

---

# 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 .....	11.0	Corn for grain or seed .....	3.1
Land in farms .....	6.5	Wheat for grain .....	5.8
Estimated market value of land and buildings <sup>1</sup> .....	6.7	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold .....	2.5	Cattle and calves .....	3.9
Harvested cropland .....	5.7	Hogs and pigs .....	2.3
		Layers 20 weeks old and older .....	1.1

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>COMPLETE COUNT ITEM</b>		<b>SAMPLE COUNT ITEM</b>	
Number of farms reporting:		Number of farms reporting:	
25 .....	5.9	25 .....	42.0
50 .....	3.9	50 .....	29.1
75 .....	2.9	75 .....	23.2
100 .....	2.3	100 .....	19.7
150 .....	1.4	150 .....	15.3
200 .....	.7	200 .....	12.5
300 .....	.5	300 .....	9.0
500 .....	.4	500 .....	4.4
750 .....	.3	750 .....	3.6
1,000 .....	.3	1,000 .....	3.1
1,500 .....	.2	1,500 .....	2.5
2,000 .....	(X)	2,000 .....	(X)



**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)
<b>FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS</b>			<b>FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES<sup>1</sup></b>		
Farms ..... number..	61 593	.7	Total farm production expenses ..... farms..	61 591	.7
Land in farms ..... acres..	46 089 268	.6	..... \$1,000..	7 290 703	.3
Average size of farm ..... acres..	748	.9	Average per farm ..... dollars..	118 373	.8
<b>MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD</b>			<b>NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)<sup>1</sup></b>		
Total sales (see text) ..... farms..	61 593	.7	All farms ..... number..	61 591	.7
..... \$1,000..	9 207 130	.2	..... \$1,000..	1 877 913	.7
Average per farm ..... dollars..	149 483	.7	Average per farm ..... dollars..	30 490	1.0
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains <sup>2</sup> ..... number..	37 570	1.0
Less than \$1,000 (see text) ..... farms..	6 796	.9	..... \$1,000..	2 115 876	.6
..... \$1,000..	1 045	1.1	Average net gain ..... dollars..	56 318	1.1
\$1,000 to \$2,499 ..... farms..	4 172	.8	Farms with net losses ..... number..	24 021	1.2
..... \$1,000..	7 043	.8	..... \$1,000..	237 963	1.5
\$2,500 to \$4,999 ..... farms..	5 068	.7	Average net loss ..... dollars..	9 906	1.9
..... \$1,000..	18 439	.7	<b>GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME</b>		
\$5,000 to \$9,999 ..... farms..	6 767	.7	Government payments ..... farms..	39 735	.8
..... \$1,000..	49 005	.7	..... \$1,000..	343 771	.6
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ..... farms..	7 734	.9	Other farm-related income <sup>1</sup> ..... farms..	24 249	1.3
..... \$1,000..	111 212	.9	..... \$1,000..	119 958	2.5
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ..... farms..	2 559	1.2	Customwork and other agricultural services ..... farms..	6 333	2.7
..... \$1,000..	56 831	1.2	..... \$1,000..	53 778	3.8
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ..... farms..	5 272	1.2	Gross cash rent or share payments ..... farms..	8 643	2.4
..... \$1,000..	168 193	1.2	..... \$1,000..	51 224	3.8
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ..... farms..	2 485	1.3	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ..... farms..	271	13.8
..... \$1,000..	111 053	1.3	..... \$1,000..	727	25.2
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ..... farms..	7 304	1.2	Other farm-related income sources ..... farms..	15 800	1.6
..... \$1,000..	519 424	1.2	..... \$1,000..	14 229	4.4
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ..... farms..	8 016	.9	<b>COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS</b>		
..... \$1,000..	1 267 370	.8	Total ..... farms..	4 406	.9
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ..... farms..	3 417	—	..... \$1,000..	91 100	.6
..... \$1,000..	1 187 352	—			
\$500,000 or more ..... farms..	2 003	—			
..... \$1,000..	5 710 162	—			
Sales by commodity or commodity group:					
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops..... farms..	42 059	.8			
..... \$1,000..	3 221 766	.4			
Grains ..... farms..	36 838	.8			
..... \$1,000..	2 952 786	.4			
Corn for grain ..... farms..	9 481	.7			
..... \$1,000..	828 473	.3			
Wheat ..... farms..	30 326	.8			
..... \$1,000..	1 191 123	.5			
Soybeans ..... farms..	14 703	.8			
..... \$1,000..	466 631	.5			
Sorghum for grain ..... farms..	18 874	.8			
..... \$1,000..	438 010	.5			
Barley ..... farms..	98	2.7			
..... \$1,000..	665	2.9			
Oats ..... farms..	1 316	1.1			
..... \$1,000..	3 609	1.3			
Other grains ..... farms..	1 174	.9			
..... \$1,000..	24 275	.6			
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms..	45	3.0			
..... \$1,000..	(D)	(D)			
Tobacco ..... farms..	12	7.6			
..... \$1,000..	(D)	(D)			
Hay, silage, and field seeds ..... farms..	14 030	.7			
..... \$1,000..	209 777	.5			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms..	398	1.6			
..... \$1,000..	3 454	4.2			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ..... farms..	205	2.2			
..... \$1,000..	1 621	4.8			
Nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	528	1.5			
..... \$1,000..	49 302	.7			
Other crops ..... farms..	72	3.4			
..... \$1,000..	2 187	2.9			
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms..	38 885	.7			
..... \$1,000..	5 985 364	.1			
Poultry and poultry products ..... farms..	901	1.2			
..... \$1,000..	47 976	.2			
Dairy products ..... farms..	1 073	1.1			
..... \$1,000..	158 909	.5			
Cattle and calves ..... farms..	36 207	.7			
..... \$1,000..	5 456 072	.1			
Hogs and pigs ..... farms..	2 873	.9			
..... \$1,000..	299 836	.3			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ..... farms..	1 505	1.0			
..... \$1,000..	9 971	1.2			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ..... farms..	2 288	.9			
..... \$1,000..	12 599	1.8			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms..	1 492	1.0			
..... \$1,000..	3 663	2.0			

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)
<b>FARMS BY SIZE</b>			<b>LIVESTOCK</b>		
1 to 9 acres . . . . . farms..	2 223	.9	Cattle and calves inventory . . . . . farms..	36 244	.7
10 to 49 acres . . . . . farms..	6 970	.7	number..	6 506 089	.3
50 to 69 acres . . . . . farms..	192 966	.7	Beef cows . . . . . farms..	29 446	.7
70 to 99 acres . . . . . farms..	2 150	.9	number..	1 466 429	.7
100 to 139 acres . . . . . farms..	125 554	.9	Milk cows . . . . . farms..	1 466	1.0
140 to 179 acres . . . . . farms..	4 781	.8	number..	82 080	.6
180 to 219 acres . . . . . farms..	389 077	.8	Cattle and calves sold . . . . . farms..	36 207	.7
220 to 259 acres . . . . . farms..	3 100	.8	number..	8 271 113	.2
260 to 499 acres . . . . . farms..	361 212	.8	\$1,000..	5 456 072	.1
500 to 999 acres . . . . . farms..			Hogs and pigs inventory . . . . . farms..	2 831	.9
1,000 to 1,999 acres . . . . . farms..			number..	1 585 224	.3
2,000 acres or more . . . . . farms..			Hogs and pigs sold . . . . . farms..	2 873	.9
			number..	3 184 437	.3
			\$1,000..	299 836	.3
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory . . . . . farms..	1 478	1.0
			number..	119 099	1.2
			Sheep and lambs sold . . . . . farms..	1 454	1.0
			number..	108 372	1.1
			Horses and ponies inventory . . . . . farms..	10 630	.6
			number..	52 828	.8
			Horses and ponies sold . . . . . farms..	1 755	.9
			number..	6 474	1.6
			<b>POULTRY</b>		
			Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) . . . . . farms..	2 019	.9
			number..	1 805 127	.2
			Layers 20 weeks old and older . . . . . farms..	1 964	.9
			number..	1 427 290	.3
			Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold . . . . . farms..	93	3.2
			number..	35 018	8.3
			<b>SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED</b>		
			Corn for grain or seed . . . . . farms..	10 833	.7
			acres..	2 497 516	.3
			bushels..	356 413 100	.3
			Corn for silage or green chop . . . . . farms..	1 765	.7
			acres..	117 472	.5
			tons, green..	2 042 941	.5
			Sorghum for grain or seed . . . . . farms..	20 398	.8
			acres..	3 077 984	.5
			bushels..	231 561 211	.5
			Wheat for grain . . . . . farms..	30 392	.8
			acres..	9 560 615	.5
			bushels..	407 515 802	.5
			Barley for grain . . . . . farms..	152	2.3
			acres..	8 203	2.5
			bushels..	336 453	2.7
			Oats for grain . . . . . farms..	2 603	1.0
			acres..	79 163	1.0
			bushels..	4 530 823	.9
			Soybeans for beans . . . . . farms..	14 733	.8
			acres..	2 208 642	.6
			bushels..	78 563 054	.6
			Dry edible beans, excluding dry limas . . . . . farms..	118	1.8
			acres..	17 767	1.2
			cwt..	362 021	1.1
			Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes . . . . . farms..	68	3.7
			acres..	924	6.2
			cwt..	278 751	3.7
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) . . . . . farms..	30 573	.7
			acres..	2 565 482	.6
			tons, dry..	6 147 197	.6
			Alfalfa hay . . . . . farms..	12 915	.8
			acres..	795 847	.6
			tons, dry..	3 123 045	.5
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) . . . . . farms..	398	1.6
			acres..	3 128	3.7
			Land in orchards . . . . . farms..	406	1.7
			acres..	6 834	6.0
<b>FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM</b>					
Oilseed and grain farming (1111) . . . . . farms..	30 768	.8			
acres..	28 185 689	.6			
Vegetable and melon farming (1112) . . . . . farms..	159	2.7			
acres..	9 371	10.1			
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113) . . . . . farms..	169	2.6			
acres..	10 942	5.2			
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114) . . . . . farms..	444	1.6			
acres..	21 326	4.0			
Other crop farming (1119) . . . . . farms..	4 434	.8			
acres..	1 814 146	.9			
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111) . . . . . farms..	19 839	.7			
acres..	13 311 621	.6			
Cattle feedlots (112112) . . . . . farms..	1 331	.8			
acres..	1 452 709	.5			
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212) . . . . . farms..	764	1.2			
acres..	462 862	1.0			
Hog and pig farming (1122) . . . . . farms..	1 098	1.1			
acres..	382 836	1.0			
Poultry and egg production (1123) . . . . . farms..	256	1.8			
acres..	30 400	1.7			
Sheep and goat farming (1124) . . . . . farms..	437	1.7			
acres..	45 188	3.1			
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129) . . . . . farms..	1 894	1.0			
acres..	362 178	1.5			

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS</b>			<b>FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES<sup>1</sup></b>		
Farms .....	38 790	.8	Total farm production expenses .....	38 878	.9
Land in farms .....	42 642 965	.5	Average per farm .....	184 267	.9
Average size of farm .....	1 099	1.0	Livestock and poultry purchased .....	14 943	1.6
<b>MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD</b>			<b>NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)<sup>1</sup></b>		
Total sales (see text) .....	38 790	.8	All farms .....	38 878	.9
Average per farm .....	235 411	.9	Average per farm .....	49 588	1.1
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains <sup>2</sup> .....	30 798	1.0
\$10,000 to \$19,999 .....	7 734	.9	Average net gain .....	68 239	1.1
\$1,000 .....	111 212	.9	Farms with net losses .....	8 080	2.3
\$20,000 to \$24,999 .....	2 559	1.2	Average net loss .....	21 504	2.9
\$1,000 .....	56 831	1.2	<b>GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME</b>		
\$25,000 to \$39,999 .....	5 272	1.2	Government payments .....	29 783	.8
\$1,000 .....	168 193	1.2	Other farm-related income <sup>1</sup> .....	300 695	.6
\$40,000 to \$49,999 .....	2 485	1.3	Customwork and other agricultural services .....	18 096	1.4
\$1,000 .....	111 053	1.3	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products .....	100 786	2.6
\$50,000 to \$99,999 .....	7 304	1.2	Gross cash rent or share payments .....	5 467	2.8
\$1,000 .....	519 424	1.2	Other farm-related income sources .....	50 757	3.9
\$100,000 to \$249,999 .....	8 016	.9	Forests products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products .....	4 960	3.1
\$1,000 .....	1 267 370	.8	Other farm-related income sources .....	36 715	4.4
\$250,000 to \$499,999 .....	3 417	—	<b>COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS</b>		
\$1,000 .....	1 187 352	—	Total .....	4 150	.9
\$500,000 or more .....	2 003	—	Total .....	90 802	.6
\$1,000 .....	5 710 162	—			
Sales by commodity or commodity group:					
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops .....	33 516	.8			
Grains .....	3 192 036	.4			
Corn for grain .....	31 830	.8			
Wheat .....	2 932 240	.4			
Soybeans .....	9 151	.7			
Sorghum for grain .....	827 604	.3			
Barley .....	27 143	.8			
Oats .....	1 179 677	.5			
Other grains .....	13 183	.8			
Cotton and cottonseed .....	461 950	.5			
Tobacco .....	17 559	.8			
Hay, silage, and field seeds .....	434 667	.5			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons .....	93	2.7			
Fruits, nuts, and berries .....	656	3.0			
Nursery and greenhouse crops .....	1 182	1.2			
Other crops .....	3 464	1.3			
Livestock, poultry, and their products .....	1 145	.9			
Poultry and poultry products .....	24 222	.6			
Dairy products .....	44	2.9			
Cattle and calves .....	(D)	(D)			
Hogs and pigs .....	8	9.3			
Sheep, lambs, and wool .....	85	10.7			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) .....	10 085	.8			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) .....	201 993	.5			

See footnotes at end of table.





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

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate
Farms .....	-2.7	1.3	-6.5	1.4
Land in farms .....	-1.2	1.0	-1.2	1.0
Average size of farm .....	1.4	1.7	5.6	1.9
Estimated market value of land and buildings <sup>1</sup> :				
Average per farm .....	25.4	2.3	30.1	2.6
Average per acre .....	24.6	2.2	23.6	2.2
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment <sup>1</sup> :				
Average per farm .....	25.9	2.4	27.3	2.7
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres .....	-15.5	1.4	-34.2	1.5
10 to 49 acres .....	15.7	1.8	-9.5	1.9
50 to 179 acres .....	6.3	1.0	6.5	1.4
180 to 499 acres .....	-8.5	1.3	-8.1	1.5
500 to 999 acres .....	-10.4	1.7	-10.2	1.7
1,000 to 1,999 acres .....	-10.4	1.4	-10.6	1.3
2,000 acres or more .....	3.9	.5	4.1	.5
Total cropland .....	-4.0	1.3	-6.1	1.4
Harvested cropland .....	-3.5	1.0	-2.9	1.0
farms .....	-7.8	1.2	-6.0	1.4
acres .....	5.6	1.0	6.9	1.1
Irrigated land .....	-6.2	1.0	-5.6	1.0
acres .....	1.0	.5	1.0	.5
Market value of agricultural products sold .....				
Average per farm .....	10.7	.4	10.9	.4
\$1,000 .....	13.7	1.5	18.6	1.9
dollars .....				
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops .....	41.9	1.2	43.1	1.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products .....	-1.0	.2	-1.0	.2
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500 .....	30.8	1.6	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999 .....	-9.8	1.2	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999 .....	-13.3	1.2	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999 .....	-15.2	1.2	-15.2	1.2
\$25,000 to \$49,999 .....	-17.4	1.4	-17.4	1.4
\$50,000 to \$99,999 .....	-11.8	1.8	-11.8	1.8
\$100,000 to \$249,999 .....	3.6	1.3	3.6	1.3
\$250,000 to \$499,999 .....	40.3	-	40.3	-
\$500,000 or more .....	34.0	-	34.0	-
Total farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> .....	5.3	.8	5.5	1.0
Average per farm .....	8.2	1.5	13.2	1.8
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) <sup>1</sup> .....				
farms .....	-2.7	1.3	-6.8	1.4
Average per farm .....	34.8	1.4	34.2	1.4
\$1,000 .....	38.5	2.3	44.0	2.7
dollars .....				
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming .....	-11.0	1.3	-11.2	1.3
Other .....	11.1	1.4	9.3	1.8
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any .....	3.6	1.4	.7	1.6
200 days or more .....	8.9	1.4	7.3	1.8
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory .....	-4.3	1.3	-8.5	1.4
number .....	7.2	.7	7.2	.7
Beef cows .....	-2.8	1.3	-6.1	1.5
number .....	2.3	1.3	1.6	1.3
Milk cows .....	-32.3	1.1	-33.6	1.2
number .....	-3.6	1.1	-3.7	1.1
Cattle and calves sold .....	-4.4	1.3	-8.4	1.4
number .....	7.4	.3	7.3	.3
Hogs and pigs inventory .....	-50.2	.8	-51.3	.8
number .....	.1	.8	1.5	.8
Hogs and pigs sold .....	-52.8	.7	-52.9	.8
number .....	6.4	.9	7.6	.9
Sheep and lambs inventory .....	-30.3	1.1	-33.3	1.4
number .....	-42.3	.9	-42.0	1.0
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) .....	-16.1	1.3	-27.2	1.5
number .....	-6.3	.9	-5.6	.9
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .....	16.3	5.8	22.6	8.8
number .....	-60.4	5.5	-70.0	4.1
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed .....	12.8	1.5	14.6	1.5
acres .....	42.8	.9	43.2	.9
bushels .....	37.8	.8	38.0	.8
Corn for silage or green chop .....	-1.8	1.2	-1.4	1.2
acres .....	11.4	.9	11.6	.9
tons, green .....	12.8	1.0	13.2	1.0
Sorghum for grain or seed .....	-14.4	1.3	-11.2	1.4
acres .....	4.1	1.1	5.2	1.1
bushels .....	4.2	1.1	5.0	1.1
Wheat for grain .....	-17.0	1.2	-12.1	1.3
acres .....	-3.8	1.0	-2.2	1.0
bushels .....	23.8	1.2	25.2	1.2
Oats for grain .....	-44.1	.9	-43.1	1.0
acres .....	-33.4	1.1	-31.4	1.2
bushels .....	-24.8	1.2	-23.0	1.3
Soybeans for beans .....	-1	1.5	2.4	1.7
acres .....	32.3	1.5	33.6	1.5
bushels .....	38.2	1.5	39.4	1.5
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .....	-7.1	1.2	-9.2	1.4
acres .....	2.2	1.2	2.3	1.2
tons, dry .....	3.5	1.1	4.1	1.1

<sup>1</sup>Data 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 <sup>1</sup>		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment <sup>1</sup>	
	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)
<b>Kansas</b> .....	<b>61 593</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>46 089 268</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>748</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>430 533</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>4 560 051</b>	<b>.9</b>
Allen .....	604	.6	271 137	1.0	449	1.2	316 499	9.6	30 874	9.2
Anderson .....	688	.8	367 031	1.1	533	1.4	312 459	4.9	40 706	4.8
Atchison .....	632	.7	242 096	1.2	383	1.4	341 992	6.7	33 865	5.4
Barber .....	433	.8	595 104	.9	1 374	1.3	483 866	4.2	32 681	7.0
Barton .....	742	.5	612 617	.6	826	.8	465 071	4.2	62 166	5.0
Bourbon .....	805	.7	329 461	1.2	409	1.4	212 173	4.1	29 188	5.8
Brown .....	599	.8	332 927	.8	556	1.1	537 933	3.5	62 187	8.3
Butler .....	1 256	.5	758 784	.6	604	.7	419 543	2.7	52 177	3.6
Chase .....	285	.6	409 224	.7	1 436	.9	670 702	5.0	18 618	10.4
Chautauqua .....	376	.6	391 291	.9	1 041	1.0	439 384	6.2	12 560	12.6
Cherokee .....	725	.7	269 253	1.0	371	1.2	284 197	3.3	47 658	5.4
Cheyenne .....	398	.8	562 300	1.0	1 413	1.3	674 856	4.8	39 644	6.6
Clark .....	260	.8	545 587	.7	2 098	1.0	1 059 398	5.4	21 821	11.2
Clay .....	546	1.3	368 540	1.5	675	2.0	382 985	4.3	46 264	3.8
Cloud .....	545	1.0	393 227	1.3	722	1.7	401 427	3.7	44 869	5.5
Coffey .....	555	.9	306 865	1.2	553	1.4	333 979	4.6	38 829	6.7
Comanche .....	256	.7	503 976	.8	1 969	1.1	804 529	7.0	17 023	4.9
Cowley .....	962	.6	642 549	.7	668	1.0	354 339	4.1	43 141	4.9
Crawford .....	787	.7	290 557	1.1	369	1.2	220 657	6.5	37 133	10.7
Decatur .....	396	.8	515 162	.9	1 301	1.1	557 592	3.4	40 080	7.8
Dickinson .....	893	.7	513 942	.8	576	1.1	373 307	5.0	70 952	5.9
Doniphan .....	507	.9	222 074	1.0	438	1.3	457 744	5.7	36 981	10.1
Douglas .....	839	.5	218 517	1.1	260	1.2	297 347	6.8	44 375	14.3
Edwards .....	302	.6	356 591	.7	1 181	.9	671 063	3.7	37 071	6.6
Elk .....	383	.7	330 832	1.3	864	1.5	368 335	8.1	11 863	14.9
Ellis .....	674	1.1	507 232	1.4	753	1.8	319 820	8.0	42 221	10.6
Ellsworth .....	424	.9	375 563	1.1	886	1.5	344 471	4.7	30 094	10.8
Finney .....	520	.8	761 443	.6	1 464	1.0	950 539	2.8	101 253	4.2
Ford .....	692	1.0	668 993	.9	967	1.4	482 770	5.8	89 997	8.6
Franklin .....	956	.6	303 061	1.0	317	1.1	316 757	7.3	36 294	5.2
Geary .....	223	.6	153 941	1.8	690	1.9	375 258	9.4	11 328	9.8
Gove .....	439	.8	648 624	.8	1 478	1.2	681 830	3.6	51 157	7.1
Graham .....	382	1.0	485 646	1.1	1 271	1.5	458 254	8.2	30 088	8.6
Grant .....	257	.7	332 607	.7	1 294	1.0	888 069	3.4	45 041	4.0
Gray .....	461	.6	555 937	.6	1 206	.8	785 515	3.1	79 064	5.4
Greeley .....	273	.7	441 609	.8	1 618	1.1	719 536	3.1	31 686	3.6
Greenwood .....	593	.8	634 169	.9	1 069	1.2	515 763	4.7	31 870	7.4
Hamilton .....	267	.8	527 709	.8	1 976	1.1	711 131	5.4	31 349	6.4
Harper .....	529	.8	460 898	.8	871	1.1	458 605	4.5	34 300	4.8
Harvey .....	779	.4	321 003	.6	412	.7	449 065	3.7	66 437	4.7
Haskell .....	241	.4	368 790	.5	1 530	.7	1 320 848	1.9	57 974	1.7
Hodgeman .....	359	.8	485 004	1.0	1 351	1.3	536 362	5.4	31 907	6.5
Jackson .....	1 050	.6	321 435	1.1	306	1.3	206 386	4.8	32 999	7.3
Jefferson .....	1 018	.5	269 019	1.0	264	1.2	239 162	7.4	38 724	5.7
Jewell .....	579	1.0	459 122	1.2	793	1.5	417 733	5.6	51 637	9.4
Johnson .....	604	.7	135 787	1.6	225	1.8	488 092	7.7	22 285	10.4
Kearny .....	271	.7	525 746	.6	1 940	.9	889 966	6.6	40 187	4.9
Kingman .....	759	.6	520 667	.8	686	1.0	366 429	5.0	54 912	6.3
Kiowa .....	318	.9	441 979	.9	1 390	1.3	640 485	5.9	28 819	6.5
Labette .....	901	.6	331 489	1.0	368	1.2	229 214	4.5	43 389	7.2
Lane .....	287	1.0	435 349	1.0	1 517	1.4	595 107	5.8	27 915	9.7
Leavenworth .....	1 046	.6	201 826	1.0	1 193	1.1	334 865	8.7	32 077	5.7
Lincoln .....	454	.7	427 554	1.2	942	1.4	480 933	9.6	27 286	6.4
Linn .....	757	.6	278 086	.9	367	1.0	217 253	5.6	23 708	6.2
Logan .....	326	.9	627 972	.8	1 926	1.2	646 502	3.9	27 965	4.6
Lyon .....	855	.7	495 789	.9	580	1.1	333 053	5.8	52 220	13.5
McPherson .....	1 163	.6	522 758	.8	449	1.0	346 024	4.1	74 309	4.9
Marion .....	968	.8	562 926	.9	582	1.2	394 029	3.8	67 739	5.5
Marshall .....	922	1.0	514 195	1.2	558	1.6	400 701	6.5	64 357	5.4
Meade .....	416	.9	554 522	.8	1 333	1.2	605 977	2.8	51 603	4.3
Miami .....	1 245	.5	279 859	1.0	225	1.1	320 710	4.2	50 491	8.2
Mitchell .....	487	1.0	454 521	.9	933	1.4	532 822	4.9	56 522	7.3
Montgomery .....	964	.5	328 342	1.0	341	1.1	216 727	5.6	51 462	11.2
Morris .....	489	1.0	395 856	1.3	810	1.7	385 789	9.6	34 841	6.8
Morton .....	233	1.2	422 492	.8	1 813	1.4	653 331	3.4	41 497	3.4
Nemaha .....	1 007	.9	417 656	1.1	415	1.4	301 437	4.2	60 527	5.1
Neosho .....	722	.6	344 968	.9	478	1.1	272 032	5.1	38 469	8.0
Ness .....	516	1.0	623 096	1.1	1 208	1.5	379 598	8.1	37 822	8.4
Norton .....	399	.9	478 809	1.1	1 200	1.4	621 338	7.8	32 286	9.5
Osage .....	890	.6	359 967	.9	404	1.1	248 416	4.2	41 727	6.5
Osborne .....	465	1.0	505 320	1.2	1 087	1.5	387 048	5.7	37 627	6.0
Ottawa .....	498	1.0	399 959	1.2	803	1.5	382 924	6.4	34 425	7.4
Pawnee .....	425	.7	480 034	.7	1 129	1.0	636 649	5.7	44 351	5.9
Phillips .....	501	1.0	554 603	1.2	1 107	1.6	456 369	5.5	35 520	11.7
Pottawatomie .....	787	.7	443 014	1.0	563	1.2	390 175	5.2	39 116	3.5
Pratt .....	434	.7	437 382	.6	1 008	1.0	539 978	4.5	55 629	8.4
Rawlins .....	431	1.0	646 616	1.0	1 500	1.4	567 747	6.5	42 476	8.2
Reno .....	1 363	.8	661 960	.9	486	1.2	360 697	4.1	78 850	4.4
Republic .....	684	.9	428 037	1.0	626	1.3	399 622	4.6	56 639	8.6
Rice .....	519	.7	457 655	.7	882	.9	463 325	3.9	51 582	6.5
Riley .....	468	.7	237 773	1.4	508	1.5	298 513	6.5	28 231	11.9
Rooks .....	435	1.0	569 511	1.1	1 309	1.5	443 452	5.2	31 902	8.4
Rush .....	486	1.0	412 285	1.2	848	1.5	370 275	6.3	35 543	9.0
Russell .....	494	.9	429 267	1.1	869	1.4	327 475	9.9	33 834	10.9

See footnotes at end of table.



