



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

July 2004

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

Acknowledgements

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges the following funders whose major support in 2003-2004 has helped to make possible our work on expanding and improving nutrition programs.

America's Second Harvest	John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
Anonymous	A.L. Mailman Family Foundation
California Endowment	MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger
The Annie E. Casey Foundation	The Moriah Fund
Community Capacity Fund	National Dairy Council
Consumer Health Foundation	Nestle USA
Entertainment Industry Foundation	New Directions Foundation
Equal Justice Works	New Prospect Foundation
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	The David and Lucile Packard Foundation
Fannie Mae Foundation	Prince Charitable Trusts
Food Marketing Institute	Pritzker Cousins Foundation
General Mills Foundation	Public Welfare Foundation
Robert P. Judith N. Goldberg Foundation	Charles H. Revson Foundation
Grocery Manufacturers of America	Sara Lee Foundation
Joyce Foundation	Share Our Strength
Kaiser Permanente	Taste of the NFL
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation	Trellis Fund
Kraft Foods, Inc.	Trust for Early Education
Land O'Lakes Foundation	Unilever United States, Inc.
	United Food & Commercial Workers Union

Additional Copies

Free PDF versions of this report can be found at <http://www.frac.org>, and hard copies of this publication may be purchased for \$7 (Washington, D.C. residents must add 6 percent sales tax). All orders must be prepaid and sent to:

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

For More Information

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

About FRAC

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

This report was prepared by Randy Rosso, Bi Vuong, Crystal Weedall FitzSimons, Nicole Woo, Lynn Parker, and Jim Weill.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Major Findings	1
Why Summer Nutrition Matters to Children, and to State and Local Governments	4
The Federal Summer Nutrition Programs.....	7
National Trends: Summers of 2002 and 2003.....	8
Simplified Reimbursement Pilot Projects (“Lugar Pilots”).....	9
Seamless Summer Food Waiver	10
State Trends.....	12
SFSP June Peak Participation States	13
Children Who Aren’t Being Served	14
What State Governments Can Do to Increase Participation in the SFSP	15
What Local Governments Can Do to Increase Participation in the SFSP	19
How the Federal Government Can Help State and Local Governments Increase Participation in the SFSP.....	22
Conclusions	24
Appendix 1: Improvements to the SFSP Enacted by the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004	25
Appendix 2: Three Model Programs.....	27
Appendix 3: Technical Notes.....	30
Table 1: Summer Nutrition Participation in July 2002 and July 2003	33
Table 2: Change in SFSP Participation from July 2002 to July 2003.....	34
Table 3: Change in Number of SFSP Sponsors and Sites from July 2002 to July 2003	35
Table 4: SFSP Participation in June 2002 and June 2003 in June Peak States.....	36
Table 5: SFSP Lunches Served in June, July, and August 2003.....	37
Table 6: Estimated Participation and Funding if 40 Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 Low-Income Children in School-Year NSLP.....	38
Table 7: State Legislative and Funding Initiatives to Support Summer Nutrition.....	39

Major Findings

Schools letting out for the summer can spell trouble for many poor and hungry children who no longer can get school lunches and breakfasts. However, the federal government, in cooperation with states, schools, and local agencies, offers children from low-income families the kind of nutritious meals and snacks that they would receive during the school year through two programs – the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP). Together they are referred to in this report as the Summer Nutrition programs.

Unfortunately, participation in the federal Summer Nutrition programs lags far behind participation in the school breakfast and lunch programs. Nevertheless, federal and state efforts to expand the availability of Summer Nutrition are beginning to pay off in states chosen to participate in a Congressionally created pilot program that reduces paperwork and maximizes reimbursement (called the “Lugar pilot” program – see page 9). The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, signed into law on June 30, 2004, made the Lugar pilot program permanent, expanded it beyond schools and local government agencies to include non-profit sponsors, and added six new states. See Appendix 1 for details on this new law.

The key findings of this report include:

Summer Nutrition (SFSP and NSLP combined)

- Only 20 children participate in Summer Nutrition programs for every 100 who eat regular school-year school lunches – a continuing abysmal record that means millions of children are not obtaining adequate nutrition in the summer.
- Overall participation in the Summer Nutrition programs (SFSP and NSLP combined) decreased 1.3 percent from July 2002 to July 2003, the third consecutive year of no growth in program participation. The decreases were concentrated heavily in California, Florida, and Illinois, with these states serving a combined 105,000 fewer children in July 2003 than in July 2002.

- Excluding California, Florida, and Illinois, Summer Nutrition participation in the rest of the United States increased 3.6 percent. Excluding just California, participation in the rest of the country increased 1.2 percent.
- Summer Nutrition participation increased in 31 states, decreased in 14 states, and remained about the same in the other six states.
- The ratio of children in Summer Nutrition for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price meals through the school-year NSLP increased in 17 states, while it decreased or remained about the same in the other 34 states.

“Lugar Pilot” States and the SFSP

- The Lugar pilot program is very successful. Summer Nutrition participation (SFSP and NSLP combined) in states with the Lugar pilot program increased 13.1 percent, while participation in the rest of the country decreased 2.5 percent. Summer Nutrition participation increased in 11 of the 13 Lugar pilot states.
- The ratio of children in Summer Nutrition for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price meals through the school-year NSLP increased in ten of the 13 Lugar pilot states.
- SFSP participation alone increased 13.7 percent in states with the Lugar pilot program, while it fell 5.5 percent in the rest of the country. SFSP participation increased in ten of the 13 Lugar pilot states.
- Over its three years of existence, the Lugar pilot program has increased Summer Nutrition participation 20.1 percent in the 13 states using the program, while participation in the rest of the states has slipped 2.7 percent.

Other Findings

- A “Seamless Summer Food Waiver,” created by USDA (and described in more detail on page 10), helped many states reduce paperwork and bring in more participants. Summer Nutrition participation increased from July 2002 to July 2003 in 19 of the 32 states using the Seamless waiver. Participation fell in eight of these states, and it remained about the same in the remaining five states.
- Nationwide, Summer Nutrition participation in states using the waiver decreased 1.7 percent, but more than three-fourths of this decrease (76.2 percent) was concentrated in just three states (California, Florida, and Illinois) with unusually large drops in participation. Excluding these three states, all of which used the waiver, in the remaining waiver states Summer Nutrition participation increased 4.1 percent.
- Having summer programs or activities that are platforms for other services like nutrition is critical. According to reports from state agencies operating the Summer Nutrition programs, cuts to summer school and summer programs caused by state budget crises are denying Summer Nutrition programs to needy children. In fact, July NSLP participation decreased in 19 states in 2003, including 10 of the 14 states with decreases in overall Summer Nutrition participation.

About the National School Lunch Program (NSLP)

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

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

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

Why Summer Nutrition Matters to Children, and to State and Local Governments

During the school year, families struggling to make ends meet know that their children can receive a nutritious meal at school every weekday. When school lets out for the summer, this source of nutrition disappears for many children unless they can access meals through summer feeding programs. Since only one in five children who receive free or reduced-price lunches during the school year participates in summer feeding programs, many working families must scramble to feed their children until the school year starts again, a daunting challenge.

Likewise, state and local governments also face daunting challenges, many of which directly affect the children within their borders. Three major challenges include: improving learning and test scores; preventing childhood obesity; and ensuring safe and educational environments for children when school is out and their parents are working. Summer Nutrition programs can help states and localities achieve all three of these important goals at the same time that they help low-income families care for their children.

Summer Learning For almost a hundred years, educational researchers have been documenting setbacks in educational achievement during summer vacation, a phenomenon so robust it is often referred to simply as the "summer effect." "All students experience learning losses when they do not engage in constructive activities over the summer," states a review of studies of summer enrichment programs by the Center for Summer Learning at Johns Hopkins University. According to the Center, students lose an overall average of one month of grade-equivalent skills over the summer.

Low-income students lose more academic ground during the summer than higher income students, and the variable most strongly associated with summer learning differences is economic status. One important explanation for the differing rates of academic gain during the summer is that low-income families are unable to afford learning and enrichment activities for their children. However, research demonstrates that when summer enrichment programs are available to low-income children, they can improve student achievement.

For example, in Montgomery County, Maryland, a study found that children who attended an intensive summer school program that provided breakfast and lunch did not experience the summer effect.

Defining Hunger and Food Insecurity

*Households classified as **hungry** by an annual US Department of Agriculture (USDA) and Census Bureau survey are those in which adults have decreased the quality and quantity of food they consume, because of lack of money and other resources like food stamps, to the point where they are quite likely to be hungry on a frequent basis, or in which children's intake has been reduced, due to lack of family financial resources, to the point that children are likely to be hungry on a regular basis and adults' food intake is severely reduced. Approximately 3.8 million households, with 9.4 million members, were hungry in 2002, the last year with data available.*

*Households are considered **food insecure** by the survey when resources are so limited that adults in the household are running out of food, or reducing the quality of food their family eats, or feeding their children unbalanced diets, or skipping meals so their children can eat, or are forced to use emergency food charities or to take other serious steps to adjust to the economic problems threatening the adequacy of the family's diet. Approximately 8.3 million households, with 25.5 million members, were food insecure without hunger in 2002.*

Altogether, 12 million households (11.1 percent of all households) were found to be food insecure, with or without hunger, in 2002. This represented 34.9 million people, or 12.5 percent of the U.S. population.

