



# Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Breakfast Status Report

September 2016 ■ [www.FRAC.org](http://www.FRAC.org)



# Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

## Summer Breakfast 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 lead sponsorship of this report from the Kellogg Company Fund.

FRAC acknowledges additional support of its work to expand and improve the Summer Nutrition Programs in 2015–2016 from:

- The California Endowment
- ConAgra Foods Foundation
- National League of Cities Institute
- Tyson Foods, Inc.
- Walmart Foundation
- 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
- 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 [www.frac.org](http://www.frac.org).



## Introduction

---

**B**reakfast, long considered as the most important meal of the day, has been shown to support academic achievement and to improve health. The federally funded School Breakfast Program provides millions of low-income children the nutritional boost they need at the start of their school day to be ready to learn and to remain healthy. When summer vacation begins, however, children lose access to the school breakfasts and school lunches they rely on during the academic year. The Summer Nutrition Programs — the Summer Food Service Program, the School Breakfast Program, and the National School Lunch Program — are designed to close the summer nutrition gap by providing meals over the long and often hungry summer months at sites that typically offer educational, enrichment, physical, and recreational activities; keep children safe and out of trouble; and provide crucial child care supports for working parents.

Yet the Summer Nutrition Programs have struggled to serve the low-income children who participate in the School Breakfast and National School Lunch Programs during the school year. In response, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has prioritized increasing participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs and has led expansion

efforts in partnership with national, state, and local anti-hunger and child advocates as well as state child nutrition agencies. These efforts have resulted in significant gains in participation over the last four years. Still, the programs have a limited reach, serving lunch to only 3.2 million children on an average weekday in July 2015, meaning for every six low-income children who participated in school lunch during the 2014–2015 school year, only one child received lunch through the Summer Nutrition Programs.

Nobody has taken a close look at summer breakfast participation to see whether it is doing better than — or not as well as — summer lunch. In this first report on summer breakfast, the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) looks at national and state data on summer breakfast performance.

The bottom line is that participation in summer breakfast is even more limited than in summer lunch. Reaching 1.7 million children on an average weekday in July 2015, it serves just over half the number of children that participate in summer lunch.

The federal Summer Nutrition Programs provide funding to serve two meals a day at most sites (with some types of sites

---

being able to serve three meals), but too many sites provide just lunch or lunch and a snack. By not providing the maximum number of meals available, these sites miss out on an important opportunity to better meet children’s nutritional needs. They fall far short of providing the nutrition that low-income children have access to during the school year.

The sites also miss out on additional federal funding when the maximum number of meals are not made available. They lose out on the economies of scale available when they incorporate breakfast — often with limited additional administrative or transportation costs.

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 participation in summer breakfast is to incorporate breakfast into existing summer lunch sites. Still, it is imperative to increase the number of children receiving both breakfast and lunch during the summer months. The efforts to increase summer lunch participation must continue in tandem with the work to increase the reach of summer breakfast.

---

## About This Report

This report measures the reach of breakfast through the Summer Nutrition Programs in July 2015, nationally and in each state. This is FRAC’s first report on the reach of summer breakfast and is a companion piece to FRAC’s *Summer Nutrition Status Report: Hunger Doesn’t Take a Vacation*, which focuses on summer lunch participation. This report is based on a variety of metrics and it examines the impacts of trends and policies on program participation. This report:

- assesses national and state breakfast participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs among children certified for free and reduced-price meals;
- measures July 2015 breakfast participation against July 2015 participation in lunch, using the lunch data reported in FRAC’s *Summer Nutrition Status Report: Hunger Doesn’t Take a Vacation*;
- compares breakfast participation across states by calculating the ratio of the number of children participating in breakfast for every 100 children participating in lunch; this ratio ranges from 15.3:100 in Utah to 86.1:100 in New Hampshire;
- 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 and describes 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 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 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.

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. Sites that serve primarily migrant children and summer camps can provide three meals.

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 the schools can provide meals and snacks at non-school as well as school sites over the summer.

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

Nearly 3.2 million low-income children across the country received a lunch through the Summer Nutrition Programs on an average weekday in July 2015. Just over half (52.8 percent) of these children — 1.7 million — also had access to a nutritious breakfast through these programs. The remaining 1.5 million children missed this important meal. The Summer Nutrition Programs served breakfast to slightly more children in July 2015 than in the previous year; participation increased by 20,000 children, a 1.2 percent increase.

Of course, participation in the summer lunch programs being used as a basis of measurement varied widely across the states, and a low level of participation in summer lunch sets an artificially low bar for summer breakfast participation. Likewise, strong summer lunch participation sets a much higher bar for summer breakfast participation. To account for this, FRAC is grouping states by a typology of four categories.

*On an average weekday in July 2015, 1.7 million children had access to a nutritious summer breakfast.*

## Group 1: Strong Participation in Summer Breakfast<sup>1</sup> and Lunch<sup>2</sup>

Summer Nutrition				
State	Breakfast	Lunch	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch
District of Columbia	17,136	22,185	77.2	51.9
Connecticut	29,341	39,573	74.1	25.4
Maryland	45,418	63,081	72.0	22.2
New York	254,671	361,177	70.5	31.2
Vermont	5,805	8,779	66.1	33.3
Maine	8,132	14,511	56.0	24.8

In summer 2015, five states (Connecticut, Maryland, New York, Vermont, and Maine) and the District of Columbia had summer lunch ratios of at least 20:100. For every five children who participated in school lunch during the 2014–2015 school year, at least one child received summer lunch through the Summer Nutrition Programs. This group also had a summer breakfast ratio of at least 50:100, meaning they served summer breakfast to at least half as many children as those who received summer lunch. This performance was consistent: these same states had fit into this group in summer 2014 as well.

*Five states and the District of Columbia had strong participation in summer breakfast and lunch.*

## Group 2: Strong Breakfast<sup>1</sup> Participation Relative to Weak Lunch<sup>2</sup> Participation

Summer Nutrition				
State	Breakfast	Lunch	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch
New Hampshire	4,391	5,099	86.1	13.5
Virginia	49,833	65,739	75.8	16.1
Louisiana	25,635	34,555	74.2	8.9
Delaware	8,035	10,887	73.8	17.6
New Jersey	56,883	79,092	71.9	18.5
Hawaii	3,797	5,411	70.2	8.4
Nevada	10,843	17,293	62.7	10.5
Minnesota	27,671	44,191	62.6	16.4
Arkansas	22,880	36,565	62.6	16.0
West Virginia	7,139	11,759	60.7	9.7
Arizona	42,060	72,835	57.7	15.6
Illinois	64,649	112,234	57.6	14.1
Massachusetts	30,681	53,468	57.4	18.0
Missouri	18,754	32,777	57.2	9.0
Texas	139,124	245,435	56.7	10.2
North Carolina	57,193	101,902	56.1	15.7
Wisconsin	25,259	46,586	54.2	16.5
Michigan	38,031	70,286	54.1	12.7
Mississippi	11,866	21,931	54.1	7.3
Oklahoma	9,438	18,730	50.4	6.4

This group of 20 states succeeded in providing summer breakfast to at least half as many children as those who received summer lunch, but the good news was tempered by their anemic summer lunch performance, with participation ratios of summer-to-school-year-lunch below 20:100.

