

**MILK HAULING CHARGES IN THE  
UPPER MIDWEST MARKETING AREA  
MAY 2011**



Staff Paper 12-03

Prepared by:  
Corey Freije

April 2012

Federal Milk Market Administrator's Office  
1600 West 82<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite 200  
Minneapolis, MN 55431-1420

**MILK HAULING CHARGES IN THE UPPER MIDWEST MARKETING AREA  
MAY 2011**

Corey Freije

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all of its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, (including gender identity and expression), marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, political beliefs, genetic information, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write to: USDA, Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Stop 9410, Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call toll-free at (866) 632-9992 (English) or (800) 877-8339 (TDD) or (866) 377-8642 (English Federal-relay) or (800) 845-6136 (Spanish Federal-relay). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
I. Introduction .....	1
II. Analysis by Size Group .....	2
III. Analysis by State .....	3
IV. Percentage of Milk Deliveries by State .....	6
V. Average Milk Hauling Charge by Size Range of Producer Delivery .....	7
VI. Average Milk Hauling Charge by State and County .....	10
VII. Summary .....	10
Appendix	

# MILK HAULING CHARGES IN THE UPPER MIDWEST MARKETING AREA MAY 2011

Corey Freije<sup>1</sup>

## Introduction

This study breaks down and categorizes hauling charges based on state, county, and producer size groups for May 2011. The payroll data for producers who were associated with the Upper Midwest Marketing Order were examined. 15,806 dairy producers were associated with the market.

In response to requests from the industry and to provide consistency between papers published by this office, four changes in the methodology of this paper were made. As standard in the other papers published by this office, the data on hauling charges are now aggregated on the farm level. This aggregation results in a lower dairy producer count from the earlier analysis. Another change was to include a weighted average hauling charge by producer and by state. Previously, the hauling charges were only weighted by state production for the marketing order as a whole. The numbers as previously calculated are included in Table 1 as Comparable Weighted Charges. In order to avoid data that frequently skewed previous analysis, the data presented will be for all counties in the states comprising Federal Order 30 and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. Lastly, the new size distribution will be consistent on staff papers from Federal Order 30.

---

<sup>1</sup> Corey Freije is an Agricultural Economist with the Market Administrator's Office, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Assisting Dr. Freije was Rachel M. Benecke of the Upper Midwest Market Administrator's office.

---

---

**Table 1**

**Average Hauling Charge for the Marketing Area for May**

<b>Statistic</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2010</b>
Producer Deliveries (pounds)	3,447,189,366	3,829,040,726
Total Hauling Charges (\$)	\$5,687,570.80	\$6,827,361.55
Weighted average charges (\$/cwt.)	0.1650	0.1783
Comparable Weighted Charges <sup>2</sup> (\$/cwt.)	0.3007	0.3029
Simple average charges (\$/cwt.)	0.5076	0.5595

---

---

The hauling charges data received by the Federal Order 30 office often times represents a flat fee charged by the handler. This flat fee structure leads to a decreasing average hauling charge when viewed on a per hundredweight basis. The possibility also exists that the hauling charge relationship for large producers may differ on a handler by handler basis. This relationship may mean the producer pays all charges external to the handler's payroll or may haul his own milk. Previous analysis has indicated that hauling charges are a function of producer pounds, the farm's distance to plants, the farm's distance to population centers, competition among handlers, and the prevalence of dairy farms in the market.

**Analysis by Size Group**

Table 2 presents the simple average hauling charge, total hauling charges, production, number of farms, producer average monthly delivery and weighted average hauling charges for each of ten size groups. Skewness dominates the results in Table 2, with 48% of milk produced by 6% of the farmers. In addition these largest categories of farmers pay 32% of the total hauling charges. Chart 2, on page 7, shows the inverse relationship between average pounds of production and average hauling charges for each size category.

---

<sup>2</sup> Changes in methodology led to a difference in weighting systems and would make the weighted average hauling charge incomparable to those in previous studies; a consistent weighted hauling charge is included to preserve this comparability.

