
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.

1997 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

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	12.8	Corn for grain or seed	8.0
Land in farms	4.1	Wheat for grain	3.7
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹	5.0	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold	1.5	Cattle and calves	5.3
Harvested cropland	3.2	Hogs and pigs	8.2
		Layers 20 weeks old and older3

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM		SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:		Number of farms reporting:	
25	6.0	25	42.2
50	3.7	50	29.0
75	2.5	75	23.1
100	1.6	100	19.4
150	1.3	150	14.8
200	1.1	200	11.9
3009	300	8.0
5007	500	1.3
7506	750	1.1
1,0005	1,0009
1,5004	1,5008
2,0003	2,0007

Table D. **Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1997—Con.**

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY			SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED—Con.		
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) farms..	245	1.8	Soybeans for beans farms..	348	1.5
				39 740	1.2
	12 582 555	.3		1 003 636	1.2
Layers 20 weeks old and older farms..	225	1.9	Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes farms..	117	1.6
				41 234	.2
	11 589 123	.2		8 812 258	.1
					132
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold farms..	286	.9	Sugarcane for sugar farms..	421 369	1.8
				15 717 245	.1
	105 677 252	.2		673	1.0
				75 956	.6
				208 801 200	.6
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED					
Corn for grain or seed farms..	748	1.0	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) farms..	2 383	.7
				215 665	.8
	(D)	(D)		600 407	.8
	(D)	(D)	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) farms..	1 214	.8
Tobacco farms..	168	1.6		249 719	.2
				4 689	.8
	6 844	1.1	Land in orchards farms..	933 231	.2
	16 136 440	1.0			

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate
Farms	-1.2	1.3	-1.4	1.3
Land in farms	-2.9	.4	-4.2	.3
Average size of farm	-2.0	1.4	-2.9	1.3
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :				
Average per farm	7.0	1.9	5.7	1.8
Average per acre	10.0	1.5	9.4	1.5
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :				
Average per farm	-1	1.8	-7.4	1.7
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	-3.5	1.6	5.4	1.7
10 to 49 acres5	1.5	.2	1.7
50 to 179 acres	2.5	1.1	1.4	1.2
180 to 499 acres	-8.1	1.1	-10.0	1.2
500 to 999 acres	-4.2	1.5	-7.0	1.4
1,000 to 1,999 acres	3.4	.9	-	.8
2,000 acres or more	-3.2	-	-2.8	-
Total cropland	-5.4	1.3	-3.0	1.3
Harvested cropland	-5.2	.6	-3.7	.5
Irrigated land	-6.8	1.2	-1.8	1.3
Irrigated land	1.5	.4	3.3	.4
Market value of agricultural products sold	14.0	.2	14.2	.2
Average per farm	15.4	1.6	15.7	1.5
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	14.8	.2	14.9	.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products	11.1	.3	11.3	.3
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500	-2.2	1.4	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999	2.0	1.9	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999	-7	1.7	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999	-2.2	1.5	-2.2	1.5
\$25,000 to \$49,999	-3.3	1.6	-3.3	1.6
\$50,000 to \$99,999	-3.3	1.9	-3.3	1.9
\$100,000 to \$249,999	-3.7	1.4	-3.7	1.4
\$250,000 to \$499,999	-9.4	-	-9.4	-
\$500,000 or more	15.8	-	15.8	-
Total farm production expenses ¹	7.4	.7	7.7	.8
Average per farm	8.7	1.5	9.5	1.5
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹	-1.2	1.4	-1.6	1.4
Average per farm	38.1	.9	35.5	.8
Average per farm	39.8	2.1	37.7	2.1
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	-4.7	1.2	-3.8	1.1
Other	2.0	1.6	3.1	1.7
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	-2.4	1.5	-6.1	1.5
200 days or more	-1.3	1.6	-2.6	1.6
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory	2.1	1.5	-5.9	1.3
Beef cows	1.4	.6	.2	.5
Milk cows	1.3	1.5	-4.6	1.3
Milk cows	4.2	.7	3.3	.6
Milk cows	-24.1	1.4	-27.3	1.1
Milk cows	-7.0	.1	-7.1	.1
Cattle and calves sold	3.3	1.5	-5.8	1.3
Hogs and pigs inventory	-3.1	.6	-5.4	.5
Hogs and pigs sold	-25.7	1.4	-39.3	1.5
Hogs and pigs sold	-56.2	.9	-59.1	1.0
Hogs and pigs sold	-37.4	1.3	-45.2	1.4
Sheep and lambs inventory	-51.8	1.0	-52.8	1.0
Sheep and lambs inventory	10.2	3.3	-2.3	4.6
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	-23.3	2.6	-48.1	1.9
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	-17.3	1.7	-25.1	1.9
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	16.7	.6	17.4	.6
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	-11.6	1.3	-13.3	1.1
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	8.3	.4	8.0	.4
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed	-18.1	1.6	-17.3	1.8
Corn for grain or seed	-19.4	1.2	(D)	(D)
Soybeans for beans	-14.7	1.4	(D)	(D)
Soybeans for beans	-2.7	2.4	-9	2.6
Soybeans for beans	-16.4	1.7	-15.8	1.7
Sugarcane for sugar	-32.7	1.4	-32.0	1.4
Sugarcane for sugar	9.4	2.7	-2.9	2.3
Sugarcane for sugar	-2.4	.1	-2.4	.1
Sugarcane for sugar	-2.7	.1	-2.7	.1
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	-1.9	1.4	-5.7	1.4
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	-1.6	1.2	-1.4	1.2
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	5.0	1.2	4.8	1.3
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	-24.5	1.2	-20.8	1.2
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	-16.4	.2	-16.2	.2
Land in orchards	-8.6	1.4	3.3	1.6
Land in orchards	7.4	.5	11.9	.4

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm ¹		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Florida	34 799	.6	10 454 217	.2	300	.7	662 538	.9	1 421 654	.9
Alachua	1 086	.7	198 193	1.2	182	1.4	360 956	5.2	24 035	4.9
Baker	157	.6	13 035	1.9	83	2.0	247 169	5.6	5 875	19.0
Bay	70	.9	6 732	9.8	96	9.9	178 733	8.2	1 628	6.9
Bradford	274	.6	43 579	1.5	159	1.6	262 500	13.3	7 183	16.0
Brevard	470	.6	276 573	.4	588	.8	909 187	4.6	15 337	7.5
Broward	347	.7	30 897	2.1	89	2.2	414 044	17.0	11 396	10.7
Calhoun	130	.5	43 799	1.7	337	1.7	395 452	3.5	4 487	4.2
Charlotte	209	.5	290 340	.4	1 389	.7	1 877 627	3.0	9 430	2.6
Citrus	294	.5	49 192	2.2	167	2.3	339 900	11.3	6 024	10.2
Clay	211	.8	70 834	.9	336	1.2	623 247	4.5	6 465	7.4
Collier	235	.7	277 279	.5	1 180	.9	2 152 046	3.4	39 063	4.1
Columbia	600	.7	97 100	1.4	162	1.6	348 563	9.1	16 691	14.8
Dade	1 576	.9	85 093	1.1	54	1.5	408 330	4.6	77 583	3.7
De Soto	715	.7	322 402	.5	451	.8	1 133 735	2.6	41 895	6.1
Dixie	155	.7	33 508	2.8	216	2.9	211 203	3.7	2 652	3.9
Duval	320	.8	35 531	2.8	111	2.9	390 172	11.8	8 647	16.0
Escambia	466	.6	54 617	1.2	117	1.3	248 484	6.8	16 732	6.9
Flagler	91	.7	87 737	.8	964	1.1	1 235 927	3.0	7 672	9
Franklin	19	1.3	5 125	2.9	270	3.2	358 268	5.8	496	5.2
Gadsden	290	.6	57 933	2.0	200	2.1	545 860	9.7	18 165	7.9
Gilchrist	365	.5	78 090	1.3	214	1.4	428 540	5.2	15 883	9.2
Glades	188	.7	380 377	.5	2 023	.8	1 663 359	3.9	7 068	2.5
Gulf	33	1.6	3 823	5.7	116	6.0	131 637	9.1	544	6.6
Hamilton	256	.7	66 379	1.4	259	1.6	302 842	5.6	7 599	4.7
Hardee	1 045	.7	345 643	.6	331	.9	859 608	2.3	33 300	7.2
Hendry	403	.8	604 677	.3	1 500	.8	4 288 707	1.1	72 070	1.9
Hernando	432	.6	52 999	2.3	123	2.4	415 946	7.7	7 650	8.2
Highlands	779	.6	489 579	.4	628	.8	1 190 743	3.1	42 603	5.4
Hillsborough	2 639	.6	247 502	.9	94	1.1	391 045	3.7	82 406	2.8
Holmes	578	.6	87 582	1.5	152	1.6	217 569	16.6	11 422	6.1
Indian River	437	.6	168 399	.4	385	.7	1 243 117	3.2	40 811	4.1
Jackson	844	.6	244 552	.9	290	1.1	300 497	4.4	34 698	6.0
Jefferson	342	.8	126 590	1.2	370	1.4	498 805	5.6	8 254	6.6
Lafayette	221	.6	93 434	1.2	423	1.4	547 086	9.7	11 450	8.6
Lake	1 389	.6	185 311	1.4	133	1.5	406 637	6.0	36 862	4.4
Lee	509	.7	129 001	1.0	253	1.2	723 893	3.7	19 531	3.7
Leon	243	.9	67 539	1.8	278	2.0	456 258	5.8	6 305	11.9
Levy	549	.6	157 376	1.0	287	1.1	364 963	9.1	17 314	7.5
Liberty	47	.7	7 238	4.2	154	4.3	227 102	5.9	1 028	4.1
Madison	486	.6	131 577	1.4	271	1.6	380 680	9.3	21 933	8.0
Manatee	697	.6	267 993	.7	384	.9	921 872	2.8	49 401	5.4
Marion	1 669	.8	265 572	.7	159	1.0	491 266	4.5	44 707	4.0
Martin	305	.8	183 724	.8	602	1.1	1 617 780	3.2	32 559	4.0
Monroe	13	1.3	1 241	6.9	95	7.0	296 297	9.5	146	8.1
Nassau	238	.8	35 165	1.7	148	1.9	275 889	5.8	5 350	8.2
Okaloosa	342	.6	50 822	2.2	149	2.3	249 245	16.5	8 656	7.3
Okeechobee	459	.9	391 871	.4	854	1.0	1 227 122	5.1	25 176	15.1
Orange	862	.6	175 017	1.0	203	1.2	603 726	3.6	53 488	5.4
Osceola	485	.7	610 825	.3	1 259	.7	1 646 904	1.6	21 654	4.8
Palm Beach	855	.8	604 703	.1	707	.8	2 397 652	1.5	71 850	2.9
Pasco	951	.7	161 939	.9	170	1.1	500 412	5.3	27 736	4.3
Pinellas	129	.8	1 895	7.0	15	7.1	283 991	8.9	3 368	7.5
Polk	2 464	.6	621 489	.6	252	.9	531 715	2.3	76 739	4.1
Putnam	391	.6	85 794	1.6	219	1.7	467 078	4.9	10 970	7.2
St. Johns	149	.5	49 631	.7	333	.9	748 864	2.6	20 975	2.2
St. Lucie	500	.7	227 414	.5	455	.8	1 182 701	2.6	29 843	4.0
Santa Rosa	438	.5	87 971	1.3	201	1.4	297 052	5.1	21 827	8.7
Sarasota	315	.5	128 655	1.1	408	1.2	899 896	3.5	8 519	6.2
Seminole	344	.7	37 222	1.6	108	1.7	331 507	11.8	4 695	8.3
Sumter	718	.6	183 374	1.0	255	1.2	467 695	8.7	15 646	10.1
Suwannee	840	.6	158 406	1.1	189	1.2	289 572	3.1	30 772	3.6
Taylor	126	.8	56 784	1.2	451	1.5	396 058	10.7	1 926	9.7
Union	213	.7	62 503	1.0	293	1.2	408 651	3.2	5 556	5.0
Volusia	910	.7	111 502	1.5	123	1.6	447 093	8.1	26 993	6.8
Wakulla	88	.6	11 426	4.4	130	4.4	223 264	5.0	2 641	2.2
Walton	476	.6	78 844	1.6	166	1.7	202 967	8.6	11 410	8.8
Washington	322	.6	55 268	2.2	172	2.3	229 495	9.5	8 864	8.3
Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
						Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Florida	40 869	1.1	6 004 554	.1	172 550	.7	34 785	.6	4 384 423	.2
Alachua	22 172	4.9	50 256	.6	46 276	.9	1 084	.8	38 532	2.5
Baker	37 419	19.1	25 204	.3	160 535	.6	157	1.8	19 020	1.7
Bay	23 258	7.9	2 672	1.4	38 176	1.7	70	3.8	1 120	4.0

