



Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Breakfast
Status Report

June 2017 ■ www.FRAC.org



Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Breakfast Status Report 2017

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by Clarissa Hayes, Randy Rosso, Signe Anderson, and Crystal FitzSimons of the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC).

FRAC gratefully acknowledges lead sponsorship of this report from the Kellogg Company Fund.

FRAC also acknowledges support of its work to expand and improve the Summer Nutrition Programs in 2016–2017 from:

- The California Endowment;
- ConAgra Foods Foundation;
- National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.;
- National League of Cities Institute;
- Tyson Foods, Inc.;
- Walmart Foundation; and
- YMCA of the USA.

General support of FRAC's work to expand and improve the child nutrition programs has been provided by the following:

- Annie E. Casey Foundation;
- Anonymous Donor;
- Bainum Family Foundation;
- Cargill Foundation;

- Eos Foundation;
- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;
- General Mills Foundation;
- Hunger Is, a joint program of the Albertsons Companies Foundation and the Entertainment Industry Foundation;
- The JPB Foundation;
- Leaves of Grass Fund;
- MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger;
- The Moriah Fund;
- New Directions Foundation;
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; and
- Turrell Fund.

About FRAC

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) is the leading national organization working for more effective public and private policies to eradicate domestic hunger and undernutrition. For more information about FRAC, or Summer Nutrition Programs, or to sign up for FRAC's *Weekly News Digest*, visit frac.org.



Introduction

When the school year ends, millions of low-income children lose access to the School Breakfast Program, which provides the nutritional boost students need to start their school day ready to learn. The Summer Nutrition Programs — the Summer Food Service Program, along with the School Breakfast Program and National School Lunch Program operating during summer months — are designed to close the summer nutrition gap and ensure children remain healthy when school typically is out.

The Summer Nutrition Programs provide funding to sponsors, such as schools, local government agencies, and private nonprofit organizations, to offer meals at sites that typically provide educational, enrichment, physical, and recreational activities; keep children safe and out of trouble; and provide crucial child care supports for families with working parents.

These federal programs provide funding to serve two meals a day at most sites (with camps and sites serving primarily migrant children being able to serve three meals), but too many sites provide just lunch or lunch and a snack.

Sponsors and sites miss out on an important opportunity to better meet children’s nutritional needs when they serve less than the maximum number of meals available. They fall far short of providing the nutrition that many low-income children can receive during a regular school day — which includes school breakfast and lunch as well as an afterschool snack and sometimes supper —

and leave struggling families with an even larger summer nutrition gap to fill. Summer meals sites serving only lunch also miss out on receiving the federal breakfast reimbursement, which improves the economies of scale for operating the Summer Nutrition Programs and supports their financial viability.

Increasing the number of children participating in summer breakfast is an important strategy to reduce hunger during the summer. The first and easiest step to increase summer breakfast participation is to incorporate breakfast into existing summer lunch sites. Strategies — such as replacing a morning snack with breakfast, serving breakfast later in the morning, providing breakfast on the weekend, and incorporating programming at sites — have all helped sites successfully add breakfast.

Unfortunately, getting all summer lunch sites to provide breakfast will not eliminate the summer nutrition gap. The Summer Nutrition Programs struggle to serve the 20 million low-income children who receive school meals during the school year. On an average day in July 2016, only 1.6 million children received breakfast and 3 million children received lunch at a summer meals site. This disparity is even more disheartening in light of the fact that both programs lost ground in July 2016 compared to a year earlier, with summer breakfast and summer lunch respectively reaching 4.7 and 4.8 percent fewer children than in July 2015.

CONTINUED

Growing participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs means increasing participation in breakfast and lunch among sponsors, sites, and children as well as conducting outreach efforts that promote both meals. For example, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, state child nutrition agencies, and national, state, and local anti-hunger advocates work to recruit new schools, local government agencies, and private nonprofit organizations to sponsor the Summer Nutrition Programs and to identify additional summer meal sites. This recruitment should encourage new sites to serve breakfast in ways that increase participation. Outreach

to families should highlight the availability of both breakfast and lunch at sites.

Most importantly, more federal, state, and local investments in summer education and enrichment programs are needed to ensure that low-income communities have the platform on which to build strong summer nutrition programs, thereby increasing children's access to summer breakfast and lunch. Strategies to increase participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs are described in greater detail in FRAC's [*Hunger Doesn't Take A Vacation: Summer Nutrition Status Report*](#).

About This Report

This report measures the reach of breakfast through the Summer Nutrition Programs in July 2016, nationally and in each state. This report is a companion piece to FRAC's *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation: Summer Nutrition Status Report*, which focuses on summer lunch participation. The summer breakfast report is based on a variety of metrics and examines the impact of trends and policies on program participation. This report:

- assesses national and state breakfast participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs;
- measures July 2016 breakfast participation against July 2016 participation in lunch, using the lunch data reported in *FRAC's Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation: Summer Nutrition Status Report*;
- analyzes participation by placing states in one of four groups:
 - states with strong participation in summer breakfast and summer lunch;
 - states with strong breakfast participation relative to weak lunch participation;
 - states with weak breakfast participation relative to strong lunch participation; and
 - states with weak participation in both breakfast and lunch;
- measures year-over-year changes in summer breakfast participation by state;
- compares breakfast participation across states by calculating the ratio of the number of children participating in summer breakfast for every 100 children participating in summer lunch. This ratio ranges from 83.6 to 100 in New Hampshire to 11.7 to 100 in Utah;
- sets an ambitious, but achievable, goal of reaching 70 children with summer breakfast through the Summer Nutrition Programs for every 100 participating in summer lunch, and calculates the number of unserved children and the federal dollars lost in each state that is not meeting this goal; and
- identifies best practices for providing summer breakfast.

The Summer Nutrition Programs

The available federal Summer Nutrition Programs — the Summer Food Service Program and the School Breakfast and the National School Lunch programs through the “Seamless Summer Option” — provide funding to serve meals and snacks to children at sites where at least 50 percent of the children in the geographic area are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals; at sites at which at least 50 percent of the children participating in the program are individually determined eligible for free or reduced-price school meals; and at sites that serve primarily migrant children. Once a site is determined eligible, all of the children can eat for free.

Summer camps also can participate, but they are only reimbursed for the meals served to children who are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals. The School Breakfast and National School Lunch programs also reimburse schools for feeding children who are eligible for free or reduced-price meals and attend summer school.

Public and private nonprofit schools, local government agencies, National Youth Sports Programs, and private nonprofit organizations can participate in the Summer Food Service Program and operate one or more sites. Only schools are eligible to operate the School Breakfast and National School Lunch programs, but schools can provide meals and snacks at both non-school and school sites over the summer.

Most sites can provide a maximum of two meals per day — breakfast and lunch, breakfast and dinner, or a meal and a snack, but not lunch and dinner, and not two meals and a snack. Sites that serve primarily migrant children and summer camps can provide three meals.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture provides the funding for these programs through a state agency in each state — usually the state department of education.



