
Appendix C.

Statistical Methodology

THE SCREENING PHASE AND THE MAIL LIST MODEL

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

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

- 1) Records on selected agriculture specialty lists that had no other list source,
- 2) Records identified by a mail list model as having a low probability of being a farm.

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

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

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

CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

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

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

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Each execution of the computer edit consisted of records from only one State sorted by reported State and county. For a given execution of the edit, the stored entries in the various matrices were retained in memory only until a succeeding record having acceptable characteristics for the same sections of the report form was processed by the

computer. Then the acceptable responses of the succeeding operation replaced those previously stored. When a record processed through the edit had unreported or unacceptable data, the record was assigned the last acceptable ratio or response from an operation with a similar set of characteristics. Once each execution of the computer edit for a State was completed, the possible imputation variables were reset to the default values and relationships for subsequent executions. An edit run usually consisted of 10,000 or more records.

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

CENSUS ESTIMATION

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

Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sample Estimation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

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

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

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

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

The following example illustrates the computations necessary to produce a confidence statement for an estimate. Assume that the estimate of number of farms for a State is 94,382 and the relative standard error of the estimate is 0.1 percent (0.001). Multiplying 94,382 by 0.001 yields 94, the standard error; therefore, a 90-percent confidence interval is 94,227 to 94,537 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.65 x 94).

If corresponding confidence intervals were constructed for all possible samples of the same size and design, approximately 90 percent of these intervals would contain the true population parameter. Similarly, a 95-percent confidence interval is 94,198 to 94,566 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.96 x 94).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts is affected jointly by sampling errors (described in the previous section) and nonsampling errors. Extensive efforts were made to compile a complete and accurate mail list for the census, to

design an understandable report form with instructions, and to minimize processing errors through the use of quality control measures. Nonsampling errors arise from many sources, including respondent or enumerator error or incorrect data keying, editing, or imputing for missing data. These nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Nonsampling error due to mail list incompleteness and duplication as well as misclassification of records on the mail list is called coverage error. The section titled "Coverage Evaluation" discusses the evaluation studies conducted to measure the extent of this error in the census.

Respondent and Enumerator Error

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

Item Nonresponse

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

Processing Error

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

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

COVERAGE EVALUATION

Coverage Overview

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

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

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

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

The first component, mail list undercount, is by far the largest component of coverage error. Duplication, though occurring far less frequently, can involve larger farms and have a larger impact on acreage and sales estimates. The

last two components involve the misclassification of either farms or nonfarms. Misclassification can arise from errors in either reporting or processing the data.

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

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

Area Frame Surveys to Measure Mail List Undercoverage

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

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

Classification Error Survey to Measure Three Types of Coverage Error

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

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

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

Coverage Estimation

The adjusted census total, T, is estimated as the census farm count, C, plus undercount and minus overcount adjustments. Undercount includes 1) farms not on the mail

list (NML) and 2) farms incorrectly classified as nonfarms (ICU). Overcount includes 3) nonfarms incorrectly classified as farms (ICO) and 4) farms duplicated in the census (DUP). Altogether, the adjusted census total is:

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

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

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

Item	Percent of total	Item	Percent of total
Farms	10.9	Corn for grain or seed	4.0
Land in farms	7.8	Wheat for grain	3.5
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹	7.7	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold	1.3	Cattle and calves	8.1
Harvested cropland	5.2	Hogs and pigs	2.8
		Layers 20 weeks old and older	3.0

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table B. Reliability Estimates for Number of Farms in a County Reporting a Complete Count Item or Sample Count Item: 1997

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM		SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:		Number of farms reporting:	
25	5.9	25	38.0
50	3.9	50	27.1
75	2.9	75	22.3
100	2.3	100	19.5
150	1.5	150	16.2
2008	200	14.2
3007	300	11.9
5005	500	9.8
7504	750	8.5
1,0004	1,000	7.7
1,5003	1,500	6.9
2,0003	2,000	6.5

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1997

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Farms number ..	41 384	.6	Total farm production expenses farms ..	41 376	.6
Land in farms acres ..	8 704 385	.4 \$1,000 ..	2 509 917	.2
Average size of farm acres ..	210	.7	Average per farm dollars ..	60 661	.6
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
Total sales (see text) farms ..	41 384	.6	All farms number ..	41 377	.6
..... \$1,000 ..	3 098 989	.1 \$1,000 ..	490 081	.8
Average per farm dollars ..	74 884	.6	Average per farm dollars ..	11 844	1.0
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains ² number ..	17 741	1.2
Less than \$1,000 (see text) farms ..	8 131	.9 \$1,000 ..	645 422	.5
..... \$1,000 ..	1 992	1.1	Average net gain dollars ..	36 380	1.3
\$1,000 to \$2,499 farms ..	7 155	.9	Farms with net losses number ..	23 636	1.1
..... \$1,000 ..	11 950	.9 \$1,000 ..	155 341	1.5
\$2,500 to \$4,999 farms ..	6 940	.8	Average net loss dollars ..	6 572	1.8
..... \$1,000 ..	24 905	.8	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
\$5,000 to \$9,999 farms ..	6 279	.7	Government payments farms ..	9 253	.6
..... \$1,000 ..	44 110	.7 \$1,000 ..	42 061	.5
\$10,000 to \$19,999 farms ..	4 102	.7	Other farm-related income ¹ farms ..	8 307	2.2
..... \$1,000 ..	56 512	.7 \$1,000 ..	49 706	3.0
\$20,000 to \$24,999 farms ..	883	1.2	Customwork and other agricultural services farms ..	2 214	4.6
..... \$1,000 ..	19 533	1.2 \$1,000 ..	15 965	5.4
\$25,000 to \$39,999 farms ..	1 326	1.0	Gross cash rent or share payments farms ..	2 766	4.2
..... \$1,000 ..	41 481	1.0 \$1,000 ..	9 727	5.7
\$40,000 to \$49,999 farms ..	516	1.4	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products farms ..	1 930	4.9
..... \$1,000 ..	22 900	1.4 \$1,000 ..	19 315	5.1
\$50,000 to \$99,999 farms ..	1 358	1.0	Other farm-related income sources farms ..	3 012	3.6
..... \$1,000 ..	96 250	1.0 \$1,000 ..	4 698	3.8
\$100,000 to \$249,999 farms ..	1 466	.5	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
..... \$1,000 ..	235 125	.4	Total farms ..	388	1.3
\$250,000 to \$499,999 farms ..	1 364	— \$1,000 ..	6 337	1.0
..... \$1,000 ..	501 600	—			
\$500,000 or more farms ..	1 864	—			
..... \$1,000 ..	2 042 631	—			
Sales by commodity or commodity group:					
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops farms ..	12 013	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	632 978	.2			
Grains farms ..	3 744	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	112 978	.3			
Corn for grain farms ..	2 529	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	49 719	.4			
Wheat farms ..	717	.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	10 259	.5			
Soybeans farms ..	1 878	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	50 350	.4			
Sorghum for grain farms ..	57	2.9			
..... (D) \$1,000 ..	37.8	(D)			
Barley farms ..	1	37.8			
..... (D) \$1,000 ..	1	(D)			
Oats farms ..	155	1.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	794	1.5			
Other grains farms ..	156	1.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 435	1.5			
Cotton and cottonseed farms ..	1 467	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	177 785	.2			
Tobacco farms ..	16	6.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	858	2.8			
Hay, silage, and field seeds farms ..	5 786	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	22 260	.8			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons farms ..	996	1.1			
..... \$1,000 ..	21 352	.8			
Fruits, nuts, and berries farms ..	927	1.1			
..... \$1,000 ..	7 812	1.3			
Nursery and greenhouse crops farms ..	849	1.0			
..... \$1,000 ..	178 216	.2			
Other crops farms ..	1 698	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	111 719	.3			
Livestock, poultry, and their products farms ..	31 169	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	2 466 010	.1			
Poultry and poultry products farms ..	3 464	.3			
..... \$1,000 ..	2 030 608	(L)			
Dairy products farms ..	235	1.1			
..... \$1,000 ..	52 516	.3			
Cattle and calves farms ..	27 705	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	285 197	.4			
Hogs and pigs farms ..	750	1.1			
..... \$1,000 ..	32 598	.4			
Sheep, lambs, and wool farms ..	222	2.1			
..... \$1,000 ..	288	4.4			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) farms ..	2 871	.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	64 803	.4			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) farms ..	1 373	1.0			
..... \$1,000 ..	5 401	1.4			

See footnotes at end of table.

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1997—Con.

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			TENURE OF OPERATOR		
Total cropland farms..	34 407	.6	All operators farms..	41 384	.6
Harvested cropland farms..	4 197 670	.4	Full owners acres..	8 704 385	.4
Farms by acres harvested:	24 819	.5	Part owners farms..	27 509	.6
1 to 9 acres farms..	2 077 139	.3	Tenants acres..	4 400 585	.5
10 to 19 acres farms..	4 559	.8	Land owned farms..	11 333	.5
20 to 29 acres acres..	21 544	.9	Rented or leased land in farms farms..	3 783 392	.3
30 to 49 acres farms..	5 246	.7	Land owned acres..	2 542	.9
50 to 99 acres acres..	68 175	.7	Owned land in farms acres..	520 408	.8
100 to 199 acres farms..	3 685	.7	Land rented or leased from others farms..	13 989	.5
200 to 499 acres acres..	82 218	.7	Landlords acres..	2 545 825	.4
500 to 999 acres farms..	3 935	.7	Rented or leased land in farms farms..	33 929	.5
1,000 acres or more acres..	142 075	.7	Landlords acres..	13 875	.5
50 to 99 acres farms..	3 335	.7	Land rented or leased to others farms..	4 301	.7
100 to 199 acres acres..	217 207	.7	Landlords acres..	583 962	1.1
200 to 499 acres farms..	1 890	.8	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
500 to 999 acres acres..	243 516	.8	Land owned farms..	38 899	.6
1,000 acres or more farms..	1 324	.7	Owned land in farms acres..	6 742 522	.4
Cropland:	399 788	.6	Land rented or leased from others farms..	38 842	.6
Pasture or grazing only farms..	535	.5	Landlords acres..	6 199 014	.4
Other cropland farms..	369 807	.4	Rented or leased land in farms farms..	13 989	.5
Total woodland farms..	310	—	Landlords acres..	2 545 825	.4
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured farms..	532 809	—	Rented or leased land in farms farms..	33 929	.5
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. farms..	9 739	.6	Landlords acres..	13 875	.5
Irrigated land farms..	1 062 424	.5	Land rented or leased to others farms..	4 301	.7
Acres irrigated:	408 682	.6	Landlords acres..	583 962	1.1
1 to 9 acres farms..	1 301	.8	OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
10 to 49 acres acres..	76 871	.6	Operators by place of residence:		
50 to 99 acres farms..	714	1.2	On farm operated	29 861	.6
100 to 199 acres acres..	1 898	1.5	Not on farm operated	8 266	.7
200 to 499 acres farms..	262	1.7	Not reported	3 257	.7
500 to 999 acres acres..	5 581	1.7	Operators by principal occupation:		
1,000 acres or more farms..	129	1.9	Farming	15 568	.4
Harvested cropland irrigated farms..	8 617	1.9	Other	25 816	.7
Pasture and other land irrigated acres..	89	1.7	Operators by days worked off farm:		
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs farms..	12 185	1.6	Any	25 259	.7
Reserve Programs acres..	82	1.3	200 days or more	18 677	.7
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS¹			FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Estimated market value of land and buildings farms..	41 377	.6	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) farms..	37 697	.6
Average per farm \$1,000..	12 340 422	.9	Partnership acres..	6 772 576	.4
Average per acre dollars..	298 244	1.1	Corporation farms..	2 734	.8
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT¹			HIRED FARM LABOR¹		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment farms..	41 373	.6	Hired workers by days worked:		
Average per farm \$1,000..	1 485 851	.9	150 days or more farms..	3 843	2.7
Average per acre dollars..	35 914	1.1	Workers	9 588	1.3
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS¹			INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Commercial fertilizer farms..	25 989	1.0	Farm-related injuries:		
Acres on which used acres..	2 290 837	1.0	Operator and family members farms..	335	1.6
			Number	385	1.7
			Hired workers farms..	108	1.6
			Number	175	1.0
			Farm-related deaths:		
			Operator and family members farms..	9	—
			Number	9	—
			Hired workers farms..	2	—
			Number	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1997—Con.

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE			LIVESTOCK		
1 to 9 acres	farms.. 2 141	1.0	Cattle and calves inventory	farms.. 28 450	.6
10 to 49 acres	acres.. 10 302	1.1	number.. 1 530 566		.4
50 to 69 acres	farms.. 11 854	.8	Beef cows	farms.. 25 384	.6
70 to 99 acres	acres.. 336 610	.8	number.. 832 298		.4
100 to 139 acres	farms.. 4 103	.8	Milk cows	farms.. 608	1.2
140 to 179 acres	acres.. 238 635	.8	number.. 27 848		.3
180 to 219 acres	farms.. 4 704	.7	Cattle and calves sold	farms.. 27 705	.6
220 to 259 acres	acres.. 387 111	.7	number.. 767 806		.4
260 to 499 acres	farms.. 4 424	.7	\$1,000.. 285 197		.4
500 to 999 acres	acres.. 511 349	.7	Hogs and pigs inventory	farms.. 932	1.1
			number.. 183 811		.5
			Hogs and pigs sold	farms.. 750	1.1
			number.. 380 853		.5
			\$1,000.. 32 598		.4
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms.. 294	1.9
			number.. 8 173		2.7
			Sheep and lambs sold	farms.. 209	2.2
			number.. 4 625		3.7
			Horses and ponies inventory	farms.. 7 434	.7
			number.. 42 541		.9
			Horses and ponies sold	farms.. 1 659	1.1
			number.. 6 222		2.3
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM			POULTRY		
1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms.. 1 039	.8	Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	farms.. 1 250	.9
2,000 acres or more	acres.. 1 401 268	.7	number.. 13 432 845		.7
	farms.. 497	—	Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms.. 1 146	1.0
	acres.. 1 686 212	—	number.. 10 703 589		.5
			Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms.. 2 477	.2
			number.. 871 123 702		(L)
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM			SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED		
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	farms.. 3 695	.8	Corn for grain or seed	farms.. 3 687	.6
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)	acres.. 1 319 092	.7	acres.. 230 484		.4
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)	farms.. 701	1.3	bushels.. 19 735 218		.4
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)	acres.. 96 239	1.2	farms.. 293		1.5
Other crop farming (1119)	farms.. 910	1.2	acres.. 17 181		.8
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)	acres.. 101 792	1.6	tons, green.. 194 480		.7
Cattle feedlots (112112)	farms.. 740	1.1	farms.. 99		2.3
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)	acres.. 73 166	1.0	acres.. 5 294		1.4
Hog and pig farming (1122)	farms.. 4 905	.6	bushels.. 254 902		1.4
Poultry and egg production (1123)	acres.. 1 904 438	.4	farms.. 732		.9
Sheep and goat farming (1124)	farms.. 23 233	.6	acres.. 82 440		.6
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)	acres.. 4 177 749	.5	bushels.. 3 326 421		.5
	farms.. 566	1.4	farms.. 1 470		.6
	acres.. 83 968	2.0	acres.. 433 160		.3
	farms.. 196	1.3	bales.. 523 864		.2
	acres.. 91 990	.7	farms.. 1 889		.6
	farms.. 413	1.6	acres.. 316 019		.4
	acres.. 51 672	1.7	bushels.. 7 867 880		.4
	farms.. 3 233	.3	farms.. 147		2.2
	acres.. 423 678	.2	acres.. 5 968		1.4
	farms.. 343	2.0	cwt.. 909 170		1.6
	acres.. 23 305	3.0	farms.. 112		2.5
			acres.. 3 489		.8
			bushels.. 771 952		.7
			farms.. 1 510		.7
			acres.. 181 393		.3
			pounds.. 356 492 286		.3
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms.. 19 085	.5
			acres.. 778 602		.5
			tons, dry.. 1 750 870		.5
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms.. 996	1.1
			acres.. 20 809		.9
			Land in orchards	farms.. 1 874	.9
			acres.. 29 109		1.2

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains.

