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#### Abstract

This publication presents two types of ranking information derived from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's cash receipts statistics for the marketing of agricultural commodities within States. One type is the 25 leading commodities for each State and the Nation, ranked according to the estimated value of receipts. The second is the ranking of States by receipts from each of the 25 leading U.S. commodities and by several major commodity groups. The ranking of commodities produced in a State indicates a State's production environment, physical and economic. The ranking of States for a commodity provides information about the location of production and the commodity's relative and regional importance.


Keywords: Cash receipts, government payments, State rankings

## Acknowledgments

Connie Dixon provided statistical assistance and is a principal source of cash receipts information. Janusz Kubica provided the systems analysis and computer programming to accomplish the assorted ranking schemes and the construction of tables.

## Contents

Cash Receipts Ranking Information ..... $\stackrel{1}{1}$
Overview of the 1992 Agricultural Sector
Facts From the Ranking Tables ..... 2
Table
Leading commodities for cash receipts, by State, 1992 ..... 1992
1 United States
2 Alabama ..... 4
3 Alaska ..... 5
4 Arizona ..... 6
5 Arkansas ..... 7
6 California ..... 8
7 Colorado ..... 9
8 Connecticut ..... 10
9 Delaware ..... 11
10 Florida ..... 12
11 Georgia ..... 13
12 Hawaii ..... 14
13 Idaho ..... 15
14 Illinois ..... 16
15 Indiana ..... 17
16 Iowa ..... 18
17 Kansas ..... 19
18 Kentucky ..... 20
19 Louisiana ..... 21
20 Maine ..... 22
21 Maryland ..... 23
22 Massachusetts ..... 24
23 Michigan ..... 25
24 Minnesota ..... 26
25 Mississippi ..... 27
26 Missouri ..... 28
27 Montana ..... 29
28 Nebraska ..... 30
29 Nevada ..... 31
30 New Hampshire ..... 32
31 New Jersey ..... 33
32 New Mexico ..... 34
33 New York ..... 35
34 North Carolina ..... 36
35 North Dakota ..... 37
36 Ohio ..... 38
37 Oklahoma ..... 39
38 Oregon ..... 40
39 Pennsylvania ..... 41
40 Rhode Island ..... 42
41 South Carolina ..... 43
42 South Dakota ..... 44
43 Tennessee ..... 45
44 Texas ..... 46
45 Utah ..... 4748
46 Vermont ..... 49
47 Virginia ..... 50
48 Washington
48 Washington
51
51
49 West Virginia
52
52
50 Wisconsin ..... 53
5] Wyoming ..... 54
States' rankings for cash receipts, by leading commodities, 1992
52 Cattle and calve
55
53 Dairy products ..... 56
54 Corn ..... 57
55 Soybeans
58
58
56 Hogs ..... 59
57 Broilers ..... 60
58 Greenhouse and nursery products ..... 61
59 Wheat
62
62
60 Cotton ..... 63
61 Chicken eggs ..... 64
62 Tobacco ..... 65
63 Hay ..... 66
64 Turkeys
67
67
65 Potatoes
68
68
66 Tomatoes ..... 69
67 Grapes ..... 70
68 Apples ..... 71
69 Oranges
72
72
70 Sorghum grain ..... 73
71 Peanuts
74
74
72 Rice ..... 75
73 Sugarbeets
76
76
74 Lettuce
77
77
75 Cane for sugar
78
78
76 Barley ..... 79
States' rankings for cash receipts, by commodity groups, 1992
77 All commodities
80
78 Livestock and products ..... 81
79 Crops
82
82
80 Meat animals
83
83
81 Poultry and eggs
84
84
82 Food grains ..... 85
83 Feed crops ..... 86
84 Oil crops
87
87
85 Vegetables
88
88
86 Fruits and nuts ..... 89

# Ranking of States and Commodities by Cash Receipts, 1992 

Roger P. Strickland<br>Cheryl J. Steele<br>Robert P. Williams

## Cash Receipts Ranking Information

Cash receipts are the major component of gross income in the U.S. Department of Agricuiture's (USDA) farm income accounts and reflect the sales of commodities from farms where produced within a calendar year. Of the principal components of both income and expenses, cash receipts tend to be the most variable, reflecting the effects of weather and government programs on the production and sale of crops, particularly corn. Occasionally, but with less frequency, biological phenomena, such as insects and disease, can have a severe effect on crop or livestock production.

A ranking by cash receipts of leading commodities within States can convey a significant amount of information about the product mix within a State. Similarly, a ranking of States by cash receipts from sales of a specific commodity or commodily group can convey information about the importance of the commodity to individual States and geographic regions. Such rankings are an aid in analyzing the effects of adverse weather, changes in farm programs, or economic conditions affecting the prices of commodities.

Tables for each of the 50 States show the 25 leading commodities ranked by value of receipts. There are three noteworthy exceptions. First, while no State is likely to have fewer than 25 commodities produced within its borders, a few do not have statistics that are sufficiently reliable to report for each of the 25 separate commodities. Sales of these minor commodities are typically combined into several misceilaneous or other commodity groupings for the income accounts but are excluded from this publication.

Second, some commodities were omitted from the rankings for certain States to avoid disciosing confidential information about individual producers. When collecting the data, usually through surveys, the USDA makes a commitment to producers that precludes the dissemination of any information that might allow perceptive users to discern the attributes of individual producers. Such omissions are few and generally involve commodities that would occupy a position in the bottom half of a State's ranked listing of 25 leading commodities.

Third, a portion of the cash receipts for some commodities may be reported only in combination with receipts for other commodities in order to preserve confidentiality. In these cases, receipts reported for the commodity do not represent a complete accounting of the commodity's sales. A prime example is tomatoes for which only the sales of fresh tomatoes are reported so that sales of processed tomatoes can be kept confidential. Sales of fresh tomatoes are reported in other publications; thus, publication of total sales would amount to a disclosure of the processed tomatoes by deduction. In the tables in this publication, such situations are marked with an asterisk immediately preceding the name of the commodity or State, as appropriate.

## Overview of the 1992 Agricultural Sector

U.S. net farm income rose 21 percent in 1992 to $\$ 48.6$ billion. U.S. net farm income is a measure of the farm sector's net value of production. Weather conditions were for the most part extremely favorable, with adequate rain and moderate temperatures in summer and early fall greatly influencing agricultural production in 1992 and, thereby, the estimates of net income. The favorable weather improved yields and produced large volumes of crop and livestock products to either sell or hold in inventory. Below-average temperatures eliminated the heat stress that often inhibits production of fall crops and livestock.

Corn yields jumped to a record-shattering 131 bushels per acre and yields were high for all crops harvested in both summer and fall. Corn and soybean prices declined in the second half of the year as the size of the harvest became apparent, but held up surprisingly well due to high demand. Milk production was up 2 percent in 1992 as output per cow more than offsei a decline in the number of dairy cows. The mild temperatures in late summer and early fall also reduced heat stress on cows and mitigated the seasonal decline in the yearly milk production cycle.

Corn, as both the Nation's most important crop and the one most sensitive to weather conditions, is a barometer of production for the agricultural sector. When the corn harvest is good, net farm income can be expected to follow suit. Cash receipts from sales of crops were up $\$ 2.9$ billion and farmers added another $\$ 2.8$ billion worth of crops to inventories for future sale or onfarm use as feed or seed. Large harvests often depress farm prices temporarily and farmers typically respond by holding a larger proportion of commodities for sale in the next year. Receipts for crops were generally up. Cash receipts from livestock and livestock products were down only slightly.

For additional information regarding farm income and other financial statistics, see Economic Indicators of the Farm Sector: National Financial Summary and Economic Indicators of the Farm Sector: State Financial Summary.

## Facts From the Ranking Tables

Thirty States had livestock receipts exceeding crop receipis. In 12 States, over 50 percent of receipts were from sales of a single commodity, indicating a high degree of dependence on the production and market conditions for that commodity. In 10 States, 1 livestock commodity accounted for more than 50 percent of the State's total receipts:

| Cattle and calves |  | Dairy |  | Broilers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Percent | State | Percent |  |  |
| Wyoming | 70 | Vermont | 76 | Delaware | 63 |
| Colorado | 63 | Wisconsin | 57 | Delaware | 63 |
| Kansas | 58 | New York | 52 |  |  |
| Nevada | 55 |  | 52 |  |  |
| Oklahoma | 53 |  |  |  |  |
| Nebraska | 53 |  |  |  |  |

In Alaska and Rhode Island, a single crop commodity, greenhouse and nursery, accounted for more than 50 percent of the State's total receipts: Alaska, 59 percent; Rhode Island, 57 percent.

Seven States were sufficiently diversified in their agricultural production that the leading commodity accounted for less than 20 percent of total receipts. The lack of dependence on the fortunes of any single commodity should typically be advantageous to a State's economy simply because it dilutes the effects of adversity from weather, insects, disease, and markets. Those States and their two leading commodities are:

| State | Percent | State | Percent | State | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| California: <br> Dairy Greenhouse | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | Oregon: Cattle Greenhouse | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | Minnesota: <br> Dairy <br> Corn | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| Florida: <br> Oranges Greenhouse | 18 17 | South Carolina: Tobacco Broilers | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | Virginia: Cattle Broilers | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ohio: <br> Soybeans Com | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |

Table 9 - United States: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of U.S. total for each commodity and att preceding commodities.
2/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-xind.

Table 2-Alabama: Leading comodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

1/ The cunutative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked (ist of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked tist of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disctosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Goverment payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-xind.

Table 3-Alaska: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


Iable 4--Arizona: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Additional cash receipts have been excluded to avoid disctosure of individual operations.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each comnodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclasure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 5-Arkansas: Leading commodities for cash receipts,

-. = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.
2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked (ist of 25 leading connodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.
4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-xind.

Table 6-California: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## - = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Additional cash receipts have been excluded to avoid disclosure of individual operations.
// The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each comnodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the botton of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclasure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Govermment payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 7--Colorado: Leading commodities for cash receipts


## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line iten.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked tist of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared yithin the ranked list of 25 leading comodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individuat producers.

4/ Government payments made directity to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 8--Connecticut: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The comulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 teading commodities; but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind

Table 9-Delaware: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

*- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding comodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same tine item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disctosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-xind.

Table 10--florida: leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Additional cash receipts have been excluded to avoid disclosure of individual operations.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commosity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the botton of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data nould have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Xind.

Table 11-Georgia: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Additional cash receipts have been excluded to avoid disclosure of individual operations.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.
2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line it
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of conmodities and having no accompanyin data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual oroducers

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind

Table 12--Hawaii: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## - = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3 / Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked ist of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-kind.

Table 13-1daho: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commadities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading comodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individua! producers

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-kind.

Table 14-1llinois: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- $=$ Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each comodity and all preceding commodities.
2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading comodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or payment-in-Kind.

Table 15--Indiana: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- $=$ Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commadity and all preceding commadities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 16--Iowa: lesding commodities for cash receipts, 1992


[^1]3/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3 Comnodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data yould have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading comodities, but were excltaded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Govermment payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 17-Kansas: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked ist of comodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.
4) Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-kind.

Table 18-Kentucky: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading comodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or payment-in-Kind.

Table 19--Louisiana: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
i/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all precedins commodities.
2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Comodities at the bottom of the above ranked (ist of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disctosure of confidential information about individual producers.
4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-kind.

Table 20--Maine: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | - Items |  | Value of receipts | Percent of total receipts | Cumulative percent 1/ | : Percent <br> : of U.s. <br> : value 2/ | $:$ Value <br> $:$ of U.s. <br> $:$ receipts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,000 dollars |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | ------- | Percent | ------ |  |
|  | All commodities |  | 513,187 | 100.0 | -- | 0.3 | 171,168,411 |
|  | Livestock and products |  | 300,501 | 58.5 | - - | 0.3 | 86,357,964 |
|  | Crops |  | 212,686 | 41.4 | $\ldots$ | 0.2 | $84,857,964$ |
| 1 | Potatoes |  | 113,215 | 22.0 |  |  |  |
| 2 | Dairy products |  | 113,215 93,755 | 18.2 | 22.0 40.3 | 5.5 | 2,033,176 |
| 3 | Chicken eggs |  | 83,759 80,407 | 18.2 15.6 | 40.3 | 0.4 | 19,847,999 |
| 4 | Aquacuiture |  | 39,000 | 15.6 7.6 | 56.0 63.6 | 2.3 | 3,389,042 |
| 5 | Blueberries | : | 36,203 | 7.0 | 63.6 70.6 | 7.7 28.3 | 502,211 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 127.925 |
| 6 | Cattle and calves |  | 21,125 | 4.1 | 74.7 | 0.0 | $37.882,368$ |
| 7 | Greenhouse and nursery |  | 18,700 | 3.6 | 78.4 | 0.2 | $37,882,368$ $8,998,769$ |
| 8 | Apples |  | 14,653 | 2.8 | 81.2 | 0.8 | 1,684,037 |
| 10 | Hay | - | 6,646 | 1.2 | 82.5 | 0.2 | 2,912,702 |
|  | Maple products |  | 2,433 | 0.4 | 83.0 | 6.2 | $39.125$ |
| 19 | Oats |  | 1,914 | 0.3 |  |  |  |
| 12 | Hogs |  | 1,370 | 0.2 | 83.4 83.6 | 1.1 | 164,980 |
| 13 | Farm chickens |  | 1, 944 | 0.1 | 83.6 63.8 | 0.0 | 10,088,234 |
| 14 | Honey |  | 416 | 0.0 | 63.8 83.9 | 1.1 | 82,901 |
| 15 |  |  | 251 | 0.0 | 83.9 | 0.2 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $124,073$ |
| 16 | Wool |  | 58 | 0.0 | 84.0 | 0.1 | 60,493 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Peas, green |  | 3/ | - | -- | -- | -- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Government payments 4/ |  | 10,253 | $\cdots$ | -- | 0.1 | 9,168,920 |

## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
$1 /$ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanyin data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 21*-Maryland: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- $=$ Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Additional cash receipts have been excluded to avoid disclosure of individual operations.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 22-Massachusetts: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data youtd have appeared within the ranked list of 25 teading commodities, but were excluded to avofd disclosure of confidential information about individual producers
4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment in-Kind.

