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Federal milk order reform amendments extends the time for implementing February 1 and April 4, 1999, and this decision be issued between Appropriations Bill, which requires that Emergency Supplemental consolidated into between 10 to 14 current Federal milk orders be Farm Bill which mandates that the consolidation complies with the 1996 consolidates the current 31 Federal milk orders.

Milk in the New England and Other Marketing Areas; Decision on Proposed Amendments to Marketing Agreements and to Orders
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 CFR Part</th>
<th>Marketing area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>General Provisions of Federal Milk Marketing Orders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>New England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>New York-New Jersey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Middle Atlantic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>Carolina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>Upper Florida.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007</td>
<td>Southeast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Tampa Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1013</td>
<td>Southeastern Florida.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>Chicago Regional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032</td>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1033</td>
<td>Ohio Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1036</td>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Southern Michigan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1044</td>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1046</td>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1049</td>
<td>Indiana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Central Illinois.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064</td>
<td>Greater Kansas City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1068</td>
<td>Upper Midwest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076</td>
<td>Eastern South Dakota.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079</td>
<td>Iowa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1106</td>
<td>Southwest Plains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1124</td>
<td>Pacific Northwest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1126</td>
<td>Texas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1131</td>
<td>Central Arizona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134</td>
<td>Western Colorado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1135</td>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1137</td>
<td>Eastern Colorado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1138</td>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1139</td>
<td>Great Basin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY: This final decision consolidates the current 31 Federal milk marketing orders into 11 orders. This consolidation complies with the 1996 Farm Bill which mandates that the current Federal milk orders be consolidated into between 10 to 14 orders. This decision also conforms to the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill, which requires that this decision be issued between February 1 and April 4, 1999, and extends the time for implementing Federal milk order reform amendments to October 1, 1999. This decision sets forth a replacement for the Class I price structure and replaces the basic formula price with a multiple component pricing system. This decision also establishes a new Class IV which would include milk used to produce nonfat dry milk, butter, and other dry milk powders; reclassifies eggnog; and addresses other minor classification changes. Part 1000 is expanded to include sections that are identical to all of the consolidated orders to assist in simplifying and streamlining the orders.

This decision does not provide for conducting referendums of producers to determine if they approve of the issuance of the consolidated orders.

DATES: A notice to conduct a referendum on each of the consolidated orders will be published separately at a future date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John F. Borovies, Branch Chief, USDA/AMS/Dairy Programs, Order Formulation Branch, Room 2971, South Building, PO Box 96456, Washington, DC 20090-6456, (202) 720-6274, e-mail address John_F_Borovies@usda.gov (after
April 19, 1999, the e-mail address will change to John.Borovies@usda.gov.

For specific information on the Final Regulatory Impact Analysis and the Civil Rights Impact Analysis contact: John R. Mengel, Chief Economist, USDA/AMS/Dairy Programs, Office of Chief Economist, Room 2753, South Building, PO Box 96456, Washington, DC 20090–6456, (202) 720–4664, e-mail address John_R_Mengel@usda.gov (after April 19, 1999, the e-mail address will change to John.Mengel@usda.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Major changes from the proposed rule issued on January 21, 1998, are as follows:

1. Consolidation of Marketing Areas
   (a) The Western New York State order was removed from the proposed Northeast marketing area.
   (b) Six currently-unregulated counties were removed from the consolidated Central marketing area.
   (c) The current Western Colorado order was moved from the consolidated Western order to the consolidated Central marketing area along with 7 currently-unregulated Colorado counties.

2. Basic Formula Price Replacement
   (a) The proposed Class III and Class IV pricing formulas are revised to adjust for product yields and make allowances that result in lowering the Class III and IV prices.
   (b) Barrel cheese prices (NASS survey) are included in the Class III price formula.
   (c) The basis for measuring the protein content in milk is changed from a test for total nitrogen to a test for true protein.
   (d) Advance pricing for Class I will continue to be provided, but with a shorter time period (7 days vs. 25 days) prior to the effective month. The proposed rule had suggested a 6-month declining average mover.
   (e) Provides for advance pricing for skim milk in Class II uses in the same manner as for Class I.

3. Class I Price Structure
   Adopts a Class I price structure that uses the generally higher differential levels as proposed in Option 1A while retaining the pricing surface of the Department’s preferred option.

4. Classification
   (a) Cream cheese is moved from Class II to Class III.
   (b) Shrinkage calculations are revised.
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I. Prior Documents

Prior documents in this proceeding include:

II. Legislative and Background Requirements

Legislative Requirements

Section 143 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Farm Bill), 7 USC 7253, required that by April 4, 1999, the current Federal milk marketing orders issued under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674), be consolidated into between 10 to 14 orders. The Secretary of Agriculture (Secretary) is also directed to designate the State of California as a Federal milk order if California dairy producers petition for and approve such an order.

In addition, the Farm Bill provided that the Secretary may address related issues such as the use of utilization rates and multiple basing points for the pricing of fluid milk and the use of uniform multiple component pricing when developing one or more basic prices for manufacturing milk.

Besides designating a date for completion of the required consolidation, the Farm Bill further required that no later than April 1, 1997, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress on the progress of the Federal order reform process that included: a description of the progress made toward implementation, a review of the Federal order system in light of the reforms.

1. Section 143(b)(2) requires that a proposed rule be published by April 4, 1998, and Section 143(b)(3) provides that “in the event that the Secretary is enjoined or otherwise restrained by a court order from publishing or implementing the consolidation and related reforms under subsection (a), the length of time for which that injunction or other restraining order is effective shall be added to the time limitations specified in paragraph (2) thereby extending those time limitations by a period of time equal to the period of time for which the injunction or other restraining order is effective.”

2. Since this proceeding was initiated on May 2, 1996, the Black Hills, South Dakota and the Tennessee Valley orders have been terminated. Effective October 1, 1996, the operating provisions of the Black Hills order were terminated (61 FR 47038), and the remaining administrative provisions were terminated effective December 31, 1996 (61 FR 67927). Effective October 1, 1997, the operating provisions of the Tennessee Valley order were terminated (62 FR 47923). The remaining administrative provisions of the Tennessee Valley order will be terminated before this consolidation process is completed.

3. The Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill, signed into law in October 1998, extended the time frame for implementing Federal milk order reform amendments from April 4, 1999, to October 1, 1999. The extension specifies that the final decision defined as the final rule for purposes of this legislation, will be issued between February 1 and April 4, 1999, with the new amendments becoming effective on October 1, 1999. The legislation also provides that California has from the date of issuance of the final decision until September 30, 1999, to become a separate Federal milk marketing order.
required, and any recommendations considered appropriate for further improvements and reforms. This report was submitted to Congress on April 1, 1997.4

Finally, the 1996 Farm Bill specified that USDA use informal rulemaking to implement these reforms.

**Background**

The authorization of informal rulemaking to achieve the mandated reforms of the Farm Bill has resulted in a rulemaking process that is substantially different from the formal rulemaking process required to promulgate or amend Federal orders. The formal rulemaking process requires that decisions by USDA be based solely on the evidentiary record of a public hearing held before an Administrative Law Judge. Formal rulemaking involves the presentation of sworn testimony, the cross-examination of witnesses, the filing of briefs, the issuance of a recommended decision, the filing of exceptions, the issuance of a final decision that is voted on by affected producers, and upon approval by producers, the issuance of a final order.

The informal rulemaking process does not require these procedures. Instead, informal rulemaking provides for the issuance of a proposed rule by the Agricultural Marketing Service, a period of time for the filing of comments by interested parties, and the issuance of a final decision by the Secretary. Referendums will be conducted to determine approval of the final decision by the requisite number of producers before the new orders will become effective.

Full participation by interested parties has been essential in the reform of Federal milk orders. The issues are too important and complex to be developed without significant input from all facets of the dairy industry. The experience, knowledge, and expertise of the industry and public have been integral to the development of the rule. To ensure that maximum public input into the process was received, USDA developed a plan of action and projected time line. The plan of action developed consists of three phases: Developmental, rulemaking, and implementation.

The first phase of the plan was the Developmental Phase. The use of a developmental phase allowed USDA to interact freely with the public to develop viable proposals that accomplished the Farm Bill mandates, as well as related reforms. The USDA met with interested parties to discuss the reform process, assisted in developing ideas or provided data and analysis on various possibilities, issued program announcements, and requested public input on all aspects of the Federal order program. The developmental phase began on April 4, 1996, and concluded with the issuance of the proposed rule on January 21, 1998 (68 FR 4802).

The second phase of the plan is the rulemaking phase. The rulemaking phase began with the issuance and publication of the proposed rule. The proposed rule provided the public 60 days to submit written comments on the reform proposals to USDA. On March 10, 1998, (68 FR 12417) the comment period was extended for an additional 30 days until April 30, 1998. In addition to requests for written comments, four listening sessions were held to receive verbal comments on the proposed rule. All comments were reviewed and considered prior to the issuance of this rule.

The third and final phase of the plan is the implementation phase. The implementation phase begins after this rule is published in the Federal Register. This phase consists of informational meetings conducted by Market Administrator personnel and referendums.5 The objective of the informational meetings is to inform producers and handlers about the newly consolidated orders and explain the projected effects on producers and handlers in the new marketing order areas. After informational meetings are held, the referendums will be conducted. Upon approval of the consolidated orders and related reforms by the required number of producers in each marketing area, a final order implementing the new orders will be issued and published in the Federal Register.

Although all of the issues regarding Federal milk order reform are interrelated, USDA established several committees to address specific issues. The use of committees allowed the reform process to be divided into more manageable tasks. The committees worked throughout the developmental and rulemaking phases. The committees established were: Price Structure, Basic Formula Price, Identical Provisions, Classification, and Regional. The Regional committee was divided into four subcommittees: Midwest, Northeast, Southeast, and West.

Committee membership consisted of both field and headquarters Dairy Programs personnel. The committees were given specific assignments related to their designated issue and began meeting in May 1996.

In addition to utilizing USDA personnel, partnerships were established with two university consortia to provide expert analyses on the issues relating to price structure and basic formula price options. Dr. Andrew Novakovic of Cornell University led the analysis on price structure and published a staff paper entitled “U.S. Dairy Sector Simulator: A Spatially Disaggregated Model of the U.S. Dairy Industry” and a research bulletin entitled “An Economic and Mathematical Description of the U.S. Dairy Sector Simulator”6 The Modified Product Value and Fresh Milk Base Price Formulas as BFP Alternatives”, “The Modified Product Value and Fresh Milk Base Price Formulas as BFP Alternatives”, and “Evaluation of ‘Final’ Four Basic Formula Price Options”.7

**Actions Completed During Developmental Phase**

USDA maintained frequent contact with the industry regarding the reform process. To begin, on May 2, 1996, the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) Dairy Division issued a memorandum to interested parties announcing the planned procedures for implementing the Farm Bill8. In this memorandum, all interested parties were requested to submit ideas on reforming Federal milk orders, specifically as to the consolidation and pricing structure of orders. Input was requested by July 1, 1996.

On June 24, 1996, USDA issued a press release announcing that a public forum would be held in Madison, Wisconsin, on July 29, 1996. The forum would address price discovery techniques for the value of milk used in

4. Copies of the Report to Congress can be obtained from Dairy Programs at (202) 720-4392 or via the Internet at http://www.ams.usda.gov/dairy/.

5. As previously noted, this is also the time period in which California can consider becoming a Federal order based on the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill provisions.

6. Copies of these reports may be obtained by contacting Dr. Ronald Knutson, Agricultural and Food Policy Center, Dept of Ag. Economics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-2124, (409) 845-5913.

7. Copies of these reports may be obtained by contacting Ms. Wendy Barrett, Cornell University, ARME, 348 Warren Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853-7801, (607) 255-1581.

8. Copies of this announcement and all subsequent announcements and reports can be obtained from Dairy Programs at (202) 720-4392, any Market Administrator office, or via the Internet at http://www.ams.usda.gov/dairy/.
manufactured dairy products. Thirty-one Senators, Congressmen, university professors, representatives of processor and producer organizations, and dairy farmers made presentations at the forum.

On October 24, 1996, AMS Dairy Division issued a memorandum to interested parties requesting input regarding all aspects of Federal milk order reform and specifically as to its impact on small businesses. USDA anticipated that the consolidation of Federal orders would have an economic impact on handlers and producers affected by the program, and USDA wanted to ensure that, while accomplishing their intended purpose, the newly consolidated Federal orders would not unduly inhibit the ability of small businesses to compete.

On December 3, 1996, AMS Dairy Division issued a memorandum to interested parties announcing the release of the preliminary report on Federal milk order consolidation. The report suggested the consolidation of the then current 32 Federal milk orders into ten orders. (See Appendix A for report summary.) The memorandum requested input from all interested parties on the suggested consolidated orders and on any other aspect of the milk marketing order program by February 10, 1997.

On March 7, 1997, AMS Dairy Division issued a memorandum to interested parties announcing the release of three reports that addressed the Class I price structure, the classification of milk, and the identical provisions contained in a Federal milk order. The price structure report consisted of a summary report and a technical report and discussed several options for modifying the Class I price structure. (See Appendix B for report summary.) The classification report recommended the reclassification of certain dairy products, including the removal of Class III-A pricing for nonfat dry milk. (See Appendix C for report summary.) The identical provisions report recommended simplifying, modifying, and eliminating unnecessary differences in Federal order provisions. (See Appendix D for report summary.) Comments on the contents of these reports, as well as on any other aspect of the program, were requested from interested parties by June 1, 1997.

On April 18, 1997, AMS Dairy Division issued a memorandum to interested parties announcing the release of the preliminary report on Alternatives to the Basic Formula Price (BFP). The report contained suggestions, ideas, and alternatives for BFP alternatives. Over eight categories of options were identified with four options recommended for further review and discussion. (See Appendix E for report summary.) The memorandum requested input from all interested parties on a BFP alternative and on any other aspect of the milk marketing order program by June 1, 1997.

On May 20, 1997, AMS Dairy Division issued a memorandum to interested parties announcing the release of a revised preliminary report on Federal milk order consolidation. The revisions were based on the input received from interested parties in response to the initial preliminary report on order consolidation. (See Appendix F for report summary.) Instead of suggesting 10 consolidated orders as in the first report, the revised report suggested 11 consolidated orders and suggested the inclusion of some currently unregulated territory. The memorandum requested comments from all interested parties on the suggested consolidated orders and on any other aspect of the milk marketing order program by June 15, 1997.

To elicit further input on the role of the National Cheese Exchange price in calculating the basic formula price, on January 29, 1997, the Secretary issued a press release announcing steps being taken by USDA to address concerns raised by dairy producers about how milk prices are calculated. In the press release, the Secretary requested further comments from interested parties about the use of the National Cheese Exchange in the determination of the basic formula price, which is the minimum price that handlers must pay dairy farmers for milk used to manufacture Class III products (butter and cheese) and the price used to establish the Class I and Class II prices. These comments were requested by March 31, 1997, and were useful in analyzing alternatives to the basic formula price in context of the order reform process.

Actions Completed During Rulemaking Phase

On January 21, 1998, USDA issued a proposed rule (68 FR 4802) that recommended consolidating the current 31 orders into 11 orders, proposed two options for consideration as a replacement for the Class I price structure, and recommended replacing the basic formula price. The proposed rule also recommended establishing a new Class IV which would include milk used to produce nonfat dry milk, butter, and other dry milk powders; recommended reclassifying eggnog and cream cheese, addressing other minor classification issues; and recommended expanding part 1000 to include sections that are identical to all of the consolidated orders. A Preliminary Regulatory Impact Analysis (PRIA) was also issued that evaluated the costs and benefits of the proposed rule contents and alternatives. Comments were requested on the proposed rule and the PRIA on or before March 31, 1998. An informational packet describing the contents of the proposed rule was sent to interested parties.

On March 10, 1998, USDA issued a document that extended the time for filing comments on the proposed rule an additional 30 days, until April 30, 1998. The document also announced that USDA would conduct four listening sessions to assist interested parties in submitting comments to USDA. The listening sessions were held on March 30 in Atlanta, Georgia; Liverpool, New York; and Dallas, Texas; and on March 31 in Green Bay, Wisconsin.

On April 15, 1998, AMS Dairy Programs announced the issuance of a report entitled “Report on the Impacts of the Federal Order Reform Proposals on Food and Nutrition Service Programs, Participants, and Administering Institutions” by the Food and Nutrition Service of USDA. The report analyzed the potential impacts of the milk order reform pricing proposals contained in the proposed rule on the Food Stamp Program, the Women, Infants, and Children Program, and the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs. The report indicated that adoption of the proposed rule with either Class I price structure would have minimal economic impact on these programs. Comments on the report were requested by April 30, 1998. No comments were received.

Public Interaction and Input

As a result of the developmental phase announcements and forum, more than 1,600 individual comments were received by USDA. In addition to the individual comments, more than 2,000 form letters were received. As a result of the rulemaking phase proposed rule and listening sessions, nearly 4,500 additional comments were received. A further breakdown of the rulemaking comments by issue is as follows: 1,273 consolidation; 376 basic formula price; 4,224 Class I price structure; 101 classification; and 79 provisions applicable to all orders.

The proposed rule provided interested parties an opportunity to file comments until March 31, 1998. This period was later extended to April 30, 1998. Over 205 comments were

Copies of this report can be obtained from Dairy Programs at (202) 720-4392, or via the Internet at http://www.ams.usda.gov/dairy.
postmarked after the April 30th deadline. Most of these comments did not raise any issues that were not previously addressed by comments timely submitted and considered in this rulemaking.

All comments that were reviewed by USDA personnel were available for public inspection at USDA. To assist the public in accessing the comments, USDA contracted to have the comments scanned and published on compact discs. The use of this technology allowed interested parties throughout the United States access to the information received by USDA.

USDA also made all publications and requests for information available on the Internet. A separate page under the Dairy Programs section of the AMS Homepage was established to provide information about the reform process. To assist in transmitting correspondence to USDA, a special electronic mail account—Milk_Order_Reform@usda.gov—was opened to receive input on Federal milk order reforms.

USDA personnel met frequently with interested parties from May 1996 through the issuance of the proposed rule to gather information and ideas on the consolidation and reform of Federal milk orders. During this time period, USDA personnel addressed over 250 groups comprised of more than 22,000 individuals on various issues related to Federal order reforms.

USDA personnel also conducted in-person briefings for both the Senate and House Agricultural Committees on the progress of Federal milk order reforms. Since May 1996, nine briefings were conducted for the committees. The briefings advised the committees of the plan of action for implementing the Farm Bill mandates; explained the preliminary report on the consolidation of Federal milk orders; explained the contents of the reports addressing Class I price structure, classification of milk, identical provisions and basic formula price; discussed the congressional report; and explained the proposed rule contents.

To ensure the involvement of all interested parties, particularly small businesses as defined in the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA), in the process of Federal order reform, three primary methods of contact were used: direct written notification, publication of notices through various media forms, and speaking and meeting with organizations and individuals regarding the issue of Federal order reforms. In addition, information has been made available to the public via the Internet. USDA also made one written program announcement specifically requesting information from small businesses. Comments were also specifically requested on the IRFA published in the January 21, 1998, proposed rule. More than 1,000 comments were received from interested parties that specifically stated or documented they were small businesses. However, this number may not be fully representative of the number of small businesses that actually submitted comments because a majority of commenters did not indicate their size. A few comments specifically addressed the IRFA, Executive Order 12866, and the paperwork reduction analysis.

All announcements and an information packet summarizing the proposed rule were mailed to over 20,000 interested parties, State Governors, State Department of Agriculture Secretaries or Commissioners, and the national and ten regional Small Business Administration offices. In addition, most dairy producers under the orders were notified through regular market service bulletins published by Market Administrators on a monthly basis. Press releases were issued by USDA for the May 2, 1996, December 3, 1996, January 29, 1997, March 7, 1997, and May 20, 1997, announcements; for the July 31, 1996, public forum; for the January 21, 1998, proposed rule; and for the March 30 and 31, 1998, listening sessions and extension of time for submitting comments.10 These press releases were distributed to approximately 33 wire services and trade publications and to each State Department of Agriculture Communications Officer. These methods of notification helped to ensure that virtually all identified small businesses were contacted.

Departmental personnel, both in the field and from Washington, actively met with interested parties to gather input and to clarify and refine ideas already submitted. Formal presentations, round table discussions, and individually scheduled meetings between industry representatives and Departmental personnel were held. Over 250 organizations and more than 22,000 individuals were reached through this method. Of these individuals, approximately 13,400 were identified as small businesses.

10 Copies of these press releases may be obtained from Dairy Programs at (202) 720-4392, or via the Internet at http://www.ams.usda.gov/news/newsrel.htm.
Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, 7 U.S.C. 7253, (the Farm Bill) which required the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretary) to consolidate the existing 31 Federal milk marketing orders, as authorized by the AMAA, into between 10 and 14 orders. The Farm Bill further provided that the Secretary may address related issues such as the use of utilization rates and multiple basing points for the pricing of fluid milk and the use of uniform multiple component pricing when developing one or more basic formula prices for manufacturing milk. The Secretary was also directed to designate the State of California as a Federal milk order if California dairy producers petition for and approve such an order. Finally, the Farm Bill specified that the Department of Agriculture use informal rulemaking to implement these reforms.

The Farm Bill required that a proposed rule be published by April 4, 1998, and all reforms of the Federal milk order program be completed by April 4, 1999. However, the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill, passed in October 1998, extended the time frame for implementing Federal milk order reform amendments from April 4, 1999, to October 1, 1999. The extension specified that the final decision, defined as the final rule for purposes of this legislation, be issued between February 1 and April 4, 1999, with the new amendments becoming effective on October 1, 1999. The legislation also provides that California has from the date of issuance of the final decision until September 30, 1999, to become a separate Federal milk marketing order.

The final decision sets forth the consolidation of the current 31 Federal milk orders into 11 orders. The marketing areas are: Northeast, Midwest, Upper Midwest, Central, Appalachian, Southeast, Florida, Southwest, Arizona, Las Vegas, Western, and Pacific Northwest. Several issues related to the consolidation of Federal milk orders are also addressed. The final decision contains a replacement for the current Class I price structure and the basic formula price (BFP). The final decision adopts a Class I price structure that uses the proposed Option 1B price surface as modified to provide for better alignment of Class I prices and increases the differential level by 40 cents. The current BFP is replaced with a multiple component pricing system that derives component values from surveyed prices of manufactured dairy products. These changes set the stage for increasing efficiencies in supplying the milk needs of Class I markets and address concerns that the BFP is no longer a statistically significant measure of the value of manufacturing milk.

The rule also classifies milk into four classes according to the products made from such milk. Milk used to produce defined fluid milk products is classified as Class I milk. Milk used to produce defined soft manufactured products is classified as Class II milk. Class III milk is milk used to produce cream cheese and defined hard manufactured cheeses, and Class IV milk is milk used to produce butter and all milk powders. The minimum monthly price for milk classified as Class I is equal to the Class I differential specified for each marketing order plus the Class I price mover announced on or before the 23rd day of the month preceding the month for which the price is being announced. The Class I price mover is equal to the higher result from the formula used to establish Class III and Class IV prices using weighted average prices for manufactured products as published by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) for the most recent two weeks preceding the 23rd of the month. Weekly prices are weighted by sales volumes reported by NASS.

Finally, this rule expands Part 1000 to include provisions that are identical within each consolidated order to assist in simplifying the regulations. These provisions include the definitions of route disposition, plant, distributing plant, supply plant, nonpool plant, handler, other source milk, fluid milk product, fluid cream product, cooperative association, and commercial food processing establishment. In addition, the milk classification section, pricing provisions, and most of the provisions relating to payments have been included in the General Provisions. These changes adhere with the efforts of the National Performance Review—Regulatory Reform Initiative to simplify, modify, and eliminate unnecessary repetition of regulations. Unique regional issues or marketing conditions have been considered and included in each market's order provisions.

In the summary of the initial RIA for the January 21, 1998, proposed rule, the economic impact of certain individual sections of the regulations were discussed that were considered to be economically significant. Not all of the changes contained in the proposed rule were considered economically significant. The sections individually addressed in the January 21st proposed rule were marketing area consolidation, the BFP, the Class I pricing structure and classification provisions. Since these are adopted together in the final decision, this analysis reviews the impacts of adopting all of the provisions simultaneously on the dairy industry. The analysis also reviews the impacts of adopting the provisions contained in the January 21st proposed rule with two alternative Class I pricing structures.

The final RIA and the final decision explain in detail the components adopted in the Federal order regulations and analyzed by the model. A review of the projected economic impacts of the final decision and the projected economic impacts of the alternatives that were considered on dairy producers, processors, consumers, and international trade follows. The projected impacts are compared to the baseline projections over a 6-year period from the years of 2000–2005. The baseline assumes that the Class III price would be the BFP, the Class II price would be the BFP plus 30 cents, each region's Class I price would be the BFP plus the current Class I differential and the Class III-a price would continue. The RIA details the impacts of the final decision and the other options considered on each current order, the Federal orders combined, the State of California, and the United States.

The following table summarizes the impacts of adopting the newly consolidated orders and their specific provisions, including the Class I price structure adopted in this final decision. The table also provides data detailing the projected impacts of the consolidated orders and the specific provisions utilizing the two alternative Class I price structures—Location-Specific Differentials (Option 1A) and Relative-Value Specific Differentials (Option 1B). Since adopting new Federal milk order provisions affect both the regulated dairy industry and associated producers, as well as the unregulated and State regulated dairy industries, a comparison of the impacts both Federally and U.S.-wide are included where possible.
As is evidenced by the summary table, the economic impacts resulting from the adoption of the final decision are minimal when compared to the total values included in the Federal order system and in the U.S. This is also true with the alternative options that were considered. Changes in the all-milk price, milk marketings, Class I use, and cash receipts all represent less than one percent of the total baseline projections. Although the total impacts are minimal from a national perspective, processors, and consumers may experience a greater impact on a more localized level as is described in the RIA.

The consolidation of Federal milk orders into 11 orders with the adopted price structure and all other provision modifications of the final decision best adheres to the requirements of the Farm Bill while fulfilling the objectives of the AMAA. The changes adopted in the final decision enhance the efficiencies of fluid milk markets while maintaining equity among processors of fluid milk selling in marketing order areas and among dairy farmers supplying the areas' fluid demands. The final decision provisions achieve this while having minor overall impacts on the Federal order system and on the U.S. dairy industry. Although both of the alternatives considered also have minor impacts, the final decision best achieves economic efficiencies, equity, and program objectives.

Final Decision

A brief review of the impacts that are projected to occur with the implementation of the final decision are:

Producers. In general, producers in markets located in the western, southwestern, and northeastern areas of the U.S. may not fare as well as producers located in other parts of the country, as measured by the all-milk price and cash receipts from milk marketings. The average all-milk price for the combined Federal order markets is expected to average $0.02 per hundredweight lower than the baseline. The average all-milk price is projected to increase in 13 current markets from $0.01 to $0.52 per hundredweight and decrease in 19 markets from $0.01 to $0.50. One market is estimated to average unchanged. The average all-milk price throughout the entire U.S. is projected to remain unchanged. It is important to recognize that the all-milk price can be impacted considerably by the change in the Class I utilization due to consolidation and the necessary alignment of Class I prices within consolidated areas.

Over the 2000–2005 period, gross cash receipts within the Federal order system are expected to increase an estimated $222.3 million primarily because of changes in transportation payments and the pooling of additional milk under the Federal order system. After adjusting for these changes, annual cash receipts are projected to decline from the baseline an average of $2.5 million during the 6-year period. With the baseline cash receipts averaging $16,944.5 million this represents a very insignificant reduction. Fifteen markets are projected to have increases with 18 markets projected to have decreases.

Processors. Since the final decision is expected to have little effect on where milk is produced, little impact is expected on fluid milk processors or manufacturers of dairy products.

Impacts on fluid milk processors will likely result from changes in the minimum Class I and Class II prices that are the handler's obligation under the Federal order system. Fluid processors in 14 of the current Federal order markets will experience increased differentials, while processors in 17 of the markets will see decreases. Fluid processors in two markets will see no change. The estimated weighted average Class I differential for all current Federal order markets would decrease $0.29 per hundredweight. The all-market average Federal order Class I price would decrease $0.19 per hundredweight when compared to the baseline during the years of 2000–2005. The value of manufacturing milk would be increased, on average, $82.5 million per year during the six-year period.

Consumers. Since adoption of the final decision is projected to result in a slight decrease in the average Class I
price for the years of 2000–2005, it is expected that average retail prices will decrease about $0.02 per gallon. On an individual order basis, the changes in the average retail price per gallon may range from an increase of $0.06 to a decrease of $0.09. Although consumers will be spending less on fluid milk products, consumption is projected to remain relatively unchanged.

International Trade. Adopting the final decision is not expected to have a significant impact on domestic butter and nonfat dry milk prices and therefore, little change in international trade is expected. International trade of raw milk and fluid milk products between the United States, Mexico, and Canada should be unaffected. However, the increase in the Class II price could negatively affect the Mexican market for those products.

