FRAC
Food Research & Action Center

Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Nutrition Status Report

June 2017 ■ www.FRAC.org

Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Nutrition Status Report

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by Clarissa Hayes, Randy Rosso, Signe Anderson, and Crystal FitzSimons.

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) gratefully acknowledges support of its work to expand and improve the Summer Nutrition Programs in 2016–2017 from:

- The California Endowment;
- ConAgra Foods Foundation;
- Kellogg Company Fund;
- 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;
- National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.;
- 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, Summer Nutrition Programs, or to sign up for FRAC's *Weekly News Digest*, visit ***frac.org***.

FRAC
Food Research & Action Center

Introduction

Millions of children who rely on free and reduced-price school breakfasts and lunches to keep hunger at bay during the school year lose access to those meals when the school year ends. The federal Summer Nutrition Programs, which include the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), are key resources that provide nutritious meals and snacks to children during the summer months.

In July 2016, the Summer Nutrition Programs served 3 million children. After four consecutive years of growth in participation, 153,000 — or 4.8 percent — fewer children were served compared to the previous summer. As participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs was dropping, school-year participation in NSLP increased by 119,000 low-income children, so the Summer Nutrition Programs met an even smaller share of its need. The summer programs served only 15 children for every 100 low-income children who participated in NSLP during the regular school year, a decrease from 15.8 to 100 the previous year.

Numerous reasons have been driving the low participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs and making it difficult to ensure that children who need summer meals receive them. One of the primary drivers has been the limited number of basic summer programs for low-income children. Summer meals are provided at sites in communities, such as schools, recreation centers, YMCAs, Boys & Girls Clubs, churches, and parks — with the vast majority offering educational and enrichment activities. The activities combined with healthy, federally funded meals provide the basis for strong sites that meet two important needs of low-income children: good nutrition, so they are not going hungry during the summer months, and educational and enrichment activities that keep them learning, engaged, active, and safe, so they return to school well-nourished and better prepared to return to the classroom.

Limited transportation in rural and more spread-out areas also can reduce participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs as well as the underlying summer program sites. The short duration of the summer also means the schools, local government agencies, and private nonprofit organizations that sponsor the Summer Nutrition Programs, which are often providing programming and services year-round, are in a sprint leading up to summer vacation to develop and launch a six-to-eight week program each year. In the months leading up to summer, the sponsors must apply to the program; attend trainings; identify the source and process for getting the meals to the sites; recruit, sign up, qualify, and train site staff; and promote or work with partners to market their sites to ensure that the families know where their children can get summer meals.

The importance of ensuring access to nutritious meals and summer programming is the reason why so many national youth-serving organizations, including the YMCA of the USA, the Boys & Girls Clubs of America, the Afterschool Alliance, the National Summer Learning Association, and the National Recreation and Park Association, have been working diligently to promote the Summer Nutrition Programs at summer programming sites across the country for many years. Their efforts, combined with the leadership of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the work of national, state, and local anti-hunger and child advocacy organizations, are critical to ensuring that the programs reach the children who are served.

This expansion effort has been critical to the increase in participation that occurred in the summers of 2012 (13,000 additional children), 2013 (161,000 additional children), 2014 (215,000 additional children), and 2015 (11,000 additional children), before the unfortunate loss of ground last summer.

In communities that are not served by the Summer Nutrition Programs, the Summer Electronic Benefits Transfer to Children (SEBTC) program is an exciting new approach that is being piloted by USDA to meet the nutritional needs of children during the summer months. By providing an electronic benefit card with resources to purchase food, SEBTC enables families to replace the food that is lost when school meals are not available to their children. It does not ensure that children have access to the educational, enrichment, and other summer programs they need, but it does stave off hunger and eases the additional financial burden faced by struggling families during the summer months.

The redoubling of efforts is crucial to ensure that many more children have access to summer meals. Many of the strategies that have been undertaken to increase participation, such as promoting the program to sponsors, sites, and families, have resulted in a net gain in participation since 2012, but the Summer Nutrition Programs require continuous nurturing and focus. Investments at the federal, state, and local levels to support more high-quality summer programming for low-income children will make it easier for sponsors to support children year-round and will mean less summer hunger. Continued and greater investments at the federal level to the SEBTC program will ensure low-income children receive the nutrition they need during the summer months, even when Summer Nutrition Programs are out of reach.

About This Summer Food Report

This report measures the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs in July 2016, nationally and in each state, and with comparisons to the prior summer. This report is based on a variety of metrics and examines the impact of trends and policies on program participation.

First, this report looks at lunch participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs — the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) as used in the summer, among children certified for free and reduced-price meals, combined. It uses free and reduced-price participation in NSLP in the prior regular school year as a benchmark against which to compare summer participation. Because there is broad participation in the regular school-year lunch program by low-income students across the states, that is a useful comparison by which to measure how many students could — and should — be benefiting from the Summer Nutrition Programs. This report also looks at the number of sponsors and sites operating SFSP, as this is an important indicator of access to the program for low-income children at the state level.

Finally, this report sets an ambitious, but achievable, goal of reaching 40 children with the Summer Nutrition Programs for every 100 participating in school lunch, and calculates the number of unserved children and the federal dollars lost in each state that is not meeting this goal. This report also identifies effective expansion strategies for improving participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs, including making additional investments in summer enrichment and educational programs and state and district-level successes. It also explores the role of the Summer Electronic Benefits Transfer for Children (SEBTC) program in improving access to nutrition during the summer.

National Findings for 2016

National participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs decreased in 2016, marking the first drop in participation since 2011. Both the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) saw decreases in average daily participation, but the majority of the decrease was in NSLP.

