

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 non-sample 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
Farmsnumber. .	18.2
Land in farms.....acres. .	7.6
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹\$1,000. .	3.8
Market value of agricultural products sold ..\$1,000. .	8.0
Harvested croplandacres. .	10.2
Corn for grain or seedacres. .	11.2
Wheat for grainacres. .	8.0
Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Cattle and calvesnumber. .	9.5
Hogs and pigsnumber. .	9.5
Hens and pullets of laying age.....number. .	.8

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	6.4
50	4.4
75	3.5
100	2.9
150	2.2
200	1.8
300	1.2
5009
7507
1,0006
1,5005
2,000	(NA)
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:	
25	25.3
50	19.2
75	16.7
100	15.3
150	13.8
200	12.9
300	12.0
500	11.3
750	10.9
1,000	10.6
1,500	10.4
2,000	(NA)

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--	34 057	1.5	Total farm production expenses -----farms--	34 056	1.5
Land in farms -----acres--	44 828 124	.7	-----\$1,000--	2 563 564	.8
Average size of farm -----acres--	1 316	1.7	Average per farm -----dollars--	75 275	1.7
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			Livestock and poultry purchased -----farms--		
Total sales (see text) -----farms--	34 057	1.5	-----\$1,000--	632 721	.8
-----\$1,000--	3 243 554	.7	Feed for livestock and poultry -----farms--	22 463	1.7
Average per farm -----dollars--	95 239	1.7	-----\$1,000--	360 923	.9
Farms by value of sales:			Commercially mixed formula feeds -----farms--	9 125	2.2
Less than \$1,000 (see text) -----farms--	1 446	1.9	-----\$1,000--	117 184	1.2
-----\$1,000--	288	2.6	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees -----farms--	23 696	1.7
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----farms--	1 346	2.1	-----\$1,000--	106 547	1.2
-----\$1,000--	2 261	2.0	Commercial fertilizer -----farms--	19 672	1.7
\$2,500 to \$4,999 -----farms--	1 658	1.9	-----\$1,000--	128 044	1.1
-----\$1,000--	6 073	1.9	Agricultural chemicals -----farms--	21 271	1.7
\$5,000 to \$9,999 -----farms--	2 779	1.9	-----\$1,000--	110 347	1.2
-----\$1,000--	20 415	1.9	Petroleum products -----farms--	32 702	1.5
\$10,000 to \$19,999 -----farms--	3 904	2.1	-----\$1,000--	157 432	1.1
-----\$1,000--	3 904	2.1	Electricity -----farms--	28 325	1.6
\$20,000 to \$24,999 -----farms--	57 081	2.1	-----\$1,000--	45 110	1.3
-----\$1,000--	1 589	2.2	Hired farm labor -----farms--	12 699	1.9
-----\$1,000--	35 490	2.2	-----\$1,000--	95 956	1.0
\$25,000 to \$39,999 -----farms--	3 758	2.2	Contract labor -----farms--	3 246	3.6
-----\$1,000--	120 320	2.2	-----\$1,000--	10 668	4.0
\$40,000 to \$49,999 -----farms--	2 034	2.2	Repair and maintenance -----farms--	30 693	1.6
-----\$1,000--	90 919	2.2	-----\$1,000--	173 729	1.2
\$50,000 to \$99,999 -----farms--	6 829	1.8	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment -----farms--	17 130	1.9
-----\$1,000--	493 727	1.8	-----\$1,000--	64 050	1.8
\$100,000 to \$249,999 -----farms--	6 496	.9	Interest expense -----farms--	22 126	1.7
-----\$1,000--	980 306	.8	-----\$1,000--	198 194	1.2
\$250,000 to \$499,999 -----farms--	1 547	—	Secured by real estate -----farms--	15 127	1.9
-----\$1,000--	513 540	—	-----\$1,000--	115 199	1.4
\$500,000 or more -----farms--	671	—	Not secured by real estate -----farms--	14 359	2.0
-----\$1,000--	923 133	—	-----\$1,000--	82 995	1.5
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Cash rent -----farms--	15 030	1.9
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops -----farms--	23 630	1.5	-----\$1,000--	148 810	1.5
-----\$1,000--	1 072 895	.9	Property taxes -----farms--	29 959	1.5
Grains -----farms--	21 595	1.6	-----\$1,000--	90 689	1.3
-----\$1,000--	988 230	.9	All other farm production expenses -----farms--	32 691	1.5
Corn for grain -----farms--	13 350	1.6	-----\$1,000--	240 344	1.1
-----\$1,000--	323 310	1.0			
Wheat -----farms--	11 985	1.5	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
-----\$1,000--	293 739	.7	All farms -----number--	34 056	1.5
Soybeans -----farms--	11 478	1.5	-----\$1,000--	662 184	1.4
-----\$1,000--	268 791	1.0	Average per farm -----dollars--	19 444	2.0
Sorghum for grain -----farms--	1 026	1.8	Farms with net gains ² -----number--	23 304	1.7
-----\$1,000--	9 178	1.2	-----\$1,000--	775 963	1.2
Barley -----farms--	2 322	1.4	Average net gain -----dollars--	33 297	2.1
-----\$1,000--	20 366	.8	Farms with net losses -----number--	10 752	2.3
Oats -----farms--	5 120	1.8	-----\$1,000--	113 779	2.5
-----\$1,000--	22 461	1.5	Average net loss -----dollars--	10 582	3.4
Other grains -----farms--	2 884	1.3			
-----\$1,000--	50 385	.6	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Cotton and cottonseed -----farms--	—	—	Government payments -----farms--	20 924	1.5
-----\$1,000--	—	—	-----\$1,000--	176 585	1.0
Tobacco -----farms--	—	—	Other farm-related income ¹ -----farms--	13 246	2.2
-----\$1,000--	—	—	-----\$1,000--	56 752	3.1
Hay, silage, and field seeds -----farms--	6 775	1.6	Customwork and other agricultural services -----farms--	3 796	3.6
-----\$1,000--	61 815	1.3	-----\$1,000--	23 710	4.5
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons -----farms--	135	3.0	Gross cash rent or share payments -----farms--	4 660	3.6
-----\$1,000--	913	6.0	-----\$1,000--	25 386	5.0
Fruits, nuts, and berries -----farms--	26	6.0	Forest products and Christmas trees -----farms--	101	21.6
-----\$1,000--	157	2.7	-----\$1,000--	590	39.7
Nursery and greenhouse crops -----farms--	88	3.5	Other farm-related income sources -----farms--	8 351	2.6
-----\$1,000--	13 551	1.0	-----\$1,000--	7 066	3.5
Other crops -----farms--	72	3.3	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
-----\$1,000--	8 229	.9	Total -----farms--	4 615	1.4
Livestock, poultry, and their products -----farms--	26 254	1.5	-----\$1,000--	97 214	.8
-----\$1,000--	2 170 659	.6			
Poultry and poultry products -----farms--	677	2.0			
-----\$1,000--	48 336	.1			
Dairy products -----farms--	2 402	1.6			
-----\$1,000--	178 626	1.0			
Cattle and calves -----farms--	22 802	1.5			
-----\$1,000--	1 555 540	.6			
Hogs and pigs -----farms--	7 125	.8			
-----\$1,000--	328 765	.8			
Sheep, lambs, and wool -----farms--	3 614	1.5			
-----\$1,000--	40 184	.9			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) -----farms--	1 592	1.5			
-----\$1,000--	19 208	1.4			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) -----farms--	531	1.9			
-----\$1,000--	1 092	2.0			

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 ..	30 142	1.5	All operators ----- farms ..	34 057	1.5
Harvested cropland ----- farms ..	19 582 565	1.0	Full owners ----- farms ..	44 828 124	.7
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	28 430	1.5	Part owners ----- farms ..	13 669	1.6
10 to 19 acres ----- farms ..	13 624 006	.9	Tenants ----- farms ..	13 094 416	.7
20 to 29 acres ----- farms ..	641	2.2	Land owned ----- farms ..	15 332	1.4
30 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	3 184	2.4	Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	27 273 133	.7
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	652	2.2	Land rented or leased from others ----- farms ..	5 056	1.8
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	8 704	2.2	Owned and rented land ----- farms ..	4 460 575	1.0
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	624	2.2	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	14 173	2.2	Land owned ----- farms ..	29 318	1.5
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	1 193	2.0	Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	30 566 595	.7
Cropland:	44 868	2.0	Land rented or leased from others ----- farms ..	29 001	1.5
Pasture or grazing only ----- farms ..	2 464	2.0	Rented or leased land in farms ----- farms ..	27 699 929	.7
Other cropland ----- farms ..	177 898	2.0	Land rented or leased to others ----- farms ..	6 024	1.7
Total woodland ----- farms ..	4 594	2.1	acres ..	3 132 238	1.3
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured ----- farms ..	654 953	2.1	OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. ----- farms ..	9 044	2.0	Operators by place of residence:		
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	2 977 941	1.9	On farm operated ----- farms ..	24 946	1.5
Acres irrigated:	6 068	1.3	Not on farm operated ----- farms ..	6 191	1.8
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	4 202 030	1.3	Not reported ----- farms ..	2 920	1.2
10 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	3 150	—	Operators by principal occupation:		
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	5 540 255	—	Farming ----- farms ..	26 141	1.5
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	12 758	1.6	Other ----- farms ..	7 916	1.7
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	2 485 119	1.6	Operators by days worked off farm:		
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	16 430	1.5	Any ----- farms ..	12 540	1.6
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	3 473 440	1.0	200 days or more ----- farms ..	6 614	1.7
Total woodland ----- farms ..	4 209	1.5	Operators by sex:		
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured ----- farms ..	255 193	1.2	Male ----- farms ..	32 623	1.5
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. ----- farms ..	17 326	1.4	Female ----- farms ..	43 117 867	.7
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	23 946 525	.4	Average age of operator ----- years ..	1 434	1.7
Acres irrigated:	21 368	1.5	FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
1 to 9 acres ----- farms ..	1 043 841	1.1	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ----- farms ..	29 525	1.6
10 to 49 acres ----- farms ..	1 674	1.2	Partnership ----- farms ..	30 392 198	.9
50 to 99 acres ----- farms ..	371 263	.8	Corporation: ----- farms ..	3 179	1.5
100 to 199 acres ----- farms ..	120	3.2	Family held ----- farms ..	5 663 081	.6
200 to 499 acres ----- farms ..	321	3.8	Other than family held ----- farms ..	91	2.6
500 to 999 acres ----- farms ..	209	2.4	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	139 024	.8
1,000 acres or more ----- farms ..	5 884	2.5	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	13	3.6
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	278	2.3	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ----- farms ..	78	3.0
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	19 737	2.3	Hired workers ----- farms ..	249	2.1
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:	477	1.6	150 days or more ----- farms ..	5 025	2.4
Diverted under annual commodity programs ----- farms ..	65 015	1.6	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	8 502	2.0
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	442	1.2	INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Estimated market value of land and buildings ----- farms ..	130 015	1.2	Farm-related injuries:		
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	74 754	1.7	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	522	1.9
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	35	—	Hired workers ----- farms ..	582	1.9
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	75 537	—	Hired workers ----- farms ..	140	1.6
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	1 629	1.2	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	169	1.3
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:	357 602	.8	Farm-related deaths:		
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	157	2.7	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	10	10.3
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	13 000	1.5	Hired workers ----- farms ..	10	10.3
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	309 794	.8	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	1	—
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	6 124	1.6	Hired workers ----- farms ..	(D)	(D)
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	1 300 085	1.3	VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS ¹		
Estimated market value of land and buildings ----- farms ..	34 056	1.5	Estimated market value of land and buildings ----- farms ..	34 056	1.5
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	12 263 928	1.1	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	360 111	1.9
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	360 111	1.9	Average per acre ----- dollars ..	273	1.4
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	70 495	2.0	VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT ¹		
Average per farm ----- dollars ..	34 021	1.5	Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	34 021	1.5
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	2 398 312	1.3	Average per farm ----- dollars ..	70 495	2.0
Average per acre ----- dollars ..	70 495	2.0	AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ¹		
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	19 621	1.7	Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	19 621	1.7
acres on which used ----- farms ..	7 572 947	1.1	acres on which used ----- farms ..	7 572 947	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

[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 ..	26 828	1.6	Total farm production expenses farms ..	26 859	1.6
Land in farms acres ..	38 965 040	.7 \$1,000 ..	2 516 919	.8
Average size of farm acres ..	1 452	1.7	Average per farm dollars ..	93 709	1.7
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
Total sales (see text) farms ..	26 828	1.6	All farms number ..	26 859	1.6
..... \$1,000 ..	3 214 516	.7 \$1,000 ..	679 054	1.4
Average per farm dollars ..	119 819	1.7	Average per farm dollars ..	25 282	2.1
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains ² number ..	20 900	1.7
\$10,000 to \$19,999 farms ..	3 904	2.1 \$1,000 ..	771 081	1.2
..... \$1,000 ..	57 081	2.1	Average net gain dollars ..	36 894	2.1
\$20,000 to \$24,999 farms ..	1 589	2.2	Farms with net losses number ..	5 959	3.0
..... \$1,000 ..	35 490	2.2 \$1,000 ..	92 027	2.8
\$25,000 to \$39,999 farms ..	3 758	2.2	Average net loss dollars ..	15 443	4.1
..... \$1,000 ..	120 320	2.2	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
\$40,000 to \$49,999 farms ..	2 034	2.2	Government payments farms ..	18 619	1.5
..... \$1,000 ..	90 919	2.2 \$1,000 ..	165 386	1.0
\$50,000 to \$99,999 farms ..	6 829	1.8	Other farm-related income ¹ farms ..	11 276	2.2
..... \$1,000 ..	493 727	1.8 \$1,000 ..	50 237	3.3
\$100,000 to \$249,999 farms ..	6 496	.9	Customwork and other agricultural services farms ..	3 473	3.7
..... \$1,000 ..	980 306	.8 \$1,000 ..	23 038	4.6
\$250,000 to \$499,999 farms ..	1 547	—	Gross cash rent or share payments farms ..	3 371	4.1
..... \$1,000 ..	513 540	— \$1,000 ..	19 853	5.6
\$500,000 or more farms ..	671	—	Forest products and Christmas trees farms ..	58	25.6
..... \$1,000 ..	923 133	— \$1,000 ..	566	41.3
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Other farm-related income sources farms ..	7 713	2.6
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops farms ..	20 820	1.6 \$1,000 ..	6 780	3.4
..... \$1,000 ..	1 062 001	.9	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Grains farms ..	19 836	1.5	Total farms ..	4 517	1.4
..... \$1,000 ..	980 975	.9 \$1,000 ..	97 019	.8
Corn for grain farms ..	12 619	.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	321 192	1.0			
Wheat farms ..	11 283	1.4			
..... \$1,000 ..	291 437	.7			
Soybeans farms ..	10 921	1.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	267 128	1.0			
Sorghum for grain farms ..	951	1.8			
..... \$1,000 ..	9 036	1.2			
Barley farms ..	2 241	1.4			
..... \$1,000 ..	20 208	.8			
Oats farms ..	4 785	1.8			
..... \$1,000 ..	21 861	1.5			
Other grains farms ..	2 754	1.3			
..... \$1,000 ..	50 113	.6			
Cotton and cottonseed farms ..	—	—			
..... \$1,000 ..	—	—			
Tobacco farms ..	—	—			
..... \$1,000 ..	—	—			
Hay, silage, and field seeds farms ..	5 409	1.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	58 383	1.3			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons farms ..	91	3.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	809	6.7			
Fruits, nuts, and berries farms ..	11	7.3			
..... \$1,000 ..	132	.5			
Nursery and greenhouse crops farms ..	64	4.1			
..... \$1,000 ..	13 490	1.0			
Other crops farms ..	62	3.4			
..... \$1,000 ..	8 212	.9			
Livestock, poultry, and their products farms ..	21 939	1.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	2 152 516	.6			
Poultry and poultry products farms ..	482	2.2			
..... \$1,000 ..	48 190	.1			
Dairy products farms ..	2 359	1.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	178 484	1.0			
Cattle and calves farms ..	19 870	1.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 542 992	.6			
Hogs and pigs farms ..	6 499	1.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	326 675	.8			
Sheep, lambs, and wool farms ..	2 617	1.7			
..... \$1,000 ..	38 010	.9			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) farms ..	1 078	1.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	18 165	1.5			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) farms ..	374	2.1			
..... \$1,000 ..	927	1.9			

