

# CRS Report for Congress

## Dairy Policy Issues

Updated May 2, 2007

Ralph M. Chite  
Specialist in Agricultural Policy  
Resources, Science, and Industry Division



Prepared for Members and  
Committees of Congress

# Dairy Policy Issues

## Summary

Two federal programs that support the price and income received by dairy farmers are expiring in 2007 — the dairy price support program and the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) program. The reauthorization of these and other farm commodity price and income support programs is being debated by the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress in the context of a pending omnibus 2007 farm bill.

The MILC program allows participating dairy farmers to receive a government payment when the farm price of milk used for fluid consumption falls below an established target price. The MILC program is generally supported by milk producer groups in the Northeast and the Upper Midwest. Large farmers, particularly in the West, contend that the program payment limit is biased against them. In its original authorization in the 2002 farm bill (P.L. 107-171), the MILC program was scheduled to expire in 2005. However, the FY2006 budget reconciliation act (P.L. 109-171) extended MILC program authority for two years, through September 30, 2007. As a cost-saving measure, P.L. 109-171 prohibits any MILC payments for the last month (September 2007). Under budget rules, this means that the program will have no baseline budget spending allocated to it beyond its expiration date. The conference agreement on the FY2007 supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 1591), which was vetoed by the President on May 1, 2007, would have amended the authorizing statute to allow MILC payments to be made in September 2007, thus creating baseline beyond its expiration date. A similar provision could be included in a future compromise supplemental measure.

The dairy price support program indirectly supports the farm price of milk at \$9.90 per hundredweight (cwt.) until December 31, 2007, through government purchases of surplus dairy products from dairy processors. In order to achieve the support price, USDA has a standing offer to dairy processors to purchase surplus manufactured dairy products at stated prices. Consequently, the government purchase prices usually serve as a floor for the market price of these products, which in turn indirectly supports the farm price of milk at \$9.90 per cwt. Government purchases and costs have been relatively small in recent years. Most dairy farm groups view the program as a necessary safety net in a market that is frequently characterized by volatile prices. Dairy processors consider the price support and MILC programs to operate at cross-purposes, which they say contributes to surplus milk production. Others are concerned that dairy support might have to be modified in order to comply with our trade obligations in the World Trade Organization.

On January 31, 2007, the Administration released a comprehensive 2007 farm bill proposal that included recommendations for both the dairy price support program and the MILC program. The Administration supports the extension of the price support program at the current level of \$9.90 per cwt., viewing the program as a low-cost stabilizing influence on farm milk prices. It also supports a continuation of MILC payments at the current target price of \$16.94 per cwt. In order to defray the cost of MILC program extension, the Administration recommends that the payment rate be gradually reduced over a five-year period. Annual payments to any producer would continue to be restricted to 2.4 million lbs. under the proposal.

## Contents

Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) Payments .....	1
Background .....	1
MILC Program Mechanics .....	1
MILC Payment History .....	2
Federal Cost of MILC .....	3
MILC Issues in the 2007 Farm Bill .....	5
Funding .....	5
MILC Provisions in the Vetoed FY2007 Supplemental .....	5
Administration's Farm Bill Proposal .....	5
Regional Issues .....	6
Dairy Price Support Program .....	6
Farm Bill Issues .....	7
Federal Milk Marketing Orders .....	9
Background .....	9
Milk Regulatory Equity Act (P.L. 109-215, S. 2120) .....	9
Regulation of Certain Interstate Milk Shipments .....	10
Producer-Handler Exemption .....	10
Nevada Exclusion from Federal Milk Marketing Orders .....	11

## List of Tables

Table 1. Monthly Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) Payment Rates .....	3
Table 2. MILC Payments Ranked by State, FY2003-FY2007 .....	4
Table 3. Dairy Price Support Purchases and Costs, 1980/81-2006/07 .....	8

# Dairy Policy Issues

## Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) Payments

### Background

In FY1999-FY2001, Congress provided just over \$32.5 billion in emergency spending for USDA programs, primarily to help farmers recover from low farm commodity prices and natural disasters. The majority of these funds were for supplemental direct farm payments made to producers of certain commodities, primarily grains and cotton, but also including soybeans, peanuts, tobacco, and milk. Of this amount, dairy farmers received supplemental “market loss” payments of \$200 million in FY1999 under the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (P.L. 105-277), \$125 million under the FY2000 agriculture appropriations act (P.L. 106-78), and \$675 million under the emergency provisions in the FY2001 agriculture appropriations act (P.L. 106-387).

