



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

July 2006

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 2005-2006 has helped to make possible our work on expanding and improving nutrition programs.

S. Daniel Abraham	MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger
America's Second Harvest – The Nation's Food Bank Network	Eugene & Agnes E. Meyer Foundation
Anonymous Donors	The Moriah Fund
Atlantic Philanthropies	The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
Morris & Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation	National Dairy Council
California Endowment	Nestlé USA
Case Foundation	New Directions Foundation
The Annie E. Casey Foundation	New Prospect Foundation
Community Capital Fund	The David & Lucile Packard Foundation
Consumer Health Foundation	Prince Charitable Trusts
East Side Entrees, Inc.	Pritzker Early Childhood Foundation
Lois & Richard England Family Foundation	Public Welfare Foundation
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Sara Lee Foundation
Food Marketing Institute	Share Our Strength
General Mills Foundation	Sodexo USA
Grocery Manufacturers Association	Taste of the NFL
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation	Trellis Fund
Kaiser Permanente Foundation	Unilever United States
Kraft Foods, Inc.	UPS Foundation
Land O'Lakes Foundation	Wallace Genetic Foundation
John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	Weissberg Foundation

Additional Copies

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

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

For More Information

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

About FRAC

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

This report was prepared by Crystal FitzSimons, Randy Rosso, Lynn Parker, Alexis Bylander, Jim Weill, Vanessa Hoffman, and Natania Gazek.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1 – Summer Nutrition in 2005	
Summary of Major Findings	1
National Participation Rates and Trends	3
Simplified Summer Food Program (“Lugar Pilots”)	4
Seamless Summer Food Option	6
State Participation Rates and Trends	7
Children Who Aren’t Being Served	8
SFSP Participation Throughout Summer	9
Conclusions.....	10
PART 2 – Resources	
Technical Notes	12
Web Resources for Summer Nutrition Programs	14
PART 3 – Tables	
Table 1: Summer Nutrition Participation in July 2004 and July 2005	16
Table 2: Change in SFSP Participation from July 2004 to July 2005	17
Table 2A: Change in National School Lunch Program Attendance from July 2004 to July 2005	18
Table 3: Change in Number of SFSP Sponsors and Sites from July 2004 to July 2005	19
Table 4: Number of SFSP Lunches Served in June, July, and August 2004 and 2005.....	20
Table 5: Estimated Number of Children Participating and Additional Federal Payments in July 2005 Summer Nutrition, if States Served 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP.....	21
Table 6: Five-Year Trends in Summer Nutrition Participation	22

About the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)

The USDA provides funding through a state agency in each state—usually the state education department—to reimburse eligible sponsors for meals and snacks served to children at summer programs. Sponsors are fiscal intermediary 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. National Youth Sports Programs, or*
- 4. private nonprofit organizations.*

The SFSP is operated at sites where at least half the children in the geographic area are eligible for free or reduced price school meals, or at sites in which at least 50 percent of the children participating in the program are determined eligible for free or reduced price school meals based on individual applications. Once the site is eligible on one of these bases, all children (up to age 18) can eat SFSP meals and snacks for free.

Sites serving primarily migrant children and summer camps also can participate.

Summary of Major Findings

When the school bell rings to signal the start of summer vacation, millions of children who receive free or reduced price breakfast and lunch at school during the regular school year no longer have access to those meals. And their working parents, many of whom are struggling with stagnant wages and rising health care, energy, and housing costs, must find a way to provide these meals for their children during the summer months.

Two federal programs—the Summer Food Service Program and the National School Lunch Program (see page 2 for more information)—offer children from low-income families and neighborhoods the kind of nutritious meals and snacks in the summer that they would receive during the school year. Together they are referred to in this report as the Summer Nutrition programs.

Providing good nutritious meals goes hand in hand with ensuring that children have constructive activities to keep them safe, engaged, and learning during the summer months. The Summer Nutrition programs support meals served at local summer education and enrichment programs, recreation centers, Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCA's, churches, parks, and any other location at which children congregate during the summer. These meals draw children into programs that are critical for their development, health, and well-being, while their parents are working.

Unfortunately, too few children have access to the Summer Nutrition programs. This report analyzes children's participation in these key nutrition programs and makes recommendations to improve program access.

About the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) in the Summer

In the summer, USDA provides funding to state agencies—usually the state education department—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 substantially 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.

Schools could always use the Summer Food Service Program to serve children who are not in school over the summer, but the paperwork deterred many schools. USDA now offers a “Seamless Summer Food Option,” under which schools can 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 but can serve students not in summer school. 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.

The major findings of this report include:

National Trends

- Participation in the federal Summer Nutrition programs lags far behind participation in the regular school breakfast and lunch programs during the school year. Only 18 children participate in Summer Nutrition programs for every 100 who receive free or reduced price school lunches.
- Overall participation in the Summer Nutrition programs (SFSP and NSLP combined) decreased 2.7 percent from July 2004 to July 2005, and now has declined for seven consecutive years.
- If every state had served in summer 2005 just two-fifths of the children who eat free or reduced price school lunch during the regular school year, an additional 3.5 million children would have been fed through the Summer Nutrition programs, bringing states an additional \$188.8 million in federal funds.

Simplified Summer Food Program States (“Lugar States”)

- Thirteen states originally were included in the Simplified Summer Food Program (formerly the “Lugar Pilot”), a Congressionally created pilot program that reduces paperwork and maximizes reimbursement. Since the program’s inception in 2001, these 13 states increased Summer Nutrition participation by 41.3 percent, while the rest of the states fell 11.9 percent.
- Summer Nutrition participation (SFSP and NSLP combined) in the 13 original states increased 4.3 percent from 2004 to 2005.
- SFSP participation alone increased 7.9 percent in the 13 states from 2004 to 2005.

- Six more states were added to the Simplified Summer Food Program beginning in 2005 (Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Ohio, and Oregon). Participation in the Summer Nutrition programs grew in half of the new states in 2005.
- Participation in the SFSP grew in the new six states by 8.9 percent, with the number of organizations operating the program growing by 13.4 percent and the number of locations where children could receive meals increasing by 15.9 percent.

National Participation Rates and Trends

Summer nutrition programs provide important benefits to children even beyond their primary goal of offering nutritious meals. They can help reduce or eliminate the learning losses that summer can bring and can help keep children safe, engaged, and intellectually and physically fit. They also help working families meet their child care needs. Summer nutrition programs strengthen summer programs—they bring children in the door, and help them stay alert and engaged.

Despite these benefits, the vast majority of students who are eligible for—and could benefit from—summer nutrition programs are still not being served. States can do better. Indeed, as described in Table 5, FRAC estimates that 3.5 million additional children, at a minimum, could have been reached each day if all states simply performed as well as the leading states in Summer Nutrition—a highly attainable goal.

On an average day in July 2005 about 2.8 million children were served in the Summer Nutrition programs (the Summer Food Service Program and the National School Lunch Program)—only 18 children for every 100 receiving a free or reduced price school lunch during the regular school year (2004-2005).

The 2005 rate was a step backward. Summer Nutrition participation slipped 2.7 percent from July 2004 to July 2005, continuing a trend of declining participation. In fact, from July 2000 to July 2005, participation nationwide fell by 249,908 children (an 8.1 percent drop). (See Table 6.) Participation now has declined for seven straight years.

The number of SFSP sponsors and sites saw a slight increase from 2004 to 2005, 2.5 percent and 2.3 percent respectively, with the growth occurring in the Simplified Summer Food Program states.

