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	8.7	Corn for grain or seed ..... acres	2.6
Land in farms ..... acres	5.2	Wheat for grain ..... acres	1.6
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1] $1,000	5.5	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold $1,000	.9	Cattle and calves ..... number	6.2
Harvested cropland ..... acres	2.7	Hogs and pigs ..... number	1.0
		Layers 20 weeks old and older ..... number	–

[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	5.2	25	40.0
50	3.2	50	27.8
75	2.2	75	22.3
100	1.5	100	18.9
150	1.2	150	14.9
200	1.1	200	12.3
300	.9	300	9.1
500	.7	500	5.3
750	.6	750	.4
1,000	.5	1,000	.4
1,500	.4	1,500	.3
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..	20 189	.4
Land in farms ..... acres..	4 593 452	.3
Average size of farm ..... acres..	228	.5
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) ..... farms..	20 189	.4
$1,000..	1 588 173	.1
Average per farm ..... dollars..	78 665	.4
Farms by value of sales:		
Less than $1,000 (see text) ..... farms..	4 718	.6
$1,000..	1 000	.9
$1,000 to $2,499 ..... farms..	3 437	.6
$1,000..	5 688	.6
$2,500 to $4,999 ..... farms..	3 060	.6
$1,000..	10 868	.6
$5,000 to $9,999 ..... farms..	2 714	.6
$1,000..	19 120	.6
$10,000 to $19,999 ..... farms..	1 826	.8
$1,000..	25 287	.8
$20,000 to $24,999 ..... farms..	448	1.5
$1,000..	9 925	1.5
$25,000 to $39,999 ..... farms..	717	1.2
$1,000..	22 484	1.2
$40,000 to $49,999 ..... farms..	286	1.9
$1,000..	12 644	1.9
$50,000 to $99,999 ..... farms..	703	1.2
$1,000..	49 784	1.2
$100,000 to $249,999 ..... farms..	802	–
$1,000..	132 108	–
$250,000 to $499,999 ..... farms..	630	–
$1,000..	226 582	–
$500,000 or more ..... farms..	848	–
$1,000..	1 072 682	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	8 851	.4
$1,000..	791 104	.1
Grains ..... farms..	4 648	.5
$1,000..	190 461	.2
Corn for grain ..... farms..	2 913	.6
$1,000..	69 856	.2
Wheat ..... farms..	2 103	.6
$1,000..	44 498	.2
Soybeans ..... farms..	3 004	.5
$1,000..	73 699	.2
Sorghum for grain ..... farms..	40	3.1
$1,000..	239	4.6
Barley ..... farms..	36	3.7
$1,000..	171	3.1
Oats ..... farms..	272	1.5
$1,000..	815	1.7
Other grains ..... farms..	183	1.6
$1,000..	1 184	1.0
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms..	891	.6
$1,000..	134 290	.1
Tobacco ..... farms..	1 274	.6
$1,000..	205 570	.1
Hay, silage, and field seeds ..... farms..	2 753	.6
$1,000..	14 308	.7
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms..	1 039	.9
$1,000..	59 313	.2
Fruits, nuts, and berries ..... farms..	614	1.1
$1,000..	33 037	.2
Nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	766	1.0
$1,000..	144 313	.1
Other crops ..... farms..	288	1.5
$1,000..	9 812	.5
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms..	11 367	.4
$1,000..	797 069	.1
Poultry and poultry products ..... farms..	882	.6
$1,000..	587 774	(L)
Dairy products ..... farms..	201	1.1
$1,000..	54 535	.2
Cattle and calves ..... farms..	9 287	.4
$1,000..	76 008	.4
Hogs and pigs ..... farms..	1 031	.9
$1,000..	64 550	.1
Sheep, lambs, and wool ..... farms..	127	2.5
$1,000..	119	4.7
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ..... farms..	1 489	.8
$1,000..	14 083	1.0
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms..	966	1.0
$1,000..	6 080	1.0

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses ..... farms..	20 188	.4
$1,000..	1 233 736	.2
Average per farm ..... dollars..	61 112	.4
Livestock and poultry purchased ..... farms..	4 480	2.7
$1,000..	88 949	.7
Feed for livestock and poultry ..... farms..	9 768	1.5
$1,000..	410 005	.2
Commercially mixed formula feeds ..... farms..	5 930	2.3
$1,000..	378 023	.1
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ..... farms..	8 251	1.6
$1,000..	36 777	1.0
Commercial fertilizer ..... farms..	13 351	1.1
$1,000..	92 169	.8
Agricultural chemicals ..... farms..	8 402	1.6
$1,000..	76 319	.6
Petroleum products ..... farms..	18 262	.6
$1,000..	59 101	.6
Electricity ..... farms..	10 136	1.5
$1,000..	19 540	.7
Hired farm labor ..... farms..	5 826	2.1
$1,000..	129 512	.4
Contract labor ..... farms..	1 785	4.1
$1,000..	18 063	3.2
Repair and maintenance ..... farms..	15 498	.9
$1,000..	70 769	.8
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ..... farms..	4 228	2.8
$1,000..	13 788	1.9
Interest ..... farms..	5 581	2.1
$1,000..	47 350	1.1
Secured by real estate ..... farms..	4 168	2.6
$1,000..	31 121	1.6
Not secured by real estate ..... farms..	2 534	3.2
$1,000..	16 229	.9
Cash rent ..... farms..	4 611	2.4
$1,000..	41 957	1.2
Property taxes ..... farms..	19 162	.5
$1,000..	19 179	1.4
All other farm production expenses ..... farms..	16 220	.8
$1,000..	110 258	.4
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)[1]		
All farms ..... number..	20 189	.4
$1,000..	328 569	.8
Average per farm ..... dollars..	16 275	.9
Farms with net gains[2] ..... number..	8 583	1.5
$1,000..	399 307	.5
Average net gain ..... dollars..	46 523	1.6
Farms with net losses ..... number..	11 606	1.2
$1,000..	70 738	1.8
Average net loss ..... dollars..	6 095	2.1
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments ..... farms..	5 834	.5
$1,000..	28 977	.4
Other farm-related income[1] ..... farms..	3 707	3.2
$1,000..	26 240	3.5
Customwork and other agricultural services ..... farms..	1 059	6.3
$1,000..	7 726	4.6
Gross cash rent or share payments ..... farms..	1 521	5.4
$1,000..	5 044	6.1
Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ..... farms..	827	7.0
$1,000..	10 990	6.8
Other farm-related income sources ..... farms..	1 059	5.4
$1,000..	2 481	7.0
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total ..... farms..	410	1.2
$1,000..	6 076	.4

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)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			
Total cropland	farms	17 514	.4
	acres	2 462 818	.3
Harvested cropland	farms	13 426	.4
	acres	1 654 535	.2
Farms by acres harvested:			
1 to 9 acres	farms	2 800	.6
	acres	12 697	.7
10 to 19 acres	farms	2 562	.7
	acres	33 197	.7
20 to 29 acres	farms	1 698	.8
	acres	38 530	.8
30 to 49 acres	farms	1 798	.7
	acres	66 057	.7
50 to 99 acres	farms	1 749	.8
	acres	115 471	.8
100 to 199 acres	farms	1 096	.9
	acres	149 130	.9
200 to 499 acres	farms	911	.7
	acres	276 425	.6
500 to 999 acres	farms	448	.3
	acres	310 040	.2
1,000 acres or more	farms	364	–
	acres	652 988	–
Cropland:			
Pasture or grazing only	farms	9 189	.4
	acres	508 887	.5
Other cropland	farms	5 339	.5
	acres	299 396	.6
Total woodland	farms	13 150	.4
	acres	1 620 282	.5
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms	3 328	.5
	acres	244 352	1.0
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms	12 114	.4
	acres	266 000	.7
Irrigated land	farms	1 248	.7
	acres	86 477	.3
Acres irrigated:			
1 to 9 acres	farms	703	1.1
	acres	1 946	1.2
10 to 49 acres	farms	275	1.5
	acres	5 944	1.4
50 to 99 acres	farms	83	1.7
	acres	5 704	1.8
100 to 199 acres	farms	64	1.8
	acres	8 440	2.0
200 to 499 acres	farms	83	.7
	acres	25 176	.7
500 to 999 acres	farms	28	–
	acres	19 036	–
1,000 acres or more	farms	12	–
	acres	20 231	–
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms	1 192	.7
	acres	85 086	.3
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms	81	3.0
	acres	1 391	4.3
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms	2 811	.6
	acres	218 211	.9
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]			
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms	20 189	.4
	$1,000	6 558 081	1.2
Average per farm	dollars	324 834	1.3
Average per acre	dollars	1 482	1.6
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]			
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms	20 189	.4
	$1,000	902 193	.9
Average per farm	dollars	44 687	1.0
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]			
Commercial fertilizer	farms	13 258	1.1
	acres on which used	1 559 396	.9

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
TENURE OF OPERATOR			
All operators	farms	20 189	.4
	acres	4 593 452	.3
Full owners	farms	13 016	.4
	acres	2 060 979	.5
Part owners	farms	5 921	.4
	acres	2 279 862	.3
Tenants	farms	1 252	.8
	acres	252 611	.7
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			
Land owned	farms	18 972	.4
	acres	3 292 896	.4
Owned land in farms	farms	18 937	.4
	acres	3 106 683	.4
Land rented or leased from others	farms	7 245	.4
	acres	1 514 729	.3
	landlords	23 110	.4
Rented or leased land in farms	farms	7 173	.4
	acres	1 486 769	.3
Land rented or leased to others	farms	2 152	.7
	acres	214 173	1.2
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
Operators by place of residence:			
On farm operated		14 259	.4
Not on farm operated		4 219	.5
Not reported		1 711	.6
Operators by principal occupation:			
Farming		7 959	.4
Other		12 230	.4
Operators by days worked off farm:			
Any		11 615	.4
200 days or more		8 472	.5
Operators by sex:			
Male	farms	18 197	.4
	acres	4 258 085	.3
Female	farms	1 992	.7
	acres	335 367	1.1
Average age of operator	years	56.3	.5
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION			
Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms	18 078	.4
	acres	3 414 360	.3
Partnership	farms	1 337	.8
	acres	714 882	.5
Corporation:			
Family held	farms	564	.9
	acres	338 524	.7
More than 10 stockholders	farms	12	2.0
10 or less stockholders	farms	552	1.0
Other than family held	farms	85	2.1
	acres	63 211	.9
More than 10 stockholders	farms	8	7.4
10 or less stockholders	farms	77	2.2
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms	125	2.6
	acres	62 475	2.5
HIRED FARM LABOR[1]			
Hired workers by days worked:			
150 days or more	farms	2 373	2.7
	workers	8 500	1.0
Less than 150 days	farms	5 304	2.3
	workers	23 890	2.0
INJURIES AND DEATHS			
Farm-related injuries:			
Operator and family members	farms	136	2.3
	number	155	2.5
Hired workers	farms	111	1.3
	number	198	1.0
Farm-related deaths:			
Operator and family members	farms	3	–
	number	3	–
Hired workers	farms	1	–
	number	(D)	(D)

