



Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Breakfast
Status Report

June 2018 ■ www.FRAC.org



Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Breakfast Status Report 2018

Acknowledgments

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

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) gratefully acknowledges lead sponsorship of this report from the Kellogg Company Fund.

FRAC also acknowledges the following for supporting its work to expand and improve the Summer Nutrition Programs in 2017–2018:

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

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

- Annie E. Casey Foundation;
- Anonymous Donor;
- Eos Foundation;

- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;
- General Mills Foundation;
- Hunger Is, a joint program of the Albertsons Companies Foundation and the Entertainment Industry Foundation;
- The JPB Foundation;
- Menemsha Family Fund;
- National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.;
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; and
- Turrell Fund.

About FRAC

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



Introduction

Summer vacation can be a difficult time for millions of families across the country. Children lose access to the school breakfasts and lunches they rely on during the school year, and many working parents are left scrambling to find a safe, supervised environment for their children during the summer break. Without the structure and supports the school day provides, families often struggle to stretch already tight budgets to afford food and summer programs. This creates summer nutrition and opportunity gaps that leave many children hungry and unprepared for the classroom when they return to school.

The good news is that the Summer Nutrition Programs, which include the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program and National School Breakfast Program through the Seamless Summer Option (SSO), provide funding to sponsors (schools, local government agencies, and private nonprofit organizations) to serve breakfast and lunch¹ to children 18 and younger at sites in low-income communities, helping to combat summer hunger. Sites can be schools, YMCAs, Boys & Girls Clubs, churches, parks, recreation centers, and other places where children gather during the summer. The sites frequently combine educational and enrichment programming with nutritious meals to keep children healthy, learning, engaged, and active during the summer months.

Despite the clear benefits of the Summer Nutrition Programs for children in every state, these programs struggle to reach many of the low-income children who

participate in the National School Lunch Program during the regular school year. In school year 2016–2017, an average of 20.1 million children ate a school lunch each day. In July 2017, just 3 million children received lunch through the Summer Nutrition Programs, and even fewer children — only 1.6 million — received breakfast. These numbers represent a slight decrease in participation in both summer lunch (-14,163 children) and breakfast (-13,855 children) from July 2016, compounding the larger drops in participation from July 2015 to July 2016 (-78,286 in breakfast and -152,530 in lunch).

The disparity between participation in breakfast and lunch shows that too many summer meal sites are serving just lunch, or lunch and a snack. This also means that existing summer sponsors — who have the experience and systems in place to serve the maximum number of allowable meals — are missing out on drawing down more in federal reimbursements and better meeting the nutritional needs of the children they serve.

There are several strategies sponsors can implement to reach more children with summer breakfast. Adding breakfast to existing lunch sites is the most straightforward way to reach additional children. Moving breakfast later in the morning or serving breakfast instead of a morning snack are other steps sponsors can take to boost summer breakfast participation; however, these strategies alone are not enough to fill the summer nutrition gap.

¹ Most sites can provide a maximum of two meals per day, which can include breakfast and lunch.

The most successful summer breakfast sites — and summer sites overall — are those that offer an enrichment or educational component alongside meals. The combination of meals and programming is what draws children to meal sites and helps reduce any stigma that may be associated with attending a site that provides only meals. Additionally, programs that operate the entire day, or even just the entire morning, make it easier to provide breakfast and lunch to children. And, of course, these longer programs do a better job of meeting the child care needs of working families.

Unfortunately, there are not enough summer programs available — or accessible — to low-income families. To effectively move the needle on summer meals

and boost breakfast and lunch participation, there must be more programs in low-income communities that offer activities and meals. To increase access to summer programs, more investment of public dollars at the federal, state, and local levels, as well as private funding, are needed.

Growing the number of children participating in summer breakfast programs is a win-win for summer sponsors and the children they serve. Maximizing the number of meals served allows sponsors to increase their program financial viability by drawing down more in federal reimbursements. Most importantly, children have increased access to the nutrition and programming they need to support their academic achievement, health, and well-being.

About This Report

This report measures the reach of breakfast through the Summer Nutrition Programs in July 2017, nationally and in each state, and is a companion piece to the Food Research & Action Center's (FRAC) *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation: Summer Nutrition Status Report*, which focuses on summer lunch participation. The summer breakfast report is based on a variety of metrics and examines the impact of trends and policies on program participation. In this report, FRAC does the following:

- assesses national and state breakfast participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs; measures July 2017 breakfast participation against July 2017 participation in lunch by calculating the ratio of children participating in summer breakfast for every 100 children participating in summer lunch, using the lunch data reported in the companion report;
- analyzes participation by placing states in one of four groups:
 - states with strong participation in summer breakfast and summer lunch;
 - states with strong breakfast participation relative to weak lunch participation;
 - states with weak breakfast participation relative to strong lunch participation; and
 - states with weak participation in both breakfast and lunch;
- measures year-over-year changes in summer breakfast participation by state;
- sets an ambitious but achievable goal of reaching 70 children with summer breakfast through the Summer Nutrition Programs for every 100 participating in summer lunch, and calculates the number of *unserved* children and the federal dollars lost in each state that is not meeting this goal; and
- identifies best practices for providing summer breakfast.

The Summer Nutrition Programs

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

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

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

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

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



National and State Findings

Just over 3 million low-income children across the country received a lunch through the Summer Nutrition Programs on an average weekday in July 2017. A nutritious summer breakfast was served to just over half (52.6 percent) as many children — nearly 1.6 million. Participation in summer breakfast in July 2017 dropped slightly from the previous year, serving 13,855 fewer children — a 0.9 percent decrease.

Average daily participation (ADP) in the summer lunch programs varied widely across the states, and for most states, a low level of participation in summer lunch sets an artificially low bar for comparing summer breakfast participation. Likewise, strong summer lunch participation sets a much higher bar for summer breakfast participation. To account for this, the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) in this analysis groups states into four categories:

Group 1: Strong Participation in Summer Breakfast and Lunch

In July 2017, six states (Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Vermont) and the District of Columbia had strong participation in both summer breakfast and lunch when compared to other states.