<sup>1</sup> Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July, plus free and reduced-price average daily participation in the School Breakfast Program in July, including the Seamless Summer Option.

<sup>2</sup> Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July, plus free and reduced-price average daily participation in the National School Lunch Program in July, including the Seamless Summer Option.

Eight of these states (Louisiana, Hawaii, Nevada, West Virginia, Missouri, Texas, Mississippi, and Oklahoma) rank among the 15 lowest ratios of summer lunch participation in the country, reaching between six and 11 children for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the prior school year. While it is encouraging that these states served breakfast to the majority of the children eating lunch through the Summer Nutrition Programs, the states in this group need to expand both breakfast and lunch programs to serve the many children who are missing out on both summer breakfast and summer lunch.

### Group 3: Weak Breakfast<sup>3</sup> Participation Relative to Strong Lunch<sup>4</sup> Participation

Summer Nutrition				
State	Breakfast	Lunch	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch
New Mexico	28,767	59,410	48.4	35.4
Wyoming	2,348	5,133	45.7	21.0
South Carolina	31,219	70,132	44.5	20.5
Idaho	3,531	20,934	16.9	21.8

The four states in this group achieved relatively strong summer lunch participation ratios, between 20.5:100 (South Carolina) and 35.4:100 (New Mexico).

While they are all among the top 10 states in the country for summer lunch participation, they lagged in serving breakfast during the summer (ratio below 50:100). New Mexico, Wyoming, and South Carolina served breakfast to just under half as many children as those who received lunch. Idaho had the second-lowest breakfast-to-lunch ratio in the country.

Wyoming joined this category of states in 2015 by increasing the summer lunch ratio from 19.2:100 in July 2014 to 21:100 in July 2015. The state's summer breakfast participation in July 2015 was essentially unchanged from July 2014.

### Group 4: Weak Participation in Both Breakfast<sup>3</sup> and Lunch<sup>4</sup>

Summer Nutrition				
State	Breakfast	Lunch	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch
Florida	98,887	198,917	49.7	15.5
Kentucky	13,571	28,298	48.0	7.7
Georgia	71,579	151,143	47.4	17.2
Ohio	30,775	65,525	47.0	10.1
Colorado	9,884	21,285	46.4	9.3
Rhode Island	4,544	9,813	46.3	19.7
South Dakota	3,967	8,708	45.6	17.8
Pennsylvania	50,473	113,746	44.4	18.9
California	194,501	477,918	40.7	19.2
Indiana	31,689	78,858	40.2	18.4
Montana	3,227	8,204	39.3	18.3
Tennessee	27,519	70,844	38.8	14.2
Alaska	1,766	4,757	37.1	12.7
Nebraska	3,539	9,739	36.3	8.5
Iowa	6,863	19,153	35.8	11.2
Kansas	5,556	15,570	35.7	8.2
North Dakota	1,034	2,927	35.3	9.9
Alabama	13,107	38,637	33.9	10.4
Oregon	11,550	34,476	33.5	16.6
Washington	14,155	48,959	28.9	14.0
Utah	4,586	30,019	15.3	18.4

The remaining 21 states 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. Furthermore, this group failed to provide summer breakfast to even half of this already small subset of eligible children.

<sup>3</sup>Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July, plus free and reduced-price average daily participation in the School Breakfast Program in July, including the Seamless Summer Option.

<sup>4</sup>Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July, plus free and reduced-price average daily participation in the National School Lunch Program in July, including the Seamless Summer Option.



For example, Nebraska, Kansas, and North Dakota 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. These states also served breakfast to barely one-third as many children as those who participated in summer lunch.

New to this category of states are North Dakota and Indiana. While North Dakota succeeded in expanding lunch participation by 39 percent between July 2014 and July 2015, they are still only reaching 10 children for every 100 who participate during the school year. Unfortunately, this expansion did not extend to summer breakfast, where participation fell 12.2 percent and the summer breakfast-to-lunch ratio dropped from 55.9 to 35.3, placing the state in this low-performing group.

Indiana also experienced a decline in its summer lunch participation, serving 7.5 percent fewer children in July 2015 than it did the year before. While summer breakfast participation remained flat, the drop in summer lunch participation increased Indiana's summer breakfast-to-lunch ratio from 36.9:100 to 40.2:100.

With low participation in both summer breakfast and lunch, these states have a long way to go to ensure children have access to adequate nutrition when school is out during the summer.

## Change in Summer Breakfast Participation From July 2014 to July 2015

Ten states expanded participation in summer breakfast by at least 10 percent between July 2014 and July 2015. Arizona led the way with a 39.4 percent increase in the number of children receiving breakfast, followed by Alabama (36.6 percent), Nevada (29.3 percent), and Georgia (28.4 percent), demonstrating that dramatic improvement is possible.

## Top 10 Increases in Summer Breakfast Participation, July 2014 to July 2015

State	ADP, July 2014	ADP, July 2015	Percent Change
Arizona	30,170	42,060	39.4
Alabama	9,592	13,107	36.6
Nevada	8,389	10,843	29.3
Georgia	55,752	71,579	28.4
Kansas	4,381	5,556	26.8
Kentucky	10,818	13,571	25.5
Utah	3,715	4,586	23.4
Maine	6,729	8,132	20.8
Vermont	5,012	5,805	15.8
Tennessee	23,908	27,519	15.1

By contrast, another 10 states saw participation decline by at least 10 percent over the same time period. The starkest drops were in Arkansas (31.1 percent), Louisiana (26.9 percent), and Oklahoma (20.6 percent).

## 10 States With Largest Declines in Summer Breakfast Participation, July 2014 to July 2015

State	ADP, July 2014	ADP, July 2015	Percent Change
Arkansas	33,219	22,880	-31.1
Louisiana	35,071	25,635	-26.9
Oklahoma	11,881	9,438	-20.6
Missouri	22,979	18,754	-18.4
Mississippi	13,709	11,866	-13.4
Nebraska	4,057	3,539	-12.8
North Dakota	1,177	1,034	-12.2
Oregon	13,029	11,550	-11.4
District of Columbia	19,234	17,136	-10.9
Michigan	42,340	38,031	-10.2

*Ten states expanded participation in summer breakfast by at least 10 percent between July 2014 and July 2015.*

<sup>5</sup> Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July, plus free and reduced-price average daily participation in the School Breakfast Program in July, including the Seamless Summer Option.



