enough is establishing a Class I differential structure and indeed may have resulted in harm to producers located in northern and western New York. Prior to the 1991 final rule, the price difference between the New York base zone and New York City was 59 cents. The 1991 final rule increased this to 72 cents, but in doing so, the differential at the base zone was lowered by 13 cents. This resulted in a lowering of blend prices to producers in the far reaches of the milkshed. This observation may provide the basis for further examination of the Class I differential structure presented under Option 1A. Specifically, a 5-cent increase in the New York Class I differential and a similar increase in the Class I differential at Philadelphia, together with appropriate location adjustments between these pricing points, may accomplish what a producer price differential schedule does not seem to accomplish at its current state of development.

A submission from New York State Dairy Foods, Inc., (NYSDF) a trade association representing dairy product manufacturers and retailers voiced the need for raising the New York City Class I differential. NYSDF proposed an 8-cent per cwt. increase to reflect the reality of higher hauling rates. If this proposal is accepted, this would raise the Class I differential in New York City from the current $3.14 to $3.22. According to NYSDF, the 8-cent increase may not be sufficient depending on the length of time needed to implement milk order reforms. NYSDF also commented on their support for retaining farm-point pricing, but offered no compelling arguments for doing so.

Marketwide Service Payments

Cooperative Service Payments. The Secretary proposes that cooperative service payments as part of a marketwide service payment provision for the consolidated Northeast order should not be included in a consolidated Northeast order. As proposed by ADCNE a 2-cent per cwt. payment would be made out of the marketwide pool to cooperatives and non-cooperative entities for funding ''information and policy services'' that would be of marketwide benefit. Cooperative service payments of this sort currently are provided for under terms of the New York-New Jersey order, but are not provided for in either the New England or Middle Atlantic orders. However, under the New York-New Jersey order, cooperative service payments are made only to qualified cooperatives that meet the conditions specified under the order and does not provide for such payments to non-cooperative entities.

Rationale offered in support for a cooperative service type payment to cooperatives and non-cooperative entities were based on recognizing that in a regulatory pool structure, private parties provide important services that are of benefit to everyone involved in the marketwide pool, including the promulgation, amendments to, and administration of the order. Not to provide a mechanism for the recovery of a portion of the expense involved in providing such services would disadvantage those incurring these expenses while everyone in the market benefits as a result of these services.

Qualification criteria presented for entities eligible to receive this payment included a demonstration to the market administrator that it provides information with respect to market order prices and marketing conditions, that it has retained legal and economic staff or consulting personnel available to participate in marketing order amendatory proceedings, to consult with the market administrator with respect to marketing order issues, and that the entity pool at least 2.5 percent of the order's total milk volume.

As presently presented there is not a compelling reason to adopt this sort of compensatory plan to reimburse those entities that incur these costs. Market administrators and their staffs make themselves available to meet with, discuss, and aid in formulating positions that are reflective of the need of the marketing area as a normal part of their duties. Additionally, there are numerous provisions in the order that require as a matter of course, the issuance of reports, prices, and other information that affect all marketing order participants and to provide service to the entities affected by the regulatory plan of the order. Finally, no other current or recommended consolidated order recommends providing for such cost compensation. Cooperative and proprietary handlers in the New England and Middle Atlantic marketing areas included in the consolidated Northeast order, as well as entities in all other marketing areas have not experienced or have demonstrated any of the harm or ''disadvantage'' that arises, or may arise, if such costs are not shared by the entire pool of producers in the marketing area. This proposed rule can only assume that industry participants that have an interest in developing the promulgation and amendments to marketing orders would be willing to do so at their own expense. The positions and arguments offered are largely issues of the self-interest of entities. As such, self-interest may or may not be of marketwide benefit.

Balancing Payments. The Secretary proposes that a marketwide service payment plan offered for inclusion in the consolidated Northeast order includes a 4-cent per cwt. marketwide service payment to qualified handlers that perform market balancing from the marketwide pool should not be included in the consolidated Northeast order.

The proposal for balancing payments from the marketwide pool is intended to reflect that there are costs that handlers incur in balancing the Class I needs of the market and in providing for clearing the market of temporary surpluses. According to the proponents, these balancing costs are not fully recoverable from Class I handlers, however the benefit that results from this service being provided is a benefit of all producers in the market.

Handlers that incur the costs would be those handlers that would receive partial cost reimbursement. Cooperatives would be eligible to form common marketing agencies or federations for purposes of qualifying for balancing payments. Such handlers would include those who: (1) demonstrate ownership or operation of a balancing plant with the capacity to process a million pounds of milk per day into storable products such as cheese, butter, and nonfat dry milk and that such handler also represent at least 2.5 percent of the total volume of milk pooled under the order; (2) have under contract and the obligation to pool on a year-round basis at least 8 percent of the market's milk volume; (3) own a balancing plant that must be made available to other handlers or cooperatives at the request of the market administrator; (4) qualify to provide pool producers with a temporary market for their milk for up to 30 days at the request of the market administrator; and (5) demonstrate to the market administrator that their utilization of milk in Class I uses is greater than the minimum shipments required for pool plant qualification under the order.

There are several reasons for not recommending balancing payments for the consolidated Northeast order. First, the proposed Northeast order consolidates two current orders, New England and the Middle Atlantic, that do not currently provide for balancing cost offsets to handlers for such purposes and that these markets have not experienced any undue harm or disadvantage by not providing for this sort of cost offset. Secondly, and in addition to expressed opposition to

compensate handlers for balancing the market, an appropriate class price has been provided for market clearing purposes—the Class III—A price. It is a price that is applicable in all current Northeast orders, and is continued in this proposed rule as the Class IV price. While these two class prices are not the same (as explained in the BFP section of this decision), they are conceptually similar in that handlers have been provided with a market clearing price and further compensation beyond this is not warranted. Lastly, the proposed 4-cent per cwt. level is unexplained with respect to how adequately it tends to offset balancing costs.

The ''Pass-Through'' Provision

Currently, the New York order provides for what is commonly referred to as the ''pass-through'' provision. The intent of this provision is to provide for a degree of competitive equity for handlers that pay the order's Class I price for milk so that they can compete with handlers in unregulated areas that do not. This provision has been in place in the New York order since 1957 and is a part of how the order allocates and classifies milk. In functional terms, the pass-through provision removes the amount of milk distributed outside of the marketing area from the full Class I allocation provisions of the order, thereby providing a degree of price relief to handlers who compete with other handlers who are not held to the pricing provisions of the order in unregulated areas. Regulated New York handlers currently compete with unregulated handlers in the unregulated areas of Pennsylvania and other areas in the Northeast region.

The current provisions of the New England and Middle Atlantic orders do not have this provision although they too adjoin similar non-federally regulated areas. Handlers regulated by these two orders also compete with these same handlers for Class I sales. The merging and expansion of these three Northeast orders continue to result in areas that adjoin the recommended Northeast order that would not be regulated.

While there were proposals both for and against retaining a pass-through provision in the consolidated order, the need for it was expresses on the basis of the extent the Northeast consolidated order would be expanded to include currently unregulated areas. Generally, handlers support continuing to provide for a pass-through provision, and this position can only be considered reinforced given the limited degree of expansion of the consolidated Northeast order. If the entire Northeast region would fall under Federal milk order regulation, the need for the pass-through would be moot.

The Secretary proposes that a pass through provision, even in light of the limited expansion suggested for the consolidated Northeast order, should not be included. Class I prices charged to handlers that compete within the marketing area for fluid sales are determined by the location value of their plants. The Class I differential structure recommended by either Option 1A or Option 1B both recognize the location value of milk for Class I uses and are both designed to establish Class I differential values to cause milk to be delivered to bottling plant to satisfy fluid demands. Accordingly, any handler located in high-valued pricing areas will be charged for the location value of Class I milk at their plant location regardless of whether or not they compete with other handlers for fluid sales in areas where the location value of Class I milk at these plant locations are lower. This location value pricing principle should be extended to address handlers competing for sales with handlers who do not pay the same price for Class I milk in unregulated areas.

Seasonal Adjustments to the Class III and Class IV Prices

The three northeast orders to be consolidated into a single Northeast order currently provide for a seasonal adjustor on Class III and Class IIIA milk prices. These provisions have been a part of these three orders for more than 30 years. Prior to the adoption of the Minnesota-Wisconsin (M–W) price series in the mid-1970's, these markets established the equivalent of the modern Class III price on the basis of what was known as the U.S. Average Manufacturing Grade Milk-Price Series (U.S. average price).

The U.S. average price series was a competitive pay price series, but differed from the M–W in that it recorded price averages consistently below the M–W that was rapidly being adopted elsewhere in the country as the appropriate price for surplus uses of milk and used as a price mover for higher-valued class prices. Given the national marketplace in which surplus diary products compete for sales, a mechanism was needed to align these two differing price series. Accordingly, seasonal adjustments to the Class III price were developed and made a part of these orders. These seasonal adjustors were found not only to be warranted for better price coordination between these two price series, but also served to encourage handlers to dispose of the maximum amount of milk in Class I uses.

By the mid-1970's, the M–W was adopted to replace the US. average price series and the seasonal adjustors were retained. The reason for retaining these adjustments were indicated to encourage handlers to make more milk readily available for fluid use in the short production months and to facilitate the orderly disposition of excess reserve milk supplies in flush production months. Although some regional price disparity was acknowledged to result from retaining these adjustments, they were nevertheless retained because there was no evidence that providing for such adjustment had led to any interregional problems in the marketing of the reserve milk supply.

Agri-Mark, a major cooperative in the northeast, has proposed that seasonal adjustments continue in the consolidated Northeast order. The main thrust of their proposal is that markets with relatively high Class I use create a burden on the manufacturing sector in their areas. They view seasonal adjustments as also assisting in sending the proper economic signal to manufacturers. This is important, according to Agri-Mark because the seasonal adjustment provides an economic ''disincentive'' for Class III and Class IV manufacturers to use milk in the fall when less producer milk is available and additional supplies are needed for Class I uses.

The Secretary proposes that as presently formulated, seasonal adjustors to the Class III and Class IV prices should not be incorporated into the provisions of the consolidated Northeast order. This proposed rule proposes a much more permanent replacement for the current BFP. If the suggested BFP is adopted in all new consolidated orders, there is no compelling reason offered at this time to contemplate continuing seasonal adjustments to Class III and Class IV prices in light of how these prices would be derived. They are also not proposed for orders that are expected to have Class I utilizations similar to those anticipated in the consolidated Northeast order and who similarly have important manufacturing activity in such markets.

6b. Southeast Regional Issues

The 3 proposed orders for the Southeastern United States—Florida, Southeast, and Appalachian—are faced with a different set of marketing conditions than other orders. The Southeastern United States is one of the fastest growing areas of the country but the most deficit area in terms of milk

production per capita. From 1988 to 1995, the population of the 12 Southeastern states rose from 57.9 million to 63.5 million. By the year 2000, the population is expected to reach 66.8 million people.

While population increases in the Southeast, milk production in the 12 Southeast states (i.e., Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia) has been decreasing—from 15.4 billion pounds in 1988 to 13.7 billion pounds in 1996. The net result of these opposite trends is a widening gap between the local supply of milk for fluid use and the demand for such milk.

Unlike other parts of the country, the Southeast has few facilities for handling surplus milk. Consequently, surplus production during the months of January through June must, in some cases, be shipped hundreds of miles for processing at manufacturing plants generally to the north. For this reason, the provisions in these orders must be aimed at the twin goals of encouraging supplemental milk to move to these markets during the short production months—generally July through December—but they must also discourage supplemental milk to move to these markets when it is not needed in the flush production months—generally January through June—because such milk would simply displace local milk and increase cooperative organizations' costs to dispose of the milk.

Transportation Credits

As a result of the need to import milk to the Southeast from many areas outside the Southeast during certain months of the year, transportation credit provisions were incorporated in the Carolina, Southeast, Tennessee Valley, and Louisville-Lexington-Evansville orders in August 1996. These provisions provide credits to handlers that import supplemental milk for fluid use to the market during the short production months of July through December. The provisions restrict credits to producers and plants outside of the marketing areas. The credits are also restricted to producers who supply the markets during the short season and are not applicable to producers who are on the market throughout the year.

Following the initial implementation of transportation credits in August 1996, the provisions were modified in a final decision issued on May 12, 1997. The amendments became effective on August 1, 1997, in 3 of the 4 orders.[33]

The Secretary proposes that transportation credit provisions should be retained in the new Southeast and Appalachian orders but should not be included in the Florida order. Written comments received in response to the advance notice of proposed rulemaking indicate that producers in the Southeast favor retention of these provisions for these two orders. The Secretary proposes that the provisions should not be included in the Florida order, however, because that market is largely supplied by 2 cooperative associations which are able to recoup their costs of supplying the market with supplemental milk.

With the consolidation of orders, the Secretary proposes that some conforming changes should be made to the transportation credit provisions of the Southeast and Appalachian orders. Section 82(c)(1) of the present orders limits transportation credits on transferred bulk milk to plants that are regulated under orders other than the southeast orders that currently have the provisions, and section 82(c)(2)(ii) limits the area where farms may be located to be eligible for transportation credits on milk shipped directly from producers' farms. In §§ 1005.82(c)(1), 1007.82(c)(1), 1005.82(c)(2)(ii), and 1007.82(c)(2)(ii), the references to ''1011 and 1046'' should be removed.

The addition of northwest Arkansas and southern Missouri to the Southeast marketing area will make those 2 areas ineligible for transportation credits. This change in the application of the credits would naturally follow from the logic for incorporating these 2 areas in the Southeast marketing area. Specifically, northwest Arkansas and southern Missouri are regular sources of supply for handlers in the Southeast marketing area and, in addition, include plants that compete for sales with handlers regulated under the Southeast order. Accordingly, the producers in these 2 areas should, and will, regularly share in the pool proceeds of the Southeast market. Of course, since transportation credits are designed to attract supplemental milk to the market for fluid use from producers who are not regularly associated with the market, transportation credits should not, and will not, apply to a farm or a plant in northwest Arkansas or that portion of southern Missouri that is to be included in the Southeast marketing area.

[33] The Tennessee Valley order, as amended, was not approved by producers. The order was terminated effective October 1, 1997.

Pooling Standards

A number of comments were submitted regarding the issue of pooling standards in the southeast region. The Southeast Dairy Farmers Association (SDFA) recommended that pooling standards be maintained at levels that are as strict or stricter than current regulations and that southeastern milk marketing orders contain pooling requirements that reflect the deficit nature of these markets. SDFA argued that such provisions would discourage the movement of milk into and out of a Federal marketing area that does not normally serve the area unless the milk was actually needed. The association stated that performance requirements for plants are an important element in ensuring that southeastern fluid markets are adequately supplied on a year-round basis and in ensuring that only those plants that have as their principle purpose the supplying of the markets' fluid milk requirements receive the benefits of higher uniform prices. Currently, pooling standards vary between markets and regions, and the association believes that these varying standards should be maintained. SDFA supports a 50% route disposition requirement for pool distributing plants and recommends that the in-area route disposition requirement be standardized at 15% and the 1500-pound daily average exemption be changed to 150,000 pounds per month.

The National Farmers Organization (NFO), recommends that pooling standards for all of the orders recognize and accommodate the pooling on a year-round basis of milk supplies which are actually required for that market's Class I needs on a seasonal basis. NFO suggests that each order should be viewed separately in determining the standards and urges the Department to carefully evaluate pooling provisions to assure equity throughout the system. Another commentor, Middlefield Cheese of Ohio (Middlefield), recommends that all orders have the same pooling requirements. Middlefield states that varying pooling standards between orders create great difficulty in procuring milk for small businesses. It argues that uniformity would allow milk to be economically and efficiently marketed to where it is needed as opposed to a ''large co-op dictating control over the milk market.''

One of the major cooperatives operating within the Southeast, Mid-America Dairymen, Inc. (Mid-Am), recommends that the pooling standard for distributing plants in high utilization markets should be 50% Class I. Mid-Am also recommends that market

administrators be given the authority to adjust shipping requirements in all orders.

A number of comments addressed the issue of where a plant should be regulated and whether there should be a ''lock-in'' provision which would keep a distributing plant regulated under the order where it is located rather than where it may have the most sales. SDFA supports the adoption of lock-in provisions in the consolidated southeast orders. Prairie Farms Dairy, Inc. states that pool distributing plants should be regulated where located rather than where route disposition occurs. Another cooperative association, Milk Marketing Inc. (MMI), states that competition for local milk supply and a competitive pay price with neighboring plants is much more important to both producers and processors than a price that is competitive with other plants that compete for sales in a given area. Therefore, MMI recommends regulating a distributing plant in the market where it is located rather than on the location of its sales. MMI contends that the Federal milk order program should be concerned with attracting milk to a plant, not the retail location. The cooperative states that plants in unregulated areas should continue to be regulated based on sales areas.

Some comments received addressed supply plant requirements. SDFA recommends that for the southeastern orders the supply plant shipping requirement be 60% of a plant's receipts during July through November and 40% during December through June. However, SDFA also acknowledges that specific exceptions to this principle may be necessary to accommodate specific needs and should be considered on a case by case basis.

SDFA states that supply plant performance requirements should not be changed in an effort to allow all Grade A milk to be included in a marketwide pool. Such a change, it contends, would result in disorderly marketing and jeopardize the viability of local supplies. SDFA requested year-round shipping requirements for supply plants under Orders 5, 6, and 7.

SDFA also states that automatic pooling should be provided for manufacturing or receiving plants located in the marketing area if the plant is operated by a cooperative association, but only if the cooperative has a substantial association with the market.

MMI maintains that southeastern orders would be well-served by provisions which allow reserve supply plants in the North and West to participate in higher blend prices throughout the year, in exchange for greater assurance of a milk supply in the short production months when additional milk is needed. Land O'Lakes (LOL) recommended the elimination of shipping requirements for supply plants, but suggested that supply plant operators make a commitment to supply the market when additional milk is needed. LOL also supports the adoption of a ''call'' provision in each order that would allow the market administrator to require supply plant shipments on an as-needed basis.

Another cooperative operating in the Southeast wrote that reserve supply plant qualification should be based on total cooperative performance but that such plants should not be required to be located in the marketing area. This cooperative contends that if a cooperative is performing a balancing function for the market, it should not be discriminated against just because its plant is not located in the marketing area.

Suggestions were also received concerning certain specialty plants that are located in the Southeast. SDFA recommended amending the *route disposition* definition to accommodate a specialty fluid milk plant in Jacksonville that disposes of long shelf life dairy products. SDFA states that although a large portion of its fluid supply is disposed for Class I use, because of the nature of its business, it is likely that the plant would not meet the 50% route disposition requirement for pool status.

Proposal: The Secretary proposes that the pool plant provisions for the Appalachian, Florida, and Southeast orders under consideration should closely follow the provisions now contained in the southeast orders. The performance standards proposed are appropriate for the needs of these seasonally-deficit markets.

Section 7(a) of each Federal milk order describes the pooling standards for a distributing plant. To qualify for pooling under each of the 3 orders, a distributing plant must dispose of 50 percent of the total fluid milk products received at the plant as route disposition. In addition, at least 10 percent of the plant's receipts must be disposed of as route disposition in the marketing area. These standards would indicate that a distributing plant is closely associated with the fluid market and, therefore, should be part of the marketwide pool.

Paragraph (b) of Section 7 would accommodate the pooling of plants that specialize in aseptically-packaged products. There are at least two such plants in the southeast markets: the Ryan Foods Company plants in Jacksonville, Florida and Murray, Kentucky.

Unlike a typical distributing plant, a plant specializing in aseptically packaged products may have a more erratic processing schedule, reflecting the longer shelf life of the products packaged at the plant. Consequently, a plant's Class I utilization may vary considerably from month to month. In the past, such variability has resulted in shifting pool status for some of these plants from one order to another. In some months, the plant may have been partially regulated, even though all of the milk received at the plant was priced under the order. This type of regulatory instability is not conducive to orderly marketing. To guarantee greater regulatory stability for these plants, they should be fully regulated pool plants if they are located in the marketing area and have route disposition in the marketing area. However, if the plant has no route disposition in the marketing area during the month, the plant operator may request nonpool status for the plant.

The Secretary proposes that each of the three orders also should specify pooling standards for a supply plant. For the Appalachian and Southeast orders, a supply plant must ship at least 50 percent of the milk physically received during the month from dairy farmers and cooperative bulk tank handlers. In the case of the Florida order, the shipping percentage should be slightly higher at 60 percent.

Unlike supply plant provisions in other orders, the supply plant provisions in the three southeast orders should not recognize shipments directly from producers' farms as qualifying shipments for a supply plant. At the present time, there are no plants qualifying as ''pool supply plants'' under any of the southeast orders.

Almost all of the plants that balance the fluid needs of the Southeast are operated by cooperative associations. These ''balancing plants'' qualify for pooling based upon the performance of the cooperative association and not based upon shipments from the plant alone. The Secretary proposes that balancing plant provisions should be maintained for the three southeast orders.

A balancing plant may qualify based upon shipments directly from producers' farms as well as shipments from the plant. To qualify as a balancing plant, the plant must be located within the order's marketing area. This requirement ensures that milk pooled through the balancing plant is economically available to processors of fluid milk if needed. However, in the

case of the Appalachian order only, a balancing plant also may be located in the State of Virginia. This provision has been in the Carolina order and should be continued in the Appalachian order. The performance standards for a balancing plant should be 60 percent of producer receipts under each of the orders every month of the year.

There is no necessity to seasonally adjust the supply plant and balancing plant shipping requirements for the three southeast orders because the standards proposed are flexible enough to accommodate the disposal of surplus milk during the flush production season. In addition, the Secretary proposes that each of the three orders should contain a provision to allow the market administrator to increase or decrease shipping requirements and other pooling standards by up to 10 percentage points. This provision also should be included in the producer milk section of all three orders with respect to the percentage of milk that may be diverted and the number of days in which a producer's milk must be received at a pool plant.

In addition to the provisions described above, the Secretary proposes that each of the southeast orders should contain a provision to allow unit pooling of distributing plants operated by the same handler. The proposed rule is based upon the provision that has been in the Southeast order since 1995.

Some distributing plants may meet the pooling standards of more than one order. Consequently, the Secretary proposes that it is necessary to specify the rules for determining where a plant will be regulated. Under the southeast orders, if a plant meets the pooling standards of the order and is located in the order's respective marketing area, the plant should be regulated under that order even if it has greater sales in some other order's marketing area. This provision has evolved as a result of several price alignment problems in the Southeast involving a plant located in one marketing area but regulated under another order. In every such case, a plant's supply of milk was put in jeopardy as a result of a lower blend price under the order in which it became regulated based on its sales. Notwithstanding the merging of several of the smaller markets in the Southeast, the Secretary proposes that this provision should be retained for the southeast orders to preclude a repetition of this problem. There was widespread support in comment letters for retention of this provision.

In the case of a distributing plant that is not located within any order's marketing area, the Secretary proposes that a different standard should apply. Since, in this case, it cannot be presumed with certainty that a plant is most closely associated with the market in which it is located, its association with a market should be determined based upon where it has the most sales.

Producer-Handler

The Secretary proposes that the producer-handler provisions for the three southeast orders should be very similar to the current provisions. To qualify as a producer-handler, a dairy farmer would have to have route disposition in excess of 150,000 pounds per month; otherwise, the producer's plant would be exempt from regulation pursuant to a provision that has been uniformly adopted for all orders.

To qualify as a producer-handler, a dairy farmer may receive no fluid milk products from sources other than his or her farm and may dispose of no fluid milk products using the distribution system of another handler. Finally, the dairy farmer must provide proof satisfactory to the market administrator that the care and management of the dairy animals and other resources necessary to produce all Class I milk handled, and the processing, packaging, and distribution operations, are his/her own enterprise and are operated at his/her own risk.

At the present time, there are three or four producer-handlers operating in the southeast markets. None of these operations would lose their status as producer-handlers under the provision recommended for new southeast orders.

Producer/Producer Milk

The Secretary proposes that the producer and producer milk definitions recommended for the three southeast orders should be nearly identical to the provisions now in the individual orders. These provisions define which dairy farmers are eligible to share in the proceeds of the marketwide pool.

A *producer* should be defined as a dairy farmer whose milk is received at a pool plant, diverted to a nonpool plant, or received by a cooperative association acting as a bulk tank handler. It excludes a producer-handler, a dairy farmer whose milk is delivered to an exempt plant, or a dairy farmer whose milk is reported as diverted milk under the provisions of another Federal order.

The proposed diversion limits that are specified in the producer milk section should be slightly different among the three southeast orders. To qualify for diversion to a nonpool plant, a minimum amount of a producer's milk should be received at a pool plant during the month (i.e., this is called a ''touch-base'' requirement). Under the Appalachian order, six days' production should be received at a pool plant during each of the months of July through December, and two days' production should be received at a pool plant during each of the other months of the year. Under the Southeast order, ten days' production should be required to be delivered to a pool plant during each of the months of July through December to qualify a producer's milk for diversion to a nonpool plant. During the months of January through June, 4 days' production should be required to be delivered to a pool plant.

Under the proposed Florida order, which will have a higher Class I utilization and less need to divert milk, a producer should be required to deliver at least ten days' production to a pool plant during every month of the year in order to be eligible for diversion to a nonpool plant. These proposed standards are comparable to those required under the separate Florida orders.

The total quantity of milk which may be diverted by a pool plant operator or cooperative association during the month also should vary by market as well as by month. Under the Appalachian order, a pool plant operator or cooperative association should be permitted to divert 25 percent of their producer milk during the months of July through November, January and February. During the months of December and March through June, the total diversion limit should increase to 40 percent of producer milk receipts. The Secretary proposes that the Southeast order should provide a total diversion limit of 33 percent during the months of July through December, and 50 percent during the other months. The proposed diversion limits under the Florida order should be 20 percent during the months of July through November, 25 percent during the months of December through February, and 40 percent during all other months.

The proposed ''touch base'' requirements and gross diversion limits described above should be adjustable by the market administrator to assure orderly marketing and/or efficient handling of milk in the marketing area. This procedure is described in §§ 1005.13(d)(7), 1006.13(d)(6), and 1007.13(d)(7).

Although a ''dairy farmer for other markets'' provision was requested for the new orders by some producer organizations, it was opposed by others. The Secretary does not propose inclusion of this provision in the three southeast orders at this time. Such a

provision would restrict the free movement of milk as needed between market. The proposed diversion limits and touch-base requirements in the southeast orders should preclude the association of milk with these markets when such milk is not needed at pool plants.

Report of Receipts and Utilization

The Secretary proposes that to accommodate the payment schedule desired for the three southeast orders, the handler's report of receipts and utilization must be in the market administrator's office no later than the 7th day of the month. The producer payroll report will be required by the 20th day of the month. The information to be included in these proposed reports is essentially identical to the current order provisions.

Payments for Milk

The Secretary proposes that the southeast orders should provide uniform payment schedules for payments to and from the producer-settlement fund and to producers and cooperative associations. Payment to the producer-settlement fund should be made by the 12th day of the month and payment from the producer-settlement fund should be made one day later.

In the case of payments to producers and cooperative associations, the Secretary proposes that the merged Florida order should maintain the longstanding three-payment schedule that has been part of the present Florida orders for many years. The partial payments to producers under the new Florida order should be made on the 20th day of the month for milk received during the first 15 days of the month and on the 5th day of the following month for milk received during the remainder of the month. The rate of payment should be at not less than 85 percent of the preceding month's uniform price, adjusted for plant location and for proper deductions authorized in writing by the producer. The final payment for milk received during the previous month should be made on or before the 15th day of the month.

The Secretary proposes that the Appalachian and Southeast orders should have identical payment schedules. The partial payment for milk received during the first 15 days of the month should be made on the 26th day of the month. The rate of payment should be 90 percent of the preceding month's uniform price. The final payment should be required to be received by the producer on or before the 15th day of the following month. The rate of final payment for all 3 orders should be the preceding month's uniform price adjusted for butterfat, plant location, partial payments, marketing services, and proper deductions authorized in writing by the producer.

Each order now requires payment to a cooperative association to be made one day earlier than the payment to an individual producer. The Secretary proposes that this practice should continue under the new orders.

6c. Midwest Region

Upper Midwest Order

Pool Plant

The Secretary proposes that the pool distributing and pool supply plant definitions of the proposed consolidated Upper Midwest order should use the standard order language used in other orders, adapted to marketing conditions in the Upper Midwest.

The proposed *pool distributing plant* definition specifies that for a plant to be a pool distributing plant, it must have 15 percent or more of its total receipts of bulk fluid milk distributed as route disposition. This percentage is considerably lower than the percentage used in the Chicago Regional order, which varies from 30 percent to 45 percent depending on the month. However, the current Upper Midwest order uses a percentage based on the marketwide Class I percentage for the same month of the previous year. During ''normal'' months this percentage is approximately 15 percent. When some milk is held off the pool for economic reasons (primarily unusual price differences between classes), the percentage may vary considerably, ranging from the ''normal'' 15 percent to over 50 percent. Use of a constant percentage at approximately the market Class I percentage will reduce the current opportunities available to distributing plants to become partially regulated by manipulating their reported receipts and diversions of milk. In addition, the proposed language should eliminate month-to-month uncertainty caused by basing handlers' regulatory status on the market's fluctuating utilization percentage.

In addition to specifying the route disposition percentage at 15 percent, the proposed percentage would be calculated on the basis of the total receipts of bulk fluid milk products physically received at the distributing plant. Currently both the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders include milk diverted from the distributing plant in the total bulk receipts used to compute the route disposition percentage.

The Identical Provisions Committee recommended that the in-area distribution criteria for pool distributing plants be 15 percent of total route disposition. The Committee explained that use of total route disposition rather than bulk receipts as the denominator would reduce opportunities for handlers to manipulate the manner in which they may report their operations to avoid regulation. Currently in the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders the in-area route disposition standard is computed using the same basis (bulk receipts, including diversions) as is used to determine whether a plant meets the definition of a pool distributing plant.

The Secretary proposes that provision be made for a single handler to form a unit of distributing plants and manufacturing plants, all of which must be located within the marketing area. The unit would have to meet the requirements for a pool distributing plant and at least one of the plants in the unit would be required to meet the pool distributing plant requirements as a separate plant. Plants not meeting the pool distributing plant definition would be required to have disposition of packaged fluid milk products, packaged fluid cream products, or cottage cheese and other soft manufactured products of at least half of their receipts of Grade A bulk fluid milk products, including milk diverted by the plant operator.

Manufacturing plants traditionally have been included in units with distributing plants because the manufacturing plants produced products such as packaged fluid cream, sour cream, and cottage cheese that are marketed in conjunction with bottled fluid milk products. In addition, some of these plants produce a limited quantity of fluid milk products. Handlers have argued that the operator of a free-standing manufacturing plant that manufactures these complementary products should be able to pool its milk supply for both (or for several) plants as if all of the products were made in the bottling plant.

Both the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders contain a provision for a distributing plant unit. Although the current Chicago Regional order does not specify the types of products that may be manufactured at plants in the unit, the Upper Midwest order does. The Secretary proposes that it is reasonable to place restrictions on the types of products that are disposed of from the manufacturing plants in the unit, since these plants would receive the benefits reserved for pool distributing plants and

shipments from supply plants to the plants in the unit would be considered in determining pool supply plant qualifications.

A *pool supply plant* operator should ship as qualifying shipments at least 10 percent of the plant's receipts of milk from producers, including milk diverted by the handler, each month. As in the current Chicago Regional order, it is proposed that such shipments may be made to pool distributing plants, pool distributing plant units, plants of producer-handlers, partially regulated distributing plants, or distributing plants fully regulated by other Federal milk orders. The extent of shipments to partially regulated distributing plants to be used for qualification would be limited to the quantity classified as Class I. Qualifying shipments to distributing plants regulated by other Federal milk orders should be limited to the quantity shipped to pool distributing plants, and may not be agreed-upon Class II, Class III or Class IV utilization. Shipments directly from farms to pool distributing plants and to plants contained in pool distributing plant units should be included as shipments that help to meet the percentage qualification standard.

The proposed 10 percent shipping requirement is approximately 5 percentage points less than the anticipated Class I percentage for the proposed consolidated Upper Midwest order. The 10 percent shipping standard is greater than the current individual supply plant shipping standard and equal to the maximum shipping percentage required of pool units during the qualifying period in the current Chicago Regional order. The standard under the current Upper Midwest order, which uses the Class I use percentage of the same month in the previous year as the supply plant shipping percentage, would exceed the proposed percentage. Also under the current Upper Midwest order, a reserve supply plant must ship 10 percent of its receipts to pool distributing plants during January through June, and the marketwide Class I percentage for the same months of the preceding year for the months of July through December.

Although the proposed shipping percentage is below the estimated Class I percentage for the proposed Upper Midwest order, the 10 percent shipping standard should be appropriate, in view of the fact that many distributing plants have a supply of milk from their own producers. In September 1997, approximately 27 percent of the milk pooled or received at distributing plants in the Chicago Regional order was pooled as producer milk with the distributing plant operators as the handlers, rather than as producer milk pooled by cooperatives and other handlers. The milk pooled by distributing plant handlers accounted for approximately 12 percent of the total milk pooled in September 1997 (or approximately 5 percent of the total milk that would have been pooled if all of the milk eligible to be pooled in September 1997 had been pooled). Approximately 7 percent of the Class I producer milk, or approximately 2 percent of the total producer milk, pooled under the Upper Midwest order is pooled by distributing plant operators. The combination of the supply plant shipping percentage and the percentage of milk pooled directly by distributing plant handlers would appear sufficient to meet anticipated Class I needs in the proposed Upper Midwest order. The proposed 10 percent supply plant shipping percentage also should be appropriate to avoid unnecessary and uneconomic shipments.