Table D. **Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1997—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)
POULTRY			SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED—Con.		
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) farms . . .	623	.9	Wheat for grain farms . . .	652	.8
Layers 20 weeks old and older farms . . .	541	1.0	Wheat for grain acres . . .	80 976	.6
Layers 20 weeks old and older farms . . .	541	1.0	Wheat for grain bushels . . .	3 278 036	.5
Layers 20 weeks old and older number . . .	13 397 121	.6	Cotton farms . . .	1 356	.6
Layers 20 weeks old and older number . . .	10 692 228	.5	Cotton acres . . .	431 444	.2
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold farms . . .	2 465	.1	Cotton bales . . .	522 382	.2
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold number . . .	871 116 646	(L)	Soybeans for beans farms . . .	1 525	.6
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED			Soybeans for beans acres . . .	305 157	.4
Corn for grain or seed farms . . .	2 179	.6	Soybeans for beans bushels . . .	7 671 125	.4
Corn for grain or seed acres . . .	215 513	.4	Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes farms . . .	91	2.2
Corn for grain or seed bushels . . .	18 970 997	.4	Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes acres . . .	5 898	1.4
Corn for silage or green chop farms . . .	201	1.4	Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes cwt . . .	896 832	1.6
Corn for silage or green chop acres . . .	16 189	.8	Sweetpotatoes farms . . .	70	2.7
Corn for silage or green chop tons, green . . .	185 059	.6	Sweetpotatoes acres . . .	3 403	.8
Sorghum for grain or seed farms . . .	86	2.0	Sweetpotatoes bushels . . .	760 954	.7
Sorghum for grain or seed acres . . .	5 213	1.1	Peanuts for nuts farms . . .	1 299	.6
Sorghum for grain or seed bushels . . .	251 372	1.0	Peanuts for nuts acres . . .	179 094	.3
			Peanuts for nuts pounds . . .	353 119 452	.3
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass	7 068	.4
			silage, green chop, etc. (see text) farms . . .	475 706	.5
			silage, green chop, etc. (see text) acres . . .	1 160 933	.5
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) tons, dry . . .	481	1.2
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) farms . . .	18 751	.9
			Land in orchards acres . . .	542	1.0
			Land in orchards farms . . .	15 388	1.7
			Land in orchards acres . . .		

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains.

Table E. Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1992 to 1997

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate
Farms	9.2	1.2	-6.7	.7
Land in farms	3.0	.7	-7.7	.5
Average size of farm	-5.8	1.2	-1.0	.9
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :				
Average per farm	35.4	2.4	38.9	2.4
Average per acre	44.2	2.8	43.7	2.9
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :				
Average per farm	18.3	2.1	12.7	2.1
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	12.6	1.9	-19.8	1.2
10 to 49 acres	16.6	1.6	-7.1	.9
50 to 179 acres	7.3	.9	-6.0	.7
180 to 499 acres	5.6	1.0	-3.5	.9
500 to 999 acres	1.5	1.1	-11.1	.9
1,000 to 1,999 acres	4.9	.8	-5.1	.6
2,000 acres or more	-3.1	-	-8.0	-
Total cropland	6.4	1.1	-6.3	.8
acres	-9	.7	-7.1	.5
Harvested cropland2	1.0	-7.3	.8
acres	-1.3	.5	-4.2	.4
Irrigated land	-5.7	1.2	-8.3	1.0
acres	-6.3	.6	-9.1	.5
Market value of agricultural products sold	30.8	.2	31.6	.2
Average per farm	19.8	1.3	41.0	1.1
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	-2.5	.3	-2.5	.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products	43.4	.2	44.7	.2
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500	31.1	1.7	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999	6.7	1.6	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999	5.8	1.5	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999	-1.8	1.2	-1.8	1.2
\$25,000 to \$49,999	-15.4	1.2	-15.4	1.1
\$50,000 to \$99,999	-18.2	1.2	-18.2	1.2
\$100,000 to \$249,999	-34.7	.3	-34.7	.3
\$250,000 to \$499,999	-13.6	-	-13.6	-
\$500,000 or more	75.8	-	75.8	-
Total farm production expenses ¹	30.0	.8	30.3	.6
Average per farm	19.1	1.4	37.7	1.5
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹	9.1	1.2	-5.4	1.0
Average per farm	28.3	1.6	32.0	1.3
Average per farm	17.6	1.9	39.5	2.0
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	-9	.9	-7.9	.7
Other	16.3	1.5	-4.6	1.0
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	15.2	1.4	-3.5	1.0
200 days or more	14.3	1.5	-5.5	1.0
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory	7.9	1.2	-2.1	.9
number	5.3	.8	1.4	.7
Beef cows	6.1	1.2	-1.0	.9
number	7.9	.9	5.1	.8
Milk cows	-38.9	1.1	-58.1	.7
number	-38.7	.3	-39.8	.3
Cattle and calves sold	8.5	1.2	-1.0	.9
number	13.5	.9	10.6	.8
Hogs and pigs inventory	-50.4	.8	-59.4	.7
number	-40.3	.4	-38.7	.4
Hogs and pigs sold	-56.3	.7	-61.6	.7
number	-33.4	.5	-31.4	.5
Sheep and lambs inventory	-8.1	2.6	-26.6	3.0
number	-25.8	2.9	-7.9	5.3
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	-23.9	1.1	-13.1	1.2
number	-7.3	.8	-7.2	.8
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold7	.2	.9	.2
number	18.1	(L)	18.1	(L)
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed	-30.5	.7	-26.7	.7
acres	-18.0	.5	-16.2	.5
bushels	-20.9	.5	-19.6	.5
Wheat for grain	-15.9	1.1	-12.5	1.0
acres	-4.2	.7	-2.9	.7
bushels	-3.9	.7	-3.2	.7
Cotton1	1.0	5.5	.9
acres3	.3	.7	.3
bales	-12.9	.2	-12.7	.2
Soybeans for beans	-8.5	1.0	-5.9	1.0
acres	3.4	.7	4.0	.7
bushels	-11.3	.6	-10.5	.6
Peanuts for nuts	-33.0	.7	-32.9	.7
acres	-23.6	.3	-23.8	.3
pounds	-39.2	.3	-39.3	.3
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	9.2	1.2	.8	.9
acres	14.7	1.0	8.5	.9
tons, dry	24.3	1.1	17.5	1.0

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm ¹		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Alabama	41 384	.6	8 704 385	.4	210	.7	298 244	1.1	1 485 851	.9
Autauga	348	.6	104 785	1.1	301	1.3	373 741	5.9	12 646	12.2
Baldwin	977	.5	165 565	.8	169	.9	425 400	6.0	42 961	3.6
Barbour	417	.5	153 775	1.0	369	1.1	308 079	4.1	20 032	5.4
Bibb	177	.6	46 903	2.1	265	2.2	312 886	13.1	5 468	6.5
Blount	1 191	.5	138 509	.9	116	1.0	244 186	6.0	34 222	4.5
Bullock	277	.6	168 715	1.1	609	1.3	568 067	4.7	10 825	4.1
Butler	440	.5	97 298	1.6	221	1.6	204 125	9.1	14 170	14.6
Calhoun	629	.5	77 429	1.3	123	1.4	260 024	6.1	20 092	5.8
Chambers	324	.6	94 277	1.5	291	1.6	275 429	12.5	8 673	12.0
Cherokee	494	.6	123 122	.9	249	1.1	301 715	5.9	21 801	5.1
Chilton	663	.5	98 746	1.2	149	1.3	230 853	6.1	21 615	5.7
Choctaw	225	1.0	65 027	1.7	289	2.0	239 916	8.2	7 163	8.2
Clarke	248	.8	61 436	1.7	248	1.9	185 640	10.6	5 886	10.2
Clay	397	.5	75 249	1.3	190	1.4	225 326	8.9	10 673	10.8
Cleburne	340	.6	50 782	1.6	149	1.7	260 798	6.3	10 724	10.0
Coffee	788	.5	186 981	1.1	237	1.2	282 153	4.8	36 392	10.0
Colbert	557	.6	115 542	1.0	207	1.2	303 717	11.6	19 355	5.5
Conecuh	366	.5	88 276	1.0	241	1.1	256 937	10.4	7 618	6.7
Coosa	213	.6	41 716	2.5	196	2.6	257 017	8.0	5 891	7.3
Covington	899	.5	180 056	.8	200	.9	276 114	6.0	34 310	7.4
Crenshaw	488	.6	129 460	1.0	265	1.2	237 355	5.2	16 709	7.9
Cullman	2 151	.4	202 861	.6	94	.8	252 638	3.5	69 674	4.2
Dale	422	.5	130 975	.9	310	1.1	364 544	7.2	23 991	7.2
Dallas	435	.7	248 674	.9	572	1.1	564 581	4.9	21 556	4.5
De Kalb	2 080	.5	223 685	.7	108	.9	221 160	2.9	63 427	3.0
Elmore	560	.5	124 260	1.0	222	1.1	378 369	6.6	19 832	6.5
Escambia	380	.7	87 056	1.0	229	1.2	256 339	6.9	20 040	7.1
Etowah	904	.5	94 970	1.0	105	1.1	207 193	6.4	25 231	5.2
Fayette	305	.5	62 974	1.5	206	1.5	218 942	14.9	11 614	13.8
Franklin	833	.6	128 437	1.2	154	1.3	196 097	7.5	20 513	4.5
Geneva	872	.4	206 615	.7	237	.8	287 870	4.5	39 386	4.4
Greene	261	.8	123 243	1.6	472	1.8	313 979	10.3	13 170	8.9
Hale	411	.7	157 743	1.2	384	1.4	368 555	7.4	29 388	9.3
Henry	334	.4	153 529	.6	460	.7	441 914	5.2	23 012	6.0
Houston	690	.5	198 215	.7	287	.8	339 525	4.9	42 978	6.1
Jackson	1 296	.7	221 166	1.0	171	1.3	254 716	4.6	38 729	4.8
Jefferson	426	.8	41 333	2.2	97	2.4	289 476	10.6	11 484	10.9
Lamar	387	.7	71 351	1.7	184	1.8	244 283	10.7	10 506	7.7
Lauderdale	1 355	.6	211 586	.8	156	1.0	226 531	4.5	36 954	5.5
Lawrence	1 287	.8	204 970	1.0	159	1.3	261 395	4.7	42 733	4.0
Lee	347	.4	75 786	1.7	218	1.7	408 826	11.5	16 292	15.4
Limestone	1 127	.6	253 889	.6	225	.9	480 035	3.9	52 467	3.2
Lowndes	330	.6	173 049	.8	524	1.0	514 745	5.4	13 054	9.8
Macon	300	.6	127 334	1.1	424	1.2	446 391	5.9	13 864	7.4
Madison	973	.5	210 455	.8	216	.9	452 139	4.3	36 357	4.2
Marengo	464	.8	198 422	1.2	428	1.4	324 894	5.4	20 965	10.3
Marion	677	.6	98 078	1.1	145	1.3	148 430	7.8	21 618	11.6
Marshall	1 583	.6	146 129	.8	92	1.0	204 584	4.9	45 198	4.4
Mobile	755	.6	121 320	1.4	161	1.5	297 150	7.7	28 267	8.1
Monroe	422	.6	134 551	1.1	319	1.3	349 512	7.1	27 161	6.3
Montgomery	654	.7	240 951	1.1	368	1.3	582 160	5.6	28 863	6.0
Morgan	1 214	.8	158 711	1.0	131	1.2	265 812	5.3	28 050	5.0
Perry	340	.7	144 648	1.3	425	1.5	362 501	7.6	9 478	8.4
Pickens	454	.6	123 132	1.1	271	1.3	308 663	8.5	17 827	12.7
Pike	580	.6	173 522	.9	299	1.1	302 435	6.4	24 194	5.2
Randolph	599	.5	108 122	1.4	181	1.5	214 792	6.0	18 988	7.0
Russell	246	.6	96 088	1.7	391	1.8	448 146	5.9	9 830	7.7
St. Clair	594	.7	76 849	1.6	129	1.7	280 973	5.4	18 188	5.6
Shelby	435	.6	68 421	1.5	157	1.6	448 919	8.3	14 963	9.1
Sumter	369	.8	174 769	1.4	474	1.6	388 670	9.5	10 135	8.0
Talladega	523	.5	109 560	1.2	209	1.3	296 994	6.4	22 036	6.8
Tallapoosa	344	.5	78 232	1.3	227	1.4	314 582	12.4	10 675	13.9
Tuscaloosa	510	.6	99 827	1.4	196	1.5	293 797	6.9	15 058	5.6
Walker	470	.6	54 950	2.3	117	2.4	262 308	12.0	12 006	5.5
Washington	397	.7	87 143	1.8	220	1.9	273 775	13.8	12 134	7.6
Wilcox	248	.7	154 065	1.2	621	1.3	564 029	7.4	10 690	8.8
Winston	582	.6	59 090	1.2	102	1.4	180 899	12.7	16 049	11.2
Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
						Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Alabama	35 914	1.1	3 098 989	.1	74 884	.6	41 376	.6	2 509 917	.2
Autauga	36 339	12.3	11 174	.9	32 108	1.1	348	1.0	8 067	3.5
Baldwin	44 017	3.6	62 291	.3	63 757	.5	976	.6	45 077	1.6
Barbour	48 155	5.5	24 261	.5	58 180	.7	416	.8	19 929	1.3

