

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**Agricultural Marketing Service**

7 CFR Parts 1000, 1001, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1030, 1032, 1033, 1124, 1126, 1131, and 1135

[Docket No. AO-14-A69, et al.: DA-00-03]

Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing Areas; Recommended Decision and Opportunity To File Written Exceptions on Proposed Amendments to Tentative Marketing Agreements and to Orders

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

7 CFR part	Marketing area	AO Nos.
1001	Northeast	AO-14-A69
1005	Appalachian	AO-388-A11
1006	Florida	AO-356-A34
1007	Southeast	AO-366-A40
1030	Upper Midwest	AO-361-A34
1032	Central	AO-313-A43
1033	Midwest	AO-166-A67
1124	Pacific Northwest	AO-368-A27
1126	Southwest	AO-231-A65
1131	Arizona-Las Vegas	AO-271-A35
1135	Western	AO-380-A17

SUMMARY: This decision recommends changes to Federal milk orders based on the record of a hearing held May 8-12, 2000, to consider proposals submitted by the industry to change the pricing formulas included in the final rule for the consolidation and reform of Federal milk orders and on comments filed in response to a tentative final decision issued November 29, 2000. The proceeding was undertaken in response to a Congressional mandate included in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000, to reconsider the Class III and Class IV pricing formulas. The material issues on the record of the hearing relate to the elements of the Class III and Class IV pricing formulas, including: commodity prices, manufacturing (make) allowances, factors related to product yield, role of producer costs of production, and the issue of whether to omit a recommended decision. After issuance of the tentative final decision, approval of the proposed order amendments by producers, and issuance of an interim final rule, some of the provisions of the interim final rule were enjoined by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. This decision considers comments filed in response to the tentative final decision and recommends changes that are consistent

with the Court's ruling. Changes from the tentative final decision would increase the dry whey make allowance and remove a snubber used in the other solids component price calculation, revise the Class III butterfat and protein component price formulas consistent with the Court's ruling, eliminate the pooling of butterfat values in paying producers in component pricing orders, and change the classification of several high-fat products from Class IV back to Class III.

DATES: Comments should be submitted on or before November 26, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments (six copies) should be filed with the Hearing Clerk, Room 1081, South Building, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250. Reference should be made to the title of action and docket number.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Constance M. Brenner, Marketing Specialist, USDA/AMS/Dairy Programs, Order Formulation Branch, Room 2968, South Building, P.O. Box 96456, Washington, DC 20090-6456, (202) 720-2357, e-mail address connie.brenner@usda.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This administrative action is governed by the provisions of sections 556 and 557 of title 5 of the United States Code and, therefore, is excluded from the requirements of Executive Order 12866.

These proposed amendments have been reviewed under Executive Order 12988, Civil Justice Reform. The amendments are not intended to have a retroactive effect. If adopted, the proposed amendments will not preempt any state or local laws, regulations, or policies, unless they present an irreconcilable conflict with this rule.

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601-674), provides that administrative proceedings must be exhausted before parties may file suit in court. Under section 608c(15)(A) of the Act, any handler subject to an order may request modification or exemption from such order by filing with the Secretary a petition stating that the order, any provision of the order, or any obligation imposed in connection with the order is not in accordance with the law. A handler is afforded the opportunity for a hearing on the petition. After a hearing, the Secretary would rule on the petition. The Act provides that the district court of the United States in any district in which the handler is an inhabitant, or has its principal place of business, has jurisdiction in equity to review the Secretary's ruling on the

petition, provided a bill in equity is filed not later than 20 days after the date of the entry of the ruling.

Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

This decision responds to a Congressional mandate to reconsider the Class III and Class IV pricing formulas included in the final rule for the consolidation and reform of Federal milk orders. The mandate was included in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000 (Pub. L. 106-113, 115 Stat. 1501).

In accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) has considered the economic impact of this action on small entities and has prepared this regulatory flexibility analysis. When preparing such analysis an agency shall address: the reasons, objectives, and legal basis for the anticipated proposed rule; the kind and number of small entities which would be affected; the projected recordkeeping, reporting, and other requirements; and federal rules which may duplicate, overlap, or conflict with the proposed rule. Finally, any significant alternatives to the proposal should be addressed. This regulatory flexibility analysis considers these points and the impact of this proposed regulation on small entities. The legal basis for this action is discussed in the preceding section.

The RFA seeks to ensure that, within the statutory authority of a program, the regulatory and informational requirements are tailored to the size and nature of small businesses. For the purpose of the RFA, a dairy farm is considered a "small business" if it has an annual gross revenue of less than \$500,000, and a dairy products manufacturer is a "small business" if it has fewer than 500 employees. For the purposes of determining which dairy farms are "small businesses," the \$500,000 per year criterion was used to establish a production guideline of 326,000 pounds per month. Although this guideline does not factor in additional monies that may be received by dairy producers, it should be an inclusive standard for most "small" dairy farmers. For purposes of determining a handler's size, if the plant is part of a larger company operating multiple plants that collectively exceed the 500-employee limit, the plant will be considered a large business even if

the local plant has fewer than 500 employees.

USDA has identified as small businesses approximately 66,327 of the 71,716 dairy producers (farmers) that have their milk pooled under a Federal order. Thus, small businesses constitute approximately 92.5 percent of the dairy farmers in the United States. On the processing side, there are approximately 1,200 plants associated with Federal orders, and of these plants, approximately 720 qualify as "small businesses," constituting about 60 percent of the total.

During January 2000, there were approximately 240 fully regulated handlers (of which 186 were small businesses), 43 partially regulated handlers (of which 28 were small businesses), and 71 producer-handlers of which all were considered small businesses for the purpose of this regulatory flexibility analysis, submitting reports under the Federal milk marketing order program. This volume of milk pooled under Federal orders represents 72 percent of all milk marketed in the U.S. and 74 percent of the milk of bottling quality (Grade A) sold in the country. Forty-four distributing plants were exempt from Federal order regulation on the basis of their small volume of distribution.

Producer deliveries of milk used in Class I products (mainly fluid milk products) totaled 3.965 billion pounds in January 2000—38.8 percent of total Federal order producer deliveries. More than 200 million Americans reside in Federal order marketing areas—approximately 77 percent of the total U.S. population.

In order to accomplish the goal of imposing no additional regulatory burdens on the industry, a review of the current reporting requirements was completed pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). In light of this review, it was determined that these proposed amendments would have little or no impact on reporting, recordkeeping, or other compliance requirements because these would remain identical to the current Federal order program. No new forms have been proposed, and no additional reporting would be necessary.

This notice does not require additional information collection that requires clearance by the OMB beyond the currently approved information collection. The primary sources of data used to complete the forms are routinely used in most business transactions. Forms require only a minimal amount of information which can be supplied without data processing equipment or a

trained statistical staff. Thus, the information collection and reporting burden is relatively small. Requiring the same reports for all handlers does not significantly disadvantage any handler that is smaller than the industry average.

No other burdens are expected to fall upon the dairy industry as a result of overlapping Federal rules. This proposed rulemaking does not duplicate, overlap or conflict with any existing Federal rules.

To ensure that small businesses are not unduly or disproportionately burdened based on these proposed amendments, consideration was given to mitigating negative impacts.

A comment filed by the managing partner of a large dairy farm argued that dairy producers selling less than 326,000 pounds of milk per month may comprise the majority of dairy farms, but not the majority of milk sold. The comment further stated that it is not appropriate to identify one sector and imply that they are most in need of protection and preservation.

The production guideline of 326,000 pounds per month in identifying small dairy farms is an attempt to relate a measure of size for which data is available (pounds of production per farm) with the criteria specified by the Small Business Administration (revenue from sales), for which data is not readily available to USDA on an individual farm basis. The Regulatory Flexibility Analysis does not represent an attempt to create special privileges for farms defined as small, but to examine the regulations to assure that they do not create a disproportionate burden or competitive disadvantage for such farms.

One of the principal issues considered at the hearing was the source of price data that should be used to generate prices for milk components and, thereby, prices to be paid to producers. The options considered were the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) surveys of selling prices of manufactured dairy products, Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME) prices, and producer costs of production. The decision selects the NASS-reported prices as the most appropriate for use in determining product prices because of the considerably larger volume of product represented in those price series than in the CME price data. Producer cost of production was not included in the calculation of prices because assuring dairy farmers that their costs of production will be covered addresses only the milk supply side of the market and ignores factors

underlying demand or changes in demand for milk and milk products.

Various proposals to reduce or increase the levels of the manufacturing (make) allowances of butter, nonfat dry milk, cheddar cheese and dry whey were considered. This decision adjusts these make allowances from the levels adopted under Federal order reform on the basis of data and testimony contained in the hearing record. Most of the adjustments are minimal. Primarily, manufacturing cost surveys done by USDA's Rural Cooperative Business Service (RBCS) and the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) were used to determine the most appropriate levels of make allowance for the products used in calculating Federal order class prices.

The only other actual collection of manufacturing cost data for cheddar cheese and dry whey that was cited in the hearing record was a survey of cheddar cheese and dry whey manufacturing costs arranged for by the National Cheese Institute (NCI). This survey was conducted by persons unfamiliar with the dairy industry among cheese processors who did not testify about the data that they submitted for the survey, and entered into the hearing record by a witness who had no firsthand knowledge of the data included. As a result, the NCI survey should be relied upon to a lesser degree than the two studies used to determine the cheddar cheese make allowance. In the case of the RBCS study, the person who gathered the data testified about its collection and what it represented. In the case of the CDFA-collected data, a manual detailing the method by which the data was collected and presented was made available, and several witnesses familiar with the survey testified about it.

In addition, one nonfat dry milk manufacturer testified to costs of manufacture that exceeded those of the two studies by a significant amount, mostly in the areas of return on investment and marketing costs. The data did not include any information about the pounds of product manufactured and could not have been weighted with the data from the two other studies.

Several proposals to change the factor reflecting the yield of nonfat dry milk from nonfat solids in milk would have increased the nonfat solids price and the Class IV skim price, but ignored the need to reflect the generally lower price and higher manufacturing cost of buttermilk powder that also must be considered in calculating the Class IV nonfat solids price. Testimony and data in the record was used to determine a

factor more representative of nonfat dry milk yield and the effect of buttermilk powder price and cost. The alternatives to the formula adopted either did not include consideration of the price, cost, and volume of buttermilk powder relative to those of nonfat dry milk, or gave those factors too great an influence.

Proposals were made to reduce the butter and cheese product prices used in calculating the butterfat price and the Class III component prices. The record of this proceeding continues to support the use of the product prices adopted in the final rule in the Federal milk order reform process as representing accurately the values of these products. In the case of adjusting the Grade AA butter price to reflect the value of Grade A butter, the record fails to reveal any source of information for obtaining current prices for Grade A butter. In the case of proposals to remove the 3-cent adjustment between the barrel and 40-pound block cheese prices, there was no testimony about the actual difference in cost between the two types of packaging that overcame testimony that 3 cents is the actual cost difference, or any data that indicates that the customary price difference is not at least 3 cents.

Proposals to reconsider the class price relationships in the orders were considered, although a proposal to use a weighted average of the Class III and Class IV prices as a Class I price mover was not noticed for hearing in this proceeding. The hearing record supports the continued relationships between the Class IV and Class II prices and between the higher of the manufacturing class prices and the Class I price.

A proposal that the Class II differential be changed to negate any changes in the Class IV price formula that would affect the current price relationship between nonfat dry milk and Class II failed to consider that the Class II-Class IV price difference adopted in Federal order reform is based on the difference in the value of milk used to make dry milk and the value of milk used to make Class II products.

Proposals that any increases resulting from changes to the Class III and Class IV price formulas not be allowed to result in increases in Class I prices did not address the rationale for the current Class I price differentials above the manufacturing price levels for the purpose of obtaining an adequate supply of milk for fluid (drinking) use.

The changes to the Class III and Class IV price formulas included in this decision should have no special impact on small handler entities. All handlers manufacturing dairy products from milk classified as Class III or Class IV would remain subject to the same minimum

prices regardless of the size of their operations. Such handlers would also be subject to the same minimum prices to be paid to producers. These features of minimum pricing are required by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act and should not raise barriers to the ability of small handlers to compete in the marketplace. It is similarly expected that small producers would not experience any particular disadvantage to larger producers as a result of any of the proposed amendments.

Interested parties are invited to comment on the probable regulatory and informational impact of the amended provisions of this decision on small businesses. Also, parties may suggest modifications of this decision for the purpose of tailoring the applicability of the provisions to small businesses.

An analysis was done on the effects of the alternatives selected, and is summarized below.

Analysis

In order to assess the impact of changes in Federal order milk pricing formulas, the Department conducted an economic analysis. While the primary purpose of this decision is to amend the product pricing formulas used to price milk regulated under Federal milk marketing orders and classified as either Class III or Class IV milk, these product price formulas also affect the prices of regulated milk classified as Class I and Class II.

The modifications in this decision are analyzed simultaneously as a change from the set of formulas implemented on January 1, 2000. This analysis focuses on impacts on milk marketed under all Federal milk marketing orders, and treats the Federal order system as a single entity for purposes of generating system-wide price and quantity changes. Order-specific changes in uniform blend prices and blend prices plus premiums are estimated as well. Milk marketed in California, milk marketed under other state regulations and unregulated milk are treated separately. The hard manufactured dairy product markets are national.

Comments Concerning Model Analysis

In response to the tentative final decision, several commenters raised issues regarding model analysis of the effects of changes in order provisions. Select Milk Producers, Inc., et al. (Select), expressed reservations about analysis of the Federal order system as a whole, without including analysis for each order. Select asserted that use of the Model as a national evaluation masks the damage of a low Class III price in some orders, such as the

Western and the Upper Midwest where Class III utilization, pooled or not, is high. Select also contended that a national model ignores the fact that the impact of higher nonfat dry milk prices and corresponding increases in Class I and Class II prices may increase national average returns, but do not have such an effect in areas where Class III use is dominant. Select claimed that national analysis violates the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

The dairy industry model is a national model that includes three separate marketing areas: the aggregated Federal Milk Order system, California, and aggregated all other markets. The aggregated Federal order system includes a minimum Class I differential that is an average over the 11 orders, as well as the Federal order minimum prices for Classes II, III, and IV. Changes in the Federal order system prices adopted in the tentative final decision were reported in Table 1 of the Economic Analysis available for that decision, both for milk at 3.5 percent butterfat and at average class test. Since Class I differentials are held constant in the analysis, any changes in Class I minimum prices must be caused by changes in Class III and Class IV prices. Blend prices are affected in relation to an order's class utilizations and the changes in the class prices.

Concerns that markets with high Class III utilizations would suffer sharp declines in producer income and milk marketings were considered and dismissed without further analysis because of the minuscule price changes resulting from the formula changes. The analysis of the tentative final decision indicates that the Federal order Class III price (at test) would have decreased by an average of \$0.015 per hundredweight over the five-year period. Even if an order had a Class III utilization of 100 percent, such a small price change would result in no observable change in milk supplied. The estimated changes in all the class prices at test under the tentative final decision were so small that no single order blend price could have been increased or reduced by more than about 2 cents per hundredweight, or less than .2 percent. A change of this magnitude has to be considered "approximately zero" in an analysis of milk markets. [See Table 1 of the Economic Analysis for the Tentative Final Decision on Class III and Class IV Price Formulas].

Select also raised an issue over the use of the model, asserting that its use could represent post-hearing testimony that is not subject to cross-examination by hearing participants. Select argued

that changes in the model between any description of it in testimony at the hearing and analysis used in the decision would represent evidence not legitimately part of the record, and concluded that the Secretary should clearly identify any alterations in the model.

The model used to analyze the tentative final decision was modified and substantially improved between the preliminary economic analysis (a summary of which was published with the hearing notice in this proceeding) and the Economic Analysis for the Tentative Final Decision on Class III and Class IV Price Formulas. The original model accounted for milk on a butterfat basis. The improved model accounts for both nonfat solids and fat solids in milk and allocates the solids among the various milk and dairy products. The improved model's performance is much better, particularly with respect to simulating the effects of program changes on the manufactured dairy product markets which generate the prices used to drive the Federal milk order pricing system. Further improvements have been completed recently, including re-estimating the supply and demand relationships using data from 1980 forward. Previous estimates used data from 1970 forward. The economic analysis of this recommended decision uses the model as modified, with new supply and demand relationships documented in the complete Economic Analysis for the Recommended Decision on Class III and Class IV Price Formulas.

More to the point, however, is that Federal milk order decisions do not depend upon the model results. Proposals must have their own economic substantiation. Testimony and evidence relative to the issues considered in the proceeding must be submitted to support the need for changes in order provisions. Thus, the model is not the evidentiary record for the proposals in this decision. The function of the model is to evaluate the impacts of the proposed changes on the dairy industry generally, and particularly to assess if an adequate supply of milk will be forthcoming to meet the Class I needs of the order marketing areas. The preliminary economic analysis, published with the hearing notice, was performed with the intention of providing analysis that the industry might find useful. In the period between the hearing and the tentative final decision, the model was improved and an economic analysis was performed on the tentative decision and made public. The model-estimated results of implementing the tentative

final decision changes were deemed to have no discernable effect on the quantity of milk supplied. Thus, it was concluded that Class I needs would continue to be met in all orders.

In comments filed in response to the tentative final decision, National Farmers Union (NFU) questioned the baseline assumption that the price support program would end on December 31, 2000. Subsequently, the support program was extended for another year, and NFU questioned whether the results of the analysis would have been different if the analysis had incorporated an extension of the support program.

The official USDA baseline considers policies and programs as given at the time of its development. The baseline provides AMS and other agencies with an official interagency forecast against which to conduct policy analysis. To have assumed continuation of the support price program would have required that a number of other assumptions be made, including the relationship of butter and nonfat dry milk support prices. Dairy Programs does not create its own baseline because it might direct debate toward the correctness of the baseline and away from the issues under consideration. With respect to the effect on the results, it is not thought that including an additional year of dairy price support would have much effect.

Scope of Analysis

Impacts are measured as changes from the model baseline as adapted from the USDA dairy baseline published in February 2001. This baseline used the Class III and IV pricing formulas implemented on January 1, 2000, as a result of Federal order reform. The USDA baseline is a national, annual projection of the supply-demand-price situation for milk and dairy products. Baseline assumptions are: (1) The price support program would end on December 31, 2001; (2) the Dairy Export Incentive Program would continue to be utilized; and (3) the Federal Milk Marketing Order Program would continue as reformed on January 1, 2000.

It was necessary to make the following simplifying assumptions in order to conduct the analysis. The Federal order share of U.S. milk marketings is about 71 percent. About 65 percent of all milk manufactured (Classes II, III, and IV) is marketed under Federal order regulation. Given the prominence of Federal order marketings in the U.S. milk manufacturing industry, prices paid for manufactured milk under Federal orders

cannot get too far out of alignment with the value of milk for manufacturing in the rest of the United States. Similarly, the fluid prices in non-Federal order markets are largely reflective of Federal order minimum Class I prices.

California stands out as the state with the highest production and has its own market regulations. California milk marketings are estimated as a function of the California pool price. Non-California milk marketings are estimated as a function of an all-milk price that incorporates the Federal order pool price and over-order payment estimates. The Federal order share of those non-California marketings is estimated as a function of the Federal order blend price relative to the minimum prices of Class III and IV value of manufactured milk.

The decision's formula changes have an impact on Class I and Class II prices. Class II prices move in concert with changes in Class IV. The effects on Class I prices depend upon the effect of the formula changes on the Class III price relative to the Class IV price. Class I prices are based on the higher of the Class III or Class IV prices.

Demands for fluid milk and manufactured dairy products are functions of per capita consumption and population. Per capita consumption for the major milk and dairy products are estimated as functions of own prices, substitute prices, and income. Retail and wholesale margins are assumed unchanged from the baseline. The demands for fluid milk and soft manufactured products are satisfied by the eligible supply of milk. The milk supply for manufacturing hard products is the result of milk marketings minus the volumes demanded for fluid and soft manufactured products. The remaining volume is allocated to making cheese and making butter/nonfat dry milk according to returns to manufacturing in each class. Wholesale prices for cheese, butter, nonfat dry milk, and dry whey reflect supply and demand for these products. These prices underlie the Federal pricing system.

Summary of Results

The results of the changes to the Class III and Class IV formulas adopted under Federal order reform that are recommended in this decision are summarized using five-year, 2002–2006, average changes from the model baseline. The results presented for the Federal order system are in the context of the larger U.S. market. In particular, the Federal order price formulas use national manufactured dairy product prices.

The advanced Class I base price is the higher of the Class III or Class IV advance pricing factors. The Class I base price is the Class IV price in all years of the analytical period for the baseline, while Class III becomes the Class I base price in 2002 and 2006 under this decision. The Class I price, at the class average test of 2 percent butterfat, is slightly above the baseline in each year. This slight price increase results in small proportional reductions in the demand for skim milk and butterfat for Class I use. Milk generally shifts from Class I use to the production of butter, nonfat dry milk, and cheese in generally the same proportions as in the baseline. As a result, the wholesale prices of butter, nonfat dry milk and cheese each decrease slightly, which reduces the returns per hundredweight for U.S. milk for manufacturing.

Producers. Over the five-year period, the changes taken as a whole result in an increase of about \$0.20 per hundredweight in the Federal order minimum blend price for milk at test. Including the effects of Class I premiums and the reduced returns from manufactured milk, the Federal order all-milk price is increased by \$0.10 per hundredweight. Federal order marketings increase by an average 83 million pounds due to an increase in production in response to higher producer prices. Cash receipts increase by \$136 million (0.8 percent) from baseline receipts of \$17,194 million.

The distribution of the 2002–2006 annual average price changes across the 11 orders varies with the distribution of Class III and Class IV utilizations. Estimates of annual average price changes by order are provided in the economic analysis for this decision.

The five-year annual average U.S. all-milk price increases by \$0.07 per hundredweight, and includes an average manufactured milk value decline of \$0.05 per hundredweight. U.S. milk marketings increase by an average 65 million pounds annually, and cash receipts increase by \$126 million (0.5 percent) from baseline receipts of \$23,884 million.

