

---

# 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 .....	8.9	Corn for grain or seed .....	2.9
Land in farms .....	6.2	Wheat for grain .....	1.9
Estimated market value of land and buildings <sup>1</sup> .....	6.6	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold .....	3.1	Cattle and calves .....	4.7
Harvested cropland .....	5.0	Hogs and pigs .....	4.2
		Layers 20 weeks old and older .....	2

<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 .....	5.2	25 .....	38.5
50 .....	3.8	50 .....	26.9
75 .....	3.1	75 .....	21.7
100 .....	2.8	100 .....	18.5
150 .....	2.4	150 .....	14.7
200 .....	2.1	200 .....	12.4
300 .....	1.9	300 .....	9.5
500 .....	1.6	500 .....	6.3
750 .....	1.5	750 .....	3.8
1,000 .....	1.4	1,000 .....	1.3
1,500 .....	1.3	1,500 .....	1.1
2,000 .....	1.3	2,000 .....	.9



**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 ..	31 757	.5	Total farm production expenses ..... farms ..	31 810	.5
Land in farms ..... acres ..	7 254 470	.4	Average per farm ..... dollars ..	2 191 903	.4
Average size of farm ..... acres ..	228	.6	Livestock and poultry purchased ..... farms ..	9 787	1.9
			..... \$1,000 ..	111 258	1.6
			Feed for livestock and poultry ..... farms ..	17 393	1.2
			..... \$1,000 ..	482 735	.7
			Commercially mixed formula feeds ..... farms ..	13 643	1.4
			..... \$1,000 ..	329 114	.9
			Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ..... farms ..	16 580	1.2
			..... \$1,000 ..	85 818	1.2
			Commercial fertilizer ..... farms ..	18 390	1.1
			..... \$1,000 ..	93 010	.9
			Agricultural chemicals ..... farms ..	15 392	1.2
			..... \$1,000 ..	75 892	1.1
			Petroleum products ..... farms ..	30 184	.6
			..... \$1,000 ..	97 075	.7
			Electricity ..... farms ..	23 839	.8
			..... \$1,000 ..	71 134	.8
			Hired farm labor ..... farms ..	11 563	1.6
			..... \$1,000 ..	336 357	.6
			Contract labor ..... farms ..	2 355	4.0
			..... \$1,000 ..	15 989	2.6
			Repair and maintenance ..... farms ..	28 200	.7
			..... \$1,000 ..	171 351	.8
			Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ..... farms ..	7 883	2.1
			..... \$1,000 ..	29 214	1.7
			Interest ..... farms ..	12 525	1.5
			..... \$1,000 ..	130 266	1.0
			Secured by real estate ..... farms ..	8 947	1.9
			..... \$1,000 ..	83 545	1.3
			Not secured by real estate ..... farms ..	7 324	2.1
			..... \$1,000 ..	46 721	1.4
			Cash rent ..... farms ..	8 363	1.9
			..... \$1,000 ..	48 093	1.5
			Property taxes ..... farms ..	30 136	.6
			..... \$1,000 ..	129 269	.9
			All other farm production expenses ..... farms ..	29 109	.6
			..... \$1,000 ..	314 442	.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) ..... farms ..	31 757	.5	All farms ..... number ..	31 810	.5
..... \$1,000 ..	2 834 512	.3	..... \$1,000 ..	514 724	1.2
Average per farm ..... dollars ..	89 256	.5	Average per farm ..... dollars ..	16 181	1.3
Farms by value of sales:			Farms with net gains <sup>2</sup> ..... number ..	15 498	1.1
Less than \$1,000 (see text) ..... farms ..	4 071	.6	..... \$1,000 ..	656 695	.9
..... \$1,000 ..	893	.9	Average net gain ..... dollars ..	42 373	1.4
\$1,000 to \$2,499 ..... farms ..	3 636	.6	Farms with net losses ..... number ..	16 312	1.0
..... \$1,000 ..	5 893	.6	..... \$1,000 ..	141 971	1.6
\$2,500 to \$4,999 ..... farms ..	3 424	.6	Average net loss ..... dollars ..	8 703	1.9
..... \$1,000 ..	12 263	.6			
\$5,000 to \$9,999 ..... farms ..	3 484	.7			
..... \$1,000 ..	24 642	.7			
\$10,000 to \$19,999 ..... farms ..	3 348	.8			
..... \$1,000 ..	46 749	.8			
\$20,000 to \$24,999 ..... farms ..	921	1.2			
..... \$1,000 ..	20 269	1.2			
\$25,000 to \$39,999 ..... farms ..	1 752	1.0			
..... \$1,000 ..	55 303	1.0			
\$40,000 to \$49,999 ..... farms ..	921	1.2			
..... \$1,000 ..	41 122	1.2			
\$50,000 to \$99,999 ..... farms ..	3 335	1.0			
..... \$1,000 ..	243 967	1.0			
\$100,000 to \$249,999 ..... farms ..	4 442	.7			
..... \$1,000 ..	685 785	.6			
\$250,000 to \$499,999 ..... farms ..	1 441	—			
..... \$1,000 ..	488 202	—			
\$500,000 or more ..... farms ..	982	—			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 209 424	—			
Sales by commodity or commodity group:					
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms ..	17 770	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 000 417	.2			
Grains ..... farms ..	4 611	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	179 531	.3			
Corn for grain ..... farms ..	3 277	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	118 608	.3			
Wheat ..... farms ..	1 838	.7			
..... \$1,000 ..	21 209	.4			
Soybeans ..... farms ..	933	.8			
..... \$1,000 ..	21 974	.5			
Sorghum for grain ..... farms ..	2	17.8			
..... (D)	(D)	(D)			
Barley ..... farms ..	195	1.7			
..... \$1,000 ..	(D)	(D)			
Oats ..... farms ..	1 140	.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	3 579	.9			
Other grains ..... farms ..	702	1.0			
..... \$1,000 ..	13 455	.7			
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms ..	—	—			
..... \$1,000 ..	—	—			
Tobacco ..... farms ..	1	—			
..... \$1,000 ..	(D)	(D)			
Hay, silage, and field seeds ..... farms ..	9 164	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	87 102	.6			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms ..	2 719	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	206 866	.2			
Fruits, nuts, and berries ..... farms ..	2 449	.7			
..... \$1,000 ..	185 078	.3			
Nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms ..	3 346	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	290 722	.3			
Other crops ..... farms ..	1 421	.8			
..... \$1,000 ..	(D)	(D)			
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms ..	18 536	.5			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 834 095	.3			
Poultry and poultry products ..... farms ..	1 140	.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	86 449	.1			
Dairy products ..... farms ..	8 162	.7			
..... \$1,000 ..	1 459 707	.3			
Cattle and calves ..... farms ..	15 494	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	197 978	.4			
Hogs and pigs ..... farms ..	1 001	.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	14 894	.9			
Sheep, lambs, and wool ..... farms ..	1 361	.9			
..... \$1,000 ..	3 413	1.7			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ..... farms ..	2 458	.7			
..... \$1,000 ..	71 655	.4			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms ..	4 038	.6			
..... \$1,000 ..	40 088	.6			
			Total ..... farms ..	623	.8
			..... \$1,000 ..	22 273	.3

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.. 2 226	.7	Cattle and calves inventory .....	farms.. 16 444	.5
10 to 49 acres .....	acres.. 8 949	.8	number.. 1 450 090	.4	
50 to 69 acres .....	farms.. 5 499	.6	farms.. 6 160	.6	
70 to 99 acres .....	acres.. 149 771	.6	number.. 86 078	.7	
100 to 139 acres .....	farms.. 2 402	.7	farms.. 8 732	.7	
140 to 179 acres .....	acres.. 139 529	.7	number.. 700 480	.4	
180 to 219 acres .....	farms.. 2 786	.7	Cattle and calves sold .....	farms.. 15 494	.6
220 to 259 acres .....	acres.. 1 752	.9	number.. 618 039	.4	
260 to 499 acres .....	farms.. 417 842	.9	\$1,000.. 197 978	.4	
500 to 999 acres .....	acres.. 417 842	.9	farms.. 1 508	.8	
1,000 to 1,999 acres .....	farms.. 5 491	.7	number.. 79 000	.9	
2,000 acres or more .....	acres.. 1 947 695	.7	farms.. 1 001	.9	
	farms.. 2 530	.5	number.. 167 201	.9	
	acres.. 1 678 032	.5	\$1,000.. 14 894	.9	
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory .....	farms.. 1 515	.8
			number.. 61 440	1.4	
			Sheep and lambs sold .....	farms.. 1 212	.9
			number.. 48 426	1.6	
			Horses and ponies inventory .....	farms.. 6 491	.6
			number.. 47 755	1.0	
			Horses and ponies sold .....	farms.. 1 416	.9
			number.. 5 595	1.5	
			<b>POULTRY</b>		
			Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory		
			(see text) .....	farms.. 1 909	.8
			number.. 4 393 064	.1	
			Layers 20 weeks old and older .....	farms.. 1 842	.8
			number.. 3 784 743	.1	
			Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .....	farms.. 172	2.2
			number.. 1 310 733	1.5	
<b>FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM</b>			<b>SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED</b>		
Oilseed and grain farming (1111) .....	farms.. 2 549	.7	Corn for grain or seed .....	farms.. 5 493	.6
Vegetable and melon farming (1112) .....	acres.. 909 974	.5	acres.. 578 715	.3	
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113) .....	farms.. 1 585	.8	bushels.. 62 242 783	.3	
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114) .....	acres.. 357 642	.4	farms.. 8 250	.6	
Other crop farming (1119) .....	farms.. 1 913	.7	acres.. 551 365	.4	
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111) .....	acres.. 219 331	.6	tons, green.. 8 235 781	.3	
Cattle feedlots (112112) .....	farms.. 2 820	.7	farms.. 1 887	.7	
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212) .....	acres.. 194 353	.9	acres.. 120 927	.5	
Hog and pig farming (1122) .....	farms.. 5 744	.6	bushels.. 6 339 980	.4	
Poultry and egg production (1123) .....	acres.. 1 020 345	.6	farms.. 2 808	.7	
Sheep and goat farming (1124) .....	farms.. 4 821	.6	acres.. 77 240	.7	
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129) .....	acres.. 836 050	.7	bushels.. 4 841 802	.7	
	farms.. 580	1.2	acres.. 402	1.2	
	acres.. 92 522	1.4	farms.. 43 305	.8	
	farms.. 7 852	.7	cwt.. 649 449	.8	
	acres.. 3 257 510	.5	farms.. 544	1.1	
	farms.. 314	1.6	acres.. 23 920	.5	
	acres.. 37 340	2.1	cwt.. 6 611 891	.4	
	farms.. 281	1.6	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .....	farms.. 20 805	.5
	acres.. 38 999	1.1	acres.. 2 073 486	.5	
	farms.. 696	1.1	tons, dry.. 4 035 722	.5	
	acres.. 69 430	1.7	farms.. 10 532	.6	
			acres.. 600 523	.6	
			tons, dry.. 1 421 329	.6	
			farms.. 2 720	.6	
			acres.. 169 331	.3	
			farms.. 2 436	.6	
			acres.. 101 628	.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 E. Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1992 to 1997**

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate
Farms .....	-1.7	1.1	-5.1	1.1
Land in farms .....	-2.7	.8	-4.4	.7
Average size of farm .....	-1.3	1.3	.6	1.4
Estimated market value of land and buildings <sup>1</sup> :				
Average per farm .....	1.4	1.8	1.3	1.9
Average per acre .....	3.8	1.9	2.7	2.0
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment <sup>1</sup> :				
Average per farm .....	3.8	1.7	1.1	1.8
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres .....	4.6	1.7	21.8	2.3
10 to 49 acres .....	5.7	1.6	7.4	2.1
50 to 179 acres .....	1.5	.9	1.1	1.2
180 to 499 acres .....	-9.5	.9	-13.0	.9
500 to 999 acres .....	-6.7	.6	-7.6	.6
1,000 to 1,999 acres .....	1.2	-	.7	-
2,000 acres or more .....	26.2	-	27.8	-
Total cropland .....	-2.9	1.1	-5.6	1.1
Harvested cropland .....	-3.2	.7	-3.4	.7
Irrigated land .....	-4.0	1.0	-5.6	1.1
Irrigated land .....	5.1	.7	4.9	.7
Market value of agricultural products sold .....	8.1	.4	8.2	.4
Average per farm .....	10.0	1.3	14.0	1.4
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops .....	23.6	.5	24.2	.4
Livestock, poultry, and their products .....	1.2	.5	1.3	.5
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500 .....	5.2	1.4	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999 .....	1.0	1.5	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999 .....	-1.5	1.5	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999 .....	2.7	1.5	2.7	1.5
\$25,000 to \$49,999 .....	2.8	1.7	2.8	1.7
\$50,000 to \$99,999 .....	-16.1	1.8	-16.1	1.8
\$100,000 to \$249,999 .....	-12.1	.6	-12.1	.6
\$250,000 to \$499,999 .....	-6.1	-	-6.1	-
\$500,000 or more .....	32.9	-	32.9	-
Total farm production expenses <sup>1</sup> .....	2.3	.6	2.2	.8
Average per farm .....	3.9	1.3	7.5	1.4
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) <sup>1</sup> .....	-1.6	1.1	-5.0	1.1
Average per farm .....	12.8	1.8	12.1	1.6
Average per farm .....	14.6	2.2	17.9	2.2
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming .....	-7.6	1.0	-8.8	1.0
Other .....	7.8	1.5	13.5	1.8
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any .....	5.6	1.4	6.6	1.6
200 days or more .....	5.7	1.5	6.6	1.7
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory .....	-9.3	1.0	-12.7	1.0
number .....	-1.4	.6	-2.1	.6
Beef cows .....	4.8	1.4	9.7	1.6
number .....	18.0	1.6	23.1	2.0
Milk cows .....	-18.4	.9	-18.3	.9
number .....	-2.9	.6	-2.9	.6
Cattle and calves sold .....	-9.7	1.0	-13.0	1.0
number .....	-3.3	.6	-3.6	.6
Hogs and pigs inventory .....	-28.0	1.1	-29.4	1.3
number .....	-12.5	1.2	-8.9	1.4
Hogs and pigs sold .....	-33.2	1.1	-33.5	1.4
number .....	-6	1.5	2.8	1.6
Sheep and lambs inventory .....	-11.1	1.5	-9.4	2.0
number .....	-19.9	1.9	-20.1	2.9
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) .....	-8.6	1.5	-8.8	1.9
number .....	-3.2	.2	-3.0	.2
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .....	21.1	4.4	3.4	5.5
number .....	25.8	3.8	25.8	3.9
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed .....	-4.0	.9	-2.4	.9
acres .....	11.5	.6	12.4	.5
bushels .....	30.5	.6	31.4	.6
Corn for silage or green chop .....	-16.3	.9	-15.8	.9
acres .....	1.3	.5	1.9	.5
tons, green .....	12.8	.5	13.3	.5
Oats for grain .....	-30.8	.8	-30.5	.9
acres .....	-29.6	.7	-29.7	.7
bushels .....	-29.7	.6	-29.7	.6
Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes .....	-7.3	1.7	-2.1	1.9
acres .....	-17.1	.5	-16.9	.5
cwt .....	-5.9	.5	-5.6	.5
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .....	-7.0	1.0	-9.1	1.1
acres .....	3.0	.9	2.1	.9
tons, dry .....	-5.5	.7	-6.9	.7
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) .....	-1.4	1.2	4.2	1.3
acres .....	21.1	.6	22.2	.5
Land in orchards .....	-17.1	1.1	-12.2	1.2
acres .....	-10.0	.6	-10.4	.6