Table 23-Michigan: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## -- = Not appiticable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Additionat cash receipts have been excluded to avoid disclosure of individual operations.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-kind

Table 24--Minnesota: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | k Items |  | Value of receipts | : | Percent of total receipts | Cumulative percent 1/ | : Percent <br> : of U.S. <br> : value $2 /$ | Value <br> of U.S. <br> receipts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,000 dollars |
|  |  |  | 1,000 dollars |  | -------- | Percent | -------- |  |
|  | Alt commodities |  | 7,082,069 |  | 100.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Livestock and products |  | 3,622,301 |  | 51.1 | -- | 4.1 | 171,168,411 |
|  | crops |  | 3,459,768 |  | 48.8 | -- | 4.1 4.0 | $86,357,964$ $84,810,44$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 84,810,447 |
| 2 | Dairy products Corn |  | 1,249,663 |  | 17.6 | 17.6 | 6.3 | 19,847,999 |
| 3 | Soybeans |  | $1,223,987$ 988,223 |  | 17.2 | 34.9 | 8.3 | 14,741,596 |
| 4 | Hogs |  | 971,661 |  | 13.7 | 48.8 | 8.7 | 11,343,492 |
| 5 |  |  | 864,685 |  | 12.2 | 74.8 | 8.5 | 10,088,234 |
|  | Wheat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Turkeys |  | 409,847 |  | 5.6 | 80.4 | 5.2 | 7,640,578 |
| 8 | Sugarbeets |  | 283,185 |  | 4.0 | 84.4 | 11.8 | 2,386,780 |
| 9 | Hay |  | 102,113 |  | 3.8 1.4 | 88.3 | 24.8 | 1,109,065 |
| 10 | Chicken eggs |  | 95,838 |  | 1.3 | 91.1 | 3.5 | 2,912,702 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2.8 |  | 3,389,042 |  |
| 11 | Greenhouse and nursery |  | 86,565 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Barley |  | 84,609 |  | 1.1 | 92.3 | 0.9 | 8,998,769 |
| 13 | Potatoes |  | 78,925 |  | 1.1 | 93.5 | 9.9 | 851,692 |
| 14 | aroilers | : | 74,619 |  | 1.1 | 94.7 | 3.8 | 2,033,176 |
| 15 | Corn, sweet |  | 42,897 |  | 0.5 | 96.3 | 0.7 | 9,155,992 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 9.5 |  | 447,428 |  |
| 16 | Sunflower |  | 39,940 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | Peas, green |  | 36,733 |  | 0.5 | 96.8 | 13.9 | 285,960 |
| 18 | Dry beans | : | 36,016 |  | 0.5 | 97.4 | 27.0 | 136,022 |
| 19 | Sheep and lambs | : | 17,723 |  | 0.4 | 97.8 | 6.3 | 487,423 |
| 20 | Oats | : | 14,665 |  | 0.2 | 98.2 | 3.8 | 455,902 |
|  |  | : |  |  | 8.8 |  | 164,980 |  |
| 21 | Honey |  | 9,405 |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| 22 A | Apples | : | 8,896 |  | 0.1 | 98.4 | 7.5 | 124,073 |
| 23 M | Mink pelts | : | 8,256 |  | 0.1 | 98.5 98.6 | 0.5 | 1,684,037 |
| 24 | Carrots | : | 3,687 |  | 0.0 | 98.7 | 11.6 | 70,633 |
|  |  | : |  |  | 1.0 |  | 338,247 |  |
|  | Beans, snap |  | $3 /$ |  |  | -- | -- | $\cdots$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 422,023 |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 4.6 | 9,168,920 |  |

## -- = Not spplicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and
at 1 preceding commodities.
2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table $25-$ Mississippi: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- Fot applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
if The cumutative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of $U . S$. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disciosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-kind.

Table 26-Missouri: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

1/ The cumutative percentage is the sum of the percent of totat receipts for each commadity and all preceding comodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked tist of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-xind.

Table 27--Montana: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


Table 28--Nebraska: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line iten.
3/ Comodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 feading comodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 29-Nevada: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 9992

-- $=$ Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each conmodity and all preceding commodities
2) Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.

3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of comodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.
4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 30-kew hampshire: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each comodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Comodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were exctuded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.
4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or payment-in-kind.
table 31--New Jersey: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Addition
individual operations. all preceding commodities.
2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Comnodities at the bottor of
data would have appeared within the rabke ranked ist of commodities and having no accompanying avoid disclosure of confidential information of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to
4/ Government payments made directly

Table 32--New Mexico: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ the cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each comodity and all preceding comodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Comodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of conmodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.
4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 33-Hew York: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## -- $=$ Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Additional cash receipts have been excluded to avoid disclosure of individual operations.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and liaving no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but yere excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers., but rere excluded to
4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 34--North Carolina: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Additional cash receipts have been excluded to avaid disclosure of individual operations.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Comodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 35*North Dakota: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same tine item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential informetion about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Xind.

Table 36-Ohio: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-kind.

Table 37-0klahoma: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


* = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Comodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading comodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers
4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or payment-in-kind.

Table 38-0regon: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 9992

-- = *ot appi icable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Additional cash receipts have been excluded to avoid disclosure of individual operations.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and al 1 preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked tist of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked ist of 25 leading comodities, but were excluded to avoid disclasure of confidential information about individual producers
4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or payment-in-Xind.

Table 39~-Pennsylvania: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

1/ The cumblative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each conmodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same tine item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of comodities and having no accompanyin data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-kind.

Teble 40-Rhode island: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding comnodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3 Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 41--South Carotina: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## " = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Additional cash receipts have been excluded to avoid disclosure of individual operations.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.
2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked tist of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.
4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 42--South Dakota: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

. $=$ Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.
2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading comodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Tabte 43--Tennessee: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 4992


## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

* Additional cash receipts have been excluded to avoid disclosure of individual operations.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commadities.
2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Govermment payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 44-Texas: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | Items |  | Value of receipts | : Percent <br> : of total <br> : receipts | : <br> : Cumulacive <br> : percent 1/ | : Percent <br> : of U.S. <br> : value $2 /$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vaiue } \\ & \text { of U.s, } \\ & \text { receipts } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1,000 dollars | ------- | -- Percent | ------- | 1,000 dollars |
|  | All commodities |  | 11,619,842 | 100.0 | -- | 6.7 | 171.168,411 |
|  | Livestock and products |  | 7,523,088 | 64.7 | *- | 8.7 | 86,357,964 |
|  | Crops |  | 4,096,754 | 35.2 | -- | 4.8 | 84,810,447 |
| 1 | Cattle and catves |  | 5,644,620 | 48.5 | 48.5 |  |  |
| 2 | Cotton |  | 1,033,838 | 48.5 8.9 | 48.5 57.4 | 14.9 19.8 | 37,882,368 |
| 3 | Dairy products |  | 760,213 | 6.5 | 57.4 64.0 | 19.8 3.8 | $\begin{array}{r}5,207,216 \\ 19,847 \\ \hline 809\end{array}$ |
| 5 | Greenhouse and nurserySorghum grain |  | 628,000 | 5.4 | 64.0 | 3.8 6.9 | 19,847,999 |
|  |  | : | 555,752 | 4.7 | 74.2 | 6.9 39.7 | $8,998,769$ $1,396,650$ |
| 6 | groilers | : | 553,784 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Corn |  | 553,784 464,384 | 4.7 | 78.9 | 6.0 | 9,155,992 |
| 8 | Wheat |  | -364,384 | 4.0 3.3 | 82.9 | 3.1 | 14,741,596 |
| 9 | Peanuts |  | 182,960 | 3.3 1.5 | 86.3 | 5.0 | 7,640,578 |
| 10 | Chicken eggs |  | 181,755 | 1.5 | 87.8 89.4 | 14.2 | 1,285,671 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.3 | 3,389,042 |
| 11 | Rice |  | 152,355 | 1.3 | 90.7 |  |  |
| 12 | Hay |  | 121,825 | 1.0 | 91.8 | 12.3 4.1 | 1,232,132 |
| 13 | Pecans |  | 87,300 | 0.7 | 91.8 92.5 | 4.1 36.2 | 2,912,702 |
| 14 | Hogs |  | 75,505 | 0.6 | 92.5 | 36.2 0.7 | 240,623 $10,088,234$ |
| 15 | Sheep and tambs |  | 72,385 | 0.6 | 93.8 | 0.7 15.8 | 10,088, 234 |
| 16 | Onions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | Soybeans |  | 61,022 | 0.5 | 94.3 | 9.1 | 664,611 |
| 18 | Hatermelons |  | 47,601 | 0.4 | 94.7 | 0.4 | 71,343,492 |
| 19 | Cane for sugar |  | 34,320 33,308 | 0.3 | 95.0 | 17.2 | 198,866 |
| 20 | Peppers, green |  | 23,277 | 0.2 0.2 | 95.3 95.5 | 3.6 7.6 | 927,531 |
| 21 | Sugarbeets |  |  |  | 85 | 7.6 | 367,650 |
|  |  |  | 25,727 | 0.2 | 95.8 | 2.3 | 1,109,065 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , |
|  | Turkeys Mushrooms Cabbage Cantaloups |  | $3 /$ | -- | -- | $\cdots$ |  |
|  |  |  | 3/ | -- | -- | . |  |
|  |  |  | 3/ | -- | -- |  |  |
|  |  |  | $3 /$ | -- | - | -* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Government payments 4/ |  | 1,162,039 | -- | *- | 12.6 | 9,168,920 |

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total recejpts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.
2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3 Comodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading conmodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential infornation about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.
rable 45--Utah: Leading commodities for cash receipts,


## $\cdots$ = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Comodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading comodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 46--Vermont: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | Items |  | Value of receipts | Percent : of total : receipts : | Cumulative percent 1/ | : Percent <br> : of U.S. <br> : value 2/ | ```Value of U.S. receipts``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | -- | Percent | ---- | 1,000 dollars |
|  |  |  | 451.898 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
|  | Livestock and products |  | 388,502 | 85.9 | -- | 0.2 | 171,168,411 |
|  | Crops |  | 63,396 | 14.0 | -- | 0.4 0.0 | $86,357,964$ $84,810,447$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 84,810.447 |
| 1 | Dairy products |  | 343,198 | 75.9 | 75.9 | 1.7 | 19,847,999 |
| 2 | Cattle and calves |  | 32,346 | 7.1 | 83.1 | 0.0 | 37,882,368 |
| 3 | Greenhouse and nursery |  | 23,000 | 5.0 | 88.1 | 0.2 | 8,998,769 |
| 4 | Hay |  | 12,725 | 2.8 | 81.0 | 0.4 | 2,912,702 |
| 5 | Maple products |  | 12,711 | 2.8 | 93.8 | 32.4 | 39,125 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Apples |  | 7,945 | 1.7 | 95.5 | 0.4 | 1,684,037 |
| 7 | Chicken egas |  | 2,532 | 0.5 | 96.1 | 0.0 | 3,389,042 |
| 8 | Sheep and lambs |  | 1,314 | 0.2 | 96.4 | 0.2 | +455,902 |
| 9 | Hogs |  | 951 | 0.2 | 96.6 | 0.0 | 10,088, 234 |
| 10 | Honey | - | 325 | 0.0 | 96.7 | 0.2 | 124,073 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Aquaculture |  | 300 | 0.0 | 96.7 | 0.0 | 502,211 |
| 12 | Wool |  | 86 | 0.0 | 96.8 | 0.1 | 60.493 |
| 13 | Farm chickens |  | 20 | 0.0 | 96.8 | 0.0 | 82,901 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Goversment payments 3/ |  | 5,550 | -- | -- | 0.0 | 9,168,920 |

-. = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 47--Virginia: leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## - = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rotinding

* Additional cash receipts have been exciuded to avoid disclosure of individual operations.

1/ The cumutative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3 Commodities at the botton of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Goverment payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Kind.

Table 48-Washington: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


## -- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding comkodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-Xind.

Table 49-West Virginia: Leading commodities for cash receipts

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent state receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked tist of commodities and having no accompanying data hould have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.
4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or payment-in-Kind.

Table 50--wisconsin: Leading commodities for cash receipts, 1992


- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of total receipts for each commodity and all preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.3. receipts for same line item,
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked list of commodities and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 leading commodities, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

4/ Government payments made directly to farmers in cash or Payment-in-kind.

Iable 5i--Wyoming: $i e a d i n g$ commodities for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of totat receipts for each commodity and al! preceding commodities.

2/ Percent State receipts are of U.S. receipts for same line item.
3/ Commodities at the bottom of the above ranked if ist of commoditi
data would have appeared within the ranked list of 25 lea avoid disclosure of confidential information
$4 /$ Government payments made directly to far

Table 52-Cattle and calves: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

$-\overline{-}=$ Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and

Table 53--Dairy products: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | k States | Value of commodity <br> : receipts | Percent of commodity total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | $\begin{aligned} & \text { State's } \\ & \vdots \text { total } \\ & \text { foralt commodities } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | Wisconsin | 3,133,362 | 15.7 | 15.7 |  |  |
| 2 | California | 2,608,281 | 13.1 | 28.9 | 14.3 | 5,499,038 |
| 3 | New York | 1,527,541 | 7.7 | 36.6 | 14.3 51.8 | 18,234,014 |
| 5 | Pennsylvania Minnesota | 1,485,184 | 7.4 | 44.1 | 41.0 | $2,946,039$ $3,618,490$ |
|  |  | 1,249,663 | 6.3 | 50.4 | 17.6 | 7,082,069 |
| 6 | Texas | 760.213 | 3.8 | 54.2 |  |  |
| 7 8 | Hichigan | 711:290 | 3.8 | 54.2 57.8 | 6.5 21.6 | 11,619,842 |
| 8 | Washington | 645,710 | 3.2 | 61.0 | 21.6 14.5 | $3,286,329$ $4,454,223$ |
| 10 | Iowa | 624,440 542,750 | 3.1 | 64.2 | 14.9 | 4,167,316 |
| 0 | Iowa | 542,750 | 2.7 | 66.9 | 5.2 | 10,329,712 |
| 11 | Florida | 401,700 | 2.0 | 68.9 |  |  |
| 12 | Mis souri | 379,600 | 1.9 | 68.9 70.8 | 8.5 | 6,144,508 |
| 13 | Idaho | 370,800 | 1.8 | 72.8 | 9.2 | 4,123,300 |
| 14 15 | Illinois | 352,450 | 1.7 | 74.5 | 13.1 4.6 | 2,815,512 |
| 15 | Vermont | 343,198 | 1.7 | 74.5 76.2 | 4.6 75.9 | $\begin{array}{r} 7.633,692 \\ 451,898 \end{array}$ |
| 16 | Indiana | 300,979 | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| 17 | Virginia | 291,888 | 1.4 | 77.7 | 6.6 | 4,505.292 |
| 18 19 | Tennessee | 287,980 | 1.4 | 89.2 80.7 | 13.6 | 2,134,353 |
| $\begin{array}{r}19 \\ \\ \hline 10\end{array}$ | Kentucky | 284,960 | 1.4 | 82.1 | 13.6 8.8 | 2,103,471 |
| 20 | New Mexico | 269,310 | 1.3 | 83.4 | 8.8 17.6 | $3,221,305$ $1,530,425$ |
| 21 | Arizona | 236,607 | 1.9 |  |  |  |
| 22 | Georgía | 229,860 | 1.1 | 84.6 | 12.8 | 1,835,250 |
| 23 | Oregon | 225,642 | 1.1 | 85.8 86.9 | 5.6 | 4,073,125 |
| 24 | North Carolina | 215,350 | 1.1 | 86.9 88.0 | 9.0 | 2,489,821 |
| 25 | South Dakota | 210,816 | 1.0 | 88.0 89.1 | 4.1 6.5 | 5,181,017 $3,229,480$ |
| 26 | Maryl and | 200,760 | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| 27 | Colorado | 189,386 | 0.9 | 90.1 | 14.4 | 1,390,765 |
| 28 | Utah | 169.532 | 0.8 0.8 | 91.0 91.9 | 4.6 22.9 | 4,038,389 |
| 29 | Oklahoma | 166,455 | 0.8 0.8 | 91.9 92.7 | 22.9 | 738,338 $3,634,931$ |
| 30 | Kansas | 151,074 | 0.7 | 92.7 93.5 | 4.5 2.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 3,634,931 \\ & 7,000,307 \end{aligned}$ |
| 31 | Nebrasika | 150,570 | 0.7 |  |  |  |
| 32 | Louisiana | 135,360 | 0.6 | 94.3 | 1.7 | 8,782,653 |
| 33 | North Dakota | 118,080 | 0.5 | 94.9 | 7.3 | 1,846,181 |
| 34 35 | Mississippi | 906,500 | 0.5 | 93.5 96.1 | 3.8 4.0 | 3,093,612 |
| 35 | Arkansas | 106,057 | 0.5 | 96.6 | 4.0 2.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 2,601,966 \\ & 4,602,230 \end{aligned}$ |
| 36 | Maine | 93.755 |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | Connecticut | 76.319 | 0.4 | 97.1 97.5 | 18.2 | 513,187 |
| 38 | Massachusetts | 74.450 | 0.3 | 97.5 | 15.6 | 488,746 |
| 39 | Alabama | 72,500 | 0.3 | 97.8 | 15.1 | 491,234 |
| 40 | South Carolina | 58,099 | 0.2 | 98.2 98.5 | 2.5 4.9 | $\begin{aligned} & 2,830,062 \\ & 1,176,746 \end{aligned}$ |
| 41 | New Jersey |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42 | New Hampshire | 46,248 | 0.2 | 98.7 | 7.6 | 656.888 |
| 43 | Nevada | 43,152 | 0.2 | 99.0 | 32.1 15.8 | 143,983 |
| 44 | Montana | 41,795 | 0.2 | 99.4 | 15.8 2.4 | 1772,795 |
| 45 | West Virginia | 36,448 | 0.1 | 99.6 | 10.6 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,742,408 \\ 342,548 \end{array}$ |
| 46 | Hawai | 32,495 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| 47 | Delaware | 19,880 | 0.1 | 99.8 | 5.7 | 564.151 |
| 48 | Hyoming | 12,375 | 0.0 | 99.9 99.9 | 3.1 1.6 | 635,762 |
| 49 | Rhode Island | 4,512 | 0.0 | 99.9 99.9 | 1.6 6.2 | 773,312 |
| 50 | Alaska | 2,391 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 9.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 72,218 \\ & 25,478 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | United States | 19,847,999 | -- | -- |  |  |