Milk Manufacturers and Processors. Annual Class IV and Class II skim milk prices increase each year for an average of \$0.08 per hundredweight (1.1 percent) for the 2002–2006 period. This increase results mainly from changing the conversion factor for nonfat dry milk to nonfat solids from 1.02 to 1.0. The Class I skim milk price increases by an average of \$0.10 per hundredweight. Butterfat prices decline each year by an average of 1.05 cents per pound.

The Class IV price at test (about 6.82 percent butterfat) declines by an average

of –\$0.07 per hundredweight, mainly as the result of a slight reduction in the butterfat content of Class IV over 2002–2006. The Class II price at test is unchanged. The Class I price at test (about 2 percent butterfat) increases on average \$0.07 per hundredweight (0.57 percent).

The annual average Class III price at test (3.82 percent butterfat) increases by about \$0.38 per hundredweight during 2002–2006. From the 2002 and 2003 Class III price increase of \$0.47 and \$0.48 per hundredweight, respectively, the changes steadily decline, ending in an increase of \$0.23 in 2006. The major change in the Class III price is the average protein price increase of \$0.18 per pound, ranging from an increase of \$0.22 in 2002 and 2003 and declining steadily to an increase of about \$0.13 in 2006. The change in the Class III price results primarily from a combination of changes in the protein formula that reduces the impact of the butterfat price on the protein price. The major changes in the protein price formula are multiplying the butterfat price by 0.90, reflecting a 90 percent butterfat retention rate in the cheese, and replacing the 1.28 factor with 1.17.

Consumers. The expected \$0.07 per hundredweight increase in the minimum Class I price for 2002–2006 results in an average \$0.006 increase in the price per gallon of fluid milk for consumers. Annual consumer costs for fluid milk over 2002–2006 are estimated to increase on average by about \$28 million in the Federal order system and by \$26 million in the U.S.

The price of butter is estimated to decrease on average \$0.008 per pound for the period. Cheese is estimated to decrease \$0.005 per pound. Annual consumer expenditures over the five-year period are estimated to decrease by \$10 million on butter, and by \$16 million on American cheese.

A complete Economic Analysis for the Recommended Decision on Class III and Class IV Price Formulas is available upon request from Howard McDowell, Senior Economist, USDA/AMS/Dairy Programs, Office of the Chief Economist, Room 2753, South Building, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250, (202)720–7091, e-mail address howard.mcdowell@usda.gov.

Civil Rights Impact Statement

This decision is based on the record of a public hearing held May 8–12, 2000, in Alexandria, Virginia, in response to a mandate from Congress via the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000, that required the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a formal rulemaking proceeding to reconsider the

Class III and Class IV milk pricing formulas included in the final rule for the consolidation and reform of Federal milk orders. The consolidated orders were implemented on January 1, 2000. A tentative final decision on the issues considered at the hearing was issued November 29, 2000 (65 FR 76832), and an interim final order (65 FR 82832) became effective January 1, 2001. A preliminary injunction enjoining portions of the interim final order was granted in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on January 31, 2001.

Pursuant to Departmental Regulation (DR) 4300–4, a comprehensive Civil Rights Impact Analysis (CRIA) was conducted and published with the final decision on Federal milk order consolidation and reform. That CRIA included descriptions of (1) the purpose of performing a CRIA; (2) the civil rights policy of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; and (3) basics of the Federal milk marketing order program to provide background information. Also included in that CRIA was a detailed presentation of the characteristics of the dairy producer and general populations located within the former and current marketing areas.

The conclusion of that analysis disclosed no potential for affecting dairy farmers in protected groups differently than the general population of dairy farmers. All producers, regardless of race, national origin, or disability, who choose to deliver milk to handlers regulated under a Federal order will receive the minimum blend price. Federal orders provide the same assurance for all producers, without regard to sex, race, origin, or disability. The value of all milk delivered to handlers competing for sales within a defined marketing area is divided equally among all producers delivering milk to those handlers.

The issues addressed at the May 2000 hearing are issues that were addressed as part of Federal milk order consolidation and reform. Establishing representative make allowances in the formulas that price milk used in Class III and Class IV dairy products is an issue that affects the obligations of handlers of those products to the Federal milk order pool, and similarly the pool obligations of Class I and Class II handlers. The decision should result in no differential benefits in dividing the pool among all producers delivering milk to those regulated handlers. Therefore, USDA sees no potential for affecting dairy farmers in protected groups differently than the general population of dairy farmers.

Decisions on proposals to amend Federal milk marketing orders must be based on testimony and evidence presented on the record of the proceeding. The hearing notice in this proceeding invited interested persons to address any possible civil rights impact of the proposals being considered in testimony at the hearing. No such testimony was received.

Copies of the Civil Rights Impact Analysis done for the final decision on Federal milk order consolidation and reform can be obtained from AMS Dairy Programs at (202) 720-4392; any Milk Market Administrator office; or via the Internet at: www.ams.usda.gov/dairy/

Prior documents in this proceeding: *Notice of Hearing*: Issued April 6, 2000; published April 14, 2000 (65 FR 20094).

Tentative Final Decision: Issued November 29, 2000; published December 7, 2000 (65 FR 76832).

Interim Final Rule: Issued December 21, 2000; published December 28, 2000 (65 FR 82832).

Preliminary Statement

Notice is hereby given of the filing with the Hearing Clerk of this recommended decision with respect to proposed amendments to the tentative marketing agreements and orders regulating the handling of milk in the Northeast and other marketing areas. This notice is issued pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*), and the applicable rules of practice and procedure governing the formulation of marketing agreements and marketing orders (7 CFR part 900).

Interested parties may file written exceptions to this tentative decision with the Hearing Clerk, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250, by the 30th day after publication of this decision in the **Federal Register**. Six copies of the exceptions should be filed. All written submissions made pursuant to this notice will be made available for public inspection at the office of the Hearing Clerk during regular business hours (7 CFR 1.27(b)).

The Hearing Notice specifically invited interested persons to present evidence concerning the probable regulatory and informational impact of the proposals on small businesses. To the extent that this issue was raised, it is considered in the following findings and conclusions.

This recommended decision responds to a Congressional mandate to reconsider the Class III and Class IV pricing formulas included in the final

rule for the consolidation and reform of Federal milk orders. The mandate was included in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000 (Pub. L. 106-113, 115 Stat. 1501). The findings and conclusions set forth below are based on the record of a public hearing to consider proposals submitted by the industry to change the pricing formulas in the marketing agreements and the orders regulating the handling of milk in the Northeast and ten other marketing areas held in Alexandria, Virginia, on May 8-12, 2000. Notice of such hearing was issued on April 6, 2000 and published on April 14, 2000 (65 FR 20094).

In addition, this recommended decision is issued in response to comments received on the tentative final decision (issued November 29, 2000; 65 FR 76832) on the above hearing and is consistent with the injunction issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on January 31, 2001.

Brief Summary of Changes to Class III and IV Formulas

As instructed by the legislation requiring this proceeding, the Class III and IV pricing formulas and all of the elements of the formulas were re-considered in developing the tentative final decision and this recommended decision. The changes made in the Class IV component formulas adopted in Federal order reform are minimal. The product prices used in the Class IV formulas (butterfat and nonfat solids) are unchanged. The make allowances for butter and nonfat dry milk are increased slightly, by .1 cents for butter and .3 cents for nonfat dry milk. The divisor used in the butterfat component formula is unchanged, while the 1.02 divisor used in the nonfat solids price formula to reflect the relative values and yields of buttermilk powder and nonfat dry milk is eliminated.

The Class III component price formulas follow the format of the formulas included in Federal order reform and made effective pursuant to the injunction granted by the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia. The formulas revert to using the same butterfat price calculated from the butter price as in Class IV, and a protein price formula that includes an adjustment to represent the differential value of butterfat used in cheese and butterfat used in butter. In the butterfat adjustment to the protein price, the amount of butterfat accounted for at its value in butter is reduced to the same amount as that accounted for at its value in cheese (90 percent), and the 1.28 multiplier is changed to 1.17. The dry

whey price, for computing the other solids price, is unchanged. The whey powder make allowance is increased from the tentative final decision to recognize the somewhat greater cost of drying whey than of drying skim milk, and the snubber on the other solids price is removed.

The material issues on the record of the hearing relate to:

1. Role of producer costs of production.
2. Commodity prices (CME vs. NASS).
3. Commodity and component price issues.
 - a. General approaches on make allowances.
 - b. Class IV butterfat and nonfat solids prices.
 - c. Class III butterfat, protein, and other nonfat solids prices.
 - d. Effects of changes to Class III and Class IV price formulas.
4. Class price relationships.
5. Class I price mover.
6. Miscellaneous and conforming changes.
 - a. Advance Class I butterfat price.
 - b. Classification.
 - c. Distribution of butterfat value to producers.
 - d. Inclusion of Class I other source butterfat in producer butterfat price computation.
7. Re-opening of hearing, issuance of a final decision, or issuance of a recommended decision.

Summary of Changes to the Interim Amendments

This recommended decision differs from the tentative final decision in several respects and includes summaries of comments submitted on each of the issues within the discussion of the issue. The key changes that would be made to the interim order amendments are as follows:

1. In Issue 3c, changes are made to the formulas for calculating the protein and other solids prices, and the Class III butterfat price would be the same as that calculated for Class IV on the basis of butter.

2. In Issue 3d, the changes made in the Class III component price formulas would result in different effects on Class III component, skim, and hundredweight prices.

3. In Issue 6b, the classification of frozen cream, plastic cream and anhydrous milkfat would be changed back to Class III.

4. In Issue 6c, butterfat values would be pooled for the purpose of calculating producer butterfat prices in the orders in which producers are not paid on a component basis. In orders under which producers are paid on a multiple component basis, however, the producer

butterfat price would be the same as that for butterfat used in Classes III and IV.

5. In Issue 6d, the butterfat in other source milk used in Class I is included in calculating the producer butterfat price in marketwide pools that do not use multiple component pricing, but would continue to be included in the producer price differential calculation in multiple component pricing pools.

6. Issue 7 is changed to explain the reasons for issuing a recommended decision at this point in this proceeding, instead of a final decision.

Findings and Conclusions

The following findings and conclusions on the material issues are based on evidence presented at the hearing and the record thereof:

1. Role of Producer Costs of Production

Proposal 29 in the hearing notice proposed that producers' costs of production be incorporated into the Class III and Class IV pricing formulas. A number of dairy farmer witnesses testified that, just as manufacturing processors are assured that their costs of processing milk products will be covered, dairy farmers should also have some assurance that they will be able to continue to operate their dairy farms without losing money. Under the current system, according to the National Farmers Union (NFU) witness, incorporating a make allowance for processors but not for producers leaves dairy farmers to bear the entire burden of changes in supply and demand.

Support for using cost of production in the Class III and IV pricing formulas was reiterated in the comments received in response to the tentative final decision issued November 29, 2000. The National Farmers' Union comment expressed disappointment that no portion of the milk pricing formulas was based on producer cost of production. The American Raw Milk Producers Pricing Association suggested that the USDA ignored existing law as written in the 1937 Agricultural Agreement Act, section 608c(18). Two dairy farmers also mentioned their concern about the need to follow 608c(18). Another dairy farmer advocated a producer-influenced supply control/price control system.

As explained in both the proposed rule and final decision under Federal order reform and in the tentative final decision in this proceeding, assuring producers that their costs of production will be covered addresses only the milk supply side of the market and ignores factors underlying demand or changes in demand for milk and milk products. As noted by the Dairy Farmers of America (DFA) witness, although

pricing proposals incorporating cost of production have been noticed and reviewed several times in the last decade without success, if a sound mechanical concept could be advanced that overcomes the objections relative to supply and demand, it should be considered.

The proposals by NFU and National Farmers Organization (NFO) that advocated adoption of make allowances that would be adjusted for changes in indexes reflecting dairy farmers' production costs are discussed under Issue 3a, General Approaches on Make Allowances.

In this recommended decision, consideration has again been given to cost of production proposals. As noted by the NFO witness, the current pricing system uses the interaction of supply and demand for milk products as an indirect method of meeting the pricing requirements of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (the Act) for milk. The record of this proceeding contains no new dairy farmer cost of production data that could be used to reflect both the supply and demand sides of the market for dairy products. There is no evidence in the record that either USDA's Economic Research Service or the CDFA costs of production have ever been used to price milk.

The Act stipulates that the price of feeds, the availability of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk and its products be taken into account in the determination of milk prices. This requirement currently is fulfilled by the Class III and Class IV component price calculations. If conditions increase supply costs, the quantity of milk produced would be reduced due to lower profit margins. As the milk supply declines, plants buying manufacturing milk would pay a higher price to maintain an adequate supply of milk to meet their needs. As the resulting farm profit margins increase, so should the supply of milk. Likewise, the reverse would occur if economic conditions reduce supply costs. The price of feed is not directly included in the determination of the price for milk, but rather is one economic condition which may cause a situation in which the price of milk may increase or decrease. A change in feed prices may not necessarily result in a change in milk prices. For instance, if the price of feed increases but the demand for cheese declines, the milk price may not increase since milk plants would need less milk and therefore would not bid the price up in response to lower milk supplies. Also, other economic

conditions could more than offset a change in feed prices and, thus, not necessitate a change in milk prices.

The pricing system continued in this decision will continue to account for changes in feed costs, feed supplies and other economic conditions, as explained above. The product price formulas adopted in this rule should reflect accurately the market values of the products made from producer milk used in manufacturing. As supply costs increase with a resulting decline in production, commodity prices would increase as a result of manufacturers attempting to secure enough milk to meet their needs. Such increases in commodity prices would mean higher prices for milk. The opposite would be true if supply costs were declining. Additionally, since Federal order prices are minimum prices, handlers may increase their pay prices in response to changing supply/demand conditions even when Federal order prices do not increase.

Additionally, the pricing formulas developed in this decision are applicable to handlers, since handlers are the regulated parties under Federal milk order regulation. The formulas are used to establish minimum prices for milk used in making particular dairy products, not for determining payments to dairy farmers.

2. Commodity Prices (CME vs. NASS)

As adopted in the interim final rule in this proceeding (published on December 28, 2000 (65 FR 82832)), commodity prices determined by surveys conducted by USDA's National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) continue to be used in the component price formulas that replaced the BFP. This decision recommends no changes in the source of product price data.

Several proposals (1, 5, 10 and 19) were considered during the current proceeding that recommended using prices reported by the Chicago Mercantile Exchange (CME) instead of the NASS surveys to determine commodity prices. Both the CME and the NASS surveys were supported by testimony at the hearing and in briefs. The CME is a cash market where speculators, producers, and processors can buy and sell products. It is a mechanism for establishing prices on which the dairy industry relies. Thus, a lot of contracts to buy and sell dairy products are based on CME prices. A USDA witness testified that he is unaware of any other indices used to price cheese in the U.S. According to several witnesses, cheese and butter processors generally base their contract sales on CME prices.

The NASS price survey gathers selling prices of cheddar cheese, Grade AA butter, nonfat dry milk, and dry whey from a number of manufacturers of these products nationwide. At the time the proposed rule on Federal order reform was published (January 30, 1998), the NASS survey included prices for cheddar cheese only. This survey had begun in March 1997. In September 1998, before the final decision was published in April 1999, NASS began surveys of Grade AA butter prices, dry whey prices, and nonfat dry milk prices. In developing these commodity surveys, input was obtained from the dairy industry on appropriate types of products, packaging, and package sizes to be included for the purpose of obtaining unbiased representative prices. A sale is considered to occur when a transaction is completed, the product is shipped out, or title transfer occurs. In addition, all prices are f.o.b. the processing plant/storage center, with the processor reporting total volume sold and total dollars received or price per pound. NASS Dairy Products Prices reports wholesale cheddar cheese prices for both 500-pound barrels and 40-pound blocks, USDA Grade AA butter, USDA Extra Grade or USPH Grade A non-fortified dry milk, and USDA Extra Grade edible non-hygroscopic dry whey. A more-detailed description of the surveys can be found in the final decision of April 2, 1999 (64 FR 16093).

The proponents of proposal 1, Western States Dairy Producers Trade Association, et al. (WSDPTA), a group of several trade associations and cooperatives, proposed that the NASS commodity prices for butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk that currently are used for computing the Federal order component prices be replaced with prices determined by trading on the CME. Dry whey was not included in the proposal because there is no dry whey cash contract traded on the CME. A witness from WSDPTA did not oppose the collection and reporting of NASS data, but expressed the opinion that while it serves an important function as information, it should not be used to establish prices. The proponents presented several benefits of using the CME over the NASS survey for commodity prices.

Proponents explained that by using CME prices in the formulas, prices would be known immediately rather than a week later when the NASS prices are published, reflecting more quickly the supply-demand conditions for dairy products. The one-week delay is caused by the time necessary to collect data. A witness for National Farmers Organization noted that interested

persons are able to check the CME value of products on a daily basis and use the reported prices as a factor in establishing what they will pay, or what they will be paid, for cheese.

A witness from WSDPTA went on to explain that buyers, sellers, and speculators trade the CME, trying to obtain a price in their favor, while the price actually is determined by supply and demand forces. He described the rules as fair and the results as transparent, with participants having a number of interests. The witness continued by noting that the CME price result is instant and results cannot be altered. In contrast, he stated, NASS prices are reported by sellers only, who are not disinterested parties. He argued that NASS respondents can modify their numbers or file an initial report after calculating the price impact of the latest reports.

The proponents also concluded that the urging by many hearing participants that the NASS price series include mandatory participation and be audited proves that the NASS series is not reliable enough to be used as a price-discovery method.

Finally, the witness from WSDPTA expressed the view that the NASS price series would feed on itself and result in price setting, not price discovery. He continued by noting that plants and their buyers will obtain prices one week and sell the commodity in the following week at a price derived in large part from the price obtained in the prior week. The witness compared the NASS survey to the CDFA survey of powder prices which, he claimed, results in a circular pricing system that is mathematically incapable of fully reflecting the top of the market price for powder because so little of the survey volume is priced off of the spot market. Proponents expressed the belief that this circularity causes prices to remain lower than they would without it and that prices would increase more slowly and decrease more rapidly than would prices on the CME, causing overall lower prices for dairy farmers.

In the comments filed on the tentative final decision, the proponents of changing from NASS to CME prices commented only that USDA should reconsider the use of NASS prices. A partner/manager of a dairy farm stated that there is little correlation between the NASS and wholesale prices, and questioned the accuracy of NASS survey numbers. He also stated that block and barrel cheese is traded only between manufacturers and that they therefore have an influence on setting the price, especially if the percentage of the product traded is very low. He argued

that a fair price would reflect retail prices or at least true wholesale price, not the value of the last pound of product produced.

Opponents of changing from NASS to CME prices to compute component prices included International Dairy Foods Association (IDFA), Dairy Farmers of America (DFA), and National Milk Producers Federation (NMPF). Witnesses for these parties argued that the NASS survey includes pricing based on a significantly larger volume of product than does the CME. In the case of the nonfat dry milk market, the table of 1999 monthly Chicago Mercantile Exchange Cash Markets data from the 1999 Annual Dairy Market Statistics showed that there were no sales reported for either extra grade or Grade A in the year 1999.

According to a witness from IDFA, the volume of cheddar cheese in the NASS survey is equal to 26.4 percent of all cheddar cheese production in the U.S. for the period September 1998 through February 2000. During the same period, the CME volume of cheddar cheese traded represented only 1.7 percent of U.S. cheddar cheese production. The witness stated that for the same 18-month period, the NASS survey volumes represented 14.4 percent of all U.S. butter production while CME trading consisted of only 2.6 percent. He also noted that switching from the NASS survey data to the CME data would result in a change from a very broad to an extremely thin representation of actual product transactions.

Opponents to the proposal to use CME prices also pointed out that prices at the CME are Chicago or Midwest prices based on the delivery location specification of the contract. Therefore, they argued, the scope of the reported prices for cheese, butter, and nonfat dry milk are not national. A witness for Kraft noted that reliance on the CME alone would exclude the substantial and growing volume of cheese produced in the western United States (U.S.), particularly California. A witness for Northwest Dairy Association suggested that a transportation credit would need to be used with CME prices, at least in the West, to reduce the value of the CME to a more representative level. Opponents went on to explain that since the NASS survey contains data from plants located all over the United States, NASS prices represent a national scope of the prices of each of the particular commodities.

Several of the comments filed in response to the tentative final decision supported use of the NASS price series to determine product prices.

According to the testimony in the record and a number of the briefs, cheese and butter sellers and buyers look to the CME to identify the most current price levels. As a result, prices move in response to supply and demand conditions in the marketplace as reflected at the CME. Since the transaction prices of commodities are based off of the CME, it is difficult to see how the NASS survey can cause, or result in, circularity. The NASS prices reflect the CME prices with a short lag but are based on a much greater volume, enhancing the stability of the price series. Continued use of the NASS price survey appears to be the best method of obtaining reliable data about commodity prices.

As stated in the final decision on Federal order reform, NASS data traditionally have been collected via a survey with voluntary participation. The price information, like most NASS data, has not been audited. NASS, however, applies various statistical techniques and cross-checking with other sources to provide the most reliable information available. The issue of mandatory and audited NASS data was not within the scope of the rulemaking and could not be addressed on the basis of the hearing record. At the time of the hearing NASS was not authorized to conduct such activities, but legislation has since been passed that authorizes mandatory and verified price reporting.

3. Commodity and Component Price Issues

a. General Approaches on Make Allowances

Changes to the make allowances for each of the product formulas used in calculating component prices were proposed and discussed at length during this proceeding. Except in the case of dry whey, make allowances adopted in the component price formulas in this decision are calculated using a weighted average of the most recent CDFA study and the RBCS study. A marketing cost of \$.0015 per pound is added to both the CDFA costs and the RBCS costs, and the CDFA value for return on investment is used to adjust the RBCS cost. This is generally the same approach used to determine the appropriate make allowances under Federal order reform, and results in values that differ little from the formulas adopted at that time.