<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>New York</b> . . . . .	<b>31 757</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>7 254 470</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>286 620</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1 906 163</b>	<b>.9</b>
Albany . . . . .	396	.5	56 782	1.3	143	1.4	235 570	7.0	15 802	13.7
Allegany . . . . .	724	.5	157 744	.8	218	.9	162 682	8.0	23 706	5.4
Bronx . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome . . . . .	511	.4	85 804	1.0	168	1.1	154 623	4.9	20 185	7.2
Cattaraugus . . . . .	946	.6	192 015	.8	203	1.0	191 978	5.9	43 005	5.8
Cayuga . . . . .	846	.4	251 820	.5	298	.6	318 248	2.7	64 117	4.3
Chautauqua . . . . .	1 557	.4	244 921	.6	157	.7	172 023	3.3	71 043	4.2
Chemung . . . . .	313	.4	59 272	1.1	189	1.2	185 534	5.6	12 925	7.1
Chenango . . . . .	801	.5	183 312	.7	229	.9	194 573	6.2	42 857	5.3
Clinton . . . . .	488	.6	148 677	.8	305	1.0	274 816	4.5	35 481	6.6
Columbia . . . . .	464	.6	114 883	.8	248	1.0	627 489	5.1	40 311	5.3
Cortland . . . . .	452	.6	120 838	1.0	267	1.2	270 354	4.6	29 019	6.7
Delaware . . . . .	717	.4	183 667	.7	256	.8	246 268	8.7	33 173	6.9
Dutchess . . . . .	539	.6	106 749	1.2	198	1.3	791 094	7.7	28 866	5.7
Erie . . . . .	973	.3	143 234	.6	147	.7	249 147	5.3	56 378	5.5
Essex . . . . .	197	.6	48 196	1.3	245	1.4	315 718	3.5	10 102	4.1
Franklin . . . . .	476	.6	163 017	.7	342	.9	216 906	3.9	30 899	7.9
Fulton . . . . .	176	.4	34 291	1.3	195	1.3	232 450	6.2	10 946	8.1
Genesee . . . . .	516	.5	170 878	.5	331	.6	342 100	2.1	53 215	3.6
Greene . . . . .	244	.5	48 770	1.6	200	1.7	281 800	5.3	11 287	10.7
Hamilton . . . . .	13	—	788	—	61	—	126 257	—	436	—
Herkimer . . . . .	583	.8	141 847	1.0	243	1.2	206 707	5.0	34 465	6.8
Jefferson . . . . .	916	.6	291 103	.7	318	.9	219 159	3.4	60 515	2.8
Kings . . . . .	8	1.4	8	1.4	1	2.0	102 188	16.5	126	11.7
Lewis . . . . .	623	.5	179 696	.7	288	.9	186 568	4.8	42 347	8.8
Livingston . . . . .	625	.5	197 408	.5	316	.7	334 050	3.8	59 069	3.8
Madison . . . . .	692	.5	185 924	.7	269	.8	237 676	5.9	44 154	5.1
Monroe . . . . .	480	.5	103 097	.9	215	1.0	402 475	5.1	29 105	5.3
Montgomery . . . . .	542	.6	134 940	.8	249	1.0	214 517	4.1	34 496	6.5
Nassau . . . . .	55	.7	1 390	5.9	25	5.9	994 223	4.1	2 593	4.8
New York . . . . .	2	3.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Niagara . . . . .	687	.5	127 355	.7	185	.8	225 730	3.0	47 589	5.3
Oneida . . . . .	928	.6	216 094	.7	233	.9	239 415	5.9	50 353	4.6
Onondaga . . . . .	602	.6	147 109	.8	244	1.0	297 385	3.2	44 495	5.8
Ontario . . . . .	692	.4	185 924	.7	269	.8	388 031	3.6	57 331	3.6
Orange . . . . .	624	.7	94 771	1.1	152	1.2	576 124	8.5	47 938	5.2
Orleans . . . . .	456	.4	143 397	.5	314	.6	325 857	3.1	41 686	4.7
Oswego . . . . .	605	.5	102 537	.9	169	1.0	185 595	6.2	31 726	7.6
Otsego . . . . .	865	.7	206 985	.9	239	1.2	231 588	5.7	43 898	5.1
Putnam . . . . .	48	.8	3 433	4.6	72	4.7	477 895	6.7	1 697	5.4
Queens . . . . .	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Rensselaer . . . . .	459	.4	98 965	.8	216	.9	407 172	8.1	23 711	7.1
Richmond . . . . .	7	1.2	29	24.2	4	24.2	624 595	13.2	301	13.1
Rockland . . . . .	21	.5	561	2.6	27	2.6	1 391 986	4.1	1 182	2.9
St. Lawrence . . . . .	1 363	.5	396 406	.6	291	.8	192 334	6.0	65 775	4.4
Saratoga . . . . .	472	.4	72 928	.8	155	.9	368 047	7.9	24 503	10.9
Schenectady . . . . .	151	.3	18 168	1.6	120	1.6	271 704	7.3	5 431	11.1
Schoharie . . . . .	518	.6	110 773	1.1	214	1.2	231 375	5.7	20 642	12.2
Schuyler . . . . .	318	.5	65 281	1.1	205	1.2	202 907	7.1	13 237	10.1
Seneca . . . . .	413	.6	117 426	.8	284	1.0	313 580	5.6	24 718	6.1
Steuben . . . . .	1 295	.4	348 971	.5	269	.7	200 320	3.1	64 763	4.1
Suffolk . . . . .	606	.5	35 858	1.0	59	1.1	641 978	6.9	43 591	4.7
Sullivan . . . . .	311	.6	58 067	1.3	187	1.4	379 677	11.8	19 497	12.9
Tioga . . . . .	497	.4	109 356	.9	220	1.0	181 649	3.5	21 381	7.5
Tompkins . . . . .	447	.4	95 451	.9	214	1.0	348 292	7.6	30 763	5.4
Ulster . . . . .	409	.4	68 989	.8	169	.9	535 573	7.7	21 682	4.9
Warren . . . . .	58	.6	9 187	2.7	158	2.8	298 891	5.3	2 584	10.9
Washington . . . . .	738	.5	194 962	.7	264	.9	319 743	4.4	46 190	3.6
Wayne . . . . .	840	.4	167 190	.6	199	.7	310 657	7.2	62 207	4.3
Westchester . . . . .	91	.7	7 528	3.0	83	3.0	690 132	4.4	5 489	3.2
Wyoming . . . . .	702	.5	194 902	.5	278	.7	292 355	2.8	65 384	3.9
Yates . . . . .	657	.4	104 790	.8	159	.9	246 162	6.6	35 566	8.3
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>New York</b> . . . . .	<b>59 923</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>2 834 512</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>89 256</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>31 810</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>2 191 903</b>	<b>.4</b>
Albany . . . . .	39 704	13.7	15 770	1.1	39 823	1.2	398	.9	11 501	4.3
Allegany . . . . .	32 788	5.5	34 852	.7	48 138	.9	723	.8	28 536	2.8
Bronx . . . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome . . . . .	39 423	7.3	24 016	.9	46 997	1.0	512	.8	18 366	3.5

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	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)
Cattaraugus	45 507	5.8	53 473	.6	56 526	.9	945	.8	42 503	2.1
Cayuga	75 699	4.3	115 438	.3	136 452	.5	847	.6	89 751	1.0
Chautauqua	45 628	4.2	88 673	.5	56 951	.7	1 557	.6	68 151	1.4
Chemung	41 164	7.1	12 898	1.2	41 209	1.2	314	1.0	10 431	2.6
Chenango	53 438	5.3	53 154	.6	66 359	.8	802	.7	43 085	2.6
Clinton	72 410	6.7	69 328	.4	142 066	.7	490	1.0	53 275	1.9
Columbia	86 319	5.4	72 675	.3	156 627	.6	467	.8	55 894	1.8
Cortland	63 918	6.8	37 447	.8	82 848	1.0	454	.9	29 617	3.3
Delaware	46 202	7.0	43 498	.7	60 666	.8	718	.7	33 078	3.3
Dutchess	53 258	5.8	33 964	.8	63 013	1.0	542	.9	26 914	2.8
Erie	57 942	5.6	77 830	.3	79 990	.5	973	.5	65 126	1.3
Essex	50 763	4.5	8 006	1.3	40 639	1.4	199	1.7	7 645	2.5
Franklin	64 507	7.9	44 285	.7	93 037	.9	479	.8	33 294	2.1
Fulton	62 196	8.3	9 625	1.4	54 686	1.5	176	1.7	6 940	4.9
Genesee	103 330	3.7	109 614	.2	212 430	.5	515	.7	78 210	.8
Greene	45 514	10.8	8 781	1.7	35 988	1.8	248	1.2	8 777	4.8
Hamilton	33 538	—	79	—	6 065	—	13	—	118	—
Herkimer	58 915	6.8	45 824	.9	78 600	1.2	585	1.0	34 328	2.8
Jefferson	65 849	2.9	77 076	.6	84 144	.8	919	.7	58 404	1.6
Kings	15 788	15.7	374	7.8	46 719	7.9	8	10.5	170	15.3
Lewis	67 864	8.9	61 686	.6	99 015	.8	624	.8	41 456	2.7
Livingston	94 662	3.9	72 936	.3	116 698	.6	624	.8	59 767	.8
Madison	63 622	5.2	65 690	.6	94 928	.6	694	.7	48 030	2.1
Monroe	60 762	5.3	47 954	.5	99 904	.7	479	.7	35 867	2.1
Montgomery	63 645	6.5	48 723	.6	89 894	.9	542	.8	36 983	2.2
Nassau	47 150	6.1	3 119	2.5	56 716	2.6	55	3.7	3 732	1.9
New York (D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	3.6	(D)	(D)
Niagara	69 371	5.3	57 726	.4	84 026	.6	686	.7	43 173	1.9
Oneida	54 143	4.7	74 056	.6	79 802	.9	930	.7	52 965	2.0
Onondaga	73 790	5.8	70 951	.4	117 859	.7	603	.8	57 150	1.2
Ontario	83 089	3.7	77 983	.3	112 692	.6	690	.7	67 603	.8
Orange	76 456	5.2	69 847	.6	111 934	.9	627	.8	54 735	1.7
Orleans	91 416	4.8	62 128	.3	136 246	.5	456	.7	48 102	1.0
Oswego	52 267	7.7	31 454	.8	51 991	.9	607	.7	21 615	4.2
Otsego	50 749	5.2	51 612	1.0	59 667	1.2	865	.9	39 312	2.8
Putnam	35 344	6.9	2 928	3.1	60 997	3.2	48	4.2	2 095	3.6
Queens (D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)
Rensselaer	51 435	7.1	28 700	.8	62 528	.9	461	.7	23 375	2.9
Richmond	43 000	15.0	472	13.3	67 486	13.3	7	7.2	261	2.4
Rockland	56 293	4.9	2 361	.4	112 448	.7	21	4.0	1 595	.5
St. Lawrence	48 187	4.5	89 078	.6	65 354	.8	1 365	.6	71 060	1.5
Saratoga	51 585	10.9	29 855	.6	63 252	.7	475	.7	25 526	2.5
Schenectady	35 263	11.2	6 108	1.3	40 447	1.3	154	1.5	4 837	3.9
Schoharie	39 696	12.2	26 973	1.1	52 071	1.2	520	.9	19 450	5.9
Schuyler	41 625	10.1	14 034	1.3	44 133	1.4	318	1.0	11 371	8.3
Seneca	59 851	6.2	41 069	.6	99 440	.8	413	.8	30 797	1.7
Steuben	49 971	4.2	78 665	.5	60 745	.6	1 296	.5	61 316	1.6
Suffolk	72 290	4.8	167 858	.2	276 993	.5	603	.7	122 536	.9
Sullivan	62 091	12.9	23 364	.9	75 126	1.1	314	1.0	19 833	3.8
Tioga	42 933	7.5	27 536	.9	55 405	1.0	498	.8	20 794	4.3
Tompkins	68 820	5.5	47 548	.5	106 372	.6	447	.7	37 640	2.2
Ulster	52 627	5.0	42 278	.3	103 368	.5	412	.7	32 361	1.2
Warren	44 554	11.4	2 180	3.8	37 581	3.9	58	3.4	1 810	2.2
Washington	62 251	3.7	77 544	.5	105 073	.7	742	.7	61 313	1.4
Wayne	74 144	4.3	107 566	.3	128 055	.5	839	.6	80 608	1.5
Westchester	60 317	4.4	10 568	1.0	116 135	1.2	91	3.0	6 374	1.4
Wyoming	93 139	4.0	134 654	.3	191 815	.5	702	.7	111 776	.5
Yates	54 217	8.3	40 259	.7	61 277	.8	656	.6	30 349	2.6

