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	14.3
Land in farms	acres	1.0
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1]	$1,000	2.3
Market value of agricultural products sold	$1,000	1.2
Harvested cropland	acres	3.2
Corn for grain or seed	acres	1.5
Wheat for grain	acres	2.1
Livestock and poultry inventory:		
2.1		
Cattle and calves	number	2.1
Hogs and pigs	number	3.8
Hens and pullets of laying age	number	.3

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

Sample Estimation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	5.9
50	3.6
75	2.3
100	1.3
150	1.0
200	.9
300	.7
500	.6
750	.5
1,000	.4
1,500	.3
2,000	(X)
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	23.7
50	18.1
75	15.8
100	14.4
150	13.0
200	12.2
300	11.4
500	10.7
750	10.3
1,000	10.1
1,500	9.9
2,000	(X)

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

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

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

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

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

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

Census Coverage

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

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

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

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

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

Mail List Coverage

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

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

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

Respondent and Enumerator Error

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

Item Nonresponse

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

Processing Error

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

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

Classification Error

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

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

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			
Farms	number	14 279	1.1
Land in farms	acres	46 849 244	.1
Average size of farm	acres	3 281	1.1
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			
Total sales (see text)	farms	14 279	1.1
	$1,000	1 258 883	.1
Average per farm	dollars	88 163	1.1
Farms by value of sales:			
Less than $1,000 (see text)	farms	2 812	1.7
	$1,000	678	2.1
$1,000 to $2,499	farms	2 056	1.8
	$1,000	3 420	1.8
$2,500 to $4,999	farms	1 840	1.6
	$1,000	6 556	1.6
$5,000 to $9,999	farms	1 738	1.4
	$1,000	12 170	1.4
$10,000 to $19,999	farms	1 380	1.2
	$1,000	19 306	1.1
$20,000 to $24,999	farms	472	1.3
	$1,000	10 464	1.3
$25,000 to $39,999	farms	847	1.0
	$1,000	26 892	1.0
$40,000 to $49,999	farms	361	1.2
	$1,000	15 969	1.2
$50,000 to $99,999	farms	969	.7
	$1,000	68 582	.7
$100,000 to $249,999	farms	919	–
	$1,000	143 032	–
$250,000 to $499,999	farms	460	–
	$1,000	160 992	–
$500,000 or more	farms	425	–
	$1,000	790 823	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	farms	5 070	1.0
	$1,000	375 571	.1
Grains	farms	1 239	.7
	$1,000	77 291	.2
Corn for grain	farms	280	1.2
	$1,000	25 706	.3
Wheat	farms	875	.7
	$1,000	29 548	.3
Soybeans	farms	5	7.0
	$1,000	108	.5
Sorghum for grain	farms	517	.8
	$1,000	15 649	.3
Barley	farms	36	2.8
	$1,000	755	.8
Oats	farms	76	3.4
	$1,000	190	3.9
Other grains	farms	84	2.7
	$1,000	5 335	.2
Cotton and cottonseed	farms	458	1.0
	$1,000	25 317	.3
Tobacco	farms	–	–
	$1,000	–	–
Hay, silage, and field seeds	farms	2 642	1.2
	$1,000	64 422	.4
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	farms	658	1.2
	$1,000	103 344	.1
Fruits, nuts, and berries	farms	1 281	1.4
	$1,000	50 100	.4
Nursery and greenhouse crops	farms	218	2.1
	$1,000	29 284	.2
Other crops	farms	148	1.6
	$1,000	25 811	.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products	farms	9 711	1.0
	$1,000	883 312	.1
Poultry and poultry products	farms	286	2.6
	$1,000	11 497	.2
Dairy products	farms	204	1.6
	$1,000	226 870	(L)
Cattle and calves	farms	8 426	.9
	$1,000	615 259	.1
Hogs and pigs	farms	326	2.5
	$1,000	4 251	.7
Sheep, lambs, and wool	farms	1 104	1.4
	$1,000	17 756	.3
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)	farms	1 621	1.4
	$1,000	7 679	1.3
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text)	farms	919	1.7
	$1,000	3 963	1.3
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]			
Total farm production expenses	farms	14 279	.8
	$1,000	1 049 010	.3
Average per farm	dollars	73 465	.8
Livestock and poultry purchased	farms	4 816	1.9
	$1,000	257 230	.4
Feed for livestock and poultry	farms	8 761	1.2
	$1,000	221 787	.3
Commercially mixed formula feeds	farms	2 925	2.5
	$1,000	56 530	.6
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees	farms	3 353	2.3
	$1,000	15 594	1.1
Commercial fertilizer	farms	4 576	1.9
	$1,000	29 236	1.1
Agricultural chemicals	farms	3 382	2.2
	$1,000	15 096	1.2
Petroleum products	farms	12 925	.9
	$1,000	49 222	1.0
Electricity	farms	7 732	1.3
	$1,000	22 663	.8
Hired farm labor	farms	5 597	1.6
	$1,000	115 633	.4
Contract labor	farms	2 673	2.5
	$1,000	32 608	1.0
Repair and maintenance	farms	10 989	1.0
	$1,000	48 589	1.1
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment	farms	3 587	2.2
	$1,000	15 561	2.7
Interest expense	farms	5 339	1.6
	$1,000	69 101	1.1
Secured by real estate	farms	3 585	2.2
	$1,000	39 886	1.7
Not secured by real estate	farms	2 875	2.3
	$1,000	29 215	.9
Cash rent	farms	2 799	2.5
	$1,000	29 172	1.9
Property taxes	farms	13 240	.9
	$1,000	14 996	1.4
All other farm production expenses	farms	12 383	.9
	$1,000	112 522	.5
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) [1]			
All farms	number	14 279	.8
	$1,000	196 574	1.1
Average per farm	dollars	13 767	1.3
Farms with net gains [2]	number	6 965	1.4
	$1,000	241 803	.7
Average net gain	dollars	34 717	1.5
Farms with net losses	number	7 314	1.5
	$1,000	45 230	2.2
Average net loss	dollars	6 184	2.7
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME			
Government payments	farms	2 467	.6
	$1,000	31 792	.4
Other farm-related income [1]	farms	2 172	3.3
	$1,000	15 623	3.6
Customwork and other agricultural services	farms	818	5.3
	$1,000	6 124	4.3
Gross cash rent or share payments	farms	1 032	5.0
	$1,000	6 540	6.9
Forest products and Christmas trees	farms	160	13.8
	$1,000	1 674	10.0
Other farm-related income sources	farms	411	7.2
	$1,000	1 284	9.0
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS			
Total	farms	295	1.1
	$1,000	8 043	.9

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 1
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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

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

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			
Total cropland	farms	9 447	1.1
	acres	2 252 970	.4
Harvested cropland	farms	7 213	1.1
	acres	1 060 345	.3
Farms by acres harvested:			
1 to 9 acres	farms	2 732	1.7
	acres	10 963	1.8
10 to 19 acres	farms	1 001	1.7
	acres	13 056	1.7
20 to 29 acres	farms	584	1.8
	acres	13 298	1.8
30 to 49 acres	farms	586	1.6
	acres	22 030	1.6
50 to 99 acres	farms	645	1.4
	acres	44 319	1.4
100 to 199 acres	farms	511	1.2
	acres	69 735	1.2
200 to 499 acres	farms	581	.7
	acres	183 352	.7
500 to 999 acres	farms	335	.5
	acres	233 028	.5
1,000 acres or more	farms	238	–
	acres	470 564	–
Cropland:			
Pasture or grazing only	farms	4 192	1.3
	acres	529 620	1.1
Other cropland	farms	2 759	.9
	acres	663 005	.5
Total woodland	farms	1 147	1.5
	acres	2 312 531	.2
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms	6 767	.8
	acres	41 963 350	.1
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms	5 686	1.1
	acres	320 393	.5
Irrigated land	farms	7 331	1.2
	acres	738 272	.4
Acres irrigated:			
1 to 9 acres	farms	2 825	1.7
	acres	11 795	1.7
10 to 49 acres	farms	2 379	1.4
	acres	53 652	1.4
50 to 99 acres	farms	715	1.4
	acres	48 761	1.4
100 to 199 acres	farms	515	1.2
	acres	70 009	1.2
200 to 499 acres	farms	543	.7
	acres	169 273	.6
500 to 999 acres	farms	251	.5
	acres	170 299	.4
1,000 acres or more	farms	103	.4
	acres	214 483	.2
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms	6 277	1.2
	acres	627 553	.3
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms	2 157	1.4
	acres	110 719	1.1
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:			
Diverted under annual commodity programs	farms	883	.6
	acres	32 018	.3
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms	856	1.0
	acres	342 976	.7
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS [1]			
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms	14 279	.8
	$1,000	9 219 617	1.4
Average per farm	dollars	645 677	1.6
Average per acre	dollars	194	1.5
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT [1]			
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms	14 217	.8
	$1,000	525 911	1.0
Average per farm	dollars	36 992	1.3
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS [1]			
Commercial fertilizer	farms	4 539	1.9
	acres on which used	764 160	1.6

