677	.5
	number	1 676 171	.2
Beef cows	farms	6 894	.5
	number	581 812	.3
Milk cows	farms	523	1.1
	number	215 844	(L)
Cattle and calves sold	farms	8 094	.5
	number	1 308 236	.1
	$1,000	647 440	.1
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	346	1.7
	number	6 114	6.0
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	246	2.0
	number	7 997	4.0
	$1,000	900	4.7
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms	917	1.1
	number	291 808	.4
Sheep and lambs sold	farms	786	1.1
	number	203 026	.5
Horses and ponies inventory	farms	5 859	.6
	number	38 816	.5
Horses and ponies sold	farms	984	1.0
	number	3 524	1.2
POULTRY			
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	farms	669	1.3
	number	(D)	(D)
Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms	651	1.3
	number	(D)	(D)
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	11	10.0
	number	(D)	(D)
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED			
Corn for grain or seed	farms	316	1.2
	acres	80 122	.2
	bushels	13 795 021	.2
Corn for silage or green chop	farms	275	1.2
	acres	46 730	.4
	tons, green	1 029 234	.3
Sorghum for grain or seed	farms	496	.9
	acres	188 615	.7
	bushels	7 059 484	.6
Wheat for grain	farms	711	.8
	acres	264 190	.5
	bushels	8 605 057	.5
Cotton	farms	459	.9
	acres	67 996	.6
	bales	113 281	.6
Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	farms	35	3.6
	acres	9 385	(L)
	cwt	3 499 484	.1
Peanuts for nuts	farms	71	1.9
	acres	16 132	.6
	pounds	42 372 773	.5
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	4 616	.6
	acres	318 213	.5
	tons, dry	1 207 842	.4
Alfalfa hay	farms	3 641	.7
	acres	207 525	.5
	tons, dry	971 581	.4
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	526	1.1
	acres	38 375	.2
Land in orchards	farms	1 744	.8
	acres	33 600	.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..	5 476	.4
Land in farms ..... acres..	41 579 487	.1
Average size of farm ..... acres..	7 593	.4
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) ..... farms..	5 476	.4
$1,000..	1 595 307	.1
Average per farm ..... dollars..	291 327	.4
Farms by value of sales:		
$10,000 to $19,999 ..... farms..	1 339	.8
$1,000..	18 871	.9
$20,000 to $24,999 ..... farms..	416	1.5
$1,000..	9 191	1.5
$25,000 to $39,999 ..... farms..	740	1.1
$1,000..	23 216	1.1
$40,000 to $49,999 ..... farms..	359	1.5
$1,000..	16 058	1.5
$50,000 to $99,999 ..... farms..	896	.9
$1,000..	63 318	.9
$100,000 to $249,999 ..... farms..	847	.5
$1,000..	134 007	.4
$250,000 to $499,999 ..... farms..	394	–
$1,000..	137 983	–
$500,000 or more ..... farms..	485	–
$1,000..	1 192 662	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	2 517	.5
$1,000..	455 567	.1
Grains ..... farms..	878	.6
$1,000..	85 448	.2
Corn for grain ..... farms..	213	1.0
$1,000..	36 877	.2
Wheat ..... farms..	618	.8
$1,000..	26 428	.4
Soybeans ..... farms..	3	–
$1,000..	28	–
Sorghum for grain ..... farms..	433	.9
$1,000..	16 139	.6
Barley ..... farms..	18	3.4
$1,000..	(D)	(D)
Oats ..... farms..	29	4.0
$1,000..	(D)	(D)
Other grains ..... farms..	60	2.4
$1,000..	4 909	.4
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms..	410	.8
$1,000..	38 778	.4
Tobacco ..... farms..	–	–
$1,000..	–	–
Hay, silage, and field seeds ..... farms..	1 534	.7
$1,000..	115 127	.3
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms..	365	1.0
$1,000..	88 355	.1
Fruits, nuts, and berries ..... farms..	342	1.2
$1,000..	42 035	.3
Nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	120	2.2
$1,000..	48 038	.3
Other crops ..... farms..	98	1.5
$1,000..	37 786	.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms..	4 259	.4
$1,000..	1 139 740	.1
Poultry and poultry products ..... farms..	56	3.5
$1,000..	16 189	.3
Dairy products ..... farms..	176	1.0
$1,000..	463 410	(L)
Cattle and calves ..... farms..	4 039	.4
$1,000..	634 092	.1
Hogs and pigs ..... farms..	80	2.9
$1,000..	671	6.2
Sheep, lambs, and wool ..... farms..	336	1.2
$1,000..	16 427	.5
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ..... farms..	535	1.1
$1,000..	8 952	1.2
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms..	257	1.7
$1,000..	3 089	1.5
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses ..... farms..	5 424	.4
$1,000..	1 162 311	.3
Average per farm ..... dollars..	214 290	.6
Livestock and poultry purchased ..... farms..	2 476	2.7
$1,000..	217 110	.7
Feed for livestock and poultry ..... farms..	3 727	1.7
$1,000..	329 449	.3
Commercially mixed formula feeds ..... farms..	2 246	3.1
$1,000..	84 579	.6
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ..... farms..	2 078	3.2
$1,000..	19 602	1.3
Commercial fertilizer ..... farms..	2 260	2.7
$1,000..	33 502	2.6
Agricultural chemicals ..... farms..	1 868	3.1
$1,000..	17 688	1.5
Petroleum products ..... farms..	5 298	.6
$1,000..	44 234	.9
Electricity ..... farms..	3 957	1.7
$1,000..	29 256	1.5
Hired farm labor ..... farms..	3 189	2.2
$1,000..	138 962	.6
Contract labor ..... farms..	1 578	3.7
$1,000..	28 896	1.5
Repair and maintenance ..... farms..	4 947	1.0
$1,000..	49 975	1.2
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ..... farms..	1 744	3.4
$1,000..	17 679	2.5
Interest ..... farms..	3 196	2.2
$1,000..	73 844	1.2
Secured by real estate ..... farms..	2 163	3.1
$1,000..	40 855	1.7
Not secured by real estate ..... farms..	1 976	3.1
$1,000..	32 989	1.3
Cash rent ..... farms..	1 732	3.4
$1,000..	30 067	2.0
Property taxes ..... farms..	5 016	.9
$1,000..	13 119	1.1
All other farm production expenses ..... farms..	5 422	.4
$1,000..	118 928	.6
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)[1]		
All farms ..... number..	5 424	.4
$1,000..	429 854	.8
Average per farm ..... dollars..	79 250	.9
Farms with net gains[2] ..... number..	3 978	1.6
$1,000..	462 695	.6
Average net gain ..... dollars..	116 313	1.7
Farms with net losses ..... number..	1 446	4.2
$1,000..	32 841	4.2
Average net loss ..... dollars..	22 712	6.0
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments ..... farms..	1 659	.6
$1,000..	22 246	.6
Other farm-related income[1] ..... farms..	1 169	5.1
$1,000..	15 570	5.3
Customwork and other agricultural services ..... farms..	510	8.2
$1,000..	8 053	8.5
Gross cash rent or share payments ..... farms..	387	10.3
$1,000..	5 309	7.5
Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ..... farms..	63	28.4
$1,000..	409	37.7
Other farm-related income sources ..... farms..	440	7.0
$1,000..	1 800	8.3
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total ..... farms..	154	1.5
$1,000..	4 925	.7