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)
FARMS BY SIZE			
1 to 9 acres	farms	1 224	.9
	acres	5 894	1.1
10 to 49 acres	farms	5 712	.5
	acres	158 893	.5
50 to 69 acres	farms	2 035	.7
	acres	118 334	.7
70 to 99 acres	farms	2 026	.7
	acres	167 501	.7
100 to 139 acres	farms	2 053	.7
	acres	237 674	.7
140 to 179 acres	farms	1 388	.8
	acres	218 148	.8
180 to 219 acres	farms	972	.9
	acres	(D)	(D)
220 to 259 acres	farms	683	1.1
	acres	(D)	(D)
260 to 499 acres	farms	1 956	.7
	acres	690 335	.7
500 to 999 acres	farms	1 225	.7
	acres	825 603	.7
1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms	638	.7
	acres	872 553	.7
2,000 acres or more	farms	277	–
	acres	943 913	–
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM			
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	farms	3 630	.6
	acres	1 188 145	.6
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)	farms	700	1.1
	acres	100 083	1.2
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)	farms	533	1.3
	acres	95 949	1.7
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)	farms	682	1.0
	acres	69 084	.9
Other crop farming (1119)	farms	3 437	.5
	acres	1 404 251	.3
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)	farms	7 746	.4
	acres	(D)	(D)
Cattle feedlots (112112)	farms	206	2.0
	acres	(D)	(D)
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)	farms	179	1.1
	acres	85 913	.4
Hog and pig farming (1122)	farms	565	1.2
	acres	80 778	.9
Poultry and egg production (1123)	farms	711	.5
	acres	140 202	.7
Sheep and goat farming (1124)	farms	289	1.8
	acres	22 546	3.2
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)	farms	1 511	.8
	acres	146 987	1.3
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	9 902	.4
	number	453 631	.4
Beef cows	farms	8 671	.4
	number	229 048	.5
Milk cows	farms	394	1.2
	number	24 766	.2
LIVESTOCK—Con.			
Cattle and calves sold	farms	9 287	.4
	number	216 812	.4
	$1,000	76 008	.4
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	1 226	.9
	number	304 793	.2
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	1 031	.9
	number	711 109	.1
	$1,000	64 550	.1
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms	168	2.2
	number	3 316	5.8
Sheep and lambs sold	farms	112	2.7
	number	1 830	5.0
Horses and ponies inventory	farms	3 713	.6
	number	22 981	.8
Horses and ponies sold	farms	772	1.1
	number	3 064	2.6
POULTRY			
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	farms	730	1.1
	number	5 711 843	.3
Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms	695	1.1
	number	5 052 008	.2
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	366	.4
	number	158 678 646	(L)
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED			
Corn for grain or seed	farms	3 531	.5
	acres	300 934	.3
	bushels	28 107 576	.2
Corn for silage or green chop	farms	226	1.5
	acres	20 124	.4
	tons, green	280 856	.4
Wheat for grain	farms	2 138	.6
	acres	306 935	.2
	bushels	14 500 101	.2
Barley for grain	farms	67	2.7
	acres	2 976	1.4
	bushels	172 365	1.5
Oats for grain	farms	625	1.0
	acres	17 281	1.2
	bushels	961 509	1.2
Cotton	farms	894	.6
	acres	285 858	.1
	bales	397 545	.1
Tobacco	farms	1 275	.6
	acres	54 660	.2
	pounds	125 220 334	.1
Soybeans for beans	farms	3 044	.5
	acres	507 687	.2
	bushels	11 554 522	.2
Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	farms	60	3.9
	acres	355	1.5
	cwt	79 750	1.0
Sweetpotatoes	farms	112	2.5
	acres	753	2.0
	bushels	144 399	3.0
Peanuts for nuts	farms	146	1.9
	acres	10 097	.6
	pounds	28 250 921	.4
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	7 618	.4
	acres	287 002	.5
	tons, dry	592 327	.5
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	1 040	.8
	acres	28 774	.4
Land in orchards	farms	885	1.0
	acres	24 775	.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)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS		
Farms ..... number..	6 260	.4
Land in farms ..... acres..	2 940 793	.3
Average size of farm ..... acres..	470	.4
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD		
Total sales (see text) ..... farms..	6 260	.4
$1,000..	1 551 497	.1
Average per farm ..... dollars..	247 843	.4
Farms by value of sales:		
$10,000 to $19,999 ..... farms..	1 826	.7
$1,000..	25 287	.7
$20,000 to $24,999 ..... farms..	448	1.3
$1,000..	9 925	1.3
$25,000 to $39,999 ..... farms..	717	1.1
$1,000..	22 484	1.1
$40,000 to $49,999 ..... farms..	286	1.7
$1,000..	12 644	1.7
$50,000 to $99,999 ..... farms..	703	1.1
$1,000..	49 784	1.1
$100,000 to $249,999 ..... farms..	802	–
$1,000..	132 108	–
$250,000 to $499,999 ..... farms..	630	–
$1,000..	226 582	–
$500,000 or more ..... farms..	848	–
$1,000..	1 072 682	–
Sales by commodity or commodity group:		
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	4 474	.4
$1,000..	777 937	.1
Grains ..... farms..	2 957	.5
$1,000..	185 480	.2
Corn for grain ..... farms..	1 942	.5
$1,000..	67 685	.2
Wheat ..... farms..	1 691	.5
$1,000..	43 640	.2
Soybeans ..... farms..	2 257	.5
$1,000..	71 915	.2
Sorghum for grain ..... farms..	24	3.5
$1,000..	219	4.6
Barley ..... farms..	27	3.0
$1,000..	152	1.5
Oats ..... farms..	191	1.5
$1,000..	727	1.8
Other grains ..... farms..	158	1.3
$1,000..	1 142	.8
Cotton and cottonseed ..... farms..	853	.5
$1,000..	134 121	.1
Tobacco ..... farms..	1 168	.6
$1,000..	205 126	.1
Hay, silage, and field seeds ..... farms..	878	.8
$1,000..	10 123	.9
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons ..... farms..	574	.9
$1,000..	57 681	.2
Fruits, nuts, and berries ..... farms..	274	1.3
$1,000..	32 453	.2
Nursery and greenhouse crops ..... farms..	471	1.0
$1,000..	143 317	.1
Other crops ..... farms..	173	1.5
$1,000..	9 634	.5
Livestock, poultry, and their products ..... farms..	3 458	.4
$1,000..	773 560	(L)
Poultry and poultry products ..... farms..	668	.4
$1,000..	587 584	(L)
Dairy products ..... farms..	195	1.0
$1,000..	54 527	.1
Cattle and calves ..... farms..	2 654	.4
$1,000..	55 892	.4
Hogs and pigs ..... farms..	471	1.0
$1,000..	63 313	.1
Sheep, lambs, and wool ..... farms..	34	4.1
$1,000..	36	5.2
Other livestock and livestock products (see text) ..... farms..	358	1.3
$1,000..	12 208	1.1
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text) ..... farms..	353	1.2
$1,000..	5 252	1.2

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES[1]		
Total farm production expenses ..... farms..	6 140	.4
$1,000..	1 167 756	.2
Average per farm ..... dollars..	190 188	.5
Livestock and poultry purchased ..... farms..	1 904	3.4
$1,000..	84 922	.6
Feed for livestock and poultry ..... farms..	3 032	2.2
$1,000..	401 760	.1
Commercially mixed formula feeds ..... farms..	2 189	3.1
$1,000..	373 880	.1
Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees ..... farms..	4 196	1.6
$1,000..	35 303	1.1
Commercial fertilizer ..... farms..	5 158	1.0
$1,000..	83 125	.8
Agricultural chemicals ..... farms..	4 353	1.5
$1,000..	74 475	.6
Petroleum products ..... farms..	6 009	.6
$1,000..	53 407	.6
Electricity ..... farms..	4 771	1.5
$1,000..	17 996	.6
Hired farm labor ..... farms..	3 750	2.0
$1,000..	127 995	.4
Contract labor ..... farms..	1 148	4.4
$1,000..	17 490	3.3
Repair and maintenance ..... farms..	5 709	.9
$1,000..	59 948	.7
Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment ..... farms..	2 146	3.1
$1,000..	12 427	2.1
Interest ..... farms..	3 242	2.2
$1,000..	41 981	1.0
Secured by real estate ..... farms..	2 296	2.8
$1,000..	26 294	1.4
Not secured by real estate ..... farms..	1 785	3.1
$1,000..	15 687	.9
Cash rent ..... farms..	2 900	2.4
$1,000..	40 975	1.2
Property taxes ..... farms..	5 856	.7
$1,000..	11 970	1.6
All other farm production expenses ..... farms..	6 139	.4
$1,000..	103 981	.4
NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)[1]		
All farms ..... number..	6 141	.4
$1,000..	357 221	.6
Average per farm ..... dollars..	58 170	.8
Farms with net gains[2] ..... number..	4 690	1.4
$1,000..	392 138	.5
Average net gain ..... dollars..	83 611	1.5
Farms with net losses ..... number..	1 451	4.4
$1,000..	34 917	2.0
Average net loss ..... dollars..	24 064	4.8
GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Government payments ..... farms..	2 800	.4
$1,000..	21 442	.2
Other farm-related income[1] ..... farms..	1 547	4.3
$1,000..	17 849	4.0
Customwork and other agricultural services ..... farms..	479	7.7
$1,000..	6 482	4.8
Gross cash rent or share payments ..... farms..	477	9.0
$1,000..	2 337	7.1
Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products ..... farms..	366	10.2
$1,000..	6 906	8.1
Other farm-related income sources ..... farms..	643	5.4
$1,000..	2 124	10.4
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Total ..... farms..	338	1.1
$1,000..	6 034	.4

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			
Total cropland	farms	5 890	.4
	acres	1 885 925	.2
Harvested cropland	farms	5 479	.4
	acres	1 475 156	.2
Cropland:			
Pasture or grazing only	farms	2 420	.5
	acres	248 170	.7
Total woodland	farms	4 094	.4
	acres	768 176	.4
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and woodland pastured	farms	905	.7
	acres	134 020	1.4
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	farms	3 789	.4
	acres	152 672	.7
Irrigated land	farms	828	.7
	acres	84 227	.3
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms	810	.7
	acres	83 232	.3
Pasture and other land irrigated	farms	39	3.6
	acres	995	5.3
Land under Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve Programs	farms	884	.7
	acres	77 041	.8
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS[1]			
Estimated market value of land and buildings	farms	6 141	.4
	$1,000	3 687 209	1.3
Average per farm	dollars	600 425	1.4
Average per acre	dollars	1 302	1.8
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT[1]			
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment	farms	6 141	.4
	$1,000	590 337	1.0
Average per farm	dollars	96 130	1.0
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS[1]			
Commercial fertilizer	farms	5 136	1.0
	acres on which used	1 344 385	.9
TENURE OF OPERATOR			
All operators	farms	6 260	.4
	acres	2 940 793	.3
Full owners	farms	2 528	.5
	acres	805 598	.6
Part owners	farms	3 156	.4
	acres	1 929 577	.2
Tenants	farms	576	1.0
	acres	205 618	.5
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			
Land owned	farms	5 698	.4
	acres	1 746 829	.4
Owned land in farms	farms	5 684	.4
	acres	1 668 990	.4
Land rented or leased from others	farms	3 755	.4
	acres	1 292 116	.2
	landlords	16 782	.4
Rented or leased land in farms	farms	3 732	.4
	acres	1 271 803	.2
Land rented or leased to others	farms	721	.9
	acres	98 152	1.0
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			
Operators by place of residence:			
On farm operated		4 423	.4
Not on farm operated		1 334	.7
Not reported		503	.8
Operators by principal occupation:			
Farming		4 074	.4
Other		2 186	.6
Operators by days worked off farm:			
Any		2 659	.5
200 days or more		1 674	.6
Operators by sex:			
Male		5 841	.4
Female		419	1.2
Average age of operator	years	54.6	.5

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION			
Individual or family (sole proprietorship)	farms	5 054	.4
	acres	1 999 624	.3
Partnership	farms	700	.8
	acres	588 279	.4
Corporation:			
Family held	farms	407	.8
	acres	278 427	.6
More than 10 stockholders	farms	10	–
10 or less stockholders	farms	397	.9
Other than family held	farms	63	1.9
	acres	43 818	1.0
More than 10 stockholders	farms	5	–
10 or less stockholders	farms	58	2.0
Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etc.	farms	36	4.3
	acres	30 645	3.4
HIRED FARM LABOR[1]			
Hired workers by days worked:			
150 days or more	farms	1 998	2.4
	workers	8 102	1.0
Less than 150 days	farms	3 252	2.3
	workers	19 910	2.2
INJURIES AND DEATHS			
Farm-related injuries:			
Operator and family members	farms	59	3.0
	number	65	3.0
Hired workers	farms	95	.8
	number	175	.8
Farm-related deaths:			
Operator and family members	farms	2	–
	number	(D)	(D)
Hired workers	farms	1	–
	number	(D)	(D)
FARMS BY SIZE			
1 to 9 acres		232	1.6
10 to 49 acres		670	.9
50 to 69 acres		330	1.3
70 to 99 acres		375	1.3
100 to 139 acres		579	1.0
140 to 179 acres		477	1.2
180 to 219 acres		429	1.1
220 to 259 acres		316	1.4
260 to 499 acres		1 168	.7
500 to 999 acres		902	.6
1,000 to 1,999 acres		538	.6
2,000 acres or more		244	–
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM			
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)		1 017	.8
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)		304	1.3
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)		128	1.9
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)		422	1.1
Other crop farming (1119)		1 827	.5
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)		1 333	.6
Cattle feedlots (112112)		69	2.6
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)		169	1.0
Hog and pig farming (1122)		184	1.5
Poultry and egg production (1123)		610	.3
Sheep and goat farming (1124)		19	6.0
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)		178	2.0
LIVESTOCK			
Cattle and calves inventory	farms	2 667	.4
	number	283 685	.5
Beef cows	farms	2 342	.5
	number	131 911	.6
Milk cows	farms	214	1.0
	number	24 271	.2
Cattle and calves sold	farms	2 654	.4
	number	149 317	.5
	$1,000	55 892	.4
Hogs and pigs inventory	farms	494	1.0
	number	293 418	.2
Hogs and pigs sold	farms	471	1.0
	number	698 119	.1
	$1,000	63 313	.1
Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms	40	3.7
	number	788	6.4
Sheep and lambs sold	farms	30	4.5
	number	588	6.8
Horses and ponies inventory	farms	735	.8
	number	6 342	1.3
Horses and ponies sold	farms	195	1.8
	number	1 821	4.9

