
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	9.4	Corn for grain or seed	5.0
Land in farms	4.3	Wheat for grain	3.2
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹	5.3	Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Market value of agricultural products sold	3.9	Cattle and calves	5.2
Harvested cropland	4.7	Hogs and pigs	3.3
		Layers 20 weeks old and older1

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM		SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting:		Number of farms reporting:	
25	5.4	25	39.3
50	3.5	50	27.1
75	2.6	75	21.6
100	2.0	100	18.2
150	1.1	150	14.1
200	1.0	200	11.5
3008	300	8.0
5006	500	3.2
7505	750	2.6
1,0004	1,000	2.3
1,5004	1,500	1.9
2,000	(X)	2,000	(X)

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES¹		
Farms	31 284	.8	Total farm production expenses	31 284	.8
Land in farms	44 354 880	.5	farms	\$1,000..	2 733 387
Average size of farm	1 418	.9	Average per farm	dollars ..	87 373
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD			NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT)¹		
Total sales (see text)	31 284	.8	All farms	number ..	31 284
Average per farm	\$1,000..	.4	farms	\$1,000..	801 485
Farms by value of sales:	dollars ..	.9	Average per farm	dollars ..	25 620
Less than \$1,000 (see text)	farms ..	.8	Farms with net gains ²	number ..	19 917
\$1,000 to \$2,499	\$1,000..	1.5	Average net gain	\$1,000..	961 208
\$2,500 to \$4,999	farms ..	.9	Average net loss	dollars ..	48 261
\$5,000 to \$9,999	\$1,000..	1.0	Farms with net losses	number ..	11 367
\$10,000 to \$19,999	farms ..	.9	Average net loss	\$1,000..	159 723
\$20,000 to \$24,999	\$1,000..	1.1	Government payments and other farm-related income	dollars ..	14 051
\$25,000 to \$39,999	farms ..	1.3	Government payments	farms ..	22 037
\$40,000 to \$49,999	\$1,000..	1.3	Other farm-related income ¹	\$1,000..	180 817
\$50,000 to \$99,999	farms ..	1.4	Customwork and other agricultural services	farms ..	15 647
\$100,000 to \$249,999	\$1,000..	1.4	Gross cash rent or share payments	\$1,000..	84 118
\$250,000 to \$499,999	farms ..	1.3	Forest products, excluding Christmas trees and maple products	farms ..	3 888
\$500,000 or more	\$1,000..	1.3	Other farm-related income sources	\$1,000..	31 390
Sales by commodity or commodity group:			Total	farms ..	4 746
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	farms ..	.9	Total	\$1,000..	37 723
Grains	\$1,000..	.5	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Corn for grain	farms ..	1.0	Total	farms ..	3 745
Wheat	\$1,000..	.6	Total	\$1,000..	129 023
Soybeans	farms ..	.8			
Sorghum for grain	\$1,000..	.3			
Barley	farms ..	1.0			
Oats	\$1,000..	.6			
Other grains	farms ..	1.1			
Cotton and cottonseed	\$1,000..	.9			
Tobacco	farms ..	.8			
Hay, silage, and field seeds	\$1,000..	.9			
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	farms ..	2.5			
Fruits, nuts, and berries	\$1,000..	5.6			
Nursery and greenhouse crops	farms ..	4.2			
Other crops	\$1,000..	2.8			
Livestock, poultry, and their products	farms ..	2.6			
Poultry and poultry products	\$1,000..	1.0			
Dairy products	farms ..	2.9			
Cattle and calves	\$1,000..	.4			
Hogs and pigs	farms ..	.8			
Sheep, lambs, and wool	\$1,000..	.4			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)	farms ..	1.0			
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text)	\$1,000..	.9			
Total	farms ..	1.4			
Total	\$1,000..	3.0			

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE			LIVESTOCK		
1 to 9 acres	farms.. 1 015	1.1	Cattle and calves inventory	farms.. 20 502	.9
10 to 49 acres	acres.. 3 384	1.3	number.. 3 723 271		.6
50 to 69 acres	farms.. 2 596	.7	Beef cows	farms.. 17 428	.9
70 to 99 acres	acres.. 69 183	.7	number.. 1 675 000		.6
100 to 139 acres	farms.. 1 144	1.1	Milk cows	farms.. 1 802	1.1
140 to 179 acres	acres.. 41 901	1.2	number.. 95 882		.7
180 to 219 acres	farms.. 1 144	1.1	Cattle and calves sold	farms.. 20 782	.9
220 to 259 acres	acres.. 93 042	1.1	number.. 2 448 551		.5
260 to 499 acres	farms.. 1 010	1.2	\$1,000.. 1 332 772		.4
500 to 999 acres	acres.. 117 466	1.2	Hogs and pigs inventory	farms.. 2 899	1.0
1,000 to 1,999 acres	farms.. 1 968	1.1	number.. 1 396 326		.4
2,000 acres or more	acres.. 311 049	1.1	Hogs and pigs sold	farms.. 3 067	1.0
			number.. 2 596 164		.4
			\$1,000.. 281 516		.4
			Sheep and lambs of all ages inventory	farms.. 2 354	1.0
			number.. 416 570		.9
			Sheep and lambs sold	farms.. 2 527	1.0
			number.. 406 597		.9
			Horses and ponies inventory	farms.. 6 688	.7
			number.. 51 775		.7
			Horses and ponies sold	farms.. 1 287	1.0
			number.. 7 468		3.8
			POULTRY		
			Layers and pullets 13 weeks old and older inventory		
			(see text)	farms.. 754	1.3
			number.. 2 347 423		.3
			Layers 20 weeks old and older	farms.. 725	1.3
			number.. 2 178 074		.3
			Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	farms.. 92	3.0
			number.. 285 735		.5
			SELECTED CROPS HARVESTED		
			Corn for grain or seed	farms.. 14 342	1.0
			acres.. 3 175 113		.6
			bushels.. 295 056 391		.6
			Corn for silage or green chop	farms.. 4 785	1.0
			acres.. 308 116		.7
			tons, green.. 3 061 677		.6
			Sorghum for grain or seed	farms.. 753	1.0
			acres.. 106 218		.8
			bushels.. 6 475 034		.8
			Wheat for grain	farms.. 9 561	.8
			acres.. 3 177 527		.4
			bushels.. 89 470 811		.4
			Barley for grain	farms.. 966	1.1
			acres.. 104 892		.7
			bushels.. 4 233 108		.7
			Oats for grain	farms.. 3 729	1.0
			acres.. 253 972		.8
			bushels.. 13 726 509		.8
			Sunflower seed	farms.. 2 858	.8
			acres.. 740 707		.4
			pounds.. 1 041 102 232		.4
			Soybeans for beans	farms.. 11 700	1.0
			acres.. 2 939 146		.6
			bushels.. 100 762 163		.6
			Potatoes, excluding sweetpotatoes	farms.. 49	3.3
			acres.. 4 386		.7
			cwt.. 932 485		.4
			Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass		
			silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	farms.. 19 298	.9
			acres.. 3 584 798		.7
			tons, dry.. 6 590 651		.7
			Alfalfa hay	farms.. 16 085	.9
			acres.. 2 070 754		.7
			tons, dry.. 4 459 532		.7
			Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)	farms.. 150	2.4
			acres.. 1 238		5.3
FARMS BY NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM					
Oilseed and grain farming (1111)	farms.. 13 049	.9			
acres.. 16 260 903		.5			
Vegetable and melon farming (1112)	farms.. 54	4.0			
acres.. 17 014		9.6			
Fruit and tree nut farming (1113)	farms.. 13	6.7			
acres.. 887		8.4			
Greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture production (1114)	farms.. 102	2.9			
acres.. 18 372		2.5			
Other crop farming (1119)	farms.. 2 357	1.0			
acres.. 4 012 391		.5			
Beef cattle ranching and farming (112111)	farms.. 10 957	.8			
acres.. 19 948 847		.5			
Cattle feedlots (112112)	farms.. 977	1.0			
acres.. 1 407 023		.6			
Dairy cattle and milk production (11212)	farms.. 932	1.3			
acres.. 621 132		1.1			
Hog and pig farming (1122)	farms.. 868	1.2			
acres.. 511 290		1.0			
Poultry and egg production (1123)	farms.. 89	2.8			
acres.. 48 056		1.9			
Sheep and goat farming (1124)	farms.. 751	1.2			
acres.. 620 593		1.3			
Animal aquaculture and other animal production (1125, 1129)	farms.. 1 135	1.0			
acres.. 888 372		.7			

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

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

Item	All farms		Farms with sales of \$10,000 or more	
	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1992 to 1997	Standard error of estimate
Farms	-8.1	1.6	-10.3	1.6
Land in farms	-1.1	.8	3.1	.9
Average size of farm	7.8	2.0	14.9	2.3
Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹ :				
Average per farm	35.2	3.0	40.5	3.3
Average per acre	27.5	2.3	25.1	2.3
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹ :				
Average per farm	29.3	3.1	29.4	3.2
Farms by size:				
1 to 9 acres	-32.5	1.5	-42.9	1.6
10 to 49 acres	-1.0	1.9	-20.9	2.1
50 to 179 acres	-2.7	1.4	-6.8	1.7
180 to 499 acres	-10.8	1.8	-13.7	1.8
500 to 999 acres	-15.2	1.9	-16.1	1.9
1,000 to 1,999 acres	-7.1	1.6	-7.5	1.6
2,000 acres or more	2.1	.7	2.5	.6
Total cropland	-8.1	1.6	-9.3	1.6
Harvested cropland	-1.2	1.2	-1.0	1.1
farms	-9.8	1.6	-8.9	1.6
acres	4.8	1.1	5.5	1.1
Irrigated land	-14.0	1.3	-15.3	1.3
acres	-7.4	1.0	-7.4	.9
Market value of agricultural products sold				
Average per farm	10.1	.9	10.3	.9
\$1,000	19.8	2.3	22.9	2.4
dollars				
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	54.2	1.6	55.0	1.6
Livestock, poultry, and their products	-11.7	.7	-11.8	.7
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500	19.6	1.9	(X)	(X)
\$2,500 to \$4,999	-3.2	2.0	(X)	(X)
\$5,000 to \$9,999	-18.2	1.7	(X)	(X)
\$10,000 to \$24,999	-17.8	1.6	-17.8	1.6
\$25,000 to \$49,999	-19.0	1.7	-19.0	1.7
\$50,000 to \$99,999	-20.7	1.8	-20.7	1.8
\$100,000 to \$249,999	-1.7	1.3	-1.7	1.3
\$250,000 to \$499,999	33.5	-	33.5	-
\$500,000 or more	48.7	-	48.7	-
Total farm production expenses ¹	6.6	1.2	6.7	1.3
Average per farm	16.1	2.3	18.7	2.4
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				
farms	-8.1	1.6	-10.1	1.6
Average per farm	21.0	2.3	21.4	2.2
\$1,000	31.8	3.3	35.0	3.5
dollars				
Operators by principal occupation:				
Farming	-13.1	1.5	-12.7	1.5
Other	8.4	2.0	4.1	2.3
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	4.1	1.9	2.2	2.1
200 days or more	10.2	2.0	7.8	2.4
Livestock and poultry:				
Cattle and calves inventory	-9.2	1.6	-11.2	1.6
farms	-1.4	1.0	-1.8	1.0
number	-6.3	1.6	-8.0	1.7
Beef cows	4.4	1.2	4.0	1.2
farms	-37.3	1.2	-38.0	1.2
number	-18.4	1.1	-18.4	1.1
Milk cows				
farms	-8.9	1.6	-11.1	1.6
number	-2.1	.8	-2.4	.8
Hogs and pigs inventory	-56.8	.8	-55.9	.8
farms	-29.4	.7	-28.9	.7
number	-57.0	.8	-55.7	.8
Hogs and pigs sold	-29.0	.7	-28.5	.7
farms	-30.5	1.3	-30.0	1.4
number	-37.1	.8	-36.4	.8
Sheep and lambs inventory	-32.1	1.5	-36.7	1.6
farms	9.9	.4	10.4	.4
number	-29.2	3.2	-44.4	3.0
farms	135.6	3.0	139.5	3.1
number				
Selected crops harvested:				
Corn for grain or seed	-12.7	1.6	-11.0	1.6
farms	2.5	1.2	3.0	1.2
acres	20.2	1.4	20.7	1.4
bushels	-23.3	1.4	-22.9	1.4
Corn for silage or green chop	-21.8	.9	-21.6	.9
farms	-8.2	1.1	-8.1	1.1
acres	-20.4	1.4	-18.5	1.4
bushels	-4.9	.8	-4.2	.8
Wheat for grain	-11.5	.7	-11.0	.7
farms	-70.6	.5	-70.4	.5
acres	-71.0	.3	-70.9	.3
bushels	-75.7	.3	-75.7	.3
Barley for grain	-58.8	.8	-58.3	.8
farms	-59.5	.6	-59.3	.6
acres	-63.1	.6	-62.9	.6
bushels	81.9	2.5	81.4	2.5
Sunflower seed	111.8	1.5	111.7	1.5
farms	143.3	1.6	143.4	1.6
acres				
pounds				
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)	-9.8	1.6	-9.9	1.6
farms	6.8	1.3	7.3	1.3
acres	14.9	1.5	15.1	1.4
tons, dry				