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	3 445	.5
	acres	1 687 650	.4
Harvested cropland	farms	2 917	.5
	acres	1 021 579	.3
Cropland:			
Pasture or grazing only	farms	1 323	.8
	acres	317 948	1.3
Total woodland	farms	298	1.6
	acres	2 201 061	.4
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms	3 378	.5
	acres	37 360 433	.1
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms	2 116	.6
	acres	330 343	1.4
Irrigated land	farms	2 755	.5
	acres	719 971	.3
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms	2 459	.5
	acres	624 075	.2
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms	751	1.0
	acres	95 896	.9
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms	567	1.0
	acres	253 614	1.2
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]			
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms	5 424	.4
	$1,000	6 597 800	1.3
Average per farm	dollars	1 216 408	1.4
Average per acre	dollars	161	1.4
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]			
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms	5 423	.4
	$1,000	436 799	2.0
Average per farm	dollars	80 546	2.0
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]			
Commercial fertilizer	farms	2 262	2.7
	acres on which used	695 923	2.5
TENURE OF OPERATOR			
All operators	farms	5 476	.4
	acres	41 579 487	.1
Full owners	farms	2 370	.6
	acres	13 694 756	.2
Part owners	farms	2 420	.5
	acres	24 745 490	.2
Tenants	farms	686	1.0
	acres	3 139 241	.5
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			
Land owned	farms	4 833	.4
	acres	28 051 118	.1
Owned land in farms	farms	4 790	.4
	acres	27 160 961	.1
Land rented or leased from others	farms	3 151	.5
	acres	14 629 719	.2
	landlords	6 925	.6
Rented or leased land in farms	farms	3 106	.5
	acres	14 418 526	.2
Land rented or leased to others	farms	551	1.1
	acres	1 101 350	1.4
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
Operators by place of residence:			
On farm operated		3 709	.5
Not on farm operated		1 399	.7
Not reported		368	.9
Operators by principal occupation:			
Farming		4 139	.4
Other		1 337	.8
Operators by days worked off farm:			
Any		2 145	.6
200 days or more		1 066	.9
Operators by sex:			
Male		4 958	.4
Female		518	1.2
Average age of operator	years	55.9	.6

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION			
Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms	3 958	.5
	acres	17 721 612	.2
Partnership	farms	716	.9
	acres	6 830 599	.3
Corporation:			
Family held	farms	600	.7
	acres	7 373 242	.2
More than 10 stockholders	farms	18	3.7
10 or less stockholders	farms	582	.8
Other than family held	farms	55	2.9
	acres	1 063 367	.5
More than 10 stockholders	farms	3	–
10 or less stockholders	farms	52	3.1
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms	147	1.7
	acres	8 590 667	.1
HIRED FARM LABOR[1]			
Hired workers by days worked:			
150 days or more	farms	1 916	2.9
	workers	7 604	1.2
Less than 150 days	farms	2 510	2.7
	workers	12 903	1.9
INJURIES AND DEATHS			
Farm-related injuries:			
Operator and family members	farms	88	2.7
	number	102	2.7
Hired workers	farms	115	1.2
	number	214	1.0
Farm-related deaths:			
Operator and family members	farms	–	–
	number	–	–
Hired workers	farms	–	–
	number	–	–
FARMS BY SIZE			
1 to 9 acres		227	1.8
10 to 49 acres		441	1.3
50 to 69 acres		155	2.4
70 to 99 acres		169	2.3
100 to 139 acres		166	2.1
140 to 179 acres		193	2.0
180 to 219 acres		113	2.5
220 to 259 acres		99	2.6
260 to 499 acres		488	1.2
500 to 999 acres		589	1.0
1,000 to 1,999 acres		623	1.0
2,000 acres or more		2 213	.5
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM			
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)		452	.9
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)		195	1.4
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)		190	1.7
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)		100	2.3
Other crop farming (1119)		1 070	.8
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)		2 965	.5
Cattle feedlots (112112)		68	3.1
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)		157	.9
Hog and pig farming (1122)		15	7.7
Poultry and egg production (1123)		19	5.7
Sheep and goat farming (1124)		118	2.0
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)		127	2.6
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	3 983	.4
	number	1 568 837	.2
Beef cows	farms	3 240	.5
	number	525 774	.3
Milk cows	farms	303	1.0
	number	215 376	(L)
Cattle and calves sold	farms	4 039	.4
	number	1 269 000	.1
	$1,000	634 092	.1
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	103	2.6
	number	4 237	8.4
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	80	2.9
	number	5 798	5.1
	$1,000	671	6.2
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms	337	1.3
	number	279 322	.4
Sheep and lambs sold	farms	323	1.3
	number	195 127	.5
Horses and ponies inventory	farms	2 393	.5
	number	23 472	.4
Horses and ponies sold	farms	429	1.2
	number	2 444	1.4

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)
POULTRY			
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	farms	140	2.2
	number	(D)	(D)
Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms	136	2.2
	number	(D)	(D)
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	4	14.8
	number	(D)	(D)
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED			
Corn for grain or seed	farms	245	.9
	acres	79 721	.2
	bushels	13 766 899	.2
Corn for silage or green chop	farms	238	1.0
	acres	46 503	.4
	tons, green	1 026 575	.3
Sorghum for grain or seed	farms	459	.9
	acres	186 093	.6
	bushels	6 995 306	.6
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED—Con.			
Wheat for grain	farms	623	.8
	acres	259 568	.5
	bushels	8 517 591	.5
Cotton	farms	410	.8
	acres	67 622	.6
	bales	112 776	.6
Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	farms	25	3.1
	acres	9 382	.1
	cwt	3 498 665	.1
Peanuts for nuts	farms	68	1.8
	acres	16 119	.6
	pounds	42 355 889	.5
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	1 962	.6
	acres	276 638	.5
	tons, dry	1 129 353	.4
Alfalfa hay	farms	1 506	.7
	acres	179 798	.5
	tons, dry	911 569	.4
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	366	1.0
	acres	38 079	.2
Land in orchards	farms	413	1.1
	acres	27 272	.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 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	–1.3	1.1	–6.1	.6
Land in farms ..... acres	–2.3	.2	–2.0	.1
Average size of farm ..... acres	–1.0	1.2	4.4	.7
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1]:				
Average per farm ..... dollars	–3.2	2.1	–3.0	1.6
Average per acre ..... dollars	.5	2.2	–5.3	1.5
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1]:				
Average per farm ..... dollars	19.1	2.6	16.6	2.8
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	–.2	2.0	–23.8	2.0
10 to 49 acres	.3	1.8	4.5	2.3
50 to 179 acres	1.0	1.2	–3.4	1.5
180 to 499 acres	–1.5	1.3	–1.3	1.4
500 to 999 acres	–2.2	1.5	–1.5	1.5
1,000 to 1,999 acres	–4.3	1.4	–12.3	1.3
2,000 acres or more	–3.7	.5	–7.4	.4
Total cropland ..... farms	–.1	1.2	–3.2	.8
acres	–3.3	.6	–5.0	.5
Harvested cropland ..... farms	–2.8	1.2	–2.9	.8
acres	1.8	.4	2.3	.4
Irrigated land ..... farms	1.5	1.3	1.0	.9
acres	9.0	.5	9.1	.4
Market value of agricultural products sold $1,000	28.5	.1	29.1	.1
Average per farm ..... dollars	30.2	1.5	37.5	.9
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops $1,000	23.1	.3	23.4	.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products $1,000	30.8	.1	31.5	.1
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than $2,500	4.7	1.5	(X)	(X)
$2,500 to $4,999	–1.6	1.8	(X)	(X)
$5,000 to $9,999	–1.6	1.7	(X)	(X)
$10,000 to $24,999	–5.2	1.2	–5.2	1.1
$25,000 to $49,999	–9.0	1.1	–9.0	1.1
$50,000 to $99,999	–7.5	1.1	–7.5	1.1
$100,000 to $249,999	–7.8	.5	–7.8	.5
$250,000 to $499,999	–14.3	–	–14.3	–
$500,000 or more	14.1	–	14.1	–
Total farm production expenses[1] $1,000	14.8	.7	15.3	.6
Average per farm ..... dollars	16.5	1.2	23.7	1.2
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text)[1] ..... farms	–1.4	.9	–6.8	.8
$1,000	108.7	2.8	100.4	2.4
Average per farm ..... dollars	111.7	3.5	115.0	3.1
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	–4.5	.8	–6.9	.6
Other	2.3	1.6	–3.7	1.3
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	–1.1	1.4	–7.2	.9
200 days or more	–1.7	1.6	–10.0	1.2
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory ..... farms	–3.2	1.1	–7.6	.6
number	5.4	.3	5.1	.2
Beef cows ..... farms	–4.9	1.0	–7.5	.6
number	–7.9	.3	–9.0	.3
Milk cows ..... farms	–19.5	1.4	–21.5	1.1
number	95.5	.1	96.0	.1
Cattle and calves sold ..... farms	–3.9	1.0	–8.5	.6
number	10.7	.2	10.8	.2
Hogs and pigs inventory ..... farms	–30.2	1.9	–14.9	3.1
number	–69.8	1.8	–75.3	2.1
Hogs and pigs sold ..... farms	–24.5	2.4	–20.0	3.4
number	–81.7	.7	–85.4	.8
Sheep and lambs inventory ..... farms	–20.7	1.4	–23.6	1.2
number	–36.7	.3	–36.2	.3
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) ..... farms	–25.6	1.7	–25.5	2.1
number	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold ..... farms	–45.0	7.0	–33.3	12.5
number	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed ..... farms	–20.6	1.4	–12.8	1.2
acres	10.7	.4	11.0	.4
bushels	17.2	.4	17.3	.4
Sorghum for grain or seed ..... farms	–12.7	1.1	–12.1	1.0
acres	4.5	.9	4.6	.8
bushels	–13.3	.6	–13.4	.6
Wheat for grain ..... farms	–20.3	.9	–20.9	.8
acres	–22.5	.5	–22.6	.5
bushels	–17.5	.5	–17.6	.5
Cotton ..... farms	–	1.4	2.2	1.3
acres	27.4	.9	28.0	.9
bales	51.1	1.0	51.8	1.1
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) ..... farms	2.5	1.4	9.8	1.1
acres	19.0	.9	24.0	.8
tons, dry	29.3	.7	32.4	.7
Land in orchards ..... farms	–7.5	1.5	–14.0	1.5
acres	6.2	1.3	9.6	1.4