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	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Bradford	26 215	16.1	17 402	.6	63 509	.8	274	.9	15 445	2.6
Brevard	32 701	7.6	37 956	.5	80 758	.8	469	.8	26 911	3.9
Broward	32 746	10.7	49 024	.6	141 280	.9	348	.8	30 370	2.0
Calhoun	34 783	4.5	16 197	.7	124 592	.9	129	1.6	11 325	1.8
Charlotte	45 117	2.9	50 162	.3	240 010	.6	209	1.1	37 677	.7
Citrus	20 560	10.2	6 172	3.0	20 992	3.0	293	1.0	4 761	9.9
Clay	30 641	7.5	30 118	.2	142 739	.8	211	1.4	23 673	.5
Collier	165 521	4.3	276 924	.1	1 178 401	.7	236	1.2	183 049	.5
Columbia	27 818	14.9	22 060	.8	36 767	1.1	600	.9	20 927	6.1
Dade	49 166	3.8	416 502	.2	264 278	.9	1 578	1.0	284 059	.5
De Soto	58 513	6.1	180 983	.2	253 123	.7	716	.8	143 949	.6
Dixie	17 112	4.3	4 626	3.2	29 844	3.2	155	1.9	3 791	3.2
Duval	27 107	16.0	26 463	.4	82 697	.8	319	1.1	22 336	1.8
Escambia	35 906	7.0	16 183	1.1	34 727	1.2	466	.9	14 294	5.2
Flagler	84 309	3.0	27 837	.3	305 906	.7	91	2.8	19 173	.4
Franklin	26 112	7.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	19	4.7	228	5.0
Gadsden	63 071	8.0	92 632	.2	319 421	.6	288	1.0	61 590	.7
Gilchrist	43 634	9.2	52 043	.3	142 583	.6	364	.8	44 452	1.7
Glades	37 597	2.7	58 589	.3	311 642	.7	188	1.0	48 604	1.0
Gulf	16 491	8.7	359	3.9	10 876	4.2	33	5.6	311	6.2
Hamilton	29 800	4.9	13 080	.8	51 094	1.0	255	1.1	10 707	2.1
Hardee	31 835	7.3	154 837	.3	148 170	.8	1 046	1.0	119 827	1.7
Hendry	178 390	2.0	323 438	.1	802 575	.8	404	.8	225 770	.6
Hernando	17 748	8.3	23 011	.6	53 267	.8	431	.7	18 305	2.5
Highlands	54 690	5.4	202 863	.2	260 414	.7	779	.8	157 457	1.0
Hillsborough	31 226	2.8	332 736	.2	126 084	.7	2 639	.7	239 523	.7
Holmes	19 727	6.2	31 534	1.1	54 557	1.2	577	.8	23 870	2.9
Indian River	93 604	4.2	95 144	.3	217 722	.7	436	.8	82 830	1.0
Jackson	41 161	6.0	51 455	.7	60 965	.9	843	.7	39 269	2.9
Jefferson	24 207	6.7	18 050	1.0	52 779	1.3	341	1.0	12 637	5.8
Lafayette	52 046	8.6	54 322	.4	245 800	.7	220	.8	42 600	1.9
Lake	26 520	4.5	168 137	.3	121 049	.6	1 390	.7	115 799	1.6
Lee	38 372	3.8	116 397	.2	228 678	.7	509	.9	91 008	1.0
Leon	26 054	11.9	3 463	3.4	14 252	3.5	242	1.2	4 360	16.5
Levy	31 595	7.5	51 822	.5	94 393	.8	548	.8	37 145	1.9
Liberty	21 877	5.8	551	4.1	11 733	4.2	47	4.2	479	4.2
Madison	45 222	8.0	31 992	.6	65 827	.9	485	.9	24 646	3.8
Manatee	70 877	5.4	239 624	.1	343 793	.6	697	.7	152 561	.7
Marion	26 787	4.0	101 530	.5	60 833	.9	1 669	.8	87 600	1.3
Martin	106 400	4.2	145 023	.2	475 486	.8	306	1.1	118 830	.8
Monroe	11 231	10.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	13	6.5	758	2.4
Nassau	22 478	8.3	27 572	.6	115 849	1.0	238	1.0	24 026	1.2
Okaloosa	25 310	7.4	8 711	1.0	25 470	1.2	342	1.0	6 969	5.7
Okeechobee	54 969	15.1	138 006	.2	300 666	.9	459	1.1	113 106	1.3
Orange	62 051	5.5	247 759	.2	287 423	.6	862	.7	180 816	.5
Osceola	44 646	4.8	88 784	.2	183 061	.7	485	.8	71 017	1.8
Palm Beach	83 936	3.0	872 877	.1	1 020 908	.8	856	.8	566 608	.2
Pasco	29 165	4.3	84 301	.4	85 644	.7	951	.7	71 726	1.4
Pinellas	26 107	7.8	11 867	1.0	91 994	1.3	129	2.0	7 813	1.4
Polk	31 131	4.2	253 459	.3	102 865	.7	2 465	.7	187 552	.9
Putnam	28 055	7.3	34 023	.5	87 017	.8	391	.9	23 087	4.2
St. Johns	140 770	2.6	46 047	.3	309 042	.6	149	1.5	32 689	.8
St. Lucie	59 805	4.1	173 137	.2	346 274	.7	499	.9	153 546	.8
Santa Rosa	49 833	8.7	29 971	1.0	66 426	1.1	438	.7	20 820	5.0
Sarasota	27 046	6.3	24 147	.6	76 657	.8	315	1.0	16 562	2.6
Seminole	13 688	8.4	19 966	1.0	58 040	1.2	343	.9	12 566	5.1
Sumter	21 821	10.2	34 442	.7	47 970	.9	717	.7	27 726	3.1
Suwannee	36 678	3.7	121 153	.3	144 230	.7	839	.7	93 431	.8
Taylor	15 288	10.0	4 312	2.1	34 226	2.2	126	2.4	3 862	3.9
Union	26 084	5.3	11 009	.8	51 687	1.0	213	1.5	9 886	.8
Volusia	29 695	6.8	120 358	.3	132 261	.7	909	.7	73 623	1.9
Wakulla	30 014	3.7	3 062	.9	34 798	1.1	88	3.0	1 318	2.5
Walton	24 022	8.8	19 768	.8	41 529	1.0	475	.8	15 441	4.3
Washington	27 528	8.4	9 352	1.5	29 042	1.6	322	1.1	8 653	5.3

Farm production expenses¹—Con.

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased		Feed for livestock and poultry		Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees							
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value					
	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)
Florida	6 697	2.3	145 770	.9	14 829	1.4	446 861	.3	9 902	1.7	217 919	.5
Alachua	253	11.2	2 025	5.9	601	6.1	6 027	7.1	289	11.2	1 215	4.9
Baker	65	10.0	1 844	1.0	103	6.4	8 473	.2	58	9.8	984	7.5
Bay	7	14.3	20	22.8	24	7.0	78	21.7	16	8.0	6	17.5
Bradford	112	15.3	2 150	5.1	181	10.8	8 536	.5	81	20.0	65	16.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Brevard	57	22.4	722	17.5	119	17.9	819	13.0	90	19.1	920	2.0
Broward	46	28.6	625	17.8	76	21.5	2 032	2.7	134	16.0	2 797	6.2
Calhoun	21	23.6	142	24.1	57	11.4	453	21.9	59	10.1	594	1.9
Charlotte	44	14.2	462	3.3	108	7.7	586	3.3	39	19.9	699	7.3
Citrus	80	20.4	424	34.9	139	11.7	499	35.1	52	22.8	197	15.5
Clay	53	20.8	7 393	.4	159	6.1	8 148	.3	68	17.7	254	4.4
Collier	35	32.3	1 007	8.1	60	23.9	964	7.7	91	14.9	6 915	2.1
Columbia	183	13.3	2 831	17.2	348	8.9	6 734	2.6	179	14.9	6 645	6.6
Dade	71	28.2	857	13.6	112	22.1	837	8.3	629	5.9	26 301	1.1
De Soto	107	16.2	3 214	7.0	261	10.7	7 884	1.1	133	18.0	2 219	1.9
Dixie	44	11.2	287	6.8	108	4.8	971	9.5	26	13.1	141	4.3
Duval	76	21.4	1 268	9.1	212	7.2	8 195	1.7	79	19.0	901	.7
Escambia	98	24.4	337	10.2	224	12.0	2 612	3.4	221	10.9	581	11.9
Flagler	26	4.7	283	(D)	46	4.0	132	4.5	25	3.7	3 414	.2
Franklin	7	8.7	(D)	(D)	12	7.5	32	8.6	6	6.7	5	7.2
Gadsden	64	21.9	(D)	(D)	132	12.4	(D)	(D)	132	12.1	2 878	1.2
Gilchrist	76	20.2	3 406	1.2	236	8.5	17 499	.5	116	12.9	476	11.2
Glades	44	15.9	2 179	2.4	104	11.1	6 715	.8	33	26.1	2 256	.1
Gulf	12	9.1	54	11.7	16	7.8	39	10.4	9	11.9	6	12.5
Hamilton	34	23.6	512	2.6	110	12.0	2 504	1.4	127	10.7	367	12.2
Hardee	142	16.6	4 240	9.2	320	11.6	11 555	.8	344	9.3	3 518	3.8
Hendry	69	25.5	1 082	21.5	130	16.3	2 728	2.8	117	15.4	7 620	.6
Hernando	117	19.3	2 323	7.1	264	9.2	6 588	.5	80	24.2	234	6.1
Highlands	99	19.4	2 979	.7	300	10.6	9 043	.8	141	15.3	512	4.6
Hillsborough	465	9.1	13 233	2.8	1 095	4.5	24 822	1.4	595	7.6	8 370	3.7
Holmes	178	12.0	2 331	5.0	358	7.2	12 154	3.8	226	10.9	492	9.3
Indian River	51	22.9	936	27.6	68	20.5	1 574	12.5	79	14.0	1 391	1.3
Jackson	223	12.3	1 427	7.2	401	8.6	3 264	3.5	463	6.1	2 754	7.0
Jefferson	48	24.8	478	53.1	138	11.3	1 022	7.1	113	11.6	676	9.6
Lafayette	80	12.9	4 542	3.3	158	9.2	23 044	2.4	75	17.1	325	31.7
Lake	206	15.2	2 864	5.2	475	7.4	10 072	1.2	434	8.6	7 191	3.3
Lee	91	23.9	248	34.2	236	11.8	429	15.1	120	16.9	7 255	1.9
Leon	40	30.7	438	30.0	122	9.5	786	19.3	76	14.6	268	66.8
Levy	142	16.1	2 010	8.1	334	8.0	11 961	3.1	143	15.4	1 045	5.2
Liberty	14	6.6	54	8.2	20	6.7	92	6.4	10	9.8	(D)	(D)
Madison	175	13.8	3 106	5.4	273	8.8	7 434	2.3	170	13.2	600	10.5
Manatee	125	16.2	1 790	7.5	313	9.2	6 635	3.8	180	12.4	6 898	.7
Marion	428	9.0	15 776	3.2	1 082	4.1	15 685	2.1	315	11.5	1 398	11.3
Martin	69	23.2	3 418	8.1	134	14.8	14 909	2.0	74	16.6	3 451	.2
Monroe	2	17.6	(D)	(D)	3	11.7	(D)	(D)	2	17.6	(D)	(D)
Nassau	100	13.2	2 929	7.9	183	5.5	15 447	.2	53	18.0	(D)	(D)
Okaloosa	72	20.3	419	12.3	157	10.5	1 390	2.4	97	15.7	285	21.1
Okeechobee	158	14.7	8 621	1.9	304	7.6	38 983	.2	49	31.9	545	2.1
Orange	50	21.9	454	6.3	131	15.9	822	5.1	318	6.4	21 622	1.3
Osceola	70	17.5	2 282	.9	190	10.3	8 741	.8	110	14.4	1 848	4.5
Palm Beach	74	25.3	320	21.3	173	13.7	679	8.7	444	5.8	64 903	.5
Pasco	166	15.9	7 867	.7	443	7.8	28 292	.5	145	16.8	1 084	17.3
Pinellas	15	23.6	18	44.0	21	20.4	35	28.7	55	9.9	626	1.3
Polk	388	9.9	4 920	2.4	740	5.7	20 862	1.3	398	9.9	1 771	10.8
Putnam	102	17.4	386	16.2	161	11.5	976	6.4	155	10.2	1 291	13.3
St. Johns	29	16.3	395	11.1	67	7.7	964	10.0	74	6.3	4 810	.7
St. Lucie	76	22.4	710	8.2	108	18.7	3 242	5.2	96	18.1	2 740	1.0
Santa Rosa	67	22.1	171	29.7	172	12.1	619	29.5	245	8.9	1 966	8.4
Sarasota	37	24.3	557	3.2	150	12.9	1 375	4.5	49	25.3	380	8.1
Seminole	34	35.6	202	14.6	120	17.3	469	7.2	58	24.1	538	46.0
Sumter	171	15.0	2 631	2.4	447	6.8	10 401	1.3	100	19.4	468	46.9
Suwannee	246	11.0	12 571	.5	603	5.1	37 909	1.5	305	7.9	1 961	6.2
Taylor	25	15.8	374	1.1	83	7.2	1 869	.7	34	15.8	33	24.3
Union	72	9.6	1 101	2.1	136	5.5	4 284	.6	91	7.9	144	7.0
Volusia	127	19.0	328	18.4	280	10.8	2 130	5.1	265	9.9	1 340	10.3
Wakulla	29	4.6	101	3.8	48	4.0	137	6.5	27	5.7	34	5.5
Walton	123	16.0	2 218	7.2	200	12.7	5 745	.8	153	14.2	322	14.7
Washington	87	16.5	560	5.8	140	10.9	2 112	2.6	132	13.4	317	16.9

