

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	9.1
Land in farms.....	1.7
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹	3.8
Market value of agricultural products sold	2.2
Harvested cropland	3.0
Corn for grain or seed	1.3
Wheat for grain	1.6
Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Cattle and calves	3.7
Hogs and pigs	5.0
Hens and pullets of laying age.....	.3

¹Data 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	5.2
50	3.4
75	2.6
100	2.0
150	1.2
2005
3004
5003
7503
1,0002
1,5002
2,0002
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	36.4
50	25.6
75	20.8
100	17.9
150	14.4
200	12.3
300	9.8
500	7.2
750	5.4
1,000	4.2
1,500	2.5
2,0009

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

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

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

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

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

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

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

Census Coverage

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

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

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

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

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

Mail List Coverage

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

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

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

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

Respondent and Enumerator Error

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

Item Nonresponse

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

Processing Error

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

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

Classification Error

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

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

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Farms ----- number ..	31 892	1.0	Total farm production expenses ----- farms ..	31 875	1.1
Land in farms ----- acres ..	17 609 497	.2	----- \$1,000 ..	1 881 731	.4
Average size of farm ----- acres ..	552	1.0	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	59 035	1.2
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			Livestock and poultry purchased ----- farms ..		
Total sales (see text) ----- farms ..	31 892	1.0	----- \$1,000 ..	160 847	1.3
----- \$1,000 ..	2 292 973	.3	Feed for livestock and poultry ----- farms ..	18 983	1.4
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	71 898	1.0	----- \$1,000 ..	230 557	.9
Farms by value of sales:			Commercially mixed formula feeds ----- farms ..	6 929	2.5
Less than \$1,000 (see text) ----- farms ..	5 727	1.2	----- \$1,000 ..	82 108	1.0
\$1,000 to \$2,499 ----- farms ..	1 781	1.3	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ----- farms ..	8 422	1.9
\$2,500 to \$4,999 ----- farms ..	5 763	1.2	----- \$1,000 ..	51 855	.8
\$5,000 to \$9,999 ----- farms ..	9 395	1.2	Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	16 616	1.4
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ----- farms ..	4 569	1.3	----- \$1,000 ..	119 158	.9
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ----- farms ..	16 129	1.3	Agricultural chemicals ----- farms ..	23 952	1.2
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ----- farms ..	3 734	1.3	Petroleum products ----- farms ..	104 042	1.0
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ----- farms ..	26 216	1.3	----- \$1,000 ..	28 479	1.1
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ----- farms ..	2 946	1.3	Electricity ----- farms ..	80 192	.8
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ----- farms ..	2 946	1.3	----- \$1,000 ..	22 431	1.3
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ----- farms ..	41 312	1.3	Hired farm labor ----- farms ..	45 048	1.0
\$500,000 or more ----- farms ..	855	1.5	----- \$1,000 ..	11 480	1.7
----- \$1,000 ..	18 953	1.5	Contract labor ----- farms ..	367 047	.5
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			----- \$1,000 ..	4 850	2.8
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	14 822	.9	Repair and maintenance ----- farms ..	31 329	3.2
----- \$1,000 ..	1 452 213	.3	----- \$1,000 ..	25 574	1.2
Grains ----- farms ..	3 528	.8	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	121 370	.8
Corn for grain ----- farms ..	205 724	.3	----- \$1,000 ..	9 015	2.0
----- \$1,000 ..	112	1.6	Interest expense ----- farms ..	38 704	2.0
Wheat ----- farms ..	6 117	.5	----- \$1,000 ..	12 384	1.7
----- \$1,000 ..	2 996	.8	Secured by real estate ----- farms ..	133 197	1.2
Soybeans ----- farms ..	173 625	.3	----- \$1,000 ..	9 408	2.0
----- \$1,000 ..	-	-	Not secured by real estate ----- farms ..	90 004	1.6
Sorghum for grain ----- farms ..	-	-	----- \$1,000 ..	5 971	2.3
----- \$1,000 ..	-	-	43 193	1.1	
Barley ----- farms ..	882	1.0	Cash rent ----- farms ..	6 069	2.3
----- \$1,000 ..	16 767	.6	----- \$1,000 ..	85 134	1.3
Oats ----- farms ..	613	1.2	Property taxes ----- farms ..	29 510	1.1
----- \$1,000 ..	4 291	1.2	----- \$1,000 ..	68 203	1.1
Other grains ----- farms ..	215	1.3	All other farm production expenses ----- farms ..	28 623	1.1
----- \$1,000 ..	4 924	1.0	----- \$1,000 ..	245 048	.8
Cotton and cottonseed ----- farms ..	-	-	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
----- \$1,000 ..	-	-	All farms ----- number ..	31 875	1.1
Tobacco ----- farms ..	-	-	----- \$1,000 ..	398 979	1.2
----- \$1,000 ..	-	-	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	12 517	1.6
Hay, silage, and field seeds ----- farms ..	7 277	1.0	Farms with net gains ² ----- number ..	12 338	1.6
----- \$1,000 ..	269 373	.4	----- \$1,000 ..	527 951	.7
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ----- farms ..	1 508	.8	Average net gain ----- dollars ..	42 791	1.7
----- \$1,000 ..	174 208	.2	Farms with net losses ----- number ..	19 537	1.4
Fruits, nuts, and berries ----- farms ..	4 144	1.0	----- \$1,000 ..	128 972	1.9
----- \$1,000 ..	248 216	.5	Average net loss ----- dollars ..	6 601	2.3
Nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	2 309	.8	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
----- \$1,000 ..	364 343	.1	Government payments ----- farms ..	4 350	.8
Other crops ----- farms ..	913	.8	----- \$1,000 ..	51 655	.3
----- \$1,000 ..	190 348	.2	Other farm-related income ¹ ----- farms ..	8 740	2.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products ----- farms ..	20 309	1.0	----- \$1,000 ..	70 926	3.5
----- \$1,000 ..	840 760	.3	Customwork and other agricultural services ----- farms ..	2 729	3.9
Poultry and poultry products ----- farms ..	1 345	1.4	----- \$1,000 ..	20 765	7.3
----- \$1,000 ..	84 901	.1	Gross cash rent or share payments ----- farms ..	3 599	3.5
Dairy products ----- farms ..	813	.9	----- \$1,000 ..	17 257	4.9
----- \$1,000 ..	208 762	.2	Forest products and Christmas trees ----- farms ..	2 099	4.3
Cattle and calves ----- farms ..	15 608	1.0	----- \$1,000 ..	25 822	4.6
----- \$1,000 ..	483 601	.3	Other farm-related income sources ----- farms ..	2 177	4.1
Hogs and pigs ----- farms ..	1 463	1.4	----- \$1,000 ..	7 083	17.7
----- \$1,000 ..	9 088	1.2	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Sheep, lambs, and wool ----- farms ..	3 648	1.1	Total ----- farms ..	304	1.1
----- \$1,000 ..	27 011	.5	----- \$1,000 ..	7 125	.6
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ----- farms ..	3 715	1.2			
----- \$1,000 ..	27 396	1.3			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ----- farms ..	4 263	1.1			
----- \$1,000 ..	10 323	1.0			

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			TENURE OF OPERATOR		
Total cropland ----- farms ..	26 508	.9	All operators ----- farms ..	31 892	1.0
Harvested cropland ----- farms ..	5 037 764	.4	Full owners ----- farms ..	17 609 497	.2
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	20 743	.9	Part owners ----- farms ..	22 152	1.0
10 to 19 acres ----- farms ..	2 823 972	.4	Tenants ----- farms ..	6 722 566	.3
20 to 29 acres ----- farms ..	6 966	1.1	Tenants ----- farms ..	7 004	.8
30 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	26 937	1.1	Tenants ----- farms ..	8 710 418	.1
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	3 154	1.2	Tenants ----- farms ..	2 736	1.2
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	41 552	1.2	Tenants ----- farms ..	2 176 513	.2
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	1 824	1.3	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	41 727	1.3	Land owned ----- farms ..	29 248	1.0
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	2 031	1.3	Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	12 551 762	.3
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	74 304	1.3	Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	29 156	1.0
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	2 077	1.3	Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	11 029 722	.2
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	143 151	1.3	Land rented or leased from others ----- farms ..	9 822	.8
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	1 668	1.2	Rented or leased land in farms ----- farms ..	6 701 591	.2
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	227 727	1.2	Rented or leased land in farms ----- farms ..	24 901	.7
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	1 618	.8	Rented or leased land in farms ----- farms ..	9 740	.8
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	502 952	.7	Rented or leased land in farms ----- farms ..	6 579 775	.2
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	793	.4	Land rented or leased to others ----- farms ..	3 990	1.0
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	551 721	.3	Land rented or leased to others ----- farms ..	1 643 856	.8
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	612	—	OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	1 213 901	—	Operators by place of residence:		
Cropland:			On farm operated ----- farms ..	26 714	1.0
Pasture or grazing only ----- farms ..	13 307	1.0	Not on farm operated ----- farms ..	3 730	1.1
Other cropland ----- farms ..	817 735	.9	Not reported ----- farms ..	1 448	1.1
Other cropland ----- farms ..	6 682	.8	Operators by principal occupation:		
Other cropland ----- farms ..	1 396 057	.2	Farming ----- farms ..	15 306	.9
Total woodland ----- farms ..	10 367	.9	Other ----- farms ..	16 586	1.1
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured ----- farms ..	8 621	.9	Operators by days worked off farm:		
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. ----- farms ..	10 383 818	.1	Any ----- farms ..	18 419	1.1
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	19 078	1.0	200 days or more ----- farms ..	12 089	1.1
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	357 757	.6	Operators by sex:		
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	15 002	1.0	Male ----- farms ..	27 967	.9
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	1 622 235	.5	Female ----- farms ..	16 437 388	.2
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	5 551	1.1	Female ----- farms ..	3 925	1.1
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	20 533	1.2	Female ----- farms ..	1 172 109	.3
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	4 627	1.2	Average age of operator ----- years ..	53.4	1.4
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	106 309	1.2	FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	1 574	1.3	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ----- farms ..	27 506	1.0
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	109 471	1.3	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ----- farms ..	9 941 065	.3
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	1 361	1.2	Partnership ----- farms ..	2 481	1.0
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	187 701	1.2	Partnership ----- farms ..	3 172 316	.2
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	1 209	.8	Corporation:		
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	370 806	.8	Family held ----- farms ..	1 477	.7
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	429	.6	Family held ----- farms ..	3 176 873	.1
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	289 680	.6	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	29	3.8
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	251	—	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	1 448	.6
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	537 735	—	Other than family held ----- farms ..	195	1.8
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	11 756	.9	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	322 989	.2
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	1 237 787	.4	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	25	5.2
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	6 090	1.1	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	170	1.8
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	384 448	.7	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ----- farms ..	233	1.7
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ----- farms ..	996 254	.1
Diverted under annual commodity programs ----- farms ..	1 504	.7	HIRED FARM LABOR		
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	43 894	.2	Hired workers by days worked:		
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	1 123	.8	150 days or more ----- farms ..	5 012	10.0
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	409 888	.3	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	21 060	3.3
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	10 657	12.8
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	99 646	7.6
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Farm-related injuries:		
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Operator and family members ----- farms ..	247	1.6
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Operator and family members ----- farms ..	280	1.6
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Hired workers ----- farms ..	602	.7
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Hired workers ----- farms ..	1 342	.4
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Farm-related deaths:		
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Operator and family members ----- farms ..	6	8.5
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Operator and family members ----- farms ..	6	8.5
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Hired workers ----- farms ..	4	5.9
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Hired workers ----- farms ..	4	5.9
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..			Hired workers ----- farms ..	4	5.9

