## Producer Milk Marketed under Federal Milk Orders by State of Origin - 2014

Sixty-three percent of the 2014 U.S. milk production sold to milk dealers was marketed under Federal milk marketing orders in 2014.

Forty-six of the fifty states marketed some milk under Federal milk marketing orders in 2014. Thirty-six states marketed $70 \%$ or more of their milk marketings under Federal milk marketing orders. Thirteen states marketed $98 \%$ or more of their milk marketings under Federal milk marketing orders: Maryland and South Carolina (100\%); Florida, North Carolina, Vermont, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Mississippi (all 99\%); Delaware, Maine, Arizona, Arkansas, and Tennessee (all 98\%).

Three states marketed very small amounts of producer milk under Federal milk marketing orders: California ( $0.5 \%$ ), Idaho ( $0.7 \%$ ), and Utah ( $0.1 \%$ ) while four states did not market any milk under federal milk marketing orders: Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, and Nevada.

States marketing milk under Federal milk marketing orders varied from marketing milk under as many as seven different milk marketing orders to as few as a single milk marketing order area as follows:

- States marketing milk into 7 different Federal milk marketing orders include: Indiana, Ohio, and Texas.
- States marketing milk into 6 different Federal milk marketing orders include: Kentucky, Michigan, Missouri, and Wisconsin.
- States marketing milk into 5 different Federal milk marketing orders include: Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, New Mexico, and Oklahoma.
- States marketing milk into 4 different Federal milk marketing orders include: Arkansas, Maryland, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia.
- States marketing milk into 3 different Federal milk marketing orders include: California, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, New York, South Carolina, and West Virginia.
- States marketing milk into 2 different Federal milk marketing orders include: Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Utah.
- States marketing milk into a single Federal milk marketing order include: Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, and Wyoming.

The ten Federal milk marketing orders received producer milk from the following numbers of states in 2014:

- Southeast and Appalachian - 23 states
- Central - 22 states
- Northeast - 20 states
- Mideast - 19 states
- Upper Midwest - 17 states
- Southwest - 10 states
- Florida - 8 states
- Pacific Northwest - 5 states
- Arizona - 3 states

TABLE A--RECEIPTS OF PRODUCER MILK BY HANDLERS REGULATED UNDER FEDERAL MILK ORDERS, 2014, WITH COMPARISONS

| State and Region | 2014 |  |  | 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 | 13,220 | 97 | 97 | Wisconsin | 23,856 | 88 | 87 |
| Pennsylvania | 9,910 | 93 | 93 | Minnesota | 7,712 | 86 | 85 |
| Vermont | 2,636 | 99 | 99 | Iowa | 3,910 | 85 | 84 |
| Maryland | 980 | 100 | 100 | South Dakota | 1,636 | 79 | 78 |
| Maine | 587 | 98 | 98 | Nebraska | 821 | 69 | 69 |
| Connecticut | 371 | 98 | 98 | North Dakota | $\underline{206}$ | $\underline{67}$ | $\underline{65}$ |
| New Hampshire | 269 | 96 | 96 | Midwest | 38,140 | 86 | 85 |
| Massachusetts | 219 | 95 | 95 |  |  |  |  |
| New Jersey | 115 | 92 | 92 |  |  |  |  |
| Delaware | 94 | 98 | 98 | Colorado | 3,466 | 97 | 97 |
| Rhode Island | $\underline{12}$ | $\underline{70}$ | $\underline{70}$ | Kansas | 2,475 | 80 | 80 |
| Northeast | 28,411 | 96 | 96 | Missouri | 1,195 | 90 | 88 |
|  |  |  |  | Oklahoma | 644 | 93 | 93 |
|  |  |  |  | Arkansas | $\underline{93}$ | $\underline{99}$ | $\underline{99}$ |
| Florida | 2,497 | 100 | 100 | Central | 7,872 | 90 | 89 |
| Georgia | 1,629 | 97 | 97 |  |  |  |  |
| Virginia | 1,371 | 77 | 77 |  |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | 990 | 100 | 100 | Washington | 5,983 | 91 | 91 |
| North Carolina | 952 | 100 | 100 | Oregon | 1,846 | 73 | 73 |
| Tennessee | 736 | 99 | 99 | California | 204 | 0 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 259 | 100 | 100 | Idaho | 103 | 1 | 1 |
| Louisiana | 198 | 99 | 99 | Wyoming | 89 | 69 | 69 |
| Mississippi | 185 | 99 | 99 | Utah | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Alabama | 105 | $\underline{98}$ | $\underline{98}$ | Alaska | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeast | 8,923 | 95 | 95 | Hawaii | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | Montana | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Michigan | 8,124 | 85 | 85 | Nevada | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ |
| Ohio | 4,983 | 95 | 92 | West | 8,227 | 12 | 12 |
| Indiana | 3,473 | 90 | 90 |  |  |  |  |
| Illinois | 1,717 | 95 | 93 |  |  |  |  |
| West Virginia | 103 | $\underline{75}$ | $\underline{75}$ | Total U.S. | 129,379 | 63 | 63 |
| Mideast | 18,399 | 89 | 88 |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ 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 - 2014 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).