---

## State Spotlight: Increasing Summer Breakfast

In Arizona, many schools shifted from serving meals through the Summer Food Service Program to using the Seamless Summer Option (which allows schools to provide summer meals through the School Breakfast and National School Lunch Program). This allowed for a smooth transition from school-year School Breakfast Program service to summertime breakfast service. While Arizona's Summer Food Service Program breakfast participation declined by 27.6 percent in July 2015 from the year before, the state's July Seamless Summer Option participation almost doubled, resulting in Arizona's overall summer breakfast ratio improving from 53.7:100 to 57.7:100.

Georgia expanded participation in summer breakfast through both the Summer Food Service Program (35 percent) and the School Breakfast Program (21.9 percent), at the same time that the state spurred growth in summer lunch participation (13.5 percent). This expansion improved Georgia's summer breakfast-to-lunch ratio from 41.8:100 to 47.4:100. These positive results were the outcome of a major outreach effort by the state ahead of the 2015 summer.

---

## Money Left on the Table

On an average weekday in July 2015, nine states (Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Louisiana, 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 70:100 is an attainable goal for the other 41 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 states would have received in the form of federal reimbursements had they done so.

Altogether, states with summer breakfast ratios below 70:100 in July 2015 would have served breakfast to an additional 549,127 children had all states achieved the 70:100 ratio. These states would have received an additional \$24.6 million in federal reimbursements.

California, Florida, Georgia, Texas, and Pennsylvania 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 72 percent more children. See Table 3.

---

## Strategies for Increasing Access to Breakfast

Detailed below are promising practices that can help increase the reach of breakfast during the summer, including serving breakfast later in the day, providing breakfast on weekends, promoting breakfast participation, incorporating activities for children, and maximizing economies of scale. Implementing these strategies will maximize participation in breakfast and ensure that children have access to the nutrition they need all day long when school is out.

### Serve Breakfast Instead of a Morning Snack

Serving breakfast instead of a morning snack provides children additional food and better supports the financial viability of the program by providing significantly higher reimbursement than the snack reimbursement. Many sites that serve breakfast early in the morning report low participation. However, sponsors have the flexibility to serve breakfast throughout the morning, making it an effective way to increase breakfast participation.

---

## Provide Breakfast on Weekends

The Summer Nutrition Programs provide federal funding for meals served at eligible sites served on any day of the week, including those served on weekends and holidays. By serving breakfast — in addition to lunch — every day of the week during the summer, sponsors can better meet children’s nutritional needs. Youth-serving and faith-based organizations often run programming on weekends, which can be an easy time to begin breakfast expansion.

- Community Renewal Team (CRT) provided breakfast at 55 sites across the state of Connecticut. Through a referral partnership with a statewide faith-based organization, CRT was able engage faith-based organizations that were interested in serving breakfast on weekends before their program activities began for the day.
- The Detroit Parks and Recreation Department served nutritious breakfasts and lunches during the week at sites across the city, and then expanded to provide breakfasts and lunches on the weekends during programs and events. By hiring a staff member to cover weekend monitoring, they were able to ensure that children had access to the nutrition they needed all week long.

## Promote Breakfast Participation Among Sites

Sponsors that promote breakfast see greater child participation at sites choosing to participate. Including information about breakfast in all communications and outreach is an easy and effective way to increase awareness.

- Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) encourages all sites in Maryland under its sponsorship to serve a summer breakfast, and they work with sites to implement the program successfully. MCPS also leads a countywide workgroup that identifies underserved areas, barriers and challenges, and brings together partners working on expanding both breakfast and lunch during the summer.

- The City of Seattle’s Human Services Department works closely with Seattle Public Schools to sponsor summer meals at more than 100 sites, and actively promotes the breakfast component through site recruitment. Seattle also works with nonprofits that help spread the word about the Summer Nutrition Programs and ways to get involved, including serving breakfast during the summer.

## Incorporate Activities

Many summer sites provide educational enrichment and recreational activities, along with meals, which help children continue to learn and stay safe when school is out. The combination of meals and activities acts as a magnet to draw children to sites. Sites without structured programming or summer school can work with community partners to incorporate such free or low-cost activities at sites.

- New London Public Schools (Connecticut) found that sites with programming and enrichment activities saw greater breakfast participation. As a result, the school district used an Americorps VISTA and other volunteers to lead taste tests and other activities at sites that lacked summer school or other structured programming. They also spread the word about programming through additional outreach.
- Colorado Springs School District partnered with outside organizations to run free programming and host book giveaways at meal sites. Sites serving both breakfast and lunch saw greater participation throughout the entire summer.

## Maximize Economies of Scale

Operating cost-effective Summer Nutrition Programs is an important part of expanding their reach. By serving two meals a day at every site, sponsors increase the number of meals reimbursed and create a better economy of scale that sets programs up for success.

- In July 2015, Family League of Baltimore City’s vendors delivered lunch, along with breakfast for the next day. By delivering both meals at the same time, they were able to cut back on per meal transportation

---

and staff costs. Family League works with their sites to ensure they have adequate storage for milk and fruit.

- To keep costs down, the Capital Area Food Bank (Washington, DC) works to reduce food waste by serving child-friendly meals, such as French toast,

cereal, fruit, and milk. By working closely with sites to see what meals are well received, and getting accurate counts, the sponsor is able to keep food waste down and run a financially viable program.

---

## 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 is more than two times the snack reimbursement (about \$2.04 for breakfast, compared to about \$0.85 for snack for the 2015 summer), but only requires three meal components compared to the two required for snacks. In addition, the program

is more cost effective when the combined breakfast and lunch reimbursements are available to cover the administration and transportation costs of operating the program. This allows sponsors to spread these non-food costs over the combined breakfast and lunch reimbursement of about \$5.63.

---

## Conclusion

Too few children have access to breakfast through the Summer Nutrition Programs. Only 1.7 million children received breakfast on an average weekday in July 2015, which is just over half of the number that received lunch in that same month. Summer lunch also suffers from low participation, serving only one in six of the low-income children who participate in school lunch during the school year, so lagging breakfast participation is doubly problematic.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture; national, state, and local anti-hunger and child advocates; and state child nutrition agencies are working hard to increase

participation in these programs, but more can be done. National and state efforts to increase participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs should include aggressive efforts to increase the number of sites that provide both breakfast and lunch at existing sites and new sites, add programming, conduct outreach, and adopt the other strategies described in this report. By serving breakfast and lunch, sites will better meet the nutrition needs of the children in their community and will be able to operate more financially viable and sustainable Summer Nutrition Programs.

*Providing breakfast is an important way to help ensure the financial viability of a summer nutrition program.*

---

## 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. Likewise, “summer nutrition lunch” is the sum of the 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 on 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.

