



HUNGER  
DOESN'T  
TAKE A  
VACATION:  
SUMMER  
NUTRITION  
STATUS REPORT

June 2005

Food Research and Action Center  
1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 540  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
Tel: 202-986-2200  
<http://www.frac.org>

## Acknowledgements

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges the following funders whose major support in 2004-2005 has helped to make possible our work on expanding and improving nutrition programs.

Anonymous	MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger
Atlantic Philanthropies	Eugene & Agnes E. Meyer Foundation
Morris & Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation	The Moriah Fund
California Endowment	National Dairy Council
Case Foundation	Nestlé USA
The Annie E. Casey Foundation	New Directions Foundation
Community Capital Fund	New Prospect Foundation
Consumer Health Foundation	The David & Lucile Packard Foundation
Lois & Richard England Family Foundation	Prince Charitable Trusts
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Pritzker Early Childhood Foundation
Food Marketing Institute	Public Welfare Foundation
General Mills Foundation	Charles H. Revson Foundation
Robert P. & Judith N. Goldberg Foundation	Rockefeller Family Fund
Grocery Manufacturers of America	Sara Lee Foundation
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation	Share Our Strength
Joyce Foundation	Sodexo USA
Kaiser Permanente Foundation	Taste of the NFL
Kraft Foods, Inc.	Trellis Fund
Land O'Lakes Foundation	Unilever United States
John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	UPS Foundation
	Weissberg Foundation

## Additional Copies

Free PDF versions of this report can be found at <http://www.frac.org>, and hard copies of this publication may be purchased for \$9 (Washington, D.C. residents must add 6 percent sales tax). All orders must be prepaid and sent to:

FRAC Publications, Attn. Wanda Putney  
1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 540  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
Tel: 202-986-2200

## For More Information

For more information about the programs reviewed in this report, or to sign up for FRAC's weekly New Digest, visit FRAC's website at <http://www.frac.org>.

## About FRAC

The Food Research and Action Center is the leading national organization working for more effective public and private policies to eradicate domestic hunger and under-nutrition.

This report was prepared by Randy Rosso, Crystal Weedall FitzSimons, Shireen Cama, Lynn Parker, and Jim Weill.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PART 1 – Summer Nutrition in 2004</b>	
Summary of Major Findings .....	1
National Participation Rates and Trends .....	4
Simplified Reimbursement Pilot Projects (“Lugar Pilots”) .....	5
Seamless Summer Food Waiver .....	6
State Participation Rates and Trends.....	8
Children Who Aren’t Being Served .....	9
SFSP June Peak Participation States .....	10
Expanding Summer Nutrition Participation in 2005 – It’s Not Too Late .....	11
Conclusions .....	13
<b>PART 2 – Resources</b>	
Why Summer Nutrition Matters to Children and to State and Local Governments .....	15
The Federal Summer Nutrition Programs.....	17
Improvements to the SFSP Enacted by the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004.....	18
Technical Notes .....	20
Web Resources for Summer Nutrition Programs .....	22
<b>PART 3 – Tables</b>	
Table 1: Summer Nutrition Participation in July 2003 and July 2004 ....	24
Table 2: Change in SFSP Participation from July 2003 to July 2004.....	25
Table 3: Change in Number of SFSP Sponsors and Sites from July 2003 to July 2004 .....	26
Table 4: SFSP Lunches Served in June, July, and August 2003 and 2004 .....	27
Table 5: Estimated Participation and Funding if 40 Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 Low-Income Children in School-Year NSLP.....	28
Table 6: Five-Year Trends in Summer Nutrition, Using Revised Methodology for Estimating Number of Children in SFSP .....	29
Table 7: State Legislative and Funding Initiatives to Support Summer Nutrition.....	30

# **PART 1**

## **SUMMER NUTRITION IN 2004**

## Summary of Major Findings

**S**chool-aged children need constructive activities when school lets out for the summer – programs that keep them safe and engaged. And they need good nutrition as well. Schools letting out for the summer can spell trouble for many poor and hungry children who no longer can get school lunches and breakfasts.

The federal government, in cooperation with states, schools, and local public and non-profit agencies, offers children from low-income families the kind of nutritious meals and snacks that they would receive during the school year in the summer as well, through two programs – the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP). Together they are referred to in this report as the Summer Nutrition programs.

The key findings of this report include:

### Summer Nutrition (SFSP and NSLP combined)

- Unfortunately, participation in the federal Summer Nutrition programs lags far behind participation in the regular school-year school breakfast and lunch programs. Only 19 children participate in Summer Nutrition programs for every 100 who eat regular school-year school lunches – a continuing severe problem that means millions of children are not obtaining adequate nutrition in the summer.
- Having summer programs or activities that are platforms for other services like nutrition is critical. According to reports from state agencies operating the Summer Nutrition programs, cuts to summer school and summer programs caused by state budget crises are having the domino effect of denying summer nutrition to needy children.
- If every state had reached with summer nutrition just two-fifths of the children who eat free or reduced-price school lunch during the regular school year, an additional 3.2 million children would have been served in Summer Nutrition programs, bringing states an additional \$163.7 million in federal funds.

- Overall participation in the Summer Nutrition programs (SFSP and NSLP combined) decreased 1.7 percent from July 2003 to July 2004, marking five consecutive years of declining program participation.
- The decreases were concentrated heavily in California, Illinois, Maryland, and New York.
- Excluding these four states, Summer Nutrition participation in the rest of the United States increased 4.0 percent.
- The ratio of children in Summer Nutrition for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price meals through the school-year NSLP increased in 13 states, while it decreased or remained about the same in the other 39 states.

#### Simplified Summer Food Program States (“Lugar States”)

- A Congressionally created pilot program that reduces paperwork and maximizes reimbursement (called the Simplified Summer Food Program, formerly the “Lugar pilot” program) has operated in 13 states since 2001. Six more states have been added for 2005 and beyond.
- States in this program have outperformed the other states and continued to do so in 2004. Summer Nutrition participation (SFSP and NSLP combined) in the 13 states with the Lugar pilot program increased 1.8 percent from 2003 to 2004, while participation in the rest of the country decreased 2.0 percent.
- From 2000 to 2004, the 13 states increased Summer Nutrition participation 25.2 percent, while participation in the rest of the states fell 8.6 percent.
- Idaho and Wyoming, both Lugar states, more than doubled Summer Nutrition participation from 2000 to 2004. Twelve of the 13 Lugar states increased participation over the four years, with increases ranging from 5.9 percent in Texas to 122.5 percent in Idaho.

- SFSP participation alone increased 5.4 percent in the 13 states from 2003 to 2004, while it fell 2.5 percent in the rest of the country.
- Had all states been able to operate the pilot and had gains equal to the 13 pilot states from 2000 to 2004, nearly 1 million more children would have been served each day in summer 2004.

#### Other Findings

- A “Seamless Summer Food Waiver,” created by USDA (and described in more detail on page 6), also has helped many states reduce paperwork and bring in more participants. Summer Nutrition participation increased from 2003 to 2004 in 15 of the 32 states using the Seamless waiver. Participation fell in nine of these states, and it remained about the same in the remaining eight states.
- Nationwide, Summer Nutrition participation in states using the waiver decreased 2.5 percent, but most of this decrease was concentrated in just four states (California, Illinois, Maryland, and New York) with unusually large drops in participation. In the remaining waiver states Summer Nutrition participation increased 4.1 percent.

## National Participation Rates and Trends

Summer nutrition programs provide important benefits to children – reducing or eliminating learning losses that follow summer days can bring, and keeping children safe, engaged, and intellectually and physically fit. They also help working families meet their child care needs. Summer nutrition programs strengthen summer programs – they bring children in the door, and help them become alert and engaged – and they improve children’s nutrition.

Despite these benefits, the vast majority of students who could qualify for – and could benefit from – summer nutrition programs are still not being served.

On an average day in July 2004 about 2.9 million children were served in the Summer Nutrition programs (Summer Food Service Program and summertime National School Lunch Program combined). This is just 19 children for every 100 receiving a free or reduced-price school lunch in the regular school year (2003-2004).

As described in Table 5, FRAC estimates that 3.2 million additional children, at a minimum, could have been reached each day if all states simply performed as well as the leading states in Summer Nutrition – a highly attainable goal.

The 2004 rate was a step backward. Summer Nutrition participation slipped 2.0 percent from July 2003 to July 2004, continuing a trend of declining participation. In fact, from July 2000 to July 2004, participation nationwide fell by 189,053 children (a 6.1 percent drop). (See Tables 1, 2, and 5.) The number of SFSP sponsors and sites was about the same in 2004 as in 2003 (Table 3).

Aside from the difficulties in operating summer food programs, it is unclear why this decline has occurred. One contributing factor likely is the reduction in reimbursement rates Congress passed in 1996. Another contributing factor may be the number of states cutting summer school programs and summertime recreation programs in the face of state budget problems. This has had a detrimental impact on summer nutrition participation in states across the nation. When states cut summer programs, children not only get less education, but also less nutrition. A drop in summer National School Lunch Program participation in 23 states indicates that cuts in summer school are likely denying children needed nutrition, as well as academic and physical stimulation.

*"There is still a large gap of children not receiving meals during the summer months.*

*Administrative burdens caused by federal paperwork and reimbursement requirements prevent program sponsors from offering this program to needy children. That is why I worked with my colleagues to create the Lugar Pilot Projects that streamline paperwork requirements and encourage groups to feed hungry children during the summer. I am proud that the Summer Food Service Program provides many nutritious meals to our nation's children. My hope is that we will continually work towards providing an effective nutrition safety net for our nation's children."*

*-Sen. Richard Lugar,  
2002*

*Note: The tables in the back of the report have the Lugar pilot states shaded in gray and include sub-totals for pilot states and non-pilot states. The Lugar pilot program is allowing its states to outperform the rest of the nation in program growth.*

The picture is not all bleak. In a clear indication that there are strategies that have been proven to reach more children, the states operating the "Lugar pilot states" (called the Simplified Summer Food Program beginning in 2005) made gains in 2004, for the fourth straight year. And many of the states using the Seamless Summer Food Waiver showed signs of improvement as well.