---

---

## Table 2

### Average Producer Delivery for the Marketing Area for May 2011

Size	Simple Average Hauling Charge	Total Hauling Charges	Production	Number of Farms	Producer Average Monthly Delivery	Weighted Average Hauling Charges
	(\$/cwt.)	(\$)	(pounds)		(pounds)	(\$)
Up to 49,999	\$0.5235	\$483,332.41	109,682,022	3,447	31,820	\$0.4407
50,000 to 99,999	\$0.2837	\$1,001,222.20	360,035,206	4,902	73,447	\$0.2781
100,000 to 249,999	\$0.2145	\$1,546,844.26	740,835,598	4,889	151,531	\$0.2088
250,000 to 399,999	\$0.1656	\$521,656.22	317,062,769	1,016	312,070	\$0.1645
400,000 to 599,999	\$0.1250	\$329,826.83	266,346,070	546	487,813	\$0.1238
600,000 to 999,999	\$0.1159	\$370,395.98	324,319,772	422	768,530	\$0.1142
1,000,000 to 1,499,999	\$0.0938	\$290,092.67	309,754,259	255	1,214,723	\$0.0937
1,500,000 to 2,499,999	\$0.0941	\$331,203.59	343,109,277	181	1,895,631	\$0.0965
2,500,000 to 4,999,999	\$0.1169	\$415,052.90	356,808,752	107	3,334,661	\$0.1163
5,000,000 or more	\$0.1326	\$397,943.74	319,235,641	41	7,786,235	\$0.1247
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0.2903</b>	<b>\$5,687,570.80</b>	<b>3,447,189,366</b>	<b>15,806</b>	<b>218,094</b>	<b>\$0.1650</b>

---

---

### Analysis by State

Table 3 presents the simple average hauling charge, total hauling charges, production, number of farms, producer average monthly delivery, and weighted average hauling charges for each state comprising the order. Analyzing hauling charges by state has previously led Federal Order 30 staff to hypothesize that non-scale factors such as distance to plants, and population centers, and competition among handlers along with the predominance of dairying in a market affect hauling charges. These factors have been tested and their relevance supported in earlier papers.

---

---

**Table 3**

**Average Producer Delivery, by State and for the Marketing Area for May 2011**

<b>State</b>	<b>Simple Average Hauling Charge</b>	<b>Total Hauling Charges</b>	<b>Production</b>	<b>Number of Farms</b>	<b>Producer Average Monthly Delivery</b>	<b>Weighted Average Hauling Charges</b>
	<b>(\$/cwt.)</b>	<b>(\$)</b>	<b>(pounds)</b>		<b>(pounds)</b>	<b>(\$)</b>
Illinois	\$0.2825	\$74,902.25	54,100,819	319	169,595	\$0.1384
Iowa	\$0.3158	\$633,586.96	296,920,369	1,064	279,060	\$0.2134
Michigan UP	\$0.5504	\$21,551.04	6,889,518	33	208,773	\$0.3128
Minnesota	\$0.3856	\$1,802,755.56	764,292,001	3,793	201,501	\$0.2359
North Dakota	\$1.1423	\$133,914.84	23,063,218	89	259,137	\$0.5806
South Dakota	\$0.6398	\$501,088.78	143,755,721	230	625,025	\$0.3486
Wisconsin	\$0.2366	\$2,519,771.37	2,158,167,720	10,278	209,979	\$0.1168
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0.2903</b>	<b>\$5,687,570.80</b>	<b>3,447,189,366</b>	<b>15,806</b>	<b>218,094</b>	<b>\$0.1650</b>

---

---

As Table 3 indicates, North Dakota has the highest average hauling charge with a low number of farms, the longest distance from high demand areas, and less handler competition. Wisconsin in contrast has the lowest average hauling charge with a high number of farms and close proximity to high demand areas. Of interest is how the average pounds in this table don't correlate as well as Table 2 with average hauling charge implying additional factors determine a farmer's hauling charge.

On the following page, Table 4 shows the May fuel price in relation to the May average hauling charge. Additionally the table shows the percentage change from the previous year for both the price of fuel and the average hauling charge. Both levels are above historical averages with the hauling charge showing less fluctuation and a dampened overall increase to the more volatile fuel price. That volatility is evident in the large positive and negative percentage change values in fuel. In contrast the percentage change in the average hauling charge is much smaller. Given the handlers' tendency to subsidize hauling charges this smaller volatility seems to indicate a stronger tendency to resist passing through the increased hauling costs.