Group 1: Strong Participation in Summer Breakfast¹ and Summer Lunch²

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
District of Columbia	20,260	47.9	15,606	77.0
Connecticut	34,257	21.3	25,754	75.2
New York	358,046	30.4	255,817	71.4
Maryland	63,735	21.6	45,437	71.3
New Jersey	101,138	23.7	72,082	71.3
Vermont	7,843	30.7	5,186	66.1
Maine	15,682	27.4	8,697	55.5

New Jersey increased summer lunch participation by 25 percent in 2017, allowing it to move into this group from the strong breakfast and weak lunch participation group. For these top performers, at least one child received summer lunch for every five low-income children who participated in school lunch during the 2016–2017 regular school year. This group of states served more than half as many children summer breakfast as those who received summer lunch.

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

Eighteen states succeeded in providing summer breakfast to at least half as many children as those who received summer lunch. But these states fell far short of FRAC's benchmark for summer lunch performance, with

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

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
New Hampshire	5,586	16.0	4,686	83.9
Virginia	66,007	16.1	47,849	72.5
Delaware	10,147	16.2	7,083	69.8
Louisiana	28,795	6.8	19,363	67.2
West Virginia	10,667	8.2	6,712	62.9
Mississippi	22,656	7.7	14,157	62.5
Minnesota	46,948	17.3	29,026	61.8
Arkansas	24,302	10.7	14,814	61.0
Hawaii	5,861	9.6	3,489	59.5
Massachusetts	53,581	16.7	31,591	59.0
Missouri	31,139	8.8	18,345	58.9
Texas	197,088	8.2	112,790	57.2
Wisconsin	41,685	15.4	23,123	55.5
North Carolina	100,468	15.7	55,437	55.2
Michigan	66,414	12.7	35,895	54.0
South Carolina	61,610	17.8	32,856	53.3
Pennsylvania	93,566	14.8	48,586	51.9
Nevada	8,364	4.9	4,224	50.5

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

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

ratios of summer-to-school-year lunch not only below the benchmark for summer lunch of 40 children to 100, but below 20 to 100. Thus their breakfast participation compared to poor lunch participation rates.

Eight of these states (Arkansas, Hawaii, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, Texas, and West Virginia) ranked among the 20 states with the lowest ratios of summer lunch participation in the country, reaching between five and 11 children for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the prior school year. While it is encouraging that these states served summer breakfast to the majority of the children eating summer lunch, too many children are still missing out on both meals. This group needs to expand summer breakfast and lunch programs to reach more children.

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

Two states lagged in serving breakfast, even while they achieved relatively strong summer lunch participation ratios: New Mexico (28.4 to 100), and Georgia (22.4 to 100). While they are among the top 10 states in the country for summer lunch participation, these states had summer breakfast-to-lunch ratios below 45 to 100. By adding breakfast to summer lunch sites, these states could easily better children’s outcomes by joining the other states in Group 1 that had strong participation in summer breakfast and summer lunch.

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

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
New Mexico	49,193	28.4	20,841	42.4
Georgia	195,233	22.4	77,246	39.6

Group 4: Weak Participation in Summer Breakfast and Summer Lunch

The remaining 24 states, similar to the states in Group 2, fell short of even a modest standard of serving summer lunch to at least one child for every five children who received a free or reduced-price lunch during the regular school year. These 24 states also fell short in breakfast; they failed to provide summer breakfast to even half of this already small subset of eligible children. For example, Colorado, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska,

Group 4: Weak Participation in Summer Breakfast¹ and Summer Lunch²

State	Children, Summer Lunch	Ratio of Summer Lunch to School Year Lunch	Children, Summer Breakfast	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch
Rhode Island	9,770	19.4	4,846	49.6
Arizona	48,216	10.4	23,909	49.6
Florida	213,812	16.0	104,877	49.1
Illinois	89,065	11.6	43,199	48.5
Alabama	37,031	10.2	17,787	48.0
Ohio	64,864	10.4	30,244	46.6
Indiana	79,276	19.0	35,698	45.0
Oklahoma	14,458	4.7	6,470	44.7
Colorado	19,625	8.7	8,466	43.1
Tennessee	65,379	13.6	28,074	42.9
Montana	8,599	18.4	3,609	42.0
Kentucky	30,876	7.8	12,849	41.6
Nebraska	8,155	6.9	3,308	40.6
South Dakota	7,522	15.7	3,038	40.4
Iowa	19,778	11.5	7,961	40.3
California	443,214	18.3	177,752	40.1
Washington	37,660	11.1	14,165	37.6
North Dakota	3,254	10.4	1,171	36.0
Alaska	4,062	10.5	1,461	36.0
Oregon	33,475	16.3	11,302	33.8
Kansas	17,637	9.6	5,726	32.5
Wyoming	3,916	15.8	1,094	27.9
Idaho	18,301	19.7	3,695	20.2
Utah	23,573	14.8	3,147	13.4

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

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

and Oklahoma provided summer lunch to less than one-tenth of the number of children who received a free or reduced-price lunch during the prior school year, and they served breakfast to less than half of the small lunch number. With low participation in both summer breakfast and lunch, these states leave much room for improvement to ensure that children have access to adequate nutrition when school is out during the summer.

Change in Summer Breakfast Participation From July 2016 to July 2017

Nineteen states expanded participation in summer breakfast from July 2016 to July 2017, and six of those states increased participation by at least 10 percent. Indiana led the way with a 34.9 percent increase in the number of children receiving breakfast, followed by Georgia (21.2 percent), New Jersey (20.2 percent), and Alabama (20.1 percent), demonstrating that dramatic improvement is possible.

By contrast, 32 states saw participation decline over the same period. The starkest drops were in Nevada (65.8 percent), Wyoming (40.6 percent), and Arizona (28.8 percent).