There are many reasons for the declines. The program has complicated administrative and accounting requirements, which make it challenging to operate, causing some sponsors to drop out of the program and potential sponsors to be reluctant to operate the program. The cut in reimbursement rates passed by Congress in

1996 also has continued to hurt the program. It is hard for many sponsors to break even. Another contributing factor may be states and localities cutting summer school programs and summertime recreation programs in the face of budget problems. This has had a detrimental impact on summer nutrition participation in states across the nation. When states cut summer programs, children not only get less education, but also less nutrition. A drop in summer National School Lunch Program participation in 28 states indicates that cuts in summer school are likely denying children needed nutrition, as well as academic and recreational opportunities.

What is clear is that the decline in children served does not reflect a reduced need. Since 2000, the number of children in poverty has risen by over 1.4 million (through 2004), and the number of children receiving free or reduced price lunch in the regular school year has risen by nearly 1.9 million.

Simplified Summer Food Program (“The Lugar Pilots”)

The picture is not all bleak. In a clear indication that there are strategies that can reach more children, the states operating the Simplified Summer Food Program (originally called the Lugar Pilots) made gains in 2005, for the fifth straight year.

In an effort to increase children’s access to summer meals, Sen. Richard Lugar (R-IN) sponsored and led the effort to pass legislation in 2000 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 originally included in the pilot were: Alaska, Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming. (Puerto Rico was also included in the pilot program, but data for Puerto Rico are not included in this report.)

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

Congress made the pilot permanent, allowed all sponsors—public and private non-profit—to participate (originally it was limited

Note: The tables in the back of the report have the 13 original Simplified Summer Food Program states shaded in gray and the six new states in bold face italics. The tables include sub-totals for pilot states and non-pilot states. The Simplified Summer Food Program is allowing its states to outperform the rest of the nation in program growth.

primarily to public sponsors), and added six additional states—Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Ohio, and Oregon—through the 2004 Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization. The summer of 2005 was the first year of the Simplified Summer Food Program for the six new states.

Through the FY 2006 Agriculture Appropriations bill, Congress added seven new states—Arizona, Maine, North Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin—which are beginning the program in the summer of 2006. Now, 26 states are included in the Simplified Summer Food Program.

How it works. The program eliminates traditional SFSP cost-based accounting that separates administrative and operating costs when calculating reimbursements to sponsors. 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 2005 most SFSP sponsors were allowed to receive a per lunch reimbursement of up to \$2.695, with \$2.48 to cover operating costs (such as food and labor) and \$0.215 for administrative costs. If a sponsor actually had \$2.55 in operating costs, but only \$0.10 in administrative costs, the sponsor could not receive any of the unused administrative reimbursement to cover its extra operating costs. So, even though the sponsor's total costs for providing the lunch were \$2.65 and the maximum reimbursement is \$2.695, the sponsor only received \$2.48 for operating costs and \$0.10 for administrative costs, a \$0.07 loss per lunch. Under the Simplified Summer Food Program, the same sponsor could have combined administrative and operating costs, and thus received the full reimbursement of \$2.695 per lunch served. The maximum reimbursement would cover the sponsor's costs and provide an additional \$0.045 cents per meal that could be reinvested into the program to improve the nutritional quality of the meals, to open more sites, or to conduct outreach to attract more children.

Results. The cumulative gains over the first five years in the 13 original Simplified Summer Food Program states are impressive. From July 2000 to July 2005, participation in summer nutrition (both programs combined) grew in the original Simplified Summer

Top Ten States Improving the Number of Children in Summer Nutrition, July 2004 to July 2005

Maryland	22.9%
Hawaii	20.6%
District of Columbia	17.6%
Nevada	
16.7%	
Iowa	12.9%
Oklahoma	12.2%
Minnesota	12.0%
Idaho	10.8%
North Carolina	10.2%
Wyoming	10.1%
Indiana	10.1%

Bottom Ten States in Change in Number of Children in Summer Nutrition, July 2004 to 2005

Michigan	-10.1%
Mississippi	-13.9%
Florida	-14.7%
Connecticut	-16.9%
New Hampshire	-17.5%
Louisiana	-19.0%
Utah	-19.6%
Alabama	-19.7%
North Dakota	-20.3%
Arizona	-25.9%

Food states by 41.3 percent, as participation in the rest of the country fell 11.9 percent.

From July 2004 to July 2005, the original 13 Simplified Summer Food Program states increased participation in summer nutrition programs by 4.3 percent with growth occurring in nine of the 13 states. These states improved SFSP participation alone by 7.9 percent. The states increased the number of sponsors by 8.1 percent and the number of sites by 15.0 percent.

The summer of 2005 was the first summer that Colorado, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Ohio, and Oregon were part of the Simplified Summer Food Program. Participation in the Summer Nutrition programs grew in three of the six new states, but significant declines in Louisiana, Michigan, and Mississippi led to a cumulative decrease of 6.7 percent. Much of this seems to be due to Louisiana's and Michigan's loss of a good deal of participation from the NSLP, 70.4 percent and 39.9 percent respectively. Such an NSLP decline usually is due to a decrease in the number of children participating in summer school. Mississippi cites less funding for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program as the primary cause of its 13.9 percent drop in the Summer Nutrition programs.

On the other hand, Summer Food Service Program participation in the six new states grew by 8.9 percent. And the number of sponsors and sites grew by 13.4 percent and 15.9 percent respectively.

Seamless Summer Food Option

The Seamless Summer Food Option is a USDA initiative that began as a waiver in 2002 and became law through the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004. It seeks to help school SFSP sponsors reach more hungry children in low-income areas when school is out, and provides more efficient meal services to those children.

How it works. This option reduces paperwork and administrative burdens that are normally associated with operating the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) during the school year and switching to the SFSP in summer. Under the waiver, schools offer summer meals as a continuation 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 is lower than that for SFSP. The advantage for schools is that they do not have to apply for and operate two different programs, which significantly decreases their administrative costs.

Participation in this program is rolled into the NSLP participation data, which makes it impossible to analyze the impact that this program, independent from traditional NSLP summer participation (meals served to children attending summer school), is having on Summer Nutrition participation.

Top Ten States in Ratio of Children in July Summer Nutrition to Children in Free or Reduced Price School-Year School Lunch, 2005

District of Columbia	76.8
Hawaii	53.5
New Mexico	34.2
California	32.4
Nevada	31.1
New York	28.9
Pennsylvania	26.7
Missouri	25.4
Delaware	24.9
New Jersey	24.8

Bottom Ten States in Ratio of Children in July Summer Nutrition to Children in Free or Reduced Price School-Year School Lunch, 2005

Louisiana	9.4
Iowa	8.7
Colorado	8.7
Texas	8.1
Nebraska	8.1
Arkansas	7.1
Kansas	6.8
Oklahoma	6.1
Alaska	6.0
Mississippi	5.9

State Participation Rates and Trends

While the national summer nutrition participation rate fell, overall, 19 states had a noticeable increase—3 percent or more—in the number of Summer Nutrition participants in July 2005 compared to July 2004. On the other hand, 19 had a decrease of at least 3 percent and 13 showed little change (Table 1). In the left margin on page 6 is a list of the top ten and bottom ten states in expanding participation in Summer Nutrition over the one-year period.

In order to make a comparison among states in how well they are reaching eligible children with summer meals, FRAC compares the number of participants receiving lunches in July Summer Nutrition programs to the number in free or reduced price school lunch during the regular school year. This ratio (summer nutrition participants per 100 regular school year participants) shows how well each state is reaching eligible students. The top ten and bottom ten states on this measure are listed on the left margin.

Overall, seven states increased their ratio by at least 1.0, 19 states declined and 25 states stayed approximately the same on this ratio when comparing July 2004 to 2005 (Table 1).

While Simplified Summer Food Program states did better than others generally, states not in this program can make significant progress as well. For example, Maryland increased participation in Summer Nutrition programs by 22.9 percent from July 2004 to July 2005, improving its ratio from 17.5 to 20.8, above the national average. Hawaii increased participation by 20.6 percent.