For the calculation of the Class III "other nonfat solids" price, neither the CDFA nor RBCS studies included information on the cost of making dry whey. The tentative final decision determined that the make allowance for

dry whey should remain the same as that for nonfat dry milk. However, the results of a survey done for this proceeding under the auspices of IDFA are being recommended in this decision for use in determining the make allowance for dry whey.

A number of the proposals considered in this proceeding would change the manufacturing, or make, allowances adopted for the pricing formulas under Federal order reform. There was considerable testimony on the appropriate factors to be considered in establishing make allowances, and several sources of data were cited as the most accurate to use for such a purpose.

Two surveys of product manufacturing costs that were averaged for use in calculating make allowances under Federal order reform were the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) study, which is done annually and includes nearly 100 percent of dairy products manufactured in California, and the Rural Business Cooperative Service (RBCS) study, which is conducted annually by USDA as an in-plant benchmark study for participating cooperative associations. These two surveys had both been updated since earlier versions had been used in determining the manufacturing allowances used in the component pricing formulas adopted under Federal order reform. In addition, the National Cheese Institute (NCI), an affiliate of IDFA, contracted with a third party to conduct a survey of the costs of manufacturing cheese and whey powder for use in this proceeding.

A witness for NMPF stated that make allowances should reflect the costs incurred by average plants manufacturing the particular dairy product used in the component/Class price formulas: butter, nonfat dry milk, cheese, and dry whey. The witness went on to explain that the procedure used by the Secretary for determining the make allowances under Federal order reform, using an average of the CDFA cost of production studies and the RBCS study, was sound and that the same procedure should be used as a result of this hearing, using the updated data from both surveys. In calculating an appropriate make allowance, the witness supported addition of a marketing cost of \$.0015 per pound to both the CDFA costs and the RBCS costs, as under Federal order reform, and the CDFA value for return on investment used to adjust the RBCS costs under Federal order reform. The witness explained that both of these factors should be included as they are legitimate and necessary costs incurred in operating manufacturing plants.

The witness for IDFA supported inclusion of the CDFA cost studies in the computation of the make allowance; however, the witness stated that the appropriate procedure for computing the make allowance for cheese was to compute a weighted average of the CDFA cost studies and the NCI survey. The witness explained that the RBCS study does not include all the necessary costs that must be recovered in the make allowance, and that the NCI survey is needed to determine what the additional cost values should be. The costs that the IDFA witness pointed out—those which are not included in the RBCS survey but which are included in the NCI survey—are general plant administrative costs, such as the plant manager's salary and corporate overhead; return on investment or capital costs; and marketing costs.

The IDFA representative testified that the danger inherent in regulated prices is setting the manufacturing allowance at a level too low to assure that manufacturers will be able to recover their costs of manufacturing finished products and to have the money needed to invest in new plants. The witness pointed out that an inadequate make allowance would force manufacturers either to move to areas that do not have regulated pricing or go out of business. At the very least, the witness explained, the manufacturers would not invest in new plants and equipment, which in the long run would cause a decline in the productivity of the dairy industry. A number of briefs filed on the basis of the hearing transcript emphasized the importance of covering all handlers' costs of manufacturing, and not just average costs.

The IDFA witness explained that if make allowances are established at too low a level, proprietary plants are placed at a competitive disadvantage relative to cooperative-owned plants. The witness explained that since cooperatives do not have to pay their producers the minimum order price, as proprietary plants are required to do, cooperative plants can reduce the prices paid to member producers to make up the difference in cost.

The IDFA witness explained further that the problem with a make allowance established below the amount needed to cover plant costs occurs because the plant sells the finished product at the same price that is used in the formula for establishing the minimum price the plant must pay for the raw material (milk). The manufacturing allowances are the only place the plant has the opportunity to cover its costs, and those allowances are fixed in the formula that determines the raw material price.

The witness for IDFA asserted that there is very little risk in setting a make allowance too high. He explained that if the make allowance is established at a level above plant costs, the additional revenue stream will be corrected through market forces by requiring the plant operators to pay competitive over-order premiums to milk suppliers to obtain an adequate supply of milk.

A witness for WSDPTA explained that the most important part of determining a manufacturing allowance is to pick a method and stick with that method. The witness testified that the appropriate method is to use the results of the RBCS study with adjustments to include factors for marketing costs and for capital costs. The witness pointed out that use of the RBCS study is appropriate because the study is voluntary and represents the costs of making the particular commodities, and the plants are geographically widely dispersed. The WSDPTA witness stated that including the results of the CDFA study in the computation of the make allowance for pricing Federal order milk is inappropriate since there is no logical reason for considering the manufacturing costs of plants that do not procure any of the milk that would be priced using those costs.

Witnesses testifying on behalf of NFU and NFO both supported the concept of variable make allowances, in which changes in dairy farmer production cost indexes would be used to adjust handler make allowances. The NFU proposal would use an average national cost of production, presumably as published by USDA's Economic Research Service, and the NFO proposal would use the CDFA milk production cost index. The witnesses supported such an approach as a means of addressing the problem of manufacturers being insulated from changes in supply and demand by their fixed make allowances.

The NFU and NFO witnesses explained that a fixed make allowance, as contained in the current pricing system, does not vary with market conditions and creates a situation in which manufacturers will not respond to market signals since the manufacturers will receive a profit no matter what the supply and demand is for the finished products. The witnesses testified that as long as the make allowance allows manufacturers a sufficient return, the manufacturers will continue to produce the finished product even if there is limited demand for the product, thus resulting in a continued low price paid to producers for their milk. As a result, they argued, producers are left to bear the burden of changes in supply and demand. The

NFO witness characterized a variable make allowance tied to the cost of producing milk as a market-oriented system.

The NFU witness described the California milk pricing system, in which manufacturers' production costs are covered through the make allowance, as an example of the problems encountered by producers with the use of product price formulas incorporating make allowances. He testified that California continues to produce a large quantity of lower-valued products because the pricing system makes the manufacturer immune to the supply of and demand for the products. The witness blamed the California make allowance system for the traditionally low milk prices in California that, he claimed, result in expansion of dairy herds to make up for reduced cash flow. The witness predicted that if the Federal order system follows the same pricing path, the same production patterns as witnessed in California would follow in the rest of the United States.

In comments filed in response to the tentative final decision, NFU stated that producers, as well as processors, will fail if they don't attain their costs of production. NFU also argued in its comments that under a variable make allowance processors can avoid reduced make allowances by increasing product prices.

The NFU comment overlooks the fact that the make allowances included in the component price formulas do not cover all of the costs of all processors, and probably allow for greater costs than are experienced by some processors. In this sense, the margins experienced by processors under product price formulas are variable between plants. Also, it is likely that processors share some of their margin with producers in the form of over order prices. The degree to which this sharing occurs certainly may vary with producers' cost/price situations, as perceived by processors. Although increased product prices would have the effect of increasing manufacturing margins, the ability of processors to increase prices while maintaining sales is limited by the fact that the marketplace in which they sell their products is competitive.

There would appear to be no logical or economic reason for changing make allowances for processing plants because of a change in the cost of producing milk. If milk is to clear the market, plants must be willing to accept it. Make allowances that decline as a result of increasing milk production costs would squeeze plant margins, and manufacturers will have to choose

between not receiving milk, refusing to receive pooled milk, or paying less than order prices to cooperative associations for milk used in manufactured products. None of these outcomes would be in the best long-term interests of dairy farmers, processors, or consumers. Many dairy farmers, facing increased costs of production, would have to find alternative outlets for their milk. Decisions on the part of many processors to cease operating, use only nonpool milk, or buy milk below order prices likely would result in very disorderly conditions among dairy farmers looking for outlets for their milk.

Most hearing participants agreed that the make allowance should cover the cost of converting milk to a finished manufactured dairy product. However, several participants disagreed with the IDFA contention that there is very little risk in setting the make allowance too high. They argued that if the make allowance is set in excess of the cost to manufacture finished products, the additional revenue would be kept by the manufacturing plants as higher profits and not distributed to the producers supplying milk to the plant. They explained that in many parts of the country there is little if any competition for the dairy farmers' milk and therefore no incentive for a plant to pay above the minimum Federal order price. These plants, according to the witnesses, could be expected to keep the extra make allowance for themselves. Comments filed by Michigan Milk Producers Association continued to urge caution against logic that suggests a low risk of setting make allowances too high. The cooperative stated that not all of its 2,700 members might survive a market adjustment period if make allowances were set too high, even if theoretically greater premiums might be returned to producers.

Several witnesses opposed the idea of setting make allowances at levels that guarantee plants a profit, or at least a return on investment, when the dairy farmers supplying milk to the manufacturing plants have no similar assurances for covering the costs of producing milk. These witnesses pointed to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, Sec. 608c(18), as justification for setting a lower make allowance for plants, resulting in higher milk prices that would come closer to covering dairy farmers' costs of producing milk. This point of view was reiterated in a half-dozen comments filed in response to the tentative final decision.

As supported by most of the hearing participants, the make allowances

incorporated in the component price formulas under the Federal milk orders should cover the costs of most of the processing plants that receive milk pooled under the orders. In part, this approach is necessary because pooled handlers must be able to compete with processors whose milk receipts are not priced in regulated markets. The principal reason for this approach, however, is to assure that the market is cleared of reserve milk supplies.

In comments on the tentative final decision, IDFA continued to argue that some legitimate manufacturing costs are excluded from the RBCS survey and attacked the data gathered as "inherently suspicious and unreliable." IDFA also stated that the survey is not taken seriously by some of its participants. Both IDFA and Leprino Foods Company argued in comments on the tentative final decision that adding factors for costs excluded in the RBCS study constitutes a less accurate result than if those costs were included in a comprehensive study. IDFA also commented that the need to allow for changes in cost factors that might occur over time (such as recent increases in energy costs) also supports the need for a make allowance that is too high rather than one that is too low.

Although the RBCS survey does not include such costs as general plant administrative costs, return on investment or capital costs, and marketing costs, it is a survey that has been done for sixteen years with the same fundamental methodology and with some continuity of participants. Because the survey is done for the benefit of the participating organizations (cooperatives) to help them identify their costs and compare them with those of their peer group, there is every reason to believe that the costs provided are as accurate as possible. In addition, the years of experience with the survey have enabled USDA to shape the questions to obtain more accurate results.

When the RBCS survey results are adjusted to include the factors that were mentioned above as not included by using the values for those factors from the CDFA survey, the two surveys' costs are comparable, especially considering that the RBCS survey represents manufacturing plants with a wide distribution around the U.S., while the CDFA survey includes only California plants. The CDFA survey is also done every year and is done according to a published procedure manual, with the costs being audited by personnel employed by the State for that purpose. Although no CDFA employee was available to respond to questions about

the conduct of the survey, official notice was taken of the procedure manual and of California publications associated with manufacturing cost data. In addition, several witnesses who are deeply involved with the California dairy industry testified regarding the perceived reliability of the survey results.

The use of manufacturing plant data from California plants that do not procure any of the milk that would be priced using those costs should not cause concern. The costs of manufacturing dairy products may vary slightly by region, but adoption of representative make allowances in product price formulas should not fail to use a well-documented study that includes a large amount of audited data, such as the CDFA survey.

In contrast to the RBCS and CDFA surveys, the survey of cheese and whey powder manufacturing costs arranged for by NCI was developed solely for the purpose of establishing costs to be used in determining make allowances for this proceeding. The survey was conducted by persons unfamiliar with the dairy industry among cheese processors who would benefit from the adoption of overgenerous make allowances. No one who actually conducted the survey was made available to testify, and although the IDFA witness stated that survey participants would testify regarding their responses to the survey later in the hearing, none of the participating firms' witnesses would respond to questions about their firms' results.

Although less weight must be given the NCI survey than either the RBCS or the CDFA surveys for the reasons stated above, the NCI survey's resulting manufacturing costs for cheese are not considerably different from a weighted average of the RBCS and the CDFA surveys. In fact, although the IDFA hearing participants went to great lengths to discredit the RBCS study for use in identifying an appropriate level of manufacturing costs, the hearing record reflects that the NCI survey of cheese and dry whey manufacturing costs used the RBCS 1996 survey results to identify outliers (plus or minus 10 percent) in the study commissioned by NCI.

In comments filed on the tentative final decision, IDFA urged that USDA use the NCI and CDFA studies for use in determining make allowances for cheese and whey powder rather than using the RBCS and CDFA studies. The IDFA comments stated that the characterization of the RBCS study as neutral and not developed or commissioned for use in this proceeding was inaccurate, as cooperative

associations attending the National Milk Producers Federation annual meeting were encouraged to participate in the survey so the results could be used in this proceeding. Since the RBCS study was developed and has continued for sixteen years for purposes other than establishing make allowances, and the methodology did not change from past years for the study used in the hearing, it is unlikely that it was designed for any purpose other than the one for which it was developed and has been used for that period. If the comment is intended to raise concerns that cooperative associations generally favor lower make allowances, it should be noted that only manufacturing cooperatives were surveyed. The record contains ample evidence that many manufacturing cooperatives desire make allowances just as generous as those favored by proprietary manufacturers.

A comment filed on behalf of the Association of Dairy Cooperatives in the Northeast (ADCNE), some of which are national in scope, argued that use of the NCI data would demean the importance of sworn first-hand testimony that is subject to cross-examination.

As a result of the differences in conduct of the three surveys, manufacturing costs used to determine appropriate make allowances for cheddar cheese, butter, and nonfat dry milk in this proceeding are calculated primarily from a weighted average of the RBCS and CDFA surveys, with a check against the NCI survey cost of manufacturing cheddar cheese. Since the record lacks any other data regarding the cost of making whey powder, the NCI survey results are used for the make allowance in the other solids formula.

One proposal included in the hearing notice would have eliminated any marketing allowance from the make allowances, and a number of witnesses' testimony objected to the inclusion of return on investment. The American Farm Bureau witness questioned the need for a marketing allowance since producers already pay a 15-cent assessment for promotion and research. A brief filed by the proponent of eliminating the marketing allowance stated that the allowance appears to be an "adjustment" or a "hedge," since it is not defined in the final decision in the Federal order reform process.

There was general agreement among those testifying that a marketing allowance should be included in manufacturing costs, but no consensus about the appropriate number. Some of the costs covered by the marketing allowance include maintaining and staffing warehouses, supporting a

marketing and sales staff, and transporting product to market, as well as accounting costs associated with the sale of products. The NCI survey identified a marketing cost of \$.0011 per pound of product, while the DFA witness stated that DFA's costs were approximately \$.0018. The DFA witness testified that because the costs included in the activities designated as marketing generally fall within a common department under common management, it is appropriate to apply the same allowance to each product.

A witness for Northwest Dairy Association (NDA), a cooperative association in the Pacific Northwest, stated that NDA's marketing costs are \$.0026 but identified costs associated with the aging of cheese as included in that number. Since the NASS survey price does not include cheese intended for aging, the marketing allowance certainly should not include costs of aging cheese. The Associated Milk Producers, Inc. (AMPI), witness used a \$.0024 marketing allowance in the calculation of AMPI's proposed make allowance for nonfat dry milk. The witness for Agri-Mark, Inc., a large Northeast cooperative association with several processing plants, stated that Agri-Mark's estimates of marketing costs ranged from \$.0025 to \$.005 per pound.

The costs identified as those included in a marketing allowance are necessarily incurred in getting a product to market and are not related to the consumer education and advertising activities covered by the National Dairy Board assessment. Since the marketing cost determined by NCI is the only one of the estimates included in the hearing record that is supported by a survey, and it varies from the \$.0015 rate included in Federal order reform by only 4 one-hundredths of a cent and applies only to cheese and dry whey, there seems to be no solid basis for making any change to the current marketing allowance.

Some producer witnesses objected to the inclusion of any allowance for return on investment in manufacturing allowances on the basis that dairy farmers are assured of no such return. The CDFA manufacturing cost surveys include allowances for depreciation, which is included in the non-labor processing costs; and for return on investment, which represents the opportunity cost of the processors' resources invested in the business. These costs are supported by audited data.

Both the marketing allowance and return on investment factors should be included in the manufacturing allowances provided in the component price formulas at the rates supported by

the CDFA data. If processors are not provided enough of a manufacturing allowance to market the product they process, or to earn any return on investment, they will not continue to provide processing capacity for producers' milk. At the same time, the manufacturing allowances incorporated in the formulas will not provide enough of an allowance to assure that every processor, no matter how inefficient or high-cost, will earn a profit. Allowances set at such a level certainly could result in the situation warned of by producer groups in which processors manufacture greater volumes of product than the market demands because they are guaranteed a profit on all their production. As a result, the only way to market all of the product would be to reduce prices, with a profit to processors still locked in through the make allowance, which would result in decreasing prices paid to producers. In addition, manufacturers who are assured a profit on all of their output would have a lesser incentive to make a sufficient quantity of milk available for fluid use—a basic goal of the Federal milk order program.

One area addressed by several hearing participants in testimony and in briefs as appropriate to consider in establishing make allowances or yields was the loss of milk components during manufacturing processes.

Two cheese manufacturers, IDFA, and Land O'Lakes (LOL) continued to argue in their comments on the tentative final decision that make allowances should be increased, or yields reduced, to reflect shrinkage between farms and warehouses.

As stated in the tentative final decision, the orders have always provided an allowance for shrinkage and continue to do so, but inflating costs of production or reducing yield factors to reflect shrinkage would not properly reflect the value of producers' milk used in manufactured products. Processing costs determined by the surveys described above, which underlie the manufacturing costs incorporated in the pricing formulas, are expressed in cents per pound of end product manufactured, not in the cost per hundredweight of converting milk to manufactured products. The component pricing formulas are based on the content of those components in the finished products for which a manufacturing cost per pound has been established. Both the CDFA and RBCS cost surveys allocate all plant costs to actual end products, a process which should take shrinkage into account. Similarly, the yield factors in the formulas refer to the amount of finished

product resulting from the processing of a given volume of input or to the amount of component present in the finished product. Both of these factors in the pricing formulas include consideration of shrinkage.

A comment filed by Lamers Dairy argued that using make allowances to calculate Class III and Class IV prices but not Class I and Class II prices constitutes unequal treatment. The comment disregards the fact that the make allowances in the Class III and Class IV price calculations are used to determine prices for milk used in those classes, and that the prices for milk used in Classes I and II are based on those milk prices. The Class I and II prices are determined for the purpose of valuing milk in uses that are alternatives to manufacturing uses. Once the Class III and IV prices have been established, the Class I and II prices can be calculated using differentials from the base prices.

The detailed explanation of each product's manufacturing allowance is included with the description of its primary component's pricing formula later in this decision.

b. Class IV Butterfat and Nonfat Solids Prices

Butterfat Price. This decision continues to use the NASS price for Grade AA butter for calculating the butterfat price to be used in Class IV and to change the manufacturing allowance in the butterfat price formula by $\frac{1}{10}$ of a cent per pound of butter from the allowance used under Federal order reform. The .82 divisor in the price formula is unchanged. The make allowance change is the same as that included in the tentative final decision, and neither it nor the other factors were affected by the injunction. However, the injunction resulted in the same butterfat price formula being used to value both Class III butterfat and Class IV butterfat.

Several proposals were heard that would reduce butterfat prices, either by reducing the butter price used in the computation of the butterfat prices for all classes or by subtracting a fixed amount from the butterfat price computed for Class IV. Proposals also were made that would change the make allowance used in calculation of the butterfat prices. There were no proposals to change the butterfat divisor of .82, although one witness representing a western cooperative association suggested that it be reconsidered as he felt it did not include a shrinkage factor.

Product Price (Butter). Several witnesses for proprietary processor proponents of the proposal to deduct six cents from the butter price before

computing the butterfat price stated that historically the value of butterfat in the Federal milk orders has been based on the price of Grade A butter. The witnesses explained that an equivalent price determination had been issued in 1998 (when the CME discontinued trading Grade A butter) that nine cents would be subtracted from the Grade AA butter price for use in calculating Federal order butterfat prices. This equivalent price, according to the witnesses, was found to be "essential" to the continued operation of the Federal milk order program. Further, they argued that its adoption continued the policy of basing butterfat pricing under the Federal milk orders on a value below that of Grade AA butter.

The witnesses complained that under Federal order reform the butterfat value is determined by using the NASS Grade AA price of butter, which effectively increases the butterfat value under Federal milk orders. According to proponents' calculations, the increase does not amount to a full nine cents but is tempered by the use of the NASS Grade AA price, which has averaged approximately three cents below the CME Grade AA price, in the butterfat pricing formula. Therefore, they stated, the actual increase in the butter price used to calculate butterfat prices is approximately six cents. According to the witnesses, subtraction of six cents from the NASS butter price would return the relationship between the butterfat value under the orders and the selling price of butter to the relationship that existed prior to Federal order reform.

Several witnesses explained that when handlers must pay for butterfat on the basis of the Grade AA butter market they cannot then sell cream or finished products at a price that would allow them to recover their costs. They testified that cream is sold at a price that is termed a "multiple" of the butter price, and that the multiples used when the butterfat price was calculated from the Grade A butter price have not adjusted to the new pricing formula using Grade AA butter.

The IDFA witness pointed out that the IDFA proposal to subtract six cents from the NASS Grade AA butter price would apply not only to the butterfat formula for Class II, Class III, and Class IV but would apply to the advance butterfat formula used for computing the Class I butterfat price. The witness testified that by applying the same formula to all classes of butterfat the current relationship between the class prices would be maintained. The witness contended that there is no justification for changing the relationships between

the class prices, particularly if the adjustment would widen the class price spreads or, in effect, increase the Class I and Class II differentials.

