



June 2012

# **Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:**

## Summer Nutrition Status Report 2012

## 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](http://www.frac.org). For information about the Summer Nutrition Programs, go to [www.frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/summer-programs/](http://www.frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/summer-programs/).

## Acknowledgements

---

This report was prepared by Rachel Cooper, Signe Anderson and Crystal FitzSimons.

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges the following funders whose major support in 2011-2012 has helped to make possible our work on expanding and improving nutrition programs:

AARP  
Anonymous Donors  
Annie E. Casey Foundation  
California Endowment  
Claneil Foundation  
ConAgra Foods Foundation  
CREDO/Working Assets  
Eos Foundation  
General Mills Foundation  
Kresge 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  
Newman's Own Foundation  
Open Society Foundations  
Sara Lee Foundation  
Share Our Strength  
Taste of the NFL  
Tides Foundation  
Turrell Fund  
Tyson Foods, Inc.  
Walmart Foundation  
YMCA of the USA

# Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation: Summer Nutrition Status Report 2012

Summer vacation should be a carefree time for children, but for millions of low-income students, summer vacation brings an end to the healthy, filling meals on which they rely, and their families lack the resources to make up the deficit. The federally-funded Summer Nutrition Programs, which can provide nutritious meals and snacks to low-income children during the summer months, in summer 2011 only fed one in seven of the low-income students who depended on the National School Lunch Program during the regular 2010-2011 school year. The limited reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs meant that millions of low-income children and their parents spent the summer struggling to avoid going hungry.

As state and local governments have tried to cope with massive budget shortfalls during the recession, one result has been major funding cuts to, and closing of, 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 existing need. While the number of children eating free or reduced-price lunches during the school year continued to increase from 2009-2010 to 2010-2011, in 2011 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, renewed effort must be made 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.

## National Findings for 2011

Even though record numbers of low-income children were eligible for and receiving free and reduced-price meals during the 2010-2011 school year, participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs fell in 2011 nationally.

- In July 2011<sup>1</sup>, the Summer Nutrition Programs (i.e., the Summer Food Service Program and the National School Lunch Program combined) only served lunch to 2.79 million children on an average day. The total number of children participating in Summer Nutrition fell by 24,000, or 0.9 percent, from July 2010 to July 2011. Since July 2008, total participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs has dropped by 112,000 children, or 3.9 percent.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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, with many regular school years going into June or starting in August, July also is the month when the vast majority of schools are closed.

- 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 against which to measure summer participation nationally and in each state. In July 2011, only 14.6 children received Summer Nutrition for every 100 low-income students who received lunch in the 2010-2011 school year. Only one in seven children who needed summer food, according to this measure, was getting it.
- The 2011 ratio of 14.6:100 was a significant decrease when compared to the ratio of 15.1:100 children in July 2010. The magnitude of the 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 significantly (by 472,000 low-income children) during the 2010-2011 school year, reflecting the growing need in the aftermath of the recession. Since July 2008 the share of children in need being served by the Summer Nutrition Programs has fallen from a ratio 17.3:100 to only 14.6:100.
- 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 70,000 fewer students being served by the National School Lunch Program in July 2011 than in the previous year. The losses in the NSLP outstripped the gain of 46,000 children achieved by the Summer Food Service Program.

## State Findings for 2011

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, four top performing states managed to reach at least one in four of their low-income children in July 2011: District of Columbia (73.5:100), New Mexico (31.2:100), New York (28.5:100) and Connecticut (25.5:100).
- Unfortunately, 13 states fed less than one-tenth of their low-income children through their Summer Nutrition Programs in 2011. Oklahoma (3.7:100) and Kansas (6.5:100) fed less than 1 in 15.
- Thirty-two states experienced growth in their Summer Nutrition Programs participation even with budget cuts in some of them closing schools or other sites. Hawaii led the way with a 71.1 percent increase in the number of children fed by the Summer Nutrition Programs from July 2010 to July 2011. Louisiana (41.8 percent), Mississippi (23.3 percent), Nebraska (13.8 percent), Colorado (13.6 percent) and Kansas (13.6 percent) also had large increases in participation.
- Of the states that had a decline in participation, Nevada (-60.8 percent)<sup>2</sup> and South Carolina (-22.6 percent) had double digit decreases.
- 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 strong Summer Nutrition Programs in the past, especially in schools, have been weakened dramatically. California served 33,000 fewer children in 2011 than in 2010, representing more than the entire national drop in Summer Nutrition participation. California has slipped from feeding 27.4:100 children in July 2008 to feeding only 17.0:100 in July 2011.
- While not used in calculations for this report, it is important to note that 23 states had their peak 2011 participation in Summer Nutrition Programs during the month of June. Five states—Arizona, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and Oklahoma—served more than twice the number of SFSP meals in June as in July.

