Forty-five of the fifty states marketed some milk under Federal milk marketing orders in 2012. Thirty-seven states marketed $70 \%$ or more of their milk marketings under Federal milk marketing orders with four of those thirty-seven states marketing about $100 \%$ of their milk marketings under Federal milk marketing orders: Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, and North Carolina.

Four states marketed very small amounts of producer milk under Federal milk marketing orders: California (0.4\%), Idaho (2.1\%), Montana (0.2\%) and Utah (5.4\%) while three states did not market any milk under federal milk marketing orders: Alaska, Hawaii, 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:

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

The ten Federal milk marketing orders received producer milk from the following numbers of states in 2012:

- Southeast - 22 states
- Central - 22 states
- Appalachian - 20 states
- Northeast - 18 states
- Mideast - 18 states
- Upper Midwest - 14 states
- Florida - 10 states
- Southwest - 9 states
- Pacific Northwest - 5 states
- Arizona - 3 states

TABLE A--RECEIPTS OF PRODUCER MILK BY HANDLERS REGULATED UNDER FEDERAL MILK ORDERS, BY STATE OF ORIGIN, 2012

| 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 | 12,707 97 97 Wisconsin    <br>  22,425 85 83    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pennsylvania | 9,568 92 92 |  |  | Minnesota | 7,006 | 79 | 78 |
| Vermont | 2,538 9909 |  |  | lowa | 3,660 | 84 | 83 |
| Maryland | 972100 |  |  | South Dakota | 1,329 | 69 | 68 |
| Maine | 599 98 98 |  |  | Nebraska | 919 | 79 | 78 |
| Connecticut | 3469797 |  |  | North Dakota | 187 | $\underline{59}$ | $\underline{55}$ |
| New Hampshire | 263 96 96 |  |  | Midwest | 35,525 | 82 | 81 |
| Massachusetts | 2059494 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Jersey | 1199393 |  |  | Colorado | 3,024 | 95 | 95 |
| Delaware | 9097 |  |  | Kansas | 2,293 | 84 | 84 |
| Rhode Island | 13 | $\underline{73}$ |  | Missouri | 1,229 | 92 | 89 |
| Northeast | 27,419 | 95 | 95 | Oklahoma | 711 | 85 | 85 |
|  |  |  |  | Arkansas | 130 | $\underline{99}$ | $\underline{99}$ |
| Florida | 2,327 | 100 | 100 | Central | 7,387 | 90 | 89 |
| Georgia | 1,477 | 97 | 97 |  |  |  |  |
| Virginia | 1,309 | 76 | 76 | Texas | 8,003 | 84 | 84 |
| Kentucky | 1,108 | 100 | 100 | New Mexico | 5,032 | 62 | 62 |
| North Carolina | 930 | 100 | 100 | Arizona | 4,419 | $\underline{98}$ | $\underline{98}$ |
| Tennessee | 791 | 99 | 99 | Southwest | 17,453 | 79 | 79 |
| South Carolina | 273 | 99 | 99 |  |  |  |  |
| Louisiana | 216 | 99 | 99 | Washington | 5,151 | 83 | 83 |
| Mississippi | 196 | 99 | 99 | Oregon | 1,501 | 60 | 60 |
| Alabama | 127 | $\underline{97}$ | $\underline{97}$ | Idaho | 282 | 2 | 2 |
| Southeast | 8,753 | 95 | 95 | California | 170 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  | Utah | 105 | 5 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  | Wyoming | 79 | 72 | 64 |
| Michigan | 8,346 | 94 | 94 | Montana | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Ohio | 4,687 | 91 | 88 | Alaska | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Indiana | 3,626 | 99 | 98 | Hawaii | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Illinois | 1,744 | 92 | 90 | Nevada | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{0}$ |
| West Virginia | 107 | $\underline{69}$ | $\underline{69}$ | West | 7,289 | 11 | 11 |
| Mideast | 18,510 | 94 | 93 | Total U.S. | 122,336 | 62 | 61 |

1/ The source of the receipt is based on 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 - 2012 Summary", NASS, USDA. NOTE: Total milk marketed includes milk sold to plants and dealers as whole milk and equivalent amounts of milk for cream, milk produced by dealers' own herds, milk sold directly to consumers, and milk produced by institutional herds. $3 /$ Milk marketed that is eligible for fluid use (Grade A in most States). Table Contact: Randal Stoker, randal.stoker@usda.gov or 202-690-1932

