TABLE A-RECEIPTS OF PRODUCER MILK BY HANDLERS REGULATED UNDER FEDERAL MILK ORDERS, BY STATE OF ORIGIN, 2010

| State and Region | Producer milk receipts |  |  | State and Region | Producer milk receipts |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total 1/ | Share of total milk marketed by producers $2 /$ |  |  | Total 1/ | Share of total milk marketed by producers $2 /$ |  |
|  |  | Fluid Grade 3/ | All milk |  |  | Fluid Grade 3/ | All milk |
|  | Million pounds | Percent | Percent |  | Million pounds | Percent | Percent |
| New York | 12,221 | 96 | 96 | Wisconsin | 23,913 | 95 | 92 |
| Pennsylvania | 9,907 | 92 | 92 | Minnesota | 8,564 | 96 | 94 |
| Vermont | 2,492 | 99 | 99 | lowa | 3,799 | 88 | 88 |
| Maryland | 993 | 99 | 99 | South Dakota | 1,707 | 92 | 91 |
| Maine | 575 | 98 | 98 | Nebraska | 928 | 80 | 79 |
| Connecticut | 352 | 96 | 96 | North Dakota | $\underline{270}$ | 85 | 70 |
| New Hampshire | 283 | 95 | 95 | Midwest | 39,180 | 94 | 91 |
| Massachusetts | 226 | 93 | 93 |  |  |  |  |
| Other 4l | $\underline{229}$ | $\underline{92}$ | $\underline{92}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast | 27,279 | 95 | 95 | Colorado | 2,680 | 95 | 95 |
|  |  |  |  | Kansas | 2,171 | 87 | 87 |
|  |  |  |  | Missouri | 1,251 | 90 | 87 |
| Florida | 2,123 | 100 | 100 | Oklahoma | 692 | 72 | 72 |
| Georgia | 1,331 | 95 | 95 | Arkansas | 81 | $\underline{52}$ | $\underline{52}$ |
| Virginia | 1,228 | 71 | 71 | Central | 6,875 | 88 | 87 |
| Kentucky | 1,139 | 98 | 98 |  |  |  |  |
| North Carolina | 857 | 99 | 99 |  |  |  |  |
| Tennessee | 832 | 98 | 98 | Texas | 7,371 | 83 | 83 |
| South Carolina | 282 | 99 | 99 | New Mexico | 7,263 | 92 | 92 |
| Louisiana | 226 | 96 | 96 | Arizona | 4.131 | 100 | 100 |
| Mississippi | 219 | 98 | 98 | Southwest | 18,765 | 90 | 90 |
| Alabama | 153 | 96 | 96 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast | 8,392 | 93 | 93 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Washington | 5,765 | 98 | 98 |
|  |  |  |  | Oregon | 2,119 | 88 | 88 |
| Michigan | 7,872 | 95 | 95 | Idaho | 654 | 5 | 5 |
| Ohio | 4,583 | 91 | 87 | California | 280 | 1 | 1 |
| Indiana | 3,245 | 95 | 95 | Other 5/ | $\underline{96}$ | 3 | $\underline{3}$ |
| Illinois | 1,701 | 91 | 89 | West | 8,913 | 14 | 14 |
| West Virginia | 112 | 71 | 71 |  |  |  |  |
| Mideast | 17,513 | 93 | 92 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total U.S. | 126,917 | 67 | 66 |

$1 /$ Receipts are listed according to the location of the producer, not the location of the regulated handler. Regional and Total U.S. figures may not add due to rounding. Excludes volumes not pooled due to disadvantageous price relationships. 2/Computed from data contained in "Milk Production, Disposition and Income - 2010 Summary", NASS, USDA. NOTE: Milk sold to plants and dealers as whole milk and equivalent amounts of milk for cream. Includes milk produced by dealers' own herds and milk sold directly to consumers. Also includes milk produced by institutional herds. 3 / Milk marketed that is eligible for fluid use (Grade A in most States). $4 /$ Includes data for New Jersey, Delaware, and Rhode Isiand for which the information is administratively confidential. $5 /$ Includes data for Alaska, Hawail, Montana, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming for which the information is administratively confidential.

