CIVIL RIGHTS IMPACT ANALYSIS
OF
FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDER REFORM

Executive Summary

Pursuant to Departmental Regulation (DR) 4300-4, this Civil Rights Impact Analysis (CRIA) reviews the final decision regarding reforms to the Federal Milk Marketing Order program to identify any provisions within the final decision with actual or potential adverse effects for minorities, women, and persons with disabilities.

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

The analysis discloses no potential for affecting dairy farmers in protected groups differently than the general population of dairy farmers. All producers, regardless of race, national origin, or disability, who choose to deliver milk to a Federal order regulated handler will receive the minimum blend price.

Purpose of a Civil Rights Impact Analysis

The CRIA describes the civil rights implications of proposed policy actions before the actions are approved and implemented. The CRIA provides information about the most likely beneficiaries of a decision, program, or activity; how and to what degree the benefits will be demonstrated; and whether the originally planned policy, action, decision, program, or activity should be modified or otherwise changed if possible to ensure increased benefits or more effective outcomes. The CRIA helps to advise USDA policymakers, managers, and administrators about whether the action or decision will have the effect of unintentionally or otherwise illegally discriminating against USDA customers based on race, color, sex, national origin, religion, age, disability, marital or familial status. Also, the CRIA serves to advise USDA policymakers, managers, and administrators of the effectiveness of decisions as related to ensuring efficient, appropriate allocation or distribution of goods and services in a manner that ensures compliance with all the laws, rules, and regulations under which USDA must operate.
**USDA Civil Rights Policy**

The Civil Rights Policy for the Department of Agriculture, Departmental Regulation 4300-4 dated March 16, 1998, states that the following are among the civil rights strategic goals: (1) Managers, supervisors, and other employees are held accountable for ensuring that USDA customers are treated fairly and equitably, with dignity and respect; and (2) Equal access is assured and equal treatment is provided in the delivery of USDA programs and services to all customers. This is a “one size fits all” policy for all customers regardless of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, marital status or family status.

**Basics of Federal Milk Marketing Orders**

In order to provide background information on the Federal Milk Marketing Order (FMMO) program, this section defines a Federal milk order, states the FMMO program objectives and means of achieving these objectives, states what the FMMO program does not do, and gives reasons for its success.

*What is a Federal milk marketing order?*

A Federal milk marketing order is a legal instrument issued to regulate at a minimum level pricing transactions between dairy farmers and buyers of Grade A milk in a specified geographic area. Legal authority for Federal milk orders comes from the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (1937 Act).

*What is a milk handler?*

Milk handlers are the only persons regulated under a Federal milk order. Handlers include fluid milk processors who distribute milk to consumers and retailers, and also persons who sell milk to other milk handlers for fluid distribution. The term “handler” applies to proprietary operations (individuals, partnerships or corporations) and also to cooperative associations that handle the milk of their members.

*What is a producer?*

A producer, as defined in most orders, is a dairy farmer who delivers to a fully-regulated handler milk that is approved for distribution as fluid milk products in the regulated market.

*What does the legislation say?*

The 1937 Act spells out the provisions that the Secretary of Agriculture may use in achieving program objectives. To achieve the objectives of the Federal milk marketing order program, milk orders do the following: (1) classifying milk according to use; (2) establishing minimum prices that handlers are required to pay producers according to use; (3) distributing or pooling the proceeds of sales in all uses equitably among producers in the market; (4) verifying the weight and butterfat tests of milk delivered by individual producers; (5) conducting an impartial audit to insure payments to producers and to verify reported utilization of milk; (6) providing procedures, including the use of a hearing, to obtain facts on which the terms of an order must be based; and (7) making extensive market information available to all parties.
What do Federal milk marketing orders do?

Four major objectives of Federal milk orders are to: (1) promote orderly marketing conditions in fluid milk markets; (2) stabilize milk prices and improve the income situation of producers; (3) supervise the terms of trade in milk markets in such a manner as to achieve more equality in the market power of producers as compared to that of handlers; and (4) assure consumers of adequate supplies of good quality milk at reasonable prices.

What do Federal milk marketing order NOT do?

While Federal milk orders are an important marketing tool, by law they serve only a limited function in the marketing of fluid milk. They do not control production, nor restrict the marketing of milk by producers, who are free to deliver milk to any handler who will accept it. They do not guarantee producers a market with any handler. They do not regulate from whom a handler may buy milk, to whom a handler shall sell the milk, how much a handler shall buy or sell, or at what price a handler may sell the milk. While orders do fix minimum prices that handlers pay for milk, the price producers receive depends upon how much of the market’s milk is utilized in fluid products and how much is converted into manufactured products. The orders do not guarantee a fixed level of price to producers nor do they set a ceiling on producer prices. They do not set wholesale or retail prices. The orders do not establish sanitary or quality standards.

What are the benefits of Federal milk marketing orders?

Federal milk orders provide assurances of equity among producers and equity among handlers who are supplying or selling milk in a given marketing area via the same minimum price. This equity leads to a number of benefits for producers, handlers, and consumers. Several factors have played a role in the success and growth of the Federal order program: (1) it is a voluntary program in that producers may, at any time, vote to suspend or terminate the order with which they are associated; (2) terms of an order are developed by producers, processors, and other interested parties working in partnership with Government; (3) the public hearing process provides a means for all interested parties to express views as to order provisions and needed changes in provisions; (4) it benefits producers by assisting in developing steady, dependable markets and correcting conditions of price instability and unnecessary price fluctuations. The benefits result in producers being more willing to make the heavy investments in milk cows and equipment that are needed to produce higher-quality milk; (5) it benefits handlers by preventing competitors from paying less for their milk than the established minimum prices, and assuring steady supplies of milk year-round. With this assurance, handlers can direct their efforts to improving plant and marketing efficiencies in order to compete for larger and more profitable shares of the market; and (6) consumers are well-served, with an adequate supply of milk available throughout the year at steady, reasonable prices to meet their needs.

Civil Rights Impact Analysis of Federal Order Reform

To aid in this CRIA, population data have been collected and analyzed. The data include: (1) the composition of the total population to be affected by the policy change, identified by race, color,
national origin, gender, and disability; and (2) comparisons of these groups within the general population with their representations in the population that will be the target of the policy change. This information is included in Appendix A.

Following are requirements (indicated by underline) to be addressed in this CRIA.

1. The analysis should evaluate and assess whether and the extent to which the various populations are affected by or associated with any of the following factors, to include an evaluation of the extent of the impact and the manner in which the impact will be manifested.

1a. Is the policy, action, program or activity newly devised or subject to substantial modifications or revisions?

Section 143 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Farm Bill), 7 USC § 7523 requires that by April 4, 1999, the current Federal milk marketing orders be consolidated into between 10 to 14. The Secretary of Agriculture (Secretary) is also directed to designate the State of California as a Federal milk order if California dairy producers petition for and approve such an order. In addition, the Farm Bill provides that the Secretary may address related issues such as the use of utilization rates and multiple basing points for the pricing of fluid milk and the use of uniform multiple component pricing when developing one or more basic prices for manufacturing milk.

This mandate requires substantial modifications to the entire Federal marketing order system. Five issues are addressed in the final decision for Federal order reform: (1) consolidation of the current 31 Federal milk marketing orders into 11 orders; (2) replacement of the current Class I price structure; (3) replacement of the current basic formula price (BFP) with product price formulas to set minimum class price levels; (4) changes to classification of milk by end products -- specifically, the establishment of a new manufacturing class (Class IV) which includes milk to produce nonfat dry milk, butter, and other dry milk powders, and reclassification of eggnog; and (5) simplification and streamlining the order through expansion of Part 1000 to include sections that are identical to all of the consolidated orders.

1b. What are the goals and objectives of the decision or the intended program outcomes and outputs?

The objectives of the final decision are: (1) to comply with the requirements of the 1996 Farm Bill; and (2) to make other changes in order provisions consistent with the goals and requirements of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq). The focus of these changes is to enhance the efficiencies of fluid milk markets while maintaining equity among processors of fluid milk selling in marketing order areas and among dairy farmers supplying the areas’ fluid demands.

Consolidation complies with the Congressional mandate. When new marketing order regions are defined, realignments of the Class I price structure are necessary to continue to assure an adequate supply of milk as well as to improve efficiency in the marketing of milk. Replacement of
the current basic formula price recognizes that this price is based on a survey of plants and a volume of milk that may not provide an adequate value of milk used for manufacturing. Establishing a new Class IV recognizes that butter, like milk powders, is a residual product. Finally, identifying and incorporating provisions identical to all markets in one section adheres with the efforts of the National Performance Review - Regulatory Reform Initiative to simplify, modify, and eliminate unnecessary repetition of regulations. Unique regional issues or marketing conditions have been considered and are included in each market’s order provisions.

1c. Does data and information indicate that historically, one or more identifiable groups have not been included among the beneficiary or participant population?

For this analysis, a protected group (female, minority male, person with disability) is considered to be “significant” if the group accounts for at least five percent of the population.

Females represent at least five percent of all dairy operators (as obtained from the 1992 census) in 19 of the 31 current Federal order marketing areas (plus the Tennessee Valley Federal order, terminated October 1997), 4.9 percent for all markets combined. About 96.8 percent of female dairy farmers are white non-Hispanic. Minority males represent at least five percent of all dairy operators in 5 of the 32 marketing areas, 1.3 percent for all markets combined. White Hispanic and black males each represent about one-third of minority males.

The current markets with over 5 percent of females or minority males as dairy operators are listed in the following tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT MARKETING AREAS: FEMALE, OVER FIVE PERCENT TOTAL DAIRY OPERATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT MARKETING AREAS:
MINORITY MALE, OVER FIVE PERCENT TOTAL DAIRY OPERATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Area</th>
<th>% Minority Male</th>
<th>Marketing Area</th>
<th>% Minority Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico - West Texas</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persons with disabilities are a protected group to be addressed in the CRIA. However, data regarding disability status of dairy operators is not available from the 1992 census. A 1982 study done by the Breaking New Ground (BNG) Resource Center at Purdue University “found that 19 percent of farm operators had a physical disability that prevented them from completing essential operations on the farm. Presently the BNG Resource Center estimates that there are approximately 500,000 farmers, ranchers, and agricultural workers who fall into this category (The National AgrAbility Program 1991-1996).” Although this information is not specific to dairy farmers, or to regions of the country, it is reasonable to estimate that, in general, the 5 percent threshold is exceeded for persons with disabilities.

The existence of the Federal milk order program is not expected to have a direct impact on individuals’ choices of whether to participate in the dairy industry. With or without Federal orders, dairying is a capital- and labor-intensive business. As noted previously, one of the reasons for the Federal order program’s success is that all producers benefit through assistance in developing steady, dependable markets, reducing price instability and unnecessary price fluctuations, and assurances of a minimum price for their milk. With this assurance, producers are more willing to make the significant cost investments in milk cows and equipment needed to produce high-quality milk. Federal orders provide the same assurance for all producers, without regard to sex, race, origin, or disability. The value of all milk delivered to handlers competing for sales within a defined marketing area is divided equally among all producers delivering milk to those handlers.

1d. **Does pre-decision research indicate that one or more identifiable groups will be disproportionately under- or over-represented in the beneficiary or participant population with an interest or stake in the program policy or decision?**

For this analysis, a protected group (female, minority male, person with disability) is considered to be “significant” if the group accounts for at least five percent of the population.

---

In 6 of the 11 consolidated marketing areas, females represent at least five percent of all dairy operators, slightly under 5 percent for all markets combined. In 3 of the 11 consolidated marketing areas, minority males represent at least five percent of all dairy operators, 1.3 percent of all markets combined.

The consolidated markets with over 5 percent of females or minority males as dairy operators are listed in the following tables. All producers, regardless of race, national origin, or disability, choosing to deliver milk to a Federal order regulated handler will receive the minimum blend price.

### CONSOLIDATED MARKETING AREAS: FEMALE, OVER FIVE Percent TOTAL DAIRY OPERATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Area</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONSOLIDATED MARKETING AREAS: MINORITY MALE, OVER FIVE Percent TOTAL DAIRY OPERATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Area</th>
<th>% Minority Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated previously, it is reasonable to estimate that, in general, the 5 percent threshold is exceeded for persons with disabilities.

Milk orders do not regulate where a producer may market milk. Of the total U.S. fluid milk, Federal orders regulate about 80 percent, the California State order regulates about 15 percent, and the remaining 5 percent is regulated by other State orders.
Even though all of the protected groups combined represent less than 20 percent of the total population of dairy farmers, all provisions of milk orders apply to all handlers and producers serving a defined market.

1e. What is the geographic location in which the decision, action, program or activity will have the greatest or least impact?

The Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA), published separately from the final decision, analyzes the impact of consolidation and pricing structure on dairy farmers, fluid milk processors and dairy product manufacturers, consumers, and international trade. The RIA reports changes over the six years 2000 to 2005 from a market-by-market baseline consistent with USDA’s official national baseline projections for the dairy sector. The average six-year percent change will be reported for the purposes of this CRIA. For each market, a pricing point or city is used to represent that market, with adjustments for location (distance from the pricing point).

“Cash receipts,” an indicator reported in the RIA provides the impact on dairy producers. This variable is determined by multiplying the milk marketings volume by the all-milk (blend) price. Changes in cash receipts indicate changes in the dairy producer’s ability and willingness to produce milk.

Over the six years, cash receipts are expected to increase 0.02% for all Federal order markets, ranging from a 4.9% increase for the Iowa (Des Moines) market to a 3.9% decrease for the Texas (Dallas) market. An increase in cash receipts is expected to occur for 15 markets (mostly in the midwest and southeast areas), while the remaining 18 markets are expected to have a decrease in cash receipts (mostly in the southwestern, northeastern, and western areas).

The current markets in which over five percent of total dairy farms are operated by females and minority males are shown in the two following tables with the expected six-year average change in cash receipts. All producers, regardless of race, national origin, or disability choosing to deliver milk to a Federal order regulated handler will receive the minimum blend price.

Of the 19 markets with females operating more than 5 percent of the farms, the average cash receipts for 8 markets are expected to increase from between 0.1 to 3.6%, and average cash receipts for 11 markets are expected to decrease from between -0.4 to -3.9%.

Of the five markets with minority males operating more than 5 percent of the farms, the average cash receipts for 3 markets are expected to increase from between 1.7 to 3.6%, and average cash receipts for 2 markets are expected to decrease from between -1.2 to -2.4%.
### CURRENT MARKETING AREAS: FEMALE, OVER 5 PERCENT TOTAL DAIRY OPERATORS AVERAGE CHANGE IN CASH RECEIPTS 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Area</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>% Change in Cash Receipts</th>
<th>Marketing Area</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>% Change in Cash Receipts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Southwestern Idaho - Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>New Mexico - West Texas</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>New York - New Jersey</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CURRENT MARKETING AREAS: MINORITY MALE, OVER 5 PERCENT TOTAL DAIRY OPERATORS AVERAGE CHANGE IN CASH RECEIPTS 2000-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Area</th>
<th>% Minority Male</th>
<th>% Change in Cash Receipts</th>
<th>Marketing Area</th>
<th>% Minority Male</th>
<th>% Change in Cash Receipts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico - West Texas</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If. The composition of the population within the target geographic location.

Along with the dairy producer population, the general population in both the current and consolidated marketing areas is described fully in Appendix A.
The economic impact for the population/geographic location and other related economic factors associated with the beneficiary or participant population.

Over the 2000-2005 period, the final decision has very minor impacts on the overall production and consumption of milk and dairy products in the United States. Consumers of Class I (fluid) products will see their cost reduced modestly while consumers of soft and hard manufactured products will see their costs increase modestly. As a result, cash receipts to producers for milk marketings will be virtually unchanged as will annual milk marketings. Thus, more milk will be consumed as fluid products because of slightly lower price, but less milk will be consumed as soft and hard manufactured products because of higher prices.

Regionally, the change in the milk production structure may be slowed as cash receipts are lowered in areas that have had increases in milk production in recent years. Likewise in areas where milk production has declined in recent years, cash receipts are expected to show some increases and thus stimulate, or at least slow the declines in, milk production.

The following two tables summarize the average six-year impacts for the final decision. The first table lists impacts for the Federal order markets, while the second table lists impacts for the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF IMPACTS ON FEDERAL ORDER MARKETS, 6-YEAR AVERAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change In:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I differentials 1/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-milk price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk marketings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing expenditures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ weighted average
SUMMARY
OF IMPACTS ON THE U.S.,
6-YEAR AVERAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change In:</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All-milk price</td>
<td>dol / cwt</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk marketings</td>
<td>mil lbs</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I use</td>
<td>mil lbs</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing use</td>
<td>mil lbs</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash receipts</td>
<td>mil dol</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluid expenditures</td>
<td>mil dol</td>
<td>-79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing expenditures</td>
<td>mil dol</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1h. The extent to which identifiable group members will directly participate in or influence the decisions, policies, program and activities or be limited in their opportunity to participate, coupled with information to indicate the quality or character of the participation, and

1i. Efforts to notify and provide outreach to potential beneficiary and participant populations.

Full participation by interested parties has been essential in the reform of Federal milk orders. The issues are too important and complex to be developed without significant input from all facets of the dairy industry. The experience, knowledge, and expertise of the industry and public have been integral to the development of the final decision.

“Interested parties” is an inclusive group regulated by or interested in Federal orders. Included as interested parties are: all regulated handlers of milk; any person or group associated with a regulated handler requesting separate notification; and any person or group requesting to receive information. This last group includes dairy producers, consumers, public and private schools, attorneys, dairy industry consultants, university researchers, State and County extension personnel, State Departments of Agriculture, Federal agencies (e.g. Food and Nutrition Service, Food and Drug Administration), commodity exchanges, news agencies, trade associations, and other agricultural industries. If dairy producers are members of a dairy cooperative association, the cooperative is responsible to inform them of Federal order program announcements. If dairy producers are not cooperative members, each of the Market Administrators publishes a monthly marketing service bulletin with information relevant to that particular marketing order and area.

To ensure that maximum public input into the process was received, USDA developed a plan of action and projected time line. The plan of action developed consists of three phases: developmental, rulemaking, and implementation.
The first phase of the plan was the developmental phase which allowed USDA to interact freely with the public to develop viable proposals that accomplished the Farm Bill mandates, as well as related reforms. The USDA met with interested parties to discuss the reform progress, assisted in developing ideas or provided data and analysis on various possibilities, issued program announcements, and requested public input on all aspects of the Federal order program. This phase began on April 4, 1996, and concluded with the issuance of the proposed rule on January 21, 1998 (68 FR 4802).

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

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

Actions Completed During Developmental Phase.

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

- On June 24, 1996, USDA issued a press release announcing that a public forum would be held in Madison, Wisconsin, on July 29, 1996. The forum would address price discovery techniques for the value of milk used in manufactured dairy products. Thirty-one members of the U.S. Congress, university professors, representatives of processor and producer organizations, and dairy farmers made presentations at the forum.

---

2 Copies of this announcement and all subsequent announcements and reports were, and still are, available from Dairy Programs at (202) 720-4392, any Market Administrator office, or via the Internet at http://www.ams.usda.gov/dairy/.
On October 24, 1996, AMS Dairy Division issued a memorandum to interested parties requesting input regarding all aspects of Federal milk order reform and specifically as to its impact on small businesses. USDA anticipated that the consolidation of Federal orders would have an economic impact on handlers and producers affected by the program, and USDA wanted to ensure that, while accomplishing their intended purpose, the newly consolidated Federal orders would not unduly inhibit the ability of small businesses to compete.

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

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

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

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

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

**Actions Completed During Rulemaking Phase.**
- On January 21, 1998, USDA issued a proposed rule (68 FR 4802) that consolidated the current 31 orders into 11 orders, set forth two options for consideration as a replacement for the Class I price structure, and proposed replacing the basic formula price. The proposed rule also established a new Class IV which included milk used to produce nonfat dry milk, butter, and other dry milk powders, reclassified eggnog and cream cheese, addressed other minor classification issues, and expanded part 1000 to include sections that are identical to all of the consolidated orders. Comments were requested on the proposed rule on or before March 31, 1998. An informational packet describing the contents of the proposed rule was sent to interested parties.

- USDA financed the production of a video developed by University and Extension personnel. This video was used by Extension personnel throughout the country to explain the proposed rule and educate dairy producers and other interested parties.

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

- On April 15, 1998, AMS Dairy Programs announced the issuance of a report entitled “Report on the Impacts of the Federal Order Reform Proposals on Food and Nutrition Service Programs, Participants, and Administering Institutions” by the Food and Nutrition Service of USDA. The report analyzed the potential impacts of the milk order reform pricing proposals contained in the proposed rule on the Food Stamp Program, the Women, Infants, and Children Program, and the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs. Comments on the report were requested by April 30, 1998.

**Public Interaction.**
- As a result of the developmental phase announcements and forum, more than 1,600 individual comments were received by USDA. In addition to the individual comments, more than 3,000 form letters were received. As a result of the rulemaking phase proposed rule and listening sessions, nearly 4,500 comments were received. All comments were reviewed by USDA personnel and are available for public inspection at USDA. To assist the public in accessing the comments, USDA contracted to have the comments scanned and published on compact discs. The use of this technology allowed interested parties throughout the United States access to the information received by USDA.
USDA also made all publications and requests for information available on the Internet. A separate page under the Dairy Programs section of the AMS Homepage was established to provide information about the reform process. To assist in transmitting correspondence to USDA, a special electronic mail account—Milk_Order_Reform@usda.gov—is opened to receive input on Federal milk order reforms.