[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)
New Mexico ..	**14 094**	**.5**	**45 787 108**	**.2**	**3 249**	**.5**	**625 307**	**1.5**	**619 915**	**1.8**
Bernalillo	468	.6	464 801	.7	993	.9	402 766	5.3	10 879	9.5
Catron	217	.5	1 795 362	.5	8 274	.7	927 596	4.8	5 718	8.2
Chaves	562	.4	2 944 354	.4	5 239	.6	1 074 931	3.6	39 598	9.2
Cibola	166	.6	1 699 341	.5	10 237	.8	1 230 759	1.8	4 285	4.1
Colfax	322	.2	2 227 155	.2	6 917	.3	1 348 196	5.5	12 730	13.6
Curry	655	.5	947 748	.7	1 447	.8	588 033	3.1	59 021	6.0
De Baca	191	.5	1 441 609	.5	7 548	.7	872 507	1.8	10 429	3.6
Dona Ana	1 290	.4	581 436	.9	451	1.0	540 790	1.9	84 342	5.0
Eddy	467	.4	1 275 527	.7	2 731	.8	578 406	8.4	27 859	8.0
Grant	286	.3	1 173 599	.7	4 103	.7	557 997	6.9	9 426	12.6
Guadalupe	236	.5	1 418 966	.6	6 013	.8	722 197	3.8	5 792	9.7
Harding	172	.4	1 254 877	.6	7 296	.7	(D)	(D)	4 466	5.2
Hidalgo	146	.4	1 104 820	.6	7 567	.8	1 124 802	3.3	7 189	3.9
Lea	528	.3	2 001 931	.6	3 792	.6	563 359	11.4	27 556	19.1
Lincoln	337	.5	1 975 017	.7	5 861	.9	858 362	7.1	11 950	8.6
Los Alamos	4	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	37	–
Luna	192	.5	603 428	.9	3 143	1.0	738 486	4.6	19 858	1.6
McKinley	224	.9	3 157 138	.3	14 094	1.0	1 396 217	3.2	7 530	7.5
Mora	398	.6	974 759	.8	2 449	1.0	634 096	5.9	10 542	8.3
Otero	417	.3	1 081 057	.3	2 592	.5	605 141	9.5	8 569	7.9
Quay	583	.4	1 855 726	.6	3 183	.7	514 167	4.3	33 667	7.4
Rio Arriba	940	.8	1 463 396	.8	1 557	1.2	369 965	4.6	23 163	10.5
Roosevelt	738	.5	1 419 250	.8	1 923	.9	521 346	3.0	47 714	3.5
Sandoval	353	.8	779 766	.7	2 209	1.1	373 723	15.7	8 992	12.6
San Juan	666	.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	313 797	5.5	20 498	7.5
San Miguel	643	.8	2 556 803	.5	3 976	.9	762 327	4.8	15 588	5.4
Santa Fe	336	.7	651 977	1.2	1 940	1.4	685 048	31.8	9 792	6.7
Sierra	180	.6	1 286 887	.7	7 149	.9	1 467 495	16.8	5 949	8.9
Socorro	395	.6	1 650 979	.6	4 180	.9	651 623	10.1	15 531	10.6
Taos	422	.8	310 284	1.4	735	1.6	390 492	19.6	8 693	10.0
Torrance	473	.4	1 477 127	.7	3 123	.9	498 327	6.3	21 201	11.0
Union	448	.3	2 227 347	.5	4 972	.6	681 647	3.6	25 821	3.0
Valencia	639	.5	383 531	.7	600	.8	295 109	5.8	15 526	6.7

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm[1]		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses[1]			
							Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico ..	**44 047**	**1.8**	**1 617 708**	**.1**	**114 780**	**.5**	**14 075**	**.5**	**1 204 227**	**.3**
Bernalillo	23 345	9.5	31 028	.2	66 298	.6	467	.9	25 257	1.0
Catron	26 351	8.2	14 494	.6	66 793	.7	217	.8	11 823	2.0
Chaves	70 584	9.2	220 127	.1	391 684	.4	561	.6	163 913	.9
Cibola	25 973	4.4	5 692	1.1	34 290	1.2	165	1.4	3 687	2.9
Colfax	39 658	13.6	40 236	.2	124 955	.3	321	.7	31 979	2.7
Curry	90 247	6.0	195 438	.1	298 378	.5	654	.5	144 109	.7
De Baca	54 601	3.9	25 173	.4	131 798	.7	191	1.4	21 101	1.1
Dona Ana	65 432	5.0	235 484	.1	182 546	.4	1 289	.5	177 315	.4
Eddy	59 783	8.0	84 586	.2	181 127	.4	466	.6	64 172	1.2
Grant	32 958	12.6	7 319	.6	25 590	.7	286	.8	6 696	3.9
Guadalupe	24 543	9.8	12 424	.5	52 645	.7	236	1.0	10 396	1.0
Harding	25 965	5.5	13 733	.5	79 845	.6	172	1.7	10 884	1.3
Hidalgo	49 243	4.1	18 311	.3	125 417	.6	146	1.4	13 074	1.2
Lea	52 190	19.1	60 392	.2	114 379	.4	528	.6	50 080	2.7
Lincoln	35 566	8.7	14 026	.8	41 620	1.0	336	.9	13 815	6.0
Los Alamos	9 250	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	4	–	15	–
Luna	103 427	2.0	49 067	.2	255 557	.5	192	1.2	36 538	.7
McKinley	33 768	7.6	9 330	.5	41 651	1.1	223	1.2	5 804	2.5
Mora	26 555	8.4	11 059	.8	27 787	1.0	397	1.0	10 473	2.7
Otero	20 550	8.0	9 694	.8	23 247	.9	417	.7	8 195	4.6
Quay	57 649	7.4	40 630	.5	69 691	.6	584	.7	32 338	5.0
Rio Arriba	24 694	10.5	10 435	1.3	11 101	1.6	938	.9	8 601	8.1
Roosevelt	64 653	3.6	128 293	.2	173 839	.5	738	.7	94 806	1.1
Sandoval	25 545	12.6	9 987	.9	28 291	1.2	352	.9	6 969	8.8
San Juan	30 824	7.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	665	.9	51 404	1.5
San Miguel	24 280	5.5	20 654	.5	32 121	.9	642	1.0	16 794	3.1
Santa Fe	29 229	6.7	12 507	.7	37 223	1.0	335	.9	10 670	6.4
Sierra	33 052	8.9	15 766	.5	87 589	.8	180	1.0	12 061	3.7
Socorro	39 420	10.6	25 229	.5	63 872	.8	394	.7	19 928	3.3
Taos	20 650	10.1	3 748	2.4	8 882	2.5	421	1.1	2 662	11.7
Torrance	44 918	11.0	30 847	.4	65 215	.6	472	.7	23 144	4.8
Union	57 636	3.0	130 494	.1	291 281	.3	448	.6	95 835	.6
Valencia	24 336	6.8	26 599	.4	41 625	.6	638	.7	19 687	1.7

