Appendix C.
Statistical Methodology

THE SCREENING PHASE AND THE MAIL LIST MODEL

The 1997 Census of Agriculture featured a pre-census screening phase that surveyed selected records, by mail or telephone, for presence or absence of agricultural activity. Records selected for screening had a low probability of qualifying as farms. All records responding to the screener and reporting no agricultural activity were removed from the census mail list. Eliminating nonfarm records from the mail list reduced respondent burden and data collection costs.

The screening phase included nearly 500,000 records. Records were selected for screening using one of the following criteria:

1) Records on selected agriculture specialty lists that had no other list source,

2) Records identified by a mail list model as having a low probability of being a farm.

A mail list model predicted the probability that an addressee on the 1997 preliminary census mail list operated a farm. The model defined groups based on combinations of characteristics such as source(s) of the mail list record, expected value of agricultural production, and geographic location. Farm proportions were estimated for these groups by calculating the proportion of 1992 census respondent records that were farms which exhibited the characteristics defined by the group. This proportion, also called the in-scope rate, provided an estimate of the probability that an addressee in the group operated a farm.

Each address record on the 1997 preliminary census mail list was assigned to a model group by matching record characteristics to model group characteristics. Records belonging to the groups with the highest farm probability were those more likely to be farms. Records with a farm probability of approximately 30 percent or less were selected for screening, along with records included on selected agriculture specialty lists as noted above.

Before screening, the preliminary census mail list consisted of 3,314,790 records. There were 478,298 records selected for screening. Of these, 125,570 records were determined to be nonfarms as a result of the screening phase and were removed. These records were removed from the final census mail list. The remaining 3,189,220 records received census report forms.

CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

All name and address records on the final census mail list were designated to receive a 1997 Census of Agriculture report form. Two different types of census report forms, sample and nonsample, were used to collect data. Sections 1 through 20 and 28 through 32 of the sample form were identical to sections on the nonsample census form. Sample form sections 21 through 27 contained additional questions on usage of fertilizers and chemicals, farm production expenditures, value of machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, farm-related income, and hired workers. There were 11 regional versions of the nonsample form and 13 regional versions of the sample form with listings of crops varying by region. These different forms were used to reduce the response burden of the census, while providing reliable information on a large number of data items.

The sample form was mailed to all mail list records in Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island and to a sample of records in other States selected from the final mail list. Mail list records were selected into the sample with certainty if they (1) were expected to have large total value of agricultural products sold or large acreage, (2) were multi-unit operations (i.e., separate farms producing under one company organization), (3) were in a county with less than 100 farms in 1992, or (4) had other special characteristics. Farms with special characteristics were abnormal farms, such as institutional farms, experimental and research farms, and Indian reservations. Mail list records in counties containing 100 to 199 farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 2; records in counties containing 200 to 299 farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 4; and records in counties containing 300 or more farms in 1992 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 6. The remaining mail list records not chosen to receive the sample form received the nonsample census form. This differential sampling scheme was used to provide reliable data for the sample sections of the report form for all counties.

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

The census of agriculture complex edit and imputation system is an automated computerized system that performed the following functions:

- Ensured reasonable relationships between/among data items, values for various sizes of farms, combinations of commodities, and economic interactions.

- Ensured necessary consistencies were present (there were more than 70 distinct consistency requirements).

- Ensured climatic, geographic, legal, and physical constraints were met.

The system performed these and similar functions for more than 900 data key codes for sample records and approximately 850 data key codes for nonsample records.

For the 1997 Census of Agriculture, as in previous censuses, all reported data were keyed and then edited by computer. The edits were used to determine whether the reports met the minimum criteria to be counted as farms in the census. The complex edit and imputation system provided the basis for deciding to accept, impute (supply), delete, or alter the reported value for each data record item.

Whenever possible, edit imputations, deletions, and changes were based on component or related data on the respondent's report form. For some items, such as operator characteristics, data for that record from the previous census were used when available. Values for other missing or unacceptable reported data items were calculated based on reported quantities and known fixed price parameters.

When these and similar methods were not available and values had to be supplied, the imputation process used information reported for another farm operation in a geographically adjacent area with characteristics similar to those of the farm operation with incomplete data. For example, a farm operation that reported acres of corn harvested, but did not report quantity of corn harvested, was assigned the same bushels of corn per acre harvested as that of the last nearby farm with similar characteristics that reported acceptable yields during that particular execution of the computer edit. The imputation for missing items in each section of the report form was conducted separately; thus, assigned values for one operation could come from more than one respondent.

Prior to the imputation operation, a set of default values and relationships was assigned to the possible imputation variables. The relationships and values varied depending on the item being imputed. For example, different default values were assigned for several Standard Industrial Classifications and total value of sales categories when imputing hired farm labor expenses. These values and item relationships for the possible imputation variables were stored in the computer in a series of matrices.

Each execution of the computer edit consisted of records from only one State sorted by reported State and county. For a given execution of the edit, the stored entries in the various matrices were retained in memory only until a succeeding record having acceptable characteristics for the same sections of the report form was processed by the computer. Then the acceptable responses of the succeeding operation replaced those previously stored. When a record processed through the edit had unreported or unacceptable data, the record was assigned the last acceptable ratio or response from an operation with a similar set of characteristics. Once each execution of the computer edit for a State was completed, the possible imputation variables were reset to the default values and relationships for subsequent executions. An edit run usually consisted of 10,000 or more records.

After the initial computer edit, all keyed reports not meeting the census farm definition were reviewed to ensure that the data had been keyed correctly. Edit referrals were generated for 17 percent of the reports included as farms; they were reviewed for keying accuracy and to ensure that the computer edit actions were correct. If the results of the computer edit were not acceptable, corrections were made and the record re-edited.

CENSUS ESTIMATION

The 1997 Census of Agriculture used two types of statistical estimation procedures to account for whole farm nonresponse and sample data collection. The procedures were necessary because some farm operators did not respond to the census despite numerous attempts to contact them, and estimates for certain data items were based on a sample of farm operators rather than a full enumeration.

Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

Whole farm nonresponse to the census occurred when a response was never received for a record. If the record was a large farm, as defined by value of production or acreage, or a unique farm operation, intensive telephone or personal followup was conducted during census processing to obtain a response. If these attempts failed, either the NASS survey database, the census historic database, or other more current sources were used to impute data for the record.

During mail list development, the State Statistical Offices (SSOs), in an effort to reduce respondent burden, identified records that participated in multiple NASS surveys and/or situations where there were special reporting relationships between an enumerator and a respondent. These records were referred to as tagged records. The SSOs had full responsibility for the data collection for these records, including imputation of data for the record if a response was not obtainable.

Whole farm nonresponse that occurred within the remaining universe of records was accounted for by a statistical weighting procedure. The weights of the responding farms were adjusted to account for farms that did not respond. The information needed for this process was obtained from the 1997 Nonresponse Survey. The SSOs conducted the nonresponse survey using computer-assisted telephone interviewing (Blaise-CATI) or personal enumeration when telephone contact was not possible. Alaska and Rhode

Island were not eligible for the survey because all nonrespondents were subject to extensive followup. In these cases, data were collected by telephone or other methods. The nonresponse survey collected information from a sample of census nonrespondents to determine farm status and estimate the proportion of farms in the nonresponse universe. The information was then used to estimate the number of nonresponding farm operations by State and county.

The 1997 Nonresponse Survey consisted of a stratified systematic sample of the nonresponse records within each State. The sample was selected near the end of the census follow-up operations. Five strata were defined to be homogeneous on probability of farm status and were based on screener status, total value produced, and list source(s) of the mail list record.

Based on survey results, estimates of the proportion of census nonrespondents operating farms were made for each stratum in the State. The estimates were applied to the total number of census nonrespondents in that stratum, providing a State estimate of the number of census nonrespondents that operated farms. The number of census nonrespondents that operated farms was then derived for each county by stratum. This estimation procedure assumed that the distribution of farms in a stratum by county was the same for census nonrespondents as for census respondents.

Within each stratum in a county, a noninteger nonresponse weight was calculated and assigned to each eligible respondent farm record. Census respondent farms that were designated as large farms or tagged records or as farms that exhibited "rare" commodities were ineligible to represent nonrespondent farms and were excluded from the nonresponse weighting procedure. These records were assigned nonresponse weights of 1.0.

The noninteger nonresponse weight is the ratio of the sum of the estimated number of nonrespondent farms from the nonresponse survey and the number of eligible census respondent farms, divided by the number of eligible census respondent farms. Stratum controls were established to ensure that this weight never exceeded 2.0. For the published tabulations of the complete count items, the noninteger nonresponse weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight of either 1 or 2 for each record. For the sample count items, the noninteger nonresponse weight was used in the calculation of the final sample weight.

Table A quantifies the effect of the nonresponse estimation procedure on selected census data items. The percentages in this table are percents of the census values contributed by nonresponse estimation. These indicate the potential for bias in published figures resulting from nonresponse to the census. The estimates provided in this table do not reflect the effect of item nonresponse to individual census data items. The effect of this item nonresponse is discussed in the "Census Nonsampling Error" section.

Sample Estimation

Sample data estimation determined the population totals that would have resulted from a complete census for the items in sections 21 through 27 of the sample form. The estimates were obtained from a weighting procedure that assigned a weight to each respondent record containing sample items. For any given county, a sample item total was estimated by multiplying the data items for each farm in the county by the corresponding sample weight and summing over all sample records.

Each respondent sample farm was assigned a sample weight for use in producing estimates for all sample items. For example, if the weight given to a sample farm had the value 6, all sample data items reported by that farm were multiplied by 6.

The noninteger sample weight is calculated for each respondent sample farm by multiplying the noninteger nonrespondent weight by the sampling factor. For published tabulations of the sample count items, the noninteger sample weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight for each record. For certainty farms, the sampling factor equals 1 so the sample weight is just equal to the nonresponse weight. Sampling factor calculation for non-certainty farms is described below.

Within a county, the weighting procedure for non-certainty farms was performed in three steps using three variables. The first variable contained eight 1997 total value of agricultural production (TVP) groups. The second and third variables, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code and farm acreage, contained two groups. The three sets of groups were:

TVP	SIC	Acres
$1 to $999	01, 08 All crops	1 to 69
$1,000 to $2,499	02 All livestock	70 or more
$2,500 to $4,999		
$5,000 to $9,999		
$10,000 to $24,999		
$25,000 to $49,999		
$50,000 to $99,999		
$100,000 or more		

The first step in the estimation procedure classified the sample records into 32 mutually exclusive initial strata formed by the three variable groups. The total and sample farm counts were expanded to account for nonresponse. Each cell containing sample farm records was assigned an initial sample factor equal to the ratio of the total farm count to the sample farm count. This factor was approximately equal to the inverse of the probability of selecting a farm for the census sample.

The second step in the estimation procedure combined, when necessary, the 32 initial strata to increase the reliability of the weighting procedure. Any stratum that contained less than 10 sample farms or had a factor greater than twice the mail sample rate was collapsed with another stratum. The mail sample rate was either 2, 4, or 6,

depending on whether the county had a 1 in 2, 1 in 4, or 1 in 6 sample selection rate. The collapsing occurred within the 32 initial strata according to a specified collapsing pattern. After the collapsing process was completed, new total farm counts and sample farm counts were computed from each final strata and used to calculate final sample factors.

The final step calculated the noninteger sample weight as the product of the final sampling factor and the noninteger nonresponse weight. As described previously, the noninteger sample weight for each record is randomly rounded to an integer weight which is used in published tabulations. For example, if the final weight for a farm was 7.2, then the record would be rounded to either 7 or 8.

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

The sample for the 1997 Census of Agriculture was only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. In this context, "sample" refers to the sample for both the nonresponse survey and the selection of farms to receive sample forms.

The standard error, or sampling error, of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples. It is a measure of precision - that is, how well an estimate from a particular sample approximates the true population parameter. The percent relative standard error of an estimate is defined as the standard error of the estimate divided by the value of the estimate, then multiplied by 100. The true population parameter can be defined or conceptualized several different ways. One way is to think of the true population parameter as the average result of all possible samples (selected using a given sample design). A second way is to think of the true population parameter as the figure obtained from carrying out a complete enumeration of the population.

If all possible samples were selected, each of the samples surveyed under essentially the same conditions, and an estimate and its standard error calculated from each sample, then:

1. Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.65 standard errors below the estimate to 1.65 standard errors above the estimate would include the true population parameter.

2. Approximately 95 percent of the intervals from 1.96 standard errors below the estimate to 1.96 standard errors above the estimate would include the true population parameter.

The following example illustrates the computations necessary to produce a confidence statement for an estimate. Assume that the estimate of number of farms for a State is 94,382 and the relative standard error of the estimate is 0.1 percent (0.001). Multiplying 94,382 by 0.001 yields 94, the standard error; therefore, a 90-percent confidence interval is 94,227 to 94,537 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.65 x 94).

If corresponding confidence intervals were constructed for all possible samples of the same size and design, approximately 90 percent of these intervals would contain the true population parameter. Similarly, a 95-percent confidence interval is 94,198 to 94,566 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.96 x 94).

Census items were classified as either complete count or sample count items. All farm operators were asked the complete count items. Examples of complete count items were: land in farms, harvested cropland, livestock inventory and sales, crop acreage, quantities harvested and crop sales, land use, irrigation, government loans and payments, conservation acreage, type of organization, and operator characteristics.

Only a sample of farm operators were asked the sample count items. These items appeared only in sections 21 through 27 of the sample form. Sample count items were included under the following section headings: commercial fertilizers, chemicals, production expenses, farm machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, farm-related income, and hired workers.

Variability in the estimates of complete count items was due only to the nonresponse survey estimation procedure. With regard to the estimates of sample count items, variability was due to both the nonresponse survey estimation procedure and the census sample selection and estimation procedure. Therefore, variability in the sample count item estimates tends to be larger than the variability in the complete count item estimates. Percent relative standard error is a common measure of variability.

Table B provides the generalized reliability estimates of the estimated number of farms in a county that reported complete count and sample count items. The top half of the table shows the percent relative standard errors for estimated number of farms in a county that reported a complete count item, and the bottom half relates to sample count items. These reliability estimates are derived from regression equations. Separate regression equations were used to produce each section of table B. Each regression equation was fit with the estimated number of farms in a county reporting an item as the independent variable and the relative variance of that estimate as the dependent variable for the appropriate counties in the State. To illustrate the use of this table, assume that the estimate of the number of farms reporting hogs and pigs for a particular county, as given in county table 15, is 89. Since hogs and pigs is a complete count data item, refer to the first part of table B and use the estimated percent relative standard error of the estimate from the row with farm count equal to or just less than the estimated number of farms, 89. For this example, the percent relative standard error of the estimate comes from the row for 75 farms reporting. For sample count items, follow the same procedure using the second part of table B. For counties with fewer than 100 farms in the 1992 Census of Agriculture, variability in sample count

item estimates came only from nonresponse survey estimation procedures. The estimated relative standard error for a sample count item in these counties may be obtained using the first part of table B.

Use caution when referring to the "Sample Count Item" section of table B to make inferences on counties. Some counties may have been sampled at the rate of 1 in 2 or 1 in 4, but the reliability estimates shown were computed using only data from counties sampled at the rate of 1 in 6. Therefore, the reliability estimates shown would likely be overstated (or conservative) if the county was actually sampled at a higher rate.

Table C presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms, and table D presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms with sales of $10,000 or more.

Table E presents the standard error for percent change in State totals from 1992 to 1997. The general purpose of the percent change estimate is to provide a relative measure of the difference in a characteristic between censuses. The relative change for a given characteristic is defined as the ratio of the difference of the 1997 and the 1992 estimate for that characteristic to the 1992 estimate. This ratio is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent change. The standard error of a percent change estimate is the standard error of the ratio multiplied by 100.

Table F presents the percent relative standard error for State and county totals for selected data items. The percent relative standard error of the estimate for the same item differs among counties in the State. Reasons for this are differences among counties in the (1) total number of farms, (2) number of large farms included with certainty, (3) size classifications of the farms sampled, (4) amount of nonresponse, (5) general agricultural characteristics, and (6) specific characteristic being measured.

The farm counts and related estimates displayed in tables A through F relate to unadjusted census totals. These totals are the same as the "Census total" displayed in the first column of table G (which will be discussed later in this appendix).

For most of the tables in this appendix, and also many of the tables throughout the publication, there is a footnote that reads "Data are based on a sample of farms." The table entries that this footnote relate to are estimates of totals. To illustrate, suppose that the entry "other farm-related income" is shown with this footnote and has some number of farms given. This number given would represent an estimated total number of farms with "other farm-related income," based on the farms that were in the sample. This number should not be interpreted as the number of farms in the sample that have "other farm-related income."

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts is affected jointly by sampling errors (described in the previous section) and nonsampling errors. Extensive efforts were made to compile a complete and accurate mail list for the census, to design an understandable report form with instructions, and to minimize processing errors through the use of quality control measures. Nonsampling errors arise from many sources, including respondent or enumerator error or incorrect data keying, editing, or imputing for missing data. These nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Nonsampling error due to mail list incompleteness and duplication as well as misclassification of records on the mail list is called coverage error. The section titled "Coverage Evaluation" discusses the evaluation studies conducted to measure the extent of this error in the census.

Respondent and Enumerator Error

Incorrect or incomplete responses to the census report form or to the questions posed by an enumerator can introduce error into the census data. To reduce reporting error, detailed instructions for completing the report form were provided to each respondent. Questions were phrased as clearly as possible based on previous tests of the report form. In addition, each respondent's answers were checked for completeness and consistency by the complex edit and imputation system.

Item Nonresponse

As information flowed from data collection to tabulation, various types of item nonresponses were identified on the census report forms. Nonresponse to particular questions on the census report form that logically should have been present created a type of nonsampling error in both complete count and sample count data. In this case, information from a similar farm was used to impute for these missing data items. The resulting data may have been biased if the characteristics of the nonreporting respondents were different from those of reporting respondents for those items.

Processing Error

All phases of processing for each census report form were potential sources for the introduction of nonsampling error. An automated check-in recorded that the report had been returned and excluded from further followup mailings. Approximately one-third of the mail returns were reviewed to resolve questions dealing with multiple reports, respondent remarks, or no reported data. The remaining mail returns (about two-thirds) were batched and sent directly to data keying, along with some of the reviewed cases containing farm data. Keyed records were transmitted, formatted, and run through the complex edit and imputation system. About one-fifth of all forms edited were clerically reviewed for inconsistencies, omissions, or questionable values. While reviewing these forms, the edit review staff determined if the action taken by the computer edit and imputation system was correct. Edited records were tabulated to the county level. Each county was reviewed and, when necessary, individual records were corrected prior to publication.

Developing accurate processing methods is complicated by the complex structure of agriculture. Among the complexities are the many places to be included, the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the continuing changes in the relationship of operators to the farm operated, the expiration of leases and the initiation or renewal of leases, the problem of obtaining a complete list of agriculture operations, the difficulty of contacting and identifying some types of contractor/contractee relationships, the operator's absence from the farm during the data collection period, and the operator's opinion that part or all of the operation does not qualify and should not be included in the census. During data collection and processing of the census, all operations underwent a number of quality control checks to ensure as accurate an application as possible.

COVERAGE EVALUATION

Coverage Overview

The primary objectives of the census of agriculture are to accurately count U.S. farms, measure commodity production and sales, and measure demographic characteristics of farm operators. Since 1945, an evaluation of census coverage has been conducted for each census of agriculture to provide estimates of the completeness of census farm counts. These results help to identify problems and focus improvements for future censuses.

According to coverage evaluation results, the past five censuses of agriculture included an average of 92 percent of U.S. farms and 98 percent of agriculture production. Complete enumeration of agricultural operations satisfying the farm definition of $1,000 or more in agricultural sales is complicated by the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the multiplicity of names used for an operation, the number of operations in which an operator participates, and the difficulty in classifying those operations just around the $1,000 sales range. In 1997, extensive efforts were made to compile as complete and accurate a mail list as possible, while reducing the duplication and number of nonfarm operations on the list.

The 1997 coverage evaluation program was designed to measure four components of error in the census farm counts. These components include:

1. Undercount due to farms Not on the Mail List (NML)

2. Overcount due to farms Duplicated or enumerated more than once (DUP)

3. Undercount due to farms Incorrectly Classified as nonfarms (ICU)

4. Overcount due to nonfarms Incorrectly Classified as farms (ICO).

The first component, mail list undercount, is by far the largest component of coverage error. Duplication, though occurring far less frequently, can involve larger farms and have a larger impact on acreage and sales estimates. The last two components involve the misclassification of either farms or nonfarms. Misclassification can arise from errors in either reporting or processing the data.

Table G - Coverage Estimates - illustrates the effect of coverage adjustments on census farm counts by demographic characteristics, land in farms, and total value of sales. The coverage total is defined as the net difference between undercounted and overcounted farms. The adjusted census total is the sum of the census total and the net coverage total. The relative standard error is shown for the final census coverage adjusted number. This number will be similar to the relative standard error for the census number, except when the coverage total is negative or close to zero. The coverage adjustment percentage shows the coverage total as a percentage of total census adjusted farms for that characteristic.

The 1997 Census of Agriculture is the first census to include all four components of coverage error in table G. Previous publications only included the coverage error component due to farms not on the mail list (NML). Because of this, caution should be taken when comparing coverage estimates from table G with previous years. In addition, the coverage total is a negative number for some characteristics. This means that the number of farms overcounted for this characteristic was greater than the number of farms undercounted.

Area Frame Surveys to Measure Mail List Undercoverage

Names and addresses collected in the 1997 June Agricultural Survey and 1997 Fall Area Survey were used to estimate the undercount due to farms not on the census mail list (NML). These names were matched to the census mail list, and those that did not match were contacted by telephone or person. The enumerator verified whether the operation had reported in the census, and if not, a census of agriculture report form was completed.

The percentage of farms missed in the census varies considerably by State. In general, farms not on the mail list tended to be small in acreage, production, and sales of agricultural products. Farm operations could be missed for various reasons, including the possibility that the operation started after the mail list was developed, the operation may be so small as not to appear in any agriculture-related source lists, or the operation may have been falsely classified as a nonfarm prior to mailout.

Classification Error Survey to Measure Three Types of Coverage Error

The remaining three types of coverage error were measured by the Classification Error Survey. This survey was used to estimate the number of farms counted more than once (DUP), the number of farms misclassified as nonfarms (ICU), and the number of nonfarms misclassified as farms (ICO). A sample of census of agriculture respondents was selected for reinterview to determine their farm/nonfarm status and collect information to identify

potential duplication. The farm classification from this interview was compared with the classification on the census of agriculture report form. Any differences between these two classifications were reconciled to determine the true farm status. Each operation was reviewed for duplication by matching the additional information received from the reinterview (landlords, tenants, other names, etc.) to the list of census respondents. Potential duplication was reviewed and discrepancies reconciled.

In general, the classification error rate is higher for small farms close to the $1,000 agricultural sales requirement. This rate is also higher for farms with small acreage (less than 49 acres), higher for tenant farms than for full- or part-owner farms, and higher for farms where farming is not the operator's principal occupation.

Coverage Estimation

The adjusted census total, T, is estimated as the census farm count, C, plus undercount and minus overcount adjustments. Undercount includes 1) farms not on the mail list (NML) and 2) farms incorrectly classified as nonfarms (ICU). Overcount includes 3) nonfarms incorrectly classified as farms (ICO) and 4) farms duplicated in the census (DUP). Altogether, the adjusted census total is:

$$T = C + (NML + ICU) - (ICO + DUP).$$

In some States, estimates of misclassification of farms owned by operators having rare demographic characteristics were based on particularly small sample sizes. Where such small sample sizes occurred, a form of small area estimation was used in which data from similar States contributed to that State's estimates. In these cases, the coverage totals are weighted totals of the direct State estimate and the direct estimate from the region. Direct estimates were used to the largest extent possible, based on the amount of survey cases available for the particular item being estimated.