- On an average day in July 2016, the Summer Nutrition Programs (SFSP and NSLP combined) served lunch to 3.04 million children. The total number of children participating in the Summer Nutrition Programs decreased by more than 153,000 children, or 4.8 percent, from July 2015 to July 2016.
- Participation dropped in both Summer Nutrition Programs, but NSLP contributed the most to the decline, serving nearly 114,000 fewer children, compared to the drop in SFSP of about 39,000 children.
- In July 2016, only 15 children received summer lunch for every 100 low-income students who received lunch in the 2015–2016 school year, reaching only 1 in 7 who rely on free and reduced-price school meals during the school year.
- The ratio dropped from 15.8 to 15 children participating in summer lunch for every 100 participating in school lunch from 2015 to 2016. During school year 2015–2016, an additional 119,000 low-income students participated in NSLP on an average day. The decrease in Summer Nutrition Programs participation, combined with the increased reach of NSLP during the school year, resulted in the Summer Nutrition Programs meeting even less of the summer nutritional need.
- The number of SFSP sponsors and sites saw a slight decrease from July 2015 to July 2016. Nationally, 50 sponsors (a 0.9 percent decrease) and 39 sites (a 0.1 percent decrease) were lost.
- The Summer Nutrition Programs further struggled to feed children because many sites do not operate during the entire summer break. June and July saw a decrease in the number of SFSP lunches served. However, there was some progress in the month of August, with a 7.8 percent (more than 1 million) increase in the number of SFSP lunches served. This may indicate that summer programs are operating for longer periods.

The Summer Nutrition Programs

The two federal Summer Nutrition Programs — the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Seamless Summer Option and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) — 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 in 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 that come to the site can eat for free. Summer camps also can participate, but they are only reimbursed for the meals served to children who are individually eligible for free or reduced-price school meals. NSLP also reimburses schools for feeding children eligible for free or reduced-price meals who attend summer school.

Public and private nonprofit schools, local government agencies, National Youth Sports Programs, and private nonprofit organizations can participate in SFSP and sponsor one or more sites. Only schools are eligible to participate in NSLP (but the schools can use NSLP to provide meals and snacks at non-school as well as school sites over the summer). A sponsor enters into an agreement with their state agency to run the program and receives reimbursement for each eligible meal and snack served at meal sites. A site is the physical location where children receive meals during the summer. Sites work directly with sponsors.

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.

State Findings for 2016

Participation rates in the Summer Nutrition Programs in July 2016 varied throughout the country. There also were significant shifts in participation, with 22 states increasing, and 28 states and the District of Columbia dropping in participation.

- Top-performing states reached at least 1 in 4 children with summer lunch in July 2016, when comparing Summer Nutrition Programs participation to regular school-year free and reduced-price lunch participation. The top performers included:
  - District of Columbia (48.8 to 100);
  - New Mexico (35.8 to 100);
  - Vermont (34.9 to 100);
  - New York (29.9 to 100); and
  - Maine (27.4 to 100).
- Four other states reached at least 1 in 5 children with summer lunches:
  - Maryland (23.6 to 100);
  - Connecticut (23.4 to 100);
  - Idaho (21.4 to 100); and
  - Rhode Island (20.1 to 100).
- Eight states saw an increase in the number of students participating by 10 percent or more: Hawaii (25.1 percent), Nevada (17.8 percent), Kentucky (13.9 percent), Maryland (11.6 percent), Maine (11.3 percent), Florida (10.8 percent), Kansas (10.4 percent), and Montana (10 percent).
- Ten states provided summer lunches to fewer than 1 in 10 children in July 2016: Oklahoma (5.5 to 100), Nebraska (7.8 to 100), Mississippi (8 to 100), Texas (8.1 to 100), Kentucky (8.2 to 100), Colorado (8.8 to 100), Kansas (9.2 to 100), Louisiana (9.4 to 100), West Virginia (9.5 to 100), and Missouri (9.7 to 100).
- While not used in calculations for this report, it is important to note that 24 states had their highest participation during the month of June. Four states served twice as many lunches through SFSP in June as in July — Arizona, Mississippi, Missouri, and Nebraska.
- The month of August is not used in calculations for this report and participation often drops off during this time, leaving a gap in providing meals to children between the time when summer ends and school begins. In 2016, states made efforts to close that gap and served over 1 million more lunches than in August 2015.

Top 10 Performing States

State	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP	Rank
District of Columbia	48.8	1
New Mexico	35.8	2
Vermont	34.9	3
New York	29.9	4
Maine	27.4	5
Maryland	23.6	6
Connecticut	23.4	7
Idaho	21.4	8
Rhode Island	20.1	9
South Carolina	19.9	10

Bottom 10 Performing States

State	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP	Rank
Missouri	9.7	42
West Virginia	9.5	43
Louisiana	9.4	44
Kansas	9.2	45
Colorado	8.8	46
Kentucky	8.2	47
Texas	8.1	48
Mississippi	8.0	49
Nebraska	7.8	50
Oklahoma	5.5	51

Missed Opportunities

The Summer Nutrition Programs provide federal funding to states so they can offer healthy meals to low-income children. In addition to addressing food insecurity and improving the health and well-being of children, states have the opportunity to bring additional funding to their state by serving more meals. In many communities, the federal reimbursement helps program providers to operate sustainable programs and increase job security among program and food service staff.

The Summer Nutrition Programs have the ability to bring millions of dollars to states. For every lunch that an eligible child does not receive, the state and community miss out on $3.69 (rounded up to the nearest penny) in federal Summer Food Service Program funding per child. That means millions of dollars are being left on the table by almost every state.

USDA's "One More Challenge" for Summer Sponsors

While expanding participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs requires collaboration and partnership at all levels, the leadership and investment of strong summer sponsors in serving more meals and reaching more children are key components. To encourage further growth in the summer of 2016, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) challenged Summer Nutrition Program sponsors to commit to "One More Challenge." Through this initiative, sponsors were challenged to evaluate their summer meals program and determine how to add "one more" — whether it be a site, meal, activity, or week of service — to expand the reach of their summer operations. By encouraging small, coordinated steps towards serving more meals, USDA supported sponsors focused on growing their program sustainably. For example, the Iowa State Department of Education saw a 4.4 percent increase from summer 2015 to summer 2016 by encouraging the "One More Challenge."