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)
POULTRY			
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text)	farms	169	1.5
	number	5 698 231	.3
Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms	151	1.6
	number	5 040 198	.2
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms	348	.3
	number	158 677 727	(L)
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED			
Corn for grain or seed	farms	2 141	.5
	acres	283 103	.2
	bushels	27 034 553	.2
Corn for silage or green chop	farms	156	1.2
	acres	19 194	.3
	tons, green	269 923	.3
Wheat for grain	farms	1 697	.5
	acres	296 999	.2
	bushels	14 181 675	.2
SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED—Con.			
Barley for grain	farms	47	2.4
	acres	2 781	.9
	bushels	161 441	.8
Oats for grain	farms	406	1.0
	acres	14 420	1.2
	bushels	840 099	1.1
Cotton	farms	854	.5
	acres	285 190	.1
	bales	396 918	.1
Tobacco	farms	1 169	.6
	acres	54 446	.2
	pounds	124 912 756	.1
Soybeans for beans	farms	2 262	.5
	acres	489 044	.2
	bushels	11 250 672	.2
Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	farms	24	6.0
	acres	328	1.5
	cwt	76 857	1.0
Sweetpotatoes	farms	53	3.3
	acres	624	2.0
	bushels	132 359	3.2
Peanuts for nuts	farms	101	1.6
	acres	9 965	.6
	pounds	28 030 772	.4
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms	2 375	.5
	acres	160 533	.6
	tons, dry	382 503	.6
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms	575	.9
	acres	26 964	.4
Land in orchards	farms	275	1.3
	acres	20 779	.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 E. **Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1992 to 1997**

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of $10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate
Farms ..... number	–.3	1.5	–6.4	.9
Land in farms ..... acres	2.7	.7	–2.8	.5
Average size of farm ..... acres	3.2	1.7	4.0	1.1
Estimated market value of land and buildings[1]:				
Average per farm ..... dollars	29.1	2.9	30.7	3.1
Average per acre ..... dollars	30.3	3.1	29.7	3.4
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment[1]:				
Average per farm ..... dollars	35.1	2.6	32.3	2.5
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	–6.0	2.7	–6.1	2.7
10 to 49 acres	3.9	2.4	–3.3	2.0
50 to 179 acres	–1.2	.9	–6.0	1.0
180 to 499 acres	–2.4	.9	–7.0	.9
500 to 999 acres	–3.0	1.1	–10.5	.9
1,000 to 1,999 acres	–.6	.7	–7.2	.5
2,000 acres or more	10.8	–	7.0	–
Total cropland ..... farms	–2.9	1.4	–6.9	.9
acres	–4.9	.6	–5.7	.4
Harvested cropland ..... farms	–8.0	1.3	–7.3	.9
acres	4.0	.5	5.1	.4
Irrigated land ..... farms	2.4	1.6	8.2	1.3
acres	14.3	.6	15.2	.6
Market value of agricultural products sold $1,000	49.0	.3	51.1	.3
Average per farm ..... dollars	49.4	2.3	61.4	1.5
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops $1,000	40.8	.4	41.9	.3
Livestock, poultry, and their products $1,000	58.1	.3	61.6	.2
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than $2,500	11.1	1.9	(X)	(X)
$2,500 to $4,999	–7.7	1.7	(X)	(X)
$5,000 to $9,999	–6.3	1.5	(X)	(X)
$10,000 to $24,999	–6.3	1.3	–6.3	1.3
$25,000 to $49,999	–22.9	1.3	–22.9	1.2
$50,000 to $99,999	–25.0	1.2	–25.0	1.2
$100,000 to $249,999	–15.3	–	–15.3	–
$250,000 to $499,999	3.8	–	3.8	–
$500,000 or more	81.6	–	81.6	–
Total farm production expenses[1] $1,000	37.4	.7	40.7	.7
Average per farm ..... dollars	37.8	2.0	48.9	2.0
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text)[1] ..... farms	–.3	1.4	–5.5	1.2
$1,000	108.3	3.5	92.2	2.4
Average per farm ..... dollars	108.9	4.5	103.4	3.6
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	–10.2	1.0	–10.5	.7
Other	7.5	2.1	2.4	1.5
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	3.1	1.9	–3.4	1.3
200 days or more	1.8	2.0	–2.8	1.5
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory ..... farms	–1.2	1.4	.1	1.0
number	.4	.9	1.4	.8
Beef cows ..... farms	–3.6	1.3	1.4	1.1
number	2.9	1.1	5.9	1.0
Milk cows ..... farms	–27.0	1.5	–30.7	1.0
number	–22.4	.3	–22.7	.2
Cattle and calves sold ..... farms	–.5	1.3	.1	1.0
number	8.2	1.0	8.0	1.0
Hogs and pigs inventory ..... farms	–45.2	1.0	–47.9	.8
number	–7.0	.5	–3.3	.4
Hogs and pigs sold ..... farms	–49.7	1.0	–50.8	.8
number	11.5	.5	14.8	.5
Sheep and lambs inventory ..... farms	–.6	3.6	–	5.2
number	5.5	7.6	–27.2	5.3
Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory (see text) ..... farms	–20.7	2.0	–14.6	2.0
number	–.5	.3	–.4	.3
Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold ..... farms	25.3	1.0	25.6	.7
number	49.5	.1	49.5	.1
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed ..... farms	–18.8	1.1	–14.4	.8
acres	–3.5	.5	–2.2	.4
bushels	3.4	.5	4.3	.4
Wheat for grain ..... farms	–4.4	1.0	–1.5	.9
acres	27.6	.5	29.5	.5
bushels	38.5	.5	40.1	.5
Cotton ..... farms	3.8	1.0	8.5	.9
acres	49.1	.4	49.8	.4
bales	77.7	.4	78.3	.4
Tobacco ..... farms	–35.1	.8	–29.7	.8
acres	8.9	.4	9.9	.4
pounds	19.7	.4	20.5	.4
Soybeans for beans ..... farms	–24.2	.9	–18.1	.8
acres	–4.7	.4	–2.4	.4
bushels	.3	.4	2.5	.3
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text) ..... farms	8.0	1.5	6.6	1.1
acres	17.5	1.3	17.5	1.1
tons, dry	23.0	1.3	20.0	1.2
Land in orchards ..... farms	–23.5	1.6	–12.4	1.7
acres	–41.1	.4	–40.5	.3

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

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

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm[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)
South Carolina	**20 189**	**.4**	**4 593 452**	**.3**	**228**	**.5**	**324 834**	**1.3**	**902 193**	**.9**
Abbeville	471	.3	81 245	1.1	172	1.1	213 178	10.7	10 597	9.4
Aiken	729	.4	134 069	1.0	184	1.0	254 333	5.4	28 658	5.9
Allendale	131	.4	91 891	.8	701	.9	777 554	4.3	8 213	3.1
Anderson	1 271	.4	165 896	1.0	131	1.1	308 300	5.5	35 657	6.6
Bamberg	254	.5	100 925	1.4	397	1.5	351 614	4.1	12 449	4.4
Barnwell	325	.5	97 084	1.4	299	1.4	323 105	8.4	10 367	4.5
Beaufort	99	.7	39 147	2.5	395	2.6	674 178	6.0	3 954	5.2
Berkeley	292	.5	51 426	2.3	176	2.4	276 673	9.5	10 107	8.9
Calhoun	293	.3	102 296	.7	349	.8	369 298	8.7	20 957	3.3
Charleston	266	.5	44 082	2.8	166	2.8	436 733	6.3	12 339	7.1
Cherokee	412	.3	64 770	1.4	157	1.4	205 817	6.2	8 073	9.8
Chester	340	.3	80 691	1.4	237	1.5	319 049	9.3	11 504	9.4
Chesterfield	537	.3	124 282	1.2	231	1.2	244 855	7.7	19 366	6.5
Clarendon	304	.4	142 216	.5	468	.6	394 841	2.3	28 343	2.3
Colleton	416	.4	154 829	1.0	372	1.1	395 961	5.6	17 220	6.4
Darlington	346	.5	158 132	.7	457	.9	396 552	4.1	35 100	2.7
Dillon	199	.3	91 088	.8	458	.9	487 012	2.5	28 474	2.0
Dorchester	314	.4	65 333	1.5	208	1.6	207 591	6.4	12 871	2.7
Edgefield	271	.4	71 425	1.5	264	1.5	304 330	6.7	9 653	5.9
Fairfield	172	.4	46 609	2.6	271	2.6	286 154	6.4	4 804	6.9
Florence	615	.5	168 600	.5	274	.7	337 227	3.4	41 284	2.9
Georgetown	206	.6	53 168	2.3	258	2.3	561 893	8.4	9 970	12.9
Greenville	761	.3	70 382	1.3	92	1.3	299 156	6.9	22 575	7.6
Greenwood	377	.4	68 065	1.5	181	1.5	253 330	10.5	8 742	7.4
Hampton	207	.5	117 387	.8	567	1.0	572 086	4.9	15 089	7.9
Horry	896	.5	183 590	.7	205	.8	383 908	5.1	64 208	4.0
Jasper	123	.7	68 151	1.9	554	2.0	548 847	10.3	7 253	8.9
Kershaw	324	.4	72 625	1.5	224	1.5	343 019	9.0	12 825	6.2
Lancaster	500	.4	75 181	1.7	150	1.7	228 528	8.2	12 534	9.1
Laurens	686	.2	126 761	.9	185	.9	369 169	9.4	23 119	8.3
Lee	222	.3	119 741	.8	539	.8	506 705	7.0	19 358	5.1
Lexington	799	.3	93 408	1.0	117	1.0	237 546	5.8	30 273	5.8
McCormick	92	.3	20 306	2.9	221	3.0	360 156	4.6	2 939	4.4
Marion	200	.6	80 158	.8	401	1.0	533 514	5.0	19 444	2.8
Marlboro	180	.3	116 548	.7	647	.8	603 263	3.1	23 761	1.1
Newberry	499	.2	94 597	.8	190	.8	259 187	6.3	18 081	5.8
Oconee	611	.2	66 497	1.0	109	1.0	331 103	11.2	19 480	4.8
Orangeburg	965	.5	271 709	.8	282	.9	318 566	5.2	54 058	2.5
Pickens	532	.3	46 862	1.4	88	1.4	263 632	11.4	12 691	5.0
Richland	350	.4	56 579	1.7	162	1.8	341 289	7.7	9 678	9.5
Saluda	556	.3	111 376	1.2	200	1.3	274 288	10.4	23 621	8.3
Spartanburg	1 067	.3	106 937	.9	100	1.0	256 333	7.3	31 691	7.3
Sumter	396	.4	139 411	.6	352	.8	361 960	9.0	25 999	10.4
Union	255	.3	53 142	2.2	208	2.2	157 385	6.8	7 304	12.7
Williamsburg	602	.6	189 415	.9	315	1.0	364 000	9.1	36 741	2.6
York	726	.4	115 420	1.1	159	1.2	327 771	8.1	20 767	6.5

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)
South Carolina	**44 687**	**1.0**	**1 588 173**	**.1**	**78 665**	**.4**	**20 188**	**.4**	**1 233 736**	**.2**
Abbeville	22 499	9.4	8 289	.5	17 599	.6	471	.7	6 912	3.2
Aiken	39 312	6.0	58 754	.1	80 595	.4	729	.6	47 215	.8
Allendale	62 697	3.6	13 824	.3	105 526	.5	131	1.9	13 431	.8
Anderson	28 054	6.6	34 538	.3	27 174	.5	1 271	.6	24 643	2.0
Bamberg	49 014	4.5	20 715	.4	81 554	.7	254	.9	16 098	1.9
Barnwell	31 998	4.6	14 615	.5	44 970	.6	324	1.0	11 052	2.6
Beaufort	39 543	5.5	8 353	.5	84 377	.9	99	1.9	5 584	1.3
Berkeley	34 614	9.0	22 123	.3	75 765	.6	292	.9	15 681	1.5
Calhoun	71 526	3.4	26 322	.2	89 837	.4	293	.7	19 332	1.3
Charleston	46 213	7.2	26 859	.3	100 974	.6	267	1.0	14 670	2.0
Cherokee	19 593	9.8	13 193	.3	32 023	.5	412	.8	11 146	3.1
Chester	33 836	9.4	11 675	.4	34 338	.5	340	.8	9 388	2.0
Chesterfield	36 131	6.5	71 856	.1	133 811	.3	536	.6	42 754	1.6
Clarendon	93 541	2.4	76 646	.1	252 123	.4	303	.7	50 896	.7
Colleton	41 393	6.5	15 191	.5	36 516	.7	416	.8	12 776	2.9
Darlington	101 739	2.8	61 257	.2	177 045	.5	345	.7	46 308	1.8
Dillon	143 086	2.2	65 919	.1	331 251	.3	199	.9	49 863	.8
Dorchester	40 991	2.8	21 506	.4	68 490	.5	314	.8	15 061	2.5
Edgefield	35 620	5.9	15 240	.3	56 235	.5	271	.8	12 862	1.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm[1]		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses[1]			
							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)
Fairfield	27 931	7.1	13 504	.3	78 512	.5	172	1.9	13 646	.5
Florence	67 129	3.0	69 106	.2	112 367	.5	615	.6	51 767	1.6
Georgetown	48 399	12.9	14 889	.4	72 277	.7	206	.9	10 715	3.3
Greenville	29 626	7.6	17 512	.4	23 012	.6	762	.6	13 862	3.4
Greenwood	23 189	7.4	12 291	.4	32 603	.5	377	.9	7 731	3.6
Hampton	72 894	8.0	15 774	.3	76 204	.5	207	1.2	13 177	1.9
Horry	71 581	4.0	82 788	.2	92 397	.5	897	.6	59 521	2.0
Jasper	58 492	9.1	4 713	1.0	38 320	1.3	124	1.9	3 454	2.9
Kershaw	39 584	6.3	59 748	.1	184 408	.4	324	.8	59 693	.3
Lancaster	25 068	9.1	40 680	.2	81 359	.4	500	.7	42 048	.6
Laurens	33 652	8.3	18 565	.3	27 063	.3	687	.6	14 531	4.3
Lee	87 196	5.2	45 383	.1	204 427	.3	222	1.1	34 866	.6
Lexington	37 888	5.8	108 429	.1	135 706	.3	799	.6	88 043	.5
McCormick	31 951	5.2	6 963	.2	75 688	.4	92	2.7	5 239	.5
Marion	96 736	3.0	32 719	.2	163 593	.7	201	1.2	23 206	.9
Marlboro	132 005	1.6	36 469	.2	202 605	.4	180	1.3	25 852	.4
Newberry	36 234	5.8	42 734	.1	85 639	.2	499	.6	37 034	1.2
Oconee	31 882	4.8	44 308	.1	72 517	.3	611	.6	36 032	.8
Orangeburg	56 019	2.6	87 899	.2	91 088	.5	965	.6	67 415	1.2
Pickens	23 855	5.1	5 908	.7	11 105	.7	532	.8	5 529	6.5
Richland	27 729	9.5	10 830	.6	30 943	.8	349	.9	9 107	1.4
Saluda	42 560	8.3	55 937	.1	100 606	.4	555	.6	50 609	.6
Spartanburg	29 701	7.3	23 114	.4	21 663	.5	1 067	.5	20 640	1.6
Sumter	65 819	10.4	60 173	.1	151 951	.4	395	.7	43 115	1.2
Union	28 645	12.7	1 817	1.8	7 125	1.9	255	1.0	1 692	13.3
Williamsburg	61 032	2.7	47 872	.3	79 522	.6	602	.7	34 657	1.3
York	28 604	6.5	41 172	.2	56 710	.4	726	.6	34 885	1.1