### ***Simplified Summer Food Program ("The Lugar Pilots")***

When it became clear, including through data in FRAC's 2000 summer nutrition report that the SFSP was struggling, Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN) sponsored and led the effort to pass legislation creating a three-year pilot project (it became permanent beginning in 2005) with the goal of increasing participation and easing paperwork in the states then reaching the fewest children through SFSP (compared to the school-year school lunch program). The states included in the pilot were: Alaska, Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming. (Puerto Rico was also included in the pilot program, but is not included in this report.)

The legislation was first implemented in the summer of 2001. The 13 states, over the past four summers, have fared substantially better in program growth, as a whole, than the rest of the nation.

***How it works*** The program eliminates traditional SFSP cost-based accounting that separates administrative and operating costs when calculating reimbursements. Instead, sponsors under this pilot simply earn the maximum reimbursement as a standard for all meals. Sponsors gain the double benefit of potentially higher reimbursements and less paperwork.

For example, in 2004 most SFSP sponsors were allowed to receive reimbursements of up to \$2.41 for operating costs (such as food and labor), and \$0.21 for administrative costs, per lunch served. If a sponsor actually had \$2.51 in operating costs and \$0.11 in administrative costs, the sponsor was not allowed to claim some of the operating costs from the administrative costs line. So, the sponsor was allowed only to receive reimbursements of \$2.41 for operating costs and \$0.11 for administrative costs, a ten-cent loss per lunch served. Under the Lugar pilot project, the same sponsor could have combined administrative and operating costs, and thus received the full reimbursement of \$2.62 per lunch served.

The Lugar pilot project has applied only to public SFSP sponsors (including schools, government agencies, residential camps and

National Youth Sports Programs). The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 made these Lugar pilots permanent, extended them to non-profit sponsors such as food banks, and added six new states (Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Oregon, and Ohio), all effective beginning January 2005 (after the period covered by this report).

**Results.** In 2004, the Lugar pilot states increased participation in summer nutrition programs by 1.8 percent while the non-pilot states decreased participation by 2.0 percent. The Lugar pilot states improved SFSP participation alone by 5.4 percent, compared to a 2.5 percent drop for the rest of the country. The Lugar states increased the number of sponsors by 3.0 percent and the number of sites by 11.2 percent (compared to increases of 2.5 percent and 0.1 percent, respectively, in the non-Lugar states).

From July 2003 to July 2004, summer nutrition participation increased in ten of the 13 Lugar pilot states (not counting Puerto Rico). In the rest of the country it fell in 19 of 38 states.

The cumulative gains over the first four years of the Lugar pilots are impressive. From July 2000 to July 2004, the Lugar pilot states increased participation in summer nutrition (both programs combined) by 25.2 percent, as participation in the rest of the country fell 8.6 percent. Participation just in the SFSP has increased 37.0 percent in the pilot states over the same time period, while SFSP participation in non-pilot states has fallen 25.3 percent. (Some of this decrease is due to non-pilot states using the so-called Seamless Summer Food Waiver and counting children through the NSLP instead of through the SFSP.) And Lugar pilot states have increased the number of sponsors operating the SFSP by 20.8 percent and the number of sites by 54.8 percent. If Lugar pilot rules had been in effect in all states from 2001 to 2004 and all states had grown at the rate of the 13 pilot states, nearly 1 million more children (968,492) would have been served last summer.

### ***Seamless Summer Food Waiver***

**T**he Seamless Summer Food Waiver is a USDA initiative begun in 2002 that seeks to help school SFSP sponsors reach more hungry children in low-income areas when school is out, and that provides more efficient meal services to those children. While available nationwide, this waiver is available only to school sponsors. The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 codified the Seamless waiver into law as the Seamless Summer

*Top Ten States in Change in Number of Children in Summer Nutrition, July 2003 to July 2004*

<b>North Dakota</b>	<b>62.9%</b>
<b>Wyoming</b>	<b>37.8</b>
Oregon	33.9
Arizona	26.1
New Jersey	20.0
Hawaii	19.7
<b>Idaho</b>	<b>17.9</b>
Georgia	13.2
<b>Kentucky</b>	<b>13.0</b>
<b>Oklahoma</b>	<b>10.6</b>

*(Lugar pilot states marked in bold italics)*

*Bottom Ten States in Change in Number of Children in Summer Nutrition, July 2003 to 2004*

North Carolina	-6.5%
California	-7.2
Michigan	-7.7
<b>Alaska</b>	<b>-8.2</b>
New York	-9.7
Alabama	-11.4
Mississippi	-12.6
Illinois	-15.0
<b>Arkansas</b>	<b>-16.9</b>
Maryland	-25.5

*(Lugar pilot states marked in bold italics)*

Food Option, requiring states to make this option available to interested school sponsors, effective January 2005.

**How it works.** The waiver reduces paperwork and administrative burdens that are normally associated with operating the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) during the school year and switching to the SFSP in summer. Under the waiver, schools offer summer meals as an extension of the NSLP, rather than having to apply to participate in the SFSP. The schools are reimbursed at the NSLP rate for free meals, which are lower than SFSP rates. The advantage for schools is that they do not have to apply for and operate two different programs.

**Results.** Thirty-two states are using the Seamless Summer Food Waiver to reduce paperwork and attract new school summer food sponsors. Summer Nutrition participation increased noticeably (at least 3 percent) in 15 of the 32 states offering the waiver, decreased more than 3 percent in seven states, and stayed about the same in the remaining 10. Overall, Summer Nutrition participation decreased 2.5 percent in states using the waiver, compared to a 3.8 percent increase in states not using the waiver. But most of the decrease in waiver states was concentrated in just four states, California, Illinois, Maryland, and New York. The other waiver states increased participation 4.1 percent.

Even though the waiver was received positively in many areas, some schools chose not to participate in the waiver because it offered a lower reimbursement rate, and some states chose not to offer the waiver to their schools.

Most of the schools in Lugar pilot states chose not to participate in the seamless waiver, since the Lugar pilots decrease paperwork while still providing the higher SFSP reimbursement rate. But four Lugar pilot states, Arkansas, Indiana, Kansas and Texas, did offer the waiver at least on a limited basis.

Interpreting the effect of the Seamless Waiver on Summer Nutrition participation is difficult, particularly since the USDA does not collect data on waiver participation and many states do not track these data separately. (The USDA did collect waiver data for Summer 2002 as a one-time project.) But the fact that many of the states using the waiver showed improvement indicates that the waiver can be beneficial.

*Top Ten States in Ratio of Children in July Summer Nutrition to Children in Free or Reduced Price School-Year School Lunch, 2004*

District of Col.	66.1
Hawaii	42.8
New Mexico	36.8
California	34.2
Nevada	31.1
Utah	30.7
Pennsylvania	28.9
New York	29.0
Connecticut	27.0
Missouri	25.0

*Bottom Ten States in Ratio of Children in July Summer Nutrition to Children in Free or Reduced-Price School-Year School Lunch, 2004*

Wyoming	11.0
Colorado	8.0
Iowa	7.8
Arkansas	7.8
Nebraska	7.8
Texas	7.0
Alaska	6.4
Kansas	6.4
Mississippi	6.4
Oklahoma	5.5

## State Participation Rates and Trends

**W**hile the national summer nutrition participation rate fell, overall, 24 states had a noticeable increase – at least 3 percent – in the number of Summer Nutrition participants in July 2004 compared to July 2003. On the other hand, 15 had a decrease of at least 3 percent and 12 showed little change (Table 1). In the left margin is a list of the top ten and bottom ten states in expanding July participation in Summer Nutrition over the one-year period.

In order to make a comparison among states in how well they are reaching children who might be eligible to participate in summer feeding programs, FRAC looks at the number of participants in July summer nutrition programs per 100 in free or reduced-price school lunch during the regular school year. This ratio shows how well each state is reaching students in greatest need. The top ten and bottom ten states on this measure are listed on the left margin.

Overall, 12 states increased their ratio by at least 1.0, 19 states declined and 20 states stayed approximately the same on this ratio when comparing July 2003 to 2004 (Table 1).

While generally “Lugar pilot” states did better than others, states not in the Lugar program can make significant progress as well. For example, Oregon increased participation in Summer Nutrition programs by 33.9 percent from July 2003 to July 2004, improving its ratio from 15.1 to 19.2, above the national average. Arizona increased participation by 26.1 percent over the previous summer, and by 79.9 percent from July 2000 to July 2004. Arizona’s ratio improved from 12.8 in July 2000 to 18.4 in July 2004.

There remains considerable room for growth. Thirty-five states continue to reach fewer than one in five children who are eligible for free or reduced price lunches during the school year. Among them are a number of Lugar pilot states, but it should be remembered that the Lugar pilot states were chosen because they all ranked at the bottom on this measure in 2000.

Only two states are reaching at least two in five children (Hawaii’s ratio is 42.8 and the District of Columbia’s is 66.1).

## Children Who Aren't Being Served

Since the National School Lunch program reaches so broadly during the school year, comparing participation in Summer Nutrition to participation in school year free and reduced-price meals indicates how well a state is doing in reaching low-income families. The performance of the top states in the past few years demonstrates that reaching 40 children in Summer Nutrition per 100 children receiving free or reduced-price lunches during the school year is a reasonable goal, and shows that the national performance ratio (currently 19 children in summer per 100 in the school year free or reduced-price school lunch program) could be more than doubled.

Using this standard, Table 5 indicates how many children are not being fed in July by each state, and how much money each state leaves on the table in Summer Nutrition funding just for July by not matching the average performance of the leading states. FRAC estimates that an additional 3.2 million children could have been reached each day had all states performed as well as the leading states. We also estimate that an additional \$163.7 million of federal funds could have been obtained by these states for summer child nutrition, had they run summer programs just for the 21 weekdays in July 2004 (not counting the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday) for these unserved children. (This is a conservative estimate, as we applied only the \$2.41 per-meal reimbursement for operating costs, excluding the \$0.21 per-meal administrative cost reimbursement.)

