destroyed the market for sweetened condensed milk. Hershey Foods Corporation filed a comment letter objecting to the difference in classification for fresh milk used to make chocolate compared to fresh milk used to make powder that is used to make chocolate. Specifically, Hershey argued that the Class II classification for fresh milk used to make chocolate, compared to the Class IV classification for milk used to make powder that is subsequently used in chocolate violates the Act because such milk starts out in the same form and is used for the same purpose.

Hershey explained that whole milk, sugar, cocoa butter, and chocolate liquor are used to make “chocolate crumb,” which is further processed to make chocolate. According to Hershey, the chocolate crumb has a moisture content of only 1 percent, which means that if a manufacturer receives fresh whole milk, it must remove 99 percent of the water from it in order for the milk to perform its function in the chocolate. An alternative to starting with whole milk and drying it is to purchase whole milk powder and mix it with the sugar, cocoa butter, and chocolate liquor to make the chocolate crumb.

Hershey argues that maintaining the current disparate classifications for fresh milk used to make chocolate and fresh milk that is first dried and then used to make chocolate, in combination with the proposed 70-cent Class II differential, will pressure manufacturers to change their manufacturing processes and formulas, reduce the use of fresh milk and increase the use of milk powders, reduce milk solids in product formulas, replace milk solids with lower cost alternatives, and might even influence the location of chocolate manufacturing plants. Hershey also notes that the State of California does not discriminate between manufacturers of chocolate, but instead prices all milk used to manufacture chocolate in the same class whether the chocolate manufacturer begins its process with fluid milk, sweetened condensed milk, evaporated milk, nonfat dry milk, or whole milk powder.

Galloway and Hershey conclude that there is no justification for pricing milk used to make sweetened condensed milk or chocolate crumb in a higher class than milk used to produce powdered milk. However, Galloway states, if sweetened condensed milk is kept in a class higher than powder, the differential for that class should be no more than 30 cents per hundredweight.

Manufactured milk used as an intermediate product in ice cream, candy, and other manufactured products. However, these manufactured products can also be made from powdered milk. When powder prices are low relative to the Class II price, there is an economic incentive for powder to be substituted for bulk sweetened condensed milk. As a result, there must be an economic relationship between the Class II price and the cost of using alternative dry or concentrated products to make Class II products. Under current pricing provisions, the Class II price can be excessive relative to using nonfat dry milk since the Class II price is a measure of the value of milk in cheese (the Class III price) plus a differential.

Conceptually, we do not believe that the value of milk used in demand-driven products like chocolate and sweetened condensed milk that is used in food products is the same as milk that is sometimes made into powder for lack of any other use. The major point of the ability to substitute among forms of milk, sweetened condensed milk, and nonfat dry milk in certain uses is that there is a fixed relationship between the Class II and Class IV price. The appropriate price relationship is discussed in the Class II pricing section of this decision.

In the proposed rule, no allowance was provided for dumped milk or milk used for animal feed, and a Class III classification was recommended for milk lost in a fire, flood, or accident. Many handlers and the National Milk Producers Federation objected to the removal of the Class III classification for milk that is dumped or used as animal feed.

On the basis of the comments filed on this issue, a surplus use has been established for milk that is dumped or used as animal feed. The price applicable to such use will be the lowest class price for the month.

4h. Shrinkage and Overage

Shrinkage is experienced by handlers in milk processing operations and in the receipt of farm bulk tank milk at receiving stations and processing plants. Milk is unavoidably lost as it remains in pipe lines, adheres to tank walls and/or other plant equipment, and is washed away in the cleaning operations. In addition, unexpected losses, including spillage or leaking packages, also contribute to shrinkage.

In the proposed rule, we proposed a pro rata assignment of shrinkage based on a handler's utilization. In other words, each handler's shrinkage would have been classified according to the handler's use of milk that was not lost in transit or processing. We believed that the adoption of such a provision would have simplified both order language and accounting procedures, and we thought that it would be acceptable to handlers because, although in some cases it increased their costs slightly, the change applied equally to everyone.

There were very few comment letters that supported the proposal and an overwhelming number of comments urging us to keep the current provision. Many of the opponents were high Class I utilization handlers who complained that the proposed change would reclassify their shrinkage from Class III to Class I, increasing their costs for this lost milk.

It was not only handlers that disliked the proposed shrinkage provision. Several producer organizations, including Dairy Farmers of America and the National Milk Producers Federation, also voiced their opposition to the proposal. Most of the comment letters urged us to retain the key features of the present shrinkage provision, but there were very few comments suggesting a simpler provision.

Based on the comments received, this final decision retains, in large part, the present method of calculating shrinkage allowances and pricing shrinkage, but with certain modifications. Just as in the current provisions, there are specified allowances for shrinkage. The major difference is that shrinkage is not automatically assigned to a specified class, as it is now, but rather is assigned to the "lowest-priced class." This change was made to conform with the new 4-class pricing system and, more importantly, to recognize that there is no fixed relationship between class prices because of the different formulas used to compute them. For example, the formulas as for Class III and IV prices are not directly related, it cannot be known in advance which class price will be lowest. Since the relationship between class prices will vary from one month to the next, under the provision adopted here shrinkage may be priced in Class III one month and in Class IV the next. It is necessary to price shrinkage in the lowest-priced class to avoid the situation where a cheese plant, for example, would have to pay more for its shrinkage than it would for milk used in cheese. Such would be the case if shrinkage was always priced in Class IV.

As noted, the current shrinkage allowances has been retained. The resulting provision is that a pool plant operator would receive a lowest-priced class shrinkage allowance based on 2...
percent of the total quantity of milk physically received at the plant directly from producers' farms on the basis of farm weights and tests, plus 1.5 percent of bulk milk received on a basis other than farm weights and tests, and minus 1.5 percent of the quantity of bulk milk transferred to other plants, excluding concentrated milk transferred to another plant for an agreed-upon use other than Class I. A cooperative association handler that delivers milk to pool plants on a basis other than farm weights and tests would receive a shrinkage allowance of .5 percent of the total quantity of milk picked up at producers' farms. Shrinkage in excess of these allowances will be assigned in series starting with Class I to the extent of available utilization.

The shrinkage provision adopted for the new orders contains language to accommodate shrinkage associated with "concentrated milk." Prior to the 1993 classification decision, condensed milk, which is made for use in ice cream and other manufactured products, was not a fluid milk product. Hence, it was not addressed by the shrinkage provision. This changed after the decision, however, when condensed milk became a fluid milk product. In making this change to the fluid milk product definition, certain conforming changes that should have been made in the shrinkage provisions were overlooked. The current proceeding involving all Federal orders has been the first opportunity to rectify this oversight.

During the interim period, the unique problem associated with condensed milk has been handled administratively. Thus, the new language added to the shrinkage provision does not represent a change from the way the rules have been administered but merely codifies them.

Some plants receive milk from producers, condense (i.e., concentrate) the milk into a product that contains not more than 50 percent total milk solids, and then transfer this product on an agreed-upon basis to another plant for use in some product other than a fluid milk product (e.g., ice cream). In this case, the first plant should retain the full 2 percent shrinkage allowance because it incurs processing shrinkage in the course of concentrating—i.e., most likely condensing—the milk. The plant purchasing this concentrated milk (i.e., condensed) milk should get no shrinkage allowance on this milk since the designated use of this milk is for non-fluid use. Accordingly, the value of any shrinkage incurred in further processing this concentrated milk would not be much less than its use value.

As noted elsewhere in this decision, a recent development in milk processing is the use of on-farm filtering equipment (e.g., reverse osmosis or ultra-filtration) to concentrate milk before it is shipped to a plant for use in a variety of milk products. Although this milk falls under the same broad "concentrated milk" category as condensed milk, it is actually a very different product which can conceivably be used for fluid use as well as in a manufactured product such as cheese or ice cream. Thus, language is needed in the shrinkage provision to differentiate this type of concentrated milk from condensed milk. We have accommodated these 2 types of concentrated milk by allowing the shipping and receiving handlers to agree on the use of this milk. Accordingly, if a handler receives concentrated milk from another plant by agreement for use in Class II, III, or IV, the receiving handler will get no shrinkage on this milk. If no such agreement is specified, however, the receiving handler will get the 1.5 percent shrinkage allowance, just as would be the case for uncondensed milk that was received from another plant.

For example, milk may be concentrated at a plant by using reverse osmosis or ultra-filtration techniques and then be transferred to a 2nd plant for use in a fluid milk product. In such case, the milk will not be transferred by agreement for other than Class I use, but instead will be allocated to use at the 2nd plant receiving this concentrated milk. In this instance, it is appropriate to treat the concentrated milk as just like uncondensed milk that is received at a plant and then transferred to a 2nd plant. Thus, the first plant will initially get a 2 percent shrinkage allowance for the milk received from producers, but will be required to subtract 1.5 percent from the 2 percent when the milk, even though concentrated, is transferred to the 2nd plant. The 2nd plant will get a shrinkage allowance based on 1.5 percent of the reconstituted volume of the concentrated milk. In other words, for accounting purposes the water that was initially removed from the milk will be added back to the concentrated milk before computing the 1.5 percent shrinkage allowance for the 2nd plant.

In the example above, the concentrated milk will likely be from a farm plant which concentrates its milk before shipping it using either reverse osmosis (RO) or ultra-filtration (UF). As explained in the uniform provision discussion in this final decision, milk from a single farm with RO or UF equipment will transfer from the concentrate to the producer milk of the first pool plant receiving this milk. However, when the milk of 2 or more producers is commingled on a farm with RO or UF equipment, that farm will be treated as a plant and the dairy farmer owning or leasing the farm will be the responsible handler for all of the milk processed that month.

The shrinkage provision in this final decision differs from the current shrinkage provisions in one other respect. At the present time, when a manufacturing facility that has absolutely no Class I utilization has "excess shrinkage" (i.e., shrinkage that exceeds its 2 percent shrinkage allowance) the excess shrinkage is assigned to Class I even though the plant has no Class I utilization. Thus, the milk that is "lost" by the plant is actually priced higher than the milk that is "used" by the plant.

Under the proposed provision, such excess shrinkage would be assigned to whatever utilization the plant has, starting with Class I. In the case of a cheese plant that has no utilization other than Class III, the excess shrinkage would be assigned to Class III.

After shrinkage is assigned pursuant to § 1000.43(b) of the proposed orders, it will be added to a handler's reported utilization to arrive at the "gross utilization in each class." The gross utilization in each class will then be carried over to § 1000.44, where it will be used to allocate the handler's receipts to its gross utilization of such receipts.

Overage occurs when the reported utilization of producer milk exceeds the reported quantity of producer milk received. Overage, as well as shrinkage, can occur for a number of reasons but is usually the result of record-keeping and measurement errors.

As set forth in the proposed rule, overage would have been classified by being prorated to a handler's reported utilization. It then would have been subtracted from the handler's reported utilization to arrive at the gross utilization in each class which would have been used to allocate a handler's receipts in § 1000.44.

No comments were received specifically focusing on the proposed treatment of overage, undoubtably because the proration of overage does not have the same financial impact as the proration of shrinkage. Nevertheless, in conjunction with the change in the treatment of shrinkage, the treatment of overage also should remain the same as it is now in the orders. Accordingly, in this final decision, overage is classified in § 1000.44(a)(11) by subtracting the excess pounds of skim milk and butterfat from each class, beginning with Class IV. This treatment is identical to the way overage is classified under the present orders in section
proceeds to their members. In most cooperative associations that reblend between orders is diverted by market and case-by-case basis. As a administrative problems on a market-by-given some flexibility to handle these cases. It makes little difference to a cooperative association whether a dairy farmer is a producer on one order or another order; any differences in blend prices between the orders will be washed out in the reblending process. In the case of milk of nonmember producers that is diverted between orders, however, differences could arise in a producer’s net proceeds for the month depending upon how much milk was pooled in each order. Therefore, these situations should be handled in such a way as to be least disruptive to individual dairy farmers.

A market administrator does not know until handlers’ reports have been received that some portion of milk reported as diverted to another order cannot be absorbed by the amount of non-Class I utilization in the receiving order’s plant. In such a case, the diverting handler should be given the option of designating the entire load of diverted milk as producer milk at the plant physically receiving the milk.

Alternatively, if the diverting handler wishes, it may designate which dairy farmers on the diverted load of milk will be designated as producers under the order physically receiving the milk. As a last resort, the market administrator will prorate the portion of diverted milk among all the dairy farmers whose milk was received from the diverting handler on the last day of the month, then the second-to-last day, and continuing in that fashion until the diverted milk that is in excess of Class II, III, and IV use has been assigned as producer milk under the receiving order.

A conforming change that should be made in each order relates to milk that is transferred or diverted for Class II or III use. Presently, milk may be transferred or diverted on a requested Class II or III basis. However, with 4 classes of utilization in the new orders, milk could be diverted for requested Class IV use also. Rather than specifying “Class II, III, or IV,” however, the orders should simply state “other than Class I” to accommodate a system of more than 3 classes. This provision is simpler, shorter, and accomplishes the same end.

To simplify and clarify the classification of transfers and diversions of bulk fluid milk products and bulk fluid cream products from a pool plant to a nonpool plant, which are classified by assigning the nonpool plant’s utilization to its receipts, the phrase, “excluding the milk equivalent of both nonfat milk solids and concentrated milk used in the plant during the month,” has been added in § 1000.42(d)(2)(i). This language will help to clarify the steps to be followed in verifying the utilization of bulk fluid milk and cream at the nonpool plant. It has been added to ensure administrative consistency and does not represent a change in the application of this provision.

In § 1000.42(d)(2)(vi), the allocation process for bulk fluid milk transferred from pool plants to nonpool plants is modified such that any remaining unassigned receipts of bulk fluid products are assigned, pro rata among such plants, to the extent possible first to any remaining Class I utilization and then to all other utilization, in sequence beginning with the lowest class at the nonpool plant. This change returns the order language to the assignment sequence that was adopted in the Uniform Classification Decision of 1974. Receipts from pool plants should not be given preference by assigning such milk to the available Class II use before assigning receipts from dairy farmers who constitute the regular source of milk for such nonpool plant. Generally, milk transferred or diverted from pool plants to nonpool plants is surplus milk and would be used in storables manufactured products, such as nonfat dry milk and butter. By assigning transferred or diverted milk to a nonpool plant’s Class II utilization first, the pool plant operator is forced to account for this milk at the Class II price, even though the nonfat dry milk or other surplus product that was made with the milk is of a lesser value. This process will prevent the assignment of receipts at a higher utilization than the actual utilization.

Receipts of bulk fluid cream products at nonpool plants from pool plants and plants regulated under other Federal orders, similarly, will be assigned to the lowest class utilization first. Generally, a plant operator will use its regular source of supply in the highest valued uses before using alternative supplies. Thus, if a nonpool plant receives cream from a pool plant or a plant regulated under another Federal order, it is likely that the regulated plants were trying to dispose of their excess cream. The nonpool plant receiving the cream will most likely use it for manufacturing purposes; therefore, it should be assigned to the lowest class first. The priority given to regular source supplies is recognized and the provision modified to reflect this.

For classification purposes, the milk of a cooperative bulk tank handler—i.e., a “9(c) handler”—that is delivered to a pool plant will be treated as “producer milk” of the pool plant operator. This
change will shorten and simplify the allocation section.

The computation and classification of shrinkage and overage have been added to this section. This will eliminate Section 41, the section previously used for this purpose. Also, the last paragraph of Section 43 has been removed because milk for Class IV use now would be classified in Section 44 of the orders.

No comments were received pertaining to this section.

4k. Classification of Producer Milk (§ 1000.44)

A handler may receive milk from a producer, a cooperative association acting as a handler on bulk tank milk, by transfer from another pool plant, or from "other sources" such as nonpool plants, partially regulated plants, and plants that are regulated under other orders. Because of this diversity in sources of receipt, it is necessary in a milk order to go through an allocation sequence to determine which source of milk gets priority to a particular class of utilization and to determine how producer milk was used. In some orders, this allocation sequence is done on a system-wide basis; in others, it is done for each plant receiving producer milk.

Section 44 is one of the most complicated and difficult-to-understand sections in a milk order. Consequently, an attempt has been made to simplify and shorten it. Part of this task was made easier by proposed changes to other sections (e.g., elimination of filled milk, elimination of individual handler pools, and modification of the treatment of inter-order transfers and diversions). All orders are not now uniform in the classification of producer milk. For example, some orders (e.g., Chicago Regional) provide for system allocation while others allocate receipts on a plant-by-plant basis for a multiple plant handler.

Under the consolidated orders, milk will be allocated on a plant-by-plant basis, as modified to reflect other changes proposed herein. The system allocation method that is found in some orders is based upon a set of marketing conditions concerning the locations of handlers' plants and the market's available milk supply in relation to those plants. These provisions were intended to stop abuses that occurred when milk was transferred from one market to another. Rather than permit an inter-order transfer to be assigned at a handler's high Class I utilization plant, while the handler's producer milk was assigned to lower use value at another of its plants, the system allocation provisions assigned the transfers on the basis of the handler's utilization at all plants combined. The objective was to prevent more distant other order milk from being assigned to Class I use at the expense of producers who were located nearer to the city markets and who represented the normal source of supply for the markets' fluid milk needs.

The 11 new orders do not fit within the parameters of the classical model where a major consumption area is surrounded by production areas. The marketing areas proposed for the consolidated orders span several states and have a number of major population centers. They also have pockets of milk production that, in a number of cases, are in higher-priced areas than some of the fluid milk plants within the marketing area. This milk may not be economically available to a fluid milk plant several hundred miles away. In fact, it may be that a plant near the periphery of a multi-state market may find its closest and cheapest source of supply from outside the market rather than from within the marketing area. Accordingly, the system allocation rules are not supported by current marketing conditions. Therefore, all orders have been modified to allocate milk only on a plant-by-plant basis rather than on a system basis.

Another change that has been made in the allocation section concerns the "98/2" rule. At the present time, only 98 percent of the packaged fluid milk products transferred between orders is allocated to Class I; the remaining 2 percent is allocated to Class III. This provision, originating from the June 19, 1964, "compensatory payment" decision, was adopted to provide an allowance for "route returns." According to that decision, "it is reasonable to expect some route returns will be associated with inter-market transfers just as there are in connection with milk locally processed in the receiving market . . . a small allowance of 2 percent for such returns, which must fall into surplus use, should be included to avoid such over-assignment in Class I." (29 FR 9120).

This final decision classifies route returns based upon the use of such returns. If route returns are used for animal feed, an "other use" classification is provided and such milk is priced at the lowest class price for the month. If route returns are used to make another product, such as cottage cheese for example, the milk would be reclassified as Class II. This classification not only applies to packaged products made from producer milk, but also includes packaged products that were received from other plants, distributed on routes, and then returned to the last plant of receipt. A handler transferring packaged fluid milk products to another handler's plant may incur some lost product en route to the buying handler's plant. In such cases, the transferring handler may report such product as route returns and account for the milk used in such product at the lowest class price.

In view of the reclassification for route returns for either handler involved in an inter-order transfer who reports such returns, subject to market administrator verification, it is not necessary to classify interorder transfers of fluid milk products at 98 percent Class I and 2 percent Class III because this rule overcompensates handlers for route returns and unfairly reduces income to producers. For these reasons, the "98/2" rule has been eliminated.

In addition to the changes discussed above, Section 44 has been shortened and simplified by removing unnecessary references that serve to confuse the language rather than make it easier to understand. Where possible, simpler language has been used to replace lengthy section references.

No comments were received supporting or opposing these recommendations.

4l. Conforming Changes to Other Sections

Paragraph (b) of the other source milk definition has been removed to reflect the fact that all packaged fluid cream products now would be accounted for on a used-to-produce basis. Also, as previously noted, the simpler and shorter treatment for shrinkage shortens the existing shrinkage provision to the point where it is no longer necessary to keep a separate section for it. Therefore, a separate section for shrinkage is eliminated and the revised contents of that section are now incorporated as a new paragraph (b) in § 1000.43. Finally, conforming changes have been made to § . . . . (Handler's value of milk for computing the uniform price) to reflect the elimination of filled milk from the order, and to reflect changes in references due to other modifications such as the changes in the treatment of shrinkage and overage.

4m. Organic milk

During the development stage of the order reform process, a proposal was received from Horizon Foods to exempt organic milk from pricing and pooling under Federal milk orders.

In 1990, Congress passed, and the President signed into law, the Organic Food Production Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 20128 Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 63 / Friday, April 2, 1999 / Proposed Rules
6501 et seq.), establishing the first Federal standards for organic food products. A proposed rule was issued on December 5, 1997, and published in the Federal Register on December 16, 1997 (62 FR 65849), to implement the National Organic Program.

Organic dairy products can now be found in many, if not most, major grocery chains in metropolitan areas. The retail price of organic dairy products is well above non-organic products. In addition to carrying organic milk, many supermarkets now also carry organic yogurt, sour cream, butter, and other organic dairy products. All of these products are priced well above their non-organic counterparts.

Processors of organic milk have asked for exemption from Federal regulation. In a May 20, 1997, letter to the Department, Horizon Foods argued that (1) organic milk is a different commodity; (2) the market for organic dairy products is a niche market; and (3) Federal order regulation of organic milk is contrary to the intent of the Organic Foods Production Act because it does not “facilitate interstate commerce in fresh and processed food that is organically produced.” Horizon’s proposed solution was to exempt organic milk from the producer milk definition if the milk is produced on a certified organic farm and if the broker pays the producer at least 110% of the month’s Class I price for such milk.

The proposal to exempt organic milk from Federal order pricing is denied for several reasons. First, contrary to the assertions of Horizon Foods that all organic milk is priced at 110% of the Class I price, regardless of how the milk is used, there is evidence that some organic milk has been pooled and priced as non-organic milk under some orders, including the Chicago Regional and Southern Michigan orders, for example. Second, although the retail price of organic milk is well above non-organic milk, we believe that organic milk competes with the retail market and, therefore, also must be fully regulated. Third, if Congress wished to exempt organic milk from Federal milk order regulation, they could have done so either in the Organic Foods Production Act or in the 1996 Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act; but they did not. Fourth, there is no indication that all processors of organic milk price their receipts the same way as Horizon Foods. Even if they did, however, the one class/one price system currently used by Horizon could be a temporary phenomenon due to their growing market for organic products. The day may come when the organic market becomes saturated and milk in excess of fluid needs must be disposed of at competitive prices. If and when this happens, it is likely that some form of classified pricing will be implemented. Finally, the Act provides for classifying and pricing milk on the basis of its form and use. As a result, different costs that may be associated with producing organic milk or other types of milk are not relevant. For these reasons, it would be inappropriate at this time to exempt organic milk from pooling or to provide any other type of special treatment for it under the guise of Federal order reform.

No comments were filed concerning this issue with the exception of Horizon Foods, which continued to support its proposal.

4n. Allocation of Location Adjustment Credits

A provision that is now common to most orders has not been carried forward to the consolidated orders. This provision, which allocates location adjustment credits that are applied to transfers of bulk fluid milk products between pool plants, is commonly found in Section 52 of most current orders (See, for example, §§1001.53(h), 1007.52(b), 1030.52(c), or 1079.52(d)).

Under most orders, intra market shipments of milk between handlers are assigned to Class I use, unless both handlers agree on a lower classification. Milk that is assigned to Class I use is priced at the receiving plant subject to a location adjustment credit that may apply if it is demonstrated that such milk is actually needed for Class I use. If the credit is applied, the milk is priced at the transferring plant. This assignment of location adjustment credits is intended to prevent the use of pool proceeds to pay the hauling cost for the transfer of bulk milk between pool plants when the intended use of the milk is for other than Class I use. To carry out this concept, the provision typically assigns a pool distributing plant’s Class I use first to its milk receipts directly from producers, then to bulk milk received from a cooperative bulk tank handler, then to milk received by diversion from another pool plant, and then to packaged fluid milk products received from other pool plants. The remaining Class I use in the distributing plant is then assigned to bulk milk received by transfer from other pool plants. In some orders, this remaining Class I use is assigned proportionally to all of the pool plants from which bulk milk was obtained. In other orders, the remaining Class I milk is first assigned to pool plants with the same Class I price and then, in sequence, to pool plants with progressively lower Class I prices.

This final decision is based on the premise that Class I milk does not have the same value at every location. For this reason, Class I differentials have been established for each order with location adjustments that result in establishing a unified Class I price structure that applies to every county and city in the contiguous 48 states. Given this approach, it is no longer appropriate to classify a bulk movement of milk as Class I milk in one section of the order and then in another section of the order depart from the principle of pricing such Class I milk at the plant where it was physically received.

In actual practice, a distributing plant does not receive a fixed amount of milk each day of the week. Some days are heavy bottling days when more milk is needed for Class I use. On such days, a distributing plant may not be able to obtain enough local milk to meet its Class I needs and may have to import milk from more distant locations. At the end of the month, however, when the allocation of location adjustment credits takes place, it may appear that there was more than enough local milk to meet the distributing plant’s fluid needs, even though this was not the case when recapped on a daily basis.

Nevertheless, the allocation provision allocates location adjustment credits based on monthly volumes of milk, not daily volumes, so the supply plant could be in a position where it receives no Class I location adjustment credit even though the milk was indeed shipped for Class I use.

Some of the new orders have transportation credit provisions that provide for hauling credits on bulk milk received by transfer from a plant regulated under another Federal order and assigned to Class I use at the receiving plant. To arrive at the classification of such milk, the milk is assigned to the lower of the receiving plant’s or the receiving market’s Class I utilization. When milk is purchased in this manner, the transportation cost of the milk assigned to Class I is absorbed, for the most part, by the transportation credit that is provided for the handler purchasing the milk without regard to whether milk could have been purchased from a closer source of supply.

Finally, the current application of the provision in question can result in a situation where there is more incentive to receive bulk milk transferred from a plant regulated under another Federal order than from a plant under the same order, whether or not any other transportation credits are
involved. Should this occur, it can result in a transfer of Class I sales to the transferring plant’s Federal order market.

For all of the reasons cited above, the allocation of location adjustment credits has been removed from the orders. Several comment letters were received supporting this change; none were received in opposition to it.

5. Provisions Applicable to All Orders

In addition to the terms and conditions of milk orders previously described, there are a number of other provisions common to all milk orders that describe and define those persons and plants affected by the regulatory plan of the program. Different marketing conditions in the consolidated areas, together with institutional factors, do not lend themselves to an entirely uniform set of provisions for all orders. Consequently, in each of the consolidated orders there are provisions that are unique to each order.

This part of the final decision discusses the nature of these common order provisions, their purpose, and whether or not a provision can be uniformly applied to all orders. When a provision does not lend itself to uniform application, it is discussed in subsequent sections of this final rule together with the provisions unique to each of the individual orders.

To the extent that provisions can be uniformly applicable for all of the consolidated orders, they are included in Part 1000, the General Provisions of Federal Milk Marketing Orders which are, by reference, already a part of each milk order. Thus, as provided here, the General 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 General Provisions include the milk classification section of the order, pricing provisions, and some of the provisions relating to payments. These additions to the General Provisions should make milk order provisions more understandable to the general public by removing the differences that now exist and by consolidating uniform provisions in one place. Thus, an interested person would only have to read one “nonpool plant” section, for instance, to understand how that term is applied to all orders. By contrast, at the present time, “nonpool plant” is defined in every order and there are slight differences in the definition from one order to the next.

No comments to the proposed rule were received with regard to most of the provisions discussed in this section. To the extent that there were comments, they are specifically discussed below. Most of the provisions in the proposed rule are adopted without substantive change. Any substantive changes are specifically discussed below.

The Concept of Pooling Milk Proceeds

All Federal milk orders today, save one, provide for the statewide pooling of milk proceeds among all producers supplying the market. The one exception to this form of pooling is found in the Michigan Upper Peninsula market, where individual handler pooling has been used.

Marketwide sharing of the classified use value of milk among all producers in a market is one of the most important features of a Federal milk marketing order. It ensures that all producers supplying handlers in a marketing area receive the same uniform price for their milk, regardless of how their milk is used. This method of pooling is widely supported by the dairy industry and has been universally adopted for the 11 consolidated orders.

There were a number of proposals and public comments considered in determining how Federal milk orders should pool milk and which producers should be eligible to have their milk pooled in the consolidated orders. Many of these comments advocated a policy of liberal pooling, thereby allowing the greatest number of dairy farmers to share in the economic benefits that arise from the classified pricing of milk.

A number of comments supported identical pooling provisions in all orders, but others stated that pooling provisions should reflect the unique and prevailing supply and demand conditions in each marketing area. Fundamental to most pooling proposals and comments was the notion that the pooling of producer milk should be performance-oriented in meeting the needs of the fluid market. This, of course, is a purpose of the Federal milk order program is to ensure an adequate supply of milk for fluid use.

A suggestion for “open pooling,” where milk can be pooled anywhere, has not been adopted, principally because open pooling provides no reasonable assurance that milk will be made available in satisfying the fluid needs of a market. Proposals to create and fund “stand-by” pools are similarly rejected for the same reason.

The pooling provision for the consolidated orders provide a reasonable balance between encouraging handlers to supply milk for fluid use and ensuring orderly marketing by providing a reasonable means for producers within a common marketing area to establish an association with the fluid market. Obviously, matching these goals to the very disparate marketing conditions found in different parts of the country requires customized provisions to meet the needs of each market.

For example, in the Florida marketing area, where close to 90 percent of the milk in the pool will be used for fluid use, pooling standards will require a high degree of association with the fluid market and will permit a relatively small amount of milk to be sent to manufacturing plants for use in lower-valued products. In the Upper Midwest market, on the other hand, a relatively small percentage of milk will be needed for fluid use. Accordingly, under the pooling standards for that order smaller amounts of milk will be required to be delivered to fluid milk plants and larger amounts of milk will be permitted to be sent to manufacturing plants for use in storable products such as butter, nonfat dry milk, and hard cheese. The specific pooling provisions adopted for each order are discussed in detail in the sections of this document pertaining to each of the consolidated orders.

Route Disposition

Route disposition is a measure of fluid milk sales in commercial channels. It is defined to mean the amount of milk delivered by a distributing plant to a retail or wholesale outlet (except a plant), either directly or through any distribution facility (including disposition from a plant store, vendor or vending machine), of a fluid milk product in consumer-type packages or dispenser units that is classified as Class I milk.

The route disposition definition adopted here differs from the definition contained in some current orders. Presently, the route disposition definition of several orders makes reference to plant movements of packaged fluid milk products between distributing plants with respect to determining if such transfers should be considered “route disposition” of the transferring plant or the receiving plant. As provided here, however, this issue is addressed in section 7(a) of the pool plant section, which essentially treats such transfers as if they were route disposition.

Plant

A plant definition is included in all orders to specify what constitutes an operating entity for pricing and regulatory purposes. As provided in
§ 1000.4 of the General Provisions, a plant is the land, buildings, facilities, and equipment constituting a single operating unit or establishment at which milk or milk products are received, processed, or packaged. This is meant to encompass all departments, including those where milk products are stored, such as a cooler. The plant definition does not include a physically separate facility without stationary storage tanks that is used only as a distribution point for storing packaged fluid milk products in transit for route disposition.

To account for regional differences and practices in transporting milk, some of the consolidated orders provide for the use of reload points for transporting bulk milk that do not have stationary storage tanks.