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	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)
Bibb	30 892	6.7	2 150	1.5	12 149	1.6	177	1.8	1 937	4.3
Blount	28 662	4.5	137 982	.1	115 854	.5	1 194	.6	115 662	.6
Bullock	39 079	4.2	24 691	.3	89 138	.7	2 277	1.0	17 680	1.9
Butler	32 205	14.7	30 773	.3	69 940	.6	440	.8	24 026	1.8
Calhoun	32 198	5.9	53 885	.2	85 667	.6	628	.8	39 253	1.1
Chambers	26 767	12.1	4 269	1.3	13 176	1.4	324	.9	4 972	10.7
Cherokee	44 132	5.2	49 324	.2	99 847	.6	494	.9	36 058	2.0
Chilton	32 553	5.8	9 449	1.2	14 252	1.3	664	.7	9 269	4.4
Choctaw	31 834	8.3	6 669	.7	29 641	1.2	225	1.5	6 146	4.9
Clarke	23 733	10.3	1 998	2.2	8 055	2.3	248	1.3	1 886	14.7
Clay	26 884	10.9	24 729	.4	62 290	.6	397	.8	20 321	1.1
Cleburne	31 634	10.1	45 854	.2	134 864	.6	339	.9	36 287	.9
Coffee	46 241	10.0	136 282	.1	172 947	.5	787	.6	109 337	.7
Colbert	34 687	5.5	32 590	.3	58 509	.7	558	.8	26 857	1.1
Conecuh	20 871	6.7	5 709	1.2	15 599	1.3	365	.8	5 839	11.9
Coosa	27 655	7.5	1 323	2.2	6 210	2.3	213	1.6	1 332	6.2
Covington	38 207	7.4	65 735	.2	73 120	.5	898	.7	52 937	1.4
Crenshaw	34 309	7.9	54 066	.2	110 790	.6	487	.7	44 916	.6
Cullman	32 392	4.2	334 148	.1	155 345	.4	2 151	.5	276 642	.5
Dale	56 851	7.2	34 339	.3	81 371	.6	422	.8	30 597	1.5
Dallas	49 553	4.6	29 813	.3	68 537	.8	435	.9	23 082	2.5
De Kalb	30 464	3.0	234 276	.1	112 633	.5	2 082	.6	193 223	.4
Elmore	35 413	6.5	19 419	.6	34 677	.8	560	.7	15 524	4.1
Escambia	52 737	7.2	18 348	.5	48 285	.8	380	1.0	13 803	4.2
Etowah	27 942	5.2	54 944	.2	60 779	.6	903	.7	44 219	1.0
Fayette	38 078	13.8	8 149	1.2	26 719	1.3	305	1.0	8 358	6.3
Franklin	24 625	4.5	90 361	.1	108 477	.6	833	.8	72 023	.6
Geneva	45 219	4.4	108 157	.2	124 033	.5	871	.6	89 190	1.0
Greene	50 458	8.9	11 520	.8	44 137	1.2	261	1.3	8 822	2.1
Hale	71 503	9.3	32 222	.5	78 399	.9	411	.9	25 342	2.4
Henry	68 899	6.1	27 199	.4	81 435	.5	334	.8	23 348	2.7
Houston	62 377	6.1	56 290	.4	81 579	.6	689	.6	48 778	1.5
Jackson	29 860	4.9	64 157	.3	49 504	.8	1 297	.8	49 278	1.4
Jefferson	27 021	11.0	16 049	.5	37 673	.9	425	1.1	10 574	1.9
Lamar	27 147	7.7	5 389	1.1	13 926	1.3	387	1.1	4 928	3.7
Lauderdale	27 252	5.6	29 079	.5	21 461	.8	1 356	.8	24 898	2.0
Lawrence	33 178	4.1	79 910	.2	62 090	.9	1 288	.8	64 571	.9
Lee	46 950	15.4	19 857	.4	57 226	.6	347	.7	12 687	1.6
Limestone	46 554	3.2	53 026	.3	47 051	.7	1 127	.7	43 781	1.4
Lowndes	39 559	9.8	31 024	.3	94 012	.6	330	.9	25 545	2.0
Macon	46 213	7.5	9 577	.9	31 923	1.1	300	.9	8 046	4.0
Madison	37 328	4.2	29 160	.5	29 969	.7	974	.7	29 882	2.5
Marengo	45 182	10.3	14 868	.9	32 044	1.2	464	.9	12 394	5.1
Marion	31 932	11.6	26 143	.3	38 616	.7	677	.7	21 204	1.9
Marshall	28 552	4.5	200 632	.1	126 742	.6	1 583	.6	161 948	.5
Mobile	37 540	8.1	62 661	.3	82 994	.7	753	.8	44 952	1.2
Monroe	64 364	6.3	22 891	.6	54 245	.9	422	.9	16 613	4.2
Montgomery	44 200	6.1	33 114	.4	50 633	.8	653	.8	26 810	2.3
Morgan	23 105	5.1	78 185	.2	64 403	.8	1 214	.9	62 521	.8
Perry	27 876	8.4	10 214	1.1	30 040	1.3	339	1.0	8 085	5.8
Pickens	39 266	12.7	60 574	.2	133 424	.7	454	.9	49 292	1.3
Pike	41 786	5.2	60 737	.2	104 719	.7	579	.7	47 898	1.0
Randolph	31 753	7.1	54 311	.2	90 670	.6	598	.7	47 414	1.3
Russell	39 961	7.8	7 577	1.1	30 799	1.2	246	1.1	6 091	3.3
St. Clair	30 620	5.7	51 728	.2	87 084	.7	594	.9	42 524	.9
Shelby	34 398	9.1	11 216	.9	25 784	1.1	435	.9	9 325	3.7
Sumter	27 465	8.1	11 237	1.2	30 454	1.4	369	1.1	11 151	5.9
Talladega	42 215	6.9	40 341	.3	77 134	.6	522	.9	23 173	1.9
Tallapoosa	31 033	13.9	7 434	.9	21 609	1.0	344	.9	7 127	3.0
Tuscaloosa	29 467	5.7	20 529	.5	40 254	.8	511	1.0	18 399	2.9
Walker	25 600	5.6	54 765	.1	116 522	.6	469	.8	45 316	1.0
Washington	30 565	7.6	21 886	.6	55 127	.9	397	.9	16 954	2.6
Wilcox	43 105	8.8	7 218	.9	29 106	1.1	248	1.0	6 501	3.9
Winston	27 576	11.2	59 110	.2	101 564	.6	582	.7	49 294	1.3

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)
Alabama	13 213	1.6	341 450	.4	26 309	1.0	1 140 545	.2	11 621	1.7	44 465	1.0
Autauga	52	22.0	330	12.0	219	10.0	741	8.4	145	14.6	276	4.4
Baldwin	206	13.9	2 812	4.0	445	7.7	5 263	1.8	448	7.5	2 453	6.2
Barbour	140	15.9	1 198	7.5	290	6.3	5 172	.8	178	9.2	1 102	3.1
Bibb	44	14.9	454	7.2	115	6.2	413	5.5	25	22.7	12	12.5

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	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)
Blount	388	7.2	14 521	.5	849	3.9	74 418	.6	212	12.2	379	11.8
Bullock	78	16.1	1 142	17.9	170	7.8	3 567	1.6	41	18.3	443	1.5
Butler	101	17.2	4 512	1.2	298	7.6	11 777	2.1	106	18.9	195	5.8
Calhoun	209	11.2	9 831	1.2	388	6.6	15 904	.4	149	13.6	525	5.5
Chambers	121	17.8	385	26.7	237	8.6	770	14.0	85	23.6	107	20.4
Cherokee	128	19.3	4 199	9.5	281	9.7	13 118	1.5	178	10.4	706	3.2
Chilton	155	14.8	514	29.6	341	7.1	754	10.0	203	12.5	174	10.9
Choctaw	70	18.9	604	14.3	176	6.4	3 281	3.4	71	20.0	27	25.9
Clarke	57	21.2	189	36.5	148	9.5	177	11.8	75	16.5	50	20.3
Clay	147	14.0	2 360	3.0	261	8.6	11 978	.4	42	31.7	32	22.9
Cleburne	123	13.3	6 486	1.0	230	8.0	20 630	.1	54	26.3	52	15.9
Coffee	273	8.5	17 219	.7	506	5.0	57 010	.1	360	7.9	1 873	6.1
Colbert	167	13.6	2 260	4.2	375	6.4	10 967	.8	122	17.5	783	.9
Conecuh	95	19.4	951	10.9	192	10.5	577	13.8	128	15.8	231	17.4
Coosa	51	15.0	138	19.1	134	6.2	255	8.0	45	15.4	15	20.4
Covington	241	11.3	4 350	2.0	498	6.6	24 213	.4	351	9.1	1 010	9.7
Crenshaw	206	10.3	5 107	1.0	353	6.4	26 158	.2	165	12.7	418	7.2
Cullman	905	5.3	40 288	.7	1 593	3.1	170 928	.6	414	10.3	595	18.7
Dale	129	15.2	2 580	5.1	250	8.3	12 805	.4	189	10.5	1 146	5.1
Dallas	98	19.8	1 073	23.1	253	6.1	3 673	6.9	127	14.7	678	2.0
De Kalb	875	5.7	30 646	.9	1 381	3.8	112 215	.3	445	9.5	877	7.5
Elmore	149	18.0	1 060	29.7	353	8.2	1 884	8.4	202	14.2	956	1.4
Escambia	70	26.6	528	32.4	149	14.3	395	10.8	169	11.6	623	5.6
Etowah	330	8.6	4 825	3.6	625	4.7	27 387	.4	161	15.4	145	11.5
Fayette	78	17.6	728	26.0	154	12.4	3 579	6.4	95	17.7	191	13.3
Franklin	296	9.1	12 228	1.2	581	5.0	43 692	.2	167	15.5	127	11.1
Geneva	246	10.5	11 550	1.3	542	5.4	40 410	.8	431	7.0	2 592	4.5
Greene	81	13.5	1 358	5.9	159	7.2	1 762	2.5	86	14.8	87	9.8
Hale	141	17.3	4 052	3.2	274	8.5	8 894	3.9	93	20.6	239	21.6
Henry	114	17.0	486	26.6	219	9.1	1 237	10.3	187	10.9	2 274	6.2
Houston	196	15.0	6 972	1.4	368	8.6	3 369	6.5	440	6.7	3 808	2.7
Jackson	395	10.1	6 692	2.6	726	6.3	22 051	.4	339	10.7	1 135	13.7
Jefferson	110	21.9	(D)	(D)	265	9.1	545	10.2	98	21.2	88	8.4
Lamar	92	17.8	357	11.3	231	7.2	1 713	2.3	160	10.9	97	13.1
Lauderdale	509	8.8	2 171	9.1	923	4.5	4 876	2.4	308	11.4	893	5.2
Lawrence	399	9.4	10 261	1.8	791	4.9	28 631	.4	278	10.9	1 047	2.1
Lee	97	18.6	(D)	(D)	244	7.0	832	11.4	68	27.9	(D)	(D)
Limestone	343	11.1	2 294	7.2	770	4.7	9 035	1.2	359	9.2	1 809	1.2
Lowndes	140	13.1	3 668	2.5	260	6.3	10 296	2.6	83	16.4	202	3.9
Macon	36	31.9	140	15.3	161	12.0	694	8.3	68	21.5	256	8.9
Madison	300	11.1	1 520	8.0	568	5.7	4 645	2.9	282	9.8	1 182	3.1
Marengo	125	17.2	844	13.9	296	7.6	3 249	6.4	99	16.9	163	13.3
Marion	195	12.9	2 458	4.7	460	6.1	12 449	.5	145	17.0	130	23.0
Marshall	620	6.4	35 314	.4	1 116	3.6	85 572	.4	296	11.4	327	13.5
Mobile	164	16.1	1 693	8.5	335	9.2	2 181	3.1	277	10.9	2 548	1.2
Monroe	109	19.5	555	17.1	193	13.1	1 188	7.1	222	10.2	872	9.7
Montgomery	223	11.1	3 801	8.4	465	5.4	7 423	1.9	173	15.3	(D)	(D)
Morgan	415	8.6	10 080	1.0	732	5.2	32 032	.9	257	11.7	354	15.2
Perry	87	20.1	532	9.1	187	9.8	1 441	5.1	132	12.3	369	9.2
Pickens	205	10.6	8 037	2.0	334	5.9	29 103	1.7	101	19.9	136	7.3
Pike	201	13.4	6 218	3.0	370	5.6	21 636	.3	201	14.1	1 026	6.9
Randolph	190	11.4	5 578	4.0	419	5.3	30 042	1.0	143	15.1	131	47.1
Russell	73	16.4	238	24.8	164	7.2	523	7.3	39	23.6	197	3.4
St. Clair	186	13.0	7 135	3.0	397	6.5	23 689	.6	137	16.6	207	5.9
Shelby	96	19.9	575	16.7	281	7.4	1 277	12.4	92	19.1	405	6.0
Sumter	149	14.7	2 430	12.0	238	9.5	2 373	5.2	92	21.9	157	12.7
Talladega	124	17.5	2 147	2.7	340	7.8	8 854	.6	140	15.4	478	11.3
Tallahassee	69	19.9	710	7.0	235	8.0	2 507	1.5	83	19.3	79	29.5
Tallapoosa	167	13.2	1 638	7.2	277	8.6	7 154	.9	141	14.6	429	11.4
Tuscaloosa	191	12.5	7 905	1.2	362	6.1	27 578	1.1	87	24.5	67	28.9
Washington	140	14.8	3 962	2.3	213	9.8	6 503	4.8	186	12.5	179	15.1
Wilcox	59	23.8	526	9.0	141	10.5	1 162	6.3	67	20.1	170	9.4
Winston	244	10.3	8 420	1.1	408	5.9	29 915	1.2	79	23.1	51	39.7

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)
Alabama	26 159	1.0	106 011	.9	13 672	1.5	73 867	1.0	38 349	.6	80 237	.6
Autauga	244	7.4	1 501	4.9	115	16.8	647	3.0	321	3.8	524	8.4
Baldwin	722	3.9	5 462	2.2	502	6.8	4 794	4.4	855	2.6	2 355	3.8
Barbour	283	6.9	1 852	3.5	177	10.7	1 752	4.1	351	4.5	975	2.9
Bibb	126	5.4	251	8.5	19	24.9	16	15.4	168	2.7	138	6.8