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
TENURE OF OPERATOR			
All operators	farms	14 279	1.1
	acres	46 849 244	.1
Full owners	farms	8 383	1.3
	acres	17 109 602	.1
Part owners	farms	4 389	.8
	acres	25 162 266	.1
Tenants	farms	1 507	1.2
	acres	4 577 376	.2
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			
Land owned	farms	12 844	1.1
	acres	31 846 390	.1
Owned land in farms	farms	12 772	1.1
	acres	30 093 081	.1
Land rented or leased from others	farms	5 979	.8
	acres	17 373 231	.1
	landlords	11 182	.7
Rented or leased land in farms	farms	5 896	.8
	acres	16 756 163	.1
Land rented or leased to others	farms	1 235	1.2
	acres	2 370 377	.7
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
Operators by place of residence:			
On farm operated		9 404	1.1
Not on farm operated		3 854	1.2
Not reported		1 021	1.1
Operators by principal occupation:			
Farming		7 540	.7
Other		6 739	1.5
Operators by days worked off farm:			
Any		7 590	1.3
200 days or more		4 673	1.4
Operators by sex:			
Male	farms	12 846	1.0
	acres	44 090 263	.1
Female	farms	1 433	1.4
	acres	2 758 981	.2
Average age of operator	years	55.3	1.5
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION			
Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms	11 959	1.1
	acres	21 543 276	.1
Partnership	farms	1 276	1.0
	acres	7 227 086	.1
Corporation:			
Family held	farms	698	.7
	acres	7 882 487	(L)
More than 10 stockholders	farms	33	3.5
10 or less stockholders	farms	665	.7
Other than family held	farms	96	2.4
	acres	1 161 875	.1
More than 10 stockholders	farms	9	5.1
10 or less stockholders	farms	87	2.6
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms	250	1.7
	acres	9 034 520	(L)
HIRED FARM LABOR			
Hired workers by days worked:			
150 days or more	farms	2 583	2.2
	workers	8 506	1.2
Less than 150 days	farms	4 900	1.8
	workers	19 236	1.3
INJURIES AND DEATHS			
Farm-related injuries:			
Operator and family members	farms	116	2.1
	number	137	2.0
Hired workers	farms	143	1.0
	number	280	.7
Farm-related deaths:			
Operator and family members	farms	3	26.0
	number	3	26.0
Hired workers	farms	3	16.6
	number	3	16.6

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 2
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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

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

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE			
1 to 9 acres	farms	2 600	1.8
	acres	10 506	1.9
10 to 49 acres	farms	2 611	1.7
	acres	60 960	1.6
50 to 69 acres	farms	446	1.9
	acres	25 529	1.9
70 to 99 acres	farms	557	1.8
	acres	45 478	1.8
100 to 139 acres	farms	513	1.8
	acres	58 941	1.8
140 to 179 acres	farms	626	1.7
	acres	98 700	1.7
180 to 219 acres	farms	333	2.2
	acres	66 144	2.2
220 to 259 acres	farms	262	2.3
	acres	62 674	2.3
260 to 499 acres	farms	1 153	1.3
	acres	422 576	1.3
500 to 999 acres	farms	1 260	1.2
	acres	897 170	1.2
1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms	1 161	1.1
	acres	1 628 098	1.1
2,000 acres or more	farms	2 757	–
	acres	43 472 468	–
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION			
Cash grains (011)	farms	556	1.0
	acres	875 882	.4
Field crops, except cash grains (013)	farms	1 801	1.4
	acres	959 164	.4
Vegetables and melons (016)	farms	405	1.5
	acres	1 647 631	(L)
Fruits and tree nuts (017)	farms	1 260	1.6
	acres	97 734	1.4
Horticultural specialties (018)	farms	165	2.3
	acres	8 557	1.6
General farms, primarily crop (019)	farms	360	1.9
	acres	434 096	.4
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021)	farms	8 091	1.0
	acres	40 838 335	.1
Dairy farms (024)	farms	162	1.4
	acres	107 268	.6
Poultry and eggs (025)	farms	78	4.6
	acres	11 790	6.6
Animal specialties (027)	farms	1 066	2.0
	acres	581 073	.6
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029)	farms	335	1.8
	acres	1 287 714	.3
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	8 964	1.0
	number	1 589 978	.2
Beef cows	farms	7 248	.9
	number	631 738	.2
Milk cows	farms	650	1.3
	number	110 422	(L)
Cattle and calves sold	farms	8 426	.9
	number	1 181 980	.1
	$1,000	615 259	.1
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	496	2.2
	number	20 233	1.0
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	326	2.5
	number	43 633	.7
	$1,000	4 251	.7
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms	1 156	1.4
	number	460 700	.2
Sheep and lambs sold	farms	1 042	1.4
	number	292 885	.3
Horses and ponies inventory	farms	5 738	1.1
	number	41 430	.7
Horses and ponies sold	farms	1 246	1.4
	number	4 200	1.3
POULTRY			
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory	farms	899	1.8
	number	1 363 949	.5
Hens and pullets of laying age	farms	892	1.8
	number	1 166 160	(L)
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	20	7.9
	number	2 026	24.6
CROPS HARVESTED			
Corn for grain or seed	farms	398	1.4
	acres	72 348	.3
	bushels	11 773 777	.3
Corn for silage or green chop	farms	222	1.5
	acres	28 401	.4
	tons, green	605 098	.3
Sorghum for grain or seed	farms	568	.8
	acres	180 421	.5
	bushels	8 144 520	.4
Wheat for grain	farms	892	.7
	acres	341 016	.3
	bushels	10 433 609	.3
Cotton	farms	459	1.0
	acres	53 393	.4
	bales	74 954	.3
Irish potatoes	farms	31	4.2
	acres	9 543	(L)
	cwt	3 494 206	(L)
Peanuts for nuts	farms	101	1.5
	acres	16 206	.4
	pounds	41 996 244	.4
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	4 502	1.2
	acres	267 507	.5
	tons, dry	934 026	.4
Alfalfa hay	farms	3 581	1.2
	acres	194 614	.5
	tons, dry	794 617	.4
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	658	1.2
	acres	51 896	.2
Land in orchards	farms	1 885	1.4
	acres	31 648	1.0

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

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 3
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS		
Farms — number	5 833	.5
Land in farms — acres	42 425 896	(L)
Average size of farm — acres	7 273	.5
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) — farms	5 833	.5
$1,000	1 236 059	.1
Average per farm — dollars	211 908	.5
Farms by value of sales:		
$10,000 to $19,999 — farms	1 380	1.2
$1,000	19 306	1.1
$20,000 to $24,999 — farms	472	1.3
$1,000	10 464	1.3
$25,000 to $39,999 — farms	847	1.0
$1,000	26 892	1.0
$40,000 to $49,999 — farms	361	1.2
$1,000	15 969	1.2
$50,000 to $99,999 — farms	969	.7
$1,000	68 582	.7
$100,000 to $249,999 — farms	919	–
$1,000	143 032	–
$250,000 to $499,999 — farms	460	–
$1,000	160 992	–
$500,000 or more — farms	425	–
$1,000	790 823	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops — farms	2 548	.7
$1,000	369 094	.1
Grains — farms	1 037	.6
$1,000	76 783	.2
Corn for grain — farms	242	1.0
$1,000	25 650	.3
Wheat — farms	783	.6
$1,000	29 282	.3
Soybeans — farms	5	7.0
$1,000	108	.5
Sorghum for grain — farms	480	.7
$1,000	15 529	.3
Barley — farms	34	2.8
$1,000	(D)	(D)
Oats — farms	47	3.5
$1,000	(D)	(D)
Other grains — farms	57	2.2
$1,000	5 301	.2
Cotton and cottonseed — farms	401	1.0
$1,000	25 130	.3
Tobacco — farms	–	–
$1,000	–	–
Hay, silage, and field seeds — farms	1 274	.9
$1,000	61 225	.4
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons — farms	473	.9
$1,000	102 901	.1
Fruits, nuts, and berries — farms	416	1.4
$1,000	48 280	.4
Nursery and greenhouse crops — farms	121	2.3
$1,000	29 021	.2
Other crops — farms	122	1.2
$1,000	25 753	.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products — farms	4 615	.5
$1,000	866 966	.1
Poultry and poultry products — farms	53	4.0
$1,000	11 390	.2
Dairy products — farms	172	1.4
$1,000	226 764	(L)
Cattle and calves — farms	4 414	.5
$1,000	601 796	.1
Hogs and pigs — farms	100	3.0
$1,000	3 925	.6
Sheep, lambs, and wool — farms	445	.9
$1,000	17 054	.3
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) — farms	632	1.0
$1,000	6 036	1.5
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) — farms	248	1.9
$1,000	3 236	1.4

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses — farms	5 820	.7
$1,000	1 008 004	.3
Average per farm — dollars	173 197	.8
Livestock and poultry purchased — farms	2 833	1.9
$1,000	252 682	.4
Feed for livestock and poultry — farms	4 335	1.3
$1,000	216 305	.3
Commercially mixed formula feeds — farms	1 663	2.8
$1,000	55 529	.6
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees — farms	2 111	2.5
$1,000	15 214	1.1
Commercial fertilizer — farms	2 186	2.4
$1,000	28 091	1.1
Agricultural chemicals — farms	2 016	2.5
$1,000	14 699	1.3
Petroleum products — farms	5 720	.8
$1,000	43 953	1.0
Electricity — farms	4 343	1.4
$1,000	21 296	.8
Hired farm labor — farms	3 467	1.6
$1,000	114 152	.4
Contract labor — farms	1 687	2.8
$1,000	31 709	1.0
Repair and maintenance — farms	5 192	1.1
$1,000	42 654	.9
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment — farms	1 908	2.7
$1,000	14 613	2.9
Interest expense — farms	3 596	1.6
$1,000	64 752	1.1
Secured by real estate — farms	2 281	2.3
$1,000	36 089	1.7
Not secured by real estate — farms	2 277	2.3
$1,000	28 663	.9
Cash rent — farms	1 898	2.7
$1,000	28 270	1.9
Property taxes — farms	5 412	.9
$1,000	11 293	1.4
All other farm production expenses — farms	5 820	.7
$1,000	108 319	.5
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) [1]		
All farms — number	5 820	.7
$1,000	214 545	.9
Average per farm — dollars	36 863	1.2
Farms with net gains [2] — number	4 323	1.3
$1,000	236 901	.7
Average net gain — dollars	54 800	1.5
Farms with net losses — number	1 497	3.4
$1,000	22 355	3.1
Average net loss — dollars	14 933	4.6
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments — farms	1 781	.5
$1,000	27 131	.3
Other farm-related income [1] — farms	1 099	4.2
$1,000	12 494	3.8
Customwork and other agricultural services — farms	468	6.4
$1,000	5 360	4.5
Gross cash rent or share payments — farms	456	7.3
$1,000	4 787	7.3
Forest products and Christmas trees — farms	63	16.7
$1,000	1 303	4.1
Other farm-related income sources — farms	263	8.7
$1,000	1 044	10.8
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total — farms	279	1.1
$1,000	8 014	.9