Other Alternatives

Although implementation of the consolidated orders with either the Option 1B or Option 1A price surface would still result in less than a projected one percent change in overall Federal order and U.S. prices, cash receipts, and marketings, these two alternatives do not promote market efficiencies, equity or program objectives as well as the provisions adopted and would not result in the most preferable allocation of resources over time. A brief review of the impacts that were projected to occur with the implementation of these two alternatives are:

Producers. In general, Option 1B would have reduced producer income in total and would have reduced the proportion of the Class I value represented in Federal order pools. Mainly producers located in the Upper Midwest and Florida areas would have benefited while producers throughout the rest of the U.S. would have been negatively impacted. The all-milk price for all Federal order markets combined was expected to average $0.10 per hundredweight lower than the baseline during the years of 2000–2005. The average all-milk price was projected to increase in 10 current markets from $0.06 to $0.42 per hundredweight and decrease in 23 markets from $0.01 to $0.61 during this time period. This would have resulted in changing the gross cash receipts on an individual order basis during this period ranging from an annual average decrease of $48.4 million to an increase of $38.5 million. Overall, gross cash receipts would have averaged $128.4 million less than currently received.

Under Option 1A the all-milk price for all Federal order markets combined was expected to average $0.03 per hundredweight higher than the baseline during the years of 2000–2005. The average all-milk price was projected to increase in 15 current markets from $0.01 to $0.34 per hundredweight and decrease in 18 markets from $0.01 to $0.66. These changes would have resulted in changing the gross cash receipts on an individual order basis during this period ranging from an annual average decrease of $10.3 million to an increase of $48.4 million. Overall, gross cash receipts would have averaged $104.9 million higher than currently received.

Processors. Since Option 1B would have lowered the Class I differentials by a weighted average of $0.69 per hundredweight, the all-market average Class I price charged to fluid handlers would have declined by $0.49 per hundredweight when compared to the baseline during the years of 2000–2005. Lower Class I prices would have been expected to increase sales of fluid milk within the Federal order system by an annual average of 106.7 million pounds, representing less than one percent increase. Similar responses would have occurred throughout the U.S. Fluid processors would have benefited from lower fluid milk prices and increased fluid milk sales.

Option 1A would have increased Class I differentials by a weighted average of $0.04 per hundredweight resulting in the all-market average Class I price charged to fluid handlers increasing by $0.08 per hundredweight when compared to the baseline during the years of 2000–2005. Since the impact of the increased Class I prices would have resulted in an insignificant decrease in fluid milk consumption within the Federal order system, a decrease of 16.6 million pounds, and within the U.S., a decrease of 14.9 million pounds, this option would have little expected overall effect on processors or manufacturers of dairy products.

Consumers. Since adoption of Option 1B was projected to result in a decrease in the average Class I price for the period 2000–2005, it was expected that retail prices would decrease an average of $0.04 per gallon. On an individual order basis the changes in the average retail price per gallon would have ranged from an increase of $0.03 to a decrease of $0.12. As a result of the overall price decrease, consumers would have spent slightly more on fluid milk products and purchased about the same amount of milk for fluid use.

International Trade. Options 1B or 1A were not expected to have a significant impact on domestic butter and nonfat dry milk prices and therefore, little change in international trade would have resulted. International trade of raw milk and fluid milk products between the United States, Mexico, and Canada would have been unaffected.

In response to the final decision, the Food and Nutrition Service updated the analysis on the impacts of Federal Order reform provisions on Food and Nutrition Service programs, participants, and administering institutions. The updated report analyzes the potential impacts of the milk order reform pricing provisions contained in the final decision on the Food Stamp Program, the Women, Infants, and Children Program, and the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs. The report also analyzes impacts of adopting either of the alternative Class I price structure options. The report indicates that adoption of the final decision provisions, as well as either of the alternatives considered, will have minimal economic impact on these programs. This report is included in the final RIA appendix.

The impacts of the provisions adopted in the final decision or either of the alternatives considered are minimal when compared to the total marketings and revenue generated in the dairy industry both on a national and Federal order basis. However, neither of the alternative options considered would appear to improve market efficiencies or equity as well as adopting the provisions contained in the final decision. Based on the analyses completed, the final decision regulations have been tailored to impose the least burden on society while meeting regulatory objectives. In doing so, these regulations will replace current regulations and will not duplicate any current regulations that may exist.

Civil Rights Impact Analysis Executive Summary

Pursuant to Departmental Regulation (DR) 4300–4, a Civil Rights Impact Analysis (CRIA) reviews the final decisions and any Final Supplements to Final Decisions. The CRIA report is intended to provide a rational, objective analysis of the potential impacts of any final decision on persons with disabilities. The report is not intended to determine whether the actions will or will not violate applicable Federal or State laws, but rather, to determine whether the actions will or will not cause significant adverse impact on persons with disabilities. The CRIA report will provide the Secretary and the Agency with a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the potential impacts on persons with disabilities of any final decision or Final Supplement to Final Decision, so that the Secretary and the Agency can make an informed decision on whether the actions should or should not be taken. The CRIA report is intended to be a tool for ensuring that the actions taken by the Agency will not result in the denial of equal participation to persons with disabilities.
decision regarding reforms to the Federal Milk Marketing Order program to identify any provisions within the final decision with actual or potential adverse effects for minorities, women, and persons with disabilities.

The CRIA includes descriptions of (1) the purpose of performing a CRIA; (2) the civil rights policy of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA); and (3) basics of the Federal milk marketing order program are provided for background information. The civil rights impact analysis of Federal Order Reform meets the requirements prescribed by DR 4300-4. As part of the analysis, the extensive outreach efforts of USDA through the entire reform process and after the final decision is published are highlighted. Additionally, statistical detail is provided of the characteristics of the dairy producer and general populations located within the current and consolidated marketing areas.

The analysis discloses no potential for affecting dairy farmers with specific characteristics more negatively than the general population of dairy farmers. All producers, regardless of race, national origin, or disability choosing to deliver milk to a Federal order regulated handler will receive the minimum blend price.

Copies of the Civil Rights Impact Analysis can be obtained from Dairy Programs at (202) 720-4392; any Market Administrator office; or via the Internet at http://www.ams.usda.gov/dairy.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act and the Effects on Small Businesses

Pursuant to the requirements set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) has considered the economic impact of the rule on small entities and has prepared this final regulatory flexibility analysis. The Regulatory Flexibility Act provides, in summary, that when preparing such analysis an agency shall address: The need for and objectives of the rule; summary of the significant issues raised in public comments, agency assessment of the issues raised, and changes made to the proposed rule based on these issues; the kind and number of small entities affected; the recordkeeping, reporting, and other requirements; and steps taken to minimize the economic impact on small entities.

This regulatory action is in accordance with section 143 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, 7 U.S.C. 7253, (the Farm Bill) which required the Secretary of Agriculture (Secretary) to consolidate the existing 31 Federal milk marketing orders, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (AMAA), into between 10 and 14 orders. The Farm Bill further provided that the Secretary may address related issues such as the use of utilization rates and multiple basing points for the pricing of fluid milk and the use of uniform multiple component pricing when developing one or more basic prices for manufacturing milk. The Secretary was also directed to designate the State of California as a Federal milk order if California dairy producers petition for and approve such an order. Finally, the Farm Bill specified that the Department of Agriculture use informal rulemaking to implement these reforms.

The Farm Bill required that a proposed rule be published by April 4, 1998, and all reforms of the Federal milk order program be completed by April 4, 1999. However, the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill, passed in October 1998, extended the time frame for implementing Federal dairy order reform amendments from April 4, 1999, to October 1, 1999. The extension specified that the final decision, defined as the final rule for purposes of this legislation, be issued between February 1 and April 4, 1999, with the new amendments becoming effective on October 1, 1999. The legislation also provides that California has from the date of issuance of the final decision until September 30, 1999, to become a separate Federal milk marketing order.

The final decision sets forth the consolidation of the current 31 Federal milk orders into 11 orders. Several issues related to the consolidation of Federal milk orders are also addressed. The final decision contains a replacement for the Class I price structure and the basic formula price. These changes set the stage for increasing efficiencies in supplying the milk needs of Class I markets and address concerns that the BFP is no longer a statistically significant measure of the value of manufacturing milk. The final decision changes the classification of milk by (1) establishing Class IV provisions which would include milk used to produce nonfat dry milk, butter, and other dry milk powders; (2) reclassifying eggnog; and (3) making other minor classification changes. These changes recognize the position of butter and milk powders as residual products that balance the supply of milk with overall demand, and equalize the cost of competing products. Finally, this final decision expands and consolidates provisions that are identical within each consolidated order to assist in simplifying the regulations. These provisions include the definitions of route disposition, plant, distributing plant, supply plant, nonpool plant, handler, other source milk, fluid milk product, fluid cream product, cooperative association, and commercial food processing establishment. In addition, the milk classification section, pricing provisions, and some of the provisions relating to payments have been included in the General Provisions. These changes adhere with the efforts of the National Performance Review—Regulatory Reform Initiative to simplify, modify, and eliminate unnecessary repetition of regulations. Unique regional issues or marketing conditions have been considered and included in each market’s order provisions.

The purpose of the Regulatory Flexibility Act is to fit regulatory actions to the scale of business subject to the actions in order that small businesses are not unduly or disproportionately burdened. To accomplish this purpose, it first is necessary to define a small business. According to the Small Business Administration’s definition of a “small business,” a dairy farm is a “small business” if it has an annual gross revenue of less than $500,000 and a handler is a “small business” if it has fewer than 500 employees. For purposes of determining which dairy farms are “small businesses,” the $500,000 per year criterion was used to establish a production guideline of 326,000 pounds per month. Although this guideline does not factor in additional monies that may be received by dairy producers, it should be an inclusive standard for most “small” dairy farmers. For purposes of determining a handler’s size, if the plant is part of a larger company operating multiple plants that collectively exceed the 500-employee limit, the plant will be considered a large business even if the local plant has fewer than 500 employees.

Based on 1996 data, USDA identified approximately 80,000 of the 83,000 dairy producers (farmers) that had their milk pooled under a Federal order as small businesses. Thus, small businesses represent approximately 96 percent of the producers in the United States. By 1997 the total number of dairy producers that had their milk pooled under a Federal order had declined to about 79,000. It is estimated that nearly 76,000 are small businesses. During 1997, 78,590 dairy farmers delivered over 105.2 billion pounds of milk, handlers regulated under the milk orders. This volume represents 68 percent of all milk marketed in the U.S.
and 70 percent of the milk of bottling quality (Grade A) sold in the country. The value of the milk delivered to Federal milk order handlers at minimum order blend prices was nearly $14.0 billion. Producer deliveries of milk used in Class I products (fluid milk products) totaled 44.9 billion pounds—42.7 percent of total Federal order producer deliveries. More than 200 million Americans reside in Federal order marketing areas—77 percent of the total U.S. population.

On the processing side, there are over 1,200 individual plants associated with Federal orders, and of these plants, approximately 700 qualify as “small businesses” representing about 55 percent of the total. During October 1997, there were more than 485 fully regulated handlers (306 distributing plants of which 111 were small businesses and nearly 180 supply plants of which about 50 percent were small businesses), 51 partially regulated handlers of which 28 were small businesses and 111 producer-handlers of which 26 were considered small businesses for purposes of this final RFA, submitting reports under the Federal milk marketing order program.

The Federal milk order program is designed to set forth the terms of trade between buyers and sellers of fluid milk. A Federal order enforces the minimum price that processors (handlers) in a given marketing area must pay producers for milk according to how it is utilized. A Federal order further requires that the payments for milk be paid on the basis of milk received by individual dairy producers or cooperative associations on the basis of a uniform or average price. It is important to note that a Federal milk order, including the pricing and all other provisions, only becomes effective after approval, through a referendum, by dairy producers associated with the order.

Development of this final decision began with the premise that no additional burdens should be placed on the industry as a result of Federal order consolidation and reform. As a step in accomplishing the goal of imposing no additional regulatory burdens, a review of the current reporting requirements was completed pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). In light of this review, it was determined that this final decision would have little impact on reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance requirements because these would remain almost identical to the current Federal order program. No new forms are required; however, some additional reporting will be necessary in the orders that are adopting multiple component pricing if the current orders do not contain these provisions. Overall, there would be slight change in the burdens placed on the dairy industry.

There are two principal reporting forms for handlers to complete each month that are needed to administer the Federal milk marketing orders. The forms are used to establish the quantity of milk used and received by handlers, the pooling status of the handler, the class-use of the milk used by the handler, the butterfat content and amounts of other components of the milk. This information is used to compute the monthly uniform price paid to producers in each of the markets. Handlers in the marketing areas adopting multiple component pricing will be required to complete additional information regarding the components of the milk and to assure that proper payments are made to producers. This information is necessary to establish the values of milk on the basis of milk components and to assure that producers are paid correctly. Any handler is trained statistical staff. Thus, the information that handlers report to the market administrator is readily available from normally maintained business records, and as such, the burden on handlers to complete these recordkeeping and reporting requirements is minimal. In addition, assistance in completing forms is readily available from market administrator offices. A description of the forms and a complete Paperwork Reduction Act analysis follows this section.

New territory, or pockets of unregulated territory within and between current order areas has been included in the consolidated marketing areas where such expansion will not have the effect of fully regulating plants that are not now regulated. The addition of these areas benefits regulated handlers by eliminating the necessity of reporting sales outside the Federal order marketing area for the purpose of determining pool qualification. Where such areas can be added to a consolidated area without having the effect of causing the regulation of any currently-unregulated handler, they are added.

Handlers not currently fully regulated under Federal orders may become regulated for two main reasons: first, in the process of consolidating marketing areas, some handlers who currently are partially regulated may become fully regulated because their sales in the combined marketing areas meet the pooling standards of a consolidated order area. Second, a previously unregulated area in New York, Vermont, New Hampshire and Massachusetts was added on the basis of supporting information. As a result, previously unregulated handlers would become fully regulated. Because of these two reasons, 11 additional plants are expected to become fully regulated under the program. Of these 11 plants, it is estimated that 5 are small businesses that would need to comply with the reporting, recordkeeping, and compliance requirements. The completion of these reports will require a person knowledgeable about the receipt and utilization of milk and milk products handled at the plant. This most likely will be a person already on the payroll of the business such as a bookkeeper, controller or plant manager. The completion of the necessary reporting, recordkeeping, and compliance requirements do not require any highly specialized skills and should not require the addition of personnel to complete. In fact, much of the information that handlers report to the market administrator is readily available from normally maintained business records, and as such, the burden on handlers to complete these recordkeeping and reporting requirements is minimal. In addition, assistance in completing forms is readily available from market administrator offices. A description of the forms and a complete Paperwork Reduction Act analysis follows this section.

No other burdens are expected to fall upon the dairy industry as a result of overlapping Federal rules. The regulations contained in this final decision do not duplicate, overlap or conflict with any existing Federal rules.

Public Comments

More than 1,000 comments were received from interested parties that specifically stated or documented they were small businesses. However, this number may not be fully representative of the number of small businesses that actually submitted comments because a majority of commenters did not indicate their size. Of the comments submitted, the majority were received from dairy producers. The comments from the producers primarily addressed the issues of Class I pricing and consolidation.

A few comments were received that specifically addressed the initial regulatory flexibility analysis (IRFA).
These comments also addressed the issues of Class I pricing and consolidation and further addressed the issue of producer-handler regulation. The Small Business Administration submitted views specifically addressing exempt plant status and requesting further analysis of the impact of consolidation on previously unregulated entities, if possible.

Nearly all of the 1,000 comments addressed Class I pricing and discussed the impact of Option 1A or Option 1B on dairy producers’ income. A majority of these comments supported Option 1A because it would maintain the revenue necessary to stay in business. Many commenters opposing Option 1B argued that the Class I differential decreases that would occur under this option would result in financial losses that would force many dairy farmers out of business. Comments filed by service providers such as feed and implement stores that claimed to be small businesses commented on the negative impact lower prices received by dairy producers had on surrounding community businesses. One commenter supporting Option 1A further stated that in order to comply with the purposes and objectives of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, as stated in the IRFA, a Class I price structure that avoids a burdensome financial impact on dairy farmers must be adopted.

About 200 of the comments received from declared small businesses addressed consolidation issues. These comments focused on the impact of including or excluding currently-unregulated areas. A majority of the comments focused on the Northeast order and the inclusion or exclusion of the currently-unregulated territories in New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. Comments supporting the inclusion of currently-unregulated territory discussed the need to include this territory to prevent inequitable, unfair and disorderly marketing conditions. One supporting commenter noted that the expansion into unregulated areas would result in more small businesses becoming subject to Federal order regulation but the commenter did not believe that it would unduly impact their ability to compete. Commenters opposing the inclusion of currently-unregulated Pennsylvania territory argued that producer returns would decline if handlers in this area were subject to Federal order regulations.

A few comments were received addressing the extent of regulation applied to producer-handlers. One comment from a business producer-handler, indicated that the combination of new definitions and classification of milk provisions will result in its regulation. The commenter argued that this effect is contrary to the IRFA that stated “no additional regulatory burdens should be placed on the industry” and to the intent of the proposed rule that stated the changes were not intended to fully regulate any producer-handler that is currently exempt from regulation. Other commenters suggested that producer-handlers should not be exempt from regulation if their route disposition of Class I products at wholesale exceeds 500,000 pounds per month or if they have retail sales other than at a retail establishment located on the premises of the producer-handler’s plant. They argued that producer-handlers with route disposition above this limit cannot be considered small businesses and should be subject to regulation.

After reviewing the public comments filed by small businesses in combination with updated marketing data and information and updated analyses, changes were made to the provisions contained in the proposed rule. Not all of the changes requested by small businesses were feasible but when changes were beneficial to small businesses without affecting the objectives of the rule, they were incorporated. The changes made to the proposed rule, based in part on small business comments, are discussed below by issue.

Consolidation

The proposed rule advanced 11 consolidated Federal milk marketing orders. The marketing areas of these orders were expanded to include currently-unregulated areas if this did not result in the regulation of any currently-unregulated handlers or was not an area in which handlers are subject to minimum Class I pricing provisions under State regulations. After reviewing the issue in light of the public comments and updating the initial analysis based on more recent marketing data, 11 consolidated orders are adopted in the final decision, the same number as proposed in the January 21, 1998, rule, but with significant modifications being made to the marketing areas of the proposed Northeast and Western orders, and minor modifications to the marketing areas of the proposed Southeast, Mideast, Upper Midwest and Central orders. The final decision continues to omit currently-unregulated areas specified in the January 21st proposed rule and also omits currently-unregulated areas that comprise a significant distribution area for currently-unregulated handlers, some of which were proposed to be included in consolidated areas.

Numerous comments were received from small businesses supporting the inclusion of currently-unregulated areas in the Northeast order. However, after considering the requirements of the Farm Bill, the consolidation of the existing orders does not necessitate expansion of the consolidated orders into unregulated areas or areas in which handlers are subject to minimum Class I pricing under State regulation, especially when the states’ Class I prices exceed or equal those that would be established under Federal milk order regulation. Such regulation could have the effect of reducing returns to producers already included under State regulation without significantly affecting prices paid by handlers who compete with Federally-regulated handlers.

Two changes made to the prior proposed rule as a result of comments submitted by small businesses related to the exclusion of territories from consolidated marketing areas. These changes occurred in the Mideast and Central orders. The changes ensure that two currently-unregulated handlers maintain this status.

One change occurred in the Mideast order. Based on a comment received from Toft Dairy, Incorporated (Toft Dairy), a small business dairy processor, and Sandusky County Milk Producers Association, a dairy cooperative representing dairy farmers classified as small businesses, one partial and three entire counties in north Central Ohio are excluded from the Mideast marketing area. These areas are currently unregulated. The proposed rule had suggested including this currently-unregulated territory in the Mideast marketing area which would have resulted in the regulation of Toft Dairy. Since the intent of the consolidating marketing orders was not to cause the regulation of any currently-unregulated handler, these areas have been removed from the marketing area of the Mideast order. Toft Dairy will remain an unregulated processor unless its sales area changes significantly.

Another change occurred in the Central order. Based on a comment received from Central Dairy, Incorporated (Central Dairy), a small business dairy processor, six currently-unregulated counties in northeast Missouri that were proposed to be included in the Central order are excluded from the marketing area. These areas are currently unregulated. Central Dairy opposes inclusion of these six counties because the handler plans to expand its distribution into this...
area. Again, since the intent of consolidating marketing orders was not to cause the regulation of any currently-unregulated producer handler these areas have been removed from the marketing area of the Central order.

Producer-Handlers

Another change to the proposed rule resulting from public comments involves producer-handlers. Since the intent of the proposed rule was not to increase regulation to any currently-unregulated producer-handlers, minor modifications have been made to the classification of milk provisions applicable to all orders and to the producer-handler definition in certain individual orders.

A comment submitted by Promised Land Dairy, a producer-handler defined as a small business, stated that the change in the classification of milk provisions combined with other order changes would result in their regulation. Promised Land Dairy argues that the addition of the words “or acquired for distribution” in § 1000.44(a)(3)(iv) would force milk delivered by a producer-handler to any store associated with a regulated handler to be sold at no more than the Class III price because it would be considered a receipt from a producer-handler. Promised Land Dairy argued that this would force producer-handlers to become fully regulated. In addition, they argued that changes made to the Southwest order’s producer-handler definition are not warranted and would further result in the regulation of Promised Land Dairy.

The changes in the proposed rule were not intended to fully regulate any producer-handler that is currently exempt from regulation. Producer-handlers have been exempt from the pricing and pooling provisions of the order for several reasons. First, the care and management of the dairy farm and other resources necessary for own-farm production and the management and operation of the processing are the personal enterprise and risk of the owner. Second, typically producer-handlers are small businesses that operate in a self-sufficient manner. Finally, producer-handlers do not have an advantage as either producers or handlers so long as they are responsible for balancing their fluid milk needs and cannot transfer balancing costs to other market participants.

While the provisions objected to by Promised Land Dairy would not directly regulate this entity, they could have a very serious negative economic impact on its continued operations as a producer-handler. Because it is still the intent of the Department to allow currently-unregulated producer-handlers to maintain this status, changes have been made to § 1000.44(a)(3)(iv) in the general provisions by removing the words “or acquired for distribution” and re-adding these words to § 1124.44, and changes have been made to the individual order definitions of producer-handlers. Hence, no changes are made in the final decision to regulate a producer-handler that is currently exempt from regulation.

A comment submitted by small businesses regarding producer-handlers advocated implementing a limitation on the exemption of producer-handlers based on size. The commenters suggested that the producer-handler exemption should be limited to those whose Class I route disposition is 500,000 pounds or less, or whose entire Class I disposition of fluid milk is made as retail sales from a retail establishment located on the premises of the producer-handler’s processing plant.

Since the intent of the final decision is not to regulate any currently-unregulated producer-handlers, these requests have been denied. A review of October 1997 producer-handler route disposition data indicates that if a 500,000 pound Class I route disposition limit were implemented, 20 producer-handlers out of 111 producer-handlers would become regulated. The Department’s reasons for exempting producer-handlers as discussed previously have not changed and the intent of this rule is not to make changes to regulate currently-unregulated producer-handlers regardless of size. Consequently, these suggested changes have not been included in the final decision.

Class I Price Structure

Another change to the proposed rule, resulting in part from the public comments received, involves the Class I price structure. In the proposed rule the Department advanced two main price options—1A and 1B. The Department indicated a preference for Option 1B because it was more market-oriented. However, the Department recognized in the proposed rule that Option 1B would result in lower Class I prices and lower blend prices which would have a significant economic impact on small businesses, particularly producers. To lessen the impact, three phase-in program options were proposed to be adopted in conjunction with Option 1B. The objective of the phase-in programs was to provide dairy producers and processors the opportunity to adjust marketing practices to adapt to more market-determined Class I prices. A majority of the public comments supported Option 1A. Many of the comments opposing Option 1B indicated that the price levels established under this price structure would be significantly lower than present levels, and as a result, they—primarily dairy producers—would be forced out of business. Of the comments supporting Option 1B, few supported the adoption of a phase-in program.

Option 1B was preferred by the Department because it would move the dairy industry into a more market-determined pricing system. Establishing a national Class I price structure based on results from the U.S. Dairy Sector Simulator model, developed and administered by Cornell University, may increase market efficiencies in the dairy industry and lowering the differentials would allow marketing conditions to have a greater impact on actual Class I prices paid to producers who service the Class I market. The Department recognized that this would impact small businesses, both producer and processors, because less of the actual value of Class I milk would be regulated. In the proposed rule the Department stated the following:

“Smaller, less efficient producers would likely have a greater responsibility to bargain with processors for over-order premiums that adequately cover their costs. With processors less likely to face similar raw product costs, less efficient small processors may have to negotiate and/or sustain over-order price levels necessary to attract and maintain a sufficient supply of milk. Large businesses, both producers and processors, may be in a better competitive position to do this.” (63 FR 4912)

After reviewing the public comments and updating marketing data and analyses of Option 1A and Option 1B, the Department adopted a Class I price structure that provides greater structural efficiencies in the assembly and shipment of milk and dairy products. The adopted Class I pricing structure establishes a price surface that utilizes USDSS model results adjusted for all known plant locations and establishes differential levels that will result in prices that generate sufficient revenue to assure an adequate supply of milk. The differential levels will better maintain equity by raising the level 40 cents per hundredweight higher than the level proposed in Option 1B. The higher differential level reduces the likelihood

---

11 The U.S. Dairy Sector Simulator model is used to evaluate the geographic or “spatial” value of milk and milk components across the U.S. under the assumption of globally efficient markets. A more detailed description of the model is contained in the decision.
of class-price inversions, where the Class I prices are below the manufacturing milk prices for the month. Updated analysis conducted by the Interagency Dairy Analysis Team in the final Regulatory Impact Analysis indicates that increasing the differential level lessens the economic impact of moving toward more market-orientation on small businesses.

Exempt Plant Limits

The Office of the Chief Counsel for Advocacy (Office of Advocacy) of the U.S. Small Business Administration submitted views on the IRFA pursuant to its authority under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601, as amended by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act, Pub. L. 104–121, 110 Stat. 866 (1996). With regard to the impact of the order consolidation and pricing formulae, the Office of Advocacy stated that these issues should be left to the regulated community and the Department. The Office of Advocacy did comment that a system that “best resembles the free market and imposes the least burden on the industry would be the best alternative.”

The Office of Advocacy requested an explanation of how the 150,000 pound handler exemption was derived and a determination of whether this exemption could be increased. They questioned whether a greater number of small entities would benefit from an increase in the limit. The Office of Advocacy further requested additional analysis on the impact of the consolidation of orders on previously unregulated entities, if possible.

The 150,000 pound handler exemption was determined after reviewing provisions currently contained in the Federal milk marketing orders. The 150,000 pound exemption was the highest level currently utilized, with some orders containing no such exemption. A review of the impact of this exemption level on distributing plants that were fully regulated in October 1997 indicated that 15 plants, 14 of which are small businesses, would become exempt from regulation based on this provision. In addition, five partially-regulated plants, four of which are small businesses, would also become exempt. No public comments were received addressing this issue.

Federal milk order regulations must balance the interests of small business dairy producers versus small business dairy processors. Although only processors are regulated under Federal milk orders, producers receive benefits from the regulations. Thus, whenever dairy processors are exempt from Federal order regulations they are not required to pay dairy producers minimum Federal order prices. Exempting processors from regulation directly impacts dairy producers. Based on October 1997 data, a review of the impacts of increasing the exemption levels on processors was completed. As expected, increasing the level would allow additional processors to become exempt. In October 1997, 54 handlers had route disposition equal to or less than 150,000 pounds. An additional 57 handlers had route disposition between 150,000 to 1,000,000 pounds and 327 handlers had route disposition greater than 1 million pounds.

Although it may appear that increasing the exemption level would not result in exempting many additional plants, these plants receive milk from a significant number of producers, a majority of whom are small businesses. In addition, contrary to the intent of the proposed rule, increasing the exemption level, more handlers that are considered large businesses could become exempt from regulation. Implementing the 150,000 pound level results in two large businesses currently regulated (one fully-regulated and one partially-regulated) becoming exempt plants. When more large businesses become exempt it not only impacts producers, but also impacts other regulated handlers.

In an attempt to maintain a balance between the interests of both small handlers and small dairy producers, the 150,000 pound exemption is maintained. Based on previous experience, the exemption of plants of this size poses no economic threat to the order’s regulated handlers.

Minimization of Significant Economic Impacts on Small Businesses

The Department developed the final decision aware of the impacts of its adoption on small businesses, both dairy producers and processors. In the final decision, the Department has minimized the significant economic impacts of these regulations on small entities to the fullest extent reasonably possible while adhering to the stated objectives. The Department reviewed the regulatory and financial burdens resulting from these regulations and determined that as much as reasonably possible, the impact on small businesses’ abilities to compete in the market place. The Department reviewed the regulations from both the small producer and small processor perspectives attempting to maintain a balance between these competing interests.

The Farm Bill mandated that the current 31 orders be consolidated into between 10 to 14 orders. The Farm Bill also specified that other issues could be addressed. Eleven orders are adopted in the final decision as well as a new Class I price structure, a basic formula price replacement, classification of milk provisions, and the establishment of identical provisions in all orders where possible. The objectives of the final decision are (1) to comply with the requirements of the Farm Bill and (2) to make other changes in order provisions consistent with the goals and requirements of the AMAA. The focus of these changes is to enhance the efficiencies of fluid milk markets while maintaining equity among processors of fluid milk selling in marketing order areas and among dairy producers supplying the areas.