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to roundimg.
i/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and

Table 54-Corn: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States |  | Value of commedity receipts | Percent of commodity total | Cumulative percent $1 /$ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | ```: State's total fo: all : commodities``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1,000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | Illinois |  | 2,779,942 | 18.8 | 18.8 | 36.4 | 7,633,692 |
| 2 | Iowa |  | 2,579,344 | 17.5 | 36.3 | 36.4 24.9 | 10,329,712 |
| 3 | Nebraska |  | 1.912,994 | 12.9 | 49.3 | 24.7 | 8,782,653 |
| 4 5 | Indiana |  | 1,281,792 | 8.7 | 58.0 | 28.4 | 4.505,292 |
| 5 | Minnesota |  | 1,223,987 | 8.3 | 66.3 | 17.2 | 7,082,069 |
| 6 | Ohio |  | 779,039 | 5.2 | 71.6 | 18.6 | 4,167,316 |
| 7 | Kansas |  | 477,469 | 3.2 | 74.8 | 6.8 | 7,000,307 |
| 8 | Texas |  | 464,384 | 3.1 | 78.0 | 4.0 | 11,619.842 |
| 9 | Missouri |  | 452,220 | 3.0 | 81.0 | 10.9 | 4,123,300 |
| 10 | Michigan |  | 401,679 | 2.7 | 83.8 | 12.2 | 3,286,329 |
| 11 | Wisconsin |  | 350,752 | 2.3 | 86.1 | 6.3 |  |
| 12 | South Dakota |  | 340,989 | 2.3 | 88.4 | 10.5 | 3,499,038 |
| 13 | Colorado |  | 268.494 | 1.8 | 90.3 | 6.6 | 4,038,389 |
| 14 15 | Kentucky |  | 245.624 | 1.6 | 91.9 | 7.6 | 3,221,305 |
| 15 | North Carolina |  | 194,413 | 1.3 | 93.2 | 3.7 | 5,181,017 |
| 16 | Georgia |  | 118,272 | 0.8 | 94.1 | 2.9 | 4,073,125 |
| 17 | Maryland | : | 94,478 | 0.6 | 94.7 | 6.7 | 1,390,765 |
| 18 | Pennsylvania | : | 84,361 | 0.5 | 95.3 | 2.3 | 3,618,490 |
| 19 | Tennessee |  | 79,857 | 0.5 | 95.8 | 3.8 | 2,103,471 |
| 20 | North Dakota | : | 77,320 | 0.5 | 96.3 | 2.5 | 3,093,612 |
| 21 | Louisiana |  | 60,788 | 0.4 | 96.7 |  |  |
| 22 | Hew York |  | 58,666 | 0.4 | 97.1 | 1.9 | 2,846,181 |
| 23 | Virginia |  | 50,715 | 0.3 | 97.5 | 2.3 | 2,134,353 |
| 24 25 | South Carolina |  | 48,912 | 0.3 | 97.8 | 4.3 | 1,176,746 |
| 25 | California |  | 46,176 | 0.3 | 98.1 | 0.2 | 18,234,014 |
| 26 | Delanare |  | 36,694 | 0.2 | 98.4 | 5.7 |  |
| 27 | Washington |  | 34,138 | 0.2 | 98.6 | 0.7 | 4,454,223 |
| 28 | Atabama |  | 31,733 | 0.2 | 98.8 | 1.1 | 4,434,223 |
| 29 30 | Mississippi |  | 31.474 | 0.2 | 99.0 | 1.2 | 2,601,966 |
| 30 | Oklahoma |  | 26,734 | 0.1 | 99.2 | 0.7 | 3,634,931 |
| 31 | New Mexico |  | 21,627 | 0.1 | 99.4 | 1.4 |  |
| 32 | Arkansas |  | 19,897 | 0.1 | 99.5 | 0.4 | 4,602,230 |
| 33 34 | New Jersey Florida |  | 15,307 | 0.1 | 99.6 | 2.3 | -656,888 |
| 34 35 | Florida |  | 13.448 | 0.0 | 99.7 | 0.2 | 6,144,508 |
| 35 | Idaho |  | 12,218 | 0.0 | 99.8 | 0.4 | 2,815,512 |
| 36 | Hyoming |  | 5,882 | 0.0 | 99.8 | 0.7 | 773,312 |
| 37 | Utah |  | 5,727 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.7 | 738,338 |
| 38 39 | Oregon west virginia |  | 4,455 4,189 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.1 | 2,489,821 |
| 39 40 | West Virginia Montana |  | 4,189 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 1.2 | , 342,548 |
| 40 | Montana | : | 3,575 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.2 | 1,742,408 |
| 41 | Arizona |  | 1,834 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.1 | 1,835,250 |
|  | United States |  | 14,741,596 | -- | ** | 8.6 | 171,168,411 |

[^2]$1 /$ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of comodity total for each state and all preceding states.


Table 56-Hogs: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States | : Value of <br> : commodity <br> : receipts | Percent of commodity total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of State's total for alt commodities | $\begin{aligned} & : \text { state's } \\ & \vdots \text { fotas } \\ & : \text { commodities } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | Percent | ---. | 1,000 dollars |
| i | Iowa | 2,740,885 | 27.1 | 27.1 | 26.5 | 10,329,712 |
| 2 | Itlinois | 1,041,579 | 10.3 | 37.4 | 13.6 | 7,633,692 |
| 3 | Minnesota | 864,685 | 8.5 | 46.0 | 12.2 | 7,082,069 |
| 4 | Mebraska | 777,039 | 7.7 | 53.7 | 8.8 | 8,782,653 |
| 5 | Indiana | 739,184 | 7.3 | 61.0 | 16.4 | 4,505,292 |
| 6 | Horth Carolina | 729.750 | 7.2 | 68.3 | 14.0 | 5,181,017 |
| 7 | Missouri | 455,030 | 4.5 | 72.8 | 11.0 | 4,123,300 |
| 8 | South Dakota | 346,693 | 3.4 | 76.2 | 10.7 | 3,229,480 |
| 9 | Ohio | 324,046 | 3.2 | 79.4 | 7.7 | 4,167,316 |
| 10 | Kansas | 272,306 | 2.7 | 82.1 | 3.8 | 7,000,307 |
| 11 | Wisconsin | 202,788 | 2.0 | 84.2 | 3.6 | 5,499,038 |
| 12 | Michigan | 198,281 | 1.9 | 86.1 | 6.0 | 3,286,329 |
| 33 | Georgia | 172,228 | 1.7 | 87.8 | 4.2 | 4,073,125 |
| 14 | Kentucky | 146,334 | 1.4 | 89.3 | 4.5 | 3,221,305 |
| 15 | Pennsylvania | 126,094 | 1.2 | 90.5 | 3.4 | 3,618,490 |
| 16 | Arkansas | 120,537 | 1.1 | 91.7 | 2.6 | 4,602,230 |
| 17 | Alabama | 110,039 | 1.0 | 92.8 | 3.8 | 2,830,062 |
| 18 | Fennessee | 101,609 | 1.0 | 93.8 | 4.8 | 2,103,471 |
| 19 | Texas | 75,505 | 0.7 | 94.6 | 0.6 | 11,619,842 |
| 20 | Colorado | 73,382 | 0.7 | 95.3 | 1.8 | 4,038,389 |
| 21 | Virginia | 73,218 | 0.7 | 96.0 | 3.4 | 2,134,353 |
| 22 | South Carolina | 60:674 | 0.6 | 96.6 | 5.1 | 1,176,746 |
| 23 | Oklahoma | 44,673 | 0.4 | 97.1 | 1.2 | 3,634,931 |
| 24 | California | 41,189 | 0.4 | 97.5 | 0.2 | 18,234,014 |
| 25 | Montana | 39,749 | 0.3 | 97.9 | 2.2 | 1,742,408 |
| 26 | North Dakota | 39,533 | 0.3 | 98.3 | 1.2 | 3,093,612 |
| 27 | Maryland | 29,364 | 0.2 | 98.5 | 2.1 | 1,390,765 |
| 28 | Mississippi | 22,343 | 0.2 | 98.8 | 0.8 | 2,601,966 |
| 29 | Arizona | 19,253 | 0.1 | 99.0 | 1.0 | 1,835,250 |
| 30 | Florida | 13,126 | 0.1 | 99.1 | 0.2 | 6,144,508 |
| 31 | New York | 12,018 | 0.1 | 99.2 | 0.4 | 2,946,039 |
| 32 | Oregon | 11,882 | 0.1 | 99.3 | 0.4 | 2,489,821 |
| 33 | Idaho | 8,318 | 0.0 | 99.4 | 0.3 | 2,815,512 |
| 34 | Louisiana | 7,242 | 0.0 | 99.5 | 0.3 | 1,846,181 |
| 35 | Washington | 6,912 | 0.0 | 99.6 | 0.1 | 4,454,223 |
| 36 | Hawai i | 6,521 | 0.0 | 99.6 | 1.1 | 564,151 |
| 37 | West Virginia | 5,554 | 0.0 | 99.7 | 1.6 | 342,548 |
| 38 | delaware | 5,191 | 0.0 | 99.7 | 0.8 | 635,762 |
| 39 | Hyoming | 4,864 | 0.0 | 99.8 | 0.6 | 773,312 |
| 40 | Utah | 4,435 | 0.0 | 99.8 | 0.6 | 738,338 |
| 41 | New Mexico | 3,880 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.2 | 1,530,425 |
| 42 | Massachusetts | 2,579 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.5 | ,491,234 |
| 43 | Mevada | 1,879 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.6 | 272,795 |
| 44 | Maine | 1,370 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.2 | 513,187 |
| 45 | New Jersey | 1,142 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.1 | 656,888 |
| 46 | Vermont | 951 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.2 | 451,898 |
| 47 | Connecticut | 948 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.1 | 488,746 |
| 48 | Nen Kampshire | 757 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.5 | 143,983 |
| 49 | Rhode lstand | 496 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.6 | 72,218 |
| 50 | Alaska | 179 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.7 | 25,478 |
|  | United States | 10,088,234 | -- | $\cdots$ | 5.8 | 171, 168,411 |

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and all preceding states.

Table 57--Broilers: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States | : | Value of commodity receipts | Percent of commodity tota! | Cumulative percent 1/ | percent of State's total for alt commodities | $\begin{gathered} \text { State's } \\ \text { total } \\ \text { for all } \\ \text { commodities } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1,000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | Arkansas |  | 1,529,660 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 33.2 | 4,602,230 |
| 2 | Georgia |  | 1,268,096 | 13.8 | 30.5 | 31.1 | 4,073,125 |
| 3 | Alabama North Carolina |  | $1,194,901$ 855,729 | 13.0 0.3 | 43.6 | 42.2 | 2,830,062 |
| 5 | Mississippi | : | 855,729 664,814 | 9.3 7.2 | 52.9 60.2 | 16.5 25.5 | 5,181,017 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , 6 |
| 7 | Texas |  | 553,784 | 6.0 | 66.2 | 4.7 | 11.619.842 |
| 7 8 | Maryland Dataware |  | 403.920 | 4.4 | 70.6 | 29.0 | 1,390,765 |
| 9 | California |  | 401,798 350,549 | 4.3 3.8 | 75.0 | 63.2 | 6835,762 |
| 10 | Virginia | : | 330, 145 | 3.8 3.6 | 78.8 82.5 | 1.9 15.4 | $18,234,014$ $2,134,353$ |
| 11 | OKlahoma | : | 203,878 |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Missouri |  | 184,212 | 2.2 | 84.7 86.7 | 5.6 | 3,634.931 |
| 13 | Pennsylvania | : | 183,142 | 2.0 | 86.7 88.7 | 4.4 | 4,123,300 |
| 14 | Florida | : | 164,856 | 1.8 | 88.7 90.5 | 5.0 2.6 | 3,618,490 |
| 15 | Tennessee | : | 152,685 | 1.6 | 92.2 | 7.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 6,144,508 \\ & 2,103,471 \end{aligned}$ |
| 16 | South Carolina | : | 136,317 | 1.4 | 93.6 |  |  |
| 17 | Minnesota | : | 71,619 | 1.4 0.7 | 93.6 94.4 | 11.5 1.0 | $1,176,746$ $7.082,069$ |
| 18 | Washington | : | 58,374 | 0.6 | 94.4 | 1.0 | 7,082,069 |
| 19 | West Virginia | : | 55,780 | 0.6 | 95.7 | 16.3 | $4,454,223$ 342,548 |
| 20 | Kentucky | : | 48,496 | 0.5 | 96.2 | 16.2 +.5 | $\begin{array}{r} 342,548 \\ 3,221,305 \end{array}$ |
| 21 | Oregon | ; | 37.440 | 0.4 | 96.6 |  |  |
| 22 | Ohio | : | 30,428 | 0.3 | 96.6 | 1.5 | $2,489,821$ $4,167,316$ |
| 23 | lowa | : | 27,999 | 0.3 | 97.3 | 0.7 | 10,329, ${ }^{4} 12$ |
| 24 | Hisconsin | : | 22,770 | 0.2 | 97.5 | 0.4 | 10,399,712 |
| 25 | Nebraska | : | 5,520 | 0.0 | 97.6 | 0.0 | 8,782,653 |
| 26 | Hanaif | : | 2,807 | 0.0 | 97.6 |  |  |
| 27 | New York | : | 1,369 | 0.0 | 97.6 97.6 | 0.5 0.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 564.151 \\ 2.946 .039 \end{array}$ |
| 28 | Michigan | : | . 996 | 0.0 | 97.6 | 0.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 2,946,039 \\ & 3,286,329 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Louisiana | : | $2 /$ | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |
|  | Indiana | : | 21 | - |  |  |  |
|  | Connecticut | : | 21 | -- | - |  |  |
|  | South Dakota | : | 2/ | -- | -- |  |  |
|  | North Dakota | : | $2 /$ | - |  |  |  |
|  | United States | : | 9,155,992 | -- | $\cdots$ | 5.3 | 171,168,41 |

-- $=$ Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
$1 /$ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and all preceding States.
2/ States at the bottom of the above ranked list of states and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the list of 50 states' rankings, but were excluded to avoid disciosure of confidential information about individual producers.