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 4
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE		
Total cropland — farms	3 558	.6
acres	1 775 763	.3
Harvested cropland — farms	3 003	.7
acres	998 902	.2
Cropland:		
Pasture or grazing only — farms	1 344	.9
acres	274 458	.9
Total woodland — farms	316	1.3
acres	2 038 949	.1
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured — farms	3 710	.4
acres	38 358 688	(L)
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. — farms	2 091	.7
acres	252 496	.3
Irrigated land — farms	2 728	.7
acres	660 179	.3
Harvested cropland irrigated — farms	2 481	.7
acres	581 734	.3
Pasture and other land irrigated — farms	662	1.1
acres	78 445	.8
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:		
Diverted under annual commodity programs — farms	828	.6
acres	30 368	.2
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs — farms	546	.8
acres	241 594	.6
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS [1]		
Estimated market value of land and buildings — farms	5 820	.7
$1,000	7 297 625	.7
Average per farm — dollars	1 253 888	1.0
Average per acre — dollars	170	.8
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT [1]		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment — farms	5 820	.7
$1,000	401 973	1.1
Average per farm — dollars	69 068	1.3
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]		
Commercial fertilizer — farms	2 173	2.4
acres on which used	722 629	1.6
TENURE OF OPERATOR		
All operators — farms	5 833	.5
acres	42 425 896	(L)
Full owners — farms	2 391	.7
acres	15 108 850	(L)
Part owners — farms	2 661	.4
acres	23 389 659	(L)
Tenants — farms	781	1.0
acres	3 927 387	.1
OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
Land owned — farms	5 086	.5
acres	28 567 054	.1
Owned land in farms — farms	5 052	.5
acres	27 227 847	(L)
Land rented or leased from others — farms	3 496	.5
acres	15 763 756	.1
landlords	7 421	.4
Rented or leased land in farms — farms	3 442	.5
acres	15 198 049	.1
Land rented or leased to others — farms	619	1.0
acres	1 904 914	.7
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Operators by place of residence:		
On farm operated	3 793	.5
Not on farm operated	1 580	.7
Not reported	460	.8
Operators by principal occupation:		
Farming	4 444	.4
Other	1 389	1.0
Operators by days worked off farm:		
Any	2 311	.8
200 days or more	1 185	1.0
Operators by sex:		
Male	5 396	.5
Female	437	1.2
Average age of operator — years	54.9	.7

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Individual or family (sole proprietorship) — farms	4 295	.6
acres	18 667 225	.1
Partnership — farms	773	.7
acres	6 782 170	.1
Corporation:		
Family held — farms	575	.5
acres	7 699 259	(L)
More than 10 stockholders — farms	26	3.1
10 or less stockholders — farms	549	.5
Other than family held — farms	66	2.3
acres	1 113 855	.1
More than 10 stockholders — farms	6	–
10 or less stockholders — farms	60	2.5
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. — farms	124	1.6
acres	8 163 387	(L)
HIRED FARM LABOR		
Hired workers by days worked:		
150 days or more — farms	2 079	2.1
workers	7 948	1.1
Less than 150 days — farms	2 818	2.0
workers	14 777	1.3
INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Farm-related injuries:		
Operator and family members — farms	66	1.8
number	80	1.5
Hired workers — farms	129	.8
number	262	.5
Farm-related deaths:		
Operator and family members — farms	–	–
number	–	–
Hired workers — farms	3	16.6
number	(D)	(D)
FARMS BY SIZE		
1 to 9 acres	298	2.0
10 to 49 acres	422	1.8
50 to 69 acres	134	2.5
70 to 99 acres	207	2.2
100 to 139 acres	150	2.3
140 to 179 acres	216	2.0
180 to 219 acres	124	2.6
220 to 259 acres	107	2.8
260 to 499 acres	478	1.2
500 to 999 acres	598	1.1
1,000 to 1,999 acres	710	1.1
2,000 acres or more	2 389	–
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION		
Cash grains (011)	428	.9
Field crops, except cash grains (013)	710	1.2
Vegetables and melons (016)	290	1.2
Fruits and tree nuts (017)	247	2.0
Horticultural specialties (018)	93	2.6
General farms, primarily crop (019)	130	1.4
Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021)	3 688	.5
Dairy farms (024)	145	1.1
Poultry and eggs (025)	8	10.0
Animal specialties (027)	89	3.4
General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029)	5	16.1
LIVESTOCK		
Cattle and calves inventory — farms	4 310	.5
number	1 492 465	.1
Beef cows — farms	3 504	.5
number	577 458	.1
Milk cows — farms	386	1.0
number	109 872	(L)
Cattle and calves sold — farms	4 414	.5
number	1 145 814	.1
$1,000	601 796	.1
Hogs and pigs inventory — farms	121	2.5
number	17 182	.8
Hogs and pigs sold — farms	100	3.0
number	39 823	.6
$1,000	3 925	.6
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory — farms	441	.9
number	437 653	.2
Sheep and lambs sold — farms	436	.9
number	278 983	.3
Horses and ponies inventory — farms	2 295	.5
number	26 606	.4
Horses and ponies sold — farms	500	1.0
number	2 586	1.2

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 5
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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

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

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY			
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory	farms	188	1.9
	number	(D)	(D)
Hens and pullets of laying age	farms	187	1.9
	number	(D)	(D)
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	6	11.6
	number	1 176	39.0
CROPS HARVESTED			
Corn for grain or seed	farms	281	1.0
	acres	71 845	.3
	bushels	11 737 656	.3
Corn for silage or green chop	farms	184	1.2
	acres	28 143	.4
	tons, green	601 584	.3
Sorghum for grain or seed	farms	522	.7
	acres	177 948	.5
	bushels	8 073 802	.4
CROPS HARVESTED—Con.			
Wheat for grain	farms	788	.6
	acres	335 331	.3
	bushels	10 331 870	.3
Cotton	farms	401	1.0
	acres	52 823	.4
	bales	74 292	.3
Irish potatoes	farms	22	2.7
	acres	9 522	(L)
	cwt	3 490 318	(L)
Peanuts for nuts	farms	94	1.2
	acres	16 141	.4
	pounds	41 941 028	.4
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	1 787	.8
	acres	223 051	.4
	tons, dry	852 877	.4
Alfalfa hay	farms	1 400	.8
	acres	165 900	.5
	tons, dry	732 097	.4
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	473	.9
	acres	51 438	.2
Land in orchards	farms	480	1.4
	acres	24 894	1.1

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

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 6
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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	.2	1.4	3.4	.7
Land in farms—acres	1.8	.1	2.7	.1
Average size of farm—acres	1.6	1.5	–.6	.7
Estimated market value of land and buildings [1]:				
Average per farm—dollars	10.9	2.4	5.1	1.7
Average per acre—dollars	7.8	2.0	4.9	1.6
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment [1]:				
Average per farm—dollars	11.8	2.1	8.0	2.0
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	7.4	2.7	3.5	2.9
10 to 49 acres	–3.7	2.2	15.0	2.9
50 to 179 acres	–1.0	1.9	15.5	2.3
180 to 499 acres	–5.3	1.7	–9.7	1.5
500 to 999 acres	–6.0	1.6	–11.7	1.4
1,000 to 1,999 acres	3.1	1.6	5.0	1.6
2,000 acres or more	4.4	(L)	6.7	(L)
Total cropland—farms	.2	1.5	.7	.9
acres	–1.1	.6	–.7	.5
Harvested cropland—farms	–.8	1.5	.2	.9
acres	7.2	.5	9.3	.5
Irrigated land—farms	4.4	1.7	2.9	1.0
acres	2.8	.6	5.6	.5
Market value of agricultural products sold—$1,000	18.7	.2	19.1	.1
Average per farm—dollars	18.5	1.7	15.3	.8
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops—$1,000	43.6	.4	44.5	.4
Livestock, poultry, and their products—$1,000	10.6	.1	10.8	.1
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than $2,500	–4.6	1.6	(X)	(X)
$2,500 to $4,999	2.1	2.2	(X)	(X)
$5,000 to $9,999	2.2	2.0	(X)	(X)
$10,000 to $24,999	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.4
$25,000 to $49,999	–2.1	1.2	–2.1	1.2
$50,000 to $99,999	.3	1.1	.3	1.1
$100,000 to $249,999	–.2	(L)	–.2	(L)
$250,000 to $499,999	20.1	–	20.1	–
$500,000 or more	36.7	–	36.7	–
Total farm production expenses [1]—$1,000	17.5	1.0	18.1	1.0
Average per farm—dollars	17.2	1.4	13.2	1.1
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) [1]—farms	.2	1.1	4.3	.9
$1,000	19.1	2.3	18.5	2.0
Average per farm—dollars	18.9	2.7	13.6	2.2
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	4.1	1.1	2.8	.7
Other	–3.8	1.9	5.3	1.5
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	–6.7	4.8	–1.2	5.0
200 days or more	–5.3	4.9	3.7	5.3
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory—farms	.4	1.3	4.9	.7
number	10.0	.3	11.2	.2
Beef cows—farms	4.5	1.3	9.3	.7
number	10.3	.3	11.5	.3
Milk cows—farms	–23.3	1.3	–13.5	1.1
number	88.4	.2	89.7	.2
Cattle and calves sold—farms	–1.1	1.2	2.8	.7
number	–9.0	.2	–8.8	.1
Hogs and pigs inventory—farms	–16.2	2.3	–36.0	2.0
number	–54.3	.6	–58.2	.6
Hogs and pigs sold—farms	–12.6	2.7	–33.3	2.4
number	–51.1	.5	–53.5	.5
Sheep and lambs inventory—farms	–15.2	1.6	–16.5	1.1
number	–1.6	.4	–.1	.3
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory—farms	–34.0	1.5	–45.8	1.3
number	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold—farms	5.3	10.9	–	13.8
number	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed—farms	–8.3	1.8	2.2	1.7
acres	92.7	1.3	95.3	1.4
bushels	122.1	1.4	123.5	1.4
Sorghum for grain or seed—farms	–26.8	.9	–25.2	.9
acres	14.9	1.0	16.0	1.0
bushels	–6.2	.7	–5.6	.7
Wheat for grain—farms	–27.4	.8	–21.7	.8
acres	10.3	.7	13.0	.7
bushels	18.3	.7	19.9	.7
Cotton—farms	–34.1	.9	–33.5	.9
acres	–32.5	.5	–32.4	.5
bales	–33.7	.4	–33.6	.4
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)—farms	–6.8	1.6	–3.0	1.0
acres	–3.4	.7	–2.2	.6
tons, dry	–2.8	.6	–2.3	.6
Land in orchards—farms	23.5	2.4	24.7	2.4
acres	10.9	1.4	14.6	1.5