---

---

**Table 4**

**Midwest Fuel Retail Price and Average Hauling Charge<sup>3</sup>**

<b>Year</b>	<b>May Fuel Price</b>	<b>% Change from Previous Year</b>	<b>May Average Hauling Charge</b>	<b>% Change from Previous Year</b>
	(\$/gallon)	(%)	(\$/cwt)	(%)
2007	2.763	-2.88%	\$0.2500	6.43%
2008	4.382	58.60%	\$0.2774	10.96%
2009	2.170	-50.48%	\$0.2984	7.57%
2010	3.038	40.00%	\$0.3029	1.51%
2011	4.001	31.70%	\$0.3007	-0.73%

---

---

Chart 1 shows that over 80% of the milk delivered on Federal Order 30 was from Wisconsin and Minnesota, the other states on the order each had less than 10% of the delivered milk. This predominance for Wisconsin and Minnesota indicates that their weighted averages will pull the overall average for the order down relative to North and South Dakota and the Michigan UP. Wisconsin and Minnesota have not only most of the milk production but also have close proximity to the majority of the population centers and processing plants. Chart 2 shows the milk production percentage for each size class and also the percentage of total hauling charges paid by each size class. For the first three size classes the percentage of hauling charges is greater than their percentage of total production. For the latter seven classes their percentage of hauling charges is smaller than their percentage of production. The commonly accepted explanation for this distribution of charges is that hauling costs are higher for the smaller farm given the increased number of stops in order to fill out a load. Chart 3, on page 9, builds on Chart 2's distribution to show that the average hauling charge and the average milk production are inversely related.

---

<sup>3</sup> Retail fuel prices are for Midwest No. 2 Diesel published by the U.S. Energy Information Administration. [http://www.eia.doe.gov/dnav/pet/hist/LeafHandler.ashx?n=pet&s=emd\\_epd2d\\_pte\\_r20\\_dpg&f=m](http://www.eia.doe.gov/dnav/pet/hist/LeafHandler.ashx?n=pet&s=emd_epd2d_pte_r20_dpg&f=m). May Average Hauling Charge is the "Comparable Weighted Charges" as shown in Table 1.

## Percentage of Milk Deliveries by State


In May 2011, dairy producers from three states delivered the majority of the milk associated with the Upper Midwest Order. The State of Wisconsin producers delivered the most milk of any of the states, by supplying 62.61 percent of the total milk volume associated with the market. Producers from the States of Minnesota and Iowa were second and third in milk volume supplied to the order, respectively.

---

---

### Chart 1

Percent of Delivery Volume by State for May 2011




---

---

## Chart 2

Percent of Hauling Charges and Producer Deliveries for May 2011



---

---

### Average Milk Hauling Charge by Size Range of Producer Delivery

The data shown in Table 5 indicates that there are several other factors that contribute to fluctuating hauling charges. The data reflects the aforementioned relationship between farm location and distances to competing dairy plant manufacturing operations does not explain all of the variation in average hauling charges. This study found that even though a specific dairy producer may be located a very long distance from the Upper Midwest market's largest fluid milk disposition area, it does not necessarily mean that this producer will pay the market's highest rate per hundredweight for hauling. This study recognizes that other factors exist; including the fact that a dairy producer's herd size or milk volume influences the producer's cost of hauling.

The data in Table 5 breaks down the market's dairy producers into ten producer milk volume categories or size ranges. The data presented in Table 5 show a strong indication that as the producer's milk volume increases, the average hauling charge per hundredweight decreases.