TABLE B--NUMBER OF FEDERAL ORDERS UNDER WHICH MILK WAS MARKETED 2014, WITH COMPARISONS

| State and Region | Number of Federal Orders ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | State and Region | Number of Federal Orders ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2014 | 2009 | 2004 |  | 2014 | 2009 | 2004 |
|  | Number |  |  |  | Number |  |  |
| Maine | 1 | 2 | 1 | Wisconsin | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| New Hampshire | 1 | 1 | 1 | Minnesota | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Vermont | 1 | 2 | 2 | North Dakota | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Massachusetts | 2 | 2 | 1 | South Dakota | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Rhode Island | 1 | 1 | 1 | Iowa | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Connecticut | 1 | 1 | 1 | Nebraska | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{3}$ | $\underline{2}$ |
| New York | 3 | 3 | 3 | Midwest | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| New Jersey | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Pennsylvania | 4 | 5 | 5 | Missouri | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Delaware | 2 | 2 | 2 | Kansas | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| Maryland | 4 | 4 | 4 | Colorado | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| Northeast | 4 | 5 | 5 | Oklahoma | 5 | 7 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  | Arkansas | $\underline{4}$ | $\underline{4}$ | $\underline{3}$ |
| Virginia | 4 | 5 | 3 | Central | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| North Carolina | 4 | 4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| South Carolina | 3 | 3 | 2 | Texas | 7 | 7 | 5 |
| Georgia | 3 | 3 | 5 | New Mexico | 5 | 4 | 6 |
| Florida | 3 | 3 | 2 | Arizona | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{3}$ |
| Alabama | 2 | 3 | 3 | Southwest | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Mississippi | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Louisiana | 2 | 1 | 2 | Montana | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Tennessee | 4 | 4 | 3 | Idaho | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Kentucky | $\underline{6}$ | 4 | $\underline{3}$ | Wyoming | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Southeast | 6 | 5 | 7 | Utah | 2 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  | Nevada | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Ohio | 7 | 6 | 7 | Washington | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Indiana | 7 | 7 | 6 | Oregon | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Illinois | 5 | 6 | 6 | California | $\underline{3}$ | $\underline{3}$ | $\underline{5}$ |
| Michigan | 6 | 7 | 7 | West | 5 | 7 | 8 |
| West Virginia | $\underline{3}$ | $\underline{3}$ | $\underline{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 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 2014. 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
FEDERAL MILK ORDERS, 2014, WITH COMPARISONS


TABLE C--SOURCES OF MILK FOR FEDERAL MILK ORDERS: RECEIPTS OF PRODUCER MILK BY
MARKETING AREA AND STATE, $2014{ }^{1}$ Cont.