Farm-Separated Milk

With the advent of new technology for on-farm separation of milk into its components, some additional regulatory language has been added to the plant definition to specify who is the responsible handler for the milk or milk components leaving the farm and how these components will be classified and priced. This determination will be based, in part, on whether the farm processing facility is a plant.

Ultrafiltration (UF) is a membrane process that transfers water and low-molecular-weight compounds through a membrane while retaining suspended solids, colloids, and large organic molecules. It selectively fractionates some milk solids components and selectively concentrates other solids components of milk.

When a UF membrane is used, water, lactose, uncomplexed minerals and other low-molecular-weight organic compounds pass through the membrane. For example, if unaltered milk containing 3.5 percent fat, 3.1 percent protein, and 4.9 percent lactose is run through a UF membrane until half of the original volume is eliminated, the remaining product not passing through the membrane (i.e., retentate) will contain all of the fat and protein but only half of the lactose. The permeate (i.e., that part of the original milk that does pass through the membrane) will contain water, lactose, non-protein nitrogen, and about one-sixth of the minerals.

Reverse osmosis (RO) is also a membrane process, but the membranes have much smaller pores than UF membranes, which allows only the water to pass through. The end product essentially is concentrated milk.

At the present time, both reverse osmosis and ultrafiltration systems are being utilized on some farms, principally large farms in the southwestern United States. The product shipped from these farms (i.e., the retentate) currently is sent to processing plants for use in manufactured products but it could be used in a range of milk products.

The retentate received from a farm with a UF or RO system will be treated as producer milk at the pool plant at which the milk is physically received or, if the retentate is shipped to a nonpool plant, as producer milk diverted to a nonpool plant. In either case, the milk or milk components will be priced at the pool plant or nonpool plant where the milk is physically received.

To be considered a farm and a producer, as opposed to a plant and a handler, an RO or UF unit must be under the same ownership as the farm on which it is located and only milk from that farm or other farms under the same ownership may be processed through the unit. The producer operating the unit shall be responsible for providing records of the daily weights of the milk going through the unit. Also, the producer must provide samples for each load of milk going through the unit and must furnish the receiving plant with a manifest on each load of retentate showing the scale weight along with samples of the retentate. Finally, the producer operating the RO or UF unit must maintain records of all transactions which must be available to the Market Administrator upon request. If the producer does not meet these recordkeeping and reporting requirements, the unit will be considered to be a plant.

RO and UF retentate will be considered to be producer milk at the plant which receives it. The pounds of RO and UF retentate received will be priced according to the skim-equivalent pounds of such milk. The skim-equivalent pounds for RO retentate will be determined by dividing the solids-not-fat pounds in the retentate by the average producer solids-not-fat in the skim portion of the producer milk used in the product. The butterfat pounds would then be added to this number to arrive at the product skim-equivalent pounds.

In computing the fluid equivalent of UF retentate, the fluid equivalent factor should be computed by dividing the true protein test in the skim milk portion of the true protein test in the skim milk portion of the producer milk used in the product. Adding the butterfat pounds to this computation will yield the product equivalent pounds.

In addition to having UF and RO equipment, some farms today may have a separator to separate skim milk from cream before they leave the farm. Rules are also established for this type of operation.

Skim milk and cream going through a farm separator also should be treated as producer milk if received at a pool plant or diverted to a nonpool plant. The producer will be required to obtain scale weights and tests on each load of skim and cream shipped along with samples of each. The same ownership, recordkeeping, sampling and reporting requirements that apply to RO and UF units will also be applicable.

In formulating a policy for the treatment of RO and UF retentate, it is important to recognize that the milk produced on a farm with RO or UF equipment is fully available to meet the needs of the fluid market, either before or after passing through such units.

Therefore, there should be no question concerning the propriety of pooling this milk along with other producers' milk.

At this writing, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has not yet decided whether UF retentate can be reconstituted and sold as fluid milk. However, FDA has approved the use of UF retentate in certain cheese products on a trial basis. Therefore, before receiving UF retentate for use in any product, handlers should be certain that such use has been approved by the FDA.

Distributing Plant

A distributing plant is defined as a plant that is approved by a duly constituted regulatory agency to handle Grade A milk and at which fluid milk products are processed or packaged and from which there are route disposition or transfers of packaged fluid milk products to other plants. This definition, and the following supply plant definition, are essentially the same as those found in present orders, except for minor changes made to conform with the pool plant provisions adopted for the consolidated orders.

Supply Plant

A supply plant is a regular or reserve supplier of bulk milk for the fluid market that helps to coordinate the supply of milk with the demand for milk in a market. As defined in this decision, a supply plant is a plant approved by a duly constituted regulatory agency for the handling of Grade A milk that receives milk directly from dairy farmers and transfers or diverts fluid milk products to other
plants or manufactures dairy products on its premises.

Pool Plant

The pool plant definition of each order describes those plants which receive milk that shares in the marketwide pool. It provides standards to identify those plants engaged in serving the fluid needs of the marketing area. Pool plants serve the fluid market to a degree that warrants their producers sharing in the added value that derives from the classified pricing of milk. While the pool plant definition in every consolidated order provides for a set of common principles, the standards applicable to pool plants differ among the consolidated orders, reflecting the fact that marketing conditions vary across the country. The goal in drafting pooling standards is to ensure both an adequate supply of milk for fluid use and orderly marketing by allowing all milk in a marketing area the opportunity to serve the fluid market and thereby share in the fluid market.

There are 2 performance standards applicable to pool distributing plants in the consolidated orders. The first standard, which varies among orders, requires a distributing plant to have a minimum Class I utilization. Since route disposition includes only Class I milk, the specific standard is a measure of a distributing plant's route disposition as a percent of its total receipts of fluid milk products. This standard is generally directly related to the market's Class I utilization. Accordingly, in the higher Class I utilization markets in the Southeast, the overall route disposition standard is 50 percent. In a market such as the Upper Midwest, on the other hand, where Class I utilization will be much lower, the overall route disposition standard is only 15 percent. The specific standards for each consolidated order are discussed in Section 6 of this decision.

One change common to all orders from the proposed rule to this final decision is the substitution of "total receipts of fluid milk products" for "receipts of bulk fluid milk products" in computing the total and in-area disposition for a distributing plant. This change was made to achieve consistency in accounting for packaged receipts at a distributing plant that are subsequently disposed of as route disposition or transferred to another plant. Since all such disposition will count towards meeting an order's specified pooling standards, receipts of such products from another plant also should be counted as part of the plant's receipts.

Once it is determined that a distributing plant is sufficiently associated with the fluid market to share in the pool, a second standard determines if the plant is sufficiently associated with a particular market to share in the pool applicable to that market. The "in-area" standard adopted for the consolidated orders requires that a distributing plant have 25 percent of its route disposition within a marketing area before it can be fully regulated by the order covering that marketing area.

The 15 percent in-area standard in the proposed rule has been changed to 25 percent for all orders to reflect the larger, merged marketing areas that are adopted. This change should not affect the regulatory status of any current distributing plant.

At the present time, some orders describe the in-area route disposition standard as a percent of plant receipts, while in other orders it is described as a percent of route disposition. For the new orders, the in-area standard for all orders is expressed as a percent of total route disposition. This methodology will ensure that the in-area route disposition standard never exceeds the total route disposition standard, a situation that is now possible under the terms of the present Upper Midwest order. For most orders, this change will make little difference and should not result in regulating any plant that is now unregulated.

Under the consolidated orders, a distributing plant that has sales in more than one Federal order marketing area will be regulated, for the most part, under the order in which it has the most sales. There are certain exceptions to this rule, however, particularly in the 3 Southeast orders, where the shifting of plants among markets has created disorderly marketing conditions in recent times. In the Florida, Southeast, and Appalachian orders, a distributing plant that is located within the marketing area and that meets the order's pooling standards will be regulated under that order even though it might have more route disposition in some other marketing area.

When the regulation of a plant does shift from one order to another, the shift will only occur after the plant has had greater sales in such other market for 3 consecutive months. This provision will provide some stability to avoid the frequent shifting of regulation between orders.

To facilitate proper administration and accounting, all orders currently provide that packaged fluid milk products transferred from one handler to another be treated as inter-handler transfers. In the past, such transfers have been properly identified and specifically reported to affected market administrators. This should continue in the consolidated orders. However, for the single purpose of qualifying a plant as a pool distributing plant, the pool distributing plant definition has been modified to treat transfers of packaged fluid milk products to other plants as if they were route disposition of the transferring plant for the purpose of identifying the plant's association with the fluid market. This is necessary to preclude a plant from becoming partially regulated if the plant shipped significant quantities of packaged fluid milk products to another distributing plant. A conforming change has been made to the distributing plant definition in § 1000.5 to reflect this change.

A special pool distributing plant provision (i.e., Section 7(b) of the consolidated orders) has been adopted for distributing plants that distribute ultra-pasteurized or aseptically-processed fluid milk products. Such plants must be located in the marketing area and must process a certain percentage of their milk receipts into ultra-pasteurized or aseptically-processed fluid milk products during the month. The minimum percentage used for each order in Section 7(b) is equal to the total route disposition percentage required in Section 7(a) of the order for distributing plants processing standard shelf-life fluid milk products. However, unlike the standards for a 7(a) plant, there is no route disposition standard for a 7(b) plant to meet.

Plants specializing in ultra-pasteurized or aseptically-processed fluid milk products tend to have erratic processing and distribution patterns reflecting the long-life nature of the product they process. In some months, they may process fluid milk products but have little or no route disposition because the products are stored in inventory. In addition, these plants often have much wider distribution patterns than do other distributing plants and, under current orders, frequently shift regulation from one order to another. This shifting regulation is disruptive to the producers and/or cooperatives supplying these plants and is an additional regulatory burden to the plant operator.

To provide regulatory stability for these plants, they will be treated as a fully regulated plant if they process a minimum percent of their milk receipts into ultra-pasteurized or aseptically-processed fluid milk products during the month. Having met this standard, which varies among orders, they will not be subject to regulation by another order simply because they have more route disposition in such other order's
marketing area. In fact, they need not have any route disposition in the order in which they are located to remain regulated. However, if they do not meet the processing standard of the order in which they are located but do meet the 7(a) standards for a distributing plant under one or more other orders, they will become regulated under the order in which they have the most route disposition. If they continue to qualify for pool status on this basis, they may be subject to regulatory shifts depending upon the pattern of their route disposition.

Pool Supply Plant

Performance standards for pool supply plants are designed to attract an adequate supply of milk to meet the demands for fluid milk in a market. Pool supply plants move milk to pool distributing plants that service the marketing area.

The pool supply plant definition, like the distributing plant definition, does not lend itself to uniform application in all consolidated orders. Consequently, pool supply plant performance standards should be established according to regional needs. The specific standards adopted in each order are described in section 7(c) of each new order and are explained in more detail in the regional discussions of this document.

In most current orders, a pool supply plant does not include any portion of a plant that is not approved for handling Grade A milk and that is physically separated from a portion of the plant that has such approval. Some inspection agencies render only one type of approval for an operation. To accommodate those areas where split operations are permitted, some of the consolidated orders provide for a physically separated portion of the plant as a “nonpool plant.”

Pool Supply Plant

Performance standards for pool supply plants are designed to attract an adequate supply of milk to meet the demands for fluid milk in a market. Pool supply plants move milk to pool distributing plants that service the marketing area.

The pool supply plant definition, like the distributing plant definition, does not lend itself to uniform application in all consolidated orders. Consequently, pool supply plant performance standards should be established according to regional needs. The specific standards adopted in each order are described in section 7(c) of each new order and are explained in more detail in the regional discussions of this document.

In most current orders, a pool supply plant does not include any portion of a plant that is not approved for handling Grade A milk and that is physically separated from a portion of the plant that has such approval. Some inspection agencies render only one type of approval for an operation. To accommodate those areas where split operations are permitted, some of the consolidated orders provide for a physically separated portion of the plant as a “nonpool plant.”

Pool Pooling

Unit Pooling

Unit pooling allows 2 or more plants located in the marketing area and operated by the same handler to qualify for pool status as a unit by meeting the total and in-area route disposition standard as if they were a single pool distributing plant. To qualify as a unit, at least one of the plants in the unit—i.e., the primary plant—must qualify as a pool distributing plant on its own standing and the other plants in the unit must process only Class I or Class II milk products.

Unit pooling serves to accommodate and provide a flexible regulatory approach in addressing the specialization of plant operations. It also minimizes unintended regulatory effects that may cause the uneconomical and inefficient movement of milk for the sole purpose of retaining pool status. However, some conditions need to be satisfied for unit pooling. The “other” plant(s) of the pool unit—i.e., the plants that would not qualify for pool status as a single plant—must be located in an equivalent or a lower price zone than the primary pool distributing plant. This condition is required to assure that the transportation of milk for Class II uses will not be subsidized through the marketwide pool and to assure pricing equity to all handlers processing Class II products that do not use unit pooling. Unit pooling status must be requested in writing and approved by the market administrator for its proper implementation and administration.

System Pooling

Supply plants and reserve supply plants provide a benefit to the market because they are required to meet certain performance standards in supplying the needs of the fluid market. They also serve to balance the market. Because handlers often operate more than one supply plant within the market, some of the merged orders allow a single proprietary handler or one or more cooperative associations to combine their plants into systems for the purpose of meeting the order’s performance standards for pooling. Under system pooling, 2 or more plants in a system can qualify for pool status by meeting the applicable performance standards in the same manner as a single plant. However, not all plants in a system of supply plants must transfer or divert milk to a distributing plant. In recognition of this fact, the supply plant definition in $1000.6 has been modified to conform with this provision.

Adjustment of Pooling Standards

The consolidated orders provide the market administrator with authority to adjust shipping standards for supply plants, reserve supply plants, balancing plants, and supply plant units if he/she finds that such revision is necessary to encourage needed shipments or to prevent uneconomic shipments of milk. A finding by the market administrator that adjustments are warranted would follow an investigation conducted on the market administrator’s own initiative or at the request of interested parties. Before making a finding that revisions are warranted, the market administrator would notify interested parties of this possibility and invite data, views, and arguments. If the market administrator determines that a revision is warranted, he/she shall provide written notification to interested parties of such revision at least one day before the revision goes into effect.

This provision allows the market administrator to respond promptly to changes in local marketing conditions and should result in better service to the dairy industry and to the public. The authority given to the market administrator to make needed adjustments in the manner specified is commensurate with the authorities already delegated by the Secretary to the market administrator.

As provided in the proposed rule, the market administrator would have had the authority to adjust pooling standards for distributing plants as well as supply plants. However, such authority has not been provided in any of the current marketing orders except for the Southeast, and in that market it has never been needed. Consequently, it was concluded that any changes that may need to be made to pool distributing plant standards can best be handled through normal amendatory and suspension procedures.

Treatment of Concentrated Milk

An issue related to pooling that should be clarified with the issuance of new orders is the treatment of concentrated milk that is shipped between plants.

Prior to the 1993 classification decision, condensed milk was not defined as a fluid milk product. Accordingly, when condensed milk was shipped from a supply plant to a distributing plant, it was not counted as a qualifying shipment for the purpose of determining the pool status of the supply plant. By the same token, when a distributing plant received a shipment of condensed milk from another plant, the condensed milk was excluded from the distributing plant’s receipts for the purpose of computing the pool plant status of the distributing plant.

In the 1993 classification decision, condensed milk was redefined as concentrated milk and was included in the fluid milk product definition. An unintended consequence of this change was that certain plants which had never been pool plants before suddenly became pool plants because of their shipments of condensed milk, and

As used in parts 1000 through 1135, the term "concentrated milk" means milk that contains not less than 25.5 percent, and not more than 50 percent, total milk solids. It may include milk that has been condensed or milk that has been filtered using such methods as reverse osmosis and ultra-filtration. Concentrated milk may be pasteurized and it may be homogenized.
certain distributing plants that had been pool plants suddenly found themselves unable to qualify as pool plants because their receipts of “fluid milk products” were enlarged to include their condensed milk receipts. When handlers complained about these unforeseen and unexplained changes, it was decided administratively to continue the previous treatment for condensed milk until the orders could be amended.

The consolidated orders should continue this special treatment for condensed milk. Although condensed milk conceivably may be reconstituted for fluid use, as a practical matter this is rarely, if ever, done. Sometimes, condensed milk is used to fortify fluid milk, but for the most part condensed milk is made to be used in ice cream mix or some other manufactured dairy product.

When condensed milk is transferred from the plant of origin to a distributing plant in the same or another order, it is generally transferred, by agreement, for Class II or III use. Using this criteria as a distinguishing feature of this product, the pool supply plant provision of each order should exclude from qualifying shipments to distributing plants “concentrated milk transferred, by agreement, for other than Class I use.” By the same token, a distributing plant also should exclude from its receipts, for pooling purposes, “concentrated milk received, by agreement, for other than Class I use.”

Using this language will preserve the regulatory treatment that has applied to condensed milk for many years. At the same time, however, this language allows flexibility for different treatment in the case of concentrated milk that is not destined for Class II or III use.

In recent years, there has been much greater use of filtering equipment to remove water from milk at the farm. This technology may be used to reduce hauling costs in shipping milk long distances for use as fluid milk products. Although this concentrated milk is not at present being used for fluid use, this situation may change in the future. For this reason, it is reasonable to provide some flexibility in handling this type of product for both shrinkage and pooling purposes. At this point in time, we believe that the best way to provide this flexibility is to allow the handlers involved in making and using this product to decide among themselves how it will be used and reported, knowing ahead of time the shrinkage and pooling implications involved with these purposes. Thus, if concentrated milk is purchased from another plant by agreement for other than Class I use, the buying handler understands that there will be no shrinkage allowance allowed on the milk. The buying handler also knows that the volume of concentrated milk received will not be counted as a plant receipt for the purpose of determining its pool status.

A supply plant shipping concentrated milk for Class II use may or may not wish to be pooled under a Federal order. If the plant wished to be treated as a nonpool plant, concentrated milk could be transferred for Class II or III use by agreement with the receiving handler. In such case, the transfer of concentrated milk would not be counted as a qualifying shipment in meeting the pool supply plant shipping standards and the receipt of concentrated milk at the distributing plant would not be counted as part of the distributing plant’s receipts for purposes of computing its total route disposition. Of course, the agreement to transfer milk for a pre-arranged use is contingent upon the receiving distributing plant having sufficient Class II or III utilization to absorb these shipments.

On the other hand, if a supply plant making concentrated milk wished to qualify for pool status, it could simply transfer concentrated milk to a pool distributing plant without specifying its designated use. In such case, the shipment would count as a qualifying shipment for the purpose of meeting the order’s pool supply plant shipping requirements provided that the distributing plant receiving the concentrated milk was a pool plant. Since the receipt of concentrated milk would be counted as part of the receiving distributing plant’s receipts in determining the distributing plant’s pool status under the order, the plant would have to have sufficient Class I sales to maintain its identity with the fluid market. If the distributing plant did not have sufficient Class I use to meet the order’s pooling standards, it would not be qualified to have its receipts pooled under the order and, by extension, neither would the supply plant that shipped the concentrated milk to the distributing plant.

This regulatory flexibility for concentrated milk should accommodate varied situations in the consolidated orders. It will follow the historical treatment for condensed milk but, at the same time, it will provide for new uses and treatment for other types of concentrated milk.

Nonpool Plant

A definition is provided in all orders describing plants which receive, process or package milk, but which do not satisfy the standards for being a pool plant. While providing for such a definition may appear redundant, this provision is useful to more clearly define the extent of regulation applicable to plants.

Nonpool plants should include a plant that is fully regulated under another Federal order, a producer-handler plant, a partially regulated distributing plant, an unregulated supply plant, and an exempt plant. The definitions for these nonpool plants are not materially different than those provided in the current orders with the possible exception of an “exempt plant.”

Certain plants are exempt from regulation under Federal milk orders. These plants fall into 4 categories: (1) Plants that are operated by a governmental agency which have no route disposition in commercial channels; (2) plants operated by a college or university that dispose of fluid milk products only through their own facilities with no route disposition in commercial channels; (3) plants from which the total route disposition is for individuals or institutions for charitable purposes without remuneration; and (4) plants that have route disposition of 150,000 pounds or less during the month. These types of plants have little impact on the regulated market and need not be regulated to ensure the integrity of the regulatory plan.

A number of Federal orders exempt from regulation small distributing plants which, because of their size, do not significantly impact competitive relationships among handlers in the market. The level of route disposition required before an exempt plant becomes regulated varies in the current orders. As adopted for the merged orders, any plant with route disposition during the month of 150,000 pounds or less would be exempt from regulation. This limit reflects the maximum amount of fluid milk products allowed by an exempt plant in any current Federal milk order and ensures that plants currently exempt from regulation will remain exempt.

Many current Federal orders also provide regulatory exemption for a plant operated by a state or Federal governmental agency. For example, some states have dairy farm and plant operations that provide milk for their prison populations. As provided herein, regulatory exemption would be continued under the consolidated orders unless pool plant status is requested.

Regulatory exemption also should apply to colleges, universities, and charitable institutions because these institutions generally handle fluid milk
products internally and have no impact in the mainstream commercial market. However, in the event that these entities distribute fluid milk through commercial channels, route sales by such entities, including government agencies, will be monitored to determine if Federal regulation should apply.

The determination and verification of exempt plant status will, from time to time, necessitate the need for the market administrator to require reports and information deemed appropriate for the sole purpose of making this determination. Such authority is currently provided in orders and should continue.

**Handler**

Federal milk orders regulate those persons who buy milk from dairy farmers. Such persons are called handlers under the order. These persons have a financial responsibility for payments to dairy farmers for milk in accordance with its classified use. They must file reports with the market administrator detailing their receipts and utilization of milk.

The handler definition adopted for the consolidated orders includes the operator of a pool plant, a cooperative association that diverts milk to nonpool plants or delivers milk to pool plants for its account, and the operator of a “nonpool plant,” which would encompass a producer-handler, a partially regulated distributing plant, a plant fully regulated under another Federal order, an unregulated supply plant, and an exempt plant.

In addition, “third party” organizations that are not otherwise regulated under provisions of an order are included in the handler definition. This category includes any person who engages in the business of receiving milk from any plant for resale and distribution to wholesale and retail outlets, brokers or others who negotiate the purchase or sale of fluid milk products or fluid cream products from or to any plant, and persons who, by purchase or direction, cause the milk of producers to be picked up at the farm and/or moved to a plant. Such intermediaries provide a service to the dairy industry. These persons are not, however, recognized or regulated as entities required to make minimum payments to producers. The expanded marketing chain brought about by such intermediaries has made it increasingly difficult for the market administrator to track the movement of milk from farms to consumers. The revised handler definition enables the market administrator to more readily identify those entities.

**Producer-Handler**

It has been a long-standing policy to exempt from full regulation many of those entities that operate as both a producer and a handler. Generally, a producer-handler is any person who provides satisfactory proof to the market administrator that the care and management of the dairy farm and other resources necessary for own-farm production and the management and operation of the processing plant are the personal enterprise and risk of such person. A primary basis for exempting producer-handlers from the pricing and pooling provisions of a milk order is that these entities are customarily small businesses that operate essentially in a self-sufficient manner. Also, during the history of producer-handler exemption from full regulation there has been no demonstration that such entities 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, including the cost of disposing of reserve milk supplies, to other market participants.

The current orders have varying producer-handler definitions that address specific marketing conditions and circumstances. For example, they specify different limits on the amount of milk that producer-handlers may purchase and retain their exempt status. Some modifications have been made to the producer-handler provisions in the consolidated orders for standardization. However, no changes have been made that would intentionally regulate a producer-handler that is currently exempt from regulation under their current operating procedures. Because the producer-handler provision is slightly different from one order to the next, the specific details regarding each definition are described in the regional discussions that follow. Any general provision in the proposed rule, such as the phrase “or acquired for distribution” in §1000.44(a)(3)(iv), that would have changed the status of a current producer-handler has been eliminated.

Public comments were received regarding the extent of regulation that should apply to producer-handlers. The majority of public comments supported the status quo regarding the regulatory treatment of producer-handlers, emphasizing that they should remain exempt from regulation in accordance with current order provisions and that the provisions should be regional in nature so as not to affect or change the current regulatory status of producer-handlers.

One of the public comments received proposed that the exemption of producer-handlers from the regulatory plan of milk orders be eliminated. This proposal is denied. In the legislative actions taken by the Congress to amend the AMAA since 1965, the legislation has consistently and specifically exempted producer-handlers from regulation. The 1996 Farm Bill, unlike previous legislation, did not amend the AMAA and was silent on continuing to preserve the exemption of producer-handlers from regulation. However, past legislative history is replete with the specific intent of Congress to exempt producer-handlers from regulation. If it had been the intent of Congress to remove the exemption, Congress would likely have spoken directly to the issue rather than through omission of language that had, for over 30 years, specifically addressed the regulatory treatment of producer-handlers.

Since producer-handlers are intended to be exempt from most regulation, some means must be provided to determine and to verify producer-handler status. Accordingly, the market administrator is provided with the authority to require reports and other information deemed appropriate to determine that an entity satisfies the requirements for producer-handler status. Such authority is currently provided in the orders and should continue.

**Producer**

Under all orders, producers are dairy farmers that supply the market with milk for fluid use or who are at least capable of doing so if necessary. Producers are eligible to share in the revenue that accrues from marketwide pooling of milk. The producer definitions of the individual orders are described under the regional discussions later in this document. Responding to regional needs, producer definitions will differ by order with respect to the degree of association that a dairy farmer must demonstrate with a market.

A dairy farmer may not be considered a producer under more than one Federal milk order with respect to the same milk. If a dairy farmer’s milk is diverted by a handler regulated under one Federal order to a plant regulated under another Federal order, and the milk is allocated at the receiving plant (by request of the diverting handler) to Class II, III or IV, the dairy farmer will maintain producer status in the original order from which milk was diverted.
Since producer-handlers and exempt plants are specifically exempt from Federal order pricing provisions, the term producer should not include a producer-handler as defined in any Federal order. Likewise, the term producer should not apply to any person whose milk is delivered to an exempt plant, excluding producer milk diverted to such exempt plant. Some of the new orders (See Orders 1001, 1124, 1131, and 1134) also exclude from producer status a dairy farmer whose milk is received at a nonpool plant as other than producer milk. The reasons for including this provision are explained in the regional discussions describing those orders.

Producer Milk

The producer milk definition identifies the milk of producers which is eligible for inclusion in a particular market-wide pool. This definition is specific to each consolidated order, reflecting the fact that marketing conditions vary among regions.

In general, the definition of producer milk for all consolidated orders continues to include the milk of a producer which is received at a pool plant or which is received by a cooperative association in its capacity as a handler. Most current orders consider milk to be “received” when it is physically unloaded at the plant and the consolidated orders would continue that treatment.

In order to promote the efficient handling of milk, all orders currently allow a handler to move producer milk, within certain specified limits, from a producer’s farm to a plant other than the handler’s own plant. This is referred to as a “diversion” of milk. Under the consolidated orders, the definition of producer milk allows unlimited diversions to other pool plants, thereby providing maximum flexibility in efficiently supplying the fluid market.

Under some orders, unlimited diversions to nonpool plants would also be allowed only a dairy farmer has become associated with a particular order. Under other orders, however, a producer would be required to “touch base” at a pool plant one or more times each month and, in addition, aggregate diversion limits may be applied to a handlers’ total diversions. The specific touch base and diversion limits are described in the regional discussions pertaining to each order.

Even for orders without any diversion limits, there is a practical limit to how much milk may be diverted from a pool plant because of the pooling standards that must be met. For a pool supply plant, for example, there is a standard computed by dividing the amount of milk shipped to distributing plants by a plant’s total receipts. As provided in the orders, “receipts” include milk that is physically received at the plant as well as diverted to nonpool plants. This inclusion of diverted milk in a plant’s receipts automatically limits the amount of milk that may be diverted by those plants. Thus, the maximum quantity of milk that such plants would be able to divert and still maintain their pool plant status would be 100 percent less the pool plant shipping standards for the month.

This treatment of diverted milk will mitigate the need for suspending order diversion limitations, an action that is quite common in some of the current orders. Unlimited diversions for many of the new orders will allow for maximum efficiency in balancing the market’s milk supply. The market administrator’s ability to adjust shipping percentages for pool supply plants, pool reserve supply plants, and balancing plants will ensure that an adequate supply of milk is available for the fluid market without the imposition of diversion limits.

While a one-time producer “touch base” standard and virtually unlimited diversions are appropriate for most of the consolidated Federal orders, they are not appropriate for certain “deficit” markets in the Southeast. For these orders, touch base requirements and diversion limits provide another tool to ensure that an adequate supply of fluid milk is available to meet the markets’ needs. The specific standards for these orders are discussed in the regional section of this document.

In order to provide regulatory flexibility and marketing efficiencies, all of the new orders having diversion limits allow the market administrator to increase or decrease these limits on relatively short notice. This provision currently exists in some Federal orders and has proven to be a responsive, efficient, and effective way to deal with rapidly changing marketing conditions.

Cooperative Association

All current orders provide a definition for dairy farmer cooperative associations that market milk on behalf of their dairy farmer members. Providing for a uniform definition of a cooperative association facilitates the administration of the various order provisions as they apply to such producer organizations and recognizes the unique standing granted to dairy farmer cooperatives under the Capper-Volstead Act. Dairy farmer cooperatives are responsible for marketing the majority of the milk supplied to regulated handlers under the Federal order system.

As provided herein, a cooperative association means any cooperative marketing association of producers which the Secretary determines, after application for such recognition by the cooperative, is qualified as such under the provisions of the Act of Congress of February 18, 1922, as amended, known as the “Capper-Volstead Act.”

Additionally, the new orders continue to require that a cooperative association have full authority in the sale of the milk of its members and that it be engaged in making collective sales or marketings of milk or milk products for its dairy farmer members.

Several current orders provide a definition for a federation of 2 or more cooperative associations. As adopted here, all consolidated orders recognize a federation of cooperatives as satisfying the cooperative definition for the purposes of determining milk payments and pooling. Individual cooperatives of a federation of cooperatives must also meet the criteria as set forth for individual cooperative associations and their federations as incorporated under state laws.

Handler Reports

All current orders require handlers to submit monthly reports detailing the sources and uses of milk and milk products so that market average use values, or blend prices, can be determined and administered. Payroll reports and other reports required by the market administrator are also provided for in the orders. The order language for the consolidated orders is similar to that contained in current orders. The dates when reports are due in the market administrator’s office differ slightly by order according to custom and industry practice.

Announcements by the Market Administrator

In the course of administering the order, the market administrator is required to make several announcements each month with respect to classification, class prices and component prices, an “equivalent price” when necessary, and various producer prices. As adopted here, these provisions are uniform and are nearly identical to current order provisions, with the exception of section 62 (Announcement of producer prices), which differs to some extent among orders depending on the degree of component pricing used in the order.
Producer-Settlement Fund

In all of the current and consolidated orders, handlers are required to pay minimum class prices for the milk received from producers. These proceeds are blended through the market-wide pool so that producers are returned a uniform, or blend, price for their milk. The mechanism for the equalization of a handler’s use value of milk is the producer-settlement fund. It is established and administered by the market administrator for each order.