Table S8-Greenhouse and nursery products: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | k States | Value of commodity receipts | Percent of commodity total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | $\begin{array}{lc} : & \text { State's } \\ \vdots & \text { total } \\ : & \text { for all } \\ : \text { comodities } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | - Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | California | 1,882,421 | 20.9 | 20.9 | 10.3 | 18,234,014 |
| 2 | Florióa | 1,024,324 | 11.3 | 32.3 | 16.6 | $18,234,014$ $6,144,508$ |
| 4 | Texas Ohio | 628,000 470,541 | 6.9 5.2 | 39.2 | 5.4 | 11,619,842 |
| 5 | Michigan | 386,815 | 4.3 | 44.5 48.8 | 11.2 11.7 | $4,167,316$ $3,286,329$ |
| 6 | Hew York | 375,250 | 4.1 | 52.9 |  |  |
| 7 | Oregon | 369,618 | 4.9 | 57.0 | 12.7 14.8 | $2,946,039$ $2,489,821$ |
| 8 | North Carolina | 317.177 | 3.5 | 60.6 | 4.8 6.1 | $2,489,821$ $5,181,017$ |
| 90 | Pennsylvania Ok!ahoma | 304,749 274,000 | 3.3 3.0 | 64.0 67.0 | 8.4 | 3,618,490 |
| 10 | Ok،ahoma | 274,000 | 3.0 | 67.0 | 7.5 | 3,634,931 |
| 11 | Marytand | 208,721 | 2.3 | 69.3 |  |  |
| 12 | Alabama | 205,781 | 2.3 | 69.3 71.6 | 15.0 7.2 | 1,390,765 |
| 13 | Georgia | 183,963 | 2.0 | 73.6 | 7.2 | 2,830,062 |
| 14 | New Jersey | 181,248 | 2.0 | 75.7 | 27.5 | 4,073,125 |
| 15 | Washington | 176,570 | 1.9 | 77.6 | 27.5 3.9 | $\begin{array}{r} 656,888 \\ 4,454,223 \end{array}$ |
| 16 | Illinois | 174.497 | 1.9 |  |  |  |
| 17 | Massachusetts | 159,329 | 1.7 | 89.6 81.3 | 32.2 | 7.633,692 |
| 18 | Hisconsin | 148,338 | 1.6 | 81.3 83.0 | 32.4 2.7 | 791.234 5.499 .038 |
| 19 | Connecticut | 143,006 | 1.5 | 84.6 | 29.7 29.2 | $5,499,038$ 488,746 |
| 20 | Tennessee | 130,682 | 1.4 | 86.0 | 6.2 | $2,103,471$ |
| 21 | Virginia | 112,584 | 1.2 | 87.3 |  |  |
| 22 | Indiana | 91,510 | 9.0 | 88.3 | 5.2 | 2,134,353 |
| 23 | Minnesota | 86,565 | 0.9 | 89.3 | 1.0 | 4,505,292 |
| 24 25 | Cotorado | 81, 134 | 0.9 | 90.3 90.2 | 1.2 | 7,082,069 |
| 25 | Hawai | 78,779 | 0.8 | 91.0 | 13.9 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,038,389 \\ 564,151 \end{array}$ |
| 26 | Iowa | 63,133 | 0.7 | 91.7 |  |  |
| 27 | Missouri | 62, 822 | 0.7 | 92.4 | 1.6 | 10,329,712 |
| 28 | Kentucky | 57,850 | 0.6 | 93.4 | 1.5 | 4,123,300 |
| 29 | Idaho | 53,638 | 0.6 | 93.7 | 1.8 | 3,221,305 |
| 30 | Arizona | 48,012 | 0.5 | 94.2 | 2.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 2,815,512 \\ & 1,835,250 \end{aligned}$ |
| 31 | New Mexico | 44,441 | 0.4 |  |  |  |
| 32 | Rhode Is and | 41,250 | 0.4 | 94.7 | 27.9 | 1,530,425 |
| 33 | Delaware | 35,000 | 0.4 | 95.2 95.5 | 57.1 5.5 | 72,218 635,762 |
| 34 35 | New Hampshire | 34,000 | 0.3 | 95.9 | 5.5 23.6 | $635,762$ |
| 35 | Kansas | 29.579 | 0.3 | 96.2 | 23.8 0.4 | $\begin{array}{r} 143,983 \\ 7,000,307 \end{array}$ |
| 36 | Louisiana | 27,692 | 0.3 |  |  |  |
| 37 | North Dakota | 27,000 | 0.3 | 96.6 96.9 |  | $1,846,181$ |
| 38 | Utah | 26, 500 | 0.2 | 96.9 | 0.8 3.5 | 3,093,612 |
| 39 | Arkansas | 26, 240 | 0.2 | 97.4 | 3.5 0.5 | 4,738,338 |
| 40 | Vermont | 23,000 | 0.2 | 97.7 | 5.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,602,230 \\ 451,898 \end{array}$ |
| 49 | Mississippi | 21,000 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| 42 | Maine | 18, 700 | 0.2 | 97.9 98.1 | 0.8 3.6 | 2,601.966 |
| 43 | West Virginia | 16,500 | 0.1 | 98.1 | 3.6 4.8 | 513,187 342,548 |
| 44 | Alaska | 15,060 | 0.1 | 98.3 98.5 | 4.8 59.1 | 342,548 25,478 |
| 45 | Nebraska | 15,000 | 0.1 | 98.7 | 0.1 | 8,782,653 |
| 46 | Montana | 10,000 | 0.1 | 98.8 |  |  |
| 47 | South Dakota | 7,090 | 0.0 | 98.8 | 0.5 | 1,742,408 |
| 48 | Nevada | 3,060 | 0.0 | 98.8 98.9 | 0.2 | 3,229,480 |
| 49 | Hyoming | 1,600 | 0.0 | 98.9 | 0.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 272,795 \\ & 773,312 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | South Carolina | 2/ | -- | $\cdots$ | -- |  |
|  | United States | 8,998,769 | -- | -- | 5.2 | 171, 688.411 |

- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and all preceding States.

2/ States at the bottom of the above ranked list of states and having no accompanying data would have appeared within the list of 50 States' rankings, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual producers.

Table 59--Wheat: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

$\because=$ Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total fof each state and

| Rank | States | $\begin{gathered} \text { Value of } \\ \text { commodity } \\ \text { receipts } \end{gathered}$ | Persent of commodity total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of State's total for at 1 commodities | $\begin{aligned} & \text { State's } \\ & \vdots \text { total } \\ & \vdots \text { commodities } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\vdots 1,000$ dollars |  | percent |  | 1,000 dotlars |
| 1 | Catifornia | 1,121,676 | 21.5 | 21.5 | 6.1 | 18,234,014 |
| 3 | Mississippi | : $\quad 1,033,838$ | 19.8 12.8 | 41.3 | 8.9 | 11,619,842 |
| 4 | Arkanses | : 520,422 | 12.8 9.9 | 54.2 | 25.6 | 2,601,966 |
| 5 | Louisiana | : 429,039 | 8.2 | 72.4 | 23.2 | 4,602,230 $1,846,181$ |
| 6 | Arizona | : 303,728 | 5.8 |  |  |  |
| 7 | Tennessee | : 246,996 | 4.7 | 83.0 | 11.7 | 1.835,250 |
| 8 | Georgia | : 212,632 | 4.0 | 87.1 | 5.2 | 4,073,125 |
| 10 | Missouri | : $\quad 172.137$ | 3.3 | 9 | 6.0 | 2,830,062 |
|  |  | : 157.324 | 3.0 | 93.4 | 3.8 | 4,123,300 |
| 11 | North Carolina | : 143,928 | 2.7 | 96.2 |  |  |
| \% | South Carolina | : $\quad 74,433$ | 1.4 | 97.6 | 6.3 | 5,181,017 |
| 14 | S.u Mexico | : $\quad 24.727$ | 1.3 | 98.9 | 1.8 | 3,634,931 |
| 15 | florida | : 21,837 | 0.4 | 99.8 | 1.6 | 1,530,425 |
| 16 |  | : 7,624 |  |  |  | 6,144,508 |
| 17 | Kansas | $\vdots \quad 7.624$ | 0.1 | 99.9 | 0.3 | 2,134,353 |
|  |  | - 289 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 7,000,307 |
|  | United States | 5,207,216 | -- | - | 3.0 | 171,168,413 |

-- $=$ Not apolisable.
Numbers may net add due to rounding.
i/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and all preceding states.

Table 61-Chicken eggs: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1892


-     - Not appticable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
l/ The cumutative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and

Table 62--Tobacco: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States | Value of commodity receipts | Percent of commodity total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | $\begin{gathered} \text { State's } \\ \text { total } \\ \text { foral! } \\ \text { commodities } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | North Carolina | 1,049,524 | 35.4 | 35.4 | 20.2 | 5,181,017 |
| 2 | Kentucky | 877.357 | 29.6 | 65.0 | 27.2 | 3,221,305 |
| 3 4 | Tennessee South Carolina | 246,389 190,448 | 8.3 | 73.3 | 11.7 | 2,103,471 |
| 4 5 | South Carolina Virginia | 190,448 189,907 | 6.4 | 79.8 86.2 | 16.1 8.9 | $1,176,746$ $2,134,353$ |
| 6 | Georgia | : 170,101 | 5.7 | 91.9 |  |  |
| 7 | Ohio | 42,169 | 1.4 | 93.4 | 4.1 1.0 | 4,073, 125 |
| 8 | Indiana | 35,187 | 1.1 | 94.5 | 1.0 0.7 | 4,167,316 |
| 9 | Connectitut | 32, 894 | 1.1 | 94.5 95.7 | 0.7 6.7 | 4,505,292 |
| 10 | Florida | 31,729 | 1.0 | 96.7 | 0.5 | 6,144,508 |
| 11 | Pennsylvania | : 27,233 |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Wisconsin | : 27,233 | 0.9 0.7 | 97.6 | 0.7 | 3,618,490 |
| 13 | Maryland | : 20,898 | 0.7 | 98.4 | 0.4 | 5,499,038 |
| 14 | Massachusetts | : 10,793 | 0.7 | 99.1 | 1.5 | 1,390,765 |
| 45 | Missouri | : 7,226 | 0.2 | 99.7 | 0.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 491,234 \\ 4,123,300 \end{array}$ |
| 16 | West Virginia | $: 51.851$ | 0.2 | 99.9 |  |  |
| 17 | Atabama | : 1,282 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 342,548 \\ 2,830,062 \end{array}$ |
|  | United States | 2,961,212 | -- | -- | 1.7 | 171,168,411 |

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
9 The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and all preceding States.

Table 63-Hay: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

-. = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and

| Rank | States | Value of commodity receipts | Percent of commodity total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of State's total for alt commodities | $\begin{aligned} & \text { State's } \\ & \vdots \text { total } \\ & \vdots \text { commoditiles } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | North Carolina Minnesota | 475,416 | 19.9 | 19.9 | 9.1 |  |
| 3 | Arkansas | 283,185 | 11.8 | 31.7 | 4.0 | 5,181,017 |
| 4 | California | 196,650 | 8.2 | 40.0 | 4.2 | 4,602,230 |
| 5 | Missouri | 163,590 | 8.8 | 48.1 55.0 | 1.0 3.9 | 18,234,014 |
| 6 | Indiana | 146,824 |  |  |  | 4,123,300 |
| 7 | Virginia | 146,824 137.879 | 6.1 | 61.1 | 3.2 | 4,505,292 |
| 9 | Iowa | 90,558 | 3.7 | 66.9 | 6.4 | 2,134,353 |
| 9 | Pennsytvania | 74,659 | 3.1 | 73.8 | 0.8 | 10,329,712 |
| 10 | South Carolina | 70,637 | 2.9 | 76.8 | 2.0 6.0 | $3,618,490$ $1,176,746$ |
| 11 | Ohio | 54,933 |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Utah | 41,344 | 1.7 | 89.7 | 1.3 | 4,167,316 |
| 114 | South Dakota | 29,694 | 1.2 | 82.1 | 5.6 | 738,338 |
| 15 | Illinais | 29,290 29,274 | 1.2 | 83.3 | 8.5 | 3,229,480 |
|  |  | 29,274 | 1.2 | 84.5 | 0.3 | 7,653,692 |
| 16 | Georgia | 24,596 | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| 17 | Oregon Nebraska | 17,784 | 0.7 | 88.3 | 0.6 | 4,073,125 |
| 19 | North Dakota | 13,293 8,619 | 0.5 | 86.8 | 0.7 | 2,489,821 |
| 20 | Kansas | 7,240 | 0.3 0.3 | 87.2 | 0.2 | 3,093,612 |
|  |  | 7.24 |  |  | 0.1 | 7,000,307 |
| 22 | New York | 4,268 | 0.1 | 87.7 | 0.1 |  |
| 23 | Maryland | 3,455 | 0.1 | 87.8 | 0.7 | $2,946,039$ 491, |
| 24 | Nen Jersey | 1,483 | 0 | 87.9 | 0.1 | 1,390,765 |
| 25 c | Connecticut | 579 | 0.0 | 88.0 | 0.2 | 656.888 |
| 26 | New Hampshire Delaware |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |
| 27 D |  | 53139 | 0.0 | 88.0 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0.0 | 88.0 | 0.0 | $635,762$ |
|  | Wiscons in | 21 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Texas | : 21 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Michigan | : 21 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Colorado | : 21 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2/ | -- |  |  |  |
| United States |  | 2,386,780 | - -- |  | 1.3 171,163,411 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $-=$ Not applicable. <br> Numbers may not add due to rounding. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and all preceding states. <br> 2/ States at the bottom of the above ranked list of States and hoving no accompanying data would have appeared within the list of 50 States! rankings, but were excluded to avoid disclosure of confidential information about individual próducers. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 65--Potatoes: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States | Value of commodity receipts | Percent of commodity total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | ```State's total for all commodities``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | Idaho | 526,480 | 25.8 | 25.8 |  |  |
| 2 | Washington | 290,891 | 14.3 | 25.8 40.2 | 18.7 6.5 | 2,815,512 |
| 4 | California North Dakota | : 131,424 | 6.4 | 40.6 | 0.7 | 18,234,014 |
| 5 | North Dakota Maine | 117,252 | 5.7 | 52.4 | 3.7 | +3,093,614 |
|  |  | 113.215 | 5.5 | 58.0 | 22.0 | 513,187 |
| 6 | Wisconsin | 112,717 | 5.5 | 63.5 | 2.0 |  |
| 7 | Florida | 92,890 | 4.5 | 68.1 | 2.0 | 5,499,038 |
| 8 | Oregon | 90, 243 | 4.4 | 72.5 | 1.5 | 6,144,508 |
| 9 10 | Michigan | 81,962 | 4.0 | 76.5 | 3.6 2.4 | 2,489,821 |
| 10 | Minnesota | 78,925 | 3.8 | 80.4 | 1.1 | 7,082,069 |
| 11 | Colorado | 67,110 | 3.3 |  |  |  |
| 12 | New York | 64,209 | 3.3 | 83.7 | 1.6 | 4,038,389 |
| 13 | Pennsylvania | 31,728 | 1.5 | 88.9 | 2.1 0.8 | 2,946,039 |
| 14 | North Carolina | 27,798 | 1.5 1.3 | 88.4 89.8 | 0.8 | 3,618,490 |
| 15 | Texas | 22,131 | 1.0 | 89.8 90.9 | 0.5 0.1 | $\begin{array}{r} 5,181,017 \\ 11,619,842 \end{array}$ |
| 16 | New Mexico | 20,257 | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| 17 | Ohio | 18,933 | 0.9 | 97.9 | 1.3 | 1,530,425 |
| 18 | Nebraska | 18,570 | 0.9 | 92.8 | 0.4 | 4,167,316 |
| 19 | Virginia | 17,770 | 0.9 0.8 | 934.6 | 0.2 0.8 | 8,732,653 |
| 20 | Montana | 15,826 | 0.8 | 94.6 95.4 | 0.8 0.9 | $2,134,353$ $1,742,408$ |
| 21 | Arizona | 10,912 |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | Alabama | 10,912 | 0.5 | 95.9 | 0.5 | 1,835,250 |
| 23 | Nevada | 10,693 | 0.5 0.5 | 96.5 | 0.3 | 2,830,062 |
| 24 | Delanare | 10,074 | 0.5 | 97.0 | 3.9 | 272,795 |
| 25 | Utah | 8,463 | 0.4 | 97.5 97.9 | 1.5 | $635,762$ |
| 26 | Illinois | 7.194 |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | South Dakota | 7,008 | 0.3 0.3 | 98.2 | 0.0 | 7,633,692 |
| 28 | New Jersey | 6,048 | 0.3 | 98.6 98.9 | 0.2 | 3,229,480 |
| 29 | Indiana | 5,898 | 0.2 | 98.9 | 0.9 | 656.888 |
| 30 | Massachusetts | 4,884 | 0.2 | 99.4 | 0.1 0.9 | $4,505,292$ 491,234 |
| 31 | Maryland | 3,232 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| 32 | Wyoming | 2,428 | 0.1 | 99.6 | 0.2 | 1,390,765 |
| 33 | Rhode Island | 2,428 | 0.1 | 99.7 99.8 | 0.3 | 773,312 |
| 34 | Alaska | 1,591 | 0.0 | 99.8 99.9 | 3.0 6.2 | 72,218 |
| 35 | Iowa | 1,444 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 6.2 0.0 | 10,329, 712 |
|  | United States | 2,033,176 | -- | - |  |  |

