
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	9.4	Corn for grain or seed	4.0
Land in farms	4.8	Wheat for grain	2.6
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹	5.0	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold	1.6	Cattle and calves	3.9
Harvested cropland	3.3	Hogs and pigs	4.9
		Layers 20 weeks old and older2

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM		SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:		Number of farms reporting:	
25	5.4	25	39.3
50	3.6	50	27.3
75	2.7	75	21.9
100	2.1	100	18.6
150	1.2	150	14.6
2003	200	12.1
3002	300	8.9
5002	500	5.1
7501	750	4.2
1,0001	1,000	3.6
1,5001	1,500	2.9
2,0001	2,000	2.6

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Farms number ..	22 314	.5	Total farm production expenses farms ..	22 334	.5
Land in farms acres ..	11 830 167	.4	Average per farm dollars ..	2 705 028	.3
Average size of farm acres ..	530	.7		121 117	.6
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD					
Total sales (see text) farms ..	22 314	.5	Livestock and poultry purchased farms ..	7 820	2.0
Average per farm dollars ..	149 945	.6	Feed for livestock and poultry farms ..	469 600	.4
Farms by value of sales:			Commercially mixed formula feeds farms ..	11 438	1.4
Less than \$1,000 (see text) farms ..	3 243	.8	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees farms ..	450 829	.6
\$1,000 to \$2,499 farms ..	612	1.2	Petroleum products farms ..	5 461	2.5
\$2,500 to \$4,999 farms ..	2 420	.8	Electricity farms ..	102 153	1.4
\$5,000 to \$9,999 farms ..	3 992	.8	Commercial fertilizer farms ..	9 308	1.5
\$10,000 to \$19,999 farms ..	2 350	.7	Agricultural chemicals farms ..	94 322	.7
\$20,000 to \$24,999 farms ..	8 371	.8	Hired farm labor farms ..	11 564	1.4
\$25,000 to \$39,999 farms ..	2 362	.8	Contract labor farms ..	245 440	.6
\$40,000 to \$49,999 farms ..	16 776	.8	Repair and maintenance farms ..	11 383	1.4
\$50,000 to \$99,999 farms ..	2 455	.9	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment farms ..	118 406	.7
\$100,000 to \$249,999 farms ..	34 559	.9	Interest farms ..	20 090	.7
\$250,000 to \$499,999 farms ..	727	1.4	Secured by real estate farms ..	100 076	.8
\$500,000 or more farms ..	16 157	1.4	Not secured by real estate farms ..	15 661	1.1
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Cash rent farms ..	89 854	.7
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops farms ..	11 927	.6	Hired farm labor farms ..	9 410	1.6
Grains farms ..	1 773 699	.2	Contract labor farms ..	270 843	.7
Corn for grain farms ..	7 199	.7	Repair and maintenance farms ..	3 501	3.0
Wheat farms ..	573 088	.3	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment farms ..	32 680	1.6
Soybeans farms ..	590	1.1	Interest farms ..	18 147	.9
Wheat farms ..	17 592	.8	Secured by real estate farms ..	152 222	.7
Soybeans farms ..	5 171	.6	Not secured by real estate farms ..	8 597	1.8
Sorghum for grain farms ..	346 339	.3	Cash rent farms ..	69 649	1.4
Barley farms ..	—	—	Property taxes farms ..	11 087	1.4
Oats farms ..	—	—	All other farm production expenses farms ..	178 482	.9
Other grains farms ..	3 613	.7		7 784	1.9
Cotton and cottonseed farms ..	140 145	.4		98 667	1.4
Tobacco farms ..	298	1.6		6 719	2.0
Hay, silage, and field seeds farms ..	1 832	1.8		79 815	.8
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons farms ..	1 625	.8		5 387	2.3
Fruits, nuts, and berries farms ..	67 179	.6		124 518	1.0
Nursery and greenhouse crops farms ..	—	—		21 097	.6
Other crops farms ..	—	—		55 081	1.0
Livestock, poultry, and their products farms ..	7 647	.6		20 669	.7
Poultry and poultry products farms ..	255 141	.4		253 025	.7
Dairy products farms ..	641	1.0			
Cattle and calves farms ..	50 636	.5			
Hogs and pigs farms ..	287	1.7			
Sheep, lambs, and wool farms ..	24 408	.6			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) farms ..	706	1.1			
	57 189	.6			
	2 148	.5			
	813 238	.1			
	13 691	.6			
	1 572 166	.2			
	412	1.5			
	15 000	.7			
	1 056	.7			
	557 339	.1			
	11 684	.6			
	910 805	.2			
	573	1.3			
	4 473	2.0			
	1 077	1.0			
	29 977	.4			
	2 335	.8			
	54 571	.6			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) farms ..	1 205	.9			
	3 047	1.1			
			NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
			All farms number ..	22 334	.5
			Average per farm dollars ..	590 283	1.2
			Farms with net gains ² farms ..	26 430	1.3
			Average net gain dollars ..	11 024	1.3
			Farms with net losses farms ..	707 464	.8
			Average net loss dollars ..	64 175	1.6
			GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
			Government payments farms ..	11 310	1.3
			Other farm-related income ¹ farms ..	117 181	2.3
			Customwork and other agricultural services farms ..	10 361	2.7
			Gross cash rent or share payments farms ..	7 848	.7
			Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products farms ..	73 124	.7
			Other farm-related income sources farms ..	6 508	2.2
			Customwork and other agricultural services farms ..	58 462	3.2
			Gross cash rent or share payments farms ..	1 981	4.2
			Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products farms ..	24 521	5.5
			Other farm-related income sources farms ..	2 800	3.9
			Customwork and other agricultural services farms ..	24 182	4.5
			Gross cash rent or share payments farms ..	597	7.8
			Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products farms ..	6 200	9.7
			Other farm-related income sources farms ..	2 608	3.7
			Customwork and other agricultural services farms ..	3 558	6.0
			COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
			Total farms ..	889	.8
				29 610	.5

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			TENURE OF OPERATOR		
Total cropland farms..	18 994	.6	All operators farms..	22 314	.5
Harvested cropland farms..	6 308 877	.4	Full owners farms..	11 830 167	.4
Farms by acres harvested:	15 494	.6	Part owners farms..	4 699 642	.6
1 to 9 acres farms..	4 478 862	.3	Tenants farms..	6 037 239	.4
10 to 19 acres farms..	2 282	.8	acres..	2 147	.8
20 to 29 acres farms..	10 893	.9	acres..	1 093 286	.6
30 to 49 acres farms..	1 582	.9			
50 to 99 acres farms..	21 328	.9			
100 to 199 acres farms..	1 052	1.0	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
200 to 499 acres farms..	24 165	1.0	Land owned farms..	20 264	.5
500 to 999 acres farms..	1 472	1.0	Owned land in farms farms..	9 027 774	.5
1,000 acres or more farms..	54 353	1.0	acres..	20 167	.5
			acres..	7 897 630	.5
			Land rented or leased from others farms..	8 535	.6
			acres..	4 007 597	.4
			landlords..	21 918	.7
			Rented or leased land in farms farms..	8 439	.6
			acres..	3 932 537	.4
			Land rented or leased to others farms..	3 433	.7
			acres..	1 205 204	.8
			OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
			Operators by place of residence:		
			On farm operated	17 068	.5
			Not on farm operated	3 801	.8
			Not reported	1 445	.7
			Operators by principal occupation:		
			Farming	12 049	.6
			Other	10 265	.6
			Operators by days worked off farm:		
			Any	12 230	.6
			200 days or more	7 885	.6
			Operators by sex:		
			Male farms..	20 565	.5
			acres..	11 310 688	.4
			Female farms..	1 749	.9
			acres..	519 479	1.3
			Average age of operator years..	53.2	.8
			FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
			Individual or family (sole proprietorship) farms..	18 631	.6
			acres..	6 226 860	.6
			Partnership farms..	1 956	.9
			acres..	2 302 246	.6
			Corporation:		
			Family held farms..	1 351	.8
			acres..	2 222 151	.5
			More than 10 stockholders farms..	41	3.2
			10 or less stockholders farms..	1 310	.9
			Other than family held farms..	108	2.6
			acres..	121 513	1.4
			More than 10 stockholders farms..	24	5.6
			10 or less stockholders farms..	84	2.8
			Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. farms..	268	1.8
			acres..	957 397	.4
			HIRED FARM LABOR¹		
			Hired workers by days worked:		
			150 days or more farms..	4 531	2.1
			workers..	16 401	1.1
			Less than 150 days farms..	8 249	1.8
			workers..	47 014	1.9
			INJURIES AND DEATHS		
			Farm-related injuries:		
			Operator and family members farms..	280	1.6
			number..	317	1.6
			Hired workers farms..	446	.7
			number..	723	.7
			Farm-related deaths:		
			Operator and family members farms..	6	—
			number..	6	—
			Hired workers farms..	4	—
			number..	5	—
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS¹			VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT¹		
Estimated market value of land and buildings farms..	22 334	.5	Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment farms..	22 333	.5
\$1,000..	11 982 650	.9	\$1,000..	1 740 107	1.0
Average per farm dollars..	536 521	1.1	Average per farm dollars..	77 916	1.1
Average per acre dollars..	1 017	1.6			
			AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS¹		
			Commercial fertilizer farms..	11 502	1.4
			acres on which used..	3 526 053	.9

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE			LIVESTOCK		
1 to 9 acres	farms.. 3 092	.8	Cattle and calves inventory	farms.. 12 063	.6
10 to 49 acres	acres.. 13 925	.8	number.. 1 908 097		.4
50 to 69 acres	farms.. 5 621	.6	Beef cows	farms.. 8 405	.6
70 to 99 acres	acres.. 138 567	.6	number.. 555 676		.7
100 to 139 acres	farms.. 1 006	1.1	Milk cows	farms.. 1 404	.7
	acres.. 58 063	1.1	number.. 265 854		.1
	farms.. 1 406	1.0	Cattle and calves sold	farms.. 11 684	.6
	acres.. 114 250	1.0	number.. 1 578 375		.3
	farms.. 1 159	1.0	\$1,000.. 910 805		.2
	acres.. 134 194	1.1	Hogs and pigs inventory	farms.. 714	1.2
			number.. 29 026		2.0
			Hogs and pigs sold	farms.. 573	1.3
			number.. 44 626		2.1
			\$1,000.. 4 473		2.0
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms.. 1 097	1.0
			number.. 273 804		.3
			Sheep and lambs sold	farms.. 1 035	1.0
			number.. 291 435		.4
			Horses and ponies inventory	farms.. 8 682	.6
			number.. 59 559		.9
			Horses and ponies sold	farms.. 1 783	.8
			number.. 6 196		1.5
			POULTRY		
			Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory		
			(see text)	farms.. 886	1.1
			number.. (D)		(D)
			Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms.. 865	1.1
			number.. 922 612		.1
			Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms.. 55	3.8
			number.. 6 043		8.9
			SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED		
			Corn for grain or seed	farms.. 694	1.1
			acres.. 41 162		.7
			bushels.. 6 390 279		.8
			Corn for silage or green chop	farms.. 1 041	.8
			acres.. 79 086		.6
			tons, green.. 1 991 808		.7
			Wheat for grain	farms.. 5 199	.6
			acres.. 1 410 978		.3
			bushels.. 108 941 849		.3
			Barley for grain	farms.. 4 178	.7
			acres.. 711 504		.4
			bushels.. 54 317 070		.4
			Oats for grain	farms.. 549	1.3
			acres.. 20 406		1.5
			bushels.. 1 472 775		1.4
			Dry edible beans, excluding dry limas	farms.. 1 138	.9
			acres.. 92 743		.7
			cwt.. 2 036 315		.7
			Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	farms.. 1 402	.5
			acres.. 394 977		.1
			cwt.. 135 578 736		.1
			Sugar beets for sugar	farms.. 921	.6
			acres.. 195 651		.2
			tons.. 5 078 013		.2
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
			silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms.. 11 960	.6
			acres.. 1 260 010		.6
			tons, dry.. 4 395 396		.5
			Alfalfa hay	farms.. 10 001	.6
			acres.. 946 882		.6
			tons, dry.. 3 721 968		.5
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms.. 645	1.0
			acres.. 37 783		.6
			Land in orchards	farms.. 377	1.5
			acres.. 9 903		1.0
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM					
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	farms.. 3 925	.8			
acres.. 3 059 691		.6			
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)	farms.. 980	.7			
acres.. 1 103 642		.2			
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)	farms.. 271	1.7			
acres.. 18 400		2.0			
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)	farms.. 444	1.5			
acres.. 34 785		1.8			
Other crop farming (1119)	farms.. 4 746	.6			
acres.. 2 226 722		.5			
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)	farms.. 7 697	.6			
acres.. 4 362 989		.6			
Cattle feedlots (112112)	farms.. 443	1.4			
acres.. 185 974		1.5			
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)	farms.. 926	.7			
acres.. 306 299		.7			
Hog and pig farming (1122)	farms.. 180	2.3			
acres.. 9 251		4.5			
Poultry and egg production (1123)	farms.. 84	3.2			
acres.. 11 622		14.6			
Sheep and goat farming (1124)	farms.. 465	1.4			
acres.. 342 182		.4			
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)	farms.. 2 153	.8			
acres.. 168 610		1.8			