The producer-settlement fund ensures that all handlers are able to return the market blend price to producers whose milk was pooled under the order. Payments into the producer-settlement fund are made each month by handlers whose total classified use value of milk exceeds the value of such milk calculated at the uniform price (or at component prices for those orders with component pricing). Similarly, payments out of the producer-settlement fund are made each month to any handler whose use value is below the value of milk at the uniform price or component prices, as the case may be. The transfer of funds enables handlers with a use value below the average for the market to pay their producers the same uniform price as handlers whose Class I utilization exceeds the market average. This provision is uniform for all consolidated orders.

The consolidated orders vary with respect to dates for payments to the producer-settlement fund, due largely to industry practices and regional preferences. Each consolidated order provides for payment dates, and they are specific for each consolidated order.

In view of the need to make timely payment to handlers from the producer-settlement fund, it is essential that money due the fund be received by the due date. Accordingly, under all of the new orders payment to the producer-settlement fund will be considered made upon receipt by the market administrator.

The new orders specify that payment cannot be received on a nonbusiness day. Therefore, if the due date for a payment, including a payment to or from the producer-settlement fund, falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or national holiday, the payment would not be due until the next business day. This is specified in § 1000.90 of the General Provisions.

Payments to Producers and Cooperative Associations

The AMAA provides that handlers must pay to all producers and producer associations the uniform price. The existing orders generally allow proper deductions authorized by the producer in writing. Proper deductions are those that are unrelated to the minimum value of milk in the transaction between the producer and handler. Producer associations are allowed by the statute to “reblend” their payments to their producer members. The Capper Volstead Act and the AMAA make it clear that cooperative associations have a unique role in this regard.

The payment provisions to producers and cooperatives for the consolidated orders vary with respect to payment frequency, timing, and amount. These differences are generally consistent with current order provisions and with industry practices and customs in each of the new marketing areas.

Each of the new orders will require handlers to make at least one partial payment to producers in advance of the announcement of the applicable uniform prices. The Florida order will require 2 partial payments, mirroring the payment process provided in the 3 separate Florida orders. The amount of the partial payment varies among the new orders, reflecting the anticipated uniform price. Thus, for example, in the Upper Midwest order, the partial payment rate for milk received during the first 15 days of the month will be not less than the lowest announced class price for the preceding month. By comparison, the partial payment for the Florida order for milk received during the first 15 days of the month will be at a rate that is not less than 85 percent of the preceding month’s uniform price, adjusted for plant location.

The final payment for milk under the new orders will be required to be made so that it is received by producers no later than 2 days after the required pay-out date of monies from the producer-settlement fund.

Cooperatives will be paid by handlers for bulk milk and skim milk on the terms described for individual producers except that payment will be due one day earlier. Providing for an earlier payment date for cooperative associations is warranted because it will permit the cooperative association the time needed to distribute payments to individual producer members. The cooperative payment language in each of the consolidated orders has been expanded to include bulk milk and skim sold by cooperatives from their pool plants as well as by cooperatives acting as handlers for milk delivered directly from producers’ farms.

When milk is received by transfer from a cooperative’s pool plant, a minimum payment should be required for such milk just as if it were producer milk received directly from producers’ farms. Many, but not all, of the current orders have such a provision.

For Class I bulk milk that is received from a cooperative’s pool plant, the minimum Class I price level for such milk should be the price applicable at the location of the receiving handler’s plant. In the case of such transfers, it is presumed that milk will move from lower-priced areas to higher-priced areas. Under these circumstances, part of the transportation cost in moving the milk is covered by the difference in the Class I prices at the receiving plant and shipping plant.

Pricing Class I transfers at the receiving plant’s location ensures that a handler would not have an incentive to receive more distant plant milk instead of closer milk directly from producers’ farms. It also ensures that all similarly-located pool plants will pay the same minimum prices for their receipts regardless of whether the milk comes from another plant or directly from producers. Finally, it ensures that the handler receiving transferred milk pays at least a portion of the transportation cost to move the milk to its plant. Since transportation cost is likely to exceed the difference in prices between the transferor and transferee plants, the difference in cost will have to be made up through over-order premiums.

All of the payment dates are receipt dates. Since payment cannot be received on a non-business day, payment dates that fall on a Saturday, Sunday, or national holiday will be delayed until the next business day. While this has the effect of delaying payment to cooperatives and producers, the delay is offset by the shift from “date of payment” to “date of payment receipt.”

Minimum Payments to Producers

In a proceeding involving the current Carolina, Southeast, Louisville-Lexington-Evansville, and the former Tennessee Valley Federal milk orders (Orders 5, 7, 46, and 11, respectively), a proposal was made to clarify what constitutes a minimum payment to producers. The proposal was recommended by Hunter Farms (Hunter) and Milko Inc. (Milko), 2 handlers regulated under the current Carolina order. Under the proposal, a handler (except a cooperative acting in its capacity as a handler pursuant to paragraph 9(b) or 9(c)) may not reduce its obligations to producers or cooperatives by permitting producers or cooperatives to provide services which are the responsibility of the handler. According to the Hunter/Milko proposal, such services include: (1)
Preparation of producer payroll; (2) conduct of screening tests of tanker loads of milk; and (3) any services for processing or marketing of raw milk or marketing of packaged milk by the handler.

At the May 1996 hearing, representatives of Hunter and Milkco testified that both handlers receive milk from cooperative associations and Piedmont Milk Sales, a marketing agent handling the milk of non-member producers. The Hunter representative explained that due to competitive marketing conditions in the Southeast in late 1994 and early 1995 handlers were able to purchase milk supplies at Federal order minimum prices without any over-order premiums being charged. As a result of the absence of over-order premiums, the representative stated, Hunter received underpayment notices from the market administrator on milk that it had received from Piedmont Milk Sales.

Hunter argued that the problem of what constitutes a minimum payment to producers should be clarified to preclude another underpayment situation should premiums again disappear in the future. If this issue is not resolved, according to Hunter, it will suffer a loss of milk sales and its producers will receive lower prices. Hunter stated that the current policy is discriminatory and unfair and that everyone would benefit from a clarification of the rules defining Federal order minimum prices.

Based on the testimony presented at the public hearing and comments received, the Department issued a final decision on July 16, 1998 (63 FR 39039), denying the Hunter/Milkco proposal. However, the decision stated that this issue should be revisited as part of Federal order reform.

In the proposed rule for Federal order reform, interested parties were invited to comment on this issue. Only one Federal order reform comment, besides Hunter/Milkco's, discussed this issue. This comment letter, filed by the same law firm that represents Hunter/Milkco, expressed sentiments nearly identical to those that have been expressed by Hunter/Milkco.

Based on our review of these comments, we continue to believe that incorporation of Hunter/Milkco’s proposed language in the consolidated Federal orders will not necessarily solve the handler equity problem but could create a host of additional problems. For the reasons stated in the aforementioned final decision, the proposal is again denied for the consolidated orders.

**Payment Obligation of a Partially Regulated Distributing Plant**

All current and consolidated orders provide a method for determining the payment obligations due to producers by handlers that operate plants which are not fully regulated under any Federal order. These unregulated handlers are not required under the scope of Federal milk order regulation to account to dairy farmers for their milk at classified prices or to return a minimum uniform price to producers who have supplied the handler with milk. However, such handlers may sell fluid milk on routes in a regulated area in competition with handlers who are fully regulated. Therefore, the regulatory plan of Federal milk orders provides a minimum level of regulation to all handlers who have routes sales in a regulated marketing area. This is necessary so that classified pricing and pooling provisions of an order can be maintained. It is also necessary so that orderly marketing conditions can be assured with respect to handlers being charged the classified value under an order for the milk they purchase from dairy farmers. Without this provision, milk prices in an order would not be uniform among handlers competing for sales in the marketing area, a milk pricing requirement of the AMAA.

There are 3 regulatory options available to a partially regulated handler. First, the handler can purchase Class I milk that is priced under a Federal order in an amount equal to, or in excess of, quantities sold in the marketing area. Second, a payment may be made by the partially regulated handler into the producer-settlement fund of the regulated market at a rate equal to the difference between the Class I price and the uniform price of the regulated market. Finally, the operator of a partially regulated plant can demonstrate that the payment for its total supply of milk received from dairy farmers was equal to the amount which the partially regulated plant would have been required to pay if the plant had been fully regulated. This amount may be paid entirely to the dairy farmers that supplied the handler or in part to those dairy farmers with the balance paid into the producer-settlement fund of the regulated market.

The regulatory options described above and the payment option for reconstituted milk have worked well in the current orders and are continued uniformly in § 1000.76 for the consolidated orders.

**Adjustment of Accounts**

All current orders provide for the market administrator to adjust, based on verification of a handler’s reports, books, records, or accounts, any amount due to or from the market administrator, or to a producer or a cooperative association. This provision is continued in the consolidated orders. The provision requires the market administrator to provide prompt notification to a handler of any amount due and requires payment adjustment to be made on or before the next date for making payments as set forth in the provisions under which the error(s) occurred.

**Charges on Overdue Accounts**

All current orders provide for an additional charge to handlers who fail to make required payments to the producer-settlement fund when due. Such payments include payments to the producer-settlement fund, payments to producers and cooperative associations, payments by a partially regulated distributing plant, assessments for order administration and marketing service, and certain other payment obligations in orders with specialized provisions such as transportation credits. This should continue to be provided for in the consolidated orders.

In order to discourage late payments, a 1.0 percent charge per month is incorporated in the consolidated orders. This rate represents the mid-point in the range of charges by all orders presently. Overdue charges shall begin the day following the date an obligation was due. Any remaining amount due will be increased at the rate of 1.0 percent on the corresponding day of each month until the obligation is paid in full.

All overdue charges would accrue to the administrative assessment fund. The late-payment charge is to be a penalty that is meant to induce compliance with the payment terms of the order. If late-payment charges for monies due on producer milk were to accrue to the balance owed to either producers, cooperatives or producers/cooperatives via the producer-settlement fund, it could result in such producers and cooperatives being less concerned whether they are paid on time. By placing late-payment charges in the administrative fund, however, cooperatives and producers would not be placed in a position where they would prefer to be paid several days late so that they would receive the late-payment charges (or increase the level of producer prices due to late payment fee accrual to the producer-settlement fund). This is of particular concern in
markets with a single dominant cooperative. Additionally, by having late-payment fees accrue to the administrative fund, monies are made available to enforce late-payment provisions that would otherwise have to be generated through handlers' administrative assessments.

**Assessment for Order Administration**

The AMAA provides that the cost of order administration shall be financed by an assessment on handlers. Under the consolidated orders, a maximum rate of 5 cents per hundredweight is provided. This assessment would apply to all of a handler's receipts pooled under the order.

**Deduction for Marketing Services**

As in most current orders, the consolidated orders provide for the furnishing of marketing services to producers for whom cooperative associations do not perform services. Such services include providing market information and establishing or verifying weights, samples, and tests of milk received from such producers. In accordance with the Act, a marketing services provision must benefit all nonmember producers under the order.

The market administrator may contract with a qualified agent, including a cooperative association, to provide such services. The cost of such services should be borne by the producers for whom the services are provided. Accordingly, each handler will be required to deduct a maximum of 7 cents per hundredweight from amounts due each producer for whom a cooperative association is not providing such services. All amounts deducted must be paid to the market administrator not later than the due date for payments to the producer-settlement fund.

**6a. Northeast Region**

The Northeast Marketing Area

The recommended consolidated Northeast order differs significantly from other consolidated orders. In addition to merging three existing Federal milk orders, the Northeast order also calls for expansion in the northern region of New York state, and all currently unregulated areas of the New England states (except Maine).

While the current New England (Order 1) and Middle Atlantic (Order 4) orders have similar provisions for adjusting producer blend prices in a manner identical to plant price adjustments for location, the current New York-New Jersey (Order 2) order employs a "farm-point" pricing method. This decision adopts a plant-point pricing methodology in the consolidated Northeast order. This method is used in every other current marketing area and in every consolidated marketing area. This represents a considerable change in how milk will be priced for those handlers and producers whose milk currently is priced under the provisions of the New York-New Jersey order.

In addition to the different pricing provisions of the three existing orders, other important differences and related provisions need to be addressed in the Northeast regional order that will accomplish the goals of the AMAA. These include what is commonly referred to in the New York-New Jersey order as the "pass through" provision; the need for providing marketwide service payments in the form of cooperative service payments and balancing payments that currently exist in the New York-New Jersey order and do not exist in either the current New England or Middle Atlantic orders. Additionally, the three current northeast orders also provide for seasonal adjustments to the Class III and IIIA price.

It is fair to observe that the current order most affected by the consolidation is the New York-New Jersey order. In addition to the differences already described, certain terms and provisions of the Northeast order are also different in how they are described and presented but are nevertheless consistent with existing provisions that accomplish the goals of the AMAA. This is less of an issue for those entities that are accustomed to the terminology of provisions used in the New England and Middle Atlantic orders. The following presents a discussion of the recommended order provisions and issues that are unique to the consolidated Northeast order.

**Plant**

The plant definition for the consolidated Northeast order should differ from that of the other consolidated orders by allowing stationary storage tanks to be used as reload points. This exception to the plant definition is warranted for the consolidated Northeast order due to certain unique conditions that affect the ability of handlers and haulers to assemble milk in an efficient manner and subsequently transport it to a plant that actually processes milk into finished dairy products, including fluid milk products. This exception would not consider the reload point or facility as a point from which to price producer milk. Rather, milk once assembled would be shipped to a processing plant where it would be priced.

A portion of the Northeast milk supply is derived from some 200 small dairy farms located in Maine. Because much of this state is serviced by secondary and rural winding roads, the current New England order has provided for reload points as a workable solution to the inherent hauling difficulties in transporting relatively small loads of milk from the countryside to reload points and facilities with stationary storage tanks that do not serve as a pricing point. This should continue to be provided for in the consolidated Northeast order. Not to provide this accommodation would adversely affect a substantial number of small producers and the milk haulers that service them.

**Pool Plant**

The pool distributing and pool supply plant definitions of the consolidated Northeast order use the standard order language format used in other orders, combined with performance standards that are adapted to marketing conditions in the Northeast.

The pool distributing plant definition specifies that a pool distributing plant must have 25 percent or more of its total physical receipts of fluid milk distributed as route disposition and that at least 25 percent of route disposition be within the marketing area. The 25 percent level of total receipts distributed on routes is reasonably high enough to establish a distributing plant's association with the fluid milk market. The in-area route distribution performance standard level of 25 percent is adopted because it tends to minimize changing the regulatory status of handlers from their current regulatory status by the Federal order program that may result from the consolidation of existing orders. The 25 percent in-area sales standard is also a reasonable measure for identifying a level at which a distributing plant is sufficiently associated with the marketing area.

As already discussed, the consolidated Northeast order and other nearby consolidated marketing orders do not call for expansion to include certain currently unregulated areas. This includes areas in the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the entire state of Maine. Some distributing plants in these areas are not currently regulated, or are only partially regulated to the extent they have some Class I sales in regulated areas. A 25 percent in-area route distribution level will serve to ensure or minimize any changes in their current regulatory status under the Federal program that result from...
consolidation of the three northeast marketing areas into a single new order. Unit pooling, wherein two or more plants operated by the same handler located in the marketing area can qualify for pooling as a unit by meeting the total and in-area route distribution requirements of a pool distributing plant, is included in the consolidated Northeast order. Providing for unit pooling provides a degree of regulatory flexibility for handlers by recognizing specialization of plant operations. Due primarily to positions offered by many of the major Northeast dairy cooperatives and their recommendations on appropriate pool supply plant performance requirements, the consolidated Northeast order supply plant performance requirements initially should be set to require that in the months of August and December, at least 10 percent of the total quantity of bulk milk that is received at a supply plant be shipped to distributing plants. For the months of September through November, shipments by pool supply plants should be at least 20 percent. To the extent that a supply plant has met these performance requirements, no performance requirement is recommended for the months of January through July. However, a supply plant that has not met these performance requirements will need to meet a 10 percent performance requirement in each of the months of January through July in order to qualify as a pool supply plant.

This decision also provides for a system of supply plants for the consolidated Northeast order. This provision allows two or more supply plants operated by the same handler, or by one or more cooperative associations to be qualified for pool plant status by meeting the shipping standards in the same manner as a single supply plant subject to certain conditions. These conditions include written notification to the market administrator of the plants that will be included in the system, how pool status of plants will be affected if individual plants are removed from the system, and provisions for adding plants to the system.

Producer-Handler

The producer-handler definition for the consolidated Northeast order limits receipts to no more than 150,000 pounds of fluid milk products from handlers fully regulated under any Federal order. While the proposed rule addressed significant limitations on producer handlers with respect to how it distributed their milk, this decision removes such limitations. The intent of providing an appropriate producer-handler definition was to cause no change in the regulatory status of any known producer-handler currently in operation in the Northeast order region. However, the three orders being consolidated have significant differences in the extent of control a producer-handler must retain over its distribution practices. The current Middle Atlantic region does not limit the distribution facilities that may be used by a producer-handler. Thus, any limitation with respect to distribution could either cause a current producer-handler to lose such status, or may cause the need for a producer-handler to modify its business practices. Therefore, the producer-handler definition adopted herein removes any restrictions on how it distributes its products.

Also removed from the producer-handler definition is the provision that a producer-handler would not include any producer who also operates a distributing plant if it is requested that their dairy farm and plant be operated as separate entities. Removing this component of the producer-handler definition tends to strengthen the principle that producer-handlers rely primarily on their own farm production to bear the burden of balancing their fluid sales and to find outlets for their surplus production.

Producer

The producer definition of the consolidated Northeast order defines and describes those dairy farmers who are properly associated with the Northeast marketing area and who will share in the benefits that accrue from the marketwide pooling of milk under the order.

The producer definition establishes seasonal limitations for determining if a dairy farmer is considered to be a producer under the order. Basically, the order prohibits a dairy farmer from being a producer under the order during the flush production period if the dairy farmer did not supply the market during the months of relatively short production when milk supplies are needed most to meet fluid demands. Accordingly, the producer definition does not include dairy farmers whose milk during any month of December through June is received at a pool plant or by a cooperative association handler if the operator of the pool plant or the cooperative association caused the milk from such producer’s farm to be delivered to any plant as other than producer milk as defined in the producer milk provision of the consolidated Northeast order, or any other Federal milk order during the same month, in either of the two preceding months, or during any of the months of July through November.

Similarly, a dairy farmer would not be considered a producer under the order for any month of July through November if any milk of the dairy farmer is received at a pool plant or by a cooperative association handler if the pool plant operator or the cooperative association caused the dairy farmer’s milk to be delivered to any plant as other than producer milk, as defined in this proposed order, or in any other Federal milk order during the same month.

Producer Milk

The producer milk definition of the consolidated Northeast order follows the general structure and format of other consolidated orders. It differs from other consolidated orders in that it requires cooperative handlers to organize reports of producer receipts that originate outside of the states included in the marketing area, or the states of Maine or West Virginia, into reporting units with each unit separately reporting receipts. No diversion limits are established as they are in other consolidated orders. However, diversions are limited in functional terms. The maximum quantity of milk that a supply plant would be able to divert and still maintain pool plant status would be 100 percent minus the applicable shipping standard. This should provide for a maximum amount of flexibility in marketing milk in the most efficient manner to balance fluid milk needs.

Component Pricing

The consolidated Northeast order will employ a component pricing plan in the classified pricing of milk under the order as previously discussed in the BFP section of this decision. This is consistent with positions taken and proposals offered by major cooperative groups in the Northeast who supply a large percentage of the milk needs of the market. However, on the basis of public comments, the consolidated Northeast order will not contain a somatic-cell adjustor.

In response to the proposed rule, one major association representing primarily milk processors and dairy product manufacturers in New York expressed opposition to employing a multiple component pricing plan in the Northeast order. Their objection to its adoption is that it will be burdensome for handlers. This was expressed primarily as burdens associated with changing from farm point pricing to plant point pricing of milk and changes that handlers would need to make for producer pay-roll purposes and in the
accounting software that they contend would entail considerable cost outlays. Also expressed in opposition to its adoption was that multiple component pricing does not favor fluid milk handlers, that it is designed primarily for high-solids producers and manufacturers, that it may result in manufacturers having to pay premiums to attract high-solids milk, and that it rewards some producers while reducing pay prices to others.

These objections are unpersuasive. Multiple component pricing is a method for determining, among other things, how producer milk will be priced under the order on a basis beyond just skim milk and butterfat. Components of milk have values that are recognized by the marketplace and producers have expressed the desire for having their pay prices adjusted according to such values. Nevertheless, it does not affect the total per hundredweight value of milk. Additionally, multiple component pricing does not either favor or disfavor fluid milk handlers as the multiple component pricing plan adopted for the Northeast order will continue to price Class I milk on the basis of skim milk and butterfat.

It should be noted that there are many multiple component pricing plans operated by many handlers in the northeast region. The existence of such plans provides evidence that it is appropriate and reasonable to formalize a multiple component pricing plan for the consolidated Northeast marketing order, especially when there is strong support for its adoption among producers to the extent that there are so many similar plans, it should not be particularly burdensome for a one-time change by handlers in their accounting systems for determining producer payroll.

Farm-Point vs. Plant Point Pricing

At issue in merging the three northeast marketing areas is the use of two distinct pricing methods for milk. The Middle Atlantic and New England marketing areas employ a system of plant-point pricing. This pricing method is also employed in every other marketing area in the Federal order system. Only the New York-New Jersey marketing area uses what is called “farm-point” pricing. This decision adopts plant-point pricing as the pricing method for the consolidated Northeast order.

Plant-point pricing of milk that is pooled under an order prices milk f.o.b. the plant of first receipt. The cost of hauling from the farm to the plant is the responsibility of the producer. When the receiving handler is also the hauler, orders permit the handlers in making payments to each producer to deduct hauling costs up to the full amount authorized in writing by the producer. As originally employed in the New York-New Jersey order (Order 2), farm-point pricing establishes the price for milk by the zone (distance from market computed from the nearer of the basing points) of the township in which a producer’s milkhouse is located. While termed “farm-point,” farms are grouped by their township location because this is the nearest practicable proxy for actual farm location. In functional terms, when a handler picks up milk at a producer’s farm, the handler takes title of the milk at the time and point of pickup. Accordingly, there were no adjustments in payments to producers to cover any part of the cost of pickup or hauling in moving milk to the handler’s plant. Farm-point pricing fundamentally shifts the cost of transporting milk from the producer to the handler. Farm-point pricing has been in effect in Order 2 since 1961. While the fundamental concept of farm-point pricing has been retained with respect to its overall structure of mileage zones, other order provisions were adopted subsequent to its establishment and modified over time so that farm-point pricing could remain viable while allowing handlers to charge some of the cost of hauling producers’ milk to the plant of first receipt.

In the decision that established farm-point pricing (25 FR 8610, Sept. 7, 1960), prevailing marketing conditions were invoked to warrant this type of pricing system. At the time of the emergence of bulk-tank milk began to take on a degree of prominence in the milk supply of Order 2. Prior to the adoption of farm-point pricing (1959), about 8 percent of the producers had bulk tanks, accounting for at least 14 percent of the volume of milk associated with the market. About 92 percent of producers delivered their milk at their own expense directly to plants in 40 quart cans. Most of the milk can-delivered was from farms within a radius of not more than 15 miles from the plant. The milk of producers who had converted to bulk tanks, in some instances, was hauled more than 200 miles from farm to city plants, but the majority of bulk tank milk was moved much shorter distances to country receiving plants. The decision cited that in October, 1959, milk was received from 49,719 producers at 691 plants.

When milk was delivered in cans to a producer’s plant, the plant was the location at which milk was weighed, sampled, and tested for purity and quality, and where cans were washed. It was at the plant that milk was accepted or rejected. It was the place where milk was cooled and co-mingled with other individual producer’s milk. More importantly, it was the place where control of the milk passed from producer to the plant operator or from which the milk was moved by the plant to other plants for fluid or manufacturing uses. Minimum prices required by the order to be paid by handlers were adjusted for the location of the plant at which milk was received from dairy farmers.

Bulk tank milk brought a set of new factors. When milk was transferred from a producer’s bulk tank to the hauler, the point of transfer was also the point where several functions are performed. Milk in a producer’s bulk tank has already been cooled, and therefore is not subject to the early delivery deadlines. The weight of milk was determined at the bulk tank, and samples were taken for butterfat and quality. It was also here that the individual producer’s milk was rejected or accepted and lost its identity by being co-mingled with other milk.

Numerous problems were identified and inregulating the handling of bulk tank milk in an order where pooling depended upon direct delivery from the farm to a pool plant and under which minimum class prices and the uniform prices to be paid to producers was reflective of the location of the plant where delivery was made:

1. Administrative problems associated with bulk tank handling arose, particularly where and when milk was regarded to have been received. Bulk tank milk provided the opportunity to deliver milk to different plants, some pool and some nonpool. Where a given tank load of milk was unloaded if it went to two or more plants of the same or different handlers on the same day was difficult to determine.

2. The incentive arose (because of the administrative difficulty of determining when and where milk was received) for handlers to behave in a way that would result in the maximum exclusion of milk from the pool for fluid use outside the marketing area.

3. The incentive arose for the maximum inclusion in the pool of milk in fluid and manufacturing uses.

4. The incentive and opportunity arose for handlers to select one of several plants for receipt of bulk tank milk, with or without manipulation of hauling charges. This distorted and impinged upon the effectiveness of the minimum price provisions of the order, especially in the case of relatively long hauls of bulk tank milk.

The 1961 decision that established farm-point pricing provided eight scenarios that demonstrated how handlers behaved so as to minimize
their pricing obligations to producers. Most of the scenarios arose from the inability to determine when milk was received at a plant. In order to mitigate such circumstances, several things were done. Foremost was the establishment of farm-point pricing on the basis of bulk tank units and the designation of each bulk tank unit as either a pool or nonpool unit and defining the circumstances under which such designations could be changed.

The pricing of milk at the farm eliminated the incentive for handlers to attempt to make it appear that the plant of receipt was other than the plant where milk is actually received and handled. It was made crystal clear that delivery and receipt of bulk milk takes place at the farm. Once acquired by the handler, the plant or plants to which the milk may be delivered depended on decision of the handler, not the producer. Under these circumstances, where the milk was actually used was not a factor to be reflected in the minimum producer price. The operator of the 10-cent per cwt. charge for hauling under the Order, provided that producers authorized this maximum level in writing.

In the 1963 decision, the Secretary found that allowing for a limited authorized service charge for hauling bulk tank milk at a maximum rate of 10 cents per cwt. was sufficient. This was largely based on the fact that handlers were not then charging for bulk tank pickup and hauling, but rather were paying premiums to bulk tank milk. Additionally, can-milk direct delivered by producers to plants was still very much the norm. While bulk tank milk was growing, it had not yet accounted for a majority of milk pooled on the order.

This decision raised, for the first time with respect to farm-point pricing, the maintenance of orderly conditions and uniform pricing to handlers on all milk received by producers authorized this maximum rate of 10 cents per cwt. charge for hauling under the Order, provided that producers authorized this maximum level in writing.

By 1977, some 16 years after the adoption of farm-point pricing, marketing conditions had changed again and the issue of providing for more equitable competition among handlers both within the Order 2 market and between other orders took on primary importance. By this time, can-milk was about 3 percent of the market, with the balance represented by bulk tank milk, the near inverse of the marketing conditions prevailing in 1961. The transportation credit that had been established for handlers in the 1970 decision for manufacturing milk was now extended to all milk received by handlers. The transportation credit was increased to 15 cents per cwt., plus an additional 15-cent maximum negotiable credit above the “automatic” 15 cents because total average transportation costs were found to be about 30 cents per cwt. For reasons nearly identical to the 1963 and 1970 decisions, “formalizing” the negotiable hauling charge was not adopted because of needed flexibility in accounting for milk movements from the farm to the township pricing point (42 FR 41582, Aug. 17, 1977). In that decision the Secretary also raised the direct delivery differential from 5 cents to 15 cents per cwt. in the 1–70 mile zone for can-milk delivered by farmers to plants within this zone, and changed the transportation adjustment rate from 0.2 cents per cwt. for each 10 miles to 1.5 cents per cwt. for each 10-mile zone beyond the 201–210 zone, and 1.8 cents
Cooperatives were of the strong opinion that the cost of milk assembly and transportation are the marketing costs of the handler and not producers. However, they also indicated that changes were warranted in the order because of the failure of neighboring markets to adopt farm-point pricing.

Comparative examples of handler price inequities with respect to their cost of milk was amply demonstrated for both intra and inter market situations. With respect to inappropriate price alignment between orders, the competitive relationships between Order 2 and Order 4 were closely examined. On intra-order movements of milk, it was shown that Class I handlers in New York City had a significantly lower procurement cost for direct-ship over bulk tank milk because bulk tank milk from “distant” supply plants had higher transfer and over-the-road hauling costs. Supply plant milk at the city represented about 80 percent of milk receipts at city plants. The inter-market situation demonstrated that handlers in Philadelphia accounted for milk at prices lower than New York handlers. Order 4 handlers were in a position to establish lower resale prices for fluid milk than their competitors in the New York market because the burden of increased hauling costs fell largely on Order 2 handlers. As in 1970, other proposals were denied in light of adopting the 15-cent hauling credit for handlers. These other proposals included lowering Class I and the manufacturing price for milk in the order by 15 cents per cwt.

By 1981, bulk tank milk accounted for nearly the entire milk supply pooled on Order 2—about 99.6 percent. As the result of a hearing held in June 1980, in the final decision (FR 46 33008, June 25, 1981) the Secretary again amended the transportation credit provisions of the order. The 15 cents per cwt credit for handlers was retained; however, the 15-cent negotiable transportation service charge was modified to allow handlers to negotiate with producers for any farm-to-first plant hauling cost in excess of the 15-cent transportation credit, plus the amount that the class use value of the milk at the location of the plant of first receipt was in excess of its class use value at the location where milk was received in the bulk tank unit from which the milk was transferred. According to the 1981 decision, this amendment would adjust hauling allowances for handlers to more closely relate the value of milk to the costs incurred in transporting milk from farms and country plants to distributing plants in the major consumption areas of the market. Additionally, the decision indicated that this change was necessary to reflect current marketing conditions and permit a more equitable competitive situation for regulated handlers, both on an intra market and inter market basis. The decision also applied a 15-cent direct delivery differential for bulk tank milk received at plants within 70 miles of New York City on the basis that a direct delivery differential is applicable to milk received in cans at a plant in the 1-70 mile zone.

In the 1981 decision, the Secretary found that the majority of milk moved to distributing plants in 1979 from the 1-70 mile zone moved directly from farms. This accounted for about 58 percent of the milk in this zone with 48 percent being reloaded. Moreover, the decision found that Order 2 plants located in northern New Jersey received direct shipped milk as did handlers located in Order 4. Thus, inter market price alignment needed to be structured primarily on the basis of handlers obtaining costs associated with handlers. This resulted in handlers being able to successfully argue that with this burden, it became much more difficult for the order to establish and maintain uniform prices to handlers as required by section 608(5)(c) of the AMAA. This is evidenced by the nature of the decisions of 1963, 1970, 1977, and 1981. Much “repair” to other order provisions were also needed to retain farm-point pricing.

Few comments were received in response to the recommended adoption of plant-point pricing by current Order 2 entities. One New Jersey entity thought that its elimination would eventually lead to increased hauling costs borne by producers. Another comment received from a trade organization representing fluid milk processors and dairy product manufacturers, thought that too much emphasis was placed on the “free-hauling” to the detriment of other desirable features embodied in farm-point pricing. Most important was this entity’s view that farm-point pricing provides for increased flexibility and in providing for automatic incentives for the most efficient hauls of milk for/by handlers in assembling and moving milk while not affecting the price paid to dairy farmers.