Some dairy farmer groups sought a permanent direct payment program for dairy farmers to be included in the 2002 farm bill as a means of supplementing dairy farm income when farm milk prices are low. Prior to the emergency payments made each year on an ad-hoc basis in FY1999 through FY2001, dairy farmers generally were not recipients of direct government payments. However, some groups contended that farm milk prices had been volatile in recent years and that dairy farmers needed more income stability.

Separately, the Northeast Dairy Compact, which provided price premiums to New England dairy farmers when market prices fell below a certain level, expired on September 30, 2001. These premiums were funded by assessments on fluid milk processors, whenever fluid farm milk prices in the region fell below \$16.94 per hundredweight (cwt.). Supporters of the Northeast Compact had sought for an extension of the compact; the southeastern states were seeking new authority to create a separate compact. However, dairy processors and Upper Midwest producers strongly oppose regional compacts.

### MILC Program Mechanics

Section 1502 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-171, the 2002 farm bill) authorized a new counter-cyclical national dairy market loss payment program. (Upon implementation, USDA dubbed the program the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) program.) This program did not replace the dairy price support program or federal milk marketing orders, other current federal milk pricing policy tools. Instead, it was created as an alternative to regional dairy compacts and ad-hoc emergency payments to farmers, by authorizing additional federal payments when farm milk prices fall below an established target price. Authority for the MILC program expired on September 30, 2005, as required by the

2002 farm bill. However, the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-171, S. 1932, enacted February 8, 2006) authorized a two-year extension of the program until September 30, 2007. (See “MILC Program Reauthorization” below for details.)

Under the MILC program, dairy farmers nationwide are eligible for a federal payment whenever the minimum monthly market price for farm milk used for fluid consumption in Boston falls below \$16.94 per hundredweight (cwt.). In order to receive a payment, a dairy farmer must enter into a contract with the Secretary of Agriculture. Under the original farm bill authority, a producer received a payment equal to 45% of the difference between the \$16.94 per cwt. target price and the market price, in any month that the Boston market price falls below \$16.94. As a cost-saving measure, P.L. 109-171 reduced the payment rate from 45% to 34% effective for MILC payments in any month from October 2005 through August 2007. Under the law, a producer can receive a payment on all milk production during any month, but no payments are made on any annual production in excess of 2.4 million pounds per dairy operation.

The MILC program is akin to the Northeast Dairy Compact, which was in effect in the six New England states from 1997 until its expiration on September 30, 2001. However, under the expired dairy compact, dairy processors were required to pay the full difference between the \$16.94 per cwt. fluid milk target price and any market price shortfall for fluid use milk in the compact region. The MILC program shifted the responsibility of the payment from the processor (and ultimately the consumer) to the federal government.

Although the MILC program originally expired on September 30, 2005, and was not extended until several months after that date, P.L. 109-171 allowed for USDA to make MILC payments retroactively for December 2005 through May 2006. For FY2006, USDA accepted applications in two phases. Eligible milk producers had until May 17, 2006 to sign up for payments to begin with one of the retroactive payment months (December 2005 through May 2006). After May 17, retroactive payments were no longer available, and a producer could only choose to begin receiving payments in the current month or a future month. (For a USDA fact sheet on the extended MILC program, referred to as the MILC-X program, see [<http://165.221.16.19/dafp/psd/MILC.htm>]).