## 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

---

<sup>2</sup> Nevada's decrease was driven by 55 elementary schools in the Clark County (Las Vegas) School District moving away from a year-round calendar.

a state failed to feed a low-income child a lunch during the summer of 2011, the state lost \$3.2375 in federal SFSP funding (and even more for rural or “self-preparation” sites).

- If every state in July 2011 had reached the goal of feeding 40 children Summer Nutrition for every 100 receiving free and reduced-price lunches during the 2010-2011 school year, an additional 4.9 million children would have been fed each day, and the states would have collected an additional \$316 million in child nutrition funding in July (assuming the programs operated 20 days).
- The five states that missed out on the most federal funding (and failed to feed the most children) were: Texas (\$46,345,980; 715,768 children); California (\$36,023,380; 556,346 children); Florida (\$19,983,409; 308,624 children); Georgia (\$13,858,605; 214,033 children); and Ohio (\$11,835,835; 182,793 children).

## **Time for Action**

As state and local budget cuts force summer schools and youth programs to scale back services or shut their doors, participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs continues to suffer. The Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act made some improvements, but Congress missed the opportunity to make some substantial and far-reaching changes to strengthen summer food so it could weather troubled economic times. Unfortunately, children are paying the price.

It is noteworthy, however, that several states managed to increase participation and make significant improvements to the quality of the meals offered. Such improvements can be a model for other states and local agencies to replicate.

### *Expanding Outreach*

Provisions in the 2010 Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act contributed to some of the growth seen in the Summer Food Service Program. The Act requires new outreach efforts, reduces paperwork, and removes caps on the number of children and sites served by nonprofit sponsors – leading to several states reporting increased efforts to provide outreach to families and the community, and an increase in the number of children receiving summer meals.

- In Florida, flyers that announce summer meal program sites are sent home with all children in schools located in areas eligible for the programs. Public service announcements about summer meal site locations are made on cable channels across the state. Local news stations report on summer meal programs while community-based organizations work to promote the program.
- In Kansas, Nutrition Activity Books listing information for summer food sites in the state are sent home at the end of the school year.
- The Texas Department of Agriculture instituted a policy requiring all schools to promote the Summer Nutrition Programs and provides schools with posters, flyers and brochures to distribute. Compliance with this requirement is evaluated as a part of the school food authority’s Coordinated Review Effort.

In addition to the states listed above, many others have increased their outreach efforts and are taking multiple steps to promote the summer nutrition programs. State agencies, anti-hunger advocates and program providers are using simple strategies such as hanging banners, distributing door hangers and post-cards as well as communicating through newsletters, Facebook and on websites. Additionally these groups are organizing summits, webinars, conferences and community meetings to share information about the program and advance their outreach efforts.

It’s not too late for states to make a difference for this summer.

### *Improving Nutrition Quality*

Summer can signify a time of inconsistent meals that do not measure up to the nutrition quality of the meals children receive during the regular school year. Weight-gain and obesity are exacerbated in the summer months because children are often less active and consume meals of reduced nutritional quality.

In addition to fighting hunger, the Summer Nutrition Programs can provide healthy meals and support recreational opportunities for children who need them. Summer meals are required to meet the federal nutrition guidelines, which ensure that children will receive fruits, vegetables, protein and other important nutrients they need to grow. These

meals can replace unhealthy high-calorie processed foods that children might otherwise consume, steering them away from foods that contribute to weight gain.

Several states have taken steps to improve nutrition quality in the summer meals served to children. Many states have directed summer meal programs to implement higher nutrition standards, and others are offering incentives for programs that exceed basic nutrition guidelines.

- Delaware has set aggressive nutrition guidelines designed to reduce fried foods, fat, sugar and sodium from their summer meal programs.
- In Washington D.C., the Healthy Schools Act of 2010 requires programs to serve summer meals that meet or exceed federal nutrition standards. An additional reimbursement was provided for schools that meet the requirements under the D.C. Healthy Schools Act and for summer meal programs that include local unprocessed foods as a part of the meal.
- In Kentucky, summer sites are encouraged to use the federal reimbursement to purchase fresh, healthy and nutritious products such as fresh fruits and vegetables, lean meats, and unprocessed cheese to improve summer meals.
- Massachusetts is working with the Farm to School initiative to improve the summer nutrition programs by offering local and fresh produce. As a result there has been an emphasis on serving more fruits and vegetables.

FRAC's Summer Food Standards of Excellence can help states and advocates raise awareness about what a high quality Summer Food site looks like and encourage sponsors to improve their programs. The Standards give a framework to rank Summer Food sites gold, silver, or bronze based upon the nutrition quality and appeal of the food provided at the site, the environment, and outreach efforts. The standards are available online at <http://frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/summer-programs/standards-of-excellence-summer-programs/>.