Federal milk order regulations do not disparately apply to small and large businesses. If a handler is regulated under a Federal milk order, the provisions of that order apply the same to all handlers regardless of size. Likewise, if a producer’s milk is associated with a Federal order pool, the same pricing and payment provisions will be utilized for all producers regardless of size. This final decision addresses several issues and adopts provisions that will result in applying equally to all businesses, both large and small. The provisions adopted herein attempt to reduce the economic impact of Federal milk order regulations on small businesses to the most reasonable extent possible.

After reviewing submitted comments and updating marketing data and analyses, changes were made to the provisions contained in the proposed rule. The IRFA discussed the projected impacts of the primary components of the proposed rule on small entities. These included consolidation, basic formula price, Class I price structure, and classification. Because Federal order provisions are interrelated, it was difficult to determine the overall impact of each component on small entities because the proposed rule contained two pricing options. To the fullest extent possible, such estimations were set forth in the proposed rule.

Below is a description of the primary components contained in the final decision that were fully discussed in the IRFA. For comparison purposes, impacts resulting from each component

Copies of the Regulatory Impact Analysis can be obtained from Dairy Programs at (202) 720-4392, any Market Administrator office, or via the Internet at http://www.ams.usda.gov/dairy.
are briefly discussed. Because this rule establishes the specific provisions to be contained in Federal milk marketing orders, analysis of the impacts of the consolidated orders on small businesses is provided.

Consolidation

The IRFA discussed three order consolidation options: (1) The consolidated marketing areas suggested in the December 1996 Initial Preliminary Report on Order Consolidation; (2) the consolidated marketing areas suggested in the May 1997 Revised Preliminary Report on Order Consolidation; and (3) the consolidated marketing areas suggested in the proposed rule. Determining the specific economic impacts of marketing area consolidation on handlers, producers, and consumers is difficult. The IRFA detailed the assumptions utilized to quantify the economic effects of consolidation. The IRFA included an analysis of each of the three consolidation options on the weighted average use value to determine the potential impacts of each option on producers. The IRFA also included projections regarding the number of handlers that would be regulated under the consolidation options and the number of these handlers that are small businesses.

The consolidation of orders adopted in the final decision is a result of the examination and analysis of more recent marketing data in combination with the comments received on the proposed rule. This resulted in modifying significantly from the proposed rule the marketing areas of the Northeast and Western orders, and in making minor modifications to the marketing areas of the proposed Southeast, Mideast, Upper Midwest and Central orders. The consolidated orders adopted in the final decision are as follows (* denotes changes made from the proposed rule):

1. NORTHEAST—current marketing areas of the New England, New York, New Jersey and Middle Atlantic Federal milk orders, with the addition of: the contiguous unregulated areas of New Hampshire, northern New York and Vermont; and the non-Federally regulated portions of Massachusetts.

2. APPALACHIAN—Current marketing areas of the Carolinas and Louisville-Lexington-Evansville (minus Logan County, Kentucky) Federal milk orders plus the marketing area of the former Tennessee Valley order, with the addition of 21 currently-unregulated counties in Indiana and Kentucky.

3. FLORIDA—current marketing areas of the Upper Florida, Tampa Bay, and Southeastern Florida Federal milk orders.

4. SOUTHEAST—current marketing area of the Southeast Federal milk order, plus 1 county from the Louisville-Lexington-Evansville Federal milk order marketing area; plus 11 northwest Arkansas counties and 22 entire Missouri counties that currently are part of the Southwest Plains marketing area; plus 6 Missouri counties that currently are part of the Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri marketing area; plus 16 currently unregulated southeast Missouri counties (including 4 that were part of the former Paducah marketing area); plus 20 currently unregulated Kentucky counties (including 5 from the former Paducah marketing area).

5. MIDEAST—current marketing areas of the Ohio Valley, Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania, Southern Michigan and Indiana Federal milk orders, plus Zone 2 of the Michigan Upper Peninsula Federal milk order, and most currently-unregulated counties in Michigan, Indiana and Ohio.

6. UPPER MIDWEST—current marketing areas of the Chicago Regional, Upper Midwest, Zones I and I(a) of the Michigan Upper Peninsula Federal milk orders, and unregulated portions of Wisconsin. The Iowa Federal order marketing area portion of one Illinois county is added to the consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area and the Chicago Regional portion of another Illinois county is removed and added to the consolidated Central area.

7. CENTRAL—current marketing areas of the Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri, Central Illinois, Greater Kansas City, Southwest Plains, Eastern Colorado, Nebraska-Western Iowa, Eastern South Dakota, Iowa (* less the portion of an Illinois county that will become part of the consolidated Upper Midwest area) and *Western Colorado Federal milk orders, plus *the portion of an Illinois county currently in the Chicago Regional Federal order area, minus 11 northwest Arkansas counties and 1 partial and 22 entire Missouri counties that are part of the current Southwest Plains marketing area, minus 6 Missouri counties that are part of the current Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri marketing area, plus 54 currently-unregulated counties in Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska and Colorado, plus 8 counties in central Missouri *(six fewer than in the proposed rule) that are not considered to be part of the distribution area of an unregulated handler in central Missouri, plus 7 currently unregulated Colorado counties located between the current Western and Eastern Colorado order areas.

8. SOUTHWEST—current marketing areas of Texas and New Mexico-West Texas Federal milk orders, with the addition of two currently-unregulated northeast Texas counties and 47 currently-unregulated counties in southwest Texas.

9. ARIZONA-LAS VEGAS—current marketing area of Central Arizona, plus the Clark County, Nevada, portion of the current Great Basin marketing area, plus eight currently-unregulated Arizona counties.

10. WESTERN—current marketing areas of the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon and Great Basin Federal milk orders, minus Clark County, Nevada. The Western Colorado order area, proposed to be included in the Western order area, is instead included in the consolidated Central order.

11. PACIFIC NORTHWEST—current marketing area of the Pacific Northwest Federal milk order plus 1 currently-unregulated county in Oregon.

The consolidated orders presented herein reflect the most appropriate boundaries for the purpose of implementing the requirements of the Farm Bill. These orders attempt to avoid extending regulation to handlers whose primary sales areas are outside current Federal order marketing areas and who are not subject to Federal order regulation. These orders also minimize the regulatory burden placed on handlers.

Based on October 1997 data, it is projected that 306 distributing plants will be fully regulated and 32 distributing plants will be exempt. The number of fully-regulated small businesses will be 111. The number of fully-regulated small businesses is down from 164, a 32 percent decline from the proposed rule. This is mainly a result from either large business acquisitions of these small businesses or because they have gone out of business. Two small businesses that are currently unregulated will become regulated and, as mentioned previously, 14 fully-regulated and four partially-regulated small businesses will become exempt.
Basic Formula Price

The IRFA reviewed the basic formula price replacement options considered. These options included pricing components based on their value in manufactured products which was proposed and is adopted in the final decision, economic formulas, futures markets, cost of production, competitive pay pricing, and pricing differentials only.

The rule closely follows the pricing plan described in the proposed rule by replacing the current basic formula price (BFP) with a multiple component pricing system that derives component values from surveyed prices of manufactured dairy products. The adopted pricing system determines butterfat prices for milk used in Class II, Class III and Class IV products from a butter price, protein and other solids prices for milk used in Class III products from cheese and whey prices; and nonfat solids prices for milk used in Class II and Class IV products from nonfat dry milk product prices. The specific formulas used to calculate the prices are described in complete detail in the final decision.

All market participants, both large and small, would be affected by the BFP replacement in the same manner. There would be no uneven impact on market participants on the basis of size. However, the existence of minimum order pricing serves to assure that large handlers pay no less for their milk than smaller entities, and that small producers receive at least the same minimum uniform price for the milk or components of milk they produce as large producers. Consumers can be assured that the prices generally charged for dairy products are prices that reflect, as closely as possible, the forces of supply and demand in the market.

Impact of Multiple Component Pricing Provisions on Small Entities

As set forth in the proposed rule, seven of the 11 orders adopted in the final decision provide for milk to be paid for on the basis of its components—multiple component pricing (MCP).

Five of the seven MCP orders also provide for milk values to be adjusted according to the somatic cell count of producer milk. The equipment needed for testing milk for its component content can be very expensive to purchase, and requires highly-skilled personnel to maintain and operate. The cost of infra-red analyzers ranges from just under $100,000 to $200,000. The infra-red machines that are used by most laboratories would test for total solids and somatic cells at the same time the butterfat and protein tests are done.

No new report forms are needed under multiple component pricing; however, some additional reporting is necessary to enable handlers’ values of milk to be determined on the basis of components, and to assure that producers are paid correctly. For the market administrators to compute the processor price differential, handlers would need to supply additional information on their currently-required monthly reports of receipts and utilization. In addition to the product pounds and butterfat currently reported, handlers would be required to report pounds of protein, pounds of other solids, and, in 5 of the orders, somatic cell information. This data would be required from each handler for all producer receipts, including milk diverted by the handler, receipts from cooperatives as 9(c) handlers (that is, the cooperative acts as a handler); and, in some cases, receipts of bulk milk received by transfer or diversion.

Since producers would be receiving payments based on the component levels of their milk, the payroll reports that handlers supply to producers must reflect the basis for such payment. Therefore the handler would be required to supply the producer not only with the information currently supplied, but also, (a) the pounds of butterfat, the pounds of protein, and the pounds of other solids contained in the producer’s milk, as well as the producer’s average somatic cell count; and (b) the minimum rates that are required for payment for each pricing factor and, if a different rate is paid, the effective rate also. Many handlers already report this additional information. It should be noted that handlers already are required to report information relative to pounds of production, butterfat and rates of payment for butterfat and hundredweight of milk to the appropriate Market Administrator.

Of over 74,000 producers whose milk was pooled in December 1996 under 23 of the current orders that would be part of consolidated orders providing for multiple component pricing, the milk of 52,500 of these producers was pooled under 13 current orders that have MCP. Handlers in these markets already have incurred the initial costs of testing milk for its component content, and have made the needed transition to reporting the component contents of milk receipts on their reports to the market administrators, and on their reports of what they have paid producers.

Of the remaining 21,750 producers who would be affected by MCP provisions under a Federal order (including an estimated 20,650 producers qualifying as small businesses), the milk of approximately 13,000, or 60 percent, currently is received by handlers who test or have the capability of testing for multiple components and, in many cases, somatic cells. Many of these handlers also report component results to the producers with their payments. Almost all of the producers whose milk currently is not being tested or paid for on the basis of components are located in the New England and New York-New Jersey marketing areas, which would be consolidated with the Middle Atlantic area into the Northeast order.

Accommodation has been made to ameliorate handlers’ expenses of testing producer milk for component content. As component pricing plans have been adopted under a number of the present Federal milk orders since 1988, the component testing needed to implement these pricing plans has been performed by the market administrators responsible for the administration of the orders involved for handlers who have not been equipped to make all of the determinations required under the amended orders. It has been made clear in the decisions under which these plans have been adopted that handlers who would find it unduly burdensome to obtain the equipment and personnel needed to accomplish the required testing may rely on the market administrators to verify or publish the tests under which producers are paid. As noted above, however, many handlers not now subject to MCP provisions under Federal orders have nevertheless already undertaken multiple component testing and payment programs.

Class I Price Structure

The IRFA discussed two price structure options—location-specific differentials (Option 1A) and relative-value specific differentials (Option 1B). The IRFA set forth the projected impacts that these two price structures would have on producers and processors.

The price structure adopted in this final decision resulted from an examination and review of more recent marketing data in combination with the comments received on the proposed rule. As discussed previously, the Department adopted a Class I price structure that provides greater structural efficiencies in the assembly and shipment of milk to products. The adopted Class I pricing structure establishes a price surface that utilizes
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The adopted Class I price structure best provides the incentives necessary for increased efficiency in the organization and distribution of the milk supply and dairy products.

Classification Provisions

The IRAF discussed the classification of milk provisions contained in the proposed rule. The IRAF concluded that the classification of milk provisions would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. With two primary exceptions, these changes are adopted in the final decision. The two exceptions are: (1) Leaving cream cheese as a Class III product as currently classified, and (2) leaving the fluid milk product exclusion standard for products packaged in “all-metal, hermetically-sealed containers” as currently classified. In addition, other minor changes have been made including revising the shrinkage provisions to more closely resemble current provisions, re-adding the provision for milk that is dumped or used for animal feed, and classifying inventory of fluid milk products and fluid cream products in bulk form in Class IV. One additional change, as previously discussed in the comment section, was made to ensure that producer-handlers that are not currently regulated by the Federal order program will maintain this status. The provisions improve reporting and accounting procedures for handlers and provide for greater market efficiencies.

Conclusion

A review of the impacts on small entities of consolidating the current Federal milk orders into 11 orders in conjunction with the basic formula price replacement, classification provisions, and the three different Class I price structure options, indicates that the provisions set forth in the final decision adhere to the mandates of the Farm Bill, and provides more market efficiencies while minimizing the impact of these regulations on small entities. Since the Federal order program serves to benefit dairy producers by regulating dairy processors through classified pricing, provisions must be established that maintain a balance between the interests of small dairy producers and processors. The provisions contained in the final decision best maintain this balance. The adoption of the consolidated orders and the provisions contained therein, including the adopted Class I price structure, will affect some small entities. Producers located in the western, southwestern, and northeastern areas may not fare as well as producers in other parts of the country when comparing the all-milk prices and cash receipts from milk marketings to current baseline projections. These producers represent approximately one-third of the total producers associated with Federal orders. Of these producers, about 30 percent are considered small businesses. When compared to the baseline, over a 6-year period from the years of 2000-2005, the all-milk price for all Federal orders is expected to decrease an average of $0.02 per hundredweight. Changes in the all-market price on an individual order basis is projected to range from a decrease of $0.50 per hundredweight to an increase of $0.52 per hundredweight. Cash receipts are expected to increase by an estimated $222.3 million primarily because of changes in transportation payments and the pooling of additional milk. After adjusting for these changes, cash receipts are projected to decline from the baseline an average of $2.5 million during the 6-year period. With the baseline cash receipts averaging $16,944.5 million this represents a very small reduction.

Since the final decision is projected to have minor effects on where milk is produced, little impact is expected on processors or manufacturers of dairy products. A majority of the fully-regulated processors associated with Federal orders will benefit from a decrease in Class I prices. About 209 processors, 74 of which are small businesses, would experience decreases ranging from $0.04 to $1.18 per hundredweight. About 69 processors, 22 of which are small businesses, located primarily in the Midwest and Florida areas, would experience Class I price increases ranging from $0.08 to $0.57 per hundredweight. About 28 processors, 14 of which are small businesses, would experience no change in Class I prices.

Implementing the consolidated orders with the modified Option 18 price structure would have a significant impact on many small entities, both producers and processors. Producers located everywhere except the Midwest and Florida regions would have been negatively impacted. When compared to the baseline, over a 6-year period from the years of 2000-2005, the all-milk price for all Federal orders was projected to annually average $0.09 per hundredweight lower, with individual order changes ranging from $0.61 per hundredweight to $0.42 per hundredweight. Cash receipts were expected to annually average over $100 million less than the baseline, a 0.1 percent decrease.
Most fully-regulated fluid processors would have benefitted from the decrease in Class I differentials. Lower differentials would have reduced Class I prices in 29 of the current markets from between $0.01 to $0.15 per hundredweight. Two markets would have had increases of $0.15 and $0.20 per hundredweight in Class I prices. When compared to the baseline, the Class I price for all Federal orders was projected to average $0.49 per hundredweight lower over a 6-year period from the years of 2000–2005. Lower Class I prices would have been expected to increase U.S. sales of fluid milk by 98.8 million pounds annually.

Most fluid processors would have benefitted from the lower fluid milk prices and increased fluid milk sales. Although most fluid processors would have benefitted from the consolidation of orders with the modified Option 1B price surface, only about one-third of the fully-regulated plants are small businesses and these plants may have been negatively impacted. With less of the actual value of fluid milk represented by the minimum prices established by Federal orders, more emphasis would have been placed on processors’ and producers’ abilities to negotiate and/or sustain over-order prices that might be necessary to maintain an adequate supply of milk. This would have resulted in less handler equity which could have placed small processors at a disadvantage in competing for a supply of milk.

Adoption of this option would have resulted in large fluid processors benefitting from the regulations at the expense of more than 50 percent of the total producers who would have experienced price decreases. Additionally, small processors would not have been assured equity in competing with large businesses for a milk supply. Hence, the Department determined the impact of consolidating orders with the modified Option 1B price structure would have had a more burdensome financial impact on a significant number of small businesses.

Implementing the consolidated orders with the Option 1A price structure would have minimal overall impact on small businesses. When compared to the baseline, the all-milk price for all Federal orders was projected to average $0.03 per hundredweight higher, with individual order changes ranging from –$0.66 per hundredweight to $0.34 per hundredweight over a 6-year period from the years of 2000–2005. Cash receipts were expected to average over $482.1 million more than the baseline, a 0.2 percent increase. Nearly 50 percent of the producers would have benefitted from this modest increase.

Since this option is projected to have minor effects on where milk is produced, little impact would have been expected on processors or manufacturers of dairy products. Option 1A would have increased Class I differentials by an average of $0.04 per hundredweight resulting in the all-market average Class I price charged to fluid handlers increasing by $0.08 per hundredweight when compared to the baseline during the years of 2000–2005. Processors would have experienced a Class I price increase in 21 of the current orders ranging from $0.01 to $0.50 per hundredweight, affecting nearly 190 fully-regulated processors of which about one-third are small businesses. Since the impact of the increased Class I prices would have resulted in an insignificant decrease in fluid milk consumption within the Federal order system, a decrease of 17.1 million pounds, and within the U.S., a decrease of 14.9 million pounds, this option would have little expected effect on processors or manufacturers of dairy products.

Implementing the consolidated orders with the Option 1A price structure would likely have minimized the financial impact of Federal milk orders on small entities. However, this option does not facilitate the movement towards a more efficient system of supplying fluid milk to meet market demands within the Federal order regulatory program. Although this option minimizes the impact of regulations on small businesses, it does not best meet the desired outcomes and objectives of the final decision.

The provisions adopted in the final decision best fulfill the requirements of the AMAA while minimizing the regulatory burdens on small businesses. The consolidated orders, with the adopted Class I price structure and other provisions, ensures that the Federal order program will continue to establish and maintain market stability and orderly marketing conditions for milk. The adopted provisions will further provide that milk prices are established at levels high enough to generate sufficient revenue for producers to maintain adequate supplies of milk while providing equity to handlers. The provisions contained in the final decision do not unduly or disproportionately burden small businesses.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

The information collection requirements contained in this decision previously were approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35) under OMB control number 0581–0032, through September 30, 2001.

The amendments set forth in the final decision do not contain additional information collections that require clearance by the OMB under the provisions of 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35. Following is a general description of the reporting and recordkeeping requirements, reasons for these requirements and an estimate of the annual burden on the dairy industry.

Title: Report Forms Under Federal Milk Orders (From Milk Handlers and Milk Marketing Cooperatives).

OMB Control Number: 0581–0032.

Expiration Date of Approval: September 30, 2001.

Type of Request: Extension and revision of a currently approved information collection.

Abstract: Federal Milk Marketing Order regulations authorized under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601–674), require milk handlers to report in detail the receipt and utilization of milk and milk products handled at each of their plants that are regulated by a Federal Order. The data are needed to administer the classified pricing system and related requirements of each Federal Order.

Rulemaking amendments to the orders must be approved in referendum conducted by the Secretary.

The terms of each of the current milk marketing orders are found at 7 CFR parts 1001–1199; the terms of each of the proposed orders in this document are found at 7 CFR parts 1001–1135. The authority for requiring reports is found at 8c(5) and (7) and 8d of the Act. The current authority for requiring records to be kept is found in the general provisions at 7 CFR part 1000.5. In the final decision, this authority is found in the general provisions at 7 CFR part 1000.27. The Act also provides for milk marketing agreements, but there are none in effect.

A Federal milk marketing order is a regulation issued by the Secretary of Agriculture that places certain requirements on the handling of milk in the area it covers. It requires that handlers of milk for a marketing area pay not less than certain minimum class prices according to how the milk is used. These prices are established under an order on the basis of evidence concerning the supply and demand conditions for milk in the market. A milk order requires that payments for milk be pooled and paid to individual farmers or cooperative associations of
farmers on the basis of a uniform or average price. Thus, all eligible farmers (producers) share in the market wide use-values of milk by regulated handlers.

The Report of Receipts and Utilization and the Producer Payroll Report are completed by regulated milk handlers and milk marketing cooperatives and are the principal reporting forms needed to administer Federal milk marketing orders. These burdens are readily available from market administrator offices. The market administrator employs a staff that verifies handlers' reports by examining records to determine that the required payments are made to producers. The market administrator must conduct the required payments to handlers at least monthly. Without monthly information, the market administrator, such as the partial payment for milk received the first 15 days of the month and the final payment which is payable after the end of the month. The Act imposes penalties for order violations, such as the failure to pay producers not later than prescribed dates. The orders require payments to and from the producer-settlement fund to be made monthly. Also, class prices are based on the monthly Basic Formula price series.

Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Burden

- Estimate of Burden: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.87 hours per response.
- Respondents: Milk Handlers and Milk Marketing Cooperatives.
- Estimated Number of Respondents: 772.
- Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 35.
- Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 23,858 hours.

It is important to note that the burden being reported is an estimate of the amount of time that would be required of current program participants.

It is expected that the final decision should have little impact on the reporting and recordkeeping burden on handlers regulated under the Federal milk marketing order program. In fact, as a result of the consolidation of Federal orders from 31 to 11 as proposed, an overall reduction in reporting and recordkeeping requirements may occur due to greater uniformity in forms used and fewer "special" forms that currently apply to one or a few orders. There should also be a reduction in the burden on handlers that currently file reports for individual orders that are being consolidated.

Non-substantial changes would be necessary on the required reports and records to correctly identify the new Federal market order (e.g. the current—and separate—reports for the Upper Florida, Tampa Bay and Southeastern Florida marketing areas would be consolidated into one report for the Florida marketing area).
Consolidation Preceding the proposed rule addressed the subject of order received in response to the proposed than 14. Nearly 1,300 public comments were invited to submit comments on the regulatory and informational impacts of this proposed rule on small businesses. More than 1,000 comments were received from interested parties that specifically stated or documented they were small businesses. However, this number may not be fully representative of the number of small businesses that actually submitted comments because a majority of commenters did not indicate their size. A few comments specifically addressed the initial regulatory flexibility analysis (IRFA), the Executive Order 12866, and the Paperwork Reduction Analysis. These comments have been considered and addressed above.

Preliminary Statement
The material issues in this rule relate to:
1. Consolidation of marketing areas.
2. Basic formula price replacement and other class price issues.
3. Class I pricing structure.
5. Provisions applicable to all orders.
6. Regional issues:
   a. Northeast Region.
   b. Midwest Region.
   c. Southeast Region.
   d. Western Region.
7. Miscellaneous and administrative matters:
   a. Consolidation of the marketing service, administrative expense, and producer-settlement funds.
   b. Consolidation of the transportation credit balancing funds.
   c. General findings.

II. Discussion of Material Issues and Amendments to the Orders

A discussion and explanation of the material issues and determinations contained in this rule are as follows:

1. Consolidation of Marketing Areas

Subtitle D, Chapter 1 of the 1996 Farm Bill, entitled “Consolidation and Reform of Federal Milk Marketing Orders,” requires, among other things, that the Federal milk marketing orders be limited to not less than 10 and not more than 14. Nearly 1,300 public comments received in response to the proposed rule addressed the subject of order consolidation. Preceding the proposed rule, two preliminary reports on order consolidation were issued by the Agricultural Marketing Service’s Dairy Division, in December 1996 and May 1997. The proposed rule, issued in January 1998, included consideration of public comments received in response to these preliminary reports.

The 1996 Farm Bill specifically provides for the inclusion of California as a separate Federal milk order, but the provision is contingent upon petition and approval by California producers. The Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill, passed in October 1998, extended the time for implementing Federal milk order reform amendments from April 4, 1999 to October 1, 1999. The legislation provides that California has from the date of issuance of this final decision until September 30, 1999, to become a separate Federal milk order. This additional time is intended to allow California dairy interests the opportunity review this final decision to determine whether to pursue a proposal for a California Federal milk order for California, consistent with the provisions adopted for the consolidated orders, would best meet their milk marketing regulatory needs.

Over 150 comments were received that addressed the issue of a Federal milk order for California, with approximately 120 of them being a form letter advocating California’s Federal milk order. These comments, and a number of individual comments, came primarily from California producers who expressed a need for California and Federal order prices for milk used in manufactured products to be in closer alignment to eliminate California manufacturers’ perceived competitive advantage in product prices.

In a Federal milk order has been expressed by some California producers, but for the most part California commenters expressed a desire to have a chance to study and comment on this final decision before deciding whether to pursue a proposal for a California Federal order.

The preliminary reports, the proposed rule, and this final decision concerning order consolidation were prepared using data gathered about receipts and distribution of fluid milk products by all known fluid milk processors for that month. Data describing the geographic distribution of route sales by individual handlers and their specific sources of producer milk were used in re-examining the appropriate boundaries of the consolidated marketing areas. The revised preliminary area map comprised of 10 order areas covering all of the contiguous 48 states. The other form letters advocated the addition of currently-unregulated to the Northeast area. Another 350 comments also addressed the desirability of adding unregulated areas to the proposed consolidated marketing areas (primarily the Northeast), with only about 55 of these being opposed to the inclusion of unregulated areas.

The comments specifically applicable to each of the consolidated marketing areas are described in the sections dealing with the individual consolidated areas.

In combination with consideration of the comments received, data similar to that gathered for October 1995 were compiled for October 1997 to determine whether the consolidated marketing areas delineated in the proposed rule continued to represent the most appropriate boundaries for the purpose of implementing the requirements of the 1996 Farm Bill.

The October 1997 data allowed a “snapshot” of the marketing patterns of fluid milk processors for that month. The regulatory status of fluid milk processors for October 1997 is known, and the regulatory status of each plant could be projected on the basis of the plant’s receipts and dispositions, and where its milk was distributed. The information in the sections entitled “Distributing Plants” within the description of each marketing area are based on the October data. These data are the list of plants and pool plant status following the consolidation portion of this decision. It should
understood that the regulatory status of any plant can change whenever its operations or areas of distribution change.

The result of the examination and analysis of the more recent data in combination with the comments on the proposed rule was to modify significantly the proposed rule the marketing areas of the proposed Northeast and Western orders, and to make very minor modifications to the marketing areas of the proposed Southeast, Mideast, Upper Midwest and Central orders.

As in the case of data referring to the operations of less than three handlers or producers in the preliminary reports and proposed rule, some of the data used to determine the consolidated areas is restricted from use by the public because it refers to individual fluid milk distributing plants and the origins of producer milk supply for those plants. However, the basis for the marketing area boundaries is described as specifically possible without divulging such proprietary information.

The same seven primary criteria as were used in the two preliminary reports and the proposed rule were used to determine which markets exhibit a sufficient degree of association in terms of sales, procurement, and structural relationships to warrant consolidation. These criteria are as follows:

1. Overlapping route disposition. The movement of packaged milk between Federal orders indicates that plants from more than one Federal order are in competition with each other for Class I sales. In addition, a degree of overlap that results in the regulatory status of plants shifting between orders creates disorderly conditions in changing price relationships between competing handlers and neighboring producers. This criterion is considered to be the most important.

2. Overlapping areas of milk supply. This criterion applies principally to areas in which major proportions of the milk supply are shared between more than one order. The competitive factors affecting the cost of a handler's milk supply are influenced by the location of the supply. The pooling of milk produced within the same procurement area under the same order facilitates the uniform pricing of producer milk.

Consideration of the criterion of overlapping procurement areas does not mean that all areas having overlapping areas of milk procurement should be consolidated. An area that supplies a minor proportion of an adjoining area's milk supply with a minor proportion of its own total milk production while handlers located in the area are engaged in minimal competition with handlers located in the adjoining area likely does not have a strong enough association with the adjoining area to require consolidation.

For a number of the consolidated areas it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to find a boundary across which significant quantities of milk are not procured for other marketing areas. In such cases, analysis was done to determine where the minimal amount of route disposition overlap between areas occurred, and the criterion of overlapping route disposition generally was given greater weight than overlapping areas of milk supply. Some analysis also was done to determine whether milk pooled on adjacent markets reflects actual movements of milk between markets, or whether the variations in amounts pooled under a given order may indicate that some milk is pooled to take advantage of price differences rather than because it is needed for Class I use in the other market.

3. Number of handlers within a market. Formation of larger-size markets is a stabilizing factor. Shifts of milk and/or plants between markets becomes less of a disruptive factor in larger markets. Also, the existence of Federal order markets with handlers too few in number to allow meaningful statistics to be published without disclosing proprietary information should be avoided.

4. Natural boundaries. Natural boundaries and barriers such as mountains and deserts often inhibit the movement of milk between areas, and generally reflect a lack of population (limiting the range of the consumption area) and lack of milk production. Therefore, they have an effect on the placement of marketing area boundaries. In addition, for the purposes of market consolidation, large unregulated areas and political boundaries also are considered a type of natural barrier.