- If every state had reached the Food Research & Action Center's goal of 40 children participating in the Summer Nutrition Programs in July 2016 for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the 2015–2016 school year, an additional 5.1 million children would have been fed each day. States would have collected an additional $373 million in child nutrition funding in July alone (assuming the program operated 20 days).
- The six states that missed out on the most federal funding and failed to feed the most children by the 40 to 100 goal were: Texas ($56.5 million; 766,383 children); California ($38.8 million; 526,727 children); Florida ($22.8 million; 309,330 children); Illinois ($16.3 million; 221,425 children); Georgia ($15.5 million; 210,052 children); and Ohio ($13.9 million; 189,134 children).

Summer Learning Loss and Summer Programs

Summer learning loss, also known as summer slide, is the diminishment of knowledge and skills and the unraveling of academic achievement gained during the school year. This happens over the course of the summer months in the absence of quality summer programming for children. During the summer, most students experience a gap in their education calendar, but how that gap affects students is largely determined by the income level of the family and the availability of summer enrichment programs.[1] Parents with higher incomes often enroll their children in summer academic enrichment programs, send them to camps, or sign them up for athletic activities. Many low-income families cannot take advantage of these opportunities because of enrollment costs and transportation barriers.

The summer nutrition gap and summer slide hit low-income children harder than their higher-income peers, leaving them hungry and struggling to succeed academically when the next school year begins. Low-income students experience negative gains in math and reading scores, sometimes losing 1–3 months of learning.[2] The effects of summer learning loss are cumulative, meaning with each summer a child does not have access to quality summer programming, he or she falls further behind peers who participate in summer programs. By the end of fifth grade, students who do not participate in summer learning opportunities can fall as far as three grade levels behind their higher-income peers.[3] Summer learning loss that happens during children's elementary school years can adversely affect their educational future. For low-income children who do not have summer enrichment opportunities, there is an increased likelihood that they will not earn a high school diploma or pursue a college education.[4]

Nevada

Nevada saw a 17.8 percent increase in participation in summer lunch served. Clark County School District was the main driver of the state's growth, increasing the number of sites that served summer meals in Las Vegas and surrounding rural areas from 61 in 2015 to 81 in 2016. In 2015, the school district served 771,000 meals during the summer months, and served over 1 million meals in 2016. The district provided meals to summer school sites as well as community-based sites, such as the Boys & Girls Clubs and YMCAs. Some of the summer activities that took place included athletic practices, Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, and Special Olympics camps. Any site that was area-eligible — at least 50 percent of the children in the area were eligible for free or reduced-price meals — was designated as an "open" site, so that all children could participate. The district also kept its schools open longer into August to minimize the gap between the summer and the school year. By doing so, the state increased the number of SFSP lunches served during August by 42 percent.

Expanding summer program opportunities for elementary school-age children can increase high school graduation rates and ensure that more students go to college.

The Afterschool Alliance's *America After 3 PM Special Report: Afterschool in Communities of Concentrated Poverty* finds that 66 percent of parents want their children to participate in summer learning programs. If programs were available and not out of financial reach, more children would participate.[5] It is estimated that only 4 percent of low-income children attend

[1] Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Olson, L. S. (2007). Summer learning and its implications: Insights from the Beginning School Study. New Directions for Youth Development, 114, 11-32.

[2] Cooper, H., Nye, B., Charlton, K., Lindsay, J., & Greathouse, S. (1996). The Effect of Summer Vacation on Achievement Test Scores: A narrative & meta-analytic review. Review of Educational Research, 66, 227-268.

[3] Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Olson, L. S. (2007). Lasting Consequences of the Summer Learning Gap. American Sociological Review, 72, 167-180.

[4] Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., & Olson, L. S. (2007). Lasting Consequences of the Summer Learning Gap. American Sociological Review, 72, 167-180.

[5] Afterschool Alliance. (2016). *America After 3 PM Special Report: Afterschool in Communities of Concentrated Poverty*. Available at: ***http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/AA3PM/Concentrated_Poverty.pdf***. Accessed on May 12, 2017.

summer camps, while 18 percent of higher-income youth do so.[6]

Summer programs, combined with summer meals, reduce childhood hunger and help ensure children return to school ready to learn. While the extent of the programming for low-income children is limited, schools, YMCAs, Boys & Girls Clubs, parks and recreation agencies, libraries, religious institutions, and many other local entities are providing opportunities for children to engage in academic and physical activities. These places are also safe spaces for children to be while their parents are at work or school. In addition to academic improvements, quality summer programming can have a positive impact on the social and emotional health of students participating in the programs.

Public funding is necessary to provide summer programs for low-income children, and the level of investment needs to be increased to ensure low-income children access programming and summer meals. For example, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program is the largest federal funding source for summer and afterschool programs; yet, it served only 1.6 million children in fiscal year (FY) 2016, leaving millions unserved. Congress increased funding for 21st Century Community Learning Centers in FY 2017, so an additional 25,000 children can be served.[7] Still, the current administration has proposed to defund the program entirely in FY 2018.[8] This would be devastating to students' access to educational and enrichment programming and would eliminate thousands of summer meal sites. Instead of cutting funding, additional resources are needed to meet the academic and nutritional needs of the millions of low-income students who fall further behind each summer.

Hawaii

Hawaii saw an increase of 25 percent in 2016, growing its average daily participation by over 1,000 children during the month of July and continuing the increase in participation that started in July 2015, when the state grew participation by 28 percent. To share information and strategically plan for summer 2016, the state agency convened partners at the beginning of the summer. Strong partnerships were established among the organizations that attended the meeting, including the Kapiolani Community College, which agreed to serve as a vendor for additional sites. Hawaii First Lady Dawn Ige championed the Summer Nutrition Programs and encouraged sites and sponsors to increase participation in areas where there was need. On the Big Island, Kona Pacific Public Charter School doubled its mobile meal program, from five sites in 2015 to 10 in 2016, and meals served from 5,000 to 10,000.