TABLE B-NUMBER OF FEDERAL ORDERS UNDER WHICH MILK WAS MARKETED, BY STATE AND REGION, 2010, WITH COMPARISONS 1/

| State and Region | Number of Federal orders |  |  | State and Region | Number of Federal orders |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2005 | 2000 |  | 2010 | 2005 | 2000 |
|  | Number |  |  |  | Number |  |  |
| Maine | $1 \begin{array}{lll}1 & 1\end{array}$ |  |  | Wisconsin | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| New Hampshire |  | 1 | 1 | Minnesota | 6 | 4 | 5 |
| Vermont | 1 | 1 | 1 | North Dakota | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Massachusetts | 1 | 1 | 1 | South Dakota | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Rhode Island |  | 1 | 1 | lowa | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Connecticut | 1 | 1 | 1 | Nebraska | 1 | $\underline{2}$ | 4 |
| New York | 1 | 2 | 4 | Midwest | 7 | 6 | 7 |
| New Jersey | 4 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Pennsylvania |  | 5 | 4 | Missouri | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| Delaware | 4 2 | 2 | 3 | Kansas | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| Maryland | 2 4 | $\underline{5}$ | 4 | Colorado | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Northeast | $\frac{4}{4}$ | 5 | 4 | Oklahoma | 4 | 5 | 4 |
|  | 4 |  |  | Arkansas | 3 | $\underline{3}$ | $\underline{3}$ |
| Virginia | 6 | 4 | 4 | Central | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| North Carolina | 4 | 5 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| South Carolina | 3 | 3 | 2 | Texas | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| Georgia | 4 | 3 | 3 | New Mexico | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Florida | 4 | 2 | 2 | Arizona | $\underline{2}$ | 3 | 1 |
| Alabama | 3 | 3 | 2 | Southwest | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| Mississippi |  | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Louisiana | 2 | 3 | 1 | Montana | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Tennessee |  | 3 | 3 | Idaho | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| Kentucky | 4 5 | 3 | 4 | Wyoming | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Southeast | $\frac{5}{6}$ | 6 | 5 | Utah | 4 | 3 | 5 |
|  | 6 |  |  | Nevada | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Ohio | 6 | 7 | 3 | Washington | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Indiana | 7 | 7 | 5 | Oregon | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Illinais | 6 | 5 | 5 | California | 4 | $\underline{5}$ | 4 |
| Michigan | 7 | 7 | 5 | West | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| West Virginia | 4 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Mideast | 7 | 7 | 7 | Total U.S. | 10 | 10 | 11 |

1/ Number of orders under which milk produced by dairy farmers located in the state was marketed to regulated handlers. For example, milk produced in New York was marketed under three Federal milk orders in 2010. The regional figure is the net number of orders under which the milk produced by dairy farmers located in the region was marketed to regulated handlers.