In fact, those children who attended the program regularly made gains in math and reading. In addition, a recent study of a summer literacy camp in Los Angeles found that disadvantaged, low-achieving students made significant gains when compared to students who did not attend the camp. The Summer Nutrition programs help make these programs possible, often attract children to them, and keep children alert and ready to learn while they are there.

Summer Nutrition. Without access to the regular year school meals programs, low-income families worry about whether they will have enough food during the summer for their children to eat well, or sometimes at all. With 11.1 percent of all households in the United States – and 16.5 percent of all households with children – reporting that they are food insecure or hungry, the risk to children's nutrition and health when school is out is real and widespread (see sidebar on this page for definitions).

The Summer Nutrition programs fight hunger and provide healthy, balanced meals to children. They also combat obesity, by providing healthy food and bolstering programs that promote physical activity. A recent nationwide USDA study of the SFSP reported that 93 percent of SFSP programs offered activities in addition to healthy meals. These activities usually include physical activities like sports or swimming. Children in programs operating the SFSP are substituting physical exercise for television-watching and milk and fruit for soda and candy.

Summer Child Care. Working parents everywhere are concerned about what their children do when school lets out for the summer. Are they engaged in some productive activity? Are they where they should be? Who is watching them? Are they safe? Across the country there is a growing interest in what is filling children's out-of-school time, a term that includes summer and other school vacations as well as the regular school year hours after school lets out. This interest has resulted in a mounting call for all levels of government to provide support for afterschool and summer programs.

The Urban Institute, reviewing data from the National Survey of America's Families, reports that when school lets out for summer approximately 11 percent of children ages 6 through 12 with working caretakers are regularly caring for themselves. Children ages 6 through 12 with employed primary caretakers, regardless of the main child care arrangements, spend an average of 5 hours a week in self-care during the school year and approximately 10 hours a week in self-care in the summer. The authors of the report note

that the estimate of the percentage of children in self-care most likely is a conservative one, because respondents are often reluctant to acknowledge that they regularly leave their children alone.

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

About the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)

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

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

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

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

The Federal Summer Nutrition Programs

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

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

National School Lunch Program. While largely used during the fall to spring school year, this program can also be offered as part of summer school or in school systems that continue through the summer (e.g., “year-round” schools that stagger their vacation periods). (See sidebar on page 4.) Throughout this report NSLP participation and meals data only refer to those children receiving free or reduced-price meals due to limited family income.

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

National Trends: Summers of 2002 and 2003

Despite the benefits to families and the educational and nutritional continuity summer food programs provide to children, the vast majority of students who could qualify for – and could benefit from – these programs is still not being served. In July 2003 about 3.2 million children were served in the Summer Nutrition programs. This is just 20 children for every 100 receiving a free or reduced-price school lunch in the preceding school year (2002-2003).

As described in Table 6, FRAC estimates that 3.2 million additional children, at a minimum, could be reached in July if all states simply performed as well as the leading states in Summer Nutrition – a highly attainable goal.

Despite the urgent need to reach many more children, Summer Nutrition participation slipped 1.3 percent from July 2002 to July 2003, the third consecutive year of no change in participation. (See Tables 1 and 2 in the back of the report.) The number of SFSP sponsors and sites was about the same in 2003 as in 2002 (see Table 3).

Nevertheless, the states operating special “Lugar Pilot” programs continued to make strong strides in program growth. And many of the states using the Seamless Summer Food Waiver showed signs of improvement as well.

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

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

*-Sen. Richard Lugar,
2002*

Note: The tables in the back of the report have the Lugar pilot states shaded in gray and include sub-totals for pilot states and non-pilot states. The Lugar pilot program is allowing its states, which were low in SFSP participation and making little progress before the pilots, to out-perform the rest of the nation in program growth.

Simplified Reimbursement Pilot Project ("The Lugar Pilots")

After FRAC's 2000 Summer Nutrition report showed the SFSP struggling, Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN) sponsored and was key to passage of legislation creating a three-year pilot project with the goal of increasing participation and easing paperwork in the states then reaching the fewest children through SFSP (compared to the school-year school lunch program). The states included in the pilot are: Alaska, Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming. (Puerto Rico was also included in the pilot program, but is not included in this report.) The legislation was first implemented in the summer of 2001. These states, over the past three summers, have fared better in program growth, as a whole, than the rest of the nation. And they showed major improvement in 2003.

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

For example, in 2003 most SFSP sponsors were allowed to receive reimbursements of up to \$2.35 for operating costs (such as food and labor), and \$0.205 for administrative costs, per lunch served. If a sponsor actually had \$2.45 in operating costs and \$0.105 in administrative costs, the sponsor was not allowed to claim some of the operating costs from the administrative costs line. So, the sponsor was allowed only to receive reimbursements of \$2.35 for operating costs and \$0.105 for administrative costs, a ten-cent loss per lunch served. Under the Lugar pilot project, the same sponsor could have combined administrative and operating costs, and thus received the full reimbursement of \$2.555 per lunch served.

The Lugar pilot project has applied only to public SFSP sponsors, including schools, government agencies, residential camps and National Youth Sports Programs. The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 makes these Lugar pilots permanent, extends them to non-profit sponsors such as food banks, and adds six new states (Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Oregon, and Ohio), all effective beginning January 2005.

Results. In 2003, the Lugar pilot states outstripped the rest of the nation, increasing overall participation in Summer Nutrition programs by 13.1 percent while the non-pilot states decreased participation by 2.5 percent. The Lugar pilot states improved SFSP participation alone by 13.7 percent, compared to a 5.5 percent drop for the rest of the country.

In its first two years of existence, the Lugar pilot program made positive strides, but in 2003 the Lugar pilot states experienced their largest expansion yet. From July 2002 to July 2003, Summer Nutrition participation increased in 11 of the 13 Lugar pilot states. The ratio of children in Summer Nutrition for every 100 children receiving a free or reduced price school lunch during the school year improved in ten of the 13 Lugar pilot states.

The cumulative gains over the first three years of the Lugar pilots are impressive. From July 2000 to July 2003, the Lugar pilot states have increased participation in Summer Nutrition (both programs combined) by 20.1 percent as the rest of the country has slipped 2.7 percent. Participation just in the SFSP has increased 25.5 percent in the pilot states over the same time period, while SFSP participation in non-pilot states has fallen 18.0 percent. (Some of this decrease is due to non-pilot states using the so-called Seamless Summer Food Waiver and counting children through the NSLP instead of through the SFSP.) And Lugar pilot states have increased the number of sponsors operating the SFSP by 21.0 percent and the number of sites by 40.3 percent. With the expansions of the Lugar Pilot program to non-profit sponsors and six new states in the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, Summer Nutrition programs should reach many more children in the summers ahead.

Seamless Summer Food Waiver

The Seamless Summer Food Waiver is a USDA initiative begun in 2002 that seeks to help school SFSP sponsors reach more hungry children in low-income areas when school is out, and that provides more efficient meal services to those children. While available nationwide, this waiver is available only to school sponsors. The waiver reduces paperwork and administrative burdens that are normally associated with operating the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) during the school year and the SFSP in summer.

How it works. Under the waiver, schools offer summer meals as an extension of the NSLP, rather than having to apply to participate in the SFSP. The schools are reimbursed at the NSLP rate for free meals, which are lower than SFSP rates. The advantage for schools is that they do not have to apply for and operate two different programs.

Results. Thirty-two states are using the Seamless Summer Food Waiver to reduce paperwork and attract new school summer food sponsors, and it is paying dividends. Summer Nutrition participation increased noticeably (more than 3 percent) in 19 of the 32 states offering the waiver, decreased more than 3 percent in five states, and stayed about the same in the remaining eight. Overall, Summer Nutrition participation decreased 1.7 percent in states using the waiver, compared to a 1.5 percent increase in states not using the waiver. But over three-fourths (76.2 percent) of the decrease in waiver states was concentrated in just three states, California, Florida, and Illinois. The other waiver states increased participation 4.1 percent.

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

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

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

Ten Best States in Growth in July Participation in Summer Nutrition, 2002 to 2003

District of Col.	47.2%
Indiana	32.5
Utah	30.5
Arizona	29.4
Kansas	28.2
Vermont	26.4
Arkansas	17.7
Kentucky	16.9
Pennsylvania	16.0
Virginia	15.8

(Lugar pilot states marked in bold italics)

Ten Worst States in Decline in July Participation in Summer Nutrition, 2002 to 2003

Mississippi	-8.2%
California	-8.3
Delaware	-10.3
Illinois	-10.3
Massachusetts	-10.6
Maryland	-14.7
Oregon	-14.8
Florida	-15.7
Oklahoma	-16.0
North Dakota	-22.3

(Lugar pilot states marked in bold italics)

State Trends

Overall, 31 states had a noticeable increase – more than 3 percent – in the number of Summer Nutrition participants in July 2003 compared to July 2002. This is an improvement over 2002, when only 27 states had increased noticeably from the prior summer. On the other hand, 14 had a decrease of more than 3 percent and six showed little change. (See Table 1.) The two lists in the left margin of this page list the best ten and worst ten states in expanding July participation in Summer Nutrition over the one-year period.