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

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 7
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm [1]		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment [1]	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**14 279**	**1.1**	**46 849 244**	**.1**	**3 281**	**1.1**	**645 677**	**1.6**	**525 911**	**1.0**
Bernalillo	504	1.4	415 263	.4	824	1.4	393 646	10.0	7 852	4.2
Catron	236	.5	1 553 328	.1	6 582	.5	853 011	7.3	6 800	4.2
Chaves	592	.7	3 112 271	.1	5 257	.7	790 873	2.4	37 943	7.6
Cibola	184	1.8	2 080 760	.1	11 308	1.8	1 490 186	2.6	4 571	5.0
Colfax	303	.7	2 085 387	.1	6 882	.7	1 311 089	2.7	11 000	3.5
Curry	610	.7	924 678	.3	1 516	.8	501 997	5.2	48 071	1.6
De Baca	191	.6	1 343 237	.1	7 033	.6	780 572	1.9	7 086	3.8
Dona Ana	1 271	1.0	526 407	.2	414	1.0	720 823	1.4	68 334	1.1
Eddy	495	.9	1 138 681	.2	2 300	1.0	420 935	3.6	23 865	4.7
Grant	297	.7	1 209 335	.2	4 072	.7	682 069	3.9	7 474	8.0
Guadalupe	271	1.1	1 532 887	.2	5 656	1.1	526 701	3.7	4 765	5.2
Harding	195	.5	1 289 733	.1	6 614	.5	763 382	3.8	5 594	4.8
Hidalgo	147	.8	843 401	.2	5 737	.8	906 981	7.3	7 931	2.3
Lea	544	.7	2 149 450	.2	3 951	.8	461 893	3.2	17 380	3.2
Lincoln	338	.9	1 881 764	.1	5 567	.9	638 587	3.7	8 846	7.8
Los Alamos	4	–	10	–	3	–	(D)	(D)	100	–
Luna	185	.6	797 117	.2	4 309	.6	727 478	2.1	16 080	5.1
McKinley	213	2.0	3 224 090	.1	15 137	2.0	2 564 078	2.1	5 787	6.8
Mora	398	1.7	905 235	.3	2 274	1.7	405 155	5.5	5 816	7.8
Otero	477	.9	1 166 009	.2	2 444	.9	534 400	3.0	8 512	4.4
Quay	586	.7	1 769 177	.2	3 019	.8	425 730	3.6	24 738	4.2
Rio Arriba	964	1.5	1 552 865	.3	1 611	1.6	565 999	20.6	19 433	3.2
Roosevelt	734	.8	1 646 707	.2	2 243	.8	455 070	2.9	49 375	1.9
Sandoval	345	1.2	770 155	.2	2 232	1.2	723 478	3.1	9 293	3.6
San Juan	641	1.5	1 896 131	.1	2 958	1.5	953 881	2.1	22 433	4.9
San Miguel	661	1.6	2 579 730	.2	3 903	1.6	720 571	3.8	13 552	10.4
Santa Fe	313	1.3	517 952	.3	1 655	1.3	466 739	10.2	5 991	7.2
Sierra	207	.9	1 233 794	.1	5 960	.9	(D)	(D)	6 915	3.1
Socorro	413	1.1	1 868 074	.1	4 523	1.1	766 569	5.8	13 470	2.7
Taos	440	1.9	324 476	.4	737	1.9	339 908	14.8	8 867	8.3
Torrance	485	1.1	1 797 466	.2	3 706	1.1	456 578	5.6	11 111	10.6
Union	460	.6	2 364 443	.1	5 140	.6	644 257	4.9	20 584	4.1
Valencia	575	1.3	349 231	.3	607	1.4	319 100	4.1	16 344	4.9

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm [1]		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses [1]			
							Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**36 992**	**1.3**	**1 258 883**	**.1**	**88 163**	**1.1**	**14 279**	**.8**	**1 049 010**	**.3**
Bernalillo	15 894	4.5	22 553	.3	44 748	1.4	503	1.6	20 508	1.1
Catron	28 812	4.3	12 597	.2	53 378	.5	236	.9	10 362	4.3
Chaves	64 093	7.6	150 968	.1	255 014	.7	592	.8	126 950	.7
Cibola	24 843	5.2	9 791	.3	53 209	1.8	184	1.2	7 807	2.1
Colfax	36 305	3.6	34 827	.2	114 939	.7	303	1.0	28 493	1.7
Curry	78 934	1.7	140 506	.1	230 338	.7	610	.7	119 460	1.0
De Baca	37 100	4.1	24 796	.2	129 822	.6	191	1.5	19 170	1.5
Dona Ana	54 362	1.6	199 700	.1	157 121	1.0	1 271	1.0	158 476	.4
Eddy	48 212	4.7	40 802	.3	82 429	1.0	495	.8	35 698	1.9
Grant	25 165	8.0	10 637	.3	35 813	.8	297	.8	8 461	4.8
Guadalupe	17 581	5.4	16 082	.3	59 344	1.2	271	1.3	13 759	2.1
Harding	28 686	5.0	14 036	.2	71 981	.5	195	1.4	11 718	1.3
Hidalgo	53 952	2.7	18 676	.4	127 049	.8	147	1.5	14 174	.8
Lea	31 949	3.3	42 220	.2	77 611	.8	544	.9	35 057	1.1
Lincoln	26 171	7.9	12 431	.5	36 777	1.0	338	1.3	10 970	2.6
Los Alamos	25 000	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	4	–	7	–
Luna	86 450	5.1	49 784	.1	269 105	.6	186	.7	41 817	.7
McKinley	28 092	7.1	10 184	.3	47 812	2.0	213	1.9	7 937	5.3
Mora	14 613	7.9	8 907	.5	22 379	1.8	398	1.3	6 391	2.1
Otero	17 845	4.4	9 789	.7	20 522	1.2	477	.7	8 061	2.5
Quay	42 214	4.3	40 484	.3	69 085	.8	586	1.0	33 642	1.3
Rio Arriba	20 138	3.4	11 948	1.1	12 395	1.9	965	1.2	10 554	3.2
Roosevelt	67 177	2.1	96 081	.1	130 901	.8	735	.9	79 286	1.0
Sandoval	27 092	3.8	15 177	.3	43 991	1.2	344	1.0	11 942	.9
San Juan	35 496	5.2	51 645	.2	80 570	1.5	641	1.2	44 271	.8
San Miguel	20 502	10.4	17 993	.3	27 222	1.6	661	1.1	17 489	1.5
Santa Fe	19 771	7.5	7 984	.7	25 508	1.5	312	1.2	7 013	2.5
Sierra	33 569	3.4	13 056	.5	63 072	1.1	206	1.3	10 578	1.7
Socorro	32 693	2.9	27 563	.3	66 738	1.1	412	1.1	22 424	1.5
Taos	20 152	8.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	440	1.2	2 149	4.9
Torrance	22 863	10.6	18 926	.5	39 022	1.2	486	1.0	16 251	8.5
Union	45 340	4.2	109 089	.1	237 151	.6	460	.6	93 645	1.1
Valencia	28 674	5.1	16 991	.5	29 550	1.4	576	1.1	14 492	1.6

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 8
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses [1]—Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**4 816**	**1.9**	**257 230**	**.4**	**8 761**	**1.2**	**221 787**	**.3**	**3 353**	**2.3**	**15 594**	**1.1**
Bernalillo	147	11.1	2 395	2.6	315	5.1	8 412	.8	103	13.4	419	.7
Catron	99	8.8	3 458	3.5	181	5.2	1 536	2.9	16	28.9	6	11.3
Chaves	232	7.7	19 242	.2	416	4.5	44 526	.2	134	11.2	583	9.0
Cibola	62	14.8	2 658	2.1	128	7.2	2 097	1.3	31	26.6	40	26.8
Colfax	136	10.1	12 943	1.4	233	4.5	3 715	2.6	33	23.2	29	21.0
Curry	272	8.0	51 011	1.2	404	5.4	28 420	.6	348	5.2	1 994	2.1
De Baca	100	6.6	8 614	2.0	132	4.5	2 811	1.8	57	11.0	134	5.0
Dona Ana	153	11.3	4 984	.8	262	8.7	38 810	.1	385	7.1	2 829	1.3
Eddy	166	8.2	4 214	7.9	283	4.8	4 620	1.4	174	7.1	384	8.3
Grant	104	12.7	1 420	7.7	221	7.2	1 575	3.0	47	30.1	26	17.0
Guadalupe	100	14.9	4 516	2.9	202	6.7	2 227	4.3	31	34.3	69	4.9
Harding	87	6.5	3 820	2.1	175	1.8	2 447	1.7	12	24.9	4	34.9
Hidalgo	46	6.5	1 607	.6	97	2.0	1 644	1.0	45	5.0	345	2.0
Lea	222	8.0	8 485	1.7	332	6.2	6 538	1.1	111	13.6	393	9.7
Lincoln	120	10.2	1 364	6.9	276	3.9	2 103	4.9	8	–	9	–
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	53	17.4	6 335	.7	93	6.5	2 218	1.1	84	12.0	1 295	1.2
McKinley	72	11.7	1 680	3.9	147	6.0	2 606	6.5	32	23.4	(D)	(D)
Mora	97	16.0	1 978	1.1	230	8.4	773	4.2	36	28.8	24	5.7
Otero	139	9.0	994	6.9	267	3.5	1 707	2.1	49	14.2	35	3.8
Quay	279	7.9	11 260	1.4	470	4.7	4 844	3.9	204	8.4	327	6.9
Rio Arriba	224	7.6	2 725	4.8	511	4.0	1 515	3.6	155	9.8	39	8.3
Roosevelt	280	8.3	13 639	1.4	505	4.3	15 462	.8	395	5.9	2 707	2.3
Sandoval	84	10.9	3 794	.6	220	5.8	2 820	1.0	51	19.7	87	6.4
San Juan	197	9.7	12 515	1.4	372	5.3	4 867	1.0	193	10.3	(D)	(D)
San Miguel	219	7.7	4 918	5.0	507	2.8	2 461	1.9	87	15.8	54	29.4
Santa Fe	102	13.2	1 588	6.3	167	8.4	932	3.9	74	18.2	372	.7
Sierra	77	5.7	1 484	7.1	127	4.4	3 106	1.4	44	10.0	108	4.5
Socorro	198	6.2	4 549	2.2	291	4.5	5 237	1.0	98	11.9	144	17.9
Taos	86	17.8	148	8.6	165	12.4	354	11.2	63	20.8	39	10.8
Torrance	199	9.9	3 998	8.3	319	5.3	2 041	6.7	46	24.0	285	31.6
Union	268	5.2	53 620	.9	389	2.4	14 562	2.7	91	12.4	477	14.7
Valencia	196	10.8	1 277	4.7	324	6.8	4 801	1.2	116	12.8	120	7.1