Farm production expenses[1]—Con.

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Carolina	**4 480**	**2.7**	**88 949**	**.7**	**9 768**	**1.5**	**410 005**	**.2**	**8 251**	**1.6**	**36 777**	**1.0**
Abbeville	120	19.5	496	9.8	273	10.0	2 618	5.1	119	19.3	138	10.5
Aiken	142	15.7	4 177	1.3	365	8.6	24 650	.2	262	10.7	596	9.1
Allendale	16	23.6	533	4.4	32	12.2	140	2.9	67	6.3	866	1.9
Anderson	359	10.7	2 173	5.1	751	4.7	8 238	2.3	304	11.2	333	4.1
Bamberg	43	17.9	587	26.7	94	13.0	2 203	3.6	158	9.8	837	4.5
Barnwell	32	26.1	85	20.6	120	14.0	777	3.1	186	8.0	529	7.1
Beaufort	10	19.6	113	5.1	37	13.0	(D)	(D)	42	10.0	201	2.5
Berkeley	66	27.1	235	31.4	153	13.5	946	7.9	181	8.3	1 431	2.0
Calhoun	64	21.9	748	6.8	99	17.3	1 265	1.7	150	8.8	812	3.5
Charleston	34	26.3	949	4.3	104	13.4	1 012	3.7	117	10.7	865	3.6
Cherokee	90	22.2	906	11.6	219	10.6	6 632	.8	116	20.4	260	65.6
Chester	89	19.5	640	6.3	251	7.5	4 935	1.1	65	24.0	56	3.5
Chesterfield	146	13.7	4 778	4.8	277	8.1	23 142	.3	149	14.4	267	9.1
Clarendon	72	12.6	2 252	3.0	109	11.4	12 284	1.1	212	5.7	1 816	1.5
Colleton	90	16.7	425	10.0	179	13.0	1 362	3.1	278	7.6	679	5.4
Darlington	38	35.1	1 220	10.3	97	20.8	8 521	3.2	213	9.2	1 484	3.3
Dillon	31	12.2	7 585	.1	50	15.8	11 673	.4	143	6.3	967	7.0
Dorchester	90	21.6	1 710	5.5	164	13.3	4 725	3.8	184	11.9	484	4.2
Edgefield	41	23.4	375	8.3	117	9.2	1 756	3.8	46	14.8	101	7.5
Fairfield	40	13.6	1 165	.9	114	6.0	10 688	.1	38	13.0	24	12.5
Florence	82	24.1	839	6.1	195	14.8	5 102	2.1	504	4.6	2 817	8.5
Georgetown	33	38.9	220	.9	58	21.8	611	4.9	129	6.6	1 056	2.6
Greenville	136	17.7	605	40.5	344	9.1	1 308	9.5	191	12.7	1 697	3.7
Greenwood	107	18.8	726	7.1	279	7.3	2 811	3.4	90	18.1	34	18.9
Hampton	44	25.8	197	6.6	75	16.1	279	6.2	126	8.6	810	2.1
Horry	128	19.7	1 759	6.3	289	10.9	5 083	2.6	634	4.3	2 477	4.1
Jasper	9	30.5	32	37.2	49	13.3	96	16.5	59	10.1	160	8.8
Kershaw	97	12.7	5 269	.6	145	9.8	43 883	.2	116	11.1	173	21.8
Lancaster	156	13.8	3 613	2.9	304	8.5	32 925	.1	77	22.0	349	4.2
Laurens	168	16.8	1 284	21.2	417	6.4	4 555	2.6	178	15.8	102	9.9
Lee	44	18.2	1 740	3.7	77	14.6	10 763	.5	110	7.7	1 008	3.3
Lexington	246	9.7	10 155	.6	411	7.3	47 221	.2	251	9.7	1 190	2.1
McCormick	25	4.9	875	.5	60	3.3	(D)	(D)	17	5.4	17	9.7
Marion	27	28.6	110	13.3	70	13.3	622	3.2	136	6.4	800	2.4
Marlboro	33	16.8	679	2.3	65	9.0	4 748	.2	97	5.8	1 035	.6
Newberry	114	18.1	3 806	.5	304	8.4	19 223	.4	169	14.3	294	5.6
Oconee	177	12.8	4 105	1.1	357	7.5	22 088	.4	141	14.6	264	3.1
Orangeburg	173	13.3	3 357	.7	354	9.9	16 674	1.0	538	5.3	2 401	3.1
Pickens	82	20.9	169	41.8	268	9.3	536	23.5	126	15.4	454	8.9

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	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Livestock and poultry purchased				Feed for livestock and poultry				Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Richland	71	19.1	928	2.2	172	10.0	3 043	1.4	167	10.4	366	5.2
Saluda	245	9.9	4 480	2.0	390	5.6	24 097	.4	150	14.2	314	3.8
Spartanburg	225	13.6	1 163	14.1	558	6.4	3 694	2.1	222	12.0	1 015	1.9
Sumter	117	14.8	8 247	.6	131	18.8	8 834	.6	282	6.7	1 486	3.7
Union	62	19.9	266	34.7	156	8.7	226	20.8	53	20.4	27	22.1
Williamsburg	93	21.6	774	5.7	194	12.2	3 026	3.0	435	4.6	1 526	2.9
York	173	15.4	2 397	2.5	441	6.3	18 189	1.0	223	12.3	2 157	2.1

Geographic area	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Commercial fertilizer				Agricultural chemicals				Petroleum products			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Carolina	**13 351**	**1.1**	**92 169**	**.8**	**8 402**	**1.6**	**76 319**	**.6**	**18 262**	**.6**	**59 101**	**.6**
Abbeville	306	6.8	602	11.7	114	19.9	71	39.5	396	3.9	277	10.7
Aiken	477	5.9	1 704	8.0	286	9.0	1 041	7.4	672	2.8	1 593	2.9
Allendale	80	5.9	2 665	.8	58	7.4	2 350	.5	110	3.5	785	1.3
Anderson	846	4.5	1 884	6.1	451	7.9	334	10.5	1 141	2.2	1 231	5.0
Bamberg	184	7.8	2 544	5.0	129	10.8	1 820	2.0	222	5.7	902	5.6
Barnwell	212	7.3	1 730	3.8	161	9.0	1 349	3.0	271	4.3	692	2.9
Beaufort	53	6.4	300	1.6	40	8.1	203	6.6	83	3.9	246	2.8
Berkeley	189	8.7	657	8.8	176	10.9	237	14.8	271	3.5	1 220	2.9
Calhoun	181	8.3	2 882	1.9	153	7.4	3 628	.9	259	4.8	995	2.7
Charleston	163	7.9	853	4.8	108	10.7	651	1.2	233	3.6	529	3.9
Cherokee	179	14.6	331	18.8	76	27.1	92	5.3	363	3.9	305	10.6
Chester	246	7.6	405	6.8	69	20.2	170	7.8	303	4.9	311	4.9
Chesterfield	293	6.9	1 343	6.5	154	13.6	861	3.4	408	4.6	1 326	6.0
Clarendon	226	5.1	4 636	1.2	214	4.5	5 206	.8	280	3.4	2 736	1.5
Colleton	279	7.7	1 857	3.7	228	9.0	1 261	4.4	394	3.1	844	7.6
Darlington	276	6.3	5 580	2.0	224	9.0	5 944	2.1	306	4.7	3 302	1.6
Dillon	153	4.6	3 603	3.4	149	3.6	3 950	2.2	173	5.0	2 867	1.5
Dorchester	208	9.9	1 364	5.0	132	16.3	1 155	8.6	283	5.1	745	2.4
Edgefield	170	9.2	760	7.5	97	13.7	811	3.0	228	5.3	527	7.8
Fairfield	98	6.7	162	11.0	37	13.5	33	13.5	148	3.5	164	6.7
Florence	510	4.5	6 339	2.9	496	5.4	5 983	1.5	613	.6	4 753	1.9
Georgetown	136	8.0	792	5.6	117	9.9	438	4.1	198	2.9	799	3.9
Greenville	485	6.0	1 173	10.0	206	11.4	470	7.6	671	2.7	592	5.8
Greenwood	212	10.3	362	19.1	105	18.5	55	56.9	367	2.1	272	9.2
Hampton	144	6.9	2 718	2.6	148	6.4	2 497	2.8	195	2.7	938	3.4
Horry	767	3.3	7 655	4.3	714	3.9	4 769	2.8	861	1.9	6 205	2.9
Jasper	77	8.0	405	8.5	59	10.9	216	5.4	110	3.8	206	4.5
Kershaw	181	7.8	532	7.3	103	12.1	231	7.4	281	4.3	786	6.1
Lancaster	300	7.8	440	12.3	64	19.1	86	25.1	442	4.0	622	5.7
Laurens	425	6.0	976	10.7	101	21.6	453	1.8	631	2.5	508	8.5
Lee	130	7.0	3 048	1.4	110	5.2	4 214	1.0	191	4.9	1 687	1.6
Lexington	518	4.6	2 278	7.7	392	7.5	1 118	2.0	761	1.5	2 311	2.4
McCormick	53	3.5	101	3.7	20	5.5	4	6.7	85	2.7	72	3.6
Marion	162	4.1	2 278	1.9	143	5.6	2 616	1.4	172	4.6	2 301	1.1
Marlboro	118	5.0	3 345	.5	101	5.8	4 503	.5	157	3.1	1 377	.8
Newberry	345	6.7	1 521	7.8	149	15.4	401	7.6	470	2.6	1 011	5.1
Oconee	317	9.3	631	12.7	211	12.9	284	4.5	559	2.2	797	3.8
Orangeburg	606	4.8	7 061	2.1	540	6.2	5 930	2.1	822	2.2	2 924	2.1
Pickens	340	6.9	644	12.2	125	15.6	161	10.8	473	3.6	399	5.8
Richland	248	6.4	730	5.8	159	12.0	345	5.7	312	4.0	447	5.9
Saluda	335	7.3	1 787	7.7	150	13.4	716	1.8	507	2.8	1 432	2.1
Spartanburg	723	4.7	1 816	5.8	262	11.2	1 072	9.4	980	2.1	929	4.8
Sumter	304	7.9	3 484	4.3	260	9.0	3 177	2.3	361	4.4	2 250	3.1
Union	153	8.8	251	17.1	44	24.6	8	21.7	237	3.0	129	15.1
Williamsburg	475	4.3	4 896	2.0	394	5.2	4 687	1.8	582	1.8	2 941	1.4
York	468	5.5	1 043	7.1	173	12.6	716	34.1	680	2.0	817	4.9

Geographic area	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Carolina	**10 136**	**1.5**	**19 540**	**.7**	**5 826**	**2.1**	**129 512**	**.4**	**1 785**	**4.1**	**18 063**	**3.2**
Abbeville	209	12.5	77	14.2	127	18.7	844	4.4	10	54.2	9	.8
Aiken	311	10.2	573	5.9	216	12.0	3 482	.9	73	25.0	675	2.4
Allendale	60	9.1	180	2.1	45	8.8	1 789	.3	12	14.0	296	1.4

