

Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation: Summer Nutrition Status Report 2011



The federally-funded Summer Nutrition Programs, which provide nutritious meals and snacks to low-income children during the summer months, are falling increasingly short of meeting the needs of low-income children. Only one in seven of the low-income students who depended on the National School Lunch Program during the regular 2009–2010 school year had access to summer meals in 2010. The limited reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs meant that for the majority of those children, the end of the school year was the end of the healthy, filling meals on which they counted. It also meant a summer of struggling to avoid going hungry.

The continuing fallout of the Great Recession has not only had profound adverse effects on families; it has severely strained state and local budgets, resulting in major cuts in summer schools and youth programs throughout the country. The decrease in programs where food can be served makes it more difficult for the Summer Nutrition Programs to respond to the dramatic increase in need. Contrary to the recent trend in federal nutrition programs in general, in 2010 the Summer Nutrition Programs actually fed fewer children than in the previous year, extending the decline first seen in 2009.

If low-income children are going to have access to the healthy food they need during the summer months, aggressive steps must be taken at the federal, state and local levels to ensure that the Summer Nutrition Programs are available to low-income children and that families know about them and know how to participate.

The Summer Nutrition Programs

The two federal Summer Nutrition Programs—the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)—provide funding to serve meals and snacks to children: at sites where at least half the children in the geographic area are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals; at sites in which at least 50 percent of the children participating in the program are individually determined eligible for free or reduced-price school meals; and at sites that serve primarily migrant children. Once a site is eligible, all of the children can eat for free. Some summer camps also can participate. The NSLP also reimburses schools for feeding children that attend summer school.

Public and private nonprofit schools, local governments, National Youth Sports Programs, and private nonprofit organizations can participate in the SFSP and operate one or more sites. Only schools are eligible to participate in the NSLP (but they can use the NSLP to provide meals and snacks to non-school as well as school sites over the summer).

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) provides the funding for both programs through a state agency in each state—usually the state department of education.

About FRAC

The Food Research and 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 to sign up for FRAC's Weekly News Digest, visit www.frac.org. For information about the Summer Nutrition Programs, go to <http://frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/summer-programs/>.



Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Rachel Cooper and Crystal FitzSimons.

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges the following funders whose major support in 2010–2011 has helped to make possible our work on expanding and improving nutrition programs:

- AARP
- AARP Foundation
- Anonymous Donors
- The Atlantic Philanthropies
- Annie E. Casey Foundation
- ConAgra Foods Foundation
- CREDO/Working Assets
- Eos Foundation
- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
- General Mills Foundation
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- Kaiser Permanente
- Kraft Foods Foundation
- Land O'Lakes Foundation
- Leaves of Grass Fund
- MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger
- The Moriah Fund
- National Dairy Council / Dairy Management, Inc.
- New Directions Foundation
- Open Society Foundations
- Pritzker Early Childhood Foundation
- Sara Lee Foundation
- Taste of the NFL
- Tyson Foods, Inc.
- Walmart Foundation
- YMCA of the USA

National Findings for 2010

Despite record numbers of children being eligible for and receiving free and reduced-price meals during the 2009–2010 school year, participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs fell in 2010 nationally.

- In July 2010*, the Summer Nutrition Programs (i.e., the Summer Food Service Program and the National School Lunch Program combined) only served lunch to 2.812 million children on an average day. The total number of children participating in Summer Nutrition fell by 17,000, or 0.6 percent, from July 2009 to July 2010. Since July 2008, total participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs has dropped by 90,000 children, or 3.1 percent.
- The number of low-income children who are receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the regular school year is one excellent indicator of the need for the Summer Nutrition Programs. Because of this, FRAC uses it as a benchmark to measure summer participation nationally and in the states. In July 2010, only 15 children received Summer Nutrition for every 100 low-income students who received lunch in the 2009–2010 school year. Only one in seven children who needed summer food, according to this measure, was getting it.
- The 2010 ratio of 15.0:100 was a significant decrease when compared to a ratio of 16.1:100 children in July 2009. The significant drop was due to the fact that the number of children being fed during the summer fell slightly, while the number of low-income children receiving help from the school lunch program grew (by a record 1.1 million low-income children) during the 2009–2010 school year, reflecting the growing need.
- The story behind the overall numbers shows the impact of the recession on this program. At the same time that more children had to use the regular school year food programs, in many states budget cuts caused school districts to eliminate or reduce their summer programs, resulting in 83,000 fewer students being served by the National School Lunch Program in July 2010 than in the previous year. The losses in this program outstripped the gain of 65,000 children achieved by the Summer Food Service Program.