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

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

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

Geographic area	Farms		Land in farms		Average size of farm		Average market value of land and buildings per farm ¹		Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment ¹	
	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota .	31 284	.8	44 354 880	.5	1 418	.9	487 039	1.2	2 852 531	1.1
Aurora	421	.9	342 846	1.1	814	1.4	455 022	12.9	28 876	6.7
Beadle	731	.8	707 461	.9	968	1.2	435 969	7.7	70 569	4.6
Bennett	258	.8	797 299	.7	3 090	1.1	696 940	4.1	32 242	17.4
Bon Homme	672	1.3	310 703	1.5	462	2.0	348 498	9.8	62 001	6.8
Brookings	886	.6	407 595	.8	460	1.0	295 311	4.1	66 650	3.4
Brown	1 006	.7	1 069 597	.6	1 063	.9	586 110	3.4	119 556	3.7
Brule	382	.9	460 707	1.1	1 206	1.4	464 025	5.2	29 758	6.2
Buffalo	77	.4	302 077	.5	3 923	.7	904 277	2.4	9 550	1.4
Butte	547	.6	1 165 934	.6	2 132	.9	454 242	3.0	32 882	7.8
Campbell	286	1.0	395 572	1.2	1 383	1.6	394 551	5.8	23 524	7.1
Charles Mix	735	.8	679 852	.7	925	1.1	438 247	6.4	84 341	4.3
Clark	563	.7	514 048	.9	913	1.1	332 852	5.1	50 875	8.8
Clay	397	.9	225 902	1.1	569	1.4	488 365	5.0	48 497	9.7
Codington	619	.9	384 527	1.0	621	1.4	339 500	3.9	52 177	6.0
Corson	425	.8	1 604 504	.5	3 775	.9	657 411	3.6	36 003	8.3
Custer	326	.5	476 498	1.2	1 462	1.3	498 053	11.6	15 044	9.9
Davison	429	.9	274 474	1.1	640	1.4	365 492	4.5	34 084	6.6
Day	693	.8	536 160	.9	774	1.2	334 761	5.2	52 754	5.6
Deuel	564	.9	310 529	1.2	551	1.5	299 642	6.3	42 953	8.8
Dewey	375	.6	1 850 727	.3	4 935	.7	879 726	1.8	28 625	8.7
Douglas	392	.9	246 947	1.1	630	1.4	339 681	3.9	36 487	6.2
Edmunds	449	.7	635 324	.7	1 415	.9	427 011	4.9	49 197	10.5
Fall River	309	.5	978 000	.6	3 165	.8	530 486	2.3	13 402	6.7
Faulk	316	.7	571 356	.8	1 808	1.1	603 194	5.0	47 061	6.1
Grant	534	.9	359 043	1.0	672	1.3	343 835	4.2	50 739	5.6
Gregory	570	.9	565 516	1.1	992	1.4	342 407	8.6	35 855	8.6
Haakon	309	.5	1 325 137	.4	4 288	.6	683 288	2.8	29 390	5.5
Hamlin	413	1.1	278 763	1.1	675	1.6	459 310	5.7	49 591	6.1
Hand	488	1.1	811 273	.9	1 662	1.4	467 995	8.0	53 863	4.1
Hanson	326	.6	231 423	.8	710	1.0	359 008	3.8	35 252	8.1
Harding	275	.9	1 702 146	.5	6 190	1.0	1 064 862	9.5	28 991	7.0
Hughes	287	.8	391 370	1.1	1 364	1.4	523 668	5.4	30 027	5.8
Hutchinson	804	1.2	479 439	1.2	596	1.7	382 097	4.0	85 712	4.8
Hyde	229	.8	532 207	.9	2 324	1.2	590 019	3.5	23 650	7.0
Jackson	295	.7	1 354 471	.5	4 591	.9	876 972	3.6	27 124	9.5
Jerauld	276	.9	346 432	1.1	1 255	1.4	358 691	4.5	25 444	6.0
Jones	203	.6	588 702	.7	2 900	.9	626 304	3.9	17 216	4.8
Kingsbury	580	1.0	480 507	.9	828	1.4	419 215	5.0	57 402	3.9
Lake	500	1.0	307 210	1.1	614	1.5	478 008	3.6	53 537	6.7
Lawrence	270	.6	171 380	2.1	635	2.2	453 506	12.8	10 513	5.5
Lincoln	806	.7	318 707	.8	395	1.1	468 809	3.9	68 516	5.6
Lyman	414	.7	943 644	.7	2 279	1.0	701 048	7.9	31 929	4.5
McCook	544	.7	312 485	.9	574	1.2	378 477	4.2	52 528	8.1
McPherson	397	.7	569 047	.9	1 433	1.1	415 266	9.3	56 193	11.2
Marshall	490	.8	504 858	.9	1 030	1.2	453 846	5.2	54 956	7.4
Meade	829	.8	2 074 294	.7	2 502	1.1	564 354	4.5	45 950	4.8
Mellette	217	.9	654 597	.9	3 017	1.3	590 810	3.9	14 798	8.4
Miner	369	.9	280 289	1.1	760	1.4	398 632	6.2	24 745	4.9
Minnehaha	1 125	.9	406 280	1.1	361	1.4	411 601	3.8	99 151	5.0
Moody	549	1.1	283 783	1.2	517	1.6	506 870	7.7	46 318	6.2
Pennington	637	.6	1 043 959	.9	1 639	1.0	511 641	6.7	31 426	3.4
Perkins	520	.8	1 705 233	.6	3 279	1.0	509 595	4.5	40 120	5.0
Potter	285	.7	530 038	.7	1 860	1.0	669 546	7.2	36 348	6.0
Roberts	803	.8	570 758	.8	711	1.2	377 810	3.4	67 988	4.4
Sanborn	382	1.1	346 524	1.6	907	1.9	313 275	5.2	29 086	7.3
Shannon	175	.1	1 474 029	.2	8 423	.2	2 083 588	1.9	9 656	5.0
Spink	647	.8	849 345	.6	1 313	1.1	582 978	2.8	92 651	3.9
Stanley	194	.7	895 781	.5	4 617	.9	902 163	2.1	21 994	4.3
Sully	261	.8	599 047	.5	2 295	.9	1 015 734	3.6	46 901	5.9
Todd	210	.6	1 084 351	.4	5 164	.7	932 164	6.3	16 505	17.1
Tripp	654	.8	930 351	.8	1 423	1.2	443 669	6.2	51 838	6.3
Turner	832	1.1	352 353	1.1	1 424	1.5	383 434	3.5	88 623	7.6
Union	494	.6	254 028	.6	514	.8	607 801	4.4	48 305	7.1
Walworth	338	.8	437 312	.9	1 294	1.2	347 072	8.2	29 898	7.0
Yankton	636	1.0	261 071	1.2	410	1.6	377 536	10.4	45 391	6.5
Ziebach	259	.8	1 499 058	.4	5 788	.9	911 898	4.1	19 307	7.4
Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
						Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
South Dakota .	91 182	1.4	3 569 951	.4	114 114	.9	31 284	.8	2 733 387	.6
Aurora	68 590	6.8	54 960	.7	130 547	1.1	421	1.1	46 772	3.3
Beadle	96 538	4.7	96 202	.6	131 603	1.0	731	.9	73 173	2.1
Bennett	124 968	17.4	28 772	.8	111 521	1.1	258	1.1	20 423	3.4
Bon Homme	92 263	7.0	65 507	1.1	97 480	1.7	672	1.4	51 165	2.5

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm ¹		Market value of agricultural products sold		Average market value of agricultural products sold per farm		Farm production expenses ¹			
	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total farm production expenses			
							Farms		Value	
							Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Brookings	75 225	3.4	87 628	.6	98 903	.8	886	.7	71 713	1.8
Brown	118 843	3.8	146 001	.4	145 130	.8	1 006	.8	112 544	1.5
Brule	77 902	6.3	45 785	.8	119 856	1.2	382	1.1	36 746	3.3
Buffalo	124 021	2.6	21 647	.4	281 127	.6	77	2.2	16 611	.6
Butte	60 113	7.9	41 119	.7	75 171	.9	547	.9	35 668	2.7
Campbell	82 253	7.2	30 515	.8	106 695	1.3	286	1.3	24 582	3.7
Charles Mix	114 750	4.4	111 347	.5	151 493	.9	735	.9	80 350	1.3
Clark	90 365	8.8	72 689	.5	129 111	.9	563	.9	54 645	2.2
Clay	122 158	9.8	46 140	.9	116 222	1.3	397	1.1	30 561	3.8
Codington	84 157	6.1	64 636	.7	104 421	1.2	620	1.1	49 232	2.5
Corson	84 713	8.4	30 558	.8	71 901	1.1	425	1.2	22 912	3.9
Custer	46 147	9.9	11 404	1.3	34 982	1.4	326	.9	10 498	5.9
Davison	79 450	6.8	39 238	.9	91 464	1.3	429	1.3	27 570	4.1
Day	76 125	5.7	49 180	.8	70 967	1.2	693	1.0	42 412	2.9
Deuel	76 023	8.8	47 430	.9	84 096	1.3	565	1.0	35 374	3.3
Dewey	76 333	8.7	26 356	.7	70 283	1.0	375	.8	18 771	3.7
Douglas	93 080	6.3	54 808	.7	139 817	1.2	392	1.1	42 197	2.4
Edmunds	109 569	10.5	61 619	.4	137 237	.8	449	.8	46 685	3.0
Fall River	43 371	6.7	60 382	.3	195 411	.6	309	.9	51 007	.7
Faulk	148 927	6.1	53 289	.5	168 635	.9	316	1.0	38 894	2.6
Grant	94 839	5.7	77 839	.7	145 766	1.1	535	1.1	51 493	2.4
Gregory	62 903	8.6	43 104	1.0	75 621	1.4	570	1.1	28 729	4.0
Haakon	95 112	5.5	40 786	.5	131 994	.7	309	.8	29 618	3.4
Hamlin	119 784	6.2	48 593	.9	117 660	1.4	414	1.3	40 636	3.1
Hand	110 375	4.3	65 978	.7	135 200	1.3	488	1.2	52 804	2.2
Hanson	108 134	8.2	43 346	.6	132 963	.9	326	1.0	31 544	2.8
Harding	105 424	7.1	27 931	.8	101 567	1.2	275	1.2	23 025	2.2
Hughes	104 623	5.9	36 908	.7	128 599	1.1	287	1.0	32 093	2.1
Hutchinson	106 607	4.9	102 970	.9	128 073	1.5	804	1.3	76 161	2.4
Hyde	103 277	7.1	30 352	.8	132 541	1.1	229	1.2	24 321	2.5
Jackson	91 946	9.5	28 273	.7	95 841	1.0	295	1.0	22 822	2.7
Jerauld	92 187	6.1	37 186	.7	134 731	1.1	276	1.3	28 733	2.2
Jones	84 807	5.1	18 584	.8	91 546	1.0	203	1.5	15 863	2.4
Kingsbury	98 969	4.0	73 110	.8	126 052	1.3	580	1.2	56 312	3.0
Lake	107 288	6.8	67 886	.8	135 773	1.3	499	1.3	53 285	2.8
Lawrence	38 936	5.6	9 487	1.6	35 139	1.7	270	1.1	7 679	4.7
Lincoln	85 113	5.6	100 154	.6	124 261	1.0	805	.9	72 005	1.9
Lyman	77 122	4.6	40 437	.7	97 675	1.0	414	.9	34 160	3.5
McCook	96 560	8.2	63 627	.7	116 961	1.0	544	1.0	43 069	2.7
McPherson	141 545	11.2	56 423	.5	142 123	.8	397	1.0	47 914	2.7
Marshall	111 927	7.5	79 596	.5	162 441	.9	491	1.0	58 417	1.9
Meade	55 429	4.9	52 063	.8	62 803	1.1	829	1.0	38 363	2.5
Mellette	68 193	8.5	17 739	1.0	81 746	1.4	217	1.6	15 149	3.8
Miner	67 059	5.0	40 045	.8	108 524	1.2	369	1.0	30 995	4.3
Minnehaha	88 135	5.1	103 938	.8	92 390	1.3	1 125	1.0	82 011	1.8
Moody	84 522	6.3	67 768	.9	123 439	1.4	548	1.3	50 806	2.4
Pennington	49 334	3.5	39 678	.7	62 288	.9	637	.8	33 432	2.3
Perkins	77 303	5.1	42 287	.7	81 322	1.0	519	1.0	34 457	2.5
Potter	127 535	6.1	44 689	.5	156 802	.9	285	1.1	31 028	3.1
Roberts	84 562	4.5	86 630	.7	107 883	1.0	804	1.0	65 218	2.3
Sanborn	75 943	7.4	41 350	1.0	108 247	1.5	383	1.3	32 558	3.4
Shannon	55 175	5.2	12 690	.7	72 515	.7	175	1.3	10 124	3.1
Spink	143 201	4.1	116 647	.4	180 290	.9	647	1.0	90 149	1.2
Stanley	113 371	4.6	22 941	.7	118 250	1.0	194	1.6	22 254	1.4
Sully	179 696	6.0	52 729	.4	202 026	.8	261	1.2	40 904	2.5
Todd	78 594	17.1	25 130	.7	119 666	.9	210	1.0	19 229	6.2
Tripp	79 264	6.4	65 717	.7	100 485	1.1	654	.9	50 928	2.7
Turner	106 646	7.7	97 247	.8	116 883	1.3	831	1.1	68 566	2.1
Union	97 981	7.2	86 335	.4	174 768	.7	493	.8	63 248	2.3
Walworth	88 456	7.1	31 214	.8	92 349	1.1	338	1.1	23 795	3.5
Yankton	71 482	6.6	60 401	.9	94 970	1.4	635	1.1	40 926	3.0
Ziebach	74 543	7.5	22 926	.9	88 517	1.2	259	1.1	18 060	4.3

Farm production expenses¹—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 Dakota	12 882	1.6	452 194	.8	19 837	1.2	369 705	.9	20 099	1.2	157 342	1.0
Aurora	192	11.6	6 846	7.4	337	5.6	11 720	1.8	295	5.8	2 541	8.3
Beadle	338	8.5	11 551	6.1	485	5.8	11 147	6.1	465	4.3	4 452	4.7
Bennett	100	14.2	3 872	2.6	158	9.3	1 328	6.0	127	12.1	626	17.4
Bon Homme	323	9.0	12 507	4.2	513	4.8	7 449	5.1	544	3.5	3 209	4.3