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Electricity				Hired farm labor				Contract labor			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Anderson	519	7.6	431	7.1	237	13.0	2 535	2.7	70	25.8	335	17.2
Bamberg	179	7.8	253	2.8	92	15.3	1 690	10.1	42	20.5	498	8.3
Barnwell	206	8.1	233	5.5	102	12.2	1 872	1.9	49	22.6	137	29.8
Beaufort	57	8.9	118	3.1	39	8.0	1 532	.2	19	16.6	903	.6
Berkeley	165	12.1	334	2.4	87	19.7	4 514	2.2	2	–	(D)	(D)
Calhoun	168	9.4	257	2.7	111	13.8	2 339	1.1	17	1.0	212	.2
Charleston	160	7.0	401	14.9	114	9.9	3 109	2.5	56	14.2	1 690	.4
Cherokee	90	22.4	121	15.5	79	26.1	1 373	9.4	12	53.0	27	21.5
Chester	132	12.2	141	4.3	103	13.7	540	2.8	21	36.4	73	36.8
Chesterfield	252	9.8	579	2.1	148	14.0	3 718	2.4	29	29.4	161	10.4
Clarendon	227	5.4	734	1.4	147	8.9	5 104	1.0	72	14.2	1 068	1.6
Colleton	204	9.5	263	4.7	89	20.2	1 693	2.7	28	32.1	180	17.0
Darlington	200	11.0	651	4.7	135	13.5	5 527	1.4	23	.1	218	(L)
Dillon	156	5.7	860	1.7	118	8.5	4 711	.8	27	17.1	308	5.1
Dorchester	163	12.8	275	14.2	102	18.9	1 204	4.5	45	32.0	108	15.8
Edgefield	107	11.9	273	2.4	68	14.2	2 605	2.6	28	23.0	1 956	1.0
Fairfield	62	10.3	69	3.8	39	11.8	286	9.5	7	36.7	6	35.2
Florence	437	5.2	1 011	3.7	275	9.6	7 210	1.4	119	17.3	1 562	35.1
Georgetown	135	8.4	242	5.0	76	15.9	2 555	4.1	24	41.3	45	42.3
Greenville	290	9.9	188	7.8	154	14.2	3 150	2.4	43	29.9	253	36.0
Greenwood	132	16.6	64	7.9	50	23.6	(D)	(D)	24	44.5	126	10.3
Hampton	110	9.9	137	5.3	65	6.0	1 181	2.3	14	26.4	293	.8
Horry	672	4.6	1 501	3.3	428	7.3	7 136	2.1	163	13.2	1 135	3.3
Jasper	50	11.3	89	4.2	38	14.2	990	.9	12	23.0	163	7.9
Kershaw	133	10.2	619	2.1	100	14.1	1 642	.5	22	19.5	47	3.6
Lancaster	201	10.1	206	3.6	92	17.2	460	4.2	28	34.8	59	39.9
Laurens	311	10.0	350	2.7	124	17.8	1 084	6.6	51	29.8	(D)	(D)
Lee	165	6.8	336	2.0	102	9.9	3 219	.7	29	25.0	115	21.6
Lexington	410	6.5	898	3.0	168	11.5	6 103	.8	46	25.7	371	1.5
McCormick	43	3.7	43	1.7	16	5.7	(D)	(D)	3	12.4	3	12.2
Marion	154	6.4	561	1.6	112	7.5	3 843	1.3	40	22.0	519	2.3
Marlboro	101	5.1	203	1.3	72	6.4	2 891	.3	15	15.2	148	4.8
Newberry	251	10.2	504	2.5	92	18.2	2 937	2.1	26	46.0	22	52.8
Oconee	285	9.4	527	4.8	139	13.1	1 166	4.8	38	18.1	89	7.9
Orangeburg	525	5.8	1 206	2.2	300	8.9	8 544	.5	109	20.9	350	19.3
Pickens	198	11.3	67	10.8	87	20.3	733	3.8	16	40.1	192	6.5
Richland	194	10.2	122	6.9	86	14.6	722	2.7	21	41.3	27	37.8
Saluda	319	8.0	1 936	.4	203	10.0	4 464	.6	26	20.0	310	.5
Spartanburg	429	9.4	326	4.7	212	13.3	4 724	1.0	101	22.5	228	23.9
Sumter	258	10.2	558	1.8	166	14.4	3 675	1.2	53	23.0	709	3.9
Union	85	16.4	20	15.6	25	32.1	80	3.8	14	46.8	4	50.3
Williamsburg	346	6.8	689	2.8	247	9.0	4 275	1.1	51	22.9	541	4.2
York	275	10.0	312	6.9	199	10.3	4 325	4.5	55	29.3	161	19.2

Geographic area	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Carolina	**15 498**	**.9**	**70 769**	**.8**	**4 228**	**2.8**	**13 788**	**1.9**	**5 581**	**2.1**	**47 350**	**1.1**
Abbeville	316	7.8	448	12.5	81	23.4	111	27.7	103	20.0	195	23.4
Aiken	583	4.4	1 889	7.4	136	17.3	255	12.4	196	13.0	1 226	9.4
Allendale	97	4.8	895	2.7	35	13.9	364	4.8	35	11.4	675	2.1
Anderson	1 033	3.2	1 824	7.5	231	14.2	234	21.0	195	14.1	1 156	17.6
Bamberg	215	6.1	1 043	3.9	94	12.5	466	20.2	81	11.0	1 040	5.9
Barnwell	230	6.9	1 071	6.2	78	16.5	262	11.9	104	14.1	602	9.2
Beaufort	69	5.8	518	1.3	14	21.5	68	2.9	23	17.0	125	18.1
Berkeley	237	6.3	1 121	3.6	40	34.2	221	8.1	46	26.8	792	2.9
Calhoun	203	8.3	1 427	3.3	46	17.8	479	14.6	86	12.8	895	4.3
Charleston	218	4.7	1 099	3.6	28	26.3	69	7.7	85	14.0	867	6.4
Cherokee	217	10.8	294	9.9	28	40.0	88	22.1	58	26.1	239	21.8
Chester	256	7.2	486	13.2	59	23.8	96	44.9	53	22.9	504	12.2
Chesterfield	364	6.3	1 672	6.0	78	21.3	457	10.2	121	13.5	1 094	5.6
Clarendon	245	5.4	2 933	2.6	137	9.6	880	2.9	141	7.3	2 722	.8
Colleton	311	6.3	1 460	7.0	87	21.6	188	22.9	140	15.6	622	13.0
Darlington	306	5.6	3 804	4.2	99	14.5	682	20.1	143	13.0	2 068	3.5
Dillon	164	5.6	2 703	2.2	74	10.4	642	6.4	108	8.0	1 800	3.4
Dorchester	289	4.2	753	10.0	62	26.7	73	13.2	95	18.7	643	5.2
Edgefield	182	7.1	942	8.6	32	22.2	375	1.3	60	17.5	472	13.7
Fairfield	137	4.5	239	6.7	14	19.6	10	25.3	33	13.1	164	5.6
Florence	542	4.1	4 192	1.6	232	12.4	636	8.5	288	9.5	2 878	5.4
Georgetown	154	8.0	904	7.4	54	20.6	574	1.7	63	19.1	684	6.2
Greenville	492	5.4	1 031	6.2	131	18.6	178	15.3	124	17.0	551	20.4
Greenwood	281	7.3	297	11.7	41	31.6	25	41.4	139	15.2	290	14.5

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Repair and maintenance				Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery and equipment				Interest			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Hampton	162	6.8	967	4.4	62	17.5	517	3.4	90	13.6	717	4.7
Horry	777	3.2	4 901	3.2	405	8.1	1 105	3.5	412	6.8	3 096	3.4
Jasper	105	4.7	327	8.8	21	21.7	51	10.3	27	20.1	144	19.5
Kershaw	282	3.4	860	5.1	71	16.0	67	11.3	88	12.6	1 121	3.0
Lancaster	372	6.3	758	12.2	50	27.3	83	16.2	161	13.1	922	10.2
Laurens	538	4.8	959	8.8	106	19.4	109	22.5	138	17.3	521	23.2
Lee	194	4.4	1 981	4.3	57	11.1	500	1.2	91	8.7	1 298	1.7
Lexington	607	4.6	2 416	4.8	128	15.8	102	12.9	229	9.0	1 405	5.5
McCormick	62	3.2	125	2.5	10	7.7	2	8.4	15	6.1	264	1.6
Marion	157	6.5	1 788	1.8	76	12.4	235	6.0	85	10.9	1 716	3.0
Marlboro	135	3.8	1 695	1.0	41	9.0	252	3.1	80	7.3	941	1.4
Newberry	402	5.5	1 805	5.9	81	23.0	166	16.4	157	15.0	1 074	9.1
Oconee	426	6.0	924	12.6	102	21.7	77	21.2	142	14.2	953	4.2
Orangeburg	699	4.3	5 607	2.6	233	13.0	1 146	7.4	324	9.4	2 711	6.5
Pickens	373	6.5	583	12.8	101	20.8	33	25.9	84	20.6	314	25.3
Richland	292	4.7	563	6.8	40	29.8	46	17.4	75	19.6	502	8.6
Saluda	461	4.4	3 723	2.4	145	15.8	187	10.9	165	10.3	2 078	4.8
Spartanburg	768	4.2	1 575	4.5	162	17.1	193	11.8	142	15.8	785	9.5
Sumter	302	8.5	2 079	3.7	114	21.3	707	9.5	159	17.2	1 670	5.6
Union	184	6.0	146	17.6	36	27.7	17	31.3	45	24.1	169	44.0
Williamsburg	487	4.4	2 741	3.0	143	13.2	623	8.8	175	9.5	1 868	7.1
York	572	4.3	1 205	5.6	133	18.7	138	12.9	177	12.9	776	5.9

Geographic area	Farm production expenses[1]—Con.											
	Cash rent				Property taxes paid				All other farm production expenses			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Value		Farms		Value	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total ($1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Carolina	**4 611**	**2.4**	**41 957**	**1.2**	**19 162**	**.5**	**19 179**	**1.4**	**16 220**	**.8**	**110 258**	**.4**
Abbeville	49	30.4	53	21.8	432	3.6	232	13.8	398	4.4	742	5.1
Aiken	151	13.3	440	5.2	721	.9	555	8.3	604	3.9	4 357	1.1
Allendale	40	11.0	652	1.9	121	2.5	252	3.2	100	4.7	988	1.0
Anderson	141	18.5	143	12.3	1 222	1.5	873	4.3	1 002	3.2	2 918	2.3
Bamberg	86	9.5	621	4.7	243	2.3	351	11.6	193	6.9	1 244	2.2
Barnwell	81	13.7	382	3.1	311	2.1	237	8.2	246	6.2	1 095	7.3
Beaufort	10	30.1	(D)	(D)	99	1.9	291	10.3	85	5.0	745	1.1
Berkeley	50	27.2	(D)	(D)	269	3.8	348	4.1	216	8.5	2 774	4.2
Calhoun	101	14.0	1 183	1.5	273	3.4	366	6.2	229	5.7	1 844	2.9
Charleston	49	15.0	344	1.4	246	2.8	389	19.1	210	4.1	1 844	1.6
Cherokee	49	32.8	65	22.1	395	2.9	173	7.3	334	4.8	241	11.9
Chester	66	24.9	79	8.3	332	2.3	261	14.1	259	6.7	692	4.2
Chesterfield	156	13.2	604	17.1	508	2.5	460	7.9	404	5.7	2 292	2.0
Clarendon	130	10.0	2 637	2.8	276	2.2	501	3.2	284	3.0	5 385	.9
Colleton	134	15.4	733	7.3	386	3.1	376	10.4	304	6.1	832	5.2
Darlington	143	11.9	2 634	2.1	330	2.5	522	3.1	308	5.5	4 151	3.4
Dillon	100	8.7	3 123	1.1	190	2.2	416	2.4	176	3.0	4 654	.7
Dorchester	114	18.1	462	3.6	264	6.4	246	15.6	265	5.4	1 113	3.4
Edgefield	37	21.1	330	3.6	258	2.6	363	25.7	221	5.9	1 214	2.6
Fairfield	35	14.0	43	16.7	164	2.6	154	7.5	136	4.8	439	4.5
Florence	264	8.9	3 688	4.4	546	3.9	701	3.3	526	4.7	4 056	2.2
Georgetown	49	22.1	471	8.6	199	3.2	276	10.2	139	11.8	1 049	6.5
Greenville	61	25.0	149	11.3	733	1.7	502	11.2	627	3.4	2 014	5.2
Greenwood	43	29.4	(D)	(D)	355	2.9	173	12.8	319	4.2	671	6.4
Hampton	76	14.0	771	5.3	196	3.1	342	7.4	172	6.1	813	2.3
Horry	402	7.5	6 667	5.6	821	2.1	1 008	3.3	812	2.2	5 026	3.0
Jasper	21	22.6	131	5.0	118	3.0	200	12.2	78	6.3	242	4.4
Kershaw	45	19.2	193	14.5	301	3.0	367	5.3	253	5.4	3 902	.5
Lancaster	100	17.0	265	7.5	480	2.2	248	7.0	409	5.1	1 013	6.3
Laurens	58	26.1	(D)	(D)	669	1.6	481	9.5	512	4.8	1 869	3.3
Lee	98	9.0	1 952	1.2	203	3.6	322	6.6	201	3.7	2 681	1.6
Lexington	125	14.8	515	1.6	768	1.4	617	7.8	690	3.3	11 344	.5
McCormick	11	7.5	(D)	(D)	90	2.7	67	4.1	79	2.8	797	.7
Marion	70	11.9	2 219	2.7	200	1.2	336	3.9	167	5.2	3 261	.9
Marlboro	72	6.3	1 499	1.2	179	1.3	397	1.2	138	4.1	2 141	.5
Newberry	90	16.5	319	8.8	491	1.4	510	9.0	360	6.7	3 440	1.8
Oconee	136	17.2	414	2.9	592	2.3	509	23.4	482	5.7	3 203	1.9
Orangeburg	260	9.6	1 846	3.7	919	1.9	1 264	6.6	817	2.7	6 395	1.5
Pickens	95	18.9	319	27.7	490	3.0	218	9.9	425	5.3	708	7.7
Richland	53	21.6	146	9.2	336	2.4	309	8.8	283	5.5	811	4.0
Saluda	116	16.7	366	4.8	522	2.7	575	5.7	449	5.1	4 144	1.0
Spartanburg	227	12.6	320	12.1	1 026	1.6	595	6.6	794	4.1	2 205	2.8
Sumter	110	17.6	2 059	6.7	377	2.8	510	9.1	329	5.9	3 669	1.5
Union	27	33.2	35	13.7	250	2.1	139	7.8	179	7.2	172	10.6
Williamsburg	195	9.9	2 316	6.5	547	2.9	763	4.4	460	3.9	2 990	2.0
York	85	22.6	185	21.6	714	1.3	386	10.3	546	4.5	2 077	6.2