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1 The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and

Table 66-Tomatoes: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

-- = Not applicable.
Wumberswit\} not adci due to exclusion of confidential data.

* Additional cash receipts have been excluded to avoid disc
cosure of individual operations.
解
2/ States at the
would have appeared within of the above ranked ilst of states end having no accompanying data disclosure of confidential information about individuat produt were excluded to avold


Table 68-*Apples: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States | Value of commodity receipts | Percent of commodity total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : State's } \\ & \vdots \text { total } \\ & : \text { for all } \\ & \text { commodities } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | Percent | -- | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | Washington | $: \quad 913.432$ | 54.2 | 54.2 | 20.5 | 4,454,223 |
| 2 | California | : 179,139 | 10.6 | 64.8 | 0.9 | 18,234,014 |
| 3 | New York | : 129,301 | 7.6 | 72.5 | 4.3 | 18,234,014 |
| 4 | Michigan | : 100,432 | 5.9 | 78.5 | 4.3 3.0 | 2,946,039 |
| 5 | Pennsylvania | 46,065 | 2.7 | 81.2 | 1.2 | 3,618,490 |
| 6 | Virginia | 36,247 | 2.1 | 83.4 |  |  |
| 7 | Ohio | 24,588 | 1.4 | 83.4 84.8 | 1.7 | 2,134,353 |
| 8 | Horth Carolina | 23:188 | 1.3 | 86.2 | 0.5 0.4 | $4,167,316$ $5,181,017$ |
| 9 | Oregon | 22, 311 | 1.3 | 87.5 | 0.4 0.9 | $5,181,017$ $2,489,821$ |
| 10 | Hest Virginia | 17,378 | 1.0 | 88.6 | 5.0 | $2,489,821$ 342,548 |
| 11 | Wisconsin | 16,489 | 0.9 | 89.5 | 0.3 |  |
| 12 | Massachusetts | 15,064 | 0.8 | 89.5 | 3.3 | $5,499,038$ 491,234 |
| 13 | Idaho | 14,691 | 0.8 | 91.3 | 0.5 | 2,815,512 |
| 14 | Majne | 14,653 | 0.8 | 92.2 | 2.8 | 2,513,187 |
| 15 | Illinois | : 13,691 | 0.8 | 93.0 | 0.1 | 7,633,692 |
| 16 | Indiana | : 13,046 | 0.7 | 93.8 | 0.2 |  |
| 17 | New Hampshire | : 9,020 | 0.5 | 94.3 | 6.2 | 4,505,292 |
| 18 | Minnesota | 8,896 | 0.5 | 94.8 | 0.2 | $\begin{array}{r} 143,983 \\ 7.082,069 \end{array}$ |
| 19 | Colorado | 8,738 | 0.5 | 95.3 | 0.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 7,082,069 \\ & 4,038,389 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20 | New Jersey | 8,327 | 0.4 | 95.8 | 1.2 | 6,656,888 |
| 21 | Vermont | 7,945 | 0.4 | 96.3 | 1.7 |  |
| 22 | Connecticut | 7,776 | 0.4 | 96.8 | 1.5 | 488,746 |
| 23 | Utah | 7,575 | 0.4 | 97.2 | 1.0 | 738,338 |
| 24 | South Carolina | 7,501 | 0.4 | 97.7 | 0.6 | 1,176,746 |
| 25 | Missouri | 7,031 | 0.4 | 98.1 | 0.1 | 4,123,300 |
| 26 | Maryland | 6,293 | 0.3 | 98.5 | 0.4 | 1,390,765 |
| 27 | Arizona | 6,059 | 0.3 | 98.8 | 0.4 | -1,390,765 |
| 28 | Georgia | 5,112 | 0.3 | 99.1 | 0.3 | 4,835, 250 |
| 29 | Kentucky | 3,332 | 0.2 | 99.3 | 0.1 | 4,073,125 |
| 30 | I owa | 2,898 | 0.1 | 99.5 | 0.0 | $3,221,305$ $40,329,712$ |
| 31 | New Mexico | 2,535 | 0.1 | 99.6 | 0.1 |  |
| 32 | Terinessee | 2,184 | 0.1 | 99.8 | 0.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,530,425 \\ & 2,103,471 \end{aligned}$ |
| 33 | Delaware | 2,096 | 0.1 | 99.8 99.9 | 0.3 | 2,103,471 635,762 |
| 34 | Rhode Island | 1,004 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 1.3 | 72,218 |
|  | United States | 1,684,037 | - | -- | 0.9 | 171,168,411 |

-- $=$ Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
$1 /$ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and all preceding states.

Table 69--0ranges: Scates' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States | Value of commodity receipts | Percent of commodity total | Cumutative percent $1 /$ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | $\begin{aligned} & : \text { State's } \\ & : \text { fotal } \\ & \vdots \text { for alt } \\ & \text { comodities } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | Florida | 1,075,833 | 66.5 | 66.5 | 17.5 |  |
| 3 | California Arizona | : $\begin{array}{r}\text { 525,171 } \\ 13,921\end{array}$ | 32.5 | 99.0 | 17.5 2.8 | -18,144,508 |
| 4 | Texas | 13,9219 | 0.8 0.0 | 99.9 100.0 | 0.7 | 1,835,250 |
|  | United St | : 1,615,844 |  | 100.0 | 0.0 | 11,619,842 |
|  | united st | 1,615,844 | $\cdots$ | -- | 0.9 | 171,168,411 |

-- $=$ Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each State and alt preceding states.

Table 70--Sorghum grain: states' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States |  | Percent of commodity total | tumulative percent $1 /$ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | State's total for all commodities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dotlars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | Texas | 555,752 | 39.7 | 39.7 | 4.7 | 11,619,842 |
| 3 | Kansas | 316,727 | 22.6 | 62.4 | 4.7 | $11,619,842$ $7,000,307$ |
| 4 | Nebraska Missouri | : 204,125 | 14.6 | 77.0 | 2.3 | 8,782,653 |
| 5 | Arkansas | $\begin{aligned} & : \\ & :\end{aligned} \quad 83,780$ | 6.0 4.3 | 83.0 | 2.0 | 4,123,300 |
|  |  | : 60,782 | 4.3 | 87.4 | 1.3 | 4,602,230 |
| 6 | Itlinais | : 31,720 | 2.2 | 89.7 | 0.4 |  |
| 7 8 | Oklahoma | : 30,143 | 2.1 | 91.8 | 0.4 | 7,633,692 |
| 8 | Louisiana | 26,668 | 1.9 | 93.7 | 0.8 1.4 | 3,634,931 |
| 9 | New Mexico | 23,221 | 1.6 | 93.7 95.4 | 1.4 | $1,846,181$ $1.530,425$ |
| 10 | Mississippi | $: 16,309$ | 1.1 | 96.6 | 0.6 | 1,530,425 |
| 11 | Colorado | 14,785 | 1.0 |  |  |  |
| 12 | South Dakota | 12,798 | 1.0 | 97.6 | 0.3 | 4,038,389 |
| 13 | Tennessee | 9,524 | 0.8 0.6 | 98.5 99.2 | 0.4 | 3,229,480 |
| 14 45 | Kentucky | 3,135 | 0.2 | 89.2 | 0.4 | 2,103,471 |
| 15 | Georgía | 3,064 | 0.2 | 99.7 | 0.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 3,221,305 \\ & 4,073,125 \end{aligned}$ |
| 16 | Morth Carolina | 1.862 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| 17 | Alabama | 1,224 | 0.0 | 99.8 | 0.0 | 5,181,017 |
| 18 | South Carolina | + 635 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.0 | 2,830,062 |
| 19 | Arizona | 396 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 0.0 | $1,176,746$ $1,835,250$ |
|  | United States | 1,396,650 | -- | $\cdots$ | 0.8 | 171, 168,41$\}$ |

-- = Not applicable
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and all preceding states

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumatative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity totat for each state and

Table 72--Rice: States rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States | Value of commodity : receipts | Percent of commodity tota! | Cumulative percent $1 /$ | Percent of State's tocal for all commodities | $\begin{aligned} & : \text { State's } \\ & \vdots \text { totgl } \\ & : \text { commodities } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $: 1,000$ dotlars |  | Percent |  | 1.000 dollars |
| 1 | Arkansas | 530.862 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 11.5 |  |
| 2 | California | : 210.587 | 17.0 | 60.1 | 1.1 | 18, 234, 014 |
| 3 | Leuisiana | : 180,115 | 15.1 | 75.2 | 10.0 | 1,846,184 |
| 5 | Mississippi | : 152,355 | 12.3 8.4 | 87.6 97.0 | 1.3 | 11.619 .842 |
|  | Mississippi | : 115.953 | 9.4 | 97.0 | 4.4 | 2,601,966 |
| 6 | Missouri | : 36,260 | 2.9 | 100.0 | 0.8 | 4,123,300 |
|  | United States | : 1,232,132 | -- | *- | 0.7 | 171,168,411 |

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and all preceding States.

Table 73--Sugarbeets: Stetes' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States |  | Value of commodity receipts | Percent of commodity total | Cumulative percent $1 /$ | ```Percent of State's total for alt commodities``` | ```State's total for all commodities``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : | 1,000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 doltars |
| 1 | Minnesota |  | 275,169 | 24.8 | 24.8 |  |  |
| 3 | California |  | 187,670 | 16.9 | 49.7 | 3.8 6.6 | 7,082,069 |
| 4 | Morth Dakota | : | 145,803 134,165 | 13.1 | 54.8 | 6.6 0.8 | $2,815,512$ $18,234,014$ |
| 5 | Michigan |  | 118,034 | 12.1 | 66.9 77.6 | 4.3 | 3,093,612 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 77.6 | 3.5 | 3,286,329 |
| 7 | Nebraska | : | 55.037 | 4.9 | 82.5 | 7.1 |  |
| 8 | Montana | : | 54,093 | 4.8 | 87.4 | 0.6 | 8,782,653 |
| 9 | Colorado | : | 47,446 | 4.2 | 91.7 | 2.7 | 1,742,408 |
| 10 | Texas | : | 25,727 | 3.4 2.3 | 95.1 | 0.9 | 4,038,389 |
|  |  | . |  |  | 97.4 | 0.2 | 11,619,842 |
| 12 | Oregon |  | 14,570 | 1.3 | 98.7 |  |  |
| 12 | Onto | : | 13,382 | 1.2 | 100.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ | $2,489,821$ |
|  | United States | : | 1,109,065 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.6 | 171,168,411 |

= Not applicable
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
I/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and

Table 74--Lettuce: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992


- Not applicable

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and st.! preceding states.

2/ States at the bottom of the above ranked list of states and having no accompanyirf data would have appeared within the list of 50 states' renkings, but were excluded to avaid disclosure of confidential information about individunt producers

Table 75--Cane for sugar: 5tates' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States | Value of commodity receipts | Percent of commodity total | Cumulative percent $9 /$ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | $\begin{aligned} & : \text { State's } \\ & : \text { total } \\ & : \text { for all } \\ & : \text { commodities } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | Florida | : 478,415 | 51.9 |  |  |  |
| 2 | Louisiana | : 213,837 | 23.2 | 51.9 75.9 | 7.7 11.5 | 6,144,508 |
| 4 | Rewaii | : 195,971 | 21.2 | 96.3 | 34.7 | $1,846,181$ 564,151 |
| 4 | Texas | : 33,308 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 0.2 | 11,619,842 |
|  | United States | 921,531 | -- | -- | 0.5 | 171,168,411 |

- = Not applicable.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and


- = Not applicable.

Humbers may not add due to rounding.
all preceding sative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity total for each state and

Table 77--All comnodities: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

-- $=$ Not applicable
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of all commodities total for each State and all preceding states.