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	
	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>New York</b>	<b>9 787</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>111 258</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>17 393</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>482 735</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>16 580</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>85 818</b>	<b>1.2</b>
Albany	83	17.9	1 362	8.3	201	10.7	1 894	7.5	172	11.0	481	13.3
Allegany	275	10.1	1 953	10.1	460	5.5	9 039	4.3	379	6.6	629	4.9
Bronx	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome	168	15.3	1 627	10.2	278	10.3	5 047	7.3	223	9.7	597	9.2
Cattaraugus	337	9.6	3 001	10.7	557	5.8	10 841	6.2	427	7.2	1 696	6.1
Cayuga	290	10.3	5 081	4.5	393	7.8	20 442	2.6	598	4.4	3 882	6.2
Chautauqua	352	9.7	3 414	15.8	715	5.4	15 275	5.2	569	7.0	1 157	4.9
Chemung	85	15.9	895	5.1	158	9.3	1 640	8.2	148	9.1	323	6.8
Chenango	237	12.0	2 392	21.0	549	5.0	15 329	4.8	373	7.3	673	9.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <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)
Clinton	212	11.7	3 413	9.2	336	5.3	15 063	3.9	245	9.3	814	8.7
Columbia	112	19.9	2 195	9.9	215	10.9	9 910	3.3	288	7.2	1 137	11.4
Cortland	205	11.7	1 826	10.4	295	7.9	8 963	6.3	238	9.0	580	13.3
Delaware	270	10.1	1 996	18.7	497	4.6	11 191	5.6	271	10.3	396	11.2
Dutchess	138	16.4	1 776	19.5	289	7.8	2 954	6.2	230	9.3	2 002	1.2
Erie	346	9.0	4 048	7.4	487	6.8	15 282	3.8	473	7.2	2 248	9.4
Essex	49	10.2	587	4.8	79	6.0	1 589	2.4	86	7.2	123	7.0
Franklin	180	14.7	1 776	11.5	345	5.6	10 187	4.0	239	7.8	639	3.5
Fulton	57	11.5	316	9.8	100	4.4	1 719	3.8	81	7.6	170	7.8
Genesee	135	14.1	4 723	4.1	244	9.3	16 004	1.0	301	6.5	3 175	1.9
Greene	70	15.4	377	13.5	116	10.8	2 007	7.8	99	9.9	203	5.7
Hamilton	—	—	—	—	3	—	2	—	6	—	2	—
Herkimer	257	11.3	2 482	14.1	406	5.0	10 444	3.0	322	8.5	692	7.2
Jefferson	354	9.9	3 251	5.7	606	4.4	18 545	3.2	374	7.8	1 189	5.5
Kings	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	10.5	74	18.9
Lewis	275	10.1	2 027	9.7	447	5.6	13 958	4.1	359	8.1	688	3.5
Livingston	178	12.5	3 012	3.6	309	9.1	11 908	1.3	347	6.5	2 836	4.7
Madison	255	11.8	2 463	14.5	497	5.3	12 787	4.5	448	6.0	1 481	7.9
Monroe	83	23.1	736	7.3	181	12.6	1 788	3.7	295	8.2	2 519	7.9
Montgomery	224	11.7	1 639	10.5	334	7.5	10 182	4.5	331	7.3	1 040	6.6
Nassau	4	15.0	26	21.6	13	8.1	118	10.9	28	4.7	149	5.5
New York	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	3.6	(D)	(D)
Niagara	137	19.9	1 446	11.8	226	14.3	4 562	3.2	435	7.3	2 154	9.5
Oneida	352	10.3	2 766	14.6	577	5.6	11 762	5.5	550	4.9	1 810	6.4
Onondaga	133	16.2	2 765	5.0	256	9.6	15 328	2.4	361	6.9	1 977	6.8
Ontario	232	12.4	3 154	8.3	294	10.6	10 288	3.7	446	5.2	3 852	5.7
Orange	148	15.6	1 492	17.6	285	9.1	8 104	7.3	386	6.4	2 493	6.1
Orleans	126	17.2	410	35.6	174	13.1	1 938	9.1	287	6.5	2 999	2.4
Oswego	216	11.9	905	25.6	324	7.2	3 150	5.9	281	8.0	1 058	1.8
Otsego	270	12.2	2 651	15.8	565	5.6	11 792	5.0	401	7.1	802	8.2
Putnam	13	7.5	(D)	(D)	21	6.4	55	8.9	22	6.4	71	4.8
Queens	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)
Rensselaer	148	13.7	850	6.3	256	7.3	4 027	5.8	208	8.3	941	5.6
Richmond	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	7.2	117	1.4
Rockland	—	—	—	—	2	—	(D)	(D)	13	5.3	201	.3
St. Lawrence	561	8.0	4 340	8.2	993	3.4	23 875	2.2	608	5.9	1 133	4.0
Saratoga	111	19.0	930	9.7	228	10.8	6 250	2.9	240	9.7	831	6.5
Schenectady	30	18.3	127	9.2	49	14.6	600	2.5	65	10.6	252	13.1
Schoharie	117	16.6	592	7.4	327	7.1	4 734	7.3	283	8.2	626	20.3
Schuyler	42	29.7	461	12.0	103	19.6	2 923	15.0	150	12.3	295	9.8
Seneca	133	20.8	1 415	11.2	205	13.9	5 793	10.7	303	8.3	1 505	7.8
Steuben	332	10.3	2 397	6.0	768	4.8	15 730	3.5	669	5.6	2 263	2.6
Suffolk	57	23.4	2 015	9.3	95	21.2	5 926	4.5	410	6.0	17 495	4.0
Sullivan	154	13.0	2 078	5.7	172	10.2	9 420	4.3	103	18.6	150	10.6
Tioga	197	11.9	1 248	20.9	324	6.4	6 326	6.5	216	8.8	428	12.7
Tompkins	84	19.7	4 812	2.4	205	12.1	6 435	1.6	260	8.0	1 039	9.2
Ulster	40	24.6	416	38.7	153	15.6	1 343	8.5	155	11.7	840	3.6
Warren	10	8.2	248	.9	18	6.2	298	1.5	26	5.1	181	9.1
Washington	284	10.8	3 569	5.1	542	5.9	18 352	3.4	361	8.2	1 105	3.0
Wayne	140	15.4	3 059	2.4	290	9.9	8 223	2.5	510	5.1	3 211	4.8
Westchester	12	9.0	(D)	(D)	20	6.8	102	5.0	57	3.5	471	2.7
Wyoming	273	9.7	6 145	6.0	497	5.5	37 147	.7	403	7.6	2 603	2.8
Yates	204	11.9	1 729	17.2	313	7.9	4 138	6.7	403	6.5	1 311	6.0

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>New York</b>	<b>18 390</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>93 010</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>15 392</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>75 892</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>30 184</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>97 075</b>	<b>.7</b>
Albany	196	9.6	381	10.0	139	13.5	196	6.1	355	3.8	633	7.4
Allegany	365	7.5	894	3.8	277	9.8	400	7.3	681	2.1	1 288	7.1
Bronx	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome	252	9.3	383	8.9	175	14.6	343	28.9	488	2.9	876	5.3
Cattaraugus	510	5.7	1 202	7.5	396	8.4	765	18.2	877	2.2	1 716	5.9
Cayuga	560	5.3	5 036	3.4	521	4.8	3 289	3.3	813	1.5	3 893	2.7
Chautauqua	1 028	4.2	2 822	9.9	881	4.6	2 505	6.9	1 465	1.6	2 864	6.2
Chemung	132	10.4	299	11.8	152	9.2	245	14.3	302	2.1	528	4.6
Chenango	421	6.7	1 455	8.6	306	9.5	603	7.6	766	1.9	1 846	3.9
Clinton	295	7.9	1 536	4.9	196	10.8	1 296	10.2	486	1.0	1 906	2.4
Columbia	298	8.1	2 070	3.5	254	9.9	1 715	5.6	435	3.0	2 335	4.4
Cortland	245	7.4	934	11.3	202	9.7	640	12.5	444	1.5	1 210	5.3
Delaware	258	10.3	642	5.8	180	12.3	240	8.2	686	1.9	1 220	4.5
Dutchess	240	9.2	733	4.6	228	9.8	471	4.4	492	2.8	1 065	4.0

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	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)
Erie .....	564	6.1	2 365	4.2	412	7.2	1 505	6.1	896	2.1	3 241	3.5
Essex .....	88	6.7	213	4.0	76	7.5	191	13.9	182	2.8	352	3.6
Franklin .....	325	7.1	1 059	4.4	181	12.4	549	3.6	454	2.8	1 230	4.3
Fulton .....	86	7.1	276	8.1	70	8.5	122	11.7	169	2.0	317	5.2
Genesee .....	344	5.5	4 727	1.9	303	6.9	3 575	3.2	488	2.5	3 122	2.5
Greene .....	117	9.0	281	26.4	73	13.0	110	9.1	237	2.6	490	6.6
Hamilton .....	5	—	4	—	2	—	(D)	(D)	13	—	12	—
Herkimer .....	296	8.3	911	6.8	248	9.8	549	8.1	577	1.4	1 495	4.3
Jefferson .....	387	7.7	1 478	4.5	294	11.3	1 098	6.9	848	2.0	2 520	3.4
Kings .....	5	16.1	(D)	(D)	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	3	17.5	13	17.2
Lewis .....	405	5.9	1 374	9.0	295	9.6	631	5.4	615	1.2	1 675	5.8
Livingston .....	377	5.2	4 356	3.6	323	5.4	2 639	5.3	582	2.4	3 121	2.6
Madison .....	385	7.0	1 855	7.2	330	8.5	1 171	13.1	665	2.0	2 089	4.6
Monroe .....	292	8.4	2 794	6.3	282	9.4	2 323	4.9	442	3.3	2 015	5.0
Montgomery .....	316	7.6	1 650	7.5	297	8.2	925	7.6	511	2.6	1 708	5.1
Nassau .....	27	4.4	145	.7	30	4.2	63	1.3	54	3.7	137	8.5
New York .....	—	—	—	—	2	3.6	(D)	(D)	2	3.6	(D)	(D)
Niagara .....	530	5.6	3 005	5.0	494	4.7	2 971	4.1	637	2.4	2 317	5.3
Oneida .....	531	6.1	2 488	5.8	459	7.0	1 428	6.2	876	1.6	2 643	4.8
Onondaga .....	376	6.5	2 515	3.3	336	7.0	2 165	2.9	591	1.2	2 637	2.7
Ontario .....	451	4.4	4 673	3.8	453	4.4	2 998	3.3	635	2.3	3 264	3.3
Orange .....	400	6.9	2 096	4.5	413	5.9	3 681	5.4	608	1.4	2 502	4.6
Orleans .....	332	4.9	3 757	2.4	308	6.0	5 403	3.5	445	1.7	2 456	1.9
Oswego .....	308	9.0	911	9.1	209	12.0	1 487	9.9	577	2.4	1 125	5.7
Otsego .....	436	6.7	1 256	5.9	304	9.1	580	8.4	792	2.3	1 865	4.5
Putnam .....	29	5.5	28	3.8	16	7.0	27	4.3	42	4.5	143	2.8
Queens .....	2	—	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)
Rensselaer .....	258	6.4	1 229	6.3	222	9.9	620	6.1	437	2.5	1 286	5.8
Richmond .....	4	5.1	4	14.6	4	8.1	1	12.4	7	7.2	8	4.2
Rockland .....	12	6.4	45	.6	10	5.9	49	.3	17	4.9	72	.4
St. Lawrence .....	761	5.3	2 099	5.4	536	7.5	1 021	6.2	1 246	2.0	2 830	5.6
Saratoga .....	261	8.9	934	8.3	154	13.6	772	16.7	441	3.2	1 286	7.1
Schenectady .....	72	9.9	97	9.5	58	11.5	44	20.5	144	3.0	260	9.1
Schoharie .....	269	8.6	834	15.3	226	11.8	421	16.9	486	2.5	992	12.9
Schuyler .....	184	11.4	320	11.8	141	13.2	288	5.7	318	1.0	619	14.9
Seneca .....	297	9.2	2 575	7.4	298	8.1	1 821	7.2	410	.8	1 631	6.1
Steuben .....	697	5.1	3 051	4.0	602	5.9	2 435	5.6	1 255	1.3	3 207	3.2
Suffolk .....	437	4.1	4 048	4.3	420	5.5	2 596	11.4	589	2.3	4 838	2.1
Sullivan .....	128	15.2	318	22.8	111	18.2	162	15.5	293	3.5	535	12.1
Tioga .....	273	7.3	807	7.3	204	9.6	346	12.0	497	.8	867	4.9
Tompkins .....	256	9.2	1 281	11.5	246	8.9	826	9.6	433	1.8	1 236	6.8
Ulster .....	196	9.5	767	3.1	197	10.8	2 327	4.1	396	2.4	1 677	2.8
Warren .....	37	4.2	52	2.3	20	5.3	16	2.5	56	3.4	119	2.4
Washington .....	445	6.4	2 697	2.8	329	7.5	1 451	3.6	722	1.7	2 474	2.5
Wayne .....	624	3.5	4 210	6.1	568	4.5	7 593	3.4	810	1.6	3 548	2.1
Westchester .....	51	3.7	92	1.9	52	3.3	103	6.0	85	3.0	438	1.8
Wyoming .....	424	6.7	3 048	2.5	377	6.3	2 552	1.6	678	1.7	3 770	1.9
Yates .....	490	3.9	1 895	8.8	496	4.2	1 545	11.4	631	1.6	1 502	6.7