5. Cooperative association service areas. While not one of the first criteria used to determine marketing areas, cooperative membership often may be an indication of market association. Therefore, data concerning cooperative membership can provide additional support for combining certain marketing areas.

6. Features or regulatory provisions common to existing orders. Markets that already have similar regulatory provisions that recognize similar marketing conditions may have a head start on the consolidation process. With calculation of the milk formula price replacement on the basis of components, however, this criterion becomes less important. The consolidation of markets having different payment plans will be more dependent on whether the basic formula component pricing plan is appropriate for a given consolidated market, or whether it would be more appropriate to adopt a pricing plan using hundredweight pricing derived from component prices.

7. Milk utilization in common dairy products. Utilization of milk in similar manufactured products (cheese vs. butter-powder) was also considered to be an important criterion in determining how to consolidate the existing orders.

Comments on Consolidation Criteria

Most of the comments relative to order consolidation criteria were submitted prior to publication of the proposed rule. It was the overall opinion of the commenters that overlapping route disposition and milk procurement are the most important criteria to consider in the consolidation process. In addition, Class I use percentages and regulation on the basis of handler location were noted as important criteria to consider. To some extent, the consolidated marketing areas included in this final decision do combine markets with similar Class I utilization rates rather than markets that would result in Class I use percentages being more uniform between markets. This result occurs because adjoining markets, where most of the sales and procurement competition takes place between handlers regulated under different orders, tend to have similar utilization rates rather than because the criterion is one that should be used to determine appropriate consolidations. Also, Class I utilization rates are a function of how much milk is pooled on an order with a given amount of Class I use. Differences in rates, to the extent they result in differences in blend prices paid to producers, provide an incentive for milk to move from markets with lower Class I utilization percentages to markets with higher Class I use.

Regulation of poolers on the basis of their location rather than their sales areas has largely been incorporated in the consolidated orders by a provision that would pool a handler under the order for the area in which the handler is located unless more than 50 percent of the handler's Class I route dispositions are distributed in another order area. This provision should help to assure that the order under which a distributing plant is pooled will not change from month to month, and that a plant operator is subject to the same provisions, such as producer pay prices, as are its primary competitors.
The consolidated orders also include provisions that lock plants processing primarily ultra-high temperature (UHT) or extended shelf-life milk into regulation under the order for the area in which the plant is located. Such plants often have widely dispersed route sales into a number of order areas, with sporadic deliveries to different areas. Without some type of lock-in provision, such a plant may be pooled in several different orders in as many months. At the same time, the plant's milk supply generally is procured from a given group of producers located in the same area as the UHT (or extended shelf-life) plant. Having the plant pooled under a succession of different orders with widely varying blend prices creates a disorderly condition for the producers involved.

On the basis of the distributing plant pooling standards included for all eleven orders in this final decision, there are three non-UHT pool distributing plants that would have more sales in an order area other than the one in which they are located. Two of these plants are the Superbrand Dairy Products distributing plant in Greenville, South Carolina, and the Kroger Dairy distributing plant in Winchester, Kentucky, both located in the Appalachian order, but which likely will qualify for pooling under the Southeast and MidEast orders. In addition, the Hilland Dairy plant in Fayetteville, Arkansas, in the Southeast consolidated area, likely will qualify for pooling under the Central order. In cases in which these plants compete almost entirely for a producer milk supply in the area in which they are located, lock-in provisions are incorporated to assure that the plant is pooled where located for the purpose of competitive equity.

Some changes in regulatory status are expected to occur because of the addition of regulated area (in the Northeast), the consolidation of marketing areas, changes in pooling standards, and changes in the definitions of types of plants. The expected changes are based on data collected for October 1997 and may differ in some respects at the time the consolidated orders go into effect.

The regulatory status of three Vermont handlers is expected to change from partially regulated to fully regulated because a significant percentage of their sales is in areas that will be added to the Northeast consolidated marketing area, and a partially-regulated New York handler is expected to change from pooling standards because of the consolidation of marketing areas. Two other currently partially regulated handlers, one in New York and one in Vermont, are expected to become fully regulated because the pooling provisions of the consolidated order will be more like those of all the other orders than is currently the case in the New York-New Jersey order. Two plants that currently are fully regulated on the basis of the "grandfather" clause of the New York-New Jersey order will become partially regulated when this provision ceases to exist.

In the consolidated Appalachian marketing area, two distributing plants, one currently unregulated and one partially regulated, would become fully regulated as a result of including the marketing area of the Tennessee Valley order, terminated in October 1997. These plants both were fully regulated under the Tennessee Valley order, and lost their regulatory status as a result of the termination.

A plant currently partially regulated under the Southeast order would become fully regulated as a result of "locking in" to regulation plants that distribute primarily UHT or extended shelf-life products. Another Southeast distributing plant, currently fully regulated, would become partially regulated because of failure to meet the consolidated order's pooling standards.

Two distributing plants that currently are partially regulated under the Chicago Regional order would become fully regulated under the consolidated Upper Midwest order because of a change in the definition of receipts that are used in the calculation of percentage of total receipts used in route disposition for the determination of pool status.

Three plants, one in each of the consolidated Upper Midwest, Central, and Pacific Northwest marketing areas, would change regulatory status as depicted in the attached list of distributing plants and regulatory status. These plants are distributing plants that are listed as being fully regulated in October 1997 and becoming either partially regulated or exempt under the consolidated orders. These plants, having small amounts of route dispositions, actually were pooled on the basis of their performance as supply plants or as part of supply plant units. It is unknown whether they will continue to qualify as pool supply plants, but will not meet the pool distributing plant standards of the consolidated orders.

In the Pacific Northwest, the Oregon and Washington State prison systems both operate fluid processing plants that have route distribution in commercial channels, competing with regulated handlers. These plants are not currently fully regulated. Under the consolidated order, one of the plants will be partially regulated only with respect to its commercial sales, and the other will be exempt on the basis of size.

Several comments advocated that all of a state's territory should be included in one Federal order to assure that all producers in a state are paid on an equitable basis, or to make it easier to maintain state statistical data. One of the primary reasons for Federal milk orders is that milk marketing occurs readily across state boundaries, making state milk marketing regulation more difficult to enforce. It is important that Federal milk marketing areas continue to recognize the free interstate movement of milk to and from milk plants. There are cases where natural boundaries such as mountains or rivers may result in part of a state having a closer marketing relationship with an adjoining state than with other areas of the same state.

Although the Revised Preliminary Report suggested that several currently non-Federally regulated areas be added to some consolidated marketing areas, the proposed rule omitted areas in which handlers are subject to minimum Class I pricing under State regulation unless the affected handlers or States requested inclusion. This final decision continues to omit such areas, and also omits currently-unregulated areas that comprise a significant distribution area for currently-unregulated handlers, some of which were proposed to be included in consolidated areas.

Considering the requirements of the 1996 Farm Bill, consolidation of the existing orders does not necessitate expansion of the consolidated orders into unregulated areas or areas in which handlers are subject to minimum Class I pricing under State regulation, especially when the states' Class I prices exceed or equal those that would be established under Federal milk order regulation. Such regulation could have the effect of reducing returns to producers already included under State regulation without significantly affecting prices paid by handlers who compete with Federally-regulated handlers.

However, there are numerous counties and portions of counties located within and between Federal order marketing areas that have not been included in the defined order areas during the course of the more than 60 years the program has developed. In some cases, these small areas were left unregulated many years ago to maintain the unregulated status of the commercial handler. In others, these areas probably formed a "buffer" between separate
smaller order areas and were not incorporated when the smaller orders were merged. Some of these areas form "buffer" zones today between current order areas that will be consolidated in the course of this process. These areas should be included in the defined consolidated marketing areas if their inclusion would not have the effect of regulating any unregulated handlers who currently distribute milk in these areas. The issue of whether to regulate currently-unregulated areas is discussed in more detail with regard to the individual consolidated marketing areas in the sections of this decision dealing with those areas, especially the Northeast area.

The occurrence of partial counties in marketing area definitions should be minimized for the purpose of simplifying handlers' reporting burden. The continued existence of these unregulated areas, partially regulated counties, and counties split between marketing areas serves only to complicate the reporting of route dispositions outside the marketing area by regulated distributing plant handlers for the purpose of determining pool qualifications and increase the costs of administering the orders.

In order to avoid extending Federal regulation to handlers whose primary sales areas are outside current Federal order marketing areas and who currently are not subject to Federal order regulation, it has been determined that the appropriate in-area Class I disposition percentage portion of the pool distributing plant definition is 25 percent for all orders. Discussion of this provision is included in the section of this decision dealing with identical provisions. The 25-percent level of in-area sales will assure that currently-regulated handlers retain their pool status. At the same time, increasing from current levels the percentage of in-area sales required for pool status under the consolidated orders will allow State-regulated and most other non-Federally regulated handlers to operate at their current level of sales within Federal order areas without being subject to full Federal order regulation.

Cornell University Study

In addition to AMS' analysis of the receipt and distribution data in the development of this decision, researchers at Cornell University also provided input on potential consolidated marketing areas early in the Federal order reform process. This input was part of Cornell's partnership agreement with AMS to provide alternative analyses on Federal order reform issues. These researchers used an economic model (the Cornell U.S. Dairy Sector Simulator, or USDSS), to determine 10-14 optimal marketing areas. Cornell's first options for 10-14 marketing areas were presented at an October 1996 invitational workshop for dairy economists and policy analysts held in Atlanta, Georgia. Based on USDSS model results, these options would result in minimum cost flows of milk using the known concentrations of milk production and population, without considering the location of milk plants. The marketing area maps that were circulated using these first results were those referenced by interested persons who cited the Cornell results in their comments on the Preliminary Reports on Order Consolidation and on the proposed rule.

A second set of options was presented by Cornell researchers in spring 1997. These options were generated with a further-developed USDSS model. In updating the model, the researchers enhanced the inputs to its model as a means of better reflecting the actual structure of the national market for fluid milk products. These model updates allowed for determination of the minimum cost flows of: milk, intermediate and final products from producers to plants; from plants to plants; and from plants to consumers on the basis of the locations of milk supplies, dairy product processing plants, and consumers. The enhanced model is intended to provide for geographic market definition on the basis of a resulting set of optimal, efficient simulated flows of milk and dairy products between locations.

Although the USDSS model considers important factors such as milk supply and demand locations and transportation constraints in determining the optimal consolidated marketing areas, it aggregates processing locations, sometimes at locations that are not representative of where substantial volumes of milk are processed. In addition, the model does not consider several important factors such as large areas that are not Federally regulated and certain economic factors which influence the movement of milk.

AMS is unaware of any other analyses performed to determine or suggest consolidated marketing areas.

As noted before, AMS' analysis focused initially on distributing plant receipts and distribution information for October 1995, updated as needed for further analysis during development of the proposed rule. Equivalent data was gathered for October 1997 to assure that the consolidated marketing areas continue to represent actual marketing relationships between the current order areas, with more current information used as needed for further analysis. The data gathered by the Dairy Division from Federal Milk Market Administrators reflects actual movements of milk, both from production areas to processing plants, and from processing plants to consumption areas. This final decision considers this data, the seven criteria described fully above, and information provided by the USDSS model analysis.

The consolidated marketing area options presented by Cornell are not adopted because the USDSS model does not adequately reflect issues or factors that strongly affect which current marketing areas are most closely related. For this reason, this decision is based on data reflecting actual distribution and procurement by fluid milk processing plants.

Marketing Areas

Following are maps of the current marketing areas and the 11 consolidated marketing areas, followed by brief descriptions of the marketing areas (with those modified from the Proposed Rule, and the modifications, marked by *) and the major reasons for consolidation. A more detailed description of each consolidated order follows this summary.

At the end of the Order Consolidation portion of this decision is appended a list of distributing plants associated with each consolidated marketing area, with each plant's expected regulatory status, determined on the basis of data describing the plants' operations during October 1997.
Eleven Consolidated Marketing Areas

*1. NORTH EAST—current marketing areas of the New England, New York-New Jersey and Middle Atlantic Federal milk orders, with the addition of: the contiguous unregulated areas of New Hampshire, northern New York and Vermont; and the non-Federally regulated portions of Massachusetts. *The Western New York State order area (ten entire and 5 partial western New York counties) proposed to be included in the expanded Northeast order area has been omitted. The handlers who would be added to those currently fully regulated under the three separate orders either have a sufficient percentage of their route disposition within the consolidated marketing area to meet the pooling requirements or are located in the area to be added. Reasons for consolidation include the existence of overlapping sales and procurement areas between New England and New York-New Jersey and between New York-New Jersey and Middle Atlantic. An important measure of association is evidenced by industry efforts to study and pursue consolidation of the three Federal orders prior to the 1996 Farm Bill.

2. APPALACHIAN—Current marketing areas of the Carolina and Louisville-Evansville (minus Logan County, Kentucky) Federal milk orders plus the marketing area of the former Tennessee Valley order, with the addition of 21 currently-unregulated counties in Indiana and Kentucky. Overlapping sales and procurement areas between these marketing areas are major factors for this consolidation.

3. FLORIDA—current marketing areas of the Upper Florida, Tampa Bay, and Southeastern Florida Federal milk orders.

Natural boundary limitations and overlapping sales and procurement areas among the three orders are major reasons for consolidation, as well as a measure of association evidenced by cooperative association proposals to consolidate these three marketing areas. Further, the cooperative associations in this area have worked together for a number of years to accommodate needed movements of milk between the three Florida Federal orders.

*4. SOUTHEAST—current marketing area of the Southeast Federal milk order, plus 1 county from the Louisville-Evansville Federal milk order marketing area; plus 11 northwest Arkansas counties and 22 entire Missouri counties that currently are part of the Southwest Plains marketing area; plus 6 Missouri counties that currently are part of the Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri marketing area; plus 16 currently unregulated southeast Missouri counties (including 4 that were part of the former Paducah marketing area); plus 20 currently-unregulated Kentucky counties (including 5 from the former Paducah marketing area). *A partial Missouri county that has been part of the Southwest Plains marketing area will become completely unregulated to minimize the reporting complications caused by partially regulated counties.

Major reasons for this consolidation include sales and procurement area overlaps between the Southeast order and these counties.

*5. MIDEAST—current marketing areas of the Ohio Valley, Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania, Southern Michigan and Indiana Federal milk orders, plus Zone 2 of the Michigan Upper Peninsula Federal milk order, and most currently-unregulated counties in Michigan, Indiana and Ohio. *One partial and 3 entire counties in north central Ohio are left unregulated, since they represent the distribution area of a currently-partially regulated distributing plant (Toft Dairy in Sandusky, Ohio).

Major criteria for this consolidation include the overlap of fluid sales in the Ohio Valley marketing area by handlers from the other areas to be consolidated. With the consolidation, most route disposition by handlers located within the Mideast order would be within the marketing area. Also, nearly all milk produced within the area would be pooled under the consolidated order. The portion of the Michigan Upper Peninsula marketing area included in the Mideast consolidated area has sales and milk procurement areas in common with the southern Michigan area and has minimal association with the western end of the current Michigan Upper Peninsula marketing area.

*6. UPPER MIDWEST—current marketing areas of the Chicago Regional, Upper Midwest, Zones I and I(a) of the Michigan Upper Peninsula Federal milk orders, and unregulated portions of Wisconsin. *The Iowa Federal order marketing area portion of one Illinois county, in which Chicago Regional handlers have the preponderance of sales, is added to the consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area, and the Chicago Regional portion of another Illinois county, in which Iowa order handlers have the preponderance of sales, is removed and added to the consolidated Central area. These changes will reduce overlapping route disposition between the two consolidated orders and reduce the incidence of partial counties in marketing areas.

Major consolidation criteria include an overlapping procurement area between the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders and overlapping procurement and route disposition area between the western end of the Michigan Upper Peninsula order and the Chicago Regional order. A number of the same cooperative associations market member milk throughout the consolidated area.

*7. CENTRAL—current marketing areas of the Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri, Central Illinois, Greater Kansas City, Southwest Plains, Eastern Colorado, Nebraska-Western Iowa, Eastern South Dakota, Iowa (*less the portion of an Illinois county that will become part of the consolidated Upper Midwest area) and *Western Colorado Federal milk orders, *plus the portion of an Illinois county currently in the Chicago Regional Federal order area, minus 11 northwestern Arkansas counties and 1 partial and 22 entire Missouri counties that are part of the current Southwest Plains marketing area, minus 6 Missouri counties that are part of the current Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri marketing area, plus 54 currently-unregulated counties in Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska and Colorado, plus 8 counties in central Missouri (*six fewer than in the proposed rule) that are not considered to be part of the distribution area of an unregulated handler in central Missouri, *plus 7 currently unregulated Colorado counties located between the current Western and Eastern Colorado order areas.

This configuration would leave 31 unregulated counties in central Missouri that are intended to delineate the distribution area of Central Dairy at Jefferson City, Missouri, which has limited distribution in Federal order territory.

Major criteria on which this consolidation is based include overlapping route disposition and procurement between the current orders. The consolidation would result in a concentration of both the sales and supplies of milk within the consolidated marketing area. The consolidation would combine several relatively small orders and provide for the release of market data without revealing proprietary information. In addition, many of the producers in these areas share membership in several common cooperatives. The Western Colorado area has become more closely associated with the Eastern Colorado area than with the Great Basin area since issuance of the proposed rule.
8. SOUTHWEST—current marketing areas of Texas and New Mexico-West Texas Federal milk orders, with the addition of two currently-unregulated northeast Texas counties and 47 currently-unregulated counties in southwest Texas.

Major criteria supporting this consolidation include sales and procurement area overlaps and common cooperative association membership between the Texas and New Mexico-West Texas marketing areas, and similar marketing concerns with respect to trade with Mexico for both orders. Addition of the currently-unregulated Texas counties will result in the regulation of no additional handlers, and will reduce handlers' recordkeeping and reporting burden and the market administrator's administrative costs.

9. ARIZONA-LAS VEGAS—current marketing area of Central Arizona, plus the Clark County, Nevada, portion of the current Great Basin marketing area, plus eight currently-unregulated Arizona counties.

The major criterion on which the consolidation is based is sales overlap between the sole Las Vegas, Nevada, handler and handlers regulated under the Central Arizona order in both Clark County, Nevada, and unregulated portions of northern Arizona. The Grand Canyon and sparsely populated areas in the northwestern part of Arizona, and the sparsely populated desert region of eastern Arizona constitute natural barriers between this and adjacent marketing areas. In addition, the most significant relationship between this area and any other is represented by the substantial volumes of bulk and packaged milk exchanged between the Arizona-Las Vegas area and Southern California.

*10. WESTERN—current marketing areas of the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon and Great Basin Federal milk orders, minus Clark County, Nevada. The Western Colorado order area, proposed to be included in the Western order area, is instead included in the consolidated Central order. The major criteria on which the consolidation is based include overlapping sales between Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon and Great Basin, as well as a significant overlap in procurement for the two orders in five Idaho counties.

The two orders also have similar multiple component pricing plans and most of the milk used in nonfluid products under both orders is used in cheese.

Collection of detailed data for individual handlers indicates that the strength of earlier relationships between the former Great Basin and Lake Mead orders that justified their 1988 merger have dwindled significantly, with the Las Vegas area now more closely related to a combination of southern California and Central Arizona handlers.

11. PACIFIC NORTHWEST—current marketing area of the Pacific Northwest Federal milk order plus 1 currently-unregulated county in Oregon. The degree of association with other marketing areas is insufficient to warrant consolidation.

**Table 1.—Market Information: Population, Utilization, Producer Milk and Weighted Average Utilization Value (WAUV) in Consolidated Marketing Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Population 1 (millions)</th>
<th>Class I utilization 2 (percent)</th>
<th>Producer milk 2 (1000 lbs.)</th>
<th>WAUV 2,3 (per cwt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>1,962,335</td>
<td>$13.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>410,372</td>
<td>13.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>217,952</td>
<td>15.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>482,499</td>
<td>13.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>1,040,112</td>
<td>13.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>1,597,232</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>868,443</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>649,872</td>
<td>13.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>195,943</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>304,129</td>
<td>13.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>539,987</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>217.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7,756,390</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on July 1, 1997 estimates.
2 Based on October 1997 information, for plants which would be fully regulated under assumptions used in this decision.
3 Not a blend price—shown solely for the purpose of showing impact of consolidation on utilization.

**Table 2.—Market Information: Number of Plants in Consolidated Marketing Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Fully regulated (FR)</th>
<th>Exempt 2</th>
<th>FR small businesses</th>
<th>Manufacturing and supply plants 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptions of Consolidated Marketing Areas

Each of the consolidated order areas is described in the text following this introduction. The criteria which were used to determine which areas should be consolidated are explained. For each consolidated area, the following information is included:

Geography. The political units (states, counties, and portions of counties) included in each area, the topography, and the climatic conditions are described for the purpose of delineating the territory to be incorporated in each consolidated marketing area and describing its characteristics pertaining to milk production and consumption. This information was derived principally from Microsoft® Encarta® 96 Encyclopedia, and augmented by several U.S. atlases.

Population. The total population of each area and its distribution within the area is included for the purpose of identifying where milk is consumed. July 1, 1997, population estimates were obtained from “CO–97–1 Estimates of the Population of Counties;” Population Estimates Program, Population Division of the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) information is provided by the United States Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which defines metropolitan areas according to published standards that are applied to Census Bureau data. To be described as an MSA, an area (one or more counties) must include at least one city with 50,000 or more inhabitants, or a Census Bureau-defined urbanized area (of at least 50,000 inhabitants) and a total metropolitan population of at least 100,000 (75,000 in New England). Areas with more than 1 million population may be described as “consolidated metropolitan statistical areas” (CMSAs) made up of component parts designated as primary metropolitan statistical areas (PMSAs).

For purposes of the marketing area descriptions in this decision, the term “MSA” also includes CMSAs and PMSAs.

Per capita consumption. Available data pertaining to per capita consumption is discussed to help describe how much milk is needed to supply the fluid needs of the population of each marketing area. Per capita consumption numbers were estimated by state using data from a report on “Per Capita Sales of Fluid Milk Products in Federal Order Markets,” published in the December 1992 issue of Federal Milk Order Market Statistics, 391, issued May 1993. This data was the most recent available.

Production. A description of the amount and sources of milk production for the market is included for the purpose of identifying the supply area for each consolidated marketing area. Production data by state and county for each Federal milk order was compiled from information collected by the offices administering the current Federal milk orders (market administrators’ offices). For most of the consolidated marketing areas, production data has been updated to October 1997. For several of the consolidated areas, however, October 1997 data is difficult to compile and, when compared with previously published statistics, may yield confidential information. For these areas, the data cited in the proposed rule has been used to describe the sources of milk for the consolidated market.

Distributing plants. For each marketing area the number and types of distributing plants expected to be associated with each marketing area are included. The locations of plants by distribution centers, to identify where milk must be delivered. This information was collected by market administrators’ offices. The expected regulatory status was determined on the basis of each plant’s receipts and route distribution of fluid milk during October 1997. Changes in plant operations or distribution patterns could change the expected status.

Utilization. The utilization percentages of the current individual orders and the effect of consolidation on the consolidated orders are described for each marketing area, with an estimate of the effect of consolidation on each current individual order’s blend price. The current utilization data is published each month for each Federal milk order market. Pool data was used to calculate the effects of consolidation on utilization.

Other plants. The presence of manufacturing and supply plants (including cooperative associations pooling member milk under current individual orders) is described for each consolidated area. This information was collected by market administrators’ offices for May 1997, and has been changed from the proposed rule only where changes from the proposed marketing areas have occurred.

Cooperative Associations. The number of cooperative associations supplying milk to the consolidated areas, the number that pool milk in more than one of the areas is identified. This information was obtained from market administrators’ offices, updated to December 1997 from the proposed rule. For purposes of the consolidation discussion, the four cooperative associations that combined to create Dairy Farmers of America (DFA) are considered to be a single organization.

Criteria for Consolidation. The extent to which the criteria used in identifying markets to be consolidated are supported by the marketing conditions present in each of the consolidated areas is discussed.

Discussion of comments and alternatives. Comments filed in response to the consolidation section of the proposed rule and alternatives considered are summarized and discussed for each consolidated area.

Northeast

The consolidated Northeast marketing area is comprised of the current New England, New York-New Jersey, and Middle Atlantic Federal milk order marketing areas (Orders 1, 2, and 4), with currently-unregulated areas in northern New York, Vermont and New Hampshire added. The entire areas of the States of Connecticut (8 counties), Delaware (3 counties), Massachusetts (14 counties), New Hampshire (10 counties), New Jersey (21 counties),
Rhode Island (5 counties), and Vermont (14 counties) are contained within the consolidated Northeast order area. In addition, the District of Columbia, 21 counties and the City of Baltimore in Maryland, 41 complete and 3 partial counties and the 5 boroughs of New York City in New York, the 15 Pennsylvania counties currently included in the Middle Atlantic marketing area, and 4 counties and 5 cities in Virginia are included in the consolidated order. There are 156 complete and 3 partial counties and 8 cities, including the District of Columbia, in the consolidated Northeast marketing area.

The Western New York State order area, proposed to be included in the consolidated Northeast area, is not included at the request of the business entity that would be most affected by its inclusion because the currently unregulated portions of Pennsylvania are not included.

**Geography**

The Northeast marketing area extends from the Canadian border on the north, south to northern Virginia, eastern Maryland and Delaware, with its eastern edge along the western border of Maine at the northern end of the marketing area, and along the Atlantic Ocean for the remainder. The total northeast-southwest extent of the marketing area is approximately 600 miles. The marketing area extends westward to Lake Ontario in New York State (about 350 miles east to west), goes only as far west as the northern part of New Jersey (about 60 miles), and expands westward again across the eastern half of southern Pennsylvania, taking in a small part of northeast Virginia, eastern Maryland, and Delaware (about 230 miles east to west). There is a large State-regulated area in Pennsylvania just to the west of the marketing area, and most of the State of Virginia to the south of the marketing area also is regulated under a State order. The consolidated Northeast marketing area is contiguous to no other consolidated marketing areas, but parts of it, in south central New York State and south central Pennsylvania, are very close to the consolidated Mideast area.

The northern and northwestern parts of the Northeast area are large areas of coniferous forests that are somewhat mountainous. To the south and southeast of the forested areas are areas where dairy farming predominates as the primary type of agriculture. In fact, for 4 of the 10 states that are located in the Northeast marketing area (New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania and Vermont) dairy products were the number 1 agricultural commodity in terms of cash receipts during 1996. Principally along the Atlantic coastline is a flatter area where other agricultural activities, including greenhouse and nursery, fruit, truck and mixed farming, take place. A near-continuous strip along the east coast of the area, from northeastern Massachusetts southwest to the Baltimore area, is a major industrial area and is heavily populated.

**Population**

According to July 1, 1997, population estimates, the total population in the consolidated Northeast marketing area is 49 million. The area is very densely populated, especially along a coastal strip extending from Boston, Massachusetts, in the northeast to Washington, D.C., in the southwest. In this consolidated marketing area of approximately 160 counties, 106 are included within Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs). The 20 Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the consolidated Northeast marketing area account for 93.7 percent of the total market area population.

Almost sixty percent of the marketing area population is located in 6 interconnected MSAs in 48 counties, extending from central New Jersey to southern New England. The six MSAs are: Springfield, Massachusetts; Boston-Worcester-Lawrence, Massachusetts/New Hampshire/Maine Connecticut; Providence-Fall River-Warwick, Rhode Island/Massachusetts; New London-Norwich, Connecticut/Rhode Island; Hartford, Connecticut; and New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, New York/New Jersey/Connecticut/Pennsylvania. The population in this northeastern portion of the marketing area is concentrated most heavily at its northern and southern ends—the New York City area has a population of approximately 20 million, and the Boston area's population is approximately 5.5 million. Two of the other MSAs, Hartford and Providence, each have over 1 million population. Although each of these six MSAs is described as a separate area in the population data, many of the counties involved are divided between separate MSAs.

Just southwest of the New York City MSA is the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City, Pennsylvania/New Jersey/Delaware/Maryland MSA, with a population of 6 million. Some counties of these two MSAs are adjacent: Southwest of the Philadelphia MSA and separated from it by only one county is the Washington, DC/Baltimore, Maryland/northern Virginia MSA, with a population in the consolidated marketing area of 6.8 million. Of the 12 other MSAs in the consolidated marketing area, 6 are located in New York State, with an average population of nearly 400,000 each. Two are located in Pennsylvania, with populations of .6 and .45 million. One MSA in Vermont, 1 in Delaware, and 2 in Massachusetts have average populations of 163,000.

**Fluid Per Capita Consumption**

Fluid per capita consumption estimates vary within the Northeast from 16.7 pounds per month in the more southern parts of the region to 20 pounds per month in New England. These rates would result in a weighted average of 18 pounds per month, and an estimated total fluid milk consumption rate of 882 million pounds per month for the Northeast marketing area. Approximately 752 million pounds of this fluid milk consumption would be required along the heavily populated coastal area extending from northeast Massachusetts southwest through Washington, D.C. and northern Virginia. Handlers who would have been fully regulated under the consolidated Northeast order during October 1997 distributed 828.1 million pounds within the consolidated marketing area. October 1997 sales within the marketing area by handlers that would be regulated by other orders totaled 6.2 million pounds, and sales by handlers who would have been partially regulated were 18.9 million pounds. Sales in the marketing area are exempt and government plants, and by producer-handlers totaled 6.6 million pounds.