Top 10 Increases in Summer Breakfast¹ Participation, July 2016 to July 2017

State	ADP, July 2016	ADP, July 2017	Percent Change
Indiana	26,433	35,698	35.1%
Georgia	63,740	77,246	21.2%
New Jersey	59,988	72,082	20.2%
Alabama	14,807	17,787	20.1%
Texas	98,568	112,790	14.4%
Pennsylvania	43,407	48,586	11.9%
Virginia	44,237	47,849	8.2%
Tennessee	26,055	28,074	7.7%
South Carolina	31,405	32,856	4.6%
Minnesota	27,796	29,026	4.4%

10 States With Largest Declines in Summer Breakfast¹ Participation, July 2016 to July 2017

State	ADP, July 2016	ADP, July 2017	Percent Change
Nevada	12,355	4,224	-65.8%
Wyoming	1,841	1,094	-40.6%
Arizona	33,601	23,909	-28.8%
New Mexico	29,239	20,841	-28.7%
South Dakota	3,888	3,038	-21.9%
Louisiana	24,036	19,363	-19.4%
Missouri	22,168	18,345	-17.2%
Oklahoma	7,817	6,470	-17.2%
Arkansas	17,754	14,814	-16.6%
Kentucky	15,150	12,849	-15.2%

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

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

On an average weekday in July 2017, seven states (Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, and Virginia) and the District of Columbia provided a nutritious breakfast to at least 70 children for every 100 participating in summer lunch. A summer breakfast ratio of 70 to 100 is an attainable goal for the other 43 states. For each of these states, FRAC calculated how many additional children would have been served on an average weekday if these states had reached this goal, and how much additional funding states would have received in the form of federal reimbursements.

Cumulatively, states with summer breakfast ratios below 70 to 100 in July 2017 would have served breakfast to an additional 537,628 children had they all achieved the 70 to 100 goal. These states would have received an additional \$23.1 million in federal reimbursements.

Just four lagging states — California, Florida, Georgia, and Texas — would have served half of the over 520,000 additional children and claimed half of the additional reimbursements. Over one-quarter of the additional federal dollars would have gone to California alone, which would have served 70 percent more children. See Table 3.

Summer Learning, Programming, and Opportunities

Many of the children who face a nutrition gap when the school year ends also are affected disproportionately by summer learning loss. Also known as the “summer slide,” this refers to the loss of academic skills and knowledge over the summer. Quality summer programs can help reduce summer learning loss, but are either non-existent or unaffordable for many low-income families. This means such children return to school in the fall academically behind their higher-income peers and struggling to catch up before classes even begin.

Structured summer enrichment and educational activities provide an important foundation on which strong summer meals programs can be built. Therefore, it is important that there are enough summer programs available, and that families are not priced out of participating in these programs. Increased investments in summer programs for low-income children at federal, state, and local levels would ensure children have access to the learning opportunities and meals they need to succeed.

The [*21st Century Community Learning Centers*](#) program, the largest federal funding source for summer and afterschool programming, demonstrates the positive impact federal funding can have on supporting students’ academic achievement. Despite proposals by the

It Pays to Serve Summer Breakfast

Providing breakfast is an important way to help ensure the financial viability of a summer nutrition program. The 2017 Summer Food Service Program per breakfast reimbursement was more than twice the snack reimbursement (\$2.15 for breakfast, \$0.89 for a snack), but summer breakfast only requires three meal components, as opposed to the two required for a snack. In addition, the combined breakfast and lunch reimbursement of \$5.92 makes program operations more cost-effective. Sponsors do have more food costs when they provide both meals, but they often are able to serve both meals without significant increases to administrative and transportation costs.

current administration to eliminate funding for the program completely in both fiscal year (FY) 2018 and FY 2019, Congress recently approved \$1.21 billion in funding for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program for FY 2018 — \$20 million above the previous year. Twenty-thousand additional children will join the 1.6 million already benefiting from the program. However, millions more remain unserved, and the program

remains vulnerable to future funding cuts. With clear evidence of the detrimental impact that summer learning loss has on students — and ultimately, on the future workforce — Congress should continue investing more resources into the 21st Century Community Learning Centers as well as other summer enrichment opportunities, not cut them.

Summer Breakfast Expansion Strategies

Increasing the number of children participating in summer breakfast is an important step toward reducing summer hunger and learning gaps. Detailed below are five promising practices that can help increase the reach of breakfast during the summer.

■ **Serve breakfast instead of a morning snack.**

Serving breakfast instead of a morning snack better relieves children's hunger and better supports the financial viability of summer meals programs by providing a significantly higher reimbursement than the snack reimbursement. In 2017, the reimbursement for a snack was \$0.89, while the breakfast reimbursement was \$2.15. By adding one additional component, sponsors can more than double the reimbursement they receive with very few added logistics or costs.

■ **Serve breakfast later in the morning.** Many summer meal sites that serve breakfast early in the morning report low participation. Fortunately, sponsors have the flexibility to serve breakfast throughout the morning. By shifting the breakfast service time to 10 or 11 a.m., or extending the meal service times, sites can easily reach more children and teens with summer breakfast.

■ **Provide breakfast on weekends.** Many youth-serving and faith-based organizations often run programming on weekends. Working with weekend programs to add breakfast and lunch during the summer can help sponsors draw down more in reimbursements as well as feed more

children and draw them into safe and supervised weekend activities.

■ **Have sponsors promote breakfast participation among sites.**

To maximize meal service, sponsors can focus part of their expansion efforts on summer breakfast. Successful strategies for increasing breakfast participation include encouraging sites to expand their meal service to include breakfast, targeting outreach to those programs that provide activities in the morning, and mentioning in outreach materials and trainings the option to include breakfast in current programming.

■ **Maximize economies of scale.** Operating cost-effective Summer Nutrition Programs is an important part of expanding summer breakfast. By serving two meals a day at every site, sponsors increase the total number of meals reimbursed and create a better economy of scale that helps reduce labor costs per meal and increases purchasing power. This sets up both programs and children for success. For example, delivering breakfast and lunch at the same time is just one way sponsors can cut costs and run a more efficient program. Sites can also store and reuse certain menu items if there are fluctuations in participation on a certain day.

Learn more from the Food Research & Action Center's resource, [How it Works: Increasing Summer Breakfast Participation](#).

In addition to federal investments, more efforts to establish stable summer funding opportunities on a state level are needed. A number of states, such as [Massachusetts](#) and [California](#), have prioritized summer learning by allocating funding to support such programs, and many states are moving in the right direction. For example, Nevada recently passed [legislation](#) that would designate certain tax revenue to support summer learning programs in low-income areas. Learn more about state level opportunities for increasing access to summer learning and enrichment activities with the National Summer Learning Association's [Funding Resource Guide](#).