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

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm <sup>1</sup>		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment <sup>1</sup>	
	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)
Saline .....	720	.7	413 752	1.1	575	1.3	428 031	11.0	40 682	9.6
Scott .....	335	.6	476 259	.6	1 422	.8	694 388	4.5	49 090	5.0
Sedgwick .....	1 395	.6	539 763	.6	387	.9	493 244	5.7	80 208	5.5
Seward .....	251	1.0	327 830	.8	1 306	1.3	834 249	4.4	48 365	4.8
Shawnee .....	823	.5	224 143	.9	272	1.1	280 195	5.1	32 181	8.7
Sheridan .....	442	.7	507 393	.8	1 148	1.1	537 017	4.5	45 298	6.2
Sherman .....	478	.9	652 688	.8	1 365	1.2	684 431	4.7	55 339	4.7
Smith .....	557	.9	491 990	1.1	883	1.4	490 021	8.7	58 020	6.8
Stafford .....	475	.8	434 617	.8	915	1.2	502 507	3.7	61 579	8.3
Stanton .....	253	.9	400 232	.8	1 582	1.2	946 709	2.6	48 889	5.7
Stevens .....	304	.6	511 859	.5	1 684	.8	908 392	3.3	76 074	3.7
Sumner .....	1 064	.6	667 229	.6	627	.8	412 217	4.4	78 746	4.4
Thomas .....	553	.9	679 384	.8	1 229	1.2	704 670	5.3	64 277	5.4
Trego .....	399	.9	462 388	1.3	1 159	1.6	571 464	8.6	34 695	11.4
Wabaunsee .....	597	.7	478 426	.9	801	1.1	378 753	3.9	26 732	6.7
Wallace .....	277	.8	480 043	1.0	1 733	1.3	613 917	5.5	29 142	11.6
Washington .....	780	.9	536 328	1.0	688	1.3	444 171	4.1	62 536	4.3
Wichita .....	310	.9	449 558	.9	1 450	1.3	763 813	7.1	40 881	6.0
Wilson .....	541	.4	301 477	.7	557	.8	280 229	4.1	36 814	7.5
Woodson .....	371	.6	254 482	1.1	686	1.3	335 500	6.6	16 687	10.3
Wyandotte .....	189	.9	22 351	2.7	118	2.8	262 758	7.0	5 532	7.5
Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm <sup>1</sup>		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup>			
	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)
<b>Kansas .....</b>	<b>74 047</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>9 207 130</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>149 483</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>61 591</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>7 290 703</b>	<b>.3</b>
Allen .....	51 116	9.3	33 031	.9	54 688	1.1	604	.8	23 839	5.7
Anderson .....	59 165	4.9	53 256	.9	77 407	1.2	688	1.0	37 038	2.6
Atchison .....	53 584	5.5	35 657	1.1	56 420	1.3	632	.9	25 793	3.5
Barber .....	75 476	7.1	48 183	.7	111 277	1.1	433	1.1	38 224	2.6
Barton .....	83 895	5.1	185 656	.2	250 210	.5	741	.7	160 948	.7
Bourbon .....	36 304	5.8	29 604	1.3	36 775	1.4	804	.9	22 823	2.9
Brown .....	103 644	8.3	70 253	.6	117 284	1.0	600	1.0	48 844	2.5
Butler .....	41 542	3.6	133 456	.3	106 255	.5	1 256	.6	108 063	1.1
Chase .....	65 326	10.4	64 779	.3	227 296	.7	285	1.0	37 343	1.7
Chautauqua .....	33 404	12.6	29 016	.7	77 171	.9	376	1.0	22 057	3.6
Cherokee .....	65 826	5.5	52 187	.7	71 982	1.0	724	.8	41 479	2.2
Cheyenne .....	99 607	6.6	53 543	.6	134 530	1.0	398	.9	46 326	2.0
Clark .....	83 925	11.3	105 342	.2	405 162	.8	260	1.2	89 100	.3
Clay .....	84 733	4.1	64 130	.9	117 455	1.6	546	1.4	43 011	2.7
Cloud .....	82 328	5.6	45 832	1.0	84 095	1.5	545	1.0	29 173	3.3
Coffey .....	70 089	6.8	39 308	1.0	70 825	1.3	554	.9	26 428	4.1
Comanche .....	66 495	5.1	29 110	.7	113 712	1.0	256	1.4	22 940	2.6
Cowley .....	44 892	5.0	67 530	.5	70 197	.8	961	.8	52 492	2.6
Crawford .....	47 243	10.8	35 206	1.0	44 735	1.2	786	1.0	24 029	4.8
Decatur .....	101 213	7.9	67 589	.4	170 679	.9	396	1.0	47 020	2.0
Dickinson .....	79 454	5.9	91 842	.5	102 847	.9	893	.8	61 502	1.9
Doniphan .....	72 796	10.2	47 107	.9	92 913	1.3	508	1.1	27 908	3.5
Douglas .....	52 953	14.3	38 885	.8	46 347	1.0	838	.7	27 791	4.2
Edwards .....	122 752	6.7	81 908	.4	271 217	.7	302	1.1	62 371	2.2
Elk .....	30 975	14.9	20 518	1.2	53 571	1.4	383	1.0	15 097	4.2
Ellis .....	62 643	10.6	50 199	.8	74 479	1.4	674	1.2	34 087	2.7
Ellsworth .....	70 976	10.9	29 181	1.1	68 823	1.4	424	1.2	17 334	4.9
Finney .....	194 718	4.3	479 824	.1	922 739	.8	520	.8	405 296	.3
Ford .....	129 866	8.7	308 296	.2	445 514	1.0	693	1.0	264 116	.4
Franklin .....	37 965	5.3	47 289	.8	49 466	1.0	956	.7	35 460	5.0
Geary .....	51 025	9.8	19 012	1.1	85 257	1.3	222	1.0	14 580	7.0
Gove .....	116 266	7.1	121 705	.3	277 233	.9	440	1.0	106 781	.9
Graham .....	78 559	8.7	41 736	.7	109 256	1.2	383	1.4	30 614	2.5
Grant .....	175 258	4.1	291 279	.1	1 133 381	.7	257	1.0	264 048	.3
Gray .....	171 506	5.5	373 688	.1	810 604	.6	461	.7	308 646	.5
Greeley .....	119 120	3.8	122 580	.2	449 010	.8	273	1.2	106 502	.6
Greenwood .....	53 743	7.5	57 960	.6	97 740	1.0	593	.9	44 370	2.7
Hamilton .....	117 413	6.5	175 865	.1	658 671	.8	267	1.2	167 886	.6
Harper .....	64 839	4.9	55 184	.7	104 318	1.1	529	1.0	40 047	2.9
Harvey .....	85 285	4.7	71 397	.5	91 652	.6	779	.6	48 436	2.3
Haskell .....	240 557	1.8	432 446	.1	1 794 382	.5	241	.8	351 269	.2
Hodgeman .....	88 876	6.5	96 423	.3	268 587	.8	359	1.0	74 388	1.1
Jackson .....	31 398	7.4	28 913	1.2	27 536	1.4	1 051	.7	26 327	3.8
Jefferson .....	38 039	5.7	34 740	1.0	34 126	1.1	1 018	.7	27 426	4.3
Jewell .....	89 184	9.4	51 224	1.0	88 470	1.4	579	1.1	37 451	3.0
Johnson .....	36 835	10.4	37 332	.7	61 808	1.0	605	.8	24 745	3.7
Kearny .....	148 292	5.1	184 714	.1	681 602	.7	271	1.1	166 359	.5
Kingman .....	72 348	6.3	56 075	.7	73 880	1.0	759	.8	40 670	3.2
Kiowa .....	90 626	6.6	47 386	.5	149 012	1.0	318	1.1	34 717	3.2

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm <sup>1</sup>		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup>			
	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)
Labette .....	48 210	7.3	58 555	.6	64 989	.9	900	.8	44 887	1.7
Lane .....	97 264	9.8	134 362	.2	468 159	1.0	287	1.2	112 514	.5
Leavenworth .....	30 607	5.8	42 483	.7	40 615	.9	1 048	.7	33 705	3.1
Lincoln .....	60 234	6.5	34 411	1.0	75 796	1.3	454	1.0	23 637	7.5
Linn .....	31 360	6.2	30 012	.7	39 646	.9	756	.7	21 372	4.5
Logan .....	85 783	4.8	36 271	.6	111 259	1.1	326	1.2	32 596	3.0
Lyon .....	61 076	13.5	77 424	.5	90 555	.8	855	.8	51 296	2.4
McPherson .....	63 894	5.0	113 040	.5	97 196	.8	1 163	.7	78 644	1.8
Marion .....	70 051	5.5	81 302	.7	83 990	1.1	967	.9	60 719	2.5
Marshall .....	69 802	5.5	70 264	1.0	76 208	1.4	922	1.2	45 798	3.5
Meade .....	124 046	4.4	112 668	.4	270 837	.9	416	1.0	96 018	1.3
Miami .....	40 587	8.2	39 902	.8	32 050	.9	1 244	.6	30 835	2.6
Mitchell .....	115 825	7.4	86 545	.5	177 710	1.2	488	1.4	62 452	1.7
Montgomery .....	53 439	11.3	45 525	.5	47 225	.7	963	.8	27 655	4.6
Morris .....	71 249	6.9	47 229	.9	96 583	1.4	489	1.2	35 584	5.1
Morton .....	178 101	3.8	57 746	.3	247 839	1.3	233	1.6	40 630	1.6
Nemaha .....	60 107	5.2	90 606	.8	89 977	1.2	1 007	1.0	65 685	2.0
Neosho .....	53 355	8.1	37 946	.9	52 556	1.1	721	.9	26 275	3.8
Ness .....	73 016	8.4	34 357	1.1	66 584	1.5	518	1.1	23 370	4.8
Norton .....	80 916	9.6	41 674	.8	104 447	1.2	399	1.0	37 354	3.3
Osage .....	46 885	6.6	40 717	.9	45 749	1.1	890	.8	29 549	2.6
Osborne .....	81 094	6.1	40 964	.9	88 096	1.3	464	1.0	30 034	3.6
Ottawa .....	68 988	7.5	61 877	.7	124 251	1.2	499	1.2	44 325	2.0
Pawnee .....	104 356	6.0	117 557	.2	276 605	.8	425	1.0	95 853	.9
Phillips .....	70 898	11.7	44 760	1.0	89 340	1.4	501	1.2	33 423	5.1
Pottawatomie .....	49 703	3.6	51 811	.8	65 834	1.0	787	.8	39 275	3.1
Pratt .....	128 177	8.5	147 530	.2	339 931	.8	434	.9	119 500	1.0
Rawlins .....	98 552	8.3	38 079	.8	88 351	1.3	431	1.1	29 738	4.0
Reno .....	57 893	4.5	133 987	.5	98 303	.9	1 362	.9	106 806	1.6
Republic .....	82 927	8.6	92 892	.6	135 807	1.0	683	1.0	84 093	1.6
Rice .....	99 388	6.5	96 849	.4	186 606	.8	519	.8	68 698	2.3
Riley .....	60 194	11.9	30 199	1.1	64 527	1.3	469	.9	24 887	4.7
Rooks .....	73 337	8.5	41 103	.7	94 489	1.2	435	1.4	33 315	2.1
Rush .....	72 983	9.1	29 523	1.2	60 746	1.6	487	1.2	22 021	6.3
Russell .....	68 489	11.0	27 357	1.2	55 379	1.4	494	1.2	22 577	7.2
Saline .....	56 502	9.7	45 312	.9	62 933	1.2	720	.8	28 811	4.5
Scott .....	146 538	5.1	451 264	.1	1 347 057	.6	335	.8	342 458	.4
Sedgwick .....	57 497	5.6	81 798	.6	58 636	.8	1 395	.7	56 651	2.5
Seward .....	192 687	4.9	256 618	.1	1 022 381	1.0	251	1.1	229 854	.5
Shawnee .....	39 149	8.7	29 103	1.0	35 362	1.1	822	.7	19 282	4.8
Sheridan .....	102 484	6.3	79 802	.4	180 547	.8	442	1.0	60 434	1.5
Sherman .....	115 771	4.9	82 964	.5	173 565	1.0	478	1.2	62 020	1.7
Smith .....	104 165	6.9	51 974	.8	93 311	1.2	557	1.0	38 138	2.9
Stafford .....	129 641	8.4	100 008	.4	210 542	.9	475	1.1	71 923	1.6
Stanton .....	193 236	5.9	118 707	.2	469 197	.9	253	1.2	95 514	.8
Stevens .....	250 242	3.8	154 227	.1	507 326	.6	304	.9	123 149	1.1
Sumner .....	74 009	4.5	89 103	.5	83 744	.8	1 064	.7	60 020	3.0
Thomas .....	116 233	5.5	117 634	.4	212 719	1.0	553	1.1	92 974	1.2
Trego .....	86 739	11.5	41 008	.7	102 777	1.1	400	1.2	37 281	4.6
Wabaunsee .....	44 777	6.8	41 235	.8	69 070	1.0	597	.8	30 906	3.8
Wallace .....	105 587	11.7	36 042	.8	130 115	1.1	276	1.2	28 263	3.4
Washington .....	80 174	4.5	84 751	.6	108 655	1.1	780	1.0	66 020	1.9
Wichita .....	131 450	6.1	273 853	.1	883 396	1.0	311	.9	250 312	.7
Wilson .....	68 174	7.5	35 259	.7	65 173	.8	540	.7	24 972	3.5
Woodson .....	44 978	10.3	26 907	1.0	72 527	1.2	371	.8	19 818	6.0
Wyandotte .....	29 114	7.7	4 658	2.2	24 647	2.4	190	1.6	3 586	3.6

Farm production expenses<sup>1</sup>—Con.

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased										Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		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)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
																	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Kansas .....</b>	<b>19 518</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>2 687 621</b>	<b>.2</b>	<b>32 955</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1 506 407</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>36 221</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>167 748</b>	<b>1.0</b>						
Allen .....	181	15.2	2 384	6.8	339	8.2	2 527	11.9	315	6.8	1 256	17.9						
Anderson .....	213	11.8	7 652	2.9	422	5.8	3 724	5.7	450	5.4	2 027	7.2						
Atchison .....	228	12.1	2 821	15.1	421	7.3	2 777	15.5	394	6.6	1 962	5.5						
Barber .....	211	10.4	13 755	4.4	279	9.1	3 640	6.8	208	11.2	484	9.3						
Barton .....	208	11.8	86 472	1.0	325	9.1	30 594	.7	514	4.9	1 950	5.4						
Bourbon .....	251	11.1	4 291	5.0	482	6.2	2 418	7.1	287	8.9	661	10.7						
Brown .....	148	15.8	8 030	2.3	302	9.0	3 958	2.0	455	4.3	3 666	4.4						
Butler .....	486	7.7	46 709	1.6	770	5.1	22 178	1.6	479	7.0	1 539	7.2						
Chase .....	158	9.6	13 738	3.8	210	6.2	9 046	3.7	150	10.4	481	8.5						

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Chautauqua .....	184	10.4	6 749	4.4	246	7.4	2 972	5.9	93	17.7	310	2.2
Cherokee .....	223	12.5	3 047	2.9	485	5.5	16 091	1.2	333	6.9	1 248	7.3
Cheyenne .....	113	13.7	9 666	5.0	175	10.3	6 321	3.0	299	5.8	1 832	6.2
Clark .....	102	9.7	41 311	.5	139	9.2	23 332	.2	142	8.8	630	4.6
Clay .....	178	14.5	5 945	3.1	331	7.3	8 660	10.7	436	5.0	1 493	7.1
Cloud .....	160	16.1	2 492	12.5	306	9.5	1 939	7.1	374	4.9	1 305	7.0
Coffey .....	252	12.0	6 637	11.2	304	9.5	2 339	9.2	346	6.7	1 206	6.6
Comanche .....	120	11.2	7 208	3.9	182	6.3	2 336	7.6	153	10.3	459	3.6
Cowley .....	308	11.6	15 280	5.5	606	5.3	9 758	5.2	426	7.9	990	12.0
Crawford .....	190	14.9	2 489	3.6	485	5.9	2 736	13.2	409	6.9	1 047	11.3
Decatur .....	84	17.7	10 562	1.5	202	11.0	9 769	2.3	330	5.4	1 456	6.9
Dickinson .....	299	9.6	18 659	3.6	439	7.6	9 025	6.3	646	4.0	1 772	6.3
Doniphan .....	131	15.7	1 711	11.0	203	12.7	1 722	11.9	338	5.6	2 634	5.2
Douglas .....	215	13.3	5 710	6.4	430	7.2	3 039	9.4	317	8.1	1 724	8.9
Edwards .....	123	15.2	22 466	1.5	182	9.2	8 170	2.0	221	7.3	2 210	7.6
Elk .....	115	16.2	3 948	3.7	272	7.5	1 949	6.2	175	12.7	283	22.4
Ellis .....	219	14.4	4 609	7.6	440	6.7	10 134	2.6	375	7.9	574	7.3
Ellsworth .....	166	13.1	2 510	22.2	213	10.0	1 516	11.3	303	5.3	614	10.0
Finney .....	113	15.2	197 978	.2	129	15.0	106 155	.4	392	5.2	5 089	3.0
Ford .....	252	10.3	130 402	.5	301	8.3	65 899	.9	448	5.6	2 268	3.5
Franklin .....	271	12.9	6 737	10.1	522	7.6	3 231	12.5	449	7.6	2 447	43.9
Geary .....	96	11.7	2 913	12.1	142	8.0	3 488	4.7	120	7.9	322	8.8
Gove .....	132	11.5	50 267	.4	235	7.9	24 913	.5	331	4.6	1 392	7.4
Graham .....	140	15.4	8 085	7.6	210	10.5	4 637	2.0	263	6.8	734	10.4
Grant .....	52	18.6	139 277	(L)	60	17.9	81 027	.1	192	5.8	2 404	5.2
Gray .....	163	11.6	155 231	.4	179	11.8	76 550	.1	353	4.5	3 860	4.8
Greeley .....	63	14.7	51 451	.8	86	13.2	26 451	1.0	171	5.6	1 164	4.3
Greenwood .....	252	10.1	18 668	4.5	423	6.4	6 069	3.4	212	9.8	659	17.0
Hamilton .....	64	18.9	99 613	.6	99	15.0	37 629	.9	140	10.1	957	9.6
Harper .....	188	11.0	9 855	5.1	291	7.3	3 050	7.4	307	5.9	837	12.4
Harvey .....	271	9.8	9 070	5.9	362	8.2	6 232	6.3	558	4.4	2 070	5.3
Haskell .....	41	10.9	179 506	(L)	61	11.5	106 056	.1	187	4.7	4 233	1.7
Hodgeman .....	129	15.6	33 658	1.1	185	11.9	18 670	1.0	228	8.4	742	10.7
Jackson .....	462	7.3	5 048	10.2	713	4.5	3 148	13.4	318	7.8	1 163	9.7
Jefferson .....	315	10.9	4 505	13.2	563	6.2	4 044	21.6	415	7.1	1 284	5.9
Jewell .....	249	11.8	3 841	11.1	358	8.7	4 770	8.0	417	5.7	1 374	7.2
Johnson .....	126	18.7	6 031	1.5	317	8.7	4 076	13.6	258	10.3	849	11.2
Kearny .....	51	22.8	87 241	(L)	83	17.5	40 106	.5	156	9.4	1 849	2.6
Kingman .....	253	11.3	5 420	3.9	425	6.5	4 194	9.2	431	5.8	1 246	8.7
Kiowa .....	96	11.1	7 277	5.1	165	11.7	3 092	6.4	193	4.5	1 493	7.1
Labette .....	302	11.3	16 421	1.2	576	5.7	9 033	1.4	417	7.0	864	21.0
Lane .....	85	13.2	(D)	(D)	118	10.2	(D)	(D)	220	3.8	873	14.2
Leavenworth .....	300	10.5	1 694	7.4	615	5.4	3 493	13.1	418	6.3	4 197	1.8
Lincoln .....	145	18.6	2 747	27.5	261	8.1	1 513	12.2	355	4.1	651	18.5
Linn .....	230	12.3	4 014	2.1	482	5.7	3 121	19.2	253	11.2	758	7.4
Logan .....	91	12.8	6 407	4.5	188	9.7	3 286	3.2	227	6.1	1 160	7.1
Lyon .....	278	12.1	11 730	2.5	394	8.8	9 928	1.4	520	5.4	1 932	11.8
McPherson .....	370	9.5	21 465	2.2	536	7.4	14 516	3.7	836	3.8	2 188	6.8
Marion .....	339	9.3	14 254	3.7	522	7.2	9 680	8.2	707	4.0	1 708	10.1
Marshall .....	306	10.0	5 303	13.3	491	6.9	4 680	8.8	674	2.7	2 784	7.1
Meade .....	169	12.9	31 540	2.1	217	10.0	15 746	3.3	250	6.6	3 171	4.5
Miami .....	337	11.3	6 069	3.8	764	5.3	2 180	12.1	348	8.3	1 379	7.4
Mitchell .....	152	15.1	21 422	1.9	229	10.5	10 084	1.6	370	4.9	1 231	4.6
Montgomery .....	281	12.3	2 389	16.0	639	4.9	4 105	4.6	309	8.3	1 496	14.1
Morris .....	191	14.0	11 569	7.0	296	9.3	5 255	10.6	300	7.7	1 004	10.5
Morton .....	58	17.6	(D)	(D)	79	12.8	(D)	(D)	146	5.4	962	7.8
Nemaha .....	397	7.1	9 252	9.4	628	4.4	17 283	4.3	721	3.2	2 501	4.9
Neosho .....	163	16.9	3 517	2.1	395	9.1	3 954	14.3	370	6.8	1 073	9.7
Ness .....	186	11.2	4 309	16.5	308	7.5	1 885	10.8	338	6.6	632	10.9
Norton .....	183	12.2	4 018	7.9	280	7.8	6 494	4.9	316	6.2	1 791	7.6
Osage .....	297	10.2	6 562	8.6	447	6.6	2 860	6.1	439	5.3	1 501	7.7
Osborne .....	180	12.7	5 169	5.3	236	10.0	2 826	8.2	352	4.7	945	10.7
Ottawa .....	197	12.9	16 459	1.4	304	9.3	6 565	6.0	337	6.4	861	8.4
Pawnee .....	91	17.5	35 093	1.4	155	13.6	15 855	2.0	292	6.4	2 047	5.8
Phillips .....	191	12.2	4 263	19.3	332	5.7	5 374	16.6	363	4.4	1 078	6.2
Pottawatomie .....	259	11.0	8 634	4.9	506	6.2	6 097	4.2	459	6.1	1 436	6.3
Pratt .....	152	13.7	40 863	1.4	233	8.9	26 015	.8	245	8.0	2 407	7.6
Rawlins .....	120	18.0	1 965	16.4	177	13.1	2 059	10.5	364	4.5	1 426	10.0
Reno .....	341	10.1	30 468	1.8	660	6.4	22 132	2.8	808	3.7	2 169	5.8
Republic .....	238	12.2	24 953	2.0	373	8.0	13 091	3.0	552	4.0	3 279	5.6
Rice .....	155	14.8	20 092	1.7	271	9.2	15 327	2.4	358	4.8	1 475	6.0
Riley .....	167	11.3	5 375	15.0	314	6.5	4 217	8.1	265	6.6	613	6.3
Rooks .....	109	21.9	6 355	6.2	239	12.4	4 582	5.6	286	8.1	589	9.5
Rush .....	91	20.0	2 278	5.7	173	14.6	1 110	18.1	288	7.3	884	14.2
Russell .....	126	20.0	4 058	38.3	214	12.5	1 412	20.3	272	7.9	593	8.3
Saline .....	226	12.5	3 071	16.2	283	10.9	2 240	13.5	421	5.3	1 032	7.4
Scott .....	102	13.7	172 969	.3	123	13.2	116 543	.5	233	6.7	1 533	6.4
Sedgwick .....	326	10.0	4 876	9.7	569	6.9	8 284	14.0	849	4.1	2 732	6.1
Seward .....	62	17.3	130 527	.2	97	12.4	50 853	.1	120	12.5	1 975	5.1
Shawnee .....	194	14.6	1 407	16.2	371	8.3	1 445	15.6	346	8.0	1 634	8.7