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.											
	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)
Brookings	277	10.3	11 853	3.5	542	5.3	10 568	4.0	582	3.9	4 807	6.1
Brown	425	8.5	20 142	3.4	632	5.6	9 707	5.5	568	4.5	7 678	2.8
Brule	188	9.6	6 478	7.7	284	7.4	3 373	4.8	288	6.9	2 273	9.0
Buffalo	36	3.2	5 351	.1	54	2.8	2 394	.5	52	2.5	602	.9
Butte	270	9.3	10 061	4.6	390	5.8	6 736	5.5	235	10.0	585	15.4
Campbell	85	16.3	3 655	8.7	185	8.5	3 561	10.9	157	10.6	840	4.4
Charles Mix	380	7.4	15 257	2.8	555	4.7	12 069	3.1	585	3.7	5 178	2.6
Clark	240	12.0	14 560	7.1	350	6.9	8 005	3.4	437	4.7	2 775	6.0
Clay	92	20.6	1 735	15.8	104	19.0	2 182	12.4	371	2.1	3 289	5.7
Codington	227	9.3	7 645	7.9	409	6.1	8 829	4.2	409	5.7	2 760	6.5
Corson	195	10.3	2 575	17.2	231	7.4	2 288	7.4	187	12.1	797	10.0
Custer	164	9.7	1 202	16.0	228	8.3	1 547	11.5	64	24.7	97	21.1
Davison	183	12.8	2 612	14.6	264	8.2	2 959	9.1	291	5.7	2 500	3.7
Day	186	13.3	3 952	10.2	343	8.4	2 392	11.6	462	5.6	2 784	8.3
Deuel	236	11.3	5 735	9.6	357	7.8	4 619	14.9	399	5.8	2 359	7.2
Dewey	128	12.1	2 585	9.7	256	6.5	1 859	7.9	157	11.4	420	8.3
Douglas	180	10.9	4 515	5.3	266	6.8	12 814	5.3	290	5.1	2 552	6.2
Edmunds	148	12.3	8 318	2.3	290	6.1	6 231	4.6	303	6.6	2 145	9.9
Fall River	164	8.8	(D)	(D)	238	5.0	6 697	1.5	123	11.0	211	18.5
Faulk	125	12.5	2 659	6.7	224	6.3	4 765	4.4	232	4.3	2 312	3.6
Grant	196	11.4	11 784	3.3	326	6.9	5 791	7.8	389	4.3	3 166	5.7
Gregory	225	11.1	3 430	16.8	387	7.0	4 661	12.6	400	5.5	1 917	7.9
Haakon	179	8.3	4 469	7.5	231	3.7	3 407	6.0	143	8.3	660	4.7
Hamlin	166	14.7	3 013	6.7	272	9.6	5 830	8.9	300	5.7	3 406	6.8
Hand	232	9.1	7 239	4.9	329	5.1	4 316	4.6	316	6.1	2 591	7.5
Hanson	151	14.0	3 520	10.5	235	9.2	6 547	7.8	221	6.5	2 350	7.0
Harding	143	6.8	2 745	5.0	214	4.9	4 068	3.8	114	9.5	316	4.9
Hughes	93	13.6	2 610	7.6	180	6.9	3 722	4.2	167	6.1	1 863	4.7
Hutchinson	335	9.0	7 296	6.5	481	6.6	15 333	4.6	677	3.8	5 309	4.1
Hyde	143	8.6	3 097	10.1	179	6.0	2 446	6.8	140	8.4	1 034	4.9
Jackson	135	12.6	2 741	8.5	222	6.0	2 528	7.0	113	14.1	654	6.6
Jerauld	128	8.2	6 593	3.5	194	5.2	4 596	3.2	184	6.2	1 361	2.5
Jones	82	8.4	3 269	5.5	124	5.0	1 400	6.0	98	6.6	592	4.5
Kingsbury	187	14.9	7 912	5.4	363	7.5	4 767	19.2	471	2.9	5 050	5.2
Lake	185	12.2	6 916	11.2	280	8.5	7 387	3.7	387	4.5	4 537	3.7
Lawrence	116	13.8	(D)	(D)	182	7.1	1 574	8.9	63	17.3	49	21.8
Lincoln	224	11.7	13 150	2.4	348	8.7	11 524	4.2	643	3.3	5 420	5.0
Lyman	168	11.4	4 162	17.0	236	8.2	2 940	16.4	261	6.3	1 755	8.7
McCook	240	10.1	3 840	11.3	344	7.3	4 937	7.6	399	4.3	3 878	5.0
McPherson	174	11.1	11 867	7.3	217	9.1	12 741	2.6	214	8.9	836	11.1
Marshall	186	11.6	13 263	3.5	288	7.1	7 672	6.2	306	5.8	2 813	4.6
Meade	435	6.6	6 837	8.0	617	4.1	4 597	4.5	261	8.6	507	8.2
Mellette	124	9.2	2 492	11.9	184	5.2	1 543	4.7	121	9.8	424	10.8
Miner	172	13.3	4 463	9.4	258	7.5	3 796	6.8	247	7.8	2 134	5.3
Minnehaha	384	9.4	11 389	4.6	575	6.0	10 068	3.2	808	3.2	6 436	2.8
Moody	218	9.2	8 482	7.5	379	6.0	6 446	6.0	428	3.6	3 826	3.7
Pennington	280	9.3	6 683	4.5	439	5.7	5 675	3.1	148	13.8	749	7.7
Perkins	244	8.9	5 617	5.3	357	5.8	4 427	4.8	217	11.1	890	18.3
Potter	67	16.0	4 524	1.0	141	13.4	2 555	15.5	184	7.5	1 597	7.2
Roberts	265	9.9	7 528	10.7	456	6.9	6 596	5.9	572	3.8	4 281	5.4
Sanborn	168	12.8	7 016	6.5	271	7.6	3 265	3.7	296	6.2	1 740	10.9
Shannon	91	6.5	1 487	13.8	118	5.4	921	5.3	46	9.8	246	5.0
Spink	268	10.2	12 695	4.1	425	5.5	10 558	7.9	496	4.2	6 891	3.6
Stanley	92	6.9	2 235	5.6	122	5.2	2 018	3.5	68	6.1	991	1.5
Sully	89	16.7	3 549	3.4	105	14.3	1 761	3.2	209	6.5	2 719	6.0
Todd	87	14.5	2 567	8.4	142	9.1	1 684	9.2	83	14.5	736	7.7
Tripp	302	8.5	9 020	8.2	421	6.2	8 415	4.3	415	5.2	2 179	8.8
Turner	337	8.7	11 701	4.9	475	6.9	11 377	3.7	715	3.0	5 127	4.6
Union	189	12.8	9 154	3.9	262	9.2	9 300	2.4	413	4.4	3 804	3.8
Walworth	134	14.0	2 489	14.2	228	7.4	3 250	5.3	189	8.4	1 096	6.5
Yankton	203	12.8	5 701	8.5	339	8.6	6 088	10.6	442	4.9	3 111	8.5
Ziebach	163	4.9	3 283	15.9	196	5.6	1 941	4.4	112	11.2	509	12.2

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 Dakota	18 287	1.2	185 850	1.0	19 619	1.2	175 778	1.1	29 541	.9	159 131	.8
Aurora	240	7.7	2 509	16.2	302	7.2	2 477	11.3	395	3.1	2 467	4.9
Beadle	408	5.6	5 059	6.4	470	5.2	3 920	6.5	660	2.5	3 793	4.4
Bennett	115	12.0	1 141	10.9	118	11.5	591	8.3	252	1.9	1 647	5.1
Bon Homme	545	3.7	3 244	5.1	474	4.9	2 707	6.3	649	2.1	2 695	4.8

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	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)
Brookings	543	4.2	4 357	4.9	587	4.5	5 435	5.3	795	1.9	3 431	3.0
Brown	523	4.9	9 565	3.5	535	6.3	8 304	4.5	931	2.5	5 910	3.3
Brule	270	7.5	2 737	7.2	230	9.0	2 106	8.7	364	2.9	2 258	4.3
Buffalo	49	2.5	1 161	.8	44	2.7	704	1.7	73	2.2	723	1.9
Butte	163	11.3	609	15.5	221	9.0	412	12.1	520	2.1	2 130	4.3
Campbell	153	9.9	1 695	7.3	140	12.0	1 128	6.3	279	2.4	1 570	4.8
Charles Mix	596	3.5	6 278	3.0	577	3.8	4 987	3.4	710	2.1	4 504	2.7
Clark	388	5.2	2 958	8.1	435	4.3	3 515	7.8	563	.9	3 108	4.6
Clay	362	3.4	3 776	8.3	317	5.7	3 202	8.8	384	2.3	2 108	5.2
Codington	416	4.9	2 929	7.4	445	5.1	3 673	9.0	591	1.9	2 700	4.7
Corson	149	13.1	1 047	8.4	146	12.1	864	12.1	399	2.8	2 149	6.2
Custer	41	22.4	162	10.6	85	19.7	123	18.2	305	3.5	838	8.5
Davison	299	5.5	2 585	4.8	286	6.4	2 758	4.9	394	3.7	1 423	4.8
Day	433	5.6	4 321	6.6	435	5.4	4 793	6.5	587	2.5	2 969	5.5
Deuel	364	6.1	2 204	8.9	419	5.3	2 840	8.3	548	2.1	2 231	5.2
Dewey	119	15.3	573	6.8	118	14.4	645	17.7	356	2.2	2 049	3.4
Douglas	266	5.3	2 547	6.6	284	6.0	2 121	4.9	363	3.2	2 205	4.9
Edmunds	263	7.3	3 710	4.6	269	7.3	2 631	4.8	425	2.1	2 960	4.1
Fall River	69	15.6	228	17.0	106	10.8	251	15.7	276	3.2	1 056	3.9
Faulk	203	6.4	3 841	4.4	210	6.0	2 664	5.0	288	2.9	2 679	3.0
Grant	375	5.4	3 714	9.7	393	5.1	3 580	7.3	531	1.1	2 573	4.6
Gregory	368	6.6	1 898	10.9	426	5.7	1 662	11.2	542	2.5	1 836	4.4
Haakon	114	11.5	1 994	2.7	133	11.3	1 055	4.0	295	1.6	1 741	5.4
Hamlin	321	6.0	3 573	8.0	314	7.0	3 994	4.9	393	3.4	2 426	5.1
Hand	268	8.0	3 496	5.1	273	8.4	2 620	4.7	477	2.1	3 691	3.1
Hanson	211	6.6	2 514	5.5	238	8.2	2 469	7.1	305	3.3	1 836	3.6
Harding	80	11.3	450	6.3	124	10.4	330	7.7	254	3.3	1 417	3.3
Hughes	147	6.5	3 192	5.8	150	7.5	2 019	5.9	288	3.3	1 871	4.2
Hutchinson	688	3.6	5 397	4.2	643	4.5	6 057	7.3	769	2.3	4 094	3.6
Hyde	118	9.7	1 293	4.2	112	10.6	1 169	3.6	212	3.3	1 826	4.8
Jackson	84	17.2	899	7.2	138	10.2	907	9.1	267	4.0	1 729	5.3
Jerauld	158	7.0	1 366	6.0	182	7.7	1 504	6.2	269	2.3	1 521	4.7
Jones	74	9.1	703	8.5	119	5.4	866	5.4	187	2.6	1 099	4.0
Kingsbury	421	4.2	4 385	5.5	492	3.4	5 913	9.2	569	1.6	3 325	4.4
Lake	379	5.1	4 717	7.7	434	4.2	4 338	5.6	490	2.0	3 198	3.6
Lawrence	45	23.9	65	25.0	99	12.8	160	26.0	269	1.1	655	6.1
Lincoln	636	3.6	5 658	5.3	584	4.7	5 041	7.0	756	1.9	2 859	6.1
Lyman	194	8.7	2 482	5.1	235	7.5	2 122	5.0	347	3.3	2 353	3.9
McCook	380	5.5	3 444	6.5	432	5.1	4 412	6.7	535	1.0	2 577	4.0
McPherson	157	13.7	1 444	13.3	214	9.3	1 443	17.4	366	3.7	3 110	6.9
Marshall	326	6.2	3 538	5.3	327	7.3	3 964	4.9	474	2.4	2 842	2.4
Meade	168	12.6	619	1.7	246	9.8	724	3.1	797	1.7	2 922	3.9
Mellette	61	14.8	464	17.6	51	18.9	235	10.5	208	2.7	1 257	5.0
Miner	227	8.5	2 082	9.0	256	7.7	2 495	7.2	342	3.0	1 694	5.2
Minnehaha	800	3.5	6 164	3.6	905	3.1	6 421	4.9	1 088	1.6	4 283	3.6
Moody	399	4.5	4 299	3.9	452	4.0	4 534	4.0	525	2.5	2 422	3.6
Pennington	148	13.6	940	3.8	214	12.3	705	7.0	585	2.8	2 035	4.2
Perkins	228	10.6	1 321	9.8	193	12.0	722	13.4	463	3.1	2 628	4.2
Potter	161	10.2	3 078	4.5	153	15.4	2 032	7.3	269	3.7	2 001	3.6
Roberts	534	4.3	5 557	4.6	570	4.4	5 757	4.8	778	1.8	4 153	3.2
Sanborn	226	10.1	1 746	12.2	265	7.5	1 860	10.3	362	3.1	1 768	6.4
Shannon	48	6.8	487	10.4	52	10.1	350	4.1	158	2.5	715	3.4
Spink	439	5.1	7 175	4.8	456	4.8	9 012	6.6	622	1.5	5 015	3.7
Stanley	47	9.1	1 286	1.8	76	6.1	1 189	1.2	171	2.9	1 143	2.4
Sully	200	7.3	4 577	4.3	218	5.0	3 858	5.2	261	1.2	2 377	3.7
Todd	79	18.1	937	15.2	72	18.6	571	18.3	197	4.0	1 543	11.6
Tripp	318	8.0	3 342	9.3	336	7.9	1 958	11.9	605	2.2	3 119	5.3
Turner	635	3.5	4 925	5.0	711	3.1	5 774	5.5	786	2.3	3 268	3.7
Union	395	3.9	5 462	5.3	369	5.5	4 464	6.8	487	1.3	3 071	3.9
Walworth	164	10.8	2 753	12.7	159	11.7	1 373	11.6	309	3.7	1 491	6.9
Yankton	402	5.3	2 569	8.8	457	5.8	2 761	7.9	607	2.0	2 481	9.6
Ziebach	87	12.7	604	4.7	93	11.3	503	12.3	239	3.8	1 557	5.8

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 Dakota	25 727	1.0	46 851	1.0	11 987	1.6	109 897	1.2	2 956	3.5	12 328	2.9
Aurora	380	3.9	833	6.0	163	13.1	1 199	9.6	28	42.8	74	73.7
Beadle	615	3.2	1 228	5.0	237	11.3	2 177	15.7	79	20.5	340	12.8
Bennett	212	5.0	330	6.3	140	7.7	1 438	11.6	26	24.7	61	15.6
Bon Homme	578	3.2	1 068	6.4	327	8.9	938	18.8	49	33.7	125	40.8