## **MILC Payment History**

USDA began accepting applications for the original MILC Program on August 15, 2002. (See **Table 1** for MILC payment history.) Monthly market prices were sufficiently low between December 2001 and August 2003 that MILC payments were made in every month during this period. Beginning in the late summer months of 2003, market farm milk prices greatly improved, rebounding from a 25-year low that prevailed throughout most of the early months of 2003. Hence, no MILC payments were required in September through December 2003. However, farm milk prices began to decline again in the latter part of 2003. Consequently, MILC payments resumed in January and February 2004. Market farm milk prices reversed their course in the late winter months and early spring of 2004, increasing to record high levels by the spring of 2004. Market prices remained sufficiently high from May 2004 through May 2005 so that no MILC payments were required over that time period. Market prices declined to the point that a small MILC payment (\$0.03 per

cwt.) was made for June 2005 milk production, the only payment that was made in all of FY2005. However, market prices declined in late 2005, triggering payments in each month from December 2005 through February 2007, which to date is the last month that MILC payments have been required.

**Table 1. Monthly Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC)  
Payment Rates**

Month	Payment (per hundredweight)	Month	Payment (per hundredweight)
December 2001	\$0.77	January 2004	\$0.83
January 2002	\$0.78	February 2004	\$0.95
February 2002	\$0.78	March 2004	\$0.79
March 2002	\$0.93	April 2004	\$0.02
April 2002	\$1.00	May 2004-May 2005	\$0.00
May 2002	\$1.09	June 2005	\$0.03
June 2002	\$1.20	July-November 2005	\$0.00
July 2002	\$1.38	December 2005	\$0.04
August 2002	\$1.45	Jan.-Feb. 2006	\$0.105
September 2002	\$1.45	March 2006	\$0.41
October 2002	\$1.59	April 2006	\$0.84
November 2002	\$1.39	May 2006	\$0.925
December 2002	\$1.43	June 2006	\$1.00
January 2003	\$1.41	July 2006	\$0.80
February 2003	\$1.56	August 2006	\$0.925
March 2003	\$1.75	September 2006	\$0.965
April 2003	\$1.82	October 2006	\$0.43
May 2003	\$1.79	November 2006	\$0.44
June 2003	\$1.78	December 2006	\$0.43
July 2003	\$1.76	January 2007	\$0.03
August 2003	\$1.22	February 2007	\$0.10
Sept.- Dec. 2003	\$0.00	March-May 2007	\$0.00

Source: USDA, Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS).

## Federal Cost of MILC

For the first 4½ years of the MILC program, its cumulative cost was just under \$2.5 billion — \$1.8 billion in FY2003, \$221 million in FY2004, \$8.8 million in FY2005, \$350.5 million in FY2006, and \$114.7 million to date in FY2007. The FY2003 total includes two fiscal years worth of payments, since retroactive payments for FY2002 were made over the course of FY2003. FY2004 and FY2005 outlays were significantly lower because market farm milk prices were much stronger than in the two previous years, reaching a record high in the summer of 2004. Five states have accounted for just over one-half of the total payments made over the time period (see **Table 2**).

