

## Appendix C.

# Statistical Methodology

---

### MAIL LIST MODEL

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

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

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

### CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

Each of the 3.55 million name and address records on the census mail list was designated to receive one of three different types of census report forms. The three forms were the nonsample form, the screener form, and the

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

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

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

### CENSUS ESTIMATION

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

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

### Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

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

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

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

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

Table A quantifies the effect of the nonresponse estimation procedure on selected census data items. The percentages in these tables are the percents of the census values contributed by nonresponse estimation. These indicate the potential for bias in published figures resulting from nonresponse to the census. The estimates provided

in these tables do not reflect the effect of item nonresponse to individual census data items. The effect of item nonresponse is discussed in the Census Nonsampling Error section.

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

Item	Percent of total
Farms .....number. .	15.2
Land in farms.....acres. .	9.4
Estimated market value of land and buildings <sup>1</sup> .....\$1,000. .	3.9
Market value of agricultural products sold ..\$1,000. .	2.5
Harvested cropland .....acres. .	6.8
Corn for grain or seed .....acres. .	6.1
Wheat for grain .....acres. .	3.0
Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Cattle and calves .....number. .	11.3
Hogs and pigs .....number. .	5.6
Hens and pullets of laying age.....number. .	2.8

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

### Sample Estimation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

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

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

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

1. Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.65 standard errors below the estimate to 1.65 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.
2. Approximately 95 percent of the intervals from 1.96 standard errors below the estimate to 1.96 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>COMPLETE COUNT ITEM</b>	
Number of farms reporting:	
25 .....	6.2
50 .....	4.0
75 .....	2.9
100 .....	2.2
150 .....	1.2
200 .....	1.0
300 .....	.8
500 .....	.6
750 .....	.5
1,000 .....	.4
1,500 .....	.4
2,000 .....	.3
<b>SAMPLE COUNT ITEM</b>	
Number of farms reporting:	
25 .....	40.0
50 .....	27.6
75 .....	22.0
100 .....	18.6
150 .....	14.4
200 .....	11.7
300 .....	8.3
500 .....	3.6
750 .....	2.9
1,000 .....	2.5
1,500 .....	2.1
2,000 .....	1.8

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

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

Table E presents the percent standard error for percent change in State totals from 1987 to 1992. The general

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

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

### CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

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

### Census Coverage

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

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

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

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

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

## Mail List Coverage

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

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

coverage. Estimates of farms not on the census mail list are computed using a capture-recapture dual frame estimator which will be described in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

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

## Respondent and Enumerator Error

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

## Item Nonresponse

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

## Processing Error

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

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

### **Classification Error**

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

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

### **EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS</b>			<b>FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES<sup>1</sup></b>		
Farms -----number--	37 905	.9	Total farm production expenses -----farms--	37 910	1.0
Land in farms -----acres--	8 450 823	.6	-----\$1,000--	1 930 063	.3
Average size of farm -----acres--	223	1.1	Average per farm -----dollars--	50 912	1.0
<b>MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD</b>			Livestock and poultry purchased -----farms--		
Total sales (see text) -----farms--	37 905	.9	-----\$1,000--	13 720	1.6
Average per farm -----dollars--	2 369 179	.1	-----farms--	294 066	.4
Farms by value of sales:			Feed for livestock and poultry -----farms--	25 158	1.2
Less than \$1,000 (see text) -----farms--	5 467	1.3	-----\$1,000--	731 753	.2
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----farms--	1 635	1.5	Commercially mixed formula feeds -----farms--	10 692	1.8
\$2,500 to \$4,999 -----farms--	6 196	1.3	-----\$1,000--	664 157	.2
\$5,000 to \$9,999 -----farms--	10 485	1.3	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees -----farms--	12 412	1.7
\$10,000 to \$19,999 -----farms--	6 506	1.3	-----\$1,000--	40 718	1.0
\$20,000 to \$24,999 -----farms--	23 335	1.3	Commercial fertilizer -----farms--	25 260	1.2
\$25,000 to \$39,999 -----farms--	5 936	1.2	-----\$1,000--	103 080	.9
\$40,000 to \$49,999 -----farms--	41 850	1.2	Agricultural chemicals -----farms--	13 018	1.6
\$50,000 to \$99,999 -----farms--	4 135	1.2	Petroleum products -----farms--	72 317	.9
\$100,000 to \$249,999 -----farms--	4 135	1.2	-----\$1,000--	36 228	1.0
\$250,000 to \$499,999 -----farms--	57 582	1.2	Electricity -----farms--	76 567	.7
\$500,000 or more -----farms--	941	1.5	Hired farm labor -----farms--	19 141	1.3
	20 902	1.5	Contract labor -----farms--	25 232	.8
			Repair and maintenance -----farms--	12 754	1.6
			-----\$1,000--	140 414	.4
			Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment -----farms--	3 867	3.0
			-----\$1,000--	15 095	1.4
			Interest expense -----farms--	30 761	1.1
			-----\$1,000--	93 031	.8
			Secured by real estate -----farms--	9 446	2.0
			-----\$1,000--	20 757	1.8
			Not secured by real estate -----farms--	13 501	1.6
			-----\$1,000--	82 647	1.1
			Cash rent -----farms--	9 792	1.8
			-----\$1,000--	59 466	1.3
			Property taxes -----farms--	6 606	2.3
			-----\$1,000--	23 181	1.7
			All other farm production expenses -----farms--	8 876	2.0
			-----\$1,000--	47 011	1.2
				35 150	1.0
				16 934	1.4
				32 239	1.0
				170 440	.4
			<b>NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)<sup>1</sup></b>		
			All farms -----number--	37 910	1.0
			Average per farm -----dollars--	381 882	.9
			Farms with net gains <sup>2</sup> -----number--	19 169	1.3
			Average net gain -----dollars--	474 773	.6
				24 768	1.4
			Farms with net losses -----number--	18 741	1.5
			Average net loss -----dollars--	92 890	2.1
				4 957	2.6
			<b>GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME</b>		
			Government payments -----farms--	5 838	.8
			-----\$1,000--	48 850	.4
			Other farm-related income <sup>1</sup> -----farms--	7 194	2.5
			-----\$1,000--	41 158	3.3
			Customwork and other agricultural services -----farms--	2 407	4.3
			-----\$1,000--	17 868	5.2
			Gross cash rent or share payments -----farms--	2 521	4.3
			-----\$1,000--	6 833	7.2
			Forest products and Christmas trees -----farms--	1 793	5.1
			-----\$1,000--	13 011	6.3
			Other farm-related income sources -----farms--	1 730	4.9
			-----\$1,000--	3 447	6.7
			<b>COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS</b>		
			Total -----farms--	696	1.0
			-----\$1,000--	35 694	.2

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE</b>			<b>TENURE OF OPERATOR</b>		
Total cropland ----- farms ..	32 327	.9	All operators ----- farms ..	37 905	.9
Harvested cropland ----- farms ..	4 237 057	.6	Full owners ----- farms ..	8 450 823	.6
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	24 780	.9	Part owners ----- farms ..	24 686	1.0
10 to 19 acres ----- farms ..	2 104 064	.4	Tenants ----- farms ..	3 888 844	.7
20 to 29 acres ----- farms ..	4 835	1.2	Tenants ----- farms ..	10 860	.9
30 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	22 897	1.2	Tenants ----- farms ..	3 995 009	.4
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	5 171	1.2	Tenants ----- farms ..	2 359	1.3
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	67 075	1.2	Tenants ----- farms ..	566 970	.7
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	3 613	1.1	<b>OWNED AND RENTED LAND</b>		
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	81 510	1.1	Land owned ----- farms ..	35 601	.9
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	3 753	1.1	Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	6 240 187	.6
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	136 111	1.1	Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	35 546	.9
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	3 187	1.1	Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	5 779 314	.6
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	210 315	1.1	Land rented or leased from others ----- farms ..	13 304	.9
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	1 881	1.0	Rented or leased land in farms ----- farms ..	2 709 399	.4
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	250 630	1.0	Rented or leased land in farms ----- farms ..	32 454	.7
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	1 463	.6	Rented or leased land in farms ----- farms ..	13 219	.9
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	449 066	.5	Rented or leased land in farms ----- farms ..	2 671 509	.4
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	582	.2	Land rented or leased to others ----- farms ..	3 688	1.1
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	392 990	.2	Land rented or leased to others ----- farms ..	498 763	1.8
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	295	—	<b>OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>		
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	493 470	—	Operators by place of residence:		
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	20 828	1.0	On farm operated ----- farms ..	27 107	.9
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	1 534 509	.8	Not on farm operated ----- farms ..	7 182	1.1
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	8 439	.9	Not reported ----- farms ..	3 616	1.0
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	598 484	.6	Operators by principal occupation:		
Cropland:			Farming ----- farms ..	15 712	.8
Pasture or grazing only ----- farms ..	20 828	1.0	Other ----- farms ..	22 193	1.1
Other cropland ----- farms ..	1 534 509	.8	Operators by days worked off farm:		
Other cropland ----- farms ..	8 439	.9	Any ----- farms ..	21 921	1.0
Other cropland ----- farms ..	598 484	.6	200 days or more ----- farms ..	16 343	1.1
Total woodland ----- farms ..	23 497	.9	Operators by sex:		
Woodland pastured ----- farms ..	2 788 358	.6	Male ----- farms ..	35 019	.9
Woodland pastured ----- farms ..	9 121	.9	Female ----- farms ..	7 962 987	.5
Woodland pastured ----- farms ..	1 124 845	.5	Female ----- farms ..	2 886	1.1
Woodland pastured ----- farms ..	20 976	.9	Female ----- farms ..	487 836	.9
Woodland pastured ----- farms ..	300 563	.8	Average age of operator ----- years ..	54.8	1.3
Woodland pastured ----- farms ..	1 380	.9	<b>FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION</b>		
Woodland pastured ----- farms ..	82 015	.3	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ----- farms ..	34 257	1.0
Acres irrigated:			Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ----- farms ..	6 519 363	.6
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	769	1.3	Partnership ----- farms ..	2 843	1.0
10 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	2 145	1.6	Partnership ----- farms ..	1 408 348	.4
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	291	1.7	Corporation:		
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	6 688	1.6	Family held ----- farms ..	542	1.0
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	99	1.6	Family held ----- farms ..	368 868	.5
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	6 942	1.7	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	16	5.0
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	107	1.3	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	526	1.1
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	14 370	1.2	Other than family held ----- farms ..	124	2.1
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	82	.4	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	61 920	1.0
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	23 914	.4	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	23	2.5
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	22	—	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	101	2.5
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	14 695	—	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ----- farms ..	139	2.4
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	13 261	—	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ----- farms ..	92 324	1.1
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	1 322	.9	<b>HIRED FARM LABOR</b>		
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	77 263	.3	Hired workers by days worked:		
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	98	3.0	150 days or more ----- farms ..	5 269	2.2
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	4 752	1.9	150 days or more ----- farms ..	11 918	1.2
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	1 322	.9	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	11 558	1.8
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	77 263	.3	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	31 985	2.2
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	98	3.0	<b>INJURIES AND DEATHS</b>		
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	4 752	1.9	Farm-related injuries:		
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	98	3.0	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	236	2.0
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	4 752	1.9	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	254	2.1
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:			Hired workers ----- farms ..	157	1.5
Diverted under annual commodity programs ----- farms ..	1 574	.7	Hired workers ----- farms ..	431	1.0
Diverted under annual commodity programs ----- farms ..	35 124	.2	Farm-related deaths:		
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	2 922	1.0	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	4	17.2
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	270 179	.8	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	4	17.2
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	2 922	1.0	Hired workers ----- farms ..	3	12.7
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	270 179	.8	Hired workers ----- farms ..	4	9.5
<b>VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS <sup>1</sup></b>			<b>HIRED FARM LABOR</b>		
Estimated market value of land and buildings ----- farms ..	37 910	1.0	Hired workers by days worked:		
Estimated market value of land and buildings ----- farms ..	8 350 260	1.1	150 days or more ----- farms ..	5 269	2.2
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	220 265	1.4	150 days or more ----- farms ..	11 918	1.2
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	1 000	1.4	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	11 558	1.8
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	1 000	1.4	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	31 985	2.2
<b>VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT <sup>1</sup></b>			<b>INJURIES AND DEATHS</b>		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	37 850	1.0	Farm-related injuries:		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	1 148 900	1.0	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	236	2.0
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	30 354	1.4	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	254	2.1
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	30 354	1.4	Hired workers ----- farms ..	157	1.5
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	30 354	1.4	Hired workers ----- farms ..	431	1.0
<b>AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS <sup>1</sup></b>			<b>INJURIES AND DEATHS</b>		
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	25 065	1.2	Farm-related deaths:		
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	2 346 150	1.0	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	4	17.2
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	2 346 150	1.0	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	4	17.2
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	2 346 150	1.0	Hired workers ----- farms ..	3	12.7
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	2 346 150	1.0	Hired workers ----- farms ..	4	9.5

See footnotes at end of table.



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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>FARMS BY SIZE</b>			<b>LIVESTOCK</b>		
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	1 902	1.3	Cattle and calves inventory ----- farms ..	26 360	1.0
----- acres..	8 172	1.5	number..	1 453 137	.7
10 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	10 165	1.2	Beef cows ----- farms ..	23 925	1.0
----- acres..	294 147	1.2	number..	771 151	.7
50 to 69 acres ----- farms ..	3 659	1.2	Milk cows ----- farms ..	995	1.2
----- acres..	212 636	1.2	number..	45 454	.3
70 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	4 407	1.2	Cattle and calves sold ----- farms ..	25 532	1.0
----- acres..	362 260	1.2	number..	676 215	.7
100 to 139 acres ----- farms ..	4 131	1.1	\$1,000..	275 464	.6
----- acres..	478 035	1.1	Hogs and pigs inventory ----- farms ..	1 880	1.2
			number..	307 672	.5
			Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	1 715	1.1
			number..	571 680	.5
			\$1,000..	49 577	.4
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory ----- farms ..	320	2.0
			number..	11 016	2.9
140 to 179 acres ----- farms ..	2 732	1.2	Sheep and lambs sold ----- farms ..	233	2.3
----- acres..	427 285	1.2	number..	5 772	3.7
180 to 219 acres ----- farms ..	1 963	1.3	Horses and ponies inventory ----- farms ..	5 658	1.1
----- acres..	387 286	1.3	number..	29 741	1.2
220 to 259 acres ----- farms ..	1 382	1.3	Horses and ponies sold ----- farms ..	1 338	1.4
----- acres..	328 165	1.3	number..	4 654	1.7
260 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	3 817	1.0	<b>POULTRY</b>		
----- acres..	1 347 826	1.0	Chickens 3 months old or older inventory ----- farms ..	1 643	1.2
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	2 244	.9	number..	14 493 030	.5
----- acres..	1 528 674	.9	Hens and pullets of laying age ----- farms ..	1 533	1.2
			number..	11 848 768	.4
1,000 to 1,999 acres ----- farms ..	990	—	Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold ----- farms ..	2 460	.2
----- acres..	1 326 219	—	number..	737 608 903	(L)
2,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	513	—	<b>CROPS HARVESTED</b>		
----- acres..	1 750 118	—	Corn for grain or seed ----- farms ..	5 305	.9
			acres..	281 053	.5
			bushels..	24 941 228	.4
			Corn for silage or green chop ----- farms ..	426	1.4
			acres..	23 346	.5
			tons, green ..	305 886	.6
			Sorghum for grain or seed ----- farms ..	362	1.5
			acres..	24 343	1.3
			bushels..	1 178 791	1.2
			Wheat for grain ----- farms ..	870	.9
			acres..	86 071	.5
			bushels..	3 461 454	.4
			Cotton ----- farms ..	1 469	.7
			acres..	431 665	.2
			bales..	601 506	.2
			Soybeans for beans ----- farms ..	2 065	.9
			acres..	305 713	.5
			bushels..	8 871 365	.5
			Irish potatoes ----- farms ..	262	2.0
			acres..	10 355	.5
			cwt..	1 695 801	.5
			Sweetpotatoes ----- farms ..	194	2.5
			acres..	4 706	1.1
			bushels..	1 292 798	1.1
			Peanuts for nuts ----- farms ..	2 254	.9
			acres..	237 516	.3
			pounds..	586 013 571	.3
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) ----- farms ..	17 480	.9
			acres..	678 726	.8
			tons, dry ..	1 409 044	.7
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) ----- farms ..	1 363	1.3
			acres..	25 883	.9
			Land in orchards ----- farms ..	2 309	1.1
			acres..	34 534	1.1
<b>FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION</b>					
Cash grains (011) ----- farms ..	1 920	1.2			
----- acres..	649 945	.7			
Field crops, except cash grains (013) ----- farms ..	4 897	.9			
----- acres..	2 115 244	.4			
Vegetables and melons (016) ----- farms ..	806	1.6			
----- acres..	81 881	1.7			
Fruits and tree nuts (017) ----- farms ..	1 051	1.5			
----- acres..	116 049	1.7			
Horticultural specialties (018) ----- farms ..	621	1.1			
----- acres..	59 506	1.0			
General farms, primarily crop (019) ----- farms ..	727	1.5			
----- acres..	194 356	1.0			
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021) ----- farms ..	22 114	1.1			
----- acres..	4 253 007	.8			
Dairy farms (024) ----- farms ..	511	1.2			
----- acres..	177 380	.6			
Poultry and eggs (025) ----- farms ..	3 159	.3			
----- acres..	371 774	.2			
Animal specialties (027) ----- farms ..	1 628	1.4			
----- acres..	229 329	1.0			
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029) ----- farms ..	471	1.9			
----- acres..	202 352	1.5			