[6] Wimer, C., Bouffard, S., Caronongan, P., Dearing, E., Simpkins, S., Little, P., & Weiss, H. (2006). What are kids getting into these days? Demographic differences in youth out-of-school time participation. Harvard, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

[7] Afterschool Alliance. (2017). Afterschool funding preserved in proposed FY2017 spending bill, still under attack for 2018. Available at: ***http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/afterschoolSnack/Afterschool-funding-preserved-in-proposed-FY2017-spending-bill_05-01-2017.cfm***. Accessed on May 12, 2017.

[8] Afterschool Alliance. (2017). *What does the president's "skinny budget" mean for afterschool and summer learning?* Available at: ***http://www.afterschoolalliance.org/afterschoolSnack/What-does-the-president-s-skinny-budget-mean-for-afterschool_03-20-2017.cfm***. Accessed on May 12, 2017

Summer EBT: An Important Strategy to Close the Nutrition Gap

The Summer Electronic Benefits Transfer for Children (SEBTC) program is a relatively new way to support during the summer low-income families who rely on school meals during the school year. It provides families with a debit card (with a fixed amount of funds) that can be used to purchase groceries during the summer months. Participation in SEBTC is not captured in this report's analysis of the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs, but 250,000 children across eight states and Indian Tribal Organizations were estimated to have participated in summer 2016.[9]

As detailed in the previous section, children need and benefit from both the nutrition and the academic and enrichment activities provided at summer meal sites in order to return to school ready to learn. However, in communities that struggle to provide summer meals due to transportation or other barriers, the SEBTC approach is an important way to ensure children have access to nutrition during the summer, at a time when states with low participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs otherwise have the largest seasonal increases in food insecurity.[10]

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) has provided SEBTC benefits to children who are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals through its Summer Demonstration Projects since 2011. In the first year, SEBTC reached 12,500 children in Connecticut, Michigan, Missouri, Oregon, and Texas.[11] The program was estimated to have grown to serve 250,000 children nationwide in 2016. A 2016 report[12] assessed the different levels of monthly summer benefits provided through the demonstration projects ($60 and $30) as well as the different distribution models: benefits tied to specific food items, similar to the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), versus a specific monetary value available for food purchases, similar to the Supplemental Nutrition

Kansas

Recognizing that there were still a large number of counties in the state without summer meal programs in 2015, the Kansas State Department of Education partnered with Kansas Appleseed to identify gaps in participation and target expansion efforts to underserved areas. They convened partners at regional stakeholder meetings to identify eligible, non-participating areas, identify sponsors to serve those areas, and share strategies to boost participation at existing meal sites. As a result of this collaborative effort, Kansas developed summer meal sites in 16 previously unserved counties. In spring 2016, Kansas was selected as one of three states to participate in Cities Combating Hunger through the Afterschool and Summer Meal Programs (CHAMPS), an initiative led by the National League of Cities and the Food Research & Action Center to encourage city agencies to support and expand year-round participation in the Summer and Afterschool Nutrition Programs. These efforts — along with statewide promotional efforts, such as "Lunch Across Kansas Week," which drew media coverage to the summer meal sites — helped the state to increase participation by 10.4 percent and put in place important building blocks to help Kansas continue to grow its summer meal programs.

[9] U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2016). USDA Announces Awardees of Summer EBT Grants, Extends Benefits to Flint, Michigan and Other High-Need Areas. [Press release]. Available at: ***https://www.fns.usda.gov/pressrelease/2016/008716***. Accessed on May 12, 2017.

[10] Nord, M. & Romig, K. (2006). Hunger in the summer: seasonal food insecurity and the National School Lunch and Summer Food Service programs. *Journal of Children and Poverty*, 12(2), 141-158.

[11] U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2017). Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer for Children (SEBTC). Available at: ***https://www.fns.usda.gov/ops/summer-electronic-benefit-transfer-children-sebtc***. Accessed on May 12, 2017.

[12] Abt Associates. (2016). *Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer for Children (SEBTC) Demonstration: Summary Report.* Available at: ***https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/ops/sebtcfinalreport.pdf***. Accessed on May 12, 2017.

Assistance Program (SNAP). Both approaches resulted in numerous benefits, but the WIC model had a higher administrative cost. The report found that the SEBTC program has accomplished a number of important objectives:

- **Reduced food insecurity:** By providing low-income households with a $30 or $60 benefit per month per child, the most severe type of food insecurity (very low food security) was reduced by one-third, and food insecurity was reduced by one-fifth.
- **Improved nutrition:** Both the $30 and $60 monthly benefit levels led to an improvement in children's summertime nutritional intake, but children in households that received the $60 benefit ate slightly more nutritious foods (fruits, vegetables, and whole grains) than those in the $30 group.
- **Contributed to high participation rates:** Throughout the duration of the demonstration projects, more than 75 percent of households redeemed some or all of their benefits. While both models were efficient in reaching families, those who participated in the SNAP model redeemed benefits at higher rates than those in the WIC model (95 percent versus 83 percent). This is likely due to the more limited availability of WIC retailers and the fact that WIC participants had a more limited set of eligible foods to choose from. Additionally, unused benefits in the WIC model expired at the end of the month, while unused benefits in the SNAP model were available until the end of summer.

Recognizing the impact that SEBTC has on reducing food insecurity, Congress has continued to invest in and expand its reach through the annual appropriations process. Over the last few years, there have been a number of proposals and legislative bills introduced that would have made even larger investments to SEBTC, including the Stop Summer Hunger Child Nutrition Act of 2015 (S. 1539/H.R. 2715), introduced by Senator Patty Murray (D-WA) and Representative Susan Davis (D-CA).

As too many children continue to miss out on summer meals, it is crucial to invest in and expand this successful approach to reducing food insecurity.

Maine

To ensure more children have access to nutritious meals and to close the summer learning gap, the Preble Street Maine Hunger Initiative worked with partners across the state to advocate for, and ultimately enact state legislation requiring high-poverty schools (those in which at least 50 percent of students qualify for free or reduced-price meals) that operate summer programming to provide meals through the Summer Nutrition Programs. The state's average daily participation grew by 28 percent, from 12,613 children served in 2014 — prior to the passage of the legislation — to 16,157 children served in 2016.