**Table 2. MILC Payments Ranked by State, FY2003-FY2007**

	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	Total
Wisconsin	\$372,042,880	\$41,754,746	\$1,369,537	\$71,838,550	\$23,906,505	510,912,218
New York	169,423,978	17,222,870	383,632	32,257,023	10,605,556	229,893,059
Pennsylvania	160,673,846	19,263,582	1,352,555	27,082,715	10,659,170	219,031,867
Minnesota	147,400,075	15,946,997	286,412	27,169,579	9,941,499	200,744,562
California	122,764,930	25,142,045	1,186,734	34,913,717	10,878,010	194,885,436
Michigan	75,828,865	8,799,034	316,507	15,563,328	5,234,795	105,742,529
Ohio	68,772,479	7,550,599	194,479	11,922,216	4,117,464	92,557,237
Iowa	60,686,427	6,512,172	236,348	11,629,909	4,216,210	83,281,065
Texas	38,793,821	6,282,787	199,362	9,024,192	2,833,816	57,133,978
Vermont	40,826,421	4,389,019	138,325	8,126,455	2,358,159	55,838,379
Idaho	33,211,800	5,496,523	371,276	8,719,484	1,699,743	49,498,825
Missouri	36,267,942	3,426,748	128,206	6,204,901	1,954,645	47,982,442
Illinois	34,170,687	3,818,084	158,274	6,144,976	2,098,120	46,390,142
Washington	30,869,213	5,064,507	111,841	7,539,782	1,855,240	45,440,583
Indiana	30,180,470	3,510,016	214,743	5,255,495	1,548,957	40,709,680
Kentucky	31,094,215	3,364,755	96,648	4,508,582	1,553,071	40,617,271
Virginia	29,876,611	2,895,202	324,527	5,174,178	1,588,842	39,859,361
Tennessee	24,469,076	2,545,783	62,281	3,853,946	1,389,069	32,320,156
South Dakota	20,355,578	2,148,893	31,015	3,738,836	1,073,656	27,347,977
Maryland	18,132,857	1,774,254	161,405	3,184,670	919,536	24,172,721
Oregon	16,295,432	2,178,087	35,910	4,036,387	1,163,919	23,709,736
Utah	15,782,707	2,027,249	-18,216	3,419,809	742,235	21,953,784
Georgia	15,764,327	1,930,999	31,078	3,136,152	1,041,666	21,904,223
Kansas	15,747,021	1,775,859	57,526	2,765,443	822,813	21,168,662
North Carolina	15,395,265	1,766,672	35,218	2,764,319	662,802	20,624,275
Nebraska	14,835,308	1,588,040	121,518	2,544,254	857,155	19,946,274
Puerto Rico	12,388,197	4,222,742	381,336	966,771	1,006,833	18,965,879
New Mexico	11,493,657	2,825,129	127,273	3,354,332	1,095,265	18,895,657
Oklahoma	12,519,405	1,307,138	50,983	1,958,338	597,487	16,433,350
Louisiana	11,430,924	1,066,703	31,415	1,517,821	449,378	14,496,240
Florida	9,783,286	1,761,420	31,601	2,342,573	677,334	14,596,214
Maine	10,250,302	984,845	13,481	1,904,303	585,737	13,738,668
Colorado	8,754,312	1,537,030	52,001	2,051,322	595,154	12,989,820
Arizona	7,641,285	1,526,600	163,838	2,138,679	540,790	12,011,193
North Dakota	8,964,621	1,111,814	56,389	1,291,575	514,520	11,938,920
Mississippi	8,916,963	880,166	66,520	1,189,543	370,512	11,423,703
Arkansas	7,499,823	665,206	27,202	1,011,333	242,656	9,446,219
Massachusetts	6,877,027	625,496	8,973	1,113,219	294,619	8,919,334
Connecticut	6,143,097	699,449	8,509	1,145,967	307,292	8,304,314
New Hampshire	5,095,796	515,693	11,031	973,494	306,335	6,902,350
Montana	4,901,714	519,903	21,112	1,023,945	239,646	6,706,320
South Carolina	4,779,476	529,781	52,581	914,359	275,777	6,551,974
Alabama	4,286,766	512,368	3,719	593,777	131,026	5,527,655
West Virginia	3,942,927	459,851	13,707	614,441	173,187	5,204,113
New Jersey	4,012,708	373,719	2,101	596,928	233,424	5,218,879
Nevada	2,014,582	351,358	25,597	589,067	56,619	3,037,224
Delaware	1,768,299	184,425	2,947	310,154	132,339	2,398,163
Wyoming	1,015,120	101,807	2,655	205,252	50,521	1,375,356
Hawaii	407,366	117,018	46,913	52,150	13,763	637,210
Rhode Island	451,901	36,430	390	58,558	24,271	571,550
Alaska	350,368	26,291	358	35,340	14,114	426,472
Virgin Islands	100,347	7,723	83	8,682	0	116,835
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,795,452,502</b>	<b>221,125,627</b>	<b>8,789,854</b>	<b>350,480,820</b>	<b>114,651,255</b>	<b>2,490,500,058</b>