The states missing out on the most federal money for summer child nutrition are Texas (\$29.7 million), Florida (\$10.1 million), Georgia (\$7.1 million), North Carolina (\$6.8 million), Ohio (\$6.8 million), and New York (\$5.9 million). Together, these six states are turning down \$66.4 million in federal dollars that could feed children in the summertime, two-fifths of the \$163.7 million going unused nationwide.

Clearly, far more children could be reached, and funds accessed, than these estimates represent if states were to expand programs across the entire 10-week summer.

## SFSP June Peak Participation States

**I**n 2004, 20 states served more meals in June than in July. Estimating Summer Nutrition participation in June is more difficult than estimating July participation because in many states school lets out at different times in June. It becomes difficult to know how many of the NSLP meals were part of the regular school-year NSLP and how many were part of summer feeding. And it is hard to determine how many days in June children do not have access to school-year NSLP meals and therefore may be in need of summer feeding.

Nevertheless, generally the trends in June and July are similar. States that increase participation in July generally increase participation in June as well, and states that decrease participation in July show a decrease in June as well. Overall, of the 20 states serving more lunches in June than in July, only two states showed a positive trend in July but a negative one in June. In only six of these states (Arkansas, Colorado, Louisiana, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Texas) did their performance look better in June than in July.

Regardless of June or July peaks, July is likely the month with the most out-of-school days for all states and therefore the time when children are in most need of these programs. July is also the month for which the most data are available. Thus, July is the standard month for our comparisons.

Table 4 shows the number of SFSP lunches that were served in June, July, and August in 2003 and 2004. This table demonstrates the dramatic drop-off in many states after their peak month – whether it is June or July – indicating the extent to which many programs do not operate for the full summer. The shorter the program, the longer many children are in danger of not receiving nutritious meals every day before school resumes in the fall.

## Expanding Summer Nutrition Participation in 2005 – It's Not Too Late

As this report comes out, summer food programs have begun in many communities, and soon will start in others. But there are still steps that programs, city and state agencies, advocates and others can take to boost participation this summer – and lay the groundwork for future years.



**Conduct outreach in your community.** Many summer food sites do not serve all the children in the community who might want to participate. Often, this is due to parents and children being unaware of the program or not knowing where it is available. It is not too late to inform families about the program by distributing flyers, hanging up posters, or working with local radio, television, or newspapers on publicizing the availability of the program and where the sites are. You can also ask the local schools to alert kids and parents or urge your mayor, city council, and state legislators to publicize the availability and locations of summer nutrition sites. For more outreach ideas, visit: [http://www.frac.org/html/federal\\_food\\_programs/programs/summerexpansion.pdf](http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/summerexpansion.pdf)



**Take advantage of the expanded Simplified Summer Food Program (formerly the Lugar Pilot Program).** The reauthorization act extended the rules of the Lugar Pilot Program to six new states (Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Ohio, and Oregon). And now community-based organizations as well as schools and public agencies can take advantage of the simplified rules. The time is now to start capitalizing on these changes.



**Invite elected officials to visit a summer food site.** This is a good way both to educate them on the importance of the SFSP and to get media coverage of the existence of

programs. Work with officeholders and their staff to turn the visit into a press event. Elected officials often appreciate the opportunity to get positive publicity and to help their community find out about an important summer program.



**Hold a summer food kick-off.** Even if the program has already begun, it is not too late to hold an “official” kick-off so more families know about it. A kick-off is usually held at a summer food site, which creates a good photo opportunity for the media, and it can be turned into a fun event for the children. You can invite local celebrities to draw more media and public attention.



**Make sure children have access to meals throughout the entire summer.** When sites end their activities weeks before school starts up again, children lose access to crucial nutrition. You can work with sites to extend their programs, and with sites that are not open the entire summer to inform the children they serve about other sites in the area where they can continue to receive meals.



**Debrief at the end of the summer.** Organize a meeting at the end of the summer with sponsors, site staff, the state child nutrition agency, and other stakeholders. Discuss the challenges and the successes of 2005, and make plans to improve, expand and lengthen the operation of the program next summer. It is important to start early to re-enlist current sponsors, recruit new sponsors, and identify new sites so that even more children receive nutritious meals next summer.

## Conclusions

**T**he Summer Nutrition programs not only provide nutritious meals to low-income children who depend on school lunches and breakfasts during the school year, but they also can serve as a catalyst for summer programs for low-income children, act as a funding base for education and enrichment programs, and attract children to programs that keep them safe and engaged. Participation in the nutrition programs expanded in many states in 2004, and the Lugar pilot states especially show remarkable improvement over the last five summers. But there is a long way to go before states and the federal government can be satisfied with efforts to reach hungry children with these important benefits.

National participation in the Summer Nutrition programs slipped 1.7 percent from July 2003 to July 2004. Four states, California, Illinois, Maryland, and New York, experienced particularly large decreases. Compared to the 15.3 million children who received free and reduced price lunches during the school year, the Summer Nutrition programs served only 2.9 million children in July 2004, not even one in five.

But the Lugar pilot program and the Seamless Summer Food Waiver helped many states reach more children. The 13 Lugar pilot states increased participation 1.8 percent, and the states using the waiver, outside of California, Illinois, Maryland, and New York, increased participation 4.1 percent. Over the last five summers, participation in the Lugar pilot states jumped 25.2 percent, while participation in the non-pilot states fell 8.6 percent.

But there is still a long way to go before the Summer Nutrition programs are adequate to the need. Increasing participation in the Summer Nutrition programs is in the best interest of everyone – the federal, state and local governments, sponsors and sites, summer programs, and, most important, families and children. Not only does Summer Nutrition provide healthy meals to children who may have insufficient access to enough nutritious food in the summertime, but it supports children's enrichment through engagement in positive activities, thereby improving their chances to reach their educational potential during the upcoming school year.

The expansion of the Lugar pilot project to six new states and non-profit sponsors in the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 brings the potential for more improvement in the years to come. It is vital that all of the states in the new Simplified Summer Food Program (formerly the Lugar pilot program) take

advantage of the expansion to bring new sponsors and sites, and therefore children, into the program. It is just as crucial that the states not in the Simplified Summer Food Program step up their efforts to reach more children.

Given the enormous benefits of these programs and the grave risks to children in need whom the programs do not reach, it is disheartening that the programs continue to reach so few. It is critical that we redouble our efforts at every level; otherwise we will continue to leave many children behind.

**PART 2**

**RESOURCES**

## ***Defining Hunger and Food Insecurity***

*Households classified as **hungry** by an annual US Department of Agriculture (USDA) and Census Bureau survey are those in which adults have decreased the quality and quantity of food they consume, because of lack of money and other resources like food stamps, to the point where they are quite likely to be hungry on a frequent basis, or in which children's intake has been reduced, due to lack of family financial resources, to the point that children are likely to be hungry on a regular basis and adults' food intake is severely reduced. Approximately 3.9 million households, with 9.6 million members, were hungry in 2003, the last year with data available.*

*Even when hunger is not present, households are determined to be **food insecure** by the survey when resources are so limited that adults in the household are running out of food, or reducing the quality of food their family eats, or feeding their children unbalanced diets, or skipping meals so their children can eat, or are forced to use emergency food charities or to take other serious steps to adjust to the economic problems threatening the adequacy of the family's diet. Approximately 8.7 million households, with 26.6 million members, were food insecure without hunger in 2003.*

*Altogether, 12.6 million households (11.2 percent of all households) were found to be food insecure, with or without hunger, in 2003. This represented 36.3 million people, or 12.7 percent of the U.S. population.*

## **Why Summer Nutrition Matters to Children and to State and Local Governments**

**U**nless they can access meals through summer feeding programs, many low-income children lose a vital source of nutrition when school lets out for the summer and school breakfast and lunch are no longer available. Many working families must scramble to feed their children until the school year starts again. At the same time, state and local governments face daunting challenges of their own which directly affect the children within their communities, including: improving learning and test scores; preventing childhood obesity; and ensuring safe and educational environments for children when school is out and their parents are working. Summer Nutrition programs can help states and localities achieve all three of these important goals while helping low-income families care for their children.

### ***Summer Learning***

- Numerous studies document the “summer effect:” a setback in educational achievement of students who do not engage in constructive activities during the summer. According to the Center for Summer Learning at Johns Hopkins University, students lose an overall average of one month of grade-equivalent skills over the summer. “All students experience learning losses when they do not engage in constructive activities over the summer,” states a review of studies of summer enrichment programs by the Center.
- Low-income students lose more academic ground during the summer than higher income students, as low-income families are unable to afford learning and enrichment activities for their children. However, research demonstrates that participation in summer enrichment programs can improve student achievement in low-income children. For instance, a recent study of a summer literacy camp in Los Angeles found that disadvantaged, low-achieving students made significant gains when compared to students who did not attend the camp.
- By helping attract children to summer enrichment programs and by keeping them alert and ready to learn while they are there, Summer Nutrition programs help make summer learning possible.

## ***About the National School Lunch Program (NSLP)***

*In the summer, USDA provides funding to state agencies to reimburse public schools, private non-profit schools and residential child care institutions for serving nutritious breakfasts, lunches and snacks to children in summer school or year-round school. Meals are served free to children with family incomes below 130 percent of the federal poverty line, and at a reduced price when income is between 130 and 185 percent of poverty. The program also provides a small reimbursement for all other students for administrative support of the meal program.*

*At the state level, the program is generally administered by the state education agency. Some states defer administration of school lunches in private schools and residential child care institutions to the USDA regional office or to another state agency.*

*Under the "Seamless Summer Food Waiver," put in place by USDA beginning in 2002, states can allow schools to offer summer meals as if they were operating the Summer Food Service Program, but without additional paperwork. In essence, the school simply continues its NSLP meal service into the summer to students not in summer school. However, schools are reimbursed at the NSLP free meal rates, as opposed to the higher SFSP rates, if they take this option. These meals served are counted in the summer NSLP rather than as part of the SFSP.*

## ***Summer Nutrition:***

- With 16.7 percent of all U.S. households with children reporting that they are food insecure or hungry, children face serious nutritional and health risks when they stop receiving school meals during the summer months. The Summer Nutrition programs fight hunger and provide healthy, balanced meals to children.
- Summer Nutrition meals also help combat obesity by providing healthy food and bolstering programs that promote physical activity. A recent nationwide USDA study of the SFSP reported that 93 percent of SFSP programs offered activities in addition to healthy meals. These activities usually include physical activities like basketball or swimming. Children in programs operating the SFSP are substituting physical exercise for television-watching and milk and fruit for soda and candy.