There remains great room for growth. Thirty-four states continue to reach fewer than one in five children who are eligible for free or reduced price lunches during the school year. Paradoxically, all of them are Simplified Summer Food Program states, but the Simplified Summer Food Program states were chosen because they ranked at the bottom in Summer Nutrition participation. Therefore, even though there has been significant growth, only one of these states has surpassed the national average.

Only two states are reaching at least two in five children (the District of Columbia's ratio is 76.8:100 and Hawaii's is 53.5:100).

Children Who Aren't Being Served

Since the National School Lunch Program reach is so broad during the regular school year, comparing participation in Summer Nutrition to participation in school year free and reduced price meals allows for an examination of how well a state is doing in reaching low-income families. The performance of the top states in the past few years demonstrates that reaching 40 children in Summer Nutrition per 100 children receiving free or reduced price lunches during the school year is a minimally reasonable goal, and shows that the 2005 national performance ratio (18 children in summer per 100 in the school year free or reduced price school lunch program) could be more than doubled.

Using this standard, Table 5 indicates how many children are not being fed in July by each state, and how much Summer Nutrition money each state “leaves on the table” just for July by not matching the average performance of the leading states. FRAC estimates that an additional 3.5 million children could have been reached each day in July 2005 had all states performed as well as the leading states. We also estimate that an additional \$188.8 million of federal funds could have been obtained by these states for summer child nutrition, had they run summer programs just for the 20 weekdays in July 2005 (not counting the July 4th holiday) for these unserved children. (This is a conservative estimate, as we apply the \$2.695 per meal reimbursement, which includes a lower administrative reimbursement for vended and urban sites.)

The states missing out on the most federal money for summer child nutrition are Texas (\$32.3 million), Florida (\$13.2 million), Georgia (\$8.7 million), California (\$8.0 million), Illinois (\$7.6 million), and North Carolina (\$7.5 million). Together, these six states are turning down \$77.3 million in federal dollars that could feed children in the summertime, two-fifths of the \$188.8 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 vacation.

SFSP Participation Throughout Summer

Children need access to nutritious meals throughout the summer, from the first day to the last. Unfortunately, many summer food sponsors do not operate for the entire summer, and participation in the SFSP tends to peak in one month during the summer, with far lower participation during the other summer months.

Most states peak in July, which is why the data in this report focus on July. The report also focuses on the month of July because estimating Summer Nutrition participation in June and August is more difficult than estimating July participation—in many states school lets out at different times in June and begins at different times in August. It becomes difficult to know how many of the NSLP meals were part of the regular school-year NSLP and how many were part of summer feeding. And it is hard to determine how many days in June and August are vacation days on which children do not have access to school-year NSLP meals and therefore may be in need of summer feeding.

Even though most states do serve more children in July, 22 states served more meals through the SFSP in June 2005 than in July. These states tend to begin summer vacation earlier than those states that peak in July. There are no states that peak in August.

Table 4 shows the number of SFSP lunches that were served in June, July, and August in 2004 and 2005. This table demonstrates the dramatic drop-off in many states after their peak month – whether it is June or July – indicating the extent to which many programs do not operate for the full summer. The shorter the program, the longer children are in danger of not receiving nutritious meals every day before school resumes in the fall.

In 2005, the hard work of the United States Department of Agriculture, state agencies, and anti-hunger and other child advocates to increase the length of the Summer Nutrition programs resulted in a seven percent growth in participation during the month of August. Most of this expansion occurred in Simplified Summer Food Program states, with those states originally included

growing by 14 percent, the six new states increasing by 61 percent, and all other states growing by four percent.

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. Given these important roles of summer food, it is simply unacceptable that participation has declined for seven straight years. Compared to the 15.8 million children who received free and reduced price lunches during the school year, the Summer Nutrition programs served only 2.8 million children in July 2005, not even one in five.

Participation in the nutrition programs did expand by 3 percent or more in 19 states in 2005, and the Simplified Summer Food Program (Lugar Pilot) states especially have been showing remarkable improvement over the last five summers. But still far too few children have access to the Summer Nutrition programs. And the national trend is going in the wrong direction. National participation in the Summer Nutrition programs dropped 2.7 percent from July 2004 to July 2005.

Aggressive action is needed to turn around this situation.

One important first step is dramatically expanding the Simplified Summer Food Program. The 13 states originally included in the program increased participation 4.3 percent in 2005. Over the last five summers, participation in the original Simplified Summer Food Program states jumped 41.3 percent, while participation in the other states fell 11.9 percent.

Beyond expanding the Simplified Summer Food Program, numerous other steps are possible. 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—and everyone has a role to play.

- The United States Department of Agriculture, which has prioritized expanding summer food and has had success in a number of target states, must continue and ratchet up its efforts.
- State agencies must make program expansion a top priority and aggressively recruit new sponsors and sites.
- Schools, local governments, and private non-profit organizations, understanding that the Summer Nutrition programs are critical for their children's health and well-being, must take on the responsibility of operating the Summer Nutrition programs for the children in their community.
- Parents must weigh in with public officials on the need for the Summer Nutrition programs and get involved as well in their school district's implementation of its wellness policy. (See FRAC's Web Pages and Publications for additional information on School Wellness Policies.)
- Children, of course, need to come to the sites, eat the nutritious meals they offer, play, learn, be safe, and have fun.

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.

Technical Notes

National School Lunch Program data. USDA provided FRAC Excel spreadsheets containing the official monthly average daily lunch attendance (including free, reduced price, and paid lunch attendance combined) in the National School Lunch Program by state from September 1999 through May 2005 and for July of each year (2000 through 2005). USDA provided separate spreadsheets for numbers of free and reduced price lunches served, by state.

We followed USDA methodology in order to calculate the school-year NSLP average daily lunch attendance for each state. First, we averaged over the school year (from September through May) each state's reported average daily lunch attendance per month. Then, we calculated the number of days in each state's school year by dividing the total number of free, reduced price and paid lunches served in the state during the school year by this average reported daily lunch attendance. Next, we divided the total number of free lunches served by the total estimated number of days in the school year to produce each state's average daily free lunch attendance for the year as a whole, and repeated the process for reduced price lunches.

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

Note that USDA calculates average daily *participation* in the NSLP by dividing the average daily lunch attendance by a factor of 0.927. This is to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. FRAC's *School Breakfast Scorecard* reports the NSLP average daily *participation* numbers – that is, including the 0.927 factor. To make the NSLP numbers consistent with the summer food numbers, for which there is no analogous absenteeism factor, the 2006 *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation* report did not include the absenteeism factor. As a result, the NSLP numbers in this report do not match the NSLP numbers in the *2005 School Breakfast Scorecard*.

Summer Food Service Program. USDA provided FRAC with the number of SFSP lunches served in each state. FRAC calculated each state's July average daily lunch attendance in the SFSP by dividing the

total number of SFSP lunches served by the total number of weekdays (excluding the Independence Day holiday) in July. The average daily lunch attendance numbers reported in this report are slightly different from the average daily participation numbers reported by USDA and in past FRAC summer food reports prior to 2005. FRAC is using the revised measure to allow consistent comparisons from state to state and year to year. The new measure is also more in line with the average daily lunch attendance numbers in the school-year NSLP, as described above. The numbers of lunches served by state are from USDA.

Note that USDA does not report the number of sponsors or sites for June or August—it only reports 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 data on sponsors, sites, and total number of lunches for June, July, and August that we obtained from USDA.

Where changes were made to USDA data by a state agency, that is noted on the table with an asterisk. Table 4, which is the total number of lunches for June, July, and August, however, does not note any changes made by state agencies that were 1 percent or less. This is due to frequent but extremely small differences between the state and USDA's data for total number of lunches.