The arguments for retaining farm-point pricing are not persuasive in light of the detailed discussion on the entire life-cycle of its history discussed above. This is not to discount the importance of this item of desirable nature of farm-point pricing that led to its adoption and that have been articulated over the
years for its retention in the New York-
New Jersey marketing area.

Nevertheless, farm-point pricing has
outlived its intended purpose and the
Secretary determines that it will not be
retained in a consolidated Northeast
order.

The Need for a Producer-Price
Mechanism

As discussed above, farm-point
pricing for producers did provide some
rational pricing incentives to promote
efficiency within the Order 2 marketing
area. This can reasonably be summed up
by concluding that farm-point pricing
would not provide, as plant-point
pricing would, incentives to haul direct-
shipped milk to city plants for
manufacturing uses, since there would
not be a credit from the pool for the full
amount by which a uniform price
transportation differential at the city
plant exceeds the transportation
differential for the zone of the bulk
unit. Adopting plant pricing would have
had the effect of encouraging milk to
move long distances to city plants for
manufacturing uses when transportation
savings could be realized if such milk
stayed nearer to manufacturing plants
generally located in the milkshed.

In an effort to address the dairy
industry structures that have evolved
over the past four decades in the three
current northeast marketing areas,
efforts were undertaken by a major
group of dairy farmer cooperatives in
the northeast to address what the
pricing implications are to producers
and handlers as the region moves to a
unified plant-point pricing method.

This has resulted in a proposal by the
Association of Dairy Cooperatives in the
Northeast (ADCNE) that include St.
Albans Cooperative Creamery, Inc.,
Land O'Lakes, Upstate Farms
Cooperative, Inc., Agri-Mark, Inc., Dairy
Farmers of America, Inc., Dairylea
Cooperative Inc., and Maryland &
Virginia Milk Producers Cooperative
Association Inc. These dairy farmer
cooperatives account for well over half
of the milk that would be pooled and
priced under the proposed consolidated
Northeast order. Their proposal calls for
establishing a producer differential
structure that would “overlay” the Class
I differential structure that would apply
in the consolidated Northeast order.

The structure proposed is a county-
based plant-point price structure,
providing for 14 zones that
accommodate the need to reflect
existing and longstanding competitive
price relationships among plants, while
integrating the farm and plant point
pricing systems currently used in
Orders 1, 2, and 4 and with currently
state-regulated areas that fall outside
of the proposed marketing area. Further,
the ADCNE proposed prices at the major
cities in the Northeast, including
Boston, New York City, Philadelphia,
Baltimore, and Washington, D.C.,
included specific Class I differential
levels that are somewhat different from
those presented in the Option 1A Class
I price surface. For example, the
recommended decision recommended a
New York City Class I differential of
$3.15, while ADCNE proposed $3.20. In
general, the ADCNE proposal assumed
that the Class I differential structure that
would be adopted was Option 1A,
which is the Class I pricing option they
strongly support, and also is the Class
I pricing option overwhelmingly
supported in public comments received
from interested parties from the
northeast.

With respect to a producer differential
surface, the ADCNE proposed that a
debit of 5 cents per cwt. be made to the
blend price applicable at non-
distributing plants in certain zones. The
need for the debit, according to the
ADCNE proposal, is to make deliveries
to distributing plants somewhat more
attractive to producers, while decreasing
the amount by which manufacturing
plants draw on the marketwide pool for
transportation values, offering also that
such a debit is economically justified
and authorized by the AMAA.

According to ADCNE, it is distributing
plants that provide the revenue—in the
form of Class I values—which form the
blend price paid to producers.

Deliveries to retail, according to ADCNE,
do not contribute to increasing the value
to the marketwide pool. The debit,
according to ADCNE, is a reflection in
part of the Order 2 system, which has
priced some 50 percent of the milk in
the northeast region, and which does
not provide location-based
transportation payments for movements
from farms to manufacturing plants.
The ADCNE proposal provides that
deliveries to Class I plants are rewarded
under this system with an additional 5-
cent payment from the pool for the
marketwide benefit conferred by a
distributing plant’s utilization.

For the Western New York State order,
ADCNE also proposed a broad area
in which a producer differential of $2.40
per cwt. to producers would be payable
on deliveries of producer milk at all
plant locations in this area. This portion
of the price surface proposed by ADCNE
purports to be reflective of the major
historical movements of milk from east
to west in the region which returned the
eastern dairy farmers under Order 2’s farm-point
price system, and that the Western New York
State order has not had any location
differentials, thereby establishing a
“flat” price surface in the area. If those
plants, for producer pricing purposes,
were zoned lower in value reflecting the
westerly and northerly distance from
New York City or Philadelphia, ADCNE
is of the view that the ability of both
distributing and supply plants to attract
an adequate supply of milk could be in
jeopardy. Furthermore, the expectation
that Class I utilization of the proposed
Mideast order will be nearly 10 percent
higher than the Class I utilization in the
Northeast order was also offered in
support of the ADCNE-proposed
producer differential level in this area.

The ADCNE proposal also
recommended producer differential
levels in areas that they believed should
be included in either the consolidated
Northeast order or the Mideast order.

Additionally, the ADCNE proposal also
addressed producer differential levels at
other locations outside of the Northeast
region. Additional supporting and
amplifying comments were also provided
by Dairylea. These comments supported
the major themes offered in the ADCNE
proposal for a producer differential
overlay to Class I differential levels.

Dairylea stated that moving directly to
a plant-point pricing method would
accentuate “existing inequities and
market dysfunctions.” Dairylea further
commented that a plant-point
differential schedule would maintain
current inter-plant price differences in
the current New England and Middle
Atlantic orders, but would worsen them
for New York manufacturing plants,
many of which are cooperatively
owned. Their view of the ADCNE
pricing proposal was that it maintains
economic incentives for milk to move
to Class I distributing plants, would
provide for more balanced procurement
parity among competing manufacturing
plants, maintains equitable producer
pricing when milk is marketed by
transporting it from a higher priced zone
to a lower priced zone, and provides a
structure that allows for adequately
blend price levels in all areas of the
Northeast milkshed.

Dairylea further commented that
under plant-point pricing, “near-in”
manufacturing plants (plants
located in a relatively high differential
location) would enjoy a procurement
advantage relative to their competitors
that are located in a lower-priced
location. Dairylea recommended
narrowing the price differences between
manufacturing plants that compete for
producer milk. Dairylea supported lowering producer
differentials for manufacturing plants
that are located in high-valued locations and increasing those differentials at manufacturing plants in areas that have lower location values. Dairylea advocated the ADCNE proposal for a producer differential that is 5 cents lower than those of Class I plants when such plants are located in the same pricing zones. Dairylea's view of this design results in maintaining, or slightly increasing, producer differentials applicable at Class I plants and reducing those applicable at "near-in" manufacturing plants. At the same time, this would provide for increasing producer differentials at manufacturing plants in central, western, and northern New York. According to Dairylea, this pricing surface would present a more equitable marketing environment than strict plant-point pricing currently employed in Orders 1 and 4, while at the same time not threatening the viability of manufacturing plants in those areas of a consolidated Northeast marketing area.

A major theme of Dairylea was its view that Federal milk orders and their provisions should foster an environment under which manufacturing plants are provided equal cost and procurement ability, and not disfavor such manufacturing plants located in high milk production areas where Class I differentials are lower. Dairylea also stated that the final rule of 1991 that realigned intra-order prices in Order 2 resulted in harm to producers in northern and western New York. While it is not appropriate to specifically revisit this issue and decision here, official notice is taken of the final decision (55 FR 50934, December 11, 1990) that realigned Class I differentials in the three existing northeast marketing areas.

Comments supporting the ADCNE proposal for a producer pricing surface were also offered by Upstate Farms Cooperative, Inc. The Upstate Farms views served to reiterate the major themes developed in the ADCNE proposal.

Agri-Mark noted, receive a higher price than farms farther from the city, even though their milk ends up in the same place.

Agri-Mark noted that most manufacturing plants, especially cheese plants, were built in the northeast prior to the adoption of farm-point pricing and not in response to it. Rather, says Agri-Mark, these plants were built at their present locations because of their proximity to abundant milk supplies. The procurement problems for manufacturing plants that Order 2 entities alert us to did not arise in New England manufacturing plants under plant-point pricing even though these plants were located as far north as possible within the milkshed for New England.

Simply put, Agri-Mark believes that rather than decreasing the differential between manufacturing plants and city distributing plants, an increase is justified. They are also of the opinion that manufacturing plants located far from higher will maintain an advantage even with the adoption of strict plant-point pricing because this milk does not need to travel long distances to reach manufacturing plants. Agri-Mark indicates that the ADCNE proposal would cause Agri-Mark producers to receive lower prices that competitive price relationships do not warrant.

The Agri-Mark view of Federal milk marketing orders differed substantially from the views expressed by Dairylea. Agri-Mark stated that the role of Federal milk marketing orders is to treat all producers equitably relative to how their milk is used and not to weaken price integrity by causing destructive competition among producers for sale to Class I outlets. This is best accomplished, according to Agri-Mark, with appropriate pooling requirements and Class I differentials to satisfy the Class I demands of the market. Agri-Mark fears that if the regulatory pricing plan gives a distributing plant an advantage over a cooperative manufacturing/balancing plant in the same zone, that plant can use this advantage for itself instead of passing it along to farmers to offset transporting their milk to market.

Lastly, in their opposition to the ADCNE proposal, Agri-Mark noted that no manufacturing plant has been built in any city zone for decades, noting that the only significant plants in such areas for the northeast are older plants producing nonfat dry milk and butter and which serve to balance the Class I need. This is a major reason that such plants are there for common sense and efficiency reasons. In support of this observation, Agri-Mark noted that existing Class I differentials have not been adjusted to more fully account for increases in hauling costs.

A producer pricing differential structure that differs from a Class I differential is denied. The issue before the Department is to minimize the impact of the change from farm-point to plant-point pricing on producers as part of adopting plant-point pricing for the new consolidated order. The change to plant-point pricing will affect approximately one-half of the producers in the consolidated marketing area and is a significant departure from historical methods of distributing the revenue that accrues from classified pricing to producers whose milk is pooled under the current New York-New Jersey order. Plants, however, will not experience significant change since plants currently regulated under Order 2 already account to the marketwide pool at the Class I location differential value. The issue then, tends to focus on how to pool and distribute the revenue equitably as possible to producers. Of the few public comments that were received on this issue in response to the January 30, 1998, proposed rule, it was requested that this issue be reconsidered. However, no new or persuasive arguments were advanced that would cause a change in denying this proposal.

Competitive equity between manufacturing plants is already ensured by the classified prices applicable to handlers who operate such plants. In fact, this decision adopts uniform Class III and Class IV pricing that are applicable for all locations. The more appropriate issue this proposal seems to address is that manufacturing plants are often cooperatively owned. All entities, including cooperatives in their capacity as handlers, account to the marketwide pool at the manufacturing price for milk received at their plants. The price paid to producers is the blend price for all milk pooled on the market that was priced according to its use. Cooperatively owned manufacturing plants located in higher-priced areas will pay a higher blend price to producers who deliver milk to that location provided they meet the performance requirements for being pooled, thereby demonstrating the appropriate degree of association with the market. In this regard, it is worthy to note that not all manufacturing plants in the high-valued zones in the New York marketing area are pool plants. Blend prices are adjusted everywhere according to the location value of the plant. Adjusting blend prices on the basis of whether or not milk was delivered to a distributing plant or to a
manufacturing plant seems to create a form of producer price discrimination that classified pricing and the mechanism of marketwide pooling and its related provisions attempt to mitigate. Such marketwide pooling provisions provide a degree of equity to producers in the form of a uniform blend price adjusted only for the location value on all milk pooled on the market. Classified pricing and marketwide pooling have served well to mitigate the price competition between producers seeking preferred higher-valued outlets for their milk, while at the same time ensuring handlers uniform prices, adjusted only for location, in the prices they pay for milk.

Marketwide Service Payments

Cooperative Service Payments—

Cooperative service payments, as part of a marketwide service payment provision for the consolidated Northeast order, should not be included in a consolidated Northeast order. As originally proposed by ADCNE, a 2-cent per cwt. payment would be made out of the marketwide pool to cooperatives and non-cooperative entities for funding information-gathering and services related to amending Federal milk marketing order provisions that would be of marketwide benefit. Cooperative service payments of this sort currently are provided for under terms of the New York-New Jersey order, but are not provided for in either the New England or Middle Atlantic orders. However, under the New York-New Jersey order, cooperative service payments are made only to qualified cooperatives that meet the conditions specified under the order and does not provide for such payments to non-cooperative entities. In comments provided in response to the proposed rule published on January 30, 1998, the ADCNE withdrew this component of their marketwide service payment proposal.

Rationale offered in support of a cooperative service type payment to cooperatives and non-cooperative entities was based on recognizing that in a regulatory pool structure, private parties provide important services that are of benefit to everyone involved in the marketwide pool, including the promulgation, amendments to, and administration of the order. Not to provide a mechanism for the recovery of a portion of the expense involved in providing such services would disadvantage those incurring these expenses while everyone in the market benefits as a result of these services. Qualifying criteria presented for entities eligible to receive this payment included a demonstration to the market administrator that it provides information with respect to market order prices and marketing conditions, that it has retained legal and economic staff or consulting personnel available to participate in marketing order amendatory proceedings, to consult with the market administrator with respect to marketing order issues, and that the entity pool at least 2.5 percent of the order’s total milk volume.

There is not a compelling reason to adopt this sort of compensatory plan to reimburse those entities that incur these costs. Market administrators and their staffs make themselves available to meet with, discuss, and aid in formulating positions that reflect marketing conditions as a normal part of their duties. Additionally, there are numerous provisions in the order that require as a matter of course the issuance of reports, prices, and other information that affect all marketing order participants and that provide a service to the entities affected by the regulatory plan of the order. Finally, no other current or consolidated order provides for such cost compensation. Cooperative and proprietary handlers in the New England and Middle Atlantic marketing areas included in the consolidated Northeast order, as well as entities in all other marketing areas have not experienced or have demonstrated any of the harm or “disadvantage” that arises, or may arise, if such costs are not shared by the entire pool of producers in the marketing area. This decision can only assume that industry participants that have an interest in developing the promulgation and amendments to marketing orders would be willing to do so at their own expense. The positions and arguments offered are largely issues of the self-interest of entities. As such, self-interest may or may not be of marketwide benefit.

Balancing Payments—A marketwide service payment plan which would compensate qualified handlers that perform market balancing should be included in the consolidated Northeast order at this time.

The original proposal for providing balancing payments from the marketwide pool was intended to reflect the additional costs that handlers incur in balancing the Class I needs of the market and clearing the market of temporary milk surpluses. According to the proponents, these balancing costs are not fully recoverable from Class I handlers; however, the benefit that results from this service being provided is a benefit of all producers in the market.

Handlers that incur the costs would be those handlers that would receive partial cost reimbursement of 4 cents per cwt. Cooperatives would be eligible to form common marketing agencies or federations for purposes of qualifying for balancing payments. Such handlers would include those who: (1) Demonstrate ownership or operation of a balancing plant with the capacity to process a million pounds of milk per day into storable products such as cheese, butter, and nonfat dry milk and who also represent at least 2.5 percent of the total volume of milk pooled under the order; (2) have under contract, and the obligation to pool on a year-round basis, at least 8 percent of the market’s milk volume; (3) own a balancing plant that must be made available to other handlers or cooperatives at the request of the market administrator; (4) qualify to provide pool producers with a temporary market for their milk for up to 30 days at the request of the market administrator; and (5) demonstrate to the market administrator that their utilization of milk in Class I uses is greater than the minimum shipments required for pool plant qualification under the order.

ADCNE modified the above described original proposal for balancing payments. The modified proposal calls for a balancing payment of 6 cents per cwt. and revised criteria for those entities eligible to receive balancing payments from the marketwide pool. As with their original proposal, they are of the opinion that a system of reimbursement is necessary to offset costs associated with absorbing, or balancing, the daily, weekly, and seasonal fluctuation in Class I demand in the market. Balancing payments would be made on qualifying pounds of pooled milk delivered to manufacturing milk plants. Additionally, this milk would be subject to a “cal” by the market administrator during times when there is additional need for milk by distributing plants in the market.

The modified proposal would provide balancing payments to any handler in any month in which the handler’s deliveries of milk to distributing plants are greater than 20 percent but less than 65 percent of its total pooled milk volume. According to ADCNE, the lower percentage requires handlers to maintain a constant, significant association with the Class I market and is higher than the level required by other handlers for pooling qualification. Additionally, the 65 percent, says ADCNE, serves to limit participation to handlers with substantial quantities of reserve milk not dedicated to the Class I service. Qualifying criteria for Class I handlers would be determined on a “net shipment” basis to prevent the reshipment of milk.
deliveries that would otherwise qualify for balancing payments. Payment would be made on the reserve volumes of milk. In the event that the market administrator issues a "call" for additional milk deliveries to distributing plants, the volume of milk delivered to non-distributing plants in the prior month by handlers subject to the call would be used as a basis for requiring handlers to make additional shipments to distributing plants on a pro-rata basis. For example, if participating handlers in the prior month had delivered 100 million pounds of milk to non-distributing plants and the market needed 10 million pounds of milk delivered to distributing plants, each handler subject to the call would be obligated to deliver an additional volume of milk to distributing plants equal to 10 percent of its deliveries to non-distributing plants in the prior month. ADCNE viewed their balancing payment provision as establishing a "standby pool" of milk among qualifying handlers who elect to participate. Participation in the pool would entitle the qualified handler to a payment of 6 cents per hundredweight, determined monthly, on the handler's deliveries to manufacturing plants, but would also obligate the handler to deliver additional quantities in the event of a "call" for up to one year after a balancing payment has been received.

According to ADCNE, the costs involved with matching the demands of the Class I market with the total production of milk costs which marketing handlers, proprietary and cooperative alike, must absorb. These costs are neither fully reflected in Class I prices, nor in over-order handling charges and are not uniformly shared throughout the market, while the Class I value is shared equally within the marketwide pool, says ADCNE. The unique structural characteristics of the northeast's markets and the preponderance of producers delivering directly to proprietary Class I handlers on a regular basis, says ADCNE, prevents supplying handlers from recovering these costs from Class I handlers.

According to the ADCNE, the proposed Northeast marketing area will comprise the largest Class I market in the Federal order system and also represent the largest pool in the country in terms of producer milk. According to ADCNE, monthly Class I sales will be approximately 900 million pounds and will be more than 65 percent greater than the current consolidated order's Class I pool. ADCNE says this huge Class I market presents significant challenges to its suppliers with respect to balancing daily, weekly and seasonal needs and sets the Northeast order apart from other orders.

The ADCNE offers additional justification for balancing payments, in part, by drawing on the example of other orders providing for marketwide service payments for offsetting the additional costs of moving milk from assembly areas and for plant-to-plant movements of milk. ADCNE notes that such payments from the marketwide pool are provided for in recognition of the marketwide benefit that accrues to all market participants when the costs of milk assembly and the movement of milk are shared by all producers.

Other public comments similarly articulated the uniqueness of the current New York market and its role as part of the consolidated Northeast marketing area. One commenter observed that the Northeast marketing area, and New York in particular, is unique in terms of the mix of producers who are represented by cooperatives and those that are not. According to this commenter, about 65 percent of the producers in New York are represented by cooperatives, while the remaining 35 percent are independent producers to the market. Further, noted this commenter, it has been cooperatives that have, since the 1960's, taken over the role of balancing the Class I needs of the market by moving milk around on a daily basis between distributing and manufacturing plants. According to this commenter, such was and should continue to be an important factor to consider for the larger consolidated market that expects to need about two thirds of its milk supply balanced between an expected 45 percent Class I and about 20 percent Class II utilization. This commenter was of the opinion that markets characterized by very high cooperative membership already spread the costs of balancing uniformly over a large pool of producers.

All other public comments supported inclusion of balancing payments in the consolidated Northeast order. These comments similarly called attention to the unique structure of the Northeast marketing area, primarily in terms of the number of producers represented by cooperatives and the relatively high number of independent milk producers and the unequal costs that would be incurred by producers who incur the additional costs of balancing the fluid needs of the market. While there was specific recognition of the important role that cooperatives play in balancing the market, it was generally thought that if balancing payments would be provided for in the consolidated order, they should be made available to cooperative and proprietary handlers alike.

The consolidated Northeast marketing area is expected to retain a unique feature of the existing New York-New Jersey marketing area—a relatively high percentage of producers who are not members of cooperatives. As of December 1997, the current New York-New Jersey market had about 68 percent of its milk and about 69 percent of its producers represented by cooperatives. In the consolidated Northeast marketing area, the expected amount of milk represented by cooperatives will increase to about 76 percent with about 75 percent of the number of producer represented by cooperatives. While the percent of milk volume and number of producers represented by cooperatives is growing, the volume of milk and number of independent producers remains significant. This is especially important given the role of cooperatives who operate manufacturing plants and who provide and incur the cost associated with balancing Class I needs of the market. Without providing for some cost offset for balancing, about 26 percent of the milk and about 25 percent of the producers would not be sharing in the burden of balancing the market.

The revised criteria presented by the ADCNE seem reasonable in determining which handlers would be eligible to receive balancing payments from the marketwide pool. The qualification standards for receiving balancing payments are as follows:

- The consolidated Northeast marketing area is expected to retain a unique feature of the existing New York-New Jersey marketing area—a relatively high percentage of producers who are not members of cooperatives. As of December 1997, the current New York-New Jersey market had about 68 percent of its milk and about 69 percent of its producers represented by cooperatives. In the consolidated Northeast marketing area, the expected amount of milk represented by cooperatives will increase to about 76 percent with about 75 percent of the number of producer represented by cooperatives. While the percent of milk volume and number of producers represented by cooperatives is growing, the volume of milk and number of independent producers remains significant. This is especially important given the role of cooperatives who operate manufacturing plants and who provide and incur the cost associated with balancing Class I needs of the market. Without providing for some cost offset for balancing, about 26 percent of the milk and about 25 percent of the producers would not be sharing in the burden of balancing the market.

The revised criteria presented by the ADCNE seem reasonable in determining which handlers would be eligible to receive balancing payments from the marketwide pool. The qualification standards for receiving balancing payments are as follows:

- The consolidated Northeast marketing area is expected to retain a unique feature of the existing New York-New Jersey marketing area—a relatively high percentage of producers who are not members of cooperatives. As of December 1997, the current New York-New Jersey market had about 68 percent of its milk and about 69 percent of its producers represented by cooperatives. In the consolidated Northeast marketing area, the expected amount of milk represented by cooperatives will increase to about 76 percent with about 75 percent of the number of producer represented by cooperatives. While the percent of milk volume and number of producers represented by cooperatives is growing, the volume of milk and number of independent producers remains significant. This is especially important given the role of cooperatives who operate manufacturing plants and who provide and incur the cost associated with balancing Class I needs of the market. Without providing for some cost offset for balancing, about 26 percent of the milk and about 25 percent of the producers would not be sharing in the burden of balancing the market.

The revised criteria presented by the ADCNE seem reasonable in determining which handlers would be eligible to receive balancing payments from the marketwide pool. The qualification standards for receiving balancing payments are as follows:

- The consolidated Northeast marketing area is expected to retain a unique feature of the existing New York-New Jersey marketing area—a relatively high percentage of producers who are not members of cooperatives. As of December 1997, the current New York-New Jersey market had about 68 percent of its milk and about 69 percent of its producers represented by cooperatives. In the consolidated Northeast marketing area, the expected amount of milk represented by cooperatives will increase to about 76 percent with about 75 percent of the number of producer represented by cooperatives. While the percent of milk volume and number of producers represented by cooperatives is growing, the volume of milk and number of independent producers remains significant. This is especially important given the role of cooperatives who operate manufacturing plants and who provide and incur the cost associated with balancing Class I needs of the market. Without providing for some cost offset for balancing, about 26 percent of the milk and about 25 percent of the producers would not be sharing in the burden of balancing the market.

The revised criteria presented by the ADCNE seem reasonable in determining which handlers would be eligible to receive balancing payments from the marketwide pool. The qualification standards for receiving balancing payments are as follows:

- The consolidated Northeast marketing area is expected to retain a unique feature of the existing New York-New Jersey marketing area—a relatively high percentage of producers who are not members of cooperatives. As of December 1997, the current New York-New Jersey market had about 68 percent of its milk and about 69 percent of its producers represented by cooperatives. In the consolidated Northeast marketing area, the expected amount of milk represented by cooperatives will increase to about 76 percent with about 75 percent of the number of producer represented by cooperatives. While the percent of milk volume and number of producers represented by cooperatives is growing, the volume of milk and number of independent producers remains significant. This is especially important given the role of cooperatives who operate manufacturing plants and who provide and incur the cost associated with balancing Class I needs of the market. Without providing for some cost offset for balancing, about 26 percent of the milk and about 25 percent of the producers would not be sharing in the burden of balancing the market.
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another way, the less commitment a
handler has to the Class I market, the
larger the balancing payments.

Additionally, basing balancing
payments criteria on only
manufacturing milk seems to provide a
disincentive to handlers in serving the
Class I market needs because handlers
that would provide additional Class I
milk would lose 6 cents per cwt. Lastly,
basing balancing payments on just
manufacturing milk seems to provide an
unwarranted monetary incentive to
cause additional milk to associate with
the marketing pool for the sole
purpose of receiving an additional 6
cents per cwt.

In addition to the above concern on
limiting balancing payments to
manufacturing milk, the reasons for not
recommending balancing payments for
the consolidated Northeast order
articulated in the proposed rule were
not all sufficiently addressed. The
proposed Northeast order consolidates
two current orders, New England and
the Middle Atlantic, that do not
currently provide for balancing cost
offsets to handlers for such purposes.
These markets have not experienced any
undue harm or disadvantage by not
providing for this sort of cost offset. To
the extent that further analysis on the
need for balancing payments can rest
upon the high percentage of
independent milk that is expected to be
represented in the consolidated
Northeast order, such analysis does
provide a legitimate and important
factor in further considering the
appropriateness of a balancing payment
provision.

The proposed rule also indicated that
balancing payments should not be
adopted because an appropriate class
price has been provided for market
clearing purposes—the Class IIIA price.
It is a price that is applicable in all
current northeast orders, and is
continued in this decision as the Class
IV price. While these two class prices
are not the same, (as explained in the
BFP section of this decision) they are
conceptually similar in that handlers
have been provided with a market
clearing price and further compensation
beyond this does not appear to be
warranted.

Lastly, the proposed rule indicated
that the original 4-cent per cwt.
balancing payment level was
unexplained with respect to how
adequately it tends to offset balancing
costs. The same is also observed for the
modified payment level of 6 cents per
cwt. Subsequent to the publication of
the proposed rule, public comments
received in letters and from public
forums and “listening sessions” did
result in being able to extrapolate a
single cooperative entity’s cost for
balancing, however, this measure may
or may not be appropriate for
characterizing or determining the
proposed payment level.

The “Pass-Through” Provision

Currently, the New York order
provides for what is commonly referred
to as the “pass-through” provision. The
intention of this provision is to provide
for a degree of competitive equity for
handlers that must pay at least the
order’s Class I price for milk so that
they can compete with handlers in
unregulated areas that do not. This
provision has been in place in the New
York order since 1957 and is a part of
how the order allocates and classifies
milk. In functional terms, the pass-
through provision removes the amount
of milk distributed outside of the
marketing area from the full Class I
allocation provisions of the order,
thereby providing a degree of price
relief to handlers that are expected to
compete with other handlers who are not
held to the pricing provisions of the order
in unregulated areas. Regulated New York
handlers currently receive with unregulated handlers in the unregulated
areas of Pennsylvania and other areas in
the northeast region.

The current provisions of the New
England and Middle Atlantic orders do
not have this provision although they
adjoin similar non-Federally
regulated areas. Handlers regulated
by these two orders also compete with
these same unregulated handlers for
Class I sales. The merging and
expansion of these three northeast
orders continue to result in areas that
adjoin the recommended Northeast
order that would not be regulated.

While there were proposals both for
and against retaining a pass-through
provision in the consolidated order, the
need for it was expressed on the basis
of the extent to which the Northeast
consolidated order would be expanded
to include currently unregulated areas.
Generally, handlers support continuing
to provide for a pass-through provision,
and this position can only be considered
reinforced given the limited degree
of expansion of the consolidated Northeast
order. If the entire Northeast region
would fall under Federal milk order
regulation, the need for the pass-through
would be moot. These observations
remain valid in light of the public
comments received in response to the
proposed rule published on January 30,
1998.

The pass-through provision,
notwithstanding the limited extent of
marketing area expansion, or in light of
few public comments supporting its
continuation, is not included in the
consolidated Northeast order for the
same compelling reasons articulated in
the proposed rule published on January
30, 1998. Class I prices charged to
handlers that compete within the
marketing area for fluid sales are
determined by the location value of
milk delivered to their plants. The Class
I differential structure adopted in this
decision recognizes the location value of
milk for Class I uses and is designed to
cause milk to be delivered to bottling
plants to satisfy fluid demands.

Accordingly, handlers located in high-
valued pricing areas will be charged for
the location value of Class I milk at their
plant locations regardless of whether or
not they compete with other handlers
for fluid sales in areas where the
location value of Class I milk at these
plant locations are lower. This location
value pricing principle is extended to
handlers competing for sales with
handlers who do not pay the same price
for Class I milk in unregulated areas.

Seasonal Adjustments to the Class III
and Class IV Prices

The three northeast orders to be
consolidated into a single Northeast
order currently provide for a seasonal
adjustor on Class III and Class IIIA milk
prices. These provisions have been a
part of these three orders for more than
30 years. Prior to the adoption of the
Minnesota-Wisconsin (M-W) price
series in the mid-1970’s, these markets
established the equivalent of the
modern Class III price on the basis of
what was known as the U.S. Average
Manufacturing Grade Milk Price Series
(U.S. Average Price Series).

The U.S. Average Price Series was a
competitive pay price series, but
differed from the M-W in that it
recorded price averages consistently
below the M-W that was rapidly being
adopted elsewhere in the country as the
appropriate price for surplus uses of
milk and used as a price mover for
higher-valued class prices. Given the
national marketplace in which surplus
dairy products compete for sales, a
mechanism was needed to align these
two differing price series. Accordingly,
seasonal adjustments to the Class III
price were developed and made a part
of these orders. These seasonal
adjustors were found not only to be
warranted for better price coordination between these
two price series, but also served to
encourage handlers to dispose of the
maximum amount of milk in Class I
uses.

By the mid-1970’s, the M-W was
adopted to replace the U.S. Average
Price Series and the seasonal adjustors
were retained. The reason for retaining these adjustments was to encourage handlers to make more milk readily available for fluid use in the short production months and to facilitate the orderly disposition of excess reserve milk supplies in flush production months. Although some regional price disparity was acknowledged to result from retaining these adjustments, they were nevertheless retained because there was no evidence that providing for such adjustment had led to any interregional problems in the marketing of the reserve milk supply.