## MILC Issues in the 2007 Farm Bill

**Funding.** The 2002 farm bill required the MILC program to expire on September 30, 2005, while all other major farm commodity support programs authorized by the farm bill are scheduled to expire at the end of the 2007 crop year. Proponents of the MILC program wanted program expiration to coincide with the expiration of all other commodity support programs. Hence, a provision in the FY2006 omnibus reconciliation act (P.L. 109-171, S. 1932) extends the MILC program through September 30, 2007. It also reduces the MILC payment rate so that a recipient receives 34% of the difference between the target price and the lower market price, instead of the 45% payment rate in the recently expired program. This payment rate reduction is effective from October 2005 through August 2007.

The payment rate was reduced as a budget-saving measure in order to keep the two-year estimated cost of program extension just below \$1 billion. (CBO estimated the two-year cost of the provision at \$998 million, compared with \$1.2 billion if the program had been extended without the payment rate reduction.) Also, in order to minimize the cost of program extension, P.L. 109-171 reduced the MILC payment rate to 0% in September 2007, the last month of program authority. This means that when the 2007 farm bill is formulated, the MILC program will have no baseline budget spending allocated to it beyond August 2007. This does not necessarily preclude the possibility of the MILC program being extended in the 2007 farm bill. However, if the total spending allocated to the farm bill is no greater than the baseline budget, the cost of the MILC program might have to be offset with reductions in spending in other farm bill programs.

**MILC Provisions in the Vetoed FY2007 Supplemental.** The conference agreement on the FY2007 Iraq war supplemental (H.R. 1591), which was vetoed by the President on May 1, 2007, would have amended the MILC authorizing statute so that MILC payments could be made at the current payment rate of 34% through September 30, 2007. This effectively would have created a budget baseline for the MILC program beyond its expiration date. CBO estimates that the projected total cost of the MILC program is approximately \$1.24 billion for FY2008-FY2012, which is the expected timeframe of the next farm bill, or \$2.4 billion over 10 years (FY2008-FY2017). If the language in the conference agreement is eventually adopted, these amounts would be added to the baseline budget, thus giving the agriculture committees the needed funds to extend the MILC program, or they could apply the funding to other initiatives.

**Administration's Farm Bill Proposal.** On January 31, 2007, the Administration released a comprehensive 2007 farm bill proposal that included several recommendations for the MILC program. The Administration supports a continuation of MILC payments at the current target price of \$16.94 per cwt. In order to defray the cost of MILC program extension, the Administration recommends that the payment rate be gradually reduced over a five-year period. It proposes maintaining the payment rate at the current level of 34% through FY2008, and then reducing it to 31% in FY2009, 28% in FY2010, 25% in FY2011, 22% in FY2012, and 20% in FY2013-FY2017. Annual payments per operation would continue to be restricted to 2.4 million lbs. under the proposal. It also would base payments on



historical production rather than current production in order to forestall potential challenges to the program in the World Trade Organization.

**Regional Issues.** Since its inception, the MILC program has been generally supported by milk producer groups in the Northeast and the Upper Midwest. Producer groups in the Northeast region viewed it as an alternative to the Northeast dairy compact. Upper Midwest producers preferred the new program to state compacts since the new program shares the price premiums nationally. Large dairy farmers have expressed concern that the MILC program causes excess milk production that in turn decreases market farm milk prices. They contend that this negatively affects their income, since their annual production is well in excess of the 2.4 million lb. payment limit, and any production in excess of 2.4 million pounds receives the market price and no federal payments. (Annual production of 2.4 million pounds is roughly equal to the annual production of a herd of approximately 120 to 130 dairy cows.)

## Dairy Price Support Program

The Agricultural Act of 1949 first established the dairy price support program by permanently requiring USDA to support the farm price of milk. Since 1949, Congress has regularly amended the program, usually in the context of multi-year omnibus farm acts and budget reconciliation acts. (See **Table 3**, below, for a recent history of spending on the dairy price support program and related activities.) Most recently, Section 1501 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-171, the omnibus 2002 farm bill) authorized a 5½-year extension of the program through December 31, 2007, at the then-current support price of \$9.90 per hundredweight (cwt.) of farm milk. Reauthorization of the program will be debated in the context of a new omnibus farm bill this year.