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Florida	23 235	1.0	347 559	.4	17 841	1.2	350 556	.4	29 619	.8	131 636	.6
Alachua	698	4.8	2 914	4.3	420	9.2	1 550	8.3	950	2.7	1 563	7.1
Baker	92	6.8	349	3.6	61	10.1	159	6.8	151	2.5	491	2.5
Bay	36	5.2	134	3.8	28	5.7	55	2.1	56	4.2	71	5.1
Bradford	208	7.1	686	22.7	114	15.9	77	34.7	260	2.7	430	12.8

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Brevard	354	5.7	3 236	4.0	306	7.8	2 134	5.8	415	4.0	1 065	6.8
Broward	203	9.5	1 084	17.4	202	8.8	638	5.4	253	7.1	745	12.9
Calhoun	86	7.0	964	3.0	55	10.6	988	1.6	110	4.1	468	3.9
Charlotte	128	5.8	3 591	1.1	102	8.1	4 064	1.6	193	3.6	869	1.7
Citrus	133	12.8	323	10.9	91	17.3	140	17.1	238	4.3	282	13.5
Clay	126	9.7	243	5.5	68	18.2	71	3.4	165	6.9	317	5.6
Collier	149	9.7	12 048	.6	133	10.6	16 245	.6	212	4.2	5 780	.8
Columbia	385	8.6	1 302	12.1	157	17.8	600	18.0	537	4.2	1 061	10.8
Dade	1 392	2.5	17 254	1.6	1 220	3.4	18 804	2.2	1 262	3.2	9 077	3.7
De Soto	542	5.3	13 456	1.5	493	5.3	17 742	1.3	612	4.1	3 534	8.8
Dixie	64	9.0	309	2.8	29	15.2	101	2.1	145	2.5	194	5.1
Duval	181	10.3	498	16.7	105	16.5	199	16.1	285	3.9	689	3.7
Escambia	313	7.5	1 667	8.7	183	13.4	1 417	11.8	415	4.0	761	11.2
Flagler	53	3.4	1 869	.4	44	3.6	1 369	.3	84	2.9	738	.7
Franklin	6	6.7	16	4.0	13	4.7	15	4.8	19	4.7	30	2.7
Gadsden	201	6.7	2 191	1.9	119	13.3	2 306	4.9	251	4.5	896	3.0
Gilchrist	241	7.7	1 371	7.1	128	13.1	878	24.1	312	4.2	964	4.5
Glades	80	16.1	3 932	1.1	82	13.5	3 108	1.4	176	4.1	1 570	4.4
Gulf	18	8.5	32	11.6	9	9.8	16	16.7	30	5.9	19	5.0
Hamilton	186	6.8	1 415	4.9	117	9.7	424	4.5	230	4.1	797	4.2
Hardee	897	3.3	11 820	1.9	806	3.7	12 789	3.4	924	3.2	2 951	4.8
Hendry	269	5.3	28 008	.5	279	5.7	21 657	1.0	326	5.9	6 073	.7
Hernando	261	8.1	516	10.3	188	13.1	344	16.6	369	4.7	504	13.0
Highlands	513	6.6	14 863	2.2	500	5.3	17 073	1.5	660	4.0	3 536	5.9
Hillsborough	1 772	2.8	11 091	2.7	1 525	3.2	12 001	2.8	2 257	2.1	6 280	2.1
Holmes	342	6.7	942	6.8	134	15.0	613	9.9	497	3.6	755	6.9
Indian River	398	2.3	9 198	1.3	374	3.8	12 347	3.6	380	3.4	2 169	2.4
Jackson	639	3.6	5 603	6.3	447	6.4	5 653	5.5	773	2.4	2 224	3.5
Jefferson	253	4.8	1 384	10.5	123	9.7	693	18.8	290	4.1	500	7.4
Lafayette	131	10.8	1 081	18.3	71	12.9	288	25.2	201	5.0	1 062	7.2
Lake	1 026	3.2	5 538	10.0	803	4.7	5 759	6.3	1 163	2.9	3 829	3.2
Lee	262	9.8	5 248	4.3	254	11.0	7 200	5.5	449	4.0	2 128	2.6
Leon	135	10.8	195	18.5	58	16.2	46	23.4	209	6.0	218	26.0
Levy	267	9.9	2 508	4.7	157	14.9	1 511	10.0	466	4.6	1 270	6.8
Liberty	23	6.6	29	9.0	13	5.4	15	10.3	40	4.5	47	3.6
Madison	241	9.8	1 937	8.7	174	11.2	918	3.7	443	3.7	1 279	4.4
Manatee	419	6.5	13 926	1.8	379	6.7	19 161	.9	614	3.0	4 227	1.3
Marion	823	5.7	3 279	7.0	544	7.7	1 624	9.6	1 442	2.2	2 530	4.5
Martin	172	10.6	11 928	.9	134	12.6	10 225	.4	265	5.9	3 790	1.5
Monroe	8	9.4	5	10.6	11	6.7	14	6.3	9	5.9	16	3.5
Nassau	113	11.6	104	14.3	50	16.7	26	7.9	230	2.1	463	5.2
Okaloosa	180	8.1	678	15.6	83	17.9	308	14.7	279	4.0	356	11.0
Okeechobee	190	11.4	5 899	3.9	158	13.8	4 522	1.9	380	5.9	1 879	4.4
Orange	646	3.3	5 726	2.1	532	5.5	8 265	2.1	691	3.9	4 682	1.8
Osceola	324	6.9	8 920	2.7	235	10.2	6 673	4.2	423	3.7	1 945	6.2
Palm Beach	644	4.4	69 279	.1	537	4.5	59 973	.4	613	5.0	19 744	.6
Pasco	645	4.9	2 396	5.9	543	6.3	1 964	5.2	845	2.9	1 306	4.3
Pinellas	75	7.0	158	6.3	76	8.3	300	3.0	98	5.1	268	2.8
Polk	1 892	2.1	16 539	2.4	1 735	2.6	23 128	2.2	1 959	2.4	5 637	3.4
Putnam	251	6.6	1 762	2.4	193	8.8	1 682	2.0	325	4.1	888	11.4
St. Johns	95	5.0	3 115	1.7	88	6.2	4 025	2.3	120	4.1	1 505	1.1
St. Lucie	391	5.4	14 763	1.6	393	5.1	24 112	1.6	377	5.9	4 870	.9
Santa Rosa	349	4.5	2 900	7.8	240	8.7	2 946	9.2	405	2.4	1 185	8.3
Sarasota	141	13.7	1 183	2.6	110	15.3	1 065	3.7	271	6.0	424	3.8
Seminole	184	9.7	605	15.3	148	12.3	307	9.9	292	5.3	462	15.9
Sumter	384	6.8	1 468	10.4	217	12.1	563	11.9	581	4.1	861	5.6
Suwannee	561	5.3	4 373	3.3	347	8.2	2 118	5.8	785	2.4	3 511	2.7
Taylor	68	8.0	252	17.7	28	17.9	22	26.7	118	3.0	145	7.0
Union	140	4.9	773	3.5	62	9.5	246	3.1	186	2.8	356	3.7
Volusia	658	4.9	4 566	5.9	554	5.8	3 848	3.0	771	3.4	2 375	4.0
Wakulla	43	4.5	132	2.9	34	4.7	116	1.0	79	3.2	86	2.6
Walton	314	7.9	929	7.8	121	15.7	838	31.7	374	4.5	522	6.1
Washington	221	5.1	1 053	11.5	104	12.8	480	14.8	279	3.8	366	12.3