**Table 5**

**Average Hauling Charge, by Size Range of Monthly Producer Deliveries, by State, for May 2011 (\$ per cwt.)**

Size	Illinois	Iowa	Michigan	Minnesota	North Dakota	South Dakota	Wisconsin	Average
Up to 49,999	\$0.4854	\$0.5191	\$1.2106	\$0.5427	\$1.4359	\$1.1510	\$0.3840	\$0.4407
50,000 to 99,999	\$0.2488	\$0.3088	\$0.6010	\$0.3881	\$1.3536	\$0.7235	\$0.2181	\$0.2781
100,000 to 249,999	\$0.1554	\$0.2166	\$0.2941	\$0.2922	\$0.9394	\$0.6106	\$0.1587	\$0.2088
250,000 to 399,999	\$0.1160	\$0.1817	\$0.5407	\$0.2189	\$1.0999	\$0.5766	\$0.1179	\$0.1645
400,000 to 599,999	\$0.0420	\$0.1696		\$0.1684	R	\$0.6164	\$0.0872	\$0.1238
600,000 to 999,999	\$0.0337	\$0.1782		\$0.1595	R	\$0.3498	\$0.0797	\$0.1142
1,000,000 to 1,499,999	R	\$0.1777		\$0.1423	\$0.4103	\$0.2695	\$0.0594	\$0.0937
1,500,000 to 2,499,999	\$0.0829	\$0.2127		\$0.1265	\$0.1507	\$0.2255	\$0.0606	\$0.0965
2,500,000 to 4,999,999		\$0.2651	R	\$0.1730	R	\$0.2434	\$0.0557	\$0.1163
5,000,000 or more		\$0.1773		\$0.1721		\$0.3507	\$0.0324	\$0.1247
<b>Average</b>	<b>\$0.1384</b>	<b>\$0.2134</b>	<b>\$0.3128</b>	<b>\$0.2359</b>	<b>\$0.5806</b>	<b>\$0.3486</b>	<b>\$0.1168</b>	<b>\$0.1650</b>


R = Restricted, fewer than three producers.

The study acknowledges that there are several major factors causing differences in hauling charges between individual producer sizes. The most obvious factor responsible for influencing the producer's hauling rate per hundredweight, by herd size range, is that most Upper Midwest handlers charge a fixed hauling dollar value to dairy producers, regardless of volume of milk the particular producer is marketing. Therefore, as one of these producer's production increases, his or her hauling charge per hundredweight will automatically decrease. This increase/decrease relationship is apparent when examining most of the data shown in Table 5. Further, this study finds that 84.8 percent of the producer milk is procured from the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin. The study also finds that these two states have more small dairy producers. Many of these producers are

generally located within the vicinity of multiple milk processors. Therefore, these producers will apparently pay for shorter hauling distances, and therefore their hauling charges on a per hundredweight basis are going to be less than similar size producers located in other parts of the market's procurement area. The detail in Chart 3 shows the average hauling charge, by size range, for all producer milk associated with the market, for May 2011.

**Chart 3**

**Producer Delivery versus Average Hauling Charges for May 2011**



As mentioned above, one factor that contributes to varying hauling rate charges is the dairy producer's location to the market, or those areas possessing strong procurement competition among fluid dairy processors and/or cheese manufacturing plants. This factor is quite noticeable in the milkshed areas found in Minnesota and Wisconsin. The study finds that lower hauling charges in these areas reflect strong procurement competition

accompanied by shorter hauling distances between dairy farm operations and dairy manufacturing plants.

### **Average Milk Hauling Charge by State and County**

In the Appendix, the counties with the highest average hauling charges were mainly located in northern Minnesota and North Dakota. The study acknowledges that many of these counties lack multiple dairy plant operators and/or ample local competition for milk procurement. The dairy producers and plant operations found in these semi-remote areas are geographically more spread-out compared to many dairy producers and plant operations in other counties within the marketing area. The added distance between these farms and plants raises the actual transportation cost for moving their milk to market. As mentioned above, the vast majority of handlers on this market charge producers a flat hauling value regardless of the size or volume of milk being marketed. Therefore, the lower the producer's milk production, the higher his or her average hauling charge on a per hundredweight basis. This study finds that many of these semi-remote counties do in fact lack a couple of these "large dairy farm" operations that would otherwise have decreased the county's average hauling rate considerably. Many of these smaller farms were located in these semi-remote counties possessing lower human populations.