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Farms ----- number ..	12 099	.9	Total farm production expenses ----- farms ..	12 117	1.1
Land in farms ----- acres ..	15 599 876	.1	----- \$1,000 ..	1 760 394	.4
Average size of farm ----- acres ..	1 289	.9	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	145 283	1.2
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
Total sales (see text) ----- farms ..	12 099	.9	All farms ----- number ..	12 117	1.1
----- \$1,000 ..	2 239 453	.2	----- \$1,000 ..	466 885	.9
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	185 094	1.0	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	38 531	1.4
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains ² ----- number ..	8 645	1.6
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ----- farms ..	2 946	1.3	----- \$1,000 ..	522 323	.7
----- \$1,000 ..	41 312	1.3	Average net gain ----- dollars ..	60 419	1.7
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ----- farms ..	855	1.5	Farms with net losses ----- number ..	3 472	3.1
----- \$1,000 ..	18 953	1.5	----- \$1,000 ..	55 438	2.7
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ----- farms ..	1 499	1.5	Average net loss ----- dollars ..	15 967	4.2
----- \$1,000 ..	47 116	1.5	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ----- farms ..	684	1.6	Government payments ----- farms ..	3 146	.7
----- \$1,000 ..	30 142	1.6	----- \$1,000 ..	46 152	.2
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ----- farms ..	1 940	1.3	Other farm-related income ¹ ----- farms ..	3 980	2.8
----- \$1,000 ..	137 533	1.3	----- \$1,000 ..	48 866	3.6
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ----- farms ..	2 155	.7	Customwork and other agricultural services ----- farms ..	1 475	5.0
----- \$1,000 ..	346 398	.6	----- \$1,000 ..	18 503	8.1
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ----- farms ..	1 118	—	Gross cash rent or share payments ----- farms ..	1 524	5.1
----- \$1,000 ..	390 906	—	----- \$1,000 ..	10 772	6.0
\$500,000 or more ----- farms ..	902	—	Forest products and Christmas trees ----- farms ..	649	6.8
----- \$1,000 ..	1 227 094	—	----- \$1,000 ..	14 505	4.3
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Other farm-related income sources ----- farms ..	1 492	4.6
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	8 030	.9	----- \$1,000 ..	5 087	3.3
----- \$1,000 ..	1 435 124	.2	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Grains ----- farms ..	3 022	.8	Total ----- farms ..	285	1.0
----- \$1,000 ..	204 183	.3	----- \$1,000 ..	7 068	.6
Corn for grain ----- farms ..	105	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	6 099	.5			
Wheat ----- farms ..	2 652	.7			
----- \$1,000 ..	172 527	.3			
Soybeans ----- farms ..	—	—			
----- \$1,000 ..	—	—			
Sorghum for grain ----- farms ..	—	—			
----- \$1,000 ..	—	—			
Barley ----- farms ..	809	1.0			
----- \$1,000 ..	16 593	.6			
Oats ----- farms ..	480	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	4 069	1.2			
Other grains ----- farms ..	197	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	4 896	1.0			
Cotton and cottonseed ----- farms ..	—	—			
----- \$1,000 ..	—	—			
Tobacco ----- farms ..	—	—			
----- \$1,000 ..	—	—			
Hay, silage, and field seeds ----- farms ..	3 610	1.1			
----- \$1,000 ..	262 746	.4			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ----- farms ..	1 091	.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	173 364	.2			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ----- farms ..	2 195	1.1			
----- \$1,000 ..	243 560	.5			
Nursery and greenhouse crops ----- farms ..	1 374	.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	361 129	.1			
Other crops ----- farms ..	841	.8			
----- \$1,000 ..	190 142	.2			
Livestock, poultry, and their products ----- farms ..	7 125	1.0			
----- \$1,000 ..	804 329	.3			
Poultry and poultry products ----- farms ..	237	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	84 509	.1			
Dairy products ----- farms ..	710	.9			
----- \$1,000 ..	208 544	.2			
Cattle and calves ----- farms ..	6 120	.2			
----- \$1,000 ..	457 102	.3			
Hogs and pigs ----- farms ..	372	1.6			
----- \$1,000 ..	7 863	1.4			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ----- farms ..	1 112	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	23 681	.4			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ----- farms ..	1 075	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	22 630	1.4			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ----- farms ..	911	1.3			
----- \$1,000 ..	6 556	1.1			

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Total cropland ----- farms ..	11 053	.9	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ----- farms ..	8 925	1.0
Harvested cropland ----- acres..	4 442 844	.3	Partnership ----- farms ..	8 551 395	.2
Harvested cropland ----- farms ..	9 956	.9	Partnership ----- farms ..	1 653	1.0
Cropland: ----- acres..	2 663 733	.3	Corporation: ----- farms ..	2 975 601	.1
Pasture or grazing only ----- farms ..	4 506	1.1	Family held ----- farms ..	1 268	.6
Pasture or grazing only ----- acres..	552 491	.9	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	3 069 868	(L)
Total woodland ----- farms ..	3 520	.9	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	28	3.4
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and ----- acres..	1 437 996	.2	Other than family held ----- farms ..	150	1.7
woodland pastured ----- farms ..	3 795	.8	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	315 785	.2
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. ----- farms ..	9 440 690	.1	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	18	5.9
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	6 861	1.0	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ----- farms ..	103	1.7
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	278 346	.5	acres..	687 227	.1
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	7 640	1.0			
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- acres..	1 498 885	.5			
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	6 778	.9			
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- acres..	1 182 290	.4			
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	2 482	1.2			
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- acres..	316 595	.7			
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:					
Diverted under annual commodity programs ----- farms ..	1 437	.7			
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve ----- acres..	43 452	.2			
Programs ----- farms ..	812	.7			
Programs ----- acres..	314 047	.2			
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS ¹			HIRED FARM LABOR		
Estimated market value of land and buildings ----- farms ..	12 117	1.1	Hired workers by days worked:		
Average per farm ----- \$1,000..	8 534 219	1.0	150 days or more ----- farms ..	3 843	9.4
Average per farm ----- dollars	704 318	1.5	Less than 150 days ----- workers..	19 829	2.8
Average per acre ----- dollars	543	1.5	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	6 299	13.7
			Less than 150 days ----- workers..	88 438	7.5
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT ¹			INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Estimated market value of all machinery and ----- farms ..	12 117	1.1	Farm-related injuries:		
Average per farm ----- \$1,000..	1 170 194	1.1	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	133	1.5
Average per farm ----- dollars	96 575	1.5	Hired workers ----- farms ..	155	1.5
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	561	.6
			Hired workers ----- number..	1 288	.3
			Farm-related deaths:		
			Operator and family members ----- farms ..	2	—
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	(D)	(D)
			Hired workers ----- farms ..	4	5.9
			Hired workers ----- number..	(D)	(D)
			FARMS BY SIZE		
			1 to 9 acres -----	851	1.3
			10 to 49 acres -----	2 190	1.3
			50 to 69 acres -----	628	1.5
			70 to 99 acres -----	833	1.4
			100 to 139 acres -----	830	1.5
			140 to 179 acres -----	704	1.6
			180 to 219 acres -----	535	1.7
			220 to 259 acres -----	384	1.8
			260 to 499 acres -----	1 491	1.3
			500 to 999 acres -----	1 213	1.2
			1,000 to 1,999 acres -----	861	—
			2,000 acres or more -----	1 579	—
			FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION		
			Cash grains (011) -----	1 075	.9
			Field crops, except cash grains (013) -----	1 784	1.2
			Vegetables and melons (016) -----	560	1.1
			Fruits and tree nuts (017) -----	1 750	1.3
			Horticultural specialties (018) -----	1 072	.8
			General farms, primarily crop (019) -----	423	1.2
			Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties -----		
			(021) -----	4 283	1.0
			Dairy farms (024) -----	625	.8
			Poultry and eggs (025) -----	95	1.5
			Animal specialties (027) -----	405	1.9
			General farms, primarily livestock and animal -----		
			specialties (029) -----	27	5.1
			LIVESTOCK		
			Cattle and calves inventory ----- farms ..	6 128	.9
			Beef cows ----- farms ..	1 302 210	.4
			Milk cows ----- farms ..	4 764	1.0
			Milk cows ----- farms ..	554 573	.4
			Milk cows ----- farms ..	982	.9
			Milk cows ----- number..	97 948	.3
			Cattle and calves sold ----- farms ..	6 120	.9
			Hogs and pigs inventory ----- farms ..	835 974	.4
			Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	457 102	.3
			Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	406	1.6
			Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	48 766	1.8
			Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	372	1.6
			Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	84 107	1.5
			Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	7 863	1.4
			Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..		
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory ----- farms ..	1 092	1.3
			Sheep and lambs sold ----- farms ..	308 103	.7
			Sheep and lambs sold ----- farms ..	1 071	1.3
			Sheep and lambs sold ----- farms ..	372 282	.5
			Horses and ponies inventory ----- farms ..	2 886	1.0
			Horses and ponies sold ----- farms ..	20 531	1.0
			Horses and ponies sold ----- farms ..	702	1.3
			Horses and ponies sold ----- farms ..	3 578	2.0

See footnotes at end of table.