Some states are cutting summer school programs and summertime recreation programs in the face of state budget crises. This has had a detrimental impact on Summer Nutrition participation in states across the nation. When states cut summer programs, children not only get less education, but also less nutrition.

July NSLP participation decreased more than 3 percent in 19 states in 2003, including 10 of the 14 states with noticeable declines in Summer Nutrition participation. This indicates both that the Seamless waiver cannot fully explain the drop in SFSP participation from 2002 to 2003 and that cuts in summer school are likely denying children needed nutrition, as well as academic and physical stimulation.

In order to make a comparison among states in how well they are reaching children who might be eligible to participate in summer feeding programs, FRAC looks at the number of participants in July programs per 100 in free or reduced-price school lunch during the school year. This ratio shows how well each state is reaching students in greatest need in July. The top ten and bottom ten states on this measure are listed on the left margin of page 13.

Overall, 17 states increased their ratio by at least 1.0, 13 states declined and 21 states stayed approximately the same on this ratio when comparing July 2002 to 2003. (See Table 1.) Arizona, Indiana, Kentucky, and Utah showed significant improvement from July 2002 to July 2003. Arizona served 29.4 percent more children and increased its ratio of Summer Nutrition participants to school-year NSLP participants from 13.3 to 15.8. Arizona's national rank on this measure improved from 37th in the nation to 29th. Indiana served 32.5 percent more children, increased its ratio from 9.9 to 12.2, and improved its national rank from 43rd to 38th. Kentucky increased participation 16.9 percent and increased its ratio from 14.8 to 17.0, jumping in the national rankings from 33rd to 25th.

Ten Best States in Ratio of Children in July Summer Nutrition to Children in Free or Reduced Price School-Year School Lunch, 2003

District of Col.	52.4
California	37.3
New Mexico	35.6
Pennsylvania	35.5
Hawaii	34.2
Nevada	33.3
Utah	32.7
New York	29.9
South Carolina	28.2
Connecticut	26.9

Ten Worst States in Ratio of Children in July Summer Nutrition to Children in Free or Reduced-Price School-Year School Lunch, 2003

Arkansas	9.7
Colorado	9.5
Kansas	8.7
North Dakota	8.7
Nebraska	8.2
Iowa	8.1
Wyoming	7.9
Alaska	7.9
Texas	7.5
Oklahoma	4.9

And Utah improved its program by serving 30.5 percent more children, increasing its ratio from 26.7 to 32.7 and climbing to number 7 in the national rankings. Arizona and Utah used the Seamless waiver and Indiana and Kentucky are Lugar pilot states.

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

Only one state is reaching two in five children.

SFSP June Peak Participation States

An increasing number of states report June as their peak month for SFSP participation. Table 4 shows the number of children participating in June 2002 and June 2003 in states that tend to peak in participation in June. (Data for this table are available only when provided by the states to FRAC, since the USDA does not collect June participation data.)

Of the states on the “Ten Worst” list for July for ratio of Summer Nutrition to school-year participation, many peaked in participation in June. Several of these states had a higher ratio in June than in July, but the trend in participation for these states from 2002 to 2003 was similar whether using June or July participation data. Generally speaking, if participation increased or decreased from July 2002 to July 2003, it followed the same pattern from June 2002 to June 2003.

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

Table 5 shows the number of SFSP lunches that were served in June, July and August in 2003. This table demonstrates the dramatic drop-off in many states after their peak month, indicating the extent to which many programs do not operate for the full summer. The shorter the program, the longer many children are in danger of not receiving nutritious meals every day before school resumes in the fall.

Children Who Aren't Being Served

Since the National School Lunch program reaches so broadly during the school year, comparing participation in Summer Nutrition to participation in school year free and reduced-price meals indicates how well a state is doing in reaching low-income families. The July performance of the top states in the past few years demonstrates that reaching 40 children in Summer Nutrition per 100 children receiving free or reduced-price lunches during the school year is a reasonable goal, and shows that the national performance ratio (currently 20.0) could be doubled.

Using this standard, Table 6 indicates how many children are not being fed in July by each state, and how much money each state forgoes in Summer Nutrition funding for July by not matching the average performance of the leading states in recent years. For July alone, FRAC estimates that an additional 3.2 million children could have been reached had all states performed as well as the leading states. We also estimate that an additional \$166.5 million of federal funds could have been used by these states for summer child nutrition, had they run summer programs for the 22 weekdays in July 2003 (not counting the July 4 holiday) for these unserved children. (This is a conservative estimate, as we applied only the lowest possible free lunch reimbursement to all children.)

The states missing out on the most federal money for summer child nutrition are Texas (\$31.0 million), Florida (\$11.4 million), Ohio (\$7.1 million), Georgia (\$7.0 million), and Illinois (\$6.9 million). Together, these five states are turning down \$63.3 million in federal dollars that could feed children in the summertime, almost two-fifths of the \$166.5 million going unused nationwide.

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

What State Governments Can Do to Increase Participation in the Summer Food Service Program

While the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) is overseen by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), it is administered by state agencies – in most states the State Department of Education. State SFSP agencies, as well as state legislatures and governors, can take a variety of steps to increase participation in the SFSP. Such steps include legislative strategies, outreach and publicity efforts, reduction of red tape, and leadership and coordination.

Legislative Strategies. State legislators and governors in at least eleven states have passed initiatives to support summer nutrition. State funding to support the SFSP can be directed to meal reimbursements (supplementing the federal reimbursement), start-up and expansion grants, administrative costs, transportation, toll-free hunger hotlines, and publicity. For example, Minnesota has provided supplemental per-meal reimbursements in summer of about 4 cents per breakfast, 14 cents per lunch or supper and 10 cents per snack. California has provided up to \$15,000 per site for public schools to start or expand the SFSP. Vermont has allocated \$102,000 for SFSP activities, transportation and outreach work. (For more descriptions of state initiatives to support summer nutrition, see Table 7.) In addition to funds allocated specifically for the SFSP, state officials can help SFSP sponsors and sites find funding for recreational and academic enrichment programs to complement their meals and snacks.

A different approach than the funding “carrot” is the requirement “stick.” Some states require SFSP sites in high poverty areas. For example, in Missouri the SFSP is required in school districts where 50 percent or more of the children are eligible for free or reduced price school meals.

Outreach and Publicity Efforts. State officials can actively recruit schools, local government agencies (such as parks and recreation departments), and non-profit organizations to sponsor the SFSP at numerous sites throughout their communities. Together, these types of organizations have the capacity to serve the entire community and to increase substantially the number of children participating in the program.

Governors and their spouses, state legislators and state agency directors can draw media attention to and increase public awareness of the SFSP. For example, they can appear on community public affairs programs, hold summer food “kick-off” or other events, write op-ed pieces for local newspapers, and produce public service announcements for television and radio.

State officials also can notify families that the SFSP is available in their neighborhoods and explain how children can participate. Articles and announcements can be distributed through:

- utility bills,
- constituent mailings,
- human service agency newsletters,
- community and ethnic newspapers,
- church bulletins, and
- pennysavers.

Other important local outreach vehicles include advertisements on public transportation, billboards, milk cartons, and grocery bags. In addition, state officials can make certain that hunger hotlines are able to help parents locate the SFSP sites closest to their homes.

Reduction of Red Tape. To reduce administrative burdens, state agencies can take advantage of decreased paperwork options in the SFSP. For example, they can let school SFSP sponsors know that they may apply for a “Seamless Summer Food Waiver” (see page 10) to streamline their school meals and summer food programs. The Seamless Waiver provides a great opportunity for schools to start the SFSP or to add more SFSP sites to existing programs.

In addition, in Alaska, Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, Wyoming and Puerto Rico, school and local government SFSP sponsors now fall under the “Lugar pilot” program that reduces red tape and paperwork and allows for maximum meal reimbursements. The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, signed into law on June 30, 2004 (P.L. 108-265), made these pilots permanent, expanded them to include non-profit sponsors, and added six new states (Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Ohio, and Oregon), effective January

2005. State officials can make sure that potential sponsors know that this pilot makes it easier for them to run the SFSP.

Leadership and Coordination. In addition to appearing in the media, some governors have formed advisory committees to draw further statewide attention to hunger and the SFSP. Both governors and other state officials also can support the SFSP by enhancing customer service, streamlining administration, and forming coalitions to overcome logistical barriers to participation in the SFSP. In addition, state officials can ensure the platforms are there through which summer feeding can occur by making sure summer programs and summer school are available across the state.