National and State Findings

Over 3 million low-income children across the country received a lunch through the Summer Nutrition Programs on an average weekday in July 2016. A nutritious summer breakfast was served to just over half (52.9 percent) as many children — 1.6 million. This leaves 1.4 million children without this important meal. The Summer Nutrition Programs served breakfast to somewhat fewer children in July 2016 than in the previous year; participation decreased by 78,286 children — a 4.7 percent decrease.

Participation in the summer lunch programs varied widely across the states, and a low level of participation in summer lunch sets an artificially low bar for comparing summer breakfast participation. Likewise, strong summer lunch participation sets a much higher bar for summer breakfast participation. To account for this, FRAC groups states into four categories:

Group 1: Strong Participation in Summer Breakfast and Lunch

In summer 2016, as in the previous two summers, five states (Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, New York, and Vermont) and the District of Columbia had strong participation in both breakfast and lunch when

Group 1: Strong Participation in Summer Breakfast¹ and Summer Lunch²

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
District of Columbia	21,711	48.8	15,933	73.4
Connecticut	37,303	23.4	27,166	72.8
Maryland	70,391	23.6	50,929	72.4
New York	352,265	29.9	251,889	71.5
Vermont	9,041	34.9	6,104	67.5
Maine	16,157	27.4	8,703	53.9

compared to other states. For these top performers, for every five children who participated in school lunch during the 2015–2016 school year, at least one child received summer lunch through the Summer Nutrition Programs. In this group of states, at least half as many children received summer breakfast as those who received summer lunch.

Group 2: Strong Summer Breakfast Participation Relative to Weak Summer Lunch Participation

Twenty states succeeded in providing summer breakfast to at least half as many children as those who received summer lunch, but fell far short of FRAC's benchmark for

Group 2: Strong Participation in Summer Breakfast¹ Relative to Weak Participation in Summer Lunch²

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
New Hampshire	5,531	15.1	4,623	83.6
Delaware	10,211	16.3	7,599	74.4
New Jersey	80,915	18.9	59,988	74.1
Virginia	62,703	15.2	44,237	70.6
Mississippi	24,105	8.0	16,321	67.7
Hawaii	6,767	10.8	4,514	66.7
West Virginia	11,879	9.5	7,732	65.1
Louisiana	37,594	9.4	24,036	63.9
Missouri	35,208	9.7	22,168	63.0
Minnesota	44,497	16.3	27,796	62.5
Arkansas	28,921	12.6	17,754	61.4
Nevada	20,364	11.8	12,355	60.7
Wisconsin	42,391	15.1	24,932	58.8
Massachusetts	56,376	17.8	32,965	58.5
Arizona	57,533	12.4	33,601	58.4
North Carolina	102,769	15.8	59,101	57.5
Michigan	64,422	11.9	35,146	54.6
Illinois	91,504	11.7	48,108	52.6
Texas	195,681	8.1	98,568	50.4
Florida	220,486	16.6	110,936	50.3

¹ Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program in July.

² Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program in July.

summer lunch performance, with ratios of summer-to-school-year-lunch not just below 40 to 100, but below 20 to 100.

Ten of these states (Arizona, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, Texas, and West Virginia) ranked among the 20 states with the lowest ratios of summer lunch participation in the country, reaching between eight and 12 children for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the prior school year. While it is encouraging that these states served summer breakfast to the majority of the children eating summer lunch, too many children are still missing out on both meals. This group needs to expand breakfast and lunch programs to reach more children.

Group 3: Weak Summer Breakfast Participation Relative to Strong Summer Lunch Participation

Three states lagged in serving breakfast, even while they achieved relatively strong summer lunch participation ratios: New Mexico (35.8 to 100), Idaho (21.4 to 100), and Rhode Island (20.1 to 100). While they are among the top 10 states in the country for summer lunch participation, these states all had summer ratios below 50 to 100. New Mexico and Rhode Island served breakfast to just fewer than half as many children as those who received lunch. Idaho had the second-lowest breakfast-to-lunch ratio in the country, 17.9.

Group 3: Weak Participation in Summer Breakfast¹ Relative to Strong Participation in Summer Lunch²

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
New Mexico	61,999	35.8	29,239	47.2
Rhode Island	10,239	20.1	4,651	45.4
Idaho	20,423	21.4	3,664	17.9

Group 4: Weak Participation in Both Breakfast and Lunch

The remaining 22 states, similar to the states in Group 2, fell short of even a modest standard of serving summer lunch to at least one child for every five children who received a free or reduced-price lunch during the regular school year. But these 22 states went on to fall short in breakfast; they failed to provide summer breakfast to even half of this already small subset of eligible children. For example, Colorado, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, and Oklahoma provided summer lunch to less than one-tenth of the number of children who received a free or reduced-price lunch during the prior school year.

Group 4: Weak Participation in Summer Breakfast¹ and Summer Lunch²

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
Pennsylvania	89,745	14.5	43,407	48.4
South Dakota	8,237	16.7	3,888	47.2
Ohio	62,939	10.0	29,615	47.1
Kentucky	32,243	8.2	15,150	47.0
Oklahoma	16,992	5.5	7,817	46.0
South Carolina	69,466	19.9	31,405	45.2
Georgia	141,784	16.1	63,740	45.0
Colorado	20,271	8.8	8,924	44.0
California	456,607	18.6	188,320	41.2
Montana	9,022	19.5	3,707	41.1
Wyoming	4,585	18.5	1,841	40.2
Tennessee	65,713	13.3	26,055	39.6
Iowa	19,990	11.6	7,892	39.5
Alabama	37,879	10.2	14,807	39.1
Indiana	68,151	16.0	26,433	38.8
Alaska	3,994	10.8	1,537	38.5
North Dakota	3,166	10.4	1,182	37.3
Washington	37,530	11.0	13,772	36.7
Kansas	17,187	9.2	6,181	36.0
Nebraska	9,017	7.8	3,197	35.5
Oregon	34,455	16.2	12,079	35.1
Utah	28,294	17.6	3,310	11.7

¹ Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program in July.

² Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program in July.

Top 10 Increases in Summer Breakfast¹ Participation, July 2015 to July 2016

State	ADP, July 2015	ADP, July 2016	Percent Change
Mississippi	11,866	16,321	37.5
Hawaii	3,797	4,514	18.9
Missouri	18,754	22,168	18.2
Iowa	6,863	7,892	15.0
Montana	3,227	3,707	14.9
North Dakota	1,034	1,182	14.3
Nevada	10,843	12,355	13.9
Alabama	13,107	14,807	13.0
Florida	98,887	110,936	12.2
Maryland	45,418	50,929	12.1

10 States With Largest Declines in Summer Breakfast¹ Participation, July 2015 to July 2016

State	ADP, July 2015	ADP, July 2016	Percent Change
Texas	139,124	98,568	-29.2
Utah	4,586	3,310	-27.8
Illinois	64,649	48,108	-25.6
Arkansas	22,880	17,754	-22.4
Wyoming	2,348	1,841	-21.6
Arizona	42,060	33,601	-20.1
Oklahoma	9,438	7,817	-17.2
Indiana	31,689	26,433	-16.6
Pennsylvania	50,473	43,407	-14.0
Alaska	1,766	1,537	-13.0

¹ Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program in July.