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>New York .....</b>	<b>23 839</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>71 134</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>11 563</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>336 357</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>2 355</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>15 989</b>	<b>2.6</b>
Albany .....	256	7.4	311	7.8	125	12.8	1 800	5.7	20	39.8	41	13.0
Allegany .....	459	6.1	893	5.8	160	13.6	3 207	2.2	28	39.3	96	22.4
Bronx .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome .....	334	8.2	660	6.6	83	15.8	2 007	1.7	28	42.6	34	14.1
Cattaraugus .....	654	4.5	1 314	3.4	291	11.3	4 948	4.3	66	23.2	647	8.8
Cayuga .....	616	4.4	2 617	3.3	324	9.2	12 935	1.3	26	28.3	318	2.4
Chautauqua .....	1 112	3.7	1 857	4.7	575	7.2	9 232	5.1	353	9.9	1 314	13.0
Chemung .....	227	5.2	399	7.5	73	16.0	1 806	1.2	11	41.3	13	23.9
Chenango .....	559	4.3	1 868	6.3	227	12.0	2 864	9.0	28	40.1	208	38.5
Clinton .....	323	5.8	1 847	3.7	168	11.9	8 920	2.9	28	33.2	1 176	.8
Columbia .....	355	5.4	1 909	3.7	194	11.2	15 180	2.5	57	32.8	342	30.2
Cortland .....	369	3.7	1 145	5.5	196	11.8	3 258	3.5	13	41.0	12	10.4
Delaware .....	537	4.4	1 236	4.8	283	9.3	2 724	3.7	58	31.3	145	44.5
Dutchess .....	399	5.3	596	5.9	273	9.2	6 099	3.4	40	29.0	87	8.0
Erie .....	743	3.8	1 919	4.9	357	8.7	10 628	3.1	65	25.7	300	9.5
Essex .....	125	4.1	241	5.6	78	6.2	1 455	5.1	15	16.4	58	8.2
Franklin .....	413	3.6	1 446	3.8	228	10.9	2 851	8.2	17	58.0	33	18.7
Fulton .....	127	4.6	332	6.1	55	10.9	546	5.0	25	16.1	102	15.0
Genesee .....	378	5.6	1 795	1.8	204	9.1	12 725	2.1	34	32.9	476	.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses <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)
Greene	191	5.3	348	6.1	49	15.8	1 371	6.8	13	48.9	19	34.3
Hamilton	8	—	4	—	5	—	4	—	1	—	(D)	(D)
Herkimer	505	3.7	1 561	3.9	220	11.8	2 640	9.5	37	36.6	112	16.4
Jefferson	749	3.4	2 596	3.7	337	9.6	5 048	3.6	49	31.9	146	22.3
Kings	6	12.1	12	13.3	2	19.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Lewis	504	3.9	1 981	6.7	199	10.5	3 062	3.1	22	4.5	86	5.7
Livingston	463	5.1	1 378	3.8	180	11.0	7 987	1.2	34	28.7	278	5.5
Madison	571	3.5	2 062	4.7	225	11.5	4 372	3.8	29	27.8	183	7.8
Monroe	346	6.2	1 242	4.5	172	11.3	7 806	5.0	30	33.2	404	4.6
Montgomery	462	4.5	1 448	4.3	186	14.0	3 640	5.7	20	44.4	108	2.5
Nassau	37	4.4	96	3.4	32	4.5	1 234	2.3	6	7.6	16	.6
New York	2	3.6	(D)	(D)	2	3.6	(D)	(D)	2	3.6	(D)	(D)
Niagara	470	6.1	1 012	4.9	221	13.1	9 020	4.3	27	44.3	129	4.7
Oneida	748	3.5	2 241	5.2	398	8.7	6 446	9.8	39	29.0	87	13.4
Onondaga	457	4.3	1 838	3.5	239	8.7	8 058	1.8	25	32.1	179	2.1
Ontario	473	5.3	1 649	3.1	215	11.2	9 990	3.2	50	24.2	299	12.0
Orange	511	3.4	1 854	10.0	297	8.1	12 001	5.0	63	25.4	683	9.1
Orleans	343	5.7	1 058	2.0	184	8.9	11 648	.8	19	27.5	209	6.8
Oswego	463	4.8	844	6.1	193	11.4	3 951	5.3	38	24.8	74	7.2
Otsego	659	3.4	1 915	5.0	289	10.8	3 184	6.3	24	25.0	184	1.2
Putnam	37	4.8	52	7.1	24	5.4	748	5.3	8	9.3	21	9.7
Queens	1	—	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Rensselaer	324	5.5	784	6.7	158	13.0	2 474	3.1	22	43.6	46	51.6
Richmond	3	—	(D)	(D)	6	8.5	40	5.6	—	—	—	—
Rockland	11	3.1	39	.3	9	3.8	654	.1	3	11.3	8	10.6
St. Lawrence	1 050	3.4	2 802	3.6	551	7.4	6 399	4.8	83	24.9	456	40.0
Saratoga	389	4.9	753	5.6	95	17.5	3 574	1.2	28	44.5	78	14.7
Schenectady	94	6.7	186	5.3	30	18.4	1 138	6.0	5	27.8	80	5.3
Schoharie	377	5.6	751	10.3	156	14.5	1 716	12.0	17	58.3	27	40.2
Schuyler	208	8.2	501	18.0	63	22.3	1 000	2.3	49	30.6	71	37.2
Seneca	339	6.8	858	5.1	146	15.1	3 506	8.7	53	36.2	222	22.4
Steuben	940	3.6	2 171	3.8	414	8.8	6 982	6.2	85	24.8	221	16.4
Suffolk	512	5.1	3 007	2.3	401	7.3	37 432	1.6	97	19.1	1 214	15.4
Sullivan	248	6.0	660	10.5	107	17.4	808	4.3	7	6.8	80	2.7
Tioga	346	5.6	920	7.4	194	11.3	2 191	14.1	20	24.1	99	27.6
Tompkins	335	5.7	1 016	3.0	195	9.9	6 149	2.0	26	35.5	111	33.9
Ulster	327	5.7	1 017	2.2	194	9.1	9 011	1.1	46	24.9	1 975	.8
Warren	34	4.8	47	4.0	14	7.6	246	3.5	3	17.4	(D)	(D)
Washington	578	4.8	2 250	2.9	269	11.4	7 906	4.9	79	25.4	234	16.9
Wayne	618	4.0	1 694	2.6	405	6.5	19 314	1.7	159	13.2	1 796	9.6
Westchester	61	3.2	166	2.2	58	3.4	1 507	1.4	15	6.5	146	3.1
Wyoming	555	4.0	3 032	1.7	302	9.0	15 158	1.2	30	42.1	174	1.8
Yates	498	5.1	900	4.7	232	11.5	3 646	4.3	80	24.3	325	22.5

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>New York</b>	<b>28 200</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>171 351</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>7 883</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>29 214</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>12 525</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>130 266</b>	<b>1.0</b>
Albany	368	2.8	1 226	12.7	51	27.8	97	38.0	90	17.5	493	21.4
Allegany	618	3.4	1 969	5.2	174	14.5	275	21.6	195	12.1	1 969	8.1
Bronx	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome	429	5.3	1 430	4.4	53	21.0	160	7.6	159	15.8	1 031	10.3
Cattaraugus	808	3.2	3 228	10.1	174	13.6	713	10.1	348	8.0	2 816	5.6
Cayuga	773	2.5	7 161	2.7	326	9.9	2 161	8.2	431	7.4	5 727	3.5
Chautauqua	1 353	2.1	5 558	3.3	545	7.5	1 682	9.3	619	6.8	5 142	8.2
Chemung	256	4.5	907	6.5	56	18.0	50	12.7	107	11.3	827	6.5
Chenango	726	2.7	3 316	3.0	209	13.6	406	10.6	381	7.7	2 593	5.7
Clinton	440	3.9	3 042	4.1	96	17.7	331	8.7	182	11.3	2 701	3.6
Columbia	431	3.2	3 829	3.5	94	14.4	433	3.3	165	14.0	2 390	6.2
Cortland	383	4.3	2 354	6.5	111	16.3	313	13.0	190	11.4	1 958	7.7
Delaware	670	2.3	2 407	3.7	140	16.4	291	18.7	305	8.3	2 098	7.3
Dutchess	488	3.4	2 461	4.8	79	21.1	202	14.3	146	13.9	1 097	11.6
Erie	837	2.9	4 735	4.5	194	13.8	684	9.1	310	8.3	2 679	4.7
Essex	149	3.9	600	3.5	22	17.9	45	13.4	57	9.2	328	7.8
Franklin	430	3.3	2 724	4.7	120	18.0	266	9.2	262	8.1	2 881	9.8
Fulton	167	2.6	679	6.7	29	17.7	127	11.8	61	10.1	588	12.7
Genesee	454	4.3	5 828	3.2	191	12.2	2 158	4.9	217	10.5	4 373	1.8
Greene	205	4.6	834	6.9	49	17.8	78	19.8	47	15.0	283	10.2
Hamilton	13	—	23	—	4	—	4	—	4	—	14	—
Herkimer	540	3.1	3 149	9.1	112	17.6	272	17.9	328	8.5	1 965	8.3
Jefferson	787	3.6	5 050	6.8	177	15.0	430	8.4	441	6.7	4 875	6.3
Kings	4	14.3	11	15.5	3	16.8	8	16.7	—	—	—	—

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.											
	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)
Lewis .....	561	2.7	3 634	4.4	210	12.3	704	6.9	269	9.3	2 383	8.9
Livingston .....	535	4.0	4 733	2.4	198	13.3	604	7.5	241	9.5	4 092	3.4
Madison .....	637	2.6	4 410	4.7	181	14.5	602	14.3	356	7.9	3 656	7.7
Monroe .....	436	3.5	3 174	3.3	82	19.6	712	6.4	139	14.8	1 603	9.7
Montgomery .....	525	2.1	3 230	6.0	121	15.8	419	14.2	209	12.9	2 508	9.0
Nassau .....	47	3.8	219	1.9	6	4.8	(D)	(D)	9	6.5	75	.6
New York .....	2	3.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	2	3.6	(D)	(D)
Niagara .....	600	3.7	3 598	3.9	157	15.6	572	8.3	259	11.6	2 954	7.7
Oneida .....	804	3.5	4 328	4.1	259	12.6	474	9.9	439	7.8	3 600	7.1
Onondaga .....	505	4.4	3 889	3.2	159	10.6	843	16.2	246	7.3	2 976	5.1
Ontario .....	582	3.6	5 534	2.8	259	8.5	1 523	6.1	304	7.7	5 304	3.8
Orange .....	596	1.6	4 180	6.6	160	13.5	804	16.1	235	10.6	2 258	6.9
Orleans .....	401	3.8	3 957	1.8	131	12.1	767	.8	214	9.1	2 493	2.7
Oswego .....	522	3.6	1 853	7.3	74	22.4	209	26.9	173	14.6	1 668	7.4
Otsego .....	754	3.1	3 531	6.8	184	14.5	350	13.7	292	10.7	1 869	7.2
Putnam .....	41	4.7	127	6.6	6	12.6	3	20.2	9	9.3	96	2.4
Queens .....	2	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rensselaer .....	399	4.2	2 195	3.5	79	16.4	504	10.1	109	14.8	1 084	5.5
Richmond .....	6	5.4	9	2.5	1	—	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)
Rockland .....	20	3.8	108	1.6	2	—	(D)	(D)	9	5.4	93	.3
St. Lawrence .....	1 162	2.8	5 700	4.4	339	11.1	884	7.9	630	7.1	4 887	6.0
Saratoga .....	453	2.4	2 214	7.6	74	22.7	176	15.0	132	15.7	1 366	16.5
Schenectady .....	125	4.1	410	6.6	17	25.7	37	14.6	41	14.9	295	14.8
Schoharie .....	482	2.6	2 018	7.6	97	20.9	141	9.8	166	14.4	1 379	12.8
Schuyler .....	282	4.6	1 368	13.8	92	21.6	143	36.0	98	19.1	763	18.9
Seneca .....	369	5.2	2 470	4.0	203	15.0	636	13.7	218	11.3	2 426	4.9
Steuben .....	1 135	2.4	5 478	3.2	233	12.1	526	8.8	455	6.9	3 287	5.6
Suffolk .....	558	2.7	6 049	3.0	131	18.7	673	10.0	272	10.3	4 509	5.1
Sullivan .....	280	3.9	1 430	14.1	60	25.5	129	24.2	86	20.1	633	13.3
Tioga .....	432	3.7	1 755	5.6	106	14.9	186	11.4	158	13.1	1 327	10.9
Tompkins .....	404	3.3	2 522	7.0	144	14.7	431	6.9	163	13.4	1 527	4.8
Ulster .....	346	5.2	2 727	2.7	49	18.2	284	18.9	106	14.9	1 483	2.9
Warren .....	50	3.6	106	5.0	7	10.0	10	11.5	15	6.6	125	2.4
Washington .....	723	1.3	4 944	3.4	176	15.0	530	3.6	337	8.9	2 979	5.1
Wayne .....	777	1.9	5 697	2.3	350	8.3	1 053	17.8	407	6.9	4 619	5.1
Westchester .....	85	3.0	602	3.1	11	8.0	(D)	(D)	28	4.3	168	1.7
Wyoming .....	655	2.0	7 470	2.1	228	10.2	2 068	2.4	355	7.5	8 449	2.0
Yates .....	578	3.5	3 134	6.4	288	10.0	910	14.8	297	8.6	2 483	9.3