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	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)
Brookings	693	3.4	1 467	4.0	326	8.3	3 867	4.8	45	30.4	215	10.9
Brown	805	4.1	1 321	4.3	341	9.3	4 371	3.8	76	19.7	462	7.6
Brule	309	5.9	676	7.0	151	13.0	1 894	12.2	48	29.6	335	37.6
Buffalo	66	2.3	279	1.0	41	2.7	572	.8	15	3.7	117	2.6
Butte	423	5.4	578	7.0	199	10.2	1 541	2.9	141	15.4	271	7.5
Campbell	232	6.4	504	7.3	111	9.7	955	15.4	22	30.8	106	45.0
Charles Mix	639	2.6	1 391	3.6	298	8.7	3 260	3.6	46	32.5	218	20.9
Clark	444	5.2	774	6.3	252	10.4	1 758	5.2	23	38.3	75	7.9
Clay	335	3.9	585	8.3	108	18.1	772	7.8	26	50.7	72	38.4
Codington	495	4.8	1 030	4.5	195	13.2	2 285	2.5	18	37.5	162	20.9
Corson	334	4.9	456	6.9	152	14.9	1 006	4.5	35	32.2	68	16.9
Custer	255	6.9	247	12.8	99	17.7	567	15.1	56	27.9	122	41.3
Davison	353	4.5	482	7.3	155	12.5	764	8.7	17	35.3	187	1.9
Day	543	3.5	794	6.3	207	13.1	1 865	20.3	59	29.2	115	38.9
Deuel	431	5.8	725	9.4	156	14.8	1 180	5.4	22	50.6	61	59.0
Dewey	304	4.5	448	5.7	112	14.8	608	6.6	34	24.4	117	28.3
Douglas	340	4.7	990	6.6	146	13.8	1 198	7.6	34	28.7	100	29.3
Edmunds	348	5.4	705	8.5	162	13.6	1 679	5.9	45	25.9	143	28.7
Fall River	270	3.9	444	3.0	108	11.2	1 383	3.5	52	19.8	(D)	(D)
Faulk	246	4.0	626	3.8	95	14.2	1 629	7.5	20	39.3	195	2.5
Grant	451	3.6	738	5.0	187	11.9	2 248	2.9	25	24.3	129	2.6
Gregory	486	4.3	556	7.8	256	10.9	1 001	11.3	55	28.5	125	44.1
Haakon	229	6.3	412	6.7	154	10.6	1 323	3.2	37	19.3	238	.9
Hamlin	367	5.0	748	6.9	162	13.5	1 334	16.5	34	36.8	286	14.1
Hand	437	3.8	1 081	4.1	166	10.6	2 274	4.1	74	21.5	516	11.9
Hanson	273	6.6	548	8.1	148	15.5	550	10.9	40	30.6	139	39.7
Harding	195	5.9	370	6.0	148	8.8	1 455	7.8	81	12.7	257	10.3
Hughes	229	4.5	739	3.9	114	11.0	1 928	4.0	31	26.4	209	27.2
Hutchinson	703	3.4	1 336	3.6	386	8.1	2 686	13.0	61	30.2	140	37.8
Hyde	196	3.8	544	2.9	106	10.9	1 244	3.6	22	20.9	296	6.7
Jackson	225	6.3	403	5.2	113	13.4	1 336	9.6	51	23.4	274	14.8
Jerauld	252	3.3	470	3.6	125	9.0	1 082	4.7	25	31.9	102	20.9
Jones	155	3.4	210	4.1	98	7.5	842	5.4	27	17.3	140	9.0
Kingsbury	436	5.8	756	6.9	264	11.2	2 980	5.7	44	31.5	152	7.7
Lake	445	3.0	929	3.2	185	11.6	1 797	5.2	41	29.3	92	30.1
Lawrence	192	7.8	175	7.8	76	17.3	399	4.6	15	44.4	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	676	3.2	997	7.6	279	8.8	1 434	5.7	59	27.5	231	12.5
Lyman	320	5.1	574	5.6	176	10.1	1 152	8.6	32	31.5	679	5.5
McCook	430	4.8	769	4.7	201	10.7	1 162	13.2	35	33.7	86	18.4
McPherson	294	6.4	868	10.5	154	13.1	1 133	8.1	29	35.9	47	37.9
Marshall	434	3.8	808	4.7	173	13.0	3 029	4.1	65	22.9	219	7.1
Meade	647	4.2	614	3.9	400	7.7	2 509	6.4	83	17.6	264	15.5
Mellette	179	5.3	241	7.2	86	13.2	839	12.4	20	35.5	52	33.6
Miner	330	4.8	594	5.4	111	16.0	1 003	10.1	33	35.8	123	46.6
Minnehaha	905	3.5	1 314	4.1	364	9.3	3 684	5.1	82	24.6	207	28.6
Moody	476	4.5	786	5.4	237	10.4	1 316	11.2	29	40.3	120	23.6
Pennington	541	4.1	614	6.9	179	11.9	2 551	10.0	62	24.4	172	20.5
Perkins	429	4.8	607	5.2	218	10.3	2 164	6.6	89	19.8	159	23.0
Potter	207	9.0	577	8.0	99	17.6	1 099	3.4	25	47.6	214	54.5
Roberts	704	3.1	981	4.8	305	9.9	2 240	9.6	94	21.1	458	9.7
Sanborn	336	4.1	462	7.1	156	14.6	1 099	21.7	37	32.2	52	26.2
Shannon	147	3.4	164	5.0	68	8.6	515	5.5	48	11.9	204	12.9
Spink	534	3.9	1 650	7.3	326	8.8	3 797	7.8	41	17.1	208	2.5
Stanley	144	3.8	358	3.2	78	6.8	979	1.7	33	10.7	174	10.6
Sully	224	5.4	950	3.6	126	10.1	2 356	3.8	47	26.6	435	32.0
Todd	199	3.0	560	25.1	78	12.7	1 366	8.5	29	26.7	105	27.0
Tripp	512	4.1	747	5.8	209	12.1	1 845	4.4	59	22.6	320	22.4
Turner	720	3.3	1 098	4.1	280	9.8	1 992	4.9	32	25.4	144	44.5
Union	435	3.8	1 014	5.1	248	9.4	3 237	2.3	59	24.0	252	13.0
Walworth	235	8.5	418	6.8	107	15.6	1 315	36.6	67	25.4	158	21.0
Yankton	526	4.3	820	7.4	231	10.7	1 532	12.9	56	27.2	143	22.4
Ziebach	222	3.8	274	5.6	129	7.8	1 166	21.9	32	20.9	153	15.1

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 Dakota	27 502	1.0	202 374	1.0	15 150	1.5	83 396	1.5	20 557	1.2	226 685	1.1
Aurora	388	3.3	3 086	5.6	258	8.7	1 149	13.4	283	8.0	3 064	9.9
Beadle	624	2.7	5 433	3.9	382	6.4	2 541	8.2	494	4.3	6 525	4.6
Bennett	236	3.7	1 776	7.3	84	14.8	1 057	16.3	178	8.8	2 112	11.9
Bon Homme	610	2.9	4 322	6.9	304	8.6	739	9.7	435	6.3	4 365	9.4

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.											
	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)
Brookings	718	3.1	5 234	4.7	403	7.6	1 384	8.9	555	5.0	6 043	5.5
Brown	877	2.9	7 431	3.8	454	7.4	4 079	9.8	618	5.1	8 648	3.9
Brule	325	5.6	2 860	5.4	224	9.9	1 551	14.5	271	7.8	2 988	8.2
Buffalo	74	2.2	707	1.2	50	2.6	595	1.5	59	2.5	1 302	1.0
Butte	475	3.6	2 326	6.2	182	11.2	691	12.0	340	5.9	3 219	5.3
Campbell	255	4.5	2 016	5.7	135	13.4	957	9.3	203	8.7	1 852	8.6
Charles Mix	693	2.1	5 679	3.5	410	6.4	1 455	7.2	503	5.6	5 771	6.0
Clark	530	2.9	3 581	6.6	316	7.9	1 480	10.3	368	7.0	3 541	7.1
Clay	374	3.5	2 419	7.7	171	12.7	845	15.0	270	8.1	2 854	8.3
Codington	539	2.9	3 326	6.3	313	9.0	1 035	10.4	380	7.0	3 004	6.5
Corson	326	7.0	2 239	6.4	186	11.8	966	16.0	262	9.4	2 353	10.1
Custer	308	2.8	1 356	17.0	101	18.3	237	32.4	129	13.3	1 112	17.1
Davison	387	4.0	2 168	6.3	198	11.5	651	19.5	224	10.1	2 168	7.4
Day	575	3.8	3 594	4.9	376	7.2	1 527	9.8	469	5.6	3 997	8.6
Deuel	506	3.9	2 668	5.8	282	9.8	936	9.9	356	7.8	3 025	9.4
Dewey	265	6.1	2 037	11.7	125	13.6	560	14.1	207	8.5	1 721	8.2
Douglas	372	3.1	2 217	6.5	203	10.8	875	9.5	261	7.8	3 382	7.4
Edmunds	380	4.2	3 328	6.8	244	7.8	2 066	5.7	294	7.0	3 973	11.0
Fall River	280	3.2	1 282	4.8	83	13.0	429	9.2	188	7.0	1 836	6.0
Faulk	273	3.1	3 085	6.4	218	6.0	1 913	7.3	207	6.7	3 710	8.1
Grant	500	2.3	3 927	5.0	239	9.9	895	10.3	361	6.2	4 130	7.6
Gregory	528	3.0	2 470	5.2	226	11.7	592	18.0	387	7.1	2 294	11.0
Haakon	265	3.7	2 145	6.7	145	11.6	1 504	8.6	198	7.3	3 728	6.3
Hamlin	395	3.1	3 036	8.6	225	10.7	768	7.9	305	6.5	3 956	7.9
Hand	462	2.8	4 907	4.4	242	9.6	2 290	7.8	360	6.1	5 905	5.2
Hanson	290	5.0	2 179	6.7	140	12.9	1 392	7.8	227	9.1	2 464	8.3
Harding	255	3.3	1 986	4.4	189	6.7	693	6.6	212	5.0	2 741	4.4
Hughes	208	6.0	2 734	5.0	169	7.2	2 196	5.0	213	4.9	3 220	4.8
Hutchinson	725	2.5	5 656	4.5	486	7.1	1 886	9.3	608	5.1	6 416	6.2
Hyde	200	4.4	2 340	3.9	121	10.6	1 444	6.7	162	6.7	2 223	4.5
Jackson	236	5.7	1 674	5.7	125	14.3	685	23.5	212	6.6	3 128	5.2
Jerauld	254	3.4	2 025	3.9	156	8.0	802	6.4	193	6.0	1 875	5.2
Jones	180	2.8	1 118	4.1	80	8.7	504	6.6	138	5.0	1 533	4.8
Kingsbury	556	2.4	4 478	5.4	352	7.4	1 233	12.5	420	6.0	4 483	7.8
Lake	462	3.2	3 808	5.0	242	9.9	1 235	6.3	392	5.2	4 837	6.1
Lawrence	227	5.5	803	9.7	79	17.4	92	15.2	123	11.8	629	15.2
Lincoln	699	2.9	3 905	7.0	367	7.3	1 302	10.2	548	5.2	4 749	6.3
Lyman	336	4.1	2 807	4.6	194	9.2	1 888	6.6	295	5.4	3 338	7.0
McCook	463	4.3	3 671	6.0	281	7.7	1 300	14.1	338	7.5	3 828	7.9
McPherson	328	5.2	3 554	8.8	220	8.4	1 295	12.7	270	8.1	3 112	8.0
Marshall	455	2.8	3 907	2.9	279	8.7	1 563	6.2	334	6.6	3 815	5.7
Meade	684	3.3	3 353	3.9	275	8.1	936	8.5	466	6.3	4 499	5.0
Mellette	199	4.1	1 163	6.1	114	11.3	674	16.0	145	8.1	1 401	9.1
Miner	324	4.6	2 582	9.5	237	9.8	653	13.6	255	8.5	2 347	5.4
Minnehaha	1 002	2.5	5 616	4.2	522	7.5	1 608	7.6	717	4.6	7 001	5.1
Moody	500	2.8	3 290	6.0	292	7.3	1 461	13.5	389	6.4	3 964	7.2
Pennington	593	2.7	2 554	6.3	137	14.6	884	12.3	316	8.6	3 023	6.5
Perkins	450	3.8	2 843	5.1	247	9.8	1 063	11.3	369	6.3	3 966	6.4
Potter	247	6.2	2 495	3.8	177	10.1	1 681	5.7	160	12.1	2 134	13.3
Roberts	727	2.8	6 008	9.2	412	7.4	1 760	10.1	513	6.1	4 497	5.5
Sanborn	356	3.0	2 360	6.7	224	10.5	964	20.5	314	4.4	3 571	10.4
Shannon	159	2.6	975	3.5	42	10.0	342	14.2	112	6.2	951	7.4
Spink	542	3.4	6 284	4.2	412	5.6	2 648	8.5	516	4.2	6 838	5.0
Stanley	152	3.6	1 566	2.4	93	6.5	2 161	2.8	118	4.8	1 957	5.2
Sully	226	5.3	3 482	5.9	170	7.6	3 738	5.4	177	7.7	3 801	8.1
Todd	173	7.3	1 570	10.1	74	18.1	622	29.4	143	9.0	1 394	6.4
Tripp	502	3.7	3 835	5.1	272	8.7	1 588	15.9	417	6.3	4 433	7.5
Turner	733	2.9	4 881	5.8	382	8.0	1 355	7.9	467	6.9	4 210	8.8
Union	457	2.8	4 299	4.1	252	8.1	1 331	13.2	358	5.4	4 116	5.5
Walworth	267	6.1	1 619	7.8	159	10.2	1 069	11.2	139	12.3	1 638	12.0
Yankton	570	3.4	2 981	6.1	307	8.6	1 028	17.8	413	6.5	3 637	9.8
Ziebach	225	4.6	1 315	9.7	91	12.6	548	13.6	203	5.9	2 335	8.3

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 Dakota	14 133	1.5	189 113	1.3	27 765	1.0	98 335	1.1	29 867	.9	264 410	.9
Aurora	230	8.4	2 369	10.1	366	4.3	1 303	6.4	413	1.9	5 133	5.0
Beadle	381	6.7	6 427	11.7	630	3.6	2 267	6.6	684	2.0	6 313	4.7
Bennett	72	18.4	885	9.5	238	3.6	957	7.0	234	2.8	2 601	5.7
Bon Homme	282	9.6	2 080	11.5	613	3.1	1 866	7.3	660	1.8	3 850	5.7