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 <sup>1</sup> —Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Sheridan .....	167	11.9	14 497	6.0	180	11.0	7 346	2.0	354	4.8	2 553	5.3
Sherman .....	92	19.4	10 979	6.1	162	13.1	8 274	2.6	351	6.2	3 007	3.7
Smith .....	178	12.4	6 366	6.4	314	8.4	4 179	6.4	422	4.2	1 292	8.7
Stafford .....	146	13.7	24 641	1.3	209	11.0	7 459	1.7	327	6.4	2 810	6.5
Stanton .....	64	12.2	30 725	.3	100	8.9	22 999	.1	164	3.9	2 655	4.0
Stevens .....	60	21.9	(D)	(D)	105	17.5	(D)	(D)	194	6.9	4 141	5.0
Sumner .....	270	11.3	5 685	11.7	426	8.2	4 493	20.4	709	4.9	2 151	8.3
Thomas .....	130	15.1	21 957	1.2	208	10.8	13 419	1.5	434	3.5	3 818	3.7
Trego .....	108	20.0	(D)	(D)	199	12.7	(D)	(D)	301	5.9	561	14.0
Wabaunsee .....	223	10.3	7 834	7.8	373	6.4	5 149	9.4	269	7.3	875	10.4
Wallace .....	75	18.7	4 416	2.2	127	12.2	3 273	3.5	155	6.0	1 232	8.3
Washington .....	299	10.3	13 059	4.4	519	5.3	13 307	4.6	530	4.8	2 483	6.6
Wichita .....	90	18.9	139 969	.3	148	11.1	71 235	.2	226	6.4	1 379	7.6
Wilson .....	199	12.3	3 793	11.4	331	7.4	2 532	8.6	282	7.0	1 227	7.1
Woodson .....	141	16.1	6 723	8.2	274	6.6	1 569	11.8	198	11.7	554	7.6
Wyandotte .....	44	17.5	289	9.1	86	9.9	318	9.6	54	10.2	198	6.3
Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
<b>Kansas</b> .....	<b>42 255</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>373 353</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>35 165</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>224 156</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>56 929</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>294 353</b>	<b>.7</b>
Allen .....	360	6.2	3 109	10.5	296	9.5	1 868	11.5	583	2.3	1 367	6.6
Anderson .....	536	4.3	3 672	6.7	434	5.7	2 806	7.7	665	2.0	2 063	6.9
Atchison .....	537	4.0	3 028	5.6	477	5.6	2 833	7.1	614	1.8	1 772	5.8
Barber .....	251	9.4	2 331	6.3	124	14.5	543	16.4	385	3.1	2 150	7.0
Barton .....	552	4.6	5 317	3.9	450	6.5	2 457	7.1	701	2.2	4 541	3.0
Bourbon .....	441	6.5	2 088	8.5	284	9.1	1 094	8.8	719	2.3	1 477	5.6
Brown .....	507	4.1	4 755	3.5	463	4.5	5 572	4.9	554	3.1	2 308	3.9
Butler .....	689	5.3	4 445	6.1	562	6.7	2 791	9.3	1 114	2.2	2 951	4.5
Chase .....	203	7.4	986	14.6	154	9.2	624	7.2	270	2.8	1 039	5.9
Chautauqua .....	189	10.3	532	8.2	85	14.4	414	11.9	359	2.5	863	9.8
Cherokee .....	459	5.3	3 423	4.6	308	8.0	2 121	7.8	655	3.0	2 258	6.0
Cheyenne .....	333	4.2	4 154	5.1	260	6.8	2 300	7.6	383	2.2	3 557	5.4
Clark .....	153	7.7	1 853	4.5	125	10.5	870	6.7	244	2.9	2 273	2.1
Clay .....	429	5.7	4 014	5.8	422	6.4	2 053	6.8	509	2.9	2 343	7.4
Cloud .....	388	5.6	4 145	5.1	360	6.8	1 822	7.1	483	3.7	2 527	5.4
Coffey .....	391	5.7	1 708	6.2	351	7.5	1 635	9.5	531	2.4	1 565	4.6
Comanche .....	154	8.6	1 254	6.1	125	9.8	805	6.1	216	4.7	1 073	5.9
Cowley .....	639	5.6	3 462	7.0	445	7.8	1 447	5.7	859	2.9	2 539	6.6
Crawford .....	530	5.8	3 183	12.5	337	8.7	1 642	14.1	727	2.5	1 723	5.8
Decatur .....	317	5.4	3 512	4.9	232	9.2	2 087	9.9	376	2.9	2 410	4.7
Dickinson .....	682	3.9	5 524	6.1	552	5.9	2 366	8.6	849	1.6	3 380	4.9
Doniphan .....	337	5.7	3 072	4.8	383	6.0	3 813	5.6	478	3.1	1 933	15.0
Douglas .....	534	5.8	2 441	9.4	420	6.9	2 086	8.1	785	2.3	1 580	11.3
Edwards .....	232	4.1	4 776	3.8	201	8.1	2 458	4.1	280	2.3	2 991	5.3
Elk .....	238	9.3	822	20.7	166	13.1	469	13.2	376	2.0	676	7.7
Ellis .....	370	7.8	1 485	8.0	305	10.4	708	13.5	645	2.6	2 060	6.0
Ellsworth .....	323	5.1	2 144	5.4	236	7.9	848	10.9	383	3.2	1 481	4.6
Finney .....	364	5.6	10 868	3.0	329	6.3	7 673	2.4	483	4.0	10 548	1.8
Ford .....	453	4.8	5 536	3.8	391	6.3	3 233	3.3	633	3.1	5 791	3.9
Franklin .....	687	4.8	2 782	8.3	532	6.6	1 765	7.7	883	2.0	2 157	6.2
Geary .....	153	7.6	829	10.0	140	6.7	522	12.7	206	3.4	622	7.9
Gove .....	320	5.1	3 284	7.8	272	7.2	2 312	9.8	413	2.5	2 828	4.7
Graham .....	256	5.2	1 944	5.0	236	8.1	1 340	9.4	339	4.8	1 947	9.5
Grant .....	186	5.6	3 830	4.5	187	6.0	2 913	3.5	227	4.9	5 421	2.7
Gray .....	376	4.0	8 346	7.7	353	3.8	5 989	5.5	436	2.2	8 024	2.2
Greeley .....	155	8.0	2 057	6.0	117	8.8	1 464	5.6	220	3.9	2 096	2.5
Greenwood .....	310	7.9	1 364	8.8	255	10.3	815	12.7	560	2.7	1 733	8.7
Hamilton .....	144	9.2	2 067	11.8	110	12.7	1 289	11.4	197	6.1	2 248	3.4
Harper .....	376	5.1	4 668	6.0	176	12.7	1 092	21.2	493	1.6	3 053	8.0
Harvey .....	620	3.8	5 115	3.6	541	4.5	2 982	4.8	704	2.7	3 038	4.9
Haskell .....	184	5.3	6 680	2.1	167	5.7	5 078	1.8	229	2.2	6 924	1.3
Hodgeman .....	212	9.3	1 739	9.5	210	8.1	1 178	9.2	348	2.4	2 260	5.4
Jackson .....	669	4.7	2 574	8.8	477	6.2	1 488	8.9	949	1.9	1 613	5.2
Jefferson .....	723	4.0	2 515	6.2	590	5.4	1 900	6.9	895	2.5	1 461	5.7
Jewell .....	400	6.8	3 893	7.4	390	5.7	2 707	6.1	560	2.5	2 549	5.5
Johnson .....	412	6.2	1 527	8.2	388	8.2	1 094	10.9	552	3.6	1 096	4.8
Kearny .....	165	6.3	4 594	2.7	180	6.7	2 713	3.6	238	4.4	4 380	3.6
Kingman .....	517	4.4	5 470	5.6	402	7.0	1 391	10.0	699	2.4	3 148	3.9
Kiowa .....	220	5.0	3 545	7.3	171	6.4	1 821	11.6	262	5.9	2 423	6.4
Labette .....	635	4.9	3 246	5.7	348	8.0	1 366	6.6	848	2.2	1 882	4.1
Lane .....	206	4.9	1 672	4.6	165	7.2	1 629	8.3	255	3.3	2 151	3.3
Leavenworth .....	686	5.0	2 227	10.9	495	6.7	1 954	22.3	946	2.5	1 587	4.0
Lincoln .....	333	5.3	2 760	11.3	305	5.5	1 691	10.4	429	2.5	2 203	9.1
Linn .....	431	6.9	1 777	9.1	313	9.9	1 018	10.4	734	1.5	1 224	5.2

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
Logan	179	9.1	2 244	6.4	151	13.2	1 516	11.2	314	2.7	2 992	5.4
Lyon	604	4.6	2 702	5.8	586	5.2	2 631	12.5	781	2.7	2 204	4.7
McPherson	915	3.2	6 154	5.5	801	4.1	3 131	7.6	1 094	1.5	3 965	5.7
Marion	781	3.0	6 203	5.8	689	4.3	2 557	7.1	888	1.9	3 140	4.4
Marshall	706	3.3	5 214	5.0	662	4.2	3 398	7.9	851	2.3	3 180	5.2
Meade	281	6.3	4 848	3.3	232	9.8	3 059	4.6	389	3.4	5 879	1.9
Miami	770	5.1	2 449	5.1	575	7.0	1 778	5.9	1 183	1.6	1 637	4.3
Mitchell	382	3.7	5 337	4.7	376	4.3	2 686	6.4	475	1.7	2 867	5.1
Montgomery	484	7.1	3 051	7.5	297	8.6	1 934	11.1	851	2.4	1 736	6.9
Morris	345	5.9	1 808	7.2	309	8.2	1 104	9.8	430	3.8	1 724	6.0
Morton	132	6.8	2 294	5.6	111	8.6	1 180	8.9	193	4.6	2 858	4.0
Nemaha	774	3.0	5 815	4.9	714	3.7	3 490	5.7	906	2.4	3 288	3.1
Neosho	476	5.8	2 995	10.2	380	8.1	1 283	9.0	663	2.4	1 616	6.2
Ness	293	8.0	1 528	10.9	292	8.8	1 356	21.4	486	2.6	2 054	6.3
Norton	293	6.6	3 495	9.3	239	7.9	1 778	8.1	364	2.8	2 004	4.4
Osage	555	4.2	2 413	5.5	554	5.3	1 986	7.4	803	2.1	1 847	6.9
Osborne	386	3.8	3 050	7.4	321	6.8	1 756	11.4	455	2.0	2 282	5.3
Ottawa	338	4.9	3 305	7.3	304	8.3	1 324	13.0	469	2.9	1 810	5.0
Pawnee	309	6.2	4 030	6.0	250	8.8	1 933	4.8	376	3.2	3 445	5.1
Phillips	352	5.5	2 616	7.8	278	7.7	1 703	7.6	472	2.7	2 261	6.8
Pottawatomie	449	6.3	2 062	7.1	506	5.9	1 754	5.8	727	2.4	1 955	4.9
Pratt	308	6.2	6 210	3.9	208	9.8	2 995	7.2	407	2.7	4 019	3.2
Rawlins	355	5.1	3 667	7.7	291	7.9	2 074	8.2	424	2.0	2 721	5.7
Reno	846	3.9	6 978	5.1	656	6.0	2 862	7.4	1 241	2.2	5 310	6.7
Republic	545	3.9	5 768	6.1	553	4.1	4 232	5.5	668	1.9	4 048	3.4
Rice	410	3.4	4 805	4.1	342	6.3	2 210	5.6	473	2.8	3 113	4.4
Riley	334	5.8	1 401	8.5	313	6.6	1 212	10.4	438	2.5	1 299	7.1
Rooks	309	3.9	2 279	3.8	260	9.6	1 758	13.1	405	3.8	1 968	4.8
Rush	323	6.4	2 480	14.6	275	9.8	1 357	22.9	432	4.1	1 884	6.8
Russell	288	7.1	1 767	11.5	227	13.4	591	22.6	446	3.3	2 323	14.2
Saline	473	5.4	3 437	9.6	448	6.6	1 921	15.5	657	2.1	2 133	5.8
Scott	210	8.3	3 085	5.5	214	8.1	2 926	8.3	314	2.1	4 254	6.4
Sedgwick	1 004	3.1	6 806	7.4	724	5.3	2 416	8.9	1 282	1.8	4 156	4.1
Seward	119	8.6	3 758	4.8	118	9.6	2 167	7.5	183	7.8	4 722	6.0
Shawnee	568	4.8	1 868	7.6	535	6.1	1 967	8.4	735	2.5	1 442	10.2
Sheridan	341	5.7	4 201	4.1	298	5.5	3 440	5.3	434	1.7	4 476	5.6
Sherman	343	5.8	5 792	5.5	267	7.7	3 080	7.9	467	1.9	5 139	4.3
Smith	447	2.8	3 435	5.2	404	5.4	2 451	9.0	545	1.5	2 670	5.6
Stafford	334	4.3	6 709	6.9	275	6.7	2 628	6.2	417	3.6	3 454	4.7
Stanton	148	3.1	4 614	3.0	153	3.6	2 724	2.3	222	3.4	5 345	2.7
Stevens	206	6.0	8 394	2.9	190	7.4	4 449	4.6	265	4.6	7 369	2.2
Sumner	843	3.9	9 054	4.9	576	6.7	2 320	8.2	1 029	1.2	5 038	5.7
Thomas	435	3.2	6 962	2.6	397	4.6	5 281	5.0	519	2.3	5 208	3.7
Trego	265	6.7	1 754	12.0	289	8.3	1 419	15.2	381	2.9	1 842	4.8
Wabaunsee	386	6.2	1 941	6.2	306	8.1	1 333	12.3	538	2.8	1 521	4.9
Wallace	157	6.8	1 988	5.0	132	5.5	1 225	3.8	255	2.5	3 025	8.7
Washington	581	4.2	5 354	6.1	526	5.5	3 665	8.3	742	2.4	3 292	4.6
Wichita	206	7.3	2 841	6.8	182	10.2	2 392	9.5	310	9	3 916	6.9
Wilson	366	5.0	2 570	9.3	313	7.1	1 802	9.2	533	1.5	1 424	5.1
Woodson	235	9.1	1 341	10.0	197	13.3	745	13.4	353	2.3	945	9.3
Wyandotte	99	8.3	336	7.3	92	9.7	230	8.1	163	4.0	245	4.5

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
<b>Kansas</b>	<b>40 578</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>60 077</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>20 660</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>306 410</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>6 973</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>29 419</b>	<b>2.9</b>
Allen	377	7.7	287	11.7	183	14.5	848	11.2	105	23.4	114	28.4
Anderson	483	5.7	342	7.5	181	13.5	1 497	24.2	67	28.2	194	16.3
Atchison	470	5.9	392	9.4	177	14.7	738	5.8	39	31.1	110	16.5
Barber	290	6.4	253	6.1	150	13.8	1 443	3.8	42	24.6	215	1.4
Barton	529	5.5	1 379	6.8	281	9.7	5 759	3.0	76	19.1	314	15.6
Bourbon	546	5.0	374	8.8	216	12.1	952	16.7	44	30.3	69	22.1
Brown	425	6.0	504	8.2	183	12.1	2 535	3.8	50	23.9	210	7.8
Butler	810	4.5	991	10.8	404	8.0	4 685	11.2	165	16.4	355	17.6
Chase	224	5.4	243	9.5	112	11.7	1 354	9.2	38	24.9	109	10.3
Chautauqua	186	11.1	153	30.2	133	14.7	2 099	3.3	42	27.6	142	11.9
Cherokee	461	5.6	446	4.1	140	13.6	1 175	8.0	51	25.5	81	21.0
Cheyenne	299	6.2	822	8.7	188	9.9	2 419	7.9	76	20.7	553	18.8
Clark	159	7.4	667	2.1	107	9.1	5 456	1.5	32	15.9	197	7.8
Clay	395	6.7	565	5.2	197	11.5	3 224	5.2	31	36.8	318	38.5
Cloud	367	6.4	333	8.6	235	11.0	1 570	11.1	31	42.2	78	29.4
Coffey	362	6.4	239	7.8	199	12.3	1 030	3.8	42	31.3	166	39.5
Comanche	197	4.4	198	8.1	117	10.0	1 167	3.1	66	19.4	205	27.8
Cowley	572	6.5	394	8.3	306	10.6	1 972	11.1	154	19.0	301	21.0
Crawford	491	5.6	331	10.7	164	15.9	1 059	12.3	91	21.5	336	46.2