The proposed rule would allow the market administrator to increase or decrease the required shipping percentage on a marketwide or selected area basis if deemed necessary to assure an adequate supply of milk to pool distributing plants or to prevent uneconomic shipments of milk. If the shipping percentage is increased by the market administrator, shipments made for the purpose of meeting the increased percentage may be made only to pool distributing plants or plants contained in pool distributing plant units.

Groups of two or more supply plants should be allowed to form *systems of supply plants* for the purpose of meeting the shipping requirements, by shipping the same percentage as that required for individual pool supply plants that are not part of such a system. These pool supply plant systems may consist of plants of the same handler, more than one handler, and may contain both proprietary and cooperative handlers. The only requirement affecting an individual plant within the unit is that the plant must be physically located within the marketing area. This restriction is necessary to prevent distant plants from receiving the benefits of participating in the marketwide pool without having an actual association with the market.

Several plants located outside the boundaries of the proposed marketing area currently are included in supply plant units by a ''grandfather clause'' in the Upper Midwest order. The proposed order provides that these plants may continue to be included in a supply plant unit if they so desire as long as they maintain continuous pool plant status.

The Secretary proposes that handlers may form supply plant systems by filing a written request by July 15, listing the plants to be in the system. The system would remain in effect from August 1 through July 31 of the following year. These dates deviate from those proposed for other orders because of the difference in seasonal production variations between this and other orders. The handler or handlers establishing the system may also delete a plant from the system or dissolve the system by submitting a written request to the market administrator. Any plant deleted from a system, or plants that were part of a system that was discontinued, may not be part of a system until the following August.

Provisions that allow handlers to add plants to a system under certain circumstances and to allow systems to reorganize in the event a plant changes ownership or in the event of a business failure by a handler are also incorporated in the proposed order.

A system failing to meet pooling standards would be allowed to drop plants from the system until the system does qualify. The handler responsible for assuring that the system qualifies should notify the market administrator of which plants are to be deleted from the system. If the handler does not notify the market administrator, the market administrator would exclude plants from the system beginning with the plant at the bottom of the list of plants submitted by the handler responsible for qualifying the system, and continuing up the list until the system qualifies.

The provisions for supply plant systems are very similar to the provisions currently contained in both the Chicago Regional and Upper Midwest orders. Unlike the Chicago Regional and the Upper Midwest orders, however, the proposed order does not contain a specific shipping requirement for individual plants within a supply plant system. In the current Chicago Regional order, pool supply plant systems have twice the percentage shipping standard of individual supply plants, with individual plants within the systems required to ship 47,000 pounds or three percent of their producer receipts, whichever is less, in five of the six months of August through January. The current Upper Midwest order requires handlers with supply plants in a supply plant system to ship five percent of each handler's Grade A receipts, including milk diverted by the handler to nonpool plants, during one of

the months of August through December.

This proposed rule does not propose providing for the category of supply plants referred to as reserve supply plants. Reserve supply plants ceased to be included in the Chicago Regional order in 1987, while the Upper Midwest continues to provide for them. With year-round shipping requirements, the unlimited ability of the market administrator to change shipping percentages both in level and in area, and the ability of supply plants to form systems, it is proposed that there is no compelling reason to have two categories of supply plants.

A provision to allow plants to remain qualified for up to two consecutive months due to unavoidable circumstances, such as a natural disaster, fire, breakdown of equipment, or work stoppage is included in this proposed order. The provision is contained in the Chicago Regional order and has worked quite well in giving handlers some administrative relief in the face of certain unavoidable circumstances.

Producer Milk

The definition of producer milk determines which milk will be eligible to participate in the Federal order pool. The proposed order provides that milk received at a pool plant directly from producers or from a cooperative association acting as a handler should be eligible to be producer milk. Milk for which the operator of a pool plant is the handler that is delivered directly from the farm to another pool plant should also be considered producer milk. Under certain circumstances, milk delivered to a nonpool plant may also be considered producer milk. Milk delivered directly from a farm to a nonpool plant may be considered producer milk if at least one day's production is received at a pool plant during the dairy farmer's first month as a producer.

In order to qualify as producer milk the milk pooled by a cooperative association acting as a handler described in § 1030.9(c), the cooperative must deliver at least 10 percent of the milk for which it is the handler pursuant to § 1030.9(c) to pool distributing plants, units of pool distributing plants, plants of producer-handlers, partially regulated distributing plants, or distributing plants fully regulated by other Federal milk orders. The shipments to partially regulated distributing plants are limited to the quantity classified as Class I. Qualifying shipments to distributing plants regulated by other Federal milk orders are limited to the same quantity shipped to pool distributing plants and may not be shipped as agreed-upon Class II, Class III or Class IV utilization. These are the same performance requirements that would apply to supply plants. Likewise, the same performance requirements that apply to supply plants would apply to cooperative associations acting as handlers if the market administrator adjusts the shipping percentages.

The Secretary proposes that there would be no significant differences in the treatment of milk received at pool plants under the proposed order and under the Chicago Regional or Upper Midwest orders. There are, however, several differences relating to diverted milk. The proposed order would allow the operator of a pool plant to divert, or ship milk directly from the farm to another pool plant, the milk of producers for which it is the handler, and account for the milk as producer milk at the shipping plant. Allowing either a proprietary pool plant or a cooperative pool plant to divert milk to another pool plant is consistent with the Chicago Regional order. In the Upper Midwest order, milk that is received at a pool plant and for which a cooperative association is the handler is considered producer milk at the receiving plant. The Upper Midwest order specifies that a proprietary handler may divert milk to another pool plant and that such milk will be considered producer milk of the diverting proprietary handler. The proposed language leaves to the discretion of the cooperative association the option of diverting milk to another pool plant from its own pool plant or delivering the milk to the pool plant in its capacity as a handler of producer milk pursuant to § 1030.9(c).

The proposed Upper Midwest order would require that a new producer or a producer who has broken association with the market have at least one day's production received at a pool plant during the first month in which the producer's milk is reported as producer milk. Currently the Chicago Regional order requires a new producer on the market or a producer who has broken association with the market to have at least one day's production received at the pool plant at which the milk is reported during the first month in which the producer's milk is considered to be producer milk eligible for diversion to a nonpool plant. In addition, at least one day's production of a producer's milk must be received at a pool plant in each of the months of August through January to be eligible for diversion to a nonpool plant. The current Upper Midwest order requires that a new producer or a producer who has broken association with the market be received at a pool plant prior to the milk being diverted to a nonpool plant.

There is little or no justification for forcing producer milk to be received at a pool plant to maintain or prove association with the market. Supply plants and cooperatives would be required to ship a fixed percentage of their total milk supply, not just that portion received at their plants, to the fluid market. Since both cooperatives and proprietary handlers can move milk directly from the farm to the fluid market there is little reason to force milk into a pool plant for regulatory purposes only. Certainly the extra cost to the handler of moving milk for regulatory purposes does not enhance economic efficiency or milk quality and in fact decreases economic efficiency and milk quality to the detriment of the entire market.

The proposed order provides that producer milk be priced in the month in which it is picked up at the farm and at the location of the plant at which the milk is physically unloaded into processing facilities or a storage tank. In the current Chicago Regional order milk is priced where milk is pumped within the confines of a plant. The proposed order would eliminate the pricing of milk where it is pumped from truck to truck and price the milk where it is eventually unloaded into processing facilities or a storage tank.

Location Adjustments and Transportation Credits

To help move milk to the fluid market a transportation credit and a procurement credit to be applied to Class I milk are contained in the proposed Upper Midwest order. The *transportation credit* would be computed by multiplying the hundredweight of Class I milk contained in transfers of bulk fluid milk from pool plants to pool distributing plants by the value obtained by multiplying .0028 times the number of miles between the shipping plant and the receiving plant. The transportation credit should be paid to the shipping handler, since the milk would be priced at the location at which it is first received.

The proposed transportation credit is similar to the transportation credit currently contained in the Chicago Regional order. Both the proposed transportation credit and the current credit, which use the same .0028 rate, are applied to Class I milk only. However, in the current Chicago Regional order the credit is based on 110 percent of the Class I milk received

at the pool distributing plant, rather than on the Class I milk delivered by the shipping handler, as proposed. Since the transportation credit is computed on the basis of milk classified as Class I at the shipping plant, the credit would be paid to the shipping handler.

Unlike the transportation credit, which is based on mileage and paid only on transfers of bulk milk to pool distributing plants, the *procurement credit* would be paid at the rate of 8 cents per hundredweight of Class I milk transferred or diverted by a pool plant to a pool distributing plant. A procurement credit also will be applied to milk received from producers and from cooperative associations acting as handlers pursuant to § 1030.9(c) based on the pro rata share of producer milk delivered to a pool distributing plant and allocated to Class I.

A transportation credit and procurement credit would be incorporated in the proposed order to assist handlers in supplying the Class I market. These transportation and procurement credits, to be paid on Class I milk only in combination with the Class I price surface discussed elsewhere in this proposed rule, will help handlers move milk to the fluid market by distributing the cost of supplying the fluid market to all market participants who share in the marketwide pool. Handlers and producers who supply the Class I market on a regular basis should not be expected to bear the entire cost of supplying the Class I market while handlers and producers who meet only the minimum requirements derive the benefits of marketwide pooling. Incorporation of a transportation credit and procurement credit on Class I milk in the marketwide pool will assure that at least some of the cost of supplying the Class I market is shared among all market participants.

Mideast Order

Many of the provisions of the proposed Mideast order are explained in the ''Identical Provisions'' portion of this proposed rule, and need not be addressed here. The provisions that deviate somewhat from those proposed for other order areas are the provisions dealing with standards for determining the pool status of producers and handlers, and those describing the pricing of milk under a component pricing plan that differs slightly from that common to the other orders with proposed multiple component pricing provisions. For the most part, pooling provisions have less effect on the current Michigan Upper Peninsula market than on the 4 other markets included in this consolidated order because Michigan Upper Peninsula is the only remaining individual handler pool in the current Federal order system. Therefore, pooling provisions are discussed in relation to the 4 principal markets included in the proposed Mideast order.

Pool Plant

The proposed Mideast *pool distributing plant* definition would differ from that contained in most of the other proposed orders to make less likely the full Federal regulation of three State-regulated plants, two in Pennsylvania and one in Virginia, that currently are partially regulated under one or more of these orders. These State-regulated handlers must pay a minimum Class I price for milk used in fluid products, often a higher price than would be applied under Federal order regulation. At the same time, Federal regulation of the Pennsylvania and Virginia-regulated handlers under the consolidated order would reduce producer returns while having little effect on handlers' costs of Class I milk.

Specifically, the percentage of a handler's total route dispositions distributed within the marketing area that would result in the handler being fully regulated under the Mideast order should be 30 percent under this order rather than the 15-percent standard proposed for all but one of the other 10 orders. This level of sales in the marketing area can be compared to the current pooling standards for distributing plants in the Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania and Indiana orders. These orders currently have variable (30–50 percent) pooling standards for the percentage of a distributing plant's receipts distributed on routes, combined with a 10–15 percent standard for receipts distributed within the marketing area. Plants that meet the total dispositions standard at the lower end of the range (35 or 40 percent) and distribute only 10 or 15 percent of their receipts on routes in the marketing area would actually distribute approximately 30 percent of their route dispositions on routes in the marketing area. At the same time, it would be difficult to justify establishing a pooling standard so high that the significant role played in a market by a handler having more than 30 percent of its route disposition in the marketing area would fail to be recognized by inclusion in the marketwide pool.

In addition to specifying the in-area route disposition percentage at 30 percent of total routes, the total and in-area route disposition percentages would be calculated on the basis of the total receipts of bulk fluid milk products physically received at the distributing plant. Currently all four of the larger orders to be included in the consolidated Mideast order include milk diverted from the distributing plant in the total bulk receipts used to compute the route disposition percentages.

To assure continued pool qualification for all of the handlers who currently are associated with the Mideast markets, the *pool supply plant* definition of the consolidated Mideast order would provide for all of the types of supply plants that currently qualify for pooling under the 4 principal orders. The Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania pool plant provision includes a plant operated by a cooperative if the cooperative association delivers to distributing plants at least 35 percent of the milk for which it is the handler during the current month or over the preceding 12 months. The Southern Michigan order includes as pool supply plants: (a) a plant that has been a pool plant for 12 consecutive months and has a marketing agreement with a cooperative association, and (b) a system of supply plants operated by one or more handlers. Order 40 also includes some shipments to other Federal order plants and partially regulated distributing plants, in addition to pool distributing plants, as qualifying shipments by supply plants.

The percentage of receipts as qualifying shipments to distributing plants currently ranges from 30 to 40 percent for these orders, with direct deliveries from farms rather than plant transfers limited to half of the required deliveries under three of the orders. All four of the orders require performance of pooling standards by supply plants for the months of September through February, followed by a ''free ride'' period during which shipping percentages need not be met by supply plants that met the shipping standards during the required period. The Indiana order contains a provision allowing the continued pooling of a plant that fails to meet pooling standards because of circumstances beyond the handler's control.

The proposed shipping standards for pool supply plants are 35 percent for all months, with plants meeting the standard for the months of September through February being allowed to retain their pool status for the immediately following months of March through August. For the purpose of making the 35 percent level of shipping standard less burdensome, up to 90 percent of required shipments should be allowed to be made directly from farms

to distributing plants. The cooperative association plant provided for in the Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania order would be retained, as would the supply plant provisions peculiar to the Southern Michigan order.

Producer Milk

The *producer* and *producer milk* provisions of the orders to be consolidated in the Mideast order are quite similar and differ little from those to be incorporated in the other consolidated orders. The principal difference between some of the individual orders and the consolidated order would be the limit on the percentage of a handler's pooled producer milk that may be diverted to nonpool plants. The Ohio Valley, Indiana and Eastern Ohio-Western Pennsylvania orders all contain 50 percent diversion limits for the months of September through November, January and February and a 60 percent limit for the month of December, with no diversion limit for the months of March through August. The Southern Michigan order contains a 60-percent diversion limit for the months of September through February, with no limit for the months of March through August. In order to assure that all of the milk that has been pooled under these orders continues to qualify for pooling, the diversion limit proposed for the Mideast order is 60 percent for the months of September through February, with no limit for the March through August period. At the same time, the market administrator would be authorized to increase or reduce the diversion limit as needed to maintain orderly marketing and efficient handling of milk in the marketing area.

Multiple Component Pricing

The reporting and payment provisions of the proposed consolidated Mideast order differ somewhat from those of the other consolidated orders that provide for multiple component pricing (MCP) by retaining the current Southern Michigan component pricing plan. The Southern Michigan multiple component pricing plan is very similar to that proposed for the other MCP orders, but prices ''fluid carrier'' instead of ''other solids.'' The Mideast order language is changed accordingly. This difference appears to be favored by market participants in the Mideast, and would result in very little difference in total payments, either by handlers or to producers whose milk is pooled under the differing provisions.

Central Order

Many of the provisions of the proposed Central order are explained in the ''Identical Provisions'' portion of this proposed rule, and need not be addressed here. The provisions that deviate somewhat from those proposed for other order areas are the provisions dealing with standards for determining the pool status of producers and handlers. An effort is made to explain significant differences between the pooling provisions of the 8 individual orders included in this consolidation and those of the consolidated order.

Pool Plant

The proposed Central *pool distributing plant* definition should follow closely the provisions contained in most of the other proposed orders. The proposed provisions would make no difference in the pool status of distributing plants currently pooled under the individual orders.

Specifically, the percentage of a handler's total route disposition distributed within the marketing area that would result in the handler being fully regulated under the Central order should be the 15-percent standard proposed for most of the other 10 orders. The minimum percentage of a pool distributing plant's actual physical receipts of bulk fluid milk products that would have to be distributed on route is proposed to be 25. Currently most of the orders to be included in the consolidated Central order include milk diverted from the distributing plant in the total bulk receipts used to compute the route disposition percentages.

The proposed order would provide that a single handler be allowed to form a unit of distributing plants and Class II manufacturing plants, all of which must be located within the marketing area. The unit would have to meet the requirements for a pool distributing plant, and at least one of the plants in the unit would be required to meet the pool distributing plant requirements as a separate plant. Plants in the unit that do not meet the pool distributing plant definition would be required to have disposition of packaged fluid milk products, packaged fluid cream products, or cottage cheese and other Class II products of at least half of their receipts of Grade A bulk fluid milk products, including milk diverted by the plant operator.

The proposed inclusion of Class II manufacturing plants in units with distributing plants is supported because the manufacturing plants produce products such as packaged fluid cream, sour cream, and cottage cheese that are marketed in conjunction with bottled fluid milk products. In addition, some of these plants produce a limited quantity of fluid milk products. Handlers have argued that the operator of a free-standing manufacturing plant that manufactures these complementary products should be able to pool its milk supply for both (or for several) plants as if all of the products were made in the bottling plant.

The *pool supply plant* definition of the consolidated Central order would contain provisions that assure continued pool qualification for any handlers or milk currently associated with the markets consolidated into the proposed Central market. The Iowa order contains no limit on the amount of direct-shipped milk that can be used to qualify a supply plant, and several of the other orders allow such deliveries to make up a portion of qualifying shipments. The proposed order allows direct-shipped milk to be counted as pool qualifying shipments without limit.

The Greater Kansas City, Nebraska-Western Iowa, Southern Illinois-Eastern Missouri, and Southwest Plains orders contain cooperative balancing plant provisions, allowing cooperative-operated plants to be pooled if the cooperative delivers a given percentage of the milk for which it is the handler to pool distributing plants. The proposed Central order also contains such a provision, including in the pool plant definition a cooperative association plant that supplies at least 35 percent of the milk for which it is the handler to pool distributing plants, either during the current month or for the immediately preceding 12-month period. The deliveries to pool distributing plants may include deliveries directly from the farms of producers for whom the co-op is the handler, as well as transfers from the cooperative's plant.

Cooperative association ''balancing plants'' serve the market as the outlet of last resort. When surplus milk has no other place to go on weekends, holidays, or during months of surplus production, it moves to cooperative association ''balancing plants'' where it is manufactured into storable products. When production decreases, these plants operate at minimal capacity or may be shut down completely. Cooperative members assume the burden and cost of processing surplus milk through such plants.

Most of the Central orders allow a period during which supply plants do not have to meet shipping percentages if they have done so for the months during which milk production levels are

low and demand for fluid milk is high. The Iowa order has reduced shipping standards for such months. The proposed order should include a period during which supply plants that have served the needs of the market when milk supplies are tight are not required to meet shipping standards, but it is reduced from the 5–7 month period existing in the current orders to a 3-month period from May through July.

The percentage of receipts as qualifying shipments to distributing plants currently ranges from 30 to 50 percent for these orders, the Iowa percentage reduced to 20 for the months of December through August.

The proposed shipping standards for pool supply plants under the proposed consolidated order are 35 percent for the months of September through November and January and 25 percent for all other months, with plants meeting the percentage standard for the months of August through April being allowed to retain their pool status for the immediately following months of May through July.

Groups of two or more supply plants should be allowed to form systems of supply plants for the purpose of meeting the shipping requirements, by shipping the same percentage as that required for individual pool supply plants that are not part of such a system. These pool supply plant systems may consist of plants of the same handler or more than one handler, and may contain both proprietary and cooperative handlers. The only requirement affecting each plant within the system is that the plant must be physically located within the marketing area. This restriction is necessary to prevent distant plants from receiving the benefits of participating in the marketwide pool without having an actual association with the market.

As in the other proposed consolidated orders, the market administrator would have the authority to increase or reduce the order's pooling provisions as marketing conditions change for the purpose of assuring that an adequate supply of milk will be available for fluid use, or to assure that the order does not require handlers to undertake uneconomic movements of milk to maintain the pool status of their plants.

Producer Milk

The *producer* and *producer milk* provisions of the orders to be consolidated in the Central order are quite similar to each other and differ little from those to be incorporated in the other consolidated orders. The principal difference between some of the individual orders and the consolidated order would be the limit on the percentage of a handler's pooled producer milk that may be diverted to nonpool plants. The percentage of a handler's milk that may be diverted to nonpool plants varies under the individual orders from 20 percent of milk received at pool plants during some months under the Eastern Colorado order to 70 percent for some months under the Nebraska-Western Iowa and Iowa orders. Most of the orders require each producer's milk to be received at a pool plant at least once each month.

In order to assure that all of the milk that has been pooled under these orders continues to qualify for pooling, the diversion limit proposed for the Central order is 65 percent for the months of September through November and January, and 75 percent for the months of February through April and December. Allowable diversions for the months of May through July would be unlimited. There would be no requirement that each producer's milk be received at pool plants for a minimum number of days per month. At the same time, the market administrator would be authorized to increase or reduce the diversion limit as needed to maintain orderly marketing and efficient handling of milk in the marketing area.

Multiple Component Pricing

The reporting and payment provisions of the proposed consolidated Central order would include those common to other orders with multiple component pricing. These markets have a significant amount of milk used in manufactured products, and component pricing will enable producers to be paid according to the valuable components of their milk.

6d. Western Region

Southwest Order

The proposed consolidated Southwest marketing area is comprised principally of the current Texas and New Mexico-West Texas marketing areas. With regard to milk production and population (consumption), these areas are both in the process of change, but in different ways. Texas has one of the fastest-growing populations in the U.S., and until recently has been able to maintain milk production on a per capita basis. After a significant increase in milk production during the 1988–1994 period, Texas milk production has been declining somewhat, accompanied by the exit of approximately 29 percent of the State's Grade A dairy farmers. If the current trend continues, the Texas market could come to resemble more closely those of the Southeast portion of the U.S., relying significantly on more distant milk supplies to meet the market's Class I and II needs. This scenario currently is true for the southern parts of Texas.

The State of New Mexico has experienced relatively slow population growth, but dramatic increases in milk production—from 1.099 billion pounds in 1988 to an estimated 4.020 billion pounds in 1997. With the declining production in Texas, the New Mexico milkshed will be drawn upon more often to supply Class I and II needs in the Texas demand centers, 500–600 miles distant. Procurement costs would be expected to increase dramatically. In light of these circumstances, proposed provisions in the proposed Southwest order would provide flexibility to handlers supplying the market to prevent inefficient movements of milk and unnecessary costs of operation incurred for the purpose of participating in the marketwide pool.

Prior to enactment of the 1996 Farm Bill, cooperatives operating in the Southwestern Markets had determined that the two milk orders in the region were being operated as one and should be merged. Much discussion took place and proposed order provisions were developed by the principal cooperatives involved. These comments, with numerous others, were considered in the development of this proposed rule for the Southwest marketing area.

Pooling Standards

Most of the pooling standards in the Texas and New Mexico-West Texas orders have been suspended for some time. The rapid expansion of milk production in the region during the late 1980's created a situation in which handlers operating in the region could no longer meet the provisions of the orders while pooling all of their milk supplies.

Pool Distributing Plant. The identical provisions committee recommended that a pool distributing plant distribute as route disposition at least 25% of its bulk fluid milk receipts at the plant, and distribute at least 15% of its total route disposition within the marketing area. One partially regulated plant located in the Texas marketing area would become fully regulated under this provision. The plant has been partially regulated under the Texas order and, periodically, fully regulated under the Chicago Regional order. The proposed percentages for pool distributing plants will cause this plant to become fully regulated under the Southwest order and alleviate the disorderly conditions caused by its shifts between orders. There should be no change in the

plant's costs, since their supply of milk comes from Southwest pool sources.

Pool Supply Plant. The Texas and New Mexico-West Texas orders currently contain a 50% pool supply plant shipping percentage during the Fall months, with a lower percentage or an automatic pooling provision for the remaining months. Currently there are no pool supply plants regulated under either of the Southwest orders, but provision is made for such an operation if it should meet the proposed order's definition. A provision defining cooperative plants located in the marketing area would base pool qualification on total cooperative performance in delivering at least 30 percent of the cooperative's milk supply pooled under this order to pool distributing plants.

Although neither the Texas nor New Mexico-West Texas orders currently have provisions for split-plant operations (plants that have both pool and nonpool portions) or the authority for the Market Administrator to adjust shipping requirements, these provisions are included in the proposed order, as recommended by the identical provisions committee.

Producer Milk

The current Texas and New Mexico-West Texas orders have provisions that require a producer's milk to be received at a pool plant, or touch base, before milk of the producer is eligible to be diverted. Based on comments received, the order would limit diversions of producer milk on the basis of a portion of a handler's total milk supply. At least fifty percent of the milk pooled by a handler should be received at pool plants for the handler's entire milk supply to be pooled. Milk produced by producers located in the marketing area should be eligible for pooling without a particular percentage or number of days' production being required to be received at a pool plant. For producers located outside the marketing area, however, the currently-suspended ''touch-base'' provision of 15% delivered to pool plants during the month (rather than before diversions are allowed), is continued in this proposed rule.

Diversion limits are suggested to be 50% of a handler's total milk supply. The current Texas order allows an amount equal to one-third of the milk delivered to pool plants to be diverted (this provision is currently suspended), while the (currently suspended) New Mexico-West Texas provision allows 50% of a handler's total milk supply to be diverted. The current Texas order provisions base allowable diversions on deliveries to individual pool plants, greatly exacerbating the time and effort required to keep track of milk movements. The total performance standard will allow handlers to meet diversion limits more easily with more efficient movements of milk. In addition, the increased percentage of allowable diversions will assure that all of the producers whose milk would qualify for pooling under either of the two orders being consolidated would continue to meet pooling qualifications.

Transportation Credits for Surplus Milk

The Texas order currently has a market-wide service payment provision that gives credits for hauling surplus milk located in certain zones in Texas to nonpool plants outside the State for use in manufactured products. The provision has not been included in the proposed Southwest order language because of declining production and increasing balancing plant capacity in the affected areas of Texas.

Payment Provision

The Texas order is one of only a few marketing orders that require handlers to submit the full classified value during the month to the market Administration. In turn, the Market Administrator acts as a clearing house and forwards these proceeds on to the respective organizations. Interested persons have expressed an interest in retaining these provisions, not only for the proposed Southwest order, but for all other orders.

The current Texas payment provision was found necessary because of problems encountered in assuring timely payments by pooled handlers. The provision has been in the Texas order since 1979, and the earlier payment problems have been remedied. Such a provision involves a rather large degree of regulatory intervention between milk processors and their suppliers that should be shown to be necessary to correct existing problems. There is no indication that such problems currently exist, or would exist in the absence of the provision. Nearly all of the milk that will be pooled under the consolidated Southwest order is produced by cooperative members and pooled by the cooperatives. These large, business-oriented organizations should be able to assure that they receive full payment for their members' milk in a timely manner.

Arizona-Las Vegas Order

Many of the provisions of the proposed Arizona-Las Vegas order are explained in the ''Identical Provisions'' portion of this proposed rule and need not be addressed here. Those provisions that deviate to some extent from the ''Identical Provisions'' are addressed in this discussion.

Pool Plant

The proposed *pool distributing plant* definition is similar to that contained in most of the other proposed orders. The minimum percentage of a pool distributing plant's physical receipts of bulk fluid milk products that are disposed of as route disposition is proposed to be 25%. The percentage of a handler's total route disposition into the marketing area that would result in a distributing plant becoming fully regulated under the Arizona-Las Vegas order is proposed to be 15%. While this definition differs slightly from the current order language, it provides uniformity with other proposed orders and should result in no additional distributing plants being pooled under the proposed order or any change in the pool status of distributing plants currently pooled.

The proposed *pool supply plant* definition would require a supply plant to ship 50% of its physical receipts of milk from dairy farmers to pool distributing plants during the month in order to be a pool supply plant. This definition would provide for easy, effective order administration and would result in no additional handlers being regulated under the order. There are currently no pool supply plants in the proposed marketing area.

The current Central Arizona order permits a manufacturing plant located in the marketing area that is operated by a cooperative association to be a pool plant, provided that the cooperative ships at least 50% of its member milk to pool plants of other handlers during the current month or the previous 12-month period ending with the current month. This percentage requirement is currently suspended. The proposed order would reduce this percentage to 35%. In conjunction with the market administrator being authorized to increase or reduce the percentage in response to market conditions, the reduced performance standard should enable the continued pooling of producer milk that currently is pooled without resulting in uneconomic handling or disorderly marketing.

The proposed Arizona-Las Vegas order should provide that a single handler be allowed to form a unit of distributing plants and Class II manufacturing plants provided each plant is located within the marketing area. The unit in total would be required to meet the requirements for a pool distributing plant and at least one of the

plants in the unit would be required to meet the pool distributing plant definition individually. This provision would provide uniformity with other federal orders and would not change the status of any plants currently pooled. Class II manufacturing plants are included for unit pooling with distributing plants operated by the same handler because such plants produce products that are marketed in conjunction with fluid milk products.

A provision permitting the market administrator to adjust the percentages specified in the pool plant definition will provide the flexibility to respond in a timely manner to changing marketing conditions without the need for a formal hearing process.

Producer

The proposed order contains a *dairy farmer for other markets* definition. A producer could not be pooled under the proposed Arizona-Las Vegas order unless all of the milk from the same farm was pooled under this or some other federal order or unless such nonpooled milk went to a plant with only Class III or Class IV utilization. This differs slightly from the current definition in the Central Arizona Order. Such a provision is needed in the proposed order to prevent dairy farmers whose milk is regularly used for fluid disposition in other markets from pooling the surplus portion of their production under the proposed order.

Producer Milk

The percentage of a handler's pooled milk that may be diverted to nonpool plants is proposed to be 20% in any month. Currently, diversions under the Central Arizona order are limited to eight days' production of a producer during four months of the year, with unlimited diversions the remainder of the year. The 20% diversion limit would result in the amount of milk eligible for diversion being approximately equivalent to eight days' production and would be easier to administer. The 20% limit year round will assure that pooled milk will have a close association with the market's fluid processing plants.

Component Pricing

The proposed Arizona-Las Vegas order does not provide for multiple component pricing. There are six plants that are expected to be regulated under the proposed order: five proprietary distributing plants, and one manufacturing plant operated by a cooperative association. The Class I utilization for the proposed order is expected to be less than 50 percent, a level that would, in some other orders, be an indication that component pricing would be appropriate. However, the Class I utilization at the five distributing plants is more than 80 percent. With the exception of the one cooperative balancing plant, the handlers to be regulated constitute predominantly a Class I market. They have expressed no interest in component pricing, and the fluid nature of much of the market would not seem to warrant multiple component pricing at this time.

Western Order

Many of the provisions of the proposed Western order are explained in the ''Identical Provisions'' portion of this proposed rule and need not be addressed here. Those provisions that differ from those explained in the ''Identical Provisions,'' or those currently contained in the orders to be consolidated, are discussed below.

Pool Plant

The proposed *pool distributing plant* definition is similar to that contained in most of the other proposed orders. The minimum percentage of a pool distributing plant's physical receipts of bulk fluid milk products that are disposed of as route disposition is proposed to be 25%. The percentage of a handler's total route disposition distributed into the marketing area that would result in a distributing plant becoming fully regulated under the Western order is proposed to be 15%. While this definition differs slightly from the current language of the orders involved in this proposed consolidation, it provides uniformity with other proposed orders and should result in no additional distributing plants being pooled under the proposed order or any change in the pool status of distributing plants currently pooled.

The proposed *pool supply plant* definition would require a supply plant operator to ship 35% of the milk pooled at the supply plant, either by transfer or diversion, to pool distributing plants during the month in order to qualify for pooling. This definition would provide for more efficient order administration and would result in no additional handlers being regulated under the order. The proposed percentage is slightly higher than that contained in the current Southwest Idaho-Eastern Oregon order and slightly lower than that contained in the current Great Basin and Western Colorado orders. This change should result in no milk that is currently associated with any of the three orders losing such association.

The proposed pool supply plant definition includes provision for a March through August period during which a supply plant that has met the order's shipping percentages for the preceding months of September through February to be able to continue to be a pool plant without meeting the shipping standards. As with other proposed orders, the market administrator would have the authority to increase or decrease the order's supply plant pooling standards as marketing conditions change.

The proposed order contains a provision that would permit a manufacturing plant operated by a cooperative association and located in the marketing area to be a pool plant if 35% of the milk for which the cooperative is the handler is received at pool distributing plants during the month or during the immediately preceding 12-month period. This provision is similar to one currently contained in the Great Basin order and in some of the other proposed orders. The proposed order retains the ''bulk tank handler'' provision that is currently in the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order, permitting a handler other than a cooperative association to divert milk to nonpool plants for the handler's account based on shipments of milk to pool plants of other handlers.

Although the three current orders proposed to be consolidated do not contain such a provision, the proposed Western order would provide that a single handler be allowed to form a unit of distributing plants and Class II manufacturing plants provided each plant is located within the marketing area, as suggested by the Identical Provisions committee. The unit in total would be required to meet the requirements for a pool distributing plant and at least one of the plants in the unit would be required to meet the pool distributing plant definition individually. This provision would provide uniformity with other federal orders and would not change the status of any plants currently pooled. Class II manufacturing plants are proposed to be included for unit pooling with distributing plants operated by the same handler because such plants produce products that are marketed in conjunction with fluid milk products.

Producer

The proposed order contains a *dairy farmer for other markets* definition. A producer would not qualify for pooling under the proposed Western order unless all of the milk from the same farm was pooled under this or some other federal order or unless such nonpooled milk went to a plant with only Class III or Class IV utilization.

This differs slightly from the current definition in the Great Basin order. Such a provision is proposed for the consolidated order to prevent dairy farmers whose milk is regularly used for fluid disposition in other markets from pooling the surplus portion of their production on the proposed order.