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	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)
Blount	729	4.8	1 512	7.1	422	8.0	812	18.1	1 086	2.0	2 387	3.0
Bullock	123	8.3	714	9.9	78	15.8	320	3.2	255	2.9	968	4.1
Butler	276	7.8	725	10.2	105	19.4	333	4.5	414	3.6	732	6.5
Calhoun	340	7.3	946	10.7	210	11.8	316	28.1	595	1.8	1 063	3.4
Chambers	217	9.6	582	12.9	76	22.2	101	29.0	289	4.4	354	15.7
Cherokee	368	6.1	2 136	4.1	160	14.7	1 280	8.2	487	1.3	1 358	3.8
Chilton	531	4.2	1 483	10.0	240	10.2	445	15.4	629	1.8	765	14.7
Choctaw	157	7.0	373	24.1	32	29.5	57	9.1	193	5.4	280	13.0
Clarke	187	6.9	330	15.1	40	26.9	33	17.3	223	3.4	205	26.5
Clay	205	10.4	427	20.6	66	25.1	29	33.2	383	1.7	602	4.8
Cleburne	189	10.5	285	17.0	149	12.5	107	16.1	329	2.0	1 016	8.6
Coffee	503	5.5	3 208	7.0	400	7.6	3 755	2.9	712	2.3	2 528	3.9
Colbert	336	7.8	2 162	2.5	159	14.6	1 948	2.9	514	2.2	1 063	3.4
Conecuh	218	8.2	921	13.8	122	16.8	440	34.7	290	3.0	482	15.9
Coosa	125	6.2	173	11.4	45	16.2	17	27.3	202	2.5	116	8.3
Covington	607	4.7	2 850	4.8	281	10.3	2 383	8.9	771	2.8	1 700	3.6
Crenshaw	302	7.3	1 218	4.6	171	9.4	755	4.4	436	3.9	1 147	2.7
Cullman	1 296	3.8	2 483	6.9	956	5.1	958	7.3	2 067	1.0	5 269	2.5
Dale	298	6.7	1 677	6.3	199	9.4	1 905	5.2	401	2.5	1 205	2.8
Dallas	218	9.1	1 784	4.5	130	15.7	1 365	1.9	341	4.2	1 374	3.7
De Kalb	1 247	4.1	3 363	8.7	863	6.1	1 123	7.8	1 980	1.2	4 272	1.7
Elmore	387	6.6	2 128	2.3	159	16.5	1 176	1.5	548	2.1	1 077	3.4
Escambia	288	6.3	2 335	6.1	171	13.9	2 641	5.0	348	3.9	860	8.5
Etowah	563	5.6	1 127	6.1	229	12.5	348	5.9	862	1.6	1 270	5.3
Fayette	190	9.8	713	13.1	86	18.0	379	2.9	280	3.5	347	9.4
Franklin	511	5.0	1 051	9.1	157	14.6	164	17.5	769	2.3	1 609	2.7
Geneva	608	3.7	4 092	4.6	433	6.3	4 060	5.5	754	2.6	2 504	5.0
Greene	157	8.9	559	9.6	74	16.9	173	6.3	240	3.3	470	5.4
Hale	214	11.9	694	13.1	83	22.1	298	17.9	383	3.7	945	4.7
Henry	227	8.3	2 485	5.6	181	9.7	3 299	4.2	292	5.3	1 611	3.1
Houston	524	5.7	5 045	3.5	432	6.6	6 030	2.9	647	2.4	2 360	3.1
Jackson	908	4.3	3 225	5.4	478	8.7	1 123	6.9	1 255	1.6	1 926	3.7
Jefferson	219	11.3	216	17.8	125	17.4	28	28.6	378	3.7	394	7.2
Lamar	305	4.5	560	7.8	160	11.4	128	18.5	331	3.4	224	8.0
Lauderdale	882	4.8	3 223	3.5	293	10.8	1 698	4.5	1 322	1.4	1 374	4.6
Lawrence	801	5.0	3 121	4.4	314	11.2	2 817	.9	1 236	1.6	2 071	4.5
Lee	188	9.9	499	11.6	86	23.4	597	1.4	286	6.4	589	3.1
Limestone	730	4.4	5 131	2.7	342	10.2	4 498	3.7	1 067	1.7	2 242	4.1
Lowndes	133	10.8	1 100	5.1	59	23.7	1 084	1.5	319	2.6	739	3.6
Macon	148	12.5	853	5.8	67	23.1	560	1.2	268	4.7	408	6.4
Madison	627	5.2	4 359	3.9	319	9.9	3 225	5.1	929	1.7	1 776	4.1
Marengo	280	9.0	1 083	18.3	61	27.2	399	5.8	428	3.0	660	9.0
Marion	439	6.6	933	8.6	183	14.3	224	23.5	624	2.8	655	7.3
Marshall	970	4.2	1 605	5.0	524	7.4	396	8.6	1 502	1.4	3 422	1.7
Mobile	550	5.1	2 841	3.1	279	10.1	1 954	2.0	685	2.5	1 913	2.4
Monroe	293	7.0	2 548	8.0	211	11.3	2 904	5.5	392	3.2	1 125	5.7
Montgomery	268	11.0	1 264	7.7	128	17.9	347	2.5	601	2.2	1 218	3.8
Morgan	841	4.5	1 733	6.3	346	9.9	579	5.9	1 156	1.7	1 965	2.5
Perry	205	8.8	904	20.9	115	15.4	643	27.2	306	2.8	438	3.9
Pickens	229	10.6	779	16.4	82	21.0	343	5.2	400	3.7	1 185	3.6
Pike	385	6.4	2 195	10.0	201	13.9	1 892	4.9	476	5.4	1 386	4.2
Randolph	376	6.2	863	11.2	211	11.1	182	22.4	563	2.8	997	4.1
Russell	151	7.2	589	11.2	55	19.4	799	.9	221	3.6	400	6.7
St. Clair	374	7.3	527	11.2	182	13.8	340	3.4	579	1.7	790	4.6
Shelby	230	9.6	782	13.3	107	16.9	402	19.2	396	3.5	517	5.8
Sumter	186	11.8	619	12.0	109	18.8	146	10.1	317	5.0	671	9.9
Talladega	304	7.9	1 400	6.8	163	16.3	641	10.4	493	2.4	1 013	10.4
Tallahassee	212	8.3	521	14.2	95	18.4	147	20.7	319	3.4	411	8.6
Tuscaloosa	335	6.7	1 299	15.9	142	13.1	858	16.6	470	2.4	904	5.0
Walker	265	9.7	383	15.0	163	15.2	103	14.7	462	1.6	817	2.4
Washington	319	5.8	978	15.9	102	20.6	208	7.5	380	2.9	581	6.8
Wilcox	142	11.8	760	12.7	45	24.7	230	3.5	222	4.7	457	6.8
Winston	348	7.3	469	8.3	203	11.5	112	12.6	551	2.1	1 036	3.7

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)
Alabama	19 501	1.2	28 638	.7	12 055	1.6	134 016	.6	4 149	3.0	16 205	1.4
Autauga	171	12.0	92	10.1	118	14.7	948	2.5	20	35.8	92	7.9
Baldwin	492	6.9	459	5.9	235	10.1	6 073	6.8	136	16.6	783	4.0
Barbour	238	9.4	216	5.9	156	11.4	1 455	1.2	41	20.6	267	12.0
Bibb	64	12.1	21	9.2	26	19.6	47	12.9	9	33.9	17	30.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Blount	485	6.9	1 083	1.0	306	9.2	1 668	5.9	114	16.4	509	8.0
Bullock	116	11.4	411	2.0	120	10.2	5 219	.9	50	16.5	375	2.0
Butler	211	10.0	313	2.5	94	17.5	877	7.6	49	28.0	44	12.7
Calhoun	247	10.5	448	1.9	172	12.8	3 223	2.0	61	23.2	165	24.6
Chambers	87	18.9	59	18.3	103	19.7	516	13.2	35	40.4	32	45.9
Cherokee	253	10.9	362	2.8	145	17.8	4 319	.7	57	25.4	276	9.0
Chilton	310	9.1	145	13.8	212	10.4	1 310	12.9	47	30.2	120	20.0
Choctaw	77	17.9	35	17.7	85	17.0	162	20.4	4	—	6	—
Clarke	88	14.2	19	14.6	68	18.9	142	27.7	23	36.4	11	38.6
Clay	146	13.5	235	2.6	93	18.6	507	2.5	30	32.4	120	3.0
Cleburne	123	12.3	427	11.8	103	16.7	1 104	2.9	23	36.3	60	13.3
Coffee	510	5.1	1 035	1.3	227	10.5	2 912	5.7	62	20.6	239	4.4
Colbert	264	10.5	257	3.5	164	13.8	1 328	2.7	53	26.8	193	7.8
Conecuh	145	15.8	68	18.3	116	16.0	502	29.9	27	42.0	23	31.4
Coosa	81	10.7	23	14.8	29	19.7	30	26.0	19	24.4	8	35.5
Covington	400	8.1	487	3.4	185	12.9	2 475	3.4	89	18.9	297	8.8
Crenshaw	208	10.4	470	1.8	185	10.3	1 074	2.2	31	24.2	553	2.5
Cullman	1 190	4.1	2 772	2.7	634	7.0	6 925	5.0	245	12.2	1 413	5.4
Dale	284	7.5	299	4.3	105	14.2	1 128	2.4	58	18.9	180	12.2
Dallas	245	10.2	443	4.5	174	12.8	4 174	.5	130	17.3	434	6.0
De Kalb	913	5.3	2 187	2.7	572	7.4	4 592	2.5	259	12.6	416	11.3
Elmore	334	9.0	225	6.4	171	15.9	2 199	6.0	49	31.9	93	33.3
Escambia	157	14.5	128	3.8	110	18.7	967	3.9	39	35.0	265	22.8
Etowah	401	8.5	377	3.8	215	13.4	903	12.9	103	20.9	115	18.3
Fayette	138	12.1	118	15.8	67	19.9	414	1.7	16	32.0	8	28.4
Franklin	426	6.1	777	1.3	276	10.2	1 266	3.0	58	20.0	245	28.5
Geneva	496	6.4	943	2.5	267	11.1	3 293	3.2	92	22.0	542	3.2
Greene	112	8.9	155	5.3	109	9.5	1 092	4.2	20	24.5	62	1.3
Hale	203	11.0	812	8.5	137	16.1	1 920	2.2	53	28.4	198	21.8
Henry	216	9.5	235	7.1	142	12.7	2 198	4.1	32	29.9	138	2.6
Houston	456	6.7	513	6.2	226	11.8	3 733	2.4	80	22.0	668	8.0
Jackson	566	8.0	530	3.0	294	12.5	1 475	4.5	62	25.9	151	23.4
Jefferson	150	16.1	247	9.2	62	26.3	1 434	.7	24	53.3	(D)	(D)
Lamar	161	11.0	54	10.4	96	17.0	1 195	15.2	37	29.7	33	36.3
Lauderdale	543	8.1	301	8.5	350	10.9	1 457	3.9	102	20.3	323	17.1
Lawrence	600	6.9	719	2.8	461	8.6	2 485	2.7	109	18.7	133	11.0
Lee	186	9.4	259	2.9	74	24.4	3 686	1.7	3	.2	(D)	(D)
Limestone	599	6.9	412	4.0	284	11.3	4 499	.8	100	21.3	708	4.4
Lowndes	173	11.5	229	7.2	131	13.3	2 328	1.9	30	28.9	135	8.3
Macon	103	17.8	111	13.0	87	19.9	1 441	3.3	48	27.5	147	29.1
Madison	464	7.5	360	6.5	293	10.7	2 317	2.8	106	20.8	198	12.9
Marengo	165	15.3	186	8.9	133	16.3	1 549	5.7	83	25.3	112	14.0
Marion	292	10.7	207	7.0	203	13.3	344	13.7	24	47.4	15	30.2
Marshall	837	4.8	1 907	2.8	402	8.8	4 356	7.3	168	14.6	414	7.2
Mobile	384	7.0	801	3.6	177	12.6	13 016	1.1	101	19.2	2 293	2.6
Monroe	190	11.4	138	9.9	173	13.1	1 333	9.3	52	25.9	103	10.3
Montgomery	326	8.2	396	7.3	216	11.9	3 048	2.6	91	23.0	(D)	(D)
Morgan	555	6.5	660	2.2	298	10.9	1 824	1.7	101	22.6	214	8.9
Perry	156	12.3	160	4.1	110	15.4	783	5.1	29	36.0	39	24.3
Pickens	230	9.2	595	4.7	158	13.0	1 011	2.8	36	33.1	95	29.0
Pike	291	10.5	470	2.9	221	13.0	1 596	5.7	52	18.0	199	5.7
Randolph	180	11.3	501	5.6	144	14.7	581	10.1	36	21.4	243	.8
Russell	133	10.1	91	7.7	98	11.9	904	2.7	9	44.0	8	24.4
St. Clair	277	10.1	311	5.3	208	12.2	1 473	3.5	51	22.5	160	21.8
Shelby	239	10.1	175	13.5	154	14.1	1 577	4.1	49	28.7	62	23.0
Sumter	123	13.8	202	12.1	196	9.6	917	9.4	55	21.8	110	11.6
Talladega	221	10.4	339	4.4	176	12.9	1 864	2.4	63	27.8	553	2.2
Tallapoosa	149	12.4	91	14.4	136	15.0	507	7.2	34	35.5	52	30.7
Tuscaloosa	224	10.9	205	10.2	162	13.1	1 461	5.4	77	22.7	181	18.8
Walker	198	11.0	389	2.2	70	21.6	1 242	1.7	31	28.2	39	26.2
Washington	177	10.0	336	5.9	103	18.8	837	3.5	67	23.3	121	19.3
Wilcox	92	14.7	75	7.2	96	14.3	700	6.2	56	21.8	130	26.9
Winston	240	8.6	529	2.4	142	14.4	1 079	6.1	49	33.5	78	44.0

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Alabama	32 078	.8	99 127	.9	8 915	2.1	20 749	1.8	13 367	1.5	90 000	1.2
Autauga	249	7.0	781	8.1	42	27.1	148	11.6	108	16.1	520	20.9
Baldwin	774	3.7	3 671	5.5	269	11.7	876	5.0	311	10.4	2 230	7.7
Barbour	306	6.2	1 605	5.8	101	16.4	337	10.3	122	13.4	917	9.7
Bibb	131	5.2	145	14.1	19	23.2	23	28.8	23	21.1	89	14.6