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
Decatur	317	6.1	696	9.3	156	12.9	2 527	6.0	62	27.1	344	35.4
Dickinson	591	5.3	569	8.4	347	10.2	1 724	11.4	117	16.1	308	27.8
Doniphan	308	8.3	292	17.5	188	12.8	1 639	23.4	33	38.9	63	23.5
Douglas	421	7.8	263	7.2	106	20.0	1 020	9.1	35	34.1	99	39.5
Edwards	210	7.9	430	5.9	146	12.1	2 879	8.2	57	22.0	630	21.6
Elk	200	10.9	114	16.4	115	17.6	447	10.6	65	26.4	301	36.4
Ellis	436	5.8	368	6.2	173	15.1	2 073	8.6	39	35.0	91	32.2
Ellsworth	299	5.7	225	11.8	127	15.6	459	7.1	51	24.3	200	20.5
Finney	358	6.8	1 841	1.0	271	8.2	16 220	2.4	92	13.6	1 606	3.0
Ford	486	6.0	1 197	3.7	325	8.4	8 457	3.5	103	17.1	893	20.7
Franklin	538	6.0	512	14.0	195	15.3	1 679	13.5	64	26.9	67	20.1
Geary	170	5.1	160	11.9	67	15.8	1 321	17.0	19	36.9	21	35.2
Gove	343	4.4	615	6.8	176	11.0	4 049	6.9	71	19.7	328	5.2
Graham	269	8.6	324	6.9	157	13.4	1 092	12.5	78	26.1	144	27.5
Grant	175	6.4	1 411	1.0	117	7.9	11 183	.3	32	20.2	235	2.6
Gray	280	7.1	1 165	2.3	230	9.1	8 641	3.8	82	14.0	423	3.1
Greely	163	6.4	575	2.2	103	10.4	4 201	1.5	27	13.6	294	7.4
Greenwood	357	7.5	241	11.1	165	11.3	1 859	13.0	115	17.7	365	30.0
Hamilton	158	6.0	1 193	6.6	121	8.6	5 211	3.7	36	29.6	394	32.8
Harper	348	6.8	302	9.5	220	9.5	1 471	10.4	49	29.3	465	47.5
Harvey	535	4.7	532	7.2	286	8.1	2 497	4.5	77	21.7	234	27.7
Haskell	161	5.9	1 120	1.8	126	6.3	8 909	.3	70	10.1	738	21.7
Hodgeman	265	7.4	470	10.2	160	13.5	2 329	6.4	51	28.4	141	19.0
Jackson	605	5.6	271	8.8	205	13.8	595	15.6	67	23.9	96	23.4
Jefferson	575	6.0	443	11.3	197	14.1	1 082	26.5	42	35.7	116	54.8
Jewell	453	6.2	497	7.1	311	9.3	2 104	8.8	44	37.5	90	46.3
Johnson	340	8.6	333	7.0	163	17.2	1 696	3.0	58	29.2	135	25.8
Kearny	163	8.2	687	1.4	143	10.5	5 197	3.0	61	18.3	541	44.1
Kingman	470	5.8	505	7.9	366	7.5	1 960	8.6	63	23.1	176	26.4
Kiowa	221	9.1	307	4.5	139	9.2	1 807	4.9	34	30.6	224	30.2
Labette	503	6.7	465	6.6	230	12.4	1 317	7.3	70	23.9	211	17.8
Lane	200	6.4	573	4.6	120	11.1	3 395	3.1	52	20.1	490	24.6
Leavenworth	614	5.8	385	12.4	202	13.8	6 723	1.6	80	22.1	120	25.6
Lincoln	280	8.9	339	12.6	181	14.4	597	13.8	42	33.2	112	74.1
Linn	489	6.6	264	8.5	154	16.5	876	7.4	57	30.2	51	33.9
Logan	220	8.6	484	13.7	152	13.1	2 114	8.8	38	32.9	112	5.5
Lyon	583	5.1	428	4.5	200	14.5	1 877	8.5	106	21.9	316	26.1
McPherson	837	4.0	810	6.5	485	6.4	3 019	8.9	123	20.1	234	15.2
Marion	701	4.6	608	7.1	342	10.1	1 871	10.6	127	19.4	291	24.4
Marshall	694	4.2	593	9.3	341	9.7	1 373	13.5	45	30.0	76	8.7
Meade	318	5.4	1 544	3.2	192	9.4	8 615	.8	94	15.9	702	14.4
Miami	664	6.4	363	9.2	226	12.5	1 431	11.0	129	20.9	225	39.8
Mitchell	314	6.9	452	9.2	254	8.7	2 041	6.2	57	23.3	408	36.2
Montgomery	482	7.7	430	4.7	166	17.0	2 123	8.8	115	19.9	241	21.7
Morris	389	6.6	377	8.5	130	16.3	1 483	3.7	52	39.3	42	46.0
Morton	131	8.6	1 097	1.4	68	10.4	5 653	.9	31	22.8	138	9.9
Nemaha	765	3.8	961	5.2	367	8.7	2 228	6.4	50	27.6	156	24.0
Neosho	468	6.8	434	7.3	174	15.3	1 081	7.3	69	28.5	147	26.4
Ness	291	8.1	223	12.1	159	14.9	802	11.8	54	32.9	140	32.2
Norton	330	5.2	577	6.4	176	11.4	2 761	6.6	96	21.2	583	29.5
Osage	540	5.8	313	9.0	192	13.6	776	4.9	65	23.4	141	18.5
Osborne	349	6.1	315	7.8	196	11.1	1 033	8.3	18	36.2	73	42.2
Ottawa	386	5.7	300	10.0	191	12.4	1 563	8.5	56	31.9	118	10.0
Pawnee	275	8.4	799	5.1	193	11.4	4 613	4.5	70	20.3	951	6.3
Phillips	401	5.1	524	8.7	170	11.0	2 186	3.9	51	25.4	180	25.1
Pottawatomie	510	5.7	507	6.7	248	11.6	2 651	8.4	64	27.7	93	22.8
Pratt	319	5.8	776	6.6	174	10.0	4 809	4.6	65	16.7	679	6.8
Rawlins	311	7.2	444	9.0	176	11.5	1 434	7.3	31	29.5	177	27.0
Reno	975	4.0	947	6.0	511	6.4	4 516	4.9	187	15.3	384	18.7
Republic	502	4.9	810	8.3	303	9.8	2 545	8.0	103	21.9	354	61.2
Rice	394	5.2	686	5.2	216	12.6	3 897	3.0	70	24.5	181	16.5
Riley	320	6.3	482	16.6	204	11.3	1 720	4.8	55	31.6	58	54.8
Rooks	339	7.3	342	10.0	171	13.5	1 718	4.2	76	22.9	304	36.6
Rush	329	7.0	377	18.4	153	14.0	1 506	21.6	58	25.4	144	37.5
Russell	345	6.2	409	31.0	152	18.1	1 079	23.5	93	25.2	253	38.2
Saline	471	6.5	336	11.0	233	12.7	1 589	7.4	44	33.7	158	21.1
Scott	247	6.8	1 199	2.4	160	9.6	10 606	1.3	92	14.0	1 135	13.6
Sedgwick	752	4.8	923	7.0	441	8.3	3 747	3.3	123	18.3	193	10.8
Seward	174	6.7	1 476	1.9	91	9.7	8 995	.4	33	19.0	376	.5
Shawnee	414	7.6	259	8.2	150	15.2	898	14.5	43	29.3	43	25.3
Sheridan	345	5.2	922	7.7	161	11.7	2 393	11.1	107	13.1	410	11.7
Sherman	335	6.8	711	4.5	200	10.6	3 446	6.9	65	21.2	504	10.0
Smith	429	5.0	514	5.0	203	10.1	3 188	14.4	63	26.4	179	32.8
Stafford	290	6.3	758	15.4	177	11.7	4 111	5.9	76	18.1	334	19.0
Stanton	163	6.2	967	5.7	113	7.1	6 201	3.2	49	13.6	459	9.9
Stevens	232	6.8	1 187	2.2	136	10.8	6 690	3.2	69	18.1	661	17.4
Sumner	650	5.8	531	8.7	401	7.9	1 803	9.8	140	18.1	583	37.8
Thomas	420	3.8	912	5.1	257	8.0	3 409	3.3	119	13.8	524	16.4
Trego	299	7.4	318	11.2	109	20.6	973	13.1	12	46.1	24	.4
Wabaunsee	409	5.7	350	7.7	178	13.3	1 099	3.8	47	25.4	100	21.1

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 <sup>1</sup> —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)
Wallace .....	175	10.4	277	14.2	108	14.2	2 072	5.5	56	23.6	274	12.6
Washington .....	534	5.7	907	5.5	266	10.8	2 927	4.7	56	30.6	162	60.9
Wichita .....	230	7.3	1 095	4.6	115	13.4	5 649	3.9	80	16.1	362	33.1
Wilson .....	277	8.8	199	7.4	223	12.0	1 084	15.6	60	22.8	119	25.6
Woodson .....	212	11.4	141	13.0	67	26.5	397	19.5	37	35.5	98	59.8
Wyandotte .....	94	9.3	90	3.4	28	16.7	396	6.5	17	31.1	11	34.8
Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
<b>Kansas .....</b>	<b>50 328</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>358 071</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>23 546</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>160 477</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>32 648</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>351 690</b>	<b>.9</b>
Allen .....	513	2.8	2 496	10.1	152	15.6	571	15.5	288	8.1	2 043	11.1
Anderson .....	593	3.4	2 717	8.3	206	12.9	915	8.9	365	7.7	2 935	8.9
Atchison .....	546	4.1	2 421	8.5	243	12.3	759	18.0	379	7.1	2 069	12.1
Barber .....	361	4.9	2 264	6.0	166	13.6	1 611	11.3	278	8.1	3 251	4.9
Barton .....	631	3.5	5 475	4.4	299	9.2	1 725	7.4	402	7.3	4 133	7.4
Bourbon .....	622	3.6	2 196	7.6	209	12.1	500	12.7	365	8.4	2 140	10.1
Brown .....	517	4.0	3 860	7.2	334	8.1	1 735	8.0	374	6.8	3 550	5.8
Butler .....	913	3.8	4 584	4.6	310	10.2	895	9.5	573	6.6	4 902	5.6
Chase .....	232	5.6	1 353	6.8	124	13.5	402	11.7	202	7.3	2 379	9.1
Chautauqua .....	309	5.7	1 299	16.9	76	18.1	192	12.2	167	12.3	1 083	8.4
Cherokee .....	635	3.3	3 474	6.0	202	12.6	597	12.7	278	9.1	2 008	7.8
Cheyenne .....	360	3.3	3 041	5.3	229	8.9	1 547	7.8	292	5.9	3 145	7.4
Clark .....	204	6.4	2 870	2.1	109	11.9	1 164	9.1	122	9.2	2 480	2.1
Clay .....	452	5.1	3 430	7.5	228	12.0	950	16.9	379	6.5	3 481	9.7
Cloud .....	488	4.0	3 522	4.7	203	11.5	788	11.3	313	8.7	2 806	9.6
Coffey .....	445	5.6	2 351	7.1	200	12.7	658	26.1	315	8.5	2 226	8.7
Comanche .....	191	7.4	1 499	6.0	95	10.5	805	11.3	171	7.2	1 789	5.1
Cowley .....	758	4.4	3 620	8.4	253	12.9	734	8.1	481	8.4	3 888	10.1
Crawford .....	599	4.6	2 310	7.4	207	13.2	580	21.6	364	8.6	2 015	9.7
Decatur .....	334	5.0	3 204	6.3	198	10.4	1 872	18.6	266	8.2	2 840	7.7
Dickinson .....	791	2.8	4 700	6.0	332	9.5	1 035	11.0	498	6.7	3 387	6.9
Doniphan .....	367	6.3	2 070	7.9	209	12.2	1 019	16.1	241	9.5	2 546	7.4
Douglas .....	640	4.2	2 205	7.4	262	11.4	640	16.0	293	10.3	2 152	20.0
Edwards .....	265	4.2	3 099	5.4	166	9.6	2 344	12.8	182	9.6	2 849	6.8
Elk .....	313	5.6	1 014	11.3	99	19.9	234	25.6	222	10.2	1 569	10.5
Ellis .....	589	4.0	2 541	7.4	176	15.4	757	22.4	295	10.7	2 893	9.2
Ellsworth .....	288	6.9	1 932	8.0	137	13.7	392	19.0	220	9.3	1 552	13.4
Finney .....	425	5.6	9 506	2.1	306	8.6	5 462	3.5	369	6.7	10 866	2.9
Ford .....	630	3.6	6 876	3.1	307	8.6	5 041	4.9	309	8.0	8 765	2.4
Franklin .....	722	4.1	3 106	11.6	268	12.3	644	13.5	528	7.0	3 463	8.4
Geary .....	177	5.2	1 032	10.1	55	19.9	215	11.6	114	10.3	1 108	10.9
Gove .....	363	3.7	3 328	5.3	227	8.7	1 757	8.4	305	6.1	4 207	7.6
Graham .....	343	4.8	1 951	6.3	233	8.3	1 414	13.2	255	8.1	2 574	10.3
Grant .....	232	4.2	4 983	3.5	158	7.4	1 740	6.4	186	7.7	2 525	5.1
Gray .....	404	3.8	7 295	3.2	257	8.2	4 983	7.0	329	6.4	10 323	2.4
Greeley .....	170	6.1	2 632	6.1	132	8.9	2 481	5.5	140	8.2	3 390	4.2
Greenwood .....	475	5.0	1 981	6.5	144	13.2	533	13.6	312	8.4	3 199	5.6
Hamilton .....	188	5.3	3 025	4.6	99	13.7	1 942	9.1	163	9.4	5 533	4.3
Harper .....	452	3.7	3 732	10.2	214	11.7	1 996	12.8	287	8.3	2 725	6.8
Harvey .....	622	3.9	4 211	5.3	351	8.3	1 216	7.2	398	6.9	3 566	8.1
Haskell .....	218	2.7	6 729	2.0	164	3.6	4 401	4.5	158	7.3	6 427	1.7
Hodgeman .....	305	5.5	3 192	6.9	199	10.3	1 867	15.7	218	10.3	3 625	6.5
Jackson .....	868	3.0	2 648	6.8	286	10.3	507	12.6	462	6.8	2 535	9.9
Jefferson .....	765	3.8	2 350	6.3	305	11.0	504	13.4	396	8.7	1 867	9.3
Jewell .....	516	3.2	3 668	6.6	254	10.6	1 411	13.4	433	5.9	3 085	8.8
Johnson .....	387	7.1	1 310	8.3	157	16.6	386	10.5	204	12.8	2 333	10.1
Kearny .....	208	6.4	4 154	3.1	125	10.4	3 136	4.8	176	8.3	3 799	6.5
Kingman .....	624	4.0	4 125	7.8	335	9.1	1 858	9.7	384	7.2	3 260	9.8
Kiowa .....	246	7.3	2 940	6.6	158	9.3	1 543	8.7	188	7.3	2 517	3.9
Labette .....	810	2.7	2 533	7.2	290	12.1	508	19.5	378	8.0	2 531	10.3
Lane .....	201	6.5	2 566	3.0	156	7.6	1 916	12.4	178	7.2	2 466	4.2
Leavenworth .....	763	4.2	2 028	6.8	276	11.2	554	14.0	325	9.3	3 053	12.1
Lincoln .....	390	4.3	2 759	9.1	210	11.9	633	16.2	276	8.6	2 340	14.2
Linn .....	622	4.2	1 701	8.6	156	15.8	381	10.0	295	10.5	2 189	11.3
Logan .....	263	6.6	2 346	9.1	174	10.6	1 792	13.4	246	6.4	3 518	4.0
Lyon .....	704	3.7	3 031	5.7	325	9.7	2 276	10.2	471	7.5	3 932	10.8
McPherson .....	948	3.0	6 329	7.9	478	8.4	1 963	12.4	611	5.8	4 412	9.2
Marion .....	863	2.0	5 440	5.5	440	8.0	1 178	16.0	569	6.1	4 306	7.6
Marshall .....	784	3.0	4 633	4.9	438	7.5	1 034	15.5	513	6.4	5 206	11.3

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 <sup>1</sup> —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)
Meade .....	358	5.1	4 395	4.1	168	12.8	2 685	5.7	252	7.4	3 560	2.7
Miami .....	935	3.7	2 290	6.1	265	13.1	438	15.4	501	8.1	2 834	8.7
Mitchell .....	434	3.3	3 262	6.1	230	9.6	1 764	16.0	277	8.2	3 942	8.8
Montgomery .....	717	4.7	2 896	8.4	183	14.7	396	12.7	434	8.1	2 208	8.6
Morris .....	396	4.6	2 348	13.3	157	16.0	638	22.9	276	9.0	2 126	7.8
Morton .....	168	7.5	2 198	6.7	74	14.5	872	13.8	102	11.1	2 639	8.5
Nemaha .....	815	2.9	5 199	5.6	513	6.3	1 366	11.3	560	6.3	4 662	6.9
Neosho .....	586	3.7	1 928	9.6	258	12.6	635	10.1	265	12.2	2 348	11.5
Ness .....	458	2.8	2 667	6.4	195	12.5	1 084	17.9	298	8.8	1 854	10.7
Norton .....	345	6.3	3 107	15.7	173	14.4	967	19.2	228	9.4	3 496	11.5
Osage .....	703	3.3	2 448	5.5	233	10.9	566	12.8	445	7.2	3 095	8.7
Osborne .....	427	3.7	2 702	9.0	275	7.2	1 510	17.9	298	7.8	2 544	8.8
Ottawa .....	437	3.7	2 639	8.0	126	17.6	806	17.9	303	8.6	2 848	11.1
Pawnee .....	325	4.4	6 809	2.8	185	13.3	2 335	7.8	224	9.8	4 576	3.7
Phillips .....	422	4.4	2 611	6.7	221	10.7	1 071	15.6	270	8.5	3 268	11.2
Pottawatomie .....	678	2.9	2 968	9.5	253	11.3	1 109	18.9	499	6.4	3 521	6.3
Pratt .....	392	2.9	5 817	8.1	154	11.4	1 982	7.4	222	9.3	5 682	8.2
Rawlins .....	374	4.4	2 848	7.9	231	10.0	1 630	11.9	251	8.6	3 312	11.6
Reno .....	1 109	3.1	6 991	5.0	491	7.6	2 327	9.5	703	5.8	5 848	9.8
Republic .....	566	3.6	4 552	4.6	373	5.8	3 163	6.7	434	6.4	6 018	6.4
Rice .....	420	4.3	4 195	4.2	253	10.1	1 953	14.6	230	11.5	3 155	4.8
Riley .....	400	2.8	2 588	8.6	185	13.0	337	15.3	223	11.0	1 662	15.8
Rooks .....	388	4.9	2 938	8.7	176	13.9	1 373	9.2	277	9.8	3 496	8.1
Rush .....	368	6.0	2 389	9.5	177	10.5	909	16.1	250	9.9	1 533	12.2
Russell .....	433	3.5	2 015	8.5	138	17.8	661	9.3	242	11.9	1 859	10.4
Saline .....	578	4.3	3 144	10.2	239	11.4	1 031	19.3	356	8.2	2 128	10.3
Scott .....	270	5.1	4 654	3.8	226	7.1	3 437	4.3	241	6.4	5 375	6.3
Sedgwick .....	1 048	3.5	5 691	5.4	435	8.4	1 973	11.2	590	6.2	4 942	7.3
Seward .....	190	6.3	5 476	1.5	88	15.0	2 646	5.9	126	11.2	4 713	1.5
Shawnee .....	637	4.0	2 257	7.4	193	14.1	481	19.6	255	9.6	1 898	11.6
Sheridan .....	381	3.9	3 935	6.0	288	7.3	2 979	5.5	302	6.7	4 633	7.6
Sherman .....	393	4.5	4 787	3.3	302	7.4	3 779	7.0	328	5.9	3 882	3.5
Smith .....	496	3.4	3 521	8.6	301	8.4	1 220	10.2	360	6.4	3 211	9.0
Stafford .....	382	5.0	4 481	4.9	226	9.3	2 192	9.8	284	8.0	3 886	4.5
Stanton .....	209	4.3	3 968	2.4	132	8.3	3 123	3.6	168	6.5	2 872	3.8
Stevens .....	254	5.5	5 718	6.3	132	13.3	2 425	6.9	219	8.1	4 092	3.7
Sumner .....	916	3.1	6 270	6.1	513	7.8	5 070	10.8	588	6.4	5 570	9.1
Thomas .....	435	4.1	6 025	4.7	378	5.8	5 242	7.1	361	6.2	7 810	5.8
Trego .....	331	4.5	2 400	14.5	209	10.2	2 331	38.2	245	10.4	1 616	10.4
Wabaunsee .....	480	4.1	2 181	6.6	163	13.8	452	17.1	255	9.6	1 966	11.2
Wallace .....	226	4.9	2 099	10.6	98	13.9	1 460	7.2	180	7.6	2 569	10.9
Washington .....	674	3.4	4 600	4.5	342	9.1	1 286	10.6	482	6.2	4 331	9.2
Wichita .....	256	6.6	4 467	8.1	152	11.8	2 779	11.8	204	9.2	2 618	8.3
Wilson .....	468	4.2	2 474	11.3	225	11.0	928	17.7	292	9.0	2 204	13.3
Woodson .....	275	6.6	1 112	8.6	83	22.1	289	10.6	193	10.2	1 253	19.2
Wyandotte .....	131	6.3	325	6.6	33	17.9	83	4.3	54	12.5	274	8.8

  

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
<b>Kansas .....</b>	<b>18 302</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>186 278</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>57 280</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>117 225</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>56 328</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>467 416</b>	<b>.6</b>
Allen .....	208	13.8	931	13.9	596	1.2	1 042	12.4	539	4.0	2 996	8.5
Anderson .....	221	10.1	2 062	10.3	674	1.6	1 167	6.0	635	2.6	3 265	8.3
Atchison .....	165	14.0	1 092	9.9	607	2.6	877	5.3	608	1.9	2 143	5.4
Barber .....	202	11.9	2 279	8.1	382	4.9	951	12.9	409	2.5	3 053	4.8
Barton .....	182	13.5	2 283	7.7	716	1.8	2 123	7.1	690	2.7	6 427	2.9
Bourbon .....	177	12.6	1 206	7.0	784	1.5	1 097	4.9	711	2.7	2 259	5.6
Brown .....	199	10.5	2 329	8.4	548	3.2	1 408	5.9	546	2.7	4 422	4.9
Butler .....	346	8.7	3 310	5.5	1 176	1.7	2 051	5.9	1 136	2.2	5 678	3.5
Chase .....	81	17.5	2 362	6.9	266	3.2	662	10.0	285	1.0	2 564	3.9
Chautauqua .....	126	14.8	1 157	13.3	370	1.7	728	6.8	335	3.5	3 365	8.2
Cherokee .....	163	14.1	1 176	6.1	686	2.1	954	5.7	663	2.7	3 382	4.9
Cheyenne .....	131	14.5	1 207	12.5	334	4.4	1 021	5.3	376	3.0	4 741	4.4
Clark .....	85	12.5	1 321	5.7	238	3.4	550	8.2	240	3.3	4 123	1.9
Clay .....	146	14.8	1 484	7.6	518	2.9	1 092	7.8	502	3.3	3 959	6.5
Cloud .....	108	17.2	1 213	11.4	494	3.9	1 094	7.9	512	3.5	3 538	7.0
Coffey .....	174	13.9	1 218	14.9	523	2.8	736	5.7	505	3.0	2 714	6.8
Comanche .....	121	11.9	1 909	10.1	234	4.5	617	6.9	245	2.7	1 615	3.2
Cowley .....	262	12.4	2 304	12.1	890	2.6	1 500	9.9	859	3.2	4 305	5.4
Crawford .....	168	16.7	1 163	12.2	746	2.1	1 016	8.1	664	3.6	2 399	10.5

See footnotes at end of table.



