

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
	<u>Million pounds</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>		<u>Million pounds</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
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	Iowa	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	<u>North Dakota</u>	<u>270</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>70</u>
New Hampshire	283	95	95	Midwest	39,180	94	91
Massachusetts	226	93	93				
<u>Other 4/</u>	<u>229</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>92</u>	Colorado	2,680	95	95
Northeast	27,279	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	<u>Arkansas</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>52</u>
Virginia	1,228	71	71	Central	6,875	88	87
Kentucky	1,139	98	98				
North Carolina	857	99	99	Texas	7,371	83	83
Tennessee	832	98	98	New Mexico	7,263	92	92
South Carolina	282	99	99	<u>Arizona</u>	<u>4,131</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Louisiana	226	96	96	Southwest	18,765	90	90
Mississippi	219	98	98				
<u>Alabama</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>96</u>	Washington	5,765	98	98
Southeast	8,392	93	93	Oregon	2,119	88	88
				Idaho	654	5	5
Michigan	7,872	95	95	California	280	1	1
Ohio	4,583	91	87	<u>Other 5/</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
Indiana	3,245	95	95	West	8,913	14	14
Illinois	1,701	91	89				
<u>West Virginia</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>71</u>				
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 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, 2010, WITH COMPARISONS 1/

State and Region	Number of Federal orders			State and Region	Number of Federal orders		
	2010	2005	2000		2010	2005	2000
	<u>Number</u>				<u>Number</u>		
Maine	1	1	1	Wisconsin	6	6	6
New Hampshire	1	1	1	Minnesota	6	4	5
Vermont	1	1	1	North Dakota	2	2	2
Massachusetts	2	1	1	South Dakota	2	2	3
Rhode Island	1	1	1	Iowa	5	4	4
Connecticut	1	1	1	<u>Nebraska</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
New York	4	2	4	Midwest	7	6	7
New Jersey	2	1	2				
Pennsylvania	4	5	4	Missouri	5	6	4
Delaware	2	2	3	Kansas	5	4	5
<u>Maryland</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	Colorado	1	2	2
Northeast	4	5	4	Oklahoma	4	5	4
				<u>Arkansas</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
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	<u>Arizona</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
Alabama	3	3	2	Southwest	7	6	5
Mississippi	2	3	1				
Louisiana	1	3	1	Montana	0	1	1
Tennessee	4	3	3	Idaho	4	3	5
<u>Kentucky</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	Wyoming	1	1	2
Southeast	6	6	5	Utah	4	3	5
				Nevada	0	2	3
Ohio	6	7	3	Washington	1	1	1
Indiana	7	7	5	Oregon	1	3	2
Illinois	6	5	5	<u>California</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>
Michigan	7	7	5	West	7	7	6
<u>West Virginia</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>				
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 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
	<u>1,000 lbs.</u>	<u>Percent</u>		<u>1,000 lbs.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
APPALACHIAN	6,041,864	100.00	FLORIDA	2,901,758	100.00
Virginia	999,272	16.54	Florida	1,919,588	66.15
Indiana	772,619	12.79	Georgia	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
Illinois	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 -			Indiana	1,600,566	9.98
NM - NJ - NY - OK - WI - WV	242,416	4.01	New York	1,384,615	8.64
			Pennsylvania	1,284,894	8.01
			Wisconsin	1,010,916	6.31
			FL - GA - IA - IL - KY - MA - MD -		
			MN - MO - NC - TX - UT -		
			VA - WV	273,919	1.71
ARIZONA	4,231,673	100.00			
Arizona	4,008,804	94.73			
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
Iowa	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			
AR - CA - IN - KY - MI - MO					
OH - TN - UT - WY	428,469	3.21			

CONTINUED

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/	Producer milk receipts		Federal milk marketing area and State 2/	Producer milk receipts	
	Total	Share of		Total	Share of market
	<u>1,000 lbs.</u>	<u>Percent</u>		<u>1,000 lbs.</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>PACIFIC NORTHWEST</u>	<u>8,005,861</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>SOUTHWEST</u>	<u>11,210,050</u>	<u>100.00</u>
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
<u>SOUTHEAST</u>	<u>7,001,124</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>UPPER MIDWEST</u>	<u>33,804,144</u>	<u>100.00</u>
Texas	1,394,421	19.92	Wisconsin	22,462,589	66.45
Missouri	917,485	13.10	Minnesota	8,198,214	24.25
Indiana	748,263	10.69	South Dakota	1,142,187	3.38
Kentucky	598,359	8.55	Iowa	1,017,040	3.01
Kansas	574,895	8.21	Illinois	522,982	1.55
Georgia	543,853	7.77	ID - IN - MI - MO - ND - VA	461,132	1.36
Tennessee	383,512	5.48			
Michigan	276,635	3.95			
Oklahoma	239,451	3.42			
Louisiana	226,314	3.23			
Mississippi	218,982	3.13			
Florida	170,254	2.43			
Alabama	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			
CA - IA - MD - MN - NC - NY -					
PA - SC - UT - VA - WI - WV	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 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 D--THE TEN STATES FROM WHICH THE LARGEST VOLUME OF PRODUCER MILK 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 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	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
Total Top Ten 3/		91,588	72.2%			77,398	66.2%			65,344	63.8%	

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.

3/ In 2000, top 10 States included Iowa. In 1990, top 10 States included Iowa and Missouri.