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 ..	24 980	1.5	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) ----- farms ..	22 972	1.6
Harvested cropland ----- acres..	18 799 463	1.0	Partnership ----- farms ..	28 872 164	.9
Cropland:			Corporation:		
Pasture or grazing only ----- farms ..	10 685	1.7	Family held ----- farms ..	5 502 125	.6
----- acres..	2 281 133	1.6	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	3 301 675	.9
Total woodland ----- farms ..	3 331	1.6	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	38	1.8
----- acres..	223 489	1.2	Other than family held ----- farms ..	899	.9
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured ----- farms ..	14 216	1.4	More than 10 stockholders ----- farms ..	66	2.4
----- acres..	19 024 357	.5	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	129 516	.4
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. ----- farms ..	17 399	1.6	Other ----- farms ..	12	3.9
----- acres..	917 731	1.1	10 or less stockholders ----- farms ..	54	2.8
Irrigated land ----- farms ..	1 498	1.2	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ----- farms ..	123	3.0
----- acres..	363 807	.8	----- acres..	1 159 560	.2
Harvested cropland irrigated ----- farms ..	1 476	1.2			
----- acres..	352 267	.8	HIRED FARM LABOR		
Pasture and other land irrigated ----- farms ..	119	2.9	Hired workers by days worked:		
----- acres..	11 540	3.2	150 days or more ----- farms ..	4 741	2.4
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:			----- workers..	8 206	1.9
Diverted under annual commodity programs ----- farms ..	12 508	1.5	Less than 150 days ----- farms ..	10 125	2.1
----- acres..	306 955	.8	----- workers..	23 583	2.6
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs ----- farms ..	5 090	1.5			
----- acres..	1 085 747	1.2	INJURIES AND DEATHS		
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS ¹			Farm-related injuries:		
Estimated market value of land and buildings ----- farms ..	26 859	1.6	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	476	1.9
----- \$1,000..	10 954 877	1.2	----- number..	534	1.9
Average per farm ----- dollars	407 866	2.0	Hired workers ----- farms ..	133	1.5
Average per acre ----- dollars	279	1.5	----- number..	162	1.2
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT ¹			Farm-related deaths:		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ----- farms ..	26 859	1.6	Operator and family members ----- farms ..	10	10.3
----- \$1,000..	2 281 511	1.3	----- (D)	(D)	(D)
Average per farm ----- dollars	84 944	2.0	Hired workers ----- farms ..	1	-
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS¹			----- (D)	(D)	(D)
Commercial fertilizer ----- farms ..	17 985	1.7	FARMS BY SIZE		
----- acres on which used ..	7 483 432	1.1	1 to 9 acres -----	707	2.2
TENURE OF OPERATOR			10 to 49 acres -----	637	2.1
All operators ----- farms ..	26 828	1.6	50 to 69 acres -----	194	3.0
----- acres..	38 965 040	.7	70 to 99 acres -----	484	2.4
Full owners ----- farms ..	8 535	1.8	100 to 139 acres -----	541	2.4
----- acres..	8 823 547	.9	140 to 179 acres -----	1 323	2.3
Part owners ----- farms ..	14 316	1.4	180 to 219 acres -----	637	2.6
----- acres..	26 320 456	.7	220 to 259 acres -----	803	2.4
Tenants ----- farms ..	3 977	1.9	260 to 499 acres -----	4 654	2.2
----- acres..	3 821 037	1.1	500 to 999 acres -----	6 472	1.9
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			1,000 to 1,999 acres -----	5 378	1.4
Land owned ----- farms ..	23 100	1.5	2,000 acres or more -----	4 998	.5
----- acres..	25 143 742	.8	FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION		
Owned land in farms ----- farms ..	22 851	1.5	Cash grains (011) -----	9 323	1.6
----- acres..	23 005 436	.7	Field crops, except cash grains (013) -----	557	2.3
Land rented or leased from others ----- farms ..	18 433	1.5	Vegetables and melons (016) -----	9	14.5
----- acres..	16 191 591	.8	Fruits and tree nuts (017) -----	2	-
landlords -----	46 561	1.3	Horticultural specialties (018) -----	57	4.3
----- farms ..	18 293	1.5	General farms, primarily crop (019) -----	320	2.4
----- acres..	15 959 604	.8	Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties (021) -----	14 500	1.5
Land rented or leased to others ----- farms ..	4 292	1.8	Dairy farms (024) -----	1 422	1.7
----- acres..	2 370 293	1.2	Poultry and eggs (025) -----	49	2.9
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			Animal specialties (027) -----	159	2.9
Operators by place of residence:			General farms, primarily livestock and animal specialties (029) -----	430	2.1
On farm operated -----	20 405	1.6	LIVESTOCK		
Not on farm operated -----	4 255	1.9	Cattle and calves inventory ----- farms ..	19 485	1.5
Not reported -----	2 168	1.2	----- number..	3 701 121	.9
Operators by principal occupation:			Beef cows ----- farms ..	16 132	1.6
Farming -----	22 985	1.5	----- number..	1 564 885	1.0
Other -----	3 843	1.9	Milk cows ----- farms ..	2 726	1.6
Operators by days worked off farm:			----- number..	117 107	1.1
Any -----	8 196	1.8	Cattle and calves sold ----- farms ..	19 870	1.5
200 days or more -----	3 558	1.9	----- number..	2 470 428	.7
Operators by sex:			----- \$1,000..	1 542 992	.6
Male -----	26 039	1.5	----- farms ..	6 146	1.6
Female -----	789	1.9	----- number..	1 957 598	.8
Average age of operator ----- years ..	50.8	2.2	Hogs and pigs sold ----- farms ..	6 499	1.6
			----- number..	3 623 571	.8
			----- \$1,000..	326 675	.8
			----- farms ..	2 456	1.7
			----- number..	613 278	1.0
			Sheep and lambs sold ----- farms ..	2 614	1.7
			----- number..	577 865	1.0
			Horses and ponies inventory ----- farms ..	4 163	1.4
			----- number..	26 864	1.2
			Horses and ponies sold ----- farms ..	826	1.6
			----- number..	4 562	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..	-6.4	1.8	-5.1	1.9
Land in farms..... acres ..	1.5	.9	2.9	1.0
Average size of farm.....acres ..	8.4	2.3	8.4	2.4
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :				
Average per farm.....dollars ..	10.4	2.7	9.6	2.8
Average per acre.....dollars ..	1.5	1.9	-	1.9
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :				
Average per farm.....dollars ..	28.2	3.3	28.5	3.4
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres.....	-20.0	1.9	-4.6	2.9
10 to 49 acres.....	-6	2.2	4.3	3.0
50 to 179 acres.....	-2.1	2.2	8.4	2.9
180 to 499 acres.....	-15.5	2.2	-15.1	2.3
500 to 999 acres.....	-9.2	2.2	-10.2	2.2
1,000 to 1,999 acres.....	-2.5	1.8	-3.1	1.8
2,000 acres or more.....	7.6	.7	7.6	.6
Total cropland.....farms ..	-7.1	1.8	-6.2	1.8
.....acres ..	-3	1.3	-2	1.3
Harvested cropland.....farms ..	-8.6	1.7	-6.9	1.8
.....acres ..	4.9	1.3	5.9	1.3
Irrigated land.....farms ..	-10.4	1.3	-9.5	1.4
.....acres ..	2.6	1.1	3.5	1.1
Market value of agricultural products sold.....\$1,000 ..	19.3	1.1	19.7	1.1
Average per farm.....dollars ..	27.4	2.7	26.2	2.8
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops.....\$1,000 ..	25.1	1.5	26.0	1.5
Livestock, poultry, and their products.....\$1,000 ..	16.6	1.0	16.8	1.0
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500.....	-3.3	1.5	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999.....	-17.9	1.9	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999.....	-12.9	2.0	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999.....	-18.8	2.1	-18.8	2.1
\$25,000 to \$49,999.....	-17.6	2.2	-17.6	2.2
\$50,000 to \$99,999.....	-11.4	2.0	-11.4	2.0
\$100,000 to \$249,999.....	22.2	1.4	22.2	1.4
\$250,000 to \$499,999.....	51.4	-	51.4	-
\$500,000 or more.....	51.1	-	51.1	-
Total farm production expenses ¹\$1,000 ..	19.9	2.0	20.4	2.0
Average per farm.....dollars ..	28.1	2.8	27.5	2.9
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹farms..	-6.4	1.8	-5.6	1.9
.....\$1,000 ..	15.4	2.1	15.5	2.1
Average per farm.....dollars ..	23.2	3.3	22.4	3.3
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming.....	-8.0	1.8	-7.4	1.8
Other.....	-7	2.1	11.1	2.7
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any.....	-7.5	4.9	-4.7	5.1
200 days or more.....	-4	5.3	9.3	5.9
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory.....farms ..	-5.9	1.8	-5.2	1.8
.....number..	4.1	1.2	4.6	1.2
Beef cows.....farms ..	-2.3	1.9	-1.4	1.9
.....number..	6.8	1.3	7.3	1.3
Milk cows.....farms ..	-27.1	1.5	-26.1	1.5
.....number..	-14.3	1.3	-14.0	1.3
Cattle and calves sold.....farms ..	-6.8	1.7	-5.7	1.8
.....number..	4.3	.9	4.6	.9
Hogs and pigs inventory.....farms ..	-15.1	1.7	-15.7	1.7
.....number..	13.0	1.3	13.1	1.3
Hogs and pigs sold.....farms ..	-13.8	1.7	-15.1	1.7
.....number..	14.9	1.3	14.9	1.3
Sheep and lambs inventory.....farms ..	-14.5	1.6	-14.8	1.8
.....number..	9.6	1.4	10.4	1.4
Chickens 3 months old or older inventory.....farms ..	-48.9	1.1	-52.4	1.2
.....number..	21.9	.6	22.7	.6
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold.....farms ..	-51.7	2.0	-55.9	2.0
.....number..	-49.0	.9	-47.9	.9
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed.....farms ..	-15.5	1.7	-12.6	1.7
.....acres ..	20.3	1.6	21.7	1.6
.....bushels..	23.2	1.6	24.2	1.6
Corn for silage or green chop.....farms ..	-10.4	1.7	-9.9	1.7
.....acres ..	5.3	1.4	5.7	1.4
.....tons, green..	8.4	1.4	8.6	1.4
Wheat for grain.....farms ..	-21.3	1.5	-18.5	1.5
.....acres ..	3.4	1.1	4.7	1.1
.....bushels..	10.9	1.1	11.9	1.1
Barley for grain.....farms ..	-58.5	.7	-57.4	.8
.....acres ..	-52.8	.5	-52.4	.5
.....bushels..	-41.2	.6	-40.8	.6
Oats for grain.....farms ..	-33.2	1.4	-31.5	1.4
.....acres ..	-31.8	1.2	-31.2	1.2
.....bushels..	-11.4	1.5	-10.6	1.5
Sunflower seed.....farms ..	-5.3	1.5	-3.7	1.5
.....acres ..	33.0	1.1	33.6	1.1
.....pounds..	35.5	1.0	35.9	1.0
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text).....farms ..	-7.5	1.7	-7.4	1.8
.....acres ..	-	1.4	.6	1.3
.....tons, dry..	.9	1.4	1.5	1.4

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)
South Dakota	34 057	1.5	44 828 124	.7	1 316	1.7	360 111	1.9	2 398 312	1.3
Aurora	438	2.3	379 973	2.0	868	3.0	208 805	5.1	25 773	4.6
Beadle	813	1.7	724 776	1.3	891	2.1	313 624	4.7	62 977	3.3
Bennett	284	1.8	787 857	.7	2 774	2.0	472 226	7.7	17 752	5.5
Bon Homme	737	2.3	322 432	2.2	437	3.2	246 616	4.8	49 140	6.3
Brookings	959	1.9	444 440	1.4	463	2.4	264 403	4.2	60 757	3.8
Brown	1 089	1.6	1 026 353	.8	942	1.8	386 940	4.1	84 766	3.1
Brule	419	2.1	496 799	1.6	1 186	2.7	327 527	4.9	31 506	6.1
Buffalo	83	1.6	279 202	.8	3 364	1.8	787 991	4.2	7 369	8.8
Butte	541	1.3	1 243 168	.5	2 298	1.4	356 080	4.0	24 643	6.6
Campbell	323	2.1	417 697	1.7	1 293	2.7	460 987	21.3	23 059	5.1
Charles Mix	796	2.0	688 081	1.5	864	2.5	307 370	3.6	64 613	4.1
Clark	610	1.9	534 829	1.6	877	2.5	267 698	4.6	46 167	4.8
Clay	437	1.9	236 608	1.6	541	2.5	417 758	4.4	41 997	7.9
Codington	658	1.9	392 935	1.6	597	2.4	276 173	4.9	49 472	5.7
Corson	450	1.9	1 701 991	.7	3 782	2.0	506 519	4.8	28 807	5.0
Custer	323	1.2	462 238	.8	1 431	1.4	259 166	5.5	9 894	13.4
Davison	462	1.8	270 665	1.5	586	2.4	277 428	3.9	27 171	4.5
Day	721	2.2	561 312	1.9	779	2.9	244 949	5.3	48 677	5.2
Deuel	634	2.1	341 131	2.0	538	2.9	207 130	6.0	41 112	6.7
Dewey	409	1.8	1 859 161	.5	4 546	1.9	754 410	2.2	18 557	5.4
Douglas	442	2.0	252 419	1.8	571	2.6	227 790	4.5	31 800	6.8
Edmunds	494	1.5	641 911	1.2	1 299	1.9	330 581	4.6	45 932	4.9
Fall River	298	.9	974 811	.4	3 271	1.0	384 608	3.6	13 025	6.6
Faulk	326	1.3	560 057	.8	1 718	1.5	464 454	2.9	27 924	1.8
Grant	644	2.0	373 787	1.8	580	2.7	260 211	4.9	50 624	5.6
Gregory	609	2.1	601 034	1.8	987	2.8	259 233	8.2	35 987	7.1
Haakon	321	1.3	1 204 465	.6	3 752	1.5	738 937	8.3	28 529	7.5
Hamlin	468	2.0	276 744	1.4	591	2.4	294 485	5.0	36 364	7.6
Hand	542	1.5	861 129	.7	1 589	1.6	362 968	2.4	47 027	4.1
Hanson	353	2.0	245 174	1.5	695	2.5	372 910	22.5	29 738	8.3
Harding	282	1.0	1 657 305	.3	5 877	1.0	627 692	6.3	19 327	8.4
Hughes	256	1.8	390 720	1.4	1 526	2.2	434 538	3.4	20 725	6.3
Hutchinson	931	2.2	502 469	1.9	540	2.9	304 323	5.1	79 423	4.4
Hyde	240	2.0	545 064	1.1	2 271	2.3	441 203	3.8	17 293	5.5
Jackson	327	2.0	1 361 106	.7	4 162	2.1	567 304	3.5	18 665	8.5
Jerauld	282	1.9	334 057	1.5	1 185	2.5	278 001	9.8	17 817	5.0
Jones	198	1.6	584 231	.8	2 951	1.8	447 492	5.6	15 084	6.7
Kingsbury	614	1.8	460 063	1.4	749	2.3	292 441	3.6	49 439	6.1
Lake	573	2.0	297 819	1.7	520	2.6	284 856	4.9	40 568	4.4
Lawrence	272	1.6	195 077	1.6	717	2.3	285 830	11.3	8 559	11.8
Lincoln	939	1.8	322 802	1.7	344	2.5	365 589	12.1	54 216	4.7
Lyman	421	2.0	846 435	1.2	2 011	2.3	499 184	5.6	29 240	5.8
McCook	619	1.6	325 998	1.4	527	2.1	247 246	3.7	39 514	5.7
McPherson	464	1.6	661 474	1.3	1 426	2.1	361 213	9.6	38 306	4.5
Marshall	487	1.6	485 748	1.1	997	1.9	338 759	3.9	45 135	5.1
Meade	811	1.2	2 076 199	.5	2 560	1.3	447 305	4.7	37 175	5.1
Mellette	265	1.9	701 352	.9	2 647	2.1	394 150	7.5	13 781	7.9
Miner	424	2.0	313 435	1.7	739	2.6	276 014	8.0	26 598	6.4
Minnehaha	1 262	1.7	425 288	1.4	337	2.2	285 846	4.0	69 203	4.0
Moody	640	1.7	284 888	1.5	445	2.3	324 619	4.5	51 617	6.4
Pennington	636	1.3	1 066 060	.7	1 676	1.5	325 858	3.9	29 243	6.0
Perkins	555	1.9	1 726 299	.8	3 110	2.1	374 641	3.5	40 912	6.3
Potter	321	1.4	507 101	.8	1 580	1.6	515 595	3.9	32 715	7.2
Roberts	904	1.7	604 219	1.2	668	2.1	313 354	4.0	65 385	3.6
Sanborn	408	2.2	322 784	2.0	791	2.9	259 392	7.0	22 617	11.6
Shannon	191	1.7	1 417 516	.3	7 422	1.8	1 076 995	10.9	6 987	7.4
Spink	743	1.2	890 711	.7	1 199	1.4	460 934	5.7	89 159	4.1
Stanley	198	1.3	903 980	.4	4 566	1.4	774 473	2.3	14 442	2.8
Sully	282	1.4	615 479	.5	2 183	1.5	727 761	3.9	31 463	5.3
Todd	245	2.0	1 079 266	.4	4 405	2.1	757 643	2.9	15 442	4.4
Tripp	741	1.9	1 006 831	1.2	1 359	2.3	349 015	10.1	48 383	3.7
Turner	955	2.0	367 239	1.3	385	2.4	283 268	3.8	74 236	4.3
Union	560	1.4	259 517	1.1	463	1.8	410 453	3.6	43 270	3.8
Walworth	378	1.9	448 834	1.5	1 187	2.4	328 500	5.9	26 238	7.5
Yankton	692	2.2	271 200	2.1	392	3.0	267 329	6.6	40 268	6.9
Ziebach	258	1.6	1 406 379	.4	5 451	1.6	865 289	4.7	14 707	6.9
Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	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)
South Dakota	70 495	2.0	3 243 554	.7	95 239	1.7	34 056	1.5	2 563 564	.8
Aurora	58 977	5.3	43 880	1.3	100 182	2.6	437	2.6	35 644	2.9
Beadle	77 558	3.7	82 323	.9	101 258	1.9	812	1.7	65 869	1.7
Bennett	62 507	5.8	21 692	1.0	76 379	2.1	284	1.8	17 982	4.0
Bon Homme	66 676	6.7	72 796	1.5	98 773	2.8	737	2.5	58 350	2.9