State Findings for 2010

While participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs fell nationally, the performance of the programs varied dramatically throughout the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

- Despite state budget challenges nationwide, five top performing states managed to reach at least one in four of their low-income children in July 2010: District of Columbia (80.2:100), New Mexico (30.6:100), New York (28.6:100); South Carolina (27.1:100), and Delaware (26.4:100).
- Unfortunately, 14 states served less than one-tenth of their low-income children through their Summer Nutrition Programs in 2010. Five states served fewer than 1 in 15: Oklahoma (3.9:100), Mississippi (5.4:100), Kansas (6.0:100), Colorado (6.6:100), and Louisiana (6.6:100).
- Thirty-two states experienced growth in their Summer Nutrition Programs even with budget cuts closing school sites, with Arizona leading the way with a 44.6 percent increase in the number of children served by the Summer Nutrition Programs from July 2009 to July 2010. Arkansas (36.5 percent), Utah (23.9 percent), Wyoming (17.6 percent) and Tennessee (14.9 percent) also had large increases in participation.
- Of the states that had a decline in participation, four dropped by more than 20 percent: Hawaii (-30.7 percent), Missouri (-26.7 percent), Nebraska (-24.9 percent) and Kentucky (-20.1 percent).
- California’s budget crisis continued to have an outsized effect on the national trend, both because of California’s sheer size, and because of its relatively stronger Summer Nutrition Programs (historically),

* In calculating the Summer Nutrition participation rates used in this report, FRAC focuses on data from the month of July because it is the peak month for summer nutrition participation for most states. School schedules vary widely across the country, it is also the month when the vast majority of schools are closed.

especially in schools, have been weakening rapidly. California served 65,000 fewer children in 2010 than in 2009, a much larger decrease than the total national drop in Summer Nutrition participation.

- While not used in calculations for this report, it is important to note that 22 states have their peak participation in Summer Nutrition Programs during the month of June. Eight states—Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska and Oklahoma —served more than twice the number of SFSP meals in June as July. Of course, the Summer Nutrition Programs should be available from the first day of summer vacation until the start of the new school year.

Missed Opportunities

At a time of great and continuing economic stress on state and local governments as well as families, not only are states with low Summer Nutrition participation rates failing to provide for their low-income children, they are missing out on the millions of dollars in federal funds that exist to provide healthy foods for these children. For each day that a state failed to serve a low-income child a lunch during the summer of 2010, the state lost \$3.195 in federal SFSP funding (and even more for rural or “self-preparation” sites).

- If every state in July 2010 had reached the goal of serving 40 children Summer Nutrition for every 100 receiving free and reduced-price lunches during the 2009-2010 school year, an additional 4.7 million children would have been fed each day, and the states would have collected an additional \$313 million in child nutrition funding over the summer (assuming the programs operated 21 days).
- The five states that passed on the most federal funding (and failed to serve the most children) were: Texas (\$47,069,354); California (\$33,614,449); Florida (\$19,230,072); Georgia (\$14,206,029); and Illinois (\$12,264,521).

Looking Forward

After two years of decreases in participation, compounded by the dramatic increase in need caused by the recession, now is the time to re-double efforts at the federal, state, and local levels and within the public and private sectors to re-build the Summer Nutrition Programs so that nutritious summer meals are getting to the children who need them. Everyone has a role to play:

- At the federal level, USDA is helping to lead the charge by organizing a Summer Food Service Program Awareness Week, which includes a wide range of events and activities to raise the visibility of summer meals; by reducing administrative barriers that keep sponsors from participating; and by re-committing to increasing access to meals in the summer.
- Although the 2010 child nutrition reauthorization law—the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act—does not re-shape the Summer Nutrition Programs, it does include modest provisions that can help support the expansion and outreach efforts:
 - Nonprofits now can better serve the need in their communities, because an artificial cap on sites and children served by nonprofit sponsors has been removed. They should be encouraged to operate the program, and existing nonprofit sponsors should be encouraged to grow their programs.
 - Schools are required to help with summer food outreach and should be encouraged to take multiple steps to communicate the availability of the Summer Nutrition Programs.
 - Paperwork has been reduced. When the Act’s improvements are combined with the 2008 “simplification” of the accounting rules the new waivers offered by USDA through administrative reforms, it is now considerably easier to operate the Summer Nutrition Programs. That message constitutes a powerful outreach tool as many potential sponsors are intimidated by the perceived administrative requirements of the program.

- USDA’s two Summer Food demonstration projects (one in Arkansas, one in Mississippi) have shown a significant impact on participation and should be replicated. In Arkansas, federal funding was provided to encourage sponsors to operate more days during the summer. Summer Food participation increased by 7 percent in June, 7 percent in July, and 56 percent in August. In Mississippi, the funding was used to provide activities at sites. Mississippi’s Summer Food participation increased by 16 percent in July.
- Some state agencies, such as the Arizona Department of Education, have taken aggressive steps to grow the program—recruiting more sponsors and sites and conducting outreach to families. More states need to make access to Summer Nutrition a top priority.
- Other states, such as Florida and Ohio, have recently passed mandates that require certain schools (with high proportions of low income students or that operate summer school) to operate the Summer Nutrition Programs. Other states can take this proactive step.
- Regardless of legislation, schools need to re-commit to meeting the nutritional needs of their students during the summer, even if they scale back summer school. They have the expertise to run the program and tend to run large programs. It is in a school’s best interest to ensure that its students have adequate nutrition during the summer so they return to school in the fall healthy and ready to learn.
- Anti-hunger and child advocates who have worked on Summer Nutrition expansion for years must continue to ratchet up their efforts, building upon the momentum at the national level to grow program participation.
- Private funders are taking a proactive role in supporting the success of the Summer Nutrition Programs by providing funding to cover the costs that cannot be covered by the federal reimbursement, including outreach, equipment, programming at the site and meals for parents. Additional funders can follow their lead, especially in states that have very low participation or that have experienced significant declines.