Governors across the country have implemented creative initiatives to fight hunger and support anti-hunger programs such as the SFSP. In 2003 and 2004, New Mexico's Gov. Bill Richardson and Oregon's Gov. Ted Kulongoski held hunger summits in their states to develop goals and strategies to reduce hunger and food insecurity. The governors of Arizona, Delaware, Iowa, Maine, Maryland and Wisconsin have formed State advisory committees, policy councils and commissions; issued executive orders; or put forth legislative priorities to reduce food insecurity and increase participation in anti-hunger programs, including the SFSP.

The leadership of state officials is critical to the local success of any summer meal program. State agencies can more effectively recruit and maintain SFSP sponsors and sites by enhancing customer service and streamlining administration as much as possible. For example, state agencies can make sponsor training sessions customer-friendly, limit the amount of paperwork required from sponsors and sites, post important information on and allow forms to be submitted through their web sites, and utilize site monitoring sessions as opportunities to provide technical assistance.

Unfortunately, many SFSP sites operate only for part of the summer, while hungry children need access to meals throughout the summer months. State officials can encourage SFSP sites to stay open for the entire summer in order to ensure that low-income children do not encounter a "meals gap" while school's out.

State officials also can encourage coordination to overcome logistical barriers. For example, one of the greatest obstacles to participation is the lack of transportation for children in rural areas during the summer. State officials can work to coordinate transportation for children to SFSP sites in rural communities. To overcome not just transportation but also other logistical barriers, state officials can

sponsor coalition meetings of state agencies, anti-hunger advocates, schools, parks and recreation departments, YMCAs, Boys & Girls Clubs, religious congregations, etc., to encourage sponsors and sites to participate, to engage in problem solving, and to develop partnerships.

What Local Governments Can Do to Increase Participation in the Summer Food Service Program

Local governments have a great potential interest in ensuring the health and well-being of the children in their communities. The SFSP plays an important role in achieving this goal by keeping hunger at bay and providing nutritious foods when school meals are no longer available. It also supports local summer programs that keep children engaged, safe, and out of trouble while their parents are at work. Local jurisdictions can help guarantee that the SFSP reaches the children it was designed to serve by sponsoring the program, promoting it to the community, and creating a Summer Food Task Force.

Sponsor the Summer Food Service Program. For children to have access to the SFSP, local government agencies, schools, and private non-profit organizations must sponsor the program. Local government agencies are some of the best and largest sponsors in the country. In 2001, they constituted only 14 percent of all sponsors, but served 36 percent of the summer food sites and provided 31 percent of the meals. The Department of Recreation and Parks or Department of Social Services often sponsors the program, but it can be any local agency – public housing, education, health, the mayor’s office, or others.

Municipalities are in a unique position to sponsor the SFSP, because of their financial strength and administrative capacities. The SFSP provides federal reimbursement for meals after they are served. Local governments have the resources to advance the up-front funding for the SFSP, which helps ensure that the program runs smoothly. When a municipal agency sponsors the program, it usually provides meals to numerous sites throughout the community and feeds a large number of children. Because large sponsors like local governments have more power than smaller sponsors to negotiate lower prices with vendors, they are able to keep per-child costs lower.

The SFSP, like any federal program, has administrative and paperwork requirements to ensure program integrity. Few local organizations that operate summer programs have ever applied for or received federal grants, whereas most local government agencies have both the experience and the

capacity to administer federal grants. This expertise makes it easier for them to sponsor the SFSP.

Sponsoring the SFSP requires no matching funds and is a vital service that municipalities can provide to the community.

Promote Summer Food. One of the biggest challenges to expanding SFSP participation is that it requires a comprehensive outreach campaign each year to ensure that sponsors and sites sign up to participate in the program and that families know it is available. Local municipalities can draw upon their relationships within the community and use their resources to promote the program. For example, they can work with the media to promote the program, send out information in their regular community correspondence, put information at local WIC, food stamp and other municipal offices, hang posters and placards on buses, at bus stops, and in grocery stores, and talk about the program at community meetings. City officials also have relationships with local businesses whose resources can be garnered to support outreach efforts.

A growing number of cities and counties are providing funding to summer programs to keep children safe and engaged during the summer. Participation in the SFSP can be made a requirement for sponsors to receive the local dollars for the underlying program. This not only helps expand the reach of the SFSP, but it increases the impact of the municipality's own financial support for summer programs since its program dollars can be spent on other program essentials rather than on purchasing food.

Create a Summer Food Task Force. The municipality can create a Summer Food Task Force comprised of local officials, SFSP sponsors, the business community, the school district, summer programs, anti-hunger advocates, and the state summer food agency. The Task Force could conduct SFSP outreach campaigns, identify underserved areas and recruit new sites, and develop an SFSP hotline that parents can call for site information.

The Task Force also can identify local barriers to the SFSP and make recommendations to the local government on steps to expand access. For example, in many areas, transportation is a barrier to participation. The Task Force could identify the city's transportation resources, such as city

vans or its bus system, and make recommendations on how its resources could be used to transport children. Another barrier is that many summer food sites do not operate throughout the entire summer. The Task Force can develop a plan to extend the length of time sites operate, or to link children who attend sites that close before the start of the school year to sites that are still running.

How the Federal Government Can Help State and Local Governments Increase Participation in the Summer Food Service Program

With the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, signed into law on June 30, 2004, Congress took positive steps to improve the Summer Food Service Program. The Act makes permanent the successful 13-state Lugar pilot program, expands it to include non-profit sponsors, and adds six new states (Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Ohio, and Oregon), among other changes (see Appendix 1).

This is good news, because the 13 states currently in the Lugar pilot program are increasing participation while participation in the rest of the country is stagnant. But the summer nutrition problem in this country is so large, and the need is so great, that even this significant progress in expanding the Summer Food Service Program is far too little.

There is much work left for the federal government to do, so long as four out of every five children who receive free or reduced-price meals during the school year are not benefiting from the Summer Nutrition programs and may be in jeopardy of falling behind nutritionally and educationally.

Congress should build on its work in the reauthorization process by expanding the Lugar pilot program to the entire nation. Congress also should increase the per-meal reimbursements to make the SFSP program more financially manageable for sponsors and sites.

And Congress should make it easier for sites in rural areas to qualify for the program by reducing the eligibility threshold. Currently, a site can be reimbursed for feeding all the children in the neighborhood (without an individual means test) only if at least 50 percent of the children in that area are low-income. This threshold was once 33.3 percent. Recently, the 21st Century Community Learning Centers funding was changed to reach after-school and summer programs in areas where 40 percent of the children are low-income (it was 50 percent). The threshold should be

lowered at least to 40 percent in the nutrition programs as well. The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 created a pilot to lower the threshold to 40 percent in rural areas of Pennsylvania for two years. But Pennsylvania is hardly the only state with rural areas that need this change. Congress needs to lower the threshold to 40 percent or lower across the nation, permanently.

USDA has worked hard to help states expand their Summer Nutrition programs through outreach and technical assistance efforts. But much work remains to be done. USDA can have a potentially large impact by requiring local programs receiving federal funds for summer programs to offer meals through the Summer Nutrition programs. In addition, USDA can encourage states to work with schools to determine if the Seamless Summer Food Waiver is a good option for them to further reduce their paperwork burden.

USDA also can help states reach more children by coordinating with its regional offices to promote best practices for recruiting and retaining sponsors and to provide technical assistance on implementing these practices.

Some areas where USDA can share best practices and prod states to improve include:

- using short, user-friendly sponsor/site applications;
- providing clear, focused, in-person training on becoming a sponsor or site;
- establishing clear and minimal reporting requirements;
- making the monitoring process constructive instead of punitive;
- establishing a mix of small and large sites to allow cost savings;
- pursuing successful outreach techniques; and
- encouraging the creation of programs and activities of types that consistently attract children.

USDA also should focus on recruiting more sponsors and increasing the number of sites per sponsor. Especially in rural areas, USDA should encourage states to focus on partnerships between schools and small sites, and to consider local institutions such as health centers, libraries, hospitals, and food banks as potential sponsors and sites.

Conclusions

The Summer Nutrition programs not only provide nutritious meals to low-income children who depend on school lunches and breakfasts during the school year, but they also can serve as a catalyst for summer programs for low-income children, act as a funding base for education and enrichment programs, and attract children to programs that keep them safe and engaged. Participation in the nutrition programs expanded in many states in 2003, especially in Lugar pilot states, but there is a long way to go before states and the federal government can be satisfied with efforts to reach hungry children with these important benefits.

National participation in the Summer Nutrition programs slipped 1.3 percent from July 2002 to July 2003. Three states, California, Florida, and Illinois, experienced particularly large decreases. Compared to the 16 million children who receive free and reduced price lunches during the school year, the Summer Nutrition programs served only 3.2 million children in July 2003, or one in five.