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Farm production expenses 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)
Brookings	255	10.0	3 599	8.1	788	2.7	2 611	6.0	813	1.9	6 843	2.8
Brown	521	6.2	11 220	4.2	906	2.4	3 628	6.8	969	1.9	10 079	4.7
Brule	225	9.2	2 385	8.2	308	6.2	1 135	7.8	365	2.8	3 696	4.8
Buffalo	47	2.8	615	3.3	64	2.3	320	1.7	74	2.2	1 168	1.2
Butte	160	13.3	1 139	7.6	508	2.7	1 473	3.8	526	2.5	3 897	5.0
Campbell	141	11.3	2 278	5.5	253	4.7	971	9.2	278	2.4	2 492	7.2
Charles Mix	427	6.6	4 321	7.2	657	3.0	2 518	5.3	695	2.4	7 465	3.7
Clark	277	8.6	3 380	12.0	495	3.8	1 365	7.3	563	.9	3 767	7.4
Clay	151	15.4	2 574	9.6	310	5.8	1 188	7.6	397	1.1	2 960	10.8
Codington	243	10.8	2 755	5.5	545	3.8	1 663	8.5	596	2.0	5 435	4.2
Corson	194	11.2	1 661	10.3	411	2.2	1 456	6.7	382	3.1	2 986	6.8
Custer	71	20.5	616	23.2	294	3.9	1 070	9.6	278	4.5	1 204	8.9
Davison	223	8.7	2 041	6.1	364	4.3	1 105	7.6	416	2.5	3 167	6.4
Day	296	9.7	3 041	11.3	627	2.9	1 987	7.6	656	1.9	4 281	9.0
Deuel	234	11.0	2 607	11.4	498	3.9	1 322	7.8	548	2.1	2 862	4.5
Dewey	149	11.7	1 422	9.1	352	1.5	961	6.9	345	2.9	2 766	6.5
Douglas	227	8.9	1 900	10.9	329	5.2	892	9.2	392	1.1	3 891	6.9
Edmunds	245	8.2	3 516	5.3	432	2.2	1 443	10.1	421	2.1	3 837	4.1
Fall River	79	15.0	488	13.4	267	4.5	1 002	13.1	284	3.1	1 905	5.1
Faulk	191	8.0	3 206	9.4	271	4.4	1 413	7.6	306	2.1	4 198	3.9
Grant	255	8.3	3 758	6.9	470	3.3	1 376	6.2	512	2.0	3 683	4.6
Gregory	238	12.3	1 506	12.6	489	4.5	1 483	8.8	561	1.8	3 298	6.8
Haakon	126	12.3	1 676	20.3	285	3.8	1 515	4.2	302	1.5	3 750	7.0
Hamlin	181	9.9	3 077	10.4	381	3.9	1 619	8.7	405	2.4	3 572	4.7
Hand	272	9.3	4 377	5.4	440	2.9	2 097	8.1	477	2.1	5 404	4.9
Hanson	140	13.7	1 544	11.0	285	5.3	1 007	8.4	297	3.0	2 485	7.1
Harding	164	7.9	1 547	5.0	272	1.2	1 277	7.6	270	2.0	3 375	3.1
Hughes	123	10.9	1 698	10.0	269	2.7	1 180	4.4	276	3.0	2 912	4.5
Hutchinson	386	7.2	4 455	8.1	726	3.3	2 244	6.0	784	2.0	7 854	5.4
Hyde	106	10.9	1 347	5.4	201	4.4	1 285	5.6	215	3.0	2 733	5.8
Jackson	81	16.6	1 145	27.7	238	5.9	1 256	5.5	275	3.1	3 463	5.3
Jerauld	134	8.9	1 928	6.7	259	2.8	775	5.7	266	2.4	2 734	5.1
Jones	74	8.2	1 124	7.7	179	3.0	811	4.9	198	1.9	1 651	5.2
Kingsbury	321	8.5	4 001	6.7	485	4.5	1 485	6.7	567	1.9	5 392	4.6
Lake	263	8.4	3 385	7.5	413	4.9	1 703	6.1	483	2.4	4 407	4.7
Lawrence	54	18.6	330	28.5	237	4.0	521	7.7	251	4.0	1 204	8.9
Lincoln	352	7.3	6 988	8.6	728	2.8	1 928	7.1	744	1.9	6 819	6.4
Lyman	167	9.7	2 656	7.3	346	5.5	1 335	7.4	379	2.4	3 918	5.0
McCook	232	7.7	2 364	6.8	506	2.7	1 704	6.3	503	2.6	5 098	7.1
McPherson	237	8.6	2 121	10.0	352	4.6	1 286	7.8	365	3.7	3 057	6.6
Marshall	259	9.0	5 019	5.1	414	4.9	1 606	8.6	466	2.5	4 359	3.5
Meade	248	10.8	2 658	7.1	765	2.5	2 451	4.2	754	2.2	4 874	4.7
Mellette	122	10.0	1 603	11.7	182	4.2	793	6.8	206	3.4	1 971	6.7
Miner	223	7.5	2 945	7.4	334	4.1	1 060	8.1	361	2.1	3 022	4.1
Minnehaha	506	6.6	8 291	6.0	940	3.3	2 553	6.4	1 076	1.7	6 976	4.1
Moody	259	8.7	4 357	6.7	496	3.5	1 681	5.3	537	2.2	3 820	9.2
Pennington	150	15.1	1 044	13.7	573	3.1	2 091	4.9	605	2.3	3 710	4.9
Perkins	219	9.2	2 317	6.5	458	4.0	1 740	6.2	518	1.0	3 992	6.6
Potter	157	13.7	2 778	8.1	240	7.1	1 371	9.8	285	1.1	2 891	6.7
Roberts	449	6.4	6 570	6.4	730	2.5	2 140	5.8	780	1.9	6 692	3.8
Sanborn	229	9.6	2 232	9.4	350	4.2	1 250	6.2	377	1.8	3 173	5.9
Shannon	65	10.1	444	8.7	155	3.6	647	3.0	169	2.1	1 677	4.0
Spink	389	6.8	7 415	6.3	580	3.2	2 210	7.1	636	1.3	7 753	3.7
Stanley	74	8.3	2 901	1.8	162	3.2	946	2.9	181	2.3	2 350	1.6
Sully	138	10.1	2 074	10.4	246	2.6	1 708	7.4	255	2.5	3 520	2.8
Todd	109	12.9	1 817	12.1	199	3.1	854	8.7	189	5.2	2 904	14.1
Tripp	263	10.4	2 596	10.3	593	2.8	2 235	6.0	613	2.0	5 294	5.5
Turner	372	6.9	4 339	7.5	768	2.4	2 398	4.9	805	2.0	5 976	3.8
Union	208	10.6	5 355	15.0	420	4.3	1 483	6.2	477	2.1	6 907	5.7
Walworth	138	15.0	1 783	11.5	309	4.4	974	9.4	310	4.0	2 369	7.0
Yankton	214	12.7	2 084	13.9	538	4.4	1 385	7.7	602	2.3	4 605	5.8
Ziebach	115	10.7	941	4.9	226	4.7	958	6.8	240	4.0	1 973	11.4
	Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) ¹				Total cropland				Harvested cropland			
	Farms		Value		Farms		Acres		Farms		Acres	
Geographic area	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota	31 284	.8	801 485	1.3	27 712	.9	19 355 256	.6	25 654	.9	14 284 741	.5
Aurora	421	1.1	11 229	12.3	379	1.0	225 770	1.1	351	1.1	165 334	1.0
Beadle	731	.9	23 448	6.7	644	1.0	492 691	.9	593	1.0	343 293	.8
Bennett	258	1.1	6 300	11.1	223	1.1	233 806	1.0	211	1.2	162 151	.8
Bon Homme	672	1.4	14 258	6.7	624	1.4	246 622	1.5	596	1.4	203 186	1.5
Brookings	886	.7	13 659	9.0	775	.7	331 354	.8	694	.8	267 642	.8
Brown	1 006	.8	30 292	5.4	884	.8	817 581	.5	793	.8	633 651	.5
Brule	382	1.1	9 485	14.0	348	1.0	271 790	1.1	328	1.1	196 513	1.0
Buffalo	77	2.2	5 036	.9	64	1.0	85 209	1.1	64	1.0	69 703	.7
Butte	547	.9	7 038	17.4	440	.9	161 503	1.2	409	1.0	100 112	1.1

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	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)
Campbell	286	1.3	5 124	12.7	252	1.2	212 315	1.3	239	1.3	157 992	1.1
Charles Mix	735	.9	29 251	4.5	662	.9	495 998	.7	637	.9	380 389	.7
Clark	563	.9	16 828	13.0	512	.8	359 377	.8	465	.9	258 599	.8
Clay	397	1.1	13 216	14.5	382	.9	207 671	1.1	373	1.0	185 843	1.0
Codington	620	1.1	14 283	6.5	541	1.1	286 424	1.1	506	1.2	225 655	1.0
Corson	425	1.2	7 434	15.6	366	1.0	335 596	1.0	331	1.1	216 897	.8
Custer	326	.9	1 200	62.1	249	1.0	71 179	2.7	215	1.2	41 756	1.6
Davison	429	1.3	11 264	8.8	387	1.0	215 099	1.0	361	1.1	167 786	1.0
Day	693	1.0	6 024	27.8	625	1.0	384 792	.9	546	1.1	276 631	.9
Deuel	565	1.0	12 139	11.5	502	1.0	215 935	1.2	461	1.1	163 237	1.1
Dewey	375	.8	8 238	15.7	302	1.0	240 243	1.1	264	1.1	158 683	.9
Douglas	392	1.1	13 826	9.5	357	1.1	196 898	1.1	337	1.1	148 966	1.1
Edmunds	449	.8	13 941	10.5	407	.8	431 090	.6	352	.9	308 508	.6
Fall River	309	.9	9 113	6.4	243	.9	119 090	1.3	207	1.1	56 483	1.3
Faulk	316	1.0	12 081	7.5	277	1.0	344 244	.8	265	1.0	274 178	.6
Grant	535	1.1	21 283	4.2	489	1.0	271 126	1.0	465	1.0	228 560	.9
Gregory	570	1.1	13 205	9.4	509	1.0	264 182	1.2	487	1.1	193 409	1.1
Haakon	309	.8	8 914	8.9	261	.8	427 689	.5	245	.9	254 739	.4
Hamlin	414	1.3	9 605	17.0	376	1.2	231 682	1.2	351	1.3	186 262	1.2
Hand	488	1.2	8 649	14.2	431	1.2	472 329	.9	406	1.3	352 550	.7
Hanson	326	1.0	10 682	8.8	304	.7	182 904	.8	288	.8	152 412	.8
Harding	275	1.2	5 484	8.2	222	1.3	193 293	1.2	209	1.3	131 696	1.1
Hughes	287	1.0	6 798	9.1	236	1.2	237 173	.8	215	1.4	192 674	.7
Hutchinson	804	1.3	23 364	5.7	741	1.3	403 668	1.2	714	1.3	329 288	1.2
Hyde	229	1.2	7 055	9.0	200	1.2	214 413	1.0	192	1.3	173 706	.7
Jackson	295	1.0	5 593	8.7	257	1.0	267 352	.9	227	1.2	160 561	.7
Jerauld	276	1.3	8 262	6.3	251	1.1	184 403	1.1	232	1.2	130 808	1.1
Jones	203	1.5	2 237	20.8	178	.9	214 260	.9	154	1.1	114 925	.7
Kingsbury	580	1.2	18 047	8.0	515	1.1	385 816	.9	489	1.2	304 028	.9
Lake	499	1.3	14 585	7.5	447	1.2	260 328	1.1	432	1.2	221 681	1.1
Lawrence	270	1.1	1 843	15.5	216	1.1	48 011	2.2	200	1.2	29 942	2.3
Lincoln	805	.9	26 750	5.9	746	.8	291 076	.8	722	.8	273 444	.8
Lyman	414	.9	4 640	27.1	365	.9	417 738	.9	322	1.0	245 651	.7
McCook	544	1.0	22 240	6.1	501	.8	254 309	.9	466	.9	215 585	.9
McPherson	397	1.0	10 058	13.2	371	.8	310 507	.9	327	.9	215 288	.8
Marshall	491	1.0	19 325	5.6	434	.9	324 570	.9	383	1.1	233 240	.8
Meade	829	1.0	11 516	6.3	690	1.0	432 483	1.1	651	1.0	283 485	.8
Mellette	217	1.6	2 699	18.8	182	1.2	161 432	1.4	174	1.3	92 089	1.2
Miner	369	1.0	8 732	10.6	333	1.0	199 170	1.2	294	1.2	149 246	1.0
Minnehaha	1 125	1.0	20 592	5.8	1 016	1.0	351 788	1.1	942	1.1	309 077	1.1
Moody	548	1.3	16 393	7.7	519	1.2	236 564	1.1	488	1.3	202 617	1.1
Pennington	637	.8	4 551	19.8	503	.9	287 674	1.0	458	1.0	171 743	.8
Perkins	519	1.0	7 644	11.0	452	.9	454 014	1.0	410	1.0	258 703	.7
Potter	285	1.1	10 697	9.2	260	.9	351 690	.6	236	1.1	259 644	.6
Roberts	804	1.0	19 611	7.0	734	.9	440 986	.8	684	1.0	361 349	.8
Sanborn	383	1.3	7 578	13.6	349	1.3	219 812	1.6	318	1.4	143 538	1.3
Shannon	175	1.3	2 193	10.7	117	.9	101 749	1.2	102	1.0	61 602	.8
Spink	647	1.0	25 571	7.5	585	.9	685 793	.6	545	1.0	530 747	.5
Stanley	194	1.6	1 067	25.5	158	1.2	243 364	.9	138	1.5	143 689	.7
Sully	261	1.2	12 654	6.4	238	.9	469 545	.5	226	1.0	373 657	.4
Todd	210	1.0	7 985	13.6	185	1.0	173 293	.8	173	1.1	139 497	.7
Tripp	654	.9	14 272	9.5	571	1.0	453 706	.9	515	1.1	313 871	.8
Turner	831	1.1	29 141	4.8	766	1.2	312 124	1.1	734	1.2	281 758	1.1
Union	493	.8	23 602	5.3	469	.6	236 010	.6	444	.7	215 554	.6
Walworth	338	1.1	7 998	15.2	304	1.0	245 813	1.0	270	1.1	174 332	.9
Yankton	635	1.1	18 293	5.8	568	1.2	218 720	1.3	536	1.2	181 186	1.3
Ziebach	259	1.1	5 370	10.0	218	1.1	240 420	1.2	192	1.3	133 720	.9
Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry								
Geographic area	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
					Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota	1 439	.9	343 742	.6	20 502	.9	3 723 271	.6	17 428	.9	1 675 000	.6
Aurora	1	42.1	(D)	(D)	310	1.2	50 383	1.4	281	1.3	23 195	1.5
Beadle	39	4.4	8 327	3.2	529	1.1	98 920	1.1	448	1.2	42 373	1.3
Bennett	18	5.4	5 232	3.2	192	1.4	52 433	1.3	177	1.5	26 083	1.5
Bon Homme	32	4.1	5 650	2.5	506	1.5	56 260	1.3	388	1.7	17 187	1.9
Brookings	71	2.4	13 463	2.2	485	1.0	56 900	1.0	379	1.2	21 189	1.2
Brown	22	3.2	4 948	1.0	560	1.0	102 037	.9	463	1.1	39 583	1.3
Brule	6	—	2 109	—	287	1.3	67 387	1.2	269	1.3	28 468	1.4
Buffalo	7	—	11 385	—	58	1.3	26 527	1.0	57	1.3	(D)	(D)
Butte	261	1.5	42 032	1.9	380	1.1	60 358	.9	318	1.2	28 209	1.2
Campbell	12	7.1	3 810	3.6	198	1.6	39 442	1.4	166	1.8	15 795	1.7
Charles Mix	45	2.9	15 016	2.0	569	1.0	105 282	.9	503	1.1	43 953	1.0
Clark	22	4.7	4 921	5.0	364	1.1	61 882	1.1	310	1.3	23 732	1.4
Clay	29	3.9	7 608	2.3	132	2.0	12 637	2.0	98	2.4	5 119	2.2
Codington	15	7.1	4 193	3.2	390	1.4	49 490	1.2	281	1.7	15 662	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	Irrigated land				Livestock and poultry							
	Farms		Acres		Cattle and calves inventory				Beef cows inventory			
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
					Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Corson	6	9.5	2 939	4.3	306	1.2	68 794	1.0	278	1.3	40 886	1.1
Custer	36	4.3	5 522	4.4	245	1.1	35 093	1.5	217	1.2	22 025	1.6
Davison	8	7.3	1 611	2.1	282	1.4	34 720	1.7	240	1.6	15 685	1.8
Day	8	7.4	1 318	4.0	420	1.3	42 300	1.3	333	1.5	16 446	1.7
Deuel	14	7.0	1 618	8.4	374	1.2	46 726	1.4	282	1.5	15 439	1.8
Dewey	2	—	(D)	(D)	290	1.0	61 015	.9	266	1.1	39 246	.9
Douglas	4	—	1 356	—	279	1.3	33 639	1.5	226	1.6	12 061	2.0
Edmunds	3	17.6	925	6.8	313	1.0	70 572	1.0	295	1.1	30 347	1.3
Fall River	78	2.5	16 420	2.7	252	.9	73 898	.7	230	1.0	27 447	1.1
Faulk	3	14.8	(D)	(D)	218	1.3	61 448	1.0	205	1.3	30 569	1.1
Grant	12	6.2	2 380	3.3	309	1.3	42 399	1.4	209	1.7	11 548	2.5
Gregory	5	6.1	917	8.0	469	1.1	74 867	1.3	411	1.2	35 298	1.5
Haakon	2	—	(D)	(D)	238	1.0	86 855	.6	217	1.1	45 433	.7
Hamlin	15	6.4	5 150	5.6	277	1.5	32 069	1.5	199	1.9	10 605	1.9
Hand	5	14.8	488	21.7	364	1.3	99 223	1.1	328	1.4	45 028	1.2
Hanson	3	—	659	—	230	1.1	25 944	1.2	197	1.2	10 720	1.5
Harding	9	7.8	829	11.6	231	1.2	69 134	.8	228	1.2	41 808	.9
Hughes	30	4.3	11 858	2.6	167	1.7	31 133	2.4	151	1.9	16 294	2.6
Hutchinson	13	5.9	1 756	4.5	569	1.4	68 121	1.3	472	1.5	27 170	1.5
Hyde	4	—	1 213	—	180	1.3	71 138	1.0	167	1.4	(D)	(D)
Jackson	5	6.2	1 350	9.2	239	1.1	67 179	1.0	221	1.2	41 613	1.0
Jerauld	3	13.7	1 013	6.1	226	1.2	56 790	1.1	202	1.4	23 146	1.6
Jones	3	9.5	(D)	(D)	143	1.3	43 803	1.1	133	1.4	22 359	1.2
Kingsbury	14	7.6	1 751	6.8	358	1.4	61 362	1.3	306	1.6	24 553	1.6
Lake	10	8.9	1 867	8.0	288	1.5	31 807	1.6	234	1.8	11 843	2.1
Lawrence	29	4.9	1 977	5.4	178	1.3	20 289	2.2	158	1.6	10 677	2.4
Lincoln	11	6.7	1 465	6.3	339	1.3	35 031	1.1	240	1.6	7 717	1.8
Lyman	11	6.1	8 020	1.8	283	1.1	71 002	1.2	251	1.3	36 953	1.3
McCook	1	24.9	(D)	(D)	330	1.2	38 649	1.3	259	1.4	14 946	1.7
McPherson	8	7.5	1 162	7.9	292	1.0	71 202	1.1	265	1.1	32 142	1.2
Marshall	7	10.9	847	14.9	312	1.2	74 187	1.0	276	1.4	25 940	1.5
Meade	50	3.9	9 985	2.8	643	1.0	129 488	.9	592	1.1	73 143	1.0
Mellette	5	8.2	395	1.8	194	1.1	53 428	1.2	188	1.2	31 865	1.3
Miner	2	18.6	(D)	(D)	282	1.2	42 649	1.4	258	1.3	19 143	1.5
Minnekahta	22	4.8	643	4.8	559	1.4	51 844	1.3	409	1.6	17 227	1.8
Moody	15	7.2	2 207	8.8	289	1.7	34 712	1.6	229	1.9	12 746	2.0
Pennington	71	3.3	8 932	5.2	444	1.0	68 107	1.2	393	1.1	37 742	1.4
Perkins	6	8.2	606	3.8	394	1.0	95 915	.9	371	1.1	53 185	1.0
Potter	14	6.3	3 546	5.2	151	1.6	44 943	1.0	135	1.8	18 137	1.3
Roberts	12	3.7	1 693	6.7	433	1.2	50 971	1.3	329	1.4	19 534	1.7
Sanborn	4	13.2	(D)	(D)	291	1.5	56 340	1.7	260	1.6	24 362	2.0
Shannon	—	—	—	—	131	.7	34 844	.8	116	.9	(D)	(D)
Spink	39	3.0	14 006	1.9	405	1.2	80 821	.9	364	1.3	34 769	1.1
Stanley	3	10.5	900	3.5	134	1.5	38 244	1.2	120	1.7	20 211	1.4
Sully	17	5.3	20 405	1.2	119	1.9	30 053	1.2	105	2.2	(D)	(D)
Todd	23	4.3	14 765	2.0	178	1.1	65 393	.7	165	1.2	33 417	.9
Tripp	19	4.7	2 465	4.5	491	1.1	116 127	1.0	442	1.2	49 537	1.2
Turner	60	2.9	16 874	2.5	472	1.4	50 835	1.2	326	1.8	13 008	2.0
Union	84	2.1	30 823	1.3	174	1.5	22 525	1.2	135	1.8	5 922	1.8
Walworth	13	6.2	2 246	5.3	207	1.4	37 227	1.4	190	1.5	19 130	1.5
Yankton	37	4.0	5 883	4.2	359	1.5	33 496	1.5	287	1.7	12 672	1.9
Ziebach	1	50.0	(D)	(D)	191	1.3	44 982	.9	180	1.4	28 263	1.1