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>New York .....</b>	<b>8 363</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>48 093</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>30 136</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>129 269</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>29 109</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>314 442</b>	<b>.6</b>
Albany .....	53	23.8	106	15.5	373	3.0	1 063	7.0	347	3.3	1 417	9.6
Allegany .....	160	14.0	620	15.6	689	1.7	2 184	4.6	607	3.8	3 120	6.3
Bronx .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome .....	72	23.5	270	5.6	492	2.4	1 460	6.3	406	6.0	2 441	7.2
Cattaraugus .....	250	9.7	983	12.8	901	1.8	2 951	4.8	824	2.8	5 682	4.3
Cayuga .....	315	9.1	2 462	4.3	798	1.9	3 697	3.0	795	2.2	11 050	2.9
Chautauqua .....	317	10.3	1 374	7.6	1 488	1.4	5 137	4.3	1 400	1.8	8 817	3.7
Chemung .....	64	15.2	211	19.6	312	1.0	955	5.5	273	3.6	1 334	3.4
Chenango .....	209	11.7	681	10.0	769	2.0	3 193	4.9	729	2.4	5 657	5.9
Clinton .....	158	13.4	790	4.6	459	3.1	1 719	5.7	470	2.3	8 721	3.2
Columbia .....	131	18.0	966	10.3	427	4.2	2 759	5.1	437	2.5	8 724	3.5
Cortland .....	147	13.9	468	4.4	442	.9	1 942	6.9	424	2.5	4 013	5.5
Delaware .....	198	12.4	637	23.6	666	2.8	2 589	7.3	665	2.4	5 266	3.8
Dutchess .....	53	23.6	240	10.0	508	2.8	3 991	7.6	522	1.9	3 141	3.7
Erie .....	303	9.9	1 494	3.6	911	2.0	3 566	5.0	873	2.4	10 430	1.6
Essex .....	33	10.6	121	10.4	184	2.5	672	3.1	178	2.7	1 068	5.6
Franklin .....	147	15.4	438	6.6	469	2.3	1 672	4.2	455	2.8	5 542	5.9
Fulton .....	57	8.4	203	5.6	166	2.9	599	5.0	158	2.9	843	9.5
Genesee .....	193	9.6	2 748	2.4	513	.7	2 801	3.2	465	3.7	9 979	1.2
Greene .....	53	17.9	65	14.6	235	2.3	926	6.9	217	4.1	1 386	7.7
Hamilton .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	12	—	35	—	13	—	10	—
Herkimer .....	152	14.7	1 003	24.1	546	2.9	2 090	5.2	547	2.5	4 964	7.1
Jefferson .....	197	13.4	787	6.3	883	1.2	2 889	3.7	838	2.2	8 502	4.6
Kings .....	1	35.5	(D)	(D)	5	13.4	(D)	(D)	7	10.4	19	21.0
Lewis .....	133	16.1	734	13.4	580	2.8	2 315	5.3	602	1.8	6 205	4.7
Livingston .....	178	10.2	2 211	3.4	599	1.8	3 097	3.7	565	2.9	7 515	1.6
Madison .....	252	11.3	1 059	9.1	646	2.6	3 007	4.5	659	2.2	6 834	2.3
Monroe .....	142	15.7	1 090	6.8	432	3.7	2 626	5.6	449	2.9	5 035	1.7
Montgomery .....	185	12.6	743	10.2	534	1.3	2 482	5.4	505	2.1	5 260	4.7

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)
Nassau .....	4	13.2	(D)	(D)	50	3.8	862	1.5	47	4.2	486	1.5
New York .....	2	3.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	2	3.6	(D)	(D)
Niagara .....	236	10.3	1 273	5.4	619	3.2	2 396	4.1	580	3.7	5 765	5.1
Oneida .....	276	10.4	1 419	20.3	880	2.2	3 759	4.2	877	1.8	7 713	5.9
Onondaga .....	204	10.7	1 351	3.6	575	2.0	2 954	4.4	568	2.5	7 675	1.9
Ontario .....	244	10.2	2 422	4.3	645	2.6	3 575	5.7	638	2.5	9 078	2.8
Orange .....	194	12.5	1 171	17.7	548	4.0	3 263	5.8	595	1.7	8 152	2.3
Orleans .....	137	10.8	2 246	2.4	439	2.1	2 638	2.9	384	4.2	6 123	1.0
Oswego .....	85	18.1	263	9.1	588	2.2	1 692	5.4	543	3.1	2 425	11.7
Otsego .....	187	13.9	580	22.0	820	2.2	3 092	5.2	782	2.5	5 658	3.9
Putnam .....	9	10.6	(D)	(D)	39	4.7	326	5.2	47	4.2	277	5.0
Queens .....	—	—	—	—	2	—	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)
Rensselaer .....	95	15.6	545	5.3	459	.7	2 311	6.1	434	2.8	4 479	5.1
Richmond .....	—	—	—	—	7	7.2	42	2.9	7	7.2	23	4.5
Rockland .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	19	4.0	117	2.7	19	4.0	204	.5
St. Lawrence .....	305	11.2	988	9.1	1 343	1.2	4 405	4.0	1 273	1.7	9 239	3.7
Saratoga .....	94	19.3	510	9.1	457	2.3	1 791	6.9	432	3.5	4 061	3.2
Schenectady .....	15	26.1	91	47.7	142	2.8	436	5.6	121	4.7	784	3.0
Schoharie .....	114	16.4	296	18.5	507	2.1	1 927	8.9	439	3.5	2 996	6.8
Schuyler .....	51	28.4	110	25.6	317	1.0	1 112	5.4	294	3.6	1 397	9.7
Seneca .....	165	15.7	1 124	6.2	380	4.3	1 338	6.8	412	.8	3 477	5.1
Steuben .....	365	8.3	1 232	9.5	1 241	1.7	4 426	5.1	1 153	2.0	7 912	2.5
Suffolk .....	149	16.2	1 607	11.8	479	4.2	3 346	4.8	577	2.3	27 781	1.2
Sullivan .....	66	23.9	147	38.6	310	1.6	1 329	8.4	308	1.7	1 954	5.7
Tioga .....	140	14.1	237	5.8	476	2.5	1 733	5.8	442	2.9	2 324	5.3
Tompkins .....	149	14.9	599	13.6	439	.7	2 487	10.5	407	4.0	7 168	1.7
Ulster .....	51	17.8	742	2.5	379	3.0	2 139	8.3	383	3.6	5 611	2.2
Warren .....	6	13.3	(D)	(D)	55	3.4	160	3.6	55	3.5	195	2.9
Washington .....	247	9.1	1 238	4.4	702	2.3	3 082	5.1	713	1.8	8 504	2.1
Wayne .....	240	10.9	2 010	9.3	798	2.0	3 718	6.6	790	1.7	10 862	1.8
Westchester .....	12	7.3	80	7.4	81	3.1	674	2.9	84	3.1	977	1.9
Wyoming .....	213	10.4	2 449	.6	692	.7	3 553	3.3	653	2.3	14 157	1.0
Yates .....	153	14.8	726	18.2	609	2.5	2 156	8.4	618	2.2	3 949	4.8
	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	
Geographic area	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>New York .....</b>	<b>31 810</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>514 724</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>29 747</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>4 722 143</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>27 569</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>3 716 942</b>	<b>.4</b>
Albany .....	398	.9	2 645	17.5	376	.6	35 877	1.4	352	.7	25 651	1.6
Allegany .....	723	.8	5 046	18.4	681	.6	89 801	.8	626	.6	61 426	.9
Bronx .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome .....	512	.8	3 461	17.0	471	.6	47 201	1.1	443	.6	35 007	1.1
Cattaraugus .....	945	.8	7 956	12.0	887	.6	105 384	.8	807	.7	73 856	.8
Cayuga .....	847	.6	20 022	3.4	797	.5	192 590	.5	726	.5	166 880	.5
Chautauqua .....	1 557	.6	17 945	7.2	1 476	.5	144 923	.6	1 406	.5	110 617	.6
Chemung .....	314	1.0	1 008	34.7	295	.6	36 054	1.4	270	.7	23 848	1.7
Chenango .....	802	.7	8 623	13.2	743	.5	104 034	.8	693	.6	81 137	.9
Clinton .....	490	1.0	12 858	6.8	430	.8	76 635	.9	399	.9	60 691	.8
Columbia .....	467	.8	18 803	7.8	435	.7	79 237	.9	396	.8	62 876	.8
Cortland .....	454	.9	4 940	16.8	426	.7	66 864	1.1	398	.8	52 736	1.0
Delaware .....	718	.7	8 316	11.4	677	.5	94 676	.8	624	.6	68 572	.9
Dutchess .....	542	.9	3 490	28.8	481	.7	62 898	1.4	404	1.0	41 212	1.3
Erie .....	973	.5	9 197	7.9	905	.4	102 573	.6	811	.5	76 232	.6
Essex .....	199	1.7	635	24.2	176	.9	25 004	1.7	156	1.1	17 611	2.1
Franklin .....	479	.8	9 820	11.5	451	.7	78 358	.9	430	.8	61 214	.9
Fulton .....	176	1.7	1 163	12.2	163	.6	21 623	1.4	147	1.0	16 727	1.4
Genesee .....	515	.7	27 605	2.1	483	.5	142 764	.5	448	.6	128 517	.4
Greene .....	248	1.2	-203	(H)	218	.8	25 315	2.5	209	.9	17 689	2.6
Hamilton .....	13	—	-39	—	11	—	(D)	(D)	10	—	257	—
Herkimer .....	585	1.0	7 604	11.6	553	.8	90 171	1.1	516	.9	68 036	1.1
Jefferson .....	919	.7	14 392	8.9	845	.6	193 684	.7	793	.7	150 429	.7
Kings .....	8	10.5	203	13.0	8	1.4	8	1.4	8	1.4	8	1.4
Lewis .....	624	.8	10 999	11.5	570	.7	101 521	.8	539	.7	82 748	.7
Livingston .....	624	.8	10 504	3.4	586	.6	154 110	.5	523	.7	127 478	.5
Madison .....	694	.7	13 801	10.6	646	.6	120 577	.7	616	.6	100 079	.7
Monroe .....	479	.7	6 647	7.4	456	.6	89 730	.9	420	.7	74 809	.9
Montgomery .....	542	.8	8 423	8.7	515	.7	104 553	.8	492	.7	84 866	.8
Nassau .....	55	3.7	-613	9.3	47	2.0	737	9.8	38	2.8	275	5.7
New York .....	2	3.6	(D)	(D)	2	3.6	(D)	(D)	2	3.6	(D)	(D)
Niagara .....	686	.7	12 087	8.6	666	.5	111 878	.7	628	.6	90 080	.7
Oneida .....	930	.7	21 045	6.3	881	.6	138 645	.7	828	.7	109 521	.7
Onondaga .....	603	.8	12 290	4.4	552	.7	111 557	.7	508	.8	93 336	.8