Table A. Percent of State Totals Contributed by Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation: 1997

Item	Percent of total	Item	Percent of total
Farms .... number..	11.8	Corn for grain or seed .... acres..	4.8
Land in farms .... acres..	7.1	Wheat for grain .... acres..	4.6
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1] .... $1,000..	7.7	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold .... $1,000..	2.1	Cattle and calves .... number..	8.5
Harvested cropland .... acres..	5.2	Hogs and pigs .... number..	.2
		Layers 20 weeks old and older .... number..	5.8

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

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

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM		SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:		Number of farms reporting:	
25	5.6	25	41.4
50	3.5	50	28.8
75	2.4	75	23.2
100	1.6	100	19.8
150	1.3	150	15.6
200	1.1	200	13.0
300	.9	300	9.8
500	.7	500	6.1
750	.6	750	2.8
1,000	.5	1,000	2.5
1,500	.4	1,500	2.0
2,000	(X)	2,000	(X)

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS		
Farms ....number..	49 406	.5
Land in farms ....acres..	9 122 379	.3
Average size of farm ....acres..	185	.6
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) ....farms..	49 406	.5
$1,000..	7 676 523	.1
Average per farm ....dollars..	155 376	.5
Farms by value of sales:		
Less than $1,000 (see text) ....farms..	6 603	.7
$1,000..	1 745	.9
$1,000 to $2,499 ....farms..	7 050	.7
$1,000..	11 635	.7
$2,500 to $4,999 ....farms..	6 642	.8
$1,000..	23 757	.8
$5,000 to $9,999 ....farms..	6 261	.8
$1,000..	44 236	.8
$10,000 to $19,999 ....farms..	5 025	.8
$1,000..	70 270	.8
$20,000 to $24,999 ....farms..	1 445	1.1
$1,000..	32 021	1.1
$25,000 to $39,999 ....farms..	2 454	1.0
$1,000..	77 306	1.0
$40,000 to $49,999 ....farms..	1 016	1.3
$1,000..	45 086	1.3
$50,000 to $99,999 ....farms..	2 764	1.0
$1,000..	197 211	1.0
$100,000 to $249,999 ....farms..	3 579	.8
$1,000..	588 773	.8
$250,000 to $499,999 ....farms..	2 742	–
$1,000..	994 156	–
$500,000 or more ....farms..	3 825	–
$1,000..	5 590 327	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ....farms..	28 510	.5
$1,000..	2 595 213	.2
Grains ....farms..	13 048	.5
$1,000..	521 040	.2
Corn for grain ....farms..	7 373	.5
$1,000..	197 315	.3
Wheat ....farms..	5 812	.5
$1,000..	92 937	.3
Soybeans ....farms..	9 792	.5
$1,000..	226 000	.2
Sorghum for grain ....farms..	114	2.4
$1,000..	726	1.7
Barley ....farms..	238	1.7
$1,000..	1 481	1.3
Oats ....farms..	502	1.3
$1,000..	1 660	1.6
Other grains ....farms..	247	1.5
$1,000..	920	1.0
Cotton and cottonseed ....farms..	2 312	.6
$1,000..	298 159	.2
Tobacco ....farms..	12 077	.5
$1,000..	1 137 742	.3
Hay, silage, and field seeds ....farms..	6 889	.6
$1,000..	31 747	.6
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ....farms..	2 160	.8
$1,000..	73 707	.5
Fruits, nuts, and berries ....farms..	955	1.1
$1,000..	30 137	1.2
Nursery and greenhouse crops ....farms..	3 269	.8
$1,000..	318 203	.3
Other crops ....farms..	2 544	.6
$1,000..	184 478	.2
Livestock, poultry, and their products ....farms..	27 389	.5
$1,000..	5 081 310	.1
Poultry and poultry products ....farms..	4 116	.4
$1,000..	2 118 786	.1
Dairy products ....farms..	677	1.0
$1,000..	179 204	.4
Cattle and calves ....farms..	21 286	.5
$1,000..	169 869	.4
Hogs and pigs ....farms..	2 666	.5
$1,000..	2 568 492	(L)
Sheep, lambs, and wool ....farms..	511	1.4
$1,000..	605	2.3
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ....farms..	2 795	.8
$1,000..	44 355	1.0
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ....farms..	2 176	.9
$1,000..	11 628	1.1

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses ....farms..	49 383	.5
$1,000..	5 673 379	.1
Average per farm ....dollars..	114 885	.5
Livestock and poultry purchased ....farms..	11 609	1.7
$1,000..	916 191	.2
Feed for livestock and poultry ....farms..	22 116	1.2
$1,000..	2 262 032	.1
Commercially mixed formula feeds ....farms..	14 292	1.5
$1,000..	2 136 745	.1
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ....farms..	23 456	1.0
$1,000..	130 860	.7
Commercial fertilizer ....farms..	36 387	.8
$1,000..	243 960	.7
Agricultural chemicals ....farms..	25 671	1.0
$1,000..	188 784	.6
Petroleum products ....farms..	46 229	.6
$1,000..	198 201	.6
Electricity ....farms..	29 259	.9
$1,000..	87 664	.4
Hired farm labor ....farms..	18 984	1.2
$1,000..	487 395	.4
Contract labor ....farms..	6 485	2.4
$1,000..	67 291	1.6
Repair and maintenance ....farms..	39 441	.7
$1,000..	207 332	.6
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ....farms..	13 093	1.6
$1,000..	55 032	1.2
Interest ....farms..	16 538	1.3
$1,000..	205 129	.6
Secured by real estate ....farms..	11 820	1.6
$1,000..	140 144	.7
Not secured by real estate ....farms..	8 229	2.0
$1,000..	64 985	.7
Cash rent ....farms..	13 746	1.5
$1,000..	180 559	.7
Property taxes ....farms..	46 926	.6
$1,000..	72 025	.9
All other farm production expenses ....farms..	42 095	.6
$1,000..	370 924	.3
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)[1]		
All farms ....number..	49 391	.5
$1,000..	1 601 413	.5
Average per farm ....dollars..	32 423	.7
Farms with net gains[2] ....number..	27 045	.9
$1,000..	1 772 548	.4
Average net gain ....dollars..	65 541	1.0
Farms with net losses ....number..	22 346	1.1
$1,000..	171 135	1.3
Average net loss ....dollars..	7 658	1.7
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments ....farms..	12 269	.5
$1,000..	51 035	.3
Other farm-related income[1] ....farms..	12 334	1.8
$1,000..	75 354	2.8
Customwork and other agricultural services ....farms..	3 074	3.9
$1,000..	25 999	5.4
Gross cash rent or share payments ....farms..	6 008	2.9
$1,000..	24 450	4.5
Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ....farms..	1 743	5.4
$1,000..	17 684	6.4
Other farm-related income sources ....farms..	3 936	3.3
$1,000..	7 221	2.5
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total ....farms..	1 414	.9
$1,000..	22 171	.7

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			**TENURE OF OPERATOR**		
Total cropland .... farms..	44 502	.5	All operators .... farms..	49 406	.5
acres..	5 608 388	.3	acres..	9 122 379	.3
Harvested cropland .... farms..	38 241	.5	Full owners .... farms..	28 608	.6
acres..	4 233 693	.2	acres..	3 184 392	.5
Farms by acres harvested:			Part owners .... farms..	16 591	.5
1 to 9 acres .... farms..	10 267	.7	acres..	5 217 057	.3
acres..	43 057	.7	Tenants .... farms..	4 207	.8
10 to 19 acres .... farms..	7 028	.7	acres..	720 930	.5
acres..	92 950	.7			
20 to 29 acres .... farms..	4 412	.7	**OWNED AND RENTED LAND**		
acres..	101 667	.7			
30 to 49 acres .... farms..	4 570	.7	Land owned...................................... farms..	45 338	.5
acres..	168 155	.7	acres..	5 697 692	.4
50 to 99 acres .... farms..	4 390	.7	Owned land in farms .... farms..	45 199	.5
acres..	296 877	.7	acres..	5 234 476	.4
100 to 199 acres.......................... farms..	2 899	.7	Land rented or leased from others .... farms..	21 008	.5
acres..	396 312	.8	landlords..	3 952 084	.3
200 to 499 acres .... farms..	2 628	.6		80 685	.4
acres..	821 558	.6	Rented or leased land in farms .... farms..	20 798	.5
500 to 999 acres .... farms..	1 234	.3	acres..	3 887 903	.3
acres..	859 487	.3	Land rented or leased to others .... farms..	8 381	.6
1,000 acres or more....................... farms..	813	–	acres..	527 397	.8
acres..	1 453 630	–			
			OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Cropland:					
Pasture or grazing only .... farms..	21 639	.5	Operators by place of residence:		
acres..	882 844	.5	On farm operated	34 817	.5
Other cropland .... farms..	13 476	.5	Not on farm operated	9 771	.7
acres..	491 851	.5	Not reported	4 818	.5
			Operators by principal occupation:		
Total woodland .... farms..	31 171	.5	Farming	24 355	.5
acres..	2 639 726	.4	Other	25 051	.6
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and			Operators by days worked off farm:		
woodland pastured................................ farms..	8 034	.6	Any	25 856	.6
acres..	384 903	.6	200 days or more	18 028	.6
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. .... farms..	32 453	.5	Operators by sex:		
acres..	489 362	.4	Male .... farms..	45 343	.5
Irrigated land .... farms..	4 695	.6	acres..	8 689 487	.3
acres..	156 250	.4	Female .... farms..	4 063	.8
			acres..	432 892	.8
Acres irrigated:			Average age of operator ....years..	55.2	.7
1 to 9 acres .... farms..	2 342	.9			
acres..	7 108	1.0	**FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION**		
10 to 49 acres .... farms..	1 602	.8			
acres..	37 034	.8	Individual or family (sole proprietorship)................ farms..	42 887	.5
50 to 99 acres .... farms..	411	.9	acres..	6 506 629	.3
acres..	27 144	.9	Partnership .... farms..	4 166	.8
100 to 199 acres .... farms..	218	.9	acres..	1 323 383	.5
acres..	27 689	.9	Corporation:		
200 to 499 acres .... farms..	89	1.2	Family held .... farms..	1 951	.7
acres..	25 034	1.2	acres..	1 162 084	.3
500 to 999 acres .... farms..	25	–	More than 10 stockholders .... farms..	23	4.3
acres..	16 024	–	10 or less stockholders .... farms..	1 928	.8
1,000 acres or more........................... farms..	8	–	Other than family held .... farms..	175	2.1
acres..	16 217	–	acres..	62 206	1.1
			More than 10 stockholders .... farms..	18	5.2
Harvested cropland irrigated .... farms..	4 451	.6	10 or less stockholders .... farms..	157	2.2
acres..	146 035	.4	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. .... farms..	227	2.1
Pasture and other land irrigated .... farms..	411	1.4	acres..	68 077	1.5
acres..	10 215	1.4			
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands			**HIRED FARM LABOR[1]**		
Reserve Programs .... farms..	3 328	.7			
acres..	133 346	.8	Hired workers by days worked:		
			150 days or more .... farms..	7 680	1.9
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]			workers..	29 489	1.2
			Less than 150 days .... farms..	17 449	1.3
Estimated market value of land and buildings .... farms..	49 391	.5	workers..	97 445	1.6
$1,000..	18 565 852	.8			
Average per farm .... dollars..	375 895	.9	**INJURIES AND DEATHS**		
Average per acre .... dollars..	2 081	1.0			
			Farm-related injuries:		
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]			Operator and family members .... farms..	323	1.7
			number..	388	1.7
Estimated market value of all machinery and			Hired workers .... farms..	348	1.0
equipment .... farms..	49 391	.5	number..	668	.8
$1,000..	2 425 402	.8	Farm-related deaths:		
Average per farm .... dollars..	49 106	1.0	Operator and family members .... farms..	16	–
			number..	20	–
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]			Hired workers .... farms..	7	–
			number..	12	–
Commercial fertilizer .... farms..	36 171	.8			
acres on which used..	3 670 634	.7			

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE		
1 to 9 acres ... farms..	3 968	.8
acres..	17 304	.8
10 to 49 acres ... farms..	15 601	.6
acres..	427 353	.6
50 to 69 acres ... farms..	5 259	.7
acres..	306 481	.7
70 to 99 acres ... farms..	5 323	.7
acres..	439 310	.7
100 to 139 acres ... farms..	4 785	.7
acres..	554 766	.7
140 to 179 acres ... farms..	2 892	.8
acres..	453 387	.8
180 to 219 acres ... farms..	2 040	.9
acres..	403 881	.9
220 to 259 acres ... farms..	1 463	.9
acres..	349 125	.9
260 to 499 acres ... farms..	4 003	.6
acres..	1 415 606	.6
500 to 999 acres ... farms..	2 461	.6
acres..	1 665 842	.6
1,000 to 1,999 acres ... farms..	1 133	–
acres..	1 526 792	–
2,000 acres or more ... farms..	478	–
acres..	1 562 532	–
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM		
Oilseed and grain farming (1111) ... farms..	5 627	.7
acres..	1 496 889	.5
Vegetable and melon farming (1112) ... farms..	1 161	1.1
acres..	157 378	.7
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113) ... farms..	797	1.2
acres..	78 455	1.4
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114) ... farms..	2 781	.9
acres..	179 590	.9
Other crop farming (1119) ... farms..	14 657	.6
acres..	4 136 067	.3
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111) ... farms..	14 594	.6
acres..	1 621 745	.6
Cattle feedlots (112112) ... farms..	443	1.6
acres..	47 471	2.1
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212) ... farms..	612	1.0
acres..	241 998	.6
Hog and pig farming (1122) ... farms..	2 017	.5
acres..	496 882	.2
Poultry and egg production (1123) ... farms..	3 564	.4
acres..	487 109	.2
Sheep and goat farming (1124) ... farms..	464	1.6
acres..	27 040	3.0
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129) ... farms..	2 689	.8
acres..	151 755	1.1
LIVESTOCK		
Cattle and calves inventory ... farms..	22 632	.5
number..	941 311	.4
Beef cows ... farms..	19 616	.5
number..	435 672	.5
Milk cows ... farms..	1 092	.9
number..	78 400	.4

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LIVESTOCK—Con.		
Cattle and calves sold ... farms..	21 286	.5
number..	443 147	.5
$1,000..	169 869	.4
Hogs and pigs inventory ... farms..	2 986	.5
number..	9 624 860	(L)
Hogs and pigs sold ... farms..	2 666	.5
number..	36 431 039	(L)
$1,000..	2 568 492	(L)
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory ... farms..	613	1.3
number..	13 827	2.1
Sheep and lambs sold ... farms..	451	1.5
number..	9 094	2.3
Horses and ponies inventory ... farms..	7 160	.6
number..	41 177	.9
Horses and ponies sold ... farms..	1 515	1.0
number..	5 449	1.9
POULTRY		
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) ... farms..	1 726	.8
number..	16 162 563	.8
Layers 20 weeks old and older ... farms..	1 566	.9
number..	12 306 292	.7
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold ... farms..	2 086	.3
number..	591 248 423	.1
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED		
Corn for grain or seed ... farms..	8 862	.5
acres..	821 039	.3
bushels..	74 423 999	.3
Corn for silage or green chop ... farms..	1 212	.9
acres..	80 164	.5
tons, green..	1 128 059	.5
Sorghum for grain or seed ... farms..	210	1.8
acres..	8 344	1.6
bushels..	404 508	1.5
Wheat for grain ... farms..	5 949	.5
acres..	616 397	.3
bushels..	30 357 728	.3
Barley for grain ... farms..	412	1.3
acres..	16 838	.9
bushels..	1 110 796	.9
Oats for grain ... farms..	1 059	.9
acres..	21 870	1.0
bushels..	1 401 369	1.1
Cotton ... farms..	2 320	.6
acres..	677 541	.2
bales..	916 278	.2
Tobacco ... farms..	12 095	.5
acres..	320 599	.3
pounds..	703 559 462	.3
Soybeans for beans ... farms..	9 933	.5
acres..	1 280 412	.3
bushels..	35 785 336	.3
Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes ... farms..	459	1.5
acres..	18 806	.3
cwt..	3 586 031	.3
Sweetpotatoes ... farms..	512	1.2
acres..	29 058	.4
bushels..	8 221 798	.3
Peanuts for nuts ... farms..	1 765	.7
acres..	122 784	.3
pounds..	325 662 397	.3
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) ... farms..	19 761	.5
acres..	602 755	.5
tons, dry..	1 218 338	.5
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) ... farms..	2 160	.8
acres..	50 079	.6
Land in orchards ... farms..	1 213	1.0
acres..	15 388	1.5

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

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			**FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]**		
			Total farm production expenses .... farms..	22 632	.5
Farms ....number..	22 850	.5	$1,000..	5 538 296	.1
Land in farms ....acres..	7 178 390	.3	Average per farm .... dollars..	244 711	.5
Average size of farm ....acres..	314	.5	Livestock and poultry purchased .... farms..	6 993	1.8
			$1,000..	908 055	.2
			Feed for livestock and poultry .... farms..	10 306	1.5
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			$1,000..	2 249 533	.1
			Commercially mixed formula feeds .... farms..	7 675	1.7
			$1,000..	2 131 254	.1
Total sales (see text) .... farms..	22 850	.5	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees .... farms..	15 131	1.0
$1,000..	7 595 150	.1	$1,000..	127 993	.7
Average per farm .... dollars..	332 392	.5	Commercial fertilizer .... farms..	18 658	.8
Farms by value of sales:			$1,000..	227 607	.7
$10,000 to $19,999 .... farms..	5 025	.7	Agricultural chemicals .... farms..	16 391	1.0
$1,000..	70 270	.7	$1,000..	184 681	.6
$20,000 to $24,999 .... farms..	1 445	1.1	Petroleum products .... farms..	22 215	.5
$1,000..	32 021	1.1	$1,000..	187 035	.6
$25,000 to $39,999 .... farms..	2 454	1.0	Electricity .... farms..	18 132	.9
$1,000..	77 306	1.0	$1,000..	84 528	.4
$40,000 to $49,999 .... farms..	1 016	1.3	Hired farm labor .... farms..	13 962	1.2
$1,000..	45 086	1.3	$1,000..	484 139	.4
$50,000 to $99,999 .... farms..	2 764	1.0	Contract labor .... farms..	4 788	2.6
$1,000..	197 211	1.0	$1,000..	65 895	1.6
$100,000 to $249,999 .... farms..	3 579	.8	Repair and maintenance .... farms..	20 736	.7
$1,000..	588 773	.8	$1,000..	188 417	.6
$250,000 to $499,999 .... farms..	2 742	–	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment .... farms..	8 572	1.7
$1,000..	994 156	–	$1,000..	52 160	1.3
$500,000 or more .... farms..	3 825	–	Interest .... farms..	11 830	1.3
$1,000..	5 590 327	–	$1,000..	192 148	.5
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Secured by real estate .... farms..	8 231	1.6
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops..... farms..	17 425	.5	$1,000..	128 856	.7
$1,000..	2 559 673	.2	Not secured by real estate .... farms..	6 436	2.1
Grains.. farms..	9 747	.5	$1,000..	63 292	.7
$1,000..	511 736	.2	Cash rent .... farms..	10 153	1.6
Corn for grain .... farms..	5 879	.5	$1,000..	178 041	.7
$1,000..	194 183	.3	Property taxes..................................... farms..	21 589	.6
Wheat....................................... farms..	5 085	.5	$1,000..	49 913	.9
$1,000..	91 739	.3	All other farm production expenses.................. farms..	22 552	.5
Soybeans.................................... farms..	7 796	.5	$1,000..	358 149	.3
$1,000..	221 257	.2			
Sorghum for grain .... farms..	87	2.5	**NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)[1]**		
$1,000..	693	1.8			
Barley .... farms..	195	1.8			
$1,000..	1 429	1.3	All farms...number..	22 635	.5
Oats .... farms..	368	1.4	$1,000..	1 653 587	.5
$1,000..	1 552	1.8	Average per farm .... dollars..	73 054	.7
Other grains .... farms..	214	1.5	Farms with net gains[2] ....number..	18 515	.9
$1,000..	881	1.0	$1,000..	1 755 702	.4
Cotton and cottonseed .... farms..	2 204	.6	Average net gain .... dollars..	94 826	1.0
$1,000..	297 724	.2	Farms with net losses ....number..	4 120	3.2
Tobacco .... farms..	9 543	.5	$1,000..	102 115	1.6
$1,000..	1 127 686	.3	Average net loss............................... dollars..	24 785	3.6
Hay, silage, and field seeds .... farms..	2 915	.6			
$1,000..	24 310	.7	**GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME**		
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons .... farms..	1 330	.8			
$1,000..	71 234	.5			
Fruits, nuts, and berries .... farms..	533	1.3	Government payments .... farms..	8 317	.5
$1,000..	29 296	1.2	$1,000..	46 195	.2
Nursery and greenhouse crops .... farms..	1 970	1.0	Other farm-related income[1] .... farms..	6 531	2.3
$1,000..	313 979	.3	$1,000..	55 974	3.3
Other crops .... farms..	2 148	.6	Customwork and other agricultural services .... farms..	1 618	4.9
$1,000..	183 709	.2	$1,000..	22 411	6.1
Livestock, poultry, and their products .... farms..	12 100	.4	Gross cash rent or share payments .... farms..	2 857	4.2
$1,000..	5 035 477	.1	$1,000..	15 268	6.0
Poultry and poultry products................... farms..	3 743	.4	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products .... farms..	864	7.5
$1,000..	2 118 342	.1	$1,000..	12 022	7.7
Dairy products............................... farms..	645	.9	Other farm-related income sources................. farms..	2 710	3.7
$1,000..	179 143	.4	$1,000..	6 273	1.9
Cattle and calves .... farms..	7 998	.5			
$1,000..	129 924	.4	**COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS**		
Hogs and pigs .... farms..	2 128	.4			
$1,000..	2 567 286	(L)			
Sheep, lambs, and wool .... farms..	155	2.2			
$1,000..	274	3.8			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text).. farms..	828	1.2			
$1,000..	40 508	1.0			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) .... farms..	899	1.1	Total .... farms..	1 240	.9
$1,000..	9 841	1.3	$1,000..	22 007	.7

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE		
Total cropland . . . . . . farms..	21 081	.5
acres..	4 799 444	.3
Harvested cropland . . . . . farms..	19 746	.5
acres..	3 914 798	.2
Cropland:		
Pasture or grazing only . . . . . farms..	8 076	.5
acres..	511 946	.6
Total woodland . . . . . farms..	14 058	.5
acres..	1 801 091	.3
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured . . . . . farms..	3 159	.6
acres..	243 588	.6
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc. . . . . . farms..	15 336	.5
acres..	334 267	.4
Irrigated land . . . . . farms..	3 705	.6
acres..	151 153	.4
Harvested cropland irrigated . . . . . farms..	3 563	.6
acres..	142 630	.4
Pasture and other land irrigated . . . . . farms..	266	1.5
acres..	8 523	1.4
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs . . . . . farms..	1 555	.8
acres..	66 104	.7
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]		
Estimated market value of land and buildings . . . . . farms..	22 635	.5
$1,000..	13 338 895	.9
Average per farm . . . . . dollars..	589 304	1.0
Average per acre . . . . . dollars..	1 914	1.1
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment . . . . . farms..	22 635	.5
$1,000..	1 861 643	.8
Average per farm . . . . . dollars..	82 246	1.0
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]		
Commercial fertilizer . . . . . farms..	18 574	.7
acres on which used..	3 326 781	.7
TENURE OF OPERATOR		
All operators . . . . . farms..	22 850	.5
acres..	7 178 390	.3
Full owners . . . . . farms..	9 914	.6
acres..	1 833 461	.4
Part owners . . . . . farms..	10 507	.5
acres..	4 697 376	.2
Tenants . . . . . farms..	2 429	.9
acres..	647 553	.5
OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
Land owned . . . . . farms..	20 502	.5
acres..	3 885 932	.3
Owned land in farms . . . . . farms..	20 421	.5
acres..	3 612 793	.3
Land rented or leased from others . . . . . farms..	13 018	.5
acres..	3 616 234	.2
landlords..	65 206	.4
Rented or leased land in farms . . . . . farms..	12 936	.5
acres..	3 565 597	.2
Land rented or leased to others . . . . . farms..	4 153	.7
acres..	323 776	.9
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Operators by place of residence:		
On farm operated	15 823	.5
Not on farm operated	4 680	.8
Not reported	2 347	.5
Operators by principal occupation:		
Farming	16 024	.5
Other	6 826	.7
Operators by days worked off farm:		
Any	8 992	.6
200 days or more	5 395	.7
Operators by sex:		
Male	21 397	.5
Female	1 453	1.1
Average age of operator . . . . . years..	53.5	.7

See footnotes at end of table.

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
Individual or family (sole proprietorship) . . . . . farms..	18 307	.5
acres..	4 775 851	.3
Partnership . . . . . farms..	2 657	.8
acres..	1 172 778	.4
Corporation:		
Family held . . . . . farms..	1 668	.7
acres..	1 124 120	.2
More than 10 stockholders . . . . . farms..	19	2.8
10 or less stockholders . . . . . farms..	1 649	.7
Other than family held . . . . . farms..	127	2.1
acres..	57 069	1.0
More than 10 stockholders . . . . . farms..	15	4.6
10 or less stockholders . . . . . farms..	112	2.2
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc. . . . . farms..	91	2.9
acres..	48 572	1.5
HIRED FARM LABOR[1]		
Hired workers by days worked:		
150 days or more . . . . . farms..	6 505	1.8
workers..	28 263	1.2
Less than 150 days . . . . . farms..	12 475	1.3
workers..	86 489	1.7
INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Farm-related injuries:		
Operator and family members . . . . . farms..	163	2.1
number..	195	2.2
Hired workers . . . . . farms..	331	1.0
number..	649	.8
Farm-related deaths:		
Operator and family members . . . . . farms..	10	—
number..	(D)	(D)
Hired workers . . . . . farms..	5	—
number..	(D)	(D)
FARMS BY SIZE		
1 to 9 acres	1 347	1.0
10 to 49 acres	4 073	.7
50 to 69 acres	1 758	.9
70 to 99 acres	2 082	.8
100 to 139 acres	2 337	.8
140 to 179 acres	1 692	.9
180 to 219 acres	1 363	1.0
220 to 259 acres	1 085	1.0
260 to 499 acres	3 307	.6
500 to 999 acres	2 239	.5
1,000 to 1,999 acres	1 099	—
2,000 acres or more	468	—
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM		
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	2 275	.8
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)	503	1.4
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)	274	1.8
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)	1 625	1.1
Other crop farming (1119)	9 559	.6
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)	2 420	.8
Cattle feedlots (112112)	114	3.0
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)	591	1.0
Hog and pig farming (1122)	1 642	.3
Poultry and egg production (1123)	3 411	.4
Sheep and goat farming (1124)	22	6.4
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)	414	1.7
LIVESTOCK		
Cattle and calves inventory . . . . . farms..	8 175	.5
number..	634 226	.4
Beef cows . . . . . farms..	6 894	.5
number..	264 041	.5
Milk cows . . . . . farms..	750	.9
number..	77 421	.4
Cattle and calves sold . . . . . farms..	7 998	.5
number..	316 145	.5
$1,000..	129 924	.4
Hogs and pigs inventory . . . . . farms..	2 194	.4
number..	9 613 609	(L)
Hogs and pigs sold . . . . . farms..	2 128	.4
number..	36 418 631	(L)
$1,000..	2 567 286	(L)
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory . . . . . farms..	182	2.0
number..	5 495	3.5
Sheep and lambs sold . . . . . farms..	142	2.3
number..	3 948	4.0
Horses and ponies inventory . . . . . farms..	1 999	.8
number..	13 448	1.7
Horses and ponies sold . . . . . farms..	425	1.6
number..	3 110	3.3

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY			**SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED**—Con.		
			Barley for grain .... farms..	325	1.4
			acres..	16 092	.9
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory			bushels..	1 074 009	.9
(see text) .... farms..	908	1.0	Oats for grain .... farms..	725	1.0
number..	16 046 651	.8	acres..	19 474	1.1
Layers 20 weeks old and older .... farms..	776	1.1	bushels..	1 276 679	1.3
number..	12 290 883	.7	Cotton.. farms..	2 204	.6
			acres..	676 008	.2
			bales..	914 583	.2
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold .... farms..	2 063	.3	Tobacco .... farms..	9 547	.5
number..	591 237 381	.1	acres..	315 955	.3
			pounds..	696 713 446	.3
			Soybeans for beans .... farms..	7 861	.5
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED			acres..	1 243 207	.3
			bushels..	34 994 725	.2
			Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes.................. farms..	205	2.0
			acres..	18 598	.3
Corn for grain or seed .... farms..	6 628	.5	cwt..	3 561 832	.3
acres..	798 574	.3	Sweetpotatoes .... farms..	397	1.3
bushels..	73 015 237	.2	acres..	28 861	.4
Corn for silage or green chop...................... farms..	897	.9	bushels..	8 195 233	.3
acres..	77 430	.5	Peanuts for nuts .... farms..	1 610	.6
tons, green..	1 094 526	.5	acres..	121 924	.3
Sorghum for grain or seed .... farms..	149	1.9	pounds..	323 847 142	.3
acres..	7 926	1.7	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
bushels..	385 915	1.5	silage, green chop, etc. (see text) .... farms..	7 709	.4
Wheat for grain .... farms..	5 154	.5	acres..	371 317	.5
acres..	604 677	.3	tons, dry..	832 512	.5
bushels..	29 919 469	.3	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text) .... farms..	1 330	.8
			acres..	47 548	.6
			Land in orchards.................................. farms..	423	1.4
			acres..	10 982	1.8