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)
New Mexico	**4 419**	**2.6**	**221 246**	**.8**	**7 760**	**1.6**	**334 541**	**.3**	**3 313**	**3.1**	**20 014**	**1.3**
Bernalillo	126	16.6	1 683	2.4	216	11.8	12 295	1.2	83	22.0	496	8.1
Catron	73	13.3	5 781	2.3	170	5.6	1 118	3.4	10	60.7	6	67.2
Chaves	205	8.5	26 483	.5	344	7.5	60 769	.5	172	11.9	926	8.3
Cibola	73	9.1	929	4.5	121	5.0	584	5.8	22	24.8	22	64.9
Colfax	165	12.8	17 016	3.4	221	9.8	4 356	2.8	39	31.3	73	38.6
Curry	275	9.1	35 786	2.0	383	6.4	41 773	.8	337	6.0	2 828	5.1
De Baca	79	7.8	6 893	.6	126	5.7	4 658	.7	50	12.3	304	9.3
Dona Ana	123	18.5	6 076	1.7	196	14.4	53 931	.1	331	8.2	4 281	1.4
Eddy	196	12.7	7 812	.4	227	10.4	21 116	1.5	149	16.0	590	7.3
Grant	99	13.9	970	6.1	198	6.8	1 009	4.5	30	28.3	28	70.0
Guadalupe	81	13.5	3 615	1.5	191	5.2	2 440	1.4	16	42.0	6	35.5
Harding	65	7.8	2 968	2.9	130	3.6	2 192	2.1	8	28.5	2	25.4
Hidalgo	44	13.0	504	7.2	93	6.0	631	4.5	43	13.3	344	2.6
Lea	212	10.8	5 975	8.1	313	7.3	16 411	.9	108	17.7	879	12.0
Lincoln	123	13.6	1 505	9.4	255	5.0	3 006	12.8	10	66.9	(D)	(D)
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	4	–	9	–	1	–	(D)	(D)
Luna	59	11.5	899	3.1	87	8.5	3 152	1.2	74	8.0	1 324	3.0
McKinley	64	17.4	1 781	5.7	151	9.4	1 442	2.4	21	33.9	8	30.5
Mora	147	13.2	3 491	4.7	239	8.6	2 153	4.1	42	34.1	18	34.7
Otero	111	17.1	881	21.7	216	9.9	1 170	6.0	41	27.1	87	8.8
Quay	238	11.9	6 837	11.3	350	7.9	4 125	8.5	211	11.4	743	11.4
Rio Arriba	203	14.9	1 157	11.5	472	7.3	984	10.5	230	14.6	65	16.6
Roosevelt	242	10.2	13 831	4.1	355	6.8	27 606	.6	301	8.1	2 079	3.3
Sandoval	80	30.8	911	60.5	159	17.9	2 707	2.1	70	36.5	37	28.1
San Juan	202	12.1	15 852	3.3	406	7.2	8 564	3.6	173	14.9	(D)	(D)
San Miguel	208	12.9	3 294	4.3	484	4.9	3 167	3.5	111	17.4	66	10.9
Santa Fe	110	19.0	1 726	5.2	189	10.5	1 466	13.8	52	29.1	499	2.1
Sierra	72	17.2	1 912	22.1	109	12.0	2 770	2.8	43	21.7	186	3.3
Socorro	105	16.5	1 970	3.7	198	11.8	6 202	1.8	85	23.2	92	25.5
Taos	70	27.9	53	31.0	157	15.6	317	22.6	99	24.5	55	22.8
Torrance	170	14.7	5 643	1.3	381	4.6	3 582	3.8	66	26.6	653	9.1
Union	233	10.8	34 464	1.1	337	5.5	32 704	.6	104	20.1	703	5.1
Valencia	166	14.8	2 550	4.8	282	10.5	6 128	1.5	181	15.5	304	5.4

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)
New Mexico	**4 793**	**2.4**	**34 563**	**2.5**	**3 315**	**3.0**	**18 085**	**1.5**	**12 467**	**.8**	**49 544**	**.9**
Bernalillo	199	13.1	184	8.5	111	18.7	62	11.7	378	4.7	622	6.0
Catron	8	52.1	14	17.5	8	52.1	3	24.5	211	2.1	593	5.4
Chaves	208	10.9	1 876	5.3	176	12.4	1 170	3.4	504	3.5	4 041	3.2
Cibola	18	24.3	13	23.2	17	26.9	12	25.0	151	2.6	291	7.1
Colfax	43	28.7	245	23.0	27	41.3	38	5.1	321	.7	993	7.0
Curry	264	7.1	5 251	4.3	231	7.3	2 868	4.6	549	3.3	5 327	3.8
De Baca	73	9.1	286	8.0	52	11.3	196	7.9	181	2.1	1 077	2.6
Dona Ana	871	4.5	6 893	1.1	670	6.0	3 306	1.8	1 155	2.1	5 731	2.1
Eddy	226	10.8	1 414	4.2	207	11.9	854	5.6	437	1.6	2 248	4.7
Grant	13	47.4	26	63.7	33	27.4	7	41.8	236	4.6	617	5.9
Guadalupe	13	46.6	5	59.8	26	34.0	10	33.5	225	2.8	532	4.1
Harding	7	32.6	9	38.3	23	20.4	14	31.6	144	3.2	601	2.9
Hidalgo	40	14.1	598	2.7	36	17.7	262	2.9	132	4.1	943	2.2
Lea	167	12.6	1 810	15.5	119	16.4	901	2.9	432	4.5	2 058	3.9
Lincoln	28	38.7	33	32.3	27	34.7	(D)	(D)	287	4.9	1 141	6.3
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	2	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Luna	102	6.2	2 290	1.4	95	6.5	1 866	.8	176	2.3	2 064	1.5
McKinley	7	52.5	(D)	(D)	9	46.8	11	50.4	209	4.7	453	5.1
Mora	80	21.0	63	19.8	28	34.8	7	28.9	376	2.8	541	6.0
Otero	140	15.0	226	5.0	118	14.7	54	8.0	346	4.8	905	7.3
Quay	213	12.1	1 806	24.5	112	17.0	339	24.8	495	3.7	2 258	4.5
Rio Arriba	288	12.2	106	29.6	177	17.7	73	46.5	866	2.7	1 063	7.7
Roosevelt	220	9.8	4 217	15.0	212	10.7	1 794	9.1	588	3.4	3 735	2.5
Sandoval	156	16.4	42	18.7	62	32.6	26	47.7	339	3.4	278	7.7
San Juan	327	9.6	(D)	(D)	148	16.7	(D)	(D)	585	3.2	1 695	4.4
San Miguel	97	22.9	131	14.7	35	31.9	29	9.1	604	2.6	1 162	4.3
Santa Fe	98	19.8	205	4.7	20	42.2	231	.2	291	5.4	575	5.9
Sierra	38	29.0	160	8.8	41	28.5	120	6.5	165	5.4	672	4.4
Socorro	196	9.3	386	10.6	92	21.9	162	15.3	327	5.0	1 099	7.2
Taos	104	21.3	41	26.8	21	55.9	4	22.7	387	3.9	389	27.7
Torrance	75	23.2	700	11.0	67	23.8	396	21.3	419	3.9	1 645	7.1
Union	69	18.2	1 717	4.3	94	18.6	561	4.3	390	3.0	3 427	4.3
Valencia	405	7.1	367	9.2	219	11.2	123	10.0	561	3.0	765	8.1