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) <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)
Ontario .....	690	.7	9 348	7.7	652	.5	153 765	.7	585	.6	129 451	.7
Orange .....	627	.8	12 757	8.4	584	.7	86 112	1.1	530	.9	51 124	1.1
Orleans .....	456	.7	12 392	4.7	445	.5	121 665	.5	406	.6	101 698	.4
Oswego .....	607	.7	7 207	11.8	558	.6	59 069	1.0	512	.7	41 096	1.1
Otsego .....	865	.9	8 899	14.0	824	.7	116 366	1.0	780	.8	84 555	1.0
Putnam .....	48	4.2	833	5.4	42	1.8	1 638	8.1	41	1.9	1 198	9.9
Queens .....	2	—	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)	2	—	(D)	(D)
Rensselaer .....	461	.7	4 830	21.0	434	.5	59 409	.9	400	.7	47 805	.9
Richmond .....	7	7.2	211	16.8	7	1.2	(D)	(D)	7	1.2	(D)	(D)
Rockland .....	21	4.0	767	1.3	18	2.1	343	.8	18	2.1	324	.6
St. Lawrence .....	1 365	.6	13 914	7.3	1 261	.6	220 183	.7	1 189	.6	165 579	.7
Saratoga .....	475	.7	3 661	14.9	429	.5	46 001	.9	380	.7	35 903	1.0
Schenectady .....	154	1.5	949	25.6	144	.6	10 938	1.9	138	.7	7 746	2.0
Schoharie .....	520	.9	2 784	30.7	498	.6	70 120	1.2	462	.7	53 756	1.3
Schuyler .....	318	1.0	2 493	19.4	307	.6	36 976	1.3	283	.7	27 170	1.6
Seneca .....	413	.8	7 664	8.3	387	.7	97 052	.9	363	.8	84 575	.9
Steuben .....	1 296	.5	15 326	7.4	1 245	.4	216 517	.6	1 150	.5	164 745	.6
Suffolk .....	603	.7	41 364	3.1	565	.6	29 691	.9	535	.7	24 896	.8
Sullivan .....	314	1.0	2 775	21.5	279	.9	34 813	1.5	261	1.0	25 045	1.8
Tioga .....	498	.8	3 501	13.7	479	.5	62 716	.9	449	.6	46 017	1.0
Tompkins .....	447	.7	6 604	7.7	415	.5	63 961	1.0	376	.7	49 671	1.0
Ulster .....	412	.7	8 925	4.4	371	.6	38 240	1.0	350	.7	29 857	.9
Warren .....	58	3.4	369	16.8	51	1.2	2 480	4.5	41	2.1	1 171	2.1
Washington .....	742	.7	11 028	6.9	678	.6	123 017	.7	637	.7	96 595	.8
Wayne .....	839	.6	23 472	3.7	802	.4	125 278	.6	739	.5	105 272	.6
Westchester .....	91	3.0	4 195	1.9	75	1.6	3 116	2.7	68	2.0	2 123	3.1
Wyoming .....	702	.7	20 331	2.9	635	.6	136 047	.5	590	.6	115 438	.5
Yates .....	656	.6	7 305	12.3	651	.4	77 370	.8	611	.5	59 692	.8
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)	Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>New York .....</b>	<b>2 501</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>69 197</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>16 444</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>1 450 090</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>6 160</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>86 078</b>	<b>.7</b>
Albany .....	66	3.0	482	4.0	156	1.8	9 193	1.7	107	2.4	1 837	4.9
Allegany .....	12	7.5	508	20.3	442	1.0	29 646	1.0	199	1.7	2 965	2.1
Bronx .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome .....	32	4.6	167	2.2	264	1.2	16 616	1.3	143	2.0	1 704	4.0
Cattaraugus .....	34	4.9	398	4.0	595	.9	39 776	.8	227	1.6	2 140	2.5
Cayuga .....	32	4.5	528	6.3	427	.9	53 558	.5	144	2.0	2 391	2.5
Chautauqua .....	56	3.2	543	2.3	670	.9	52 037	.7	227	1.6	2 625	2.5
Chemung .....	21	5.3	102	3.6	160	1.4	8 434	1.7	80	2.4	944	3.5
Chenango .....	20	5.5	433	2.9	494	.9	43 772	.7	154	2.0	2 388	3.0
Clinton .....	18	7.0	167	7.3	300	1.2	35 072	.7	74	3.0	819	3.9
Columbia .....	74	2.8	3 126	1.2	189	1.5	24 063	.7	81	2.9	1 498	4.0
Cortland .....	12	7.4	97	23.9	289	1.2	29 115	1.0	101	2.4	1 408	4.4
Delaware .....	32	5.1	228	6.2	472	.8	34 685	.7	185	1.8	2 479	2.6
Dutchess .....	68	3.2	1 149	3.6	183	1.8	12 366	2.0	97	2.7	2 143	4.3
Erie .....	106	2.1	2 024	2.1	394	.9	29 719	.6	150	1.9	1 477	2.9
Essex .....	15	6.9	72	10.0	91	2.2	6 370	2.1	54	3.2	881	3.9
Franklin .....	11	7.7	(D)	(D)	333	1.0	33 286	.8	78	3.0	1 137	4.6
Fulton .....	11	9.6	42	14.2	99	1.8	8 015	1.7	42	3.4	495	5.4
Genesee .....	42	3.1	5 374	.3	243	1.1	42 702	.5	86	2.4	1 254	2.8
Greene .....	23	5.8	419	9.7	117	1.9	5 145	2.8	70	2.9	793	3.7
Hamilton .....	3	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Herkimer .....	17	7.8	173	10.2	395	1.2	36 235	1.0	93	2.8	1 389	6.8
Jefferson .....	24	5.8	348	12.3	596	.9	60 354	.7	192	1.8	3 486	2.6
Kings .....	5	13.8	5	13.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lewis .....	13	7.1	87	11.0	481	.8	49 594	.7	71	2.8	601	4.4
Livingston .....	18	6.5	1 247	2.0	305	1.2	40 065	.8	153	2.0	2 185	2.8
Madison .....	21	5.9	286	9.4	439	.9	46 823	.7	109	2.5	1 518	4.3
Monroe .....	80	2.5	2 735	.9	112	2.0	8 333	2.2	51	3.5	653	5.6
Montgomery .....	24	5.9	307	2.3	355	1.1	33 078	.9	82	3.1	897	5.0
Nassau .....	32	3.2	148	2.9	2	25.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
New York .....	2	3.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Niagara .....	100	2.4	2 029	1.8	236	1.4	17 814	1.1	124	2.1	1 780	3.6
Oneida .....	31	5.0	443	3.6	584	.9	51 798	.8	138	2.2	1 632	3.4
Onondaga .....	55	3.6	1 445	3.8	254	1.4	32 892	.8	87	3.0	1 319	3.6
Ontario .....	42	3.3	706	.9	261	1.3	30 907	.7	109	2.4	1 618	4.2
Orange .....	118	2.3	4 569	1.4	221	1.8	17 787	1.6	57	4.0	1 118	8.8
Orleans .....	48	2.5	2 407	.3	175	1.6	10 694	1.5	98	2.5	1 803	4.3
Oswego .....	45	4.0	1 213	1.7	301	1.2	14 901	1.4	145	1.9	1 632	3.0
Otsego .....	26	6.6	500	12.1	561	1.0	40 355	1.0	203	1.9	2 485	3.8

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	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)
Putnam .....	13	7.5	32	14.5	8	10.9	150	15.4	4	16.7	86	18.2
Queens .....	2	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rensselaer .....	46	3.9	716	3.5	239	1.2	16 597	1.3	131	2.0	1 742	3.1
Richmond .....	7	1.2	13	.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rockland .....	9	5.6	56	1.3	1	37.3	(D)	(D)	1	37.3	(D)	(D)
St. Lawrence .....	33	5.6	154	10.8	964	.7	79 895	.6	336	1.4	4 176	2.2
Saratoga .....	56	3.1	438	5.9	191	1.5	14 607	1.1	98	2.4	1 225	3.5
Schenectady .....	23	4.1	337	5.4	41	3.2	1 713	2.8	26	4.5	309	5.9
Schoharie .....	35	5.0	525	6.5	300	1.2	21 324	1.4	141	2.1	1 837	3.7
Schuyler .....	13	6.4	119	6.6	166	1.5	9 775	1.9	84	2.5	1 208	5.7
Seneca .....	14	7.4	45	12.2	185	1.6	17 003	1.4	69	3.1	1 596	4.5
Steuben .....	53	3.4	2 685	1.2	799	.7	55 996	.6	373	1.1	5 340	1.8
Suffolk .....	413	.9	16 028	.7	16	7.3	176	11.3	7	11.2	53	9.4
Sullivan .....	19	6.8	109	15.5	160	1.7	11 012	1.8	69	3.2	1 082	4.9
Tioga .....	38	4.0	696	6.6	310	1.0	22 672	1.2	138	1.9	2 159	4.1
Tompkins .....	34	4.6	167	2.4	214	1.3	18 846	.9	93	2.5	1 171	4.1
Ulster .....	89	2.0	5 332	.3	115	2.2	5 275	1.7	74	3.0	1 228	2.7
Warren .....	14	6.3	22	8.3	11	6.7	929	2.7	10	7.3	(D)	(D)
Washington .....	44	4.3	831	5.3	482	.9	51 189	.7	166	2.0	2 087	4.2
Wayne .....	83	2.2	1 730	2.3	271	1.2	18 883	1.1	120	2.1	1 503	3.5
Westchester .....	27	4.7	86	2.7	6	11.0	(D)	(D)	3	16.6	(D)	(D)
Wyoming .....	20	6.0	2 496	.8	469	.8	80 525	.4	130	2.1	1 964	2.1
Yates .....	27	4.1	1 400	1.1	300	1.1	18 073	1.2	76	2.8	1 487	5.2
Livestock and poultry—Con.												
Geographic area	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>New York .....</b>	<b>8 732</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>700 480</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>1 508</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>79 000</b>	<b>.9</b>	<b>1 515</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>61 440</b>	<b>1.4</b>
Albany .....	34	4.3	1 826	3.6	26	5.8	399	13.0	38	4.4	912	7.0
Allegany .....	185	1.6	12 667	1.0	53	3.4	4 562	1.3	38	4.5	1 947	10.2
Bronx .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome .....	97	2.1	7 310	1.4	25	5.0	179	9.1	25	5.0	1 415	5.0
Cattaraugus .....	313	1.4	19 698	.9	91	2.9	1 008	5.1	36	4.6	1 046	11.2
Cayuga .....	214	1.3	26 252	.5	35	4.4	9 079	.6	40	4.1	1 280	8.8
Chautauqua .....	353	1.2	25 433	.8	55	3.6	1 031	11.6	30	4.8	535	6.7
Chemung .....	57	2.9	3 288	2.4	21	5.7	615	15.7	13	6.1	391	4.8
Chenango .....	319	1.1	22 552	.8	28	4.8	420	11.6	44	4.2	1 100	10.7
Clinton .....	186	1.6	18 687	.8	22	6.0	261	18.8	11	8.8	190	13.7
Columbia .....	82	2.1	11 822	.7	20	6.1	383	12.7	35	4.5	3 373	2.0
Cortland .....	178	1.6	14 701	1.1	18	5.8	572	4.5	18	6.9	3 558	5.9
Delaware .....	267	1.1	16 337	.8	39	4.2	237	7.8	35	4.3	875	7.1
Dutchess .....	64	3.1	4 129	2.1	26	5.7	396	9.4	52	3.9	2 856	7.1
Erie .....	173	1.2	15 273	.7	47	3.3	1 906	5.8	47	3.9	1 191	5.1
Essex .....	35	4.0	2 543	2.1	15	6.8	103	7.0	16	7.5	275	20.7
Franklin .....	237	1.2	18 143	.9	25	5.5	281	13.3	7	12.8	467	15.5
Fulton .....	60	2.3	3 987	1.9	8	9.4	41	10.2	8	7.7	719	7.1
Genesee .....	117	1.5	20 696	.3	25	4.6	8 180	1.5	32	4.2	2 064	6.6
Greene .....	39	3.9	1 658	3.9	13	6.7	111	8.8	20	6.6	546	10.1
Hamilton .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)
Herkimer .....	278	1.5	19 522	1.1	20	6.4	210	13.0	17	6.9	691	10.7
Jefferson .....	370	1.2	30 047	.8	48	3.9	372	7.5	38	3.9	906	4.0
Kings .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lewis .....	390	.9	28 221	.7	27	5.0	316	14.3	14	8.0	191	14.7
Livingston .....	100	1.8	17 279	.5	29	4.8	293	9.1	41	4.3	2 397	6.7
Madison .....	324	1.1	25 070	.8	35	4.3	830	7.0	23	5.5	965	12.4
Monroe .....	35	3.4	2 910	2.0	8	8.4	(D)	(D)	23	5.3	574	8.5
Montgomery .....	238	1.3	17 315	.9	19	7.3	256	15.9	19	6.8	1 133	13.9
Nassau .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)
New York .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Niagara .....	70	2.5	6 478	1.1	33	4.6	956	11.5	20	6.0	915	13.9
Oneida .....	397	1.1	27 387	.9	30	5.0	180	8.1	39	4.4	900	6.9
Onondaga .....	141	1.8	17 162	.8	12	9.0	60	11.7	20	7.2	960	12.4
Ontario .....	112	1.8	13 834	.6	19	5.9	4 191	2.1	29	4.4	1 875	3.1
Orange .....	125	2.3	9 525	1.4	11	7.1	770	10.5	24	6.5	973	15.4
Orleans .....	42	2.7	3 289	1.3	17	6.5	2 298	7.2	19	6.5	343	7.4
Oswego .....	115	2.1	5 997	2.0	48	3.9	1 069	14.1	21	5.3	140	9.3
Otsego .....	324	1.5	19 641	1.2	34	4.7	170	6.3	52	4.1	1 817	10.5
Putnam .....	3	20.6	9	20.6	3	13.3	8	15.0	11	8.4	409	10.4
Queens .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rensselaer .....	91	2.1	7 063	1.4	26	5.5	1 131	14.6	32	4.9	1 581	11.5
Richmond .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rockland .....	—	—	—	—	1	37.3	(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.											
	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)
St. Lawrence .....	584	1.0	40 567	.7	97	3.0	1 587	4.4	80	3.0	2 277	4.7
Saratoga .....	79	2.4	6 446	1.2	37	4.0	472	7.3	36	4.2	879	8.9
Schenectady .....	10	4.8	577	3.1	9	8.9	199	1.9	4	9.1	156	12.1
Schoharie .....	156	1.9	9 264	1.6	30	5.5	265	10.6	43	4.4	1 571	6.1
Schuyler .....	59	3.0	3 756	2.2	18	5.3	(D)	(D)	23	5.2	1 354	13.5
Seneca .....	92	2.3	7 177	1.4	22	4.9	13 584	1.3	17	6.8	569	9.9
Steuben .....	373	1.1	22 732	.8	65	3.1	3 512	5.1	42	3.6	1 245	8.2
Suffolk .....	7	12.2	27	11.6	11	8.7	533	9.3	16	7.0	302	10.3
Sullivan .....	72	2.6	4 505	2.1	11	9.3	126	11.4	23	6.0	334	7.6
Tioga .....	148	1.6	10 562	1.3	28	4.7	1 166	31.9	33	4.0	1 123	7.0
Tompkins .....	103	1.9	8 679	1.1	24	5.3	263	10.8	28	4.9	1 992	11.1
Ulster .....	34	4.1	1 103	2.8	23	5.5	2 147	11.3	32	5.0	679	12.2
Warren .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	7	10.4	77	12.9	—	—	—	—
Washington .....	271	1.3	26 090	.7	40	4.5	841	7.0	49	4.1	2 408	9.5
Wayne .....	103	2.0	7 713	1.3	24	4.6	6 408	1.7	34	3.9	545	5.8
Westchester .....	3	16.6	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)	4	17.4	(D)	(D)
Wyoming .....	289	1.1	45 281	.4	31	4.4	381	7.4	32	4.2	3 171	6.6
Yates .....	182	1.5	7 986	1.4	17	5.3	1 814	2.6	30	4.2	1 190	8.1

  