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

<sup>2</sup>Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS</b>			<b>FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES<sup>1</sup></b>		
Farms ----- number ..	13 800	.7	Total farm production expenses ----- farms ..	13 492	.9
Land in farms ----- acres ..	5 660 123	.4	----- \$1,000 ..	1 810 103	.3
Average size of farm ----- acres ..	410	.8	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	134 161	1.0
<b>MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD</b>			<b>NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)<sup>1</sup></b>		
Total sales (see text) ----- farms ..	13 800	.7	All farms ----- number ..	13 492	.9
----- \$1,000 ..	2 291 873	.1	----- \$1,000 ..	422 671	.7
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	166 078	.7	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	31 328	1.2
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains <sup>2</sup> ----- number ..	10 470	1.3
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ----- farms ..	4 135	1.2	----- \$1,000 ..	458 411	.6
----- \$1,000 ..	57 582	1.2	Average net gain ----- dollars ..	43 783	1.4
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ----- farms ..	941	1.5	Farms with net losses ----- number ..	3 022	3.5
----- \$1,000 ..	20 902	1.5	----- \$1,000 ..	35 740	3.5
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ----- farms ..	1 538	1.4	Average net loss ----- dollars ..	11 827	5.0
----- \$1,000 ..	48 016	1.4	<b>GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME</b>		
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ----- farms ..	640	1.6	Government payments ----- farms ..	3 489	.7
----- \$1,000 ..	28 349	1.5	----- \$1,000 ..	42 327	.3
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ----- farms ..	1 661	1.1	Other farm-related income <sup>1</sup> ----- farms ..	3 152	3.2
----- \$1,000 ..	119 088	1.1	----- \$1,000 ..	28 522	3.8
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ----- farms ..	2 246	—	Customwork and other agricultural services ----- farms ..	1 182	5.5
----- \$1,000 ..	370 654	—	----- \$1,000 ..	14 861	5.9
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ----- farms ..	1 579	—	Gross cash rent or share payments ----- farms ..	965	6.5
----- \$1,000 ..	558 439	—	----- \$1,000 ..	4 134	10.2
\$500,000 or more ----- farms ..	1 060	—	Forest products and Christmas trees ----- farms ..	594	8.0
----- \$1,000 ..	1 088 842	—	----- \$1,000 ..	6 644	6.0
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Other farm-related income sources ----- farms ..	1 117	5.3
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	6 923	.7	----- \$1,000 ..	2 883	7.1
----- \$1,000 ..	634 051	.2	<b>COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS</b>		
Grains ----- farms ..	3 237	.8	Total ----- farms ..	600	.9
----- \$1,000 ..	100 731	.4	----- \$1,000 ..	35 555	.2
Corn for grain ----- farms ..	2 254	.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	42 667	.4			
Wheat ----- farms ..	738	.9			
----- \$1,000 ..	10 410	.4			
Soybeans ----- farms ..	1 611	.9			
----- \$1,000 ..	43 961	.5			
Sorghum for grain ----- farms ..	217	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	1 817	1.4			
Barley ----- farms ..	6	6.9			
----- \$1,000 ..	(D)	(D)			
Oats ----- farms ..	199	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	(D)	(D)			
Other grains ----- farms ..	157	1.5			
----- \$1,000 ..	1 001	1.2			
Cotton and cottonseed ----- farms ..	1 285	.7			
----- \$1,000 ..	175 062	.2			
Tobacco ----- farms ..	12	6.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	(D)	(D)			
Hay, silage, and field seeds ----- farms ..	1 994	.9			
----- \$1,000 ..	13 604	1.1			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ----- farms ..	692	1.4			
----- \$1,000 ..	20 178	.9			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ----- farms ..	381	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	(D)	(D)			
Nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	477	1.0			
----- \$1,000 ..	129 992	.1			
Other crops ----- farms ..	2 103	.9			
----- \$1,000 ..	186 035	.3			
Livestock, poultry, and their products ----- farms ..	11 178	.7			
----- \$1,000 ..	1 657 822	.1			
Poultry and poultry products ----- farms ..	3 133	.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	1 278 982	(L)			
Dairy products ----- farms ..	533	1.1			
----- \$1,000 ..	76 191	.3			
Cattle and calves ----- farms ..	8 995	.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	218 415	.5			
Hogs and pigs ----- farms ..	959	1.1			
----- \$1,000 ..	47 736	.4			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ----- farms ..	72	3.2			
----- \$1,000 ..	143	5.3			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ----- farms ..	735	1.2			
----- \$1,000 ..	36 356	.5			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ----- farms ..	477	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	4 148	1.5			

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE</b>			<b>FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION</b>		
Total cropland ----- farms ..	12 225	.7	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ----- farms ..	11 631	.7
Harvested cropland ----- farms ..	3 119 429	.4	Partnership ----- farms ..	4 001 094	.5
Cropland: ----- farms ..	10 688	.7	Corporation: ----- farms ..	1 604	.9
Pasture or grazing only ----- farms ..	1 803 569	.3	Family held ----- farms ..	1 209 860	.4
----- farms ..	7 241	.8	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	321 413	.9
----- farms ..	884 915	.7	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	12	5.3
Total woodland ----- farms ..	8 620	.7	----- farms ..	401	.9
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured ----- farms ..	1 571 701	.5	Other than family held ----- farms ..	83	1.7
----- farms ..	3 367	.8	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	53 325	.8
----- farms ..	801 993	.4	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	21	1.4
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. ----- farms ..	7 760	.7	----- farms ..	62	2.2
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	167 000	.7	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ----- farms ..	69	2.2
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	892	.8	----- farms ..	74 793	.7
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	78 817	.3			
----- farms ..	868	.8			
----- farms ..	74 731	.3			
----- farms ..	51	3.2			
----- farms ..	4 086	1.7			
Land under federal acreage reduction programs: ----- farms ..	1 394	.7			
Diverted under annual commodity programs ----- farms ..	34 372	.2			
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	1 538	.8			
----- farms ..	173 141	.6			
<b>VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS <sup>1</sup></b>			<b>HIRED FARM LABOR</b>		
Estimated market value of land and buildings ----- farms ..	13 492	.9	Hired workers by days worked: ----- farms ..	3 541	1.9
Average per farm ----- \$1,000 ..	5 151 755	1.0	150 days or more ----- farms ..	10 153	1.0
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	381 838	1.4	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	6 204	1.9
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	931	1.4	----- farms ..	20 865	2.5
<b>VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT <sup>1</sup></b>			<b>INJURIES AND DEATHS</b>		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	13 491	.9	Farm-related injuries: ----- farms ..	129	2.0
Average per farm ----- \$1,000 ..	796 581	1.2	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	140	2.0
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	59 045	1.5	Hired workers ----- farms ..	141	1.2
			----- farms ..	403	.6
<b>AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS<sup>1</sup></b>			<b>FARM-RELATED DEATHS:</b>		
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	9 721	1.4	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	2	15.6
acres on which used ----- farms ..	1 910 794	1.1	----- farms ..	(D)	(D)
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	2	—
			----- farms ..	(D)	(D)
<b>TENURE OF OPERATOR</b>			<b>FARMS BY SIZE</b>		
All operators ----- farms ..	13 800	.7	1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	576	1.0
Full owners ----- farms ..	5 660 123	.4	10 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	1 879	.7
Part owners ----- farms ..	6 929	.7	50 to 69 acres ----- farms ..	778	1.2
Tenants ----- farms ..	1 879 689	.6	70 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	1 103	1.2
	5 796	.7	100 to 139 acres ----- farms ..	1 333	1.2
	3 325 399	.4	140 to 179 acres ----- farms ..	1 090	1.3
	1 075	1.2	180 to 219 acres ----- farms ..	899	1.5
	455 035	.6	220 to 259 acres ----- farms ..	733	1.4
			260 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	2 343	1.0
			500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	1 738	.8
			1,000 to 1,999 acres ----- farms ..	868	—
			2,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	460	—
<b>OWNED AND RENTED LAND</b>			<b>FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION</b>		
Land owned ----- farms ..	12 745	.7	Cash grains (011) ----- farms ..	940	1.2
Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	3 647 810	.5	Field crops, except cash grains (013) ----- farms ..	2 760	.8
----- farms ..	12 725	.7	Vegetables and melons (016) ----- farms ..	328	2.0
----- farms ..	3 427 370	.5	Fruits and tree nuts (017) ----- farms ..	137	2.7
Land rented or leased from others ----- farms ..	6 910	.7	Horticultural specialties (018) ----- farms ..	435	1.0
----- farms ..	2 261 593	.4	General farms, primarily crop (019) ----- farms ..	213	1.9
----- farms ..	23 072	.6	Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021) ----- farms ..	5 166	1.1
----- farms ..	6 871	.7	Dairy farms (024) ----- farms ..	435	1.2
----- farms ..	2 232 753	.4	Poultry and eggs (025) ----- farms ..	3 071	.3
----- farms ..	1 495	1.1	Animal specialties (027) ----- farms ..	291	1.8
----- farms ..	249 280	3.2	General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029) ----- farms ..	24	4.7
<b>OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS</b>			<b>LIVESTOCK</b>		
Operators by place of residence: ----- farms ..	10 004	.7	Cattle and calves inventory ----- farms ..	8 956	.8
On farm operated ----- farms ..	2 504	1.0	----- farms ..	995 374	.6
Not on farm operated ----- farms ..	1 292	.9	Beef cows ----- farms ..	8 077	.8
----- farms ..	8 729	.6	Milk cows ----- farms ..	512 184	.6
----- farms ..	5 071	.9	----- farms ..	44 113	.3
Operators by principal occupation: ----- farms ..	8 729	.6	Cattle and calves sold ----- farms ..	8 995	.8
Farming ----- farms ..	5 071	.9	----- farms ..	507 889	.6
----- farms ..	6 164	.9	Hogs and pigs inventory ----- farms ..	218 415	.5
----- farms ..	4 099	.9	----- farms ..	937	1.1
----- farms ..	12 766	.7	Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	287 256	.5
----- farms ..	1 034	1.0	----- farms ..	959	1.1
----- farms ..	53.4	1.0	----- farms ..	542 097	.5
			----- farms ..	47 736	.4
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory ----- farms ..	94	2.8
			----- farms ..	4 326	3.9
			Sheep and lambs sold ----- farms ..	68	3.2
			----- farms ..	2 616	5.7
			Horses and ponies inventory ----- farms ..	1 578	1.0
			----- farms ..	9 862	1.8
			Horses and ponies sold ----- farms ..	366	1.7
			----- farms ..	2 213	2.5

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>POULTRY</b>			<b>CROPS HARVESTED—Con.</b>		
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory -----farms --	717	1.0	Cotton ----- farms --	1 285	.7
-----number--	14 434 591	.5	-----acres--	428 268	.2
Hens and pullets of laying age -----farms --	622	1.1	-----bales--	598 112	.2
-----number--	11 797 654	.4	Soybeans for beans ----- farms --	1 620	.9
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold -----farms --	2 442	.2	-----acres--	293 337	.5
-----number--	737 595 231	(L)	-----bushels--	8 573 135	.5
<b>CROPS HARVESTED</b>			Irish potatoes ----- farms --	144	2.0
Corn for grain or seed -----farms --	2 974	.8	-----acres--	10 214	.5
-----acres--	257 086	.4	-----cwt--	1 679 906	.5
-----bushels--	23 583 375	.4	Sweetpotatoes ----- farms --	99	2.8
Corn for silage or green chop -----farms --	272	1.2	-----acres--	4 549	1.2
-----acres--	21 643	.5	-----bushels--	1 269 164	1.1
-----tons, green--	286 367	.5	Peanuts for nuts ----- farms --	1 937	.9
Sorghum for grain or seed -----farms --	303	1.4	-----acres--	235 032	.3
-----acres--	23 242	1.3	-----pounds--	581 772 917	.3
-----bushels--	1 142 482	1.2	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
Wheat for grain -----farms --	745	.9	-----farms --	7 014	.8
-----acres--	83 375	.5	-----acres--	438 602	.7
-----bushels--	3 387 176	.4	-----tons, dry--	987 952	.7
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) -----farms --	692	1.4
			-----acres--	23 112	1.0
			Land in orchards ----- farms --	736	1.2
			-----acres--	19 314	1.3

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

<sup>2</sup>Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

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

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate
Farms..... number..	-12.5	1.1	-1.3	.3
Land in farms..... acres..	-7.6	.7	-4.6	.4
Average size of farm..... acres..	5.7	1.5	-3.3	2.3
Estimated market value of land and buildings <sup>1</sup> :				
Average per farm.....dollars..	31.0	2.4	20.9	2.2
Average per acre.....dollars..	25.0	2.3	24.0	2.4
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment <sup>1</sup> :				
Average per farm.....dollars..	17.5	2.2	12.8	2.3
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres.....	-26.9	1.4	-5.9	.4
10 to 49 acres.....	-17.7	1.3	-2.4	.2
50 to 179 acres.....	-9.6	1.2	8.0	.3
180 to 499 acres.....	-7.9	1.2	-3.7	.7
500 to 999 acres.....	-9.1	1.1	-8.7	.8
1,000 to 1,999 acres.....	-10.9	—	-12.0	—
2,000 acres or more.....	4.7	—	5.5	—
Total cropland.....farms..	-13.0	1.0	-1.7	.3
Harvested cropland.....farms..	-5.8	.7	-3.0	.4
.....acres..	-13.1	1.0	-1.9	.4
.....acres..	-5.7	.5	-3.6	.4
Irrigated land.....farms..	2.7	1.2	5.2	.7
.....acres..	-2.4	.6	.7	.6
Market value of agricultural products sold.....\$1,000..	24.2	.3	26.0	.2
Average per farm.....dollars..	41.9	1.7	27.6	4.0
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops.....\$1,000..	30.3	.4	32.2	.4
Livestock, poultry, and their products.....\$1,000..	22.0	.2	23.8	.2
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500.....	-22.7	1.1	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999.....	-15.8	1.3	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	-9.2	1.3	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999.....	-2.6	1.4	-2.6	1.4
\$25,000 to \$49,999.....	-6.3	1.6	-6.3	1.6
\$50,000 to \$99,999.....	-15.1	1.2	-15.1	1.2
\$100,000 to \$249,999.....	-16.6	(L)	-16.6	(L)
\$250,000 to \$499,999.....	26.0	—	26.0	—
\$500,000 or more.....	96.3	.1	96.3	.1
Total farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> .....\$1,000..	19.8	1.2	21.8	1.2
Average per farm.....dollars..	36.9	1.7	25.3	1.5
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) <sup>1</sup> .....farms..	-12.5	1.0	-2.8	1.1
.....\$1,000..	70.7	3.1	63.1	2.3
Average per farm.....dollars..	95.0	4.2	67.7	3.0
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming.....	-4.2	1.0	-2.2	.5
Other.....	-17.6	1.2	.3	.2
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any.....	-18.5	4.2	-6.3	4.8
200 days or more.....	-18.9	4.1	-3.4	4.9
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory.....farms..	-11.7	1.1	3.7	.3
.....number..	.2	.8	4.5	.5
Beef cows.....farms..	-7.6	1.1	6.7	.3
.....number..	3.1	.9	9.8	.6
Milk cows.....farms..	-25.5	1.3	4.2	.7
.....number..	-1.2	.5	1.7	.5
Cattle and calves sold.....farms..	-12.9	1.1	1.6	.3
.....number..	-18.7	.7	-16.7	.5
Hogs and pigs inventory.....farms..	-47.6	.8	-41.3	.4
.....number..	-12.9	.7	-9.5	.7
Hogs and pigs sold.....farms..	-46.7	.8	-39.3	.4
.....number..	-11.8	(L)	-8.6	(L)
Sheep and lambs inventory.....farms..	49.5	4.6	44.6	1.6
.....number..	106.5	11.3	87.6	4.9
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory.....farms..	-41.0	1.0	-13.2	1.4
.....number..	-4.1	.5	-4.1	.5
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold.....farms..	-3.8	.3	-3.3	.3
.....number..	30.6	.1	30.7	.1
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed.....farms..	-28.4	.9	-11.4	.5
.....acres..	19.8	.8	30.9	.7
.....bushels..	59.6	1.1	70.8	1.0
Wheat for grain.....farms..	-54.5	.6	-52.5	.5
.....acres..	-45.0	.4	-43.6	.4
.....bushels..	-29.4	.5	-27.8	.5
Cotton.....farms..	-19.3	.9	-13.9	.7
.....acres..	24.8	.5	25.6	.5
.....bales..	57.9	.6	58.6	.6
Soybeans for beans.....farms..	-49.9	.6	-41.6	.5
.....acres..	-46.9	.4	-44.7	.4
.....bushels..	-23.7	.5	-21.7	.5
Peanuts for nuts.....farms..	-15.1	1.0	-5.5	.9
.....acres..	14.2	.7	16.1	.7
.....pounds..	36.6	.8	38.4	.8
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text).....farms..	-8.3	1.1	1.9	.4
.....acres..	4.8	1.0	8.4	.6
.....tons, dry..	18.7	1.1	19.4	.7