Web Resources for Expanding Summer Nutrition Programs

FRAC Web Pages and Publications

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

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

FRAC's website on the Summer Food Service Program:

http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/sfsp.html

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

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

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

http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/summerexpansion.pdf

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

http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/statelegcando.html

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

http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/SFSPSchoolAdmin.pdf

Summer Food Geo-Mapping:

http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/sfspGeoMappingIntro.htm

School Wellness Policy and Practice: Meeting the Needs of Low-Income Students

http://www.frac.org/pdf/wellness_guide2006.pdf

Parent Outreach Brochure on School Wellness Policies

http://www.frac.org/pdf/parent_outreach.pdf

Resources for the Simplified Summer Food Program (“Lugar Pilots”)

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

http://www.frac.org/html/news/sfsp_pilots.html

Brochure on the Simplified Summer Food Program:

http://www.frac.org/html/building_blocks/Lugar_Pilots.pdf

Outreach materials for anti-hunger organizations and state agencies:

http://www.frac.org/Out_Of_School_Time/Summer/Simplified_SFSP_Outreach.html

USDA memoranda and Questions and Answers on the Simplified Summer Food Program:

http://www.summerfood.usda.gov/states/Simplified_Summer.html

Resources on the Seamless Summer Food Option

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

http://www.frac.org/html/federal_food_programs/programs/seamlesswaiver.html

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

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

Other USDA Web Resources

USDA's SFSP Website:

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

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

http://www.summerfood.usda.gov/Administration/meal_patterns.html

SFSP Model Programs booklet:

http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Summer/States/model_programs.html

Contact information for the State agencies administering the SFSP:

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

2006 Summer Food Service Week Proclamation:

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

TABLE 1: Summer Nutrition Attendance in July 2004 and July 2005 (Lunches in Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Combined) by State

State	July 2004 Summer Nutrition				July 2005 Summer Nutrition				Percent Change in Summer Nutrition 2004-2005
	Children in 03-04 School-Year NSLP*	Children in Summer Nutrition (NSLP** & SFSP Combined), July 2004	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 03-04 School-Year NSLP*	Rank	Children in 04-05 School-Year NSLP*	Children in Summer Nutrition, July 2005	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 04-05 School-Year NSLP*	Rank	
Alabama	315,742	48,368	15.3	30	321,058	38,855	12.1	37	-19.7%
Alaska	28,606	1,836	6.4	49	30,134	1,818	6.0	50	-1.0%
Arizona	338,606	62,314	18.4	20	361,416	46,186	12.8	35	-25.9%
Arkansas	187,693	14,663	7.8	46	198,668	14,033	7.1	47	-4.3%
California	1,943,168	665,566	34.3	4	1,972,325	639,909	32.4	4	-3.9%
Colorado	159,545	13,110	8.2	44	159,761	13,917	8.7	44	6.2%
Connecticut	123,437	33,381	27.0	9	127,728	27,751	21.7	14	-16.9%
Delaware	33,684	8,857	26.3	10	35,541	8,848	24.9	9	-0.1%
District of Columbia	35,472	23,450	66.1	1	35,892	27,575	76.8	1	17.6%
Florida	912,320	164,486	18.0	24	961,297	140,293	14.6	29	-14.7%
Georgia	614,669	106,242	17.3	26	644,843	96,003	14.9	27	-9.6%
Hawaii	56,423	24,162	42.8	2	54,488	29,131	53.5	2	20.6%
Idaho	75,208	13,597	18.1	23	77,759	15,066	19.4	19	10.8%
Illinois	626,177	123,755	19.8	17	644,524	116,879	18.1	21	-5.6%
Indiana	270,241	34,529	12.8	37	286,904	38,007	13.2	33	10.1%
Iowa	123,287	9,678	7.8	45	125,195	10,928	8.7	43	12.9%
Kansas	136,467	8,733	6.4	50	141,186	9,566	6.8	48	9.5%
Kentucky	269,645	42,458	15.7	29	276,968	43,496	15.7	24	2.4%
Louisiana	381,031	44,217	11.6	40	382,598	35,796	9.4	42	-19.0%
Maine	45,984	7,289	15.9	28	46,683	7,147	15.3	25	-1.9%
Maryland	200,386	35,143	17.5	25	207,862	43,193	20.8	17	22.9%
Massachusetts	209,758	46,327	22.1	16	214,327	46,488	21.7	15	0.3%
Michigan	417,474	55,390	13.3	35	431,050	49,781	11.5	39	-10.1%
Minnesota	189,386	24,921	13.2	36	196,984	27,923	14.2	31	12.0%
Mississippi	273,552	19,073	7.0	48	277,103	16,418	5.9	51	-13.9%
Missouri	285,943	71,473	25.0	12	297,879	75,611	25.4	8	5.8%
Montana	35,998	6,536	18.2	22	36,197	6,417	17.7	22	-1.8%
Nebraska	84,750	6,593	7.8	47	87,685	7,111	8.1	46	7.9%
Nevada	86,207	26,853	31.1	5	100,723	31,349	31.1	5	16.7%
New Hampshire	29,483	4,951	16.8	27	28,500	4,087	14.3	30	-17.5%
New Jersey	293,196	67,529	23.0	15	298,362	73,941	24.8	10	9.5%
New Mexico	145,239	53,482	36.8	3	147,959	50,560	34.2	3	-5.5%
New York	1,056,340	306,120	29.0	7	1,055,372	304,971	28.9	6	-0.4%
North Carolina	479,495	56,847	11.9	39	503,094	62,631	12.4	36	10.2%
North Dakota	24,810	3,105	12.5	38	25,204	2,475	9.8	41	-20.3%
Ohio	461,976	51,261	11.1	41	476,080	52,093	10.9	40	1.6%
Oklahoma	231,667	13,064	5.6	51	240,634	14,664	6.1	49	12.2%
Oregon	160,353	30,841	19.2	18	166,405	31,591	19.0	20	2.4%
Pennsylvania	451,200	130,507	28.9	8	474,004	126,460	26.7	7	-3.1%
Rhode Island	46,327	11,348	24.5	13	44,913	10,884	24.2	12	-4.1%
South Carolina	280,624	65,630	23.4	14	288,849	61,713	21.4	16	-6.0%
South Dakota	39,893	7,309	18.3	21	39,880	7,897	19.8	18	8.0%
Tennessee	343,444	47,401	13.8	34	356,637	46,358	13.0	34	-2.2%
Texas	1,782,073	147,939	8.3	43	1,879,963	152,638	8.1	45	3.2%
Utah	119,604	36,733	30.7	6	123,937	29,536	23.8	13	-19.6%
Vermont	20,825	5,227	25.1	11	21,160	5,169	24.4	11	-1.1%
Virginia	286,227	54,274	19.0	19	302,294	53,508	17.7	23	-1.4%
Washington	263,041	39,827	15.1	31	269,795	37,639	14.0	32	-5.5%
West Virginia	105,919	16,033	15.1	32	107,095	16,140	15.1	26	0.7%
Wisconsin	200,282	28,780	14.4	33	208,918	30,725	14.7	28	6.8%
Wyoming	20,449	2,246	11.0	42	21,256	2,474	11.6	38	10.1%
United States	15,303,324	2,923,456	19.1		15,815,093	2,843,649	18.0		-2.7%
Original Simplified States	3,264,379	303,393	9.3		3,420,056	316,362	9.3		4.3%
New Simplified States	1,853,931	213,893	11.5		1,892,998	199,596	10.5		-6.7%
Other States	10,185,014	2,406,170	23.6		10,502,039	2,327,691	22.2		-3.3%

* School-Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance in school-years 2003-2004 and 2004-2005.