Many of the counties that had the lowest average hauling charges are geographically located in close proximity to large Class I fluid markets. Most of the counties with the lowest average hauling charges were found in areas with large numbers of dairy farm operations and/or within close proximity to multiple competing dairy manufacturers. Most of the counties with the lowest average hauling charges had several large dairy farm operations that helped to reduce the county's average hauling rate considerably

### **Summary**

The average hauling distance to the point of delivery is normally highest in perimeter, remote and/or isolated counties. In many instances, the added cost required for hauling milk in these areas combined with a lack of competition among milk procuring handlers, usually results in an increase in the average hauling charges. On the other hand, counties with the lowest average hauling charges tend to be located in areas with relatively high

concentrations of dairy farm operations combined with an adequate supply of milk procuring handlers.

This study revealed that a majority of handlers participating in the Upper Midwest Marketing Area charge their producers a flat hauling value regardless of the producer's size or volume of milk being marketed. In each of these cases, where the handler charges a flat rate, the hauling charge per hundredweight declines as the producer's milk volume increases. A specific county's average hauling cost can be greatly influenced by the county's composition of farm sizes.

Weighted average hauling charges are lowest for larger producers in states with a high concentration of processors and population centers. Hauling charges are highest for small producers at increased distances to processors and the effect is amplified if the concentration of farms is lower. These effects lead to larger charges for farmers in the Dakotas and the U.P. of Michigan and distant counties in Minnesota and Wisconsin. Lastly the weighted average hauling charge for Federal Order 30 shows handlers pass on little of the recent changes in fuel costs to farmers.

---

---

## Appendix

### Upper Midwest Order Reported Payroll Average Hauling Charge, by State and County for May 2011

State	County	Simple Average Hauling Charge (Dollars Per Cwt.)
Illinois	Adams	R
	Boone	\$0.22
	Brown	R
	Carroll	\$0.18
	Champaign	R
	De Kalb	\$0.16
	Grundy	R
	Iroquois	R
	Jo Daviess	\$0.20
	Kane	\$0.28
	Kankakee	R
	Knox	R
	Lake	\$0.38
	Lee	R
	McHenry	\$0.21
	McLean	R
	Ogle	\$0.15
	Pike	R
	Rock Island	\$0.19
	Stephenson	\$0.15
Washington	R	
Whiteside	\$0.36	
Will	\$1.15	
Winnebago	\$0.17	
Iowa	Allamakee	\$0.43
	Appanoose	\$0.58
	Benton	\$0.22
	Boone	R
	Bremer	\$0.30
	Buchanan	\$0.50
	Butler	\$0.21
	Carroll	R
	Cedar	\$0.22
	Cerro Gordo	R
	Cherokee	\$0.64
	Chickasaw	\$0.25
	Clarke	R
	Clay	R
	Clayton	\$0.27
	Clinton	\$0.27

---

---

---

---

## Appendix

### Upper Midwest Order Reported Payroll Average Hauling Charge, by State and County for May 2011

State	County	Simple Average Hauling Charge (Dollars Per Cwt.)
Iowa (continued)	Crawford	R
	Davis	\$0.42
	Decatur	\$0.64
	Delaware	\$0.26
	Des Moines	\$0.29
	Dickinson	\$0.54
	Dubuque	\$0.22
	Emmet	R
	Fayette	\$0.23
	Floyd	\$0.18
	Franklin	R
	Grundy	\$0.36
	Hancock	R
	Hardin	\$0.41
	Henry	\$0.42
	Howard	\$0.19
	Humboldt	R
	Ida	\$0.82
	Iowa	\$0.26
	Jackson	\$0.22
	Jasper	\$0.20
	Jefferson	\$0.39
	Johnson	\$0.29
	Jones	\$0.21
	Keokuk	\$0.09
	Kossuth	\$0.93
	Lee	R
	Linn	\$0.24
	Louisa	R
	Lucas	R
	Lyon	\$0.46
	Mahaska	\$0.22
	Marion	\$0.24
	Marshall	R
	Mitchell	\$0.20
	Monroe	R
Muscatine	\$0.57	
O'Brien	\$0.55	
Osceola	\$0.56	
Palo Alto	\$0.81	
Plymouth	\$0.76	
Pocahontas	\$0.56	