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	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)
Brookings	63 421	4.3	78 772	.8	82 140	2.1	958	1.9	66 675	1.5
Brown	78 342	3.5	126 722	.6	116 366	1.7	1 088	1.7	104 897	1.6
Brule	75 372	6.4	41 521	1.3	99 095	2.5	418	2.1	36 305	3.8
Buffalo	88 782	9.1	16 429	.7	197 941	1.7	83	2.1	13 995	1.8
Butte	45 468	6.8	39 457	.7	72 933	1.5	542	1.4	31 990	2.2
Campbell	71 391	5.6	26 929	1.6	83 373	2.6	323	2.2	22 272	5.0
Charles Mix	81 892	4.7	82 873	1.1	104 112	2.3	797	2.1	64 553	2.3
Clark	75 684	5.2	72 136	.9	118 255	2.1	610	2.0	64 763	2.5
Clay	95 883	8.2	44 063	1.2	100 831	2.3	438	2.3	30 358	3.1
Codington	75 300	6.1	58 594	1.1	89 048	2.2	657	2.0	46 005	2.6
Corson	64 015	5.3	37 216	1.1	82 701	2.2	450	1.8	29 037	3.3
Custer	30 726	13.5	10 175	1.3	31 500	1.7	322	1.6	8 407	10.3
Davison	58 811	4.9	33 688	1.3	72 917	2.2	462	1.9	23 728	2.0
Day	67 513	5.7	47 967	1.6	66 528	2.7	721	2.4	38 113	2.9
Deuel	64 846	7.0	43 403	1.6	68 459	2.6	634	2.1	36 192	3.2
Dewey	45 372	5.7	25 390	1.4	62 077	2.3	409	2.0	16 894	3.9
Douglas	71 947	7.1	40 519	1.5	91 672	2.5	442	2.0	32 281	3.0
Edmunds	92 980	5.2	53 962	.8	109 235	1.7	494	1.7	42 541	2.6
Fall River	43 708	6.7	66 773	.2	224 070	.9	298	1.5	54 091	1.2
Faulk	85 395	2.2	42 601	.6	130 677	1.4	327	1.3	33 017	3.0
Grant	78 486	6.1	58 050	1.3	90 140	2.4	645	2.3	42 595	3.1
Gregory	59 093	7.4	37 711	1.8	61 923	2.8	609	2.1	28 592	5.0
Haakon	88 600	7.7	32 083	.5	99 946	1.4	322	1.6	26 379	2.8
Hamlin	77 867	7.9	43 008	1.1	91 897	2.3	467	2.2	35 989	2.9
Hand	86 926	4.4	62 278	.7	114 904	1.6	541	1.5	48 122	2.7
Hanson	84 005	8.6	35 314	1.2	100 039	2.3	354	2.1	28 265	4.7
Harding	68 535	8.5	25 147	.4	89 175	1.0	282	1.6	18 830	2.4
Hughes	80 641	6.5	27 809	.9	108 630	2.0	257	1.6	20 180	2.8
Hutchinson	85 401	5.1	86 110	1.5	92 492	2.7	930	2.5	62 417	2.4
Hyde	71 755	5.9	24 420	1.2	101 750	2.3	241	2.2	19 925	5.8
Jackson	57 256	8.7	27 922	.9	85 388	2.2	326	1.7	20 117	2.0
Jerauld	63 180	5.4	34 820	.9	123 474	2.2	282	2.1	28 320	2.5
Jones	76 180	6.9	18 467	.9	93 269	1.8	198	1.5	14 321	7.1
Kingsbury	80 519	6.4	63 107	1.0	102 780	2.1	614	2.0	49 695	2.2
Lake	70 923	4.9	65 476	1.1	114 268	2.3	572	2.1	51 779	2.3
Lawrence	31 352	11.9	8 968	1.6	32 969	2.3	273	1.4	7 245	6.5
Lincoln	57 800	5.0	77 487	1.3	82 521	2.2	938	1.8	57 085	2.6
Lyman	69 618	6.1	31 872	1.2	75 705	2.3	420	1.9	28 097	4.4
McCook	63 835	5.9	54 798	1.1	88 527	2.0	619	1.7	40 036	2.8
McPherson	82 378	4.9	47 793	.9	103 002	1.9	465	1.9	35 953	2.3
Marshall	92 680	5.5	86 835	.5	178 306	1.7	487	2.0	71 176	1.7
Meade	45 838	5.2	45 586	.9	56 210	1.5	811	1.1	36 163	5.0
Mellette	52 004	8.2	18 338	1.2	69 199	2.3	265	2.1	12 710	3.8
Miner	62 880	6.8	36 909	1.4	87 049	2.5	424	2.2	26 780	3.4
Minnehaha	54 836	4.5	101 865	1.1	80 717	2.0	1 262	2.1	79 829	2.1
Moody	80 651	6.7	58 068	1.1	90 732	2.0	640	1.9	44 955	2.6
Pennington	46 052	6.2	39 909	.8	62 750	1.5	635	1.4	33 981	3.8
Perkins	75 069	6.8	40 514	1.0	72 998	2.2	555	2.0	31 668	2.7
Potter	101 916	7.7	44 242	.6	137 827	1.5	321	2.5	35 101	2.3
Roberts	72 249	4.0	75 539	1.0	83 561	2.0	905	1.7	58 121	2.8
Sanborn	55 298	11.8	49 964	1.0	122 461	2.4	409	2.0	46 447	3.0
Shannon	36 774	7.7	11 666	1.4	61 076	2.2	190	2.0	9 047	8.6
Spink	119 998	4.2	120 071	.4	161 603	1.3	743	1.0	99 349	1.4
Stanley	72 939	3.3	17 865	.6	90 226	1.5	198	1.8	15 710	1.6
Sully	111 969	5.6	53 337	.3	189 137	1.4	281	2.0	42 367	2.6
Todd	63 027	4.8	23 129	.9	94 403	2.2	245	1.9	18 933	3.1
Tripp	65 382	4.2	57 406	1.1	77 471	2.2	740	1.9	44 481	2.4
Turner	77 653	4.7	102 496	.9	107 325	2.2	956	1.9	77 267	1.8
Union	76 993	4.4	77 782	.7	138 896	1.6	562	2.2	58 585	1.4
Walworth	69 229	7.7	28 533	1.4	75 483	2.4	379	1.9	22 446	3.8
Yankton	58 191	7.3	61 446	1.5	88 795	2.6	692	2.4	44 413	2.5
Ziebach	59 303	7.6	19 540	1.0	75 738	1.9	258	1.5	16 137	7.2

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)
South Dakota	16 009	1.8	632 721	.8	22 463	1.7	360 923	.9	23 696	1.7	106 547	1.2
Aurora	214	10.5	7 795	6.6	309	7.8	9 379	3.3	333	6.6	1 219	7.2
Beadle	429	6.7	18 021	2.7	599	4.5	9 425	4.6	567	4.9	2 667	3.1
Bennett	131	13.4	4 083	6.3	186	9.6	1 864	18.5	133	13.2	362	10.3
Bon Homme	402	7.6	22 377	3.9	529	5.4	10 415	4.4	636	3.3	2 155	4.3

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.											
	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)
Brookings	397	6.7	15 970	2.2	563	5.1	9 471	3.9	688	4.4	3 639	3.1
Brown	490	6.5	30 771	1.0	701	4.0	9 651	3.9	765	3.7	4 970	3.5
Brule	273	8.1	8 852	5.2	303	7.7	5 140	6.1	311	6.9	1 380	8.8
Buffalo	38	12.3	4 320	3.8	60	8.5	2 891	.5	55	7.5	341	1.7
Butte	261	8.1	8 977	4.6	390	5.4	5 332	5.4	270	7.9	416	13.1
Campbell	167	12.0	4 469	8.9	210	9.3	2 425	7.5	258	6.5	649	9.0
Charles Mix	425	7.7	14 315	3.6	627	4.7	9 588	4.4	663	4.3	2 952	3.7
Clark	290	8.4	25 466	3.8	424	6.0	9 220	2.0	489	4.8	2 467	4.4
Clay	181	14.4	3 068	8.1	221	12.4	2 572	9.9	402	4.4	2 797	4.7
Codington	354	9.0	8 219	5.5	494	6.1	7 126	5.0	487	5.3	2 207	5.9
Corson	223	9.8	5 628	6.8	292	7.4	3 045	6.0	256	8.5	708	16.7
Custer	169	13.5	(D)	(D)	251	8.0	1 340	20.6	76	20.7	61	20.4
Davison	245	9.0	3 193	6.1	303	8.2	3 218	4.8	312	7.4	1 627	5.0
Day	310	11.4	6 701	4.5	466	7.1	3 800	11.3	547	6.2	1 807	5.8
Deuel	303	8.8	8 760	9.8	420	6.3	5 221	5.7	531	4.2	1 676	6.0
Dewey	191	12.5	2 775	7.9	267	8.0	2 275	7.7	150	14.2	253	11.1
Douglas	281	8.3	5 585	6.4	342	5.6	8 031	3.2	339	6.1	1 339	5.2
Edmunds	228	11.0	7 477	5.5	331	7.1	6 680	4.5	385	4.6	1 564	4.3
Fall River	150	12.1	(D)	(D)	251	5.4	7 038	1.1	118	12.7	176	17.4
Faulk	163	10.4	8 107	4.0	267	3.6	3 337	12.2	259	6.9	1 215	3.8
Grant	224	14.4	9 477	3.0	351	10.1	5 783	10.6	497	5.1	2 296	5.0
Gregory	256	11.7	4 163	13.6	392	7.3	5 497	14.4	359	8.4	1 029	10.1
Haakon	157	11.9	3 939	11.7	208	8.0	3 191	3.3	176	10.3	667	4.0
Hamlin	245	10.6	5 785	8.2	285	9.1	5 461	11.2	371	5.5	2 404	6.9
Hand	275	7.2	11 723	7.6	395	5.2	5 400	5.8	359	6.9	1 826	4.1
Hanson	187	13.7	3 438	10.2	207	12.5	4 902	4.0	304	5.6	1 664	8.3
Harding	163	9.2	3 229	5.2	225	5.6	2 781	3.9	154	10.4	267	4.6
Hughes	70	18.8	1 872	8.2	150	13.0	4 116	1.4	166	11.4	725	4.1
Hutchinson	438	8.2	8 421	6.1	648	5.9	11 815	3.1	860	3.4	4 127	4.1
Hyde	129	13.8	3 806	17.1	199	7.4	3 055	3.6	141	12.5	533	4.2
Jackson	160	8.6	3 597	3.2	232	8.1	2 410	5.4	127	13.3	320	4.7
Jerauld	139	16.5	12 302	2.8	194	12.3	3 398	6.7	192	8.2	715	13.8
Jones	80	20.0	4 036	13.4	122	10.0	1 350	10.8	120	9.5	276	9.7
Kingsbury	269	10.3	12 316	4.2	368	7.8	5 785	3.6	458	5.8	3 029	4.1
Lake	290	9.5	10 904	5.1	392	6.4	8 500	3.5	435	5.2	2 748	4.4
Lawrence	105	16.0	1 149	9.3	149	11.8	1 196	10.5	83	19.7	58	17.5
Lincoln	426	8.2	13 933	5.3	545	6.4	6 647	6.0	736	3.3	3 584	5.0
Lyman	180	11.9	5 947	18.1	258	7.6	3 082	8.0	221	10.3	863	8.6
McCook	258	11.0	5 294	9.7	408	6.8	6 039	5.4	507	4.0	2 605	5.0
McPherson	258	7.6	9 234	3.9	346	5.8	6 107	2.3	340	6.1	721	10.1
Marshall	217	9.7	29 819	1.7	293	7.3	11 270	3.0	336	5.5	2 189	4.9
Meade	429	6.6	7 260	19.6	564	4.4	4 804	5.9	310	10.2	415	6.9
Mellette	96	14.4	2 008	6.5	205	7.6	1 519	11.0	135	12.6	261	3.9
Miner	211	11.8	5 310	5.7	306	7.2	3 749	1.9	346	5.6	1 576	6.0
Minnehaha	492	7.3	16 619	3.4	724	5.7	12 659	4.1	934	3.3	4 592	6.2
Moody	282	10.3	10 070	5.4	355	8.6	5 308	6.5	504	4.1	2 753	4.4
Pennington	359	7.2	8 510	8.1	436	6.6	5 388	4.0	186	12.4	308	3.4
Perkins	260	9.8	5 651	6.2	334	8.0	3 370	6.4	279	9.8	707	9.9
Potter	166	12.0	8 949	2.8	208	9.4	3 915	8.1	252	6.8	1 238	3.2
Roberts	354	7.8	9 323	9.7	524	6.8	5 489	5.7	690	4.6	3 216	5.5
Sanborn	177	17.5	18 297	3.5	230	12.9	6 858	4.0	245	11.2	1 188	12.5
Shannon	96	16.7	1 374	6.5	143	11.3	881	12.2	58	25.0	167	17.7
Spink	316	8.4	33 158	2.0	488	4.4	11 006	2.6	647	2.3	4 795	1.8
Stanley	92	6.9	4 005	3.8	129	5.1	1 165	3.3	100	6.5	312	2.8
Sully	77	14.9	10 534	.3	111	12.7	3 402	1.2	249	6.7	2 191	4.9
Todd	108	16.0	4 230	7.2	189	7.5	2 305	5.6	144	11.8	509	11.0
Tripp	323	7.6	8 618	6.4	567	4.3	7 297	5.4	509	5.0	1 346	4.0
Turner	468	6.9	22 646	2.1	636	4.7	14 217	3.5	817	3.3	3 487	3.7
Union	218	11.9	15 220	2.4	256	10.2	9 059	2.7	469	4.7	2 718	3.5
Walworth	175	11.2	3 328	10.4	230	8.8	2 351	7.5	211	8.3	766	7.1
Yankton	332	9.2	9 431	5.7	455	7.1	8 007	5.4	555	4.3	2 392	5.4
Ziebach	137	11.8	2 672	5.3	200	5.1	1 904	3.8	84	15.7	315	8.1

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota ..	19 672	1.7	128 044	1.1	21 271	1.7	110 347	1.2	32 702	1.5	157 432	1.1
Aurora	312	8.0	1 514	10.9	290	8.3	1 348	10.5	421	3.5	2 118	7.4
Beadle	490	6.1	3 747	3.0	466	6.1	2 652	3.8	812	1.7	4 303	4.5
Bennett	75	16.1	433	11.3	131	12.4	431	12.9	270	3.5	1 268	7.0
Bon Homme	546	5.0	1 807	4.9	555	5.2	1 604	7.5	708	2.8	2 800	4.9