TABLE B--NUMBER OF FEDERAL ORDERS UNDER WHICH MILK WAS MARKETED, BY STATE AND REGION, 2012, WITH COMPARISONS 1/

| State and Region | Number of Federal orders |  |  | State and Region | Number of Federal orders |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2012 | 2007 | 2002 |  | 2012 | 2007 | 2002 |
|  | Number |  |  |  | Number |  |  |
| Connecticut | 1 | 1 | 1 | Iowa | 4 | 6 | 4 |
| Delaware | 1 | 2 | 3 | Minnesota | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Maine | 1 | 1 | 1 | Nebraska | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Maryland | 3 | 4 | 4 | North Dakota | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Massachusetts | 2 | 1 | 1 | South Dakota | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| New Hampshire | 1 | 1 | 1 | Wisconsin | $\underline{5}$ | $\underline{6}$ | 7 |
| New Jersey | 1 | 1 | 2 | Midwest | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| New York | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Pennsylvania | 3 | 5 | 4 | Arkansas | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Rhode Island | 1 | 1 | 1 | Colorado | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Vermont | 1 | 1 | $\underline{1}$ | Kansas | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Northeast | 3 | 5 | 4 | Missouri | 5 | 5 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  | Oklahoma | 4 | $\underline{6}$ | 4 |
| Alabama | 2 | 2 | 3 | Central | 6 | 7 | 6 |
| Florida | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Georgia | 3 | 3 | 3 | Arizona | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Kentucky | 5 | 4 | 5 | New Mexico | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Louisiana | 1 | 3 | 2 | Texas | 7 | 5 | 4 |
| Mississippi | 1 | 3 | 1 | Southwest | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| North Carolina | 5 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| South Carolina | 3 | 3 | 3 | Alaska | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 3 | 6 | 3 | California | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Virginia | $\underline{5}$ | $\underline{5}$ | $\underline{2}$ | Hawaii | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeast | 5 | 7 | 7 | Idaho | 4 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  | Montana | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Illinois | 5 | 6 | 5 | Nevada | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Indiana | 7 | 7 | 5 | Oregon | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Michigan | 7 | 7 | 6 | Utah | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Ohio | 7 | 6 | 5 | Washington | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| West Virginia | 4 | $\underline{3}$ | 3 | Wyoming | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Mideast | 7 | 7 | 6 | West | 6 | 6 | 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 2012. The regional figure is the net number of orders under which the milk produced by dairy farmers located in the region was marketed to Federally regulated handlers. Table Contact: Randal Stoker: randal.stoker@usda.gov or 202-690-1932.

TABLE C--SOURCES OF MILK FOR FEDERAL MILK ORDERS: RECEIPTS OF PRODUCER MILK BY MARKETING AREA AND STATE, 2012 1/

| 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 |
| APPALACHIAN | 5,862,598 | 100.00 | FLORIDA | 2,889,842 | 100.00 |
| Virginia | 1,082,875 | 18.47 | Florida | 2,092,287 | 72.40 |
| Indiana | 999,822 | 17.05 | Georgia | 745,014 | 25.78 |
| North Carolina | 845,272 | 14.42 | SC - TX - OH - NC - VA - AL |  |  |
| Kentucky | 477,365 | 8.14 | IN - MI | 52,541 | 1.82 |
| Ohio | 462,303 | 7.89 |  |  |  |
| Tennessee | 460,427 | 7.85 |  |  |  |
| Pennsylvania | 373,761 | 6.38 |  |  |  |
| Michigan | 326,806 | 5.57 |  |  |  |
| South Carolina | 255,819 | 4.36 | MIDEAST | 16,804,999 | 100.00 |
| Texas | 131,473 | 2.24 | Michigan | 7,627,372 | 45.39 |
| Illinois | 94,491 | 1.61 | Ohio | 3,907,697 | 23.25 |
| New Mexico | 93,408 | 1.59 | Indiana | 2,083,996 | 12.40 |
| Maryland | 82,485 | 1.41 | New York | 1,367,979 | 8.14 |
| KS - WV - WI - GA - IA - NY - FL | 176,292 | 3.01 | Pennsylvania | 1,109,876 | 6.60 |
|  |  |  | Wisconsin | 501,811 | 2.99 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IL - VA - WV - MD - IA - MA } \\ & \text { KY - MN - NC - NM - MO - TX } \end{aligned}$ | 206,268 | 1.23 |
| ARIZONA | 4,555,678 | 100.00 |  |  |  |
| Arizona | 4,367,253 | 95.86 |  |  |  |
| CA - TX | 188,426 | 4.14 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | NORTHEAST | 24,695,080 | 100.00 |
|  |  |  | New York | 11,335,929 | 45.90 |
|  |  |  | Pennsylvania | 8,083,904 | 32.73 |
|  |  |  | Vermont | 2,538,160 | 10.28 |
| CENTRAL | 13,388,598 | 100.00 | Maryland | 860,449 | 3.48 |
| Colorado | 3,023,570 | 22.58 | Maine | 599,451 | 2.43 |
| Iowa | 2,887,737 | 21.57 | Connecticut | 345,621 | 1.40 |
| Kansas | 1,621,372 | 12.11 | New Hampshire | 262,762 | 1.06 |
| Illinois | 970,128 | 7.25 | MA - NJ - DE - MI - VA - OH |  |  |
| Nebraska | 852,448 | 6.37 | WV - RI-IN - KY - NC | 668,804 | 2.71 |
| Texas | 844,163 | 6.31 |  |  |  |
| New Mexico | 668,340 | 4.99 |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | 490,656 | 3.66 |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma | 487,210 | 3.64 | PACIFIC NORTHWEST | 6,676,958 | 100.00 |
| South Dakota | 477,780 | 3.57 | Washington | 5,150,881 | 77.14 |
| Missouri | 386,366 | 2.89 | Oregon | 1,500,663 | 22.48 |
| Idaho | 257,375 | 1.92 | CA - ID - UT | 25,413 | 0.38 |
| Minnesota | 215,748 | 1.61 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { UT - WY - TN - MI - IN - OH - KY } \\ & \text { MT - AR } \end{aligned}$ | 205,707 | 1.54 |  |  |  |

