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 .... number..	11.0	Corn for grain or seed .... acres..	2.8
Land in farms .... acres..	6.1	Wheat for grain .... acres..	4.7
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1] .... $1,000..	6.2	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold .... $1,000..	1.8	Cattle and calves... number..	4.2
Harvested cropland... acres..	5.3	Hogs and pigs .... number..	.7
		Layers 20 weeks old and older.............................. number..	.1

[1]Data 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	5.5	25	45.3
50	3.5	50	31.2
75	2.4	75	24.8
100	1.6	100	20.8
150	1.3	150	15.9
200	1.1	200	12.8
300	.9	300	8.6
500	.7	500	1.3
750	.6	750	1.1
1,000...	.5	1,000...	1.0
1,500...	.4	1,500...	.8
2,000...	.4	2,000...	.7

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)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS		
Farms ....number..	28 268	.7
Land in farms ....acres..	32 634 221	.5
Average size of farm ....acres..	1 154	.9
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) ....farms..	28 268	.7
$1,000..	4 534 213	.1
Average per farm ....dollars..	160 401	.7
Farms by value of sales:		
Less than $1,000 (see text) ....farms..	4 453	.9
$1,000..	773	1.2
$1,000 to $2,499 ....farms..	2 875	.9
$1,000..	4 748	.9
$2,500 to $4,999 ....farms..	2 849	.9
$1,000..	10 244	.9
$5,000 to $9,999 ....farms..	3 220	.9
$1,000..	22 904	.9
$10,000 to $19,999 ....farms..	3 301	1.0
$1,000..	47 075	1.1
$20,000 to $24,999 ....farms..	1 126	1.4
$1,000..	24 965	1.4
$25,000 to $39,999 ....farms..	2 019	1.3
$1,000..	63 911	1.3
$40,000 to $49,999 ....farms..	1 041	1.5
$1,000..	46 326	1.5
$50,000 to $99,999 ....farms..	2 620	1.2
$1,000..	186 680	1.2
$100,000 to $249,999 ....farms..	2 605	.8
$1,000..	406 530	.7
$250,000 to $499,999 ....farms..	1 169	–
$1,000..	401 744	–
$500,000 or more ....farms..	990	–
$1,000..	3 318 313	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ....farms..	14 103	.7
$1,000..	1 326 944	.3
Grains ....farms..	7 488	.8
$1,000..	644 163	.3
Corn for grain ....farms..	3 348	.8
$1,000..	310 046	.3
Wheat ....farms..	5 387	.8
$1,000..	239 989	.4
Soybeans ....farms..	14	6.3
$1,000..	346	4.3
Sorghum for grain ....farms..	447	1.6
$1,000..	10 264	1.3
Barley ....farms..	588	1.2
$1,000..	25 275	.6
Oats ....farms..	272	1.9
$1,000..	1 860	2.0
Other grains ....farms..	1 823	.7
$1,000..	56 382	.4
Cotton and cottonseed ....farms..	–	–
$1,000..	–	–
Tobacco ....farms..	–	–
$1,000..	–	–
Hay, silage, and field seeds ....farms..	8 414	.8
$1,000..	200 890	.7
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ....farms..	546	1.1
$1,000..	110 992	.2
Fruits, nuts, and berries ....farms..	442	1.5
$1,000..	10 029	2.3
Nursery and greenhouse crops ....farms..	631	1.2
$1,000..	211 743	.2
Other crops ....farms..	865	.8
$1,000..	149 127	.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products ....farms..	17 925	.7
$1,000..	3 207 269	.1
Poultry and poultry products ....farms..	680	1.3
$1,000..	142 212	(L)
Dairy products ....farms..	367	1.1
$1,000..	189 496	.1
Cattle and calves ....farms..	15 124	.7
$1,000..	2 537 589	.1
Hogs and pigs ....farms..	1 035	1.1
$1,000..	170 699	.1
Sheep, lambs, and wool ....farms..	1 631	1.0
$1,000..	137 930	.1
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ....farms..	2 913	.9
$1,000..	29 343	1.1
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ....farms..	1 752	.9
$1,000..	6 611	1.3

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses ....farms..	28 272	.7
$1,000..	3 725 343	.2
Average per farm ....dollars..	131 768	.7
Livestock and poultry purchased ....farms..	9 954	1.8
$1,000..	1 271 336	.2
Feed for livestock and poultry ....farms..	15 919	1.3
$1,000..	861 580	.2
Commercially mixed formula feeds ....farms..	8 403	2.1
$1,000..	254 594	.4
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ....farms..	10 288	1.6
$1,000..	86 109	1.1
Commercial fertilizer ....farms..	12 571	1.4
$1,000..	124 307	1.1
Agricultural chemicals ....farms..	11 335	1.6
$1,000..	74 701	1.5
Petroleum products ....farms..	25 745	.8
$1,000..	121 592	.8
Electricity ....farms..	18 055	1.2
$1,000..	68 478	1.0
Hired farm labor ....farms..	9 394	1.8
$1,000..	263 603	.6
Contract labor ....farms..	4 311	2.9
$1,000..	28 385	2.7
Repair and maintenance ....farms..	22 453	1.0
$1,000..	154 182	1.0
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ....farms..	9 669	1.8
$1,000..	74 222	1.6
Interest ....farms..	13 057	1.5
$1,000..	179 469	1.0
Secured by real estate ....farms..	8 767	2.0
$1,000..	104 910	1.5
Not secured by real estate ....farms..	7 689	2.0
$1,000..	74 559	1.2
Cash rent ....farms..	5 722	2.4
$1,000..	79 086	1.9
Property taxes ....farms..	25 319	.8
$1,000..	54 425	1.1
All other farm production expenses ....farms..	25 682	.8
$1,000..	283 871	.7
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)[1]		
All farms ....number..	28 272	.7
$1,000..	803 321	.8
Average per farm ....dollars..	28 414	1.1
Farms with net gains[2] ....number..	13 474	1.4
$1,000..	1 001 136	.6
Average net gain ....dollars..	74 301	1.5
Farms with net losses ....number..	14 798	1.3
$1,000..	197 816	1.5
Average net loss ....dollars..	13 368	2.0
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments ....farms..	8 972	.8
$1,000..	117 843	.8
Other farm-related income[1] ....farms..	8 665	2.1
$1,000..	67 178	3.2
Customwork and other agricultural services ....farms..	2 710	3.9
$1,000..	37 097	4.6
Gross cash rent or share payments ....farms..	3 378	3.7
$1,000..	22 031	5.0
Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ....farms..	197	15.5
$1,000..	1 174	22.5
Other farm-related income sources ....farms..	4 532	2.8
$1,000..	6 875	5.4
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total ....farms..	904	1.1
$1,000..	34 350	.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..	22 357	.7	All operators ..... farms..	28 268	.7
acres..	10 509 384	.5	acres..	32 634 221	.5
Harvested cropland ..... farms..	18 406	.7	Full owners ..... farms..	16 486	.7
acres..	5 896 984	.4	acres..	9 976 307	.6
Farms by acres harvested:			Part owners ..... farms..	8 439	.8
1 to 9 acres ..... farms..	2 341	.9	acres..	19 293 351	.5
acres..	10 755	1.0	Tenants ..... farms..	3 343	.9
10 to 19 acres ..... farms..	1 707	1.0	acres..	3 364 563	.8
acres..	22 560	1.0			
20 to 29 acres ..... farms..	1 221	1.1	**OWNED AND RENTED LAND**		
acres..	27 917	1.1			
30 to 49 acres ..... farms..	1 755	1.0	Land owned..... farms..	25 093	.7
acres..	64 580	1.0	acres..	22 427 388	.5
50 to 99 acres ..... farms..	2 369	1.1	Owned land in farms ..... farms..	24 925	.7
acres..	165 007	1.1	acres..	20 465 506	.5
100 to 199 acres..... farms..	2 528	1.2	Land rented or leased from others ..... farms..	11 914	.7
acres..	347 782	1.2	acres..	12 440 550	.6
200 to 499 acres ..... farms..	3 196	1.1	landlords..	26 071	.8
acres..	1 003 358	1.1	Rented or leased land in farms ..... farms..	11 782	.7
500 to 999 acres ..... farms..	1 784	.9	acres..	12 168 715	.6
acres..	1 247 066	.9	Land rented or leased to others ..... farms..	3 855	.9
1,000 acres or more..... farms..	1 505	—	acres..	2 233 717	1.3
acres..	3 007 959	—			
Cropland:			**OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS**		
Pasture or grazing only ..... farms..	8 254	.8			
acres..	700 536	1.0	Operators by place of residence:		
Other cropland ..... farms..	8 001	.8	On farm operated	20 500	.7
acres..	3 911 864	.7	Not on farm operated	5 958	.9
			Not reported	1 810	.7
Total woodland ..... farms..	2 357	.9	Operators by principal occupation:		
acres..	1 177 843	.8	Farming	15 399	.8
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and			Other	12 869	.8
woodland pastured..... farms..	12 952	.7	Operators by days worked off farm:		
acres..	19 943 701	.5	Any	15 459	.7
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. ..... farms..	16 041	.7	200 days or more	9 615	.8
acres..	1 003 293	.8	Operators by sex:		
Irrigated land ..... farms..	15 470	.7	Male ..... farms..	25 067	.7
acres..	3 430 129	.5	acres..	30 765 706	.5
			Female ..... farms..	3 201	.9
Acres irrigated:			acres..	1 868 515	1.2
1 to 9 acres ..... farms..	2 295	.9	Average age of operator ..... years..	53.8	1.0
acres..	10 973	1.0			
10 to 49 acres ..... farms..	4 390	.8	**FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION**		
acres..	108 471	.8			
50 to 99 acres ..... farms..	2 117	1.1	Individual or family (sole proprietorship)..... farms..	23 281	.7
acres..	147 918	1.1	acres..	20 015 329	.6
100 to 199 acres ..... farms..	2 245	1.2	Partnership ..... farms..	2 789	1.0
acres..	310 016	1.2	acres..	5 837 397	.6
200 to 499 acres ..... farms..	2 603	1.1	Corporation:		
acres..	817 367	1.0	Family held ..... farms..	1 688	1.1
500 to 999 acres ..... farms..	1 183	.7	acres..	4 426 099	.5
acres..	816 339	.6	More than 10 stockholders ..... farms..	45	3.6
1,000 acres or more..... farms..	637	.4	10 or less stockholders ..... farms..	1 643	1.1
acres..	1 219 045	.4	Other than family held ..... farms..	198	2.0
			acres..	520 277	1.2
Harvested cropland irrigated ..... farms..	13 559	.7	More than 10 stockholders ..... farms..	36	4.4
acres..	2 762 068	.5	10 or less stockholders ..... farms..	162	2.1
Pasture and other land irrigated ..... farms..	5 930	.8	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. ..... farms..	312	1.9
acres..	668 061	1.0	acres..	1 835 119	.5
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands					
Reserve Programs ..... farms..	3 692	1.0	**HIRED FARM LABOR**[1]		
acres..	1 567 513	1.2			
			Hired workers by days worked:		
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]			150 days or more ..... farms..	4 406	2.3
			workers..	15 232	1.1
Estimated market value of land and buildings ..... farms..	28 272	.7	Less than 150 days ..... farms..	8 204	2.0
$1,000..	19 992 983	1.1	workers..	30 840	2.0
Average per farm ..... dollars..	707 165	1.3			
Average per acre ..... dollars..	618	1.5	**INJURIES AND DEATHS**		
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]			Farm-related injuries:		
			Operator and family members ..... farms..	354	1.6
Estimated market value of all machinery and			number..	406	1.7
equipment ..... farms..	28 271	.7	Hired workers ..... farms..	300	1.1
$1,000..	2 019 029	1.2	number..	607	.7
Average per farm ..... dollars..	71 417	1.4	Farm-related deaths:		
			Operator and family members ..... farms..	11	—
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]			number..	12	—
			Hired workers ..... farms..	5	—
Commercial fertilizer ..... farms..	12 519	1.5	number..	5	—
acres on which used..	4 084 229	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)
FARMS BY SIZE			
1 to 9 acres	farms..	2 502	.9
	acres..	10 198	1.0
10 to 49 acres	farms..	5 516	.8
	acres..	147 699	.8
50 to 69 acres	farms..	1 089	1.1
	acres..	62 772	1.1
70 to 99 acres	farms..	1 665	1.0
	acres..	134 490	1.0
100 to 139 acres	farms..	1 295	1.1
	acres..	150 071	1.1
140 to 179 acres	farms..	1 699	1.1
	acres..	268 650	1.1
180 to 219 acres	farms..	795	1.4
	acres..	156 361	1.4
220 to 259 acres	farms..	729	1.4
	acres..	174 149	1.4
260 to 499 acres	farms..	3 309	1.0
	acres..	1 204 543	1.0
500 to 999 acres	farms..	3 030	1.0
	acres..	2 163 266	1.1
1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms..	2 731	1.0
	acres..	3 826 126	1.1
2,000 acres or more	farms..	3 908	.7
	acres..	24 335 896	.4
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM			
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	farms..	5 820	.8
	acres..	8 464 304	.5
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)	farms..	492	1.1
	acres..	308 952	.5
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)	farms..	464	1.5
	acres..	22 119	3.8
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)	farms..	533	1.3
	acres..	116 092	3.1
Other crop farming (1119)	farms..	4 838	.8
	acres..	3 081 696	.7
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)	farms..	10 883	.8
	acres..	17 728 728	.6
Cattle feedlots (112112)	farms..	786	1.0
	acres..	1 200 837	.6
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)	farms..	301	1.1
	acres..	191 403	1.5
Hog and pig farming (1122)	farms..	398	1.6
	acres..	139 246	1.7
Poultry and egg production (1123)	farms..	150	2.4
	acres..	17 837	3.1
Sheep and goat farming (1124)	farms..	741	1.2
	acres..	639 994	.5
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)	farms..	2 862	.9
	acres..	723 013	1.6

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms..	15 592	.7
	number..	3 307 301	.3
Beef cows	farms..	12 243	.8
	number..	918 891	.7
Milk cows	farms..	814	1.1
	number..	79 617	.2
Cattle and calves sold	farms..	15 124	.7
	number..	3 751 788	.2
	$1,000..	2 537 589	.1
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms..	1 225	1.0
	number..	787 440	.1
Hogs and pigs sold	farms..	1 035	1.1
	number..	1 452 164	.2
	$1,000..	170 699	.1
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms..	1 628	1.0
	number..	593 755	.3
Sheep and lambs sold	farms..	1 552	1.0
	number..	1 217 150	.1
Horses and ponies inventory	farms..	11 185	.7
	number..	81 665	.8
Horses and ponies sold	farms..	2 168	.9
	number..	9 138	2.3
POULTRY			
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	farms..	1 628	1.0
	number..	3 793 457	(L)
Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms..	1 577	1.0
	number..	3 595 189	(L)
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms..	74	3.5
	number..	11 933	6.9
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED			
Corn for grain or seed	farms..	3 579	.7
	acres..	919 784	.4
	bushels..	130 170 731	.3
Corn for silage or green chop	farms..	1 160	.9
	acres..	96 344	.6
	tons, green..	2 021 799	.6
Sorghum for grain or seed	farms..	504	1.5
	acres..	148 004	1.2
	bushels..	5 272 619	1.2
Wheat for grain	farms..	5 407	.8
	acres..	2 515 100	.4
	bushels..	76 656 526	.4
Barley for grain	farms..	657	1.1
	acres..	84 564	.7
	bushels..	8 639 798	.6
Oats for grain	farms..	404	1.6
	acres..	20 001	1.7
	bushels..	1 112 532	1.8
Dry edible beans, excluding dry limas	farms..	1 095	.8
	acres..	116 544	.6
	cwt..	2 028 685	.5
Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	farms..	320	1.1
	acres..	85 446	.3
	cwt..	28 081 460	.3
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms..	13 446	.7
	acres..	1 607 991	.7
	tons, dry..	3 989 176	.7
Alfalfa hay	farms..	9 528	.7
	acres..	833 471	.7
	tons, dry..	2 715 837	.7
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms..	546	1.1
	acres..	43 026	.3
Land in orchards	farms..	761	1.2
	acres..	7 753	1.9