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

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

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

Outreach.
We believe that dairy producers who are part of a protected group have been informed about the reform of Federal milk orders through the extensive outreach process that is routinely utilized. However, because dairy producers will be participating in the referendum process to determine approval of the newly consolidated Federal orders, special efforts are being made to notify and educate members of protected groups about the contents of the final decision. A national outreach plan and 13 regional outreach plans have been developed to ensure that individuals within the various protected groups have access to this information.

Educational materials, in the form of fact sheets, have been developed to explain the contents of the final decision. These fact sheets explain the primary final decision items such as the consolidation of marketing orders, the basic formula price replacement, the classification
provisions, and the Class I pricing system. The fact sheets also provide a basic explanation of a Federal milk marketing order. To ensure availability to all protected groups, the fact sheets will be available in both English and Spanish.

The fact sheets will also include the following Equal Employment Opportunity statement:

_The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, and marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA’s TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD)._

_To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call (202) 720-5964 (voice or TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer._

The final decision outreach efforts that will be completed by Dairy Programs consist of six components. These components include: (1) outreach to academia including 1890 Land-Grant Universities, Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) and Tribal Colleges and Universities; (2) outreach through national organizations; (3) outreach through various media; (4) outreach through regional market administrator offices; (5) outreach that will be completed by other agencies within USDA; and (6) other outreach efforts. The objective of these outreach efforts is to provide educational information to dairy producers to ensure effective participation in the referendum process. Each component is described in detail below.

1. **Outreach to academia.** A press release announcing the issuance of the final decision will be electronically sent to universities and colleges specifically identified with a protected group. The press release will contain a contact person for obtaining further information. Listservs (electronic mailing lists) have been obtained or are being created to reach eighteen 1890 Universities, 192 HACU’s, and 32 Tribal Colleges and Universities. A listing of these institutions is attached in Appendix B. In addition, more than 130 of these universities will be contacted directly by a Market Administrator office as discussed later.

2. **Outreach through national organizations.** Dairy Programs has contacted several national agricultural organizations and will be submitting information for publication in their national newsletters. These organizations include:

   - **AgrAbility - Breaking New Ground Newsletter** sent to between 22,000-30,000 farmers with disabilities
   - **National Black Farmers Association, Inc.**
   - **MANNRS: Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Related Sciences**
   - **WIFE: Women Involved in Farm Economics**
   - **Agri-Women**
Several of these organizations will also be contacted on a local, state or regional level by a Market Administrator office as discussed later.

3. Outreach through various media. In addition to the media contacted through other USDA agencies or departments, Dairy Programs will be submitting the Spanish-translated press release and informational materials to Spanish printed dairy publications. Currently, two publications, the Spanish edition of Hoard’s Dairymen and Lechero Latino, have been identified to receive this information.

4. Outreach through regional market administrator offices. Each regional Market Administrator office has developed an outreach plan. Through these individual plans, approximately 15 1890 Universities, 85 HACU’s, and 30 Tribal Universities will be contacted by Market Administrator offices who will offer to provide additional written materials and attend meetings to discuss the final decision contents. Five regional MANNRS contacts will also be reached by Market Administrator offices. In addition, more than 30 women’s organizations and about 20 State AgrAbility chapters will be contacted. Twenty local minority targeted newspapers have been identified by Market Administrator offices and will be sent the Spanish-translated press release for publication. Market Administrator offices will also be mailing information to all interested parties and dairy producers within their marketing areas. A copy of each plan is included in Appendix C.

5. Outreach completed by other USDA agencies. Informational packets will be distributed electronically to the Farm Service Agency (FSA) and to the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES). The informational packets will be distributed to 2,500 FSA outlets and sent to 2,000 CSREES individuals who will further disseminate the information across the entire extension and land-grant university system. The local FSA and CSREES contacts will also be utilized by the regional Market Administrator offices to assist in organizing and planning meetings with an emphasis on inviting protected groups to attend. The Office of Communications (OC) outreach program will be utilized to send the press release to their minority media lists. The OC Constituent Newsletter will also be utilized to send information to more than 900 rural newspapers. The Foreign Agriculture Service’s Agricultural Minister Counselor for Mexico will also be provided information.

6. Other outreach methods. All information regarding the final decision will be available via the Dairy Programs Internet site. This will include English and Spanish versions of the press release and informational material. Four of the principal Mexican dairy cooperatives will be sent the Spanish-translated informational materials. Two organizations, MANNRS and Agri-Women will be hosting national meetings after publication of the final decision. These organizations are being contacted to provide speakers for meetings or materials for dissemination to meeting participants.

These specialized outreach efforts combined with the general outreach efforts normally utilized by Dairy Programs should ensure that dairy producers are informed about the contents of the final decision. This information will educate all dairy producers about the final decision contents on Federal milk order reform and allow them to effectively participate in the referendum process.
2. Where the analysis discloses the potential for an effect that is significantly different for a given identifiable population, the analysis should proceed to determine whether the effect will be adverse. If adverse, the next step in the analytical process is to determine whether the impact will be substantial. If substantial, the analysis should proceed to identify feasible alternatives that could eliminate or reduce the negative effects or unfavorable impacts. The analysis should include a discussion of the potential benefits or losses of both the original approach and the alternatives.

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

3. The CRIA is appropriate and complete only to the extent that it reasonably identifies all the various adverse implications for each identifiable population, and reasonably and rationally disposes of each. To the extent that the analysis concludes that the agency’s decision poses an adverse impact for one or more protected populations, the analysis must document that either:
   1. the impact will have only minimal implications for the particular identifiable group(s), or
   2. although a substantial adverse impact will result for one or more identifiable populations, the agency has no alternative but to go forward with its policy, action, program or activity in accordance with its originally planned approach.

The objective of the Federal milk order program is to assure that all dairy farmers delivering milk to a defined market receive the same price for milk regardless of use. This analysis concludes that the Department’s decision poses no adverse impact for any farmers in the protected population in relation to the population not protected under civil rights laws.
APPENDIX A
Characteristics of the Dairy Producer and General Populations,
By Current and Consolidated Federal Order Marketing Areas

As part of the Civil Rights Impact Analysis (CRIA) of Federal Milk Marketing Order Reform’s final decision, data on the characteristics of the dairy producer and general population were gathered. The following sections describe the data in detail for the current and consolidated Federal order marketing areas. Appendix Maps 1 and 2 (current and consolidated Federal order marketing areas) and all Appendix Tables are included at the end of this appendix. Appendix Table 1 lists the current and consolidated Federal market orders.

CHARACTERISTICS OF DAIRY PRODUCERS

County-level data used to describe the characteristics of farm operators was obtained from the 1992 U.S. Census of Agriculture (1992 census), carried out by the U.S. Department of Commerce’s Bureau of the Census (Census Bureau).

Specifically, the following 1992 census data was gathered for this analysis:

- Sex of operator: male or female.
- Race of operator (senior partner or person in charge): White; Black or African American; American Indian; Asian or Pacific Islander; or Other (specified by respondent).
- Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino origin or background (regardless of race) of operator.
- Number of farms with at least one milk cow kept for production of milk.
- Number of milk cows kept for production of milk, including dry milk cows and milk heifers that had calved, December 31, 1992, inventory.

If sex or race were not reported, the 1992 census imputed or assigned sex or race based on information reported by farms with similar acreage, tenure, and value of sales. That is, the total number of responses for sex and race always equals the total number of farms. However, the 1992 census does not impute a response for surveys without an answer to the question regarding Hispanic origin. Along with “no” responses to this question, non-responses have been designated as non-Hispanic.

Persons with disabilities are a protected group to be addressed in the CRIA. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) defines disability as a “physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities.” However, data regarding disability

---

1 The Census Bureau treats race and ethnicity as separate and independent categories. Thus everyone is classified as both a member of one of the five race groups (White, Black, American Indian, Asian, Other) and also either as Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino (Hispanic) or non-Hispanic.
status of dairy producers is not available from the 1992 census. A 1982 study done by the 
Breaking New Ground (BNG) Resource Center at Purdue University “found that 19 percent of 
farm operators had a physical disability that prevented them from completing essential operations 
on the farm. Presently the BNG Resource Center estimates that there are approximately 500,000 
farmers, ranchers, and agricultural workers who fall into this category (The National AgrAbility 
Program 1991-1996).”² Although this information is not specific to dairy producers, or to 
regions of the country, it is reasonable to estimate that, in general, a threshold of 5 percent 
indicating significant population is exceeded for persons with disabilities.

To describe the characteristics of the dairy farm operators for the current and consolidated 
marketing areas, the following designations are used: total male producers and total female 
producers. Male producers are separated into five groups, following 1992 census categories: 
White, Black, American Indian, Asian, and Other. Each of these five groups are further separated 
into two groups for Hispanic origin: Hispanic and non-Hispanic. Thus, 10 groupings are used to 
describe male producers. Similar categories are used to separate female producers into 10 groups 
(race and Hispanic origin).

To analyze the data, county data was summarized twice: first, according to the current Federal 
order marketing area in which the county is located; and second, according to the consolidated 
Federal order marketing area in which the county would be located. For example, the Texas 
county of Bernalillo currently is in the New Mexico-West Texas marketing area (Federal order 
138). Under this final decision, Bernalillo county would be in the Southwest marketing area. A 
listing of counties in each of the 11 consolidated marketing areas can be found in the final 
decision.

It is important to emphasize two points about the data used and presented in this CRIA. First, the 
data obtained from the 1992 census identifies 135,000 farms “with at least one milk cow” for the 
counties in question. However, 1992 Federal milk order statistics indicate that an average of 
97,791 producers delivered milk to handlers regulated under the then-39 Federal milk orders. It is 
most likely that many of the smallest farms included in the 1992 census data are not associated 
with Federal orders; that is, they did not deliver milk to a regulated Federal order handler. In fact, 
they may have used all milk for their own needs and not delivered to any handler.

Second, the data obtained from the 1992 census identifies dairy farms located in counties which 
are part of either or both current and consolidated Federal milk order marketing areas. Thus, the 
data represents the number of dairy farms physically located within the order marketing area. 
However, the fact that a producer is located within the boundaries of the marketing area does not 
mean that the producer has to deliver his milk to a handler regulated by that Federal order. 
Producers are not limited to whom they sell; they may sell to an unregulated processor.

² “Special Breaking New Ground Technical Report; Potential Health and Safety Risks of 
Farming/Ranching with a Disability,” Plowshares #27, Breaking New Ground Resource Center, 
Department of Agricultural & Biological Engineering, Purdue University, 1997.
Consequently, the number of producers delivering milk to handlers regulated under Federal orders is not the same as the information from the 1992 census. These are two reasons why the 1992 census data does not match published Federal order data. However, because the Federal order program does not keep records regarding the sex, race, or Hispanic origin of producers, the 1992 census provides the best information available from which to describe dairy producer characteristics and the potential impact of regulatory changes upon dairy producers.

**CURRENT ORDERS - Dairy Producer Population**

According to 1992 census information, 126,294 farms located in current Federal order milk marketing areas reported having at least one milk cow during 1992. This number represent over 81 percent of the total dairy farms within the continental United States. The markets with the most dairy producers are Upper Midwest (23,298), Chicago Regional (20,605), Southeast (7,467), Southwest Plains (7,100), and New York-New Jersey (6,390). The markets with the fewest dairy producers are Southeastern Florida (82), Western Colorado (135), Central Arizona (238), Tampa Bay (251), and Central Illinois (308). See Appendix Table 2.

Of the farms located in current marketing areas, 6,220 (4.9%) farms were female-operated, while the remaining 120,074 (95.1%) were male-operated. See Appendix Tables 3 (female) and 4 (male).

**FEMALE.** The percent of female-operated farms in the current marketing areas range from 2.4% (Eastern South Dakota) to 13.9% (Upper Florida). The Upper Midwest has the most female dairy producers, although the 728 farms represent only 3.1% of farms in that market.

Following is a characterization by race and origin, of the 6,220 female producers. See Appendix Table 3.

- **WHITE.** The 6,068 white female dairy producers account for 97.6% of all female dairy producers. Three markets each have over 500 white female dairy producers: Southeast, Chicago Regional, and Upper Midwest. White females account for 2.4% (Eastern South Dakota) to 12.6% (Upper Florida) of the total dairy farms in the current orders. Only 49 of the 6,068 white females -- less than one percent of white females -- are Hispanic. Almost one-quarter of the white Hispanic females are located in the Texas marketing area, with the balance located in 13 other marketing areas. White non-Hispanic females are located in every current marketing area, ranging from 9 in both Southeastern Florida and Western Colorado to 720 in the Upper Midwest.

- **BLACK.** There are 98 black female dairy producers located in the current marketing areas, 1.6% of all female dairy producers. Of this total, 4.1% or 4, of black females are Hispanic. These four are located in four markets throughout the country. Half of the black non-Hispanic females are located in the Southeast marketing area, with 7, 11, and 18 located in the
Southwest Plains, Carolina, and Texas markets, respectively. The remaining 11 black females are located in 6 marketing areas. No black females operate dairy farms in 21 markets. With the exception of Upper Florida at 1.0%, black females account for less than 1% of the total dairy farms in each of the current orders.

- **AMERICAN INDIAN.** There are 32 American Indian female dairy producers located in the current marketing areas, 0.5% of all female dairy producers. Of this total, one located in the Texas market is Hispanic. Over one-third of the non-Hispanic American Indian females are located in the Southwest Plains marketing area, with the remaining 20 located in 10 other marketing areas. There are 21 markets in which there are no American Indian female dairy producers. American Indian females account for less than 1% of the total dairy farms in each of the current orders.

- **ASIAN.** There are five Asian female dairy producers located in the current marketing areas, less than 1% of all female dairy producers, with none Hispanic. These five are located in five markets throughout the country. Asian females account for less than 1% of the total dairy farms in each of the current orders.

- **OTHER.** Seventeen 1992 census respondents categorized themselves as “Other,” less than 1% of all female dairy producers. Of the 17, 15 or 88.2% indicated they are Hispanic. Most “Other” Hispanic females are located in the Texas and New Mexico-West Texas markets (7 and 4 dairy producers, respectively). The remaining four are located in three other marketing areas. The two “Other” non-Hispanic females are located in two marketing areas. “Other” females account for less than 1% of the total dairy farms in each of the current orders.

**MALE.** The percent of male-operated farms in the current marketing areas range from 86.2% (Upper Florida) to 97.6% (Eastern South Dakota). Male minority-operated dairy farms, which includes white Hispanic males, account for 1,632 or 1.3% of the total farms in the current order markets. This ranges from 0.2% (Michigan Upper Peninsula) to 19.6% (New Mexico-West Texas). Almost two-thirds of the male minority-operated dairy farms are located in five order markets (the Southeast, Texas, New Mexico-West Texas, Southwest Plains, and Carolina).

Following is a characterization by race and origin, of the 120,074 male producers. See Appendix Table 4.

- **WHITE NON-HISPANIC.** The 118,442 white non-Hispanic males account for 98.6% of all male dairy producers and 93.8% of the total dairy producers in the current orders. White non-Hispanic males account for least 80% of the dairy producers in all of the current order markets, except for Southeastern Florida (70.7%) and New Mexico-West Texas (74.0%). The Southeastern Florida marketing area also has the fewest number of white non-Hispanic male dairy producers (58 of 82 total dairy producers). The Eastern South Dakota marketing area has the highest percentage of white male dairy producers, 97.1% of total dairy farms.
• WHITE HISPANIC. Only 528 of the 126,294 dairy farms located within the current orders -- less than half of a percent -- are operated by white Hispanic males, but this group accounts for almost one-third of the total 1,632 male minorities in the current markets. Over one-third of the white Hispanic males are located in the New Mexico-West Texas, Texas, and Southeast marketing areas. Only the Western Colorado marketing area has no white Hispanic male dairy producers. The Southeastern Florida marketing area has the highest percentage of white Hispanic male dairy producers with 11.0%.

• BLACK. There are 615 black male dairy producers located in the current marketing areas, 0.5% of total male dairy producers and 37.7% of the total male minority dairy producers. Of this total, 5 are Hispanic; they are located in three markets throughout the country. Over half of the black non-Hispanic males are located in the Southeast marketing area, with an additional 29% located in the Carolina and Texas markets. Five order markets have no black male dairy producers. Carolina has the highest percentage of black male dairy producers with 4.9%.

• AMERICAN INDIAN. There are 233 American Indian male dairy producers located in the current marketing areas, 0.2% of all male dairy producers and 14.3% of all male minority dairy producers. Of this total, four are Hispanic and located in three market areas. Over half of the American Indian male dairy producers are located in the Southwest Plains market, in which they account for 1.7% of all dairy producers. An additional 25% are located in the Texas, Carolina, and Southeast markets. Ten markets do not have any American Indian male dairy producers.

• ASIAN. There are 28 Asian male dairy producers located in 13 current marketing areas, less than 0.1% of all male dairy producers. None of the 28 is of Hispanic origin. With the exception of the Southeastern Florida market (1.2%), this group accounts for less than 1% of the total dairy farms in each of the current orders. Asian males make up the smallest percentage of minority male operated dairy farms with less than two percent.

• OTHER. There are 228 male dairy producers located in the current orders that categorized themselves as “Other” in response to the 1992 census, less than 0.5% of total male dairy producers but 14.0% of total male minority dairy producers. Of the total “Other,” 202 or 88.6% indicated they are Hispanic. Over 70% of the “Other” Hispanic males are located in the Texas and New Mexico-West Texas markets (65 and 81, respectively). The remaining 56 are located in fifteen other marketing areas. The New Mexico-West Texas market has the largest percentage of its dairy farms operated by “Other” Hispanic males with 8.9%. The 26 “Other” non-Hispanic males are located in seven marketing areas, with 11 in the New Mexico-West Texas market. “Other” non-Hispanic males account for less than 1% of the total dairy farms in each of the current orders, except for New Mexico-West Texas (1.2%).
CONSOLIDATED ORDERS - Dairy Producer Population

According to 1992 census information, 134,621 farms with at least one milk cow are located within the consolidated Federal order milk marketing areas, over 87 percent of the total dairy farms within the continental United States. The increase in farm numbers from current order areas results from adding counties previously not in an order area. Typically these are “pockets” of unregulated areas within and between current order areas that do not change the regulatory status of handlers. Some areas, such as northern Vermont, are added upon requests from the majority of handlers even though regulation of previously unregulated plants would occur.

The markets that would have the most dairy operations are the Upper Midwest (44,758), Northeast (18,632), Mideast (18,560), and Central (18,300). The markets that would have the fewest dairy operations are Arizona-Las Vegas (313), Florida (824), and Western (3,204). See Appendix Table 5.

Of the farms that would be located within the consolidated marketing areas, 6,668 (5.0%) farms would be female-operated, while the remaining 127,956 (95.0%) would be male-operated. See Appendix Tables 6 (female) and 7 (male).

FEMALE. The percent of female-operated farms in the consolidated marketing areas range from 3.3% (Upper Midwest) to 12.3% (Florida). The Upper Midwest has the most female dairy producers, although the 1,477 farms represent only 3.3% of farms in that area.

Following is a characterization by race and origin, of the 6,668 female producers. See Appendix Table 6.

- WHITE. There are 6,512 white female dairy producers located in the consolidated marketing areas, which accounts for 97.7% of all female dairy producers. Only 49 of the 6,512 white females are Hispanic. Almost 60% of the total white Hispanic females are located in the Southwest and Upper Midwest marketing areas, while neither the Appalachian nor the Arizona-Las Vegas order markets have any white Hispanic female dairy producers. White non-Hispanic females account for 4.8% of all dairy producers in the consolidated order markets with a range of 3.3% (Upper Midwest) to 11.4% (Florida).

- BLACK. The 100 black female dairy producers account for 1.5% of all female dairy producers. Of this total, only 4 are Hispanic. These four are located in three markets throughout the country. Just under half of the black non-Hispanic females are located in the Southeast order market with an additional one-third located in the Appalachian and Southwest order markets. No black female dairy producers are located in 4 consolidated orders (Upper Midwest, Western, Arizona-Las Vegas, and Pacific Northwest).

- AMERICAN INDIAN. There are 34 American Indian female dairy producers located in the consolidated orders, 0.5% of all female dairy producers. One American Indian female of
Hispanic origin is located in the Southwest market. Over one third of the non-Hispanic American Indian females are located in the Central order market, with the remaining 21 located in seven markets. American Indian females account for less than 1% of the total dairy farms in each of the consolidated orders.

- **ASIAN.** There are 5 Asian female-operated dairy farms located in the consolidated order markets, less than 1% of all female dairy producers. None of the five are Hispanic.

- **OTHER.** The seventeen females that categorized themselves as “Other” account for less than 0.5% of all female dairy producers. Of the 17, 15 are Hispanic. Over 70% of the “Other” Hispanic females are located in the Southwest order market. The two “Other” non-Hispanic females are located in two markets. “Other” females account for less than 1% of the total dairy farms in each of the consolidated order markets.

**MALE.** The percent of male-operated farms in the consolidated marketing areas range from 87.7% (Florida) to 96.7% (Upper Midwest). Male minority-operated dairy farms, which includes white Hispanic males, account for 1,739 or 1.3% of the total farms in the consolidated order markets, ranging from 0.3% (Upper Midwest) to 7.7% (Southwest). Other markets with male minorities operating over 5% of the dairy farms are Florida (7.3%) and Arizona-Las Vegas (8.8%). Over half of the male minority-operated dairy farms are located in two consolidated markets, the Southeast and Southwest order markets.

Following is a characterization by race and origin, of the 134,621 male producers. See Appendix Table 7.