** National School Lunch Program July numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance and include participation in the Seamless Summer Option.

Shaded states are the 13 states originally in the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2001.

Bolded italicized states were added to the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2005.

TABLE 2: Change in Summer Food Service Program Lunch Attendance from July 2004 to July 2005, by State

<i>State</i>	<i>Children in Summer Food Service Program, July 2004</i>	<i>Children in Summer Food Service Program, July 2005</i>	<i>SFSP Percent Change from 2004 to 2005</i>	<i>Ratio of Children in July 2005 SFSP per 100 in 2004-2005 School-Year NSLP*</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Alabama	31,244	29,751	-4.8%	9.3	27
Alaska	1,062	1,184	11.5%	3.9	49
Arizona	4,017	3,303	-17.8%	0.9	51
Arkansas	9,755	9,939	1.9%	5.0	46
California	116,027	104,373	-10.0%	5.3	44
Colorado	4,805	7,355	53.1%	4.6	48
Connecticut	9,700	8,216	-15.3%	6.4	37
Delaware	7,792	7,612	-2.3%	21.4	4
District of Columbia	21,906	25,850	18.0%	72.0	1
Florida	117,792	96,895	-17.7%	10.1	26
Georgia	64,427	58,344	-9.4%	9.0	29
Hawaii	5,285	4,598	-13.0%	8.4	32
Idaho	12,615	13,707	8.7%	17.6	9
Illinois	69,258	65,519	-5.4%	10.2	25
Indiana	26,077	31,116	19.3%	10.8	22
Iowa	6,235	7,242	16.2%	5.8	39
Kansas	7,258	8,151	12.3%	5.8	40
Kentucky	38,258	39,550	3.4%	14.3	15
Louisiana	34,071	32,790	-3.8%	8.6	31
Maine	6,676	6,593	-1.2%	14.1	16
Maryland	31,007	39,039	25.9%	18.8	6
Massachusetts	39,924	39,520	-1.0%	18.4	8
Michigan	36,219	38,267	5.7%	8.9	30
Minnesota	21,417	23,037	7.6%	11.7	20
Mississippi	18,115	14,812	-18.2%	5.3	43
Missouri	33,935	32,205	-5.1%	10.8	23
Montana	5,998	5,830	-2.8%	16.1	11
Nebraska	4,635	5,025	8.4%	5.7	41
Nevada	3,618	3,564	-1.5%	3.5	50
New Hampshire	4,020	3,273	-18.6%	11.5	21
New Jersey	55,212	55,072	-0.3%	18.5	7
New Mexico	36,433	34,467	-5.4%	23.3	3
New York	250,656	252,551	0.8%	23.9	2
North Carolina	29,565	32,038	8.4%	6.4	38
North Dakota	2,722	2,078	-23.6%	8.2	33
Ohio	43,127	44,081	2.2%	9.3	28
Oklahoma	10,805	12,045	11.5%	5.0	45
Oregon	11,582	23,787	105.4%	14.3	14
Pennsylvania	79,864	75,582	-5.4%	15.9	12
Rhode Island	9,170	9,451	3.1%	21.0	5
South Carolina	49,592	39,621	-20.1%	13.7	17
South Dakota	3,305	3,229	-2.3%	8.1	35
Tennessee	37,619	19,808	-47.3%	5.6	42
Texas	83,627	90,004	7.6%	4.8	47
Utah	11,932	13,150	10.2%	10.6	24
Vermont	3,689	3,689	0.0%	17.4	10
Virginia	44,007	45,032	2.3%	14.9	13
Washington	21,653	21,068	-2.7%	7.8	36
West Virginia	12,845	13,510	5.2%	12.6	19
Wisconsin	25,088	26,912	7.3%	12.9	18
Wyoming	1,585	1,730	9.2%	8.1	34
United States	1,617,228	1,585,568	-2.0%	10.0	
Original Simplified States	208,652	225,046	7.9%	6.6	
New Simplified States	147,920	161,093	8.9%	8.5	
Other States	1,260,656	1,199,429	-4.9%	9.7	

* School-Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance in school-year 2004-2005.

Shaded states are the 13 states originally in the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2001.

Bolded italicized states were added to the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2005.

TABLE 2A: Change in National School Lunch Program Lunch Attendance from July 2004 to July 2005, by State

<i>State</i>	<i>Children in National School Lunch Program, July 2004*</i>	<i>Children in National School Lunch Program, July 2005*</i>	<i>NSLP Percent Change from 2004 to 2005*</i>	<i>July School Lunch Participation Rate Among Low-Income Children in 2004-2005 School-Year NSLP**</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Alabama	17,124	9,104	-46.8%	2.8	31
Alaska	774	633	-18.2%	2.1	38
Arizona	58,297	42,883	-26.4%	11.9	7
Arkansas	4,908	4,094	-16.6%	2.1	39
California	549,538	535,536	-2.5%	27.2	3
Colorado	8,305	6,562	-21.0%	4.1	23
Connecticut	23,682	19,535	-17.5%	15.3	4
Delaware	1,065	1,236	16.0%	3.5	25
District of Columbia	1,544	1,724	11.7%	4.8	20
Florida	46,694	43,398	-7.1%	4.5	22
Georgia	41,815	37,660	-9.9%	5.8	18
Hawaii	18,877	24,532	30.0%	45.0	1
Idaho	983	1,358	38.2%	1.7	42
Illinois	54,498	51,360	-5.8%	8.0	11
Indiana	8,452	6,890	-18.5%	2.4	36
Iowa	3,443	3,686	7.0%	2.9	29
Kansas	1,475	1,415	-4.1%	1.0	49
Kentucky	4,200	3,946	-6.1%	1.4	46
Louisiana	10,145	3,006	-70.4%	0.8	50
Maine	613	554	-9.6%	1.2	47
Maryland	4,136	4,154	0.4%	2.0	40
Massachusetts	6,403	6,968	8.8%	3.3	27
Michigan	19,171	11,514	-39.9%	2.7	33
Minnesota	3,504	4,885	39.4%	2.5	34
Mississippi	958	1,606	67.7%	0.6	51
Missouri	37,538	43,406	15.6%	14.6	5
Montana	537	587	9.2%	1.6	44
Nebraska	1,959	2,086	6.5%	2.4	37
Nevada	23,234	27,784	19.6%	27.6	2
New Hampshire	931	813	-12.6%	2.9	30
New Jersey	12,316	18,869	53.2%	6.3	15
New Mexico	17,048	16,093	-5.6%	10.9	9
New York	55,463	52,420	-5.5%	5.0	19
North Carolina	27,282	30,593	12.1%	6.1	17
North Dakota	383	397	3.6%	1.6	45
Ohio	8,134	8,012	-1.5%	1.7	43
Oklahoma	2,259	2,619	15.9%	1.1	48
Oregon	19,259	7,803	-59.5%	4.7	21
Pennsylvania	50,643	50,878	0.5%	10.7	10
Rhode Island	2,179	1,433	-34.2%	3.2	28
South Carolina	16,038	22,092	37.7%	7.6	12
South Dakota	4,004	4,668	16.6%	11.7	8
Tennessee	9,782	26,550	171.4%	7.4	13
Texas	64,312	62,634	-2.6%	3.3	26
Utah	24,801	16,386	-33.9%	13.2	6
Vermont	1,538	1,480	-3.7%	7.0	14
Virginia	10,267	8,476	-17.4%	2.8	32
Washington	18,174	16,571	-8.8%	6.1	16
West Virginia	3,187	2,630	-17.5%	2.5	35
Wisconsin	3,693	3,814	3.3%	1.8	41
Wyoming	661	743	12.4%	3.5	24
United States	1,306,228	1,258,080	-3.7%	8.0	
Original Simplified States	94,741	91,316	-3.6%	2.7	
New Simplified States	65,973	38,503	-41.6%	2.0	
Other States	1,145,514	1,128,261	-1.5%	9.1	

* National School Lunch Program July numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance and include participation in the Seamless Summer Option.