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	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)
Brookings	649	5.4	3 924	3.9	686	5.2	3 944	4.1	929	2.3	3 434	2.2
Brown	653	5.5	7 008	2.5	656	4.8	5 149	6.0	1 068	1.8	5 822	2.5
Brule	275	7.5	1 999	7.5	285	8.2	1 506	10.2	408	2.6	2 147	6.0
Buffalo	55	7.5	599	4.2	50	7.8	424	1.4	82	2.1	630	3.6
Butte	168	11.8	463	19.9	194	11.1	545	18.1	538	1.4	1 958	4.2
Campbell	194	10.1	893	9.0	206	9.3	875	8.9	308	2.9	1 802	4.9
Charles Mix	606	4.8	4 318	3.4	629	4.6	2 879	3.7	768	2.6	4 204	3.9
Clark	420	6.2	3 128	5.9	434	6.1	2 479	5.5	607	2.0	3 333	5.6
Clay	387	5.1	2 742	4.3	357	5.9	2 451	8.6	422	3.4	2 143	4.4
Codington	425	7.3	2 816	3.4	470	6.0	2 389	7.9	626	3.0	2 987	4.2
Corson	144	13.4	783	13.9	202	9.6	816	11.3	442	2.3	2 408	4.6
Custer	28	33.7	34	9.2	86	23.1	52	30.5	274	6.4	694	6.8
Davison	286	7.6	1 518	3.0	290	6.5	1 480	5.5	442	3.1	1 697	4.3
Day	506	7.2	2 794	5.8	489	7.5	2 507	5.3	697	3.0	2 754	4.5
Deuel	482	5.0	1 823	5.8	479	5.3	1 596	6.5	606	2.8	2 156	4.1
Dewey	64	18.7	145	13.7	109	16.7	318	6.5	381	3.2	1 617	4.8
Douglas	341	6.3	1 344	5.4	328	6.1	1 353	6.9	432	3.0	2 023	4.2
Edmunds	320	6.9	2 007	4.3	307	7.1	1 803	3.7	463	3.5	3 061	3.2
Fall River	54	21.4	229	21.2	115	12.1	230	11.1	284	3.3	1 134	6.0
Faulk	195	7.8	2 082	1.4	222	8.7	1 576	6.0	326	1.3	2 200	3.8
Grant	491	5.5	3 206	5.4	475	5.5	2 630	6.1	636	2.6	2 639	4.8
Gregory	334	9.4	1 254	8.8	336	8.2	904	13.5	559	3.5	2 267	6.3
Haakon	77	17.1	665	7.0	164	11.4	1 199	2.3	291	3.4	1 817	3.5
Hamlin	374	5.4	2 776	5.8	323	5.6	2 355	8.2	467	2.2	2 436	4.6
Hand	275	7.4	1 990	5.6	288	8.6	1 757	2.4	539	1.5	3 759	3.9
Hanson	235	10.0	1 609	6.4	263	7.5	1 392	9.4	345	2.5	2 168	4.2
Harding	65	18.8	238	5.1	91	17.3	191	7.5	245	5.9	1 480	7.6
Hughes	105	11.2	929	1.8	91	12.1	822	.8	248	3.6	1 253	5.1
Hutchinson	738	4.7	3 252	3.9	778	4.1	3 415	5.4	919	2.9	4 113	3.6
Hyde	100	16.9	431	7.3	103	15.3	424	6.6	239	2.2	1 570	6.3
Jackson	50	16.9	301	5.2	158	11.9	449	28.3	299	4.5	1 839	2.9
Jerauld	125	16.2	803	6.4	102	15.9	581	2.8	279	2.1	1 267	6.0
Jones	48	20.3	231	3.0	112	11.9	500	6.2	173	6.2	906	5.2
Kingsbury	439	6.5	3 196	5.9	419	6.5	3 129	5.7	604	2.2	2 897	3.9
Lake	380	6.8	3 365	4.4	445	4.8	2 794	5.9	549	3.0	3 020	3.1
Lawrence	99	20.0	110	23.6	121	15.3	160	50.3	259	3.7	518	9.3
Lincoln	691	3.9	4 818	6.3	708	4.2	3 269	6.9	918	2.1	2 931	4.1
Lyman	118	14.9	952	7.7	177	9.4	1 081	5.4	389	3.0	2 209	4.3
McCook	447	4.7	3 115	7.3	466	5.2	2 715	7.6	574	3.3	2 820	4.8
McPherson	152	13.1	981	6.0	257	8.9	654	4.1	435	3.5	2 398	3.0
Marshall	315	4.5	3 322	4.6	326	6.2	2 441	5.2	462	3.2	2 802	3.5
Meade	132	16.5	418	3.9	211	11.2	669	4.7	717	2.8	2 957	4.5
Mellette	38	25.7	119	2.6	73	20.0	261	6.7	249	4.4	1 181	5.2
Miner	279	7.3	1 466	6.6	298	6.3	1 700	7.4	415	2.5	1 733	6.0
Minnehaha	888	3.8	5 026	3.7	930	3.7	3 867	4.0	1 218	2.4	4 184	3.9
Moody	502	4.7	3 819	4.7	499	4.4	2 899	5.4	614	3.0	2 570	4.3
Pennington	104	16.7	599	2.2	230	9.8	711	4.5	593	3.2	1 990	5.2
Perkins	182	13.3	826	5.8	252	9.4	868	13.6	514	3.5	2 451	3.6
Potter	222	7.5	1 633	6.0	230	7.8	1 276	9.4	320	2.6	2 037	2.9
Roberts	682	4.7	4 373	4.8	687	4.8	3 972	4.3	872	2.3	4 190	2.7
Sanborn	243	10.9	1 552	9.5	290	6.4	1 260	16.5	403	2.3	1 741	8.6
Shannon	28	36.4	289	28.5	57	25.4	337	24.7	173	5.1	870	14.0
Spink	585	3.1	6 205	2.7	593	2.9	5 029	2.8	724	1.4	5 265	2.6
Stanley	35	8.9	289	.5	92	7.4	783	3.2	192	2.4	1 061	2.2
Sully	155	12.7	1 722	2.6	169	11.6	2 216	4.6	280	2.0	2 792	5.6
Todd	59	21.2	736	25.8	68	15.9	310	10.4	237	2.9	1 158	4.8
Tripp	270	8.4	1 456	7.4	394	7.4	1 288	7.4	715	2.6	3 329	4.1
Turner	737	4.8	3 526	5.5	727	5.0	3 180	4.0	920	2.3	4 007	3.5
Union	457	4.8	4 585	2.9	459	5.3	3 126	3.2	541	3.3	2 588	3.8
Walworth	223	8.1	1 442	9.4	210	8.7	1 219	9.1	368	3.0	1 574	4.7
Yankton	457	6.8	1 942	6.7	491	6.0	1 750	7.3	651	3.7	2 569	5.5
Ziebach	61	17.9	328	16.3	72	18.3	346	15.8	243	3.2	1 385	7.9

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)
South Dakota	28 325	1.6	45 110	1.3	12 699	1.9	95 956	1.0	3 246	3.6	10 668	4.0
Aurora	382	5.4	539	5.5	140	16.2	1 153	19.6	40	36.0	164	6.4
Beadle	681	4.1	1 081	4.8	293	8.7	1 795	2.4	37	13.8	123	3.5
Bennett	231	7.0	358	6.2	105	15.3	1 017	6.9	57	24.5	298	41.9
Bon Homme	637	4.3	907	5.9	278	10.2	857	6.7	39	24.3	141	21.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses 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)
Brookings	741	4.4	1 427	4.5	322	9.7	3 027	2.6	101	20.3	350	22.8
Brown	829	3.7	1 425	5.5	462	8.6	4 448	4.8	131	21.0	436	25.7
Brule	379	4.5	802	13.0	173	13.0	1 136	11.3	27	33.0	69	12.4
Buffalo	75	4.5	178	3.1	39	9.7	528	5.7	—	—	58	—
Butte	464	3.9	514	4.7	209	9.7	1 821	5.1	102	14.8	277	18.5
Campbell	270	6.3	487	8.0	121	14.5	767	7.3	11	6.3	47	1.4
Charles Mix	725	3.5	1 275	3.0	262	10.6	2 360	7.0	65	25.4	107	25.0
Clark	516	5.0	817	4.6	233	10.3	2 208	3.5	37	32.1	69	8.1
Clay	390	4.9	701	5.2	258	10.7	1 176	3.9	45	37.5	266	4.2
Codington	584	3.8	1 125	4.6	235	12.0	2 321	3.3	30	29.4	179	2.0
Corson	406	4.4	569	6.8	163	10.1	1 114	3.1	71	22.0	133	10.7
Custer	254	7.0	259	13.7	101	17.6	444	17.3	56	30.3	(D)	(D)
Davison	387	5.6	577	7.3	123	13.5	1 033	7.7	47	36.7	64	28.8
Day	609	5.1	966	5.4	166	15.4	1 559	3.9	73	31.2	72	20.4
Deuel	518	4.4	863	5.5	278	9.7	925	8.2	83	22.8	153	32.1
Dewey	305	6.7	497	23.5	96	14.0	488	5.4	56	27.0	192	8.2
Douglas	421	3.5	765	3.9	182	11.2	785	9.4	29	37.8	48	11.4
Edmunds	460	3.1	799	2.5	179	12.0	1 421	4.0	90	22.8	270	31.0
Fall River	251	4.2	522	3.7	115	12.2	1 423	7.6	43	20.8	(D)	(D)
Faulk	284	4.5	472	4.6	157	12.7	1 060	3.7	47	28.6	99	14.9
Grant	536	5.3	874	6.9	204	15.1	1 287	2.0	13	7.5	39	8.4
Gregory	514	4.1	617	7.0	266	11.3	1 074	9.5	87	24.9	82	19.6
Haakon	238	7.7	349	4.5	115	11.9	960	4.0	36	25.2	205	8.8
Hamlin	373	5.4	682	4.2	227	12.2	1 387	15.2	64	23.1	254	1.1
Hand	448	3.4	931	7.5	246	9.9	1 352	.8	64	24.4	292	42.6
Hanson	310	6.3	794	3.5	113	18.1	916	5.5	9	9.3	14	6.3
Harding	240	3.9	338	6.1	130	14.0	915	1.6	57	26.3	173	12.8
Hughes	205	8.8	434	3.6	94	14.0	1 484	3.2	21	3.9	172	4.1
Hutchinson	840	3.7	1 418	3.2	392	7.6	1 728	5.5	57	24.9	125	32.3
Hyde	206	7.2	330	6.6	111	15.2	1 142	2.2	15	4.5	64	3.6
Jackson	222	8.1	260	5.5	95	16.7	764	5.5	39	17.8	101	22.2
Jerauld	200	11.4	384	9.3	100	18.1	972	.6	11	4.0	55	.2
Jones	119	10.5	142	10.5	58	16.8	885	10.4	20	38.5	37	7.8
Kingsbury	511	4.2	729	5.2	178	13.9	1 320	3.8	44	25.4	231	22.7
Lake	517	3.9	909	4.1	242	10.7	3 436	4.8	50	28.4	110	35.8
Lawrence	187	10.1	144	14.0	82	21.1	569	20.4	27	35.7	34	26.9
Lincoln	774	3.6	856	5.4	344	9.4	1 605	13.4	59	23.8	344	36.1
Lyman	320	6.0	430	5.3	104	11.3	1 037	.9	48	11.2	92	1.2
McCook	498	5.4	824	4.6	222	10.3	1 382	11.9	36	25.6	90	15.5
McPherson	436	3.4	732	3.2	146	12.2	919	6.8	49	26.6	276	1.9
Marshall	410	4.2	754	3.6	143	10.2	2 337	1.2	34	27.2	132	20.1
Meade	645	4.1	644	4.4	299	9.2	1 566	6.1	109	17.0	320	13.0
Mellette	171	9.4	193	7.1	71	14.0	624	4.0	16	17.2	42	6.5
Miner	364	5.7	511	5.7	153	14.8	812	6.1	26	32.8	60	6.1
Minnehaha	1 078	3.6	1 506	2.9	536	8.0	3 593	12.1	68	29.7	361	35.3
Moody	566	3.8	854	5.7	266	9.7	1 177	7.9	30	25.7	69	30.1
Pennington	468	6.6	545	8.2	222	12.1	2 079	11.1	73	18.6	172	8.5
Perkins	464	5.3	551	4.8	218	10.2	1 626	5.5	92	22.5	159	19.0
Potter	252	7.4	551	11.5	101	12.5	1 344	.5	16	2.3	55	1.3
Roberts	753	3.6	1 114	4.4	364	8.3	1 658	4.4	108	24.5	359	47.2
Sanborn	343	4.2	477	8.5	188	15.7	768	11.0	25	39.5	132	44.8
Shannon	123	11.9	126	11.0	66	23.4	389	5.1	30	41.2	129	39.7
Spink	577	3.5	1 202	3.0	285	7.9	2 654	8.9	90	18.9	312	13.3
Stanley	146	4.6	193	3.4	69	6.2	672	4.2	24	12.7	183	15.1
Sully	182	7.7	593	2.9	124	14.4	2 966	2.9	38	22.6	418	10.3
Todd	209	6.7	558	6.5	75	15.6	1 099	1.1	43	29.1	67	11.8
Tripp	569	4.1	667	4.5	281	8.7	1 664	4.3	66	18.6	219	9.4
Turner	845	3.8	1 511	9.0	361	9.6	2 521	7.1	40	25.1	92	10.0
Union	523	3.3	929	4.8	255	10.3	2 202	7.5	66	22.3	199	10.0
Walworth	331	5.1	472	4.0	148	10.9	812	19.7	39	34.1	115	55.4
Yankton	602	4.7	802	6.7	221	12.6	2 862	3.8	39	31.1	73	4.9
Ziebach	211	5.9	258	6.9	94	15.8	527	12.4	44	24.8	369	38.3

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)
South Dakota	30 693	1.6	173 729	1.2	17 130	1.9	64 050	1.8	22 126	1.7	198 194	1.2
Aurora	416	3.4	2 328	6.5	247	9.5	679	8.9	265	9.6	1 826	6.8
Beadle	728	3.2	4 360	3.6	397	7.6	1 228	6.2	500	5.8	5 061	4.5
Bennett	233	6.2	1 372	7.4	135	11.4	705	19.6	144	11.2	1 693	8.4
Bon Homme	724	2.7	3 376	5.2	406	8.0	738	10.2	441	7.1	3 681	8.7

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.											
	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)
Brookings	808	3.6	3 972	3.6	443	8.3	1 083	8.5	594	6.4	5 468	4.6
Brown	997	2.6	6 468	4.0	578	7.1	3 178	4.0	700	4.2	6 984	2.9
Brule	415	2.1	2 552	5.5	240	9.8	1 407	27.2	302	5.9	2 446	9.0
Buffalo	78	3.5	607	3.5	49	8.5	379	4.4	53	9.8	859	2.5
Butte	498	2.7	1 942	7.6	237	9.2	621	5.3	354	6.3	2 356	7.4
Campbell	284	5.7	1 930	6.5	240	5.8	1 013	14.5	205	10.1	1 912	8.4
Charles Mix	734	3.5	4 554	3.6	469	7.3	1 110	9.6	530	6.2	5 111	6.3
Clark	568	3.4	2 957	8.3	339	8.0	1 173	8.5	434	6.1	4 212	5.7
Clay	417	3.7	2 330	7.4	234	11.1	835	13.7	352	6.4	3 058	8.2
Codington	626	3.0	4 026	6.5	314	9.2	1 090	8.1	455	7.0	3 546	6.9
Corson	421	3.2	2 230	5.1	235	8.2	636	13.1	277	8.7	3 481	6.3
Custer	248	7.0	794	9.0	57	23.0	93	44.4	141	13.6	982	18.7
Davison	419	4.4	2 157	4.3	241	10.5	493	11.2	239	9.5	1 595	7.2
Day	653	3.6	3 501	5.6	437	8.9	1 320	8.5	466	7.7	2 731	8.3
Deuel	549	3.9	2 680	5.9	317	8.5	784	10.7	421	6.7	2 964	7.1
Dewey	383	3.1	1 433	5.8	147	13.1	504	9.5	273	8.7	1 829	7.7
Douglas	413	3.6	1 974	5.5	233	8.8	553	10.8	295	7.7	2 411	5.2
Edmunds	471	3.1	3 858	5.5	272	8.5	1 509	7.7	329	7.3	3 643	7.2
Fall River	270	4.1	1 537	7.8	100	14.7	228	9.6	182	8.3	2 113	5.6
Faulk	313	2.4	2 078	3.4	177	9.9	1 193	3.7	242	7.6	2 733	3.4
Grant	593	3.4	3 152	5.9	335	10.0	879	18.4	429	7.1	3 289	9.2
Gregory	530	3.8	2 738	7.9	304	10.1	707	10.1	304	9.9	2 275	10.1
Haakon	275	5.5	2 235	5.9	197	9.2	1 433	8.0	199	9.0	3 243	4.1
Hamlin	444	3.2	2 489	5.6	232	11.4	698	11.6	365	5.8	2 904	5.1
Hand	501	2.9	3 427	5.7	305	8.0	1 493	5.7	381	6.0	4 666	4.6
Hanson	318	6.1	2 153	6.8	191	12.6	480	10.6	284	6.4	2 451	13.2
Harding	258	4.1	1 730	5.0	110	16.4	409	12.1	194	9.3	2 177	6.2
Hughes	205	8.0	1 337	3.3	109	12.7	923	1.7	168	10.2	2 300	8.2
Hutchinson	854	3.6	4 972	4.8	510	7.4	1 221	10.8	583	6.3	4 659	4.9
Hyde	221	4.7	1 557	6.6	116	15.1	588	8.9	194	7.6	1 912	5.1
Jackson	277	4.6	1 476	3.9	81	15.3	1 381	2.0	211	9.4	2 369	5.9
Jerauld	264	5.5	1 363	3.4	100	15.1	658	4.9	198	10.0	1 775	11.3
Jones	170	6.3	976	6.4	76	14.7	458	7.9	132	10.1	1 175	8.7
Kingsbury	544	4.2	3 598	6.6	317	9.1	890	7.2	426	6.2	3 831	7.8
Lake	525	3.6	3 582	4.9	306	8.8	612	12.8	319	7.7	2 670	7.5
Lawrence	242	4.8	772	12.5	36	27.9	76	18.0	109	15.1	457	14.5
Lincoln	815	3.3	3 455	5.2	447	7.8	1 241	12.3	595	5.5	5 066	9.5
Lyman	342	5.4	2 095	4.5	168	12.0	1 256	22.5	226	9.3	2 220	3.5
McCook	536	3.7	3 034	6.4	261	9.4	700	15.3	431	5.8	3 521	5.0
McPherson	421	4.1	3 077	4.2	285	8.4	1 056	18.9	303	7.0	2 997	4.6
Marshall	432	4.1	3 362	3.1	257	7.9	1 320	8.0	303	6.8	3 298	5.8
Meade	661	4.2	2 562	6.5	298	10.8	990	11.8	452	6.8	3 483	8.4
Mellette	235	5.7	991	4.0	98	16.7	419	10.9	199	6.7	1 450	5.2
Miner	395	2.8	1 806	5.1	177	13.9	641	19.4	303	7.0	1 904	10.3
Minnehaha	1 094	3.5	4 847	5.0	603	6.8	1 302	9.3	809	6.1	5 787	5.3
Moody	570	3.9	3 114	6.9	339	8.8	879	14.0	423	7.4	3 476	8.1
Pennington	561	4.3	2 609	6.4	224	12.6	692	10.9	296	8.6	3 003	11.2
Perkins	506	4.0	2 910	6.0	294	8.9	746	9.9	383	6.8	3 370	4.8
Potter	309	3.6	2 337	7.8	237	7.3	1 749	7.8	223	8.7	2 592	4.0
Roberts	808	3.0	4 913	3.3	570	6.0	1 807	6.1	624	5.8	4 910	5.9
Sanborn	368	5.2	1 916	7.2	236	11.5	538	9.4	313	7.4	2 786	11.5
Shannon	182	4.4	595	7.9	74	22.4	545	35.9	105	17.6	678	17.2
Spink	697	2.1	5 709	3.3	477	5.0	2 482	11.8	582	3.4	6 875	3.2
Stanley	173	3.4	949	3.4	97	5.4	796	2.7	133	4.9	1 707	3.0
Sully	280	2.0	2 395	5.6	189	11.3	2 656	4.9	195	9.7	3 657	7.0
Todd	221	5.7	1 603	4.4	101	15.3	411	31.9	177	7.8	1 336	7.7
Tripp	687	3.0	3 636	5.5	321	7.5	1 036	7.9	520	5.2	4 609	5.5
Turner	848	3.6	4 301	3.8	537	6.7	1 391	9.0	618	5.7	4 488	6.8
Union	486	4.7	2 859	4.3	276	9.6	1 221	11.4	349	8.2	3 237	6.4
Walworth	350	4.0	1 982	6.0	215	9.5	1 147	13.2	245	9.4	1 746	6.6
Yankton	605	4.1	2 839	5.8	358	8.0	885	15.2	426	7.9	3 401	8.0
Ziebach	224	3.4	1 262	10.8	122	13.6	685	13.5	203	6.8	1 748	13.7