Providing additional nutritional support to families in underserved and hard-to-reach areas through the SEBTC program, while simultaneously strengthening the Summer Nutrition Programs to ensure that low-income children have access to the food and programming they need over the summer, will ensure more children return to school healthy, nourished, and ready to learn.

Conclusion

The Summer Nutrition Programs help meet two critical summer needs for low-income children: access to nutritious meals to keep hunger at bay and access to summer programming to reduce summer learning loss. In July 2016, the Summer Nutrition Programs served 3 million children, a decrease of 4.8 percent from July 2015. Greater investments are needed in summer programs to increase participation and ensure that low-income communities have the program platforms for building summer meal sites to reduce both hunger and the summer learning slide.

When the Summer Nutrition Programs are not available, SEBTC provides resources to meet children's nutritional needs during the summer months. This approach has been shown to reduce food insecurity and should be expanded to increase its reach and help more children access nutritious food in the summer months.

While many states saw decreases in participation from July 2015 to July 2016, 22 states grew participation, with eight growing by 10 percent or more. Some of their successful strategies include conducting outreach, developing creative partnerships, increasing mobile meal sites, and passing state legislation that fosters more sponsors and sites. These efforts provide important examples for other states to emulate to increase participation. The U.S. Department of Agriculture's continuing leadership and investment in the nutrition programs, such as through its "One More Challenge" initiative, also will be critical to increasing the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs.

Kentucky

In Kentucky, addressing transportation barriers and supporting sponsors were keys to expanding the Summer Nutrition Programs. The state grew program participation by 13.9 percent from 2015 to 2016. Kentucky — a very rural state — continues to see growth in various mobile summer meal initiatives, ranging from retrofitted school buses to library bookmobiles. Making the meals "mobile" allows sponsors to more easily connect with children in underserved, hard-to-reach communities — especially in rural areas. Kentucky also has seen huge success in providing sponsors the opportunity to learn from each other. In late winter, the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) hosted a series of "best practices share sessions," which were an opportunity for sponsors to learn from their peers about successful efforts to provide summer meals across the state. KDE surveyed its sponsors at the end of summer to determine successes, challenges, and how resources and technical assistance can impact and inform the state's plans for increasing participation moving forward.

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.

Due to rounding, totals in the tables may not add up to 100 percent.

Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)

USDA provided FRAC with the number of SFSP lunches served in each state. FRAC calculated each state's July average daily lunch attendance in SFSP by dividing the total number of SFSP lunches served in July by the total number of weekdays in July (excluding the Independence Day holiday). The average daily lunch attendance numbers for July reported in FRAC's analysis are slightly different from USDA's average daily participation numbers. 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 school year National School Lunch Program (NSLP), as described below.

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.

USDA obtains the July numbers of sponsors and sites from the states and reports them as the states provide them. USDA does not report the number of sponsors or sites for June or August.

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

National School Lunch Program (NSLP)

Using data provided by USDA, FRAC calculated the regular school year NSLP average of daily low-income attendance for each state, based on the number of free and reduced-price meals served from September through May.

FRAC used the July average daily attendance figures provided by USDA for the summertime NSLP participation data in this report. The NSLP summer meal numbers include all of the free and reduced-price lunches served through NSLP during July.[13] This includes lunches served at summer school, through the NSLP Seamless Summer Option, and on regular school days (during July).

Note that USDA calculates average daily participation in the regular year NSLP by dividing the average daily lunch 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* reports these NSLP average daily participation numbers; that is, including the attendance factor. To make the NSLP numbers consistent with the SFSP numbers, for which there is no analogous attendance factor, *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation* does not include the attendance factor. As a result, the regular school year NSLP numbers in this report do not match the 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 in July for every 100 children receiving free or reduced-price lunches during the regular school year. FRAC then calculated the number of additional children who would be reached if that state achieved a 40 to 100 ratio of summer nutrition to regular school year lunches. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the summer lunch reimbursement rate for 20 days (the number of weekdays in July 2016, not counting the Independence Day holiday) of SFSP lunches. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available.

[13] 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 NSLP participation in Hawaii that did not reflect summer meal program participation. The state provided FRAC with data on the number of lunches served in July 2015 through the Seamless Summer Option. FRAC divided these numbers by the number of days that Seamless Summer lunches were served (8 days in July 2015) to calculate the July NSLP average daily participation for each year, and added the results to the July 2015 SFSP lunch participation to estimate Summer Nutrition participation in Hawaii.

Table 1:

Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition[1] in July 2015 and July 2016, Compared to Regular School Year National School Lunch Program (NSLP)[2] Average Daily Participation (ADP) for School Years 2014–2015 and 2015–2016, by State

State	Summer Nutrition ADP July 2015	NSLP ADP 2014–2015	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP[3] 2014–2015	Rank 2014–2015	Summer Nutrition ADP July 2016	NSLP ADP 2015–2016	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP[3] 2015–2016	Rank 2015–2016	Percent Change in Summer Nutrition 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 Nutrition includes the Summer Food Service Program and free and reduced-price National School Lunch Program, including the Seamless Summer Option.
[2] School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch participation during the regular school year.
[3] Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP is the number of children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in NSLP.