Producer Milk

The percentage of a handler's pooled milk that may be diverted to nonpool plants is proposed to be 80% in any month. This is identical to the percentage currently included in the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order and is only slightly higher than that for the present Great Basin order, which is 75% for cooperatives and 70% for proprietary handlers. The 80% limit on movements of pooled milk to nonpool plants should permit all milk associated with the market that is not needed at pool plants during the month to be pooled and priced under the order. These percentages are higher than those contained in the Western Colorado order, but should not have the effect of encouraging additional amounts of unneeded milk to be pooled in that area.

Reports of Receipts and Utilization and Payroll Reports

The proposed order requires pool handlers to file a ''report of receipts and utilization'' on or before the seventh day after the end of the month. This is identical to the current reporting date in the Western Colorado and Great Basin orders but two days earlier than the same provision in the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order. Almost all handlers currently file reports by FAX or some other form of electronic data transfer, which eliminates delays due to mail handling. A seven-day reporting period should allow adequate time for handlers to prepare reports and will allow the computation and release of producer price information to occur on or before the 12th day after the end of the month.

The date on which the report of payments to producers is proposed to be due to the market administrator under the Western order is on or before the 21st day after the end of the month. This is the same date as that under the Great Basin order, but one day earlier than under the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order and two days earlier than the Western Colorado order. The earlier reporting date and announcement of producer prices should assure that an earlier payroll reporting date would not be burdensome.

Multiple Component Pricing

Both the Great Basin order and the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order currently have multiple component pricing based on protein; the Western Colorado order does not. The multiple component pricing provisions of the proposed Western order should be the same as those for other proposed orders that provide for multiple component pricing based on protein. The proposed Western order has a significant amount of milk used in manufactured products, especially cheese, and component pricing will enable producers to be paid according to the value of the components of their milk. However, the somatic cell adjustment included in most of the rest of the orders for which component pricing is proposed is not warranted by marketing conditions under the Western order, and such an adjustment is not included.

Payments to and From the Producer Settlement Fund

Payments to the producer settlement fund under the proposed order are due on or before the 14th day after the end of the month. This is two days after the announcement of uniform producer prices, which is an identical time period to that which exists in the three current orders proposed to be consolidated.

Payments from the producer settlement fund under the proposed order would be due on or before the 15th day after the end of the month. This is the same date as under the current Great Basin order, three days earlier than under the Southwestern Idaho-Eastern Oregon order, and one day later than the Western Colorado order. This payment date should be practicable given the use of current banking and transmission techniques.

Payments to Producers and Cooperative Associations

Under the proposed order, partial payments would be due from handlers to producers who are not members of cooperative associations on or before the 25th day of the month in an amount not less than 1.2 times the lowest class price for the preceding month multiplied by the hundredweight of milk received from such producers during the first 15 days of the month. Final payments would be due on or before the 17th day after the end of the month.

Partial payments to cooperative associations would be due on or before the 24th day of the month at the same rate as above, with final payments due on or before the 16th day after the end of the month. These final payment dates represent very little or no change from the orders' present payment dates. The proposed partial payment dates are earlier than those required under the current orders, but are very close to those suggested by the Identical Provisions committee, and compliance should present no hardship to handlers who would already have had the use of the producers' milk for 9 to 23 days.

Pacific Northwest Order

Many of the provisions of the proposed Pacific Northwest order are explained in the ''Identical Provisions'' portion of this proposed rule, and need not be addressed here. The provisions that deviate somewhat from those proposed for other order areas are the provisions dealing with standards for determining the pool status of producers and handlers, the definition of producer-handlers, the factors upon which payments to producers are calculated, and reporting and payment dates. Because this order is not proposed to be consolidated with any other orders, there is little reason for changing the substance of many of the provisions that are not included in the General Provisions.

Pool Distributing Plant

The pool distributing plant provisions of the proposed Pacific Northwest Order would be changed from the current definition to one that more closely resembles the definition suggested in the identical provisions report. Rather than basing the identification of a pool distributing plant on only 10 percent of the plant's receipts as in-area route dispositions, the order should specify that such a plant have at least 25 percent of its physical receipts distributed as route disposition, and at least 15 percent of its route disposition distributed within the marketing area.

It is not expected that the proposed pooling standard will affect the pool status of any plant that currently does or does not meet the pooling standard of the Pacific Northwest order. In addition, it would remedy a provision that could result in fully regulating a plant that has minimal association with the marketing area.

Pool Supply Plant

For the most part, the current pool supply plant definition of the Pacific Northwest order is appropriate to the marketing conditions in the area. However, the provision that currently *requires* a handler to include producer milk moved directly to pool distributing plants in the shipments on which pool plant performance is calculated would be changed to *allow* the handler to

include such movements if the handler wants to qualify its plant for pooling. A plant operator who receives milk at a plant only for manufacturing use also would be able to supply producer milk directly to distributing plants without a requirement that the manufacturing plant be a supply plant.

The Pacific Northwest order's current pool supply plant performance standard of 20 percent of milk receipts shipped to distributing plants should continue to be appropriate for this market. The current March through August period during which supply plants do not have to ship the minimum percentage to distributing plants if they have done so during the previous September through February period would continue to be included in the pool supply plant definition.

As in the other proposed consolidated orders, the market administrator is proposed to have the authority to increase or decrease the order's pooling provisions as marketing conditions change for the purpose of assuring that an adequate supply of milk will be available for fluid use, or to assure that the order does not require handlers to undertake uneconomic movements of milk to maintain: (1) the pool status of their plants, or (2) the pooling of producers who have historically been associated with the market and who help serve Class I needs.

Nonpool Plant

The current definition and exemption for milk produced and processed by state institutions, as contained in the present order's producer-handler definition, would be expanded and moved to be included in the ''Nonpool plant'' definition contained in the General Provisions. Such entities, along with colleges and universities and charitable organizations, would not be subject to the orders' pricing and pooling provisions as long as they have no sales in commercial channels.

The present Pacific Northwest order provisions allow a state institution to avoid any regulation on the portion of its milk that is used only within the institution, and apply some pricing regulation to that portion that is distributed in commercial channels. In some respects, this arrangement is similar to the situation of partially regulated distributing plants. However, partially regulated distributing plant operators, to avoid obligations under Federal orders, must show that they pay the dairy farmers who ship milk to them at a rate at least commensurate with that paid to producers whose milk is pooled under the order. In any case, they must procure a milk supply in the competitive market. State institutions may have any number of cost advantages over regulated handlers in the production and processing of milk, such as not having to pay a minimum wage and not having to pay property taxes. It would be unjust to allow such institutions to compete with fully regulated handlers in regular commercial channels as if the playing field were level. Therefore, state and other institutions that compete with regulated handlers in regular commercial channels, such as bids for school milk programs, would also be fully regulated.

Producer-Handler

The current Pacific Northwest producer-handler provisions should remain essentially untouched. Some of the ''Identical Provisions'' features of the producer-handler definition, such as the 150,000-pound thresholds for route dispositions, own farm production, and receipts from pool plants; and the ability to request to operate as both a pool plant and a producer, would be adopted. The rest of the current producer-handler provisions would remain in effect for administrative purposes.

Producer-handlers represent a much larger portion of the Class I dispositions in the Pacific Northwest marketing area than in most other Federal order areas. In many marketing areas, producer-handlers supply 1 percent or less of the Class I sales. In the Pacific Northwest area, however, they furnish almost 10 percent of the market's Class I dispositions. The larger average size of the dairy farmers in the western United States makes more likely the existence of a producer-handler that is a significant factor in the market.

The current order's producer-handler provisions are based on the history of producer-handler operations in this marketing area, reflecting difficulties encountered in order administration, attempts to circumvent order provisions, and court challenges.

In addition to the current order provisions, the producer-handler definition would also contain language clarifying that milk received by the producer-handler at a location other than the producer-handler's processing plant for distribution on routes will be included as a receipt from another handler.

Reserve Supply Unit

The Pacific Northwest order would continue to provide for a cooperative reserve supply unit. The existing provision has many similarities to a reserve supply plant, which is not provided in this order but which is included in several of the proposed consolidated orders.

Under the terms of the present provision, the cooperative members of the reserve supply unit must be located near a pool distributing plant, as a reserve supply plant must be located in the marketing area. Both the reserve supply unit and the reserve supply plant provisions require that the plant or unit operator request prior approval of the market administrator to initiate and cancel their status, both require long-term association with the market, and both provide substantial penalties for failing to meet all required conditions. Although the cooperative unit does not have monthly qualification requirements, it is subject to a call by the market administrator after the market administrator's investigation of the need for supplemental supplies of milk. Because of the current existence of this provision, based on the need shown at a public hearing, and its similarities to a pooling mechanism suggested for other orders, provision for the cooperative reserve supply unit would continue to be included in the proposed Pacific Northwest order.

Producer and Producer Milk

The proposed Pacific Northwest order would contain a ''dairy farmer for other markets'' provision for each month of the year. The large volume of milk production in California and California's quota system give dairy farmers an incentive to pool production in a volume equal to their quota pounds on the California order, and then attempt to share in the Pacific Northwest Class I market with their over-quota production, for which returns under the California order are much less. At the same time, none of the California Class I returns would be shared with Pacific Northwest producers. Similarly, the reserve supplies for the State-regulated markets of Western Nevada and Montana should not be allowed to share in returns from the Pacific Northwest order's higher classes of utilization while enjoying the benefits of the State orders' Class I returns.

The current provisions of the Pacific Northwest order do not require that a producer's milk be received at pool plants for the producer's first pooled delivery on the market or for any specified period. If a handler meets its overall performance requirements for supplying milk to the market, it should make no difference which individual producer's milk is actually delivered to pool plants as long as the milk of each

producer participating in the pool is Grade A and available to the market if and when needed. It is expensive, inefficient, and unnecessary to move milk from areas close to nonpool manufacturing plants to bottling plants in the city markets when that milk is not needed for bottling. For the above reasons and the physical fact that there are often great distances and mountainous terrain between plants and farms in the more sparsely populated West, no ''touch base'' requirements should be included.

This order and other western orders have allowed producers to pool milk on more than one order during the same month. Because of the locations of a number of dairy farmers, their milk may be used by pool plants regulated under more than one order in a single month. These producers also represent a reserve supply for more than one market. Large, multi-market handlers should be given the flexibility to market and transport their milk to fulfill the needs of their customers in the most efficient way possible.

The small degree of change from the current provisions necessary in the pooling provisions of the proposed Pacific Northwest results in very little change proposed for the order's diversion limits. The limit of 80% of the handler's supply of producer milk should remain unchanged, with the months during which the percentage is effective changed from September through April to September through February. These months will correspond to the months during which supply plants must ship 20 percent of their receipts to pool distributing plants. There would be no limit on diversions of producer milk for the months of March through August. These delivery standards have not been overly restrictive nor associated unneeded supplies with the market and should be allowed to continue without change.

Payments to Producers and Cooperative Associations

Although the current Pacific Northwest order contains a multiple component pricing plan very like that proposed to be standard for the consolidated orders, it does not now and would not under this reform process contain a somatic cell adjustment provision. The level of somatic cells in the western U.S. is generally lower than in the east, with an overall average of approximately 250,000 instead of 350,000. This lower somatic cell count would seem to reduce the need for such a provision. Historically, the principal argument for a somatic cell adjuster has been the negative effect of somatic cells on the cheese yields. Although cheese manufacturing in the Northwest is increasing, most cheese manufacturing is done by cooperative associations who have expressed the opinion that an adjustment for somatic cells is a quality issue best dealt with internally. The somatic cell adjustments in the proposed consolidated orders are not incorporated in the proposed Pacific Northwest order.

Announcement of Producer Prices

The dates on which handler reports, market administrator's announcement of producer prices, and payment to producers would remain unchanged from those of the current order.

8. Miscellaneous and Administrative

(a) Consolidation of the Marketing Service, Administrative Expense, and Producer-Settlement Funds

To complete the proposed consolidation of the present 31 Federal orders effectively and equitably, the reserve balances in the marketing service, administrative expense, and producer-settlement funds that have resulted under the individual orders would be combined.

The balances in these three funds should be combined on the same basis that the marketing areas are consolidated into regional orders herein. For instance, the Texas and New Mexico-West Texas marketing areas are merged into a new regional Southwest order. Accordingly, the reserve balances in the marketing service, administrative expense and producer-settlement funds of the two individual orders likewise should be combined into three separate funds established under the consolidated Southwest order.

The marketing areas of the proposed 11 consolidated orders essentially represent the territory covered by the 31 individual orders plus the territory included in the former Tennessee Valley marketing area. Because of this, the handlers and producers servicing the milk needs of the individual markets will continue to furnish the milk needs of the applicable regional market for the most part.

In that regard, the reserve balances in the funds that have resulted under the 31 individual orders should be combined on a marketing area basis into the appropriate separate fund established for each of the 11 regional orders. Any liabilities of such funds under the individual orders would be paid from the appropriate newly established fund of the applicable regional order. Similarly, obligations that are due the separate funds under the individual orders would be paid to the appropriate combined fund of the applicable consolidated order.

In most cases, the entire marketing area of an order or orders is included in the proposed consolidated marketing area of one of the 11 regional orders. Three present marketing areas would be split between two consolidated orders. One county of the present Louisville-Lexington-Evansville (Order 46) marketing area would be included in the Southeast order, and the rest of the territory in the Order 46 marketing area would be included under the Appalachian order. Even though one Order 46 county is included in the proposed Southeast order, all of the present Order 46 producers and handlers are expected to be covered under the proposed consolidated Appalachian order. Accordingly, the balances in the Order 46 marketing service, administrative expense, and producer settlement funds should be consolidated into the three separate funds established for the consolidated Appalachian market.

Different regulatory situations, however, will occur in the other two instances where a current marketing area is divided between two proposed consolidated orders. One county of the current Great Basin (Order 139) marketing area would be included in the consolidated Arizona-Las Vegas order and the rest of the Order 139 marketing area would be included in the consolidated marketing area for the West. Some of the present Order 139 producers and handlers would become regulated under the Arizona-Las Vegas consolidated order and others would become regulated under the regional order for the West. Similarly, two zones of the Michigan Upper Peninsula (Order 44) marketing area would be included in the consolidated Upper Midwest marketing area and the other zone of the Order 44 marketing area would be included in the marketing area for the Mideast regional order. Accordingly, any reserve balances in the marketing service, administrative expense and producer-settlement funds of these two individual orders should be divided equitably among the applicable consolidated orders.

The money accumulated in the marketing service funds of the individual orders is that which has been paid by producers for whom the market administrators are performing such services. Since the marketing areas of the proposed 11 regional orders encompass the territory covered by the individual orders, for the most part, the producers who have contributed to the

marketing service funds of the individual orders are expected to continue supplying milk for the consolidated orders. Since marketing service programs will be continued for these producers under the regional orders, it would be appropriate to combine the reserve balances in the marketing service funds of the order or orders that are represented in the consolidation of each of the proposed 11 regional orders.

When the proposed consolidated marketing area includes the marketing area of one or more individual orders, any remaining balance in the marketing service fund of the individual order or orders should be combined in the marketing service fund established for the applicable consolidated order. If a current marketing area is split between two consolidated markets and the regulatory status of producers and handlers is divided between the two regional orders, as is the case with the Michigan Upper Peninsula and Great Basin orders, any balance in the marketing service fund of the individual order should be prorated between the two consolidated orders on the basis of the amount of milk subject to the marketing service deduction that will be covered by each respective regional order (using producer deliveries in the last month the individual orders are in effect but assuming that the marketing areas had been consolidated).

The money paid to the administrative expense fund is each handler's proportionate share of the cost of administering the order. For the most part, handlers currently regulated under the individual orders will continue to be regulated under the proposed consolidated orders. In view of this, it would be an unnecessary administrative and financial burden to allocate the reserve funds of the individual orders back to handlers and then accumulate an adequate reserve for each of the consolidated orders. It would be as equitable and more efficient to combine the remaining administrative monies accumulated under the individual orders in the same manner as the marketing areas are proposed to be combined.

For the orders where the proposed consolidated marketing area includes the regulated territory of one or more of the individual orders, any remaining balance in the administrative expense fund of the individual order or orders would be combined into the administrative expense fund established for the applicable consolidated order. In the situations where the current individual marketing area is split and the regulatory status of producers and handlers is divided (as in the case of the Michigan Upper Peninsula and Great Basin orders) between two consolidated marketing areas, the remaining balance in the administrative expense fund should be prorated between the two regional orders on the basis of the amount of milk that would be pooled and priced under each respective consolidated order (using producer milk deliveries during the last month the individual orders are in effect but assuming that the orders had been consolidated).

Likewise, the producer-settlement fund balances of the individual orders should be combined. They should be combined on the same basis as the marketing areas are consolidated herein. This will enable the producer-settlement funds of the consolidated orders to continue without interruption.

The producers currently supplying the individual markets are expected to supply milk for the proposed consolidated markets. Thus, monetary balances in the producer-settlement funds of the individual orders now would be reflected in the pay prices of the producers who will benefit from the applicable consolidated orders. The combined fund for each proposed consolidated order also would serve as a contingency fund from which money would be available to meet obligations (resulting from audit adjustments and otherwise) occurring under the individual orders.

The same procedure used in combining the remaining balances in the marketing service and administrative expense funds of the individual orders should be followed in combining the producer-settlement fund balances when the individual orders are consolidated. For orders where the consolidated marketing area includes the marketing area of one or more orders, any remaining balance in the producer-settlement fund of the individual order or orders would be combined into the producer-settlement fund established for the applicable consolidated order. In the two situations (Michigan Upper Peninsula and Great Basin) where the marketing area of a current order is split between two proposed consolidated orders and some of the individual market's producers and handlers would be regulated under one consolidated order and others would be regulated under another consolidated order, the balance in the producer-settlement fund should be divided equitably between the two consolidated orders. Since the Michigan Upper Peninsula order is an individual-handler pool market, no producer-settlement fund is provided. The remaining balance in the producer-settlement fund of the Great Basin order should be prorated between the consolidated Arizona-Las Vegas order and the regional order for the West on the basis of the amount of milk that will be pooled and priced under each respective proposed consolidated order (using producer milk deliveries during the last month the individual orders are in effect but assuming that the orders had been consolidated).

(b) Consolidation of the Transportation Credit Balancing Funds

To complete the consolidation process, the reserve balances in the transportation credit balancing funds that are in effect now under three Southeast orders (Carolina, Order 5; Southeast, Order 7; and Louisville-Lexington-Evansville, Order 46) should be consolidated also. These funds should be combined on a marketing area basis. In that regard, the reserve balances in the transportation credit balancing funds of the Carolina and Louisville-Lexington-Evansville orders should be consolidated into a newly established transportation credit balancing fund for the Appalachian order, which also includes the current marketing areas of these two orders with the exception of one county. Similarly, the reserve balance in the transportation credit balancing fund of the present Southeast order should be transferred to the consolidated Southeast order, which includes all of the marketing area of the present Southeast order. These procedures will enable the transportation credits to continue without interruption under these two proposed consolidated orders.

(c) Proposed General Findings

The proposed findings and determinations hereinafter set forth supplement those that were made when 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.

(1) The tentative 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;

(2) 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 each of the aforesaid marketing areas, and the minimum

prices specified in the tentative 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;

(3) The tentative 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 the marketing agreements;

(4) All milk and milk products handled by handlers, as defined in the tentative marketing agreements and the orders as hereby proposed to be amended, are in the current of interstate commerce or directly burden, obstruct, or affect interstate commerce in milk or its products; and

(5) It is hereby found that the necessary expense of the market administrator for the maintenance and functioning of such agency will require the payment by each handler, as his pro rata share of such expense, 5 cents per hundredweight or such lesser amount as the Secretary may prescribe, with respect to milk specified in § 1000.85 of the General Provisions.

Proposed Marketing Agreements and Order Amending the Orders

The proposed marketing agreements are not included in this proposed rule 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 regulating the handling of milk in the respective marketing areas of these orders is proposed as the detailed and appropriate means by which the foregoing conclusions may be carried out.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Chapter X

Milk marketing orders.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble and under the authority of 7 U.S.C. 601–674, Title 7, chapter X, CFR parts 1002, 1004, 1012, 1013, 1036, 1040, 1044, 1046, 1049, 1050, 1064, 1065, 1068, 1076, 1079, 1106, 1135, 1137, 1138, and 1139 are proposed to be removed, and Parts 1000, 1001, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1030, 1032, 1033, 1124, 1126, 1131, and 1134 are proposed to be revised as follows:

PART 1000—GENERAL PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL MILK MARKETING ORDERS

Subpart A—Scope and Purpose

Sec.
1000.1 Scope and purpose of Part 1000.

Subpart B—Definitions

1000.2 General definitions.
1000.3 Route disposition.
1000.4 Plant.
1000.5 Distributing plant.
1000.6 Supply plant.
1000.8 Nonpool plant.
1000.9 Handler.
1000.14 Other source milk.
1000.15 Fluid milk product.
1000.16 Fluid cream product.
1000.17 [Reserved]
1000.18 Cooperative association.
1000.19 Commercial food processing establishment.

Subpart C—Rules of Practice and Procedure Governing Market Administrators

1000.25 Market administrator.

Subpart D—Rules Governing Order Provisions

1000.26 Continuity and separability of provisions.

Subpart E—Rules of Practice and Procedure Governing Handlers

1000.27 Handler responsibility for records and facilities.
1000.28 Termination of obligations.

Subpart F—Classification of Milk

1000.40 Classes of utilization.
1000.41 [Reserved]
1000.42 Classification of transfers and diversions.
1000.43 General classification rules.
1000.44 Classification of producer milk.
1000.45 Market administrator's reports and announcements concerning classification.

Subpart G—Class Prices

1000.50 Class prices and component prices.
1000.51 [Reserved]
1000.52 Adjusted Class I differentials.
1000.53 Announcement of class prices and component prices.
1000.54 Equivalent price.

Subpart H—Payments for Milk

1000.70 Producer-settlement fund.
1000.71 Payments to the producer-settlement fund.
1000.72 Payments from the producer-settlement fund.
1000.76 Payments by a handler operating a partially regulated distributing plant.
1000.77 Adjustment of accounts.
1000.78 Charges on overdue accounts.

Subpart I—Administrative Assessment and Marketing Service Deduction

1000.85 Assessment for order administration.
1000.86 Deduction for marketing services.

Subpart J—Miscellaneous Regulations

1000.90 Dates.
1000.91–1000.92 [Reserved]
1000.93 OMB control number assigned pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

Subpart A—Scope and Purpose

§ 1000.1 Scope and purpose of Part 1000.

This part sets forth certain terms, definitions, and provisions which shall be common to and part of each Federal milk marketing order in 7 CFR, chapter X except as specifically defined otherwise, or modified, or otherwise provided, in an individual order in 7 CFR, chapter X.

Subpart B—Definitions

§ 1000.2 General definitions.

(a) *Act* means Public Act No. 10, 73d Congress, as amended and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*).

(b) *Order* means the applicable part of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations issued pursuant to Section 8c of the Act as a Federal milk marketing order (as amended).

(c) *Department* means the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

(d) *Secretary* means the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States or any officer or employee of the Department to whom authority has heretofore been delegated, or to whom authority may hereafter be delegated, to act in his stead.

(e) *Person* means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other business unit.

§ 1000.3 Route disposition.

Route disposition means a delivery to a retail or wholesale outlet (except a plant), either directly or through any distribution facility (including disposition from a plant store, vendor, or vending machine) of a fluid milk product in consumer-type packages or dispenser units classified as Class I milk.

§ 1000.4 Plant.

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, *plant* means the land, buildings, facilities, and equipment constituting a single operating unit or establishment at which milk or milk products are received, processed, or packaged, including a facility described in paragraph (b)(2) of this section if the facility receives the milk of more than one dairy farmer.

(b) Plant shall not include:

(1) A separate building without stationary storage tanks that is used only

as a reload point for transferring bulk milk from one tank truck to another or a separate building used only as a distribution point for storing packaged fluid milk products in transit for route disposition; or

(2) An on-farm facility operated as part of a single dairy farm entity for the separation of cream and skim or the removal of water from milk.

§ 1000.5 Distributing plant.

Distributing plant means a plant that is approved by a duly constituted regulatory agency for the handling of Grade A milk and at which fluid milk products are processed or packaged and from which there is route disposition.

§ 1000.6 Supply plant.

Supply plant means a plant, other than a distributing plant, that is approved by a duly constituted regulatory agency for the handling of Grade A milk and at which fluid milk products are received or from which fluid milk products are transferred or diverted.

§ 1000.8 Nonpool plant.

Nonpool plant means any milk receiving, manufacturing, or processing plant other than a pool plant. The following categories of nonpool plants are further defined as follows:

(a) *A plant fully regulated under another Federal order* means a plant that is fully subject to the pricing and pooling provisions of another Federal order.

(b) *Producer-handler plant* means a plant operated by a producer-handler as defined under any Federal order.

(c) *Partially regulated distributing plant* means a nonpool plant that is not a plant fully regulated under another Federal order, a producer-handler plant, or an exempt plant, from which there is route disposition in the marketing area during the month.

(d) *Unregulated supply plant* means a supply plant that does not qualify as a pool supply plant and is not a plant fully regulated under another Federal order, a producer-handler plant, or an exempt plant.

(e) *An exempt plant* means a plant described in this paragraph that is exempt from the pricing and pooling provisions of any order provided that the operator of the plant files reports as prescribed by the market administrator to enable determination of the handler's exempt status:

(1) A plant that is operated by a governmental agency that has no route disposition in commercial channels;

(2) A plant that is operated by a duly accredited college or university disposing of fluid milk products only through the operation of its own campus with no route disposition in commercial channels;

(3) A plant from which the total route disposition is for individuals or institutions for charitable purposes without remuneration; or

(4) A plant that has route disposition of 150,000 pounds or less during the month.

§ 1000.9 Handler.

Handler means:

(a) Any person who operates a pool plant or a nonpool plant.

(b) Any person who receives packaged fluid milk products from a plant for resale and distribution to retail or wholesale outlets, any person who as a broker negotiates a purchase or sale of fluid milk products or fluid cream products from or to any pool or nonpool plant, and any person who by purchase or direction causes milk of producers to be picked up at the farm and/or moved to a plant. Persons who qualify as handlers only under this paragraph under any Federal milk order in 7 CFR, chapter X are not subject to the payment provisions of §§ ____.70, ____.71, ____.72, ____.73, ____.76, and ____.85 of that order.

(c) Any cooperative association with respect to milk that it receives for its account from the farm of a producer and delivers to pool plants or diverts to nonpool plants pursuant to § __.13 of the order. The operator of a pool plant receiving milk from a cooperative association may be the handler for such milk if both parties notify the market administrator of this agreement prior to the time that the milk is delivered to the pool plant and the plant operator purchases the milk on the basis of weights determined from its measurement at the farm and butterfat tests determined from farm bulk tank samples.

§ 1000.14 Other source milk.

Other source milk means all skim milk and butterfat contained in or represented by:

(a) Receipts of fluid milk products and bulk fluid cream products from any source other than producers, handlers described in § 1000.9(c), or pool plants;

(b) Products (other than fluid milk products, fluid cream products, and products produced at the plant during the same month) from any source which are reprocessed, converted into, or combined with another product in the plant during the month; and

(c) Receipts of any milk product (other than a fluid milk product or a fluid cream product) for which the handler fails to establish a disposition.

§ 1000.15 Fluid milk product.

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, *fluid milk product* means any milk products in fluid or frozen form containing less than 9 percent butterfat that are intended to be used as beverages. Such products include, but are not limited to: Milk, fat-free milk, lowfat milk, light milk, reduced fat milk, milk drinks, eggnog and cultured buttermilk, including any such beverage products that are flavored, cultured, modified with added nonfat milk solids, sterilized, concentrated (to not more than 50 percent total milk solids), or reconstituted.

(b) The term fluid milk product shall not include:

(1) Plain or sweetened evaporated milk/skim milk, sweetened condensed milk/skim milk, formulas especially prepared for infant feeding or meal replacement, any product that contains by weight less than 6.5 percent nonfat milk solids, and whey; and

(2) The quantity of skim milk equivalent in any modified product specified in paragraph (a) of this section that is greater than an equal volume of an unmodified product of the same nature and butterfat content.

§ 1000.16 Fluid cream product.

Fluid cream product means cream (other than plastic cream or frozen cream), including sterilized cream, or a mixture of cream and milk or skim milk containing 9 percent or more butterfat, with or without the addition of other ingredients.

§ 1000.17 [Reserved]

§ 1000.18 Cooperative association.

Cooperative association means any cooperative marketing association of producers which the Secretary determines is qualified under the provisions of the Capper-Volstead Act, has full authority in the sale of milk of its members, and is engaged in marketing milk or milk products for its members. A federation of two or more cooperatives incorporated under the laws of any state will be considered a cooperative association under any Federal milk order if all member cooperatives meet the requirements of this section.

§ 1000.19 Commercial food processing establishment.

Commercial food processing establishment means any facility, other than a milk plant, to which fluid milk products and fluid cream products are

disposed of, or producer milk is diverted, that uses such receipts as ingredients in food products and has no other disposition of fluid milk products other than those received in consumer-type packages (1 gallon or less). Producer milk diverted to commercial food processing establishments shall be subject to the same provisions relating to diversions to plants, including, but not limited to, §§ ____.13 and ____.52 of each Federal milk order in 7 CFR, chapter X.

Subpart C—Rules of Practice and Procedure Governing Market Administrators

§ 1000.25 Market administrator.

(a) *Designation*. The agency for the administration of the order shall be a market administrator selected by the Secretary and subject to removal at the Secretary's discretion. The market administrator shall be entitled to compensation determined by the Secretary.

(b) *Powers*. The market administrator shall have the following powers with respect to each order under his/her administration:

(1) Administer the order in accordance with its terms and provisions;

(2) Maintain funds outside of the United States Department of the Treasury for the purpose of administering the order;

(3) Make rules and regulations to effectuate the terms and provisions of the order;

(4) Receive, investigate, and report complaints of violations to the Secretary; and

(5) Recommend amendments to the Secretary.

(c) *Duties*. The market administrator shall perform all the duties necessary to administer the terms and provisions of each order under his/her administration, including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) Employ and fix the compensation of persons necessary to enable him/her to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the office;

(2) Pay out of funds provided by the administrative assessment, except expenses associated with functions for which the order provides a separate charge, all expenses necessarily incurred in the maintenance and functioning of the office and in the performance of the duties of the office, including the market administrator's compensation;

(3) Keep records which will clearly reflect the transactions provided for in the order, and upon request by the Secretary, surrender the records to a successor or such other person as the Secretary may designate;

(4) Furnish information and reports requested by the Secretary and submit office records for examination by the Secretary;

(5) Announce publicly at his/her discretion, unless otherwise directed by the Secretary, by such means as he/she deems appropriate, the name of any handler who, after the date upon which the handler is required to perform such act, has not:

(i) Made reports required by the order;

(ii) Made payments required by the order; or

(iii) Made available records and facilities as required pursuant to § 1000.27;

(6) Prescribe reports required of each handler under the order. Verify such reports and the payments required by the order by examining records (including such papers as copies of income tax reports, fiscal and product accounts, correspondence, contracts, documents or memoranda of the handler, and the records of any other persons that are relevant to the handler's obligation under the order), by examining such handler's milk handling facilities, and by such other investigation as the market administrator deems necessary for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any report or any obligation under the order. Reclassify skim milk and butterfat received by any handler if such examination and investigation discloses that the original classification was incorrect;

(7) Furnish each regulated handler a written statement of such handler's accounts with the market administrator promptly each month. Furnish a corrected statement to such handler if verification discloses that the original statement was incorrect; and

(8) Prepare and disseminate publicly for the benefit of producers, handlers, and consumers such statistics and other information concerning operation of the order and facts relevant to the provisions thereof (or proposed provisions) as do not reveal confidential information.

Subpart D—Rules Governing Order Provisions

§ 1000.26 Continuity and separability of provisions.

(a) *Effective time*. The provisions of the order or any amendment to the order shall become effective at such time as the Secretary may declare and shall continue in force until suspended or terminated.

(b) *Suspension or termination*. The Secretary shall suspend or terminate any or all of the provisions of the order whenever he/she finds that such provision(s) obstructs or does not tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act. The order shall terminate whenever the provisions of the Act authorizing it cease to be in effect.

(c) *Continuing obligations*. If upon the suspension or termination of any or all of the provisions of the order there are any obligations arising under the order, the final accrual or ascertainment of which requires acts by any handler, by the market administrator or by any other person, the power and duty to perform such further acts shall continue notwithstanding such suspension or termination.

(d) *Liquidation*. (1) Upon the suspension or termination of any or all provisions of the order, the market administrator, or such other liquidating agent designated by the Secretary, shall, if so directed by the Secretary, liquidate the business of the market administrator's office, dispose of all property in his/her possession or control, including accounts receivable, and execute and deliver all assignments or other instruments necessary or appropriate to effectuate any such disposition; and

(2) If a liquidating agent is so designated, all assets and records of the market administrator shall be transferred promptly to such liquidating agent. If, upon such liquidation, the funds on hand exceed the amounts required to pay outstanding obligations of the office of the market administrator and to pay necessary expenses of liquidation and distribution, such excess shall be distributed to contributing handlers and producers in an equitable manner.

(e) *Separability of provisions*. If any provision of the order or its application to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the application of such provision and of the remaining provisions of the order to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Subpart E—Rules of Practice and Procedure Governing Handlers

§ 1000.27 Handler responsibility for records and facilities.

Each handler shall maintain and retain records of its operations and make such records and its facilities available to the market administrator. If adequate records of a handler, or of any other persons, that are relevant to the obligation of such handler are not maintained and made available, any

skim milk and butterfat required to be reported by such handler for which adequate records are not available shall be considered as used in the highest-priced class.