Geographic area	Farm production expenses [1]—Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**4 576**	**1.9**	**29 236**	**1.1**	**3 382**	**2.2**	**15 096**	**1.2**	**12 925**	**.9**	**49 222**	**1.0**
Bernalillo	177	8.6	262	2.0	89	14.0	30	14.8	410	3.9	544	8.9
Catron	13	35.6	52	64.4	15	2.8	16	1.8	205	4.0	648	5.1
Chaves	206	10.1	1 665	1.3	210	9.1	968	3.3	534	3.3	3 609	1.4
Cibola	21	26.9	(D)	(D)	17	34.1	(D)	(D)	144	6.5	373	9.2
Colfax	27	24.2	68	5.8	34	24.6	22	23.2	289	2.3	1 039	3.8
Curry	322	6.3	4 069	3.0	274	7.3	2 123	2.4	572	2.5	4 664	4.3
De Baca	77	9.3	230	6.6	72	9.2	89	7.0	185	1.7	730	2.5
Dona Ana	806	3.7	6 228	1.2	577	4.8	3 222	2.3	1 169	1.5	5 500	2.2
Eddy	262	5.6	1 007	6.5	220	6.7	858	3.2	413	2.0	2 951	2.6
Grant	54	25.7	95	41.1	37	32.1	77	8.6	285	2.8	550	4.2
Guadalupe	42	29.7	56	16.4	38	27.2	23	13.7	267	1.3	835	4.2
Harding	5	44.2	6	58.4	15	20.0	20	9.8	183	2.0	572	2.9
Hidalgo	41	4.7	464	4.1	46	4.9	237	1.9	133	2.0	1 142	1.3
Lea	142	12.1	1 047	7.6	94	14.6	476	8.0	499	1.9	2 084	3.3
Lincoln	37	32.7	72	22.7	28	15.9	96	.5	279	5.6	947	6.6
Los Alamos	1	–	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)
Luna	75	10.8	2 278	1.5	78	10.4	1 484	.1	174	4.1	2 295	4.6
McKinley	14	37.5	13	22.8	10	20.2	(D)	(D)	182	4.5	(D)	(D)
Mora	84	20.5	41	15.3	9	–	16	–	379	2.6	588	6.9
Otero	173	2.7	101	15.1	185	8.3	48	11.6	423	1.9	642	3.7
Quay	178	10.9	1 053	5.3	150	9.2	725	7.2	568	1.8	2 333	3.1
Rio Arriba	311	6.9	202	27.7	217	9.3	67	11.7	905	1.4	1 063	4.0
Roosevelt	287	7.8	5 019	3.5	237	9.1	1 996	2.1	673	2.3	5 045	2.2
Sandoval	78	15.8	144	2.0	31	27.5	35	12.3	303	3.5	492	2.5
San Juan	206	10.0	2 035	3.2	128	10.8	1 165	2.8	604	1.7	1 531	2.9
San Miguel	69	15.1	58	14.9	51	15.0	128	3.1	643	1.3	1 036	3.4
Santa Fe	82	16.0	193	1.2	66	19.2	163	2.1	250	5.4	360	7.2
Sierra	69	8.0	280	9.0	58	8.3	115	7.9	186	1.7	609	2.9
Socorro	192	6.9	413	7.6	89	12.0	127	10.0	373	2.7	1 316	2.8
Taos	84	19.2	39	39.2	32	26.6	13	38.5	354	4.9	362	7.9
Torrance	38	27.7	433	31.1	66	19.8	269	49.5	372	4.2	1 459	18.5
Union	72	11.9	1 098	5.3	83	13.1	302	5.8	435	1.6	2 838	4.5
Valencia	331	6.1	288	6.9	124	13.1	113	13.6	533	2.2	646	4.0

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 9
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses [1]—Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**7 732**	**1.3**	**22 663**	**.8**	**5 597**	**1.6**	**115 633**	**.4**	**2 673**	**2.5**	**32 608**	**1.0**
Bernalillo	269	7.2	392	2.2	174	10.1	2 601	1.5	90	16.2	127	13.5
Catron	138	7.3	115	4.1	86	8.7	726	2.2	51	1.5	186	.1
Chaves	480	3.8	3 293	2.4	302	6.5	15 100	1.7	189	10.2	1 877	12.5
Cibola	90	12.1	(D)	(D)	55	16.8	603	1.5	22	25.6	59	12.5
Colfax	169	6.8	259	3.9	113	11.4	2 093	2.6	37	25.8	154	28.9
Curry	443	3.9	2 235	2.7	251	7.1	4 528	2.9	100	12.1	835	10.6
De Baca	111	5.8	194	4.9	91	6.8	977	1.6	43	11.5	145	13.9
Dona Ana	566	4.9	2 768	.8	677	4.2	29 417	.4	486	6.2	13 305	1.1
Eddy	331	4.7	1 511	6.8	238	6.3	5 320	2.6	162	9.3	1 894	4.1
Grant	154	9.3	154	6.8	129	11.3	1 081	.9	17	–	67	–
Guadalupe	115	14.0	208	5.1	105	15.5	1 130	2.0	30	21.3	206	.5
Harding	93	6.4	108	3.1	76	6.5	855	2.9	32	12.5	89	11.5
Hidalgo	120	2.3	388	2.7	79	3.8	2 568	.9	35	5.3	1 011	2.3
Lea	325	6.8	992	5.1	188	10.0	3 914	2.1	103	14.1	381	7.7
Lincoln	239	5.3	252	6.2	154	7.8	1 258	6.2	102	15.1	350	14.2
Los Alamos	2	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	138	.7	2 510	.4	113	10.4	5 201	.5	92	11.0	8 337	.5
McKinley	97	8.9	109	19.3	75	12.1	842	2.2	13	37.3	72	56.5
Mora	154	12.5	120	18.0	127	14.7	883	3.3	48	23.1	52	13.8
Otero	314	5.2	319	7.5	151	7.1	860	1.8	81	14.3	140	6.9
Quay	364	5.9	400	6.0	227	5.9	1 704	4.6	91	11.2	226	3.8
Rio Arriba	278	8.0	106	8.7	407	5.3	627	5.3	171	12.2	181	8.9
Roosevelt	558	4.9	3 210	1.4	321	7.0	6 480	1.5	89	11.3	941	1.6
Sandoval	126	9.1	174	7.5	134	9.8	1 690	1.7	14	29.9	211	4.0
San Juan	274	6.7	318	3.1	251	7.7	11 557	.7	89	13.3	308	3.0
San Miguel	221	7.4	155	3.8	198	7.4	2 085	1.1	49	13.8	87	5.7
Santa Fe	119	11.3	115	7.1	99	15.2	1 107	4.6	16	15.3	16	32.9
Sierra	135	3.8	249	2.2	73	5.2	1 326	2.6	39	8.5	337	11.2
Socorro	264	4.4	424	2.5	170	6.0	2 415	2.4	96	9.9	256	11.0
Taos	161	12.3	56	14.3	74	14.8	142	13.9	28	26.2	18	6.6
Torrance	286	4.9	369	6.0	142	10.6	1 617	13.2	41	13.1	123	3.3
Union	305	4.9	658	2.3	179	7.1	3 373	1.7	78	13.5	401	7.1
Valencia	293	7.4	418	7.1	138	11.3	1 555	1.7	139	13.4	218	9.6

Geographic area	Farm production expenses [1]—Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest expense			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**10 989**	**1.0**	**48 589**	**1.1**	**3 587**	**2.2**	**15 561**	**2.7**	**5 339**	**1.6**	**69 101**	**1.1**
Bernalillo	396	3.8	860	7.9	131	10.3	72	10.6	60	16.9	645	4.2
Catron	180	5.3	655	8.9	29	15.4	51	.9	109	7.3	1 121	22.5
Chaves	461	4.5	5 309	3.8	168	10.8	1 564	1.7	316	5.0	9 646	1.7
Cibola	104	10.0	(D)	(D)	23	29.3	22	27.2	81	12.3	(D)	(D)
Colfax	221	4.8	802	4.4	39	19.7	158	15.8	120	10.5	2 114	15.0
Curry	533	2.9	3 689	2.3	251	7.1	2 720	11.6	320	6.1	4 844	3.5
De Baca	163	2.9	699	3.8	71	8.9	148	11.3	110	6.0	1 579	4.5
Dona Ana	898	3.2	7 190	1.1	487	6.0	2 616	4.1	593	4.8	10 139	1.8
Eddy	383	3.5	2 318	4.8	166	9.2	1 269	12.0	227	6.3	3 499	7.6
Grant	268	3.2	940	31.3	44	24.2	68	12.6	107	13.6	537	8.4
Guadalupe	174	9.9	617	8.2	19	–	45	–	84	11.6	1 398	3.7
Harding	159	3.5	624	3.2	23	13.9	41	6.3	89	6.3	1 147	3.7
Hidalgo	132	2.1	1 245	3.3	36	8.8	173	14.3	88	3.7	971	1.8
Lea	425	3.2	1 766	2.9	133	12.0	784	10.8	239	8.7	2 621	5.2
Lincoln	250	6.5	808	5.8	29	18.4	121	8.8	116	7.8	1 066	7.8
Los Alamos	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)
Luna	141	7.1	2 125	1.6	60	13.5	713	5.0	89	7.9	2 074	1.2
McKinley	173	4.7	311	8.7	74	11.9	23	9.2	40	18.1	546	1.3
Mora	262	7.0	477	8.8	98	14.9	110	15.9	68	16.5	353	1.8
Otero	373	2.8	855	3.3	87	14.5	107	8.7	155	8.1	516	4.5
Quay	455	3.4	1 951	4.7	192	10.9	931	12.9	361	5.0	2 969	2.6
Rio Arriba	740	2.7	801	4.9	183	10.1	128	13.0	294	7.1	847	7.4
Roosevelt	605	3.5	4 279	2.6	247	8.6	1 859	5.4	351	6.7	6 770	4.1
Sandoval	232	4.9	582	4.3	56	16.6	44	6.6	48	11.8	434	12.6
San Juan	537	2.5	1 317	5.5	260	7.6	167	10.1	135	10.2	808	9.5
San Miguel	508	3.2	1 014	4.3	84	12.3	76	5.2	118	9.9	1 560	4.4
Santa Fe	216	7.4	439	11.8	37	23.6	47	7.7	38	16.4	364	16.8
Sierra	168	2.8	510	2.4	44	7.6	134	1.0	88	5.4	809	5.8
Socorro	356	3.4	1 223	2.7	84	10.6	96	7.1	220	6.2	2 149	4.0
Taos	300	5.4	317	9.3	95	15.9	40	12.3	70	18.5	161	16.9
Torrance	303	5.2	1 208	15.4	49	26.5	63	7.2	130	14.6	1 528	12.6
Union	354	4.2	2 398	5.2	101	12.9	837	10.8	305	4.6	4 085	2.3
Valencia	518	2.6	1 013	4.9	187	10.2	333	7.7	169	11.3	1 386	8.5