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

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

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

Item	All farms — Percent change from 1992 to 1997	All farms — Standard error of estimate	Farms with sales of $10,000 or more — Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Farms with sales of $10,000 or more — Standard error of estimate
Farms ....number..	−4.7	1.0	−8.7	1.2
Land in farms ....acres..	2.1	.8	2.0	.8
Average size of farm ....acres..	7.6	1.4	11.7	1.7
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1]:				
Average per farm ....dollars..	39.7	2.4	44.8	2.9
Average per acre ....dollars..	32.3	2.3	31.9	2.5
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1]:				
Average per farm ....dollars..	27.7	2.1	25.8	2.4
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	−14.7	1.1	−9.8	1.5
10 to 49 acres	−1.6	1.1	−11.0	1.3
50 to 179 acres	−5.7	.8	−12.0	.9
180 to 499 acres	−6.3	1.0	−7.9	1.1
500 to 999 acres	−4.0	.9	−5.7	.9
1,000 to 1,999 acres	7.5	−	7.1	−
2,000 acres or more	32.8	−	33.0	−
Total cropland.......farms..	−6.3	1.0	−9.1	1.3
.......acres..	.5	.8	1.1	.8
Harvested cropland ....farms..	−9.2	1.0	−9.8	1.3
.......acres..	5.9	.8	6.6	.8
Irrigated land ....farms..	8.3	1.4	12.0	1.5
.......acres..	38.7	.9	39.4	.9
Market value of agricultural products sold ....$1,000..	58.8	.5	60.1	.5
Average per farm ....dollars..	66.7	1.9	75.3	2.4
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ....$1,000..	30.0	.8	31.2	.8
Livestock, poultry, and their products.......$1,000..	79.1	.2	80.2	.2
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than $2,500	8.2	1.1	(X)	(X)
$2,500 to $4,999	−8.4	1.2	(X)	(X)
$5,000 to $9,999	−10.1	1.3	(X)	(X)
$10,000 to $24,999	−15.3	1.2	−15.3	1.2
$25,000 to $49,999	−21.1	1.4	−21.1	1.4
$50,000 to $99,999	−24.1	1.8	−24.1	1.8
$100,000 to $249,999	−19.5	.9	−19.5	.9
$250,000 to $499,999	−2.4	−	−2.4	−
$500,000 or more	83.2	−	83.2	−
Total farm production expenses[1] ....$1,000..	48.6	.9	50.0	.9
Average per farm ....dollars..	56.0	1.8	64.8	2.4
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text)[1] ....farms..	−4.8	1.0	−8.9	1.3
.......$1,000..	75.6	1.5	74.3	1.5
Average per farm ....dollars..	84.3	2.6	91.4	3.2
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	−11.0	1.0	−10.7	1.2
Other	2.3	1.2	−3.4	1.5
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	−.4	1.1	−6.9	1.4
200 days or more	.2	1.1	−4.7	1.5
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory ....farms..	−.4	1.0	−2.6	1.2
.......number..	4.4	.9	4.9	.9
Beef cows ....farms..	.4	1.0	.9	1.3
.......number..	13.0	1.2	18.1	1.4
Milk cows.......farms..	−29.6	.9	−30.4	.9
.......number..	−21.0	.4	−21.1	.4
Cattle and calves sold.......farms..	2.5	1.0	−.4	1.2
.......number..	11.1	1.0	9.4	1.0
Hogs and pigs inventory ....farms..	−30.7	.9	−23.0	1.0
.......number..	88.7	.2	89.9	.2
Hogs and pigs sold ....farms..	−33.5	.9	−24.5	1.0
.......number..	238.1	.4	239.4	.4
Sheep and lambs inventory ....farms..	6.8	2.2	−7.1	2.8
.......number..	−29.3	2.2	−48.1	2.6
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) ....farms..	−16.4	1.1	−13.2	1.5
.......number..	−10.9	.9	−11.0	.8
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold ....farms..	−1.4	.5	−1.4	.5
.......number..	18.5	.2	18.5	.2
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed.......farms..	−32.1	.9	−28.0	1.1
.......acres..	−19.5	.6	−18.4	.6
.......bushels..	−23.0	.6	−22.2	.6
Wheat for grain ....farms..	−13.6	1.1	−8.6	1.3
.......acres..	25.7	.9	27.7	.9
.......bushels..	31.1	.9	32.5	.9
Cotton ....farms..	14.0	1.6	15.0	1.6
.......acres..	89.4	.9	89.8	.9
.......bales..	105.7	1.0	106.0	1.0
Tobacco.......farms..	−31.4	.9	−25.7	1.1
.......acres..	12.9	.9	14.8	.9
.......pounds..	16.5	.9	18.0	.9
Soybeans for beans ....farms..	−24.1	1.1	−20.8	1.3
.......acres..	−.6	.8	.8	.8
.......bushels..	4.7	.8	6.0	.8
Peanuts for nuts.......farms..	−25.6	1.4	−23.0	1.5
.......acres..	−17.7	.7	−17.4	.6
.......pounds..	−18.3	.6	−18.2	.6
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) ....farms..	8.2	1.1	8.0	1.3
.......acres..	29.1	1.2	33.1	1.4
.......tons, dry..	32.1	1.3	33.3	1.4

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

1997 CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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

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

Geographic area	Farms Total (number)	Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Land in farms Total (acres)	Land in farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Average size of farm Total (acres)	Average size of farm Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Average market value of land and buildings per farm[1] Value (dollars)	Average market value of land and buildings per farm[1] Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1] Total ($1,000)	Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1] Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**49 406**	**.5**	**9 122 379**	**.3**	**185**	**.6**	**375 895**	**.9**	**2 425 402**	**.8**
Alamance	731	.6	107 801	1.0	147	1.2	339 851	7.7	30 394	8.1
Alexander	565	.5	59 826	1.3	106	1.4	218 443	8.5	14 636	8.4
Alleghany	545	.5	85 964	1.2	158	1.3	356 936	12.4	18 587	8.4
Anson	442	.5	81 984	1.1	185	1.2	340 812	7.1	18 004	5.4
Ashe	1 043	.5	104 922	1.0	101	1.1	238 020	7.3	28 683	6.1
Avery	429	.9	27 037	1.8	63	2.1	201 317	6.7	12 640	6.4
Beaufort	385	.5	155 460	.5	404	.7	577 181	2.3	39 752	3.2
Bertie	371	.5	154 338	.7	416	.9	468 132	5.1	37 184	5.5
Bladen	553	.6	128 231	.9	232	1.1	345 618	5.7	31 096	3.9
Brunswick	213	.8	36 770	1.4	173	1.6	453 751	17.6	7 493	10.0
Buncombe	1 009	.6	87 382	1.1	87	1.3	322 623	6.6	23 527	9.0
Burke	354	.5	29 373	2.3	83	2.3	254 996	16.4	12 680	17.3
Cabarrus	481	.5	63 102	1.4	131	1.5	464 123	7.8	10 407	8.5
Caldwell	331	.6	37 050	2.1	112	2.1	236 122	8.5	10 102	6.7
Camden	76	.2	51 685	.7	680	.8	1 053 186	2.5	13 149	1.0
Carteret.............	101	.6	59 869	.5	593	.8	980 308	4.9	6 281	7.0
Caswell	564	.4	137 873	.9	244	1.0	370 540	8.3	22 746	4.2
Catawba	596	.4	72 264	1.4	121	1.4	335 757	7.9	18 851	10.5
Chatham	956	.4	112 923	.9	118	1.0	293 475	7.2	28 937	6.0
Cherokee	243	.8	24 533	2.6	101	2.7	241 072	12.4	6 538	5.7
Chowan	151	.7	51 341	.8	340	1.1	519 454	3.3	17 931	5.0
Clay	166	.6	18 288	2.6	110	2.7	309 316	8.3	4 781	7.8
Cleveland	864	.4	104 029	1.0	120	1.1	328 211	8.2	21 700	6.1
Columbus	884	.7	169 945	.9	192	1.1	275 070	4.0	47 179	10.9
Craven	277	.4	83 850	.9	303	1.0	355 701	6.9	23 298	4.3
Cumberland	433	.6	103 182	.9	238	1.1	461 356	4.2	28 500	16.9
Currituck	86	.5	39 571	.8	460	1.0	835 550	3.3	8 885	.8
Dare	9	–	4 961	–	551	–	555 033	–	683	–
Davidson.............	929	.5	98 971	1.1	107	1.2	391 877	7.4	28 303	8.1
Davie	557	.3	70 579	1.1	127	1.1	372 048	7.1	20 067	10.8
Duplin	1 224	.5	238 300	.5	195	.7	457 117	6.4	83 518	6.5
Durham	159	.6	22 238	2.4	140	2.4	555 036	5.4	7 314	5.9
Edgecombe	315	.5	171 589	.5	545	.7	723 173	2.7	35 611	4.9
Forsyth	621	.5	51 091	1.6	82	1.7	268 909	8.2	17 815	11.6
Franklin	524	.5	136 941	.9	261	1.0	480 183	6.8	25 448	5.7
Gaston	333	.6	34 860	2.0	105	2.1	323 537	9.3	8 746	6.7
Gates	147	.3	62 004	.8	422	.8	629 836	2.7	21 388	2.2
Graham	110	.8	7 194	4.4	65	4.5	119 170	10.2	1 988	9.4
Granville	637	.5	161 818	.9	254	1.0	385 341	5.8	25 745	8.5
Greene	313	.4	103 201	.6	330	.7	680 322	4.2	42 620	3.4
Guilford	920	.5	111 882	1.0	122	1.1	356 275	5.5	31 447	5.1
Halifax..............	339	.6	185 382	.6	547	.9	679 344	3.4	37 442	3.5
Harnett	626	.6	116 004	1.0	185	1.1	426 026	7.2	36 225	10.5
Haywood..............	776	.6	65 212	1.3	84	1.4	262 499	9.2	18 486	6.5
Henderson	488	.6	44 511	1.4	91	1.5	394 121	4.3	19 905	4.8
Hertford.............	169	.6	76 439	.9	452	1.1	594 186	2.2	19 459	4.4
Hoke	162	.6	66 920	.8	413	1.0	593 849	3.7	14 974	5.5
Hyde	100	.3	95 327	.6	953	.7	1 149 503	2.2	15 350	1.6
Iredell	1 189	.5	156 748	.9	132	1.0	376 292	6.3	44 907	4.8
Jackson..............	217	1.0	18 882	2.8	87	3.0	295 540	8.3	5 724	8.5
Johnston	1 216	.4	211 011	.6	174	.7	418 861	5.2	63 605	5.0
Jones................	154	.4	71 769	.7	466	.8	646 824	2.4	14 987	2.0
Lee..................	311	.7	45 205	1.4	145	1.6	370 180	7.7	11 196	4.9
Lenoir	447	.5	149 650	.6	335	.8	703 098	5.5	47 542	2.5
Lincoln..............	497	.5	63 177	1.3	127	1.4	286 822	7.1	12 365	7.5
McDowell	223	.6	20 680	2.3	93	2.4	207 511	5.3	5 018	3.5
Macon	309	.7	22 784	2.0	74	2.2	260 995	7.8	5 681	11.2
Madison	907	.9	80 041	1.5	88	1.7	195 966	8.1	14 908	7.1
Martin	389	.6	115 202	.8	296	1.0	355 861	3.9	30 236	4.0
Mecklenburg	295	.8	29 015	2.3	98	2.4	603 586	11.6	19 667	5.6
Mitchell	306	.6	25 170	2.1	82	2.2	147 392	11.2	7 972	12.5
Montgomery...........	256	.6	41 792	1.7	163	1.8	304 634	9.8	8 555	7.6
Moore	683	.5	100 668	1.0	147	1.1	306 500	6.3	30 369	6.8
Nash	472	.4	175 278	.5	371	.6	794 217	5.7	57 646	3.7
New Hanover	62	1.0	5 435	2.8	88	2.9	299 973	5.7	3 324	1.7
Northampton	342	.5	160 464	.6	469	.8	597 037	2.6	36 681	4.5
Onslow	369	.5	63 419	1.1	172	1.2	291 132	4.5	17 838	4.7
Orange	485	.4	72 515	1.3	150	1.4	445 793	12.3	22 330	9.5
Pamlico	67	.2	50 232	.5	750	.6	979 556	1.5	14 570	.6
Pasquotank	174	.7	86 306	.8	496	1.1	730 602	2.4	19 746	1.3
Pender	283	.6	68 861	1.2	243	1.3	434 172	5.5	15 646	5.5
Perquimans	202	.5	77 196	.9	382	1.0	602 653	5.4	21 261	10.2
Person...............	401	.5	120 470	.7	300	.9	504 166	11.3	20 060	7.5
Pitt	474	.4	193 377	.5	408	.7	766 717	2.9	53 030	3.6
Polk	188	.5	30 701	1.8	163	1.9	373 226	7.5	6 416	9.3
Randolph	1 366	.4	148 301	.9	109	1.0	281 968	6.2	51 695	7.2
Richmond	251	.6	54 498	1.4	217	1.6	335 591	9.6	9 295	5.2
Robeson	1 004	.9	285 186	.7	284	1.2	377 101	5.1	60 275	2.7
Rockingham	780	.5	133 842	1.0	172	1.1	260 114	5.8	26 368	5.8
Rowan...............	779	.5	107 555	.9	138	1.0	321 963	7.5	32 513	7.9
Rutherford	505	.4	61 147	1.4	121	1.5	219 606	9.0	11 069	8.9
Sampson	1 186	.6	270 840	.5	228	.8	464 467	2.5	85 393	4.1
Scotland	123	.6	53 501	1.2	435	1.3	459 458	2.2	9 972	1.8
Stanly	558	.3	94 709	.7	170	.8	289 043	5.4	25 476	6.5

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm[1]		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1]	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Stokes	926	.4	110 003	1.2	119	1.3	205 411	8.5	27 247	8.3
Surry	1 194	.5	129 840	.9	109	1.0	220 632	4.9	40 863	6.6
Swain	77	.8	6 624	4.6	86	4.7	191 647	5.7	1 848	4.3
Transylvania	174	.7	12 675	3.7	73	3.8	317 525	12.7	5 315	7.0
Tyrrell	83	.4	54 838	.4	661	.5	850 500	2.5	12 423	1.7
Union	1 142	.4	178 173	.7	156	.8	427 785	5.0	51 654	3.5
Vance	232	.7	66 584	1.4	287	1.6	396 015	6.8	19 901	13.3
Wake	772	.6	113 201	1.1	147	1.2	507 767	4.9	34 617	6.6
Warren	282	.6	80 155	1.0	284	1.2	309 225	6.8	14 219	7.6
Washington	203	.5	107 280	.6	528	.7	657 527	1.7	26 605	8.2
Watauga	674	.5	56 508	1.2	84	1.3	259 563	6.5	16 201	8.1
Wayne	827	.5	229 423	.5	277	.7	542 144	2.2	68 836	4.3
Wilkes	1 170	.5	127 428	.8	109	.9	258 168	5.4	36 803	7.6
Wilson	385	.4	128 108	.5	333	.7	612 811	3.5	43 888	2.9
Yadkin	884	.6	101 838	.9	115	1.1	269 462	7.4	34 841	8.4
Yancey	604	.7	40 057	1.9	66	2.1	142 064	9.4	10 312	7.8

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm[1]		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses[1]			
							Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**49 106**	**1.0**	**7 676 523**	**.1**	**155 376**	**.5**	**49 383**	**.5**	**5 673 379**	**.1**
Alamance	41 635	8.1	34 603	1.1	47 337	1.2	730	.7	23 534	2.3
Alexander	25 904	8.4	46 791	.7	82 817	.8	565	.8	34 225	3.4
Alleghany	34 042	8.4	25 340	.9	46 496	1.0	546	.7	16 077	5.9
Anson	40 825	5.4	98 554	.3	222 973	.6	438	.8	75 734	1.1
Ashe	27 500	6.2	22 160	.9	21 246	1.0	1 043	.7	13 651	3.6
Avery	29 327	6.6	16 907	1.7	39 411	1.9	431	1.4	8 051	5.6
Beaufort	102 985	3.3	81 695	.4	212 196	.6	386	.7	57 172	1.0
Bertie	100 496	5.6	110 924	.3	298 986	.6	370	.8	72 137	1.3
Bladen	56 232	4.0	238 728	.1	431 696	.6	553	.7	185 545	.3
Brunswick	34 853	10.0	30 306	.7	142 283	1.1	215	1.2	22 532	1.8
Buncombe	23 271	9.0	34 413	.7	34 106	1.0	1 011	.8	30 898	2.0
Burke	35 719	17.3	28 242	.6	79 779	.8	355	.8	18 678	1.4
Cabarrus	21 637	8.5	20 860	.8	43 368	1.0	481	.7	17 011	2.9
Caldwell	30 614	6.8	23 712	.8	71 638	1.0	330	.9	12 639	1.9
Camden	173 008	2.6	19 747	.5	259 827	.6	76	2.4	14 455	.7
Carteret	62 189	7.2	18 958	.7	187 703	1.0	101	1.9	15 219	1.6
Caswell	40 329	4.3	28 385	.9	50 327	1.0	564	.6	19 544	2.6
Catawba	31 630	10.6	24 396	1.0	40 933	1.0	596	.7	16 179	3.7
Chatham	30 205	6.0	120 705	.3	126 261	.5	958	.5	90 511	1.1
Cherokee	27 017	5.9	12 611	1.0	51 899	1.3	242	1.3	10 135	1.7
Chowan	118 746	5.2	34 002	.5	225 181	.9	151	1.5	23 034	1.3
Clay	28 799	7.9	4 678	2.0	28 181	2.1	166	1.6	4 174	4.3
Cleveland	25 116	6.1	33 687	.7	38 990	.8	864	.6	28 054	2.2
Columbus	53 430	10.9	139 913	.4	158 273	.8	883	.9	95 693	1.2
Craven	83 805	4.4	66 933	.4	241 636	.6	278	.8	50 748	2.3
Cumberland	66 126	16.9	67 684	.3	156 313	.7	431	.8	52 016	1.3
Currituck	103 312	3.1	14 964	.5	174 005	.7	86	3.0	12 026	.7
Dare	75 877	–	836	–	92 923	–	9	–	579	–
Davidson	30 466	8.2	23 645	1.0	25 452	1.2	929	.7	17 290	5.5
Davie	36 027	10.8	15 651	1.7	28 099	1.7	557	.7	12 365	8.0
Duplin	68 178	6.5	746 449	.1	609 844	.5	1 225	.7	574 138	.2
Durham	46 292	6.1	7 247	2.5	45 576	2.6	158	1.6	4 203	4.9
Edgecombe	113 051	4.9	148 778	.2	472 312	.6	315	.9	95 549	.6
Forsyth	28 734	11.7	16 262	1.6	26 187	1.6	620	.7	9 930	6.4
Franklin	48 566	5.8	60 792	.5	116 015	.7	524	.7	42 265	1.7
Gaston	26 265	6.8	9 947	1.0	29 872	1.2	332	1.1	6 759	3.3
Gates	145 495	2.5	44 943	.3	305 737	.4	147	1.2	32 639	1.0
Graham	18 071	9.6	1 094	3.8	9 946	3.9	110	2.1	679	12.8
Granville	40 480	8.5	37 011	.8	58 102	1.0	636	.7	21 428	2.9
Greene	136 602	3.5	180 964	.1	578 160	.4	312	.7	142 370	.6
Guilford	34 219	5.1	48 872	.8	53 121	1.0	919	.6	29 988	3.1
Halifax	110 447	3.6	97 223	.3	286 794	.7	339	.8	75 450	.5
Harnett	57 960	10.5	94 083	.4	150 292	.8	625	.9	67 436	1.6
Haywood	23 853	6.6	14 646	1.2	18 874	1.3	775	.7	10 579	5.7
Henderson	40 872	4.9	46 743	.6	95 785	.9	487	.9	32 976	1.3
Hertford	115 830	4.6	60 556	.3	358 317	.7	168	1.5	49 244	.5
Hoke	92 429	5.7	66 083	.2	407 919	.6	162	1.6	47 881	.6
Hyde	153 497	2.3	32 996	.3	329 965	.5	100	1.7	23 850	.8
Iredell	37 769	4.8	99 614	.4	83 780	.7	1 189	.7	69 091	1.2
Jackson	26 502	8.7	6 236	2.5	28 735	2.7	216	2.0	3 358	5.7
Johnston	52 307	5.0	179 430	.3	147 557	.5	1 216	.6	121 775	1.1
Jones	97 953	2.4	107 629	.1	698 891	.4	153	1.4	73 863	.4
Lee	36 118	5.0	26 078	.8	83 853	1.1	310	1.0	19 111	1.4
Lenoir	106 597	2.6	199 573	.1	446 473	.5	446	.8	146 423	.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	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm[1] Value (dollars)	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm[1] Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Market value of agricultural products sold Total ($1,000)	Market value of agricultural products sold Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm Value (dollars)	Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farm production expenses[1] Total farm production expenses Farms Number	Farm production expenses[1] Total farm production expenses Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farm production expenses[1] Total farm production expenses Value Total ($1,000)	Farm production expenses[1] Total farm production expenses Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Lincoln	24 880	7.6	19 214	1.0	38 660	1.1	497	.7	13 329	1.9
McDowell	22 300	3.8	13 473	1.0	60 418	1.1	225	1.4	9 218	2.3
Macon	18 386	11.3	3 447	2.9	11 157	3.0	309	1.2	2 183	5.0
Madison	16 454	7.1	10 120	1.7	11 158	1.9	906	.9	6 638	6.8
Martin	77 729	4.1	62 958	.6	161 846	.9	389	.9	40 414	2.5
Mecklenburg	66 666	5.7	43 002	.3	145 769	.8	295	1.1	32 002	1.1
Mitchell	25 882	12.6	3 792	2.8	12 394	2.9	308	1.0	2 040	7.2
Montgomery	33 548	7.7	46 160	.3	180 312	.6	255	1.0	38 938	.4
Moore	44 399	6.9	113 221	.3	165 771	.6	684	.7	77 508	1.4
Nash	122 650	3.8	167 761	.2	355 426	.4	470	.7	116 881	.5
New Hanover	53 614	3.8	4 325	.8	69 753	1.2	62	3.4	3 182	1.2
Northampton	107 568	4.6	92 228	.3	269 673	.6	341	.9	75 255	1.0
Onslow	48 341	4.7	101 549	.3	275 201	.5	369	.8	75 716	.9
Orange	46 041	9.5	25 835	1.1	53 268	1.2	485	.6	17 937	3.7
Pamlico	217 457	1.6	22 871	.3	341 358	.4	67	1.5	15 613	.4
Pasquotank	114 139	1.9	33 107	.5	190 271	.9	173	1.3	25 736	1.4
Pender	54 897	5.6	109 576	.2	387 196	.6	285	.9	86 645	.7
Perquimans	105 775	10.2	38 044	.6	188 338	.8	201	1.2	31 118	2.2
Person	50 026	7.5	29 042	.7	72 423	.9	401	.8	18 496	5.5
Pitt	111 642	3.7	196 139	.2	413 795	.5	475	.6	143 677	.7
Polk	34 128	9.5	3 315	3.3	17 631	3.4	188	1.6	2 928	4.6
Randolph	37 816	7.2	147 329	.4	107 855	.6	1 367	.5	100 981	1.4
Richmond	37 033	5.3	66 100	.3	263 348	.7	251	1.1	50 563	.6
Robeson	60 094	2.8	221 444	.3	220 562	1.0	1 002	1.0	161 987	.8
Rockingham	33 848	5.9	37 172	1.0	47 657	1.1	779	.7	22 823	4.4
Rowan	41 737	7.9	31 828	.8	40 858	.9	779	.7	22 954	2.6
Rutherford	21 918	8.9	5 438	3.0	10 768	3.0	505	.8	5 165	6.3
Sampson	72 062	4.1	732 859	.1	617 925	.6	1 185	.6	577 584	.2
Scotland	80 419	2.2	55 056	.3	447 609	.7	124	1.3	44 136	.2
Stanly	45 737	6.6	67 689	.3	121 307	.4	557	.6	51 748	.8
Stokes	29 456	8.3	33 786	1.0	36 486	1.1	925	.6	20 122	4.7
Surry	34 224	6.6	98 364	.5	82 382	.7	1 194	.6	60 369	1.4
Swain	24 003	5.6	2 322	3.0	30 158	3.1	77	3.7	1 556	3.8
Transylvania	30 544	7.1	10 314	.9	59 279	1.1	174	1.6	6 346	2.9
Tyrrell	149 673	3.0	35 687	.2	429 966	.4	83	2.4	25 227	.3
Union	45 311	3.5	283 564	.1	248 304	.4	1 138	.5	232 550	.2
Vance	85 781	13.3	19 567	1.5	84 341	1.7	232	1.0	10 918	5.0
Wake	44 899	6.6	70 808	.7	91 720	.9	771	.7	46 836	2.1
Warren	50 423	7.7	37 607	.5	133 356	.7	282	.9	26 667	1.7
Washington	131 707	8.2	67 555	.3	332 784	.5	202	1.0	48 110	.4
Watauga	24 037	8.2	11 641	1.7	17 272	1.8	674	.7	6 140	9.4
Wayne	83 337	4.3	337 089	.1	407 604	.5	825	.6	270 331	.3
Wilkes	31 456	7.6	214 889	.2	183 665	.5	1 170	.6	171 196	.8
Wilson	114 291	3.0	120 443	.2	312 840	.5	384	.6	87 044	1.0
Yadkin	39 458	8.4	50 160	.8	56 742	1.0	883	.7	32 537	3.8
Yancey	17 017	7.8	5 347	3.1	8 853	3.2	606	.9	3 144	10.3

Farm production expenses[1]—Con.