Witnesses for NMPF and several large cooperative associations testified in support of NMPF's proposal to reduce the calculated butterfat price by six cents, with the reduction applied to Class IV butterfat only. Under this proposal, the computation of the butterfat prices for other classes would not contain the six-cent adjustment. Several witnesses representing cooperative associations that process butter explained that butter manufacturers incur additional costs when procuring cream used for manufacturing butter as opposed to the cost of converting producer milk to butter. The witnesses explained that these additional costs include transportation, additional handling, and additional pasteurization. The witness for LOL testified that the additional costs amounted to 4.57 cents per pound of butterfat for transportation and .4 cents per pound for receiving, storing, and repasteurization. A witness for Agri-Mark stated that Agri-Mark's transportation costs are slightly less than LOL's, probably due to the proximity of the Agri-Mark plant to the sources of cream, but that the other additional costs are slightly higher than the LOL costs, at .5 cents per pound of butterfat.

The proponents of reducing the Class IV butterfat value also referred to the computation of the California Class 4a butterfat price, which involves a subtraction of 4.5 cents per pound from the CME Grade AA butter price to adjust for the costs of moving butter from the west coast to the Midwest.

Those parties who favored reducing the butter price before using the butterfat price formula to calculate any of the butterfat prices disagreed vehemently with the proposal to reduce only the Class IV butterfat price. They argued that such a reduction would distort the relationship between the Class II and Class IV prices, resulting in a greatly-increased price for Class II butterfat in relation to Class IV butterfat. Specifically, the projected increase in the Class II-Class IV butterfat price difference was cited as 6.7 cents per pound (from the current difference of .7 cents). These parties argued that butterfat values would most appropriately be reduced to the same degree in all classes.

The price to be used for butterfat in Class III and Class IV should be computed by subtracting a make allowance of .115 dollars per pound from the monthly average NASS Grade

AA butter price and dividing the result by .82 since 1.2213 pounds of butter can be made from 1 pound of butterfat. The Class II butterfat price should continue to be the Class IV butterfat price plus .007 cents, while the Class I butterfat price will be the advance butterfat price plus the applicable Class I differential.

Contrary to the belief stated by some witnesses, the use of the Grade AA butter price for computing the butterfat price under Federal order reform was not an "oversight." Trading of Grade A butter on the CME was ended as of June 26, 1998 (not by USDA, as implied in one brief, but by the CME) because the volume of Grade A butter traded was not great enough to warrant maintaining a trading venue. One brief argued that the Grade A butter price represents a minimum price, and that there is no need for concern that there will not be an available market for Grade A and Grade B butter. However, with the end of trading in Grade A butter on the CME, there is no published (or any other known) source for obtaining a price for Grade A butter.

The use of the Grade AA butter price for establishing butterfat prices is appropriate since that is the only grade of butter that has significant enough trading volume to warrant a publicly-reported price. Grade AA butter prices are the only butter prices regularly available and represent the vast majority (about 95 percent) of the butter sold. Although the "multiples" of the butter price apparently had not adjusted to the use of the Grade AA price during the first 4 months of experience under the revised orders and probably should not be expected to adjust during the period in which this proceeding is under consideration, the marketplace should, in time, make the needed adjustments.

Various witnesses estimated that Grade A and Grade B butter combined make up 3-7 percent of the butter in the U.S. Although a witness noted that the Minnesota-Wisconsin (M-W) price for non-Grade A milk continued to be surveyed even after the percentage of milk eligible for the survey had fallen below a 5 percent level, it was widely recognized for some time that a pricing alternative to the M-W must be found because the M-W eventually would no longer provide a representative price for a large volume of unregulated milk. Similarly, with the decline of Grade A butter (and the unavailability of prices for that product), the only alternative available for determining price is Grade AA butter. A finding in the equivalent price determination that a Grade A butter price was "essential" to continued operation of the orders referred solely to the fact that the Grade

A price was specified in all of the orders at that time, not that the butterfat value under Federal milk orders could never be based on any other price.

Making an adjustment to a clearly valid price series to approximate a price series that has been discontinued for several years due to insufficient volume for trading is inappropriate. Comments to the tentative final decision from IDFA and Schreiber Foods continued to encourage the use of an estimate of the discontinued Grade A price series for the current formulas. Since it has been about four years since a publicly-traded price for Grade A butter has been available, it is impossible to determine what the current difference between these prices would be because there are no reports of the Grade A price available. The vast majority of butter made and sold in the U.S. is Grade AA, and that is the appropriate product to which to look for a value of butterfat used in butter.

The 3-cent average difference between the CME and NASS butter prices makes up $\frac{2}{3}$ of the 4.5-cent adjustment made by CDFA in calculating the value of butterfat used in butter. An additional 6 cents deducted from the butterfat price calculated from the NASS price would much more than make up the remaining 1.5-cent difference. Also, the 4.5-cent CDFA adjustment is made for the purpose of reflecting the cost of moving butter from California to Chicago. The butterfat price calculated under the Federal order program is not intended to apply to only one state. The NASS price is a nationwide survey and likely includes a significant representation of California butter prices. If there are additional costs involved in making butter, they would more appropriately be included in the make allowance for butter.

Make Allowance (Butter). The make allowance factor in the butterfat price formula should be derived from a combination of the manufacturing costs determined by CDFA and by RBCS, as they were in the tentative final decision. The CDFA cost data is divided into two groups representing high cost and low cost butter plants, with the four plants in the high cost group manufacturing, on average, about the same average number of pounds of butter as the seven plants in the RBCS study. Use of the data for the CDFA high-cost group of butter plants is more appropriate than use of the weighted average cost for all of the California plants because it is more likely that the high-cost plants, like the plants in the RBCS survey, serve a predominately balancing function.

When the RBCS data is adjusted to reflect the same packaging cost, general

and administrative costs, and return on investment as the CDFA data for the high cost group, and a marketing allowance of \$0.0015 is added to both sets of data, the weighted average of the two data sets is \$0.115. This butter manufacturing allowance is very close to the current allowance of \$0.114 and should continue to provide a representative level of the costs of making butter in plants that serve a balancing function.

The increased costs of making butter, not including transportation, cited by the proponents of reducing the butterfat price are expected to be included in this manufacturing allowance, which exceeds the low cost group in the CDFA survey by 3 cents per pound. The only class of use for which adjustments for transportation have regularly been included under Federal order regulation is Class I. Assuring that the order provides an allowance for moving milk for use in manufactured products would interfere with provisions designed to assure an adequate supply of milk for fluid use.

Yield (Butter). Although one witness suggested that the divisor in the butter price formula that reflects the butterfat content of butter be reconsidered, he did not indicate any number more appropriate than the .82 divisor used in the current formula. There was no other testimony in the record questioning the butter content factor. In fact, the only data in the record applicable to the issue was a CDFA report on butter and powder yields at California plants in 1996 that was included in an exhibit. This report shows a 1.2213 weighted average butter yield (1 pound of butterfat results in 1.2213 pounds of butter), which corresponds to the use of the .82 divisor.

The record does not support adoption of a Class IV butterfat price that is not reflected directly in the Class II butterfat price. There was testimony from several witnesses that the current Class IV-Class II price relationship is rational and appropriate, and an adjustment to the Class IV butterfat price that is not reflected in the Class II butterfat price would disrupt the current relationship. In addition, it would seem reasonable that some of the extra costs claimed by butter manufacturers, such as transportation costs for supplemental cream supplies, butterfat standardization of outside cream sources, and additional pasteurization would be as applicable for Class II manufacturers of high-fat products using surplus cream as for butter makers. Accordingly, reduction of the Class IV butterfat price only is not considered appropriate.

Class IV Nonfat Solids Price. As in the tentative final decision, this recommended decision maintains the use of the NASS survey price reported for nonfat dry milk and increases the make allowance for nonfat dry milk from 13.7 cents to 14 cents per pound of nonfat dry milk. In addition, the tentative final decision change to eliminate the 1.02 divisor in the nonfat solids price formula to reflect the incorporation of dry buttermilk (with a lower product price and higher make allowance) is continued. This decision maintains the nonfat solids price formula continued under the injunction.

Six proposals to change some part of the nonfat solids price formula were considered at the hearing. Three of the proposals dealt with the manufacturing allowance for nonfat dry milk (NFDm), with two of the proposals advocating use of the RBCS survey results and one proposal supporting an increase in the make allowance. The other three proposals supported changes in the yield factor of the nonfat solids price formula that would reflect greater powder yield from a pound of nonfat solids. Two of the proposals to change yield factors included using CME NFDm prices instead of the NASS survey. As discussed earlier in this decision, the product prices used in the component pricing formulas should continue to be obtained from the NASS survey.

Product Price (Nonfat dry milk). No proposals were considered that would have changed the product price used in the nonfat solids price formula, and the record contains no basis for making any change in this formula factor.

Make Allowance (Nonfat dry milk). At the time the hearing notice was issued, the most recent RBCS data were not available, and those costs were not specified in the proposals. By the time the hearing was held, however, the RBCS data had been released and were included in the information introduced at the hearing. NMPF supported continued use of a weighted average of the CDFA and the RBCS manufacturing cost surveys, with inclusion of a marketing allowance and the CDFA factor for return on investment. NMPF proposed that the NFDm make allowance be \$0.140 per pound.

South East Dairy Farmers Association also proposed that the RBCS survey be used to determine a make allowance for NFDm, but did not propose that a marketing allowance be included. The necessity of including a marketing allowance is discussed earlier in this decision.

Associated Milk Producers, Inc. (AMPI), proposed that the NFDm manufacturing allowance be increased

from \$0.137 to \$0.1563 per pound, a rate based on AMPI's cost of making NFDM at its own three plants in the upper Midwest over a 5-year period. The AMPI witness stated that in addition to a processing and packaging cost of \$0.1254, the make allowance should include a marketing allowance of \$0.0024 and return on investment of \$0.026, for a total allowance of \$0.1538 per pound, modified from the level proposed in the hearing notice. The witness testified that the three AMPI plants operate at approximately 80 percent of capacity.

No comments were filed that specifically addressed the adopted make allowance for use in the nonfat solids price.

On the basis of the data and testimony included in the hearing record, the manufacturing cost level that appears to be most appropriate for use in the pricing formula for nonfat solids is \$0.14 per pound. This value is calculated by using a weighted average of the RBCS survey and the two less-cost California groups of plants, adding the CDFA General and Administrative costs and Return on Investment expenses for those two groups to the RBCS numbers, and adding a \$0.0015 marketing allowance to both sets of data. The basis for using the two lower-cost groups of California plants are that the mid-cost group is of a similar average size as the group included in the RBCS survey, and that the lowest-cost California group has a very similar total cost to the mid-cost group. These three groups of plants (the RBCS plants and the two California groups) are similar enough in size and cost to consider as fairly representative, and should encompass those plants that perform a market balancing function. The highest-cost California group should not be included since its average cost is more than ten cents per pound of NFDM above the RBCS group or either of the other two California groups.

The AMPI cost numbers cannot be included in the weighted average since the number of pounds of NFDM associated with those costs is not available. When the AMPI marketing allowance and return on investment estimates are replaced with the more moderate numbers used in the make allowance calculation, the AMPI manufacturing costs do not differ much from the other two sources. This is true despite the wide discrepancy in the capacity utilization percentage estimates for the two data sets (80 percent for the AMPI plants versus less than 50 percent for the plants in the RBCS survey). Inclusion of the AMPI costs in the RBCS

survey would have included a larger representation of NFDM manufactured outside California. However, the record indicates that a high percentage of the NFDM manufactured in the U.S. comes from California, and the proportion of cost data representing California in the manufacturing allowance is reasonable.

"Yield" (*Nonfat solids*). The elimination of the divisor of the nonfat solids price formula adopted in the tentative final decision and continued in effect after the injunction should be maintained.

A considerable portion of the testimony dealing with the nonfat solids pricing formula pertained to the 1.02 divisor. The divisor is not strictly a yield factor but is intended to reflect the amount of nonfat solids in NFDM, with an adjustment for the small amount of buttermilk powder that is made in conjunction with the manufacture of butter and NFDM. Testimony by a number of witnesses asserted that the product price minus the make allowance should be either multiplied by a number greater than 1 (such as 1.02) or divided by a number smaller than 1 (such as .99 or .975) to reflect the fact that more than 1 pound of NFDM can be expected to be manufactured from 1 pound of nonfat solids due to the moisture content of NFDM.

Many of the hearing participants supported the 1.02 divisor, adopted under Federal order reform, and expressed understanding of the approach of adjusting the "yield" of NFDM to compensate for the fact that some of the powdered product made from Class IV milk is buttermilk powder (BMP). Although 1.03 to 1.05 pounds of NFDM generally can be obtained per pound of nonfat solids, the formula also recognizes a lower value and higher manufacturing cost for BMP.

Several witnesses correctly assessed an alternate solution to the dilemma of calculating a component price from two commodities with different prices and different make allowances as one requiring addition of dry buttermilk as another component price in the Federal milk order pricing system. As described by at least one witness, such an undertaking would require adding dry buttermilk to the NASS price survey, determining a separate make allowance, and calculating a yield factor. This procedure would be a burdensome undertaking for very little benefit, since dry buttermilk represents only about 5 percent of the dry products resulting from the manufacture of butter and nonfat dry milk. The issue that remains is how best to reflect the value of nonfat solids used in both NFDM and BMP in the same component pricing formula.

The IDFA witness testified that for the 19-month period beginning with September 1998, the central states' dry buttermilk price had averaged \$0.798 per pound, while the central states' "mostly" price for NFDM averaged \$1.043. The LOL witness similarly testified that the 1999 Northeast "mostly" price for NFDM averaged \$1.0389, while the BMP price was \$0.7686 per pound. On the basis of these numbers, it would appear that the price of BMP is roughly 75% that of NFDM. However, comparison of BMP and NFDM prices for the years of 1996 through 1999 and into 2000 reflects a more complex relationship between these prices than the hearing testimony would indicate. The BMP price as a percentage of the nonfat dry milk price (using Western prices) was 100.9% in 1996, 94.5% in 1997, 88 percent in 1998, and 71% in 1999. During the first third of 2000, BMP prices generally averaged less than 70% of NFDM prices. As the year 2000 progressed, however, the percentage increased, being at levels up to 100% in late July and remaining above 85% for the second half of the year in all areas.

The witness representing Agri-Mark stated that Agri-Mark employees engaged in manufacturing operations had estimated that the costs of producing BMP range from 1 to 3 cents more per pound than those of producing NFDM. Given that the manufacturing costs estimated by the Agri-Mark witness for other products were somewhat higher than those supported by the bulk of the hearing record, it is reasonable to consider the extra cost of manufacturing BMP to be generally not more than 2 cents in excess of the cost of manufacturing NFDM. In addition, it is difficult to justify increasing the powder make allowance for all of the powdered product represented in the make allowance since the RBCS witness testified that manufacturing costs of BMP manufactured at the plants included in the RBCS survey are included in the powder costs reported by RBCS.

Testimony regarding actual yields of NFDM and BMP were provided by only one witness representing a manufacturing plant operator. The numbers provided, while not complete enough for an exact accounting of the ultimate disposition of the plant's receipts of producer milk, indicate strongly that the approximate loss of nonfat solids used in the manufacture of NFDM at the specific plant was 3 percent, with 16 percent lost in the manufacture of BMP, for a combined weighted average loss of more than 3.5 percent of nonfat solids. In comparison,

data published by the State of California showed a weighted average loss of solids not fat of 2.13 percent in the manufacture of butter and powdered products.

The California data indicate a weighted average powder yield of 1.0252 pounds of NFDM and BMP from 1 pound of nonfat solids. One witness discounted this data by observing that the "high" California yield was reported as 1.0406, which would represent a higher-than-allowable moisture content. This number may be influenced by the "high" reported BMP yield of .0749.

As noted above, the general impression conveyed by testimony in the hearing record, that BMP is worth considerably less than NFDM and that the cost of processing it is significantly greater than that of processing NFDM, is misleading. The average BMP price over the period 1996–July 2000 is approximately 87 percent of the NFDM price, and the cost of manufacturing BMP is, on the basis of the information available, no more than 2 or 3 cents in excess of the \$0.14 recommended as the NFDM make allowance. These small adjustments to the product price and the make allowance used in the nonfat solids formula apply to little more than 5 percent of powder manufactured. It is apparent from the information contained in the record of this proceeding that the 1.02 factor, as a divisor, is excessive.

The following information from the hearing record was used to determine a multiplier or divisor for the total nonfat solids pricing formula that would result in a minimum price for nonfat solids while incorporating the data and testimony in the record about the manufacture of NFDM and BMP. To assure that the result represents a minimum price, the low or high areas of ranges of numbers related to the manufacture of these two products were used. The CDFA report on butter and powder yield in California plants in 1996 was used in making some of the calculations regarding this factor.

a. The price of BMP represents roughly 80 percent of the price of NFDM (80 percent is less than the average historical relationship of these prices over the past 5 years).

b. The cost of manufacturing BMP is not more than 2 cents greater than the make allowance for manufacturing NFDM.

c. Using a theoretical yield of 1.03 pounds of powder containing 3 percent moisture made from milk containing 8.62 percent nonfat solids would result in .054 pounds of BMP and .976 pounds of NFDM.

d. Adjusting the theoretical yield of 1.03 pounds to the minimal yield of 1.01 pounds (the "low" yield in the CDFA report) and prorating the BMP and NFDM to 1.01 pounds instead of to 1.03 pounds, the amount of BMP manufactured from a pound of nonfat solids used in butter/powder is approximately .053 pounds. When the NFDM yield is prorated, the resulting minimum yield is .957 pounds.

Using a NFDM price of \$1.03 per pound, a make allowance of \$0.14 cents per pound of NFDM, and a divisor of 1, the resulting calculation is: \$1.03 – \$0.14 = \$0.89 per pound of nonfat solids. The same result is achieved through a more complicated calculation using both product prices and make allowances, as follows:

Buttermilk powder:		
$(\$1.03 \times .80) - \$0.16 =$		
$\$0.664; \$0.664 \times .053$	=	\$0.03519
+ Nonfat dry milk:		
$\$1.03 - \$0.14 = \$0.89;$		
$\$0.89 \times .957$	=	\$0.85173
		\$0.88692
		(Rounded to \$0.89)

On the basis of this analysis, no multiplier or divisor is necessary in this formula.

A number of comments were filed in response to this aspect of the tentative final decision, with some supporting the use of a divisor of "1," two comments suggesting that a divisor of 1.01 would be more appropriate (but one determining that such a change would not be possible on the record of this proceeding), and several insisting that the above analysis is flawed by use of incorrect or inappropriate data and that the divisor should be returned to the 1.02 level in effect before January 1, 2001.

The IDFA comments stated that, in the interest of establishing minimum pricing, no more than 70 percent of the NFDM value should be assumed for the BMP price and that 3 cents should be added to the BMP make allowance instead of 2. IDFA also indicated that the formula should include shrinkage. NDA and LOL criticized the use of the California yield data in determining the comparative yields of NFDM and BMP, both because some of the data reflected information that included powder with higher-than-allowable moisture and because no witnesses who had participated in the survey were present to testify about it. LOL criticized USDA's use of Western prices rather than the Northeast and Central prices quoted by witnesses who discussed the relative values of NFDM and BMP.

Comments filed by Agri-Mark protested elimination of the 1.02 divisor, arguing that USDA relied on a casual remark about the difference between the cost of manufacturing BMP and NFDM rather than on detailed cost information as in the other make allowances. Agri-Mark also stated that the role of Class IV in balancing surplus cream from Class I use increases the ratio of BMP to NFDM over that calculated from an assumption about uses of the nonfat solids in producer milk.

Criticism of use of the Western BMP and NFDM price series to analyze the relative values of BMP and NFDM in the tentative final decision did not consider the fact that the Western price (mostly) series is the only one with an uninterrupted data series for the five years considered. In addition, the percentage of the NFDM price represented by the BMP price for the Western region was lower during each of the years 1996–2000 than for the Central region; and very similar, with some years averaging higher and some lower, to the Northeast region. Criticism of the CDFA yield data ignores the fact that the yield factors used in the initial analysis for the tentative final decision adjusted the relative "weighted average" yields of BMP and NFDM to the "low" yield.

The hearing record contains enough information on the issue of the relative weights, values, and costs of manufacturing NFDM and BMP to support the conclusion reached in the tentative final decision about the appropriate divisor in the nonfat solids price formula. The .96 divisor considered in the proposed rule on Federal order reform represented the pounds of nonfat solids in NFDM rather than the yield of nonfat dry milk from nonfat solids. Use of the divisor of 1 adopted in the tentative final decision accounts for all of the nonfat solids used in Class IV and results in 3–4 cents less per pound of nonfat solids (over a NFDM price range of \$.86–\$1.10) than the value that would be calculated if the formula attributed all of the Class IV skim value to NFDM.

The Agri-Mark comment emphasized that the ratio of BMP to NFDM milk considered in the nonfat solids price calculation should be calculated on the basis of the butterfat content in Class IV because butterfat surplus to Class I use is used in butter. The Agri-Mark comment observed that the butterfat percentage of milk used in Class IV in the Northeast over a 3-month period averaged 5.67%.

Even if the national average of butterfat in Class IV (6.4%) is used to

determine the breakdown between nonfat solids used in BMP and nonfat solids used in NFDM, less than .8 pounds of nonfat solids out of the 8.4 contained in a hundredweight of Class IV milk at 6.4% butterfat should be attributed to use in BMP. In effect, the price of each of the 8.4 pounds would be reduced by 3–4 cents. Such a calculation results in 25.2–33.6 cents per hundredweight of milk containing 6.4% butterfat to cover the additional costs of making .8 pounds of BMP and the lower value of .8 pounds of BMP compared to the NFMP manufacturing cost and price. A 3-cent additional cost per pound of manufacturing .8 pounds of BMP would equal 2.4 cents, and a 25-percent reduction of the BMP value from that of NFDM would equal approximately 20 cents. These calculations would still leave 2.8–11.2 cents per hundredweight to cover any additional costs of making and selling BMP over those of NFDM.