Agri-Mark, a major cooperative in the northeast, proposed that seasonal adjustments continue in the consolidated Northeast order. The main thrust of their proposal was that markets with relatively high Class I use create a burden on the manufacturing sector in their areas. They view seasonal adjustments as also assisting in sending the proper economic signal to manufacturers. This is important, according to Agri-Mark, because the seasonal adjustment provides an economic “disincentive” for Class III and Class IV manufacturers to use milk in the fall when less producer milk is available and additional supplies are needed for Class I uses.

Seasonal adjustments to the Class III and Class IV prices are not incorporated into the provisions of the consolidated Northeast order. This decision provides a much more permanent replacement for the current BFP. Because Class III and Class IV product price formulas are incorporated in all consolidated orders, there is no compelling reason offered to contemplate continuing seasonal adjustments to Class III and Class IV prices. They are also not provided in orders that are expected to have Class I utilizations similar to that anticipated in the consolidated Northeast order and who similarly have important manufacturing activity.

**6b. Southeast Region**

The 3 proposed orders for the Southeastern United States—Florida, Southeast, and Appalachian—are faced with a different set of marketing conditions than other orders. The Southeastern United States is one of the fastest growing areas of the country in terms of population growth and is the most deficit area in terms of milk production per capita. From 1988 to 1997, the population of the 12 Southeastern states rose from 57.9 million to 65.1 million.

While population has been increasing in the Southeast, milk production in the 12 Southeast States (i.e., Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia) has been decreasing—from 15.4 billion pounds in 1988 to 13.6 billion pounds in 1997. The net result of these opposite trends is a widening gap between the local supply of milk for fluid use and the demand for such milk. This is evident by the drop in per capita milk production for these 12 states, from 265 pounds per capita in 1988 to 210 pounds per capita in 1997.

Unlike other parts of the country, the Southeast has few facilities for handling surplus milk. Consequently, surplus production during the months of January through June must, in some cases, be shipped hundreds of miles for processing at manufacturing plants generally to the north. For this reason, the provisions in these orders must be aimed at the twin goals of encouraging supplemental milk to move to these markets during the short production months—generally July through December—and they must also discourage supplemental milk from moving to these markets when it is not needed in the flush production months—generally January through June—because such milk would simply displace local milk and increase the cost of disposing of such milk for surplus use.

Very few comments were received with respect to the order provisions proposed for the Appalachian, Florida, and Southeast orders. Most of the comments that were received endorsed the proposed provisions. A few comment letters stated that seasonal pricing provisions should be included in the Southeast orders and a few comment letters suggested that the Class I price mover for the Southeast should be a 12-month moving average rather than the proposed 6-month moving average. These comments are discussed in the pricing sections of this final decision. Other comments received are discussed below.

Transportation credits. As a result of the need to import milk to the Southeast from many areas outside the Southeast during certain months of the year, transportation credit provisions were incorporated in the Carolina, Southeast, Tennessee Valley, and Louisville-Lexington-Evansville orders in August 1996. These provisions provide credits to handlers who incur additional costs to import supplemental milk for fluid use for markets during the short production months of July through December. The provisions restrict the use of these credits to milk received from producers and plants located outside of the marketing areas.

The credits are also restricted to milk received from producers who supply the markets only during the short season and are not applicable to milk of producers who supply the market throughout the year.

Following the initial implementation of transportation credits in August 1996, the provisions were modified in a final decision issued on May 12, 1997. The amendments became effective on August 1, 1997.

Transportation credit provisions are retained in the new Southeast and Appalachian orders but have not been included in the Florida order.

Only a few comments filed in response to the proposed rule specifically addressed the issue of transportation credits. Two producers requested that transportation credits be removed from the orders because they have not performed as expected. A handler who supported transportation credits for the Southeast and Appalachian orders suggested that the provisions also be included in the Florida order.

In the past 5 years, dairy cooperatives representing the large majority of producers in the Southeast have strongly supported transportation credit provisions for the Southeast and Appalachian orders because the provisions have been helpful in obtaining supplemental supplies of milk for fluid use and in sharing the costs associated with these supplemental supplies more equitably among all handlers in the market. They have not, however, been supported by the 2 cooperative associations which supply the Florida market and there is no indication that such provisions are needed to more equitably share the costs of supplemental milk. There was no indication from the public comments that were received that these cooperative positions have changed.

With the addition of northwest Arkansas and southern Missouri to the Southeast marketing area, milk from these 2 areas will be ineligible for transportation credits under the Southeast and Appalachian orders. This change in the application of the credits is consistent with the logic for incorporating these 2 areas in the Southeast marketing area. Specifically, northwest Arkansas and southern Missouri are regular sources of supply for handlers in the Southeast marketing area and, in addition, include plants that compete for sales with handlers regulated under the Southeast order. Accordingly, the producers in these 2 areas will share in the pool proceeds of the Southeast market. Of course, since
transportation credits are designed to attract supplemental milk to the market for fluid use from producers who are not regularly associated with the market. Transportation credits should not apply to a farm or a plant in northwest Arkansas or that portion of southern Missouri that is to be included in the Southeast marketing area.

Two other changes have been made in the transportation credit provisions of Orders 5 and 7. First, at the present time, if a dairy farmer is a producer under the order for more than 2 months of the January through June period and more than 50 percent of the dairy farmer's milk is received as producer milk under the order during those 2 months, the dairy farmer's milk is ineligible for transportation credits during the following months of July through December. This rule should be modified.

Experience with the transportation credit provision in the Southeast indicates that the months of January and June are the months in which supplemental milk is needed during those months, but in other years it is not. Indeed, it is for this reason that the market administrator has given the authority to extend transportation credits to these months upon finding that the extension is necessary to assure the market of an adequate supply of milk for fluid use. When the market administrator makes a finding that January or June should be included in the transportation credit period, these months are excluded from the restrictions of the orders, as described above. Sometimes, however, in these 2 months it is not apparent that supplemental milk will be needed until after the month begins. In this case, it is too late for the market administrator to include these months in the transportation credit period, but it is not too late for a cooperative association or handler needing supplemental milk from a dairy farm to qualify to disqualify the dairy farmer's milk for transportation credits by receiving producer milk from the dairy farmer for more than 2 months or by exceeding the 50 percent limit.

In view of this problem, the months during which a dairy farmer may not be a producer have been changed from January through June to February through May. This will provide greater flexibility to receive supplemental milk when needed without disqualifying a dairy farmer's milk from transportation credits.

The other change that has been made to the transportation credit provisions has to do with the computation of the credit with respect to milk shipped directly from producers' farms. At present, the market administrator must determine an origin point for this milk and once the point is determined ascertain what the Class I differential, adjusted for location, would be at that point. If the origin point is within a Federal order marketing area, the applicable Class I differential is the one that would apply at the origin point under the order regulating that area. However, if the origin point is in an unregulated county, a Class I differential, adjusted for location, is computed based upon the provisions of the order receiving the milk (i.e., at present Order 5, 7, or 46).

The different methods now used to compute the Class I differential at the origin point for a load of milk occasionally lead to very different transportation credits for a load of milk originating within a Federal order marketing area compared to another load of milk that originates from a point just outside of that marketing area. At the time when the transportation credit provisions were adopted, there was not a better way of determining the Class I differential at an origin point outside of a marketing area because there was no single Class I pricing surface. Consequently, with 31 different orders, there were probably 31 different Class I differentials that would have applied in that unregulated county based on the location adjustments provided in the 31 different orders. Under the circumstances, it appeared to be the most reasonable way to determine the Class I differential that would apply under the order receiving the milk.

With the national Class I price surface adopted in this final decision, there is a single Class I differential for every county in the 48 states. Consequently, § 1005.82(d)(3)(v) and § 1007.82(d)(3)(v) have been changed to use the Class I differential specified in § 1000.52 for purposes of determining the price to be used at the origin point of a load of milk shipped directly from producers' farms. This change will remove the large disparities that can now exist in computing transportation credits for similarly-located milk.

One final change has been made in paragraph (d)(3)(i) of §§ 1005.82 and 1007.82. At the present time, 2 methods are provided for determining the origin point for a load of supplemental milk directly from producers' farms. The origin point may be the city nearest to the farm of the last producer to ship milk to the truck stop or on a tank truck. Alternatively, the hauler may stop at an independently-operated truck stop and obtain a weight certificate indicating the weight of the truck and its contents, the date and time of weighing, and the location of the truck stop.

The latter option has never been used to establish an origin point during the life of this provision, perhaps because it is not cost effective to stop and weigh a load of milk. For this reason, it should be removed from the order.

Pooling standards. Several comment letters from producers and producer organizations expressed support for the pooling provisions recommended in the proposed rule for the proposed southeast orders. The comments emphasized the necessity to incorporate strict performance standards in these orders. Commenters argued that such standards would ensure that the markets are adequately supplied throughout the year in an orderly manner and prevent opportunistic pooling which, they contend, would lower the blend prices to producers serving these marketing areas throughout the year, thereby decreasing production in these already-deficit markets and forcing handlers to pay higher prices to obtain supplementary milk.

The comments leading to the proposed rule and those submitted in response to it endorsed pooling standards at levels that are as strict or stricter than current regulations and emphasized that the southeastern milk marketing orders should provide pooling standards that reflect the deficit nature of these markets. These comments are embodied in the standards adopted for these orders.

The pool plant provisions adopted for the Appalachian, Florida, and Southeast orders closely follow the provisions now contained in the southeast orders. These provisions are appropriate for the needs of these seasonally-deficit markets.

Section 7(a) of each Federal order describes the pooling standards for a distributing plant. To qualify for pooling under each of the 3 orders, a distributing plant must have route disposition equal to at least 50 percent of the total fluid milk products physically received at the plant. In addition, at least 25 percent of the plant’s receipts must be disposed of as route disposition in the marketing area. These standards will ensure that a distributing plant meeting them is closely associated with the fluid market and, therefore, should be part of the marketwide pool. At the present time, the Carolina order has a 15 percent in-area route disposition standard, while the
Southeast, Upper Florida, Tampa Bay, Southeastern Florida, and Louisville-Evansville orders have a 10 percent standard. This level is raised to 25 percent under the merged orders. The reason for raising this standard to 25 percent is to better identify those plants which should be fully regulated under the larger, merged orders. With 11 large markets, instead of 31 smaller markets, the higher 25 percent standard, which is uniform for all 11 markets, will better maintain the regulatory status of plants throughout the country. It will leave unregulated, or partially regulated, those plants which have only a small amount of their sales within a Federal order marketing area.

Paragraph (b) of section 7 will accommodate the pooling of plants that specialize in extended shelf-life fluid milk products (i.e., 60–90 days) requiring refrigeration. There are at least 3 such plants in the southeast markets: the Ryan Foods Company plants in Jacksonville, Florida, and Murray, Kentucky, and the Dasi Products plant in Datur, Alabama.

Unlike a typical distributing plant, a plant specializing in extended shelf-life products may have a more erratic processing schedule, reflecting the longer shelf life of the products packaged at the plant. Consequently, a plant’s Class I utilization may vary considerably from month to month. In the past, such variability has resulted in shifting pool status for some of these plants from one order to another. In some months, the plant may have been partially or even totally idle, even though all of the milk received at the plant was priced under the order. This type of regulatory instability is not conducive to orderly marketing. To provide greater regulatory stability for these plants, they should be fully regulated pool plants if they are located in the marketing area, have route disposition in the marketing area during the month, and process a majority of their milk receipts into fluid milk products. This provision will not guarantee that a plant qualifies as a fully-regulated pool plant every month; some months a plant may fail to process a “majority” of its milk receipts into fluid milk products. Nevertheless, the provision will guarantee that when a plant qualifies for pool plant status, it will be qualified under the same order all the time unless it fails to have any route disposition in the marketing area in which it is located.

One change in section 7(a) and (b) of each order will help to stabilize the pool status of an extended shelf-life plant. At the present time in most orders, when packaged fluid milk products that are transferred from one plant to another plant are ultimately delivered from the 2nd plant to a retail or wholesale outlet, these sales are considered to be the route disposition of the 2nd plant. However, as adopted in this final decision, such transfers will be treated as route disposition from the 1st plant for the purpose of determining its pool status. Since some plants specializing in extended shelf-life products transfer such products between plants, this change will make it more likely that such plants will have route disposition in the marketing area.

Almost all of the dairy product manufacturing plants in the Southeast are “balancing plants” operated by cooperative associations. These “balancing plants” qualify for pooling based upon the performance of the cooperative association, not upon shipments from the plant alone.

A balancing plant may qualify for pool plant status based upon shipments directly from producers’ farms as well as shipments from the plant. To qualify as a balancing plant, the plant must be located within the order’s marketing area. This requirement ensures that milk pooled through the balancing plant is economically available to processors of fluid milk if needed. However, in the case of the Appalachian order only, a balancing plant also may be located in the State of Virginia. This provision has been in the Carolina order and should be continued in the Appalachian order. The performance standards for a balancing plant require that 60 percent of a cooperative’s producer receipts be delivered to pool distributing plants every month of the year. This provision is identical under the 3 southeast orders.

Each of the 3 orders also contains pooling standards for a supply plant. For the Appalachian and Southeast orders, a supply plant must ship at least 50 percent of the milk received during the month from dairy farmers and cooperative bulk tank handlers. The plant’s receipts include milk that is diverted from the plant as well as milk physically received at the plant. In the case of the Florida order, the shipping percentage is slightly higher at 60 percent.

Unlike supply plant provisions in other orders, the supply plant provisions in the 3 southeast orders do not recognize shipments directly from producers’ farms as qualifying for a supply plant. At the present time, there are no plants qualifying as “pool supply plants” under any of the southeast orders.

Kraft filed a comment in opposition to the supply plant provision proposed for the Southeast order, arguing that it should be permitted to pool its Bentonville, Arkansas, cheese plant based on milk diverted from this plant directly from producers’ farms to pool distributing plants. Kraft argues that the proposed pool supply plant provision of Order 7 would require it to physically receive milk at its plant, reload it onto a truck, and ship it to pool distributing plants in order for the Bentonville plant to meet the supply plant shipping standards of Order 7.

Currently, there are no pool supply plants on the Southeast, Appalachian, or Florida orders. When supplemental milk is needed for these markets, most of the milk comes directly from producers’ farms, some of which can fill an over-the-road tank truck several times a day. With farms of this size, there is obviously no need to aggregate the milk from several farms at a supply plant.

A primary mission of most cooperatives supplying the Southeast is to provide milk to handlers for fluid use and to dispose of milk when not needed for fluid use efficiently. The order provisions should accommodate and encourage efficient milk handling practices.

The cooperative balancing plant provision is intended to allow cooperatives to supply the fluid market in the most efficient manner possible and also to process milk efficiently when such milk is not needed for fluid use. In the Southeast region, the dominant cooperative operates butter-powder plants in Kentucky and Louisiana and one cheese plant in Tennessee. Oftentimes during the year, these plants are completely idle when all available milk is needed for Class I and II use.

In the Southeast, where fluid handlers are subject to relatively high Class I prices, order provisions should aid them in procuring milk supplies by providing stringent pooling standards. This will help to ensure that the Class I prices applicable to these handlers will serve their purpose in generating uniform prices that will attract milk for fluid use. The supply plant provisions proposed by Kraft are neither needed nor supported by the vast majority of participants in these markets and therefore are not adopted.

It is not necessary to seasonally adjust the supply plant and balancing plant shipping requirements for the 3 southeast orders because the standards proposed are flexible enough to accommodate the disposal of surplus milk during the ush production season. In addition, each of the 3 orders contains a provision to allow the market
administer to increase or decrease shipping requirements and other pooling standards by up to 10 percentage points. This provision also includes the producer milk section of all 3 orders with respect to the percentage of milk that may be diverted and in the number of days that a producer's milk must be received at a pool plant.

In addition to the provisions described above, each of the southeast orders contains a provision to allow unit pooling of distributing plants operated by the same handler. This provision has been in the Southeast order since 1995. Some distributing plants may meet the pooling standards of more than one order. Consequently, it is necessary to specify the rules for determining where a plant will be regulated. Under the southeast orders, if a plant meets the pooling standards of the order and is located in the order's respective marketing area, the plant will be regulated under that order even if it has great sales may be outside that order's marketing area. This provision has evolved as a result of several price alignment problems in the Southeast involving a plant located in one marketing area but regulated under another order. In every such case, a plant's supply of milk was put in jeopardy as a result of a lower blend price under the order in which it became regulated based on its sales. Notwithstanding the merging of several of the smaller markets in the Southeast, this provision should be retained for the southeast orders to preclude a repetition of this problem. There is widespread support in comment letters for retention of this provision.

In the case of a distributing plant that is not located within any order's marketing area, a different standard should apply. Since, in this case, it cannot be presumed with certainty that a plant is closely associated with the market in which it is located, its association with a market should be determined based upon where it has the most sales. Producer-handler. The producer-handler provision for the 3 southeast orders is very similar to the current provisions. There were no comments received in opposition to this provision.

To qualify as a producer-handler, a dairy farmer would have to have route disposition in excess of 150,000 pounds per month; otherwise, the producer's plant would be exempt from regulation pursuant to a provision that has been uniformly adopted for all orders. In addition, a dairy farmer may receive no fluid milk products from sources other than his or her farm. Finally, the dairy farmer must provide proof satisfactory to the market administrator that the care and management of the dairy animals and other resources necessary to produce all Class I milk handled, and the processing and packaging operations, are his/her own enterprise and are operated at his/her own risk.

At the present time, there are fewer than 5 producer-handlers operating in the southeast markets. The status of these handlers occasionally fluctuates between being fully regulated plants in some months and producer-handlers in other months. None of these operations would lose their status as producer-handlers under the provision adopted for the new southeast orders.

Producer/Producer milk. The producer and producer milk definitions adopted for the 3 southeast orders are nearly identical to the provisions now in the individual orders. These provisions define which dairy farmers are eligible to share in the proceeds of the marketwide pool.

A producer is defined as a dairy farmer whose milk is received at a pool plant, diverted to a nonpool plant, or received by a cooperative association acting as a bulk tank handler. It excludes a producer-handler, a dairy farmer whose milk is delivered to an exempt plant, or a dairy farmer whose milk is reported as diverted milk under the provisions of another Federal order. The diversion limits that are specified in the producer milk section of the new orders are slightly different among the 3 southeast orders. To qualify for diversion to a nonpool plant, a minimum amount of a producer's milk must be received at a pool plant during the month (i.e., this is called a "touch-base" requirement). Under the Appalachian order, 6 days' production must be received at a pool plant during each of the months of July through December, and 2 days' production must be received at a pool plant during each of the other months of the year. Under the Southeast order, 10 days' production is required to be delivered to a pool plant during each of the months of July through December to qualify a producer's milk for diversion to a nonpool plant. During the months of January through June, 4 days' production is required to be delivered to a pool plant.

Under the proposed Florida order, which will have a higher Class I utilization and less need to divert milk, a producer is required to deliver at least 10 days' production to a pool plant during every month of the year in order to be eligible for diversion to a nonpool plant. These proposed standards are comparable to those required under the separate Florida orders. The total quantity of milk which may be diverted by a pool plant operator or cooperative association during the month also varies by market as well as by month. Under the Appalachian order, a pool plant operator or cooperative association is permitted to divert 25 percent of its producer milk during the months of July through November, January and February. During the months of December and March through June, the total diversion limit increases to 40 percent of producer milk receipts. In the Southeast order, a total diversion limit of 33 percent is provided during the months of July through December, and 50 percent during the other months. The diversion limits under the Florida order are 20 percent during the months of July through November, 25 percent during the months of December through February, and 40 percent during all other months. The "touch base" requirements and gross diversion limits described above are adjustable by the market administrator to assure orderly marketing and/or efficient handling of milk in the marketing area. This procedure is described in §§ 1005.13(d)(7), 1006.13(d)(6), and 1007.13(d)(7).

Although a "dairy farmer for other markets" provision was requested for the new orders by some producer organizations, it was opposed by others. This provision is not included in the 3 southeast orders at this time. Such a provision could restrict the free movement of milk as needed among markets. The proposed diversion limits and touch-base requirements in the southeast orders should preclude the association of milk with these markets when such milk is not needed at pool plants.

Reports of receipts and utilization. To accommodate the payment schedule desired for the 3 southeast orders, the handler’s report of receipts and utilization must be in the market administrator’s office no later than the 7th day of the month. The producer payroll report will be required by the 20th day of the month. The information to be included in these proposed reports is essentially identical to the current order provisions.

Payments for milk. The southeast orders provide uniform payment schedules for payments to and from the producer-settlement fund. Payment to the producer-settlement fund must be made by the 12th day of the month and payment from the producer-settlement fund must be made one day later.
In the case of payments to producers and cooperative associations, the merged Florida order will maintain the longstanding 3-payment schedule that has been part of the present Florida orders for many years. The partial payments to producers under the new Florida order must be made on the 20th day of the month for milk received during the first 15 days of the month and on the 5th day of the following month for milk received during the remainder of the month. The rate of payment will be at not less than 85 percent of the preceding month’s uniform price, adjusted for plant location and for proper deductions authorized in writing by the producer. The final payment for milk received during the previous month must be made on or before the 15th day of the month.

The Appalachian and Southeast orders adopted here have identical payment schedules. The partial payment for milk received during the first 15 days of the month must be made on the 26th day of the month, and the rate of payment must be 90 percent of the preceding month’s uniform price. The final payment must be received by the producer on or before the 14th day of the following month. The rate of final payment for all 3 orders is the preceding month’s uniform price adjusted for butterfat, plant location, partial payments, marketing services, and proper deductions authorized in writing by the producer. Each order will require payment to a cooperative association to be made one day earlier than the payment to a cooperative association to be made on or before the 15th day of the month.

It should be noted that the payment dates described above may be delayed if the payment is due on a Saturday, Sunday, or national holiday. In such case, the payment will be due on the next day that the market administrator’s office is open for business. This new rule is provided in § 1000.90.

6c. Midwest Region

Pool Plant

The pool distributing and pool supply plant definitions of the consolidated Upper Midwest order should use the standard order language used in other orders, adapted to marketing conditions in the Upper Midwest.

The pool distributing plant definition specifies that for a plant to be a pool distributing plant, it must have 15 percent or more of its total receipts of fluid milk distributed as route disposition. This percentage is considerably lower than the percentage used in the Chicago Regional order, which varies from 30 percent to 45 percent depending on the month. However, the current Upper Midwest order uses a percentage based on the marketwise Class I percentage for the same month of the previous year. During “normal” months this percentage is approximately 15 percent. When some milk is held off the pool for economic reasons (primarily unusual price differences between classes), the percentage may vary considerably, ranging from the “normal” 15 percent to over 50 percent.

In addition to specifying the route disposition percentage at 15 percent, the percentage would be calculated on the basis of the total receipts of fluid milk products physically received at the distributing plant. Currently both the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders include milk diverted from the distributing plant in the total bulk receipts used to compute the route disposition percentage. Use of a constant percentage at approximately the market Class I percentage, and removing diverted milk from a distributing plant’s receipts in determining its regulatory status, will reduce the current opportunities available to distributing plants to become partially regulated by manipulating their reported receipts and diversions of milk. In addition, the language adopted should eliminate month-to-month uncertainty caused by basing handlers’ regulatory status on the market’s fluctuating utilization percentage.

The Identical Provisions Committee recommended that the in-area distribution criteria for pool distributing plants be 15 percent of total route disposition, and that percentage was included in the proposed rule. However, it was determined that a 25-percent standard for in-area sales would be appropriate for all markets to assure that handlers not already regulated would not become regulated solely because of order consolidation. The Committee explained that use of total route disposition rather than bulk receipts as the denominator would reduce opportunities for handlers to manipulate the manner in which they report their operations to avoid regulation. Currently in the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders the in-area route disposition standard (10 percent in Chicago Regional and 15 percent in Upper Midwest) is computed using the same basis (bulk receipts, including diversions) as is used to determine whether a plant meets the definition of a pool distributing plant. Provision is made for a single handler to form a unit of distributing plants and manufacturing plants, all of which must be located within the marketing area. The unit would have to meet the requirements for a pool distributing plant and at least one of the plants in the unit must meet the pool distributing plant requirements as a separate plant. Plants not meeting the pool distributing plant definition will be required to have disposition of packaged fluid milk products, packaged fluid cream products, or cottage cheese and other soft manufactured products of at least half of their receipts of Grade A bulk fluid milk products, including milk diverted by the plant operator.

Manufacturing plants traditionally have been included in units with distributing plants because the manufacturing plants produced products such as packaged fluid cream, sour cream, and cottage cheese that are marketed in conjunction with bottled fluid milk products. In addition, some of these plants produce a limited quantity of fluid milk products. Handlers have argued that the operator of a free-standing manufacturing plant that manufactures these complementary products should be able to pool its milk supplies for both (or for several) plants as if all of the products were made in the bottling plant.

Both the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders contain a provision for a distributing plant unit. Although the current Chicago Regional order does not specify the types of products that may be manufactured at plants in the unit, the Upper Midwest order does. It is reasonable to place restrictions on the types of products that are disposed of from the manufacturing plants in the unit, since these plants will receive the benefits reserved for pool distributing plants and shipments from supply plants to the plants in the unit will be considered in determining pool supply plant qualifications.

A pool supply plant operator should ship as qualifying shipments at least 10 percent of the plant’s receipts of milk from producers, including milk diverted by the handler, each month. As in the current Chicago Regional order, such shipments may be made to pool distributing plants, pool distributing plant units, plants of producer-handlers, partially regulated distributing plants, or distributing plants fully regulated by other Federal milk orders. The extent of shipments to partially regulated distributing plants to be used for qualification would be limited to the quantity classified as Class I. Qualifying shipments to distributing plants regulated by other Federal milk orders should be limited to the quantity shipped to pool distributing plants, and
may not be agreed-upon Class II, Class III or Class IV utilization. Shipments, directly from farms to pool distributing plants and to plants contained in pool distributing plant units should be included as shipments that help to meet the percentage qualification standard.

The 10 percent shipping requirement adopted in this decision is approximately 5 percentage points less than the anticipated Class I percentage for the consolidated Upper Midwest order. The 10 percent shipping standard is greater than the current individual supply plant shipping standard and equal to the maximum shipping percentage required of pool units during the qualifying period in the current Chicago Regional order. The standard under the current Upper Midwest order, which uses the Class I use percentage of the same month in the previous year as the supply plant shipping percentage, would exceed the adopted percentage. Also under the current Upper Midwest order, a reserve supply plant must ship 10 percent of its receipts to pool distributing plants during January through June and the marketwide Class I percentage for the same months of the preceding year for the months of July through December.

Several handlers, including a large cooperative association, a cheesemakers' organization, and a fluid milk handler, filed comments stating that the 10 percent shipping standard for supply plants is too high for this market with a Class I utilization percentage that rarely would exceed 20 percent. The 10-percent shipping percentage is below the estimated Class I percentage for the consolidated Upper Midwest order and should be appropriate, even in view of the fact that many distributing plants have a supply of milk from their own producers. In September 1997, approximately 27 percent of the milk pooled or received at distributing plants in the Chicago Regional order was pooled as producer milk with the distributing plant operators as the handlers, rather than as producer milk pooled by cooperatives and other handlers. The milk pooled by distributing plant handlers accounted for approximately 12 percent of the total milk pooled in September 1997 (or approximately 5 percent of the total milk that would have been pooled if all of the milk eligible to be pooled in September 1997 had been pooled). Approximately 7 percent of the Class I producer milk, or approximately 2 percent of the total producer milk, pooled under the Upper Midwest order is pooling plant operators. The combination of the supply plant shipping percentage and the percentage of milk pooled directly by distributing plant handlers would appear sufficient to meet anticipated Class I needs in the consolidated Upper Midwest order. The 10 percent supply plant shipping percentage also should be appropriate to avoid unnecessary and uneconomic shipments.

It should be remembered that the provisions adopted in this decision will allow the market administrator to increase or decrease the required shipping percentage on a marketwide or selected area basis if deemed necessary to assure an adequate supply of milk to pool distributing plants or to prevent uneconomic shipments of milk. If the shipping percentage is increased by the market administrator, shipments made for the purpose of meeting the increased percentage may be made only to pool distributing plants or plants contained in pool distributing plant units.

A comment filed by a cheesemakers' organization expressed concern about the potential competitive inequities of a provision enabling the market administrator to change the shipping percentage for a selected portion of the marketing area. This provision has existed in the current Upper Midwest order for some time without resulting in any controversy. The provision probably will be more useful with the considerable enlargement of the marketing area through consolidation. It may be more inequitable to require increased shipments from plants in, for instance, Grand Forks, North Dakota, to supply deficits in the Chicago area (700 miles distant) than it currently would be to require those plants to increase qualifying shipments so that distributing plants in the Twin Cities area (300 miles away) will be able to obtain needed supplies. It should be remembered that there are plentiful supplies of milk produced within 100-200 miles of any part of this marketing area. Certainly care will be taken to assure that handlers are not placed at a significant competitive disadvantage.

Groups of two or more supply plants will be allowed to form systems of supply plants for the purpose of meeting the shipping requirements, by shipping the same percentage as that required for individual pool supply plants that are not part of such a system. These pool supply plant systems may consist of plants of the same handler or more than one handler, and may contain both proprietary and cooperative handlers. The only requirement affecting an individual plant within the unit is that the plant must be physically located within the unit. This restriction is necessary to prevent plants from receiving the benefits of participating in the marketwide pool without having an actual association with the market.

Several plants located outside the boundaries of the consolidated marketing area currently are included in supply plant units by a "grandfather clause" in the Upper Midwest order. The order will provide that these plants may continue to be included in a supply plant system if they so desire as long as they maintain continuous pool plant status.

Handlers may form supply plant systems by filing a written request by July 15, listing the plants to be in the system. Such a system will remain in effect from August 1 through July 31 of the following year. These dates deviate from those provided for other orders because of the difference in seasonal production variations between this and other orders.

The provision allowing handlers to add plants to a system under certain circumstances and to allow systems to reorganize in the event a plant changes ownership or in the event of a business failure by a handler are also incorporated in the order. A system failing to meet pooling standards will be allowed to drop plants from the system until the system does qualify. The handler responsible for assuring that the system qualifies must notify the market administrator of which plants are to be deleted from the system. If the handler does not notify the market administrator, the market administrator will exclude plants from the system beginning with the plant at the bottom of the list of plants submitted by the handler responsible for qualifying the system, and continuing up the list until the system qualifies.

The provisions for supply plant systems are very similar to the provisions currently contained in both the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders. Unlike the Chicago Regional and the Upper Midwest orders, however, this order does not contain a specific shipping requirement for individual plants within a supply plant system. In the current Chicago Regional order, pool supply plant systems have twice the percentage shipping standard of individual supply plants, with individual plants within systems required to ship 47,000 pounds or three percent of their producer receipts,
whichever is less, in five of the six months of August through January. The current Upper Midwest order requires handlers with supply plants in a supply plant system to ship five percent of each handler’s Grade A receipts, including milk diverted by the handler to nonpool plants, during one of the months of August through December.

This decision does not provide for the category of supply plants referred to as reserve supply plants. Reserve supply plants ceased to be included in the Chicago Regional order in 1987, while the Upper Midwest continues to provide for them. With year-round shipping requirements, the unlimited ability of the market administrator to change shipping percentages both in level and in area, and the ability of supply plants to form systems, there is no compelling reason to have two categories of supply plants.