- **WHITE NON-HISPANIC.** The 126,214 white non-Hispanic males account for 98.6% of all male dairy producers and 93.8% of all dairy producers. White non-Hispanic males account for at least 85% of the dairy producers in each marketing area except for the Florida and Southwest markets (80.5% and 83.8%, respectively). The consolidated Upper Midwest order market has the highest percentage of white male dairy producers, 96.4% of total dairy farms.

- **WHITE HISPANIC.** Only 577 of the 134,621 dairy farms located within the consolidated orders -- less than half of a percent -- are operated by white Hispanic males, but this group accounts for one-third of the total 1,739 male minorities in the consolidated markets. There are white Hispanic males in all consolidated markets, yet almost 30% are located in the Southwest marketing area. The Arizona-Las Vegas and Florida consolidated marketing areas have the highest percentage of white Hispanic male dairy producers with 3.5% and 3.4%, respectively, while the Upper Midwest has the lowest percentage with 0.2%.

- **BLACK.** There are 631 black male dairy producers located in the consolidated marketing areas, 0.5% of total male dairy producers and 36.3% of the total male minority dairy producers. Of this total, 5 are Hispanic. Over half of the black non-Hispanic males are located in the Southeast order market. Another third are located in the Appalachian and
Southwest markets. Only one consolidated market, Arizona-Las Vegas, has no dairy farms operated by a black male. The Southeast market has the highest percentage of black male dairy producers with 2.6%.

- **AMERICAN INDIAN.** There are 247 American Indian male dairy producers located in the consolidated marketing areas, 0.2% of all male dairy producers, 0.2% of all dairy producers, and 14.2% of all male minority dairy producers. Of this total, six are Hispanic. Slightly less than half of the American Indian male dairy producers are located in the consolidated Central marketing area. Another third are located in the Southwest, Appalachian, and Southeast marketing areas. American Indian males account for 1.3% of all dairy producers in the Arizona-Las Vegas marketing area but they account for less than 1% of the total dairy farms in each of the other consolidated marketing areas.

- **ASIAN.** There are 29 Asian male dairy producers located in the consolidated marketing areas, none Hispanic. This group accounts for less than 0.1% of all male dairy producers and comprise the smallest percentage (less than 2%) of minority male-operated dairy farms. Two of the 11 consolidated marketing areas, Southwest and Arizona-Las Vegas, have no dairy farms operated by Asian males.

- **OTHER.** There are 258 male dairy producers located in the consolidated order markets that categorized themselves as “Other” in response to the 1992 census, less than 0.5% of total male dairy producers and 14.8% of total male minority dairy producers. Of the total “Other,” 230 or 89.1% are Hispanic. Over 70% (169) of the “Other” Hispanic males are located in the Southwest market. The 28 “Other” non-Hispanic males are located in five marketing areas, with 18 located in the Southwest order market. The “Other” non-Hispanic males account for less than 1% of the total dairy farms in each of the consolidated orders.

**CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GENERAL POPULATION**

County-level data used to describe the characteristics of the general population was obtained from the July 1, 1997 County Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin (1997 estimates) carried out by the U.S. Department of Commerce’s Bureau of the Census (Census Bureau).

Specifically, the following July 1, 1997 population estimates were gathered for this analysis:

- Sex of individual: male or female.
- Race of individual: White; Black; American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut; Asian and Pacific Islander.
- Individual of Hispanic origin.

As with the 1992 census, race and origin are treated as separate and independent categories. Unlike the 1992 census, the 1997 estimates do not provide an “Other” category.
As the above table illustrates, the Hispanic population is predominately white. Because the number of Hispanics in the race category is relatively small (other than white), it is difficult to estimate populations accurately at smaller levels of geography. Thus, the Census Bureau publishes Hispanic origin only for the white population.

Additionally, one of the protected groups that is to be addressed in this analysis is persons with disabilities. The Census Bureau, based on its Survey of Income and Program Participation conducted during 1994 and 1995, estimated that about 54 million Americans, or 20% of the total population, have a disability. About 10% of the total population has a disability that is severe (i.e., unable to perform one or more activities or roles).

The general population for both males and females is separated into five groups, following Census Bureau categories: White Non-Hispanic, White Hispanic, Black, American Indian, and Asian. The population for each of the 10 groups is provided in the following description of the current and consolidated marketing areas.

**CURRENT ORDERS - General Population**

The total population of the current Federal order marketing areas is slightly under 212 million, nearly 80% of the total population of the continental United States. The five order markets with the highest populations are Southeast (24.6 million), New York-New Jersey (20.9 million), Texas (17.1 million), Middle Atlantic (15.4 million), and Chicago Regional (12.6 million). The order markets with the smallest populations are Western Colorado (0.2 million), Michigan Upper Peninsula (0.3 million), Eastern South Dakota (0.4 million), Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon (0.7 million), and Central Illinois (0.9 million). See Appendix Tables 8 (female) and 9 (male).

**FEMALE.** Females comprise 51.3% of the total population in the current order markets with a range from 49.0% (Michigan Upper Peninsula) to 52.1% (Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania). The Southeast (12.7 million) and New York-New Jersey (10.8 million) order markets have the highest female populations.
Following is a characterization by race and origin, of the 108.7 million females in current order markets. See Appendix Table 8.

- **WHITE.** The 89.5 million white females account for 82.4% of the total females and 42.2% of the total population. Of this total, 81.4 million are white non-Hispanic females, which account for 75.0% of the total females and 38.4% of the total population in the current order markets, ranging from 24.3% (New Mexico-West Texas) to 49.4% (Eastern South Dakota). The total population of white Hispanic females in the current order markets is 8.0 million or 7.4% of total females, and also 3.8% of the total population in the current order markets, ranging from 0.2% (Michigan Upper Peninsula) to 21.5% (New Mexico-West Texas). The Texas and New York-New Jersey order markets have the largest population of white Hispanic females with 2.1 and 1.3 million, respectively.

- **BLACK.** There are over 15.7 million black females residing in the current marketing areas, accounting for 14.5% of the total females and 7.4% of the total population. This group ranges from 0.2% (Michigan Upper Peninsula) to 14.9% (Southeast) of the total population in each order. Over 20% of the 15.7 million black females live in the Southeast order market.

- **AMERICAN INDIAN.** There are 0.8 million American Indian females residing in the current marketing areas, accounting for less than 1% of the total females. American Indian females are 0.4% of the current order market population, ranging from 0.1% (Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania and Louisville-Lexington-Evansville) to 2.7% (New Mexico-West Texas). The Southwest Plains market has the largest total population of American Indian females with 0.1 million.

- **ASIAN.** The 2.7 million Asian females account for 2.5% of the total female population. The percentage of Asian females in the total current order market population is 1.3%, ranging from 0.3% (Tennessee Valley) to 3.1% (New York-New Jersey). The New York-New Jersey market also has the largest total population of Asian females with 0.6 million.

**MALE.** Males comprise 48.8% of the total population in the current order markets with a range from 47.9% (Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania) to 51.0% (Michigan Upper Peninsula). The Southeast (11.9 million) and New York-New Jersey (10.1 million) marketing areas have the highest male populations.

There are 25.7 million minority males (all races other than white, plus white Hispanic males) in the current order markets, 12.1% of the total population. This group ranges from 1.8% (Eastern South Dakota) to 25.9% (New Mexico-West Texas) of current order market population. The 25.7 million is 24.8% of all males.

Following is a characterization by race and origin, of the 103.3 million males in current order markets. See Appendix Table 9.
• WHITE NON-HISPANIC. There are 77.7 million white non-Hispanic males residing within the current marketing areas, 75.2% of the total male population. White non-Hispanic males comprise 36.7% of the total population, ranging from 23.3% (New Mexico-West Texas) to 47.4% (Eastern South Dakota).

• WHITE HISPANIC. The 8.3 million white Hispanic males represent 8.0% of the total male population and 32.4% of the male minority population. White Hispanic males comprise 3.9% of the total population, ranging from 0.3% (Eastern South Dakota and Michigan Upper Peninsula) to 20.9% (New Mexico-West Texas). At 2.2 million, the Texas order market has the largest population of white Hispanic males.

• BLACK. Black males account for 13.6% of the total males and 54.8% of the total male minority population. The 14.1 million black males residing in the current order markets represent 6.6% of the total population, ranging from 0.3% (Western Colorado) to 13.0% (Southeast). The Southeast has the largest population of black males, 3.2 million.

• AMERICAN INDIAN. There are 0.8 million American Indian males living in the current marketing areas, less than 1% of all males and 3.0% of all minority males. The current orders are composed of 0.4% American Indian males with a range from 0.1% (Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania and Louisville-Lexington-Evansville) to 2.5% (New Mexico-West Texas). Almost 20% of the total American Indian population resides within the Southwest Plains marketing area.

• ASIAN. Asian males account for 2.5 million of the total population of the current orders, which is 2.5% of all males and 9.9% of all minority males. The percentage of Asian males in the total population for the current orders is 1.2%, ranging from 0.3% (Tennessee Valley) to 3.0% (New York-New Jersey). New York-New Jersey also has the largest population of Asian males with 0.6 million.

CONSOLIDATED ORDERS - General Population

The total population of the consolidated Federal order marketing areas is over 217 million, almost 82% of the total population of the continental United States. The three consolidated orders with the largest populations are Northeast (49.0 million), Mideast (30.9 million), and Southeast (27.0 million), while the smallest populated orders are Western (3.1 million), Arizona-Las Vegas (5.7 million), and Pacific Northwest (9.0 million). See Appendix Tables 10 (female) and 11 (male).

FEMALE. Females represent 51.2% of the total population in the consolidated order markets with a range from 50.1% (Western) to 51.6% (Northeast). The Northeast (25.3 million) and Mideast (15.9 million) order markets have the largest female populations.
Following is a characterization by race and origin, of the 111.3 million females in current order markets. See Appendix Table 10.

- **WHITE.** There are 91.9 million white females in the consolidated order markets, representing 82.6% of all females and 42.3% of the total population. The total population includes 83.6 million or 38.5% white non-Hispanic females, ranging from 28.3% (Southwest) to 44.7% (Western). White Hispanic females constitute 3.9% of the total population for the consolidated order markets, ranging from 0.6% (Appalachian) to 14.4% (Southwest). The Southwest order market has the largest total population of white Hispanic females with about 3.1 million.

- **BLACK.** The 15.8 million black females represent 14.2% of the total females and 7.3% of the total population for the consolidated order markets, ranging from 0.3% (Western) to 13.8% (Southeast). The Northeast order market has the largest population of black females with 4.1 million.

- **AMERICAN INDIAN.** There are 0.9 million American Indian females residing within the consolidated order markets, less than 1% of all females and the total population. This group constitutes 0.4% of the consolidated markets total population, ranging from 0.2% (Northeast) to 2.4% (Arizona-Las Vegas). The Central order market has the greatest number of American Indian females with less than 0.2 million.

- **ASIAN.** The 2.7 million Asian females account for 2.4% of the total female population. The total percentage of Asian females in the consolidated order markets is 1.3%, ranging from 0.5% (Appalachian) to 2.4% (Pacific Northwest).

**MALE.** Males comprise 48.8% of the total population in the consolidated order markets with a range from 48.4% (Northeast) to 49.9% (Western). The Northeast (23.7 million), Mideast (15.0 million), and Southeast (13.1 million) have the largest male populations.

There are 26.2 million minority males in the consolidated order markets, 12.1% of the total population. This group ranges from 5.7% (Western) to 22.2% (Southwest) of total consolidated market population. The 26.2 million is 24.7% of all males.

Following is a characterization by race and origin, of the 105.9 million males in current order markets. See Appendix Table 11.

- **WHITE NON-HISPANIC.** There are 79.7 million white non-Hispanic males residing in the consolidated order market areas, 75.3% of the total male population. White non-Hispanic males account for 36.7% of the total consolidated order market population with a range from 27.3% (Southwest) to 44.2% (Western). The Northeast order market has the largest white non-Hispanic male population, 17.0 million.
• **WHITE HISPANIC.** The 8.7 million white Hispanic males represent 8.2% of all males and 33.0% of all minority males located in the consolidated order markets. White Hispanic males represent 4.0% of the total population, ranging from 0.7% (Appalachian) to 14.8% (Southwest). The Southwest order market also has the largest white Hispanic male population, over 3.1 million.

• **BLACK.** There are 14.1 million black males in the consolidated orders, 13.4% of all males and 54.0% of all minority males. For the consolidated order markets, black males constitute 6.5% of the population, ranging from 0.4% (Western) to 12.1% (Southeast). Slightly less than half of the black males are in the Northeast and Southeast order markets.

• **AMERICAN INDIAN.** There are 0.8 million American Indian males in the consolidated order markets, less than 1% of the total males and 3.2% of the total minority males. American Indian males constitute less than 1% of the total population, ranging from 0.2% (Northeast) to 2.3% (Arizona-Las Vegas). The Central market has the largest male American Indian population, almost 0.2 million.

• **ASIAN.** There are 2.6 million Asian males in the total population for the consolidated order markets, 2.4% of all males and 9.8% of all minority males. Asian males would comprise only 1.2% of the total population, ranging from 0.5% (Appalachian) to 2.2% (Pacific Northwest). Over 40% of the Asian males reside in the Northeast order market.
**APPENDIX TABLE 1:**

Current and Consolidated Marketing Order Areas.

Current marketing areas are listed by consolidated marketing area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>Central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX TABLE 2:

Total Dairy Farms Located Within the Current Federal Order Marketing Areas.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>Total Farms</th>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>Total Farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
<td>2,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
<td>1,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>1,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>7,467</td>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>New Mexico-Western Texas</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>4,341</td>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>1,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>6,112</td>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3,447</td>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>3,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>20,605</td>
<td>All Orders</td>
<td>126,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>23,298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Number of farms with at least one milk cow kept for production of milk.

APPENDIX TABLE 3:

Breakdown of Female Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Current Federal Order Marketing Areas. 1/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>Total Farmers Within Orders</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>White Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Black Non-Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>7,467</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>4,341</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>6,112</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3,447</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>20,605</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>23,298</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6,146</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4,783</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 126,294 100.0% 6,019 4.77% 49 0.04% 94 0.07%

1/ Number of farms with at least one milk cow kept for production of milk.

## APPENDIX TABLE 3:

Breakdown of Female Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Current Federal Order Marketing Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>Black Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Indian Non-Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Indian Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Asian Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska-Wyoming Iowa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.004%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TABLE 3:

Breakdown of Female Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Current Federal Order Marketing Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>Asian Hispanic</th>
<th>% of Total Female Within Order</th>
<th>Other Non-Hispanic Hispanic</th>
<th>% of Total Female Within Order</th>
<th>Other Hispanic % of Total Female Within Order</th>
<th>Total Female % of Total Female Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.002%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX TABLE 4:

Breakdown of Male Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Current Orders. 1/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>Total Farmers</th>
<th>Total % of Total Farmers Within Orders</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>White Hispanic Males</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Black Non-Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6,016</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5,809</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>7,467</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6,516</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>4,341</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4,144</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>6,112</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5,816</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3,447</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>20,605</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>19,846</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>23,298</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>22,499</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>6,146</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5,908</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6,421</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4,783</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>3165</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2804</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>126,294</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>118,442</strong></td>
<td><strong>93.78%</strong></td>
<td><strong>528</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.42%</strong></td>
<td><strong>610</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.48%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Number of farms with at least one milk cow kept for production of milk.

### APPENDIX TABLE 4:

Breakdown of Male Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Current Orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>Black Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Indian Non-Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Indian Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Asian Non-Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>229</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.18%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.02%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TABLE 4:
Breakdown of Male Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Current Orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>Asian Male % of Total Dairy Farmers</th>
<th>Other Male % of Total Dairy Farmers</th>
<th>Other Male % of Total Dairy Farmers</th>
<th>Total Male % of Total Dairy Farmers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Non-Hispanic Order</td>
<td>In Non-Hispanic Order</td>
<td>In Hispanic Order</td>
<td>In Hispanic Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>174.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>234.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>178.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>26.02%</td>
<td>202.016%</td>
<td>1,632.129%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TABLE 4:
Breakdown of Male Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Current

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>Total Males</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>6,045</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>6,886</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>5,837</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>3,897</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3,338</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>19,897</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>22,570</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>5,929</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>6,595</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>2,843</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120,074</td>
<td>95.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX TABLE 5:**

Total Dairy Farms Located Within the Consolidated Orders.  1/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>Total Dairy Farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>18,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>8,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>12,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>18,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>44,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>18,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>6,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>3,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>3,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134,621</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Number of farms with at least one milk cow kept for production of milk.

APPENDIX TABLE 6:

Breakdown of Female Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Consolidated Orders.  1/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>Total Dairy Farmers</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>White Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Black Non-Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>18,632</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>8,129</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>12,634</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>18,560</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>44,758</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>6,093</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>3,204</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134,621</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>6,463</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Number of farms with at least one milk cow kept for production of milk.
## APPENDIX TABLE 6:

Breakdown of Female Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Consolidated Orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>Black Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Indian Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Asian Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.003%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TABLE 6:

Breakdown of Female Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Consolidated Orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>Asian Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Other Non-Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Other Hispanic Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Total Female</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.001%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>6,668</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TABLE 7:

Breakdown of Male Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Consolidated Orders. 1/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>Total Dairy Farmers</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>White Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Black Non-Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>18,632</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>17,624</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>8,129</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>7,369</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>12,634</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>11,304</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>18,560</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>17,673</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>44,758</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>43,158</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>17,239</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>6,093</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5,103</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>3,204</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2,811</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134,621</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>126,214</td>
<td>93.76%</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Number of farms with at least one milk cow kept for production of milk.
APPENDIX TABLE 7:

Breakdown of Male Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Consolidated Orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>Black Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Indian Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Indian Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Asian Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.004%</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.004%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TABLE 7:

Breakdown of Male Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Consolidated Orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>Asian Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Other Non-Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Other Hispanic Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
<th>Total Minority Male</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>1739</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TABLE 7:

Breakdown of Male Dairy Farmers by Race and Hispanic Origin in the Consolidated Orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>Total Males</th>
<th>% of Total Dairy Farmers Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>17,710</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>7,555</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>11,714</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>17,741</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>43,281</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>17,473</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>3,044</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127,956</td>
<td>95.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TABLE 8:
Breakdown of the Female General Population by Race within the Current Orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>% of Total Population</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>11,188,043</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4,928,216</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>283,452</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>377,874</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>20,934,190</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6,852,918</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>1,311,146</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2,010,125</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>15,400,944</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5,590,845</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>301,799</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1,724,978</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>11,185,364</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4,090,841</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>74,735</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1,474,348</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>3,066,904</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1,474,229</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>11,476</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>84,245</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>2,819,292</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1,301,374</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>9,436</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>129,015</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>24,646,868</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8,667,729</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>187,342</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3,672,418</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>4,910,112</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1,870,394</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>127,496</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>437,201</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>4,056,158</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1,708,441</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>147,963</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>211,698</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>5,085,096</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1,398,999</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>703,131</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>472,701</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>341,502</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>159,750</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>8,736,044</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3,573,714</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>101,019</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>716,716</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>8,045,488</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3,652,553</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>48,568</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>442,910</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>8,126,802</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3,707,830</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>37,848</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>378,391</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>5,237,373</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2,313,681</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>59,501</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>258,961</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>12,603,186</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4,673,461</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>545,123</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>974,974</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>5,696,947</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2,673,934</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>37,017</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>66,543</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2,580,939</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1,243,406</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>25,712</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>31,753</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
<td>2,005,987</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>935,913</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>32,153</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>35,249</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
<td>443,839</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>219,130</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>917,096</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>427,497</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>8,795</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>26,405</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>4,391,753</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1,916,179</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>23,534</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>291,402</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>5,854,140</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2,545,573</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>89,821</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>168,647</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>3,365,441</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1,339,019</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>222,195</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>81,721</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>204,406</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>92,707</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>9,175</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>2,580,476</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1,108,030</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>40,625</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>141,099</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>17,091,891</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5,069,331</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>2,095,223</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>1,176,033</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
<td>3,282,698</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>796,225</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>704,140</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>54,450</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>722,213</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>321,667</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>29,853</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>3,534,698</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1,462,887</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>148,974</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>66,271</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>3,999,938</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1,435,660</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>406,693</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>75,828</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>8,939,026</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3,870,367</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>215,252</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>120,387</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Orders</td>
<td>211,994,852</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>81,440,501</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>8,041,240</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>15,705,737</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>265,857,570</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>99,070,490</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>12,981,136</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>17,799,544</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: July 1, 1997, County Population Estimates by Age, Race, Sex and Hispanic Origin, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce
### APPENDIX TABLE 8:

Breakdown of the Female General Population by Race within the Current Orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>American, etc. Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>Asian, etc. Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>Total Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>14,352</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>161,994</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>5,765,887</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>34,006</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>641,730</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>10,849,925</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>20,382</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>291,492</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>7,929,496</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>52,384</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>65,347</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5,757,655</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>3,445</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>9,328</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1,582,723</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>11,071</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1,453,136</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>40,739</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>154,895</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>12,723,123</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>9,730</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>52,341</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2,497,162</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>6,726</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>28,257</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2,103,085</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Florida</td>
<td>7,160</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>43,243</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2,625,234</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>5,298</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>167,426</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>22,976</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>72,925</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4,487,349</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>6,685</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>38,547</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4,189,265</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>43,325</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4,175,034</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>27,090</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2,684,153</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>26,951</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>212,039</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6,432,547</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>37,897</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>65,703</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2,881,094</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>3,248</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>16,863</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1,320,983</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
<td>8,563</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>12,367</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1,024,245</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
<td>2,979</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>225,669</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3,982</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>467,509</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>27,772</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2,262,980</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>145,797</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>38,638</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2,988,476</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>45,950</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1,702,853</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>103,705</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>8,266</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>20,977</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1,318,997</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>39,145</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>254,192</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>8,633,924</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
<td>88,673</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>24,291</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1,667,779</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>5,267</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>361,685</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>25,304</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>57,016</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1,760,452</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>53,766</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>46,017</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2,017,964</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>72,689</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>217,286</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4,490,981</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Orders</td>
<td>776,661</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2,693,340</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>108,657,478</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>1,117,510</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4,781,672</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>135,750,352</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TABLE 9:

Breakdown of the Male General Population by Race within the Current Orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>% of Total Population</th>
<th>White Males</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>White Males</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>11,188,043</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4,617,729</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>284,281</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>351,968</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>20,934,190</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6,419,173</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>1,259,924</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1,744,839</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>15,400,944</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5,333,420</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>315,702</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1,531,463</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>11,185,364</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3,924,897</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>92,533</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1,298,986</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>3,066,904</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1,386,484</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>12,201</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>73,475</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>2,819,292</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1,226,806</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>115,849</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>24,646,868</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8,313,129</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>212,288</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3,214,479</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>4,910,112</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1,219,229</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>131,340</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>405,711</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>4,056,158</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1,569,898</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>157,364</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>194,859</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>5,085,096</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1,302,795</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>670,055</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>437,852</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>341,502</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>161,342</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>5,052</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>8,736,044</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3,427,379</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>103,492</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>624,952</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>8,045,488</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3,384,570</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>48,915</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>379,582</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>8,126,802</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3,516,619</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>38,877</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>347,304</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>5,237,373</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2,225,496</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>63,468</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>231,483</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>12,603,186</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4,475,824</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>611,434</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>853,288</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>5,696,947</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2,606,393</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>40,073</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>70,280</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2,580,939</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1,180,620</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>27,618</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>32,189</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
<td>2,005,987</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>891,152</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>36,352</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>34,086</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Dakota</td>
<td>443,839</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>210,420</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>917,096</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>405,172</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>10,313</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>29,318</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>4,391,753</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1,814,797</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>25,582</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>257,022</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>5,854,140</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2,425,861</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>100,344</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>163,522</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>3,365,441</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1,296,582</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>228,531</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>83,361</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>204,406</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>89,162</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>9,576</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>2,580,476</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1,060,530</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>43,141</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>131,475</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>17,091,891</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4,878,667</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>2,198,775</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>1,094,278</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
<td>3,282,698</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>765,859</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>685,140</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>59,524</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>722,213</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>315,983</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>34,240</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>3,534,698</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1,466,482</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>164,618</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>68,045</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>3,999,938</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1,377,329</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>432,421</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>79,241</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>8,939,026</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3,780,000</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>254,775</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>134,159</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Orders</td>
<td>211,994,852</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>77,676,796</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>8,305,980</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>14,051,939</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>265,857,570</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>94,702,841</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>13,740,437</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>16,088,222</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: July 1, 1997, County Population Estimates by Age, Race, Sex and Hispanic Origin, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce
# APPENDIX TABLE 9:
Breakdown of the Male General Population by Race within the Current Orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Orders</th>
<th>American % of Total Males</th>
<th>% of Total Population</th>
<th>% of Total Minority Males</th>
<th>Total Males</th>
<th>% of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>13,944</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>154,234</td>
<td>804,427</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York-New Jersey</td>
<td>34,003</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>626,325</td>
<td>3,665,091</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>20,734</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>270,128</td>
<td>2,138,028</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td>52,171</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>59,122</td>
<td>1,502,812</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Valley</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>8,659</td>
<td>97,697</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville-Lexington-Evansville</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>10,499</td>
<td>139,350</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>41,363</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>142,486</td>
<td>3,610,616</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Florida</td>
<td>10,238</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>46,432</td>
<td>593,721</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>7,184</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>23,768</td>
<td>383,175</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Florida</td>
<td>7,122</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>42,038</td>
<td>1,157,067</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>5,504</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>12,734</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Michigan</td>
<td>22,309</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>70,563</td>
<td>821,316</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania</td>
<td>6,483</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>36,672</td>
<td>471,653</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Valley</td>
<td>7,945</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>41,024</td>
<td>435,149</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>7,313</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>25,460</td>
<td>327,724</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Regional</td>
<td>27,443</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>202,941</td>
<td>1,694,815</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>37,499</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>61,609</td>
<td>209,460</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>3,148</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>16,382</td>
<td>79,336</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska-Western Iowa</td>
<td>8,413</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>11,739</td>
<td>90,590</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern South Dakota</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3,973</td>
<td>44,145</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>26,904</td>
<td>313,976</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Plains</td>
<td>139,455</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>36,482</td>
<td>439,804</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Colorado</td>
<td>13,976</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>40,536</td>
<td>366,024</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Colorado</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>11,539</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kansas City</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>18,183</td>
<td>200,949</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>41,411</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>244,836</td>
<td>3,579,300</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico-West Texas</td>
<td>83,023</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>21,373</td>
<td>849,060</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>44,545</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Basin</td>
<td>24,531</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>50,570</td>
<td>307,764</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Arizona</td>
<td>50,903</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>24,082</td>
<td>604,646</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>72,771</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>194,340</td>
<td>656,045</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Orders</td>
<td>765,150</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2,537,510</td>
<td>25,660,578</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>1,099,969</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4,475,749</td>
<td>35,403,377</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48.5%
APPENDIX TABLE 10:

Breakdown of the Female General Population by Race within the Consolidated Orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>% of Total Population</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>White Hispanic Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>48,950,903</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>18,052,058</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>1,907,556</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4,125,337</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>17,324,325</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6,993,134</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>96,208</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1,687,754</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>26,974,944</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>9,784,372</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>201,026</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3,713,702</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>14,051,366</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4,977,834</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>978,590</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1,121,600</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>30,851,271</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>13,595,046</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>256,468</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1,802,009</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>18,537,456</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7,466,248</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>580,772</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1,041,428</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>21,521,677</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9,418,186</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>450,712</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>774,024</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>21,251,067</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6,021,551</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>3,068,974</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>1,247,291</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>3,150,864</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1,408,241</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>101,811</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>10,681</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>5,661,013</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1,961,384</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>530,524</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>135,847</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>8,960,309</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3,880,439</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>215,511</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>120,406</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Consolidated Orders</td>
<td>217,235,196</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>83,558,492</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>8,388,151</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>15,780,078</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>265,895,746</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>99,083,768</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>12,981,921</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>17,801,914</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: July 1, 1997, County Population Estimates by Age, Race, Sex and Hispanic Origin, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce
**APPENDIX TABLE 10:)**

Breakdown of the Female General Population by Race within the Consolidated Orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>American Indian, etc. Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>Asian, etc. Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>Total Females</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast</strong></td>
<td>72,307</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1,103,647</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>25,260,904</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appalachian</strong></td>
<td>58,230</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>85,986</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>8,921,312</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southeast</strong></td>
<td>48,657</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>164,861</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>13,912,618</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florida</strong></td>
<td>23,616</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>123,841</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>7,225,481</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mideast</strong></td>
<td>49,727</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>183,889</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>15,887,138</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Midwest</strong></td>
<td>66,393</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>278,600</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>9,433,441</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central</strong></td>
<td>182,066</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>163,219</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>10,988,207</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest</strong></td>
<td>129,975</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>280,391</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>10,748,182</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western</strong></td>
<td>22,949</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>33,442</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1,577,124</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona-Las Vegas</strong></td>
<td>136,589</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>77,306</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2,841,650</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pacific Northwest</strong></td>
<td>72,936</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>217,396</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4,506,688</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Consolidated Orders</strong></td>
<td>863,445</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2,712,578</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>111,302,745</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total U.S.</strong></td>
<td>1,117,615</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4,782,685</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>135,767,903</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TABLE 11:

Breakdown of the Male General Population by Race within the Consolidated Orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>% of Total Population</th>
<th>White Non-Hispanic Males</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>White Hispanic Males</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>48,950,903</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>17,031,425</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>1,874,567</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3,653,298</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>17,324,325</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6,661,626</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>115,998</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1,488,872</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>26,974,944</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>9,376,629</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>227,559</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3,257,213</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>14,051,366</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4,691,922</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>958,759</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1,038,422</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>30,851,271</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12,879,943</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>265,009</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1,593,838</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>18,537,456</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7,198,395</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>649,861</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>923,815</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>21,521,677</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8,993,039</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>482,244</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>731,089</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>21,251,067</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5,792,241</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3,144,800</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>1,171,403</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>3,150,864</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1,392,893</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>113,578</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>13,947</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>5,661,013</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1,917,654</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>564,593</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>138,838</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>8,960,309</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3,796,964</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>255,063</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>134,178</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Consolidated Orders</td>
<td>217,235,196</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>79,732,731</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>8,652,031</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>14,144,913</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>265,895,746</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>94,718,461</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>13,741,528</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>16,091,438</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: July 1, 1997, County Population Estimates by Age, Race, Sex and Hispanic Origin, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce
APPENDIX TABLE 11:

Breakdown of the Male General Population by Race within the Consolidated Orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consolidated Orders</th>
<th>American Indian, etc. Males</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>Asian, etc. Males</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>Total Males</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
<th>Total Minority Males</th>
<th>% of Population Within Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>72,428</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1,058,281</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>23,690,000</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>6,658,575</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian</td>
<td>58,017</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>78,500</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>8,403,013</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>1,741,387</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>49,168</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>151,757</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>13,062,326</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>3,685,697</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>24,544</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>112,238</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>6,825,885</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>2,133,963</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mideast</td>
<td>49,598</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>175,745</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>14,964,133</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>2,084,191</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Midwest</td>
<td>66,650</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>265,294</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>9,104,015</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>1,905,620</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>176,364</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>150,734</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>10,533,470</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>1,540,431</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>126,633</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>267,808</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>10,502,885</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>4,710,644</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>22,363</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>30,959</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1,573,740</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>180,847</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona-Las Vegas</td>
<td>129,751</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>68,527</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2,819,363</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>901,709</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Northwest</td>
<td>73,015</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>194,401</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4,453,621</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>656,657</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Consolidated Orders</td>
<td>848,531</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2,554,244</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>105,932,451</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>26,199,720</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>1,100,096</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4,476,320</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>130,127,843</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>35,409,382</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: UNIVERSITY CONTACTS

1890 LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES (6 pages)
HISPANIC ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (7 pages)
TRIBAL COLLEGES (3 pages)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA A&amp;M UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Jane Ford-Wilson&lt;br&gt;School of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences&lt;br&gt;Room 300 Dawson, Extension Building&lt;br&gt;P.O. Box 1477&lt;br&gt;Normal, AL 35762&lt;br&gt;Phone: (205) 851-5417&lt;br&gt;Fax: (205) 851-5906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCORN STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Clifton Peters&lt;br&gt;1000 ASU Drive, #1139&lt;br&gt;Room 104 Agriculture Science Building&lt;br&gt;Lorman, MS 39096&lt;br&gt;Phone: (601) 877-3849&lt;br&gt;Fax: (601) 877-3821&lt;br&gt;Voice: 448-1005&lt;br&gt;E-Mail: <a href="mailto:CEPETERS@LORMAN.ALCORN.EDU">CEPETERS@LORMAN.ALCORN.EDU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Median (Bill) Vidrine&lt;br&gt;Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources&lt;br&gt;1200 North Dupont Highway, Room 115&lt;br&gt;Dover, DE 19901&lt;br&gt;Phone: (302) 677-1937/739-4900&lt;br&gt;Fax: (302) 739-4997&lt;br&gt;Voice: 448-1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA A&amp;M UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Rozier Crew&lt;br&gt;Box 338&lt;br&gt;Tallahassee, FL 32307-4100&lt;br&gt;FOR OVERNIGHT/DELIVERY OF PARCEL ONLY&lt;br&gt;Room 303 North, Perry-Paige Building&lt;br&gt;Tallahassee, FL 32307-4100&lt;br&gt;Phone: (904) 561-2191&lt;br&gt;Fax: (904) 561-2794&lt;br&gt;Voice: 448-1015&lt;br&gt;E-Mail: <a href="mailto:CREWR@NETTALLY.COM">CREWR@NETTALLY.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT VALLEY STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td>Levi Glover&lt;br&gt;Agricultural Research Station&lt;br&gt;Fort Valley, GA 31030&lt;br&gt;Phone: (912) 825-6806&lt;br&gt;Fax: (912) 825-6376&lt;br&gt;Voice: 448-1020&lt;br&gt;E-Mail: <a href="mailto:LGLOVER@FVS3.FVSC.PEACHNET.EDU">LGLOVER@FVS3.FVSC.PEACHNET.EDU</a>&lt;br&gt;(Note: The E-Mail is temporary and will be changed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Jesse K. Moore&lt;br&gt;Atwood Research Facility&lt;br&gt;Frankfort, KY 40601-2355&lt;br&gt;Phone: (502) 227-6738&lt;br&gt;Fax: (502) 227-6381&lt;br&gt;Voice: 747-4265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGSTON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>James Tillman&lt;br&gt;P.O. Box 846&lt;br&gt;Langston, OK 73050&lt;br&gt;Phone: (405) 466-2939&lt;br&gt;Fax: (405) 466-2909/466-3364&lt;br&gt;Voice: 448-1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINCOLN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Bernadette Miller&lt;br&gt;College of Agriculture&lt;br&gt;111 Allen Hall&lt;br&gt;820 Chestnut Street&lt;br&gt;Jefferson City, MO 65101&lt;br&gt;Phone: (573) 681-5524&lt;br&gt;Fax: (573) 681-5273&lt;br&gt;Voice: 747-4260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA A&amp;T STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>James C. Brown&lt;br&gt;Room 107 B.C. Webb Hall&lt;br&gt;Greensboro, NC 27411&lt;br&gt;Phone: (910) 334-7709&lt;br&gt;Fax: (910) 334-7580&lt;br&gt;Voice: 747-4250&lt;br&gt;E-Mail: <a href="mailto:JAMESCB@ATHEMACAT.EDU">JAMESCB@ATHEMACAT.EDU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAIRIE VIEW A&amp;M UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Horace Hodge&lt;br&gt;P.O. Box 2736&lt;br&gt;Prairie View, TX 77446&lt;br&gt;Phone: (409) 857-2812/857-2996&lt;br&gt;Fax: (409) 857-2811/857-2998&lt;br&gt;Voice: 448-1045&lt;br&gt;E-Mail: <a href="mailto:HORACE_HODGE@PVAMU.EDU">HORACE_HODGE@PVAMU.EDU</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>Vacant&lt;br&gt;South Carolina State University&lt;br&gt;P.O. Box 7246&lt;br&gt;300 College Street, NE, 1890 Research Building&lt;br&gt;Orangeburg, SC 29117&lt;br&gt;Phone: (803) 536-8844/539-8397&lt;br&gt;Fax: (803) 536-7102&lt;br&gt;Voice: 448-1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td>Orlando Phelps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td>William A. Nesby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUSKEEgee UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td>Louis Black, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS-PINE BLUFF</strong></td>
<td>George W. Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND-EASTERN SHORE</strong></td>
<td>Loney B. Stewart, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIRGINIA STATE UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td>Cheryl Jackson-Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| WEST VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE | Carl Butler  
P.O. Box 1000  
Campus Box 143 - WVSC  
Institute, WV 25112  
Phone: (304) 766-4163  
FAX: (304) 766-5182 (Temporary) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS      | Della Stracty-Wilhoit  
National Scholars Program Manager  
Human Resources Management  
Room 306-W  
1400 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20250-9650  
Phone: (202) 720-1164  
FAX: (202) 690-0359  
Voice: 448-1385  
E-Mail: DSTREATYWILHOFT@USDA.GOV |
| NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS      | Theresa Winding  
National Scholars Program  
Program Assistant  
Human Resources Management  
Room 320-W  
1400 Independence Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20250-9650  
Phone: (202) 720-1048  
FAX: (202) 720-9148 |
RESEARCH DIRECTORS
1890 LAND-GRA NT UNIVERSITIES AND TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY

Dr. McArthur Floyd
Research Director
Alabama A&M University
P. O. Box 285
Normal, Alabama 35762
Telephone: 256-851-5781
Fax: 256-851-5906
E-mail: aamaa01@asnaam.aamu.edu

Dr. Walter A. Hill
Research Director
Tuskegee University
Tuskegee, Alabama 36088
Telephone: 334-727-8157
Fax: 334727-8493
E-mail: hillwa@acd.tusk.edu

Dr. Jacquelyn McCray
Research Director
P. O. Box 4990
1200 North University Drive
University of Arkansas - Pine Bluff
Pine Bluff, Arkansas 71601-2799
Telephone: 870-543-8529
Fax: 870-543-6984
E-mail: mccray_j@uw4500.uapb.edu

Dr. Kenneth Bell
Research Director
Delaware State University
Dover, Delaware 19901-2277
Telephone: 302-739-4929
Fax: 302-739-4997
E-mail: kbell@names.dsc.edu

Dr. Bobby R. Phillips
Research Director
Florida A&M University
Tallahassee, Florida 32307
Telephone: 850-599-3594
Fax: 850-561-2794
E-mail: bphillls@email.msn.com

Dr. Seyoum Gelaye
Research Director
Fort Valley State University
Fort Valley, Georgia 31030-3298
Telephone: 912-825-6320
Fax: 912-825-6376
E-mail: gelayes@mail.fvsu.edu

Dr. Harold R. Benson
Research Director
Kentucky State University
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
Telephone: 502-227-6310
Fax: 502-227-5933
E-mail: hbenso@gwmail.ksu.edu

Dr. Kirkland Mellad
Interim Research Director
Southern University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70813-2073
Telephone: 504-771-3660
Fax: 504-771-5134
E-mail: kmellad@subr.edu

Dr. Carolyn B. Brooks
Research Director
University of Maryland Eastern Shore
Princess Anne, Maryland 21853
Telephone: 410-651-6072
Fax: 410-651-7657
E-mail: cbbrooks@mail.umes.edu
Dr. Leroy Davis  
Research Director  
Walter Washington Building  
Room 423  
1000 Alcorn State University Drive #690  
Alcorn State University  
Alcorn State, Mississippi 39096  
Telephone: 601-877-6136  
Fax: 601-877-6219  
E-mail: ldavisasu@aol.com

Dr. Stephen H. Kolison, Jr.  
Research Director  
Tennessee State University  
Nashville, Tennessee 37209-1561  
Telephone: 615-963-5761 or 5819  
Fax: 615-963-5532  
E-mail: skolison@picard.tnstate.edu

Dr. Alfred L. Parks  
Research Director  
Prairie View A&M University  
P.O. Box 4079  
Prairie View, Texas 77446-4079  
Telephone: 409-857-2030  
Fax: 409-857-2325  
E-mail: alfred_parks@pvamu.edu

Dr. Daniel Godfrey  
Research Director  
North Carolina A&T State University  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411  
Telephone: 336-334-7979  
Fax: 336-334-7580  
E-mail: daniel@dncat.edu

Dr. Winfrey S. Clarke  
Research Director  
Virginia State University  
Petersburg, Virginia 23803  
Telephone: 804-524-5151  
Fax: 804-524-5950  
E-mail: vsuarms@aol.com

Dr. Marvin Burns  
Research Director  
Langston University  
Langston, Oklahoma 73050  
Telephone: 405-466-3833  
Fax: 405-466-3188  
E-mail: mburns@uresext.edu

Dr. Samuel L. Donald  
Regional Research Director  
Early Childhood Center, Rm 1103  
University of Maryland Eastern Shore  
Princess Anne, Maryland 21853-1299  
Telephone: 410-651-6074  
Fax: 410-651-7657  
E-mail: sldonald@mail.umes.edu

Dr. Oscar P. Butler, Jr.  
Research Director  
South Carolina State University  
Orangeburg, South Carolina 29117  
Telephone: 803-536-8229  
Fax: 803-536-7102  
E-mail: oz_op.butler@scsu.edu
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Lynn McConnell, Director  
Arizona Institute of Bus. & Tech.-Mesa  
925 S. Gilbert Road #201  
Mesa, AZ 85204

Todd McDonald, Director  
Arizona Institute of Bus. & Tech.-Phoenix  
6049 North 43 Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85019

Don Schoening, President  
Arizona Western College  
P.O. Box 929  
Yuma, AZ 85366

Dr. John Klein, President  
Central Arizona College  
8470 N. Overfield Rd.  
Coolidge, AZ 85228

Karen Nicodemus, President  
Cochise College  
4190 West Hwy. 80  
Douglas, AZ 85607

Homero Lopez, President  
Estrella Mountain Community College  
3000 North Dysart Road  
Avondale, AZ 853231000

Robert Jensen, Chancellor  
Pima Community College  
4905C East Broadway  
Tucson, AZ 857091005

John Cordova, President  
South Mountain Community College  
7050 South 24th Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85040

Ann Foxworthy, President  
Allan Hancock College  
800 S. College Drive  
Santa Maria, CA 93454

Sandra Serrano, President  
Bakersfield College  
1801 Panorama Drive  
Bakersfield, CA 93305

Tomas A. Arciniega, President  
California State University, Bakersfield  
9001 Stockdale Highway  
Bakersfield, CA 93311099

Herbert Carter, President  
California State University, Dominguez Hills  
1000 East Victoria Street  
Carson, CA 90747

John D. Welty, President  
California State University, Fresno  
5150 Maple Avenue  
Fresno, CA 93740

James Rosser, President  
California State University, Los Angeles  
5151 State University Dr.  
Los Angeles, CA 90032

Peter Smith, President  
California State University, Monterey Bay  
100 Campus Center  
Seaside, CA 939558001

Fred Gaskin, President  
Cerritos Community College  
11110 Alondra Boulevard  
Norwalk, CA 90650