Historically, the supported farm price for milk is intended to protect farmers from price declines that might force them out of business and to protect consumers from seasonal imbalances of supply and demand. USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) supports milk prices by its standing offer to purchase surplus nonfat dry milk, cheese, and butter from dairy processors. Government purchases of these storable dairy products indirectly support the price of milk for all dairy farmers. Prices paid to the processors are set administratively by USDA at a level that should permit them to pay dairy farmers at least the federal support price for their milk.

In order to achieve the support price of \$9.90 per cwt. of milk, USDA has a standing offer to processors to purchase surplus manufactured dairy products at the following prices: \$1.05 per lb. for butter, \$0.80 for nonfat dry milk, \$1.1314 per lb. for block cheddar, and \$1.1014 per lb. for barrel cheese. Whenever market prices fall to the support level, processors generally make the business decision of selling surplus product to the government rather than to the marketplace. Consequently, the government purchase prices usually serve as a floor for the market price, which in turn indirectly supports the farm price of milk at \$9.90 per cwt.

Government purchases of surplus dairy products have been relatively small since late 2003, as market prices have remained above the support price during that period. In the early 1980s, the support price was \$13.10 per cwt. and government purchases peaked at \$2.6 billion in 1983. A gradual decline in the support price to the current level of \$9.90 has significantly reduced the cost of the program from peak levels. (See **Table 3** for a history of government purchases and costs since the 1981 marketing year.)

## Farm Bill Issues

At issue in Congress this year is whether the dairy price support program should be extended beyond its December 31, 2007, expiration date. Funding is available in the budget baseline to extend the program at the current \$9.90 per cwt. level of support. In its January 31, 2007, farm bill proposal, the Administration recommended the extension of the program, viewing it as a low-cost stabilizing influence on farm milk prices. It stated that many dairy producers see the need for a floor to be kept under farm milk prices to maintain an adequate milk supply and provide a safety net. Dairy processor groups have expressed concern that the dairy price support program in combination with MILC payments work at cross-purposes, by artificially stimulating milk production and causing persistent surpluses. They also question whether having the government as a guaranteed buyer of surplus products discourages investment to produce dairy ingredients (e.g. milk protein concentrates) that are increasingly in demand in the market.

Separately, some policymakers are concerned that because of the way domestic price support programs are viewed under our trade obligations in the World Trade Organization (WTO), modifications to dairy support might be required under a new trade agreement. Although federal outlays for the dairy price support program have been relatively small (under \$100 million) in recent years (see **Table 3**), the WTO measures the level of support differently. Under our current trade obligations, the aggregate measure of support for dairy is based on how much higher the domestic support price is set above a fixed world reference price, and this imputed subsidy is applied to all domestic milk production. Using this formula, the WTO views the aggregate measure of support for the dairy price support program to be more than \$4.5 billion annually, and classifies it as “amber box” or the most trade-distorting category. The current U.S. proposal in the Doha Round is to reduce its total amber box support from the current \$19.1 billion to \$7.6 billion. With dairy support such a large percentage of the proposed new maximum, some have expressed interest in shifting future policy away from price support to some type of WTO-compliant direct payment that is decoupled from price and production.