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)
South Dakota	15 030	1.9	148 810	1.5	29 959	1.5	90 689	1.3	32 691	1.5	240 344	1.1
Aurora	194	12.8	1 510	11.8	417	3.6	1 035	6.7	431	3.0	3 039	3.3
Beadle	418	6.6	4 581	7.6	760	2.6	1 854	3.6	772	2.3	4 971	3.9
Bennett	139	12.4	1 203	10.5	269	4.1	1 002	6.9	264	4.1	1 893	5.5
Bon Homme	316	9.9	1 653	8.8	621	4.6	1 484	6.2	728	2.6	4 354	7.4

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)
Brookings	264	8.5	2 562	3.9	843	3.3	2 573	5.2	896	2.9	5 833	4.0
Brown	532	5.6	7 410	4.6	970	2.9	2 950	3.7	1 063	2.0	8 226	5.2
Brule	221	10.9	2 272	9.2	369	4.7	1 249	6.2	417	2.1	3 348	7.2
Buffalo	39	9.2	533	1.4	71	5.6	350	5.0	83	2.1	1 297	2.3
Butte	142	11.8	1 122	7.7	503	2.5	1 481	4.0	522	2.2	4 166	3.2
Campbell	184	10.6	2 130	17.0	288	5.8	873	6.4	311	3.0	2 000	7.5
Charles Mix	376	8.1	3 374	8.4	727	3.6	2 074	4.4	756	2.7	6 332	3.3
Clark	304	9.0	2 046	5.7	541	4.3	1 511	6.8	601	2.4	3 676	5.4
Clay	175	12.7	2 469	9.8	329	7.8	1 019	7.0	431	2.7	2 731	5.2
Codington	266	10.6	2 428	14.2	598	3.6	1 439	4.5	648	2.4	4 107	5.5
Corson	222	9.2	2 079	7.7	421	3.5	1 293	6.0	432	3.0	4 114	10.6
Custer	52	22.1	439	26.2	299	3.9	849	9.9	305	4.0	1 206	15.9
Davison	217	10.8	1 628	8.3	396	5.4	888	6.9	440	3.6	2 560	3.9
Day	306	11.3	2 459	8.9	630	5.0	1 693	7.6	699	2.4	3 448	6.0
Deuel	304	9.3	1 828	11.2	533	4.6	1 151	5.0	590	3.1	3 612	5.2
Dewey	165	13.9	1 305	6.0	333	6.7	764	5.6	379	3.5	2 499	6.3
Douglas	247	9.0	1 600	7.3	383	5.2	994	6.7	415	2.9	3 475	8.3
Edmunds	265	8.8	2 941	5.8	462	3.5	1 485	4.3	494	1.7	4 021	4.0
Fall River	107	11.3	791	4.0	249	4.3	902	9.0	289	2.8	2 511	5.0
Faulk	179	7.9	2 123	7.9	294	3.9	1 292	4.0	326	1.3	3 450	6.2
Grant	285	11.8	2 738	15.5	522	5.8	1 176	6.6	620	3.0	3 130	7.0
Gregory	268	10.6	1 849	7.8	515	5.2	1 178	7.3	600	2.5	2 956	5.2
Haakon	114	14.3	1 644	11.7	274	6.1	1 431	5.8	293	4.1	3 400	4.7
Hamlin	189	12.8	1 816	12.6	410	5.2	1 126	8.7	462	2.5	3 416	4.5
Hand	288	7.3	3 175	5.4	474	3.7	2 046	4.1	527	1.9	4 286	5.0
Hanson	214	11.9	1 732	11.4	307	6.4	1 071	6.1	354	2.1	3 482	12.7
Harding	170	8.5	1 280	9.6	273	2.3	1 019	2.9	269	3.5	2 601	2.9
Hughes	87	16.1	842	12.8	241	4.8	796	4.1	226	7.0	2 173	4.7
Hutchinson	507	6.7	3 975	7.1	833	3.9	2 573	5.1	930	2.5	6 602	3.6
Hyde	150	11.8	1 413	13.0	203	8.0	905	6.9	241	2.2	2 194	6.4
Jackson	89	11.5	1 063	10.0	306	3.7	794	4.2	291	4.0	2 993	2.9
Jerauld	112	17.3	1 079	6.8	242	8.0	773	9.7	276	2.8	2 185	5.4
Jones	69	20.8	872	6.3	171	7.7	719	6.4	173	7.0	1 756	15.5
Kingsbury	276	10.5	2 988	6.9	502	5.4	1 235	4.7	586	2.7	4 521	5.3
Lake	233	10.9	2 279	9.2	518	4.0	1 442	6.7	542	3.0	5 409	3.7
Lawrence	74	18.4	447	17.1	243	5.1	533	9.2	240	6.0	1 023	4.6
Lincoln	363	8.8	3 704	6.7	773	4.0	1 889	9.0	898	2.3	3 742	6.0
Lyman	160	13.2	1 964	16.1	337	6.2	1 687	9.1	404	2.3	3 181	4.3
McCook	275	9.2	1 763	8.2	522	4.5	1 632	5.9	619	1.7	4 501	5.0
McPherson	230	8.4	1 588	9.4	454	2.6	1 110	4.5	451	2.7	4 102	3.3
Marshall	253	7.8	2 956	6.2	434	4.0	1 291	3.8	464	2.5	3 884	3.4
Meade	245	11.4	2 236	6.0	759	2.9	2 857	5.7	743	2.1	4 984	8.6
Mellette	110	14.0	1 319	5.6	231	6.4	652	4.4	250	3.9	1 672	8.9
Miner	253	9.5	2 257	9.4	391	4.2	864	9.7	411	2.7	2 391	3.5
Minnehaha	519	7.5	5 964	7.6	1 074	3.8	2 876	7.1	1 199	2.6	6 645	4.4
Moody	293	9.0	2 840	11.1	545	4.7	1 588	6.5	605	2.9	3 538	4.4
Pennington	158	15.6	865	16.8	584	3.5	1 895	7.0	584	3.7	4 615	6.1
Perkins	235	8.9	2 318	15.2	489	4.5	1 877	3.6	534	3.0	4 239	3.6
Potter	204	7.9	2 861	11.5	255	6.9	1 157	5.0	321	2.5	3 407	3.1
Roberts	437	7.1	4 775	6.1	827	2.7	2 359	5.4	869	2.5	5 663	4.3
Sanborn	194	14.5	3 212	10.8	352	6.5	1 010	13.7	403	2.3	4 711	5.4
Shannon	52	29.5	512	34.0	176	4.5	341	22.5	178	6.0	1 815	18.3
Spink	456	3.9	5 449	3.9	661	2.6	2 252	3.6	720	1.7	6 954	7.3
Stanley	73	7.1	1 236	2.2	172	3.2	810	4.1	192	2.6	1 549	2.5
Sully	149	14.2	2 193	15.9	231	8.5	1 330	4.7	253	6.3	3 299	4.2
Todd	158	8.6	1 731	14.3	235	3.4	575	4.4	235	4.3	2 305	3.5
Tripp	371	6.9	2 907	4.3	686	2.9	2 222	4.5	701	2.7	4 186	4.0
Turner	354	9.9	3 716	9.4	820	4.1	2 325	6.6	913	2.4	5 860	4.1
Union	204	9.8	3 558	6.1	431	5.9	1 603	8.0	553	2.3	5 482	3.6
Walworth	186	10.3	1 942	9.6	342	4.8	1 060	7.8	363	3.4	2 490	3.8
Yankton	232	11.4	1 997	17.1	585	4.9	1 379	10.4	682	2.8	4 085	5.2
Ziebach	107	12.3	1 270	19.1	253	1.5	1 025	4.3	234	4.3	2 045	10.6

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)
	South Dakota	34 056	1.5	662 184	1.4	30 142	1.5	19 582 565	1.0	28 430	1.5	13 624 006
Aurora	437	2.6	8 090	9.0	393	2.4	257 273	2.0	378	2.5	169 941	1.9
Beadle	812	1.7	18 222	7.1	709	1.8	495 886	1.4	661	1.8	344 685	1.2
Bennett	284	1.8	3 861	11.9	233	2.1	244 081	1.7	211	2.2	116 310	1.5
Bon Homme	737	2.5	14 146	8.2	689	2.4	265 066	2.2	670	2.4	214 327	2.2
Brookings	958	1.9	9 612	10.1	856	1.9	358 126	1.4	794	2.0	282 267	1.3
Brown	1 088	1.7	20 555	4.2	977	1.6	802 016	.9	921	1.5	621 780	.8
Brule	418	2.1	7 007	11.3	383	2.2	290 271	1.8	368	2.2	197 710	1.5
Buffalo	83	2.1	2 593	3.9	69	1.9	78 743	1.3	65	2.2	58 791	1.2
Butte	542	1.4	7 277	12.0	422	1.5	147 971	1.6	370	1.6	77 890	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	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)
Campbell	323	2.2	9 138	15.0	291	2.2	225 008	2.0	271	2.3	145 736	1.8
Charles Mix	797	2.1	17 021	5.1	715	2.1	479 605	1.5	697	2.1	368 552	1.4
Clark	610	2.0	8 938	9.1	561	2.0	385 748	1.7	533	2.0	271 109	1.6
Clay	438	2.3	11 873	6.5	416	2.0	217 393	1.5	400	2.1	193 744	1.4
Codington	657	2.0	11 261	9.3	585	2.0	304 627	1.6	555	2.0	237 818	1.5
Corson	450	1.8	8 724	9.6	391	2.0	354 816	1.6	368	2.0	210 916	1.4
Custer	322	1.6	2 149	23.5	244	1.4	63 723	2.0	202	1.5	33 320	1.6
Davison	462	1.9	10 186	5.0	403	2.0	218 546	1.6	383	2.0	166 124	1.5
Day	721	2.4	9 010	10.1	662	2.3	424 282	1.8	636	2.3	298 292	1.7
Deuel	634	2.1	6 292	16.9	578	2.2	246 424	2.0	546	2.2	178 235	2.0
Dewey	409	2.0	4 605	10.8	326	2.1	257 990	1.9	289	2.1	130 014	1.5
Douglas	442	2.0	7 550	9.7	396	2.1	207 165	1.7	384	2.1	156 546	1.7
Edmunds	494	1.7	11 448	5.2	453	1.6	441 566	1.2	432	1.7	306 946	1.1
Fall River	298	1.5	12 973	3.4	238	1.2	100 041	1.6	211	1.3	54 366	1.1
Faulk	327	1.3	7 777	5.7	303	1.3	353 709	.8	294	1.4	263 376	.8
Grant	645	2.3	13 433	7.5	585	2.1	289 832	1.7	568	2.2	241 931	1.6
Gregory	609	2.1	11 329	8.5	534	2.2	284 477	2.1	513	2.3	197 681	1.9
Haakon	322	1.6	6 397	8.3	261	1.6	354 005	.9	240	1.6	166 672	.7
Hamlin	467	2.2	7 428	14.0	416	2.0	236 032	1.4	393	2.0	192 816	1.3
Hand	541	1.5	12 681	7.0	485	1.4	463 567	.8	468	1.4	332 624	.7
Hanson	354	2.1	8 347	17.9	322	2.1	194 962	1.5	310	2.1	157 940	1.5
Harding	282	1.6	6 163	9.4	226	1.0	193 951	.8	202	1.1	95 065	.7
Hughes	257	1.6	4 768	6.0	221	1.9	221 814	1.4	204	2.0	145 373	1.1
Hutchinson	930	2.5	24 635	4.4	866	2.3	427 924	1.9	843	2.3	338 774	1.9
Hyde	241	2.2	5 065	12.3	207	2.2	203 402	1.3	198	2.2	139 594	1.2
Jackson	326	1.7	6 644	6.6	263	2.1	237 199	1.4	232	2.2	125 740	.9
Jerauld	282	2.1	4 939	5.7	239	2.2	165 565	1.7	225	2.2	112 921	1.5
Jones	198	1.5	3 719	7.7	178	1.8	206 917	1.2	161	1.9	95 351	1.2
Kingsbury	614	2.0	13 084	7.3	549	2.0	369 114	1.5	525	2.0	284 578	1.4
Lake	572	2.1	13 438	7.4	502	2.1	257 107	1.7	474	2.2	209 994	1.7
Lawrence	273	1.4	1 339	22.3	225	1.8	42 580	2.5	204	1.9	24 695	2.2
Lincoln	938	1.8	18 711	6.5	846	1.9	293 696	1.7	817	2.0	264 036	1.7
Lyman	420	1.9	4 111	18.2	370	2.1	433 565	1.4	344	2.1	206 512	1.3
McCook	619	1.7	15 216	7.8	572	1.7	273 160	1.3	539	1.7	217 334	1.3
McPherson	465	1.9	9 784	7.4	427	1.8	361 829	1.5	404	1.8	229 035	1.3
Marshall	487	2.0	15 613	5.0	439	1.5	342 465	1.2	413	1.6	257 375	1.0
Meade	811	1.1	13 452	19.3	709	1.2	398 707	.9	637	1.2	229 128	.7
Mellette	265	2.1	4 695	8.3	208	2.2	159 789	1.7	197	2.2	86 400	1.4
Miner	424	2.2	7 510	13.2	378	2.1	236 970	1.8	362	2.2	163 870	1.6
Minnehaha	1 262	2.1	21 372	8.8	1 129	1.7	369 405	1.4	1 071	1.7	311 584	1.4
Moody	640	1.9	11 336	7.3	593	1.7	248 696	1.5	562	1.8	206 992	1.5
Pennington	635	1.4	7 587	12.7	513	1.4	291 086	1.1	455	1.4	143 698	1.0
Perkins	555	2.0	7 882	9.6	482	2.0	423 543	1.5	453	2.1	231 083	1.2
Potter	321	2.5	10 503	9.7	281	1.5	325 859	.9	268	1.4	227 033	.8
Roberts	905	1.7	15 448	5.9	815	1.8	473 599	1.2	773	1.8	380 454	1.1
Sanborn	409	2.0	3 569	26.7	370	2.3	210 741	2.1	339	2.4	136 177	1.9
Shannon	190	2.0	2 204	17.9	122	2.4	95 900	2.4	113	2.5	45 414	1.5
Spink	743	1.0	21 431	3.7	678	1.2	712 322	.7	653	1.3	560 768	.6
Stanley	198	1.8	2 397	8.4	166	1.7	229 190	.9	151	1.8	106 462	.8
Sully	281	2.0	10 654	3.9	258	1.5	476 887	.6	254	1.4	342 805	.5
Todd	245	1.9	4 068	9.4	209	2.1	144 420	1.2	191	2.0	96 079	1.0
Tripp	740	1.9	12 688	6.7	648	1.9	466 520	1.5	598	2.0	289 694	1.3
Turner	956	1.9	23 999	5.6	876	1.9	325 995	1.3	842	1.9	283 298	1.3
Union	562	2.2	16 801	5.7	511	1.5	240 197	1.1	495	1.5	204 458	1.1
Walworth	379	1.9	6 400	9.3	329	2.1	256 327	1.7	300	2.2	164 449	1.6
Yankton	692	2.4	16 507	6.1	632	2.2	229 359	2.1	615	2.3	191 208	2.1
Ziebach	258	1.5	4 529	14.9	209	1.8	193 814	1.3	185	1.9	88 116	1.2