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹				
Farms	11 939	.7	Total farm production expenses	11 924	.7		
Land in farms	10 344 465	.4	farms	\$1,000..	2 643 560		
Average size of farm	866	.8	Average per farm	dollars ..	221 701		
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹				
Total sales (see text)	farms..	11 939	.7	All farms	number..	11 924	.7
Average per farm	\$1,000..	3 316 113	.2	Average per farm	\$1,000..	621 425	1.1
	dollars..	277 755	.7	Farms with net gains ²	number..	8 609	1.3
Farms by value of sales:				Average net gain	dollars..	81 627	1.6
\$10,000 to \$19,999	farms..	2 455	.9	Farms with net losses	number..	3 315	3.2
\$20,000 to \$24,999	farms..	727	1.4	Average net loss	\$1,000..	81 302	3.1
\$25,000 to \$39,999	farms..	1 407	1.2	Farms with net gains ²	dollars..	24 526	4.4
\$40,000 to \$49,999	farms..	661	1.5	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME			
\$50,000 to \$99,999	farms..	1 898	1.2	Government payments	farms..	5 936	.7
\$100,000 to \$249,999	farms..	370 413	.9	Other farm-related income ¹	\$1,000..	59 068	.5
\$250,000 to \$499,999	farms..	420 925	—	Customwork and other agricultural services	farms..	4 327	2.5
\$500,000 or more	farms..	1 281	—	Gross cash rent or share payments	\$1,000..	49 424	3.4
Sales by commodity or commodity group:				Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	farms..	1 536	4.6
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	farms..	8 621	.7	Other farm-related income sources	\$1,000..	22 973	5.8
Grains	farms..	1 763 877	.2	Forests products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	farms..	1 545	5.1
Corn for grain	farms..	555	1.1	Other farm-related income sources	\$1,000..	19 149	4.8
Wheat	farms..	4 809	.6	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS			
Soybeans	farms..	—	—	Total	farms..	871	.8
Sorghum for grain	farms..	—	—	Total	\$1,000..	29 597	.5
Barley	farms..	3 332	.7				
Oats	farms..	246	1.7				
Other grains	farms..	67 078	.6				
Cotton and cottonseed	farms..	—	—				
Tobacco	farms..	—	—				
Hay, silage, and field seeds	farms..	5 224	.7				
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	farms..	531	1.0				
Fruits, nuts, and berries	farms..	142	2.1				
Nursery and greenhouse crops	farms..	474	1.2				
Other crops	farms..	813 091	.1				
Livestock, poultry, and their products	farms..	7 680	.7				
Poultry and poultry products	farms..	14 864	.7				
Dairy products	farms..	1 043	.7				
Cattle and calves	farms..	7 119	.7				
Hogs and pigs	farms..	252	1.8				
Sheep, lambs, and wool	farms..	29 092	.4				
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)	farms..	972	1.1				
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text)	farms..	488	1.2				
Value of agricultural products sold through intermediaries	\$1,000..	2 149	1.4				

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Total cropland farms	10 968	.7	Individual or family (sole proprietorship) farms	9 099	.7
Harvested cropland acres	5 779 762	.4	Partnership farms	5 376 608	.6
Cropland: acres	10 235	.7	Family held farms	2 151 105	.5
Pasture or grazing only farms	4 362 559	.3	Corporation: acres		
Total woodland farms	4 838	.8	More than 10 stockholders farms	1 176	.8
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured acres	656 200	.9	10 or less stockholders farms	2 149 469	.4
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. farms	3 724	.8	Other than family held acres	38	2.8
Irrigated land farms	3 890 271	.5	More than 10 stockholders farms	1 138	.8
Harvested cropland irrigated acres	7 149	.7	10 or less stockholders farms	86	2.7
Pasture and other land irrigated farms	320 023	.9	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. farms	111 257	1.0
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs farms	9 215	.7	Less than 150 days farms	21	5.7
Reserve Programs acres	3 366 976	.7	150 days or more farms	65	3.0
	8 451	.7	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. acres	121	2.6
	2 995 217	.3		556 026	.6
	3 805	.8	HIRED FARM LABOR¹		
	371 759	.9	Hired workers by days worked:		
			150 days or more farms	4 128	2.1
			Less than 150 days workers	15 975	1.1
			150 days or more farms	6 213	1.9
			Less than 150 days workers	42 684	2.0
			INJURIES AND DEATHS		
			Farm-related injuries:		
			Operator and family members farms	205	1.6
			Hired workers number	232	1.6
			Farm-related deaths:		
			Operator and family members farms	5	—
			Hired workers number	(D)	(D)
				4	—
				(D)	(D)
			FARMS BY SIZE		
			1 to 9 acres	459	1.6
			10 to 49 acres	1 297	.9
			50 to 69 acres	462	1.4
			70 to 99 acres	829	1.2
			100 to 139 acres	697	1.3
			140 to 179 acres	764	1.3
			180 to 219 acres	572	1.4
			220 to 259 acres	525	1.4
			260 to 499 acres	1 831	1.0
			500 to 999 acres	1 905	.8
			1,000 to 1,999 acres	1 417	.7
			2,000 acres or more	1 181	.6
			FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM		
			Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	2 661	.9
			Vegetable and melon farming (112)	898	.6
			Fruit and tree nut farming (113)	99	2.5
			Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (114)	251	1.8
			Other crop farming (119)	2 857	.8
			Beef cattle ranching and farming (12111)	3 575	.9
			Cattle feedlots (1212)	178	1.8
			Dairy cattle and milk production (1212)	918	.7
			Hog and pig farming (122)	51	4.1
			Poultry and egg production (123)	22	5.6
			Sheep and goat farming (124)	118	2.2
			Animal aquaculture and other animal production (125, 1129)	311	1.8
			LIVESTOCK		
			Cattle and calves inventory farms	7 035	.7
			Beef cows number	1 812 497	.4
			Milk cows farms	4 996	.8
			200 days or more farms	512 450	.7
			200 days or more farms	1 147	.7
			200 days or more number	265 317	.1
			Cattle and calves sold farms	7 119	.7
			Hogs and pigs inventory number	1 537 894	.2
			Hogs and pigs sold farms	895 486	.2
			200 days or more farms	292	1.7
			200 days or more number	24 810	2.2
			200 days or more farms	252	1.8
			200 days or more number	39 358	2.3
			200 days or more farms	3 993	2.2
			200 days or more number	469	1.3
			200 days or more farms	259 060	.3
			200 days or more farms	456	1.3
			200 days or more number	280 185	.4
			Horses and ponies inventory farms	3 984	.8
			Horses and ponies sold number	32 052	1.2
			200 days or more farms	730	1.2
			200 days or more number	4 025	2.2

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY			SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED—Con.		
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) farms..	242	1.8	Barley for grain farms..	3 830	.7
Layers 20 weeks old and older farms..	235	1.8 acres..	703 734	.4
..... number..	(D)	(D) bushels..	53 919 010	.4
..... number..	912 480	.1	Oats for grain farms..	458	1.3
..... number..		 acres..	19 133	1.6
..... number..		 bushels..	1 405 590	1.5
..... number..		 farms..	1 117	.9
..... number..		 acres..	92 584	.7
..... number..		 cwt..	2 033 178	.7
..... number..	26	5.4	Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes farms..	1 364	.5
..... number..	3 807	12.6 acres..	394 866	.1
		 cwt..	135 564 580	.1
		 tons..	911	.6
			Sugar beets for sugar farms..	195 605	.2
		 acres..	5 076 851	.2
		 tons..		
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
			silage, green chop, etc. (see text) farms..	7 592	.7
		 acres..	1 164 390	.6
		 tons, dry..	4 194 217	.5
			Alfalfa hay farms..	6 788	.7
		 acres..	886 916	.6
		 tons, dry..	3 573 493	.5
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) farms..	533	1.0
		 acres..	37 565	.6
		 farms..	146	2.0
			Land in orchards farms..	8 916	1.0
		 acres..		

