



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Staff Paper #373

March 2005

Dairy Programs Face Difficult Future

Ken Bailey

Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
College of Agricultural Sciences
The Pennsylvania State University
Armsby Building
University Park, PA 16802-5600

The Pennsylvania State University is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to programs, facilities, admission, and employment without regard to personal characteristics not related to ability, performance, or qualifications as determined by University policy or by state or federal authorities. It is the policy of the University to maintain an academic and work environment free of discrimination, including harassment. The Pennsylvania State University prohibits discrimination and harassment against any person because of age, ancestry, color, disability or handicap, national origin, race, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status. Discrimination or harassment against faculty, staff or students will not be tolerated at The Pennsylvania State University. Direct all inquiries regarding the nondiscrimination policy to the Affirmative Action Director, The Pennsylvania State University, 328 Boucke Building, University Park, PA 16802-2801, Tel (814) 865-4700/V, (814) 863-1150/TTY.

Introduction

Federal dairy programs face a difficult future due to a combination of current budget cuts, future WTO commitments, and a looming Farm Bill. The President's Budget is calling for a two-year extension of the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) program, along with a reduction in spending under the Dairy Price Support Program (DPSP). A new WTO agreement will almost certainly call for reduced amber box spending, which will directly target the DPSP. And discussions on the upcoming Farm Bill will almost certainly call into question the effectiveness of both the MILC program and the DPSP.

National farm organizations like the American Farm Bureau and the National Milk Producers Federation will struggle to find united positions on these important dairy issues. That will be difficult since regional differences will prevent a consensus of opinions. The analysis below clearly indicates that support for the DPSP and the MILC program is highly regional and in direct opposition to each other.

President's Budget

The President's Budget for Fiscal Year 2006 calls for agricultural program cuts (USDA, February 7, 2005). Surprisingly it also includes new program spending. The MILC program is to be extended an additional two years beyond September 30, 2005. This decision by the White House was based on a campaign promise by the President. It also calls for the following cuts:

- Lowering the payment limit cap on total individual payments from \$360,000 per year to \$250,000.
- Reducing crop and dairy payments to farmers by 5 percent.

The USDA savings under the DPSP were realized by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust the butter-nonfat dry milk "tilt" in order to realize greater budget savings (more about the tilt below). One can assume these tilts will occur more than just twice a year, as is the current authority. The USDA is hinting that the Congress give them very clear authority to manage the DPSP in such a way as to reduce program costs without the resulting political ramifications.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) estimated that the President's Budget will result in new spending of \$1.2 billion in FY 2006 and FY 2007 due to the MILC program, and savings from the DPSP of \$360 million over 5 years (FY 2006-10).

The President's Budget has since gone to the Congress where the Budget committees have assigned spending target reductions to relevant committees of jurisdiction. In this process the OMB numbers are no longer relevant. Instead, the Congress looks to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). Interestingly, CBO came up with alternative estimates of savings under the President's Budget. Their estimate, called a "score," had costs of \$1.307 billion for extension of the MILC program and savings of just \$251 million over 5 years for the DPSP.

This budget exercise raises a number of interesting questions for the U.S. dairy industry. First, who benefits from an extension of the MILC payment program? Since an extension will require savings elsewhere in the budget, could the savings come from the DPSP? Who benefits from the existing DPSP program? Finally, if maintaining the MILC program required a

greater tradeoff, would the U.S. dairy industry be willing to suffer a reduction in the milk price support level?

Who Benefits from the MILC Program?

The Milk Income Loss Contract Program (MILC) pays dairy producers monthly when the Boston Class I milk price falls below \$16.94 per cwt. Payment rates are determined by multiplying this positive difference by 45 percent. Payments are issued to individual producers up to a maximum of 2.4 million pounds of milk produced and marketed per fiscal year.

The program acts as a counter cyclical payment program since payments rise whenever milk prices fall. It is also a targeted program since payments are limited each fiscal year to 2.4 million pounds per farm operation. A 110-cow farm producing 60 pounds of milk per day from each cow will receive the MILC payments on 100 percent of their milk marketings.

The targeting feature of the program makes it fiscally responsible since it limits program payments. It also makes the program less likely to expand the U.S. milk supply since program benefits are tied to smaller farms, those less likely to expand in the future. But this feature also makes it very political since larger dairy farms will receive payments that are only a fraction of their annual gross milk sales. Thus states with large numbers of small dairy farms will likely support the MILC payment program, whereas larger dairy states with fewer farms will not.

Table 1 indicates the major states that received the bulk of the MILC payments over the period December 1, 2001 and December 28, 2004. The top four states in terms of payments accounted for 47 percent of all MILC payments since the beginning of the program. As the data suggest, these are also major milk producing states. With the exception of California, the top five states for MILC payments can be characterized as states with large numbers of small dairy farms. Wisconsin alone has over 15,000 licensed dairy herds. This measure of dairy herds by USDA more accurately reflects individual dairy operations or families that market milk.

Table 1. Milk Income Loss Payment Expenditures by Major State

State	Total MILC Payments 1/ Mil \$	2004 Milk Production Mil Lbs	Licenses No. Dairy Farms 2004
Wisconsin	414.0	22,085	15,570
New York	186.7	11,650	6,630
Pennsylvania	180.3	10,062	8,720
Minnesota	163.4	8,102	5,810
California	147.9	36,465	2,030
Idaho	38.8	9,093	755
New Mexico	14.3	6,710	170
Washington	35.9	5,416	620
Texas	45.1	6,009	810
Arizona	9.2	3,646	150

Source: USDA.