(a) *Records to be maintained.* (1) Each handler shall maintain records of its operations (including, but not limited to, records of purchases, sales, processing, packaging, and disposition) as are necessary to verify whether such handler has any obligation under the order, and if so, the amount of such obligation. Such records shall be such as to establish for each plant or other receiving point for each month:

(i) The quantities of skim milk and butterfat contained in, or represented by, products received in any form, including inventories on hand at the beginning of the month, according to form, time, and source of each receipt;

(ii) The utilization of all skim milk and butterfat showing the respective quantities of such skim milk and butterfat in each form disposed of or on hand at the end of the month; and

(iii) Payments to producers, dairy farmers and cooperative associations, including the amount and nature of any deductions and the disbursement of money so deducted.

(2) Each handler shall keep such other specific records as the market administrator deems necessary to verify or establish such handler's obligation under the order.

(b) *Availability of records and facilities.* Each handler shall make available all records pertaining to such handler's operations and all facilities the market administrator finds are necessary to verify the information required to be reported by the order and/or to ascertain such handler's reporting, monetary or other obligation under the order. Each handler shall permit the market administrator to weigh, sample, and test milk and milk products and observe plant operations and equipment and make available to the market administrator such facilities as are necessary to carry out his/her duties.

(c) *Retention of records.* All records required under the order to be made available to the market administrator shall be retained by the handler for a period of 3 years to begin at the end of the month to which such records pertain. If, within such 3-year period, the market administrator notifies the handler in writing that the retention of such records, or of specified records, is necessary in connection with a proceeding under section 8c(15)(A) of the Act or a court action specified in such notice, the handler shall retain such records, or specified records, until further written notification from the market administrator. The market administrator shall give further written notification to the handler promptly upon the termination of the litigation or when the records are no longer necessary in connection therewith.

§ 1000.28 Termination of obligations.

The provisions of this section shall apply to any obligation under the order for the payment of money:

(a) Except as provided in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, the obligation of any handler to pay money required to be paid under the terms of the order shall terminate 2 years after the last day of the month during which the market administrator receives the handler's report of receipts and utilization on which such obligation is based, unless within such 2-year period, the market administrator notifies the handler in writing that such money is due and payable. Service of such written notice shall be complete upon mailing to the handler's last known address and it shall contain, but need not be limited to, the following information:

(1) The amount of the obligation;

(2) The month(s) on which such obligation is based; and

(3) If the obligation is payable to one or more producers or to a cooperative association, the name of such producer(s) or such cooperative association, or if the obligation is payable to the market administrator, the account for which it is to be paid.

(b) If a handler fails or refuses, with respect to any obligation under the order, to make available to the market administrator all records required by the order to be made available, the market administrator may notify the handler in writing, within the 2-year period provided for in paragraph (a) of this section, of such failure or refusal. If the market administrator so notifies a handler, the said 2-year period with respect to such obligation shall not begin to run until the first day of the month following the month during which all such records pertaining to such obligation are made available to the market administrator.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, a handler's obligation under the order to pay money shall not be terminated with respect to any transaction involving fraud or willful concealment of a fact, material to the obligation, on the part of the handler against whom the obligation is sought to be imposed.

(d) Unless the handler files a petition pursuant to section 8c(15)(A) of the Act and the applicable rules and regulations (7 CFR 900.50 *et seq.*) within the applicable 2-year period indicated below, the obligation of the market administrator:

(1) To pay a handler any money which such handler claims is due under the terms of the order shall terminate 2 years after the end of the month during which the skim milk and butterfat involved in the claim were received; or

(2) To refund any payment made by a handler (including a deduction or offset by the market administrator) shall terminate 2 years after the end of the month during which payment was made by the handler.

Subpart F—Classification of Milk

§ 1000.40 Classes of utilization.

Except as provided in § 1000.42, all skim milk and butterfat required to be reported pursuant to § ____.30 of each Federal milk order in 7 CFR, chapter X shall be classified as follows:

(a) *Class I milk* shall be all skim milk and butterfat:

(1) Disposed of in the form of fluid milk products, except as otherwise provided in this section;

(2) Used to produce fluid milk products modifed in volume by the addition of nonmilk ingredients and/or previously processed and priced skim milk and butterfat, including milkshake and milkshake drinks sold in containers less than one half-gallon;

(3) In packaged fluid milk products in inventory at the end of the month, exclusive of skim milk and butterfat accounted for in paragraph (a)(2) of this section; and

(4) In shrinkage assigned pursuant to § 1000.43(b).

(b) *Class II milk* shall be all skim milk and butterfat:

(1) In fluid milk products in containers larger than 1 gallon and fluid cream products disposed of or diverted to a commercial food processing establishment if the market administrator is permitted to audit the records of the commercial food processing establishment for the purpose of verification. Otherwise, such uses shall be Class I;

(2) Used to produce:

(i) Cottage cheese, lowfat cottage cheese, dry curd cottage cheese, ricotta cheese, pot cheese, Creole cheese, cream cheese and any similar soft, high-moisture cheese resembling cottage cheese in form or use;

(ii) Milkshake and ice milk mixes (or bases), frozen desserts, and frozen dessert mixes distributed in half-gallon containers or larger and intended to be used in soft or semi-solid form;

(iii) Aerated cream, frozen cream, sour cream, sour half-and-half, sour cream

mixtures containing nonmilk items, yogurt, and any other semi-solid product resembling a Class II product;

(iv) Custards, puddings, pancake mixes, coatings, batter, and similar products;

(v) Buttermilk biscuit mixes and other buttermilk for baking that contain food starch in excess of 2% of the total solids, provided that the product is labeled to indicate the food starch content;

(vi) Formulas especially prepared for infant feeding or meal replacement;

(vii) Candy, soup, bakery products and other prepared foods which are processed for general distribution to the public, and intermediate products, including sweetened condensed milk, to be used in processing such prepared food products;

(viii) A fluid cream product or any product containing artificial fat or fat substitutes that resembles a fluid cream product, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (c) of this section;

(ix) Any product not otherwise specified in this section; and

(3) In shrinkage assigned pursuant to § 1000.43(b).

(c) *Class III milk* shall be all skim milk and butterfat:

(1) Used to produce:

(i) Spreadable cheeses (other than cream cheese) and hard cheese of types that may be shredded, grated, or crumbled and that are not included in paragraph (b)(2)(i) of this section;

(ii) Plastic cream, anhydrous milkfat, and butteroil; and

(iii) Evaporated or sweetened condensed milk/skim milk in a consumer-type package;

(2) In inventory at the end of the month of fluid milk products and fluid cream products in bulk form;

(3) In any products classified pursuant to paragraphs (a) or (b) of this section that are destroyed or lost by a handler in a vehicular accident, flood, fire, or in a similar occurrence beyond the handler's control, to the extent that the quantities destroyed or lost can be verified from records satisfactory to the market administrator;

(4) In the skim milk equivalent of nonfat milk solids used to modify a fluid milk product that has not been accounted for in Class I; and

(5) In shrinkage assigned pursuant to § 1000.43(b).

(d) *Class IV milk* shall be all skim milk and butterfat:

(1) Used to produce:

(i) Butter; and

(ii) Any milk product in dried form; and

(2) In shrinkage assigned pursuant to § 1000.43(b).

§ 1000.41 [Reserved]

§ 1000.42 Classification of transfers and diversions.

(a) *Transfers and diversions to pool plants.* Skim milk or butterfat transferred or diverted in the form of a fluid milk product or transferred in the form of a bulk fluid cream product from a pool plant to another pool plant shall be classified as Class I milk unless the operators of both plants request the same classification in another class. In either case, the classification shall be subject to the following conditions:

(1) The skim milk and butterfat classified in each class shall be limited to the amount of skim milk and butterfat, respectively, remaining in such class at the receiving plant after the computations pursuant to § 1000.44(a)(9) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b);

(2) If the transferring plant received during the month other source milk to be allocated pursuant to § 1000.44(a)(3) or the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b), the skim milk or butterfat so transferred shall be classified so as to allocate the least possible Class I utilization to such other source milk; and

(3) If the transferring handler received during the month other source milk to be allocated pursuant to § 1000.44(a)(8) or (9) or the corresponding steps of § 1000.44(b), the skim milk or butterfat so transferred, up to the total of the skim milk and butterfat, respectively, in such receipts of other source milk, shall not be classified as Class I milk to a greater extent than would be the case if the other source milk had been received at the receiving plant.

(b) *Transfers and diversions to a plant regulated under another Federal order.* Skim milk or butterfat transferred or diverted in the form of a fluid milk product or transferred in the form of a bulk fluid cream product from a pool plant to a plant regulated under another Federal order shall be classified in the following manner. Such classification shall apply only to the skim milk or butterfat that is in excess of any receipts at the pool plant from a plant regulated under another Federal order of skim milk and butterfat, respectively, in fluid milk products and bulk fluid cream products, respectively, that are in the same category as described in paragraph (b)(1) or (2) of this section:

(1) As Class I milk, if transferred as packaged fluid milk products;

(2) If transferred or diverted in bulk form, classification shall be in the classes to which allocated under the other order:

(i) If the operators of both plants so request in their reports of receipts and utilization filed with their respective market administrators, transfers in bulk form shall be classified as other than Class I to the extent that such utilization is available for such classification pursuant to the allocation provisions of the other order;

(ii) If diverted, the diverting handler must request a classification other than Class I. If the plant receiving the diverted milk does not have sufficient utilization available for the requested classification and some of the diverted milk is consequently assigned to Class I use, the diverting handler shall be given the option of designating the entire load of diverted milk as producer milk at the plant physically receiving the milk. Alternatively, if the diverting handler so chooses, it may designate which dairy farmers whose milk was diverted during the month will be designated as producers under the order physically receiving the milk. If the diverting handler declines to accept either of these options, the market administrator will prorate the portion of diverted milk in excess of Class II, III, and IV use among all the dairy farmers whose milk was received from the diverting handler on the last day of the month, then the second-to-last day, and continuing in that fashion until the excess diverted milk has been assigned as producer milk under the receiving order; and

(iii) If information concerning the classes to which such transfers or diversions were allocated under the other order is not available to the market administrator for the purpose of establishing classification under this paragraph, classification shall be Class I, subject to adjustment when such information is available.

(c) *Transfers and diversions to producer-handlers and to exempt plants.* Skim milk or butterfat that is transferred or diverted from a pool plant to a producer-handler under any Federal order in 7 CFR, chapter X or to an exempt plant shall be classified:

(1) As Class I milk if transferred or diverted to a producer-handler;

(2) As Class I milk if transferred to an exempt plant in the form of a packaged fluid milk product; and

(3) In accordance with the utilization assigned to it by the market administrator if transferred or diverted in the form of a bulk fluid milk product or transferred in the form of a bulk fluid cream product to an exempt plant. For this purpose, the receiving handler's utilization of skim milk and butterfat in each class, in series beginning with Class IV, shall be assigned to the extent

possible to its receipts of skim milk and butterfat, in bulk fluid cream products, and bulk fluid milk products, respectively, pro rata to each source.

(d) *Transfers and diversions to other nonpool plants.* Skim milk or butterfat transferred or diverted in the following forms from a pool plant to a nonpool plant that is not a plant regulated under another order in 7 CFR, chapter X, an exempt plant, or a producer-handler plant shall be classified:

(1) As Class I milk, if transferred in the form of a packaged fluid milk product; and

(2) As Class I milk, if transferred or diverted in the form of a bulk fluid milk product or transferred in the form of a bulk fluid cream product, unless the following conditions apply:

(i) If the conditions described in paragraphs (d)(2)(i)(A) and (B) of this section are met, transfers or diversions in bulk form shall be classified on the basis of the assignment of the nonpool plant's utilization, excluding the milk equivalent of both nonfat milk solids and concentrated milk used in the plant during the month, to its receipts as set forth in paragraphs (d)(2)(ii) through (viii) of this section:

(A) The transferring handler or diverting handler claims such classification in such handler's report of receipts and utilization filed pursuant to § ____.30 of each Federal milk order in 7 CFR, chapter X for the month within which such transaction occurred; and

(B) The nonpool plant operator maintains books and records showing the utilization of all skim milk and butterfat received at such plant which are made available for verification purposes if requested by the market administrator;

(ii) Route disposition in the marketing area of each Federal milk order in 7 CFR, chapter X from the nonpool plant and transfers of packaged fluid milk products from such nonpool plant to plants fully regulated thereunder shall be assigned to the extent possible in the following sequence:

(A) Pro rata to receipts of packaged fluid milk products at such nonpool plant from pool plants;

(B) Pro rata to any remaining unassigned receipts of packaged fluid milk products at such nonpool plant from plants regulated under other Federal orders in 7 CFR, chapter X;

(C) Pro rata to receipts of bulk fluid milk products at such nonpool plant from pool plants; and

(D) Pro rata to any remaining unassigned receipts of bulk fluid milk products at such nonpool plant from plants regulated under other Federal orders in 7 CFR, chapter X;

(iii) Any remaining Class I disposition of packaged fluid milk products from the nonpool plant shall be assigned to the extent possible pro rata to any remaining unassigned receipts of packaged fluid milk products at such nonpool plant from pool plants and plants regulated under other Federal orders in 7 CFR, chapter X;

(iv) Transfers of bulk fluid milk products from the nonpool plant to a plant regulated under any Federal order in 7 CFR, chapter X, to the extent that such transfers to the regulated plant exceed receipts of fluid milk products from such plant and are allocated to Class I at the receiving plant, shall be assigned to the extent possible in the following sequence:

(A) Pro rata to receipts of fluid milk products at such nonpool plant from pool plants; and

(B) Pro rata to any remaining unassigned receipts of fluid milk products at such nonpool plant from plants regulated under other Federal orders in 7 CFR, chapter X;

(v) Any remaining unassigned Class I disposition from the nonpool plant shall be assigned to the extent possible in the following sequence:

(A) To such nonpool plant's receipts from dairy farmers who the market administrator determines constitute regular sources of Grade A milk for such nonpool plant; and

(B) To such nonpool plant's receipts of Grade A milk from plants not fully regulated under any Federal order in 7 CFR, chapter X which the market administrator determines constitute regular sources of Grade A milk for such nonpool plant;

(vi) Any remaining unassigned receipts of bulk fluid milk products at the nonpool plant from pool plants and plants regulated under other Federal orders in 7 CFR, chapter X shall be assigned, pro rata among such plants, to the extent possible first to any remaining Class I utilization and then to all other utilization, in sequence beginning with Class IV at such nonpool plant;

(vii) Receipts of bulk fluid cream products at the nonpool plant from pool plants and plants regulated under other Federal orders in 7 CFR, chapter X shall be assigned, pro rata among such plants, to the extent possible to any remaining utilization, in sequence beginning with Class IV at such nonpool plant; and

(viii) In determining the nonpool plant's utilization for purposes of this paragraph, any fluid milk products and bulk fluid cream products transferred from such nonpool plant to a plant not fully regulated under any Federal order in 7 CFR, chapter X shall be classified on the basis of the second plant's utilization using the same assignment priorities at the second plant that are set forth in this paragraph.

§ 1000.43 General classification rules.

In determining the classification of producer milk pursuant to § 1000.44, the following rules shall apply:

(a) Each month the market administrator shall correct for mathematical and other obvious errors all reports filed pursuant to § ____.30 of each Federal milk order in 7 CFR, chapter X and shall compute separately for each pool plant, and for each cooperative association with respect to milk for which it is the handler pursuant to § 1000.9(c) the pounds of skim milk and butterfat, respectively, in each class in accordance with §§ 1000.40 and 1000.42, and paragraph (b) of this section.

(b) For purposes of classifying all milk reported by a handler pursuant to § ____.30 of each Federal milk order in 7 CFR, chapter X, the market administrator shall:

(1) Determine the shrinkage or overage of skim milk and butterfat for each pool plant and for each handler described in § 1000.9(c) by subtracting total utilization from total receipts. Any positive difference would be shrinkage, and any negative difference would be overage;

(2) Prorate the shrinkage or overage computed in paragraph (b)(1) of this section to the respective quantities of skim milk and butterfat reported in each class. In the case of a handler described in § 1000.9(c), the proration of shrinkage shall be based upon the utilization of the plants to which the milk was delivered; and

(3) Add the prorated shrinkage to, or subtract the prorated overage from, the handler's reported utilization. The results shall be known as the gross utilization in each class.

(c) If any of the water contained in the milk from which a product is made is removed before the product is utilized or disposed of by the handler, the pounds of skim milk in such product that are to be considered under this part as used or disposed of by the handler shall be an amount equivalent to the nonfat milk solids contained in such product plus all of the water originally associated with such solids.

(d) Skim milk and butterfat contained in receipts of bulk concentrated fluid milk and nonfluid milk products that are reconstituted for fluid use shall be assigned to Class I use, up to the reconstituted portion of labeled reconstituted fluid milk products, on a pro rata basis (except for any Class I use

of specific concentrated receipts that is established by the handler) prior to any assignments under § 1000.44. Any remaining skim milk and butterfat in concentrated receipts shall be assigned to uses under § 1000.44 on a pro rata basis, unless a specific use of such receipts is established by the handler.

§ 1000.44 Classification of producer milk.

For each month the market administrator shall determine for each handler described in § 1000.9(a) for each pool plant of the handler separately and for each handler described in § 1000.9(c) the classification of producer milk by allocating the handler's receipts of skim milk and butterfat to the gross utilization of such receipts pursuant to § 1000.43(b)(3) by such handler as follows:

(a) Skim milk shall be allocated in the following manner:

(1) Subtract from the pounds of skim milk in Class I the pounds of skim milk in:

(i) Receipts of packaged fluid milk products from an unregulated supply plant to the extent that an equivalent amount of skim milk disposed of to such plant by handlers fully regulated under any Federal order in 7 CFR, chapter X is classified and priced as Class I milk and is not used as an offset for any other payment obligation under any order in 7 CFR, chapter X;

(ii) Packaged fluid milk products in inventory at the beginning of the month. This paragraph shall apply only if the pool plant was subject to the provisions of this paragraph or comparable provisions of another Federal order in 7 CFR, chapter X in the immediately preceding month;

(iii) Fluid milk products received in packaged form from plants regulated under other Federal orders in 7 CFR, chapter X;

(iv) Any remaining receipts of skim milk shall be allocated pursuant to paragraph (a)(3)(iv) of this section.

(2) Subtract from the pounds of skim milk in Class II the pounds of skim milk in the receipts of skim milk in bulk concentrated fluid milk products and in other source milk (except other source milk received in the form of an unconcentrated fluid milk product or a fluid cream product) that is used to produce, or added to, any product in Class II (excluding the quantity of such skim milk that was classified as Class III milk pursuant to § 1000.40(c)(4)). Any remaining receipts of skim milk shall be allocated pursuant to paragraph (a)(3)(iv) of this section.

(3) Subtract from the pounds of skim milk remaining in each class, in series beginning with Class IV, the pounds of skim milk in:

(i) Receipts of bulk concentrated fluid milk products and other source milk (except other source milk received in the form of an unconcentrated fluid milk product);

(ii) Receipts of fluid milk products and bulk fluid cream products for which appropriate health approval is not established and from unidentified sources;

(iii) Receipts of fluid milk products and bulk fluid cream products from an exempt plant;

(iv) Fluid milk products and bulk fluid cream products received, or acquired for distribution, from a producer-handler as defined under this order or any other Federal order in 7 CFR, chapter X; and

(v) Any receipts not subtracted pursuant to paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this section.

(4) Subtract from the pounds of skim milk remaining in all classes other than Class I, in sequence beginning with Class IV, the receipts of fluid milk products from an unregulated supply plant that were not previously subtracted in this section for which the handler requests classification other than Class I, but not in excess of the pounds of skim milk remaining in these other classes combined.

(5) Subtract from the pounds of skim milk remaining in all classes other than Class I, in sequence beginning with Class IV, receipts of fluid milk products from an unregulated supply plant that were not subtracted in previous paragraphs, and which are in excess of the pounds of skim milk determined pursuant to paragraphs (a)(5)(i) through (iii) of this section;

(i) Multiply by 1.25 the pounds of skim milk remaining in Class I at this allocation step;

(ii) Subtract from the above result the pounds of skim milk in receipts of producer milk and fluid milk products from pool plants of other handlers; and

(iii) Multiply any plus quantity resulting above by the percentage that the receipts of skim milk in fluid milk products from unregulated supply plants remaining at this pool plant is of all such receipts remaining pursuant to this allocation step.

(6) Subtract from the pounds of skim milk remaining in all classes other than Class I, in sequence beginning with Class IV, the pounds of skim milk in receipts of bulk fluid milk products from a handler regulated under another Federal order in 7 CFR, chapter X that are in excess of bulk fluid milk products transferred or diverted to such handler, if other than Class I classification is requested, but not in excess of the pounds of skim milk remaining in these classes combined.

(7) Subtract from the pounds of skim milk remaining in each class, in series beginning with Class III (or Class IV if the plant had only Class IV utilization), the pounds of skim milk in fluid milk products and bulk fluid cream products in inventory at the beginning of the month that were not previously subtracted in this section.

(8) Subtract from the pounds of skim milk remaining in each class at the plant, pro rata to the total pounds of skim milk remaining in Class I and in all other classes combined, and in sequence beginning with Class IV, the pounds of skim milk in receipts of fluid milk products from an unregulated supply plant that were not previously subtracted in this section and that were not offset by transfers or diversions of fluid milk products to the unregulated supply plant from which fluid milk products to be allocated at this step were received.

(9) Subtract in the manner specified below from the pounds of skim milk remaining in each class the pounds of skim milk in receipts of bulk fluid milk products from a handler regulated under another Federal order in 7 CFR, chapter X that are in excess of bulk fluid milk products transferred or diverted to such handler that were not subtracted in paragraph (a)(6) of this section;

(i) Such subtraction shall be pro rata to the pounds of skim milk in Class I and in all other classes combined, with the quantity prorated to all classes combined being subtracted in sequence beginning with Class IV, with respect to whichever of the following quantities represents the lower proportion of Class I milk:

(A) The estimated utilization of skim milk of all handlers in each class as announced for the month pursuant to § 1000.45(a); or

(B) The total pounds of skim milk remaining in each class at this allocation step.

(ii) [Reserved]

(10) Subtract from the pounds of skim milk remaining in each class the pounds of skim milk in receipts of fluid milk products and bulk fluid cream products from another pool plant according to the classification of such products pursuant to § 1000.42(a).

(b) Butterfat shall be allocated in accordance with the procedure outlined for skim milk in paragraph (a) of this section; and

(c) The quantity of producer milk in each class shall be the combined pounds of skim milk and butterfat remaining in each class after the

computations pursuant to paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

§ 1000.45 Market administrator's reports and announcements concerning classification.

(a) Whenever required for the purpose of allocating receipts from other Federal order plants pursuant to § 1000.44(a)(9) and the corresponding step of § 1000.44(b), the market administrator shall estimate and publicly announce the utilization (to the nearest whole percentage) in Class I during the month of skim milk and butterfat, respectively, in producer milk of all handlers. The estimate shall be based upon the most current available data and shall be final for such purpose.

(b) The market administrator shall report to the other Federal order market administrators, as soon as possible after the handlers' reports of receipts and utilization are received, the class to which receipts from other Federal order plants are allocated pursuant to §§ 1000.43(d) and 1000.44 (including any reclassification of inventories of bulk concentrated fluid milk products), and thereafter any change in allocation required to correct errors disclosed on the verification of such report.

(c) The market administrator shall furnish each handler operating a pool plant who has shipped fluid milk products or bulk fluid cream products to a plant fully regulated under another Federal order in 7 CFR, chapter X the class to which the shipments were allocated by the market administrator of the other Federal order in 7 CFR, chapter X on the basis of the report by the receiving handler and, as necessary, any changes in the allocation arising from the verification of such report.

(d) The market administrator shall report to each cooperative association which so requests, the percentage of producer milk delivered by members of the association that was used in each class by each handler receiving the milk. For the purpose of this report, the milk so received shall be prorated to each class in accordance with the total utilization of producer milk by the handler.

Subpart G—Class Prices

§ 1000.50 Class prices and component prices.

Subject to the provisions of § 1000.52, the class prices per hundredweight of milk containing 3.5 percent butterfat and the component prices for the month shall be as follows:

(a) *Class I price.* The Class I price shall be .965 times the Class I skim milk price plus 3.5 times the Class I butterfat price.

(b) *Class II price.* The Class II price shall be .965 times the Class II skim milk price plus 3.5 times the month's butterfat price.

(c) *Class III price.* The Class III price shall be .965 times the Class III skim milk price plus 3.5 times the month's butterfat price.

(d) *Class IV price.* The Class IV price shall be .965 times the Class IV skim milk price plus 3.5 times the month's butterfat price.

(e) *Class I differential price.* The Class I differential price shall be the difference between the current month's Class I and Class III prices (this price may be negative).

(f) *Class II differential price.* The Class II differential price shall be the difference between the current month's Class II and Class IV prices.

(g) *Class I skim milk price.* The Class I skim milk price per hundredweight, rounded to the nearest cent, shall be the adjusted Class I differential effective at the location of the plant as specified in § 1000.52(a) plus a six month declining average computed by totaling the value of the higher of Class III or Class IV skim milk price for each month, starting with the second preceding month, multiplied by a factor of six and reducing the factor by one for each preceding month and dividing the sum by 21.

(h) *Class II skim milk price.* The Class II skim milk price per hundredweight shall be the Class IV skim milk price for the month plus 70 cents.

(i) *Class III skim milk price.* The Class III skim milk price per hundredweight, rounded to the nearest cent, shall be the protein price per pound times 3.3 pounds of protein plus the other solids price per pound times 5.7 pounds of other solids;

(j) *Class IV skim milk price.* The Class IV skim milk price per hundredweight, rounded to the nearest cent, shall be the nonfat solids price per pound times 9 pounds of nonfat solids.

(k) *Class I butterfat price.* The Class I butterfat price per pound, rounded to the nearest one-hundredth cent, shall be the adjusted Class I differential effective at the location of the plant as specified in § 1000.52(a) divided by 100, plus a six month declining average computed by totaling the value of the butterfat price for each month, starting with the second preceding month, multiplied by a factor of six and reducing the factor by one for each preceding month and dividing the sum by 21.

(l) *Butterfat price.* The butterfat price per pound, rounded to the nearest one-hundredth cent, shall be the National Agricultural Statistical Service (NASS) AA Butter survey price as reported by the Department less .079 (make allowance), with the result divided by 0.82.

(m) *Nonfat solids price.* The nonfat solids price per pound, rounded to the nearest one-hundredth cent, shall be the NASS nonfat dry milk survey price as reported by the Department less $0.125 (make allowance), with the result divided by 0.96.

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

(1) The NASS 40-lb block cheese survey price as reported by the Department less 12.7 cents, with the result multiplied by 1.32; and

(2) Multiply by 1.20 an amount computed as follows: The NASS 40-lb block cheese survey price as reported by the Department less 12.7 cents, with the result multiplied by 1.582 then reduced by the butterfat price.

(o) *Other solids price.* The other solids price per pound, rounded to the nearest one-hundredth cent, shall be the NASS dry whey survey price as reported by the Department minus 10 cents, with the result divided by 0.968.

(p) *Somatic cell adjustment.* (1) The somatic cell adjustment rate, per 1,000 somatic cells, rounded to five decimal places, shall be computed by multiplying .0005 times the monthly NASS 40-pound block cheese survey price;

(2) The somatic cell adjustment, per hundredweight, shall be determined by subtracting from 350 the somatic cell count (in thousands) of the milk, multiplying the difference by the somatic cell adjustment rate, and rounding to the nearest full cent.

§ 1000.51 [Reserved]

§ 1000.52 Adjusted Class I differentials.

The Class I differential adjusted for location to be used in § 1000.50(g) and (k) shall be as follows, except that:

(1) Under the Option 1B Revenue-Enhancement Phase-In, the differential shall be increased by $1.10 in 1999, $.70 in 2000, $.40 in 2001, and $.20 in 2002; and

(2) Under the Option 1B Revenue Neutral Phase-In, the differential shall be increased by $.55 in 1999, $.35 in 2000, $.20 in 2001, and $.10 in 2002:

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
AUTAUGA	AL	3.30	3.12	2.96	2.79	2.63	2.47
BALDWIN	AL	3.50	3.43	3.29	3.14	3.00	2.85
BARBOUR	AL	3.45	3.27	3.14	3.00	2.87	2.74
BIBB	AL	3.10	2.93	2.78	2.63	2.48	2.33
BLOUNT	AL	3.10	2.80	2.62	2.45	2.27	2.09
BULLOCK	AL	3.30	3.16	3.04	2.91	2.79	2.67
BUTLER	AL	3.45	3.26	3.11	2.97	2.82	2.68
CALHOUN	AL	3.10	2.92	2.75	2.59	2.42	2.26
CHAMBERS	AL	3.10	3.05	2.92	2.79	2.66	2.53
CHEROKEE	AL	3.10	2.82	2.66	2.51	2.35	2.19
CHILTON	AL	3.10	3.02	2.86	2.71	2.55	2.39
CHOCTAW	AL	3.30	3.23	3.06	2.90	2.73	2.56
CLARKE	AL	3.45	3.25	3.10	2.94	2.79	2.64
CLAY	AL	3.10	2.94	2.80	2.65	2.51	2.37
CLEBURNE	AL	3.10	2.93	2.78	2.63	2.48	2.33
COFFEE	AL	3.45	3.28	3.16	3.05	2.93	2.81
COLBERT	AL	2.90	2.67	2.50	2.34	2.17	2.01
CONECUH	AL	3.45	3.27	3.13	3.00	2.86	2.73
COOSA	AL	3.10	3.02	2.86	2.71	2.55	2.39
COVINGTON	AL	3.45	3.28	3.15	3.03	2.90	2.78
CRENSHAW	AL	3.45	3.26	3.12	2.97	2.83	2.69
CULLMAN	AL	3.10	2.79	2.60	2.41	2.22	2.03
DALE	AL	3.45	3.28	3.16	3.05	2.93	2.81
DALLAS	AL	3.30	3.13	2.98	2.82	2.67	2.52
DE KALB	AL	2.90	2.68	2.53	2.38	2.23	2.08
ELMORE	AL	3.30	3.12	2.96	2.81	2.65	2.49
ESCAMBIA	AL	3.45	3.28	3.16	3.04	2.92	2.80
ETOWAH	AL	3.10	2.81	2.65	2.48	2.32	2.15
FAYETTE	AL	3.10	2.83	2.68	2.54	2.39	2.24
FRANKLIN	AL	2.90	2.68	2.53	2.39	2.24	2.09
GENEVA	AL	3.45	3.29	3.19	3.08	2.98	2.87
GREENE	AL	3.10	3.03	2.88	2.72	2.57	2.42
HALE	AL	3.10	3.03	2.88	2.73	2.58	2.43
HENRY	AL	3.45	3.28	3.17	3.05	2.94	2.82
HOUSTON	AL	3.45	3.29	3.19	3.08	2.98	2.87
JACKSON	AL	2.90	2.66	2.50	2.33	2.17	2.00
JEFFERSON	AL	3.10	2.90	2.72	2.55	2.37	2.19
LAMAR	AL	3.10	2.84	2.70	2.55	2.41	2.27
LAUDERDALE	AL	2.90	2.65	2.48	2.30	2.13	1.95
LAWRENCE	AL	2.90	2.66	2.49	2.31	2.14	1.97
LEE	AL	3.30	3.06	2.95	2.83	2.72	2.60
LIMESTONE	AL	2.90	2.64	2.44	2.25	2.05	1.86
LOWNDES	AL	3.30	3.14	2.99	2.85	2.70	2.56
MACON	AL	3.30	3.14	3.01	2.87	2.74	2.60
MADISON	AL	2.90	2.64	2.44	2.25	2.05	1.86
MARENGO	AL	3.30	3.13	2.98	2.83	2.68	2.53
MARION	AL	3.10	2.81	2.65	2.48	2.32	2.15
MARSHALL	AL	2.90	2.66	2.49	2.33	2.16	1.99
MOBILE	AL	3.50	3.43	3.27	3.12	2.96	2.81
MONROE	AL	3.45	3.26	3.12	2.97	2.83	2.69
MONTGOMERY	AL	3.30	3.13	2.99	2.84	2.70	2.55
MORGAN	AL	2.90	2.65	2.47	2.30	2.12	1.94
PERRY	AL	3.10	3.03	2.89	2.74	2.60	2.45
PICKENS	AL	3.10	2.93	2.78	2.64	2.49	2.34
PIKE	AL	3.45	3.26	3.12	2.98	2.84	2.70
RANDOLPH	AL	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.69	2.56	2.43
RUSSELL	AL	3.30	3.16	3.05	2.93	2.82	2.70
SHELBY	AL	3.10	2.91	2.75	2.58	2.42	2.25
ST. CLAIR	AL	3.10	2.90	2.72	2.54	2.36	2.18
SUMTER	AL	3.10	3.04	2.90	2.75	2.61	2.47
TALLADEGA	AL	3.10	2.92	2.76	2.61	2.45	2.29
TALLAPOOSA	AL	3.10	3.04	2.90	2.76	2.62	2.48
TUSCALOOSA	AL	3.10	2.92	2.76	2.61	2.45	2.29
WALKER	AL	3.10	2.81	2.65	2.48	2.32	2.15
WASHINGTON	AL	3.45	3.25	3.11	2.96	2.82	2.67
WILCOX	AL	3.30	3.14	3.00	2.86	2.72	2.58
WINSTON	AL	3.10	2.80	2.61	2.43	2.24	2.06
ARKANSAS	AR	2.90	2.71	2.59	2.46	2.34	2.22
ASHLEY	AR	3.10	2.92	2.76	2.60	2.44	2.28
BAXTER	AR	2.60	2.36	2.17	1.97	1.78	1.59