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)
New Mexico	**7 045**	**1.7**	**30 598**	**1.5**	**5 226**	**2.3**	**140 862**	**.6**	**2 368**	**3.7**	**29 672**	**1.7**
Bernalillo	236	9.8	615	3.7	111	18.3	3 372	1.2	65	27.7	132	28.6
Catron	92	12.1	162	6.2	72	13.0	632	6.3	27	–	121	–
Chaves	403	5.2	4 699	4.0	284	6.9	19 428	1.7	141	13.7	1 531	11.5
Cibola	74	8.2	54	14.2	48	13.2	183	26.6	18	23.2	28	23.0
Colfax	174	13.2	176	9.5	119	15.6	1 870	10.5	49	19.4	216	26.2
Curry	420	5.5	3 739	6.4	233	9.5	8 844	3.7	112	15.9	1 558	9.9
De Baca	105	6.2	201	3.8	70	8.2	1 884	2.0	41	11.8	75	5.2
Dona Ana	511	6.7	3 374	3.6	582	6.8	33 511	.8	400	9.0	12 049	1.3
Eddy	305	9.1	2 019	10.4	188	13.2	8 181	1.7	128	16.7	825	6.0
Grant	125	10.9	117	10.9	119	10.4	812	6.0	43	22.1	66	20.2
Guadalupe	99	13.7	126	7.2	101	12.2	794	4.7	26	27.8	41	9.8
Harding	101	4.9	141	3.1	68	9.0	1 017	2.2	30	10.1	147	7.4
Hidalgo	97	4.6	548	2.6	73	6.6	2 790	1.5	36	13.7	1 566	3.2
Lea	387	5.3	1 584	4.3	152	12.1	5 195	.9	113	16.5	695	7.8
Lincoln	190	6.6	414	11.3	145	10.6	2 175	10.5	99	15.5	284	16.4
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)
Luna	136	4.7	3 454	2.3	116	4.2	5 598	1.6	64	6.6	6 209	.3
McKinley	84	15.8	65	6.9	53	19.4	(D)	(D)	18	37.0	(D)	(D)
Mora	145	13.9	149	7.8	160	13.6	884	5.0	55	24.8	86	13.3
Otero	230	9.8	260	11.5	149	14.1	1 126	3.9	69	22.6	154	30.3
Quay	363	7.5	690	14.5	284	10.1	2 171	8.2	74	22.8	636	47.7
Rio Arriba	347	10.7	106	13.0	343	10.7	604	29.4	112	22.3	87	21.7
Roosevelt	473	4.6	3 650	4.0	217	9.3	10 685	1.6	113	16.4	714	4.4
Sandoval	171	17.4	86	11.3	123	22.9	1 119	2.9	49	41.6	66	46.1
San Juan	211	13.0	465	4.4	202	13.8	(D)	(D)	55	26.1	258	12.4
San Miguel	235	11.1	248	9.3	202	12.1	2 576	10.5	70	24.9	243	28.2
Santa Fe	118	16.8	319	3.9	109	18.6	2 160	6.5	29	40.3	346	68.6
Sierra	116	11.4	300	8.8	98	11.9	1 452	2.1	56	21.3	469	4.4
Socorro	172	12.5	368	4.8	185	11.7	2 233	4.8	61	23.6	151	32.2
Taos	137	17.1	60	27.3	142	16.7	406	19.1	32	47.6	21	33.8
Torrance	306	7.8	757	10.3	114	17.4	1 752	6.2	71	22.6	330	2.0
Union	263	7.5	1 312	2.9	144	12.6	3 844	2.5	66	14.9	364	1.9
Valencia	219	11.2	341	2.6	220	12.4	2 443	4.8	45	30.9	175	17.7

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)
New Mexico	**10 582**	**1.1**	**55 600**	**1.2**	**2 993**	**3.3**	**18 436**	**2.4**	**4 808**	**2.2**	**78 791**	**1.2**
Bernalillo	321	7.3	843	8.3	103	20.6	243	6.1	56	26.3	928	2.3
Catron	175	6.1	464	6.0	11	40.0	7	31.7	88	12.2	1 159	3.9
Chaves	445	5.2	5 662	3.3	126	14.4	2 920	7.9	265	8.4	11 656	3.1
Cibola	123	4.3	199	6.0	19	23.4	8	25.3	43	10.9	615	6.0
Colfax	282	4.8	1 060	9.1	23	33.3	67	4.6	140	15.4	1 892	4.4
Curry	475	5.6	5 057	2.9	219	9.6	2 536	9.9	344	7.1	8 000	5.7
De Baca	160	2.9	768	4.5	61	9.1	218	24.0	103	6.3	1 505	5.7
Dona Ana	853	4.6	7 338	2.6	442	7.8	2 771	5.3	355	8.0	9 399	1.7
Eddy	341	6.6	3 498	4.9	119	16.2	1 796	3.3	269	8.7	5 314	5.6
Grant	211	5.7	735	13.2	21	34.0	29	39.9	79	13.2	745	12.9
Guadalupe	190	6.3	635	4.3	15	29.0	60	2.2	53	15.3	805	2.2
Harding	128	4.3	577	2.9	20	15.4	48	7.9	83	6.8	1 276	3.7
Hidalgo	139	2.0	1 103	1.3	40	14.3	152	14.2	84	7.1	1 351	4.0
Lea	379	5.6	2 988	9.6	97	17.4	1 007	8.8	200	12.3	3 682	7.4
Lincoln	249	5.5	1 074	7.2	48	25.0	131	18.4	152	12.8	1 407	10.1
Los Alamos	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	166	3.5	1 949	1.6	54	10.3	587	4.0	92	6.7	1 835	2.1
McKinley	176	7.8	(D)	(D)	28	28.5	15	25.9	47	27.5	297	15.3
Mora	305	6.0	582	9.4	67	24.6	46	28.2	64	20.6	847	15.9
Otero	315	6.4	1 004	9.9	28	37.4	48	7.6	177	10.8	911	12.0
Quay	501	3.7	2 859	8.7	222	10.5	834	9.5	253	10.1	3 131	8.3
Rio Arriba	692	5.1	1 067	14.5	127	22.0	131	29.7	252	12.2	1 086	18.6
Roosevelt	514	4.4	4 687	2.8	186	11.6	1 824	6.6	345	7.0	7 222	3.4
Sandoval	288	5.0	328	11.6	58	38.9	61	42.0	100	23.5	451	17.2
San Juan	471	5.6	968	8.2	163	14.2	173	13.2	192	13.5	1 859	7.9
San Miguel	506	4.9	1 530	4.7	59	29.7	79	33.3	117	15.7	1 003	3.9
Santa Fe	206	8.5	715	14.0	41	34.3	93	10.0	22	33.7	661	4.9
Sierra	171	4.1	772	9.0	59	17.3	122	23.7	81	16.7	833	10.1
Socorro	308	4.4	1 305	10.4	81	24.3	326	13.0	183	11.7	1 955	9.9
Taos	268	10.2	532	21.6	86	24.9	69	25.4	33	25.4	128	24.4
Torrance	394	5.0	1 364	10.0	59	25.5	487	10.5	132	16.1	1 829	12.1
Union	376	3.6	2 459	3.9	77	20.4	1 086	11.0	245	10.2	3 754	4.7
Valencia	453	6.0	1 138	6.0	234	11.7	462	12.5	159	15.0	1 256	11.1