It should be noted that the additional 3 cents per pound cost of making BMP is on the high end of the information in the hearing record, and that the 25% reduction in value of BMP compared to NFDM is on the low end. Over the past 5 years, only during the period cited by witnesses testifying about the relative values of BMP and NFDM and during the first 4 months of 2000 has the BMP price as a percentage of the NFDM price fallen below eighty percent. In addition, the preceding calculations assumed that all of the nonfat solids not used in NFDM were used in BMP, whereas some are used in whole milk powder, which has a higher value than either NFDM or BMP. Therefore, elimination of the 1.02 divisor is appropriate.

c. Class III Butterfat, Protein, and Other Nonfat Solids Prices

In a change from the orders promulgated under the Federal order reform process, the tentative final decision calculated a Class III butterfat price from the value of butterfat in cheese rather than using the butterfat price calculated from the value of butter for both Classes III and IV. The Class III butterfat price in the tentative final decision was calculated to represent the value of the component in the NASS cheddar cheese price, as was a revised protein price formula.

Before the interim final rule became effective on January 1, 2001, several petitions were filed requesting the Secretary to delay implementation because industry participants objected to the effects of the separate Class III butterfat price. Implementation could not be stayed because of the Congressional deadline on the

rulemaking procedure, and partial implementation was not possible because the interim final rule had been approved by producers in its entirety. Before the separate Class III and Class IV butterfat prices could become effective, implementation of the separate butterfat prices was enjoined in the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia at the urging of organizations representing most of the interests in the dairy industry. The Court's order returned the price formulas for the Class III components to their earlier forms, with the new make allowances and cheese moisture adjustment incorporated.

By the end of the comment period, comments representing nearly 100 interested parties from most segments of the industry were received that objected to separating the Class III and Class IV butterfat prices and reducing the level of the protein price. The comments urged USDA to continue to calculate the Class III butterfat price on the basis of the value of butterfat in butter, and return to the Class III price formula formats in use before effectuation of the interim final rule.

Several reasons were given for rejecting the change to Class III component prices based on the contribution of butterfat and protein to cheese yield. Numerous commenters cited the negative effects of a marked increase in the cost of milk for use in high-fat cheeses and the incentive created for handlers to substitute lower-valued Class IV forms of butterfat for use in cheese-making. Others stressed the difficulties created by the decision in marketing cream. Several commenters argued that the shift in value from protein to butterfat caused by the decision did not make sense in light of the importance of protein in cheese-making, and that the reduced protein price would send incorrect economic signals to dairy farmers. One particular concern was the potential significant reduction in the Class I skim value if the Class III price at 3.5 percent butterfat became the mover for the Class I price.

Based on comments received, this decision recommends that the Class III butterfat price be the same as the Class IV butterfat price, calculated from the value of butterfat in butter. In addition, the portion of the protein price formula that adjusts the protein price to accommodate the differential value of butterfat in cheese, as opposed to butter, is incorporated in the formula. Technical corrections to the protein price formula are recommended that should make the protein price correlate somewhat more closely with the cheese

price than has been the case with the earlier formula.

The tentative final decision made only one modification to the specifications of the cheese price, currently a weighted average of the prices of cheese sold in 40-pound blocks and 500-pound barrels (with a 3-cent addition to the barrel price). That change, to adjust the price of 500-pound barrels to 38 percent moisture instead of the 39 percent moisture price currently reported by NASS, is continued in this decision. Also as in the tentative final decision, this decision would reduce the make allowance for cheese from 17.02 to 16.5 cents per pound.

The other nonfat solids price would continue to be calculated by subtracting the make allowance from the NASS-reported price for dry whey and dividing by .968. However, the make allowance is increased from 13.7 cents (14 cents in the tentative final decision) to 15.9 cents per pound of dry whey.

Class III Product Price (Cheese). Several proposals included in the hearing notice would, if adopted, have changed the NASS cheese price used in the Class III pricing formulas. One proposal would limit the cheese prices included to 40-pound blocks reported by the CME, while another would add 640-pound blocks to the prices surveyed by NASS for inclusion in the cheddar cheese price. A third proposal would replace the current 3-cent price adjustment between 500-pound barrel prices and 40-pound block prices to a value that reflects the actual differential industry cost of making 40-pound blocks over 500-pound barrels. Still another proposal would adjust 40-pound block cheese prices for moisture, as 500-pound barrel prices are adjusted.

As discussed above in Issue 2, CME commodity prices should not be used as the basis for calculating component prices. Eliminating 500-pound barrels, which represent approximately two-thirds of the cheese represented in the NASS survey, from calculation of the market value of cheddar cheese would reduce greatly the degree to which the current product prices represent U.S. cheddar cheese prices. The record of this hearing provides no support for relying solely on prices for 40-pound blocks to identify a market price of cheddar cheese.

Several parties testified that the NASS weighted average cheese price should include the value of 640-pound block cheese in the cheese price computation. They contended that such inclusion would improve the reliability of the average cheese price by adding a substantial quantity of cheese to the price survey. Witnesses' estimates of the

percentage of U.S. cheddar cheese production represented by 640-pound blocks ranged from 20 to 27 percent. Witnesses testified that the increased volume would better reflect the true value of cheese and additionally would reduce the potential for price distorting manipulation by individual handlers.

In comments filed on the tentative final decision, IDFA stated that USDA had erred by excluding 640-pound blocks. IDFA reiterated the argument that 640-pound blocks represent as much as 27 percent of total cheddar cheese production. Furthermore, the comment noted that past data-collection problems are irrelevant because "all participation in NASS surveys regarding data used to calculate federal order minimum prices is now mandatory." IDFA concluded that the argument that 640-pound blocks should not be used due to their being made on a custom basis to customers' specifications is not valid because adjustments can be made, as they are for moisture in barrel cheese.

Opponents to inclusion of the 640's in the cheese price computation explained that the vast majority of 640's are made on a custom basis to customers' specifications and therefore are not sufficiently uniform to have a standard identity. One witness noted that much of the commerce in 640's is made on a long-term contractual basis and as such would rarely be reflective of changing market conditions.

ADCNE's comments on the tentative final decision reiterated USDA's position, stating that "the market in 640-pound blocks of cheddar cheese does not involve sufficient buyers and sellers in arms-length transactions to provide good data to establish the Class III price for producer milk in all federal milk orders."

As stated in the tentative final decision, standardized pricing cannot be developed without a standard identity for the product, which 640-pound blocks lack. In addition, there appears to be an insufficient volume of 640-pound block cheese transactions to warrant inclusion. At the beginning of the NASS survey, price data for 640-pound blocks was collected but was discontinued due to lack of volume and too few participants to allow disclosure of data. Even earlier (1995-96), the former National Cheese Exchange attempted to include trading in 640-pound blocks but discontinued doing so because of lack of interest. Testimony from witnesses representing organizations that manufacture cheese in 640-pound blocks, and who favored inclusion of such product in the NASS survey, stated that the 640-pound blocks manufactured by their organizations are used

internally, making that cheese ineligible for inclusion. Therefore, even though price reporting is now mandatory, 640-pound blocks of cheese do not meet the criteria necessary for the prices of these products to be eligible for inclusion in the NASS survey.

Elimination or reduction to one cent of the three-cent adjustment that is added to the barrel price for computing the weighted average cheese price was advocated in testimony at the hearing, comments contained in post-hearing briefs, and comments responding to the tentative final decision. The witnesses argued that since the barrel cheese price is adjusted to 39 percent moisture and block cheese is approximately 38 percent moisture, at least 2 cents of the observed difference in price between 40-pound blocks and 500-pound barrels is due to moisture and has nothing to do with actual differences in costs. In fact, they argued that there is no difference in packaging costs between block and barrel cheese.

The witness for DFA, a cooperative that manufactures cheese packaged in both 40-pound blocks and 500-pound barrels, testified that three cents is an acceptable and reasonable spread between blocks and barrels and that there is no compelling reason to change the three-cent addition to the barrel price. The witness for LOL testified that the three cents is an appropriate difference between blocks and barrels and that adding three cents to the barrel price when computing the weighted cheese price is an appropriate adjustment. DFA and ADCNE argued, in a brief filed on behalf of both parties, that the record supports a conclusion that the 3-cent adjustment of the barrel price is attributable to volume utility and cost differences in packaging and handling.

The National Cheese Institute, which proposed reducing or eliminating the 3-cent adjustment, argued that the adjustment should include only the actual cost differences involved in manufacturing and packaging the two sizes of cheese. Although a number of witnesses representing cheese manufacturers testified in favor of reducing or eliminating the adjustment, including one whose employer makes both sizes of cheddar, none of them addressed the actual cost differences of packaging and manufacturing 40-pound blocks and 500-pound barrels. Instead, the only testimony that was offered involved attributing a 2-cent difference to the moisture-adjusted value of the two sizes of cheese packages. In comments responding to the tentative final decision, ADCNE argued that the 3-cent adjustment is representative of

the historical difference in market value between barrel cheese and block cheese after adjustments for moisture.

If the difference between the block and barrel prices were due to the difference in moisture, the difference between the prices should widen as the cheese price increases since the moisture adjustment is based on the price and moisture of the cheese. An analysis of historical cheese prices indicates that the difference between the block cheese and barrel cheese prices does not change with changes in price level. In fact, three of the largest differences between the block and barrel prices occurred at approximately the 40-month NASS weighted average monthly prices.

In comments filed by Leprino Foods Company (Leprino) on the tentative final decision, Leprino argued that comparisons of the block and barrel cheese prices from May 1995 through December 1999 are not valid because of artificial market distortions. Leprino stated that valid relative price data is available only for calendar year 2000, during which the average spread is 1.54 cents. Leprino continued, in its comment, that the price spread between blocks and barrels does not move in lock-step because it is affected by many factors, and will continue to be driven by current market forces.

The record contains no basis for concluding that the actual cost of manufacturing and packaging the two sizes of cheese is not the historical 3-cent price spread. In fact, during the period September 1998 through June 2000 the difference between the block and barrel prices has been 4.4 cents per pound. The record of this proceeding supports maintaining the 3-cent addition to the barrel cheese price.

An expert witness, and several other witnesses, testified that the moisture content of the cheese used for determining the NASS cheese prices and the moisture content used in the Van Slyke cheese yield formula used for computing the "yield" coefficients in the protein formula should be the same. The witnesses explained that failure to align the formula and the moisture content represented by the cheese price survey would result in overstating or understating the formula coefficients.

The expert witness explained that the barrel cheese price is reported at 39 percent moisture after being adjusted from the actual moisture, while the block cheese price is reported at an unknown moisture level. The only testimony dealing with the actual moisture level of block cheese indicates that it averages about 38 percent.

The coefficients originally used for determining the Class III protein price and the Class III butterfat price and used in the formulas in this decision were derived from using the Van Slyke cheese yield formula at 38 percent moisture. Therefore, it is appropriate to use cheese prices that reflect cheese containing 38 percent moisture. The current practice of using the 40-pound block cheese price unadjusted for moisture and the 500-lb barrel price adjusted for moisture should be continued, but with the barrel price adjusted to 38 percent moisture instead of 39.

In several comments on the tentative final decision, commenters stated that the 38-percent moisture adjustment to the barrel price requires an adjustment to 1 cent and not 3 cents for the price spread between 500-pound barrels and 40-pound blocks. Other interested persons filed comments supporting both adjustments. DFA argued in its comment that eliminating either adjustment should result in use of only 40-pound block cheese prices.

The hearing record provides no basis for altering the composition of cheese prices surveyed for use in the Class III pricing formulas or for changing the calculation of the NASS weighted average cheese price, other than the moisture adjustment to 38 percent for 500-pound barrels.

Several witnesses testified that types of cheeses other than cheddar should be included in the NASS price survey as a more comprehensive basis for identifying a cheese price, although such a proposal was not included in the hearing notice. The cheddar cheese included in the NASS survey meets certain standard criteria that makes prices for the reported cheese sales comparable. If the survey included other descriptions of cheddar and other types of cheese, such as mozzarella, it would not be possible to consider the reported price as representative of the value of any particular product. Further, the manufacturing costs surveyed are, to a great extent, limited to the costs of processing cheddar cheese.

Class III Make Allowance (Cheese). Several proposals to adjust the manufacturing allowance for cheese were included in the hearing notice and considered at the hearing. The NMPF witness testified that the organization had determined that the most appropriate cheese make allowance would be a weighted average of the updated RBCS and CDFA surveys, with addition of a marketing allowance. Thus, the NMPF supported adoption of a cheese make allowance of \$0.1536 per pound of cheese. Several witnesses

representing cooperative associations supported the NMPF \$0.1536 proposal but also would have included a cost factor for return on investment. One witness testified that the make allowance should be based on data from actual plant operations through the surveys conducted by RBCS and CDFA and testimony from individual plant operators; that it should include California data, as California plants represent a large proportion of cheese manufacture; and that it should be generous enough to assure adequate plant capacity for continued manufacture of cheese.

The witness representing NCI testified that the cheese make allowance should be no less than \$0.1687, the weighted average of the NCI-sponsored and CDFA surveys with the addition of a marketing cost of \$0.0011. He stated that such an allowance would represent the production of 24 cheese plants and 53% of U.S. cheese. Several cheese manufacturer representatives supported use of the NCI-supported make allowance, stressing the importance of adoption of an allowance that covers *all* of the costs of manufacturing cheese.

A witness representing Farmers Union and the American Farm Bureau witness both supported adoption of a make allowance of \$0.1521, as a weighted average of RBCS and CDFA data; and a witness for National Farmers Organization supported a make allowance of \$0.141 composed of the RBCS cost with the addition of a marketing allowance and return on investment.

Although ADCNE, in its comments on the tentative final decision, supported the use of California data as compiled and audited by a state agency, ADCNE disagreed with inclusion in the cheese make allowance of the CDFA "general and administrative expense" item, which added 1.9 cents per pound to the make allowance. ADCNE described this allowance as "generous, to say the least," as it represents \$2–\$3.5 million for the newest, largest, and most efficient cheese plants, and stated a preference for having some basis in testimony before building that sort of expense level into plant costs at the expense of minimum producer prices.

The general and administrative expense was one of the cost factors included in the CDFA weighted average cost study, but not in the RBCS study. Therefore, it must be added to the RBCS data to make the two cost studies comparable.

The make allowance used for computing the Class III protein and butterfat prices, \$.165, was determined by combining the CDFA plant survey

with the RBCS survey. As was pointed out by several witnesses at the hearing, several cost factors that are necessary to maintain the viability of processing plants are not represented in one or both of the RBCS and the CDFA studies. These cost factors include marketing costs, return on investment, and general and administrative expenses. A discussion of these expenses is included earlier in this decision. Neither the CDFA nor the RBCS survey included a marketing cost, so the \$0.0015 marketing allowance was added to both studies. In addition, the CDFA return on investment cost of \$0.0103 and the general and administrative expense of \$0.0190, both of which were included in the CDFA weighted average cost, were added to the RBCS study, which included neither factor. The resulting adjusted costs for each survey are \$0.1708 for CDFA and \$0.15996 for RBCS. A weighted average of the two studies was computed using the respective adjusted make allowances and the pounds of cheese reported in each study—466,396,548 for the CDFA study and 633,142,812 for the RBCS study—to arrive at the Class III price make allowance of \$0.165.

In a comment filed in response to the tentative final decision, NFU stated that the reduction in the cheese make allowance should have been greater than \$.0052, but that the cooperative could support an increased make allowance if it were tied to producer cost of production and market price through implementation of a variable make allowance. The \$.165 make allowance is based on actual costs discovered by two surveys, the conduct of which were open to review in the hearing record, and is very close to the results of another that was conducted in a somewhat less accessible manner. There is no basis in the record for adopting a lower make allowance and, as discussed earlier, no acceptable rationale for implementing variable make allowances.

Class III Butterfat Price. As discussed in the introductory portion of the Class III price section of this decision, above, the Class III butterfat price adopted in the tentative final decision was changed by a court injunction to be the same as the Class IV butterfat price. Based on evaluation of that decision and the comments received, this decision recommends that the butterfat prices for all classes of use be based on the value of butterfat in butter. The order will refer to both the Class III and Class IV butterfat prices as "the butterfat price," as it did previously.

The tentative final decision was based on the observation that market

distortions occur due to using the Class IV butterfat price calculated from the value of butterfat in butter to also represent the value of butterfat in cheese (Class III), and trying to incorporate the difference in value in the protein price. Analysis shows that there is very little relationship between the cheese price and either the current butterfat price or the current protein price.

As a result, instances have occurred when the protein price declines while, at the same time, the cheese price is increasing. This outcome is contrary to the concept of pricing components on the basis of the value of the products in which they are used. The same inverse price scenario has affected the butterfat price, with occurrences in which the Class III butterfat price increases because the butter price has increased while the cheese market has been declining.

Although reflection of the value of a manufactured product in the prices for the milk components that are instrumental in the yield of that product would require that the Class III protein and butterfat prices be tied more directly to their value in cheese than the result obtained from the Federal order reform price formulas, that outcome cannot be accomplished on the basis of this hearing record. However, any distortion between the Class III butterfat and protein prices and the cheese price should be ameliorated partially by the following changes recommended in the protein formula.

Protein price. The tentative final decision on the hearing record for this proceeding derived formulas for calculating a Class III butterfat price and a protein price that considered only the contribution of each of those components to cheese yield and resulted in a 100 percent correlation with the cheese market. Therefore, the individual factors in the portion of the earlier protein price formula that adjusted the contribution of protein to cheese yield to account for differences in value between butterfat used in cheese and in butter and accounted for much debate in the hearing record were not considered in any detail.

The protein price formula resulting from the tentative final decision took the following form:

(NASS weighted average cheese price—.165) \times 1.405. This formula eliminated the following butterfat adjustment portion of the earlier protein price formula:

+ {(NASS weighted average cheese price—.165) \times 1.582}—[the butterfat price] \times 1.28

This butterfat adjustment portion of the formula represents the difference between the value of butterfat used in cheese and the value of butterfat used in butter. The butterfat adjustment portion became unnecessary when the Class III butterfat price was calculated from the value of butterfat in cheese in the tentative final decision.

Reconsideration of the protein formula in light of the determination that there should be only one butterfat price for Class III and Class IV results in the following recommended protein price formula:

[(NASS weighted average cheese price—.165) \times 1.405] + {(NASS weighted average cheese price—.165) \times 1.582}—[the butterfat price \times .9] \times 1.17).

Leprino, in response to the tentative final decision, urged that the 1.405 factor used to reflect the yield effect of one pound of protein in milk be reduced to 1.367 because the 1.405 factor assumes that true protein contains more casein (83.3%) than is supported by testimony in the record (82.2—82.4%).

The hearing record contains much discussion of the derivation of the 1.32 cheese yield factor per pound of crude protein used to determine the 1.405 cheese yield factor per pound of true protein. Two explanations of the factor were advanced. The first involved assumption of 75 percent casein retention, 90 percent butterfat retention, and 38 percent moisture content in the cheese. Holding butterfat and moisture constant and changing the protein content by .1 results in a .1318 (rounded to .132) pound change in the cheese yield, or a one percent change in protein results in a 1.32 pound change in cheese yield. The second method assumes 78 percent casein retention, 90 percent butterfat retention, and a 38 percent moisture content in the cheese. In this second method the cheese yield is computed using a 3.2 percent protein and zero butterfat. The resulting cheese yield is divided by 3.2 to arrive at 1.316 pounds of cheese per pound of protein. The 1.316 was rounded to 1.32. Given these particular assumptions, both methods resulted in the same answer—1.32. A witness for National All Jersey testified that the second method is the appropriate procedure and was the one used to compute the 1.32 yield factor in past Federal order protein price decisions. However, if 78 percent is a more appropriate factor to use as the appropriate value for casein retention, then the first method yields a 1.37 yield factor. The 1.32 factor was used in the protein price formula in the Federal order reform proposed rule and in the

five Upper Midwest markets beginning in January 1996 to compute the protein price prior to Federal order reform. The 1.32 yield factor generally has been accepted as an appropriate factor to use for computing a protein price.

When the final decision on Federal order reform was issued, the protein price computation was changed to compute the protein price on the basis of true protein rather than crude protein, which had been the basis for protein price computations in the past. As in determining the 1.32 factor, certain assumptions were made to arrive at the current 1.405 yield factor. The 1.405 factor was computed based on the assumption that milk testing 3.3 percent crude protein has an equivalent true protein test of 3.1 percent. The relationship between crude protein and true protein was based on the results of laboratory testing of producer milk for both crude and true protein. The resulting percentage change in protein is 106.4516 (3.3/3.1), which was then multiplied by 1.32 to arrive at 1.405. In addition, use of the 1.405 yield factor when pricing true protein results in a protein value equivalent to use of the 1.32 factor in pricing crude protein.

Regardless of which procedure is used, assumptions must be made with regard to the various factors used in the formulas. These assumptions directly affect the outcome of the factors used in the protein formula and the resulting protein price and value. Since use of the 1.405 factor results in an equivalent protein value to use of the 1.32—and there was no testimony or comments filed that the 1.32 factor was not appropriate—there is no reason to change the 1.405 cheese yield factor in this decision.

Leprino argued that the appropriate casein recovery should be 82.3 percent which, when using the second procedure above with a 2.99 true protein level, would result in a factor of 1.388. However, the majority (2/3) of the difference between 1.405 and the 1.367 factor advocated by Leprino accounts for shrinkage between the farm and the cheese vat. The issue of including shrinkage as an additional make allowance or yield factor in the calculation of component prices has been discussed earlier in this decision and determined to be inappropriate. Eliminating shrinkage from the 1.367 protein factor results in a factor close to the 1.405. In fact, using the second procedure above and a 82.95 casein recovery, which an expert witness testified is equivalent to the 78 percent casein recovery used for crude protein, and a true protein test of 3 percent, which is equivalent to the 3.2 percent

used in the second procedure, the protein factor would be 1.3997, not significantly less than the 1.405. Testimony from other parties stated that the 1.405 is appropriate and should be continued.

Based on the hearing record, comments filed in response to the hearing and tentative final decision, and the above analysis, there is no justification for reducing the 1.405 cheese yield factor.