Implementing some of these steps will impact Summer Nutrition participation in 2012. Equally important, it is not too late to have an impact this summer. Conducting outreach and elevating the visibility of the Summer Nutrition Programs will bring children to sites this summer. Now is the time for action.

Technical Notes

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

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

Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)

USDA provided FRAC with the number of SFSP lunches served in each state. FRAC calculated each state’s July average daily lunch attendance in the SFSP by dividing the total number of SFSP lunches served by the total number of weekdays (excluding the Independence Day holiday) in July.

FRAC uses July data because it is problematic to use the months of June or August for analysis. It is impossible to determine for those months how many days were regular school days, and how many days schools actually were closed for the summer recess. Because of the limits of the available USDA data, it also is not possible to separate National School Lunch Program data to determine if meals were served as part of the summer program or as part of the regular school year.

The average daily lunch attendance numbers for July reported in FRAC’s analysis are slightly different from USDA’s average daily participation numbers are based upon serving days instead of the number of days that meals can be served. FRAC’s revised measure allows consistent comparisons from state to state and year to year. This measure is also more in line with the average daily lunch attendance numbers in the school year NSLP, as described below.

The numbers of lunches served by state are from USDA.

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

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 FRAC obtained from USDA. Their changes are included.

National School Lunch Program

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

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

The NSLP summer meal numbers include the lunches served at summer school and through the NSLP Seamless Summer Option, as well as the regular summer NSLP lunches.

Note that USDA calculates average daily *participation* in the NSLP by dividing the average daily lunch attendance by a factor of 0.936. 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 0.936 factor. To make the NSLP numbers consistent with the summer food numbers, for which there is no analogous absenteeism factor, this report (*Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation 2011*) does not include the absenteeism factor. As a result, the regular school year NSLP numbers in this report do not match the NSLP numbers in the *School Breakfast Scorecard School Year 2009-2010*.

The Cost of Low Participation

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving Summer Nutrition for every 100 children receiving free or reduced-price lunches during the regular school year. FRAC then calculated the number of additional children who would be reached if each state achieved a 40 to 100 ratio of summer nutrition to regular school year lunches. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the reimbursement rate for 22 days (the number of weekdays in July 2010 not counting the July 4th holiday) of SFSP lunches. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available.

TABLE 1: Summer Nutrition Participation in July 2009 and July 2010 by State (Lunches in Summer Food Service Program - SFSP - and National School Lunch Program - NSLP - * Combined)