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

### SFSP

USDA provided FRAC with the number of SFSP breakfasts and lunches served in July 2014 and 2015 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<sup>1</sup>. This includes meals served at summer school, through the Seamless Summer Option, and 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* reports these SBP and NSLP average daily participation numbers; that is, including the attendance factor. To make the SBP and

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 2014 and July 2015 through the Seamless Summer Option. FRAC divided these numbers by the number of days that Seamless Summer breakfasts and lunches were served (9 days in July 2014 and 8 days in July 2015) to calculate the July SBP and NSLP average daily participation for each year, and added the results to the July 2014 and July 2015 SFSP breakfast and lunch participation, respectively, to estimate Summer Nutrition participation in Hawaii.

---

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 2014–2015*.

## **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 70:100 ratio of summer nutrition breakfast participation to summer nutrition lunch participation. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the summer breakfast reimbursement rate for 22 days (the number of weekdays in July 2015, not counting the Independence Day holiday) for SFSP breakfasts. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available (\$2.0375 per breakfast for July 2015).

**Table 1**  
**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Breakfast<sup>1</sup> and Summer Lunch<sup>2</sup> in July 2014 and July 2015, by State**

Summer Nutrition									
State	Breakfast ADP, July 2014	Lunch ADP, July 2014	Ratio <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Breakfast ADP, July 2015	Lunch ADP, July 2015	Ratio <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Percentage
Alabama	9,592	37,109	25.8	49	13,107	38,637	33.9	47	36.6
Alaska	1,861	4,795	38.8	41	1,766	4,757	37.1	42	-5.1
Arizona	30,170	56,131	53.7	26	42,060	72,835	57.7	16	39.4
Arkansas	33,219	53,897	61.6	13	22,880	36,565	62.6	14	-31.1
California	191,772	485,733	39.5	39	194,501	477,918	40.7	38	1.4
Colorado	9,926	21,254	46.7	33	9,884	21,285	46.4	32	-0.4
Connecticut	27,055	40,148	67.4	10	29,341	39,573	74.1	5	8.4
Delaware	7,725	10,410	74.2	6	8,035	10,887	73.8	6	4.0
District of Columbia	19,234	24,683	77.9	3	17,136	22,185	77.2	2	-10.9
Florida	91,873	187,601	49.0	30	98,887	198,917	49.7	27	7.6
Georgia	55,752	133,219	41.8	37	71,579	151,143	47.4	30	28.4
Hawaii	3,709	4,243	87.4	2	3,797	5,411	70.2	10	2.4
Idaho	3,721	21,828	17.0	51	3,531	20,934	16.9	50	-5.1
Illinois	60,488	107,161	56.4	20	64,649	112,234	57.6	17	6.9
Indiana	31,457	85,241	36.9	45	31,689	78,858	40.2	39	0.7
Iowa	7,349	19,676	37.4	42	6,863	19,153	35.8	44	-6.6
Kansas	4,381	13,270	33.0	48	5,556	15,570	35.7	45	26.8
Kentucky	10,818	26,305	41.1	38	13,571	28,298	48.0	29	25.5
Louisiana	35,071	46,048	76.2	5	25,635	34,555	74.2	4	-26.9
Maine	6,729	12,613	53.4	27	8,132	14,511	56.0	22	20.8
Maryland	45,712	59,705	76.6	4	45,418	63,081	72.0	7	-0.6
Massachusetts	32,676	55,571	58.8	19	30,681	53,468	57.4	18	-6.1
Michigan	42,340	75,583	56.0	21	38,031	70,286	54.1	24	-10.2
Minnesota	26,017	42,264	61.6	14	27,671	44,191	62.6	13	6.4
Mississippi	13,709	25,128	54.6	25	11,866	21,931	54.1	25	-13.4
Missouri	22,979	37,623	61.1	16	18,754	32,777	57.2	19	-18.4
Montana	3,299	8,441	39.1	40	3,227	8,204	39.3	40	-2.2
Nebraska	4,057	10,975	37.0	44	3,539	9,739	36.3	43	-12.8
Nevada	8,389	13,723	61.1	15	10,843	17,293	62.7	12	29.3
New Hampshire	4,550	5,052	90.1	1	4,391	5,099	86.1	1	-3.5
New Jersey	56,744	81,140	69.9	8	56,883	79,092	71.9	8	0.2
New Mexico	29,319	58,983	49.7	28	28,767	59,410	48.4	28	-1.9
New York	246,163	358,574	68.7	9	254,671	361,177	70.5	9	3.5
North Carolina	62,149	104,388	59.5	18	57,193	101,902	56.1	21	-8.0
North Dakota	1,177	2,106	55.9	22	1,034	2,927	35.3	46	-12.2
Ohio	30,343	68,752	44.1	35	30,775	65,525	47.0	31	1.4
Oklahoma	11,881	19,775	60.1	17	9,438	18,730	50.4	26	-20.6

Summer Nutrition									
State	Breakfast ADP, July 2014	Lunch ADP, July 2014	Ratio <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Breakfast ADP, July 2015	Lunch ADP, July 2015	Ratio <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Percentage
Oregon	13,029	35,809	36.4	46	11,550	34,476	33.5	48	-11.4
Pennsylvania	49,623	112,097	44.3	34	50,473	113,746	44.4	37	1.7
Rhode Island	4,203	8,461	49.7	29	4,544	9,813	46.3	33	8.1
South Carolina	28,988	67,252	43.1	36	31,219	70,132	44.5	36	7.7
South Dakota	4,110	8,543	48.1	31	3,967	8,708	45.6	35	-3.5
Tennessee	23,908	64,032	37.3	43	27,519	70,844	38.8	41	15.1
Texas	152,090	273,655	55.6	23	139,124	245,435	56.7	20	-8.5
Utah	3,715	17,255	21.5	50	4,586	30,019	15.3	51	23.4
Vermont	5,012	7,674	65.3	11	5,805	8,779	66.1	11	15.8
Virginia	47,472	65,045	73.0	7	49,833	65,739	75.8	3	5.0
Washington	13,377	38,519	34.7	47	14,155	48,959	28.9	49	5.8
West Virginia	7,853	12,254	64.1	12	7,139	11,759	60.7	15	-9.1
Wisconsin	23,923	43,638	54.8	24	25,259	46,586	54.2	23	5.6
Wyoming	2,303	4,835	47.6	32	2,348	5,133	45.7	34	2.0
<b>US</b>	<b>1,663,011</b>	<b>3,178,217</b>	<b>52.3</b>		<b>1,683,303</b>	<b>3,189,186</b>	<b>52.8</b>		<b>1.2</b>

<sup>1</sup>Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July, plus free and reduced-price average daily participation in the School Breakfast Program in July, including the Seamless Summer Option.

<sup>2</sup>Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July, plus free and reduced-price average daily participation in the National School Lunch Program in July, including the Seamless Summer Option.