Table 2:

Change in Summer Food Service Program Average Daily Participation (ADP); and in National School Lunch Program ADP from July 2015 to July 2016, by State

State	SFSP July 2015	SFSP July 2016	Percent Change 2015–2016	NSLP July 2015	NSLP July 2016	NSLP Percent Change 2015–2016
Alabama	33,836	33,190	-1.9	4,801	4,689	-2.3
Alaska	4,064	3,310	-18.5	694	684	-1.4
Arizona	14,927	9,424	-36.9	57,908	48,110	-16.9
Arkansas	27,096	20,251	-25.3	9,468	8,669	-8.4
California	119,061	121,533	2.1	358,857	335,074	-6.6
Colorado	18,185	18,413	1.3	3,100	1,858	-40.1
Connecticut	24,784	29,635	19.6	14,789	7,668	-48.1
Delaware	9,772	9,048	-7.4	1,115	1,163	4.3
District of Columbia	19,175	19,229	0.3	3,010	2,482	-17.6
Florida	175,841	192,447	9.4	23,076	28,039	21.5
Georgia	67,420	64,238	-4.7	83,723	77,545	-7.4
Hawaii	1,091	1,600	46.6	4,320	5,167	19.6
Idaho	20,354	19,855	-2.5	580	568	-2.1
Illinois	71,300	57,766	-19.0	40,934	33,739	-17.6
Indiana	37,710	34,769	-7.8	41,148	33,382	-18.9
Iowa	16,994	17,999	5.9	2,159	1,992	-7.8
Kansas	14,314	15,939	11.4	1,256	1,248	-0.7
Kentucky	25,437	29,526	16.1	2,860	2,717	-5.0
Louisiana	32,526	35,779	10.0	2,029	1,815	-10.6
Maine	14,189	15,759	11.1	323	398	23.4
Maryland	61,244	68,767	12.3	1,837	1,624	-11.6
Massachusetts	48,449	48,720	0.6	5,019	7,655	52.5
Michigan	58,264	54,944	-5.7	12,022	9,479	-21.2
Minnesota	36,249	36,865	1.7	7,942	7,632	-3.9
Mississippi	21,111	23,268	10.2	820	838	2.2
Missouri	23,819	24,667	3.6	8,958	10,541	17.7
Montana	7,671	8,429	9.9	533	593	11.2
Nebraska	8,235	7,466	-9.3	1,504	1,551	3.1
Nevada	7,747	7,726	-0.3	9,546	12,638	32.4
New Hampshire	4,504	4,583	1.8	595	948	59.3
New Jersey	52,801	56,724	7.4	26,291	24,191	-8.0
New Mexico	35,055	37,440	6.8	24,356	24,559	0.8
New York	288,473	280,439	-2.8	72,704	71,826	-1.2
North Carolina	62,153	65,589	5.5	39,749	37,180	-6.5
North Dakota	2,605	2,869	10.1	321	297	-7.5
Ohio	53,528	53,369	-0.3	11,997	9,570	-20.2
Oklahoma	15,054	13,705	-9.0	3,676	3,287	-10.6
Oregon	31,908	30,784	-3.5	2,568	3,671	43.0
Pennsylvania	87,436	68,790	-21.3	26,310	20,955	-20.4
Rhode Island	8,815	9,281	5.3	998	958	-4.0
South Carolina	42,401	46,699	10.1	27,731	22,767	-17.9
South Dakota	5,525	5,537	0.2	3,183	2,700	-15.2
Tennessee	47,597	41,326	-13.2	23,247	24,388	4.9
Texas	135,610	123,246	-9.1	109,826	72,436	-34.0
Utah	4,190	4,586	9.4	25,829	23,708	-8.2
Vermont	8,201	8,492	3.5	578	550	-4.8
Virginia	56,506	56,111	-0.7	9,233	6,592	-28.6
Washington	43,040	31,624	-26.5	5,919	5,906	-0.2
West Virginia	9,775	9,810	0.4	1,983	2,069	4.3
Wisconsin	43,408	39,337	-9.4	3,178	3,054	-3.9
Wyoming	4,153	3,718	-10.5	980	868	-11.5
US	2,063,603	2,024,620	-1.9	1,125,583	1,012,036	-10.1

Table 3:
Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors and Sites from July 2015 to July 2016, by State

State	Sponsors July 2015	Sponsors July 2016	Sponsors Percent Change	Sites July 2015	Sites July 2016	Sites Percent Change
Alabama	103	99	-3.9	930	925	-0.5
Alaska	26	27	3.8	179	153	-14.5
Arizona	23	23	0.0	419	278	-33.7
Arkansas	156	116	-25.6	720	574	-20.3
California	217	208	-4.1	2,271	2,224	-2.1
Colorado	76	79	3.9	452	470	4.0
Connecticut	34	43	26.5	479	598	24.8
Delaware	26	28	7.7	334	336	0.6
District of Columbia	18	19	5.6	298	299	0.3
Florida	142	153	7.7	3,981	4,209	5.7
Georgia	103	96	-6.8	1,371	1,438	4.9
Hawaii	20	20	0.0	88	84	-4.5
Idaho	63	60	-4.8	263	278	5.7
Illinois	169	165	-2.4	1,758	1,519	-13.6
Indiana	225	218	-3.1	1,313	1,248	-5.0
Iowa	132	147	11.4	356	427	19.9
Kansas	115	129	12.2	388	477	22.9
Kentucky	149	150	0.7	1,812	1,640	-9.5
Louisiana	81	104	28.4	569	652	14.6
Maine	114	113	-0.9	382	389	1.8
Maryland	45	47	4.4	1,392	1,455	4.5
Massachusetts	101	102	1.0	1,007	1,051	4.4
Michigan	278	297	6.8	1,515	1,548	2.2
Minnesota	177	176	-0.6	698	751	7.6
Mississippi	107	113	5.6	562	507	-9.8
Missouri	125	119	-4.8	734	752	2.5
Montana	91	89	-2.2	197	202	2.5
Nebraska	70	55	-21.4	206	186	-9.7
Nevada	32	29	-9.4	262	304	16.0
New Hampshire	24	25	4.2	160	170	6.3
New Jersey	108	111	2.8	1,112	1,351	21.5
New Mexico	53	56	5.7	640	637	-0.5
New York	336	348	3.6	2,890	2,908	0.6
North Carolina	118	133	12.7	1,812	2,028	11.9
North Dakota	43	36	-16.3	89	85	-4.5
Ohio	176	178	1.1	1,585	1,653	4.3
Oklahoma	174	77	-55.7	659	522	-20.8
Oregon	139	139	0.0	783	812	3.7
Pennsylvania	272	283	4.0	2,403	2,365	-1.6
Rhode Island	24	25	4.2	209	208	-0.5
South Carolina	67	72	7.5	1,620	1,509	-6.9
South Dakota	42	43	2.4	84	90	7.1
Tennessee	75	59	-21.3	1,667	1,522	-8.7
Texas	255	279	9.4	3,427	3,220	-6.0
Utah	13	14	7.7	79	102	29.1
Vermont	62	53	-14.5	273	293	7.3
Virginia	141	139	-1.4	1,523	1,459	-4.2
Washington	146	151	3.4	827	860	4.0
West Virginia	104	101	-2.9	429	413	-3.7
Wisconsin	161	155	-3.7	739	712	-3.7
Wyoming	27	27	0.0	83	97	16.9
US	5,578	5,528	-0.9	48,029	47,990	-0.1