---

---

---

---

## Appendix

### Upper Midwest Order Reported Payroll Average Hauling Charge, by State and County for May 2011

State	County	Simple Average Hauling Charge (Dollars Per Cwt.)
Iowa (continued)	Polk	R
	Poweshiek	\$0.26
	Ringgold	R
	Sac	\$0.86
	Scott	\$0.41
	Sioux	\$0.41
	Story	\$0.55
	Tama	\$0.40
	Union	R
	Van Buren	\$0.40
	Wapello	R
	Warren	\$0.25
	Washington	\$0.36
	Wayne	\$0.87
	Webster	R
	Winnebago	R
	Winneshiek	\$0.23
	Woodbury	R
	Worth	\$1.12
Michigan	Delta	\$0.48
	Dickinson	R
	Menominee	\$0.58
Minnesota	Aitkin	\$0.58
	Anoka	\$0.90
	Becker	\$0.51
	Beltrami	\$0.51
	Benton	\$0.43
	Big Stone	\$0.51
	Blue Earth	\$0.68
	Brown	\$0.37
	Carlton	\$0.36
	Carver	\$0.44
	Cass	\$0.45
	Chippewa	\$0.34
	Chisago	\$0.32
	Clay	\$0.48
	Clearwater	\$0.71
	Cottonwood	\$0.46
	Crow Wing	\$0.33
Dakota	\$0.63	

---

---

---

---

## Appendix

### Upper Midwest Order Reported Payroll Average Hauling Charge, by State and County for May 2011

State	County	Simple Average Hauling Charge (Dollars Per Cwt.)
<b>Minnesota (continued)</b>		
	Dodge	\$0.22
	Douglas	\$0.36
	Faribault	\$0.28
	Fillmore	\$0.39
	Freeborn	\$0.23
	Goodhue	\$0.36
	Grant	\$0.30
	Hennepin	\$0.32
	Houston	\$0.26
	Hubbard	\$0.63
	Isanti	\$0.52
	Itasca	\$2.02
	Jackson	\$0.51
	Kanabec	\$0.38
	Kandiyohi	\$0.37
	Koochiching	\$0.41
	Lac Qui Parle	\$0.47
	Le Sueur	\$0.44
	Lincoln	\$0.35
	Lyon	\$0.51
	Mahnomen	\$0.47
	Marshall	\$0.47
	Martin	\$0.58
	McLeod	\$0.50
	Meeker	\$0.33
	Mille Lacs	\$0.42
	Morrison	\$0.37
	Mower	\$0.34
	Murray	\$0.44
	Nicollet	\$0.42
	Nobles	\$0.46
	Norman	\$1.00
	Olmsted	\$0.31
	Otter Tail	\$0.46
	Pennington	\$1.54
	Pine	\$0.33
	Pipestone	\$0.47
	Polk	\$0.78
	Pope	\$0.36
	Ramsey	R
	Red Lake	\$0.28

---

---

---

---

## Appendix

### Upper Midwest Order Reported Payroll Average Hauling Charge, by State and County for May 2011

State	County	Simple Average Hauling Charge (Dollars Per Cwt.)
<b>Minnesota (continued)</b>		
	Redwood	\$0.36
	Renville	\$0.34
	Rice	\$0.53
	Rock	\$0.41
	Roseau	\$0.61
	Scott	\$0.38
	Sherburne	\$0.39
	Sibley	\$0.42
	St. Louis	\$0.36
	Stearns	\$0.33
	Steele	\$0.36
	Stevens	\$0.26
	Swift	\$0.39
	Todd	\$0.44
	Traverse	R
	Wabasha	\$0.29
	Wadena	\$0.41
	Waseca	\$0.35
	Washington	\$0.34
	Watonwan	\$0.38
	Wilkin	R
	Winona	\$0.23
	Wright	\$0.39
	Yellow Medicine	\$0.50
<b>North Dakota</b>		
	Barnes	\$1.10
	Burleigh	\$1.63
	Cass	R
	Dunn	R
	Emmons	\$0.89
	Foster	R
	Grand Forks	R
	Grant	\$1.35
	Hettinger	R
	Kidder	R
	La Moure	\$1.11
	Logan	\$0.87
	McHenry	R
	McIntosh	\$1.14
	McLean	R
	Morton	\$1.29