But the Lugar pilot program and the Seamless Summer Food Waiver helped many states reach more children. The 13 Lugar pilot states increased participation 13.1 percent, and the states using the waiver, outside of California, Florida, and Illinois, increased participation 4.1 percent. The expansion of the Lugar pilot project in the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 brings the potential for more improvement in the years to come.

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

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

Appendix 1:
The Child Nutrition
and WIC
Reauthorization Act
of 2004

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

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

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

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

These changes take effect in January 2005.

The Act also creates, effective immediately, a summer food residential camp pilot that eases paperwork requirements for Camp Penuel in Missouri and another camp to be determined. The new pilot allows these two camps, which serve children from low-income areas, to serve three meals a day to all children at the camps without individually qualifying them for free or reduced-price school meals.

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

Appendix 2: Three Model Programs

Pulaski County Schools Pulaski, Kentucky

Having worked with the program since its inception in 1989, Lucille Hudson, Food Service Coordinator, knows “children who come back to school in the fall looking pale from undernourishment,” and she knows that the Summer Food Service Program helps to alleviate that problem. Motivated by her belief that “it is our responsibility to look after the children in our county,” Hudson begins promoting the program in March through advertising in local newspapers, radio, and the schools’ web page. Hudson also makes a concerted effort to involve community leaders in the process of feeding children during the summer.

Pulaski County Schools work with parks, libraries, day care centers, YMCAs, camps, Vacation Bible Schools, and churches to provide meals for children during the summer months. Each partnership is unique, and Hudson works with these sites to find innovative ways to feed children, ranging from running a bookmobile to holding youth meetings at a church.

Since Pulaski is a rural farming community, it is difficult for many children to travel to a summer food site. So Hudson has worked with the local library, which has a summer reading program, to bring the meals to the children. The library operates a bookmobile that travels throughout the community, and at its designated stops neighborhood children pick up a book as well as receive a sack lunch. This program has been well received.

Hudson’s collaboration with housing projects faces different challenges. Since the summer food site is within walking distance for all the children in the community, the children often want to return home after picking up their lunches instead of eating at the site. To encourage children to eat at the site, and to educate children about healthy eating habits, Hudson and the County Extension Office are working together to provide nutrition classes for the children.

*Contact: Lucille Hudson,
Food Service Coordinator
1-606-679-1123*

*Yuma Union High School District
Yuma, Arizona*

Charlene Story, District Director of Food Services, knew that school meals may be “the only food that these children ate for the day,” and was “worried about them during the summer.” To reach the different sectors of Yuma County, Story worked to expand the SFSP from two sites to 18 sites in three years.

One group of sites includes Yuma County’s high schools. Story expanded the SFSP to five Yuma summer schools, each of which serves meals both to the students who attend summer school and to neighborhood children.

Story also works with local community organizations, including public libraries, community centers, and family shelters. The Yuma Public Library runs a Children’s Summer Reading program, making it a logical partner for a summer feeding program. The children check out a book from the library and go outside, where they pick up a packaged lunch and have a picnic in the adjacent park. In the first year of the partnership 1,072 students participated in the Summer Reading Program and the Summer Food Service Program. Last year, participation increased to 1,910 students, with part of this increase attributable to the SFSP.

Story recently began working with a family shelter in an economically depressed area. She recognized that the participation numbers might not be as high as at the other sites because the shelter was smaller and a new site, but she wanted to ensure that the children at the shelter received nutritious meals.

In addition to these partnerships, Story has used the SFSP to provide a positive outlet to local teens. Yuma County has one of the highest rates of drug use and teenage pregnancy in the state. Through her work with the local Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA) – a work training program for teenagers – Story has recruited local teenagers to work at SFSP sites, preparing and serving meals to children. In addition to reducing labor costs for the SFSP sites, this program has taught these teenagers about “food safety, baking, preparing meals, and the responsibility of holding a job.”

*Contact: Charlene Story,
District Director of Food
Services
1-928-344-4656*

Montana Office of Public Instruction

Montana is dotted with small rural communities, making it difficult to reach children in need with the Summer Food Service Program. In spite of this difficulty, however, there are sponsors and sites in low-income areas in each of the six large cities and on each of the seven American Indian reservations throughout the state.

To ensure that there are sponsors in each of these communities, the state Office of Public Instruction (OPI) actively recruits sponsors throughout the school year. Outreach to new sponsors begins in February with a public service announcement. In March, OPI begins promoting the SFSP in monthly administrator announcements and conducts other outreach efforts throughout the spring. OPI also works with organizations that have been referred to them by churches, parents, and other organizations.

Two examples of programs include Browning Public Schools and Billings Public Schools. Browning Public Schools provide summer meals at five sites, serving over 500 children daily. To ensure that students are able to access these summer meals, Browning has arranged bus pick-up and drop-offs for the children. Browning also promotes the program with a float at the annual Indian Day Parade.

The Billings Public Schools system tries to increase student participation in the program by forging partnerships with local community organizations, news media, church groups, boys and girls clubs, and other organizations. The school system also encourages parents and community members to participate in the program on special days or occasions when people gather, such as barbecues in the park.

In addition to actively recruiting sponsors, OPI works to make the program more appealing to children. For example, the Pro Rodeo Cowboy Association cowboys will be visiting five different sites this summer. Collaborations with service-oriented professions, such as the police and fire departments, are also helping to promote the program to children. Police officers and firemen will be visiting sites throughout the summer to educate children on the important role that they play in keeping themselves and other children safe.

*Contact: Christine Emerson,
Director, School Nutrition
Programs
1-406-444-2502*

Appendix 3: Technical Notes

National School Lunch Program data. USDA e-mailed Excel spreadsheets to FRAC containing the official monthly average daily attendance in the National School Lunch Program by state from September 2001 through July 2003. USDA sent separate spreadsheets for children receiving free meals and for those paying the reduced price, by state. To calculate the school-year NSLP average daily attendance for each state, we added the number of children receiving free lunches and the number paying the reduced price for each month, and calculated the average of the sums for each month from September through May of each school year (2001-2002 and 2002-2003). We used the July 2002 and July 2003 average daily attendance figures for the NSLP as provided by USDA for the summertime NSLP participation data in the report. Note that USDA calculates average daily attendance in the NSLP by dividing the total number of lunches served in a given month in a given state by the number of school days in that month, and then dividing by an attendance factor of 0.927. (This accounts for children who were absent from school.) In past years FRAC has performed this calculation, but this year USDA calculated average daily attendance before sending the spreadsheets to FRAC.

Summer Food Service Program. USDA e-mailed spreadsheets to FRAC containing the official average daily participation numbers for July 2002 and July 2003, the total number of sponsors and sites in July 2002 and July 2003, and the total number of meals served in June, July, and August of 2002 and 2003, all by state. Note that USDA does not report average daily participation or the number of sponsors or sites for June or August – they only report these data for July of each year. USDA obtains the July numbers from the states and reports them as they receive them.

For this report, FRAC gave states the opportunity to update the participation, sponsor and site data that we obtained from USDA. Further, FRAC analyses and subsequent conversations with state officials revealed that several states changed their methodology for calculating their SFSP average daily participation. Most of these states changed from dividing total lunches by operating days to dividing total meals by operating days. This resulted initially in an apparent spike in participation in the data. Either FRAC or the state recalculated the average daily participation using total lunches instead of total meals, so the July 2003 numbers are comparable to the July 2002 numbers. For these reasons, some data in the report may not reflect

published reports by the USDA. FRAC also asked states for data for June, which are not collected by USDA.

Summer Seamless Waiver. FRAC asked states about their participation in and experience with the waiver option. Only some states were able to separate participation in schools using the waiver from schools using the NSLP during summer school. Thus, the impact of the waiver on daily participation was difficult to discern.

TABLE 1: Summer Nutrition Participation in July 2002 and July 2003 (Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and National School Lunch Program (NSLP)*, Combined) by State

