TABLE A--RECEIPTS OF PRODUCER MILK BY HANDLERS REGULATED UNDER FEDERAL MILK ORDERS, BY STATE OF ORIGIN, 2009

| 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 | 11,848 | 95 | 95 | Wisconsin | 22,877 | 93 | 91 |
| Pennsylvania | 9,789 | 93 | 93 | Minnesota | 7,805 | 88 | 87 |
| Vermont | 2,439 | 99 | 99 | Iowa | 3,642 | 84 | 83 |
| Maryland | 997 | 99 | 99 | South Dakota | 1,430 | 78 | 76 |
| Maine | 584 | 98 | 98 | Nebraska | 930 | 78 | 78 |
| Connecticut | 341 | 97 | 97 | North Dakota | $\underline{223}$ | 72 | 58 |
| New Hampshire | 279 | 95 | 95 | Midwest | 36,907 | 90 | 88 |
| Massachusetts | 229 | 93 | 93 |  |  |  |  |
| Other 4/ | 259 | $\underline{92}$ | $\underline{92}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Northeast | 26,766 | 95 | 95 | Colorado | 2,644 | 93 | 93 |
|  |  |  |  | Kansas | 2,256 | 91 | 91 |
|  |  |  |  | Missouri | 1,327 | 88 | 85 |
| Florida | 2,072 | 100 | 100 | Oklahoma | 626 | 62 | 62 |
| Georgia | 1,354 | 97 | 97 | Arkansas | 162 | 98 | 98 |
| Virginia | 1,334 | 77 | 77 | Central | 7,014 | 88 | 87 |
| Kentucky | 1,175 | 99 | 99 |  |  |  |  |
| Tennessee | 892 | 98 | 98 |  |  |  |  |
| North Carolina | 870 | 98 | 98 | Texas | 7,408 | 84 | 84 |
| South Carolina | 322 | 100 | 100 | New Mexico | 6,686 | 85 | 85 |
| Louisiana | 260 | 95 | 95 | Arizona | 3,917 | $\underline{96}$ | $\underline{96}$ |
| Mississippi | 245 | 98 | 98 | Southwest | 18,012 | 87 | 87 |
| Alabama | 162 | $\underline{99}$ | $\underline{99}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast | 8,686 | 94 | 94 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Washington | 5,221 | 94 | 94 |
|  |  |  |  | Oregon | 1,651 | 73 | 73 |
| Michigan | 7,770 | 98 | 98 | Idaho | 1,104 | 9 | 9 |
| Ohio | 4,735 | 95 | 91 | California | 190 | 4/ | 5/ |
| Indiana | 3,319 | 99 | 98 | Other 5/ | 88 | $\underline{3}$ | $\underline{3}$ |
| Illinois | 1,738 | 92 | 90 | West | 8,253 | 13 | 13 |
| West Virginia | 130 | 80 | 80 |  |  |  |  |
| Mideast | 17,691 | 96 | 95 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total U.S. | 123,330 | 66 | 65 |

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 - 2009 Summary", NASS, USDA. NOTE: NASS "milk marketed" includes milk sold to plants and dealers, 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). 4/ Includes data for New Jersey, Delaware, and Rhode Island for which the information is administratively confidential. 5 / Includes data for Alaska, Hawaii, 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, 2009, WITH COMPARISONS 1/