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>New York .....</b>	<b>1 842</b>	<b>.8</b>	<b>3 784 743</b>	<b>.1</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>1 310 733</b>	<b>1.5</b>
Albany .....	37	4.5	995	5.9	3	16.4	(D)	(D)
Allegany .....	46	3.9	890	5.3	2	18.9	(D)	(D)
Bronx .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome .....	30	4.5	3 705	18.7	3	16.4	(D)	(D)
Cattaraugus .....	86	3.3	2 146	3.8	9	9.7	381	12.8
Cayuga .....	35	4.0	134 346	1.4	2	20.0	(D)	(D)
Chautauqua .....	55	3.6	1 589	8.6	7	10.7	698	16.1
Chemung .....	15	5.9	352	9.0	—	—	—	—
Chenango .....	52	3.6	1 559	7.7	5	12.8	(D)	(D)
Clinton .....	20	6.3	(D)	(D)	2	24.4	(D)	(D)
Columbia .....	26	5.7	(D)	(D)	2	14.7	(D)	(D)
Cortland .....	32	4.9	4 639	1.0	3	18.5	(D)	(D)
Delaware .....	56	3.4	1 643	4.2	7	9.5	807	13.3
Dutchess .....	46	4.1	9 011	1.7	5	13.5	(D)	(D)
Erie .....	42	3.9	(D)	(D)	10	7.8	(D)	(D)
Essex .....	22	5.7	743	9.1	1	35.0	(D)	(D)
Franklin .....	11	8.5	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Fulton .....	12	7.2	332	5.6	—	—	—	—
Genesee .....	16	5.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Greene .....	26	5.3	(D)	(D)	1	34.3	(D)	(D)
Hamilton .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Herkimer .....	27	5.7	2 509	24.7	3	20.8	1 250	25.0
Jefferson .....	36	4.4	(D)	(D)	4	11.7	60	11.7
Kings .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lewis .....	24	5.4	619	7.2	1	44.3	(D)	(D)
Livingston .....	39	4.2	(D)	(D)	5	11.6	162	19.0
Madison .....	42	3.7	1 103	6.4	2	19.1	(D)	(D)
Monroe .....	20	5.6	2 009	8.9	1	22.3	(D)	(D)
Montgomery .....	29	5.8	645	8.5	3	14.7	(D)	(D)
Nassau .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
New York .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Niagara .....	30	4.7	(D)	(D)	7	11.3	530	13.0
Oneida .....	44	4.2	1 468	9.4	1	29.9	(D)	(D)
Onondaga .....	26	5.8	(D)	(D)	2	22.1	(D)	(D)
Ontario .....	30	4.5	(D)	(D)	1	25.6	(D)	(D)
Orange .....	34	5.1	(D)	(D)	1	32.3	(D)	(D)
Orleans .....	24	5.8	472	8.6	5	11.8	410	15.2
Oswego .....	34	4.5	736	5.8	2	18.6	(D)	(D)
Otsego .....	55	3.9	1 470	10.4	7	10.6	330	16.7
Putnam .....	13	7.6	349	10.7	2	23.6	(D)	(D)
Queens .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rensselaer .....	36	4.6	5 876	10.1	4	15.6	227	20.8
Richmond .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rockland .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Lawrence .....	114	2.7	3 041	4.8	5	12.5	172	15.1
Saratoga .....	38	4.0	(D)	(D)	2	18.9	(D)	(D)
Schenectady .....	5	10.7	(D)	(D)	1	27.6	(D)	(D)
Schoharie .....	48	4.0	1 651	7.0	3	16.9	(D)	(D)
Schuyler .....	14	6.4	(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)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Seneca .....	25	5.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Steuben .....	75	2.8	(D)	(D)	6	10.0	720	9.6	—	—		
Suffolk .....	19	6.4	3 166	11.8	2	21.8	(D)	(D)	—	—		
Sullivan .....	30	5.6	(D)	(D)	11	6.1	1 208	1.6	336	1.6		
Tioga .....	32	4.1	812	4.6	4	15.0	(D)	(D)	—	—		
Tompkins .....	22	5.8	(D)	(D)	1	27.5	(D)	(D)	—	—		
Ulster .....	43	4.4	2 315	6.6	7	12.7	1 321	27.2	—	—		
Warren .....	3	12.0	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Washington .....	45	4.3	(D)	(D)	4	17.9	134	15.2	—	—		
Wayne .....	30	4.7	(D)	(D)	2	18.6	(D)	(D)	—	—		
Westchester .....	6	15.2	344	19.5	2	20.8	(D)	(D)	—	—		
Wyoming .....	37	3.9	(D)	(D)	7	9.2	495	18.3	—	—		
Yates .....	46	3.3	2 339	6.1	2	15.0	(D)	(D)	—	—		
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)
<b>New York .....</b>	<b>5 493</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>578 715</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>62 242 783</b>	<b>.3</b>	<b>8 250</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>551 365</b>	<b>.4</b>	<b>8 235 781</b>	<b>.3</b>
Albany .....	21	5.7	1 081	3.4	122 994	2.6	49	3.5	2 839	2.5	37 416	1.9
Allegany .....	86	2.7	2 739	2.6	287 085	2.7	179	1.7	10 685	1.1	161 479	1.0
Bronx .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome .....	34	4.0	1 291	5.1	128 193	3.6	92	2.3	5 734	1.4	81 227	1.5
Cattaraugus .....	126	2.3	4 657	2.6	534 349	2.7	318	1.3	15 667	1.0	246 089	1.0
Cayuga .....	396	.9	56 993	.7	6 433 149	.7	233	1.3	19 240	.7	330 771	.7
Chautauqua .....	127	2.0	7 383	2.3	782 410	2.0	291	1.3	16 780	.8	244 503	.8
Chemung .....	48	3.0	3 751	3.5	426 943	3.4	56	2.8	2 786	3.5	38 660	3.4
Chenango .....	71	2.4	4 632	1.8	457 971	1.7	254	1.3	14 942	1.1	204 776	1.1
Clinton .....	39	2.8	6 278	.8	788 586	.6	159	1.8	13 894	.9	232 390	.7
Columbia .....	81	2.3	11 427	1.1	1 288 872	1.0	98	2.0	10 718	.9	153 272	.7
Cortland .....	75	2.6	5 736	2.8	605 362	2.6	171	1.7	10 943	1.1	167 815	1.0
Delaware .....	15	5.7	718	2.8	72 850	2.2	200	1.3	8 308	1.0	115 105	.9
Dutchess .....	73	2.8	5 218	1.5	565 282	1.7	79	2.8	4 346	2.7	67 576	2.5
Erie .....	165	1.5	10 917	1.3	1 118 979	1.2	194	1.3	12 570	1.2	197 361	1.3
Essex .....	3	23.0	4	19.6	210	29.4	29	4.1	2 440	2.6	35 442	3.3
Franklin .....	27	4.1	1 326	4.9	139 780	4.7	177	1.6	11 175	.9	175 885	1.0
Fulton .....	23	4.2	1 201	3.7	126 704	3.4	53	2.5	3 215	1.7	60 707	1.3
Genesee .....	192	1.3	27 231	.8	2 889 770	.7	133	1.5	16 816	.6	275 228	.5
Greene .....	14	6.8	638	10.8	74 235	9.5	31	4.0	1 018	5.1	10 924	3.7
Hamilton .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Herkimer .....	81	2.6	5 362	3.1	582 193	2.9	248	1.6	13 450	1.2	190 305	1.3
Jefferson .....	102	2.0	10 230	1.7	983 296	1.4	278	1.4	22 323	.8	331 366	.7
Kings .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lewis .....	43	1.9	4 294	.9	449 250	.8	303	1.1	16 943	.9	251 299	.9
Livingston .....	234	1.3	34 549	.8	3 838 938	.7	136	1.7	15 282	.6	258 523	.5
Madison .....	197	1.5	16 344	1.6	1 704 553	1.6	322	1.1	20 372	.9	293 646	.9
Monroe .....	117	1.9	21 614	1.0	2 270 703	1.0	44	2.9	2 655	2.5	40 441	2.5
Montgomery .....	124	2.0	11 015	1.4	1 099 908	1.5	228	1.3	16 619	.9	210 844	.9
Nassau .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
New York .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Niagara .....	192	1.6	28 739	.7	2 978 862	.6	92	2.2	6 414	1.4	96 447	1.1
Oneida .....	205	1.5	20 068	1.0	2 235 680	1.0	343	1.2	18 256	.9	267 056	.8
Onondaga .....	200	1.6	28 930	1.0	2 969 209	1.0	159	1.8	12 306	.9	192 833	.8
Ontario .....	289	1.1	39 289	1.0	4 324 098	.9	133	1.7	11 412	.8	186 583	.6
Orange .....	43	3.7	4 671	1.8	463 360	1.7	123	2.3	7 902	1.4	107 534	1.3
Orleans .....	139	1.5	31 335	.5	3 606 152	.5	68	2.5	3 737	1.3	56 085	1.5
Oswego .....	83	2.6	4 754	2.7	459 362	2.7	120	2.1	5 340	1.8	74 353	1.9
Otsego .....	71	2.5	5 635	1.8	549 131	2.0	297	1.5	14 511	1.3	202 115	1.3
Putnam .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	20.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Queens .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rensselaer .....	92	2.1	11 455	.9	1 190 275	.8	118	1.9	8 177	1.6	92 248	1.6
Richmond .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rockland .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Lawrence .....	88	2.5	5 894	2.4	612 632	2.4	432	1.1	32 606	.7	476 816	.6
Saratoga .....	51	2.9	5 105	1.3	530 852	1.4	92	2.1	7 408	1.2	112 118	1.0
Schenectady .....	6	7.4	141	7.7	10 691	7.3	11	3.8	421	3.5	3 258	4.0
Schoharie .....	47	3.5	4 213	3.0	450 868	2.9	148	1.9	7 373	1.9	94 188	1.9
Schuyler .....	49	3.5	2 537	3.6	250 575	3.2	59	3.1	3 507	2.1	52 892	1.6
Seneca .....	176	1.5	26 722	1.1	2 940 061	1.1	91	2.4	5 347	1.6	81 474	1.4
Steuben .....	258	1.3	19 047	1.2	2 020 358	1.2	352	1.1	19 244	.8	277 620	.7
Suffolk .....	24	4.9	2 115	6.8	285 908	8.7	6	12.0	112	10.7	2 034	11.7
Sullivan .....	8	7.0	693	1.5	69 580	1.2	52	3.2	2 523	2.8	27 579	3.0
Tioga .....	81	2.3	3 882	2.1	403 835	1.9	149	1.6	7 964	1.5	104 582	1.4