With low participation in both summer breakfast and lunch, these states leave much room for improvement to ensure children have access to adequate nutrition when school is out during the summer.

Change in Summer Breakfast Participation From July 2015 to July 2016

Twelve states expanded participation in summer breakfast by at least 10 percent between July 2015 and July 2016. Mississippi led the way with a 37.5 percent increase in the number of children receiving breakfast, followed by Hawaii (18.9 percent), Missouri (18.2 percent), and Iowa (15 percent), demonstrating that dramatic improvement is possible.

By contrast, 12 states saw participation decline by at least 10 percent over the same period. The starkest drops were in Texas (29.2 percent), Utah (27.8 percent), and Illinois (25.6 percent).

Missed Opportunities — Children's Well-being; and Federal Dollars

On an average weekday in July 2016, seven states (Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, and Virginia) and the District of Columbia provided a nutritious breakfast to at least 70

children for every 100 participating in summer lunch. A summer breakfast ratio of 70 to 100 is an attainable goal for the other 43 states. For each of these states, FRAC calculated how many additional children would have been served on an average weekday if they had reached this goal, and how much additional funding that states would have received in the form of federal reimbursements.

Cumulatively, states with summer breakfast ratios below 70 to 100 in July 2016 would have served breakfast to an additional 520,642 children had they all achieved the 70 to 100 goal. These states would have received an additional \$21.8 million in federal reimbursements.

California, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, and Texas together would have served half of the additional children, and claimed half of the additional reimbursements. Over one-quarter of the additional federal dollars would have gone to California alone, which would have served 70 percent more children. See Table 3.

Best Practices

Pennsylvania, Maryland, Alabama, and Colorado have used various strategies to increase summer breakfast participation rates. This section briefly reviews these states' methods. These best practices could be adapted to fit other states' summer breakfast programming.

It Pays to Serve Summer Breakfast

Providing breakfast is an important way to help ensure the financial viability of a summer nutrition program. The Summer Food Service Program breakfast reimbursement for the 2016 summer was more than twice the snack reimbursement (about \$2.09 for breakfast, compared to about \$0.87 for a snack), but summer breakfast only required three meal components compared to the two required for a snack. In addition, the program is more cost-effective when the combined breakfast and lunch reimbursements are available to cover the administrative and transportation costs of operating the program. This allows sponsors to spread the non-food costs over the combined breakfast and lunch reimbursement.

Minimizing Costs — Pittsburgh Department of Parks and Recreation

The Pittsburgh Department of Parks and Recreation worked closely with Pittsburgh Public Schools as a vendor to provide breakfast to more than half of the school systems' summer sites in 2016. Every day, the school district delivered lunch and breakfast for the next day — an effective way to reduce transportation and staff costs. The two organizations worked closely with sites to ensure they had the proper warmers and storage needed to provide nutritious meals. By serving two meals a day at sites, Pittsburgh Department of Parks and Recreation increased the number of meals reimbursed and the program's sustainability. Pittsburgh also saw its breakfast and lunch participation grow as a result of its citywide marketing and branding campaign, *GrubUp*.

Promotion and Collaboration in Maryland

Maryland saw a 12 percent increase in the number of children who received a breakfast last summer as a result of outreach efforts by sponsors and anti-hunger partners. To maximize meal service and bring in additional reimbursement, sponsors focused part of their expansion efforts on summer breakfast. Successful strategies for increasing breakfast participation included encouraging sites to expand their meal service to include breakfast and to be more flexible on when they offered breakfast. Maryland Hunger Solutions — an initiative of FRAC and a statewide anti-hunger group working to expand participation in the federal nutrition programs — also encouraged youth-serving programs to serve breakfast in addition to lunch or supper in all of its summer meal outreach and promotion efforts.

Importance of Programming and Activities — Huntsville Public Schools

Recognizing that good programming is a magnet for children and that it has a large impact on summer nutrition participation, Huntsville Public Schools in Alabama targeted their breakfast expansion to 10 sites that offered structured morning programming and encouraged those that did not have any programming to add free or low-cost activities.

In an effort to keep costs low while continuing to serve child-friendly meals, Huntsville Public Schools limited their breakfast menu to cold items, such as milk and cereal. This allowed sites to store and reuse certain menu items if there were fluctuations in participation.

Serving Breakfast Later in Denver

The city of Denver served breakfast at all of its 20 sites to ensure that children had access to both breakfast and lunch in the summer. Last summer, the city prioritized increasing breakfast participation and worked with its sites to develop a breakfast program that would appeal to children. First, it worked with site coordinators to determine when children usually arrived at sites, and what menu items they enjoyed most. Second, Denver extended the service time for breakfast so that children who arrived at sites later in the morning still had the opportunity to eat breakfast. Sponsors have significant flexibility in determining the time that breakfast is served, and offering breakfast later in the morning is an easy strategy to increase participation.

Conclusion

The Summer Nutrition Programs provided breakfast to only 1.6 million children, or 52.9 children for every 100 who ate summer lunch, in July 2016. The limited reach of summer breakfast further exacerbates the summer nutrition gap for millions of low-income children who lose access to the school meals they receive during the regular school year.

Meeting a modest benchmark of providing summer breakfast to 70 children for every 100 eating lunch would result in nearly 521,000 additional children eating summer breakfast, and states would receive almost \$21.8 million in additional federal reimbursements. Summer breakfast federal reimbursements are more than twice the summer snack reimbursement, so adding breakfast to a summer program makes it more cost-effective due to the combined reimbursements to cover the administrative and operating costs.

There are a number of ways that participation in summer breakfast can be increased. The most straightforward strategy for increasing summer breakfast participation is for existing sites that currently do not provide breakfast and lunch each day to begin doing so. In addition,



... serving breakfast later in the morning, promoting the availability of breakfast at the site, and combining breakfast and lunch with educational, enrichment, and recreational programs, all will help to increase the number of children eating breakfast during the summer.

Technical Notes

The data in this report are collected from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and from an annual survey of state child nutrition officials conducted by the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC). This report does not include the Summer Nutrition Programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or Department of Defense schools.

In this report, “summer nutrition breakfast” is defined as the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) breakfast service in July, plus the average daily participation in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) in July. “Summer nutrition lunch” is the sum of that average daily participation in SFSP lunch service in July plus the average daily participation in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) in July.