**Milk Production**

In October 1997, nearly 19,000 producers from 13 states pooled 1.9 billion pounds of milk on the three orders comprising the consolidated Northeast order. With the addition of several currently unregulated handlers, it is probable that approximately 2 billion pounds of milk per month will be pooled under the Northeast order. Eleven of the 13 states supplying milk to the three Federal order pools are at least partly in the marketing area, and 84 percent of the producer milk pooled under the three orders in October 1997 came from just 3 states—New York (41.5 percent), Pennsylvania (32.2 percent), and Vermont (10.3 percent). Over 10 million pounds of milk was produced in each of fifty-one counties: 1 county in northeast Connecticut, 3 in the most northwestern of the Middle Atlantic portion of the marketing area, 30 spread over most of New York, 1 on the western edge of...
northern Virginia, and 16 in southeast to south central Pennsylvania and in the eastern part of the northern tier of Pennsylvania counties, with an additional Pennsylvania county, Lancaster, accounting for over 150 million pounds of milk. Over seventy percent of the markets' total producer milk was produced within the consolidated marketing area.

Less than one-third of the milk production for the consolidated market was produced within 100 miles of the heavily populated coastal corridor. Although the Northeast area contains two out of the top five milk-producing states in the U.S. (New York and Pennsylvania), the population of the marketing area is nearly 20 million more than the next most-populated consolidated area (the Mid-Atlantic, with 31 million people). The Northeast, therefore, is a very significant milk production area with a very high demand for fluid milk and dairy products.

Distributing Plants

Using distributing plant lists included in the proposed rule, with the pooling standards at 25 percent of route dispositions as in-area sales, and updated for known plant closures through December 1998, 141 distributing plants would be expected to be associated with the Northeast marketing area. On the basis of data collected for October 1997, the plants associated would include 64 fully regulated distributing plants (58 currently fully regulated, 5 currently partially regulated, and 1 currently unregulated), 15 partially regulated (2 currently fully regulated and 13 currently partially regulated), nine exempt plants having less than 150,000 pounds of total route disposition per month (3 currently fully regulated, 2 currently partially regulated, 2 currently exempt based on size, and 2 currently unregulated) and 47 producer-handlers (45 currently producer-handlers, 1 currently partially regulated, and 1 currently unregulated) would have been associated with the market during October 1997. Three handlers who currently are exempt based on institutional status would continue to be exempt on the same basis, and 3 handlers located in the Western New York area who would have been fully regulated under the proposed rule would continue to be unregulated under any Federal order.

Since October 1997, 14 distributing plants (3 in New York, 2 in each of the States of Massachusetts, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Vermont, and 1 in Connecticut) have gone out of business.

Less than half (60) of the Northeast distributing plants which were identified as being in business as of December 1998 were located in the 6 Northeast MSAs that have over a million people each. This number includes 31 of the pool distributing plants. Under the consolidated order, it is anticipated that there would be 5 pool distributing plants in the Boston-Worcester-Lawrence area, 6 in the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City area, and 11 in the New York-Northern New Jersey-Lang Island area. The Hartford, Connecticut area would have 2 pool distributing plants, Providence-Fall River-Warwick would have 3, and the Washington-Baltimore area would have 4 pool distributing plants.

Of the remaining 81 distributing plants, 14 pool distributing plants were located in other MSAs as follows: 8 in New York; 4 in Pennsylvania; and 2 in Massachusetts. Sixty-seven distributing plants, including 19 pool distributing plants, were not located in MSAs.

Utilization

According to October 1997 pool statistics for handlers who would be fully regulated under this Northeast order, the utilization percentages for the New England, New York-New Jersey, and Middle Atlantic markets were 52, 45, and 53 percent, respectively. Based on calculated weighted average use values for (1) the current order with current use of milk, and (2) the current order with projected use of milk in the consolidated Northeast order, the potential impact of this decision on producers who supply the current market areas is estimated to be New England, a 9-cent per cwt decrease (from $14.09 to $14.00); New York-New Jersey, a 8-cent per cwt increase (from $13.91 to $13.99); and Middle Atlantic, a 10-cent per cwt decrease (from $14.00 to $13.90). The weighted average use value for the consolidated Northeast order market is estimated to be $13.97 per cwt. For October 1997, combined Class I utilization for Orders 1, 2, 3 and 4 was 47.7 percent based of 917.3 million pounds of producer milk used in Class I out of 1,922 billion total producer milk pounds.

The Northeast area is one of two consolidated marketing areas that would have a significantly higher-than-average percentage of its milk used in Class II. Currently, all three of the orders have Class II utilization between 15 and 25 percent. When the markets are combined the average for the consolidated market will be approximately 18 percent.

Other Plants

Located within the consolidated Northeast marketing area during May 1997 were 95 supply or manufacturing plants: 13 in Vermont (4 in the Burlington area), 1 in New Hampshire and 10 in Massachusetts (all in the Boston-Worcester-Lawrence area), 1 in Rhode Island (in the Providence-Fall River-Warwick area), 7 in Connecticut (3 in the Hartford area and 4 in the New York-Northern New Jersey-Lang Island area), 12 in New Jersey (all in the New York-Northern New Jersey-Lang Island area), 2 in Delaware (one in the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City area), 7 in Maryland (four in the Washington-Baltimore area), 13 in Pennsylvania (5 in the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City area), and 29 in New York (9 in the New York-Northern New Jersey-Lang Island area).

Fifteen of the 95 plants are pool plants. Of these pool plants, 7 are manufacturing plants—5 manufacture primarily powder, 1 manufactures primarily cheese and 1 manufactures primarily other products. There are 8 pool supply plants—1 has no primary product, but ships only to distributing plants; 5 are supply plants that manufacture primarily Class II products, and 2 supply plants manufacture primarily cheese. Of the remaining 80 nonpool plants in the Northeast marketing area, 73 are manufacturing plants—37 manufacture primarily Class II products, 1 manufactures primarily butter, 33 manufacture primarily cheese and 2 manufacture primarily other products. Seven of the remaining nonpool plants are supply plants—2 are supply plants that manufacture primarily Class II products and 5 are supply plants that manufacture primarily cheese.

There are also six supply or manufacturing plants in the unregulated area of New York—one in the unregulated county of Chautauqua, one in the unregulated portion of Cattaraugas County, two in the unregulated portion of Allegany County, and two in the unregulated portion of Steuben County. Two are pool supply plants—one manufactures primarily Class II products and the other manufactures primarily cheese. The remaining four are nonpool manufacturing plants—three manufacture primarily cheese and one manufactures primarily Class II products.
Cooperative Associations

During December 1997, 76 cooperative associations pooled their members' milk on the three Northeast orders. Three of the cooperatives pooled milk on all three orders; 3 pooled milk on both the New England and New York-New Jersey orders, and 3 others pooled milk on both the New York-New Jersey and Middle Atlantic orders. The 9 cooperative associations that pooled milk on more than one of the Northeast orders represented 72.6 percent of cooperative milk pooled under the 3 orders and 55 percent of the total milk. Seventy-six percent of the milk pooled in the Northeast is cooperative association milk, with 80 percent of Federal Order 1 milk, 68.4 percent of Federal Order 2 milk, and 87 percent of Federal Order 4 milk pooled by cooperatives.

The 5 cooperatives that market milk only under Order 1 account for 26.7 percent of the milk marketed under that order by cooperative associations, and 21.3 percent of total milk marketed under Order 1. In Order 2, only 40.4 percent of cooperative association milk is marketed by the 59 co-ops that market milk only under Order 2. Milk marketed by these cooperatives represents 27.6 percent of the total milk pooled for December 1997. Three cooperative associations that marketed milk only on the Order 4 portion of the Northeast order marketed 8.2 percent of the milk marketed by cooperatives under this order. This amount of milk represented 7.2 percent of total milk pooled under Order 4 in December 1997.

Criteria for Consolidation

The current New England, New York-New Jersey, and Middle Atlantic Federal milk order marketing areas (Orders 1, 2, and 4) should be consolidated because of the interrelationship between Orders 1 and 2 and between Orders 2 and 4 regarding route disposition and milk supply. Eighty percent of fluid milk disposition by handlers who would be fully regulated under the consolidated order is distributed within the consolidated marketing area. Fully regulated handlers account for 96 percent of the fluid milk products distributed within the consolidated marketing area. The utilization of the three markets is similar, and several cooperative associations market their members' milk in all three markets. The three markets are surrounded by State-regulated and unregulated areas to the west and south, the Atlantic Ocean to the east, and Canada to the north. The adjoining Maine State milk order also serves as somewhat of a barrier to milk marketing in the northeast by limiting the association of non-Maine milk with the Maine pool.

The merger of these markets has been proposed by interested parties. A committee comprised chiefly of Northeast region cooperatives was formed over three years ago to study a merger of the three Federal orders. In support of a Northeast consolidation, the committee and other interested parties, including handlers and regulatory agencies, have noted: overlapping sales and procurement areas; a trend toward consolidation of cooperative processors and handlers in the region (leaving the remaining handlers with larger distributing areas and volumes); and regulation of plants by an order in which they are not located. The proponents of consolidation have indicated that consolidation would tend to solve some of the presently existing inequities and would lead to greater efficiency for handlers and order administration.

Discussion of Comments and Alternatives

Prior to issuance of the proposed rule, alternatives to the consolidation of the order areas included in the Northeast marketing area that were considered included the addition of all currently unregulated and State-regulated area adjoining the Order 1, 2 and 4 marketing areas. These considerations included Pennsylvania Milk Marketing Board (PMMB) Areas 2, 3, and 6, some or all of the non-Federally regulated part of the State of Virginia, the unregulated areas of West Virginia and Maryland, the Western New York State order area and northern New York, northern Vermont and New Hampshire, pockets of unregulated area in Massachusetts, and the State of Maine. The proposed rule would have included in the consolidated Northeast marketing area the unregulated areas of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, northern New York, and the Western New York State order area.

Nearly 1,150 comments that dealt to some extent with the consolidation of the Northeast order area were received in response to the proposed rule. Approximately 125 of these comments favored adoption of a national marketing area map that would include all U.S. territory in the 48 contiguous states in one of ten Federal order areas. Over 950 comments favored the expansion of the Northeast area into all of Pennsylvania, with more than 600 of these comments also favoring expansion into some combination of the unregulated areas of New York, Maryland, West Virginia, Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine. More than 50 commenters urged the continued omission of Pennsylvania Milk Marketing Board Areas 2, 3, and 6 from any of the consolidated Federal order areas.

Most of the comments supporting expansion of the Northeast consolidated marketing area into non-federally regulated areas, especially Pennsylvania, argued that handlers in the non-federally regulated areas compete for milk supplies in the same milksheds and for fluid milk sales in the same markets as Federally-regulated handlers, with the surrounding federal order pool(s) carrying the necessary reserve milk supplies for the Class I sales distributed by non-regulated handlers. In addition, the comments argued that dairy farmers whose milk is priced in individual handler pools at primarily-fluid milk under PMMB regulation have a competitive advantage over neighboring producers whose milk is included in marketwide pools that blend the cost of balancing milk supplies for fluid use with returns from the fluid market.

Nearly 60 comments, many from Pennsylvania dairy farmers, opposed expansion of the consolidated Northeast order area into Pennsylvania. Comments stated that the PMMB individual handler pools result in greater returns to producers, and producer returns would decline if handlers are required to pay the additional fluid value into the marketwide pool to subsidize cheese/powder plants.

As stated in the introduction to the consolidation discussion, consolidation of the existing orders does not necessitate expansion of the consolidated orders into currently-unregulated areas, especially if such expansion would result in the regulation of currently-unregulated handlers. Handlers located in PMMB areas 2, 3, and 6 are regulated under the State of Pennsylvania if they do not have enough sales in any Federal order area to meet an order's pooling standards. These PMMB handlers are subject to minimum Class I pricing, sometimes at price levels that exceed those that would be established under Federal milk order regulation. When such plants do meet Federal order pooling standards, the State of Pennsylvania continues to enforce some of its regulations in addition to Federal order regulations. Inclusion of the Pennsylvania-regulated handlers in the consolidated marketing area would have little effect on handlers' costs of Class I milk (or might reduce them), and would reduce returns to a few producers. In
view of these considerations, it appears that stable and orderly marketing conditions can be maintained without extending full Federal regulation to State-regulated handlers.

There are significant differences between PMMB regulation and Federal order regulation that make it difficult to determine whether PMMB regulation gives State-regulated handlers a cost advantage over Federally-regulated plants distributing milk in the same areas. Some of the differences between PMMB and Federal order regulation are: (1) The number of classes of use (two versus four); (2) the location at which milk is priced (where it is distributed for sale to consumers versus where it is received from producers for processing); (3) individual handler pooling versus marketwide pooling; and (4) State regulatory treatment of milk sold in interstate commerce, including milk distributed outside the State and received from outside the State. In addition to creating different costs among similarly-located State- and Federal-regulated handlers, PMMB regulation may result in different costs between similarly-located PMMB-regulated handlers. However, since the main focus of this rulemaking process has been to consolidate existing Federal marketing areas, it would be more appropriate to consider this issue of marketing area expansion on Pennsylvania at a future time.

Maine has been and continues to be excluded from Federal order regulation. Three comments, two from New York State Dairy Foods, Inc., and one from Crowley Foods, Inc., a fluid milk processor with distributing plants regulated under the New York-New Jersey and New England orders, suggested including Maine in the consolidated Northeast area on the basis that Maine regulation depends on balancing seasonal reserves on the New England order, and that the inclusion of Maine would allow similarly situated handlers equal opportunities. Five comments supported Maine’s exclusion from Federal orders because of its geography as compared to other areas, its long history of successful milk marketing regulation, and the limited impact of its pricing system on other regulated areas.

There appears to be little reason to add the State of Maine to the consolidated Northeast order area. Maine handlers with significant distribution in the Federal order areas can be and are pooled under Federal orders, limiting the extent of any competitive advantage. Inclusion of Maine handlers in the consolidated marketing area would have little effect on handlers’ costs of Class I milk (or might reduce them), and would reduce returns to a few producers. When not pooled under Federal orders, Maine handlers are subject to minimum prices paid for milk, and producers are assured minimum prices in payment for milk. There is no compelling reason to extend Federal order regulation to encompass this State-regulated marketing area.

The Western New York order area, proposed to be added to the consolidated Northeast area because the persons regulated under that order had so requested, is not included. Upstate Milk Producers Cooperative (Upstate), the entity that would be most affected by the inclusion of this area, had supported its addition prior to issuance of the proposed rule. Because the proposed rule failed to include the State-regulated Pennsylvania areas in the consolidated Northeast area, however, Upstate determined that it would be faced with unfair competition from PMMB-regulated handlers and requested that the Western New York order area be left out of the consolidated Northeast order area.

All of the comments received that dealt with the inclusion of unregulated area in the States of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont and the currently-unregulated northern area of New York State in the consolidated Northeast order area supported the addition of this area. According to the comments, inclusion of the currently unregulated areas will assure that dairy operations there are fully regulated when, as is likely, Congress decides to include these areas in the Federal order program. Inclusion of the currently unregulated areas would lighten handlers’ reporting burden and ease the reporting burden of market administrators in keeping separate data on sales in this small unregulated area. The number of handlers who would be affected by these additions is minimal, and the additions would enhance the efficiency of Federal order administration while easing the reporting burden of regulated handlers.

In addition to the northern portions of New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York, and the small area of Massachusetts, the offshore Massachusetts counties of Dukes and Nantucket are added to the marketing area. The only entity currently operating in those counties (a producer-handler on Martha’s Vineyard) would be exempt from the pooling and pricing provisions of the order by virtue of its status as a producer-handler and by having fewer than 150,000 pounds of route disposition per month. Mainland handlers distributing milk in these two counties would find their reporting burden eased if these counties become part of the marketing area.

Appalachian

The consolidated Appalachian marketing area is comprised of the current Carolina (Order 5) and Louisville-Lexington-Evansville (Order 46) marketing areas in Virginia and Kentucky counties that is included in the consolidated Southeast marketing area) as well as 64 counties and 2 cities formerly comprising the marketing area of the Tennessee Valley Federal Order (Order 11), terminated in October 1997, and currently-unregulated counties in Indiana and Kentucky. There are 297 counties and 2 cities in this consolidated marketing area. This area remains unchanged from the proposed rule.

Geography

The Appalachian market is described geographically as follows: 7 unregulated Georgia counties (formerly part of Order 11), 21 Indiana counties (17 currently in Order 46 and 3 currently unregulated), and 81 Kentucky counties (47 currently in Order 46, 16 formerly part of Order 11, and 18 currently unregulated), all North Carolina and South Carolina counties (100 and 46, respectively, and all currently in Order 5), 33 Tennessee counties (formerly part of Order 11), 8 counties and 2 cities in Virginia (formerly part of Order 11), and 2 West Virginia counties (formerly part of Order 11).

The consolidated Appalachian market reaches from the Atlantic coastline westward to southern Indiana and western Kentucky’s border with Illinois. It is surrounded by Illinois on the west, Indiana, northeastern Kentucky, West Virginia and Virginia to the north, the Atlantic Ocean on the east, and Georgia, Alabama, western Tennessee, and southwestern Kentucky to the south. Measuring the extreme dimensions, this market extends about 625 miles from its northwest corner in Indiana to its southeastern corner on the South Carolina-Georgia border, about 300 miles south-to-north from the South Carolina-Georgia border to the North Carolina-Virginia border, about 50 miles west-to-east from the Appalachian-Southeast markets’ border in Tennessee to eastern North Carolina, and about 375 miles west-to-east from the Illinois-Indiana border to West Virginia and Virginia.

The Appalachian market is contiguous to 3 other consolidated
marketing areas: the Southeast area to the southwest and south, the Central area to the west and the Mid east area to the north. Unregulated counties in West Virginia and State-regulated area in Virginia also border this market to the north. North and South Carolina have almost 500 miles of coastline on the Atlantic Ocean.

In terms of physical geography, similarities exist across the states or areas included in this market. Southern Indiana and central Kentucky are in the Interior Low Plateau region where valleys and steep hillsides are typical. In this market, the Appalachian or Cumberland and Alleghany Plateaus are found in West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee and northwestern Georgia on the western edge of the Appalachian Mountains. Eastern Tennessee and both western North and South Carolina are in the Blue Ridge region, which is part of the Appalachian Mountain range. Moving eastward toward the Atlantic Ocean, the central part of the Carolinas are in the Piedmont Plateau, with the Atlantic Coastal Plain covering approximately the remaining eastern half of both these states.

Climatic types in this region vary somewhat. Humid subtropical climates are typical in most of North and South Carolina, as well as Virginia (which is affected by elevation differences) and southern Indiana. Humid continental climates are typical for northwestern Georgia, western North and South Carolina and southern West Virginia. Temperate climates are common in eastern Tennessee and central Kentucky.

Much of the consolidated Appalachian area does not provide a hospitable climate for dairy farming. As an agricultural pursuit, dairy farming is far down the list in the area, accounting for an average of less than five percent of all receipts from farm commodities for the states involved. Crops such as tobacco, corn and soybeans, and other livestock commodities such as cattle/calves, turkeys and broiler chickens are more prevalent in this region.

Population

According to July 1, 1997, population estimates, the total population in the Appalachian marketing area is 17.3 million. There are 24 Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) within the consolidated marketing area, containing 62.3 percent of the area’s population. The largest 17 contain 57 percent of the population of the market. Charlotte, North Carolina, is the largest MSA in the marketing area with a population of 1.35 million. Charlotte is located near the South Carolina border about at the midpoint of the North and South Carolina border, and about 250 miles west of the Atlantic coast. Less than 100 miles to the north lies the second-largest MSA of Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, North Carolina, with a population of 1.15 million. About 50 miles east of Greensboro is the third-largest MSA, Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill, with 1.05 million people. The Raleigh MSA abuts the Greensboro MSA. An additional four North Carolina MSAs are among the largest of the 17 MSAs containing 57 percent of the population of the consolidated marketing area, for a combined population of one million. North Carolina is the most populous state in the consolidated marketing area with 7.4 million; over sixty percent of the population of North Carolina is located in these seven MSAs.

South Carolina is the second-most populous state in the consolidated area, with 3.8 million people. The Carolinas contain nearly two-thirds of the consolidated market’s population. Greenville is the largest MSA in the state with a population of 905,000. Greenville is located in the northwest corner of the state. Charleston, the second-largest MSA in South Carolina, with over half a million people, is approximately at the midpoint of South Carolina’s coast.

The Tennessee portion of the consolidated Appalachian market has a population of 2 million, with three MSAs that are included in the largest 17 in the market. These three areas contain 1.6 million, or just under 80 percent of the population in that part of Tennessee that is included in the Appalachian marketing area. The largest Tennessee MSA is Knoxville, which is in the eastern part of Tennessee near North Carolina. Six counties make up the Knoxville MSA with a combined population of 650,000. The Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol area, the second-largest Tennessee MSA, is located in the northeastern tip of Tennessee along the Virginia and North Carolina border, and contains 460,000 people. Chattanooga, the third-largest MSA in Tennessee, is located on the Tennessee-Georgia border, and has a population of 447,000. The three MSAs run northeast to southwest just west of the North Carolina border.

The Kentucky portion of the consolidated Appalachian market contains 2.7 million people. There are two MSAs within the state that are included in the largest 17 in the market. The largest of these areas, which lies on the border with Indiana and has a population of one million. Lexington, the second-largest Kentucky MSA, is located in the center of the state and has just under half a million people. Generally, the Kentucky counties in the Appalachian marketing area are not heavily populated. Only two have populations over 100,000. They are Jefferson county, where Louisville is located, and Fayette county, home to Lexington.

Indiana counties in the Appalachian market have a population of .8 million. Only Vanderburgh county has a population over 100,000. Evansville, the only MSA in the portion of Indiana included in the Appalachian market, is in Vanderburgh county. Evansville’s MSA contains 289,000 and is located on the Indiana-Kentucky border, near the Illinois state line.

There are seven Georgia counties within the consolidated Appalachian marketing area, with a total population of 3.3 million. Three of them, Catoosa, Dade, and Walker, are part of the Chattanooga MSA. These three counties have a combined population of 124,000. The 10 Virginia counties in the Appalachian market have a population of .3 million. Three of the counties, Scott, Washington and Bristol City, are part of the Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol MSA. The two West Virginia counties within the Appalachian market have a total population of .1 million.

Fluid Per Capita Consumption

Estimates of fluid per capita consumption within the consolidated Appalachian marketing area vary from 15.8 pounds per month for South Carolina to 20.4 pounds per month for Indiana. Use of 17 pounds per month as a weighted average results in an estimated 294 million pounds of fluid milk consumption for the Appalachian marketing area. Appalachian handlers’ route disposition within the area during October 1997 totalled 283 million pounds, with another 21 million distributed by other order plants, partially regulated plants, and plants exempt both for reasons of both size and institutional status.

Milk Production

Milk production data for the Appalachian consolidated order area has not been updated from December 1996 to October 1997 as have the data for most of the other consolidated order areas. The Tennessee Valley order was terminated October 1997. As a result, on the basis of 10 percent of receipts distributed within the Southeast order areas, three of the Tennessee Valley-regulated handlers became pool plants under the Southeast order. Consequently, milk production data for
the consolidated Appalachian and Southeast orders based on October 1997 pool data would not be representative of the milk that would be pooled on those consolidated orders. Available information indicates that the sources of milk for the consolidated Appalachian market have not changed in any significant way from the December 1996 data.

In December 1996, over 4,000 producers from 359 counties in 15 states pooled 443.3 million pounds of producer milk on Orders 5, 11, and 46. Approximately 71 percent of the milk pooled on the three orders was produced within the proposed consolidated marketing area.

North and South Carolina are the only States that are located entirely within the consolidated marketing area, and provided nearly all of their producers’ milk to Order 5 (encompassing the entire States of North and South Carolina), with 103.7 and 34 million pounds, respectively. Neither of these states through milk to meet even the fluid milk requirements of its population. Kentucky producers pooled 101.1 million pounds on the three orders, with 89 percent produced within the consolidated marketing area. Tennessee producers pooled 69.9 million pounds on the three orders, principally on Order 11, with 84 percent produced within the consolidated marketing area. Although Virginia is primarily outside the marketing area, producers from 40 Virginia counties supplied 68.5 million pounds of milk for the Tennessee Valley and Carolina order markets in December 1996. Georgia producers pooled 27.6 million pounds and Indiana producers pooled 21 million pounds in December, with the balance of the milk pooled on the three orders originating in Alabama, Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

Thirty-four counties each supplied over 3 million pounds of milk to the three markets consolidated in this area. One such county was located in New Mexico, and another in Pennsylvania. Eight were located in Kentucky, south and southwest of Lexington, and southeast of Louisville. Eleven were located in North Carolina west of the Raleigh-Durham area, with all but one located near Greensboro, Winston-Salem, Asheville, Charlotte or Durham. Of the two South Carolina counties that supplied over 3 million pounds each, one was located northwest of Columbia, and the other northwest of Charleston. The five counties that pooled over 3 million pounds of milk on the three orders are located in northeast and southeast Tennessee; two in the Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol area and three southwest of Knoxville. Only one of the six counties in Virginia that supplied over 3 million pounds to Orders 5 and 11 is located within the marketing area. Five of the six are located in southwest Virginia, with the other in the northwest part of the State.

**Distributing Plants**

Using distributing plant lists included in the proposed rule, with the pooling standards adjusted to 25 percent of route dispositions as in-area sales and updated for known plant closures through December 1996, 31 distributing plants would be expected to be associated with the Appalachian marketing area, including 25 fully regulated distributing plants (23 currently fully regulated, 1 currently partially regulated, and 1 currently unregulated), 2 partially regulated (both currently partially regulated), 3 exempt plants, on the basis of having less than 150,000 pounds of total route disposition per month (2 currently fully regulated and 1 currently unregulated), and 1 government agency plant (currently a government agency plant).

Four of the 31 distributing plants expected to be associated with the consolidated Appalachian order, including 25 fully regulated distributing plants (23 currently fully regulated, 1 currently partially regulated, and 1 currently unregulated), 2 partially regulated (both currently partially regulated), 3 exempt plants, on the basis of having less than 150,000 pounds of total route disposition per month (2 currently fully regulated and 1 currently unregulated), and 1 government agency plant (currently a government agency plant).

Four of the 31 distributing plants expected to be associated with the consolidated Appalachian marketing area, including 25 fully regulated distributing plants (23 currently fully regulated, 1 currently partially regulated, and 1 currently unregulated), 2 partially regulated (both currently partially regulated), 3 exempt plants, on the basis of having less than 150,000 pounds of total route disposition per month (2 currently fully regulated and 1 currently unregulated), and 1 government agency plant (currently a government agency plant).

Four of the 31 distributing plants expected to be associated with the consolidated Appalachian order, including 25 fully regulated distributing plants (23 currently fully regulated, 1 currently partially regulated, and 1 currently unregulated), 2 partially regulated (both currently partially regulated), 3 exempt plants, on the basis of having less than 150,000 pounds of total route disposition per month (2 currently fully regulated and 1 currently unregulated), and 1 government agency plant (currently a government agency plant).

Four of the 31 distributing plants expected to be associated with the consolidated Appalachian order, including 25 fully regulated distributing plants (23 currently fully regulated, 1 currently partially regulated, and 1 currently unregulated), 2 partially regulated (both currently partially regulated), 3 exempt plants, on the basis of having less than 150,000 pounds of total route disposition per month (2 currently fully regulated and 1 currently unregulated), and 1 government agency plant (currently a government agency plant).
per cwt decrease (from $13.38 to $13.32). The weighted average use value for the consolidated Appalachian order market is estimated to be $13.35 per cwt. For September 1997, combined Class I utilization for Orders 5, 11 and 46 was 85.0 percent based on 349.0 million pounds of producer milk used in Class I out of 410.4 million total producer milk pounds pooled.

Other Plants

Also located within the consolidated Appalachian marketing area during May 1997 were 13 supply or manufacturing plants: 4 in Kentucky (1 in the Louisville area), 5 in North Carolina (1 in the Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill area and one in the Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point area), 1 in Tennessee, and 3 nonpool cheese plants in Indiana (1 in the Lexington area and one in the Louisville area). Three of the 13 plants are pool plants, or have a "pool side." Two of the three pool plants (one in Kentucky and the one in Tennessee) are "split plants," that is, one side of a plant is a manufacturing facility, and the other side receives and ships Grade A milk, and accounting is done separately. Of these pool plants, the pool sides of the 2 split plants have no primary product, shipping only to distributing plants. The nonpool side of one of these plants manufactures cheese, while the nonpool side of the other manufactures powder. The other pool plant is a supply plant that manufactures primarily Class II products. Of the other nonpool plants in the Appalachian marketing area, 5 manufacture primarily cheese and 5 manufacture primarily Class II products.