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..	-4	1.3	3.3	1.1
Land in farms acres ..	-1.1	.2	1.0	.2
Average size of farm acres ..	-7	1.3	-2.3	1.1
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :				
Average per farmdollars ..	23.7	2.2	18.8	2.2
Average per acredollars ..	22.3	2.4	19.9	2.6
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :				
Average per farmdollars ..	27.0	2.4	18.8	2.3
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	15.4	2.1	34.2	2.3
10 to 49 acres	-1.9	1.6	15.8	1.9
50 to 179 acres	-6.5	1.4	-5	1.6
180 to 499 acres	-6.3	1.4	-2.8	1.5
500 to 999 acres	-3.3	1.4	-3.4	1.4
1,000 to 1,999 acres	-1.1	-	-7	-
2,000 acres or more5	-	.5	-
Total croplandfarms ..	-3.0	1.2	1.7	1.1
Harvested croplandacres..	-3.8	.5	-3.4	.4
.....farms ..	-4.5	1.1	.1	1.1
.....acres..	-3	.4	1.2	.4
Irrigated landfarms ..	4.1	1.3	4.8	1.2
.....acres..	-1.6	.6	-9	.5
Market value of agricultural products sold\$1,000 ..	24.2	.4	25.1	.4
Average per farmdollars ..	24.7	1.7	21.0	1.4
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops\$1,000 ..	38.5	.4	39.1	.4
Livestock, poultry, and their products\$1,000 ..	5.4	.3	6.0	.3
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500	-2.2	1.4	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999	-4.5	1.7	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999	-1.0	1.7	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999	2.8	1.7	2.8	1.7
\$25,000 to \$49,999	-5	1.8	-5	1.8
\$50,000 to \$99,999	-1.6	1.6	-1.6	1.6
\$100,000 to \$249,999	-1.4	.7	-1.4	.7
\$250,000 to \$499,999	7.7	.1	7.7	.1
\$500,000 or more	45.2	.1	45.2	.1
Total farm production expenses ¹\$1,000 ..	22.6	1.4	23.9	1.4
Average per farmdollars ..	23.1	1.6	19.8	1.6
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹farms..	-4	1.2	3.5	1.2
.....\$1,000..	32.7	2.6	29.7	2.1
Average per farmdollars ..	33.3	3.1	25.4	2.5
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	-3	1.1	.3	1.1
Other	-4	1.6	13.8	1.7
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	-2.5	5.0	4.4	5.4
200 days or more	-4.4	4.9	6.8	5.5
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventoryfarms ..	-2.4	1.3	.7	1.1
.....number..	-2.5	.5	-2.3	.4
Beef cowsfarms ..	-2.0	1.3	5.9	1.2
.....number..	1.7	.6	2.7	.5
Milk cowsfarms ..	-20.4	1.0	-16.9	.9
.....number..	3.9	.4	4.4	.4
Cattle and calves soldfarms ..	-7.2	1.2	-2	1.1
.....number..	-5.9	.4	-5.0	.4
Hogs and pigs inventoryfarms ..	12.6	2.1	-20.5	1.6
.....number..	-32.5	1.3	-37.0	1.3
Hogs and pigs soldfarms ..	4.5	2.0	-21.0	1.6
.....number..	-32.2	1.2	-35.2	1.2
Sheep and lambs inventoryfarms ..	-12.1	1.3	-19.2	1.3
.....number..	-16.4	.9	-16.6	.8
Chickens 3 months old or older inventoryfarms ..	-22.0	1.4	-31.1	1.3
.....number..	-3.1	.1	-3.1	.1
Broilers and other meat-type chickens soldfarms ..	-7.6	2.6	9.9	3.0
.....number..	32.8	.3	32.9	.3
Selected crops harvested:				
Wheat for grainfarms ..	-22.2	.8	-18.5	.8
.....acres..	10.3	.3	11.0	.3
.....bushels..	-10.3	.3	-9.9	.3
Barley for grainfarms ..	-39.3	.7	-38.5	.7
.....acres..	-31.8	.4	-31.8	.4
.....bushels..	-36.5	.4	-36.4	.4
Oats for grainfarms ..	-28.6	1.1	-23.7	1.2
.....acres..	-8.0	1.3	-4.2	1.4
.....bushels..	6.2	1.6	10.4	1.7
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)farms ..	-13.3	1.1	-10.5	1.1
.....acres..	-7.6	.7	-5.6	.6
.....tons, dry..	-2.8	.7	-3	.7
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)farms ..	-1.3	1.1	-5.8	1.0
.....acres..	3.8	.3	3.8	.3
Land in orchardsfarms ..	-4.8	1.3	4	1.4
.....acres..	5.6	1.0	11.3	1.0

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm 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)
Oregon	31 892	1.0	17 609 497	.2	552	1.0	370 938	1.5	1 532 094	1.0
Baker	593	1.7	818 736	.3	1 381	1.7	509 924	3.9	33 703	6.5
Benton	658	.9	118 818	.9	181	1.3	343 901	4.2	33 741	3.0
Clackamas	3 155	.9	148 848	.9	47	1.3	233 136	2.9	102 486	2.6
Clatsop	233	1.1	24 740	2.3	106	2.5	180 844	11.3	4 706	12.5
Columbia	661	.9	71 839	1.0	109	1.4	236 364	11.2	15 126	7.4
Coos	722	1.3	174 872	.9	242	1.6	301 592	8.6	20 838	5.5
Crook	503	1.1	894 853	.1	1 779	1.1	456 612	5.7	25 242	5.7
Curry	177	1.3	74 375	.9	420	1.6	531 029	6.8	6 302	3.9
Deschutes	1 036	1.4	139 483	.9	135	1.6	234 107	4.8	24 931	5.7
Douglas	1 823	1.0	402 023	.7	221	1.3	268 486	5.6	44 998	7.8
Gilliam	143	.3	766 373	.1	5 359	.3	981 494	3.3	16 993	3.2
Grant	394	.8	1 154 399	.1	2 930	.8	642 630	6.0	15 558	8.0
Harney	442	1.2	1 457 339	.1	3 297	1.2	856 347	5.9	26 090	6.4
Hood River	563	1.1	27 201	1.4	48	1.8	281 531	4.2	29 143	4.9
Jackson	1 573	1.1	262 251	.7	167	1.2	281 734	4.6	51 629	4.1
Jefferson	345	1.0	530 960	.2	1 539	1.0	496 783	4.2	28 794	7.2
Josephine	607	.9	31 249	1.5	51	1.8	181 973	7.7	14 861	9.8
Klamath	954	2.0	720 153	.7	755	2.1	480 199	5.5	69 917	7.0
Lake	366	1.0	833 025	.2	2 276	1.0	730 199	8.9	23 178	8.5
Lane	1 969	.9	242 121	.7	123	1.2	258 863	4.9	70 371	4.9
Lincoln	283	1.2	34 292	2.1	121	2.4	202 434	6.9	5 834	15.6
Linn	1 948	1.0	380 464	.6	195	1.1	322 921	2.5	101 295	3.4
Malheur	1 186	1.1	1 318 447	.2	1 112	1.1	525 126	5.8	97 761	3.2
Marion	2 494	1.0	302 462	.6	121	1.1	360 561	3.2	165 231	2.4
Morrow	348	.7	1 119 004	.1	3 216	.7	1 109 442	4.6	57 859	3.6
Multnomah	602	1.1	31 294	1.0	52	1.5	252 843	5.8	22 224	4.7
Polk	1 027	.9	167 880	.7	163	1.2	304 688	2.9	44 031	3.8
Sherman	179	.5	487 534	.1	2 724	.5	779 164	4.7	20 652	4.1
Tillamook	338	.7	39 559	.7	117	1.0	354 124	2.6	20 358	2.3
Umatilla	1 441	.9	1 466 580	.2	1 018	.9	490 907	2.4	110 055	2.6
Union	751	1.0	473 316	.5	630	1.1	317 302	5.8	37 072	5.4
Wallowa	459	1.0	694 304	.2	1 513	1.0	478 391	5.2	20 881	9.7
Wasco	456	.9	1 152 965	.1	2 528	.9	971 253	3.7	30 940	4.5
Washington	1 627	.8	139 820	.7	86	1.1	388 474	4.3	66 307	3.6
Wheeler	145	.5	728 131	.1	5 022	.5	1 006 613	3.9	8 160	13.5
Yamhill	1 691	.9	179 787	.8	106	1.2	294 376	3.2	64 828	3.2

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Oregon	48 223	1.5	2 292 973	.3	71 898	1.0	31 875	1.1	1 881 731	.4
Baker	57 124	6.7	39 033	.9	65 823	1.9	593	1.7	33 083	2.4
Benton	51 357	3.2	37 272	.4	56 644	1.0	657	1.2	37 030	2.2
Clackamas	32 743	2.8	151 211	.3	47 927	1.0	3 152	1.0	133 296	1.1
Clatsop	20 197	12.5	6 557	1.1	28 141	1.6	233	1.3	5 083	3.1
Columbia	23 094	7.5	12 263	.8	18 552	1.2	661	1.2	12 820	7.2
Coos	29 103	5.7	27 527	1.3	38 126	1.8	722	1.3	20 461	4.3
Crook	50 284	5.9	28 073	.6	55 811	1.2	502	1.5	23 368	3.0
Curry	35 809	4.5	10 457	.7	59 080	1.4	176	2.3	7 377	3.8
Deschutes	24 229	6.0	16 360	1.4	15 792	1.9	1 036	1.6	16 568	4.7
Douglas	24 697	7.8	31 232	.7	17 132	1.3	1 822	1.2	29 625	3.6
Gilliam	118 834	3.4	17 306	.1	121 023	.3	143	1.2	14 708	1.3
Grant	39 587	8.0	18 150	.4	46 066	.9	393	1.0	16 321	3.1
Harney	59 028	6.6	35 402	.4	80 095	1.3	442	1.4	30 894	6.2
Hood River	51 856	5.1	54 921	.7	97 551	1.3	562	1.5	41 338	2.1
Jackson	33 159	4.4	51 633	.5	32 825	1.2	1 572	1.3	47 628	1.7
Jefferson	83 460	7.3	42 456	.5	123 061	1.1	345	1.3	33 580	3.3
Josephine	24 483	9.9	12 300	.7	20 264	1.2	607	1.0	12 134	2.8
Klamath	73 288	7.4	85 035	.8	89 135	2.2	954	2.2	71 967	2.2
Lake	63 327	8.6	36 574	.5	99 930	1.1	366	.9	28 475	4.3
Lane	35 757	5.0	70 225	.4	35 665	1.0	1 968	1.1	64 264	1.4
Lincoln	20 689	15.7	5 779	2.2	20 421	2.5	282	1.6	5 612	15.1
Linn	52 026	3.6	139 526	.3	71 626	1.0	1 947	1.1	110 082	1.4
Malheur	82 359	3.5	199 678	.3	168 363	1.1	1 187	1.4	144 771	.9
Marion	66 331	2.7	313 155	.2	125 563	1.0	2 491	1.3	244 747	.6
Morrow	166 261	3.8	94 132	.2	270 495	.7	348	1.0	82 904	1.2
Multnomah	37 288	5.0	38 667	.5	64 231	1.2	603	1.6	28 502	2.7
Polk	42 915	4.0	65 608	.4	63 883	1.0	1 026	1.1	55 736	1.9
Sherman	115 372	4.6	20 585	.1	115 000	.5	179	2.0	15 321	2.4
Tillamook	60 231	2.5	63 663	.4	188 352	.8	338	1.0	52 244	1.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	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			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Umatilla	76 374	2.8	186 690	.2	129 556	.9	1 441	1.1	158 390	1.0
Union	49 895	5.6	46 422	.4	61 814	1.1	751	1.1	38 501	1.6
Wallowa	46 401	9.9	28 679	.7	62 481	1.2	459	1.3	22 870	5.0
Wasco	67 850	4.7	48 743	.3	106 891	1.0	456	1.1	35 721	5.0
Washington	41 159	3.7	127 539	.3	78 389	.9	1 625	1.0	103 643	1.5
Wheeler	56 275	13.7	6 485	.4	44 726	.6	145	1.8	5 944	4.4
Yamhill	38 496	3.4	123 633	.3	73 112	.9	1 691	1.2	96 725	1.0