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	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)
South Carolina	**20 189**	**.4**	**328 569**	**.8**	**17 514**	**.4**	**2 462 818**	**.3**	**13 426**	**.4**	**1 654 535**	**.2**
Abbeville	471	.7	598	32.0	394	.6	35 986	1.2	257	1.0	9 891	1.7
Aiken	729	.6	8 940	4.3	623	.5	62 028	1.1	482	.8	34 641	1.0
Allendale	131	1.9	–224	41.6	98	1.4	54 509	.5	72	1.9	43 494	.4
Anderson	1 271	.6	8 929	7.4	1 113	.5	90 470	1.1	777	.7	36 943	1.4
Bamberg	254	.9	4 598	5.9	216	.9	53 414	1.1	169	1.3	41 992	.9
Barnwell	324	1.0	3 259	8.1	271	.9	48 030	1.3	204	1.3	32 139	1.3
Beaufort	100	1.9	2 480	2.8	83	1.6	10 652	2.1	62	2.7	5 181	2.3
Berkeley	292	.9	6 477	2.8	264	.8	18 227	2.0	218	1.2	11 930	1.8
Calhoun	293	.7	6 376	3.2	221	.9	61 969	.5	190	1.1	51 472	.4
Charleston	267	1.0	10 721	1.9	229	.9	17 297	1.8	168	1.5	8 036	1.9
Cherokee	412	.8	1 898	10.3	352	.6	30 968	1.3	245	1.1	12 059	1.9
Chester	340	.8	1 451	15.4	292	.6	32 969	1.5	213	1.1	11 190	1.5
Chesterfield	536	.6	28 191	1.7	414	.7	55 270	1.1	297	1.0	32 788	.8
Clarendon	303	.7	25 424	2.0	278	.6	112 085	.3	229	.9	98 663	.3
Colleton	416	.8	1 429	17.5	379	.7	49 646	1.0	300	1.0	30 622	1.0
Darlington	345	.7	15 427	3.4	301	.8	114 733	.4	266	1.0	101 334	.4
Dillon	199	.9	15 865	2.2	187	.5	68 734	.3	166	.8	64 219	.3
Dorchester	314	.8	4 409	7.7	281	.7	37 521	1.0	221	1.1	28 222	1.2
Edgefield	271	.8	2 398	8.0	227	.9	28 044	1.0	170	1.4	16 472	1.2
Fairfield	172	1.9	–146	35.4	140	1.0	15 482	3.5	107	1.6	4 338	2.9
Florence	615	.6	17 804	2.9	579	.6	114 479	.5	525	.7	95 991	.4
Georgetown	206	.9	3 414	10.1	180	1.0	15 250	2.8	157	1.4	8 978	1.8
Greenville	762	.6	3 814	7.7	660	.5	37 789	1.6	438	.9	15 042	2.0
Greenwood	377	.9	4 200	4.7	309	.8	27 774	1.5	203	1.4	9 172	1.8
Hampton	207	1.2	1 680	13.9	186	.9	57 813	.7	144	1.5	47 824	.4
Horry	897	.6	21 671	3.7	860	.5	116 584	.5	778	.6	95 548	.5
Jasper	124	1.9	1 179	11.5	110	1.3	15 740	2.6	78	2.4	5 545	2.1
Kershaw	324	.8	–849	16.4	258	.8	23 574	1.8	171	1.5	11 035	2.0
Lancaster	500	.7	–2 156	11.0	399	.7	30 688	2.1	261	1.2	11 903	3.3
Laurens	687	.6	3 300	11.9	595	.4	62 005	.9	424	.7	21 584	.9
Lee	222	1.1	9 261	1.3	191	.7	89 202	.4	153	1.0	80 941	.3
Lexington	799	.6	18 455	3.0	695	.5	49 269	.8	577	.6	34 864	.9
McCormick	92	2.7	1 724	.6	76	1.3	6 894	4.5	42	3.0	2 184	5.1
Marion	201	1.2	9 047	1.8	186	.9	52 653	.5	161	1.3	42 768	.5
Marlboro	180	1.3	10 296	.5	163	.8	83 670	.4	130	1.3	70 687	.3
Newberry	499	.6	5 424	6.1	441	.4	48 857	.7	334	.7	23 102	1.0
Oconee	611	.6	7 082	4.0	539	.4	31 232	.8	430	.7	13 113	1.0
Orangeburg	965	.6	17 982	3.3	842	.6	163 889	.6	656	.8	129 862	.4
Pickens	532	.8	1 623	36.9	458	.6	24 781	1.4	331	.9	9 379	1.6
Richland	349	.9	1 364	22.1	299	.8	27 755	1.6	242	1.1	16 688	1.6
Saluda	555	.6	5 088	7.1	470	.6	54 298	1.1	350	.9	23 359	1.1
Spartanburg	1 067	.5	2 291	15.9	911	.5	64 287	1.0	659	.7	28 538	1.1
Sumter	395	.7	16 366	3.5	344	.7	94 882	.5	265	1.1	79 603	.4
Union	255	1.0	345	(H)	221	.7	21 804	1.8	136	1.4	5 558	3.5
Williamsburg	602	.7	12 057	3.7	550	.7	93 251	.6	486	.8	72 748	.5
York	726	.6	7 606	10.4	629	.5	56 364	1.1	482	.8	22 893	1.2

Geographic area	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
					Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Farms		Acres		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)
South Carolina	**1 248**	**.7**	**86 477**	**.3**	**9 902**	**.4**	**453 631**	**.4**	**8 671**	**.4**	**229 048**	**.5**
Abbeville	9	7.8	336	4.7	357	.7	16 794	1.4	333	.8	9 874	1.5
Aiken	41	3.8	2 180	1.3	319	1.2	12 426	1.5	283	1.3	6 839	1.8
Allendale	13	4.5	4 963	.5	30	4.3	4 351	1.3	27	4.7	1 905	1.6
Anderson	40	4.2	594	3.6	830	.7	39 254	1.3	729	.8	20 325	1.5
Bamberg	47	3.0	4 488	1.2	71	2.7	8 019	1.8	46	3.7	2 064	3.7
Barnwell	47	3.5	5 529	.6	86	2.7	3 656	3.2	66	3.2	2 111	3.4
Beaufort	27	5.2	1 587	.7	28	5.3	1 273	9.1	21	6.4	299	7.4
Berkeley	18	6.8	510	6.6	111	2.4	2 649	3.8	91	2.8	1 503	3.8
Calhoun	41	2.5	7 245	.4	71	2.6	2 962	2.8	67	2.6	1 867	2.6
Charleston	72	2.5	2 245	.6	65	3.5	2 156	5.5	55	3.9	(D)	(D)
Cherokee	6	8.6	(D)	(D)	270	1.0	13 115	1.6	251	1.1	6 335	2.2
Chester	9	8.0	106	3.1	245	.9	12 681	1.5	223	1.0	6 711	1.5
Chesterfield	10	7.8	649	.9	278	1.1	13 190	2.3	246	1.2	(D)	(D)
Clarendon	22	3.4	2 352	1.7	72	2.6	2 704	3.6	62	2.9	(D)	(D)
Colleton	24	5.4	1 226	1.0	188	1.6	6 786	2.3	157	1.8	4 078	2.2
Darlington	18	5.0	1 379	4.0	74	3.2	4 874	2.2	63	3.5	(D)	(D)
Dillon	4	13.2	(D)	(D)	35	3.4	1 588	9.9	30	3.8	865	9.8
Dorchester	16	6.0	(D)	(D)	121	2.1	6 081	1.8	105	2.3	2 501	2.9
Edgefield	32	3.6	2 640	.7	148	1.5	8 255	1.6	131	1.7	4 146	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	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)
Fairfield	9	7.8	51	11.4	117	1.4	6 327	3.6	111	1.5	(D)	(D)
Florence	35	4.4	1 899	5.3	116	2.4	4 728	4.1	100	2.6	(D)	(D)
Georgetown	12	6.0	501	.2	68	3.4	2 414	6.7	61	3.6	(D)	(D)
Greenville	54	3.1	1 601	1.9	464	.9	13 783	1.7	400	1.0	7 097	1.8
Greenwood	7	8.0	(D)	(D)	290	.9	14 008	1.9	252	1.1	7 721	1.9
Hampton	11	6.6	1 369	2.4	60	3.2	2 872	2.8	47	3.7	(D)	(D)
Horry	36	4.7	1 482	.8	284	1.5	10 455	1.7	241	1.7	6 059	2.2
Jasper	10	7.6	1 420	.5	36	5.0	866	8.6	29	5.7	483	8.2
Kershaw	16	7.2	166	26.4	113	2.0	3 714	3.9	95	2.3	2 443	3.9
Lancaster	12	7.3	228	14.5	339	.9	12 482	1.7	311	1.0	6 887	1.7
Laurens	37	2.9	1 023	2.9	479	.6	26 402	1.1	411	.7	12 745	1.3
Lee	9	6.9	283	.4	39	4.0	2 107	6.2	38	4.1	1 150	5.5
Lexington	88	2.4	6 072	1.1	359	1.0	11 682	1.8	286	1.2	6 115	2.0
McCormick	3	12.4	3	12.4	66	1.7	3 199	3.8	64	1.8	(D)	(D)
Marion	16	6.9	909	1.0	72	3.1	2 999	4.0	68	3.3	(D)	(D)
Marlboro	18	5.9	1 229	5.8	51	3.2	2 899	5.4	48	3.4	1 547	3.0
Newberry	16	3.5	429	3.2	391	.5	25 038	.6	350	.6	9 382	1.0
Oconee	20	4.8	549	1.5	450	.6	18 855	.9	406	.7	10 154	1.1
Orangeburg	96	2.3	14 941	.8	252	1.6	17 603	1.1	195	1.9	4 482	2.5
Pickens	22	4.6	215	3.1	350	.9	10 585	1.4	311	1.0	6 079	1.6
Richland	49	3.8	571	20.2	131	2.0	6 538	1.5	105	2.4	2 734	2.0
Saluda	23	4.4	2 101	1.8	434	.7	27 662	1.3	392	.8	14 831	1.6
Spartanburg	72	2.8	1 127	2.1	589	.8	22 231	1.2	520	.9	10 518	1.6
Sumter	31	4.0	5 053	.9	111	2.4	5 517	1.6	95	2.7	(D)	(D)
Union	6	8.7	(D)	(D)	192	1.0	9 118	2.8	180	1.1	5 476	3.5
Williamsburg	14	4.8	785	1.3	169	2.2	5 499	3.1	150	2.3	3 014	2.9
York	30	3.7	455	1.7	481	.8	21 234	1.3	419	.9	10 440	1.5