<sup>3</sup>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 Breakfast<sup>1</sup> and Summer Lunch<sup>2</sup> in July 2014 and July 2015, by Rank**

Summer Nutrition									
State	Breakfast ADP, July 2014	Lunch ADP, July 2014	Ratio <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Breakfast ADP, July 2015	Lunch ADP, July 2015	Ratio <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Percentage
New Hampshire	4,550	5,052	90.1	1	4,391	5,099	86.1	1	-3.5
District of Columbia	19,234	24,683	77.9	3	17,136	22,185	77.2	2	-10.9
Virginia	47,472	65,045	73.0	7	49,833	65,739	75.8	3	5.0
Louisiana	35,071	46,048	76.2	5	25,635	34,555	74.2	4	-26.9
Connecticut	27,055	40,148	67.4	10	29,341	39,573	74.1	5	8.4
Delaware	7,725	10,410	74.2	6	8,035	10,887	73.8	6	4.0
Maryland	45,712	59,705	76.6	4	45,418	63,081	72.0	7	-0.6
New Jersey	56,744	81,140	69.9	8	56,883	79,092	71.9	8	0.2
New York	246,163	358,574	68.7	9	254,671	361,177	70.5	9	3.5
Hawaii	3,709	4,243	87.4	2	3,797	5,411	70.2	10	2.4
Vermont	5,012	7,674	65.3	11	5,805	8,779	66.1	11	15.8
Nevada	8,389	13,723	61.1	15	10,843	17,293	62.7	12	29.3
Minnesota	26,017	42,264	61.6	14	27,671	44,191	62.6	13	6.4
Arkansas	33,219	53,897	61.6	13	22,880	36,565	62.6	14	-31.1
West Virginia	7,853	12,254	64.1	12	7,139	11,759	60.7	15	-9.1
Arizona	30,170	56,131	53.7	26	42,060	72,835	57.7	16	39.4
Illinois	60,488	107,161	56.4	20	64,649	112,234	57.6	17	6.9
Massachusetts	32,676	55,571	58.8	19	30,681	53,468	57.4	18	-6.1
Missouri	22,979	37,623	61.1	16	18,754	32,777	57.2	19	-18.4
Texas	152,090	273,655	55.6	23	139,124	245,435	56.7	20	-8.5
North Carolina	62,149	104,388	59.5	18	57,193	101,902	56.1	21	-8.0
Maine	6,729	12,613	53.4	27	8,132	14,511	56.0	22	20.8
Wisconsin	23,923	43,638	54.8	24	25,259	46,586	54.2	23	5.6
Michigan	42,340	75,583	56.0	21	38,031	70,286	54.1	24	-10.2
Mississippi	13,709	25,128	54.6	25	11,866	21,931	54.1	25	-13.4
Oklahoma	11,881	19,775	60.1	17	9,438	18,730	50.4	26	-20.6
Florida	91,873	187,601	49.0	30	98,887	198,917	49.7	27	7.6
New Mexico	29,319	58,983	49.7	28	28,767	59,410	48.4	28	-1.9
Kentucky	10,818	26,305	41.1	38	13,571	28,298	48.0	29	25.5
Georgia	55,752	133,219	41.8	37	71,579	151,143	47.4	30	28.4
Ohio	30,343	68,752	44.1	35	30,775	65,525	47.0	31	1.4
Colorado	9,926	21,254	46.7	33	9,884	21,285	46.4	32	-0.4
Rhode Island	4,203	8,461	49.7	29	4,544	9,813	46.3	33	8.1
Wyoming	2,303	4,835	47.6	32	2,348	5,133	45.7	34	2.0
South Dakota	4,110	8,543	48.1	31	3,967	8,708	45.6	35	-3.5
South Carolina	28,988	67,252	43.1	36	31,219	70,132	44.5	36	7.7

Summer Nutrition									
State	Breakfast ADP, July 2014	Lunch ADP, July 2014	Ratio <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Breakfast ADP, July 2015	Lunch ADP, July 2015	Ratio <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Percentage
Pennsylvania	49,623	112,097	44.3	34	50,473	113,746	44.4	37	1.7
California	191,772	485,733	39.5	39	194,501	477,918	40.7	38	1.4
Indiana	31,457	85,241	36.9	45	31,689	78,858	40.2	39	0.7
Montana	3,299	8,441	39.1	40	3,227	8,204	39.3	40	-2.2
Tennessee	23,908	64,032	37.3	43	27,519	70,844	38.8	41	15.1
Alaska	1,861	4,795	38.8	41	1,766	4,757	37.1	42	-5.1
Nebraska	4,057	10,975	37.0	44	3,539	9,739	36.3	43	-12.8
Iowa	7,349	19,676	37.4	42	6,863	19,153	35.8	44	-6.6
Kansas	4,381	13,270	33.0	48	5,556	15,570	35.7	45	26.8
North Dakota	1,177	2,106	55.9	22	1,034	2,927	35.3	46	-12.2
Alabama	9,592	37,109	25.8	49	13,107	38,637	33.9	47	36.6
Oregon	13,029	35,809	36.4	46	11,550	34,476	33.5	48	-11.4
Washington	13,377	38,519	34.7	47	14,155	48,959	28.9	49	5.8
Idaho	3,721	21,828	17.0	51	3,531	20,934	16.9	50	-5.1
Utah	3,715	17,255	21.5	50	4,586	30,019	15.3	51	23.4
<b>US</b>	<b>1,663,011</b>	<b>3,178,217</b>	<b>52.3</b>		<b>1,683,303</b>	<b>3,189,186</b>	<b>52.8</b>		<b>1.2</b>

<sup>1</sup>Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July, plus free and reduced-price average daily participation in the School Breakfast Program in July, including the Seamless Summer Option.

<sup>2</sup>Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July, plus free and reduced-price average daily participation in the National School Lunch Program in July, including the Seamless Summer Option.