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased Farms Number	Livestock and poultry purchased Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Livestock and poultry purchased Value Total ($1,000)	Livestock and poultry purchased Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Feed for livestock and poultry Farms Number	Feed for livestock and poultry Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Feed for livestock and poultry Value Total ($1,000)	Feed for livestock and poultry Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees Farms Number	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees Value Total ($1,000)	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**11 609**	**1.7**	**916 191**	**.2**	**22 116**	**1.2**	**2 262 032**	**.1**	**23 456**	**1.0**	**130 860**	**.7**
Alamance	161	14.9	1 913	14.0	378	8.5	7 676	6.0	322	8.4	715	20.0
Alexander	164	17.2	4 074	8.5	401	6.8	20 105	3.4	100	27.7	229	33.2
Alleghany	129	19.7	1 843	43.0	282	9.9	3 376	3.5	138	18.0	280	13.2
Anson	164	11.9	14 563	3.0	235	8.8	47 880	.1	110	13.3	444	17.0
Ashe	206	12.3	822	15.5	409	7.0	715	17.1	325	8.3	577	14.6
Avery	16	36.8	46	40.3	52	20.5	64	28.1	191	8.1	375	16.3
Beaufort	38	30.7	3 000	1.6	71	28.1	10 372	.3	334	4.9	3 785	9.1
Bertie	101	16.6	4 935	2.3	156	14.2	26 877	1.5	308	4.8	2 166	2.9
Bladen	125	10.7	55 214	.2	204	9.1	74 101	.2	422	3.8	1 785	4.8
Brunswick	50	24.1	5 041	.6	60	20.7	6 431	.6	135	11.2	624	14.7
Buncombe	243	13.1	718	7.7	473	8.2	2 460	7.7	368	9.4	(D)	(D)
Burke	61	23.8	3 336	.6	163	13.7	6 401	2.4	109	14.9	394	10.0
Cabarrus	129	12.1	1 674	10.1	306	7.5	8 513	2.5	109	16.6	499	7.5
Caldwell	62	27.6	661	3.8	197	10.2	2 987	1.4	86	19.9	788	16.4
Camden	9	6.6	(D)	(D)	19	4.8	(D)	(D)	60	2.5	1 321	.8
Carteret	4	51.2	(D)	(D)	19	16.6	111	17.7	55	6.7	1 378	3.0
Caswell	91	17.3	1 240	2.8	199	11.9	1 199	4.0	341	5.8	506	8.1
Catawba	114	16.1	2 803	3.6	313	7.9	3 652	2.7	134	17.2	357	12.9
Chatham	371	8.9	20 863	.9	702	4.5	48 418	1.4	243	12.1	342	33.8

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased Farms Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Feed for livestock and poultry Farms Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees Farms Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Cherokee	51	25.4	617	3.9	100	14.9	(D)	(D)	67	20.2	85	49.5
Chowan	21	16.6	1 281	.7	39	13.8	4 019	1.0	123	4.7	1 736	1.8
Clay	41	13.2	509	4.4	88	8.0	1 581	4.7	36	11.6	15	17.7
Cleveland	183	16.0	2 237	3.5	435	7.6	13 548	.7	248	13.1	881	4.9
Columbus	99	16.1	18 505	.2	217	13.3	26 555	.3	654	4.6	2 471	4.0
Craven	42	17.0	11 307	.1	93	16.5	9 044	3.1	195	7.0	1 433	8.3
Cumberland	111	19.5	12 869	1.0	185	13.3	17 774	2.8	220	12.1	922	10.0
Currituck	10	8.5	(D)	(D)	20	6.2	467	.5	66	3.4	1 087	.9
Dare	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	5	–	87	–
Davidson	256	13.7	1 058	11.6	476	7.5	4 795	1.5	352	9.0	558	33.1
Davie	140	17.0	1 150	16.7	346	8.0	3 932	17.3	168	13.5	327	8.4
Duplin	568	5.8	165 628	.1	709	5.5	287 966	.1	767	3.6	3 602	3.3
Durham	19	20.8	135	26.1	73	9.3	210	9.5	64	9.8	142	15.3
Edgecombe	67	18.5	6 142	.8	92	18.6	32 004	.1	234	6.4	2 916	3.9
Forsyth	140	19.0	509	35.0	287	10.0	538	16.5	291	9.6	471	8.7
Franklin	140	16.5	4 156	4.0	212	11.8	9 875	1.0	233	10.8	1 740	1.9
Gaston	102	16.6	445	7.8	190	9.2	1 997	5.5	101	16.3	244	6.1
Gates	33	12.3	3 886	.2	61	10.0	11 173	.3	121	3.3	1 288	3.4
Graham	18	24.9	66	32.9	55	8.7	98	22.4	39	14.0	5	25.9
Granville	82	24.6	254	14.7	236	13.8	1 320	5.3	282	9.6	611	14.6
Greene	100	7.6	30 903	.2	153	11.7	58 024	(L)	234	4.7	1 941	5.1
Guilford	147	18.1	2 230	6.9	301	10.8	3 390	2.1	475	6.7	2 051	5.5
Halifax	77	16.8	9 325	.4	137	13.6	15 106	.9	203	8.5	2 778	2.5
Harnett	175	16.5	6 339	3.1	278	11.3	25 471	.4	343	9.5	1 120	6.6
Haywood	191	14.1	1 075	10.1	403	8.0	2 363	8.2	302	9.5	297	27.3
Henderson	64	26.6	455	9.7	143	14.4	2 280	1.3	223	9.4	2 449	2.3
Hertford	32	8.7	3 273	.2	37	9.1	20 421	.2	139	3.1	1 520	1.8
Hoke	24	16.8	6 850	.3	53	9.4	18 794	(L)	102	5.2	732	9.4
Hyde	7	–	443	–	13	17.8	1 384	.1	93	3.0	2 280	1.1
Iredell	304	10.7	8 450	2.2	661	5.7	27 482	2.9	446	8.1	1 050	12.6
Jackson	29	15.8	31	26.2	68	9.1	178	21.2	72	9.4	173	15.3
Johnston	241	13.1	13 365	1.3	535	7.8	38 214	.3	737	4.6	3 730	3.0
Jones	36	10.6	18 454	(L)	57	10.4	31 084	(L)	113	4.4	999	1.9
Lee	65	20.1	1 664	1.2	129	12.8	6 189	.3	140	8.8	505	2.6
Lenoir	122	12.6	27 043	.1	201	11.7	59 495	.1	353	4.0	2 948	4.8
Lincoln	136	15.2	1 233	4.5	271	9.3	5 787	1.4	94	20.0	112	5.1
McDowell	44	14.8	521	4.8	106	8.1	2 092	1.4	80	10.1	70	11.9
Macon	51	23.2	214	9.8	97	15.3	258	6.3	85	15.8	103	28.4
Madison	203	15.0	366	24.5	339	11.0	257	14.3	543	5.6	332	8.0
Martin	32	15.3	997	.4	76	19.6	4 912	.8	341	2.4	2 343	3.3
Mecklenburg	40	32.8	59	29.6	142	13.1	1 970	3.4	103	17.3	3 467	1.3
Mitchell	34	44.7	139	64.2	78	24.7	78	39.1	134	14.3	90	19.0
Montgomery	76	12.0	9 353	.5	119	10.6	22 531	.1	89	14.6	95	10.4
Moore	215	11.2	13 701	.7	364	8.1	41 211	.5	288	10.2	382	6.9
Nash	89	13.3	11 953	.3	158	12.9	36 105	.2	266	8.0	2 905	3.0
New Hanover	5	14.2	(D)	(D)	7	11.7	39	8.1	36	4.5	394	2.0
Northampton	56	18.7	10 016	.2	79	18.0	21 114	.3	304	3.3	2 613	2.3
Onslow	101	12.3	13 863	.3	143	10.7	43 136	.2	221	7.3	841	11.3
Orange	130	17.0	1 314	5.3	236	10.9	3 610	4.3	173	12.3	920	18.5
Pamlico	9	7.4	209	.7	17	4.4	1 293	.1	51	1.5	1 305	1.2
Pasquotank	19	19.3	153	3.6	36	14.9	613	2.1	147	3.3	2 882	2.0
Pender	77	19.5	19 484	.1	111	15.4	33 566	.1	180	9.9	1 301	4.9
Perquimans	34	11.2	1 759	.1	57	13.5	9 537	.1	189	2.2	1 509	2.9
Person	64	25.7	368	27.1	166	16.2	1 485	8.9	214	11.3	755	5.1
Pitt	92	20.9	15 130	.8	178	14.1	43 841	.3	334	7.3	3 762	4.3
Polk	44	14.6	236	21.1	95	8.1	461	15.4	38	15.5	142	7.2
Randolph	462	9.1	14 604	2.7	869	5.3	58 692	1.3	301	13.4	784	9.2
Richmond	122	10.8	6 498	.5	139	10.2	31 872	.4	109	11.7	392	9.5
Robeson	138	19.1	20 665	.2	253	13.6	58 443	1.7	745	4.4	3 718	3.0
Rockingham	127	19.7	502	9.0	235	13.2	2 314	1.2	435	7.6	962	5.5
Rowan	193	15.4	1 263	11.5	385	7.4	7 063	3.2	262	10.6	552	14.3
Rutherford	149	15.4	1 346	20.2	268	9.4	1 346	5.3	110	18.8	69	37.7
Sampson	376	3.7	138 054	(L)	558	5.8	279 245	(L)	810	4.0	4 470	3.9
Scotland	26	7.1	4 977	(L)	69	11.3	20 952	.1	74	5.5	367	2.5
Stanly	134	14.5	4 030	.8	329	7.3	28 298	.2	160	12.0	1 024	3.3
Stokes	114	19.8	1 454	6.9	325	10.5	2 235	4.2	472	7.4	734	21.6
Surry	241	13.4	5 071	4.5	509	7.9	28 803	3.0	488	7.1	739	10.5
Swain	12	7.5	268	3.4	34	5.5	276	4.3	27	6.2	(D)	(D)
Transylvania	34	17.7	1 389	2.2	78	8.6	1 164	6.6	62	10.9	332	16.0
Tyrrell	11	6.0	725	1.3	20	4.6	7 951	.1	60	2.8	2 029	.4
Union	463	6.6	29 884	.8	730	4.0	153 623	.1	318	8.5	1 768	2.2
Vance	23	30.4	99	54.5	50	27.9	91	26.3	113	14.3	479	10.0
Wake	103	27.8	(D)	(D)	292	13.3	5 915	1.8	455	7.9	1 993	7.4
Warren	53	25.2	3 748	1.2	123	17.5	8 612	2.1	120	14.6	256	6.6
Washington	37	17.8	5 334	.1	63	17.5	14 046	.2	118	6.8	2 691	1.0
Watauga	146	14.8	860	15.0	272	10.4	527	11.5	244	10.9	303	25.9
Wayne	276	7.6	51 905	.1	384	7.4	124 611	.1	582	4.2	3 706	4.6
Wilkes	537	7.3	25 273	1.2	880	4.1	116 745	.8	344	11.7	399	17.8
Wilson	61	23.4	8 656	.1	105	18.3	12 629	.8	274	7.4	4 776	1.1
Yadkin	188	16.6	2 108	10.5	379	10.1	8 464	6.3	436	8.5	1 030	12.2
Yancey	57	31.8	367	60.2	169	15.5	199	28.3	296	10.0	84	17.0

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
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)	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)
North Carolina	**36 387**	**.8**	**243 960**	**.7**	**25 671**	**1.0**	**188 784**	**.6**	**46 229**	**.6**	**198 201**	**.6**
Alamance	539	5.1	1 885	7.1	316	9.2	540	8.8	679	2.9	1 355	5.5
Alexander	394	7.9	1 018	9.3	207	14.4	318	13.3	537	2.3	924	5.9
Alleghany	440	4.1	994	4.6	219	12.9	487	4.7	499	2.7	644	6.8
Anson	200	8.3	1 157	33.4	153	12.6	501	14.2	343	4.5	881	3.8
Ashe	828	3.1	975	6.3	550	5.6	349	5.5	973	1.9	869	9.1
Avery	377	3.5	714	6.0	341	4.4	485	14.7	411	2.1	461	7.1
Beaufort	328	5.0	6 870	1.7	314	5.3	4 827	3.2	369	3.0	3 165	2.9
Bertie	275	6.6	4 114	3.6	308	4.8	6 048	3.7	336	3.7	2 564	4.7
Bladen	426	3.9	3 030	4.0	363	6.3	2 359	4.4	549	.7	5 198	1.4
Brunswick	166	7.4	1 608	4.8	151	8.7	595	5.2	187	4.9	1 048	7.4
Buncombe	780	4.4	1 044	5.6	375	9.3	411	18.2	948	2.3	1 856	4.5
Burke	293	4.8	338	9.0	110	17.2	161	29.5	323	3.8	729	8.0
Cabarrus	344	6.1	1 121	13.6	112	17.6	203	13.5	461	2.1	479	7.2
Caldwell	238	7.6	495	6.7	131	14.1	245	11.5	299	4.3	485	7.4
Camden	58	2.6	2 033	.9	57	2.5	2 134	.7	74	2.4	660	1.0
Carteret	78	5.1	2 400	2.8	68	7.3	1 970	1.6	97	2.5	649	6.2
Caswell	482	3.1	1 672	3.9	331	5.0	658	6.7	537	2.3	2 249	7.0
Catawba	441	5.2	1 449	12.5	146	11.8	435	18.8	552	2.5	707	7.0
Chatham	486	7.1	1 116	13.4	325	9.7	369	9.1	901	1.9	1 663	3.1
Cherokee	170	8.0	253	17.4	66	19.1	44	9.8	227	4.5	286	6.3
Chowan	124	3.9	2 228	3.4	119	4.4	2 292	2.6	146	2.3	1 237	2.4
Clay	121	5.2	183	9.2	53	11.3	85	30.3	147	3.4	172	7.9
Cleveland	577	5.2	1 343	9.6	221	13.9	560	12.3	764	3.2	1 146	14.1
Columbus	766	2.8	5 817	3.5	732	3.4	3 767	2.5	842	2.0	5 367	7.3
Craven	209	5.6	3 685	7.5	185	8.0	3 017	3.5	258	2.5	2 405	5.7
Cumberland	296	8.4	2 078	3.4	196	13.4	1 472	3.3	408	2.9	1 946	1.3
Currituck	69	3.3	1 892	1.0	68	3.3	1 374	1.4	82	3.0	556	.9
Dare	6	–	99	–	6	–	81	–	8	–	35	–
Davidson	740	4.0	1 254	10.4	334	10.1	436	17.3	897	1.6	1 175	10.7
Davie	423	4.4	1 207	8.6	148	16.3	295	10.0	517	2.5	594	9.8
Duplin	810	3.2	8 489	5.5	774	3.7	5 262	4.3	1 186	1.3	10 842	2.2
Durham	106	5.6	419	3.6	72	7.7	179	5.3	139	3.4	447	5.1
Edgecombe	250	4.1	6 069	1.7	258	3.6	5 855	.9	291	4.6	4 001	1.6
Forsyth	527	3.6	1 089	8.1	288	9.9	390	9.7	581	2.4	884	9.2
Franklin	302	8.3	2 629	15.9	258	9.1	2 164	2.1	465	2.6	2 255	4.3
Gaston	257	5.5	503	7.1	96	14.1	169	26.5	318	2.2	329	4.8
Gates	114	3.5	2 572	3.9	118	4.2	3 527	2.1	147	1.2	1 179	2.0
Graham	90	5.0	68	14.6	40	13.2	12	15.0	95	3.2	76	13.2
Granville	474	5.5	1 775	5.3	366	7.6	990	2.8	550	3.8	2 366	7.3
Greene	262	3.0	4 279	2.5	241	4.5	3 728	2.3	300	2.6	4 228	2.8
Guilford	695	4.0	2 396	5.9	417	8.3	996	6.1	853	2.1	2 231	7.5
Halifax	229	5.2	5 784	2.2	215	8.1	6 586	2.1	284	6.4	2 928	3.8
Harnett	459	6.6	3 997	5.2	385	6.8	3 288	10.1	574	3.5	3 203	5.8
Haywood	582	4.8	760	8.5	329	9.7	229	15.8	709	2.6	570	5.0
Henderson	416	4.5	1 165	5.0	351	5.6	2 887	7.3	477	2.0	2 081	2.1
Hertford	138	2.1	2 520	3.2	137	3.1	3 353	2.0	164	1.8	1 734	1.7
Hoke	121	4.3	1 580	1.7	103	5.3	2 100	1.2	146	2.7	1 142	4.2
Hyde	87	3.9	4 443	1.0	86	4.0	2 949	.8	95	3.3	1 344	1.0
Iredell	796	4.5	3 518	8.9	498	7.1	1 115	5.5	1 123	1.9	2 029	6.8
Jackson	171	4.0	213	6.6	127	5.9	128	11.0	203	2.7	170	5.1
Johnston	950	3.1	7 709	4.5	782	3.9	5 618	4.5	1 140	2.1	6 347	4.7
Jones	128	2.6	2 707	1.8	113	5.2	2 738	1.1	150	1.5	1 872	1.9
Lee	194	8.5	1 073	2.8	128	8.4	1 054	4.6	281	4.3	1 066	3.8
Lenoir	368	4.1	6 667	4.5	289	8.4	5 924	1.5	421	3.3	5 077	2.7
Lincoln	353	6.5	891	12.0	138	15.9	320	30.0	446	3.4	487	4.8
McDowell	155	5.6	281	9.0	97	8.5	121	10.2	198	2.2	310	10.8
Macon	246	4.7	321	10.4	107	13.6	57	16.3	293	2.5	164	10.5
Madison	792	2.7	836	10.0	569	5.1	262	15.0	858	1.8	408	11.5
Martin	354	2.3	4 463	5.0	326	3.4	5 253	3.9	352	2.9	2 813	4.2
Mecklenburg	198	7.3	975	8.9	100	15.5	765	2.9	270	2.4	1 814	1.6
Mitchell	246	7.5	203	10.0	211	8.8	114	10.4	293	3.3	155	12.1
Montgomery	155	8.1	277	8.4	89	14.2	153	13.0	218	4.5	454	2.2
Moore	388	7.4	1 787	11.5	307	8.1	1 180	8.6	652	1.6	1 949	8.0
Nash	326	6.2	5 396	2.8	311	5.9	6 378	1.4	425	3.7	5 834	.8
New Hanover	38	4.2	106	3.2	40	4.3	83	3.2	54	3.7	123	4.0
Northampton	306	3.3	5 146	5.4	304	3.2	6 180	3.0	338	.9	2 672	5.3
Onslow	259	6.3	2 126	10.1	225	6.9	1 385	5.8	352	2.4	1 928	3.8
Orange	363	5.7	1 311	10.9	214	10.0	351	13.9	438	2.8	1 075	10.6
Pamlico	52	1.5	2 500	.9	44	1.0	1 885	.1	61	1.3	795	.4
Pasquotank	146	3.0	4 074	2.4	144	3.9	2 881	1.9	166	2.3	1 377	2.9
Pender	210	8.0	2 064	8.8	173	8.1	1 299	4.4	265	4.2	1 423	3.6
Perquimans	174	4.5	3 763	5.4	176	3.2	2 937	6.7	194	2.2	1 060	5.1
Person	313	5.8	2 061	8.1	242	8.2	1 155	5.7	391	2.3	1 842	7.3
Pitt	370	5.1	8 748	1.8	373	4.7	7 376	2.2	461	2.3	7 199	2.1
Polk	128	6.1	310	9.6	81	10.3	138	5.9	178	2.3	173	6.2
Randolph	699	6.7	1 759	9.4	378	10.6	657	26.9	1 279	1.5	2 536	8.9
Richmond	140	7.7	665	7.3	114	9.2	401	3.9	221	3.7	1 071	3.1
Robeson	863	2.8	8 715	2.6	745	4.4	7 959	6.2	979	1.7	6 572	3.2
Rockingham	683	3.0	2 095	4.6	416	6.6	960	10.0	757	1.7	2 487	6.4

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]

	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
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)	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)
Rowan	628	3.9	2 338	5.1	264	11.6	759	4.5	735	2.0	1 108	7.6
Rutherford	337	6.5	521	15.2	114	16.9	47	17.4	458	3.3	406	11.2
Sampson	890	2.9	10 627	2.6	848	3.5	7 499	2.1	1 166	.9	13 260	1.1
Scotland	82	7.2	1 145	1.2	74	8.3	1 630	1.1	112	3.4	1 019	.9
Stanly	372	6.0	2 303	3.6	193	12.5	1 499	8.6	514	3.0	1 091	3.4
Stokes	814	3.1	1 567	6.6	516	6.3	617	8.1	882	1.7	1 971	8.1
Surry	945	3.6	3 202	8.2	565	6.4	1 399	10.3	1 132	2.0	3 087	4.7
Swain	49	4.6	50	8.0	37	5.2	31	12.8	72	3.8	89	4.6
Transylvania	129	5.4	182	15.8	107	7.0	83	13.1	165	2.7	190	5.7
Tyrrell	66	2.7	2 396	.5	62	2.8	1 906	.3	77	2.4	890	.5
Union	539	7.1	3 692	3.1	427	6.8	3 161	2.4	1 032	2.4	3 154	1.4
Vance	187	6.9	1 053	7.7	124	13.3	790	5.9	210	5.0	1 149	3.5
Wake	606	3.4	3 934	3.3	515	5.9	2 449	5.1	730	2.0	3 756	4.3
Warren	186	10.8	1 043	8.1	162	8.2	916	15.0	262	4.3	1 049	8.7
Washington	136	4.3	4 835	1.9	122	5.6	4 147	.7	189	3.6	1 497	1.1
Watauga	483	5.4	491	16.7	328	9.2	195	21.2	635	2.5	480	17.3
Wayne	634	3.7	7 219	2.5	584	4.7	5 845	2.7	794	1.9	7 335	2.8
Wilkes	604	6.4	1 175	14.2	434	8.6	661	12.3	1 080	2.1	3 654	3.6
Wilson	340	3.2	5 217	2.0	310	4.3	5 273	3.8	372	1.8	3 833	2.0
Yadkin	682	4.5	3 230	9.7	425	7.7	1 740	13.7	852	1.7	2 345	7.0
Yancey	521	4.3	370	10.2	360	8.6	130	17.5	558	2.7	214	11.9

	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
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)	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)
North Carolina	**29 259**	**.9**	**87 664**	**.4**	**18 984**	**1.2**	**487 395**	**.4**	**6 485**	**2.4**	**67 291**	**1.6**
Alamance	448	6.3	574	5.6	254	11.2	1 995	9.0	50	25.7	164	16.0
Alexander	412	5.7	600	7.0	104	20.5	1 344	.5	71	33.9	470	59.4
Alleghany	214	12.9	207	6.5	198	13.1	2 383	6.0	53	20.9	555	6.6
Anson	243	6.1	908	2.6	107	13.5	1 951	.3	38	30.8	89	17.0
Ashe	366	7.8	184	11.6	404	7.6	2 971	4.1	148	15.7	547	18.6
Avery	142	11.0	134	7.2	160	9.1	2 486	9.0	108	12.2	457	11.1
Beaufort	293	7.5	983	3.4	160	11.6	6 428	1.2	75	26.3	553	5.8
Bertie	286	5.0	1 052	2.0	214	9.2	6 616	1.5	61	22.4	1 220	2.9
Bladen	399	5.7	2 816	.8	239	8.7	11 883	.5	133	13.7	2 697	9.7
Brunswick	137	10.3	396	4.0	70	19.4	1 679	1.7	45	24.6	320	10.9
Buncombe	450	8.4	414	7.8	252	12.9	5 621	4.9	145	17.9	333	16.2
Burke	170	12.8	280	4.7	106	18.1	2 024	5.1	21	39.8	226	9.2
Cabarrus	275	7.4	221	9.7	78	19.4	1 182	2.5	44	29.5	15	38.1
Caldwell	171	11.3	165	9.6	96	17.7	2 928	1.6	32	27.5	331	5.4
Camden	43	2.5	162	.6	35	2.4	1 887	.6	12	4.1	254	.9
Carteret	71	5.6	126	7.0	57	6.7	1 832	1.9	12	19.7	84	5.5
Caswell	469	3.2	536	4.7	321	5.8	3 298	3.8	60	25.3	311	10.3
Catawba	323	7.5	274	4.6	122	16.4	1 807	2.1	36	35.7	24	39.1
Chatham	539	5.8	1 029	6.0	246	10.9	2 853	16.6	138	18.6	563	55.2
Cherokee	57	21.0	177	2.9	43	19.2	(D)	(D)	20	44.4	109	8.0
Chowan	110	5.7	280	2.3	86	7.9	2 342	3.3	52	11.6	926	3.1
Clay	83	8.8	96	5.8	49	10.5	644	9.2	11	29.8	10	10.1
Cleveland	381	8.9	387	8.3	195	13.5	2 003	11.1	49	32.1	174	27.8
Columbus	653	4.1	1 982	5.2	433	6.8	8 789	2.2	208	14.0	1 514	9.7
Craven	193	9.2	835	10.4	167	9.1	5 648	5.4	45	25.6	454	2.1
Cumberland	247	8.8	860	1.6	217	12.0	3 906	3.7	73	20.3	1 195	1.3
Currituck	55	3.2	135	1.4	44	3.3	2 268	.3	16	6.6	(D)	(D)
Dare	5	–	11	–	5	–	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)
Davidson	480	7.4	456	8.3	195	15.5	1 177	12.2	70	29.2	104	19.9
Davie	273	9.3	265	10.0	160	14.8	628	10.0	32	43.7	111	56.1
Duplin	960	3.5	5 705	1.3	695	5.2	23 331	2.3	299	9.8	3 472	5.3
Durham	102	6.5	150	7.3	63	9.2	866	5.4	18	17.4	132	6.0
Edgecombe	227	8.6	1 417	1.6	169	10.7	9 956	2.5	81	15.7	1 489	2.1
Forsyth	306	9.7	245	13.7	189	13.3	1 700	13.0	24	40.0	82	9.0
Franklin	326	6.6	604	4.8	235	9.6	6 008	2.1	67	22.2	601	9.4
Gaston	119	13.2	136	8.1	39	24.2	869	2.5	11	59.2	(D)	(D)
Gates	111	6.1	274	2.1	74	8.4	1 857	1.6	26	13.2	142	3.1
Graham	48	10.4	15	29.0	34	16.0	54	38.4	7	26.6	5	24.7
Granville	404	7.1	624	7.1	338	6.7	4 668	5.7	47	28.9	285	2.8
Greene	233	8.1	2 061	2.1	239	7.5	12 471	1.3	66	16.9	811	5.3
Guilford	514	6.2	653	6.4	334	9.0	5 956	4.5	68	27.3	269	7.1
Halifax	206	5.7	1 165	2.1	162	9.9	9 151	1.4	82	18.1	1 028	2.4
Harnett	440	6.5	1 346	2.3	268	10.7	6 450	2.5	71	22.8	919	11.7
Haywood	336	9.7	207	5.7	200	14.2	1 588	14.6	18	43.1	145	29.5

