

FRAC

Food Research & Action Center

FRAC.org



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

June 2015

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 www.frac.org/federal-foodnutrition-programs/summer-programs/.

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by Crystal FitzSimons, Signe Anderson, Clarissa Hayes, and Michael Burke.

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges support of its work to expand and improve the Summer Nutrition Programs in 2014-2015 from:

The California Endowment
ConAgra Foods Foundation
Hillshire Brands
David and Lucile Packard Foundation
Walmart Foundation
YMCA of the USA

General support of our work to expand and improve the child nutrition programs has been provided by the following:

AARP Foundation	The JPB Foundation
Anonymous Donor	Kellogg Company Fund
Bank of America Charitable Foundation	Leaves of Grass Fund
Cargill Foundation	MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger
Annie E. Casey Foundation	The Moriah Fund
Commonweal Foundation	National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.
Convergence Partnership Fund of Tides Foundation	New Directions Foundation
Entertainment Industry Foundation	Newman's Own Foundation
Eos Foundation	The Safeway Foundation
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Sand Dollar Fund
General Mills Foundation	Turrell Fund
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation	Tyson Foods, Inc.

Introduction

Summer 2014 yielded good news for the Summer Nutrition Programs and for low-income children. Last summer marked the largest increase in children eating summer meals since July 1993, the third year of growth in the programs. During July 2014, the Summer Nutrition Programs served nearly 3.2 million children, an increase of 215,000 (7.3 percent) from 2013.

During July 2014, the Summer Nutrition Programs served nearly 3.2 million children, an increase of 215,000 (7.3 percent) from 2013.

When the school bell rings to mark the beginning of the long summer recess, millions of low-income children lose access to the school breakfasts and lunches they rely on during the school year. The Summer Nutrition Programs are designed to replace school breakfast and lunch, providing meals at sites that offer educational, enrichment, physical and recreational activities, keep children safe and out of trouble, and provide crucial child care for working parents. Increasing participation in the federal Summer Nutrition Programs—the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP)—is critical to ensure the health and well-being of low-income children.

Growing participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs means that more low-income children are experiencing these benefits. In 2014, the number of children eating summer meals increased as did the reach of these programs. The programs grew to serve 16.2 children for every 100 low-income children participating in school lunch during the 2013-2014 school year, a slight increase from the ratio of 15.1:100 served in the 2012-2013 school year.

In 2014, the number of children eating summer meals increased as did the reach of these programs.

While more children are receiving summer meals, more work is needed to further strengthen the Summer Nutrition Programs so they can adequately meet children's needs. Participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs began dropping in July 2009, as states and communities cut back child care and funding for summer programs and summer school, which provide platforms for the Summer Nutrition Programs. This trend began to reverse in 2012 with a slight increase in participation, followed by much larger increases in 2013 and 2014. Still, only one in six of the low-income children who rely on school lunch during the school year participates in the Summer Nutrition Programs.

Recognizing the importance of the Summer Nutrition Programs, in 2013 the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prioritized increasing participation in them and has continued to provide the leadership necessary to expand program access. USDA set an ambitious goal to provide 10 million more summer meals in 2014 than in 2013. Comprehensive outreach, improved policies, and expanded partnerships with national, state, and local stakeholders all contributed to USDA surpassing its goal, providing 11 million more meals during summer 2014 than in 2013.¹ Expanded participation over the last few summers demonstrates that growing participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs is entirely possible when USDA leads efforts to promote programs and addresses barriers to participation; when state child nutrition agencies focus on expanding participation; and when national, state, and local stakeholders support those efforts.

Expanded participation over the last few summers demonstrates that growing participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs is entirely possible.

Last summer's gains provide important momentum to further the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs so they can serve more low-income children who lose access to nutritious meals when the school year ends. The upcoming Child Nutrition Reauthorization also provides an important opportunity for Congress to invest in the Summer Nutrition Programs and make crucial improvements enabling more low-income children to access nutritious meals throughout the summer as well as programming and activities that support their academic achievement, health, and well-being.

¹ www.fns.usda.gov/pressrelease/2015/fns-0003-15

The Summer Nutrition Programs

The two federal Summer Nutrition Programs—the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Seamless Summer Option and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)—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 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 determined eligible, all of the 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. 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 SFSP and operate one or more sites. Only schools are eligible to participate in NSLP (but the schools can use 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 - 2014

National participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs grew significantly in 2014, marking the third consecutive year of growth. While this upward trend is promising, the Summer Nutrition Programs continued to serve too few children who rely on free or reduced-price school meals during the school year.