A provision to allow plants to remain qualified for up to two consecutive months due to unavoidable circumstances as a natural disaster, fire, breakdown of equipment, or work stoppage is included in this decision. The provision is contained in the Chicago Regional order and has worked quite well in giving handlers some administrative relief in the face of certain unavoidable circumstances.

Comments filed by a cooperative association and a fluid milk handler urged that the unit reporting, accounting and allocation provisions of the Chicago Regional order be retained in the consolidated order. This issue is considered and addressed in the Classification section of this decision.

Producer Milk

The definition of producer milk determines which milk will be eligible to participate in the Federal order pool. This decision provides that milk received at a pool plant directly from producers or from a cooperative association acting as a handler should be eligible to be producer milk. Milk for which the operator of a pool plant is the handler that is delivered directly from the farm to another pool plant should also be considered producer milk.

Under certain circumstances, milk delivered to a nonpool plant may also be considered producer milk. Milk delivered directly from a farm to a nonpool plant may be considered producer milk if at least one day’s production is received at a pool plant during the dairy farmer’s first month as a producer.

In order to qualify as producer milk the milk pooled by a cooperative association acting as a handler described in §1030.9(c), the cooperative must deliver at least 10 percent of the milk for which it is the handler pursuant to §1030.9(c) to pool distributing plants, units of pool distributing plants, plants of producer-handlers, or partially regulated distributing plants. The shipments to partially regulated distributing plants are limited to the quantity classified as Class I. These are the same performance requirements that apply to supply plants, with the exception of the treatment of milk shipped direct from farms to distributing plants regulated under other orders. If such milk is allocated to Class I under the other order, it will become producer milk under that order. The same performance requirements that apply to supply plants apply to cooperative associations acting as handlers if the market administrator adjusts the shipping percentages.

No significant differences in the treatment of milk received at pool plants are provided under this decision than under the current Chicago Regional or Upper Midwest orders. There are, however, several differences relating to diverted milk. This decision allows the operator of a pool plant to divert, or ship milk directly from the farm to another pool plant, the milk of producers for which it is the handler, and account for the milk as producer milk at the shipping plant. Allowing either a proprietary pool plant or a cooperative pool plant to divert milk to another pool plant is consistent with the Chicago Regional order. In the Upper Midwest order, milk received at a pool plant and for which a cooperative association is the handler is considered producer milk at the receiving plant.

The Upper Midwest order specifies that a proprietary handler may divert milk to another pool plant and that such milk will be considered producer milk of the diverting proprietary handler. The language adopted under this decision leaves to the discretion of the cooperative association the option of diverting milk to another pool plant from its own pool plant or diverting the milk to the pool plant in its capacity as a handler of producer milk pursuant to §1030.9(c).

The consolidated Upper Midwest order requires that a new producer or a producer who has broken association with the market have at least one day’s production received at a pool plant during the first month in which the producer’s milk is reported as producer milk. Currently the Chicago Regional order requires a new producer on the market who has broken association with the market to have at least one day’s production received at the pool plant at which the milk is reported during the first month in which the producer’s milk is considered to be producer milk eligible for diversion to a nonpool plant. In addition, at least one day’s production of a producer’s milk must be received at a pool plant in each of the months of August through January to be eligible for diversion to a nonpool plant. The current Upper Midwest order requires that a new producer or a producer who has broken association with the market be received at a pool plant prior to the milk being diverted to a nonpool plant.

There is little or no justification for forcing producer milk to be received at a pool plant to maintain or prove association with the market. Supply plants and cooperatives will be required to ship a fixed percentage of their total milk supply, not just that portion received at their plants, to the fluid market. Since both cooperatives and proprietary handlers can move milk directly from the farm to the fluid market there is little reason to force milk into a pool plant solely for regulatory purposes. Certainly the extra cost to the handler of moving milk for regulatory purposes does not enhance economic efficiency or milk quality and in fact decreases economic efficiency and milk quality to the detriment of the entire market.

This decision provides that producer milk be priced in the month in which it is delivered to the plant of first receipt, although the proposed rule would have priced milk in the month in which it is picked up at the farm. Some orders have allowed milk picked up on the last day of a month but delivered to a plant in the next month to be priced in the month in which it was picked up. A comment filed by Wisconsin Cheesemakers favored continuation of this regulatory treatment. For purposes of uniformity between the consolidated orders (which apply to many handlers, cooperative and proprietary, who operate in more than one order area) and clarity of plant accounting for milk received and used during each month all orders now will provide that producer milk is not received until it actually enters a plant.

Under the consolidated order, as in the proposed rule, producer milk will be priced at the location of the plant at which the milk is physically unloaded into processing facilities or a storage tank. In the current Chicago Regional order milk is priced where milk is pumped within the confines of a plant. The adopted order language will eliminate the pricing of milk where it is pumped from truck to truck and price the milk where it is eventually unloaded
into processing facilities or a storage tank.

Location Adjustments and Transportation Credits

To help move milk to the fluid market, a transportation credit and an assembly/procurement credit for Class I milk are contained in the Upper Midwest order. The transportation credit will be computed by multiplying the hundredweight of milk contained in tons of bulk milk from pool plants to pool distributing plants and used in Class I by the value obtained by multiplying .0028 times the number of miles between the transferor plant and transferee plants with an offset for a positive difference between the Class I prices at the transferee and transferor plants. The transportation credit should be paid to the receiving handler, as the milk will be pooled at the location from which it is shipped and the credit will, to some extent, duplicate the function of the location adjustment in helping to cover the cost of moving it from supply plants to fluid milk handlers. The transportation credit is similar to the transportation credit currently contained in the Chicago Regional order. Both the transportation credit adopted in this decision and the current credit, which uses the same .0028 rate, are applied to Class I milk only. However, in the current Chicago Regional order the credit is based on 110 percent of the Class I milk received at the pool distributing plant. The proposed rule would have provided that the transportation credit be paid to the shipping handler on the basis of Class I milk transferred to fluid milk plants.

Several interested persons commented on the use of transportation credits and assembly credits in this consolidated order, with most favoring such provisions but disagreeing to some extent with their proposed application. There was disagreement between the comments on whether the credit should apply to the shipping or the receiving handler and whether it should apply to all Class I milk, both direct-shipped and from plants, or just to milk transferred from plants and used in Class I. One commenter also stated that the proposed rate did not cover enough of the actual cost of moving milk.

In the case of milk received at a distributing plant from a supply plant operated by a cooperative association, the order provides that a distributing plant pay the supply plant from which it receives milk at not less than the price applicable at the distributing plant. The shipping association is responsible for the cost of moving milk to the fluid market. There must be some contribution from consumers to the cost of moving milk to deficit locations. However, incorporating the entire cost of hauling milk in the transportation credit could have the effect of encouraging handlers to procure milk from greater distances than necessary. If milk is moved from a higher-priced zone to a lower-priced zone (which may be necessary to obtain needed supplies of milk at outlying distributing plants), there will be no offset for differences in Class I prices between the shipping and receiving plants.

Unlike the transportation credit, which is based on mileage and paid only on transfers of bulk milk to pool distributing plants, the assembly/procurement credit is paid at the rate of 8 cents per hundredweight of Class I milk transferred or diverted by a pool plant to a pool distributing plant. An assembly/procurement credit also will be applied to milk received from producers and from cooperative associations acting as handlers pursuant to § 1030.9(c) based on the pro rata share of producer milk delivered to a pool distributing plant and allocated to Class I. A comment filed by a cooperative association stated that assembly credits should not apply to distributing plants’ own milk supplies, but only to milk obtained from supply plants or cooperatives. If such a change were made, distributing plant operators who have arranged for their own milk supplies would have an 8-cent disadvantage in procuring milk in comparison with their competitors who obtain milk only from supply plants and cooperatives.

A transportation credit and procurement credit are incorporated in the order to assist handlers in supplying the Class I market. These transportation and procurement credits, to be paid on Class I milk only in combination with the Class I price surface discussed elsewhere in this final decision, will help handlers move milk to the fluid market. The cost of supplying the fluid market to all market participants who share in the marketwide pool. Handlers and producers who supply the Class I market on a regular basis should not be expected to bear the entire cost of supplying the Class I market while handlers and producers who meet only the minimum requirements derive the benefits of marketwide pooling. Incorporation of a transportation credit and procurement credit on Class I milk in the marketwide pool will assure that at least some of the cost of supplying the Class I market is shared among all market participants.

Reporting and Payment Dates

Comments filed by two handlers opposed changing the reporting dates for the consolidated order from the 10th to the 9th of the month following receipt and use of the milk. It should be apparent, especially to the cooperative association that filed this comment, that payment to producers cannot be determined until the marketwide pooling process is completed and minimum producer pay prices are calculated. The earlier the pooling process can begin, the sooner producers can be paid. The reporting date of the 9th, adopted in this decision, is the latest date for filing handler reports in any of the consolidated orders. Two other orders specify the 9th, with one order requiring reporting on the 8th and the other seven orders specifying that handler reports be filed on or before the 7th of the following month. Because reporting should be somewhat more uniform among the Upper Midwest handlers after consolidation of the orders, their reporting burdens should be reduced accordingly. Further, technology certainly has improved the ability of all businesses to keep records and organize data for reporting purposes since the current reporting dates were established (over 35 years ago).

Wisconsin Cheesemakers’ comments opposed reducing the time lag between when producers deliver milk to handlers and when they are paid for that milk. The current dates for paying producers for the milk delivered in the first half of each month (the 3rd and 4th of the following month) under these two orders are among the latest, if not the latest, in the entire Federal milk order system. The date adopted in this decision, the 26th of the same month, is the same as in three other consolidated orders, later than in five of the other orders, and earlier than in two of the orders (none of which is later than the last day of the month). The date specified for final payment to producers is the 9th, the latest date for filing handler reports in any of the consolidated orders.
as possible. The adopted provisions will accomplish that goal.

Central Order

Many of the provisions of the consolidated Central order are explained in the “Identical Provisions” portion of this decision, and need not be addressed here. The provisions that deviate somewhat from those adopted for other order areas are the provisions dealing with standards for determining the pool status of producers and handlers. An effort is made to explain significant differences between the pooling provisions of the 9 individual orders included in this consolidation and those of the consolidated order.

Pool Plant

The Central pool distributing plant definition follows closely the provisions contained in most of the other consolidated orders. The provisions adopted would make no difference in the pool status of distributing plants currently pooled under the individual orders. Specifically, the percentage of a handler's total route disposition distributed within the marketing area will result in the handler being fully regulated under the Central order is the same 25-percent standard adopted for all of the other orders. The minimum percentage of a pool distributing plant's actual physical receipts of fluid milk products that would have to be distributed on routes is 25. Currently most of the orders included in the consolidated Central order include milk diverted from the distributing plant in the total bulk receipts used to compute the route disposition percentages.

The consolidated Central order provides that a single handler be allowed to form a unit of distributing plants and Class II manufacturing plants, all of which must be located within the marketing area. The unit must meet the requirements for a pool distributing plant, and at least one of the plants in the unit is required to meet the pool distributing plant requirements as a separate plant. Plants in the unit that do not meet the pool distributing plant definition are required to have disposition of packaged fluid milk products, packaged fluid cream products, or cottage cheese and other Class II products of at least half of their receipts of Grade A bulk fluid milk products, including milk diverted by the plant operator.

Class II manufacturing plants are included in units with distributing plants because the manufacturing plants produce products such as packaged fluid cream, sour cream, and cottage cheese that are marketed in conjunction with bottled fluid milk products. In addition, some of these plants produce a limited quantity of fluid milk products. Handlers have argued that the operator of a free-standing manufacturing plant that manufactures these complementary products should be able to pool its milk supply for both (or for several) plants as if all of the products were made in the bottling plant.

The pool supply plant definition of the consolidated Central order contains provisions that assure continued pool qualification for any handlers or milk currently associated with the markets included in the consolidated Central market. The Iowa order contains no limit on the amount of direct-shipped milk that can be used to qualify a supply plant, and several of the other orders allow such deliveries to make up a portion of qualifying shipments. The consolidated order allows direct-shipped milk to be counted as pool qualifying shipments without limit.

The Greater Kansas City, Nebraska-Western Iowa, Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri, and Southwest Plains orders contain cooperative balancing plant provisions, allowing cooperative-operated plants to be pooled if the cooperative delivers a given percentage of the milk for which it is the handler to pool distributing plants. The consolidated Central order also contains such a provision, including in the pool plant definition a plant operated by a cooperative association that supplies at least 35 percent of the milk for which it is the handler to pool distributing plants. Either during the current month or for the immediately preceding 12-month period. The deliveries to pool distributing plants may include deliveries directly from the farms of producers for whom the co-op is the handler, as well as transfers from the cooperative's plant.

Cooperative association “balancing plants” serve the market as the outlet of last resort. When surplus milk has no other place to go on weekends, holidays, or during months of surplus production, it moves to cooperative association “balancing plants” where it is manufactured into storable products. When production decreases, these plants operate at minimal capacity or may be shut down completely. Cooperative members assume the burden and cost of processing surplus milk through such plants.

Most of the Central orders allow a period during which supply plants do not have to meet shipping percentages if they have done so for the months during which milk production levels are low and demand for fluid milk is high. The Iowa order has reduced shipping standards for such months. The order provisions adopted with this decision include a period during which supply plants that have served the needs of the market when milk supplies are tight are not required to meet shipping standards, but it is reduced from the 5-7 month period existing in the current orders to a 3-month period from May through July.

The percentage of receipts as qualifying shipments to distributing plants currently ranges from 30 to 50 percent for these orders, with the Iowa percentage reduced to 20 for the months of December through August. The adopted shipping standards for pool supply plants under the consolidated Central order are 35 percent for the months of September through November and January and 25 percent for all other months, with plants meeting the percentage standard for the months of August through April being allowed to retain their pool status for the immediately following months of May through July.

Groups of two or more supply plants are allowed to form systems of supply plants for the purpose of meeting the shipping requirements by shipping the same percentage as that required for individual pool supply plants that are not part of such a system. These pool supply plants systems may consist of plants of the same handler or more than one handler, and may contain both proprietary and cooperative handlers. The only requirement affecting each plant within the system is that the plant must be physically located within the marketing area. This restriction is necessary to prevent distant plants from receiving the benefits of participating in the marketwide pool without having an actual association with the market.

As in the other consolidated orders, the market administrator will have the authority to increase or reduce the required shipping percentage as marketing conditions change for the purpose of assuring that an adequate supply of milk will be available for fluid use, or to assure that the order does not require handlers to undertake uneconomic movements of milk to maintain the pool status of their plants. In addition, as in the consolidated Upper Midwest order, the provisions adopted in this decision will allow the market administrator to increase or decrease the required shipping percentage on a selected area basis, as well as a marketwide basis, if deemed necessary to reflect needed milk movements within this geographically
extensive marketing area. This provision has existed in the current Upper Midwest order for some time without resulting in any controversy, and is expected to be useful in view of the considerable enlargement of the marketing area through consolidation. Care in using the provision must be exercised to avoid placing handlers in areas in which shipping percentages are temporarily increased or decreased at a competitive disadvantage or advantage to handlers in areas that have not been affected. However, it would be more inequitable to require increased shipments from plants in, for instance, Eastern Colorado, to ship milk to plants in eastern Illinois to supply deficits in that portion of the marketing area.

Producer Milk

The producer and producer milk provisions of the orders consolidated in the Central order are quite similar to each other and differ little from those to be incorporated in the other consolidated orders. The principal difference between some of the individual orders and the consolidated order is the limit on the percentage of a handler's pooled producer milk that may be diverted to nonpool plants. The percentage of a handler's milk that may be diverted to nonpool plants varies under the individual orders from 20 percent of milk received at pool plants during some months under the Eastern Colorado order to 70 percent for some months under the Nebraska-Western Iowa and Iowa orders. Most of the orders require each producer's milk to be received at a pool plant at least once each month. The consolidated Central order requires that a new producer or a producer who has broken association with the market have at least one day's production physically received as producer milk at a pool plant before the producer's milk is eligible to be diverted to nonpool plants.

In order to assure that all of the milk that has been pooled under these orders continues to qualify for pooling, the diversion limit adopted for the Central order is 65 percent for the months of September through November and January, and 75 percent for the months of February through April and December. Allowable diversions for the months of May through July are unlimited. There is no requirement that each producer's milk be received at pool plants for a minimum number of days per month. At the same time, the market administrator is authorized to increase or reduce the diversion limit as needed to maintain orderly marketing and efficient handling of milk in the marketing area.

Multiple Component Pricing

The reporting and payment provisions of the consolidated Central order include those common to other orders with multiple component pricing. These markets have a significant amount of milk used in manufactured products, and component pricing will enable producers to be paid according to the valuable components of their milk.

Mideast Order

Many of the provisions of the order for the consolidated Mideast marketing area are explained in the "Identical Provisions" portion of this final decision, and need not be addressed here. The provisions that deviate somewhat from those provided for other orders are the provisions dealing with standards for determining the pool status of producers and handlers. A significant change from the proposed rule is that the uniform multiple component pricing plan provided for the six other orders that use multiple component pricing is also incorporated into the Mideast order, in place of the proposed pricing plan that differed slightly from the one common to the other orders with multiple component pricing provisions. This change is discussed more fully later in this section of this decision.

For the most part, pooling provisions have less effect on the current Michigan Upper Peninsula market than on the four other markets included in this consolidated order because Michigan Upper Peninsula is the only remaining individual handler pool in the current Federal order system. Therefore, pooling provisions are discussed in relation to the four principal markets included in the consolidated Mideast order.

Pool Plant

The Mideast pool distributing plant definition, in which the in-area route disposition qualification was proposed to exceed that contained in most of the other proposed orders (30 percent instead of 15 percent) to make less likely the full Federal regulation of three State-regulated plants, will instead use the same 25-percent standard of in-area route dispositions of receipts that is being provided in all of the other orders.

Several comments opposed use of an in-area standard higher than 15 percent, arguing that the standard in the Mideast area should not be higher than in other areas, and that handlers outside the market should be held to the "current" 15-percent standard. The adoption of a uniform 25-percent standard of in-area sales as a percentage of total route dispositions for all orders is discussed in the section of this decision dealing with Provisions Common to all Orders. As in the other consolidated orders, the total route disposition percentage will be calculated on the basis of the total receipts of fluid milk products physically received at the distributing plant. Currently all four of the larger orders to be included in the consolidated Mideast order include milk diverted from the distributing plant in the total receipts used to compute the total route disposition percentage.

One comment urged that a pass-through provision similar to that in the current New York-New Jersey order (Order 2) be incorporated in the consolidated order to deal with the in-area route dispositions of handlers who do not meet the order's pooling requirements. Continuation of such a provision in Order 2 was considered and rejected in this decision, in the regional discussion of the Northeast order. There would be no valid basis for including such a provision in the Mideast order when it has been found not appropriate for use in the Northeast.

To assure continued pool qualification for all of the handlers who currently are associated with the Mideast markets, the pool supply plant definition of the consolidated Mideast order provides for all of the types of supply plants that currently qualify for pooling under the 4 principal orders. The Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania pool plant provision includes a plant operated by a cooperative if the cooperative association delivers to distributing plants at least 35 percent of the milk for which it is the handler during the current month or over the preceding 12 months. The Southern Michigan order (Order 40) includes as pool supply plants: (a) A plant that has been a pool plant for 12 consecutive months and has a marketing agreement with a cooperative association, and (b) a system of supply plants operated by one or more handlers. Order 40 also includes some shipments to other Federal order plants and partially regulated distributing plants, in addition to pool distributing plants, as qualifying shipments by supply plants.

The percentage of receipts as qualifying shipments to distributing plants currently ranges from 30 to 40 percent for these orders, with direct deliveries from farms rather than plant transfers limited to half of the required deliveries under three of the orders. All four of the orders require performance of pooling standards by supply plants for the months of September through February, followed by a "free ride" period during which shipping
percentages need not be met by supply plants that met the shipping standards during the required period. The Indiana order contains a provision allowing the continued pooling of a plant that fails to meet pooling standards because of circumstances beyond the handler’s control.

The shipping standards adopted under this decision for pool supply plants are 30 percent for all months, with plants meeting the standard for the months of September through February being allowed to retain their pool status for the immediately following months of March through August. For the purpose of making the 30 percent level of shipping standard less burdensome, up to 90 percent of required shipments are allowed to be made directly from farms to distributing plants. The cooperative association plant defined as a pool plant in the Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania order is retained, as are the supply plant provisions peculiar to the Southern Michigan order. These provisions reflect marketing conditions specific to these current areas, and will assure that plants currently qualified for pooling will retain such status.

Producer Milk

The producer and producer milk provisions of the orders consolidated in the Mideast order are quite similar to and differ little from those incorporated in the other consolidated orders. The principal difference between some of the individual orders and the consolidated order would be the limit on the percentage of a handler’s pooled producer milk that may be diverted to nonpool plants. The Ohio Valley, Indiana and Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania orders all contain 50 percent diversion limits for the months of September through November, January and February and a 60 percent limit for the month of December, with no diversion limit for the months of March through August. The Southern Michigan order contains a 60-percent diversion limit for the months of September through February, with no limit for the months of March through August. In order to assure that all of the milk that has been pooled under these orders continues to qualify for pooling, the diversion limit adopted for the Mideast order is 60 percent for the months of September through February, with no limit for the March through August period. At the same time, the market administrator is authorized to increase or reduce the diversion limit as needed to maintain orderly marketing and efficient handling of milk in the marketing area.

Multiple Component Pricing

In a change from the proposed rule, the reporting and payment provisions of the consolidated Mideast order adopted in this decision now conform to those of the other consolidated orders that provide for multiple component pricing (MCP). The proposed rule would have incorporated a pricing plan similar to the current Southern Michigan MCP plan in the consolidated order instead of the MCP plan proposed for the other consolidated orders. The Southern Michigan MCP plan differs from that included in the other current MCP orders only by pricing “fluid carrier” instead of “other solids.”

The Farm Bill authorizes adoption of a “uniform” multiple component pricing plan. As a result, the component pricing plan has been modified to be the same as the plan contained in other MCP orders. The differences between the adopted MCP plan and that originally proposed for the consolidated Mideast order are not significant. The same prices would be used to compute component values, the same protein and butterfat prices would be used, and the proposed “fluid carrier” price was derived directly from the “other solids” price. The Mideast order language is changed accordingly, and will result in very little difference in total payments, either by handlers or to producers whose milk is pooled under the differing provisions.

Somatic Cell Adjustment

Michigan Milk Producers Association (MMPA), a large cooperative association in Michigan, opposed changing the current Michigan (Order 40) somatic cell count (SCC) adjustment schedule to the adjustment schedule proposed uniformly for all of the MCP orders with SCC adjustments. Changing the current Michigan SCC adjustment schedule to the uniform schedule included in the proposed rule would have the effect of reducing (from the current Order 40 level) the positive value adjustments on milk containing less than 200,000 SCCs and reducing the negative value adjustments on milk containing more than 700,000 SCCs. Incorporating the proposed adjustment in all of the consolidated orders that have somatic cell adjustments will make for a more uniform system of pricing and may better reflect measurable differences in value.

Reporting and Payment Dates

MMPA proposed that handler reports be submitted one day earlier (on the 6th instead of the 7th day after the end of each month) so that producers can be paid a day earlier. The cooperative also advocated that producers be paid with two partial payments instead of one (on the 21st day of the month for the first 15 days’ production and the 6th of the next month for the second half of the month’s production instead of one partial payment on the 26th day of the month for the first 15 days’ production, as proposed). Final payment for each month’s milk would then be made no later than the 16th of the following month, instead of the 17th. The cooperative stated that reducing the time lag between delivering milk and being paid for it would better accommodate the cash flow requirements of modern larger dairy farms.

The Southern Michigan order currently requires that handler reports be filed no later than the 5th of the next month, and that nonmember producers be paid on the 15th. These dates are very early compared to most other Federal orders. Two of the orders included in the consolidated Mideast order currently have a reporting date of the 8th and payment dates of the 18th.

The dates included in the proposed rule and adopted in this decision represent an effort to find a middle ground between significant differences in the orders to be consolidated. The desire to accelerate payment to producers, both by increasing the number of partial payments and advancing the final payment date, is understandable. However, other interested parties in the consolidated area had no opportunity to indicate agreement with or opposition to such changes. These proposals would more properly be addressed in a formal rulemaking proceeding after this proceeding is completed.

6d. Western Region

This final decision adopts four Federal milk orders (i.e., Southwest, Arizona-Las Vegas, Western, and Pacific Northwest orders) for the western region. A number of comments were received in response to the proposed rule. These comments are addressed below under the applicable order discussion.

A number of changes have been made to the consolidated orders since the proposed rule. The significant changes that have been made to all or most of the consolidated orders are explained at the end of this regional discussion, whereas, those modifications that are unique to an individual order are discussed under the applicable order.
Southwest Order

The consolidated Southwest marketing area is comprised principally of the current Texas and New Mexico-West Texas marketing areas. With regard to milk production and population (consumption), these areas are both in the process of change, but in different ways. Texas has one of the fastest-growing populations in the U.S., and until recently has been able to maintain milk production on a per capita basis. After a significant increase in milk production during the 1988-1994 period, Texas milk production has been declining somewhat, accompanied by the exit of approximately 29 percent of the State's Grade A dairy farmers. If the current trend continues, the Texas market could come to resemble more closely those of the Southeast portion of the U.S., relying significantly on more distant milk supplies to meet the market’s Class I and II needs. This situation currently exists for the southern parts of Texas.

The State of New Mexico has experienced relatively slow population growth, but dramatic increases in milk production—from 1.099 billion pounds in 1988 to an estimated 4.020 billion pounds in 1997. With the declining production in Texas, the New Mexico milk-shed will be drawn upon more often to supply Class I and II needs in the Texas demand centers, 500–600 miles distant. Procurement costs would be expected to increase dramatically. In light of these circumstances, provisions in the Southwest order must provide flexibility to cooperatives and handlers supplying the market to prevent inefficient movements of milk and unnecessary costs of operation incurred for the purpose of participating in the market-wide pool.

Prior to enactment of the 1996 Farm Bill, cooperatives operating in the southwestern markets had determined that the two milk orders in the region were being operated as one and should be merged. Much discussion took place, and proposed order provisions were developed by the principal cooperatives involved. These comments, with numerous others, were considered in the development of this final decision for the Southwest marketing area.

Pooling standards

Most of the pooling standards in the Texas and New Mexico-West Texas orders have been suspended for some time. The rapid expansion of milk production in the region during the late 1980s created a situation in which cooperatives and handlers operating in the region could not meet the provisions of the orders while pooling all of their milk supplies. For this reason, the pooling standards for the Southwest order have been relaxed.

As adopted in this final decision, the pooling standards for a distributing plant require the plant to have route disposition equal to at least 25 percent of its fluid milk receipts at the plant during the month. In addition, at least 25 percent of the plant's route disposition must be in the marketing area.

As proposed, to qualify as a pool plant, a partially regulated plant located in the Texas marketing area will become fully regulated under this provision. The plant has been partially regulated under the Texas order and, periodically, fully regulated under the Chicago Regional order. The lowering from 50 percent to 25 percent of total route disposition for a pool distributing plant in the Southwest order would cause this plant to become fully regulated under the Southwest order and, thereby, alleviate the disorderly conditions caused by its shifts in regulation. There should be no change in the plant's costs, since their supply of milk comes from Southwest pool sources.

The pool plant provisions of the Southwest order have been revised in this final decision. The modification provides for the pooling of plants that specialize in ultra-pasteurized or aseptically-processed fluid milk products. A detailed explanation of the changes is located at the end of the western regional discussion.

There are no pool supply plants regulated under the present Texas and New Mexico-West Texas orders. Nevertheless, as recommended in the proposed rule and adopted in this final decision, provision is made for such an operation under the Southwest order. As proposed, to qualify as a pool plant, a supply plant must ship 50 percent or more of the total quantity of milk that is physically received during the month from dairy farmers and handlers in the State of New Mexico described in § 1000.9(c) to pool distributing plants. The supply plant provisions have been modified in this final decision to include milk that is diverted to other plants as well as milk physically received at the plant to allow for more efficient movement of milk to distributing plants when needed.

A provision for the pooling of cooperative association balancing plants is also included in the consolidated order. A plant located within the marketing area that is operated by a cooperative association would qualify as a pool plant if pool plant status is requested for such plant by the cooperative association and during the month at least 30 percent of the producer milk of members of such cooperative association is delivered directly from farms to pool distributing plants or is transferred to such plants as a fluid milk product from the cooperative's plant. The requirement that the plant be located in the marketing area ensures that milk pooled through the balancing plant is economically available to processors of fluid milk if needed.

One comment was received regarding the proposed pooling standards for supply plants. Kraft Foods, Inc. (Kraft), stated that the Southwest order should adopt all the options and pooling efficiencies contained in Section 7 of the proposed Central marketing order. Kraft asserts that the two markets have virtually identical populations (21 million) and Class I utilization (48 percent–49 percent). In addition, the handler contends that the pool supply plant provisions of the Southwest order provide intra-market inequity among handlers in the Southwest market. Kraft indicated that a proprietary supply plant could qualify only by transferring 50 percent of milk physically received at the plant and noted that no farm to plant shipments are permitted to count towards qualifying. However, the handler stated, a plant in the marketing area operated by a cooperative association may make qualifying shipments directly from farms. The performance level, Kraft indicates, is 30 percent of all milk pooled by the cooperative.

A primary mission of most cooperatives supplying the Southwest market is to provide milk to handlers for fluid use and to dispose of milk efficiently when not needed for fluid use. The order provisions should accommodate and encourage efficient milk handling practices. The cooperative balancing plant provision is intended to allow cooperatives to supply the fluid market in the most efficient manner possible and also to process milk efficiently when such milk is not needed for fluid use. Almost all of the fluid products manufactured by plants in the current Texas and New Mexico-Coast Texas marketing areas are operated by cooperatives.

As stated in the proposed rule, the pooling provisions for the Southwest order are similar to the provisions in the present Texas and New Mexico-West Texas orders. The pool supply plant standards are consistent with and reflect the current marketing conditions of the consolidated Southwest order. The standards should ensure that milk of producers servicing the needs of the market will be pooled. The provisions for a supply plant in this
final decision does not recognize shipments directly from producers’ farms as qualifying shipments for a supply plant. However, there currently are no supply plants regulated under the Texas or New Mexico-West Texas orders. Accordingly, the provisions should not place proprietary handlers at a competitive disadvantage and are appropriate to meet the needs of the market.

It is not necessary to seasonally adjust the supply plant and balancing plant shipping requirements for the Southwest order because the standards proposed are flexible enough to accommodate the disposal of surplus milk during the flush production season. Also, this order, like the other new consolidated orders, contains a provision to allow the market administrator to increase or decrease these shipping requirements.

In addition to the provisions described above, the Southwest order contains a provision to allow unit pooling of distributing plants operated by the same handler.

**Producer-Handler**

The producer-handler provisions that were proposed have been revised in this final decision to be very similar to the provisions in the current Texas and New Mexico-West Texas orders. The revisions should assure that the status of current producer-handlers will be unchanged.