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	Electricity Farms Number	Electricity Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Electricity Value Total ($1,000)	Electricity Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hired farm labor Farms Number	Hired farm labor Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hired farm labor Value Total ($1,000)	Hired farm labor Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Contract labor Farms Number	Contract labor Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Contract labor Value Total ($1,000)	Contract labor Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Henderson	267	7.5	661	1.8	223	7.4	10 298	1.6	97	20.2	1 305	7.8
Hertford	122	4.4	809	.8	107	5.4	3 877	1.5	26	11.6	289	9.8
Hoke	111	5.5	841	.9	77	7.0	5 451	1.3	21	14.6	462	1.3
Hyde	77	5.1	196	1.2	65	5.7	2 469	1.8	31	10.0	648	.9
Iredell	656	5.5	1 366	4.4	308	9.8	7 591	5.6	83	23.7	481	46.4
Jackson	97	7.3	46	7.9	61	10.0	975	6.1	33	12.2	124	18.3
Johnston	841	4.7	2 252	2.2	541	5.9	11 770	4.9	249	11.9	3 634	4.7
Jones	118	4.7	637	1.7	101	6.3	3 718	1.1	41	14.1	462	.6
Lee	154	11.0	402	3.1	109	13.2	2 034	5.3	29	37.0	125	21.0
Lenoir	350	7.0	2 134	1.6	305	9.1	11 401	1.8	80	21.2	792	4.7
Lincoln	254	10.2	185	5.8	118	20.9	856	3.7	64	31.8	42	20.5
McDowell	118	7.3	148	6.3	47	14.0	2 464	2.2	12	30.4	215	24.1
Macon	123	12.3	37	18.5	63	14.9	187	18.6	25	31.9	20	32.3
Madison	313	11.2	66	15.5	327	9.5	674	11.6	160	19.0	357	40.8
Martin	262	8.7	795	4.5	233	9.5	4 557	4.6	73	20.3	960	3.3
Mecklenburg	169	11.6	579	2.3	83	16.0	11 832	.4	16	43.1	16	14.7
Mitchell	112	15.1	25	17.3	97	19.3	209	16.9	56	32.1	46	30.3
Montgomery	134	9.3	400	.8	86	15.4	1 221	1.6	53	16.8	147	7.3
Moore	439	5.3	1 119	3.9	258	10.0	4 829	6.4	81	24.2	312	37.4
Nash	335	7.4	2 467	.9	284	6.7	14 087	.8	93	13.1	4 088	.9
New Hanover	39	4.3	65	1.6	25	4.7	1 323	.9	12	7.7	(D)	(D)
Northampton	258	7.1	1 025	3.6	164	12.0	6 932	2.8	25	32.1	263	20.5
Onslow	291	5.2	881	1.4	175	10.5	3 327	4.5	45	22.6	392	7.1
Orange	322	7.3	376	9.0	146	16.6	2 689	7.5	80	22.2	179	49.7
Pamlico	55	1.6	175	.7	34	1.7	2 362	.2	15	−	284	−
Pasquotank	134	5.0	202	5.8	95	6.3	3 041	3.4	39	9.9	1 408	.9
Pender	201	9.4	1 100	1.5	105	10.4	10 306	.4	69	20.5	749	10.6
Perquimans	129	9.1	313	8.4	100	14.8	1 728	1.8	29	26.4	424	19.1
Person	264	9.0	532	6.8	177	11.9	2 953	6.5	63	29.5	381	13.9
Pitt	402	5.2	3 507	1.7	351	6.0	16 966	1.8	102	16.5	1 641	15.0
Polk	100	7.9	55	11.5	64	11.9	306	12.6	34	15.0	131	6.6
Randolph	806	5.3	1 648	4.0	311	12.1	5 962	2.7	180	16.0	949	30.2
Richmond	167	8.6	797	1.1	95	13.1	2 890	5.8	27	19.5	55	1.5
Robeson	546	7.9	2 519	2.3	488	8.3	16 591	2.8	173	19.7	1 322	4.4
Rockingham	526	5.6	727	7.7	343	8.3	3 806	9.3	67	26.2	487	15.9
Rowan	402	8.4	384	4.9	192	14.3	2 704	2.1	72	28.9	669	6.3
Rutherford	206	12.0	88	20.1	110	16.5	180	27.3	55	30.9	75	61.3
Sampson	846	4.3	9 393	.4	635	5.8	33 859	.5	276	10.4	10 413	1.9
Scotland	86	9.0	724	.7	68	11.2	4 944	.4	16	9.9	303	.3
Stanly	304	7.8	621	4.8	127	16.3	3 163	6.9	29	39.1	83	57.9
Stokes	593	5.8	526	11.0	417	8.0	3 569	12.2	54	34.3	116	56.6
Surry	643	5.6	1 013	6.8	566	5.8	5 724	8.7	77	23.9	575	17.5
Swain	34	5.0	38	1.8	26	6.5	181	6.6	3	10.0	(D)	(D)
Transylvania	78	8.8	62	9.2	53	10.2	937	3.3	24	21.5	33	20.0
Tyrrell	49	2.5	176	.7	40	2.3	2 475	.2	17	4.2	355	.1
Union	691	5.0	2 141	1.4	337	8.1	7 765	.7	144	12.8	479	5.9
Vance	143	10.2	326	8.3	119	15.8	2 720	8.3	11	5.0	184	4.4
Wake	556	5.8	1 277	2.9	345	9.3	8 763	2.8	128	21.1	1 175	7.9
Warren	192	8.2	510	2.8	127	14.8	3 484	4.1	26	34.5	682	1.2
Washington	147	7.2	356	2.0	86	11.0	3 579	.3	25	1.1	910	.2
Watauga	277	10.8	91	18.7	235	11.5	937	24.9	52	30.3	106	28.6
Wayne	596	5.2	5 033	.9	467	5.3	20 880	1.3	156	14.2	1 883	32.3
Wilkes	710	6.1	1 750	3.9	355	9.7	4 446	5.0	63	23.2	315	5.0
Wilson	305	6.6	1 965	1.6	224	8.3	15 358	2.4	117	16.6	1 758	10.6
Yadkin	585	5.7	898	8.9	307	11.2	2 889	11.4	43	35.3	371	8.9
Yancey	204	14.2	58	20.7	126	17.7	163	19.7	69	29.0	115	25.7

Farm production expenses[1]—Con.

Geographic area	Repair and maintenance Farms Number	Repair and maintenance Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Repair and maintenance Value Total ($1,000)	Repair and maintenance Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment Farms Number	Customwork... Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Customwork... Value Total ($1,000)	Customwork... Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Interest Farms Number	Interest Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Interest Value Total ($1,000)	Interest Value Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**39 441**	**.7**	**207 332**	**.6**	**13 093**	**1.6**	**55 032**	**1.2**	**16 538**	**1.3**	**205 129**	**.6**
Alamance	621	4.1	1 641	6.1	140	16.2	147	9.8	188	12.8	1 582	12.4
Alexander	399	7.9	1 047	6.3	87	22.4	158	17.5	138	20.3	1 208	13.9
Alleghany	467	4.0	1 185	9.1	110	20.3	302	17.4	187	14.8	1 104	11.3
Anson	281	5.5	1 852	15.6	89	17.7	199	22.5	140	11.9	1 917	2.9
Ashe	774	3.9	1 016	5.8	191	13.4	185	20.0	184	13.5	914	10.2
Avery	305	5.4	726	8.7	55	20.6	80	14.6	109	13.4	667	18.3
Beaufort	349	3.9	3 729	5.5	184	13.7	1 103	6.2	215	10.9	2 954	2.4
Bertie	302	6.0	3 520	4.6	143	15.1	1 052	9.2	150	12.0	3 190	7.3
Bladen	463	4.4	5 589	1.9	175	13.1	1 107	4.7	268	9.2	5 960	2.5

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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

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

	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
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)	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)
Brunswick	161	7.7	887	6.5	41	25.5	310	8.8	98	13.3	1 233	6.8
Buncombe	704	5.2	1 708	15.9	142	17.2	(D)	(D)	166	17.0	1 421	14.3
Burke	259	6.6	674	7.7	108	18.7	98	15.5	62	21.8	528	6.6
Cabarrus	382	5.2	677	11.0	55	25.9	94	36.0	78	19.0	423	16.0
Caldwell	214	10.2	599	6.5	99	21.1	378	5.5	46	27.5	388	5.7
Camden	61	2.5	1 251	.6	34	2.9	243	2.4	36	2.5	794	1.5
Carteret	76	5.8	1 307	2.6	34	15.3	90	9.1	27	11.1	(D)	(D)
Caswell	510	3.0	1 503	5.7	144	14.9	155	8.8	238	9.3	1 396	8.5
Catawba	447	5.3	1 059	8.8	43	27.9	80	11.6	133	16.8	837	18.2
Chatham	765	3.5	2 345	10.1	182	13.9	1 635	6.5	311	9.3	1 991	9.1
Cherokee	146	11.3	264	7.5	18	37.5	8	46.1	28	35.8	199	11.3
Chowan	128	3.8	1 367	3.7	76	7.2	523	4.5	87	7.3	919	4.3
Clay	113	5.3	182	9.8	19	23.4	11	22.6	37	13.4	174	12.9
Cleveland	651	4.5	1 273	6.2	122	21.0	216	14.6	197	13.3	1 218	15.6
Columbus	735	3.9	4 302	5.0	407	7.8	1 337	7.9	443	8.1	4 233	4.7
Craven	249	2.8	2 208	7.0	109	16.6	814	13.8	112	5.4	2 136	1.1
Cumberland	358	4.4	1 810	5.0	117	18.2	386	8.4	162	12.5	2 140	14.4
Currituck	67	3.3	984	.9	30	3.8	170	1.1	38	3.5	351	1.5
Dare	6	–	23	–	3	–	(D)	(D)	4	–	42	–
Davidson	775	3.7	1 766	15.3	98	23.3	142	18.9	215	15.5	1 278	18.9
Davie	485	3.1	986	11.0	115	19.3	147	21.4	146	18.0	721	26.7
Duplin	1 125	2.2	9 654	2.1	562	6.9	3 133	4.3	626	5.0	16 286	1.1
Durham	120	5.6	414	10.8	32	14.1	94	16.0	36	12.9	209	14.1
Edgecombe	275	6.3	3 561	.8	142	14.0	1 543	7.4	191	10.4	3 715	1.6
Forsyth	509	4.8	898	10.0	97	21.8	181	30.9	126	18.2	555	15.0
Franklin	403	5.3	2 379	3.6	154	12.9	641	5.5	155	12.8	1 692	5.2
Gaston	243	6.4	455	6.7	24	35.5	(D)	(D)	68	18.2	339	22.7
Gates	134	3.5	1 423	3.7	80	6.8	325	4.2	70	8.2	862	3.2
Graham	72	6.8	101	14.2	7	49.1	3	47.5	18	26.9	40	34.6
Granville	502	4.4	2 249	5.7	189	14.5	361	8.3	192	13.5	912	13.8
Greene	268	5.2	3 529	3.6	165	11.1	1 263	4.6	192	10.1	6 761	.9
Guilford	736	4.4	1 906	4.8	233	12.6	366	24.3	207	14.0	1 358	11.7
Halifax	246	6.6	3 518	1.3	136	12.9	1 383	6.6	170	9.3	3 622	2.0
Harnett	565	3.2	2 759	3.4	167	15.5	753	5.5	254	12.3	3 445	6.3
Haywood	554	5.3	723	6.1	75	26.0	65	15.3	173	15.2	415	19.1
Henderson	456	2.8	2 816	2.4	99	18.6	685	2.9	161	14.0	1 464	4.9
Hertford	140	3.5	1 706	2.6	68	7.9	522	8.2	92	5.7	1 327	3.3
Hoke	130	4.6	1 583	1.9	56	11.1	571	22.5	61	9.4	1 512	2.3
Hyde	91	3.8	1 589	3.5	55	6.7	417	4.2	76	4.2	1 197	1.0
Iredell	911	3.8	2 477	4.7	267	11.0	778	5.1	364	9.2	2 793	5.9
Jackson	149	5.3	232	8.0	22	16.1	42	25.4	47	11.8	233	13.8
Johnston	985	3.5	5 618	3.6	491	7.0	1 781	7.1	490	7.0	5 211	3.2
Jones	133	4.1	1 713	1.5	78	8.0	478	4.1	85	7.4	2 142	2.3
Lee	251	5.9	1 082	9.7	83	18.0	249	3.3	111	15.9	1 067	10.9
Lenoir	413	4.0	4 770	3.5	236	11.2	1 628	1.9	226	6.7	4 208	4.5
Lincoln	435	4.1	785	6.1	118	19.1	111	14.4	114	17.4	775	23.0
McDowell	178	4.2	501	4.1	37	15.5	38	18.3	41	13.6	322	6.1
Macon	243	4.4	293	8.0	22	37.1	14	40.0	37	24.4	95	17.6
Madison	640	4.6	740	15.2	89	24.3	57	31.5	218	14.6	664	18.2
Martin	311	4.9	2 723	4.9	197	12.1	1 274	6.6	217	10.5	1 631	3.9
Mecklenburg	243	5.7	2 015	7.0	47	23.3	244	4.3	47	23.6	1 015	3.8
Mitchell	206	10.1	199	11.6	35	38.7	13	41.3	81	23.7	288	19.0
Montgomery	169	7.5	683	5.2	67	19.2	57	18.5	85	11.8	950	5.8
Moore	596	3.1	2 106	4.7	134	15.1	301	12.0	301	9.4	2 100	8.1
Nash	389	4.9	4 778	2.7	189	11.6	1 678	5.1	241	9.3	4 824	1.4
New Hanover	53	3.6	163	3.4	13	7.1	47	4.3	24	5.3	54	5.1
Northampton	312	3.8	3 705	4.0	164	11.9	1 262	6.6	165	11.5	3 887	2.7
Onslow	305	5.7	1 752	10.7	134	11.1	489	10.9	135	12.6	1 541	2.1
Orange	367	6.0	1 114	8.7	88	21.6	286	13.1	156	14.6	716	17.4
Pamlico	58	1.5	1 004	.6	25	–	366	–	34	–	633	–
Pasquotank	146	4.3	2 007	3.1	82	8.1	615	3.1	91	6.9	1 270	1.8
Pender	216	8.0	1 660	2.4	80	12.2	508	22.8	137	14.1	2 340	1.1
Perquimans	190	2.7	1 856	7.0	96	15.2	715	6.9	121	11.3	1 094	5.0
Person	347	5.0	1 459	8.6	213	11.4	514	10.0	189	14.0	1 346	12.0
Pitt	403	3.9	6 432	1.4	177	14.6	1 732	4.5	268	8.2	5 718	3.3
Polk	145	4.7	256	9.6	32	19.6	25	25.2	55	11.9	200	15.9
Randolph	1 096	3.2	3 232	4.1	258	15.1	371	13.9	336	9.7	2 627	7.4
Richmond	219	4.3	1 162	5.8	56	15.8	210	3.1	112	10.5	1 385	6.5
Robeson	763	5.3	6 218	7.1	442	8.1	2 739	13.2	397	7.9	4 043	2.7
Rockingham	643	4.0	2 052	5.8	156	17.3	390	14.1	270	11.6	1 353	8.1
Rowan	596	4.8	1 298	6.3	162	16.8	485	41.3	187	14.2	971	13.1
Rutherford	346	6.7	373	13.8	73	23.4	41	42.2	119	17.0	401	16.6
Sampson	1 023	3.0	11 940	1.6	575	6.4	3 178	3.4	608	5.9	15 724	1.3
Scotland	108	5.0	1 873	.7	43	13.1	372	5.6	54	13.8	1 160	.6
Stanly	423	5.3	2 033	3.6	124	18.1	258	6.7	113	13.0	2 037	2.7
Stokes	792	2.5	2 009	10.5	241	13.4	220	20.4	261	11.1	1 423	14.1
Surry	938	4.0	2 409	4.1	243	12.8	338	11.5	407	8.6	2 504	4.9
Swain	54	4.4	133	4.6	5	17.2	(D)	(D)	15	6.7	(D)	(D)
Transylvania	125	5.4	231	4.7	18	23.9	15	37.4	44	12.1	247	17.5
Tyrrell	72	2.5	1 259	.4	34	2.6	598	.6	50	2.8	799	.7

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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

| Geographic area | 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)
Union	845	3.5	4 373	1.8	278	9.5	987	4.8	353	5.4	5 567	1.0
Vance	190	7.1	852	6.6	45	24.3	180	9.5	76	19.8	505	12.8
Wake	661	3.5	3 898	5.3	218	15.5	(D)	(D)	182	16.0	1 462	4.4
Warren	191	8.5	1 234	4.4	96	15.4	175	3.0	89	17.6	768	3.9
Washington	180	4.2	2 579	1.2	82	11.3	695	3.1	115	7.0	1 977	.8
Watauga	482	5.8	547	11.4	105	19.9	65	23.6	115	17.1	302	22.5
Wayne	724	3.0	7 693	2.0	357	9.1	2 002	6.3	409	7.0	11 403	1.3
Wilkes	925	3.5	2 746	4.2	172	14.8	238	14.9	397	9.4	3 894	5.0
Wilson	317	5.6	3 612	3.6	221	9.8	1 315	6.9	203	9.5	4 446	2.8
Yadkin	687	4.7	2 372	10.4	277	12.5	467	15.0	318	10.2	1 816	10.7
Yancey	425	6.8	337	10.6	85	25.7	33	28.8	117	20.4	325	23.6

Farm production expenses[1]—Con.

| Geographic area | 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)
North Carolina	**13 746**	**1.5**	**180 559**	**.7**	**46 926**	**.6**	**72 025**	**.9**	**42 095**	**.6**	**370 924**	**.3**
Alamance	193	12.2	617	11.0	718	1.3	739	4.6	610	4.2	1 990	4.1
Alexander	148	18.9	387	9.2	564	.8	473	5.2	486	5.0	1 869	2.1
Alleghany	135	17.3	501	10.3	531	1.5	634	12.2	490	3.1	1 583	7.0
Anson	113	13.6	564	5.9	432	1.5	701	6.1	321	4.6	2 128	2.0
Ashe	163	13.5	427	6.8	986	1.8	1 041	6.5	844	3.0	2 057	6.7
Avery	86	16.2	225	10.3	408	2.3	295	7.4	334	3.6	834	5.6
Beaufort	204	10.4	4 343	3.4	365	3.3	783	3.4	326	5.6	4 276	5.2
Bertie	220	9.1	3 681	5.7	342	2.1	899	8.3	337	4.1	4 201	2.6
Bladen	195	11.0	2 711	2.1	508	3.1	1 334	2.2	455	4.1	9 762	.5
Brunswick	64	17.0	690	6.3	194	4.8	286	7.6	187	4.7	1 384	6.2
Buncombe	163	16.9	317	18.8	899	3.1	1 124	5.7	781	4.0	4 312	1.3
Burke	51	20.3	181	19.4	349	1.7	296	6.8	289	6.5	3 011	1.6
Cabarrus	102	18.6	277	13.2	475	1.2	538	6.7	389	5.1	1 096	6.9
Caldwell	80	23.6	147	9.5	315	3.0	377	21.9	252	7.6	1 665	2.3
Camden	39	2.7	1 369	1.4	69	2.6	196	.9	69	2.4	1 537	.5
Carteret	35	10.9	327	8.6	90	4.8	544	1.9	91	4.0	1 196	1.4
Caswell	194	10.1	1 160	6.8	548	1.5	723	6.8	516	2.7	2 938	3.3
Catawba	101	19.4	243	29.4	574	1.9	665	9.3	487	4.2	1 787	3.9
Chatham	177	14.0	460	23.7	893	2.3	1 255	7.9	832	2.8	5 609	2.0
Cherokee	42	27.4	(D)	(D)	237	2.2	160	10.2	197	7.0	1 083	4.8
Chowan	72	8.4	1 266	3.3	147	2.1	376	3.0	144	2.7	2 239	2.0
Clay	39	13.8	49	18.0	157	2.4	138	9.0	126	4.3	325	4.9
Cleveland	182	13.8	483	12.8	826	1.7	993	7.3	658	4.8	1 593	3.9
Columbus	402	8.4	4 387	5.9	818	2.6	1 351	5.7	822	2.4	5 315	5.0
Craven	103	11.3	3 235	4.6	249	5.3	448	7.0	248	3.3	4 081	3.8
Cumberland	96	17.9	1 287	2.4	419	1.2	712	5.0	398	3.1	2 660	2.3
Currituck	31	4.9	1 153	1.1	72	3.1	151	3.5	70	3.2	1 136	.7
Dare	3	–	(D)	(D)	8	–	10	–	8	–	36	–
Davidson	225	13.8	370	21.0	885	1.9	792	7.1	720	4.2	1 927	6.8
Davie	93	23.9	225	14.4	545	1.7	497	14.9	483	3.2	1 280	8.5
Duplin	455	8.4	6 774	3.3	1 180	1.5	2 993	2.4	1 137	1.9	21 003	1.1
Durham	28	14.8	126	8.4	150	2.6	313	5.4	132	3.2	368	5.6
Edgecombe	167	10.5	9 317	1.2	291	5.3	916	3.4	308	1.7	6 648	1.5
Forsyth	157	17.0	458	28.5	606	1.6	896	8.9	470	5.1	1 033	8.2
Franklin	168	11.8	2 381	4.3	515	1.5	1 012	11.6	465	3.5	4 129	2.7
Gaston	65	19.3	80	18.7	312	2.4	394	7.7	254	5.8	656	3.4
Gates	83	7.6	2 059	2.6	144	2.2	390	3.1	139	2.9	1 681	1.1
Graham	15	23.1	11	30.6	90	5.5	44	9.4	77	6.9	82	15.7
Granville	190	12.9	2 042	16.2	594	3.2	800	16.5	497	4.5	2 172	5.2
Greene	129	14.2	4 695	3.8	289	4.0	846	4.2	293	3.4	6 828	.9
Guilford	229	12.3	887	5.7	895	1.3	1 315	8.3	802	2.8	3 984	3.1
Halifax	129	12.8	6 398	1.7	328	1.6	736	3.9	325	2.5	5 943	1.1
Harnett	195	13.4	3 719	5.9	614	1.4	1 092	7.1	534	3.9	3 537	2.1
Haywood	165	15.0	301	16.7	716	2.6	601	6.4	665	3.5	1 239	15.8
Henderson	141	11.6	1 093	19.5	470	2.0	571	4.8	439	3.6	2 767	4.2
Hertford	93	6.1	1 695	2.5	148	3.2	658	2.4	165	1.8	5 540	.7
Hoke	54	9.0	1 107	4.7	154	2.5	356	3.7	140	3.4	4 800	.6
Hyde	55	6.8	2 263	1.2	95	2.5	341	1.8	95	3.3	1 888	1.3
Iredell	346	9.0	1 016	9.8	1 169	1.1	1 200	3.7	1 005	3.1	7 746	3.0
Jackson	37	13.1	146	13.9	204	2.7	202	11.2	179	3.7	466	10.1
Johnston	477	7.5	6 497	4.1	1 148	1.9	1 951	7.5	1 049	2.6	8 076	1.6
Jones	68	9.0	2 884	2.4	149	1.5	508	2.9	139	2.6	3 468	1.6
Lee	66	20.2	772	5.3	296	2.6	471	17.9	262	5.3	1 357	2.2
Lenoir	193	11.6	6 249	2.0	435	.8	1 008	5.6	411	3.7	7 079	2.3

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	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)
Lincoln	107	21.6	133	12.2	477	2.2	448	7.5	421	4.5	1 165	6.1
McDowell	31	14.2	189	2.1	216	2.3	180	3.8	179	3.9	1 767	2.3
Macon	50	20.7	30	23.6	299	2.1	196	10.4	236	5.6	194	13.1
Madison	106	23.2	121	31.0	845	2.6	667	8.9	724	4.2	832	6.3
Martin	193	12.1	3 439	6.2	355	3.1	555	5.5	364	2.8	3 699	4.0
Mecklenburg	57	24.7	126	14.7	287	2.2	565	8.0	239	5.4	6 559	.6
Mitchell	27	40.5	11	28.3	294	3.2	224	9.7	223	7.7	247	13.9
Montgomery	43	24.5	116	15.1	243	2.5	333	4.2	223	4.6	2 168	.9
Moore	150	16.0	1 482	19.5	646	2.2	767	5.6	567	3.7	4 283	2.4
Nash	179	10.4	6 942	2.4	444	3.2	1 077	3.0	404	4.5	8 366	1.6
New Hanover	14	7.2	50	3.8	59	3.6	64	6.4	50	3.7	642	.8
Northampton	200	7.9	2 969	1.4	322	3.1	1 105	4.2	333	2.2	6 366	1.4
Onslow	102	17.2	1 438	4.7	350	2.9	449	5.6	319	4.4	2 166	1.9
Orange	121	17.1	579	12.3	485	.6	778	7.9	418	3.5	2 639	3.8
Pamlico	35	.9	1 268	.8	67	1.5	242	.3	60	1.2	1 292	.1
Pasquotank	90	7.3	2 590	2.7	158	3.0	389	4.4	160	2.5	2 233	1.0
Pender	123	16.4	918	8.4	250	5.3	810	30.3	236	7.0	9 117	1.0
Perquimans	145	6.4	2 178	8.4	178	5.9	304	6.6	197	2.2	1 942	6.3
Person	159	13.6	1 080	11.3	392	2.2	621	11.9	365	4.2	1 943	7.5
Pitt	201	11.7	11 066	2.3	437	3.6	1 441	5.5	465	2.2	9 118	1.5
Polk	27	18.2	63	13.2	180	2.4	198	5.4	144	5.2	233	7.1
Randolph	253	14.1	834	17.0	1 330	1.1	1 596	8.9	1 164	2.6	4 731	3.4
Richmond	37	25.4	380	11.3	249	1.1	493	4.9	192	6.9	2 292	1.3
Robeson	374	11.0	7 050	2.7	915	3.4	1 800	4.1	896	2.9	13 634	1.2
Rockingham	243	12.5	1 361	14.1	699	3.0	802	5.1	683	2.8	2 526	6.9
Rowan	194	13.6	562	12.2	759	1.4	949	4.2	660	3.8	1 850	5.7
Rutherford	70	24.6	36	29.6	496	1.7	516	10.3	391	5.7	399	14.4
Sampson	474	8.2	8 568	3.2	1 125	1.7	3 156	2.5	1 096	2.3	28 200	.6
Scotland	42	13.1	781	2.1	113	3.0	295	3.4	103	6.0	3 595	.2
Stanly	120	13.2	1 405	1.6	496	3.3	631	5.0	488	3.6	3 273	2.1
Stokes	195	14.0	723	32.7	881	2.0	734	6.1	769	3.2	2 224	6.3
Surry	240	12.4	990	7.7	1 136	1.5	1 000	8.8	992	3.2	3 515	6.6
Swain	18	7.5	24	23.0	70	3.8	43	4.7	56	4.2	184	5.6
Transylvania	35	18.5	64	38.7	161	3.2	120	9.2	144	4.0	1 297	3.3
Tyrrell	45	2.9	1 967	.5	76	2.5	233	1.2	77	2.4	1 469	.5
Union	224	11.2	2 557	2.8	1 103	1.2	2 138	3.8	953	2.7	11 261	.6
Vance	53	22.7	818	3.8	219	4.2	422	10.3	184	7.8	1 249	4.8
Wake	217	12.1	2 936	7.2	752	1.5	941	8.4	672	3.0	4 656	3.0
Warren	80	22.7	956	14.1	272	2.7	564	6.0	245	5.2	2 668	1.9
Washington	75	12.5	1 835	2.1	194	2.5	534	2.1	197	2.6	3 095	.5
Watauga	106	19.3	113	14.3	649	2.1	485	8.5	549	4.7	638	5.8
Wayne	363	8.2	6 899	3.8	757	2.5	1 603	2.0	750	2.4	12 313	.9
Wilkes	238	13.5	760	10.2	1 136	1.3	1 304	3.6	990	2.7	7 836	2.8
Wilson	173	12.0	6 976	2.4	336	4.3	869	6.1	353	3.3	10 360	.7
Yadkin	207	15.9	973	7.8	834	2.2	916	5.9	733	3.9	2 919	5.7
Yancey	54	26.5	57	31.7	569	2.5	321	7.2	479	4.9	370	9.8