Jerry W. Young, Superintendent/President  
Chaffey College  
5885 Haven Avenue  
 Rancho Cucamonga, CA 917373002

Louis E. Zellers, President  
Citrus College  
1000 W. Foothill Boulevard  
Glendora, CA 91741899

William R. Kroonen, President  
College of the Desert  
43-500 Monterey Avenue  
Palm Desert, CA 92260

Kamiran Badrkhan, Superintendent/President  
College of the Sequoias  
915 South Mooney Boulevard  
Visalia, CA 93277

Ulsa C. Williams, President/Superintendent  
Compton Community College  
1111 E. Artesia Boulevard  
Compton, CA 90221

Carmine R. Vairo, President  
Don Bosco Technical Institute  
1151 San Gabriel Blvd.  
Rosemead, CA 91770

Ernest H. Moreno, President  
East Los Angeles College  
1301 Avenida Cesar Chavez  
Monterey Park, CA 91754

Thomas M. Fallow, President  
El Camino College  
16007 Crenshaw Blvd.  
Torrance, CA 90506

H. Clay Widow, President  
Evergreen Valley College  
3095 Yerba Buena Road  
San Jose, CA 95135

Daniel L. Larios, President  
Fresno City College  
1101 E. University Avenue  
Fresno, CA 93741

President's Office  
Fullerton College  
321 E. Chapman Avenue  
Fullerton, CA 928322095

Rose Marie Joyce, President  
Gavilan College  
5055 Santa Teresa Blvd.  
Gilroy, CA 95020

Edward J. Vaieau, President/Superintendent  
 Hartnell Community College  
156 Homestead Ave.  
Salinas, CA 93901

Mike Mallorie, Director  
Heald Business College-Fresno  
255 W. Bullard  
Fresno, CA 93704
Kenneth Miller, Director  
Heald Business College-Salinas  
1450 North Main Street  
Salinas, CA 93906

John Luotto, Director  
Heald Business College-San Jose  
2665 N. First Street  
San Jose, CA 95134

Suzanne Mutimer, Director  
Heald Business College-Stockton  
1605 E. March Lane  
Stockton, CA 95210

Gilbert Dominguez,  
Superintendent/President  
Imperial Valley College  
P.O. Box 158  
Imperial, CA 92251

Tom Cajka, President  
Kelsey-Jenney College  
7310 Miramar Road, Suite 300  
San Diego, CA 92126

Ben Carlisen, Director  
L.A. County Medical School of Nursing  
1200 N. State Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90033

Dianne McNinch, President  
Long Beach City College  
4901 E. Carson Street  
Long Beach, CA 90808

Mary S. Spangler, President  
Los Angeles City College  
655 N. Vermont Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90029-9990

Jose Robledo, President  
Los Angeles Harbor College  
1111 Figueroa Place  
Wilmington, CA 90744-2397

William E. Norlund, President  
Los Angeles Mission College  
13355 Eldridge Avenue  
Sylmar, CA 91342-3244

Hani A. Nabi, President  
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College  
400 W. Washington Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Tyree O. Wieder, President  
Los Angeles Valley College  
5800 Fulton Avenue  
Van Nuys, CA 91401-4096

Ben Duran, President  
Merced College  
3600 M. Street  
Merced, CA 95348-2898

William H. Feddersen, President  
Mount San Antonio College  
1100 North Grand  
Walnut, CA 91789

Karen M. Kenelly, President  
Mount St. Mary's College  
12001 Chalon Road  
Los Angeles, CA 90049-1599

Steven F. Arviza, President  
Oxnard College  
4000 South Rose Avenue  
Oxnard, CA 93033

Donald F. Averill, President  
Palo Verde College  
811 W. Chanslorway  
Blythe, CA 92225

James P. Kossler, President  
Pasadena City College  
1570 E. Colorado Boulevard  
Pasadena, CA 91106

Bonnie L. Rogers, President  
Porterville College  
100 E. College  
Porterville, CA 93257

Eddie Hernandez, Chancellor  
Rancho Santiago Community College  
1530 W. 17th Street  
Santa Ana, CA 92706

Tom Crow, President  
Reedley College  
995 North Reed Avenue  
Reedley, CA 93654

Jesus Carreon, President  
Rio Hondo College  
3600 Workman Mill Road  
Whittier, CA 90601

Salvatore G. Rotella, President  
Riverside Community College  
4800 Magnolia Avenue  
Riverside, CA 92506

Edward Clark, President Rector  
Saint John's Seminary College  
5118 Seminary Road  
Camarillo, CA 93012-2599

Sharon S. Caballero, President  
San Bernardino Valley College  
701 S. Mt. Vernon Ave.  
San Bernardino, CA 92401

Chui Tsang, President  
San Jose City College  
2100 Moorpark Avenue  
San Jose, CA 95128

Serafin A. Zasueta, Ph.D, President  
Southwestern College  
900 Otay Lakes Road  
Chula Vista, CA 91910-7299

Dr. Roberto Cruz, President  
The National Hispanic University  
14271 Story Road  
San Jose, CA 95127

Dr. Larry Calderon, President  
Ventura College  
4667 Telegraph Road  
Ventura, CA 93003

Frank Gornick, President  
West Hills Community College  
300 Cherry Lane  
Coalinga, CA 93210
James L. Ash Jr., President
Whittier College
P.O. Box 634
Whittier, CA 90608

Dr. Kenneth R. Nielsen, President
Woodbury University
7500 Glen Oaks Blvd.
Burbank, CA 91510

Neal Yawn, Exec. Director
Commonwealth International University,
7350 N. Broadway
Denver, CO 80221

Byron Mcllenney, President
Community College of Denver
1068 Ninth Street Park
Denver, CO 802173363

William Richards, President
Otero Junior College
Otero Junior College
La Junta, CO 81050

Joe May, President
Pueblo Community College
900 W. Orman Ave.
Pueblo, CO 81004

Harold Deselms, President
Trinidad State Junior College
600 Prospect Street
Trinidad, CO 81082

Jeanne O’Laughlin, President
Barry University
11300 N.E. 2nd Avenue
Miami Shores, FL 33161

Salvador Santiago-Negron, President
Carib. Center for Adv. Studies-Miami
5160 N.W. 36th Street, 2nd Floor
Miami, FL 331666653

Modesto A. Maidique, President
Florida International University
University Park, Office of the President
Miami, FL 33199

Judy Lima, President
Jones College-Miami Campus
5353 Arlington Expressway
Jacksonville, FL 32211

Eduardo J. Padron, District President
Miami-Dade Community College,
Dist. Admin.
300 NE 2nd Avenue
Miami, FL 331322297

John Noonan, President
St. John Vianney College Seminary
2900 SW 87th Ave.
Miami, FL 33165

Franklyn M. Casale, President
St. Thomas University
16400 NW 32nd Avenue
Miami, FL 330546498

Rector Msg. Pablo Navarro
St. Vincent De Paul Regional Seminary
10701 S. Military Trail
Boynton Beach, FL 33436

Greg Waybright, President
Trinity International University
500 NE 1st Avenue
Miami, FL 331321196

Edward T. Foote II, President
University of Miami
P.O. Box 248006
Coral Gables, FL 33124

Phoebe K. Heim, President
City Colleges of Chicago, Harry S.
Truman
1145 W. Wilson Ave.
Chicago, IL 60640

Zarrin Campbell, President
City Colleges of Chicago, Malcom X
College
1900 W. Van Buren Street
Chicago, IL 60612

Raymond F. LeFevour, President
City Colleges of Chicago, Wilbur
Wright College
4300 N. Narragansett Avenue
Chicago, IL 60634

Ted Martinez, President
City Colleges of Chicago, Richard J.
Daley
7500 S. Pulaski Rd.
Chicago, IL 60652

Susan Mangels, President
Lexington College
10840 S. Western Ave.
Chicago, IL 606433294

John H. Allen, President
MacCormac College
506 S. Wabash Avenue
Chicago, IL 606051667

John A. Neuhaus, President
Morton College
3801 South Central Avenue
Cicero, IL 60804

Michael Violit, President
Robert Morris College
180 N. La Salle Street
Chicago, IL 60601

Carlos A. Plazas, Ph.D, President
Saint Augustine College
1345 W. Argyle
Chicago, IL 60640

Glen Gabert, President
Hudson County Community College
25 Journal Square
Jersey City, NJ 073064301

Steven Rose, President
Passaic County Community College
One College Boulevard
Paterson, NJ 075051179

Michael J. Glennon, Interim President
Albuquerque Tech. Voc. Institute
525 Buena Vista SE
Albuquerque, NM 87106

James Fries, President
College of Santa Fe
1600 St. Michaels Drive
Santa Fe, NM 87505
Angel E. Juan Ortega, President
Caribbean University-Bayamon
P.O. Box 493
Bayamon, PR 00960-0493

Sr. Miguel A. Fernandez, Director/Dean
Caribbean University-Carolina
Apartado 4760
Carolina, PR 00984

Dr. Edgardo Rosaleey, Director/Dean
Caribbean University-Ponce
P.O. Box 7733
Ponce, PR 00732-7733

Sr. Angel Diaz, Chancellor
Caribbean University-Vega Baja
Apartado 4258
Vega Baja, PR 00763

Dr. Ricardo Alegria, President
Center for Adv. Studies on PR & the Caribbean
P.O. Box 902-3970
Old San Juan, PR 00902-3970

Dr. Ildefonso Caraballo, President
Colegio Bíblico Pentecostal de P.R.
Post Office Box 901
San Just, PR 00750-0901

Dra. Olga Benitez Garay, Chancellor
Colegio Tech. del Municipio de San Juan
180 Oliver Ave., PO Box 701790
San Juan, PR 00936

Alberto Maldonado Ruiz, Chancellor
Colegio Universitario del Este-Carolina
Post Office Box 2010
Carolina, PR 00982-2010

Sra. Maria del Carmen Gil, Chancellor
Conservatory of Music of Puerto Rico
350 Rafael Lamar Street
San Juan, PR 00918

Marimar Benitez, Chancellor
Escuela de Artes Pasticas ICPR
Post Office Box 1112
San Juan, PR 00921-1112

Sra. Raquel Marti, President
Humacao Community College
Apartado 9139
Humacao, PR 00792

Carlos E. Ramos Gonzalez, Dean
Inter American Univ. of P.R.-School of Law
Post Office Box 70351
San Juan, PR 00936-8351

Samuel Febres Santiago, Chancellor
Inter American University of P.R.,
Guayama
P.O. Box 10004
Guayama, PR 00785

Manuel J. Fernos, Chancellor
Inter American University of P.R.,
Metropolitan
Post Office Box 191293
San Juan, PR 00919-293

Vilma Colon, Chancellor
Inter American University of P.R.,
Ponce
Carr.1, Km.123.2 Interior
Mercedita, PR 00715

Agnes Mojica, Chancellor
Inter American University of P.R., San German
Post Office Box 5100
San German, PR 00683

Anibal Aponte, Chancellor
InterAmerican University of P.R.,
Aguadilla
Box 20000
Aguadilla, PR 00605

Zaida Vega, Chancellor
InterAmerican University of P.R.,
Arecibo
Post Office Box 4050
Arecibo, PR 00614-4050

Irene Fernandez, Chancellor
InterAmerican University of P.R.,
Baranquitas
P.O. Box 517
Baranquitas, PR 00794-0517

Marilina Wayland, Chancellor
InterAmerican University of P.R.,
Bayamón
Carrera 830 #500
Bayamón, PR 00957

Ismael Suarez, Chancellor
InterAmerican University of P.R.,
Fajardo
P.O. Box 607003
Fajardo, PR 00738-7003

Dr. Hector Santiago, Dean
InterAmerican University School of Optometry
P.O. Box 191049
San Juan, PR 00919-1049

Jaime Rivera Dueno, President/Dean
Ponce School of Medicine
Post Office Box 7004
Ponce, PR 00732-7004

Marcelina Velez-De Santiago, President
Pontificial Catholic Univ. of P.R., Ponce
2250 Ave. Las Americas, Suite 564
Ponce, PR 00731-6382

Carmen Gloria Ortiz, Chancellor
Pontificial Catholic Univ. of P.R.-Arecibo
Call Box 144045
Arecibo, PR 00614-4045

Lic. Andre Casanuva Escobar,
Chancellor
Pontificial Catholic Univ. of P.R.-
Guayama
5 S Palmer Street

Lic. Arnaldo Irizarry, Chancellor
Pontificial Catholic Univ. of P.R.-
Mayaguez
Apartado 1326
Mayaguez, PR 00681

Adolfo Firpo, Chancellor
Univ. of P.R., Medical Sciences Campus
GPO Box 355067
San Juan, PR 00936-5067

Myrna Colon, President/Chancellor
Universidad Adventista de las Antillas
Box 118
Mayaguez, PR 00681-0118

Dra. Nilda Candelario, President
Universidad Central del Caribe
Call Box 60-327
Bayamon, PR 00960-6032
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Alicea, Chancellor</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Universidad del Turabo</td>
<td>Estacion Universidad, Apartado 3030</td>
<td>Gurabo, PR 00778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federico M. Matheu, Chancellor</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Universidad Metropolitana</td>
<td>Post Office Box 21150</td>
<td>San Juan, PR 009281150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernesto Vasquez-Barquet, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Universidad Politecnica de P.R.</td>
<td>Post Office Box 192017</td>
<td>San Juan, PR 009192017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juana Segarra, Dean and Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of P.R., Aguadilla</td>
<td>P.O. Box 25160</td>
<td>Arecibo, PR 00613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefa Garcia, Dean and Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of P.R., Arecibo</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4010</td>
<td>Arecibo, PR 00613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen A. Rivera, Dean and Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of P.R., Bayamon</td>
<td>Carretera 174 Parque Industrial Minilla</td>
<td>Bayamon, PR 00959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan C. Sepulveda, Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of P.R., Carolina</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4800</td>
<td>Carolina, PR 00984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lic. Rivera Rafael, Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of P.R., Cayey</td>
<td>Avenida Antonio R. Barcelo</td>
<td>Cayey, PR 00736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Marrero, Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of P.R., Humacao</td>
<td>100 Carretera 908 CUH Station</td>
<td>Humacao, PR 007914300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon Colon Murphy, Director and</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of P.R., La Montaña</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2500</td>
<td>Utuado, PR 006412500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Soltero Jarinto, Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of P.R., Mayaguez</td>
<td>Box 9000 College Station</td>
<td>Mayaguez, PR 00681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma Rodriguez, Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of P.R., Ponce</td>
<td>P.O. Box 7186</td>
<td>Ponce, PR 00732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge L. Sanchez, Interim Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td>University of the Sacred Heart</td>
<td>P.O. Box 12383</td>
<td>San Juan, PR 009140383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Wallace, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bee County College</td>
<td>3800 Charo Road</td>
<td>Beeville, TX 78102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry L. Dicianna, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Del Mar College</td>
<td>101 Baldwin Blvd.</td>
<td>Corpus Christi, TX 78404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ramon Dominguez, Interim</td>
<td></td>
<td>El Paso Community College</td>
<td>P.O. Box 20500</td>
<td>El Paso, TX 79998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vance W. Gipson, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Odessa College</td>
<td>201 West University</td>
<td>Odessa, TX 79764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salley Mahoney, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Our Lady of the Lake University</td>
<td>411 S.W. 24th Street</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX 782074689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Amerman, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain View College</td>
<td>4849 W. Illinois Avenue</td>
<td>Dallas, TX 75211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon H. Dovalina, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laredo Community College</td>
<td>West End Washington Street</td>
<td>Laredo, TX 780404395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Solis, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Palo Alto College</td>
<td>1400 W. Villaret</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX 78224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert N. Funk, President, ad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Edward's University</td>
<td>3001 South Congress Ave.</td>
<td>Austin, TX 78704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary D. McDaniel, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Plains College</td>
<td>South Texas Community College</td>
<td>McAllen, TX 78502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy Word, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southwest Texas Junior College</td>
<td>2401 Garner Field Road</td>
<td>Uvalde, TX 78801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. John Moder, S.M., President</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Mary's University</td>
<td>One Camino Santa Maria</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX 78228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles A. Taylor, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Philip's College</td>
<td>1801 Martin Luther King Drive</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX 78203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vern Loland, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Antonio College</td>
<td>1300 San Pedro Avenue</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX 78212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Vic. Morgan, President</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sul Ross State University</td>
<td>P.O. Box c-114</td>
<td>Alpine, TX 79832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Charles J. Jennett, President
Texas A&M International University
5201 University Boulevard
Laredo, TX 78041

Dr. Juliet Garcia
Texas Southmost College
80 Fort Brown
Brownsville, TX 78520

Max Castillo, President
University of Houston- Downtown
One Main Street, Suite 625-S
Houston, TX 77002

Miguel A. Navarez, President
University of Texas, Pan American
1201 W. University Drive
Edinburg, TX 785392970

Robert R. Furgason, President
Texas A&M University- Corpus Christi
6300 Ocean Drive
Corpus Christi, TX 78412

J. Gilbert Leal, President
Texas State Technical College-Harlingen
2424 Boxwood St.
Harlingen, TX 785503697

Diana Natalicio, President
University of Texas at El Paso
Office of the President
El Paso, TX 799680512

Louis J. Agnese, President
University of the Incarnate Word
4301 Broadway, UPO #303
San Antonio, TX 782096397

Marc Cisneros, President
Texas A&M University- Kingsville
Campus Box 101
Kingsville, TX 78363

Juliet V. Garcia, President
U.T.Brownsville
80 Fort Brown
Brownsville, TX 78520

Samuel Kirkpatrick, President
University of Texas at San Antonio
6900 N. Loop 1604 West
San Antonio, TX 78249

Jimmy Goodson, President
Victoria College
2200 E. Red River
Victoria, TX 77901
Tribal College Address List: updated on December 8, 1998

Bay Mills Community College
Martha McLeod, President
12214 West Lake Shore Drive
Brimley, MI 49715
906.248.3354
(f)906.248.3351
e-mail: mmcleod@bmcc.org

Blackfeet Community College
Carol Murray, President
P.O. Box 819
Browning, MT 59417
406.338.7755
(f)406.338.3272

Cankdeska Cikana Community College
Erich Longie, President
P.O. Box 269
Fort Totten, ND 58835
701.766.4415
(f)701.766.4077
e-mail: ericstev@hoopster.little-hoop.cc.nd.us

Cheyenne River Community College
Mike McCafferty, President
P.O. Box 220
Eagle Butte, SD 57625
605.964.6044
(f)605.964.1144
e-mail: igarretti@rapidnet.com
(James Garrett-Vice President)

College of the Menominee Nation
Dr. Verna Fowler, President
P.O. Box 1179
Keshena, WI 54135
715.799.4921
(f)715.799.1308
http://www.menominee.com
e-mail: v Fowler@menoninee.com

Crownpoint Institute of Technology
James Tutt, President
P.O. Box 849
Crownpoint, NM 87313
505.786.5851
(f)505.786.5644

D-O University
Dr. Morgan Otis, President
P.O. Box 409
Davis, CA 95617
530.758.0470
(f)530.758.4891
e-mail: motis@dgu.cc.ca.us

Diné College
Dr. Tommy Lewis, President
P.O. Box 126
Tsaile, AZ 86556
520.724.6669
(f)520.724.3327
e-mail: tlewis@crystal.ncc.cc.nm.us

Dull Knife Memorial College
Alonzo Spang, President
P.O. Box 98
Lame Deer, MT 59043
406.477.6215
(f)406.477.6219
e-mail: aspang@dkmc.cc.mt.us

Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College
Lester Jack Briggs, President
2101 14th Street
Cloquet, MN 55720-2964
218.879.0800
(f)218.879.0814
e-mail: l Briggs@assab.fdl.cc.mn.us
(gopher://gopher.fdl.cc.mn.us/

Fort Belknap College
Dr. Philip Shortman, President
P.O. Box 159
Harlem, MT 59526
406.353.2607
(f)406.353.2898

Fort Berthold Community College
Elizabeth Yellowbird Demery, President
P.O. Box 490
New Town, ND 58763
701.627.4738
(f)701.627.3609
e-mail: l demery@nt1.fort-bertholdcc.nd.us

Fort Peck Community College
Dr. James Shanley, President
P.O. Box 398
Poplar, MT 59255
406.768.5551
(f)406.768.5552
e-mail: jshanley@fpcc.cc.mt.us

Haskell Indian Nations University
Dr. Bob Martin, President
155 Indian Avenue, Box 5030
Lawrence, KS 66046-4800
785.749.8497
(f)785.749.8411
e-mail: bmartin@ross1.cc.haskell.edu
Institute of American Indian Arts
Della Warrior, President
Box 20007, St. Michael's Drive
Santa Fe, NM 87504
505.988.6463
(f)505.986.5543
email: dwarrior@incad.org

Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwa Community College
Dr. Tom Davis, President
R.R. 2, Box 2357
Hayward, WI 54843
715.634.4790 x134
(f)715.634.5049
email: tomdavis@lco-college.edu

Leech Lake Tribal College
Larry Aitken, President
Rt. 3, Box 100
Cass Lake, MN 56633
218.335.2828
(f)218.335.7845
email: larry@paulbunyan.net

Little Big Horn College
Dr. Janine Pease-Prentice, President
P.O. Box 370
Crow Agency, MT 59022
406.638.2228
(f)406.638.2229
email: janine@main1.bhc.cc.mt.us

Little Priest Tribal College
John Blackhawk, President
P.O. Box 270
Winnebago, NE 68071
402.878.2380
(f)402.878.2355
email: jwb@lptc.cc.ne.us