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)
South Dakota	1 674	1.2	371 263	.8	22 576	1.5	3 777 822	.9	18 597	1.5	1 604 838	1.0
Aurora	1	49.9	(D)	(D)	349	2.5	55 149	2.1	317	2.6	24 305	2.3
Beadle	59	3.9	12 558	2.4	571	1.9	112 584	1.3	480	2.0	44 271	1.6
Bennett	24	5.8	5 576	3.8	200	2.2	43 420	1.1	173	2.3	22 495	1.3
Bon Homme	32	3.9	5 941	2.3	537	2.6	59 446	1.8	403	2.8	15 051	2.6
Brookings	79	2.6	14 666	2.3	524	1.7	61 962	1.1	379	1.8	20 129	1.5
Brown	32	3.9	6 700	1.3	619	1.4	108 382	.8	515	1.5	39 862	1.0
Brule	15	7.2	7 565	3.5	330	2.3	70 285	1.8	302	2.4	32 006	2.0
Buffalo	11	-	7 953	-	64	1.9	24 926	1.4	61	2.1	(D)	(D)
Butte	293	1.9	49 459	2.4	346	1.6	57 775	.9	269	1.8	25 912	1.1
Campbell	12	8.3	2 011	5.8	238	2.3	41 407	1.9	186	2.5	15 006	2.2
Charles Mix	44	3.0	15 533	1.5	603	2.2	100 017	1.7	536	2.3	41 773	1.9
Clark	22	5.7	6 351	2.3	404	2.2	75 288	1.4	342	2.4	25 500	2.0
Clay	33	3.7	8 306	1.8	131	2.5	11 293	2.1	94	2.9	3 997	2.4
Codington	11	5.9	3 871	(L)	442	2.1	55 218	1.7	310	2.5	16 083	2.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	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)
Corson	6	11.8	1 278	14.8	351	2.0	80 503	1.3	329	2.0	45 171	1.4
Custer	26	3.7	3 167	2.0	238	1.5	28 822	1.1	211	1.6	16 432	1.1
Davison	18	5.2	2 380	2.9	294	2.3	30 458	1.9	221	2.6	12 077	2.1
Day	17	7.7	2 593	4.2	495	2.4	55 579	2.0	381	2.6	18 918	2.5
Deuel	15	8.6	2 048	7.4	444	2.3	49 731	1.9	280	2.8	14 290	2.8
Dewey	3	—	504	—	310	1.9	59 210	1.4	282	2.1	36 906	1.5
Douglas	5	9.8	1 162	2.1	337	2.2	38 658	2.2	268	2.5	13 030	2.5
Edmunds	8	10.0	1 295	5.9	371	1.8	71 086	1.4	337	1.9	29 203	1.8
Fall River	60	3.0	12 154	3.3	228	1.2	64 546	.6	199	1.4	22 997	1.3
Faulk	—	—	—	—	227	1.5	59 729	.8	208	1.6	25 700	1.1
Grant	18	5.9	4 242	2.7	370	2.4	48 406	2.1	208	3.1	10 942	3.7
Gregory	12	9.0	2 027	8.9	494	2.3	77 279	2.0	421	2.4	36 990	2.1
Haakon	4	—	870	—	253	1.5	70 266	.7	243	1.5	38 815	.7
Hamlin	25	5.1	6 735	4.9	308	2.1	32 419	1.5	202	2.4	9 002	1.8
Hand	14	4.5	1 967	6.9	400	1.5	103 133	.9	363	1.5	44 968	.9
Hanson	8	8.7	1 283	2.0	261	2.2	26 347	2.1	214	2.5	11 392	2.3
Harding	6	5.1	1 362	.2	221	1.2	66 161	.4	219	1.2	38 688	.4
Hughes	34	4.4	12 344	4.7	156	2.4	31 772	1.9	147	2.5	16 268	2.1
Hutchinson	12	8.3	1 605	4.8	677	2.4	67 547	2.0	548	2.6	24 873	2.4
Hyde	3	16.7	370	8.8	185	2.3	63 654	1.2	176	2.4	(D)	(D)
Jackson	18	7.4	3 040	8.9	265	2.1	69 930	1.1	245	2.1	41 314	1.0
Jerauld	7	10.0	1 413	7.0	219	2.2	52 103	1.4	188	2.4	20 472	1.8
Jones	9	4.9	1 215	3.3	127	2.2	41 009	1.2	118	2.3	20 576	1.1
Kingsbury	17	7.5	3 041	4.3	385	2.1	61 685	1.5	338	2.2	25 840	1.8
Lake	7	10.0	1 562	4.3	341	2.3	37 528	2.0	259	2.6	12 229	2.7
Lawrence	34	4.0	3 041	3.5	171	2.2	18 473	2.1	145	2.5	8 604	2.1
Lincoln	11	12.0	1 688	17.8	429	2.2	38 376	1.4	283	2.6	7 799	2.7
Lyman	12	6.4	6 151	1.2	284	2.2	61 461	1.7	253	2.3	30 854	1.9
McCook	1	32.6	(D)	(D)	408	1.6	42 802	1.4	310	1.8	14 742	1.9
McPherson	13	7.4	2 054	10.0	374	1.7	77 426	1.3	323	1.9	31 839	1.5
Marshall	8	7.3	1 083	7.7	306	1.8	72 186	.8	262	1.9	23 369	1.5
Meade	48	3.3	6 281	4.6	626	1.4	116 628	1.0	561	1.4	66 010	.9
Mellette	10	7.0	862	5.2	236	2.0	53 695	1.5	222	2.0	30 793	1.4
Miner	2	34.2	(D)	(D)	313	2.3	43 383	2.1	280	2.5	19 380	2.4
Minnehaha	25	5.4	1 112	7.4	695	1.8	64 198	1.4	455	1.9	18 410	1.6
Moody	16	9.1	1 601	11.8	341	2.1	36 776	1.7	266	2.4	11 994	2.2
Pennington	81	3.2	11 646	4.0	431	1.5	68 357	1.1	383	1.4	36 418	1.2
Perkins	9	9.6	531	6.7	392	1.9	87 314	1.0	372	1.9	51 594	1.0
Potter	17	4.6	3 477	4.7	178	1.7	45 004	.9	156	1.9	16 358	1.3
Roberts	21	3.6	2 491	2.4	495	1.8	53 419	1.5	377	2.0	18 890	1.8
Sanborn	5	12.4	122	22.6	297	2.4	54 053	2.0	259	2.6	21 217	2.6
Shannon	4	21.4	119	34.4	148	2.1	30 824	1.6	138	2.2	18 078	1.9
Spink	74	2.3	21 325	1.7	496	1.3	101 521	.7	441	1.4	34 227	1.0
Stanley	6	14.2	327	9.1	131	2.0	39 146	1.0	115	2.1	19 989	1.0
Sully	21	4.7	19 552	1.0	130	1.5	35 246	.8	125	1.6	14 419	1.1
Todd	31	4.0	14 091	1.6	206	2.1	60 020	.9	194	2.1	29 477	1.0
Tripp	16	6.2	2 430	3.5	577	1.9	112 132	1.3	495	2.1	51 769	1.4
Turner	60	2.6	18 175	1.8	543	1.8	53 222	1.1	336	2.2	11 972	1.8
Union	78	3.2	26 141	2.3	224	2.0	31 597	1.1	168	2.2	6 344	2.3
Walworth	18	5.9	2 838	6.6	230	2.4	37 293	1.8	210	2.6	18 609	2.1
Yankton	31	5.9	7 783	3.7	411	2.5	36 042	2.2	321	2.7	12 133	2.7
Ziebach	2	—	(D)	(D)	189	1.8	42 515	1.2	175	1.9	24 586	1.5

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)
South Dakota	2 873	1.6	117 454	1.1	6 710	1.5	1 978 195	.9	3 386	1.5	661 872	1.0
Aurora	25	6.3	811	5.7	158	3.1	41 148	2.3	64	5.0	8 815	5.6
Beadle	46	4.0	2 803	2.5	158	2.7	44 188	1.8	86	4.2	8 683	6.2
Bennett	19	8.2	147	3.1	29	6.3	3 446	8.9	3	23.2	(D)	(D)
Bon Homme	69	5.3	2 292	5.1	286	2.8	79 908	2.3	38	6.3	3 752	7.5
Brookings	84	2.7	3 844	2.1	212	2.1	70 832	1.0	113	3.0	11 993	2.3
Brown	46	4.0	2 219	3.0	162	2.2	55 738	1.2	140	2.4	29 074	1.4
Brule	25	7.4	770	6.4	112	3.5	40 267	2.1	45	5.6	6 106	7.0
Buffalo	6	7.9	(D)	(D)	17	6.7	1 437	8.5	11	8.8	1 194	15.8
Butte	57	3.7	2 839	1.7	31	5.9	3 657	6.9	187	2.1	11 687	1.0
Campbell	39	5.4	1 673	4.7	40	4.7	7 153	3.7	22	6.7	3 866	4.7
Charles Mix	53	5.1	2 517	3.4	276	2.7	84 916	2.2	44	6.0	5 395	11.2
Clark	37	5.2	1 249	4.2	92	3.8	42 444	1.5	73	4.2	6 619	4.6
Clay	8	10.3	227	11.0	106	2.8	30 818	1.9	44	4.5	3 455	7.7
Codington	103	2.9	7 344	1.7	91	3.8	17 644	3.1	102	3.9	11 800	3.3

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	Livestock and poultry – Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Corson	29	5.2	947	5.7	31	5.4	3 676	6.5	29	5.1	5 145	5.5
Custer	28	4.9	647	6.3	15	7.2	477	5.6	26	5.3	487	6.8
Davison	47	4.8	1 863	3.4	136	2.9	30 091	2.5	51	4.8	3 529	7.2
Day	134	3.5	5 463	3.2	111	4.0	13 505	4.0	57	5.6	4 680	11.6
Deuel	136	3.4	6 658	2.4	97	3.8	15 772	4.5	65	5.1	7 255	7.7
Dewey	38	4.4	1 247	6.5	61	4.5	9 087	4.8	40	5.4	8 354	5.2
Douglas	66	4.3	2 983	3.7	214	2.5	58 007	2.1	32	6.2	3 924	8.4
Edmunds	47	4.0	2 189	2.4	67	3.9	25 512	1.3	27	6.8	4 832	5.7
Fall River	14	6.4	214	.7	16	5.9	1 326	6.7	29	4.2	11 025	2.2
Faulk	10	9.7	215	8.8	52	3.9	31 619	1.4	41	4.9	8 788	5.5
Grant	110	3.6	5 357	2.5	80	4.3	18 005	4.8	42	6.4	3 848	9.7
Gregory	81	4.3	3 471	3.4	141	3.4	20 059	3.4	32	6.4	2 815	6.8
Haakon	27	4.4	84	4.5	32	4.9	7 495	8.4	22	5.5	10 566	2.0
Hamlin	83	3.3	3 947	2.2	74	3.7	19 834	2.0	45	4.3	4 047	5.3
Hand	35	3.2	2 145	1.4	104	2.6	27 136	1.5	50	3.7	9 425	3.7
Hanson	38	4.5	1 699	3.7	105	3.2	41 567	1.7	31	6.8	2 182	10.7
Harding	21	4.2	45	4.5	23	4.9	5 200	3.5	122	1.7	74 602	1.2
Hughes	13	10.6	95	5.4	37	4.3	32 327	.9	25	5.6	3 873	8.8
Hutchinson	121	3.5	5 308	2.6	318	2.5	114 595	1.7	83	4.4	5 663	5.8
Hyde	5	14.1	(D)	(D)	31	6.2	7 961	2.6	45	5.2	10 027	3.2
Jackson	26	4.2	125	1.1	28	6.2	4 402	7.8	25	6.3	2 877	8.9
Jerauld	16	8.4	342	7.0	49	4.7	15 428	3.0	31	6.3	3 982	7.3
Jones	14	7.1	145	6.4	16	7.8	2 423	11.2	6	12.6	3 101	15.6
Kingsbury	34	6.2	1 126	6.0	77	3.8	18 000	2.6	76	4.3	8 364	6.7
Lake	36	6.3	1 179	6.2	160	2.8	63 573	1.5	50	5.0	3 177	8.0
Lawrence	16	5.1	886	1.6	11	9.3	1 035	19.8	24	5.7	2 086	6.7
Lincoln	41	5.7	1 896	4.4	205	2.5	62 289	2.2	87	3.9	6 726	7.1
Lyman	10	7.1	507	.1	60	4.8	11 630	4.3	32	6.6	6 282	4.4
McCook	62	2.8	3 304	1.9	178	1.9	67 112	1.3	54	3.8	3 262	3.6
McPherson	59	3.7	2 815	2.5	58	4.3	26 673	1.0	32	6.1	3 898	6.5
Marshall	27	4.7	1 462	3.7	74	3.1	29 005	1.9	48	4.3	6 119	4.4
Meade	87	2.7	1 369	4.1	54	3.5	5 048	4.5	111	2.4	31 561	2.0
Mellette	25	5.6	300	6.0	29	5.8	4 208	3.1	17	7.6	1 806	7.3
Miner	34	5.9	1 338	6.3	108	3.3	38 252	1.7	59	5.0	6 783	7.4
Minnehaaha	121	2.9	5 623	2.2	301	2.3	103 713	1.5	84	3.4	10 795	2.1
Moody	38	5.3	1 802	3.7	175	2.6	52 127	1.8	61	4.9	23 411	1.6
Pennington	35	5.1	811	5.9	29	6.3	3 206	9.3	22	6.9	2 768	2.3
Perkins	41	4.3	310	6.7	32	4.7	4 170	5.6	104	3.4	45 257	2.3
Potter	4	–	432	–	82	2.6	22 748	2.3	21	6.3	4 631	8.4
Roberts	83	2.9	3 339	2.5	161	2.4	41 632	1.6	79	3.4	7 708	4.3
Sanborn	18	9.7	676	10.3	78	3.9	21 523	2.5	54	5.3	5 479	4.9
Shannon	8	12.3	23	12.5	8	–	2 729	–	–	–	–	–
Spink	21	4.6	881	3.0	147	2.2	58 711	.9	92	3.0	17 273	2.7
Stanley	5	9.9	14	3.5	15	9.0	791	5.2	3	16.5	(D)	(D)
Sully	7	12.0	20	8.1	36	3.9	9 413	3.4	16	7.5	3 147	6.3
Todd	15	6.5	276	8.2	20	6.3	1 839	5.1	12	7.0	945	10.0
Tripp	73	4.3	3 110	2.9	218	2.6	57 050	2.1	52	4.7	11 660	2.2
Turner	122	2.7	5 953	2.1	286	2.4	87 857	1.4	107	3.2	17 513	1.7
Union	20	6.2	1 016	3.4	168	2.2	63 102	1.6	35	5.0	3 320	3.8
Walworth	18	6.2	811	2.2	64	4.1	15 025	2.6	28	6.0	2 492	5.9
Yankton	38	5.8	1 309	5.2	219	2.9	70 567	2.2	65	4.6	5 573	7.0
Ziebach	19	6.2	39	13.0	49	4.1	6 067	6.4	33	5.0	9 491	3.5

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)
South Dakota	1 096	1.8	2 057 618	.3	130	3.4	121 283	1.2
Aurora	19	8.1	(D)	(D)	3	16.6	540	13.9
Beadle	19	8.3	6 359	1.6	4	12.0	(D)	(D)
Bennett	18	8.6	508	9.0	4	17.5	280	19.0
Bon Homme	32	7.2	3 207	11.4	4	18.0	490	23.8
Brookings	22	6.0	4 053	7.4	3	21.1	180	20.9
Brown	21	7.0	878	11.5	5	12.4	980	12.2
Brule	11	12.7	803	5.7	3	16.6	3 600	5.5
Buffalo	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Butte	31	5.9	541	7.0	2	24.8	(D)	(D)
Campbell	6	15.9	712	21.5	6	16.7	1 070	17.2
Charles Mix	41	5.9	26 101	1.8	5	17.2	290	19.4
Clark	11	10.2	687	3.3	7	11.4	7 608	7.7
Clay	8	10.3	415	10.3	1	40.1	(D)	(D)
Codington	19	9.1	601	15.8	–	–	–	–