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 10
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses [1]—Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**2 799**	**2.5**	**29 172**	**1.9**	**13 240**	**.9**	**14 996**	**1.4**	**12 383**	**.9**	**112 522**	**.5**
Bernalillo	64	20.9	146	14.5	469	2.4	372	7.5	401	3.5	3 230	1.1
Catron	37	15.9	212	2.3	221	3.1	233	6.0	202	3.7	1 346	4.8
Chaves	98	9.3	3 225	.1	558	1.9	1 344	10.1	582	1.2	14 998	.7
Cibola	32	25.7	67	6.3	159	4.2	109	6.5	131	6.8	(D)	(D)
Colfax	84	13.4	1 486	5.4	257	3.7	326	3.4	272	2.3	3 284	2.0
Curry	164	9.8	2 244	9.6	524	3.3	699	2.4	576	1.8	5 386	1.1
De Baca	46	9.2	507	7.5	175	2.6	317	2.7	181	1.7	1 996	1.3
Dona Ana	287	8.0	4 606	1.8	1 187	1.3	2 377	4.2	1 186	1.5	24 486	1.0
Eddy	107	11.7	1 382	7.1	470	1.6	524	2.5	462	1.6	3 947	4.4
Grant	40	2.0	109	4.1	294	.8	291	3.0	271	4.2	1 471	2.9
Guadalupe	81	19.5	529	2.5	253	3.2	203	5.9	245	4.4	1 695	3.5
Harding	49	10.4	326	8.4	178	2.7	179	1.8	166	3.1	1 482	1.5
Hidalgo	37	7.4	786	.4	143	1.5	183	2.4	143	1.5	1 411	1.5
Lea	85	16.7	1 226	3.7	505	1.6	514	6.9	468	3.2	3 836	2.3
Lincoln	87	18.5	324	10.2	316	3.5	460	5.9	292	4.9	1 742	3.0
Los Alamos	1	–	(D)	(D)	4	–	3	–	3	–	(D)	(D)
Luna	54	15.8	881	1.5	165	4.2	277	4.5	170	5.5	3 794	1.0
McKinley	25	23.8	306	18.3	182	4.7	199	6.1	202	3.1	773	5.0
Mora	53	18.9	161	2.9	365	3.6	196	5.7	270	6.2	620	5.3
Otero	41	19.2	110	38.2	453	1.9	307	8.6	420	2.4	1 320	7.2
Quay	183	9.4	1 280	7.3	550	2.2	560	2.5	476	3.9	3 077	5.7
Rio Arriba	185	9.4	416	13.8	917	1.8	417	3.6	803	2.1	1 421	10.1
Roosevelt	214	9.8	3 389	5.1	659	3.4	784	6.1	681	2.1	7 706	1.1
Sandoval	32	23.0	68	17.7	319	2.2	242	7.5	268	4.3	1 125	1.8
San Juan	50	15.4	(D)	(D)	596	2.1	386	5.2	530	2.3	5 044	.9
San Miguel	103	11.6	1 159	2.4	622	1.7	729	7.1	504	3.0	1 968	1.2
Santa Fe	17	–	203	–	291	3.1	261	9.2	255	5.6	853	4.0
Sierra	38	13.0	391	6.2	177	2.7	191	1.7	167	2.6	929	3.0
Socorro	95	13.2	507	13.9	405	1.1	625	2.8	365	2.9	2 943	2.9
Taos	80	19.9	58	29.0	418	2.6	175	9.2	347	5.0	228	8.2
Torrance	85	17.5	785	41.8	453	2.6	386	6.9	397	2.9	1 687	9.2
Union	162	8.1	1 876	12.5	400	3.2	543	1.5	440	1.6	6 577	2.9
Valencia	83	16.5	354	16.8	555	2.0	582	5.3	507	3.0	1 389	2.7

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) [1]				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**14 279**	**.8**	**196 574**	**1.1**	**9 447**	**1.1**	**2 252 970**	**.4**	**7 213**	**1.1**	**1 060 345**	**.3**
Bernalillo	503	1.6	1 754	11.2	376	1.6	18 026	3.0	281	1.9	8 289	1.0
Catron	236	.9	2 158	8.5	69	2.5	27 209	2.4	27	4.5	(D)	(D)
Chaves	592	.8	23 323	1.7	341	1.1	120 517	.6	260	1.4	53 448	.4
Cibola	184	1.2	1 040	7.7	76	3.0	22 761	2.6	52	3.7	6 644	3.2
Colfax	303	1.0	5 687	5.7	155	1.7	34 489	2.1	116	2.0	13 894	1.5
Curry	610	.7	19 133	2.2	512	.8	454 101	.4	383	.9	243 849	.4
De Baca	191	1.5	5 170	3.5	97	1.7	(D)	(D)	77	2.3	5 883	2.0
Dona Ana	1 271	1.0	39 273	2.0	1 184	1.1	94 405	.5	1 133	1.1	78 282	.3
Eddy	495	.8	6 977	6.9	350	1.2	(D)	(D)	296	1.4	45 103	.6
Grant	297	.8	2 050	21.5	148	1.7	10 433	4.9	71	2.9	1 158	4.7
Guadalupe	271	1.3	3 165	14.1	102	2.8	7 280	4.6	77	3.4	2 579	2.5
Harding	195	1.4	1 936	9.5	52	2.4	21 559	3.8	11	4.9	1 109	2.2
Hidalgo	147	1.5	4 333	3.1	77	1.8	(D)	(D)	59	2.5	8 837	1.3
Lea	544	.9	6 474	7.1	325	1.2	98 045	1.1	178	1.8	30 577	.8
Lincoln	338	1.3	1 936	22.7	120	2.6	9 932	4.8	66	3.8	1 418	2.3
Los Alamos	4	–	–3	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)
Luna	186	.7	7 068	3.7	113	1.5	(D)	(D)	103	1.6	28 501	.7
McKinley	213	1.9	2 860	4.8	72	3.9	(D)	(D)	32	5.7	2 651	6.9
Mora	398	1.3	1 981	9.8	296	1.9	36 680	2.4	248	2.2	8 060	2.0
Otero	477	.7	991	13.1	318	1.3	(D)	(D)	248	1.7	3 847	2.8
Quay	586	1.0	6 352	7.8	384	1.1	237 927	.8	281	1.3	106 175	.7
Rio Arriba	965	1.2	1 226	21.5	790	1.7	68 156	2.2	687	1.7	20 765	1.7
Roosevelt	735	.9	13 157	4.7	527	.9	378 637	.6	371	1.1	218 667	.4
Sandoval	344	1.0	2 691	5.1	234	1.7	25 554	2.2	171	2.1	6 761	1.5
San Juan	641	1.2	5 916	3.9	522	1.7	(D)	(D)	419	1.8	61 552	.4
San Miguel	661	1.1	338	58.1	358	2.1	53 605	3.2	214	2.6	5 760	2.1
Santa Fe	312	1.2	1 410	20.3	202	1.8	23 576	2.4	145	2.2	7 877	1.1
Sierra	206	1.3	2 156	5.8	126	1.7	(D)	(D)	98	2.1	5 054	1.3
Socorro	412	1.1	5 485	6.4	273	1.5	23 175	1.5	205	1.9	13 076	1.5
Taos	440	1.2	459	30.0	388	1.9	31 032	1.5	348	2.0	10 045	1.7
Torrance	486	1.0	2 873	24.4	206	2.1	41 390	2.3	83	3.2	11 296	1.3
Union	460	.6	14 738	3.7	182	1.3	106 297	.8	114	1.3	(D)	(D)
Valencia	576	1.1	2 465	9.3	471	1.5	17 642	2.0	358	1.6	11 399	1.9