Table 4:

Number of Summer Food Service Program Lunches Served in June, July, and August 2015 and 2016, by State

State	Lunches June 2015	Lunches June 2016	Percent Change June	Lunches July 2015	Lunches July 2016	Percent Change July	Lunches August 2015	Lunches August 2016	Percent Change August
Alabama	993,946	993,685	0.0	744,399	663,792	-10.8	14,403	37,525	160.5
Alaska	105,296	80,986	-23.1	89,399	66,204	-25.9	27,663	22,426	-18.9
Arizona	521,357	424,987	-18.5	328,387	188,478	-42.6	14,867	9,027	-39.3
Arkansas	430,641	414,687	-3.7	596,121	405,028	-32.1	158,939	120,998	-23.9
California	1,933,652	1,631,700	-15.6	2,619,340	2,430,660	-7.2	493,360	502,251	1.8
Colorado	512,946	514,512	0.3	400,069	368,257	-8.0	39,183	59,146	50.9
Connecticut	64,130	106,492	66.1	545,237	592,697	8.7	144,818	203,070	40.2
Delaware	90,999	88,397	-2.9	214,993	180,964	-15.8	83,260	88,712	6.5
District of Columbia	11,837	1,836	-84.5	421,846	384,583	-8.8	87,184	8,513	-90.2
Florida	3,002,989	3,062,516	2.0	3,868,507	3,848,930	-0.5	795,881	825,701	3.7
Georgia	1,617,985	1,582,993	-2.2	1,483,247	1,284,769	-13.4	95,238	69,139	-27.4
Hawaii	27,489	44,404	61.5	24,012	31,998	33.3	0	0	0.0
Idaho	465,432	481,078	3.4	447,789	397,107	-11.3	91,852	104,652	13.9
Illinois	663,952	553,562	-16.6	1,568,608	1,155,314	-26.3	578,439	509,959	-11.8
Indiana	994,802	1,068,993	7.5	829,609	695,382	-16.2	52,449	51,462	-1.9
Iowa	404,401	424,435	5.0	373,869	359,973	-3.7	73,537	82,087	11.6
Kansas	550,557	546,673	-0.7	314,897	318,785	1.2	18,846	36,714	94.8
Kentucky	588,538	740,305	25.8	559,619	590,524	5.5	38,834	41,964	8.1
Louisiana	1,200,455	1,200,455	0.0	715,579	715,579	0.0	12,708	12,708	0.0
Maine	9,563	22,043	130.5	312,151	315,179	1.0	99,226	123,567	24.5
Maryland	133,425	80,266	-39.8	1,347,364	1,375,337	2.1	191,648	252,083	31.5
Massachusetts	40,834	88,378	116.4	1,065,879	974,404	-8.6	480,694	525,986	9.4
Michigan	598,432	484,387	-19.1	1,281,815	1,098,871	-14.3	591,453	723,517	22.3
Minnesota	599,483	599,005	-0.1	797,483	737,308	-7.5	284,862	360,621	26.6
Mississippi	913,098	976,713	7.0	464,444	465,353	0.2	5,555	7,121	28.2
Missouri	1,810,044	1,799,387	-0.6	524,019	493,341	-5.9	66,397	94,568	42.4
Montana	136,665	164,850	20.6	168,761	168,571	-0.1	58,740	72,836	24.0
Nebraska	409,123	381,227	-6.8	181,174	149,327	-17.6	11,162	17,421	56.1
Nevada	142,221	152,930	7.5	170,429	154,513	-9.3	57,429	81,766	42.4
New Hampshire	11,583	16,277	40.5	99,077	91,664	-7.5	32,297	38,722	19.9
New Jersey	811	9,483	1,069.3	1,161,616	1,134,479	-2.3	393,684	522,580	32.7
New Mexico	672,038	542,358	-19.3	771,201	748,806	-2.9	8,295	19,996	141.1
New York	247,829	139,110	-43.9	6,346,397	5,608,776	-11.6	3,640,898	4,175,645	14.7
North Carolina	571,481	776,268	35.8	1,367,368	1,311,785	-4.1	391,075	516,348	32.0
North Dakota	69,169	88,730	28.3	57,305	57,382	0.1	14,839	16,853	13.6
Ohio	995,749	1,076,885	8.1	1,177,609	1,067,376	-9.4	248,508	331,861	33.5
Oklahoma	632,402	533,889	-15.6	331,193	274,093	-17.2	46,224	29,823	-35.5
Oregon	352,213	301,939	-14.3	701,982	615,678	-12.3	359,086	397,032	10.6
Pennsylvania	420,904	528,659	25.6	1,923,582	1,375,804	-28.5	909,451	818,632	-10.0
Rhode Island	9,901	26,125	163.9	193,940	185,628	-4.3	103,826	107,991	4.0
South Carolina	849,200	834,227	-1.8	932,824	933,989	0.1	204,059	166,294	-18.5
South Dakota	148,156	140,935	-4.9	121,541	110,749	-8.9	34,250	50,731	48.1
Tennessee	1,246,240	1,045,816	-16.1	1,047,141	826,513	-21.1	60,970	5,845	-90.4
Texas	3,874,789	4,046,122	4.4	2,983,417	2,464,912	-17.4	1,185,567	1,074,451	-9.4
Utah	110,556	123,756	11.9	92,184	91,723	-0.5	26,956	34,148	26.7
Vermont	36,047	48,084	33.4	180,426	169,833	-5.9	43,502	53,275	22.5
Virginia	386,723	362,407	-6.3	1,243,126	1,122,211	-9.7	410,577	458,485	11.7
Washington	361,755	255,185	-29.5	946,886	632,478	-33.2	400,554	349,875	-12.7
West Virginia	79,465	108,607	36.7	215,056	196,209	-8.8	11,891	14,174	19.2
Wisconsin	513,944	647,456	26.0	954,970	786,735	-17.6	229,389	240,333	4.8
Wyoming	74,454	95,433	28.2	91,371	74,351	-18.6	18,247	18,379	0.7
US	30,639,701	30,459,633	-0.6	45,399,258	40,492,402	-10.8	13,442,772	14,487,013	7.8