Farm production expenses¹—Con.

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Oregon	10 937	1.9	160 847	1.3	18 983	1.4	230 557	.9	8 422	1.9	51 855	.8
Baker	293	7.3	6 649	4.3	451	4.5	4 784	4.9	173	12.3	330	11.7
Benton	216	12.6	536	19.8	355	7.4	3 549	2.8	273	10.7	1 091	12.0
Clackamas	947	5.2	4 473	8.5	1 767	2.8	18 203	5.2	780	5.3	5 306	2.0
Clatsop	81	19.1	558	7.0	193	7.4	1 958	2.7	40	34.9	22	49.0
Columbia	228	12.5	2 022	34.1	518	4.7	1 565	4.0	74	21.5	(D)	(D)
Coos	295	9.9	2 606	11.6	483	5.8	3 920	9.9	140	17.2	78	16.8
Crook	182	14.0	4 343	2.0	329	7.4	2 713	5.3	47	14.7	240	26.2
Curry	50	9.8	412	8.6	120	5.0	480	12.2	24	16.2	123	26.6
Deschutes	473	7.1	2 257	16.2	722	4.4	1 843	6.4	118	19.7	482	3.6
Douglas	678	6.5	7 013	7.7	1 287	3.3	3 346	5.0	264	11.6	230	14.7
Gilliam	53	9.9	1 016	4.4	83	5.9	1 314	4.2	84	5.7	556	4.0
Grant	205	10.3	3 201	10.6	273	8.1	3 482	6.0	61	21.9	77	18.0
Harney	215	11.2	5 076	11.9	361	6.2	5 564	10.8	109	22.7	244	17.1
Hood River	98	24.1	852	57.0	155	15.5	589	12.8	121	14.7	393	10.2
Jackson	656	6.9	4 248	7.8	1 024	4.0	4 270	6.2	304	9.9	407	10.9
Jefferson	134	14.9	6 458	3.0	188	8.6	1 867	9.7	133	12.4	531	4.3
Josephine	241	11.7	785	7.2	355	7.6	3 279	2.7	111	18.0	179	8.1
Klamath	395	8.4	12 138	7.2	640	5.4	10 333	4.2	237	11.3	1 725	5.7
Lake	162	12.4	3 842	10.7	289	6.2	3 354	4.4	90	19.0	237	10.2
Lane	688	6.3	7 948	3.4	1 249	3.5	9 787	1.2	405	8.2	1 479	4.9
Lincoln	104	12.7	256	29.5	207	5.9	622	40.2	41	28.0	(D)	(D)
Linn	696	6.6	5 561	5.6	1 260	3.6	11 140	3.2	446	7.6	1 769	3.3
Malheur	446	8.2	18 182	2.2	673	4.9	20 310	3.0	646	5.1	4 033	2.1
Marion	566	8.3	5 956	4.9	1 154	4.3	22 824	2.9	763	6.4	7 431	1.3
Morrow	145	12.3	3 002	6.2	201	8.4	2 065	5.1	164	8.3	3 950	2.0
Multnomah	141	14.6	183	16.8	218	10.1	312	18.5	170	11.1	1 664	5.4
Polk	328	9.2	3 030	8.6	573	5.6	10 923	1.6	254	9.7	688	6.0
Sherman	29	11.6	490	1.9	87	7.4	1 989	1.4	113	5.0	799	4.8
Tillamook	124	12.3	2 104	4.0	300	3.4	26 913	2.2	37	21.7	29	12.0
Umatilla	412	9.6	22 898	1.5	778	4.7	18 486	1.8	641	5.2	6 237	1.9
Union	294	10.4	11 844	2.7	495	5.7	2 511	9.0	277	9.5	863	6.2
Wallowa	234	10.9	2 995	10.4	352	6.3	3 943	7.8	94	21.8	247	11.1
Wasco	122	13.5	1 872	9.1	220	6.7	1 490	7.2	180	7.8	560	6.6
Washington	385	9.3	1 548	16.0	647	5.8	5 677	2.8	538	6.0	4 692	2.7
Wheeler	60	12.0	809	7.7	96	6.8	1 081	11.1	30	12.2	53	13.5
Yamhill	561	6.5	3 683	3.0	880	4.4	14 070	1.4	440	7.3	4 249	3.1

Farm production expenses¹—Con.

Geographic area	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Oregon	16 616	1.4	119 158	.9	23 952	1.2	104 042	1.0	28 479	1.1	80 192	.8
Baker	244	8.4	1 128	8.4	361	6.1	428	5.3	583	2.0	1 851	4.7
Benton	356	7.2	4 146	3.4	600	3.2	3 645	4.0	609	2.5	1 567	2.9
Clackamas	1 721	3.0	3 753	3.4	2 754	1.7	3 652	3.2	2 835	1.6	4 115	2.1
Clatsop	58	26.4	29	24.4	72	20.7	25	28.2	209	5.3	226	15.3
Columbia	185	14.4	416	18.8	339	9.2	269	33.8	573	3.4	470	7.9
Coos	317	8.6	706	8.5	462	5.5	307	14.5	629	3.2	937	6.8
Crook	246	9.9	1 443	7.2	167	13.8	780	9.2	440	4.5	1 387	5.7
Curry	83	7.3	416	8.8	125	5.0	261	2.8	149	3.3	299	7.1
Deschutes	639	5.5	742	10.8	502	7.6	230	18.8	837	3.4	757	8.0

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses 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)
Douglas	776	5.9	1 288	8.9	1 464	2.5	618	8.0	1 600	2.2	1 475	7.3
Gilliam	91	4.2	1 197	4.1	128	2.8	1 488	5.6	136	2.2	1 140	2.1
Grant	100	16.1	485	9.1	154	11.4	138	8.5	361	3.6	1 025	6.8
Harney	113	24.4	731	27.3	146	14.8	412	10.5	409	4.0	1 852	6.6
Hood River	448	5.8	1 078	4.9	447	5.5	5 016	4.1	518	3.3	1 477	4.5
Jackson	677	6.7	1 060	8.2	1 205	3.4	4 176	2.2	1 365	2.5	1 742	4.7
Jefferson	240	6.9	3 021	5.6	232	8.0	2 634	9.3	279	3.2	1 343	8.1
Josephine	329	8.4	325	10.8	442	5.3	190	14.3	501	4.6	505	12.4
Klamath	263	9.8	3 958	6.6	666	5.0	2 503	5.9	900	2.8	3 841	4.0
Lake	102	16.7	1 080	6.5	162	11.6	600	15.5	339	3.3	1 940	5.2
Lane	938	4.5	3 860	3.2	1 625	2.4	4 131	7.1	1 738	1.9	2 857	2.7
Lincoln	91	18.3	176	56.7	246	4.3	83	9.8	251	3.8	383	16.8
Linn	1 082	4.0	13 952	2.6	1 703	2.2	9 109	2.2	1 737	2.0	4 752	1.6
Malheur	593	5.1	11 618	2.3	872	3.9	7 861	2.0	1 111	2.0	7 149	2.6
Marion	1 685	3.0	17 034	2.2	2 318	1.7	13 263	2.2	2 252	1.9	8 736	1.8
Morrow	240	6.5	8 775	1.6	252	6.4	8 635	1.6	318	2.7	3 472	3.1
Multnomah	352	6.3	1 138	6.0	405	5.8	992	8.4	536	2.8	974	6.1
Polk	601	5.4	5 380	4.5	749	3.9	4 487	4.4	907	2.5	2 407	2.2
Sherman	128	4.2	1 728	5.2	159	3.2	1 476	4.8	163	2.9	1 335	3.2
Tillamook	108	11.2	229	9.4	161	8.1	121	6.2	321	2.4	933	1.6
Umatilla	808	4.1	12 428	1.9	1 094	3.2	13 169	3.3	1 282	2.2	6 544	3.2
Union	402	7.0	2 884	5.2	526	5.3	1 334	3.9	683	2.6	1 596	3.8
Wallowa	233	11.6	1 031	12.0	271	9.3	417	15.8	419	3.7	1 261	5.3
Wasco	289	5.6	2 037	4.4	279	6.6	2 611	2.9	402	2.9	1 570	3.3
Washington	1 089	3.7	4 673	4.6	1 441	2.2	4 320	3.6	1 429	2.2	3 952	2.4
Wheeler	34	17.0	84	17.5	76	7.4	103	11.7	132	3.2	445	5.2
Yamhill	955	4.2	5 128	4.8	1 347	2.6	4 559	9.4	1 526	2.0	3 878	2.3