| State and Region | Number of Federal orders |  |  | State and Region | Number of Federal orders |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2009 | 2004 | 1999 |  | 2009 | 2004 | 1999 |
|  | Number |  |  |  | Number |  |  |
| Connecticut | 1 | 1 | 2 | Iowa | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| Delaware | 2 | 2 | 2 | Minnesota | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| Maine | 2 | 1 | 2 | Nebraska | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Maryland | 4 | 4 | 7 | North Dakota | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Massachusetts | 2 | 1 | 2 | South Dakota | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| New Hampshire | 1 | 1 | 1 | Wisconsin | $\underline{6}$ | $\underline{6}$ | 11 |
| New Jersey | 2 | 2 | 2 | Midwest | 6 | 6 | 15 |
| New York | 3 | 3 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Pennsylvania | 5 | 5 | 7 | Arkansas | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Rhode Island | 1 | 1 | 1 | Colorado | 3 | 6 | 12 |
| Vermont | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{2}$ | Kansas | 5 | 6 | 10 |
| Northeast | 5 | 5 | 8 | Missouri | 4 | 4 | 11 |
|  |  |  |  | Oklahoma | 7 | $\underline{5}$ | 7 |
| Alabama | 3 | 3 | 3 | Central | 7 | 8 | 19 |
| Florida | 3 | 2 | 5 |  |  |  |  |
| Georgia | 3 | 5 | 6 | Arizona | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Kentucky | 4 | 3 | 4 | New Mexico | 4 | 6 | 9 |
| Louisiana | 1 | 2 | 1 | Texas | 7 | $\underline{5}$ | 11 |
| Mississippi | 2 | 2 | 1 | Southwest | 7 | 7 | 13 |
| North Carolina | 4 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| South Carolina | 3 | 2 | 2 | Alaska | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 4 | 3 | 4 | California | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| Virginia | $\underline{5}$ | $\underline{3}$ | $\underline{5}$ | Hawaii | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southeast | 6 | 7 | 9 | Idaho | 4 | 4 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  | Montana | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Illinois | 6 | 6 | 8 | Nevada | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Indiana | 7 | 6 | 9 | Oregon | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Michigan | 7 | 7 | 10 | Utah | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| Ohio | 6 | 7 | 7 | Washington | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| West Virginia | 3 | $\underline{3}$ | $\underline{6}$ | Wyoming | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{2}$ | $\underline{2}$ |
| Mideast | 7 | 7 | 14 | West | 7 | 8 | 8 |
|  |  |  |  | Total U.S. | 10 | 11 | 31 |

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 2009. 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, 2009 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 | 5,950,398 | 100.00 | FLORIDA | 3,027,184 | 100.00 |
| Virginia | 1,094,815 | 18.40 | Florida | 2,014,352 | 66.54 |
| Indiana | 898,613 | 15.10 | Georgia | 783,586 | 25.88 |
| North Carolina | 798,978 | 13.43 | Virginia | 102,026 | 3.37 |
| Ohio | 606,280 | 10.19 | South Carolina | 51,064 | 1.69 |
| Kentucky | 530,911 | 8.92 | North Carolina | 34,531 | 1.14 |
| Tennessee | 479,121 | 8.05 | AL - IN - MI - NM - OK - PA - |  |  |
| Pennsylvania | 460,026 | 7.73 | TN - TX | 41,625 | 1.38 |
| Michigan | 298,589 | 5.02 |  |  |  |
| South Carolina | 254,486 | 4.28 |  |  |  |
| Texas | 215,606 | 3.62 |  |  |  |
| Maryland | 106,804 | 1.79 | MIDEAST | 16,597,328 | 100.00 |
| Illinois | 65,568 | 1.10 | Michigan | 7,026,612 | 42.34 |
| AL - DE - FL- GA - KS - |  |  | Ohio | 3,997,794 | 24.09 |
| NJ - NY - OK - WI - WV | 140,601 | 2.36 | Indiana | 1,734,071 | 10.45 |
|  |  |  | New York | 1,609,591 | 9.70 |
|  |  |  | Pennsylvania | 1,268,037 | 7.64 |
|  |  |  | Wisconsin | 710,872 | 4.28 |
| ARIZONA | 4,042,327 | 100.00 | IA - IL - KY - MA - MD - ME - MN - |  |  |
| Arizona | 3,828,233 | 94.70 | NC - TX - UT - VA - VT - WV | 250,352 | 1.51 |
| CA - TX | 214,094 | 5.29 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | UPPER MIDWEST | 32,170,322 | 100.00 |
| CENTRAL | 12,685,175 | 100.00 | Wisconsin | 21,687,318 | 67.41 |
| Colorado | 2,628,077 | 20.72 | Minnesota | 7,521,704 | 23.38 |
| Iowa | 2,552,067 | 20.12 | lowa | 1,067,503 | 3.32 |
| Kansas | 1,395,879 | 11.00 | South Dakota | 959,741 | 2.98 |
| New Mexico | 1,031,676 | 8.13 | Illinois | 532,051 | 1.65 |
| Illinois | 1,002,324 | 7.90 | AR - ID - IN - MI - MO - ND - |  |  |
| Nebraska | 899,705 | 7.09 | NE - OH-OK | 402,006 | 1.25 |
| Texas | 634,840 | 5.00 |  |  |  |
| Idaho | 592,000 | 4.67 |  |  |  |
| South Dakota | 469,843 | 3.70 |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | 422,091 | 3.33 |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma | 369,922 | 2.92 |  |  |  |
| Missouri | 329,117 | 2.59 |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | 279,653 | 2.20 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AR - CA - IN - KY - MI - } \\ & \text { OH - TN - UT - WY } \end{aligned}$ | 77,981 | 0.61 |  |  |  |