Since all of the butterfat used in Class III is to be priced on the basis of its value in butter, an adjustment must be made to account for the difference in butterfat values between cheese and butter. The butterfat adjustment portion of the protein price formula is the method chosen for making that adjustment. The first part of the butterfat adjustment portion of the protein price formula calculates the value of butterfat in Cheddar cheese using the Van Slyke formula, assuming a 90 percent recovery of butterfat in the finished cheese. The resulting cheese yield factor attributable to butterfat is a multiplier of 1.582. Testimony in the hearing record and comments on the tentative final decision urged adoption of different multipliers in the butterfat adjustment portion of the protein price formula that represents the effects of butterfat on cheese yield. Suggestions to increase the butterfat recovery factor of 1.582 (to 1.6 or 1.617) were made by DFA; Select, Elite, et al.; and National All-Jersey, Inc. These commenters relied on hearing testimony that butterfat recovery in cheddar cheese generally ranges between 90 and 93 percent, although Kraft testified that their butterfat recovery is lower. The commenters favored use of a factor that reflected 91 or 92 percent fat recovery because that level of recovery is common. In a comment filed by Leprino, the cheese manufacturer urged that the 1.582 factor not be increased, as any increase would exacerbate the overvaluation of whey fat in the current formula and because the 90 percent recovery factor reflects results from many cheese vats installed prior to the late 1980's.

Even though many cheese makers may be able to achieve a higher fat retention in cheese, use of the 1.582 factor representing 90 percent fat recovery in cheese continues to be appropriate. As a result of the 90 percent level, butterfat in cheese is not overvalued, and those cheese makers who fail to recover more than 90 percent of the fat will not suffer a competitive disadvantage. The preponderance of the record indicates that most cheese

manufacturers should be able to obtain a 90 percent butterfat recovery.

In testimony at the hearing and comments filed on the tentative final decision the issue was raised of whether the butterfat adjustment portion of the protein price formula in which the value of butterfat in butter is subtracted from the value of butterfat in cheese is based on equivalent amounts of butterfat. The 1.582 factor represents 90 percent recovery in cheese of one pound of butterfat used in its manufacture, while the butterfat price represents the value of one pound of butterfat used to make butter. Clearly, subtracting the value of a pound of butterfat in butter from the value of .9 pounds of butterfat in cheese reduces the actual value of butterfat used in cheese. Therefore, the value of butterfat used in butter should be reduced by 10 percent in this calculation.

Testimony at the hearing and analysis of the relationship between the current cheese, butterfat, and protein prices revealed that the current Class III pricing formulas cause inequities in producer payments based on the relationship between producers' butterfat and protein tests. The inequities were attributed to the use of the 1.28 factor used in the portion of the protein price formula that is designed to incorporate the butterfat value of milk used in cheese that is not already accounted for by the Class III and IV butterfat price. Such a factor is necessary to reflect the fact that there is more than one pound of butterfat in cheese for every pound of protein.

The record supports a conclusion that when the price of butter increases, the price paid for milk used in cheese and for milk delivered by producers will decline if the milk has a fat to protein ratio of less than 1.28, and decline at a more rapid rate than that at which the butter price increases. According to the record and numerous comments filed, most milk delivered by producers has a fat-to-protein ratio less than 1.28.

In a number of the comments filed in response to the tentative final decision, commenters argued that this factor should be reduced—to 1.22, 1.19, or 1.17—to better reflect the fat-to-protein ratio in producer milk. The factor, which originally appeared in a comment filed early in the Federal order reform process as 1.20, was calculated by dividing 1.582 by 1.32. When the change was made from crude protein to true protein, 1.20 was multiplied by 1.0645 to reflect that change, becoming 1.28. The recommended factor of 1.17 in the protein price formula represents a minimum value for the ratio of butterfat to true protein in producer milk. Its use

assures that the value adjustment for butterfat in butter to butterfat in cheese included in the protein price formula accounts for the full amount of butterfat in producer milk.

The Alliance of Western Milk Producers argued in a comments filed in response to the tentative final decision that the Class III component price formulas adopted in that decision would lead to disorderly marketing and provide an incentive for processors to seek alternative sources of butterfat, resulting in negative effects on producer income. The Alliance favored a return to the Federal order reform Class III component price formulas, but suggested that a snubber to prevent the butterfat value adjustment to the protein price from becoming negative would mitigate the potential for undervaluing protein under the formula.

Although the protein formula recommended in this decision would still allow the butterfat value adjustment to have a negative effect on the protein price, use of the .9 multiplier in the butter portion of the butterfat value adjustment and reduction of the 1.28 multiplier to 1.17 should reduce the magnitude of that effect.

Class III—Other Nonfat Solids price (Dry Whey). This decision continues to calculate the price of the nonfat solids other than protein in milk used to make cheese by subtracting a manufacturing allowance from the NASS dry whey price and dividing the result by the content of these "other nonfat solids" in dry whey. No change is made or was proposed in the dry whey product price or divisor in the formula. The manufacturing allowance for dry whey is increased from the 14 cents per pound adopted in the tentative final decision to 15.9 cents per pound of dry whey to reflect a higher cost of drying whey than of drying nonfat dry milk. This decision is also changed from the tentative final decision to remove the snubber in the other solids formula that would prevent the other solids price from falling below zero.

The hearing included several proposals that would change the dry whey or other solids price formula by changing the make allowance. Although the hearing notice included a proposal to use the CME average dry whey price, the proponent withdrew support for the proposal when it became apparent that the CME has no cash exchange market for dry whey. The NASS survey that currently is being used to identify commodity prices has included price data on dry whey since September 1998. There were no proposals to change the 0.968 yield factor in the other solids price formula. The 0.968 factor reflects

the solids content of dry whey, given a 3.2 percent moisture content.

Make Allowance (Dry Whey). Since the most recent CDFA and RBCS cost surveys did not include costs for drying whey, there is no information from those two studies to use for computing the dry whey make allowance. A witness from NMPP suggested using the nonfat dry milk manufacturing cost allowance for dry whey since both products involve similar processing equipment and then adding \$0.01 per pound to reflect the additional energy and higher equipment costs incurred in drying whey. Since the make allowance for nonfat dry milk adopted under the tentative final decision is \$0.140, this procedure would result in a dry whey make allowance of \$0.150.

DFA proposed a dry whey make allowance of \$0.1478 per pound based on costs at its plant at Smithfield, Utah. The plant is a cheddar block plant running throughout the year that condenses and dries whey from the cheese manufactured in this Smithfield plant only. The DFA costs include both direct and indirect costs, and return on investment and marketing cost data.

A witness from WSDPTA testified that there is no reason to change the other solids price computation from the current formula, and that it is a necessary component of the cheese pricing formula. He noted that the use of dry whey as a commodity is correct and that the 0.968 factor in the pricing formula reflects 96.8 pounds of solids in 100 pounds of dry whey.

Most witnesses who testified about the cost of drying whey expressed the belief that drying whey costs more than drying nonfat dry milk. Two cooperative association witnesses testified that their organizations have determined that the returns from whey powder with the current make allowance would not cover the costs associated with building and operating whey powder plants.

IDFA presented the results of the survey, discussed earlier in this decision, contracted for by NCI. The IDFA witness testified that the survey showed a dry whey manufacturing cost of at least \$0.1592. The IDFA witness testified that using the nonfat dry milk make allowance significantly understates the manufacturing cost of dry whey due to the relatively higher percentage of water in liquid whey compared to skim milk and the additional crystallization process required.

A witness representing Leprino testified on the differences in the manufacturing processes for dry whey and nonfat dry milk that result in higher costs to produce whey powder. The

witness concluded that the cost of making dry whey is \$0.02559 above the cost of drying nonfat dry milk.

The brief submitted by Leprino argued that the additional costs of processing whey powder over those of processing nonfat dry milk should include additional staffing, cleaning, and maintenance associated with the additional equipment for whey product.

A witness from Kraft agreed that the dry whey manufacturing costs are about 2.6 cents per pound greater than the nonfat dry milk manufacturing costs. Although Kraft described its Tulare plant as large and efficient, it also represents a recent capital investment, meaning that depreciation costs are likely higher than average.

Comments on the dry whey make allowance portion of the tentative final decision generally followed the lines of the testimony in the hearing record. WSDPTA favored maintaining the 14-cent make allowance adopted in the tentative final decision, and ADCNE/DFA supported not using the NCI survey on the manufacturing cost of dry whey. IDFA, Leprino, and Northwest Dairy Association advocated adoption of a dry whey make allowance of at least 15.92 cents per pound, the level determined in the NCI survey. These comments cited testimony in the record that the cost of drying whey is as much as 2.6 cents greater than that of drying skim milk, a calculation that would result in a make allowance of 16.6 cents. Kraft favored adding a value reflecting the reduced value of butterfat in whey to the whey make allowance and increasing the make allowance by at least 2 cents.

Since information regarding the costs of drying whey was not available from the sources used for determining the other make allowances in product price formulas, the tentative final decision determined that the dry whey make allowance should remain the same as that for nonfat dry milk. However, that determination should be changed to reflect testimony and other evidence in the hearing record that the cost of drying whey is greater than that of drying nonfat dry milk.

The other solids price will be computed by subtracting the make allowance of \$0.159 from the NASS weighted average dry whey price and dividing the result by .968. The differential costs of manufacturing whey powder, from one source, over those of nonfat dry milk, from others, do not provide close enough agreement with the NCI-sponsored survey to use them with any confidence. Neither of the witnesses who testified that the extra costs of drying whey are 2.6 cents

greater than the costs of drying nonfat dry milk testified about the total costs of either operation.

In lieu of other studies and direct evidence of the total cost of drying whey, the NCI-commissioned study results, rounded to the nearest 1/10 cent, should be used for determining the make allowance.

Snubber/Other Solids Price. The tentative final decision snubbed the other solids price at zero. Thus, if the NASS dry whey price minus the make allowance resulted in a negative number, the other solids price would become zero. Michigan Milk Producers Association supported the inclusion of such a "snubber" concept for the whey price in a brief, citing testimony in which the DFA witness referred to the difficulty of explaining to producers a negative component price. Snubbing the other solids price to zero would have prevented it from negatively affecting the value of other Class III components or having a negative impact on the producer price differential. Support was expressed for use of the snubber in two comments.

The snubber in the other solids price formula was opposed in comments filed by two parties. Leprino stated that sound policy should allow not only positive, but negative net revenues to be reflected in the milk price to prevent overvaluing milk. IDFA opposed the snubber on the grounds that it would prevent manufacturers of dry whey from covering all manufacturing costs if wholesale prices for dry whey failed to fully cover manufacturing costs. Both commenters suggested that if the component price were to become negative, the negative value could be pooled as part of the producer price differential, as inferred by the DFA witness.

The prices calculated for the components in Class III milk are intended to reflect the value of those components in the products from which the prices are calculated. Use of a snubber to limit the other nonfat solids price would be inconsistent with the purpose of a pricing formula to reflect a component value and would appear to be an arbitrary adjustment to the price formula. After a thorough review of the record, including briefs and the comments on the tentative final decision, USDA has determined that the snubber on the other solids price should be eliminated.

d. Effects of Changes to Class III and Class IV Price Formulas

The changes to the Class III and Class IV component price formulas discussed above would result not only in changes

to the respective component prices, but also to the resulting Class III and Class IV skim milk and hundredweight milk prices at 3.5 percent butterfat. The changes discussed in this portion of the decision are relative to the formulas resulting from Federal order reform. The calculations that follow, and those included in the model analysis of this recommended decision, show some increase in the level of the Class III price. USDA believes that the Class III pricing formulas incorporated in this decision are more technically correct than those adopted as a result of Federal order reform because they are based on more complete information derived through the formal rulemaking process.

It is important to note that these calculated class price differences, or the "static effect" of the recommended changes, are based on historical product price data and not on product prices that will occur in the future. The price differences calculated in this portion of the decision cannot be used to calculate or estimate changes in revenue that would have occurred or may occur in the future because changing intersections of supply and demand for each product result in different prices.

All of the comparisons that follow are calculated based on the NASS weighted average commodity prices from January 2000 through July 2001. NASS weighted average commodity prices for this time period were available, and no estimates of the relevant commodity prices need to be made. Although this time period is relatively short, a number of interesting price relationships occurred in the data series.

For instance, during this period the cheddar cheese (39 percent moisture) market ranged from a low of \$1.0245 per pound during November 2000 to a high of \$1.6434 per pound during July 2001. The November low was about 7.5 cents below the \$1.10 per pound support price for 40-pound blocks of cheddar. During this same 19-month period the NASS weighted average nonfat dry milk price showed little movement until July 2001, ranging from a high of \$1.0165 per pound during January 2001 to \$0.9634 per pound during July 2001. The July 2001 decline was the result of a reduced support price. In fact, the nonfat dry milk price stayed within about one cent of support over the January 2000 through June 2001 period.

Unlike the cheese and nonfat dry milk market, the butter price did not trade anywhere near the butter support price of \$0.65 per pound or the revised support price of \$0.8548 per pound. The butter price traded in a range from a low of \$0.8820 per pound during January 2000 to a high of \$1.9263 per pound

during June 2001. It is important to keep in mind that since all milk is priced on the basis of butterfat and skim or nonfat components under Federal orders, focusing on the calculated hundredweight prices at 3.5 percent butterfat that are announced for comparison purposes may result in misleading conclusions.

The formulas used for computing the Class IV prices are unchanged from those contained in the interim final decision, which currently are being used.

Changing the butterfat price make allowance from \$0.114 to \$0.115 results in a calculated average decline in the Class IV butterfat price of \$0.0012 over the 19-month period studied. The two changes to the Class IV nonfat solids formula—increasing the make allowance from \$0.137 to \$0.140 and eliminating the 1.02 divisor—would result in a net increase of \$0.0141 per pound in the Class IV nonfat solids price in the absence of any other changes. Since the Class II prices are to continue to be computed on the basis of the Class IV formulas plus the Class II differential of \$0.70 per hundredweight, changes to the Class II prices will be the same as the changes to the Class IV prices. The calculated Class IV skim milk price would increase by an average of \$0.127 per hundredweight. The calculated 3.5 percent Class IV milk price would increase by an average of \$0.118 per hundredweight, reflecting the net difference between the increase in the skim milk price and the very small decline in the Class IV butterfat price.

As a result of the 38-percent moisture adjustment to barrel cheese prices, the NASS weighted average cheese price used for computing the Class III protein price would be calculated to be higher by \$0.011 per pound over the 19-month period January 2000 through July 2001. Use of this cheese price increase in the recommended protein price formula results in an increase of 3.6 cents per pound of protein. The decrease in the make allowance from \$0.1702 to \$0.165 in the recommended protein price formula accounts for an increase of 1.7 cents per pound of protein. The two changed factors in the protein price formula (0.9 and 1.17), using data for the 19-month period, result in an increase in the calculated protein price averaging approximately 14.8 cents. The total increase in the protein price as a result of three changes to aspects of the Federal order reform protein price formula (moisture adjustment, make allowance, and formula changes) would be approximately 20.6 cents above the

price that would have been computed based on the formula prior to 2001.

At the same time, the increase from \$0.137 to \$0.159 in the dry whey make allowance for calculating the other solids price results in a calculated decline in the other solids price of \$0.0227 over the 19-month period. Elimination of the snubber on the other solids price would have made no difference during the period considered. The combination of the changes in both the protein price and the other solids price would have resulted in an average of about \$0.50 per hundredweight increase in the Class III skim milk price over the 19-month period if cheese and dry whey prices were unchanged.

The changes in the protein price formula improve significantly the relationship between the cheese price and the protein price, from a correlation coefficient of 0.54, using the Federal order reform protein formula, to a correlation coefficient of .70 using the formula recommended in this decision. In addition to improving the relationship between the cheese price and the protein price, the recommended protein formula reduces the variability of the protein price and moderates the extremes that occurred under the Federal order reform protein formula, thereby giving producers a more consistent and positive protein price signal.

The calculation of the Class III price at 3.5 percent butterfat, based on the formulas contained in this decision, would have averaged about \$0.48 per hundredweight above the 3.5 percent Class III price based on the Class III formulas implemented under Federal order reform.

In comments filed in response to the tentative final decision, IDFA and Leprino urged that in no case should the Class III price be enhanced relative to price levels under Federal order reform. Leprino reiterated arguments addressed earlier as to the importance of assuring that yield factors not be too high or make allowances too low for cheese plants to make enough profit to maintain their operations. IDFA focused on the negative long-term effects on producer prices, as described in USDA's analysis, of adopting enhanced Class III and Class IV prices. As described in detail above (in Issue 3c), the factors incorporated in the Class III component price calculations are based solidly on testimony and data in the hearing record.

The record provides ample basis for believing that the margins allowed for cheesemakers under these recommended price formulas should be entirely adequate for them to maintain

their operations. As observed at the hearing and in comments filed in response to the tentative final decision by the expert witness from Cornell, a break-even point would be where the value of cheese plus whey cream plus whey powder equals the value of the milk price plus the make allowances. According to the witness, under Federal order reform, and to a greater extent in the tentative final decision, the total value of these products exceeded the sum of the milk price and the make allowances.

The discussion at the hearing centered specifically on the make allowance used in the protein formula, with the implication that it represented the entire make allowance for cheese. Unlike the Class IV price formulas, where the make allowances used in the butterfat and nonfat solids price formulas can be attributed directly to butter and nonfat dry milk, the make allowances used for butterfat, protein, and other solids in the pricing formulas for Class III must be looked at in aggregate. All three components are involved in the cheesemaking process and have a significant effect on cheesemakers' costs and returns.

Gross margins (including make allowances) can be compared using both the cost of milk based on the Federal order reform Class III formulas, and the cost of milk based on the Class III formulas recommended in this decision. For this purpose, gross margins are defined as the difference between the sum of the selling price of cheese and dry whey based on monthly average NASS prices and whey butter, estimated at nine cents below the NASS AA butter price, and the cost of milk under the two sets of formulas. The gross margins therefore reflect the amount of money available to processors to procure, process, and market the end products of milk used in Class III: cheese, whey butter and dry whey.

Using Class III component tests from the Upper Midwest market to estimate product yields, the estimated gross margins would have averaged approximately \$3.00 per hundredweight using the Federal order reform Class III formulas and \$2.52 per hundredweight over the 19-month period of January 2000 through July 2001 if the recommended Class III formulas had been in effect. These gross margins are significantly different than the cheese make allowances of \$0.1702 and \$0.165 used in the formulas, which would be equivalent to approximately \$1.70 and \$1.65 per hundredweight of milk with a estimated yield of 10 pounds of cheese. Such a difference is expected since the make allowances for whey butter and

dry whey are significantly lower than the cheese make allowance. Any residual value can be used by the handler to improve returns or increase producer pay prices. Also, the lower gross margins under the recommended formulas could lead to reduced over-order premiums to reflect increased milk costs and maintain current gross margins.

4. Class Price Relationships

The price relationships between classes established under the Federal order reform process should be maintained. One proposal heard in this proceeding would have reduced the Class IV butterfat price without affecting the computation of other butterfat or product prices. That proposal is addressed specifically in the section of this decision dealing with Class IV Butterfat price.

The current pricing system uses the same formulas for computing the advance component prices used to compute the Class I skim milk and butterfat prices and Class II skim milk price as are used to calculate the Class III and Class IV component prices. Several witnesses testified as to what the class price relationships should be if changes were made to any of the Class III or Class IV component price formulas. The witness for IDFA and several other parties stated that any changes to the Class III and Class IV formulas should also apply to the advance price formulas used for computing the Class I and Class II prices. The witness explained that failure to use the same formulas between the related classes of use would result in a direct impact on the Class I and Class II differentials which was clearly not the intent of Congress when Congress instructed the Secretary to conduct a rulemaking proceeding concerning the Class III and Class IV price formulas.

A witness for Hershey Foods pointed out that the Secretary went to great lengths to justify the 70-cent Class II differential above the Class IV price. In support of Proposal 31, the witness said that there is no justification or new evidence for changing the current price relationship that exists between the manufactured products (butter and nonfat dry milk) and the Class II price if the Class IV formulas were revised as suggested in several proposals. The witness stated that such changes in price relationships clearly were not the intent of Congress. A brief filed on behalf of IDFA in support of Proposal 31 stated that the correct price relationship between NFDM and Class II is 70 cents and that the record provides no basis for

changing that relationship. Actually, as explained in the final decision on Federal order reform, 70 cents represents the correct price relationship between milk used to make dry milk powder and milk used in Class II, as nearly as can be determined from the information available.

A proposal (Proposal 30) by two parties that any increases resulting from changes to the Class III and Class IV price formulas not be allowed to result in increases in Class I prices was supported in testimony by one of the parties, who argued that any increases in the Class I price mover should be balanced with reductions in Class I differentials. The witness stated that the proponents want to be sure that Class I prices are not further decoupled from Class III and Class IV pricing formulas, or that Class I prices are not artificially inflated.

Neither Proposal 30 nor Proposal 31 were adopted under the tentative final decision.

In comments on the tentative final decision filed by ADCNE and fully supported by DFA, consideration of Proposal 30 was opposed as being beyond the scope of the Congressional mandate and not fully debated at the hearing. ADCNE further opposed any modifications to Proposal 30, such as the Family Dairies' testimony supporting a weighted average Class I price mover, or to a similar proposal relative to the Class II price, that would change the basis for Class I and Class II prices or Class I and Class II differentials. ADCNE continued that there was no evidence presented at the hearing that would support the substantial revenue reductions to farmers throughout the Federal order system which Proposals 30 and 31 would cause. ADCNE urged that the conclusions of the tentative final decision to deny proposals 30 and 31 be affirmed.