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm <sup>1</sup>		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment <sup>1</sup>	
	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)
<b>Alabama</b> .....	<b>37 905</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>8 450 823</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>220 265</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1 148 900</b>	<b>1.0</b>
Autauga .....	322	.9	107 259	.8	333	1.2	226 198	9.1	10 986	8.5
Baldwin .....	941	.9	167 832	.8	178	1.3	240 396	4.0	33 605	5.6
Barbour .....	421	.9	177 189	.7	421	1.1	327 882	4.5	19 653	3.0
Bibb .....	177	1.0	48 022	1.8	271	2.0	251 103	13.4	4 451	14.2
Blount .....	1 121	.9	137 426	1.1	123	1.4	168 503	4.7	32 408	4.4
Bullock .....	271	1.3	144 799	1.0	534	1.6	377 496	7.5	11 406	8.7
Butler .....	455	.9	96 427	1.2	212	1.5	152 832	10.7	9 756	5.6
Calhoun .....	570	.9	73 841	1.4	130	1.7	181 237	8.0	12 857	5.7
Chambers .....	343	.8	109 555	1.0	319	1.2	185 562	6.3	9 440	23.5
Cherokee .....	441	1.0	121 504	.8	276	1.3	248 739	4.9	18 348	4.6
Chilton .....	637	1.2	99 466	1.6	156	2.0	166 530	9.4	15 427	7.7
Choctaw .....	215	1.2	67 950	1.4	316	1.8	269 743	8.5	5 698	10.6
Clarke .....	213	1.2	61 426	1.7	288	2.1	235 348	11.4	2 996	18.4
Clay .....	370	.7	68 478	1.3	185	1.5	144 690	6.5	9 762	9.1
Cleburne .....	338	.8	47 200	1.6	140	1.8	190 805	7.0	7 546	6.5
Coffee .....	760	1.1	175 209	.9	231	1.4	197 638	5.9	27 961	4.3
Colbert .....	488	1.0	138 135	.8	283	1.3	303 962	6.7	15 799	4.6
Conecuh .....	326	1.1	82 466	1.3	253	1.7	265 524	19.1	7 549	7.8
Coosa .....	191	.5	40 832	1.4	214	1.5	167 247	11.2	3 920	14.2
Covington .....	831	1.0	166 490	1.1	200	1.5	154 272	4.7	23 904	3.9
Crenshaw .....	458	.9	111 315	.8	243	1.2	168 240	5.5	14 899	3.8
Cullman .....	2 086	.9	196 859	1.0	94	1.4	162 486	3.4	54 778	4.0
Dale .....	403	.6	134 555	.7	334	.9	297 237	3.3	19 830	8.3
Dallas .....	408	1.0	233 422	.6	572	1.2	343 932	3.8	18 196	5.9
De Kalb .....	1 894	.9	210 733	1.1	111	1.4	163 268	4.7	46 268	3.7
Elmore .....	519	.9	104 364	1.0	201	1.3	188 213	4.1	15 571	4.9
Escambia .....	362	1.0	85 872	.8	237	1.3	202 922	8.8	17 038	7.3
Etowah .....	774	.8	85 821	1.2	111	1.4	134 955	5.8	15 220	6.1
Fayette .....	299	1.3	64 755	2.0	217	2.4	175 447	8.5	7 260	7.8
Franklin .....	767	.9	130 063	1.3	170	1.6	172 005	4.6	16 100	3.4
Geneva .....	806	1.0	195 536	.9	243	1.3	204 218	3.7	33 293	3.7
Greene .....	255	1.5	128 357	1.0	503	1.8	328 170	13.3	9 861	9.7
Hale .....	382	1.3	167 583	.9	439	1.5	284 308	8.0	13 040	6.2
Henry .....	357	.8	166 949	.5	468	1.0	342 843	3.4	24 594	5.5
Houston .....	753	1.0	191 810	.7	255	1.3	266 062	5.2	40 541	4.8
Jackson .....	1 139	1.1	204 487	1.1	180	1.6	154 017	4.0	30 545	6.1
Jefferson .....	387	1.1	35 748	1.8	92	2.1	209 951	12.7	7 864	10.8
Lamar .....	299	1.2	56 102	1.9	188	2.3	157 354	12.9	7 731	11.6
Lauderdale .....	1 143	1.0	201 892	.8	177	1.3	188 317	6.0	26 847	3.8
Lawrence .....	915	1.2	173 468	1.0	190	1.5	196 954	3.7	30 782	3.6
Lee .....	336	.9	67 962	1.6	202	1.8	248 264	13.7	8 034	8.6
Limestone .....	910	.9	207 226	.6	228	1.1	350 247	3.2	33 798	2.7
Lowndes .....	315	1.1	199 714	.7	634	1.3	373 202	6.1	14 676	26.9
Macon .....	311	1.2	138 437	.9	445	1.5	323 929	7.0	9 391	7.4
Madison .....	871	.9	224 370	.6	258	1.1	422 270	3.4	33 620	4.3
Marengo .....	434	1.3	199 117	.9	459	1.6	253 060	6.3	12 278	6.3
Marion .....	566	1.0	89 228	1.2	158	1.6	111 273	7.8	11 442	6.5
Marshall .....	1 364	.9	142 873	1.2	105	1.6	196 999	7.7	39 998	3.8
Mobile .....	670	.8	104 342	1.0	156	1.3	299 380	5.2	23 996	4.7
Monroe .....	400	1.3	110 066	.9	275	1.6	212 790	6.2	14 519	5.8
Montgomery .....	598	1.0	231 243	.8	387	1.3	417 068	5.0	19 611	10.1
Morgan .....	1 129	1.0	155 914	1.2	138	1.6	194 427	6.4	28 132	7.3
Perry .....	312	1.2	144 193	.8	462	1.4	244 883	3.3	9 978	9.8
Pickens .....	404	1.0	106 206	1.3	263	1.6	195 729	7.3	12 564	7.1
Pike .....	549	.9	179 319	.7	327	1.2	224 265	7.9	21 950	4.5
Randolph .....	559	.9	96 435	1.1	173	1.4	144 156	7.0	10 588	6.1
Russell .....	213	.9	112 620	.8	529	1.2	344 502	8.7	5 740	5.7
St. Clair .....	555	.9	78 176	1.5	141	1.8	201 482	9.4	13 201	6.0
Shelby .....	426	.9	71 697	1.5	168	1.7	372 297	18.2	11 916	8.4
Sumter .....	336	1.2	167 923	.9	500	1.5	253 426	11.8	8 517	8.9
Talladega .....	472	1.0	104 199	1.3	221	1.6	232 692	8.1	13 408	5.8
Tallapoosa .....	317	1.1	78 889	1.6	249	1.9	175 628	16.7	7 222	12.2
Tuscaloosa .....	436	.8	96 194	1.0	221	1.2	253 677	5.1	11 226	7.8
Walker .....	430	.8	50 257	1.3	117	1.5	131 466	7.5	10 854	7.6
Washington .....	361	1.5	85 086	1.7	236	2.2	207 880	12.3	8 426	8.7
Wilcox .....	235	1.3	141 260	1.1	601	1.7	342 832	9.1	7 021	11.6
Winston .....	559	.9	56 680	1.6	101	1.9	122 159	4.6	13 062	3.6
Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm <sup>1</sup>		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup>			
	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)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Alabama</b> .....	<b>30 354</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>2 369 179</b>	<b>.1</b>	<b>62 503</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>37 910</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1 930 063</b>	<b>.3</b>
Autauga .....	34 117	8.6	14 164	.7	43 987	1.1	322	1.3	11 627	3.7
Baldwin .....	35 712	5.8	47 813	.4	50 811	1.0	941	1.4	40 479	1.8
Barbour .....	46 682	3.2	31 695	.4	75 285	1.0	421	1.1	24 072	2.1
Bibb .....	25 146	14.3	2 634	1.5	14 879	1.8	177	1.5	2 383	13.1

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm <sup>1</sup>		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup>			
	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)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Blount .....	29 118	4.5	96 924	.2	86 462	.9	1 121	1.0	79 905	.6
Bullock .....	42 090	8.9	19 087	.4	70 430	1.4	271	1.4	15 447	3.5
Butler .....	21 441	5.7	22 549	.5	49 558	1.0	455	1.2	19 040	1.8
Calhoun .....	22 596	5.8	37 791	.3	66 300	1.0	569	1.1	30 002	.9
Chambers .....	27 442	23.5	4 149	1.1	12 095	1.3	344	1.1	3 855	4.5
Cherokee .....	41 606	4.7	39 717	.3	90 062	1.0	441	1.1	31 317	1.9
Chilton .....	24 180	7.8	12 048	1.1	18 914	1.6	638	1.2	9 770	3.5
Choctaw .....	26 504	10.7	5 359	.6	24 925	1.4	215	1.7	4 630	3.1
Clarke .....	14 065	18.4	1 654	2.7	7 763	3.0	213	1.4	1 784	12.2
Clay .....	26 312	9.1	22 012	.3	59 493	.8	371	1.0	18 259	1.8
Cleburne .....	22 325	6.6	34 360	.2	101 656	.8	338	1.1	27 908	.6
Coffee .....	36 791	4.5	94 608	.3	124 484	1.1	760	1.2	75 760	1.1
Colbert .....	32 374	4.7	27 504	.2	56 360	1.0	488	1.2	22 238	1.2
Conojuh .....	23 158	7.8	6 638	1.1	20 362	1.6	326	1.0	5 534	10.0
Coosa .....	20 524	14.2	1 395	1.9	7 303	2.0	191	1.1	1 363	11.9
Covington .....	28 731	4.0	44 891	.4	54 020	1.1	832	1.1	36 467	1.5
Crenshaw .....	32 531	4.0	46 269	.2	101 025	.9	458	1.1	36 800	1.0
Cullman .....	26 450	4.1	237 475	.1	113 842	.9	2 085	1.0	195 879	.5
Dale .....	49 205	8.4	34 816	.3	86 391	.7	403	.8	27 644	1.8
Dallas .....	44 597	6.0	24 930	.4	61 104	1.1	408	1.2	20 280	1.7
De Kalb .....	24 429	3.8	162 175	.2	85 626	.9	1 894	1.0	130 124	.6
Elmore .....	29 943	5.1	17 862	.5	34 416	1.0	520	1.2	14 150	3.2
Escambia .....	47 066	7.5	15 052	.6	41 581	1.2	362	1.5	11 653	4.2
Etowah .....	19 664	6.1	32 628	.3	42 155	.9	774	1.0	27 613	2.2
Fayette .....	24 282	7.9	6 588	1.5	22 035	2.0	299	1.5	5 101	6.3
Franklin .....	20 991	3.6	49 595	.3	64 660	1.0	767	1.1	41 405	1.1
Geneva .....	41 307	3.8	80 286	.3	99 611	1.0	806	1.1	62 816	.9
Greene .....	38 671	9.8	8 963	.8	35 149	1.7	255	1.5	7 135	4.9
Hale .....	34 226	6.5	25 695	.4	67 266	1.3	381	1.8	20 017	3.3
Henry .....	68 892	5.6	41 172	.2	115 328	.8	357	1.1	30 452	2.1
Houston .....	53 910	4.9	56 564	.4	75 118	1.1	752	1.3	44 453	1.2
Jackson .....	26 841	6.2	47 522	.4	41 723	1.2	1 139	1.2	38 096	2.1
Jefferson .....	20 269	10.9	4 829	1.1	12 478	1.6	388	1.5	4 582	7.3
Lamar .....	25 857	11.7	4 615	1.3	15 434	1.8	299	1.6	3 963	3.6
Lauderdale .....	23 488	4.0	26 900	.5	23 534	1.1	1 143	1.2	22 386	2.8
Lawrence .....	33 901	3.8	56 398	.3	61 637	1.2	915	1.3	46 952	2.0
Lee .....	23 841	8.7	10 756	.6	32 013	1.1	337	1.3	7 630	5.0
Limestone .....	37 140	2.8	53 856	.2	59 183	1.0	910	1.0	40 897	1.7
Lowndes .....	46 592	26.9	22 934	.3	72 805	1.1	315	1.1	20 610	3.3
Macon .....	30 197	7.6	9 119	.7	29 323	1.4	311	1.6	9 302	4.3
Madison .....	38 511	4.4	48 427	.3	55 599	1.0	873	1.0	39 231	2.0
Marengo .....	28 357	6.5	13 935	.8	32 109	1.5	433	1.3	12 303	4.1
Marion .....	20 216	6.6	15 704	.5	27 745	1.1	566	1.1	13 567	2.2
Marshall .....	29 497	4.0	135 617	.1	99 426	.9	1 363	1.0	113 253	.7
Mobile .....	35 868	4.8	54 706	.2	81 651	.8	669	.9	45 556	.6
Monroe .....	36 756	6.1	14 325	.6	35 813	1.4	400	1.5	12 088	3.1
Montgomery .....	32 849	10.1	30 414	.3	50 860	1.0	597	1.1	25 268	2.3
Morgan .....	24 917	7.4	57 597	.3	51 016	1.1	1 129	1.2	48 498	1.3
Perry .....	31 981	9.9	13 337	.6	42 748	1.3	312	1.3	11 815	4.3
Pickens .....	31 175	7.2	49 081	.2	121 488	1.1	403	1.2	40 502	.4
Pike .....	39 981	4.7	40 821	.4	74 355	1.0	549	1.1	31 316	1.7
Randolph .....	19 111	6.3	31 311	.2	56 012	.9	560	1.1	24 917	1.4
Russell .....	26 948	5.8	7 180	.8	33 710	1.2	213	1.3	6 393	4.6
St. Clair .....	23 786	6.1	39 893	.3	71 879	1.0	555	1.1	32 499	.9
Shelby .....	27 971	8.4	12 526	.7	29 404	1.1	426	1.1	10 374	3.2
Sumter .....	25 425	9.0	10 817	.8	32 193	1.4	335	1.4	7 900	3.9
Talladega .....	28 347	6.0	14 846	.8	31 453	1.3	473	1.3	13 228	1.7
Tallapoosa .....	22 711	12.3	5 872	1.0	18 524	1.5	318	1.5	4 882	6.5
Tuscaloosa .....	25 688	7.8	20 568	.4	47 175	.9	437	1.0	17 045	4.8
Walker .....	25 126	7.7	29 701	.2	69 072	.8	432	1.4	24 348	1.4
Washington .....	23 341	8.9	16 284	.8	45 107	1.7	361	1.7	12 971	4.0
Wilcox .....	31 484	12.6	7 227	.8	30 751	1.5	235	1.6	5 698	6.4
Winston .....	23 367	3.8	54 998	.2	98 387	.9	559	1.3	44 627	.8

Farm production expenses<sup>1</sup>—Con.