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.											
	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)
New Mexico	**2 559**	**3.4**	**31 086**	**2.0**	**13 115**	**.7**	**17 764**	**1.3**	**12 042**	**.9**	**123 425**	**.6**
Bernalillo	27	34.6	452	.5	450	2.1	445	8.2	358	6.0	2 884	1.3
Catron	24	25.3	510	3.3	216	.8	191	5.4	197	4.0	1 062	4.3
Chaves	125	11.8	2 737	2.4	510	3.1	1 369	2.5	481	3.9	18 646	1.6
Cibola	28	17.8	86	7.1	139	3.5	101	12.5	136	3.9	562	5.2
Colfax	52	22.9	1 523	6.3	288	4.2	522	9.4	287	4.8	1 932	5.8
Curry	151	12.9	3 796	7.0	573	3.4	1 081	2.4	590	3.1	15 665	2.1
De Baca	65	9.5	604	7.5	176	2.8	372	5.3	185	1.8	2 060	1.7
Dona Ana	223	10.9	4 881	3.1	1 202	1.8	3 017	3.4	1 131	2.6	20 756	.6
Eddy	81	20.1	1 887	6.0	440	2.8	620	6.0	436	2.4	5 998	1.8
Grant	43	19.6	161	10.1	267	3.2	314	14.8	240	4.2	1 060	3.7
Guadalupe	62	19.3	212	20.0	206	5.2	233	2.6	200	5.2	882	4.7
Harding	57	8.6	487	4.8	163	2.8	278	2.2	149	3.3	1 126	2.9
Hidalgo	35	11.8	743	1.4	138	2.8	235	2.8	131	3.9	1 304	2.6
Lea	89	16.7	1 055	5.1	511	1.6	746	4.0	455	3.5	5 094	5.1
Lincoln	59	24.1	321	3.7	325	2.4	462	4.9	305	3.9	1 848	8.5
Los Alamos	1	–	(D)	(D)	4	–	2	–	3	–	(D)	(D)
Luna	45	11.9	780	4.7	169	3.7	466	5.9	185	2.0	4 066	.9
McKinley	31	25.9	326	5.6	185	6.9	186	10.5	204	3.5	(D)	(D)
Mora	60	23.5	189	7.4	387	1.3	257	6.8	280	7.5	1 160	2.6
Otero	43	32.3	24	30.3	390	3.3	316	12.0	386	3.6	1 028	7.3
Quay	195	10.2	1 513	13.9	559	2.0	652	6.1	527	3.6	3 743	3.8
Rio Arriba	191	17.1	459	43.8	891	2.1	433	7.0	783	3.8	1 180	9.1
Roosevelt	152	14.5	2 463	7.9	653	3.0	763	2.8	615	3.4	9 536	1.0
Sandoval	27	45.4	85	31.0	345	.9	315	21.6	314	7.2	456	6.3
San Juan	79	22.9	(D)	(D)	559	4.2	544	14.9	590	3.3	1 625	8.6
San Miguel	77	24.0	962	2.0	635	1.1	873	3.2	496	4.8	1 431	5.3
Santa Fe	52	28.2	386	11.2	317	2.4	375	9.2	287	4.7	914	9.8
Sierra	44	19.9	414	16.7	162	5.8	237	7.3	165	5.3	1 640	3.9
Socorro	80	19.1	724	42.1	377	2.3	479	9.2	353	3.9	2 476	3.7
Taos	61	31.9	50	38.4	396	2.6	201	14.6	281	9.7	336	28.3
Torrance	42	25.5	694	17.7	464	1.6	494	14.3	392	4.5	2 818	5.4
Union	120	14.7	1 868	8.9	408	3.6	513	3.4	411	2.3	7 060	1.9
Valencia	138	17.5	428	12.2	610	2.3	673	9.1	489	5.2	2 534	2.4

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)
New Mexico	**14 075**	**.5**	**410 261**	**.9**	**9 435**	**.5**	**2 179 428**	**.5**	**7 008**	**.5**	**1 079 953**	**.3**
Bernalillo	467	.9	5 397	5.5	336	1.1	17 672	3.2	241	1.5	7 507	1.0
Catron	217	.8	2 016	5.2	64	3.0	12 247	5.1	18	6.8	810	7.5
Chaves	561	.6	56 685	1.3	333	1.0	(D)	(D)	261	1.3	63 045	.8
Cibola	165	1.4	2 016	6.1	76	2.9	21 296	4.5	36	4.9	2 426	6.5
Colfax	321	.7	8 930	9.2	191	1.1	46 354	1.2	133	1.4	17 730	1.2
Curry	654	.5	57 368	1.9	561	.7	443 861	.7	351	1.0	249 767	.6
De Baca	191	1.4	3 738	3.1	100	2.0	18 033	5.4	70	2.9	6 485	4.2
Dona Ana	1 289	.5	58 787	1.4	1 202	.4	91 148	.7	1 164	.5	80 940	.4
Eddy	466	.6	17 131	2.4	320	.9	65 198	1.1	280	1.1	44 161	.7
Grant	286	.8	411	55.0	122	1.7	13 428	6.1	58	3.0	954	8.1
Guadalupe	236	1.0	1 533	11.9	102	2.2	7 105	4.5	68	3.2	1 893	2.8
Harding	172	1.7	2 421	5.2	41	3.8	19 711	6.2	13	6.0	1 934	13.8
Hidalgo	146	1.4	5 113	2.4	77	2.0	23 047	2.3	50	2.7	8 084	1.1
Lea	528	.6	7 663	14.5	315	1.0	103 501	2.4	174	1.6	38 726	1.0
Lincoln	336	.9	1 154	25.0	96	2.7	9 252	7.0	48	4.1	597	5.2
Los Alamos	4	–	–15	–	2	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Luna	192	1.2	12 383	2.1	129	1.4	(D)	(D)	108	1.7	30 560	.6
McKinley	223	1.2	3 349	4.4	75	3.7	(D)	(D)	32	6.0	1 804	2.8
Mora	397	1.0	517	40.3	305	1.1	40 639	2.2	247	1.4	9 296	1.9
Otero	417	.7	539	(H)	280	1.0	(D)	(D)	215	1.3	4 808	1.9
Quay	584	.7	7 221	21.1	418	.8	245 021	1.1	259	1.3	107 310	1.0
Rio Arriba	938	.9	1 858	38.1	785	1.0	65 078	2.6	690	1.1	18 872	2.2
Roosevelt	738	.7	31 384	3.3	562	.8	348 902	.9	340	1.2	197 780	.6
Sandoval	352	.9	2 464	12.5	231	1.4	31 822	2.4	171	1.9	6 410	2.8
San Juan	665	.9	56 066	1.0	545	.9	83 839	1.0	432	1.1	60 807	.4
San Miguel	642	1.0	4 287	14.4	357	1.5	50 498	3.0	231	2.0	7 742	2.8
Santa Fe	335	.9	2 793	11.0	188	1.7	23 231	4.1	129	2.4	9 524	3.1
Sierra	180	1.0	4 272	9.8	106	1.9	(D)	(D)	71	2.9	4 670	2.8
Socorro	394	.7	6 161	14.9	245	1.3	20 257	2.8	177	1.8	10 626	2.2
Taos	421	1.1	2 168	28.7	391	1.0	26 849	2.5	354	1.1	11 089	2.6
Torrance	472	.7	6 031	6.6	186	1.8	64 825	3.0	76	2.9	17 053	1.5
Union	448	.6	31 126	2.6	160	1.5	89 715	2.0	105	1.7	43 868	1.0
Valencia	638	.7	7 291	4.0	534	.7	17 092	1.5	406	1.0	12 675	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	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
					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)
New Mexico	**7 444**	**.5**	**804 616**	**.3**	**8 677**	**.5**	**1 676 171**	**.2**	**6 894**	**.5**	**581 812**	**.3**
Bernalillo	303	1.2	11 021	5.6	178	2.0	17 625	.7	104	2.8	4 525	1.7
Catron	49	3.7	1 690	4.7	186	.9	31 603	1.0	170	1.1	20 603	1.2
Chaves	288	1.2	65 590	.8	336	1.0	164 137	.3	233	1.4	37 503	.9
Cibola	35	4.8	2 436	8.3	126	1.7	21 592	1.0	108	2.0	13 209	1.1
Colfax	151	1.3	27 224	1.1	261	.7	58 993	.4	203	1.0	20 067	.7
Curry	204	1.3	92 884	.6	338	1.1	149 617	.3	191	1.6	15 180	1.1
De Baca	87	2.4	8 469	3.9	141	1.4	40 045	.6	105	2.0	12 680	.9
Dona Ana	1 189	.4	82 265	.3	197	1.7	82 714	.4	121	2.3	7 432	1.4
Eddy	289	1.1	45 983	.9	254	1.2	65 107	.5	189	1.5	21 773	1.1
Grant	98	2.1	3 155	4.6	243	.7	37 806	1.0	219	.9	24 064	1.0
Guadalupe	85	2.7	2 270	5.3	210	.9	33 700	.6	185	1.2	17 126	.8
Harding	6	10.7	(D)	(D)	154	.8	42 809	.7	138	1.0	21 999	.8
Hidalgo	60	2.4	9 837	1.8	110	1.3	29 410	.9	102	1.4	19 246	.9
Lea	199	1.4	40 985	.9	364	.8	76 041	.7	280	1.1	28 998	.8
Lincoln	85	3.0	3 016	2.6	269	1.0	43 624	1.1	238	1.2	26 493	1.3
Los Alamos	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	116	1.6	31 184	.6	103	1.8	29 121	.7	89	2.1	(D)	(D)
McKinley	34	5.6	3 869	7.1	183	1.5	26 948	.8	144	2.0	(D)	(D)
Mora	225	1.6	13 433	3.0	331	1.0	26 545	1.1	293	1.1	11 663	1.4
Otero	261	1.1	6 399	1.8	196	1.4	25 414	.9	166	1.5	14 334	.9
Quay	208	1.5	40 519	1.5	445	.8	86 141	.6	379	.9	34 800	.9
Rio Arriba	708	1.1	23 943	2.1	599	1.2	32 497	2.0	509	1.4	16 210	2.1
Roosevelt	207	1.7	68 168	.7	413	1.0	96 963	.6	273	1.4	20 067	1.2
Sandoval	211	1.6	10 731	1.7	221	1.5	16 502	1.3	192	1.8	(D)	(D)
San Juan	536	.9	68 589	.6	367	1.3	39 495	.7	274	1.6	18 754	.9
San Miguel	224	2.1	11 653	5.1	529	1.0	61 081	.7	453	1.2	31 375	.8
Santa Fe	152	2.1	10 863	2.7	174	1.9	19 698	1.2	128	2.3	(D)	(D)
Sierra	95	2.2	5 871	3.0	130	1.6	26 809	1.2	103	2.1	(D)	(D)
Socorro	241	1.3	14 664	1.8	270	1.2	44 509	1.1	223	1.5	20 398	1.5
Taos	361	1.1	14 145	2.7	276	1.5	7 569	2.5	249	1.7	4 140	2.6
Torrance	102	2.5	20 013	1.8	373	.8	41 309	.9	310	1.1	17 932	1.5
Union	88	1.8	46 580	.5	385	.6	170 998	.3	291	.9	37 545	.7
Valencia	546	.7	16 671	1.7	315	1.3	29 749	.6	232	1.6	7 200	1.3