Geographic area	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text)[1]				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**49 391**	**.5**	**1 601 413**	**.5**	**44 502**	**.5**	**5 608 388**	**.3**	**38 241**	**.5**	**4 233 693**	**.2**
Alamance	730	.7	6 617	9.4	659	.7	59 375	1.2	552	.8	28 091	1.4
Alexander	565	.8	4 127	9.6	486	.7	34 730	1.3	401	1.0	17 413	1.3
Alleghany	546	.7	6 232	8.2	510	.6	41 506	1.5	458	.8	18 422	1.2
Anson	441	.8	18 781	4.5	310	.9	35 472	1.9	203	1.4	19 809	3.0
Ashe	1 043	.7	7 915	7.6	979	.5	46 699	1.2	897	.6	17 036	1.1
Avery	431	1.4	6 520	7.3	417	1.0	14 377	2.2	400	1.1	9 328	2.1
Beaufort	386	.7	20 087	4.2	364	.6	136 349	.6	336	.7	130 083	.6
Bertie	370	.8	30 022	2.7	331	.7	97 316	.7	319	.8	89 437	.7
Bladen	553	.7	49 506	1.1	504	.7	74 768	.9	458	.8	61 810	.9
Brunswick	215	1.2	5 363	8.3	202	1.0	23 749	1.5	179	1.3	19 012	1.7
Buncombe	1 011	.8	4 506	29.3	917	.7	36 102	1.4	806	.8	14 883	1.6
Burke	355	.8	6 322	11.3	328	.7	14 222	3.3	285	.9	8 148	3.5
Cabarrus	481	.7	3 318	13.5	443	.6	40 203	1.7	364	.9	23 206	2.4
Caldwell	330	.9	8 048	2.5	301	.8	17 774	1.8	251	1.1	10 537	2.1
Camden	76	2.4	5 292	.4	72	.5	48 489	.6	61	1.1	46 865	.6
Carteret	101	1.9	2 845	7.2	91	1.1	46 280	.4	78	1.7	44 643	.4
Caswell	564	.6	6 388	9.9	543	.5	54 110	1.0	499	.6	22 350	1.2
Catawba	596	.7	3 946	12.2	547	.5	47 827	1.5	452	.7	25 836	2.1
Chatham	958	.5	18 198	6.3	769	.6	53 567	1.1	557	.8	21 713	1.2
Cherokee	242	1.3	1 021	14.9	221	1.0	9 951	4.4	170	1.6	4 137	5.0
Chowan	151	1.5	9 774	1.5	134	1.0	38 412	1.0	129	1.1	36 269	1.0
Clay	166	1.6	346	20.8	156	.8	9 282	3.2	136	1.3	3 831	5.1
Cleveland	864	.6	1 450	32.3	752	.5	61 951	1.3	529	.8	29 483	1.8
Columbus	883	.9	37 078	3.4	829	.7	116 400	.9	771	.8	99 259	.9

See footnotes at end of table.

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

| Geographic area | Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text)[1] | | | | Total cropland | | | | Harvested cropland | | | |
| | Farms | | Value | | Farms | | Acres | | Farms | | Acres | |
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Craven	278	.8	15 411	7.3	255	.6	62 492	1.0	220	1.0	55 114	1.0
Cumberland	431	.8	16 227	4.4	384	.8	57 126	1.1	320	1.1	46 041	1.2
Currituck	86	3.0	2 938	1.2	83	.8	34 165	.9	75	1.2	32 714	1.0
Dare.................	9	–	257	–	8	–	4 265	–	7	–	3 769	–
Davidson..............	929	.7	3 690	28.8	878	.6	55 974	1.1	789	.6	33 253	1.4
Davie	557	.7	1 979	47.0	492	.5	42 496	1.1	414	.7	24 586	1.5
Duplin	1 225	.7	157 400	.9	1 068	.6	157 125	.5	908	.7	135 469	.6
Durham	158	1.6	1 142	17.8	143	1.0	11 148	2.2	117	1.6	5 166	2.3
Edgecombe	315	.9	47 353	1.3	280	.8	115 570	.5	251	.9	104 385	.4
Forsyth	620	.7	3 708	17.2	583	.6	29 955	1.9	497	.8	17 899	2.7
Franklin	524	.7	11 566	6.6	461	.7	71 692	1.0	388	.9	45 185	.7
Gaston	333	1.1	1 831	11.3	301	.8	19 947	1.9	257	1.1	10 660	2.6
Gates	147	1.2	11 406	1.1	128	.8	49 078	.8	116	1.0	46 481	.8
Graham..............	110	2.1	132	53.0	97	1.4	2 754	7.2	80	2.0	706	6.3
Granville	636	.7	13 904	6.6	591	.6	59 452	1.1	512	.7	29 218	1.2
Greene	312	.7	32 933	2.5	287	.5	79 835	.6	267	.6	72 348	.6
Guilford..............	919	.6	11 098	11.5	856	.6	59 752	1.2	735	.7	35 157	1.4
Halifax	339	.8	16 461	2.5	290	.9	127 593	.7	243	1.2	104 435	.6
Harnett	625	.9	17 874	3.2	569	.7	72 658	.9	484	.9	52 193	1.0
Haywood..............	775	.7	2 613	15.6	691	.7	27 751	1.6	602	.8	10 680	1.5
Henderson	487	.9	12 443	3.0	456	.7	27 527	1.5	407	.9	21 780	1.3
Hertford..............	168	1.5	11 476	2.0	152	.8	53 366	.7	145	1.0	50 694	.8
Hoke	162	1.6	17 453	1.5	147	.8	41 644	.6	127	1.3	35 936	.7
Hyde	100	1.7	9 520	2.5	96	.5	82 504	.5	91	.7	76 045	.5
Iredell	1 189	.7	24 487	5.5	1 038	.6	98 410	.9	884	.7	58 989	.9
Jackson..............	216	2.0	2 759	4.6	206	1.1	6 321	2.7	180	1.5	3 735	2.8
Johnston	1 216	.6	49 680	3.0	1 128	.5	137 562	.6	1 001	.6	110 980	.6
Jones..............	153	1.4	32 897	.9	136	.7	50 200	.9	124	1.1	45 360	1.0
Lee..............	310	1.0	3 935	9.3	276	.9	21 594	1.5	224	1.3	12 880	1.8
Lenoir	446	.8	47 091	3.4	400	.7	110 431	.4	374	.8	100 386	.5
Lincoln..............	497	.7	2 984	16.2	442	.7	39 147	1.4	370	.9	23 193	1.9
McDowell	225	1.4	3 412	6.3	200	.9	9 157	2.4	179	1.1	5 402	2.3
Macon	309	1.2	879	13.4	278	.9	11 041	2.7	242	1.2	4 455	2.8
Madison	906	.9	2 597	17.4	848	.9	27 023	1.9	757	1.0	7 645	1.9
Martin	389	.9	14 825	4.1	363	.8	81 133	.8	346	.8	74 588	.8
Mecklenburg	295	1.1	9 618	2.6	250	1.1	15 936	2.5	205	1.5	9 053	3.4
Mitchell	308	1.0	1 063	12.1	298	.6	10 579	2.5	271	.8	3 768	2.3
Montgomery	255	1.0	4 361	8.1	213	1.0	14 912	2.1	155	1.5	6 317	3.7
Moore	684	.7	22 629	3.3	574	.6	36 534	1.1	429	.9	17 694	1.5
Nash	470	.7	42 047	1.9	412	.6	110 001	.6	353	.8	90 913	.4
New Hanover	62	3.4	1 142	2.0	55	1.7	4 181	2.6	53	1.9	3 426	2.4
Northampton	341	.9	10 616	6.3	297	.8	103 760	.7	279	.9	94 286	.7
Onslow	369	.8	21 820	2.7	334	.7	41 969	1.1	281	.9	35 573	1.2
Orange	485	.6	3 586	14.0	439	.6	40 949	1.4	373	.8	22 518	1.5
Pamlico..............	67	1.5	7 258	.1	59	.8	43 368	.6	55	.9	42 754	.6
Pasquotank	173	1.3	6 076	5.0	163	.9	79 312	.9	159	1.0	77 125	.9
Pender	285	.9	19 174	2.1	255	.8	41 510	1.1	214	1.1	34 195	1.2
Perquimans	201	1.2	5 022	9.8	187	.7	70 338	.9	179	.8	67 857	.9
Person..............	401	.8	7 779	14.1	387	.6	56 452	.9	344	.8	31 498	.8
Pitt	475	.6	47 422	3.0	436	.6	144 464	.5	389	.7	132 083	.5
Polk	188	1.6	85	(H)	165	1.0	9 645	2.8	129	1.5	4 893	3.3
Randolph	1 367	.5	16 183	9.4	1 151	.5	78 249	1.2	867	.7	39 580	1.6
Richmond	251	1.1	10 906	6.5	212	.9	26 484	2.0	160	1.4	17 896	2.6
Robeson	1 003	1.0	55 095	5.5	948	1.0	214 259	.7	870	1.0	198 738	.7
Rockingham	779	.7	9 976	7.4	755	.6	54 542	1.2	677	.7	28 353	1.2
Rowan..............	779	.7	5 315	8.9	710	.6	71 024	1.1	628	.7	42 276	1.2
Rutherford	505	.8	–475	61.6	452	.6	30 268	1.8	375	.8	13 048	2.5
Sampson	1 185	.6	144 212	.8	1 039	.7	183 467	.5	918	.7	160 230	.5
Scotland	124	1.3	8 128	.8	111	.9	35 826	1.5	93	1.5	31 508	1.6
Stanly	557	.6	10 030	6.7	488	.5	66 771	.8	384	.8	50 303	1.0
Stokes..............	925	.6	10 279	8.3	896	.5	50 411	1.3	823	.6	20 013	1.2
Surry	1 194	.6	32 756	7.6	1 104	.5	69 842	.9	970	.6	38 273	.9
Swain	77	3.7	766	5.1	66	1.6	1 890	4.1	56	2.4	820	5.5
Transylvania...........	174	1.6	3 687	3.0	157	1.1	6 354	4.7	135	1.5	3 130	4.6
Tyrrell	83	2.4	10 460	.3	70	1.1	50 769	.3	65	1.3	50 168	.3
Union..............	1 140	.5	34 123	2.1	915	.5	131 486	.7	623	.8	102 320	.8
Vance	232	1.0	4 473	19.0	212	1.0	26 582	1.6	199	1.2	15 212	2.3
Wake	771	.7	14 834	5.9	709	.7	60 188	1.0	590	.9	37 385	1.0
Warren	282	.9	7 122	2.9	240	.9	35 127	1.2	192	1.2	19 033	1.3
Washington	202	1.0	17 009	.7	179	.9	91 734	.6	159	1.1	88 259	.6
Watauga	674	.7	3 582	11.7	636	.5	24 042	2.1	569	.7	8 336	1.6
Wayne	826	.6	59 753	1.7	705	.6	146 909	.6	628	.7	133 956	.6
Wilkes	1 170	.6	24 709	4.8	1 005	.6	58 837	.9	787	.8	30 395	1.1
Wilson	384	.6	25 115	3.7	359	.6	91 227	.5	334	.7	84 090	.5
Yadkin	883	.7	12 411	11.8	805	.6	67 176	.9	722	.7	43 075	.9
Yancey	606	.9	1 208	16.7	578	.8	14 215	2.3	525	.9	4 215	2.7

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

[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			
					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)
North Carolina	**4 695**	**.6**	**156 250**	**.4**	**22 632**	**.5**	**941 311**	**.4**	**19 616**	**.5**	**435 672**	**.5**
Alamance	107	2.7	2 214	3.1	456	1.0	22 969	1.3	390	1.2	9 778	1.9
Alexander	8	12.0	201	2.7	399	1.0	20 408	1.3	348	1.1	8 573	1.9
Alleghany	20	5.9	293	6.2	352	1.1	24 473	1.4	271	1.4	9 366	1.9
Anson	16	6.5	173	5.3	204	1.4	10 491	1.7	188	1.4	5 651	2.0
Ashe	39	4.8	110	5.2	579	.9	19 081	1.4	448	1.1	8 313	1.6
Avery	47	4.9	588	12.6	80	3.4	1 490	5.0	62	3.9	(D)	(D)
Beaufort	22	6.0	1 508	3.3	35	5.0	920	5.5	31	5.3	495	5.2
Bertie	24	4.4	9 082	1.9	37	4.8	1 537	7.8	29	5.6	845	8.4
Bladen...............	47	3.1	2 893	2.3	121	2.5	5 253	2.5	102	2.8	2 675	2.8
Brunswick	27	5.3	1 013	2.4	54	4.0	1 868	5.3	46	4.5	1 027	4.5
Buncombe	73	3.6	672	8.8	621	1.0	18 528	1.3	529	1.2	8 165	1.7
Burke	28	5.2	650	3.6	194	1.5	5 928	4.4	173	1.6	3 199	4.5
Cabarrus.............	19	6.1	227	1.8	315	1.1	13 983	2.2	287	1.2	7 643	2.0
Caldwell	19	6.6	352	6.2	197	1.5	6 918	1.8	178	1.6	3 100	2.2
Camden	3	–	(D)	(D)	14	5.3	(D)	(D)	13	5.6	154	3.0
Carteret..............	20	6.3	294	6.8	13	7.5	392	6.6	11	7.6	130	11.1
Caswell	156	1.9	3 154	1.9	279	1.2	12 428	2.1	230	1.5	5 349	2.3
Catawba	30	4.8	584	5.0	389	.9	18 661	2.4	351	1.0	9 170	2.8
Chatham	58	3.6	724	12.4	666	.7	34 967	1.2	590	.8	17 439	1.3
Cherokee	13	8.8	181	6.8	161	1.7	5 017	4.1	138	2.0	2 432	5.3
Chowan...............	27	3.8	3 033	1.5	31	4.5	1 301	3.3	27	4.7	(D)	(D)
Clay	3	18.4	10	18.6	130	1.3	5 619	2.7	112	1.7	3 229	3.2
Cleveland	39	4.1	266	5.2	516	.9	22 710	1.7	462	1.0	12 164	1.8
Columbus	50	4.8	1 107	8.5	222	2.0	8 364	3.4	200	2.2	5 009	4.0
Craven	27	4.9	595	3.3	70	3.1	2 059	6.1	58	3.5	1 129	6.1
Cumberland	51	3.6	2 206	3.7	132	2.2	5 332	2.8	120	2.3	2 788	2.9
Currituck	18	6.3	452	3.9	11	7.3	290	7.8	9	8.7	188	11.5
Dare.................	3	–	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson.............	91	3.0	1 280	3.8	540	1.0	17 543	1.4	474	1.1	7 528	1.7
Davie	28	5.2	274	8.0	388	.8	15 982	1.7	336	1.0	7 522	1.9
Duplin	139	1.5	6 277	2.2	324	1.3	13 717	1.4	273	1.4	6 771	1.4
Durham	21	6.6	563	6.6	73	2.7	2 845	3.9	59	3.3	(D)	(D)
Edgecombe	41	3.3	5 169	.8	84	2.6	3 970	2.6	78	2.8	(D)	(D)
Forsyth	77	3.3	743	5.1	263	1.5	7 247	2.3	229	1.6	3 631	2.4
Franklin..............	135	2.1	5 298	1.7	181	1.9	11 573	2.3	157	2.1	(D)	(D)
Gaston	24	6.2	197	12.9	195	1.6	8 118	2.1	165	1.9	3 157	3.2
Gates	13	5.6	495	10.0	31	4.0	1 261	2.8	26	4.4	(D)	(D)
Graham..............	1	35.7	(D)	(D)	57	3.2	1 187	8.5	45	3.8	515	8.8
Granville	160	2.0	4 935	1.6	304	1.3	12 709	1.9	263	1.5	6 578	2.4
Greene	39	2.7	1 513	.5	52	2.6	2 206	2.3	46	2.7	(D)	(D)
Guilford	167	2.0	3 403	1.8	468	1.1	16 344	2.1	392	1.3	6 626	2.8
Halifax...............	20	4.4	2 585	.3	104	2.5	10 018	2.0	95	2.7	4 737	2.0
Harnett	78	3.4	3 008	1.8	232	1.8	10 018	2.2	193	2.0	(D)	(D)
Haywood.............	45	4.7	261	5.6	525	1.0	19 922	1.3	467	1.1	8 757	1.7
Henderson	74	3.4	1 704	4.4	164	2.1	8 508	2.0	134	2.5	2 233	4.2
Hertford..............	32	4.2	3 736	3.8	14	8.2	436	11.8	11	9.2	268	13.4
Hoke	13	8.0	104	2.0	44	4.1	1 529	4.6	39	4.6	(D)	(D)
Hyde	6	4.9	(D)	(D)	12	6.6	427	3.2	8	9.3	(D)	(D)
Iredell	41	4.7	754	4.0	839	.7	51 129	.9	705	.9	17 832	1.4
Jackson..............	34	5.6	115	6.9	83	3.1	1 630	4.9	74	3.3	(D)	(D)
Johnston.............	148	2.2	2 998	2.4	446	1.1	14 097	1.5	398	1.2	7 826	1.7
Jones................	15	6.7	254	1.6	34	4.2	2 371	1.5	29	4.6	663	2.9
Lee..................	62	3.5	1 494	2.5	142	2.1	3 718	3.8	120	2.4	(D)	(D)
Lenoir	36	3.9	902	2.9	79	2.6	4 308	2.1	67	2.9	(D)	(D)
Lincoln...............	22	6.2	275	5.9	309	1.1	14 674	1.6	266	1.3	6 074	2.4
McDowell	13	6.0	532	.7	126	1.8	3 459	2.6	108	2.1	1 531	3.4
Macon	14	8.5	85	13.8	194	1.6	5 620	3.1	172	1.8	3 135	4.0
Madison	43	5.2	206	8.4	486	1.4	10 372	2.0	449	1.4	6 001	2.0
Martin	22	5.8	656	9.0	51	3.8	1 894	5.4	48	4.0	(D)	(D)
Mecklenburg	30	5.7	440	5.9	172	1.8	10 052	1.6	148	2.1	2 984	3.3
Mitchell	11	9.3	51	27.2	128	2.1	2 527	3.0	118	2.2	1 470	3.0
Montgomery	27	4.7	770	5.0	138	1.9	6 033	2.4	122	2.1	3 313	3.1
Moore	122	2.2	4 653	1.5	318	1.2	9 092	1.5	280	1.3	(D)	(D)
Nash	109	2.0	13 915	.3	132	2.1	8 337	3.3	117	2.3	4 723	3.5
New Hanover	24	4.4	102	1.4	1	43.3	(D)	(D)	1	43.3	(D)	(D)
Northampton	15	3.5	2 286	1.5	52	3.4	2 914	3.1	46	3.7	1 736	3.0
Onslow	16	8.1	123	5.8	121	2.3	2 530	3.5	97	2.6	1 319	4.0
Orange	73	3.5	1 283	3.4	247	1.4	15 300	2.2	211	1.6	6 130	2.6
Pamlico	5	–	746	–	12	4.1	284	3.7	12	4.1	(D)	(D)
Pasquotank	7	9.9	(D)	(D)	25	5.9	475	5.5	20	6.8	(D)	(D)
Pender	33	4.8	1 275	1.4	69	3.0	1 834	3.7	57	3.3	(D)	(D)
Perquimans	10	7.0	416	8.9	51	3.2	1 535	5.1	46	3.5	832	4.9
Person...............	97	2.3	2 553	1.6	178	1.7	8 293	1.9	161	1.9	4 358	2.3
Pitt	41	3.4	2 132	4.7	108	2.4	4 490	4.5	99	2.6	2 819	4.8
Polk	9	7.4	(D)	(D)	96	2.0	4 212	5.2	77	2.4	1 432	5.5
Randolph.............	47	3.9	985	4.1	909	.7	41 612	1.0	794	.8	16 991	1.4
Richmond	47	3.2	1 412	1.6	87	2.6	4 686	2.9	81	2.8	(D)	(D)
Robeson	41	4.6	1 569	5.4	210	2.3	5 162	3.0	184	2.5	2 803	3.5
Rockingham	204	2.0	4 347	2.0	360	1.3	11 086	2.0	306	1.5	4 954	2.5

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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

	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
					Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
Geographic area	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)
Rowan	45	4.0	1 024	6.7	531	.8	24 787	1.2	473	.9	10 126	1.7
Rutherford	12	7.6	55	15.1	338	1.0	12 802	1.7	308	1.1	6 842	2.2
Sampson	153	1.9	8 702	1.1	328	1.4	22 247	1.2	293	1.5	(D)	(D)
Scotland	12	7.8	1 033	1.9	35	4.0	1 277	4.2	30	4.4	(D)	(D)
Stanly	19	5.3	208	9.1	372	.8	18 454	1.2	345	.9	9 853	1.4
Stokes	81	3.4	1 046	3.8	382	1.3	13 893	1.3	334	1.4	4 529	1.9
Surry	79	3.3	1 772	3.1	690	.9	24 230	1.6	597	1.0	11 084	1.8
Swain	6	15.3	15	20.0	35	4.3	601	9.2	27	5.1	277	10.2
Transylvania	17	7.6	58	6.1	84	2.6	2 795	4.2	69	3.0	(D)	(D)
Tyrrell	3	7.6	111	5.6	13	6.0	286	6.9	12	6.3	195	8.8
Union	38	5.1	208	4.2	601	.8	25 217	1.6	544	.9	14 416	2.0
Vance	84	2.8	3 116	2.4	71	3.2	2 351	4.6	63	3.5	1 385	4.4
Wake	204	2.0	6 046	1.9	206	2.0	6 938	2.8	180	2.2	3 407	3.4
Warren	52	3.1	2 113	2.8	144	1.7	10 097	1.4	122	2.0	5 049	1.6
Washington	13	6.0	1 881	.1	40	4.1	1 608	5.3	35	4.6	768	4.4
Watauga	23	5.2	60	8.6	336	1.2	11 186	2.3	240	1.5	4 126	1.9
Wayne	80	2.4	2 431	.8	218	1.7	9 005	2.2	191	1.9	(D)	(D)
Wilkes	27	5.4	374	3.2	790	.7	33 163	.9	690	.8	16 937	1.0
Wilson	52	3.5	1 892	1.3	77	3.0	2 282	3.5	67	3.1	(D)	(D)
Yadkin	56	4.0	1 051	5.4	536	1.0	22 561	1.2	462	1.1	9 831	1.6
Yancey	23	7.4	53	10.1	269	1.6	4 976	3.0	228	1.8	2 584	2.6

Livestock and poultry—Con.

| | Milk cows inventory | | | | Hogs and pigs inventory | | | | Sheep and lambs inventory | | | |
| | Farms | | Total | | Farms | | Total | | Farms | | Total | |
Geographic area	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)
North Carolina	**1 092**	**.9**	**78 400**	**.4**	**2 986**	**.5**	**9 624 860**	**(L)**	**613**	**1.3**	**13 827**	**2.1**
Alamance	34	4.0	2 986	1.8	18	7.9	1 614	13.0	8	10.3	51	17.1
Alexander	33	4.6	3 252	2.4	4	15.9	(D)	(D)	4	15.5	47	17.1
Alleghany	42	3.8	4 046	1.7	3	20.9	18	25.7	16	7.6	770	9.1
Anson	6	10.0	167	6.5	16	2.9	55 450	(L)	–	–	–	–
Ashe	20	6.2	264	8.7	14	7.1	281	15.6	19	6.3	892	6.6
Avery	2	25.2	(D)	(D)	4	19.1	26	28.9	2	23.9	(D)	(D)
Beaufort	–	–	–	–	45	3.5	101 729	.2	5	14.6	35	16.3
Bertie	–	–	–	–	39	5.3	45 351	.3	1	45.7	(D)	(D)
Bladen	4	14.5	139	4.2	105	1.9	758 701	.1	1	–	(D)	(D)
Brunswick	4	14.5	12	20.2	42	4.5	77 191	.5	1	–	(D)	(D)
Buncombe	31	4.9	2 434	2.3	14	9.0	126	7.3	25	6.5	774	9.5
Burke	8	9.3	332	2.7	7	11.8	(D)	(D)	3	17.2	8	18.2
Cabarrus	9	11.5	318	17.2	15	7.4	5 618	1.2	13	7.4	379	9.3
Caldwell	15	7.2	1 182	2.0	9	8.3	4 552	6.5	5	14.4	55	17.9
Camden	–	–	–	–	6	8.2	4 569	.3	3	17.9	68	17.9
Carteret	1	50.0	(D)	(D)	6	9.7	2 043	11.3	–	–	–	–
Caswell	9	8.6	349	.8	17	6.1	2 365	2.2	4	9.9	74	10.5
Catawba	18	5.6	1 127	3.6	14	7.0	727	16.5	8	7.8	83	8.0
Chatham	27	3.8	2 097	1.7	25	5.2	7 632	1.8	10	9.4	355	16.7
Cherokee	9	10.3	390	5.0	5	13.7	330	25.5	1	–	(D)	(D)
Chowan	2	26.0	(D)	(D)	14	5.1	15 347	1.7	3	17.3	(D)	(D)
Clay	7	9.6	296	11.5	3	17.2	6	17.2	6	10.7	187	11.4
Cleveland	19	6.2	761	4.0	10	9.8	(D)	(D)	14	7.8	528	17.9
Columbus	5	14.8	23	4.3	69	2.9	257 920	.1	–	–	–	–
Craven	6	13.9	21	20.9	41	2.8	108 144	(L)	2	15.7	(D)	(D)
Cumberland	–	–	–	–	45	3.4	123 044	.1	6	11.3	89	19.0
Currituck	–	–	–	–	6	8.8	4 270	.2	1	–	(D)	(D)
Dare	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson	34	4.1	2 219	2.6	38	4.7	2 020	12.3	11	7.0	90	12.8
Davie	23	6.1	1 284	5.5	8	8.6	(D)	(D)	4	15.7	27	19.2
Duplin	8	10.4	104	33.2	400	.7	2 034 349	(L)	3	14.4	(D)	(D)
Durham	2	20.2	(D)	(D)	7	11.9	35	19.7	7	13.0	228	16.1
Edgecombe	1	–	(D)	(D)	29	3.3	168 909	.1	3	13.5	9	18.0
Forsyth	16	6.9	428	7.3	11	8.1	81	9.6	10	9.8	120	8.7
Franklin	7	11.3	(D)	(D)	17	6.8	19 060	.1	7	13.3	153	20.4
Gaston	13	6.1	1 568	2.5	11	11.2	273	23.3	4	13.8	24	20.7
Gates	1	–	(D)	(D)	23	3.9	30 349	.2	3	9.6	63	3.7
Graham	3	21.0	7	21.3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Granville	18	5.4	1 016	1.4	22	6.1	2 465	3.7	12	7.1	112	8.9
Greene	1	27.6	(D)	(D)	78	.4	391 672	(L)	9	3.2	231	3.7
Guilford	21	5.1	2 101	1.6	21	6.8	10 148	4.9	14	7.7	257	14.3
Halifax	5	11.5	448	9.2	30	4.7	88 875	.5	4	9.8	(D)	(D)
Harnett	9	11.0	(D)	(D)	40	4.2	77 884	.2	7	13.5	32	14.4
Haywood	28	4.4	2 218	1.6	6	14.2	14	14.4	18	7.4	549	10.3

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Livestock and poultry—Con.