## ***Summer Child Care:***

- Working parents everywhere are concerned about what their children do when school lets out each day and for the summer. Are they engaged in something productive? Are they safe? People across the country are interested in what is filling children's out-of-school time and are calling for all levels of government to provide support for after school and summer programs.
- The Urban Institute reports that approximately 11 percent of children ages 6 through 12 with working guardians regularly care for themselves when school is out for the summer. They spend approximately 5 hours a week in self-care during the school year and about 10 hours a week in self-care in the summer. These are most likely conservative estimates given the fact that respondents are often reluctant to acknowledge that they leave their young children alone.

Because summer food sites are located in low-income communities and/or serve a majority of low-income children, they can provide a focal point for summer programs for low-income children. The funding available through the Summer Food Service Program can act as a catalyst for summer programs for children of working parents, helping to ensure that they are engaged in safe activities during the long summer break.

## ***About the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)***

*The USDA provides funding through state agencies to reimburse eligible sponsors for meals and snacks served to children at summer programs. Sponsors are organizations that operate one or more sites where programs for children provide meals and snacks. Eligible SFSP sponsors can be:*

- 1. public or private nonprofit school food authorities,*
- 2. local governments,*
- 3. residential camps,*
- 4. National Youth Sports Programs, or*
- 5. private nonprofit organizations.*

*At the state level the program is generally administered by the state education agency.*

*The SFSP is operated in “open sites,” where at least half the children in the geographic area are eligible for free or reduced-price meals, and in “enrolled sites,” where 50 percent or more of the children participating in the particular program are determined eligible for free or reduced-price meals based on individual applications. Once the site is eligible, all children (up to age 18) can eat SFSP meals and snacks for free. Open sites must also be open for food to children in the neighborhood, regardless of whether they are enrolled in the overall program or not.*

## **The Federal Summer Nutrition Programs**

**W**hen schools let out for the summer, two federal programs offer children from low-income families the kind of nutritious meals and snacks that they would receive during the school year. Those two federal programs – the Summer Food Service Program and the National School Lunch Program – are together referred to in this report as the Summer Nutrition programs.

***Summer Food Service Program.*** The primary Summer Nutrition service is the Summer Food Service Program. SFSP serves about two-thirds of all the children who are in Summer Nutrition. Administered at the federal level by the USDA, the SFSP funds schools, public agencies, and private non-profit organizations to serve nutritious meals to children in low-income areas when school is not in session. (See sidebar on this page.)

***National School Lunch Program.*** While largely used during the fall to spring school year, this program can also be offered as part of summer school or in school systems that continue through the summer (e.g., “year-round” schools that stagger their vacation periods). (See sidebar on page 16.) Throughout this report NSLP participation and meals data only refer to those children receiving free or reduced-price meals due to limited family income.

Unless otherwise noted, FRAC generally draws on data for July when discussing program growth and state performance. July, typically the peak month for Summer Nutrition, is the one summer month when schools are least likely to be in session and is the month for which the most data on Summer Nutrition are available.

## Improvements to the Summer Food Service Program Enacted by the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004

On Wednesday, June 30, 2004, President Bush signed the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 into law (Public Law 108-265). The Act expanded the availability of nutritious meals and snacks to more children in school, in out-of-school time programs, and in child care; and improved the quality of food in schools.

The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 improved the Summer Food Service Program by:

- expanding to private non-profit sponsors the successful SFSP paperwork reduction program (formerly known as "Lugar Pilots"), which has already resulted in thousands more low-income children receiving nutritious meals during the summer months in 13 states and Puerto Rico (the pilot currently only applies to public sponsors);
- adding six new states - Colorado, Mississippi, Louisiana, Michigan, Oregon, and Ohio - to this expanded SFSP paperwork reduction program;
- making this paperwork reduction program permanent in all 20 states (the 14 currently participating and the six new states);
- making the Seamless Summer Food Waiver permanent (now called the Seamless Summer Food Option) and requiring states to make it available to interested school sponsors;
- changing the SFSP area eligibility threshold in rural areas of Pennsylvania from 50 to 40 percent for two years (in effect, expanding eligibility); and
- providing for 60 sponsors in five states to implement innovative solutions to rural transportation barriers in the SFSP (the initial grant applications were due June 15, 2005).

These changes took effect in January 2005.

In addition, the Act included a new California pilot, effective immediately, that allows private non-profit organizations and local government agencies except schools to feed children year-round

through the SFSP. Eligible organizations and agencies can serve children: up to two meals each day during the summer and during year-round schools' extended vacations (in California many schools are year-round, so such vacations occur throughout the year), and a snack during the school year. The pilot greatly reduces the current administrative burden on sponsors who serve children year-round, because they no longer are required to switch back and forth between SFSP and the Child and Adult Care Food Program, which have different rules and administrative requirements.

## Technical Notes

***National School Lunch Program data.*** USDA provided FRAC Excel spreadsheets containing the official monthly average daily lunch attendance (including free, reduced-price, and paid lunch attendance combined) in the National School Lunch Program by state from September 1999 through May 2004 and for July of each year (2000 through 2004). USDA provided separate spreadsheets for numbers of free and reduced-price lunches served, by state.

Following the USDA methodology for calculating the school-year NSLP average daily lunch attendance for each state, we summed the number of children receiving free lunches (and, separately, reduced price lunches) from September through May of each school year. We then estimated the number of days in each state's school year by averaging each state's reported average daily lunch attendance over the school year, and dividing the total number of lunches served over the school year by the state's average reported daily lunch attendance. Finally, we divided the number of free lunches served by the estimated number of days in the school year to produce each state's average daily free lunch attendance, and repeated the process for reduced price lunches.

We used the July average daily attendance figures for the NSLP as provided by USDA for the summertime NSLP participation data in the report.

Note that USDA calculates average daily *participation* in the NSLP by dividing the average daily lunch attendance by a factor of 0.927. This is to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. FRAC's *School Breakfast Scorecard* reports the NSLP average daily *participation* numbers – that is, including the 0.927 factor. To make the NSLP numbers consistent with the summer food numbers, for which there is no analogous absenteeism factor, the 2005 *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation* report did not include the absenteeism factor. As a result, the NSLP numbers in this report do not match the NSLP numbers in the *2004 School Breakfast Scorecard*.

***Summer Food Service Program.*** USDA provided FRAC with the number of SFSP lunches served in each state. FRAC calculated each state's July average daily lunch attendance in the SFSP by dividing the total number of SFSP lunches served by the total number of weekdays (excluding the Independence Day holiday) in July. The average daily lunch attendance numbers reported in this report are slightly different from the average daily participation numbers reported by USDA and in past FRAC summer food

reports. FRAC is using the revised measure to allow consistent comparisons from state to state and year to year. The new measure is also more in line with the average daily lunch attendance numbers in the school-year NSLP, as described above. The numbers of lunches served by state are from USDA.

Note that USDA does not report the number of sponsors or sites for June or August – they only report these data for July of each year. USDA obtains the July numbers from the states and reports them as they receive them.

For this report, FRAC gave states the opportunity to update the sponsor and site data that we obtained from USDA.

## Web Resources for Expanding Summer Nutrition Programs

### ***FRAC Web Pages and Publications***

Income Guidelines and Reimbursement Rates for the Federal Child Nutrition Programs:

<http://www.frac.org/pdf/rates.PDF>

FRAC's website on the Summer Food Service Program:

[http://www.frac.org/html/federal\\_food\\_programs/programs/sfsp.html](http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/sfsp.html)

FRAC's fact sheet on the Summer Food Service Program:

<http://www.frac.org/pdf/cnsfsp.PDF>

Tips for boosting participation in SFSP for anti-hunger advocates:

[http://www.frac.org/html/federal\\_food\\_programs/programs/summerexpansion.pdf](http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/summerexpansion.pdf)

Information on What a State Legislator Can Do to Increase Participation in the Summer Food Program:

[http://www.frac.org/html/federal\\_food\\_programs/programs/statelegcando.html](http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/statelegcando.html)

What School Administrators Need to Know about Summertime School Meals (a brochure written in conjunction with the American Association of School Administrators):

[http://www.frac.org/html/federal\\_food\\_programs/programs/SFSPSchoolAdmin.pdf](http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/SFSPSchoolAdmin.pdf)

Summer Food Geo-Mapping:

[http://www.frac.org/html/federal\\_food\\_programs/programs/sfspGeoMappingIntro.htm](http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/sfspGeoMappingIntro.htm)

### ***Resources for the Simplified Summer Food Program ("Lugar Pilots")***

FRAC's web page on the Simplified Summer Food Program:

[http://www.frac.org/html/news/sfsp\\_pilots.html](http://www.frac.org/html/news/sfsp_pilots.html)

Brochure on the Simplified Summer Food Program:

[http://www.frac.org/html/building\\_blocks/Lugar\\_Pilots.pdf](http://www.frac.org/html/building_blocks/Lugar_Pilots.pdf)

Outreach materials for anti-hunger organizations and state agencies:

[http://www.frac.org/Out\\_Of\\_School\\_Time/Summer/Simplified\\_SFSP\\_Outreach.html](http://www.frac.org/Out_Of_School_Time/Summer/Simplified_SFSP_Outreach.html)

USDA memoranda on the Simplified Summer Food Program:

[http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Governance/policy/Reauthorization\\_04/Reauthorization\\_2004.htm](http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Governance/policy/Reauthorization_04/Reauthorization_2004.htm)