**Table 3. Dairy Price Support Purchases and Costs,  
1980/81-2006/07**

Marketing Year <sup>a</sup>	Net Removals Milk Equivalent (billion lbs.) <sup>b</sup>	Net Outlays (million \$)	CCC Support Price (\$ per cwt.)	CCC Purchases as Percentage of Production
1980-81	12.7	1,975	13.10	9.6
1981-82	13.8	2,239	13.49-13.10	10.2
1982-83	16.6	2,600	13.10	12.0
1983-84	10.4	1,597	13.10-12.60	7.6
1984-85	11.5	2,181	12.60-11.60	8.2
1985-86	12.3	2,420	11.60	8.5
1986-87	5.4	1,238	11.60-11.35	3.8
1987-88	9.7	1,346	11.10-10.60	6.7
1988-89	9.6	712	10.60-11.10	6.7
1989-90	8.4	505	10.60-10.10	5.7
1990-91	10.4	839	10.10	7.0
1991-92	10.1	232	10.10	6.7
1992-93	7.6	253	10.10	5.0
1993-94	4.2	158	10.10	2.8
1994-95	2.9	4	10.10	1.8
1995-96	0.1	-98	10.10-10.35	0.1
1996-97	0.7	67	10.20	0.4
1997-98	0.7	291	10.20-10.05	0.4
1998-99	0.3	280	10.05-9.90	0.2
1999-2000	0.8	569	9.90	0.5
2000-01	0.3	465	9.90	0.2
2001-02	0.2	622	9.90	0.1
2002-03	0.5	699	9.90	0.3
2003-04	NA	74	9.90	NA
2004-05	NA	- 104	9.90	NA
2005-06	NA	60	9.90	NA
2006-07	NA	22	9.90	NA

**Source:** U.S. Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency, selected publications.

a. The marketing year is October 1-September 30.

b. The milk equivalent is the pounds of fluid milk used to manufacture cheese and butter, on a milkfat basis.

NA = Not Available

## Federal Milk Marketing Orders

### Background

The farm price of approximately two-thirds of the nation's fluid milk is regulated under federal milk marketing orders. Federal orders, which are administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), were instituted in the 1930s to promote orderly marketing conditions by, among other things, applying a uniform system of classified pricing throughout the market. Some states, California for example, have their own state milk marketing regulations instead of federal rules. Producers delivering milk to federal marketing order areas are affected by two fundamental marketing order provisions: the classified pricing of milk according to its end use, and the pooling of receipts to pay all farmers a blend price.

Proponents of federal orders argue that orders are necessary because dairy farmers have a competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis dairy handlers (processors) when it comes to determining prices that farmers receive for their raw, perishable milk. Federal orders regulate handlers who sell milk or milk products within a defined marketing area by requiring them to pay not less than established minimum class prices for the Grade A milk they purchase from dairy producers, depending on how the milk is used. This classified pricing system requires handlers to pay a higher price for milk used for fluid consumption (Class I) than for milk used in manufactured dairy products such as yogurt, ice cream, and sour cream (Class II products), cheese (Class III), and butter and dry milk products (Class IV products). These differences between classes reflect the different market values for the products.

Blend pricing allows all dairy farmers who ship to the market to pool their milk receipts and then be paid a single price for all milk based on order-wide usage (a weighted average of the four usage classes). Paying all farmers a single blend price is seen as an equitable way of sharing revenues for identical raw milk directed to both the higher-valued fluid market and the lower-valued manufacturing market.

Manufactured class (Class II, III and IV) prices are the same in all orders nationwide and are calculated monthly by USDA based on current market conditions for manufactured dairy products. The Class I price for milk used for fluid consumption varies from area to area. Class I prices are determined by adding to a monthly base price, a "Class I differential" that generally rises with the geographical distance from milk surplus regions in the Upper Midwest, the Southwest, and the West. Class I differential pricing is a mechanism designed to ensure adequate supplies of milk for fluid use at consumption centers. The supply of milk may come from local supplies or distant supplies, whichever is more efficient. However, local dairy farmers are protected by the minimum price rule against lower-priced milk that might otherwise be hauled into their region.

### Milk Regulatory Equity Act (P.L. 109-215, S. 2120)

On April 11, 2006, the President signed into law the Milk Regulatory Equity Act (P.L. 109-215, S. 2120), which addressed several federal milk marketing order issues relevant to the western United States. Among the milk marketing order issues

addressed in H.R. 4015/S. 2120 are (1) the regulation of fluid milk processors who operate a plant in a federal order area, are not regulated by that order, and ship packaged milk into a state marketing order (not a federal order); (2) the regulation of fluid processors who produce, package and distribute their milk, also known as producer-handlers or producer-distributors; and (3) the exclusion of Nevada from federal milk marketing orders.