### *Looking Ahead*

Children cannot continue to bear the burden of budget cuts. It is in everyone's best interest to ensure that children have adequate nutrition during the summer so they stay healthy and are ready to learn, and everyone has a role to play in making that happen:

- Schools must recommit to meeting the nutritional needs of their students during the summer, even if they scale back summer school.
- Anti-hunger and child advocates who have worked on Summer Nutrition expansion for years must continue to ratchet up their efforts and find strategies that help and prod states to make these programs a priority.
- 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.
- At the national level, USDA continues to promote summer food through various means, including a Summer Food Service Program Awareness Week, which involves a wide range of events and activities to raise the visibility of summer meals. States should build on this national awareness campaign, and look to raise the visibility of the program.

Decisive action is needed to ensure that far more children from low-income households have access to meals during the summer.

# 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 in July 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 in those months 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 which 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.

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 regular 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 regular year NSLP by dividing the average daily lunch by an attendance factor to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. FRAC's *School Breakfast Scorecard* reports these NSLP average daily *participation* numbers — that is, including the attendance factor (divide by 0.944). To make the NSLP numbers consistent with the summer food numbers, for which there is no analogous attendance factor, this report (*Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation 2012*) does not include the attendance 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 2010-2011*.

## 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 that 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 20 days (the number of weekdays in July 2011 not counting the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday) of SFSP lunches. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available.

**TABLE 1: Summer Nutrition Participation in July 2010 and July 2011 by State (Lunches in Summer Food Service Program - SFSP - and National School Lunch Program - NSLP - \* Combined)**

State	July 2010 Summer Nutrition				July 2011 Summer Nutrition				Percent Change in Children in Summer Nutrition 2010 to 2011
	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 09-10 Regular School Year NSLP**	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 09-10 School Year NSLP**	Rank	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 10-11 Regular School Year NSLP**	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 10-11 School Year NSLP**	Rank	
Alabama	27,508	352,638	7.8	46	26,488	355,833	7.4	47	-3.7%
Alaska	3,289	34,585	9.5	40	3,532	35,511	9.9	39	7.4%
Arizona	53,850	449,683	12.0	32	49,158	448,087	11.0	36	-8.7%
Arkansas	32,758	229,936	14.2	27	31,651	232,502	13.6	27	-3.4%
California	444,372	2,363,426	18.8	14	411,191	2,418,841	17.0	17	-7.5%
Colorado	14,521	220,579	6.6	47	16,501	227,629	7.2	48	13.6%
Connecticut	32,357	141,142	22.9	8	36,639	143,633	25.5	4	13.2%
Delaware	12,692	48,112	26.4	5	11,560	51,463	22.5	5	-8.9%
District of Columbia	28,008	34,918	80.2	1	25,763	35,043	73.5	1	-8.0%
Florida	158,893	1,113,756	14.3	26	160,379	1,172,507	13.7	26	0.9%
Georgia	108,511	800,602	13.6	29	114,653	821,713	14.0	23	5.7%
Hawaii	4,564	53,685	8.5	44	7,810	62,332	12.5	30	71.1%
Idaho	21,211	95,535	22.2	9	21,771	99,666	21.8	7	2.6%
Illinois	105,653	721,116	14.7	24	109,626	725,108	15.1	22	3.8%
Indiana	48,273	404,592	11.9	33	48,169	412,219	11.7	34	-0.2%
Iowa	13,758	153,461	9.0	42	14,889	159,345	9.3	42	8.2%
Kansas	10,438	174,767	6.0	49	11,858	181,538	6.5	50	13.6%
Kentucky	27,038	315,517	8.6	43	25,193	320,928	7.9	46	-6.8%
Louisiana	24,728	376,579	6.6	47	35,067	380,050	9.2	43	41.8%
Maine	9,009	58,370	15.4	23	9,780	59,287	16.5	19	8.6%
Maryland	51,480	243,181	21.2	10	50,419	255,706	19.7	11	-2.1%
Massachusetts	49,812	254,236	19.6	12	51,776	261,125	19.8	10	3.9%
Michigan	73,773	545,281	13.5	30	68,561	548,080	12.5	30	-7.1%
Minnesota	35,485	245,960	14.4	25	35,532	253,475	14.0	23	0.1%
Mississippi	16,045	294,410	5.4	50	19,788	294,695	6.7	49	23.3%
Missouri	40,509	345,872	11.7	34	43,264	344,847	12.5	30	6.8%
Montana	7,489	44,342	16.9	20	7,288	45,833	15.9	20	-2.7%
Nebraska	10,258	105,477	9.7	38	11,672	109,854	10.6	37	13.8%
Nevada	31,291	128,117	24.4	6	12,266	151,800	8.1	45	-60.8%
New Hampshire	4,209	37,522	11.2	36	4,665	38,777	12.0	33	10.8%
New Jersey	68,533	378,029	18.1	15	75,064	393,306	19.1	13	9.5%
New Mexico	49,047	160,293	30.6	2	50,176	160,843	31.2	2	2.3%
New York	314,986	1,099,893	28.6	3	319,787	1,123,041	28.5	3	1.5%
North Carolina	78,088	599,271	13.0	31	78,413	611,453	12.8	29	0.4%
North Dakota	2,353	27,747	8.5	44	2,560	28,120	9.1	44	8.8%
Ohio	70,853	607,744	11.7	34	66,038	622,078	10.6	37	-6.8%
Oklahoma	11,097	283,905	3.9	51	10,949	292,891	3.7	51	-1.3%
Oregon	35,630	200,113	17.8	17	36,693	204,218	18.0	16	3.0%
Pennsylvania	128,946	544,621	23.7	7	119,195	553,339	21.5	8	-7.6%
Rhode Island	6,791	48,430	14.0	28	6,619	49,127	13.5	28	-2.5%
South Carolina	87,995	324,939	27.1	4	68,077	329,017	20.7	9	-22.6%
South Dakota	8,954	45,570	19.6	12	8,740	46,560	18.8	15	-2.4%
Tennessee	48,494	434,868	11.2	36	51,008	444,956	11.5	35	5.2%
Texas	208,980	2,276,283	9.2	41	221,188	2,342,390	9.4	41	5.8%
Utah	24,633	154,202	16.0	21	24,849	161,965	15.3	21	0.9%
Vermont	5,126	24,584	20.9	11	5,570	25,303	22.0	6	8.7%
Virginia	64,645	364,679	17.7	18	72,873	376,882	19.3	12	12.7%
Washington	30,975	322,532	9.6	39	31,964	334,161	9.6	40	3.2%
West Virginia	20,738	115,228	18.0	16	20,843	109,577	19.0	14	0.5%
Wisconsin	42,190	264,677	15.9	22	38,999	279,584	13.9	25	-7.6%
Wyoming	4,222	24,233	17.4	19	4,267	25,259	16.9	18	1.1%
<b>United States</b>	<b>2,815,058</b>	<b>18,689,237</b>	<b>15.1</b>		<b>2,790,776</b>	<b>19,161,494</b>	<b>14.6</b>		<b>-0.9%</b>