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

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of $10,000 or More: 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 EXPENSES[1]**		
Farms ....number..	14 871	.8	Total farm production expenses ....farms..	14 915	.8
Land in farms ....acres..	28 888 209	.5	$1,000..	3 639 635	.2
Average size of farm ....acres..	1 943	.9	Average per farm ....dollars..	244 025	.9
			Livestock and poultry purchased ....farms..	6 249	2.1
			$1,000..	1 263 406	.2
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			Feed for livestock and poultry ....farms..	9 138	1.5
			$1,000..	850 996	.2
			Commercially mixed formula feeds ....farms..	4 714	2.6
Total sales (see text) ....farms..	14 871	.8	$1,000..	252 057	.4
$1,000..	4 495 545	.1	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ....farms..	8 063	1.6
Average per farm ....dollars..	302 303	.8	$1,000..	85 108	1.1
Farms by value of sales:			Commercial fertilizer ....farms..	9 220	1.5
$10,000 to $19,999 ....farms..	3 301	1.0	$1,000..	121 972	1.1
$1,000..	47 075	1.0	Agricultural chemicals ....farms..	8 041	1.7
$20,000 to $24,999 ....farms..	1 126	1.4	$1,000..	73 379	1.5
$1,000..	24 965	1.4	Petroleum products ....farms..	14 569	.9
$25,000 to $39,999 ....farms..	2 019	1.3	$1,000..	113 758	.9
$1,000..	63 911	1.3	Electricity ....farms..	11 694	1.2
$40,000 to $49,999 ....farms..	1 041	1.5	$1,000..	66 100	1.1
$1,000..	46 326	1.5	Hired farm labor ....farms..	7 214	1.8
$50,000 to $99,999 ....farms..	2 620	1.2	$1,000..	261 861	.7
$1,000..	186 680	1.2	Contract labor ....farms..	3 122	3.2
$100,000 to $249,999 ....farms..	2 605	.8	$1,000..	27 343	2.8
$1,000..	406 530	.7	Repair and maintenance ....farms..	13 527	1.0
$250,000 to $499,999 ....farms..	1 169	–	$1,000..	141 643	.9
$1,000..	401 744	–	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ....farms..	6 555	2.0
$500,000 or more............................farms..	990	–	$1,000..	71 751	1.7
$1,000..	3 318 313	–	Interest ....farms..	9 369	1.5
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			$1,000..	168 639	1.0
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops.....farms..	10 010	.8	Secured by real estate ....farms..	6 175	2.1
$1,000..	1 314 528	.3	$1,000..	95 981	1.5
Grains......................................farms..	6 670	.8	Not secured by real estate ....farms..	6 105	2.1
$1,000..	640 975	.3	$1,000..	72 658	1.1
Corn for grain ....farms..	3 205	.7	Cash rent ....farms..	4 467	2.5
$1,000..	309 584	.3	$1,000..	76 935	2.0
Wheat....................................farms..	4 810	.8	Property taxes..................................farms..	13 227	1.0
$1,000..	237 685	.4	$1,000..	42 738	1.2
Soybeans..................................farms..	14	6.3	All other farm production expenses.................farms..	14 913	.8
$1,000..	346	4.2	$1,000..	274 006	.7
Sorghum for grain ....farms..	415	1.6			
$1,000..	10 184	1.3	**NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)[1]**		
Barley ....farms..	559	1.2			
$1,000..	25 208	.6	All farms.......................................number..	14 915	.8
Oats ....farms..	226	2.1	$1,000..	850 107	.8
$1,000..	1 774	2.0	Average per farm ....dollars..	56 997	1.1
Other grains ....farms..	1 769	.7	Farms with net gains[2] ....number..	10 501	1.4
$1,000..	56 193	.4	$1,000..	995 265	.6
Cotton and cottonseed ....farms..	–	–	Average net gain ....dollars..	94 778	1.5
$1,000..	–	–	Farms with net losses ....number..	4 414	2.8
Tobacco ....farms..	–	–	$1,000..	145 158	1.8
$1,000..	–	–	Average net loss.............................dollars..	32 886	3.3
Hay, silage, and field seeds ....farms..	5 417	.9			
$1,000..	193 240	.7	**GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME**		
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ....farms..	430	1.2			
$1,000..	110 658	.2			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ....farms..	216	2.2	Government payments ....farms..	6 765	.8
$1,000..	9 514	2.4	$1,000..	95 011	.7
Nursery and greenhouse crops ....farms..	447	1.3	Other farm-related income[1] ....farms..	5 570	2.3
$1,000..	211 084	.2	$1,000..	57 738	3.4
Other crops ....farms..	834	.8	Customwork and other agricultural services ....farms..	1 988	4.3
$1,000..	149 057	.2	$1,000..	34 719	4.8
Livestock, poultry, and their products ....farms..	10 375	.8	Gross cash rent or share payments ....farms..	1 712	4.9
$1,000..	3 181 017	.1	$1,000..	15 840	5.4
Poultry and poultry products...................farms..	193	2.3	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ....farms..	117	19.6
$1,000..	141 927	(L)	$1,000..	963	26.7
Dairy products..............................farms..	350	1.1	Other farm-related income sources.................farms..	3 458	2.9
$1,000..	189 455	.1	$1,000..	6 216	5.1
Cattle and calves ....farms..	9 570	.8			
$1,000..	2 517 836	.1	**COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS**		
Hogs and pigs ....farms..	460	1.5			
$1,000..	169 873	.1			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ....farms..	736	1.3			
$1,000..	136 593	.1			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)....................................farms..	1 214	1.1			
$1,000..	25 332	1.2			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ....farms..	671	1.3	Total ....farms..	864	1.0
$1,000..	5 115	1.6	$1,000..	34 285	.4

See footnotes at end of table.

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)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			**FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION**		
			Individual or family (sole proprietorship) .... farms..	11 281	.9
Total cropland .... farms..	12 776	.8	acres..	17 549 626	.6
acres..	9 473 142	.5	Partnership .... farms..	1 966	1.0
Harvested cropland .... farms..	11 946	.8	acres..	5 367 574	.6
acres..	5 685 012	.4	Corporation:		
Cropland:			Family held .... farms..	1 319	1.0
Pasture or grazing only .... farms..	3 733	1.0	acres..	4 082 872	.5
acres..	436 097	1.2	More than 10 stockholders .... farms..	32	3.4
Total woodland .... farms..	1 058	1.2	10 or less stockholders .... farms..	1 287	1.0
acres..	836 495	1.0	Other than family held .... farms..	142	2.0
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and			acres..	430 738	1.2
woodland pastured................................ farms..	7 798	.8	More than 10 stockholders .... farms..	25	4.4
acres..	17 765 699	.5	10 or less stockholders .... farms..	117	2.2
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. .... farms..	8 511	.8	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. .... farms..	163	2.3
acres..	812 873	.9	acres..	1 457 399	.5
Irrigated land .... farms..	9 327	.8			
acres..	3 211 083	.5	**HIRED FARM LABOR[1]**		
Harvested cropland irrigated .... farms..	8 812	.8	Hired workers by days worked:		
acres..	2 651 877	.5	150 days or more .... farms..	3 950	2.3
Pasture and other land irrigated .... farms..	2 903	1.0	workers..	14 748	1.0
acres..	559 206	1.1	Less than 150 days .... farms..	6 083	2.1
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands			workers..	26 940	2.0
Reserve Programs .... farms..	2 241	1.0			
acres..	1 031 467	1.1	**INJURIES AND DEATHS**		
			Farm-related injuries:		
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]			Operator and family members .... farms..	222	1.9
			number..	257	1.9
Estimated market value of land and buildings .... farms..	14 915	.8	Hired workers .... farms..	290	1.0
$1,000..	15 951 956	1.3	number..	597	.6
Average per farm ....dollars..	1 069 524	1.5	Farm-related deaths:		
Average per acre ....dollars..	560	1.7	Operator and family members .... farms..	7	–
			number..	(D)	(D)
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]			Hired workers .... farms..	5	–
			number..	(D)	(D)
Estimated market value of all machinery and					
equipment .... farms..	14 914	.8	**FARMS BY SIZE**		
$1,000..	1 680 180	1.2			
Average per farm ....dollars..	112 658	1.5	1 to 9 acres	562	1.5
			10 to 49 acres	889	1.2
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]			50 to 69 acres	298	1.9
			70 to 99 acres	609	1.4
Commercial fertilizer .... farms..	9 212	1.5	100 to 139 acres	531	1.6
acres on which used..	3 976 311	1.4	140 to 179 acres	808	1.4
			180 to 219 acres	447	1.7
TENURE OF OPERATOR			220 to 259 acres	415	1.8
			260 to 499 acres	2 098	1.2
All operators .... farms..	14 871	.8	500 to 999 acres	2 290	1.1
acres..	28 888 209	.5	1,000 to 1,999 acres	2 267	1.0
Full owners .... farms..	6 487	.9	2,000 acres or more.......................................	3 657	.6
acres..	7 959 712	.6			
Part owners .... farms..	6 224	.8	**FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM**		
acres..	17 989 444	.5			
Tenants .... farms..	2 160	1.0	Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	4 186	.8
acres..	2 939 053	.8	Vegetable and melon farming (1112)	402	1.0
			Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)	154	2.6
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production		
			(1114)	389	1.3
Land owned....................................... farms..	12 814	.8	Other crop farming (1119)	2 396	1.1
acres..	19 224 157	.5	Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)	5 844	1.0
Owned land in farms .... farms..	12 711	.8	Cattle feedlots (112112)	390	1.1
acres..	17 838 051	.5	Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)	293	1.1
Land rented or leased from others .... farms..	8 465	.8	Hog and pig farming (1122)	150	2.4
acres..	11 270 304	.6	Poultry and egg production (1123)	31	4.4
landlords..	20 540	.8	Sheep and goat farming (1124)	200	1.9
Rented or leased land in farms .... farms..	8 384	.8	Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125,		
acres..	11 050 158	.5	1129)	436	1.6
Land rented or leased to others..................... farms..	2 134	1.0			
acres..	1 606 252	1.4	**LIVESTOCK**		
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			Cattle and calves inventory.......................... farms..	9 322	.9
			number..	3 130 098	.3
Operators by place of residence:			Beef cows .... farms..	7 582	.9
On farm operated	10 637	.8	number..	845 854	.7
Not on farm operated	3 216	1.1	Milk cows .... farms..	567	1.1
Not reported	1 018	.7	number..	79 094	.2
Operators by principal occupation:			Cattle and calves sold .... farms..	9 570	.8
Farming	11 082	.8	number..	3 699 591	.2
Other	3 789	1.0	$1,000..	2 517 836	.1
Operators by days worked off farm:			Hogs and pigs inventory .... farms..	490	1.5
Any	6 316	1.0	number..	780 995	.1
200 days or more	3 051	1.0	Hogs and pigs sold................................ farms..	460	1.5
Operators by sex:			number..	1 444 335	.2
Male	13 853	.8	$1,000..	169 873	.1
Female	1 018	1.3	Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory................ farms..	711	1.4
			number..	572 102	.3
			Sheep and lambs sold .... farms..	706	1.4
			number..	1 199 923	.1
Average age of operator ....years..	53.8	1.2	Horses and ponies inventory .... farms..	4 970	.9
			number..	40 088	1.1
			Horses and ponies sold............................ farms..	938	1.2
			number..	6 652	3.0

See footnotes at end of table.

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			Barley for grain .... farms..	621	1.2
(see text) .... farms..	491	1.6	acres..	83 830	.7
number..	3 769 523	(L)	bushels..	8 609 710	.6
Layers 20 weeks old and older .... farms..	478	1.6	Oats for grain .... farms..	317	1.7
number..	3 574 294	(L)	acres..	17 908	1.7
			bushels..	1 030 618	1.8
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .... farms..	19	6.9	Dry edible beans, excluding dry limas .... farms..	1 061	.8
number..	8 166	9.2	acres..	115 805	.5
			cwt..	2 021 072	.5
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED			Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes.................... farms..	293	1.0
			acres..	85 387	.3
Corn for grain or seed .... farms..	3 418	.7	cwt..	28 072 363	.3
acres..	917 274	.3	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
bushels..	129 931 917	.3	silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .... farms..	8 174	.9
Corn for silage or green chop........................ farms..	1 110	.8	acres..	1 451 748	.7
acres..	95 653	.6	tons, dry..	3 752 131	.7
tons, green..	2 013 478	.6	Alfalfa hay .... farms..	6 025	.9
Sorghum for grain or seed .... farms..	468	1.5	acres..	753 176	.8
acres..	146 246	1.1	tons, dry..	2 567 891	.7
bushels..	5 232 594	1.2	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) .... farms..	430	1.2
Wheat for grain .... farms..	4 822	.8	acres..	42 805	.3
acres..	2 473 120	.4	Land in orchards.................................... farms..	254	2.0
bushels..	75 760 246	.4	acres..	5 292	2.6

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

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

Item	All farms Percent change from 1992 to 1997	All farms Standard error of estimate	Farms with sales of $10,000 or more Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Farms with sales of $10,000 or more Standard error of estimate
Farms .... number..	4.1	1.1	−1.8	1.1
Land in farms .... acres..	−4.0	.5	−6.0	.5
Average size of farm .... acres..	−7.8	1.1	−4.2	1.2
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1]:				
Average per farm .... dollars..	31.8	2.6	36.5	3.0
Average per acre .... dollars..	45.1	3.0	44.0	3.3
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1]:				
Average per farm .... dollars..	30.2	2.5	31.4	2.7
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres...	3.2	1.7	4.1	2.3
10 to 49 acres	13.3	1.7	2.2	1.9
50 to 179 acres	7.0	1.1	−.9	1.4
180 to 499 acres	5.2	1.3	.6	1.4
500 to 999 acres	−5.0	1.4	−6.2	1.5
1,000 to 1,999 acres	−.3	1.5	−3.6	1.4
2,000 acres or more	−1.5	.7	−2.0	.6
Total cropland.. farms..	2.2	1.1	−2.9	1.1
acres..	−3.9	.7	−4.8	.6
Harvested cropland .... farms..	−.9	1.0	−2.5	1.1
acres..	6.6	.6	7.2	.6
Irrigated land .... farms..	1.8	1.1	.2	1.2
acres..	8.2	.8	9.0	.8
Market value of agricultural products sold .... $1,000..	10.2	.2	10.2	.2
Average per farm .... dollars..	5.8	1.1	12.2	1.3
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops .... $1,000..	28.1	.6	28.4	.5
Livestock, poultry, and their products................................... $1,000..	4.2	.1	4.1	.1
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than $2,500	15.1	1.5	(X)	(X)
$2,500 to $4,999	8.0	1.7	(X)	(X)
$5,000 to $9,999	7.2	1.6	(X)	(X)
$10,000 to $24,999	4.2	1.5	4.2	1.4
$25,000 to $49,999	−2.4	1.5	−2.4	1.5
$50,000 to $99,999	−8.6	1.4	−8.6	1.4
$100,000 to $249,999	−9.3	.9	−9.3	.9
$250,000 to $499,999	4.8	−	4.8	−
$500,000 or more	8.9	−	8.9	−
Total farm production expenses[1] .... $1,000..	4.4	.8	4.2	.9
Average per farm .... dollars..	.2	1.2	6.4	1.3
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text)[1] .... farms..	4.1	1.2	−2.0	1.2
$1,000..	55.8	2.2	52.7	2.0
Average per farm .... dollars..	49.6	2.7	55.8	2.7
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	−4.8	1.0	−7.1	1.0
Other	17.3	1.6	17.6	1.7
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any...	11.1	1.4	9.3	1.5
200 days or more	15.1	1.6	15.0	1.7
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory .... farms..	5.4	1.1	−1.7	1.1
number..	7.1	.4	5.2	.4
Beef cows .... farms..	5.6	1.1	.1	1.2
number..	2.1	.8	.2	.8
Milk cows.. farms..	−29.9	1.0	−32.1	1.0
number..	−2.7	.3	−2.6	.3
Cattle and calves sold.. farms..	4.7	1.1	−2.0	1.1
number..	5.1	.2	4.8	.2
Hogs and pigs inventory .... farms..	−25.4	1.2	−43.5	1.1
number..	69.5	.8	72.5	.8
Hogs and pigs sold .... farms..	−33.6	1.1	−46.6	1.1
number..	65.3	.7	67.5	.7
Sheep and lambs inventory .... farms..	−14.8	1.3	−18.7	1.4
number..	−18.7	.3	−17.8	.3
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) .... farms..	−7.9	1.5	−20.7	1.7
number..	−10.9	.2	−10.8	.2
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .... farms..	−	5.5	−34.5	6.3
number..	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed.. farms..	−12.0	.9	−11.0	.9
acres..	3.1	.6	3.3	.6
bushels..	3.2	.5	3.3	.5
Corn for silage or green chop .... farms..	−13.5	1.0	−14.3	1.0
acres..	−2.5	.8	−2.3	.8
tons, green..	−3.9	.9	−3.5	.8
Sorghum for grain or seed .... farms..	−28.9	1.4	−28.5	1.4
acres..	−9.7	1.4	−8.2	1.3
bushels..	−16.0	1.3	−15.6	1.3
Wheat for grain .... farms..	−3.4	1.0	−1.8	1.0
acres..	5.5	.6	6.1	.6
bushels..	6.7	.5	7.0	.5
Barley for grain... farms..	−37.6	.9	−36.6	.9
acres..	−26.7	.7	−26.2	.7
bushels..	−3.3	.9	−2.7	.9
Dry edible beans, excluding dry limas .... farms..	−28.6	.9	−27.9	.9
acres..	−22.7	.7	−22.6	.7
cwt..	−19.2	.7	−19.1	.7
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc.				
(see text) .... farms..	2.2	1.1	1.1	1.2
acres..	11.0	1.0	12.7	1.0
tons, dry..	15.1	1.1	16.6	1.1