State	July 2002 Summer Nutrition				July 2003 Summer Nutrition				Percent Change in Summer Nutrition Participation 2002-2003
	Children in 01-02 School-Year NSLP*	Children in Summer Nutrition (NSLP* & SFSP Combined), July 2002	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 01-02 School-Year NSLP*	Rank	Children in 02-03 School-Year NSLP*	Children in Summer Nutrition, July 2003	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 02-03 School-Year NSLP*	Rank	
H Alabama	327,744	61,784	18.9	22	334,790	66,503	19.9	20	7.6%
Alaska	29,409	2,287	7.8	46	30,162	2,376	7.9	49	3.9%
H Arizona	317,438	42,069	13.3	37	344,802	54,436	15.8	29	29.4%
H Arkansas	193,127	16,268	8.4	44	197,247	19,149	9.7	42	17.7%
H California	1,969,613	827,326 **	42.0	1	2,033,493	758,285	37.3	2	-8.3%
H Colorado	154,677	15,927	10.3	42	163,159	15,581 **	9.5	43	-2.2%
H Connecticut	125,251	33,135	26.5	11	129,198	34,772	26.9	10	4.9%
Delaware	33,447	10,323 **	30.9	7	35,092	9,264	26.4	11	-10.3%
H District of Columbia	43,890	14,751 **	33.6	4	41,454	21,718 **	52.4	1	47.2%
H Florida	920,838	191,941	20.8	19	954,207	161,808	17.0	26	-15.7%
H Georgia	606,211	123,304	20.3	20	627,521	114,848	18.3	22	-6.9%
H Hawaii	65,856	22,050	33.5	5	64,721	22,154	34.2	5	0.5%
Idaho	74,419	11,912 **	16.0	28	77,765	13,431	17.3	24	12.8%
H Illinois	666,372	152,587	22.9	16	674,142	136,821	20.3	19	-10.3%
H Indiana	256,113	25,322 **	9.9	43	275,354	33,562 **	12.2	38	32.5%
Iowa	122,106	9,195	7.5	48	127,595	10,321	8.1	47	12.2%
H Kansas	133,541	9,573	7.2	49	140,302	12,270	8.7	44	28.2%
Kentucky	274,810	40,636	14.8	33	279,420	47,514 **	17.0	25	16.9%
H Louisiana	404,845	47,817	11.8	39	403,540	48,402 **	12.0	39	1.2%
Maine	49,561	6,618	13.4	36	47,955	7,193	15.0	31	8.7%
H Maryland	220,361	55,673 **	25.3	13	224,818	47,482	21.1	18	-14.7%
Massachusetts	220,669	56,068	25.4	12	220,785	50,134	22.7	15	-10.6%
Michigan	418,137	60,537	14.5	34	433,230	56,179	13.0	37	-7.2%
Minnesota	190,982	29,885	15.6	30	196,191	31,716	16.2	27	6.1%
Mississippi	290,880	31,603	10.9	41	289,525	29,026	10.0	41	-8.2%
H Missouri	298,313	63,871 **	21.4	17	299,588	66,322	22.1	16	3.8%
Montana	37,979	8,708 **	22.9	15	37,787	9,532 **	25.2	12	9.5%
Nebraska	85,575	7,032 **	8.2	45	88,618	7,266	8.2	46	3.3%
H Nevada	81,747	27,680	33.9	3	86,681	28,862	33.3	6	4.3%
New Hampshire	27,417	4,253	15.5	31	28,555	4,566	16.0	28	7.4%
New Jersey	317,390	67,085	21.1	18	313,696	67,352	21.5	17	0.4%
H New Mexico	150,254	52,715	35.1	2	152,685	54,410	35.6	3	3.2%
H New York	1,136,740	345,202	30.4	8	1,136,212	339,588	29.9	8	-1.6%
H North Carolina	465,809	77,101 **	16.6	26	494,600	72,409 **	14.6	34	-6.1%
North Dakota	27,319	3,034	11.1	40	27,099	2,358	8.7	45	-22.3%
H Ohio	458,223	56,061	12.2	38	472,940	52,672	11.1	40	-6.0%
Oklahoma	231,915	14,063	6.1	51	242,013	11,814	4.9	51	-16.0%
H Oregon	159,056	26,987	17.0	24	165,162	22,982	13.9	36	-14.8%
H Pennsylvania	458,663	143,164	31.2	6	467,783	166,017 **	35.5	4	16.0%
Rhode Island	40,145	9,633	24.0	14	47,026	11,083	23.6	13	15.0%
H South Carolina	290,553	76,936	26.5	10	295,861	83,333	28.2	9	8.3%
H South Dakota	42,502	7,154 **	16.8	25	43,241	7,694	17.8	23	7.6%
H Tennessee	348,374	47,395	13.6	35	354,464	49,445	13.9	35	4.3%
H Texas	1,740,569	123,482	7.1	50	1,843,025	137,476	7.5	50	11.3%
H Utah	115,324	30,790	26.7	9	122,798	40,194	32.7	7	30.5%
H Vermont	20,858	3,991	19.1	21	21,785	5,046	23.2	14	26.4%
Virginia	293,107	51,274 **	17.5	23	306,394	59,399	19.4	21	15.8%
H Washington	261,479	42,194	16.1	27	273,669	40,974	15.0	32	-2.9%
H West Virginia	109,507	16,380	15.0	32	116,121	17,164	14.8	33	4.8%
H Wisconsin	201,065	31,669	15.8	29	209,370	32,960 **	15.7	30	4.1%
Wyoming	21,412	1,634	7.6	47	21,853	1,725	7.9	48	5.6%
United States	15,531,594	3,238,080	20.8		16,015,493	3,197,589	20.0		-1.3%
Lugar Pilot States	3,217,733	268,692	8.4		3,379,007	303,828	9.0		13.1%
Non-pilot States	12,313,861	2,969,388	24.1		12,636,486	2,893,761	22.9		-2.5%

* National School Lunch Program numbers reflect free and reduced-price participation in school-years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.

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

H These states used the Seamless Summer Food Waiver option. (See page 10 for details on the Seamless Summer Food Waiver.)

Shaded states are in the Lugar pilot. (See page 9 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

TABLE 2: Change in Summer Food Service Program Participation from July 2002 to July 2003, by State

<i>State</i>	<i>Children in Summer Food Service Program, July 2002</i>	<i>Children in Summer Food Service Program, July 2003</i>	<i>SFSP Percent Change from 2002 to 2003</i>	<i>Ratio of Children in July 2003 SFSP per 100 in 2002-2003 School-Year NSLP*</i>	<i>Rank</i>
H Alabama	38,156	38,264	0.3%	11.4	25
Alaska	971	1,552	59.8%	5.1	44
H Arizona	8,577	5,749	-33.0%	1.7	51
H Arkansas	10,657	12,559	17.8%	6.4	40
H California	130,385 **	117,738	-9.7%	5.8	43
H Colorado	5,593	7,051 **	26.1%	4.3	48
H Connecticut	10,346	10,561	2.1%	8.2	35
Delaware	8,868 **	8,126	-8.4%	23.2	6
H District of Columbia	13,213 **	19,983 **	51.2%	48.2	1
H Florida	145,486	115,535	-20.6%	12.1	24
H Georgia	96,964	78,695	-18.8%	12.5	21
H Hawaii	5,426	5,866	8.1%	9.1	31
Idaho	10,384 **	12,193	17.4%	15.7	12
H Illinois	69,924	60,637	-13.3%	9.0	33
H Indiana	19,385 **	24,776 **	27.8%	9.0	32
Iowa	5,193	6,109	17.6%	4.8	46
H Kansas	8,213	10,707	30.4%	7.6	38
Kentucky	32,152	41,946 **	30.5%	15.0	13
H Louisiana	41,246	40,988 **	-0.6%	10.2	27
Maine	5,925	6,547	10.5%	13.7	19
H Maryland	47,590 **	41,276	-13.3%	18.4	10
Massachusetts	48,470	43,086	-11.1%	19.5	8
Michigan	34,749	34,867	0.3%	8.0	36
Minnesota	26,275	28,242	7.5%	14.4	15
Mississippi	30,279	27,623	-8.8%	9.5	28
H Missouri	34,540 **	38,990	12.9%	13.0	20
Montana	8,173 **	8,893 **	8.8%	23.5	5
Nebraska	4,969 **	5,444	9.6%	6.1	41
H Nevada	3,891	3,237	-16.8%	3.7	50
New Hampshire	3,325	3,537	6.4%	12.4	23
New Jersey	50,619	54,020	6.7%	17.2	11
H New Mexico	44,938	39,056	-13.1%	25.6	2
H New York	283,378	276,073	-2.6%	24.3	4
H North Carolina	44,793 **	40,784 **	-9.0%	8.2	34
North Dakota	2,605	1,916	-26.4%	7.1	39
H Ohio	43,583	42,893	-1.6%	9.1	30
Oklahoma	11,138	9,370	-15.9%	3.9	49
H Oregon	10,655	10,021	-6.0%	6.1	42
H Pennsylvania	125,526	115,524 **	-8.0%	24.7	3
Rhode Island	7,570	8,906	17.6%	18.9	9
H South Carolina	62,941	66,755	6.1%	22.6	7
H South Dakota	3,123 **	3,347	7.2%	7.7	37
H Tennessee	38,327	38,802	1.2%	10.9	26
H Texas	83,309	88,676	6.4%	4.8	45
H Utah	21,986	16,771	-23.7%	13.7	18
H Vermont	2,675	3,042	13.7%	14.0	17
Virginia	41,091 **	45,177	9.9%	14.7	14
H Washington	27,285	24,909	-8.7%	9.1	29
H West Virginia	14,077	14,504	3.0%	12.5	22
H Wisconsin	27,561	29,486 **	7.0%	14.1	16
Wyoming	1,029	1,012	-1.7%	4.6	47
United States	1,857,534	1,791,821	-3.5%	11.2	
Lugar Pilot States	193,330	219,797	13.7%	6.5	
Non-pilot States	1,664,204	1,572,024	-5.5%	12.4	

* National School Lunch Program numbers reflect free and reduced-price participation.