<sup>3</sup>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 Breakfast<sup>1</sup> and Additional Federal Reimbursement if States Reached FRAC's Goal of 70 Summer Breakfast Participants per 100 Summer Lunch<sup>2</sup> Participants**

State	Summer Breakfast ADP, July 2015	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch <sup>3</sup>	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 <sup>4</sup>
Alabama	13,107	33.9	27,046	13,939	624,827
Alaska	1,766	37.1	3,330	1,564	70,099
Arizona	42,060	57.7	50,984	8,925	400,050
Arkansas	22,880	62.6	25,595	2,716	121,739
California	194,501	40.7	334,543	140,041	6,277,358
Colorado	9,884	46.4	14,900	5,016	224,827
Connecticut	29,341	74.1	27,701	0	0
Delaware	8,035	73.8	7,621	0	0
District of Columbia	17,136	77.2	15,529	0	0
Florida	98,887	49.7	139,242	40,355	1,808,901
Georgia	71,579	47.4	105,800	34,221	1,533,943
Hawaii	3,797	70.2	3,788	0	0
Idaho	3,531	16.9	14,654	11,123	498,596
Illinois	64,649	57.6	78,564	13,915	623,730
Indiana	31,689	40.2	55,200	23,512	1,053,905
Iowa	6,863	35.8	13,407	6,544	293,332
Kansas	5,556	35.7	10,899	5,343	239,479
Kentucky	13,571	48.0	19,808	6,237	279,589
Louisiana	25,635	74.2	24,189	0	0
Maine	8,132	56.0	10,158	2,026	90,794
Maryland	45,418	72.0	44,156	0	0
Massachusetts	30,681	57.4	37,428	6,747	302,424
Michigan	38,031	54.1	49,200	11,169	500,644
Minnesota	27,671	62.6	30,934	3,263	146,253
Mississippi	11,866	54.1	15,352	3,486	156,255
Missouri	18,754	57.2	22,944	4,190	187,795
Montana	3,227	39.3	5,743	2,516	112,775
Nebraska	3,539	36.3	6,817	3,278	146,931
Nevada	10,843	62.7	12,105	1,262	56,558
New Hampshire	4,391	86.1	3,569	0	0
New Jersey	56,883	71.9	55,365	0	0
New Mexico	28,767	48.4	41,587	12,820	574,661
New York	254,671	70.5	252,824	0	0
North Carolina	57,193	56.1	71,331	14,138	633,726
North Dakota	1,034	35.3	2,049	1,015	45,488

State	Summer Breakfast ADP, July 2015	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch <sup>3</sup>	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 <sup>4</sup>
Ohio	30,775	47.0	45,867	15,093	676,522
Oklahoma	9,438	50.4	13,111	3,673	164,645
Oregon	11,550	33.5	24,133	12,584	564,064
Pennsylvania	50,473	44.4	79,622	29,149	1,306,605
Rhode Island	4,544	46.3	6,869	2,325	104,226
South Carolina	31,219	44.5	49,092	17,873	801,167
South Dakota	3,967	45.6	6,096	2,129	95,422
Tennessee	27,519	38.8	49,591	22,072	989,390
Texas	139,124	56.7	171,805	32,680	1,464,899
Utah	4,586	15.3	21,013	16,428	736,373
Vermont	5,805	66.1	6,145	340	15,240
Virginia	49,833	75.8	46,017	0	0
Washington	14,155	28.9	34,272	20,117	901,734
West Virginia	7,139	60.7	8,231	1,092	48,962
Wisconsin	25,259	54.2	32,610	7,351	329,500
Wyoming	2,348	45.7	3,593	1,246	55,842
<b>US</b>	<b>1,683,303</b>	<b>52.8</b>	<b>2,232,430</b>	<b>549,127</b>	<b>24,614,626</b>

<sup>1</sup>Summer Breakfast is the sum of the average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program breakfast service in July, plus free and reduced-price average daily participation in the School Breakfast Program in July, including the Seamless Summer Option.

<sup>2</sup>Summer Lunch is the sum of the average daily participation in the Summer Food Service Program lunch service in July, plus free and reduced-price average daily participation in the National School Lunch Program in July, including the Seamless Summer Option.

<sup>3</sup>Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch is the number of children in Summer Breakfast per 100 in Summer Lunch.

<sup>4</sup>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 Summer Food Service Program breakfast (\$2.0375 per breakfast) and are served 22 days in July 2015.

**Table 4****Average Daily Participation (ADP) in SFSP Breakfast and School Breakfast Program (SBP) in July 2014 and July 2015, by State**

State	SFSP Breakfast ADP, July 2014	SFSP Lunch ADP, July 2014	Percent Change	SBP ADP, 2013-2014	SBP ADP, 2014-2015	Percent Change
Alabama	5,046	9,060	79.5	4,545	4,047	-11.0
Alaska	1,095	1,060	-3.2	766	707	-7.7
Arizona	13,054	9,455	-27.6	17,117	32,605	90.5
Arkansas	26,751	17,177	-35.8	6,468	5,702	-11.8
California	24,969	22,419	-10.2	166,803	172,082	3.2
Colorado	7,727	7,557	-2.2	2,199	2,327	5.8
Connecticut	11,195	17,353	55.0	15,859	11,988	-24.4
Delaware	6,337	6,484	2.3	1,388	1,551	11.8
District of Columbia	16,902	14,848	-12.1	2,333	2,288	-1.9
Florida	75,703	82,888	9.5	16,169	15,999	-1.1
Georgia	27,654	37,319	35.0	28,098	34,260	21.9
Hawaii	2,064	1,848	-10.4	1,645	1,949	18.4
Idaho	3,046	2,947	-3.2	675	584	-13.5
Illinois	28,227	30,713	8.8	32,261	33,936	5.2
Indiana	13,447	13,148	-2.2	18,010	18,541	2.9
Iowa	4,645	5,040	8.5	2,704	1,824	-32.6
Kansas	3,513	4,211	19.9	868	1,346	55.0
Kentucky	9,865	11,931	20.9	953	1,640	72.1
Louisiana	30,604	23,702	-22.6	4,467	1,933	-56.7
Maine	6,433	7,787	21.1	297	345	16.4
Maryland	44,202	44,060	-0.3	1,510	1,359	-10.0
Massachusetts	25,688	25,279	-1.6	6,988	5,402	-22.7
Michigan	28,204	27,283	-3.3	14,136	10,748	-24.0
Minnesota	19,572	21,056	7.6	6,445	6,614	2.6
Mississippi	12,799	11,138	-13.0	909	727	-20.0
Missouri	10,784	10,273	-4.7	12,195	8,481	-30.5
Montana	2,683	2,653	-1.1	616	574	-6.7
Nebraska	2,717	2,462	-9.4	1,340	1,077	-19.6
Nevada	3,623	3,714	2.5	4,766	7,129	49.6
New Hampshire	3,914	3,851	-1.6	636	541	-15.1
New Jersey	35,539	34,112	-4.0	21,205	22,771	7.4
New Mexico	12,434	14,302	15.0	16,885	14,465	-14.3
New York	180,801	185,771	2.7	65,362	68,900	5.4
North Carolina	34,726	35,592	2.5	27,423	21,601	-21.2
North Dakota	871	733	-15.8	306	301	-1.9
Ohio	20,552	21,632	5.3	9,791	9,142	-6.6
Oklahoma	9,187	7,136	-22.3	2,694	2,302	-14.6
Oregon	10,586	9,314	-12.0	2,443	2,235	-8.5