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

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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

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

Geographic area	Farms — Total (number)	Farms — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Land in farms — Total (acres)	Land in farms — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Average size of farm — Total (acres)	Average size of farm — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Average market value of land and buildings per farm[1] — Value (dollars)	Average market value of land and buildings per farm[1] — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1] — Total ($1,000)	Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1] — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Colorado	**28 268**	**.7**	**32 634 221**	**.5**	**1 154**	**.9**	**707 165**	**1.3**	**2 019 029**	**1.2**
Adams.................	696	.8	673 713	.7	968	1.1	653 502	3.4	46 926	5.2
Alamosa	306	1.0	189 987	1.5	621	1.8	763 217	10.7	50 500	15.9
Arapahoe	258	.7	332 940	1.2	1 290	1.4	1 181 113	12.1	15 466	12.2
Archuleta	206	.9	112 670	3.6	547	3.7	855 487	7.5	5 633	6.3
Baca	608	1.6	1 142 327	1.4	1 879	2.1	747 804	10.3	50 440	5.9
Bent..................	270	1.0	784 273	.9	2 905	1.3	899 874	11.9	21 084	4.9
Boulder	657	.8	128 146	2.9	195	3.0	534 011	6.3	36 062	10.2
Chaffee	189	1.0	85 608	3.8	453	3.9	849 738	5.1	7 374	8.2
Cheyenne	333	1.0	795 815	1.0	2 390	1.5	585 655	5.0	36 773	9.2
Clear Creek	12	1.0	5 114	10.0	426	10.1	1 441 525	7.0	207	18.3
Conejos	429	1.5	284 676	2.3	664	2.7	449 721	15.7	30 916	12.2
Costilla	171	1.2	363 220	.7	2 124	1.4	733 408	2.9	16 360	3.4
Crowley	203	.9	389 724	1.4	1 920	1.7	1 110 080	4.1	10 674	8.7
Custer	152	.9	144 247	3.3	949	3.4	613 306	8.5	6 606	5.1
Delta	1 041	.6	281 889	1.9	271	2.0	482 853	8.0	48 084	8.8
Denver	16	1.2	74	10.9	5	10.9	(D)	(D)	1 187	6.4
Dolores	160	.4	155 741	1.3	973	1.3	633 775	11.9	10 064	6.5
Douglas...............	574	.6	204 360	2.1	356	2.2	795 452	9.0	16 310	7.3
Eagle	124	1.1	185 032	1.8	1 492	2.1	1 901 323	4.3	6 223	6.5
Elbert................	822	.4	1 095 248	.6	1 332	.8	700 457	4.9	35 674	10.2
El Paso	851	.7	866 953	.9	1 019	1.1	410 149	8.4	22 905	5.5
Fremont	561	.8	283 490	2.9	505	3.0	729 805	6.2	14 532	7.8
Garfield	475	.7	427 161	1.7	899	1.9	969 776	7.6	22 876	7.5
Gilpin	11	1.2	8 771	2.9	797	3.2	1 084 183	2.7	165	1.2
Grand	161	.8	251 202	2.4	1 560	2.5	1 269 188	6.7	8 242	6.0
Gunnison	187	.5	195 030	1.7	1 043	1.8	1 435 569	4.9	13 103	8.0
Hinsdale	14	1.4	8 834	6.1	631	6.3	872 380	9.6	450	7.7
Huerfano	273	.8	641 124	1.2	2 348	1.5	853 988	8.4	11 133	7.3
Jackson...............	126	.5	477 063	1.1	3 786	1.2	2 094 859	5.1	13 163	17.2
Jefferson..............	377	.6	97 623	3.6	259	3.7	614 664	12.0	13 485	9.9
Kiowa	339	1.2	913 801	1.1	2 696	1.6	657 478	4.7	32 548	14.7
Kit Carson............	718	1.0	1 345 724	.9	1 874	1.4	754 324	3.0	79 873	3.9
Lake..................	20	–	17 188	–	859	–	838 884	–	765	7.7
La Plata	781	.6	580 135	1.0	743	1.2	684 685	4.8	32 379	8.9
Larimer	1 298	.6	542 259	1.5	418	1.6	656 869	6.3	63 982	8.8
Las Animas	485	.7	2 214 992	.7	4 567	.9	886 185	5.4	28 358	12.3
Lincoln................	467	.9	1 648 323	.8	3 530	1.2	616 694	4.7	40 307	4.9
Logan	879	.7	1 128 756	.8	1 284	1.1	510 735	3.3	87 514	6.5
Mesa	1 489	.7	416 613	1.6	280	1.8	487 204	4.1	44 351	5.3
Mineral	10	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	460 494	–	279	–
Moffat	389	.6	1 031 091	.7	2 651	1.0	1 789 919	18.2	14 580	5.7
Montezuma	718	.5	935 330	.5	1 303	.7	576 182	6.8	28 809	7.1
Montrose	866	.6	371 881	1.7	429	1.8	507 508	4.6	46 166	4.1
Morgan	759	.7	741 007	.8	976	1.0	603 987	3.5	75 491	4.1
Otero	512	.7	579 647	1.3	1 132	1.5	472 644	6.4	33 880	4.9
Ouray	79	.7	116 906	1.2	1 480	1.4	2 180 267	3.2	4 350	2.3
Park..................	183	.9	311 182	2.4	1 700	2.5	935 538	8.6	5 375	8.1
Phillips...............	344	.4	463 376	.6	1 347	.8	841 179	3.7	63 069	7.8
Pitkin	70	1.6	25 209	4.5	360	4.8	838 651	5.8	4 789	4.7
Prowers...............	522	1.1	862 953	1.2	1 653	1.7	678 535	3.7	52 929	4.9
Pueblo................	664	.9	822 584	1.5	1 239	1.7	533 308	11.2	25 086	8.5
Rio Blanco	255	.8	466 272	1.5	1 829	1.7	885 164	8.1	13 298	4.8
Rio Grande...........	348	.8	231 734	1.4	666	1.6	908 090	3.4	50 191	3.6
Routt	494	.7	520 618	1.4	1 054	1.5	935 112	6.4	29 759	9.3
Saguache	248	.8	481 541	1.2	1 942	1.4	1 241 792	3.6	36 235	2.3
San Juan	4	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	53	–
San Miguel	83	1.0	161 937	1.9	1 951	2.1	1 340 027	4.2	4 196	3.6
Sedgwick	215	.5	294 185	1.0	1 368	1.1	744 384	3.1	34 937	5.8
Summit	35	.8	34 541	1.9	987	2.1	1 164 227	7.7	2 428	3.3
Teller................	84	.7	83 443	3.8	993	3.8	1 005 585	4.6	2 409	4.3
Washington	792	.7	1 394 238	.7	1 760	1.0	683 617	3.1	83 665	4.3
Weld	2 959	.6	1 913 603	.9	647	1.1	566 604	2.3	279 869	2.3
Yuma.................	896	.7	1 365 183	.8	1 524	1.1	891 222	2.9	144 489	3.4

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm[1] — Value (dollars)	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm[1] — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Market value of agricultural products sold — Total ($1,000)	Market value of agricultural products sold — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm — Value (dollars)	Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farm production expenses[1] — Total farm production expenses — Farms — Number	Farm production expenses[1] — Total farm production expenses — Farms — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farm production expenses[1] — Total farm production expenses — Value — Total ($1,000)	Farm production expenses[1] — Total farm production expenses — Value — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Colorado	**71 417**	**1.4**	**4 534 213**	**.1**	**160 401**	**.7**	**28 272**	**.7**	**3 725 343**	**.2**
Adams.................	67 229	5.2	87 739	.3	126 062	.8	698	.9	67 875	1.5
Alamosa	165 574	15.9	57 195	.5	186 912	1.1	306	1.3	43 041	2.5
Arapahoe	59 486	12.2	23 612	.5	91 519	.9	260	1.1	17 578	3.6
Archuleta	27 344	6.4	6 149	2.9	29 850	3.0	206	1.6	6 441	6.6

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm[1] Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Market value of agricultural products sold Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farm production expenses[1] Total farm production expenses Farms Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Baca	82 961	6.1	77 369	.5	127 252	1.7	608	1.4	63 010	1.7
Bent	78 087	5.1	50 975	.5	188 798	1.1	270	1.3	46 163	1.0
Boulder	54 889	10.3	43 671	.5	66 471	.9	657	1.0	31 299	4.4
Chaffee	39 222	8.4	5 161	2.5	27 308	2.7	188	1.8	4 357	5.7
Cheyenne	110 763	9.3	33 645	.7	101 035	1.2	332	1.1	28 281	3.9
Clear Creek	17 208	19.4	30	15.1	2 490	15.1	12	6.3	105	5.8
Conejos	72 064	12.3	25 488	1.3	59 411	2.0	429	1.6	19 348	5.3
Costilla	95 675	3.9	15 978	1.0	93 441	1.5	171	1.9	13 090	2.0
Crowley	52 580	8.8	73 487	.2	362 007	.9	203	1.1	44 582	1.2
Custer	43 460	5.4	4 816	2.3	31 681	2.5	152	1.8	3 909	3.4
Delta	46 191	8.8	39 083	.7	37 544	.9	1 041	.6	32 925	3.0
Denver	74 187	8.6	2 174	.5	135 888	1.3	16	5.8	1 287	.9
Dolores	63 293	6.8	8 601	1.0	53 753	1.1	159	1.8	6 101	3.8
Douglas	28 366	7.4	17 119	.8	29 823	1.0	575	.9	17 021	4.2
Eagle	49 787	7.0	7 413	1.8	59 784	2.1	125	2.3	7 065	3.0
Elbert	43 399	10.2	31 249	.5	38 016	.7	822	.6	29 359	3.3
El Paso	26 947	5.6	30 330	.6	35 641	.9	850	.9	26 586	4.1
Fremont	25 903	7.9	12 126	1.0	21 615	1.3	561	1.0	10 119	4.9
Garfield	48 262	7.6	22 817	1.0	48 035	1.2	474	1.0	18 748	3.9
Gilpin	14 955	1.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	11	1.2	119	1.2
Grand	51 193	6.3	8 833	1.4	54 861	1.6	161	1.9	6 975	4.8
Gunnison	70 070	8.2	8 436	1.3	45 114	1.4	187	1.7	8 396	3.3
Hinsdale	32 162	10.5	377	12.2	26 955	12.3	14	7.1	474	9.6
Huerfano	40 782	7.4	9 681	1.1	35 461	1.4	273	1.2	8 035	6.7
Jackson	104 464	17.2	15 593	.7	123 754	.9	126	1.4	12 111	2.9
Jefferson	35 393	10.0	19 474	.6	51 655	.9	381	.9	12 044	3.1
Kiowa	96 012	14.8	61 724	.3	182 077	1.2	339	1.1	45 100	1.8
Kit Carson	110 935	4.1	177 051	.3	246 588	1.1	720	1.1	151 045	1.0
Lake	38 230	–	513	–	25 655	–	20	–	610	–
La Plata	41 512	9.0	15 797	1.3	20 227	1.5	780	.8	14 652	5.1
Larimer	49 293	8.8	100 483	.3	77 414	.6	1 298	.7	77 671	1.8
Las Animas	58 469	12.3	20 336	.7	41 930	1.0	485	.9	18 029	3.4
Lincoln	86 311	5.0	44 773	.6	95 873	1.0	467	1.1	40 953	1.9
Logan	99 448	6.6	292 740	.2	333 038	.7	880	.8	244 214	.7
Mesa	29 806	5.4	50 450	.8	33 882	1.0	1 488	.8	41 524	3.0
Mineral	27 903	–	146	–	14 551	–	10	–	129	–
Moffat	37 482	5.8	18 938	.9	48 683	1.1	389	.9	16 515	5.3
Montezuma	40 179	7.2	21 874	1.0	30 465	1.1	717	.8	17 706	6.8
Montrose	53 371	4.1	88 274	.3	101 933	.7	865	.7	84 505	1.1
Morgan	99 331	4.2	405 945	.1	534 842	.7	760	.8	337 637	.5
Otero	66 171	5.0	100 214	.3	195 731	.8	512	.9	80 936	1.7
Ouray	55 065	3.8	3 237	1.6	40 980	1.8	79	3.0	2 917	1.8
Park	29 534	8.2	3 622	2.6	19 795	2.7	182	1.7	3 090	7.0
Phillips	182 809	7.8	117 064	.2	340 302	.5	345	.7	101 980	2.2
Pitkin	68 413	6.4	1 527	4.1	21 812	4.4	70	4.4	1 933	3.9
Prowers	101 591	5.0	150 677	.3	288 652	1.1	521	1.2	122 711	.8
Pueblo	37 781	8.5	33 642	.8	50 666	1.2	664	.9	30 388	3.9
Rio Blanco	52 150	4.9	14 086	1.3	55 239	1.5	255	1.2	10 600	4.7
Rio Grande	144 228	3.7	72 818	.3	209 246	.8	348	1.0	53 672	1.7
Routt	60 364	9.3	22 858	1.0	46 271	1.2	493	.9	20 476	3.9
Saguache	146 108	2.6	50 305	.4	202 844	.9	248	1.3	38 615	1.1
San Juan	13 250	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	4	–	47	–
San Miguel	50 559	4.9	2 897	2.2	34 907	2.4	83	3.4	2 917	3.2
Sedgwick	162 499	5.9	54 751	.3	254 654	.6	215	.7	42 892	2.2
Summit	69 370	5.7	1 511	2.1	43 166	2.2	35	4.6	1 280	3.1
Teller	28 684	5.4	1 277	4.0	15 207	4.1	84	3.3	1 207	3.9
Washington	105 638	4.4	97 898	.4	123 608	.8	792	.8	80 890	1.7
Weld	94 550	2.4	1 286 636	.1	434 821	.6	2 960	.6	1 002 474	.2
Yuma	161 260	3.5	481 374	.1	537 247	.7	896	.8	449 579	.3

Farm production expenses[1]—Con.