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate
Farms9	1.0	-6.6	1.0
Land in farms	-12.2	.4	-11.0	.4
Average size of farm	-13.0	.9	-4.7	1.2
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :				
Average per farm	30.8	2.2	38.2	2.5
Average per acre	49.1	3.0	43.8	3.1
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :				
Average per farm	14.9	2.0	19.0	2.3
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	11.0	1.5	-12.7	2.1
10 to 49 acres	12.0	1.3	9.8	1.8
50 to 179 acres	-6.2	1.0	-13.3	1.1
180 to 499 acres	-8.8	1.1	-11.8	1.1
500 to 999 acres	-3.1	1.2	-4.0	1.1
1,000 to 1,999 acres	3.8	.8	.1	.7
2,000 acres or more	-2.0	.6	.3	.6
Total cropland	-1.1	1.0	-7.1	1.0
Harvested cropland1	.6	-3	.6
Irrigated land	-3.3	1.0	-6.4	1.0
Irrigated land	6.0	.5	6.6	.5
Market value of agricultural products sold	12.9	.3	13.0	.3
Average per farm	11.9	1.1	21.0	1.4
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	18.9	.4	19.0	.4
Livestock, poultry, and their products	6.8	.3	6.9	.2
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500	19.8	1.2	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999	7.5	1.5	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999	-2.9	1.3	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999	-2.6	1.3	-2.6	1.3
\$25,000 to \$49,999	-12.7	1.4	-12.7	1.4
\$50,000 to \$99,999	-15.8	1.5	-15.8	1.5
\$100,000 to \$249,999	-9.4	1.1	-9.4	1.1
\$250,000 to \$499,999	-3.3	-	-3.3	-
\$500,000 or more	16.5	-	16.5	-
Total farm production expenses ¹	10.6	.7	10.6	.8
Average per farm	9.6	1.2	18.7	1.5
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹9	1.1	-6.8	1.1
Average per farm	19.5	2.0	19.7	1.9
Average per farm	18.4	2.4	28.4	2.6
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	-7.9	.9	-10.2	.9
Other	13.5	1.3	6.5	1.7
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	7.8	1.2	1.2	1.5
200 days or more	9.3	1.3	1.4	1.7
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory	-3.7	1.0	-10.1	1.0
number	5.3	.6	5.2	.6
Beef cows1	1.0	-5.5	1.1
number	-1.7	.8	-2.7	.8
Milk cows	-29.4	.8	-30.1	.9
number	46.2	.5	46.5	.5
Cattle and calves sold	-4.5	1.0	-10.4	1.0
number	-4.1	.3	-4.4	.3
Hogs and pigs inventory	-37.4	1.1	-47.5	1.2
number	-56.9	1.1	-59.2	1.1
Hogs and pigs sold	-39.0	1.1	-47.8	1.3
number	-57.4	1.1	-59.0	1.1
Sheep and lambs inventory	-16.6	1.2	-23.1	1.5
number	-21.2	.4	-20.2	.4
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	-20.8	1.3	-30.5	1.7
number	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	-6.8	5.1	13.0	9.1
number	-77.8	3.5	-78.8	4.8
Selected crops harvested:				
Wheat for grain	-14.9	.9	-13.6	.9
acres	1.9	.4	2.4	.4
bushels	15.8	.4	16.0	.4
Barley for grain	-18.9	.9	-16.3	.9
acres	2.9	.6	3.7	.6
bushels	11.7	.6	12.3	.6
Dry edible beans, excluding dry limas	-23.8	1.2	-21.3	1.2
acres	-19.3	1.0	-18.5	.9
cwt	-1.4	1.2	-.8	1.2
Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	-13.2	.7	-14.2	.7
acres	6.2	.2	6.2	.2
cwt	13.9	.2	13.9	.2
Sugar beets for sugar	-34.5	.7	-34.0	.7
acres	-3.2	.4	-3.1	.4
tons	5.2	.4	5.2	.4
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)2	1.0	-3.1	1.1
acres	18.5	1.0	20.7	1.0
tons, dry	29.7	1.0	30.7	1.0

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm ¹		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Idaho	22 314	.5	11 830 167	.4	530	.7	536 521	1.1	1 740 107	1.0
Ada	1 221	.5	231 188	1.2	189	1.3	361 757	6.9	49 295	3.5
Adams	279	.3	200 480	1.1	719	1.2	535 367	6.7	9 196	7.3
Bannock	664	.7	309 281	1.5	466	1.7	256 923	5.6	28 414	6.9
Bear Lake	410	.4	221 717	1.4	541	1.4	341 250	10.4	13 810	9.1
Beneviah	226	.7	125 988	1.2	557	1.4	506 572	4.0	13 517	5.6
Bingham	1 168	.4	796 065	.4	682	.5	650 923	2.8	122 661	2.1
Blaine	195	.8	214 985	1.9	1 102	2.0	1 445 677	2.9	13 749	8.0
Boise	78	.7	45 461	3.5	583	3.6	519 265	5.9	2 648	4.4
Bonner	501	.6	98 662	2.4	197	2.5	357 401	12.3	13 025	10.8
Bonneville	787	.5	449 426	1.0	571	1.1	504 164	3.4	66 530	2.9
Boundary	312	.5	72 685	1.6	233	1.7	399 627	10.0	11 523	7.2
Butte	207	.6	129 639	1.4	626	1.6	491 839	6.8	17 644	5.8
Camas	98	1.2	127 514	2.0	1 301	2.3	831 792	4.7	7 193	2.9
Canyon	1 898	.5	354 919	.6	187	.8	398 578	2.5	124 013	3.6
Caribou	427	.7	469 381	1.0	1 099	1.2	662 931	10.4	32 463	5.5
Cassia	729	.7	656 658	.8	901	1.1	917 627	3.0	113 290	4.2
Clark	83	1.2	215 301	1.2	2 594	1.7	1 369 548	4.0	13 169	.8
Clearwater	210	.6	73 103	3.4	348	3.5	309 911	12.5	6 433	7.4
Custer	268	.8	147 913	2.0	552	2.2	596 364	8.3	12 973	6.4
Elmore	301	.5	355 590	.9	1 181	1.0	681 544	1.9	42 805	2.9
Franklin	655	.5	246 127	1.5	376	1.6	288 891	7.6	42 174	5.1
Fremont	493	.6	334 151	.9	678	1.1	567 677	3.8	54 949	6.2
Gem	552	.4	182 981	1.8	331	1.9	381 737	9.3	21 007	7.1
Gooding	675	.8	220 362	1.4	326	1.6	495 833	3.1	68 482	6.0
Idaho	661	.5	649 851	.8	983	1.0	625 124	5.2	36 702	8.9
Jefferson	773	.6	332 535	.8	430	1.1	512 550	4.5	67 454	4.1
Jerome	683	.6	193 921	.7	284	.9	565 847	3.1	85 012	3.9
Kootenai	598	.5	130 843	1.4	219	1.5	405 762	7.8	26 948	7.3
Latah	659	.4	325 484	1.1	494	1.2	512 248	8.1	38 081	4.7
Lemhi	308	.7	196 584	1.7	638	1.9	512 340	8.3	17 196	5.2
Lewis	182	.5	193 582	1.0	1 064	1.1	821 575	3.8	18 464	3.6
Lincoln	281	.8	131 473	1.7	468	1.9	429 786	4.1	24 597	5.7
Madison	470	.6	222 817	1.0	474	1.2	948 583	2.1	55 535	3.5
Minidoka	674	.5	206 882	.6	307	.8	537 948	2.7	86 774	2.5
Nez Perce	383	.6	339 476	1.0	886	1.2	877 422	7.5	43 655	11.2
Oneida	387	.9	271 108	1.5	701	1.7	438 588	14.6	20 472	6.2
Owyhee	570	.6	682 860	.5	1 198	.8	705 265	6.8	40 427	4.8
Payette	564	.5	148 467	.8	263	.9	315 078	5.6	30 502	6.9
Power	323	.6	424 085	1.1	1 313	1.2	1 069 055	2.1	79 250	7.2
Shoshone	44	.4	4 100	2.2	93	2.2	326 062	4.3	808	5.8
Teton	270	.6	132 678	1.3	491	1.4	822 427	7.6	20 285	9.1
Twin Falls	1 439	.6	456 378	.7	317	.9	494 326	2.7	111 889	4.3
Valley	1 119	.5	64 282	2.1	540	2.2	729 404	7.6	4 560	10.8
Washington	489	.6	443 184	1.2	906	1.3	503 627	5.8	30 528	9.5
	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			
							Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
	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)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Idaho	77 916	1.1	3 345 864	.2	149 945	.6	22 334	.5	2 705 028	.3
Ada	40 373	3.6	93 719	.3	76 756	.6	1 221	.6	75 326	1.5
Adams	32 844	7.3	8 339	.8	29 890	.8	280	1.0	7 917	10.2
Bannock	42 728	7.0	25 032	1.0	37 699	1.2	665	.9	19 882	5.9
Bear Lake	33 682	9.2	14 876	1.3	36 284	1.4	410	.7	12 409	10.9
Beneviah	59 547	5.8	11 434	1.0	50 595	1.2	227	1.7	9 818	2.7
Bingham	105 018	2.2	225 493	.1	193 059	.4	1 168	.5	180 557	.6
Blaine	70 148	8.2	23 584	1.0	120 943	1.2	196	1.4	18 722	4.2
Boise	33 948	5.5	2 253	3.3	28 885	3.4	78	3.2	1 753	3.9
Bonner	25 946	10.8	7 269	2.1	14 509	2.2	502	.8	7 037	16.4
Bonneville	84 644	3.0	90 589	.4	115 106	.6	786	.7	71 648	1.5
Boundary	36 698	7.3	13 541	1.4	43 401	1.5	314	.9	10 612	8.5
Butte	84 826	6.0	21 514	.8	103 932	1.0	208	1.5	17 837	2.5
Camas	73 401	4.2	8 815	1.8	89 944	2.1	98	3.1	5 726	2.7
Canyon	65 304	3.7	311 397	.2	164 066	.5	1 899	.5	255 489	.6
Caribou	76 026	5.6	42 918	.7	100 510	1.0	427	1.0	30 967	4.3
Cassia	155 405	4.3	332 819	.1	456 541	.7	729	.9	293 322	.6
Clark	158 662	3.5	32 029	.5	385 897	1.3	83	3.4	25 210	.6
Clearwater	30 486	7.5	4 849	2.1	23 091	2.2	211	1.2	4 678	17.3
Custer	48 408	6.5	17 557	1.6	65 511	1.8	268	1.3	12 878	5.7
Elmore	142 210	3.1	220 121	.1	731 298	.5	301	1.0	211 889	.3
Franklin	64 388	5.1	57 212	.5	87 346	.8	655	.7	45 131	2.6
Fremont	111 685	6.2	81 004	.4	164 308	.7	492	.8	59 908	1.7
Gem	37 920	7.1	29 606	.6	53 634	.7	554	.7	27 126	2.3
Gooding	101 305	6.1	249 436	.2	369 535	.8	676	1.0	188 784	.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	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)		
Idaho	55 442	9.0	32 553	.9	49 248	1.0	662	.7	28 145	4.0		
Jefferson	87 375	4.2	136 132	.3	176 108	.7	772	.8	114 621	.9		
Jerome	124 469	4.0	250 374	.2	366 580	.6	683	.7	183 094	.9		
Kootenai	44 913	7.3	13 581	1.3	22 711	1.4	600	.7	14 134	7.3		
Latah	57 611	4.7	37 541	.7	56 967	.8	661	.7	33 514	3.1		
Lemhi	55 650	5.3	18 782	1.4	60 981	1.5	309	.8	13 922	4.4		
Lewis	100 345	3.9	20 157	.8	110 753	1.0	184	1.4	17 698	1.9		
Lincoln	87 534	5.8	43 896	.5	156 215	.9	281	1.0	35 283	1.9		
Madison	118 160	3.6	80 475	.4	171 223	.7	470	.9	59 567	2.1		
Minidoka	128 936	2.6	152 214	.3	225 836	.6	673	.7	122 141	1.1		
Nez Perce	114 281	11.3	37 756	.7	98 580	.9	383	.8	32 434	3.7		
Oneida	52 900	6.3	15 164	1.3	39 183	1.6	387	1.0	12 283	4.0		
Owyhee	70 925	4.9	102 974	.3	180 656	.7	570	.7	78 839	1.6		
Payette	53 890	6.9	48 801	.6	86 526	.8	566	.7	37 567	2.7		
Power	246 119	7.2	120 975	.2	374 535	.6	322	.9	103 928	.6		
Shoshone	18 369	6.7	388	1.1	8 809	1.2	44	3.4	537	2.8		
Teton	75 409	9.1	22 864	.8	84 682	1.0	269	.9	17 699	2.5		
Twin Falls	77 701	4.4	239 410	.3	166 372	.7	1 440	.7	169 585	1.0		
Valley	38 323	11.0	7 608	1.0	63 931	1.1	119	2.1	5 020	3.8		
Washington	62 176	9.6	38 816	.7	79 379	.9	491	.8	30 388	7.3		
Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.												
Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Idaho	7 820	2.0	469 600	.4	11 438	1.4	450 829	.6	9 308	1.5	94 322	.7
Ada	401	10.1	9 883	5.5	602	6.9	21 014	2.3	370	8.8	1 268	8.7
Adams	129	11.8	1 533	17.6	205	6.3	1 513	14.0	93	15.4	71	19.8
Bannock	270	10.3	1 608	24.1	401	6.5	1 771	21.5	164	14.5	1 024	4.4
Bear Lake	172	13.1	1 563	15.0	256	8.6	2 206	26.8	149	14.3	207	27.9
Benewah	60	11.8	100	18.1	104	7.0	375	15.2	79	8.6	406	7.3
Bingham	446	7.2	18 348	2.4	661	4.6	11 201	2.0	518	5.5	9 290	.9
Blaine	76	14.4	2 288	9.0	133	8.9	1 136	13.5	99	10.5	639	7.9
Boise	24	5.7	86	6.4	40	4.4	194	4.6	25	5.5	110	2.3
Bonner	136	19.6	331	26.7	276	9.4	1 418	40.0	101	20.7	418	4.4
Bonneville	216	11.8	8 250	4.5	359	7.8	3 321	13.8	348	6.1	3 223	3.3
Boundary	62	20.3	371	28.9	137	11.5	421	21.2	118	13.1	414	8.4
Butte	62	9.8	669	16.7	103	6.4	935	10.9	140	4.0	720	6.1
Camas	15	7.2	99	9.1	24	5.7	127	6.5	44	4.2	149	3.7
Canyon	701	6.6	68 596	.6	902	5.1	43 247	2.0	741	5.2	5 492	1.8
Caribou	154	13.4	3 161	24.4	184	12.3	1 917	13.2	139	13.3	1 171	4.8
Cassia	240	12.0	103 251	.5	403	7.3	51 810	.8	374	6.3	7 809	1.2
Clark	40	4.9	2 648	.4	49	4.4	682	2.6	29	4.7	1 649	.3
Clearwater	62	19.6	258	41.1	101	13.0	168	25.1	52	21.7	218	32.5
Custer	133	10.3	1 972	18.6	173	8.3	1 486	8.6	92	14.5	235	9.7
Elmore	114	10.8	(D)	(D)	131	9.0	(D)	(D)	141	8.7	4 259	1.4
Franklin	212	12.5	4 245	7.6	308	9.8	15 795	5.5	271	9.4	654	17.5
Fremont	167	15.0	2 127	11.2	285	7.7	2 922	17.6	229	8.7	4 889	2.1
Gem	218	11.6	1 852	5.4	294	9.1	7 097	2.9	194	11.4	507	7.4
Gooding	338	7.9	16 935	2.2	444	5.6	74 286	.7	280	8.5	2 684	3.9
Idaho	216	12.7	1 480	16.4	415	6.8	2 548	13.9	264	9.1	1 081	6.3
Jefferson	267	9.3	20 939	1.4	322	7.3	12 922	2.2	359	7.7	5 481	2.9
Jerome	291	8.7	20 362	3.7	349	7.3	59 890	1.3	338	6.5	4 760	3.0
Kootenai	182	13.5	562	23.9	343	7.7	653	13.8	122	17.0	259	3.6
Latah	128	18.9	648	35.4	206	13.1	817	21.0	249	10.9	1 966	8.4
Lemhi	197	9.2	1 342	15.9	226	6.8	2 601	9.6	124	14.2	186	19.6
Lewis	50	10.2	189	25.7	73	9.6	210	18.8	116	5.3	1 346	2.9
Lincoln	118	16.1	2 396	12.8	135	11.8	3 768	6.1	148	13.2	1 381	2.6
Madison	173	12.5	845	16.1	238	8.9	2 183	13.7	258	5.2	4 837	6.2
Minidoka	245	11.9	7 302	2.7	313	9.6	10 399	5.6	428	4.4	5 940	2.0
Nez Perce	123	15.2	1 327	17.1	237	8.9	1 413	13.0	186	7.1	2 070	10.4
Oneida	116	18.3	317	26.9	173	11.4	1 699	13.8	148	13.5	317	20.1
Owyhee	185	12.3	14 856	1.7	305	8.3	12 025	3.2	254	8.5	2 389	5.6
Payette	199	13.3	1 328	9.4	266	10.2	7 137	6.7	243	10.9	1 163	6.0
Power	66	12.7	(D)	(D)	131	8.9	5 676	4.3	172	7.2	5 357	1.7
Shoshone	6	5.6	12	2.8	26	4.8	(D)	(D)	10	5.1	(D)	(D)
Teton	89	16.5	640	34.0	128	12.9	813	24.4	110	13.0	1 009	5.8
Twin Falls	507	8.1	13 087	4.8	685	5.9	37 489	1.7	780	4.4	6 044	2.2
Valley	37	14.2	1 666	3.9	51	12.2	530	5.6	25	19.0	(D)	(D)
Washington	177	15.3	2 439	7.8	241	10.6	2 867	13.0	184	13.3	1 093	8.3