Additionally, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) creates an opportunity for states to prioritize summer programs that counter summer learning loss. ESSA, the most recent iteration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, requires each state to develop a plan for how they will close educational achievement gaps. Tennessee, for example, included more funding for

summer programs to support students reading at grade-level in their ESSA plan.

The most successful summer meal programs are those that offer educational or enrichment activities and meals. Investing in summer programming pays off — for children, their families, and communities.



Conclusion

The critical role that breakfast plays in positively impacting children's health and behavior does not end when the school year does. The Summer Nutrition Programs provide an important opportunity for sites to serve two healthy meals a day to children who may not get enough food at home. These sites also provide important opportunities for children to learn, play, and socialize.

Yet, the utilization of the Summer Nutrition Programs has fallen short of the need, serving just over 3 million children lunch in July 2017, or 1 in 7 of the low-income children who participate in school lunch during the school year. Summer breakfast was even more underutilized in July 2017 — reaching 13,855 fewer children than the year before and serving just over half of those children who participated in summer lunch.

When combined, summer breakfast and lunch better meet the nutritional needs of low-income children, and

efforts to increase participation and access must focus on both in order to be successful. Proven strategies for increasing breakfast participation include serving breakfast at lunch sites; promoting breakfast to all potential summer programs; serving breakfast instead of a morning snack; and moving breakfast to later in the morning. The most effective way to increase the reach of summer breakfast, however, is to ensure that there are enough summer programs and activities available for children to participate in.

Fortunately, there is a clear path forward for building stronger Summer Nutrition Programs and reaching more children with summer breakfast and lunch. Partners from every level — the U.S. Department of Agriculture, state agencies, and anti-hunger, summer, and child advocates — must step up and work together to ensure there are enough summer programs serving children — and serving meals — so that every child returns to school well-nourished and ready to learn.

Technical Notes

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

In this report, “summer nutrition breakfast” is defined as the sum of the average daily participation in Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) breakfast service in July, plus the average daily free and reduced-price participation in the School Breakfast Program (SBP) in July. “Summer nutrition lunch” is the sum of the average daily participation in SFSP lunch service in July plus the average daily participation in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) in July. The SBP and NSLP numbers include participation through the Seamless Summer Option.

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

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

SFSP

USDA provided FRAC with the number of SFSP breakfasts and lunches served in July in each state. FRAC calculated each state’s July average daily breakfast participation in SFSP by dividing the total number of SFSP breakfasts served in July by the total number of weekdays in July (excluding the Independence Day holiday). FRAC used the same method to calculate average daily lunch participation. The average daily participation numbers for July reported in FRAC’s analysis are slightly different from USDA’s average daily participation numbers, which are based on operating days instead of the total number

of weekdays in July. FRAC’s revised measure allows for consistent comparisons from state to state and year to year. This measure is also more in line with the average daily lunch participation numbers in the regular school year NSLP, as described below.

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

SBP and NSLP

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

Note that USDA adjusts average daily participation in the regular year SBP and NSLP by dividing the average daily meal figures by an attendance factor (0.938) to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. FRAC’s *School Breakfast Scorecard* for the regular school year reports these SBP and NSLP average daily participation numbers; that is, it includes the attendance factor. To make the SBP and NSLP numbers consistent with the SFSP numbers, for which there is no analogous attendance factor, this report does not include the attendance factor. As a result, the regular school year meal participation numbers in this report do not precisely match the SBP and NSLP numbers in FRAC’s *School Breakfast Scorecard: School Year 2016–2017*.

FRAC recalculated average daily SBP and NSLP participation for July 2016 and 2017 in Hawaii to resolve data inconsistencies. While the number of lunches served in July 2017 declined by 10.0 percent compared to the previous July, the reported average daily participation fell 68.0 percent, apparently due to the average number of operating days rising sharply from around nine days in

July 2016 to 24 days in July 2017. Similarly, the number of breakfasts served in Hawaii in July 2017 was 19.9 percent lower than in July 2016, but average daily participation was nearly 29 percent lower. FRAC was unable to determine the actual number of operating days in either summer. Instead, FRAC determined that Hawaii averaged about 10 operating days in July over the period from 2000 to 2015. FRAC calculated average daily participation in each breakfast and lunch in July 2016 and 2017 by dividing the number of meals served in July by 10 days.

FRAC received corrected total average daily SBP and NSLP participation data from the District of Columbia, and FRAC used these numbers to recalculate average operating days and free and reduced-price average daily participation.

The Cost of Low Participation

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving summer nutrition breakfasts in July for every 100 children receiving summer nutrition lunches. FRAC then calculated the number of additional children who would be reached if that state achieved a 70 to 100 ratio of summer nutrition breakfast participation to summer nutrition lunch participation. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the summer breakfast reimbursement rate for 20 days (the number of weekdays in July 2017, not counting the Independence Day holiday) for SFSP breakfasts. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available (\$2.1450 per breakfast for July 2017).

Table 1:**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Breakfast¹ and Summer Lunch² in July 2016 and July 2017, and Ratio and Rank, by State (Alphabetically)**