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased Farms Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Feed for livestock and poultry Farms Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees Farms Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Colorado	**9 954**	**1.8**	**1 271 336**	**.2**	**15 919**	**1.3**	**861 580**	**.2**	**10 288**	**1.6**	**86 109**	**1.1**
Adams	150	15.9	4 120	3.0	283	8.4	6 580	6.7	283	8.1	6 604	1.2
Alamosa	101	21.9	1 886	16.1	181	12.1	1 386	15.4	107	18.3	2 514	2.9
Arapahoe	64	25.2	2 443	2.1	193	5.3	2 249	7.9	112	14.0	570	5.8
Archuleta	103	7.7	2 923	10.7	121	7.0	941	10.2	21	26.2	8	27.4
Baca	210	12.5	19 915	1.7	291	9.6	12 287	1.8	293	8.4	1 748	6.3
Bent	125	12.5	17 273	1.6	163	9.3	12 135	.8	138	9.1	670	8.7
Boulder	210	13.2	2 183	13.6	375	7.0	2 058	15.0	186	13.2	1 915	2.6
Chaffee	54	11.9	263	14.2	111	7.2	663	7.9	31	18.7	262	18.1
Cheyenne	93	25.5	5 431	10.8	131	18.3	2 974	8.7	150	15.8	954	8.0

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 purchased Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Feed for livestock and poultry Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Clear Creek	2	17.4	(D)	(D)	7	7.4	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Conejos	196	16.0	1 728	27.6	180	13.8	1 431	15.8	137	14.2	612	12.4
Costilla	48	13.4	297	14.7	74	10.0	288	5.3	41	12.9	790	2.0
Crowley	123	11.9	16 598	1.2	171	6.5	17 398	.6	82	13.1	335	6.3
Custer	76	9.1	692	9.8	104	6.7	358	8.5	16	21.2	(D)	(D)
Delta	394	9.1	1 939	10.1	543	6.7	5 861	6.7	301	10.0	1 097	33.3
Denver	2	18.8	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	11	5.7	299	1.4
Dolores	22	21.2	1 608	2.1	61	14.5	249	15.9	63	9.3	132	16.2
Douglas	244	11.7	1 899	9.8	415	6.1	2 627	13.0	106	20.4	1 466	.6
Eagle	64	8.4	726	9.6	91	6.1	1 718	6.1	22	20.4	49	8.5
Elbert	341	8.8	8 771	5.3	555	5.3	4 780	4.4	163	13.7	295	20.2
El Paso	407	8.8	4 613	13.6	636	4.7	3 879	7.2	125	20.0	1 233	2.5
Fremont	180	11.5	760	14.0	334	8.9	2 716	3.6	70	26.1	302	2.8
Garfield	183	11.4	2 863	9.3	279	8.8	1 793	11.0	126	18.3	376	12.3
Gilpin	3	4.3	9	4.7	7	1.8	34	1.7	–	–	–	–
Grand	52	13.6	1 749	2.5	99	7.9	867	14.1	10	32.7	208	63.2
Gunnison	76	9.9	964	8.8	124	6.6	1 381	5.5	13	27.9	6	30.6
Hinsdale	5	9.9	126	10.9	11	7.8	95	14.0	–	–	–	–
Huerfano	85	16.3	2 081	10.0	210	5.6	1 408	8.6	34	32.0	37	39.3
Jackson	72	7.9	1 935	5.6	88	6.6	1 796	3.7	9	31.0	31	4.2
Jefferson	90	22.4	505	35.5	189	12.4	871	22.4	76	24.1	1 716	2.6
Kiowa	68	20.4	2 127	4.6	136	11.5	9 888	.8	152	14.6	651	8.4
Kit Carson	223	11.9	54 565	1.4	365	7.8	27 927	1.1	460	5.5	4 512	3.2
Lake	2	–	(D)	(D)	10	–	173	–	1	–	(D)	(D)
La Plata	297	11.3	1 994	18.2	432	7.9	2 072	10.1	205	14.2	221	18.8
Larimer	465	8.7	10 886	5.0	770	5.2	14 149	5.2	436	8.1	2 400	5.7
Las Animas	204	12.2	3 615	3.6	353	6.1	3 543	7.1	81	24.1	148	35.8
Lincoln	232	8.3	11 799	5.7	322	6.4	5 198	4.4	179	10.1	692	6.6
Logan	401	8.8	128 176	.5	546	6.0	56 344	.8	524	5.9	3 690	8.4
Mesa	335	10.1	2 914	6.8	618	6.3	7 735	4.1	395	9.8	1 365	6.3
Mineral	1	–	(D)	(D)	6	–	30	–	–	–	–	–
Moffat	148	12.0	3 137	8.9	232	8.2	2 973	6.2	63	21.5	65	14.3
Montezuma	178	15.3	2 017	29.8	352	8.8	1 068	13.0	214	14.0	312	10.5
Montrose	297	11.4	15 271	1.6	545	5.2	19 261	1.1	349	8.5	837	5.5
Morgan	286	10.6	162 108	.4	407	7.6	89 782	.5	476	5.9	4 418	3.6
Otero	217	11.6	27 941	2.1	307	8.4	25 661	1.8	242	10.8	1 221	8.8
Ouray	32	4.5	308	7.3	46	3.8	580	1.1	10	5.2	22	3.3
Park	78	9.4	345	8.4	128	5.7	684	14.4	13	26.0	19	11.4
Phillips	75	24.9	15 254	.8	117	19.7	27 796	.2	282	7.5	4 186	8.1
Pitkin	22	7.3	394	3.1	40	5.6	160	6.2	23	7.6	18	15.0
Prowers	127	16.1	58 546	1.1	225	11.1	24 150	.5	292	6.2	2 143	5.5
Pueblo	261	10.3	5 722	12.8	386	7.7	5 228	4.2	197	13.5	1 242	11.2
Rio Blanco	105	11.3	1 601	8.8	166	6.4	1 815	4.1	42	22.9	33	28.7
Rio Grande	68	25.4	321	18.0	171	11.0	801	15.4	166	11.4	2 828	2.6
Routt	213	11.1	5 082	8.5	323	7.5	3 278	6.6	64	22.2	169	38.8
Saguache	93	13.9	3 505	5.8	155	6.7	1 347	9.9	70	4.2	1 546	1.2
San Juan	1	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)
San Miguel	31	5.5	425	5.8	47	4.4	297	5.6	15	7.0	14	5.6
Sedgwick	66	16.3	8 411	1.8	109	12.2	6 976	1.7	150	5.8	1 741	6.7
Summit	15	7.1	104	10.4	19	6.1	87	7.2	5	6.5	(D)	(D)
Teller	31	4.8	133	7.1	61	3.8	256	4.7	4	16.4	(D)	(D)
Washington	201	13.7	20 131	2.7	412	8.0	12 843	2.5	445	6.8	2 427	13.6
Weld	1 058	4.9	414 770	.2	1 538	3.1	313 663	.2	1 513	3.1	15 270	2.4
Yuma	348	8.7	203 379	.2	546	4.6	104 973	.6	493	5.6	9 638	1.6

Farm production expenses[1]—Con.

Geographic area	Commercial fertilizer Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Agricultural chemicals Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Petroleum products Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Colorado	**12 571**	**1.4**	**124 307**	**1.1**	**11 335**	**1.6**	**74 701**	**1.5**	**25 745**	**.8**	**121 592**	**.8**
Adams	331	7.4	3 551	2.9	322	8.7	2 319	5.5	578	2.6	3 636	3.2
Alamosa	153	14.4	3 201	6.5	132	16.5	1 632	3.1	298	3.0	2 304	4.5
Arapahoe	85	15.7	394	7.6	106	14.5	556	7.8	236	4.1	918	7.6
Archuleta	39	17.1	58	22.4	53	14.5	20	24.2	188	3.2	277	10.4
Baca	264	9.9	3 337	6.1	282	10.0	2 201	6.1	533	3.7	3 566	7.3
Bent	146	9.0	991	7.6	134	9.9	646	12.1	256	2.6	1 548	5.5
Boulder	283	10.0	1 071	11.4	243	12.2	448	8.3	551	4.0	2 010	4.2
Chaffee	85	9.4	229	6.5	35	16.1	(D)	(D)	163	3.9	349	5.7
Cheyenne	153	14.5	2 052	9.7	146	14.7	1 323	24.3	276	5.1	2 189	6.5
Clear Creek	2	26.0	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	12	6.3	9	5.4
Conejos	137	14.0	1 132	11.0	147	17.0	420	5.9	378	5.9	1 705	9.3
Costilla	67	10.2	1 391	3.0	42	11.9	976	1.6	165	1.9	816	3.5
Crowley	68	15.8	396	13.1	87	14.2	276	18.4	180	6.0	1 004	3.2
Custer	65	10.0	303	6.3	17	18.3	35	8.2	136	3.6	346	5.5

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	Commercial fertilizer — Farms		Commercial fertilizer — Value		Agricultural chemicals — Farms		Agricultural chemicals — Value		Petroleum products — Farms		Petroleum products — 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)
Delta	565	6.0	1 322	7.5	427	8.0	958	13.9	967	2.0	2 235	6.1
Denver	11	6.7	5	6.4	7	8.2	3	8.0	12	7.2	62	.7
Dolores	37	13.9	161	16.4	62	12.9	107	22.9	135	6.0	457	8.3
Douglas	75	24.5	159	16.6	146	15.2	87	20.2	519	3.0	851	7.6
Eagle	52	10.9	111	9.0	45	10.8	59	9.6	122	2.9	536	4.9
Elbert	167	14.1	717	34.4	186	13.3	554	24.8	722	2.7	1 597	6.9
El Paso	99	21.2	413	4.9	111	21.8	112	17.8	789	2.2	1 568	5.0
Fremont	157	15.5	131	26.8	58	31.7	17	25.8	470	4.2	647	6.4
Garfield	228	9.8	770	10.7	191	12.2	98	14.0	445	2.2	1 280	6.5
Gilpin	1	–	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)	11	1.2	7	.8
Grand	37	17.4	189	6.9	30	19.0	24	25.7	150	3.1	445	8.8
Gunnison	51	13.2	227	10.7	36	15.4	50	18.7	183	2.3	596	5.1
Hinsdale	5	11.9	11	16.7	1	–	(D)	(D)	13	7.1	36	10.1
Huerfano	67	19.1	171	21.8	47	27.8	47	23.3	251	3.8	564	7.1
Jackson	66	7.9	891	5.4	12	24.5	236	19.5	122	2.2	805	3.5
Jefferson	114	15.6	123	10.7	105	18.7	70	25.3	333	4.5	1 120	5.5
Kiowa	138	15.9	1 562	8.2	166	10.5	1 568	6.1	266	7.6	1 811	6.4
Kit Carson	437	5.5	8 461	4.2	391	5.8	5 107	4.4	627	2.7	6 820	3.5
Lake	7	–	5	–	4	–	9	–	17	–	35	–
La Plata	345	9.9	696	11.0	235	12.2	243	19.4	716	2.6	1 131	8.6
Larimer	515	7.2	2 551	15.3	563	7.0	1 472	8.9	1 169	2.2	3 834	6.0
Las Animas	109	18.4	350	11.3	67	24.7	183	8.4	442	2.3	1 388	5.0
Lincoln	157	11.2	1 558	4.4	150	11.1	1 464	11.0	415	3.8	2 372	3.8
Logan	484	7.3	5 281	6.8	469	6.9	3 334	6.7	841	1.9	5 283	3.3
Mesa	843	5.1	1 771	11.1	790	5.2	1 016	6.6	1 409	1.5	2 247	6.1
Mineral	1	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	9	–	13	–
Moffat	99	17.9	402	14.0	124	14.1	422	7.6	360	3.7	907	6.4
Montezuma	334	8.6	1 047	9.8	196	13.8	206	18.6	670	2.4	1 294	7.4
Montrose	586	5.0	2 154	7.4	412	8.0	1 427	13.2	811	2.3	3 991	2.6
Morgan	431	6.2	7 464	4.4	437	6.9	3 633	5.4	699	2.5	5 553	4.0
Otero	324	8.4	1 693	10.7	280	9.3	1 784	19.8	512	.9	2 253	4.3
Ouray	45	3.3	134	1.7	29	3.8	25	2.7	73	3.0	187	2.5
Park	28	18.5	82	21.9	22	19.5	9	20.4	164	2.7	400	16.5
Phillips	306	5.3	7 475	7.4	241	9.9	4 469	8.1	341	.7	3 061	5.6
Pitkin	38	5.9	67	7.9	30	6.3	35	6.8	67	4.5	140	6.2
Prowers	272	7.6	2 585	2.6	234	8.7	1 948	7.6	462	2.6	4 071	3.9
Pueblo	199	13.0	1 253	13.8	188	13.3	1 002	11.1	598	2.4	1 669	8.0
Rio Blanco	113	10.9	438	9.2	87	12.8	125	9.9	245	2.3	908	7.3
Rio Grande	203	10.0	5 111	2.4	165	12.2	3 502	13.3	329	3.2	3 071	3.9
Routt	167	13.1	570	14.0	164	14.0	323	18.8	451	2.8	1 339	10.4
Saguache	89	9.8	4 572	.7	67	10.2	1 735	1.2	229	3.4	2 050	2.5
San Juan	2	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	4	–	1	–
San Miguel	31	5.3	63	5.1	16	6.2	114	.8	77	3.5	219	4.4
Sedgwick	173	4.4	2 887	4.2	132	8.9	1 685	8.2	189	4.0	2 395	3.3
Summit	8	8.0	34	6.1	8	7.9	(D)	(D)	35	4.6	87	5.0
Teller	10	8.6	9	10.1	11	9.2	(D)	(D)	80	3.3	85	4.5
Washington	463	5.7	5 933	4.6	369	9.5	3 124	5.6	746	2.2	4 596	4.6
Weld	1 452	3.4	16 502	2.7	1 543	3.2	12 000	2.8	2 719	1.3	17 867	1.5
Yuma	552	5.6	18 071	1.6	530	5.9	9 419	2.2	779	2.7	7 028	2.5

Farm production expenses[1]—Con.