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Carolina	**394**	**1.2**	**24 766**	**.2**	**1 226**	**.9**	**304 793**	**.2**	**168**	**2.2**	**3 316**	**5.8**
Abbeville	9	5.8	403	1.5	11	6.8	198	10.6	5	10.4	269	13.4
Aiken	11	7.5	97	1.8	57	3.4	3 211	4.3	11	8.0	245	19.8
Allendale	3	13.3	3	13.3	6	9.7	284	6.5	–	–	–	–
Anderson	26	4.7	1 745	1.1	26	5.4	1 724	.8	14	7.2	173	9.5
Bamberg	17	3.8	1 695	.7	25	5.0	9 647	.7	1	–	(D)	(D)
Barnwell	9	9.7	133	3.0	26	5.3	(D)	(D)	2	13.7	(D)	(D)
Beaufort	–	–	–	–	8	11.5	273	22.3	3	16.8	(D)	(D)
Berkeley	8	11.2	18	14.0	68	3.4	3 269	5.5	2	27.6	(D)	(D)
Calhoun	6	9.8	15	11.4	27	4.2	11 399	.3	1	30.0	(D)	(D)
Charleston	2	19.9	(D)	(D)	15	8.8	210	11.0	4	14.1	47	13.3
Cherokee	6	11.6	23	13.5	6	11.8	64	17.2	4	14.5	(D)	(D)
Chester	10	6.5	707	.4	4	14.1	(D)	(D)	1	36.9	(D)	(D)
Chesterfield	3	16.4	(D)	(D)	14	7.2	296	13.3	7	11.2	144	16.1
Clarendon	2	13.0	(D)	(D)	50	3.1	28 656	.5	–	–	–	–
Colleton	5	13.6	25	14.4	52	3.8	6 679	1.1	8	9.9	75	14.6
Darlington	3	15.9	(D)	(D)	20	7.1	966	2.4	3	16.9	(D)	(D)
Dillon	–	–	–	–	18	2.6	65 670	.1	–	–	–	–
Dorchester	7	8.1	164	1.6	57	3.3	6 532	.7	5	13.8	25	20.2
Edgefield	5	9.3	771	.1	7	9.8	(D)	(D)	1	20.8	(D)	(D)
Fairfield	5	11.7	(D)	(D)	2	23.2	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Florence	2	24.6	(D)	(D)	31	4.7	5 510	.9	1	34.6	(D)	(D)
Georgetown	2	30.3	(D)	(D)	33	5.3	6 110	1.1	3	15.3	62	17.8
Greenville	19	5.1	748	.6	20	6.0	809	2.9	10	8.3	29	10.4
Greenwood	7	9.9	101	3.6	11	8.1	34	11.5	4	15.0	48	18.4
Hampton	2	26.0	(D)	(D)	29	5.2	1 959	3.4	–	–	–	–
Horry	7	12.5	27	19.4	52	3.3	36 904	.4	8	7.9	115	10.3
Jasper	3	22.3	6	25.7	19	7.2	783	13.9	5	14.8	66	18.3
Kershaw	5	15.0	11	18.3	17	6.6	(D)	(D)	3	15.8	(D)	(D)
Lancaster	8	9.5	112	9.5	15	7.4	267	10.1	–	–	–	–
Laurens	21	3.5	1 711	.2	18	5.6	65	7.6	9	8.0	110	9.5
Lee	–	–	–	–	13	6.6	1 760	1.5	–	–	–	–
Lexington	13	7.3	337	1.7	44	3.7	2 823	4.3	5	11.8	134	23.1
McCormick	1	24.9	(D)	(D)	2	22.7	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Marion	1	–	(D)	(D)	21	6.9	7 184	1.8	–	–	–	–
Marlboro	3	20.9	3	20.9	6	12.2	217	14.3	3	18.9	9	22.6
Newberry	30	2.1	5 280	.2	24	3.7	10 685	.7	2	18.2	(D)	(D)
Oconee	12	6.0	405	1.7	12	6.1	1 080	4.8	6	10.6	41	11.9
Orangeburg	33	3.6	4 347	.8	135	2.3	38 097	.6	4	14.9	131	19.9
Pickens	10	8.2	96	3.8	13	7.1	686	4.5	5	11.1	90	25.6

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Richland	4	14.8	25	11.6	24	5.9	607	7.7	5	12.3	27	14.1
Saluda	21	3.1	1 663	.3	15	5.8	1 051	3.6	4	11.6	10	14.9
Spartanburg	18	5.2	1 610	.3	15	6.8	307	14.8	8	11.1	53	15.0
Sumter	6	13.6	(D)	(D)	50	3.8	11 474	.7	2	27.0	(D)	(D)
Union	4	16.3	26	23.9	8	8.4	54	5.9	–	–	–	–
Williamsburg	7	12.8	19	22.3	83	3.4	10 917	.8	1	34.6	(D)	(D)
York	18	5.2	1 027	1.3	17	6.2	(D)	(D)	8	9.3	118	13.5

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.							
	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Carolina	**695**	**1.1**	**5 052 008**	**.2**	**366**	**.4**	**158 678 646**	**(L)**
Abbeville	22	4.9	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Aiken	27	4.9	112 133	8.6	45	–	21 891 685	–
Allendale	1	23.5	(D)	(D)	1	23.5	(D)	(D)
Anderson	38	4.2	165 659	.6	9	4.1	3 221 600	(L)
Bamberg	9	9.0	141	11.2	–	–	–	–
Barnwell	11	8.1	(D)	(D)	1	30.3	(D)	(D)
Beaufort	7	11.6	174	17.5	–	–	–	–
Berkeley	23	6.6	(D)	(D)	2	23.8	(D)	(D)
Calhoun	6	11.4	45	12.7	2	–	(D)	(D)
Charleston	17	8.2	340	15.1	2	17.7	(D)	(D)
Cherokee	6	13.2	214	20.1	–	–	–	–
Chester	16	6.2	80 275	(L)	1	–	(D)	(D)
Chesterfield	5	10.6	(D)	(D)	13	2.0	4 150 605	(L)
Clarendon	11	7.5	(D)	(D)	22	–	14 227 569	–
Colleton	18	6.8	(D)	(D)	1	31.4	(D)	(D)
Darlington	9	10.2	(D)	(D)	9	5.3	3 144 000	.3
Dillon	3	19.1	(D)	(D)	9	–	5 348 000	–
Dorchester	18	5.4	146 847	(L)	7	5.6	2 292 013	(L)
Edgefield	11	7.5	72 614	(L)	3	9.7	(D)	(D)
Fairfield	8	8.7	147	10.4	–	–	–	–
Florence	20	5.4	(D)	(D)	3	–	1 898 000	–
Georgetown	12	10.0	276	8.0	–	–	–	–
Greenville	33	5.0	4 571	20.0	1	25.8	(D)	(D)
Greenwood	16	6.2	209 648	(L)	–	–	–	–
Hampton	4	16.7	89	16.2	–	–	–	–
Horry	24	6.6	577	8.0	3	–	1 350 000	–
Jasper	11	10.2	150	11.6	–	–	–	–
Kershaw	15	7.1	(D)	(D)	4	7.7	2 380 100	(L)
Lancaster	12	8.0	253	11.0	2	15.5	(D)	(D)
Laurens	29	4.4	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Lee	3	15.5	163	21.3	10	–	4 647 735	–
Lexington	34	4.5	282 150	(L)	90	.3	42 133 536	(L)
McCormick	6	10.0	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–
Marion	2	20.7	(D)	(D)	2	19.4	(D)	(D)
Marlboro	7	10.5	109	11.4	8	–	3 721 000	–
Newberry	18	4.4	583 923	(L)	3	–	1 211 904	–
Oconee	14	5.3	365 139	(L)	40	–	17 131 252	–
Orangeburg	21	6.1	122 729	(L)	18	1.7	7 657 025	(L)
Pickens	18	6.9	481	8.7	–	–	–	–
Richland	15	8.2	307	10.8	3	10.7	(D)	(D)
Saluda	14	6.5	451 342	(L)	34	.8	13 443 344	(L)
Spartanburg	33	4.6	584	4.5	1	32.1	(D)	(D)
Sumter	10	10.3	(D)	(D)	14	2.9	5 391 580	(L)
Union	11	7.2	614	10.3	1	30.3	(D)	(D)
Williamsburg	28	6.5	611	12.6	2	–	(D)	(D)
York	19	6.9	320	8.4	–	–	–	–

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	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)
South Carolina	**3 531**	**.5**	**300 934**	**.3**	**28 107 576**	**.2**	**2 138**	**.6**	**306 935**	**.2**	**14 500 101**	**.2**
Abbeville	9	8.4	50	12.2	2 355	16.6	12	6.8	374	7.6	14 529	8.7
Aiken	110	2.3	3 677	2.6	268 718	2.3	63	2.8	4 279	2.1	152 095	2.2
Allendale	37	2.8	11 593	.5	1 057 458	.5	21	3.0	11 186	.5	444 373	.7

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	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)
Anderson	31	4.6	884	7.3	59 631	6.5	62	3.3	4 390	4.6	194 423	4.7
Bamberg	88	2.4	12 012	1.3	1 058 546	1.2	39	3.3	5 556	1.6	236 561	1.0
Barnwell	79	2.5	7 739	1.5	627 466	1.4	42	3.6	4 309	3.2	154 619	2.8
Beaufort	22	5.7	1 440	5.5	126 648	4.7	9	5.5	853	.9	30 660	.7
Berkeley	134	2.1	5 438	2.6	403 390	3.0	18	6.2	1 684	6.6	74 941	5.9
Calhoun	91	1.8	11 954	.8	1 104 805	.9	51	2.2	6 071	1.0	302 405	.8
Charleston	24	5.9	1 120	5.5	93 649	5.0	4	–	205	–	7 610	–
Cherokee	5	12.5	49	3.9	(D)	(D)	4	9.1	375	3.6	17 630	3.6
Chester	8	8.1	281	9.0	18 383	13.8	11	5.6	1 092	3.0	50 290	3.8
Chesterfield	42	3.5	4 247	.8	359 484	.8	38	2.8	5 763	1.7	252 238	2.0
Clarendon	139	1.5	32 668	.5	3 540 255	.4	99	1.8	27 946	.4	1 642 320	.3
Colleton	182	1.7	13 794	1.2	1 264 002	1.1	35	3.9	3 009	2.1	114 606	1.8
Darlington	96	2.1	12 110	.6	1 126 648	.6	147	1.6	31 471	.6	1 536 430	.5
Dillon	44	2.4	3 715	.7	317 772	.9	97	1.4	24 031	.4	1 117 524	.3
Dorchester	114	2.0	9 936	2.0	988 502	1.7	29	3.7	3 278	1.4	152 210	1.3
Edgefield	7	8.4	138	10.1	8 121	10.7	9	6.1	692	4.7	23 200	5.7
Fairfield	6	9.6	53	9.7	3 023	9.0	4	5.2	208	.9	(D)	(D)
Florence	239	1.4	14 766	.8	1 300 727	.7	175	1.6	23 616	.6	1 048 743	.6
Georgetown	94	2.5	2 766	2.3	220 563	2.4	15	5.1	1 041	3.7	48 648	3.3
Greenville	23	5.4	436	7.5	41 304	8.3	22	6.0	1 145	10.5	56 608	10.6
Greenwood	6	10.3	254	3.4	20 010	2.2	5	12.4	317	9.3	14 600	9.2
Hampton	92	2.1	13 784	.7	1 169 794	.6	41	2.7	8 471	1.0	310 091	1.0
Horry	368	1.1	19 979	.6	1 966 600	.5	219	1.4	16 591	.9	747 320	.8
Jasper	42	4.2	1 452	4.8	145 944	3.9	8	11.1	349	8.6	12 252	8.5
Kershaw	26	4.6	1 657	3.3	136 932	2.9	22	5.1	2 011	4.6	86 885	3.4
Lancaster	23	6.0	558	6.4	42 327	7.4	11	8.2	686	5.5	29 095	4.1
Laurens	9	7.2	207	3.0	23 468	1.4	16	5.0	817	5.9	26 470	6.3
Lee	72	1.6	11 257	.2	1 049 687	.1	86	1.5	18 804	.5	1 059 845	.5
Lexington	144	1.9	6 668	1.5	549 544	1.7	61	2.8	3 680	2.8	123 729	2.5
McCormick	2	12.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Marion	50	3.4	3 611	2.9	353 234	2.6	57	2.3	12 586	.5	558 277	.5
Marlboro	25	3.6	2 182	.3	200 927	.3	53	1.6	14 337	.3	753 562	.3
Newberry	31	3.2	1 124	2.2	97 276	2.5	44	2.7	3 817	2.1	154 851	1.6
Oconee	24	4.5	515	3.2	33 405	3.4	15	5.1	1 111	2.6	47 183	2.5
Orangeburg	379	1.2	36 180	.7	3 590 783	.6	175	1.7	21 944	.7	1 045 703	.7
Pickens	19	5.1	352	8.3	16 303	7.6	7	7.1	91	8.6	1 565	9.0
Richland	47	3.8	2 471	2.9	215 770	3.6	34	4.1	4 557	2.1	211 479	2.3
Saluda	33	3.7	1 189	1.3	117 799	1.2	29	3.4	1 774	3.3	72 133	3.3
Spartanburg	25	5.2	507	6.2	38 476	5.5	37	4.0	2 281	4.5	103 652	4.4
Sumter	144	1.7	26 597	.5	2 707 520	.4	113	1.9	20 599	.5	1 009 688	.4
Union	5	14.7	(D)	(D)	895	27.4	3	18.7	170	23.4	(D)	(D)
Williamsburg	326	1.3	19 257	1.0	1 624 615	1.0	74	2.3	7 570	1.5	346 671	1.4
York	15	6.9	238	5.1	13 312	6.4	22	5.1	1 798	5.7	92 870	5.3