***Resources on the Seamless Summer Food Option***

FRAC's web page on the Seamless Summer Food Option:

[http://www.frac.org/html/federal\\_food\\_programs/programs/seamlesswaiver.html](http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/seamlesswaiver.html)

USDA's web page on the Seamless Summer Food Option:

<http://www.summerfood.usda.gov/states/waiver.html>

***Other USDA Web Resources***

USDA's SFSP Website:

<http://www.summerfood.usda.gov/>

Information on planning nutritious and balanced meals for service under the SFSP:

[http://www.summerfood.usda.gov/Administration/meal\\_patterns.html](http://www.summerfood.usda.gov/Administration/meal_patterns.html)

SFSP Model Programs booklet:

[http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Summer/States/model\\_programs.html](http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Summer/States/model_programs.html)

Contact information for the State agencies administering the SFSP:

<http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Contacts/StateDirectory.htm>

2005 Summer Food Service Week Proclamation:

<http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/summer/states/index.html#proclamation>

# **PART 3**

# **TABLES**

TABLE 1: Summer Nutrition Lunch Attendance in July 2003 and July 2004 (Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Combined) by State

State	July 2003 Summer Nutrition				July 2004 Summer Nutrition				Percent Change in Summer Nutrition 2003-2004
	Children in 02-03 School-Year NSLP*	Children in Summer Nutrition (NSLP* & SFSP Combined), July 2003	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 02-03 School-Year NSLP*	Rank	Children in 03-04 School-Year NSLP*	Children in Summer Nutrition, July 2004	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 03-04 School-Year NSLP*	Rank	
H Alabama	310,182	54,604	17.6	22	315,742	48,368	15.3	30	-11.4%
Alaska	27,944	2,000	7.2	49	28,606	1,836	6.4	48	-8.2%
H Arizona	315,083	49,420	15.7	28	338,606	62,314	18.4	20	26.1%
H Arkansas	182,942	17,547	9.6	41	187,693	14,589	7.8	46	-16.9%
H California	1,881,819	717,119	38.1	3	1,943,168	665,532	34.2	4	-7.2%
H Colorado	151,118	13,006	8.6	42	159,545	12,808	8.0	43	-1.5%
H Connecticut	119,579	34,195	28.6	10	123,437	33,381	27.0	9	-2.4%
Delaware	38,477	9,072	23.6	12	33,684	8,857	26.3	10	-2.4%
H District of Columbia	32,505	21,592	66.4	1	35,472	23,450	66.1	1	8.6%
H Florida	882,492	153,676	17.4	23	912,320	164,486	18.0	24	7.0%
H Georgia	581,708	93,821	16.1	26	614,669	106,242	17.3	26	13.2%
H Hawaii	59,994	20,179	33.6	4	56,423	24,152	42.8	2	19.7%
Idaho	72,101	11,532	16.0	27	75,208	13,597	18.1	23	17.9%
H Illinois	625,330	145,814	23.3	14	626,177	123,970	19.8	17	-15.0%
H Indiana	254,966	31,774	12.5	38	270,241	34,592	12.8	37	8.9%
Iowa	118,108	9,510	8.1	43	123,287	9,678	7.8	44	1.8%
H Kansas	129,937	8,322	6.4	50	136,467	8,733	6.4	49	4.9%
Kentucky	259,258	37,574	14.5	33	269,645	42,458	15.7	29	13.0%
H Louisiana	373,977	45,425	12.1	40	381,031	44,217	11.6	40	-2.7%
Maine	44,440	7,622	17.2	25	45,984	7,289	15.9	28	-4.4%
H Maryland	208,268	47,187	22.7	16	200,386	35,143	17.5	25	-25.5%
Massachusetts	205,442	47,434	23.1	15	209,758	46,327	22.1	16	-2.3%
Michigan	401,085	60,034	15.0	30	417,474	55,390	13.3	35	-7.7%
Minnesota	180,658	25,895	14.3	34	189,386	24,933	13.2	36	-3.7%
Mississippi	268,324	19,990	7.4	48	273,552	17,465	6.4	50	-12.6%
H Missouri	277,167	64,736	23.4	13	285,943	71,473	25.0	13	10.4%
Montana	34,992	6,059	17.3	24	35,998	6,536	18.2	22	7.9%
Nebraska	82,098	6,587	8.0	45	84,750	6,593	7.8	45	0.1%
H Nevada	80,253	26,814	33.4	5	86,207	26,853	31.1	5	0.1%
New Hampshire	26,534	4,742	17.9	21	29,483	4,951	16.8	27	4.4%
New Jersey	289,923	61,468	21.2	18	293,196	73,741	25.2	11	20.0%
H New Mexico	141,497	54,865	38.8	2	145,239	53,482	36.8	3	-2.5%
H New York	1,051,978	339,053	32.2	6	1,056,340	306,005	29.0	7	-9.7%
H North Carolina	458,023	60,831	13.3	37	479,495	56,847	11.9	39	-6.5%
North Dakota	24,992	1,906	7.6	47	24,810	3,105	12.5	38	62.9%
H Ohio	437,034	53,863	12.3	39	461,976	51,261	11.1	41	-4.8%
Oklahoma	224,170	11,607	5.2	51	231,667	12,840	5.5	51	10.6%
H Oregon	152,848	23,041	15.1	29	160,353	30,841	19.2	18	33.9%
H Pennsylvania	433,113	125,140	28.9	9	451,200	130,507	28.9	8	4.3%
Rhode Island	39,549	12,110	30.6	7	46,327	11,348	24.5	14	-6.3%
H South Carolina	274,078	61,685	22.5	17	280,624	65,452	23.3	15	6.1%
H South Dakota	39,568	7,178	18.1	20	39,893	7,309	18.3	21	1.8%
H Tennessee	328,149	45,051	13.7	36	343,444	47,401	13.8	34	5.2%
H Texas	1,707,815	130,539	7.6	46	1,782,073	125,031	7.0	47	-4.2%
H Utah	113,891	33,483	29.4	8	119,604	36,733	30.7	6	9.7%
H Vermont	20,194	5,271	26.1	11	20,825	5,227	25.1	12	-0.8%
Virginia	283,381	51,792	18.3	19	286,227	54,274	19.0	19	4.8%
H Washington	253,536	37,274	14.7	32	263,041	39,827	15.1	31	6.9%
H West Virginia	107,696	16,029	14.9	31	105,919	16,033	15.1	32	0.0%
H Wisconsin	193,918	26,933	13.9	35	200,282	28,780	14.4	33	6.9%
Wyoming	20,249	1,630	8.1	44	20,449	2,246	11.0	42	37.8%
United States	14,822,383	2,954,034	19.9		15,303,324	2,904,504	19.0		-1.7%
Lugar Pilot States	3,131,114	275,270	8.8		3,264,379	280,249	8.6		1.8%
Non-pilot States	11,691,270	2,678,763	22.9		12,038,945	2,624,255	21.8		-2.0%

\* National School Lunch Program numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch attendance in school-years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004.

H These states used the Seamless Summer Food Waiver/Option. (See page 6 for details on the Seamless Summer Food Waiver.)

Shaded states are in the Lugar Pilot Program/Simplified Summer Food Program. (See page 5 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

TABLE 2: Change in Summer Food Service Program Lunch Attendance from July 2003 to July 2004, by State

<i>State</i>	<i>Children in Summer Food Service Program, July 2003</i>	<i>Children in Summer Food Service Program, July 2004</i>	<i>SFSP Percent Change from 2003 to 2004</i>	<i>Ratio of Children in July 2004 SFSP per 100 in 2003-2004 School-Year NSLP*</i>	<i>Rank</i>
H Alabama	28,427	31,244	9.9%	9.9	28
Alaska	1,236	1,062	-14.1%	3.7	49
H Arizona	4,234	4,017	-5.1%	1.2	51
H Arkansas	11,418	9,755	-14.6%	5.2	44
H California	123,126	116,046	-5.8%	6.0	41
H Colorado	4,808	4,805	0.0%	3.0	50
H Connecticut	11,752	9,700	-17.5%	7.9	36
Delaware	7,930	7,792	-1.7%	23.1	4
H District of Columbia	19,983	21,906	9.6%	61.8	1
H Florida	110,284	117,792	6.8%	12.9	18
H Georgia	60,082	64,427	7.2%	10.5	26
H Hawaii	5,043	5,275	4.6%	9.3	30
Idaho	10,384	12,615	21.5%	16.8	11
H Illinois	75,198	69,472	-7.6%	11.1	23
H Indiana	23,630	26,140	10.6%	9.7	29
Iowa	5,605	6,235	11.2%	5.1	45
H Kansas	6,873	7,258	5.6%	5.3	43
Kentucky	32,413	38,258	18.0%	14.2	16
H Louisiana	38,570	34,071	-11.7%	8.9	32
Maine	7,023	6,676	-4.9%	14.5	15
H Maryland	41,434	31,007	-25.2%	15.5	13
Massachusetts	40,900	39,924	-2.4%	19.0	7
Michigan	40,278	36,219	-10.1%	8.7	33
Minnesota	22,675	21,428	-5.5%	11.3	22
Mississippi	18,689	16,507	-11.7%	6.0	40
H Missouri	37,327	33,935	-9.1%	11.9	21
Montana	5,466	5,998	9.7%	16.7	12
Nebraska	4,899	4,635	-5.4%	5.5	42
H Nevada	3,060	3,618	18.3%	4.2	48
New Hampshire	3,788	4,020	6.1%	13.6	17
New Jersey	49,110	61,425	25.1%	21.0	5
H New Mexico	40,631	36,433	-10.3%	25.1	2
H New York	280,007	250,542	-10.5%	23.7	3
H North Carolina	31,515	29,565	-6.2%	6.2	39
North Dakota	1,497	2,722	81.9%	11.0	24
H Ohio	44,798	43,127	-3.7%	9.3	31
Oklahoma	9,309	10,626	14.2%	4.6	47
H Oregon	11,026	11,582	5.0%	7.2	38
H Pennsylvania	78,333	79,864	2.0%	17.7	9
Rhode Island	10,092	9,170	-9.1%	19.8	6
H South Carolina	46,317	49,414	6.7%	17.6	10
H South Dakota	3,148	3,305	5.0%	8.3	34
H Tennessee	35,185	37,619	6.9%	11.0	25
H Texas	85,189	82,992	-2.6%	4.7	46
H Utah	11,770	11,932	1.4%	10.0	27
H Vermont	3,414	3,689	8.1%	17.7	8
Virginia	38,659	44,007	13.8%	15.4	14
H Washington	22,391	21,653	-3.3%	8.2	35
H West Virginia	13,564	12,845	-5.3%	12.1	20
H Wisconsin	23,713	25,088	5.8%	12.5	19
Wyoming	969	1,585	63.6%	7.7	37
United States	1,647,168	1,621,025	-1.6%	10.6	
Lugar Pilot States	197,207	207,902	5.4%	6.4	
Non-pilot States	1,449,960	1,413,124	-2.5%	11.7	

\* National School Lunch Program numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch attendance.