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.											
	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)
Idaho	11 564	1.4	245 440	.6	11 383	1.4	118 406	.7	20 090	.7	100 076	.8
Ada	546	6.9	4 025	6.7	611	6.5	1 760	6.6	1 023	3.3	2 479	2.9
Adams	96	16.0	157	18.0	120	11.8	96	20.4	243	3.5	527	8.2
Bannock	212	12.8	2 053	8.4	260	12.1	1 002	9.2	567	3.6	1 164	8.5
Bear Lake	109	18.6	402	23.0	166	13.6	353	35.5	381	3.1	993	8.1
Benewah	114	6.2	1 949	4.5	119	6.8	1 427	4.5	207	2.8	829	10.0
Bingham	675	5.0	28 897	.9	582	5.3	13 214	.6	1 064	2.0	7 800	1.6
Blaine	93	11.9	1 365	4.6	122	9.8	525	2.1	186	3.2	970	4.3
Boise	34	4.8	79	7.2	35	4.8	33	11.5	64	3.6	90	4.4
Bonner	219	13.6	246	18.8	138	19.8	71	14.4	445	4.2	432	12.0
Bonneville	424	5.6	11 302	1.9	419	6.1	4 401	3.2	688	2.2	3 798	2.3
Boundary	182	9.7	965	15.1	160	9.9	967	17.9	302	2.3	524	10.0
Butte	125	4.5	2 003	3.9	98	6.6	425	5.0	189	2.5	1 146	3.0
Camas	36	5.0	393	3.3	33	4.7	79	3.1	85	3.1	396	3.4
Canyon	946	4.3	15 452	2.3	1 090	3.8	10 039	2.4	1 654	2.0	7 408	2.1
Caribou	156	11.7	3 827	7.1	215	9.6	1 518	10.8	364	4.3	2 044	9.7
Cassia	416	6.6	21 383	1.2	394	6.6	8 987	.8	660	2.5	6 766	2.2
Clark	26	4.9	2 254	.7	24	4.9	2 241	(L)	81	3.5	955	1.0
Clearwater	116	10.3	849	37.5	90	13.9	373	23.5	199	3.2	384	17.2
Custer	134	11.0	719	14.3	86	16.0	79	37.0	245	3.4	721	7.7
Elmore	142	8.0	8 518	2.0	121	9.4	4 553	1.0	254	3.4	2 804	3.0
Franklin	291	9.6	1 151	11.1	314	9.9	621	16.0	611	2.6	1 823	4.6
Fremont	266	8.4	10 820	2.6	250	8.1	3 707	2.9	473	2.3	2 747	3.2
Gem	267	8.1	1 213	10.2	290	8.8	689	18.1	505	3.2	1 122	5.4
Gooding	367	7.4	5 017	5.4	300	8.7	2 736	3.9	617	3.1	3 791	3.2
Idaho	407	6.7	3 724	7.1	325	8.7	2 362	10.3	558	3.6	2 282	4.9
Jefferson	472	6.2	11 831	1.9	381	7.6	5 176	1.8	704	2.9	4 466	4.5
Jerome	421	5.2	10 563	3.4	419	6.0	4 567	2.1	650	2.1	4 934	2.1
Kootenai	267	9.7	2 322	11.2	271	10.7	1 010	8.4	532	3.5	804	5.0
Latah	322	7.3	5 971	4.9	377	8.1	4 586	6.1	570	3.0	2 006	4.3
Lemhi	160	12.2	610	9.5	104	18.2	54	15.4	285	3.6	972	13.1
Lewis	131	4.6	3 804	2.0	126	5.2	2 121	3.5	176	2.6	1 048	1.6
Lincoln	139	12.0	3 693	2.6	147	13.6	1 989	.8	242	5.9	1 458	4.1
Madison	296	5.8	11 384	3.8	277	6.3	4 780	2.9	438	2.5	2 976	5.4
Minidoka	447	4.9	16 339	2.0	408	5.7	8 701	2.8	615	2.9	5 159	2.2
Nez Perce	208	7.3	5 424	8.1	253	5.5	3 501	9.2	352	2.1	2 345	5.7
Oneida	154	12.0	1 214	20.1	165	12.9	186	8.0	334	3.7	1 022	7.9
Owyhee	311	7.2	5 784	5.1	242	9.5	2 375	7.0	544	1.7	3 320	5.0
Payette	308	9.0	2 682	2.3	321	8.6	1 808	12.7	526	2.6	1 504	7.0
Power	206	5.4	12 891	1.3	218	6.0	7 127	1.7	299	3.2	4 027	2.8
Shoshone	15	4.5	11	5.1	13	6.4	7	9.5	42	3.4	24	5.6
Teton	142	10.8	3 273	7.2	148	9.9	1 220	6.9	228	4.1	1 027	4.7
Twin Falls	945	3.7	16 097	2.1	820	4.5	5 388	2.6	1 329	1.9	7 242	3.2
Valley	17	25.0	124	22.9	43	14.6	72	17.6	109	3.4	210	12.3
Washington	204	12.3	2 661	9.9	288	8.4	1 482	7.5	450	2.8	1 533	9.6

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)
Idaho	15 661	1.1	89 854	.7	9 410	1.6	270 843	.7	3 501	3.0	32 680	1.6
Ada	841	4.7	1 869	3.7	402	9.0	8 477	1.7	187	14.9	1 307	8.1
Adams	211	6.0	118	12.6	105	12.5	451	25.0	30	25.9	75	48.5
Bannock	410	7.5	730	9.9	215	14.0	1 402	6.9	67	24.8	427	7.1
Bear Lake	214	10.6	389	14.2	162	12.6	880	33.8	38	35.0	54	49.1
Benewah	168	4.6	129	9.8	77	8.9	729	6.1	18	19.6	121	6.2
Bingham	941	3.3	8 964	1.4	559	5.5	18 359	1.1	137	13.1	1 057	3.7
Blaine	157	6.9	1 057	8.1	107	11.6	2 360	8.8	48	17.0	277	3.3
Boise	52	3.8	49	6.3	25	5.5	332	3.4	12	8.3	49	3.3
Bonner	286	10.1	202	14.8	149	17.6	608	15.0	79	26.2	110	16.8
Bonneville	548	4.5	3 539	3.2	307	6.7	8 254	4.0	102	18.8	441	14.1
Boundary	202	7.5	233	8.0	121	13.3	1 947	10.1	17	34.8	249	4.0
Butte	185	2.8	1 833	3.1	99	6.4	1 995	3.8	55	11.5	135	8.4
Camas	79	3.4	167	6.0	46	4.0	592	2.7	21	5.5	293	1.6
Canyon	1 302	3.4	4 454	2.0	774	5.2	29 357	2.5	323	9.4	5 188	5.5
Caribou	318	4.8	1 092	5.5	186	9.8	3 123	7.4	42	31.4	284	11.4
Cassia	561	4.8	9 376	3.3	389	6.0	18 574	.9	150	12.7	2 856	3.8
Clark	54	3.5	1 456	.3	44	3.6	1 823	1.8	17	5.7	(D)	(D)
Clearwater	111	11.0	72	21.6	56	19.6	142	11.0	21	35.0	9	57.5
Custer	201	5.0	1 004	11.7	94	15.4	1 300	12.7	70	13.6	266	25.2
Elmore	226	4.9	5 483	1.0	126	8.4	10 895	1.2	59	14.0	1 161	8.2
Franklin	463	5.7	1 319	5.0	322	8.7	5 199	4.3	93	22.1	339	13.2
Fremont	349	6.3	2 573	2.0	272	7.5	7 949	1.9	88	21.1	510	5.6
Gem	403	6.0	496	8.8	176	11.8	3 632	4.0	106	18.4	300	12.6
Gooding	547	4.0	5 784	2.6	312	5.8	23 229	.8	165	12.9	2 660	1.7