**Producer Milk**

The current Texas and New Mexico-West Texas orders have provisions that require a producer’s milk to be received at a pool plant, or touch base, before milk of the producer is eligible to be diverted. The proposed rule indicated that milk produced by producers located in the marketing area should be eligible for pooling without a particular percentage or number of days’ production being required to be received at a pool plant. For producers located outside the marketing area, the touch base provision of the proposed rule required that at least 15 percent of the production of producers be delivered to pool plants during the month in order to be eligible for pooling. Based on comments and a review of the different touch base requirements for producers both in and out of the area, the provision in the final decision has been changed. The provision in the final decision will allow diversion of producer milk of a new producer, provided there is a delivery of at least 40,000 pounds or one day’s milk production, which ever is less, to a pool plant during the month (rather than before diversions are allowed). This dual “touch base” standard has been developed to accommodate a market that is characterized by substantial differences in size among dairy farmers. The requirement that one day’s production be delivered to a pool plant, is appropriate for many producers but is unreasonable for those who produce as much as seven tanker loads a day.

The current Texas order allows an amount equal to one-third of the milk delivered to pool plants to be diverted (this provision is currently suspended), while the (currently suspended) New Mexico-West Texas provision allows 50 percent of a handler’s total milk supply to be diverted. In addition, the current Texas order provisions base allowable diversions on deliveries to individual pool plants, greatly exacerbating the time and effort required to keep track of milk movements. In the proposed rule the provision set the limit on diversions of producer milk on the basis of at least 50 percent of the milk pooled by a handler being received at pool plants for the handler’s entire milk supply to be pooled. The diversion limit in this final decision is continued at 50 percent of a handler’s total milk supply. The total performance standard will allow handlers to meet diversion limits more easily with more efficient movements of milk. In addition, the increased percentage of allowable diversions will assure that all of the producers whose milk would qualify for pooling under either of the two orders being consolidated will continue to meet pooling qualifications. A provision to allow the market administrator to make adjustments is included in the producer milk section of the order with respect to the percentage of milk that may be diverted.

**Multiple Component Pricing**

The reporting and payment provisions of the consolidated Southwest order in the final decision include those common to other orders with multiple component pricing. The multiple component pricing plan does include a somatic cell adjustment for milk used in manufactured products. The proper provisions were changed to allow the cooperatives involved in discussions to merge the current orders did include a multiple component pricing plan. As stated above, those comments were considered in the development of this final decision.

A comment was received from Lepino Foods Company (Lepino) regarding the inclusion of multiple component pricing in the consolidated Southwest order. Lepino strongly supports multiple component pricing for both handlers and producers and states that it has a direct interest in the consolidated Southwest order. Thus, there is support on both the producer, as represented by cooperative associations, and handler side of the Southwest dairy industry.

**Transportation Credits for Surplus Milk**

The Texas order currently has a market-wide service payment provision that gives credits for hauling surplus milk located in certain zones in Texas to nonpool plants outside the State for use in manufactured products. The provision has not been included in the consolidated Southwest order language because of declining production and increasing balancing plant capacity in the affected areas of Texas.

**Payment Provision**

The Texas order is one of only a few marketing orders that requires handlers to remit the full classified value during the month to the Market Administrator. In turn, the Market Administrator acts as a clearing house and forwards these proceeds on to the respective organizations. Interested persons have expressed an interest in retaining these provisions, not only for the proposed Southwest order, but for all other orders.

The current Texas payment provision was found necessary because of problems encountered in assuring timely payments by pooled handlers. The provision has been in the Texas order since 1979, and the earlier payment problems have been remedied. Such a provision involves a rather large degree of regulatory intervention between milk processors and their suppliers that should be shown to be necessary to correct existing problems. There is no indication that such problems currently exist, or would exist in the absence of the provision. Nearly all of the milk that will be pooled under the consolidated Southwest order is produced by cooperative members and pooled by the cooperatives. These large, business-oriented organizations should be able to assure that they receive full payment for their members’ milk in a timely manner. In addition, there are provisions in the General provisions (Part 1000) that provide for enforcement of late or under-payment charges at one percent per month of the amount due.

**Arizona-Las Vegas Order**

Many of the provisions of the consolidated Arizona-Las Vegas order
are explained in the “Identical Provisions” portion of this final decision and need not be addressed here. Those provisions that deviate to some extent from the “Identical Provisions” are addressed in this discussion.

Pool Plant

The pool distributing plant definition is similar to that contained in most of the other consolidated orders. The minimum percentage of a pool distributing plant’s physical receipts of bulk fluid milk products that are disposed of as route disposition is 25 percent. The percentage of a handler’s total route disposition into the marketing area that would result in a distributing plant becoming fully regulated under the Arizona-Las Vegas order is also 25 percent. While this definition differs slightly from the current order language, it provides uniformity with other consolidated orders and should result in no additional distributing plants being pooled under the Arizona-Las Vegas order or any change in the pool status of distributing plants currently pooled.

The pool plant provisions of the Arizona-Las Vegas order have been revised in this final decision. The modification provides for the pooling of plants that specialize in ultra-pasteurized or aseptically-processed fluid milk products. A detailed explanation of the changes is located at the end of the western regional discussion.

The proposed pool supply plant definition would have required a supply plant to ship at least 50 percent of its physical receipts of milk from dairy farmers to pool distributing plants during the month in order to be a pool supply plant. In the proposed rule it was indicated that this definition would provide for easy, effective order administration and would result in no additional handlers being regulated under the order. The supply plant definition has been modified in this final decision to include milk that is diverted from the plant as well as milk physically received at the plant. There are currently no pool supply plants in the proposed marketing area.

The current Central Arizona order permits a manufacturing plant located in the marketing area that is operated by a cooperative association to be a pool plant, provided that the cooperative ships at least 50 percent of its member milk to pool plants of other handlers during the current month or the previous 12-month period ending with the current month. This percentage requirement is currently suspended.

The proposed order suggested reducing this percentage to 35 percent and authorizing the market administrator to increase or reduce the percentage in response to market conditions. The 35 percent and the authorization to make adjustments in the level is contained in this final decision. The reduced performance standard should enable the continued pooling of producer milk that currently is pooled without resulting in uneconomic handling or disorderly marketing. The Arizona-Las Vegas order provides that a single handler be allowed to form a unit of distributing plants and Class II manufacturing plants provided each plant is located within the marketing area. The unit in total would be required to meet the requirements for a pool distributing plant and at least one of the plants in the unit would be required to meet the pool distributing plant definition individually. This provision would provide uniformity with other federal orders and would not change the status of any plants currently pooled. Class II manufacturing plants are included for unit pooling with distributing plants operated by the same handler because such plants produce products that are marketed in conjunction with fluid milk products.

A provision permitting the market administrator to adjust the percentages specified in the pool plant definition will provide the flexibility to respond in a timely manner to changing marketing conditions without the need for a formal hearing process.

Producer-Handler

The producer-handler provisions that were proposed have been revised in this final decision to be very similar to the provisions in the current Arizona order. The revisions should assure that the status of current producers-handlers will be unchanged.

Producer

The consolidated order contains a dairy farmer for other markets definition. A producer could not be pooled under the Arizona-Las Vegas order unless all of the milk from the same farm was pooled under this or some other federal order or unless such non-pooled milk went to a plant with only Class III or Class IV utilization. This differs slightly from the current definition in the Central Arizona order. Such a provision is needed in the consolidated order to prevent dairy farms whose milk is regularly used for fluid disposition in other markets from pooling the surplus portion of their production under the Arizona-Las Vegas order.

Producer Milk

The percentage of a handler’s pooled milk that may be diverted to nonpool plants is 50 percent in any month. The proposed rule recommended a diversion limit of 20 percent in any month. Currently, diversions under the Central Arizona order are limited to eight days’ production of a producer during four months of the year, with unlimited diversions the remainder of the year. The recommended 20 percent diversion limit was suggested because it was thought that this would have resulted in the amount of milk eligible for diversion being approximately equivalent to eight days’ production and would have been easier to administer than the current order provisions. In addition, the proposed rule stated that the 20 percent limit year round would have assured that pooled milk will have a close association with the market’s fluid processing plants.

Security Milk Producers Association (SMPA) expressed concern regarding the recommended 20 percent limit on the volume of a handler’s pooled milk that may be diverted during any month. SMPA states that diversion requirements set at anything less than 50 percent would be financially detrimental to its producers. The cooperative requests that a limit be implemented that will not detract from the orderly flow of milk.

Based on the comments received by SMPA and an reevaluation of the marketing conditions in the consolidated Arizona-Las Vegas order, and noting that eight days production is about 40 percent, this final decision adopts for the Arizona-Las Vegas order a diversion limit of 50 percent for each month of the year. The 50 percent diversion limit year round is more flexible than the current order and the 20 percent limit recommended in the proposed rule and it would be easy to administer. In addition, the 50 percent diversion limit is consistent with the diversion limit included in the Southwest order, which is adjacent to the Arizona-Las Vegas Order. Thus, the 50 percent diversion limit each month should allow the Class I needs of the market to be met while ensuring the orderly disposition of milk. In addition, the market administrator will have the authority to adjust the diversion percentage.

Multiple Component Pricing

The Arizona-Las Vegas order does not provide for multiple component pricing (MCP). There are six plants that are expected to be regulated under the consolidated order: five proprietary
distribution plants, and one manufacturing plant operated by a cooperative association. The Class I utilization for the order is expected to be less than 50 percent, a level that would, in some other orders, be an indication that component pricing would be appropriate. However, the Class I utilization at the five distributing plants is more than 80 percent. With the exception of the one cooperative balancing plant, the handlers to be regulated constitute predominantly a Class I market.

Prior to the issuance of the proposed rule, there were no comments received in support of MCP for the Arizona-Las Vegas order. However, Schreiber Foods, Inc. (Schreiber), Leprino, and SMPA have indicated support for MCP in the consolidated order. Schreiber agrees with National Milk Producers Federation that MCP is important in some but not all orders, and the rule to adopt such a plan and quality adjustments to minimum prices should be based on the dairy industry's preference in each area. The handler asserts that its Class III utilization of over 50 percent of the milk from the Arizona-Las Vegas market is a strong indication for the need of MCP in the order.

Leprino indicates that less than half of the milk in the proposed Arizona-Las Vegas order is used for Class I purposes. The handler argues that competitive inequities due to differences between fat-skim and MCP across manufacturers operating in different orders will become more significant as the manufacturing sector grows. It claims that the lack of MCP in the order will stimulate some disorderly marketing conditions as low component milk from New Mexico seeks higher revenue that will be available through the fat-skim pricing to the west. Additionally, SMPA strongly suggests that a system that prices the butterfat and protein components be incorporated in the order because it is in the best interest of producers.

This final decision does not adopt MCP for the consolidated Arizona-Las Vegas order. The current Central Arizona order does not contain a multiple component pricing plan. The handlers proposed to be regulated under the consolidated order are currently all, with one exception, regulated under the current Central Arizona order. The manufacturing of milk in the consolidated order is anticipated to be done primarily by Schreiber, at a non-pool plant. Schreiber is almost totally supplied by United Dairymen of Arizona (UDA). Due to these marketing situations (i.e., one buyer and one seller), the implementation of MCP in the consolidated Arizona-Las Vegas order would only benefit some of the producers of the order. All of the producers in the marketing area would not share equitably. As stated in the proposed rule and explained above, the fluid nature of much of the market and the current marketing situations do not warrant MCP at this time.

Payment Obligation of a Partially Regulated Distributing Plant

SMPA recommended a proposal designed to equalize Class I costs between California distributing plants and handlers fully regulated under the proposed Arizona-Las Vegas order. SMPA explained that the proposal is essentially a modification of the "Wichita Option," which represents a reasonable method for computing a partially regulated distributing plant's obligation to the producer-settlement fund.

The "Wichita Option" compares the amounts paid to producers for milk received by a nonpool distributing plant with the full class-use value of milk that would have applied if the plant were fully regulated under the order. To equalize the competitive positions of both fully regulated plants and those plants not regulated under an order, any amount by which the class-use value exceeds the value paid to producers is due to the producer-settlement fund or can be paid to the producers who supplied the handler. However, this option does not function appropriately to handle milk from plants regulated under a State order that provides for market-wide pooling. Thus, the modified "Wichita Option" includes payment provisions for any plant regulated under such a State-operated program.

The current Great Basin order provides payment provisions for any handler operating a State-regulated distributing plant having route disposition in the Great Basin order. This provision has been incorporated in Section 76 of the General provisions in this final decision and is applicable to all orders.

Western Order

Many of the provisions of the consolidated Western order are explained in the "Identical Provisions" portion of this final decision and need not be addressed here. Those provisions that differ from those explained in the "Identical Provisions," or those currently contained in the orders to be consolidated, are discussed below.

Pool plant

The pool distributing plant definition is similar to that contained in most of the other orders. The minimum percentage of a pool distributing plant's physical receipts of bulk fluid milk products that are disposed of as route disposition is 25 percent. The percentage of a handler's total route disposition distributed into the marketing area that would result in a distributing plant becoming fully regulated under the Western order is also 25 percent. While this definition differs slightly from the current language of the orders included in this consolidated Western order, it provides uniformity with other consolidated orders and should result in no additional distributing plants being pooled under the order or any change in the pool status of distributing plants currently pooled.

The pool plant provisions of the Western order have been revised in this final decision. The modification to the pool plant definition provides for the pooling of plants that specialize in ultra-pasteurized or aseptically-processed fluid milk products. A detailed explanation of the changes is located at the end of the western regional discussion.

The proposed pool supply plant definition would have required a supply plant operator to ship at least 35 percent of the milk pooled at the supply plant, either by transfer or diversion, to pool distributing plants during the month in order to qualify for pooling. The 35 percent level is included in the final decision. The percentage is slightly higher than that contained in the current Southwest Idaho-Eastern Oregon order and slightly lower than that contained in the current Great Basin order. This change should result in no milk that is currently associated with either of the two orders losing such association.

The pool supply plant definition in the final decision includes provision for a March through August period during which a supply plant that has met the order's shipping percentages for the preceding months of September through February to be able to continue to be a pool plant without meeting the shipping standards. As with other consolidated orders, the market administrator will have the authority to increase or decrease the order's supply plant pooling standards as marketing conditions change.

The Western order final decision contains a provision that would permit a manufacturing plant operated by a cooperative association and located in
the marketing area to be a pool plant if 35 percent of the milk for which the cooperative is the handler is received at pool distributing plants during the month or during the immediately preceding 12-month period. This provision is similar to one currently contained in the Great Basin order and in some of the other consolidated orders.

Although the two current orders that have been consolidated do not contain such a provision, the Western order would provide that a single handler be allowed to form a unit of distributing plants and Class II manufacturing plants provided each plant is located within the marketing area, as suggested by the Identical Provisions committee. The unit in total would be required to meet the requirements for a pool distributing plant and at least one of the plants in the unit would be required to meet the pool distributing plant definition individually. This provision would provide uniformity with other federal orders and would not change the status of any plants currently pooled. Class II manufacturing plants are proposed to be included for unit pooling with distributing plants operated by the same handler because such plants produce products that are marketed in conjunction with fluid milk products.

Proprietary Bulk Tank Handler

The consolidated Western order final decision retains the bulk tank handler provision that is currently in the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order, permitting a handler other than a cooperative association to divert milk to nonpool plants for the handler’s account based on shipments of milk to pool plants of other handlers.

Producer-Handler

The producer-handler provisions that were proposed have been revised in this final decision to be very similar to the provisions in the current Great Basin and Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon orders. The revisions should assure that the status of current producers-handlers will be unchanged.

Producer

The Western order contains a dairy farmer for other markets definition. A producer would not qualify for pooling under the Western order unless all of the milk from the same farm was pooled under this or some other federal order or unless such non-pooled milk went to a plant with only Class III or Class IV utilization. This differs slightly from the current definition in the Great Basin order. Such a provision is contained in the Western order to prevent dairy farmers whose milk is regularly used for fluid disposition in other markets from pooling the surplus portion of their production on the consolidated order. Security Milk Producers Association supports this provision and states that it is needed to prevent the pooling of surplus milk from farms whose milk is regularly associated with other markets.

Producer Milk

The percentage of a handler’s pooled milk for the Western order final decision that may be diverted to non-pool plants is 90 percent in any month. The proposed rule recommended a limit of 80 percent, which is identical to the percentage currently included in the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order and is only slightly higher than that for the present Great Basin order (i.e., 75 percent for cooperatives and 70 percent for proprietary handlers).

Avonmore West Inc. (Avonmore), a handler in the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon Twin Falls, Idaho, favors the more liberal qualification rules proposed for the Western Order whereby only one day’s production of producer milk has to be received at a pool plant. However, the handler opposed the 80 percent standard of a handler’s pooled milk that may be diverted to non-pool plants as recommended in the proposed rule. Avonmore indicated that the 80 percent diversion limitation is identical to the one currently in the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon Federal order and stated that this standard was suspended indefinitely in December 1989. The handler contends that the argument that the 80 percent diversion limitation caused uneconomic movements of milk is still valid today.

In 1997, Avonmore notes, an average of 217 million pounds of producer milk was diverted to nonpool plants each month. Accordingly, Avonmore argues that the reintroduction of the 80 percent diversion limitation would allow only 80 million pounds of producer milk to be diverted to nonpool plants. The handler contends this would preclude many dairy producers in Idaho from having their milk associated with the Western order, which could cause significant price disparities between producers and create disorderly marketing conditions that Federal orders are intended to prevent.

Utah Farm Bureau Federation filed a comment regarding the consolidation of the Great Basin and Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon orders into the Western order. In their comments the federation states that the pooling provisions of the current Great Basin order must be maintained to prohibit opportunistic entry of outside milk into the Utah Class I pool.

As adopted in this final decision, the 90 percent diversion limitation is the same as that adopted in the consolidated Upper Midwest order. The 90 percent limitation on movements of pooled milk to nonpool plants should permit all milk associated with the market that is not needed at pool plants during the month to be pooled and priced under the order. The 90 percent standard provides handlers more flexibility to efficiently move milk.

Although unlimited diversions are not incorporated in the consolidated order, the 90 percent standard should not preclude most producers associated with the current individual orders from having their milk pooled under the consolidated Western order. The 90 percent standard is an appropriate level for the consolidated order given the provisions contained in the current individual orders and should not create any disorderly marketing conditions.

The recommended standard also should ensure that additional amounts of unneeded milk would not be pooled. In addition, as contained in other consolidated orders the market administrator will have the authority to adjust the diversion percentage.

The order language allowing two or more cooperative associations to jointly met the diversion limits was inadvertently excluded from the proposed rule. Order language to allow this to occur has been included in this final decision.

Darigold Farms opposes the touch-base requirement that was recommended in the proposed rule. The cooperative contends that the exclusion of this provision may present an opportunity to obtain unified support for a provision that would prevent or reduce opportunistic pooling.

The current Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon and Great Basin orders contain such a touch-base provision. The provision ensure that a producer whose milk is pooled on the order is indeed servicing the Class I needs of the market. According to the touch-base provision recommended in the proposed rule is adopted in this final decision. The provision provides that during the month at least one day’s milk production of a dairy farmer new to the order must be physically received at a pool plant so that milk of such producer is eligible for diversion.

Reports of Receipts and Utilization and Payroll Reports

The Western order requires pool handlers to file a “report of receipts and utilization” on or before the seventh day
after the end of the month. This is identical to the current reporting date in the Great Basin order but two days earlier than the same provision in the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order. Almost all handlers currently file reports by FAX or some other form of electronic data transfer, which eliminates delays due to mail handling. A seven-day reporting period should allow adequate time for handlers to prepare reports and will allow the computation and release of producer price information to occur on or before the 12th day after the end of the month.

The date on which the report of payments to producers is due to the market administrator under the Western order is on or before the 21st day after the end of the month. This is the same date as that under the Great Basin order, but one day earlier than under the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order. The earlier reporting date and announcement of producer prices should assure that an earlier payroll reporting date would not be burdensome.

Multiple Component Pricing

Both the Great Basin order and the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order currently have multiple component pricing based on protein without a somatic cell adjustment. The multiple component pricing provisions of the consolidated Western order should be the same as those for other proposed orders that provide for multiple component pricing based on protein but without a somatic cell adjustment. The Western order has a significant amount of milk used in manufactured products, especially cheese, and component pricing will enable producers to be paid according to the value of the components of their milk. However, the somatic cell adjustment included in some of the consolidated orders for which component pricing is proposed is not warranted by marketing conditions under the Western order, and such an adjustment is not included in the final decision.

Avonmore expressed support for the use of multiple component pricing in the Western Order and strongly recommended the inclusion of a somatic cell count price adjuster. Avonmore states the SCC adjuster is necessary because the manufacture of cheese is the predominant use of milk in the Western Order. Avonmore notes that it has been documented that elevated levels of SCC impact cheese yield. In addition, the handlers add dairy products (i.e., cheese, NFDM, butter, whey products) exported to the European Union must be made with milk containing less than 400,000 SCC.

Darigold Farms, a cooperative that will have milk on the order has expressed the opinion that an adjustment for somatic cells is a quality issue that may be better dealt with between the buyer and seller. In addition, the nearby Pacific Northwest order will not have a somatic cell adjustment. The somatic cell count of milk produced in the western U.S. is at an average level of 250,000. This level is significantly lower than the 350,000 level, which provides no adjustment in the consolidated orders that adjust for somatic cell count. For the reasons stated above and due to the high quality of milk produced in the consolidated Western marketing area, a quality adjustment is unnecessary and need not be included in the order.

Payments To and From the Producer Settlement Fund

Payments to the producer settlement fund under the consolidated order are due on or before the 14th day after the end of the month. This is two days after the announcement of uniform producer prices, which is an identical time period to that which exists in the two current orders that are being consolidated. Payments from the producer settlement fund under the consolidated order would be due on or before the 15th day after the end of the month. This is the same date as under the current Great Basin order and three days earlier than under the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order. This payment date should be practicable, given the use of current banking and transmission techniques.

Payments to Producers and Cooperative Associations

Under the Western order, partial payments would be due from handlers to producers who are not members of cooperative associations on or before the 25th day of the month in an amount not less than 1.2 times the lowest class price for the preceding month multiplied by the hundredweight of milk received from such producers during the first 15 days of the month. Final payments would be due on or before the 17th day after the end of the month.

Partial payments to cooperative associations would be due on or before the 24th day of the month at the same rate as above, with final payments due on or before the 16th day after the end of the month. These final payment dates represent very little or no change from the current present payment dates. The partial payment dates are earlier than those required under the current orders, but are very close to those suggested by the Identical Provisions committee, and compliance should present no hardship to handlers who would already have had the use of the producers’ milk for 9 to 23 days.

Pacific Northwest Order

Many of the provisions of the Pacific Northwest order are explained in the “Identical Provisions” portion of this final decision, and need not be addressed here. The provisions that deviate somewhat from those incorporated in other order areas are the provisions dealing with standards for determining the pool status of producers and handlers, the definition of producer-handlers, the factors upon which payments to producers are calculated, and reporting and payment dates. Because this order is not proposed to be consolidated with any other orders, there is little reason for changing the substance of many of the provisions that are not included in the General Provisions.

Pool Distributing Plant

The pool distributing plant provisions of the proposed Pacific Northwest Order are changed from the current definition to one that more closely resembles the definition suggested in the identical provisions report. Rather than basing the identification of a pool distributing plant on only 10 percent of the plant’s receipts as in-area route dispositions, the order should specify that such a plant have at least 25 percent of its physical receipts distributed as route disposition, and at least 25 percent of its route disposition distributed within the marketing area.

It is expected that the modified pooling standard will not affect the pool status of any plant that currently does or does not meet the pooling standard of the Pacific Northwest order. In addition, it would remedy a provision that could result in fully regulating a plant that has minimal association with the marketing area.

The pool plant provisions of the Pacific Northwest order have been revised in this final decision. One modification provides for the pooling of plants that specialize in ultra-pasteurized or aseptically-processed fluid milk products. A detailed explanation of the changes is located at the end of the western regional discussion.

Pool Supply Plant

For the most part, the current pool supply plant definition of the Pacific Northwest order and the performance standard of shipping 20 percent of the
milk is appropriate to the marketing conditions in the area. However, the provision that currently requires a handler to include producer milk moved directly to pool distributing plants in the shipments on which pool plant performance is calculated is changed to allow the handler to include such movements if the handler wants to qualify its plant for pooling. A plant operator who receives milk at a plant only for manufacturing use also will be able to supply producer milk directly to distributing plants without a requirement that the manufacturing plant be a supply plant.

In the Pacific Northwest order the current March through August period during which supply plants do not have to ship the minimum percentage to distributing plants if they have done so during the previous September through February period is included in the pool supply plant definition.

As in the other consolidated orders, the market administrator will have the authority to increase or decrease the order’s pooling provisions as marketing conditions change for the purpose of assuring that an adequate supply of milk will be available for fluid use, or to assure that the order does not require handlers to undertake uneconomic movements of milk to maintain: (1) The pool status of their plants, or (2) the pooling of producers who have historically been associated with the market and who help serve Class I needs.

Nonpool Plant

The current definition and exemption for milk produced and processed by state institutions, as contained in the present order’s producer-handler definition, is expanded and moved to be included in the “Nonpool plant” definition contained in the General Provisions. Such entities, along with colleges and universities and charitable organizations, will not be subject to the orders’ pricing and pooling provisions as long as they have no sales in commercial channels.

The present Pacific Northwest order provisions allow a state institution to avoid any regulation on the portion of its milk that is used only within the institution, and apply some pricing regulation to that portion that is distributed in commercial channels. In some respects, this arrangement is similar to the situation of partially regulated distributing plants. However, partially regulated distributing plant operators, to avoid obligations under Federal orders, must show that they pay the dairy farmers who ship milk to them at a rate at least commensurate with that paid to producers whose milk is pooled under the order. In any case, they must procure a milk supply in the competitive market. State institutions may have any number of cost advantages over regulated handlers in the production and processing of milk, such as not having to pay a minimum wage and not having to pay property taxes. It would be unjust to allow such institutions to compete with fully regulated handlers in regular commercial channels as if the playing field were level. Therefore, state and other institutions that compete with regulated handlers in regular commercial channels, such as bids for school milk programs, would be regulated on those sales.

Producer-Handler

The current Pacific Northwest producer-handler provisions remain essentially untouched. Some of the “Identical Provisions” features of the producer-handler definition, such as the 150,000-pound thresholds for route dispensers, own farm production, and receipts from pool plants are adopted in this final decision. The rest of the current producer-handler provisions remain in effect for administrative purposes.

Producer-handlers represent a much larger portion of the Class I dispositions in the Pacific Northwest marketing area than in most other Federal order areas. In many marketing areas, producer-handlers supply one percent or less of the Class I sales. In the Pacific Northwest area, however, they furnish almost 10 percent of the market’s Class I dispositions. The larger average size of the dairy farms in the western United States makes more likely the existence of a producer-handler that is a significant factor in the market.

The current order’s producer-handler provisions are based on the history of producer-handler operations in the marketing area, reflecting difficulties encountered in order administration, attempts to circumvent order provisions, and court challenges. In addition to current order provisions, the producer-handler definition contains language clarifying that milk received by the producer-handler at a location other than the producer-handler’s processing plant for distribution on routes will be included as a receipt from another handler.

Reserve Supply Unit

The current Pacific Northwest order provisions for a cooperative reserve supply unit. The existing provision has many similarities to a reserve supply plant, which is not provided in this order but which is included in several of the consolidated orders.

Under the terms of the present provision, the cooperative members of the reserve supply unit must be located near a pool distributing plant, as a reserve supply plant must be located in the marketing area. Both the reserve supply unit and the reserve supply plant provisions require that the plant or unit operator request prior approval of the market administrator to initiate and cancel their status, both require long-term association with the market, and both provide substantial penalties for failing to meet all required conditions. Although the cooperative unit does not have monthly qualification requirements, it is subject to a call by the market administrator after the market administrator’s investigation of the need for supplemental supplies of milk. Because of the current existence of this provision, based on the need shown at a public hearing, and its similarities to the pooling mechanism used for other orders, provision for the cooperative reserve supply unit will continue to be included in the Pacific Northwest order.

The order language regarding the exemption from diversion limits for a cooperative reserve supply unit was inadvertently excluded from the proposed rule. The order language for this exemption has been included in this final decision. The order language allowing two or more cooperative associations to jointly meet the diversion limits was also inadvertently excluded from the proposed rule. Order language to allow this to occur has been included in this final decision.

Producer and Producer Milk

The consolidated Pacific Northwest order would contain a “dairy farmer for other markets” provision for each month of the year. The large volume of milk production in California and California’s quota system give dairy farmers an incentive to pool production in a volume equal to their quota pounds on the California order, and then attempt to share in the Pacific Northwest Class I market with their over-quota production, for which returns under the California order are much less. At the same time, none of the California Class I returns would be shared with Pacific Northwest producers. Similarly, producers subject to other state programs should not be allowed to pool the reserve supplies from the State-regulated markets and share in returns from the Pacific
Northwest pool while enjoying the benefits of the State orders' Class I returns.

The current provisions of the Pacific Northwest order do not require that a producer's milk be received at pool plants for the producer's first pooled delivery on the market or for any specified period. If a handler meets its overall performance requirements for supplying milk to the market, it should make no difference which individual producer's milk is actually delivered to pool plants as long as the milk of each producer participating in the pool is Grade A and available to the market if and when needed. It is expensive, inefficient, and unnecessary to move milk from areas close to nonpool manufacturing plants to bottling plants in the city markets when that milk is not needed for bottling. For the above reasons and furthermore because there are often great distances and mountainous terrain between plants and farms in the more sparsely populated West, no "touch base" requirements should be included. As stated previously, Darigold Farms supports the exclusion of "touch base" requirements.

The cooperative states that the exclusion may present an opportunity to obtain unified support for a provision that would prevent or reduce opportunistic pooling.

This order and other western orders have allowed producers to pool milk on more than one order during the same month. Because of the locations of a number of dairy farmers, their milk may be used by pool plants regulated under more than one order in a single month. These producers also represent a reserve supply for more than one market. Large, multi-market handlers should be given the flexibility to market and transport their milk to fulfill the needs of their customers in the most efficient way possible.

The small changes in the final decision from the current pooling provisions of the Pacific Northwest order result in very little change in the order's diversion limits. The limit of 80 percent of the handler's supply of producer milk remains unchanged, with the months during which the percentage is effective changed from September through April to September through February. These months will correspond to the months during which supply plants must ship 20 percent of their receipts to pool distributing plants.

In the current order there is no limit on diversions during May through August. In this final decision there will be a limit on diversions of producer milk for the months of March through August. The current delivery standards have not been overly restrictive nor associated unneeded suppliers with the market and should be allowed to continue basically unchanged. However, the change from without limit to a percentage amount will allow the market administrator, as provided for in other orders, the authority to adjust the percentage of milk that may be diverted.

Payments to Producers and Cooperative Associations

Although the current Pacific Northwest order contains a multiple component pricing plan very like that proposed to be standard for the consolidated orders, it does not now and would not under this reform process contain a somatic cell adjustment provision. The level of somatic cells in the western U.S. is generally lower than in the east, with an overall average of approximately 250,000 instead of 350,000. This lower somatic cell count would seem to reduce the need for such a provision. Historically, the principal argument for a somatic cell adjuster has been the negative effect of somatic cells on the cheese yields. Although cheese manufacturing in the Northwest is increasing, most cheese manufacturing is done by cooperative associations who have expressed the opinion that an adjustment for somatic cells is a quality issue best dealt with internally. The somatic cell adjustments in the consolidated orders of the final decision are not incorporated in the Pacific Northwest order.