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
BENTON	AR	2.60	2.30	2.04	1.79	1.53	1.28
BOONE	AR	2.60	2.33	2.11	1.88	1.66	1.44
BRADLEY	AR	2.90	2.82	2.66	2.50	2.34	2.18
CALHOUN	AR	2.90	2.80	2.62	2.45	2.27	2.09
CARROLL	AR	2.60	2.31	2.07	1.82	1.58	1.34
CHICOT	AR	3.10	2.93	2.78	2.64	2.49	2.34
CLARK	AR	2.90	2.64	2.45	2.27	2.08	1.89
CLAY	AR	2.60	2.42	2.30	2.17	2.05	1.92
CLEBURNE	AR	2.80	2.53	2.36	2.18	2.01	1.84
CLEVELAND	AR	2.90	2.81	2.63	2.46	2.28	2.11
COLUMBIA	AR	3.10	2.86	2.64	2.42	2.20	1.98
CONWAY	AR	2.80	2.56	2.36	2.15	1.95	1.74
CRAIGHEAD	AR	2.60	2.58	2.46	2.33	2.21	2.09
CRAWFORD	AR	2.80	2.51	2.26	2.00	1.75	1.49
CRITTENDEN	AR	2.80	2.69	2.61	2.53	2.45	2.37
CROSS	AR	2.80	2.67	2.57	2.46	2.36	2.26
DALLAS	AR	2.90	2.78	2.58	2.39	2.19	1.99
DESHA	AR	2.90	2.84	2.70	2.56	2.42	2.28
DREW	AR	2.90	2.83	2.68	2.53	2.38	2.23
FAULKNER	AR	2.80	2.59	2.41	2.22	2.04	1.86
FRANKLIN	AR	2.80	2.52	2.27	2.01	1.76	1.51
FULTON	AR	2.60	2.38	2.20	2.03	1.85	1.68
GARLAND	AR	2.80	2.58	2.39	2.19	2.00	1.81
GRANT	AR	2.90	2.66	2.50	2.33	2.17	2.00
GREENE	AR	2.60	2.44	2.33	2.23	2.12	2.01
HEMPSTEAD	AR	2.90	2.75	2.51	2.28	2.04	1.81
HOT SPRING	AR	2.90	2.64	2.45	2.27	2.08	1.89
HOWARD	AR	2.90	2.60	2.38	2.15	1.93	1.70
INDEPENDENCE	AR	2.60	2.54	2.38	2.22	2.06	1.90
IZARD	AR	2.60	2.39	2.23	2.07	1.91	1.75
JACKSON	AR	2.60	2.57	2.44	2.30	2.17	2.04
JEFFERSON	AR	2.90	2.69	2.55	2.41	2.27	2.13
JOHNSON	AR	2.80	2.47	2.24	2.02	1.79	1.56
LAFAYETTE	AR	3.10	2.84	2.60	2.35	2.11	1.87
LAWRENCE	AR	2.60	2.43	2.30	2.18	2.05	1.93
LEE	AR	2.80	2.68	2.58	2.49	2.39	2.30
LINCOLN	AR	2.90	2.82	2.66	2.51	2.35	2.19
LITTLE RIVER	AR	2.90	2.72	2.46	2.20	1.94	1.68
LOGAN	AR	2.80	2.53	2.30	2.06	1.83	1.59
LONOKE	AR	2.80	2.62	2.46	2.31	2.15	2.00
MADISON	AR	2.60	2.32	2.08	1.85	1.61	1.38
MARION	AR	2.60	2.34	2.13	1.93	1.72	1.51
MILLER	AR	3.10	2.82	2.57	2.31	2.06	1.80
MISSISSIPPI	AR	2.60	2.59	2.48	2.37	2.26	2.15
MONROE	AR	2.80	2.66	2.55	2.45	2.34	2.23
MONTGOMERY	AR	2.80	2.57	2.37	2.16	1.96	1.76
NEVADA	AR	2.90	2.77	2.55	2.34	2.12	1.91
NEWTON	AR	2.60	2.38	2.15	1.93	1.70	1.48
OUACHITA	AR	2.90	2.79	2.59	2.40	2.20	2.01
PERRY	AR	2.80	2.57	2.38	2.18	1.99	1.79
PHILLIPS	AR	2.90	2.73	2.63	2.52	2.42	2.32
PIKE	AR	2.90	2.62	2.40	2.19	1.97	1.76
POINSETT	AR	2.60	2.59	2.49	2.38	2.28	2.17
POLK	AR	2.80	2.54	2.31	2.07	1.84	1.61
POPE	AR	2.80	2.49	2.28	2.06	1.85	1.64
PRAIRIE	AR	2.80	2.64	2.52	2.39	2.27	2.14
PULASKI	AR	2.80	2.61	2.45	2.28	2.12	1.96
RANDOLPH	AR	2.60	2.41	2.27	2.12	1.98	1.84
SALINE	AR	2.80	2.60	2.43	2.26	2.09	1.92
SCOTT	AR	2.80	2.54	2.31	2.07	1.84	1.61
SEARCY	AR	2.60	2.40	2.19	1.99	1.78	1.58
SEBASTIAN	AR	2.80	2.53	2.28	2.04	1.79	1.55
SEVIER	AR	2.90	2.59	2.35	2.11	1.87	1.63
SHARP	AR	2.60	2.41	2.26	2.12	1.97	1.83
ST. FRANCIS	AR	2.80	2.68	2.58	2.49	2.39	2.30
STONE	AR	2.60	2.43	2.26	2.08	1.91	1.74
UNION	AR	3.10	2.89	2.70	2.51	2.32	2.13
VAN BUREN	AR	2.80	2.50	2.31	2.11	1.92	1.72
WASHINGTON	AR	2.60	2.31	2.07	1.82	1.58	1.34
WHITE	AR	2.80	2.61	2.46	2.30	2.15	1.99

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
WOODRUFF	AR	2.80	2.64	2.51	2.39	2.26	2.13
YELL	AR	2.80	2.55	2.33	2.12	1.90	1.68
APACHE	AZ	1.90	2.25	2.11	1.96	1.82	1.67
COCHISE	AZ	2.10	2.20	1.98	1.75	1.53	1.31
COCONINO	AZ	1.90	2.24	2.07	1.90	1.73	1.56
GILA	AZ	2.10	2.18	1.95	1.73	1.50	1.28
GRAHAM	AZ	2.10	2.28	2.03	1.79	1.54	1.30
GREENLEE	AZ	2.10	2.21	2.00	1.80	1.59	1.38
LA PAZ	AZ	2.10	2.23	2.06	1.88	1.71	1.54
MARICOPA	AZ	2.35	2.24	1.97	1.69	1.42	1.14
MOHAVE	AZ	1.90	2.10	2.00	1.90	1.80	1.70
NAVAJO	AZ	1.90	2.18	2.02	1.87	1.71	1.56
PIMA	AZ	2.35	2.37	2.10	1.82	1.55	1.28
PINAL	AZ	2.35	2.26	2.00	1.73	1.47	1.21
SANTA CRUZ	AZ	2.10	2.28	2.04	1.79	1.55	1.31
YAVAPAI	AZ	1.90	2.20	2.00	1.81	1.61	1.41
YUMA	AZ	2.10	2.25	2.08	1.92	1.75	1.58
ALAMEDA	CA	1.80	1.69	1.59	1.48	1.38	1.27
ALPINE	CA	1.70	1.53	1.36	1.20	1.03	0.86
AMADOR	CA	1.70	1.54	1.39	1.23	1.08	0.92
BUTTE	CA	1.70	1.72	1.60	1.47	1.35	1.23
CALAVERAS	CA	1.70	1.54	1.37	1.21	1.04	0.88
COLUSA	CA	1.70	1.62	1.54	1.46	1.38	1.30
CONTRA COSTA	CA	1.80	1.68	1.57	1.45	1.34	1.22
DEL NORTE	CA	1.80	1.73	1.65	1.58	1.50	1.43
EL DORADO	CA	1.70	1.55	1.39	1.24	1.08	0.93
FRESNO	CA	1.60	1.59	1.41	1.24	1.06	0.89
GLENN	CA	1.70	1.63	1.55	1.48	1.40	1.33
HUMBOLDT	CA	1.80	1.73	1.66	1.58	1.51	1.44
IMPERIAL	CA	2.00	1.92	1.84	1.77	1.69	1.61
INYO	CA	1.60	1.51	1.43	1.34	1.26	1.17
KERN	CA	1.80	1.68	1.57	1.45	1.34	1.22
KINGS	CA	1.60	1.50	1.39	1.29	1.18	1.08
LAKE	CA	1.80	1.71	1.63	1.54	1.46	1.37
LASSEN	CA	1.70	1.57	1.44	1.32	1.19	1.06
LOS ANGELES	CA	2.10	2.03	1.82	1.61	1.40	1.19
MADERA	CA	1.60	1.45	1.30	1.15	1.00	0.85
MARIN	CA	1.80	1.71	1.62	1.53	1.44	1.35
MARIPOSA	CA	1.70	1.52	1.34	1.16	0.98	0.80
MENDOCINO	CA	1.80	1.72	1.65	1.57	1.50	1.42
MERCED	CA	1.70	1.54	1.39	1.23	1.08	0.92
MODOC	CA	1.70	1.59	1.48	1.38	1.27	1.16
MONO	CA	1.60	1.45	1.30	1.14	0.99	0.84
MONTEREY	CA	1.80	1.77	1.74	1.72	1.69	1.66
NAPA	CA	1.80	1.69	1.59	1.48	1.38	1.27
NEVADA	CA	1.70	1.57	1.44	1.30	1.17	1.04
ORANGE	CA	2.10	1.93	1.76	1.60	1.43	1.26
PLACER	CA	1.70	1.56	1.41	1.27	1.12	0.98
PLUMAS	CA	1.70	1.58	1.45	1.33	1.20	1.08
RIVERSIDE	CA	2.00	1.88	1.76	1.65	1.53	1.41
SACRAMENTO	CA	1.70	1.58	1.46	1.34	1.22	1.10
SAN BENITO	CA	1.80	1.74	1.69	1.63	1.58	1.52
SAN BERNARDINO	CA	1.80	1.72	1.64	1.57	1.49	1.41
SAN DIEGO	CA	2.10	2.07	1.91	1.74	1.58	1.41
SAN FRANCISCO	CA	1.80	1.74	1.64	1.53	1.43	1.33
SAN JOAQUIN	CA	1.70	1.56	1.42	1.29	1.15	1.01
SAN LUIS OBISPO	CA	1.80	1.73	1.66	1.60	1.53	1.46
SAN MATEO	CA	1.80	1.72	1.64	1.56	1.48	1.40
SANTA BARBARA	CA	1.80	1.74	1.67	1.61	1.54	1.48
SANTA CLARA	CA	1.80	1.73	1.65	1.58	1.50	1.43
SANTA CRUZ	CA	1.80	1.75	1.70	1.65	1.60	1.55
SHASTA	CA	1.70	1.74	1.64	1.53	1.43	1.33
SIERRA	CA	1.70	1.57	1.44	1.31	1.18	1.05
SISKIYOU	CA	1.80	1.71	1.63	1.54	1.46	1.37
SOLANO	CA	1.80	1.68	1.56	1.45	1.33	1.21
SONOMA	CA	1.80	1.71	1.63	1.54	1.46	1.37
STANISLAUS	CA	1.70	1.53	1.36	1.20	1.03	0.86
SUTTER	CA	1.70	1.61	1.52	1.42	1.33	1.24
TEHAMA	CA	1.70	1.63	1.55	1.48	1.40	1.33
TRINITY	CA	1.80	1.72	1.65	1.57	1.50	1.42

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
TULARE	CA	1.60	1.48	1.37	1.25	1.14	1.02
TUOLUMNE	CA	1.70	1.52	1.35	1.17	1.00	0.82
VENTURA	CA	1.80	1.71	1.61	1.52	1.42	1.33
YOLO	CA	1.70	1.60	1.50	1.39	1.29	1.19
YUBA	CA	1.70	1.60	1.50	1.39	1.29	1.19
ADAMS	CO	2.55	2.40	2.07	1.75	1.42	1.09
ALAMOSA	CO	1.90	2.35	2.20	2.05	1.90	1.75
ARAPAHOE	CO	2.55	2.42	2.11	1.79	1.48	1.17
ARCHULETA	CO	1.90	1.73	1.76	1.80	1.83	1.86
BACA	CO	2.35	2.29	2.08	1.86	1.65	1.44
BENT	CO	2.35	2.35	2.11	1.86	1.62	1.37
BOULDER	CO	2.45	2.31	2.01	1.72	1.42	1.13
CHAFFEE	CO	1.90	2.31	2.12	1.92	1.73	1.54
CHEYENNE	CO	2.35	2.25	2.00	1.74	1.49	1.24
CLEAR CREEK	CO	2.45	2.33	2.06	1.78	1.51	1.24
CONEJOS	CO	1.90	2.29	2.18	2.06	1.95	1.84
COSTILLA	CO	1.90	2.35	2.20	2.04	1.89	1.74
CROWLEY	CO	2.45	2.47	2.20	1.94	1.67	1.41
CUSTER	CO	2.45	2.39	2.18	1.98	1.77	1.56
DELTA	CO	2.00	1.95	1.89	1.84	1.78	1.73
DENVER	CO	2.55	2.41	2.09	1.78	1.46	1.14
DOLORES	CO	1.90	1.80	1.80	1.80	1.80	1.80
DOUGLAS	CO	2.55	2.43	2.13	1.83	1.53	1.23
EAGLE	CO	1.90	1.72	1.64	1.56	1.48	1.40
EL PASO	CO	2.45	2.43	2.13	1.83	1.53	1.23
ELBERT	CO	2.55	2.45	2.18	1.90	1.63	1.35
FREMONT	CO	2.45	2.38	2.16	1.94	1.72	1.50
GARFIELD	CO	2.00	1.92	1.83	1.75	1.66	1.58
GILPIN	CO	2.45	2.32	2.04	1.76	1.48	1.20
GRAND	CO	1.90	2.25	2.00	1.74	1.49	1.24
GUNNISON	CO	1.90	1.77	1.74	1.70	1.67	1.64
HINSDALE	CO	1.90	1.79	1.78	1.78	1.77	1.76
HUERFANO	CO	2.45	2.40	2.21	2.01	1.82	1.62
JACKSON	CO	1.90	2.24	1.98	1.72	1.46	1.20
JEFFERSON	CO	2.55	2.43	2.13	1.82	1.52	1.22
KIOWA	CO	2.35	2.34	2.08	1.83	1.57	1.31
KIT CARSON	CO	2.35	2.24	1.97	1.71	1.44	1.18
LA PLATA	CO	1.90	2.29	2.08	1.87	1.66	1.45
LAKE	CO	1.90	1.73	1.76	1.78	1.81	1.84
LARIMER	CO	2.45	2.30	2.00	1.69	1.39	1.09
LAS ANIMAS	CO	2.35	2.41	2.22	2.04	1.85	1.66
LINCOLN	CO	2.45	2.33	2.06	1.78	1.51	1.24
LOGAN	CO	2.35	2.21	1.91	1.62	1.32	1.03
MESA	CO	2.00	1.95	1.89	1.84	1.78	1.73
MINERAL	CO	1.90	1.71	1.73	1.74	1.76	1.77
MOFFAT	CO	1.90	1.71	1.62	1.53	1.44	1.35
MONTEZUMA	CO	1.90	1.72	1.74	1.77	1.79	1.81
MONTROSE	CO	2.00	1.96	1.91	1.87	1.82	1.78
MORGAN	CO	2.35	2.29	1.98	1.66	1.35	1.04
OTERO	CO	2.45	2.47	2.21	1.95	1.69	1.43
OURAY	CO	1.90	1.80	1.80	1.79	1.79	1.79
PARK	CO	2.45	2.35	2.10	1.85	1.60	1.35
PHILLIPS	CO	2.35	2.13	1.87	1.60	1.34	1.07
PITKIN	CO	1.90	1.74	1.68	1.63	1.57	1.51
PROWERS	CO	2.35	2.27	2.04	1.80	1.57	1.34
PUEBLO	CO	2.45	2.48	2.23	1.99	1.74	1.49
RIO BLANCO	CO	1.90	1.73	1.66	1.60	1.53	1.46
RIO GRANDE	CO	1.90	2.27	2.15	2.02	1.90	1.77
ROUTT	CO	1.90	1.70	1.60	1.50	1.40	1.30
SAGUACHE	CO	1.90	1.69	1.67	1.66	1.64	1.63
SAN JUAN	CO	1.90	1.80	1.80	1.80	1.80	1.80
SAN MIGUEL	CO	1.90	1.80	1.80	1.80	1.80	1.80
SEDGWICK	CO	2.35	2.13	1.85	1.58	1.30	1.03
SUMMIT	CO	1.90	2.27	2.04	1.80	1.57	1.34
TELLER	CO	2.45	2.46	2.20	1.93	1.67	1.40
WASHINGTON	CO	2.35	2.30	1.99	1.69	1.38	1.08
WELD	CO	2.45	2.28	1.96	1.63	1.31	0.99
YUMA	CO	2.35	2.22	1.95	1.67	1.40	1.12
FAIRFIELD	CT	3.10	2.91	2.72	2.54	2.35	2.17
HARTFORD	CT	3.10	2.92	2.70	2.47	2.25	2.03

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
LITCHFIELD	CT	3.00	2.91	2.68	2.44	2.21	1.98
MIDDLESEX	CT	3.10	2.97	2.77	2.58	2.38	2.18
NEW HAVEN	CT	3.10	2.95	2.75	2.56	2.36	2.17
NEW LONDON	CT	3.10	2.99	2.80	2.62	2.43	2.25
TOLLAND	CT	3.10	2.97	2.76	2.54	2.33	2.11
WINDHAM	CT	3.10	3.00	2.80	2.61	2.41	2.22
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	DC	3.00	2.74	2.45	2.17	1.88	1.59
KENT	DE	3.00	2.69	2.47	2.25	2.03	1.81
NEW CASTLE	DE	3.00	2.81	2.53	2.24	1.96	1.68
SUSSEX	DE	3.00	2.68	2.49	2.29	2.10	1.91
ALACHUA	FL	3.70	3.55	3.52	3.50	3.47	3.44
BAKER	FL	3.70	3.52	3.47	3.41	3.36	3.30
BAY	FL	3.70	3.47	3.37	3.26	3.16	3.05
BRADFORD	FL	3.70	3.54	3.51	3.47	3.44	3.40
BREVARD	FL	4.00	3.86	3.84	3.83	3.81	3.79
BROWARD	FL	4.30	4.19	4.20	4.20	4.21	4.22
CALHOUN	FL	3.70	3.47	3.36	3.26	3.15	3.04
CHARLOTTE	FL	4.30	3.91	3.95	3.98	4.02	4.05
CITRUS	FL	4.00	3.82	3.77	3.71	3.66	3.60
CLAY	FL	3.70	3.55	3.51	3.48	3.44	3.41
COLLIER	FL	4.30	3.94	4.00	4.07	4.13	4.19
COLUMBIA	FL	3.70	3.52	3.47	3.41	3.36	3.30
DADE	FL	4.30	4.20	4.22	4.25	4.27	4.29
DE SOTO	FL	4.30	3.91	3.93	3.96	3.98	4.01
DIXIE	FL	3.70	3.54	3.50	3.45	3.41	3.37
DUVAL	FL	3.70	3.54	3.49	3.45	3.40	3.36
ESCAMBIA	FL	3.45	3.44	3.30	3.16	3.02	2.88
FLAGLER	FL	4.00	3.81	3.74	3.68	3.61	3.54
FRANKLIN	FL	3.70	3.50	3.42	3.35	3.27	3.19
GADSDEN	FL	3.70	3.48	3.37	3.27	3.16	3.06
GILCHRIST	FL	3.70	3.54	3.50	3.47	3.43	3.39
GLADES	FL	4.30	4.16	4.14	4.11	4.09	4.07
GULF	FL	3.70	3.49	3.40	3.30	3.21	3.12
HAMILTON	FL	3.70	3.50	3.42	3.35	3.27	3.19
HARDEE	FL	4.30	3.89	3.91	3.92	3.94	3.95
HENDRY	FL	4.30	4.17	4.15	4.14	4.12	4.11
HERNANDO	FL	4.00	3.84	3.80	3.77	3.73	3.69
HIGHLANDS	FL	4.30	3.90	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.98
HILLSBOROUGH	FL	4.00	3.87	3.85	3.84	3.82	3.81
HOLMES	FL	3.70	3.45	3.31	3.18	3.04	2.91
INDIAN RIVER	FL	4.00	4.13	4.07	4.02	3.96	3.91
JACKSON	FL	3.70	3.46	3.33	3.21	3.08	2.96
JEFFERSON	FL	3.70	3.49	3.40	3.32	3.23	3.14
LAFAYETTE	FL	3.70	3.55	3.52	3.48	3.45	3.42
LAKE	FL	4.00	3.84	3.80	3.75	3.71	3.67
LEE	FL	4.30	3.92	3.97	4.01	4.06	4.10
LEON	FL	3.70	3.49	3.39	3.30	3.20	3.11
LEVY	FL	4.00	3.80	3.72	3.64	3.56	3.48
LIBERTY	FL	3.70	3.48	3.39	3.29	3.20	3.10
MADISON	FL	3.70	3.49	3.40	3.30	3.21	3.12
MANATEE	FL	4.30	3.89	3.91	3.92	3.94	3.95
MARION	FL	4.00	3.81	3.75	3.68	3.62	3.55
MARTIN	FL	4.30	4.15	4.12	4.09	4.06	4.03
MONROE	FL	4.30	4.21	4.23	4.26	4.28	4.31
NASSAU	FL	3.70	3.51	3.45	3.38	3.32	3.25
OKALOOSA	FL	3.45	3.44	3.30	3.17	3.03	2.89
OKEECHOBEE	FL	4.30	4.14	4.11	4.07	4.04	4.00
ORANGE	FL	4.00	3.85	3.82	3.78	3.75	3.72
OSCEOLA	FL	4.00	3.87	3.86	3.84	3.83	3.82
PALM BEACH	FL	4.30	4.17	4.16	4.14	4.13	4.12
PASCO	FL	4.00	3.85	3.82	3.78	3.75	3.72
PINELLAS	FL	4.00	3.87	3.85	3.84	3.82	3.81
POLK	FL	4.00	3.87	3.86	3.85	3.84	3.83
PUTNAM	FL	3.70	3.57	3.55	3.54	3.52	3.51
SANTA ROSA	FL	3.45	3.44	3.30	3.16	3.02	2.88
SARASOTA	FL	4.30	3.90	3.93	3.95	3.98	4.00
SEMINOLE	FL	4.00	3.84	3.80	3.77	3.73	3.69
ST. JOHNS	FL	3.70	3.55	3.53	3.50	3.48	3.45
ST. LUCIE	FL	4.30	4.14	4.10	4.05	4.01	3.97
SUMTER	FL	4.00	3.83	3.79	3.74	3.70	3.65

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
SUWANNEE	FL	3.70	3.51	3.45	3.38	3.32	3.25
TAYLOR	FL	3.70	3.51	3.44	3.37	3.30	3.23
UNION	FL	3.70	3.53	3.49	3.44	3.40	3.35
VOLUSIA	FL	4.00	3.83	3.78	3.72	3.67	3.62
WAKULLA	FL	3.70	3.50	3.41	3.33	3.24	3.16
WALTON	FL	3.45	3.45	3.32	3.20	3.07	2.94
WASHINGTON	FL	3.70	3.46	3.33	3.21	3.08	2.96
APPLING	GA	3.45	3.28	3.17	3.05	2.94	2.82
ATKINSON	GA	3.45	3.31	3.22	3.12	3.03	2.94
BACON	GA	3.45	3.30	3.20	3.11	3.01	2.91
BAKER	GA	3.45	3.30	3.19	3.09	2.98	2.88
BALDWIN	GA	3.10	3.03	2.88	2.72	2.57	2.42
BANKS	GA	3.10	2.93	2.77	2.62	2.46	2.31
BARROW	GA	3.10	2.94	2.81	2.67	2.54	2.40
BARTOW	GA	3.10	2.85	2.72	2.58	2.45	2.32
BEN HILL	GA	3.45	3.28	3.16	3.03	2.91	2.79
BERRIEN	GA	3.45	3.31	3.22	3.12	3.03	2.94
BIBB	GA	3.30	3.02	2.86	2.70	2.54	2.38
BLECKLEY	GA	3.30	3.13	2.98	2.84	2.69	2.54
BRANTLEY	GA	3.45	3.33	3.26	3.20	3.13	3.06
BROOKS	GA	3.45	3.33	3.26	3.18	3.11	3.04
BRYAN	GA	3.45	3.29	3.18	3.07	2.96	2.85
BULLOCH	GA	3.30	3.16	3.04	2.93	2.81	2.69
BURKE	GA	3.30	3.05	2.91	2.78	2.64	2.51
BUTTS	GA	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.70	2.57	2.44
CALHOUN	GA	3.45	3.29	3.18	3.06	2.95	2.84
CAMDEN	GA	3.45	3.36	3.31	3.27	3.22	3.18
CANDLER	GA	3.30	3.16	3.04	2.93	2.81	2.69
CARROLL	GA	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.68	2.55	2.42
CATOOSA	GA	2.80	2.64	2.51	2.38	2.25	2.12
CHARLTON	GA	3.45	3.36	3.32	3.27	3.23	3.19
CHATHAM	GA	3.45	3.30	3.20	3.09	2.99	2.89
CHATTAHOOCHEE	GA	3.30	3.16	3.05	2.93	2.82	2.70
CHATTOOGA	GA	2.80	2.65	2.53	2.42	2.30	2.18
CHEROKEE	GA	3.10	2.86	2.73	2.61	2.48	2.36
CLARKE	GA	3.10	2.94	2.80	2.67	2.53	2.39
CLAY	GA	3.45	3.28	3.16	3.04	2.92	2.80
CLAYTON	GA	3.10	2.96	2.84	2.72	2.60	2.48
CLINCH	GA	3.45	3.34	3.27	3.21	3.14	3.08
COBB	GA	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.69	2.56	2.43
COFFEE	GA	3.45	3.30	3.19	3.09	2.98	2.88
COLQUITT	GA	3.45	3.31	3.21	3.12	3.02	2.93
COLUMBIA	GA	3.10	3.02	2.86	2.71	2.55	2.39
COOK	GA	3.45	3.31	3.22	3.13	3.04	2.95
COWETA	GA	3.10	2.96	2.84	2.71	2.59	2.47
CRAWFORD	GA	3.30	3.04	2.90	2.77	2.63	2.49
CRISP	GA	3.45	3.17	3.06	2.95	2.84	2.73
DADE	GA	2.80	2.64	2.50	2.37	2.23	2.10
DAWSON	GA	3.10	2.85	2.71	2.58	2.44	2.31
DE KALB	GA	3.45	3.32	3.24	3.15	3.07	2.99
DECATUR	GA	3.10	2.96	2.83	2.71	2.58	2.46
DODGE	GA	3.45	3.15	3.02	2.89	2.76	2.63
DOOLY	GA	3.45	3.15	3.02	2.89	2.76	2.63
DOUGHERTY	GA	3.45	3.29	3.17	3.06	2.94	2.83
DOUGLAS	GA	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.70	2.57	2.44
EARLY	GA	3.45	3.30	3.19	3.09	2.98	2.88
ECHOLS	GA	3.45	3.34	3.29	3.23	3.18	3.12
EFFINGHAM	GA	3.30	3.17	3.06	2.95	2.84	2.73
ELBERT	GA	3.10	2.92	2.77	2.61	2.46	2.30
EMANUEL	GA	3.30	3.14	3.01	2.87	2.74	2.60
EVANS	GA	3.45	3.18	3.08	2.97	2.87	2.77
FANNIN	GA	2.80	2.65	2.53	2.42	2.30	2.18
FAYETTE	GA	3.10	2.96	2.84	2.72	2.60	2.48
FLOYD	GA	3.10	2.84	2.69	2.55	2.40	2.26
FORSYTH	GA	3.10	2.94	2.79	2.65	2.50	2.36
FRANKLIN	GA	3.10	2.92	2.76	2.59	2.43	2.27
FULTON	GA	3.10	2.96	2.83	2.71	2.58	2.46
GILMER	GA	3.10	2.71	2.59	2.46	2.34	2.22
GLASCOCK	GA	3.10	3.03	2.88	2.74	2.59	2.44
GLYNN	GA	3.45	3.34	3.28	3.22	3.16	3.10

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
GORDON	GA	3.10	2.83	2.68	2.54	2.39	2.24
GRADY	GA	3.45	3.32	3.24	3.15	3.07	2.99
GREENE	GA	3.10	2.94	2.81	2.67	2.54	2.40
GWINNETT	GA	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.69	2.56	2.43
HABERSHAM	GA	3.10	2.83	2.68	2.54	2.39	2.24
HALL	GA	3.10	2.93	2.78	2.64	2.49	2.34
HANCOCK	GA	3.10	3.03	2.88	2.72	2.57	2.42
HARALSON	GA	3.10	2.93	2.79	2.64	2.50	2.35
HARRIS	GA	3.30	3.06	2.95	2.83	2.72	2.60
HART	GA	3.10	2.92	2.75	2.59	2.42	2.26
HEARD	GA	3.10	2.96	2.83	2.71	2.58	2.46
HENRY	GA	3.10	2.96	2.84	2.71	2.59	2.47
HOUSTON	GA	3.30	3.12	2.96	2.81	2.65	2.49
IRWIN	GA	3.45	3.28	3.17	3.05	2.94	2.82
JACKSON	GA	3.10	2.94	2.79	2.65	2.50	2.36
JASPER	GA	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.68	2.55	2.42
JEFF DAVIS	GA	3.45	3.28	3.16	3.05	2.93	2.81
JEFFERSON	GA	3.30	3.04	2.90	2.76	2.62	2.48
JENKINS	GA	3.30	3.14	3.00	2.87	2.73	2.59
JOHNSON	GA	3.30	3.13	2.99	2.84	2.70	2.55
JONES	GA	3.10	3.02	2.86	2.71	2.55	2.39
LAMAR	GA	3.10	3.04	2.90	2.75	2.61	2.47
LANIER	GA	3.45	3.33	3.26	3.18	3.11	3.04
LAURENS	GA	3.30	3.14	3.00	2.85	2.71	2.57
LEE	GA	3.45	3.28	3.15	3.03	2.90	2.78
LIBERTY	GA	3.45	3.30	3.20	3.09	2.99	2.89
LINCOLN	GA	3.10	2.93	2.79	2.64	2.50	2.35
LONG	GA	3.45	3.30	3.20	3.09	2.99	2.89
LOWNDES	GA	3.45	3.33	3.26	3.18	3.11	3.04
LUMPKIN	GA	3.10	2.84	2.70	2.55	2.41	2.27
MACON	GA	3.10	3.02	2.87	2.71	2.56	2.40
MADISON	GA	3.45	3.32	3.24	3.15	3.07	2.99
MARION	GA	3.30	3.15	3.01	2.88	2.74	2.61
MCDUFFIE	GA	3.10	2.93	2.79	2.64	2.50	2.35
MCINTOSH	GA	3.30	3.16	3.03	2.91	2.78	2.66
MERIWETHER	GA	3.10	3.05	2.92	2.79	2.66	2.53
MILLER	GA	3.45	3.30	3.20	3.11	3.01	2.91
MITCHELL	GA	3.45	3.30	3.20	3.11	3.01	2.91
MONROE	GA	3.10	3.03	2.88	2.73	2.58	2.43
MONTGOMERY	GA	3.45	3.17	3.05	2.94	2.82	2.71
MORGAN	GA	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.68	2.55	2.42
MURRAY	GA	2.80	2.66	2.54	2.43	2.31	2.20
MUSCOGEE	GA	3.30	3.08	2.98	2.87	2.77	2.67
NEWTON	GA	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.70	2.57	2.44
OCONEE	GA	3.10	2.94	2.81	2.67	2.54	2.40
OGLETHORPE	GA	3.10	2.94	2.79	2.65	2.50	2.36
PAULDING	GA	3.10	2.94	2.81	2.67	2.54	2.40
PEACH	GA	3.30	3.12	2.97	2.81	2.66	2.50
PICKENS	GA	3.10	2.84	2.70	2.57	2.43	2.29
PIERCE	GA	3.45	3.32	3.24	3.15	3.07	2.99
PIKE	GA	3.10	3.04	2.91	2.77	2.64	2.50
POLK	GA	3.10	2.92	2.77	2.61	2.46	2.30
PULASKI	GA	3.45	3.14	3.01	2.87	2.74	2.60
PUTNAM	GA	3.10	2.95	2.81	2.68	2.54	2.41
QUITMAN	GA	3.45	3.27	3.14	3.02	2.89	2.76
RABUN	GA	3.10	2.81	2.65	2.48	2.32	2.15
RANDOLPH	GA	3.45	3.28	3.16	3.03	2.91	2.79
RICHMOND	GA	3.30	3.03	2.88	2.72	2.57	2.42
ROCKDALE	GA	3.10	2.95	2.83	2.70	2.58	2.45
SCHLEY	GA	3.30	3.16	3.03	2.91	2.78	2.66
SCREVEN	GA	3.30	3.15	3.02	2.88	2.75	2.62
SEMINOLE	GA	3.45	3.31	3.22	3.12	3.03	2.94
SPALDING	GA	3.10	2.96	2.84	2.72	2.60	2.48
STEPHENS	GA	3.10	2.91	2.75	2.58	2.42	2.25
STEWART	GA	3.45	3.17	3.06	2.95	2.84	2.73
SUMTER	GA	3.45	3.16	3.05	2.93	2.82	2.70
TALBOT	GA	3.30	3.06	2.94	2.81	2.69	2.57
TALIAFERRO	GA	3.10	2.94	2.81	2.67	2.54	2.40
TATTNALL	GA	3.45	3.18	3.09	2.99	2.90	2.80
TAYLOR	GA	3.30	3.06	2.94	2.82	2.70	2.58