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)
Oregon	22 431	1.3	45 048	1.0	11 480	1.7	367 047	.5	4 850	2.8	31 329	3.2
Baker	433	5.0	619	9.8	207	9.8	2 263	7.2	71	16.4	276	12.0
Benton	481	5.2	850	2.5	282	8.2	6 584	4.8	146	15.4	565	8.0
Clackamas	2 206	2.5	2 190	1.8	1 145	4.2	43 201	.7	490	8.0	2 301	3.7
Clatsop	140	11.0	125	10.5	68	22.0	443	.9	18	49.0	31	41.8
Columbia	368	8.5	190	4.5	186	14.8	1 559	1.1	73	23.2	(D)	(D)
Coos	550	4.1	634	5.1	274	8.4	1 894	4.1	132	17.2	792	27.3
Crook	376	5.1	881	4.4	132	14.6	1 675	2.3	94	20.9	578	20.1
Curry	143	3.9	196	7.4	87	5.3	1 803	5.1	32	12.8	224	6.4
Deschutes	822	3.6	704	10.6	261	12.0	1 849	5.2	135	17.5	224	13.5
Douglas	1 286	3.5	626	6.0	520	8.0	1 977	9.0	242	13.2	369	19.2
Gilliam	119	3.6	354	3.5	85	2.8	1 549	4.0	28	14.5	76	6.4
Grant	270	8.0	246	8.7	119	14.2	1 439	5.9	56	20.3	139	22.4
Harney	363	7.4	1 339	7.6	169	16.4	2 108	4.5	66	30.9	345	5.7
Hood River	401	5.2	689	4.0	365	5.8	15 866	2.0	97	21.8	423	3.7
Jackson	1 066	4.2	972	3.7	480	8.6	13 652	.7	201	15.9	926	20.0
Jefferson	248	7.9	824	9.1	125	15.0	4 270	2.9	69	19.8	267	38.1
Josephine	449	5.4	396	6.0	192	13.2	1 952	6.5	62	24.0	96	9.8
Klamath	750	4.5	1 377	4.9	285	8.9	7 792	3.9	139	17.7	932	7.9
Lake	258	7.2	1 810	12.9	138	14.8	2 810	5.5	60	21.5	538	8.1
Lane	1 212	3.8	1 206	3.0	634	6.6	9 515	4.5	284	11.4	750	11.1
Lincoln	149	9.0	100	35.7	90	17.3	1 387	12.3	31	32.8	(D)	(D)
Linn	1 300	3.6	2 014	4.4	686	5.6	17 953	4.0	224	12.0	1 313	13.2
Malheur	925	3.5	2 303	1.7	460	6.0	17 206	2.0	334	8.5	5 981	3.4
Marion	1 711	3.3	4 598	2.2	1 173	4.5	66 056	1.4	392	10.5	3 612	20.2
Morrow	286	5.3	7 221	.7	170	9.5	12 198	1.4	59	18.5	906	2.8
Multnomah	342	6.1	306	7.7	240	9.5	12 541	2.8	84	17.0	521	32.2
Polk	787	3.8	852	3.6	326	8.6	7 050	3.1	161	13.8	508	11.8
Sherman	148	4.2	290	4.0	72	6.7	1 193	5.7	17	18.9	80	5.3
Tillamook	275	5.4	962	1.7	164	6.5	5 194	1.6	36	18.7	136	7.4
Umatilla	1 166	3.1	5 158	3.4	554	6.4	21 810	2.3	223	12.9	1 389	14.2
Union	464	6.1	622	5.3	273	10.2	2 723	8.3	84	20.5	478	5.0
Wallowa	343	7.2	553	15.9	147	16.5	2 467	7.4	38	33.7	401	57.3
Wasco	351	4.7	711	5.4	211	7.3	11 112	2.1	65	22.2	219	16.4
Washington	1 084	3.4	1 489	2.1	552	6.6	35 979	1.4	284	9.8	3 781	6.2
Wheeler	100	6.1	188	8.4	49	12.6	737	8.3	20	14.0	89	21.0
Yamhill	1 059	4.1	1 453	3.3	559	6.4	27 240	1.3	303	10.4	1 968	6.3

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses 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)
Oregon	25 574	1.2	121 370	.8	9 015	2.0	38 704	2.0	12 384	1.7	133 197	1.2
Baker	521	3.8	2 032	6.0	231	10.7	601	20.6	334	6.9	3 711	9.8
Benton	540	4.7	2 505	3.1	240	10.1	1 544	11.3	233	9.9	2 417	7.7
Clackamas	2 449	2.2	6 951	2.1	786	6.0	1 704	12.3	1 134	4.6	7 573	4.1
Clatsop	188	6.8	257	8.7	59	26.2	58	26.2	45	26.7	307	10.9
Columbia	430	6.3	963	8.6	157	15.4	279	22.2	197	13.2	1 209	11.1
Coos	615	3.4	1 429	6.3	137	15.1	396	32.8	245	10.1	2 003	9.5
Crook	376	5.7	1 795	6.4	115	16.7	469	13.1	188	11.7	1 987	7.7
Curry	143	3.4	678	5.9	28	14.5	110	27.2	64	7.4	495	5.6
Deschutes	767	3.9	1 278	8.2	193	13.2	243	12.1	330	10.2	2 117	12.9
Douglas	1 448	2.7	2 533	11.7	473	8.7	395	13.1	599	7.0	2 953	7.8
Gilliam	128	3.1	1 363	2.4	51	9.1	368	6.4	104	5.0	1 216	4.8
Grant	367	3.4	1 137	5.1	51	24.3	139	7.7	185	11.9	1 335	8.4
Harney	374	7.0	2 060	6.2	119	16.5	477	20.8	300	9.9	3 293	9.6
Hood River	486	4.7	2 747	4.3	155	13.8	393	13.9	267	7.3	3 456	6.7
Jackson	1 245	3.4	3 130	3.9	451	9.4	435	12.7	465	9.0	3 602	10.5
Jefferson	296	5.1	2 060	5.8	133	14.5	1 198	14.0	174	12.8	1 759	12.4
Josephine	517	3.7	967	6.6	153	15.2	308	30.5	163	15.3	664	10.0
Klamath	809	3.8	5 357	5.8	288	11.5	1 364	15.6	447	7.3	5 203	6.6
Lake	339	3.9	2 347	6.1	103	17.9	909	12.5	243	8.9	2 380	9.8
Lane	1 406	3.2	3 908	4.4	459	8.1	1 267	5.0	508	7.7	3 636	6.2
Lincoln	220	6.1	338	12.8	50	25.7	46	46.8	66	17.1	326	12.8
Linn	1 513	2.9	7 211	3.3	537	7.1	2 180	10.2	694	6.1	7 119	3.9
Malheur	1 061	2.5	8 305	1.9	614	6.2	2 981	3.5	729	4.9	10 395	4.9
Marion	2 048	2.3	15 502	1.8	929	5.3	5 722	3.9	940	5.0	15 739	1.9
Morrow	293	3.7	6 795	2.9	113	13.9	4 028	1.7	201	9.0	6 897	3.6
Multnomah	493	3.7	1 744	6.8	136	14.9	396	35.2	158	11.6	1 129	7.0
Polk	858	3.1	3 006	2.5	326	9.3	914	9.8	435	6.7	5 094	5.8
Sherman	158	3.4	1 425	4.0	69	8.1	450	13.2	109	4.5	1 093	6.7
Tillamook	286	4.4	2 627	2.1	66	12.9	411	3.4	192	6.4	3 671	6.4
Umatilla	1 158	2.9	10 817	2.4	445	7.6	4 297	6.1	650	6.3	10 236	3.4
Union	596	4.2	2 149	4.4	203	12.5	1 062	9.2	311	9.2	3 172	8.1
Wallowa	365	5.6	1 425	7.6	85	25.1	188	35.6	227	12.2	2 251	15.1
Wasco	335	4.9	2 380	3.3	124	9.9	547	5.3	248	8.3	2 940	5.9
Washington	1 210	3.0	5 721	3.6	475	7.4	1 407	4.7	571	6.4	5 404	5.8
Wheeler	130	4.0	570	12.0	13	36.7	10	30.5	60	11.7	463	8.9
Yamhill	1 406	2.6	5 858	3.0	468	8.0	1 410	22.2	568	7.1	5 948	3.4

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)
Oregon	6 069	2.3	85 134	1.3	29 510	1.1	68 203	1.1	28 623	1.1	245 048	.8
Baker	200	11.8	2 144	12.0	537	3.3	1 316	3.9	541	3.1	4 950	4.5
Benton	163	12.3	2 832	4.6	594	3.1	1 485	5.4	597	3.3	3 712	2.9
Clackamas	438	7.6	3 723	2.4	2 979	1.3	5 802	2.5	2 765	1.7	20 347	2.4
Clatsop	42	27.2	89	38.9	225	3.4	381	12.7	168	8.0	574	5.5
Columbia	70	23.6	325	41.2	656	1.3	935	6.5	551	4.0	2 015	5.9
Coos	102	17.2	593	21.7	693	1.9	1 520	5.7	669	2.5	2 647	5.7
Crook	86	17.5	1 264	3.6	485	2.1	1 116	6.4	449	3.3	2 696	6.6
Curry	35	12.8	352	4.7	153	3.4	348	5.9	167	2.5	1 179	6.1
Deschutes	137	16.4	191	13.4	991	2.1	1 583	5.6	987	2.2	2 069	7.6
Douglas	178	13.0	916	14.0	1 714	1.8	2 774	5.2	1 633	2.0	3 113	5.3
Gilliam	34	10.9	530	5.2	118	3.2	674	4.2	140	1.9	1 866	3.8
Grant	61	20.8	323	11.8	384	2.0	971	5.8	364	3.6	2 184	4.7
Harney	127	22.9	817	30.7	406	5.0	1 038	6.7	420	3.7	5 539	8.5
Hood River	79	17.1	895	6.3	542	2.3	1 605	3.7	473	4.1	5 858	7.1
Jackson	184	15.1	903	9.3	1 460	2.1	2 702	5.0	1 310	2.8	5 402	3.2
Jefferson	135	16.5	1 680	8.5	295	5.9	736	8.4	336	2.7	4 934	4.4
Josephine	41	23.3	109	8.3	592	1.4	680	7.2	570	2.4	1 698	2.4
Klamath	277	10.6	3 851	7.3	888	3.0	2 760	7.6	910	2.8	8 832	4.0
Lake	87	17.8	1 324	25.4	348	2.9	1 170	5.1	330	4.3	4 132	4.8
Lane	265	10.6	2 921	3.1	1 858	1.6	3 604	5.0	1 698	2.1	7 397	3.7
Lincoln	40	33.6	94	21.8	257	5.0	406	9.7	224	5.2	1 045	16.3
Linn	439	7.2	9 638	3.1	1 759	1.9	3 453	2.6	1 796	1.8	12 919	2.5
Malheur	416	7.5	6 848	2.5	1 047	2.7	3 139	3.0	1 137	1.9	18 459	2.1
Marion	725	6.7	14 155	2.9	2 195	2.3	6 194	3.7	2 239	2.0	37 923	1.0
Morrow	73	12.5	4 895	3.9	299	3.7	1 826	4.0	327	2.8	8 238	2.3
Multnomah	106	13.9	923	5.7	568	2.2	1 393	6.9	530	3.3	4 286	1.3
Polk	182	10.7	3 097	5.3	967	1.9	1 978	3.8	893	2.6	6 322	6.4
Sherman	16	20.2	313	4.7	137	3.9	666	6.1	174	2.4	1 993	4.2
Tillamook	86	8.2	707	8.2	304	3.7	909	3.1	298	3.8	7 300	1.7