Announcement of Producer Prices

The dates on which handler reports, market administrator's announcement of producer prices, and payment to producers would remain unchanged from those of the current order.

General Comment Related to Orders

Darigold Farms suggests that the new orders provide some performance requirements attached to each individual market, but recommends that a producer, once qualified, should be locked into the pool for a minimum of four months. This recommendation has not been incorporated in the final decision for any of the western orders. The provisions adopted in each order should ensure that the Class I needs of the markets are met.

Major Changes to Orders From the Proposed Rule

The pool plant provisions of the orders in the western region have been revised. Paragraph (b) of section 7 will accommodate the pooling of plants that specialize in ultra-pasteurized or aseptically-processed fluid milk products (i.e., fluid milk products with a shelf life of at least 60-90 days without refrigeration.) At the present time, there are no plants processing this type of product in the Southwest, Arizona-Las Vegas, or Pacific Northwest marketing areas. However, there is one plant in the Western order market area.

Unlike a typical distributing plant, a plant specializing in extended shelf-life products may have a more erratic processing schedule, reflecting the longer shelf life of the products packaged at the plant. Consequently, a plant's Class I utilization may vary considerably from month to month. In certain areas of the country, such variability has resulted in shifting pool status for this type of plant from one order to another. Such regulatory instability is not conducive to orderly marketing. To provide greater regulatory stability for these plants, they should be fully regulated pool plants if they are located in the market area and process at least 25 percent of their fluid milk product receipts during the month into ultra-pasteurized or aseptically-processed fluid milk products. This provision will not guarantee that a plant qualifies as a fully-regulated pool plant every month; some months a plant may fail to process 25 percent of its milk receipts into ultra-pasteurized or aseptically-processed fluid milk products. Nevertheless, the provision will guarantee that if a plant meets the 25 percent standard described above, it will be qualified under the same order all the time.

7. Miscellaneous and Administrative

(a) Consolidation of the marketing service, administrative expense, and producer-settlement funds. To complete the consolidation of the present 31 Federal orders effectively and equitably, the reserve balances in the marketing service, administrative expense, and producer-settlement funds that have resulted under the individual orders would be combined. The balances in these three funds should be combined on the same basis that the marketing areas are consolidated into regional orders herein. For instance, the Texas and New Mexico-West Texas marketing areas are merged into a new regional Southwest order. Accordingly, the reserve balances in the marketing service, administrative expense and producer-settlement funds of the two individual orders likewise should be combined into three separate funds established under the consolidated Southwest order.
The marketing areas of the 11 consolidated orders essentially represent the territory covered by the 31 individual orders plus the territory included in the former Tennessee Valley marketing area. Because of this, the handlers and producers servicing the milk needs of the individual markets will continue to furnish the milk needs of the applicable regional market for the most part.

In that regard, the reserve balances in the funds that have resulted under the 31 individual orders should be combined on a marketing area basis into the appropriate separate fund established for each of the 11 regional orders. Any liabilities of such funds under the individual orders would be paid from the appropriate newly established fund of the applicable regional order. Similarly, obligations that are due the separate funds under the individual orders would be paid to the appropriate combined fund of the applicable consolidated order.

In most instances where a current marketing area of an order or orders is included in the consolidated marketing area of one of the 11 regional orders. Four present marketing areas would be split between two consolidated orders. One county of the present Louisville-Lexington-Evansville (Order 46) marketing area would be included in the Southeast order, and the rest of the territory in the Order 46 marketing area would be included under the Appalachian order. Even though one Order 46 county is included in the consolidated Southeast order, all of the present Order 46 producers and handlers are expected to be covered under the consolidated Appalachian order. Accordingly, the balances in the Order 46 marketing service fund, administrative expense, and producer settlement funds should be consolidated into the three separate funds established for the consolidated Appalachian order.

Different regulatory situations, however, will occur in the other three instances where a current marketing area is divided between two consolidated orders. The southwest Missouri and northwest Arkansas portions of the current Southwest Plains order area are included in the consolidated Southeast marketing area, while the remainder of the Southwest Plains area is combined with the marketing areas of eight other orders in the consolidated Central marketing area. Similarly, one county of the current Great Basin (Order 139) marketing area is included in the consolidated Arizona-Las Vegas order area, while the rest of the Order 139 marketing area is included in the consolidated marketing area for the West. In the third instance, two zones of the Michigan Upper Peninsula (Order 44) marketing area are included in the consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area and the other zone of the Order 44 marketing area is included in the marketing area for the Mideast regional order.

In each of these 3 cases, some of the producers and handlers of each of the current order areas that are being divided will become pooled under one consolidated order, while the other producers and handlers of each of these areas will become pooled under another regional order. Accordingly, any reserve balances in the marketing service, administrative expense and producer-settlement funds of these three individual orders should be divided equitably among the applicable consolidated orders.

The money accumulated in the marketing service funds of the individual orders is that which has been paid by producers for whom the market administrators are performing such services. Since the marketing areas of the 11 regional orders encompass the territory covered by the individual orders, for the most part, the producers who have contributed to the marketing service funds of the individual orders are expected to continue supplying milk for the consolidated orders. Since marketing service programs will be continued for these producers under the regional orders, it would be appropriate to combine the reserve balances in the marketing service funds of the order or orders that are represented in the consolidation of each of the 11 regional orders.

When the consolidated marketing area includes the marketing area of one or more individual orders, any remaining balance in the marketing service fund of the individual order or orders should be combined in the marketing service fund established for the applicable consolidated order. If a current marketing area is split between two consolidated markets and the regulatory status of producers and handlers is divided (as in the case of the Michigan Upper Peninsula, Southwest Plains, and Great Basin orders) between two consolidated marketing areas, the remaining balance in the administrative expense fund should be prorated between the two regional orders on the basis of the amount of milk that would be pooled and priced under each respective consolidated order (using producer milk deliveries during the last month the individual orders are in effect but assuming that the orders had been consolidated).

Likewise, the producer-settlement fund balances of the individual orders should be combined. They should be combined on the same basis as the marketing areas are consolidated herein. This will enable the producer-settlement funds of the consolidated orders to continue without interruption.

The producers currently supplying the individual markets are expected to supply milk for the consolidated markets. Thus, monetary balances in the producer-settlement funds of the individual orders now would be reflected in the pay prices of the producers who will benefit from the applicable consolidated orders. The combined fund for each consolidated order also would serve as a contingency fund from which money would be available to meet obligations (resulting from audit adjustments and otherwise) occurring under the individual orders.
The same procedure used in combining the remaining balances in the marketing service and administrative expense funds of the individual orders should be followed in combining the producer-settlement fund balances when the individual orders are consolidated. For orders where the consolidated marketing area includes the marketing area of one or more orders, any remaining balance in the producer-settlement fund of the individual order or orders would be combined into the producer-settlement fund established for the applicable consolidated order. In the three situations (Michigan Upper Peninsula, Southwest Plains, and Great Basin) where the marketing area of a current order is split between two consolidated orders and some of the individual market’s producers and handlers would be regulated under one consolidated order and others would be regulated under another consolidated order, the balance in the producer-settlement fund should be divided equitably between the two consolidated orders. Since the Michigan Upper Peninsula order is an individual-handler pool market, no producer-settlement fund is provided. In the remaining instances in which current marketing areas are divided between 2 consolidated orders, the remaining balance in the producer-settlement funds of the Southwest Plains and Great Basin orders should be prorated between the consolidated orders on the basis of the amount of milk that will be pooled and priced under each respective consolidated order (using producer milk deliveries during the last month the individual orders are in effect but assuming that the orders had been consolidated).

(b) Consolidation of the transportation credit balancing funds. To complete the consolidation process, the reserve balances in the transportation credit balancing funds that are in effect now under three Southeast orders (Carolina, Order 5; Southeast, Order 7; and Louisville-Alexington-Evansville, Order 46) also should be consolidated. These funds should be combined on a marketing area basis. In that regard, the reserve balances in the transportation credit balancing funds of the Carolina and Louisville-Alexington-Evansville orders should be consolidated into a newly established transportation credit balancing fund for the consolidated Appalachian order, which also includes the current marketing areas of these two orders with the exception of one county. Similarly, the remaining balance in the transportation credit balancing fund of the present Southeast order should be transferred to the consolidated Southeast order, which includes all of the marketing area of the present Southeast order. These procedures will enable the transportation credits to continue without interruption under these two consolidated orders.

(c) General findings.

The findings and determinations hereinafter set forth supplement those that were made when the aforesaid orders were first issued and when they were amended. The previous findings and determinations are hereby ratified and confirmed, except where they may conflict with those set forth herein.

1. The tentative marketing agreements and the orders, as hereby proposed to be amended, and all of the terms and conditions thereof, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act;

2. The parity prices of milk as determined pursuant to section 2 of the Act are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk in each of the aforesaid marketing areas, and the minimum prices specified in the tentative marketing agreements and the orders, as hereby proposed to be amended, are such prices as will reflect the aforesaid factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest;

3. The tentative marketing agreements and the orders, as hereby proposed to be amended, will regulate the handling of milk in the same manner as, and will be applicable only to persons in the respective classes of industrial and commercial activity specified in the marketing agreements;

4. All milk and milk products handled by handlers, as defined in the tentative marketing agreements and the orders as hereby proposed to be amended, are in the current of interstate commerce or directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate commerce in milk or its products; and

5. It is hereby found that the necessary expense of the market administrator for the maintenance and functioning of such agency will require the payment by each handler, as his proportion of such expense, 5 cents per hundredweight or such lesser amount as the Secretary may prescribe, with respect to milk specified in § 1000.85 of the General Provisions.

Comments

In arriving at the findings and conclusions, and the regulatory provisions of this decision, each of the comments received was carefully and fully considered in conjunction with the rulemaking record.

Marketing Agreements and Order Amending the Orders

The marketing agreements regulating the handling of milk in each of the consolidated orders are not included in this final decision because the regulatory provisions thereof would be the same as those contained in the orders, as hereby amended. The following order amending the orders regulating the handling of milk in the respective marketing areas of these orders is proposed as the detailed and appropriate means by which the foregoing conclusions may be carried out.

Referendum Order to Determine Producer Approval

This decision does not provide for conducting referendums of producers to determine if they approve of the issuance of the consolidated orders. A notice to conduct a referendum on each of the consolidated orders will be issued at a future date.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Parts 1000, 1001, 1002, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1012, 1013, 1030, 1032, 1033, 1036, 1040, 1044, 1046, 1048, 1050, 1054, 1055, 1068, 1076, 1079, 1106, 1124, 1126, 1131, 1134, 1135, 1137, 1138 and 1139

Milk marketing orders.

Dated: March 12, 1999.

Michael V. Dunn,
Under Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs.

Order Amending the Orders Regulating the Handling of Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing Areas

This order shall not become effective unless and until the requirements of § 900.14 of the rules of practice and procedure governing proceedings to formulate marketing agreements and marketing orders have been met.

Findings and Determinations

The findings and determinations hereinafter set forth supplement those that were made when the orders were first issued and when they were amended. The previous findings and determinations are hereby ratified and confirmed, except where they may conflict with those set forth herein.

1. The said orders as hereby amended, and all of the terms and conditions thereof, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act;

2. The parity prices of milk, as determined pursuant to section 2 of the Act, are not reasonable in view of the
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Subpart A—Scope and Purpose
§ 1000.1 Scope and purpose of this Part 1000.

This part sets forth certain terms, definitions, and provisions which shall be common to and part of each Federal milk marketing order in 7 CFR, chapter X, except as specifically defined otherwise, or modified, or otherwise provided, in an individual order in 7 CFR, chapter X.

Subpart B—Definitions
§ 1000.2 General definitions.
(a) Act means Public Act No. 10, 73d Congress, as amended and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).
(b) Order or Federal milk order means the applicable part of 7 CFR, chapter X, issued pursuant to section 8c of the Act as a Federal milk marketing order (as amended).
(c) Department means the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
(d) Secretary means the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States or any officer or employee of the Department to whom authority has heretofore been delegated, or to whom authority may hereafter be delegated, to act in his stead.
(e) Person means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other business unit.

§ 1000.3 Route disposition.
Route disposition means a delivery to a retail or wholesale outlet (except a plant), either directly or through any distribution facility (including disposition from a plant store, vendor, or vending machine) of a fluid milk product in consumer-type packages or dispenser units classified as Class I milk.

§ 1000.4 Plant.
(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, plant means the land, buildings, facilities, and equipment constituting a single operating unit or establishment at which milk or milk products are received, processed, or packaged, including a facility described in paragraph (b)(2) of this section if the facility receives the milk of more than one dairy farmer.
(b) Plant shall not include:
(1) A separate building without stationary storage tanks that is used only as a reload point for transferring bulk

price of feeds, available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk in the aforesaid marketing areas. The minimum prices specified in the orders as hereby amended are such prices as will reflect the aforesaid factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest; and
(c) The said orders as hereby amended regulate the handling of milk in the same manner as, and are applicable only to persons in the respective classes of industrial or commercial activity specified in, the marketing agreements;
(d) All milk and milk products handled by handlers, as defined in the orders as hereby amended, are in the current of interstate commerce or directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate commerce in milk or its products; and
(e) It is hereby found that the necessary expense of the market administrators for the maintenance and functioning of such agency will require the payment by each handler, as his pro rata share of such expense, 5 cents per hundredweight or such lesser amount as the Secretary may prescribe, with respect to milk specified in § 1000.85 of the General Provisions.

Order Relative to Handling

It is therefore ordered, that on and after the effective date hereof, the handling of milk in the Northeast and other marketing areas shall be in conformity to and in compliance with the terms and conditions of the orders, as amended, and as hereby amended, as follows:
The provisions of the proposed marketing agreements and order amending the orders contained in the proposed rule issued by the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, on January 21, 1998, and published in the Federal Register on January 31, 1998 (63 FR 4802), as modified herein, shall be and are the terms and provisions of this order, amending the orders, and are set forth in full herein.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble and under the authority of Title 7, chapter X, parts 1000, 1001, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1030, 1032, 1033, 1124, 1126, 1131, and 1135 are revised and parts 1002, 1004, 1012, 1013, 1036, 1040, 1044, 1046, 1049, 1050, 1064, 1065, 1068, 1076, 1079, 1106, 1134, 1137, 1138 and 1139 are removed and reserved as follows:
milk from one tank truck to another or a separate building used only as a distribution point for storing packaged fluid milk products in transit for route disposition; or
(2) A plant that is operated by a duly accredited college or university disposing of fluid milk products only through the operation of its own facilities with no route disposition in commercial channels;
(3) A plant from which the total route disposition is for individuals or institutions for charitable purposes without remuneration; or
(4) A plant that has route disposition and packaged sales of fluid milk products to other plants of 150,000 pounds or less during the month.

§ 1000.9 Handler.
Handler means:
(a) Any person who operates a pool plant or a nonpool plant.
(b) Any person who receives packaged fluid milk products from a plant for resale and distribution to retail or wholesale outlets, any person who as a broker negotiates a purchase or sale of fluid milk products or fluid cream products from or to any pool or nonpool plant, and any person who by purchase or direction causes milk of producers to be picked up at the farm and/or moved to a plant. Persons who qualify as handlers only under this paragraph under any Federal milk order are not subject to the payment provisions of §§ 1000.9, 1135.11, and .76, and §1135.13 of that order.
(c) Any cooperative association with respect to milk that it receives for its own account from the farm of a producer and delivers to pool plants or diverts to nonpool plants pursuant to § 1135.6 of this section, the operator of a pool plant receiving milk from a cooperative association may be the handler for such milk if both parties notify the market administrator of this agreement prior to the time that the milk is delivered to the pool plant and the plant operator purchases the milk on the basis of farm bulk tank weights and samples.

§ 1000.14 Other source milk.
Other source milk means all skim milk and butterfat contained in or represented by:
(a) Receipts of fluid milk products and bulk fluid cream products from any source other than producers, handlers described in § 1000.9(c) and § 1135.11, or pool plants;
(b) Products (other than fluid milk products, fluid cream products, and products produced at the plant during the same month) from any source which are reprocessed, converted into, or combined with another product in the plant during the month; and
(c) Receipts of any milk product (other than a fluid milk product or a fluid cream product) for which the handler fails to establish a disposition.

§ 1000.15 Fluid milk product.
(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, fluid milk product means any milk products in fluid or frozen form containing less than 9 percent butterfat that are intended to be used as beverages. Such products include, but are not limited to: Milk, fat-free milk, lowfat milk, light milk, reduced fat milk, milk drinks, eggnog and cultured buttermilk, including any such beverage products that are flavored, cultured, modified with added nonfat milk solids, sterilized, concentrated, or reconstituted. As used in this paragraph (a) of this section, fluid milk product means milk that contains not less than 25.5 percent, and not more than 50 percent, total milk solids.
(b) The term fluid milk product shall not include:
(1) Plain or sweetened evaporated milk/skim milk, sweetened condensed milk/skim milk, formulas especially prepared for infant feeding or dietary use (meal replacement) that are packaged in hermetically sealed containers, any product that contains by weight less than 6.5 percent nonfat milk solids, and whey; and
(2) The quantity of skim milk equivalent in any modified product specified in paragraph (a) of this section that is greater than an equal volume of an unmodified product of the same nature and butterfat content.

§ 1000.16 Fluid cream product.
Fluid cream product means cream (other than plastic cream or frozen cream), including sterilized cream, or a mixture of cream and milk or skim milk containing 9 percent or more butterfat, with or without the addition of other ingredients.

§ 1000.17 [Reserved]

§ 1000.18 Cooperative association.
Cooperative association means any cooperative marketing association of producers which the Secretary determines is qualified under the provisions of the Capper-Volstead Act, has full authority in the sale of milk of its members, and is engaged in marketing milk or milk products for its members. A federation of 2 or more cooperatives incorporated under the laws of any state will be considered a cooperative association under any Federal milk order if all member cooperatives meet the requirements of this section.
§ 1000.25 Market administrator.

(a) Designation. The agency for the administration of the order shall be a market administrator selected by the Secretary and subject to removal at the Secretary’s discretion. The market administrator shall be entitled to compensation determined by the Secretary.

(b) Powers. The market administrator shall have the following powers with respect to each order under his/her administration:

1. Administer the order in accordance with its terms and provisions;

2. Maintain and invest funds outside of the United States Department of the Treasury for the purpose of administering the order;

3. Make rules and regulations to effectuate the terms and provisions of the order;

4. Receive, investigate, and report complaints of violations to the Secretary; and

5. Recommend amendments to the Secretary.

(c) Duties. The market administrator shall perform all the duties necessary to administer the terms and provisions of each order under his/her administration, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Employ and fix the compensation of persons necessary to enable him/her to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the office;

2. Pay out of funds provided by the administrative assessment, except expenses associated with functions for which the order provides a separate charge, all expenses necessarily incurred in the maintenance and functioning of the office and in the performance of the duties of the office, including the market administrator’s compensation;

3. Keep records which will clearly reflect the transactions provided for in the order and upon request by the Secretary, surrender the records to a successor or such other person as the Secretary may designate;

4. Furnish information and reports requested by the Secretary and submit office records for examination by the Secretary;

5. Announce publicly at his/her discretion, unless otherwise directed by the Secretary, by such means as he/she deems appropriate, the name of any handler who, after the date upon which the handler is required to perform such act, has not:

   (i) Made reports required by the order;

   (ii) Made payments required by the order or;

   (iii) Made available records and facilities as required pursuant to § 1000.27;

6. Prescribe reports required of each handler under the order. Verify such reports and the payments required by the order by examining records (including such papers as copies of income tax reports, fiscal and product accounts, correspondence, contracts, documents or memoranda of the handler, and the records of any other persons that are relevant to the handler’s obligations under the order), by examining such handler’s milk handling facilities, and by such other investigation as the market administrator deems necessary for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any report or any obligation under the order. Reclassify skim milk and butterfat received by any handler if such examination and investigation discloses that the original classification was incorrect;

7. Furnish each regulated handler a written statement of such handler’s accounts with the market administrator promptly each month. Furnish a corrected statement to such handler if verification discloses that the original statement was incorrect; and

8. Prepare and disseminate publicly for the benefit of producers, handlers, and consumers such statistics and other information concerning operation of the order and facts relevant to the provisions thereof (or proposed provisions) as do not reveal confidential information.

Subpart C—Rules of Practice and Procedure Governing Market Administrators

§ 1000.26 Continuity and separability of provisions.

(a) Effective time. The provisions of the order or any amendment to the order shall become effective at such time as the Secretary may declare and shall continue in force until suspended or terminated.

(b) Suspension or termination. The Secretary shall suspend or terminate any or all of the provisions of the order whenever he/she finds that such provision(s) obstructs or does not tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act. The order shall terminate whenever the provisions of the Act authorizing it cease to be in effect.

(c) Continuing obligations. If upon the suspension or termination of any or all of the provisions of the order there are any obligations arising under the order, the final accrual or ascertainment of which requires acts by any handler, by the market administrator or by any other person, the power and duty to perform such further acts shall continue notwithstanding such suspension or termination.

(d) Liquidation. (1) Upon the suspension or termination of any or all provisions of the order the market administrator, or such other liquidating agent designated by the Secretary, shall, if so directed by the Secretary, liquidate the business of the market administrator’s office, dispose of all property in his/her possession or control, including accounts receivable, and execute and deliver all assignments or other instruments necessary or appropriate to effectuate any such disposition; and

(2) If a liquidating agent is so designated, all assets and records of the market administrator shall be transferred promptly to such liquidating agent. If, upon such liquidation, the funds on hand exceed the amounts required to pay outstanding obligations of the office of the market administrator and to pay necessary expenses of liquidation and distribution, such excess shall be distributed to contributing handlers and producers in an equitable manner.

(e) Separability of provisions. If any provision of the order or its application to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the application of such provision and of the remaining provisions of the order to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Subpart D—Rules Governing Order Provisions

§ 1000.27 Handler responsibility for records and facilities.

Each handler shall maintain and retain records of its operations and make such records and its facilities available to the market administrator. If
adequate records of a handler, or of any other persons, that are relevant to the
obligation of such handler are not maintained and made available, any
skim milk and butterfat required to be reported by such handler for which
adequate records are not available shall be considered as used in the highest-
priced class.

(a) Records to be maintained. (1) Each handler shall maintain records of its
operations (including, but not limited to, records of purchases, sales,
processing, packaging, and disposition) as are necessary to verify whether such
handler has any obligation under the order and if so, the amount of such
obligation. Such records shall be such as to establish for each plant or other
receiving point for each month:

(i) The quantities of skim milk and butterfat contained in, or represented by,
products received in any form, including inventories on hand at the
beginning of the month, according to form, time, and source of each receipt;

(ii) The utilization of all skim milk and butterfat showing the respective
quantities of such skim milk and butterfat in each form disposed of on
hand at the end of the month; and

(iii) Payments to producers, dairy farmers, and cooperative associations,
including the amount and nature of any deductions and the disbursement
of money so deducted.

(2) Each handler shall keep such other specific records as the market
administrator deems necessary to verify or establish such handler’s obligation
under the order.

(b) Availability of records and facilities. Each handler shall make available
all records pertaining to such handler’s operations and all facilities
the market administrator finds are necessary to verify the information
required to be reported by the order and/or to ascertain such handler’s
reporting, monetary, or other obligation under the order. Each handler shall
permit the market administrator to weigh, sample, and test milk and milk
products and observe plant operations and equipment and make available to
the market administrator such facilities as are necessary to carry out his/her
duties.

(c) Retention of records. All records required under the order to be made
available to the market administrator shall be retained by the handler for a
period of 3 years to begin at the end of the month to which such records
pertain. If, within such 3-year period, the market administrator notifies the
handler in writing that the retention of such records, or of specified records, is
necessary in connection with a proceeding under section 8c(15)(A) of the
Act or a court action specified in such notice, the handler shall retain
such records, or specified records, until further written notification from the
market administrator. The market administrator shall give further written
notification to the handler promptly upon the termination of the litigation or
when the records are no longer necessary in connection therewith.

§ 1000.28 Termination of obligations.

(a) Except as provided in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, the obligation
of any handler to pay money required to be paid under the terms of the order
shall terminate 2 years after the last day of the month during which the market
administrator receives the handler’s report of receipts and utilization on
which such obligation is based, unless within such 2-year period, the market
administrator notifies the handler in writing that such money is due and
payable. Service of such written notice shall be complete upon mailing to the
handler’s last known address and it shall contain, but need not be limited to,
the following information:

(1) The amount of the obligation;

(2) The month(s) on which such obligation is based;

(3) If the obligation is payable to one or more producers or to a cooperative
association, the name of such producer(s) or such cooperative
association, or if the obligation is payable to the market administrator,
the account for which it is to be paid.

(b) If a handler fails or refuses, with respect to any obligation under the order,
to make available to the market administrator all records required by the
order to be made available, the market administrator may notify the handler in
writing, within the 2-year period provided for in paragraph (a) of this
section, of such failure or refusal. If the market administrator so notifies a
handler, the said 2-year period with respect to such obligation shall begin to run
until the first day of the month following the month during which all such records
pertaining to such obligation are made available to the market administrator.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, a
handler’s obligation under the order to pay money shall not be terminated with
respect to any transaction involving fraud or willful concealment of a fact,
material to the obligation, on the part of the handler against whom the obligation
is sought to be imposed.

(d) Unless the handler files a petition pursuant to section 8c(15)(A) of the Act
and the applicable rules and regulations (7 CFR 900.50 et seq.) within the
applicable 2-year period indicated below, the obligation of the market
administrator:

(1) To pay a handler any money which such handler claims is due under the
terms of the order shall terminate 2 years after the end of the month during
which the skim milk and butterfat involved in the claim were received; or

(2) To refund any payment made by a handler (including a deduction or
offset) by the market administrator shall terminate 2 years after the end of the
month during which payment was made by the handler.

Subpart F—Classification of Milk

§ 1000.40 Classes of Utilization.

Except as provided in § 1000.42, all skim milk and butterfat required to be
reported pursuant to § 1000.30 of each Federal milk order shall be classified as
follows:

(a) Class I milk shall be all skim milk and butterfat:

(1) Disposed of in the form of fluid milk products, except as otherwise
provided in this section;

(2) In packaged fluid milk products in
inventory at the end of the month; and

(3) In shrinkage assigned pursuant to
§ 1000.43(b).

(b) Class II milk shall be all skim milk
and butterfat:

(1) In fluid milk products in
containers larger than 1 gallon and fluid
cream products disposed of or diverted
to a commercial food processing
establishment if the market
administrator is permitted to audit the
records of the commercial food
processing establishment for the
purpose of verification. Otherwise, such
uses shall be Class I;

(2) Used to produce:

(i) Cottage cheese, lowfat cottage
cheese, dry curd cottage cheese, ricotta
cheese, pot cheese, Creole cheese, and
any similar soft, high-moisture cheese
resembling cottage cheese in form or
use;

(ii) Milkshake and ice milk mixes (or
bases), frozen desserts, and frozen
dessert mixes distributed in half-gallon
containers or larger and intended to be
used in soft or semi-solid form;

(iii) Aerated cream, frozen cream, sour
cream, sour half-and-half, sour cream
mixtures containing nonmilk items,
yogurt, and any other semi-solid
product resembling a Class II product;

(iv) Custards, puddings, pancake
mixes, coatings, batter, and similar
products;

(v) Buttermilk biscuit mixes and other
buttermilk for baking that contain food
starch in excess of 2% of the total

Federal Register / Vol. 64, No. 63 / Friday, April 2, 1999 / Proposed Rules 16173
transferred or diverted in the form of a fluid milk product or transferred in the form of a bulk fluid cream product from a pool plant or a handler described in §1135.11 to another pool plant shall be classified as Class I milk unless the handlers both request the same classification in another class. In either case, the classification shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. The skim milk and butterfat classified in each class shall be limited to the amount of skim milk and butterfat, respectively, remaining in such class at the receiving plant after the computations pursuant to §1000.44(a)(9) and the corresponding step of §1000.44(b);

2. If the transferring plant received during the month other source milk to be allocated pursuant to §1000.44(a)(3) or the corresponding step of §1000.44(b), the skim milk or butterfat so transferred shall be classified so as to allocate the least possible Class I utilization to such other source milk; and

3. If the transferring handler received during the month other source milk to be allocated pursuant to §1000.44(a)(8) or (9) or the corresponding steps of §1000.44(b), the skim milk or butterfat so transferred, up to the total of the skim milk and butterfat, respectively, in such receipts of other source milk, shall not be classified as Class I milk to a greater extent than would be the case if the other source milk had been received at the receiving plant.

(b) Transfers and diversions to a plant regulated under another Federal order. Skim milk or butterfat transferred or diverted in the form of a fluid milk product or transferred in the form of a bulk fluid cream product from a pool plant to a plant regulated under another Federal order shall be classified in the following manner. Such classification shall apply only to the skim milk or butterfat that is in excess of the receipts at the pool plant from a plant regulated under another Federal order of skim milk and butterfat, respectively, in fluid milk products and bulk fluid cream products, respectively, that are in the same category as described in paragraph (b)(1) or (2) of this section:

1. As Class I milk if transferred as packaged fluid milk products;

2. If transferred or diverted in bulk form, classification shall be in the classes to which allocated under the other order:

   (i) If the operators of both plants so request in their reports of receipts and utilization filed with their respective market administrators, the transfers in bulk form shall be classified as other than Class I to the extent that such utilization is available for such classification pursuant to the allocation provisions of the other order;

   (ii) If diverted, the diverting handler must request a classification other than Class I. If the plant receiving the diverted milk does not have sufficient utilization available for the requested classification and some of the diverted milk is consequently assigned to Class I use, the diverting handler shall be given the option of designating the entire load of diverted milk as producer milk at the plant physically receiving the milk. Alternatively, if the diverting handler so chooses, it may designate which dairy farmers whose milk was diverted during the month will be designated as producers under the order physically receiving the milk. If the diverting handler declines to accept either of these options, the market administrator will prorate the portion of diverted milk in excess of Class II, III, and IV use among all the dairy farmers whose milk was received from the diverting handler on the last day of the month, then the second-to-last day, and continuing in that fashion until the excess diverted milk has been assigned as producer milk under the receiving order; and

   (iii) If information concerning the classes to which such transfers or diversions were allocated under the other order is not available to the market administrator for the purpose of establishing classification under this paragraph, classification shall be Class I, subject to adjustment when such information is available.

(c) Transfers and diversions to producer-handlers and to exempt plants. Skim milk or butterfat that is transferred or diverted from a pool plant to a producer-handler under any Federal order or to an exempt plant shall be classified:

1. As Class I milk if transferred or diverted to a producer-handler;

2. As Class I milk if transferred to an exempt plant in the form of a packaged fluid milk product; and

3. In accordance with the utilization assigned to it by the market administrator if transferred or diverted in the form of a bulk fluid milk product or transferred in the form of a bulk fluid cream product to an exempt plant. For this purpose, the receiving handler’s utilization of skim milk and butterfat in each class, in series beginning with Class IV, shall be assigned to the extent possible to its receipts of skim milk and butterfat in bulk fluid cream products, and bulk fluid milk products, respectively, pro rata to each source. (d) Transfers and diversions to other nonpool plants. Skim milk or butterfat...