Note: Sponsors that serve meals for no more than 10 days in June or August are allowed to claim those lunches in July to reduce paperwork. Occasionally this results in a state reporting that no meals were served in one or both of these months.

Table 5:

Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition[1] and Additional ADP and Additional Federal Reimbursement if States Reached FRAC's Goal of 40 Summer Nutrition Participants per 100 Regular School Year National School Lunch Program (NSLP)[2] Participants

State	Summer Nutrition ADP, July 2016	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP[3]	Total Summer Nutrition ADP if Summer Nutrition to NSLP Ratio Reached 40:100	Additional Summer Nutrition ADP if Summer Nutrition to NSLP Ratio Reached 40:100	Additional Federal Reimbursement Dollars if Summer Nutrition to NSLP Ratio Reached 40:100[4]
Alabama	37,879	10.2	148,930	111,051	8,184,488
Alaska	3,994	10.8	14,827	10,833	798,410
Arizona	57,533	12.4	186,176	128,643	9,480,957
Arkansas	28,921	12.6	91,660	62,739	4,623,868
California	456,607	18.6	983,335	526,727	38,819,800
Colorado	20,271	8.8	92,013	71,742	5,287,414
Connecticut	37,303	23.4	63,793	26,490	1,952,277
Delaware	10,211	16.3	25,030	14,819	1,092,182
District of Columbia	21,711	48.8	17,783	0	0
Florida	220,486	16.6	529,816	309,330	22,797,654
Georgia	141,784	16.1	351,836	210,052	15,480,866
Hawaii	6,767	10.8	25,067	18,300	1,348,729
Idaho	20,423	21.4	38,176	17,753	1,308,362
Illinois	91,504	11.7	312,929	221,425	16,319,002
Indiana	68,151	16.0	170,558	102,407	7,547,390
Iowa	19,990	11.6	68,955	48,964	3,608,677
Kansas	17,187	9.2	75,033	57,846	4,263,233
Kentucky	32,243	8.2	156,969	124,727	9,192,356
Louisiana	37,594	9.4	159,158	121,564	8,959,290
Maine	16,157	27.4	23,555	7,398	545,234
Maryland	70,391	23.6	119,365	48,974	3,609,407
Massachusetts	56,376	17.8	126,869	70,494	5,195,400
Michigan	64,422	11.9	216,528	152,106	11,210,194
Minnesota	44,497	16.3	109,037	64,540	4,756,607
Mississippi	24,105	8.0	120,713	96,608	7,119,990
Missouri	35,208	9.7	144,511	109,303	8,055,626
Montana	9,022	19.5	18,519	9,497	699,942
Nebraska	9,017	7.8	46,192	37,175	2,739,763
Nevada	20,364	11.8	69,068	48,705	3,589,522
New Hampshire	5,531	15.1	14,659	9,128	672,708
New Jersey	80,915	18.9	171,352	90,437	6,665,191
New Mexico	61,999	35.8	69,326	7,327	540,007
New York	352,265	29.9	471,426	119,161	8,782,147
North Carolina	102,769	15.8	260,523	157,754	11,626,499
North Dakota	3,166	10.4	12,208	9,042	666,413
Ohio	62,939	10.0	252,073	189,134	13,939,182
Oklahoma	16,992	5.5	122,683	105,691	7,789,463
Oregon	34,455	16.2	85,231	50,776	3,742,162
Pennsylvania	89,745	14.5	247,620	157,875	11,635,406
Rhode Island	10,239	20.1	20,359	10,120	745,852
South Carolina	69,466	19.9	139,365	69,899	5,151,543
South Dakota	8,237	16.7	19,759	11,522	849,157
Tennessee	65,713	13.3	198,003	132,290	9,749,744
Texas	195,681	8.1	962,065	766,383	56,482,452
Utah	28,294	17.6	64,195	35,901	2,645,903
Vermont	9,041	34.9	10,371	1,330	98,018
Virginia	62,703	15.2	165,525	102,822	7,578,012
Washington	37,530	11.0	135,935	98,404	7,252,402
West Virginia	11,879	9.5	49,992	38,113	2,808,920
Wisconsin	42,391	15.1	112,562	70,172	5,171,641
Wyoming	4,585	18.5	9,888	5,302	390,783
US	3,036,655	15.0	8,101,523	5,064,868	373,280,768

[1] Summer Nutrition includes the Summer Food Service Program and free and reduced-price National School Lunch Program during the summer, including the Seamless Summer Option.
[2] School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch participation in regular school year 2015–2016.
[3] Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP is the number of children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in NSLP.
[4] Additional federal reimbursement dollars is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed for each child each weekday only for lunch (not also breakfast or a snack) and at the lowest rate for a SFSP lunch ($3.685 per lunch) and are served 20 days in July 2016.

FRAC
Food Research & Action Center

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

202.986.2200
ww.frac.org

@fractweets
@fracgram
facebook.com/
foodresearchandactioncenter
linkedin.com/company/
food-research-and-action-center