Nebraska Indian Community College
Schuyler Houser, President
P.O. Box 164
Niobrara, NE 68760
402.857.2434
(f)402.857.2543
email: skv708@aol.com

Northwest Indian College
Dr. Robert Lorence, President
2522 Kwina Road
Bellingham, WA 98226
360.676.2772
(f)360.738.0136
email: blorence@nwic.edu

Oglala Lakota College
Thomas Shortbull, President
P.O. Box 490
Kyle, SD 57752
605.455.2321
(f)605.455.2787
email: tshortbull@olc.edu.com

Red Crow Community College
Marie Smallface Marule, President
P.O. Box 1258
Cardston, Alberta, Canada T0K0K0
403.737.2400
(f)403.737.2101
email: redcrow@upanet.uleth.ca

Salish Kootenai College
Dr. Joe McDonald, President
P.O. Box 117
Pablo, MT 59855
406.675.4800
(f)406.675.4801
email: joe_mcdonald@skc.edu
also: anita_bissel@skc.edu

Sinte Gleska University
Dr. Lionel Bordeaux, President
P.O. Box 490
Rosebud, SD 57570
605.747.2263
(f)605.747.2098

Sisseton Wahpeton Community College
Elden Lawrence, President
P.O. Box 689
Sisseton, SD 57262
605.698.3966
(f)605.698.3132
email: elden@daknet.com

Sitting Bull College
Ron McNeil, President
HC1 Box 4
Fort Yates, ND 58338
701.854.3861
(f)701.854.3403
email: rsmcneil@aol.com

Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute
Dr. Carolyn Elgin, President
P.O. Box 10146-9169
Coors Road, NW
Albuquerque, NM 87184
505.346.2347
(f)505.346.2343
email: ce@native.sipi.bia.edu
Stone Child College
Steve Galbavy, President
Rocky Boy Rt. Box 1082
Box Elder, MT 59521
406.395.4313
(f)406.395.4836
email: steve@sccrockybov.org

Turtle Mountain Community College
Dr. Cary Monette, President
P.O. Box 340
Belcourt, ND 58316
701.477.5605
(f)701.477.5028
email: carym@aol.com

United Tribes Technical College
Dr. David Gipp, President
3315 University Drive
Bismarck, ND 58504
701.255.3285
(f)701.255.1844
email: dmgipp@aol.com

White Earth Tribal and Community College
Dr. Helen Klassen
202 Main Street South
P.O. Box 478
Mahnomen, MN 56557
218.935.0417
(f)218.935.0423

American Indian Higher Education Consortium
121 Oronoco Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703.838.0400
(f)703.838.0388
email: aihec@aihec.org

White House Initiative on Tribal Colleges and Universities
Carrie Billy, Executive Director
330 C. Street, SW MES 4050
Washington, D.C. 20202-7594
202.260.5714
(f) 202.260.5702
email: carrie_billy@ed.gov
APPENDIX C: MARKET ADMINISTRATOR
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLANS

ALBANY (4 pages)
ALEXANDRIA (4 pages)
ATLANTA (7 pages)
BOSTON (2 pages)
CARROLLTON (4 pages)
CHICAGO (8 pages)
CLEVELAND (5 pages)
KANSAS CITY (3 pages)
LOUISVILLE (3 pages)
MINNEAPOLIS (4 pages)
PHOENIX (2 pages)
SEATTLE (5 pages)
TULSA (2 pages)
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN
New York – New Jersey Market Administrator Office
Albany, New York

Targeted Audience: Hispanic, Black, American Indian, and Asian dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule to ensure effective participation in the referendum process.

Actions:
General Outreach Initiatives

- The NYNJMA currently provides a link on its web-site to the USDA Dairy Programs federal order reform web-site area. The final rule and related informational material written in Spanish will be available at that internet location.

- The monthly Market Administrator’s Bulletin is mailed to all dairy producers and includes dairy producers in the targeted audience. This Bulletin serves as the primary means for alerting producers to federal order reform activities.

- The referendum procedures to be conducted under Order No. 2 will ensure that all dairy producers are made aware of the final rule and given an opportunity to participate in the referendum process.

- The NYNJMA will continue to provide equal opportunity access in all programs, activities, and services. All managers and supervisors will receive training to ensure awareness of policies, practices, and procedures to ensure effective communication with all customers. All employees holding a “public contact position” will be made aware of this targeted civil rights outreach plan.

- Major dairy cooperative organizations operating in the region will be contacted and requested to assist in developing outreach plans to identify members in the targeted audience.

- During March-April 1999 the annual educational outreach program will be held under Order No. 2 for cooperative payment purposes. The program will contain a short announcement identifying the special emphasis outreach to the targeted audience.
• The NYNJMA will contact the state Farm Service Agency (FSA) Offices in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Copies of each state’s Targeted Outreach Plans will be obtained to identify demographic profiles for all farmers in each state. Available information from the NYNJMA will be used to estimate the dairy farmer subset belonging to the targeted civil rights outreach audience.

• The NYNJMA will consult with state FSA, National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), and Cooperative Extension offices to further identify affiliated target audience communities that have been under-served.

• All public meeting announcements will list a contact person to make arrangements for any special accommodations.

Outreach to African American, Asian American, Hispanic, and Native American Dairy Producers

• Targeted outreach initiatives will be developed based on identifying producers in the targeted audience.

• Appropriate print and broadcast media will be contacted.

Outreach to Female Dairy Producers

• The NYNJMA has scheduled an outreach meeting with the NY chapter of WIFE – Women Involved in Farm Economics during mid-April 1999. NY WIFE will cooperate with targeted outreach initiatives by publicizing the proposed rule in either a special mailing or in their regular newsletter.

• The Pennsylvania Agri-Women Association will be contacted to further publicize the proposed rule.

Outreach to Disabled Dairy Producers

• AgriAbility Project coordinators for New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania will be contacted to assist in distributing information to the targeted audience.
Contacts and Addresses:

**Affiliate Presidents of American Agri-Women**

Gail McPherson
Penn’s Agri-Women
251 East Maple Lawn Road
New Park, PA 17352

---

**National AgrAbility Project**

**New Jersey AgrAbility Project**

Wei Zhao - zhao@aesop.rutgers.edu
Phone: (908) 932-9754
Fax: (908) 932-7931

Garth Heid - geeheid@aol.com
Phone: (609) 392-4004 Ext. 533
Fax: (609) 392-3505

---

**New York AgrAbility Project**

Joe Phillips - nycamh@lakenet.org
Phone: (800) 343-7527
Fax: (607) 547-6087

Bassett Healthcare
NY Center for Ag Medicine and Health
One Atwell Road
Cooperstown, NY 13326

---

**Pennsylvania AgrAbility Project**

Doug Schaufler - dhs106@psu.edu
Phone: (814) 863-7868
Fax: (814) 863-4753

---

Linda Fetzer - lfm8@psu.edu
Phone: TDD/TTY: (814) 238-4434
Fax: (814) 238-3721

---

**1999 WIFE (Women Involved in Farm Economics) State Presidents**

**New York**

Mary Alger (Burt)
7011 Oatman Road
Boonville, NY 13309
Phone: (315) 942-5369 EST
Message Ph: (315) 827-4934
E-mail: highmeadows@juno.com

**WIFE**

National Dairy Chair
Ruth Laribee
RD 1 Box 263
Lowville, NY 13367
Phone: (315) 376-7269 EST
Farm Service Agencies

New York State FSA Office
411 S. Salina Street
Suite 356, 5th Floor
Syracuse, NY 13202

Marc Smith
State Executive Director
Phone: (315) 477-6300

New Jersey State FSA Office
Mastoris Professional Plaza
163 Route 130, Bldg. 2
Suite E
Bordentown, NJ 08505-2249

Debra Borie-Holtz
State Executive Director
Phone: (609) 298-3446
Fax: (609) 298-8761

Pennsylvania State FSA Office
Suite 320
One Credit Union Pl.
Harrisburg, PA 17110-2994

William Baumgartner
State Executive Director
Phone: (717) 237-2113

State Agricultural Statistics Offices

New York Agricultural Statistics Service
State Statistician: Stephen Ropel
Department of Agriculture & Markets
1 Winners Circle
Albany, NY 12235
Voice: (518) 457-5570
Fax: (518) 453-6564
E-mail: nass-ny@nass.usda.gov

New Jersey Agricultural Statistics Service
State Statistician: Vic Tolomeo
P. O. Box 330
Trenton, NJ 08625
Voice: (609) 292-6385
Fax: (609) 633-9231
E-mail: nass-nj@nass.usda.gov

Pennsylvania Agricultural Statistics Service
State Statistician: W. C. Evans
Phone: (717) 787-3904
Fax: (717) 782-4011
2301 North Cameron Street
Harrisburg, PA 17110-9405
E-mail: nass-pa@nass.usda.gov
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN
MIDDLE ATLANTIC MARKET ADMINISTRATOR OFFICE
Alexandria, Virginia

Targeted Audiences: Hispanic, Black, America Indian and Asia dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule to ensure effective participation in the referendum process.

Actions:
- Maintain printed copies of the Spanish informational materials for dissemination as requested.
- Contact Agriculture/Dairy Science Department at the following 1890 Universities to:
  - schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with faculty and students
  - obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials

  * Delaware State University
    Median (Bill) Vidrine
    Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources
    1200 North Dupont Highway, Room 115
    Dover, DE 19901
    Phone: (302) 677-1937/739-4900
    Fax: (302) 739-4997
    Voice: 448-1010

  * University of Maryland Eastern Shore
    Loney B. Stewart, Jr.
    Princess Anne, MD 21853
    Phone: (410) 651-6313
    Fax: (410) 651-7931
    Voice: 448-1075
    E-Mail: LSTEWART@UMES-BIRD.UMD.EDU
- Virginia State University
  Cheryl Jackson-Brown
  P.O. Box 9081
  Owens Hall, Room 100
  Petersburg, VA 23806
  Phone: (804) 524-5470
  Fax: (804) 524-5967
  Voice: 448-1110

- West Virginia State College
  Carl Butler
  P.O. Box 143 - WVSC
  Institute, WV 25112
  Phone: (304) 766-4163
  Fax: (304) 766-5182

- Contact Agriculture/Dairy Science Department at the following HACU Universities to:
  - establish contact persons/departments
  - schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with faculty and students
  - obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials
    Community College of Philadelphia
    The Pennsylvania State University

- Contact the National President of WIFE-Women Involved In Farm Economics to:
  - obtain information/mailing lists of local chapters
  - schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with members

- WIFE
  Sheila Massey
  P.O. Box 70
  Animas, New Mexico 88020
  Phone: (505)-548-2705
  Fax: (505)-548-2613
Contact the following offices for Agri-Women, and MANRRS-Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resource and Related Sciences to:
- schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with members
- submit information for local newsletter
- obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials

- Penn’s Agri-Women
  Gail McPherson
  251 East Maple Lawn Road
  New Park, PA 17352

- MANRRS Region I VP
  Norman Barclift
  207 Carlisle Dr.
  Dover, DE 19904
  Phone: (302)-677-0752
  Voice: 888-700-3061
  E-Mail: nbarclift@hotmail.com

Contact the following state AgrAbility chapters (program for Farmers with Disabilities) to:
- submit information for state newsletter
- obtain information/mailing list of targeted producers to send informational materials

- Delaware AgrAbility Project
  Ronald Jester
  University of Delaware
  RD 6 Box 48
  Georgetown, DE 19947
  Phone: (302)-856-7303 ext. 310
  Fax: (302)-856-1845
  E-Mail: ronaldjester@mvs.udel.edu

- New Jersey AgrAbility Project
  Wei Zhao
  Rutgers University - Cook Campus
  Bioresource Department
  20 Ag Extension Way
  New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8500
• Identify and contact any minority agriculture organizations that are having national/regional meetings to:
  - obtain speaking opportunity
  - provide information for distribution to participants

• Work with local extension agents to organize meetings targeted to minorities regarding the final rule.

• Identify local minority targeted media and submit information for publication.

• Contact local cooperatives and obtain any information or mailing lists that may assist in contacting minority producers.

• Contact the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau and the Pennsylvania Dairy Stakeholders to obtain any information or mailing lists that may assist in contacting minority producers.
  • Joel Rotz
    Pennsylvania Farm Bureau
    P.O. Box 8736
    Camp Hill, PA 17001
  
  • Alan Bair
    Pennsylvania Dairy Stakeholders
    777 West Harrisburg Pike
    Middletown, PA 17057

• Publish information concerning the Final Rule and referendum process in the
Market Administrator’s Bulletin which is distributed to all producers and known interested parties.

- Include on all announcements regarding meetings a contact person to make arrangements for any special accommodations.
Targeted Audiences: Hispanic, Black, American Indian and Asian dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule to ensure effective participation in the referendum process.

Actions

- Provide a link from the Atlanta Market Administrator website to the Dairy Programs website which will contain informational materials on the final rule in Spanish.

- Maintain printed copies of Spanish informational materials for dissemination as requested.

- Publicize that informational materials are available in English and Spanish in the monthly Bulletin and Florida Fluid Milk Report.

- Send informational materials to all non-member dairy producers.

- Contact agriculture/dairy or food science/extension agents at 1890 Land Grant Universities located in the Southeast and Florida Marketing Areas. (List attached)
  - Obtain a contact person to be added to list of interested parties mailings.
  - Inform them of the availability of informational materials.
  - Inquire about publications such as alumni newsletters and other publications for which we could provide informational articles or source materials.
  - Inquire about any targeted groups or organizations to which we could provide information.
  - Inquire about any other outlets for dissemination of information.
  - Inform them of our availability to conduct informational meetings.
  - Inform them of any scheduled information meetings to be held.

- Contact State Departments of Agriculture/Health to identify targeted groups and organizations for which we can provide informational materials. (List attached)
Civil Rights Outreach Plan
Federal Order Reform
Atlanta Market Administrator Office

Actions

- Contact Women Involved in Farm Economics (WIFE) state presidents, AgrAbility and Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resource and Related Sciences (MANRRS) chapters in the Southeast and Florida marketing areas. (List attached)
  - Identify contact person to be added to list of interested parties mailings.
  - Inform them of the availability of informational materials.
  - Inquire about publications such as newsletters for which we could provide informational articles or source materials.
  - Inform them of our availability to conduct informational meetings.
  - Inform them of any scheduled information meetings to be held.

- Contact Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) member institutions in the Southeast and Florida Marketing Areas. (List attached)
  - Identify minority agriculture organizations and contacts to be added to interested parties mailings.
  - Inform them of the availability of informational materials.
  - Identify Spanish media (newspapers) for publication of informational materials.
  - Inquire about publications such as newsletters for which we could provide informational articles or source materials.
  - Inform them of our availability to conduct informational meetings.
  - Inform them of any scheduled information meetings to be held.

- Contact local cooperatives in the Southeast and Florida Marketing Areas. (List attached)
  - Inform them of special efforts and information available to reach targeted groups.
  - Inform them of our availability to conduct informational meetings.
  - Inform them of any scheduled information meetings to be held.

- Include on all announcements regarding meetings a contact person to make arrangements for any special accommodations.
List of Contacts

1890 Land Grant Universities

Jane Ford-Wilson
Alabama A&M University
School of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences
Room 300 Dawson, Extension Bldg
PO Box 1477
Normal, AL 35762
Telephone: 205-851-5417
Fax: 205-851-5906

Clifton Peters
Alcorn State University
100 ASU Drive #1139
Room 104 Agriculture Science Bldg
Lorman, MS 39096
Telephone: 601-877-3849
Fax: 601-877-3821
E-mail: CEPETERS@LORMAN.ALCORN.EDU

Rozier Crew
Florida A&M University
Box 338
Tallahassee, FL 32307-4100
Telephone: 904-561-2191
Fax: 904-561-2794
E-mail: CREWR@NETTALLY.COM

Levi Glover
Fort Valley State College
Agricultural Research Station
Fort Valley, GA 31030
Telephone: 912-825-6806
Fax: 912-825-6376
E-mail: LGLOVER@FVS3.FVSC.PEACH.NET

Orlando Phelps
Southern University
PO Box 54051
Baton Rouge, LA 70892
Telephone: 504-771-3660
Fax: 504-771-5134

William A. Nesby
Tennessee State University
PO Box 9629
3500 John Merritt Bldg
Nashville, TN 37209-1561
Telephone: 615-963-5442/321-2051
Fax: 615-321-2165
E-mail: A16TN1890@ATTMAIL.COM

Louis Black, Jr.
Tuskegee University
College of Agriculture, Environmental, and Natural Sciences
Campbell Hall, Room 103
Tuskegee, AL 36088
Telephone: 334-724-4493
Fax: 334-727-8493

George W. Richardson
University of Arkansas-Pine Bluff
PO Box 4806. UAPB
1200 North University Ave
Pine Bluff, AR 71601
Telephone: 501-541-0047
Fax: 501-535-6984
E-mail: RICHARDSONG@VX4500.UAPB.EDU
List of Contacts

State Departments of Agriculture/Health

Alabama
Mr. G.M. Gallaspy
Alabama Dept of Health
Bureau of Environmental Services
Suite 1250
PO Box 303017
Montgomery, AL 36130
Telephone: 334-206-5375
Fax: 334-206-5788

Arkansas
Mr. William Clayton
Milk and Dairy Products Control
Arkansas Dept of Health
4815 W. Markham Street Slot 46
Little Rock, AR 72205-3867
Telephone: 501-661-2171
Fax: 501-661-2572
E-mail: bclayton@mail.doh.state.ar.us

Florida
Mr. Hines Boyd
Div. of Dairy Industry
Florida Dept of Agriculture and Consumer Services
3125 Conner Blvd
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1650
Telephone: 850-487-1450
Fax: 850-922-9444
E-mail: boydh@doacs.state.fl.us

Georgia
Mr. Charles Murphy
Dairy Regulatory Division
Georgia Dept of Agriculture
19 Martin Luther King Drive
Atlanta, GA 30334
Telephone: 404-656-3625
Fax: 404-656-3723

Louisiana
Mr. Richard F. Graham
Admin. Milk and Dairy Product Unit
Louisiana Dept of Health & Hospitals
6867 Bluebonnet Blvd
Baton Rouge, LA 70810
Telephone: 225-763-5553
Fax: 225-763-5552

Mississippi
Mr. Robert J. Prescott
Dairy Farm Inspection Branch
Mississippi Dept of Health
PO Box 1700
Jackson, MS 39215-1700
Telephone: 601-576-7691
Fax: 601-576-7632
E-mail: rjprescott@msdh.state.ms.us

Missouri
Mr. Terry Long
Missouri State Milk Board
915-C Leslie Blvd
Jefferson City, MO 65101
Telephone: 573-751-3830
Fax: 573-751-2527

Tennessee
Mr. Jimmy Hopper
Division of Regulatory Services
Tennessee Dept of Agriculture
Ellington Agricultural Center
Box 40627, Melrose Station
Nashville, TN 37204
Telephone: 615-837-5150
Fax: 615-837-5335
List of Contacts

Women Involved in Farm Economics (WIFE) Chapters

**Alabama**
Clara Spivey (Winston)
PO Box 39
Louisville, AL 36048

**Arkansas**
Susan Hoskins (Dustin)
1916 Weidner
Stuttgart, AR 72160

**Florida**
Brenda Bunting
500 NE 3rd Street
Belle Glade, FL 33430

**Mississippi**
Pamela B. Walker (Sam)
PO Box 820392
Vicksburg, MS 39182

AgrAbility

Dan Underwood  
**Louisiana AgrAbility Project**  
Easter Seal Society of Louisiana, Inc.  
305 Baronne St, Suite 400  
New Orleans, LA 70112-1618  
Telephone: 504-523-7325  
Fax: 504-523-3465

Lisa Ketcham  
**Mississippi AgrAbility Project**  
AgrAbility for Mississippians  
Mississippi Easter Seal Society  
3226 North State Street  
PO Box 4958  
Jackson, MS 39296-4958  
Telephone: 601-362-2585  
Fax: 601-982-1951  
E-mail: LketchumAg@aol.com

Herb Willcut/Emily Knight  
**Mississippi AgrAbility Project**  
Mississippi State University  
PO Box 9632, 110 Moore Road  
Dept of Ag & Bio Engineering  
Mississippi State, MS 39762  
Telephone: 601-325-3103  
Fax: 601-325-3853  
E-mail: hw@abe.msstate.edu  
Erk@abe.msstate.edu

H. Willard Downs  
**Missouri AgrAbility Project**  
University of Missouri  
205 Agricultural Engineering Bldg  
Columbia, MO 65211  
Telephone: 573-882-2731  
Fax: 573-884-5650  
E-mail: wdowns@showme.missouri.edu

Brad Marsh  
**Missouri AgrAbility Project**  
Services for Independent Living  
1301 Vandiver Drive, Suite Q  
Columbia, MO 65202  
Telephone: 573-874-1646  
Fax: 573-574-3564  
E-mail: marshb@missouri.edu

Rich Guider  
**Tennessee AgrAbility Project**  
Easter Seals  
2001 Woodmont Blvd  
Nashville, TN 38301  
Telephone: 615-292-6640 Ext 114  
Fax: 615-292-7206  
E-mail: easterseals@mindspring.com
## List of Contacts

**Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resources and Related Sciences (MANNRRS)**

Latersa Hampton  
Region III VP  
PO Box 4126  
Pine Bluff, AR 71611  
Telephone: 870-540-5120  
E-mail: lhampton@hotmail.com

## Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barry University</strong></td>
<td>11300 NE Second Ave, Miami Shores, FL 53161</td>
<td>800-756-6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florida International University</strong></td>
<td>University Park, Miami, FL 33199</td>
<td>305-348-2363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miami-Dade Community College</strong></td>
<td>300 NE Second Ave, Miami, FL 33132</td>
<td>305-347-3221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Thomas University</strong></td>
<td>16400 NW 32nd Ave, Miami, FL 33054</td>
<td>305-628-6546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trinity International University</strong></td>
<td>501 NE 1st Ave, Miami, FL 33101</td>
<td>305-577-4600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Miami</strong></td>
<td>Coral Gables, FL 33124</td>
<td>305-284-4323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broward Community College</strong></td>
<td>225 E. Las Olas Blvd, Fort Lauderdale, 33301</td>
<td>305-761-7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hillsborough Community College</strong></td>
<td>PO Box 31127, Tampa, FL 33631</td>
<td>813-879-7222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Florida</strong></td>
<td>Gainesville, FL 32611</td>
<td>352-392-2297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Central Florida</strong></td>
<td>Orlando, FL 32816</td>
<td>407-823-3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of South Florida</strong></td>
<td>4202 E. Fowler Ave, Tampa, FL 33620</td>
<td>813-974-3350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Contacts

Local Cooperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry Hale</td>
<td>Arkansas Dairy Cooperative</td>
<td>PO Box 507, Damascus, AR 72039</td>
<td>501-335-7204</td>
<td>501-335-7705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Jung</td>
<td>Southeast Milk, Inc.</td>
<td>PO Box 3790, Belleview, FL 34421</td>
<td>352-245-2437</td>
<td>352-245-9434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN

Federal Order No. 1, New England Marketing Area

Boston, Massachusetts

Targeted Audience: All dairy producers including Hispanic, Black, American Indian, and Asian dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate all dairy producers, including minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule in order to ensure effective participation by all in the referendum process.