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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> —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)
Decatur	102	16.8	795	10.3	364	3.6	1 045	6.6	380	2.1	3 900	9.0
Dickinson	265	11.4	1 805	10.3	837	2.3	1 375	5.2	837	2.0	5 873	5.4
Doniphan	186	11.9	1 934	14.2	445	4.2	979	5.8	467	3.4	2 481	5.2
Douglas	161	16.3	1 076	9.6	801	1.8	1 336	7.7	760	2.8	2 421	6.6
Edwards	109	14.5	2 047	13.7	251	5.5	858	6.1	274	4.2	4 165	4.0
Elk	139	14.5	1 025	17.5	375	1.8	676	7.4	363	2.9	1 570	9.5
Ellis	296	10.6	1 459	14.9	586	4.3	1 142	16.7	635	3.0	3 192	4.5
Ellsworth	168	10.3	939	14.6	405	2.6	658	7.5	403	2.7	1 866	6.5
Finney	126	11.2	4 314	6.6	467	3.7	1 897	7.9	482	3.0	15 273	1.2
Ford	182	10.9	4 365	3.5	612	3.5	1 903	7.5	659	2.4	13 491	1.7
Franklin	208	14.7	1 606	12.5	924	1.5	1 334	5.8	863	2.3	3 930	7.7
Geary	59	19.1	476	30.5	207	3.7	303	8.6	204	3.4	1 248	11.5
Gove	139	12.7	1 498	6.9	421	2.2	1 040	5.6	427	1.7	4 963	4.6
Graham	169	10.2	1 462	9.5	364	3.0	867	7.4	363	3.0	2 098	6.8
Grant	60	14.2	1 412	10.7	235	3.9	834	3.7	239	4.1	4 851	1.9
Gray	163	12.2	4 207	16.7	425	3.2	1 862	7.4	454	1.6	11 747	2.2
Greeley	43	12.0	1 322	3.6	228	4.4	812	4.8	246	3.1	6 112	1.1
Greenwood	224	10.7	2 813	6.9	544	2.9	1 207	9.8	552	3.0	2 866	6.7
Hamilton	76	17.6	804	7.3	246	4.1	841	7.9	215	4.8	5 137	4.0
Harper	191	11.5	1 772	7.2	475	3.5	917	7.6	467	2.5	4 114	14.2
Harvey	325	6.4	2 434	8.6	743	1.9	1 379	4.6	704	2.8	3 860	6.7
Haskell	83	10.5	2 843	1.1	233	1.7	857	8.1	229	2.6	10 767	1.1
Hodgeman	134	14.3	1 079	8.6	320	4.7	927	8.5	324	3.6	2 510	5.1
Jackson	267	10.7	918	13.5	999	1.8	1 278	6.9	904	2.7	2 443	7.8
Jefferson	248	12.7	1 144	7.7	975	1.7	1 416	5.6	924	2.2	2 796	5.0
Jewell	229	11.7	2 445	14.9	504	4.9	976	8.8	535	3.0	4 041	6.9
Johnson	122	18.1	755	7.5	535	3.6	990	11.6	530	4.1	2 133	2.6
Kearny	78	17.8	1 227	5.7	243	4.1	745	10.1	250	3.8	5 991	2.7
Kingman	222	12.4	2 227	15.0	735	1.9	1 781	24.3	692	2.8	3 909	11.3
Kiowa	116	13.2	1 829	3.8	281	5.2	890	3.9	254	5.1	3 011	3.8
Labette	248	11.0	1 026	16.0	841	2.5	1 097	5.5	849	2.2	2 385	7.3
Lane	78	13.4	1 230	13.8	263	3.7	797	6.4	282	1.9	2 488	5.4
Leavenworth	263	11.0	951	21.3	984	2.0	1 417	10.3	894	3.0	3 323	3.6
Lincoln	193	9.2	1 414	10.2	429	3.2	1 000	11.1	454	1.0	2 879	13.2
Linn	165	14.7	1 000	9.0	725	2.0	843	5.7	692	2.5	2 155	8.4
Logan	100	15.3	1 242	20.8	295	4.8	819	7.9	320	2.1	2 566	4.7
Lyon	260	11.2	2 572	11.6	803	2.3	1 310	5.9	800	2.6	4 428	5.2
McPherson	415	8.0	2 790	12.5	1 085	1.9	1 628	5.4	1 057	1.6	6 042	5.2
Marion	435	8.0	2 965	10.7	895	2.5	1 399	5.7	934	1.6	5 119	9.5
Marshall	267	11.0	1 634	14.9	847	2.7	1 587	6.9	881	1.8	5 102	9.7
Meade	151	12.0	1 705	17.0	370	4.3	951	5.4	400	2.8	7 616	1.9
Miami	237	12.9	1 815	22.5	1 200	1.4	1 792	7.7	1 048	2.8	4 156	3.8
Mitchell	143	12.2	1 839	10.2	453	3.4	1 204	7.5	482	1.7	3 912	5.6
Montgomery	210	13.2	747	7.7	936	1.4	1 395	7.1	851	2.4	2 509	8.1
Morris	193	12.1	1 803	8.1	452	3.4	685	10.8	415	3.0	3 619	10.5
Morton	37	20.8	767	4.9	190	4.7	429	7.6	197	3.9	3 169	2.6
Nemaha	294	9.1	2 259	12.5	918	2.4	1 652	5.2	968	1.7	5 572	6.0
Neosho	140	18.5	1 194	7.1	673	2.8	1 245	7.6	646	3.3	2 825	9.8
Ness	203	13.7	1 380	15.7	466	4.0	885	8.1	477	2.7	2 570	10.6
Norton	208	11.5	1 345	9.6	380	3.2	1 286	9.0	381	3.1	3 652	6.0
Osage	210	12.0	1 284	9.0	834	2.0	1 170	4.6	798	2.3	2 588	5.8
Osborne	193	12.6	1 504	10.3	440	2.9	1 000	9.0	427	3.6	3 326	6.0
Ottawa	138	16.1	1 331	12.0	469	3.2	780	11.6	493	1.7	3 616	7.8
Pawnee	110	18.0	4 112	6.7	361	5.1	1 075	11.2	366	3.5	8 182	1.4
Phillips	228	9.0	2 008	10.5	450	3.7	964	8.5	466	2.7	3 314	9.4
Pottawatomie	213	12.0	1 616	9.2	755	2.1	1 076	5.8	716	2.3	3 797	5.0
Pratt	120	14.6	2 989	1.5	395	3.4	1 227	6.6	394	3.3	13 029	1.9
Rawlins	144	14.8	1 402	9.6	410	3.1	1 058	5.7	397	3.6	3 522	8.0
Reno	366	8.6	2 507	9.7	1 297	1.6	2 251	4.3	1 226	2.4	11 115	3.6
Republic	276	10.5	2 395	8.5	584	4.0	1 660	6.0	638	2.2	7 224	3.6
Rice	132	16.3	1 810	19.8	489	2.8	1 034	5.7	467	2.9	4 765	10.4
Riley	102	17.5	583	13.9	430	3.3	748	11.4	452	2.0	2 592	8.4
Rooks	151	16.1	1 646	14.1	413	3.7	1 008	7.9	378	4.7	2 959	5.9
Rush	134	15.6	1 395	21.2	438	3.1	964	9.3	445	3.8	2 810	13.7
Russell	166	17.1	1 912	37.1	455	3.6	1 111	11.0	447	3.3	2 534	7.3
Saline	207	11.8	2 256	17.7	658	2.7	995	12.9	659	2.7	3 337	6.7
Scott	102	13.2	2 647	2.8	283	5.0	929	7.9	319	2.1	11 167	3.2
Sedgwick	349	9.1	2 511	16.5	1 275	2.0	2 144	4.8	1 173	2.3	5 255	4.7
Seward	89	12.8	1 441	4.2	225	2.5	1 018	13.8	224	4.1	9 711	1.4
Shawnee	168	12.3	942	16.9	800	1.4	920	6.6	718	3.2	1 821	6.5
Sheridan	188	10.4	2 097	7.9	403	3.3	1 050	5.7	429	1.6	5 502	5.4
Sherman	90	18.6	1 842	13.0	444	2.9	1 244	11.7	445	2.3	5 556	4.7
Smith	162	12.7	1 597	12.6	495	3.0	1 200	6.2	505	2.4	3 117	5.9
Stafford	195	10.8	1 843	11.8	436	3.4	1 291	4.8	424	3.2	5 327	3.6
Stanton	70	11.6	1 578	17.1	227	2.8	807	4.0	225	3.3	6 477	3.6
Stevens	122	14.3	2 477	20.3	266	3.8	956	4.9	281	3.0	7 924	2.7
Sumner	314	10.7	2 501	18.7	1 011	1.9	2 030	7.3	1 009	1.9	6 922	6.5
Thomas	122	14.5	2 991	6.7	523	2.0	1 651	5.8	522	2.0	7 767	2.2
Trego	137	16.3	1 034	18.6	387	3.0	641	7.8	381	3.3	1 892	11.3
Wabaunsee	177	12.6	2 219	8.3	564	2.3	967	6.2	520	3.0	2 921	5.7

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 <sup>1</sup> —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)
Wallace .....	49	23.6	738	28.2	234	5.1	757	6.8	256	3.8	2 859	3.3
Washington .....	277	9.4	3 283	11.1	758	1.9	1 685	7.6	715	2.6	5 679	4.5
Wichita .....	71	20.8	2 174	8.0	292	3.4	909	12.6	289	2.7	8 528	3.3
Wilson .....	169	12.7	1 518	13.9	494	3.3	890	8.9	509	2.5	2 206	7.3
Woodson .....	120	18.1	2 165	16.5	348	4.4	559	9.0	345	3.4	1 929	6.2
Wyandotte .....	46	14.1	212	8.0	170	3.8	225	7.7	146	5.9	355	4.0
	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) <sup>1</sup>				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)
<b>Kansas .....</b>	<b>61 591</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>1 877 913</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>54 145</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>30 020 580</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>48 280</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>19 839 087</b>	<b>.5</b>
Allen .....	604	.8	9 130	10.0	534	.8	182 017	1.0	496	.8	136 687	1.0
Anderson .....	688	1.0	14 645	6.1	612	.9	242 019	1.1	567	1.0	183 502	1.1
Atchison .....	632	.9	9 955	8.3	553	.9	177 565	1.2	516	1.0	140 403	1.2
Barber .....	433	1.1	9 111	11.7	356	1.1	193 802	1.2	311	1.2	148 921	1.1
Barton .....	741	.7	24 864	4.9	682	.6	488 283	.6	614	.7	318 983	.6
Bourbon .....	804	.9	6 649	10.0	701	.8	158 334	1.4	610	.9	97 867	1.4
Brown .....	600	1.0	20 593	4.6	541	.9	267 171	.8	512	1.0	232 353	.8
Butler .....	1 256	.6	27 113	3.3	1 039	.6	313 885	.7	917	.7	228 049	.7
Chase .....	285	1.0	26 367	2.3	228	1.0	88 246	1.5	205	1.1	55 306	1.5
Chautauqua .....	376	1.0	5 139	10.9	266	1.1	61 428	1.8	226	1.3	32 449	2.0
Cherokee .....	724	.8	10 314	13.6	601	.9	208 436	.9	530	1.0	172 002	.9
Cheyenne .....	398	.9	9 126	9.5	366	.9	367 867	.9	347	1.0	187 796	.9
Clark .....	260	1.2	15 941	2.4	214	1.2	195 949	1.0	163	1.5	107 389	1.0
Clay .....	546	1.4	20 712	7.1	503	1.4	258 258	1.5	463	1.5	196 961	1.4
Cloud .....	545	1.0	17 536	6.5	489	1.2	280 365	1.3	444	1.3	208 067	1.1
Coffey .....	554	.9	12 356	9.0	486	1.0	200 562	1.3	434	1.2	149 120	1.2
Comanche .....	256	1.4	5 813	10.1	219	1.1	167 725	1.2	183	1.3	106 576	1.0
Cowley .....	961	.8	15 766	10.1	805	.8	275 708	1.0	701	.9	190 009	1.0
Crawford .....	786	1.0	9 747	15.0	653	.8	189 383	1.1	570	1.0	142 752	1.1
Decatur .....	396	1.0	21 460	3.2	361	.9	321 717	.9	345	1.0	193 368	.9
Dickinson .....	893	.8	27 802	5.1	781	.8	380 626	.9	713	.9	294 880	.8
Doniphan .....	508	1.1	16 810	4.5	457	1.0	174 290	1.0	408	1.1	148 230	1.0
Douglas .....	838	.7	14 456	7.8	722	.7	146 918	1.1	652	.8	113 646	1.1
Edwards .....	302	1.1	20 551	7.5	281	.8	282 577	.8	243	1.0	177 304	.7
Elk .....	383	1.0	3 453	20.8	294	1.1	77 920	2.3	254	1.3	42 268	1.9
Ellis .....	674	1.2	15 656	7.1	603	1.2	312 902	1.5	528	1.3	155 645	1.5
Ellsworth .....	424	1.2	9 843	7.3	390	1.0	234 264	1.2	357	1.1	139 723	1.2
Finney .....	520	.8	73 134	2.3	472	1.0	630 574	.6	408	1.0	418 603	.5
Ford .....	693	1.0	44 327	3.3	602	1.1	524 164	.9	510	1.2	297 735	.8
Franklin .....	956	.7	12 819	10.6	812	.7	192 760	1.1	747	.8	149 666	1.0
Geary .....	222	1.0	4 103	11.8	182	1.1	73 709	1.7	172	1.2	51 680	1.7
Gove .....	440	1.0	14 581	11.0	402	.9	388 644	1.0	369	1.0	220 793	.9
Graham .....	383	1.4	11 294	7.3	355	1.1	303 557	1.2	299	1.3	146 627	1.0
Grant .....	257	1.0	26 169	2.0	230	1.0	276 957	.7	188	1.2	183 861	.6
Gray .....	461	.7	65 995	2.5	416	.7	468 840	.5	370	.8	303 493	.5
Greeley .....	273	1.2	15 495	2.8	249	.9	398 932	.8	198	1.2	192 420	.7
Greenwood .....	593	.9	12 420	7.3	455	1.0	153 183	1.2	405	1.1	89 769	1.2
Hamilton .....	267	1.2	8 174	13.1	236	1.1	396 748	.8	180	1.4	174 818	.7
Harper .....	529	1.0	15 915	7.1	479	1.0	318 521	.8	424	1.1	267 893	.8
Harvey .....	779	.6	21 946	5.7	716	.5	281 879	.6	675	.6	247 026	.6
Haskell .....	241	.8	79 386	.8	219	.7	326 674	.5	198	.8	245 430	.4
Hodgeman .....	359	1.0	19 506	3.8	335	.9	343 811	1.1	302	1.1	169 548	1.0
Jackson .....	1 051	.7	4 991	15.8	885	.7	189 526	1.2	733	.9	115 438	1.4
Jefferson .....	1 018	.7	5 893	15.4	885	.7	175 768	1.1	765	.8	123 538	1.2
Jewell .....	579	1.1	14 068	11.1	529	1.1	314 910	1.2	480	1.2	227 430	1.1
Johnson .....	605	.8	10 543	6.7	496	.9	87 874	1.5	423	1.1	67 366	1.5
Kearny .....	271	1.1	19 165	5.5	242	.9	381 150	.7	200	1.1	209 155	.5
Kingman .....	759	.8	14 576	8.9	675	.8	350 962	.8	593	.9	266 308	.8
Kiowa .....	318	1.1	10 588	6.9	286	1.1	268 186	1.1	233	1.3	136 813	.9
Labette .....	900	.8	10 721	9.3	749	.8	212 153	1.1	664	.9	156 239	1.1
Lane .....	287	1.2	20 822	3.0	265	1.1	320 791	1.1	235	1.3	162 039	.9
Leavenworth .....	1 048	.7	8 304	8.0	911	.7	126 275	1.1	817	.7	92 913	1.2
Lincoln .....	454	1.0	10 294	9.8	415	.9	248 298	1.1	384	1.0	168 914	1.0
Linn .....	756	.7	6 864	10.5	648	.7	156 596	1.1	529	.9	100 160	1.0
Logan .....	326	1.2	4 703	17.9	288	1.1	361 843	1.0	269	1.2	177 903	.8
Lyon .....	855	.8	28 497	7.4	772	.8	256 769	1.1	682	.9	175 686	1.0
McPherson .....	1 163	.7	32 050	4.0	1 064	.6	411 564	.7	1 006	.7	344 435	.7
Marion .....	967	.9	22 067	4.4	882	.8	367 692	1.0	826	.9	286 536	1.0
Marshall .....	922	1.2	22 497	5.7	828	1.1	357 574	1.2	773	1.1	283 203	1.2
Meade .....	416	1.0	16 949	9.6	375	1.0	349 440	.9	330	1.1	222 967	.8
Miami .....	1 244	.6	8 447	8.2	1 052	.6	174 958	1.0	911	.7	121 602	1.0
Mitchell .....	488	1.4	23 415	3.8	447	1.1	357 007	.9	410	1.2	271 909	.9
Montgomery .....	963	.8	19 049	5.2	729	.7	183 748	1.0	611	.9	128 522	.9
Morris .....	489	1.2	8 994	12.4	420	1.2	186 007	1.8	394	1.3	132 516	1.5