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Florida	21 403	1.1	55 022	.6	12 199	1.5	925 607	.3	7 481	2.1	477 373	.6
Alachua	681	5.8	1 018	13.4	420	9.2	5 988	4.2	218	14.1	3 134	5.0
Baker	75	8.9	302	2.4	35	13.0	2 713	2.3	10	29.4	48	24.2
Bay	43	4.9	27	7.2	15	7.8	302	4.2	12	8.5	115	2.6
Bradford	128	13.9	157	3.3	56	25.7	491	2.1	21	39.8	142	3.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	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)
Brevard	189	10.8	222	11.3	180	12.0	4 789	4.7	74	20.0	3 156	3.2
Broward	277	6.2	520	7.1	156	9.7	10 186	4.2	77	22.3	1 958	16.6
Calhoun	76	8.0	117	6.3	44	11.8	2 762	1.4	15	25.3	567	2.0
Charlotte	92	11.6	283	6.1	80	9.0	4 515	1.8	51	12.9	8 471	.5
Citrus	177	9.0	102	23.4	59	21.0	1 269	24.2	42	30.4	128	43.5
Clay	159	7.6	686	1.2	33	23.1	2 311	.1	14	23.4	201	2.9
Collier	159	8.1	1 491	1.3	102	12.8	45 008	.7	67	15.8	26 463	.5
Columbia	281	11.4	428	10.1	130	16.7	1 088	7.9	51	23.8	958	1.9
Dade	961	4.8	2 471	2.7	779	5.7	87 939	1.2	477	7.5	20 410	6.2
De Soto	431	7.3	1 012	4.9	236	11.6	16 305	3.2	329	9.5	38 024	2.0
Dixie	78	7.2	104	5.3	49	9.8	554	1.6	8	29.0	151	8.7
Duval	199	8.8	387	4.0	82	14.5	4 037	.7	33	26.8	889	2.9
Escambia	290	9.3	249	7.3	132	18.5	1 284	5.4	66	27.0	387	8.6
Flagler	70	2.9	203	.6	34	3.1	3 415	.3	20	4.4	2 337	.2
Franklin	11	7.2	7	8.2	7	8.7	8	15.7	2	—	(D)	(D)
Gadsden	180	9.2	1 981	1.2	102	13.4	24 882	.3	23	26.9	1 774	.3
Gilchrist	180	11.0	835	3.0	85	18.6	5 947	.8	64	24.0	657	25.8
Glades	122	9.4	512	10.4	92	13.6	7 709	1.8	45	23.5	2 597	1.9
Gulf	21	6.5	8	7.1	7	9.2	37	1.3	4	14.4	4	9.3
Hamilton	118	10.2	233	3.9	94	13.3	1 066	.9	23	29.8	180	5.9
Hardee	646	6.1	1 181	7.1	451	8.0	17 099	5.2	438	8.4	23 184	3.1
Hendry	291	6.5	2 811	1.8	213	8.7	40 300	.9	176	8.8	48 197	1.5
Hernando	285	9.4	351	5.4	99	18.5	2 647	4.6	58	22.4	650	7.5
Highlands	441	6.8	1 334	5.0	285	9.2	18 414	1.8	290	9.7	38 172	1.6
Hillsborough	1 693	3.4	3 290	3.2	995	4.8	65 051	1.3	556	7.8	25 032	2.2
Holmes	261	8.9	497	8.2	158	11.6	851	9.7	54	26.2	112	27.8
Indian River	295	6.4	908	1.5	201	9.7	11 477	1.9	157	10.5	14 795	2.2
Jackson	486	5.8	617	5.0	226	10.9	4 521	4.2	112	17.3	637	5.0
Jefferson	151	12.0	210	15.7	119	12.8	3 110	8.7	46	22.0	574	18.8
Lafayette	134	7.9	886	2.6	120	11.3	4 066	2.6	12	45.8	129	34.3
Lake	829	5.0	1 455	5.7	442	8.3	39 634	.7	377	9.7	6 815	10.8
Lee	311	7.8	1 005	3.0	158	15.4	42 072	.4	148	15.6	3 499	1.5
Leon	161	10.0	95	17.0	57	21.9	481	20.9	26	42.8	12	27.6
Levy	389	5.3	757	2.8	157	15.3	4 600	1.3	98	19.9	1 082	8.4
Liberty	33	4.9	14	6.6	11	8.0	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)
Madison	314	8.4	540	4.8	122	15.4	3 045	7.6	22	45.2	716	16.0
Manatee	417	6.2	1 219	2.5	249	9.4	32 070	.4	158	11.0	23 293	1.3
Marion	1 100	4.1	1 572	7.7	556	7.3	15 184	3.0	262	12.1	2 767	7.8
Martin	205	9.8	1 021	2.1	144	10.0	22 718	1.8	70	17.4	19 071	.2
Monroe	7	9.1	16	5.1	4	8.8	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)
Nassau	165	8.0	235	2.4	51	18.2	746	9.6	38	21.3	195	10.7
Okaloosa	152	12.7	107	7.7	41	27.0	872	26.2	14	36.0	158	15.4
Okeechobee	263	9.5	1 665	.9	165	12.6	16 846	1.2	75	15.5	4 683	8.7
Orange	576	4.5	2 967	1.5	454	6.4	73 511	.5	159	11.1	10 396	2.5
Osceola	305	7.0	618	3.4	163	12.5	15 673	1.7	112	15.2	7 159	3.1
Palm Beach	692	4.0	5 032	1.0	528	5.4	122 042	.4	156	10.2	50 830	.6
Pasco	582	6.0	836	4.0	296	10.1	8 839	4.7	217	14.0	3 266	11.3
Pinellas	98	5.7	290	2.3	48	8.8	3 393	2.6	15	23.3	108	11.5
Polk	1 572	3.5	2 519	2.9	811	6.1	28 795	2.3	896	5.8	30 984	3.2
Putnam	277	6.7	378	10.5	152	11.7	7 266	2.9	49	26.3	1 040	33.4
St. Johns	118	4.3	516	1.1	85	5.1	5 298	1.5	43	8.7	1 193	4
St. Lucie	327	6.2	1 846	1.7	215	10.0	21 101	2.1	235	8.5	37 219	.8
Santa Rosa	245	10.4	251	9.2	125	12.3	3 047	3.7	50	14.9	603	4.9
Sarasota	175	9.7	181	12.7	101	18.4	4 094	4.8	42	26.6	1 742	1.1
Seminole	192	10.5	194	19.6	95	12.7	4 641	6.5	73	19.3	481	13.2
Sumter	451	6.0	536	5.5	193	13.7	2 633	2.6	92	21.4	623	12.9
Suwannee	553	6.2	2 080	1.5	294	8.5	10 625	3.0	116	17.0	787	8.2
Taylor	70	7.7	73	13.3	29	15.7	94	37.9	7	38.5	105	39.5
Union	126	5.8	190	4.8	74	7.5	796	2.8	15	21.5	106	14.7
Volusia	639	4.7	1 038	5.3	372	7.9	31 865	.8	196	13.3	3 742	11.9
Wakulla	49	4.0	27	5.3	24	5.2	151	3.4	6	10.1	12	6.5
Walton	197	12.0	163	10.1	45	22.8	424	2.2	32	18.4	264	7.3
Washington	132	13.0	143	20.3	62	13.7	452	10.6	34	29.9	183	15.1

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)
Florida	24 621	1.0	195 760	.6	7 081	2.2	99 207	.9	10 162	1.8	237 536	.6
Alachua	781	4.5	2 838	7.0	166	16.1	774	16.6	349	10.6	2 088	6.1
Baker	122	4.8	394	5.0	17	22.0	116	2.7	37	12.7	554	4.1
Bay	46	4.7	74	7.7	4	20.8	(D)	(D)	19	7.1	42	8.4
Bradford	237	5.6	628	13.7	45	34.1	75	14.4	65	25.6	490	11.8

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.											
	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)
Brevard	328	7.0	1 937	4.7	96	19.5	1 181	2.7	106	18.5	933	16.7
Broward	275	6.0	2 221	22.5	39	30.5	208	4.9	72	20.9	892	10.3
Calhoun	88	6.7	491	6.3	42	14.1	379	1.6	48	12.2	762	2.5
Charlotte	132	8.4	1 614	2.5	40	13.1	1 856	1.4	64	12.0	3 822	1.1
Citrus	189	8.5	391	18.1	15	39.5	68	56.5	45	26.4	173	26.8
Clay	179	5.7	655	3.0	23	(D)	(D)	(D)	72	17.3	783	7.0
Collier	173	7.3	6 656	1.1	46	17.3	4 400	.1	72	14.8	11 737	.4
Columbia	426	7.5	944	12.7	136	18.4	271	20.6	154	16.2	1 218	19.7
Dade	1 121	3.8	11 994	2.3	330	10.8	3 606	3.9	425	8.8	11 522	1.8
De Soto	447	6.8	5 384	1.7	173	12.0	3 462	2.7	258	11.6	13 045	3.9
Dixie	105	5.4	210	7.0	19	20.1	137	4.8	42	10.3	164	7.3
Duval	251	5.9	918	6.7	34	30.9	251	3.5	86	18.5	1 035	4.9
Escambia	363	6.6	1 115	13.3	64	23.1	174	4.5	160	16.6	1 052	14.1
Flagler	67	2.9	787	.4	18	5.1	63	1.7	35	2.9	1 282	.4
Franklin	12	5.1	38	4.9	3	—	(D)	(D)	6	6.7	13	1.3
Gadsden	236	5.8	2 459	4.1	93	17.3	891	5.5	124	11.3	1 240	6.7
Gilchrist	287	4.7	2 134	3.7	59	21.6	770	13.1	119	12.8	1 616	5.5
Glades	171	4.5	1 639	2.6	44	22.4	2 623	.7	68	13.0	3 477	1.9
Gulf	21	6.8	29	7.6	4	19.8	3	25.7	6	15.3	20	12.9
Hamilton	185	7.3	680	5.7	82	12.5	303	11.3	81	15.1	558	14.2
Hardee	744	4.5	4 096	3.7	308	10.8	3 947	5.9	314	11.0	6 024	3.4
Hendry	278	7.4	11 411	.7	134	14.3	6 784	.4	133	11.8	17 835	1.1
Hernando	259	10.2	722	8.0	56	28.2	237	7.2	117	19.8	823	16.1
Highlands	506	6.1	5 290	3.9	166	13.0	7 475	.6	259	10.6	14 407	1.5
Hillsborough	1 845	3.2	9 482	2.4	573	7.8	3 264	5.9	579	7.4	7 921	3.9
Holmes	390	6.1	1 160	11.6	158	15.1	224	21.7	192	12.2	1 060	9.8
Indian River	291	6.7	2 769	4.9	159	12.1	7 904	1.6	137	11.6	5 335	1.8
Jackson	681	4.1	2 995	6.5	259	12.2	954	9.7	242	11.9	2 574	5.8
Jefferson	193	9.0	730	7.5	65	21.8	164	8.8	81	18.9	997	13.2
Lafayette	173	7.6	1 399	2.4	45	17.2	578	5.7	108	11.2	1 139	3.9
Lake	1 026	3.7	5 838	2.7	242	13.3	1 155	7.5	413	9.1	4 381	8.1
Lee	371	7.0	4 797	2.9	80	21.5	568	5.4	109	19.0	5 943	1.8
Leon	175	8.4	399	12.7	12	54.5	25	7.4	46	25.1	227	32.8
Levy	332	7.4	1 984	3.5	64	23.9	1 017	11.8	232	11.5	3 019	5.7
Liberty	31	5.0	45	5.0	4	10.1	4	15.5	11	8.0	24	14.9
Madison	348	7.2	1 510	6.1	90	20.8	308	23.9	107	19.2	554	14.5
Manatee	475	5.7	6 283	2.0	145	10.9	5 303	7.2	248	10.4	8 082	3.1
Marion	1 281	3.2	6 378	3.7	320	11.2	736	5.2	469	9.0	3 881	5.5
Martin	227	7.6	4 936	1.9	60	17.9	2 376	.7	109	12.8	6 985	1.6
Monroe	9	7.1	73	9.8	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Nassau	177	6.5	575	3.9	27	24.9	114	14.5	75	14.3	810	6.5
Ocala	216	7.5	486	10.8	42	29.7	100	15.1	110	16.5	395	15.0
Okeechobee	316	8.9	5 251	4.0	62	16.4	1 574	.4	161	12.4	7 955	1.9
Orange	620	4.7	7 461	1.8	128	13.5	2 220	19.7	250	7.5	6 229	2.1
Osceola	322	7.8	2 518	4.9	86	18.3	2 114	8.5	105	13.7	3 992	1.5
Palm Beach	701	3.4	23 313	1.5	178	11.0	8 914	1.5	298	8.4	32 272	.7
Pasco	715	4.4	2 502	3.4	226	12.4	1 205	7.2	269	10.1	2 515	9.1
Pinellas	93	5.7	292	3.4	15	23.8	43	8.6	29	16.0	123	15.4
Polk	1 443	3.9	8 753	3.4	655	7.5	9 003	3.6	792	6.3	9 539	5.9
Putnam	298	5.1	1 354	6.1	57	18.7	271	7.4	96	16.2	943	7.4
St. Johns	126	3.2	2 526	1.8	49	9.9	369	4.7	83	6.7	2 218	.8
St. Lucie	326	7.6	7 578	1.0	184	10.7	5 501	2.9	136	9.1	7 967	2.5
Santa Rosa	309	7.1	1 589	8.3	113	10.7	504	11.1	157	13.5	1 491	8.3
Sarasota	183	11.3	677	14.4	32	30.2	256	13.1	33	27.5	838	1.5
Seminole	240	8.4	656	7.7	43	32.6	97	25.7	86	18.1	441	11.6
Sumter	507	5.6	1 397	6.8	108	19.6	328	27.0	159	15.9	1 239	9.3
Suwannee	664	4.1	4 402	3.7	186	14.5	612	9.3	340	8.6	3 355	4.6
Taylor	85	6.5	231	7.3	12	23.7	21	10.4	14	22.6	41	12.1
Union	159	4.1	444	6.5	44	12.6	95	11.4	53	11.4	430	5.8
Volusia	663	4.5	3 624	4.7	132	14.3	571	15.5	224	10.4	3 292	2.9
Wakulla	70	3.5	117	4.6	8	10.8	(D)	(D)	26	5.5	129	5.3
Walton	291	6.4	691	7.8	91	19.8	470	29.1	138	17.7	899	18.5
Washington	220	6.6	796	10.7	70	15.9	146	27.8	109	12.5	694	12.8

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)
Florida	4 277	2.8	56 025	1.3	32 866	.7	136 457	.6	29 438	.8	561 134	.3
Alachua	112	19.5	518	8.9	1 043	1.6	1 995	6.8	945	2.6	4 886	3.5
Baker	6	32.1	9	22.4	152	2.5	269	3.5	120	4.9	2 314	5.7
Bay	2	23.3	(D)	(D)	69	3.9	62	5.8	54	4.2	130	4.0
Bradford	13	61.2	48	15.0	258	3.9	318	12.2	215	8.0	1 151	2.3