Geographic area	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Henderson	16	6.1	2 781	.1	6	15.5	32	22.2	6	15.7	59	21.0
Hertford	–	–	–	–	9	7.6	72 281	.1	2	29.5	(D)	(D)
Hoke	1	45.2	(D)	(D)	20	4.6	122 692	(L)	–	–	–	–
Hyde	1	–	(D)	(D)	6	–	9 890	–	–	–	–	–
Iredell	95	2.1	11 399	.8	16	7.1	(D)	(D)	22	5.3	263	5.1
Jackson	6	15.5	(D)	(D)	3	22.0	17	26.1	1	44.8	(D)	(D)
Johnston	7	11.8	41	16.6	114	2.1	206 291	.2	8	10.7	101	16.9
Jones	–	–	–	–	42	1.9	252 715	(L)	3	15.1	(D)	(D)
Lee	1	38.6	(D)	(D)	9	8.9	(D)	(D)	5	13.3	20	15.6
Lenoir	3	15.7	(D)	(D)	76	1.3	315 588	(L)	1	–	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	19	5.0	1 843	2.2	12	7.0	(D)	(D)	6	12.0	79	13.0
McDowell	7	9.5	434	4.5	9	9.5	114	9.1	–	–	–	–
Macon	8	9.1	158	3.2	6	12.8	66	25.5	4	13.0	89	14.6
Madison	27	6.7	256	12.8	6	16.4	24	22.3	30	6.0	749	11.1
Martin	1	40.5	(D)	(D)	26	5.7	10 583	.7	2	20.4	(D)	(D)
Mecklenburg	10	6.3	2 489	1.1	4	16.8	26	20.0	6	15.0	91	17.8
Mitchell	–	–	–	–	8	8.1	50	9.6	4	12.8	107	12.9
Montgomery	3	22.9	7	22.9	15	6.4	22 965	.1	–	–	–	–
Moore	3	15.0	(D)	(D)	36	4.4	41 552	.1	12	9.2	142	12.6
Nash	9	11.1	192	6.0	33	3.3	89 209	.3	4	17.9	68	24.2
New Hanover	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	43.3	(D)	(D)
Northampton	3	17.2	12	24.8	42	3.7	135 931	.2	1	–	(D)	(D)
Onslow	4	16.9	59	25.0	64	2.7	144 591	(L)	2	18.8	(D)	(D)
Orange	29	5.1	2 483	3.9	15	5.7	18 323	1.2	16	6.7	718	8.8
Pamlico	1	35.0	(D)	(D)	4	15.3	(D)	(D)	1	35.0	(D)	(D)
Pasquotank	2	–	(D)	(D)	10	9.0	1 493	1.2	3	18.3	(D)	(D)
Pender	2	22.0	(D)	(D)	61	2.5	269 766	.1	4	13.9	116	4.1
Perquimans	5	11.7	6	12.3	22	4.6	11 800	3.1	2	24.7	(D)	(D)
Person	5	9.1	303	.8	23	4.9	12 649	1.2	4	16.8	(D)	(D)
Pitt	–	–	–	–	63	2.4	303 393	.2	6	11.9	354	14.9
Polk	6	14.4	215	21.8	3	16.4	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Randolph	37	3.2	4 921	.9	46	3.7	33 200	.8	11	8.0	223	13.1
Richmond	1	43.7	(D)	(D)	19	5.4	54 720	.1	2	16.0	(D)	(D)
Robeson	8	13.1	22	18.2	66	3.5	327 559	.1	5	14.6	51	14.4
Rockingham	11	6.2	1 182	.2	16	6.8	(D)	(D)	8	11.2	220	12.4
Rowan	36	3.9	3 425	1.9	14	8.2	3 171	8.5	13	7.3	187	11.9
Rutherford	14	8.4	479	14.2	10	11.3	79	20.5	15	8.3	373	11.5
Sampson	5	7.9	(D)	(D)	320	.9	1 775 702	(L)	2	–	(D)	(D)
Scotland	1	27.1	(D)	(D)	14	6.5	133 197	(L)	4	14.1	141	11.1
Stanly	7	6.3	693	.3	11	8.7	807	7.6	9	9.8	179	20.9
Stokes	8	10.0	295	6.3	21	6.3	(D)	(D)	13	9.0	429	13.7
Surry	35	4.7	1 515	3.7	26	5.5	15 598	1.8	13	7.8	385	15.4
Swain	3	22.6	3	22.6	2	26.8	(D)	(D)	1	44.2	(D)	(D)
Transylvania	6	11.8	(D)	(D)	3	20.6	(D)	(D)	2	25.0	(D)	(D)
Tyrrell	–	–	–	–	11	4.2	39 087	(L)	2	20.1	(D)	(D)
Union	23	5.5	573	6.1	41	3.8	40 728	1.1	23	5.8	332	8.1
Vance	–	–	–	–	2	17.0	(D)	(D)	3	18.4	(D)	(D)
Wake	8	10.1	481	6.9	16	7.0	2 718	.5	15	8.8	381	13.0
Warren	11	7.0	896	.1	20	5.0	41 325	.3	2	24.9	(D)	(D)
Washington	–	–	–	–	17	6.5	72 730	.5	3	17.8	48	17.8
Watauga	12	8.1	166	12.4	8	8.9	21	10.4	12	7.5	207	14.2
Wayne	7	10.5	(D)	(D)	150	1.5	529 439	.1	8	11.9	127	13.5
Wilkes	31	5.4	1 375	5.1	9	10.1	112	16.5	4	13.7	(D)	(D)
Wilson	1	32.6	(D)	(D)	27	3.6	77 487	(L)	2	24.8	(D)	(D)
Yadkin	38	4.6	3 240	1.5	8	12.3	188	33.4	5	16.9	59	19.3
Yancey	14	8.7	116	34.3	9	11.3	209	24.1	3	19.9	30	21.8

Livestock and poultry—Con.

Geographic area	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**1 566**	**.9**	**12 306 292**	**.7**	**2 086**	**.3**	**591 248 423**	**.1**
Alamance	47	4.1	492 560	4.1	10	8.4	1 918 000	4.2
Alexander	65	3.4	681 000	3.1	42	1.4	11 373 400	.6
Alleghany	6	12.4	92	12.5	2	–	(D)	(D)
Anson	7	12.0	(D)	(D)	50	1.4	16 794 537	.4
Ashe	24	5.4	344	6.0	–	–	–	–
Avery	4	20.5	45	29.8	–	–	–	–
Beaufort	10	10.3	187	11.6	1	–	(D)	(D)
Bertie	2	22.8	(D)	(D)	64	2.1	18 372 040	.6
Bladen	9	11.7	34 211	22.1	7	–	4 590 000	–

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

	Livestock and poultry—Con.							
	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
Geographic area	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)
Brunswick	13	9.5	350	11.4	2	16.4	(D)	(D)
Buncombe	40	5.0	1 149	13.6	1	33.1	(D)	(D)
Burke	7	10.3	(D)	(D)	23	4.0	4 850 598	1.4
Cabarrus	20	6.3	(D)	(D)	4	10.3	(D)	(D)
Caldwell	20	6.5	72 968	4.7	11	5.3	1 971 460	2.9
Camden	2	18.7	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Carteret	6	12.4	187	13.5	–	–	–	–
Caswell	13	7.6	61 431	10.4	1	–	(D)	(D)
Catawba	18	5.0	53 677	10.3	15	4.9	2 960 560	2.6
Chatham	43	4.0	282 663	3.5	142	1.3	32 300 662	.5
Cherokee	13	8.2	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Chowan	1	37.3	(D)	(D)	7	7.2	1 700 664	2.7
Clay	8	9.7	97 112	5.4	–	–	–	–
Cleveland	14	7.8	(D)	(D)	25	2.7	5 573 960	1.0
Columbus	17	9.4	476	11.4	3	–	1 522 000	–
Craven	8	11.5	171	16.4	–	–	–	–
Cumberland	13	8.9	265	14.3	4	13.1	970	17.3
Currituck	5	12.8	95	16.8	–	–	–	–
Dare	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson	33	4.9	(D)	(D)	8	4.1	2 276 850	1.2
Davie	26	5.3	245 031	6.1	–	–	–	–
Duplin	28	5.7	257 118	6.8	98	1.7	23 431 741	.7
Durham	5	11.2	71	10.8	–	–	–	–
Edgecombe	8	8.5	72 094	(L)	21	–	7 498 615	–
Forsyth	14	7.5	192	11.7	–	–	–	–
Franklin	18	6.2	422 023	1.8	7	–	2 152 944	–
Gaston	4	16.3	128	25.4	6	7.8	1 405 000	4.1
Gates	4	12.9	(D)	(D)	18	2.6	4 735 000	.9
Graham	7	12.5	84	14.0	–	–	–	–
Granville	18	7.2	324	7.4	–	–	–	–
Greene	2	22.6	(D)	(D)	12	–	5 090 200	–
Guilford	19	6.9	62 702	7.3	2	–	(D)	(D)
Halifax	11	8.7	102 386	(L)	19	4.3	4 283 528	1.5
Harnett	8	12.9	179	18.3	40	1.9	13 973 775	.3
Haywood	14	7.8	266	14.4	–	–	–	–
Henderson	15	8.6	205	10.6	–	–	–	–
Hertford	1	42.2	(D)	(D)	24	2.1	10 192 800	.4
Hoke	2	22.6	(D)	(D)	4	–	1 465 000	–
Hyde	3	9.8	14	4.2	–	–	–	–
Iredell	124	2.6	1 253 939	2.3	10	8.4	1 589 315	2.4
Jackson	10	11.6	169	18.6	–	–	–	–
Johnston	20	6.2	92 633	11.8	16	4.1	4 821 774	.8
Jones	3	22.3	49	22.0	–	–	–	–
Lee	7	11.0	86	11.0	14	3.0	4 050 279	.7
Lenoir	11	7.6	68 819	8.5	9	3.2	2 331 982	1.5
Lincoln	9	8.7	(D)	(D)	16	5.2	3 474 790	1.7
McDowell	14	6.5	147 751	3.8	7	9.0	765 280	6.0
Macon	12	8.0	294	14.8	–	–	–	–
Madison	36	5.7	502	7.2	–	–	–	–
Martin	5	17.9	106	21.8	14	4.1	3 219 500	1.3
Mecklenburg	10	9.8	146	14.0	–	–	–	–
Mitchell	5	10.1	102	7.2	–	–	–	–
Montgomery	4	9.1	(D)	(D)	47	1.5	15 413 134	.5
Moore	9	11.0	(D)	(D)	139	1.1	32 753 866	.5
Nash	20	5.0	1 177 770	.7	38	1.9	12 759 797	.4
New Hanover	2	16.5	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Northampton	2	18.5	(D)	(D)	36	3.2	8 657 500	1.6
Onslow	10	9.8	323	11.4	3	14.2	724 150	5.5
Orange	19	5.3	106 249	1.2	–	–	–	–
Pamlico	2	17.5	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Pasquotank	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)
Pender	3	18.2	(D)	(D)	4	–	1 775 038	–
Perquimans	2	16.3	(D)	(D)	19	1.7	6 691 372	.5
Person	5	13.0	88	15.7	–	–	–	–
Pitt	13	7.0	442 392	(L)	13	5.6	5 555 500	1.5
Polk	3	16.4	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Randolph	63	3.6	747 210	4.6	209	1.1	43 975 897	.5
Richmond	7	8.9	(D)	(D)	58	1.5	19 349 804	.4
Robeson	21	8.0	342	10.2	27	–	15 469 580	–
Rockingham	14	7.4	(D)	(D)	2	15.6	(D)	(D)
Rowan	33	5.0	68 292	15.2	1	–	(D)	(D)
Rutherford	11	8.8	108	10.7	4	14.1	659 168	5.4
Sampson	8	11.9	152 220	12.6	12	–	4 695 000	–
Scotland	1	–	(D)	(D)	15	3.1	7 392 000	.7
Stanly	19	3.2	618 300	(L)	23	2.0	6 104 246	.7
Stokes	26	5.5	105 177	5.6	1	43.7	(D)	(D)
Surry	38	4.6	387 113	3.8	85	2.1	16 759 891	.9
Swain	3	20.2	61	18.8	–	–	–	–
Transylvania	5	15.6	243	20.9	–	–	–	–
Tyrrell	2	20.0	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Union	49	3.8	1 189 987	1.1	184	.7	69 650 167	.2
Vance	1	32.4	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Wake	19	7.3	(D)	(D)	2	–	(D)	(D)
Warren	8	10.3	66 909	8.7	11	2.1	3 365 000	.7
Washington	2	26.6	(D)	(D)	18	1.9	4 868 100	1.2
Watauga	18	6.2	280	8.0	2	12.4	(D)	(D)
Wayne	17	7.8	138 631	7.0	70	2.1	15 795 934	.9
Wilkes	77	3.1	682 385	3.0	272	.8	89 648 301	.2
Wilson	8	11.2	(D)	(D)	5	–	2 696 000	–
Yadkin	67	3.2	845 350	3.3	24	3.8	3 265 003	2.3
Yancey	14	9.0	237	9.0	2	23.7	(D)	(D)

Selected crops harvested

Geographic area	Corn for grain or seed						Wheat for grain					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**8 862**	**.5**	**821 039**	**.3**	**74 423 999**	**.3**	**5 949**	**.5**	**616 397**	**.3**	**30 357 728**	**.3**
Alamance	89	3.0	3 357	3.8	242 273	3.5	68	3.4	2 645	2.8	123 784	2.8
Alexander	39	4.3	894	5.2	71 525	6.0	12	8.2	681	7.0	36 470	6.6
Alleghany	3	11.2	207	5.7	17 220	5.5	3	11.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Anson	47	3.5	5 824	3.6	543 777	3.2	39	4.1	3 975	3.9	191 229	3.7
Ashe	2	21.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	32.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Avery	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Beaufort	232	1.3	48 353	.8	4 890 866	.8	182	1.6	45 878	.7	2 273 821	.8
Bertie	222	1.3	21 279	1.4	1 635 759	1.5	26	4.8	2 581	2.3	138 119	2.6
Bladen	246	1.6	20 770	1.5	1 784 257	1.5	52	4.1	4 084	2.9	163 965	3.3
Brunswick	80	3.1	5 462	2.6	464 907	2.1	31	5.4	2 423	6.0	105 879	5.3
Buncombe	33	5.3	538	10.4	40 140	10.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Burke	37	4.7	1 223	18.4	93 444	14.4	6	9.6	65	14.4	3 200	10.8
Cabarrus	55	3.5	3 155	5.3	249 094	5.6	41	3.8	3 010	4.0	147 550	3.4
Caldwell	42	4.1	1 251	4.1	105 954	4.5	8	11.9	350	20.5	17 040	22.6
Camden	47	1.8	17 204	.8	1 926 730	.9	46	1.3	14 344	.7	814 853	.9
Carteret	28	4.5	19 822	.4	(D)	(D)	11	6.2	6 577	.9	225 318	1.5
Caswell	73	3.1	1 231	3.0	69 451	3.0	101	2.5	2 586	3.0	99 955	3.0
Catawba	48	4.0	1 697	5.8	139 607	6.6	58	3.5	5 418	4.6	277 237	4.6
Chatham	37	3.5	1 190	2.2	80 699	2.8	14	5.5	792	3.4	33 320	4.2
Cherokee	29	5.7	618	14.7	56 434	20.6	1	36.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Chowan	70	2.2	5 976	1.8	522 722	1.8	27	3.4	2 136	3.2	113 703	3.2
Clay	9	9.5	211	24.4	(D)	(D)	1	34.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cleveland	39	4.4	1 526	6.6	106 596	7.0	64	3.4	3 737	4.4	206 260	4.8
Columbus	378	1.4	28 249	1.3	2 703 465	1.3	192	2.0	14 658	1.3	686 952	1.3
Craven	107	2.1	12 973	1.3	1 139 406	1.3	39	3.8	5 945	4.1	280 143	5.1
Cumberland	126	2.2	10 477	2.0	705 828	1.5	56	3.0	6 309	2.1	297 730	2.3
Currituck	29	3.3	11 309	1.2	1 374 685	1.0	25	3.8	9 880	1.3	579 939	1.3
Dare	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson	192	1.9	4 668	3.0	388 470	3.3	101	2.7	2 335	3.9	106 341	3.8
Davie	46	3.9	3 991	1.8	389 885	1.3	30	5.1	3 335	2.6	148 742	3.5
Duplin	492	1.0	43 112	.7	3 584 753	.8	215	1.6	21 893	1.4	961 089	1.4
Durham	12	8.5	73	7.3	5 116	5.7	11	8.1	524	2.7	25 714	2.5
Edgecombe	144	1.5	19 206	.9	1 538 690	.8	75	2.3	8 879	.8	391 034	.8
Forsyth	78	3.1	2 196	6.3	162 867	8.5	60	3.5	1 848	4.5	95 746	5.2
Franklin	29	5.1	1 955	1.9	180 660	2.0	128	1.9	10 154	1.1	435 477	1.1
Gaston	18	7.6	763	2.1	61 510	1.0	7	11.4	582	9.9	30 357	10.3
Gates	90	1.4	10 791	1.5	594 968	1.4	35	3.2	2 493	1.6	145 884	1.8
Graham	5	14.4	5	14.4	307	14.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Granville	54	3.5	1 365	3.9	100 729	3.8	93	2.6	4 277	2.5	166 668	2.3
Greene	147	1.4	14 105	1.0	1 241 438	1.1	109	1.8	11 666	1.4	540 856	1.4
Guilford	129	2.6	4 352	4.5	273 400	4.7	143	2.2	5 953	1.9	273 066	1.9
Halifax	98	2.3	8 105	1.1	526 356	1.4	51	3.0	3 445	1.9	158 068	2.0
Harnett	116	2.6	4 690	2.3	367 364	2.5	60	3.5	4 269	1.7	167 810	1.8
Haywood	30	5.2	285	1.2	20 466	1.6	1	28.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Henderson	17	7.4	2 130	4.1	274 700	3.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hertford	101	1.9	10 730	1.5	715 536	1.3	10	6.9	1 383	1.2	72 925	1.7
Hoke	17	5.8	1 908	2.3	151 494	2.2	32	3.7	4 044	.8	194 781	.7
Hyde	73	1.5	31 990	.6	4 106 060	.5	57	1.7	18 989	.6	992 296	.7
Iredell	99	2.5	5 727	2.5	488 767	2.3	86	2.7	5 345	1.9	307 606	1.6
Jackson	10	11.6	19	14.5	1 265	22.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Johnston	286	1.4	12 548	1.5	915 867	1.3	214	1.6	13 483	1.0	647 338	1.0
Jones	76	2.2	10 508	1.9	930 974	1.4	32	4.2	4 738	2.3	234 032	2.4
Lee	46	4.0	1 154	10.2	88 455	11.3	26	5.3	1 011	2.9	51 916	2.8
Lenoir	210	1.3	23 788	.9	2 019 526	.9	124	1.8	14 434	1.0	713 221	1.0

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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

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

Selected crops harvested

Geographic area	Corn for grain or seed — Farms Number	Corn — Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Corn — Acres Number	Corn — Acres Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Corn — Quantity Bushels	Corn — Quantity Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Wheat for grain — Farms Number	Wheat — Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Wheat — Acres Number	Wheat — Acres Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Wheat — Quantity Bushels	Wheat — Quantity Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Lincoln	30	4.7	1 700	2.6	114 151	2.1	52	3.6	3 103	4.1	152 620	4.4
McDowell	33	5.0	480	7.9	43 776	9.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Macon	16	7.8	81	10.0	6 581	11.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Madison	32	6.1	90	17.0	6 935	21.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Martin	146	2.1	8 817	2.0	719 336	2.0	58	3.6	3 531	3.1	148 835	2.8
Mecklenburg	10	9.6	322	17.7	26 041	17.9	20	6.6	1 688	8.3	80 889	8.7
Mitchell	13	7.8	55	16.5	5 465	15.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Montgomery	29	5.7	825	16.2	60 467	15.6	8	10.5	405	14.3	9 020	10.8
Moore	84	3.0	1 654	4.6	125 917	2.1	39	4.2	2 513	2.6	112 245	2.2
Nash	56	2.8	3 339	1.4	222 640	1.0	106	2.0	9 008	1.0	420 039	1.0
New Hanover	10	7.8	1 035	4.7	123 670	5.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Northampton	89	2.3	5 615	1.6	380 705	1.5	26	3.4	2 690	.8	134 984	.9
Onslow	155	1.7	12 634	1.8	988 986	1.5	48	3.6	3 280	2.3	142 516	2.4
Orange	40	4.5	1 892	2.1	113 779	2.8	50	4.2	2 136	4.1	96 504	4.1
Pamlico	34	1.8	13 014	.5	1 330 592	.6	26	1.3	12 250	1.7	634 680	2.3
Pasquotank	124	1.5	24 079	1.0	2 388 174	.9	96	1.9	21 730	1.3	1 206 856	1.1
Pender	109	2.2	12 133	1.8	1 086 700	2.0	43	3.7	4 851	2.6	232 505	2.4
Perquimans	135	1.4	19 725	1.1	1 800 857	1.2	85	2.2	11 322	1.4	608 665	1.6
Person	50	3.4	3 307	1.3	244 230	1.0	105	2.1	7 739	.7	323 421	.7
Pitt	195	1.5	22 966	1.0	1 976 547	1.0	168	1.6	24 212	.9	1 048 524	.9
Polk	5	13.2	40	29.2	3 820	30.6	9	9.6	243	10.6	12 581	10.7
Randolph	159	2.1	5 414	4.0	431 120	4.8	70	3.1	3 458	4.3	161 114	4.4
Richmond	20	6.1	2 207	3.2	143 166	4.7	30	4.7	2 398	6.0	99 956	6.6
Robeson	408	1.5	41 982	.9	3 777 047	.9	344	1.6	40 652	1.0	1 946 479	1.0
Rockingham	85	3.1	1 930	2.4	128 128	2.6	153	2.3	5 465	2.1	236 174	2.0
Rowan	111	2.5	5 121	2.1	464 236	2.0	110	2.5	6 011	2.5	331 120	2.7
Rutherford	36	4.7	633	12.2	49 952	13.9	11	8.4	241	16.8	11 232	22.0
Sampson	385	1.3	30 218	1.0	2 235 703	1.0	212	1.8	16 839	1.3	808 662	1.4
Scotland	19	4.4	2 967	1.3	244 724	1.6	25	4.5	4 257	3.2	201 921	4.0
Stanly	89	2.2	12 699	1.4	1 183 719	1.2	79	2.4	9 722	1.7	482 188	1.7
Stokes	108	2.8	862	3.1	56 663	2.8	62	3.8	821	4.7	36 147	5.1
Surry	161	2.1	6 469	2.0	601 667	1.9	90	3.0	2 792	2.1	151 013	2.0
Swain	8	11.2	33	10.1	1 920	8.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Transylvania	20	6.8	216	13.8	23 489	16.3	2	24.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Tyrrell	44	2.4	18 999	.5	2 242 422	.5	28	2.4	13 065	.2	765 354	.3
Union	132	1.9	24 706	.9	2 567 745	.9	148	1.8	34 204	1.0	1 917 013	.9
Vance	14	9.1	100	10.2	6 360	10.5	75	3.0	3 706	2.6	168 839	2.5
Wake	41	4.9	1 310	2.7	100 550	2.9	111	2.9	5 331	2.3	231 343	1.9
Warren	26	3.6	828	.9	50 643	1.1	43	3.3	2 704	3.0	108 676	3.9
Washington	101	1.8	30 734	.6	3 522 799	.5	80	2.1	25 381	.7	1 469 002	.8
Watauga	2	20.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Wayne	315	1.3	31 685	.9	2 119 570	.9	243	1.5	27 507	1.0	1 276 534	1.0
Wilkes	89	3.0	2 685	3.0	233 814	2.5	11	6.6	269	8.7	12 078	9.4
Wilson	143	1.7	12 695	.8	1 135 853	.8	145	1.7	12 143	1.0	614 047	1.1
Yadkin	179	2.0	7 492	1.5	652 985	1.7	134	2.3	5 131	1.7	271 464	1.6
Yancey	8	11.1	25	15.4	2 354	16.3	–	–	–	–	–	–

Selected crops harvested—Con.