\* 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 during the regular school year.



**TABLE 2: Change in Summer Food Service Program and in National School Lunch Program Participation from July 2010 to July 2011 by State**

State	Children in Summer Food Service Program			Children in National School Lunch Program		
	July 2010	July 2011	Change 2010 to 2011	July 2010	July 2011	Change 2010 to 2011
Alabama	19,602	19,080	-2.7%	7,906	7,407	-6.3%
Alaska	2,554	2,855	11.8%	735	677	-7.9%
Arizona	13,978	19,086	36.5%	39,873	30,073	-24.6%
Arkansas	17,949	22,353	24.5%	14,809	9,298	-37.2%
California	117,770	111,430	-5.4%	326,603	299,761	-8.2%
Colorado	10,584	14,246	34.6%	3,937	2,255	-42.7%
Connecticut	10,830	12,817	18.3%	21,527	23,821	10.7%
Delaware	11,395	9,526	-16.4%	1,296	2,034	56.9%
District of Columbia	26,076	24,027	-7.9%	1,931	1,736	-10.1%
Florida	137,693	139,900	1.6%	21,200	20,479	-3.4%
Georgia	44,495	48,925	10.0%	64,016	65,728	2.7%
Hawaii	3,186	1,286	-59.6%	1,379	6,524	373.2%
Idaho	20,422	20,949	2.6%	790	822	4.1%
Illinois	64,366	62,862	-2.3%	41,287	46,764	13.3%
Indiana	41,364	42,303	2.3%	6,909	5,866	-15.1%
Iowa	9,628	10,608	10.2%	4,130	4,281	3.6%
Kansas	8,445	10,786	27.7%	1,994	1,073	-46.2%
Kentucky	24,909	23,429	-5.9%	2,129	1,764	-17.1%
Louisiana	21,817	30,491	39.8%	2,911	4,577	57.2%
Maine	8,646	9,331	7.9%	363	450	23.8%
Maryland	48,939	47,649	-2.6%	2,541	2,770	9.0%
Massachusetts	43,447	45,134	3.9%	6,365	6,642	4.4%
Michigan	43,775	43,063	-1.6%	29,997	25,498	-15.0%
Minnesota	27,835	28,947	4.0%	7,650	6,586	-13.9%
Mississippi	15,280	17,642	15.5%	765	2,146	180.6%
Missouri	22,304	24,669	10.6%	18,205	18,594	2.1%
Montana	6,801	6,661	-2.1%	688	627	-8.9%
Nebraska	8,376	9,579	14.4%	1,882	2,093	11.2%
Nevada	5,165	5,856	13.4%	26,126	6,410	-75.5%
New Hampshire	3,505	3,843	9.7%	705	822	16.7%
New Jersey	48,289	54,913	13.7%	20,244	20,151	-0.5%
New Mexico	30,259	30,165	-0.3%	18,788	20,011	6.5%
New York	255,361	259,098	1.5%	59,625	60,689	1.8%
North Carolina	36,035	39,089	8.5%	42,053	39,324	-6.5%
North Dakota	2,004	2,183	8.9%	349	377	8.1%
Ohio	58,813	52,536	-10.7%	12,040	13,503	12.1%
Oklahoma	8,866	8,652	-2.4%	2,231	2,297	3.0%
Oregon	32,100	33,577	4.6%	3,529	3,117	-11.7%
Pennsylvania	78,541	78,651	0.1%	50,405	40,543	-19.6%
Rhode Island	5,616	5,082	-9.5%	1,176	1,538	30.8%
South Carolina	39,572	29,941	-24.3%	48,423	38,136	-21.2%
South Dakota	4,071	4,358	7.1%	4,882	4,381	-10.3%
Tennessee	30,635	29,813	-2.7%	17,859	21,195	18.7%
Texas	149,866	161,648	7.9%	59,114	59,540	0.7%
Utah	10,585	11,506	8.7%	14,047	13,343	-5.0%
Vermont	2,804	3,920	39.8%	2,322	1,650	-28.9%
Virginia	54,688	61,520	12.5%	9,957	11,353	14.0%
Washington	25,823	27,246	5.5%	5,152	4,717	-8.4%
West Virginia	14,503	14,673	1.2%	6,235	6,169	-1.1%
Wisconsin	37,943	35,586	-6.2%	4,247	3,413	-19.6%
Wyoming	3,107	2,994	-3.6%	1,115	1,273	14.1%
<b>United States</b>	<b>1,770,617</b>	<b>1,816,479</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>1,044,441</b>	<b>974,297</b>	<b>-6.7%</b>