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.											
	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)
Brevard	36	23.5	503	10.7	445	2.4	2 089	4.0	387	5.2	3 206	4.9
Broward	61	27.6	296	17.8	299	5.4	876	11.2	321	3.5	5 290	2.6
Calhoun	25	18.5	262	2.2	125	2.2	333	6.8	110	4.0	2 042	1.1
Charlotte	29	22.1	204	.9	194	3.0	1 102	2.6	193	3.3	5 539	.8
Citrus	30	31.2	103	15.5	271	3.0	254	8.7	225	6.7	407	10.9
Clay	13	44.1	(D)	(D)	196	4.0	430	3.4	168	7.0	2 048	.9
Collier	43	25.8	2 965	2.8	198	6.2	4 416	1.7	220	4.2	36 953	.6
Columbia	65	20.4	258	47.3	596	.9	874	6.5	478	6.0	1 716	7.1
Dade	224	12.2	5 605	3.9	1 419	2.1	4 906	3.9	1 400	2.5	62 474	.7
De Soto	47	28.5	664	1.2	707	1.2	3 910	2.2	625	3.1	14 094	1.0
Dixie	49	9.0	68	4.3	133	3.2	89	7.5	128	3.9	309	4.0
Duval	30	30.2	147	11.8	303	3.0	662	13.8	247	7.0	2 262	1.1
Escambia	98	18.4	634	10.6	443	2.4	745	20.9	379	5.8	1 278	4.6
Flagler	21	3.7	247	.4	86	2.9	372	1.2	82	2.8	2 661	.5
Franklin	2	20.2	(D)	(D)	18	4.2	12	4.2	17	4.4	24	3.0
Gadsden	58	14.8	513	5.9	266	3.8	802	4.4	228	6.1	13 713	.7
Gilchrist	55	19.3	958	4.8	351	2.1	826	4.4	284	5.3	6 114	1.2
Glades	18	37.3	368	13.3	171	4.9	2 804	1.0	162	5.7	7 115	.5
Gulf	4	18.8	4	23.6	27	5.9	10	8.9	28	5.9	29	3.6
Hamilton	54	17.0	172	9.4	243	3.0	407	7.7	204	6.0	1 090	2.0
Hardee	107	19.8	919	12.1	1 020	1.6	3 877	3.1	935	2.4	12 626	3.1
Hendry	53	28.8	2 111	.5	347	3.3	10 232	2.3	359	3.0	18 921	.8
Hernando	42	27.9	276	19.3	410	2.6	544	8.9	383	4.5	1 545	11.8
Highlands	76	21.6	2 146	2.2	766	1.2	7 275	1.7	659	3.9	14 936	3.9
Hillsborough	333	10.5	2 095	4.2	2 480	1.3	6 186	3.0	2 120	2.3	41 406	1.0
Holmes	77	23.4	268	11.8	561	1.7	518	6.2	450	5.1	1 893	13.2
Indian River	30	32.5	187	6.1	414	2.1	2 433	4.1	409	3.2	9 406	.8
Jackson	174	14.5	1 712	12.0	783	2.3	998	4.4	731	3.1	3 335	3.0
Jefferson	54	23.1	286	7.3	318	3.0	808	6.0	282	4.1	1 005	5.7
Lafayette	40	22.8	302	1.8	205	4.4	479	11.3	166	7.9	3 280	2.2
Lake	123	19.2	992	5.2	1 338	1.3	2 578	3.7	1 206	2.6	17 699	1.5
Lee	78	22.7	588	6.2	454	3.7	2 009	8.6	425	5.0	8 018	1.6
Leon	38	34.5	49	38.6	224	4.5	706	25.5	183	7.6	417	30.2
Levy	164	15.9	535	8.1	482	3.3	1 165	17.8	462	4.8	2 681	2.0
Liberty	4	17.8	8	17.4	44	4.3	49	7.8	39	4.3	71	4.8
Madison	52	19.1	373	12.3	477	1.8	730	6.6	435	4.3	1 596	3.8
Manatee	96	17.2	1 890	1.9	647	2.1	4 002	2.7	588	3.5	17 781	.8
Marion	172	14.3	1 173	6.0	1 616	1.2	3 799	4.0	1 431	2.5	11 818	1.7
Martin	45	25.0	1 130	4.6	288	3.2	2 299	2.2	290	3.6	10 573	2.0
Monroe	1	—	(D)	(D)	12	6.3	23	10.9	12	6.2	50	2.7
Nassau	9	50.9	(D)	(D)	234	1.0	333	6.0	210	4.4	1 849	1.5
Okaloosa	59	21.2	352	15.5	328	2.5	294	11.2	264	5.7	768	9.1
Okeechobee	74	21.6	667	17.4	436	3.3	3 323	5.8	391	4.6	10 692	1.5
Orange	60	12.3	887	.2	801	2.2	3 895	3.3	749	3.2	31 677	1.4
Osceola	45	28.5	581	1.8	451	2.8	2 548	3.5	421	3.2	5 403	3.0
Palm Beach	178	12.5	13 349	.8	774	2.6	21 768	1.0	722	3.5	74 191	.3
Pasco	66	20.1	521	3.6	926	1.3	2 119	4.3	790	3.4	7 015	1.7
Pinellas	25	18.8	49	22.9	110	4.5	251	7.1	113	3.7	1 859	.8
Polk	158	15.7	1 084	6.9	2 376	1.1	8 498	2.5	2 123	1.9	15 519	3.2
Putnam	38	26.8	749	46.9	376	2.0	774	8.4	339	4.0	3 327	3.1
St. Johns	40	8.6	773	1.0	144	1.9	755	2.4	135	2.7	4 228	.7
St. Lucie	50	26.4	795	5.3	488	1.7	5 176	2.3	454	3.2	15 925	1.2
Santa Rosa	117	18.0	856	13.0	410	3.5	525	3.7	342	4.6	2 168	5.2
Sarasota	31	30.9	624	63.9	265	6.0	633	6.6	258	6.8	2 532	3.5
Seminole	24	35.2	135	22.8	305	4.3	364	8.4	272	6.2	2 976	4.1
Sumter	93	21.0	400	13.2	666	2.3	962	8.7	571	4.1	3 215	12.8
Suwannee	130	16.2	687	3.7	820	1.5	1 376	4.9	747	3.3	7 066	1.5
Taylor	10	3.8	97	.3	118	2.9	123	13.2	103	5.5	381	9.5
Union	16	19.4	38	5.2	200	2.4	320	5.1	177	3.4	563	3.7
Volusia	92	17.9	1 010	4.5	873	1.6	2 305	7.1	774	3.2	11 590	3.7
Wakulla	5	13.0	(D)	(D)	88	3.0	100	4.2	78	3.2	144	2.8
Walton	67	23.5	227	4.8	466	1.7	452	10.1	353	6.9	1 278	4.3
Washington	36	18.5	193	26.4	312	1.6	290	9.2	267	5.2	868	19.1
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)
	34 787	.6	1 573 154	.4	27 141	.6	3 639 850	.3	21 017	.7	2 435 702	.2
Alachua	1 084	.8	11 130	9.3	854	.9	75 368	1.5	596	1.1	31 132	1.4
Baker	157	1.8	6 540	.9	119	1.5	4 911	1.8	71	2.7	1 723	2.5
Bay	70	3.8	1 552	.7	51	2.6	3 087	3.8	39	3.6	1 111	6.3
Bradford	274	.9	1 278	30.8	220	1.1	10 268	3.1	154	1.8	4 143	3.0

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	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)
Brevard	469	.8	11 625	5.5	387	.9	26 729	1.4	339	1.0	21 691	.6
Broward	348	.8	17 055	8.9	276	1.1	6 569	4.6	248	1.3	3 737	2.1
Calhoun	129	1.6	3 775	3.3	108	1.3	27 223	1.7	88	1.9	19 928	1.8
Charlotte	209	1.1	12 455	2.3	138	1.4	44 577	.8	107	1.8	28 755	.6
Citrus	293	1.0	1 878	36.0	212	1.2	20 661	3.7	137	1.9	6 950	5.4
Clay	211	1.4	4 869	3.3	139	1.7	7 863	3.6	80	2.6	3 582	5.9
Collier	236	1.2	91 871	.3	186	1.3	69 212	.7	169	1.5	55 213	.4
Columbia	600	.9	2 607	32.8	467	1.0	46 268	1.5	266	1.6	16 002	1.8
Dade	1 578	1.0	130 641	1.0	1 466	1.0	67 550	.6	1 437	1.0	62 693	.4
De Soto	716	.8	37 479	2.7	558	.9	126 633	.5	459	1.1	89 405	.3
Dixie	155	1.9	354	12.8	75	2.9	6 371	5.3	37	5.0	1 771	5.4
Duval	319	1.1	3 421	11.8	224	1.4	11 127	4.3	147	2.1	6 617	5.4
Escambia	466	.9	1 622	31.5	381	.9	34 942	1.4	297	1.2	28 235	1.5
Flagler	91	2.8	8 665	.5	56	2.4	12 656	2.8	42	3.2	8 871	.6
Franklin	19	4.7	56	3.1	9	6.5	(D)	(D)	7	7.1	(D)	(D)
Gadsden	288	1.0	30 009	1.0	252	.9	23 827	1.5	187	1.4	14 088	1.2
Gilchrist	364	.8	7 247	11.2	296	1.0	43 552	1.9	191	1.6	20 403	1.7
Glades	188	1.0	9 141	2.7	91	2.5	41 361	1.7	58	3.4	29 099	1.5
Gulf	33	5.6	48	28.1	23	3.6	968	7.0	15	7.5	241	11.9
Hamilton	255	1.1	1 806	11.7	218	1.1	25 398	1.5	153	1.8	11 445	1.6
Hardee	1 046	1.0	30 666	3.3	897	.8	105 878	1.1	776	1.0	67 465	.7
Hendry	404	.8	99 763	1.2	278	1.3	204 996	.5	245	1.5	183 206	.3
Hernando	431	.7	3 736	16.6	286	1.2	21 024	3.0	184	1.7	7 460	2.8
Highlands	779	.8	44 536	1.9	597	.9	121 762	.9	471	1.1	93 135	.3
Hillsborough	2 639	.7	90 158	2.2	2 042	.7	103 266	1.1	1 590	.8	60 333	.9
Holmes	579	.8	4 807	11.6	450	.9	41 243	1.5	315	1.3	18 969	1.7
Indian River	436	.8	11 767	6.6	390	.8	85 820	.6	373	.8	76 135	.5
Jackson	843	.7	11 122	7.3	728	.8	136 123	1.0	581	.9	89 386	.9
Jefferson	341	1.0	7 005	7.8	290	1.1	33 477	1.8	227	1.5	17 860	1.6
Lafayette	220	.8	10 433	4.4	174	1.2	22 221	2.5	114	1.9	8 454	2.6
Lake	1 390	.7	49 774	1.7	1 186	.7	80 063	1.6	985	.8	41 475	1.2
Lee	509	.9	24 446	3.9	363	1.1	34 155	.9	301	1.4	25 025	.9
Leon	242	1.2	63	(H)	187	1.5	16 467	3.0	132	2.3	4 613	4.3
Levy	548	.8	13 730	8.3	376	1.0	68 488	1.4	229	1.5	31 715	1.1
Liberty	47	4.2	72	21.9	25	4.6	1 179	9.4	17	7.5	343	9.2
Madison	485	.9	4 363	10.7	372	1.0	54 254	1.5	253	1.5	26 437	1.3
Manatee	697	.7	86 724	1.2	525	.9	105 743	1.0	400	1.2	64 302	.3
Marion	1 669	.8	16 263	6.6	1 123	.9	100 264	1.1	585	1.3	34 020	1.7
Martin	306	1.1	26 533	4.0	205	1.5	75 180	1.1	156	1.8	64 205	.6
Monroe	13	6.5	58	30.6	9	1.8	(D)	(D)	8	6.2	(D)	(D)
Nassau	238	1.0	3 032	4.9	159	1.6	6 131	4.7	105	2.4	2 874	3.0
Okaloosa	342	1.0	1 884	17.1	272	1.1	21 161	1.7	191	1.6	10 027	1.7
Okeechobee	459	1.1	24 094	2.4	255	1.6	72 659	1.3	139	2.2	36 466	.8
Orange	862	.7	65 948	2.0	753	.7	44 266	1.3	703	.8	30 286	.7
Osceola	485	.8	18 022	3.9	355	1.0	50 505	1.2	269	1.3	30 345	.6
Palm Beach	856	.8	303 625	.3	693	1.0	529 138	.1	628	1.1	462 690	(L)
Pasco	951	.7	11 687	9.0	718	.9	58 038	1.7	560	1.1	24 949	1.1
Pinellas	129	2.0	4 817	6.0	107	1.5	902	10.8	100	1.8	530	8.9
Polk	2 465	.7	62 541	3.2	2 006	.7	186 878	.8	1 703	.8	129 262	.4
Putnam	391	.9	12 011	5.5	307	1.0	17 218	2.0	239	1.4	9 556	1.4
St. Johns	149	1.5	13 486	1.5	108	1.6	24 597	.7	95	1.8	20 319	.5
St. Lucie	499	.9	17 098	5.7	422	.9	136 131	.3	384	1.0	122 287	.3
Santa Rosa	438	.7	8 535	8.5	369	.8	59 263	1.6	295	1.1	47 476	1.3
Sarasota	315	1.0	6 783	5.2	189	1.4	18 781	1.7	123	2.0	5 323	1.1
Seminole	343	.9	4 879	19.0	267	1.2	6 599	2.4	214	1.5	4 020	3.2
Sumter	717	.7	6 492	18.0	488	1.0	54 694	1.9	263	1.7	17 562	1.5
Suwannee	839	.7	24 928	2.6	676	.8	86 524	1.0	471	1.1	47 269	1.3
Taylor	126	2.4	657	18.0	91	2.0	6 027	4.0	53	3.4	1 299	4.4
Union	213	1.5	1 123	14.6	166	1.3	15 504	2.9	104	2.3	6 763	3.6
Volusia	909	.7	43 957	1.9	758	.8	30 134	2.0	648	.9	14 292	1.1
Wakulla	88	3.0	1 744	1.3	56	2.4	3 640	4.5	38	3.8	1 412	4.6
Walton	475	.8	1 484	37.7	370	1.0	35 304	1.5	241	1.5	15 014	1.4
Washington	322	1.1	1 183	34.4	247	1.1	25 583	2.7	185	1.5	13 404	3.1
	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
					Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Florida	12 673	.7	1 862 404	.2	15 849	.6	1 808 900	.3	13 600	.6	1 003 072	.3
Alachua	228	2.0	7 942	1.5	643	1.1	49 567	1.3	559	1.2	27 324	1.4
Baker	17	6.3	803	4.7	107	1.8	4 258	1.4	92	2.1	1 987	2.1
Bay	18	6.4	437	2.7	18	7.3	292	7.9	14	8.8	183	8.8
Bradford	23	6.4	264	3.5	187	1.5	9 527	2.4	157	1.8	5 203	2.7