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Blount	997	3.0	2 888	6.6	255	11.9	632	7.3	393	8.0	2 637	5.7
Bullock	201	6.8	1 491	2.8	34	22.9	107	6.3	98	13.2	749	15.5
Butler	363	5.0	1 034	21.6	85	21.4	159	7.1	148	11.6	754	8.8
Calhoun	494	4.5	1 392	5.4	85	19.0	195	14.6	165	13.6	815	9.2
Chambers	257	7.3	648	20.6	57	30.6	38	34.2	99	18.4	433	25.4
Cherokee	366	6.9	1 460	4.0	114	16.1	291	7.7	211	11.0	1 330	8.2
Chilton	533	4.5	1 100	14.0	93	21.4	69	28.9	181	13.5	775	19.6
Choctaw	164	8.0	267	15.6	43	25.8	31	33.0	42	27.8	67	14.1
Clarke	174	7.3	233	15.7	22	36.7	23	56.6	58	20.9	152	34.2
Clay	293	6.7	535	7.3	73	21.6	69	17.5	113	16.8	708	3.0
Cleburne	277	5.7	846	11.0	44	26.5	86	7.7	108	13.1	1 103	10.6
Coffee	610	4.5	2 753	4.1	194	13.9	812	6.4	364	8.3	3 157	5.8
Colbert	421	5.7	1 451	5.3	108	19.9	437	3.2	183	13.9	1 310	6.5
Conecuh	234	8.2	463	13.7	35	38.7	22	13.5	110	20.2	246	24.0
Coosa	156	5.0	194	11.0	17	27.3	28	35.4	45	15.0	100	27.3
Covington	605	5.0	2 556	4.5	199	13.9	609	14.5	284	10.1	1 864	8.0
Crenshaw	385	5.8	1 339	3.7	133	13.9	359	8.0	139	13.0	1 199	4.9
Cullman	1 750	2.3	5 117	4.7	595	7.8	964	13.3	855	4.7	5 982	4.6
Dale	340	5.5	1 340	5.2	119	14.9	390	5.9	130	11.1	1 362	5.7
Dallas	344	4.3	1 760	4.9	74	21.8	337	4.5	111	16.1	1 446	7.3
De Kalb	1 587	2.8	4 109	3.8	549	8.6	818	9.4	793	6.4	5 740	3.4
Elmore	477	4.9	1 330	4.5	86	21.8	182	17.9	175	15.5	900	8.6
Escambia	263	8.9	1 068	5.5	86	23.0	344	22.1	133	15.8	994	4.3
Etowah	686	4.5	1 431	8.0	195	14.1	284	8.1	258	11.8	1 169	8.4
Fayette	211	6.9	395	8.7	72	21.8	106	16.8	51	21.3	330	17.2
Franklin	638	4.2	1 297	7.4	187	13.8	320	11.1	262	10.1	1 959	8.0
Geneva	715	3.2	2 912	4.6	274	11.5	1 042	8.6	390	7.0	3 645	4.2
Greene	204	5.1	709	5.2	54	20.8	145	6.1	102	11.2	571	8.2
Hale	339	5.7	2 069	7.6	99	20.9	389	27.0	179	10.2	1 759	7.9
Henry	258	7.1	1 823	4.0	118	14.0	515	7.1	143	12.9	1 705	8.2
Houston	571	4.3	2 975	3.2	303	10.1	1 440	11.1	285	10.6	3 022	6.8
Jackson	932	4.4	2 278	7.6	227	14.3	280	10.3	325	10.6	1 799	8.8
Jefferson	315	6.5	683	7.5	40	33.2	30	43.7	54	32.9	360	21.2
Lamar	326	3.9	465	12.9	78	19.6	106	26.6	103	16.2	212	18.2
Lauderdale	1 028	3.7	2 144	6.7	224	13.7	599	8.8	358	10.9	1 620	7.2
Lawrence	1 067	3.2	2 514	3.1	322	10.9	711	8.3	336	10.2	2 113	8.2
Lee	277	5.3	984	4.8	34	40.3	127	4.9	71	24.6	137	36.4
Limestone	850	4.2	2 638	4.9	329	10.7	744	5.9	342	10.6	2 039	7.8
Lowndes	259	6.5	1 060	10.9	83	18.7	260	10.0	110	14.1	851	8.9
Macon	206	9.0	1 017	3.8	57	24.7	230	15.7	91	16.9	614	19.6
Madison	752	4.1	2 108	4.9	210	13.5	460	13.6	295	11.0	2 193	7.5
Marengo	326	6.5	958	7.0	90	24.4	168	10.3	126	11.9	933	14.3
Marion	548	3.8	847	22.1	156	17.0	168	20.4	189	14.3	510	10.2
Marshall	1 337	2.3	4 192	3.0	431	8.9	489	11.3	689	6.3	5 043	7.6
Mobile	612	4.3	2 865	2.1	102	21.7	337	6.3	137	15.9	1 307	18.1
Monroe	323	5.8	1 588	5.0	94	20.5	246	28.5	165	14.0	1 069	9.8
Montgomery	485	5.0	1 684	7.3	109	19.3	192	23.3	220	11.4	1 214	12.6
Morgan	952	3.5	2 185	7.2	289	11.8	440	7.3	311	9.5	1 884	6.0
Perry	242	7.0	718	13.7	74	21.7	97	20.5	143	11.8	716	14.0
Pickens	348	6.1	1 035	7.3	58	17.9	479	4.8	198	10.9	1 470	4.5
Pike	419	5.9	1 721	3.1	154	16.6	529	10.4	217	12.2	1 963	7.5
Randolph	434	5.1	1 020	10.7	119	16.9	228	12.2	221	9.9	1 472	8.7
Russell	198	5.2	535	9.2	32	28.6	38	31.4	58	17.8	526	11.6
St. Clair	479	5.1	1 137	6.2	68	25.5	69	20.1	218	11.5	1 341	11.5
Shelby	312	6.7	930	8.0	72	24.2	102	29.8	135	15.2	885	19.2
Sumter	256	7.7	858	8.2	79	21.6	133	26.6	143	14.9	807	12.3
Talladega	417	5.1	1 192	7.7	103	20.4	177	17.4	189	13.6	937	9.9
Tallapoosa	282	5.7	467	9.2	47	28.9	57	26.7	96	18.0	350	16.0
Tuscaloosa	393	5.4	1 009	5.5	88	21.4	187	12.2	107	15.7	645	16.6
Walker	376	5.2	789	7.4	66	26.3	73	13.7	188	12.8	1 021	8.4
Washington	325	6.3	710	8.5	63	26.0	61	17.7	95	17.1	599	13.0
Wilcox	178	8.9	624	5.6	43	25.4	99	5.9	41	25.6	432	9.1
Winston	451	5.0	982	6.4	141	15.4	209	18.7	224	11.4	1 199	18.8

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)
Alabama	8 475	2.0	45 732	1.1	38 769	.6	21 970	1.3	33 714	.7	266 906	.3
Autauga	85	18.7	325	7.6	323	3.2	133	18.7	281	5.2	1 009	4.1
Baldwin	182	11.7	2 328	3.1	876	2.5	520	10.2	770	3.5	4 998	1.4
Barbour	95	13.9	1 082	5.7	395	2.7	197	7.9	368	4.6	1 804	4.2
Bibb	29	20.2	41	24.3	168	2.9	117	21.2	121	5.6	154	8.5

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	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)
Blount	175	14.1	502	6.8	1 157	1.3	565	5.8	950	3.3	11 149	.9
Bullock	58	18.1	259	15.6	260	2.5	399	10.5	205	6.1	1 518	3.1
Butler	92	20.9	394	4.9	412	3.4	135	8.6	344	6.1	2 041	2.1
Calhoun	104	17.5	312	11.6	602	2.0	427	12.0	497	4.5	3 691	1.5
Chambers	25	29.2	98	36.1	297	4.2	283	25.0	302	3.5	568	7.7
Cherokee	121	16.1	757	4.9	460	3.4	449	7.2	419	4.5	4 018	1.7
Chilton	142	14.7	170	18.0	625	2.4	307	9.3	522	4.2	1 138	5.3
Choctaw	53	24.4	47	15.2	202	4.6	107	22.0	180	6.4	801	6.6
Clarke	33	28.8	46	16.7	212	5.2	100	20.3	213	5.2	174	13.2
Clay	45	27.1	79	11.6	376	3.1	167	11.4	297	5.1	2 474	1.7
Cleburne	50	28.8	74	21.6	333	1.9	238	8.1	275	6.1	3 774	.7
Coffee	165	11.2	1 827	4.2	706	3.4	450	5.2	719	2.2	10 557	1.9
Colbert	94	19.2	387	3.9	521	2.8	252	14.8	453	4.4	2 059	1.8
Conecuh	97	21.3	186	29.2	351	2.9	212	10.6	236	7.4	515	9.2
Coosa	23	22.1	19	25.7	209	1.8	68	8.1	180	3.9	148	8.2
Covington	207	13.3	1 291	10.4	850	2.2	404	9.1	683	4.0	6 448	1.1
Crenshaw	101	13.2	630	4.7	472	1.7	245	4.8	401	4.6	4 244	1.3
Cullman	409	10.2	1 273	8.6	2 055	1.2	939	5.4	1 907	1.8	30 735	.5
Dale	80	14.4	1 815	4.0	402	2.5	289	9.6	369	3.9	2 475	2.8
Dallas	115	17.3	1 077	8.1	429	1.0	329	8.4	388	4.4	3 135	2.8
De Kalb	420	9.4	1 282	5.0	1 996	1.2	932	6.2	1 694	2.6	20 649	.6
Elmore	142	16.9	577	5.7	519	2.8	226	8.9	460	5.5	1 511	3.5
Escambia	122	17.1	1 143	7.6	327	4.3	146	8.2	277	8.1	1 367	6.0
Etowah	97	21.1	229	16.1	857	2.0	394	5.0	749	3.5	4 216	1.5
Fayette	61	24.7	139	9.2	284	3.1	116	11.3	221	7.1	794	13.3
Franklin	189	13.5	332	8.0	813	1.1	401	10.3	715	3.3	6 553	1.3
Geneva	186	11.5	1 641	8.0	811	2.5	592	6.9	720	3.5	9 371	1.9
Greene	92	12.2	265	7.2	240	3.6	149	11.6	226	4.3	1 265	1.8
Hale	131	10.2	669	11.3	370	4.2	297	7.7	345	5.2	2 108	5.8
Henry	129	11.1	3 120	5.2	321	2.3	316	10.0	304	4.2	1 906	2.8
Houston	253	11.7	3 946	3.7	630	3.4	400	7.6	660	1.9	4 499	3.7
Jackson	250	13.4	843	8.8	1 245	1.7	528	6.4	1 046	3.6	5 244	1.9
Jefferson	112	20.5	144	13.2	337	6.1	190	10.5	295	7.9	765	3.5
Lamar	99	16.5	215	7.8	372	2.0	142	8.7	260	6.1	425	9.6
Lauderdale	316	11.0	1 215	4.4	1 265	1.9	697	8.5	1 068	3.6	2 309	5.6
Lawrence	267	12.5	990	5.7	1 196	2.1	561	11.1	982	3.7	6 396	.9
Lee	67	25.8	70	26.0	324	3.4	303	9.6	261	6.8	2 784	.9
Limestone	260	12.1	2 130	2.6	1 079	1.5	612	5.2	958	3.1	4 991	1.6
Lowndes	86	19.1	335	6.7	306	3.4	224	7.0	301	4.2	3 033	2.3
Macon	43	20.5	196	8.1	284	3.4	216	11.6	228	7.3	1 164	3.9
Madison	217	12.8	1 585	11.3	906	2.1	596	6.9	837	3.2	3 358	4.1
Marengo	102	18.8	493	16.1	406	4.7	253	10.4	390	5.6	1 345	3.5
Marion	58	28.0	125	35.1	631	2.4	194	28.0	530	4.7	1 946	2.8
Marshall	245	13.3	579	8.6	1 428	2.2	649	4.1	1 335	2.4	17 677	.7
Mobile	76	18.3	1 321	1.7	706	2.2	532	7.1	581	4.3	9 351	2.2
Monroe	156	12.7	1 033	9.9	401	2.6	235	7.1	344	6.0	1 675	4.6
Montgomery	170	13.8	642	17.2	598	2.9	409	7.0	496	4.1	2 554	3.0
Morgan	286	11.3	577	5.7	1 106	2.1	572	5.5	931	3.4	7 422	.7
Perry	115	15.7	363	8.4	315	3.6	222	10.6	296	4.3	658	6.2
Pickens	116	18.1	265	11.6	422	3.1	206	7.3	370	5.7	4 552	1.9
Pike	186	12.9	1 330	5.0	552	2.6	339	11.0	485	3.6	5 398	1.4
Randolph	50	27.9	142	7.0	562	2.6	308	9.5	461	5.0	5 127	.9
Russell	66	13.8	247	10.6	229	2.9	258	7.0	189	5.2	739	4.2
St. Clair	58	19.2	208	4.7	580	1.5	292	6.4	482	4.9	4 844	.9
Shelby	67	21.7	233	21.6	411	2.5	320	8.0	369	4.2	1 084	7.0
Sumter	108	16.9	414	22.3	340	4.1	296	9.6	287	6.7	1 017	7.5
Talladega	109	19.1	497	8.3	477	3.3	321	5.8	429	4.3	2 760	2.9
Tallapoosa	60	23.4	131	19.5	337	1.8	159	9.4	252	7.2	938	3.8
Tuscaloosa	90	16.2	414	9.0	456	3.2	189	10.6	392	5.3	1 825	2.5
Walker	56	25.4	68	27.9	447	2.7	307	27.5	379	5.8	4 535	.8
Washington	76	23.3	149	23.7	381	3.0	174	8.7	321	5.5	1 554	3.1
Wilcox	54	21.8	350	9.4	241	2.3	142	11.5	207	4.7	643	6.2
Winston	52	31.0	64	8.8	568	1.7	222	13.6	501	3.4	4 930	1.3
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)		Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Total (\$1,000)		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Alabama	41 377	.6	490 081	.8	34 407	.6	4 197 670	.4	24 819	.5	2 077 139	.3
Autauga	348	1.0	1 831	18.2	293	.9	46 415	1.1	210	1.4	26 702	1.2
Baldwin	976	.6	15 884	5.4	837	.6	117 013	.7	669	.8	88 383	.7
Barbour	416	.8	3 205	7.1	359	.8	63 408	1.0	269	1.1	33 254	.9
Bibb	177	1.8	167	42.3	149	1.1	16 082	2.3	98	2.0	4 613	2.4