FRAC uses July data because it is impossible to determine for June and August how many days were regular school days and how many were summer vacation days. Due to limitations in USDA’s data, it also is not possible in those months to separate NSLP data to determine if meals were served as part of the summer program or as part of the regular school year.

SFSP

USDA provided FRAC with the number of SFSP breakfasts and lunches served in July in each state. FRAC calculated each state’s July average daily breakfast attendance in SFSP by dividing the total number of SFSP breakfasts served in July by the total number of weekdays in July (excluding the Independence Day holiday). FRAC used the same method to calculate average daily lunch participation. The average daily attendance numbers for July reported in FRAC’s analysis are slightly different from USDA’s average daily participation numbers, which are based on operating days instead of the total number of weekdays in July. FRAC’s revised measure allows consistent comparisons from state to state and year to year. This measure is also more in line with the average daily lunch attendance numbers in the regular school year NSLP, as described below.

For this report, FRAC gave states the opportunity to update the July data on the total number of breakfasts and lunches for June, July, and August that FRAC obtained from USDA. The state changes are reflected in the tables.

SBP and NSLP

FRAC used the July average daily attendance figures provided by USDA for the summertime SBP and NSLP participation data in this report. The SBP and NSLP summer meal numbers include all of the free and reduced-price breakfasts and lunches served during July. This includes meals served at summer school, meals served through the Seamless Summer Option, and meals served on regular school days (during July).

Note that USDA adjusts average daily participation in the regular year SBP and NSLP by dividing the average daily meal figures by an attendance factor (0.938) to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. FRAC’s *School Breakfast Scorecard* for the regular school year reports these SBP and NSLP average daily participation numbers; that is, it includes the attendance factor. To make the SBP and NSLP numbers consistent with the SFSP numbers, for which there is no analogous attendance factor, this report does not include the attendance factor. As a result, the regular school year meal participation numbers in this report do not precisely match the SBP and NSLP numbers in FRAC’s *School Breakfast Scorecard: School Year 2015–2016*.

The Cost of Low Participation

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving summer nutrition breakfasts in July for every 100 children receiving summer nutrition lunches. FRAC then calculated the number of additional children who would be reached if that state achieved a 70 to 100 ratio of summer nutrition breakfast participation to summer nutrition lunch participation. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the summer breakfast reimbursement rate for 20 days (the number of weekdays in July 2016, not counting the Independence Day holiday) for SFSP breakfasts. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available

¹ Hawaii began its regular 2015–2016 school year earlier than in past years, serving NSLP meals during the last three days of July. This caused a large spike in July SBP and NSLP participation in Hawaii that did not reflect summer meal program participation. The state provided FRAC with data on the number of breakfasts and lunches served in July 2015 through the Seamless Summer Option. FRAC divided these numbers by the number of days that Seamless Summer breakfasts and lunches were served (8 days in July 2015) to calculate the July SBP and NSLP average daily participation, and added the results to the July 2015 SFSP breakfast and lunch participation to estimate Summer Nutrition participation in Hawaii.

Table 1:**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Breakfast¹ and Summer Lunch² in July 2015 and July 2016, and Ratio and Rank, by State (Alphabetically)**

Summer Nutrition									
State	Breakfast ADP, July 2015	Lunch ADP, July 2015	Ratio ³	Rank	Breakfast ADP, July 2016	Lunch ADP, July 2016	Ratio ³	Rank	Percent Change
Alabama	13,107	38,637	33.9	47	14,807	37,879	39.1	42	13.0
Alaska	1,766	4,757	37.1	42	1,537	3,994	38.5	44	-13.0
Arizona	42,060	72,835	57.7	16	33,601	57,533	58.4	20	-20.1
Arkansas	22,880	36,565	62.6	14	17,754	28,921	61.4	16	-22.4
California	194,501	477,918	40.7	38	188,320	456,607	41.2	37	-3.2
Colorado	9,884	21,285	46.4	32	8,924	20,271	44.0	36	-9.7
Connecticut	29,341	39,573	74.1	5	27,166	37,303	72.8	5	-7.4
Delaware	8,035	10,887	73.8	6	7,599	10,211	74.4	2	-5.4
District of Columbia	17,136	22,185	77.2	2	15,933	21,711	73.4	4	-7.0
Florida	98,887	198,917	49.7	27	110,936	220,486	50.3	26	12.2
Georgia	71,579	151,143	47.4	30	63,740	141,784	45.0	35	-11.0
Hawaii	3,797	5,411	70.2	10	4,514	6,767	66.7	11	18.9
Idaho	3,531	20,934	16.9	50	3,664	20,423	17.9	50	3.8
Illinois	64,649	112,234	57.6	17	48,108	91,504	52.6	24	-25.6
Indiana	31,689	78,858	40.2	39	26,433	68,151	38.8	43	-16.6
Iowa	6,863	19,153	35.8	44	7,892	19,990	39.5	41	15.0
Kansas	5,556	15,570	35.7	45	6,181	17,187	36.0	47	11.2
Kentucky	13,571	28,298	48.0	29	15,150	32,243	47.0	31	11.6
Louisiana	25,635	34,555	74.2	4	24,036	37,594	63.9	13	-6.2
Maine	8,132	14,511	56.0	22	8,703	16,157	53.9	23	7.0
Maryland	45,418	63,081	72.0	7	50,929	70,391	72.4	6	12.1
Massachusetts	30,681	53,468	57.4	18	32,965	56,376	58.5	19	7.4
Michigan	38,031	70,286	54.1	24	35,146	64,422	54.6	22	-7.6
Minnesota	27,671	44,191	62.6	13	27,796	44,497	62.5	15	0.5
Mississippi	11,866	21,931	54.1	25	16,321	24,105	67.7	9	37.5
Missouri	18,754	32,777	57.2	19	22,168	35,208	63.0	14	18.2
Montana	3,227	8,204	39.3	40	3,707	9,022	41.1	38	14.9
Nebraska	3,539	9,739	36.3	43	3,197	9,017	35.5	48	-9.7
Nevada	10,843	17,293	62.7	12	12,355	20,364	60.7	17	13.9
New Hampshire	4,391	5,099	86.1	1	4,623	5,531	83.6	1	5.3
New Jersey	56,883	79,092	71.9	8	59,988	80,915	74.1	3	5.5
New Mexico	28,767	59,410	48.4	28	29,239	61,999	47.2	29	1.6
New York	254,671	361,177	70.5	9	251,889	352,265	71.5	7	-1.1
North Carolina	57,193	101,902	56.1	21	59,101	102,769	57.5	21	3.3
North Dakota	1,034	2,926	35.3	46	1,182	3,166	37.3	45	14.3
Ohio	30,775	65,525	47.0	31	29,615	62,939	47.1	30	-3.8
Oklahoma	9,438	18,730	50.4	26	7,817	16,992	46.0	32	-17.2
Oregon	11,550	34,476	33.5	48	12,079	34,455	35.1	49	4.6
Pennsylvania	50,473	113,746	44.4	37	43,407	89,745	48.4	27	-14.0
Rhode Island	4,544	9,813	46.3	33	4,651	10,239	45.4	33	2.4
South Carolina	31,219	70,132	44.5	36	31,405	69,466	45.2	34	0.6
South Dakota	3,967	8,708	45.6	35	3,888	8,237	47.2	28	-2.0
Tennessee	27,519	70,844	38.8	41	26,055	65,713	39.6	40	-5.3
Texas	139,124	245,435	56.7	20	98,568	195,681	50.4	25	-29.2
Utah	4,586	30,019	15.3	51	3,310	28,294	11.7	51	-27.8
Vermont	5,805	8,779	66.1	11	6,104	9,041	67.5	10	5.1
Virginia	49,833	65,739	75.8	3	44,237	62,703	70.6	8	-11.2
Washington	14,155	48,959	28.9	49	13,772	37,530	36.7	46	-2.7
West Virginia	7,139	11,759	60.7	15	7,732	11,879	65.1	12	8.3
Wisconsin	25,259	46,586	54.2	23	24,932	42,391	58.8	18	-1.3
Wyoming	2,348	5,133	45.7	34	1,841	4,585	40.2	39	-21.6
US	1,683,303	3,189,186	52.8		1,605,017	3,036,656	52.9		-4.7