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
					Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Brevard	184	1.8	30 636	.4	115	2.4	23 757	1.7	101	2.6	(D)	(D)
Broward	200	1.6	2 133	.6	46	4.5	11 587	1.5	37	5.2	(D)	(D)
Calhoun	14	6.0	1 107	1.3	59	2.9	3 711	2.9	52	3.3	1 871	3.8
Charlotte	72	2.5	26 496	.6	108	1.9	25 159	.6	90	2.3	(D)	(D)
Citrus	53	4.0	508	13.8	186	1.5	9 578	2.9	156	1.7	6 871	3.2
Clay	32	4.7	1 443	.5	132	1.8	11 641	.9	106	2.3	2 824	2.7
Collier	151	1.7	53 188	.4	49	4.2	9 990	3.4	44	4.4	(D)	(D)
Columbia	68	3.6	2 916	3.1	424	1.1	23 224	1.4	358	1.3	13 312	1.4
Dade	1 232	1.0	57 585	.4	61	4.7	3 297	6.4	48	5.2	2 479	6.5
De Soto	378	1.3	72 939	.3	341	1.3	76 226	.6	301	1.5	(D)	(D)
Dixie	11	8.9	636	.6	88	2.3	5 145	7.4	70	2.9	2 278	4.0
Duval	77	3.4	624	5.0	187	1.7	12 993	2.0	157	2.0	4 476	3.6
Escambia	45	4.2	1 111	3.4	221	1.6	8 712	1.7	184	1.9	3 242	2.5
Flagler	27	3.6	7 924	.2	56	2.1	6 358	4.0	49	2.5	4 781	3.5
Franklin	4	12.5	19	15.8	3	16.7	(D)	(D)	3	16.7	(D)	(D)
Gadsden	55	3.0	5 253	.6	131	1.9	5 294	3.8	118	2.1	3 259	4.2
Gilchrist	57	3.4	6 336	2.5	256	1.2	34 540	1.2	226	1.4	9 897	2.4
Glades	49	3.7	26 334	2.0	137	1.6	67 693	.7	129	1.7	(D)	(D)
Gulf	4	16.0	6	24.2	17	6.6	393	9.6	14	7.9	(D)	(D)
Hamilton	39	3.8	4 336	1.7	143	1.9	10 287	2.0	134	2.0	(D)	(D)
Hardee	653	1.1	54 026	.7	476	1.2	92 706	.8	431	1.2	51 582	.8
Hendry	221	1.6	184 109	.2	156	2.0	91 875	.5	138	2.1	(D)	(D)
Herrando	58	3.9	1 142	5.6	262	1.3	14 626	1.9	226	1.5	7 717	2.6
Highlands	418	1.2	88 103	.4	369	1.3	110 926	.6	313	1.5	66 136	.7
Hillsborough	1 122	1.0	46 298	1.1	1 177	.9	62 328	1.0	968	1.0	37 756	1.1
Holmes	11	9.5	276	9.2	351	1.2	17 279	2.0	306	1.4	8 246	2.1
Indian River	331	1.0	77 411	.5	63	3.3	19 197	1.2	51	3.7	(D)	(D)
Jackson	102	2.6	18 314	1.2	453	1.2	36 549	1.6	393	1.3	18 663	1.9
Jefferson	57	4.1	1 432	2.8	148	2.2	11 320	3.1	126	2.5	(D)	(D)
Lafayette	48	3.7	3 865	8.8	143	1.6	23 332	1.0	109	2.1	4 231	3.6
Lake	717	1.0	26 206	1.4	495	1.3	34 442	1.7	399	1.4	17 693	2.2
Lee	234	1.7	26 106	.5	165	2.0	12 358	1.7	142	2.3	(D)	(D)
Leon	49	4.8	2 531	2.2	109	2.7	6 550	5.1	96	3.0	(D)	(D)
Levy	82	2.9	13 022	1.3	364	1.1	52 661	.8	306	1.3	21 840	1.2
Liberty	4	19.1	6	19.0	16	7.3	757	6.6	11	9.7	(D)	(D)
Madison	56	3.7	4 312	4.8	308	1.3	20 533	2.0	268	1.4	(D)	(D)
Manatee	298	1.4	57 790	.3	367	1.2	58 753	1.2	331	1.3	34 602	1.3
Marion	208	2.2	6 115	1.4	814	1.0	51 792	1.0	695	1.1	27 867	1.1
Martin	127	2.1	61 615	.5	137	1.9	26 062	1.3	117	2.1	(D)	(D)
Monroe	5	9.9	33	21.3	2	23.6	(D)	(D)	2	23.6	(D)	(D)
Nassau	17	7.6	54	11.4	168	1.5	6 612	1.9	141	1.9	3 128	2.9
Okaloosa	24	5.8	156	6.5	167	1.8	5 348	2.9	141	2.1	2 850	2.8
Okeechobee	87	2.7	35 210	.9	381	1.1	157 714	.5	346	1.2	68 234	.7
Orange	530	1.0	25 489	.6	180	2.2	15 989	1.9	151	2.4	10 388	1.9
Osceola	185	1.7	58 024	.2	258	1.5	105 404	.3	235	1.6	76 105	.3
Palm Beach	535	1.1	417 368	.1	108	3.2	3 771	2.3	81	3.7	2 751	2.3
Pasco	327	1.6	12 940	1.3	509	1.1	41 448	1.2	438	1.2	22 362	1.3
Pinellas	74	2.5	249	9.3	11	9.7	214	9.5	9	10.8	171	10.1
Polk	1 387	.9	118 085	.5	925	1.0	95 768	.9	801	1.1	62 722	1.0
Putnam	153	1.9	6 630	1.1	186	1.7	9 010	3.1	160	1.9	(D)	(D)
St. Johns	78	2.1	19 861	.5	39	3.7	4 525	1.3	34	4.1	(D)	(D)
St. Lucie	341	1.1	139 412	.4	107	2.4	25 478	1.2	91	2.7	(D)	(D)
Santa Rosa	40	4.1	5 487	1.2	226	1.4	8 634	3.0	198	1.5	(D)	(D)
Sarasota	97	2.5	5 008	2.7	167	1.6	25 651	2.0	148	1.8	16 157	1.8
Seminole	171	1.8	3 658	5.6	97	2.8	6 504	1.8	77	3.3	(D)	(D)
Sumter	95	3.2	2 106	5.1	613	.8	48 043	1.3	551	.9	29 859	1.4
Suwannee	128	2.4	15 244	1.3	562	.9	38 533	.9	480	1.1	17 342	1.2
Taylor	21	6.0	488	11.2	82	2.3	5 117	2.3	74	2.6	(D)	(D)
Union	20	6.0	1 651	.3	169	1.4	10 824	1.9	142	1.8	7 301	1.8
Volusia	476	1.1	10 419	.8	290	1.7	12 843	2.4	239	1.9	(D)	(D)
Wakulla	12	7.7	221	15.0	44	2.8	1 659	4.8	37	3.3	(D)	(D)
Walton	22	6.0	634	8.7	276	1.3	12 544	2.1	235	1.6	5 426	2.8
Washington	14	8.1	322	22.7	194	1.5	9 503	3.8	164	1.8	4 811	4.3
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)
Florida	666	1.2	159 614	.1	1 431	1.1	50 309	1.4	336	1.9	5 722	2.5
Alachua	26	5.8	3 341	.4	54	4.3	1 292	3.1	23	7.2	716	12.2
Baker	7	8.6	991	.3	18	7.6	225	13.4	2	22.1	(D)	(D)
Bay	—	—	—	—	4	21.2	36	23.5	—	—	—	—
Bradford	6	10.4	523	.1	13	8.8	279	3.3	3	17.4	3	17.4