** School-Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance in school-year 2004-2005.

Shaded states are the 13 states originally in the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2001.

Bolded italicized states were added to the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2005.

TABLE 3: Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors and Sites from July 2004 to July 2005, by State

State	Number of Sponsors, July 2004	Number of Sponsors, July 2005	Percent Change	Number of Sites, July 2004	Number of Sites, July 2005	Percent Change
Alabama	61	54	-11.5%	635	654	3.0%
Alaska	15 *	16	6.7%	35 *	49	40.0%
Arizona	18	18	0.0%	127	93	-26.8%
Arkansas	71	73	2.8%	157	147	-6.4%
California	170	186 *	9.4%	1,363	1,456 *	6.8%
Colorado	29	45	55.2%	84	139	65.5%
Connecticut	27	21	-22.2%	137	124	-9.5%
Delaware	20	18	-10.0%	263	222	-15.6%
District of Columbia	27	25	-7.4%	296	301	1.7%
Florida	106	95	-10.4%	2,327	2,123	-8.8%
Georgia	123	106	-13.8%	1,612	1,400	-13.2%
Hawaii	19 *	17	-10.5%	100	101	1.0%
Idaho	64 *	70	9.4%	163 *	180	10.4%
Illinois	106	114	7.5%	1,219	1,266	3.9%
Indiana	92	109	18.5%	539	648	20.2%
Iowa	42	55	31.0%	141	171	21.3%
Kansas	44	47	6.8%	144	183 *	27.1%
Kentucky	136	147	8.1%	1,477	1,747	18.3%
Louisiana	81 *	70	-13.6%	565 *	640	13.3%
Maine	57 *	57 *	0.0%	115	108	-6.1%
Maryland	44	39	-11.4%	764	872	14.1%
Massachusetts	86	86	0.0%	671	719	7.2%
Michigan	106	105	-0.9%	718	748	4.2%
Minnesota	40	34	-15.0%	320	327	2.2%
Mississippi	67	67	0.0%	258	287	11.2%
Missouri	81 *	98 *	21.0%	458 *	545 *	19.0%
Montana	59	50 *	-15.3%	153	147 *	-3.9%
Nebraska	29	34	17.2%	83	90	8.4%
Nevada	21	27	28.6%	60	72	20.0%
New Hampshire	28	28	0.0%	66	98	48.5%
New Jersey	93 *	96	3.2%	1,106 *	1,063	-3.9%
New Mexico	53	48 *	-9.4%	651	610 *	-6.3%
New York	286	291	1.7%	2,437 *	2,472 *	1.4%
North Carolina	100	82	-18.0%	812	757	-6.8%
North Dakota	28	29	3.6%	33	32	-3.0%
Ohio	117	135	15.4%	1,032	1,107	7.3%
Oklahoma	49	51	4.1%	209	236	12.9%
Oregon	34	70 *	105.9%	177	365 *	106.2%
Pennsylvania	202 *	222 *	9.9%	1,938 *	2,218 *	14.4%
Rhode Island	14	12	-14.3%	166	159	-4.2%
South Carolina	55	53	-3.6%	1,178	966	-18.0%
South Dakota	22	22	0.0%	52	43	-17.3%
Tennessee	51	51	0.0%	1,022	627	-38.6%
Texas	169	170	0.6%	1,415	1,555	9.9%
Utah	15	15	0.0%	86	116	34.9%
Vermont	39	34 *	-12.8%	95	94 *	-1.1%
Virginia	112	114	1.8%	951	1,032	8.5%
Washington	69	63	-8.7%	430	407	-5.3%
West Virginia	89	91	2.2%	368	398	8.2%
Wisconsin	91	86	-5.5%	385	367	-4.7%
Wyoming	10	11	10.0%	29	28	-3.4%
United States	3,567	3,657	2.5%	29,622	30,309	2.3%
Original Simplified States	777	840	8.1%	4,491	5,164	15.0%
New Simplified States	434	492	13.4%	2,834	3,286	15.9%
Other States	2,356	2,325	-1.3%	22,297	21,859	-2.0%

* State made revisions to USDA data. See technical notes at the back of report.

Shaded states are the 13 states originally in the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2001.

Bolded italicized states were added to the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2005.

TABLE 4: Number of Summer Food Service Program Lunches* Served in June, July, and August 2004 and 2005, by State

State	June 2004 SFSP Lunches	June 2005 SFSP Lunches	% Change	July 2004 SFSP Lunches	July 2005 SFSP Lunches	% Change	August 2004 SFSP Lunches	August 2005 SFSP Lunches	% Change
Alabama	848,946	878,844	4%	656,130	595,013	-9%	15,975	15,743	-1%
Alaska	17,790	17,509	-2%	22,296	23,684	6%	6,434	9,117	42%
Arizona	243,755	249,662	2%	84,365	66,059	-22%	214	3,664	1612%
Arkansas	289,645	300,917	4%	204,858	198,775	-3%	18,433	17,823	-3%
California	817,787	614,970	-25%	2,436,976	2,087,466	-14%	855,760	800,396	-6%
Colorado	140,638	216,093	54%	100,910	147,098	46%	918	7,997	771%
Connecticut	N/A	N/A	N/A	203,695	164,320	-19%	47,820	46,467 **	-3%
Delaware	77,077	70,760	-8%	163,631	152,236	-7%	84,607	89,250	5%
District of Columbia	406	792	95%	460,025	517,007	12%	203,393	181,697	-11%
Florida	2,065,942	2,349,116	14%	2,473,639	1,937,900	-22%	8,342	1,697	-80%
Georgia	1,706,979	1,701,452	0%	1,352,973	1,166,875	-14%	69,182	94,765	37%
Hawaii	94,655	100,011	6%	110,784	91,964	-17%	4,620	3,177	-31%
Idaho	305,149	296,368	-3%	264,907	274,148	3%	118,774	136,025	15%
Illinois	493,915	587,862	19%	1,454,410	1,310,370	-10%	718,880	632,829	-12%
Indiana	381,340	431,095	13%	547,625	622,321	14%	131,982	128,730	-2%
Iowa	138,212	132,452	-4%	130,928	144,849	11%	17,412	27,604	59%
Kansas	236,566	253,743	7%	152,408	163,020	7%	21,825	19,111	-12%
Kentucky	951,126	1,050,475	10%	803,416	791,005	-2%	72,974	63,031	-14%
Louisiana	1,269,926	1,390,060	9%	715,499	655,807	-8%	20,780	87,230	320%
Maine	18,971	9,687	-49%	140,189	131,864	-6%	35,956 **	40,780	13%
Maryland	81,463	111,334	37%	651,145	780,786	20%	185,884	169,331	-9%
Massachusetts	26,529	9,995	-62%	838,407	790,400	-6%	426,666	477,237	12%
Michigan	263,335	177,138	-33%	760,598	765,348	1%	163,957	204,523	25%
Minnesota	281,222	226,545	-19%	449,762	460,747	2%	61,915	70,033	13%
Mississippi	948,722	923,249	-3%	380,416	296,236	-22%	12,167	12,631	4%
Missouri	912,280	1,021,911	12%	712,634	644,103	-10%	92,845	320,414	245%
Montana	73,612	95,960 **	30%	125,964	116,607 **	-7%	29,382	26,318	-10%
Nebraska	130,371	137,696	6%	97,326	100,491	3%	15,061	19,985	33%
Nevada	56,444	47,178	-16%	75,985	71,286	-6%	47,161	47,013	0%
New Hampshire	5,993	13,717	129%	84,429	65,468	-22%	45,328	31,412	-31%
New Jersey	17,163 **	8,234	-52%	1,159,458 **	1,101,448	-5%	577,101 **	518,738	-10%
New Mexico	857,588	853,426 **	0%	765,102	689,337	-10%	73,799	11,920	-84%
New York	270,527	118,034	-56%	5,263,784	5,051,022	-4%	3,451,343	3,569,058	3%
North Carolina	678,385	585,029	-14%	620,874	640,755	3%	35,921	173,695	384%
North Dakota	55,063	56,716	3%	57,160	41,567	-27%	13,219	15,160	15%
Ohio	578,891	619,952	7%	905,675	881,627	-3%	191,234	262,466	37%
Oklahoma	398,381	422,291	6%	226,896	240,894	6%	26,932	7,948	-70%
Oregon	69,905	96,613 **	38%	243,225	475,741 **	96%	96,507	205,208 **	113%
Pennsylvania	562,406	562,747	0%	1,677,147	1,511,631	-10%	804,679	767,907	-5%
Rhode Island	N/A	N/A	N/A	192,561	189,027	-2%	103,269	108,469	5%
South Carolina	1,430,642	1,013,846	-29%	1,041,434	792,412	-24%	24,096	59,953	149%
South Dakota	84,252	87,537	4%	69,403	64,580	-7%	35,246	35,731	1%
Tennessee	1,068,787	551,737	-48%	790,008	396,165	-50%	39,166	31,879	-19%
Texas	5,383,408	5,865,097	9%	1,756,169	1,800,083	3%	47,582	131,120	176%
Utah	230,184	287,096	25%	250,573	263,003	5%	101,031	108,018	7%
Vermont	4,949	1,869	-62%	77,471	73,781	-5%	6,675	9,135	37%
Virginia	171,272	159,722	-7%	924,148	900,640	-3%	309,800	373,786	21%
Washington	108,425	99,481	-8%	454,712	421,367	-7%	174,887	203,218	16%
West Virginia	96,624	96,676	0%	269,750	270,190	0%	57,075	64,047	12%
Wisconsin	186,025	183,292	-1%	526,841	538,232	2%	184,910 **	158,375	-14%
Wyoming	29,315	29,523	1%	33,280	34,609	4%	10,594	14,391	36%
United States	25,160,988	25,115,509	0%	33,962,001	31,711,364	-7%	9,899,713	10,616,252	7%
Original Simplified States	8,322,359	9,007,599	8%	4,381,698	4,500,914	3%	546,550	621,457	14%
New Simplified States	3,271,417	3,423,105	5%	3,106,323	3,221,857	4%	485,563	780,055	61%
Other States	13,567,212	12,684,805	-7%	26,473,980	23,988,593	-9%	8,867,600	9,214,740	4%