- In July 2014, on an average day, the Summer Nutrition Programs (SFSP and NSLP combined) served lunch to 3.2 million children. The total number of children participating in Summer Nutrition increased by more than 215,000, or 7.3 percent, from July 2013 to July 2014.
- In July 2014, only 16.2 children received Summer Nutrition for every 100 low-income students who received lunch in the 2013-2014 school year. That is, only one child in six children who needed summer meals received them.
- The ratio of 16.2:100 in July 2014 was an increase compared to the ratio of 15.1:100 in July 2013. The increase in the ratio was mitigated due to an additional 97,000 low-income students participating in NSLP during the 2013-2014 school year over 2012-2013.
- The number of SFSP sponsors and sites increased from July 2013 to July 2014. Nationally, 277 sponsors (a 5.3 percent increase) and 3,899 sites (a 9.3 percent increase) were added, primarily due to the extensive outreach conducted by USDA, state agencies, and national, state, and local stakeholders.
- The Summer Nutrition Programs struggled to feed children throughout the entire summer vacation due to many sites not operating the full length of summer vacation, but there was some progress. In 2014, the number of SFSP lunches increased 7.7 percent (2.1 million) in June from 2013, but decreased 2.4 percent (329,000) in August.

State Findings for 2014

While participation rates varied greatly throughout the United States, a vast majority of states – 42 – saw growth in Summer Nutrition. The increase in many states was driven by state agencies and partner organizations intensifying their outreach efforts.

- Five top-performing states reached at least one in four of their low-income children in July 2014, when comparing Summer Nutrition participation to regular school-year free and reduced-price lunch numbers: the District of Columbia (ratio of 59.0:100), New Mexico (37.0:100), New York (31.2:100), Connecticut (27.0:100), and Vermont (29.4:100). Six additional states reached at least one in five children with summer meals: Arkansas (23.3:100), Idaho (22.6:100), Maine (21.8:100), Maryland (21.6:100), South Carolina (20.1:100), and Indiana (20.0:100).
- Nine states fed summer meals to fewer than one in ten of their low-income children in July 2014. Oklahoma (6.7:100), Kansas (7.0:100), and Kentucky (7.5:100) were the three lowest-performing states, but each had a 2014 ratio better than in the previous year.
- Forty-two states increased Summer Nutrition participation, with 18 states growing participation by more than 10 percent. Oklahoma had the largest increase, at 52.6 percent, followed by Mississippi with 45.3 percent, and Missouri with 33.9 percent.
- Nine states experienced decreases in Summer Nutrition participation; program participation in three states shrank by more than 10 percent. Arizona decreased by 18.3 percent, followed by West Virginia (17.2 percent), and Delaware (11.5 percent).
- While not used in calculations for this report, it is important to note that 20 states had their highest SFSP participation during the month of June. Mississippi, Missouri, and Nebraska all served more than twice as many lunches in June as in July.

Top Ten Performing States

State	Ratio of Students in Summer Nutrition to NSLP	Rank
District of Columbia	59.0	1
New Mexico	37.0	2
New York	31.2	3
Vermont	29.4	4
Connecticut	27.0	5
Arkansas	23.5	6
Idaho	22.6	7
Maine	21.8	8
Maryland	21.6	9
South Carolina	20.1	10

Bottom Ten Performing States

State	Ratio of Students in Summer Nutrition to NSLP	Rank
Alabama	10.3	41
West Virginia	10.3	41
Nebraska	9.5	43
Colorado	9.3	44
Hawaii	9.1	45
Mississippi	8.4	46
Nevada	8.4	46
Kentucky	7.5	48
North Dakota	7.2	49
Kansas	7.0	50
Oklahoma	6.7	51

Missed Opportunities

The Summer Nutrition Programs provide federal funding to states so that they can serve healthy meals to low-income children, improving health and well-being at a time when youth are at increased risk for food insecurity and weight gain. With many families continuing to feel the effects of the recession—the child poverty rate persists at a much higher rate than prior to the recession—it remains urgent that states continue to build on 2014’s progress in feeding children during summer. It is important to embrace efforts to expand participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs not only to improve child nutrition and health, but to boost state economies. The Summer Nutrition Programs provide healthy meals to low-income children, and funnel millions of dollars to states. For every lunch that an eligible child does not receive, the state and community miss out on \$3.4875² per child in federal SFSP funding. That can mean millions of dollars are left on the table.