Summer Nutrition									
State	Breakfast ADP, July 2016	Lunch ADP, July 2016	Ratio ³	Rank	Breakfast ADP, July 2017	Lunch ADP, July 2017	Ratio ³	Rank	Percent Change in Breakfast ADP
Alabama	14,807	37,879	39.1	42	17,787	37,031	48.0	30	20.1%
Alaska	1,537	3,994	38.5	44	1,461	4,062	36.0	46	-5.0%
Arizona	33,601	57,533	58.4	20	23,909	48,216	49.6	27	-28.8%
Arkansas	17,754	28,921	61.4	16	14,814	24,302	61.0	14	-16.6%
California	188,320	456,607	41.2	37	177,752	443,214	40.1	42	-5.6%
Colorado	8,924	20,271	44.0	36	8,466	19,625	43.1	34	-5.1%
Connecticut	27,166	37,303	72.8	5	25,754	34,257	75.2	3	-5.2%
Delaware	7,599	10,211	74.4	2	7,083	10,147	69.8	8	-6.8%
District of Columbia	15,933	21,711	73.4	4	15,606	20,260	77.0	2	-2.1%
Florida	110,936	220,486	50.3	26	104,877	213,812	49.1	28	-5.5%
Georgia	63,740	141,784	45.0	35	77,246	195,233	39.6	43	21.2%
Hawaii	3,889	6,066	64.1	12	3,489	5,861	59.5	15	-10.3%
Idaho	3,664	20,423	17.9	50	3,695	18,301	20.2	50	0.8%
Illinois	48,108	91,504	52.6	24	43,199	89,065	48.5	29	-10.2%
Indiana	26,433	68,151	38.8	43	35,698	79,276	45.0	32	35.1%
Iowa	7,892	19,990	39.5	41	7,961	19,778	40.3	41	0.9%
Kansas	6,181	17,187	36.0	47	5,726	17,637	32.5	48	-7.4%
Kentucky	15,150	32,243	47.0	31	12,849	30,876	41.6	38	-15.2%
Louisiana	24,036	37,594	63.9	13	19,363	28,795	67.2	9	-19.4%
Maine	8,703	16,157	53.9	23	8,697	15,682	55.5	20	-0.1%
Maryland	50,929	70,391	72.4	6	45,437	63,735	71.3	6	-10.8%
Massachusetts	32,965	56,376	58.5	19	31,591	53,581	59.0	16	-4.2%
Michigan	35,146	64,422	54.6	22	35,895	66,414	54.0	22	2.1%
Minnesota	27,796	44,497	62.5	15	29,026	46,948	61.8	13	4.4%
Mississippi	16,321	24,105	67.7	9	14,157	22,656	62.5	12	-13.3%
Missouri	22,168	35,208	63.0	14	18,345	31,139	58.9	17	-17.2%
Montana	3,707	9,022	41.1	38	3,609	8,599	42.0	37	-2.6%
Nebraska	3,197	9,017	35.5	48	3,308	8,155	40.6	39	3.5%
Nevada	12,355	20,364	60.7	17	4,224	8,364	50.5	25	-65.8%
New Hampshire	4,623	5,531	83.6	1	4,686	5,586	83.9	1	1.4%
New Jersey	59,988	80,915	74.1	3	72,082	101,138	71.3	7	20.2%
New Mexico	29,239	61,999	47.2	29	20,841	49,193	42.4	36	-28.7%
New York	251,889	352,265	71.5	7	255,817	358,046	71.4	5	1.6%
North Carolina	59,101	102,769	57.5	21	55,437	100,468	55.2	21	-6.2%
North Dakota	1,182	3,166	37.3	45	1,171	3,254	36.0	45	-0.9%
Ohio	29,615	62,939	47.1	30	30,244	64,864	46.6	31	2.1%
Oklahoma	7,817	16,992	46.0	32	6,470	14,458	44.7	33	-17.2%
Oregon	12,079	34,455	35.1	49	11,302	33,475	33.8	47	-6.4%
Pennsylvania	43,407	89,745	48.4	27	48,586	93,566	51.9	24	11.9%
Rhode Island	4,651	10,239	45.4	33	4,846	9,770	49.6	26	4.2%
South Carolina	31,405	69,466	45.2	34	32,856	61,610	53.3	23	4.6%
South Dakota	3,888	8,237	47.2	28	3,038	7,522	40.4	40	-21.9%
Tennessee	26,055	65,713	39.6	40	28,074	65,379	42.9	35	7.7%
Texas	98,568	195,681	50.4	25	112,790	197,088	57.2	18	14.4%
Utah	3,310	28,294	11.7	51	3,147	23,573	13.4	51	-4.9%
Vermont	6,104	9,041	67.5	10	5,186	7,843	66.1	10	-15.0%
Virginia	44,237	62,703	70.6	8	47,849	66,007	72.5	4	8.2%
Washington	13,772	37,530	36.7	46	14,165	37,660	37.6	44	2.9%
West Virginia	7,732	11,879	65.1	11	6,712	10,667	62.9	11	-13.2%
Wisconsin	24,932	42,391	58.8	18	23,123	41,685	55.5	19	-7.3%
Wyoming	1,841	4,585	40.2	39	1,094	3,916	27.9	49	-40.6%
US	1,604,392	3,035,954	52.8		1,590,537	3,021,791	52.6		-0.9%

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

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

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

Table 2:**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Breakfast¹ and Additional ADP and Additional Federal Reimbursement if States Reached FRAC's Goal of 70 Summer Breakfast Participants per 100 Summer Lunch² Participants**

State	Summer Breakfast ADP, July 2017	Ratio of Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch ³	Total Summer Breakfast ADP if Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch Ratio Reached 70:100	Additional Summer Breakfast ADP if Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch Ratio Reached 70:100	Additional Federal Reimbursement Dollars if Summer Breakfast to Summer Lunch Ratio Reached 70:100 ⁴
Alabama	17,787	48.0	25,922	8,135	\$349,001
Alaska	1,461	36.0	2,844	1,383	\$59,316
Arizona	23,909	49.6	33,752	9,842	\$422,230
Arkansas	14,814	61.0	17,011	2,197	\$94,256
California	177,752	40.1	310,250	132,498	\$5,684,174
Colorado	8,466	43.1	13,738	5,271	\$226,137
Connecticut	25,754	75.2	—	—	—
Delaware	7,083	69.8	7,103	20	\$860
District of Columbia	15,606	77.0	—	—	—
Florida	104,877	49.1	149,668	44,791	\$1,921,545
Georgia	77,246	39.6	136,663	59,418	\$2,549,017
Hawaii	3,489	59.5	4,102	614	\$26,323
Idaho	3,695	20.2	12,810	9,115	\$391,047
Illinois	43,199	48.5	62,346	19,147	\$821,415
Indiana	35,698	45.0	55,493	19,795	\$849,200
Iowa	7,961	40.3	13,845	5,883	\$252,387
Kansas	5,726	32.5	12,346	6,620	\$283,988
Kentucky	12,849	41.6	21,613	8,765	\$376,008
Louisiana	19,363	67.2	20,156	794	\$34,043
Maine	8,697	55.5	10,978	2,281	\$97,848
Maryland	45,437	71.3	—	—	—
Massachusetts	31,591	59.0	37,507	5,916	\$253,784
Michigan	35,895	54.0	46,490	10,595	\$454,524
Minnesota	29,026	61.8	32,864	3,837	\$164,624
Mississippi	14,157	62.5	15,859	1,702	\$73,009
Missouri	18,345	58.9	21,797	3,452	\$148,094
Montana	3,609	42.0	6,019	2,410	\$103,386
Nebraska	3,308	40.6	5,709	2,401	\$102,982
Nevada	4,224	50.5	5,855	1,631	\$69,973
New Hampshire	4,686	83.9	—	—	—
New Jersey	72,082	71.3	—	—	—
New Mexico	20,841	42.4	34,435	13,594	\$583,200
New York	255,817	71.4	—	—	—
North Carolina	55,437	55.2	70,328	14,891	\$638,821
North Dakota	1,171	36.0	2,278	1,107	\$47,491
Ohio	30,244	46.6	45,405	15,161	\$650,425
Oklahoma	6,470	44.7	10,120	3,651	\$156,616
Oregon	11,302	33.8	23,433	12,131	\$520,398
Pennsylvania	48,586	51.9	65,496	16,910	\$725,443
Rhode Island	4,846	49.6	6,839	1,993	\$85,509
South Carolina	32,856	53.3	43,127	10,271	\$440,630
South Dakota	3,038	40.4	5,265	2,228	\$95,572
Tennessee	28,074	42.9	45,765	17,692	\$758,966
Texas	112,790	57.2	137,962	25,171	\$1,079,851
Utah	3,147	13.4	16,501	13,354	\$572,880
Vermont	5,186	66.1	5,490	305	\$13,076
Virginia	47,849	72.5	—	—	—
Washington	14,165	37.6	26,362	12,197	\$523,263
West Virginia	6,712	62.9	7,467	755	\$32,409
Wisconsin	23,123	55.5	29,180	6,057	\$259,848
Wyoming	1,094	27.9	2,741	1,647	\$70,678
US	1,590,537	52.6	2,128,165	537,628	\$23,064,245