**TABLE 3: Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Participation in July 2011 by State**

State	Children in SFSP, July 2011	Children in 10-11 School Year NSLP*	Children in 2011 SFSP per 100 in 10-11 School Year NSLP*	Rank	Percent SFSP Contributes to State's Overall Summer Nutrition Participation
Alabama	19,080	355,833	5.4	46	72.0%
Alaska	2,855	35,511	8.0	31	80.8%
Arizona	19,086	448,087	4.3	48	38.8%
Arkansas	22,353	232,502	9.6	23	70.6%
California	111,430	2,418,841	4.6	47	27.1%
Colorado	14,246	227,629	6.3	42	86.3%
Connecticut	12,817	143,633	8.9	26	35.0%
Delaware	9,526	51,463	18.5	6	82.4%
District of Columbia	24,027	35,043	68.6	1	93.3%
Florida	139,900	1,172,507	11.9	17	87.2%
Georgia	48,925	821,713	6.0	44	42.7%
Hawaii	1,286	62,332	2.1	51	16.5%
Idaho	20,949	99,666	21.0	3	96.2%
Illinois	62,862	725,108	8.7	28	57.3%
Indiana	42,303	412,219	10.3	21	87.8%
Iowa	10,608	159,345	6.7	40	71.2%
Kansas	10,786	181,538	5.9	45	91.0%
Kentucky	23,429	320,928	7.3	35	93.0%
Louisiana	30,491	380,050	8.0	32	86.9%
Maine	9,331	59,287	15.7	10	95.4%
Maryland	47,649	255,706	18.6	5	94.5%
Massachusetts	45,134	261,125	17.3	7	87.2%
Michigan	43,063	548,080	7.9	33	62.8%
Minnesota	28,947	253,475	11.4	19	81.5%
Mississippi	17,642	294,695	6.0	43	89.2%
Missouri	24,669	344,847	7.2	36	57.0%
Montana	6,661	45,833	14.5	12	91.4%
Nebraska	9,579	109,854	8.7	27	82.1%
Nevada	5,856	151,800	3.9	49	47.7%
New Hampshire	3,843	38,777	9.9	22	82.4%
New Jersey	54,913	393,306	14.0	14	73.2%
New Mexico	30,165	160,843	18.8	4	60.1%
New York	259,098	1,123,041	23.1	2	81.0%
North Carolina	39,089	611,453	6.4	41	49.8%
North Dakota	2,183	28,120	7.8	34	85.3%
Ohio	52,536	622,078	8.4	29	79.6%
Oklahoma	8,652	292,891	3.0	50	79.0%
Oregon	33,577	204,218	16.4	8	91.5%
Pennsylvania	78,651	553,339	14.2	13	66.0%
Rhode Island	5,082	49,127	10.3	20	76.8%
South Carolina	29,941	329,017	9.1	25	44.0%
South Dakota	4,358	46,560	9.4	24	49.9%
Tennessee	29,813	444,956	6.7	39	58.4%
Texas	161,648	2,342,390	6.9	38	73.1%
Utah	11,506	161,965	7.1	37	46.3%
Vermont	3,920	25,303	15.5	11	70.4%
Virginia	61,520	376,882	16.3	9	84.4%
Washington	27,246	334,161	8.2	30	85.2%
West Virginia	14,673	109,577	13.4	15	70.4%
Wisconsin	35,586	279,584	12.7	16	91.2%
Wyoming	2,994	25,259	11.9	18	70.2%
<b>United States</b>	<b>1,816,479</b>	<b>19,161,494</b>	<b>9.5</b>		<b>65.1%</b>

\* School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch participation in regular school year 2010-2011.