Geographic area	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)
<b>Alabama</b> .....	<b>13 720</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>294 066</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>25 158</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>731 753</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>12 412</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>40 718</b>	<b>1.0</b>
Autauga .....	82	23.1	717	6.7	224	9.4	1 409	3.7	155	13.9	268	3.1
Baldwin .....	245	12.8	2 598	2.8	401	8.7	4 010	2.7	605	5.4	2 476	5.0
Barbour .....	119	12.7	1 390	4.9	271	8.1	3 852	2.1	220	9.2	1 462	4.0
Bibb .....	42	28.2	231	15.7	119	11.0	401	9.5	48	26.5	8	30.8

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
Blount	410	7.3	11 184	1.1	774	4.5	46 879	.2	273	11.0	255	8.6
Bullock	92	21.1	968	15.8	198	7.0	2 324	1.7	68	21.6	656	3.2
Butler	178	14.3	3 319	4.7	331	7.1	8 285	.8	138	17.5	280	5.3
Calhoun	191	13.9	7 859	1.0	371	7.5	10 672	.5	190	13.8	858	2.5
Chambers	113	14.5	425	16.2	230	7.9	655	6.5	54	23.3	32	9.0
Cherokee	107	17.9	2 694	3.4	212	11.3	7 777	.8	188	9.4	527	3.3
Chilton	156	15.8	536	7.6	409	6.3	907	8.4	233	11.8	317	9.6
Choctaw	68	21.2	560	8.5	162	9.9	2 327	2.8	67	23.2	37	24.8
Clarke	86	18.9	173	19.6	139	10.8	202	19.4	71	21.2	70	34.4
Clay	127	12.9	2 265	4.6	284	6.2	10 425	.7	70	21.4	29	22.2
Cleburne	152	10.8	7 457	.5	254	7.7	14 117	.4	64	27.2	29	21.1
Coffee	291	9.4	15 810	1.7	413	7.3	30 754	.2	369	7.2	2 159	7.9
Colbert	103	19.4	2 088	8.5	324	6.4	6 981	1.5	138	15.6	449	1.1
Conecuh	109	19.2	776	28.7	188	11.4	484	20.6	179	10.5	213	8.1
Coosa	31	43.5	66	48.2	182	3.9	333	18.3	26	50.5	10	50.6
Covington	256	11.0	3 956	4.4	486	6.2	12 337	.8	348	9.4	1 090	6.6
Crenshaw	215	10.4	7 046	.8	343	6.4	16 297	1.5	200	11.2	662	12.7
Cullman	1 052	4.4	40 845	.7	1 540	2.7	106 983	.6	471	7.6	711	15.5
Dale	155	11.2	2 103	4.4	294	5.6	8 444	.5	174	9.7	1 386	3.6
Dallas	160	12.9	1 004	8.5	284	5.7	2 910	2.8	140	11.4	463	3.2
De Kalb	879	5.1	24 147	1.3	1 290	3.5	70 649	.2	501	7.7	1 011	2.3
Elmore	145	14.7	696	22.3	358	5.8	2 172	4.7	207	11.1	416	8.2
Escambia	136	15.5	472	13.3	187	11.1	466	14.4	175	12.4	517	10.8
Etowah	299	10.1	4 009	5.1	576	4.5	15 310	2.4	156	14.9	242	23.5
Fayette	109	18.2	877	23.2	165	11.9	1 851	5.3	74	25.0	84	11.8
Franklin	345	8.0	6 624	3.2	503	5.5	24 023	.6	177	14.2	231	10.2
Geneva	294	8.2	6 788	1.8	529	5.9	26 914	1.1	481	5.8	2 174	4.6
Greene	51	20.8	897	25.6	197	4.4	1 849	5.5	90	16.5	83	19.1
Hale	117	14.9	2 392	6.2	288	6.9	6 284	4.6	91	16.3	258	3.4
Henry	127	16.6	811	5.7	174	14.0	1 004	6.6	215	5.6	2 923	2.6
Houston	255	12.0	5 996	3.2	378	8.4	3 754	2.7	527	5.4	3 262	2.7
Jackson	387	8.4	6 014	2.2	761	4.5	14 564	2.2	391	7.7	869	5.9
Jefferson	100	17.0	717	27.4	252	7.5	1 112	13.4	47	27.1	89	9.4
Lamar	114	15.2	354	20.1	177	12.4	1 121	5.1	117	18.5	99	11.5
Lauderdale	494	7.9	2 368	15.3	793	4.4	3 799	2.4	293	10.6	617	3.3
Lawrence	419	8.6	8 264	1.9	632	5.1	15 571	3.4	229	11.7	674	12.3
Lee	121	15.7	387	23.1	183	10.5	720	6.8	119	15.0	338	10.3
Limestone	319	9.2	2 805	6.2	571	5.0	4 695	4.6	327	8.6	1 352	.9
Lowndes	87	18.2	3 976	3.7	240	6.9	6 869	2.4	52	25.9	142	4.1
Macon	86	22.8	514	13.1	213	7.8	1 087	7.7	107	19.2	194	6.7
Madison	267	11.0	2 353	5.0	448	6.4	6 964	5.0	412	6.7	1 254	3.4
Marengo	124	18.7	1 163	16.1	270	8.6	2 653	5.2	168	15.2	182	20.4
Marion	212	12.3	1 625	6.7	328	7.4	6 470	1.9	189	12.7	179	10.9
Marshall	609	6.3	30 533	.6	1 066	3.3	52 859	.8	297	11.9	359	8.8
Mobile	177	12.1	1 666	8.7	306	7.3	2 186	4.3	268	9.5	2 812	.9
Monroe	135	13.9	771	11.3	253	6.8	919	4.4	218	9.6	362	7.3
Montgomery	187	14.5	4 103	3.8	443	4.2	5 628	3.7	149	15.8	(D)	(D)
Morgan	388	9.1	9 431	2.0	785	4.6	21 287	.7	216	14.2	469	11.1
Perry	79	20.1	1 058	9.5	173	11.0	3 068	5.0	96	16.8	234	3.8
Pickens	168	8.8	6 052	1.8	306	5.8	23 248	.6	77	20.8	148	4.6
Pike	186	12.0	2 761	5.1	381	6.4	10 160	.6	238	8.5	1 366	4.5
Randolph	257	9.2	3 423	1.8	437	4.1	14 686	.7	121	17.9	51	32.8
Russell	52	25.6	216	20.0	115	14.3	418	5.4	86	17.7	262	4.9
St. Clair	199	13.2	4 914	2.3	434	5.0	18 266	.3	89	20.4	205	8.8
Shelby	116	19.4	789	7.5	292	7.8	1 985	3.2	80	25.1	174	10.6
Sumter	115	20.4	1 872	4.6	200	9.4	1 129	6.3	113	21.8	125	6.2
Talladega	166	10.6	1 302	3.1	265	7.3	5 209	.9	144	14.9	161	10.6
Tallapoosa	93	17.9	534	6.9	209	10.7	1 330	3.0	64	26.1	(D)	(D)
Tuscaloosa	92	20.1	1 417	6.2	311	6.4	7 922	4.9	128	15.2	210	9.3
Walker	203	12.4	6 178	3.4	375	5.2	12 396	.9	108	23.0	39	18.1
Washington	116	16.0	4 253	1.7	230	9.6	4 671	11.2	123	15.6	73	19.4
Wilcox	58	38.2	619	7.9	166	13.5	905	8.4	84	30.7	184	27.6
Winston	297	6.1	11 851	1.1	465	3.9	23 836	1.2	79	18.5	30	15.7

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
<b>Alabama</b>	<b>25 260</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>103 080</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>13 018</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>72 317</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>36 228</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>76 567</b>	<b>.7</b>
Autauga	270	5.8	1 504	6.5	95	20.2	1 369	8.0	315	2.0	667	8.7
Baldwin	767	3.7	6 065	3.5	630	5.2	3 685	4.5	843	2.9	2 468	4.0
Barbour	327	6.3	2 822	3.4	290	7.8	2 350	6.1	401	3.0	1 540	2.1
Bibb	135	8.9	421	28.3	45	26.8	36	19.1	171	3.4	176	9.3
Blount	702	4.4	1 671	7.0	342	8.5	756	11.0	1 057	2.0	1 951	2.3
Bullock	131	13.7	668	22.2	82	18.6	293	2.9	259	4.2	960	10.4
Butler	325	7.5	930	7.2	130	18.8	542	3.1	430	2.9	719	10.9
Calhoun	369	7.8	685	7.4	157	16.3	230	17.7	567	1.1	1 016	6.2
Chambers	208	8.3	578	10.8	102	15.6	77	10.4	335	2.3	273	6.0

See footnotes at end of table.



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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
Cherokee	302	7.4	2 471	5.1	197	8.3	2 082	4.4	435	1.3	1 265	3.7
Chilton	516	4.3	1 509	8.5	261	9.9	591	7.4	629	1.5	746	6.9
Choctaw	158	9.6	324	10.0	38	33.1	15	14.8	202	4.3	192	12.5
Clarke	170	8.5	347	14.1	37	30.4	37	6.5	201	3.3	121	11.6
Clay	247	6.7	389	9.2	49	25.7	43	50.0	364	1.8	619	4.1
Cleburne	174	10.7	222	11.6	102	17.0	47	16.2	336	1.1	743	2.8
Coffee	538	4.9	2 952	3.2	352	8.3	2 579	5.8	745	1.5	2 440	3.8
Colbert	313	7.7	1 990	2.2	118	14.8	2 196	1.9	481	1.6	1 185	2.0
Conecuh	285	4.9	1 166	10.2	115	17.7	278	5.9	318	2.1	350	8.1
Coosa	100	18.4	136	21.1	26	50.5	24	84.7	182	3.9	142	19.4
Covington	570	4.8	2 788	6.0	377	8.6	2 256	6.0	789	1.8	1 588	3.9
Crenshaw	315	7.1	1 410	6.5	137	14.7	796	1.8	447	2.2	1 330	3.3
Cullman	1 226	3.7	2 200	7.3	847	5.4	1 166	17.8	2 010	1.2	4 305	2.0
Dale	284	6.1	2 118	5.8	218	7.2	2 412	3.8	397	1.6	1 249	3.3
Dallas	297	6.0	1 876	4.1	173	11.0	1 390	.9	383	3.1	1 401	2.8
De Kalb	1 007	4.4	2 648	4.1	516	7.0	1 108	8.6	1 821	1.3	3 641	1.8
Elmore	393	5.7	1 546	6.2	154	11.3	1 461	10.5	499	1.8	971	5.9
Escambia	257	8.7	1 610	7.1	154	12.2	2 270	6.8	342	1.5	745	5.1
Etowah	445	6.9	878	10.5	227	12.7	318	21.5	730	1.8	947	3.7
Fayette	162	12.5	511	9.9	60	23.4	214	11.3	292	2.5	218	8.2
Franklin	422	6.7	966	8.4	139	15.1	301	8.4	694	2.6	1 222	2.3
Geneva	595	4.1	3 581	2.8	441	6.2	2 544	3.9	788	1.3	2 683	3.2
Greene	149	9.9	476	7.5	74	21.3	103	13.8	226	5.6	500	10.6
Hale	203	10.5	790	4.3	81	21.2	451	6.0	379	1.8	1 032	2.8
Henry	296	4.9	3 828	2.2	242	7.2	4 230	3.3	336	2.7	2 255	4.4
Houston	584	4.5	4 616	2.3	468	5.5	4 104	2.2	711	2.6	2 694	2.0
Jackson	828	4.0	2 645	5.9	350	8.6	1 220	4.7	1 100	1.7	1 757	5.9
Jefferson	241	7.7	262	20.3	81	17.4	38	10.3	362	3.1	364	10.9
Lamar	243	6.3	531	9.5	108	18.1	124	11.1	292	2.6	241	7.4
Lauderdale	705	4.9	2 963	4.7	254	11.1	1 691	2.5	1 092	1.6	1 454	2.8
Lawrence	608	5.8	2 743	5.5	325	9.5	3 683	4.2	878	1.9	1 806	5.8
Lee	282	5.0	788	9.8	158	11.8	418	5.2	335	1.3	530	9.3
Limestone	664	4.4	4 010	1.5	317	8.8	4 271	1.3	879	1.7	2 231	1.8
Lowndes	165	10.9	1 020	7.1	70	20.6	1 003	7.9	297	3.0	872	6.9
Macon	241	7.2	1 010	8.3	100	19.8	832	8.1	296	2.7	628	7.2
Madison	654	4.0	4 553	2.1	354	7.9	4 287	2.2	836	1.7	2 349	1.9
Marengo	244	10.4	1 067	20.9	97	17.9	553	13.3	418	2.0	742	5.8
Marion	426	5.3	1 141	8.2	206	12.7	250	10.3	552	2.1	590	4.4
Marshall	861	4.4	1 642	6.4	467	8.4	506	11.4	1 321	1.4	2 561	2.6
Mobile	562	3.2	3 616	2.3	356	6.5	1 659	2.7	621	2.5	1 459	2.5
Monroe	298	6.3	1 819	6.7	176	10.7	2 032	2.3	381	2.2	811	3.6
Montgomery	297	8.1	1 437	4.4	79	17.7	327	6.5	572	2.2	1 235	6.0
Morgan	741	4.9	1 844	6.3	259	12.1	823	12.4	1 048	2.2	1 813	3.6
Perry	210	6.6	983	11.9	62	20.4	265	4.8	289	1.5	645	5.5
Pickens	226	8.9	680	4.6	98	16.0	573	.7	382	2.5	1 023	1.6
Pike	441	5.0	2 398	5.9	271	8.4	1 969	4.9	536	1.7	1 402	3.8
Randolph	386	5.7	527	12.5	144	14.9	76	11.5	541	1.6	796	5.6
Russell	163	8.7	650	9.7	112	14.0	583	3.7	188	6.1	495	7.0
St. Clair	369	6.0	773	7.6	140	16.3	244	13.0	513	3.0	830	4.6
Shelby	237	11.0	620	10.5	86	20.4	609	8.0	417	2.3	489	6.6
Sumter	226	8.9	664	23.2	40	32.1	161	3.3	283	4.8	573	5.3
Talladega	347	5.8	1 003	7.6	116	16.7	267	5.6	458	2.0	846	5.8
Tallahassee	152	12.1	434	27.3	80	23.1	204	6.1	291	5.4	270	6.3
Tuscaloosa	274	8.4	898	4.8	142	14.4	568	1.1	405	3.3	657	9.1
Walker	247	9.6	261	13.9	100	23.7	45	12.9	431	1.4	774	6.6
Washington	261	7.5	438	10.1	144	13.9	166	11.2	353	2.7	522	4.6
Wilcox	117	22.6	577	9.4	80	29.6	435	6.9	197	10.1	458	6.5
Winston	302	6.3	393	8.1	170	9.5	84	14.6	549	1.6	991	3.5

Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup>—Con.

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
<b>Alabama</b>	<b>19 141</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>25 232</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>12 754</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>140 414</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>3 867</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>15 095</b>	<b>1.4</b>
Autauga	145	14.7	122	10.5	115	18.4	1 545	2.8	50	28.1	194	35.2
Baldwin	556	6.1	598	4.9	306	9.9	5 160	1.8	93	18.3	932	1.8
Barbour	279	7.1	287	5.2	150	12.3	2 227	2.8	60	22.4	321	11.1
Bibb	81	13.4	28	11.1	51	22.4	175	33.2	9	58.5	13	11.9
Blount	568	6.0	928	1.6	320	8.7	2 917	1.1	162	14.4	1 172	6.6
Bullock	133	14.5	116	4.3	99	16.5	5 463	.5	54	26.8	207	19.0
Butler	243	9.5	236	11.3	147	14.5	562	7.8	25	47.0	56	9.7
Calhoun	283	10.8	378	2.8	172	15.5	2 637	.7	42	33.2	89	32.4
Chambers	118	13.0	50	11.1	94	16.0	466	10.7	34	32.0	28	25.3
Cherokee	207	9.2	317	1.8	152	13.6	5 342	1.5	52	27.5	111	36.8
Chilton	256	11.1	147	9.2	137	16.6	1 318	3.0	62	26.2	429	8.8
Choctaw	63	21.3	31	12.9	86	18.7	179	4.8	6	82.9	7	62.5
Clarke	39	29.5	15	16.8	76	19.9	99	23.9	25	37.5	48	40.5
Clay	172	11.1	170	5.8	115	14.4	1 061	7.2	53	25.6	394	4.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
Cleburne	134	11.4	376	1.0	97	14.7	1 070	2.0	20	32.1	69	2.3
Coffee	439	7.1	862	2.5	260	11.3	3 513	1.3	61	.6	264	.1
Colbert	236	10.8	213	4.5	182	11.5	1 378	.8	77	21.8	137	7.3
Conecuh	196	9.7	67	11.2	113	18.0	471	3.0	40	36.2	68	32.9
Coosa	83	20.9	27	38.1	71	24.7	53	34.4	24	50.9	19	39.0
Covington	441	7.3	402	3.9	227	11.9	3 105	1.0	75	15.5	225	8.9
Crenshaw	244	7.8	470	3.0	154	11.3	1 691	4.1	34	21.7	117	2.2
Cullman	1 134	4.1	2 424	2.4	736	5.3	5 632	2.5	249	10.6	1 420	2.3
Dale	263	7.3	264	2.5	120	13.1	1 194	6.6	42	9.5	98	4.4
Dallas	226	7.8	368	2.8	173	9.2	3 353	2.9	51	20.9	187	9.1
De Kalb	877	5.0	1 792	1.0	605	6.3	4 421	2.4	184	15.0	426	9.1
Elmore	257	8.0	182	6.0	173	10.8	1 587	1.2	20	1.7	104	.2
Escambia	218	10.2	103	7.0	75	21.5	775	11.7	33	35.6	83	5.4
Etowah	317	9.4	378	9.9	219	13.0	630	6.6	30	26.2	73	5.4
Fayette	123	18.8	51	7.0	74	23.3	211	5.0	24	48.0	33	14.2
Franklin	337	8.5	457	2.0	187	10.8	831	11.2	100	16.3	243	20.8
Geneva	503	6.2	891	1.9	291	8.7	2 863	4.1	148	14.8	383	3.4
Greene	113	10.8	133	3.4	133	12.6	784	7.3	43	28.2	71	16.9
Hale	153	11.2	662	5.9	110	12.3	1 884	1.7	32	23.8	137	2.9
Henry	241	8.5	293	5.2	157	9.3	2 728	1.9	57	16.8	316	3.5
Houston	484	6.5	577	4.6	264	8.2	3 624	2.9	85	13.6	540	7.9
Jackson	563	6.9	504	7.3	337	9.4	1 818	2.6	77	23.0	236	2.9
Jefferson	175	10.6	90	13.9	106	15.1	449	10.1	18	40.0	131	31.2
Lamar	145	14.6	47	10.6	89	20.2	275	12.7	32	42.6	19	28.7
Lauderdale	473	7.8	307	18.8	322	10.8	1 275	2.0	45	23.7	160	2.8
Lawrence	487	6.9	604	6.2	331	10.1	3 136	3.7	135	18.1	213	10.7
Lee	157	11.4	161	8.2	141	13.3	1 692	1.5	45	30.1	56	28.0
Limestone	432	7.0	452	5.6	382	7.6	7 818	1.7	66	21.2	192	12.0
Lowndes	181	11.1	200	14.3	155	12.4	1 593	9.8	42	32.0	79	16.9
Macon	149	15.4	153	6.1	151	13.7	1 588	4.3	44	34.9	41	32.4
Madison	455	6.9	494	7.0	330	8.3	3 663	3.0	93	19.1	667	4.1
Marengo	168	14.5	126	3.3	196	12.3	1 368	3.8	36	38.6	87	41.7
Marion	283	9.3	134	4.4	169	14.0	343	14.2	30	37.9	58	11.3
Marshall	755	5.5	1 817	4.9	446	8.3	4 570	1.2	125	16.1	282	6.8
Mobile	320	7.3	850	2.7	224	9.3	16 359	.2	81	15.3	1 309	.5
Monroe	256	6.4	137	9.7	122	14.6	821	2.0	31	20.9	167	.8
Montgomery	310	8.9	255	6.2	271	10.0	4 484	2.2	30	35.7	(D)	(D)
Morgan	587	6.2	803	3.0	342	10.1	2 548	2.2	94	20.8	337	15.8
Perry	148	10.9	270	8.5	154	11.7	1 208	2.4	33	33.8	62	36.2
Pickens	220	9.1	395	1.6	152	10.7	1 280	1.2	28	28.0	113	1.7
Pike	321	8.5	300	4.5	224	8.5	1 447	2.3	76	18.9	256	9.7
Randolph	219	9.8	308	2.1	163	13.1	678	8.6	36	26.6	98	23.0
Russell	108	15.4	86	9.0	73	19.9	1 028	5.0	50	25.7	96	34.2
St. Clair	296	8.6	389	6.4	178	13.9	1 217	2.3	97	21.4	398	9.2
Shelby	257	9.2	162	5.4	116	17.6	1 846	1.0	76	21.4	92	24.8
Sumter	108	16.7	113	4.4	178	10.8	948	7.0	31	45.1	44	32.7
Talladega	238	10.5	203	5.4	203	9.9	634	5.8	78	19.4	159	14.5
Tallapoosa	166	14.6	65	11.9	82	21.1	533	7.2	2	—	(D)	(D)
Tuscaloosa	218	8.3	204	12.0	163	13.4	1 063	1.8	26	26.2	182	2.8
Walker	246	10.0	302	3.8	124	18.3	889	4.8	25	24.6	128	1.0
Washington	182	11.7	137	15.2	117	15.7	597	7.2	42	30.3	93	25.2
Wilcox	128	21.2	120	14.5	118	20.2	632	13.4	31	46.0	51	24.6
Winston	228	7.9	629	2.3	154	7.7	1 664	.3	56	16.9	202	.6