- If every state had reached the goal of 40 children participating in Summer Nutrition in July 2014 for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the 2013-2014 school year, an additional 4.7 million children would have been fed each day. States would have collected an additional \$360 million in child nutrition funding in July alone (assuming the programs operated 22 days).
- The five states that missed out on the most federal funding and failed to feed the most children were Texas (\$51.2 million; 667,000 children), California (\$38.4 million; 500,000 children), Florida (\$23.9 million; 311,000 children), Georgia (\$16.5 million; 215,000 children), and Ohio (\$14.3 million; 187,000 children).

Congressional Child Nutrition Reauthorization

The child nutrition programs are scheduled to be reauthorized by Congress in the fall of 2015, providing an excellent opportunity to invest in the Summer Nutrition Programs to increase their reach. The last reauthorization made it easier for nonprofit organizations to serve more children and required schools to help with Summer Nutrition outreach. These modest changes have contributed to the gains in participation. The reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs could be expanded dramatically by making more significant investments in the upcoming reauthorization, including:

- Improving the area eligibility test by lowering it from 50 to 40 percent. Most sites qualify by demonstrating that they are located in a low-income area in which 50 percent of the children are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals, but this keeps many communities, especially those in rural areas, from participating even though they have significant numbers of low-income children.
- Streamlining the administrative requirements so nonprofit organizations and local government agencies can provide meals year-round, an expansion of the California Year-Round Summer Food Pilot to all states (schools already are allowed to feed children year-round through the NSLP’s Seamless Summer Option). This will reduce the duplicative administrative requirements of operating two child nutrition programs.
- Allowing sites to serve three meals per day instead of two, which is important for summer programs that provide full day care for working parents and for sites that provide evening activities for teens to keep them engaged and out of trouble.

² Reimbursement rates are slightly higher than this number for rural or “self-preparation” sites.

- Offering grants for transportation to assist sponsors in getting children and meals to sites. Transportation is one of the most common barriers to participation, especially in rural areas.

The improvements are included in the bi-partisan, bicameral Summer Meals Act of 2015 and would enhance efforts to expand the reach of the Summer Food Program to low-income children and simplify the administration of the program for sponsors. ³

In addition to expanding access to the Summer Nutrition Programs, the reauthorization should take steps to provide low-income households resources to purchase food through a Summer Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) card. This approach offers an important new opportunity to provide nutritional support to low-income families, especially in rural or other areas underserved by the Summer Nutrition Programs. USDA tested this approach as part of its Summer Demonstration Projects, and the evaluations found that it had a dramatic impact in reducing childhood food insecurity. ^{4,5}

Summer Meals Support Working Parents

More than 24 million children live in working poor families.⁶ For their parents, the Summer Nutrition Programs provide a safe environment where children get healthy food and benefit from activities that keep them engaged while school is out. The vast majority of summer meal sites offer educational and recreational activities, keeping children's bodies and minds active. In fact, the Summer Nutrition Programs also act as a magnet to draw children to these activities. As a result, working parents know their children are safe and hunger-free – even when school is out.

³ www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/senate-bill/613

⁴ www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/SEBTC2012.pdf

⁵ www.fns.usda.gov/sites/default/files/ops/sebtc2013.pdf

⁶ www.workingpoorfamilies.org

Conclusion

The important expansion of access to the Summer Nutrition Programs continued during summer 2014, building upon the successes of 2012 and 2013. The substantive increase in the number of children served demonstrates what is possible when USDA leads the charge, state child nutrition agencies rally in support of the programs, and national, state, and local organizations work together to expand the programs' reach. A steady and strong focus on program expansion—including aggressive outreach and promotion of the programs; policy solutions to the administrative barriers that limit participation; and improvements to the nutrition quality and appeal of the meals served—is necessary to continue to increase access to the Summer Nutrition Programs. The programs need to reach more of the low-income children who rely on school lunch during the school year. Serving just one hungry child in six is not enough.

The upcoming Child Nutrition Reauthorization provides an important opportunity to invest in the Summer Nutrition Programs so they can better serve low-income children and support summer programming and activities, ensuring that children return to school in the fall 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 FRAC. This report does not include the 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 in July (excluding the Independence Day holiday). The average daily lunch attendance numbers for July reported in FRAC's analysis are slightly different from USDA's average daily participation numbers. 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.

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 were summer vacation days. Because of the limits of the available USDA 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.