**TABLE 4: Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors and Sites from July 2010 to July 2011, by State**

State	Number of Sponsors			Number of Sites		
	July 2010	July 2011	Percent Change	July 2010	July 2011	Percent Change
Alabama	35	39	11.4%	542	519	-4.2%
Alaska	28	28	0.0%	104	126	21.2%
Arizona	45	61	35.6%	293	386	31.7%
Arkansas	119	140	17.6%	311	373	19.9%
California	201	201	0.0%	1,692	1,675	-1.0%
Colorado	60	70	16.7%	310	392	26.5%
Connecticut	26	27	3.8%	205	227	10.7%
Delaware	20	20	0.0%	331	313	-5.4%
District of Columbia	25	34	36.0%	317	322	1.6%
Florida	115	112	-2.6%	2,724	2,699	-0.9%
Georgia	94	95	1.1%	1,079	1,176	9.0%
Hawaii	25	19	-24.0%	162	76	-53.1%
Idaho	75	63	-16.0%	255	267	4.7%
Illinois	135	147	8.9%	1,646	1,594	-3.2%
Indiana	218	229	5.0%	1,100	1,140	3.6%
Iowa	95	87	-8.4%	236	220	-6.8%
Kansas	64	66	3.1%	219	214	-2.3%
Kentucky	144	140	-2.8%	1,884	1,227	-34.9%
Louisiana	73	75	2.7%	463	583	25.9%
Maine	69	78	13.0%	187	224	19.8%
Maryland	50	53	6.0%	1,122	1,242	10.7%
Massachusetts	85	88	3.5%	827	841	1.7%
Michigan	209	221	5.7%	1,027	1,020	-0.7%
Minnesota	101	118	16.8%	452	505	11.7%
Mississippi	84	86	2.4%	296	424	43.2%
Missouri	239	116	-51.5%	878	578	-34.2%
Montana	80	80	0.0%	188	178	-5.3%
Nebraska	57	60	5.3%	224	226	0.9%
Nevada	30	33	10.0%	104	117	12.5%
New Hampshire	22	22	0.0%	108	135	25.0%
New Jersey	87	89	2.3%	1,013	1,026	1.3%
New Mexico	56	53	-5.4%	648	621	-4.2%
New York	292	287	-1.7%	2,387	2,367	-0.8%
North Carolina	113	107	-5.3%	927	972	4.9%
North Dakota	37	40	8.1%	58	73	25.9%
Ohio	201	183	-9.0%	1,561	1,413	-9.5%
Oklahoma	65	149	129.2%	302	374	23.8%
Oregon	121	124	2.5%	675	714	5.8%
Pennsylvania	227	237	4.4%	2,095	1,972	-5.9%
Rhode Island	16	15	-6.3%	169	149	-11.8%
South Carolina	64	54	-15.6%	1,015	853	-16.0%
South Dakota	36	35	-2.8%	63	69	9.5%
Tennessee	53	50	-5.7%	1,040	1,043	0.3%
Texas	275	303	10.2%	3,216	3,214	-0.1%
Utah	13	16	23.1%	94	104	10.6%
Vermont	34	50	47.1%	106	137	29.2%
Virginia	121	128	5.8%	1,507	1,621	7.6%
Washington	118	119	0.8%	702	647	-7.8%
West Virginia	99	104	5.1%	535	498	-6.9%
Wisconsin	115	116	0.9%	557	580	4.1%
Wyoming	26	23	-11.5%	64	65	1.6%
<b>United States</b>	<b>4,792</b>	<b>4,890</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>38,020</b>	<b>37,531</b>	<b>-1.3%</b>