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	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) <sup>1</sup>				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)
Morton	233	1.6	16 153	2.8	199	1.5	268 025	1.1	144	1.9	148 151	.8
Nemaha	1 007	1.0	24 037	5.6	909	1.0	305 185	1.1	832	1.1	223 200	1.1
Neosho	721	.9	11 718	9.0	612	.8	221 197	1.1	528	.9	140 244	1.2
Ness	518	1.1	9 924	9.7	476	1.1	414 040	1.1	433	1.2	198 653	1.1
Norton	399	1.0	6 030	18.2	348	1.1	288 994	1.3	321	1.2	167 046	1.1
Osage	890	.8	10 824	7.7	792	.7	221 061	1.1	714	.8	161 681	1.1
Osborne	464	1.0	9 697	10.3	433	1.0	306 012	1.1	404	1.1	191 479	1.1
Ottawa	499	1.2	16 697	5.8	443	1.1	237 781	1.2	414	1.2	185 136	1.1
Pawnee	425	1.0	23 541	4.3	398	.8	387 932	.8	321	1.0	234 095	.6
Phillips	501	1.2	12 438	10.5	458	1.1	322 043	1.4	424	1.2	184 457	1.1
Pottawatomie	787	.8	12 008	7.9	684	.8	198 780	1.2	621	.9	217 456	1.0
Pratt	434	.9	28 729	4.5	405	.9	365 014	.6	330	1.0	261 772	.6
Rawlins	431	1.1	7 330	14.4	405	1.1	407 235	1.0	394	1.1	219 688	.9
Reno	1 362	.9	23 729	6.7	1 227	.8	500 307	.9	1 029	.9	381 856	.8
Republic	683	1.0	8 362	17.7	597	1.0	321 273	1.0	578	1.0	264 049	1.0
Rice	519	.8	24 274	6.6	469	.8	345 918	.7	422	.9	259 022	.6
Riley	469	.9	6 757	12.4	406	.9	121 535	1.7	372	1.0	87 886	1.5
Rooks	435	1.4	7 905	12.9	396	1.1	330 049	1.2	344	1.2	164 047	1.1
Rush	487	1.2	10 120	11.6	460	1.1	328 582	1.2	398	1.3	175 161	1.2
Russell	494	1.2	5 268	17.1	442	1.0	260 734	1.2	367	1.2	136 855	1.3
Saline	720	.8	15 564	8.1	646	.9	284 241	1.1	571	1.0	211 755	1.0
Scott	335	.8	109 026	1.0	287	.8	394 114	.6	267	.9	238 251	.6
Sedgwick	1 395	.7	21 067	6.4	1 246	.6	413 114	.7	1 150	.7	355 616	.7
Seward	251	1.1	25 281	1.9	208	1.3	236 690	.9	152	1.6	154 687	.5
Shawnee	822	.7	8 747	8.6	705	.7	148 011	1.1	632	.8	113 643	1.0
Sheridan	442	1.0	19 880	5.1	408	.8	364 435	.8	396	.9	218 803	.7
Sherman	478	1.2	17 447	6.4	446	1.0	526 820	.8	405	1.1	295 739	.7
Smith	557	1.0	13 596	8.1	502	1.0	344 403	1.1	473	1.1	220 631	1.0
Stafford	475	1.1	30 517	4.1	440	.9	350 621	.9	376	1.1	241 147	.7
Stanton	253	1.2	21 695	2.0	228	1.1	344 452	.8	176	1.4	206 958	.7
Stevens	304	.9	33 185	5.8	271	.8	408 018	.5	212	1.1	289 215	.4
Sumner	1 064	.7	33 675	6.5	965	.6	554 870	.6	922	.7	487 879	.5
Thomas	553	1.1	21 782	4.2	516	1.0	584 164	.8	491	1.0	352 511	.7
Trego	400	1.2	4 843	18.6	372	1.0	302 183	1.3	334	1.1	135 732	1.2
Wabaunsee	597	.8	12 973	8.4	506	.8	155 184	1.3	445	1.0	104 578	1.2
Wallace	276	1.2	6 724	7.0	243	1.1	266 220	1.0	190	1.4	137 873	1.1
Washington	780	1.0	18 351	6.5	666	1.0	347 696	1.0	609	1.1	273 272	1.0
Wichita	311	.9	20 908	5.2	276	1.1	362 728	.9	247	1.2	199 487	.8
Wilson	540	.7	10 023	9.2	454	.6	175 885	.7	416	.7	141 297	.8
Woodson	371	.8	6 049	14.3	304	1.0	121 945	1.4	275	1.1	94 106	1.3
Wyandotte	190	1.6	1 370	8.3	157	1.5	16 828	3.3	129	1.9	12 763	3.9
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)
<b>Kansas</b>	<b>6 135</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>2 707 489</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>36 244</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>6 506 089</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>29 446</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>1 466 429</b>	<b>.7</b>
Allen	5	10.3	(D)	(D)	454	.9	33 670	1.2	405	1.0	14 351	1.4
Anderson	8	11.9	1 186	12.3	477	1.1	43 619	1.4	391	1.3	16 435	1.9
Atchison	2	—	(D)	(D)	434	1.1	33 030	1.4	383	1.3	13 031	1.7
Barber	25	4.6	5 022	3.4	291	1.3	70 026	1.1	218	1.6	22 351	1.6
Barton	108	1.9	43 221	.8	407	1.0	123 654	.3	350	1.1	18 926	.9
Bourbon	3	18.9	(D)	(D)	608	.9	58 572	1.4	531	1.0	23 609	1.7
Brown	2	24.6	(D)	(D)	316	1.4	29 279	1.1	258	1.7	9 055	1.7
Butler	10	7.2	669	1.7	753	.8	122 582	.5	578	1.0	22 784	1.3
Chase	2	—	(D)	(D)	209	1.1	68 052	.5	155	1.5	14 947	1.2
Chautauqua	4	14.7	(D)	(D)	314	.9	51 930	1.0	261	1.1	18 741	1.4
Cherokee	5	13.6	(D)	(D)	496	1.0	24 632	1.8	441	1.1	12 939	2.1
Cheyenne	125	2.0	46 219	1.5	197	1.7	48 426	.8	173	1.8	14 305	1.5
Clark	16	4.1	17 452	.4	163	1.6	88 824	.4	93	2.5	9 644	1.4
Clay	51	4.0	14 558	1.9	345	1.7	39 701	1.7	280	2.0	14 420	2.1
Cloud	72	3.1	15 031	2.4	335	1.5	35 910	1.7	296	1.7	16 416	2.1
Coffey	6	9.8	263	11.5	331	1.4	30 917	1.4	235	1.8	8 657	2.1
Comanche	26	3.7	6 286	3.1	179	1.3	47 251	.9	121	1.9	15 020	1.4
Cowley	16	6.9	2 261	4.4	631	1.0	87 416	.7	497	1.2	27 704	1.2
Crawford	13	7.9	1 062	9.6	560	1.0	41 295	1.2	510	1.0	18 707	1.4
Decatur	68	2.7	12 114	2.1	226	1.5	61 449	.8	199	1.6	16 464	1.5
Dickinson	29	3.8	3 290	3.4	543	1.0	74 390	.9	397	1.3	17 111	1.8
Doniphan	5	9.2	1 021	(L)	245	1.7	16 946	1.7	212	1.9	8 000	2.0
Douglas	35	4.8	2 275	1.2	476	1.0	27 364	1.5	390	1.2	9 782	2.2
Edwards	119	1.7	76 685	.7	161	1.5	51 300	.7	125	1.9	11 007	1.3
Elk	4	14.7	11	16.0	290	1.1	47 696	1.3	251	1.3	16 085	1.9
Ellis	21	5.8	2 381	5.4	454	1.4	65 421	1.0	407	1.5	20 828	1.8
Ellsworth	8	8.9	1 089	15.1	298	1.4	33 972	1.5	271	1.5	16 445	1.7
Finney	265	1.2	230 339	.6	160	1.8	279 057	.1	92	2.9	7 746	2.0
Ford	160	2.0	70 451	.9	338	1.5	183 514	.4	200	2.0	9 609	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	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
					Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Franklin	23	6.1	1 424	4.2	652	.9	39 918	1.3	531	1.1	14 816	1.8
Geary	17	5.3	3 164	6.1	166	1.3	20 423	2.2	136	1.6	8 459	2.5
Gove	75	2.8	14 499	2.2	267	1.4	90 866	.5	207	1.7	17 723	1.5
Graham	40	3.8	8 814	3.0	224	1.5	40 565	1.1	208	1.6	15 836	1.5
Grant	150	1.4	108 674	.7	87	2.4	170 446	.1	66	3.0	(D)	(D)
Gray	259	1.1	165 311	.6	185	1.5	182 336	.3	89	2.5	(D)	(D)
Greely	33	3.7	17 734	2.6	82	2.3	62 927	.8	42	3.6	(D)	(D)
Greenwood	6	8.4	325	11.2	420	1.1	92 828	.9	343	1.3	27 583	1.6
Hamilton	48	3.1	22 292	2.3	86	2.5	88 012	.4	64	3.0	(D)	(D)
Harper	10	8.8	1 263	6.9	309	1.4	49 918	1.0	221	1.8	11 607	1.6
Harvey	120	1.9	28 061	1.3	345	1.1	34 199	.9	225	1.5	6 507	2.0
Haskell	159	1.0	176 247	.4	66	2.3	221 182	.1	33	4.0	(D)	(D)
Hodgeman	98	2.3	23 999	1.7	194	1.6	77 800	.6	117	2.5	6 695	2.8
Jackson	1	41.9	(D)	(D)	725	.9	46 501	1.4	622	1.0	23 018	1.6
Jefferson	25	5.4	2 176	4.0	677	.9	38 328	1.5	584	1.0	15 808	1.8
Jewell	34	5.1	7 952	4.4	357	1.5	35 831	1.7	299	1.7	15 409	2.0
Johnson	29	5.5	1 432	7.0	293	1.5	22 887	1.7	241	1.8	6 919	3.2
Kearny	98	1.9	79 971	.8	92	2.3	106 275	.2	72	2.7	(D)	(D)
Kingman	54	3.0	12 124	2.2	481	1.0	49 907	1.2	390	1.2	20 043	1.3
Kiowa	78	2.4	40 368	.9	156	1.8	35 016	1.0	123	2.2	(D)	(D)
Labette	9	10.6	(D)	(D)	698	.8	64 532	1.0	626	.9	22 668	1.3
Lane	44	3.0	14 326	1.3	130	2.1	86 511	.4	90	2.8	7 001	2.3
Leavenworth	14	8.4	132	16.5	693	.9	32 377	1.1	600	1.0	13 578	1.4
Lincoln	8	9.4	736	12.1	270	1.4	35 683	1.6	248	1.5	17 630	1.8
Linn	3	22.1	5	20.7	502	.9	39 461	1.3	431	1.1	15 786	1.7
Logan	48	2.5	16 435	1.4	166	1.8	33 384	1.0	130	2.1	(D)	(D)
Lyon	4	12.0	(D)	(D)	491	1.1	73 446	.8	380	1.3	15 213	1.7
McPherson	154	1.9	29 410	1.8	563	1.0	56 142	.8	417	1.2	15 668	1.5
Marion	20	5.7	2 263	3.7	606	1.0	79 361	.8	409	1.4	19 267	1.5
Marshall	12	8.1	1 292	10.5	576	1.3	42 784	1.6	477	1.4	16 878	1.9
Meade	164	1.7	115 363	.9	185	1.8	55 776	.9	117	2.6	(D)	(D)
Miami	16	6.9	583	6.2	825	.8	50 145	1.0	707	.9	19 144	1.4
Mitchell	30	3.8	5 153	3.3	271	1.6	49 185	1.0	227	1.8	14 351	1.6
Montgomery	17	5.5	1 365	.9	748	.7	40 621	1.4	676	.8	20 174	1.4
Morris	7	8.4	484	9.8	352	1.4	53 738	1.4	283	1.7	17 487	2.1
Morton	67	2.7	42 008	1.4	107	2.5	20 067	1.5	82	3.0	6 210	3.1
Nemaha	3	11.4	95	23.4	636	1.2	61 845	1.2	442	1.5	16 167	1.7
Neosho	3	17.8	(D)	(D)	519	.9	48 535	1.1	462	1.1	16 513	1.5
Ness	30	5.3	3 093	6.3	335	1.4	40 655	1.5	252	1.7	18 177	1.7
Norton	46	3.7	7 793	3.1	249	1.5	40 881	1.4	228	1.6	19 195	1.6
Osage	15	7.3	1 228	13.0	504	1.1	33 162	1.3	413	1.2	12 323	1.8
Osborne	73	3.1	8 227	3.9	274	1.5	37 464	1.6	238	1.6	18 641	1.7
Ottawa	27	4.7	4 050	4.6	290	1.5	45 552	1.5	229	1.8	14 030	2.4
Pawnee	134	1.8	70 129	.9	179	1.5	101 092	.3	150	1.7	(D)	(D)
Phillips	32	5.0	9 275	3.0	346	1.4	54 539	1.5	313	1.5	26 892	1.7
Pottawatomie	58	2.9	12 753	.9	528	1.1	66 067	1.1	462	1.2	25 070	1.5
Pratt	122	1.6	73 127	.7	202	1.5	77 078	.3	139	2.1	6 950	1.6
Rawlins	81	2.9	15 486	2.4	252	1.6	41 206	1.2	226	1.7	21 954	1.3
Reno	145	2.3	28 018	1.7	693	1.1	84 054	1.0	510	1.3	20 983	1.6
Republic	149	2.3	42 996	1.8	431	1.2	61 413	.8	381	1.3	16 693	1.7
Rice	61	2.3	21 689	1.3	296	1.3	46 313	.8	233	1.5	11 420	1.9
Riley	30	5.2	3 445	7.8	280	1.4	28 500	1.5	246	1.6	(D)	(D)
Rooks	14	5.9	1 658	8.3	265	1.4	51 693	1.1	245	1.5	19 209	1.5
Rush	47	4.2	6 224	3.6	242	1.8	22 179	2.0	207	2.0	9 033	2.2
Russell	2	24.4	(D)	(D)	286	1.4	30 507	1.5	244	1.6	14 819	1.7
Saline	35	4.9	2 369	6.7	354	1.4	42 771	1.3	294	1.6	16 678	1.8
Scott	123	1.6	46 390	1.0	117	1.8	228 753	.1	56	3.2	5 932	1.4
Sedgwick	144	2.1	27 985	1.5	612	1.1	37 484	1.0	419	1.3	10 692	1.4
Seward	91	1.7	79 987	.6	100	2.2	131 675	.2	66	3.1	(D)	(D)
Shawnee	56	3.3	12 402	1.9	411	1.1	21 902	1.7	343	1.3	9 744	1.7
Sheridan	179	1.5	63 902	.8	248	1.3	63 083	.8	214	1.5	17 266	1.4
Sherman	206	1.6	98 151	.9	154	2.1	35 095	1.2	115	2.6	(D)	(D)
Smith	56	3.3	6 438	3.3	347	1.3	51 656	1.3	300	1.5	20 230	1.8
Stafford	163	1.7	70 982	.9	218	1.6	67 866	.5	177	1.9	(D)	(D)
Stanton	132	1.6	108 532	.8	67	2.9	67 862	.2	45	3.9	(D)	(D)
Stevens	141	1.4	162 336	.4	112	2.0	63 449	.6	95	2.2	(D)	(D)
Sumner	30	4.7	4 538	4.8	545	1.0	40 380	1.0	423	1.2	12 247	1.5
Thomas	182	1.7	88 184	.8	196	1.9	56 844	.8	153	2.2	(D)	(D)
Trego	29	4.7	4 029	4.1	270	1.4	43 495	1.3	240	1.5	16 432	1.9
Wabaunsee	22	5.2	5 840	2.8	391	1.1	56 587	1.2	319	1.3	20 517	1.5
Wallace	82	2.5	42 071	1.5	134	2.1	26 595	1.4	108	2.5	(D)	(D)
Washington	41	4.1	6 581	3.1	535	1.1	61 739	1.0	466	1.3	23 180	1.3
Wichita	147	1.8	64 714	1.1	138	2.0	130 248	.3	90	2.7	(D)	(D)
Wilson	7	9.7	545	6.6	375	.8	33 565	1.1	342	.9	15 617	1.2
Woodson	3	16.5	(D)	(D)	293	1.0	29 645	1.6	262	1.2	10 703	1.8
Wyandotte	7	10.5	18	14.3	82	3.0	3 379	4.8	66	3.6	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Kansas</b> .....	<b>1 466</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>82 080</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>2 831</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>1 585 224</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>1 478</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>119 099</b>	<b>1.2</b>
Allen .....	24	5.7	1 330	3.9	24	6.1	3 683	7.3	13	9.0	196	11.7
Anderson .....	34	4.6	1 342	3.5	30	5.1	28 621	1.1	21	6.2	1 177	5.5
Atchison .....	26	5.3	794	5.8	58	3.8	9 080	4.7	7	12.3	167	16.7
Barber .....	9	6.6	866	2.8	6	11.9	736	8.6	11	8.3	1 109	14.7
Barton .....	14	6.0	711	2.5	22	5.4	3 122	3.3	10	9.2	548	11.9
Bourbon .....	24	6.1	696	5.6	34	4.7	3 275	4.2	22	6.6	346	9.7
Brown .....	17	5.2	1 067	3.4	40	3.9	25 776	1.6	19	7.2	1 418	10.5
Butler .....	19	5.8	594	3.3	86	2.4	45 713	1.2	40	4.6	1 887	5.1
Chase .....	8	8.2	372	6.2	11	6.2	6 281	1.9	9	9.4	313	15.7
Chautauqua .....	5	12.1	16	17.3	19	6.8	2 200	11.1	9	9.6	257	11.3
Cherokee .....	8	11.1	116	19.5	32	5.6	2 808	9.6	4	14.3	61	17.8
Cheyenne .....	4	16.1	31	25.4	11	6.4	2 829	3.3	3	20.9	(D)	(D)
Clark .....	—	—	—	—	3	24.3	(D)	(D)	7	10.4	957	15.8
Clay .....	17	8.5	517	9.4	68	3.4	42 547	1.4	12	10.2	1 221	25.6
Cloud .....	11	9.3	337	7.4	16	7.2	4 924	6.3	10	8.8	387	8.3
Coffey .....	6	11.7	150	2.9	8	9.2	648	3.3	17	7.8	2 970	11.2
Comanche .....	6	11.5	273	13.8	2	20.0	(D)	(D)	2	20.0	(D)	(D)
Cowley .....	19	7.1	688	5.6	59	4.0	16 254	2.9	29	5.2	2 373	6.3
Crawford .....	16	7.4	636	5.6	24	6.1	1 256	10.4	12	9.5	507	12.7
Decatur .....	3	10.9	161	2.4	22	4.8	9 331	3.2	2	16.4	(D)	(D)
Dickinson .....	22	5.9	1 219	3.3	52	3.7	13 002	2.8	27	5.6	2 872	12.6
Doniphan .....	10	7.9	513	6.8	30	5.4	3 720	4.4	17	7.4	850	13.0
Douglas .....	18	5.9	1 129	4.4	33	4.7	6 218	3.3	35	4.8	631	7.2
Edwards .....	—	—	—	—	6	10.2	69	6.3	1	46.6	(D)	(D)
Elk .....	7	12.8	119	24.4	16	7.7	2 645	4.4	10	9.4	316	10.2
Ellis .....	12	8.9	629	10.3	16	7.5	1 074	5.1	13	8.8	420	9.6
Ellsworth .....	12	7.3	222	7.6	12	8.2	2 531	3.0	6	12.7	1 036	13.7
Finney .....	6	12.0	60	16.3	16	7.4	2 461	7.7	12	9.8	350	21.0
Ford .....	5	16.0	47	26.9	16	8.1	1 988	14.3	14	8.0	450	5.2
Franklin .....	50	3.9	2 511	3.2	62	3.6	10 480	2.3	23	6.7	751	10.8
Geary .....	10	6.9	484	4.7	21	5.5	24 816	.5	1	23.5	(D)	(D)
Gove .....	9	7.6	449	5.1	10	9.2	3 077	5.3	10	11.0	2 913	9.1
Graham .....	8	7.5	363	6.6	11	8.7	6 507	4.7	4	17.4	263	23.7
Grant .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	6	10.6	173	21.6	3	21.2	47	24.3
Gray .....	2	13.4	(D)	(D)	9	7.6	(D)	(D)	3	15.3	(D)	(D)
Greeley .....	1	33.8	(D)	(D)	8	8.0	2 419	4.7	3	18.2	(D)	(D)
Greenwood .....	17	4.9	968	1.9	10	8.1	1 323	10.9	17	6.7	464	8.4
Hamilton .....	4	10.5	(D)	(D)	1	42.0	(D)	(D)	7	9.9	123	17.8
Harper .....	7	10.8	125	1.7	10	8.5	363	1.8	16	8.0	540	14.5
Harvey .....	31	4.1	1 449	3.3	60	3.0	17 476	2.9	27	5.0	2 609	7.6
Haskell .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	2	18.5	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)
Hodgeman .....	6	14.6	399	7.5	5	14.0	53	14.4	8	10.2	2 073	16.7
Jackson .....	30	5.7	595	7.6	57	4.1	4 781	7.8	19	6.3	1 119	3.5
Jefferson .....	40	4.1	1 819	2.9	45	4.2	4 872	6.8	18	6.5	457	8.8
Jewell .....	13	9.1	492	6.7	47	3.6	25 775	1.2	19	7.0	3 520	5.7
Johnson .....	16	6.4	2 085	1.8	14	9.2	2 839	4.5	16	9.4	277	12.0
Kearny .....	4	13.8	(D)	(D)	12	7.9	1 306	1.1	4	13.8	(D)	(D)
Kingman .....	13	7.0	694	2.4	24	5.4	3 729	4.0	24	5.7	1 254	11.9
Kiowa .....	1	33.1	(D)	(D)	9	9.9	3 165	6.2	4	15.6	129	21.8
Labette .....	19	6.7	709	6.3	29	5.1	983	11.2	23	5.7	823	6.9
Lane .....	—	—	—	—	9	8.6	370	24.2	2	13.3	(D)	(D)
Leavenworth .....	33	4.5	2 591	2.5	59	3.7	9 141	3.3	19	7.4	701	10.3
Lincoln .....	4	10.7	197	10.0	15	7.9	904	14.5	13	8.9	675	14.7
Linn .....	12	7.3	757	5.2	25	5.4	13 337	3.3	7	12.7	76	17.3
Logan .....	3	11.6	(D)	(D)	7	11.0	885	19.6	4	14.6	74	19.1
Lyon .....	12	6.7	412	5.7	31	4.9	6 385	3.1	17	6.8	657	8.7
McPherson .....	42	3.7	1 868	3.2	60	3.0	29 823	1.5	49	4.2	4 416	4.6
Marion .....	52	3.6	3 077	2.6	91	2.9	27 749	2.1	36	5.0	2 077	7.2
Marshall .....	46	4.5	1 866	4.5	102	2.9	26 172	2.7	19	7.7	1 064	13.2
Meade .....	2	23.8	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	6	12.0	433	16.2
Miami .....	28	5.5	832	6.4	45	4.3	3 408	8.1	27	5.8	741	8.3
Mitchell .....	3	20.3	220	13.4	30	4.9	24 482	2.2	17	8.1	752	11.7
Montgomery .....	22	6.5	443	8.5	33	4.2	27 599	.6	18	6.1	1 054	13.5
Morris .....	16	8.2	596	8.6	22	7.1	2 528	7.5	7	15.6	238	20.1
Morton .....	3	19.7	7	20.0	5	13.5	(D)	(D)	3	18.1	(D)	(D)
Nemaha .....	85	2.9	5 391	2.1	154	2.2	105 237	1.1	28	5.6	1 019	11.7
Neosho .....	19	5.3	1 230	3.1	36	5.0	8 312	7.1	22	5.9	716	6.8
Ness .....	6	13.7	80	20.5	8	9.2	203	22.0	8	10.8	1 149	22.9
Norton .....	3	22.1	146	11.5	17	6.6	50 891	.2	9	10.1	320	11.7
Osage .....	13	7.7	262	7.8	28	5.6	3 168	8.2	17	7.3	461	9.4
Osborne .....	7	8.7	250	9.8	21	5.7	6 758	2.0	15	8.1	1 663	15.5
Ottawa .....	17	7.5	250	8.1	20	6.6	3 734	8.3	16	7.6	1 011	11.1
Pawnee .....	1	35.0	(D)	(D)	12	9.2	1 735	10.8	4	11.5	930	1.7
Phillips .....	10	8.2	257	10.7	41	4.5	26 794	2.2	21	6.0	1 460	8.6
Pottawatomie .....	24	6.4	559	7.9	83	3.1	29 289	2.0	22	6.5	1 329	9.2
Pratt .....	9	8.2	267	7.8	13	7.0	(D)	(D)	11	8.3	457	11.0
Rawlins .....	6	5.8	223	.3	17	8.2	2 571	10.0	4	17.4	80	14.8
Reno .....	103	2.8	3 755	2.9	55	4.1	20 425	2.0	86	3.1	4 711	3.3
Republic .....	8	11.3	241	11.6	31	4.5	8 452	3.4	14	7.0	11 434	.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	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)
Rice	7	12.1	230	13.8	13	8.2	11 580	2.8	13	7.9	1 107	6.2
Riley	5	12.3	(D)	(D)	37	4.7	14 376	3.2	11	10.4	3 727	2.4
Rooks	7	8.3	430	5.8	9	10.0	649	11.0	15	8.0	968	12.6
Rush	5	14.6	52	23.3	4	17.9	18	18.0	3	21.1	(D)	(D)
Russell	12	8.3	230	9.0	10	11.1	2 695	13.4	14	8.1	574	9.5
Saline	14	6.7	681	5.2	20	6.6	3 354	5.8	12	9.1	940	13.6
Scott	—	—	—	—	17	5.6	32 631	1.1	7	10.4	156	15.5
Sedgwick	63	2.8	4 797	1.9	38	4.7	9 409	1.5	46	3.9	11 483	2.4
Seward	2	22.0	(D)	(D)	10	5.9	(D)	(D)	4	12.6	37	17.3
Shawnee	9	9.7	301	13.2	24	5.6	2 090	8.2	7	11.0	99	13.2
Sheridan	7	11.1	595	4.8	29	5.0	6 604	3.2	5	13.2	(D)	(D)
Sherman	4	12.7	(D)	(D)	16	7.5	750	17.7	13	7.4	1 284	12.5
Smith	13	7.8	450	7.6	45	4.2	15 655	2.4	17	6.8	1 013	6.6
Stafford	2	23.3	(D)	(D)	11	8.6	5 069	2.6	5	17.9	595	33.8
Stanton	2	19.4	(D)	(D)	4	13.6	(D)	(D)	5	13.2	(D)	(D)
Stevens	3	14.7	(D)	(D)	7	12.8	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Sumner	16	5.1	1 255	4.5	37	4.4	6 993	2.9	46	4.3	2 941	4.1
Thomas	1	35.0	(D)	(D)	9	9.5	1 287	23.4	14	8.8	1 847	6.0
Trego	8	10.0	308	12.3	8	9.5	2 536	8.5	5	13.8	184	18.6
Wabaunsee	13	6.3	433	3.5	21	5.2	9 853	.8	8	10.6	(D)	(D)
Wallace	1	35.7	(D)	(D)	8	11.1	2 154	14.5	11	9.0	659	11.6
Washington	20	5.6	1 511	3.1	107	2.5	111 825	.7	22	6.7	579	8.4
Wichita	1	49.5	(D)	(D)	6	12.1	2 248	15.9	7	10.0	425	14.2
Wilson	14	5.8	481	4.6	27	4.7	8 786	2.8	3	8.8	(D)	(D)
Woodson	—	—	—	—	13	8.0	1 495	12.4	12	8.1	830	11.8
Wyandotte	3	20.2	(D)	(D)	6	13.5	(D)	(D)	7	13.3	47	20.2

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)
<b>Kansas</b>	<b>1 964</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>1 427 290</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>35 018</b>	<b>8.3</b>
Allen	26	6.3	660	9.4	1	36.7	(D)	(D)
Anderson	30	5.9	1 233	11.4	1	31.3	(D)	(D)
Atchison	28	5.8	865	11.9	—	—	—	—
Barber	3	14.8	45	14.8	—	—	—	—
Barton	26	5.3	(D)	(D)	2	19.8	(D)	(D)
Bourbon	26	6.1	609	9.0	1	25.5	(D)	(D)
Brown	14	8.9	299	9.4	—	—	—	—
Butler	69	3.0	6 572	.9	2	23.5	(D)	(D)
Chase	14	6.1	441	14.7	1	26.2	(D)	(D)
Chautauqua	11	8.9	186	9.6	—	—	—	—
Cherokee	17	7.1	542	20.7	—	—	—	—
Cheyenne	12	8.4	283	10.2	—	—	—	—
Clark	1	31.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Clay	17	7.5	(D)	(D)	1	38.7	(D)	(D)
Cloud	14	8.6	248	12.4	—	—	—	—
Coffey	15	7.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Comanche	3	21.3	46	21.0	—	—	—	—
Cowley	34	5.2	708	7.5	—	—	—	—
Crawford	21	7.2	444	10.5	—	—	—	—
Decatur	11	8.5	294	6.9	—	—	—	—
Dickinson	18	7.0	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)
Doniphan	15	8.7	362	14.6	—	—	—	—
Douglas	40	4.6	893	7.7	4	16.1	665	22.8
Edwards	3	18.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Elk	17	7.4	614	14.4	1	35.6	(D)	(D)
Ellis	28	6.5	614	12.2	—	—	—	—
Ellsworth	19	6.8	418	7.3	—	—	—	—
Finney	9	9.3	224	8.1	1	34.0	(D)	(D)
Ford	13	7.6	328	12.0	—	—	—	—
Franklin	43	4.9	1 943	12.0	5	16.3	(D)	(D)
Geary	11	8.4	253	9.1	1	37.9	(D)	(D)
Gove	11	8.8	302	8.8	—	—	—	—
Graham	5	12.2	77	14.9	—	—	—	—
Grant	7	12.1	242	20.4	1	33.1	(D)	(D)
Gray	8	10.7	115	12.0	—	—	—	—
Greeley	1	33.8	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Greenwood	18	7.2	587	13.7	—	—	—	—
Hamilton	10	8.3	191	12.5	—	—	—	—
Harper	9	11.7	299	14.6	1	43.6	(D)	(D)
Harvey	34	4.6	(D)	(D)	5	13.3	(D)	(D)
Haskell	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hodgeman	13	8.7	348	9.6	—	—	—	—
Jackson	38	5.1	625	5.6	2	24.7	(D)	(D)
Jefferson	45	4.3	1 193	5.8	5	14.3	(D)	(D)

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.											
	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)				
Jewell	14	7.3	189	8.0	1	33.5	(D)	(D)				
Johnson	23	7.3	1 066	19.8	2	28.8	(D)	(D)				
Kearny	13	8.2	533	13.3	—	—	—	—				
Kingman	24	5.6	689	8.2	2	22.5	(D)	(D)				
Kiowa	3	23.6	64	22.8	—	—	—	—				
Labelle	19	7.3	403	9.3	1	29.9	(D)	(D)				
Lane	5	12.9	45	12.5	—	—	—	—				
Leavenworth	51	4.4	965	5.8	1	30.6	(D)	(D)				
Lincoln	13	8.9	262	11.6	—	—	—	—				
Linn	29	5.8	573	6.5	1	34.4	(D)	(D)				
Logan	12	7.5	332	13.5	—	—	—	—				
Lyon	21	6.3	407	8.6	1	26.2	(D)	(D)				
McPherson	58	3.3	353 624	(L)	8	9.4	1 047	10.2				
Marion	37	5.1	2 123	14.9	—	—	—	—				
Marshall	18	8.7	612	12.7	—	—	—	—				
Meade	8	11.6	150	11.6	—	—	—	—				
Miami	63	3.8	1 656	8.3	7	9.8	1 205	11.9				
Mitchell	9	8.9	417	15.1	—	—	—	—				
Montgomery	37	5.0	731	8.3	1	43.7	(D)	(D)				
Morris	14	9.1	558	18.9	—	—	—	—				
Morton	2	15.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Nemaha	21	7.1	(D)	(D)	2	23.7	(D)	(D)				
Neosho	20	7.4	397	11.4	1	28.9	(D)	(D)				
Ness	10	8.9	566	12.0	1	—	(D)	(D)				
Norton	17	7.7	446	8.3	2	23.1	(D)	(D)				
Osage	36	5.2	750	7.4	—	—	—	—				
Osborne	10	8.8	162	11.9	—	—	—	—				
Ottawa	22	6.4	418	6.2	1	47.8	(D)	(D)				
Pawnee	6	10.2	169	13.2	—	—	—	—				
Phillips	15	8.5	352	7.4	—	—	—	—				
Pottawatomie	21	6.9	756	17.4	1	30.8	(D)	(D)				
Pratt	8	11.6	445	21.7	—	—	—	—				
Rawlins	7	12.6	109	13.7	—	—	—	—				
Reno	65	3.6	68 260	.2	5	14.0	5 765	17.5				
Republic	16	7.7	457	9.1	2	15.8	(D)	(D)				
Rice	11	10.1	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Riley	15	8.9	298	11.2	—	—	—	—				
Rooks	10	10.0	201	9.8	1	31.2	(D)	(D)				
Rush	12	9.6	225	12.3	—	—	—	—				
Russell	20	7.0	601	10.9	—	—	—	—				
Saline	38	5.1	724	6.6	2	27.1	(D)	(D)				
Scott	3	20.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Sedgwick	53	4.2	(D)	(D)	1	27.3	(D)	(D)				
Seward	6	8.9	113	9.6	—	—	—	—				
Shawnee	36	4.4	670	5.1	5	10.6	101	13.8				
Sheridan	13	7.4	624	20.6	—	—	—	—				
Sherman	19	7.2	1 095	23.2	1	18.6	(D)	(D)				
Smith	23	6.2	481	7.4	1	35.3	(D)	(D)				
Stafford	5	12.9	115	16.2	—	—	—	—				
Stanton	2	26.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Stevens	8	10.2	102	10.1	—	—	—	—				
Sumner	31	5.2	483	6.6	—	—	—	—				
Thomas	9	10.8	160	13.5	—	—	—	—				
Trego	8	12.2	107	15.6	1	37.3	(D)	(D)				
Wabaunsee	22	6.0	570	10.6	—	—	—	—				
Wallace	8	10.9	279	11.9	1	—	(D)	(D)				
Washington	21	6.7	1 049	14.6	1	29.7	(D)	(D)				
Wichita	5	12.7	112	14.6	1	—	(D)	(D)				
Wilson	11	7.8	307	9.9	2	16.5	(D)	(D)				
Woodson	11	8.4	239	10.8	—	—	—	—				
Wyandotte	10	11.1	158	15.1	—	—	—	—				
Selected crops harvested												
Geographic area	Corn for grain or seed				Corn for silage or green chop							
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Acres		Quantity			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Kansas</b>	<b>10 833</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>2 497 516</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>356 413 100</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>1 765</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>117 472</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>2 042 941</b>	<b>.5</b>
Allen	79	2.7	11 178	1.3	1 083 938	1.6	6	9.6	384	3.6	6 522	3.5
Anderson	199	1.9	22 962	1.5	2 610 731	1.5	25	4.9	1 203	2.9	18 485	3.0
Atchison	284	1.5	42 120	1.3	4 009 392	1.3	37	4.2	1 036	5.1	13 773	7.2
Barber	14	6.1	2 541	5.0	430 824	5.0	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Barton	69	2.0	27 256	.8	4 574 137	.8	11	4.8	1 089	1.5	20 178	1.7
Bourbon	70	3.5	4 797	3.5	460 451	3.6	14	6.8	520	5.6	7 125	6.5
Brown	336	1.3	78 782	.9	8 011 789	.8	30	4.2	1 185	6.1	20 957	9.9
Butler	44	2.6	3 740	2.8	396 411	3.0	20	3.2	1 431	.6	22 859	.6
Chase	42	3.6	3 921	2.8	444 246	2.2	15	3.8	1 138	2.4	19 092	2.1