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFEREN-TIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
TELFAIR	GA	3.45	3.17	3.07	2.96	2.86	2.75
TERRELL	GA	3.45	3.28	3.15	3.03	2.90	2.78
THOMAS	GA	3.45	3.32	3.25	3.17	3.10	3.02
TIFT	GA	3.45	3.29	3.18	3.08	2.97	2.86
TOOMBS	GA	3.45	3.17	3.06	2.94	2.83	2.72
TOWNS	GA	3.10	2.70	2.56	2.43	2.29	2.16
TREUTLEN	GA	3.30	3.15	3.02	2.88	2.75	2.62
TROUP	GA	3.10	3.05	2.91	2.78	2.64	2.51
TURNER	GA	3.45	3.28	3.16	3.03	2.91	2.79
TWIGGS	GA	3.30	3.04	2.90	2.75	2.61	2.47
UNION	GA	3.10	2.70	2.57	2.45	2.32	2.19
UPSON	GA	3.10	3.05	2.91	2.78	2.64	2.51
WALKER	GA	2.80	2.64	2.51	2.39	2.26	2.13
WALTON	GA	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.68	2.55	2.42
WARE	GA	3.45	3.32	3.25	3.17	3.10	3.02
WARREN	GA	3.10	3.03	2.87	2.72	2.56	2.41
WASHINGTON	GA	3.30	3.04	2.90	2.75	2.61	2.47
WAYNE	GA	3.45	3.31	3.21	3.12	3.02	2.93
WEBSTER	GA	3.45	3.17	3.06	2.96	2.85	2.74
WHEELER	GA	3.45	3.16	3.05	2.93	2.82	2.70
WHITE	GA	3.10	2.84	2.70	2.55	2.41	2.27
WHITFIELD	GA	2.80	2.65	2.53	2.42	2.30	2.18
WILCOX	GA	3.45	3.17	3.05	2.94	2.82	2.71
WILKES	GA	3.10	2.94	2.79	2.65	2.50	2.36
WILKINSON	GA	3.30	3.03	2.89	2.74	2.60	2.45
WORTH	GA	3.45	3.29	3.18	3.06	2.95	2.84
ADAIR	IA	1.80	1.55	1.54	1.54	1.53	1.53
ADAMS	IA	1.80	1.55	1.55	1.54	1.54	1.54
ALLAMAKEE	IA	1.75	1.23	1.21	1.18	1.16	1.13
APPANOOSE	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.51	1.50	1.49
AUDUBON	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.53	1.52	1.51
BENTON	IA	1.80	1.48	1.48	1.47	1.47	1.47
BLACK HAWK	IA	1.75	1.37	1.36	1.36	1.35	1.34
BOONE	IA	1.80	1.53	1.51	1.49	1.47	1.45
BREMER	IA	1.75	1.33	1.31	1.29	1.28	1.26
BUCHANAN	IA	1.75	1.38	1.37	1.35	1.34	1.32
BUENA VISTA	IA	1.75	1.50	1.46	1.41	1.37	1.32
BUTLER	IA	1.75	1.38	1.37	1.35	1.34	1.32
CALHOUN	IA	1.75	1.52	1.49	1.46	1.43	1.40
CARROLL	IA	1.80	1.53	1.51	1.49	1.47	1.45
CASS	IA	1.80	1.71	1.67	1.62	1.58	1.54
CEDAR	IA	1.80	1.48	1.49	1.49	1.50	1.50
CERRO GORDO	IA	1.75	1.30	1.28	1.27	1.25	1.24
CHEROKEE	IA	1.75	1.66	1.57	1.48	1.39	1.30
CHICKASAW	IA	1.75	1.29	1.27	1.24	1.22	1.20
CLARKE	IA	1.80	1.54	1.54	1.53	1.53	1.52
CLAY	IA	1.75	1.22	1.24	1.26	1.27	1.29
CLAYTON	IA	1.75	1.29	1.24	1.20	1.16	1.12
CLINTON	IA	1.80	1.47	1.46	1.46	1.45	1.44
CRAWFORD	IA	1.80	1.69	1.63	1.56	1.50	1.44
DALLAS	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.52	1.51	1.50
DAVIS	IA	1.80	1.54	1.52	1.51	1.49	1.48
DECATUR	IA	1.80	1.54	1.54	1.53	1.53	1.52
DELAWARE	IA	1.75	1.34	1.31	1.29	1.26	1.24
DES MOINES	IA	1.80	1.55	1.54	1.54	1.53	1.53
DICKINSON	IA	1.75	1.20	1.21	1.23	1.24	1.25
DUBUQUE	IA	1.75	1.34	1.31	1.29	1.26	1.24
EMMET	IA	1.75	1.22	1.22	1.23	1.24	1.25
FAYETTE	IA	1.75	1.33	1.29	1.25	1.20	1.16
FLOYD	IA	1.75	1.31	1.29	1.27	1.25	1.23
FRANKLIN	IA	1.75	1.35	1.35	1.34	1.34	1.33
FREMONT	IA	1.85	1.71	1.67	1.62	1.58	1.54
GREENE	IA	1.80	1.53	1.51	1.49	1.47	1.45
GRUNDY	IA	1.75	1.40	1.40	1.39	1.38	1.37
GUTHRIE	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.52	1.51	1.50
HAMILTON	IA	1.75	1.42	1.41	1.41	1.40	1.39
HANCOCK	IA	1.75	1.33	1.32	1.31	1.29	1.28
HARDIN	IA	1.75	1.41	1.40	1.39	1.39	1.38
HARRISON	IA	1.80	1.70	1.65	1.60	1.55	1.50
HENRY	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.52	1.51	1.50

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFEREN-TIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
HOWARD	IA	1.75	1.19	1.18	1.17	1.16	1.15
HUMBOLDT	IA	1.75	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34
IDA	IA	1.75	1.67	1.60	1.52	1.45	1.37
IOWA	IA	1.80	1.49	1.49	1.50	1.50	1.51
JACKSON	IA	1.80	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38
JASPER	IA	1.80	1.54	1.52	1.51	1.49	1.48
JEFFERSON	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.51	1.50	1.49
JOHNSON	IA	1.80	1.49	1.49	1.50	1.50	1.51
JONES	IA	1.80	1.47	1.45	1.44	1.42	1.41
KEOKUK	IA	1.80	1.48	1.49	1.49	1.50	1.50
KOSSUTH	IA	1.75	1.22	1.23	1.25	1.26	1.28
LEE	IA	1.80	1.53	1.52	1.50	1.49	1.47
LINN	IA	1.80	1.48	1.49	1.49	1.50	1.50
LOUISA	IA	1.80	1.49	1.50	1.50	1.51	1.52
LUCAS	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.53	1.52	1.51
LYON	IA	1.75	1.44	1.39	1.33	1.28	1.22
MADISON	IA	1.80	1.54	1.54	1.53	1.53	1.52
MAHASKA	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.52	1.51	1.50
MARION	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.52	1.51	1.50
MARSHALL	IA	1.80	1.47	1.47	1.46	1.46	1.45
MILLS	IA	1.85	1.71	1.67	1.64	1.60	1.56
MITCHELL	IA	1.75	1.20	1.19	1.19	1.18	1.18
MONONA	IA	1.80	1.68	1.61	1.54	1.47	1.40
MONROE	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.51	1.50	1.49
MONTGOMERY	IA	1.80	1.71	1.67	1.64	1.60	1.56
MUSCATINE	IA	1.80	1.49	1.50	1.51	1.52	1.53
O'BRIEN	IA	1.75	1.45	1.41	1.36	1.32	1.27
OSCEOLA	IA	1.75	1.43	1.38	1.34	1.29	1.24
PAGE	IA	1.80	1.71	1.67	1.63	1.59	1.55
PALO ALTO	IA	1.75	1.27	1.27	1.28	1.28	1.29
PLYMOUTH	IA	1.75	1.50	1.44	1.38	1.32	1.26
POCAHONTAS	IA	1.75	1.30	1.31	1.32	1.33	1.34
POLK	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.52	1.51	1.50
POTTAWATTAMIE	IA	1.85	1.71	1.67	1.64	1.60	1.56
POWESHIEK	IA	1.80	1.48	1.48	1.49	1.49	1.49
RINGGOLD	IA	1.80	1.55	1.54	1.54	1.53	1.53
SAC	IA	1.75	1.68	1.61	1.54	1.47	1.40
SCOTT	IA	1.80	1.49	1.50	1.52	1.53	1.54
SHELBY	IA	1.80	1.70	1.65	1.61	1.56	1.51
SIOUX	IA	1.75	1.65	1.55	1.44	1.34	1.24
STORY	IA	1.80	1.53	1.51	1.49	1.47	1.45
TAMA	IA	1.80	1.47	1.46	1.46	1.45	1.44
TAYLOR	IA	1.80	1.55	1.55	1.54	1.54	1.54
UNION	IA	1.80	1.55	1.54	1.54	1.53	1.53
VAN BUREN	IA	1.80	1.53	1.51	1.50	1.48	1.46
WAPELLO	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.51	1.50	1.49
WARREN	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.53	1.52	1.51
WASHINGTON	IA	1.80	1.49	1.49	1.50	1.50	1.51
WAYNE	IA	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.52	1.51	1.50
WEBSTER	IA	1.75	1.48	1.46	1.44	1.42	1.40
WINNEBAGO	IA	1.75	1.20	1.21	1.21	1.22	1.22
WINNESHIEK	IA	1.75	1.19	1.18	1.16	1.15	1.14
WOODBURY	IA	1.75	1.55	1.49	1.44	1.38	1.32
WORTH	IA	1.75	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20
WRIGHT	IA	1.75	1.37	1.36	1.35	1.34	1.33
ADA	ID	1.60	1.31	1.21	1.12	1.02	0.93
ADAMS	ID	1.60	1.16	1.12	1.07	1.03	0.99
BANNOCK	ID	1.60	1.52	1.39	1.25	1.12	0.99
BEAR LAKE	ID	1.60	1.52	1.39	1.27	1.14	1.01
BENEWAH	ID	1.90	1.72	1.54	1.35	1.17	0.99
BINGHAM	ID	1.60	1.47	1.34	1.20	1.07	0.94
BLAINE	ID	1.60	1.39	1.28	1.17	1.06	0.95
BOISE	ID	1.60	1.39	1.28	1.16	1.05	0.94
BONNER	ID	1.90	1.72	1.53	1.35	1.16	0.98
BONNEVILLE	ID	1.60	1.46	1.32	1.19	1.05	0.91
BOUNDARY	ID	1.90	1.72	1.55	1.37	1.20	1.02
BUTTE	ID	1.60	1.39	1.27	1.16	1.04	0.93
CAMAS	ID	1.60	1.39	1.28	1.16	1.05	0.94
CANYON	ID	1.60	1.27	1.19	1.10	1.02	0.94
CARIBOU	ID	1.60	1.51	1.38	1.24	1.11	0.97

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
CASSIA	ID	1.60	1.52	1.38	1.25	1.11	0.98
CLARK	ID	1.60	1.42	1.29	1.15	1.02	0.89
CLEARWATER	ID	1.60	1.73	1.57	1.40	1.24	1.07
CUSTER	ID	1.60	1.39	1.28	1.18	1.07	0.96
ELMORE	ID	1.60	1.35	1.24	1.14	1.03	0.93
FRANKLIN	ID	1.60	1.52	1.40	1.27	1.15	1.02
FREMONT	ID	1.60	1.46	1.31	1.17	1.02	0.88
GEM	ID	1.60	1.27	1.19	1.10	1.02	0.94
GOODING	ID	1.60	1.39	1.28	1.17	1.06	0.95
IDAHO	ID	1.60	1.61	1.47	1.34	1.20	1.06
JEFFERSON	ID	1.60	1.46	1.32	1.18	1.04	0.90
JEROME	ID	1.60	1.39	1.28	1.18	1.07	0.96
KOOTENAI	ID	1.90	1.71	1.53	1.34	1.16	0.97
LATAH	ID	1.90	1.72	1.54	1.35	1.17	0.99
LEMHI	ID	1.60	1.40	1.30	1.20	1.10	1.00
LEWIS	ID	1.60	1.61	1.46	1.32	1.17	1.03
LINCOLN	ID	1.60	1.47	1.34	1.21	1.08	0.95
MADISON	ID	1.60	1.46	1.32	1.17	1.03	0.89
MINIDOKA	ID	1.60	1.47	1.35	1.22	1.10	0.97
NEZ PERCE	ID	1.60	1.60	1.45	1.31	1.16	1.01
ONEIDA	ID	1.60	1.52	1.39	1.27	1.14	1.01
OWYHEE	ID	1.60	1.29	1.21	1.12	1.04	0.95
PAYETTE	ID	1.60	1.23	1.16	1.09	1.02	0.95
POWER	ID	1.60	1.52	1.38	1.25	1.11	0.98
SHOSHONE	ID	1.90	1.73	1.56	1.39	1.22	1.05
TETON	ID	1.60	1.36	1.25	1.13	1.02	0.90
TWIN FALLS	ID	1.60	1.45	1.33	1.20	1.08	0.96
VALLEY	ID	1.60	1.40	1.30	1.19	1.09	0.99
WASHINGTON	ID	1.60	1.22	1.16	1.09	1.03	0.96
ADAMS	IL	1.80	1.68	1.61	1.54	1.47	1.40
ALEXANDER	IL	2.20	2.03	1.97	1.90	1.84	1.77
BOND	IL	2.00	1.85	1.78	1.70	1.63	1.56
BOONE	IL	1.75	1.32	1.33	1.35	1.36	1.37
BROWN	IL	1.80	1.70	1.66	1.61	1.57	1.52
BUREAU	IL	1.80	1.61	1.62	1.62	1.63	1.63
CALHOUN	IL	2.00	1.86	1.79	1.73	1.66	1.60
CARROLL	IL	1.80	1.78	1.68	1.58	1.48	1.38
CASS	IL	1.80	1.61	1.61	1.62	1.62	1.62
CHAMPAIGN	IL	1.80	1.72	1.69	1.67	1.64	1.61
CHRISTIAN	IL	2.00	1.86	1.80	1.75	1.69	1.63
CLARK	IL	2.00	1.84	1.76	1.68	1.60	1.52
CLAY	IL	2.00	1.84	1.75	1.67	1.58	1.50
CLINTON	IL	2.00	1.84	1.77	1.69	1.62	1.54
COLES	IL	2.00	1.85	1.77	1.70	1.62	1.55
COOK	IL	1.80	1.45	1.50	1.55	1.60	1.65
CRAWFORD	IL	2.00	1.84	1.76	1.67	1.59	1.51
CUMBERLAND	IL	2.00	1.84	1.76	1.69	1.61	1.53
DE KALB	IL	1.80	1.35	1.39	1.42	1.46	1.50
DE WITT	IL	1.80	1.74	1.74	1.73	1.73	1.72
DOUGLAS	IL	2.00	1.72	1.68	1.65	1.61	1.58
DU PAGE	IL	1.80	1.44	1.49	1.53	1.58	1.62
EDGAR	IL	2.00	1.71	1.67	1.63	1.59	1.55
EDWARDS	IL	2.20	1.85	1.77	1.70	1.62	1.55
EFFINGHAM	IL	2.00	1.84	1.76	1.69	1.61	1.53
FAYETTE	IL	2.00	1.84	1.77	1.69	1.62	1.54
FORD	IL	1.80	1.62	1.63	1.65	1.66	1.67
FRANKLIN	IL	2.20	1.93	1.85	1.77	1.69	1.61
FULTON	IL	1.80	1.63	1.65	1.66	1.68	1.70
GALLATIN	IL	2.20	2.01	1.93	1.84	1.76	1.67
GREENE	IL	2.00	1.85	1.79	1.72	1.66	1.59
GRUNDY	IL	1.80	1.62	1.63	1.64	1.65	1.66
HAMILTON	IL	2.20	1.93	1.85	1.76	1.68	1.60
HANCOCK	IL	1.80	1.69	1.64	1.58	1.53	1.47
HARDIN	IL	2.20	2.02	1.94	1.87	1.79	1.71
HENDERSON	IL	1.80	1.55	1.55	1.56	1.56	1.56
HENRY	IL	1.80	1.51	1.53	1.56	1.58	1.61
IROQUOIS	IL	1.80	1.61	1.61	1.60	1.60	1.60
JACKSON	IL	2.20	1.94	1.86	1.79	1.71	1.64
JASPER	IL	2.00	1.84	1.75	1.67	1.58	1.50
JEFFERSON	IL	2.00	1.85	1.78	1.70	1.63	1.56

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
JERSEY	IL	2.00	1.86	1.80	1.73	1.67	1.61
JO DAVIESS	IL	1.75	1.50	1.44	1.39	1.33	1.28
JOHNSON	IL	2.20	2.02	1.95	1.87	1.80	1.72
KANE	IL	1.80	1.43	1.46	1.50	1.53	1.56
KANKAKEE	IL	1.80	1.61	1.61	1.62	1.62	1.62
KENDALL	IL	1.80	1.44	1.48	1.53	1.57	1.61
KNOX	IL	1.80	1.62	1.64	1.65	1.67	1.68
LA SALLE	IL	1.80	1.43	1.46	1.49	1.52	1.55
LAKE	IL	1.80	1.62	1.63	1.65	1.66	1.67
LAWRENCE	IL	2.00	1.84	1.76	1.67	1.59	1.51
LEE	IL	1.80	1.31	1.35	1.40	1.45	1.50
LIVINGSTON	IL	1.80	1.63	1.65	1.66	1.68	1.70
LOGAN	IL	1.80	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75
MACON	IL	1.80	1.60	1.59	1.59	1.58	1.57
MACOUPIN	IL	1.80	1.37	1.40	1.42	1.45	1.48
MADISON	IL	1.80	1.75	1.75	1.74	1.74	1.74
MARION	IL	1.80	1.73	1.71	1.70	1.68	1.66
MARSHALL	IL	2.00	1.86	1.80	1.73	1.67	1.61
MASON	IL	2.00	1.93	1.85	1.78	1.70	1.62
MASSAC	IL	2.00	1.84	1.76	1.68	1.60	1.52
MCDONOUGH	IL	1.80	1.64	1.67	1.70	1.73	1.76
MCHENRY	IL	1.80	1.63	1.65	1.68	1.70	1.72
MCLEAN	IL	2.20	2.03	1.96	1.89	1.82	1.75
MENARD	IL	1.80	1.74	1.73	1.71	1.70	1.69
MERCER	IL	1.80	1.50	1.52	1.54	1.56	1.58
MONROE	IL	2.00	1.94	1.87	1.79	1.72	1.65
MONTGOMERY	IL	2.00	1.86	1.79	1.73	1.66	1.60
MORGAN	IL	1.80	1.72	1.69	1.67	1.64	1.61
MOULTRIE	IL	2.00	1.72	1.69	1.66	1.63	1.60
OGLE	IL	1.80	1.28	1.31	1.34	1.36	1.39
PEORIA	IL	1.80	1.65	1.69	1.74	1.78	1.82
PERRY	IL	2.00	1.93	1.85	1.76	1.68	1.60
PIATT	IL	1.80	1.73	1.71	1.69	1.67	1.65
PIKE	IL	1.80	1.70	1.66	1.61	1.57	1.52
POPE	IL	2.20	2.02	1.95	1.87	1.80	1.72
PULASKI	IL	2.20	2.03	1.96	1.89	1.82	1.75
PUTNAM	IL	1.80	1.63	1.65	1.66	1.68	1.70
RANDOLPH	IL	2.00	1.93	1.86	1.78	1.71	1.63
RICHLAND	IL	2.00	1.83	1.74	1.66	1.57	1.48
ROCK ISLAND	IL	1.80	1.50	1.52	1.53	1.55	1.57
SALINE	IL	2.20	1.94	1.87	1.80	1.73	1.66
SANGAMON	IL	1.80	1.73	1.71	1.69	1.67	1.65
SCHUYLER	IL	1.80	1.71	1.68	1.64	1.61	1.57
SCOTT	IL	1.80	1.71	1.68	1.64	1.61	1.57
SHELBY	IL	2.00	1.85	1.78	1.71	1.64	1.57
ST. CLAIR	IL	2.00	1.94	1.87	1.79	1.72	1.65
STARK	IL	1.80	1.63	1.66	1.68	1.71	1.73
STEPHENSON	IL	1.75	1.25	1.26	1.27	1.28	1.29
TAZEWELL	IL	1.80	1.66	1.70	1.75	1.79	1.84
UNION	IL	2.20	2.02	1.94	1.87	1.79	1.71
VERMILION	IL	1.80	1.72	1.68	1.65	1.61	1.58
WABASH	IL	2.20	1.85	1.78	1.70	1.63	1.56
WARREN	IL	1.80	1.61	1.61	1.60	1.60	1.60
WASHINGTON	IL	2.00	1.85	1.77	1.70	1.62	1.55
WAYNE	IL	2.20	1.84	1.77	1.69	1.62	1.54
WHITE	IL	2.20	1.93	1.85	1.78	1.70	1.62
WHITESIDE	IL	1.80	1.25	1.30	1.36	1.42	1.48
WILL	IL	1.80	1.45	1.50	1.54	1.59	1.64
WILLIAMSON	IL	2.20	1.94	1.87	1.79	1.72	1.65
WINNEBAGO	IL	1.75	1.31	1.31	1.32	1.32	1.32
WOODFORD	IL	1.80	1.65	1.69	1.74	1.78	1.82
ADAMS	IN	1.80	1.71	1.62	1.52	1.43	1.34
ALLEN	IN	1.80	1.71	1.61	1.52	1.42	1.33
BARTHOLOMEW	IN	2.20	1.82	1.73	1.65	1.56	1.48
BENTON	IN	1.80	1.75	1.71	1.66	1.62	1.57
BLACKFORD	IN	1.80	1.72	1.64	1.56	1.48	1.40
BOONE	IN	2.00	1.83	1.75	1.68	1.60	1.53
BROWN	IN	2.20	1.82	1.74	1.66	1.58	1.50
CARROLL	IN	1.80	1.74	1.68	1.61	1.55	1.49
CASS	IN	1.80	1.73	1.66	1.58	1.51	1.44

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFEREN-TIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
CLARK	IN	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.68	1.54	1.40
CLAY	IN	2.00	1.82	1.75	1.67	1.60	1.52
CLINTON	IN	1.80	1.82	1.74	1.67	1.59	1.51
CRAWFORD	IN	2.20	1.99	1.86	1.74	1.61	1.49
DAVIESS	IN	2.20	1.99	1.87	1.76	1.64	1.52
DE KALB	IN	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.71	1.58	1.45
DEARBORN	IN	2.20	1.81	1.73	1.64	1.56	1.47
DECATUR	IN	1.80	1.62	1.54	1.45	1.37	1.29
DELAWARE	IN	2.00	1.81	1.72	1.63	1.54	1.45
DUBOIS	IN	2.20	1.99	1.87	1.76	1.64	1.52
ELKHART	IN	1.80	1.61	1.53	1.44	1.36	1.27
FAYETTE	IN	2.00	1.81	1.72	1.64	1.55	1.46
FLOYD	IN	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.69	1.55	1.41
FOUNTAIN	IN	1.80	1.83	1.76	1.69	1.62	1.55
FRANKLIN	IN	2.00	1.81	1.72	1.64	1.55	1.46
FULTON	IN	1.80	1.72	1.64	1.56	1.48	1.40
GIBSON	IN	2.20	2.01	1.90	1.80	1.69	1.59
GRANT	IN	1.80	1.80	1.70	1.61	1.51	1.41
GREENE	IN	2.20	1.82	1.74	1.67	1.59	1.51
HAMILTON	IN	2.00	1.82	1.74	1.67	1.59	1.51
HANCOCK	IN	2.00	1.82	1.74	1.66	1.58	1.50
HARRISON	IN	2.20	1.98	1.84	1.71	1.57	1.44
HENDRICKS	IN	2.00	1.83	1.76	1.68	1.61	1.54
HENRY	IN	2.00	1.81	1.73	1.64	1.56	1.47
HOWARD	IN	1.80	1.81	1.72	1.64	1.55	1.46
HUNTINGTON	IN	1.80	1.71	1.62	1.54	1.45	1.36
JACKSON	IN	2.20	1.89	1.78	1.68	1.57	1.46
JASPER	IN	1.80	1.66	1.63	1.59	1.56	1.52
JAY	IN	1.80	1.72	1.64	1.55	1.47	1.39
JEFFERSON	IN	2.20	1.89	1.77	1.66	1.54	1.43
JENNINGS	IN	2.20	1.89	1.78	1.67	1.56	1.45
JOHNSON	IN	2.00	1.82	1.75	1.67	1.60	1.52
KNOX	IN	2.20	1.99	1.87	1.76	1.64	1.52
KOSCIUSKO	IN	1.80	1.61	1.52	1.42	1.33	1.24
LA PORTE	IN	1.80	1.61	1.52	1.44	1.35	1.26
LAGRANGE	IN	1.80	1.55	1.55	1.56	1.56	1.56
LAKE	IN	1.80	1.65	1.60	1.54	1.49	1.44
LAWRENCE	IN	2.20	1.90	1.80	1.69	1.59	1.49
MADISON	IN	2.00	1.82	1.73	1.65	1.56	1.48
MARION	IN	2.00	1.83	1.75	1.68	1.60	1.53
MARSHALL	IN	1.80	1.63	1.56	1.49	1.42	1.35
MARTIN	IN	2.20	1.99	1.87	1.74	1.62	1.50
MIAMI	IN	1.80	1.72	1.64	1.56	1.48	1.40
MONROE	IN	2.20	1.82	1.74	1.66	1.58	1.50
MONTGOMERY	IN	2.00	1.83	1.76	1.68	1.61	1.54
MORGAN	IN	2.00	1.83	1.75	1.68	1.60	1.53
NEWTON	IN	1.80	1.67	1.64	1.62	1.59	1.56
NOBLE	IN	1.80	1.62	1.53	1.45	1.36	1.28
OHIO	IN	2.20	1.98	1.84	1.71	1.57	1.44
ORANGE	IN	2.20	1.99	1.86	1.74	1.61	1.49
OWEN	IN	2.00	1.82	1.75	1.67	1.60	1.52
PARKE	IN	2.00	1.83	1.76	1.68	1.61	1.54
PERRY	IN	2.20	1.99	1.87	1.75	1.63	1.51
PIKE	IN	2.20	2.00	1.89	1.78	1.67	1.56
PORTER	IN	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.51	1.50	1.49
POSEY	IN	2.20	2.02	1.92	1.83	1.73	1.64
PULASKI	IN	1.80	1.65	1.60	1.56	1.51	1.46
PUTNAM	IN	2.00	1.83	1.75	1.68	1.60	1.53
RANDOLPH	IN	2.00	1.80	1.71	1.61	1.52	1.42
RIPLEY	IN	2.20	1.89	1.78	1.67	1.56	1.45
RUSH	IN	2.00	1.82	1.73	1.65	1.56	1.48
SCOTT	IN	1.80	1.63	1.55	1.48	1.40	1.33
SHELBY	IN	2.20	1.89	1.77	1.66	1.54	1.43
SPENCER	IN	2.00	1.82	1.74	1.66	1.58	1.50
ST. JOSEPH	IN	2.20	2.00	1.90	1.79	1.69	1.58
STARKE	IN	1.80	1.65	1.60	1.54	1.49	1.44
STEUBEN	IN	1.80	1.62	1.53	1.45	1.36	1.28
SULLIVAN	IN	2.20	1.82	1.74	1.67	1.59	1.51
SWITZERLAND	IN	2.20	1.89	1.78	1.66	1.55	1.44
TIPPECANOE	IN	1.80	1.83	1.75	1.68	1.60	1.53

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
TIPTON	IN	1.80	1.82	1.73	1.65	1.56	1.48
UNION	IN	2.00	1.81	1.72	1.63	1.54	1.45
VANDERBURGH	IN	2.20	2.01	1.92	1.82	1.73	1.63
VERMILLION	IN	2.00	1.83	1.76	1.69	1.62	1.55
VIGO	IN	2.00	1.83	1.75	1.68	1.60	1.53
WABASH	IN	1.80	1.71	1.63	1.54	1.46	1.37
WARREN	IN	1.80	1.83	1.76	1.70	1.63	1.56
WARRICK	IN	2.20	2.01	1.91	1.82	1.72	1.62
WASHINGTON	IN	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.71	1.58	1.45
WAYNE	IN	2.00	1.81	1.72	1.63	1.54	1.45
WELLS	IN	1.80	1.71	1.63	1.54	1.46	1.37
WHITE	IN	1.80	1.74	1.68	1.61	1.55	1.49
WHITLEY	IN	1.80	1.62	1.54	1.46	1.38	1.30
ALLEN	KS	2.20	2.11	1.92	1.72	1.53	1.34
ANDERSON	KS	2.00	1.81	1.70	1.58	1.47	1.36
ATCHISON	KS	2.00	1.83	1.74	1.64	1.55	1.46
BARBER	KS	2.20	2.11	1.92	1.72	1.53	1.34
BARTON	KS	2.20	2.10	1.89	1.69	1.48	1.28
BOURBON	KS	2.20	2.11	1.92	1.72	1.53	1.34
BROWN	KS	2.00	1.83	1.74	1.64	1.55	1.46
BUTLER	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.71	1.51	1.31
CHASE	KS	2.20	1.80	1.69	1.57	1.46	1.34
CHAUTAUQUA	KS	2.20	2.11	1.92	1.74	1.55	1.36
CHEROKEE	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.70	1.50	1.30
CHEYENNE	KS	2.20	2.15	1.91	1.66	1.42	1.17
CLARK	KS	2.20	2.27	2.04	1.81	1.58	1.35
CLAY	KS	2.00	1.80	1.69	1.57	1.46	1.34
CLOUD	KS	2.00	1.80	1.68	1.57	1.45	1.33
COFFEY	KS	2.00	1.81	1.69	1.58	1.46	1.35
COMANCHE	KS	2.20	2.11	1.92	1.73	1.54	1.35
COWLEY	KS	2.20	2.11	1.92	1.72	1.53	1.34
CRAWFORD	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.71	1.51	1.31
DECATUR	KS	2.00	1.91	1.73	1.54	1.36	1.17
DICKINSON	KS	2.00	1.80	1.68	1.56	1.44	1.32
DONIPHAN	KS	2.00	1.83	1.74	1.66	1.57	1.48
DOUGLAS	KS	2.00	1.82	1.72	1.62	1.52	1.42
EDWARDS	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.70	1.50	1.30
ELK	KS	2.20	2.11	1.92	1.72	1.53	1.34
ELLIS	KS	2.00	2.09	1.88	1.68	1.47	1.26
ELLSWORTH	KS	2.00	2.10	1.89	1.69	1.48	1.28
FINNEY	KS	2.20	2.26	2.02	1.79	1.55	1.31
FORD	KS	2.20	2.27	2.03	1.80	1.56	1.33
FRANKLIN	KS	2.00	1.81	1.71	1.60	1.50	1.39
GEARY	KS	2.00	1.80	1.69	1.57	1.46	1.34
GOVE	KS	2.20	2.25	2.00	1.74	1.49	1.24
GRAHAM	KS	2.00	1.92	1.75	1.57	1.40	1.22
GRANT	KS	2.20	2.27	2.04	1.82	1.59	1.36
GRAY	KS	2.20	2.27	2.03	1.80	1.56	1.33
GREELEY	KS	2.20	2.26	2.01	1.77	1.52	1.28
GREENWOOD	KS	2.20	2.11	1.91	1.72	1.52	1.33
HAMILTON	KS	2.20	2.27	2.03	1.80	1.56	1.33
HARPER	KS	2.20	2.11	1.91	1.72	1.52	1.33
HARVEY	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.69	1.49	1.29
HASKELL	KS	2.20	2.27	2.03	1.80	1.56	1.33
HODGEMAN	KS	2.20	2.26	2.02	1.77	1.53	1.29
JACKSON	KS	2.00	1.82	1.72	1.63	1.53	1.43
JEFFERSON	KS	2.00	1.82	1.72	1.63	1.53	1.43
JEWELL	KS	2.00	1.93	1.76	1.60	1.43	1.26
JOHNSON	KS	2.00	1.82	1.73	1.63	1.54	1.44
KEARNY	KS	2.20	2.27	2.03	1.80	1.56	1.33
KINGMAN	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.70	1.50	1.30
KIOWA	KS	2.20	2.10	1.91	1.71	1.52	1.32
LABETTE	KS	2.20	2.10	1.91	1.71	1.52	1.32
LANE	KS	2.20	2.25	2.01	1.76	1.52	1.27
LEAVENWORTH	KS	2.00	1.83	1.73	1.64	1.54	1.45
LINCOLN	KS	2.00	2.10	1.90	1.69	1.49	1.29
LINN	KS	2.00	1.81	1.71	1.60	1.50	1.39
LOGAN	KS	2.20	2.13	1.91	1.68	1.46	1.24
LYON	KS	2.00	1.81	1.69	1.58	1.46	1.35
MARION	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.69	1.49	1.29