HThese states used the Seamless Summer Food Waiver/Option. Some decline in SFSP participation is due to schools using the NSLP program through the Seamless waiver. Participants in schools using the Seamless waiver were tabulated under the July NSLP categories, instead of as SFSP participants as they were in the past. (See page 6 for details on the Seamless Summer Food Waiver/Option.)

Shaded states are in the Lugar Pilot Program/Simplified Summer Food Program. (See page 5 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

TABLE 3: Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors\* and Sites from July 2003 to July 2004, by State

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Sponsors, July 2003</i>	<i>Number of Sponsors, July 2004</i>	<i>Percent Change</i>	<i>Number of Sites, July 2003</i>	<i>Number of Sites, July 2004</i>	<i>Percent Change</i>
H Alabama	59	61	3.4%	616	635	3.1%
Alaska	18 **	19 **	5.6%	41 **	43 **	4.9%
H Arizona	17	18	5.9%	100	127	27.0%
H Arkansas	78 **	71	-9.0%	165 **	157	-4.8%
H California	181	170	-6.1%	1,404	1,362	-3.0%
H Colorado	26 **	24 **	-7.7%	77 **	79 **	2.6%
H Connecticut	25	27	8.0%	147	137	-6.8%
Delaware	20	20	0.0%	238	263	10.5%
H District of Columbia	21 **	27	28.6%	262 **	296	13.0%
H Florida	113	106	-6.2%	1,926	2,327	20.8%
H Georgia	115	123	7.0%	1,738	1,612	-7.2%
H Hawaii	19	19 **	0.0%	87	100	14.9%
Idaho	55	64 **	16.4%	139	163 **	17.3%
H Illinois	96	106	10.4%	1,219	1,262	3.5%
H Indiana	91	92	1.1%	492	539	9.6%
Iowa	36	42	16.7%	119	141	18.5%
H Kansas	37	44	18.9%	123	144	17.1%
Kentucky	134	136	1.5%	1,190	1,477	24.1%
H Louisiana	75 **	81 **	8.0%	569 **	565 **	-0.7%
Maine	51	52	2.0%	128	115	-10.2%
H Maryland	49	44	-10.2%	798	764	-4.3%
Massachusetts	83	86	3.6%	646	671	3.9%
Michigan	114	106	-7.0%	813	718	-11.7%
Minnesota	43	40 **	-7.0%	331	320 **	-3.3%
Mississippi	70	64	-8.6%	236	242	2.5%
H Missouri	60 **	81 **	35.0%	498 **	458 **	-8.0%
Montana	56	59	5.4%	135	153	13.3%
Nebraska	29	29	0.0%	92	83	-9.8%
H Nevada	21	21	0.0%	60	60	0.0%
New Hampshire	29	28	-3.4%	67	66	-1.5%
New Jersey	93	101	8.6%	1,126	1,210	7.5%
H New Mexico	58	48 **	-17.2%	691	619 **	-10.4%
H New York	279	286	2.5%	2,541	2,427 **	-4.5%
H North Carolina	94	100	6.4%	833	812	-2.5%
North Dakota	20	28	40.0%	23	33	43.5%
H Ohio	128	117	-8.6%	1,056	1,032	-2.3%
Oklahoma	47	48	2.1%	179	208	16.2%
H Oregon	39	34	-12.8%	166	177	6.6%
H Pennsylvania	170 **	201 **	18.2%	2,166 **	2,009 **	-7.2%
Rhode Island	14	14	0.0%	169	166	-1.8%
H South Carolina	49	55	12.2%	1,124	1,180	5.0%
H South Dakota	23	22	-4.3%	42	52	23.8%
H Tennessee	49	51	4.1%	992	1,022	3.0%
H Texas	173	167	-3.5%	1,388	1,406	1.3%
H Utah	16	15	-6.3%	150	86	-42.7%
H Vermont	32	39	21.9%	102	95	-6.9%
Virginia	111	112	0.9%	864	951	10.1%
H Washington	75	69	-8.0%	441	430	-2.5%
H West Virginia	80	89	11.3%	387	368	-4.9%
H Wisconsin	87	91	4.6%	376	385	2.4%
Wyoming	8	10	25.0%	19	29	52.6%
United States	3,466	3,557	2.6%	29,291	29,776	1.7%
Lugar Pilot States	755	778	3.0%	4,037	4,489	11.2%
Non-pilot States	2,711	2,779	2.5%	25,254	25,287	0.1%

\* Some sponsors may have operated Summer Food Programs in June and/or August in addition to or instead of July. On the other hand, some states only provide a total for the number of sponsors that operated at any point during the summer.

\*\* State or FRAC revisions to USDA data. See technical notes at back of report.

H These states used the Seamless Summer Food Waiver/Option. A decline in sponsors and sites may be due to this program. (See page 6 for details on the Seamless Summer Food Waiver/Option.)

Shaded states are in the Lugar Pilot Program/Simplified Summer Food Program. (See page 5 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

TABLE 4: Summer Food Service Program Lunches\* Served in June, July, and August 2003 and 2004, by State

	June 2003 SFSP Lunches	June 2004 SFSP Lunches	% Change	July 2003 SFSP Lunches	July 2004 SFSP Lunches	% Change	August 2003 SFSP Lunches	August 2004 SFSP Lunches	% Change
H Alabama	859,395	848,946	-1%	625,386	656,130	5%	4,352	15,975	267%
Alaska	18,883	15,467	-18%	27,188	22,296	-18%	6,339	6,057	-4%
H Arizona	245,295	243,755	-1%	93,157	84,365	-9%	287	214	-25%
H Arkansas	264,959	289,645	9%	251,187	204,858	-18%	27,319	18,433	-33%
H California	694,630	817,787	18%	2,708,781	2,436,976	-10%	959,494	855,760	-11%
H Colorado	124,602	140,638	13%	105,766	100,910	-5%	1,576	918	-42%
H Connecticut	N/A	N/A	N/A	258,538	203,695	-21%	59,523	47,820	-20%
Delaware	59,964	76,620	28%	174,458	163,631	-6%	70,729	84,607	20%
H District of Columbia	507	406	-20%	439,618	460,025	5%	169,665	203,393	20%
H Florida	1,828,895	2,065,942	13%	2,426,251	2,473,639	2%	209,736	8,342	-96%
H Georgia	1,627,742	1,706,979	5%	1,321,802	1,352,973	2%	65,239	69,182	6%
H Hawaii	85,345	94,655	11%	110,946	110,784	0%	4,450	4,620	4%
Idaho	241,717	307,232	27%	228,450	264,907	16%	78,952	118,774	50%
H Illinois	355,911	493,915	39%	1,655,330	1,458,915	-12%	811,015	718,880	-11%
H Indiana	304,946	382,442	25%	515,906	548,938	6%	97,041	132,213	36%
Iowa	123,097	138,212	12%	123,307	130,928	6%	12,451	17,412	40%
H Kansas	232,341	236,566	2%	151,201	152,408	1%	25,466	21,825	-14%
Kentucky	754,061	951,126	26%	713,088	803,416	13%	30,925	72,974	136%
H Louisiana	1,223,391	1,269,926	4%	848,549	715,499	-16%	14,163	20,780	47%
Maine	8,058	18,971	135%	154,507	140,189	-9%	39,366	39,956	1%
H Maryland	42,465	81,463	92%	911,552	651,145	-29%	193,125	185,884	-4%
Massachusetts	37,577	26,529	-29%	899,804	838,407	-7%	369,459	426,666	15%
Michigan	178,187	263,335	48%	886,115	760,598	-14%	146,192	163,957	12%
Minnesota	230,392	281,470	22%	498,843	449,996	-10%	62,933	61,915	-2%
Mississippi	948,338	948,722	0%	411,162	346,657	-16%	12,151	12,167	0%
H Missouri	975,143	903,304	-7%	821,201	712,634	-13%	150,155	92,845	-38%
Montana	68,462	73,612	8%	110,259	125,964	14%	22,884	29,382	28%
Nebraska	146,044	130,371	-11%	107,767	97,326	-10%	22,827	15,061	-34%
H Nevada	50,593	56,444	12%	67,317	75,985	13%	34,348	47,161	37%
New Hampshire	429	5,993	1297%	83,328	84,429	1%	41,424	45,328	9%
New Jersey	27,998	15,700	-44%	1,080,411	1,289,920	19%	527,265	642,839	22%
H New Mexico	971,496	857,588	-12%	893,890	765,102	-14%	35,238	73,799	109%
H New York	154,642	269,663	74%	6,160,146	5,261,376	-15%	3,307,780	3,446,974	4%
H North Carolina	663,794	678,385	2%	693,328	620,874	-10%	27,706	35,921	30%
North Dakota	50,160	55,063	10%	32,928	57,160	74%	9,990	13,219	32%
H Ohio	531,265	578,891	9%	985,551	905,675	-8%	186,681	191,234	2%
Oklahoma	325,541	398,495	22%	204,797	223,154	9%	13,757	26,932	96%
H Oregon	40,647	69,905	72%	242,573	243,225	0%	65,696	96,507	47%
H Pennsylvania	465,101	562,406	21%	1,723,328	1,677,147	-3%	850,828	804,679	-5%
Rhode Island	N/A	N/A	N/A	222,014	192,561	-13%	82,691	103,269	25%
H South Carolina	1,280,968	1,430,642	12%	995,574	1,037,694	4%	78,353	24,096	-69%
H South Dakota	81,489	84,252	3%	69,247	69,403	0%	28,579	35,246	23%
H Tennessee	1,104,068	1,068,787	-3%	774,076	790,008	2%	30,216	39,166	30%
H Texas	4,893,390	5,383,408	10%	1,854,096	1,742,836	-6%	48,328	47,582	-2%
H Utah	213,868	230,184	8%	258,933	250,573	-3%	85,922	101,031	18%
H Vermont	4,032	4,949	23%	75,108	77,471	3%	10,318	6,675	-35%
Virginia	150,796	171,272	14%	850,506	924,148	9%	245,155	309,800	26%
H Washington	106,583	108,425	2%	492,599	454,712	-8%	169,838	174,887	3%
H West Virginia	83,808	96,624	15%	298,397	269,750	-10%	50,866	57,075	12%
H Wisconsin	169,715	186,025	10%	519,893	526,841	1%	159,108	184,350	16%
Wyoming	20,740	29,315	41%	21,314	33,280	56%	8,686	10,594	22%
United States	23,071,470	25,150,452	9%	36,179,473	34,041,533	-6%	9,766,587	9,964,376	2%
Lugar Pilot States	7,376,308	8,323,335	13%	4,314,557	4,365,936	1%	423,505	546,404	29%
Non-pilot States	15,695,162	16,827,117	7%	31,864,916	29,675,597	-7%	9,343,082	9,417,972	1%