Livestock and poultry—Con.

Geographic area	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota	1 802	1.1	95 882	.7	2 899	1.0	1 396 326	.4	2 354	1.0	416 570	.9
Aurora	14	5.8	765	4.6	53	3.5	20 444	2.9	59	3.3	4 603	4.6
Beadle	35	4.2	2 726	2.4	72	3.3	56 581	.9	58	3.8	4 904	8.3
Bennett	9	11.5	65	22.8	11	8.5	2 058	17.1	3	16.6	583	18.5
Bon Homme	40	5.3	2 054	4.4	117	2.9	34 790	2.2	34	5.0	12 778	.8
Brookings	65	2.9	4 953	1.7	115	2.0	58 890	.9	72	3.2	8 492	3.3
Brown	37	4.2	2 350	2.7	54	3.0	22 775	1.5	93	2.9	12 921	2.1
Brule	11	7.1	505	7.6	47	3.8	22 001	2.6	29	5.5	4 386	7.6
Buffalo	2	19.3	(D)	(D)	7	8.0	900	6.5	5	11.2	605	16.7
Butte	51	3.6	2 720	1.9	16	7.0	1 377	1.9	163	1.9	73 479	1.2
Campbell	16	7.5	1 342	4.1	15	6.0	2 711	11.4	15	7.6	2 757	12.1
Charles Mix	41	3.9	1 914	3.7	125	2.3	72 528	1.0	58	3.5	4 788	4.9
Clark	25	5.5	948	7.0	21	4.4	37 756	.2	40	4.0	3 169	5.7
Clay	5	11.2	272	8.5	52	3.4	17 366	2.6	34	4.6	3 333	6.9
Codington	71	3.1	5 918	1.7	42	4.4	18 511	3.5	69	3.5	8 976	2.9

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.											
	Milk cows inventory				Hogs and pigs inventory				Sheep and lambs inventory			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Corson	20	6.3	638	8.1	15	6.5	2 139	1.4	18	5.3	4 476	4.1
Custer	12	7.5	253	6.8	9	9.4	121	14.0	8	11.5	(D)	(D)
Davison	23	6.1	1 276	4.3	54	3.4	20 193	3.2	26	6.4	1 309	8.6
Day	84	3.1	4 104	2.8	25	5.5	4 971	3.4	33	5.5	1 999	10.9
Deuel	73	2.9	5 442	1.7	27	5.3	5 029	6.3	46	4.3	2 438	5.5
Dewey	20	5.4	537	6.8	19	6.5	4 324	10.8	23	5.4	4 791	3.6
Douglas	46	3.7	2 874	3.1	107	2.2	57 151	1.3	35	4.5	3 905	7.3
Edmunds	26	3.9	1 728	3.1	23	4.7	20 472	.8	16	5.7	1 356	4.5
Fall River	5	11.3	15	11.3	10	7.8	224	12.0	24	5.3	7 103	5.5
Faulk	5	10.8	333	8.5	28	4.5	19 942	1.0	36	4.5	3 737	4.4
Grant	70	3.1	5 938	1.5	34	4.2	8 482	4.3	38	4.7	3 198	8.9
Gregory	75	3.1	3 657	2.6	65	3.5	9 800	5.1	32	5.4	1 918	7.2
Haakon	13	7.1	19	8.0	8	8.2	1 847	15.7	12	6.6	8 105	1.8
Hamlin	60	3.4	3 906	2.4	28	5.2	18 048	1.5	15	7.8	695	13.5
Hand	23	5.6	1 544	3.4	34	4.8	14 073	1.1	34	5.1	5 464	7.6
Hanson	36	3.4	1 561	3.2	43	2.9	37 337	1.1	21	5.1	1 005	11.0
Harding	8	9.8	71	1.9	8	9.3	940	7.2	78	2.7	48 224	1.9
Hughes	17	7.3	315	6.3	23	5.5	30 290	.6	21	7.0	2 350	7.7
Hutchinson	71	3.3	4 110	2.5	157	2.3	93 863	1.2	54	4.2	3 728	5.8
Hyde	6	14.0	(D)	(D)	16	7.8	2 124	9.2	31	4.8	6 353	5.4
Jackson	15	6.7	60	6.7	10	9.1	1 654	10.9	12	8.0	1 278	12.7
Jerauld	12	7.6	283	11.7	19	6.3	17 122	1.6	31	5.1	3 600	7.1
Jones	3	13.4	5	12.7	11	6.3	1 264	6.5	9	8.7	913	14.6
Kingsbury	23	6.5	995	6.0	39	4.5	9 666	3.7	61	3.9	8 167	4.8
Lake	21	6.1	846	5.1	78	2.8	42 546	1.4	33	4.5	2 276	6.3
Lawrence	12	6.8	565	3.0	1	30.0	(D)	(D)	16	7.0	1 231	8.1
Lincoln	23	5.0	1 121	4.5	99	2.3	41 406	2.0	62	3.2	4 645	5.5
Lyman	8	9.0	247	11.1	32	5.0	5 008	5.0	31	4.8	1 926	7.3
McCook	47	3.4	2 425	2.2	82	2.4	52 643	1.5	39	4.3	2 630	2.9
McPherson	35	4.0	1 756	4.0	16	5.4	30 440	.2	18	5.3	2 105	5.2
Marshall	22	5.7	1 169	4.4	36	4.2	27 066	1.2	30	5.1	2 157	8.5
Meade	46	4.4	898	5.3	18	7.9	1 601	17.8	73	3.5	17 522	4.0
Mellette	10	7.4	24	9.6	11	9.2	748	14.6	8	8.9	702	10.7
Miner	18	6.3	988	4.5	42	4.0	20 018	2.2	33	4.6	3 683	6.1
Minnehaha	66	3.3	4 508	1.7	146	2.4	63 722	1.5	64	3.8	6 632	2.9
Moody	27	4.9	1 672	3.0	83	3.0	31 657	2.7	36	5.5	2 219	8.2
Pennington	27	5.7	784	8.0	9	10.1	741	26.1	20	7.3	808	17.5
Perkins	20	5.2	421	6.8	15	5.6	1 741	6.8	81	3.0	32 951	2.9
Potter	3	11.7	195	13.5	38	3.7	15 109	2.8	14	8.1	2 367	8.5
Roberts	49	3.4	3 217	2.4	62	2.9	35 914	1.3	48	4.2	3 851	5.3
Sanborn	11	9.7	211	13.3	40	4.7	20 883	3.0	34	5.7	3 550	13.2
Shannon	2	7.8	(D)	(D)	3	8.9	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—
Spink	11	8.8	424	8.0	51	3.1	47 344	.5	48	3.9	5 442	3.8
Stanley	4	12.7	16	5.0	7	10.4	218	8.9	2	18.0	(D)	(D)
Sully	2	21.7	(D)	(D)	15	7.2	1 725	6.0	11	10.1	1 358	13.8
Todd	12	7.5	119	14.0	3	12.4	688	13.8	7	7.4	1 507	4.3
Tripp	34	5.4	1 218	5.1	91	2.7	35 916	1.9	37	4.8	6 888	2.7
Turner	74	2.9	4 486	2.1	134	2.4	58 492	1.7	63	3.9	14 101	1.8
Union	9	7.2	764	3.8	82	2.5	56 262	1.2	18	6.4	1 431	4.0
Walworth	7	9.2	458	2.8	21	5.8	12 921	1.7	15	7.1	564	8.4
Yankton	19	6.6	770	5.2	104	2.8	37 823	2.0	38	4.4	15 540	1.5
Ziebach	15	6.2	159	6.4	21	6.2	1 289	9.5	29	5.7	6 259	6.9

Geographic area	Livestock and poultry—Con.							
	Layers 20 weeks old and older inventory				Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold			
	Farms		Total		Farms		Total	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota	725	1.3	2 178 074	.3	92	3.0	285 735	.5
Aurora	8	9.8	(D)	(D)	2	21.8	(D)	(D)
Beadle	10	8.6	(D)	(D)	2	23.0	(D)	(D)
Bennett	7	9.8	192	8.8	—	—	—	—
Bon Homme	21	6.7	(D)	(D)	6	12.8	(D)	(D)
Brookings	16	6.3	1 424	10.9	2	17.3	(D)	(D)
Brown	17	6.9	603	9.9	2	20.0	(D)	(D)
Brule	3	9.8	28	3.1	1	—	(D)	(D)
Buffalo	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Butte	33	5.1	566	6.0	3	17.9	(D)	(D)
Campbell	3	18.3	104	25.1	—	—	—	—
Charles Mix	18	7.0	2 155	9.4	5	10.4	(D)	(D)
Clark	7	8.9	259	12.4	2	14.3	(D)	(D)
Clay	6	10.2	96	10.7	—	—	—	—
Codington	10	9.1	252	9.0	—	—	—	—