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	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)
Blount	1 194	.6	19 106	3.3	1 003	.6	73 400	.9	690	.8	26 662	1.2
Bullock	277	1.0	6 914	4.5	213	1.2	59 002	1.8	159	1.7	14 079	2.0
Butler	440	.8	5 825	4.8	350	.9	35 942	1.4	270	1.2	17 024	1.6
Calhoun	628	.8	13 044	2.3	512	.8	38 968	1.5	371	1.0	17 761	2.3
Chambers	324	.9	-847	42.5	256	1.0	28 327	2.1	166	1.6	8 568	2.5
Cherokee	494	.9	11 803	3.6	445	.7	69 006	.9	321	1.1	43 228	1.0
Chilton	664	.7	1 291	40.1	589	.6	44 194	1.2	434	.9	17 950	1.6
Choctaw	225	1.5	658	25.8	183	1.4	16 417	2.8	148	1.8	5 886	2.8
Clarke	248	1.3	-552	45.6	205	1.3	16 827	2.0	140	2.0	6 204	2.5
Clay	397	.8	3 266	9.7	323	.8	31 581	1.5	216	1.3	8 394	1.7
Cleburne	339	.9	7 848	10.6	273	.9	20 531	1.8	191	1.5	6 960	2.3
Coffee	787	.6	23 101	2.6	622	.7	95 383	.8	470	1.0	57 808	.9
Colbert	558	.8	5 126	5.2	469	.9	69 533	.8	321	1.3	42 699	.5
Conecuh	365	.8	65	(H)	307	.8	32 646	1.3	222	1.2	12 931	1.2
Coosa	213	1.6	-90	(H)	162	1.4	15 416	2.8	93	2.4	3 631	4.3
Covington	898	.7	10 017	7.2	730	.6	80 503	.6	495	.9	43 407	.6
Crenshaw	487	.7	7 138	3.7	402	.8	51 271	1.0	303	1.1	21 851	1.4
Cullman	2 151	.5	48 980	2.3	1 825	.5	115 493	.7	1 351	.6	48 927	.8
Dale	422	.8	3 128	12.5	366	.7	62 655	.7	288	1.0	38 940	.7
Dallas	435	.9	5 717	6.0	350	1.0	98 140	1.1	232	1.4	44 832	.8
De Kalb	2 082	.6	35 326	2.0	1 753	.6	129 898	.8	1 280	.7	63 271	.9
Elmore	560	.7	3 490	10.7	465	.7	61 970	1.0	314	1.1	34 685	.9
Escambia	380	1.0	3 004	12.7	326	.9	52 386	.9	244	1.3	38 063	.8
Etowah	903	.7	8 074	8.1	734	.7	47 448	1.1	513	.9	22 028	1.3
Fayette	305	1.0	-281	(H)	256	.8	25 537	1.6	202	1.2	12 734	1.9
Franklin	833	.8	15 368	1.8	684	.8	60 777	1.2	447	1.1	17 781	1.7
Geneva	871	.6	14 271	5.3	723	.6	119 592	.6	546	.8	73 016	.7
Greene	261	1.3	1 609	15.6	232	1.1	47 061	2.4	150	1.9	13 899	2.5
Hale	411	.9	6 513	9.6	312	1.2	53 903	1.5	210	1.7	22 644	1.5
Henry	334	.8	3 276	19.0	279	.7	89 537	.5	212	1.0	64 780	.5
Houston	689	.6	5 805	12.8	600	.6	137 415	.7	501	.8	103 444	.6
Jackson	1 297	.8	9 670	7.4	1 177	.8	130 847	.9	887	.9	78 195	.9
Jefferson	425	1.1	4 342	4.9	331	1.2	19 046	2.4	209	1.7	6 658	2.8
Lamar	387	1.1	86	(H)	332	.9	27 103	1.5	261	1.2	12 414	2.2
Lauderdale	1 356	.8	3 213	27.7	1 144	.7	133 791	.7	796	.9	71 037	.7
Lawrence	1 288	.8	12 053	4.5	1 088	.9	139 264	.9	755	1.1	71 093	.8
Lee	347	.7	6 473	4.6	256	1.0	21 912	2.1	176	1.5	7 672	2.2
Limestone	1 127	.7	8 039	5.3	973	.7	181 292	.6	700	.8	90 163	.8
Lowndes	330	.9	4 069	7.8	247	1.1	63 283	1.4	150	1.8	25 080	1.1
Macon	300	.9	1 031	32.5	239	1.0	42 524	1.4	159	1.6	14 852	1.4
Madison	974	.7	-2 510	25.8	865	.6	157 715	.6	654	.8	88 621	.7
Marengo	464	.9	1 640	22.7	361	1.1	68 134	1.7	242	1.6	23 804	1.7
Marion	677	.7	2 749	11.7	580	.8	44 166	1.1	387	1.1	18 341	1.3
Marshall	1 583	.6	34 033	1.6	1 323	.7	84 989	1.0	958	.8	40 046	1.0
Mobile	753	.8	15 101	5.4	660	.7	60 665	1.2	514	1.0	32 852	.9
Monroe	422	.9	5 340	8.2	369	.8	56 705	1.1	315	1.0	40 308	.8
Montgomery	653	.8	6 496	9.9	506	1.0	101 973	1.4	325	1.4	30 441	1.5
Morgan	1 214	.9	11 583	3.4	1 011	.9	94 607	1.1	728	1.0	47 612	1.1
Perry	340	1.0	692	70.2	267	1.1	57 884	2.0	185	1.7	21 976	2.2
Pickens	454	.9	9 315	6.7	355	.9	45 344	1.5	278	1.2	23 626	1.9
Pike	579	.7	10 253	7.1	469	.9	80 091	1.0	366	1.1	43 379	.7
Randolph	598	.7	5 973	4.3	475	.8	42 625	1.6	311	1.2	9 795	2.0
Russell	246	1.1	994	42.9	197	1.2	32 982	1.8	134	1.8	15 684	2.2
St. Clair	594	.9	7 675	6.1	483	.9	37 339	1.7	335	1.2	13 832	1.8
Shelby	435	.9	2 898	19.3	342	1.0	39 455	1.6	241	1.5	15 757	1.6
Sumter	369	1.1	1 201	38.9	284	1.2	59 247	1.8	187	1.8	12 985	2.5
Talladega	522	.9	16 846	3.4	434	.8	59 851	1.4	342	1.1	31 951	1.4
Tallapoosa	344	.9	1	(H)	257	1.0	26 934	1.6	162	1.6	6 862	2.1
Tuscaloosa	511	1.0	1 499	21.0	422	.9	42 943	1.4	320	1.1	23 680	1.6
Walker	469	.8	9 187	2.4	376	.9	27 234	2.3	273	1.3	11 739	3.1
Washington	397	.9	2 442	16.1	339	1.0	25 940	2.0	256	1.4	12 260	2.2
Wilcox	248	1.0	1 111	21.1	190	1.3	39 245	2.1	137	1.9	17 012	2.2
Winston	582	.7	7 509	5.5	468	.8	28 863	1.4	330	1.1	10 373	1.5
Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry								
Farms				Acres				Cattle and calves inventory		Beef cows inventory		
Farms		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Acres		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Farms		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Number		Number		Number		Number		Number		Number		
Alabama		1 301		76 871		28 450		25 384		832 298		
Autauga		12		252		236		210		210		
Baldwin		83		8 129		483		400		14 947		
Barbour		16		1 386		286		263		11 300		
Bibb		1		(D)		129		115		(D)		

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	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)
Blount	34	4.5	372	6.3	878	.6	42 173	1.0	797	.7	23 657	1.0
Bullock	14	5.3	(D)	(D)	152	1.7	15 373	2.4	141	1.8	(D)	(D)
Butler	7	11.6	92	13.8	315	1.0	17 157	1.7	284	1.1	10 086	2.0
Calhoun	27	4.5	799	1.8	440	.9	17 510	1.4	395	1.0	9 380	1.5
Chambers	12	7.7	186	3.9	259	1.0	16 951	1.8	238	1.2	(D)	(D)
Cherokee	15	5.5	829	2.2	319	1.2	15 476	1.7	284	1.3	7 991	1.8
Chilton	33	4.7	528	6.6	455	.9	20 546	1.6	404	1.0	11 361	1.6
Choctaw	—	—	—	—	165	1.6	7 256	2.3	135	1.9	(D)	(D)
Clarke	4	12.9	6	14.0	165	1.7	7 266	2.5	144	1.9	4 330	2.5
Clay	9	10.6	12	12.1	329	.8	19 587	1.3	291	.9	11 098	1.2
Cleburne	5	9.8	(D)	(D)	258	1.0	12 035	1.8	242	1.1	7 099	1.8
Coffee	20	5.6	1 762	4.9	458	1.0	28 887	1.4	416	1.1	15 786	1.5
Colbert	18	6.0	2 282	1.7	376	1.1	17 905	1.3	338	1.2	9 576	1.5
Conecuh	6	14.1	59	18.8	243	1.1	16 619	1.4	211	1.2	(D)	(D)
Coosa	9	9.7	56	9.6	170	1.2	6 879	3.2	154	1.4	4 205	3.9
Covington	23	5.3	(D)	(D)	579	.8	33 414	.8	502	.9	17 096	1.1
Crenshaw	20	4.1	1 953	1.5	337	1.0	23 082	1.0	299	1.1	13 157	1.1
Cullman	43	3.7	568	5.9	1 618	.5	72 612	.8	1 472	.6	40 826	.9
Dale	24	4.7	1 162	2.4	260	1.1	17 535	1.1	231	1.3	9 831	1.1
Dallas	18	4.4	1 108	.1	272	1.3	28 524	1.3	243	1.5	16 997	1.3
De Kalb	28	5.4	507	3.5	1 584	.7	62 392	.9	1 434	.7	36 118	.9
Elmore	30	5.1	890	5.4	378	1.0	19 916	1.5	329	1.1	9 849	1.8
Escambia	8	5.7	924	.3	215	1.5	12 727	1.4	180	1.8	(D)	(D)
Etowah	19	5.6	322	7.0	666	.8	24 613	1.1	578	.9	12 398	1.2
Fayette	2	22.1	(D)	(D)	192	1.3	9 194	1.7	167	1.5	4 170	2.6
Franklin	7	12.3	163	22.6	641	.8	30 497	1.2	585	.9	17 030	1.4
Geneva	41	3.5	2 019	.7	487	.9	35 213	1.2	445	1.0	18 425	1.1
Greene	6	12.1	(D)	(D)	171	1.7	14 890	2.3	145	2.0	8 313	2.5
Hale	8	11.3	444	13.4	281	1.4	24 259	1.8	242	1.6	13 870	1.8
Henry	18	5.0	3 457	5.2	206	1.1	15 665	1.1	193	1.2	8 619	1.2
Houston	55	3.3	9 896	.9	437	.9	31 707	1.3	399	1.0	17 053	1.5
Jackson	24	6.5	759	3.9	902	1.0	38 109	1.3	800	1.0	19 747	1.5
Jefferson	13	7.2	125	15.1	238	1.6	6 816	2.2	210	1.8	3 795	2.5
Lamar	8	9.7	1 107	13.9	262	1.2	9 666	1.7	229	1.4	5 110	1.9
Lauderdale	18	6.3	250	7.0	1 005	.8	40 213	1.0	879	.9	21 612	1.0
Lawrence	16	6.1	1 095	1.4	932	1.0	37 893	1.2	833	1.1	21 009	1.3
Lee	25	5.4	725	5.0	225	1.2	10 649	2.5	204	1.3	(D)	(D)
Limestone	49	3.0	4 562	.8	730	.9	28 712	1.1	663	.9	15 994	1.2
Lowndes	8	9.5	1 161	.9	272	1.0	39 053	.8	243	1.1	20 216	1.0
Macon	18	5.6	1 795	5.1	181	1.5	12 548	2.0	168	1.6	(D)	(D)
Madison	36	4.2	2 999	2.3	572	1.0	24 737	1.5	499	1.1	13 557	1.7
Marengo	6	16.4	70	28.9	343	1.2	35 008	1.5	307	1.3	18 434	1.8
Marion	4	16.1	55	18.0	481	.9	17 765	1.0	436	1.0	(D)	(D)
Marshall	16	6.9	370	1.6	1 190	.7	45 226	1.0	1 070	.8	25 038	1.0
Mobile	122	2.4	2 497	5.1	345	1.4	22 917	1.6	300	1.6	11 397	2.1
Monroe	15	6.5	1 614	4.4	261	1.3	18 363	1.8	213	1.6	9 104	2.1
Montgomery	18	7.4	611	12.6	458	1.1	44 154	1.3	412	1.2	23 468	1.5
Morgan	22	6.6	454	3.4	896	.9	42 023	1.2	800	1.0	22 116	1.4
Perry	6	10.6	(D)	(D)	238	1.3	18 544	1.7	201	1.6	9 611	2.0
Pickens	11	6.3	624	3.1	284	1.2	18 009	1.4	252	1.4	8 926	1.9
Pike	22	3.0	3 056	1.7	408	1.0	30 483	1.2	379	1.1	18 007	1.3
Randolph	13	7.9	278	6.1	484	.8	24 156	1.3	443	.9	13 397	1.3
Russell	20	5.6	2 077	3.2	146	1.7	8 201	1.9	127	1.9	(D)	(D)
St. Clair	35	3.7	2 059	1.4	434	1.0	18 064	1.7	398	1.1	10 655	1.9
Shelby	20	6.4	1 267	1.6	261	1.4	12 718	2.5	234	1.5	7 074	2.7
Sumter	7	10.1	379	26.1	271	1.3	25 198	1.7	227	1.6	13 102	1.9
Talladega	16	6.7	749	5.7	359	1.0	21 553	1.4	320	1.1	10 732	1.6
Tallapoosa	10	7.4	223	5.9	268	.9	11 219	1.5	237	1.1	6 700	1.8
Tuscaloosa	28	4.7	535	5.0	319	1.1	13 547	1.6	286	1.3	7 554	1.8
Walker	3	16.7	(D)	(D)	338	1.1	11 875	1.7	306	1.2	6 624	2.1
Washington	5	12.3	47	26.7	286	1.2	11 123	2.3	231	1.5	6 009	2.5
Wilcox	6	14.0	72	31.2	168	1.5	17 662	1.8	154	1.7	9 647	2.0
Winston	6	12.2	148	17.2	453	.8	20 317	1.2	417	.9	11 017	1.4
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)
Alabama	608	1.2	27 848	.3	932	1.1	183 811	.5	294	1.9	8 173	2.7
Autauga	6	11.4	72	5.6	7	9.7	3 768	1.1	2	29.5	(D)	(D)
Baldwin	16	6.6	398	1.7	20	5.9	3 348	5.5	9	10.1	244	18.2
Barbour	6	12.1	17	15.2	13	7.3	2 349	7.4	—	—	—	—
Bibb	2	17.0	(D)	(D)	4	16.3	13	18.4	2	23.9	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	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)
Blount	22	4.6	776	.8	8	11.0	89	20.2	14	7.5	186	9.1
Bullock	1	—	(D)	(D)	4	15.8	43	16.9	—	—	—	—
Butler	4	19.1	15	24.6	17	6.5	2 212	2.8	3	19.3	(D)	(D)
Calhoun	9	8.1	279	2.4	25	6.3	(D)	(D)	10	9.2	158	11.5
Chambers	3	16.5	(D)	(D)	5	14.1	35	16.4	2	24.7	(D)	(D)
Cherokee	6	11.3	192	1.3	10	9.9	895	11.6	4	14.8	(D)	(D)
Chilton	5	14.4	32	22.5	12	8.9	(D)	(D)	5	12.1	64	14.8
Choctaw	1	41.8	(D)	(D)	17	7.2	153	7.2	—	—	—	—
Clarke	4	17.9	18	22.3	10	9.9	504	2.8	3	19.3	8	25.7
Clay	5	6.8	206	1.1	7	11.1	(D)	(D)	3	20.1	43	26.6
Cleburne	3	21.0	13	21.4	12	9.0	2 331	10.5	5	17.1	21	21.0
Coffee	6	9.7	709	.3	35	5.6	4 248	4.8	5	12.8	90	14.7
Colbert	4	13.8	11	14.8	8	10.5	1 079	13.6	5	15.4	75	19.5
Conecuh	3	11.2	(D)	(D)	10	7.5	150	7.3	1	13.4	(D)	(D)
Coosa	3	14.7	13	18.3	2	22.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Covington	12	7.5	495	.8	31	4.9	1 533	2.7	5	13.4	170	15.7
Crenshaw	4	13.9	15	12.2	22	5.9	1 347	11.0	5	11.7	32	16.2
Cullman	36	3.9	1 981	1.1	17	7.5	380	12.7	16	6.5	515	6.6
Dale	5	13.4	22	19.4	14	7.2	1 620	10.2	4	15.0	90	15.7
Dallas	11	9.2	432	.8	10	9.3	813	1.7	—	—	—	—
De Kalb	24	4.7	817	.6	38	4.1	25 807	.3	8	8.1	129	4.9
Elmore	10	7.5	895	.3	12	7.4	(D)	(D)	8	11.2	194	18.0
Escambia	4	12.9	(D)	(D)	14	7.3	965	9.5	1	32.1	(D)	(D)
Etowah	18	6.9	724	.5	28	5.4	856	13.9	12	6.6	166	8.4
Fayette	13	7.2	1 142	3.7	4	11.8	(D)	(D)	2	14.6	(D)	(D)
Franklin	13	8.1	892	3.3	4	16.2	(D)	(D)	3	20.7	(D)	(D)
Geneva	10	7.6	1 099	.4	28	4.9	2 555	7.1	3	13.6	53	5.0
Greene	6	13.7	23	16.3	5	16.0	(D)	(D)	2	29.7	(D)	(D)
Hale	11	8.3	731	4.3	6	13.9	(D)	(D)	1	37.5	(D)	(D)
Henry	3	14.2	7	14.0	23	4.8	3 618	3.8	—	—	—	—
Houston	6	9.7	694	.8	30	5.0	2 128	7.6	1	34.4	(D)	(D)
Jackson	21	6.8	779	.6	30	5.2	11 901	3.3	5	15.1	43	23.9
Jefferson	6	13.5	27	16.3	20	7.5	704	10.3	1	36.0	(D)	(D)
Lamar	8	6.8	570	.2	15	7.5	278	11.5	1	27.3	(D)	(D)
Lauderdale	18	7.0	596	1.0	24	6.1	2 492	7.6	6	13.2	526	20.5
Lawrence	26	5.7	596	2.9	23	7.0	1 782	7.1	10	10.5	201	12.3
Lee	2	21.3	(D)	(D)	6	9.2	(D)	(D)	5	15.3	(D)	(D)
Limestone	15	7.0	469	1.1	12	7.6	(D)	(D)	10	10.7	260	15.0
Lowndes	10	8.3	112	3.3	5	14.3	(D)	(D)	1	42.4	(D)	(D)
Macon	5	13.4	(D)	(D)	10	8.9	358	4.3	1	16.7	(D)	(D)
Madison	7	11.7	142	15.5	26	5.9	3 188	6.5	8	10.6	414	5.1
Marengo	14	7.0	1 907	.3	5	17.4	20	18.0	—	—	—	—
Marion	2	27.8	(D)	(D)	11	8.3	208	7.7	4	10.8	102	12.0
Marshall	14	7.6	406	1.2	33	4.8	3 225	3.0	10	9.8	197	12.1
Mobile	14	6.3	1 452	.2	17	7.7	(D)	(D)	10	10.8	220	5.8
Monroe	7	13.3	15	11.4	13	8.8	1 441	6.3	2	24.7	(D)	(D)
Montgomery	8	9.7	389	3.8	13	9.3	115	17.8	13	8.9	272	14.9
Morgan	23	4.9	2 759	.7	12	9.1	276	16.5	15	9.1	608	14.6
Perry	10	7.5	677	.7	8	10.6	120	38.1	3	15.3	(D)	(D)
Pickens	7	11.3	219	11.4	12	7.8	18 062	.1	3	19.4	4	21.7
Pike	8	12.5	187	3.2	15	5.9	2 037	3.5	1	41.1	(D)	(D)
Randolph	12	7.6	527	.8	16	6.7	576	2.3	6	12.3	147	19.5
Russell	3	17.5	(D)	(D)	5	16.4	81	23.0	2	19.4	(D)	(D)
St. Clair	6	13.3	20	15.4	12	7.7	22 945	.4	4	16.7	145	16.8
Shelby	6	10.4	558	2.2	6	10.4	48	3.8	8	10.1	45	11.1
Sumter	3	21.2	5	23.7	8	13.2	55	15.0	—	—	—	—
Talladega	8	10.3	441	1.3	4	13.4	(D)	(D)	2	25.5	(D)	(D)
Tallahassee	8	9.4	20	11.8	3	18.3	(D)	(D)	2	20.1	(D)	(D)
Tallapoosa	8	7.1	358	3.2	7	11.8	270	12.4	3	16.6	20	16.2
Tuscaloosa	11	16.3	8	23.5	9	11.7	(D)	(D)	3	19.9	(D)	(D)
Walker	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington	7	13.5	53	18.9	22	7.0	2 949	5.8	7	14.0	273	22.7
Wilcox	7	12.6	31	13.5	11	9.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Winston	13	6.5	850	.4	7	11.7	37	16.0	4	14.8	10	16.0