State	SFSP Breakfast ADP, July 2014	SFSP Lunch ADP, July 2014	Percent Change	SBP ADP, 2013-2014	SBP ADP, 2014-2015	Percent Change
Pennsylvania	29,729	32,620	9.7	19,893	17,853	-10.3
Rhode Island	3,298	3,602	9.2	906	942	4.0
South Carolina	14,688	16,313	11.1	14,300	14,907	4.2
South Dakota	1,575	1,747	10.9	2,535	2,220	-12.4
Tennessee	14,345	18,241	27.2	9,563	9,278	-3.0
Texas	78,229	62,275	-20.4	73,860	76,849	4.0
Utah	841	891	5.9	2,874	3,695	28.6
Vermont	4,678	5,286	13.0	334	519	55.4
Virginia	38,007	39,300	3.4	9,464	10,533	11.3
Washington	10,058	10,739	6.8	3,319	3,416	2.9
West Virginia	5,694	5,067	-11.0	2,159	2,072	-4.0
Wisconsin	20,852	22,364	7.3	3,071	2,895	-5.7
Wyoming	1,018	1,385	36.1	1,285	963	-25.1
<b>US</b>	<b>1,000,168</b>	<b>1,007,139</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>662,842</b>	<b>676,163</b>	<b>2.0</b>

**Table 5****Breakfasts Served in Summer Food Service Program,  
June, July, and August 2014 and 2015, by State**

State	June 2014	June 2015	Percent Change	July 2014	July 2015	Percent Change	August 2014	August 2015	Percent Change
Alabama	172,737	317,185	83.6	111,019	199,319	79.5	6,588	7,300	10.8
Alaska	23,729	30,504	28.6	24,091	23,312	-3.2	6,123	0	-100.0
Arizona	399,613	336,231	-15.9	287,183	208,006	-27.6	9,416	7,958	-15.5
Arkansas	426,703	279,384	-34.5	588,527	377,904	-35.8	189,000	94,605	-49.9
California	350,838	309,731	-11.7	549,307	493,224	-10.2	95,325	99,284	4.2
Colorado	222,224	231,300	4.1	169,984	166,262	-2.2	15,408	13,441	-12.8
Connecticut	7,077	15,330	116.6	246,297	381,757	55.0	80,201	83,667	4.3
Delaware	59,025	53,144	-10.0	139,414	142,639	2.3	40,885	38,412	-6.0
District of Columbia	795	6,492	716.6	371,834	326,661	-12.1	87,826	120,492	37.2
Florida	1,265,173	1,475,389	16.6	1,665,469	1,823,537	9.5	180,048	308,516	71.4
Georgia	614,181	855,360	39.3	608,384	821,024	35.0	55,427	66,625	20.2
Hawaii	41,522	42,545	2.5	45,404	40,662	-10.4	0	0	0.0
Idaho	70,990	65,753	-7.4	67,015	64,839	-3.2	13,133	9,864	-24.9
Illinois	318,402	344,028	8.0	620,987	675,686	8.8	251,446	290,728	15.6
Indiana	359,784	390,581	8.6	295,838	289,258	-2.2	29,085	25,195	-13.4
Iowa	107,831	141,930	31.6	102,190	110,873	8.5	6,350	22,401	252.8
Kansas	208,153	221,007	6.2	77,287	92,634	19.9	4,011	5,454	36.0
Kentucky	238,056	280,191	17.7	217,034	262,485	20.9	15,309	13,802	-9.8
Louisiana	996,483	798,182	-19.9	673,286	521,449	-22.6	40,755	12,087	-70.3
Maine	6,086	4,594	-24.5	141,519	171,312	21.1	41,356	45,067	9.0
Maryland	23,532	79,832	239.2	972,437	969,311	-0.3	113,240	128,586	13.6
Massachusetts	27,347	17,197	-37.1	565,138	556,140	-1.6	206,841	232,093	12.2
Michigan	218,030	303,474	39.2	620,493	600,232	-3.3	213,478	215,940	1.2
Minnesota	253,733	317,863	25.3	430,573	463,241	7.6	121,805	149,295	22.6
Mississippi	452,758	487,182	7.6	281,580	245,044	-13.0	7,765	4,238	-45.4
Missouri	1,075,039	1,186,328	10.4	237,244	226,004	-4.7	26,613	16,654	-37.4
Montana	55,748	53,631	-3.8	59,034	58,365	-1.1	19,436	21,719	11.7
Nebraska	175,260	176,407	0.7	59,771	54,166	-9.4	5,030	3,301	-34.4
Nevada	60,890	72,881	19.7	79,715	81,704	2.5	33,441	31,662	-5.3
New Hampshire	7,642	6,722	-12.0	86,108	84,713	-1.6	26,524	25,069	-5.5
New Jersey	47	0	-100.0	781,864	750,463	-4.0	286,396	269,111	-6.0
New Mexico	229,507	202,396	-11.8	273,550	314,648	15.0	159	1,473	826.4
New York	92,165	148,228	60.8	3,977,617	4,086,962	2.7	2,235,370	2,341,031	4.7
North Carolina	312,260	306,199	-1.9	763,974	783,033	2.5	294,753	219,342	-25.6
North Dakota	28,892	28,830	-0.2	19,155	16,134	-15.8	8,063	6,238	-22.6
Ohio	401,350	447,812	11.6	452,145	475,908	5.3	102,235	109,262	6.9
Oklahoma	288,341	331,538	15.0	202,111	156,994	-22.3	36,346	29,616	-18.5
Oregon	82,941	99,173	19.6	232,884	204,914	-12.0	93,000	93,174	0.2
Pennsylvania	137,962	164,416	19.2	654,042	717,644	9.7	232,431	247,545	6.5



State	June 2014	June 2015	Percent Change	July 2014	July 2015	Percent Change	August 2014	August 2015	Percent Change
Rhode Island	4,910	3,080	-37.3	72,546	79,246	9.2	26,728	37,391	39.9
South Carolina	281,274	334,499	18.9	323,126	358,877	11.1	90,118	74,231	-17.6
South Dakota	46,943	47,783	1.8	34,644	38,429	10.9	14,476	24,287	67.8
Tennessee	562,640	570,242	1.4	315,590	401,303	27.2	8,324	27,522	230.6
Texas	2,483,552	2,189,105	-11.9	1,721,046	1,370,057	-20.4	782,509	591,375	-24.4
Utah	35,192	29,826	-15.2	18,503	19,592	5.9	2,820	2,351	-16.6
Vermont	14,568	19,961	37.0	102,926	116,296	13.0	25,865	24,873	-3.8
Virginia	242,571	236,679	-2.4	836,161	864,602	3.4	238,932	245,121	2.6
Washington	67,756	82,890	22.3	221,266	236,256	6.8	77,189	89,324	15.7
West Virginia	48,325	38,878	-19.5	125,265	111,464	-11.0	5,086	4,349	-14.5
Wisconsin	255,505	302,903	18.6	458,736	492,018	7.3	87,593	88,026	0.5
Wyoming	22,968	28,901	25.8	22,389	30,464	36.1	3,071	4,161	35.5
<b>US</b>	<b>13,879,050</b>	<b>14,513,717</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>22,003,702</b>	<b>22,157,067</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>6,593,329</b>	<b>6,623,258</b>	<b>0.5</b>