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)
New Mexico	**523**	**1.1**	**215 844**	**(L)**	**346**	**1.7**	**6 114**	**6.0**	**917**	**1.1**	**291 808**	**.4**
Bernalillo	13	6.1	6 560	.2	14	9.2	129	14.9	23	7.1	1 960	1.9
Catron	7	10.4	10	12.3	2	11.9	(D)	(D)	7	10.9	131	7.6
Chaves	51	1.8	67 118	(L)	12	8.8	350	24.1	77	2.6	73 305	.6
Cibola	9	11.2	15	13.9	12	9.5	73	11.1	14	8.3	18 541	1.0
Colfax	12	6.8	55	6.5	4	11.6	(D)	(D)	19	5.5	747	8.2
Curry	33	3.5	23 855	(L)	18	6.8	214	11.3	12	8.7	849	16.3
De Baca	7	12.3	46	16.1	4	18.6	22	20.4	12	7.5	6 540	3.2
Dona Ana	23	3.7	38 103	(L)	18	6.5	230	11.4	42	4.5	1 049	3.5
Eddy	22	4.8	21 153	(L)	4	17.4	17	19.9	35	4.0	9 346	1.5
Grant	10	6.5	15	5.3	11	6.5	249	2.3	6	10.5	37	12.4
Guadalupe	9	9.6	23	10.6	3	19.5	(D)	(D)	22	4.9	12 746	.5
Harding	3	18.5	9	22.6	1	28.2	(D)	(D)	9	8.2	210	14.6
Hidalgo	7	10.6	11	10.4	6	11.9	100	3.5	1	–	(D)	(D)
Lea	21	4.8	11 238	.1	31	5.0	266	8.7	20	5.2	7 792	.9
Lincoln	10	6.5	138	20.2	3	18.1	(D)	(D)	58	3.0	66 973	1.0
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	5	9.8	(D)	(D)	2	24.5	(D)	(D)	6	15.1	60	17.9
McKinley	1	–	(D)	(D)	7	13.9	247	2.7	65	3.8	36 424	.3
Mora	12	10.1	16	11.6	4	14.4	16	15.0	19	7.7	404	10.3
Otero	14	6.8	22	7.6	15	7.5	195	9.6	41	3.8	14 493	1.8
Quay	16	6.9	161	11.6	15	7.6	151	13.4	19	6.8	1 074	10.0
Rio Arriba	16	8.8	42	15.9	11	10.2	54	11.9	62	4.3	3 364	13.7
Roosevelt	41	2.8	31 600	.1	23	6.7	383	12.2	18	7.4	1 715	7.5
Sandoval	9	10.5	(D)	(D)	11	9.5	119	5.1	36	5.3	632	7.3
San Juan	14	8.2	22	12.5	24	6.8	292	14.9	75	3.7	18 576	.6
San Miguel	26	6.4	77	7.7	8	13.5	42	16.5	14	10.3	(D)	(D)
Santa Fe	6	12.0	(D)	(D)	7	12.6	67	27.1	19	7.6	271	9.1
Sierra	15	6.5	(D)	(D)	4	16.4	15	20.2	5	13.0	503	15.8
Socorro	28	4.8	5 460	.2	6	11.8	17	13.0	20	6.8	995	4.8
Taos	17	8.8	29	9.9	12	10.4	36	14.0	43	5.3	997	8.3
Torrance	19	6.4	29	7.1	19	6.8	157	10.1	32	4.6	8 676	2.0
Union	19	5.8	161	13.9	12	7.4	1 580	19.2	24	5.4	1 004	8.5
Valencia	28	4.3	5 378	.1	23	6.1	908	17.5	62	3.6	2 234	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	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)
New Mexico	**651**	**1.3**	**(D)**	**(D)**	**11**	**10.0**	**(D)**	**(D)**
Bernalillo	43	4.8	(D)	(D)	3	20.2	90	23.1
Catron	8	8.0	74	7.7	–	–	–	–
Chaves	17	6.9	315	11.3	–	–	–	–
Cibola	8	11.0	134	6.1	–	–	–	–
Colfax	17	5.7	411	5.4	–	–	–	–
Curry	13	6.7	229	4.9	–	–	–	–
De Baca	5	17.2	101	22.2	1	37.6	(D)	(D)
Dona Ana	37	4.7	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Eddy	20	6.8	2 278	.9	1	27.2	(D)	(D)
Grant	20	5.5	375	5.8	–	–	–	–
Guadalupe	19	7.0	317	7.2	–	–	–	–
Harding	10	6.1	141	6.6	–	–	–	–
Hidalgo	6	9.4	123	10.2	–	–	–	–
Lea	17	6.8	314	7.4	–	–	–	–
Lincoln	16	7.6	348	5.7	–	–	–	–
Los Alamos	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Luna	3	22.1	84	27.5	–	–	–	–
McKinley	9	14.1	164	17.6	–	–	–	–
Mora	14	8.7	353	10.7	–	–	–	–
Otero	24	5.6	306	6.5	–	–	–	–
Quay	16	7.4	629	18.3	1	27.3	(D)	(D)
Rio Arriba	51	5.2	967	6.3	–	–	–	–
Roosevelt	25	6.0	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Sandoval	19	7.7	480	10.4	–	–	–	–
San Juan	55	4.2	852	4.8	2	27.1	(D)	(D)
San Miguel	24	7.5	434	9.4	–	–	–	–
Santa Fe	26	6.9	396	7.8	1	–	(D)	(D)
Sierra	9	9.3	174	10.7	–	–	–	–
Socorro	23	6.0	412	8.5	1	39.3	(D)	(D)
Taos	16	9.2	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Torrance	26	5.5	389	6.4	–	–	–	–
Union	14	7.4	466	14.7	–	–	–	–
Valencia	40	4.8	568	7.8	1	32.5	(D)	(D)