TABLE C-SOURCES OF MILK FOR FEDERAL MILK ORDERS: RECEIPTS OF PRODUCER MILK BY MARKETING AREA AND STATE, 2010 1/

| Federal mllk marketing area and State $2 /$ | Producar milk receipts |  | Federal milk marketing area and State $2 /$ | Producar milk receipts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Share of market total |  | Total | Share of market total |
|  | 1,000 libs. | Percent |  | $1.000 \mathrm{lis}$. | Percent |
| APPALACHIAN | 6,041,864 | 100.00 | FLORIDA | 2,901,758 | 100.00 |
| Virginia | 999,272 | 16.54 | Floricia | 1,919,588 | 66.15 |
| Indiana | 772,619 | 12.79 | Georgla | 738,334 | 25.45 |
| North Carolina | 761,595 | 12.61 | Virginia | 83,409 | 2.87 |
| Ohio | 743,953 | 12.31 | North Carolina | 72,369 | 2.49 |
| Pennsylvania | 578,845 | 9.58 | Indiana | 49,740 | 1.71 |
| Kentucky | 521,445 | 8.63 | AL - KS - MI - MS - OH-SC-TX | 38,318 | 1.32 |
| Tennessee | 442,739 | 7.33 |  |  |  |
| Michigan | 370,392 | 6.13 |  |  |  |
| South Carolina | 242,152 | 4.01 |  |  |  |
| Maryland | 156,372 | 2.59 | MIDEAST | 16,033,122 | 100.00 |
| Illimois | 106,482 | 1.76 | Michigan | 7,061,270 | 44.04 |
| Texas | 103,581 | 1.71 | Ohio | 3,416,941 | 21.31 |
| AL-DE-FL-GA-KS - |  |  | Indlana | 1,600,566 | 9.98 |
| NM - NJ - NY - OK-WI-WV | 242,416 | 4.01 | New Yark | 1,384,615 | 8.64 |
|  |  |  | Pennsylvania | 1,284,894 | 8.01 |
|  |  |  | WIsconsin | 1,010,916 | 6.31 |
| ARIZONA | 4,231,673 | 100.00 | MN - MO-NC-TX-UT- |  |  |
| Arizoria | 4,008,804 | 94.73 | VA-WV | 273,919 | 1.71 |
| CA - TX | 222,869 | 5.27 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | NORTHEAST | 24,335,641 | 100.00 |
| CENTRAL | 13,351,663 | 100.00 | New York | 10,827,730 | 44.49 |
| Jowa | 2,741,564 | 20.53 | Pennsylvania | 8,040,288 | 33.04 |
| Colorado | 2,680,431 | 20.08 | Vermont | 2,491,759 | 10.24 |
| New Mexico | 1,369,762 | 10.26 | Maryland | 806,760 | 3.32 |
| Kansas | 1,349,031 | 10.10 | Maine | 575,214 | 2.36 |
| Nebraska | 927,659 | 6.95 | Connecticut | 352,122 | 1.45 |
| Illinois | 898,612 | 6.73 | Ohio | 345,795 | 1.42 |
| Texas | 686,317 | 5.14 | New Hampshire | 283,305 | 1.16 |
| South Dakota | 565,015 | 4.23 | DE - IA - IL - IN - KY - MA - MI- |  |  |
| Idaho | 526,606 | 3.94 | MN - ND - NJ - RI - TN - VA - |  |  |
| Oklahoma | 439,916 | 3.29 | WI-WV | 612,668 | 2.52 |
| Wisconsin | 377,468 | 2.83 |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | 360,814 | 2.70 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & A R-C A-I N-K Y-M I-M O \\ & O H-T N-U T-W Y \end{aligned}$ | 428,469 | 3.21 |  |  |  |

TABLE C-SOURCES OF MILK FOR FEDERAL MILK ORDERS: RECEIPTS OF PRODUCER MILK BY
MARKETING AREA AND STATE, 2010 1/-CONT.

| Federal milk marketing area and State $2 /$ | Praducer milk receipts |  | Federal milk marketing area and State $2 /$ | Praducer milk recelpis |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Share of |  | Total | Share of market |
|  | 1,000 ibs. | Percent |  | 1,000 fibs. | Percent |
| PACIFIC NORTHWEST | 8,005,861 | 100.00 | SOUTHWEST | 11,210,050 | 100.00 |
| Washington | 5,764,843 | 72.01 | New Mexico | 5,717,747 | 51.01 |
| Oregon | 2,118,602 | 26.46 | Texas | 5,152,802 | 45.97 |
| CA - ID - UT | 122,417 | 1.53 | Kansas | 203,710 | 1.82 |
|  |  |  | AR-AZ-ID-MN-MO-OK | 135,791 | 1.21 |
| SOUTHEAST | 7,001,124 | 100.00 |  |  |  |
| Texas | 1,394,421 | 19.92 | UPPER MIDWEST | 33,804,144 | 100.00 |
| Missouri | 917,485 | 13.10 | Wisconsin | 22,462,589 | 66.45 |
| Indiana | 748,263 | 10.69 | Minnesota | 8,198,214 | 24.25 |
| Kentucky | 598,359 | 8.55 | South Dakota | 1,142,187 | 3.38 |
| Kansas | 574,895 | 8.21 | lowa | 1,017,040 | 3.01 |
| Georgia | 543,853 | 7.77 | Illinois | 522,982 | 1.55 |
| Tennessee | 383,512 | 5.48 | ID - IN - MI - MO-ND - VA | 461,132 | 1.36 |
| Michigan | 276,635 | 3.95 |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma | 239,451 | 3.42 |  |  |  |
| Louisiana | 226,314 | 3.23 |  |  |  |
| Mississippi | 218,982 | 3.13 |  |  |  |
| Flarida | 170,254 | 2.43 |  |  |  |
| Alabame | 149,545 | 2.14 |  |  |  |
| New Mexico | 139,409 | 1.99 |  |  |  |
| Illinois | 98,544 | 1.41 |  |  |  |
| Arkansas | 80,553 | 1.15 |  |  |  |
| Ohio | 75,670 | 1.08 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & C A-I A-M D-M N-N C-N Y- \\ & P A-S C-U T-V A-W I-W V \end{aligned}$ | 164,979 | 2.36 |  |  |  |