State	July 2009 Summer Nutrition				July 2010 Summer Nutrition				Percent Change in Summer Nutrition 2009 to 2010
	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 08-09 School Year NSLP**	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 08-09 School Year NSLP**	Rank	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 09-10 School Year NSLP**	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 09-10 School Year NSLP**	Rank	
Alabama	26,471	337,535	7.8	46	27,508	352,638	7.8	45	3.9%
Alaska	3,285	32,950	10.0	40	3,289	34,585	9.5	39	0.1%
Arizona	37,253	417,767	8.9	44	53,850	449,683	12.0	32	44.6%
Arkansas	23,993	222,448	10.8	38	32,758	229,936	14.2	27	36.5%
California	509,710	2,256,524	22.6	11	444,372	2,363,426	18.8	14	-12.8%
Colorado	13,781	200,213	6.9	47	14,521	220,579	6.6	47	5.4%
Connecticut	35,429	137,467	25.8	8	32,357	141,142	22.9	8	-8.7%
Delaware	12,874	43,866	29.3	5	12,692	48,112	26.4	5	-1.4%
District of Columbia	24,897	31,256	79.7	1	28,008	34,918	80.2	1	12.5%
Florida	144,916	1,030,432	14.1	29	158,893	1,113,756	14.3	26	9.6%
Georgia	112,583	757,075	14.9	26	108,511	800,602	13.6	29	-3.6%
Hawaii	6,589	47,621	13.8	31	4,564	53,685	8.5	43	-30.7%
Idaho	23,002	87,565	26.3	6	21,211	95,535	22.2	9	-7.8%
Illinois	105,031	688,919	15.2	25	105,653	721,116	14.7	24	0.6%
Indiana	44,870	367,061	12.2	35	48,273	404,592	11.9	33	7.6%
Iowa	13,089	142,262	9.2	43	13,758	153,461	9.0	41	5.1%
Kansas	10,311	161,850	6.4	49	10,438	174,767	6.0	49	1.2%
Kentucky	33,825	315,694	10.7	39	27,038	315,517	8.6	42	-20.1%
Louisiana	24,360	363,372	6.7	48	24,728	376,579	6.6	47	1.5%
Maine	8,638	52,580	16.4	23	9,009	58,370	15.4	23	4.3%
Maryland	54,115	223,245	24.2	10	51,480	243,181	21.2	10	-4.9%
Massachusetts	47,286	239,517	19.7	15	49,812	254,236	19.6	12	5.3%
Michigan	71,185	506,294	14.1	29	73,773	545,281	13.5	30	3.6%
Minnesota	32,505	223,227	14.6	27	35,485	245,960	14.4	25	9.2%
Mississippi	14,235	286,415	5.0	50	16,045	294,410	5.4	50	12.7%
Missouri	55,266	319,611	17.3	19	40,509	345,872	11.7	34	-26.7%
Montana	6,602	40,650	16.2	24	7,489	44,342	16.9	20	13.4%
Nebraska	9,831	98,816	9.9	41	7,379	105,477	7.0	46	-24.9%
Nevada	35,534	115,506	30.8	3	31,291	128,117	24.4	6	-11.9%
New Hampshire	4,440	33,355	13.3	32	4,209	37,522	11.2	36	-5.2%
New Jersey	71,637	349,359	20.5	14	68,533	378,029	18.1	15	-4.3%
New Mexico	52,385	152,747	34.3	2	49,047	160,293	30.6	2	-6.4%
New York	320,172	1,063,344	30.1	4	314,986	1,099,893	28.6	3	-1.6%
North Carolina	72,775	570,270	12.8	33	78,088	599,271	13.0	31	7.3%
North Dakota	2,123	26,094	8.1	45	2,353	27,747	8.5	43	10.8%
Ohio	69,292	562,665	12.3	34	70,853	607,744	11.7	34	2.3%
Oklahoma	13,116	266,287	4.9	51	11,097	283,905	3.9	51	-15.4%
Oregon	34,381	187,698	18.3	16	35,630	200,113	17.8	17	3.6%
Pennsylvania	125,791	510,655	24.6	9	128,946	544,621	23.7	7	2.5%
Rhode Island	8,060	46,527	17.3	19	6,791	48,430	14.0	28	-15.7%
South Carolina	80,202	310,162	25.9	7	87,995	324,939	27.1	4	9.7%
South Dakota	9,176	42,183	21.8	12	8,954	45,570	19.6	12	-2.4%
Tennessee	42,204	366,065	11.5	36	48,494	434,868	11.2	36	14.9%
Texas	199,189	2,146,472	9.3	42	208,980	2,276,283	9.2	40	4.9%
Utah	19,889	136,767	14.5	28	24,633	154,202	16.0	21	23.9%
Vermont	5,010	23,002	21.8	12	5,126	24,584	20.9	11	2.3%
Virginia	61,098	337,600	18.1	17	64,645	364,679	17.7	18	5.8%
Washington	33,133	298,126	11.1	37	30,975	322,532	9.6	38	-6.5%
West Virginia	18,788	109,706	17.1	21	20,738	115,228	18.0	16	10.4%
Wisconsin	41,729	240,104	17.4	18	42,190	264,677	15.9	22	1.1%
Wyoming	3,590	21,631	16.6	22	4,222	24,233	17.4	19	17.6%
United States	2,829,647	17,548,558	16.1		2,812,179	18,689,237	15.0		-0.6%

* 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 participation in school year 2009-2010.

TABLE 2: Change in Summer Food Service Program and in National School Lunch Program Participation from July 2009 to July 2010 by State