* 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.

** State made revisions to USDA data. See technical notes at the back of report.

Shaded states are the 13 states originally in the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2001.

Bolded italicized states were added to the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2005.

TABLE 5: Estimated Number of Children Participating and Additional Federal Payments in July 2005 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 2005</i>	<i>Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 04-05 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 Federal Reimbursement if State Reached in July a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP***</i>
Alabama	38,855	12.1	128,423	89,568	\$4,827,731
Alaska	1,818	6.0	12,054	10,236	\$551,719
Arizona	46,186	12.8	144,566	98,380	\$5,302,701
Arkansas	14,033	7.1	79,467	65,434	\$3,526,894
California	639,909	32.4	788,930	149,021	\$8,032,213
Colorado	13,917	8.7	63,905	49,988	\$2,694,346
Connecticut	27,751	21.7	51,091	23,340	\$1,258,021
Delaware	8,848	24.9	14,217	5,368	\$289,361
Florida	140,293	14.6	384,519	244,226	\$13,163,788
Georgia	96,003	14.9	257,937	161,934	\$8,728,217
Idaho	15,066	19.4	31,104	16,038	\$864,453
Illinois	116,879	18.1	257,810	140,931	\$7,596,193
Indiana	38,007	13.2	114,762	76,755	\$4,137,107
Iowa	10,928	8.7	50,078	39,150	\$2,110,181
Kansas	9,566	6.8	56,474	46,908	\$2,528,363
Kentucky	43,496	15.7	110,787	67,291	\$3,626,981
Louisiana	35,796	9.4	153,039	117,243	\$6,319,401
Maine	7,147	15.3	18,673	11,526	\$621,259
Maryland	43,193	20.8	83,145	39,952	\$2,153,402
Massachusetts	46,488	21.7	85,731	39,243	\$2,115,176
Michigan	49,781	11.5	172,420	122,639	\$6,610,222
Minnesota	27,923	14.2	78,794	50,871	\$2,741,936
Mississippi	16,418	5.9	110,841	94,423	\$5,089,413
Missouri	75,611	25.4	119,152	43,541	\$2,346,839
Montana	6,417	17.7	14,479	8,061	\$434,503
Nebraska	7,111	8.1	35,074	27,963	\$1,507,217
Nevada	31,349	31.1	40,289	8,940	\$481,891
New Hampshire	4,087	14.3	11,400	7,313	\$394,182
New Jersey	73,941	24.8	119,345	45,404	\$2,447,253
New Mexico	50,560	34.2	59,184	8,624	\$464,812
New York	304,971	28.9	422,149	117,178	\$6,315,874
North Carolina	62,631	12.4	201,238	138,606	\$7,470,887
North Dakota	2,475	9.8	10,082	7,606	\$409,978
Ohio	52,093	10.9	190,432	138,339	\$7,456,461
Oklahoma	14,664	6.1	96,253	81,590	\$4,397,687
Oregon	31,591	19.0	66,562	34,972	\$1,884,964
Pennsylvania	126,460	26.7	189,602	63,142	\$3,403,353
Rhode Island	10,884	24.2	17,965	7,081	\$381,661
South Carolina	61,713	21.4	115,540	53,827	\$2,901,275
South Dakota	7,897	19.8	15,952	8,055	\$434,178
Tennessee	46,358	13.0	142,655	96,296	\$5,190,373
Texas	152,638	8.1	751,985	599,347	\$32,304,827
Utah	29,536	23.8	49,575	20,039	\$1,080,091
Vermont	5,169	24.4	8,464	3,295	\$177,580
Virginia	53,508	17.7	120,918	67,410	\$3,633,411
Washington	37,639	14.0	107,918	70,279	\$3,788,030
West Virginia	16,140	15.1	42,838	26,698	\$1,439,036
Wisconsin	30,725	14.7	83,567	52,842	\$2,848,177
Wyoming	2,474	11.6	8,502	6,028	\$324,931
United States	2,786,943	17.7	6,289,885	3,502,942	\$188,808,550

* National School Lunch Program July numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance and include participation in the Seamless Summer Option.

** School-Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance in school-year 2004-2005.

*** This estimate is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed each day for one lunch only per child and at the lowest rate for a SFSP lunch (\$2.695 per lunch). Further, we assume that all participants are served for the full 20 weekdays in July 2005 (not counting the July 4th holiday). Note that the United States totals do not match the numbers in Table 1 as the states over 40 per 100 (Hawaii and the District of Columbia) are not in this table.

Shaded states are the 13 states originally in the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2001.

Bolded italicized states were added to the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2005.