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses 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)
Umatilla	296	10.7	6 726	3.7	1 317	2.0	3 719	2.6	1 341	1.8	14 475	4.4
Union	145	14.5	1 499	11.7	701	2.3	1 277	4.2	667	2.8	4 486	3.1
Wallowa	105	20.9	1 592	13.6	406	5.1	856	8.6	451	1.6	3 242	6.7
Wasco	85	14.3	1 611	6.6	411	3.2	1 790	5.2	428	2.3	4 271	2.4
Washington	313	9.8	4 206	8.2	1 522	1.7	3 427	4.0	1 421	2.1	17 367	3.9
Wheeler	41	14.4	184	14.5	122	4.6	454	9.4	139	1.9	673	8.3
Yamhill	260	9.8	2 862	4.6	1 580	1.7	3 515	3.4	1 480	2.2	10 904	1.4
Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
	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)
Oregon	31 875	1.1	398 979	1.2	26 508	.9	5 037 764	.4	20 743	.9	2 823 972	.4
Baker	593	1.7	4 899	17.7	490	1.8	143 418	1.3	382	1.9	67 541	1.0
Benton	657	1.2	(D)	(D)	555	1.0	86 437	.7	452	1.1	68 494	.6
Clackamas	3 152	1.0	18 868	6.2	2 610	.9	93 454	.9	2 075	.9	59 481	.9
Clatsop	233	1.3	294	48.0	175	1.5	13 113	3.4	129	1.9	4 772	2.8
Columbia	661	1.2	(D)	(D)	533	1.0	30 709	1.3	403	1.1	15 054	1.3
Coos	722	1.3	6 064	12.3	583	1.4	47 292	1.6	418	1.5	14 115	1.6
Crook	502	1.5	4 506	12.2	390	1.2	65 989	.9	279	1.5	33 874	.9
Curry	176	2.3	2 927	4.3	105	1.8	7 136	3.1	78	2.2	1 807	1.7
Deschutes	1 036	1.6	(D)	(D)	803	1.5	39 656	1.9	501	1.6	17 631	3.0
Douglas	1 822	1.2	(D)	(D)	1 432	1.1	104 834	1.3	1 018	1.1	36 889	1.1
Gilliam	143	1.2	2 692	7.2	127	.5	251 932	.1	102	.7	100 729	.2
Grant	393	1.0	1 438	36.9	300	1.0	80 405	.7	225	1.2	35 522	.4
Harney	442	1.4	6 130	14.1	362	1.3	165 752	.6	277	1.3	80 408	.5
Hood River	562	1.5	12 046	6.5	535	1.2	20 277	1.3	496	1.2	17 346	1.1
Jackson	1 572	1.3	(D)	(D)	1 299	1.1	68 216	1.4	917	1.2	32 868	1.7
Jefferson	345	1.3	9 919	7.7	312	1.1	97 725	.8	251	1.4	43 566	.8
Josephine	607	1.0	(D)	(D)	498	1.0	16 257	1.5	376	1.2	8 920	1.8
Klamath	954	2.2	13 559	8.4	762	2.3	223 457	1.5	548	2.3	133 136	1.3
Lake	366	.9	6 307	13.9	315	1.1	166 095	.7	210	1.4	95 493	.6
Lane	1 968	1.1	5 601	15.5	1 618	1.0	114 776	.9	1 262	1.0	73 344	.6
Lincoln	282	1.6	(D)	(D)	208	1.5	11 172	2.5	130	2.0	3 626	4.4
Linn	1 947	1.1	28 482	2.8	1 585	1.0	297 200	.5	1 195	1.0	247 419	.5
Malheur	1 187	1.4	54 378	2.3	1 080	1.1	252 381	.7	959	1.2	164 821	.6
Marion	2 491	1.3	66 224	1.9	2 109	1.0	242 561	.5	1 813	1.0	199 706	.5
Morrow	348	1.0	12 985	8.1	288	.9	458 086	.2	237	1.0	220 149	.2
Multnomah	603	1.6	10 575	4.3	522	1.1	19 684	1.1	451	1.2	14 642	1.0
Polk	1 026	1.1	9 331	7.1	877	1.0	118 207	.7	679	1.1	88 080	.8
Sherman	179	2.0	5 756	5.1	164	.6	314 217	.2	147	.7	127 018	.2
Tillamook	338	1.0	10 340	3.6	247	1.0	23 676	.7	113	1.6	6 348	.9
Umatilla	1 441	1.1	29 045	4.0	1 190	.9	708 209	.3	935	.9	381 564	.3
Union	751	1.1	7 596	6.2	640	1.1	144 018	1.0	547	1.1	89 011	.8
Wallowa	459	1.3	3 415	29.5	364	1.1	101 251	.9	267	1.3	53 711	.8
Wasco	456	1.1	12 305	5.6	409	1.0	236 435	.3	334	1.1	96 959	.2
Washington	1 625	1.0	24 633	3.6	1 448	.9	104 793	.8	1 268	.9	84 825	.8
Wheeler	145	1.8	741	27.0	120	.7	43 933	.5	76	1.4	10 743	.5
Yamhill	1 691	1.2	26 790	2.8	1 453	.9	125 011	.7	1 193	.9	94 360	.7
Geographic area	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Farms		Acres		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Oregon	15 002	1.0	1 622 235	.5	17 088	1.0	1 465 444	.4	13 105	1.0	629 625	.5
Baker	462	1.8	107 978	1.1	463	1.7	93 418	.9	371	1.9	45 257	.9
Benton	258	1.4	19 467	.6	286	1.5	10 362	1.6	223	1.7	3 513	2.8
Clackamas	928	1.0	23 982	.8	1 413	1.1	29 635	1.3	1 057	1.2	10 046	1.8
Clatsop	20	5.5	441	14.2	186	1.4	9 013	2.4	154	1.7	3 500	4.5
Columbia	74	2.4	2 669	2.5	486	1.1	15 470	1.7	407	1.2	5 655	2.1
Coos	289	1.8	10 150	1.6	486	1.3	27 816	1.3	376	1.5	11 102	1.5
Crook	388	1.3	47 477	.8	354	1.3	54 799	.8	303	1.5	26 717	.9
Curry	73	2.4	2 711	1.6	103	2.0	7 310	1.4	89	2.2	3 840	1.9
Deschutes	886	1.4	37 163	1.5	627	1.5	20 660	1.8	465	1.7	9 065	2.3
Douglas	577	1.3	12 746	2.1	1 193	1.1	55 186	1.1	937	1.2	21 867	1.4
Gilliam	26	2.6	4 014	1.3	84	.8	17 804	.2	79	.9	(D)	(D)
Grant	252	1.2	38 538	.7	300	1.0	56 918	.3	262	1.1	31 292	.4
Harney	285	1.3	92 650	.5	351	1.2	99 310	.4	319	1.2	60 422	.4
Hood River	533	1.2	17 674	.9	112	2.8	2 411	3.6	81	3.3	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
					Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Jackson	1 148	1.1	50 530	1.1	955	1.2	40 053	1.1	742	1.3	18 675	1.3
Jefferson	277	1.2	42 120	.9	161	1.8	28 125	1.4	135	2.0	(D)	(D)
Josephine	423	1.1	10 767	1.4	299	1.4	10 274	1.1	209	1.7	2 051	2.7
Klamath	738	2.2	213 363	1.2	635	2.1	98 756	1.2	528	2.3	41 915	1.5
Lake	244	1.3	134 094	.6	264	1.2	87 219	.4	239	1.3	47 161	.5
Lane	654	1.1	24 728	.8	1 047	1.1	37 665	1.0	829	1.2	13 777	1.6
Lincoln	63	3.2	948	8.3	202	1.6	7 313	2.8	185	1.7	3 615	2.3
Linn	521	1.3	32 424	.9	1 155	1.2	34 070	1.1	875	1.3	11 025	1.9
Malheur	1 047	1.1	178 768	.6	660	1.2	181 478	.4	471	1.2	75 424	.5
Marion	1 171	1.0	96 883	.4	973	1.2	44 462	.7	619	1.4	7 074	2.1
Morrow	200	1.3	101 506	.4	214	1.2	35 228	.9	187	1.3	20 119	.8
Multnomah	244	1.5	6 373	1.1	189	2.1	4 182	3.3	145	2.4	(D)	(D)
Polk	232	1.5	15 089	.6	496	1.3	17 952	.9	354	1.5	3 696	2.0
Sherman	24	2.5	4 087	.5	83	1.0	9 105	.2	78	1.0	(D)	(D)
Tillamook	90	1.6	6 536	1.2	299	.8	44 265	.5	96	2.2	1 023	5.0
Umatilla	919	1.1	116 001	.6	675	1.2	76 730	.5	508	1.3	31 998	.7
Union	307	1.5	49 052	.9	426	1.3	51 380	.7	360	1.4	20 149	1.0
Wallowa	312	1.3	45 205	1.3	326	1.2	61 087	.7	290	1.3	30 892	.8
Wasco	277	1.2	24 311	.8	230	1.4	32 567	.5	202	1.4	16 979	.5
Washington	581	1.1	22 964	.8	540	1.2	17 060	1.3	353	1.5	3 303	2.3
Wheeler	82	1.2	7 385	.5	113	.9	21 274	.3	97	1.1	12 530	.4
Yamhill	397	1.3	21 441	.7	702	1.1	25 078	.7	480	1.3	4 820	1.7
Livestock and poultry – Con.												
Geographic area	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Oregon	1 541	1.0	99 035	.3	1 669	1.3	58 276	1.6	3 639	1.1	392 957	.7
Baker	59	3.6	2 044	2.1	28	5.7	372	1.7	71	3.9	4 872	4.5
Benton	18	5.3	2 087	.1	46	4.0	524	6.5	102	2.7	6 216	4.3
Clackamas	96	2.7	3 614	2.1	183	2.2	4 752	3.1	314	1.7	10 575	3.6
Clatsop	19	4.4	1 411	.3	23	5.2	150	7.0	23	5.4	871	13.4
Columbia	19	5.5	1 181	.2	31	4.5	239	12.1	27	4.4	1 159	6.3
Coos	75	2.7	4 843	1.7	33	4.9	184	7.5	119	2.4	26 923	1.5
Crook	17	5.8	86	3.4	33	5.0	292	10.4	47	4.1	3 764	7.6
Curry	9	8.1	256	3.4	4	13.6	(D)	(D)	62	2.7	25 357	1.1
Deschutes	40	4.3	973	3.3	79	3.7	598	5.6	95	3.1	3 360	4.3
Douglas	79	3.2	263	8.8	90	3.1	506	4.3	474	1.4	71 220	1.2
Gilliam	4	–	(D)	(D)	3	–	(D)	(D)	7	–	120	–
Grant	29	4.0	51	4.0	23	6.1	308	9.2	50	3.3	1 288	5.4
Harney	32	4.4	80	9.8	16	8.9	145	5.4	37	4.5	6 829	1.4
Hood River	6	12.1	(D)	(D)	10	10.2	89	18.2	16	7.1	220	9.3
Jackson	53	3.6	935	5.3	126	2.7	1 176	5.3	189	2.2	5 270	4.6
Jefferson	3	18.1	(D)	(D)	18	6.7	238	6.8	37	4.2	10 578	1.2
Josephine	28	3.9	2 598	.3	64	3.3	1 239	11.3	49	3.6	837	7.1
Klamath	43	4.4	4 518	.8	54	4.7	1 143	11.1	96	3.7	13 033	2.9
Lake	16	6.2	75	1.3	10	10.0	(D)	(D)	30	5.2	2 433	17.6
Lane	59	2.9	2 977	.7	107	2.8	1 338	7.1	221	1.9	25 524	1.5
Lincoln	16	6.6	138	1.9	12	9.0	80	11.3	49	3.6	3 162	7.0
Linn	81	2.5	6 757	.5	102	2.9	2 741	3.4	352	1.6	68 286	1.2
Malheur	135	1.9	6 640	1.3	51	3.4	1 625	8.3	80	2.8	12 739	2.2
Marion	100	1.9	14 861	.3	107	2.8	10 625	2.8	267	1.9	12 412	3.3
Morrow	13	6.5	177	3.7	20	6.3	426	2.9	30	3.2	14 072	.9
Multnomah	9	8.2	(D)	(D)	22	6.2	212	8.3	42	4.5	836	5.4
Polk	41	3.7	4 489	.2	44	3.6	2 289	2.5	166	2.0	11 903	2.8
Sherman	2	–	(D)	(D)	7	6.6	378	2.1	6	8.8	70	3.2
Tillamook	188	1.0	25 580	.4	11	7.2	72	17.7	6	9.9	106	16.6
Umatilla	53	3.8	436	4.5	47	4.3	1 246	16.8	112	2.6	29 233	.8
Union	21	5.9	36	6.4	37	4.8	4 600	11.1	50	4.1	1 949	7.4
Wallowa	17	4.8	70	12.8	26	5.9	1 076	13.8	78	2.9	3 646	2.5
Wasco	23	7.8	25	16.6	26	5.4	1 601	1.8	23	5.8	611	8.9
Washington	56	2.9	4 615	1.1	66	3.2	6 594	2.5	104	2.6	1 829	3.4
Wheeler	17	3.2	81	2.4	9	5.7	175	10.6	16	4.1	625	5.7
Yamhill	65	2.6	6 719	.5	101	2.8	10 668	4.2	192	1.9	11 029	3.1