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	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)
Idaho	450	6.1	402	8.0	273	8.9	1 843	8.9	69	25.5	161	34.3
Jefferson	532	5.2	5 289	2.7	382	8.1	8 232	2.7	103	18.7	509	20.5
Jerome	573	3.5	6 106	2.6	338	7.3	21 136	1.7	156	12.9	2 059	3.1
Kootenai	339	7.8	545	12.9	168	12.8	1 317	13.7	54	24.5	185	46.5
Latah	378	7.5	289	10.9	214	12.2	3 150	13.0	92	24.8	198	43.3
Lemhi	229	7.3	314	15.4	124	14.4	1 392	8.3	56	29.4	143	45.8
Lewis	131	5.5	181	6.7	100	6.1	975	5.4	15	21.7	71	19.4
Lincoln	187	7.9	1 795	1.7	136	13.5	3 876	4.0	74	18.7	1 197	4.0
Madison	347	5.4	2 740	3.4	240	8.3	7 394	5.4	50	23.5	594	8.9
Minidoka	562	4.1	5 541	2.4	341	7.4	14 804	2.2	160	12.9	1 592	3.1
Nez Perce	207	9.1	298	9.0	147	14.0	3 357	10.9	12	26.3	24	32.8
Oneida	256	7.4	597	23.1	131	16.3	878	22.0	38	35.9	69	32.9
Owyhee	387	6.1	2 463	2.4	229	9.5	7 748	2.2	122	14.8	1 287	12.0
Payette	440	4.8	978	15.9	232	11.6	6 443	9.4	88	20.5	794	2.8
Power	253	4.7	4 210	1.7	195	5.5	9 490	1.0	50	13.4	(D)	(D)
Shoshone	28	4.1	9	5.0	11	6.1	(D)	(D)	5	6.7	(D)	(D)
Teton	186	8.6	487	3.4	86	16.0	2 338	4.5	40	21.0	198	8.8
Twin Falls	917	4.2	4 486	2.7	745	5.0	19 941	2.3	295	9.8	3 629	7.2
Valley	85	7.4	89	12.4	42	14.7	(D)	(D)	6	29.8	(D)	(D)
Washington	345	6.7	647	8.1	151	15.2	4 364	19.0	71	19.1	895	4.6

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Idaho	18 147	.9	152 222	.7	8 597	1.8	69 649	1.4	11 087	1.4	178 482	.9
Ada	969	3.3	4 423	3.5	487	8.4	2 047	4.4	488	8.0	4 579	5.5
Adams	223	4.3	710	12.3	93	13.7	137	15.8	121	9.9	720	10.9
Bannock	513	5.2	1 343	8.6	136	18.0	557	27.0	307	10.0	1 812	11.5
Bear Lake	324	5.9	1 006	8.9	163	14.1	398	33.8	183	11.5	1 113	21.3
Benewah	189	3.7	1 109	6.3	48	10.8	181	6.8	96	7.1	829	7.9
Bingham	945	3.1	12 146	2.0	434	7.3	3 677	4.2	565	5.3	14 937	2.1
Blaine	179	4.4	1 524	6.2	91	13.3	843	10.7	104	10.3	2 012	6.2
Boise	59	3.6	154	5.4	20	6.1	26	7.9	31	5.0	155	6.1
Bonner	377	7.3	668	19.9	98	23.9	53	34.8	178	15.6	611	26.3
Bonneville	607	3.7	4 477	4.3	311	8.7	1 954	9.1	374	7.1	6 649	2.4
Boundary	232	6.2	844	10.1	68	17.2	135	10.3	142	10.4	848	14.4
Butte	179	2.9	1 399	5.8	91	7.5	687	2.9	148	4.3	2 103	4.0
Camas	78	3.4	628	3.7	51	4.2	561	5.0	52	3.8	740	4.4
Canyon	1 488	2.7	10 883	2.1	882	5.1	8 406	4.6	887	5.0	12 010	3.0
Caribou	310	6.1	2 109	6.4	145	14.0	727	17.0	223	7.8	3 224	5.9
Cassia	636	3.6	11 332	1.8	346	7.9	6 195	4.4	443	6.0	14 366	3.3
Clark	74	4.4	2 032	5	26	5.3	236	3.6	52	3.9	1 206	1.1
Clearwater	190	4.0	508	28.0	39	25.8	61	49.1	71	15.7	458	28.4
Custer	224	4.7	972	10.0	98	15.4	290	9.8	134	11.0	1 521	18.5
Elmore	226	4.3	5 221	1.6	111	8.7	1 971	4.3	151	7.4	6 574	1.2
Franklin	551	4.1	3 164	4.4	278	9.4	746	18.1	336	7.5	2 743	6.7
Fremont	438	3.8	4 443	2.2	167	13.8	729	20.4	261	9.1	3 511	4.3
Gem	446	4.7	1 663	6.1	223	10.2	993	15.2	296	7.9	2 141	10.8
Gooding	553	4.4	7 961	1.6	281	8.0	5 591	4.7	399	5.9	11 682	1.7
Idaho	491	4.4	2 476	6.5	179	13.1	481	14.4	312	8.7	2 504	8.0
Jefferson	692	3.0	7 035	3.4	317	8.4	1 909	3.7	359	8.1	7 690	4.4
Jerome	564	3.4	8 186	3.0	333	7.6	4 544	5.2	440	5.0	11 124	2.1
Kootenai	466	5.0	1 301	10.7	175	14.3	252	17.2	208	11.7	1 316	14.1
Latah	487	4.9	3 216	5.9	179	14.6	939	13.6	232	11.8	2 481	24.7
Lemhi	268	4.4	1 124	8.6	86	17.8	211	27.1	138	12.8	1 634	21.8
Lewis	157	3.5	1 248	4.0	62	8.6	607	3.5	116	6.3	1 353	4.5
Lincoln	247	3.7	2 305	3.3	107	16.1	2 266	4.8	209	8.0	2 658	5.4
Madison	410	3.3	4 060	4.9	172	11.7	1 083	7.9	214	8.8	4 531	3.9
Minidoka	560	3.3	8 191	2.7	328	8.3	3 732	1.7	452	5.1	9 613	2.8
Nez Perce	325	4.0	2 367	9.1	91	20.2	913	12.0	178	9.9	2 385	6.3
Oneida	294	6.9	1 354	10.4	95	19.5	268	31.4	192	9.9	1 783	16.1
Owyhee	494	3.8	4 554	5.9	297	9.0	4 205	9.9	294	8.5	5 802	5.5
Payette	477	4.0	2 713	6.6	248	10.9	1 467	8.4	273	10.0	2 795	8.1
Power	291	3.7	6 579	2.7	148	7.5	1 569	5.2	220	5.9	7 569	3.1
Shoshone	40	3.4	64	7.2	7	8.7	6	8.9	12	6.3	39	6.0
Teton	218	5.8	1 482	5.4	67	17.6	308	13.8	103	9.9	1 122	6.0
Twin Falls	1 148	3.1	10 585	2.2	755	5.0	6 031	3.7	793	4.4	12 218	3.4
Valley	101	4.6	280	13.5	28	17.8	109	3.2	40	15.1	487	7.9
Washington	407	4.6	2 385	11.1	236	11.4	1 334	20.1	260	9.7	2 833	8.1