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed						Corn for silage or green chop					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Chautauqua	1	24.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cherokee	80	3.0	10 670	1.5	1 206 967	1.5	6	10.0	70	8.6	1 515	9.9
Cheyenne	144	1.8	42 472	1.2	5 537 597	1.2	33	3.2	2 281	2.2	24 694	2.8
Clark	10	3.2	(D)	(D)	914 732	.3	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Clay	83	3.1	11 647	1.8	1 737 828	1.8	19	5.5	758	3.1	13 371	3.8
Cloud	83	2.7	14 144	2.1	2 022 004	1.9	11	6.6	495	8.7	8 434	8.3
Coffey	113	2.5	10 746	1.7	1 235 365	1.8	5	9.6	507	6.8	8 895	5.8
Comanche	22	4.0	4 088	3.4	600 527	2.0	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cowley	17	4.9	1 787	2.5	186 885	3.1	15	3.7	1 371	1.2	23 419	.8
Crawford	118	2.5	14 938	1.5	1 740 347	1.5	3	10.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Decatur	155	1.8	45 355	1.3	3 699 254	1.3	17	5.3	796	5.5	10 310	4.8
Dickinson	87	2.3	5 838	3.1	631 002	2.4	60	2.6	1 952	2.6	28 045	2.6
Doniphan	300	1.4	63 939	1.1	7 722 876	1.1	22	4.6	475	3.0	8 415	3.4
Douglas	160	2.0	24 320	1.5	2 638 033	1.5	24	4.3	786	3.3	13 142	3.3
Edwards	102	1.7	47 138	.7	8 016 750	.7	9	—	1 166	—	22 140	—
Elk	8	10.8	432	7.8	56 808	6.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ellis	13	5.6	1 034	1.0	110 222	.6	6	10.3	200	7.1	1 610	8.5
Ellsworth	8	11.6	340	15.4	(D)	(D)	7	10.5	370	17.6	5 924	16.4
Finney	198	1.3	102 705	.5	17 922 940	.5	17	3.1	4 433	.8	83 435	.8
Ford	125	2.0	51 635	1.0	8 215 861	1.0	10	5.0	1 244	1.4	24 178	1.6
Franklin	192	1.9	19 946	1.4	2 202 042	1.3	37	3.7	1 858	4.3	27 651	4.6
Geary	36	3.9	2 468	2.9	313 069	2.6	9	5.3	713	3.1	7 371	3.4
Gove	88	2.4	18 258	2.1	2 185 817	2.2	14	4.6	1 233	3.1	20 657	3.1
Graham	71	2.7	17 463	1.5	1 773 178	1.9	7	6.0	429	1.2	7 253	1.1
Grant	122	1.6	57 117	.7	10 676 622	.8	4	8.3	827	3.0	12 378	.9
Gray	222	1.1	98 088	.6	18 210 403	.6	22	1.2	2 338	.5	55 078	.2
Greeley	37	3.4	16 154	2.3	2 216 594	2.3	6	9.3	591	10.3	14 067	10.3
Greenwood	49	3.3	3 859	3.2	405 372	3.0	12	5.1	899	2.8	13 275	2.3
Hamilton	24	3.5	9 515	.9	1 231 892	.9	10	6.0	1 592	3.2	31 225	2.6
Harper	9	7.4	2 863	.5	237 553	.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Harvey	90	2.0	14 243	1.1	2 187 462	1.2	19	3.9	1 602	1.2	20 702	1.2
Haskell	151	1.0	117 417	.4	22 815 314	.4	6	6.2	1 325	.1	32 856	.1
Hodgeman	49	3.4	7 136	2.9	1 155 397	2.7	43	3.2	5 078	2.0	106 521	1.9
Jackson	196	2.0	16 775	2.4	1 520 621	2.4	17	6.5	558	5.8	5 932	6.9
Jefferson	217	1.8	31 027	1.6	3 014 975	1.6	23	5.3	1 021	4.2	13 215	3.6
Jewell	112	2.7	13 627	2.6	1 438 864	2.9	9	9.2	394	6.1	5 472	6.2
Johnson	75	3.1	10 401	2.1	980 662	2.1	13	6.5	1 174	2.2	23 936	1.4
Kearny	81	1.9	47 409	.7	7 648 867	.5	16	3.6	1 585	2.6	35 409	2.4
Kingman	41	3.0	7 901	1.6	1 120 178	2.1	7	—	425	—	7 392	—
Kiowa	66	2.4	25 695	.6	4 616 237	.7	5	6.6	327	1.0	5 135	.5
Labette	41	4.1	2 347	4.3	252 676	4.5	10	9.5	525	12.3	8 395	16.1
Lane	49	2.9	10 076	1.5	1 276 223	1.4	14	4.9	1 893	1.9	37 088	1.5
Leavenworth	212	1.7	19 575	1.8	1 866 369	2.0	40	4.1	1 806	5.8	25 351	5.0
Lincoln	25	4.6	1 367	4.3	122 076	3.9	12	7.6	343	7.1	3 643	5.8
Linn	72	2.6	8 668	1.2	896 800	1.1	5	11.2	185	6.7	2 160	6.5
Logan	59	2.3	21 952	.9	2 591 497	1.1	8	5.9	589	2.6	9 261	2.7
Lyon	186	1.9	17 755	1.6	1 843 981	1.6	29	4.6	3 277	1.4	51 742	1.3
McPherson	146	1.9	16 526	1.7	2 645 822	1.7	35	3.5	1 816	4.5	25 726	3.1
Marion	91	2.8	5 374	2.4	544 336	2.2	54	2.9	2 501	2.5	33 314	2.6
Marshall	286	1.8	23 025	2.1	2 411 914	2.1	35	4.3	995	5.4	14 925	5.0
Meade	146	1.8	77 482	.8	14 308 838	.8	11	5.1	1 022	5.4	17 000	3.6
Miami	121	2.4	13 986	1.5	1 292 872	1.4	23	5.4	924	5.3	11 251	5.1
Mitchell	54	3.0	6 163	2.0	670 729	1.6	12	7.2	455	3.1	7 324	2.9
Montgomery	54	3.2	7 837	1.9	805 948	1.5	2	12.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Morris	75	3.6	4 523	4.2	490 126	4.1	18	6.5	1 245	6.6	19 759	6.3
Morton	45	3.0	16 359	1.6	2 918 894	1.6	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Nemaha	400	1.5	29 800	1.5	2 952 358	1.5	106	2.6	4 164	2.6	60 237	2.3
Neosho	82	2.9	7 980	2.4	912 504	2.4	5	9.0	318	10.8	4 560	7.5
Ness	16	5.3	2 413	3.3	280 808	3.5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Norton	113	2.1	29 201	1.5	2 632 851	1.7	11	6.0	583	2.7	9 744	2.7
Osage	169	1.9	15 017	2.3	1 656 719	2.5	12	6.7	308	6.6	4 325	6.4
Osborne	75	2.8	6 853	4.1	899 246	4.6	15	5.8	369	3.2	6 055	2.7
Ottawa	28	4.5	2 122	3.9	315 529	3.9	11	7.7	597	3.2	8 295	2.5
Pawnee	83	2.4	23 696	1.2	3 860 835	1.2	14	3.6	893	2.5	18 854	2.0
Phillips	72	3.1	18 215	1.7	2 006 309	2.1	15	6.9	1 394	2.6	22 109	2.3
Pottawatomie	149	2.2	17 632	1.3	2 113 459	1.3	35	3.4	2 718	1.2	47 451	.9
Pratt	118	1.6	59 298	.7	9 196 993	.8	4	—	367	—	7 910	—
Rawlins	142	2.1	34 095	1.5	2 675 812	1.6	12	7.0	308	6.0	5 457	3.7
Reno	80	2.7	13 613	1.6	2 055 359	1.7	50	3.8	1 342	4.0	23 679	4.2
Republic	282	1.6	58 672	1.3	7 158 445	1.4	24	5.3	1 109	7.4	19 244	15.7
Rice	46	2.3	12 745	1.1	2 189 188	1.2	15	3.1	994	2.8	20 986	2.0
Riley	63	3.3	5 222	4.0	553 697	4.0	27	5.4	1 100	5.1	14 654	4.9
Rooks	36	3.3	4 305	2.0	365 650	2.9	4	7.8	252	8.7	3 710	8.4
Rush	23	5.4	2 189	3.2	333 964	2.9	1	36.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Russell	9	8.8	680	7.1	57 214	7.8	1	30.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Saline	40	3.9	2 289	3.6	297 674	3.8	19	5.3	833	3.3	11 670	3.8
Scott	113	1.7	31 477	1.1	4 282 805	1.1	48	2.2	8 378	.9	172 599	1.0
Sedgwick	76	2.3	12 992	1.3	1 919 905	1.4	23	4.0	1 048	3.8	13 886	4.6
Seward	78	1.7	43 998	.5	7 646 663	.5	4	7.6	935	8.1	20 407	8.2
Shawnee	145	2.0	21 682	1.4	2 804 239	1.5	15	6.3	583	8.5	10 565	16.1

See footnotes at end of table.



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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested												
	Corn for grain or seed					Corn for silage or green chop							
	Farms		Acres		Quantity			Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Sheridan .....	190	1.5	75 621	.7	11 409 609	.7	22	4.3	1 272	4.0	19 845	4.4	
Sherman .....	194	1.6	70 730	.9	10 536 376	.8	20	5.2	1 124	4.5	18 667	7.2	
Smith .....	144	2.1	14 812	2.1	1 344 035	2.2	28	4.2	943	2.5	12 676	2.2	
Stafford .....	139	1.6	51 420	.9	8 428 103	.9	26	2.9	1 602	.9	29 247	1.0	
Stanton .....	111	1.7	57 918	.8	11 273 781	.7	7	—	1 551	—	39 289	—	
Stevens .....	133	1.3	103 391	.4	18 923 195	.4	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Sumner .....	49	2.4	6 106	2.9	513 163	2.6	17	3.7	932	3.0	12 149	2.6	
Thomas .....	213	1.6	102 225	.7	14 220 035	.7	16	3.1	1 782	1.6	23 888	2.4	
Trego .....	29	4.9	4 181	4.2	393 426	4.1	8	9.3	284	9.6	4 154	9.4	
Wabaunsee .....	86	2.8	10 821	2.6	1 228 990	2.6	23	5.5	986	5.6	12 138	4.8	
Wallace .....	81	2.5	30 658	1.7	4 049 433	1.8	7	5.4	296	3.9	4 829	2.8	
Washington .....	257	1.7	24 751	1.6	2 161 244	1.8	62	2.9	3 440	2.3	44 746	2.2	
Wichita .....	101	2.1	25 179	1.2	4 117 684	1.2	35	3.9	6 005	2.1	149 453	2.1	
Wilson .....	35	2.8	4 202	1.8	531 106	1.6	2	9.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Woodson .....	65	3.0	6 539	2.2	717 905	2.3	2	15.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Wyandotte .....	12	7.0	2 397	3.5	244 870	2.8	2	18.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.												
	Sorghum for grain or seed					Wheat for grain							
	Farms		Acres		Quantity			Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
<b>Kansas</b> .....	<b>20 398</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>3 077 984</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>231 561 211</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>30 392</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>9 560 615</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>407 515 802</b>	<b>.5</b>	
Allen .....	157	1.9	13 626	1.9	1 157 598	1.9	221	1.6	24 728	1.4	1 097 447	1.5	
Anderson .....	187	2.0	17 710	1.9	1 621 471	2.1	245	1.7	25 930	1.4	1 354 457	1.4	
Atchison .....	137	2.4	11 185	2.8	877 557	2.9	171	2.1	9 845	2.1	419 622	2.3	
Barber .....	46	3.3	5 879	2.3	332 057	2.3	262	1.4	121 444	1.1	4 616 138	1.2	
Barton .....	368	1.0	54 271	.9	4 262 744	.8	537	.8	174 290	.7	8 054 985	.7	
Bourbon .....	112	2.7	8 743	2.6	735 320	2.5	106	2.7	6 973	2.9	309 839	2.9	
Brown .....	206	1.9	19 478	2.0	1 807 382	2.0	229	1.7	18 515	1.3	919 940	1.2	
Butler .....	329	1.2	66 745	1.0	5 511 944	1.0	358	1.2	59 916	1.0	2 918 955	1.0	
Chase .....	69	2.6	5 949	3.1	460 275	3.2	96	2.1	12 574	2.5	587 680	2.4	
Chautauqua .....	19	5.7	2 082	4.4	145 903	4.1	45	3.5	6 963	4.2	298 546	3.9	
Cherokee .....	182	2.0	26 416	1.4	2 371 101	1.4	250	1.7	56 141	1.2	2 671 911	1.2	
Cheyenne .....	16	6.8	1 279	9.1	(D)	(D)	313	1.1	121 396	1.1	3 884 070	1.1	
Clark .....	63	3.2	12 833	2.0	764 919	2.6	142	1.7	73 148	1.3	2 349 924	1.3	
Clay .....	336	1.7	43 931	1.6	3 473 026	1.6	380	1.6	85 361	1.6	4 727 778	1.6	
Cloud .....	285	1.6	50 188	1.4	4 134 677	1.4	345	1.5	105 641	1.3	5 450 359	1.2	
Coffey .....	174	2.1	17 031	2.1	1 515 297	2.2	212	1.8	21 512	1.8	1 085 372	1.8	
Comanche .....	66	2.7	7 034	2.0	340 704	2.1	160	1.5	80 050	1.1	2 598 256	1.2	
Cowley .....	278	1.6	38 275	1.5	2 596 726	1.5	446	1.2	96 656	1.1	4 558 333	1.2	
Crawford .....	227	1.7	24 815	1.7	2 178 390	1.7	208	1.8	21 952	1.7	1 070 020	1.7	
Decatur .....	130	2.1	18 240	2.0	1 141 847	2.7	313	1.1	114 974	1.0	4 824 591	1.1	
Dickinson .....	475	1.1	65 095	1.0	5 411 050	1.0	578	1.0	152 668	.9	7 994 709	.9	
Doniphan .....	14	7.4	(D)	(D)	94 562	6.0	79	2.8	5 397	2.5	240 166	2.5	
Douglas .....	84	2.8	5 084	2.9	427 874	2.8	159	1.9	10 856	1.6	459 985	1.6	
Edwards .....	122	1.7	21 876	1.2	1 681 234	1.3	217	1.1	74 111	1.2	2 885 191	1.2	
Elk .....	47	3.9	3 615	3.5	268 913	2.9	88	2.9	8 290	4.0	341 484	4.1	
Ellis .....	204	2.3	23 303	2.2	1 571 186	2.3	445	1.5	111 880	1.6	4 274 650	1.7	
Ellsworth .....	222	1.6	26 964	1.7	1 931 396	1.8	286	1.3	90 401	1.3	4 391 543	1.3	
Finney .....	182	1.6	46 628	1.0	3 576 466	1.0	343	1.1	200 643	.7	8 285 003	.7	
Ford .....	259	1.6	50 690	1.3	3 944 863	1.3	441	1.3	175 940	1.0	5 466 120	1.1	
Franklin .....	174	2.0	13 087	2.0	1 149 568	2.0	163	2.1	11 836	2.5	540 736	2.3	
Geary .....	90	2.2	7 268	2.7	633 760	2.7	114	1.7	16 536	2.0	905 626	2.1	
Gove .....	204	1.6	38 353	1.4	3 126 320	1.4	340	1.1	147 462	1.0	6 263 258	1.0	
Graham .....	161	1.8	26 524	1.5	1 913 248	1.5	273	1.4	90 251	1.2	3 532 218	1.1	
Grant .....	110	1.7	27 830	1.6	1 575 865	1.8	172	1.3	84 373	.8	3 557 935	.7	
Gray .....	201	1.2	41 886	.9	3 154 323	.9	319	.9	135 326	.7	5 056 755	.6	
Greeley .....	57	2.7	11 279	1.3	674 772	1.4	195	1.2	161 412	.8	6 171 541	.7	
Greenwood .....	85	2.3	7 886	1.8	515 815	1.7	121	2.1	10 983	1.9	492 678	1.9	
Hamilton .....	67	2.3	19 870	1.5	946 303	1.6	158	1.6	128 995	.9	4 515 155	.9	
Harper .....	72	2.5	11 423	1.0	809 410	1.0	384	1.2	239 496	.8	9 654 214	.8	
Harvey .....	447	.8	78 254	.7	6 092 523	.7	500	.8	115 785	.7	6 064 429	.7	
Haskell .....	72	1.9	14 584	1.2	927 717	1.0	175	1.0	106 425	.6	4 193 971	.5	
Hodgeman .....	167	1.7	27 546	1.3	2 011 130	1.3	284	1.1	120 013	1.1	3 911 151	1.2	
Jackson .....	115	2.6	9 781	2.7	761 146	3.0	132	2.4	7 263	2.6	290 066	2.7	
Jefferson .....	94	2.8	6 703	2.9	560 119	2.9	105	2.7	5 424	2.2	219 501	2.3	
Jewell .....	357	1.5	61 621	1.2	4 803 671	1.1	410	1.4	121 992	1.2	5 486 174	1.1	
Johnson .....	24	6.1	1 580	5.3	119 501	5.4	67	3.3	7 629	2.6	313 919	2.6	
Kearny .....	72	2.2	19 512	1.4	1 264 074	1.5	153	1.4	114 482	.8	4 264 040	.7	
Kingman .....	163	1.9	12 360	1.9	808 613	1.8	506	1.0	216 044	.8	9 342 590	.9	
Kiowa .....	116	2.2	17 551	1.7	1 179 196	1.7	193	1.5	75 036	1.2	2 719 138	1.3	
Labette .....	263	1.6	31 729	1.4	2 569 272	1.4	299	1.5	47 799	1.4	2 317 780	1.4	
Lane .....	105	2.2	20 570	1.5	1 465 573	1.7	221	1.3	125 269	1.1	5 213 428	1.1	
Leavenworth .....	66	3.5	2 672	3.9	219 350	4.0	93	2.8	5 954	2.5	246 006	2.6	
Lincoln .....	271	1.3	34 977	1.3	2 685 190	1.3	350	1.1	100 765	1.2	5 072 168	1.1	
Linn .....	85	2.6	5 658	2.3	469 162	2.1	106	2.3	8 154	1.6	355 097	1.5	