¹ Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program in July.

² Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program in July.

³ Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch is the number of children in Summer Breakfast per 100 in Summer Lunch.

Table 2:**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Breakfast¹ and Summer Lunch² in July 2015 and July 2016, by State Rank in 2016**

Summer Nutrition									
State	Breakfast ADP, July 2015	Lunch ADP, July 2015	Ratio ³	Rank	Breakfast ADP, July 2016	Lunch ADP, July 2016	Ratio ³	Rank	Percent Change
New Hampshire	4,391	5,099	86.1	1	4,623	5,531	83.6	1	5.3
Delaware	8,035	10,887	73.8	6	7,599	10,211	74.4	2	-5.4
New Jersey	56,883	79,092	71.9	8	59,988	80,915	74.1	3	5.5
District of Columbia	17,136	22,185	77.2	2	15,933	21,711	73.4	4	-7.0
Connecticut	29,341	39,573	74.1	5	27,166	37,303	72.8	5	-7.4
Maryland	45,418	63,081	72.0	7	50,929	70,391	72.4	6	12.1
New York	254,671	361,177	70.5	9	251,889	352,265	71.5	7	-1.1
Virginia	49,833	65,739	75.8	3	44,237	62,703	70.6	8	-11.2
Mississippi	11,866	21,931	54.1	25	16,321	24,105	67.7	9	37.5
Vermont	5,805	8,779	66.1	11	6,104	9,041	67.5	10	5.1
Hawaii	3,797	5,411	70.2	10	4,514	6,767	66.7	11	18.9
West Virginia	7,139	11,759	60.7	15	7,732	11,879	65.1	12	8.3
Louisiana	25,635	34,555	74.2	4	24,036	37,594	63.9	13	-6.2
Missouri	18,754	32,777	57.2	19	22,168	35,208	63.0	14	18.2
Minnesota	27,671	44,191	62.6	13	27,796	44,497	62.5	15	0.5
Arkansas	22,880	36,565	62.6	14	17,754	28,921	61.4	16	-22.4
Nevada	10,843	17,293	62.7	12	12,355	20,364	60.7	17	13.9
Wisconsin	25,259	46,586	54.2	23	24,932	42,391	58.8	18	-1.3
Massachusetts	30,681	53,468	57.4	18	32,965	56,376	58.5	19	7.4
Arizona	42,060	72,835	57.7	16	33,601	57,533	58.4	20	-20.1
North Carolina	57,193	101,902	56.1	21	59,101	102,769	57.5	21	3.3
Michigan	38,031	70,286	54.1	24	35,146	64,422	54.6	22	-7.6
Maine	8,132	14,511	56.0	22	8,703	16,157	53.9	23	7.0
Illinois	64,649	112,234	57.6	17	48,108	91,504	52.6	24	-25.6
Texas	139,124	245,435	56.7	20	98,568	195,681	50.4	25	-29.2
Florida	98,887	198,917	49.7	27	110,936	220,486	50.3	26	12.2
Pennsylvania	50,473	113,746	44.4	37	43,407	89,745	48.4	27	-14.0
South Dakota	3,967	8,708	45.6	35	3,888	8,237	47.2	28	-2.0
New Mexico	28,767	59,410	48.4	28	29,239	61,999	47.2	29	1.6
Ohio	30,775	65,525	47.0	31	29,615	62,939	47.1	30	-3.8
Kentucky	13,571	28,298	48.0	29	15,150	32,243	47.0	31	11.6
Oklahoma	9,438	18,730	50.4	26	7,817	16,992	46.0	32	-17.2
Rhode Island	4,544	9,813	46.3	33	4,651	10,239	45.4	33	2.4
South Carolina	31,219	70,132	44.5	36	31,405	69,466	45.2	34	0.6
Georgia	71,579	151,143	47.4	30	63,740	141,784	45.0	35	-11.0
Colorado	9,884	21,285	46.4	32	8,924	20,271	44.0	36	-9.7
California	194,501	477,918	40.7	38	188,320	456,607	41.2	37	-3.2
Montana	3,227	8,204	39.3	40	3,707	9,022	41.1	38	14.9
Wyoming	2,348	5,133	45.7	34	1,841	4,585	40.2	39	-21.6
Tennessee	27,519	70,844	38.8	41	26,055	65,713	39.6	40	-5.3
Iowa	6,863	19,153	35.8	44	7,892	19,990	39.5	41	15.0
Alabama	13,107	38,637	33.9	47	14,807	37,879	39.1	42	13.0
Indiana	31,689	78,858	40.2	39	26,433	68,151	38.8	43	-16.6
Alaska	1,766	4,757	37.1	42	1,537	3,994	38.5	44	-13.0
North Dakota	1,034	2,926	35.3	46	1,182	3,166	37.3	45	14.3
Washington	14,155	48,959	28.9	49	13,772	37,530	36.7	46	-2.7
Kansas	5,556	15,570	35.7	45	6,181	17,187	36.0	47	11.2
Nebraska	3,539	9,739	36.3	43	3,197	9,017	35.5	48	-9.7
Oregon	11,550	34,476	33.5	48	12,079	34,455	35.1	49	4.6
Idaho	3,531	20,934	16.9	50	3,664	20,423	17.9	50	3.8
Utah	4,586	30,019	15.3	51	3,310	28,294	11.7	51	-27.8
US	1,683,303	3,189,186	52.8		1,605,017	3,036,656	52.9		-4.7

¹ Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program in July.

² Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program in July.

³ Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch is the number of children in Summer Breakfast per 100 in Summer Lunch.

Table 3:

Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Breakfast¹ and Additional ADP and Additional Federal Reimbursement if States Reached FRAC's Goal of 70 Summer Breakfast Participants per 100 Summer Lunch² Participants

State	Summer Breakfast ADP, July 2016	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch ³	Total Summer Breakfast ADP if Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch Ratio Reached 70:100	Additional Summer Breakfast ADP if Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch Ratio Reached 70:100	Additional Federal Reimbursement Dollars if Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch Ratio Reached 70:100 ⁴
Alabama	14,807	39.1	26,515	11,708	489,988
Alaska	1,537	38.5	2,796	1,258	52,666
Arizona	33,601	58.4	40,273	6,673	279,255
Arkansas	17,754	61.4	20,244	2,491	104,243
California	188,320	41.2	319,625	131,305	5,495,115
Colorado	8,924	44.0	14,190	5,266	220,373
Connecticut	27,166	72.8	26,112	0	0
Delaware	7,599	74.4	7,148	0	0
District of Columbia	15,933	73.4	15,198	0	0
Florida	110,936	50.3	154,340	43,404	1,816,472
Georgia	63,740	45.0	99,249	35,509	1,486,035
Hawaii	4,514	66.7	4,737	223	9,338
Idaho	3,664	17.9	14,296	10,632	444,962
Illinois	48,108	52.6	64,053	15,945	667,282
Indiana	26,433	38.8	47,706	21,273	890,255
Iowa	7,892	39.5	13,993	6,101	255,328
Kansas	6,181	36.0	12,031	5,850	244,818
Kentucky	15,150	47.0	22,570	7,420	310,538
Louisiana	24,036	63.9	26,316	2,280	95,424
Maine	8,703	53.9	11,310	2,607	109,100
Maryland	50,929	72.4	49,274	0	0
Massachusetts	32,965	58.5	39,463	6,498	271,938
Michigan	35,146	54.6	45,096	9,949	416,384
Minnesota	27,796	62.5	31,148	3,352	140,276
Mississippi	16,321	67.7	16,874	553	23,156
Missouri	22,168	63.0	24,645	2,477	103,661
Montana	3,707	41.1	6,315	2,608	109,146
Nebraska	3,197	35.5	6,312	3,115	130,365
Nevada	12,355	60.7	14,254	1,900	79,510
New Hampshire	4,623	83.6	3,872	0	0
New Jersey	59,988	74.1	56,641	0	0
New Mexico	29,239	47.2	43,399	14,160	592,595
New York	251,889	71.5	246,586	0	0
North Carolina	59,101	57.5	71,938	12,837	537,225
North Dakota	1,182	37.3	2,216	1,034	43,290
Ohio	29,615	47.1	44,057	14,442	604,406
Oklahoma	7,817	46.0	11,894	4,077	170,639
Oregon	12,079	35.1	24,118	12,040	503,870
Pennsylvania	43,407	48.4	62,822	19,414	812,492
Rhode Island	4,651	45.4	7,167	2,516	105,287
South Carolina	31,405	45.2	48,627	17,222	720,725
South Dakota	3,888	47.2	5,766	1,879	78,622
Tennessee	26,055	39.6	45,999	19,944	834,671
Texas	98,568	50.4	136,977	38,409	1,607,414
Utah	3,310	11.7	19,806	16,496	690,356
Vermont	6,104	67.5	6,329	225	9,415
Virginia	44,237	70.6	43,892	0	0
Washington	13,772	36.7	26,271	12,499	523,103
West Virginia	7,732	65.1	8,315	583	24,399
Wisconsin	24,932	58.8	29,674	4,741	198,420
Wyoming	1,841	40.2	3,210	1,369	57,280
US	1,605,017	52.9	2,125,659	520,642	21,788,880

¹ Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program in July.

² Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program in July.

³ Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch is the number of children in Summer Breakfast per 100 in Summer Lunch.

⁴ Additional federal reimbursement dollars is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed for each child each weekday only for breakfast (not also lunch or a snack) and at the lowest rate for a SFSP breakfast (\$2.0925 per breakfast) and are served 20 days in July 2016.

Table 4:**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Breakfast and School Breakfast Program (SBP) in July 2015 and July 2016, by State**

State	SFSP Breakfast ADP, July 2015	SFSP Breakfast ADP, July 2016	Percent Change	SBP ADP, July 2015	SBP ADP, July 2016	Percent Change
Alabama	9,060	10,929	20.6	4,047	3,878	-4.2
Alaska	1,060	849	-19.9	707	688	-2.6
Arizona	9,455	4,980	-47.3	32,605	28,620	-12.2
Arkansas	17,177	12,959	-24.6	5,702	4,794	-15.9
California	22,419	24,348	8.6	172,082	163,973	-4.7
Colorado	7,557	7,194	-4.8	2,327	1,730	-25.7
Connecticut	17,353	20,424	17.7	11,988	6,742	-43.8
Delaware	6,484	6,138	-5.3	1,551	1,462	-5.8
District of Columbia	14,848	15,139	2.0	2,288	794	-65.3
Florida	82,888	93,942	13.3	15,999	16,994	6.2
Georgia	37,319	33,215	-11.0	34,260	30,525	-10.9
Hawaii	1,848	1,587	-14.1	1,949	2,926	50.2
Idaho	2,947	3,092	4.9	584	572	-1.9
Illinois	30,713	19,636	-36.1	33,936	28,473	-16.1
Indiana	13,148	11,940	-9.2	18,541	14,494	-21.8
Iowa	5,040	6,204	23.1	1,824	1,688	-7.4
Kansas	4,211	4,852	15.2	1,346	1,329	-1.2
Kentucky	11,931	13,405	12.4	1,640	1,744	6.4
Louisiana	23,702	22,303	-5.9	1,933	1,733	-10.4
Maine	7,787	8,336	7.1	345	367	6.1
Maryland	44,060	49,653	12.7	1,359	1,277	-6.0
Massachusetts	25,279	26,087	3.2	5,402	6,878	27.3
Michigan	27,283	25,811	-5.4	10,748	9,335	-13.1
Minnesota	21,056	21,197	0.7	6,614	6,599	-0.2
Mississippi	11,138	15,558	39.7	727	762	4.8
Missouri	10,273	12,598	22.6	8,481	9,570	12.8
Montana	2,653	3,111	17.3	574	596	3.7
Nebraska	2,462	2,139	-13.1	1,077	1,058	-1.8
Nevada	3,714	3,658	-1.5	7,129	8,697	22.0
New Hampshire	3,851	3,758	-2.4	541	866	60.2
New Jersey	34,112	37,357	9.5	22,771	22,630	-0.6
New Mexico	14,302	15,446	8.0	14,465	13,794	-4.6
New York	185,771	185,450	-0.2	68,900	66,439	-3.6
North Carolina	35,592	37,145	4.4	21,601	21,957	1.6
North Dakota	733	936	27.7	301	246	-18.3
Ohio	21,632	22,501	4.0	9,142	7,114	-22.2
Oklahoma	7,136	6,007	-15.8	2,302	1,810	-21.4
Oregon	9,314	9,182	-1.4	2,235	2,897	29.6
Pennsylvania	32,620	29,330	-10.1	17,853	14,077	-21.1
Rhode Island	3,602	3,759	4.3	942	893	-5.2
South Carolina	16,313	17,981	10.2	14,907	13,424	-9.9
South Dakota	1,747	1,752	0.3	2,220	2,136	-3.8
Tennessee	18,241	15,587	-14.5	9,278	10,468	12.8
Texas	62,275	52,737	-15.3	76,849	45,831	-40.4
Utah	891	746	-16.3	3,695	2,564	-30.6
Vermont	5,286	5,606	6.1	519	497	-4.1
Virginia	39,300	37,860	-3.7	10,533	6,377	-39.5
Washington	10,739	10,582	-1.5	3,416	3,190	-6.6
West Virginia	5,067	5,545	9.4	2,072	2,188	5.6
Wisconsin	22,364	21,675	-3.1	2,895	3,257	12.5
Wyoming	1,385	952	-31.2	963	889	-7.7
US	1,007,139	1,003,176	-0.4	676,163	601,841	-11.0