TABLE C--SOURCES OF MILK FOR FEDERAL MILK ORDERS: RECEIPTS OF PRODUCER MILK BY MARKETING AREA AND STATE, 2012 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 |
| SOUTHEAST | 6,793,557 | 100.00 | SOUTHWEST | 9,994,237 | 100.00 |
| Texas | 1,438,013 | 21.17 | Texas | 5,539,917 | 55.43 |
| Missouri | 828,996 | 12.20 | New Mexico | 4,191,354 | 41.94 |
| Georgia | 693,663 | 10.21 | KS - AZ - OK - ID - MO - |  |  |
| Kentucky | 615,451 | 9.06 | CO-MN | 262,966 | 2.63 |
| Indiana | 475,211 | 7.00 |  |  |  |
| Kansas | 468,611 | 6.90 |  |  |  |
| Tennessee | 323,681 | 4.76 |  |  |  |
| Ohio | 239,761 | 3.53 |  |  |  |
| Florida | 233,647 | 3.44 | UPPER MIDWEST | 30,674,464 | 100.00 |
| Louisiana | 215,950 | 3.18 | Wisconsin | 21,347,581 | 69.59 |
| Michigan | 208,724 | 3.07 | Minnesota | 6,783,963 | 22.12 |
| Mississippi | 196,061 | 2.89 | South Dakota | 850,849 | 2.77 |
| Oklahoma | 177,658 | 2.62 | Iowa | 751,410 | 2.45 |
| Arkansas | 129,984 | 1.91 | Illinois | 517,608 | 1.69 |
| Alabama | 124,468 | 1.83 | ND - MI - NE - IN - ID - MO |  |  |
| Illinois | 112,329 | 1.65 | KS - OK - OH | 423,054 | 1.38 |
| Virginia | 110,982 | 1.63 |  |  |  |
| NM - NC - WI - CA - WV - SC | 200,366 | 2.95 |  |  |  |

$1 /$ 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 protect confidentiality. 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 Contact: Randal Stoker, randal.stoker@usda.gov or 202-690-1932.

TABLE D--THE TEN STATES FROM WHICH THE LARGEST VOLUME OF PRODUCER MILK WAS RECEIVED UNDER
FEDERAL MILK ORDERS, 2012, WITH COMPARISON

| State | 2012 |  |  |  | 2002 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Federal milk order rank 1/ | Producer milk receipts in all Federal orders |  | United 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 |  |
| Wisconsin | 1 | 22,425 | 18.3\% | 2 | 1 | 20,296 | 14.2\% | 2 |
| New York | 2 | 12,707 | 10.4\% | 4 | 2 | 11,623 | 8.1\% | 3 |
| Pennsylvania | 3 | 9,568 | 7.8\% | 5 | 3 | 10,135 | 7.1\% | 4 |
| Michigan | 4 | 8,346 | 6.8\% | 8 | 6 | 5,743 | 4.0\% | 8 |
| Texas | 5 | 7,999 | 6.5\% | 6 | 8 | 5,225 | 3.7\% | 10 |
| Minnesota | 6 | 7,006 | 5.7\% | 7 | 4 | 7,572 | 5.3\% | 5 |
| Washington | 7 | 5,151 | 4.2\% | 10 | 7 | 5,384 | 3.8\% | 9 |
| New Mexico | 8 | 5,032 | 4.1\% | 9 | 5 | 6,166 | 4.3\% | 7 |
| Ohio | 9 | 4,687 | 3.8\% | 11 | 10 | 4,018 | 2.8\% | 11 |
| Arizona | 10 | 4,419 | 3.6\% | 12 | 13 | 3,013 | 2.1\% | 13 |
| Total Top Ten $/ 3$ |  | 87,339 | 71.4\% |  |  | 81,001 | 56.6\% |  |

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. 3/ In 2002, top 10 States included Idaho.
Table Contact: Randal Stoker, randal.stoker@usda.gov or 202-690-1932.