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

For this report, FRAC gave states the opportunity to update the July data on sponsors and sites, and the total number of lunches for June, July, and August that FRAC obtained from USDA. The state changes are included. New York reported the number of sites approved to provide meals as opposed to the number of sites that operated.

National School Lunch Program (NSLP)

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

Note that USDA calculates average daily participation in the regular-year NSLP by dividing the average daily lunch 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 reports these NSLP average daily participation numbers—that is, including the attendance factor. To make the NSLP numbers consistent with the SFSP numbers, for which there is no analogous attendance factor, *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation 2014* 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 FRAC's School Breakfast Scorecard School Year 2013-2014.

The Cost of Low Participation

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving Summer Nutrition in July 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 summer lunch reimbursement rate for 22 days (the number of weekdays in July 2014, not counting the Fourth of July holiday) of SFSP lunches. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available.

Table 1. Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition¹ in July 2013 and July 2014; and National School Lunch Program (NSLP)² ADP for School Years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, by State

State	July 2013 Summer Nutrition and NSLP SY 2012-13				July 2014 Summer Nutrition and NSLP SY 2013-14				
	Summer Nutrition ADP	NSLP ADP	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP ³	Rank	Summer Nutrition ADP	NSLP ADP	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP ³	Rank	Percent Change in Summer Nutrition ADP '13 to '14
Alabama	30,456	358,221	8.5	43	37,109	360,845	10.3	41	21.8
Alaska	3,664	35,893	10.2	38	4,795	35,073	13.7	30	30.9
Arizona	68,743	461,802	14.9	24	56,131	466,611	12.0	34	-18.3
Arkansas	51,166	230,127	22.2	6	53,897	231,789	23.3	6	5.3
California	447,411	2,442,773	18.3	15	485,733	2,463,957	19.7	13	8.6
Colorado	19,457	229,933	8.5	43	21,254	227,882	9.3	44	9.2
Connecticut	38,107	144,107	26.4	4	40,148	148,885	27.0	5	5.4
Delaware	11,763	54,884	21.4	8	10,410	55,889	18.6	17	-11.5
District of Columbia	23,868	41,225	57.9	1	24,683	41,857	59.0	1	3.4
Florida	174,517	1,218,251	14.3	25	187,601	1,246,331	15.1	27	7.5
Georgia	114,842	845,282	13.6	29	133,219	871,568	15.3	26	16.0
Hawaii	5,954	66,138	9.0	42	6,037	66,645	9.1	45	1.4
Idaho	21,685	98,332	22.1	7	21,828	96,734	22.6	7	0.7
Illinois	106,818	774,814	13.8	27	107,161	725,919	14.8	28	0.3
Indiana	75,781	424,239	17.9	18	85,241	426,161	20.0	11	12.5
Iowa	16,585	165,000	10.1	39	19,676	167,111	11.8	35	18.6
Kansas	12,361	185,784	6.7	48	13,270	189,505	7.0	50	7.4
Kentucky	26,587	338,904	7.8	46	26,305	353,039	7.5	48	-1.1
Louisiana	48,189	379,264	12.7	30	46,048	379,310	12.1	33	-4.4
Maine	11,535	58,781	19.6	9	12,613	57,858	21.8	8	9.3
Maryland	50,902	268,006	19.0	12	59,705	276,047	21.6	9	17.3
Massachusetts	52,938	272,171	19.5	10	55,571	285,794	19.4	14	5.0
Michigan	67,528	571,501	11.8	35	75,583	563,851	13.4	31	11.9
Minnesota	39,088	260,682	15.0	23	42,264	264,526	16.0	24	8.1
Mississippi	17,296	297,184	5.8	50	25,128	298,043	8.4	46	45.3
Missouri	28,090	355,296	7.9	45	37,623	355,568	10.6	40	33.9
Montana	7,245	45,308	16.0	21	8,441	45,480	18.6	17	16.5
Nebraska	10,683	114,581	9.3	41	10,975	115,931	9.5	43	2.7
Nevada	10,418	162,661	6.4	49	13,723	163,048	8.4	46	31.7
New Hampshire	4,725	38,850	12.2	33	5,052	38,553	13.1	32	6.9
New Jersey	76,117	416,304	18.3	15	81,140	419,100	19.4	14	6.6
New Mexico	51,943	160,533	32.4	2	58,983	159,248	37.0	2	13.6
New York	328,350	1,165,524	28.2	3	358,574	1,148,282	31.2	3	9.2
North Carolina	85,664	626,126	13.7	28	104,388	619,683	16.8	21	21.9
North Dakota	1,998	28,931	6.9	47	2,106	29,117	7.2	49	5.4
Ohio	66,015	633,022	10.4	37	68,752	638,719	10.8	38	4.1
Oklahoma	12,957	290,852	4.5	51	19,775	294,452	6.7	51	52.6
Oregon	34,560	199,350	17.3	19	35,809	198,162	18.1	19	3.6
Pennsylvania	105,607	563,854	18.7	14	112,097	564,279	19.9	12	6.1
Rhode Island	7,182	50,480	14.2	26	8,461	50,671	16.7	22	17.8
South Carolina	64,788	334,052	19.4	11	67,252	334,091	20.1	10	3.8
South Dakota	8,558	47,297	18.1	17	8,543	47,788	17.9	20	-0.2
Tennessee	56,606	444,121	12.7	30	64,032	445,425	14.4	29	13.1
Texas	280,018	2,347,225	11.9	34	273,655	2,351,650	11.6	36	-2.3
Utah	18,558	163,740	11.3	36	17,255	161,626	10.7	39	-7.0
Vermont	6,673	25,757	25.9	5	7,674	26,121	29.4	4	15.0
Virginia	66,402	393,814	16.9	20	65,045	403,181	16.1	23	-2.0
Washington	33,943	336,313	10.1	39	38,519	340,437	11.3	37	13.5
West Virginia	14,802	117,504	12.6	32	12,254	118,935	10.3	41	-17.2
Wisconsin	40,817	268,874	15.2	22	43,638	279,507	15.6	25	6.9
Wyoming	4,749	24,955	19.0	12	4,835	25,127	19.2	16	1.8
United States	2,964,709	19,578,622	15.1		3,180,011	19,675,411	16.2		7.3