Table 78-i ivestock and products: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | $k$ States | $\begin{aligned} & : \quad \text { Vatue of } \\ & : \text { commodity } \\ & : \quad \text { group } \\ & : \quad \text { receipts } \end{aligned}$ | Percent of commodity group total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | ```: State's total for all : commodities``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | Texas | 7,523,088 | 8.7 | 8.7 |  |  |
| 2 | Nebraska | 5,673,591 | 6.5 | 15.7 | 64.7 64.6 | 11,619.842 |
| 3 | Iowa | 5,614,088 | 6.5 | 21.7 | 64.6 | $8,782,653$ $10,329,712$ |
| 4 | California | 5,054,730 | 5.8 | 27.6 | 54.3 | $10,329,712$ $18,234,014$ |
| 5 | Kansas | 4,558,065 | 5.2 | 27.6 32.9 | 27.7 65.1 | 18,234,014 7,000,307 |
| 6 | Hisconsin | 4,313,362 | 4.9 |  |  |  |
| 7 | Minnesota | 3,622,304 | 4.9 4.1 | 37.9 | 78.4 | 5,499,038 |
| 8 | Colorado | 2,955,204 | 3.4 | 42.1 | 51. | 7,082,069 |
| 9 | North Carolina | 2,794,849 | 3.2 | 48.5 48.7 | 73.1 53.8 | 4,038,389 |
| 10 | Arkensas | 2,701,729 | 3.1 | 54.8 | 53.9 58.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 5,181,017 \\ & 4,602,230 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11 | Pennsylvania | 2,554,251 | 2.9 |  |  |  |
| 12 | Ok ${ }^{\text {ahoma }}$ | 2,497,677 | 2.9 | 54.8 | 70.5 | 3,618,490 |
| 13 | Georgia | 2,309,283 | 2.8 | 57.7 60.4 | 68.7 | 3,634,931 |
| $\begin{array}{r}14 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | lllinois | 2,202,346 | 2.6 2.5 | 60.4 62.9 | 56.7 28.8 | 4,073,125 |
| 15 | missouri | 2,188,369 | 2.5 2.5 | 62.9 65.5 | 28.8 53.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 7,633,692 \\ & 4,123,300 \end{aligned}$ |
| 16 | Alabama | 2,062,559 | 2.3 |  |  |  |
| 17 | South Dakota | 1,966,368 | 2.3 | 70.8 | 72.8 | 2,830,062 |
| 18 | New York | 1,914,053 | 2.2 | 72.3 | 60.8 64.9 | 3,229,490 |
| 19 | Indiana | 1,821,443 | 2.1 | 72.3 74.4 | 64.9 40.4 | 2,946,039 |
| 20 | Kentucky | 1,641,069 | 1.9 | 76.4 | 40.4 50.9 | $\begin{aligned} & 4,505,292 \\ & 3,221,305 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21 | Ohio | 1,579,993 | 1.8 |  |  |  |
| 22 | Hashington | 1,532,071 | 1.7 | 78.2 | 37.9 | 4, 167,316 |
| 23 | Mississippi | 1,355,116 | 1.5 | 81.5 | 34.4 52.0 | 4,454, 223 |
| 24 | Virginia | 1,352,915 | 1.5 | 83.1 | 52.0 63.3 | $2,601,966$ $2,134,353$ |
| 25 | Michigan | 1,324,609 | 1.5 | 84.6 | 63.3 40.3 | $2,134,353$ $3,286,329$ |
| 26 | Idaho | 1.172,967 | 1.3 |  |  |  |
| 27 | Florida | 1,159,595 | 1.3 | 86.0 | 41.6 | 2,815,512 |
| 28 | Tennessee | 1,061,246 | 1.3 | 87.3 | 18.8 | 6,144,508 |
| 29 | New Mexico | 1,040,101 | 1.2 | 88.5 89.8 | 50.4 67.9 | 2,103,471 |
| 30 | Montana | 921,312 | 1.0 | 90.8 | 67.9 52.8 | $1,530,425$ $1.742,408$ |
| 31 | Arizona |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Maryland | 803,973 | 1.9 | 91.9 92.8 | 48.6 57.8 | 1,835,250 |
| 33 | Oregon | 795,305 | 0.9 | 92.8 | 57.8 | \%,390,765 |
| 34 | North Dakota | 754,85i | 0.9 0.8 | 93.7 94.6 | 31.9 24.4 | 2,489,821 |
| 35 | Hyoming | 606,185 | 0.7 | 95.3 | 78.3 | $3,093,612$ 773,312 |
| 36 | Lovisiana | 587,253 |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | Utah | 556,362 | 0.6 | 96.0 96.6 | 31.8 75.3 | 1,846, 181 |
| 38 | South Carolina | 545,246 | 0.6 0.6 | 96.0 97.2 | 75.3 46.3 | + 738,338 |
| 39 | Delaware | 451,326 | 0.6 0.5 | 97.2 97.8 | 46.3 | 1,176,746 |
| 40 | Vermont | 388,502 | 0.4 | 97.8 98.2 | 70.9 85.9 | $\begin{aligned} & 635,762 \\ & 451,898 \end{aligned}$ |
| 41 | Maine | 300,501 | 0.3 |  |  |  |
| 42 | West Virginia | 267,072 | 0.3 | 98.6 | 58.5 | 513,187 |
| 43 | Connecticut | 239,633 | 0.2 | 98.9 99.1 | 77.9 49.0 | 342,548 |
| 45 | Nevada | 201,648 | 0.2 | 99.1 99.4 | 49.0 | 488,746 |
| 45 | New Jersey | 192,383 | 0.2 | 99.4 99.6 | 73.9 29.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 272,795 \\ & 656,888 \end{aligned}$ |
| 46 | Massachusetts | 134,936 | 0.7 |  |  |  |
| 47 | Hawai | 88,429 | 0.1 | 99.8 | 27.4 | 491.234 |
| 48 | New Hampshire | 65,008 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 15.6 | 564.151 |
| 4 | Rhode Istand | 12,691 | 0.0 | 99.9 |  | 143.983 |
| 0 | Alaska | 5,847 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 22.9 | $\begin{aligned} & 72,218 \\ & 25,478 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | United States | 86,357,964 | -- | -- | 50.4 | 171,168,411 |

-- = Not applicable.
Humbers may not add due to rounding.
$1 /$ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity group total for each state and all preceding states.

Table 79--Crops: States' rankings for cash receipts, 9992

| Rank | $k$ States | $\begin{array}{lc} : & \text { Value of } \\ \vdots & \text { commodity } \\ : & \text { receup } \end{array}$ | Percent of commodity group total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | ```state's total for all commodiries``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1.000 dollars |
| 1 | Cal ifornia | 13,179,284 | 15.5 | 15.5 |  |  |
| 2 | llinois | 5,431,346 | 6.4 | 21.9 | 72.2 | 18,234,014 |
| 3 | Florida | 4,984,913 | 5.8 | 27.9 27.8 | 71.1 81.1 | 7,633,692 |
| 4 5 | lowa | 4.715,624 | 5.8 | 27.8 33.3 | 81.1 45.6 | $6,144,508$ $10,329,712$ |
| 5 | Texas | 4,096,754 | 4.8 | 38.2 | 35.2 | $11,619,842$ |
| 6 | Minnesota | 3,459,768 | 4.0 |  | ;-48.8 |  |
| 7 | Nebraska | 3,109,062 | 3.6 | 42.2 | 48.8 | 7,082,069 |
| 8 | Washington | 2,922,152 | 3.6 | 43.9 49.4 | 35.4 65.6 | 8,782,653 |
| 9 10 | Indiana | 2,683,849 | 3.1 | 52.5 | 65.6 59.5 | 4,454,223 |
| 10 | Onio | 2,587,323 | 3.0 | 55.6 | 62.0 | 4,167,316 |
| 19 | Kansas | 2,442,242 | 2.8 |  |  |  |
| 12 | Horth Carolina | 2,386,168 | 2.8 2.8 | 58.5 | 34.8 | 7,000,307 |
| 13 | North Dakota | 2,338,761 | 2.8 | 61.3 | 46.0 | 5,181,017 |
| 14 | Michigan | 1,961,720 | 2.3 | 66.3 | 75.6 59.6 | 3,093,612 |
| 15 | Missouri | 1,934,931 | 2.2 | 68.6 | 59.6 46.9 | $\begin{aligned} & 3,286,329 \\ & 4,123,300 \end{aligned}$ |
| 16 | Arkansas | 1,900,501 | 2.2 | 70.9 |  |  |
| 17 | Georgia | 1,763,842 | 2.0 | 70.9 | 41.3 | 4,602,230 |
| 18 | Oregon | 1,694,516 | 2.0 | 72.9 | 43.3 68.0 | 4,073,125 |
| 19 | Idaho | 1,642,545 | 1.9 | 74.9 76.9 | 68.0 58.3 | 2,489,821 |
| 20 | Kentucky | 1,580,236 | 1.8 | 78.7 | 58.3 49.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 2,815,512 \\ & 3,221,305 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21 | South Dakota | 1,263,112 | 1.4 | 80.2 |  |  |
| 22 | Louisiana | 1,258,928 | 1.4 | 81.7 | 39.1 | 3,229,480 |
| 23 | Mississippi | 1,246,850 | 1.4 | 81.7 83.2 | 68.1 | 1,846,181 |
| 24 | Wisconsin | 1,185,676 | 1.4 | 84.6 | 47.9 21.5 | 2,601,966 |
| 25 | OXI ahoma | 1,137,254 | 1.3 | 85.9 85.9 | 21.5 31.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 5,499,038 \\ & 3,634,931 \end{aligned}$ |
| 26 | Colorado | 1,083,185 | 1.2 |  |  |  |
| 27 | Pennsylvania | 1,064,239 | 1.2 | 87.2 | 26.8 | 4,038,389 |
| 28 | Tennessee | 1,042,225 | 1.2 | 88.5 | 29.4 | 3,618,490 |
| 29 | New York | 1,031,988 | 1.2 | 89.7 | 49.5 | 2,103,471 |
| 30 | Arizona | 942,787 | 1.1 | 92.0 | 35.0 51.3 | $2,946,039$ $1,835,250$ |
| 31 | Montana | 821,096 | 0.9 |  |  |  |
| 32 | Virginia | 781,438 | 0.9 | 93.9 | 47.1 | 1,742,408 |
| 33 | Alabama | 767,503 | 0.9 | 93.9 | 36.6 | 2,134,353 |
| 34 | South Carolina | 631.500 | 0.9 | 94.8 | 27.1 | 2,830,062 |
| 35 | Maryland | 588,792 | 0.7 | 95.5 96.2 | 53.6 42.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,176,746 \\ & 1,390,765 \end{aligned}$ |
| 36 | New Mexico | 490.324 | 0.5 |  |  |  |
| 37 | Kawaii | 475,722 | 0.5 | 96.8 | 32.0 | 1,530,425 |
| 38 | New Jersey | 464,505 | 0.5 | 97.4 | 84.3 | 564,151 |
| 39 | Massachusetts | 356,298 | 0.5 0.4 | 97.9 98.3 | 70.7 | 656.888 |
| 40 | Connecticut | 249,113 | 0.2 | 98.3 98.6 | 72.5 50.9 | $\begin{aligned} & 491.234 \\ & 488.746 \end{aligned}$ |
| 41 | Maine | 212,686 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| 42 | Delaware | 184,436 | 0.2 | 98.9 | 41.4 | 513,187 |
| 4 | Utah | 181,976 | 0.2 | 99.1 | 29.0 | 635,762 |
| 4 | Wyoming | 167,127 | 0.2 | 99.3 99.5 | 24.6 21.6 | 738,338 |
| 4 | New Hampshire | 78,975 | 0.0 | 97.6 | 21.6 54.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 773,312 \\ & 443,983 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 | West Virginia | $: \quad 75,476$ | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| 7 | Nevada | 71,147 | 0.0 | 99.7 | 22.0 | 342,548 |
| 8 | Vermont | 63,396 | 0.0 | 99.8 99.9 | 14.0 | $272,795$ |
| 9 | Rhode Istand | 59,527 | 0.0 | 99.9 99.9 | 14.0 | 451.898 |
| 0 | Alaska | : 19,631 | 0.0 | 99.9 100.0 | 82.4 | $\begin{array}{r} 72,218 \\ 25,478 \end{array}$ |
|  | United States | : 84,810,447 | -- | -- | 49.5 | 171,168,411 |

-- $=$ Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity group total for each State and all preceding States.

Table 80--Weat animals: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States | : Value of <br> commodity <br> group <br> : receipts | Percent of commodity group total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of stete's total for all commodities | ```State's tota! for all conmodities``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 dollars |  | - Percent | *- | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | Texas | 5,792,510 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 49.8 | $11,619,842$ |
| 2 | Nebraska | 5,406,482 | 11.1 | 23.1 | 69.5 | 8,782,653 |
| 3 | Lowa | $4,835,184$ | 9.9 | 33.1 | 46.8 | 10,329,712 |
| 4 5 | Kansas | $: \quad 4,349,462$ | 8.9 | 42.0 | 62.1 | 7,000,307 |
| 5 | colorado | $: \quad 2,643,316$ | 5.4 | 47.5 | 65.4 | 4,038,389 |
| 6 | Oklahoma | 1,980,644 | 4.0 | 51.6 |  |  |
| 7 | Minnesota | 1,854,069 | 3.8 | 51.6 55.4 | 54.4 26.1 | $3,634,931$ $7,082,069$ |
| 8 | llinois | 1,770,459 | 3.6 | 59.1 | 23.1 | 7,682,069 |
| 9 10 | South Dakota | 1.675,297 | 3.4 | 62.5 | 51.8 | 3,229,480 |
| 10 | California | 1,515,734 | 3.1 | 65.7 | 8.3 | 18,234,014 |
| 11 | Missouri | 1,340,823 | 2.7 | 68.4 | 32 |  |
| 12 | Indiana | 1,056,636 | 2.1 | 70.6 | 32.5 23.4 | $4,123,300$ $4,505,292$ |
| 13 14 | Wisconsin | -974,667 | 2.0 | 72.6 | 23.4 17.7 | 4,505,292 |
| 14 | North Carolina | 918,212 | 1.9 | 74.5 | 17.7 | 5,181,017 |
| 15 | Montana | 845,645 | $t .7$ | 76.3 | 48.5 | 1,742,408 |
| 16 | Kentucky | 839,842 | 1.7 | 78.0 | 26.0 |  |
| 17 | Idaho | 743,632 | 1.5 | 79.5 | 26.4 | 3,221,305 |
| 18 | New Mexico | 739,031 | 1.5 | 81.1 | 48.2 | 1,530,425 |
| 19 | Hashington | 696, 576 | 1.4 | 82.5 | 48.2 15.6 | 1,530,425 |
| 20 | Ohio | 651,956 | 1.3 | 83.9 | 15.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 4,454,223 \\ & 4,167,316 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21 | Arizona | 608.598 | 1.2 |  |  |  |
| 22 | North Dakota | 597,775 | 1.2 | 85.1 | 33.1 19.3 | $1,835,250$ $3,093,612$ |
| 23 | Tennessee | 579,972 | 1.2 | 87.5 | 19.3 27.5 | 3,093,612 |
| 24 | Hyoming | 578,036 | 1.1 | 88.7 | 74.7 | 2,773,312 |
| 25 | Pennsylvania | 561,424 | 1.1 | 89.9 | 15.5 | 3,618,490 |
| 26 | Alabama | 556,658 | 1.1 | 91.0 |  |  |
| 27 | Arkansas | 514,997 | 1.0 | 92.1 | 19.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 2,830,062 \\ & 403 \end{aligned}$ |
| 28 | Michigan | 477,477 | 0.9 | 93.1 | 14.5 | 4,602,230 |
| 29 | Georgia | 459.881 | 0.9 | 94.0 | 14.5 11.2 | $3,286,329$ $4,073,125$ |
| 30 | Virginia | 431,222 | 0.8 | 94.9 | 20.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 4,073,125 \\ & 2,134,353 \end{aligned}$ |
| 31 | Oregon | 418,641 |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Florida | 356,337 | 0.8 | 95.8 | 16.8 | 2,489.821 |
| 33 | Utah | 288,294 | 0.6 | 97.1 | 5.8 39.0 | 6,144,508 |
| 34 | Mississippi | 255,649 | 0.5 | 97.7 | 39.0 9.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 738,338 \\ 2.601,966 \end{array}$ |
| 35 | New York | 225,661 | 0.4 | 98.1 | 7.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 2,601,966 \\ & 2,946,039 \end{aligned}$ |
| 36 | South Carolina | 188,491 | 0.3 | 98.5 | 16.0 |  |
| 37 | Louisiana | 173,422 | 0.3 | 98.9 | 16.0 9.3 | 1,176,748 |
| 38 | Hevada | 154,466 | 0.3 | 99.2 | 56.6 | $1,846.181$ 272,795 |
| 39 | Hest Virginia | 123,007 | 0.2 | 99.4 | 56.6 35.9 | 272,795 342,548 |
| 40 | Maryland | 87,989 | 0.1 | 99.6 | 35.9 6.3 | $\begin{array}{r} 342,548 \\ 1,390,765 \end{array}$ |
| 41 | Hawai | 35.842 | 0.0 | 99.7 | 6.3 |  |
| 42 | Vermont | 34,611 | 0.0 | 99.8 | 6.3 7.6 | 564, 151 |
| 43 | Maine | 22,911 | 0.0 | 99.8 | 4.4 | 413, 187 |
| 44 | Connecticut | 16,564 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 3.4 | 513,187 488,746 |
| 45 | New Jersey | 15,514 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 3.3 2.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 488,746 \\ & 658,888 \end{aligned}$ |
| 46 | Massachusetts | 14,035 | 0.0 | 99.9 |  |  |
| 47 | Delaware | 11,035 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 2.8 | 491,234 |
| 48 | New Hampshire | 5,434 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 3.7 | 143.983 |
| 49 | Rhode Island | 1,536 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 2.1 | 143,983 72,218 |
| 50 | Alaska | 848 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 3.3 | $25,478$ |
|  | United States | 48,426,504 | -- | - | 28.2 | 171,168,411 |