\* Some states may serve lunches for a few days in June or August, but do not have data in those months. This is because sponsors are allowed, if they do not serve for more than 10 days in those months, to claim those lunches in July to reduce paperwork.

H These states used the Seamless Summer Food Waiver/Option. (See page 6 for details on the Seamless Summer Food Waiver/Option.)

Shaded states are in the Lugar Pilot Program/Simplified Summer Food Program. (See page 5 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

TABLE 5: Estimated Lunch Attendance and Additional Federal Payments\*\* in July 2004 Summer Nutrition, if States Served 40 Children per 100 Served in School Year National School Lunch Program

<i>State</i>	<i>Children in Summer Nutrition (School Lunch* &amp; Summer Food Combined), July 2004</i>	<i>Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 03-04 School-Year NSLP*</i>	<i>Total Children Who Would Be in July Summer Nutrition if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP*</i>	<i>Additional Children Reached in July if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP*</i>	<i>Additional Dollars in July Federal Reimbursements if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP**</i>
H Alabama	48,368	15.3	126,297	77,929	\$3,943,976
Alaska	1,836	6.4	11,443	9,607	\$786,786
H Arizona	62,314	18.4	135,442	73,128	\$3,701,024
H Arkansas	14,589	7.8	75,077	60,489	\$3,061,330
H California	665,532	34.2	777,267	111,736	\$5,654,944
H Colorado	12,808	8.0	63,818	51,010	\$2,581,601
H Connecticut	33,381	27.0	49,375	15,993	\$809,429
Delaware	8,857	26.3	13,473	4,616	\$233,618
H Florida	164,486	18.0	364,928	200,442	\$10,144,362
H Georgia	106,242	17.3	245,868	139,626	\$7,066,460
Idaho	13,597	18.1	30,083	16,486	\$834,348
H Illinois	123,970	19.8	250,471	126,501	\$6,402,205
H Indiana	34,592	12.8	108,096	73,504	\$3,720,056
Iowa	9,678	7.8	49,315	39,637	\$2,006,025
H Kansas	8,733	6.4	54,587	45,854	\$2,320,675
Kentucky	42,458	15.7	107,858	65,399	\$3,309,866
H Louisiana	44,217	11.6	152,412	108,196	\$5,475,794
Maine	7,289	15.9	18,394	11,105	\$562,028
H Maryland	35,143	17.5	80,154	45,011	\$2,278,026
Massachusetts	46,327	22.1	83,903	37,576	\$1,901,746
Michigan	55,390	13.3	166,990	111,600	\$5,648,057
Minnesota	24,933	13.2	75,754	50,822	\$2,572,084
Mississippi	17,465	6.4	109,421	91,955	\$4,653,867
H Missouri	71,473	25.0	114,377	42,904	\$2,171,370
Montana	6,536	18.2	14,399	7,863	\$397,960
Nebraska	6,593	7.8	33,900	27,307	\$1,381,990
H Nevada	26,853	31.1	34,483	7,630	\$386,169
New Hampshire	4,951	16.8	11,793	6,842	\$346,275
New Jersey	73,741	25.2	117,278	43,537	\$2,203,422
H New Mexico	53,482	36.8	58,095	4,614	\$233,507
H New York	306,005	29.0	422,536	116,531	\$5,897,641
H North Carolina	56,847	11.9	191,798	134,951	\$6,829,857
North Dakota	3,105	12.5	9,924	6,819	\$345,107
H Ohio	51,261	11.1	184,790	133,529	\$6,757,892
Oklahoma	12,840	5.5	92,667	79,827	\$4,040,026
H Oregon	30,841	19.2	64,141	33,300	\$1,685,308
H Pennsylvania	130,507	28.9	180,480	49,973	\$2,529,139
Rhode Island	11,348	24.5	18,531	7,183	\$363,510
H South Carolina	65,452	23.3	112,250	46,797	\$2,368,405
H South Dakota	7,309	18.3	15,957	8,648	\$437,681
H Tennessee	47,401	13.8	137,377	89,976	\$4,553,685
H Texas	125,031	7.0	712,829	587,798	\$29,748,463
H Utah	36,733	30.7	47,842	11,108	\$562,189
H Vermont	5,227	25.1	8,330	3,103	\$157,049
Virginia	54,274	19.0	114,491	60,217	\$3,047,583
H Washington	39,827	15.1	105,217	65,389	\$3,309,351
H West Virginia	16,033	15.1	42,367	26,335	\$1,332,808
H Wisconsin	28,780	14.4	80,113	51,332	\$2,597,937
Wyoming	2,246	11.0	8,180	5,934	\$300,309
United States	2,856,902	18.8	6,084,571	3,227,669	\$163,652,944

\* National School Lunch Program numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch attendance in fiscal year 2004.

\*\* This estimate is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed each day for one lunch only per child and at the lowest rate for a free SFSP lunch (\$2.41 per lunch). Further, we assume that all participants are served for the full 21 weekdays in July 2004 (not counting the July 4th holiday). Note that the United States totals do not match the numbers in Table 1 as the states over 40 per 100 (Hawaii and the District of Columbia) are not in this table.

HThese states used the Seamless Summer Food Waiver/Option. (See page 6 for details on the Seamless Summer Food Waiver/Option.)

Shaded states are in the Lugar Pilot Program/Simplified Summer Food Program. (See page 5 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

Table 6: Five-Year Trends in Summer Nutrition, Using Revised Methodology\* for Estimating Number of Children in SFSP