**Table 6**

**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Lunch<sup>1</sup> in July 2014 and July 2015; and Regular School Year (SY) National School Lunch Program (NSLP)<sup>2</sup> ADP for School Years 2013–2014 and 2014–2015, by State**

State	July 2014 Summer Lunch and NSLP SY 2013–2014				July 2015 Summer Lunch and NSLP SY 2014–2015				Percent Change in Summer Lunch ADP 2014–2015
	Summer Lunch ADP	NSLP ADP	Ratio of Summer Lunch to NSLP <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Summer Lunch ADP	NSLP ADP	Ratio of Summer Lunch to NSLP <sup>3</sup>	Rank	
Alabama	37,109	360,845	10.3	42	38,637	372,089	10.4	38	4.1
Alaska	4,795	35,073	13.7	30	4,758	37,490	12.7	34	-0.8
Arizona	56,131	466,611	12.0	34	72,835	468,354	15.6	28	29.8
Arkansas	53,897	231,789	23.3	6	36,564	229,135	16.0	26	-32.2
California	485,733	2,463,957	19.7	13	477,918	2,483,850	19.2	12	-1.6
Colorado	21,254	227,882	9.3	44	21,285	229,373	9.3	43	0.1
Connecticut	40,148	148,885	27.0	5	39,574	155,754	25.4	5	-1.4
Delaware	10,410	55,889	18.6	17	10,887	61,798	17.6	20	4.6
District of Columbia	24,683	41,857	59.0	1	22,185	42,728	51.9	1	-10.1
Florida	187,601	1,246,331	15.1	27	198,917	1,284,759	15.5	29	6.0
Georgia	133,219	871,568	15.3	26	151,142	879,694	17.2	21	13.5
Hawaii	4,243	66,645	6.4	51	5,411	64,139	8.4	47	27.5
Idaho	21,828	96,734	22.6	7	20,934	96,089	21.8	8	-4.1
Illinois	107,161	725,919	14.8	28	112,234	798,165	14.1	31	4.7
Indiana	85,241	426,161	20.0	11	78,858	429,454	18.4	16	-7.5
Iowa	19,676	167,111	11.8	35	19,154	171,536	11.2	36	-2.7
Kansas	13,270	189,505	7.0	49	15,570	190,180	8.2	48	17.3
Kentucky	26,305	353,039	7.5	47	28,297	365,744	7.7	49	7.6
Louisiana	46,048	379,310	12.1	33	34,555	386,660	8.9	45	-25.0
Maine	12,613	57,858	21.8	8	14,511	58,599	24.8	6	15.0
Maryland	59,705	276,047	21.6	9	63,080	284,319	22.2	7	5.7
Massachusetts	55,571	285,794	19.4	14	53,468	296,954	18.0	18	-3.8
Michigan	75,583	563,851	13.4	31	70,286	554,788	12.7	35	-7.0
Minnesota	42,264	264,526	16.0	24	44,191	269,312	16.4	24	4.6
Mississippi	25,128	298,043	8.4	45	21,931	300,743	7.3	50	-12.7
Missouri	37,623	355,568	10.6	40	32,776	362,834	9.0	44	-12.9
Montana	8,441	45,480	18.6	18	8,205	44,827	18.3	17	-2.8
Nebraska	10,975	115,931	9.5	43	9,738	114,053	8.5	46	-11.3
Nevada	13,723	163,048	8.4	46	17,293	164,791	10.5	37	26.0
New Hampshire	5,052	38,553	13.1	32	5,099	37,864	13.5	33	0.9
New Jersey	81,140	419,100	19.4	15	79,093	427,841	18.5	14	-2.5
New Mexico	58,983	159,248	37.0	2	59,411	167,878	35.4	2	0.7

State	July 2014 Summer Lunch and NSLP SY 2013–2014				July 2015 Summer Lunch and NSLP SY 2014–2015				Percent Change in Summer Lunch ADP 2014–2015
	Summer Lunch ADP	NSLP ADP	Ratio of Summer Lunch to NSLP <sup>3</sup>	Rank	Summer Lunch ADP	NSLP ADP	Ratio of Summer Lunch to NSLP <sup>3</sup>	Rank	
New York	358,574	1,148,282	31.2	3	361,177	1,157,597	31.2	4	0.7
North Carolina	104,388	619,683	16.8	21	101,902	650,456	15.7	27	-2.4
North Dakota	2,106	29,117	7.2	48	2,927	29,709	9.9	41	39.0
Ohio	68,752	638,719	10.8	38	65,525	646,897	10.1	40	-4.7
Oklahoma	19,775	294,452	6.7	50	18,730	294,760	6.4	51	-5.3
Oregon	35,809	198,162	18.1	19	34,476	208,240	16.6	22	-3.7
Pennsylvania	112,097	564,279	19.9	12	113,747	602,692	18.9	13	1.5
Rhode Island	8,461	50,671	16.7	22	9,813	49,774	19.7	11	16.0
South Carolina	67,252	334,091	20.1	10	70,132	342,894	20.5	10	4.3
South Dakota	8,543	47,788	17.9	20	8,708	48,919	17.8	19	1.9
Tennessee	64,032	445,425	14.4	29	70,844	497,830	14.2	30	10.6
Texas	273,655	2,351,650	11.6	36	245,435	2,397,862	10.2	39	-10.3
Utah	17,255	161,626	10.7	39	30,019	163,362	18.4	15	74.0
Vermont	7,674	26,121	29.4	4	8,779	26,328	33.3	3	14.4
Virginia	65,045	403,181	16.1	23	65,739	408,566	16.1	25	1.1
Washington	38,519	340,437	11.3	37	48,959	348,777	14.0	32	27.1
West Virginia	12,254	118,935	10.3	41	11,758	121,768	9.7	42	-4.0
Wisconsin	43,638	279,507	15.6	25	46,586	281,871	16.5	23	6.8
Wyoming	4,835	25,127	19.2	16	5,133	24,406	21.0	9	6.2
<b>US</b>	<b>3,178,217</b>	<b>19,675,411</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>3,189,185</b>	<b>20,134,502</b>	<b>15.8</b>		<b>0.3</b>	

<sup>1</sup> Summer Lunch includes the Summer Food Service Program and free and reduced-price National School Lunch Program, including the Seamless Summer Option.

<sup>2</sup> School Year National School Lunch Program numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch participation during the regular school year.

<sup>3</sup> Ratio of Summer Lunch to the National School Lunch Program is the number of children in Summer Lunch per 100 in the National School Lunch Program.



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

202.986.2200  
[www.frac.org](http://www.frac.org)

Copyright © 2016 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)