Plan:

This office is making plans to ensure that all dairy farmers in New England are aware of the numerous opportunities we offer to gain knowledge regarding the final rule. Press releases will be issued with Web site addresses, phone numbers, and contact people in order to facilitate access to information on the final rule. Dairy farmers will be encouraged to participate in outreach educational meetings that we are organizing jointly with the producer, state, government, and educational organizations in New England.

Actions taken by the staff at this office have resulted in no discovery of organizations or publications specifically servicing minority dairy farmers in the New England area. (Vermont Rural & Farm Family Vocational Rehabilitation has serviced dairy farmers who are connected with a dairy cooperative, agricultural extension, or both.) Outreach planners and meeting organizers will take efforts to identify and satisfy any individual needs such as physical accommodations for disability, language translations, and scheduling around religious observances. Our ability to gain access to every dairy farmer in New England through the agricultural network and dairy organizations in New England will ensure that all dairy farmers will have access to final rule information.

Activities in Process Attached
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN
Activities in Process

Activities:

Press Releases

- Farm Connection – issues a publication in Vermont that reaches farmers with alternative views.
- Rural Vermont – issues a publication directed to farmers and others interested in rural economic development and related studies.
- Market Administrator’s Review – provides information for nonmember producers
- Cooperative Publications – provide information for member producers
- State Department of Food & Agriculture bulletins and reports – provide local agricultural news for subscribers
- Other publications – over 30 local/regional publications that cover agricultural news of interest to subscribers
- Radio Station WDEV – broadcasting from Waterbury, VT

Educational and Outreach Meetings

- New England Producer Handler Association (April 1999)
- New Hampshire – Vermont Milk Marketing Study Group
- WIFE – Women in Farm Economics, VT/NH
- Meetings jointly sponsored by this office with dairy cooperatives, State Farm Bureaus, and State Departments of Agriculture will be held in May/June in the following states:
  - Connecticut (2 meetings)
  - Maine (2 meetings)
  - Massachusetts (2 meetings)
  - New Hampshire (1 meeting, May 1999)
  - Vermont (3 meetings)
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN
Carrollton Market Administrator Office

Targeted Audiences: Hispanic, Black, American Indian and Asian dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule to ensure effective participation in the referendum process.

Actions:

! Link MA website to Dairy Programs website that will contain informational materials on the final rule in Spanish and maintain printed copies of the Spanish informational materials for dissemination as requested.

! Contact Agriculture/Dairy Science Department at the following 1890 and HACU Universities; Prairie View A&M, Texas A&M, Texas Tech and New Mexico State to:
- provide informational packets on the final rule and explain where to obtain more information
- schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with faculty and students
- obtain information/mailing list of targeted producers to send informational materials

! Contact the Texas and New Mexico President of WIFE – Women Involved In Farm Economics, Texas and New Mexico President of American Agri-Women and the Texas A&M chapter of MANRRS – Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resource and Related Sciences to:
- schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with members
- submit information for state newsletter
- obtain information/mailing list of targeted producers to send informational materials

! Contact Texas AgriAbility chapter to:
- submit information for state newsletter
- obtain information/mailing list of targeted producers to send informational materials

! Contact Texas Dairy Women’s Association chapter to:
- provide informational packets on the final rule and explain where to obtain more information
- schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with members
Press release will be mailed to All Grade A milk producers located in the states of New Mexico and Texas announcing publication of the final rule and where to obtain information.

Include on all announcements regarding meeting a contact person to make special arrangements for any special accommodations.

Contacts:

**Prairie View A&M University**
Dr. Linda Williams-Willis - Administrator
Cooperative Extension Program
P.O. Box 3059
Prairie View, Texas 77446-3059
Phone (409) 857-4051

**Prairie View A&M University**
Dr. Alfred L. Parks – Research Director
P.O. Box 4079
Prairie View, Texas 77446-4079
Phone (409) 857-2030

**Texas A&M University**
Dr. Robert Schwart – Extension Dairy Economist
Ag Economics Dept
Rm 458 Blocker Bldg
College Station, TX 77843-2124
Phone (409) 845-5284

**Texas A&M University**
Dr. Ellen Jorden – Extension Dairy Specialist
17360 Coit Rd
Dallas, TX 75252
Phone (972) 231-5362

**Texas A&M University**
Dr. Sandy Stokes – Extension Dairy Specialist
Rt 2 Box 1
Stephenville, TX 76401
Phone (254) 968-4144
Texas A&M University  
Dr. Alfred Gonzalez – Extension Agent - Dairy  
1030 North Zaragosa, Suite A  
El Paso, TX 79907  
Phone (915) 859-7973

Texas Tech University  
Dr. Kevin Pond – Chairperson  
Department of Animal Science and Food Technology  
P.O. Box 42123  
Lubbock, TX 79409-2123  
Phone (806) 742-2505

New Mexico State University  
Dr. Bobby Rankin – Department Head  
Department of Animal and Range Sciences  
P.O. Box 30003, Campus Box 3I  
Las Cruces, NM 88003-0003  
Phone (505) 646-5279

WIFE – Women Involved In Farm Economics  
Tammy Pompeo  
P.O. Box 17  
Animas, NM 88020  
Phone (505) 548-2644

WIFE – Women Involved In Farm Economics  
Janinne Brooks  
RR 2 Box 11  
Silverton, TX 79257  
Phone (806) 847-2559

Agri-Women - Texas Agri-Women  
Denise Rhodes  
3705 Liberty Street  
Austin, TX 78705

Agri-Women - New Mexico Cow Belles  
Martha Coody  
Box 247  
Alamogordo, NM 88310
MANRRS – Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resource and Related Sciences
Statia Singleton – Region IV VP
P.O. Box 921
College Station, TX 77841
Phone (409) 847-4108

Texas AgrAbility Project
Brian Shaw
Department of Ag Engineering
303 Scoates Hall
College Station, TX 77834-2121
Phone (409) 845-9793

Texas Dairy Women’s Association
Peggy Van Zandt
Rt 1 Box 39
Grandview, TX 76050
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN
Chicago Regional and Indiana Market Administrator Office

Targeted Audiences: Hispanic, Black, American Indian and Asian dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule to ensure effective participation in the referendum process.

Actions:

- Link MA website to Dairy Programs website which will contain informational materials on the final rule in Spanish and maintain printed copies of the Spanish informational materials for dissemination as requested.
- Contact Agriculture/Dairy Science Department at the following 1890, HACU or Tribal Universities to:
  - schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with faculty and students
  - obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials

Contact will be made within two weeks of publication of the final rule. Coordination for informational meetings will be conducted with all schools or parties stating an interest.

Universities include:

**Tribal Universities**
- College of the Menominee Nation - Keshena, WI
- Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwa Community College - Hayward, WI

**HACU Universities**

**Illinois**
- Harry S. Truman College, City Colleges of Chicago - Chicago, IL
- Lexington Institute of Hospitality Careers - Chicago, IL
- MacCormac Junior College - Chicago, IL
- Malcolm X College, City Colleges of Chicago - Chicago, IL
- Morton College - Cicero, IL
- Richard J. Daley College - Chicago, IL
- Robert Morris College - Chicago, IL
- St. Augustine College - Chicago, IL
- Waubonsee Community College Sugar Grove, IL
- Wilbur Wright College - Chicago, IL
- Northeastern Illinois University - Chicago, IL
- University of Illinois at Chicago - Chicago, IL

**Indiana**
- Purdue University Calumet - Hammond, IN

**Wisconsin**
- Milwaukee Area Technical College - Milwaukee, WI
Identify and contact local chapters of American Agri-Women, MANRRS-Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resource and Related Sciences to:
- schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with members
- submit information for local newsletter
- obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials

**Chapters include:**

- American Agri-Women
  Audrey Sickinger, Wisconsin Women in Agriculture

- MANRRS
  Mattie Grant, National Student President
  West Lafayette, IN

  Kyle Jemison, National Graduate Representative
  Champaign/Urbana, IL

Identify and contact state AgrAbility chapters (programs for Farmers with Disabilities) to:
- submit information for state newsletter
- obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials

**Chapters include:**

- Illinois AgrAbility Project (AgrAbility Unlimited)
- Indiana AgrAbility Project

Identify and contact any minority agriculture organizations that are having national/regional meetings in our marketing area to:
- obtain speaking opportunity
- provide information for distribution to participants
- obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers

Work with local extension agents to organize meetings targeted to minorities regarding the final rule. Contact state-wide agents to gather and disseminate information in order to effectively target information to these local agents and target minorities.

**State-wide agents include the following:**

- Dr. Dennis R. Campion, Interim Director
  Cooperative Extension Service
  Meat and Animal Sciences
  University of Illinois

- Dr. Henry A. Wadsworth, Director
  Cooperative Extension Service
  Agricultural Economics
  Purdue University

- Dr. Carl W. O=Connor, Director
  Cooperative Extension Service
  Agricultural Economics
  University of Wisconsin
Identify local minority targeted media and submit information for publication.

**Media include:**

- Chicago Defender - Chicago, IL
- Chicago Hispanic News - Chicago, IL
- Chinese American News - Chicago, IL
- India Post - Chicago, IL
- La Raza - Chicago, IL
- La Ola Latino American - Indianapolis, IN
- La Nacion - Madison, WI
- Spanish Center - Milwaukee, WI

Contact local cooperatives and obtain any information or mailing lists that may assist in contacting minority producers.

Identify and include on our interested party database target audience parties.

Disseminate to interested parties all information, notices and material concerning final rule in a timely and appropriate manner.

Schedule five Order Consolidation Final Rule Handler Informational Meetings from April 19, 1999 through May 7, 1999 to be held at various locations throughout the orders. Special attempts will be made to identify and target minority groups for notice of these meetings.

Attend the Wisconsin Cheese Industry meeting on April 13-14, 1999 to discuss the final rule.

Schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with organizations and parties that express an interest. During the proposed rule stage our office conducted in excess of twenty of these sessions to interested parties.

Assignment of a staff member to research and identify other outreach efforts to ensure that minority dairy producers have received information regarding the final rule.

Include on all announcements regarding meetings a contact person to make arrangements for any special accommodations.

Ensure all meeting space is accessible.
**Tribal Universities**

Lac Courte Orielles Ojibwa Community College  
Dr. Tom Davis, President  
R.R. 2, Box 2357  
Hayward, WI  54843  
Phone: 715-634-4790 x134  Fax: 715-634-5049  
email: tomdavis@lco-college.edu

College of the Menominee Nation  
Dr. Verna Fowler, President  
P.O. Box 1179  
Keshena, WI  54135  
Phone: 715-799-4921  Fax: 715-799-1308  
http://www.menominee.com  email: vfowler@menominee.com

**HACU Universities**

**Illinois**

Harry S. Truman College, City Colleges of Chicago  
1145 W. Wilson Ave.  
Chicago, IL  
Phone: 878-1700

Lexington Institute of Hospitality Careers  
10840 S. Western Ave.  
Chicago, IL  
Phone: 779-3800

MacCormac Junior College  
506 S. Wabash Ave.  
Chicago, IL  60605

Malcolm X College, City Colleges of Chicago  
1900 W. Van Buren St.  
Chicago, IL  
Phone: 850-7006

Morton College  
3801 S. Central  
Cicero, IL  60650  
Phone: 708-656-8000

Northeastern Illinois University  
5500 N. St. Louis Ave.  
Chicago, IL  
Phone: 583-4050

Richard J. Daley College  
7500 S. Pulaski Ave.  
Chicago, IL  
Phone: 838-7500

Robert Morris College  
180 N. LaSalle  
Chicago, IL  
Phone: 836-4608
St. Augustine College
3255 W. Armitage Ave.
Chicago, IL
Phone: 276-9169

University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, IL 60612
Phone: 312-996-7000

Waubonsee Community College
4S783 Rt. 47
Sugar Grove, IL 60554
Phone: 630-892-3334

Wilbur Wright College
4300 N. Narragansett
Chicago, IL
Phone: 847-777-7900

Indiana
Purdue University Calumet
2253 171st Street
Hammond, IN
Phone: 708-862-5690

Wisconsin
Milwaukee Area Technical College
700 W. State St.
Milwaukee, WI 53233
Phone: 414-297-7900

American Agri-Women
Audrey Sickinger
Wisconsin Women in Agriculture
5014 Highway G
Reedsville, WI 54230

MANRRS

Undergraduate Student Officers
Maggie Grant
National Student President
3165 Pheasant Run Dr. Apt. #534
West Lafayette, IN 47905
Phone: 765-471-1570
email: kilog@expert.cc.purdue.edu

Executive Committee Officers
Kyle Jemison
National Graduate Representative
University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign
Phone: 217-244-1680
email: jemison@uiuc.edu
**AgrAbility**

**Illinois AgrAbility Project (AgrAbility Unlimited)**  
Robert A. Aherin  
Phone: 217-333-9417  
email: raa@sugar.age.uiuc.edu

Chip Petrea  
Phone: 217-333-5035  
email: rcp@sugar.age.uiuc.edu

AgrAbility Unlimited  
University of Illinois  
Dept. of Agricultural Engineering  
1304 W. Pennsylvania Ave.  
Urbana, IL  61801  
Fax: 217-244-0323

Duane Brusnighan  
Phone: TDD/TTY: 217-525-0398  Fax: 217-525-0442  
Phone: 800-525-0067 (IL Only)  
email: brusnighand@idea.ag.uiuc.edu

**AgrAbility Unlimited**  
Illinois Eastern Seal Society  
2715 South Fourth Street  
P.O. Box 1767  
Springfield, IL  62705

**Indiana AgrAbility Project**  
Ned Stoller  
Phone: TDD/TTY: 765-494-5088  
email: stoller@ecn.purdue.edu

AgrAbility Project  
Breaking New Ground Resource Center  
1146 ABE Building  
West Lafayette, IN  47907-1146  
Fax: 765-496-1356

Al Tolbert  
Phone: 812-277-9626  Fax: 812-277-9628  
TDD/TTY: 812-277-9627  
Phone: 800-845-6914 (IN Only)  
email: sicil@tima.com

Indiana AgrAbility Project  
Southern Indiana Center for Independent Living  
Stone City Mall  
3300 West 16th Street  
Bedford, IN  47421

Ed Bell  
Phone: 765-489-5753  Fax: 765-489-6136  
email: edbell@infocom.com

Indiana AgrAbility Project  
Southern Indiana Center for Independent Living  
16447 State Road 38  
Hagerstown, IN  47346
State-Wide Extension Agents

Illinois
Dr. Dennis R. Campion, Interim Director
Cooperative Extension Service
Meat and Animal Sciences
University of Illinois
123 Mumford Hall, 1301 West Gregory Drive
Urbana, IL  61801
Phone: 217-333-5900  Fax: 217-244-5403
e-mail: dcampion@uiuc.edu

Indiana
Dr. Henry A. Wadsworth, Director
Cooperative Extension Service
Agricultural Economics
Purdue University
1140 Agriculture Admin. Bldg.
West Lafayette, IN  47907-1140
Phone: 765-494-8489  Fax: 765-494-5876
e-mail: haw@ces.purdue.edu

Wisconsin
Dr. Carl W. OConnor, Director
Cooperative Extension Service
Agricultural Economics
University of Wisconsin
432 N. Lake Street, Room 601, Extension Bldg.
Madison, WI  53706-1498
Phone: 608-263-2775  Fax: 608-265-4545
e-mail: carl.oconnor@ces.uwex.edu
Local Minority Targeted Media

Illinois
Chicago Defender
2400 S. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL
Phone 312-225-2400

Chicago Hispanic News
2600 W. Peterson Ave.
Chicago, IL
Phone: 773-262-2800

La Raza
3960 W. 26th St.
Chicago, IL
Phone: 773-525-1763

Chinese American News
2166 S. Archer Ave.
Chicago, IL
Phone: 312-225-5600

India Post
311 W. Washington
Chicago, IL
Phone: 773-973-7394

Indiana
La Ola Latino American
2401 W. Washington St. Floor 1
Indianapolis, IN
Phone: 317-822-8345

Wisconsin
La Nacion
3 S. Pinckney
Madison, WI
Phone: 608-256-8641

The Spanish Center
614 W. National Ave.
Milwaukee, WI
Phone: 414-384-3700
Targeted Audiences: Hispanic, Black, American Indian and Asian dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule to ensure effective participation in the referendum process.

Actions:

- Link MA website to Dairy Programs website which will contain informational materials on the final rule in Spanish and maintain printed copies of the Spanish informational materials for dissemination as requested.

- The “Interested Parties” mailing list maintained at the Cleveland office contains 515 entities from corporations to individuals who will receive information concerning the final rule. The list includes all cooperatives that represent dairy farmers shipping to regulated plants covered by the final rule.

This office maintains a data base containing the names and addresses of all non member milk producers. Last month that list contained 3,003 dairy farmers who received a postcard of their monthly component tests and the “Market Administrator’s Bulletin” which contains market information. None of the 3,003 items were returned, so we know the addresses are good.

When the final rule is announced all interested parties, handlers, cooperatives, and non member producers will be notified. We feel we have 100 percent coverage for the producers which includes all minorities.

- Enclosed is a list of universities, publications, county agents, and state agencies that are on the “Interested Parties” list at this time. All of the Hispanic Serving Institutions and State WIFE Presidents within the proposed Mideast order area will be added to our mailing list immediately.

- The publication date of the final rule is unknown; therefore, specific dates for meetings cannot be given at this time. However, the Extension Services, Universities of Michigan, Ohio, and Western Pennsylvania have been contacted regarding our availability to participate in meetings they may wish to hold. Handlers receiving milk from non members have also told us that they will host producer meetings which we will attend. All minorities will have equal access to these meetings.

The dates will not be set until the publication date of the final rule is announced.
STATE AND COUNTY EXTENSION AGENTS

William M. Bivens
Jackson County Ext. Office
1699 Lansing Avenue
Jackson MI 49202-2176

OHIO COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SER
ATTN: THOMAS E. NOYES
428 WEST LIBERTY STREET
WOOSTER OH 44691

BRUCE BROCKETT
490 SOUTH BROAD STREET
CANTFIELD OH 44406

OHIO COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SER
ATTN: DIANNE E. SHOEMAKER
330 1/2 S. LINCOLN
LISBON OH 44432

Craig Thomas
MSU Extension Service
37 Austin St.
Sandusky MI 48471-1298

JOHN P. PARKER
100 WOODVIEW DRIVE
CORTLAND OH 44410

COOP EXTENSION AGENT
ATTN: ANDREW N. DUFRENSE
3542 TURNER RD.
JAMESTOWN NY 14701-9608

BUTLER CO, ASCS,
602 EVAN CITY RD.
SUITE 103
BUTLER PA 16001

COOP EXTENSION SERVICE
ATTN: STEVE HUDKINS
6970 STATE RT. 88
RAVENNA OH 44266

TRUMBULL COUNTY EXTENSION AG.,
ATTN: ERNEST GELKER
303 MAHONING AVE.
WARREN OH 44483

COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTOR
ATTN: MICHAEL D. ERMAN
P.O. BOX 157
STEPHENVILLE MI 49887

Holmes County
Attn: Dean Stites
165 North Washington Street
Millersburg OH 44654-1105

DARKE COUNTY AGRI, AGENT
ATTN: DENNIS BAKER
700 WAYNE ST.
GREENVILLE OH 45331

Tuscarawas County
Attn: Chris Zoller
219 Stonecreek Road NW
New Philadelphia OH 44663

OHIO COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SER
ATTN: ROGER L. AMOS
804 US 250 EAST
ASHLAND OH 44805

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY EXT.
ATTN: LAWRENCE G. ANDERSON
39 WALL STREET
JEFFERSON OH 44047
AGRICULTURAL STATISTICIAN
P.O. BOX 1120
LOUISVILLE KY 40201

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICIAN
WV AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS
C/O WV DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
CHARLESTON WV 25305

Agricultural Statistician
Ohio Department of Agriculture
8995 E. Main Street
Reynoldsburg OH 43068-3399

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
STATE MILK COMMISSION
NINTH ST. OFFICE BLDG.
NINTH & GRACE STREETS
RICHMOND VA 23219

Ohio Department of Agriculture
Dairy Division
ATTN: Division Chief
8995 E. Main St.
Reynoldsburg OH 43068-3399

MICHIGAN AGRI. STATISTICS SER
BOX 20008
LANSING MI 48901

MICHIGAN DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
P.O. BOX 30017
LANSING MI 48909

Ohio Department of Agriculture
Foods, Dairies, and Drug Div.
8995 E. Main Street
Reynoldsburg OH 43068-3399

PENNSYLVANIA MILK MKTG BOARD
2301 N. CAMERON ST.
RM. 108, AG. BLDG.
HARRISBURG PA 17110

WESTERN NEW YORK MILK MARKETING
DEPT. OF AGR. AND MKTS.
125 MAIN ST., RM 209
BUFFALO NY 14203

Farmers Home Administration
Attn: Robert Milligan
5200 Cleveland Rd. #A
Wooster OH 44691-1156

FARMERS HOME ADMIN. U.S.D.A.
200 NORTH HIGH ST.
ROOM 507
COLUMBUS OH 43215
PUBLICATIONS

LANCASTER FARMING NEWSPAPER
ATTN: E. NEWSWANGER
P. O. BOX 609
EPHRATA PA 17522

MICHIGAN FARMER
ATTN: DEAN PETERSON
911 E. STATE ST., SUITE H
ST. JOHN'S MI 48879
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN
Kansas City Market Administrator Office

Targeted Audiences: Hispanic, Black, American Indian, and Asian dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule to ensure effective participation in the referendum process.