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	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)
Corson	16	6.8	826	5.8	1	—	(D)	(D)
Custer	34	4.9	762	7.0	—	—	—	—
Davison	18	9.1	(D)	(D)	5	18.8	540	26.9
Day	20	8.7	767	12.9	4	21.0	(D)	(D)
Deuel	10	12.5	(D)	(D)	1	48.1	(D)	(D)
Dewey	12	10.3	552	9.4	—	—	—	—
Douglas	23	8.1	(D)	(D)	2	24.4	(D)	(D)
Edmunds	16	8.1	47 020	.2	3	15.3	(D)	(D)
Fall River	10	8.3	296	11.7	—	—	—	—
Faulk	3	18.1	(D)	(D)	1	38.6	(D)	(D)
Grant	11	11.6	761	17.1	4	21.2	1 900	23.2
Gregory	21	8.9	1 167	12.4	3	21.8	350	23.2
Haakon	14	6.5	606	9.9	—	—	—	—
Hamlin	11	9.8	993	5.8	2	18.3	(D)	(D)
Hand	16	5.7	7 320	1.6	1	—	(D)	(D)
Hanson	17	7.9	22 666	.8	—	—	—	—
Harding	14	6.2	316	7.0	2	—	—	—
Hughes	3	20.2	75	23.5	1	30.0	(D)	(D)
Hutchinson	39	6.3	32 458	1.4	5	17.2	(D)	(D)
Hyde	11	9.1	785	14.2	—	—	—	—
Jackson	25	6.0	825	10.0	—	—	—	—
Jerauld	11	9.8	(D)	(D)	4	17.5	110	19.8
Jones	10	10.9	291	11.6	—	—	—	—
Kingsbury	8	12.2	(D)	(D)	4	18.2	2 475	19.7
Lake	18	8.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Lawrence	12	8.8	167	13.8	—	—	—	—
Lincoln	26	7.5	(D)	(D)	2	27.5	(D)	(D)
Lyman	11	11.1	389	7.8	—	—	—	—
McCook	16	7.7	8 703	26.3	1	32.6	(D)	(D)
McPherson	22	6.1	11 428	1.2	4	11.8	(D)	(D)
Marshall	3	15.9	100	7.5	—	—	—	—
Meade	47	4.0	2 945	15.4	1	40.6	(D)	(D)
Mellette	8	12.4	134	15.6	2	24.7	(D)	(D)
Miner	10	10.9	640	15.0	1	48.4	(D)	(D)
Minnehaha	33	5.7	(D)	(D)	6	10.7	745	2.1
Moody	24	7.0	2 788	16.0	5	15.1	460	35.4
Pennington	36	5.4	1 097	9.4	2	27.8	(D)	(D)
Perkins	25	7.2	679	6.3	—	—	—	—
Potter	8	8.4	397	10.6	—	—	—	—
Roberts	20	7.0	(D)	(D)	3	14.7	(D)	(D)
Sanborn	10	11.2	745	10.3	2	30.9	(D)	(D)
Shannon	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Spink	17	7.0	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)
Stanley	5	13.9	150	16.4	—	—	—	—
Sully	6	14.0	1 560	23.6	1	43.3	(D)	(D)
Todd	15	8.3	469	12.5	—	—	—	—
Tripp	22	7.9	12 704	3.9	2	24.7	(D)	(D)
Turner	14	8.0	45 442	5.1	2	28.1	(D)	(D)
Union	14	8.7	119 237	2.8	1	37.9	(D)	(D)
Walworth	10	10.5	238	9.5	3	16.5	340	17.4
Yankton	20	7.9	11 349	1.8	1	—	(D)	(D)
Ziebach	12	9.3	398	13.1	—	—	—	—

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed					Corn for silage or green chop						
	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, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota	16 427	1.6	3 097 251	1.0	245 398 567	1.0	6 235	1.5	394 087	1.0	3 335 427	1.0
Aurora	286	2.6	56 569	2.0	4 298 762	2.0	81	4.3	3 138	3.9	22 361	3.5
Beadle	468	1.9	100 256	1.2	6 678 111	1.1	194	2.5	13 574	1.7	95 462	1.9
Bennett	19	6.8	3 589	5.3	264 607	5.5	11	4.5	898	3.5	14 518	.7
Bon Homme	589	2.5	90 847	2.2	7 941 963	2.1	235	3.1	8 114	2.5	103 602	2.1
Brookings	591	2.2	117 989	1.4	8 276 999	1.3	188	2.0	10 755	1.8	95 322	1.6
Brown	538	1.5	133 971	1.0	8 333 864	.9	132	1.9	9 140	1.3	61 542	1.3
Brule	272	2.4	55 089	1.7	3 798 806	1.6	118	3.3	7 131	2.9	54 429	2.1
Buffalo	35	3.6	10 574	1.2	786 839	.9	24	5.1	3 224	3.7	28 762	2.8
Butte	79	3.4	5 892	4.1	553 284	3.8	55	3.4	4 619	4.0	47 886	2.9
Campbell	92	3.0	11 900	2.1	616 768	2.2	117	3.0	12 108	2.2	94 167	2.2
Charles Mix	535	2.2	91 187	1.5	7 649 642	1.4	122	3.4	6 408	4.5	62 700	4.3
Clark	367	2.2	60 768	1.6	3 017 101	1.7	160	3.0	11 314	2.7	81 597	5.8
Clay	363	2.0	78 798	1.5	9 422 749	1.5	28	5.0	1 206	10.0	20 298	15.7
Codington	304	2.3	45 516	1.5	2 417 086	1.5	200	2.7	14 122	1.9	109 863	1.8

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed					Corn for silage or green chop						
	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, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Corson	42	4.3	4 758	2.6	230 807	2.9	72	3.3	6 418	3.2	33 880	3.3
Custer	10	6.5	864	5.8	89 410	8.0	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Davison	269	2.3	59 493	1.6	5 196 926	1.5	65	4.2	2 627	5.0	42 102	10.2
Day	317	2.5	35 448	1.8	1 794 208	1.7	194	3.2	9 781	3.7	69 090	3.9
Deuel	384	2.4	50 339	2.1	2 738 456	2.2	186	3.0	11 318	2.3	88 007	2.5
Dewey	42	4.7	4 618	3.9	205 786	4.0	32	5.0	2 852	5.0	16 071	4.7
Douglas	317	2.2	53 122	1.8	4 120 989	1.8	112	3.4	4 493	2.7	39 070	2.7
Edmunds	125	2.5	13 505	1.5	702 519	1.4	184	2.4	18 188	2.4	115 975	2.6
Fall River	34	4.4	3 432	4.8	354 199	5.1	3	10.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Faulk	132	2.0	22 222	1.3	1 240 772	1.1	71	2.6	6 134	1.5	33 916	1.8
Grant	372	2.4	57 445	1.7	4 344 623	1.8	136	3.2	7 834	2.7	76 702	1.8
Gregory	333	2.5	42 463	2.0	2 907 239	2.0	58	4.5	2 290	3.7	17 330	3.4
Haakon	21	5.3	3 349	3.3	164 370	2.3	21	4.7	2 743	2.3	17 978	2.0
Hamlin	341	2.1	69 144	1.4	4 237 882	1.4	136	2.2	7 108	1.6	59 688	1.4
Hand	263	1.5	49 824	.9	2 434 695	.8	184	1.4	21 863	1.0	141 862	.8
Hanson	241	2.3	61 726	1.7	5 203 986	1.6	70	3.8	2 540	3.5	27 622	4.0
Harding	3	15.7	327	11.1	15 202	8.4	12	5.5	1 513	1.4	8 257	2.9
Hughes	97	2.6	25 536	2.3	1 658 952	2.4	29	5.2	3 343	5.3	20 658	4.7
Hutchinson	758	2.4	139 457	1.9	12 421 548	1.8	310	2.8	11 285	2.9	123 446	3.5
Hyde	48	4.0	9 618	1.8	374 009	1.7	77	3.2	11 049	2.3	70 397	2.5
Jackson	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Jerauld	140	2.7	26 937	1.8	1 812 120	1.9	72	3.9	5 323	3.1	36 277	5.1
Jones	7	6.4	844	8.0	45 475	6.2	3	—	225	—	2 400	—
Kingsbury	429	2.1	100 225	1.5	6 760 400	1.5	163	2.6	10 113	3.0	80 966	2.3
Lake	393	2.3	97 600	1.7	8 431 312	1.6	138	3.2	5 946	2.6	64 675	2.2
Lawrence	4	12.7	133	2.0	(D)	(D)	7	7.3	356	4.7	2 096	4.4
Lincoln	706	2.1	125 173	1.7	13 972 466	1.7	132	3.4	4 000	4.0	62 042	5.3
Lyman	47	3.6	10 773	1.3	1 001 988	.7	18	4.8	2 225	3.9	29 020	1.9
McCook	458	1.7	89 957	1.4	8 048 037	1.3	170	2.0	7 903	2.1	87 460	4.1
McPherson	52	3.3	5 999	2.1	361 302	2.8	143	2.5	16 148	1.5	102 455	1.2
Marshall	227	1.8	61 710	1.1	3 930 972	1.1	93	2.3	6 755	1.5	47 176	1.9
Meade	12	6.1	911	11.6	98 858	15.0	24	4.0	1 630	2.1	11 635	1.6
Mellette	23	5.3	2 404	6.7	94 082	4.2	7	7.1	900	4.9	8 260	1.1
Miner	299	2.3	56 398	1.8	4 150 440	1.8	88	3.7	4 221	3.3	27 425	3.8
Minnehaha	804	1.8	148 702	1.3	14 372 001	1.3	219	2.2	7 965	2.1	108 364	2.9
Moody	489	1.9	94 298	1.5	8 461 100	1.5	125	3.0	4 463	2.5	52 581	3.5
Pennington	12	2.7	933	.7	46 015	.3	15	5.5	669	6.4	4 332	7.3
Perkins	21	4.1	2 552	.6	150 734	.3	66	3.2	9 282	1.7	62 325	1.9
Potter	145	1.9	31 205	1.0	1 553 820	1.3	50	2.8	5 436	1.7	40 343	1.1
Roberts	485	1.8	71 488	1.3	6 140 632	1.3	171	2.1	8 123	1.8	79 583	3.3
Sanborn	252	2.6	56 796	1.9	4 236 193	1.8	81	4.1	4 280	4.2	24 971	4.5
Shannon	5	13.2	466	3.2	29 510	1.0	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Spink	495	1.2	124 760	.7	7 217 858	.7	185	1.7	16 251	1.2	129 121	1.4
Stanley	3	16.5	213	12.8	18 050	10.6	3	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Sully	135	1.7	45 081	.7	2 860 991	.8	27	3.9	2 810	2.3	18 087	1.6
Todd	41	2.9	8 753	2.0	537 095	2.1	14	4.5	871	3.0	6 495	3.3
Tripp	266	2.3	35 400	1.6	1 871 374	1.8	87	3.1	4 645	2.4	34 150	3.0
Turner	725	1.9	126 607	1.3	12 992 707	1.3	260	2.0	8 968	1.7	142 394	1.4
Union	443	1.5	104 683	1.0	12 834 596	1.0	52	3.6	2 251	6.1	41 351	7.1
Walworth	110	3.0	16 328	2.2	806 091	2.6	65	4.1	5 740	3.6	32 699	3.4
Yankton	507	2.4	80 115	2.1	8 039 912	2.2	132	3.5	4 671	5.1	54 615	4.9
Ziebach	5	10.0	172	7.8	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)

Selected crops harvested — Con.

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)
South Dakota	12 014	1.5	3 340 644	.8	101 053 975	.7	3 285	1.4	361 718	.8	17 423 745	.8
Aurora	166	3.0	23 663	2.4	785 759	2.4	76	4.1	6 356	4.1	306 532	4.7
Beadle	407	2.0	91 673	1.5	2 423 506	1.4	45	4.4	3 763	1.9	149 361	2.2
Bennett	106	2.9	30 249	1.5	681 909	1.7	10	7.0	1 522	2.4	84 725	2.2
Bon Homme	129	3.7	6 699	3.9	254 208	3.9	28	6.1	1 288	4.4	67 304	5.0
Brookings	213	2.0	14 780	2.0	468 731	1.9	30	3.7	1 434	2.2	59 182	2.4
Brown	620	1.5	225 083	.9	7 686 899	.8	234	1.8	32 582	1.2	1 833 069	1.0
Brule	185	2.6	38 824	1.8	1 056 059	2.0	49	4.6	4 789	2.9	173 372	3.0
Buffalo	37	3.7	11 885	1.1	356 491	.9	18	5.4	2 044	3.3	99 945	3.9
Butte	67	3.4	14 917	2.2	335 008	1.9	18	4.3	1 577	1.7	62 255	2.1
Campbell	212	2.5	65 496	2.1	2 008 692	2.2	100	2.9	9 682	2.3	442 469	2.1
Charles Mix	291	2.4	57 707	1.2	1 881 308	1.2	48	4.8	2 467	3.8	129 115	4.5
Clark	407	2.2	82 543	1.8	2 579 801	1.8	60	4.4	4 795	3.6	246 914	2.8
Clay	12	6.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Codington	335	2.4	51 330	1.8	2 049 069	1.8	94	3.6	6 728	3.6	386 026	3.6

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	Selected crops harvested — Con.											
	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)
Corson	218	2.5	79 479	1.9	1 878 122	2.1	77	3.3	7 582	2.1	257 728	2.0
Custer	14	4.7	3 244	8.9	98 144	10.0	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Davison	138	2.7	19 993	2.5	715 132	2.4	38	4.9	3 168	3.4	150 173	4.5
Day	468	2.4	112 120	1.7	3 559 628	1.7	216	3.0	19 905	2.6	1 008 367	2.8
Deuel	253	2.8	20 472	2.7	652 021	3.0	38	6.2	1 294	6.0	50 629	8.1
Dewey	103	3.2	32 172	2.1	706 687	2.4	36	4.5	3 441	3.6	121 914	2.9
Douglas	154	2.9	20 233	2.1	698 919	1.9	65	3.8	4 189	3.4	197 935	3.2
Edmunds	344	1.8	135 480	1.2	4 291 715	1.2	169	2.4	27 853	1.5	1 299 332	1.5
Fall River	56	3.0	11 931	2.2	443 763	2.7	5	10.4	165	12.8	4 625	6.1
Faulk	247	1.5	109 829	.9	3 218 157	.9	85	2.5	17 682	1.2	913 937	1.0
Grant	385	2.4	56 030	1.9	2 172 042	1.9	33	6.6	1 935	6.0	116 627	5.7
Gregory	135	3.3	16 476	2.8	505 757	2.9	43	5.3	2 689	5.4	123 699	5.8
Haakon	156	1.8	84 748	.8	2 534 767	.6	23	4.3	3 269	2.9	103 861	2.9
Hamlin	233	2.1	29 671	1.5	1 258 179	1.5	31	4.3	2 095	3.4	112 770	3.3
Hand	325	1.4	107 849	.9	2 343 757	.9	128	1.7	16 790	1.2	638 201	1.1
Hanson	71	3.7	13 812	3.1	542 321	2.7	25	5.2	3 074	3.1	177 767	3.0
Harding	69	2.5	18 153	1.5	437 440	1.2	49	2.8	6 820	1.6	264 677	1.4
Hughes	113	2.5	67 024	1.1	1 712 138	1.2	7	10.0	588	10.0	26 292	9.1
Hutchinson	247	2.8	17 932	2.7	688 228	2.7	40	5.4	3 356	2.7	175 313	3.0
Hyde	99	3.2	46 383	1.6	910 144	1.5	45	4.2	5 397	2.3	221 857	1.7
Jackson	106	2.6	51 052	.9	1 377 746	1.1	12	8.2	3 118	6.0	108 960	7.1
Jerauld	140	2.7	29 027	1.6	918 123	1.6	52	4.6	4 786	4.6	200 349	5.3
Jones	95	2.3	41 272	1.3	812 332	1.7	3	21.1	87	25.5	5 200	21.3
Kingsbury	319	2.4	55 624	1.6	1 895 674	1.6	63	4.4	4 896	4.3	246 419	3.5
Lake	103	3.5	6 972	3.3	280 990	3.4	34	4.8	3 108	2.9	169 704	2.5
Lawrence	2	14.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	3	16.9	105	23.6	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	15	7.7	1 325	17.9	39 611	17.9	2	23.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lyman	226	2.4	90 741	1.7	2 022 652	1.8	3	16.7	72	18.1	2 760	14.1
McCook	76	3.0	5 722	4.0	218 353	3.9	31	4.4	1 819	4.4	118 247	4.3
McPherson	295	2.1	75 903	1.7	2 346 075	1.7	151	2.3	20 308	1.6	1 043 019	1.6
Marshall	295	1.6	88 779	1.1	3 463 547	1.2	104	2.3	10 352	1.7	540 494	1.6
Meade	178	1.6	61 042	1.0	1 990 753	.9	59	2.3	8 845	.8	311 489	1.1
Mellette	75	3.0	27 484	1.8	624 857	1.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Miner	140	3.1	21 935	2.3	732 379	2.5	76	3.8	5 763	3.1	298 775	3.4
Minnehaha	51	3.6	3 515	4.0	141 680	3.4	12	6.4	395	8.7	25 464	7.5
Moody	68	4.2	3 202	4.6	120 792	4.7	4	11.6	346	22.3	19 626	19.8
Pennington	155	1.9	65 843	1.0	2 209 841	.9	18	5.7	1 295	10.6	62 195	11.0
Perkins	245	2.5	77 328	1.9	2 202 471	1.4	124	2.7	15 526	1.4	631 588	1.5
Potter	235	1.6	119 709	.6	4 009 570	.9	81	2.0	15 750	1.1	725 719	1.3
Roberts	563	1.7	100 067	1.2	4 212 174	1.2	186	1.7	22 611	1.4	1 464 323	1.3
Sanborn	95	3.9	12 742	4.1	341 751	4.3	25	6.5	1 875	6.5	82 626	5.7
Shannon	35	4.8	19 666	1.7	656 280	1.8	10	8.6	882	5.9	41 750	5.3
Spink	528	1.2	215 150	.6	6 206 744	.6	101	2.0	12 152	1.4	501 168	1.4
Stanley	81	2.6	65 533	.8	1 369 675	.7	3	23.2	317	15.4	14 884	9.3
Sully	214	1.4	194 831	.6	5 387 494	.5	12	7.3	1 944	2.6	73 034	2.7
Todd	23	4.5	4 711	4.1	106 389	4.3	6	9.7	583	5.4	18 310	5.5
Tripp	253	2.3	57 855	1.4	1 196 482	1.4	32	6.0	1 797	6.2	71 275	7.2
Turner	40	3.6	1 430	2.9	55 856	2.9	13	4.3	596	5.5	44 910	6.6
Union	27	5.3	1 338	11.1	53 199	9.5	5	14.5	73	10.9	3 592	14.0
Walworth	234	2.4	80 574	1.8	2 898 361	1.7	62	3.5	7 489	2.7	375 051	2.6
Yankton	19	7.3	1 380	10.4	66 330	11.2	7	12.3	393	16.3	9 675	12.0
Ziebach	68	3.3	40 096	1.1	1 123 442	1.0	27	4.9	3 912	2.7	190 716	2.2

Selected crops harvested — Con.