Geographic area	Electricity — Farms		Electricity — Value		Hired farm labor — Farms		Hired farm labor — Value		Contract labor — Farms		Contract labor — 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)
Colorado	**18 055**	**1.2**	**68 478**	**1.0**	**9 394**	**1.8**	**263 603**	**.6**	**4 311**	**2.9**	**28 385**	**2.7**
Adams	394	6.9	1 357	8.6	193	10.2	13 409	6.2	93	21.0	1 321	3.5
Alamosa	194	12.2	2 966	6.4	133	14.2	8 951	3.2	89	22.5	496	40.0
Arapahoe	184	7.4	253	6.8	73	16.6	2 487	1.3	25	41.0	290	7.0
Archuleta	94	8.6	51	6.4	77	10.6	397	8.7	22	25.5	12	30.4
Baca	401	6.9	1 588	12.2	212	10.8	2 495	6.5	88	25.6	287	19.9
Bent	183	7.9	565	2.6	123	8.1	2 509	3.6	57	20.9	214	15.9
Boulder	426	6.8	704	5.4	169	15.3	8 590	3.8	96	21.4	385	24.7
Chaffee	107	7.4	88	11.0	59	11.2	516	14.5	6	49.5	(D)	(D)
Cheyenne	223	9.0	708	7.7	103	19.4	1 277	13.3	48	23.1	602	65.9
Clear Creek	8	6.5	2	6.9	2	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Conejos	265	12.1	906	7.4	172	17.0	1 975	6.8	78	25.7	275	5.7
Costilla	87	7.0	950	2.0	65	10.8	2 502	1.4	29	18.3	111	13.2
Crowley	165	6.9	366	3.8	57	15.7	1 848	1.7	43	27.6	121	6.5
Custer	81	8.8	55	6.1	48	12.1	362	9.3	16	27.6	(D)	(D)
Delta	531	5.9	669	4.1	373	9.5	5 105	4.0	202	14.3	914	15.8
Denver	11	7.2	39	1.7	8	7.2	396	.6	5	–	76	–
Dolores	82	10.4	50	10.8	43	13.2	622	12.0	17	23.9	34	35.5
Douglas	415	6.0	393	7.6	188	14.2	2 422	6.4	74	23.5	376	17.7
Eagle	76	6.4	251	1.8	48	12.2	863	7.9	14	24.0	118	26.8

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.											
	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)
Elbert	638	4.0	449	7.4	181	12.6	1 190	16.4	94	19.5	189	24.7
El Paso	523	6.8	569	8.3	191	14.9	4 220	5.8	53	23.7	873	2.1
Fremont	233	11.2	171	7.7	101	17.9	1 309	12.4	53	34.0	52	22.1
Garfield	265	8.8	307	11.1	129	13.7	2 589	7.5	87	21.5	205	18.3
Gilpin	6	–	2	–	2	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)
Grand	98	7.2	60	10.4	56	10.6	893	10.6	26	19.5	50	33.5
Gunnison	107	7.9	101	6.6	96	7.5	1 209	7.8	31	20.1	98	15.1
Hinsdale	8	9.9	6	10.2	9	7.9	37	15.3	3	16.1	(D)	(D)
Huerfano	127	11.6	144	23.7	88	16.3	426	10.7	46	23.5	133	16.6
Jackson	82	6.4	179	4.9	67	8.0	1 186	7.8	32	17.2	335	18.9
Jefferson	266	7.8	331	8.9	126	17.5	3 292	5.0	52	32.6	210	21.1
Kiowa	235	9.1	493	4.2	116	17.0	5 087	7.2	71	25.8	380	21.5
Kit Carson	481	5.5	3 793	3.7	269	8.5	5 012	3.4	108	18.8	581	9.5
Lake	9	–	6	–	7	–	85	–	–	–	–	–
La Plata	415	8.0	274	16.8	175	15.9	1 259	20.0	139	19.0	332	23.2
Larimer	784	5.0	1 277	7.7	381	9.2	13 104	3.5	140	18.5	986	12.4
Las Animas	295	8.0	321	6.6	186	13.6	1 403	7.5	73	23.3	208	6.2
Lincoln	327	6.7	535	6.4	135	12.9	1 503	4.3	50	23.7	289	4.4
Logan	743	3.9	2 629	3.2	405	7.9	7 001	4.8	121	18.4	506	18.3
Mesa	702	6.4	696	4.6	492	8.1	5 839	4.6	258	13.4	587	13.9
Mineral	5	–	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)
Moffat	202	9.7	189	6.6	96	16.1	2 034	7.2	55	19.3	262	36.2
Montezuma	324	9.3	199	15.2	170	12.7	2 737	10.2	87	23.2	516	30.6
Montrose	502	6.5	852	2.9	196	13.0	12 046	2.6	147	17.9	879	11.2
Morgan	626	3.8	4 255	4.1	265	9.5	12 470	2.9	162	14.9	1 071	7.6
Otero	341	7.9	723	8.5	188	12.5	4 024	4.9	100	13.3	942	16.4
Ouray	48	3.5	40	3.7	24	4.9	281	.5	12	4.8	15	5.2
Park	101	6.9	57	13.4	39	16.4	171	8.2	29	19.9	114	47.5
Phillips	256	9.1	4 076	7.5	151	14.6	5 319	4.6	41	23.5	252	4.4
Pitkin	47	5.1	31	6.0	37	5.9	167	5.4	13	8.7	15	12.4
Prowers	316	7.0	1 179	4.6	203	11.4	6 366	2.1	113	15.0	875	8.7
Pueblo	368	7.6	649	15.6	213	12.8	3 247	7.4	106	18.9	366	18.3
Rio Blanco	138	9.7	160	10.5	74	14.8	801	2.7	43	23.2	104	23.3
Rio Grande	255	6.1	4 418	3.7	182	10.2	8 294	.9	61	17.5	638	7.5
Routt	297	7.9	274	12.5	154	11.8	1 263	11.5	102	19.0	201	34.3
Saguache	181	6.1	2 297	2.2	117	7.8	5 944	1.7	64	13.5	950	6.1
San Juan	3	–	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)
San Miguel	47	4.3	28	3.7	21	5.6	185	.9	17	5.8	50	2.6
Sedgwick	169	5.6	1 287	2.7	123	9.5	3 701	3.0	59	19.0	467	9.8
Summit	22	5.9	14	8.9	16	6.1	230	1.6	9	10.4	10	12.1
Teller	54	4.0	25	5.2	21	6.2	62	8.3	17	6.7	48	7.8
Washington	585	5.1	2 506	11.2	305	10.3	3 266	6.2	82	21.7	1 183	20.4
Weld	2 226	2.4	9 448	1.8	1 004	4.3	62 244	.9	428	8.1	6 843	5.0
Yuma	671	4.6	11 457	2.1	433	6.9	15 376	1.0	122	14.2	828	4.6

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)
Colorado	**22 453**	**1.0**	**154 182**	**1.0**	**9 669**	**1.8**	**74 222**	**1.6**	**13 057**	**1.5**	**179 469**	**1.0**
Adams	509	4.2	3 828	4.6	188	12.1	3 665	5.2	279	9.0	3 497	6.6
Alamosa	254	7.0	3 168	7.4	81	22.0	1 577	3.3	192	12.3	4 153	7.0
Arapahoe	218	5.4	1 078	12.1	83	17.3	629	19.9	114	12.7	1 352	10.2
Archuleta	163	4.7	382	9.4	19	23.7	18	26.3	64	11.7	391	9.3
Baca	457	4.7	3 170	6.9	238	10.9	2 377	11.5	343	9.4	3 685	8.3
Bent	219	5.0	1 678	3.7	119	10.4	1 038	17.3	145	9.6	2 128	7.4
Boulder	480	5.8	2 058	14.8	216	13.8	1 242	9.6	152	14.8	2 286	17.1
Chaffee	136	5.0	416	10.4	28	22.7	29	24.2	82	9.0	399	10.1
Cheyenne	256	7.7	2 017	9.6	132	15.3	1 463	7.6	208	12.0	2 421	9.3
Clear Creek	6	8.7	23	8.2	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)
Conejos	298	8.9	2 054	13.7	203	14.8	798	12.3	221	11.6	2 255	10.7
Costilla	136	5.1	1 068	2.2	72	9.9	282	12.4	63	11.2	1 124	4.8
Crowley	166	7.4	1 168	7.8	72	17.4	504	46.3	120	11.9	1 064	7.8
Custer	110	6.1	391	7.2	20	18.7	35	21.6	49	10.7	362	10.2
Delta	823	3.7	2 408	5.7	388	8.7	671	5.9	385	8.7	3 026	13.0
Denver	12	5.2	73	3.1	3	12.6	10	4.5	3	–	(D)	(D)
Dolores	135	5.5	547	10.7	48	15.5	101	19.5	82	8.7	748	9.5
Douglas	463	5.3	1 581	18.4	94	20.4	281	11.9	164	15.1	1 419	13.9
Eagle	96	5.1	697	3.0	39	12.7	63	22.5	31	15.8	510	4.9
Elbert	654	3.8	2 069	11.1	198	12.3	860	15.5	350	8.2	2 780	9.4
El Paso	607	5.3	1 806	12.6	107	20.3	346	7.1	331	10.8	1 955	14.4
Fremont	384	7.7	753	8.0	154	15.7	137	27.8	176	12.9	790	19.5
Garfield	394	5.2	1 781	7.3	112	19.2	247	17.0	140	15.5	1 187	10.1
Gilpin	9	1.4	12	.2	1	–	(D)	(D)	4	–	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	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)
Grand	127	4.7	597	13.1	23	22.3	63	28.1	48	15.2	320	8.9
Gunnison	149	4.3	856	6.3	44	13.9	220	24.7	92	8.5	629	7.6
Hinsdale	12	7.7	41	11.7	1	–	(D)	(D)	2	24.2	(D)	(D)
Huerfano	195	7.3	528	9.2	30	31.6	64	26.0	74	17.2	780	22.3
Jackson	116	2.8	923	6.6	27	21.7	88	29.4	68	9.1	1 101	8.2
Jefferson	262	8.7	867	16.7	81	23.6	59	14.6	74	21.6	468	15.2
Kiowa	246	8.9	2 708	11.6	139	15.1	2 510	5.3	183	12.9	4 165	3.5
Kit Carson	618	2.7	6 537	2.8	348	7.0	4 138	4.3	392	6.7	9 541	3.9
Lake	13	–	58	–	5	–	3	–	4	–	15	–
La Plata	599	5.2	1 250	10.1	316	10.6	370	17.9	344	9.1	1 547	11.2
Larimer	1 015	3.2	5 869	5.0	437	9.2	1 702	12.3	546	6.5	5 444	5.7
Las Animas	381	5.5	1 322	9.4	142	14.4	273	14.2	180	10.3	1 134	7.1
Lincoln	386	5.0	2 231	5.8	122	14.2	1 300	3.0	285	7.2	4 739	6.4
Logan	729	4.0	6 727	4.7	343	9.2	3 207	8.6	543	6.3	5 853	6.2
Mesa	1 124	3.5	3 044	8.0	599	7.5	862	12.2	543	7.7	4 309	11.0
Mineral	4	–	22	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	(D)	(D)
Moffat	320	5.2	1 153	11.0	86	17.9	180	9.3	151	12.9	1 649	10.2
Montezuma	521	5.7	1 454	10.8	288	10.4	1 208	10.6	278	10.2	2 112	13.5
Montrose	696	4.0	5 531	2.3	360	9.4	1 518	5.9	352	9.7	3 835	8.7
Morgan	588	4.8	7 958	2.4	362	7.5	3 934	5.0	482	5.5	10 635	3.6
Otero	488	2.4	2 632	8.7	248	12.0	1 265	11.8	305	8.0	2 946	5.3
Ouray	65	3.2	335	1.9	19	5.1	47	3.4	29	4.1	241	4.0
Park	129	6.0	234	10.2	15	25.8	22	11.5	38	17.6	175	16.2
Phillips	316	5.0	5 558	3.4	193	12.4	2 567	21.4	211	11.6	5 001	6.4
Pitkin	58	4.8	185	7.0	11	9.8	9	17.7	23	7.1	111	9.2
Prowers	373	5.7	4 559	6.4	206	11.8	1 783	9.2	318	7.5	4 642	6.4
Pueblo	541	4.1	2 099	9.9	192	12.8	435	13.3	282	9.8	2 239	8.6
Rio Blanco	194	5.6	773	7.4	41	22.7	214	32.3	112	10.9	1 221	12.8
Rio Grande	324	2.8	4 598	5.2	165	12.1	2 094	5.2	240	7.8	6 398	3.1
Routt	425	3.6	1 466	9.9	112	18.2	195	11.6	221	9.1	2 518	5.9
Saguache	220	3.9	2 769	1.9	67	11.7	1 120	3.2	142	7.4	4 002	2.5
San Juan	4	–	4	–	2	–	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)
San Miguel	65	3.7	185	4.5	23	6.0	54	9.0	35	5.1	491	4.3
Sedgwick	161	7.1	2 340	6.6	130	6.9	1 562	9.2	154	5.6	3 420	6.0
Summit	26	5.3	122	5.6	8	11.0	27	5.3	14	7.2	68	4.2
Teller	67	3.6	98	4.0	12	8.4	16	13.7	23	6.1	136	5.0
Washington	662	3.7	4 591	4.1	396	7.4	3 931	9.6	471	7.1	6 233	4.1
Weld	2 517	1.7	25 096	2.0	1 145	4.2	14 351	3.2	1 472	3.8	26 402	2.7
Yuma	732	3.8	12 637	1.8	316	8.1	6 459	4.5	623	5.4	17 341	1.8

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)
Colorado	**5 722**	**2.4**	**79 086**	**1.9**	**25 319**	**.8**	**54 425**	**1.1**	**25 682**	**.8**	**283 871**	**.7**
Adams	191	12.8	2 448	9.6	582	4.1	1 519	4.4	579	3.2	10 021	2.6
Alamosa	48	28.8	692	1.6	278	5.8	1 273	5.3	282	3.9	6 841	4.0
Arapahoe	75	19.6	983	8.7	223	5.6	433	9.1	237	4.3	2 943	2.8
Archuleta	32	15.9	129	8.1	186	3.1	241	10.5	191	3.1	593	12.5
Baca	100	17.8	798	11.2	545	4.0	892	5.8	549	3.3	4 665	4.8
Bent	93	14.4	1 147	9.1	216	6.1	700	9.2	245	3.8	2 922	3.7
Boulder	77	20.2	701	12.9	578	3.0	1 014	8.9	591	3.4	4 633	4.7
Chaffee	53	12.7	118	18.2	172	3.2	225	7.7	178	3.1	773	10.4
Cheyenne	86	24.9	1 244	28.2	266	8.8	670	9.4	292	4.4	2 958	9.4
Clear Creek	–	–	–	–	12	6.3	22	5.2	9	7.1	(D)	(D)
Conejos	106	21.2	866	13.3	389	4.7	702	11.2	377	6.2	2 489	6.2
Costilla	34	14.2	929	2.4	167	2.2	338	2.6	153	3.6	1 228	5.9
Crowley	62	19.5	393	21.1	172	5.3	394	7.9	203	1.1	2 716	5.5
Custer	25	14.7	246	23.1	133	3.9	149	6.5	139	3.6	482	7.0
Delta	162	15.9	964	18.1	981	1.9	1 050	7.0	953	2.3	4 707	4.5
Denver	4	13.4	35	7.8	11	6.8	32	.7	13	6.4	200	.7
Dolores	28	18.8	186	30.0	154	2.5	187	9.0	147	3.5	912	9.6
Douglas	64	21.7	636	14.9	540	2.3	1 060	8.5	494	4.0	1 764	8.0
Eagle	29	13.6	101	33.3	113	4.2	286	9.8	120	2.9	976	3.0
Elbert	131	14.1	1 219	9.9	743	2.7	1 208	5.3	745	2.3	2 681	4.3
El Paso	103	18.4	729	16.6	792	2.2	917	7.9	737	3.6	3 353	3.0
Fremont	80	25.8	268	25.3	515	3.9	421	9.3	439	5.3	1 644	5.5
Garfield	100	20.5	1 082	11.6	462	1.6	736	10.7	419	4.0	3 434	8.6
Gilpin	1	–	(D)	(D)	11	1.2	22	.8	11	1.2	16	.9
Grand	36	16.9	282	18.0	140	4.2	319	10.5	149	3.2	910	5.6
Gunnison	31	18.2	226	13.4	171	3.4	351	7.6	174	3.0	1 482	6.7
Hinsdale	1	36.2	(D)	(D)	12	7.6	32	11.6	13	7.6	51	12.2
Huerfano	63	18.5	399	23.0	237	4.7	347	5.6	231	4.8	907	10.7
Jackson	39	7.4	734	8.8	114	3.7	383	4.5	117	3.5	1 488	10.1