Actions:

! Link MA website to Dairy Programs website which will contain informational materials on the final rule in Spanish and maintain printed copies of the Spanish informational materials for dissemination as requested.

! Contact Agriculture/Dairy Science Departments at the following 1890, HACU, or Tribal Universities:

Cheyenne River Community College  Haskell Indian Nations University
Mike McCafferty, President  Dr. Bob Martin, President
P. O. Box 220  155 Indian Avenue, Box 5030
Eagle Butte, SD 57625  Lawrence, KS 66046-4800

Little Priest Tribal College  Nebraska Indian Community College
John Blackhawk, President  Schuyler Houser, President
P. O. Box 270  P. O. Box 164
Winebago, NE 68071  Niobrara, NE 68760

Oglala Lakota College  Sinte Gleska University
Thomas Shortbull, President  Dr. Lionel Bordeaux, President
P. O. Box 490  P. O. Box 490
Klie, SD 57752  Rosebud, SD 57570

Sisseton Wahpeton Community College
Elden Lawrence, President
P. O. Box 689
Sisseton, SD 57262

to: -obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials.
Contact local chapters of WIFE-Women Involved In Farm Economics, Agri-Women, MANRRS-Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resource and Related Sciences:

Ina Selfridge (Elmer)  
HC 2 Box 52  
Burdett, KS 67523-9107

Cynthia Thomsen  
2304 RD 3  
Excter, NE 68935

Marie Harvey (Arlen)  
34600 213 St.  
Ree Heights, SD 57371

Kathy Herdt (Galen)  
R R 1 Box 195  
Veteran, WY 82243

Marcie Jacobsen  
Women of National Ag Aviation  
RR 2 Box 56A  
Letcher, SD 57359

Bonnie Phifer  
Salers Belles  
RR 1 Box 17  
Mason City, NE 68855

Charles Stewart, JR  
Region V VP  
Westgate 205A Cook  
Ames, IA 50012

to:  
-semitm information for local newsletter.  
-obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials.

Contact state AgrAbility chapters (program for Farmers with Disabilities):

Iowa AgrAbility Project  
ISU, Dept of Human Development  
& Family Studies  
62 LeBaron Hall  
Ames, IA 50011

Iowa AgrAbility Project  
The Easter Seal Society of Iowa, Inc.  
FaRM Program  
401 N. E. 66th Avenue  
P.O. Box 4002  
Des Moines, IA 50333

Easter Seal Society of Nebraska  
2727 West 2nd Street #470  
Hastings, NE 68901-4608

University of NE, Biol Sys Engr Dept  
204 L W Chase Hall  
Lincoln, NE 68583-0726

Easter Seal Society of South Dakota, Inc.  
1351 North Harrison Avenue  
Pierre, SD 57501-5879

South Dakota AgrAbility Project  
McKennon Hospital  
800 East 21 Street, P.O. Box 5045  
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5045

South Dakota University  
AE 107, Box 2120 North Campus Drive  
Brookings, SD 57001-4917
to:

- submit information for state newsletter.
- obtain information/mailing list of targeted producers to send informational materials.

Identify local minority targeted media and submit information for publication:

Dos Mundos
Bilingual Newspaper
902 S.W. Blvd
Kansas City, MO 64108

Contact local cooperatives and obtain any information or mailing lists that may assist in contacting minority producers.
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN
LOUISVILLE MARKET ADMINISTRATOR OFFICE

Targeted Audiences: Hispanic, Black, American Indian and Asian dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule to ensure effective participation in the referendum process.

Actions:

- Link MA Website to Dairy Programs website, which will contain informational materials on the final rule in Spanish and maintain printed copies of the Spanish informational materials for dissemination as requested.

- Contact Agriculture/Dairy Science Department at the following 1890, HACU or Tribal Universities to obtain information to:
  
  - Schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with faculty and students
  - Obtain information and/or mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials to as required.

Kentucky State University
Dr. Harold R. Benson, Research Director
Frankfort, KY 40601
Phone: 502-277-6310  Fax: 502-227-5933
E-Mail: hbenson@gwmail.kysu.edu

North Carolina A&T State University
Dr. Daniel Godfrey, Research Director
Greensboro, NC 27411
Phone: 336-334-7979 Fax: 336-334-7580
E-Mail: danield@ncat.edu
Contact local chapters of WIFE - Women Involved in Farm Economics, Agri-Women, MANRRS - Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resource and Related Sciences to:

- Schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with members
- Submit information for local newsletter
- Obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials

WIFE President (South Carolina):
Tammy Smith (David)
P.O. Box 231
Elgin, SC 29045

MANRRS Executive Committee National President
Curtis White (Clemson University)
Phone: 864-656-3300
E-Mail: cdwhite@clemson.edu
Contact Kentucky AgrAbility chapter (program for Farmers with Disabilities) to:

- Submit information for state newsletter
- Obtain information/mailing list of targeted producers to send informational materials

Kentucky Agrability Chapter
University of Kentucky, Agricultural Programs
304 w. p. Garrigus Building
Lexington, KY 40546
Phone: 800-333-2814  Fax: 606-323-1991

John Hancock
E-Mail: jhancock@ca.uky.edu

Madison Gates
E-Mail: mgates@ca.uky.edu

Eileen Griffin
E-Mail: emgriffin@ca.uky.edu

Identify and contact any minority agriculture organizations that are having national/regional meetings in our area to:

- Obtain speaking opportunity's
- Provide information for distribution to participants

Contact local cooperatives and obtain any information or mailing lists that may assist in contacting minority producers.

Include on all announcements regarding meetings a contact person to make arrangements for any special accommodations.
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN  
Minneapolis Market Administrator’s Office

Targeted Audiences: Hispanic, Black, American Indian and Asian dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule to ensure effective participation in the referendum process.

Actions:

- Link our website to Dairy Programs website which will contain informational materials on the final rule in Spanish and maintain printed copies of the Spanish informational materials for dissemination as requested.

- Contact Agriculture/Dairy Science Department at the following 1890, HACU or Tribal Universities to:
  - schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with faculty and students.
  - obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials.

Cankdeska Cikana Community College  
Erich Longie, President  
P O Box 269  
Fort Totten ND 58335

Cheyenne River Community College  
Mike McCafferty, President  
P O Box 220  
Eagle Butte SD 57625

College of the Menominee Nation  
Dr. Verna Fowler, President  
P O Box 1179  
Keshena WI 54135

Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College  
Lester Jack Briggs, President  
2101 14th Street  
Cloquet MN 55720-2964

Fort Berthold Community College  
Elizabeth Yellowbird Demeray, President  
P O Box 490  
New Town ND 58763
Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwa Community College  
Dr. Tom Davis, President  
R. R. 2, Box 2357  
Hayward WI 54843

Leech Lake Tribal College  
Larry Aitken, President  
Route 3, Box 100  
Cass Lake MN 56633

Oglala Lakota College  
Thomas Shortbull, President  
P O Box 490  
Kyle SD 57752

Sinte Gleska University  
Dr. Lionel Bordeau, President  
P O Box 490  
Rosebud SD 57570

Sisseton Sahpeton Community College  
Elden Lawrence, President  
P O Box 689  
Sisseton SD 57262

Sitting Bull College  
Ron McNeil, President  
HCI Box 4  
Fort Yates ND 58338

Turtle Mountain Community College  
Dr. Carty Monette, President  
P O Box 340  
Belcourt ND 58316

United Tribes Technical College  
Dr. David Gipp, President  
3315 University Drive  
Bismarck ND 58504

White Earth Tribal and Community College  
Dr. Helen Klassen  
202 Main Street South  
P O Box 478  
Mahnomen MN 56557
Dr. Jerry Hammond  
University of Minnesota  
Dept of Ag & Applied Economics  
1994 Buford Ave, 231 COB, Room 218c  
St. Paul MN 55108  

Dr. John Parsons  
Dept. Head, Dairy Science  
South Dakota State University  
Box 2104  
Brookings SD 57007  

- Contact local chapters of WIFE - Women Involved in Farm Economics, Agri-Women, MANRRS - Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resource and Related Sciences to:  
  - schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with members.  
  - submit information for local newsletter  
  - obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials.  

  Roberta Skow (Keith)  
  4230 110th Ave SW  
  Byron MN 55920  

  Mary Ann Unruh  
  2009 Prairie Oak Drive  
  Hebron ND 58638  

  Marie Harvey (Arlen)  
  34600 213 St  
  Ree Heights SD 57371  

  Sheila Massey (Randy)  
  P O Box 70  
  Animas NM 88020  

  Ruth Laribee  
  RD 1, Box 263  
  Lowville NY 13367  

  Jean Meyer  
  North Dakota Agri-Women  
  5125 49th Avenue NE  
  York ND 58386
Audrey Sickinger  
Wisconsin Women in Agriculture  
5014 Highway G  
Reedsburg WI 54230

Charles Stewart, Jr.  
MANRRS, Region V VP  
Westgate 205A Cook  
Ames IA 50012

• Contact the state AgrAbility chapter (program for Farmers with Disabilities) to submit information for the state newsletters.  
  • obtain information/mailing list of targeted producers to send informational materials from:  
    John Schutske  
    1390 Eckles Avenue 205 AGEN Dept  
    University of Minnesota  
    St. Paul MN 55108

Iowa AgrAbility Project  
ISU, Dept of Human Development & Family Studies  
62 LeBaron Hall  
Ames IA 50011

NDSU Extension Agricultural Engineering  
1221 West College Street  
P O Box 5626  
Fargo ND 58105

Eastern Seal Society of South Dakota, Inc.  
1351 North Harrison Avenue  
Pierre SD 57501-5879

AgrAbility of Wisconsin  
University of WI - Madison  
460 Henry Mall, AGEN Dept  
Madison WI 53706

• Local extension agents in Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wisconsin will be contacted to organize meetings targeted to minorities and farmers with disabilities regarding the final rule.

• Identify local minority targeted media and submit information for publication.  
  The Circle  
  1530 E. Franklin  
  Minneapolis MN 55404
• Contact local cooperatives and obtain any information or mailing lists that may assist in contacting minority producers and farmers with disabilities.

• We will include information on all announcements regarding meetings a contact person to make arrangements for any special accommodations. We will also advise all of the above contacts that we are available to provide services for anyone interested in the final rule presentation.
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN

Office of the Milk Market Administrator
Phoenix, Arizona

Target Audience: Hispanic, African-American, Native American, Asian-American, Female, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: To ensure the effective participation of minority dairy producers in the federal order referendum by process by educating minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule.

Actions:

* Link the MA website to the Dairy Programs website which will contain informational materials on the final rule in Spanish.

* Disseminate, upon request, informational materials printed in Spanish.

* Contact the Dairy Science Department at the following 1890, HACU, or Tribal Universities to make the MA office available to attend informational meetings on the contents of the final rule and to obtain mailing lists of targeted producers.

ARIZONA
Arizona State University Tempe
Arizona Western College Yuma
Central Arizona College Coolidge
Cochise College Douglas
Northern Arizona University Flagstaff
Pima County Community College Tucson
South Mountain Community College Phoenix
University of Arizona Tucson

COLORADO
Adams State College Alamosa
Colorado State University Fort Collins
Community College of Denver Denver
Metropolitan State College of Denver Denver
Otero Junior College La Junta
Pueblo Community College Pueblo
Trinidad State Junior College Trinidad
University of Southern Colorado Pueblo
* Contact local chapters of WIFE-Women Involved in Farm Economics, Agri-Women, MANRRS- Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resource and Related Sciences to make the MA office available to attend informational meetings on the contents of the final rule, to obtain mailing lists of targeted producers, and to submit requested information for organizational newsletters.

ARIZONA
Presidents of American Agri-Women Litchfield Park

COLORADO
WIFE State President Towner

* Contact state AgrAbility chapters (programs for Farmers with Disabilities) to make the MA office available to attend informational meetings on the contents of the final rule, to obtain mailing lists of targeted producers, and to submit requested information for organizational newsletters.

COLORADO
Colorado AgrAbility Project Lakewood
Colorado AgrAbility Project Fort Collins

* Work with local extension agents, as requested, to help organize final rule informational meetings targeted at minority dairy producers.

University of Arizona
Colorado State University
Utah State University

* Contact milk marketing cooperatives to obtain any information or mailing lists that may assist in contacting minority producers.

* Include the name of a contact person to make arrangements for special accommodations on all announcements regarding meetings.

* Identify local media targeted at minority audiences and submit information on the final rule for publication.

* Provide information and assistance regarding the final rule to all interested persons not listed above that contact the MA office.
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN
Seattle Market Administrator Office

Targeted Audiences: Hispanic, Black, American Indian and Asian dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule to ensure effective participation in the referendum process.

Actions: Under our website's FO Reform Heading, we will explain that the final rule is available in Spanish, and we will link our MA website to the Dairy Programs website which will contain informational materials on the final rule in Spanish.

We will contact the Agriculture/Dairy Science Departments at the following Colleges/Universities to schedule informational meetings, at their request, to discuss final rule contents with faculty and students. We will obtain information/mailing lists they have available of targeted producers to send informational materials.

Member colleges of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities in:

Washington
Heritage College, Toppenish

California
Allan Hancock College, Santa Monica
California State University, System Office, Long Beach
California State University, Bakersfield
California State University, (Dominguez Hills) Carson
California State University, Fresno
California State University, Los Angeles
California State University, (Monterey Bay) Seaside
California State University, San Bernardino; Cerritos Community College District, Norwalk
Chaffey College, Ranco Cucamanga
Charles R. Drew University of Medicine & Science, Los Angeles
Citrus College, Glendora
College of the Sequoias, Visalia
Compton Community College, Compton
Don Bosco Technical Institute, Rosemead
East Los Angeles College (Monterey Park), Los Angeles
Fresno City College, Fresno
Fullerton College, Fullerton
Gavilan Community College, Gilroy
Hartnell Community College District, Salinas
Imperial Valley College, Imperial
Reedley College, Reedley
Long Beach Community College District, Long Beach
Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles
Los Angeles Community College District, Los Angeles
Los Angeles Harbor College, Wilmington
Los Angeles Mission College, Sylmar
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College, Los Angeles
Los Angeles Valley College, Van Nuys
Merced College, Merced
Modesto Junior College, Modesto
Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles
Mount San Antonio College, Walnut Creek
National Hispanic University, San Jose
Oxnard College, Oxnard
Palo Verde College, Blythe
Pasadena City College, Pasadena
Porterville College, Porterville
Rancho Santiago Community College District, Santa Ana
Rio Hondo Community College, Whittier
Riverside Community College District, Riverside
San Bernardino Community College District, San Bernardino
San Bernardino Valley College, San Bernardino
San Diego State University, (Imperial Valley) Calexico
Santa Barbara City College, Santa Barbara
Southwestern Community College District, Chula Vista
West Hills Community College, Coalinga
Woodbury University, Burbank

Associate Members/California

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo;
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
California State University, Chico
California State University, Fullerton
California State University, Hayward
California State University, Northridge
California State University, Sacramento
California State University, San Marcos
Crafton Hills College, Yucaipa
Long Beach City College, Long Beach
National University, La Jolla
San Diego State University, San Diego
San Francisco State University, San Francisco
San Jose State University, San Jose
Santa Monica Community College, Santa Monica
University of California, Berkeley
UCLA, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego, La Jolla
University of California, Santa Cruz

Also Tribal Colleges/Universities

California

D-Q University, Davis, California

Montana

Blackfeet Community College, Browning, Montana
Dull Knife Memorial College, Lame Deer, Montana
Fort Belknap College, Harlem, Montana
Fort Peck Community College, Poplar, Montana
Little Big Horn College, Crow Agency, Montana
Salish Kootenai College, Pablo, Montana
Stone Child College, Box Elder, Montana

Washington

Northwest Indian College, Bellingham, Washington

We will contact the local chapters of Women Involved In Farm Economics, Ms. Edwards, located in Opheim, Montana, and Ms. Robertson, in Olympia, Washington; the affiliate presidents of Agri-Women, Ms. Cholewinski, located in Eugene, Oregon, Ms. Einsmann, in Irvine, California, and Ms. Lou Vik, in Cathlamet, Washington; and the Washington Women for Agriculture, Ms. Argo, located in Sunnyside, Washington; and the regional vice president of the minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resource and Related Sciences, Ms. Cerda, in Davis, California, to schedule informational meetings, at their request, to discuss final rule contents with members; to submit information for local newsletters; and to obtain information/mailing lists they have available of targeted producers to send informational materials.
We will contact the Montana/Idaho AgrAbility Project chapters located in Moscow, Idaho, Pocatello, Idaho, and Great Falls, Montana, to submit information for their state newsletters. We will also obtain information/mailing lists they have available of targeted producers to send informational materials.

We will also attempt to identify and contact any minority agricultural organizations that are having national/regional meetings in our area to provide information for distribution to participants and to offer a speaker from our office for their program.

We will work with local State University extension agents, Dr. W.R. Gomes, Director, University of California, Oakland, California, Dr. LeRoy D. Luft, Director, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, Dr. Lyla E. Houglum, Director, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, and Dr. James J. Zuiches, Director, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, and dairy organizations to organize meetings, if they request, targeted to minorities regarding the final rule.

We will contact the following newspapers and local minority-targeted media to submit information in Spanish and English for publication.

**California**

Californian, Bakersfield  
Bee, Fresno, Modesto and Sacramento  
Times, Los Angeles  
Inland Valley Daily Bulletin, Ontario  
Riverside Press-Enterprise, Riverside  
Union Tribune, San Diego  
Chronicle, San Francisco  
Examiner, San Francisco  
Index-Tribune, Sonoma  
Contra Costa Times, Walnut Creek  
Siskiyou Daily News, Yreka

**Idaho**

Idaho State Journal, Pocatello

**Oregon**

Capital Press, Salem
Washington

Columbia Basin Herald, Moses Lake
Hispanic Directory, Seattle
El Mundo, Seattle

We will contact the local cooperatives for assistance in obtaining information or mailing lists that would help us in contacting minority producers.

We will include a contact person on all announcements regarding meetings to make arrangements for any special accommodations needed by any attendees.
CIVIL RIGHTS OUTREACH PLAN
TULSA OKLAHOMA MARKET ADMINISTRATOR OFFICE

Targeted Audiences: Hispanic, Black, American Indian and Asian dairy producers, female dairy producers, and disabled dairy producers.

Purpose: The purpose of this outreach plan is to educate minority dairy producers on the contents of the final rule to ensure effective participation in the referendum process.

Actions:
♦ Link MA website to Dairy Programs website which will contain informational materials on the final rule in Spanish and maintain printed copies of the Spanish informational materials for dissemination as requested.

♦ Contact Agriculture/Dairy Science Department at the following 1890 Universities (Lincoln University, Jefferson City, MO; Langston University, Langston, OK) to:
   - offer to schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with faculty and students
   - obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials

♦ Contact local chapter of WIFE-Women Involved in Farm Economics, Agri-Women (WIFE, Kansas Chapter, Burdett, KS) to:
   - offer to schedule informational meetings to discuss final rule contents with members
   - submit information for local newsletter
   - obtain information/mailing lists of targeted producers to send informational materials

♦ Contact state AgrAbility chapter (University of Missouri, Missouri AgrAbility Project) to:
   - submit information for state newsletter
   - obtain information/mailing list of targeted producers to send informational materials

♦ Work with local extension agents to organize meetings targeted to minorities regarding the final rule. (List agents, meeting agenda, and publicity methods.)
  1. Ken Bailey - Dairy Extension Economist, University of Missouri
2. Dan Waldner – Extension Specialist, Dairy Science, Oklahoma State University
3. John Smith – Extension Specialist, Dairy Science, Kansas State
4. Dick Dunham – Extension Specialist, Dairy Science, Kansas State
5. Jodie Pennington – Extension Dairy Specialist, University of Arkansas

♦ Contact local cooperatives and obtain any information or mailing lists that may assist in contacting minority producers.

♦ Include on all announcements regarding meetings a contact person to make arrangements for any special accommodations.