Geographic area	Cotton — Farms Number	Cotton — Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Cotton — Acres Number	Cotton — Acres Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Cotton — Quantity Bales	Cotton — Quantity Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tobacco — Farms Number	Tobacco — Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tobacco — Acres Number	Tobacco — Acres Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tobacco — Quantity Pounds	Tobacco — Quantity Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**2 320**	**.6**	**677 541**	**.2**	**916 278**	**.2**	**12 095**	**.5**	**320 599**	**.3**	**703 559 462**	**.3**
Alamance	2	23.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	124	2.5	3 137	2.5	6 580 486	2.6
Alexander	–	–	–	–	–	–	38	4.7	759	3.7	1 630 503	3.5
Alleghany	1	30.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	130	2.3	512	4.5	749 460	4.5
Anson	4	12.2	442	11.1	607	8.1	5	15.3	145	20.3	309 934	20.5
Ashe	–	–	–	–	–	–	331	1.4	871	2.4	1 199 585	2.5
Avery	–	–	–	–	–	–	52	4.0	138	6.8	252 182	7.0
Beaufort	15	4.9	4 602	1.4	6 459	1.5	110	2.4	4 681	1.3	10 875 405	1.4
Bertie	116	2.2	34 319	.7	46 176	.7	170	1.7	4 162	1.8	9 125 492	1.8
Bladen	26	5.2	8 151	2.7	10 843	2.5	145	2.3	3 965	1.4	9 042 051	1.4
Brunswick	2	23.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	41	4.5	1 920	2.5	4 401 922	2.4
Buncombe	–	–	–	–	–	–	356	1.5	1 182	2.9	1 780 140	2.9
Burke	–	–	–	–	–	–	4	14.5	11	22.1	14 047	21.8
Cabarrus	1	33.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Caldwell	–	–	–	–	–	–	15	7.3	412	7.5	847 863	6.9
Camden	4	–	925	–	1 388	–						
Carteret	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	26	4.5	910	3.4	2 040 127	3.6
Caswell	–	–	–	–	–	–	303	1.1	6 095	1.2	12 621 318	1.2
Catawba	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Chatham	–	–	–	–	–	–	24	5.4	1 146	2.3	1 428 891	3.3

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	Cotton Farms Number	Cotton Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Cotton Acres Number	Cotton Acres Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Cotton Quantity Bales	Cotton Quantity Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tobacco Farms Number	Tobacco Farms Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tobacco Acres Number	Tobacco Acres Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tobacco Quantity Pounds	Tobacco Quantity Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Cherokee	–	–	–	–	–	–	16	7.5	81	3.3	107 516	3.7
Chowan	77	1.9	16 304	1.4	21 771	1.2	12	4.9	280	1.7	673 469	1.5
Clay	–	–	–	–	–	–	25	5.6	78	7.7	130 619	8.2
Cleveland	17	6.3	2 875	6.0	2 829	6.6	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Columbus	8	8.8	2 039	3.7	2 543	3.9	420	1.2	11 194	.9	26 361 471	.9
Craven	33	2.8	17 556	.8	25 007	.6	107	2.0	5 350	1.1	11 999 433	1.1
Cumberland	18	4.2	3 925	1.0	5 474	1.1	86	2.7	2 589	1.9	5 821 090	1.5
Currituck	5	8.4	1 780	1.0	2 409	1.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dare	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson	–	–	–	–	–	–	148	2.1	2 021	3.0	4 092 219	3.1
Davie	3	15.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	34	4.9	671	6.7	1 325 142	6.8
Duplin	42	3.4	14 488	1.0	20 637	.8	336	1.3	10 183	.7	23 385 738	.7
Durham	–	–	–	–	–	–	38	3.9	1 709	3.4	3 010 716	3.5
Edgecombe	114	1.6	38 939	.6	50 127	.4	149	1.4	7 634	.7	18 254 047	.6
Forsyth	–	–	–	–	–	–	123	2.4	2 764	2.7	5 347 288	2.7
Franklin	4	14.8	182	12.7	164	11.7	205	1.5	7 932	1.1	17 374 396	1.0
Gaston	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Gates	64	2.1	18 840	1.0	19 176	.9	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Graham	–	–	–	–	–	–	38	4.6	66	7.4	105 310	9.0
Granville	3	18.1	96	18.1	125	16.5	328	1.2	9 681	1.1	18 858 688	1.0
Greene	72	2.4	16 964	.8	25 131	.8	179	1.2	8 910	.7	20 074 673	.6
Guilford	–	–	–	–	–	–	235	1.6	5 450	1.5	11 799 119	1.5
Halifax	141	1.8	56 876	.7	66 263	.8	78	2.8	3 849	.8	8 473 239	.8
Harnett	54	3.5	10 978	1.9	14 126	2.2	242	1.5	9 959	1.1	20 671 906	1.0
Haywood	–	–	–	–	–	–	267	1.5	812	3.1	1 326 976	2.9
Henderson	–	–	–	–	–	–	11	10.3	63	5.3	121 920	5.8
Hertford	82	2.4	19 035	1.2	24 035	.9	60	3.2	2 291	2.1	4 185 310	2.1
Hoke	38	3.6	18 645	1.2	25 038	1.2	43	3.6	1 790	2.2	3 831 200	2.3
Hyde	9	–	4 212	–	8 551	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Iredell	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	43	4.1	576	5.3	1 231 660	5.1
Jackson	–	–	–	–	–	–	7	13.3	23	7.8	42 664	6.3
Johnston	71	2.8	12 500	2.0	16 755	1.5	508	1.0	16 932	.8	37 719 122	.7
Jones	36	3.6	18 696	.6	26 246	.6	69	2.4	3 653	1.2	8 465 029	1.3
Lee	11	6.2	1 568	.7	1 554	.6	104	2.3	3 494	1.6	7 671 790	1.5
Lenoir	77	2.1	29 330	.4	45 390	.4	224	1.2	10 958	.5	25 585 401	.5
Lincoln	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
McDowell	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	15.3	11	18.8	11 250	18.9
Macon	–	–	–	–	–	–	21	7.0	33	13.5	53 447	16.1
Madison	–	–	–	–	–	–	577	1.2	2 179	2.1	3 172 497	2.1
Martin	220	1.5	37 139	1.0	51 176	.9	221	1.4	5 402	.9	13 126 983	.9
Mecklenburg	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Mitchell	–	–	–	–	–	–	107	2.4	379	4.1	550 729	4.0
Montgomery	1	42.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	11	8.0	392	3.8	860 423	4.2
Moore	3	15.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	102	2.3	3 744	1.6	8 305 323	1.5
Nash	58	1.8	23 009	.3	26 218	.2	209	1.3	13 374	.5	31 334 055	.5
New Hanover	–	–	–	–	–	–	9	7.7	318	4.9	653 320	5.1
Northampton	221	1.2	54 929	.8	66 788	.8	99	2.4	3 450	1.6	7 837 542	1.6
Onslow	7	3.8	3 600	.5	5 557	.6	83	3.1	1 891	3.3	4 062 472	3.4
Orange	–	–	–	–	–	–	7	–	536	–	1 037 278	–
Pamlico	10	3.5	5 708	.2	10 356	.1						
Pasquotank	16	4.3	2 836	3.2	4 327	2.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Pender	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	57	3.4	1 792	2.3	4 244 246	2.2
Perquimans	68	2.6	12 117	1.5	17 388	1.5	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Person	–	–	–	–	–	–	217	1.2	6 346	.9	13 539 016	.9
Pitt	96	2.1	30 457	.5	42 304	.6	245	1.2	16 976	.5	38 649 333	.5
Polk	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Randolph	4	14.8	72	12.1	44	12.5	56	3.6	1 441	3.2	3 246 053	2.9
Richmond	4	10.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	34	3.5	1 112	2.1	2 741 490	1.8
Robeson	90	2.9	30 193	.7	40 374	.6	460	1.4	16 891	1.1	36 790 904	.8
Rockingham	–	–	–	–	–	–	368	1.2	7 432	1.3	16 154 235	1.4
Rowan	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	2	20.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Rutherford	3	23.3	341	28.4	365	26.9	9	9.8	24	24.4	36 616	23.3
Sampson	139	2.2	42 202	.6	65 918	.6	349	1.4	10 326	.7	23 680 682	.7
Scotland	29	4.0	14 033	2.4	21 575	2.4	13	5.7	664	1.4	1 412 165	1.2
Stanly	14	3.6	6 380	.7	9 497	.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Stokes	–	–	–	–	–	–	501	.9	6 848	1.6	13 995 518	1.5
Surry	–	–	–	–	–	–	387	1.2	7 588	1.3	15 827 599	1.4
Swain	–	–	–	–	–	–	7	10.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Transylvania	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	11.1	22	18.6	38 925	16.9
Tyrrell	3	–	1 311	–	1 917	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Union	15	6.6	7 798	1.3	10 211	1.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Vance	–	–	–	–	–	–	125	2.0	4 762	1.9	10 359 877	1.9
Wake	4	15.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	290	1.5	12 360	1.1	26 772 812	1.1
Warren	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	92	2.0	3 190	1.5	6 632 314	1.4
Washington	20	4.3	7 692	.7	10 023	.8	14	6.6	449	1.6	1 075 359	1.1
Watauga	–	–	–	–	–	–	237	1.5	657	3.2	1 221 390	3.9
Wayne	86	2.6	19 370	1.4	28 543	1.2	335	1.2	10 720	.6	24 297 799	.6
Wilkes	–	–	–	–	–	–	32	4.0	1 111	2.5	2 374 320	2.2
Wilson	49	2.4	15 414	.8	21 920	.9	210	1.3	10 808	.5	26 235 735	.5
Yadkin	–	–	–	–	–	–	219	1.7	4 764	2.0	9 712 454	1.8
Yancey	–	–	–	–	–	–	363	1.3	1 169	3.8	1 750 331	4.0

See footnotes at end of table.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service

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

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

Geographic area	Soybeans for beans						Peanuts for nuts					
	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)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**9 933**	**.5**	**1 280 412**	**.3**	**35 785 336**	**.3**	**1 765**	**.7**	**122 784**	**.3**	**325 662 397**	**.3**
Alamance	63	3.5	2 910	3.5	68 109	3.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Alexander	15	7.3	1 024	4.8	24 188	4.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Alleghany	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Anson	53	3.3	7 656	4.7	189 538	4.8	1	46.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Ashe	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	43.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Avery	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Beaufort	257	1.1	68 166	.7	2 126 051	.7	11	8.6	436	6.3	1 189 593	6.0
Bertie	173	1.8	10 677	1.6	315 730	1.6	242	1.2	16 738	.8	46 104 412	.9
Bladen	193	1.9	14 765	1.4	366 493	1.4	88	3.1	2 468	2.3	6 809 959	2.3
Brunswick	80	2.9	8 347	2.1	200 545	2.1	2	20.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Buncombe	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Burke	7	10.0	120	14.4	1 990	16.8	1	29.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Cabarrus.............	54	3.5	6 483	4.4	155 343	4.5	2	26.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Caldwell	20	6.4	812	11.1	19 853	9.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Camden	56	1.2	25 899	.7	914 097	.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Carteret.............	33	3.8	19 948	.6	666 848	.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Caswell	45	3.7	975	4.5	23 714	5.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Catawba	77	2.9	6 781	3.6	138 797	4.0	1	35.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Chatham	18	5.7	1 658	3.2	32 131	4.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Cherokee	1	46.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Chowan.............	85	1.9	6 319	1.6	210 433	1.5	89	1.6	5 274	1.2	18 143 529	1.2
Clay	1	34.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Cleveland	80	3.0	7 904	4.0	167 028	4.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Columbus	493	1.2	44 176	1.2	1 118 551	1.2	20	6.3	660	1.7	2 365 366	1.2
Craven	107	2.1	15 630	1.4	420 741	1.3	4	12.6	44	9.1	149 604	7.8
Cumberland	140	2.0	20 125	1.4	465 461	1.2	6	11.1	225	16.0	447 000	14.9
Currituck	46	2.8	18 489	1.2	630 750	1.1	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Dare	4	–	3 516	–	101 692	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson.............	101	2.7	6 135	3.6	166 854	3.4	1	30.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Davie	45	4.0	5 776	3.0	159 844	3.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Duplin	497	1.1	45 347	1.0	1 282 501	1.2	1	40.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Durham..............	10	9.6	433	6.5	9 916	7.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Edgecombe	159	1.5	21 796	.8	570 104	.8	113	1.6	10 932	.6	27 550 351	.5
Forsyth	62	3.4	2 823	10.7	83 794	10.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Franklin	139	2.0	16 209	1.3	353 437	1.0	1	31.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Gaston	15	8.0	1 585	11.2	34 410	12.6	3	15.5	7	6.7	19 927	5.1
Gates	90	1.6	9 217	1.1	278 010	1.0	102	1.1	6 824	1.0	20 710 372	.9
Graham	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Granville	40	4.1	2 215	3.5	51 714	4.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Greene	197	1.0	22 805	.9	665 467	1.1	2	13.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Guilford	96	2.8	4 078	2.9	106 191	2.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Halifax..............	105	2.3	8 613	1.0	211 234	.7	153	1.7	19 587	.9	44 768 026	.8
Harnett	232	1.6	17 883	1.5	389 070	1.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Haywood.............	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Henderson	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hertford.............	87	2.2	6 368	1.9	177 666	1.4	117	1.4	11 245	.8	27 474 324	.8
Hoke	49	3.3	8 750	.8	194 510	.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hyde	73	1.3	36 381	.5	1 390 283	.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Iredell	113	2.4	9 185	2.2	285 144	1.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Jackson..............	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Johnston.............	527	.9	44 717	.8	1 101 209	.7	7	6.7	99	7.2	180 260	8.4
Jones...............	63	2.7	10 828	2.1	313 205	2.0	1	37.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lee.................	58	3.7	3 165	3.4	66 824	2.9	1	34.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lenoir	212	1.2	27 000	.7	696 355	.7	3	16.6	55	9.0	126 808	5.8
Lincoln..............	57	3.5	5 679	5.0	126 857	6.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
McDowell	5	15.7	80	29.6	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Macon	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Madison	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Martin	169	1.9	9 162	1.8	251 014	1.7	278	1.1	12 757	.9	41 361 172	.9
Mecklenburg	21	6.8	1 187	10.6	26 488	12.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mitchell	2	26.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Montgomery...........	10	8.8	483	10.3	12 825	11.6	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Moore	37	4.1	2 594	5.3	62 866	5.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Nash	185	1.5	26 885	.9	628 438	.9	25	3.4	2 612	.3	6 753 867	.3
New Hanover	10	8.4	2 162	3.4	59 694	2.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Northampton	119	1.9	8 165	.8	209 104	.8	222	1.2	22 514	.8	52 968 237	1.0
Onslow	138	1.9	11 727	1.7	343 275	1.7	2	27.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Orange	40	4.6	2 790	6.1	60 031	6.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Pamlico	42	1.5	21 501	1.0	768 500	1.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Pasquotank	134	1.3	42 603	1.1	1 351 376	1.1	4	15.8	91	19.7	258 672	20.8
Pender	91	2.5	15 047	1.5	452 122	1.4	3	18.2	112	28.6	194 440	22.2
Perquimans	159	1.1	30 857	1.0	1 003 951	1.0	73	2.5	2 347	2.1	7 408 303	2.0
Person..............	48	2.9	6 474	1.9	168 146	1.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Pitt	271	1.1	45 463	.7	1 220 878	.7	89	2.4	4 122	.9	10 599 766	.8
Polk	4	8.9	260	10.0	8 836	6.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Randolph	93	2.8	5 953	5.1	163 242	5.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Richmond	21	5.4	4 077	7.8	76 863	11.1	5	12.4	28	18.8	50 272	20.1
Robeson.............	617	1.2	91 288	.9	2 004 075	.8	10	8.7	132	3.6	283 991	3.3
Rockingham	54	3.6	2 185	3.7	55 966	3.4	–	–	–	–	–	–

See footnotes at end of table.

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

Geographic area	Soybeans for beans						Peanuts for nuts					
	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)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Rowan	121	2.3	10 364	2.1	259 667	1.9	4	11.6	31	13.0	54 200	13.4
Rutherford	22	6.1	705	10.8	15 226	12.4	–	–	–	–	–	–
Sampson	538	1.1	49 472	.8	1 406 910	.8	13	8.7	202	10.7	381 766	10.2
Scotland	49	2.9	10 647	2.0	244 402	1.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
Stanly	98	2.1	17 516	1.4	466 183	1.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Stokes	56	3.8	851	4.7	20 163	5.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Surry	122	2.6	5 232	2.2	124 993	2.2	1	34.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Swain	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Transylvania	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Tyrrell	51	2.0	27 490	.5	1 080 316	.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Union	198	1.6	53 688	1.0	1 429 907	1.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Vance	58	3.6	5 297	5.4	130 857	5.2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Wake	197	2.0	12 765	1.6	248 179	1.5	2	16.3	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Warren	50	3.0	5 930	2.5	146 531	1.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Washington	128	1.5	40 792	.7	1 425 366	.8	53	3.3	2 785	1.6	8 355 450	1.6
Watauga	1	28.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Wayne	438	1.0	55 748	.7	1 532 319	.6	2	26.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Wilkes	15	7.0	549	6.7	14 582	9.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Wilson	238	1.2	33 762	.7	999 601	.5	3	12.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Yadkin	154	2.1	8 751	1.8	219 912	1.6	–	–	–	–	–	–
Yancey	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Selected crops harvested—Con.

Geographic area	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
North Carolina	**19 761**	**.5**	**602 755**	**.5**	**1 218 338**	**.5**
Alamance	422	1.1	14 682	1.6	24 801	1.7
Alexander	353	1.1	11 791	1.5	26 063	2.0
Alleghany	332	1.1	10 954	1.8	19 945	2.2
Anson	142	1.9	4 564	2.7	10 845	2.8
Ashe	510	1.0	9 314	1.5	18 505	1.7
Avery	68	3.7	1 213	6.9	1 566	5.8
Beaufort	17	6.4	467	4.0	772	2.8
Bertie	12	7.6	170	17.9	267	12.4
Bladen	125	2.3	6 847	1.6	15 525	2.0
Brunswick	38	4.5	1 287	4.2	3 164	7.4
Buncombe	541	1.1	11 423	1.8	20 732	2.1
Burke	201	1.4	4 428	3.1	7 915	2.9
Cabarrus	302	1.1	11 626	2.7	20 952	4.0
Caldwell	186	1.5	5 358	2.1	11 723	3.0
Camden	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Carteret	12	8.6	193	10.2	391	10.2
Caswell	275	1.3	11 487	1.9	19 879	3.6
Catawba	374	.9	12 430	2.0	22 198	2.7
Chatham	471	1.0	15 443	1.6	35 045	1.5
Cherokee	119	2.3	3 050	3.8	5 601	5.0
Chowan	4	17.9	158	8.4	383	18.3
Clay	112	1.7	2 979	3.4	7 560	3.5
Cleveland	422	1.0	13 646	1.8	24 306	2.5
Columbus	177	2.2	5 265	4.0	11 061	2.7
Craven	38	4.0	932	7.0	2 339	8.2
Cumberland	121	2.3	4 695	2.9	10 269	2.6
Currituck	4	18.6	197	25.5	402	19.4
Dare	–	–	–	–	–	–
Davidson	616	.9	16 307	1.3	29 577	1.8
Davie	348	1.0	12 234	2.0	22 755	1.9
Duplin	303	1.1	14 140	1.3	37 063	1.8
Durham	69	3.0	2 171	3.4	3 381	4.4
Edgecombe	26	4.8	1 054	3.2	1 822	3.2
Forsyth	327	1.2	7 206	2.0	12 176	2.2
Franklin	167	1.9	7 540	2.3	17 878	1.9
Gaston	210	1.5	6 798	2.3	12 443	2.7
Gates	3	11.4	53	5.2	91	4.5
Graham	40	4.5	570	7.4	1 132	8.6
Granville	256	1.5	11 216	2.4	18 540	2.7
Greene	42	1.8	2 079	1.3	4 834	.6
Guilford	487	1.1	13 915	2.3	23 702	2.6
Halifax	46	3.5	3 470	6.4	4 054	5.5
Harnett	161	2.3	4 189	2.2	8 578	2.6
Haywood	396	1.2	6 781	1.7	14 483	1.9

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.					
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Henderson	151	2.3	5 718	2.5	11 790	3.6
Hertford	4	17.9	17	25.6	25	25.9
Hoke	51	3.6	2 256	3.9	7 096	3.7
Hyde	7	9.9	288	17.9	520	10.8
Iredell	786	.8	30 090	1.2	68 213	1.5
Jackson	71	3.5	946	5.0	1 516	5.4
Johnston	336	1.4	8 585	2.6	19 812	3.4
Jones	33	3.9	1 305	3.6	2 674	3.5
Lee	110	2.6	2 011	4.0	3 849	5.0
Lenoir	65	2.7	1 819	3.2	3 519	4.7
Lincoln	308	1.1	11 014	2.0	21 170	2.5
McDowell	127	1.8	3 028	3.6	6 446	4.7
Macon	170	1.8	3 710	3.2	7 606	4.1
Madison	333	1.7	4 800	2.4	10 441	2.9
Martin	7	11.6	144	10.5	274	4.9
Mecklenburg	161	1.9	5 060	2.7	9 178	2.7
Mitchell	128	2.1	2 451	3.0	5 480	4.4
Montgomery	94	2.6	3 297	3.4	6 258	2.2
Moore	257	1.4	5 243	2.1	11 346	2.4
Nash	101	2.4	4 500	3.2	10 395	3.8
New Hanover	3	15.3	26	15.7	(D)	(D)
Northampton	10	6.2	908	4.0	2 330	6.5
Onslow	89	2.5	2 372	4.4	5 069	1.3
Orange	300	1.2	12 280	1.8	21 560	2.1
Pamlico	8	4.4	277	8.7	694	11.1
Pasquotank	1	49.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Pender	49	3.4	1 727	2.3	3 711	1.4
Perquimans	10	10.0	255	10.5	304	10.2
Person	183	1.7	8 089	2.3	15 069	2.9
Pitt	59	3.2	3 341	3.2	7 930	4.0
Polk	104	1.9	3 563	3.6	7 373	5.5
Randolph	723	.8	21 075	1.2	42 004	1.2
Richmond	89	2.5	3 216	2.8	6 709	2.8
Robeson	166	2.5	6 992	4.1	17 286	2.9
Rockingham	385	1.3	11 350	2.1	18 054	2.4
Rowan	539	.8	19 367	1.4	36 824	1.6
Rutherford	315	1.0	10 419	2.0	17 130	2.6
Sampson	299	1.2	12 093	1.6	34 822	1.7
Scotland	28	4.2	2 100	2.9	5 469	3.2
Stanly	315	1.0	11 173	1.6	23 162	2.0
Stokes	431	1.2	10 234	1.9	15 609	2.1
Surry	670	.9	16 170	1.4	31 347	1.6
Swain	34	4.1	583	7.8	1 291	11.0
Transylvania	76	2.9	2 121	5.5	3 880	6.9
Tyrrell	4	13.4	55	14.5	108	14.3
Union	408	1.1	11 220	1.8	26 526	2.0
Vance	72	3.3	1 954	4.4	2 466	6.3
Wake	169	2.3	4 491	3.9	7 538	5.3
Warren	113	2.1	6 292	1.8	12 136	2.1
Washington	9	9.8	116	15.5	254	13.6
Watauga	300	1.3	5 363	2.0	10 505	2.6
Wayne	154	1.8	4 972	2.5	12 904	3.7
Wilkes	707	.8	19 589	1.4	48 877	1.4
Wilson	47	3.5	1 671	3.7	3 059	3.4
Yadkin	545	1.0	14 371	1.4	30 429	1.7
Yancey	170	2.2	2 298	3.4	3 480	4.0

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

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

Item	Census total	Coverage total[1]	Adjusted census Total	Relative standard error (percent)	Coverage adjustment (percent)
Farms .... number..	49 406	9 668	59 074	2.4	16.4
Land in farms .... acres..	9 122 379	247 506	9 369 885	1.7	2.6
Average size of farm .... acres..	185	26	159	(X)	(X)
Farms by size of farm:					
Less than 10 acres	3 968	1 822	5 790	9.6	31.5
10 to 49 acres	15 601	5 410	21 011	4.5	25.7
50 to 179 acres	18 259	2 529	20 788	3.8	12.2
180 acres or more	11 578	−93	11 485	2.2	−.8
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than $2,500	13 653	6 767	20 420	4.6	33.1
$2,500 to $9,999	12 903	2 503	15 406	4.4	16.2
$10,000 or more	22 850	398	23 248	2.3	1.7
Market value of agricultural products sold .... $1,000..	7 676 523	−22 994	7 653 529	2.0	−.3
Farms by type of organization:					
Individual or family	42 887	9 534	52 421	2.6	18.2
Partnership, corporation, or other	6 519	134	6 653	2.3	2.0
Farms by tenure of operator:					
Full owners	28 608	6 787	35 395	3.4	19.2
Part owners	16 591	2 175	18 766	2.6	11.6
Tenants	4 207	706	4 913	6.8	14.4
Operators by place of residence:					
On farm operated	34 817	8 924	43 741	2.8	20.4
Not on farm operated	9 771	1 138	10 909	5.2	10.4
Not reported	4 818	−394	4 424	6.3	−8.9
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming	24 355	2 737	27 092	3.0	10.1
Other	25 051	6 931	31 982	3.5	21.7
Operators by sex:					
Male	45 343	8 382	53 725	2.4	15.6
Female	4 063	1 286	5 349	7.4	24.0
Operators by race:					
White	47 295	8 955	56 250	2.4	15.9
Black and other races	2 111	713	2 824	13.5	25.2
Operators by years on present farm:					
4 years or less	4 843	1 819	6 662	6.4	27.3
5 years or more	33 973	8 625	42 598	2.9	20.2
Not reported	10 590	−776	9 814	3.7	−7.9

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