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest expense			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Alabama</b>	<b>30 761</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>93 031</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>9 446</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>20 757</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>13 501</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>82 647</b>	<b>1.1</b>
Autauga	244	8.3	697	5.6	98	20.9	383	10.9	59	23.8	756	12.1
Baldwin	827	2.8	3 443	2.9	251	11.9	646	12.4	341	9.5	2 628	6.0
Barbour	353	5.4	1 763	6.7	146	11.2	602	24.8	204	10.3	1 624	4.1
Bibb	151	6.6	267	14.9	31	35.0	23	13.6	64	19.7	195	24.5
Blount	950	2.9	2 194	4.3	252	11.7	389	8.0	408	7.9	2 675	6.7
Bullock	219	8.4	646	7.4	54	31.0	151	19.9	113	18.6	638	8.2
Butler	351	6.4	725	12.3	76	20.1	89	22.8	175	14.7	937	13.0
Calhoun	480	4.8	1 054	6.3	80	24.7	107	13.4	152	14.6	874	11.4
Chambers	266	5.9	429	8.5	49	23.1	33	21.4	96	16.4	271	18.7
Cherokee	382	4.3	1 677	4.1	86	18.5	480	23.5	232	7.7	1 342	6.7
Chilton	531	4.7	1 077	10.3	84	22.0	194	15.7	137	17.6	412	11.7
Choctaw	180	6.6	192	13.5	16	55.4	6	42.3	37	28.7	159	21.6
Clarke	169	8.8	186	20.8	40	30.6	28	34.3	54	25.1	149	37.9
Clay	307	5.0	914	5.9	75	21.0	73	18.4	114	15.1	539	15.7
Cleburne	258	7.1	458	6.4	71	18.0	104	26.3	113	12.7	889	3.8
Coffee	601	5.0	2 985	4.5	262	12.7	514	9.4	369	8.4	2 789	4.9
Colbert	398	5.2	1 526	3.0	128	15.7	306	8.4	151	13.1	1 020	5.1
Conecuh	294	4.4	437	11.2	107	19.3	133	13.1	77	23.1	336	26.0
Coosa	137	11.3	142	16.5	24	50.5	31	53.4	42	37.3	158	41.3

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest expense			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Covington	665	3.7	2 247	3.2	217	12.9	457	11.9	294	9.2	1 785	4.8
Crenshaw	401	3.4	1 440	5.0	119	14.5	259	8.3	187	8.9	1 386	4.0
Cullman	1 720	2.4	5 356	1.9	623	6.4	790	7.2	938	4.7	5 927	3.3
Dale	339	4.2	1 491	3.1	106	13.1	537	2.7	155	10.2	1 517	6.4
Dallas	358	4.2	1 547	3.4	71	17.5	290	5.3	173	11.4	1 046	5.0
De Kalb	1 442	2.9	3 096	3.4	533	7.8	697	15.6	740	5.9	4 198	4.9
Elmore	437	3.9	1 186	6.3	103	17.7	278	6.9	118	15.2	964	15.0
Escambia	278	5.1	1 172	5.1	86	21.6	268	7.4	126	17.9	971	8.7
Etowah	600	4.2	1 098	5.9	157	15.7	141	15.2	225	12.8	815	9.9
Fayette	212	9.5	315	9.0	68	31.1	46	16.5	70	28.1	131	12.4
Franklin	518	5.0	804	6.0	161	14.0	222	15.0	214	9.1	1 857	6.3
Geneva	629	4.3	2 931	2.9	330	8.7	839	12.3	411	7.1	2 795	3.3
Greene	167	10.2	644	10.0	54	25.7	117	23.2	112	15.8	548	17.4
Hale	274	7.1	1 263	5.0	86	18.2	198	1.5	132	12.5	1 709	9.3
Henry	287	6.7	2 718	1.9	168	13.4	774	13.6	192	11.2	1 688	3.9
Houston	617	3.9	3 514	2.2	326	8.1	952	6.8	290	8.3	2 600	4.9
Jackson	968	3.0	1 978	6.0	228	13.7	228	10.3	442	8.2	2 025	9.4
Jefferson	307	5.2	380	10.2	46	23.8	22	25.1	93	17.0	241	19.4
Lamar	226	8.1	425	11.6	84	20.7	102	29.4	112	17.7	249	24.5
Lauderdale	909	3.5	1 635	3.8	266	11.6	694	6.6	342	9.7	1 632	11.8
Lawrence	724	3.9	2 092	7.2	301	10.5	1 110	4.7	379	8.5	1 675	7.2
Lee	298	4.1	833	14.7	58	25.0	64	30.8	127	13.3	497	20.3
Limestone	718	4.0	2 735	3.5	275	9.9	1 019	3.6	323	8.7	2 358	9.2
Lowndes	252	5.5	1 159	14.0	69	23.7	133	24.0	94	17.0	862	7.8
Macon	220	7.4	890	7.5	88	22.6	215	22.6	143	11.4	778	12.5
Madison	762	2.7	2 994	4.0	259	10.9	817	5.1	308	10.0	2 200	8.7
Marengo	341	6.7	972	5.7	62	21.5	290	25.3	164	12.3	927	13.6
Marion	462	4.7	606	12.0	129	18.4	96	29.2	208	12.4	605	11.3
Marshall	1 107	3.0	4 932	1.5	442	8.6	795	7.2	495	6.8	2 858	4.8
Mobile	497	4.4	2 607	2.3	134	13.1	594	1.7	189	10.5	1 150	8.1
Monroe	344	3.8	1 271	10.0	162	13.3	426	6.4	131	15.1	636	6.0
Montgomery	513	3.4	1 677	7.5	164	14.9	272	17.2	192	11.8	1 484	11.0
Morgan	936	3.3	2 071	4.3	333	10.8	461	11.7	354	9.3	1 749	7.0
Perry	226	7.5	827	6.9	61	20.0	161	10.0	161	11.8	1 338	12.2
Pickens	341	5.2	1 078	4.9	75	18.6	207	5.7	156	10.5	1 308	5.4
Pike	501	3.7	1 729	4.7	165	13.3	502	9.2	252	10.3	1 667	5.6
Randolph	481	3.6	949	10.6	121	17.7	98	18.1	182	12.8	975	7.7
Russell	194	4.9	657	6.0	57	24.6	128	16.2	86	17.0	590	27.8
St. Clair	479	3.9	843	7.0	106	18.9	105	28.1	148	13.8	1 227	5.2
Shelby	345	5.1	1 045	17.9	84	22.4	93	28.6	154	11.9	538	14.2
Sumter	271	6.3	495	12.1	67	23.7	60	20.3	81	20.2	530	8.0
Talladega	402	4.0	943	4.9	79	21.4	134	23.4	172	12.5	693	9.7
Tallapoosa	233	9.9	414	10.3	39	25.6	115	6.0	69	20.3	264	23.2
Tuscaloosa	376	4.3	830	4.9	60	24.1	257	2.9	139	14.5	859	18.1
Walker	355	5.3	567	9.6	72	22.4	131	9.8	98	16.3	814	11.3
Washington	312	5.1	406	7.3	70	22.3	58	25.6	69	20.6	350	20.4
Wilcox	157	15.6	566	8.9	34	45.6	69	12.5	58	35.7	328	27.7
Winston	462	4.1	793	3.8	118	14.8	147	20.3	265	7.6	901	4.4

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
<b>Alabama</b>	<b>8 876</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>47 011</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>35 150</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>16 934</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>32 239</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>170 440</b>	<b>.4</b>
Autauga	55	24.8	451	2.3	291	4.7	127	17.3	283	4.7	1 417	4.9
Baldwin	233	11.7	1 671	5.4	856	2.8	492	11.0	794	3.0	3 606	2.0
Barbour	119	13.8	1 442	.8	407	2.4	276	3.4	340	5.5	2 114	3.2
Bibb	69	19.4	60	17.8	151	6.6	60	10.6	138	9.3	287	28.3
Blount	181	13.9	520	11.7	1 059	1.8	380	4.6	962	2.9	6 034	1.0
Bullock	92	22.4	279	24.1	246	5.2	277	6.5	253	4.5	1 803	2.9
Butler	64	26.6	512	7.7	403	4.5	131	11.4	334	6.9	1 717	4.6
Calhoun	88	21.8	207	7.0	555	1.9	278	6.0	506	4.0	3 058	1.3
Chambers	49	24.7	32	17.5	318	3.3	152	10.2	276	5.5	345	8.2
Cherokee	71	16.0	600	13.1	432	1.6	286	6.1	398	3.6	4 347	.7
Chilton	171	13.3	130	13.0	577	3.3	207	9.2	527	4.3	1 249	2.8
Choctaw	71	19.0	101	16.1	210	2.7	101	4.7	171	8.0	398	7.5
Clarke	55	24.6	75	15.4	207	3.2	74	14.0	155	10.3	159	20.7
Clay	59	22.8	72	12.4	329	4.2	137	12.7	290	5.4	1 131	2.6
Cleburne	43	28.7	123	11.2	330	2.3	234	15.3	295	5.3	1 970	1.7
Coffee	248	11.9	2 261	9.9	689	2.8	397	4.8	661	3.5	5 481	1.4
Colbert	135	15.5	857	1.7	460	2.7	219	3.1	387	5.5	1 712	2.1
Conecuh	72	24.7	115	10.0	319	2.0	137	7.6	266	5.6	503	7.0
Coosa	33	38.3	36	39.8	191	1.1	78	12.6	169	6.6	109	12.4
Covington	219	13.4	1 276	5.4	751	3.1	224	4.1	660	4.2	2 733	1.9
Crenshaw	157	11.5	765	7.9	423	2.5	205	7.4	361	4.4	2 925	1.8
Cullman	435	8.4	847	4.7	2 000	1.4	733	3.8	1 810	1.9	16 541	.6
Dale	142	11.7	2 465	5.1	391	1.9	227	11.6	367	2.8	2 138	1.6
Dallas	145	12.4	982	3.7	378	3.1	243	7.8	326	4.4	3 219	4.0