State	Children in Summer Food Service Program			Children in National School Lunch Program		
	July 2009	July 2010	Change 2009 to 2010	July 2009	July 2010	Change 2009 to 2010
Alabama	19,522	19,602	0.4%	6,949	7,906	13.8%
Alaska	2,388	2,554	7.0%	897	735	-18.1%
Arizona	8,746	13,978	59.8%	28,507	39,873	39.9%
Arkansas	16,044	17,949	11.9%	7,948	14,809	86.3%
California	92,768	117,770	27.0%	416,941	326,603	-21.7%
Colorado	8,798	10,584	20.3%	4,984	3,937	-21.0%
Connecticut	13,733	10,830	-21.1%	21,695	21,527	-0.8%
Delaware	11,474	11,395	-0.7%	1,401	1,296	-7.5%
District of Columbia	22,844	26,076	14.2%	2,053	1,931	-5.9%
Florida	134,331	137,693	2.5%	10,585	21,200	100.3%
Georgia	48,203	44,495	-7.7%	64,380	64,016	-0.6%
Hawaii	3,572	3,186	-10.8%	3,017	1,379	-54.3%
Idaho	22,168	20,422	-7.9%	835	790	-5.4%
Illinois	55,802	64,366	15.3%	49,229	41,287	-16.1%
Indiana	35,443	41,364	16.7%	9,427	6,909	-26.7%
Iowa	9,461	9,628	1.8%	3,628	4,130	13.9%
Kansas	8,786	8,445	-3.9%	1,525	1,994	30.8%
Kentucky	31,405	24,909	-20.7%	2,420	2,129	-12.0%
Louisiana	21,486	21,817	1.5%	2,874	2,911	1.3%
Maine	8,234	8,646	5.0%	405	363	-10.3%
Maryland	51,199	48,939	-4.4%	2,917	2,541	-12.9%
Massachusetts	42,417	43,447	2.4%	4,869	6,365	30.7%
Michigan	45,298	43,775	-3.4%	25,886	29,997	15.9%
Minnesota	22,617	27,835	23.1%	9,888	7,650	-22.6%
Mississippi	12,553	15,280	21.7%	1,682	765	-54.5%
Missouri	27,831	22,304	-19.9%	27,435	18,205	-33.6%
Montana	5,912	6,801	15.0%	691	688	-0.4%
Nebraska	7,771	5,497	-29.3%	2,060	1,882	-8.6%
Nevada	4,934	5,165	4.7%	30,599	26,126	-14.6%
New Hampshire	3,714	3,505	-5.6%	726	705	-2.9%
New Jersey	53,729	48,289	-10.1%	17,908	20,244	13.0%
New Mexico	33,240	30,259	-9.0%	19,145	18,788	-1.9%
New York	262,182	255,361	-2.6%	57,990	59,625	2.8%
North Carolina	32,967	36,035	9.3%	39,809	42,053	5.6%
North Dakota	1,754	2,004	14.2%	369	349	-5.4%
Ohio	56,508	58,813	4.1%	12,784	12,040	-5.8%
Oklahoma	10,608	8,866	-16.4%	2,508	2,231	-11.0%
Oregon	29,334	32,100	9.4%	5,047	3,529	-30.1%
Pennsylvania	78,403	78,541	0.2%	47,388	50,405	6.4%
Rhode Island	5,220	5,616	7.6%	2,841	1,176	-58.6%
South Carolina	37,321	39,572	6.0%	42,881	48,423	12.9%
South Dakota	3,822	4,071	6.5%	5,355	4,882	-8.8%
Tennessee	29,891	30,635	2.5%	12,313	17,859	45.0%
Texas	120,584	149,866	24.3%	78,605	59,114	-24.8%
Utah	11,922	10,585	-11.2%	7,967	14,047	76.3%
Vermont	2,802	2,804	0.1%	2,208	2,322	5.2%
Virginia	51,531	54,688	6.1%	9,567	9,957	4.1%
Washington	27,719	25,823	-6.8%	5,414	5,152	-4.8%
West Virginia	13,627	14,503	6.4%	5,161	6,235	20.8%
Wisconsin	37,488	37,943	1.2%	4,242	4,247	0.1%
Wyoming	2,320	3,107	33.9%	1,270	1,115	-12.2%
United States	1,702,424	1,767,738	3.8%	1,127,223	1,044,441	-7.3%

TABLE 3: Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Participation in July 2010 by State

State	Children in SFSP, July 2010	Children in 09-10 School Year NSLP*	Children in 2010 SFSP per 100 in 09-10 School Year NSLP*	Rank	Percent SFSP Contributes to Summer Nutrition Participation
Alabama	19,602	352,638	5.6	42	71.3%
Alaska	2,554	34,585	7.4	32	77.7%
Arizona	13,978	449,683	3.1	51	26.0%
Arkansas	17,949	229,936	7.8	30	54.8%
California	117,770	2,363,426	5.0	46	26.5%
Colorado	10,584	220,579	4.8	48	72.9%
Connecticut	10,830	141,142	7.7	31	33.5%
Delaware	11,395	48,112	23.7	2	89.8%
District of Columbia	26,076	34,918	74.7	1	93.1%
Florida	137,693	1,113,756	12.4	17	86.7%
Georgia	44,495	800,602	5.6	43	41.0%
Hawaii	3,186	53,685	5.9	40	69.8%
Idaho	20,422	95,535	21.4	4	96.3%
Illinois	64,366	721,116	8.9	26	60.9%
Indiana	41,364	404,592	10.2	22	85.7%
Iowa	9,628	153,461	6.3	38	70.0%
Kansas	8,445	174,767	4.8	47	80.9%
Kentucky	24,909	315,517	7.9	29	92.1%
Louisiana	21,817	376,579	5.8	41	88.2%
Maine	8,646	58,370	14.8	11	96.0%
Maryland	48,939	243,181	20.1	5	95.1%
Massachusetts	43,447	254,236	17.1	7	87.2%
Michigan	43,775	545,281	8.0	27	59.3%
Minnesota	27,835	245,960	11.3	21	78.4%
Mississippi	15,280	294,410	5.2	45	95.2%
Missouri	22,304	345,872	6.4	37	55.1%
Montana	6,801	44,342	15.3	9	90.8%
Nebraska	5,497	105,477	5.2	44	74.5%
Nevada	5,165	128,117	4.0	49	16.5%
New Hampshire	3,505	37,522	9.3	24	83.3%
New Jersey	48,289	378,029	12.8	15	70.5%
New Mexico	30,259	160,293	18.9	6	61.7%
New York	255,361	1,099,893	23.2	3	81.1%
North Carolina	36,035	599,271	6.0	39	46.1%
North Dakota	2,004	27,747	7.2	33	85.2%
Ohio	58,813	607,744	9.7	23	83.0%
Oklahoma	8,866	283,905	3.1	50	79.9%
Oregon	32,100	200,113	16.0	8	90.1%
Pennsylvania	78,541	544,621	14.4	12	60.9%
Rhode Island	5,616	48,430	11.6	19	82.7%
South Carolina	39,572	324,939	12.2	18	45.0%
South Dakota	4,071	45,570	8.9	25	45.5%
Tennessee	30,635	434,868	7.0	34	63.2%
Texas	149,866	2,276,283	6.6	36	71.7%
Utah	10,585	154,202	6.9	35	43.0%
Vermont	2,804	24,584	11.4	20	54.7%
Virginia	54,688	364,679	15.0	10	84.6%
Washington	25,823	322,532	8.0	28	83.4%
West Virginia	14,503	115,228	12.6	16	69.9%
Wisconsin	37,943	264,677	14.3	13	89.9%
Wyoming	3,107	24,233	12.8	14	73.6%
United States	1,767,738	18,689,237	9.5		62.9%