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry – Con.									
	Hens and pullets of laying age inventory					Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold				
	Farms		Total			Farms		Total		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Oregon	2 451	1.3	2 699 459	.1	208	1.9	18 921 442	.2		
Baker	29	5.5	448	6.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Benton	61	3.7	40 097	3.6	4	15.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Clackamas	255	1.9	1 238 447	.2	48	3.7	4 428 187	(L)	(L)	(L)
Clatsop	23	5.3	1 255	17.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Columbia	66	3.2	5 264	.9	2	20.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Coos	51	4.1	977	5.0	2	18.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Crook	28	5.3	555	9.8	1	21.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Curry	15	6.5	257	7.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Deschutes	91	3.4	1 089	4.0	2	18.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Douglas	185	2.3	2 760	2.7	6	8.2	882 086	(L)	(L)	(L)
Gilliam	5	–	86	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Grant	39	3.5	1 186	12.8	3	16.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Harney	40	4.3	660	4.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hood River	21	6.6	262	8.0	6	10.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Jackson	159	2.5	(D)	(D)	15	7.7	675	11.1	11.1	11.1
Jefferson	13	9.1	263	11.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Josephine	80	3.0	1 424	3.8	2	20.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Klamath	48	4.7	900	5.5	4	15.7	140	19.3	19.3	19.3
Lake	19	6.8	352	8.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lane	198	2.0	(D)	(D)	22	3.3	4 212 147	.5	.5	.5
Lincoln	26	5.7	444	10.1	1	39.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Linn	186	2.2	3 572	3.2	12	4.2	2 977 787	(L)	(L)	(L)
Malheur	61	3.4	1 137	4.0	2	20.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Marion	152	2.4	(D)	(D)	10	7.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Morrow	16	7.9	372	10.9	2	20.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Multnomah	55	4.0	874	8.9	6	11.7	595	15.3	15.3	15.3
Polk	95	2.9	1 602	4.7	21	5.7	3 153 859	.2	.2	.2
Sherman	4	7.5	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Tillamook	10	7.5	121	11.2	2	15.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Umatilla	67	3.5	1 256	6.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Union	55	3.8	1 137	4.9	2	26.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Wallowa	19	7.0	338	7.5	1	28.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Wasco	32	4.8	710	6.0	4	14.8	78	17.4	17.4	17.4
Washington	112	2.6	3 567	11.8	7	11.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Wheeler	19	3.5	278	4.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Yamhill	116	2.5	(D)	(D)	21	5.1	1 896 391	1.2	1.2	1.2

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Wheat for grain					Barley for grain						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Oregon	3 025	.8	924 855	.2	46 527 762	.3	1 096	.9	127 185	.5	7 787 057	.6
Baker	39	4.5	4 734	1.7	340 989	1.8	41	3.9	2 295	3.1	137 220	2.8
Benton	58	2.5	10 350	1.3	754 965	1.2	12	6.6	264	9.3	14 749	7.7
Clackamas	86	2.8	4 746	3.0	338 747	3.0	20	6.5	227	5.8	11 831	7.0
Clatsop	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Columbia	5	2.9	1 174	1.0	72 522	1.2	3	4.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Coos	1	29.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Crook	13	4.1	999	2.3	83 220	2.5	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Curry	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	33.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Deschutes	10	8.0	724	7.5	40 534	5.7	3	8.0	47	10.8	4 641	10.7
Douglas	7	5.2	1 168	.1	64 663	.1	4	10.7	58	5.2	3 729	3.2
Gilliam	81	.6	86 678	.3	2 603 615	.1	45	.6	10 893	.1	306 202	.1
Grant	4	–	1 249	–	35 101	–	5	–	193	–	7 379	–
Harney	3	12.4	290	7.7	8 450	9.3	33	2.5	343	1.0	19 027	.4
Hood River	3	18.3	333	21.2	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	–	(D)	–
Jackson	37	4.6	1 510	7.9	86 811	8.2	34	4.7	1 670	9.1	82 141	7.6
Jefferson	88	2.1	8 547	1.3	479 658	1.1	9	4.2	454	.2	22 938	.5
Josephine	3	18.3	(D)	(D)	3 258	17.8	5	11.5	277	20.1	16 283	20.0
Klamath	70	3.0	7 842	2.0	595 214	1.9	123	2.7	37 315	1.2	3 360 204	1.0
Lake	5	13.1	390	11.9	8 718	11.2	4	9.4	427	7.3	34 815	7.4
Lane	62	1.8	6 467	.8	550 266	.7	3	8.1	109	2.7	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Linn	142	1.6	13 130	.8	1 020 376	.8	10	7.7	291	5.8	12 099	9.3
Malheur	367	1.4	36 677	1.0	3 014 051	.8	164	1.7	6 670	1.5	446 778	1.3
Marion	291	1.3	20 775	.8	1 745 381	.9	14	5.9	277	5.1	12 242	5.6
Morrow	145	.9	148 381	.3	5 620 603	.5	29	–	3 027	–	89 427	–
Multnomah	10	6.3	1 758	.9	162 885	.9	9	5.8	817	3.6	55 593	3.4
Polk	140	1.6	18 473	1.2	1 326 524	1.1	11	5.8	409	7.0	23 515	6.7
Sherman	128	.7	103 555	.3	3 580 569	.2	97	.8	21 227	.1	885 767	.1
Tillamook	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Wheat for grain					Barley for grain						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Umatilla	397	.9	268 523	.3	13 626 966	.3	130	1.4	12 134	.5	552 070	.9
Union	184	1.7	36 790	1.2	2 327 207	1.3	109	2.1	9 705	1.9	542 725	1.6
Wallowa	75	2.0	12 174	1.4	3 714 284	1.4	77	2.1	11 615	1.5	830 993	1.9
Wasco	109	1.2	75 331	.2	3 244 203	.2	33	.7	3 668	.5	163 674	.7
Washington	225	1.6	24 743	1.0	2 109 209	1.1	34	4.6	1 149	6.0	51 686	5.5
Wheeler	4	—	1 292	—	(D)	—	1	—	(D)	—	(D)	—
Yamhill	233	1.4	25 983	1.1	1 910 879	1.0	31	3.4	980	1.7	48 750	2.5