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

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

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

⁴ Additional federal reimbursement dollars is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed for each child each weekday only for breakfast (not also lunch or a snack) and at the lowest rate for an SFSP breakfast (\$2.145 per breakfast) and are served 20 days in July 2017.

Table 3:**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Breakfast and School Breakfast Program (SBP) in July 2016 and July 2017, by State**

State	SFSP Breakfast ADP, July 2016	SFSP Breakfast ADP, July 2017	Percent Change in SFSP Breakfast ADP	SBP ADP, July 2016	SBP ADP, July 2017	Percent Change in SBP ADP
Alabama	10,929	14,591	33.5%	3,878	3,196	-17.6%
Alaska	849	808	-4.8%	688	653	-5.2%
Arizona	4,980	4,081	-18.1%	28,620	19,828	-30.7%
Arkansas	12,959	10,014	-22.7%	4,794	4,800	0.1%
California	24,348	19,471	-20.0%	163,973	158,281	-3.5%
Colorado	7,194	6,859	-4.7%	1,730	1,608	-7.1%
Connecticut	20,424	19,153	-6.2%	6,742	6,601	-2.1%
Delaware	6,138	5,794	-5.6%	1,462	1,289	-11.8%
District of Columbia	15,139	13,667	-9.7%	794	1,939	144.2%
Florida	93,942	85,779	-8.7%	16,994	19,098	12.4%
Georgia	33,215	32,488	-2.2%	30,525	44,758	46.6%
Hawaii	1,587	1,645	3.6%	2,301	1,844	-19.9%
Idaho	3,092	3,090	-0.1%	572	605	5.7%
Illinois	19,636	25,540	30.1%	28,473	17,659	-38.0%
Indiana	11,940	11,896	-0.4%	14,494	23,803	64.2%
Iowa	6,204	6,454	4.0%	1,688	1,508	-10.7%
Kansas	4,852	4,485	-7.6%	1,329	1,241	-6.6%
Kentucky	13,405	12,085	-9.9%	1,744	764	-56.2%
Louisiana	22,303	17,268	-22.6%	1,733	2,095	20.9%
Maine	8,336	8,393	0.7%	367	304	-17.2%
Maryland	49,653	44,200	-11.0%	1,277	1,237	-3.1%
Massachusetts	26,087	25,149	-3.6%	6,878	6,442	-6.3%
Michigan	25,811	24,965	-3.3%	9,335	10,930	17.1%
Minnesota	21,197	23,214	9.5%	6,599	5,812	-11.9%
Mississippi	15,558	13,162	-15.4%	762	996	30.6%
Missouri	12,598	13,562	7.6%	9,570	4,783	-50.0%
Montana	3,111	3,123	0.4%	596	486	-18.5%
Nebraska	2,139	2,493	16.5%	1,058	815	-23.0%
Nevada	3,658	3,476	-5.0%	8,697	748	-91.4%
New Hampshire	3,758	3,882	3.3%	866	804	-7.1%
New Jersey	37,357	48,545	29.9%	22,630	23,537	4.0%
New Mexico	15,446	11,536	-25.3%	13,794	9,305	-32.5%
New York	185,450	188,327	1.6%	66,439	67,491	1.6%
North Carolina	37,145	34,792	-6.3%	21,957	20,645	-6.0%
North Dakota	936	953	1.8%	246	218	-11.3%
Ohio	22,501	21,910	-2.6%	7,114	8,334	17.1%
Oklahoma	6,007	5,132	-14.6%	1,810	1,338	-26.1%
Oregon	9,182	8,879	-3.3%	2,897	2,423	-16.4%
Pennsylvania	29,330	28,607	-2.5%	14,077	19,979	41.9%
Rhode Island	3,759	3,726	-0.9%	893	1,120	25.4%
South Carolina	17,981	20,948	16.5%	13,424	11,908	-11.3%
South Dakota	1,752	1,837	4.9%	2,136	1,201	-43.8%
Tennessee	15,587	15,675	0.6%	10,468	12,399	18.5%
Texas	52,737	47,507	-9.9%	45,831	65,283	42.4%
Utah	746	630	-15.5%	2,564	2,518	-1.8%
Vermont	5,606	4,883	-12.9%	497	303	-39.2%
Virginia	37,860	34,282	-9.5%	6,377	13,567	112.8%
Washington	10,582	11,182	5.7%	3,190	2,983	-6.5%
West Virginia	5,545	4,802	-13.4%	2,188	1,910	-12.7%
Wisconsin	21,675	20,344	-6.1%	3,257	2,779	-14.7%
Wyoming	952	797	-16.3%	889	296	-66.7%
US	1,003,176	976,077	-2.7%	601,216	614,460	2.2%