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

HThese states used the Seamless Summer Food Waiver option. Some decline in SFSP participation is due to schools using the NSLP program through the seamless waiver. Participants in schools using the waiver option were tabulated under the July NSLP categories, instead of as SFSP participants as they were in the past. (See page 10 for details on the Seamless Summer Food Waiver.)

Shaded states are in the Lugar pilot. (See page 9 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

TABLE 3: Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors* and Sites from July 2002 to July 2003, by State

<i>State</i>	<i>Number of Sponsors, July 2002</i>	<i>Number of Sponsors, July 2003</i>	<i>Percent Change</i>	<i>Number of Sites, July 2002</i>	<i>Number of Sites, July 2003</i>	<i>Percent Change</i>
H Alabama	61	59	-3.3%	626	616	-1.6%
Alaska	15	16	6.7%	25 **	43	72.0%
H Arizona	21	17	-19.0%	174	100	-42.5%
H Arkansas	68	94	38.2%	155	200	29.0%
H California	205	181	-11.7%	1,520 **	1,404	-7.6%
H Colorado	26	28	7.7%	81	87	7.4%
H Connecticut	26	25	-3.8%	149	150	0.7%
Delaware	22	20	-9.1%	225	238	5.8%
H District of Columbia	15	21	40.0%	138	262	89.9%
H Florida	114	113	-0.9%	2,001	1,926	-3.7%
H Georgia	132	115	-12.9%	1,873	1,738	-7.2%
H Hawaii	16	19	18.8%	85	87	2.4%
Idaho	55	55	0.0%	135	139	3.0%
H Illinois	103	98	-4.9%	1,148	1,256	9.4%
H Indiana	88	100	13.6%	415	491	18.3%
Iowa	37	36	-2.7%	103 **	123	19.4%
H Kansas	38	37	-2.6%	120	123	2.5%
Kentucky	121	137	13.2%	831	1,190	43.2%
H Louisiana	75 **	75 **	0.0%	551 **	569 **	3.3%
Maine	48	51	6.3%	117	128	9.4%
H Maryland	47	47 **	0.0%	782 **	794 **	1.5%
Massachusetts	88	83	-5.7%	705	646	-8.4%
Michigan	114	114	0.0%	846	813	-3.9%
Minnesota	51	43	-15.7%	405	331	-18.3%
Mississippi	72	70	-2.8%	239	236	-1.3%
H Missouri	58	60	3.4%	509 **	537 **	5.5%
Montana	46	56	21.7%	120	135	12.5%
Nebraska	28	29	3.6%	86	92	7.0%
H Nevada	22	21	-4.5%	65	60	-7.7%
New Hampshire	26	29	11.5%	45	67	48.9%
New Jersey	92	93	1.1%	1,047	1,126	7.5%
H New Mexico	64	58	-9.4%	787	691	-12.2%
H New York	289	279	-3.5%	2,656	2,541	-4.3%
H North Carolina	82	94	14.6%	804	833	3.6%
North Dakota	26	20	-23.1%	38	23	-39.5%
H Ohio	122	128	4.9%	1,027	1,056	2.8%
Oklahoma	56	47	-16.1%	215	179	-16.7%
H Oregon	34	39	14.7%	161	166	3.1%
H Pennsylvania	158	174 **	10.1%	2,333	1,973 **	-15.4%
Rhode Island	12	14	16.7%	168	169	0.6%
H South Carolina	45	48	6.7%	1,111	1,095	-1.4%
H South Dakota	28	23	-17.9%	49	42	-14.3%
H Tennessee	44	49	11.4%	900	992	10.2%
H Texas	177	171	-3.4%	1,191	1,379	15.8%
H Utah	21	16	-23.8%	126	150	19.0%
H Vermont	39 **	33 **	-15.4%	103 **	110 **	6.8%
Virginia	104	111	6.7%	778	864	11.1%
H Washington	80	75	-6.3%	468	441	-5.8%
H West Virginia	85	80	-5.9%	442	387	-12.4%
H Wisconsin	65	77 **	18.5%	338	376 **	11.2%
Wyoming	6	8	33.3%	15	19	26.7%
United States	3,467	3,486	0.5%	29,031	29,193	0.6%
Lugar Pilot States	741	779	5.1%	3,374	4,068	20.6%
Non-pilot States	2,726	2,707	-0.7%	25,657	25,125	-2.1%

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

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

H These states used the Seamless Summer Food Waiver option. A decline in sponsors and sites may be due to this program. (See page 10 for details on the Seamless Summer Food Waiver.)

Shaded states are in the Lugar pilot. (See page 9 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

TABLE 4: Participation in June 2002 and June 2003 in Summer Food Service Program in States Where Participation Peaks in June

	<i>State</i>	<i>Children in SFSP June 2002*</i>	<i>Children in SFSP June 2003*</i>	<i>Percentage Change</i>
H	Alabama	47,842	46,052	-3.7%
H	Arizona	8,577	5,719	-33.3%
H	Arkansas	14,870	17,300	16.3%
H	Colorado	9,088	7,330	-19.4%
H	Georgia	114,620	92,460	-19.3%
	Idaho	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Iowa	6,578	7,622	15.9%
H	Kansas	16,991	17,559	3.3%
	Kentucky	53,639	65,547	22.2%
H	Louisiana	63,974	62,506	-2%
	Mississippi	N/A	N/A	N/A
H	Missouri	49,195	55,985	13.8%
	Nebraska	10,594	10,392	-1.9%
H	New Mexico	52,883	48,071	-9.1%
	North Dakota	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Oklahoma	21,896	19,376	-11.5%
H	South Carolina	N/A	N/A	N/A
H	South Dakota	N/A	N/A	N/A
H	Tennessee	40,528	51,160	26.2%
H	Texas	266,074	252,434	-5.1%

* Totals only reflect those states reporting June data to FRAC. Some states with only brief program activity in June may report June participation in July. "N/A" indicates that FRAC was unable to obtain data on June participation from these states.

H These states used the Seamless Summer Food Waiver option. As with July data, decreases in June SFSP may reflect use of the seamless waiver option by schools. Children participating in sites using the waiver are recorded under the NSLP. (See page 10 for details on the Seamless Summer Food Waiver.)

Shaded states are in the Lugar pilot. (See page 9 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

TABLE 5: Summer Food Service Program Lunches* Served in June, July, and August 2003, by State

<i>State</i>	<i>June 2003 SFSP Lunches</i>	<i>July 2003 SFSP Lunches</i>	<i>August 2003 SFSP Lunches</i>
H Alabama	859,395	625,386	4,352
Alaska	18,883	27,188	6,339
H Arizona	245,295	93,157	287
H Arkansas	264,959	251,187	27,319
H California	694,630	2,708,781	959,494
H Colorado	124,602	105,766	1,576
H Connecticut	0	258,538	59,523
Delaware	59,964	174,458	70,729
H District of Columbia	507	439,618	169,665
H Florida	1,828,895	2,426,251	209,736
H Georgia	1,627,742	1,321,802	65,239
H Hawaii	85,345	110,946	4,450
Idaho	241,717	228,450	78,952
H Illinois	355,911	1,655,330	811,015
H Indiana	304,946	515,906	97,041
Iowa	123,097	123,307	12,451
H Kansas	232,341	151,201	25,466
Kentucky	754,061	713,088	30,925
H Louisiana	1,223,391	848,549	14,163
Maine	8,058	154,507	39,366
H Maryland	42,465	911,552	193,125
Massachusetts	37,577	899,804	369,459
Michigan	178,187	886,115	146,192
Minnesota	230,392	498,843	62,933
Mississippi	948,338	411,162	12,151
H Missouri	975,143	821,201	150,155
Montana	68,462	110,259	22,884
Nebraska	146,044	107,767	22,827
H Nevada	50,593	67,317	34,348
New Hampshire	429	83,328	41,424
New Jersey	27,998	1,080,411	527,265
H New Mexico	971,496	893,890	35,238
H New York	154,642	6,160,146	3,307,780
H North Carolina	663,794	693,328	27,706
North Dakota	50,160	32,928	9,990
H Ohio	531,265	985,551	186,681
Oklahoma	325,541	204,797	13,757
H Oregon	40,647	242,573	65,696
H Pennsylvania	465,101	1,723,328	850,828
Rhode Island	0	222,014	82,691
H South Carolina	1,280,968	995,574	78,353
H South Dakota	81,489	69,247	28,579
H Tennessee	1,104,068	774,076	30,216
H Texas	4,893,390	1,854,096	48,328
H Utah	213,868	258,933	85,922
H Vermont	4,032	75,108	10,318
Virginia	150,796	850,506	245,155
H Washington	106,583	492,599	169,838
H West Virginia	83,808	298,397	50,866
H Wisconsin	169,715	519,893	159,108
Wyoming	20,740	21,314	8,686
United States	23,071,470	36,179,473	9,766,587
Lugar Pilot States	7,376,308	4,314,557	423,505
Non-pilot States	15,695,162	31,864,916	9,343,082

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

H These states used the Seamless Summer Food Waiver option. (See page 10 for details on the Seamless Summer Food Waiver.)