**TABLE 5: Number of Summer Food Service Program Lunches Served in June, July, and August\* 2010 and 2011, by State**

State	June 2010 SFSP Lunches	June 2011 SFSP Lunches	% Change	July 2010 SFSP Lunches	July 2011 SFSP Lunches	% Change	August 2010 SFSP Lunches	August 2011 SFSP Lunches	% Change
Alabama	579,242	539,990	-7%	411,648	381,604	-7%	5,871	24,165	312%
Alaska	62,018	76,223	23%	53,635	57,099	6%	21,169	21,909	3%
Arizona	600,817	794,399	32%	293,530	381,718	30%	11,096	21,008	89%
Arkansas	380,010	427,006	12%	376,921	447,061	19%	111,509	124,638	12%
California	949,225	997,323	5%	2,473,165	2,228,601	-10%	981,493	985,766	0%
Colorado	451,526	519,750	15%	222,267	284,912	28%	13,748	32,629	137%
Connecticut	10,169	0	N/A	227,433	256,344	13%	72,071	67,570	-6%
Delaware	98,787	92,604	-6%	239,302	190,516	-20%	108,906	104,183	-4%
District of Columbia	6,832	3,681	-46%	547,604	480,541	-12%	189,582	123,566	-35%
Florida	1,762,974	2,051,081	16%	2,891,545	2,797,998	-3%	603,867	522,997	-13%
Georgia	1,067,630	1,155,375	8%	934,396	978,490	5%	93,763	106,051	13%
Hawaii	192,235	33,949	-82%	66,901	25,728	-62%	0	0	N/A
Idaho	483,020	531,812	10%	428,861	418,980	-2%	176,201	203,547	16%
Illinois	652,032	634,803	-3%	1,351,692	1,257,247	-7%	526,074	521,613	-1%
Indiana	779,012	844,978	8%	868,645	846,056	-3%	91,695	139,185	52%
Iowa	202,983	257,951	27%	202,187	212,151	5%	28,680	30,205	5%
Kansas	343,325	364,664	6%	177,335	215,710	22%	7,653	9,667	26%
Kentucky	723,451	647,354	-11%	523,095	468,578	-10%	43,902	44,663	2%
Louisiana	1,210,736	1,220,511	1%	458,157	609,814	33%	10,330	48,759	372%
Maine	28,501	15,892	-44%	181,568	186,618	3%	47,192	65,609	39%
Maryland	187,345	176,042	-6%	1,027,724	952,980	-7%	168,381	183,165	9%
Massachusetts	66,923	56,669	-15%	912,381	902,686	-1%	492,680	530,190	8%
Michigan	357,185	390,090	9%	919,283	861,253	-6%	420,416	465,671	11%
Minnesota	259,770	327,488	26%	584,531	578,936	-1%	141,320	184,717	31%
Mississippi	800,385	870,019	9%	320,890	352,832	10%	923	6,643	620%
Missouri	1,168,849	1,305,299	12%	468,379	493,388	5%	102,764	110,809	8%
Montana	113,151	134,585	19%	142,825	133,212	-7%	43,933	43,715	0%
Nebraska	356,609	377,323	6%	175,893	191,570	9%	25,511	37,616	47%
Nevada	83,960	83,884	0%	108,459	117,115	8%	56,912	68,561	20%
New Hampshire	11,515	10,958	-5%	73,596	76,858	4%	34,382	38,162	11%
New Jersey	5,172	3,962	-23%	1,014,066	1,098,252	8%	400,706	427,724	7%
New Mexico	772,843	798,735	3%	635,442	603,304	-5%	29,626	17,303	-42%
New York	337,987	128,195	-62%	5,362,586	5,181,952	-3%	3,306,113	3,619,089	9%
North Carolina	350,267	370,126	6%	756,741	781,775	3%	292,295	257,814	-12%
North Dakota	59,447	64,387	8%	42,077	43,650	4%	7,261	11,372	57%
Ohio	872,347	887,659	2%	1,235,066	1,050,713	-15%	435,294	427,860	-2%
Oklahoma	481,676	447,901	-7%	186,190	173,038	-7%	18,687	19,294	3%
Oregon	247,934	302,393	22%	674,110	671,534	0%	347,345	411,149	18%
Pennsylvania	321,058	328,866	2%	1,649,358	1,573,021	-5%	776,607	916,180	18%
Rhode Island	9,661	5,684	-41%	117,931	101,630	-14%	58,454	57,616	-1%
South Carolina	757,259	627,284	-17%	831,011	598,821	-28%	201,776	167,544	-17%
South Dakota	97,902	102,547	5%	85,497	87,168	2%	34,337	30,336	-12%
Tennessee	839,098	872,228	4%	643,328	596,255	-7%	20,928	36,031	72%
Texas	4,602,690	4,702,989	2%	3,147,186	3,232,954	3%	1,686,125	1,557,222	-8%
Utah	271,052	274,983	1%	222,294	230,120	4%	68,075	89,265	31%
Vermont	9,236	13,273	44%	58,886	78,399	33%	20,270	25,839	27%
Virginia	295,134	389,995	32%	1,148,441	1,230,407	7%	587,161	774,196	32%
Washington	178,687	206,087	15%	542,286	544,924	0%	265,615	316,898	19%
West Virginia	101,619	117,498	16%	304,555	293,469	-4%	47,426	33,353	-30%
Wisconsin	299,191	410,199	37%	796,812	711,720	-11%	167,304	174,999	5%
Wyoming	54,689	56,826	4%	65,248	59,874	-8%	8,927	13,230	48%
<b>United States</b>	<b>24,955,166</b>	<b>26,053,520</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>37,182,959</b>	<b>36,329,576</b>	<b>-2%</b>	<b>13,412,356</b>	<b>14,251,293</b>	<b>6%</b>