Table 4:**Breakfasts Served in Summer Food Service Program, June, July, and August 2016 and 2017, by State**

State	June 2016	June 2017	Percent Change	July 2016	July 2017	Percent Change	August 2016	August 2017	Percent Change
Alabama	376,860	490,421	30.1%	218,576	291,810	33.5%	16,192	26,084	61.1%
Alaska	21,979	18,683	-15.0%	16,984	16,168	-4.8%	5,960	5,792	-2.8%
Arizona	243,766	167,692	-31.2%	99,609	81,620	-18.1%	5,720	2,161	-62.2%
Arkansas	279,179	257,021	-7.9%	259,187	200,284	-22.7%	81,845	46,618	-43.0%
California	367,411	337,892	-8.0%	486,950	389,410	-20.0%	108,388	110,927	2.3%
Colorado	228,194	228,963	0.3%	143,880	137,173	-4.7%	19,377	21,392	10.4%
Connecticut	58,190	62,154	6.8%	408,476	383,061	-6.2%	126,231	120,071	-4.9%
Delaware	49,799	50,804	2.0%	122,751	115,880	-5.6%	42,147	49,533	17.5%
District of Columbia	1,931	1,677	-13.2%	302,782	273,342	-9.7%	7,349	46,388	531.2%
Florida	1,592,231	1,917,809	20.4%	1,878,841	1,715,579	-8.7%	341,126	181,895	-46.7%
Georgia	815,695	961,894	17.9%	664,304	649,760	-2.2%	42,730	39,404	-7.8%
Hawaii	47,660	57,787	21.2%	31,749	32,902	3.6%	0	0	0.0%
Idaho	83,203	82,762	-0.5%	61,834	61,801	-0.1%	12,929	13,023	0.7%
Illinois	279,464	298,515	6.8%	392,711	510,797	30.1%	155,584	173,379	11.4%
Indiana	396,928	413,427	4.2%	238,792	237,912	-0.4%	28,170	25,314	-10.1%
Iowa	154,734	175,433	13.4%	124,078	129,078	4.0%	30,831	28,346	-8.1%
Kansas	208,179	235,355	13.1%	97,034	89,693	-7.6%	11,259	10,727	-4.7%
Kentucky	347,581	378,858	9.0%	268,106	241,696	-9.9%	16,212	33,325	105.6%
Louisiana	737,640	622,723	-15.6%	446,057	345,355	-22.6%	19,594	2,097	-89.3%
Maine	12,670	13,090	3.3%	166,729	167,864	0.7%	60,179	62,515	3.9%
Maryland	48,102	99,071	106.0%	993,053	884,001	-11.0%	170,165	311,837	83.3%
Massachusetts	42,935	36,527	-14.9%	521,736	502,983	-3.6%	252,913	241,858	-4.4%
Michigan	205,727	182,910	-11.1%	516,219	499,303	-3.3%	279,289	247,591	-11.3%
Minnesota	315,776	317,773	0.6%	423,945	464,283	9.5%	188,289	218,419	16.0%
Mississippi	580,164	508,361	-12.4%	311,163	263,233	-15.4%	6,171	4,656	-24.6%
Missouri	1,204,272	1,221,524	1.4%	251,968	271,241	7.6%	31,067	35,866	15.4%
Montana	73,672	68,335	-7.2%	62,228	62,468	0.4%	26,521	31,829	20.0%
Nebraska	177,321	204,417	15.3%	42,775	49,853	16.5%	5,704	6,967	22.1%
Nevada	78,002	63,617	-18.4%	73,150	69,529	-5.0%	44,695	25,904	-42.0%
New Hampshire	11,593	10,517	-9.3%	75,152	77,642	3.3%	27,902	39,187	40.4%
New Jersey	6,241	30,552	389.5%	747,146	970,902	29.9%	316,577	424,863	34.2%
New Mexico	166,809	207,975	24.7%	308,916	230,711	-25.3%	7,582	1,104	-85.4%
New York	63,070	100,313	59.1%	3,708,999	3,766,531	1.6%	2,789,810	2,628,169	-5.8%
North Carolina	428,116	470,070	9.8%	742,891	695,837	-6.3%	300,617	247,509	-17.7%
North Dakota	28,620	40,145	40.3%	18,727	19,056	1.8%	7,288	8,503	16.7%
Ohio	476,688	481,154	0.9%	450,015	438,196	-2.6%	145,174	139,057	-4.2%
Oklahoma	255,171	283,343	11.0%	120,134	102,636	-14.6%	13,562	14,635	7.9%
Oregon	88,814	57,671	-35.1%	183,633	177,577	-3.3%	106,525	95,280	-10.6%
Pennsylvania	174,805	224,779	28.6%	586,601	572,137	-2.5%	214,991	273,421	27.2%
Rhode Island	10,862	8,762	-19.3%	75,171	74,521	-0.9%	41,355	41,994	1.5%
South Carolina	351,041	502,602	43.2%	359,618	418,950	16.5%	74,925	114,917	53.4%
South Dakota	49,290	54,311	10.2%	35,034	36,735	4.9%	21,772	20,355	-6.5%
Tennessee	528,030	555,505	5.2%	311,749	313,497	0.6%	4,824	4,710	-2.4%
Texas	2,220,175	2,216,545	-0.2%	1,054,747	950,148	-9.9%	495,414	443,161	-10.5%
Utah	23,595	30,293	28.4%	14,910	12,593	-15.5%	2,073	3,761	81.4%
Vermont	26,205	18,447	-29.6%	112,129	97,660	-12.9%	31,818	32,690	2.7%
Virginia	206,072	249,454	21.1%	757,201	685,640	-9.5%	267,430	225,286	-15.8%
Washington	81,508	68,645	-15.8%	211,636	223,634	5.7%	104,918	87,069	-17.0%
West Virginia	51,938	68,081	31.1%	110,892	96,033	-13.4%	7,699	6,886	-10.6%
Wisconsin	377,094	391,413	3.8%	433,499	406,871	-6.1%	103,334	106,572	3.1%
Wyoming	39,360	36,116	-8.2%	19,048	15,945	-16.3%	4,358	2,869	-34.2%
US	14,694,362	15,582,188	6.0%	20,063,515	19,521,531	-2.7%	7,226,585	7,085,916	-1.9%