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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)
Jefferson	68	23.5	211	20.9	343	3.4	563	8.7	343	4.3	1 638	2.9
Kiowa	60	25.4	1 175	25.7	284	5.3	883	6.0	296	4.1	10 092	1.6
Kit Carson	175	14.0	4 334	8.7	605	3.5	1 814	3.4	658	2.6	7 903	5.2
Lake	2	–	(D)	(D)	16	–	58	–	20	–	125	–
La Plata	110	19.8	296	20.8	738	2.2	774	6.7	718	3.0	2 193	9.0
Larimer	173	16.4	1 663	8.7	1 161	2.5	2 042	7.7	1 156	2.3	10 292	3.0
Las Animas	130	16.5	1 194	23.2	433	4.0	776	4.6	435	2.8	2 173	4.9
Lincoln	130	13.9	1 782	8.2	397	4.1	1 162	5.8	427	3.6	4 329	5.6
Logan	173	12.9	4 433	5.2	745	3.9	1 927	6.0	857	1.7	9 822	3.9
Mesa	272	11.9	1 406	11.6	1 451	1.3	1 839	4.7	1 371	2.0	5 896	5.1
Mineral	2	–	(D)	(D)	9	–	(D)	(D)	7	–	21	–
Moffat	92	17.8	583	15.2	373	1.5	510	14.5	353	3.8	2 049	5.6
Montezuma	83	25.2	233	22.6	674	2.5	904	10.2	624	2.8	2 401	11.6
Montrose	204	12.2	1 326	9.2	800	2.8	1 249	5.2	840	1.5	14 330	2.0
Morgan	199	12.9	4 763	9.8	630	4.1	2 022	5.1	687	2.9	17 572	3.0
Otero	122	14.4	1 421	11.7	469	3.6	777	7.1	466	3.9	5 652	8.4
Ouray	20	5.5	89	4.6	76	3.1	133	3.1	73	3.0	479	1.7
Park	41	15.3	224	21.2	160	3.6	184	10.2	143	4.3	369	11.4
Phillips	106	19.3	4 352	19.1	290	6.9	1 204	5.4	345	.7	11 411	2.4
Pitkin	15	7.9	44	20.2	64	4.6	253	5.1	64	4.7	306	4.8
Prowers	105	17.6	994	11.9	477	3.3	1 666	8.7	450	4.1	7 204	4.5
Pueblo	167	14.6	1 056	18.8	607	3.1	817	8.4	594	2.9	3 364	8.2
Rio Blanco	40	22.3	226	13.9	233	3.1	463	8.7	225	4.3	1 716	8.8
Rio Grande	96	14.0	2 342	9.4	323	3.6	1 613	2.6	332	2.7	7 642	3.3
Routt	88	17.9	539	15.4	464	2.8	1 082	11.5	442	3.7	2 177	7.1
Saguache	83	12.6	1 629	10.3	205	5.0	1 107	7.5	215	3.7	4 042	4.2
San Juan	2	–	(D)	(D)	3	–	(D)	(D)	4	–	(D)	(D)
San Miguel	20	7.2	278	3.7	79	3.4	114	4.0	79	3.5	400	4.7
Sedgwick	63	16.6	1 093	10.3	184	5.3	696	9.1	215	.7	4 231	6.3
Summit	4	13.0	37	22.7	32	4.9	64	6.0	29	5.1	372	1.2
Teller	18	7.3	77	20.0	81	3.3	92	8.7	76	3.4	162	4.4
Washington	132	18.0	1 842	9.6	695	3.6	1 813	5.8	725	2.4	6 472	4.5
Weld	608	7.2	11 470	3.2	2 505	1.9	7 059	3.0	2 777	1.2	49 489	1.0
Yuma	265	9.4	10 413	4.6	798	2.5	2 825	3.3	849	2.1	19 736	1.9

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)
Colorado	**28 272**	**.7**	**803 321**	**.8**	**22 357**	**.7**	**10 509 384**	**.5**	**18 406**	**.7**	**5 896 984**	**.4**
Adams	698	.9	18 416	3.4	561	1.0	530 148	.7	433	1.1	263 940	.5
Alamosa	306	1.3	15 098	5.3	257	1.3	102 521	1.3	231	1.5	82 756	1.3
Arapahoe	260	1.1	6 155	7.4	197	1.2	168 813	1.3	134	1.9	87 414	1.1
Archuleta	206	1.6	−493	37.7	140	1.7	17 636	7.7	104	2.2	5 392	4.3
Baca	608	1.4	15 227	8.9	498	1.7	632 572	1.3	344	1.8	283 882	1.0
Bent	270	1.3	5 248	17.6	189	1.6	(D)	(D)	165	1.9	63 074	1.5
Boulder	657	1.0	12 714	8.9	556	.9	58 603	2.2	475	1.1	41 542	2.2
Chaffee	188	1.8	558	32.6	158	1.5	24 475	2.3	139	1.8	16 327	2.3
Cheyenne	332	1.1	4 591	19.5	289	1.3	433 897	1.1	222	1.6	200 850	.8
Clear Creek	12	6.3	−75	4.7	5	10.0	(D)	(D)	3	16.7	300	16.4
Conejos	429	1.6	5 352	13.8	393	1.6	135 463	1.8	365	1.7	97 938	1.6
Costilla	171	1.9	1 555	8.9	159	1.4	(D)	(D)	146	1.6	36 280	1.8
Crowley	203	1.1	29 767	1.5	137	1.5	53 707	3.2	91	2.3	20 338	2.2
Custer	152	1.8	1 057	20.3	99	2.1	24 019	2.9	74	2.6	16 391	2.9
Delta	1 041	.6	8 365	7.8	942	.6	75 090	1.2	856	.7	46 435	1.2
Denver	16	5.8	887	.6	14	4.8	(D)	(D)	13	5.2	18	6.7
Dolores	159	1.8	2 397	15.4	142	.8	68 413	1.4	110	1.4	41 914	1.3
Douglas	575	.9	2 935	40.1	341	1.1	39 674	2.6	229	1.5	15 999	3.5
Eagle	125	2.3	897	27.9	102	1.8	19 192	3.0	77	2.7	15 212	3.4
Elbert	822	.6	1 440	66.4	495	.8	178 723	1.2	345	1.1	79 310	1.1
El Paso	850	.9	1 673	48.1	462	1.1	78 299	1.6	276	1.5	35 243	1.8
Fremont	561	1.0	1 326	42.2	424	1.1	19 065	4.0	362	1.3	9 132	3.1
Garfield	474	1.0	3 903	15.7	420	.9	62 992	1.7	354	1.1	39 209	1.8
Gilpin	11	1.2	8	16.8	3	–	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)
Grand	161	1.9	1 816	12.2	124	1.4	38 392	2.5	105	1.8	27 704	2.2
Gunnison	187	1.7	50	(H)	136	1.3	38 256	1.6	125	1.5	29 444	1.5
Hinsdale	14	7.1	−97	20.4	10	1.3	2 015	10.1	8	4.8	583	12.0
Huerfano	273	1.2	1 717	18.0	160	1.8	27 855	3.4	132	2.1	14 032	2.6
Jackson	126	1.4	2 689	16.5	98	1.3	86 340	.8	95	1.4	82 141	.8
Jefferson	381	.9	5 598	4.9	232	1.3	14 606	3.7	159	1.8	7 597	3.8
Kiowa	339	1.1	16 017	3.6	264	1.5	493 589	1.0	198	1.8	(D)	(D)
Kit Carson	720	1.1	24 348	4.8	612	1.2	838 912	.8	487	1.3	429 646	.6
Lake	20	–	−97	–	11	–	(D)	(D)	9	–	(D)	(D)
La Plata	780	.8	916	64.3	681	.7	91 129	1.9	561	.9	41 955	1.8

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	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text)[1] Farms — Number	Farms — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value — Total ($1,000)	Value — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total cropland Farms — Number	Farms — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Acres — Number	Acres — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Harvested cropland Farms — Number	Farms — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Acres — Number	Acres — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Larimer	1 298	.7	23 121	5.4	997	.7	127 348	1.6	811	.8	86 054	1.0
Las Animas	485	.9	4 624	26.8	296	1.3	76 898	1.6	212	1.7	30 157	1.7
Lincoln	467	1.1	4 525	20.4	313	1.3	(D)	(D)	239	1.5	201 255	.8
Logan	880	.8	49 973	4.6	726	.8	523 887	1.0	647	.9	288 121	.7
Mesa	1 488	.8	7 056	13.0	1 341	.8	92 482	1.6	1 133	.8	58 436	1.6
Mineral	10	–	16	–	3	–	153	–	2	–	(D)	(D)
Moffat	389	.9	1 520	43.0	309	.9	104 144	1.6	247	1.2	54 366	1.5
Montezuma	717	.8	4 845	19.8	616	.7	102 915	1.3	485	.9	67 579	1.4
Montrose	865	.7	971	95.5	781	.7	89 191	1.0	687	.8	65 276	1.1
Morgan	760	.8	67 210	1.9	597	.8	342 160	.8	531	.9	204 763	.6
Otero	512	.9	20 033	3.8	387	1.1	65 069	1.4	335	1.2	54 833	1.4
Ouray	79	3.0	321	10.9	68	1.5	14 651	7.2	61	1.9	9 683	1.9
Park	182	1.7	773	26.8	115	2.0	25 291	3.6	74	2.9	15 081	4.3
Phillips	345	.7	17 028	8.5	318	.6	388 555	.5	290	.7	248 140	.4
Pitkin	70	4.4	–406	7.3	64	2.2	10 227	4.5	53	3.0	7 190	5.1
Prowers	521	1.2	26 385	5.1	441	1.3	445 365	1.3	341	1.6	230 472	.8
Pueblo	664	.9	6 039	14.1	440	1.2	89 926	3.0	350	1.5	38 628	1.7
Rio Blanco	255	1.2	1 625	22.2	197	1.4	55 991	3.2	176	1.6	29 190	2.2
Rio Grande	348	1.0	17 915	6.8	320	.9	134 491	.9	296	1.0	110 696	.8
Routt	493	.9	1 664	38.9	419	.9	102 315	1.9	365	1.0	58 846	1.8
Saguache	248	1.3	10 092	4.3	207	1.2	140 268	1.0	187	1.3	121 632	.8
San Juan	4	–	–21	–	3	–	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)
San Miguel	83	3.4	–20	(H)	63	2.1	27 921	3.8	57	2.5	11 242	2.6
Sedgwick	215	.7	12 902	5.5	193	.8	197 365	1.0	178	.9	127 048	.7
Summit	35	4.6	231	8.1	27	2.6	7 064	2.6	21	4.1	6 117	2.7
Teller	84	3.3	71	62.7	40	3.6	4 839	6.8	26	5.1	2 766	9.8
Washington	792	.8	14 553	7.8	659	.8	852 506	.7	551	.9	438 730	.5
Weld	2 960	.6	284 738	.8	2 385	.7	882 260	.8	2 011	.7	547 532	.5
Yuma	896	.8	33 578	4.3	721	.9	633 134	.7	609	1.0	435 123	.5

Geographic area	Irrigated land Farms — Number	Farms — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Acres — Number	Acres — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Livestock and poultry Cattle and calves inventory Farms — Number	Farms — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total — Number	Total — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Beef cows inventory Farms — Number	Farms — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total — Number	Total — Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Colorado	**15 470**	**.7**	**3 430 129**	**.5**	**15 592**	**.7**	**3 307 301**	**.3**	**12 243**	**.8**	**918 891**	**.7**
Adams	241	1.7	27 140	1.8	285	1.6	21 298	1.2	193	2.0	6 926	2.3
Alamosa	258	1.3	106 104	1.6	159	2.0	17 341	3.0	138	2.3	9 189	3.7
Arapahoe	39	4.3	3 901	4.4	133	1.9	10 011	2.0	101	2.3	(D)	(D)
Archuleta	121	2.0	16 764	3.0	124	1.9	15 299	3.0	84	2.5	4 414	4.3
Baca	127	2.5	65 068	1.5	319	1.8	73 994	1.1	259	2.0	21 610	1.8
Bent	161	1.9	62 709	1.7	182	1.7	58 895	.7	160	1.9	19 837	1.3
Boulder	476	1.1	39 464	2.3	267	1.7	12 962	2.6	197	2.0	5 251	4.0
Chaffee	162	1.5	24 406	2.9	133	1.9	11 141	2.0	113	2.3	(D)	(D)
Cheyenne	50	2.8	20 632	1.6	160	1.9	41 836	1.3	121	2.3	(D)	(D)
Clear Creek	3	14.4	(D)	(D)	9	4.9	88	12.7	5	10.0	56	15.5
Conejos	386	1.6	130 581	1.7	302	1.8	45 348	2.3	258	2.0	25 118	2.4
Costilla	155	1.4	44 010	1.8	120	2.1	12 099	2.5	107	2.4	7 099	3.2
Crowley	88	2.4	21 647	4.4	161	1.4	69 137	.6	129	1.7	10 836	2.0
Custer	76	2.6	19 633	2.7	100	2.0	11 530	3.3	74	2.7	(D)	(D)
Delta	949	.6	70 981	1.4	541	1.0	52 528	1.7	456	1.1	24 813	2.0
Denver	10	4.5	14	7.9	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dolores	49	2.8	7 508	2.5	59	2.6	8 587	3.4	53	2.9	4 190	3.9
Douglas	84	2.7	3 645	5.3	268	1.4	10 367	2.8	187	1.8	5 287	3.5
Eagle	94	2.1	16 637	4.0	76	2.7	12 734	4.1	70	3.0	7 554	3.9
Elbert	65	3.0	6 135	5.5	567	.7	55 568	.9	440	.9	27 416	.9
El Paso	121	2.4	15 010	3.2	550	1.0	47 172	1.1	418	1.2	23 120	1.2
Fremont	402	1.2	19 272	1.9	289	1.5	16 080	2.3	210	1.9	7 827	2.9
Garfield	413	.9	51 383	1.7	259	1.5	39 954	2.0	220	1.7	21 760	2.0
Gilpin	1	–	(D)	(D)	6	2.1	(D)	(D)	3	4.3	(D)	(D)
Grand	125	1.5	39 778	1.9	107	1.8	25 228	2.2	87	2.2	(D)	(D)
Gunnison	142	1.2	51 397	2.4	129	1.4	29 229	1.7	113	1.6	(D)	(D)
Hinsdale	13	1.5	2 324	5.4	8	6.3	1 471	9.6	5	14.2	364	16.6
Huerfano	114	2.3	16 208	3.8	200	1.4	26 785	1.2	174	1.6	(D)	(D)
Jackson	93	1.4	123 645	.8	94	1.4	47 683	.8	86	1.5	(D)	(D)
Jefferson	136	2.0	3 277	6.7	144	2.0	6 896	2.4	99	2.6	3 158	3.0
Kiowa	25	5.4	5 922	5.6	170	2.0	26 549	2.9	149	2.3	13 584	2.8
Kit Carson	258	1.6	145 730	.7	361	1.5	153 777	.6	265	1.9	26 624	1.8
Lake	14	–	3 917	–	13	–	1 858	–	11	–	732	–
La Plata	619	.8	71 855	2.3	449	1.1	33 907	1.9	379	1.2	16 764	2.1
Larimer	775	.8	77 695	1.1	604	1.0	66 358	.9	389	1.3	16 723	2.2
Las Animas	177	1.9	24 020	2.0	390	1.0	68 983	.8	356	1.1	35 572	.9
Lincoln	25	4.1	4 509	3.6	305	1.4	65 066	1.2	251	1.6	28 894	1.5
Logan	326	1.4	109 198	1.1	490	1.1	201 846	.4	382	1.3	31 724	1.2
Mesa	1 340	.8	87 648	1.6	675	1.1	71 672	1.6	554	1.3	33 245	1.9

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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

Geographic area	Irrigated land — Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Acres Number	Acres Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Cattle and calves inventory — Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total Number	Total Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Beef cows inventory — Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total Number	Total Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Mineral	5	–	183	–	5	–	498	–	4	–	359	–
Moffat	136	2.0	29 576	8.2	229	1.3	41 829	1.1	201	1.5	21 956	1.4
Montezuma	572	.7	61 081	1.3	428	1.0	30 370	1.7	374	1.1	18 922	1.8
Montrose	804	.6	85 040	1.0	499	1.0	60 599	1.3	401	1.2	26 055	1.7
Morgan	454	1.0	142 212	.7	406	1.1	240 453	.3	283	1.5	22 051	1.7
Otero	378	1.1	63 001	1.7	319	1.3	84 581	.7	225	1.7	15 650	1.7
Ouray	64	1.7	18 349	3.4	56	2.0	11 297	1.7	46	2.6	7 012	1.7
Park	65	3.2	17 998	6.4	132	1.7	13 045	3.4	103	2.2	5 822	4.5
Phillips..............	137	1.2	87 816	.5	119	1.7	32 800	1.1	82	2.2	5 964	2.2
Pitkin	64	2.1	9 650	4.0	30	5.3	3 192	5.7	24	6.2	(D)	(D)
Prowers..............	263	1.9	111 091	1.3	286	1.7	109 101	.5	242	1.9	19 270	1.7
Pueblo...............	327	1.5	35 638	2.3	422	1.3	51 278	1.4	319	1.6	20 385	1.6
Rio Blanco	175	1.6	35 905	2.9	173	1.6	33 910	2.1	151	1.8	20 550	2.2
Rio Grande...........	317	.9	136 141	1.0	166	1.9	22 698	2.0	147	2.1	(D)	(D)
Routt	231	1.6	49 920	3.1	269	1.4	45 718	1.9	221	1.6	20 477	2.4
Saguache	205	1.2	207 200	.9	139	1.8	46 308	1.6	126	2.0	18 662	2.3
San Juan	2	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)
San Miguel	56	2.6	12 341	5.1	50	2.8	10 490	3.5	44	3.3	(D)	(D)
Sedgwick	106	1.6	51 698	1.0	93	1.9	22 763	1.1	68	2.5	(D)	(D)
Summit	24	3.6	10 939	1.6	18	5.4	2 795	4.1	15	6.0	1 567	4.3
Teller	19	5.9	1 646	8.1	53	2.6	4 002	3.3	41	3.3	(D)	(D)
Washington	136	2.0	55 568	1.6	395	1.2	68 780	.9	326	1.4	23 537	1.4
Weld	1 818	.7	393 030	.5	1 583	.7	634 690	.2	1 093	.9	62 408	1.1
Yuma.................	399	1.0	274 057	.4	513	1.1	264 498	.4	410	1.3	39 995	1.2

Livestock and poultry—Con.