**Regulation of Certain Interstate Milk Shipments.** P.L. 109-215 affects any processor (handler) of Class I (fluid-use) milk who operates a plant that is located in a federal milk marketing order area, is not regulated by the federal order because it has no sales in the federal marketing area, and has packaged fluid milk deliveries to a state that is regulated by a state marketing order. Such a plant is not currently paying a regulated price for the raw milk that is used for these dispositions or sales. The bill would require any such processor to pay into the federal order pool the minimum federal milk marketing order price for the raw milk that went into the shipments sold into the state order.

This provision is targeted at a large fluid processor who is located in Yuma, Arizona (which is part of the Arizona-Las Vegas milk marketing order area), but ships all of its packaged milk into California. Under current law and regulations, this plant's interstate shipments to California are not regulated by either the Arizona-Las Vegas order or the California state order. This provision is supported by other processors and milk producers who contend that this processor's current exclusion from paying the minimum regulated price is a "loophole" in the current federal order system, which they say provides that processor with an unfair price advantage. Opponents of this provision contend that it would adversely affect their operations and raise the price of milk to consumers. They also contend that Congress and USDA should hold hearings on the issue before any legislative changes are considered.

**Producer-Handler Exemption.** As defined by USDA, producer-handlers are dairy farmers who process milk from their own cows in their own plants and market their packaged fluid milk and other dairy products themselves. Producer-handlers sometimes are referred to as producer-distributors, or P-Ds. Producer-handlers may sell products directly to consumers through their own stores, directly to consumers on home-delivery routes, or to wholesale customers such as food stores, vendors, or institutions. Current regulations exempt producer-handlers from the minimum price requirements of federal milk marketing orders, but minimal reporting is required.

P.L. 109-215 requires the full regulation of any producer-handler with distribution of fluid milk in the Arizona-Las Vegas order area in excess of 3 million pounds in the previous month. The act primarily affects the same producer-handler in Arizona that is affected by the interstate milk shipment provision discussed above. Meanwhile, USDA has published a final regulation effective April 1, 2006, that establishes a 3 million lb. per month route disposition limit for a producer-handler exemption, both in the Pacific Northwest and the Arizona-Las Vegas order areas. The final USDA regulation affects at least three large producer handlers in the Pacific Northwest, as well as the Arizona producer-handler. (For USDA's final rule, see [<http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/01jan20061800/edocket.access.gpo.gov/>]

2006/06-1587.htm].) The Arizona producer-handler (Hein Hettinga) is challenging the new USDA regulation in court.

The producer-handler provision is a separate issue from the provision above relating to the interstate shipment of milk, but with similar implications. Producers of regulated milk want this unregulated milk to become regulated so it will increase the blend price received by all regulated dairy farmers. Regulated processors contend that it is unfair that they have to pay the regulated price while certain handlers are exempt. The producer-handlers who would become regulated argue that this is a tax being placed on independent family farms that would ultimately result in higher prices to consumers.

**Nevada Exclusion from Federal Milk Marketing Orders.** Section 760 of the FY2000 agriculture appropriations act (P.L. 106-78) was intended to remove Clark County, Nevada from the Las Vegas-Arizona federal milk marketing order area so that the only handler in this county would be subject to the lower Nevada state order price for fluid milk. However, the enacted provision was phrased in a way that did not completely remove Clark County from the federal order system. The enacted language exempted any plant operating in Clark County from being subject to any federal milk marketing order. However, it did not remove Clark County from the Arizona-Las Vegas milk marketing order area. This means that milk that is currently shipped from California to Clark County is partially regulated and compensatory payments to the Arizona-Las Vegas order are required. Hence, a provision in P.L. 109-215 completely removes the state of Nevada from the marketing area definition of any order, which supporters say would end the required compensatory payments paid by California milk shippers and allow all of Nevada to be joined together in the state order.