Table 5:**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition Lunch¹ in July 2016 and July 2017; and National School Lunch Program (NSLP)² ADP for School Years 2015–2016 and 2016–2017, by State**

State	Summer Nutrition Lunch ADP July 2016	NSLP ADP 2015–2016	Ratio of Summer Nutrition Lunch to NSLP ³ 2015–2016	Rank 2015–2016	Summer Nutrition Lunch ADP July 2017	NSLP ADP 2016–2017	Ratio of Summer Nutrition Lunch to NSLP ³ 2016–2017	Rank 2016–2017	Percent Change in Summer Nutrition Lunch ADP 2016–2017
Alabama	37,879	372,326	10.2	39	37,031	362,235	10.2	39	-2.2%
Alaska	3,994	37,068	10.8	37	4,062	38,871	10.5	35	1.7%
Arizona	57,533	465,440	12.4	31	48,216	462,360	10.4	36	-16.2%
Arkansas	28,921	229,149	12.6	30	24,302	227,029	10.7	34	-16.0%
California	456,607	2,458,336	18.6	13	443,214	2,416,712	18.3	14	-2.9%
Colorado	20,271	230,033	8.8	46	19,625	224,547	8.7	43	-3.2%
Connecticut	37,303	159,482	23.4	7	34,257	160,455	21.3	9	-8.2%
Delaware	10,211	62,576	16.3	20	10,147	62,719	16.2	19	-0.6%
District of Columbia	21,711	44,457	48.8	1	20,260	42,280	47.9	1	-6.7%
Florida	220,486	1,324,540	16.6	18	213,812	1,338,262	16.0	22	-3.0%
Georgia	141,784	879,591	16.1	22	195,233	870,584	22.4	7	37.7%
Hawaii	6,066	62,669	9.7	42	5,861	61,112	9.6	41	-3.4%
Idaho	20,423	95,440	21.4	8	18,301	92,882	19.7	10	-10.4%
Illinois	91,504	782,323	11.7	34	89,065	767,893	11.6	31	-2.7%
Indiana	68,151	426,395	16.0	23	79,276	417,168	19.0	12	16.3%
Iowa	19,990	172,387	11.6	35	19,778	172,114	11.5	32	-1.1%
Kansas	17,187	187,582	9.2	45	17,637	183,858	9.6	40	2.6%
Kentucky	32,243	392,424	8.2	47	30,876	398,106	7.8	46	-4.2%
Louisiana	37,594	397,895	9.4	44	28,795	425,670	6.8	49	-23.4%
Maine	16,157	58,887	27.4	5	15,682	57,272	27.4	5	-2.9%
Maryland	70,391	298,413	23.6	6	63,735	295,498	21.6	8	-9.5%
Massachusetts	56,376	317,174	17.8	15	53,581	321,014	16.7	17	-5.0%
Michigan	64,422	541,320	11.9	32	66,414	522,393	12.7	30	3.1%
Minnesota	44,497	272,593	16.3	19	46,948	271,639	17.3	16	5.5%
Mississippi	24,105	301,783	8.0	49	22,656	293,397	7.7	47	-6.0%
Missouri	35,208	361,277	9.7	41	31,139	352,424	8.8	42	-11.6%
Montana	9,022	46,297	19.5	11	8,599	46,828	18.4	13	-4.7%
Nebraska	9,017	115,480	7.8	50	8,155	118,849	6.9	48	-9.6%
Nevada	20,364	172,670	11.8	33	8,364	170,769	4.9	50	-58.9%
New Hampshire	5,531	36,647	15.1	26	5,586	34,854	16.0	21	1.0%
New Jersey	80,915	428,380	18.9	12	101,138	426,413	23.7	6	25.0%
New Mexico	61,999	173,316	35.8	2	49,193	173,400	28.4	4	-20.7%
New York	352,265	1,178,565	29.9	4	358,046	1,179,610	30.4	3	1.6%
North Carolina	102,769	651,308	15.8	24	100,468	640,546	15.7	24	-2.2%
North Dakota	3,166	30,521	10.4	38	3,254	31,288	10.4	38	2.8%
Ohio	62,939	630,182	10.0	40	64,864	622,186	10.4	37	3.1%
Oklahoma	16,992	306,709	5.5	51	14,458	305,955	4.7	51	-14.9%
Oregon	34,455	213,076	16.2	21	33,475	205,394	16.3	18	-2.8%
Pennsylvania	89,745	619,051	14.5	28	93,566	630,888	14.8	28	4.3%
Rhode Island	10,239	50,898	20.1	9	9,770	50,255	19.4	11	-4.6%
South Carolina	69,466	348,413	19.9	10	61,610	345,251	17.8	15	-11.3%
South Dakota	8,237	49,398	16.7	17	7,522	48,043	15.7	25	-8.7%
Tennessee	65,713	495,007	13.3	29	65,379	481,773	13.6	29	-0.5%
Texas	195,681	2,405,162	8.1	48	197,088	2,412,221	8.2	45	0.7%
Utah	28,294	160,487	17.6	16	23,573	158,817	14.8	27	-16.7%
Vermont	9,041	25,928	34.9	3	7,843	25,570	30.7	2	-13.2%
Virginia	62,703	413,812	15.2	25	66,007	410,283	16.1	20	5.3%
Washington	37,530	339,837	11.0	36	37,660	338,448	11.1	33	0.3%
West Virginia	11,879	124,980	9.5	43	10,667	130,221	8.2	44	-10.2%
Wisconsin	42,391	281,406	15.1	27	41,685	271,323	15.4	26	-1.7%
Wyoming	4,585	24,719	18.5	14	3,916	24,765	15.8	23	-14.6%
US	3,035,954	20,253,808	15.0		3,021,791	20,122,441	15.0		-0.5%

¹ Summer Nutrition lunch includes lunch service in the Summer Food Service Program and free and reduced-price National School Lunch Program, including the Seamless Summer Option.

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

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



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

202.986.2200
www.frac.org

Copyright © 2018 Food Research & Action Center



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



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



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



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