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.							
	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Alabama	1 146	1.0	10 703 589	.5	2 477	.2	871 123 702	(L)
Autauga	5	16.5	146	16.7	—	—	—	—
Baldwin	33	5.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Barbour	4	18.6	97	22.4	7	—	3 815 000	—
Bibb	5	14.8	41	18.0	—	—	—	—

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.							
	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Blount	40	3.4	419 824	1.9	148	.5	61 547 838	.1
Bullock	9	10.3	(D)	(D)	7	—	2 569 573	—
Butler	14	8.3	275	12.4	31	—	9 718 272	—
Calhoun	24	6.1	70 839	5.7	28	—	12 937 300	—
Chambers	3	19.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Cherokee	4	14.3	(D)	(D)	15	3.1	10 071 909	.2
Chilton	22	6.8	292	10.1	—	—	—	—
Choctaw	7	12.4	260	17.1	6	—	2 460 000	—
Clarke	6	14.3	119	20.5	—	—	—	—
Clay	11	6.9	210 530	3.6	29	1.7	8 753 648	.4
Cleburne	13	7.1	170 970	6.1	55	1.3	17 295 576	.2
Coffee	22	5.7	178 437	4.3	114	.7	48 614 331	.1
Colbert	11	9.6	51 847	18.8	26	1.3	9 094 226	(L)
Conecuh	8	10.2	108	13.0	1	33.5	(D)	(D)
Coosa	5	14.4	61	16.2	1	34.2	(D)	(D)
Covington	32	4.7	223 684	4.2	54	.9	19 296 380	.1
Crenshaw	10	8.0	74 566	(L)	60	.7	21 555 953	(L)
Cullman	103	1.8	1 969 596	1.0	393	.4	137 070 310	.1
Dale	9	10.2	119	9.9	27	—	11 317 040	—
Dallas	11	10.6	172	10.6	—	—	—	—
De Kalb	73	3.1	1 340 681	2.1	278	.5	89 407 118	.1
Elmore	13	8.2	215	12.0	—	—	—	—
Escambia	8	11.7	692	29.6	—	—	—	—
Etowah	17	6.7	82 960	7.0	70	1.0	24 063 016	.2
Fayette	8	10.1	89	11.9	4	—	1 966 000	—
Franklin	22	6.2	249 945	4.9	111	.8	36 746 981	.1
Geneva	25	4.5	267 558	1.9	84	.6	32 228 004	(L)
Greene	4	19.4	16	22.4	—	—	—	—
Hale	5	15.9	102	20.0	1	—	(D)	(D)
Henry	4	15.6	21	19.4	1	—	(D)	(D)
Houston	7	11.3	109 487	(L)	3	8.7	820 000	2.6
Jackson	41	5.1	233 610	6.5	63	.9	18 107 519	.2
Jefferson	6	15.8	101	17.7	1	—	(D)	(D)
Lamar	8	9.5	180	10.0	4	—	964 000	—
Lauderdale	30	5.7	39 024	15.7	9	3.1	2 701 110	.7
Lawrence	25	5.2	278 255	2.8	75	.6	22 908 527	.1
Lee	7	9.9	(D)	(D)	2	13.3	(D)	(D)
Limestone	33	4.9	139 323	3.2	12	—	5 308 715	—
Lowndes	8	10.2	(D)	(D)	15	—	5 703 000	—
Macon	9	11.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Madison	27	5.8	(D)	(D)	5	5.4	1 784 500	.7
Marengo	9	13.2	102	15.4	—	—	—	—
Marion	5	15.8	(D)	(D)	38	—	11 109 100	—
Marshall	38	3.6	1 408 227	.6	178	.5	63 740 099	.1
Mobile	26	6.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Monroe	7	14.8	125	18.4	1	—	(D)	(D)
Montgomery	13	10.3	(D)	(D)	7	—	2 722 000	—
Morgan	20	7.2	117 481	7.6	79	1.0	25 986 537	.2
Perry	15	7.4	185	9.2	1	26.6	(D)	(D)
Pickens	14	7.1	284 310	1.8	86	1.1	23 799 092	.3
Pike	11	6.0	137 138	2.4	46	1.0	18 009 774	.2
Randolph	36	3.0	729 491	1.6	53	1.4	20 672 313	.2
Russell	9	11.1	293	15.1	—	—	—	—
St. Clair	10	10.5	258	12.4	43	—	19 713 468	—
Shelby	10	10.5	180	11.4	—	—	—	—
Sumter	8	12.5	104	13.8	—	—	—	—
Talladega	13	8.4	(D)	(D)	20	2.2	6 822 716	.2
Tallapoosa	13	6.4	76 884	(L)	4	—	1 236 000	—
Tuscaloosa	15	8.3	165	11.2	15	2.3	5 852 481	(L)
Walker	15	8.5	32 541	18.7	51	—	23 314 813	—
Washington	33	5.1	212 294	4.0	22	2.2	4 496 188	.7
Wilcox	8	10.2	187	17.8	1	—	(D)	(D)
Winston	27	4.2	429 879	2.2	92	.9	23 523 119	.2

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed					Wheat for grain						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels		
Alabama	3 687	.6	230 484	.4	19 735 218	.4	732	.9	82 440	.6	3 326 421	.5
Autauga	36	4.4	1 035	3.4	75 906	4.3	9	8.6	1 340	6.4	50 360	5.5
Baldwin	102	2.2	8 588	1.1	838 687	1.0	48	3.2	6 320	2.5	203 200	2.1
Barbour	80	2.6	3 192	1.6	276 702	1.3	8	3.6	490	.6	19 400	.1
Bibb	8	10.2	81	11.3	2 510	10.9	—	—	—	—	—	—