State/Territory	July 2000 Summer Nutrition			July 2003 Summer Nutrition			July 2004 Summer Nutrition			Percentage Change in Summer Nutrition	
	July 2000 Summer Nutrition	Children in 1999-00 School-Year NSLP*	Ratio	July 2003 Summer Nutrition	Children in 2002-03 School-Year NSLP*	Ratio	July 2004 Summer Nutrition	Children in 2003-04 School-Year NSLP*	Ratio	From July 2000 to July 2004	From July 2003 to July 2004
Alabama	46,768	293,572	15.9	54,604	310,182	17.6	48,368	315,742	15.3	3.4%	-11.4%
Alaska	1,427	26,695	5.3	2,000	27,944	7.2	1,836	28,606	6.4	28.6%	-8.2%
Arizona	34,643	271,299	12.8	49,420	315,083	15.7	62,314	338,606	18.4	79.9%	26.1%
Arkansas	12,781	171,226	7.5	17,547	182,942	9.6	14,589	187,693	7.8	14.1%	-16.9%
California	764,027	1,849,555	41.3	717,119	1,881,819	38.1	665,532	1,943,168	34.2	-12.9%	-7.2%
Colorado	18,631	139,325	13.4	13,006	151,118	8.6	12,808	159,545	8.0	-31.3%	-1.5%
Connecticut	38,791	112,383	34.5	34,195	119,579	28.6	33,381	123,437	27.0	-13.9%	-2.4%
Delaware	10,411	30,253	34.4	9,072	38,477	23.6	8,857	33,684	26.3	-14.9%	-2.4%
District of Columbia	26,837	39,778	67.5	21,592	32,505	66.4	23,450	35,472	66.1	-12.6%	8.6%
Florida	225,951	815,572	27.7	153,676	882,492	17.4	164,486	912,320	18.0	-27.2%	7.0%
Georgia	93,356	522,067	17.9	93,821	581,708	16.1	106,242	614,669	17.3	13.8%	13.2%
Hawaii	15,459	61,719	25.0	20,179	59,994	33.6	24,152	56,423	42.8	56.2%	19.7%
Idaho	6,111	65,464	9.3	11,532	72,101	16.0	13,597	75,208	18.1	122.5%	17.9%
Illinois	168,097	596,977	28.2	145,814	625,330	23.3	123,970	626,177	19.8	-26.3%	-15.0%
Indiana	20,150	212,749	9.5	31,774	254,966	12.5	34,592	270,241	12.8	71.7%	8.9%
Iowa	7,822	111,686	7.0	9,510	118,108	8.1	9,678	123,287	7.8	23.7%	1.8%
Kansas	6,451	116,043	5.6	8,322	129,937	6.4	8,733	136,467	6.4	35.4%	4.9%
Kentucky	24,850	248,584	10.0	37,574	259,258	14.5	42,458	269,645	15.7	70.9%	13.0%
Louisiana	47,730	384,341	12.4	45,425	373,977	12.1	44,217	381,031	11.6	-7.4%	-2.7%
Maine	9,690	47,111	20.6	7,622	44,440	17.2	7,289	45,984	15.9	-24.8%	-4.4%
Maryland	44,823	193,095	23.2	47,187	208,268	22.7	35,143	200,386	17.5	-21.6%	-25.5%
Massachusetts	50,398	205,347	24.5	47,434	205,442	23.1	46,327	209,758	22.1	-8.1%	-2.3%
Michigan	71,290	367,304	19.4	60,034	401,085	15.0	55,390	417,474	13.3	-22.3%	-7.7%
Minnesota	29,255	171,515	17.1	25,895	180,658	14.3	24,933	189,386	13.2	-14.8%	-3.7%
Mississippi	19,338	265,371	7.3	19,990	268,324	7.4	17,465	273,552	6.4	-9.7%	-12.6%
Missouri	42,516	253,700	16.8	64,736	277,167	23.4	71,473	285,943	25.0	68.1%	10.4%
Montana	4,607	36,269	12.7	6,059	34,992	17.3	6,536	35,998	18.2	41.9%	7.9%
Nebraska	5,011	76,176	6.6	6,587	82,098	8.0	6,593	84,750	7.8	31.6%	0.1%
Nevada	28,060	63,324	44.3	26,814	80,253	33.4	26,853	86,207	31.1	-4.3%	0.1%
New Hampshire	3,370	25,561	13.2	4,742	26,534	17.9	4,951	29,483	16.8	46.9%	4.4%
New Jersey	65,998	294,254	22.4	61,468	289,923	21.2	73,741	293,196	25.2	11.7%	20.0%
New Mexico	53,184	135,055	39.4	54,865	141,497	38.8	53,482	145,239	36.8	0.6%	-2.5%
New York	416,329	1,084,192	38.4	339,053	1,051,978	32.2	306,005	1,056,340	29.0	-26.5%	-9.7%
North Carolina	63,930	405,376	15.8	60,831	458,023	13.3	56,847	479,495	11.9	-11.1%	-6.5%
North Dakota	2,539	26,547	9.6	1,906	24,992	7.6	3,105	24,810	12.5	22.3%	62.9%
Ohio	53,114	405,361	13.1	53,863	437,034	12.3	51,261	461,976	11.1	-3.5%	-4.8%
Oklahoma	14,117	211,629	6.7	11,607	224,170	5.2	12,840	231,667	5.5	-9.0%	10.6%
Oregon	27,381	135,740	20.2	23,041	152,848	15.1	30,841	160,353	19.2	12.6%	33.9%
Pennsylvania	113,505	417,574	27.2	125,140	433,113	28.9	130,507	451,200	28.9	15.0%	4.3%
Rhode Island	14,334	35,438	40.4	12,110	39,549	30.6	11,348	46,327	24.5	-20.8%	-6.3%
South Carolina	70,126	261,866	26.8	61,685	274,078	22.5	65,452	280,624	23.3	-6.7%	6.1%
South Dakota	7,152	40,805	17.5	7,178	39,568	18.1	7,309	39,893	18.3	2.2%	1.8%
Tennessee	43,644	298,190	14.6	45,051	328,149	13.7	47,401	343,444	13.8	8.6%	5.2%
Texas	118,116	1,506,632	7.8	130,539	1,707,815	7.6	125,031	1,782,073	7.0	5.9%	-4.2%
Utah	23,138	99,115	23.3	33,483	113,891	29.4	36,733	119,604	30.7	58.8%	9.7%
Vermont	4,211	19,917	21.1	5,271	20,194	26.1	5,227	20,825	25.1	24.1%	-0.8%
Virginia	46,072	269,200	17.1	51,792	283,381	18.3	54,274	286,227	19.0	17.8%	4.8%
Washington	34,111	228,755	14.9	37,274	253,536	14.7	39,827	263,041	15.1	16.8%	6.9%
West Virginia	17,273	106,061	16.3	16,029	107,696	14.9	16,033	105,919	15.1	-7.2%	0.0%
Wisconsin	25,530	175,593	14.5	26,933	193,918	13.9	28,780	200,282	14.4	12.7%	6.9%
Wyoming	1,105	20,648	5.4	1,630	20,249	8.1	2,246	20,449	11.0	103.2%	37.8%
US	3,093,557	13,952,010	22.2	2,954,034	14,822,383	19.9	2,904,504	15,303,324	19.0	-6.1%	-1.7%
Lugar States	223,849	2,819,641	7.9	275,270	3,131,114	8.8	280,249	3,264,379	8.6	25.2%	1.8%
Non-Lugar States	2,869,708	11,132,370	25.8	2,678,763	11,691,270	22.9	2,624,255	12,038,945	21.8	-8.6%	-2.0%

\* Throughout this report, FRAC estimates the number of children in the SFSP in July of each summer by dividing the total number of lunches served in each state by the total number of weekdays in July of each summer (excluding the Independence Day holiday). The number of weekdays in July varies slightly from year to year (e.g., 20 in July 2000, 22 in July 2003, and 21 in July 2004).

\*\* National School Lunch Program numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch attendance in school-years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004.

Shaded states are in the Lugar Pilot Program/Simplified Summer Food Program. (See page 5 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

**Table 7: STATE LEGISLATION PROMOTING SUMMER NUTRITION***Types of state summer nutrition legislation included in this table:***State mandate (M)** – State law requiring that all or certain schools offer the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)**Reporting requirement (R)** – State law that state, schools or districts convene advisory group, and/or report participation or reasons for nonparticipation in the SFSP**State funding (\$)** – State funds for one purpose or another related to the SFSP

State		Details
California	\$	The state allocates \$1.01 million to school districts and county offices of education to implement or expand the School Breakfast and Summer Food Service Program. The amount of funding that the Summer Food Service Program receives is based on the number of sponsor application requests that are made. School district and county offices may apply for a one-time start-up or expansion grant for both school and non-school sites. The maximum amount per grant is \$15,000 per site. CAL. ED. CODE § 49550.3.
Florida	R	Each school district superintendent is required to report to the Department of Education any activity or initiative to provide access to the SFSP to children eligible for free or reduced-price meals, including plans for sponsoring, hosting, or vending SFSP. FLA. STAT. Ch 1006.0605.
	M	Beginning in 2006, each school district will be required to develop a plan to sponsor a summer nutrition program to operate a) at least one site within 5 miles of at least one elementary school at which 50 percent or more of the students are free or reduced-price eligible, and b) at least one site within 10 miles of every other elementary school in which 50 percent or more of the students are free or reduced-price eligible. Districts may seek an exemption by including the issue at a school board meeting, with opportunity for public comment, and holding a vote on whether to be exempt, and the decision must be reconsidered each year.
Maryland	M	If the public school system operates summer school, it must offer breakfast and lunch. MD. CODE ANN., EDUC. § 7-603.
Massachusetts	\$	For summers 2003, 2004, and 2005, State allocated \$300,000 for outreach and \$646,767 for grants to sponsors to increase participation and extend the length of programs. State allocated a total of \$2.26 million for both Summer Food Service Program and School Breakfast Program outreach and expansion. Within the \$2.26 million, \$300,000 is specifically allocated for SFSP outreach and \$200,000 for School Breakfast outreach.
Minnesota	\$	State contributes \$150,000 in additional funds for education department-approved SFSP sponsors to supplement federal reimbursement rates: up to 4 cents per breakfast, 14 cents per lunch or supper, and 10 cents per snack. MINN. STAT. § 124D.119.
Missouri	M	SFSP required in school districts where 50 percent or more of the children are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch and in service institutions where more than 40 children congregate; districts can request a waiver. MO. REV. STAT. §191.810.
New York	\$	State allocates \$3.3 million to SFSP sponsors to supplement all summer breakfasts, lunches, suppers and snacks claimed for federal funds. In addition, this allocation also provides a per meal rate for sponsors serving and claiming a fourth meal supplement.
Oregon	\$	State appropriated \$49,000 over two years (2003-2004) to provide supplemental reimbursements to school districts and community groups that operate SFSP in areas where the school has 85 percent or more of its students enrolled in free or reduced-price meals.  In counties with at least one school where 70 percent or more of the students are enrolled in free or reduced-price meals, the State requires the local commissions on children and

**Table 7: STATE LEGISLATION PROMOTING SUMMER NUTRITION**

		families to discuss the coordination and provision of SFSP at one meeting.  The funding is not available in 2005.
	R	State Department of Education must convene an SFSP advisory group to make recommendations on ways to make SFSP more cost-effective and to determine the need to increase the \$49,000 funding level. OR REV. STAT. § 326.111 (2003).
Texas	§	State allocated \$700,000 to supplement federal meal reimbursements for 2003 and \$750,000 for 2004. Supplemental reimbursement is 4 cents for breakfast, 8 cents for lunch and suppers, and 2 cents for snacks. In addition, in 2004 a bonus state meal reimbursement was given to sponsors that served ten or more days in July or any portion of August and/or September.
	M	School districts are required to offer SFSP where more than 60 percent of children are eligible for free or reduced-price meals. TEX. HUM. RES. CODE § 33.024 (1993).
Vermont	§	For each summer 2003 and summer 2004, the state allocated \$52,436.00 for SFSP. Sponsors can use the funds either as reimbursement supplements or for activities and/or transportation in order to promote the program. The Department of Education encourages sponsors to use the funds for activities and/ or transportation. The state also allocated \$50,000 to Vermont Campaign to End Childhood Hunger for budget year 2003 – 2004 for its work with the child nutrition programs.
Washington	M	If the public school district operates summer school and fifty percent or more of the students enrolled in the school qualify for free or reduced-price meals, the school district must implement a summer food service program in each of the operating public schools. Sites providing the meals should be open to all children in the area unless a compelling case can be made to limit access to the program. Schools may be exempt from implementing the Summer Food Service Program if they can demonstrate the availability of an adequate alternative summer feeding program. WA. CH. 54