Geographic area	Milk cows inventory — Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total Number	Total Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hogs and pigs inventory — Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total Number	Total Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Sheep and lambs inventory — Farms Number	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total Number	Total Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Colorado	**814**	**1.1**	**79 617**	**.2**	**1 225**	**1.0**	**787 440**	**.1**	**1 628**	**1.0**	**593 755**	**.3**
Adams	20	6.0	2 382	.9	38	5.2	(D)	(D)	27	5.9	610	7.2
Alamosa	7	10.8	163	9.2	13	9.1	439	17.1	27	5.7	2 143	14.8
Arapahoe	3	17.4	(D)	(D)	25	5.9	2 342	15.5	10	8.7	(D)	(D)
Archuleta	5	12.6	61	12.6	5	14.7	39	16.3	20	6.8	906	12.0
Baca	11	8.1	99	10.4	13	8.3	(D)	(D)	11	11.3	251	13.3
Bent	8	11.6	145	2.6	19	7.2	(D)	(D)	13	7.9	511	9.6
Boulder	14	8.0	178	6.0	28	5.9	753	9.4	35	5.3	1 103	10.8
Chaffee	1	–	(D)	(D)	10	9.5	28	13.8	8	11.4	182	12.1
Cheyenne	4	17.4	(D)	(D)	7	12.1	1 045	20.3	3	21.7	111	20.0
Clear Creek	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Conejos..............	15	8.2	400	3.0	13	8.9	416	20.0	47	5.0	15 430	2.6
Costilla	5	16.1	6	13.4	2	32.6	(D)	(D)	20	7.5	2 465	7.7
Crowley	10	8.6	278	7.3	7	11.7	628	16.0	9	10.6	218	13.5
Custer	1	36.9	(D)	(D)	6	13.1	26	5.6	3	16.0	120	16.0
Delta	36	4.1	1 948	1.0	53	3.6	310	9.3	65	3.2	14 197	.6
Denver	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dolores	–	–	–	–	2	20.1	(D)	(D)	3	15.4	51	21.4
Douglas..............	6	10.3	122	3.6	20	6.1	183	12.8	29	5.1	744	7.1
Eagle.................	4	20.2	5	21.5	8	12.8	42	15.4	21	6.1	19 820	1.7
Elbert................	28	4.3	864	2.6	41	3.8	568	9.9	35	4.3	1 786	9.3
El Paso	27	5.0	1 106	2.2	65	3.7	1 526	9.9	41	4.6	690	9.6
Fremont	21	6.0	2 141	1.1	37	4.9	278	11.2	20	7.0	498	11.1
Garfield	8	10.7	122	25.4	28	5.7	219	10.3	41	4.4	16 844	2.1
Gilpin	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Grand	2	22.8	(D)	(D)	12	6.9	74	11.2	17	6.9	622	9.2
Gunnison	3	14.6	(D)	(D)	5	12.7	34	16.7	6	10.1	(D)	(D)
Hinsdale	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Huerfano	5	10.1	(D)	(D)	5	15.9	22	17.2	10	9.3	222	15.8
Jackson..............	2	17.9	(D)	(D)	7	9.2	50	12.6	10	8.7	445	9.6
Jefferson.............	4	14.0	13	19.2	15	8.5	74	13.1	13	8.9	142	12.2
Kiowa	12	8.9	251	11.2	6	15.8	(D)	(D)	4	20.0	53	21.3
Kit Carson............	14	9.5	610	5.7	27	6.6	3 896	5.2	11	9.8	387	10.5
Lake.................	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
La Plata..............	21	5.8	369	2.8	30	4.5	(D)	(D)	47	4.3	7 850	4.7
Larimer	45	3.1	7 769	.3	62	3.6	1 004	9.3	87	3.0	29 374	.6
Las Animas	22	6.3	320	3.7	8	10.3	39	16.3	5	16.1	113	26.8
Lincoln...............	11	9.7	32	19.4	15	8.2	2 247	6.8	17	6.9	3 413	2.9
Logan	13	9.4	260	9.8	42	4.0	35 271	.4	29	5.6	1 485	9.9
Mesa	37	4.8	1 030	3.4	62	3.6	2 488	12.4	95	2.9	9 906	2.6
Mineral	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Moffat	15	6.5	18	7.5	15	7.4	194	24.7	66	3.0	72 715	.8
Montezuma	15	7.1	32	8.2	15	7.1	105	10.1	45	3.9	2 202	8.6
Montrose	25	4.9	2 440	.7	43	4.1	1 180	6.3	102	2.6	35 427	1.6
Morgan	38	3.5	6 829	.6	33	4.5	12 121	3.0	32	4.6	840	5.0

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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

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

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)
Otero	21	6.9	503	2.1	27	5.6	1 289	8.1	36	5.1	4 442	3.8
Ouray	–	–	–	–	2	20.8	(D)	(D)	7	10.5	570	14.0
Park	6	11.3	19	10.5	2	13.8	(D)	(D)	9	9.1	201	10.5
Phillips	9	5.1	1 327	.2	9	8.2	(D)	(D)	9	8.5	1 274	2.8
Pitkin	1	45.8	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	2	27.8	(D)	(D)
Prowers	9	11.7	24	16.4	24	6.4	6 975	1.1	28	6.2	1 986	6.4
Pueblo	20	6.8	1 028	.8	37	5.1	2 641	1.4	30	5.6	679	9.2
Rio Blanco	9	10.6	13	12.0	8	11.2	621	24.4	50	3.8	35 959	1.4
Rio Grande	5	16.4	(D)	(D)	8	11.2	231	29.2	38	4.8	9 492	3.2
Routt	11	8.5	31	11.0	29	5.5	200	10.6	51	4.2	9 932	3.7
Saguache	11	8.3	28	5.8	8	9.7	(D)	(D)	19	6.0	2 512	5.4
San Juan	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Miguel	1	35.7	(D)	(D)	1	23.5	(D)	(D)	7	11.4	(D)	(D)
Sedgwick	1	–	(D)	(D)	2	15.7	(D)	(D)	4	15.7	152	18.6
Summit	–	–	–	–	2	–	(D)	(D)	1	40.0	(D)	(D)
Teller	2	25.6	(D)	(D)	8	10.8	52	13.9	9	8.8	109	11.6
Washington	13	6.7	699	3.4	34	4.5	20 585	.6	29	5.1	934	8.1
Weld	154	1.5	39 017	.2	157	2.2	139 775	.3	179	2.1	260 334	.1
Yuma................	23	6.1	6 059	.1	25	5.7	205 823	.2	36	5.0	3 529	6.2

Livestock and poultry—Con.

Geographic area	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)
Colorado	**1 577**	**1.0**	**3 595 189**	**(L)**	**74**	**3.5**	**11 933**	**6.9**
Adams................	38	5.0	1 746	14.5	9	11.0	479	22.2
Alamosa	13	9.1	246	11.0	1	31.4	(D)	(D)
Arapahoe	22	6.2	439	7.4	1	30.2	(D)	(D)
Archuleta	17	7.0	401	7.9	1	28.3	(D)	(D)
Baca	12	10.9	270	9.6	–	–	–	–
Bent..................	10	9.2	207	11.4	–	–	–	–
Boulder	57	4.3	(D)	(D)	1	31.7	(D)	(D)
Chaffee	12	8.8	231	10.6	–	–	–	–
Cheyenne.............	3	24.2	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Clear Creek	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Conejos..............	19	8.3	1 078	12.9	–	–	–	–
Costilla	5	19.0	71	24.0	–	–	–	–
Crowley..............	7	11.1	182	14.4	–	–	–	–
Custer	9	10.6	152	12.9	2	21.5	(D)	(D)
Delta	82	3.0	1 780	6.6	7	8.4	6 536	11.8
Denver	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dolores	8	9.3	95	10.7	–	–	–	–
Douglas..............	46	3.9	849	4.1	4	9.7	40	9.7
Eagle	11	10.9	215	13.7	1	42.1	(D)	(D)
Elbert................	65	2.9	(D)	(D)	3	14.6	(D)	(D)
El Paso	82	3.2	1 256	4.3	2	20.7	(D)	(D)
Fremont	52	4.4	958	6.2	–	–	–	–
Garfield	41	4.4	928	5.5	1	36.8	(D)	(D)
Gilpin	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Grand	7	10.6	70	15.0	1	33.5	(D)	(D)
Gunnison	4	14.5	90	15.8	–	–	–	–
Hinsdale	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Huerfano.............	5	13.3	110	15.1	–	–	–	–
Jackson...............	4	15.2	46	15.9	–	–	–	–
Jefferson.............	22	6.5	602	10.6	2	27.1	(D)	(D)
Kiowa	10	8.7	267	6.2	1	–	(D)	(D)
Kit Carson............	27	6.9	683	12.2	–	–	–	–
Lake.................	1	–	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
La Plata..............	63	3.4	1 157	4.0	1	27.9	(D)	(D)
Larimer	99	2.7	2 653	7.3	8	10.2	1 232	13.1
Las Animas	24	6.4	465	7.1	–	–	–	–
Lincoln...............	20	7.0	275	8.1	–	–	–	–
Logan	24	5.5	556	5.8	1	31.8	(D)	(D)
Mesa	99	3.0	(D)	(D)	1	31.5	(D)	(D)
Mineral	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Moffat	21	5.5	586	9.7	–	–	–	–
Montezuma	45	4.0	1 184	5.1	–	–	–	–
Montrose	46	4.0	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Morgan	35	4.7	752	5.1	3	15.3	39	15.8
Otero	32	5.8	655	6.6	2	24.6	(D)	(D)
Ouray	5	11.2	73	14.8	–	–	–	–
Park	17	7.2	311	8.2	–	–	–	–
Phillips	12	6.4	255	8.6	1	35.7	(D)	(D)
Pitkin	2	32.0	(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]

	Livestock and poultry—Con.							
	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
Geographic area	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)
Prowers...............	19	8.3	361	12.6	1	40.6	(D)	(D)
Pueblo................	22	7.1	349	7.8	1	36.8	(D)	(D)
Rio Blanco	15	7.6	193	9.4	–	–	–	–
Rio Grande...........	10	9.6	148	9.3	–	–	–	–
Routt	21	6.5	347	7.5	2	14.6	(D)	(D)
Saguache	18	6.1	370	8.3	–	–	–	–
San Juan	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Miguel	7	8.3	157	7.9	1	23.5	(D)	(D)
Sedgwick	7	10.0	237	4.6	–	–	–	–
Summit	1	35.0	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Teller	10	9.4	224	9.1	–	–	–	–
Washington	23	5.8	464	7.6	2	21.5	(D)	(D)
Weld	162	2.3	2 611 652	(L)	12	8.5	1 542	12.0
Yuma.................	26	6.2	945	16.3	1	32.0	(D)	(D)

	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed						Corn for silage or green chop					
Geographic area	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Colorado	**3 579**	**.7**	**919 784**	**.4**	**130 170 731**	**.3**	**1 160**	**.9**	**96 344**	**.6**	**2 021 799**	**.6**
Adams...............	59	3.3	12 634	1.4	1 019 356	1.9	15	6.3	520	5.5	11 385	4.9
Alamosa	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Arapahoe	4	12.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Archuleta	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Baca	74	3.1	24 298	2.0	3 825 593	1.8	6	7.6	450	6.0	9 528	6.0
Bent	92	2.7	10 579	2.2	1 415 099	2.1	40	4.3	2 185	4.0	38 925	3.6
Boulder	52	3.6	5 596	2.5	729 994	2.7	16	6.7	768	8.8	15 533	8.4
Chaffee	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Cheyenne	44	3.1	15 297	3.2	1 952 231	2.5	7	–	735	–	10 760	–
Clear Creek	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Conejos..............	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Costilla	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Crowley	37	3.9	4 068	3.7	591 925	3.3	10	7.2	287	5.5	4 872	6.3
Custer	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Delta	46	3.3	3 511	3.0	607 315	3.1	44	3.3	1 962	2.2	44 264	2.9
Denver	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dolores	–	–	–	–	–	–	6	11.3	421	15.0	4 188	14.6
Douglas..............	1	27.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	20.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Eagle	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Elbert................	4	9.0	185	4.9	8 350	6.6	3	12.1	431	14.6	2 158	11.7
El Paso	–	–	–	–	–	–	6	8.9	412	2.6	6 075	1.6
Fremont	1	33.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	23.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Garfield	3	15.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	6	13.0	92	9.8	1 872	8.4
Gilpin	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Grand	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Gunnison	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hinsdale	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Huerfano	2	24.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Jackson...............	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Jefferson.............	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	14.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Kiowa	16	5.0	2 077	4.4	200 207	4.5	3	16.7	340	17.6	3 510	20.5
Kit Carson.............	225	1.6	93 632	.7	13 092 932	.7	62	2.8	8 466	1.7	188 276	1.9
Lake.................	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
La Plata...............	5	10.2	287	11.0	33 176	10.7	6	8.7	253	8.0	3 969	9.6
Larimer	137	2.0	14 945	1.6	2 205 389	1.5	58	2.6	4 739	1.2	105 506	1.2
Las Animas	9	9.3	396	6.7	51 902	4.6	3	14.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lincoln...............	24	3.3	5 126	1.7	402 600	1.6	3	12.3	100	14.7	700	10.5
Logan	263	1.5	64 550	1.2	8 003 004	1.0	61	3.0	4 435	3.1	97 855	2.8
Mesa	89	3.1	6 229	3.7	777 572	3.7	53	4.1	2 498	4.3	46 978	4.4
Mineral	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Moffat	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Montezuma	2	15.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	3	–	336	–	6 000	–
Montrose	131	2.1	8 688	1.8	1 383 962	1.8	54	3.0	3 410	2.1	79 603	2.0
Morgan	300	1.2	70 978	.8	10 596 484	.8	79	2.1	7 845	1.7	157 249	2.0
Otero	172	1.9	18 776	1.7	2 835 030	1.7	46	3.7	1 638	4.5	28 339	4.8
Ouray	2	17.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	4	8.5	71	5.7	1 200	3.7
Park.................	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Phillips...............	177	1.1	105 750	.5	13 261 865	.4	15	4.9	1 065	2.4	22 743	3.4
Pitkin	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Prowers..............	122	2.6	19 561	1.1	2 815 177	1.1	22	5.8	2 527	4.2	49 354	3.0
Pueblo...............	87	3.1	6 762	2.1	1 111 154	2.0	7	8.8	311	2.0	4 902	3.3
Rio Blanco	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Rio Grande...........	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Routt	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	(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]