Cooperative Associations

Using September 1997 cooperative association information for the former Tennessee Valley order area and December 1997 information for the Carolina and Louisville-Lexington-Evansville (Order 46) orders, it can be estimated that approximately 75 percent of the milk in the consolidated Appalachian area was supplied by 12 cooperatives. Dairymen's Marketing Cooperative, Inc., and cooperative associations that merged to form Dairy Farmers of America supplied nearly half of the milk pooled on all three markets during these months. Carolina-Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., supplied approximately 20 percent of the milk pooled on both the Carolina and Tennessee Valley markets.

Five cooperative associations supplied 30 percent of the milk pooled under the Carolina order in December 1997, but supplied no milk to the other two markets. Three of these cooperatives pooled no milk on any other Federal order market, while one also pooled milk on the two Ohio orders, the New York-New Jersey order, and the Middle Atlantic order. In addition to the Carolina order, the fifth cooperative pooled the milk of Texas producers on the Texas, Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri, Chicago, and Southeast orders.

In addition to the 55 percent of the September 1997 Tennessee Valley milk supply from cooperative associations pooling milk on the other two Appalachian markets, one cooperative that also pooled milk on the Southeast order in December 1997 supplied approximately 15 percent of the milk pooled on the Tennessee Valley order. Three cooperative associations that supplied less than 2 percent of the milk pooled under Order 46 did not supply milk to either the Carolina or Tennessee Valley markets.

Criteria for Consolidation

Overlapping route disposition and procurement are the primary criteria on which this consolidation is based. There is a stronger relationship between the three marketing areas involved than between any one of them and any other marketing area on the basis of both criteria. Route dispositions within the Appalachian area by handlers who would be regulated under this order account for 93 percent of the total fluid milk products distributed in the area. The primary sources of the remaining 7 percent are four other consolidated order areas, with no more than 3 percent distributed by any of the four. Handlers to be regulated under the Appalachian order distributed nearly 80 percent of their route dispositions within the marketing area.

Over two-thirds of the milk supply for the Appalachian market is produced within the marketing area, with a large part of the rest of the milk supply coming from unregulated areas to the north (Virginia and Pennsylvania). The Appalachian order area supplies a significant minority of the milk supply for the Southeast market, but in October 1997 this amount was less than the amount supplied to the Southeast area from the Southwest area. In addition, a large proportion of the milk produced in the Appalachian order area that was pooled on the Southeast order in October 1997 was received at plants that formerly were pooled under the terminated Tennessee Valley order, and will be pooled under the consolidated Appalachian order. There is also common cooperative association affiliation between the markets.

Discussion of Comments and Alternatives

Prior to issuance of the proposed rule, alternatives that were considered included combining all of the current Florida, Carolina, Tennessee Valley and Southeast order areas, consolidating the Southeast and proposed Appalachian areas, and including all of the State of Kentucky in one order, specifically the Southeast. These alternative consolidations were examined at length and were found to have less overlap in sales and procurement than the Appalachian marketing area.

Thirteen comments that pertained specifically to the proposed Appalachian area were filed by 12 commenters in response to the proposed rule. Six of these comments supported the consolidation of the Appalachian marketing area as described in the proposed rule, including comments filed by several affected dairy farmers, the North Carolina Department of Agriculture, the North Carolina Dairy Producers Association, and a comment filed on behalf of Piedmont Milk Sales, Inc., Hunter Farms, Land O'Sun Dairies and MilkoCo. This last comment stated that the Appalachian and Southeast areas should not be combined because a separate milk order area should exist between the consolidated Northeast and Southeast order areas. The comment argued that existence of the Appalachian area would be expected to result in blend price differences between and among the Northeast, MidEast, Appalachian, Southeast and Florida orders such that milk supplies will move South and East as needed.

Seven comments supported the combination of the Appalachian and Southeast areas, or at least the inclusion of more territory in the Appalachian area. The Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation urged that all Kentucky counties and the proposed Appalachian area be combined with the Southeast. The comment stated that this further consolidation would make milk utilization rates more similar across the order, would facilitate and encourage milk flow to deficit areas and minimize any negative price impacts on producers. According to the Carolina-Virginia Milk Producers Association, the existence of separate Southeast and Appalachian order areas could result in disorderly marketing conditions on the eastern side of the proposed Southeast order area. Comments filed by Trauth Dairy urged the inclusion of the northern areas of Kentucky, including the Newport, Kentucky, area containing Louis Trauth Dairy, Inc., in the
proposed Appalachian area rather than in the proposed Mideast area. A comment filed by DFA supported the inclusion of Charleston, West Virginia, and areas of West Virginia south of Charleston, as well as the Ohio counties surrounding Cincinnati and the northern counties of Kentucky, in the Appalachian market rather than the Mideast market to promote orderly marketing of milk. The DFA comment stated that adequate milk supplies do not exist in close proximity to processors in the greater Cincinnati, Ohio, and Charleston, West Virginia, markets, and that an economic incentive must be provided to assure a milk supply to those processors. A second DFA comment recommended that the Southeast and Appalachian order areas be combined because the primary supplemental milk supply for both areas is in more western states (Texas, New Mexico, and Missouri). The comment stated that it is likely that these supplemental supplies would be likely to be associated with the Southeast order because of its greater proximity, and eastern Southeast milk would be "stair-stepped" across the Appalachian order to reduce hauling costs. According to DFA, during the market's flush production month, the Appalachian order would not bear the burden of surplus milk since the distant surplus milk would be associated with the Southeast order in addition to the eastern Southeast milk supplies that also would be associated with the Southeast order to avoid inefficient milk movements resulting in a disproportionate burden of surplus milk pooled on the Southeast order.

For the month of October 1997, a month when some supplemental supplies usually are required for short markets, nearly one-quarter of the producer milk pooled on the current Southeast order originated in the States of Missouri, New Mexico, and Texas. For the same month, just over 1 percent of the producer milk pooled on the Louisville-Lexington-Evansville and Carolinas orders was produced in those more western States. It is clear that the western milk is a much more important source of supply for the Southeast area than for the Appalachian area, and that the magnitude of this difference is an indication of how much these two consolidated markets differ. The ability to pool surplus milk on the Southeast order is directly related to the addition of the southern Missouri/northwest Arkansas area to the Southeast marketing area, an addition that was strongly supported by DFA. Concerns about the ability of handlers in the eastern part of the Southeast area to attract a supply of milk could be addressed more appropriately by the inclusion of transportation credits in the Southeast order than by consolidation with the Appalachian area.

A dairy farmer in West Virginia urged that the State of West Virginia be added to the Appalachian order area because milk usage for Class I milk and cost of production would then become similar to the other states in the Appalachian area. Another dairy farmer referred to a comment filed earlier to include Maryland in the Appalachian area instead of the Northeast.

As discussed in the proposed rule, consolidating the Carolina and Tennessee Valley markets with the Southeast does not represent the most appropriate consolidation option because of the minor degree of overlapping route disposition and producer milk between these areas. That conclusion continued to be supported by data gathered for distributing plants for October 1997. The northern Kentucky/southern Ohio and West Virginia area was examined in painstaking detail with updated data to determine whether or where this area could be divided to reflect handlers' sales areas and supply procurement areas better than in the proposed rule. No support for such a modification to the proposed rule could be found. Only one Appalachian handler has significant route disposition within the Ohio Valley order area, while a very small volume of Class I sales moves from the Ohio Valley area into the Order 46 area. There is even less overlap between either West Virginia or Maryland and the Appalachian area, and no justification for changing the marketing area of either of these States.

**Florida**

The consolidated Florida marketing area is comprised of the three current Federal order marketing areas contained wholly in the state of Florida: Upper Florida (Order 6), Tampa Bay (Order 12) and Southeastern Florida (Order 13). There are 63 counties in this consolidated area (40 in Order 6, 13 in Order 12, and 10 in Order 13). This area remains unchanged from the proposed rule.

**Geography**

The consolidated Florida marketing area is described geographically as all counties in the State of Florida, with the exception of the four westernmost counties in the Florida Panhandle. This marketing area is a large peninsula, ranging from about 140 miles in width in the north to about 50 miles in width in the south, that extends south from the southeast U.S. about 400 miles between the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. Also included in the Florida market is approximately 150 miles of the Panhandle, a narrow strip of land extending west along the Gulf of Mexico from the northern part of the peninsula. The water surrounding most of Florida's peninsula constitutes a natural boundary, as east-to-west travel is limited.

Almost all of Florida has a humid subtropical climate. The southern end of the state and the islands south of the peninsula have a tropical wet and dry climate. In general, the state's climate can and does affect levels of milk production negatively. Seasonal variation in production for this market typically is greater than for most other U.S. regions. The importance of dairy farming as an agricultural pursuit in Florida is relatively minor (7 percent of total receipts from agricultural commodities), with several crops contributing more total receipts to the State's income. However, no livestock commodity is as important in Florida as dairy farming.

**Population**

According to July 1, 1997, population estimates, the total population in the consolidated Florida marketing area is 14.3 million. Ninety-three percent of the population of the marketing area is located in Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs). The two largest MSAs are Miami—Fort Lauderdale—West Palm Beach (Miami) on the eastern side of the southern end of the peninsula, and Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater (Tampa) midway on the western side of the peninsula. Broward and Dade Counties comprise the Miami population center (currently in Order 13) with a population of 3.5 million. The Tampa population center (currently in Order 12) is comprised of Hernando, Hillsborough, Pasco and Pinellas counties with a population of 2.2 million. The six counties in these two population centers represent about 41 percent of the total marketing area population.

**Fluid Per Capita Consumption**

Florida customarily is considered a deficit milk production state. For much of the year, milk needs to be imported from other states in order to meet the demand for fluid consumption. Based on the population figure of 14.1 million and an estimated per capita fluid milk consumption rate of 17 pounds of fluid milk per month, total fluid milk consumption in the Florida marketing area is estimated at 239.7 million pounds per month.
During October 1997, 216 million pounds of milk were produced in the consolidated marketing area by the Florida distributing plants expected to be fully regulated under the Florida order. Other order plants had route disposition within Florida of 14.2 million pounds. Another 1.3 million pounds of milk was distributed within the consolidated area by partially regulated handlers, producer-handlers, and exempt plants. The discrepancy between actual route disposition of 231.5 million pounds and the estimated consumption level of 239.7 million pounds may be explained by the older than average population in Florida.

Milk Production

In October 1997, 175.8 million pounds of milk produced in Florida were pooled in four Federal orders; 98.5 percent of this milk was pooled on the three current Florida orders. About 340 producers located in Florida (96 percent of all Florida persons having association with Federal orders) had producer milk pooled on at least one of the three Florida markets. A small number of Florida producers had producer milk associated with Order 7, while more than 100 Georgia producers had producer milk associated with the Florida markets. Additionally, 44.7 million pounds of Georgia milk was pooled on the three Florida markets; 89 percent of this milk went to Order 12.

There are 40 counties in Florida that pooled milk in at least one of the three current Florida orders. Eight of these counties produced 66.5 percent of the milk pooled.

Three counties (Gilchrist, Lafayette and Suwannee, about 75 miles west of Jacksonville) had 42.3 million pounds of producer milk. For these three counties, 72.6 percent of the October 1997 producer milk was pooled on the Tampa Bay market, which is located approximately 150 miles southeast of the counties.

Nearly 90 percent of Clay County's producer milk was pooled in Order 6. This county is in the Jacksonville MSA, which is the largest population center in Florida.

Twenty-two and one-half million pounds of producer milk came from Hillsborough, Highlands, and Manatee Counties, all part of the Order 12 market. However, 64 percent of this milk was pooled on Order 13, with the rest pooled on Order 12.

Okeechobee County, located in the Order 13 marketing area about 125 miles north of Miami, is by far the largest milk producing county in Florida. The county had 43.8 million pounds of producer milk in October 1997, almost all of which was pooled on Order 13.

Distributing Plants

Using plant lists included in the proposed rule, with pooling standards adjusted to 25 percent of route disposition as in-area sales, updated for known plant closures through December 1998, 12 plants would be expected to be fully regulated under the consolidated Florida market. All of these plants are located in the Miami MSA and three in the Tampa MSA. Three plants are located in mid-Florida: one in the Orlando area and two in the Lakeland-Winter Haven area. Two more are located in northeast Florida: one in the Jacksonville area, and one in Daytona Beach. One plant in the Tampa MSA, currently fully regulated, would be exempt on the basis of size. One partially regulated plant in the Jacksonville area would be expected to continue its partially regulated status, and one producer-handler is not located within an MSA.

Slightly less than two-thirds of the consolidated market's population is contained in the MSAs where fully regulated plants are located.

Utilization

According to October 1997 pool statistics for handlers who would be fully regulated under this Florida order, the Class I utilization percentages for the Upper Florida, Tampa Bay, and Southeastern Florida markets were 91, 88, and 94 percent, respectively. Based on calculated weighted average use values for the current order with current use of milk, and the current order with projected use of milk in the consolidated Florida order, the potential impact of this rule on producers who supply the current market areas is estimated to be: Upper Florida, a 4-cent per cwt decrease (from $15.39 to $15.35); Tampa Bay, a 8-cent per cwt increase (from $15.54 to $15.62); and Southeastern Florida, a 13-cent per cwt increase (from $15.90). The weighted average use value for the consolidated Florida order market is estimated to be $15.69 per cwt. For October 1997, combined Class I utilization for the three Florida markets was 90.6 percent based on 197.5 million pounds of producer milk used in Class I out of 218.0 million total producer milk pounds.

Other Plants

Also located within the Florida marketing area during May 1997 were four supply or manufacturing plants, three of which are not associated with the current markets' pools. Three ice cream plants are located in the Tampa area and one pool supply plant is in the Jacksonville area.

Cooperative Associations

In December 1997, three cooperatives marketed milk in the Florida markets, representing nearly 100 percent of the milk marketed. Effective October 1, 1998, Florida Dairy Farmers Association, which marketed milk to three Florida distributors; and Tampa Independent Dairy Farmers' Association, Inc., which marketed milk only under the Tampa Bay order, merged to create Southeast Milk, Inc. The December 1997 production marketed by these two cooperatives in all three Florida orders comprised 93 percent of the producer milk associated with the three markets. Dairy Farmers of America, Inc. (DFA), members marketed nearly 7 percent of producer milk associated with the three Florida orders on the Tampa Bay and Southeastern Florida pools.

Criteria for Consolidation

The consolidated Florida market should encompass the current marketing areas of the Upper Florida, Tampa Bay and Southeastern Florida Federal milk orders. Natural boundary limitations and overlapping sales and procurement areas among the three orders are major reasons for consolidation, as well as a measure of association evidenced by cooperative association proposals to consolidate these three marketing areas. Further, the cooperative associations in this area have worked together for a number of years to accommodate needed movements of milk between the three Florida Federal orders, and into and out of the area.

Discussion of Comments and Alternatives

Prior to the issuance of the proposed rule, the inclusion of other Federal order marketing areas with the consolidated Florida area was considered because of the existence of some overlap of sales, procurement of producer milk, and dispositions of surplus milk. However, because of the closeness of the relationship between the current Florida markets and the lack of significant overlap of sales or production with other order areas no basis was seen for expanding the consolidation any further.

Only three comments were received that pertained specifically to the consolidated Florida orders. These comments, filed by the three cooperative associations with
member of the consolidated Florida marketing area, supported the consolidation of the current three Florida order areas without any additional territory.

**Southeast**

The consolidated Southeast marketing area is comprised of the current Southeast (Order 7) marketing area, portions of the current Southwest Plains (Order 106) marketing area in northwest Arkansas and southern Missouri, and six southeastern Missouri counties from the current Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri (Order 32) marketing area. Also included are 16 currently unregulated Missouri counties, 21 currently unregulated Kentucky counties, and 1 Kentucky county that is currently part of the Louisville-Lexington-Evansville (Order 46) marketing area. There are 572 counties in this consolidated area. A partial county in Missouri that was proposed to be included in the Southeast area has been omitted.

**Geography**

The Southeast market is described geographically as follows: all counties or parishes in Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi (67, 75, 64, and 82 counties, respectively), 4 in Florida, 152 in Georgia, 44 in Missouri, 62 in Tennessee and 22 in Kentucky (one—Logan County—currently is in Order 46, and 21 currently are unregulated). Of these 21 counties, 14 were part of the former Paducah, Kentucky (Order 99) marketing area. Eleven Arkansas and 22 Missouri counties are part of the current Order 106 marketing area. Six Missouri counties are part of the current Order 32 marketing area. Sixteen southeastern Missouri counties are unregulated (4 of these were part of the former Paducah Federal milk order). A partial Missouri county that was proposed to be part of the Southeast area is omitted for the purpose reducing the incidence of partially regulated counties.

The Southeast market spans the southeastern area of the United States from the Gulf of Mexico and the Alabama/Georgia-Florida border north to central Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, and South Carolina, and from the Atlantic Ocean west to Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. Measuring the extreme dimensions, this market extends about 575 miles north to south from central Missouri to southern Louisiana and 750 miles west to east from Louisiana's border with Texas to the Atlantic Ocean coast in southern Georgia.

The Southeast marketing area is contiguous to 4 other consolidated marketing areas: Florida to the southeast, the Southwest to the west, the Central to the northwest, and the Appalachian to the northeast and east. Georgia's coastline on the Atlantic Ocean is about 100 miles in length, while western Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana extend about 600 miles along the Gulf of Mexico coastline. Also contiguous to the current Southeast market are currently unregulated counties in Texas, Missouri, Kentucky (and as of October 1, 1997, the Tennessee Valley (Order 11) marketing area). The consolidated marketing area would encompass all of these counties in the Southwest, Central, Appalachian, or Southeast marketing areas, with some currently unregulated counties in central Missouri remaining unregulated under this proposal.

In terms of physical geography, the Southeast region is generally flat or gently rolling low-lying land. Relatively higher elevations, which might potentially form natural barriers or obstruct easy transportation exist in northwestern Arkansas and northeast Georgia.

Moving from the south to the north of the Southeast market, climates range from humid subtropical in coastal areas to warm and humid or humid continental to temperate in Tennessee and Kentucky. Warm, humid summers and mild winters are typical in the Southeast. These types of climates can severely limit the production level of dairy herds in the summer.

**Population**

According to July 1, 1997, population estimates, the total population in the consolidated Southeast marketing area is 26.9 million. The 42 Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) in the market account for 62.3 percent of the total marketing area population. Almost half of the Southeast population is located in the 17 most populous MSAs. Eight MSAs have populations greater than 500,000 each; their total population is about 36 percent of the Southeast population. Because of the large number of MSAs in the Southeast market and also because no large (i.e., greater than 500,000) population centers are added to this market, only those areas with populations greater than 500,000 are described in greater detail.

Over 25 percent of the Southeast market's population is located in Georgia, the most populous of the Southeast, with 7.2 million people. Almost half of Georgia's population is concentrated in the Atlanta MSA, located about 60 miles south of the Southeast-Appalachian marketing area boundary in the northwest portion of the state. Atlanta is the largest city in the Southeast market with a population of 3.6 million.

With 4.3 million people, Alabama is the Southeast market area's third most populous state. Birmingham and Mobile, the state's two largest MSA regions, are among the top eight in population in the Southeast. The Birmingham area has a population of about 900,000 and ranks 5th in size among all Southeast area MSAs. Birmingham is located about 150 miles west of Atlanta in north central Alabama. The Mobile area is a Gulf of Mexico port city in southwestern Alabama. With a population of 527,000, Mobile is the 8th largest population center in the Southeast market area.

Louisiana is the second most populous state in the Southeast market area with 4.4 million people. Two of the Southeast's 8 largest MSAs are located in Louisiana—New Orleans, the second largest MSA with 1.3 million people, and Baton Rouge, the 6th largest MSA with almost .6 million people. New Orleans is located in the state's "toe" in southeastern Louisiana. Baton Rouge also is located in Louisiana's "toe," about 80 miles west of New Orleans.

Arkansas has a total population of 2.5 million—2 million from the current Southeast marketing area and an additional 500,000 from the Arkansas portion of the Southwest Plains marketing area. The Little Rock-North Little Rock, Arkansas (Little Rock) MSA, in the center of Arkansas, has the 7th largest population concentration in the Southeast market area with 552,000.

The portion of Tennessee in the Southeast marketing area is the fourth most populated with 3.4 million people and is home to the third and fourth largest MSAs in the Southeast. The Nashville area, with a population of 1.1 million, is located in central Tennessee. The Memphis, Tennessee/Arkansas/Mississippi MSA, also with a population of 1.1 million, is located near these three state borders.

Other states or portions of states in the Southeast marketing area do not have MSAs with greater than 500,000 population. Mississippi, the Southeast's 5th most populous state, has a total population of 2.7 million. The Missouri, Florida, and Kentucky counties in the Southeast market have populations of 1.3 million, 602,000 and 529,000, respectively.

**Fluid Per Capita Consumption**

Fluid per capita consumption estimates vary throughout the Southeast...
Milk Production

Milk production data for the Southeast consolidated order area have not been updated from January 1997 to October 1997 as have the data for most of the other consolidated order areas. As a result of terminating the Tennessee Valley order as of October 1997, three of the Tennessee Valley-regulated handlers became pool plants under the Southeast order, on the basis of having at least 10% of their sales in the Southeast order marketing area. These handlers will become regulated under the consolidated Appalachian marketing area when the consolidated orders become effective. Consequently, milk production data for the consolidated Southeast order area based on October 1997 pool data would not be representative of the consolidated Southeast market. Available information indicates that the sources of milk for the consolidated Southeast market have not changed significantly from the January 1997 data.

In January 1997, 4,180 producers from 388 counties pooled 477.4 million pounds of producer milk on the current Southeast market. Over 85 percent of the Southeast's producer milk came from Southeast market area counties. Of the 388 counties, 19 pooled over 5 million pounds each, accounting for 39 percent of Order 7's producer milk. Of these 19 counties, 2 Texas counties are located outside the Southeast marketing area. Because of the large number of counties, only the locations for those top 19 production counties are described in greater detail. However, the volume of producer milk, number of producers (farms) and number of counties is provided for each state within the market area.

Almost 73 million pounds of milk were pooled on the Southeast market from 581 producers in 28 Louisiana parishes in January 1997. Top production parishes are Tangipahoa, Washington and St. Helena, all located in the state's "toe" north of New Orleans and northeast of Baton Rouge, each bordering Mississippi. Another high production area is centered on De Soto Parish in northwestern Louisiana. These four parishes account for over 62 million pounds of producer milk, with 76 percent coming from Tangipahoa and Washington parishes.

Almost 67 million pounds of milk were pooled on the Southeast market from 331 producers in 68 Georgia counties in January 1997. Of this volume, 64 million came from 312 producers in 64 Georgia counties in the Order 7 marketing area. The balance is associated with Georgia producers located in the marketing area of the former Order 11 (Tennessee Valley). Top production counties are Putnam, Morgan and Macon, which pooled 27 million pounds of producer milk on Order 7.

About 65 million pounds of milk were pooled on the Southeast market from 580 producers in 46 Tennessee counties in January 1997. Of this volume, 62 million came from 562 producers in 42 Tennessee counties in the Order 7 marketing area. The balance is associated with Tennessee producers located in the marketing area of the former Federal Order 11. Two high production counties in the state are Marshall and Lincoln, located in south central Tennessee. These counties contributed over 12 million pounds of producer milk to the Order 7 pool in January 1997.

About 61 million pounds of milk were pooled on the Southeast market from 443 producers in 48 Mississippi counties in January 1997. Top production counties are Walthall and Pike, in southern Mississippi on the state's border with Louisiana. These two counties adjoin the heavy milk production area in Louisiana. The counties contributed 15 million pounds of producer milk to the Order 7 pool in January 1997.

About 32 million pounds of milk were pooled on the Southeast market from 408 producers in 19 Kentucky counties in January 1997. Additionally, 116 producers in 15 of these counties pooled almost 9 million pounds of producer milk on Orders 11 and 46 (Louisville-Lexington-Evansville). Two counties, Barren and Monroe, contributed over 13 million pounds of producer milk. These contiguous counties are in south central Kentucky about 80 miles northeast of Nashville, Tennessee.

Four Missouri counties—Wright, Texas, Laclede and Howell—pooled 33 million pounds of producer milk on Order 7. All of these counties currently are located in the Order 106 (Southwest Plains) marketing area in southern Missouri.

Other Southeast marketing area states or areas contribute producer milk to the Southeast marketwide pool. About 37 million pounds of milk were pooled on the Southeast market from 205 producers in 51 Alabama counties, and 25 million pounds were pooled from 343 producers in 39 Arkansas counties. Sixteen Florida producers from 6 counties (2 in the Southeast market area) pooled 3.5 million pounds on Order 7 in January 1997.

In January 1997, Order 7 producer milk also originated in Missouri counties not included in the Southeast marketing area, Texas, New Mexico, Indiana and Oklahoma. Approximately 22 million pounds from Missouri (21 million pounds in addition to the 33 million described previously) and Texas (46 million pounds—20 million from Hopkins and Erath Counties) were associated with the Order 7 pool.

Distributing Plants

Using distributing plant lists included in the proposed rule, with the pooling standards adjusted to 25 percent of route disposition as in-area sales, updated for known plant closures through December 1998, 48 distributing plants located in the consolidated Southeast marketing area would be expected to be associated with the Southeast market (including the added territory in northwestern Arkansas and southern Missouri). These plants include 36 fully regulated distributing plants, 3 of which are currently regulated under the Southwest Plains order and one of which is currently partially regulated. In addition, it is expected that 3 plants would be partially regulated (one of which is fully regulated and two of which are partially regulated), and 7 plants that are, and are expected to be, exempt—1 on the basis of size and 6 on the basis of institutional status. An additional currently regulated plant is expected to be exempt on the basis of institutional status. Of the 36 fully regulated plants, 16 are located in the largest eight MSA regions. One distributing plant located in the consolidated Appalachian marketing area that has more than half of its route disposition within the Southeast marketing area would be locked into regulation under the Appalachian order.
Since October 1997, it is known that 2 pool distributing plants have gone out of business. One of these plants was located in Louisiana and the other in Missouri.

Of the 48 distributing plants, Georgia has 9; Louisiana, 10; Mississippi, 6; Alabama, 8; Arkansas, 6; Tennessee, 5; Missouri, 2; and Kentucky, 2. No distributing plants are located in the Florida counties included in the Southeast market area.

In Georgia, three pool distributing plants and one producer-handler are located in the Atlanta area, with 3 others elsewhere in the State. Georgia also has 1 partially regulated handler and 1 government agency (state prison) plant.

Eight of Louisiana's 10 distributing plants currently are and would continue to be fully regulated (pool plants) in this consolidated marketing area. Four of these 8 are located in either the New Orleans or Baton Rouge areas (2 in each). Four other pool distributing plants are located in Louisiana. The remaining two plants are affiliated with educational institutions.

Four of Mississippi's 6 currently operational distributing plants would be fully regulated pool plants in the Southeast market. Two educational institutions also have plants.

Seven of Alabama's distributing plants are fully regulated. One is located in the Birmingham area and 2 are located in the Mobile area. Of the remaining four, 2 are in northern Alabama, one is in central Alabama, and one is in the state's southeastern corner.

Four of Arkansas' 6 currently operational distributing plants are fully regulated; two are in the Little Rock area, and the other 2 are located in northwest Arkansas. Also located within Arkansas are 2 exempt distributing plants—one on the basis of size and one that is a state prison plant. Four of Tennessee's 5 distributing plants are, and are expected to be, fully regulated. Three of the 4 are located in the Nashville area and one fully regulated plant and one partially regulated plant are located in the Memphis area.

Two distributing plants that would be fully regulated under the Southeast market are located in the currently unregulated Kentucky counties that are added to this marketing area. One is located in Fulton in the southwest corner of Kentucky on the Tennessee border, and the other about 30 miles east of Fulton.

Two Missouri distributing plants are located in the consolidated Southeast area. One is a pool plant located in Springfield, and the other a plant exempt on the basis of institutional status located just south of the Springfield MSA.

Utilization

As in the case of milk production data, October 1997 data for the consolidated Southeast order are not used because of the termination that month of the Tennessee Valley order. Instead of using October 1995 data from the proposed rule, however, September 1997 data is used as representative for this section.

According to September 1997 pool statistics for handlers who are expected to be fully regulated under the Southeast order, the Class I utilization for the Southeast market was 84 percent. Based on calculated weighted average use values for (1) the current order with current use of milk, and (2) the current order with projected use of milk in the consolidated Southeast order, the potential impact of this rule on producers who supply the current market area is estimated to be a 3-cent per hundredweight increase (from $13.60 to $13.63).

For September 1997, Class I utilization for the Southeast market was 83.9 percent based on 357.2 million pounds of producer milk used in Class I out of 426 million total producer milk pounds.

Other Plants

Also located within the Southeast marketing area during May 1997 were 37 supply or manufacturing plants: 1 in Kentucky, 5 in Alabama (including 1 in the Birmingham area), 5 in Arkansas (including 1 in the Little Rock area), 7 in Georgia (including 4 in the Atlanta area), 3 in Louisiana (including 1 in the Baton Rouge area), 11 in Missouri, 2 in Mississippi, and 3 in Tennessee (including 1 each in the Memphis and Nashville areas). Eight of the 37 plants are pool plants. Of these pool plants, 2 primarily ship to distributing plants, 3 manufacture cheese, 1 manufactures Class II products, 1 manufactures butter and 1 primarily manufactures other products. Of the Southeast marketing area's 28 nonpool plants, 13 manufacture primarily Class II products, 3 manufacture cheese, 10 manufacture primarily other products, and 1 each manufacture primarily butter and cheese. One plant is a "split plant," with one side serving as a manufacturing facility primarily for Class II products, while the other side receives and ships Grade A milk.