TABLE C--SOURCES OF MILK FOR FEDERAL MILK ORDERS: RECEIPTS OF PRODUCER MILK BY
MARKETING AREA AND STATE, 2009 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 | 7,384,547 | $\underline{100.00}$ | SOUTHWEST | 10,808,790 | $\underline{100.00}$ |
| Washington | 5,220,548 | 70.70 | New Mexico | 5,461,242 | 50.53 |
| Oregon | 1,650,724 | 22.35 | Texas | 5,020,532 | 46.45 |
| CA - ID | 513,275 | 6.95 | Kansas | 219,738 | 2.03 |
|  |  |  | AZ-CO-ID - OK - UT | 107,277 | 0.99 |
| SOUTHEAST | 7,169,318 | 100.00 |  |  |  |
| Texas | 1,473,431 | 20.55 | NORTHEAST | 23,494,743 | 100.00 |
| Missouri | 992,777 | 13.85 | New York | 10,238,636 | 43.58 |
| Kentucky | 630,040 | 8.79 | Pennsylvania | 8,057,517 | 34.29 |
| Indiana | 605,060 | 8.44 | Vermont | 2,439,311 | 10.38 |
| Kansas | 604,575 | 8.42 | Maryland | 859,240 | 3.66 |
| Georgia | 552,299 | 7.70 | Maine | 583,780 | 2.48 |
| Tennessee | 405,681 | 5.66 | Connecticut | 340,977 | 1.45 |
| Michigan | 335,682 | 4.68 | New Hampshire | 278,788 | 1.19 |
| Louisiana | 260,112 | 3.63 | AR - DE - IA - IL - IN - KS - |  |  |
| Mississippi | 244,434 | 3.41 | MA - MI - MN - MO-NJ - OH- |  |  |
| Oklahoma | 242,174 | 3.38 | OK - RI - VA - WI - WV | 696,496 | 2.96 |
| New Mexico | 192,943 | 2.69 |  |  |  |
| Alabama | 162,132 | 2.26 |  |  |  |
| Arkansas | 159,096 | 2.22 |  |  |  |
| Ohio | 78,717 | 1.10 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CO - FL - IL - MD - NC - NE - } \\ & \text { PA - SC - UT - VA - WI -WY } \end{aligned}$ | 230,164 | 3.21 |  |  |  |

$1 /$ 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 sates have been combined ito 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 D--THE TEN STATES FROM WHICH THE LARGEST VOLUME OF PRODUCER MILK WAS RECEIVED UNDER
FEDERAL MILK ORDERS, 2009, WITH COMPARISONS

| State | 2009 |  |  |  | 2004 |  |  |  | 1999 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 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 $2 /$ | 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 | 22,877 | 18.5 | 2 | 1 | 14,018 | 13.6 | 2 | 1 | 16,460 | 15.3 | 2 |
| New York | 2 | 11,848 | 9.6 | 3 | 2 | 10,637 | 10.3 | 3 | 2 | 10,638 | 8.8 | 3 |
| Pennsylvania | 3 | 9,789 | 7.9 | 5 | 3 | 9,356 | 9.1 | 4 | 3 | 9,482 | 7.5 | 4 |
| Minnesota | 4 | 7,805 | 6.3 | 6 | 7 | 4,904 | 4.8 | 8 | 4 | 8,127 | 4.9 | 5 |
| Michigan | 5 | 7,770 | 6.3 | 8 | 5 | 5,725 | 5.6 | 5 | 6 | 5,220 | 4.6 | 9 |
| Texas | 6 | 7,408 | 6.0 | 7 | 4 | 8,855 | 5.7 | 7 | 5 | 5,284 | 4.8 | 7 |
| New Mexico | 7 | 6,686 | 5.4 | 9 | 6 | 5,271 | 5.1 | 11 | 9 | 3,547 | 2.7 | 10 |
| Washington | 8 | 5,221 | 4.2 | 10 | 8 | 4,714 | 4.6 | 9 | 7 | 4,969 | 3.4 | 8 |
| Ohio | 9 | 4,735 | 3.8 | 11 | 9 | 3,863 | 3.7 | 10 | 8 | 3,711 | 3.3 | 11 |
| Arizona | 10 | 3,917 | 3.2 | 13 | 10 | 3,050 | 3.0 | 13 | 12 | 2,697 | 2.2 | 13 |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Total Top Ten } \\ 3 / \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | 82,177 | 71.4 |  |  | 67,393 | 65.4 |  |  | 75,837 | 70.3 |  |

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.