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Cotton						Tobacco					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	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)
South Carolina	**894**	**.6**	**285 858**	**.1**	**397 545**	**.1**	**1 275**	**.6**	**54 660**	**.2**	**125 220 334**	**.1**
Abbeville	2	18.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Aiken	18	3.9	4 519	.9	6 640	.7	–	–	–	–	–	–
Allendale	13	3.6	6 146	.5	10 315	.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Anderson	7	8.9	718	4.7	693	3.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
Bamberg	37	3.2	11 699	.9	16 643	.9	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Barnwell	33	3.1	6 718	1.1	8 739	1.0	–	–	–	–	–	–
Beaufort	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Berkeley	9	9.8	817	2.7	901	3.9	13	9.3	167	19.8	274 272	13.1
Calhoun	66	1.8	25 387	.3	37 280	.3	–	–	–	–	–	–
Charleston	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Cherokee	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Chester	7	3.9	1 783	1.5	1 769	1.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Chesterfield	6	6.9	752	3.5	916	4.3	9	3.8	283	2.5	649 875	2.2
Clarendon	41	1.8	12 818	.4	19 620	.4	52	2.0	2 808	.3	6 139 691	.3
Colleton	7	7.3	1 358	1.8	2 062	2.1	5	10.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Darlington	77	1.8	23 471	.4	38 461	.4	97	1.9	4 765	.3	11 319 649	.3
Dillon	22	1.7	13 501	.2	17 992	.2	101	1.4	4 834	.4	10 977 999	.4
Dorchester	20	3.7	7 077	1.1	9 425	1.0	7	6.7	709	.9	1 559 600	.7
Edgefield	15	6.0	3 380	3.9	3 015	3.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Fairfield	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Florence	43	2.7	8 607	.8	11 223	.6	240	1.3	10 437	.4	22 821 848	.4
Georgetown	6	8.6	469	5.6	652	.8	45	3.2	1 017	1.0	2 542 101	1.1
Greenville	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Greenwood	1	37.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Cotton						Tobacco					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bales	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)
Hampton	39	2.3	14 186	.6	20 279	.5	–	–	–	–	–	–
Horry	5	–	1 065	–	1 082	–	386	1.0	14 265	.3	33 707 035	.3
Jasper	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Kershaw	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	1	24.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lancaster	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Laurens	2	8.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lee	63	1.1	25 588	.3	31 462	.2	15	3.9	635	.4	1 297 140	.3
Lexington	18	4.3	3 635	1.2	4 425	.9	–	–	–	–	–	–
McCormick	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Marion	7	–	3 703	–	4 721	–	78	2.0	5 988	.3	13 680 008	.3
Marlboro	57	1.3	32 426	.1	49 435	.1	12	4.8	987	.8	2 202 124	.7
Newberry	2	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Oconee	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Orangeburg	131	1.6	36 355	.5	50 079	.4	2	22.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Pickens	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Richland	1	–	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	–	–	–	–	–	–
Saluda	5	6.2	1 253	.9	1 377	1.1	–	–	–	–	–	–
Spartanburg	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Sumter	32	2.3	9 958	.6	10 964	.7	44	3.0	1 629	.6	3 775 779	.5
Union	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Williamsburg	88	1.9	23 625	.6	32 499	.5	167	1.6	5 682	.4	13 375 039	.3
York	10	2.4	3 546	.3	3 623	.2	–	–	–	–	–	–

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Soybeans for beans						Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Carolina	**3 044**	**.5**	**507 687**	**.2**	**11 554 522**	**.2**	**7 618**	**.4**	**287 002**	**.5**	**592 327**	**.5**
Abbeville	5	11.1	103	12.3	1 268	13.7	225	1.1	8 738	1.8	16 515	2.2
Aiken	82	2.5	7 304	2.2	129 062	2.0	316	1.2	11 879	1.7	30 570	1.7
Allendale	29	3.0	13 911	.6	331 403	.6	15	6.5	1 634	2.4	7 173	1.2
Anderson	49	3.6	2 948	3.8	54 508	3.5	665	.8	25 832	1.5	47 528	1.6
Bamberg	64	2.7	9 767	1.9	244 123	1.3	55	3.0	2 846	3.3	7 465	3.9
Barnwell	63	2.8	7 742	1.9	167 750	1.2	59	3.3	2 069	6.5	5 050	5.5
Beaufort	5	12.9	280	13.1	3 300	8.3	18	6.4	741	6.4	2 145	2.8
Berkeley	52	3.7	2 471	4.1	55 481	4.0	74	3.4	1 618	3.8	3 635	4.7
Calhoun	66	2.3	8 487	1.0	182 256	1.0	64	2.7	2 703	2.4	6 258	2.9
Charleston	6	10.3	684	9.1	17 230	8.5	37	5.1	1 626	6.6	2 734	7.6
Cherokee	7	10.1	552	5.9	8 012	9.1	225	1.2	8 920	2.6	14 024	2.9
Chester	4	9.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	191	1.3	6 823	1.7	11 752	1.9
Chesterfield	54	2.5	11 829	.9	308 510	.7	213	1.4	10 962	1.6	25 742	2.0
Clarendon	142	1.5	40 509	.4	1 077 039	.3	45	3.1	1 301	4.4	3 995	5.4
Colleton	71	2.7	7 248	1.8	170 215	1.6	120	2.2	3 752	2.9	10 947	3.2
Darlington	174	1.5	49 991	.5	1 003 458	.4	65	3.4	2 451	4.4	6 182	5.1
Dillon	115	1.3	36 542	.4	858 374	.3	35	3.9	1 174	6.6	3 201	9.1
Dorchester	58	2.9	7 065	1.9	139 961	2.5	94	2.5	2 097	3.0	5 957	2.9
Edgefield	11	5.3	1 268	2.0	17 883	1.2	111	2.0	5 373	2.5	10 208	5.4
Fairfield	–	–	–	–	–	–	95	1.8	3 725	3.5	7 320	4.1
Florence	292	1.2	49 139	.6	1 064 468	.5	81	3.0	1 820	3.8	4 975	5.8
Georgetown	38	3.5	2 308	2.6	60 925	2.4	40	4.9	1 267	6.2	3 218	7.9
Greenville	14	7.2	898	8.0	20 093	8.0	335	1.2	10 207	2.2	15 103	2.1
Greenwood	1	34.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	177	1.6	8 304	2.0	12 319	2.3
Hampton	67	2.3	13 943	.8	304 372	.6	34	4.3	952	3.3	2 686	3.0
Horry	475	1.0	45 650	.6	1 158 398	.5	185	2.0	4 823	2.7	12 774	3.1
Jasper	9	11.0	607	6.7	16 312	6.3	17	7.6	1 615	6.0	4 115	3.1
Kershaw	15	5.7	2 652	1.8	78 696	1.4	116	2.0	4 698	2.8	10 014	3.1
Lancaster	6	11.2	750	8.1	13 490	7.3	226	1.3	10 036	3.3	20 739	3.8
Laurens	12	5.4	747	7.9	10 437	8.5	362	.8	18 628	.9	31 160	1.1
Lee	91	1.4	33 943	.3	673 719	.3	37	4.2	1 615	6.0	3 318	5.6
Lexington	99	2.2	7 750	1.9	122 414	2.2	342	1.1	10 565	1.9	23 131	2.1
McCormick	–	–	–	–	–	–	36	3.4	2 199	5.1	3 168	4.8
Marion	99	2.0	22 876	.6	557 814	.6	59	3.5	1 886	3.4	5 106	4.0
Marlboro	81	1.5	27 163	.4	730 658	.3	43	3.5	2 159	4.5	6 896	4.0
Newberry	26	3.8	4 038	1.6	73 503	2.9	290	.8	11 863	1.1	25 650	1.2
Oconee	18	4.4	1 371	3.1	30 191	2.1	358	.8	9 053	1.3	17 783	1.4
Orangeburg	229	1.5	29 606	.8	653 532	.7	222	1.7	9 486	1.8	28 059	1.9
Pickens	14	5.4	334	5.8	6 578	6.6	279	1.1	7 999	1.8	12 889	1.9
Richland	41	4.0	6 996	1.4	122 778	1.6	134	2.0	4 275	4.4	9 830	4.4
Saluda	27	3.9	2 101	5.0	37 837	4.1	305	1.0	13 937	1.5	29 691	1.7
Spartanburg	36	3.7	2 104	3.0	42 532	3.0	488	.9	16 900	1.7	30 720	1.7
Sumter	130	1.8	25 477	.6	588 924	.6	74	3.0	3 838	2.2	9 523	2.6
Union	–	–	–	–	–	–	123	1.6	5 116	3.5	7 277	3.1
Williamsburg	153	1.9	17 064	1.3	388 233	1.3	112	2.7	2 700	3.1	6 100	3.7
York	14	6.4	1 141	4.6	20 296	3.0	421	.9	14 797	1.5	27 682	2.1

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.			
	Land in orchards			
	Farms		Acres	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Carolina	**885**	**1.0**	**24 775**	**.5**
Abbeville	18	5.3	150	5.7
Aiken	40	4.2	1 707	.6
Allendale	1	44.0	(D)	(D)
Anderson	40	4.6	263	5.3
Bamberg	12	8.4	118	11.2
Barnwell	13	6.8	(D)	(D)
Beaufort	4	17.3	44	19.5
Berkeley	3	15.9	9	10.2
Calhoun	23	5.4	191	8.0
Charleston	18	8.1	139	14.4
Cherokee	15	7.3	1 466	1.5
Chester	8	10.6	41	12.3
Chesterfield	10	7.6	699	3.8
Clarendon	5	11.7	74	16.4
Colleton	15	7.9	132	12.2
Darlington	15	8.1	106	11.7
Dillon	7	12.3	64	28.7
Dorchester	13	7.9	103	18.1
Edgefield	31	4.0	3 862	.3
Fairfield	7	10.4	36	8.8
Florence	20	6.4	115	6.2
Georgetown	6	14.4	20	19.1
Greenville	40	4.4	686	2.4
Greenwood	21	6.4	83	9.1
Hampton	5	13.7	(D)	(D)
Horry	17	7.4	155	10.2
Jasper	6	15.0	61	15.4
Kershaw	11	7.7	61	9.3
Lancaster	13	7.5	83	5.8
Laurens	22	4.4	726	.9
Lee	3	15.2	(D)	(D)
Lexington	51	4.1	536	2.2
McCormick	3	17.5	9	19.1
Marion	9	8.0	63	6.2
Marlboro	4	11.1	72	14.9
Newberry	20	4.8	164	8.8
Oconee	49	3.2	1 095	1.7
Orangeburg	46	4.5	707	5.6
Pickens	16	6.4	35	6.9
Richland	29	5.2	184	6.5
Saluda	27	4.0	2 957	1.1
Spartanburg	106	2.3	4 968	1.4
Sumter	22	6.7	109	6.5
Union	8	10.3	18	10.1
Williamsburg	9	10.8	41	11.4
York	24	4.8	409	1.8

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

Table G. **Coverage Estimates: 1997**

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

Item	Census total	Coverage total[1]	Adjusted census		Coverage adjustment (percent)
			Total	Relative standard error (percent)	
Farms ..... number	20 189	5 613	25 802	3.7	21.8
Land in farms ..... acres	4 593 452	350 034	4 943 486	3.2	7.1
Average size of farm ..... acres	228	62	192	(X)	(X)
Farms by size of farm:					
Less than 10 acres	1 224	476	1 700	15.3	28.0
10 to 49 acres	5 712	2 845	8 557	8.2	33.2
50 to 179 acres	7 502	1 720	9 222	5.4	18.7
180 acres or more	5 751	572	6 323	4.1	9.0
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than $2,500	8 155	3 890	12 045	6.4	32.3
$2,500 to $9,999	5 774	1 306	7 080	6.1	18.4
$10,000 or more	6 260	417	6 677	3.5	6.2
Market value of agricultural products sold $1,000	1 588 173	19 899	1 608 072	1.2	1.2
Farms by type of organization:					
Individual or family	18 078	5 542	23 620	3.9	23.5
Partnership, corporation, or other	2 111	71	2 182	6.6	3.3
Farms by tenure of operator:					
Full owners	13 016	4 116	17 132	4.7	24.0
Part owners	5 921	1 214	7 135	5.7	17.0
Tenants	1 252	283	1 535	27.2	18.4
Operators by place of residence:					
On farm operated	14 259	4 304	18 563	3.7	23.2
Not on farm operated	4 219	872	5 091	10.8	17.1
Not reported	1 711	437	2 148	12.0	20.3
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming	7 959	828	8 787	4.4	9.4
Other	12 230	4 785	17 015	4.8	28.1
Operators by sex:					
Male	18 197	4 780	22 977	3.9	20.8
Female	1 992	833	2 825	12.6	29.5
Operators by race:					
White	18 701	5 173	23 874	3.6	21.7
Black and other races	1 488	440	1 928	13.0	22.8
Operators by years on present farm:					
4 years or less	2 191	745	2 936	13.1	25.4
5 years or more	13 896	3 231	17 127	3.3	18.9
Not reported	4 102	1 637	5 739	9.9	28.5

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