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	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)
Idaho	5 387	2.3	124 518	1.0	21 097	.6	55 081	1.0	20 669	.7	253 025	.7
Ada	189	11.7	1 951	6.6	1 189	1.3	2 227	4.2	1 127	2.4	8 016	4.2
Adams	74	18.8	234	19.0	275	1.4	423	7.6	268	2.0	1 154	20.6
Bannock	163	17.5	1 279	7.0	632	2.4	908	10.6	606	2.7	2 802	8.2
Bear Lake	96	17.7	606	26.3	395	2.3	598	7.1	381	3.3	1 640	14.5
Benewah	35	15.0	418	4.6	216	2.5	419	3.6	204	3.0	797	3.8
Bingham	305	7.8	11 243	1.9	1 097	1.6	4 126	2.4	1 084	1.8	17 298	1.2
Blaine	44	18.5	1 317	4.0	188	2.8	481	15.4	191	2.7	1 927	13.0
Boise	11	8.3	43	11.9	73	3.4	109	5.8	74	3.3	242	7.7
Bonner	84	26.3	454	54.8	482	2.2	588	11.1	397	5.1	829	13.2
Bonneville	197	10.7	3 717	3.0	749	1.9	2 114	4.7	684	2.7	6 206	5.4
Boundary	71	14.9	1 014	24.2	297	2.0	478	9.4	275	3.8	1 201	11.6
Butte	40	11.0	584	8.3	198	2.1	563	3.6	197	2.2	2 639	3.1
Camas	25	4.9	573	2.0	93	3.1	227	3.8	90	3.2	701	3.2
Canyon	593	5.9	10 063	4.2	1 781	1.5	4 118	3.1	1 793	1.4	20 776	1.6
Caribou	123	13.9	1 638	7.6	411	2.3	1 249	8.3	383	3.2	3 884	8.2
Cassia	275	10.0	9 340	1.7	659	3.1	3 380	2.1	718	1.6	17 898	3.0
Clark	16	5.4	(D)	(D)	80	3.4	352	1.3	80	3.4	4 762	.6
Clearwater	20	41.3	151	22.3	201	3.1	324	18.5	200	2.9	488	13.3
Custer	35	30.8	260	49.1	255	2.9	453	7.8	242	3.1	1 601	5.7
Elmore	67	12.7	4 578	.9	283	1.7	1 088	2.0	285	1.9	7 491	3.5
Franklin	180	12.9	1 368	9.0	612	2.8	1 175	4.5	598	3.2	4 790	3.9
Fremont	115	14.9	5 329	1.0	473	2.1	1 398	5.6	469	2.3	6 253	4.2
Gem	138	15.1	902	18.8	530	2.2	904	6.1	508	3.0	3 615	3.8
Gooding	123	15.5	3 916	5.4	630	2.7	2 291	2.4	656	2.0	20 222	.9
Idaho	159	13.2	2 022	7.4	638	1.9	1 420	14.7	584	2.9	3 361	5.4
Jefferson	169	11.5	8 981	2.7	720	2.6	2 159	3.8	767	.9	12 001	2.3
Jerome	163	12.3	5 599	3.1	655	1.8	2 177	4.6	643	2.1	17 087	2.3
Kootenai	84	19.2	1 013	21.6	581	1.7	1 090	7.9	520	3.5	1 505	10.7
Latah	140	15.1	2 454	13.1	631	2.1	1 498	13.5	571	3.4	3 295	9.5
Lemhi	82	22.5	665	22.2	288	3.9	472	5.2	287	2.9	2 202	5.9
Lewis	88	8.6	2 052	4.2	149	3.8	681	4.4	160	3.6	1 812	3.1
Lincoln	60	23.4	1 735	3.9	273	2.7	620	4.7	267	3.7	4 147	4.1
Madison	110	14.0	3 361	2.8	456	1.6	1 735	3.1	431	2.8	7 063	3.0
Minidoka	268	10.5	10 531	4.7	618	2.8	1 949	2.7	641	2.0	12 349	2.2
Nez Perce	117	12.4	3 312	10.8	332	4.4	944	7.5	341	3.1	2 756	9.0
Oneida	50	27.8	397	20.7	365	2.9	764	8.6	355	2.9	1 419	8.8
Owyhee	109	17.4	2 639	7.4	502	3.9	1 230	6.4	552	1.9	8 161	3.7
Payette	109	20.1	2 047	5.1	556	1.2	1 155	5.7	560	1.2	3 553	3.5
Power	112	9.0	5 737	3.8	311	2.3	2 093	5.2	295	3.4	10 415	1.0
Shoshone	2	18.8	(D)	(D)	41	3.5	51	3.2	37	3.7	82	2.7
Teton	95	16.0	1 044	16.2	248	4.0	514	5.2	232	4.1	2 224	3.7
Twin Falls	346	9.1	5 605	5.1	1 341	1.8	3 175	3.3	1 362	1.8	18 568	2.6
Valley	23	21.8	89	41.4	117	2.9	228	11.1	107	3.6	500	11.8
Washington	82	17.8	1 430	3.1	476	1.5	1 131	9.0	447	3.1	3 294	14.2
	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)
Idaho	22 334	.5	590 283	1.2	18 994	.6	6 308 877	.4	15 494	.6	4 478 862	.3
Ada	1 221	.6	14 239	7.1	1 031	.6	89 540	1.2	819	.7	66 567	.8
Adams	280	1.0	1 892	25.5	233	.7	47 551	1.3	179	1.1	15 595	1.8
Bannock	665	.9	2 792	31.9	555	.9	166 700	1.5	393	1.2	74 634	1.2
Bear Lake	410	.7	1 273	62.1	373	.6	121 299	1.4	324	.8	63 134	1.3
Benewah	227	1.7	1 141	23.8	178	1.3	77 319	1.2	127	1.9	59 548	1.2
Bingham	1 168	.5	41 096	3.3	1 006	.5	377 753	.4	772	.6	310 419	.3
Blaine	196	1.4	4 485	9.0	163	1.2	70 233	2.0	145	1.4	45 149	1.6
Boise	78	3.2	500	8.8	57	2.2	6 956	4.4	43	3.2	3 151	5.9
Bonner	502	.8	-455	(H)	439	.8	36 975	2.4	354	1.1	20 232	2.5
Bonneville	786	.7	19 622	7.7	681	.7	312 093	.9	546	.8	203 034	.6
Boundary	314	.9	940	48.8	270	.8	50 657	1.6	234	1.1	38 585	1.7
Butte	208	1.5	3 598	10.6	178	1.0	70 355	1.4	165	1.2	56 972	1.2
Camas	98	3.1	3 089	2.0	85	1.8	79 958	1.8	78	2.0	57 909	1.6
Canyon	1 899	.5	52 451	3.4	1 632	.5	235 077	.5	1 348	.6	196 689	.5
Caribou	427	1.0	11 314	11.4	363	.9	265 388	1.0	276	1.2	153 406	.8
Cassia	729	.9	35 382	4.2	619	.8	378 150	.7	540	.9	277 150	.4
Clark	83	3.4	6 820	1.1	56	2.7	(D)	(D)	38	3.6	47 402	.8
Clearwater	211	1.2	-12	(H)	184	1.0	41 614	2.6	148	1.5	28 135	2.8
Custer	268	1.3	2 565	34.0	214	1.3	67 915	2.4	173	1.7	35 466	2.1
Elmore	301	1.0	7 593	6.8	242	.9	126 529	.8	200	1.2	92 326	.5
Franklin	655	.7	11 147	6.5	570	.7	148 431	1.4	466	.9	84 429	1.2
Fremont	492	.8	18 809	4.2	411	.8	193 394	.8	337	1.0	157 298	.6
Gem	554	.7	1 171	47.8	492	.6	47 908	1.3	386	.8	27 941	1.1
Gooding	676	1.0	58 748	1.9	529	1.0	(D)	(D)	427	1.2	99 625	.8

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				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)
Idaho	662	.7	1 895	46.8	559	.7	225 585	1.0	472	.8	138 890	.9
Jefferson	772	.8	21 494	5.1	660	.8	234 334	.6	564	.9	197 846	.5
Jerome	683	.7	67 519	2.5	570	.8	159 852	.6	481	.9	141 631	.5
Kootenai	600	.7	499	(H)	500	.7	76 855	1.6	394	1.0	53 469	1.5
Latah	661	.7	716	(H)	576	.6	237 543	1.0	420	.9	188 086	.7
Lemhi	309	.8	5 868	21.9	258	1.0	83 790	1.7	203	1.3	46 898	1.6
Lewis	184	1.4	1 717	18.8	152	1.1	140 160	.7	145	1.2	114 647	.7
Lincoln	281	1.0	7 156	7.7	254	1.0	(D)	(D)	225	1.2	63 907	.7
Madison	470	.9	18 130	8.5	410	.8	174 147	1.0	363	1.0	147 243	.6
Minidoka	673	.7	26 626	3.6	576	.7	(D)	(D)	477	.9	175 250	.4
Nez Perce	383	.8	8 699	29.8	306	.9	208 288	.8	253	1.2	171 767	.8
Oneida	387	1.0	2 027	28.9	355	1.0	187 730	1.5	282	1.3	84 521	1.2
Owyhee	570	.7	21 581	5.6	499	.7	157 795	.7	408	.9	113 447	.6
Payette	566	.7	7 940	18.7	486	.7	(D)	(D)	405	.9	43 224	1.0
Power	322	.9	16 011	3.9	286	.8	354 392	1.2	233	1.1	183 446	.6
Shoshone	44	3.4	-150	8.5	28	2.8	1 656	3.8	21	3.6	904	2.8
Teton	269	.9	4 907	9.8	238	.9	101 862	1.1	201	1.2	76 919	1.0
Twin Falls	1 440	.7	66 547	2.5	1 208	.7	308 139	.7	1 010	.8	256 460	.6
Valley	119	2.1	2 631	28.1	88	1.6	22 557	2.6	59	2.6	7 543	3.2
Washington	491	.8	8 269	13.3	424	.8	107 423	1.6	360	1.0	57 968	1.2
Geographic area	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Idaho	15 191	.6	3 493 542	.4	12 063	.6	1 908 097	.4	8 405	.6	555 676	.7
Ada	1 060	.6	78 112	.8	596	.9	66 194	.7	324	1.4	11 580	2.0
Adams	193	1.0	27 701	1.4	188	1.1	23 146	1.2	146	1.3	10 738	1.3
Bannock	427	1.2	41 910	1.5	358	1.3	23 795	2.5	247	1.7	12 467	2.8
Bear Lake	282	1.0	49 835	1.6	269	1.1	32 274	1.5	212	1.3	16 491	1.6
Benewah	14	8.8	211	24.4	94	2.6	3 948	5.2	81	2.9	1 808	6.3
Bingham	1 001	.5	321 610	.3	652	.7	81 747	1.0	426	1.0	25 876	1.4
Blaine	160	1.3	56 909	2.2	102	2.1	26 849	2.4	81	2.5	12 458	2.7
Boise	49	2.7	3 422	5.5	45	2.8	5 351	2.6	34	3.5	(D)	(D)
Bonner	86	3.1	1 962	14.2	235	1.5	9 210	2.8	203	1.7	4 828	3.5
Bonneville	596	.8	153 774	.6	338	1.3	44 171	1.4	224	1.6	15 350	2.1
Boundary	39	3.9	2 524	2.6	140	1.9	5 905	3.1	128	2.0	3 152	3.1
Butte	172	1.1	62 285	1.1	127	1.6	20 193	2.1	103	1.9	9 875	2.4
Camas	29	4.6	12 091	4.4	35	4.3	7 445	3.9	31	4.5	3 720	4.7
Canyon	1 684	.5	221 051	.5	1 047	.7	144 366	.4	638	1.0	20 489	1.3
Caribou	200	1.6	80 790	1.4	192	1.6	31 540	2.0	135	2.1	14 254	2.6
Cassia	607	.8	266 095	.5	398	1.2	138 686	.6	266	1.6	28 260	2.0
Clark	46	3.2	55 555	.8	57	2.4	15 758	2.8	48	3.1	(D)	(D)
Clearwater	12	7.9	127	11.6	106	2.2	3 963	4.5	94	2.5	2 089	4.8
Custer	222	1.2	61 933	2.7	183	1.6	42 004	2.3	163	1.8	(D)	(D)
Elmore	226	1.0	91 153	.5	173	1.4	123 306	.4	138	1.7	17 839	1.7
Franklin	424	1.0	54 643	1.1	382	1.1	43 953	.9	197	1.8	7 683	2.3
Fremont	349	1.0	118 997	.7	257	1.3	24 517	2.1	193	1.7	11 079	2.6
Gem	485	.6	37 183	1.2	338	.9	32 054	1.0	243	1.3	15 338	1.3
Gooding	542	.9	112 665	1.0	448	1.1	140 974	.5	248	1.8	16 421	2.3
Idaho	58	2.9	2 033	2.6	441	.9	41 393	1.3	387	1.0	20 993	1.4
Jefferson	670	.8	207 686	.5	433	1.1	62 730	1.1	302	1.4	17 374	1.9
Jerome	582	.8	151 726	.5	407	1.0	133 648	.3	188	1.8	10 750	1.3
Kootenai	148	2.1	15 794	2.9	239	1.5	6 985	3.2	182	1.8	3 422	3.5
Latah	29	5.0	266	7.9	216	1.5	10 301	3.2	183	1.7	5 497	3.1
Lemhi	267	.9	82 351	1.7	236	1.1	54 102	1.6	215	1.3	33 023	1.5
Lewis	3	19.7	(D)	(D)	80	2.2	4 723	3.4	67	2.6	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	255	1.0	72 518	.8	200	1.4	36 422	1.2	128	2.1	6 963	2.8
Madison	393	.9	128 649	.6	221	1.6	16 302	2.2	149	2.1	7 104	2.6
Minidoka	589	.7	180 791	.4	326	1.2	33 817	1.0	149	2.2	4 744	3.0
Nez Perce	67	3.1	430	4.5	186	1.5	14 168	2.1	166	1.7	(D)	(D)
Oneida	221	1.6	33 372	2.1	205	1.7	23 233	2.6	177	1.8	13 444	2.6
Owyhee	475	.8	131 976	.7	346	1.0	108 071	.7	252	1.3	41 358	.9
Payette	489	.7	52 566	1.1	303	1.2	36 029	1.1	200	1.6	12 369	1.8
Power	196	1.2	118 229	.4	124	1.8	35 933	.8	95	2.2	10 432	1.7
Shoshone	5	12.9	(D)	(D)	19	4.2	207	5.8	15	5.2	(D)	(D)
Teton	188	1.3	57 273	1.1	135	1.8	15 683	2.4	106	2.2	7 477	3.1
Twin Falls	1 223	.7	276 307	.6	832	.8	126 184	.6	557	1.1	29 664	1.3
Valley	74	2.0	24 229	2.6	70	2.2	14 347	2.1	56	2.6	5 398	2.8
Washington	354	1.0	44 686	1.3	284	1.3	42 470	1.6	228	1.5	18 303	1.9