Table 6: Five-Year Trends in Summer Nutrition Participation

State/Territory	July 2000 Summer Nutrition			July 2004 Summer Nutrition			July 2005 Summer Nutrition			Percentage Change in Summer Nutrition	
	July 2000 Summer Nutrition	Children in 1999-00 School-Year NSLP*	Ratio	July 2004 Summer Nutrition	Children in 2003-04 School-Year NSLP*	Ratio	July 2005 Summer Nutrition	Children in 2004-05 School-Year NSLP*	Ratio	From July 2000 to July 2005	From July 2004 to July 2005
Alabama	46,768	293,572	15.9	48,368	315,742	15.3	38,855	321,058	12.1	-16.9%	-19.7%
Alaska	1,427	26,695	5.3	1,836	28,606	6.4	1,818	30,134	6.0	27.4%	-1.0%
Arizona	34,643	271,299	12.8	62,314	338,606	18.4	46,186	361,416	12.8	33.3%	-25.9%
Arkansas	12,781	171,226	7.5	14,663	187,693	7.8	14,033	198,668	7.1	9.8%	-4.3%
California	764,027	1,849,555	41.3	665,566	1,943,168	34.3	639,909	1,972,325	32.4	-16.2%	-3.9%
Colorado	18,631	139,325	13.4	13,110	159,545	8.2	13,917	159,761	8.7	-25.3%	6.2%
Connecticut	38,791	112,383	34.5	33,381	123,437	27.0	27,751	127,728	21.7	-28.5%	-16.9%
Delaware	10,411	30,253	34.4	8,857	33,684	26.3	8,848	35,541	24.9	-15.0%	-0.1%
District of Columbia	26,837	39,778	67.5	23,450	35,472	66.1	27,575	35,892	76.8	2.7%	17.6%
Florida	225,951	815,572	27.7	164,486	912,320	18.0	140,293	961,297	14.6	-37.9%	-14.7%
Georgia	93,356	522,067	17.9	106,242	614,669	17.3	96,003	644,843	14.9	2.8%	-9.6%
Hawaii	15,459	61,719	25.0	24,162	56,423	42.8	29,131	54,488	53.5	88.4%	20.6%
Idaho	6,111	65,464	9.3	13,597	75,208	18.1	15,066	77,759	19.4	146.5%	10.8%
Illinois	168,097	596,977	28.2	123,755	626,177	19.8	116,879	644,524	18.1	-30.5%	-5.6%
Indiana	20,150	212,749	9.5	34,529	270,241	12.8	38,007	286,904	13.2	88.6%	10.1%
Iowa	7,822	111,686	7.0	9,678	123,287	7.8	10,928	125,195	8.7	39.7%	12.9%
Kansas	6,451	116,043	5.6	8,733	136,467	6.4	9,566	141,186	6.8	48.3%	9.5%
Kentucky	24,850	248,584	10.0	42,458	269,645	15.7	43,496	276,968	15.7	75.0%	2.4%
Louisiana	47,730	384,341	12.4	44,217	381,031	11.6	35,796	382,598	9.4	-25.0%	-19.0%
Maine	9,690	47,111	20.6	7,289	45,984	15.9	7,147	46,683	15.3	-26.2%	-1.9%
Maryland	44,823	193,095	23.2	35,143	200,386	17.5	43,193	207,862	20.8	-3.6%	22.9%
Massachusetts	50,398	205,347	24.5	46,327	209,758	22.1	46,488	214,327	21.7	-7.8%	0.3%
Michigan	71,290	367,304	19.4	55,390	417,474	13.3	49,781	431,050	11.5	-30.2%	-10.1%
Minnesota	29,255	171,515	17.1	24,921	189,386	13.2	27,923	196,984	14.2	-4.6%	12.0%
Mississippi	19,338	265,371	7.3	19,073	273,552	7.0	16,418	277,103	5.9	-15.1%	-13.9%
Missouri	42,516	253,700	16.8	71,473	285,943	25.0	75,611	297,879	25.4	77.8%	5.8%
Montana	4,607	36,269	12.7	6,536	35,998	18.2	6,417	36,197	17.7	39.3%	-1.8%
Nebraska	5,011	76,176	6.6	6,593	84,750	7.8	7,111	87,685	8.1	41.9%	7.9%
Nevada	28,060	63,324	44.3	26,853	86,207	31.1	31,349	100,723	31.1	11.7%	16.7%
New Hampshire	3,370	25,561	13.2	4,951	29,483	16.8	4,087	28,500	14.3	21.3%	-17.5%
New Jersey	65,998	294,254	22.4	67,529	293,196	23.0	73,941	298,362	24.8	12.0%	9.5%
New Mexico	53,184	135,055	39.4	53,482	145,239	36.8	50,560	147,959	34.2	-4.9%	-5.5%
New York	416,329	1,084,192	38.4	306,120	1,056,340	29.0	304,971	1,055,372	28.9	-26.7%	-0.4%
North Carolina	63,930	405,376	15.8	56,847	479,495	11.9	62,631	503,094	12.4	-2.0%	10.2%
North Dakota	2,539	26,547	9.6	3,105	24,810	12.5	2,475	25,204	9.8	-2.5%	-20.3%
Ohio	53,114	405,361	13.1	51,261	461,976	11.1	52,093	476,080	10.9	-1.9%	1.6%
Oklahoma	14,117	211,629	6.7	13,064	231,667	5.6	14,664	240,634	6.1	3.9%	12.2%
Oregon	27,381	135,740	20.2	30,841	160,353	19.2	31,591	166,405	19.0	15.4%	2.4%
Pennsylvania	113,505	417,574	27.2	130,507	451,200	28.9	126,460	474,004	26.7	11.4%	-3.1%
Rhode Island	14,334	35,438	40.4	11,348	46,327	24.5	10,884	44,913	24.2	-24.1%	-4.1%
South Carolina	70,126	261,866	26.8	65,630	280,624	23.4	61,713	288,849	21.4	-12.0%	-6.0%
South Dakota	7,152	40,805	17.5	7,309	39,893	18.3	7,897	39,880	19.8	10.4%	8.0%
Tennessee	43,644	298,190	14.6	47,401	343,444	13.8	46,358	356,637	13.0	6.2%	-2.2%
Texas	118,116	1,506,632	7.8	147,939	1,782,073	8.3	152,638	1,879,963	8.1	29.2%	3.2%
Utah	23,138	99,115	23.3	36,733	119,604	30.7	29,536	123,937	23.8	27.7%	-19.6%
Vermont	4,211	19,917	21.1	5,227	20,825	25.1	5,169	21,160	24.4	22.8%	-1.1%
Virginia	46,072	269,200	17.1	54,274	286,227	19.0	53,508	302,294	17.7	16.1%	-1.4%
Washington	34,111	228,755	14.9	39,827	263,041	15.1	37,639	269,795	14.0	10.3%	-5.5%
West Virginia	17,273	106,061	16.3	16,033	105,919	15.1	16,140	107,095	15.1	-6.6%	0.7%
Wisconsin	25,530	175,593	14.5	28,780	200,282	14.4	30,725	208,918	14.7	20.4%	6.8%
Wyoming	1,105	20,648	5.4	2,246	20,449	11.0	2,474	21,256	11.6	123.8%	10.1%
US	3,093,557	13,952,010	22.2	2,923,456	15,303,324	19.1	2,843,649	15,815,093	18.0	-8.1%	-2.7%
Original Simplified States	223,849	2,819,641	7.9	303,393	3,264,379	9.3	316,362	3,420,056	9.3	41.3%	4.3%
All Other States**	2,869,708	11,132,379	25.8	2,620,063	12,038,945	21.8	2,527,287	12,395,037	20.4	-11.9%	-3.5%

* School-Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance in school-years 1999-2000, 2003-2004, and 2004-2005.

** For purposes of analyzing the five year trends, all other states does include the six new Simplified Summer Food Program states.

Shaded states are the 13 states originally in the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2001.

Bolded italicized states were added to the Simplified Summer Food Program/Lugar Pilot Program, beginning in summer 2005.