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 11
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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			
					Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**7 331**	**1.2**	**738 272**	**.4**	**8 964**	**1.0**	**1 589 978**	**.2**	**7 248**	**.9**	**631 738**	**.2**
Bernalillo	331	1.7	10 042	2.6	216	2.3	15 563	.5	139	2.9	5 366	.9
Catron	54	2.7	2 009	2.7	200	.9	40 519	.3	183	1.0	24 588	.3
Chaves	285	1.3	57 744	.3	328	1.0	131 275	.2	250	1.1	44 148	.2
Cibola	45	4.3	4 685	4.1	135	2.2	29 313	.4	112	2.4	15 179	.7
Colfax	127	1.9	24 685	1.0	250	1.0	57 098	.4	207	1.3	18 141	.5
Curry	221	1.3	84 377	.7	377	1.1	120 149	.2	216	1.6	12 382	.9
De Baca	90	1.9	7 709	2.2	155	1.1	46 130	.2	116	1.4	17 337	.2
Dona Ana	1 126	1.1	80 029	.3	164	2.1	60 511	.4	100	2.6	10 292	1.5
Eddy	300	1.3	47 209	.6	274	1.3	49 044	.2	207	1.4	(D)	(D)
Grant	96	2.3	3 566	13.6	252	1.0	40 001	.3	229	1.1	26 358	.3
Guadalupe	83	3.3	1 916	4.5	233	1.3	41 341	.4	202	1.5	19 539	.5
Harding	8	6.7	(D)	(D)	181	.5	42 130	.4	162	.7	21 604	.4
Hidalgo	62	2.4	9 081	1.3	106	1.4	31 406	.4	97	1.4	16 764	.4
Lea	207	1.7	35 126	1.0	380	1.1	73 263	.3	291	1.3	31 464	.3
Lincoln	93	3.0	4 643	5.8	255	1.3	36 352	.5	231	1.4	23 141	.5
Los Alamos	1	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Luna	108	1.5	29 732	.8	91	1.8	37 108	.2	77	1.9	14 578	.5
McKinley	25	6.5	1 635	1.5	167	2.3	32 895	.4	142	2.3	20 791	.4
Mora	209	2.4	9 648	1.8	331	1.8	22 722	.7	304	1.9	10 885	.9
Otero	281	1.5	6 141	2.5	212	1.6	26 189	.9	174	1.7	16 281	1.0
Quay	193	1.8	27 386	2.1	454	.9	77 256	.4	380	1.1	32 202	.6
Rio Arriba	682	1.7	25 280	2.0	628	1.5	39 644	1.0	555	1.5	19 847	1.2
Roosevelt	238	1.5	76 365	.5	494	1.0	81 783	.3	335	1.3	23 036	.6
Sandoval	203	1.9	8 269	1.6	240	1.6	20 513	.7	196	1.7	(D)	(D)
San Juan	494	1.7	70 036	.5	326	1.9	45 196	.5	246	2.2	20 836	.7
San Miguel	226	2.6	8 025	2.2	554	1.7	59 448	.8	508	1.7	32 654	.5
Santa Fe	155	2.1	8 471	3.7	162	2.0	12 593	1.0	136	2.2	6 936	.5
Sierra	110	1.9	5 973	2.1	124	1.6	25 253	.6	107	1.6	(D)	(D)
Socorro	257	1.6	16 180	1.5	298	1.4	53 861	.7	235	1.6	30 630	.7
Taos	369	2.0	12 833	1.6	289	2.0	(D)	(D)	273	2.1	4 649	1.5
Torrance	95	3.0	12 645	1.5	384	1.3	41 898	.6	309	1.4	20 036	.8
Union	90	1.6	32 848	.6	377	.8	169 312	.2	285	1.0	36 248	.5
Valencia	467	1.5	13 459	1.7	326	1.8	22 199	1.6	244	2.1	7 094	1.4

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry —Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**650**	**1.3**	**110 422**	**–**	**496**	**2.2**	**20 233**	**1.0**	**1 156**	**1.4**	**460 700**	**.2**
Bernalillo	18	6.4	4 802	.2	29	6.0	200	8.3	36	6.1	(D)	(D)
Catron	10	7.4	16	6.6	7	9.9	24	14.7	5	8.7	150	2.9
Chaves	44	2.5	34 086	(L)	24	6.9	200	11.1	126	1.9	140 041	.2
Cibola	4	11.8	9	10.5	–	–	–	–	18	6.4	9 087	1.5
Colfax	21	5.0	57	5.6	10	9.4	48	9.4	25	6.2	962	9.2
Curry	16	6.7	7 285	.1	28	6.9	632	6.5	22	7.3	757	6.5
De Baca	12	4.7	35	3.2	5	10.8	22	10.7	21	3.6	16 017	(L)
Dona Ana	26	4.1	30 044	(L)	26	6.7	216	11.7	36	6.2	1 041	7.4
Eddy	31	5.2	(D)	(D)	14	8.4	116	12.6	59	2.8	24 952	1.0
Grant	16	5.5	30	4.4	12	8.4	138	2.8	7	6.8	(D)	(D)
Guadalupe	6	11.7	12	15.0	3	23.5	20	24.9	32	5.1	16 038	.6
Harding	10	2.4	127	.4	2	–	(D)	(D)	5	–	362	–
Hidalgo	11	7.4	15	11.9	5	9.9	(D)	(D)	3	23.4	43	24.7
Lea	34	4.4	4 570	.2	22	7.6	225	8.5	31	5.5	8 654	3.4
Lincoln	30	5.0	121	5.4	6	16.2	17	18.9	79	2.1	93 189	.3
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	5	15.5	5	15.5	3	16.4	(D)	(D)	5	12.2	116	20.9
McKinley	7	12.2	71	6.1	10	9.8	296	7.3	60	4.2	60 738	.3
Mora	13	9.0	72	15.4	5	13.8	7	15.6	31	5.9	1 030	8.8
Otero	27	5.2	53	6.2	30	6.3	(D)	(D)	44	4.2	17 101	.9
Quay	14	8.3	78	4.2	17	8.5	393	15.3	15	7.1	881	9.8
Rio Arriba	30	4.4	81	5.2	20	7.5	102	11.4	93	3.3	9 064	1.1
Roosevelt	49	3.2	13 812	(L)	32	6.0	811	9.1	25	5.1	1 354	3.5
Sandoval	19	6.7	(D)	(D)	11	10.2	92	5.5	41	4.2	1 676	5.8
San Juan	25	6.4	392	6.6	34	6.7	228	5.4	77	3.6	30 511	.5
San Miguel	32	5.7	89	10.8	25	7.1	172	4.6	31	6.4	1 082	28.0
Santa Fe	9	8.1	83	.9	21	7.5	150	7.3	19	7.3	311	18.7
Sierra	10	6.3	(D)	(D)	5	13.4	8	13.3	7	12.8	271	5.1
Socorro	34	4.2	3 378	.2	13	9.1	43	9.6	24	6.4	3 019	1.7
Taos	12	6.8	19	11.3	22	7.1	73	9.1	59	4.3	2 180	5.6
Torrance	17	6.5	62	14.1	22	8.0	232	12.2	38	4.9	13 062	.6
Union	24	4.8	88	5.6	12	7.1	751	11.5	27	4.4	2 598	4.3
Valencia	34	5.0	4 117	.3	21	7.8	563	13.7	55	4.8	1 997	2.9

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 12
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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.							
	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)
New Mexico	**892**	**1.8**	**1 166 160**	**–**	**20**	**7.9**	**2 026**	**24.6**
Bernalillo	53	5.0	(D)	(D)	3	21.6	(D)	(D)
Catron	10	8.5	229	12.2	–	–	–	–
Chaves	30	6.0	514	8.0	–	–	–	–
Cibola	3	15.7	45	21.0	–	–	–	–
Colfax	16	6.3	290	7.5	1	–	(D)	(D)
Curry	20	7.9	333	11.0	–	–	–	–
De Baca	8	9.6	303	6.5	2	10.2	(D)	(D)
Dona Ana	50	4.9	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Eddy	27	6.2	2 427	1.7	1	33.7	(D)	(D)
Grant	25	5.9	676	14.8	–	–	–	–
Guadalupe	10	9.8	170	9.1	–	–	–	–
Harding	11	6.4	165	6.0	–	–	–	–
Hidalgo	6	8.2	58	6.8	–	–	–	–
Lea	30	5.9	530	9.6	2	21.1	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	28	6.7	503	8.4	2	23.1	(D)	(D)
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	10	10.7	136	12.1	–	–	–	–
McKinley	6	13.6	260	3.8	–	–	–	–
Mora	23	7.4	333	9.0	–	–	–	–
Otero	53	4.5	1 176	5.5	1	41.4	(D)	(D)
Quay	31	5.5	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Rio Arriba	69	4.4	1 086	5.6	–	–	–	–
Roosevelt	25	6.4	(D)	(D)	2	33.8	(D)	(D)
Sandoval	23	6.6	1 373	14.6	–	–	–	–
San Juan	62	4.7	1 187	5.9	–	–	–	–
San Miguel	44	5.6	1 132	6.5	–	–	–	–
Santa Fe	36	5.4	965	15.1	2	28.0	(D)	(D)
Sierra	16	8.4	225	11.7	1	40.8	(D)	(D)
Socorro	21	7.4	444	17.3	–	–	–	–
Taos	28	6.8	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Torrance	43	5.4	758	6.6	–	–	–	–
Union	13	5.7	603	15.7	2	18.6	(D)	(D)
Valencia	62	4.5	1 114	6.4	1	45.8	(D)	(D)