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	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)
Tompkins	124	1.8	12 944	2.2	1 297 543	2.1	101	1.9	6 216	1.3	92 514	1.3
Ulster	22	4.4	1 732	3.2	215 042	3.8	31	4.0	1 634	3.8	24 275	3.2
Warren	3	13.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	3	13.9	270	4.6	3 680	4.1
Washington	87	2.2	8 386	2.6	859 120	2.7	272	1.3	26 443	.8	374 004	.8
Wayne	246	1.3	31 786	1.1	3 301 580	1.1	112	1.9	5 658	1.7	87 706	1.8
Westchester	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Wyoming	137	1.7	9 351	1.6	1 057 785	1.4	324	1.0	38 731	.4	640 781	.4
Yates	257	1.2	12 441	1.3	1 362 644	1.4	204	1.4	6 021	1.4	90 859	1.6
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Oats for grain					Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	Farms		Acres		Quantity		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hundredweight	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
<b>New York</b>	<b>2 808</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>77 240</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>4 841 802</b>	<b>.7</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>23 920</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>6 611 891</b>	<b>.4</b>
Albany	12	8.7	194	10.2	6 235	11.5	2	17.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Allegany	101	2.6	2 274	2.7	107 281	3.1	8	8.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Bronx	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Broome	21	5.5	273	4.9	9 392	4.6	8	9.9	12	12.8	1 260	10.6
Cattaraugus	128	2.4	2 260	2.3	142 974	2.5	13	8.0	107	1.6	(D)	(D)
Cayuga	120	2.1	3 454	2.3	216 428	2.7	12	6.1	142	4.6	15 618	11.1
Chautauqua	57	3.3	757	2.4	33 990	2.5	7	9.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Chemung	39	3.6	675	4.1	37 787	4.6	3	12.3	3	10.1	602	10.1
Chenango	52	2.5	1 292	2.4	74 214	2.2	5	12.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Clinton	13	7.1	241	4.2	8 331	2.1	6	13.9	68	7.1	(D)	(D)
Columbia	25	5.0	616	5.0	22 647	8.7	8	9.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cortland	29	4.7	687	5.3	44 163	5.7	1	26.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Delaware	5	14.4	57	15.6	3 236	16.2	5	15.3	18	29.4	1 290	23.8
Dutchess	26	4.4	567	4.0	25 268	4.5	15	7.7	49	7.4	9 628	8.2
Erie	96	2.0	2 414	1.6	143 038	1.8	23	4.3	781	4.0	169 565	4.8
Essex	3	14.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	5	11.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Franklin	12	7.6	439	12.8	27 076	15.8	8	6.4	736	3.5	202 310	2.5
Fulton	13	6.7	185	5.2	9 725	6.6	3	15.6	9	18.5	(D)	(D)
Genesee	83	2.3	2 022	2.6	137 592	2.5	11	5.6	487	2.4	134 261	1.7
Greene	14	6.9	154	8.3	4 691	7.4	2	12.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Hamilton	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Herkimer	61	3.3	1 657	4.6	103 535	4.9	3	7.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Jefferson	61	3.4	1 329	3.8	71 334	3.8	1	30.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Kings	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lewis	47	3.5	1 021	4.9	53 224	2.4	5	10.3	1	14.0	170	13.9
Livingston	90	2.5	3 421	5.9	244 924	3.5	10	5.7	1 218	1.9	316 120	1.8
Madison	129	1.9	3 532	1.9	209 764	2.0	3	15.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Monroe	38	3.7	1 649	2.3	119 497	2.0	8	7.6	275	8.9	66 877	7.7
Montgomery	59	3.3	1 592	3.5	74 762	3.1	10	8.8	30	5.1	7 280	5.3
Nassau	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
New York	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Niagara	79	2.8	3 463	2.4	260 195	2.5	18	6.6	53	9.6	11 725	9.3
Oneida	116	2.1	3 154	1.6	204 042	1.5	14	6.0	285	4.6	75 870	5.0
Onondaga	112	2.3	4 477	1.9	298 881	2.2	13	9.3	37	8.5	8 584	10.0
Ontario	106	2.2	3 716	2.1	235 372	2.0	2	13.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Orange	3	15.1	76	16.0	4 428	14.8	23	5.6	167	6.8	37 568	7.1
Orleans	44	3.3	1 427	2.5	106 136	2.4	20	4.1	644	.5	166 537	.6
Oswego	37	4.4	732	4.9	45 175	5.7	17	6.3	463	1.1	104 328	1.7
Otsego	57	3.3	1 052	2.9	59 951	2.8	4	14.4	3	16.4	424	13.2
Putnam	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Queens	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rensselaer	16	5.4	317	4.9	16 473	4.5	6	11.8	9	21.2	(D)	(D)
Richmond	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rockland	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Lawrence	46	4.5	687	4.5	30 121	4.5	14	9.2	14	14.4	1 536	7.3
Saratoga	22	4.7	420	3.3	24 065	3.5	6	9.5	8	8.6	665	6.1
Schenectady	3	11.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Schoharie	10	7.6	244	4.4	8 460	4.7	6	9.3	47	.5	12 112	.4
Schuyler	47	3.6	778	5.6	42 794	5.8	4	13.2	2	14.4	342	20.2
Seneca	66	2.8	3 398	2.3	250 985	2.4	4	16.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Steuben	273	1.3	10 864	1.2	719 616	1.2	46	2.6	5 091	.9	1 252 723	.6
Suffolk	10	5.6	182	5.2	14 311	8.1	74	2.7	5 906	1.2	1 767 368	1.1
Sullivan	2	24.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	6	12.3	17	10.3	1 262	7.8
Tioga	40	3.8	897	2.9	46 444	2.9	8	8.8	8	11.2	1 374	11.4
Tompkins	74	2.7	2 408	2.7	151 100	2.8	5	14.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Ulster	2	20.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	5	10.9	20	8.2	4 930	1.9
Warren	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Washington	22	5.5	399	8.0	19 210	9.8	12	7.0	336	7.6	92 457	6.6
Wayne	78	2.6	1 531	2.6	100 109	2.7	28	3.7	3 113	.8	927 745	.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	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Oats for grain						Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hundredweight	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Westchester .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Wyoming .....	120	2.1	2 630	1.9	173 237	1.9	10	6.2	2 279	.1	735 585	.1
Yates .....	89	2.3	1 526	2.9	95 739	3.0	12	7.1	279 113	5.1	29 161	6.5
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)						Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
<b>New York</b> .....	<b>20 805</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>2 073 486</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>4 035 722</b>	<b>.5</b>	<b>2 720</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>169 331</b>	<b>.3</b>		
Albany .....	251	1.2	20 625	1.9	28 327	1.6	42	3.6	560	5.3		
Allegany .....	540	.8	44 638	1.0	87 271	1.1	30	5.0	447	4.7		
Bronx .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Broome .....	359	.9	27 561	1.4	49 630	1.5	28	4.7	517	4.3		
Cattaraugus .....	705	.8	51 152	1.0	106 365	1.0	42	4.1	346	6.6		
Cayuga .....	554	.8	52 294	.7	125 892	.7	88	2.2	13 067	.6		
Chautauqua .....	811	.8	72 279	.8	148 907	.8	62	3.0	2 661	.6		
Chemung .....	212	1.0	15 617	1.8	26 121	2.1	16	6.0	819	5.2		
Chenango .....	611	.7	64 590	1.0	113 866	1.0	22	5.3	138	8.8		
Clinton .....	343	1.1	39 563	1.3	81 988	1.3	16	6.9	491	13.0		
Columbia .....	256	1.3	36 111	1.3	70 943	1.2	48	3.8	1 150	2.5		
Cortland .....	348	1.0	37 163	1.2	74 267	1.2	21	5.1	207	7.6		
Delaware .....	562	.7	62 725	.9	100 997	.9	33	4.5	260	8.6		
Dutchess .....	275	1.3	26 782	1.8	51 564	1.9	60	3.5	2 817	2.6		
Erie .....	559	.7	42 649	.8	92 552	.8	98	2.2	3 120	1.5		
Essex .....	123	1.6	15 284	2.4	24 531	2.6	17	7.1	252	12.0		
Franklin .....	391	.9	49 954	1.0	92 385	1.1	22	6.1	568	2.3		
Fulton .....	115	1.5	12 716	1.6	22 084	2.0	16	6.4	93	5.7		
Genesee .....	343	.9	36 108	.9	83 810	.8	100	2.0	28 750	.6		
Greene .....	180	1.2	15 297	2.8	23 988	2.5	13	8.4	551	1.8		
Hamilton .....	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)		
Herkimer .....	469	1.0	51 715	1.2	108 527	1.2	23	6.3	411	9.0		
Jefferson .....	737	.8	119 032	.8	204 352	.8	25	5.1	261	5.9		
Kings .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	23.6	(D)	(D)		
Lewis .....	497	.8	65 669	.9	135 395	1.0	18	5.1	83	9.2		
Livingston .....	395	1.0	35 350	.9	88 527	.8	86	2.4	10 172	1.2		
Madison .....	540	.7	63 697	.8	128 317	.9	41	3.9	772	4.2		
Monroe .....	190	1.5	11 877	1.4	27 521	1.4	109	2.0	10 063	1.0		
Montgomery .....	439	.8	58 480	1.1	97 776	1.0	27	5.5	390	2.4		
Nassau .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	6.2	122	2.3		
New York .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Niagara .....	340	1.1	28 601	1.3	57 270	1.3	144	2.0	5 480	.8		
Oneida .....	719	.8	70 148	.9	146 350	1.0	46	4.2	3 712	1.6		
Onondaga .....	366	1.1	36 958	1.3	88 215	1.1	75	3.2	2 436	3.6		
Ontario .....	381	1.0	33 824	1.2	81 734	1.0	77	2.3	13 336	.9		
Orange .....	282	1.5	28 550	1.7	53 313	1.9	166	2.0	8 569	1.3		
Orleans .....	243	1.2	13 132	1.7	29 128	1.6	106	1.7	19 578	1.2		
Oswego .....	378	1.0	26 380	1.4	53 530	1.5	81	2.7	3 545	1.6		
Otsego .....	702	.9	68 385	1.1	120 395	1.1	29	5.3	124	11.6		
Putnam .....	21	4.5	946	12.6	1 469	11.6	13	6.9	64	8.2		
Queens .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(D)	(D)		
Rensselaer .....	311	.9	27 077	1.3	42 892	1.3	49	3.5	1 169	2.4		
Richmond .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Rockland .....	2	18.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	5	7.5	159	1.9		
St. Lawrence .....	1 105	.6	135 106	.8	256 933	.8	44	4.4	261	5.1		
Saratoga .....	272	1.1	22 203	1.4	38 423	1.4	56	2.8	377	2.5		
Schenectady .....	101	1.4	6 543	2.4	9 028	2.8	17	4.5	312	5.5		
Schoharie .....	400	.9	42 584	1.4	70 990	1.5	34	4.8	682	5.4		
Schuyler .....	223	1.1	18 713	1.7	33 844	1.8	12	8.0	256	18.2		
Seneca .....	255	1.2	18 808	1.6	41 471	1.4	35	4.5	1 556	1.7		
Steuben .....	960	.6	107 992	.7	198 858	.8	50	3.5	1 506	1.1		
Suffolk .....	33	5.0	612	5.2	1 316	4.7	149	2.1	5 868	1.1		
Sullivan .....	210	1.3	23 488	1.9	38 529	2.2	25	5.3	157	11.4		
Tioga .....	373	.8	32 785	1.1	54 794	1.2	27	4.7	504	5.6		
Tompkins .....	274	1.1	24 708	1.1	51 116	1.1	43	3.8	1 007	1.1		
Ulster .....	186	1.5	13 082	1.7	20 905	1.5	52	3.2	3 304	.6		
Warren .....	17	5.3	519	3.3	1 346	3.3	4	12.1	13	14.2		
Washington .....	549	.8	63 250	1.0	115 772	1.1	46	4.1	737	4.9		
Wayne .....	342	1.1	16 845	1.3	40 807	1.3	97	2.1	5 824	.6		
Westchester .....	14	6.6	1 297	4.0	2 416	3.0	19	5.9	331	2.4		
Wyoming .....	523	.7	57 261	.7	140 008	.6	45	3.8	5 154	2.1		
Yates .....	417	.8	24 710	1.3	48 928	1.2	59	2.8	4 217	3.1		

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.				
	Land in orchards				
	Farms		Acres		
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
<b>New York . . . . .</b>	<b>2 436</b>	<b>.6</b>	<b>101 628</b>	<b>.5</b>	
Albany . . . . .	8	8.8	394	1.4	
Allegany . . . . .	9	9.4	41	11.1	
Bronx . . . . .	—	—	—	—	
Broome . . . . .	14	7.4	122	6.8	
Cattaraugus . . . . .	33	4.8	727	8.3	
Cayuga . . . . .	27	5.6	319	6.5	
Chautauqua . . . . .	602	1.0	17 152	1.2	
Chemung . . . . .	12	7.7	116	11.7	
Chenango . . . . .	17	6.4	57	9.2	
Clinton . . . . .	19	5.4	3 142	1.2	
Columbia . . . . .	79	2.9	3 647	1.9	
Cortland . . . . .	6	12.1	9	23.3	
Delaware . . . . .	12	8.0	33	11.0	
Dutchess . . . . .	39	4.2	1 124	3.3	
Erie . . . . .	65	3.0	1 726	1.7	
Essex . . . . .	8	11.8	316	11.1	
Franklin . . . . .	6	13.5	(D)	(D)	
Fulton . . . . .	4	10.2	45	15.0	
Genesee . . . . .	10	8.4	53	14.8	
Greene . . . . .	11	9.6	143	15.4	
Hamilton . . . . .	—	—	—	—	
Herkimer . . . . .	8	9.7	54	16.6	
Jefferson . . . . .	2	19.0	(D)	(D)	
Kings . . . . .	—	—	—	—	
Lewis . . . . .	4	13.2	57	16.4	
Livingston . . . . .	13	8.1	42	10.1	
Madison . . . . .	7	11.6	50	13.7	
Monroe . . . . .	51	3.4	2 139	2.0	
Montgomery . . . . .	16	7.5	82	10.5	
Nassau . . . . .	3	—	(D)	(D)	
New York . . . . .	—	—	—	—	
Niagara . . . . .	146	1.9	8 266	1.3	
Oneida . . . . .	12	7.3	397	3.2	
Onondaga . . . . .	24	5.4	948	1.4	
Ontario . . . . .	54	3.2	1 245	2.2	
Orange . . . . .	32	4.5	2 170	1.7	
Orleans . . . . .	98	2.1	6 877	.8	
Oswego . . . . .	27	4.8	611	8.5	
Otsego . . . . .	12	8.7	25	10.5	
Putnam . . . . .	6	11.7	55	3.1	
Queens . . . . .	—	—	—	—	
Rensselaer . . . . .	16	7.3	220	6.6	
Richmond . . . . .	—	—	—	—	
Rockland . . . . .	3	—	(D)	(D)	
St. Lawrence . . . . .	21	7.0	76	8.7	
Saratoga . . . . .	20	5.0	573	3.9	
Schenectady . . . . .	9	7.8	70	12.9	
Schoharie . . . . .	23	5.6	279	4.3	
Schuyler . . . . .	40	3.7	1 349	5.7	
Seneca . . . . .	46	3.9	2 178	1.9	
Steuben . . . . .	74	3.0	1 400	3.9	
Suffolk . . . . .	74	3.3	2 588	3.5	
Sullivan . . . . .	13	9.6	101	13.8	
Tioga . . . . .	3	14.9	(D)	(D)	
Tompkins . . . . .	10	8.5	108	2.9	
Ulster . . . . .	111	1.9	9 475	.6	
Warren . . . . .	1	24.9	(D)	(D)	
Washington . . . . .	23	5.4	217	4.8	
Wayne . . . . .	255	1.3	24 656	.7	
Westchester . . . . .	11	9.6	248	13.7	
Wyoming . . . . .	18	7.5	225	8.4	
Yates . . . . .	169	1.7	5 347	2.0	

<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..	31 757	6 493	38 250	2.5	17.0
Land in farms ..... acres..	7 254 470	528 944	7 783 414	1.7	6.8
Average size of farm ..... acres..	228	82	203	(X)	(X)
<b>Farms by size of farm:</b>					
Less than 10 acres .....	2 226	1 057	3 283	12.2	32.2
10 to 49 acres .....	5 499	2 013	7 512	5.7	26.8
50 to 179 acres .....	11 319	2 715	14 034	4.6	19.3
180 acres or more .....	12 713	708	13 421	2.4	5.3
<b>Farms by value of sales:</b>					
Less than \$2,500 .....	7 707	4 007	11 714	6.3	34.2
\$2,500 to \$9,999 .....	6 908	1 635	8 543	4.4	19.1
\$10,000 or more .....	17 142	851	17 993	2.2	4.7
Market value of agricultural products sold ..... \$1,000..	2 834 512	3 574	2 838 086	2.8	.1
<b>Farms by type of organization:</b>					
Individual or family .....	26 855	6 411	33 266	2.8	19.3
Partnership, corporation, or other .....	4 902	82	4 984	3.4	1.6
<b>Farms by tenure of operator:</b>					
Full owners .....	19 170	5 287	24 457	3.5	21.6
Part owners .....	10 742	953	11 695	3.3	8.1
Tenants .....	1 845	253	2 098	6.7	12.1
<b>Operators by place of residence:</b>					
On farm operated .....	26 320	5 524	31 844	2.8	17.3
Not on farm operated .....	3 849	704	4 553	6.1	15.5
Not reported .....	1 588	265	1 853	10.0	14.3
<b>Operators by principal occupation:</b>					
Farming .....	18 426	1 087	19 513	2.2	5.6
Other .....	13 331	5 406	18 737	4.4	28.9
<b>Operators by sex:</b>					
Male .....	28 632	5 337	33 969	2.5	15.7
Female.....	3 125	1 156	4 281	10.4	27.0
<b>Operators by race:</b>					
White .....	31 581	6 464	38 045	2.5	17.0
Black and other races .....	176	29	205	42.0	14.1
<b>Operators by years on present farm:</b>					
4 years or less .....	2 898	702	3 600	5.9	19.5
5 years or more .....	24 578	2 382	26 960	2.0	8.8
Not reported .....	4 281	3 409	7 690	9.6	44.3

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