* School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch participation in school year 2009-2010.

TABLE 4: Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors and Sites from July 2009 to July 2010, by State

State	Number of Sponsors			Number of Sites		
	July 2009	July 2010	Percent Change	July 2009	July 2010	Percent Change
Alabama	35	35	0.0%	499	542	8.6%
Alaska	29	28	-3.4%	104	104	0.0%
Arizona	36	45	25.0%	211	293	38.9%
Arkansas	114	119	4.4%	313	311	-0.6%
California	194	201	3.6%	1,738	1,692	-2.6%
Colorado	45	60	33.3%	191	310	62.3%
Connecticut	27	26	-3.7%	239	205	-14.2%
Delaware	20	20	0.0%	351	331	-5.7%
District of Columbia	20	25	25.0%	270	317	17.4%
Florida	111	115	3.6%	2,635	2,724	3.4%
Georgia	100	94	-6.0%	1,531	1,079	-29.5%
Hawaii	19	25	31.6%	144	162	12.5%
Idaho	64	75	17.2%	242	255	5.4%
Illinois	136	135	-0.7%	1,297	1,646	26.9%
Indiana	182	218	19.8%	942	1,100	16.8%
Iowa	84	95	13.1%	206	236	14.6%
Kansas	61	64	4.9%	203	219	7.9%
Kentucky	162	144	-11.1%	1,609	1,884	17.1%
Louisiana	85	73	-14.1%	466	463	-0.6%
Maine	64	69	7.8%	157	187	19.1%
Maryland	47	50	6.4%	1,032	1,122	8.7%
Massachusetts	85	85	0.0%	864	827	-4.3%
Michigan	184	209	13.6%	968	1,027	6.1%
Minnesota	79	101	27.8%	396	452	14.1%
Mississippi	81	84	3.7%	263	296	12.5%
Missouri	264	239	-9.5%	880	878	-0.2%
Montana	65	80	23.1%	186	188	1.1%
Nebraska	51	57	11.8%	101	224	121.8%
Nevada	33	30	-9.1%	102	104	2.0%
New Hampshire	18	22	22.2%	99	108	9.1%
New Jersey	95	87	-8.4%	1,011	1,013	0.2%
New Mexico	58	56	-3.4%	654	648	-0.9%
New York	292	292	0.0%	2,415	2,387	-1.2%
North Carolina	93	113	21.5%	768	927	20.7%
North Dakota	23	37	60.9%	34	58	70.6%
Ohio	201	201	0.0%	1,514	1,561	3.1%
Oklahoma	63	65	3.2%	312	302	-3.2%
Oregon	110	121	10.0%	580	675	16.4%
Pennsylvania	221	227	2.7%	1,921	2,095	9.1%
Rhode Island	14	16	14.3%	148	169	14.2%
South Carolina	52	64	23.1%	1,045	1,015	-2.9%
South Dakota	27	36	33.3%	50	63	26.0%
Tennessee	45	53	17.8%	1,030	1,040	1.0%
Texas	249	275	10.4%	2,551	3,216	26.1%
Utah	14	13	-7.1%	85	94	10.6%
Vermont	35	34	-2.9%	99	106	7.1%
Virginia	121	121	0.0%	1,474	1,507	2.2%
Washington	114	118	3.5%	584	702	20.2%
West Virginia	93	99	6.5%	408	535	31.1%
Wisconsin	107	115	7.5%	510	557	9.2%
Wyoming	18	26	44.4%	49	64	30.6%
United States	4,540	4,792	5.6%	35,481	38,020	7.2%

TABLE 5: Number of Summer Food Service Program Lunches Served in June, July, and August* 2009 and 2010, by State