---

---

---

---

## Appendix

### Upper Midwest Order Reported Payroll Average Hauling Charge, by State and County for May 2011

State	County	Simple Average Hauling Charge (Dollars Per Cwt.)
<b>North Dakota (continued)</b>		
	Mountrail	R
	Nelson	R
	Oliver	R
	Pierce	R
	Ransom	R
	Richland	R
	Sargent	R
	Sheridan	R
	Stark	\$1.23
	Stutsman	\$1.11
	Walsh	R
<b>South Dakota</b>		
	Beadle	\$0.94
	Bon Homme	\$1.13
	Brookings	\$0.58
	Brown	\$1.07
	Butte	R
	Campbell	\$0.73
	Charles Mix	\$1.62
	Clark	\$0.40
	Codington	\$0.52
	Custer	R
	Davison	R
	Day	\$0.75
	Deuel	\$0.52
	Douglas	R
	Edmunds	\$0.66
	Faulk	\$0.82
	Grant	\$0.35
	Hamlin	\$0.49
	Hand	R
	Hanson	R
	Hutchinson	\$0.96
	Kingsbury	\$0.41
	Lake	\$0.46
	Lincoln	\$0.42
	Marshall	R
	McCook	\$0.69
	McPherson	R
	Miner	R
	Minnehaha	\$0.48
	Moody	\$0.45

---

---

---

---

## Appendix

### Upper Midwest Order Reported Payroll Average Hauling Charge, by State and County for May 2011

State	County	Simple Average Hauling Charge (Dollars Per Cwt.)
<b>South Dakota (continued)</b>		
	Potter	R
	Roberts	\$0.30
	Sanborn	R
	Spink	R
	Turner	\$0.82
	Union	R
	Yankton	R
<b>Wisconsin</b>		
	Adams	\$0.56
	Ashland	\$0.35
	Barron	\$0.26
	Bayfield	\$0.39
	Brown	\$0.23
	Buffalo	\$0.19
	Burnett	\$0.22
	Calumet	\$0.28
	Chippewa	\$0.22
	Clark	\$0.16
	Columbia	\$0.31
	Crawford	\$0.36
	Dane	\$0.19
	Dodge	\$0.25
	Door	\$0.30
	Douglas	\$1.01
	Dunn	\$0.26
	Eau Claire	\$0.17
	Florence	\$0.21
	Fond du Lac	\$0.23
	Forest	\$0.16
	Grant	\$0.23
	Green	\$0.20
	Green Lake	\$0.27
	Iowa	\$0.20
	Iron	\$0.14
	Jackson	\$0.18
	Jefferson	\$0.30
	Juneau	\$0.22
	Kenosha	\$0.26
	Kewaunee	\$0.31
	La Crosse	\$0.19
	Lafayette	\$0.22
	Langlade	\$0.21

---

---

---

---

## Appendix

### Upper Midwest Order Reported Payroll Average Hauling Charge, by State and County for May 2011

State	County	Simple Average Hauling Charge (Dollars Per Cwt.)
<b>Wisconsin (continued)</b>		
	Lincoln	\$0.25
	Manitowoc	\$0.26
	Marathon	\$0.17
	Marinette	\$0.26
	Marquette	\$0.37
	Milwaukee	\$0.12
	Monroe	\$0.27
	Oconto	\$0.33
	Oneida	R
	Outagamie	\$0.27
	Ozaukee	\$0.16
	Pepin	\$0.27
	Pierce	\$0.29
	Polk	\$0.28
	Portage	\$0.23
	Price	\$0.43
	Racine	\$0.36
	Richland	\$0.33
	Rock	\$0.23
	Rusk	\$0.26
	Sauk	\$0.24
	Sawyer	\$0.25
	Shawano	\$0.24
	Sheboygan	\$0.17
	St. Croix	\$0.27
	Taylor	\$0.23
	Trempealeau	\$0.20
	Vernon	\$0.30
	Walworth	\$0.22
	Washburn	\$0.33
	Washington	\$0.20
	Waukesha	\$0.34
	Waupaca	\$0.24
	Waushara	\$0.34
	Winnebago	\$0.28
	Wood	\$0.18

---

---

R = Restricted data, counties with fewer than 3 producers delivering to the market.