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity group totat for each State and alt preceding states.

Table 89-poultry and eggs: States, rankings for cash receipts, 1992


N = Not applicabie.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity group total for each

Table 82*-Food grains: States, rankings for cash receipts, 1992

.- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
ate and all preceding states is the sum of the percent of commodity group total for each

Table 83-Feed crops: Statest rankings for cash receipts, 1992


+ = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity group total for each

Table 84-0il crops: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | States | : | Value of commodity group receipts | Percent of commodity group total | Cumulative percent 1/ | Percent of State's total for all commodities | $\begin{aligned} & : \quad \text { State's } \\ & \vdots \\ & \text { total } \\ & : \text { formalt } \\ & \text { comodities } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : | 1,000 dollars | ------- | - Percent | --- | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | Illinois | : | 2,027,033 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 26.5 | 7,633,692 |
| 2 | Iowa | : | 1,918,410 | 14.7 | 30.3 | 18.5 | 10,329,712 |
| 3 | Minnesota | : | 1,030,551 | 7.9 | 38.2 | 14.5 | 7,082,069 |
| 4 | Indiana |  | 1,019,233 | 7.7 | 46.0 | 22.4 | 4,505,292 |
| 5 | Missouri | : | 806,966 | 6.2 | 52.2 | 19.5 | 4,123,300 |
| 6 | Ohio | : | 786,406 | 6.0 | 58.3 | 18.8 |  |
| 7 | Georgia | : | 649,831 | 6.0 5.0 | 63.3 | 18.8 15.9 | 4,167,316 |
| 8 | Arkansas |  | 543,104 | 4.1 | 67.5 | 11.8 | 4,602,230 |
| 9 | Nebraska |  | 501,150 | 3.8 | 79.3 | 5.7 | 8,782,653 |
| 10 | South Dakoto | : | 357,810 | 2.7 | 74.1 | 11.0 | 3,229,480 |
| 11 | North Carolina | : | 327,778 | 2.5 | 76.6 | 6.3 | 5,181,017 |
| 12 | Kansas | . | 314,723 | 2.4 | 79.0 | 4.5 | 7,000,307 |
| 13 | Mississippi | : | 293,436 | 2.2 | 81.3 | 11.2 | 2,601,966 |
| 14 | North Dakota |  | 277,677 | 2.1 | 83.4 | 8.9 | 3,093,612 |
| 15 | Michigan | : | 270,081 | $? .0$ | 85.5 | 8.2 | 3,286,329 |
| 16 | Texas |  | 236,052 | 1.8 | 87.3 | 2.0 | 11,619.842 |
| 17 | Alabama |  | 222,923 | 1.7 | 89.0 | 7.8 | 2,830,062 |
| 18 | Kentucky | : | 221,305 | 1.7 | 90.7 | 6.8 | 3,221,305 |
| 19 | Louisiana |  | 192,048 | 1.4 | 92.2 | 10.4 | 1,846, 181 |
| 20 | Tennessee | : | 180,184 | 1.3 | 93.6 | 8.5 | 2,103,471 |
| 21 | Virginia | : | 163,008 | 1.2 | 94.8 | 7.6 | 2,134,353 |
| 22 | Wisconsin | : | 108,852 | 0.8 | 95.7 | 1.9 | 5,499,038 |
| 23 | Oklahoma | : | 108,130 | 0.8 | 96.5 | 2.9 | 3,634,931 |
| 24 | Maryland | : | 94,906 | 0.7 | 97.2 | 6.8 | 1,390,765 |
| 25 | South Carolina | : | 88,001 | 0.6 | 97.9 | 7.4 | 1,176,746 |
| 26 | Florida |  | 64,843 | 0.5 | 98.4 | 1.0 | 6,144,508 |
| 27 | Pennsylvania | : | 49,665 | 0.3 | 98.8 | 1.3 | 3,618,490 |
| 28 | Delaware | : | 38,582 | 0.3 | 99.1 | 6.0 | -635,762 |
| 29 30 | California New Jersey | : | 35,501 | 0.2 | 99.4 | 0.1 | 18,234,014 |
| 30 | New Jersey | ; | 23,210 | 0.1 | 99.6 | 3.5 | 656,888 |
| 31 | Hew Mexico | : | 19.168 | 0.1 | 99.7 | 1.2 | 1,530,425 |
| 32 | New York | : | 7,895 | 0.0 | 99.8 | 0.2 | 2,946,039 |
| 33 34 34 | Cotorado | : | 7,721 | 0.0 | 99.8 | 0.1 | 4,038,389 |
| 34 35 | Arizona | : | 5.867 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.3 | 1,835,250 |
| 35 | Montana | : | 5,225 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.3 | 1,742,408 |
| 36 | Idaho | : | 2,889 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.1 | 2,815,512 |
| 37 | Washington | : | 1,853 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.0 | 4,454,223 |
| 38 | Oregon | : | 1,001 | 0.0 | 99.9 | 0.0 | 2,489,821 |
| 38 40 | Utah | \% | 716 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.1 | 738,338 |
| 40 | Wyoming | : | 221 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 773,312 |
| 41 | West Virginia | : | 12 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |  |
| 42 | Nevada | : | 4 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | $272,795$ |
|  | United States | : | 12,995,971 | - - | -- | 7.5 | 171,168,411 |

+ = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
1/ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity group total for each state and all preceding states.

Table 85-Vegetables: States' rankings for cash receipts

| Rank | $k$ States | $\begin{array}{lc} : & \text { Value of } \\ : & \text { commodity } \\ : & \text { group } \\ : & \text { receipts } \end{array}$ | Percent of commodity group total | Cumulative percent $1 /$ | Percent of State's total for alt commodities | $\begin{aligned} & \text { State's } \\ & \vdots \text { fotal } \\ & \text { formodities } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1,000 doltars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dotlars |
| 1 | California | 3,627,824 | 31.7 | 31.7 | 19.9 | $18,234,014$ |
| 3 | Florida | 1,658,050 | \$4.5 | 46.2 | 26.9 | $18,234,014$ $6,144,508$ |
| 4 | Washington | 667,805 591,060 | 5.8 | 52.0 | 23.7 | 2,815,512 |
| 5 | Michigan | 356,061 | 5.1 | 57.2 60.3 | 13.2 | 4,454, 223 |
|  |  | 35,061 |  | 60.3 | 10.8 | 3,286,329 |
| 6 | Wisconsin | 354,492 | 3.1 | 63.4 |  |  |
| 7 | Oregon | 353,393 | 3.0 | 66.5 | 14.1 | 5,499,038 |
| 8 | Arizona | 316,057 | 2.7 | 69.3 | 14.1 | 2,489,821 |
| 9 | Texas | 310,223 | 2.7 | 72.0 | 17.2 2.6 | $1,835,250$ $11,619,842$ |
| 10 | New York | 294,973 | 2.5 | 74.5 | 2.6 9.9 | $\begin{array}{r} 11,619,842 \\ 2,946,039 \end{array}$ |
| 11 | Georgia | 245,303 | 2.1 |  |  |  |
| 12 | Colorado | 233,617 | 2.10 | 78.7 | 6.0 5.7 | 4,073,125 |
| 13 | Minnesota | 208,901 | 1.8 | 78.7 80.6 | 5.7 2.8 | 4,038,389 |
| 14 | North Dakota | 208,020 | 1.8 | 80.6 82.4 | 2.9 6.7 | 7,082,069 |
| 13 | North Carolina | 201,642 | 1.7 | 82.4 84.1 | 6.7 3.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 3,093,612 \\ & 5,181,017 \end{aligned}$ |
| 16 | New Mexico | 156, 100 | 1.3 |  |  |  |
| 17 | New Jersey | 141,934 | 1.3 | 85.5 | 10.2 | 1,530,425 |
| 18 | Ohio | 128,283 | 1.1 | 86.7 87.9 | 21.6 3.0 | 4,656.888 |
| 19 | Maine | 124,095 | 1.0 | 87.9 88.9 | 3.0 24.1 | $4,167,316$ 513,187 |
| 20 | Virginia | 113,799 | 1.0 | 88.9 89.9 | 24.1 5.3 | $\begin{array}{r} 513,187 \\ 2,134,353 \end{array}$ |
| 21 | Pennsylvania | 100,890 |  |  |  |  |
| 22 | Alabama | 82,449 | 0.8 | 90.8 91.5 | 2.7 | 3,618,490 |
| 23 | lllinois | 79,950 | 0.7 | 91.5 | 2.9 | 2,830,062 |
| 24 | Louisiana | 76.911 | 0.7 0.6 | 92.2 | 1.0 | 7,633,692 |
| 25 | Maryiand | 76,9196 | 0.6 | 92.9 | 4.1 | 1,846,181 |
|  |  | 76,196 | 0.6 | 93.6 | 5.4 | 1,390,765 |
| 26 | Nebraska | 72,387 |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | Indiana | 67,695 | 0.6 | 94.2 | 0.8 | 8,782,653 |
| 28 | Massachusetts | 57.596 | 0.5 | 94.8 | 1.5 | 4,505,292 |
| 29 | South Carolina | 52,678 | 0.4 | 95.3 | 11.7 | 1491.234 |
| 30 | Tennessee | 47,224 | 0.4 | 95.8 86.2 | 4.4 2.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,176,746 \\ & 2,103,471 \end{aligned}$ |
| 31 | Delanare | 43,344 | 0.3 |  |  |  |
| 32 | Utah | 42,454 | 0.3 | 96.6 | 6.8 | 635,762 |
| 33 | Mississippi | 41,999 | 0.3 | 96.9 97.3 | 5.7 1.6 | 738,338 |
| 34 | Oxlahoma | 41,113 | 0.3 | 97.3 97.7 | 1.6 1.1 | 2,601.966 |
| 35 | Kansas | 33,311 | 0.2 | 97.0 | 1.1 0.4 | $\begin{aligned} & 3,634,931 \\ & 7,000,307 \end{aligned}$ |
| 36 | Hanaii | 30.396 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| 37 | Kentucky | 30,278 | 0.2 | 98.2 | 5.3 | 564,151 |
| 38 | Hyoming | 25,480 | 0.2 | 98.5 | 0.9 | 3,221,305 |
| 39 | Arkansas | 21,729 | 0.1 | 98.7 98.9 | 3.2 0.4 | 773,312 $4,602,230$ |
| 40 | Neveda | 18,760 | 0.1 | 98.9 99.1 | 0.4 6.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 4,602,230 \\ 272,795 \end{array}$ |
| 41 | Montana | 18,575 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| 42 | Connecticut | 17,324 | 0.1 | 99.2 | 1.0 | 1,742,408 |
| 43 | Hew Hampshire | 46,665 | 0.1 | 99.4 99.5 | 3.5 11.5 | 488,746 143,983 |
| 44 | lowa | 11,837 | 0.1 | 99.6 | 11.5 0.1 | 10, $\begin{array}{r}143,983 \\ \hline 39,712\end{array}$ |
| 45 | South Dakota | 10,098 | 0.0 | 99.7 | 0.3 | $3,220,480$ |
| 46 | Missouri | 9,066 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| 4 | Jest Virginia | 5,800 | 0.0 | 99.8 99.8 | 0.2 | 4,123,300 |
| 48 | Rhode is iand | 5,648 | 0.0 | 99.8 | 1.6 | 342,548 |
| 49 | Vermont | 4,549 | 0.0 | 99.9 99.9 | 7.8 1.0 | 72,218 451,898 |
| 5 | Alaska | 2,531 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 9.9 | 451,898 25,478 |
|  | United States | 11,435,765 | -- | -- | 6.6 | 168.411 |

-- = Not applicable.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
// The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity group total for each State and all preceding States.