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed						Sorghum for grain or seed					
	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)
New Mexico	**316**	**1.2**	**80 122**	**.2**	**13 795 021**	**.2**	**496**	**.9**	**188 615**	**.7**	**7 059 484**	**.6**
Bernalillo	3	17.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Catron	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Chaves	7	–	1 050	–	173 344	–	8	4.5	482	3.0	43 190	3.0
Cibola	4	11.5	82	4.5	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Colfax	1	34.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Curry	83	1.3	24 906	.5	4 472 949	.5	191	1.3	75 401	1.1	3 134 301	1.0
De Baca	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dona Ana	8	–	575	–	88 670	–	3	–	235	–	21 750	–
Eddy	–	–	–	–	–	–	7	6.3	280	.8	6 809	.5
Grant	2	18.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Guadalupe	3	16.6	(D)	(D)	800	20.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Harding	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hidalgo	4	7.6	1 278	1.4	198 402	1.4	10	5.1	918	1.4	98 022	1.1
Lea	4	6.3	364	6.7	40 398	4.2	11	4.2	2 464	.7	81 211	.5
Lincoln	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	5	–	719	–	70 802	–	28	2.0	1 935	.6	157 567	.9
McKinley	7	16.1	32	19.1	2 130	19.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mora	2	27.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Otero	3	19.6	3	19.6	304	22.4	2	20.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Quay	15	4.6	2 002	3.5	243 078	3.1	74	2.5	21 932	1.6	896 982	1.4
Rio Arriba	13	9.9	63	5.2	5 265	4.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Roosevelt	32	2.3	11 873	.5	1 686 780	.4	139	1.9	80 550	1.1	2 410 610	1.0
Sandoval	12	5.6	769	3.4	41 905	4.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Juan	23	5.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Miguel	13	10.4	86	18.3	5 206	20.7	4	14.4	450	1.8	(D)	(D)
Santa Fe	2	20.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Sierra	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Socorro	8	7.8	351	3.4	53 558	4.7	1	36.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Taos	8	10.5	33	3.5	3 300	3.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Torrance	17	5.1	5 612	1.0	721 270	1.5	3	11.4	140	4.9	(D)	(D)
Union	34	1.6	16 167	.5	3 277 732	.4	14	5.0	3 503	4.8	159 599	4.2
Valencia	2	14.4	(D)	(D)	(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	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Wheat for grain						Cotton					
	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)	Bales	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**711**	**.8**	**264 190**	**.5**	**8 605 057**	**.5**	**459**	**.9**	**67 996**	**.6**	**113 281**	**.6**
Bernalillo	4	15.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Catron	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Chaves	7	–	1 556	–	93 040	–	57	2.6	6 954	2.4	11 930	2.2
Cibola	2	26.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Colfax	6	8.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Curry	268	1.1	122 879	.8	3 858 518	1.0	15	–	2 037	–	3 434	–
De Baca	2	19.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dona Ana	9	–	926	–	69 617	–	176	1.6	22 016	.7	41 099	.7
Eddy	3	9.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	75	2.2	9 808	1.0	16 290	.9
Grant	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Guadalupe	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Harding	7	9.0	490	10.6	6 964	11.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hidalgo	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	12	5.3	1 219	3.9	1 433	2.2
Lea	17	4.8	2 966	5.2	115 131	6.6	31	3.3	9 531	1.8	12 984	1.5
Lincoln	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	9	3.8	1 853	.6	169 330	.4	45	1.8	6 448	.7	11 799	1.0
McKinley	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mora	3	18.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Otero	2	25.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	20.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Quay	131	1.9	63 515	1.1	1 546 995	1.1	7	5.5	2 389	1.6	3 396	1.8
Rio Arriba	8	12.9	235	24.6	9 550	31.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Roosevelt	159	1.8	48 431	1.2	1 290 546	1.1	35	3.1	7 009	3.4	9 780	4.5
Sandoval	2	25.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Juan	4	9.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Miguel	11	9.5	500	5.0	24 033	4.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Santa Fe	3	20.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Sierra	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	9.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Socorro	3	18.4	37	25.2	1 128	30.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Taos	7	12.5	390	16.0	5 381	13.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Torrance	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Union	41	2.4	11 432	.9	669 895	.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Valencia	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.									
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)						Land in orchards			
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**4 616**	**.6**	**318 213**	**.5**	**1 207 842**	**.4**	**1 744**	**.8**	**33 600**	**.7**
Bernalillo	165	2.1	6 665	1.0	30 320	1.0	61	3.9	189	6.8
Catron	13	7.4	798	7.6	2 425	9.1	4	13.8	7	18.4
Chaves	203	1.5	39 419	.9	215 694	.7	63	3.3	3 221	2.6
Cibola	23	5.9	1 541	7.4	2 665	6.3	3	17.8	7	8.9
Colfax	125	1.5	17 147	1.2	35 156	1.3	3	17.5	(D)	(D)
Curry	96	2.1	9 250	2.3	25 848	3.2	9	9.4	87	17.8
De Baca	65	3.1	6 073	4.4	28 470	2.7	5	13.7	18	14.0
Dona Ana	445	1.1	19 947	.8	119 761	.7	746	.7	21 121	.6
Eddy	213	1.4	29 759	.9	160 043	.8	78	3.0	1 719	.9
Grant	27	4.6	788	9.7	2 290	8.0	31	4.5	144	6.6
Guadalupe	65	3.3	1 608	3.3	3 910	4.5	7	13.0	18	18.3
Harding	10	7.2	1 444	17.8	1 734	22.3	–	–	–	–
Hidalgo	22	4.9	974	4.9	5 086	5.2	12	8.1	103	5.2
Lea	98	2.2	14 264	2.1	53 718	1.1	36	4.5	531	8.5
Lincoln	12	6.3	357	5.4	1 015	10.4	36	5.2	235	10.7
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	46	3.4	5 017	2.4	23 028	2.1	32	4.7	1 471	6.5
McKinley	25	6.6	1 741	2.8	4 578	1.1	–	–	–	–
Mora	240	1.4	8 286	2.1	12 286	2.3	7	13.3	19	16.4
Otero	48	3.7	1 990	4.2	7 440	5.9	170	1.6	2 407	1.8
Quay	172	1.7	19 223	2.2	60 248	1.8	5	12.3	13	14.1
Rio Arriba	552	1.3	17 793	2.1	29 485	2.1	171	2.7	609	3.7
Roosevelt	152	2.0	25 151	1.8	73 265	1.4	15	7.6	87	13.5
Sandoval	116	2.6	5 146	3.5	17 926	2.0	42	5.0	230	6.4
San Juan	379	1.3	20 193	1.1	91 831	.9	43	5.1	382	17.5
San Miguel	197	2.3	6 545	3.8	15 279	2.2	16	9.1	28	11.1
Santa Fe	87	3.1	4 585	4.6	12 719	3.2	44	4.8	147	9.6
Sierra	43	4.1	2 489	3.3	15 381	3.0	37	4.9	506	19.6
Socorro	159	2.0	9 539	2.4	39 518	2.1	19	6.9	32	10.5
Taos	331	1.2	10 632	2.4	18 323	3.0	17	8.6	30	7.8
Torrance	48	3.6	7 229	2.8	27 231	2.4	6	12.8	63	17.2
Union	70	2.1	11 348	2.4	26 988	2.2	3	16.1	(D)	(D)
Valencia	369	1.1	11 272	1.6	44 181	2.0	23	5.9	156	9.0

[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	14 094	2 816	16 910	6.0	16.7
Land in farms ..... acres	45 787 108	174 554	45 961 662	1.9	.4
Average size of farm ..... acres	3 249	62	2 718	(X)	(X)
Farms by size of farm:					
Less than 10 acres	2 594	1 143	3 737	16.8	30.6
10 to 49 acres	2 618	1 173	3 791	10.2	30.9
50 to 179 acres	2 163	227	2 390	6.9	9.5
180 acres or more	6 719	273	6 992	2.5	3.9
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than $2,500	5 097	1 802	6 899	9.6	26.1
$2,500 to $9,999	3 521	662	4 183	3.6	15.8
$10,000 or more	5 476	352	5 828	4.3	6.0
Market value of agricultural products sold $1,000	1 617 708	6 749	1 624 457	1.1	.4
Farms by type of organization:					
Individual or family	11 783	2 757	14 540	6.8	19.0
Partnership, corporation, or other	2 311	59	2 370	6.8	2.5
Farms by tenure of operator:					
Full owners	8 653	2 476	11 129	9.0	22.2
Part owners	4 079	174	4 253	2.1	4.1
Tenants	1 362	166	1 528	4.6	10.9
Operators by place of residence:					
On farm operated	9 454	2 257	11 711	6.8	19.3
Not on farm operated	3 754	214	3 968	6.4	5.4
Not reported	886	345	1 231	10.4	28.0
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming	7 197	1 057	8 254	2.9	12.8
Other	6 897	1 759	8 656	11.3	20.3
Operators by sex:					
Male	12 429	2 243	14 672	5.5	15.3
Female	1 665	573	2 238	12.7	25.6
Operators by race:					
White	11 962	2 780	14 742	6.8	18.9
Black and other races	2 132	36	2 168	5.5	1.7
Operators by years on present farm:					
4 years or less	1 854	401	2 255	8.9	17.8
5 years or more	9 869	1 665	11 534	5.2	14.4
Not reported	2 371	750	3 121	11.5	24.0

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