Table 5:**Breakfasts Served in Summer Food Service Program, June, July, and August 2015 and 2016, by State**

State	June 2015	June 2016	Percent Change	July 2015	July 2016	Percent Change	August 2015	August 2016	Percent Change
Alabama	317,185	376,860	18.8	199,319	218,576	9.7	7,300	16,192	121.8
Alaska ¹	30,504	21,979	-27.9	23,312	16,984	-27.1	6,048	5,960	-1.5
Arizona	336,231	243,766	-27.5	208,006	99,609	-52.1	7,958	5,720	-28.1
Arkansas	279,384	279,179	-0.1	377,904	259,187	-31.4	94,605	81,845	-13.5
California	309,731	367,411	18.6	493,224	486,950	-1.3	99,284	108,388	9.2
Colorado	231,300	228,194	-1.3	166,262	143,880	-13.5	13,441	19,377	44.2
Connecticut	15,330	58,190	279.6	381,757	408,476	7.0	83,667	126,231	50.9
Delaware	53,144	49,799	-6.3	142,639	122,751	-13.9	38,412	42,147	9.7
District of Columbia	6,492	1,931	-70.3	326,661	302,782	-7.3	120,492	7,349	-93.9
Florida	1,475,389	1,592,231	7.9	1,823,537	1,878,841	3.0	308,516	341,126	10.6
Georgia	855,360	815,695	-4.6	821,024	664,304	-19.1	66,625	42,730	-35.9
Hawaii	42,545	47,660	12.0	40,662	31,749	-21.9	0	0	0.0
Idaho	65,753	83,203	26.5	64,839	61,834	-4.6	9,864	12,929	31.1
Illinois	344,028	279,464	-18.8	675,686	392,711	-41.9	290,728	155,584	-46.5
Indiana	390,581	396,928	1.6	289,258	238,792	-17.4	25,195	28,170	11.8
Iowa	141,930	154,734	9.0	110,873	124,078	11.9	22,401	30,831	37.6
Kansas	221,007	208,179	-5.8	92,634	97,034	4.7	5,454	11,259	106.4
Kentucky	280,191	347,581	24.1	262,485	268,106	2.1	13,802	16,212	17.5
Louisiana	798,182	737,640	-7.6	521,449	446,057	-14.5	12,087	19,594	62.1
Maine	4,594	12,670	175.8	171,312	166,729	-2.7	45,067	60,179	33.5
Maryland	79,832	48,102	-39.7	969,311	993,053	2.4	128,586	170,165	32.3
Massachusetts	17,197	42,935	149.7	556,140	521,736	-6.2	232,093	252,913	9.0
Michigan	303,474	205,727	-32.2	600,232	516,219	-14.0	215,940	279,289	29.3
Minnesota	317,863	315,776	-0.7	463,241	423,945	-8.5	149,295	188,289	26.1
Mississippi	487,182	580,164	19.1	245,044	311,163	27.0	4,238	6,171	45.6
Missouri	1,186,328	1,204,272	1.5	226,004	251,968	11.5	16,654	31,067	86.5
Montana	53,631	73,672	37.4	58,365	62,228	6.6	21,719	26,521	22.1
Nebraska	176,407	177,321	0.5	54,166	42,775	-21.0	3,301	5,704	72.8
Nevada	72,881	78,002	7.0	81,704	73,150	-10.5	31,662	44,695	41.2
New Hampshire	6,722	11,593	72.5	84,713	75,152	-11.3	25,069	27,902	11.3
New Jersey	0	6,241	0.0	750,463	747,146	-0.4	269,111	316,577	17.6
New Mexico	202,396	166,809	-17.6	314,648	308,916	-1.8	1,473	7,582	414.7
New York	148,228	63,070	-57.5	4,086,962	3,708,999	-9.2	2,341,031	2,789,810	19.2
North Carolina	306,199	428,116	39.8	783,033	742,891	-5.1	219,342	300,617	37.1
North Dakota	28,830	28,620	-0.7	16,134	18,727	16.1	6,238	7,288	16.8
Ohio	447,812	476,688	6.4	475,908	450,015	-5.4	109,262	145,174	32.9
Oklahoma	331,538	255,171	-23.0	156,994	120,134	-23.5	29,616	13,562	-54.2
Oregon	99,173	88,814	-10.4	204,914	183,633	-10.4	93,174	106,525	14.3
Pennsylvania	164,416	174,805	6.3	717,644	586,601	-18.3	247,545	214,991	-13.2
Rhode Island	3,080	10,862	252.7	79,246	75,171	-5.1	37,391	41,355	10.6
South Carolina	334,499	351,041	4.9	358,877	359,618	0.2	74,231	74,925	0.9
South Dakota	47,783	49,290	3.2	38,429	35,034	-8.8	24,287	21,772	-10.4
Tennessee	570,242	528,030	-7.4	401,303	311,749	-22.3	27,522	4,824	-82.5
Texas	2,189,105	2,220,175	1.4	1,370,057	1,054,747	-23.0	591,375	495,414	-16.2
Utah	29,826	23,595	-20.9	19,592	14,910	-23.9	2,351	2,073	-11.8
Vermont	19,961	26,205	31.3	116,296	112,129	-3.6	24,873	31,818	27.9
Virginia	236,679	206,072	-12.9	864,602	757,201	-12.4	245,121	267,430	9.1
Washington	82,890	81,508	-1.7	236,256	211,636	-10.4	89,324	104,918	17.5
West Virginia	38,878	51,938	33.6	111,464	110,892	-0.5	4,349	7,699	77.0
Wisconsin	302,903	377,094	24.5	492,018	433,499	-11.9	88,026	103,334	17.4
Wyoming	28,901	39,360	36.2	30,464	19,048	-37.5	4,161	4,358	4.7
US	14,513,717	14,694,362	1.2	22,157,067	20,063,515	-9.4	6,629,306	7,726,585	9.0

¹ Alaska's 2015 August breakfast numbers were revised from FRAC's 2016 *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation: Summer Breakfast Status Report*.