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Brevard	2	26.0	(D)	(D)	14	9.1	171	19.9	4	13.0	51	8.3
Broward	6	13.5	(D)	(D)	7	13.0	(D)	(D)	5	16.7	92	20.9
Calhoun	3	—	406	—	6	13.4	270	18.3	—	—	—	—
Charlotte	2	28.0	(D)	(D)	4	20.1	12	23.6	3	19.0	(D)	(D)
Citrus	5	12.7	25	19.2	21	6.1	317	9.1	3	17.1	25	19.1
Clay	6	4.4	6 100	(L)	17	7.4	132	10.2	2	25.1	(D)	(D)
Collier	1	42.3	(D)	(D)	9	11.5	147	13.8	3	18.6	18	23.4
Columbia	20	7.4	207	2.0	43	5.3	1 481	3.9	5	15.9	16	19.2
Dade	12	9.9	41	14.1	9	12.8	215	17.7	12	10.3	129	14.0
De Soto	10	9.8	(D)	(D)	18	8.0	497	30.3	4	13.2	39	12.3
Dixie	5	14.5	782	4.2	9	12.1	59	14.3	1	40.0	(D)	(D)
Duval	13	6.3	3 895	.1	15	7.7	514	11.0	9	11.3	219	14.6
Escambia	16	6.1	1 590	2.7	17	7.5	973	11.3	4	16.9	15	20.7
Flagler	4	15.5	5	18.6	9	10.4	277	18.8	—	—	—	—
Franklin	—	—	—	—	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Gadsden	4	16.4	9	20.0	11	9.1	934	19.0	3	18.0	48	17.5
Gilchrist	22	4.9	13 960	(L)	22	6.9	404	11.3	7	12.1	113	17.0
Glades	2	—	(D)	(D)	6	15.1	99	14.1	3	22.7	190	23.1
Gulf	2	23.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hamilton	2	20.4	(D)	(D)	23	5.9	2 226	.9	3	18.6	64	23.3
Hardee	21	6.1	8 790	(L)	13	7.9	302	21.1	—	—	—	—
Hendry	3	21.3	(D)	(D)	11	10.2	81	17.9	2	27.0	(D)	(D)
Hernando	9	6.6	2 662	.7	27	5.8	875	17.9	6	10.0	276	2.3
Highlands	14	6.8	6 488	.1	18	8.8	391	24.0	6	13.0	(D)	(D)
Hillsborough	54	3.9	4 463	.7	66	3.9	3 567	1.6	22	6.4	285	9.1
Holmes	19	6.1	1 254	5.1	27	5.6	682	9.1	7	11.6	140	11.4
Indian River	1	—	(D)	(D)	1	39.5	(D)	(D)	1	38.8	(D)	(D)
Jackson	25	5.5	2 131	.5	90	3.0	11 001	3.0	2	17.4	(D)	(D)
Jefferson	5	15.4	(D)	(D)	26	6.4	574	8.8	8	11.9	212	20.6
Lafayette	27	1.5	12 985	(L)	16	7.2	294	7.4	1	35.4	(D)	(D)
Lake	18	7.0	2 577	.8	48	4.3	414	11.7	10	9.1	232	6.2
Lee	2	27.4	(D)	(D)	22	7.0	155	13.6	—	—	—	—
Leon	3	19.2	(D)	(D)	14	9.3	540	16.2	5	17.1	(D)	(D)
Levy	9	9.8	7 293	.3	31	5.6	440	9.0	10	8.6	85	10.8
Liberty	1	49.5	(D)	(D)	2	28.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Madison	8	9.3	(D)	(D)	27	5.8	4 114	3.6	6	11.4	110	9.3
Manatee	18	6.0	4 726	.3	27	6.3	753	26.4	7	13.3	23	14.9
Marion	27	5.6	3 819	.2	101	3.1	2 509	4.1	32	5.6	628	3.5
Martin	7	9.4	(D)	(D)	18	7.7	256	14.0	5	16.8	10	20.9
Monroe	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nassau	9	9.6	910	.7	16	7.7	397	11.5	4	20.6	80	23.3
Okaloosa	4	17.5	10	18.3	15	8.2	697	10.9	—	—	—	—
Okeechobee	20	5.0	35 707	(L)	26	7.1	258	8.7	5	14.8	93	17.1
Orange	4	20.5	8	21.6	17	7.8	790	10.4	2	23.6	(D)	(D)
Osceola	9	8.9	181	10.9	20	7.3	195	10.4	8	9.5	151	4.6
Palm Beach	5	18.1	10	18.1	32	6.7	250	15.7	9	10.7	145	9.0
Pasco	18	5.6	5 150	.1	31	6.0	3 620	1.6	9	10.2	72	12.5
Pinellas	—	—	—	—	5	13.7	56	14.7	—	—	—	—
Polk	30	5.6	2 116	1.2	48	4.8	969	8.8	15	7.0	203	8.1
Putnam	6	10.8	(D)	(D)	30	5.9	531	11.2	3	17.9	11	14.7
St. Johns	1	—	(D)	(D)	5	14.9	33	20.9	1	42.4	(D)	(D)
St. Lucie	3	17.6	(D)	(D)	7	13.6	59	19.3	2	—	(D)	(D)
Santa Rosa	4	15.0	(D)	(D)	19	6.8	262	7.7	7	7.7	155	2.0
Sarasota	14	7.0	369	2.9	24	5.8	309	5.3	7	9.8	39	8.1
Seminole	2	22.3	(D)	(D)	14	9.6	143	14.3	5	17.5	43	20.3
Sumter	21	5.7	1 892	1.1	33	5.7	447	12.5	9	11.1	84	15.6
Suwannee	35	3.4	7 449	.3	42	4.8	586	8.7	4	18.3	19	24.5
Taylor	1	41.0	(D)	(D)	10	9.4	104	20.5	—	—	—	—
Union	6	15.3	38	34.8	19	7.2	412	6.8	1	37.3	(D)	(D)
Volusia	7	10.8	(D)	(D)	32	5.7	1 004	30.4	8	13.1	167	14.8
Wakulla	1	36.1	(D)	(D)	14	7.6	710	7.6	—	—	—	—
Walton	14	8.6	52	9.4	24	6.4	215	10.8	5	13.1	73	8.2
Washington	5	9.2	655	4.3	12	8.6	342	12.2	3	20.7	(D)	(D)

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.							
	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Florida	1 157	1.2	11 608 529	.2	321	1.0	105 967 210	.2
Alachua	40	5.4	3 823	.9	3	12.2	(D)	(D)
Baker	8	9.3	(D)	(D)	13	—	6 828 432	—
Bay	3	25.4	50	28.5	—	—	—	—
Bradford	12	10.0	147	12.3	18	4.1	9 418 002	1.1

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.											
	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold							
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total					
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)				
Brevard	13	8.3	123	15.0	2	26.0	(D)	(D)				
Broward	4	17.8	46	20.8	—	—	—	—				
Calhoun	4	14.1	73	17.8	—	—	—	—				
Charlotte	4	18.0	78	18.4	1	31.8	(D)	(D)				
Citrus	18	6.8	452	10.3	—	—	—	—				
Clay	14	9.5	271	10.3	5	—	1 898 000	—				
Collier	2	27.7	(D)	(D)	1	39.0	(D)	(D)				
Columbia	33	5.8	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)				
Dade	32	6.4	2 047	10.4	6	15.5	230	23.5				
De Soto	19	7.2	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Dixie	7	14.1	(D)	(D)	1	31.9	(D)	(D)				
Duval	15	9.3	590	19.5	7	—	2 523 000	—				
Escambia	18	7.7	275	9.3	1	—	(D)	(D)				
Flagler	4	15.5	104	21.4	—	—	—	—				
Franklin	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Gadsden	9	10.2	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Gilchrist	17	8.2	269	13.3	1	37.9	(D)	(D)				
Glades	2	26.9	(D)	(D)	1	47.8	(D)	(D)				
Gulf	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—				
Hamilton	6	9.3	125	7.5	3	—	1 563 980	—				
Hardee	14	7.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Hendry	7	12.2	142	16.1	—	—	—	—				
Hernando	26	5.4	(D)	(D)	3	12.0	(D)	(D)				
Highlands	22	7.6	382	9.9	1	33.6	(D)	(D)				
Hillsborough	82	3.3	1 409 154	(L)	4	15.9	(D)	(D)				
Holmes	21	7.0	125 863	5.9	56	3.0	11 865 247	1.4				
Indian River	5	15.1	292	12.5	—	—	—	—				
Jackson	12	9.6	160	10.5	—	—	—	—				
Jefferson	7	14.5	172	17.6	—	—	—	—				
Lafayette	9	11.3	100 136	11.5	29	2.2	10 773 186	.4				
Lake	53	4.2	(D)	(D)	3	16.3	58	16.5				
Lee	26	6.4	1 055	15.5	2	23.4	(D)	(D)				
Leon	12	10.7	253	13.0	—	—	—	—				
Levy	12	9.3	186	11.5	1	31.7	(D)	(D)				
Liberty	1	50.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Madison	19	7.0	(D)	(D)	22	—	6 033 082	—				
Manatee	25	6.4	498	8.5	—	—	—	—				
Marion	68	4.0	1 076	5.2	2	24.3	(D)	(D)				
Martin	9	11.4	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Monroe	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—				
Nassau	19	7.7	180 058	6.0	26	2.6	13 041 909	.4				
Okaloosa	8	11.5	184	12.2	4	9.3	1 103 730	(L)				
Okeechobee	16	9.4	140	12.7	2	31.6	(D)	(D)				
Orange	21	7.0	553	9.0	—	—	—	—				
Osceola	22	6.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Palm Beach	37	5.8	1 384	13.3	—	—	—	—				
Pasco	39	4.8	(D)	(D)	3	11.4	(D)	(D)				
Pinellas	5	13.4	97	14.7	—	—	—	—				
Polk	42	4.7	1 662 286	(L)	1	34.7	(D)	(D)				
Putnam	27	5.9	(D)	(D)	2	15.9	(D)	(D)				
St. Johns	5	15.8	153	28.3	1	—	(D)	(D)				
St. Lucie	7	14.4	108	17.8	—	—	—	—				
Santa Rosa	20	6.8	483	10.4	1	33.3	(D)	(D)				
Sarasota	15	7.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Seminole	14	9.7	646	12.7	4	18.6	(D)	(D)				
Sumter	27	5.5	805 101	(L)	—	—	—	—				
Suwannee	31	5.1	234 330	(L)	60	1.0	27 587 859	.2				
Taylor	6	12.7	134	18.7	3	11.3	(D)	(D)				
Union	15	7.5	271 741	(L)	1	—	(D)	(D)				
Volusia	31	6.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Wakulla	6	12.3	153	17.7	—	—	—	—				
Walton	17	8.0	59 222	14.3	23	3.0	6 662 405	1.0				
Washington	11	8.9	168	8.6	3	—	1 000 000	—				
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed					Soybeans for beans						
	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)
Florida	1 268	.9	69 623	.8	5 440 956	.8	404	1.4	41 021 410	1.2	1 025 521	1.2
Alachua	50	4.2	2 997	3.3	181 099	3.4	4	19.7	23.8	10 820	28.4	
Baker	16	8.1	106	7.4	7 090	10.7	—	—	—	—	—	
Bay	1	30.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	
Bradford	11	9.0	280	3.8	18 235	3.1	—	—	—	—	—	

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed						Soybeans for beans					
	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)
Brevard	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broward	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Calhoun	18	6.5	1 417	6.6	121 149	6.0	23	5.1	5 123	2.6	132 712	2.6
Charlotte	1	31.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Citrus	1	27.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Clay	5	13.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	21.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Collier	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Columbia	64	3.8	3 646	3.5	195 226	3.1	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Dade	13	9.0	496	.9	45 025	.9	3	12.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
De Soto	1	37.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dixie	3	21.7	30	32.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Duval	8	11.2	55	25.5	2 065	10.4	1	46.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Escambia	63	3.0	4 357	2.5	426 252	2.7	62	2.8	5 798	2.6	172 185	2.4
Flagler	3	—	440	—	24 342	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Franklin	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gadsden	45	4.1	1 141	4.4	94 713	5.1	11	7.2	1 074	2.6	33 160	1.9
Gilchrist	18	6.8	882	7.3	44 296	7.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glades	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gulf	3	21.3	30	21.3	1 800	21.3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hamilton	83	2.8	4 917	3.3	430 858	3.1	4	19.2	120	22.5	1 750	25.4
Hardee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hendry	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hernando	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Highlands	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hillsborough	8	12.7	63	27.3	7 824	33.5	4	17.4	47	34.2	(D)	(D)
Holmes	67	3.9	1 862	4.5	134 598	4.0	19	7.3	1 894	6.0	27 940	7.0
Indian River	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jackson	222	1.8	13 104	1.5	1 147 364	1.6	129	2.4	11 399	2.5	246 964	2.9
Jefferson	45	4.0	3 441	2.7	211 179	2.7	10	5.6	1 940	3.4	55 640	3.3
Lafayette	20	6.3	683	14.2	25 250	8.2	1	43.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lake	2	20.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lee	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Leon	28	6.4	916	5.0	66 058	6.0	2	29.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Levy	16	6.4	776	2.0	66 708	1.2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Liberty	1	30.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Madison	75	3.1	7 156	1.8	450 118	2.5	23	4.8	4 191	2.3	104 776	2.6
Manatee	4	—	931	—	162 625	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Marion	21	6.8	630	9.1	61 038	9.9	4	17.7	150	18.4	4 410	20.0
Martin	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Monroe	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nassau	14	8.3	172	10.8	15 800	12.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Okaloosa	33	4.9	802	3.6	56 265	3.8	10	6.0	668	3.1	19 277	1.7
Okeechobee	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	50.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Orange	3	17.9	3	17.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Osceola	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Palm Beach	1	47.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pasco	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pinellas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Polk	2	20.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Putnam	1	31.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Johns	7	6.1	1 075	.2	104 770	.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Lucie	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Santa Rosa	47	4.0	860	4.6	67 396	5.5	30	4.0	2 044	4.1	62 214	4.0
Sarasota	1	36.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Seminole	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sumter	1	40.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Suwannee	99	2.8	7 418	2.7	535 925	2.8	21	6.0	1 185	7.0	29 261	5.8
Taylor	7	11.0	114	10.3	5 385	11.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Union	18	6.3	931	1.7	76 977	2.3	2	19.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Volusia	2	27.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wakulla	4	14.7	43	5.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walton	57	3.8	1 431	4.7	106 078	4.7	16	7.2	1 587	5.2	41 265	4.0
Washington	51	3.8	3 246	5.0	260 002	4.8	21	6.0	2 207	8.0	48 119	6.6

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Sugarcane for sugar					Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Florida	152	1.9	421 421	.1	15 718 897	.1	4 798	.7	265 985	.7	697 410	.7
Alachua	1	49.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	233	2.0	10 963	2.8	33 259	3.4
Baker	—	—	—	—	—	—	19	5.6	494	4.4	1 885	4.3
Bay	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	8.7	467	13.7	878	15.3
Bradford	—	—	—	—	—	—	91	2.7	3 409	3.6	13 608	5.0