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	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)
Idaho	1 404	.7	265 854	.1	714	1.2	29 026	2.0	1 097	1.0	273 804	.3
Ada	70	2.4	13 193	.5	44	4.2	3 813	3.0	65	3.7	1 554	9.1
Adams	14	4.6	193	2.6	9	8.1	39	10.1	29	4.4	820	6.0
Bannock	29	5.5	1 037	4.0	33	5.8	439	16.6	38	5.0	3 774	1.3
Bear Lake	38	3.0	1 680	2.8	11	7.2	110	8.6	25	4.4	4 964	3.4
Benewah	12	9.9	43	19.9	4	14.9	36	24.7	16	8.0	589	12.5
Bingham	84	2.2	8 484	.7	36	4.3	1 294	7.3	58	3.0	10 853	.8
Blaine	5	5.3	229	4.2	3	15.8	28	22.0	16	5.1	31 267	.3
Boise	2	21.7	(D)	(D)	4	14.7	(D)	(D)	1	30.0	(D)	(D)
Bonner	23	6.4	343	10.3	20	7.3	131	11.5	37	5.0	1 117	7.1
Bonneville	18	6.2	657	4.3	15	7.3	110	7.9	41	4.0	3 285	2.4
Boundary	11	8.3	335	12.8	7	11.6	101	19.2	19	6.4	927	8.2
Butte	9	7.8	387	1.2	8	9.3	150	14.3	18	5.7	8 151	1.4
Camas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Canyon	124	2.1	17 665	.4	56	3.9	1 253	6.4	99	2.7	18 436	1.0
Caribou	18	5.4	1 346	3.6	11	7.9	180	16.7	27	5.6	10 144	2.4
Cassia	55	2.7	12 531	.6	24	6.4	3 582	9.9	21	5.8	14 840	.4
Clark	2	24.9	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	8	10.0	(D)	(D)
Clearwater	5	16.1	15	17.4	7	11.6	30	13.5	7	12.0	92	18.4
Custer	9	10.5	(D)	(D)	13	8.6	65	9.4	22	6.4	4 208	3.7
Elmore	8	11.0	397	4.9	13	8.1	173	10.8	14	7.5	(D)	(D)
Franklin	119	1.7	13 869	.8	20	6.2	274	7.2	27	5.5	2 005	6.1
Fremont	21	5.5	913	4.9	14	7.8	76	9.7	31	4.9	22 874	1.0
Gem	36	3.2	2 516	1.6	22	5.4	681	10.6	36	4.1	960	5.7
Gooding	112	1.6	63 415	.1	22	5.8	359	9.7	27	6.0	26 652	.4
Idaho	29	4.4	386	8.6	22	5.0	3 045	5.4	26	4.2	3 520	3.8
Jefferson	56	3.5	5 086	1.7	30	5.5	2 782	4.7	27	5.4	16 046	2.7
Jerome	74	1.8	59 107	.1	32	5.0	1 299	12.1	16	7.1	(D)	(D)
Kootenai	13	7.4	60	12.7	33	4.9	208	7.3	31	4.8	316	8.4
Latah	10	8.7	141	1.6	12	8.6	371	19.5	19	5.6	978	5.4
Lemhi	16	6.5	1 059	5.3	9	8.0	109	13.3	27	5.1	2 002	6.5
Lewis	2	13.0	(D)	(D)	1	35.0	(D)	(D)	3	20.0	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	43	3.5	6 363	1.4	15	8.4	856	22.9	13	9.0	764	13.0
Madison	21	5.2	1 521	2.6	12	9.3	131	13.7	7	12.5	461	19.7
Minidoka	57	2.8	7 874	1.1	28	5.8	2 197	7.4	24	5.7	27 821	.2
Nez Perce	5	11.1	(D)	(D)	14	7.8	239	17.9	12	8.0	208	26.3
Oneida	16	6.4	583	4.5	1	28.6	(D)	(D)	15	6.7	795	7.9
Owyhee	33	3.3	5 289	.4	15	7.4	226	21.8	29	4.9	6 834	1.7
Payette	48	3.0	5 360	1.0	19	6.6	340	12.7	28	5.3	837	9.3
Power	6	8.2	712	.2	3	12.7	(D)	(D)	4	9.0	(D)	(D)
Shoshone	1	—	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	3	11.7	(D)	(D)
Teton	26	5.0	1 172	4.8	11	8.3	60	10.4	6	10.2	182	19.9
Twin Falls	97	1.8	30 730	.2	40	4.7	3 954	1.7	82	3.2	9 968	2.8
Valley	5	10.0	34	12.1	5	11.2	21	11.9	8	8.7	598	16.0
Washington	22	6.1	574	5.2	14	8.5	93	12.9	35	4.8	15 687	.9

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)
Idaho	865	1.1	922 612	.1	55	3.8	6 043	8.9
Ada	73	3.3	1 225	4.8	2	16.6	(D)	(D)
Adams	23	4.8	274	4.9	2	15.3	(D)	(D)
Bannock	30	5.8	351	6.4	1	43.8	(D)	(D)
Bear Lake	7	9.2	148	11.1	3	15.2	31	14.5
Benewah	12	10.1	173	11.9	2	17.3	(D)	(D)
Bingham	38	4.3	671	5.8	2	16.7	(D)	(D)
Blaine	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boise	2	20.3	(D)	(D)	1	31.4	(D)	(D)
Bonner	35	5.2	509	5.5	—	—	—	—
Bonneville	20	6.2	470	7.4	1	43.8	(D)	(D)
Boundary	16	7.3	227	9.5	—	—	—	—
Butte	5	9.0	77	10.7	—	—	—	—
Camas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Canyon	91	3.0	5 074	16.4	9	9.9	3 085	15.6
Caribou	3	19.3	55	20.6	—	—	—	—
Cassia	14	8.7	242	10.3	—	—	—	—
Clark	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Clearwater	13	7.9	384	4.6	—	—	—	—
Custer	8	8.8	97	8.1	—	—	—	—
Elmore	16	7.2	432	9.1	—	—	—	—
Franklin	17	6.4	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Fremont	9	8.7	138	7.7	—	—	—	—
Gem	33	4.7	(D)	(D)	5	11.1	238	13.0
Gooding	21	6.3	231	8.3	3	16.0	198	15.5

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	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)				
Idaho	43	3.7	904	4.9	—	—	—	—				
Jefferson	20	6.9	424	9.6	—	—	—	—				
Jerome	17	6.7	277	9.1	3	14.8	93	16.6				
Kootenai	43	4.2	679	5.6	4	12.3	140	11.9				
Latah	26	5.3	364	6.3	1	23.9	(D)	(D)				
Lemhi	9	8.0	196	9.1	—	—	—	—				
Lewis	6	13.6	100	15.7	1	35.0	(D)	(D)				
Lincoln	10	10.0	131	8.9	—	—	—	—				
Madison	7	10.0	71	7.0	2	25.6	(D)	(D)				
Minidoka	21	7.2	(D)	(D)	2	18.4	(D)	(D)				
Nez Perce	13	8.2	263	9.3	—	—	—	—				
Oneida	9	10.0	239	10.7	—	—	—	—				
Owyhee	20	6.1	236	7.8	1	25.1	(D)	(D)				
Payette	32	5.0	486	5.8	2	23.1	(D)	(D)				
Power	2	19.8	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Shoshone	8	7.0	134	9.8	—	—	—	—				
Teton	6	11.8	194	12.3	—	—	—	—				
Twin Falls	56	4.1	820	5.1	6	10.3	1 208	16.0				
Valley	5	10.0	119	8.3	—	—	—	—				
Washington	25	6.2	429	8.1	2	22.0	(D)	(D)				
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Wheat for grain					Barley for grain						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Idaho	5 199	.6	1 410 978	.3	108 941 849	.3	4 178	.7	711 504	.4	54 317 070	.4
Ada	133	1.9	10 541	1.7	1 081 236	1.7	73	2.7	2 855	2.9	233 955	3.2
Adams	6	4.8	200	1.4	10 517	2.8	12	4.4	312	2.1	16 974	1.2
Bannock	97	2.6	35 110	1.5	1 811 893	1.9	100	2.6	10 282	2.4	512 035	2.3
Bear Lake	37	3.7	2 766	3.7	101 782	3.9	131	1.7	10 306	3.6	541 106	2.6
Benewah	42	2.9	29 431	1.2	1 614 382	1.2	27	4.1	4 504	2.4	302 711	2.5
Bingham	375	.8	147 789	.3	14 901 564	.3	155	1.3	20 118	1.6	1 983 056	1.2
Blaine	10	6.4	2 837	6.1	220 820	1.8	65	2.7	17 270	2.0	1 513 992	1.6
Boise	2	15.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	8	9.0	300	10.8	19 594	12.5
Bonner	4	16.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	4	13.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Bonneville	210	1.4	78 403	.9	5 193 225	.6	247	1.4	58 096	.9	4 594 275	.9
Boundary	51	3.1	17 442	2.1	927 625	2.1	33	3.8	6 223	3.5	405 640	3.5
Butte	55	2.9	12 689	2.1	1 077 132	2.2	97	2.0	14 180	1.6	1 282 435	1.5
Camas	11	6.8	2 101	9.2	71 434	8.3	39	3.4	13 549	1.8	418 916	2.3
Canyon	432	1.0	37 848	.6	4 234 738	.6	171	1.8	6 164	1.6	585 336	1.5
Caribou	106	2.1	40 857	.9	2 152 910	.9	166	1.6	74 912	1.1	5 179 361	1.1
Cassia	281	1.2	107 118	.5	9 534 177	.4	174	1.6	31 182	.7	3 157 595	.5
Clark	15	3.3	14 907	.2	1 272 880	.2	10	9.4	2 217	7.7	196 110	5.4
Clearwater	33	4.4	9 106	3.5	436 644	3.6	31	4.5	6 058	4.2	331 159	4.1
Custer	4	13.9	645	5.9	59 734	4.0	25	5.5	2 386	6.9	163 385	6.9
Elmore	51	2.4	19 124	.7	1 921 617	.5	22	4.6	3 007	1.9	284 168	1.5
Franklin	147	1.9	23 777	2.2	1 108 625	1.9	215	1.5	16 627	1.7	1 211 900	1.3
Fremont	163	1.6	37 938	.8	3 085 198	.8	175	1.5	66 462	.9	4 658 170	.7
Gem	76	2.2	3 981	2.5	382 760	2.2	28	3.8	878	4.3	73 278	4.3
Gooding	88	2.4	12 692	1.1	1 258 868	.8	52	3.6	5 032	2.6	423 583	1.8
Idaho	211	1.4	62 283	1.1	3 726 933	1.1	176	1.5	28 872	1.3	1 738 752	1.3
Jefferson	204	1.6	57 470	.6	5 127 285	.6	232	1.5	36 561	1.0	3 400 578	1.0
Jerome	242	1.4	30 452	1.0	3 193 473	.9	116	1.9	13 156	1.2	1 454 111	1.1
Kootenai	38	3.8	11 211	2.4	642 829	1.9	15	6.7	1 657	9.2	100 673	10.1
Latah	196	1.4	90 706	.8	5 759 698	.8	141	1.7	18 615	1.2	1 177 324	1.2
Lemhi	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	7.1	487	8.3	32 945	8.7
Lewis	110	1.4	64 367	.7	3 497 755	.7	88	1.7	21 851	1.1	1 292 117	1.1
Lincoln	52	2.6	16 665	.6	1 639 814	.6	68	2.7	8 240	1.1	853 912	.8
Madison	169	1.7	45 270	1.0	3 844 811	.9	176	1.6	47 500	1.1	3 766 078	.9
Minidoka	233	1.2	49 354	.7	5 210 100	.7	205	1.4	31 063	.9	3 443 947	.8
Nez Perce	175	1.4	89 990	.8	5 922 902	.8	110	1.9	21 134	1.2	1 280 687	1.4
Oneida	135	2.2	38 354	1.7	1 300 999	1.6	127	2.3	19 374	1.5	879 623	1.7
Owyhee	115	2.1	12 380	1.2	1 223 329	1.4	55	3.0	4 394	1.6	419 654	1.4
Payette	136	1.9	9 665	1.2	857 337	1.4	27	5.0	718	7.6	60 324	8.1
Power	179	1.3	119 182	.9	7 825 754	.5	42	3.1	6 729	2.6	315 318	1.9
Shoshone	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Teton	20	4.1	4 529	3.4	230 173	3.1	95	2.0	43 906	1.2	2 453 864	1.2
Twin Falls	414	1.2	48 309	.7	5 421 381	.7	382	1.2	30 230	.9	3 347 878	.9
Valley	4	6.7	652	5.8	33 666	3.2	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Washington	137	2.0	12 454	1.7	1 014 644	1.5	49	3.6	3 160	3.7	180 755	3.4