State	June 2009 SFSP Lunches	June 2010 SFSP Lunches	% Change	July 2009 SFSP Lunches	July 2010 SFSP Lunches	% Change	August 2009 SFSP Lunches	August 2010 SFSP Lunches	% Change
Alabama	613,339	579,242	-6%	429,485	411,648	-4%	960	5,871	512%
Alaska	62,210	62,018	0%	52,535	53,635	2%	21,589	21,169	-2%
Arizona	520,512	600,817	15%	192,412	293,530	53%	11,110	11,096	0%
Arkansas	355,862	380,010	7%	352,972	376,921	7%	71,542	111,509	56%
California	815,507	949,225	16%	2,040,903	2,473,165	21%	640,716	981,493	53%
Colorado	346,352	451,526	30%	193,546	222,267	15%	6,723	13,748	104%
Connecticut	20,373	10,169	N/A	302,136	227,433	-25%	96,392	72,071	-25%
Delaware	99,644	98,787	-1%	252,419	239,302	-5%	167,725	108,906	-35%
District of Columbia	90,197	6,832	-92%	502,567	547,604	9%	122,030	189,582	55%
Florida	2,243,392	1,762,974	-21%	2,955,279	2,891,545	-2%	518,686	603,867	16%
Georgia	1,294,836	1,067,630	-18%	1,060,459	934,396	-12%	61,225	93,763	53%
Hawaii	104,549	192,235	84%	78,580	66,901	-15%	367	0	-100%
Idaho	514,786	483,020	-6%	487,685	428,861	-12%	164,309	176,201	7%
Illinois	618,272	652,032	5%	1,227,634	1,351,692	10%	316,884	526,074	66%
Indiana	721,638	779,012	8%	779,747	868,645	11%	93,133	91,695	-2%
Iowa	206,307	202,983	-2%	208,149	202,187	-3%	22,806	28,680	26%
Kansas	326,639	343,325	5%	193,290	177,335	-8%	3,996	7,653	92%
Kentucky	757,169	723,451	-4%	690,920	523,095	-24%	35,307	43,902	24%
Louisiana	1,316,678	1,210,736	-8%	472,690	458,157	-3%	7,338	10,330	41%
Maine	4,805	28,501	493%	181,137	181,568	0%	42,438	47,192	11%
Maryland	169,758	187,345	10%	1,126,369	1,027,724	-9%	138,827	168,381	21%
Massachusetts	43,923	66,923	52%	933,172	912,381	-2%	439,730	492,680	12%
Michigan	378,798	357,185	-6%	996,559	919,283	-8%	361,658	420,416	16%
Minnesota	247,959	259,770	5%	497,581	584,531	17%	124,833	141,320	13%
Mississippi	813,626	800,385	-2%	276,168	320,890	16%	762	923	21%
Missouri	1,737,187	1,168,849	-33%	612,274	468,379	-24%	67,325	102,764	53%
Montana	104,382	113,151	8%	130,056	142,825	10%	28,447	43,933	54%
Nebraska	286,413	337,208	18%	170,956	115,427	-32%	23,976	16,218	-32%
Nevada	87,276	83,960	-4%	108,555	108,459	0%	45,715	56,912	24%
New Hampshire	9,011	11,515	28%	81,711	73,596	-10%	36,124	34,382	-5%
New Jersey	6,771	5,172	-24%	1,182,044	1,014,066	-14%	407,248	400,706	-2%
New Mexico	865,419	772,843	-11%	731,275	635,442	-13%	34,668	29,626	-15%
New York	220,588	337,987	53%	5,768,006	5,362,586	-7%	3,254,593	3,306,113	2%
North Carolina	300,469	350,267	17%	725,271	756,741	4%	187,687	292,295	56%
North Dakota	56,860	59,447	5%	38,592	42,077	9%	8,496	7,261	-15%
Ohio	806,671	872,347	8%	1,243,173	1,235,066	-1%	355,667	435,294	22%
Oklahoma	529,150	481,676	-9%	233,372	186,190	-20%	15,568	18,687	20%
Oregon	270,360	247,934	-8%	645,351	674,110	4%	251,819	347,345	38%
Pennsylvania	392,842	321,058	-18%	1,724,856	1,649,358	-4%	744,591	776,607	4%
Rhode Island	5,031	9,661	92%	114,829	117,931	3%	58,641	58,454	0%
South Carolina	675,039	757,259	12%	821,056	831,011	1%	218,183	201,776	-8%
South Dakota	77,673	97,902	26%	84,083	85,497	2%	32,672	34,337	5%
Tennessee	942,298	839,098	-11%	657,604	643,328	-2%	13,458	20,928	56%
Texas	4,442,696	4,602,690	4%	2,652,856	3,147,186	19%	1,279,084	1,686,125	32%
Utah	257,532	271,052	5%	262,284	222,294	-15%	70,228	68,075	-3%
Vermont	11,305	9,236	-18%	61,646	58,886	-4%	21,874	20,270	-7%
Virginia	298,770	295,134	-1%	1,133,690	1,148,441	1%	490,124	587,161	20%
Washington	161,527	178,687	11%	609,822	542,286	-11%	216,057	265,615	23%
West Virginia	88,483	101,619	15%	299,790	304,555	2%	49,075	47,426	-3%
Wisconsin	209,959	299,191	42%	824,726	796,812	-3%	171,634	167,304	-3%
Wyoming	43,658	54,689	25%	51,049	65,248	28%	10,479	8,927	-15%
United States	25,574,501	24,935,765	-2%	37,453,321	37,122,493	-1%	11,564,519	13,403,063	16%

* States may serve lunches for a few days in June or August, but 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.