Criteria for Consolidation

Retention of the Southeast marketing area as a single area is based on overlapping route dispositions within the marketing area to a greater extent than with other marketing areas. Procurement of producer milk also overlaps between states within the market. There is also a seasonal need for milk from outside the marketing area. However, the amount of supplemental seasonal supplies is not as great as the amount of milk that is actually pooled under the order from distant areas. There is common cooperative association membership within the marketing area.

As noted in the proposed rule, the addition of northwest Arkansas and southern Missouri to the marketing area is primarily in response to comments received during the public comment period.

Discussion of Comments and Alternatives

Prior to issuance of the proposed rule, alternatives that were considered included incorporating all of the State of Kentucky in the Southeast area, dividing the Southeast area on the state line between Mississippi and Alabama, combining the Florida, Carolina, Tennessee Valley and Southeast order areas, and adding the eastern part of the Texas order area to the Southeast. These
alternatives were analyzed in detail for the proposed rule and determined not to result in a configuration of marketing areas as appropriate as those proposed for reasons discussed in the proposed rule.

Seven comments filed in response to the proposed rule specifically addressed the consolidated Southeast marketing area. A comment filed on behalf of Piedmont Milk Sales, Inc., Hunter Farms, Land O'Sun, and MilkoCo., supported and endorsed the portion of the proposed rule that would maintain separate order areas for the Southeast and Appalachian areas. Comments filed by DFA and by Carolina-Virginia Milk Producers Association favored combining the proposed Southeast and Appalachian order areas. In addition, the Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation urged that all Kentucky counties and the proposed Appalachian order be combined with the Southeast. The comment stated that such a configuration would make milk utilization rates more similar across the order area and encourage milk to flow to deficit areas and minimize any negative price impacts on producers. These comments were considered in the discussion of comments and alternatives under the Appalachian area.

Comments from Carolina-Virginia Milk Producers Association and Missouri Farm Bureau Federation support the inclusion, as proposed, of southern Missouri/northwest Arkansas in the Southeast marketing area. The Carolina-Virginia Milk Producers Association's comment noted that this area is a crucial part of the supply area for the southeastern region, and that the exclusion of the area from the consolidated Southeast order area could have a detrimental impact on the over-order premium structure of that area. The comment stated that the correction of producer blend prices and creation of a unified marketing area in that part of the southeastern region is justified. With regard to southern Missouri, a representative of the Subcommittee on Livestock of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture supported adding southeastern Missouri to the Southeast order area, as proposed. A comment filed by Barber Pure Milk Company opposed adding northwest Arkansas/southern Missouri to the Southeast marketing area on the basis of the minimal overlapping route disposition and potential of diluting the Southeast pool.

A substantial share of the milk production from the portions of Missouri and Arkansas that are added to the Southeast marketing area is pooled under the Southeast order, and this milk represents a substantial share of the total milk production that is pooled under the Southeast market.

Route disposition by distributing plants located within this area would become in-area disposions from Southeast pool distributing plants. More than half of the disposions from the three plants that would become Southeast pool distributing plants would be within the consolidated Southeast marketing area.

**Mideast**

The consolidated Mideast marketing area is comprised of the current Ohio Valley (Order 33), Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania (Order 36), Southern Michigan (Order 40), part of the Michigan Upper Peninsula (Order 44), and Indiana (Order 49) marketing areas plus 6 currently unregulated Indiana counties, 2 whole and 3 partial currently unregulated Michigan counties, and 3 whole and 2 partial currently unregulated Ohio counties. There would be 301 whole and 1 partial county in this consolidated area. Three whole and one partial currently unregulated Ohio counties that were proposed to be part of the Mideast area are not included.

**Geography**

The Mideast market is described geographically as follows:

- **Indiana**—72 counties (64 currently in Order 49, 2 currently in Order 33, and 6 currently unregulated on the western edge of the State, just south of the northwest corner) Kentucky—18 counties (all currently in Order 33).
- **Michigan**—77 counties. Two whole and 3 partial counties currently are unregulated. The rest of the area currently is included in Orders 40, 44, 49, and 33. Of the total 83 Michigan counties, only 6 in the western end of the Upper Peninsula are not included in the consolidated Mideast marketing area.
- **Ohio**—84 whole and 1 partial county. Three whole and 2 partial counties to be included currently are unregulated. All of the State currently is included in Orders 33 and 36, except for 3 partial and 6 whole counties.
- **Pennsylvania**—12 whole and 2 partial counties, currently in the Order 36 area.
- **West Virginia**—37 counties; 20 currently in Order 33, 17 currently in Order 36.

The consolidated Mideast marketing area lies directly south of the Great Lakes, with the State of Michigan included to the east and west sides by Lakes Huron and Michigan. On the eastern border of the marketing area, between the Mideast and Northeast marketing areas, is Pennsylvania State-regulated territory and the Allegheny and Appalachian Mountains. On the northeast border is the Western New York State order area.

The east-to-west distance across the consolidated marketing area is approximately 450 miles, from locations on the eastern edge of the area in western Pennsylvania to the border of Indiana and Illinois. Northwest to southeast, from Marquette, Michigan, in the Upper Peninsula to the northeast area of Kentucky in the marketing area is just over 800 miles. From the northern tip of lower Michigan to southern Indiana the more direct north-south distance is 530 miles.

The consolidated Mideast marketing area is contiguous to 3 other consolidated marketing areas. The consolidated Central marketing area would provide the western border of the Mideast marketing area along the Indiana-Illinois border, and the consolidated Appalachian area would provide the southern boundary. The western end of Michigan's Upper Peninsula, part of the consolidated Upper Midwest area, would adjoin the Mideast portion of the Upper Peninsula.

In terms of physical geography, most of the consolidated Mideast marketing area is at low elevations, and relatively flat. The climate and topography are favorable to milk production, with dairy being the number one agricultural commodity in terms of financial receipts in the State of Michigan in 1996. Dairy also ranks high in terms of financial receipts in the rest of the area; 3rd in Ohio and West Virginia, and 5th in Indiana.

**Population**

According to July 1, 1997, population estimates, the total population in the consolidated marketing area is 31 million. The 34 MSAs in the consolidated Mideast marketing area include 79.8 percent of the area's population. Over 55 percent of the area's population is contained in the 8 most populous MSAs, which each have over 950,000 people. Two-thirds of the population is located in the states of Michigan and Ohio.

The Mideast area's largest and 7th largest of the 34 MSAs are located in Michigan. Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint, with 5.4 million population, is the largest MSA, and is located in the southeast portion of the state between Lakes Huron and Erie. Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland is the 7th largest MSA, is located approximately 150 miles west-northwest of Detroit, and has a population of 1 million. These two...
MSAs contain two-thirds of the population of Michigan. There are 5 other MSAs in Michigan. Two have approximately 450,000 population each, one has approximately 400,000 population, and the other two average approximately 160,000 apiece. Eighty-four percent of the population of Michigan is located in these 7 MSAs, all in the lower half of southern Michigan.

Four of the 8 largest Mideast MSAs are located in the State of Ohio. These are: (1) Cleveland-Akron, the second-largest, with a population of 2.9 million, located on Lake Erie in northwestern Ohio; (2) Cincinnati-Hamilton, OH-KY-IN, the 4th largest, with a population of 1.9 million, located in the southwest corner of Ohio; (3) Columbus, the 6th largest, with a population of 1.5 million, located approximately midway between Cincinnati and Cleveland; and (4) Dayton, the 8th largest, with a population of .95 million.

There are 6 additional MSAs in Ohio, 2 with populations of approximately .6 million each, 1 with a population of .4 million, and 3 that average just over 150,000 each. Eighty-two percent of the population of Ohio is located in MSAs, most in the northern part of the State.

The third-largest MSA in the Mideast area is Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, with a population of 2.4 million. Pittsburgh is 127 miles southeast of Cleveland. There are two smaller MSAs in the Pennsylvania portion of the consolidated Mideast marketing area, having an average population of about 200,000 each. Eighty-seven percent of the population of the Pennsylvania portion of the Mideast area is located in MSAs.

Indianapolis, Indiana, is the 5th largest MSA in the consolidated Mideast marketing area, with a population of 1.5 million. Indiana contains 9 additional MSAs, 2 with populations of .5 and .6 million, and 7 others that average 155,000 population. All but 2 of the 9 smaller MSAs are located north of Indianapolis. Seventy-four percent of the population of the portion of Indiana that is in the consolidated Mideast area is located in MSAs.

The portion of West Virginia that is within the consolidated Mideast area contains 4 MSAs, 3 of which are located on the West Virginia-Ohio border, along the Ohio River. The population of these MSAs averages just over 200,000. Forty-five percent of the population of the West Virginia portion of the consolidated Mideast area is located in MSAs.

**Fluid Per Capita Consumption.**

Estimates of fluid per capita consumption within the consolidated Mideast area vary from 18.75 pounds per month for Michigan to 20.4 pounds per month for Indiana. Use of 19 pounds per month as a weighted average results in an estimated 589 million pounds of fluid milk consumption for the Mideast marketing area. Mideast handlers' route disposition within the area during October 1997 totaled 544 million pounds, with another 36 million distributed by 23 handlers fully regulated under other orders. An additional 4.5 million pounds was distributed by partially regulated handlers, producer-handlers, and handlers that would be exempt under this rule on the basis of having less than 150,000 pounds of route disposition per month.

**Milk Production.**

In October 1997, nearly 11,000 producers from 335 counties in 12 states pooled 1 billion pounds of milk on Federal Orders 33, 36, 40, 44 and 49. Over 90 percent of this producer milk came from Mideast marketing area counties. The States of Indiana, Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania supplied 95 percent of the milk (13%, 30.6%, and 11.9%, respectively), with 90 percent coming from counties that would be in the consolidated Mideast area. Just over two-thirds of the milk pooled under these orders was produced in Michigan and Ohio counties located within the consolidated marketing area.

Other states pooling milk on the orders consolidated in the Mideast area were Illinois (0.5%), Iowa (0.1%), Kentucky (0.1%), Maryland (0.4%), New York (2.7%), Virginia (0.1%), West Virginia (1.0%), and Wisconsin (0.1%). These states contributed a total of 4.9 percent of the milk pooled on the orders.

Sixty-two of the counties that had production pooled under the five current orders supplied more than 5 million pounds of milk each during October 1997. Six of the counties were in northern and northeast Indiana, over 100 miles from Indianapolis; 11 were in western Pennsylvania—7 of them within 100 miles of Pittsburgh, and the others, including those with the most production (10–22 million pounds), in the northwest corner of the state, within 100 miles of Cleveland, Ohio. Twenty-eight Michigan counties pooled more than 5 million pounds each under the 5 orders, including 14 counties with more than 10 million pounds and 4 counties with more than 20 million pounds. All of these counties are located within 110 miles of Detroit or Grand Rapids, the two largest MSAs in Michigan. The heaviest milk production area of Ohio is the northeast quadrant of the State and within 50 miles of the Akron-Cleveland MSA, including 5 counties supplying over 10 million pounds each during October 1997, and 1 county pooling over 40 million pounds. A smaller production area in Ohio is located in the central portion of the western edge of the State within 80 miles of the Dayton MSA, and includes two counties with over 10 million pounds production and 1 county with over 20 million. The only population centers of the marketing area that do not appear to have adequate supplies of nearby milk are Indianapolis and Cincinnati, in the southern portion of the area.

**Distributing Plants.**

Using distributing plant lists included in the proposed rule, with the pooling standards adjusted to 25 percent of route disposition as in-area sales, updated for known plant closures through January 1998, 72 distributing plants would be expected to be associated with the Mideast marketing area, including 51 fully regulated distributing plants (all currently fully regulated), 4 partially regulated (all currently partially regulated), 4 exempt plants that would have less than 150,000 pounds of total route disposition per month (all currently fully regulated), and 13 producer-handlers (all currently producer-handlers). Since October 1997, 5 distributing plants (1 fully regulated in Indiana and 1 in Michigan; 2 partially regulated in Pennsylvania; and a producer-handler in Pennsylvania), have gone out of business. There would be 40 distributing plants in the 8 Mideast MSAs that each have over a million people (including Dayton-Springfield which has 950,000). Twenty-seven of these plants would be pool plants—5 in the Pittsburgh area, 6 in the Detroit area, 4 in the Cleveland area, 3 each in the Grand Rapids, Indianapolis and Cincinnati areas, 2 in Columbus and 1 in Dayton. Nine of the plants in the large MSA areas would be producer-handlers, 3 would be exempt on the basis of having less than 150,000 pounds of milk per month in Class I route dispositions, and 1 would be partially regulated.

Of the remaining 29 distributing plants located in the marketing area, 18 would be located in other MSA’s as follows: 5 pool plants and 1 producer-handler in Ohio; 4 pool plants in Indiana; 4 pool plants in Michigan; 2 pool plants in Pennsylvania; 1 pool plant in Kentucky; and 1 pool plant in
West Virginia. The ten remaining distributing plants located in the marketing area would not be located in MSA’s. Three of these pool plants and 2 producer-handlers would be located in Michigan; 2 pool plants and 1 plant exempt on the basis of size would be located in Ohio; 2 pool plants would be located in Indiana; and 1 producer-handler would be located in West Virginia.

There are 3 distributing plants that would be outside the marketing area. These would be 1 partially regulated plant in Pennsylvania, and 1 in Virginia. In addition, a small pocket of unregulated area within Ohio would contain one partially regulated plant.

The in-area route disposition standard, proposed to be 30 percent of route dispositions, will instead be 25 percent—the same percentage as in other consolidated orders. This percentage should not result in the full regulation of any handler not currently fully regulated unless they increase sales in the marketing area.

Utilization

According to October 1997 pool statistics for handlers who would be fully regulated under this Mideast order, the Class I utilization percentages for the Ohio Valley, Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania, Southern Michigan, Michigan Upper Peninsula, and Indiana markets were 58, 58, 55, 89, and 70 percent, respectively. Based on calculated weighted average use values for (1) the current order with current use of milk, and (2) the current order with projected use of milk in the consolidated Mideast order, the potential impact of this consolidation on producers who supply the current market areas is estimated to be: Ohio Valley, a 4-cent per cwt increase (from $13.46 to $13.50); Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania, a 4-cent per cwt decrease (from $13.51 to $13.47); Southern Michigan, a 6-cent per cwt increase (from $13.27 to $13.33); Michigan Upper Peninsula, a 25-cent per cwt decrease (from $13.34 to $13.09); and Indiana, a 11-cent per cwt decrease (from $13.52 to $13.41). The large decrease for Michigan Upper Peninsula is a result of changing from its current individual handler pool provisions to a market-wide pool (very little reserve milk is pooled under Order 44—instead, it is pooled on the Southern Michigan order). For October 1997, combined Class I utilization for Orders 33, 36, 40, 44 and 49 was 58.7 percent based on 601.6 million pounds of producer milk used in Class I out of 1.025 billion total producer milk pounds pooled. The weighted average use value for the consolidated Mideast market is estimated to be $13.42 per hundredweight.

The Mideast is one of two consolidated marketing areas that has a significantly-than-average percentage of its milk used in Class II. Currently, the Southern Michigan, Ohio Valley and Indiana markets have Class II utilization over 20 percent. When the markets are combined the average for the consolidated market will be just under 20 percent.

Other Plants

Also located within the Mideast marketing area during May 1997 were 59 supply or manufacturing plants: 1 in Charleston, West Virginia, 4 in Pennsylvania, 18 in Michigan, 9 in Indiana, and 27 in Ohio. Nine of the 59 plants are pool plants. Of these pool plants, 6 are supply plants—1 manufactures primarily Class II products; 3 manufacture primarily powder; and 1 makes a primary product, only shipping to distributing plants. Three pool plants are manufacturing plants, manufacturing primarily cheese. Of the 50 nonpool plants in the Mideast marketing area, one is a supply plant that manufactures primarily cheese. The other 49 nonpool plants are manufacturing plants. In this area of high Class II use, 28 of the nonpool plants manufacture primarily Class II products. In addition, 1 manufactures primarily butter, 1 manufactures primarily powder, 27 manufacture primarily cheese, and 2 manufacture primarily nonpool products.

There are also two manufacturing plants in the currently-unregulated area of Ohio—a nonpool plant that manufactures primarily Class II products in the unregulated county of Erie, Ohio and a nonpool plant that manufactures primarily cheese in the unregulated area of Sandusky, Ohio.

Cooperative Associations

In December 1997, 20 cooperative associations pooled member milk under the 5 orders to be consolidated (considering Milk Marketing, Inc., and Mid-America Dairymen, Inc., as one entity—DFA). Two of the cooperatives pooled milk on the four principal orders, 3 cooperatives had member milk pooled on 3 of the principal orders, 3 cooperatives pooled milk on 2 of the principal orders, and 12 of the cooperatives pooled milk on only one of the orders. The percentage of cooperative member milk pooled on each of the orders varied from 44 percent under Order 36 to 86.5 percent under Order 40. Of the total milk pooled on the 5 orders in December 1997, 68 percent was marketed by cooperative associations.

Criteria for Consolidation

Overlapping route disposition, overlapping production areas, natural boundaries, and multiple component pricing are all criteria that support the consolidation of these current order areas into a consolidated Mideast marketing area. Handlers who would be fully regulated under the consolidated order distribute approximately 90 percent of their route dispositions within the consolidated marketing area, and 93 percent of the milk distributed within the marketing area is from handlers who would be regulated under the order.

Many of the counties from which milk was pooled on the individual orders supplied milk to three or four of those orders. For instance, milk from a number of the same Michigan counties was pooled on the Ohio Valley, Indiana, and Southern Michigan orders; milk from several of the same Indiana counties was pooled on the Ohio Valley, Southern Michigan and Indiana counties; and milk from some of the same Ohio counties was pooled on the Ohio Valley, Indiana, and Southern Michigan orders.

The Great Lakes serve as natural boundaries on the northern edge of the area and on the eastern and western sides of Michigan, as do the mountains in central Pennsylvania. All of the orders involved in the consolidated Mideast area contain multiple component pricing provisions. Instead of the Southern Michigan component pricing plan, proposed for the consolidated Mideast order in the proposed rule, the same component pricing provisions adopted for the other consolidated orders have been incorporated in the Mideast order.

Discussion of Comments and Alternatives

Prior to issuance of the proposed rule, alternatives to the consolidation of the Ohio Valley, Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania, Southern Michigan, Indiana, and partial Michigan Upper Peninsula marketing areas that were considered included the addition of Pennsylvania Milk Marketing Board (PMMB) Area 6 to the consolidated Mideast area, with some consideration being given to the addition of currently-unregulated areas of Maryland and West Virginia, and moving the southern part of Ohio and part of West Virginia to the Appalachian order area.

Three comments that contained specifically to the consolidated Mideast marketing area were filed by 8
commenters in response to the proposed rule. Three of the comments from Michigan Milk Producers Association, United Dairy, Inc., and DFA, plus a very large number of comments that did not specifically mention the Mideast area, addressed the inclusion of unregulated areas in consolidated Federal order areas. The DFA comment included the signatures of 600 producers to a "Petition to Eliminate all Unregulated Market Areas in Pennsylvania."

Although the large number of comments that did not specifically mention the Mideast area were unclear about exactly what additional area should be added to the marketing area, they appeared to favor the addition of PMMB Area 6, with perhaps some western Maryland and West Virginia territory, to the eastern edge of the Mideast area.

As stated in the introduction to the consolidation discussion, consolidation of the existing orders does not necessitate expansion of the consolidated orders into currently-unregulated areas, especially if such expansion would result in the regulation of currently-unregulated handlers. Therefore, PMMB Area 6 and the unregulated portions of Maryland and West Virginia should not be added to the consolidated Mideast order area.

Two comments from DFA recommended including Charleston, West Virginia, and areas of West Virginia south of Charleston, as well as the Ohio counties surrounding Cincinnati and the northern counties of Kentucky, in the Appalachian market to help provide an economic incentive through the expected higher blend prices to processors to supply milk to the plants in that area. A comment by Trauth Dairy in Newport, Kentucky, also urged the inclusion of the northern area of Kentucky in the Appalachian area instead of the Mideast area. These comments are addressed in the description of comments and alternatives considered for the Appalachian order area.

Schneider's Dairy suggested that a pass-through provision similar to that of the current New York-New Jersey order be incorporated in the Mideast order to assure that regulated handlers distributing fluid milk products in unregulated areas where they compete with unregulated handlers are not disadvantaged. As discussed in the section of this decision dealing with Northeast regional issues, Class I prices are determined by the need to attract milk supplies to the location of the processing plant, and not by where the fluid products are distributed.

Therefore, a pass-through provision is not incorporated in either the Northeast order or this order. Independent Cooperative Milk Producers Association and Schneider's Dairy supported the consolidation of order areas to form the Mideast area as proposed.

Upper Midwest

The consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area is comprised of the current Upper Midwest (Order 68) and Chicago Regional (Order 30) marketing areas, with the addition of the western portion of the Michigan Upper Peninsula (Order 44) marketing area. There are 204 counties in this consolidated area. One partial Illinois county proposed to be part of the Central order area has been added to this area, and another partial Illinois county proposed to be part of this area has been changed to the Central order area.

Geography

The consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area is described geographically as follows: 15 counties in Illinois (all currently in Order 30), 6 counties in Iowa (all currently in Order 68), 6 counties in Michigan (all currently in Zones 1 and 1A of Order 44), 83 counties in Minnesota (all currently in Order 68), 16 counties in North Dakota (all currently in Order 68), 8 counties in South Dakota (all currently in Order 68), and 70 counties in Wisconsin (43 currently in Order 30, 20 currently in Order 68, and 7 currently unregulated). This market is about 600 miles east to west and about the same distance north to south.

The area described above is contiguous to the consolidated Central market to the south, a small corner of the consolidated Mideast market to the southeast, and the eastern portion of Michigan's Upper Peninsula, also part of the consolidated Mideast market, to the northeast. North of the Upper Midwest market is Lake Superior and the Canadian border, and west of the market is a large sparsely-populated and unregulated area. Most of the eastern border of the marketing area is Lake Michigan.

The consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area is generally low-lying, with some local differences in elevation in Wisconsin and the upper peninsula of Michigan. Natural vegetation in the western part of the area is tall-grass prairie, with the eastern two-thirds of the northern portion being broadleaf forest, coniferous forest, and mixed broadleaf and coniferous forest. Annual precipitation averages 30-35 inches per year. Most of the area experiences summer temperatures that average about 75 degrees; the northern and western portions average winter temperatures are in the low 'teens, while the southern and more eastern portions experience average winter temperatures in the 20's. The far western part of the market predominantly grows mixed field crops, with cattle and soybeans more to the southwest. Both Minnesota and Wisconsin are included in the top five milk-producing states, and dairy is the number 1 agricultural enterprise in Wisconsin, generating over half of the State's income derived from agricultural commodities.

Population

According to July 1, 1997, population estimates, the total population of the consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area is approximately 18.5 million. Using Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), there are 3 population centers over 1 million. The Chicago-Gary-Kenosha area, primarily in northeastern Illinois, is the largest, with a 7.9 million population in the marketing area. The Minneapolis-St. Paul area, located mostly in Minnesota, is next with 2.8 million; and the third-largest MSA is Milwaukee-Racine, Wisconsin, with a population of 1.6 million. The Chicago area is located in the southeast corner of the marketing area, on the west side of the southern end of Lake Michigan, with Milwaukee approximately 85 miles north, also along Lake Michigan. Minneapolis is located 400 miles northwest of Chicago, along the Minnesota-Wisconsin border.

Approximately two-thirds of the population of the consolidated marketing area is within the three largest MSAs, with 81 percent of the population contained within the area's 17 MSA's (with the 14 smaller MSAs averaging 196,000 population). Sixty percent of the population of the market is concentrated in the Illinois and southeast Wisconsin portion of the marketing area. In Wisconsin, nearly 90 percent of the population is located in the southern two-thirds of the state, and in Minnesota 85 percent of the population is in the southern half of the state.

Fluid Per Capita Consumption

Based on the population figure of 18.5 million and an estimated per capita fluid milk consumption rate of 20 pounds of fluid milk per month, total fluid milk consumption in the consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area is estimated at 370 million pounds per month. Plants that are fully regulated distributing plants under the Upper Midwest order had route
disposition within the market of 343 million pounds in October 1997. Handlers fully regulated under other Federal orders distributed 43 million pounds in the consolidated marketing area during October 1997, while partially regulated plants distributed 1.7 million pounds. Producer-handlers and exempt plants operating in the combined marketing areas during this month had a combined route disposition of less than .5 million pounds.

Milk Production

In October 1997, 2.4 billion pounds of milk were associated with the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest markets, but only 1.6 billion pounds of milk were pooled because of class price relationships. The 2.4 billion pounds were produced by 27,250 producers located in 13 states from Tennessee to Minnesota, and from New Mexico to Michigan. However, over 93 percent of the producer milk was produced within the consolidated marketing area, and 91.4 percent was produced within the states of Wisconsin and Minnesota. As with population density and milk plant density, most milk production in Minnesota and Wisconsin occurs in the southern parts of these states. Over 85 percent of Wisconsin milk associated with the combined Chicago Regional-Upper Midwest orders in October 1997 was produced in the southern two-thirds of the State, while 84 percent of the Minnesota milk associated with the two orders was produced in the southern half of Minnesota.

Fifty-two counties, 10 in Iowa, 15 in Minnesota, and 27 in Wisconsin supplied milk to both the current Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders during October 1997. The largest part of the common production area is in Wisconsin, where 27 counties supply 25 percent of the milk associated with Order 30, and 30 percent of the milk associated with Order 68. When data for the 52 counties is combined, 26 percent of the Chicago Regional market and 42 percent of the Upper Midwest market is supplied by this common production area.

Distributing Plants

Using distributing plant lists included in the proposed rule, with the pooling standards adjusted to 25 percent of route disposition as in-area sales, updated for known plant closures through December 1998, 35 distributing plants would be expected to be associated with the Upper Midwest marketing area, including 27 fully regulated distributing plants (2 currently partially regulated and 25 currently pool plants), 4 partially regulated (3 currently partially regulated and 1 currently fully regulated), 1 producer-handler, and 3 exempt plants, based on distributing less than 150,000 pounds of total route disposition per month (1 new, 1 currently partially regulated, and 1 currently unregulated). Since October 1997, one pool distributing plant and one partially regulated plant have gone out of business.

There would be 6 distributing plants in the Chicago area (5 pool plants and 1 exempt plant). The Milwaukee-Racine area would have 2 pool distributing plants. There would be 7 distributing plants in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area (6 pool plants and 1 partially regulated plant). Of the remaining 20 distributing plants, 16 are located in other MSAs as follows: 4 pool plants in Minnesota, 2 pool plants and 2 partially regulated plants in North Dakota, 1 pool plant in Illinois, and 5 pool plants, 1 partially regulated plant, and 1 exempt plant in Wisconsin. Four of the remaining distributing plants are not located in MSAs: 1 pool plant and 1 exempt plant in Minnesota, 1 producer-handler in Wisconsin and 1 pool plant in Michigan.

Utilization

According to October 1997 pool statistics for handlers who would be fully regulated under this Upper Midwest order, the Class I utilization percentages for the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest were 29 and 19 percent, respectively. Based on calculated weighted average use values for (1) the current order with current use of milk, and (2) the current order with projected use of milk in the consolidated Upper Midwest order, the potential impact of this consolidation on producers who supply the current market areas is estimated to be: Chicago Regional, a 4-cent per cwt decrease (from $12.98 to $12.94), and Upper Midwest, a 2-cent per cwt decrease (from $12.89 to $12.87). The weighted average use value for the consolidated Upper Midwest market, based on October 1997 data, is estimated to be $12.94 per hundredweight. However, a substantial amount of milk was omitted from both pools for October 1997 because of unusual class price relationships. Annual Class I utilization percentages may be considered more representative for these markets. For the year 1997, the annual Class I utilization percentage for the Chicago Regional market was 21.5, with 18.7 for the Upper Midwest. The Class I use percentage for the entire Michigan Upper Peninsula market, which has a individual handler pool and represents a very small portion of the producer milk that would be expected to be pooled under the consolidated Upper Midwest order, was 89 percent. It is estimated that the Class I use percentage for the consolidated order would be in the neighborhood of 20 percent.

Other Plants

Located within the consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area during May 1997 were 301 manufacturing plants: 1 in South Dakota, 3 in Iowa, 28 in Illinois (12 in the Chicago area), 39 in Minnesota (over three-quarters of which are located in the southeastern quarter of the state), and 230 in Wisconsin (over 90 percent of which are scattered throughout the southern three-quarters of the state). One hundred five of the plants are pool plants, or have a “pool side.” Eighty-five of the 105 pool plants (1 in Iowa, 4 in Illinois, 16 in Minnesota and 64 in Wisconsin) are “split plants,” that is, one side of a plant is a manufacturing facility and the other side receives and ships Grade A milk, and accounting is done separately. In most cases, the nonpool portion of such a plant is a manufacturing operation, primarily cheese-making. Most of the other pool plants are pool supply plants, located primarily in Wisconsin, that ship milk to pool distributing plants.