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	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Dry edible beans, excluding dry limas					Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatos						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hundredweight	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hundredweight	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Idaho	1 138	.9	92 743	.7	2 036 315	.7	1 402	.5	394 977	.1	135 578 736	.1
Ada	30	3.8	1 507	2.7	36 023	3.0	13	6.0	478	1.0	190 535	1.3
Adams	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bannock	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	7.2	3 449	.7	1 182 048	.6
Bear Lake	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Benewah	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	35.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Bingham	—	—	—	—	—	—	191	.7	63 344	.2	20 935 446	.1
Blaine	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	848	—	278 954	—
Boise	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bonner	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	16.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Bonneville	—	—	—	—	—	—	98	1.7	31 777	.4	8 696 639	.4
Boundary	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	11.3	90	13.2	21 595	18.4
Butte	—	—	—	—	—	—	16	4.8	2 221	3.5	557 316	3.0
Camas	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Canyon	194	1.5	11 353	1.4	252 342	1.3	95	1.7	8 563	.5	3 596 706	.4
Caribou	—	—	—	—	—	—	25	2.4	5 823	.9	1 583 234	.8
Cassia	67	2.8	5 065	3.2	98 760	3.7	137	1.3	31 219	.2	12 281 774	.2
Clark	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	12.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Clearwater	4	11.1	218	5.6	2 741	8.5	2	23.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Custer	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	11.0	507	6.2	151 960	4.0
Elmore	15	3.6	2 311	2.2	56 651	2.2	32	2.2	11 324	.4	5 049 693	.3
Franklin	2	13.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	13.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Fremont	—	—	—	—	—	—	108	1.7	32 192	.5	9 745 286	.4
Gem	8	8.3	261	8.5	6 363	9.0	1	19.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Gooding	32	4.5	1 488	5.0	30 294	5.2	36	3.4	12 099	.5	4 738 623	.6
Idaho	2	11.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jefferson	—	—	—	—	—	—	54	1.4	29 512	.2	9 904 543	.1
Jerome	128	2.0	12 998	1.7	274 817	1.5	85	1.9	18 367	.6	7 545 866	.5
Kootenai	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	11.8	266	6.8	(D)	(D)
Latah	9	6.6	1 135	4.8	15 890	5.5	1	23.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lemhi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lewis	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lincoln	5	11.1	156	12.4	3 766	11.3	14	2.0	4 147	.4	1 691 328	.3
Madison	—	—	—	—	—	—	120	1.7	40 045	.9	11 525 705	.6
Minidoka	79	2.7	6 733	2.1	140 371	2.1	101	1.5	23 812	.4	9 275 578	.3
Nez Perce	30	3.5	4 561	2.2	74 736	2.3	3	13.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Oneida	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	24.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Owyhee	46	3.1	3 860	2.1	97 860	2.2	34	3.1	5 236	.8	2 336 181	.7
Payette	17	6.1	527	5.5	19 631	11.0	15	4.1	1 694	1.1	706 240	1.0
Power	—	—	—	—	—	—	74	1.0	31 386	.1	10 693 559	.1
Shoshone	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Teton	—	—	—	—	—	—	23	3.9	7 166	1.0	1 713 307	.6
Twin Falls	459	1.1	39 664	1.0	907 900	1.0	71	1.5	18 908	.5	7 432 982	.5
Valley	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	6.4	225	3.4	80 250	4.4
Washington	10	5.8	441	2.3	9 335	2.2	5	—	1 317	—	493 404	—

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Sugar beets 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)
Idaho	921	.6	195 651	.2	5 078 013	.2	11 960	.6	1 260 010	.6	4 395 396	.5
Ada	27	2.6	3 232	1.2	100 465	1.2	674	.9	28 677	1.3	111 209	1.4
Adams	—	—	—	—	—	—	172	1.2	14 756	1.9	30 943	1.6
Bannock	—	—	—	—	—	—	334	1.4	24 303	2.0	73 501	2.2
Bear Lake	—	—	—	—	—	—	302	.9	50 483	1.4	100 944	1.7
Benewah	—	—	—	—	—	—	87	2.6	4 805	4.6	7 465	4.9
Bingham	58	1.2	17 589	.6	452 562	.6	528	.8	61 271	.9	237 380	.9
Blaine	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	125	1.7	21 615	2.0	74 127	1.8
Boise	—	—	—	—	—	—	35	3.9	2 751	6.0	8 438	7.2
Bonner	—	—	—	—	—	—	283	1.3	18 117	2.6	29 436	2.8
Bonneville	—	—	—	—	—	—	377	1.1	33 657	1.5	115 049	1.2
Boundary	—	—	—	—	—	—	167	1.6	10 733	3.0	29 436	3.0
Butte	—	—	—	—	—	—	137	1.5	28 498	1.6	105 523	1.6
Camas	—	—	—	—	—	—	74	2.2	41 581	1.6	67 422	2.0
Canyon	133	1.6	12 577	.7	378 447	.7	969	.8	46 456	1.1	223 375	1.0
Caribou	—	—	—	—	—	—	190	1.6	32 073	1.8	86 471	1.7
Cassia	167	1.3	38 914	.5	936 026	.5	376	1.2	60 673	1.0	250 118	.9
Clark	—	—	—	—	—	—	37	3.7	22 610	1.4	89 543	1.3
Clearwater	—	—	—	—	—	—	124	1.8	9 177	5.4	14 101	4.2
Custer	—	—	—	—	—	—	167	1.7	32 122	2.2	86 364	2.4
Elmore	18	3.3	10 280	.1	318 038	.1	171	1.4	39 899	1.0	199 404	.9
Franklin	—	—	—	—	—	—	419	1.0	39 864	1.3	128 289	1.3
Fremont	—	—	—	—	—	—	235	1.4	20 027	1.7	59 981	2.1
Gem	3	9.1	(D)	(D)	3 780	9.8	296	1.1	15 199	1.5	48 026	1.5
Gooding	29	4.1	4 195	1.9	113 943	1.9	357	1.3	40 173	1.2	192 465	.9

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Sugar beets 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)
Idaho	—	—	—	—	—	—	410	.9	41 025	1.3	73 653	1.4
Jefferson	—	—	—	—	—	—	471	1.1	72 903	.9	307 411	.8
Jerome	75	1.9	13 983	.7	365 942	.7	369	1.1	37 490	.8	200 688	.8
Kootenai	—	—	—	—	—	—	313	1.2	17 252	2.4	27 786	3.0
Latah	—	—	—	—	—	—	271	1.3	17 540	2.3	34 882	2.5
Lemhi	—	—	—	—	—	—	197	1.3	46 392	1.7	116 741	1.4
Lewis	—	—	—	—	—	—	83	2.1	6 335	2.0	12 191	1.8
Lincoln	28	2.7	9 634	.9	237 433	.8	196	1.4	21 172	1.6	76 832	1.8
Madison	—	—	—	—	—	—	236	1.4	15 890	1.6	57 347	1.5
Minidoka	169	1.4	41 630	.5	1 017 405	.5	304	1.3	21 914	1.1	111 425	1.1
Nez Perce	—	—	—	—	—	—	140	1.9	10 236	2.4	21 640	2.9
Oneida	—	—	—	—	—	—	226	1.5	26 344	2.2	83 330	2.4
Owyhee	33	3.0	6 079	.7	164 040	.7	350	1.1	69 604	.9	281 300	.9
Payette	21	4.1	3 181	1.2	105 966	1.1	283	1.3	13 271	1.8	55 966	1.9
Power	44	1.8	15 451	.8	388 330	.7	102	2.1	8 781	2.3	34 846	1.6
Shoshone	—	—	—	—	—	—	19	3.2	852	2.9	934	3.3
Teton	—	—	—	—	—	—	167	1.5	21 914	2.0	46 322	2.0
Twin Falls	90	1.7	14 226	.8	377 301	.7	858	.9	71 923	.7	370 874	.7
Valley	1	19.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	52	2.8	4 511	4.2	9 770	4.4
Washington	23	3.2	1 835	1.9	54 581	1.9	277	1.3	35 141	1.7	102 448	1.8

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	22 314	3 262	25 576	4.1	12.8
Land in farms	11 830 167	249 550	12 079 717	3.2	2.1
Average size of farm	530	77	472	(X)	(X)
Farms by size of farm:					
Less than 10 acres	3 092	1 334	4 426	17.6	30.1
10 to 49 acres	5 621	1 448	7 069	6.3	20.5
50 to 179 acres	4 757	129	4 886	3.7	2.6
180 acres or more	8 844	351	9 195	3.6	3.8
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than \$2,500	5 663	2 513	8 176	9.1	30.7
\$2,500 to \$9,999	4 712	793	5 505	7.1	14.4
\$10,000 or more	11 939	-44	11 895	2.7	-4
Market value of agricultural products sold	3 345 864	-48 081	3 297 783	2.3	-1.5
Farms by type of organization:					
Individual or family	18 631	2 927	21 558	4.0	13.6
Partnership, corporation, or other	3 683	335	4 018	9.7	8.3
Farms by tenure of operator:					
Full owners	13 875	2 279	16 154	5.4	14.1
Part owners	6 292	541	6 833	4.7	7.9
Tenants	2 147	442	2 589	13.1	17.1
Operators by place of residence:					
On farm operated	17 068	1 741	18 809	4.4	9.3
Not on farm operated	3 801	68	3 869	2.8	1.8
Not reported	1 445	1 453	2 898	16.6	50.1
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming	12 049	859	12 908	4.4	6.7
Other	10 265	2 403	12 668	6.0	19.0
Operators by sex:					
Male	20 565	2 760	23 325	3.5	11.8
Female	1 749	502	2 251	21.3	22.3
Operators by race:					
White	21 962	3 185	25 147	4.1	12.7
Black and other races	352	77	429	25.2	17.9
Operators by years on present farm:					
4 years or less	3 021	1 070	4 091	13.8	26.2
5 years or more	16 195	1 406	17 601	3.1	8.0
Not reported	3 098	786	3 884	13.6	20.2

¹ See text in Appendix C regarding coverage estimates.