TABLE 6: Estimated Number of Children Participating and Additional Federal Payments in July 2010 Summer Nutrition, if States Served 40 Children in Summer per 100 Served in School Year National School Lunch Program

State	Children in Summer Nutrition (School Lunch* & Summer Food Combined), July 2010	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 09-10 School Year NSLP**	Total Children Who Would Be in July Summer Nutrition if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School Year NSLP**	Additional Children Reached in July if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School Year NSLP**	Additional Federal Reimbursement if State Reached in July a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School Year NSLP***
Alabama	27,508	7.8	141,055	113,547	\$7,618,469
Alaska	3,289	9.5	13,834	10,545	\$707,512
Arizona	53,850	12.0	179,873	126,023	\$8,455,501
Arkansas	32,758	14.2	91,974	59,217	\$3,973,152
California	444,372	18.8	945,370	500,998	\$33,614,449
Colorado	14,521	6.6	88,231	73,710	\$4,945,573
Connecticut	32,357	22.9	56,457	24,100	\$1,616,966
Delaware	12,692	26.4	19,245	6,553	\$439,683
District of Columbia	28,008	80.2	--	--	--
Florida	158,893	14.3	445,502	286,610	\$19,230,072
Georgia	108,511	13.6	320,241	211,730	\$14,206,029
Hawaii	4,564	8.5	21,474	16,909	\$1,134,534
Idaho	21,211	22.2	38,214	17,003	\$1,140,785
Illinois	105,653	14.7	288,447	182,793	\$12,264,521
Indiana	48,273	11.9	161,837	113,564	\$7,619,544
Iowa	13,758	9.0	61,384	47,626	\$3,195,468
Kansas	10,438	6.0	69,907	59,469	\$3,990,055
Kentucky	27,038	8.6	126,207	99,169	\$6,653,737
Louisiana	24,728	6.6	150,632	125,904	\$8,447,538
Maine	9,009	15.4	23,348	14,339	\$962,045
Maryland	51,480	21.2	97,272	45,792	\$3,072,440
Massachusetts	49,812	19.6	101,694	51,883	\$3,481,084
Michigan	73,773	13.5	218,112	144,340	\$9,684,483
Minnesota	35,485	14.4	98,384	62,899	\$4,220,190
Mississippi	16,045	5.4	117,764	101,719	\$6,824,810
Missouri	40,509	11.7	138,349	97,840	\$6,564,603
Montana	7,489	16.9	17,737	10,248	\$687,559
Nebraska	7,379	7.0	42,191	34,812	\$2,335,710
Nevada	31,291	24.4	51,247	19,956	\$1,338,956
New Hampshire	4,209	11.2	15,009	10,799	\$724,589
New Jersey	68,533	18.1	151,211	82,679	\$5,547,315
New Mexico	49,047	30.6	64,117	15,070	\$1,011,126
New York	314,986	28.6	439,957	124,971	\$8,384,942
North Carolina	78,088	13.0	239,708	161,620	\$10,843,912
North Dakota	2,353	8.5	11,099	8,746	\$586,839
Ohio	70,853	11.7	243,098	172,245	\$11,556,783
Oklahoma	11,097	3.9	113,562	102,465	\$6,874,867
Oregon	35,630	17.8	80,045	44,415	\$2,980,057
Pennsylvania	128,946	23.7	217,849	88,903	\$5,964,933
Rhode Island	6,791	14.0	19,372	12,580	\$844,086
South Carolina	87,995	27.1	129,976	41,981	\$2,816,685
South Dakota	8,954	19.6	18,228	9,275	\$622,273
Tennessee	48,494	11.2	173,947	125,453	\$8,417,293
Texas	208,980	9.2	910,513	701,533	\$47,069,354
Utah	24,633	16.0	61,681	37,048	\$2,485,715
Vermont	5,126	20.9	9,834	4,708	\$315,873
Virginia	64,645	17.7	145,871	81,226	\$5,449,885
Washington	30,975	9.6	129,013	98,038	\$6,577,840
West Virginia	20,738	18.0	46,091	25,353	\$1,701,066
Wisconsin	42,190	15.9	105,871	63,681	\$4,272,655
Wyoming	4,222	17.4	9,693	5,471	\$367,085
United States	2,812,179	15.0	7,475,695	4,663,516	\$312,898,597

* 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 participation in school year 2009-2010.

*** This estimate is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed for each child each weekday only for lunch (not also breakfast or a snack) and at the lowest rate for a SFSP lunch (\$3.195 per lunch). It also assumes that all participants are served for 21 weekdays in July 2010 (not counting the July 4th holiday).