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	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)				
Corson	6	11.5	243	9.2	—	—	—	—				
Custer	29	5.5	493	6.0	2	20.5	(D)	(D)				
Davison	10	10.2	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Day	8	10.9	328	14.3	2	17.7	(D)	(D)				
Deuel	4	13.1	76	13.0	2	20.9	(D)	(D)				
Dewey	6	10.9	187	9.0	—	—	—	—				
Douglas	10	8.7	(D)	(D)	3	14.7	(D)	(D)				
Edmunds	12	8.8	(D)	(D)	2	22.7	(D)	(D)				
Fall River	10	8.7	299	12.4	—	—	—	—				
Faulk	2	27.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Grant	10	7.5	353	9.9	2	16.1	(D)	(D)				
Gregory	25	5.9	1 110	4.4	2	19.9	(D)	(D)				
Haakon	9	6.8	368	15.1	—	—	—	—				
Hamlin	7	11.6	166	14.1	2	20.8	(D)	(D)				
Hand	4	11.7	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)				
Hanson	7	7.2	(D)	(D)	1	—	(D)	(D)				
Harding	14	7.2	470	10.9	5	14.8	1 510	16.0				
Hughes	5	11.9	122	15.2	—	—	—	—				
Hutchinson	13	8.1	21 442	1.5	7	9.4	31 865	.5				
Hyde	9	10.5	436	14.1	—	—	—	—				
Jackson	12	8.6	420	20.8	—	—	—	—				
Jerauld	6	11.7	902	13.2	—	—	—	—				
Jones	4	11.4	135	11.5	—	—	—	—				
Kingsbury	6	10.4	70	13.6	2	18.8	(D)	(D)				
Lake	9	7.9	223 568	(L)	1	25.8	(D)	(D)				
Lawrence	10	9.6	325	13.8	1	27.3	(D)	(D)				
Lincoln	17	6.4	3 197	21.5	3	16.6	(D)	(D)				
Lyman	8	8.7	260	10.1	—	—	—	—				
McCook	5	13.5	128	16.8	1	28.7	(D)	(D)				
McPherson	11	7.0	980	2.5	2	—	(D)	(D)				
Marshall	8	8.4	607	2.0	—	—	—	—				
Meade	39	4.7	739	5.3	2	22.6	(D)	(D)				
Mellette	8	11.4	123	12.3	—	—	—	—				
Miner	7	10.5	98	8.9	—	—	—	—				
Minnehaha	24	5.8	4 122	13.8	4	14.3	706	15.9				
Moody	16	6.6	1 846	14.6	—	—	—	—				
Pennington	26	5.6	699	7.1	—	—	—	—				
Perkins	10	8.6	352	13.0	1	—	(D)	(D)				
Potter	5	15.6	152	20.4	—	—	—	—				
Roberts	12	8.6	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Sanborn	7	11.3	717	12.2	2	23.6	(D)	(D)				
Shannon	2	—	(D)	(D)	1	28.7	(D)	(D)				
Spink	11	7.8	2 129	6.0	3	14.9	1 700	19.7				
Stanley	2	25.3	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Sully	1	—	(D)	(D)	—	—	—	—				
Todd	10	8.1	195	7.5	—	—	—	—				
Tripp	19	7.0	452	7.7	2	23.7	(D)	(D)				
Turner	21	6.8	49 105	10.4	4	15.7	490	22.1				
Union	13	7.8	(D)	(D)	4	16.9	774	19.0				
Walworth	9	7.1	399	10.6	1	29.2	(D)	(D)				
Yankton	16	7.1	916	3.5	2	24.7	(D)	(D)				
Ziebach	12	9.3	251	11.1	—	—	—	—				
Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed					Corn for silage or green chop						
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota	14 342	1.0	3 175 113	.6	295 056 391	.6	4 785	1.0	308 116	.7	3 061 677	.6
Aurora	276	1.3	61 470	1.2	5 187 944	1.2	60	3.1	3 266	2.4	27 707	2.6
Beadle	419	1.2	106 831	.9	10 306 930	.8	126	2.3	7 546	2.3	78 015	2.1
Bennett	32	3.7	8 821	1.6	787 964	1.7	11	5.4	783	9.2	10 625	13.4
Bon Homme	475	1.6	75 747	1.6	5 983 421	1.5	192	2.4	7 289	2.1	68 207	1.9
Brookings	466	1.1	96 724	.9	8 740 311	.9	157	1.9	8 576	1.4	88 508	1.3
Brown	432	1.0	138 486	.5	13 590 813	.5	106	2.1	6 826	1.9	74 845	1.9
Brule	250	1.4	61 931	1.3	5 211 265	1.2	94	2.3	8 768	1.1	80 426	1.0
Buffalo	42	1.9	18 454	.8	2 229 177	.7	14	4.3	2 065	1.5	21 555	1.6
Butte	60	3.5	5 131	3.7	531 758	3.7	30	4.1	2 900	2.1	38 594	1.8
Campbell	99	2.3	14 875	1.6	1 110 621	1.2	64	3.2	5 846	4.0	52 339	4.5
Charles Mix	512	1.0	122 292	.8	11 471 919	.7	126	2.1	7 560	2.2	73 239	3.5
Clark	307	1.2	60 970	1.0	5 151 336	1.0	98	2.4	6 482	2.2	57 230	2.6
Clay	320	1.1	73 042	1.1	7 392 213	1.1	38	4.1	1 589	10.2	21 520	10.6
Codington	262	1.7	41 960	1.2	3 911 788	1.1	143	2.2	12 089	1.8	126 167	1.4

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested											
	Corn for grain or seed						Corn for silage or green chop					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Corson	39	3.6	5 985	1.9	348 204	1.3	35	3.5	3 168	2.9	15 403	4.0
Custer	16	5.8	1 758	5.8	217 966	5.4	3	9.7	162	5.4	3 400	4.3
Davison	226	1.6	56 988	1.2	5 056 328	1.2	62	3.2	3 628	4.6	37 419	4.4
Day	250	1.6	35 802	1.2	2 966 885	1.1	126	2.4	6 225	2.6	50 424	2.4
Deuel	307	1.4	47 302	1.4	3 989 757	1.5	156	2.0	8 606	1.6	103 061	1.5
Dewey	50	3.2	8 433	2.4	519 037	1.6	24	4.2	2 242	2.8	15 032	2.1
Douglas	285	1.3	53 321	1.2	4 485 517	1.2	107	2.4	4 813	3.3	43 734	4.0
Edmunds	142	1.6	24 867	1.0	1 863 948	1.0	115	1.9	9 942	1.8	85 153	1.9
Fall River	23	5.2	2 302	4.9	264 575	4.9	3	9.1	1 042	4.1	21 190	4.3
Faulk	140	1.7	34 410	.8	3 151 891	.7	49	2.9	3 938	2.3	32 777	2.0
Grant	276	1.5	58 283	1.2	5 968 973	1.3	105	2.5	6 754	2.3	77 361	2.5
Gregory	325	1.4	51 892	1.4	4 088 352	1.3	44	3.9	1 520	4.8	14 573	6.6
Haakon	23	3.9	4 043	1.9	288 210	1.6	14	2.0	2 537	.9	20 082	1.0
Hamlin	262	1.6	63 704	1.2	5 630 311	1.2	113	2.5	6 467	2.1	65 354	2.1
Hand	240	1.6	64 403	.9	5 418 822	.9	102	2.2	10 175	1.5	109 954	1.1
Hanson	221	1.1	56 600	.9	4 581 470	.9	66	2.4	3 037	2.2	26 684	2.5
Harding	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	9.8	1 054	6.4	5 410	7.3
Hughes	106	2.2	27 635	1.3	2 344 327	1.3	23	5.7	1 889	6.9	15 202	6.6
Hutchinson	615	1.4	125 669	1.2	10 510 830	1.2	244	2.0	13 064	1.7	129 033	1.9
Hyde	75	2.3	14 935	1.1	1 350 870	.7	43	2.5	8 253	1.3	62 752	.9
Jackson	6	9.8	1 138	10.0	94 580	10.4	2	20.8	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Jerauld	139	1.9	30 594	1.3	2 797 826	1.2	40	4.2	3 030	2.7	25 749	3.1
Jones	34	2.9	9 690	1.7	645 829	1.6	5	9.7	390	9.8	3 640	10.5
Kingsbury	371	1.4	90 104	1.1	8 031 017	1.1	150	2.2	9 649	2.3	99 696	2.2
Lake	346	1.4	93 198	1.1	8 560 196	1.1	102	2.8	4 496	3.2	53 645	4.4
Lawrence	4	13.3	266	8.2	25 372	9.7	9	7.7	458	4.8	4 455	6.1
Lincoln	609	.9	125 756	.9	14 258 164	.8	111	2.2	3 344	2.8	47 466	3.5
Lyman	151	1.7	33 681	1.6	2 874 440	1.5	19	5.8	1 108	5.7	10 273	4.7
McCook	386	1.0	88 553	.9	8 764 913	.9	156	1.8	7 564	1.7	78 968	1.6
McPherson	51	2.6	7 144	1.5	491 780	1.6	85	2.1	11 356	1.9	87 716	4.0
Marshall	208	1.6	64 029	.9	6 317 411	.9	84	2.5	7 140	1.7	79 798	1.5
Meade	14	6.0	1 059	3.7	75 296	3.4	14	6.3	1 142	3.8	10 550	4.4
Mellette	33	4.6	4 314	4.9	219 290	4.8	6	10.0	784	1.0	10 385	.6
Miner	214	1.5	50 610	1.2	4 103 174	1.2	84	2.5	5 550	1.7	55 423	1.6
Minnehaha	685	1.3	135 807	1.1	14 443 504	1.1	177	2.2	8 102	2.2	92 977	2.4
Moody	377	1.5	85 477	1.2	9 039 434	1.1	118	2.6	5 081	2.9	71 138	2.7
Pennington	9	5.9	2 167	.4	195 547	.3	10	7.5	665	5.4	4 722	5.4
Perkins	21	3.1	3 711	.8	251 100	.5	50	2.9	6 598	1.9	38 729	2.3
Potter	124	1.6	35 461	1.0	2 596 296	1.2	36	2.7	4 194	1.3	26 632	1.1
Roberts	375	1.3	68 825	1.0	7 835 954	1.0	150	2.0	6 818	2.0	90 154	2.3
Sanborn	230	1.7	53 185	1.5	4 181 443	1.5	69	3.4	4 991	3.3	34 771	3.2
Shannon	9	4.6	1 343	4.5	92 566	4.7	3	5.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Spink	390	1.2	127 657	.7	12 664 660	.6	125	1.9	9 056	1.3	98 388	1.1
Stanley	3	—	875	—	63 000	—	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Sully	123	1.7	50 056	.7	3 911 173	.7	15	6.1	1 098	5.3	9 464	5.2
Todd	45	3.0	15 893	1.7	1 815 744	2.1	10	3.7	724	1.5	7 815	.7
Tripp	316	1.4	65 595	1.1	5 130 235	1.0	71	2.6	3 754	1.4	42 446	1.0
Turner	612	1.3	117 875	1.2	12 120 533	1.1	180	2.2	7 350	2.2	93 585	1.8
Union	373	.8	99 061	.7	11 292 713	.6	52	2.9	2 933	3.8	38 692	4.1
Walworth	101	2.1	17 692	1.5	1 269 954	1.4	42	3.6	3 352	3.4	22 155	3.9
Yankton	405	1.4	68 905	1.4	6 225 630	1.4	107	2.7	5 257	2.2	52 687	2.2
Ziebach	5	9.3	326	4.3	13 884	6.5	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Wheat for grain						Barley for grain					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota	9 561	.8	3 177 527	.4	89 470 811	.4	966	1.1	104 892	.7	4 233 108	.7
Aurora	98	2.4	15 256	1.8	441 535	1.9	14	6.5	779	6.5	32 374	5.4
Beadle	230	1.6	54 785	1.0	1 805 037	1.0	4	8.1	510	1.6	17 505	2.8
Bennett	122	2.0	59 972	1.1	1 509 065	1.0	14	6.4	3 656	2.4	184 782	1.9
Bon Homme	107	3.0	5 889	2.9	209 478	2.9	6	13.6	135	13.3	7 020	13.0
Brookings	210	1.7	17 231	1.9	543 869	2.0	14	6.4	700	5.3	32 345	5.1
Brown	462	1.0	169 474	.6	5 883 858	.5	49	3.2	6 388	2.5	326 973	2.6
Brule	139	2.0	29 017	1.2	983 917	1.2	14	7.8	1 272	6.8	53 038	6.5
Buffalo	30	2.6	12 647	1.5	476 770	1.4	4	12.8	286	13.7	13 300	16.0
Butte	99	2.5	20 755	2.9	527 380	2.5	8	9.6	481	8.6	23 835	7.2
Campbell	184	1.7	75 405	1.3	1 882 768	1.2	56	3.3	6 695	3.3	312 073	3.3
Charles Mix	224	1.6	39 187	.8	1 391 628	.8	2	19.9	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Clark	296	1.3	56 756	1.2	1 613 283	1.3	9	8.4	666	8.6	27 130	9.0
Clay	6	10.0	418	20.3	(D)	(D)	2	20.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Codington	285	1.6	45 121	1.3	1 375 009	1.3	33	4.8	2 555	4.5	115 098	4.1

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.											
	Wheat for grain						Barley for grain					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Corson	199	1.6	96 610	1.0	2 057 385	1.0	32	3.5	3 582	3.5	117 750	3.1
Custer	20	4.8	5 097	5.3	128 302	4.9	2	14.5	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Davison	122	2.2	17 904	1.5	676 576	1.5	3	15.9	234	11.0	(D)	(D)
Day	347	1.4	98 478	1.0	3 031 708	1.0	62	3.5	4 259	2.9	175 811	3.0
Deuel	222	1.7	17 550	1.7	523 781	1.8	6	10.5	428	4.2	(D)	(D)
Dewey	116	2.0	50 388	1.2	961 198	1.1	16	5.9	1 126	6.0	38 513	6.1
Douglas	108	2.3	11 156	2.1	381 779	2.1	10	7.6	798	4.5	33 317	4.8
Edmunds	259	1.2	123 297	.7	3 392 960	.7	35	3.7	6 459	1.8	279 517	1.6
Fall River	50	3.1	10 274	2.9	270 613	3.0	2	24.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Faulk	182	1.4	83 587	.7	2 447 941	.6	13	4.9	2 352	2.1	95 610	3.5
Grant	237	1.6	36 894	1.2	1 095 738	1.3	9	7.1	1 088	3.1	42 182	2.9
Gregory	135	2.2	16 635	2.1	532 034	2.1	21	6.6	871	6.7	32 185	6.9
Haakon	164	1.3	136 440	.5	3 476 393	.4	13	4.3	2 384	1.9	67 104	1.9
Hamlin	164	2.1	18 541	1.8	574 024	1.6	7	7.0	745	3.0	26 155	2.5
Hand	248	1.5	101 784	.7	2 769 762	.7	19	5.6	2 027	2.6	76 633	2.4
Hanson	77	2.2	12 328	1.4	413 937	1.5	5	5.1	347	4.4	16 465	5.7
Harding	87	2.6	36 015	1.8	734 056	2.0	37	3.7	4 004	2.5	124 979	2.7
Hughes	137	1.9	85 075	.8	2 523 687	.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hutchinson	182	2.2	14 520	2.2	495 398	2.2	8	8.2	597	5.1	23 823	4.9
Hyde	93	2.2	50 756	.9	1 411 214	.9	17	4.0	3 080	1.3	103 520	.9
Jackson	120	1.9	66 521	.8	1 708 484	.8	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Jerauld	93	2.5	19 772	1.5	717 088	1.2	6	11.8	1 187	2.3	66 575	2.3
Jones	85	1.9	30 109	1.3	595 572	1.3	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Kingsbury	245	1.7	42 421	1.1	1 388 075	1.1	13	7.4	649	5.4	32 169	7.0
Lake	40	3.6	4 277	1.3	151 900	1.3	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lawrence	16	6.3	880	9.6	32 344	8.4	1	30.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lincoln	1	28.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)	4	12.2	87	12.5	4 321	12.5
Lyman	185	1.5	71 824	.9	2 134 090	.9	4	10.5	260	11.4	10 200	13.3
McCook	29	4.6	1 760	4.7	62 840	4.0	7	9.8	501	10.1	23 456	9.5
McPherson	221	1.3	69 373	1.1	1 470 991	1.0	83	2.2	9 868	1.8	373 064	2.0
Marshall	229	1.5	53 550	1.1	1 816 829	1.2	30	4.6	2 469	2.7	107 335	3.1
Meade	199	1.9	94 125	.9	2 345 296	.8	22	5.8	1 486	7.2	46 333	6.3
Mellette	69	2.7	19 110	2.4	484 550	2.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Miner	66	2.7	9 860	2.1	344 194	1.8	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Minnehaha	22	5.0	1 202	5.4	44 298	5.0	4	14.3	177	15.9	9 226	16.9
Moody	45	4.1	3 355	5.8	143 765	6.8	4	12.6	239	9.1	10 051	10.5
Pennington	128	2.0	78 639	.9	1 952 569	.9	11	6.8	463	7.6	9 888	7.4
Perkins	223	1.5	91 114	1.1	2 066 090	1.0	67	2.5	9 170	2.3	328 133	2.3
Potter	183	1.3	126 958	.6	3 448 926	.6	18	4.7	2 928	4.0	119 958	3.9
Roberts	440	1.2	88 747	1.0	3 109 692	.9	48	3.2	4 890	2.1	237 053	2.1
Sanborn	45	3.9	6 928	3.6	223 265	3.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Shannon	38	1.8	27 440	1.3	728 771	1.5	9	4.1	1 258	2.4	51 930	2.1
Spink	375	1.2	140 970	.6	4 222 758	.5	12	4.1	1 724	4.0	57 780	5.6
Stanley	82	2.1	89 848	.8	2 705 309	.6	2	18.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Sully	185	1.3	198 606	.4	5 484 544	.5	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Todd	24	4.1	10 911	1.1	346 102	.9	3	12.4	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Tripp	197	1.7	55 233	.8	1 604 979	.7	17	5.6	1 169	5.3	51 884	5.4
Turner	21	5.3	827	5.5	33 946	4.4	5	11.7	109	12.5	6 520	14.4
Union	10	7.5	(D)	(D)	10 634	8.9	2	12.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Walworth	201	1.5	87 117	1.1	2 244 814	1.0	23	4.3	2 969	3.3	122 141	3.4
Yankton	19	5.5	828	5.3	27 585	4.9	2	16.7	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Ziebach	84	2.3	59 626	1.2	1 265 857	1.2	17	6.3	1 703	4.5	52 734	4.4