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed						Sorghum for grain or seed					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**398**	**1.4**	**72 348**	**.3**	**11 773 777**	**.3**	**568**	**.8**	**180 421**	**.5**	**8 144 520**	**.4**
Bernalillo	9	11.7	78	14.9	12 335	16.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Catron	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Chaves	5	8.9	509	13.1	67 976	16.2	8	–	447	–	23 649	–
Cibola	6	11.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Colfax	4	11.8	76	1.9	6 240	2.3	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Curry	79	1.2	21 489	.5	3 901 895	.4	206	1.0	63 745	.8	3 199 269	.6
De Baca	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dona Ana	25	4.9	1 442	5.4	154 952	9.2	5	12.9	64	8.0	4 855	4.1
Eddy	–	–	–	–	–	–	6	5.8	317	4.3	(D)	(D)
Grant	9	10.2	26	13.3	1 909	22.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Guadalupe	3	12.2	11	3.3	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Harding	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	45.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Hidalgo	11	7.4	1 576	4.6	221 298	5.7	8	6.2	761	2.9	70 047	4.1
Lea	2	18.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	16	3.8	5 689	.9	380 443	1.0
Lincoln	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	5	10.0	866	2.9	40 394	5.9	13	3.0	977	1.7	72 299	1.2
McKinley	13	9.9	433	9.3	12 598	8.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mora	3	23.0	4	27.3	75	26.3	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Otero	2	28.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Quay	21	4.8	2 606	5.1	313 645	5.3	99	2.1	16 463	1.1	589 281	1.0
Rio Arriba	21	7.6	77	4.3	4 867	4.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Roosevelt	53	1.9	17 501	.3	2 706 941	.3	169	1.3	85 087	.7	3 482 116	.5
Sandoval	10	10.5	121	10.3	16 802	7.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Juan	34	5.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Miguel	11	10.8	68	14.4	4 169	18.5	5	13.9	390	4.3	18 330	4.3
Santa Fe	11	8.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Sierra	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Socorro	8	8.9	152	7.3	23 036	5.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Taos	7	10.5	19	6.3	1 196	7.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Torrance	13	6.3	1 262	1.4	152 008	.5	2	23.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Union	30	–	8 728	–	1 487 266	–	25	2.5	5 269	2.9	210 423	2.6
Valencia	3	21.5	12	22.2	(D)	(D)	1	45.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 13
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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.											
	Wheat for grain						Cotton					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**892**	**.7**	**341 016**	**.3**	**10 433 609**	**.3**	**459**	**1.0**	**53 393**	**.4**	**74 954**	**.3**
Bernalillo	2	22.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Catron	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Chaves	6	6.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	70	1.6	8 536	.4	11 583	.5
Cibola	3	15.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Colfax	3	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Curry	321	.9	150 077	.5	4 669 977	.6	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
De Baca	7	6.3	528	1.6	30 515	.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dona Ana	22	3.2	4 261	.7	234 332	.4	192	1.7	20 896	.6	33 601	.5
Eddy	4	17.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	91	2.2	9 299	1.1	12 250	1.0
Grant	7	11.6	121	30.1	3 243	25.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Guadalupe	4	12.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Harding	4	11.3	(D)	(D)	2 114	2.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hidalgo	7	10.7	352	5.1	29 174	4.5	18	4.2	2 404	1.1	2 268	1.4
Lea	29	2.9	5 177	2.5	198 351	2.3	23	4.6	4 589	1.9	4 805	1.7
Lincoln	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	9	–	1 881	–	112 887	–	34	2.0	3 887	1.0	6 001	.9
McKinley	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mora	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Otero	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Quay	159	1.6	76 168	.8	1 779 479	.6	8	6.9	535	2.9	635	3.8
Rio Arriba	13	9.1	274	14.0	5 668	10.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Roosevelt	203	1.2	79 565	.5	2 016 429	.3	15	4.5	2 662	1.0	2 957	1.3
Sandoval	6	16.4	55	6.8	2 050	5.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Juan	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Miguel	4	12.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Santa Fe	6	13.5	397	9.5	9 090	9.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Sierra	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	3	–	37	–	42	–
Socorro	7	6.8	354	9.0	23 764	8.1	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Taos	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Torrance	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Union	47	1.2	11 877	.4	577 727	.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Valencia	7	10.5	233	9.5	14 246	13.6	–	–	–	–	–	–

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested —Con.									
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)						Land in orchards			
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
New Mexico	**4 502**	**1.2**	**267 507**	**.5**	**934 026**	**.4**	**1 885**	**1.4**	**31 648**	**1.0**
Bernalillo	193	2.4	7 583	1.1	15 534	2.1	75	4.0	174	6.7
Catron	21	3.7	940	.5	1 951	.3	6	16.1	16	27.8
Chaves	191	1.5	31 291	.5	152 305	.4	74	3.3	2 998	3.2
Cibola	36	4.5	3 498	4.2	4 733	6.7	9	11.7	15	12.6
Colfax	111	2.1	13 428	1.6	27 513	1.4	3	11.9	(D)	(D)
Curry	86	2.4	5 719	1.3	11 629	1.2	9	10.7	103	15.8
De Baca	72	2.4	5 175	2.3	21 407	1.8	7	10.1	23	15.4
Dona Ana	411	1.5	14 905	1.0	85 043	1.1	701	1.4	18 065	.5
Eddy	235	1.5	29 869	.7	151 221	.6	78	3.3	1 263	3.1
Grant	24	5.1	477	7.6	1 275	11.4	39	4.5	232	8.6
Guadalupe	68	3.7	1 042	6.0	2 379	6.0	9	12.1	39	20.7
Harding	9	3.3	814	2.9	812	1.1	–	–	–	–
Hidalgo	22	6.0	604	6.2	2 411	9.2	5	13.2	41	20.1
Lea	87	2.9	7 032	2.1	28 835	1.6	50	4.3	655	9.5
Lincoln	18	6.8	848	1.8	2 038	1.0	55	4.4	378	7.9
Los Alamos	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Luna	32	4.0	2 730	2.0	15 587	1.8	25	5.2	1 763	11.2
McKinley	26	6.2	1 403	3.9	3 310	.8	1	49.1	(D)	(D)
Mora	244	2.2	7 236	2.2	10 236	2.1	5	14.3	16	15.8
Otero	43	4.7	1 740	5.0	5 689	4.9	204	2.0	1 779	3.5
Quay	152	2.0	9 457	2.3	27 806	2.8	6	16.0	15	17.7
Rio Arriba	520	1.8	19 263	1.7	27 477	2.3	193	3.1	880	4.5
Roosevelt	146	2.1	16 858	1.7	52 005	2.1	12	10.2	146	13.0
Sandoval	123	2.6	4 791	2.1	13 744	1.7	52	4.3	315	8.7
San Juan	360	1.9	25 087	1.0	105 402	.8	65	4.3	544	4.0
San Miguel	183	2.7	4 712	2.8	7 322	2.7	20	8.5	58	10.8
Santa Fe	95	2.8	3 959	1.2	13 225	1.2	38	5.4	108	5.2
Sierra	42	3.5	1 841	1.9	7 707	3.4	53	3.7	1 381	3.6
Socorro	175	2.1	11 527	1.8	46 587	1.5	19	8.2	362	11.5
Taos	329	2.0	9 653	1.8	15 942	2.1	16	9.0	53	17.2
Torrance	52	3.8	4 870	2.9	18 036	2.1	13	11.6	67	14.6
Union	78	1.6	9 346	1.5	21 359	1.5	4	13.7	13	7.6
Valencia	318	1.8	9 809	2.1	33 506	1.7	39	5.4	99	7.2

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

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 14
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22

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

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

Item	Census published farms		Not on mail list [1]		Percent not on mail list [1]	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (percent)	Standard error of percent
Farms ---- number	14 279	1.1	2 778	22.8	16.3	3.4
Land in farms ---- acres	46 849 244	.1	203 261	46.7	.4	.2
Average size of farm ---- acres	3 281.0	1.1	73.2	46.8	(X)	(X)
Farms by size:						
Less than 10 acres	2 600	1.8	1 646	33.6	38.8	8.0
10 to 49 acres	2 611	1.7	855	25.2	24.7	5.3
Less than 50 acres	5 211	1.7	2 501	24.1	32.4	5.6
50 acres or more	9 068	.8	277	43.5	3.0	1.3
50 to 99 acres	1 003	1.5	27	91.2	2.6	2.3
100 to 179 acres	1 139	1.5	59	76.9	4.9	3.6
180 acres or more	6 926	.6	191	55.8	2.7	1.5
Harvested cropland ---- farms	7 213	1.1	1 421	22.6	16.5	3.6
acres	1 060 345	.3	20 325	35.1	1.9	.7
Farms by value of sales:						
Less than $1,000	2 812	1.7	1 270	33.6	31.1	7.2
$1,000 to $2,499	2 056	1.8	833	42.3	28.8	8.7
Less than $2,500	4 868	1.7	2 103	29.7	30.2	6.2
$2,500 or more	9 411	.8	674	33.6	6.7	2.1
$2,500 to $9,999	3 578	1.4	615	35.9	14.7	4.5
$10,000 or more	5 833	.5	59	73.6	1.0	.7
Market value of agricultural products sold ---- $1,000	1 258 883	.1	5 374	25.8	.4	.1
Farms by standard industrial classification:						
Crops (01)	4 547	1.2	977	24.9	17.7	4.0
Livestock (02)	9 732	1.0	1 800	32.1	15.6	4.3
Farms by type of organization:						
Individual or family	11 959	1.1	2 747	23.0	18.7	3.8
Partnership or corporation	2 070	.8	2	(H)	(L)	(L)
Other	250	1.7	–	(X)	–	(X)
Farms by tenure of operator:						
Full owners	8 383	1.3	2 298	22.6	21.5	4.2
Part owners and tenants	5 896	.8	449	63.3	7.1	4.1
Part owners	4 389	.8	147	73.4	3.2	2.3
Tenants	1 507	1.2	302	85.2	16.7	11.8
Operators by place of residence:						
On farm operated	9 404	1.1	1 953	27.4	17.2	4.1
Not on farm operated	3 854	1.2	159	53.0	4.0	2.0
Not reported	1 021	1.1	666	35.6	39.5	9.0
Operators by principal occupation:						
Farming	7 540	.7	589	52.4	7.2	3.5
Other	6 739	1.5	1 741	24.5	20.5	4.4
Operators by sex:						
Male	12 846	1.0	2 476	24.0	16.2	3.5
Female	1 433	1.4	302	54.4	17.4	7.8
Operators by race:						
White	11 749	1.0	2 009	25.7	14.6	3.4
Black and other races	2 530	1.6	320	59.7	11.2	6.3
Operators by years on present farm:						
4 years or less	1 968	1.6	289	45.7	12.8	5.0
5 years or more	9 697	1.0	1 682	29.2	14.8	3.9
Average years on present farm	18.2	1.4	15.2	25.9	(X)	(X)
Not reported	2 614	1.2	807	34.6	23.6	6.6
Average age of operator	55.3	1.5	53.9	22.1	(X)	(X)

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

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

TIPS [UPF] BATCH_1189 [ACEN,C_ARLEDGE] 9/22/94 9:53 AM MACHINE: EPCV22 DATA:VOL1_TIPS_APX_85.TIPS;1 * 9/ 8/94 15:41:00 TAPE: NOreel FRAME: 15
TSF:TIPS92-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 UTF:TIPS93-15412708.DAT;1 9/ 8/94 15:41:34 META:VOL1_TIPS96_APX_85.DAT;3 9/ 8/94 15:42:22