Neither the price relationships established in the final decision between milk used in Class III or Class IV and milk used in Classes I and II should be changed. To the extent that there may be differences in the Class III or Class IV prices between the current prices and those adopted in this decision as a result of adjustments to the component pricing formulas, those changes should be reflected in the Class I and Class II prices. Any reevaluation of the formulas used to price the components used in manufactured products should be carried through to the class prices that are based on those component prices. A change in the computation of the nonfat solids price, for instance, is intended to better reflect

the value of those solids in dry milk products. If the new nonfat solids price formula results in an increase in the Class IV price, the record provides no basis for changing the difference in the value of the milk used in those solids between Class IV and Class II use. Similarly, the availability of milk for use in Class I is related to the higher of the alternative manufacturing values for that milk. The current relationships should be maintained.

5. Class I Price Mover

A proposal that was not included in the hearing notice was made at the hearing by a Family Dairies, USA, witness on behalf of that cooperative and the Midwest Dairy Coalition, which represents 13 additional organizations representing dairy farmers. The proposal would change the Class I price mover from the higher of the Class III and Class IV prices to a weighted average of the two. The witness for Family Dairies testified that the results of the current regulation are disturbing and unanticipated with the unexpected strength of the Class IV price relative to Class III.

In testimony at the hearing, the Family Dairies representative complained that 10 percent of production under Federal orders (milk used to make nonfat dry milk) has been driving the Class I price that applies to 40% of the milk. As a result, he testified, milk production for fluid purposes is encouraged in markets with high Class I differentials and relatively high Class I use at a time when marketing conditions (an oversupply of milk) should have the opposite effect. As fluid-oriented markets are receiving increased prices relative to markets in which cheese is the dominant use, he complained, inequities in blend prices between markets are increasing.

A group representing upper Midwest producer interests filed a brief describing the recent movement of milk from the Upper Midwest pool onto the Central and Mideast marketwide pools as disorderly marketing caused by increases of Class I prices in these higher-Class I use markets.

An argument stated in another brief stated that since the 1960's the dairy industry has used a Class I mover tied to a market-clearing price represented by a weighted average of milk used in butter, cheese, and powder.

In several briefs it was argued that the Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) published with the final decision on Federal order reform stated that the price formulas adopted therein were expected to generate a sufficient quantity of milk, and that both the

adoption of Class I pricing option IA and use of the higher of the Class III and IV prices as the price mover have worked to enhance Class I price levels.

A brief filed by a group representing fluid milk handlers suggested that USDA should give careful consideration to the proposal to use a weighted average of the Class III and Class IV prices to move Class I prices.

Based on analysis of the hearing record and briefs filed by interested persons, the tentative final decision continued use of the higher of the advanced Class III or Class IV prices as the mover for Class I prices.

In comments on the tentative final decision, the Midwest Dairy Coalition repeated its position that the existing mover should be changed to a weighted average of the advanced Class III and advanced Class IV prices, with the weight based on the portion of manufacturing milk used for Class III and Class IV during the prior year. The Coalition stated that using the higher of Class III or Class IV prices could result in setting a minimum fluid milk price that is actually above the market clearing price for milk, especially if the higher of the Class III and IV prices were not representative of manufacturing markets. The Coalition also expressed concern that the tentative final decision adopted, as an unnoticed and unsupported change, the higher of the advanced Class III or Class IV milk prices at 3.5 percent butterfat as the new Class I mover instead of using the skim value.

In comments, NMPF noted that significant fluctuation that could occur in the Class I skim milk price mover due to using the higher of the advanced Class III or Class IV prices at 3.5 percent butterfat. Several parties noted that use of the advanced price at 3.5 percent butterfat could cause the Class III price to be the Class I price mover, even with a very low Class III skim milk price, causing significant month-to-month changes in the Class I skim milk price.

Michigan Milk Producers Association (MMPA) filed comments, stating that using a weighted average to set the Class I mover would severely impact fluid users' ability to attract sufficient quantities of milk when there were large differences between Class III and Class IV prices. MMPA and NMPF supported the continued use of the higher of the Class III or Class IV prices as the Class I mover.

ADCNE's comments, fully supported by DFA, expressed opposition to the Family Dairies' proposal for a weighted average Class I price mover or any other proposal that would change the basis for Class I and Class II prices or Class I and

Class II differentials. ADCNE argued that there was no evidence presented at the hearing that would support the substantial revenue reductions to farmers throughout the Federal order system which would result from adoption of the weighted average Class I price mover. ADCNE urged that the conclusions of the tentative final decision to continue to use the higher of the advanced Class III and IV prices as the basis for calculating the Class I price mover be affirmed.

The shift in the pooling of milk from the upper Midwest to higher-valued markets complained of in one upper Midwest brief has been a long-sought outcome on the part of upper Midwest producer groups. It is difficult to understand why it is now seen as a manifestation of disorderly marketing.

Those briefs that cited the sufficient level of milk production projected under the RIA for Federal order reform appeared to base their arguments in opposition to use of the "higher of" Class I price mover on that projection. It should be noted that Congressional action relative to Class I prices following issuance of the final decision on Federal order reform applied only to the Class I pricing surface. Use of the higher of the Class III and IV prices as the Class I price mover was included in Federal order reform and in the accompanying RIA.

The Upper Midwest Coalition's concern that the tentative final decision adopted the higher of the advanced Class III or Class IV milk prices at 3.5 percent butterfat instead of using the skim value as the new Class I mover, and the NMPF criticism that doing so would result in significant fluctuations in the Class I skim price is now moot because of the return to the use of one butterfat price. Use of the same butterfat price for the Class III and Class IV prices will result in the "higher of" the two being determined by the relative skim milk prices. Therefore, fluctuations in the Class I skim milk price projected under the tentative final decision should be reduced as a result of this decision.

The price referred to in the brief expressing preference for the historical use of a weighted average of prices paid for milk used in butter, cheese, and powder was, at first, the Minnesota-Wisconsin price series (the M-W). The M-W, and later the M-W adjusted by a weighted average of current product prices for manufactured products, was specific to the upper Midwest area and included very little NFDM, since that area manufactures a higher percentage of cheese, relative to NFDM, than the rest of the U.S. The current pricing

system is much more representative of national supply and demand for manufactured dairy products than either of the versions of the former Class I mover.

As explained in the final decision on Federal order reform, the higher of the Class III or Class IV prices are used to move the Class I price to assure that fluid plants will be better able to attract milk away from manufacturing uses. Use of the weighted average of the two prices when there is a significant difference between them would provide no assurance that milk would be available as needed for fluid uses and would be more likely to result in Class price inversions (where the Class I price falls below one or more of the manufacturing class prices). In addition, use of a weighted average Class I price mover would increase the occurrence of the blend price falling below the Class III or IV price in markets with low Class I utilization.

Aside from the fact that the proposal to use a weighted average of the Class III and Class IV prices as the Class I mover was not noticed for consideration in this proceeding, it should be rejected on the basis of its lack of merit.

6. Miscellaneous and Conforming Changes

a. Advanced Class I Butterfat Price

Because of the change made between the interim final rule and this recommended decision—to use only one butterfat price for butterfat used in both Class III and Class IV—a conforming change made in the interim final rule to the procedure for calculating the Class I butterfat and hundredweight prices is unnecessary. The advanced butterfat price used for pricing Class I butterfat would continue to be the advanced butterfat price calculated for both classes.

b. Classification

The classification of anhydrous milkfat, butteroil, and plastic cream was changed in the tentative final decision from Class III to Class IV as a conforming change required by the adoption of separate butterfat prices for the two classes. The hearing notice contained no proposal to change the classification of these products, and there was no testimony in the record of the proceeding supporting their reclassification. Therefore, with the elimination of the separate Class III butterfat price, the sole basis for the change in classification is also eliminated. As noted in the tentative final decision, a difference between the classification of these products, which

have a very high butterfat content, and butter should not cause any market dislocation in a pricing plan where butterfat used in Class III products has the same value as butterfat used in Class IV products. One commenter opposed changing the classification of these products.

In a comment filed in response to the tentative final decision, Hershey Foods urged that the Federal orders adopt a 2-class pricing system. Such a suggestion is entirely outside the scope of the current proceeding.

c. Distribution of Butterfat Value to Producers

There were several responses to the issue of whether the butterfat price paid to producers should be the result of pooling butterfat prices from the different classes or continue to reflect the value of butterfat in Class III. A witness from Northwest Dairy Association testified that being able to line up the Class III price to plants with the component value calculation for producers is helpful, especially with regard to forward pricing. In a brief filed on behalf of DFA and ADCNE, the co-op groups supported continued use of the Class III butterfat price as the producer butterfat price. According to the brief, changes in direct pricing to the producer are not prudent at this time, and any change between the Class III and Class IV butterfat price should be settled through the producer price differential mechanism in the market order pools. The brief continued that the producer price differential is a blending of various debits and credits in the pooling process and the additional equalizing of any butterfat pricing adjustments through this procedure currently makes the most sense.

In a post-hearing brief, National All-Jersey (NAJ) urged that USDA retain the current practice of using Class III milk component values to price producer component values. NAJ noted that this scenario makes it easier to use accepted hedging tools, such as Class III futures contracts, and helps simplify pricing for producers. NAJ further stated that the current procedure maintains the same producer butterfat price in all Federal orders with multiple component pricing (MCP).

Seventy-nine dairy organizations supported payment to producers on the basis of the milk components priced in Class III, including the Class III butterfat price instead of a pooled butterfat price, plus the producer price differential in a comment filed in response to the tentative final decision. The commenters argue that payment to producers on the basis of Class III

components facilitates the use of risk management tools by producers and avoids wider fluctuations in Class I and producer fat, skim, and component values.

One of the principal reasons given in the tentative final decision for changing the pooling provisions of the MCP orders was that potential large differences between the Class III and Class IV/II butterfat prices would be likely to result in significant distortions in the effect of those differences on the producer price differential. In addition, the decision observed that it is possible that pool calculations in some markets would result in a negative producer price differential if the producer butterfat price is not changed to represent a blend of the values of butterfat in the four classes of use.

This reversal of the decision to calculate separate Class III and Class IV butterfat prices invalidates the principal reason for pooling butterfat under the MCP orders.

Therefore, producer payments under the MCP orders will continue to be made on the basis of the prices for milk components used in Class III rather than pooling the butterfat values of the four classes. The four orders that do not have component pricing will continue to pool the class use butterfat values and return a weighted average butterfat price to producers. As a result of this change between the tentative final decision and this recommended decision, some inconsistency between the producer butterfat prices under MCP and non-MCP orders will remain. It is not expected that this inconsistency will result in disorderly marketing.

d. Inclusion of Class I Other Source Butterfat in Producer Butterfat Price Computation

In the process of promulgating the tentative final decision, it was determined that the value associated with the occasional classification of other source milk as Class I should be included in pooling the class butterfat values to determine butterfat prices to producers. For the orders under which butterfat is pooled, this change was made in the interim final rule, and should continue, so that the value of all of the butterfat in the pool will be reflected in the producer butterfat price.

In the component pricing orders, the changes made in the interim final rule to include the Class I other source butterfat value in the butterfat pool should be reversed. Although the District Court's injunction had the effect of reversing these changes and the Federal order reform language has continued in effect, the order language

in the Code of Federal Regulations reflects the provisions adopted in the interim final rule. The proposed order language amendments accompanying this decision will reflect the language that is currently in effect in the MCP orders, reversing the changes that were made to include Class I other source butterfat in the butterfat pool.

7. Re-opening of Hearing, Issuance of a Final Decision, or Issuance of a Recommended Decision

The statute requiring that this proceeding be held to reconsider the Class III and Class IV pricing formulas also required that a final decision be published by December 1, 2000, with any amendments to the orders to be effective January 1, 2001.

The hearing record reflected unanimity among those addressing the issue that the industry should be afforded the opportunity to comment on a decision before its content results in a final rule. Consequently, a tentative final decision was issued, affording interested persons an opportunity to comment, even though the amendments adopted in the decision were to become effective January 1, 2001. Subsequently, an injunction was issued to prevent some of the provisions adopted in the interim final rule from becoming effective.

One option for dealing with the injunction would be to reopen the hearing for the purpose of considering additional testimony on the issue of pricing the components of milk used in cheese in such a way that the component prices track the cheese price more closely than they have done under the Federal order reform pricing formulas, or would continue to do under the formulas recommended in this decision.

Several interested parties commented in opposition to any reopening of the proceeding with regard to the Class III butterfat and protein price formulas. The only commenter that favored revisiting any of the issues involved stated that some way of reflecting increased energy costs to make allowances should be explored. The commenter seemed to refer to conducting a new proceeding rather than reopening the current proceeding. Given the present lack of interest in pursuing development of Class III component prices that are more closely correlated with cheese prices, reopening this proceeding should not be considered.

Two commenters on the Tentative Final Decision urged that USDA act quickly to conclude this proceeding. The most rapid conclusion to this

proceeding would be through issuance of a Final Decision, followed by a determination of producer approval and issuance of a Final Rule for the orders approved. However, significant changes were made to the Tentative Final Decision by the District Court order and this decision. Interested parties should have an additional opportunity to comment on those changes as well as other changes from the tentative final decision that are included in this decision. Therefore, USDA is issuing this Recommended Decision, which will allow comments (a 30-day comment period is provided) on the changes to be filed and considered before issuing a Final Decision, which producers will be asked to approve.

Rulings on Proposed Findings and Conclusions

Briefs, proposed findings and conclusions, and comments on the tentative final decision were filed on behalf of certain interested parties. These briefs, proposed findings and conclusions, comments filed, and the evidence in the record were considered in making the findings and conclusions set forth above. To the extent that the suggested findings and conclusions filed by interested parties are inconsistent with the findings and conclusions set forth herein, the requests to make such findings or reach such conclusions are denied for the reasons previously stated in this decision.

General Findings

The findings and determinations hereinafter set forth supplement those that were made when each of the aforesaid orders were first issued and when they were amended. The previous findings and determinations are hereby ratified and confirmed, except where they may conflict with those set forth herein.

The following findings are hereby made with respect to each of the aforesaid interim marketing agreements and orders;

(a) The interim marketing agreements and the orders, as hereby proposed to be amended, and all of the terms and conditions thereof, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act;

(b) The parity prices of milk as determined pursuant to section 2 of the Act are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk in the aforesaid marketing areas, and the minimum prices specified in the interim marketing agreements and the orders, as hereby proposed to be amended, are such prices as will reflect

the aforesaid factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest; and

(c) The interim marketing agreements and the orders, as hereby proposed to be amended, will regulate the handling of milk in the same manner as, and will be applicable only to persons in the respective classes of industrial and commercial activity specified in, marketing agreements upon which a hearing has been held.

Recommended Marketing Agreements and Order Amending the Orders

The recommended marketing agreements are not included in this decision because the regulatory provisions thereof would be the same as those contained in the orders, as hereby proposed to be amended. The following order amending the orders, as amended, regulating the handling of milk in the Northeast and other marketing areas is recommended as the detailed and appropriate means by which the foregoing conclusions may be carried out.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Parts 1000, 1001, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1030, 1032, 1033, 1124, 1126, 1131, and 1135

Milk marketing orders.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR Parts 1000, 1001, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1030, 1032, 1033, 1124, 1126, 1131, and 1135 are proposed to be amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR Parts 1000, 1001, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1030, 1032, 1033, 1124, 1126, 1131, and 1135 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674, 7253, Pub. L. 106–113, 115 Stat. 1501.

PART 1000—GENERAL PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDERS

1. Section 1000.40 is amended by adding paragraph (c)(1)(ii) and revising paragraph (d)(1)(i) to read as follows:

§ 1000.40 Classes of Utilization.

*	*	*	*	*
(c)	*	*	*	*
(1)	*	*	*	*
(ii)	Plastic cream, anhydrous milkfat, and butteroil; and			
*	*	*	*	*
(d)	*	*	*	*
(1)	*	*	*	*
(i)	Butter; and			
*	*	*	*	*

2. Section 1000.50 is amended by revising the last sentence of the introductory text and paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (g), (h), (j), (l), (n), (o), (p)(1), and (q)(3); and removing paragraph (q)(4) to read as follows:

§ 1000.50 Class prices, component prices, and advanced pricing factors.

* * * The price described in paragraph (d) of this section shall be derived from the Class II skim milk price announced on or before the 23rd day of the month preceding the month to which it applies and the butterfat price announced on or before the 5th day of the month following the month to which it applies.

(a) *Class I price.* The Class I price per hundredweight, rounded to the nearest cent, shall be .965 times the Class I skim milk price plus 3.5 times the Class I butterfat price.

(b) *Class I skim milk price.* The Class I skim milk price per hundredweight shall be the adjusted Class I differential specified in § 1000.52 plus the higher of the advanced pricing factors computed in paragraph (q)(1) or (2) of this section.

(c) *Class I butterfat price.* The Class I butterfat price per pound shall be the adjusted Class I differential specified in § 1000.52 divided by 100, plus the advanced butterfat price computed in paragraph (q)(3) of this section.

* * * * *

(g) *Class II butterfat price.* The Class II butterfat price per pound shall be the butterfat price plus \$.007.

(h) *Class III price.* The Class III price per hundredweight, rounded to the nearest cent, shall be .965 times the Class III skim milk price plus 3.5 times the butterfat price.

* * * * *

(j) *Class IV price.* The Class IV price per hundredweight, rounded to the nearest cent, shall be .965 times the Class IV skim milk price plus 3.5 times the butterfat price.

* * * * *

(l) *Butterfat price.* The butterfat price per pound, rounded to the nearest one-hundredth cent, shall be the U.S. average NASS AA Butter survey price reported by the Department for the month less 11.5 cents, with the result divided by .82.

* * * * *

(n) *Protein price.* The protein price per pound, rounded to the nearest one-hundredth cent, shall be computed as follows:

(1) Compute a weighted average of the amounts described in paragraphs (n)(1)(i) and (ii) of this section:

(i) The U.S. average NASS survey price for 40-lb. block cheese reported by the Department for the month; and

(ii) The U.S. average NASS survey price for 500-pound barrel cheddar cheese (38 percent moisture) reported by the Department for the month plus 3 cents;

(2) Subtract 16.5 cents from the price computed pursuant to paragraph (n)(1)

of this section and multiply the result by 1.405;

(3) Add to the amount computed pursuant to paragraph (n)(2) of this section an amount computed as follows:

(i) Subtract 16.5 cents from the price computed pursuant to paragraph (n)(1) of this section and multiply the result by 1.582; and

(ii) Subtract .9 times the butterfat price computed pursuant to paragraph (l) of this section from the amount computed pursuant to paragraph (n)(3)(i) of this section; and

(iii) Multiply the amount computed pursuant to paragraph (n)(3)(ii) of this section by 1.17.

(o) *Other solids price.* The other solids price per pound, rounded to the nearest one-hundredth cent, shall be the U.S. average NASS dry whey survey price reported by the Department for the month minus 15.9 cents, with the result divided by 0.968.

(p) * * *

(1) Multiply .0005 by the weighted average price computed pursuant to paragraph (n)(1) of this section and round to the 5th decimal place;

* * * * *

(q) * * *

(3) An advanced butterfat price per pound, rounded to the nearest one-hundredth cent, shall be calculated by computing a weighted average of the 2 most recent U.S. average NASS AA Butter survey prices announced before the 24th day of the month, subtracting 11.5 cents from this average, and dividing the result by 0.82.

PART 1001—MILK IN THE NORTHEAST MARKETING AREA

1. In § 1001.60 paragraphs (c)(3), (d)(2), and (h) are revised to read as follows:

§ 1001.60 Handler's value of milk.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class III by the butterfat price.

(d) * * *

(2) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class IV by the butterfat price.

* * * * *

(h) Multiply the difference between the Class I price applicable at the location of the nearest unregulated supply plants from which an equivalent volume was received and the Class III price by the pounds of skim milk and butterfat in receipts of concentrated fluid milk products assigned to Class I pursuant to § 1000.43(d) and § 1000.44(a)(3)(i) and the corresponding

step of § 1000.44(b) and the pounds of skim milk and butterfat subtracted from Class I pursuant to § 1000.44(a)(8) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b), excluding such skim milk and butterfat in receipts of fluid milk products from an unregulated supply plant to the extent that an equivalent amount of skim milk or butterfat disposed of to such plant by handlers fully regulated under any Federal milk order is classified and priced as Class I milk and is not used as an offset for any other payment obligation under any order.

* * * * *

2. Section 1001.61 is revised to read as follows:

§ 1001.61 Computation of producer price differential.

For each month, the market administrator shall compute a producer price differential per hundredweight. The report of any handler who has not made payments required pursuant to § 1001.71 for the preceding month shall not be included in the computation of the producer price differential, and such handler's report shall not be included in the computation for succeeding months until the handler has made full payment of outstanding monthly obligations. Subject to the conditions in this paragraph, the market administrator shall compute the producer price differential in the following manner:

(a) Combine into one total the values computed pursuant to § 1001.60 for all handlers required to file reports prescribed in § 1001.30;

(b) Subtract the total of the values obtained by multiplying each handler's total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in the milk for which an obligation was computed pursuant to § 1001.60 by the protein price, other solids price, and the butterfat price, respectively;

(c) Add an amount equal to the minus location adjustments and subtract an amount equal to the plus location adjustments computed pursuant to § 1001.75;

(d) Add an amount equal to not less than one-half of the unobligated balance in the producer-settlement fund;

(e) Divide the resulting amount by the sum of the following for all handlers included in these computations:

(1) The total hundredweight of producer milk; and

(2) The total hundredweight for which a value is computed pursuant to § 1001.60(h); and

(f) Subtract not less than 4 cents nor more than 5 cents from the price computed pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section. The result, rounded to the nearest cent, shall be known as the

producer price differential for the month.

3. In § 1001.62 paragraphs (e) and (g) are revised to read as follows:

§ 1001.62 Announcement of producer prices.

* * * * *

(e) The butterfat price;

* * * * *

(g) The statistical uniform price for milk containing 3.5 percent butterfat computed by combining the Class III price and the producer price differential.

4. Section 1001.71 is amended by revising paragraphs (b)(2) and (3) to read as follows:

§ 1001.71 Payments to the producer-settlement fund.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(2) An amount obtained by multiplying the total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in producer milk by the protein, other solids, and butterfat prices respectively; and

(3) An amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of skim milk and butterfat for which a value was computed pursuant to § 1001.60(h) by the producer price differential as adjusted pursuant to § 1001.75 for the location of the plant from which received.