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
De Kalb	439	8.1	1 072	3.3	1 790	1.7	789	15.0	1 678	2.0	10 431	1.3
Elmore	139	13.9	830	15.4	492	2.4	163	5.4	430	4.1	1 593	4.5
Escambia	160	10.8	1 130	6.9	308	4.4	114	11.4	325	4.4	957	3.9
Etowah	113	19.6	409	29.9	722	2.6	216	7.3	641	3.6	2 150	1.8
Fayette	43	28.5	75	21.1	298	1.5	72	11.6	232	8.1	414	12.4
Franklin	121	13.3	314	6.5	717	2.2	273	9.1	623	4.2	3 038	2.0
Geneva	271	9.6	1 886	5.7	752	2.7	411	4.8	735	2.8	5 133	2.6
Greene	78	21.7	238	10.0	207	6.7	139	8.0	184	8.8	554	5.2
Hale	100	14.8	542	3.8	310	6.2	212	4.5	308	5.6	2 203	1.7
Henry	160	11.9	3 714	5.4	320	5.1	240	14.9	336	3.4	2 930	2.9
Houston	293	7.6	3 752	3.6	650	3.5	284	5.1	667	3.5	4 185	2.2
Jackson	258	10.6	943	8.8	1 058	2.1	339	5.0	986	2.7	2 957	2.5
Jefferson	83	17.1	74	18.7	341	4.0	178	12.2	324	4.5	435	9.1
Lamar	48	29.1	69	9.7	278	3.6	102	11.0	242	5.3	205	7.4
Lauderdale	277	11.6	1 080	5.1	1 027	2.5	557	6.0	877	3.5	2 153	3.4
Lawrence	255	11.7	1 455	10.0	839	2.8	241	4.4	742	3.9	3 684	4.2
Lee	52	21.0	156	8.4	311	2.7	189	10.1	325	2.5	800	5.4
Limestone	222	11.2	1 373	3.1	865	1.9	385	5.8	756	3.5	5 203	1.7
Lowndes	70	19.4	723	5.1	282	4.3	230	5.1	281	4.3	1 748	5.5
Macon	79	21.8	323	5.8	276	5.4	203	7.5	261	6.0	848	5.4
Madison	232	10.3	1 893	3.9	788	2.6	588	8.7	776	2.5	4 155	2.7
Marengo	154	15.5	456	10.9	399	4.3	308	13.3	349	5.6	1 408	7.3
Marion	93	18.3	207	10.4	532	2.7	154	5.1	494	3.6	1 109	2.7
Marshall	255	12.4	853	6.7	1 308	1.6	554	4.8	1 232	2.1	8 131	.8
Mobile	88	16.6	779	2.3	622	2.3	499	5.3	558	3.5	8 011	.7
Monroe	190	11.7	766	6.4	342	4.4	151	9.9	346	4.0	999	6.3
Montgomery	175	14.0	609	14.7	519	3.3	331	9.1	547	2.7	1 571	4.8
Morgan	239	13.0	806	8.0	1 073	1.9	475	7.7	959	2.9	3 580	2.0
Perry	92	15.8	372	6.3	300	1.7	239	8.9	266	4.1	1 088	2.9
Pickens	67	19.9	214	3.6	376	3.1	190	7.1	352	4.5	3 992	.6
Pike	177	12.8	1 715	4.3	518	2.9	277	5.2	512	3.5	3 368	3.3
Randolph	43	31.0	185	3.7	534	2.2	210	7.5	465	4.0	1 856	3.0
Russell	47	23.8	305	4.4	197	4.6	204	4.7	172	7.8	676	7.4
St. Clair	87	21.4	110	21.4	517	2.8	187	6.1	500	3.6	2 793	1.9
Shelby	72	22.9	232	6.7	416	1.9	223	8.2	378	4.1	1 476	2.3
Sumter	93	18.9	144	13.6	301	4.6	221	8.7	272	7.1	822	5.1
Talladega	138	15.1	365	13.2	446	2.9	187	8.1	400	4.6	1 122	3.6
Tallapoosa	44	34.3	111	3.4	300	3.9	196	29.9	248	8.6	376	15.8
Tuscaloosa	67	19.2	324	3.9	394	3.7	209	18.2	394	2.9	1 445	7.7
Walker	57	25.8	112	26.5	399	4.2	105	20.4	354	6.3	1 607	2.8
Washington	69	20.0	185	18.2	345	3.3	108	9.5	311	5.2	914	3.5
Wilcox	74	27.4	194	4.0	193	9.8	128	7.3	181	12.4	433	13.5
Winston	56	24.4	37	18.4	515	2.9	178	7.6	491	3.1	2 892	1.2
Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) <sup>1</sup>				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)
	<b>Alabama</b>											
Alabama	<b>37 910</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>381 882</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>32 327</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>4 237 057</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>24 780</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>2 104 064</b>	<b>.4</b>
Autauga	322	1.3	853	29.6	288	1.1	57 941	.8	222	1.5	31 371	.8
Baldwin	941	1.4	7 010	9.7	859	1.0	120 586	.7	743	1.1	91 539	.6
Barbour	421	1.1	7 115	5.8	376	.9	80 496	.8	305	1.1	39 330	.5
Bibb	177	1.5	-59	(H)	159	1.4	16 095	2.9	124	2.0	6 013	2.7
Blount	1 121	1.0	13 883	2.6	978	.9	72 311	1.1	697	1.1	27 246	1.2
Bullock	271	1.4	3 424	8.4	232	1.5	53 232	1.6	185	1.9	13 300	2.3
Butler	455	1.2	2 665	10.9	368	1.2	39 345	1.6	285	1.5	16 992	1.4
Calhoun	569	1.1	6 694	4.2	469	1.1	38 404	1.9	348	1.4	16 507	2.0
Chambers	344	1.1	173	(H)	275	1.1	33 276	1.5	170	1.7	6 621	2.0
Cherokee	441	1.1	8 452	6.4	382	1.2	70 710	.9	323	1.3	46 444	.9
Chilton	638	1.2	1 992	26.8	564	1.3	46 557	1.7	446	1.5	18 785	1.5
Choctaw	215	1.7	865	21.9	190	1.5	21 557	2.1	156	1.9	6 583	2.1
Clarke	213	1.4	-105	(H)	181	1.6	17 250	2.8	122	2.3	4 645	2.9
Clay	371	1.0	3 269	12.7	290	1.0	28 707	1.7	183	1.6	5 346	2.3
Cleburne	338	1.1	5 520	3.8	245	1.2	19 465	2.1	148	2.0	6 595	2.5
Coffee	760	1.2	16 244	3.7	640	1.2	95 172	.9	528	1.3	52 177	.8
Colbert	488	1.2	3 979	5.6	432	1.1	87 663	.7	326	1.4	53 595	.4
Conecuh	326	1.0	516	53.2	287	1.2	35 924	1.6	234	1.5	15 403	1.3
Coosa	191	1.1	-189	84.3	143	1.3	11 573	2.4	98	2.0	3 322	3.8
Covington	832	1.1	6 872	5.2	734	1.1	87 932	1.2	576	1.3	36 545	.9
Crenshaw	458	1.1	8 449	6.0	394	1.0	49 613	.9	303	1.3	22 447	.8
Cullman	2 085	1.0	37 696	2.1	1 745	1.0	109 606	1.1	1 304	1.1	46 277	1.3
Dale	403	.8	7 476	5.5	356	.8	67 549	.6	290	1.0	39 214	.5
Dallas	408	1.2	3 234	14.5	353	1.2	115 821	.7	266	1.4	56 996	.5
De Kalb	1 894	1.0	28 203	2.6	1 639	1.0	121 145	1.1	1 229	1.1	60 846	.9
Elmore	520	1.2	3 135	9.7	452	1.0	59 477	1.0	332	1.3	30 033	.9
Escambia	362	1.5	3 062	9.6	337	1.1	55 162	.7	279	1.3	40 945	.7
Etowah	774	1.0	4 941	10.2	666	.9	48 161	1.3	465	1.2	19 041	1.4
Fayette	299	1.5	845	30.0	264	1.5	30 808	2.5	218	1.8	14 473	2.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) <sup>1</sup>				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)
Franklin	767	1.1	7 189	5.4	605	1.1	62 131	1.6	455	1.4	22 334	2.0
Geneva	806	1.1	17 192	4.1	704	1.1	120 851	.8	571	1.3	68 818	.7
Greene	255	1.5	1 616	19.0	218	1.7	44 588	1.6	148	2.2	12 339	2.4
Hale	381	1.8	4 996	15.3	302	1.5	58 923	1.4	237	1.8	28 695	1.3
Henry	357	1.1	10 850	4.7	325	.9	103 808	.4	274	1.1	69 183	.3
Houston	752	1.3	11 806	4.4	694	1.1	134 033	.7	602	1.2	91 289	.5
Jackson	1 139	1.2	8 380	6.5	1 044	1.2	122 380	1.1	831	1.3	73 773	1.1
Jefferson	388	1.5	207	(H)	291	1.5	18 657	2.1	208	1.9	7 165	2.3
Lamar	299	1.6	408	66.9	260	1.4	24 782	2.3	235	1.6	11 572	1.9
Lauderdale	1 143	1.2	2 638	18.1	971	1.0	126 662	.8	725	1.2	68 288	.6
Lawrence	915	1.3	8 267	7.2	795	1.3	121 151	.9	605	1.4	68 801	.8
Lee	337	1.3	3 429	8.3	278	1.2	26 380	2.1	204	1.7	8 502	2.3
Limestone	910	1.0	11 521	3.4	811	1.0	154 535	.5	634	1.1	94 637	.4
Lowndes	315	1.1	1 860	20.3	240	1.4	70 958	1.0	166	1.9	29 444	.8
Macon	311	1.6	49	(H)	251	1.5	47 758	1.4	190	1.8	17 412	1.2
Madison	873	1.0	8 677	6.0	778	1.0	164 293	.5	634	1.1	109 783	.4
Marengo	433	1.3	2 297	24.4	350	1.5	76 454	1.5	254	1.9	22 431	1.9
Marion	566	1.1	1 451	15.2	488	1.1	41 224	1.5	369	1.4	18 376	1.7
Marshall	1 363	1.0	19 709	2.4	1 161	1.0	87 676	1.4	910	1.1	44 206	1.5
Mobile	669	.9	8 888	3.8	604	.9	61 682	1.0	511	1.1	35 430	.9
Monroe	400	1.5	1 505	17.9	357	1.3	53 639	1.1	300	1.5	34 136	.9
Montgomery	597	1.1	5 939	7.7	452	1.2	95 358	1.4	316	1.5	29 096	1.0
Morgan	1 129	1.2	8 294	6.2	984	1.1	93 305	1.2	743	1.3	48 231	1.1
Perry	312	1.3	980	29.6	260	1.5	60 493	1.1	188	1.9	27 075	1.1
Pickens	403	1.2	6 739	3.3	323	1.3	44 933	1.7	254	1.6	25 281	2.1
Pike	549	1.1	7 602	6.1	472	1.0	79 960	.8	388	1.2	37 688	.6
Randolph	560	1.1	4 073	9.9	433	1.1	33 593	1.6	299	1.4	7 758	1.7
Russell	213	1.3	403	48.9	175	1.4	36 513	1.3	137	1.9	14 039	1.4
St. Clair	555	1.1	5 448	5.6	459	1.1	35 704	1.8	326	1.5	13 217	2.5
Shelby	426	1.1	719	48.5	333	1.2	38 328	1.6	247	1.6	18 416	1.7
Sumter	335	1.4	1 865	24.9	283	1.3	63 476	1.6	199	1.7	15 468	1.7
Talladega	473	1.3	1 398	24.8	408	1.2	58 491	1.4	300	1.6	26 527	2.0
Tallapoosa	318	1.5	299	(H)	230	1.6	25 933	2.2	157	2.2	7 069	2.3
Tuscaloosa	437	1.0	2 415	19.1	379	1.0	42 788	1.2	295	1.2	23 175	1.0
Walker	432	1.4	4 891	6.1	362	1.0	25 431	1.5	259	1.4	11 986	1.6
Washington	361	1.7	2 050	15.7	305	1.7	21 433	2.7	243	2.0	9 679	2.7
Wilcox	235	1.6	960	26.6	197	1.6	39 817	1.6	149	2.1	15 645	1.3
Winston	559	1.3	8 659	4.3	447	1.2	27 398	1.9	312	1.5	8 469	2.0
Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry								
Geographic area	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	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)
<b>Alabama</b>	<b>1 380</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>82 015</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>26 360</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1 453 137</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>23 925</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>771 151</b>	<b>.7</b>
Autauga	6	9.2	(D)	(D)	211	1.5	18 094	1.2	194	1.6	9 745	1.2
Baldwin	120	2.0	9 760	.5	444	1.2	31 358	1.0	390	1.3	13 662	1.3
Barbour	23	4.5	2 742	2.1	283	1.2	21 717	.9	264	1.3	12 059	.9
Bibb	7	13.0	96	21.8	141	1.6	7 411	2.6	126	1.8	(D)	(D)
Blount	49	3.8	973	2.4	829	1.0	39 441	1.2	748	1.1	19 705	1.3
Bullock	19	5.4	445	1.6	176	1.9	16 495	1.9	155	2.1	9 643	2.0
Butler	1	40.4	(D)	(D)	329	1.4	18 288	1.5	290	1.5	9 989	1.6
Calhoun	21	5.9	494	9.7	404	1.3	16 419	2.3	376	1.4	8 497	2.6
Chambers	17	5.3	339	4.1	283	1.0	16 161	1.1	267	1.1	9 028	1.1
Cherokee	19	4.1	2 169	.4	255	1.7	14 492	1.5	235	1.8	6 849	2.0
Chilton	28	6.7	287	4.7	434	1.5	18 699	2.0	405	1.6	10 386	2.2
Choctaw	1	-	(D)	(D)	173	1.7	9 022	2.1	153	1.9	5 446	2.2
Clarke	1	33.3	(D)	(D)	156	1.8	7 186	2.9	142	2.0	4 556	3.2
Clay	13	8.8	56	15.9	320	.9	16 811	1.3	299	1.0	9 911	1.6
Cleburne	5	16.2	(D)	(D)	257	1.2	10 844	1.9	236	1.3	6 139	1.9
Coffee	29	5.3	1 871	1.6	425	1.5	25 751	1.5	370	1.6	13 364	1.7
Colbert	17	6.6	3 797	.3	357	1.3	15 904	1.4	341	1.4	8 774	1.6
Conecuh	4	12.4	26	11.5	233	1.5	15 112	1.9	216	1.6	8 312	2.2
Coosa	6	11.3	23	16.5	162	1.0	6 437	1.9	154	1.1	3 902	1.7
Covington	24	6.3	2 330	.6	557	1.4	31 167	1.5	499	1.5	15 958	1.6
Crenshaw	25	4.5	2 770	1.1	301	1.3	21 370	.9	267	1.4	11 471	1.0
Cullman	34	5.0	574	15.6	1 490	1.1	67 839	1.1	1 377	1.1	35 262	1.2
Dale	31	4.6	2 693	1.1	251	1.2	15 542	1.4	227	1.3	8 199	1.2
Dallas	13	4.6	326	.9	301	1.3	32 854	1.1	274	1.4	18 309	1.2
De Kalb	24	6.0	514	4.5	1 378	1.1	55 871	1.3	1 269	1.1	31 409	1.5
Elmore	30	4.9	964	3.9	358	1.3	18 179	1.3	318	1.4	8 980	1.6
Escambia	14	7.0	989	.7	212	1.7	12 003	2.0	181	1.9	6 376	2.3
Etowah	21	5.1	242	5.4	578	1.0	22 270	1.2	534	1.1	11 708	1.4
Fayette	2	30.6	(D)	(D)	201	2.0	9 514	3.0	176	2.2	4 471	3.9
Franklin	8	7.2	(D)	(D)	582	1.2	26 018	1.4	519	1.3	13 773	1.5
Geneva	46	4.4	2 503	2.1	470	1.4	29 267	1.5	423	1.5	14 754	1.7
Greene	10	10.2	647	2.7	189	1.9	16 244	1.4	163	2.1	8 756	1.7
Hale	4	15.8	(D)	(D)	276	1.6	30 996	.8	240	1.8	14 475	1.0
Henry	20	4.4	2 958	.1	225	1.3	16 567	1.1	205	1.3	9 624	1.0

See footnotes at end of table.

**Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 – 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			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	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)
Houston	63	2.5	7 731	.4	417	1.3	28 245	1.2	380	1.4	14 459	1.3
Jackson	16	7.7	751	1.7	807	1.3	34 876	1.4	725	1.4	16 791	1.7
Jefferson	24	6.0	143	3.7	223	1.8	7 274	2.2	206	1.9	(D)	(D)
Lamar	4	16.0	(D)	(D)	215	1.8	7 495	2.4	191	2.0	3 867	3.1
Lauderdale	18	6.0	808	1.3	869	1.1	39 858	1.1	798	1.1	21 166	1.2
Lawrence	12	9.2	1 004	2.9	682	1.4	30 278	1.5	628	1.4	16 096	1.6
Lee	38	4.5	408	10.9	220	1.5	10 287	2.3	205	1.6	(D)	(D)
Limestone	31	3.5	3 036	.2	608	1.2	25 440	1.2	557	1.2	14 018	1.3
Lowndes	10	9.0	2 556	1.7	261	1.3	38 359	.9	236	1.5	22 497	1.1
Macon	20	5.9	2 310	.6	203	1.8	13 336	1.6	182	2.0	7 230	1.9
Madison	32	4.4	2 692	1.8	529	1.3	27 447	1.1	463	1.4	15 104	1.2
Marengo	9	13.0	32	27.6	350	1.6	37 078	1.3	315	1.7	20 105	1.4
Marion	3	22.4	(D)	(D)	405	1.3	16 029	1.7	367	1.4	8 498	1.8
Marshall	19	7.0	202	5.2	971	1.1	41 053	1.3	880	1.2	22 504	1.4
Mobile	132	2.1	3 095	.7	308	1.6	19 223	1.4	272	1.7	9 005	1.7
Monroe	6	—	1 022	—	253	1.8	14 880	1.7	206	2.0	8 032	1.9
Montgomery	16	6.3	226	1.9	454	1.2	41 671	1.0	406	1.3	23 037	1.2
Morgan	26	5.4	241	5.1	851	1.2	40 326	1.4	771	1.3	19 458	1.7
Perry	7	14.2	140	9.9	240	1.6	20 725	1.4	218	1.8	10 711	1.5
Pickens	12	9.7	1 170	4.8	259	1.6	13 952	2.0	238	1.8	7 215	2.1
Pike	35	2.4	4 460	1.1	402	1.1	30 774	1.0	377	1.2	17 168	1.1
Randolph	3	—	(D)	(D)	469	1.1	20 613	1.4	433	1.2	12 276	1.4
Russell	12	7.5	1 903	.2	123	2.1	6 734	2.6	111	2.2	(D)	(D)
St. Clair	35	4.5	1 568	3.6	409	1.3	17 319	2.0	380	1.3	9 936	2.2
Shelby	18	6.7	(D)	(D)	270	1.5	13 627	1.9	244	1.6	6 356	3.1
Sumter	7	10.8	361	28.0	260	1.5	23 980	1.1	225	1.6	12 124	1.3
Talladega	22	7.4	741	10.3	347	1.4	19 860	1.6	322	1.5	10 609	1.8
Tallahassee	12	7.9	255	1.1	245	1.6	11 712	1.9	227	1.7	6 054	2.1
Tuscaloosa	24	4.3	995	4.0	287	1.2	13 144	1.5	249	1.4	6 265	2.0
Walker	7	9.2	487	6.5	336	1.1	9 998	1.4	311	1.2	5 472	1.6
Washington	6	11.2	32	19.8	246	2.0	9 711	2.9	218	2.2	5 611	2.9
Wilcox	4	19.6	32	22.7	174	1.9	18 475	1.5	156	2.0	9 968	1.6
Winston	5	15.1	59	13.9	426	1.2	18 015	1.4	395	1.3	9 205	1.6

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)
<b>Alabama</b>	<b>995</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>45 454</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>1 880</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>307 672</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>11 016</b>	<b>2.9</b>
Autauga	4	16.3	103	13.2	14	7.2	9 585	.2	3	19.1	(D)	(D)
Baldwin	23	5.6	960	1.5	31	4.7	4 580	1.4	18	7.3	311	11.6
Barbour	6	11.9	79	4.5	65	2.9	8 907	2.0	2	—	(D)	(D)
Bibb	3	12.2	(D)	(D)	7	13.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Blount	29	4.7	1 270	1.0	30	6.4	6 840	.9	5	14.4	70	19.8
Bullock	7	13.8	400	8.6	6	14.4	(D)	(D)	3	—	445	—
Butler	13	9.7	324	7.1	48	4.7	3 516	4.9	3	25.0	(D)	(D)
Calhoun	17	8.3	530	3.6	19	7.4	(D)	(D)	5	15.7	43	22.3
Chambers	10	8.4	208	1.7	13	9.9	59	18.1	5	14.9	140	14.1
Cherokee	13	9.2	292	1.8	19	6.8	2 592	3.6	4	17.2	135	17.8
Chilton	17	8.9	215	12.1	24	7.2	2 280	7.4	3	16.4	49	15.6
Choctaw	5	17.2	44	13.3	8	13.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Clarke	5	18.0	28	21.2	14	9.6	777	4.8	—	—	—	—
Clay	9	5.6	392	3.0	7	11.4	(D)	(D)	3	15.0	111	18.8
Cleburne	6	10.5	120	2.2	14	7.7	2 064	2.1	2	26.1	(D)	(D)
Coffee	19	6.9	769	2.2	80	3.6	7 530	6.7	2	25.0	(D)	(D)
Colbert	6	14.2	13	14.7	19	6.1	4 571	.7	7	11.4	132	11.0
Conecuh	11	9.2	337	3.0	21	7.6	1 070	15.8	5	12.6	346	15.9
Coosa	4	13.4	16	16.0	8	11.0	162	14.5	2	22.9	(D)	(D)
Covington	13	7.3	743	1.9	79	3.8	5 412	4.9	5	16.3	111	19.4
Crenshaw	14	8.6	720	1.8	53	3.8	4 984	1.6	4	14.6	16	8.2
Cullman	41	4.5	2 020	.8	52	4.8	8 742	6.7	24	6.6	935	12.0
Dale	9	9.7	53	13.0	36	4.6	2 861	6.2	2	23.3	(D)	(D)
Dallas	18	6.3	687	1.0	14	9.7	817	1.6	1	—	(D)	(D)
De Kalb	45	4.6	1 800	.9	94	3.3	44 732	.8	17	8.9	205	8.8
Elmore	27	5.0	1 501	2.6	9	9.1	7 049	.3	5	18.3	96	18.7
Escambia	14	8.5	398	6.6	15	7.6	543	9.4	3	15.4	5	18.4
Etowah	17	5.4	853	2.3	21	6.8	1 111	8.4	11	10.2	127	13.4
Fayette	12	8.5	725	.6	11	10.0	1 586	6.7	4	19.7	176	42.2
Franklin	21	6.2	924	2.7	14	9.5	871	13.8	4	20.7	110	27.8
Geneva	9	7.6	1 085	.3	98	3.0	8 889	2.9	2	17.5	(D)	(D)
Greene	9	12.3	416	1.9	19	8.4	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)
Hale	22	4.9	1 835	.4	18	8.6	938	17.5	2	23.6	(D)	(D)
Henry	6	7.1	58	11.2	43	3.5	9 458	3.1	2	14.2	(D)	(D)
Houston	7	8.2	831	.3	79	2.5	9 591	2.9	—	—	—	—
Jackson	34	5.7	1 294	1.1	76	3.9	15 952	1.6	7	14.9	178	19.2
Jefferson	6	12.5	(D)	(D)	21	7.5	842	9.4	2	27.7	(D)	(D)
Lamar	10	7.9	475	2.3	20	7.1	2 598	3.2	1	—	(D)	(D)
Lauderdale	25	7.0	625	2.2	57	3.9	8 675	1.7	20	7.3	898	14.1