	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed						Corn for silage or green chop					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
Geographic area	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Saguache	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Juan	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Miguel	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Sedgwick	97	1.7	45 882	.8	5 668 821	.9	24	3.2	1 235	2.6	19 294	3.5
Summit	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Teller	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Washington	149	1.8	47 213	1.0	5 171 755	.8	19	2.5	2 605	1.5	28 910	.8
Weld	786	1.0	118 327	.7	17 788 545	.6	430	1.1	42 352	.8	947 941	.8
Yuma	364	1.0	212 719	.4	34 369 414	.4	40	3.2	2 683	1.8	58 017	1.4

	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Sorghum for grain or seed						Wheat for grain					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
Geographic area	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)
Colorado	**504**	**1.5**	**148 004**	**1.2**	**5 272 619**	**1.2**	**5 407**	**.8**	**2 515 100**	**.4**	**76 656 526**	**.4**
Adams	10	6.6	1 969	1.8	70 300	1.6	225	1.6	208 883	.6	6 688 672	.6
Alamosa	–	–	–	–	–	–	34	3.6	8 448	1.9	712 346	2.0
Arapahoe	4	7.6	1 969	.6	(D)	(D)	68	2.9	69 224	1.3	1 670 139	1.3
Archuleta	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	26.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Baca	175	2.3	76 183	1.8	2 557 825	1.9	273	2.0	166 527	1.1	3 899 689	1.0
Bent..................	21	6.9	1 777	9.5	99 373	10.0	69	3.0	8 712	2.5	315 524	2.1
Boulder	–	–	–	–	–	–	53	3.7	6 103	5.2	275 520	4.2
Chaffee	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Cheyenne.............	13	6.2	3 964	3.7	110 994	1.9	204	1.6	163 467	.9	4 206 356	.8
Clear Creek	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Conejos	1	46.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	16	6.2	2 422	5.6	216 685	5.5
Costilla	–	–	–	–	–	–	14	5.5	4 832	1.8	464 850	1.3
Crowley...............	5	–	1 189	–	43 523	–	7	5.9	1 705	4.7	48 815	3.2
Custer	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Delta	2	12.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	25	4.7	633	5.7	39 664	6.4
Denver	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dolores	–	–	–	–	–	–	58	2.4	17 248	1.7	386 215	1.7
Douglas	–	–	–	–	–	–	17	6.2	3 058	11.5	66 325	12.0
Eagle	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	40.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Elbert................	4	11.8	341	7.6	10 885	7.1	101	2.1	38 802	1.4	880 849	1.4
El Paso	2	11.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	26	5.3	4 029	7.7	145 607	7.8
Fremont	1	33.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	3	20.1	60	21.6	2 927	22.0
Garfield	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	10.9	1 690	12.8	49 902	13.6
Gilpin	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Grand	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Gunnison	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hinsdale	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Huerfano..............	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	22.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Jackson...............	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Jefferson..............	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	13.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Kiowa	52	3.2	24 253	2.1	920 340	2.2	173	2.0	173 535	.8	4 833 014	.8
Kit Carson............	3	11.5	328	7.9	7 420	7.0	453	1.3	272 655	.7	8 559 632	.8
Lake.................	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
La Plata...............	–	–	–	–	–	–	34	4.6	4 007	5.2	106 158	4.4
Larimer	3	13.3	30	9.3	(D)	(D)	75	2.8	12 300	3.0	491 222	2.1
Las Animas	–	–	–	–	–	–	15	6.3	5 049	5.5	91 631	4.9
Lincoln...............	24	5.5	8 490	3.1	226 710	4.6	183	1.8	146 457	.8	3 311 817	.8
Logan	7	6.5	808	3.9	24 398	4.2	450	1.1	139 321	1.1	3 895 824	1.0
Mesa	3	20.3	106	21.3	10 600	21.3	75	3.4	4 626	3.4	356 861	3.4
Mineral	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Moffat	1	31.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	43	3.8	20 350	2.8	554 209	2.6
Montezuma	–	–	–	–	–	–	51	3.3	8 988	2.9	310 196	1.9
Montrose	–	–	–	–	–	–	55	3.6	2 047	4.7	145 743	3.7
Morgan	9	6.7	2 245	2.5	83 818	2.1	212	1.6	61 079	1.3	2 131 970	1.2
Otero	9	6.5	374	2.3	30 854	1.5	95	2.6	4 025	2.4	263 111	2.0
Ouray	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Park	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	27.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Phillips...............	2	17.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	252	.9	117 658	.7	3 856 518	.7
Pitkin	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	45.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Prowers..............	105	3.1	15 652	2.5	674 060	2.1	214	1.9	119 337	1.0	3 595 043	1.0
Pueblo................	8	10.1	1 241	6.5	51 120	12.2	20	6.4	2 829	13.0	72 419	7.5
Rio Blanco	–	–	–	–	–	–	11	9.3	2 666	14.2	62 673	12.0
Rio Grande...........	2	20.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	59	2.7	10 530	1.9	1 039 287	1.9
Routt	–	–	–	–	–	–	27	5.5	9 038	6.4	227 780	5.9
Saguache	–	–	–	–	–	–	40	2.4	12 132	1.1	1 211 456	1.0
San Juan	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
San Miguel	–	–	–	–	–	–	10	7.4	4 418	3.2	76 120	3.2
Sedgwick	–	–	–	–	–	–	141	1.2	64 650	1.2	2 142 797	1.2
Summit	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

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]

	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Sorghum for grain or seed						Wheat for grain					
Geographic area	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)
Teller	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Washington	7	8.2	2 455	2.2	100 611	1.7	475	1.0	303 132	.6	9 264 556	.6
Weld	16	5.3	1 592	3.2	76 869	5.6	608	1.1	156 909	1.0	5 002 663	.9
Yuma.................	13	8.0	1 522	8.2	62 035	7.0	425	1.2	148 868	1.1	4 955 526	1.0

	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Barley for grain						Dry edible beans, including dry limas					
Geographic area	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)	Hundredweight	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Colorado	**657**	**1.1**	**84 564**	**.7**	**8 639 798**	**.6**	**1 095**	**.8**	**116 544**	**.6**	**2 028 685**	**.5**
Adams...............	7	9.1	608	8.9	20 177	6.8	9	8.4	433	8.8	8 940	7.5
Alamosa	51	3.0	12 052	1.3	1 401 455	1.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Arapahoe	2	20.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Archuleta	5	13.2	87	17.9	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Baca	4	16.2	135	27.4	6 180	10.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Bent	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Boulder	20	5.8	1 751	6.6	126 330	4.7	8	6.8	309	7.3	6 412	7.3
Chaffee	2	20.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	20.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cheyenne	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	9.7	536	1.1	7 800	1.1
Clear Creek	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Conejos..............	72	3.5	9 785	2.1	1 025 735	1.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Costilla	12	6.8	4 040	2.8	453 825	2.6	1	38.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Crowley	2	14.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Custer	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Delta	4	10.0	90	10.2	6 725	12.9	25	3.8	1 809	2.7	38 825	2.6
Denver	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dolores	1	27.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	42	3.2	12 732	2.2	99 672	2.1
Douglas..............	1	29.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Eagle	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Elbert................	1	27.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	24.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
El Paso	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	23.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Fremont	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Garfield	20	7.0	379	7.9	28 295	4.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Gilpin	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Grand	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Gunnison	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hinsdale	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Huerfano..............	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Jackson...............	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Jefferson.............	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Kiowa	1	44.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Kit Carson............	4	10.7	534	.8	30 943	.1	74	2.3	13 585	1.1	283 050	1.0
Lake.................	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
La Plata..............	10	7.7	299	8.8	11 190	2.5	3	16.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Larimer	43	3.9	2 265	4.3	177 640	4.4	64	2.9	4 126	2.4	82 899	2.6
Las Animas	1	31.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lincoln...............	1	36.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	3	18.4	265	8.6	2 650	8.6
Logan	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	56	3.3	3 200	3.1	58 996	2.6
Mesa	17	6.9	448	8.4	47 917	8.6	19	6.5	662	9.5	13 137	9.2
Mineral	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Moffat	8	9.3	1 077	3.2	41 474	2.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Montezuma	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	25	4.8	5 400	3.1	40 795	4.0
Montrose	21	5.8	947	6.3	90 026	5.0	112	2.4	8 765	2.1	157 458	2.1
Morgan	3	14.3	115	10.9	(D)	(D)	75	2.6	4 282	2.1	80 460	2.3
Otero	3	11.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	17	5.7	701	3.3	10 816	3.7
Ouray	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Park	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Phillips...............	3	–	865	–	40 050	–	43	1.2	5 316	1.1	104 051	.4
Pitkin	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Prowers..............	6	12.4	731	3.0	(D)	(D)	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Pueblo................	–	–	–	–	–	–	32	4.5	2 679	5.1	42 601	3.3
Rio Blanco	3	14.6	140	15.6	4 350	13.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Rio Grande...........	81	1.9	19 806	.8	2 471 893	.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Routt	14	7.5	2 007	2.1	57 655	2.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Saguache	54	2.6	13 769	1.4	1 617 428	2.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Juan	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
San Miguel	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	11.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Sedgwick	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	36	2.9	3 803	2.0	67 987	1.8
Summit	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Teller	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Washington	4	12.6	(D)	(D)	3 950	14.5	25	3.6	3 492	4.0	55 554	3.6
Weld	171	1.8	10 870	1.2	819 067	1.3	307	1.5	21 772	1.2	435 640	1.2
Yuma.................	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	105	1.3	21 542	.9	421 834	.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.					
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Colorado	**13 446**	**.7**	**1 607 991**	**.7**	**3 989 176**	**.7**
Adams	210	1.9	15 856	2.3	42 146	2.9
Alamosa	185	1.8	39 494	2.8	97 660	3.0
Arapahoe	77	2.8	11 779	1.8	21 754	2.2
Archuleta	95	2.4	5 216	4.4	9 904	7.6
Baca	103	3.1	16 495	2.9	46 818	2.5
Bent	148	2.0	39 127	1.6	140 538	1.3
Boulder	398	1.3	24 264	2.5	62 224	2.7
Chaffee	129	2.0	16 148	2.3	27 896	2.9
Cheyenne	66	3.5	8 184	3.0	12 701	2.3
Clear Creek	3	16.7	300	16.4	(D)	(D)
Conejos	361	1.7	82 579	1.8	169 408	1.9
Costilla	141	1.7	22 262	2.9	59 691	3.1
Crowley	80	2.5	9 986	3.0	28 251	2.9
Custer	74	2.6	16 419	2.9	36 267	2.7
Delta	696	.8	32 273	1.6	81 982	2.0
Denver	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dolores	75	2.1	11 638	2.5	32 944	2.6
Douglas	192	1.7	12 236	3.2	16 279	3.8
Eagle	75	2.8	15 057	3.4	26 886	3.6
Elbert	296	1.2	35 175	1.6	48 324	1.9
El Paso	220	1.7	27 577	1.9	45 528	2.3
Fremont	308	1.5	8 754	3.2	20 180	3.0
Garfield	319	1.2	36 652	1.7	85 750	1.9
Gilpin	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Grand	101	1.9	27 439	2.2	38 156	2.5
Gunnison	124	1.5	29 434	1.5	44 492	1.7
Hinsdale	8	4.8	583	12.0	1 022	20.5
Huerfano	126	2.1	13 681	2.6	25 603	2.4
Jackson	89	1.4	82 148	.8	110 045	.9
Jefferson	103	2.5	4 213	4.0	5 576	3.4
Kiowa	38	4.8	6 819	4.8	11 720	6.7
Kit Carson	177	2.2	19 564	1.8	50 666	2.3
Lake	8	–	534	–	329	–
La Plata	520	1.0	34 493	1.8	86 153	2.1
Larimer	672	.9	40 702	1.6	101 141	1.4
Las Animas	195	1.8	23 753	1.7	51 415	2.1
Lincoln	139	2.1	27 238	1.9	46 761	1.5
Logan	370	1.3	48 107	1.3	160 038	1.2
Mesa	818	1.0	38 718	1.9	101 664	1.8
Mineral	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Moffat	224	1.4	32 524	1.5	57 547	1.5
Montezuma	443	.9	49 848	1.5	143 410	1.7
Montrose	601	.9	37 437	1.4	107 055	1.4
Morgan	344	1.2	36 191	1.3	129 078	1.4
Otero	298	1.4	25 822	1.7	99 820	1.9
Ouray	59	1.9	9 445	2.0	16 396	2.2
Park	67	3.1	12 790	5.1	19 326	6.3
Phillips	57	2.6	4 464	2.2	14 319	2.2
Pitkin	49	3.3	7 144	5.2	11 894	3.6
Prowers	243	2.0	71 283	1.5	281 905	1.5
Pueblo	292	1.6	18 502	1.9	48 112	2.2
Rio Blanco	172	1.6	26 202	2.0	56 242	2.0
Rio Grande	228	1.4	45 206	1.9	123 860	1.8
Routt	350	1.1	47 768	1.9	90 177	2.2
Saguache	151	1.6	77 719	1.3	139 152	1.2
San Juan	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
San Miguel	48	3.1	5 090	5.6	9 931	5.8
Sedgwick	66	2.2	7 495	2.2	27 384	2.1
Summit	19	4.5	6 115	2.7	10 228	1.9
Teller	22	5.6	2 736	9.9	2 702	5.9
Washington	226	1.7	32 669	1.5	72 190	1.7
Weld	1 506	.8	137 479	.8	482 051	.8
Yuma	238	1.6	28 868	1.3	97 834	1.3

[1]Data 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..	28 268	1 895	30 163	2.6	6.3
Land in farms .... acres..	32 634 221	−542 087	32 092 134	2.2	−1.7
Average size of farm .... acres..	1 154	−286	1 064	(X)	(X)
Farms by size of farm:					
Less than 10 acres	2 502	577	3 079	10.4	18.7
10 to 49 acres	5 516	865	6 381	6.7	13.6
50 to 179 acres	5 748	545	6 293	5.8	8.7
180 acres or more	14 502	−92	14 410	2.8	−.6
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than $2,500	7 328	1 253	8 581	6.9	14.6
$2,500 to $9,999	6 069	321	6 390	3.7	5.0
$10,000 or more	14 871	321	15 192	2.6	2.1
Market value of agricultural products sold .... $1,000..	4 534 213	4 818	4 539 031	.5	.1
Farms by type of organization:					
Individual or family	23 281	1 755	25 036	3.0	7.0
Partnership, corporation, or other	4 987	140	5 127	3.9	2.7
Farms by tenure of operator:					
Full owners	16 486	1 328	17 814	3.8	7.5
Part owners	8 439	289	8 728	3.4	3.3
Tenants	3 343	278	3 621	5.4	7.7
Operators by place of residence:					
On farm operated	20 500	1 514	22 014	3.1	6.9
Not on farm operated	5 958	208	6 166	6.0	3.4
Not reported	1 810	173	1 983	8.9	8.7
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming	15 399	−208	15 191	2.5	−1.4
Other	12 869	2 103	14 972	4.6	14.0
Operators by sex:					
Male	25 067	993	26 060	2.6	3.8
Female..	3 201	902	4 103	9.1	22.0
Operators by race:					
White	27 640	1 711	29 351	2.7	5.8
Black and other races	628	184	812	25.0	22.7
Operators by years on present farm:					
4 years or less	4 275	656	4 931	4.6	13.3
5 years or more	20 065	1 299	21 364	2.3	6.1
Not reported	3 928	−60	3 868	13.3	−1.6

[1] See text in Appendix C regarding coverage estimates.