5. Section 1001.73 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(2)(ii) and (b)(3)(vi) to read as follows:

§ 1001.73 Payments to producers and to cooperative associations.

(a) * * *

(2) * * *

(ii) Multiply the pounds of butterfat received by the butterfat price for the month;

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(3) * * *

(vi) Multiply the pounds of butterfat in Class III and Class IV milk by the butterfat price for the month;

* * * * *

PART 1030—MILK IN THE UPPER MIDWEST MARKETING AREA

1. In § 1030.60 paragraphs (c)(3), (d)(2), and (i) are revised to read as follows:

§ 1030.60 Handler's value of milk.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class III by the butterfat price.

(d) * * *

(2) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class IV by the butterfat price.

* * * * *

(i) Multiply the difference between the Class I price applicable at the location of the nearest unregulated supply plants from which an equivalent volume was received and the Class III price by the pounds of skim milk and butterfat in receipts of concentrated fluid milk products assigned to Class I pursuant to § 1000.43(d) and § 1000.44(a)(3)(i) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b) and the pounds of skim milk and butterfat subtracted from Class I pursuant to § 1000.44(a)(8) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b), excluding such skim milk and butterfat in receipts of fluid milk products from an unregulated supply plant to the extent that an equivalent amount of skim milk or butterfat disposed of to such plant by handlers fully regulated under any Federal milk order is classified and priced as Class I milk and is not used as an offset for any other payment obligation under any order.

* * * * *

2. Section 1030.61 is revised to read as follows:

§ 1030.61 Computation of producer price differential.

For each month the market administrator shall compute a producer price differential per hundredweight. The report of any handler who has not made payments required pursuant to § 1030.71 for the preceding month shall not be included in the computation of the producer price differential, and such handler's report shall not be included in the computation for succeeding months until the handler has made full payment of outstanding monthly obligations. Subject to the conditions of this paragraph, the market administrator shall compute the producer price differential in the following manner:

(a) Combine into one total the values computed pursuant to § 1030.60 for all handlers required to file reports prescribed in § 1030.30;

(b) Subtract the total values obtained by multiplying each handler's total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in the milk for which an obligation was computed pursuant to § 1030.60 by the protein price, other solids price, and the butterfat price, respectively, and the total value of the somatic cell adjustment pursuant to § 1030.30(a)(1) and (c)(1);

(c) Add an amount equal to the minus location adjustments and subtract an amount equal to the plus location

adjustments computed pursuant to § 1030.75;

(d) Add an amount equal to not less than one-half of the unobligated balance in the producer-settlement fund;

(e) Divide the resulting amount by the sum of the following for all handlers included in these computations:

(1) The total hundredweight of producer milk; and

(2) The total hundredweight for which a value is computed pursuant to § 1030.60(i); and

(f) Subtract not less than 4 cents nor more than 5 cents from the price computed pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section. The result shall be known as the *producer price differential* for the month.

3. Section 1030.62 is amended by revising paragraphs (e) and (h) to read as follows:

§ 1030.62 Announcement of producer prices.

* * * * *

(e) The butterfat price;

* * * * *

(h) The statistical uniform price for milk containing 3.5 percent butterfat, computed by combining the Class III price and the producer butterfat price differential.

4. Section 1030.71 is amended by revising paragraphs (b)(2) and (b)(4) to read as follows:

§ 1030.71 Payments to the producer-settlement fund.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(2) An amount obtained by multiplying the total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in producer milk by the protein, other solids, and butterfat prices respectively;

* * * * *

(4) An amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of skim milk and butterfat for which a value was computed pursuant to § 1030.60(i) by the producer price differential as adjusted pursuant to § 1030.75 for the location of the plant from which received.

5. Section 1030.73 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(2)(ii), (c)(2)(v), and (c)(3)(ii) to read as follows:

§ 1030.73 Payments to producers and to cooperative associations.

(a) * * *

(2) * * *

(ii) The pounds of butterfat received times the butterfat price for the month;

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(2) * * *

(v) The pounds of butterfat in Class III and Class IV milk times the butterfat price;

* * * * *

(3) * * *

(ii) The pounds of butterfat received times the butterfat price for the month;

PART 1032—MILK IN THE CENTRAL MARKETING AREA

1. In § 1032.60 paragraphs (c)(3), (d)(2), and (i) are revised to read as follows:

§ 1032.60 Handler's value of milk.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class III by the butterfat price.

(d) * * *

(2) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class IV by the butterfat price.

* * * * *

(i) Multiply the difference between the Class I price applicable at the location of the nearest unregulated supply plants from which an equivalent volume was received and the Class III price by the pounds of skim milk and butterfat in receipts of concentrated fluid milk products assigned to Class I pursuant to § 1000.43(d) and § 1000.44(a)(3)(i) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b) and the pounds of skim milk and butterfat subtracted from Class I pursuant to § 1000.44(a)(8) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b), excluding such skim milk and butterfat in receipts of fluid milk products from an unregulated supply plant to the extent that an equivalent amount of skim milk or butterfat disposed of to such plant by handlers fully regulated under any Federal milk order is classified and priced as Class I milk and is not used as an offset for any other payment obligation under any order.

* * * * *

2. Section 1032.61 is revised to read as follows:

§ 1032.61 Computation of producer price differential.

For each month the market administrator shall compute a producer price differential per hundredweight. The report of any handler who has not made payments required pursuant to § 1032.71 for the preceding month shall not be included in the computation of the producer price differential, and such handler's report shall not be included in the computation for succeeding months until the handler has made full payment of outstanding monthly obligations. Subject to the conditions of this

paragraph, the market administrator shall compute the producer price differential in the following manner:

(a) Combine into one total the values computed pursuant to § 1032.60 for all handlers required to file reports prescribed in § 1032.30;

(b) Subtract the total values obtained by multiplying each handler's total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in the milk for which an obligation was computed pursuant to § 1032.60 by the protein price, the other solids price, and the butterfat price, respectively, and the total value of the somatic cell adjustment pursuant to § 1032.30(a)(1) and (c)(1);

(c) Add an amount equal to the minus location adjustments and subtract an amount equal to the plus location adjustments computed pursuant to § 1032.75;

(d) Add an amount equal to not less than one-half of the unobligated balance in the producer-settlement fund;

(e) Divide the resulting amount by the sum of the following for all handlers included in these computations:

(1) The total hundredweight of producer milk; and

(2) The total hundredweight for which a value is computed pursuant to § 1032.60(i); and

(f) Subtract not less than 4 cents nor more than 5 cents from the price computed pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section. The result shall be known as the *producer price differential* for the month.

3. Section 1032.62 is amended by revising paragraphs (e) and (h) to read as follows:

§ 1032.62 Announcement of producer prices.

* * * * *

(e) The butterfat price;

* * * * *

(h) The statistical uniform price for milk containing 3.5 percent butterfat, computed by combining the Class III price and the producer price differential.

4. Section 1032.71 is amended by revising paragraphs (b)(2) and (4) to read as follows:

§ 1032.71 Payments to the producer-settlement fund.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(2) An amount obtained by multiplying the total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in producer milk by the protein, other solids, and butterfat prices respectively;

* * * * *

(4) An amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of skim milk

and butterfat for which a value was computed pursuant to § 1032.60(i) by the producer price differential as adjusted pursuant to § 1032.75 for the location of the plant from which received.

5. Section 1032.73 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(2)(ii), (c)(2)(v), and (c)(3)(ii) to read as follows:

§ 1032.73 Payments to producers and to cooperative associations.

(a) * * *

(2) * * *

(ii) The pounds of butterfat received times the butterfat price for the month;

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(2) * * *

(v) The pounds of butterfat in Class III and Class IV milk times the butterfat price;

* * * * *

(3) * * *

(ii) The pounds of butterfat received times the butterfat price for the month;

* * * * *

PART 1033—MILK IN THE MIDEAST MARKETING AREA

1. In § 1033.60 paragraphs (c)(3), (d)(2), and (i) are revised to read as follows:

§ 1033.60 Handler's value of milk.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class III by the butterfat price.

(d) * * *

(2) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class IV by the butterfat price.

* * * * *

(i) Multiply the difference between the Class I price applicable at the location of the nearest unregulated supply plants from which an equivalent volume was received and the Class III price by the pounds of skim milk and butterfat in receipts of concentrated fluid milk products assigned to Class I pursuant to § 1000.43(d) and § 1000.44(a)(3)(i) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b) and the pounds of skim milk and butterfat subtracted from Class I pursuant to § 1000.44(a)(8) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b), excluding such skim milk and butterfat in receipts of fluid milk products from an unregulated supply plant to the extent that an equivalent amount of skim milk or butterfat disposed of to such plant by handlers fully regulated under any Federal milk order is classified and priced as Class I milk and

is not used as an offset for any other payment obligation under any order.

* * * * *

2. Section 1033.61 is revised to read as follows:

§ 1033.61 Computation of producer price differential.

For each month the market administrator shall compute a producer price differential per hundredweight. The report of any handler who has not made payments required pursuant to § 1033.71 for the preceding month shall not be included in the computation of the producer price differential, and such handler's report shall not be included in the computation for succeeding months until the handler has made full payment of outstanding monthly obligations. Subject to the conditions of this paragraph, the market administrator shall compute the producer price differential in the following manner:

(a) Combine into one total the values computed pursuant to § 1033.60 for all handlers required to file reports prescribed in § 1033.30;

(b) Subtract the total values obtained by multiplying each handler's total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in the milk for which an obligation was computed pursuant to § 1033.60 by the protein price, the other solids price, and the butterfat price, respectively, and the total value of the somatic cell adjustment pursuant to § 1033.30(a)(1) and (c)(1);

(c) Add an amount equal to the minus location adjustments and subtract an amount equal to the plus location adjustments computed pursuant to § 1033.75;

(d) Add an amount equal to not less than one-half of the unobligated balance in the producer-settlement fund;

(e) Divide the resulting amount by the sum of the following for all handlers included in these computations:

(1) The total hundredweight of producer milk; and

(2) The total hundredweight for which a value is computed pursuant to § 1033.60(i); and

(f) Subtract not less than 4 cents nor more than 5 cents from the price computed pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section. The result shall be known as the *producer price differential* for the month.

3. Section 1033.62 is amended by revising paragraphs (e) and (h) to read as follows:

§ 1033.62 Announcement of producer prices.

* * * * *

(e) The butterfat price;

* * * * *

(h) The statistical uniform price for milk containing 3.5 percent butterfat, computed by combining the Class III price and the producer price differential.

4. Section 1033.71 is amended by revising paragraphs (b)(2) and (4) to read as follows:

§ 1033.71 Payments to the producer-settlement fund.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(2) An amount obtained by multiplying the total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in producer milk by the protein, other solids, and butterfat prices, respectively;

* * * * *

(4) An amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of skim milk and butterfat for which a value was computed pursuant to § 1033.60(i) by the producer price differential as adjusted pursuant to § 1033.75 for the location of the plant from which received.

5. Section 1033.73 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(2)(ii) and (b)(3)(v) to read as follows:

§ 1033.73 Payments to producers and to cooperative associations.

(a) * * *

(2) * * *

(ii) The pounds of butterfat received times the butterfat price for the month;

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(3) * * *

(v) The pounds of butterfat in Class III and Class IV milk times the butterfat price;

* * * * *

PART 1124—MILK IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST MARKETING AREA

1. In § 1124.60 paragraphs (c)(3), (d)(2), and (h) are revised to read as follows:

§ 1124.60 Handler's value of milk.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class III by the butterfat price.

(d) * * *

(2) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class IV by the butterfat price.

* * * * *

(h) Multiply the difference between the Class I price applicable at the location of the nearest unregulated supply plants from which an equivalent

volume was received and the Class III price by the pounds of skim milk and butterfat in receipts of concentrated fluid milk products assigned to Class I pursuant to § 1000.43(d) and § 1000.44(a)(3)(i) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b) and the pounds of skim milk and butterfat subtracted from Class I pursuant to § 1000.44(a)(8) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b), excluding such skim milk and butterfat in receipts of fluid milk products from an unregulated supply plant to the extent that an equivalent amount of skim milk or butterfat disposed of to such plant by handlers fully regulated under any Federal milk order is classified and priced as Class I milk and is not used as an offset for any other payment obligation under any order.

* * * * *

2. Section 1124.61 is revised to read as follows:

§ 1124.61 Computation of producer price differential.

For each month the market administrator shall compute a producer price differential per hundredweight. The report of any handler who has not made payments required pursuant to § 1124.71 for the preceding month shall not be included in the computation of the producer price differential, and such handler's report shall not be included in the computation for succeeding months until the handler has made full payment of outstanding monthly obligations. Subject to the conditions of this paragraph, the market administrator shall compute the producer price differential in the following manner:

(a) Combine into one total the values computed pursuant to § 1124.60 for all handlers required to file reports prescribed in § 1124.30;

(b) Subtract the total values obtained by multiplying each handler's total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in the milk for which an obligation was computed pursuant to § 1124.60 by the protein price, the other solids price, and the butterfat price, respectively;

(c) Add an amount equal to the minus location adjustments and subtract an amount equal to the plus location adjustments computed pursuant to § 1124.75;

(d) Add an amount equal to not less than one-half of the unobligated balance in the producer-settlement fund;

(e) Divide the resulting amount by the sum of the following for all handlers included in these computations:

(1) The total hundredweight of producer milk; and

(2) The total hundredweight for which a value is computed pursuant to § 1124.60(h); and

(f) Subtract not less than 4 cents nor more than 5 cents from the price computed pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section. The result shall be known as the *producer price differential* for the month.

3. Section 1124.62 is amended by revising paragraphs (e) and (g) to read as follows:

§ 1124.62 Announcement of producer prices.

* * * * *

(e) The butterfat price;

* * * * *

(g) The statistical uniform price for milk containing 3.5 percent butterfat, computed by combining the Class III price and the producer price differential.

4. Section 1124.71 is amended by revising paragraphs (b)(2) and (3) to read as follows:

§ 1124.71 Payments to the producer-settlement fund.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(2) An amount obtained by multiplying the total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in producer milk by the protein, other solids, and butterfat prices respectively; and

(3) An amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of skim milk and butterfat for which a value was computed pursuant to § 1124.60(h) by the producer price differential as adjusted pursuant to § 1124.75 for the location of the plant from which received.

5. Section 1124.73 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(2)(ii), (c)(2)(v), and (c)(3)(ii) to read as follows:

§ 1124.73 Payments to producers and to cooperative associations.

(a) * * *

(2) * * *

(ii) The pounds of butterfat received times the butterfat price for the month;

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(2) * * *

(v) The pounds of butterfat in Class III and Class IV milk times the butterfat price;

* * * * *

(3) * * *

(ii) The pounds of butterfat received times the butterfat price for the month;

* * * * *

PART 1126—MILK IN THE SOUTHWEST MARKETING AREA

1. In § 1126.60 paragraphs (c)(3), (d)(2), and (i) are revised to read as follows:

§ 1126.60 Handler's value of milk.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(3) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class III by the butterfat price.

(d) * * *

(2) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class IV by the butterfat price.

* * * * *

(i) Multiply the difference between the Class I price applicable at the location of the nearest unregulated supply plants from which an equivalent volume was received and the Class III price by the pounds of skim milk and butterfat in receipts of concentrated fluid milk products assigned to Class I pursuant to § 1000.43(d) and § 1000.44(a)(3)(i) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b) and the pounds of skim milk and butterfat subtracted from Class I pursuant to § 1000.44(a)(8) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b), excluding such skim milk and butterfat in receipts of fluid milk products from an unregulated supply plant to the extent that an equivalent amount of skim milk or butterfat disposed of to such plant by handlers fully regulated under any Federal milk order is classified and priced as Class I milk and is not used as an offset for any other payment obligation under any order.

* * * * *

2. Section 1126.61 is revised to read as follows:

§ 1126.61 Computation of producer price differential.

For each month the market administrator shall compute a producer price differential per hundredweight. The report of any handler who has not made payments required pursuant to § 1126.71 for the preceding month shall not be included in the computation of the producer price differential, and such handler's report shall not be included in the computation for succeeding months until the handler has made full payment of outstanding monthly obligations.

Subject to the conditions of this paragraph, the market administrator shall compute the producer price differential in the following manner:

(a) Combine into one total the values computed pursuant to § 1126.60 for all handlers required to file reports prescribed in § 1126.30;

(b) Subtract the total of the values obtained by multiplying each handler's

total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in the milk for which an obligation was computed pursuant to § 1126.60 by the protein price, other solids price, and the butterfat price, respectively, and the total value of the somatic cell adjustment pursuant to § 1126.30(a)(1) and (c)(1);

(c) Add an amount equal to the minus location adjustments and subtract an amount equal to the plus location adjustments computed pursuant to § 1126.75;

(d) Add an amount equal to not less than one-half of the unobligated balance in the producer-settlement fund;

(e) Divide the resulting amount by the sum of the following for all handlers included in these computations:

(1) The total hundredweight of producer milk; and

(2) The total hundredweight for which a value is computed pursuant to § 1126.60(i); and

(f) Subtract not less than 4 cents nor more than 5 cents from the price computed pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section. The result shall be known as the *producer price differential* for the month.

3. Section 1126.62 is amended by revising paragraphs (e) and (h) to read as follows:

§ 1126.62 Announcement of producer prices.

* * * * *

(e) The butterfat price;

* * * * *

(h) The statistical uniform price for milk containing 3.5 percent butterfat, computed by combining the Class III price and the producer price differential.

4. Section 1126.71 is amended by revising paragraphs (b)(2) and (4) to read as follows:

§ 1126.71 Payments to the producer-settlement fund.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(2) An amount obtained by multiplying the total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in producer milk by the protein, other solids, and butterfat prices respectively;

* * * * *

(4) An amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of skim milk and butterfat for which a value was computed pursuant to § 1126.60(i) by the producer price differential as adjusted pursuant to § 1126.75 for the location of the plant from which received.

5. Section 1126.73 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(2)(ii) and (b)(3)(v) to read as follows:

§ 1126.73 Payments to producers and to cooperative associations.

- (a) * * *
- (2) * * *

(ii) Multiply the pounds of butterfat received times the butterfat price for the month;

* * * * *

- (b) * * *
- (3) * * *

(v) The pounds of butterfat in Class III and Class IV milk times the butterfat price;

* * * * *

PART 1135—MILK IN THE WESTERN MARKETING AREA

1. In § 1135.60 paragraphs (c)(3), (d)(2) and (h) are revised to read as follows:

§ 1135.60 Handler's value of milk.

* * * * *

- (c) * * *

(3) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class III by the butterfat price.

- (d) * * *

(2) Add an amount obtained by multiplying the pounds of butterfat in Class IV by the butterfat price.

* * * * *

(h) Multiply the difference between the Class I price applicable at the location of the nearest unregulated supply plants from which an equivalent volume was received and the Class III price by the pounds of skim milk and butterfat in receipts of concentrated fluid milk products assigned to Class I pursuant to § 1000.43(d) and § 1000.44(a)(3)(i) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b) and the pounds of skim milk and butterfat subtracted from Class I pursuant to § 1000.44(a)(8) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b), excluding such skim milk and butterfat in receipts of fluid milk products from an unregulated supply plant to the extent that an equivalent amount of skim milk or butterfat disposed of to such plant by handlers fully regulated under any Federal milk order is classified and priced as Class I milk and is not used as an offset for any other payment obligation under any order.

* * * * *

2. Section 1135.61 is revised to read as follows:

§ 1135.61 Computation of producer price differential.

For each month the market administrator shall compute a producer price differential per hundredweight. The report of any handler who has not made payments required pursuant to § 1135.71 for the preceding month shall not be included in the computation of the producer price differential, and such handler's report shall not be included in the computation for succeeding months until the handler has made full payment of outstanding monthly obligations. Subject to the conditions of this paragraph, the market administrator shall compute the producer price differential in the following manner:

(a) Combine into one total the values computed pursuant to § 1135.60 for all handlers required to file reports prescribed in § 1135.30;

(b) Subtract the total values obtained by multiplying each handler's total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in the milk for which an obligation was computed pursuant to § 1135.60 by the protein price, the other solids price, and the butterfat price, respectively;

(c) Add an amount equal to the minus location adjustments and subtract an amount equal to the plus location adjustments computed pursuant to § 1135.75;

(d) Add an amount equal to not less than one-half of the unobligated balance in the producer-settlement fund;

(e) Divide the resulting amount by the sum of the following for all handlers included in these computations:

(1) The total hundredweight of producer milk; and

(2) The total hundredweight for which a value is computed pursuant to § 1135.60(h); and

(f) Subtract not less than 4 cents nor more than 5 cents from the price computed pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section. The result shall be known as the *producer price differential* for the month.

3. Section 1135.62 is amended by revising paragraphs (e) and (g) to read as follows:

§ 1135.62 Announcement of producer prices.

* * * * *

(e) The butterfat price;

* * * * *

(g) The statistical uniform price for milk containing 3.5 percent butterfat computed by combining the Class III price and the producer price differential.

* * * * *

4. Section 1135.71 is amended by revising paragraph (b)(2) and removing and reserving paragraph (b)(3) to read as follows:

§ 1135.71 Payments to the producer-settlement fund.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(2) An amount obtained by multiplying the total pounds of protein, other solids, and butterfat contained in producer milk by the protein, other solids, and butterfat prices respectively; and

(3) [Reserved]

* * * * *

5. Section 1135.73 is amended by revising paragraphs (a)(2)(ii) and (b)(3)(v) to read as follows:

§ 1135.73 Payments to producers and to cooperative associations.

(2) * * *

(ii) The pounds of butterfat received times the butterfat price for the month;

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(3) * * *

(v) The pounds of butterfat in Class III and Class IV milk times the butterfat price;

* * * * *

Dated: October 19, 2001.

Kenneth C. Clayton,

Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[FR Doc. 01-26901 Filed 10-24-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-P