Tabte 86--Fruits and nuts: States' rankings for cash receipts, 1992

| Rank | k States | $\begin{array}{cc} : & \text { Value of } \\ : & \text { commodity } \\ : & \text { group } \\ : & \text { receipts } \end{array}$ | Percent of commodity group total | Cumulative percent $1 /$ | Percent of State's total for alt commodities | $\begin{aligned} & \text { : Stateis } \\ & : \text { fotal } \\ & : \text { commodities } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | : 1.000 dollars |  | Percent |  | 1,000 dollars |
| 1 | California | 5,221,166 | 51.2 | 51.2 |  |  |
| 3 | Florida | 1.607.117 | 15.7 | 67.0 | 28.6 | $18,234,014$ $6,144,508$ |
| 4 | Oregon | $1,237,237$ 257,908 | 12.1 | 79.2 | 27.7 | 4,454,223 |
| 5 | Michigan | 210,166 | 2.5 2.0 | 87.7 83.8 | 10.3 | 2,489,821 |
|  |  | , |  |  | 6.4 | 3,286,329 |
| 6 | New York | 195,873 | 1.9 | 85.7 | 6.6 |  |
| 8 | Hawait Arizona | 163,262 135,381 | 1.6 | 87.3 | 28.9 | 2,946,039 |
| 9 | Massachusetts | 135,381 117,193 | 1.3 | 88.6 | 7.3 | 1,835,250 |
| 10 | Texas | 104,559 | 1.1 | 89.8 90.8 | 23.8 | 1,491,234 |
|  |  | - |  |  |  | 11,619,842 |
| 11 | Pennsytvania | 98,267 | 0.9 | 91.7 | 2.7 | 3,618,490 |
| 13 | Wisconsin | 89.978 85,612 | 0.8 | 92.6 | 2. 2 | 4,078,490 |
| 14 | New Jersey | -85,612 | 0.8 0.8 | 93.5 | 1.5 | 5,499,038 |
| 15 | Maine | 53,418 | 0.8 0.5 | 94.3 94.8 | 12.3 10.4 | 656,888 513,187 |
| 16 | Hew Mexico | 53,275 | 0.5 |  |  |  |
| 17 | Virginia | 48.853 | 0.5 | 95.3 | 3.4 | 1,530,425 |
| 18 | North Carolina | 46,597 | 0.4 | 95.8 | 2.2 | 2,134,353 |
| 19 | Ohio | 42,946 | 0.4 | 96.2 | 0.9 | 5,181.017 |
| 20 | South Carotina | 29,047 | 0.4 0.2 | 96.7 96.9 | 1.0 2.4 | $\begin{aligned} & 4,167,316 \\ & 1,176,746 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21 | Hest Virginia | 27,205 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
| 22 | Indiana | 23,812 | 0.2 | 97.2 | 7.9 | 342,548 |
| 23 | lltinois | 23, 659 | 0.2 | 97.4 97.7 | 0.5 0.2 | 4,505,292 |
| 24 | I daho | 21,220 | 0.2 | 97.7 | 0.2 | 7.633.692 |
| 25 | Utah | 17,673 | 0.1 | 97.9 98.0 | 0.7 2.3 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,815,512 \\ 738,338 \end{array}$ |
| 26 | Connecticut | 16,867 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| 27 | Alabama | 16,508 | 0.1 | 98.2 | 3.4 0.5 | 488,746 |
| 28 | Colorado | 16.407 | 0.1 | 98.4 | 0.5 0.4 | 2,830,062 |
| 29 30 | Oklahoma | 16,289 | 0.1 | 98.7 | 0.4 0.4 | $4,038,389$ $3,634,931$ |
| 30 | Louisiana | 15,370 | 0.1 | 98.7 98.8 | 0.4 0.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 3,634,931 \\ & 1,846,181 \end{aligned}$ |
| 31 | New Hampshire |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 | Mary\{and | 13,219 | 0.1 | 99.0 | 9.1 | 143,983 |
| 33 | Missouri | 12,416 | 0.1 | 99.1 | 0.9 | 1,390,765 |
| 34 | Minnesota | 11,696 | 0.1 | 99.2 | 0.3 | 4,123,300 |
| 35 | Kentucky | 10,605 | 0.1 | 99.4 | 0.1 0.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 7,082,069 \\ & 3,221,305 \end{aligned}$ |
| 36 | Tennessee | 10,563 |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | Vermont | 9.958 | 0.1 | 99.5 | 0.5 | 2,103,471 |
| 38 | Arkansas | 9,658 8,666 | 0.1 0.0 | 99.6 99.7 | 2.2 | 451,898 |
| 39 | Mississippi | 6,820 | 0.0 | 99.7 99.8 | 0.1 | 4,602,230 |
| 40 | Iowa | 4,448 | 0.0 | 99.8 99.8 | 0.2 0.0 | $2,601,966$ $10,329,712$ |
| 1 | Delanare | 3,251 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| 2 | Kansas | 3,200 | 0.0 | 99.9 99.9 | 0.5 | 7635,762 |
| 3 | Rhode isiand | 2,784 | 0.0 0.0 | 99.9 99.9 | 0.0 | 7,000,307 |
| 5 | Nebraska | 1,950 | 0.0 | 99.9 99.9 | 3.8 0.0 | 8,72,218 |
| 5 | Montana | 481 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 8,782,653 \\ & 1,742,408 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 | South Dakota | 137 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| 7 | North Dakota | 80 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 3,229,480 |
| 8 | Nevada | 8 | 0.0 0.0 | 100.0 100.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 3,093,612 |
| 9 | Wyoming | 2 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | $\begin{aligned} & 272,795 \\ & 773,312 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | United states | 10,182,511 | -- |  | 5.9 | 1,168 |

$\because=$ Not applicabie.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.
$1 /$ The cumulative percentage is the sum of the percent of commodity group total for each
state and all preceding states.


# Characteristics, Production Costs Compared For U.S. Wheat Producers 

Producing a bushet of wheat cost U.S. farmers an average of $\$ 2.07$ in variable cash expenses in 1989. Individual farm costs ranged from less than $\$ 1.37$ to more than $\$ 3.49$ per bushel. Wheat acreage, yields, and regional differences among producers influenced wheat production costs. These findings are drawn from a recently published report by USDA's Economic Research Service, Characteristics and Produc. tion Costs of U.S. Wheat Farms, 1989.

Differences in regional production practices and adverse weather conditions were major influences on production costs and yields. Dry weather and warm temperatures reduced already low subsoil moisture levels throughout the Plains in 1989, resulting in lower wheat yields. Low snowiall and low temperatures caused freeze damage in some parts of the Central and Southern Plains region (CO, KS, NE, OK, atd TX), resulting in that region's accounting for 64 percent of all farms in the high-cost group. Since high-cost wheat farms were more diversified than low-cost farms, wheat

Cumulative distribution of wheat variable cash expenses, 1989
About 52 percent of FCRS wheat farms had variable cash expenses at or below the average cost of $\$ 2.07$ per bushel, while 65 percent of the total wheat harvest was produced at or below the average variable cash expense.

contributed less to their total tiarm income. Low-cost producers were concentrated in the North-Central (IL, IN, $\mathrm{MO}, \mathrm{NY}, \mathrm{OH}$, and PA) and Northern Plains regions (ND, $\mathrm{SD}, \mathrm{MN}, \mathrm{MT}$, and $\mathrm{W} Y$ ). Other wheat production regions included the Southeast ( $A L, A R, G A, L A, M S, N C, S C$, and $V A$ ) and the Pacific ( $A Z, C A, I D, N M, O R$, and WA).

Although there was close to a 7 -percent decline in winter wheat production in 1989, the decline was more than offset by increased production of spring and durum wheat, increasing total wheat production by nearly 12 percent for the year. About a fourth of the winter wheat acreage planted was not harvested in 1989, compared with less than 19 percent for all wheat classes. Data for this study are from the 1989 Farm Costs and Returns Survey (FCRS) of U.S. wheat farms. Responses represented 189,877 farms producing 1.27 bilion bushels of wheat on about 51.8 million acres ( 62 percent of U.S. wheat production and 68 percent of planted acreage).

## To Order This Report...

The information presented here is excerpted from Characteristics and Production Costs of U.S. Wheat Farms, 1989 (AlB-683), by Dargan Glaze. The cost is $\$ 9.00$ per copy.

To order, dial 1-300-999-6779 (toll free in the United States and Canada) and ask for the report by title. Please have your Visa or MasterCard ready.

Please add 25 percent to toreign addresses (including Canada). Or send a check (made pay. able to ERS-NASS) to:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ERS-NASS } \\
& 341 \text { Victory Drive } \\
& \text { himdon, VA } 22070 .
\end{aligned}
$$

We'll till your order by first-ciass mail.
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SUMMIAFY OF REPORT

# Fewer Farms Produce Large Share of Production in Century-Long Trend 

Contact: R. Neal Peterson, 202-219-0523

Fewer farms account for a larger share of farm production, continuing a century-long trend toward concentration of agricultural activities among large-scale farms. A new Economic Research Service report, The Changing Concentration of U.S. Agricultural Production During the 20th Century, measures concentration by examining how many farms it takes to produce half of total farm sales.

The minimum number of the largest farms in 1900 that produced half of total sales was 983,563 (17 percent of all farms), crispared with 75,682 (3.6 percent) in 1987, according: the latest available agricultural census data. Agricultural concentration has increased relatively steadily throughout the 20th century in terms of sales, but slowed markedly for acreage around 1950, to less than half its earlier rate. Every State's agriculture has become increasingly concentrated in the hands of fewer farm operators, although the degree of concentration is not uniform in all States. Farms in the western Corn Belt and northern Plains are more uniform in terms of acreage and value of output than are farms in the western, east coast, and Sun Belt regions.

Average sales in real dollars per farm increased 4,858 percent over the period, while average acres increased 756 percent. Despite these increases, the farm sector remains much less concentrated than other sectors of the economy. For example, only 0.1 percent of ali U.S. manufacturing firms accounted for 43 percent of the total value of shipments in 1982.

Farm sales concentration has increased during this century at a basically stable rate, despite a series of major social and economic events, such as the Great Depression, World War II, and the farm exodus and consolidation of the 1950's and 1960's. Technology has played the major role in fostering concentration, but other factors, such as a growing nonfarm economy and its links to the farm economy, have also contributed to the changes in farm numbers and farm sizes that underlie farm concentration. Although some of the factors that have led to greater concentration have abated, most influences will continue in force into the next century, especially the development of new technologies.

Fewer farms now produce half of farm output
In 1900, 17.1 percent of all farms produced half of ail output, but only 3.6 percent produced hall in 1987


## To Order This Report...

The information presented here is excerpted from The Changing Concentration of U.S. Agricultural Production During the 20th Century: 14th Annual Report to the Congress on the? Status of the Family Farm, AIB-671, by R. Neal Peterson and Nora L. Brooks. The cost is $\$ 9.00$.

To order, dial 1-800-999-6779 (toll tree in the United States and Canada) and ask for the report by title.

Please add 25 percent to foreign addresses (including Canada). Charge to VISA or MasterCard. Or send a check (made payable to ERS. NASS) to:

```
ERS-NASS
341 Victory Drive
Herndon, VA 22070.
```



Farm and farm-related industries provided over 21 million jobs, or 15.7 percent of U.S. employment, in 1990 (the most recent year for which data are available). Farm and farm-related industries employed 264,000 more workers in 1990 than in 1989, up 1.3 percent, with most of the new jobs ( 381,000 ) in agricultural wholesale and retail trade. The largest decline, over 90,000 jobs, occurred in agricultural processing and marketing.

According to a new report by USDA's Economic Research Service, U.S. Farm and Farm-Related Employment in 1990: A Significant Source of Jobs in Many Areas, the number of farm and farm-related jobs rose, but their share of U.S. employment decined from 15.8 percent in 1989.

Farm and farm-related jobs ranged from 10.7 perceni of total State employment in Nevada to 25.7 percent in North Dakota. Wholesale and retail trade of agricultural products contributed the bulk of farm and farmrelated jobs, providing $9-12$ percent of total employment in all States.

Farm and farm-related employment, 1990
Wholesale and retail Irade, although only peripherally related to farming, accounted for most farm and farm-related employment.



Closely related
Peripherally related

North Dakota led all States in the share of farm production jobs, which provided 11.7 percent of total State employment.
Alaska led in the share of jobs in agricultural services, forestry, and fishing ( 5.6 percent).

Agricultural input jobs were most important in lowa ( 1.9 percent of total employment), Nebraska (1.6 percent), and North Dakota (1.4 percent).

Agricultural processing and marketing provided over 5 percent of total State employment in North and South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Georgia. The apparel and textile industry is the source of much of this employment in these States.

Estimates of farm and tarm-related employment differ from those previously released by ERS because the list of industries considered to be related to farming has been updated. For example, establishments that provide landscape and horticultural services are no longer defined as farm-related, a change that reduces agricultural services employment in 1990 by 455,000 johs.

## To Order This Report...

The information presented here is excerpted from U.S. Farm and Farm-Related Employment in 1990: A Significant Source of Jobs in Many Areas, AIB-686, by Jacqueline Salsgiver and T. Alexander Majchrowicz. Cost is $\$ 7.50$.

Dial 1-800-999-6779 (toll free in the United States and Canada).

Add 25 percent to foreign addresses (including Canada). Charge to VISA or MasterCard. Or send a check (made payable to ERS-NASS) to:

ERS-NASS
341 Victory Drive
Herndon, VA 22070.

# Detailed Data un Farm Operating and Financial Characteristics Available for 1990 

Number 31, August 1993

Contact: Susan E. Bentley, 202/219-0931

An estimated 1.8 million farm operations represented by the 1990 Farm Costs and Returns Survey (FCRS) operated about 1 billion acres of land in 1990 (see table). Almost half of them rented or leased land from others (excluding public grazing lands), primarily through cash rent agreements. A new report, Farm Operating and Financial Characteristics, 1990, just released from the USDA's Economic Research Service, presents these and other detailed farm economic data and reliability measures for calendar year 1990. It includes data on the number of farms, land in farms, crop acreages and production, farm labor and wages, capital investments and improvements, farm business incorne and expenses, and farm business assets and liabilities. These data are summarized by sales class, region, production specialty, farm organization, acreage class, tenure, and operator age and major occupation.

Over one-quarter of farm operations reported removing some land from production in 1990 for summer fallow or government programs, which resulted in an

Farms and land in farms, all classes, 1990 Nearly half of all farm operations rented or leased land from others.

| Itam | Total | Farms reporting | Average per reporting larm ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,000 Number Acres |  |  |  |
| Farms Land ranted or | 1,752,125 | na | na |
| leased from others ${ }^{3}$ | 342,011 | 797,474 | 429 |
| Cropland removed from production Total acres | 56,080 | 480,937 | 429 117 |
| operated ${ }^{4}$ | 1,030,490 | 1,751,795 | 598 |
| na=Not applicable. |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Average per reporting farm is defifed as the mean per farm reponing |  |  |  |
| a nonzero for the item in the sample. ${ }^{2}$ Represents number of farms. |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {4 }}$ Defined as owned land plus land renled or leased from others (inclus. |  |  |  |
| AUM land) less iand ren |  | leased fromi | (including |

estimated 56 million acres of cropland being removed
from production.
Approximately 310,000 farms had gross sales of at least $\$ 100,000$ in 1990. Farms of this size accounted for 18 percent of all farms, 49 percent of land owned, and 57 percent of land operated. Almost a quarter of all farms reported sales between $\$ 20,000$ and $\$ 99,999$ in 1990. Farms with sales of $\$ 40,000$ to $\$ 99,999$ reported operating, on average, nearly twice the acreage of farms with sales of $\$ 20,000$ to $\$ 39,999$. Farms with sales of less than \$10,000 accounted for almost half of all farm operations, and they operated the smallest farms, averaging 123 acres.

Aimost half of all farm operations were located in three regions: the Corn Belt, the Appalachian region, and the Southern Plains. However, only about 26 percent of all acres operated were in those regions, reflecting variation in farm size as the types of agricultural activities vary. Average acres operated ranged from 174 acres in the Appalachian region to 3,223 acres in the Mountain region.

## To Order This Report...

The information presented here is excerpted from Farm Operating and Financial Characterlstics, 1990, S8-860, by Susan E. Bentley. The cost is
$\$ 15.00$ $\$ 15.00$.

To order, dial 1-800-999-6779 (toll free in the United States and Canada) and ask for the report by
titie.

Please add 25 percent to foreign addresses (including Canada). Charge to VISA or MasterCard. Or send a check (made payable to ERS-NASS) to:

ERS-NASS
341 Victory Drive
Hemdon, VA 22070.
We'll fill your order by first-class mail.
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