1/ The source of the receipt is based on the location of the producer, not the location of the regulated handler. Marketing area totals may nat add due to rounding. $2 /$ For some marketing areas, receipts from some stales have been combined in order to protect confidenilallty. The states are listed by decreasing proportions of deliveries to the marketing area. For some marketing areas, handlers elected not to pool producer milk that normally would have been associated with the marketing area due to disadvantageous price relationships.

TABLE D--THE TEN STATES FROM WHICH THE LARGEST VOLUME OF PRODUCER MLLK WAS RECEIVED UNDER FEDERAL MILK ORDERS, 2010, WITH COMPARISONS

| State | 2010 |  |  |  | 2000 |  |  |  | 1990 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Federal milk order rank $1 /$ | Producer milk receipts in all Federal orders |  | United States rank $2 /$ | Federal mlik order rank 1/ | Producer milk receipts in all Federal orders |  | United <br> States rank $2 /$ | Federal milk order rank 1/ | Producer milk receipts in all Federal orders |  | United States rank $2 /$ |
|  |  | Million pounds | Percent of total |  |  | Million pounds | Percent of total |  |  | Million pounds | Percent of total |  |
| Wisconsin | 1 | 23,913 | 26.1\% | 2 | 1 | 20,931 | 22.9\% | 2 | 1 | 18,928 | 20.7\% | 1 |
| New York, | 2 | 12,221 | 13.3\% | 4 | 2 | 11,168 | 12.2\% | 3 | 2 | 9,349 | 10.2\% | 3 |
| Pennsylvania | 3 | 9,907 | 10.8\% | 5 | 3 | 9,840 | 10.7\% | 4 | 3 | 8,240 | 9.0\% | 5 |
| Minnesota | 4 | 8,564 | 9.4\% | 6 | 4 | 8,166 | 8.9\% | 5 | 4 | 7,232 | 7.9\% | 4 |
| Michigan | 5 | 7,872 | 8.6\% | 8 | 6 | 5,335 | 5.8\% | 8 | 6 | 4,821 | 5.3\% | 7 |
| Texas | 6 | 7,371 | 8.0\% | 7 | 5 | 5,399 | 5.9\% | 7 | 5 | 5,417 | 5.9\% | 6 |
| New Mexico | 7 | 7,263 | 7.9\% | 9 | 8 | 4,803 | 5.2\% | 10 | 19 | 1,482 | 1.6\% | 23 |
| Washington | 8 | 5,765 | 6.3\% | 10 | 7 | 5,013 | 5.5\% | 9 | 7 | 4,202 | 4.6\% | 9 |
| Ohio | 9 | 4,583 | 5.0\% | 11 | 9 | 3,770 | 4.1\% | 11 | 8 | 4,087 | 4.5\% | 8 |
| Arizona | 10 | 4,131 | 4.5\% | 13 | 11 | 2,973 | 3.2\% | 13 | $>10$ | 1,586 | 1.7\% | 21 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Total Top Ten } \\ 3 / \end{gathered}$ |  | 91,588 | 72.2\% |  |  | 77,398 | 66.2\% |  |  | 65,344 | 63.8\% |  |

[^0]$3 /$ in 2000, top 10 States included lowa. In 1990, top 10 States Included lowa and Missouri.


[^0]:    1/ Ranked according to total producer milk receipts in all Federal milk order markets. $2 /$ Ranked according to total milk production in the United States.