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
MARSHALL	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.71	1.51	1.31
MCPHERSON	KS	2.00	1.81	1.71	1.60	1.50	1.39
MEADE	KS	2.20	2.27	2.04	1.82	1.59	1.36
MIAMI	KS	2.00	1.82	1.72	1.61	1.51	1.41
MITCHELL	KS	2.00	1.94	1.78	1.61	1.45	1.29
MONTGOMERY	KS	2.20	2.11	1.92	1.73	1.54	1.35
MORRIS	KS	2.00	1.80	1.69	1.57	1.46	1.34
MORTON	KS	2.20	2.28	2.06	1.84	1.62	1.40
NEMAHA	KS	2.00	1.82	1.73	1.63	1.54	1.44
NEOSHO	KS	2.20	2.11	1.91	1.72	1.52	1.33
NESS	KS	2.20	2.25	2.01	1.76	1.52	1.27
NORTON	KS	2.00	1.92	1.74	1.55	1.37	1.19
OSAGE	KS	2.00	1.81	1.70	1.60	1.49	1.38
OSBORNE	KS	2.00	1.93	1.76	1.59	1.42	1.25
OTTAWA	KS	2.00	1.80	1.68	1.55	1.43	1.31
PAWNEE	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.69	1.49	1.29
PHILLIPS	KS	2.00	1.92	1.74	1.56	1.38	1.20
POTTAWATOMIE	KS	2.00	1.81	1.71	1.60	1.50	1.39
PRATT	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.71	1.51	1.31
RAWLINS	KS	2.00	1.91	1.72	1.53	1.34	1.15
RENO	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.69	1.49	1.29
REPUBLIC	KS	2.00	1.80	1.68	1.55	1.43	1.31
RICE	KS	2.20	2.10	1.89	1.69	1.48	1.28
RILEY	KS	2.00	1.81	1.70	1.59	1.48	1.37
ROOKS	KS	2.00	1.93	1.75	1.58	1.40	1.23
RUSH	KS	2.20	2.09	1.89	1.68	1.48	1.27
RUSSELL	KS	2.00	2.09	1.89	1.68	1.48	1.27
SALINE	KS	2.00	1.80	1.67	1.55	1.42	1.30
SCOTT	KS	2.20	2.26	2.01	1.77	1.52	1.28
SEDGWICK	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.69	1.49	1.29
SEWARD	KS	2.20	2.27	2.05	1.82	1.60	1.37
SHAWNEE	KS	2.00	1.82	1.71	1.61	1.50	1.40
SHERIDAN	KS	2.00	1.92	1.74	1.56	1.38	1.20
SHERMAN	KS	2.20	2.16	1.91	1.67	1.42	1.18
SMITH	KS	2.00	1.93	1.75	1.58	1.40	1.23
STAFFORD	KS	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.69	1.49	1.29
STANTON	KS	2.20	2.27	2.05	1.82	1.60	1.37
STEVENS	KS	2.20	2.27	2.05	1.82	1.60	1.37
SUMNER	KS	2.20	2.11	1.91	1.72	1.52	1.33
THOMAS	KS	2.00	1.92	1.74	1.55	1.37	1.19
TREGO	KS	2.20	2.25	2.00	1.75	1.50	1.25
WABAUNSEE	KS	2.00	2.20	1.99	1.79	1.58	1.38
WALLACE	KS	2.20	2.25	2.00	1.74	1.49	1.24
WASHINGTON	KS	2.00	1.81	1.70	1.58	1.47	1.36
WICHITA	KS	2.20	2.26	2.01	1.77	1.52	1.28
WILSON	KS	2.20	2.11	1.91	1.72	1.52	1.33
WOODSON	KS	2.20	2.11	1.92	1.72	1.53	1.34
WYANDOTTE	KS	2.00	1.83	1.73	1.64	1.54	1.45
ADAIR	KY	2.40	1.98	1.85	1.72	1.59	1.46
ALLEN	KY	2.40	2.12	1.98	1.85	1.71	1.57
ANDERSON	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.69	1.55	1.41
BALLARD	KY	2.40	2.27	2.15	2.03	1.91	1.79
BARREN	KY	2.40	2.11	1.97	1.82	1.68	1.53
BATH	KY	2.20	2.00	1.89	1.78	1.67	1.56
BELL	KY	2.40	2.30	2.15	1.99	1.84	1.69
BOONE	KY	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.71	1.58	1.45
BOURBON	KY	2.20	1.99	1.86	1.74	1.61	1.49
BOYD	KY	2.20	2.02	1.93	1.85	1.76	1.67
BOYLE	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.69	1.55	1.41
BRACKEN	KY	2.20	1.99	1.87	1.74	1.62	1.50
BREATHITT	KY	2.20	2.28	2.11	1.94	1.77	1.60
BRECKINRIDGE	KY	2.20	1.99	1.87	1.74	1.62	1.50
BULLITT	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.69	1.55	1.41
BUTLER	KY	2.40	2.00	1.90	1.79	1.69	1.58
CALDWELL	KY	2.40	2.15	2.05	1.94	1.84	1.73
CALLOWAY	KY	2.40	2.28	2.18	2.07	1.97	1.86
CAMPBELL	KY	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.72	1.59	1.46
CARLISLE	KY	2.40	2.28	2.17	2.05	1.94	1.83
CARROLL	KY	2.20	1.97	1.84	1.70	1.57	1.43
CARTER	KY	2.20	2.01	1.92	1.82	1.73	1.63

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
CASEY	KY	2.40	1.97	1.83	1.69	1.55	1.41
CHRISTIAN	KY	2.40	2.15	2.04	1.92	1.81	1.70
CLARK	KY	2.20	1.99	1.87	1.74	1.62	1.50
CLAY	KY	2.40	2.28	2.11	1.93	1.76	1.59
CLINTON	KY	2.40	2.00	1.89	1.78	1.67	1.56
CRITTENDEN	KY	2.40	2.15	2.04	1.94	1.83	1.72
CUMBERLAND	KY	2.40	2.00	1.89	1.77	1.66	1.55
DAVIESS	KY	2.20	2.01	1.91	1.81	1.71	1.61
EDMONSON	KY	2.40	1.99	1.87	1.76	1.64	1.52
ELLIOTT	KY	2.20	2.01	1.92	1.82	1.73	1.63
ESTILL	KY	2.20	1.99	1.87	1.76	1.64	1.52
FAYETTE	KY	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.72	1.59	1.46
FLEMING	KY	2.20	2.00	1.89	1.77	1.66	1.55
FLOYD	KY	2.20	2.09	1.98	1.88	1.77	1.67
FRANKLIN	KY	2.20	1.97	1.84	1.70	1.57	1.43
FULTON	KY	2.40	2.29	2.19	2.10	2.00	1.90
GALLATIN	KY	2.20	1.98	1.84	1.71	1.57	1.44
GARRARD	KY	2.20	1.97	1.84	1.70	1.57	1.43
GRANT	KY	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.71	1.58	1.45
GRAVES	KY	2.40	2.28	2.17	2.07	1.96	1.85
GRAYSON	KY	2.40	1.99	1.87	1.75	1.63	1.51
GREEN	KY	2.40	1.98	1.85	1.71	1.58	1.45
GREENUP	KY	2.20	2.01	1.92	1.82	1.73	1.63
HANCOCK	KY	2.20	2.00	1.89	1.77	1.66	1.55
HARDIN	KY	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.72	1.59	1.46
HARLAN	KY	2.40	2.30	2.15	2.00	1.85	1.70
HARRISON	KY	2.20	1.98	1.86	1.73	1.61	1.48
HART	KY	2.40	1.98	1.86	1.73	1.61	1.48
HENDERSON	KY	2.20	2.02	1.92	1.83	1.73	1.64
HENRY	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.70	1.56	1.42
HICKMAN	KY	2.40	2.28	2.18	2.07	1.97	1.86
HOPKINS	KY	2.40	2.15	2.03	1.92	1.80	1.69
JACKSON	KY	2.20	2.26	2.07	1.89	1.70	1.51
JEFFERSON	KY	2.20	1.97	1.82	1.68	1.53	1.39
JESSAMINE	KY	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.71	1.58	1.45
JOHNSON	KY	2.20	2.08	1.97	1.87	1.76	1.65
KENTON	KY	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.72	1.59	1.46
KNOTT	KY	2.40	2.29	2.14	1.98	1.83	1.67
KNOX	KY	2.40	2.28	2.11	1.95	1.78	1.61
LARUE	KY	2.20	1.98	1.84	1.71	1.57	1.44
LAUREL	KY	2.40	2.27	2.08	1.90	1.71	1.53
LAWRENCE	KY	2.20	2.09	1.98	1.88	1.77	1.67
LEE	KY	2.20	2.27	2.09	1.91	1.73	1.55
LESLIE	KY	2.40	2.29	2.13	1.98	1.82	1.66
LETCHER	KY	2.40	2.30	2.15	1.99	1.84	1.69
LEWIS	KY	2.20	2.00	1.90	1.79	1.69	1.58
LINCOLN	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.70	1.56	1.42
LIVINGSTON	KY	2.40	2.26	2.13	2.01	1.88	1.75
LOGAN	KY	2.40	2.13	2.00	1.88	1.75	1.62
LYON	KY	2.40	2.16	2.06	1.97	1.87	1.77
MADISON	KY	2.40	2.27	2.15	2.03	1.91	1.79
MAGOFFIN	KY	2.40	2.27	2.09	1.92	1.74	1.56
MARION	KY	2.20	2.02	1.92	1.83	1.73	1.64
MARSHALL	KY	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.73	1.60	1.47
MARTIN	KY	2.20	2.08	1.97	1.85	1.74	1.63
MASON	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.70	1.56	1.42
MCCRACKEN	KY	2.40	2.27	2.15	2.04	1.92	1.80
MCCREARY	KY	2.20	2.09	1.99	1.89	1.79	1.69
MCLEAN	KY	2.20	1.99	1.88	1.76	1.65	1.53
MEADE	KY	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.73	1.60	1.47
MENIFEE	KY	2.20	2.00	1.89	1.79	1.68	1.57
MERCER	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.69	1.55	1.41
METCALFE	KY	2.40	1.99	1.87	1.74	1.62	1.50
MONROE	KY	2.40	2.00	1.89	1.77	1.66	1.55
MONTGOMERY	KY	2.20	1.99	1.88	1.76	1.65	1.53
MORGAN	KY	2.20	2.07	1.96	1.84	1.73	1.61
MUHLENBERG	KY	2.40	2.14	2.01	1.89	1.76	1.64
NELSON	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.70	1.56	1.42
NICHOLAS	KY	2.20	1.99	1.87	1.76	1.64	1.52
OHIO	KY	2.40	2.01	1.90	1.80	1.69	1.59

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
OLDHAM	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.68	1.54	1.40
OWEN	KY	2.20	1.98	1.84	1.71	1.57	1.44
OWSLEY	KY	2.20	2.27	2.10	1.92	1.75	1.57
PENDLETON	KY	2.20	1.98	1.86	1.73	1.61	1.48
PERRY	KY	2.40	2.29	2.13	1.97	1.81	1.65
PIKE	KY	2.40	2.09	1.99	1.89	1.79	1.69
POWELL	KY	2.20	2.00	1.88	1.77	1.65	1.54
PULASKI	KY	2.40	2.24	2.03	1.83	1.62	1.41
ROBERTSON	KY	2.20	1.99	1.87	1.74	1.62	1.50
ROCKCASTLE	KY	2.20	2.25	2.05	1.86	1.66	1.46
ROWAN	KY	2.20	2.01	1.90	1.80	1.69	1.59
RUSSELL	KY	2.40	1.98	1.85	1.73	1.60	1.47
SCOTT	KY	2.20	1.98	1.85	1.71	1.58	1.45
SHELBY	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.68	1.54	1.40
SIMPSON	KY	2.40	2.01	1.91	1.80	1.70	1.60
SPENCER	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.68	1.54	1.40
TAYLOR	KY	2.40	1.97	1.84	1.70	1.57	1.43
TODD	KY	2.40	2.14	2.02	1.90	1.78	1.66
TRIGG	KY	2.40	2.16	2.07	1.97	1.88	1.78
TRIMBLE	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.70	1.56	1.42
UNION	KY	2.20	2.02	1.94	1.85	1.77	1.68
WARREN	KY	2.40	2.00	1.89	1.78	1.67	1.56
WASHINGTON	KY	2.20	1.97	1.83	1.69	1.55	1.41
WAYNE	KY	2.40	1.99	1.88	1.76	1.65	1.53
WEBSTER	KY	2.40	2.02	1.94	1.85	1.77	1.68
WHITLEY	KY	2.40	2.28	2.11	1.94	1.77	1.60
WOLFE	KY	2.20	2.07	1.95	1.83	1.71	1.59
WOODFORD	KY	2.20	1.97	1.84	1.70	1.57	1.43
ACADIA	LA	3.50	3.43	3.21	3.00	2.78	2.56
ALLEN	LA	3.50	3.36	3.13	2.91	2.68	2.46
ASCENSION	LA	3.60	3.40	3.16	2.91	2.67	2.42
ASSUMPTION	LA	3.60	3.41	3.18	2.94	2.71	2.47
AVOYELLES	LA	3.40	3.21	3.01	2.82	2.62	2.43
BEAUREGARD	LA	3.50	3.35	3.12	2.88	2.65	2.42
BIENVILLE	LA	3.30	2.97	2.76	2.56	2.35	2.14
BOSSIER	LA	3.10	2.94	2.69	2.45	2.20	1.96
CADDO	LA	3.10	2.93	2.68	2.42	2.17	1.92
CALCASIEU	LA	3.50	3.42	3.19	2.97	2.74	2.51
CALDWELL	LA	3.30	3.10	2.91	2.73	2.54	2.36
CAMERON	LA	3.60	3.43	3.21	3.00	2.78	2.56
CATAHOULA	LA	3.40	3.20	3.00	2.80	2.60	2.40
CLAIBORNE	LA	3.10	2.96	2.75	2.53	2.32	2.10
CONCORDIA	LA	3.40	3.20	3.00	2.81	2.61	2.41
DE SOTO	LA	3.30	3.04	2.79	2.55	2.30	2.06
EAST BATON ROUGE	LA	3.60	3.40	3.15	2.90	2.65	2.40
EAST CARROLL	LA	3.10	3.02	2.86	2.70	2.54	2.38
EAST FELICIANA	LA	3.50	3.34	3.11	2.87	2.64	2.40
EVANGELINE	LA	3.50	3.36	3.14	2.91	2.69	2.47
FRANKLIN	LA	3.30	3.10	2.92	2.75	2.57	2.39
GRANT	LA	3.40	3.19	2.97	2.76	2.54	2.33
IBERIA	LA	3.60	3.44	3.22	3.01	2.79	2.58
IBERVILLE	LA	3.60	3.41	3.16	2.92	2.67	2.43
JACKSON	LA	3.30	3.00	2.82	2.63	2.45	2.27
JEFFERSON	LA	3.60	3.41	3.16	2.92	2.67	2.43
JEFFERSON DAVIS	LA	3.50	3.43	3.20	2.98	2.75	2.53
LA SALLE	LA	3.60	3.44	3.23	3.01	2.80	2.59
LAFAYETTE	LA	3.60	3.41	3.18	2.94	2.71	2.47
LAFOURCHE	LA	3.40	3.19	2.98	2.78	2.57	2.36
LINCOLN	LA	3.10	2.99	2.79	2.60	2.40	2.21
LIVINGSTON	LA	3.60	3.40	3.15	2.90	2.65	2.40
MADISON	LA	3.30	3.10	2.93	2.75	2.58	2.40
MOREHOUSE	LA	3.10	3.01	2.84	2.67	2.50	2.33
NATCHITOCHES	LA	3.30	3.17	2.94	2.70	2.47	2.24
ORLEANS	LA	3.60	3.41	3.17	2.93	2.69	2.45
OUACHITA	LA	3.10	3.01	2.84	2.66	2.49	2.32
PLAQUEMINES	LA	3.60	3.43	3.21	2.99	2.77	2.55
POINTE COUPEE	LA	3.50	3.35	3.12	2.90	2.67	2.44
RAPIDES	LA	3.40	3.20	2.99	2.79	2.58	2.38
RED RIVER	LA	3.30	3.05	2.82	2.58	2.35	2.12
RICHLAND	LA	3.10	3.02	2.86	2.70	2.54	2.38

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFEREN-TIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
SABINE	LA	3.30	3.16	2.92	2.68	2.44	2.20
ST. BERNARD	LA	3.60	3.41	3.18	2.94	2.71	2.47
ST. CHARLES	LA	3.60	3.41	3.16	2.92	2.67	2.43
ST. HELENA	LA	3.50	3.35	3.11	2.88	2.64	2.41
ST. JAMES	LA	3.60	3.41	3.17	2.92	2.68	2.44
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST	LA	3.60	3.41	3.16	2.92	2.67	2.43
ST. LANDRY	LA	3.50	3.36	3.14	2.93	2.71	2.49
ST. MARTIN	LA	3.60	3.43	3.21	3.00	2.78	2.56
ST. MARY	LA	3.60	3.43	3.21	3.00	2.78	2.56
ST. TAMMANY	LA	3.50	3.36	3.14	2.91	2.69	2.47
TANGIPAHOA	LA	3.60	3.40	3.16	2.91	2.67	2.42
TENSAS	LA	3.30	3.10	2.93	2.75	2.58	2.40
TERREBONNE	LA	3.60	3.42	3.20	2.97	2.75	2.52
UNION	LA	3.10	2.99	2.80	2.61	2.42	2.23
VERMILION	LA	3.60	3.44	3.23	3.03	2.82	2.61
VERNON	LA	3.40	3.18	2.97	2.75	2.54	2.32
WASHINGTON	LA	3.50	3.36	3.13	2.91	2.68	2.46
WEBSTER	LA	3.10	2.94	2.70	2.46	2.22	1.98
WEST BATON ROUGE	LA	3.60	3.40	3.16	2.91	2.67	2.42
WEST CARROLL	LA	3.10	3.02	2.85	2.69	2.52	2.36
WEST FELICIANA	LA	3.50	3.35	3.12	2.88	2.65	2.42
WINN	LA	3.30	3.08	2.88	2.69	2.49	2.29
BARNSTABLE	MA	3.25	3.06	2.87	2.69	2.50	2.32
BERKSHIRE	MA	2.80	2.71	2.49	2.28	2.06	1.85
BRISTOL	MA	3.25	3.07	2.89	2.72	2.54	2.37
DUKES	MA	3.25	3.06	2.88	2.71	2.53	2.35
ESSEX	MA	3.25	3.04	2.83	2.63	2.42	2.22
FRANKLIN	MA	3.00	2.80	2.58	2.36	2.14	1.92
HAMPDEN	MA	3.00	2.90	2.68	2.45	2.23	2.01
HAMPSHIRE	MA	3.00	2.91	2.67	2.44	2.20	1.97
MIDDLESEX	MA	3.25	3.04	2.84	2.64	2.44	2.24
NANTUCKET	MA	3.25	3.06	2.88	2.69	2.51	2.33
NORFOLK	MA	3.25	3.05	2.87	2.68	2.50	2.31
PLYMOUTH	MA	3.25	3.06	2.88	2.71	2.53	2.35
SUFFOLK	MA	3.25	3.06	2.87	2.69	2.50	2.32
WORCESTER	MA	3.10	2.99	2.78	2.58	2.37	2.17
ALLEGANY	MD	2.60	2.58	2.33	2.09	1.84	1.60
ANNE ARUNDEL	MD	3.00	2.75	2.47	2.18	1.90	1.62
BALTIMORE	MD	3.00	2.73	2.44	2.14	1.85	1.55
BALTIMORE CITY	MD	3.00	2.74	2.45	2.15	1.86	1.57
CALVERT	MD	3.00	2.77	2.50	2.24	1.97	1.71
CAROLINE	MD	3.00	2.78	2.53	2.28	2.03	1.78
CARROLL	MD	2.80	2.72	2.41	2.10	1.79	1.48
CECIL	MD	3.00	2.80	2.51	2.22	1.93	1.64
CHARLES	MD	3.00	2.76	2.48	2.21	1.93	1.66
DORCHESTER	MD	3.00	2.68	2.46	2.24	2.02	1.80
FREDERICK	MD	2.80	2.72	2.41	2.10	1.79	1.48
GARRETT	MD	2.60	2.55	2.32	2.09	1.86	1.63
HARFORD	MD	3.00	2.74	2.45	2.15	1.86	1.57
HOWARD	MD	3.00	2.73	2.44	2.14	1.85	1.55
KENT	MD	3.00	2.75	2.48	2.20	1.93	1.65
MONTGOMERY	MD	3.00	2.73	2.44	2.14	1.85	1.55
PRINCE GEORGE'S	MD	3.00	2.75	2.47	2.19	1.91	1.63
QUEEN ANNE'S	MD	3.00	2.76	2.49	2.23	1.96	1.69
SOMERSET	MD	3.00	2.77	2.52	2.26	2.01	1.75
ST. MARY'S	MD	3.00	2.64	2.46	2.27	2.09	1.91
TALBOT	MD	3.00	2.78	2.52	2.27	2.01	1.76
WASHINGTON	MD	2.80	2.71	2.39	2.08	1.76	1.44
WICOMICO	MD	3.00	2.66	2.47	2.28	2.09	1.90
WORCESTER	MD	3.00	2.65	2.48	2.30	2.13	1.96
ANDROSCOGGIN	ME	2.80	2.67	2.43	2.18	1.94	1.69
AROOSTOOK	ME	2.60	2.09	1.91	1.72	1.54	1.35
CUMBERLAND	ME	3.00	2.76	2.53	2.29	2.06	1.83
FRANKLIN	ME	2.60	2.37	2.16	1.96	1.75	1.54
HANCOCK	ME	2.80	2.26	2.07	1.87	1.68	1.49
KENNEBEC	ME	2.80	2.37	2.18	1.98	1.79	1.59
KNOX	ME	2.80	2.38	2.19	1.99	1.80	1.61
LINCOLN	ME	2.80	2.47	2.27	2.08	1.88	1.68
OXFORD	ME	2.80	2.42	2.24	2.05	1.87	1.69
PENOBSCOT	ME	2.80	2.25	2.03	1.80	1.58	1.36

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFEREN-TIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
PISCATAQUIS	ME	2.60	2.24	2.03	1.81	1.60	1.39
SAGADAHOC	ME	2.80	2.70	2.46	2.23	1.99	1.75
SOMERSET	ME	2.60	2.33	2.12	1.90	1.69	1.47
WALDO	ME	2.80	2.32	2.12	1.91	1.71	1.51
WASHINGTON	ME	2.80	2.16	1.98	1.79	1.61	1.42
YORK	ME	3.00	2.87	2.65	2.42	2.20	1.98
ALCONA	MI	1.80	1.58	1.47	1.37	1.26	1.16
ALGER	MI	1.80	1.28	1.21	1.14	1.07	1.00
ALLEGAN	MI	1.80	1.62	1.54	1.45	1.37	1.29
ALPENA	MI	1.80	1.57	1.46	1.34	1.23	1.12
ANTRIM	MI	1.80	1.55	1.42	1.29	1.16	1.03
ARENAC	MI	1.80	1.59	1.50	1.40	1.31	1.22
BARAGA	MI	1.70	1.27	1.19	1.10	1.02	0.94
BARRY	MI	1.80	1.62	1.53	1.45	1.36	1.28
BAY	MI	1.80	1.66	1.56	1.47	1.37	1.28
BENZIE	MI	1.80	1.58	1.48	1.38	1.28	1.18
BERRIEN	MI	1.80	1.64	1.57	1.51	1.44	1.38
BRANCH	MI	1.80	1.62	1.53	1.45	1.36	1.28
CALHOUN	MI	1.80	1.62	1.54	1.46	1.38	1.30
CASS	MI	1.80	1.62	1.53	1.45	1.36	1.28
CHARLEVOIX	MI	1.80	1.55	1.41	1.28	1.14	1.01
CHEBOYGAN	MI	1.80	1.55	1.42	1.30	1.17	1.04
CHIPPEWA	MI	1.80	1.32	1.30	1.27	1.25	1.22
CLARE	MI	1.80	1.60	1.52	1.44	1.36	1.28
CLINTON	MI	1.80	1.68	1.62	1.55	1.49	1.42
CRAWFORD	MI	1.80	1.55	1.42	1.30	1.17	1.04
DELTA	MI	1.70	1.11	1.07	1.04	1.00	0.96
DICKINSON	MI	1.70	1.09	1.03	0.98	0.92	0.86
EATON	MI	1.80	1.64	1.57	1.51	1.44	1.38
EMMET	MI	1.80	1.55	1.42	1.28	1.15	1.02
GENESEE	MI	1.80	1.67	1.59	1.51	1.43	1.35
GLADWIN	MI	1.80	1.59	1.50	1.41	1.32	1.23
GOGEBIC	MI	1.70	1.12	1.09	1.07	1.04	1.01
GRAND TRAVERSE	MI	1.80	1.57	1.46	1.35	1.24	1.13
GRATIOT	MI	1.80	1.67	1.59	1.52	1.44	1.36
HILLSDALE	MI	1.80	1.66	1.57	1.49	1.40	1.31
HOUGHTON	MI	1.70	1.27	1.19	1.12	1.04	0.96
HURON	MI	1.80	1.66	1.56	1.47	1.37	1.28
INGHAM	MI	1.80	1.68	1.61	1.55	1.48	1.41
IONIA	MI	1.80	1.63	1.56	1.49	1.42	1.35
IOSCO	MI	1.80	1.58	1.48	1.39	1.29	1.19
IRON	MI	1.70	1.10	1.04	0.99	0.93	0.88
ISABELLA	MI	1.80	1.61	1.54	1.46	1.39	1.32
JACKSON	MI	1.80	1.67	1.59	1.52	1.44	1.36
KALAMAZOO	MI	1.80	1.61	1.51	1.42	1.32	1.23
KALKASKA	MI	1.80	1.56	1.44	1.33	1.21	1.09
KENT	MI	1.80	1.62	1.53	1.45	1.36	1.28
KEWEENAW	MI	1.70	1.28	1.20	1.13	1.05	0.98
LAKE	MI	1.80	1.61	1.54	1.48	1.41	1.34
LAPEER	MI	1.80	1.67	1.59	1.50	1.42	1.34
LEELANAU	MI	1.80	1.56	1.45	1.33	1.22	1.10
LENAWEE	MI	1.80	1.71	1.62	1.53	1.44	1.35
LIVINGSTON	MI	1.80	1.67	1.60	1.52	1.45	1.37
LUCE	MI	1.80	1.30	1.25	1.21	1.16	1.11
MACKINAC	MI	1.80	1.30	1.25	1.21	1.16	1.11
MACOMB	MI	1.80	1.68	1.60	1.53	1.45	1.38
MANISTEE	MI	1.80	1.60	1.52	1.43	1.35	1.27
MARQUETTE	MI	1.80	1.27	1.18	1.10	1.01	0.93
MASON	MI	1.80	1.62	1.56	1.49	1.43	1.37
MECOSTA	MI	1.80	1.61	1.54	1.48	1.41	1.34
MENOMINEE	MI	1.70	1.11	1.07	1.03	0.99	0.95
MIDLAND	MI	1.80	1.60	1.53	1.45	1.38	1.30
MISSAUKEE	MI	1.80	1.59	1.49	1.40	1.30	1.21
MONROE	MI	1.80	1.72	1.63	1.55	1.46	1.38
MONTCALM	MI	1.80	1.63	1.56	1.48	1.41	1.34
MONTMORENCY	MI	1.80	1.55	1.42	1.29	1.16	1.03
MUSKEGON	MI	1.80	1.63	1.57	1.50	1.44	1.37
NEWAYGO	MI	1.80	1.61	1.55	1.48	1.42	1.35
OAKLAND	MI	1.80	1.67	1.59	1.50	1.42	1.34
OCEANA	MI	1.80	1.62	1.56	1.50	1.44	1.38

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
OGEMAW	MI	1.80	1.58	1.47	1.37	1.26	1.16
ONTONAGON	MI	1.70	1.12	1.08	1.05	1.01	0.98
OSCEOLA	MI	1.80	1.61	1.53	1.46	1.38	1.31
OSCODA	MI	1.80	1.56	1.44	1.33	1.21	1.09
OTSEGO	MI	1.80	1.54	1.40	1.25	1.11	0.97
OTTAWA	MI	1.80	1.62	1.54	1.46	1.38	1.30
PRESQUE ISLE	MI	1.80	1.56	1.44	1.33	1.21	1.09
ROSCOMMON	MI	1.80	1.57	1.46	1.35	1.24	1.13
SAGINAW	MI	1.80	1.67	1.59	1.50	1.42	1.34
SANILAC	MI	1.80	1.66	1.57	1.49	1.40	1.31
SCHOOLCRAFT	MI	1.80	1.29	1.22	1.16	1.09	1.03
SHIAWASSEE	MI	1.80	1.68	1.61	1.53	1.46	1.39
ST. CLAIR	MI	1.80	1.68	1.60	1.53	1.45	1.38
ST. JOSEPH	MI	1.80	1.61	1.52	1.44	1.35	1.26
TUSCOLA	MI	1.80	1.66	1.57	1.48	1.39	1.30
VAN BUREN	MI	1.80	1.62	1.54	1.45	1.37	1.29
WASHTENAW	MI	1.80	1.67	1.59	1.52	1.44	1.36
WAYNE	MI	1.80	1.67	1.60	1.52	1.45	1.37
WEXFORD	MI	1.80	1.59	1.50	1.42	1.33	1.24
AITKIN	MN	1.65	1.13	1.13	1.12	1.12	1.11
ANOKA	MN	1.70	1.15	1.15	1.16	1.16	1.17
BECKER	MN	1.65	1.09	1.04	0.98	0.93	0.88
BELTRAMI	MN	1.65	1.13	1.05	0.98	0.90	0.83
BENTON	MN	1.70	1.13	1.12	1.12	1.11	1.10
BIG STONE	MN	1.70	1.11	1.08	1.05	1.02	0.99
BLUE EARTH	MN	1.70	1.20	1.19	1.19	1.18	1.18
BROWN	MN	1.70	1.19	1.19	1.18	1.18	1.17
CARLTON	MN	1.65	1.15	1.17	1.18	1.20	1.21
CARVER	MN	1.70	1.15	1.15	1.16	1.16	1.17
CASS	MN	1.65	1.10	1.07	1.03	1.00	0.96
CHIPPEWA	MN	1.70	1.12	1.11	1.09	1.08	1.06
CHISAGO	MN	1.70	1.14	1.14	1.15	1.15	1.15
CLAY	MN	1.65	1.13	1.06	1.00	0.93	0.86
CLEARWATER	MN	1.65	1.13	1.05	0.98	0.90	0.83
COOK	MN	1.65	1.17	1.13	1.10	1.06	1.03
COTTONWOOD	MN	1.70	1.20	1.19	1.19	1.18	1.18
CROW WING	MN	1.65	1.12	1.10	1.08	1.06	1.04
DAKOTA	MN	1.70	1.14	1.15	1.15	1.16	1.16
DODGE	MN	1.70	1.14	1.13	1.13	1.12	1.12
DOUGLAS	MN	1.70	1.10	1.07	1.03	1.00	0.96
FARIBAULT	MN	1.70	1.20	1.20	1.21	1.21	1.21
FILLMORE	MN	1.70	1.14	1.14	1.13	1.13	1.13
FREEBORN	MN	1.70	1.20	1.19	1.19	1.18	1.18
GOODHUE	MN	1.70	1.14	1.13	1.13	1.12	1.12
GRANT	MN	1.70	1.10	1.06	1.03	0.99	0.95
HENNEPIN	MN	1.70	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20
HOUSTON	MN	1.70	1.15	1.15	1.16	1.16	1.17
HUBBARD	MN	1.65	1.09	1.05	1.00	0.96	0.91
ISANTI	MN	1.70	1.14	1.14	1.15	1.15	1.15
ITASCA	MN	1.65	1.16	1.12	1.09	1.05	1.01
JACKSON	MN	1.70	1.20	1.20	1.21	1.21	1.21
KANABEC	MN	1.70	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14
KANDIYOHI	MN	1.70	1.13	1.11	1.10	1.08	1.07
KITTSON	MN	1.60	1.13	1.06	1.00	0.93	0.86
KOOCHICHING	MN	1.65	1.14	1.09	1.03	0.98	0.92
LAC QUI PARLE	MN	1.70	1.17	1.14	1.10	1.07	1.04
LAKE	MN	1.65	1.18	1.16	1.15	1.13	1.11
LAKE OF THE WOODS	MN	1.60	1.12	1.05	0.97	0.90	0.82
LE SUEUR	MN	1.70	1.15	1.15	1.16	1.16	1.17
LINCOLN	MN	1.70	1.33	1.27	1.22	1.16	1.11
LYON	MN	1.70	1.19	1.17	1.16	1.14	1.13
MAHNOMEN	MN	1.70	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14
MARSHALL	MN	1.65	1.13	1.05	0.98	0.90	0.83
MARTIN	MN	1.65	1.12	1.05	0.97	0.90	0.82
MCLEOD	MN	1.70	1.20	1.20	1.21	1.21	1.21
MEEKER	MN	1.70	1.13	1.12	1.12	1.11	1.10
MILLE LACS	MN	1.70	1.13	1.13	1.12	1.12	1.11
MORRISON	MN	1.70	1.12	1.10	1.08	1.06	1.04
MOWER	MN	1.70	1.19	1.18	1.16	1.15	1.14
MURRAY	MN	1.70	1.19	1.19	1.18	1.18	1.17