The 196 nonpool plants in the consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area are manufacturing plants—103 manufacture primarily cheese, 15 manufacture primarily Class II products, 15 manufacture primarily butter, 23 manufacture primarily milk powders, and 39 manufacture primarily other products.

Also associated with the Upper Midwest order, but not within the marketing area, are 2 pool supply plants and 6 manufacturing plants (3 manufacturing primarily cheese, 2 making Class II products, and 1 butter plant) in North Dakota.

Cooperative Associations

In December 1997, 67 cooperative associations pooled member milk on the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders, providing 99 percent of the milk pooled under each of the two orders. Nine of the cooperatives marketed milk in both orders; accounting for nearly half of the milk pooled in the Upper Midwest (42.9 percent of the cooperative member milk), and 66.8 percent of the milk pooled in the Chicago Regional market (67.5 percent of total cooperative milk). In the two markets, 16 cooperatives pooled milk only under Order 30, and 42
cooperatives pooled milk only under Order 68.

Criteria for Consolidation

As in the proposed rule, the Chicago Regional, Upper Midwest, and the western end of the Michigan Upper Peninsula a marketing areas should be combined into a consolidated Upper Midwest Federal order marketing area. Although these areas do not have a considerable degree of overlapping fluid milk disposition, they do have an extensive overlapping procurement area. Handlers regulated under the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest markets (the predominant markets in this consolidation) distribute milk into markets further south, and approximately 10 percent of the fluid milk distributed within the consolidated area is distributed by handlers regulated under other orders. However, these marketing areas are more closely related to these markets to the south than to the consolidated Upper Midwest order area.

On the other hand, it is more appropriate to include them in other consolidated marketing areas.

Other aspects of the consolidation also fit the criteria set forth. The consolidated Upper Midwest area is bounded on three sides by Lakes Michigan and Superior, the international border with Canada, and a large unregulated area. A significant portion of both the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest markets' milk is supplied by the same cooperative associations. The two predominant markets have identical multiple component pricing plans, and both have large reserves of milk that normally is used in manufactured products, primarily cheese. Approximately 90 percent of the milk used in manufacturing in these markets is used to make cheese. The amount of cheese manufactured from milk pooled under these milk orders is enough to supply a population 3 times greater than that of the consolidated marketing area. Fluid milk handlers in both markets must compete with cheese manufacturers for a milk supply, and marketing order provisions for both markets must provide for attracting an adequate supply of milk for fluid use.

Discussion of Comments and Alternatives

Prior to issuance of the proposed rule, alternatives to the consolidation of the order areas included in the Upper Midwest marketing area that were considered included combining the Iowa, Western Iowa, Nebraska-Western Iowa, and Eastern South Dakota areas with those of the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest areas in a consolidated Upper Midwest order. Also considered was a consolidation of even more marketing areas (up to 10, including Indiana, Illinois, parts of Kentucky, Missouri, and Kansas) that would increase the population and Class I use of the consolidated Upper Midwest area.

Over 160 comments received in response to the proposed rule concerned the proposed consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area. Nearly 140 of these comments (including approximately 120 form letters) supported a consolidation of 10 marketing areas for the purpose of increasing the Class I utilization of the consolidated Upper Midwest order area to a level closer to the U.S. national average or, at the very least, including the Iowa, Eastern South Dakota, and Nebraska-Western Iowa marketing areas in the consolidated Upper Midwest area.

No justification on the basis of the criteria of overlapping sales and procurement was found for any increase in a consolidated marketing area that would be comprised of the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest order areas beyond the addition of the Iowa, Eastern South Dakota, and Nebraska-Western Iowa marketing areas. The collection of more detailed data concerning the overlap in route disposition and milk procurement showed clearly that those three areas are more closely related to markets in the south than to the north, with approximately 85 percent of the total fluid milk distributed by handlers regulated under the three orders disposed of in the consolidated Central market.

The numerous markets recommended by upper midwest producer groups to be consolidated with the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest order areas have very little distribution or procurement overlap with those areas, aside from occasional need for reserve milk supplies. When reserve supplies are needed by the other markets, upper midwest milk can be, and is, pooled on the more southern markets and shares in their pools. The potential for adding areas recommended by upper midwest producer groups would be much less than the loss to producers whose milk is pooled under orders to be consolidated in the Central, Mideast and Appalachian marketing areas.

Approximately 10 comments, including some from cooperative associations representing large numbers of producers, advocated the addition of the northwest Iowa, Central Iowa, and Upper Midwest marketing areas to the consolidated Upper Midwest area based on the extensive overlap of producers, Class I sales, and geographic similarities between that area and the adjoining consolidated Upper Midwest area. An equivalent number of comments, most from Iowa interests, argued that the consolidated Upper Midwest order should remain as proposed. This issue is more fully discussed in the "Comments and Alternatives" section of the description of the Central order area, as is the assignment to consolidated areas of 3 counties, each in its entirety, that currently are split between orders.

One comment advocated the addition of the Gary, Indiana, area to the consolidated Upper Midwest area instead of the Mideast area on the basis that Gary, Indiana, is part of the greater Chicago market. This portion of the consolidated Upper Midwest area has been part of the Indiana marketing area, and there is no data supporting its separation from that area. The single pool distributing plant located in Gary has ceased to process milk. Any distribution in Gary acquired by Chicago handlers as a result of the addition of the Gary, Indiana, area to the consolidated Upper Midwest area is distributed by handlers regulated under the three orders included in other consolidated marketing areas.

Based on the considerations of the most recent data available, comments received, and the stated consolidation criteria, limiting the extent of the consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area to the areas of the current Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest marketing areas, with the addition of the western part of the Michigan Upper Peninsula marketing area, represents the most appropriate marketing area configuration for the north central area of the U.S.

Central

The consolidated Central order marketing area merges the current 9 Federal order marketing areas of Central Illinois, most of Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri, most of Southwest Plains, Greater Kansas City, Iowa, Eastern South Dakota, Nebraska-Western Iowa, Western Colorado, and Eastern Colorado (Federal orders 50, 32, 106, 64, 79, 76, 65, 134, and 137, respectively). Moving to the consolidated Southeast marketing area are 6 Missouri counties currently in Federal order 32 and, from Order 106, 11 northwest Arkansas counties and 22 southern Missouri counties. Order 106 counties in Kansas and Oklahoma remain in the Central market. In addition, some counties in Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska that currently are not part of any order area are included in the consolidated Central market. There are 543 counties and the City of St. Louis,
Missouri, in this consolidated area. The marketing area has changed from the proposed rule by the addition of the Western Colorado marketing area and seven currently-unregulated Colorado counties, the elimination of 6 currently-unregulated Missouri counties, the addition of two partial counties and the deletion of one partial county for the purpose of eliminating the inclusion of partial counties.

Geography

The consolidated Central marketing area would include the following territory:

- **Colorado**—44 counties, including the 30 Colorado counties currently in the Eastern Colorado marketing area and the 4 Colorado counties in the Western Colorado marketing area. Ten currently-unregulated counties, 3 in the southeast corner of the state between the Eastern Colorado and Southwest Plains marketing areas, and 7 in the central part of the State between the Eastern Colorado and Western Colorado marketing areas, are added.

- **Illinois**—87 counties, including the 5 of the 6 counties currently in the Iowa marketing area (of the 2 partial Illinois counties in the Iowa marketing area, all of Whiteside and none of Jo Daviess are included in the Central area), the 19 counties currently in the Central Illinois marketing area, the 49 counties currently in the Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri marketing area and 8 currently-unregulated adjacent counties in southern Illinois, and 6 currently-unregulated counties in western Illinois located between the current Central Illinois and Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri order areas and the Mississippi River.

- **Iowa**—93 counties, including the 68 counties currently in the Iowa marketing area, the 17 counties currently in the Nebraska-Western Iowa marketing area, the 1 county currently in the Eastern South Dakota marketing area, 6 currently unregulated counties in the northwestern part of Iowa, and 1 currently unregulated county in the southeastern corner of Iowa.

- **Kansas**—the entire State (105 counties).

- **Minnesota**—the 4 southwestern Minnesota counties that currently are in the Eastern South Dakota marketing area.

- **Missouri**—39 counties and 1 city, including 6 of the counties and 1 city that currently are in the Southern Illinoies-Eastern Missouri marketing area, the 20 counties that currently are in the Greater Kansas City marketing area, the 5 counties that currently are in the Iowa marketing area; and 8 currently-unregulated counties distributed around the center area proposed to remain unregulated.

- **Nebraska**—66 counties in the southern and eastern parts of Nebraska; omitting the 11 counties in the panhandle that currently are part of the Nebraska-Western Iowa marketing area, and adding 5 currently-unregulated counties in the southwest corner of the State between the Nebraska-Western Iowa and Eastern Colorado marketing areas and 3 currently-unregulated counties in the southeast corner of the State between the Nebraska-Western Iowa and Greater Kansas City marketing areas.

- **Oklahoma**—the entire State (77 counties).

- **South Dakota**—the 26 eastern South Dakota counties (including the portion of Union County that currently is in the Nebraska-Western Iowa marketing area) that currently are in the Eastern South Dakota marketing area.

- **Wisconsin**—the 2 southwest Wisconsin counties that currently are in the Iowa marketing area.

The consolidated Central marketing area is adjacent to the consolidated Upper Midwest order area on the north and northeast, the consolidated Mid- and Appalachian areas on the east, and the northwest corner of the Southeast order area and the consolidated Southwest area on the south. The consolidated Western order area on the west. The area north of approximately the western half of the consolidated Central area also is unregulated. The north-south distance covered by the area is approximately 800 miles, from Watertown, South Dakota, to Ardmore, Oklahoma. The area west of the area, from the Indiana-Illinois border to the Colorado/Utah border, is approximately 1,200 miles.

Geographically, the Central marketing area includes a wide range of topography and climate types, ranging from the Colorado Plateau and the Rocky Mountains in the west to the central section of the Mississippi River Valley toward the eastern part of the area. Precipitation ranges from less than 15 inches per year in Denver, Colorado, to more than 30 inches at St. Louis, Missouri. Most of the area experiences fairly hot summer temperatures, while winter temperatures vary somewhat more than summer, with colder winter temperatures occurring in the northern and western parts of the Central area. The natural vegetation ranges from desert and desert scrub in western Colorado through coniferous forest in the Rocky Mountains to short grass prairie in eastern Colorado through tall grass prairie in eastern South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas and Oklahoma, and much of Illinois; to broadleaf forest on both sides of the Mississippi River.

**Population**

According to July 1, 1997, population estimates, the total population in the consolidated Central marketing area is approximately 21.5 million. Using Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), there are four population centers over 1 million. The St. Louis, Missouri/Illinois, area is the largest, with over 2.7 million population, and the Denver-Boulder-Greeley, Colorado, area is next with approximately 2.3 million. Kansas City, Missouri/Kansas, has a population of 1.7 million, and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, is just over 1 million. Approximately thirty-five percent of the population of the consolidated marketing area is within these four largest MSAs, with nearly two-thirds of the population contained within the area’s 32 MSA’s (with the 28 smaller MSA’s averaging 226,559 population). The Colorado portion of the marketing area has 91.3 percent of its population concentrated in 5 MSA’s. The Missouri portion has 94.4 percent concentrated in 3 MSA’s.

**Fluid Per Capita Consumption**

Based on the population figure of 21.5 million and a per capita fluid milk consumption rate of 19 pounds of fluid milk per month (a weighted average based on state populations in the marketing area and fluid per capita consumption estimates for each state), total fluid milk consumption in the consolidated Central marketing area would be approximately 408.5 million pounds per month. Plants that would be fully regulated distributing plants in the Central order had route disposition within the nine marketing areas included in the consolidated Central area of 366 million in October 1997. It is likely that most of the milk distributed within formerly unregulated areas by Central order handlers would be distributed within the consolidated Central marketing area. The 11 producer handlers and 3 exempt plants operating in the Central market during October 1997 had a combined in-area route disposition of 3 million pounds, partially regulated plants distributed 2 million pounds in the marketing area, and plants that are expected to be fully regulated under other consolidated orders distributed 59 million pounds in the Central marketing area during October 1997.

**Milk Production**

In October 1997, 996.7 million pounds of milk were associated with the
orders consolidated in the Central market (including all of the milk pooled under Orders 32 and 106). However, because of class price relationships in the Iowa and Nebraska-Western Iowa markets, only 893.2 million pounds of the milk was pooled. The 996.7 million pounds were produced by 9,900 producers located in 17 states from Idaho to Kentucky, and from Texas to Minnesota. Three-quarters of the milk associated with the Central market was produced within the consolidated marketing area. The states contributing the most producer milk were, in descending order of volume, Iowa, Colorado, Missouri, Kansas, Illinois and Oklahoma. However, 68 percent of the Missouri producer milk came from farms in counties which are included in the consolidated Southeast marketing area. These 6 States accounted for 71 percent of the producer milk associated with the nine current orders to be consolidated. All of the states having substantial portions of their areas in the consolidated Central market contribute producer milk to at least two of the current nine individual orders, with five of the states (Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, and Nebraska) supplying milk to five of the order areas each.

Distributing Plants

Using distributing plant lists included in the proposed rule and the pooling standards adjusted to 25 percent of route dispositions as in-area sales, updated for known plant closures through December 1998, 57 distributing plants would be expected to be associated with the Central marketing area, including 35 fully regulated distributing plants (all currently pool plants), 1 partially regulated (currently partially regulated), 3 plants exempt on the basis of size (currently pool plants but have less than 150,000 pounds of total route disposition per month), 13 producer-handlers (all currently producer-handlers), 1 unregulated plant (located in the unregulated central portion of Missouri), and 4 government agency plants (all currently government agency plants). Since October 1997, it is known that 1 pool distributing plant (in Illinois) and 1 partially regulated plant (in Wyoming) have gone out of business. There would be 10 distributing plants in the Denver area (7 pool plants and 3 producer-handlers). The Kansas City area would have 1 pool distributing plant. The St. Louis area would have 6 distributing plants (4 pool plants, 1 exempt plant, and one producer-handler). There would be 1 pool distributor and 2 producer-handlers in the Oklahoma City area. Of the remaining 37 distributing plants, 19 are located in other MSAs as follows: 1 pool plant, 1 exempt plant (on the basis of size) and 1 producer-handler in Colorado; 1 pool plant in Illinois; 4 pool plants, 1 producer-handler and 1 exempt plant in Iowa; 1 pool plant in Kansas; 3 pool plants in Nebraska; 1 pool plant and 1 producer-handler in Oklahoma; 1 pool plant and 1 partially regulated plant in South Dakota, and 1 pool plant in Wyoming.

Eighteen of the remaining distributing plants are not located in MSAs. They are: 1 pool plant and 1 government agency plant in Colorado; 4 pool plants and 1 government agency plant in Illinois; 1 pool plant and 1 producer-handler in Iowa; 1 pool plant and 1 government agency plant in Kansas; 1 unregulated and 2 producer-handlers in Missouri; 1 producer-handler in Nebraska; 2 pool plants in Oklahoma; and 1 government agency plant in South Dakota.

Utilization

According to October 1997 pool statistics for handlers who would be fully regulated under this Central order, the Class I utilization percentages for the individual markets ranged from 38 percent for the Southwest Plains market to 87 percent for the Central Illinois market. The utilization for the nine markets would result in a Class I percentage of 50 percent. Based on calculated weighted average use values for (1) the current order with current use of milk, and (2) the current order with projected use of milk in the consolidated Central order, the potential impact of this consolidation on producers who supply the current market areas is estimated to be:

- Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri, a 27-cent per cwt decrease (from $13.49 to $13.22);
- Central Illinois, a 50-cent per cwt decrease (from $13.56 to $13.06);
- Greater Kansas City, a 69-cent per cwt decrease (from $13.91 to $13.22);
- Nebraska-Wyoming, a 10-cent decrease (from $13.23 to $13.13);
- Eastern South Dakota, a 32-cent decrease (from $13.33 to $13.01);
- Iowa, a 5-cent decrease (from $13.08 to $13.03);
- Southwest Plains, a 70-cent increase (from $12.94 to $13.64);
- Western Colorado, a 65-cent decrease (from $13.88 to $13.23); and
- Eastern Colorado, an 11-cent decrease (from $13.70 to $13.59).

The weighted average use value for the consolidated Central order market is estimated to be $13.29 per cwt.

Other Plants

Located within the Central marketing area during May 1997 were 84 supply or manufacturing plants: 8 in Colorado (4 in the Denver area), 15 in Illinois (2 in the Decatur area), 23 in Iowa (2 in the Dubuque area), 6 in Kansas, 7 in Missouri (5 in the St. Louis area), 7 in Nebraska, 7 in South Dakota (1 in the Sioux Falls area), 4 in Oklahoma (1 in the Tulsa area), and 7 in Wisconsin. Twenty-two of the 84 plants are pool plants, or have a "pool side." Twelve of the 22 pool plants (6 in Iowa, 1 in Nebraska, 2 in South Dakota, and 3 in Wisconsin) are "split plants;" that is, one side of a plant is a manufacturing facility, and the other side receives and ships Grade A milk, and accounting is done separately. In most cases, the nonpool portion of such a plant is a manufacturing operation, primarily cheese-making. Of the pool plants, 8 have no primary product, but are only shipping to distributing plants, and 6 are pooled manufacturing plants.

Of the 62 nonpool plants in the consolidated Central marketing area, 59 are manufacturing plants—24 are plants that manufacture primarily Class II products, 3 manufacture primarily butter, 6 manufacture primarily powder, 25 manufacture primarily cheese, and 1 manufactures primarily other products. Also associated with the consolidated Central order, but not within the marketing area, are 2 nonpool cheese plants and a nonpool supply plant located in South Dakota.

Cooperative Associations

Twenty-five cooperative associations pooled milk in December 1997 under the nine orders consolidated in the Central market. Of these cooperatives, 1 pooled milk under 7 of the orders, 5 cooperatives associated producer milk with 3 orders each, and 2 others pooled milk under 2 orders each. Seventeen of the 25 cooperatives pooled milk under only one order, and 10 of these organizations that was the Iowa order. The percentage of cooperative milk pooled under the eight orders was 95, with a range of 80.7 percent cooperative milk under the Southwest Plains order to 100 percent cooperative member milk under the Central Illinois, Greater Kansas City and Eastern South Dakota orders.

Criteria for Consolidation

Most of the criteria used in determining the optimum consolidation
of order areas apply to the Central marketing area. The Federal order markets consolidated in the Central area are strongly related to each other through overlapping route disposition. The great majority of sales by handlers who would be regulated under the consolidated Central order are distributed within the marketing area, and the consolidated markets have a greater relationship in terms of overlapping sales areas than with any other markets. In addition, sales within the currently-unregulated areas included in the consolidated Central area are overwhelmingly from handlers that would be pooled under the Central order. Inclusion of these areas would reduce handlers’ burden of reporting out-of-area sales and take in pockets of currently-unregulated counties that occur between the current order areas. As discussed above, the milk procurement areas for the consolidated markets also have a significant degree of overlap. The Western Colorado order is included because the more recent data collected for this final decision indicates that since the proposed rule the Western Colorado marketing area has developed a closer relationship with the Eastern Colorado market than with any other market, even across the Continental Divide. A benefit of combining Western Colorado with other markets is that it is a small market where data cannot be released without revealing confidential information unless combined with data pertaining to another marketing area. Consolidation of the area will allow publication of meaningful statistics without disclosing proprietary information. In addition, several comments supported the combination of the Western Colorado area with the consolidated Central market in view of the large negative effect of lower producer pay prices on the small number of producers involved if the Western Colorado area were consolidated with the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon and Great Basin marketing areas.

Some of the currently-unregulated counties in western Illinois and central Missouri have been added to the Central marketing area. The omission from the marketing area of the counties in central Missouri that are not included in the consolidated Central marketing area are based on an estimation of the marketing area of Central Dairy, located in Jefferson City, Missouri. This handler has not been previously regulated. As discussed earlier, it is not the intent of this discussion to include currently-unregulated area in the consolidated order areas where such inclusion would have the effect of regulating previously-unregulated handlers.

An additional benefit of the consolidation of these nine order areas is that data will be able to be made public without disclosing proprietary information. Four of the current Federal order markets (Central Illinois, Greater Kansas City, Eastern South Dakota, and Western Colorado) included in this consolidated area have too few plants to be able to publish market data without revealing confidential information. In addition to these three markets, the number of handlers regulated under each of the Nebraska-Western Iowa, Iowa and Eastern Colorado orders is in the single digits.

Discussion of Comments and Alternatives

Prior to issuance of the proposed rule, alternatives to the consolidation of the order areas included in the Central marketing area that were considered included combining the Iowa, Nebraska-Western Iowa, and Eastern South Dakota order areas with those of the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest areas in a consolidated Upper Midwest order. The collection of more detailed data concerning the overlap in route disposition and milk procurement showed clearly that these marketing areas are more closely related to markets on the south than to the north. Approximately 85 percent of the total fluid milk dispositions distributed by handlers regulated under the three order areas that were suggested to be included in the Central area in the initial Preliminary Report, and in the Upper Midwest area in the Revised Preliminary Report, are disposed of in the consolidated Central market. The disposition by other Central marketing area handlers within the consolidated Central area is somewhat greater than the proportion for the three more northern order areas.

Also considered was the exclusion of the 14 Nebraska counties. In addition to the 11 already excluded, from the Central marketing area to expand the unregulated area in which Gillette Dairy could distribute milk without becoming regulated. There was no data indicating that Gillette distributes milk in those counties. In the early stages of the study of appropriate order consolidation, it was assumed that the southern Missouri and northwest Arkansas portions of the Southwest Plains order area would remain with the rest of that area. This area was included with the consolidated Southeast order area in the proposed rule. These comments expressed concern about the expected reduction in the blend price to Western Colorado producers under the Western order. An examination of updated data on route disposions and bulk milk movements resulted in making this change which is explained in greater detail in the description of comments and alternatives under the section of this decision dealing with the Western area.

A comment filed by the American Farm Bureau Federation recommended that the central area of Missouri that was proposed to be unregulated be included in the Central order area. A comment filed on behalf of Central Dairy, the handler who is located and distributes milk in the unregulated Missouri area opposed the addition of any currently unregulated territory to Federal order marketing areas, and specifically opposed the addition of six currently-unregulated northeast Missouri counties into which the handler expects to expand its distribution.

There is no intention of causing the regulation of this handler. As discussed earlier with regard to the Northeast and Mideast marketing areas, consolidation of the existing orders does not necessarily result in the expansion of the consolidated orders into currently-unregulated areas, especially if such expansion would result in the regulation of currently-unregulated handlers. At the same time, minimizing the extent of the unregulated counties in the middle of the consolidated marketing area would help to reduce the reporting burden on handlers in determining which route disposions are inside, and which are outside the marketing area. The administrative burden of verifying such reporting also would be eliminated. Six currently-unregulated northeast Missouri counties that were proposed to be added to the Central order area have been removed based comments received from the Jefferson City handler, who indicated that regulation of the six counties may result in a change in the handler’s regulatory status. No urgency on the part of regulated handlers having sales in the unregulated area to include that area in the consolidated order area was apparent from comments. In fact, none of the comments received from affected handlers advocated that the unregulated area be included in the consolidated area.
A comment by Gillette Dairy, a handler located in Rapid City, South Dakota, in the former Black Hills Federal order area, supported excluding the 11 counties of the Nebraska panhandle, currently part of the Nebraska-Western Iowa order area, from the consolidated Central area. Gillette has some sales in this area and competes there with regulated handlers, but requested that the panhandle area be excluded to lessen Gillette's likelihood of becoming fully regulated under the Central order. This area was excluded in the proposed rule, and its exclusion was unopposed by any interested persons who filed comments before the deadline for doing so. Although Gillette’s sales in the panhandle area do not represent an overwhelming majority of the total sales there, the volume of sales in this sparsely-populated area should not affect the competitive status of any regulated handlers. Therefore, the area will be excluded from the consolidated area as proposed.

Several comments, from the Iowa Department of Agriculture, Wells’ Dairy, and Anderson-Erickson Dairy, as well as Swiss Valley Farms, supported the inclusion of the Iowa order area in the consolidated Central area, stating that the attraction of a supply of milk for fluid needs requires such a consolidation.

Comments were received on dividing the current Iowa marketing area by adding the eastern edge of the Iowa marketing area to the proposed consolidated Upper Midwest order. Such a division would result in the Swiss Valley Farms distributing plant in Dubuque, Iowa, qualifying as a pool plant under the consolidated Upper Midwest order (as it now does during some months under the current Chicago Regional order). The Swiss Valley plant comprises a large majority of the Iowa market sales in the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest order areas, and one half of its milk supply is from counties that supply milk to the Chicago Regional order. The data also shows that the Dubuque plant procures most of its milk supply from counties that also supply milk to the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders, as well as to other plants pooled under the Iowa order.

One of the problems in this marketing area has been the ability of the Swiss Valley plant to choose the order under which it is regulated. As a result of differences between the current pool plant definitions of the two orders, Swiss Valley has been able to switch regulation between the Iowa and Chicago Regional orders as its price advantage shifted, and has done so frequently during 1997 and 1998. The pool plant definitions of the consolidated Upper Midwest and Central orders, which are very similar, will require that the Swiss Valley plant be regulated under the order for the area in which it has the greater volume of route disposition.

In its comments, Swiss Valley argued that the 2 southwest Wisconsin counties proposed to be included in the consolidated Central marketing area were removed from the Chicago Regional area and added to the Iowa area on the basis of a formal rulemaking proceeding in the late 1980's, at which time it was determined that the principal competition for fluid sales and milk supply in this area occurred between Iowa handlers rather than with Chicago Regional handlers. It is therefore Swiss Valley’s position that the two counties should remain within the rest of the Iowa area, in the consolidated Central marketing area.

On the basis of data gathered for this decision, the primary source of route disposition in Grant and Crawford Counties, Wisconsin, and Dubuque County, Iowa, is the Swiss Valley plant in Dubuque, and most of the rest of the milk distributed in these counties is from handlers regulated under the Chicago Regional order. The data also shows that the Dubuque plant procures most of its milk supply from counties that also supply milk to the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders, as well as to other plants pooled under the Iowa order.

One of the problems in this marketing area has been the ability of the Swiss Valley plant to choose the order under which it is regulated. As a result of differences between the current pool plant definitions of the two orders, Swiss Valley has been able to switch regulation between the Iowa and Chicago Regional orders as its price advantage shifted, and has done so frequently during 1997 and 1998. The pool plant definitions of the consolidated Upper Midwest and Central orders, which are very similar, will require that the Swiss Valley plant be regulated under the order for the area in which it has the greater volume of route disposition.

If, under the consolidated orders, the Dubuque plant distributes a greater share of its sales in the consolidated Upper Midwest area than in the consolidated Central area, the plant will be pooled under the Upper Midwest order. The only appropriate change to be made to the current Iowa marketing area is to eliminate the partial counties from the marketing area definitions of the consolidated Central and Upper Midwest orders.

The Illinois Counties of Jo Daviess and Whiteside currently are split between the Iowa and Chicago Regional order areas. More than half of the sales in Whiteside County are supplied by Iowa handlers (including Swiss Valley), so Whiteside County will be located entirely within the consolidated Central area. More than half of the sales in Jo Daviess County are supplied by Chicago Regional handlers (not including Swiss Valley), and that county will be located entirely within the consolidated Upper Midwest area. The Iowa County of Mitchell currently is located in the Upper Midwest area except for the City of Osage, which is defined as part of the current Iowa marketing area. All of Mitchell County will be included in the consolidated Upper Midwest area.

After considering all comments and other relevant information, it is determined that the territory encompassed in the Central marketing area best meets the criteria used.

Southwest

The consolidated Southwest marketing area is comprised of the current Texas (Order 126) and New Mexico-West Texas (Order 138) marketing areas as well as 49 currently unregulated Texas counties. There are 290 counties in this area. This area remains unchanged from the proposed rule.

Geography

The consolidated Southwest market is described geographically as follows: three counties in Colorado (currently in Order 138), all New Mexico counties (33, currently in Order 138) and all 254 Texas counties (162 currently in Order 126, 43 currently in Order 138, and 49 currently unregulated). Two currently unregulated counties are located in northeast Texas, while the remaining 47 are in southwest Texas.

The Southwest market spans the south central area of the United States. It is surrounded by Arizona on the west, Colorado and Oklahoma on the north, Arkansas, Louisiana and the Gulf of Mexico in the northeast, east, and southeast, and Mexico to the south. Measuring the extreme dimensions, this market extends about 800 miles north to south from southern to northern Texas and about 875 miles east to west from Texas’ border with Louisiana and Arkansas to New Mexico’s border with Arizona.

The Southwest market is contiguous to 3 consolidated marketing areas: Arizona-Las Vegas to the west, Central to the north and Southeast to the east. Unregulated counties in Colorado also form a relatively small border in the northwest corner of the market. Texas has over 350 miles of coastline on the Gulf of Mexico, while Texas and New Mexico share about 970 miles of border with Mexico.

In terms of physical geography, diverse topographic relief exists in the