Shaded states are in the Lugar pilot. (See page 9 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

TABLE 6: Estimated Participation and Additional Federal Payments** in July 2003 Summer Nutrition, if States Served 40 Children per 100 Served in School Year National School Lunch Program

<i>State</i>	<i>Children in Summer Nutrition (School Lunch* & Summer Food Combined), July 2003</i>	<i>Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 02-03 School-Year NSLP*</i>	<i>Total Children Who Would Be in July Summer Nutrition if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP*</i>	<i>Additional Children Reached in July if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP*</i>	<i>Additional Dollars in July Federal Reimbursements if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP**</i>
H Alabama	66,503	19.9	133,916	67,413	\$3,485,265
Alaska	2,376	7.9	12,065	9,688	\$814,202
H Arizona	54,436	15.8	137,921	83,485	\$4,316,155
H Arkansas	19,149	9.7	78,899	59,750	\$3,089,081
H California	758,285	37.3	813,397	55,112	\$2,849,304
H Colorado	15,581	9.5	65,263	49,682	\$2,568,562
H Connecticut	34,772	26.9	51,679	16,907	\$874,108
Delaware	9,264	26.4	14,037	4,773	\$246,777
H Florida	161,808	17.0	381,683	219,875	\$11,367,548
H Georgia	114,848	18.3	251,008	136,160	\$7,039,486
H Hawaii	22,154	34.2	25,888	3,735	\$225,943
Idaho	13,431	17.3	31,106	17,675	\$913,773
H Illinois	136,821	20.3	269,657	132,836	\$6,867,609
H Indiana	33,562	12.2	110,142	76,580	\$3,959,170
Iowa	10,321	8.1	51,038	40,717	\$2,105,044
H Kansas	12,270	8.7	56,121	43,851	\$2,267,085
Kentucky	47,514	17.0	111,768	64,254	\$3,321,943
H Louisiana	48,402	12.0	161,416	113,014	\$5,842,825
Maine	7,193	15.0	19,182	11,989	\$619,817
H Maryland	47,482	21.1	89,927	42,445	\$2,194,395
Massachusetts	50,134	22.7	88,314	38,180	\$1,973,885
Michigan	56,179	13.0	173,292	117,113	\$6,054,742
Minnesota	31,716	16.2	78,476	46,760	\$2,417,505
Mississippi	29,026	10.0	115,810	86,784	\$4,486,747
H Missouri	66,322	22.1	119,835	53,513	\$2,766,647
Montana	9,532	25.2	15,115	5,583	\$288,618
Nebraska	7,266	8.2	35,447	28,181	\$1,456,983
H Nevada	28,862	33.3	34,672	5,810	\$300,385
New Hampshire	4,566	16.0	11,422	6,856	\$354,438
New Jersey	67,352	21.5	125,479	58,127	\$3,005,157
H New Mexico	54,410	35.6	61,074	6,664	\$344,506
H New York	339,588	29.9	454,485	114,897	\$5,940,185
H North Carolina	72,409	14.6	197,840	125,431	\$6,484,787
North Dakota	2,358	8.7	10,840	8,482	\$438,521
H Ohio	52,672	11.1	189,176	136,504	\$7,057,282
Oklahoma	11,814	4.9	96,805	84,992	\$4,394,067
H Oregon	22,982	13.9	66,065	43,082	\$2,227,347
H Pennsylvania	166,017	35.5	187,113	21,096	\$1,090,672
Rhode Island	11,083	23.6	18,811	7,728	\$399,516
H South Carolina	83,333	28.2	118,344	35,011	\$1,810,065
H South Dakota	7,694	17.8	17,296	9,602	\$496,427
H Tennessee	49,445	13.9	141,786	92,340	\$4,773,997
H Texas	137,476	7.5	737,210	599,734	\$31,006,243
H Utah	40,194	32.7	49,119	8,925	\$461,441
H Vermont	5,046	23.2	8,714	3,668	\$189,644
Virginia	59,399	19.4	122,558	63,158	\$3,265,283
H Washington	40,974	15.0	109,467	68,493	\$3,541,107
H West Virginia	17,164	14.8	46,449	29,285	\$1,514,023
H Wisconsin	32,960	15.7	83,748	50,789	\$2,625,771
Wyoming	1,725	7.9	8,741	7,016	\$362,723
United States	3,175,870	20.0	6,389,616	3,213,745	\$166,496,809

* National School Lunch Program numbers reflect free and reduced-price participation in the fiscal year 2003.

** This estimate is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed each day for one lunch only and at the lowest rate for a free lunch (\$2.14 per lunch). Further, we assume that all participants are served for the full 22 weekdays in July 2003.

Note that the United States totals do not match the numbers in Table 1 as the state over 40 per 100 (the District of Columbia) is not in this table.

H These states used the Seamless Summer Food Waiver option. (See page 10 for details on the Seamless Summer Food Waiver.)

Shaded states are in the Lugar pilot. (See page 9 for details on the Lugar Pilot Program.)

State	Details
California (\$, M)	The state allocates \$1 million to school districts and county offices of education to implement or expand the School Breakfast or Summer Food Service Program. The amount of funding that the Summer Food Service Program receives is based on the number of sponsor application requests that are made. School district and county offices may apply for a one-time start-up or expansion grant for both school and non-school sites. The maximum amount per grant is \$15,000 per site. CAL. ED. CODE § 49550.3.
Florida (R)	Each school district superintendent is required to report to the Department of Education any activity or initiative to provide access to the SFSP to children eligible for free or reduced-price meals, including plans for sponsoring, hosting, or vending SFSP. FLA. STAT. Ch 1006.0605.
Maryland (M)	If the public school system operates summer school, they must offer breakfast and lunch. MD. CODE ANN., EDUC. § 7-603.
Massachusetts (\$)	For summer 2002, State allocated \$300,000 for outreach and \$646,767 for grants to sponsors to increase participation and extend the length of programs. For summer 2003, State allocated a total of \$2.26 million for both Summer Food Service Program and School Breakfast Program outreach and expansion. Within the \$2.26 million, \$300,000 is specifically allocated for SFSP outreach and \$200,000 for School Breakfast outreach.
Minnesota (\$)	State contributes \$150,000 in additional funds for education department-approved SFSP sponsors to supplement federal reimbursement rates: up to 4 cents per breakfast, 14 cents per lunch or supper, and 10 cents per snack. MINN. STAT. § 124D.119.
Missouri (M)	SFSP required in school districts where 50 percent or more of the children are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch and in service institutions where more than 40 children congregate; districts can request a waiver. MO. REV. STAT. §191.810.
New York (\$)	State allocated \$3.3 million for supplemental meal reimbursements for SFSP sponsors.
Oregon (\$, R)	State appropriated \$49,000 over two years (2003-2005) to provide supplemental reimbursements to school districts and community groups that operate SFSP in areas where the school has 85 percent or more of its students enrolled in free or reduced-price meals. In counties with at least one school where 70 percent or more of the students are enrolled in free or reduced-price meals, the State requires the local commissions on children and families to discuss the coordination and provision of SFSP at one meeting. State Department of Education must convene SFSP advisory group to make recommendations on ways to make SFSP more cost effective and to determine the need to increase the \$49,000 funding

Key

\$ = State Funding

M = State Mandate

R = Reporting Requirement

	level. OR REV. STAT. § 326.111 (2003).
Texas (\$, M)	School districts are required to offer SFSP where more than 60 percent of children are eligible for free or reduced-price meals. TEX. HUM. RES. CODE § 33.024 (1993). For the 2002 and 2003 calendar years combined, State allocated \$1.4 million to supplement federal meal reimbursements and \$100,000 for outreach, budgeted at \$700,000 for meal reimbursement supplements and \$50,000 for program outreach for each summer. Supplemental reimbursement is 4 cents for breakfast, 8 cents for lunch and suppers, and 2 cents for snacks. For 2004, State funding decreased to \$250,000. State funding will be discontinued in 2005.
Vermont (\$)	For both summer 2002 and summer 2003, the state allocated \$52,436.00 for SFSP. Sponsors can use the funds either as reimbursement supplements or for activities and/or transportation in order to promote the program. The Department of Education encourages sponsors to use the funds for activities and/ or transportation. The state also allocated \$50,000 to Vermont Campaign to End Childhood Hunger for budget year 2002 – 2003 for its work with the child nutrition programs. The Vermont Campaign to End Childhood Hunger received the same amount of funding for 2003 – 2004.
Washington (\$, M)	If the public school district operates summer school and fifty percent or more of the students enrolled in the school qualify for free or reduced-price meals, the school district must implement a summer food service program in each of the operating public schools. Sites providing the meals should be open to all children in the area unless a compelling case can be made to limit access to the program. Schools may be exempt from implementing the Summer Food Service Program if they can demonstrate the availability of an adequate alternative summer feeding program. WA. CH. 54

Key

\$ = State Funding

M = State Mandate

R = Reporting Requirement