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.											
	Oats for grain						Sunflower seed					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota	3 729	1.0	253 972	.8	13 726 509	.8	2 858	.8	740 707	.4	1 041 102 232	.4
Aurora	52	3.4	3 539	3.4	208 910	3.3	47	3.7	5 554	2.8	6 748 646	3.0
Beadle	29	5.2	2 037	4.3	125 455	4.4	180	1.9	32 206	1.4	40 178 607	1.4
Bennett	16	5.9	2 529	2.4	94 196	2.4	16	5.5	4 610	2.0	5 613 388	2.4
Bon Homme	98	3.3	3 079	3.3	168 630	3.9	2	18.1	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Brookings	97	2.4	4 678	3.1	255 651	2.6	1	27.6	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Brown	67	2.9	5 590	2.6	296 363	2.4	193	1.6	60 820	.9	92 026 838	.9
Brule	78	3.0	6 700	3.2	348 207	3.3	91	2.5	15 505	2.1	20 814 907	2.0
Buffalo	12	5.4	830	5.0	43 320	5.9	21	3.5	5 246	1.9	7 235 267	2.1
Butte	57	3.5	2 383	4.1	120 405	5.2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Campbell	93	2.8	7 635	2.8	423 821	3.0	31	3.7	7 785	1.3	11 457 515	1.2
Charles Mix	113	2.4	5 907	2.4	380 952	2.5	89	2.4	11 801	1.9	17 373 233	1.9
Clark	58	3.5	3 570	4.2	196 033	4.6	66	2.6	10 412	1.7	10 562 420	1.9
Clay	16	5.9	366	6.9	26 684	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Codington	101	2.8	6 788	2.7	366 479	2.1	10	8.7	881	6.4	825 600	6.1

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.											
	Oats for grain						Sunflower seed					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity		Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Pounds	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Corson	99	2.4	9 459	3.1	409 117	2.6	17	5.3	4 175	3.8	4 341 729	4.4
Custer	11	6.7	465	5.5	21 440	5.4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Davison	39	3.9	2 740	3.5	188 142	3.6	10	8.5	1 701	4.8	1 537 960	5.3
Day	116	2.6	6 011	2.5	323 916	2.7	38	3.9	3 900	3.6	5 408 293	3.4
Deuel	87	2.9	3 860	2.8	227 596	3.0	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Dewey	69	2.8	6 232	3.3	229 885	2.8	11	4.9	4 020	4.0	6 234 550	4.1
Douglas	77	2.9	3 685	3.3	205 146	3.9	28	5.2	2 651	5.8	3 218 514	6.2
Edmunds	95	2.4	8 516	2.3	480 752	2.4	188	1.4	66 178	.7	99 762 871	.7
Fall River	11	8.9	560	9.8	21 060	10.8	2	20.0	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Faulk	48	3.1	5 671	2.8	346 971	3.4	136	1.7	40 339	1.1	62 919 138	1.0
Grant	51	3.8	2 432	4.6	145 463	5.2	5	6.4	760	1.7	808 500	1.0
Gregory	129	2.3	9 339	2.5	583 783	2.4	105	2.5	11 665	2.2	14 688 402	2.3
Haakon	45	2.1	7 500	3.3	344 325	3.4	6	7.9	1 715	7.3	1 974 430	8.6
Hamlin	69	3.6	3 286	4.1	207 001	3.7	3	11.6	321	2.2	(D)	(D)
Hand	47	3.5	4 327	3.8	231 608	3.2	209	1.7	64 446	1.0	85 666 633	.9
Hanson	53	2.7	3 939	2.4	230 379	2.1	15	5.6	4 044	6.7	4 975 882	4.4
Harding	52	3.4	4 914	3.3	187 425	2.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Hughes	22	5.8	3 068	5.9	181 310	5.5	78	2.2	25 618	1.0	39 761 787	1.1
Hutchinson	83	3.4	3 367	3.8	176 117	3.9	4	18.8	438	19.5	323 500	18.5
Hyde	32	4.3	3 542	3.4	200 798	3.3	82	2.3	27 305	1.0	37 692 835	1.1
Jackson	30	3.8	3 008	3.0	132 074	2.8	12	4.9	2 160	4.0	2 252 955	4.2
Jerauld	27	5.2	2 029	3.4	137 270	3.0	84	2.8	18 049	2.1	25 767 506	2.2
Jones	17	5.3	1 910	4.1	88 785	4.4	19	3.6	6 782	1.1	8 494 994	.9
Kingsbury	52	4.0	2 641	4.8	154 171	5.5	29	4.2	11 160	1.5	19 481 185	.6
Lake	40	4.1	1 739	4.0	119 672	3.3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lawrence	12	8.8	411	18.3	23 180	16.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lincoln	50	3.3	1 238	4.1	82 037	4.1	1	28.2	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Lyman	21	4.6	2 284	4.4	113 666	6.5	116	1.9	35 827	1.2	48 142 815	1.3
McCook	56	3.0	2 129	3.1	127 649	3.1	1	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
McPherson	156	1.7	16 213	1.7	718 614	1.8	56	2.5	14 355	1.4	19 219 480	1.3
Marshall	46	4.1	2 789	3.6	147 815	3.5	52	3.2	7 807	3.1	11 653 050	2.8
Meade	74	3.4	3 338	3.5	133 240	3.6	2	—	(D)	(D)	(D)	(D)
Mellette	21	4.2	1 749	5.0	71 361	4.0	17	6.1	3 958	3.6	4 911 937	3.2
Miner	25	5.3	1 009	6.0	47 446	5.2	7	6.3	1 914	3.8	2 209 895	3.1
Minnehaha	117	2.7	3 564	2.8	247 569	2.9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Moody	52	3.8	1 377	3.6	79 805	4.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pennington	28	4.5	1 952	4.9	85 378	5.9	4	7.7	759	8.1	545 800	8.5
Perkins	88	2.6	7 297	2.1	327 699	2.2	13	7.0	1 949	3.3	1 739 764	3.0
Potter	58	2.9	10 063	5.1	710 045	5.6	126	1.7	43 402	.8	70 780 326	.7
Roberts	53	3.9	3 030	5.1	138 521	4.5	10	7.0	1 388	1.6	2 303 944	1.2
Sanborn	32	5.4	1 468	6.2	76 385	6.1	13	7.3	2 305	6.0	2 402 891	7.1
Shannon	7	3.1	539	1.9	12 835	3.0	8	4.6	2 042	2.8	2 703 186	2.9
Spink	49	3.8	3 175	4.6	191 095	2.9	180	1.7	34 618	1.1	41 359 421	1.2
Stanley	8	6.0	615	4.5	22 235	4.1	14	4.9	5 138	2.4	5 335 020	2.2
Sully	22	5.1	2 391	2.5	138 565	1.9	163	1.4	80 758	.7	113 945 319	.7
Todd	17	4.8	1 276	4.2	64 420	3.5	8	8.1	1 290	4.7	1 981 500	5.1
Tripp	126	2.3	10 002	1.6	557 041	1.5	141	2.0	26 018	1.3	35 405 046	1.2
Turner	92	3.0	2 484	3.4	162 305	3.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Union	60	2.7	2 220	2.6	176 567	2.7	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walworth	75	2.8	5 924	2.6	352 965	2.8	92	2.3	20 917	2.0	31 293 914	1.8
Yankton	62	3.8	1 897	4.2	121 685	4.3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ziebach	34	3.6	3 667	2.5	167 074	2.3	5	6.6	2 899	9.0	5 090 711	13.8

Selected crops harvested—Con.

Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)

Geographic area	Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Quantity	
					Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
South Dakota	19 298	.9	3 584 798	.7	6 590 651	.7
Aurora	280	1.3	44 250	1.6	94 646	1.7
Beadle	479	1.2	75 158	1.3	171 810	1.5
Bennett	174	1.5	61 190	1.4	99 630	1.8
Bon Homme	477	1.6	35 602	1.9	84 539	1.9
Brookings	479	1.0	35 374	1.4	77 216	1.3
Brown	542	1.0	77 916	1.2	166 531	1.2
Brule	262	1.4	59 906	1.5	120 198	1.7
Buffalo	55	1.4	26 181	1.2	42 399	1.5
Butte	391	1.0	70 272	1.2	122 788	1.4
Campbell	184	1.7	42 311	1.8	74 422	1.6
Charles Mix	528	1.0	79 842	1.1	185 711	1.2
Clark	336	1.2	48 791	1.4	108 567	1.5
Clay	179	1.7	17 196	2.2	54 467	1.5
Codington	388	1.4	42 905	1.4	110 363	1.4

See footnotes at end of table.

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

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

Geographic area	Selected crops harvested—Con.					
	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)					
	Farms		Acres		Quantity	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Corson	286	1.2	99 592	1.1	134 117	1.2
Custer	210	1.3	35 138	1.7	48 897	1.8
Davison	284	1.4	32 699	1.8	75 418	2.0
Day	388	1.3	50 190	1.6	102 573	1.6
Deuel	366	1.3	34 122	1.6	80 356	1.6
Dewey	239	1.2	89 288	1.1	116 896	1.3
Douglas	283	1.3	32 368	1.6	84 598	1.8
Edmunds	257	1.2	61 979	1.3	125 236	1.4
Fall River	200	1.2	42 319	1.3	64 273	1.3
Faulk	197	1.4	67 231	1.4	136 642	1.2
Grant	317	1.3	36 587	1.7	84 038	1.4
Gregory	438	1.2	90 626	1.3	198 399	1.5
Haakon	214	1.0	94 353	.8	133 162	.7
Hamlin	244	1.7	22 196	1.9	56 765	1.9
Hand	332	1.4	100 417	1.4	243 614	1.5
Hanson	216	1.1	18 679	1.4	41 777	1.5
Harding	195	1.4	86 702	1.3	87 230	1.3
Hughes	132	2.1	32 189	2.6	52 238	2.8
Hutchinson	517	1.5	42 556	1.6	112 275	1.6
Hyde	152	1.6	60 751	1.5	126 349	1.4
Jackson	210	1.3	82 612	1.0	123 285	1.0
Jerauld	201	1.4	48 839	1.5	106 784	1.5
Jones	133	1.4	61 714	1.1	77 205	1.2
Kingsbury	366	1.4	43 062	1.6	105 101	1.6
Lake	269	1.6	17 572	2.1	45 174	2.1
Lawrence	193	1.2	28 543	2.4	44 956	2.0
Lincoln	333	1.3	11 096	1.7	27 240	1.7
Lyman	240	1.3	77 901	1.4	114 864	1.4
McCook	329	1.2	23 360	1.5	61 799	1.6
McPherson	279	1.1	88 838	1.2	165 714	1.4
Marshall	287	1.3	46 125	1.8	85 862	1.6
Meade	615	1.1	182 821	1.0	264 047	1.1
Mellette	160	1.4	55 873	1.4	87 507	1.5
Miner	253	1.3	32 472	1.6	74 622	1.6
Minnehaha	611	1.3	30 728	1.5	80 429	1.4
Moody	290	1.7	15 236	1.8	41 350	1.8
Pennington	414	1.1	77 747	1.4	109 761	1.8
Perkins	363	1.1	143 276	.9	202 356	.9
Potter	145	1.7	35 124	1.3	64 154	1.3
Roberts	461	1.2	50 989	1.5	96 464	1.5
Sanborn	263	1.6	49 324	1.9	99 826	2.1
Shannon	89	1.1	23 161	.6	28 313	.5
Spink	347	1.3	51 668	1.4	124 954	1.4
Stanley	109	1.8	42 699	1.5	56 120	1.7
Sully	97	2.3	22 579	2.0	35 406	2.0
Todd	161	1.2	103 749	.8	131 661	.9
Tripp	462	1.2	132 715	1.2	230 121	1.2
Turner	473	1.4	24 309	1.7	60 992	1.6
Union	189	1.5	8 652	1.7	25 890	1.7
Walworth	201	1.5	36 182	1.7	57 957	1.4
Yankton	367	1.5	25 945	1.8	67 211	1.7
Ziebach	167	1.5	63 011	1.3	75 386	1.9

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table G. Coverage Estimates: 1997

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

Item	Census total	Coverage total ¹	Adjusted census		Coverage adjustment (percent)
			Total	Relative standard error (percent)	
Farms number..	31 284	1 884	33 168	1.6	5.7
Land in farms acres..	44 354 880	-78 116	44 276 764	1.4	-2
Average size of farm acres..	1 418	-42	1 335	(X)	(X)
Farms by size of farm:					
Less than 10 acres	1 015	54	1 069	8.8	5.1
10 to 49 acres	2 596	865	3 461	8.5	25.0
50 to 179 acres	4 844	659	5 503	4.2	12.0
180 acres or more	22 829	306	23 135	1.4	1.3
Farms by value of sales:					
Less than \$2,500	3 338	1 040	4 378	6.7	23.8
\$2,500 to \$9,999	3 878	428	4 306	4.7	9.9
\$10,000 or more	24 068	416	24 484	1.4	1.7
Market value of agricultural products sold \$1,000..	3 569 951	-7 421	3 562 529	.9	-2
Farms by type of organization:					
Individual or family	27 133	1 900	29 033	1.7	6.5
Partnership, corporation, or other	4 151	-16	4 135	1.6	-4
Farms by tenure of operator:					
Full owners	12 598	1 641	14 239	2.8	11.5
Part owners	14 322	99	14 421	1.5	.7
Tenants	4 364	144	4 508	3.8	3.2
Operators by place of residence:					
On farm operated	23 062	1 737	24 799	1.7	7.0
Not on farm operated	5 961	278	6 239	3.3	4.5
Not reported	2 261	-131	2 130	5.0	-6.2
Operators by principal occupation:					
Farming	22 704	512	23 216	1.5	2.2
Other	8 580	1 372	9 952	3.6	13.8
Operators by sex:					
Male	29 810	1 579	31 389	1.6	5.0
Female.....	1 474	305	1 779	9.1	17.1
Operators by race:					
White	30 771	1 854	32 625	1.6	5.7
Black and other races	513	30	543	8.5	5.5
Operators by years on present farm:					
4 years or less	2 752	601	3 353	5.9	17.9
5 years or more	23 709	1 390	25 099	1.6	5.5
Not reported	4 823	-107	4 716	4.2	-2.3

¹ See text in Appendix C regarding coverage estimates.