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFEREN-TIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
NICOLLET	MN	1.70	1.15	1.15	1.16	1.16	1.17
NOBLES	MN	1.70	1.37	1.33	1.28	1.24	1.20
NORMAN	MN	1.65	1.13	1.07	1.00	0.94	0.87
OLMSTED	MN	1.70	1.18	1.16	1.14	1.12	1.10
OTTER TAIL	MN	1.65	1.10	1.05	1.01	0.96	0.92
PENNINGTON	MN	1.65	1.10	1.00	0.91	0.81	0.71
PINE	MN	1.70	1.15	1.16	1.16	1.17	1.18
PIPESTONE	MN	1.70	1.36	1.31	1.25	1.20	1.15
POLK	MN	1.65	1.13	1.06	0.99	0.92	0.85
POPE	MN	1.70	1.11	1.08	1.06	1.03	1.00
RAMSEY	MN	1.70	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20
RED LAKE	MN	1.65	1.11	1.02	0.93	0.84	0.75
REDWOOD	MN	1.70	1.19	1.18	1.16	1.15	1.14
RENVILLE	MN	1.70	1.14	1.13	1.13	1.12	1.12
RICE	MN	1.70	1.14	1.15	1.15	1.16	1.16
ROCK	MN	1.70	1.41	1.36	1.30	1.25	1.20
ROSEAU	MN	1.60	1.12	1.03	0.95	0.86	0.78
SCOTT	MN	1.65	1.18	1.16	1.15	1.13	1.11
SHERBURNE	MN	1.70	1.15	1.15	1.16	1.16	1.17
SIBLEY	MN	1.70	1.14	1.14	1.13	1.13	1.13
ST. LOUIS	MN	1.70	1.14	1.15	1.15	1.16	1.16
STEARNS	MN	1.70	1.12	1.11	1.09	1.08	1.06
STEELE	MN	1.70	1.14	1.14	1.15	1.15	1.15
STEVENS	MN	1.70	1.11	1.08	1.04	1.01	0.98
SWIFT	MN	1.70	1.12	1.10	1.07	1.05	1.03
TODD	MN	1.70	1.11	1.08	1.05	1.02	0.99
TRAVERSE	MN	1.70	1.10	1.07	1.03	1.00	0.96
WABASHA	MN	1.70	1.13	1.12	1.12	1.11	1.10
WADENA	MN	1.65	1.10	1.06	1.02	0.98	0.94
WASECA	MN	1.70	1.15	1.15	1.16	1.16	1.17
WASHINGTON	MN	1.70	1.19	1.18	1.17	1.16	1.15
WATONWAN	MN	1.70	1.20	1.20	1.19	1.19	1.19
WILKIN	MN	1.65	1.09	1.05	1.00	0.96	0.91
WINONA	MN	1.70	1.14	1.14	1.15	1.15	1.15
WRIGHT	MN	1.70	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14
YELLOW MEDICINE	MN	1.70	1.18	1.16	1.13	1.11	1.09
ADAIR	MO	1.80	1.67	1.61	1.56	1.50	1.45
ANDREW	MO	1.80	1.84	1.75	1.67	1.58	1.50
ATCHISON	MO	1.80	1.84	1.76	1.68	1.60	1.52
AUDRAIN	MO	2.00	1.84	1.76	1.68	1.60	1.52
BARRY	MO	2.20	2.01	1.82	1.64	1.45	1.27
BARTON	MO	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.71	1.51	1.31
BATES	MO	2.00	1.81	1.71	1.60	1.50	1.39
BENTON	MO	2.00	1.82	1.71	1.61	1.50	1.40
BOLLINGER	MO	2.20	1.95	1.89	1.83	1.77	1.71
BOONE	MO	2.00	1.85	1.78	1.71	1.64	1.57
BUCHANAN	MO	1.80	1.83	1.75	1.66	1.58	1.49
BUTLER	MO	2.20	2.11	2.04	1.96	1.89	1.81
CALDWELL	MO	1.80	1.83	1.75	1.66	1.58	1.49
CALLAWAY	MO	2.00	1.85	1.78	1.70	1.63	1.56
CAMDEN	MO	2.00	2.03	1.87	1.72	1.56	1.40
CAPE GIRARDEAU	MO	2.20	1.95	1.89	1.84	1.78	1.72
CARROLL	MO	1.80	1.67	1.63	1.58	1.54	1.49
CARTER	MO	2.20	2.10	2.00	1.91	1.81	1.72
CASS	MO	2.00	1.82	1.72	1.63	1.53	1.43
CEDAR	MO	2.20	2.02	1.84	1.67	1.49	1.32
CHARITON	MO	1.80	1.84	1.75	1.67	1.58	1.50
CHRISTIAN	MO	2.20	2.02	1.84	1.67	1.49	1.32
CLARK	MO	1.80	1.66	1.60	1.55	1.49	1.43
CLAY	MO	1.80	1.83	1.74	1.65	1.56	1.47
CLINTON	MO	1.80	1.83	1.75	1.66	1.58	1.49
COLE	MO	2.00	1.84	1.76	1.69	1.61	1.53
COOPER	MO	2.00	1.84	1.76	1.69	1.61	1.53
CRAWFORD	MO	2.00	1.92	1.84	1.75	1.67	1.58
DADE	MO	2.20	2.01	1.83	1.65	1.47	1.29
DALLAS	MO	2.20	2.01	1.84	1.66	1.49	1.31
DAVIESS	MO	1.80	1.84	1.76	1.67	1.59	1.51
DE KALB	MO	1.80	1.84	1.75	1.67	1.58	1.50
DENT	MO	2.00	2.06	1.94	1.81	1.69	1.56
DOUGLAS	MO	2.20	2.03	1.88	1.72	1.57	1.41

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
DUNKLIN	MO	2.20	2.44	2.32	2.21	2.09	1.98
FRANKLIN	MO	2.00	1.93	1.85	1.77	1.69	1.61
GASCONADE	MO	2.00	2.07	1.94	1.82	1.69	1.57
GENTRY	MO	1.80	1.84	1.76	1.68	1.60	1.52
GREENE	MO	2.20	2.01	1.84	1.66	1.49	1.31
GRUNDY	MO	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.52	1.51	1.50
HARRISON	MO	1.80	1.54	1.54	1.53	1.53	1.52
HENRY	MO	2.00	1.82	1.72	1.61	1.51	1.41
HICKORY	MO	2.00	2.02	1.85	1.69	1.52	1.35
HOLT	MO	1.80	1.84	1.75	1.67	1.58	1.50
HOWARD	MO	2.00	1.84	1.77	1.69	1.62	1.54
HOWELL	MO	2.20	2.07	1.95	1.84	1.72	1.60
IRON	MO	2.00	2.08	1.97	1.87	1.76	1.65
JACKSON	MO	2.00	1.83	1.74	1.64	1.55	1.46
JASPER	MO	2.20	2.10	1.89	1.69	1.48	1.28
JEFFERSON	MO	2.00	1.94	1.87	1.79	1.72	1.65
JOHNSON	MO	2.00	1.82	1.73	1.63	1.54	1.44
KNOX	MO	1.80	1.66	1.60	1.54	1.48	1.42
LACLEDE	MO	2.20	2.03	1.86	1.70	1.53	1.37
LAFAYETTE	MO	2.00	1.83	1.74	1.66	1.57	1.48
LAWRENCE	MO	2.20	2.01	1.83	1.64	1.46	1.28
LEWIS	MO	1.80	1.65	1.58	1.51	1.44	1.37
LINCOLN	MO	2.00	1.85	1.78	1.72	1.65	1.58
LINN	MO	1.80	1.67	1.62	1.58	1.53	1.48
LIVINGSTON	MO	1.80	1.68	1.63	1.59	1.54	1.50
MACON	MO	2.20	2.01	1.82	1.64	1.45	1.27
MADISON	MO	1.80	1.67	1.62	1.56	1.51	1.46
MARIES	MO	2.20	2.09	1.99	1.88	1.78	1.68
MARION	MO	2.00	2.05	1.92	1.78	1.65	1.51
MCDONALD	MO	1.80	1.65	1.59	1.52	1.46	1.39
MERCER	MO	1.80	1.54	1.53	1.53	1.52	1.51
MILLER	MO	2.00	1.83	1.74	1.65	1.56	1.47
MISSISSIPPI	MO	2.20	2.28	2.17	2.05	1.94	1.83
MONITEAU	MO	2.00	1.84	1.77	1.69	1.62	1.54
MONROE	MO	1.80	1.67	1.62	1.57	1.52	1.47
MONTGOMERY	MO	2.00	1.85	1.78	1.70	1.63	1.56
MORGAN	MO	2.00	1.83	1.74	1.64	1.55	1.46
NEW MADRID	MO	2.20	2.29	2.19	2.09	1.99	1.89
NEWTON	MO	2.20	2.09	1.89	1.68	1.48	1.27
NODAWAY	MO	1.80	1.84	1.76	1.69	1.61	1.53
OREGON	MO	2.20	2.09	1.99	1.90	1.80	1.70
OSAGE	MO	2.00	1.85	1.77	1.70	1.62	1.55
OZARK	MO	2.20	2.05	1.91	1.77	1.63	1.49
PEMISCOT	MO	2.20	2.44	2.33	2.21	2.10	1.99
PERRY	MO	2.20	1.94	1.87	1.79	1.72	1.65
PETTIS	MO	2.00	1.83	1.74	1.65	1.56	1.47
PHELPS	MO	2.00	2.05	1.92	1.78	1.65	1.51
PIKE	MO	2.00	1.68	1.64	1.59	1.55	1.51
PLATTE	MO	1.80	1.83	1.74	1.65	1.56	1.47
POLK	MO	2.20	2.01	1.83	1.66	1.48	1.30
PULASKI	MO	2.20	2.04	1.90	1.75	1.61	1.46
PUTNAM	MO	1.80	1.54	1.52	1.51	1.49	1.48
RALLS	MO	2.00	1.66	1.61	1.55	1.50	1.44
RANDOLPH	MO	1.80	1.84	1.76	1.67	1.59	1.51
RAY	MO	1.80	1.67	1.63	1.58	1.54	1.49
REYNOLDS	MO	2.20	2.08	1.97	1.87	1.76	1.65
RIPLEY	MO	2.20	2.11	2.03	1.96	1.88	1.80
SALINE	MO	2.00	1.93	1.85	1.78	1.70	1.62
SCHUYLER	MO	1.80	1.53	1.51	1.50	1.48	1.46
SCOTLAND	MO	1.80	1.66	1.61	1.55	1.50	1.44
SCOTT	MO	2.20	2.27	2.15	2.02	1.90	1.78
SHANNON	MO	2.20	2.08	1.96	1.85	1.73	1.62
SHELBY	MO	1.80	1.66	1.60	1.55	1.49	1.43
ST. CHARLES	MO	2.00	1.93	1.85	1.78	1.70	1.62
ST. CLAIR	MO	2.00	1.81	1.70	1.58	1.47	1.36
ST. FRANCOIS	MO	2.00	1.94	1.86	1.79	1.71	1.64
ST. LOUIS	MO	2.00	1.94	1.87	1.80	1.73	1.66
ST. LOUIS CITY	MO	2.00	1.94	1.87	1.81	1.74	1.67
STE. GENEVIEVE	MO	2.00	1.94	1.86	1.79	1.71	1.64
STODDARD	MO	2.20	2.11	2.04	1.96	1.89	1.81

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFEREN-TIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
STONE	MO	2.20	2.01	1.84	1.66	1.49	1.31
SULLIVAN	MO	1.80	1.67	1.63	1.58	1.54	1.49
TANEY	MO	2.20	2.03	1.86	1.70	1.53	1.37
TEXAS	MO	2.20	2.05	1.91	1.77	1.63	1.49
VERNON	MO	2.20	2.11	1.92	1.73	1.54	1.35
WARREN	MO	2.00	1.93	1.84	1.76	1.67	1.59
WASHINGTON	MO	2.00	1.93	1.85	1.78	1.70	1.62
WAYNE	MO	2.20	2.10	2.01	1.92	1.83	1.74
WEBSTER	MO	2.20	2.01	1.83	1.64	1.46	1.28
WORTH	MO	1.80	1.84	1.76	1.69	1.61	1.53
WRIGHT	MO	2.20	2.03	1.87	1.70	1.54	1.38
ADAMS	MS	3.40	3.20	3.00	2.81	2.61	2.41
ALCORN	MS	2.90	2.70	2.57	2.43	2.30	2.17
AMITE	MS	3.40	3.20	3.01	2.81	2.62	2.42
ATTALA	MS	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.70	2.57	2.44
BENTON	MS	2.90	2.72	2.61	2.50	2.39	2.28
BOLIVAR	MS	3.10	2.85	2.72	2.60	2.47	2.34
CALHOUN	MS	3.10	2.86	2.74	2.63	2.51	2.39
CARROLL	MS	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.68	2.55	2.42
CHICKASAW	MS	3.10	2.85	2.73	2.60	2.48	2.35
CHOCTAW	MS	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.68	2.55	2.42
CLAIBORNE	MS	3.30	3.11	2.94	2.76	2.59	2.42
CLARKE	MS	3.30	3.13	2.98	2.84	2.69	2.54
CLAY	MS	3.10	2.94	2.80	2.65	2.51	2.37
COAHOMA	MS	2.90	2.74	2.64	2.55	2.45	2.36
COPIAH	MS	3.30	3.11	2.94	2.78	2.61	2.44
COVINGTON	MS	3.40	3.22	3.04	2.87	2.69	2.51
DE SOTO	MS	2.90	2.75	2.66	2.58	2.49	2.41
FORREST	MS	3.40	3.23	3.06	2.90	2.73	2.56
FRANKLIN	MS	3.40	3.20	3.01	2.81	2.62	2.42
GEORGE	MS	3.40	3.41	3.23	3.06	2.88	2.71
GREENE	MS	3.40	3.25	3.10	2.95	2.80	2.65
GRENADA	MS	3.10	2.87	2.75	2.64	2.52	2.41
HANCOCK	MS	3.50	3.37	3.16	2.96	2.75	2.54
HARRISON	MS	3.50	3.39	3.20	3.02	2.83	2.64
HINDS	MS	3.30	3.11	2.94	2.78	2.61	2.44
HOLMES	MS	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.68	2.55	2.42
HUMPHREYS	MS	3.10	2.95	2.81	2.68	2.54	2.41
ISSAQUENA	MS	3.10	3.02	2.86	2.71	2.55	2.39
ITAWAMBA	MS	2.90	2.71	2.59	2.46	2.34	2.22
JACKSON	MS	3.50	3.41	3.24	3.08	2.91	2.74
JASPER	MS	3.30	3.13	2.98	2.82	2.67	2.52
JEFFERSON	MS	3.40	3.20	3.01	2.81	2.62	2.42
JEFFERSON DAVIS	MS	3.40	3.22	3.04	2.85	2.67	2.49
JONES	MS	3.40	3.23	3.06	2.88	2.71	2.54
KEMPER	MS	3.10	3.03	2.89	2.74	2.60	2.45
LAFAYETTE	MS	2.90	2.74	2.65	2.55	2.46	2.37
LAMAR	MS	3.40	3.23	3.05	2.88	2.70	2.53
LAUDERDALE	MS	3.30	3.12	2.96	2.81	2.65	2.49
LAWRENCE	MS	3.40	3.21	3.02	2.84	2.65	2.46
LEAKE	MS	3.10	3.04	2.89	2.75	2.60	2.46
LEE	MS	2.90	2.72	2.60	2.49	2.37	2.26
LEFLORE	MS	3.10	2.94	2.81	2.67	2.54	2.40
LINCOLN	MS	3.40	3.21	3.02	2.82	2.63	2.44
LOWNDES	MS	3.10	2.93	2.79	2.64	2.50	2.35
MADISON	MS	3.10	3.03	2.88	2.74	2.59	2.44
MARION	MS	3.40	3.22	3.04	2.85	2.67	2.49
MARSHALL	MS	2.90	2.74	2.64	2.55	2.45	2.36
MONROE	MS	3.10	2.84	2.71	2.57	2.44	2.30
MONTGOMERY	MS	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.68	2.55	2.42
NESHOBA	MS	3.10	3.04	2.89	2.75	2.60	2.46
NEWTON	MS	3.30	3.12	2.96	2.80	2.64	2.48
NOXUBEE	MS	3.10	2.95	2.81	2.68	2.54	2.41
OKTIBBEHA	MS	3.10	2.94	2.81	2.67	2.54	2.40
PANOLA	MS	2.90	2.74	2.66	2.57	2.49	2.40
PEARL RIVER	MS	3.40	3.37	3.16	2.94	2.73	2.52
PERRY	MS	3.40	3.24	3.08	2.92	2.76	2.60
PIKE	MS	3.40	3.21	3.02	2.82	2.63	2.44
PONTOTOC	MS	2.90	2.73	2.63	2.53	2.43	2.33
PRENTISS	MS	2.90	2.70	2.57	2.44	2.31	2.18

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFEREN-TIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
QUITMAN	MS	2.90	2.74	2.65	2.57	2.48	2.39
RANKIN	MS	3.30	3.12	2.95	2.79	2.62	2.46
SCOTT	MS	3.30	3.12	2.96	2.79	2.63	2.47
SHARKEY	MS	3.10	3.02	2.87	2.71	2.56	2.40
SIMPSON	MS	3.30	3.12	2.96	2.79	2.63	2.47
SMITH	MS	3.30	3.12	2.96	2.81	2.65	2.49
STONE	MS	3.40	3.38	3.19	2.99	2.80	2.60
SUNFLOWER	MS	3.10	2.86	2.74	2.62	2.50	2.38
TALLAHATCHIE	MS	3.10	2.86	2.75	2.63	2.52	2.40
TATE	MS	2.90	2.74	2.66	2.57	2.49	2.40
TIPPAH	MS	2.90	2.71	2.60	2.48	2.37	2.25
TISHOMINGO	MS	2.90	2.69	2.54	2.40	2.25	2.11
TUNICA	MS	2.90	2.74	2.65	2.57	2.48	2.39
UNION	MS	2.90	2.72	2.61	2.51	2.40	2.29
WALTHALL	MS	3.40	3.21	3.02	2.84	2.65	2.46
WARREN	MS	3.30	3.11	2.94	2.76	2.59	2.42
WASHINGTON	MS	3.10	2.94	2.80	2.65	2.51	2.37
WAYNE	MS	3.40	3.24	3.08	2.91	2.75	2.59
WEBSTER	MS	3.10	2.95	2.81	2.68	2.54	2.41
WILKINSON	MS	3.40	3.20	3.00	2.81	2.61	2.41
WINSTON	MS	3.10	2.95	2.82	2.69	2.56	2.43
YALOBUSHA	MS	3.10	2.86	2.75	2.63	2.52	2.40
YAZOO	MS	3.10	3.03	2.88	2.73	2.58	2.43
BEAVERHEAD	MT	1.60	1.47	1.34	1.21	1.08	0.95
BIG HORN	MT	1.60	1.50	1.40	1.31	1.21	1.11
BLAINE	MT	1.60	1.53	1.45	1.38	1.30	1.23
BROADWATER	MT	1.60	1.48	1.36	1.24	1.12	1.00
CARBON	MT	1.60	1.49	1.38	1.26	1.15	1.04
CARTER	MT	1.65	1.48	1.35	1.23	1.10	0.98
CASCADE	MT	1.60	1.54	1.48	1.42	1.36	1.30
CHOUTEAU	MT	1.60	1.54	1.48	1.41	1.35	1.29
CUSTER	MT	1.60	1.49	1.38	1.28	1.17	1.06
DANIELS	MT	1.60	1.50	1.41	1.31	1.22	1.12
DAWSON	MT	1.60	1.49	1.38	1.28	1.17	1.06
DEER LODGE	MT	1.60	1.50	1.40	1.29	1.19	1.09
FALLON	MT	1.65	1.48	1.36	1.25	1.13	1.01
FERGUS	MT	1.60	1.52	1.43	1.35	1.26	1.18
FLATHEAD	MT	1.60	1.52	1.43	1.35	1.26	1.18
GALLATIN	MT	1.60	1.44	1.28	1.11	0.95	0.79
GARFIELD	MT	1.60	1.51	1.42	1.34	1.25	1.16
GLACIER	MT	1.60	1.53	1.46	1.38	1.31	1.24
GOLDEN VALLEY	MT	1.60	1.50	1.41	1.31	1.22	1.12
GRANITE	MT	1.60	1.52	1.43	1.35	1.26	1.18
HILL	MT	1.60	1.53	1.47	1.40	1.34	1.27
JEFFERSON	MT	1.60	1.48	1.36	1.25	1.13	1.01
JUDITH BASIN	MT	1.60	1.52	1.44	1.36	1.28	1.20
LAKE	MT	1.60	1.52	1.44	1.35	1.27	1.19
LEWIS AND CLARK	MT	1.60	1.52	1.44	1.35	1.27	1.19
LIBERTY	MT	1.60	1.54	1.47	1.41	1.34	1.28
LINCOLN	MT	1.80	1.50	1.40	1.29	1.19	1.09
MADISON	MT	1.60	1.50	1.40	1.30	1.20	1.10
MCCONE	MT	1.60	1.45	1.31	1.16	1.02	0.87
MEAGHER	MT	1.60	1.49	1.38	1.26	1.15	1.04
MINERAL	MT	1.80	1.51	1.42	1.32	1.23	1.14
MISSOULA	MT	1.60	1.52	1.44	1.37	1.29	1.21
MUSSELSHELL	MT	1.60	1.51	1.42	1.33	1.24	1.15
PARK	MT	1.60	1.45	1.29	1.14	0.98	0.83
PETROLEUM	MT	1.60	1.51	1.43	1.34	1.26	1.17
PHILLIPS	MT	1.60	1.52	1.44	1.36	1.28	1.20
PONDERA	MT	1.60	1.54	1.47	1.41	1.34	1.28
POWDER RIVER	MT	1.60	1.49	1.37	1.26	1.14	1.03
POWELL	MT	1.60	1.51	1.42	1.34	1.25	1.16
PRAIRIE	MT	1.60	1.49	1.39	1.28	1.18	1.07
RAVALLI	MT	1.60	1.52	1.44	1.37	1.29	1.21
RICHLAND	MT	1.60	1.49	1.38	1.27	1.16	1.05
ROOSEVELT	MT	1.60	1.50	1.39	1.29	1.18	1.08
ROSEBUD	MT	1.60	1.50	1.40	1.31	1.21	1.11
SANDERS	MT	1.80	1.51	1.41	1.32	1.22	1.13
SHERIDAN	MT	1.60	1.50	1.39	1.29	1.18	1.08
SILVER BOW	MT	1.60	1.49	1.37	1.26	1.14	1.03

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFEREN-TIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
STILLWATER	MT	1.60	1.48	1.36	1.24	1.12	1.00
SWEET GRASS	MT	1.60	1.47	1.34	1.21	1.08	0.95
TETON	MT	1.60	1.54	1.48	1.42	1.36	1.30
TOOLE	MT	1.60	1.54	1.47	1.41	1.34	1.28
TREASURE	MT	1.60	1.51	1.41	1.32	1.22	1.13
VALLEY	MT	1.60	1.51	1.42	1.34	1.25	1.16
WHEATLAND	MT	1.60	1.50	1.39	1.29	1.18	1.08
WIBAUX	MT	1.60	1.49	1.37	1.26	1.14	1.03
YELLOWSTONE	MT	1.60	1.51	1.42	1.33	1.24	1.15
YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK	MT	1.60	1.45	1.30	1.15	1.00	0.85
ALAMANCE	NC	3.10	2.86	2.63	2.41	2.18	1.96
ALEXANDER	NC	2.95	2.70	2.48	2.25	2.03	1.80
ALLEGHANY	NC	2.95	2.69	2.45	2.22	1.98	1.74
ANSON	NC	3.10	2.88	2.68	2.49	2.29	2.09
ASHE	NC	2.95	2.69	2.45	2.22	1.98	1.74
AVERY	NC	2.95	2.70	2.47	2.24	2.01	1.78
BEAUFORT	NC	3.20	3.06	2.90	2.73	2.57	2.40
BERTIE	NC	3.20	3.03	2.84	2.64	2.45	2.25
BLADEN	NC	3.30	3.07	2.91	2.76	2.60	2.44
BRUNSWICK	NC	3.30	3.11	2.99	2.86	2.74	2.62
BUNCOMBE	NC	2.95	2.72	2.51	2.29	2.08	1.87
BURKE	NC	2.95	2.71	2.49	2.26	2.04	1.82
CABARRUS	NC	3.10	2.84	2.61	2.37	2.14	1.90
CALDWELL	NC	2.95	2.70	2.47	2.25	2.02	1.79
CAMDEN	NC	3.20	3.03	2.84	2.64	2.45	2.25
CARTERET	NC	3.20	3.09	2.95	2.81	2.67	2.53
CASWELL	NC	3.10	2.84	2.60	2.36	2.12	1.88
CATAWBA	NC	3.10	2.83	2.58	2.33	2.08	1.83
CHATHAM	NC	3.10	2.88	2.68	2.48	2.28	2.08
CHEROKEE	NC	2.95	2.77	2.60	2.44	2.27	2.11
CHOWAN	NC	3.20	3.03	2.83	2.64	2.44	2.24
CLAY	NC	2.95	2.77	2.61	2.46	2.30	2.14
CLEVELAND	NC	3.10	2.84	2.61	2.37	2.14	1.90
COLUMBUS	NC	3.30	3.09	2.95	2.82	2.68	2.54
CRAVEN	NC	3.20	3.08	2.93	2.79	2.64	2.49
CUMBERLAND	NC	3.30	3.04	2.84	2.65	2.45	2.26
CURRITUCK	NC	3.20	3.03	2.83	2.64	2.44	2.24
DARE	NC	3.20	3.05	2.88	2.70	2.53	2.35
DAVIDSON	NC	3.10	2.85	2.62	2.38	2.15	1.92
DAVIE	NC	3.10	2.83	2.59	2.34	2.10	1.85
DUPLIN	NC	3.30	3.07	2.91	2.75	2.59	2.43
DURHAM	NC	3.10	2.87	2.66	2.46	2.25	2.04
EDGECOMBE	NC	3.20	3.03	2.83	2.64	2.44	2.24
FORSYTH	NC	3.10	2.84	2.59	2.35	2.10	1.86
FRANKLIN	NC	3.10	2.88	2.68	2.49	2.29	2.09
GASTON	NC	3.10	2.84	2.60	2.35	2.11	1.87
GATES	NC	3.20	3.02	2.81	2.60	2.39	2.18
GRAHAM	NC	2.95	2.76	2.58	2.41	2.23	2.06
GRANVILLE	NC	3.10	2.86	2.65	2.43	2.22	2.00
GREENE	NC	3.20	3.05	2.87	2.70	2.52	2.34
GUILFORD	NC	3.10	2.85	2.62	2.38	2.15	1.92
HALIFAX	NC	3.10	2.89	2.70	2.51	2.32	2.13
HARNETT	NC	3.30	3.02	2.81	2.59	2.38	2.17
HAYWOOD	NC	2.95	2.73	2.54	2.34	2.15	1.95
HENDERSON	NC	2.95	2.74	2.54	2.35	2.15	1.96
HERTFORD	NC	3.20	3.02	2.81	2.59	2.38	2.17
HOKE	NC	3.30	3.03	2.83	2.64	2.44	2.24
HYDE	NC	3.20	3.07	2.91	2.75	2.59	2.43
IREDELL	NC	3.10	2.83	2.58	2.33	2.08	1.83
JACKSON	NC	2.95	2.75	2.57	2.40	2.22	2.04
JOHNSTON	NC	3.20	3.03	2.82	2.62	2.41	2.21
JONES	NC	3.20	3.08	2.93	2.77	2.62	2.47
LEE	NC	3.10	2.89	2.70	2.50	2.31	2.12
LENOIR	NC	3.20	3.07	2.91	2.75	2.59	2.43
LINCOLN	NC	3.10	2.83	2.59	2.34	2.10	1.85
MACON	NC	2.95	2.71	2.49	2.27	2.05	1.83
MADISON	NC	2.95	2.76	2.59	2.42	2.25	2.08
MARTIN	NC	2.95	2.71	2.50	2.28	2.07	1.85
MCDOWELL	NC	3.20	3.04	2.86	2.67	2.49	2.30
MECKLENBURG	NC	3.10	2.84	2.60	2.37	2.13	1.89

COUNTY/PARISH	STATE	OPTION 1A DIFFERENTIAL	OPTION 1B DIFFERENTIAL (Per Year)				
			1999	2000	2001	2002	2003 & beyond
MITCHELL	NC	2.95	2.70	2.48	2.25	2.03	1.80
MONTGOMERY	NC	3.10	2.87	2.66	2.44	2.23	2.02
MOORE	NC	3.10	2.89	2.69	2.50	2.30	2.11
NASH	NC	3.10	2.90	2.72	2.54	2.36	2.18
NEW HANOVER	NC	3.30	3.11	2.98	2.86	2.73	2.61
NORTHAMPTON	NC	3.10	2.88	2.69	2.49	2.30	2.10
ONSLOW	NC	3.30	3.09	2.95	2.80	2.66	2.52
ORANGE	NC	3.10	2.87	2.65	2.44	2.22	2.01
PAMLICO	NC	3.20	3.08	2.93	2.78	2.63	2.48
PASQUOTANK	NC	3.20	3.03	2.84	2.64	2.45	2.25
PENDER	NC	3.30	3.09	2.95	2.81	2.67	2.53
PERQUIMANS	NC	3.20	3.04	2.84	2.65	2.45	2.26
PERSON	NC	3.10	2.85	2.62	2.38	2.15	1.92
PITT	NC	3.20	3.05	2.88	2.70	2.53	2.35
POLK	NC	3.10	2.85	2.63	2.40	2.18	1.95
RANDOLPH	NC	3.10	2.86	2.64	2.42	2.20	1.98
RICHMOND	NC	3.10	2.90	2.72	2.53	2.35	2.17
ROBESON	NC	3.30	3.05	2.88	2.70	2.53	2.35
ROCKINGHAM	NC	2.95	2.71	2.50	2.28	2.07	1.85
ROWAN	NC	3.10	2.84	2.60	2.37	2.13	1.89
RUTHERFORD	NC	3.10	2.84	2.60	2.37	2.13	1.89
SAMPSON	NC	3.30	3.05	2.87	2.70	2.52	2.34
SCOTLAND	NC	3.30	3.03	2.83	2.64	2.44	2.24
STANLY	NC	3.10	2.86	2.64	2.41	2.19	1.97
STOKES	NC	2.95	2.70	2.47	2.25	2.02	1.79
SURRY	NC	2.95	2.70	2.47	2.23	2.00	1.77
SWAIN	NC	2.95	2.75	2.57	2.39	2.21	2.03
TRANSYLVANIA	NC	2.95	2.75	2.56	2.38	2.19	2.01
TYRRELL	NC	3.20	3.05	2.87	2.70	2.52	2.34
UNION	NC	3.10	2.86	2.65	2.43	2.22	2.00
VANCE	NC	3.10	2.86	2.64	2.43	2.21	1.99
WAKE	NC	3.10	2.89	2.70	2.50	2.31	2.12
WARREN	NC	3.10	2.86	2.65	2.43	2.22	2.00
WASHINGTON	NC	3.30	3.05	2.87	2.69	2.51	2.33
WATAUGA	NC	2.95	2.70	2.46	2.23	1.99	1.76
WAYNE	NC	3.20	3.05	2.87	2.68	2.50	2.32
WILKES	NC	2.95	2.70	2.47	2.24	2.01	1.78
WILSON	NC	3.20	3.03	2.83	2.62	2.42	2.22
YADKIN	NC	3.10	2.71	2.49	2.26	2.04	1.82
YANCEY	NC	2.95	2.71	2.49	2.26	2.04	1.82
ADAMS	ND	1.65	1.15	1.10	1.05	1.00	0.95
BARNES	ND	1.65	1.15	1.10	1.05	1.00	0.95
BENSON	ND	1.60	1.15	1.11	1.06	1.02	0.97
BILLINGS	ND	1.60	1.16	1.12	1.09	1.05	1.01
BOTTINEAU	ND	1.60	1.16	1.12	1.07	1.03	0.99
BOWMAN	ND	1.65	1.15	1.11	1.06	1.02	0.97
BURKE	ND	1.60	1.16	1.13	1.09	1.06	1.02
BURLEIGH	ND	1.65	1.15	1.10	1.06	1.01	0.96
CASS	ND	1.65	1.14	1.08	1.01	0.95	0.89
CAVALIER	ND	1.60	1.15	1.10	1.06	1.01	0.96
DICKEY	ND	1.65	1.15	1.10	1.05	1.00	0.95
DIVIDE	ND	1.60	1.17	1.14	1.10	1.07	1.04
DUNN	ND	1.60	1.16	1.12	1.07	1.03	0.99
EDDY	ND	1.65	1.16	1.11	1.07	1.02	0.98
EMMONS	ND	1.65	1.15	1.10	1.05	1.00	0.95
FOSTER	ND	1.65	1.15	1.11	1.06	1.02	0.97
GOLDEN VALLEY	ND	1.60	1.16	1.13	1.09	1.06	1.02
GRAND FORKS	ND	1.65	1.16	1.12	1.08	1.04	1.00
GRANT	ND	1.65	1.15	1.10	1.05	1.00	0.95
GRIGGS	ND	1.65	1.15	1.11	1.06	1.02	0.97
HETTINGER	ND	1.65	1.15	1.10	1.06	1.01	0.96
KIDDER	ND	1.65	1.15	1.11	1.06	1.02	0.97
LA MOURE	ND	1.65	1.15	1.10	1.05	1.00	0.95
LOGAN	ND	1.65	1.15	1.10	1.05	1.00	0.95
MCHENRY	ND	1.60	1.16	1.11	1.07	1.02	0.98
MCINTOSH	ND	1.65	1.15	1.10	1.05	1.00	0.95
MCKENZIE	ND	1.60	1.17	1.13	1.10	1.06	1.03
MCLEAN	ND	1.60	1.16	1.11	1.07	1.02	0.98
MERCER	ND	1.60	1.16	1.11	1.07	1.02	0.98
MORTON	ND	1.65	1.15	1.10	1.06	1.01	0.96