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry – Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Lawrence	25	6.1	851	5.7	47	5.0	5 812	2.3	7	14.7	106	21.0
Lee	5	14.2	(D)	(D)	14	8.0	1 195	4.1	8	11.2	331	19.5
Limestone	18	5.7	547	2.8	24	6.0	2 918	1.5	9	11.8	353	19.2
Lowndes	21	6.8	384	6.8	16	8.3	444	3.5	1	–	(D)	(D)
Macon	9	8.3	630	1.3	15	8.9	396	4.1	1	50.0	(D)	(D)
Madison	25	5.6	913	3.3	48	4.7	5 241	2.5	4	12.7	(D)	(D)
Marengo	20	7.1	1 814	.9	10	12.4	341	29.4	1	40.7	(D)	(D)
Marion	11	9.4	276	5.5	17	7.5	2 183	1.8	–	–	–	–
Marshall	24	6.0	1 478	2.3	50	4.7	5 923	2.9	10	10.1	212	21.6
Mobile	12	5.5	1 216	.2	24	6.2	6 057	2.1	8	11.5	230	7.2
Monroe	22	6.5	353	2.2	46	4.5	6 222	1.6	2	25.0	(D)	(D)
Montgomery	15	7.2	793	2.7	19	8.6	3 201	4.8	12	9.3	390	18.9
Morgan	31	5.7	2 863	1.1	31	6.2	2 243	12.6	7	13.0	488	32.7
Perry	17	3.3	1 248	.3	19	7.5	2 656	1.1	1	–	(D)	(D)
Pickens	9	6.1	870	.2	14	9.3	2 534	5.6	–	–	–	–
Pike	17	7.1	380	5.3	38	4.3	3 456	3.4	2	30.3	(D)	(D)
Randolph	19	7.4	413	3.8	19	6.5	1 122	16.1	10	8.4	201	12.8
Russell	5	12.9	(D)	(D)	9	11.3	1 339	5.4	3	15.5	(D)	(D)
St. Clair	13	8.4	571	3.8	17	6.3	22 090	.1	3	18.6	111	23.7
Shelby	11	4.0	1 521	.2	5	9.7	(D)	–	7	10.7	157	16.8
Sumter	14	8.8	94	11.6	17	8.3	309	14.1	1	–	(D)	(D)
Talladega	16	8.2	821	2.8	6	12.6	2 144	.8	4	19.2	246	25.9
Tallapoosa	8	13.4	44	20.0	6	14.1	36	21.8	6	12.6	63	13.0
Tuscaloosa	10	6.5	1 433	.1	10	7.3	1 304	9.1	3	18.5	44	19.4
Walker	9	9.1	86	4.2	17	7.4	(D)	(D)	4	13.9	152	15.3
Washington	10	11.4	51	10.6	32	6.2	4 779	7.5	6	15.8	127	16.0
Wilcox	5	16.5	44	25.5	16	9.4	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)
Winston	28	5.6	1 533	1.5	18	7.5	3 538	1.9	9	10.5	38	7.3

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry – Con.							
	Hens and pullets of laying age inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Alabama</b>	<b>1 533</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>11 848 768</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>2 460</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>737 608 903</b>	<b>–</b>
Autauga	12	10.0	154	14.2	–	–	–	–
Baldwin	49	4.3	(D)	(D)	1	27.6	(D)	(D)
Barbour	17	6.7	190	7.2	6	–	3 371 173	–
Bibb	11	9.9	117	13.7	–	–	–	–
Blount	50	3.5	1 313 031	1.0	138	.7	49 510 172	.1
Bullock	13	9.9	41 583	(L)	6	–	2 102 368	–
Butler	19	7.9	(D)	(D)	42	1.8	9 783 558	.4
Calhoun	24	6.5	123 164	3.2	34	1.3	11 904 644	(L)
Chambers	9	10.3	235	12.0	–	–	–	–
Cherokee	5	14.6	(D)	(D)	7	–	7 634 000	–
Chilton	19	7.8	354	8.8	–	–	–	–
Choctaw	12	10.8	215	11.8	8	–	2 401 000	–
Clarke	12	9.7	845	17.8	–	–	–	–
Clay	21	5.6	793 574	1.0	29	1.7	6 504 040	.7
Cleburne	15	3.4	190 023	1.1	65	1.1	16 497 148	.2
Coffee	26	5.8	350 370	1.1	117	.7	37 163 342	.2
Colbert	16	7.6	72 382	6.4	19	–	7 245 551	–
Conecuh	14	9.6	310	9.8	–	–	–	–
Coosa	8	11.5	131	12.1	–	–	–	–
Covington	34	5.3	141 067	5.5	47	–	13 171 213	–
Crenshaw	17	6.4	131 818	(L)	68	.7	19 328 886	.1
Cullman	111	2.3	1 795 765	1.3	401	.4	121 253 358	.1
Dale	16	7.1	270	9.3	25	2.3	9 930 492	.2
Dallas	28	6.4	(D)	(D)	1	33.7	(D)	(D)
De Kalb	81	2.7	1 038 947	1.5	270	.5	79 349 113	.1
Elmore	12	10.3	163	12.2	2	–	(D)	(D)
Escambia	9	10.9	123	12.2	–	–	–	–
Etowah	24	7.0	26 091	19.0	64	.7	18 012 245	.2
Fayette	6	14.5	129	22.0	2	–	(D)	(D)
Franklin	28	6.0	159 201	6.3	99	.6	29 779 030	.3
Geneva	31	5.5	239 683	3.9	91	1.0	30 909 988	.1
Greene	19	8.5	334	10.1	–	–	–	–
Hale	19	7.8	476	10.0	1	–	(D)	(D)
Henry	7	10.0	126	9.1	–	–	–	–
Houston	18	7.4	126 825	1.8	4	–	1 130 500	–
Jackson	57	4.6	258 818	4.4	55	1.4	14 836 104	.3
Jefferson	22	6.8	1 503	26.4	2	–	(D)	(D)
Lamar	10	10.0	158	16.4	4	–	570 000	–
Lauderdale	38	5.5	936	9.0	10	4.5	2 482 507	(L)
Lawrence	20	7.1	241 104	5.2	67	1.4	16 657 713	.4
Lee	17	7.6	(D)	(D)	2	15.1	(D)	(D)
Limestone	24	6.7	(D)	(D)	8	–	3 529 000	–
Lowndes	9	11.3	102	10.4	15	–	4 903 000	–
Macon	12	10.7	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Livestock and poultry – Con.										
Geographic area	Hens and pullets of laying age inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold					
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Madison .....	25	5.9	682 288	(L)	5	–	1 800 000	–	–	
Marengo .....	12	11.9	249	14.2	–	–	–	–	–	
Marion .....	18	7.9	56 002	12.9	32	1.1	7 344 200	.1	–	
Marshall .....	53	3.3	1 193 456	.6	174	.4	52 461 272	.1	–	
Mobile .....	34	5.5	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	
Monroe .....	19	7.5	261	9.3	–	–	–	–	–	
Montgomery .....	29	6.9	(D)	(D)	6	–	2 435 000	–	–	
Morgan .....	23	7.1	73 534	6.1	82	.8	23 077 140	.1	–	
Perry .....	3	23.5	60	34.3	–	–	–	–	–	
Pickens .....	17	7.7	279 755	.8	83	1.1	26 502 207	.1	–	
Pike .....	19	6.0	111 324	(L)	39	1.0	11 642 190	.1	–	
Randolph .....	41	3.4	673 618	.4	56	.8	13 920 229	.2	–	
Russell .....	13	8.5	320	11.0	1	33.8	(D)	(D)	–	
St. Clair .....	15	9.6	346	15.6	49	–	19 742 558	–	–	
Shelby .....	20	7.4	523	13.2	–	–	–	–	–	
Sumter .....	21	7.5	272	9.0	–	–	–	–	–	
Talladega .....	11	10.9	(D)	(D)	25	2.4	5 203 938	.5	–	
Tallapoosa .....	17	8.3	(D)	(D)	5	–	975 000	–	–	
Tuscaloosa .....	17	7.3	250	10.9	14	4.3	7 076 769	.5	–	
Walker .....	16	6.6	27 017	.2	44	1.3	14 740 832	.1	–	
Washington .....	30	6.7	129 218	5.6	25	3.4	4 092 482	1.3	–	
Wilcox .....	25	7.3	475	10.7	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	
Winston .....	34	4.5	564 011	1.7	109	.9	24 231 408	.2	–	

  

Selected crops harvested												
Geographic area	Corn for grain or seed					Wheat for grain						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
<b>Alabama .....</b>	<b>5 305</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>281 053</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>24 941 228</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>86 071</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>3 461 454</b>	<b>.4</b>
Autauga .....	44	4.0	2 169	2.0	152 308	1.8	13	6.5	2 028	1.7	56 396	2.5
Baldwin .....	144	1.8	12 800	.7	1 364 257	.7	84	2.1	9 487	1.5	408 747	1.3
Barbour .....	103	2.2	4 476	1.3	332 652	1.2	5	–	155	–	4 704	–
Bibb .....	12	10.4	210	18.6	7 365	20.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Blount .....	79	3.6	2 925	2.6	298 670	2.5	4	19.4	145	23.7	4 300	21.1
Bullock .....	24	6.0	925	3.0	72 050	2.0	6	10.7	174	1.6	3 670	2.1
Butler .....	51	4.7	2 740	1.4	214 032	1.4	3	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Calhoun .....	45	4.6	2 341	1.9	230 543	1.9	9	9.6	690	7.1	28 607	7.5
Chambers .....	23	5.6	305	3.2	21 651	2.0	2	13.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cherokee .....	55	3.9	3 054	2.5	298 284	3.1	12	7.3	1 636	1.9	75 749	1.9
Chilton .....	66	4.1	951	5.0	42 664	5.2	1	46.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Choctaw .....	31	6.4	552	4.1	27 894	4.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Clarke .....	26	6.4	822	3.7	57 506	2.6	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Clay .....	15	7.8	205	14.1	9 060	12.2	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cleburne .....	26	6.1	1 067	4.3	90 660	2.6	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Coffee .....	199	2.0	9 138	1.2	735 174	1.4	33	4.1	1 691	3.5	69 874	3.4
Colbert .....	68	3.3	4 420	2.3	471 177	2.6	15	4.2	2 245	.8	95 212	.6
Conecuh .....	88	2.9	3 854	1.7	307 284	1.4	4	13.2	585	1.8	12 300	3.0
Coosa .....	5	11.3	16	14.9	745	25.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Covington .....	172	2.5	4 371	2.0	307 658	2.0	13	7.3	674	4.3	26 086	4.0
Crenshaw .....	100	2.4	3 752	1.6	346 415	1.8	8	5.6	530	2.2	19 900	2.3
Cullman .....	160	2.8	4 199	4.9	426 972	4.1	12	10.3	434	8.0	16 235	7.6
Dale .....	107	2.1	7 839	.9	566 165	.7	15	4.3	1 177	.6	37 320	.6
Dallas .....	48	4.1	4 018	.8	294 045	.6	16	2.1	4 096	.1	162 689	.1
De Kalb .....	296	1.8	18 285	1.3	2 106 741	1.2	18	3.6	1 493	3.1	45 913	2.5
Elmore .....	51	4.0	1 357	2.3	112 075	2.2	8	9.1	590	13.1	18 000	13.2
Escambia .....	110	2.3	7 882	1.6	754 528	1.2	30	4.4	2 490	2.7	121 701	3.1
Etowah .....	67	3.6	2 430	4.0	224 955	4.3	5	11.9	205	7.3	8 907	5.5
Fayette .....	85	3.6	4 241	4.4	361 782	3.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Franklin .....	88	3.7	3 825	5.2	331 726	5.4	8	12.5	471	11.9	17 715	12.3
Geneva .....	275	1.8	15 233	1.2	1 127 156	1.2	30	4.9	1 343	2.7	49 257	2.2
Greene .....	40	5.1	1 997	4.0	139 797	5.9	7	10.5	289	11.2	6 805	6.2
Hale .....	52	4.2	2 559	2.7	227 271	2.8	22	5.6	3 662	3.7	129 905	2.2
Henry .....	116	1.5	9 621	.5	616 238	.5	32	1.3	2 327	.3	83 391	.2
Houston .....	284	1.5	19 484	.7	1 547 077	.6	48	2.3	3 854	.9	156 835	.8
Jackson .....	228	2.2	20 567	1.4	2 063 760	1.4	24	4.9	2 311	2.1	100 383	1.8
Jefferson .....	21	7.1	136	6.8	7 023	8.3	1	35.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lamar .....	86	3.4	2 993	3.8	229 834	4.5	4	16.4	461	5.4	20 965	4.4
Lauderdale .....	172	2.1	6 990	1.7	653 177	1.5	64	2.8	3 820	1.7	143 161	1.4
Lawrence .....	96	3.4	4 859	1.4	478 593	.9	36	4.8	2 157	2.0	95 839	1.9
Lee .....	19	6.9	641	2.9	43 442	1.7	3	12.3	35	10.5	1 000	14.7
Limestone .....	97	2.6	5 484	1.1	533 558	1.0	38	3.4	2 558	2.2	106 424	2.1
Lowndes .....	13	8.6	1 198	.8	66 974	.4	4	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Macon .....	20	6.5	673	2.7	35 603	2.3	5	8.0	592	1.6	17 515	1.4
Madison .....	156	2.1	14 356	.6	1 416 529	.6	69	2.5	10 307	.8	494 861	.5
Marengo .....	41	6.0	811	5.0	68 683	3.1	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Marion .....	128	2.7	5 160	3.1	361 161	3.0	10	7.5	1 528	2.8	59 522	3.4
Marshall .....	151	2.5	12 999	2.4	1 404 640	2.5	2	30.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Mobile .....	49	4.2	6 193	1.9	600 786	1.3	11	7.5	2 610	3.1	113 131	1.9

See footnotes at end of table.



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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed					Wheat for grain						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Monroe	129	2.5	6 297	1.7	522 311	1.8	5	—	134	—	3 240	—
Montgomery	18	6.4	517	2.8	37 793	1.6	12	5.1	1 358	2.8	47 534	2.4
Morgan	66	3.9	3 007	1.8	314 028	1.7	29	4.8	2 702	2.0	110 139	1.7
Perry	41	5.4	878	2.0	52 074	1.2	12	5.6	2 135	.9	56 703	.9
Pickens	33	5.6	2 520	2.4	162 994	3.4	10	9.6	1 114	14.3	43 154	12.1
Pike	103	2.4	3 958	.9	370 651	.8	16	3.3	829	3.3	37 667	2.8
Randolph	76	3.5	765	5.9	37 625	8.1	3	18.2	105	13.5	5 135	8.3
Russell	26	5.3	789	4.0	45 311	3.3	6	—	616	—	31 030	—
St. Clair	32	6.1	188	9.8	10 990	12.2	1	47.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Shelby	19	7.0	346	14.2	22 474	16.1	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Sumter	37	4.8	1 969	5.0	148 387	6.1	3	20.4	90	23.2	2 000	22.1
Talladega	48	4.9	2 412	6.1	190 310	7.1	18	5.3	3 234	1.6	125 964	1.4
Tallapoosa	12	10.9	145	14.1	8 083	12.5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tuscaloosa	66	3.3	3 634	1.8	309 519	2.1	4	7.3	720	4.0	37 950	4.2
Walker	29	5.8	248	5.7	12 715	8.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington	75	4.0	2 512	4.7	194 529	5.6	8	12.0	564	9.1	26 101	11.6
Wilcox	28	5.8	3 309	.8	283 554	.9	4	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Winston	35	6.0	436	3.9	29 540	3.5	—	—	—	—	—	—

Selected crops harvested – Con.