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	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Sugarcane for sugar						Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Brevard	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	7.9	1 075	4.3	2 349	1.9
Broward	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	19.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Calhoun	—	—	—	—	—	—	35	4.6	1 348	5.5	3 240	4.9
Charlotte	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	5.0	1 209	.9	3 512	1.2
Citrus	—	—	—	—	—	—	67	3.3	4 434	4.3	8 171	4.9
Clay	1	39.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	42	4.0	1 895	2.6	6 008	2.0
Collier	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	19.2	(D)	(D)	572	25.3
Columbia	—	—	—	—	—	—	104	3.0	4 826	3.6	14 090	4.9
Dade	3	20.4	5	20.8	174	20.6	8	13.1	429	11.6	(D)	(D)
De Soto	—	—	—	—	—	—	29	4.8	4 409	.7	16 771	.6
Dixie	—	—	—	—	—	—	19	7.1	770	12.5	1 784	8.4
Duval	—	—	—	—	—	—	48	4.5	4 678	7.4	10 112	7.4
Escambia	—	—	—	—	—	—	150	2.1	3 881	2.7	10 248	2.8
Flagler	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	8.4	383	9.2	813	7.3
Franklin	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Gadsden	—	—	—	—	—	—	70	3.1	2 785	4.7	6 040	6.6
Gilchrist	2	18.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	125	2.2	8 214	3.0	27 805	3.6
Glades	13	3.7	14 847	1.0	497 731	.8	9	8.3	2 440	17.0	4 340	13.1
Gulf	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	14.5	195	15.2	398	10.4
Hamilton	—	—	—	—	—	—	66	3.3	3 022	2.7	8 530	4.7
Hardee	1	31.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	55	3.8	6 161	2.2	16 934	2.1
Hendry	14	4.5	54 008	(L)	2 028 888	(L)	5	12.7	995	38.1	310	7.8
Hernando	—	—	—	—	—	—	85	2.9	5 381	3.6	12 682	5.4
Highlands	—	—	—	—	—	—	30	4.8	3 815	5.4	13 760	8.9
Hillsborough	2	25.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	222	2.1	8 681	2.8	18 991	3.9
Holmes	3	20.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	221	1.8	7 698	2.8	17 326	3.2
Indian River	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	9.1	511	5.5	1 408	12.0
Jackson	10	10.8	315	18.4	10 174	18.3	240	1.9	9 727	3.0	27 477	3.2
Jefferson	3	16.1	4	12.1	(D)	(D)	76	3.5	3 422	5.4	8 148	5.7
Lafayette	—	—	—	—	—	—	61	2.7	4 384	1.9	18 151	1.7
Lake	—	—	—	—	—	—	144	2.5	9 413	3.3	20 431	4.3
Lee	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	13.1	615	31.2	(D)	(D)
Leon	1	41.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	43	5.2	2 953	6.0	5 527	7.0
Levy	1	37.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	147	2.1	12 564	1.6	33 372	2.3
Liberty	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	9.9	292	10.3	559	11.8
Madison	—	—	—	—	—	—	141	2.3	6 162	3.5	16 266	5.1
Manatee	—	—	—	—	—	—	61	3.6	2 879	2.9	8 240	2.9
Marion	2	29.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	303	1.8	20 307	2.2	44 014	2.2
Martin	3	—	7 107	—	(D)	(D)	9	9.8	1 922	13.5	5 684	6.7
Monroe	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	23.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Nassau	1	39.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	64	3.2	1 918	4.4	5 227	7.0
Okaloosa	—	—	—	—	—	—	113	2.5	3 544	3.2	9 124	4.4
Okeechobee	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	46	3.5	14 203	.6	41 389	.6
Orange	1	47.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	32	6.2	1 190	9.2	2 484	2.9
Osceola	—	—	—	—	—	—	36	4.3	2 198	5.1	4 706	3.3
Palm Beach	84	1.9	344 899	.1	12 911 773	.1	7	11.8	100	10.2	147	21.4
Pasco	1	34.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	153	2.2	7 854	2.4	19 394	2.5
Pinellas	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	24.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Polk	—	—	—	—	—	—	158	2.4	7 371	2.1	15 509	2.4
Putnam	—	—	—	—	—	—	65	3.5	2 396	5.5	5 981	3.5
St. Johns	—	—	—	—	—	—	16	7.0	442	4.5	943	4.3
St. Lucie	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	7.1	1 134	.5	3 879	.4
Santa Rosa	—	—	—	—	—	—	111	2.5	3 360	5.6	7 458	5.8
Sarasota	—	—	—	—	—	—	18	7.0	426	11.0	879	12.3
Seminole	—	—	—	—	—	—	19	6.4	1 226	5.9	3 632	3.3
Sumter	—	—	—	—	—	—	194	2.0	13 180	1.9	25 388	2.4
Suwannee	3	20.3	109	19.3	3 992	19.3	267	1.6	16 805	2.1	55 785	2.3
Taylor	—	—	—	—	—	—	31	4.8	1 033	4.6	2 842	4.6
Union	—	—	—	—	—	—	52	3.8	3 411	7.1	12 282	5.5
Volusia	—	—	—	—	—	—	75	3.6	2 386	4.1	6 320	4.6
Wakulla	—	—	—	—	—	—	21	5.7	945	7.0	2 294	6.7
Walton	—	—	—	—	—	—	147	2.2	4 288	2.8	11 136	2.7
Washington	—	—	—	—	—	—	116	2.3	5 734	4.8	10 688	4.4

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.							
	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)				Land in orchards			
	Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Florida	1 500	.9	250 562	.2	9 379	.7	981 910	.2
Alachua	88	3.0	5 749	2.2	157	2.6	2 050	4.0
Baker	14	8.0	149	2.6	11	10.2	42	13.2
Bay	6	13.0	14	18.2	3	19.3	31	10.7
Bradford	15	8.8	110	9.4	34	5.5	261	9.5

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	Selected crops harvested—Con.							
	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)				Land in orchards			
	Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Brevard	9	9.6	305	9.4	234	1.5	11 645	1.1
Broward	9	7.5	1 040	.3	34	5.3	387	10.2
Calhoun	3	21.5	17	20.8	10	9.4	136	16.1
Charlotte	6	—	1 201	—	69	2.6	23 504	.7
Citrus	6	13.7	93	26.1	27	5.9	352	10.4
Clay	2	20.5	(D)	(D)	8	10.6	57	7.3
Collier	19	2.1	17 070	.1	76	3.0	34 881	.4
Columbia	34	4.9	1 788	5.5	50	4.7	420	8.5
Dade	136	2.3	40 108	.3	823	1.2	12 617	1.3
De Soto	18	6.2	2 147	.6	407	1.2	81 785	.3
Dixie	4	11.2	(D)	(D)	4	17.5	13	23.2
Duval	5	15.6	21	8.0	35	5.7	216	12.6
Escambia	10	10.4	97	15.5	49	4.5	512	9.0
Flagler	10	—	2 896	—	2	29.7	(D)	(D)
Franklin	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	3	16.7	10	10.0
Gadsden	31	4.1	2 677	1.2	39	4.6	355	6.7
Gilchrist	43	4.0	1 835	6.4	17	7.2	159	11.2
Glades	2	—	(D)	(D)	33	5.1	10 596	.5
Gulf	3	22.2	22	21.7	1	47.1	(D)	(D)
Hamilton	5	—	78	—	5	15.9	56	16.6
Hardee	24	5.7	2 043	2.4	686	1.0	58 900	.7
Hendry	28	2.6	9 936	.6	186	1.8	114 618	.3
Hernando	10	9.6	66	6.0	64	3.4	1 479	6.4
Highlands	11	6.2	1 460	3.0	363	1.4	83 957	.3
Hillsborough	180	2.2	10 549	.6	916	1.1	31 754	1.3
Holmes	31	5.7	651	4.4	22	7.1	102	8.7
Indian River	7	10.2	1 050	3.9	343	1.0	72 971	.5
Jackson	68	3.5	2 161	2.9	35	5.4	476	10.6
Jefferson	23	5.3	642	4.1	81	3.4	2 423	6.3
Lafayette	17	7.0	1 401	7.2	9	11.4	32	12.0
Lake	21	7.6	433	10.2	598	1.2	25 964	1.3
Lee	24	4.6	6 938	.1	175	2.1	14 373	.9
Leon	16	8.0	205	17.8	21	8.0	144	10.3
Levy	46	4.5	2 399	4.9	21	6.8	97	9.3
Liberty	—	—	—	—	5	15.4	44	22.8
Madison	20	5.7	1 017	3.4	30	6.1	540	13.6
Manatee	44	3.0	24 947	.2	210	1.9	26 418	.7
Marion	58	3.8	4 081	1.9	125	3.0	1 549	5.3
Martin	10	8.2	(D)	(D)	80	3.0	51 467	.6
Monroe	—	—	—	—	2	25.0	(D)	(D)
Nassau	6	14.1	18	17.5	17	7.8	126	11.8
Okaloosa	14	8.1	48	7.3	34	5.0	240	8.2
Okeechobee	5	14.1	(D)	(D)	67	3.2	16 119	.6
Orange	14	5.6	23 469	.2	253	1.8	11 898	1.5
Osceola	3	10.1	(D)	(D)	185	1.8	17 124	.8
Palm Beach	70	2.6	58 002	.1	68	4.0	13 392	.7
Pasco	11	8.3	442	4.0	331	1.5	14 418	1.3
Pinellas	—	—	—	—	16	8.3	254	12.2
Polk	26	6.5	783	8.9	1 412	.9	114 531	.5
Putnam	9	8.9	814	.5	43	4.5	291	7.5
St. Johns	15	5.2	1 066	1.3	5	14.4	10	15.3
St. Lucie	4	—	(D)	(D)	342	1.1	117 840	.3
Santa Rosa	14	6.5	278	1.5	39	4.2	257	5.3
Sarasota	10	7.1	1 485	1.9	42	4.3	2 376	1.6
Seminole	14	8.2	253	11.2	94	3.0	1 721	6.1
Sumter	42	5.1	1 482	6.2	23	6.5	239	3.9
Suwannee	40	4.4	6 838	1.4	67	3.9	904	6.4
Taylor	7	11.7	26	11.7	3	20.9	16	27.1
Union	15	8.1	639	1.3	21	6.0	293	2.1
Volusia	17	7.6	290	9.6	152	2.5	1 930	5.1
Wakulla	8	10.5	20	12.0	—	—	—	—
Walton	14	7.7	181	11.6	44	4.6	338	6.2
Washington	24	5.3	913	3.9	18	7.4	154	3.9

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table G. Coverage Estimates: 1997

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

Item	Census total	Coverage total ¹	Adjusted census		Coverage adjustment (percent)
			Total	Relative standard error (percent)	
Farms number..	34 799	10 989	45 788	3.0	24.0
Land in farms acres..	10 454 217	256 961	10 711 178	4.6	2.4
Average size of farm acres..	300	23	234	(X)	(X)
Farms by size of farm:					
Less than 10 acres	7 394	3 343	10 737	6.0	31.1
10 to 49 acres	12 750	6 144	18 894	5.3	32.5
50 to 179 acres	7 932	1 167	9 099	3.5	12.8
180 acres or more	6 723	335	7 058	2.8	4.7
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than \$2,500	11 530	7 859	19 389	5.1	40.5
\$2,500 to \$9,999	8 527	2 319	10 846	3.8	21.4
\$10,000 or more	14 742	811	15 553	2.4	5.2
Market value of agricultural products sold \$1,000..	6 004 554	-14 024	5 990 529	.6	-2
Farms by type of organization:					
Individual or family	27 173	10 780	37 953	3.5	28.4
Partnership, corporation, or other	7 626	209	7 835	3.2	2.7
Farms by tenure of operator:					
Full owners	26 962	9 181	36 143	3.4	25.4
Part owners	5 492	1 227	6 719	4.8	18.3
Tenants	2 345	581	2 926	3.5	19.9
Operators by place of residence:					
On farm operated	21 333	9 958	31 291	4.1	31.8
Not on farm operated	10 106	689	10 795	3.1	6.4
Not reported	3 360	342	3 702	3.1	9.2
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming	15 782	2 958	18 740	3.7	15.8
Other	19 017	8 031	27 048	4.0	29.7
Operators by sex:					
Male	29 415	10 072	39 487	3.2	25.5
Female.....	5 384	917	6 301	4.8	14.6
Operators by race:					
White	33 481	10 769	44 250	3.1	24.3
Black and other races	1 318	220	1 538	2.3	14.3
Operators by years on present farm:					
4 years or less	4 726	839	5 565	3.6	15.1
5 years or more	23 758	2 751	26 509	2.0	10.4
Not reported	6 315	7 399	13 714	8.3	54.0

¹ See text in Appendix C regarding coverage estimates.