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested — Con.											
	Oats for grain					Hay — alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Oregon	810	1.1	38 241	1.1	2 950 737	1.2	12 066	1.0	872 535	.6	2 276 437	.6
Baker	4	9.4	103	9.1	7 779	3.3	361	2.0	59 498	1.0	138 898	1.0
Benton	22	5.2	1 466	2.1	102 899	1.6	225	1.7	10 833	1.8	23 555	1.8
Clackamas	71	3.1	1 963	4.2	142 675	4.7	938	1.2	20 407	1.5	42 678	1.5
Clatsop	—	—	—	—	—	—	111	2.1	4 920	2.7	9 282	3.9
Columbia	6	6.4	349	2.9	29 596	2.4	342	1.3	11 749	1.6	24 497	1.9
Coos	1	29.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	262	1.7	12 405	1.7	27 932	1.7
Crook	3	15.3	140	9.8	(D)	(D)	256	1.5	26 506	1.1	75 265	1.0
Curry	1	33.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	34	3.6	1 079	2.5	2 639	2.8
Deschutes	4	13.5	44	14.0	(D)	(D)	471	1.7	15 630	3.2	42 491	2.7
Douglas	14	6.4	685	15.1	46 228	16.4	808	1.2	32 036	1.2	62 413	1.3
Gilliam	2	—	(D)	—	(D)	—	27	2.5	2 800	1.4	8 596	1.1
Grant	1	—	(D)	—	(D)	—	211	1.3	35 090	.4	51 804	.6
Harney	6	8.4	359	1.5	40 835	1.6	276	1.3	81 405	.5	153 708	.7
Hood River	—	—	—	—	—	—	135	2.6	2 021	3.7	5 410	4.2
Jackson	7	10.1	25	9.1	652	6.5	676	1.3	18 600	1.8	40 442	2.3
Jefferson	2	—	(D)	—	(D)	—	172	1.8	13 424	1.5	39 139	1.8
Josephine	1	21.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	281	1.5	7 224	2.0	18 604	2.1
Klamath	47	3.5	6 448	2.7	613 123	2.9	465	2.4	71 064	1.8	233 975	1.8
Lake	9	4.7	1 750	3.1	173 777	3.3	204	1.4	93 540	.6	215 486	.8
Lane	31	3.6	1 744	2.3	117 666	2.7	731	1.2	26 403	1.3	48 152	1.3
Lincoln	1	19.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	82	2.6	3 224	4.6	3 959	3.8
Linn	48	3.2	1 478	4.1	103 700	4.0	686	1.3	25 231	1.5	54 318	2.0
Malheur	31	3.6	486	2.7	39 376	3.5	694	1.2	62 677	.7	176 798	.9
Marion	102	2.4	3 091	3.3	244 570	3.6	625	1.3	24 658	.9	62 253	.6
Morrow	—	—	—	—	—	—	120	1.8	44 175	.7	270 785	.5
Multnomah	2	17.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	134	2.5	3 459	3.2	6 673	3.5
Polk	72	2.6	3 648	2.8	234 026	2.9	359	1.4	11 270	1.8	25 026	1.6
Sherman	5	—	341	—	19 216	—	20	3.5	1 962	1.1	5 942	.7
Tillamook	—	—	—	—	—	—	98	1.8	6 471	.9	17 351	1.0
Umatilla	5	—	111	—	11 315	—	366	1.4	26 724	1.5	110 734	1.0
Union	27	3.8	549	3.0	36 509	2.6	439	1.3	31 967	1.1	66 762	1.2
Wallowa	10	6.8	190	3.6	14 550	2.9	232	1.4	30 026	1.0	84 233	1.2
Wasco	6	9.5	173	7.0	8 602	4.7	162	1.7	10 530	1.2	25 493	1.2
Washington	155	2.0	8 060	2.1	597 740	2.3	468	1.3	15 742	1.6	40 967	1.7
Wheeler	1	33.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	72	1.4	9 466	.5	15 230	.9
Yamhill	113	1.9	4 575	2.4	334 340	2.6	523	1.2	18 319	1.1	44 947	1.1

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested — Con.										
	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)					Land in orchards					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	
Oregon	1 509	.8	147 616	.2	4 200	1.0	96 166	.7	15 150	8.5	14.8
Baker	1	37.5	(D)	(D)	15	8.5	58	14.8	—	—	—
Benton	61	2.7	8 842	.2	117	2.3	792	3.6	—	—	—
Clackamas	129	2.2	6 667	.8	374	1.6	6 243	2.4	—	—	—
Clatsop	3	15.1	(D)	(D)	3	10.4	10	3.3	—	—	—
Columbia	13	5.0	366	1.1	43	3.7	190	6.7	—	—	—
Coos	10	9.2	73	11.9	40	4.3	104	6.5	—	—	—
Crook	1	—	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Curry	6	11.6	4	17.2	10	8.7	77	17.3	—	—	—
Deschutes	2	27.0	(D)	(D)	4	15.2	12	20.8	—	—	—
Douglas	46	4.0	539	4.3	213	2.1	2 013	3.1	—	—	—
Gilliam	—	—	—	—	4	13.8	(D)	(D)	—	—	—
Grant	1	40.0	(D)	(D)	9	9.6	316	2.3	—	—	—
Harney	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hood River	12	8.4	39	4.4	365	1.3	14 696	.9	—	—	—

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested — Con.							
	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)				Land in orchards			
	Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	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)
Jackson	64	3.4	534	11.6	180	2.1	10 270	.6
Jefferson	16	4.7	677	4.1	1	42.3	(D)	(D)
Josephine	27	5.3	68	9.8	66	3.2	1 062	1.9
Klamath	2	22.1	(D)	(D)	5	10.6	18	14.1
Lake	—	—	—	—	6	11.5	16	13.5
Lane	118	2.2	7 379	.6	368	1.5	4 921	1.6
Lincoln	7	12.2	8	16.9	15	6.6	131	39.9
Linn	84	2.3	9 518	.9	145	2.3	2 002	1.8
Malheur	150	1.1	11 659	.4	16	6.1	391	8.0
Marion	304	1.1	40 037	.3	452	1.5	9 479	1.9
Morrow	12	4.1	6 699	.2	5	8.0	(D)	(D)
Multnomah	63	3.1	3 549	1.6	73	3.3	253	4.2
Polk	32	3.3	2 737	1.0	231	1.7	6 410	1.5
Sherman	—	—	—	—	5	8.7	22	9.8
Tillamook	1	—	(D)	—	1	30.3	(D)	(D)
Umatilla	116	1.8	33 744	.3	221	2.0	5 079	1.8
Union	9	8.4	35	8.8	49	4.4	801	6.3
Wallowa	6	12.5	68	12.1	6	10.3	14	17.5
Wasco	4	14.8	(D)	(D)	125	1.9	7 166	.6
Washington	123	2.2	6 563	1.5	487	1.3	9 372	1.7
Wheeler	1	—	(D)	—	4	10.7	27	16.3
Yamhill	85	2.0	7 511	.5	542	1.2	12 549	1.3

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

Item	Census published farms		Not on mail list 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--	31 892	1.0	7 437	15.6	18.9	2.5
Land in farms ----- acres --	17 609 497	.2	348 950	29.2	1.9	.6
Average size of farm ----- acres --	552.2	.8	46.9	27.0	(X)	(X)
Farms by size:						
Less than 10 acres -----	6 319	1.2	3 926	19.5	38.3	4.8
10 to 49 acres -----	11 235	1.1	2 175	24.6	16.2	3.5
Less than 50 acres -----	17 554	1.1	6 101	17.5	25.8	3.6
50 acres or more -----	14 338	.9	1 336	30.7	8.5	2.4
50 to 99 acres -----	3 904	1.2	277	64.3	6.6	3.9
100 to 179 acres -----	2 844	1.2	544	45.6	16.0	6.1
180 acres or more -----	7 590	.8	515	51.2	6.4	3.0
Harvested cropland ----- farms --	20 743	.9	3 345	19.3	13.9	2.4
----- acres--	2 823 972	.4	29 106	34.0	1.0	.3
Farms by value of sales:						
Less than \$1,000 -----	5 727	1.2	3 248	27.4	36.2	6.3
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----	5 763	1.2	1 600	32.3	21.7	5.5
Less than \$2,500 -----	11 490	1.2	4 848	22.6	29.7	4.7
\$2,500 or more -----	20 402	.9	2 589	22.6	11.3	2.3
\$2,500 to \$9,999 -----	8 303	1.2	1 718	30.1	17.1	4.3
\$10,000 or more -----	12 099	.9	871	44.7	6.7	2.8
Market value of agricultural products sold -----\$1,000 --	2 292 973	.3	27 795	27.4	1.2	.3
Farms by standard industrial classification:						
Crops (01) -----	12 738	.9	1 815	29.3	12.5	3.2
Livestock (02) -----	19 154	1.0	5 574	17.2	22.5	3.2
Farms by type of organization:						
Individual or family -----	27 506	1.0	6 899	16.7	20.1	2.8
Partnership or corporation -----	4 153	.8	538	65.9	11.5	6.7
Other -----	233	1.7	--	(X)	--	(X)
Farms by tenure of operator:						
Full owners -----	22 152	1.0	5 679	16.7	20.4	2.9
Part owners and tenants -----	9 740	.8	1 757	38.0	15.3	5.0
Part owners -----	7 004	.8	787	45.6	10.1	4.2
Tenants -----	2 736	1.2	970	46.5	26.2	9.0
Operators by place of residence:						
On farm operated -----	26 714	1.0	6 616	16.2	19.9	2.7
Not on farm operated -----	3 730	1.1	561	58.3	13.1	6.7
Not reported -----	1 448	1.1	259	49.9	15.2	6.4
Operators by principal occupation:						
Farming -----	15 306	.9	2 111	28.4	12.1	3.1
Other -----	16 586	1.1	4 738	21.8	22.2	3.9
Operators by sex:						
Male -----	27 967	.9	6 490	16.2	18.8	2.6
Female -----	3 925	1.1	899	43.3	18.6	6.6
Operators by race:						
White -----	31 391	1.0	6 764	16.2	17.7	2.5
Black and other races -----	501	1.4	86	74.2	14.6	9.3
Operators by years on present farm:						
4 years or less -----	4 860	1.4	1 946	24.7	28.6	5.2
5 years or more -----	23 387	.9	4 383	21.0	15.8	2.9
Average years on present farm -----	16.7	1.3	15.7	26.3	(X)	(X)
Not reported -----	3 645	1.0	1 109	35.8	23.3	6.5
Average age of operator -----	53.4	.1	56.2	17.3	(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.

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