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested — Con.											
	Oats for grain					Sunflower seed						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota	9 055	1.7	627 557	1.3	37 228 291	1.3	1 571	1.1	349 668	.6	427 963 785	.5
Aurora	196	3.1	18 297	2.9	1 092 501	3.3	25	6.4	3 986	3.0	6 009 804	2.1
Beadle	200	2.7	14 858	2.6	737 147	2.7	125	2.4	29 699	1.2	38 100 739	1.2
Bennett	27	4.8	3 385	3.6	181 748	3.3	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Bon Homme	360	2.9	17 092	2.9	1 215 563	2.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Brookings	251	2.0	12 000	2.1	755 053	2.1	3	15.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Brown	182	2.2	14 131	1.6	819 988	1.7	127	1.8	29 023	.9	37 792 321	.8
Brule	161	3.0	13 252	2.6	623 203	2.8	19	5.9	2 603	7.9	3 053 073	9.9
Buffalo	17	6.8	1 641	4.8	86 510	4.9	8	6.0	1 687	1.8	2 839 250	1.2
Butte	57	3.6	2 096	3.4	91 716	2.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Campbell	142	2.8	11 855	2.1	702 753	2.1	6	14.4	708	9.6	698 920	7.1
Charles Mix	372	2.5	34 022	2.1	2 270 639	1.9	42	3.8	7 875	3.0	12 151 484	2.6
Clark	217	2.8	12 445	2.6	785 489	2.6	54	4.9	5 936	4.5	7 954 762	5.0
Clay	56	3.8	1 770	5.6	134 183	5.7	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Codington	215	2.7	14 070	2.5	1 102 556	2.5	30	6.5	1 818	6.4	2 684 462	6.7

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	Selected crops harvested — Con.											
	Oats for grain					Sunflower seed						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Corson	134	3.0	11 982	3.1	512 783	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Custer	12	5.4	498	4.4	22 530	3.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Davison	185	2.7	19 192	2.7	1 107 179	2.7	10	9.9	1 284	8.0	1 478 200	9.0
Day	223	3.2	10 668	3.4	659 096	3.4	48	4.8	5 198	4.4	6 267 540	4.9
Deuel	253	2.8	14 360	2.8	921 202	3.0	4	17.0	54	17.1	54 800	22.9
Dewey	82	3.4	9 303	3.5	385 606	3.3	11	10.2	2 030	7.8	1 940 000	8.7
Douglas	241	2.5	18 241	2.6	1 075 333	2.4	4	12.2	107	22.8	214 000	22.8
Edmunds	180	2.6	15 131	2.5	827 343	2.5	85	2.6	26 004	1.2	30 496 237	1.3
Fall River	29	3.7	1 481	4.6	77 948	2.8	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Faulk	113	2.3	13 037	1.4	725 095	1.5	68	2.5	17 599	1.3	22 841 445	1.2
Grant	138	3.4	5 584	3.9	410 519	4.2	16	8.2	1 385	4.1	1 222 805	5.1
Gregory	250	2.7	21 657	3.3	1 236 340	2.7	56	4.8	4 561	5.1	5 532 499	4.8
Haakon	63	2.9	6 302	2.6	358 111	3.2	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Hamlin	163	2.3	9 356	2.4	657 091	2.3	2	25.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Hand	125	2.0	11 143	2.4	466 672	2.1	115	1.7	32 127	.9	33 854 896	1.0
Hanson	173	2.6	20 133	2.5	1 335 430	2.6	13	6.5	3 816	3.4	4 326 800	4.2
Harding	44	2.4	4 205	1.2	201 193	1.3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hughes	53	2.9	6 071	2.0	340 746	1.9	27	3.2	8 334	1.7	9 982 621	1.9
Hutchinson	360	2.9	16 440	2.9	1 108 731	3.0	3	23.3	310	25.2	400 500	31.2
Hyde	82	3.3	7 572	2.8	403 284	2.2	19	5.9	3 496	4.5	4 603 798	2.4
Jackson	27	5.3	11 761	1.2	145 610	2.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jerauld	70	4.1	4 544	3.5	267 682	3.8	14	5.0	3 300	2.6	5 252 898	1.9
Jones	33	4.2	3 108	5.3	183 107	3.6	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Kingsbury	177	2.8	10 321	3.4	716 918	3.3	44	3.9	14 761	2.0	20 456 214	2.1
Lake	150	3.0	7 000	3.6	483 351	3.2	3	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lawrence	18	5.9	657	7.1	34 288	8.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lincoln	134	3.4	3 668	4.5	257 480	4.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lyman	48	4.3	4 704	3.8	166 026	2.3	14	6.2	2 472	3.7	3 642 552	2.8
McCook	192	2.1	10 948	2.1	801 584	2.1	8	9.6	1 283	9.0	1 864 700	8.3
McPherson	230	2.2	20 259	2.0	1 210 163	1.9	15	6.3	3 800	3.1	4 996 723	1.7
Marshall	96	2.5	5 689	2.3	380 570	2.1	64	2.8	8 616	2.1	11 792 070	2.2
Meade	118	2.0	7 748	1.1	373 973	1.3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mellette	34	4.2	2 806	4.0	137 378	5.7	3	—	950	—	1 199 000	—
Miner	159	3.1	10 231	3.1	648 572	3.1	21	6.1	5 578	3.3	7 385 920	3.5
Minnehaha	261	2.1	8 842	2.0	616 435	2.1	1	34.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Moody	136	2.9	3 888	2.8	306 643	2.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pennington	72	2.7	4 935	2.8	299 484	3.3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Perkins	127	2.9	9 281	1.9	499 621	1.6	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Potter	96	2.1	10 852	2.2	713 076	1.6	58	2.5	11 640	1.6	14 020 464	1.6
Roberts	170	2.4	7 874	2.7	534 788	2.5	40	3.2	4 624	2.1	6 678 171	2.2
Sanborn	117	3.5	10 279	3.2	538 927	3.5	9	7.8	2 253	3.1	2 826 694	2.5
Shannon	8	10.4	476	7.6	23 305	8.5	1	49.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Spink	155	1.9	11 077	2.1	529 967	1.8	179	1.7	35 049	1.4	39 926 473	1.4
Stanley	15	3.3	1 517	1.5	74 260	1.2	1	49.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Sully	56	2.7	5 206	1.9	283 144	2.1	100	1.7	48 109	.7	55 073 944	.6
Todd	40	3.0	2 981	2.4	151 125	2.0	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tripp	213	2.6	16 865	1.8	917 520	1.8	37	5.0	3 934	3.1	4 859 674	2.7
Turner	272	2.0	9 434	1.7	669 968	1.8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Union	113	2.7	4 483	2.9	302 259	3.0	1	37.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Walworth	127	3.0	12 227	2.7	821 426	2.4	29	5.2	4 662	2.8	6 091 522	2.8
Yankton	190	3.2	7 058	3.8	491 849	3.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ziebach	45	4.1	3 568	2.4	216 511	2.3	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested — Con.						
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota	21 402	1.5	3 356 484	1.1	5 734 128		1.1
Aurora	323	2.6	45 898	2.5	77 474		2.6
Beadle	516	2.0	70 327	1.9	148 400		1.8
Bennett	180	2.3	51 793	1.8	70 846		2.1
Bon Homme	525	2.6	31 556	2.4	72 116		2.5
Brookings	569	1.7	34 983	1.4	87 821		1.4
Brown	638	1.3	92 387	1.0	182 290		1.0
Brule	308	2.4	68 718	2.2	122 700		2.1
Buffalo	55	2.3	28 358	1.9	42 206		2.4
Butte	345	1.6	51 187	1.7	113 545		2.0
Campbell	216	2.5	40 362	2.3	66 342		2.1
Charles Mix	586	2.2	82 868	1.8	175 572		1.8
Clark	369	2.3	48 443	2.3	99 728		2.1
Clay	200	2.3	22 889	2.2	81 455		2.1
Codington	434	2.1	42 713	2.1	104 950		2.2

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.					
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Corson	313	2.1	103 821	1.5	124 972	1.5
Custer	195	1.6	29 054	1.5	31 579	1.8
Davison	299	2.3	32 752	2.2	69 243	2.3
Day	477	2.5	53 863	2.6	106 545	2.7
Deuel	428	2.4	36 761	2.5	82 488	2.5
Dewey	251	2.2	79 129	1.5	72 704	1.9
Douglas	311	2.3	33 137	2.3	71 757	2.4
Edmunds	336	1.9	71 975	1.8	119 732	1.6
Fall River	199	1.3	36 260	1.2	55 427	1.6
Faulk	225	1.5	63 462	1.2	107 837	1.3
Grant	403	2.4	39 851	2.5	100 333	2.3
Gregory	479	2.3	96 414	2.2	189 861	2.1
Haakon	193	1.7	61 257	1.0	62 619	1.0
Hamlin	274	2.0	17 962	1.8	46 286	1.6
Hand	391	1.5	99 572	1.0	166 773	1.1
Hanson	241	2.4	18 589	2.2	40 726	2.5
Harding	178	1.2	65 981	.7	59 739	.6
Hughes	144	2.4	28 976	2.4	43 432	3.0
Hutchinson	609	2.5	42 932	2.3	108 551	2.3
Hyde	159	2.5	61 299	1.7	91 929	1.4
Jackson	205	2.3	68 137	1.2	77 774	1.0
Jerauld	193	2.4	41 121	2.1	67 243	1.7
Jones	135	2.1	46 288	1.5	60 947	1.7
Kingsbury	374	2.2	37 863	2.1	91 899	2.0
Lake	291	2.5	15 121	3.0	37 900	2.8
Lawrence	199	1.9	23 722	2.2	26 918	2.6
Lincoln	465	2.2	15 313	2.5	44 139	2.7
Lyman	262	2.3	71 565	1.7	98 108	1.5
McCook	360	1.6	22 814	1.4	60 742	1.4
McPherson	327	1.9	92 849	1.6	143 200	1.6
Marshall	310	1.5	44 153	1.7	87 070	1.4
Meade	603	1.3	154 260	.9	149 905	1.1
Mellette	175	2.3	45 730	1.6	61 278	1.9
Miner	292	2.4	37 133	2.2	74 757	2.3
Minnehaha	715	1.6	35 451	1.7	102 555	1.7
Moody	327	2.1	15 024	2.2	40 946	2.1
Pennington	400	1.5	70 072	1.5	86 649	1.7
Perkins	405	2.0	121 144	1.3	144 328	1.2
Potter	152	1.9	30 060	1.5	51 057	1.4
Roberts	517	1.9	56 587	1.7	113 017	1.6
Sanborn	271	2.6	39 916	2.5	74 404	2.6
Shannon	99	2.7	18 810	2.1	22 903	2.8
Spink	430	1.4	55 713	1.3	118 893	1.4
Stanley	124	2.1	38 143	1.4	43 199	1.3
Sully	108	1.9	25 229	1.7	36 677	1.3
Todd	180	2.1	74 587	1.2	91 179	1.5
Tripp	527	2.0	132 311	1.7	219 994	1.8
Turner	531	1.8	25 268	1.5	74 718	1.4
Union	236	1.9	10 516	1.9	38 207	1.8
Walworth	221	2.5	36 437	2.5	55 389	2.4
Yankton	442	2.5	30 496	2.5	95 822	2.3
Ziebach	157	2.1	39 122	2.2	44 333	2.4

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	34 057	1.5	387	52.5	1.1	.6
Land in farms ----- acres ..	44 828 124	.7	180 946	63.7	.4	.3
Average size of farm ----- acres ..	1 316.3	1.7	467.6	64.9	(X)	(X)
Farms by size:						
Less than 10 acres -----	1 504	1.9	132	(H)	8.1	7.4
10 to 49 acres -----	2 622	1.8	—	(X)	—	(X)
Less than 50 acres -----	4 126	1.8	132	(H)	3.1	3.0
50 acres or more -----	29 931	1.5	255	59.9	.8	.5
50 to 99 acres -----	1 810	1.8	1	(H)	(L)	(L)
100 to 179 acres -----	3 167	1.9	—	(X)	—	(X)
180 acres or more -----	24 954	1.5	255	60.0	1.0	.6
Harvested cropland ----- farms ..	28 430	1.5	233	64.8	.8	.5
acres ..	13 624 006	.9	68 632	61.2	.5	.3
Farms by value of sales:						
Less than \$1,000 -----	1 446	1.9	132	(H)	8.3	7.7
\$1,000 to \$2,499 -----	1 346	2.1	—	(X)	—	(X)
Less than \$2,500 -----	2 792	1.9	132	(H)	4.5	4.3
\$2,500 or more -----	31 265	1.5	255	59.9	.8	.5
\$2,500 to \$9,999 -----	4 437	1.8	—	(X)	—	(X)
\$10,000 or more -----	26 828	1.6	255	59.9	.9	.6
Market value of agricultural products sold ---\$1,000 ---	3 243 554	.7	11 638	58.1	.4	.2
Farms by standard industrial classification:						
Crops (01) -----	12 826	1.6	233	64.8	1.8	1.1
Livestock (02) -----	21 231	1.5	154	87.2	.7	.6
Farms by type of organization:						
Individual or family -----	29 525	1.6	198	71.5	.7	.5
Partnership or corporation -----	4 283	1.3	189	76.3	4.2	3.1
Other -----	249	2.1	—	(X)	—	(X)
Farms by tenure of operator:						
Full owners -----	13 669	1.6	177	78.8	1.3	1.0
Part owners and tenants -----	20 388	1.4	153	87.6	.7	.6
Part owners -----	15 332	1.4	—	(X)	—	(X)
Tenants -----	5 056	1.8	153	87.6	2.9	2.5
Operators by place of residence:						
On farm operated -----	24 946	1.5	309	62.6	1.2	.8
Not on farm operated -----	6 191	1.8	22	97.4	.4	.3
Not reported -----	2 920	1.2	57	(H)	1.9	1.9
Operators by principal occupation:						
Farming -----	26 141	1.5	198	71.4	.8	.5
Other -----	7 916	1.7	132	99.9	1.6	1.6
Operators by sex:						
Male -----	32 623	1.5	255	59.9	.8	.5
Female -----	1 434	1.7	132	(H)	8.4	7.7
Operators by race:						
White -----	33 580	1.5	309	62.4	.9	.6
Black and other races -----	477	1.9	21	(H)	4.3	4.1
Operators by years on present farm:						
4 years or less -----	3 369	2.0	154	87.2	4.4	3.6
5 years or more -----	24 850	1.5	177	79.1	.7	.6
Average years on present farm -----	22.0	2.2	11.2	51.0	(X)	(X)
Not reported -----	5 838	1.4	57	(H)	1.0	1.0
Average age of operator -----	51.1	2.1	31.0	18.5	(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.