| Federal milk marketing area and State ${ }^{2}$ | Producer milk receipts |  | Federal milk marketing area and State ${ }^{2}$ | Producer milk receipts |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Share of market total |  | Total | Share of market total |
|  | 1,000 lbs. | Percent |  | 1,000 lbs. | Percent |
| PACIFIC NORTHWEST | 7,856,958 | 100.0 | SOUTHWEST | 12,137,143 | 100.0 |
| Washington | 5,983,192 | 76.2 | Texas | 6,857,751 | 56.5 |
| Oregon | 1,845,642 | 23.5 | New Mexico | 4,869,901 | 40.1 |
| CA, ID, UT | 15,627 | 0.2 | Kansas | 194,328 | 1.6 |
|  |  |  | Oklahoma | 108,773 | 0.9 |
|  |  |  | AZ, ID, AR, LA, MO, CO | 99,638 | 0.8 |
| SOUTHEAST | 5,288,969 | 100.0 |  |  |  |
| Georgia | 966,048 | 18.3 |  |  |  |
| Missouri | 722,877 | 13.7 | UPPER MIDWEST | 32,777,104 | 100.0 |
| TX, NM | 517,211 | 9.8 | Wisconsin | 22,411,658 | 68.4 |
| Kentucky | 450,125 | 8.5 | Minnesota | 7,337,442 | 22.4 |
| Indiana | 437,642 | 8.3 | South Dakota | 1,065,427 | 3.3 |
| Kansas | 392,962 | 7.4 | Iowa | 903,794 | 2.8 |
| Tennessee | 287,579 | 5.4 | Illinois | 467,135 | 1.4 |
| Louisiana | 196,834 | 3.7 | Michigan | 231,723 | 0.7 |
| Florida | 195,106 | 3.7 | North Dakota | 205,652 | 0.6 |
| Mississippi | 184,558 | 3.5 | Indiana | 84,216 | 0.3 |
| OH, MI | 154,746 | 2.9 | Idaho | 44,143 | 0.1 |
| Illinois | 144,199 | 2.7 | NE, TX, OH, MO, KS, NM, OK, KY | 19,473 | 0.1 |
| Alabama | 105,290 | 2.0 |  |  |  |
| NC, VA | 101,662 | 1.9 |  |  |  |
| OK, AR | 100,610 | 1.9 |  |  |  |
| PA, WI, SC, MD | 85,192 | 0.7 |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ The source of the receipt is based on the location of the producer, not the location of the regulated handler. Marketing area totals may not add due to rounding.
${ }^{2}$ For some marketing areas, receipts from some States have been combined in order to mask either administratively confidential data or small volumes. 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 MILK WAS RECEIVED UNDER FEDERAL MILK ORDERS, 2014, WITH COMPARISONS

| State | 2014 |  |  |  | 2009 |  |  |  | 2004 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Federal milk order rank ${ }^{1}$ | Producer milk receipts in all Federal orders |  | United <br> States <br> rank ${ }^{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Federal } \\ \text { milk } \\ \text { order } \\ \text { rank }^{1} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Producer milk receipts in all Federal orders |  | United <br> States <br> rank ${ }^{2}$ | Federal milk order rank ${ }^{1}$ | Producer milk receipts in all Federal orders |  | United <br> States <br> rank ${ }^{2}$ |
|  |  | Million pounds | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent of } \\ \text { total } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Million pounds | Percent of total |  |  | Million pounds | Percent of total |  |
| Wisconsin | 1 | 23,856 | 18.4\% | 2 | 1 | 22,877 | 18.5\% | 2 | 1 | 14,018 | 13.6\% | 2 |
| New York | 2 | 13,220 | 10.2\% | 4 | 2 | 11,848 | 9.6\% | 3 | 2 | 10,637 | 10.3\% | 3 |
| Pennsylvania | 3 | 9,910 | 7.7\% | 5 | 3 | 9,789 | 7.9\% | 5 | 3 | 9,309 | 9.0\% | 4 |
| Texas | 4 | 8,939 | 6.9\% | 6 | 6 | 7,408 | 6.0\% | 7 | 4 | 5,855 | 5.7\% | 9 |
| Michigan | 5 | 8,124 | 6.3\% | 7 | 5 | 7,770 | 6.3\% | 8 | 5 | 5,725 | 5.5\% | 8 |
| Minnesota | 6 | 7,712 | 6.0\% | 8 | 4 | 7,805 | 6.3\% | 6 | 7 | 4,904 | 4.7\% | 6 |
| Washington | 7 | 5,983 | 4.6\% | 10 | 8 | 5,221 | 4.2\% | 10 | 8 | 4,714 | 4.6\% | 10 |
| New Mexico | 8 | 5,840 | 4.5\% | 9 | 7 | 6,686 | 5.4\% | 9 | 6 | 5,271 | 5.1\% | 7 |
| Ohio | 9 | 4,983 | 3.9\% | 11 | 9 | 4,735 | 3.8\% | 11 | 9 | 3,863 | 3.7\% | 11 |
| Arizona | 10 | 4,627 | 3.6\% | 12 | 10 | 3,917 | 3.2\% | 13 | 10 | 3,050 | 3.0\% | 13 |
| Total Top Ten |  | 93,193 | 72.0\% |  |  | 88,056 | 71.4\% |  |  | 67,347 | 65.2\% |  |
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Ranked according to total producer milk receipts in all Federal milk order markets.
    ${ }^{2}$ Ranked according to total milk marketed in the United States. In 2014, California ranked \#1 and Idaho ranked \#3. In 2009, California ranked \#1 and Idaho ranked \#4. In 2004, California ranked \#1 and Idaho ranked \#5.