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested – Con.											
	Cotton					Soybeans for beans						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	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)
<b>Alabama</b>	<b>1 469</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>431 665</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>601 506</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>2 065</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>305 713</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>8 871 365</b>	<b>.5</b>
Autauga	38	3.4	13 532	.8	17 508	.7	5	10.9	202	17.8	5 704	15.1
Baldwin	24	2.8	6 044	1.1	10 788	.9	247	1.7	45 486	.9	1 446 378	.8
Barbour	26	1.7	5 953	.6	10 163	.2	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Bibb	1	—	—	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Blount	12	8.1	2 284	4.5	2 387	4.6	21	7.3	1 102	5.4	44 508	4.9
Bullock	3	23.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	7	7.1	493	1.5	10 148	.6
Butler	5	12.2	1 299	.3	1 751	.1	5	8.6	1 083	1.6	31 707	1.6
Calhoun	7	12.8	761	6.1	956	6.4	32	5.4	4 118	4.5	133 729	4.4
Chambers	1	—	—	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cherokee	96	2.6	21 453	.9	29 824	1.0	99	2.6	14 760	1.8	398 182	1.8
Chilton	7	9.4	1 561	.7	1 863	.7	3	21.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Choctaw	2	—	—	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Clarke	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Clay	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cleburne	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	926	—	25 550	—
Coffee	28	2.5	3 565	.5	4 811	.5	6	—	426	—	15 400	—
Colbert	68	2.6	33 801	.4	38 029	.4	29	3.0	4 314	.8	134 474	.6
Conecuh	10	6.1	2 134	1.6	3 055	1.4	6	10.7	719	4.9	18 167	6.7
Coosa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Covington	38	4.2	6 109	1.3	9 283	1.1	30	5.6	1 266	5.1	34 655	5.5
Crenshaw	13	2.5	1 972	.5	2 648	.6	3	10.9	258	3.8	6 996	3.2
Cullman	10	8.9	1 374	3.4	1 209	2.3	63	4.2	5 480	3.9	186 108	4.2
Dale	10	—	3 624	—	5 181	—	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Dallas	51	3.2	16 435	1.1	20 452	.9	30	2.5	18 294	.4	511 155	1.1
De Kalb	9	12.2	431	15.9	387	14.9	130	2.8	9 954	2.0	311 390	2.0
Elmore	52	2.5	18 561	1.1	25 811	1.0	4	7.5	469	4.4	13 080	5.9
Escambia	70	2.2	16 580	.8	25 590	.6	83	2.5	10 088	1.6	340 740	1.6
Etowah	22	6.1	2 306	1.9	2 924	1.8	36	5.0	3 294	4.1	88 955	3.9
Fayette	12	9.1	2 244	4.7	1 870	6.3	14	9.2	1 500	8.4	46 843	9.8
Franklin	6	10.6	1 075	6.5	1 253	5.4	23	7.1	3 480	3.7	83 390	3.7
Geneva	43	3.2	5 597	1.2	8 647	1.0	57	3.6	3 727	2.7	101 522	3.1
Greene	7	6.5	405	5.4	659	7.0	9	11.0	1 582	13.8	39 119	13.1
Hale	9	8.3	1 763	.4	2 160	.7	33	3.3	8 737	1.8	281 036	2.1
Henry	42	2.1	6 574	.5	9 642	.2	6	—	313	—	7 384	—
Houston	31	3.2	3 568	1.5	4 122	1.4	112	2.1	8 283	1.2	238 932	1.4
Jackson	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	150	2.7	26 964	1.7	701 001	1.7
Jefferson	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	42.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lamar	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	12	7.7	2 057	4.3	51 706	3.0
Lauderdale	92	1.9	29 001	.5	34 865	.5	73	2.6	6 398	1.2	194 019	1.2
Lawrence	80	2.9	39 939	.6	54 780	.6	64	3.6	5 942	3.5	186 748	2.9
Lee	11	6.6	2 870	3.9	3 469	3.2	1	37.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Limestone	136	1.9	58 686	.2	90 211	.2	116	2.1	12 799	1.1	402 867	1.1
Lowndes	6	8.3	7 725	1.1	9 180	1.4	8	9.3	4 162	1.7	107 472	2.4
Macon	23	4.3	5 576	1.7	7 009	1.5	10	7.2	1 154	7.0	27 648	6.7
Madison	104	2.2	38 577	.4	60 914	.5	161	1.9	29 797	.8	882 137	.9
Marengo	8	—	2 540	—	3 352	—	4	12.2	1 120	21.0	25 578	20.5
Marion	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	27	5.4	2 703	4.2	67 161	5.8
Marshall	9	10.9	498	13.7	327	12.7	88	3.5	7 700	4.3	189 919	4.3
Mobile	13	5.8	6 172	.8	8 861	.5	28	4.0	6 088	2.3	189 088	1.8
Monroe	82	2.5	18 275	.6	30 114	.6	37	3.7	2 305	3.0	61 727	3.0
Montgomery	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	7	6.6	2 592	1.3	69 113	.4
Morgan	18	5.6	4 523	2.0	5 836	2.2	62	3.8	9 105	1.8	289 481	1.7
Perry	—	—	—	—	—	—	28	4.2	13 670	1.5	318 404	.9
Pickens	15	5.4	5 244	.4	7 281	.3	16	6.9	7 065	4.6	179 501	5.3

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested — Con.												
	Cotton					Soybeans for beans							
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	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)	
Pike .....	31	2.5	2 763	.2	3 785	.3	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Randolph .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	37.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Russell .....	11	4.9	4 823	.3	7 243	.2	5	13.7	267	12.7	8 602	12.9	
St. Clair .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	28.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Shelby .....	27	4.9	5 749	2.5	8 016	2.6	3	20.4	210	20.3	3 600	20.9	
Sumter .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	7.0	—	2 520	5.7	95 928	6.1
Talladega .....	4	11.0	949	1.2	1 450	1.5	27	5.7	7 238	3.5	158 791	3.5	
Tallapoosa .....	5	12.7	1 830	2.2	2 931	2.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Tuscaloosa .....	25	3.5	7 541	1.1	9 870	1.1	6	—	765	—	26 560	—	
Walker .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Washington .....	1	—	(D)	—	(D)	—	11	10.6	803	10.6	25 777	11.7	
Wilcox .....	6	7.5	2 565	.9	4 151	.8	4	—	(D)	(D)	17 081	—	
Winston .....	1	—	(D)	—	(D)	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	

  

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested — Con.											
	Peanuts for nuts					Hay — alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Alabama .....</b>	<b>2 254</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>237 516</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>586 013 571</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>17 480</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>678 726</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>1 409 044</b>	<b>.7</b>
Autauga .....	13	8.4	313	6.5	819 830	7.1	149	2.0	10 404	1.5	25 550	2.1
Baldwin .....	1	42.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	273	1.5	9 722	1.8	19 262	2.2
Barbour .....	157	1.5	21 994	.6	55 376 360	.6	154	1.8	5 043	1.8	15 682	1.3
Bibb .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	107	2.2	5 490	2.9	10 067	3.1
Blount .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	544	1.3	17 307	1.4	35 718	1.6
Bullock .....	13	6.2	940	3.0	2 500 612	2.7	109	2.7	6 889	3.2	12 070	2.4
Butler .....	20	5.6	2 143	2.3	5 441 478	2.5	230	1.8	9 422	2.6	21 023	3.3
Calhoun .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	269	1.7	8 228	2.9	13 825	2.8
Chambers .....	1	41.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	134	2.0	5 470	2.4	11 195	2.8
Cherokee .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	176	2.2	5 367	2.2	11 321	2.3
Chilton .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	288	2.0	10 152	2.3	20 725	2.8
Choctaw .....	2	27.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	132	2.2	5 336	2.6	9 378	3.3
Clarke .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	97	2.7	3 668	3.6	8 259	4.4
Clay .....	2	20.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	150	1.8	4 840	2.5	10 578	3.7
Cleburne .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	127	2.1	4 215	3.8	6 333	4.0
Coffee .....	299	1.7	27 940	.9	70 012 664	.9	276	1.8	7 227	1.8	18 578	1.6
Colbert .....	1	35.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	241	1.7	9 906	1.7	15 568	2.8
Conecuh .....	23	4.5	1 815	3.1	3 835 885	2.7	162	2.0	6 110	2.7	14 730	2.7
Coosa .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	81	2.2	3 253	3.9	5 838	4.7
Covington .....	168	2.4	11 728	1.1	31 453 405	1.0	298	1.9	7 364	2.2	21 764	2.5
Crenshaw .....	93	2.1	7 188	1.0	19 264 867	1.2	196	1.7	7 610	1.6	20 460	1.6
Cullman .....	11	9.0	97	19.3	216 200	22.5	1 080	1.2	31 268	1.5	67 286	1.7
Dale .....	166	1.6	21 315	.6	55 158 553	.6	146	1.8	4 461	1.6	11 998	1.5
Dallas .....	4	19.5	4	19.5	5 600	21.9	193	1.7	14 186	1.4	36 732	1.4
De Kalb .....	2	17.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	995	1.2	26 024	1.4	53 829	1.6
Elmore .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	212	1.8	7 891	2.2	19 053	1.9
Escambia .....	12	7.5	367	6.3	614 700	6.4	133	2.3	4 423	3.0	10 458	4.4
Etowah .....	1	41.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	377	1.3	10 161	1.8	22 014	2.1
Fayette .....	4	22.9	4	22.9	6 818	29.7	153	2.5	6 038	4.0	11 357	4.5
Franklin .....	4	17.1	6	21.0	4 709	26.0	399	1.5	12 985	2.1	22 149	2.5
Geneva .....	377	1.6	31 210	.7	72 725 591	.8	248	2.0	7 369	1.9	14 958	2.4
Greene .....	6	15.5	6	15.5	5 300	11.5	108	2.6	7 790	2.5	15 140	2.8
Hale .....	3	21.1	3	21.1	2 400	20.1	196	2.0	13 630	1.8	27 200	1.9
Henry .....	212	1.2	42 857	.3	106 357 425	.2	92	2.2	3 839	1.1	8 104	1.3
Houston .....	427	1.3	44 735	.5	106 370 009	.5	165	2.0	5 501	2.0	13 053	2.3
Jackson .....	3	22.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	630	1.5	20 841	2.0	42 343	2.4
Jefferson .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	158	2.4	6 951	2.5	14 088	2.8
Lamar .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	180	2.1	5 200	3.4	9 835	3.4
Lauderdale .....	3	15.9	9	16.0	4 220	16.7	584	1.2	21 971	1.2	38 498	1.3
Lawrence .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	487	1.6	16 771	2.0	31 486	2.3
Lee .....	3	12.3	8	4.6	(D)	(D)	125	2.4	3 660	2.8	8 344	3.5
Limestone .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	435	1.4	15 163	1.4	25 354	1.7
Lowndes .....	6	15.4	6	15.4	10 380	16.3	132	2.1	13 118	1.6	26 968	1.1
Macon .....	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	122	2.5	6 565	2.6	13 137	2.7
Madison .....	1	29.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	429	1.4	19 311	1.6	31 605	1.6
Marengo .....	2	24.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	221	2.1	17 890	2.0	34 819	2.2
Marion .....	1	34.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	285	1.6	8 075	1.9	16 019	2.3
Marshall .....	5	15.4	7	15.4	18 200	15.4	759	1.3	21 273	1.7	46 772	2.0
Mobile .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	199	2.1	7 463	2.5	14 733	2.3
Monroe .....	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	168	2.2	6 331	2.7	14 714	2.4
Montgomery .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	263	1.7	21 860	1.3	40 299	1.4
Morgan .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	639	1.4	25 860	1.8	43 397	2.0
Perry .....	8	12.8	58	5.0	49 700	4.5	130	2.5	10 015	2.2	19 568	2.7
Pickens .....	2	24.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	200	2.0	9 449	3.1	21 862	3.8
Pike .....	166	1.8	20 157	.7	49 447 213	.7	253	1.5	9 986	1.3	30 655	1.4
Randolph .....	3	15.5	3	15.5	6 600	15.5	249	1.6	6 695	1.8	12 481	2.6
Russell .....	13	5.5	2 324	3.1	5 625 376	3.4	105	2.4	4 735	3.0	11 517	3.0
St. Clair .....	1	45.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	265	1.8	10 857	2.7	18 857	3.4
Shelby .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	190	2.0	9 540	2.9	18 948	3.0

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested — Con.											
	Peanuts for nuts						Hay — alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	
Sumter .....	7	14.1	14	17.7	9 800	16.9	167	1.9	9 645	1.5	19 779	1.4
Talladega .....	1	36.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	245	1.8	13 826	3.0	28 212	3.1
Tallapoosa .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	116	2.7	4 963	3.1	12 857	2.7
Tuscaloosa .....	1	39.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	220	1.5	9 928	1.9	27 523	1.7
Walker .....	1	40.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	240	1.5	11 324	1.7	24 390	2.4
Washington .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	193	2.4	4 992	3.1	12 233	3.6
Wilcox .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	116	2.5	7 900	2.4	19 680	2.8
Winston .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	285	1.6	7 982	2.2	16 816	2.4

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

Item	Census published farms		Not on mail list <sup>1</sup>		Percent not on mail list <sup>1</sup>	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (percent)	Standard error of percent
Farms ----- number .....	37 905	.9	10 258	14.3	21.3	2.6
Land in farms ----- acres .....	8 450 823	.6	774 412	20.0	8.4	1.6
Average size of farm ----- acres .....	222.9	1.1	75.5	15.7	(X)	(X)
<b>Farms by size:</b>						
Less than 10 acres -----	1 902	1.3	1 212	41.5	38.9	10.0
10 to 49 acres -----	10 165	1.2	4 387	20.7	30.1	4.5
Less than 50 acres -----	12 067	1.1	5 599	19.7	31.7	4.4
50 acres or more -----	25 838	.9	4 659	18.6	15.3	2.5
50 to 99 acres -----	8 066	1.1	2 364	25.6	22.7	4.7
100 to 179 acres -----	6 863	1.1	1 063	33.8	13.4	3.9
180 acres or more -----	10 909	.8	1 232	37.1	10.1	3.4
Harvested cropland ----- farms .....	24 780	.9	3 957	20.2	13.8	2.5
----- acres .....	2 104 064	.4	105 544	27.2	4.8	1.3
<b>Farms by value of sales:</b>						
Less than \$1,000 -----	5 467	1.3	4 110	23.2	42.9	5.7
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----	6 196	1.3	3 238	27.4	34.3	6.2
Less than \$2,500 -----	11 663	1.3	7 348	19.4	38.7	4.6
\$2,500 or more -----	26 242	.9	2 910	19.0	10.0	1.7
\$2,500 to \$9,999 -----	12 442	1.2	2 440	21.3	16.4	2.9
\$10,000 or more -----	13 800	.7	470	33.1	3.3	1.1
Market value of agricultural products sold ----- \$1,000 .....	2 369 179	.1	30 552	27.8	1.3	.4
<b>Farms by standard industrial classification:</b>						
Crops (01) -----	10 022	.9	1 661	23.3	14.2	2.9
Livestock (02) -----	27 883	1.0	8 596	15.2	23.6	2.9
<b>Farms by type of organization:</b>						
Individual or family -----	34 257	1.0	9 527	14.6	21.8	2.7
Partnership or corporation -----	3 509	.9	477	55.4	12.0	5.8
Other -----	139	2.4	253	(H)	64.6	23.1
<b>Farms by tenure of operator:</b>						
Full owners -----	24 686	1.0	9 152	15.1	27.0	3.2
Part owners and tenants -----	13 219	.9	1 106	27.8	7.7	2.0
Part owners -----	10 860	.9	717	35.3	6.2	2.1
Tenants -----	2 359	1.3	389	44.8	14.2	5.4
<b>Operators by place of residence:</b>						
On farm operated -----	27 107	.9	3 986	23.4	12.8	2.6
Not on farm operated -----	7 182	1.1	2 377	30.3	24.9	5.6
Not reported -----	3 616	1.0	3 895	20.2	51.9	5.6
<b>Operators by principal occupation:</b>						
Farming -----	15 712	.8	1 506	30.6	8.7	2.5
Other -----	22 193	1.1	6 005	19.6	21.3	3.2
<b>Operators by sex:</b>						
Male -----	35 019	.9	9 808	14.5	21.9	2.7
Female -----	2 886	1.1	450	54.9	13.5	6.4
<b>Operators by race:</b>						
White -----	36 370	.9	6 895	17.7	15.9	2.3
Black and other races -----	1 535	1.6	616	42.5	28.6	8.6
<b>Operators by years on present farm:</b>						
4 years or less -----	4 370	1.5	3 090	25.3	41.4	6.1
5 years or more -----	25 281	.9	2 574	31.9	9.2	2.7
Average years on present farm -----	18.9	1.3	11.2	30.7	(X)	(X)
Not reported -----	8 254	1.0	4 594	18.5	35.8	4.7
Average age of operator -----	54.8	1.3	51.8	14.6	(X)	(X)

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

<sup>1</sup>Estimates are based on a sample survey conducted independently of census data collection.