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Sorghum for grain or seed					Wheat for grain						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Logan	91	2.5	14 591	1.6	844 856	1.8	259	1.2	131 960	1.0	4 777 797	1.0
Lyon	254	1.7	20 035	1.9	1 618 381	1.8	271	1.6	20 219	1.8	843 997	1.7
McPherson	611	.9	69 285	.9	5 926 501	.9	838	.8	209 797	.8	12 267 470	.8
Marion	535	1.2	81 375	1.1	6 330 563	1.2	663	1.1	132 289	1.1	6 731 484	1.2
Marshall	555	1.4	75 646	1.4	6 825 389	1.4	574	1.3	76 256	1.4	3 230 891	1.4
Meade	125	2.2	21 507	1.9	1 446 142	2.0	302	1.2	108 491	1.1	3 389 040	1.0
Miami	107	2.8	5 245	3.4	389 865	3.6	118	2.6	7 926	2.0	337 335	2.2
Mitchell	316	1.4	67 446	1.0	5 022 248	1.0	373	1.3	174 556	.9	8 345 372	.8
Montgomery	107	2.3	14 697	1.3	1 084 816	1.3	184	1.8	33 749	1.2	1 585 359	1.1
Morris	235	1.9	26 451	1.8	2 066 066	1.8	239	1.9	37 099	2.0	1 712 097	2.0
Morton	103	2.3	49 441	1.6	2 003 759	1.4	115	2.1	82 036	.9	2 542 217	.8
Nemaha	520	1.3	71 723	1.3	6 379 836	1.3	435	1.5	30 434	1.5	1 295 936	1.4
Neosho	201	1.8	20 443	1.8	1 768 781	1.8	194	1.8	31 420	1.2	1 302 672	1.3
Ness	160	2.1	20 982	1.9	1 325 392	1.7	415	1.2	161 691	1.1	5 878 367	1.1
Norton	133	2.3	20 571	2.7	1 451 539	2.6	280	1.3	100 354	1.2	3 915 381	1.2
Osage	275	1.5	29 223	1.8	2 551 040	1.7	194	1.9	12 089	2.1	514 412	2.2
Osborne	291	1.4	41 372	1.3	2 999 770	1.4	364	1.2	120 803	1.1	5 697 175	1.0
Ottawa	220	1.8	24 266	1.8	1 829 664	1.7	337	1.4	122 712	1.1	6 552 410	1.1
Pawnee	196	1.4	44 890	.9	3 594 389	.9	289	1.1	118 448	.8	5 047 314	.9
Phillips	260	1.6	36 449	1.6	2 609 958	1.6	363	1.3	101 598	1.3	4 141 813	1.3
Pottawatomie	243	1.7	17 471	1.5	1 402 631	1.6	234	1.7	16 010	1.7	713 432	1.8
Pratt	177	1.4	33 791	1.2	2 396 953	1.0	288	1.1	145 834	.7	5 420 142	.7
Rawlins	161	2.1	19 800	1.9	1 215 328	1.8	376	1.2	143 524	1.0	5 218 141	1.1
Reno	523	1.2	85 884	1.0	6 848 495	.9	782	1.0	229 316	.9	10 631 040	.9
Republic	392	1.3	55 723	1.3	3 972 278	1.3	456	1.2	87 187	1.2	3 779 577	1.2
Rice	315	1.2	72 413	.7	6 091 807	.7	358	1.0	147 544	.7	7 499 113	.7
Riley	185	1.8	19 771	2.2	1 587 415	2.3	240	1.5	26 164	1.8	1 304 909	1.9
Rooks	169	2.0	28 777	1.7	2 012 041	1.3	292	1.4	107 439	1.2	4 396 240	1.1
Rush	198	2.0	26 757	1.4	1 882 487	1.8	370	1.3	132 243	1.3	5 379 981	1.4
Russell	203	1.7	29 219	1.7	1 992 154	1.7	293	1.4	85 334	1.5	3 849 777	1.5
Saline	261	1.6	24 856	1.5	1 953 633	1.5	422	1.2	139 904	1.1	7 314 486	1.2
Scott	148	1.5	42 949	1.0	3 778 431	.9	250	1.0	151 091	.7	7 292 400	.6
Sedgwick	518	1.1	75 284	.9	5 625 283	.9	767	.9	208 951	.8	10 132 388	.8
Seward	82	2.2	30 691	.9	1 729 393	.8	118	1.8	69 880	.9	2 360 463	.8
Shawnee	122	2.2	11 381	2.1	928 557	2.2	132	2.2	9 022	2.8	426 491	2.8
Sheridan	149	1.9	19 335	1.9	1 532 974	1.9	359	1.0	108 644	1.0	4 300 090	1.0
Sherman	27	5.0	3 612	2.4	234 195	1.6	378	1.1	177 142	.8	5 888 779	.8
Smith	333	1.4	55 522	1.2	4 140 317	1.3	417	1.2	125 792	1.1	5 942 752	1.1
Stafford	225	1.5	38 637	1.4	2 662 532	1.3	312	1.2	114 203	.9	4 684 665	.9
Stanton	84	2.1	19 139	1.9	1 235 507	2.5	172	1.4	122 116	.8	4 698 490	.7
Stevens	152	1.4	84 314	1.0	3 381 834	.8	172	1.3	93 343	.6	3 291 366	.5
Sumner	437	1.1	84 991	.8	6 196 395	.9	763	.8	345 015	.6	17 052 005	.6
Thomas	149	2.0	23 325	1.6	1 527 239	1.6	448	1.1	206 238	.9	6 808 560	.9
Trego	161	2.0	20 905	1.9	1 479 686	1.9	302	1.2	97 082	1.3	3 155 311	1.3
Wabaunsee	166	1.9	14 545	1.6	1 142 777	1.5	153	2.1	9 139	2.3	402 644	2.3
Wallace	20	6.0	2 261	5.2	139 302	5.6	165	1.7	95 699	1.2	3 333 175	1.2
Washington	453	1.3	79 192	1.1	6 038 852	1.1	485	1.2	93 528	1.1	4 248 532	1.1
Wichita	128	2.0	23 356	1.5	1 948 570	1.4	237	1.3	135 002	.9	6 490 816	1.0
Wilson	169	1.3	24 982	1.1	2 407 770	1.0	210	1.2	34 035	1.0	1 712 517	1.0
Woodson	117	2.2	12 678	2.0	1 173 803	2.1	114	2.2	15 844	1.9	773 760	1.9
Wyandotte	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	12	7.9	1 524	8.2	68 573	8.3
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Oats for grain					Soybeans for beans						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>Kansas</b>	<b>2 603</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>79 163</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>4 530 823</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>14 733</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>2 208 642</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>78 563 054</b>	<b>.6</b>
Allen	31	5.2	860	4.5	68 814	4.6	294	1.3	61 085	1.3	2 161 200	1.2
Anderson	49	4.0	1 083	3.7	70 063	3.6	371	1.3	82 226	1.3	2 978 224	1.2
Atchison	57	3.7	1 228	4.8	69 104	5.1	369	1.3	57 550	1.3	1 826 426	1.4
Barber	14	8.2	470	11.0	15 316	11.6	10	7.9	788	2.9	31 895	2.7
Barton	16	5.4	475	8.3	20 357	8.1	63	2.3	10 789	1.4	535 835	1.4
Bourbon	27	6.2	658	5.6	47 075	5.7	240	1.8	34 878	2.1	1 167 331	2.3
Brown	61	3.7	1 223	3.8	96 995	3.8	420	1.2	100 320	.9	3 664 897	.8
Butler	16	7.0	418	8.3	17 995	9.0	246	1.4	32 633	1.2	1 200 356	1.1
Chase	13	5.8	251	5.5	15 330	3.9	106	2.0	15 220	2.1	580 071	2.2
Chautauqua	3	14.2	34	16.7	1 270	19.0	23	4.9	5 750	3.6	197 693	3.5
Cherokee	13	6.7	987	5.0	73 633	6.4	285	1.6	83 747	1.1	2 565 050	1.2
Cheyenne	6	7.6	142	6.1	5 252	3.2	7	6.5	1 146	4.0	56 558	3.9
Clark	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	3	11.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Clay	39	5.4	816	6.2	47 760	6.2	323	1.8	39 016	1.6	1 393 321	1.5
Cloud	60	3.8	2 138	5.0	145 800	5.1	144	2.2	14 085	2.1	506 741	2.1
Coffey	18	6.8	368	7.1	22 974	7.3	318	1.5	64 087	1.4	2 172 208	1.4
Comanche	7	7.9	685	5.0	27 240	4.4	11	5.6	1 527	6.1	74 429	5.1
Cowley	39	4.4	1 666	3.8	88 684	2.7	172	2.0	16 804	2.1	558 433	2.2
Crawford	27	5.3	860	5.1	56 127	4.9	348	1.4	63 365	1.3	2 065 446	1.2

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Oats for grain						Soybeans for beans					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Decatur	10	9.6	218	11.6	8 872	13.3	13	6.6	1 129	3.7	51 393	3.5
Dickinson	150	2.1	4 139	2.0	275 272	2.0	267	1.5	23 554	1.4	928 093	1.4
Doniphan	16	7.3	232	7.3	16 920	7.2	304	1.4	71 265	1.1	2 860 229	1.1
Douglas	37	4.4	1 753	1.8	149 715	1.8	269	1.5	45 932	1.3	1 690 751	1.3
Edwards	5	11.4	141	7.7	7 380	5.1	84	2.1	18 590	1.1	1 019 052	1.0
Elk	12	8.4	203	8.6	12 010	7.4	79	3.1	10 202	3.9	322 995	3.6
Ellis	4	15.5	62	18.8	2 400	18.5	1	35.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Ellsworth	24	4.9	673	7.1	31 309	8.9	22	5.2	2 115	5.0	70 454	5.5
Finney	5	11.2	162	9.8	10 549	4.8	45	2.6	5 955	1.9	289 062	1.6
Ford	9	9.6	322	11.2	18 088	10.6	24	3.3	3 029	1.4	161 304	1.1
Franklin	65	3.6	1 082	4.6	70 329	4.9	380	1.3	66 901	1.3	2 232 761	1.3
Geary	22	5.6	431	7.6	27 161	8.4	95	2.1	8 987	2.2	351 029	2.4
Gove	11	5.4	528	5.2	31 355	6.5	9	7.6	925	5.2	31 980	6.1
Graham	7	9.6	232	6.9	11 575	7.2	3	14.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Grant	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	4	8.3	430	2.3	13 726	3.0
Gray	4	—	447	—	21 676	—	30	3.2	3 793	2.0	178 341	2.4
Greely	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Greenwood	13	6.0	253	8.1	11 349	7.2	169	1.9	23 789	2.3	756 917	2.3
Hamilton	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Harper	13	8.2	919	19.2	30 647	20.0	14	6.5	1 390	5.9	57 238	8.1
Harvey	20	5.3	269	4.6	15 681	4.8	237	1.3	24 220	1.2	1 082 427	1.3
Haskell	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	31	2.0	4 009	2.0	173 514	1.8
Hodgeman	2	16.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	9	8.4	768	8.4	32 025	7.7
Jackson	27	5.4	388	5.7	25 510	5.6	290	1.6	35 961	1.8	1 162 344	1.8
Jefferson	46	3.9	1 054	4.3	62 398	4.7	281	1.6	43 678	1.5	1 413 132	1.6
Jewell	39	4.7	1 248	5.0	91 523	4.8	94	2.8	7 667	2.5	285 319	2.5
Johnson	19	6.6	520	4.7	42 938	3.9	148	2.3	26 387	2.1	831 802	2.0
Kearny	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	7	—	937	—	37 379	—
Kingman	35	4.2	1 100	2.6	52 525	2.3	49	3.4	5 184	3.0	233 908	3.0
Kiowa	3	15.5	29	15.3	1 856	15.3	60	2.8	10 846	1.6	620 882	1.4
Labette	115	2.5	3 231	3.2	198 093	4.0	298	1.5	48 595	1.4	1 311 294	1.4
Lane	3	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	6	8.3	541	3.5	23 943	3.2
Leavenworth	42	4.4	623	5.4	37 914	6.2	259	1.6	31 806	1.7	1 033 723	1.7
Lincoln	41	4.0	1 884	3.8	98 631	4.0	30	4.5	1 875	4.6	62 580	5.5
Linn	34	4.7	734	5.3	32 008	5.7	205	1.7	48 387	1.4	1 611 780	1.4
Logan	6	5.8	2 425	1.4	58 312	2.1	4	8.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lyon	44	4.1	546	4.9	31 880	4.9	440	1.2	59 872	1.3	2 101 273	1.4
McPherson	35	4.7	730	7.3	38 402	7.1	247	1.5	22 130	1.5	997 314	1.6
Marion	82	3.3	2 315	3.7	131 439	3.7	218	1.9	12 976	2.1	429 560	2.1
Marshall	55	4.3	1 101	5.1	67 101	5.9	609	1.3	86 400	1.3	2 969 832	1.3
Meade	3	12.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	29	4.0	3 514	4.8	184 184	4.8
Miami	54	3.9	1 132	4.2	73 314	3.9	289	1.6	46 383	1.3	1 412 956	1.3
Mitchell	22	6.1	1 054	9.0	63 097	9.1	49	3.6	5 059	4.3	181 163	4.8
Montgomery	41	4.1	1 215	4.6	65 060	5.5	192	1.7	41 963	1.3	1 198 363	1.3
Morris	59	4.1	1 650	5.1	108 493	5.6	213	2.0	24 309	2.5	963 976	2.6
Morton	1	33.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nemaha	80	3.3	1 544	3.7	100 835	3.9	575	1.3	57 569	1.5	2 054 415	1.5
Neosho	66	3.1	2 295	2.9	146 010	3.1	284	1.5	51 367	1.6	1 753 319	1.7
Ness	6	9.1	148	5.4	5 150	4.5	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Norton	14	5.4	601	8.0	31 582	5.4	10	7.8	416	11.4	21 103	11.3
Osage	36	4.9	772	5.5	50 357	5.1	399	1.2	62 727	1.3	2 060 117	1.3
Osborne	19	7.3	550	8.3	21 441	6.2	19	6.1	833	3.8	38 819	3.4
Ottawa	30	5.4	1 074	4.9	50 581	4.6	114	2.6	9 066	2.1	325 345	2.3
Pawnee	4	14.9	136	19.6	(D)	(D)	80	2.3	16 285	1.0	786 180	1.0
Phillips	21	6.6	452	7.9	32 967	7.6	13	8.7	549	6.1	25 109	6.6
Pottawatomie	33	5.0	566	7.1	35 233	10.4	308	1.5	33 593	1.6	1 227 311	1.5
Pratt	10	6.1	293	7.6	16 668	8.0	75	1.7	12 413	1.5	645 213	1.6
Rawlins	3	11.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	6	11.7	654	16.8	23 282	17.0
Reno	41	4.3	1 087	3.8	60 920	4.5	154	2.0	15 034	1.9	654 934	2.2
Republic	71	3.2	2 145	4.1	131 579	4.6	375	1.4	38 829	1.3	1 219 509	1.2
Rice	8	8.7	185	10.6	10 550	6.1	80	2.7	7 030	2.1	297 548	2.7
Riley	42	4.4	955	6.1	45 102	4.8	210	1.7	17 353	2.2	582 359	2.4
Rooks	18	5.6	881	7.6	37 203	7.6	4	—	113	—	(D)	(D)
Rush	8	9.1	147	10.2	8 850	9.7	25	5.4	1 647	5.7	74 241	5.1
Russell	10	10.1	205	8.7	7 991	7.3	5	12.8	745	22.7	29 090	23.3
Saline	34	4.7	1 189	9.5	75 190	8.8	128	2.4	9 812	2.0	402 866	2.1
Scott	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	11	7.6	1 379	3.2	54 947	3.4
Sedgwick	19	6.0	702	10.2	30 518	9.9	193	1.7	25 170	1.3	1 151 270	1.3
Seward	1	30.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	16	3.8	1 962	3.0	96 104	1.8
Shawnee	30	4.9	398	6.0	25 608	6.2	262	1.5	39 385	1.5	1 546 089	1.5
Sheridan	6	5.3	538	5.0	18 214	2.6	31	2.5	3 611	1.5	194 751	1.6
Sherman	4	14.3	26	14.0	1 344	14.0	24	5.3	3 024	4.9	136 707	4.1
Smith	25	5.8	562	11.2	38 373	12.2	61	3.1	3 932	2.7	148 745	2.8
Stafford	6	7.8	212	9.9	9 032	5.7	90	2.0	14 489	1.5	709 122	1.4
Stanton	2	19.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Stevens	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Sumner	27	4.8	1 178	3.5	39 208	2.5	243	1.5	34 898	1.3	1 153 288	1.3
Thomas	7	8.6	436	24.8	13 604	17.6	39	3.6	5 730	2.4	294 528	2.5
Trego	5	13.5	332	23.8	8 925	22.4	6	11.5	773	13.0	36 396	16.1
Wabaunsee	45	3.9	803	4.3	54 174	4.5	197	1.8	25 117	1.5	916 496	1.5

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Oats for grain					Soybeans for beans						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Wallace .....	6	12.4	372	9.4	25 676	11.5	3	—	314	—	12 168	—
Washington .....	82	3.1	2 157	3.1	156 941	2.7	384	1.4	44 853	1.1	1 289 071	1.0
Wichita .....	6	13.0	418	11.5	11 400	11.2	23	3.3	2 157	9.9	93 669	10.5
Wilson .....	13	4.8	748	8.2	39 701	6.1	233	1.1	59 050	1.0	1 938 960	1.0
Woodson .....	21	5.6	566	5.3	29 428	6.8	164	1.8	29 591	1.6	1 074 137	1.7
Wyandotte .....	4	12.6	86	11.1	6 048	11.1	23	6.4	5 315	7.6	173 528	3.3
	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)											
Geographic area	Farms		Acres		Quantity							
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry							
					Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Tons, dry		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
<b>Kansas .....</b>	<b>30 573</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>2 565 482</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>6 147 197</b>	<b>.6</b>						
Allen .....	403	1.1	33 722	1.7	59 644	2.0						
Anderson .....	419	1.2	42 581	1.6	73 259	1.7						
Atchison .....	376	1.3	20 913	1.7	39 465	2.0						
Barber .....	187	1.7	18 483	1.8	50 104	1.5						
Barton .....	402	1.0	54 359	1.0	171 293	1.0						
Bourbon .....	527	1.0	46 558	1.7	80 022	1.9						
Brown .....	304	1.4	16 922	1.4	38 086	1.3						
Butler .....	760	.8	67 169	1.3	111 306	1.2						
Chase .....	161	1.5	17 532	2.0	34 441	1.9						
Chautauqua .....	208	1.4	18 002	1.8	29 921	2.5						
Cherokee .....	344	1.4	19 876	1.8	35 167	2.3						
Cheyenne .....	129	2.2	9 264	1.9	29 048	1.9						
Clark .....	81	2.4	11 172	1.6	35 790	1.8						
Clay .....	325	1.8	21 531	3.1	42 845	3.5						
Cloud .....	305	1.6	22 278	2.1	55 745	2.1						
Coffey .....	301	1.5	41 294	1.6	60 035	1.7						
Comanche .....	109	1.9	12 200	2.0	31 522	2.2						
Cowley .....	500	1.1	37 737	1.4	72 165	1.6						
Crawford .....	414	1.2	24 432	1.9	42 068	2.1						
Decatur .....	149	2.0	10 816	1.9	40 389	1.8						
Dickinson .....	570	1.0	47 168	1.1	125 286	1.1						
Doniphan .....	221	1.7	8 224	2.2	18 896	2.6						
Douglas .....	502	1.0	29 863	1.7	56 501	2.0						
Edwards .....	105	1.9	15 945	1.0	62 858	1.2						
Elk .....	224	1.5	22 938	1.8	36 780	1.8						
Ellis .....	299	1.8	18 066	2.1	43 895	2.2						
Ellsworth .....	271	1.4	23 306	1.8	45 696	1.9						
Finney .....	137	2.1	56 538	.9	314 814	.7						
Ford .....	172	2.2	21 288	1.9	92 224	1.6						
Franklin .....	610	1.0	38 850	1.4	72 315	1.5						
Geary .....	138	1.5	17 141	2.2	35 651	2.4						
Gove .....	142	2.0	12 822	1.8	39 459	1.6						
Graham .....	130	2.1	11 828	2.7	36 937	3.2						
Grant .....	64	2.3	13 583	1.7	60 718	1.6						
Gray .....	84	2.1	23 642	1.5	131 879	1.6						
Greely .....	22	5.5	1 883	4.0	5 147	5.1						
Greenwood .....	337	1.3	47 126	1.4	73 510	1.3						
Hamilton .....	42	3.5	14 393	3.8	52 298	5.6						
Harper .....	217	1.7	14 754	1.4	35 967	1.4						
Harvey .....	394	1.0	18 166	1.2	40 953	1.2						
Haskell .....	38	3.0	5 272	3.1	23 326	4.1						
Hodgeman .....	109	2.4	8 432	2.3	31 923	2.2						
Jackson .....	628	1.0	46 817	1.5	77 347	1.7						
Jefferson .....	615	.9	37 037	1.7	58 059	2.0						
Jewell .....	331	1.5	24 272	2.0	61 277	2.3						
Johnson .....	315	1.5	19 955	2.5	36 846	2.4						
Kearny .....	84	2.2	24 349	1.5	140 176	1.5						
Kingman .....	375	1.2	26 991	1.3	64 559	1.5						
Kiowa .....	95	2.4	10 413	1.7	27 776	1.8						
Labelle .....	518	1.1	32 841	1.5	57 710	1.5						
Lane .....	51	3.8	2 557	3.6	5 863	4.7						
Leavenworth .....	682	.9	32 925	1.5	63 283	1.9						
Lincoln .....	274	1.3	26 970	1.8	69 135	1.9						
Linn .....	443	1.0	32 722	1.6	57 640	1.5						
Logan .....	60	3.4	3 741	3.2	10 981	3.4						
Lyon .....	515	1.0	61 327	1.4	85 020	1.4						
McPherson .....	569	1.0	28 507	1.3	72 231	1.5						
Marion .....	661	1.0	57 957	1.3	134 197	1.4						
Marshall .....	538	1.4	29 043	1.8	63 228	1.9						
Meade .....	101	2.7	11 568	2.3	38 585	2.3						
Miami .....	790	.8	48 576	1.3	92 943	1.5						
Mitchell .....	230	1.7	18 361	1.7	49 963	1.5						
Montgomery .....	513	1.0	34 287	1.5	58 022	1.4						
Morris .....	308	1.6	41 090	1.9	76 548	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	Selected crops harvested—Con.						
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Morton .....	28	4.2	4 311	2.2	20 643	1.8	
Nemaha .....	584	1.3	35 817	1.6	78 507	1.5	
Neosho .....	420	1.1	30 916	1.6	55 040	1.6	
Ness .....	179	2.1	10 566	2.0	33 898	1.9	
Norton .....	178	1.8	14 226	2.1	40 565	2.6	
Osage .....	522	1.0	46 626	1.4	74 183	1.6	
Osborne .....	257	1.5	19 892	2.3	45 528	2.6	
Ottawa .....	285	1.6	23 327	1.9	57 839	1.8	
Pawnee .....	165	1.7	33 028	1.2	132 068	1.4	
Phillips .....	283	1.6	24 052	1.8	72 230	1.9	
Pottawatomie .....	510	1.1	55 151	1.4	85 172	1.4	
Pratt .....	140	1.8	13 896	1.3	50 926	1.0	
Rawlins .....	186	1.8	18 031	1.8	61 927	1.9	
Reno .....	640	1.1	42 702	1.3	117 976	1.4	
Republic .....	399	1.3	24 258	1.6	55 501	1.6	
Rice .....	256	1.4	21 826	1.8	62 445	1.9	
Riley .....	277	1.4	19 653	2.1	35 623	2.1	
Rooks .....	207	1.7	18 295	2.1	51 928	2.7	
Rush .....	185	2.1	13 126	2.4	33 451	3.2	
Russell .....	246	1.6	22 290	2.1	48 777	2.4	
Saline .....	381	1.3	35 687	1.6	80 118	1.6	
Scott .....	34	4.3	2 185	7.0	6 925	8.5	
Sedgwick .....	675	1.0	38 275	1.2	96 585	1.3	
Seward .....	42	3.4	9 817	1.1	44 447	.9	
Shawnee .....	445	1.1	32 844	1.7	49 388	1.8	
Sheridan .....	147	2.0	10 771	2.7	41 306	2.6	
Sherman .....	88	2.7	9 220	2.8	30 141	3.5	
Smith .....	315	1.5	19 517	1.9	52 213	2.0	
Stafford .....	210	1.7	23 191	2.1	77 785	2.3	
Stanton .....	31	3.9	4 620	3.2	17 135	3.3	
Stevens .....	43	2.9	14 497	1.4	59 285	1.5	
Sumner .....	474	1.1	26 400	1.7	58 742	1.7	
Thomas .....	82	2.8	8 462	2.2	28 587	1.8	
Trego .....	182	1.8	11 475	2.5	30 383	2.2	
Wabaunsee .....	367	1.2	47 457	1.5	90 550	1.6	
Wallace .....	59	3.6	4 723	3.4	13 268	3.5	
Washington .....	448	1.3	31 279	1.4	63 480	1.3	
Wichita .....	61	3.1	6 395	3.5	20 542	3.5	
Wilson .....	315	.9	30 584	1.1	48 811	1.4	
Woodson .....	224	1.4	32 544	1.8	47 457	1.7	
Wyandotte .....	75	3.3	3 175	3.9	5 085	4.4	

<sup>1</sup>Data are based on a sample of farms.

**Table G. Coverage Estimates: 1997**

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

Item	Census total	Coverage total <sup>1</sup>	Adjusted census		Coverage adjustment (percent)
			Total	Relative standard error (percent)	
Farms ..... number..	61 593	3 827	65 420	1.8	5.8
Land in farms ..... acres..	46 089 268	-325 366	45 763 902	1.9	-7
Average size of farm ..... acres..	748	-85	700	(X)	(X)
<b>Farms by size of farm:</b>					
Less than 10 acres .....	2 223	-103	2 120	12.5	-4.9
10 to 49 acres .....	6 970	1 738	8 708	7.6	20.0
50 to 179 acres .....	15 118	1 580	16 698	4.1	9.5
180 acres or more .....	37 282	612	37 894	1.7	1.6
<b>Farms by value of sales:</b>					
Less than \$2,500 .....	10 968	2 334	13 302	5.9	17.5
\$2,500 to \$9,999 .....	11 835	951	12 786	4.2	7.4
\$10,000 or more .....	38 790	542	39 332	1.6	1.4
Market value of agricultural products sold ..... \$1,000..	9 207 130	35 417	9 242 547	.5	.4
<b>Farms by type of organization:</b>					
Individual or family .....	53 196	3 980	57 176	2.0	7.0
Partnership, corporation, or other .....	8 397	-153	8 244	4.2	-1.9
<b>Farms by tenure of operator:</b>					
Full owners .....	28 441	2 572	31 013	3.2	8.3
Part owners .....	25 423	523	25 946	1.3	2.0
Tenants .....	7 729	732	8 461	4.3	8.7
<b>Operators by place of residence:</b>					
On farm operated .....	40 640	2 658	43 298	1.9	6.1
Not on farm operated .....	16 678	249	16 927	3.7	1.5
Not reported .....	4 275	920	5 195	9.3	17.7
<b>Operators by principal occupation:</b>					
Farming .....	34 979	-148	34 831	1.9	-4
Other .....	26 614	3 975	30 589	3.1	13.0
<b>Operators by sex:</b>					
Male .....	57 807	3 101	60 908	1.9	5.1
Female.....	3 786	726	4 512	8.0	16.1
<b>Operators by race:</b>					
White .....	61 241	3 760	65 001	1.8	5.8
Black and other races .....	352	67	419	29.8	16.0
<b>Operators by years on present farm:</b>					
4 years or less .....	5 849	924	6 773	5.1	13.6
5 years or more .....	45 792	2 532	48 324	1.7	5.2
Not reported .....	9 952	371	10 323	6.9	3.6

<sup>1</sup> See text in Appendix C regarding coverage estimates.