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested												
	Corn for grain or seed					Wheat for grain							
	Farms		Acres		Quantity			Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Blount	45	3.6	1 630	3.4	150 203	3.3	5	15.0	169	11.5	6 239	8.8	
Bullock	13	7.2	426	4.5	24 979	3.7	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Butler	40	3.9	2 642	3.4	199 145	2.0	5	13.1	434	6.0	12 446	9.8	
Calhoun	35	4.3	1 958	6.5	174 573	5.8	11	8.4	872	12.5	39 906	9.8	
Chambers	11	7.7	155	5.0	8 345	4.7	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Cherokee	40	4.3	2 115	6.2	150 574	6.0	17	6.0	1 001	7.3	37 441	8.0	
Chilton	48	3.9	774	4.6	41 671	4.8	7	7.9	460	6.7	18 620	7.3	
Choctaw	25	6.3	201	8.2	8 319	11.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Clarke	18	8.4	358	5.9	29 621	4.7	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Clay	12	8.9	165	26.5	14 215	30.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Cleburne	20	6.6	922	6.9	56 243	5.6	2	14.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Coffee	137	2.3	5 786	1.8	499 387	2.1	11	5.9	564	9.2	22 629	9.1	
Colbert	39	4.3	4 712	.3	465 878	.1	3	17.6	105	19.6	4 025	22.2	
Conecuh	78	2.6	3 024	2.0	238 376	2.1	7	7.0	532	2.3	20 380	2.1	
Coosa	13	7.8	114	10.4	6 053	11.0	1	31.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Covington	100	2.5	2 393	2.2	203 946	2.1	14	3.8	999	2.7	38 442	2.6	
Crenshaw	87	2.6	4 323	1.6	388 890	1.8	7	7.8	414	7.1	14 356	6.2	
Cullman	117	2.4	4 132	1.7	372 173	1.9	19	6.4	1 056	6.0	43 724	5.5	
Dale	77	2.4	4 169	1.4	353 679	1.4	14	2.2	1 373	3.3	41 608	1.8	
Dallas	39	3.9	4 012	2.1	296 215	1.4	16	4.0	2 848	5.2	110 452	4.0	
De Kalb	196	1.8	16 218	1.5	1 364 696	1.6	18	5.3	693	3.7	27 897	3.2	
Elmore	44	3.7	2 167	2.0	168 642	1.4	6	9.1	640	7.0	28 877	10.3	
Escambia	75	2.8	4 552	2.2	490 315	2.5	36	3.8	3 380	3.0	171 095	3.2	
Etowah	40	4.3	1 618	3.7	137 765	4.2	4	12.0	202	7.1	5 880	4.8	
Fayette	51	3.4	2 549	4.3	175 815	4.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Franklin	41	4.8	1 219	7.4	65 602	7.5	2	24.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Geneva	172	1.7	8 128	2.5	679 158	2.2	17	7.0	970	3.4	26 287	2.7	
Greene	37	5.2	1 599	6.4	135 992	4.9	8	10.0	1 418	9.3	38 720	5.8	
Hale	22	6.5	1 153	1.9	92 212	2.2	10	6.8	2 656	4.9	101 319	4.2	
Henry	65	2.2	5 079	.9	455 486	.8	25	2.9	1 595	2.1	49 007	2.0	
Houston	170	1.7	9 265	1.5	884 403	1.1	60	2.6	4 935	2.1	147 281	2.1	
Jackson	163	2.1	21 829	1.1	1 698 124	1.7	31	4.6	3 233	2.2	126 529	1.5	
Jefferson	11	8.9	37	10.9	1 990	11.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Lamar	66	3.3	1 803	3.4	102 559	3.2	3	17.4	333	9.3	12 100	8.7	
Lauderdale	128	2.3	7 097	1.0	531 900	.9	44	2.9	5 314	1.0	225 214	1.0	
Lawrence	77	3.1	8 133	1.1	869 657	1.1	12	5.8	2 341	.6	139 097	.4	
Lee	10	8.5	152	9.2	6 850	10.2	4	10.9	167	11.4	7 400	11.6	
Limestone	92	2.4	8 411	2.2	714 632	2.3	45	3.3	5 590	1.9	269 438	1.6	
Lowndes	16	7.4	2 575	.7	250 369	.6	3	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Macon	15	6.3	1 054	2.9	97 392	3.0	5	10.3	330	17.5	15 245	19.2	
Madison	113	2.3	15 038	1.1	1 230 174	1.1	68	2.7	10 228	1.1	473 707	1.2	
Marengo	18	7.8	829	10.9	40 647	12.5	1	29.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Marion	72	3.0	3 820	2.4	241 164	2.6	7	7.6	450	3.2	18 714	4.0	
Marshall	90	2.4	6 999	1.7	536 967	1.9	10	6.6	1 352	1.5	45 357	1.1	
Mobile	42	4.5	2 737	1.5	242 850	1.2	2	16.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Monroe	91	2.9	3 407	3.2	339 833	3.8	7	6.8	349	4.9	17 463	5.4	
Montgomery	16	7.4	975	5.8	70 950	2.9	7	9.0	722	1.4	30 652	1.3	
Morgan	56	3.7	5 901	3.4	514 636	3.2	17	5.5	1 954	2.9	97 535	3.1	
Perry	29	5.5	1 310	5.1	83 989	5.1	6	10.8	1 029	9.6	36 008	11.6	
Pickens	25	6.2	2 863	2.4	250 146	2.2	7	9.7	2 312	1.8	92 984	1.9	
Pike	86	2.4	4 521	2.1	419 565	2.0	9	—	593	—	22 245	—	
Randolph	50	4.1	605	4.3	38 246	3.9	2	15.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Russell	14	6.0	558	3.9	40 414	3.7	6	6.5	457	.5	20 103	.5	
St. Clair	9	8.7	166	13.9	8 200	6.4	1	32.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Shelby	12	7.8	344	2.5	25 360	1.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Sumter	30	5.2	896	4.4	67 078	6.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Talladega	38	4.2	7 205	2.1	828 906	2.0	14	5.1	4 120	1.5	156 450	1.3	
Tallapoosa	15	6.7	347	6.2	25 004	3.1	2	12.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Tuscaloosa	42	3.8	4 464	3.0	432 218	2.0	9	7.7	1 162	3.5	56 540	2.3	
Walker	17	6.9	87	8.5	5 090	10.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Washington	74	3.4	3 012	3.8	247 320	4.0	11	7.9	1 205	5.6	51 862	6.0	
Wilcox	22	5.4	2 731	.7	239 957	.4	4	8.7	1 033	3.4	35 385	2.5	
Winston	15	6.6	124	2.3	6 655	2.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.												
	Cotton					Soybeans for beans							
	Farms		Acres		Quantity			Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Alabama	1 470	.6	433 160	.3	523 864	.2	1 889	.6	316 019	.4	7 867 880	.4	
Autauga	29	3.6	9 956	1.1	13 374	1.3	14	5.2	1 381	5.6	29 376	3.0	
Baldwin	46	2.7	13 040	1.1	20 073	.9	183	1.6	36 081	1.2	901 131	1.2	
Barbour	28	3.3	8 292	1.9	9 415	1.3	4	10.9	428	8.2	5 935	5.9	
Bibb	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Cotton					Soybeans for beans						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Blount	4	6.7	1 394	3.1	1 597	3.4	34	3.8	3 222	3.5	86 874	3.5
Bullock	7	7.9	1 051	4.2	1 389	4.0	3	11.1	331	3.1	7 152	2.5
Butler	4	13.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	5	9.4	1 034	5.9	20 020	6.1
Calhoun	2	17.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	34	4.5	3 721	7.0	97 104	5.6
Chambers	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cherokee	69	2.7	20 041	1.2	24 721	1.1	72	2.7	10 123	2.7	222 213	2.8
Chilton	3	9.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	11	6.2	1 124	6.5	17 392	3.3
Choctaw	2	13.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Clarke	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Clay	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cleburne	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	19.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Coffee	114	2.4	17 177	1.2	14 158	1.0	18	5.7	1 891	4.8	22 096	5.6
Colbert	32	3.8	25 509	.5	27 733	.6	29	3.9	3 401	3.1	94 080	2.7
Conecuh	10	5.7	1 260	3.3	1 585	3.3	13	5.9	899	2.8	17 007	2.9
Coosa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Covington	66	2.4	14 192	.9	20 276	.6	30	4.2	1 714	4.6	41 549	4.9
Crenshaw	16	4.4	2 653	5.1	2 931	4.7	2	14.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cullman	3	10.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	62	3.1	5 681	2.7	154 085	3.0
Dale	37	2.9	10 359	1.6	9 024	1.5	5	8.2	390	3.3	5 485	6.3
Dallas	26	2.9	14 664	.8	17 873	.7	25	2.5	8 775	.8	181 848	.4
De Kalb	2	22.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	127	2.2	10 827	1.9	275 980	1.9
Elmore	38	2.7	19 393	1.0	28 524	.7	8	6.8	1 371	2.6	34 056	3.7
Escambia	75	2.2	21 522	.8	33 372	.7	69	2.7	5 981	2.3	154 232	2.3
Etowah	18	4.6	3 072	3.1	3 478	2.9	23	4.4	2 528	2.9	61 977	2.5
Fayette	4	—	2 420	—	2 369	—	14	6.6	1 562	7.0	34 794	10.2
Franklin	4	9.6	738	.3	703	.3	14	7.3	862	6.9	23 862	6.9
Geneva	125	2.0	19 106	.9	19 240	.9	70	2.9	4 374	2.8	79 739	3.1
Greene	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	6	11.4	2 360	5.3	46 900	6.6
Hale	2	18.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	16	5.0	7 195	2.6	144 502	2.8
Henry	75	1.9	19 632	.7	17 091	.8	10	5.5	685	4.8	10 424	5.2
Houston	128	1.9	27 910	1.4	25 404	.9	102	2.2	7 607	1.8	136 555	2.1
Jackson	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	131	2.3	26 992	1.6	707 479	1.6
Jefferson	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	39.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lamar	5	7.7	155	5.1	266	7.6	14	6.9	2 352	7.1	49 027	5.5
Lauderdale	72	2.1	22 968	1.2	25 682	1.1	79	2.4	11 994	2.0	301 708	1.9
Lawrence	43	3.2	24 769	.9	26 808	.6	59	3.2	12 734	1.4	348 224	1.3
Lee	11	7.0	2 454	4.7	2 691	4.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Limestone	54	2.7	21 951	.8	23 978	.7	138	1.8	36 287	1.2	1 046 298	1.1
Lowndes	6	9.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Macon	13	4.6	5 964	1.6	8 409	1.5	4	—	455	—	8 250	—
Madison	30	4.8	5 456	2.1	5 155	2.6	167	1.8	43 413	.8	1 149 660	.8
Marengo	9	9.3	3 528	3.7	5 198	3.3	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Marion	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	25	3.8	3 423	3.7	75 990	3.5
Marshall	2	11.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	71	2.9	7 679	2.6	200 446	2.7
Mobile	21	4.7	13 313	1.2	18 149	1.1	11	5.9	2 778	3.7	71 389	2.9
Monroe	92	2.1	27 857	.9	49 476	.9	10	7.4	405	8.9	9 635	11.7
Montgomery	3	—	1 372	—	2 177	—	7	6.5	2 241	1.3	47 256	1.0
Morgan	4	8.3	2 110	1.7	2 671	1.8	49	3.8	7 558	3.0	183 983	2.4
Perry	—	—	—	—	—	—	20	4.6	8 640	2.3	208 086	1.7
Pickens	3	—	1 291	—	1 788	—	13	6.6	6 675	4.8	160 967	4.2
Pike	65	2.3	12 928	1.1	13 044	.8	8	—	615	—	12 350	—
Randolph	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Russell	6	9.5	5 815	5.0	5 627	2.8	4	13.6	575	9.4	3 909	9.2
St. Clair	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Shelby	24	4.3	4 313	2.5	6 111	2.4	4	8.4	340	8.8	4 465	10.8
Sumter	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	8.4	1 836	5.8	42 695	7.9
Talladega	5	9.2	1 749	1.6	2 578	1.6	27	4.9	6 997	2.8	171 037	2.4
Tallapoosa	2	13.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	4	11.3	394	8.6	4 696	10.1
Tuscaloosa	17	4.9	4 313	2.5	6 961	1.9	9	6.3	2 118	7.1	64 490	5.8
Walker	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	10	7.8	1 171	5.8	25 875	6.1
Wilcox	5	8.3	2 627	.4	3 341	.3	6	9.0	1 179	5.8	24 329	3.1
Winston	1	31.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Peanuts for nuts					Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Alabama	1 510	.7	181 393	.3	356 492 286	.3	19 085	.5	778 602	.5	1 750 870	.5
Autauga	3	13.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	153	1.8	10 835	2.1	24 462	1.9
Baldwin	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	299	1.4	12 416	2.2	27 484	2.2
Barbour	119	1.7	12 766	1.0	24 938 870	1.1	161	1.7	6 219	2.0	16 258	1.6
Bibb	—	—	—	—	—	—	90	2.2	4 252	2.7	10 544	3.2

See footnotes at end of table.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1997—Con.

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Peanuts for nuts						Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Blount	—	—	—	—	—	—	587	.9	18 419	1.5	43 936	1.4
Bullock	10	7.6	866	2.3	2 186 242	1.7	106	2.3	7 726	3.0	17 897	3.8
Butler	17	6.0	1 351	3.0	3 424 120	1.9	223	1.3	9 806	2.2	25 505	1.9
Calhoun	—	—	—	—	—	—	300	1.2	10 331	1.7	23 750	2.3
Chambers	—	—	—	—	—	—	142	1.8	7 361	2.9	15 277	4.5
Cherokee	—	—	—	—	—	—	213	1.6	10 183	1.9	22 785	2.2
Chilton	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	302	1.3	11 064	2.4	28 328	2.3
Choctaw	—	—	—	—	—	—	116	2.2	4 706	3.4	10 920	2.8
Clarke	—	—	—	—	—	—	121	2.2	5 000	3.1	12 957	4.0
Clay	1	23.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	175	1.5	7 846	1.7	18 218	1.9
Cleburne	—	—	—	—	—	—	172	1.7	5 253	2.7	10 237	2.5
Coffee	216	1.6	22 323	1.1	40 218 323	1.0	276	1.5	8 240	1.9	21 326	1.9
Colbert	—	—	—	—	—	—	257	1.5	9 048	1.9	19 168	2.1
Conecuh	13	4.8	897	2.4	1 779 656	3.2	165	1.5	6 463	1.8	19 035	2.5
Coosa	—	—	—	—	—	—	78	2.7	3 546	4.5	6 885	4.8
Covington	117	1.9	9 457	.8	23 584 138	.8	316	1.2	10 862	1.4	30 401	1.5
Crenshaw	57	3.0	4 931	1.3	9 526 536	1.5	229	1.4	9 310	2.0	29 299	1.8
Cullman	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 194	.7	36 688	.9	88 150	1.0
Dale	113	1.8	15 512	.6	25 530 983	.8	166	1.6	6 474	2.9	19 164	3.4
Dallas	—	—	—	—	—	—	171	1.8	12 952	2.0	31 525	1.9
De Kalb	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 103	.8	33 145	1.2	77 611	1.7
Elmore	—	—	—	—	—	—	228	1.5	10 284	2.0	24 378	1.9
Escambia	5	5.6	589	3.5	1 369 850	3.0	113	2.5	4 423	2.4	9 806	3.2
Etowah	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	429	1.0	13 822	1.7	30 468	1.9
Fayette	2	20.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	161	1.5	5 642	2.6	15 139	3.6
Franklin	—	—	—	—	—	—	411	1.2	14 241	1.9	29 672	2.3
Geneva	254	1.4	25 854	.7	52 258 640	.8	300	1.3	8 861	1.8	22 473	2.2
Greene	4	15.6	4	15.6	5 956	18.9	117	2.3	8 374	3.1	17 737	3.3
Hale	—	—	—	—	—	—	176	2.0	11 646	2.3	26 405	2.1
Henry	142	1.3	31 794	.5	61 017 548	.5	92	2.0	5 323	3.5	9 825	4.6
Houston	297	1.1	39 899	.6	79 295 661	.6	208	1.6	10 738	.9	23 049	1.1
Jackson	2	28.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	723	1.1	24 282	1.4	52 903	1.6
Jefferson	1	36.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	168	2.0	6 324	3.0	14 075	3.4
Lamar	1	34.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	208	1.5	7 794	2.2	17 477	2.5
Lauderdale	3	16.7	3	16.7	738	18.5	689	1.0	26 092	1.1	47 078	1.4
Lawrence	—	—	—	—	—	—	663	1.2	22 701	1.9	42 406	1.9
Lee	—	—	—	—	—	—	112	2.1	4 049	3.0	10 804	3.5
Limestone	—	—	—	—	—	—	524	1.1	21 592	1.5	38 145	1.7
Lowndes	1	26.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	130	2.0	13 463	1.7	28 095	1.5
Macon	—	—	—	—	—	—	115	2.0	5 763	2.8	13 267	2.6
Madison	—	—	—	—	—	—	465	1.1	18 568	2.0	31 585	2.3
Marengo	3	24.6	28	25.3	68 514	26.2	225	1.7	18 631	1.9	32 529	2.4
Marion	—	—	—	—	—	—	339	1.2	10 298	1.6	22 478	1.7
Marshall	2	21.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	849	.8	24 774	1.2	59 137	1.3
Mobile	—	—	—	—	—	—	196	2.0	7 627	2.7	18 717	2.7
Monroe	2	15.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	184	1.8	7 790	2.6	19 890	2.8
Montgomery	3	12.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	287	1.5	24 266	1.9	51 638	2.7
Morgan	—	—	—	—	—	—	642	1.1	28 795	1.4	58 299	1.5
Perry	3	15.8	3	15.8	4 931	17.7	145	2.0	10 869	2.3	20 851	2.5
Pickens	2	23.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	231	1.5	10 118	3.0	26 433	2.8
Pike	104	2.0	12 647	.9	25 423 921	1.0	269	1.4	11 487	1.6	39 767	1.9
Randolph	—	—	—	—	—	—	275	1.3	8 878	2.2	17 908	2.4
Russell	6	—	2 115	—	5 064 000	—	94	2.4	5 167	3.3	14 354	4.0
St. Clair	1	38.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	290	1.4	11 780	2.1	27 254	2.2
Shelby	—	—	—	—	—	—	189	1.8	8 645	2.8	16 997	3.4
Sumter	2	30.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	165	1.9	10 040	3.0	21 877	3.7
Talladega	—	—	—	—	—	—	285	1.3	13 801	2.0	30 232	2.2
Tallapoosa	1	34.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	128	1.8	5 517	2.1	14 882	2.0
Tuscaloosa	—	—	—	—	—	—	248	1.4	11 043	1.9	21 838	2.0
Walker	—	—	—	—	—	—	253	1.4	11 108	3.3	21 971	2.2
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	—	212	1.7	6 454	2.8	14 371	3.4
Wilcox	—	—	—	—	—	—	114	2.2	9 332	3.9	19 767	3.3
Winston	—	—	—	—	—	—	318	1.2	10 055	1.5	23 771	2.1

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table G. Coverage Estimates: 1997

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

Item	Census total	Coverage total ¹	Adjusted census		Coverage adjustment (percent)
			Total	Relative standard error (percent)	
Farms number..	41 384	8 466	49 850	2.3	17.0
Land in farms acres..	8 704 385	713 827	9 418 212	2.2	7.6
Average size of farm acres..	210	84	189	(X)	(X)
Farms by size of farm:					
Less than 10 acres	2 141	658	2 799	11.2	23.5
10 to 49 acres	11 854	3 636	15 490	5.1	23.5
50 to 179 acres	16 015	3 161	19 176	3.4	16.5
180 acres or more	11 374	1 011	12 385	2.9	8.2
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than \$2,500	15 286	4 699	19 985	4.1	23.5
\$2,500 to \$9,999	13 219	2 878	16 097	3.9	17.9
\$10,000 or more	12 879	889	13 768	2.7	6.5
Market value of agricultural products sold \$1,000..	3 098 989	35 091	3 134 079	.8	1.1
Farms by type of organization:					
Individual or family	37 697	8 360	46 057	2.5	18.2
Partnership, corporation, or other	3 687	106	3 793	.9	2.8
Farms by tenure of operator:					
Full owners	27 509	6 924	34 433	3.1	20.1
Part owners	11 333	1 151	12 484	2.2	9.2
Tenants	2 542	391	2 933	9.2	13.3
Operators by place of residence:					
On farm operated	29 861	4 157	34 018	2.1	12.2
Not on farm operated	8 266	678	8 944	4.5	7.6
Not reported	3 257	3 631	6 888	10.0	52.7
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming	15 568	3 571	19 139	3.4	18.7
Other	25 816	4 895	30 711	3.1	15.9
Operators by sex:					
Male	37 865	7 340	45 205	2.3	16.2
Female.....	3 519	1 126	4 645	8.6	24.2
Operators by race:					
White	39 658	7 832	47 490	2.1	16.5
Black and other races	1 726	634	2 360	21.0	26.9
Operators by years on present farm:					
4 years or less	5 482	889	6 371	4.5	14.0
5 years or more	27 834	3 154	30 988	2.0	10.2
Not reported	8 068	4 423	12 491	6.8	35.4

¹ See text in Appendix C regarding coverage estimates.