1/ Period December 1, 2001 through December 28, 2004.

The data in Table 1 indicates that large dairy states in the Midwest and Northeast received the lions share of MILC payments since program inception. That's because these states have the largest concentrations of small family farms. Western States like Arizona, Idaho, New Mexico, Texas and Washington, while significant in terms of milk production, received much less from the MILC program. That's because these states had small numbers of larger dairy farms.

The MILC program is scheduled to terminate September 30, 2005, prior to the expiration date for the current Farm Bill. There have been legislative proposals to extend this deadline. U.S. Senator Rick Santorum (R-PA) introduced Senate Bill 307 earlier this year to extend the MILC payment program in its current form through September 30, 2007. A similar bill was introduced in the House (H. 859) by U.S. Representative Collin Peterson (D-MN). Both bills did not alter the volume limitation cap of 2.4 million pounds. Other proposals called for an extension of the MILC payment program and expanded the volume of milk eligible for program payments. Many Western legislators, however, are opposed to an MILC extension. In a letter to colleagues dated March 17, 2005, seven U.S. Senators from the West opposed efforts to extend the MILC payment program (Mike Crapo (R-ID), Jeff Bingaman (D-NM), Larry Craig (R-ID), Pete Domenici (R-NM), John Cornyn (R-TX), Dianne Feinstein (D-CA), and Barbara Boxer (D-CA)).

Who Benefits from Price Support Program?

The Dairy Price Support Program (DPSP) is managed by the USDA's Farm Service Agency. This program allows dairy processors to sell surplus quantities of butter, cheese, or nonfat dry milk to the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) at prices linked to the support price of milk. This program provides a floor for these commodity prices, effectively placing a floor on the manufacturing value for milk. Farmers theoretically indirectly benefit from this program.

The support price for milk has been at \$9.90 per cwt for milk testing 3.67 percent milk fat since August 15, 1999 (USDA, FSA July 2004). That price is linked to CCC purchase prices for butter and nonfat dry milk, and cheese. There is one support price formula for butter and nonfat dry milk, and another for cheese. Given a fixed support price for milk, the CCC purchase prices for butter and nonfat dry milk can only be raised or lowered if the price of the other product is changed in the opposite direction (called a "tilt"). Hence the CCC purchase price for nonfat dry milk can be lowered from the current level of \$0.80 per pound, but only if the butter price is raised. That would maintain the support price for manufacturing milk.

Figures 1, 2 and 3 show the relationship between wholesale commodity prices for nonfat dry milk, butter and cheese in relation to the respective CCC purchase prices. Two things are clear. First, the market prices for butter and cheese are supported by the market place, not the DPSP. Strong market demand for these products has kept their prices well above support price levels. Second, the market price for nonfat dry milk is determined in most months by the CCC purchase price for nonfat dry milk. In fact, the only reason the Western price of nonfat dry milk is currently above the CCC purchase price is because of strong international prices. Whenever international prices are below the CCC purchase price of nonfat dry milk, there are very few commercial exports of nonfat dry milk and surplus powder is directed to the DPSP.

Figure 1. Nonfat Dry Milk: Market vs. Support




Figure 2. Butter Prices: Market vs. Support





Figure 3. Block Cheese Prices: Market vs. Support



Conclusions

The current budget restrictions in the President's Budget for Fiscal year 2006 are just the beginning of possible changes to existing dairy programs. Some of these challenges were discussed in a recent paper by Professor Ed Jesse of the University of Wisconsin. Both the MILC program and the DPSP will face renewed challenges. The combination of politics, budget restrictions, global trade agreements, and economic realities will eventually result in new dairy programs in the upcoming Farm Bill.

According to Jess, the MILC program in its current form is not viable long-term. He argues that the production caps and program costs will make it vulnerable. According to Jesse, "The MILC target price is too high relative to average milk prices over the past several years." It's also not clear that the MILC program will survive the current budget cuts imposed in the President's budget.

Maintaining the current DPSP appears to be a safe bet for the existing President's budget and for inclusion in the new Farm Bill. But this program also has serious drawbacks. While it is marketed as a national program, it clearly has defined regional benefits, just like the MILC program.

In the end, somewhere in the legislative process, a compromise may be reached whereby the MILC program is extended for another two years and later added in the Farm Bill (after some adjustments). However, for now, because of the added program costs in the current budget, extension of the MILC program can only be included if some cuts were made to the DPSP. These cuts could be as little as requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to revisit the butter/powder tilt more than just twice a year in order to reduce program costs. But a compromise may require more drastic cuts, such as a reduction in the support price for milk. In the end, regional politics will determine which programs are maintained, and which are cut.

References

Jesse, Ed. "Dairy Policy in the Next Farm Bill: An Early Assessment." Marketing and Policy Briefing Paper No. 89. Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics. University of Wisconsin. March 2005.

USDA. "Johanns Outlines President's FY 2006 Agriculture Budget. News Release No. 0038.05, February 7, 2005, Washington, DC.

USDA, Farm Service Agency. "Milk Price Support Program." Fact Sheet. July 2004.

USDA, Farm Service Agency. "Milk Income Loss Contract Program." Fact Sheet: Electronic Edition. November 2002.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service. "Milk Production." February 2005.

USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service. "Dairy Products 2003 Summary." April 2004.