Table 6:**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition Lunch¹ in July 2015 and July 2016; and National School Lunch Program (NSLP)² ADP for School Years 2014–2015 and 2015–2016, by State**

State	Summer Nutrition Lunch ADP July 2015	NSLP ADP 2014–2015	Ratio of Summer Nutrition Lunch to NSLP ³ 2014–2015	Rank 2014–2015	Summer Nutrition Lunch ADP July 2016	NSLP ADP 2015–2016	Ratio of Summer Nutrition Lunch to NSLP ³ 2015–2016	Rank 2015–2016	Percent Change in Summer Nutrition Lunch ADP 2015–2016
Alabama	38,637	372,089	10.4	38	37,879	372,326	10.2	40	-2.0
Alaska	4,757	37,490	12.7	34	3,994	37,068	10.8	38	-16.0
Arizona	72,835	468,354	15.6	28	57,533	465,440	12.4	31	-21.0
Arkansas	36,565	229,135	16.0	26	28,921	229,149	12.6	30	-20.9
California	477,918	2,483,850	19.2	12	456,607	2,458,336	18.6	13	-4.5
Colorado	21,285	229,373	9.3	43	20,271	230,033	8.8	46	-4.8
Connecticut	39,573	155,754	25.4	5	37,303	159,482	23.4	7	-5.7
Delaware	10,887	61,798	17.6	20	10,211	62,576	16.3	20	-6.2
District of Columbia	22,185	42,728	51.9	1	21,711	44,457	48.8	1	-2.1
Florida	198,917	1,284,759	15.5	29	220,486	1,324,540	16.6	18	10.8
Georgia	151,143	879,694	17.2	21	141,784	879,591	16.1	22	-6.2
Hawaii	5,411	64,139	8.4	47	6,767	62,669	10.8	37	25.1
Idaho	20,934	96,089	21.8	8	20,423	95,440	21.4	8	-2.4
Illinois	112,234	798,165	14.1	31	91,504	782,323	11.7	34	-18.5
Indiana	78,858	429,454	18.4	16	68,151	426,395	16.0	23	-13.6
Iowa	19,153	171,536	11.2	36	19,990	172,387	11.6	35	4.4
Kansas	15,570	190,180	8.2	48	17,187	187,582	9.2	45	10.4
Kentucky	28,298	365,744	7.7	49	32,243	392,424	8.2	47	13.9
Louisiana	34,555	386,660	8.9	45	37,594	397,895	9.4	44	8.8
Maine	14,511	58,599	24.8	6	16,157	58,887	27.4	5	11.3
Maryland	63,081	284,319	22.2	7	70,391	298,413	23.6	6	11.6
Massachusetts	53,468	296,954	18.0	18	56,376	317,174	17.8	15	5.4
Michigan	70,286	554,788	12.7	35	64,422	541,320	11.9	32	-8.3
Minnesota	44,191	269,312	16.4	24	44,497	272,593	16.3	19	0.7
Mississippi	21,931	300,743	7.3	50	24,105	301,783	8.0	49	9.9
Missouri	32,777	362,834	9.0	44	35,208	361,277	9.7	42	7.4
Montana	8,204	44,827	18.3	17	9,022	46,297	19.5	11	10.0
Nebraska	9,739	114,053	8.5	46	9,017	115,480	7.8	50	-7.4
Nevada	17,293	164,791	10.5	37	20,364	172,670	11.8	33	17.8
New Hampshire	5,099	37,864	13.5	33	5,531	36,647	15.1	26	8.5
New Jersey	79,092	427,841	18.5	14	80,915	428,380	18.9	12	2.3
New Mexico	59,410	167,878	35.4	2	61,999	173,316	35.8	2	4.4
New York	361,177	1,157,597	31.2	4	352,265	1,178,565	29.9	4	-2.5
North Carolina	101,902	650,456	15.7	27	102,769	651,308	15.8	24	0.9
North Dakota	2,926	29,709	9.8	41	3,166	30,521	10.4	39	8.2
Ohio	65,525	646,897	10.1	40	62,939	630,182	10.0	41	-3.9
Oklahoma	18,730	294,760	6.4	51	16,992	306,709	5.5	51	-9.3
Oregon	34,476	208,240	16.6	22	34,455	213,076	16.2	21	-0.1
Pennsylvania	113,746	602,692	18.9	13	89,745	619,051	14.5	28	-21.1
Rhode Island	9,813	49,774	19.7	11	10,239	50,898	20.1	9	4.3
South Carolina	70,132	342,894	20.5	10	69,466	348,413	19.9	10	-0.9
South Dakota	8,708	48,919	17.8	19	8,237	49,398	16.7	17	-5.4
Tennessee	70,844	497,830	14.2	30	65,713	495,007	13.3	29	-7.2
Texas	245,435	2,397,862	10.2	39	195,681	2,405,162	8.1	48	-20.3
Utah	30,019	163,362	18.4	15	28,294	160,487	17.6	16	-5.7
Vermont	8,779	26,328	33.3	3	9,041	25,928	34.9	3	3.0
Virginia	65,739	408,566	16.1	25	62,703	413,812	15.2	25	-4.6
Washington	48,959	348,777	14.0	32	37,530	339,837	11.0	36	-23.3
West Virginia	11,759	121,768	9.7	42	11,879	124,980	9.5	43	1.0
Wisconsin	46,586	281,871	16.5	23	42,391	281,406	15.1	27	-9.0
Wyoming	5,133	24,406	21.0	9	4,585	24,719	18.5	14	-10.7
US	3,189,186	20,134,502	15.8		3,036,656	20,253,808	15.0		-4.8

¹ Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July plus average daily free and reduced-price participation in the National School Lunch Program in July.

² School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch participation during the regular school year.

³ Ratio of Summer Nutrition lunch to NSLP is the number of children in Summer Nutrition lunch per 100 in NSLP.



Food Research & Action Center
1200 18th Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036

202.986.2200
www.frac.org

Copyright © 2017 Food Research & Action Center



[@fractweets](https://twitter.com/fractweets)



[@fracgram](https://www.instagram.com/fracgram)



[facebook.com/
foodresearchandactioncenter](https://www.facebook.com/foodresearchandactioncenter)



[linkedin.com/company/
food-research-and-action-center](https://www.linkedin.com/company/food-research-and-action-center)