\* 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 Additional Number of Children Participating and Additional Federal Payments in July 2011 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 2011	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 10-11 Regular School Year NSLP**	Total Children Who Would Be in July Summer Nutrition if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in Regular School Year NSLP**	Additional Children Reached in July if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in Regular School Year NSLP**	Additional Federal Reimbursement if State Reached in July a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in Regular School Year NSLP***
Alabama	26,488	7.4	142,333	115,846	\$7,501,004
Alaska	3,532	9.9	14,205	10,673	\$691,081
Arizona	49,158	11.0	179,235	130,076	\$8,422,439
Arkansas	31,651	13.6	93,001	61,350	\$3,972,411
California	411,191	17.0	967,536	556,346	\$36,023,380
Colorado	16,501	7.2	91,051	74,551	\$4,827,158
Connecticut	36,639	25.5	57,453	20,815	\$1,347,741
Delaware	11,560	22.5	20,585	9,025	\$584,371
District of Columbia	25,763	73.5	--	--	--
Florida	160,379	13.7	469,003	308,624	\$19,983,409
Georgia	114,653	14.0	328,685	214,033	\$13,858,605
Hawaii	7,810	12.5	24,933	17,123	\$1,108,691
Idaho	21,771	21.8	39,866	18,096	\$1,171,688
Illinois	109,626	15.1	290,043	180,417	\$11,682,011
Indiana	48,169	11.7	164,887	116,719	\$7,557,534
Iowa	14,889	9.3	63,738	48,849	\$3,162,997
Kansas	11,858	6.5	72,615	60,757	\$3,934,025
Kentucky	25,193	7.9	128,371	103,178	\$6,680,785
Louisiana	35,067	9.2	152,020	116,953	\$7,572,676
Maine	9,780	16.5	23,715	13,934	\$902,245
Maryland	50,419	19.7	102,282	51,864	\$3,358,188
Massachusetts	51,776	19.8	104,450	52,674	\$3,410,641
Michigan	68,561	12.5	219,232	150,671	\$9,755,957
Minnesota	35,532	14.0	101,390	65,857	\$4,264,270
Mississippi	19,788	6.7	117,878	98,090	\$6,351,346
Missouri	43,264	12.5	137,939	94,675	\$6,130,216
Montana	7,288	15.9	18,333	11,046	\$715,203
Nebraska	11,672	10.6	43,941	32,270	\$2,089,469
Nevada	12,266	8.1	60,720	48,454	\$3,137,399
New Hampshire	4,665	12.0	15,511	10,846	\$702,246
New Jersey	75,064	19.1	157,322	82,259	\$5,326,247
New Mexico	50,176	31.2	64,337	14,161	\$916,909
New York	319,787	28.5	449,217	129,430	\$8,380,587
North Carolina	78,413	12.8	244,581	166,168	\$10,759,390
North Dakota	2,560	9.1	11,248	8,688	\$562,571
Ohio	66,038	10.6	248,831	182,793	\$11,835,835
Oklahoma	10,949	3.7	117,156	106,207	\$6,876,916
Oregon	36,693	18.0	81,687	44,994	\$2,913,355
Pennsylvania	119,195	21.5	221,336	102,141	\$6,613,635
Rhode Island	6,619	13.5	19,651	13,031	\$843,788
South Carolina	68,077	20.7	131,607	63,530	\$4,113,555
South Dakota	8,740	18.8	18,624	9,884	\$640,017
Tennessee	51,008	11.5	177,982	126,975	\$8,221,621
Texas	221,188	9.4	936,956	715,768	\$46,345,980
Utah	24,849	15.3	64,786	39,937	\$2,585,924
Vermont	5,570	22.0	10,121	4,551	\$294,682
Virginia	72,873	19.3	150,753	77,880	\$5,042,719
Washington	31,964	9.6	133,664	101,701	\$6,585,120
West Virginia	20,843	19.0	43,831	22,988	\$1,488,481
Wisconsin	38,999	13.9	111,834	72,835	\$4,716,037
Wyoming	4,267	16.9	10,104	5,837	\$377,955
<b>United States</b>	<b>2,790,776</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>7,664,598</b>	<b>4,873,822</b>	<b>\$315,579,970</b>

\* 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 regular school year 2010-2011.

\*\*\* 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 (\$3.2375 per lunch). It also assumes that all participants are served for 20 weekdays in July 2011 (not counting the July 4th holiday).