¹ Summer Nutrition includes 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 to NSLP is the number of children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in NSLP.

Table 2. Change in Summer Food Service Program Average Daily Participation (ADP); and in National School Lunch Program ADP from July 2013 to July 2014, by State

State	ADP Summer Food Service Program			ADP National School Lunch Program		
	July 2013	July 2014	Percent Change '13 to '14	July 2013	July 2014	Percent Change '13 to '14
Alabama	24,151	31,030	28.5	6,305	6,079	-3.6
Alaska	3,003	4,010	33.5	661	785	18.8
Arizona	20,243	20,560	1.6	48,500	35,571	-26.7
Arkansas	41,009	41,889	2.1	10,157	12,008	18.2
California	106,186	109,672	3.3	341,225	376,061	10.2
Colorado	16,381	18,317	11.8	3,076	2,937	-4.5
Connecticut	11,731	17,933	52.9	26,376	22,215	-15.8
Delaware	10,388	9,325	-10.2	1,375	1,085	-21.1
District of Columbia	21,906	21,295	-2.8	1,962	3,388	72.7
Florida	154,992	166,948	7.7	19,525	20,653	5.8
Georgia	46,224	59,151	28.0	68,618	74,068	7.9
Hawaii	1,488	1,542	3.6	4,466	4,495	0.6
Idaho	21,004	21,123	0.6	681	705	3.5
Illinois	62,786	69,909	11.3	44,032	37,252	-15.4
Indiana	38,644	41,265	6.8	37,137	43,976	18.4
Iowa	12,688	16,067	26.6	3,897	3,609	-7.4
Kansas	11,574	12,303	6.3	787	967	22.9
Kentucky	22,758	23,057	1.3	3,829	3,248	-15.2
Louisiana	43,311	40,831	-5.7	4,878	5,217	6.9
Maine	11,093	12,242	10.4	442	371	-16.1
Maryland	49,073	57,656	17.5	1,829	2,049	12.0
Massachusetts	45,936	48,779	6.2	7,002	6,792	-3.0
Michigan	51,984	58,745	13.0	15,544	16,838	8.3
Minnesota	30,397	34,780	14.4	8,691	7,484	-13.9
Mississippi	16,184	24,124	49.1	1,112	1,004	-9.7
Missouri	19,114	23,450	22.7	8,976	14,173	57.9
Montana	6,650	7,862	18.2	595	579	-2.7
Nebraska	8,472	8,713	2.8	2,211	2,262	2.3
Nevada	6,445	7,849	21.8	3,973	5,874	47.8
New Hampshire	4,058	4,379	7.9	667	673	0.9
New Jersey	51,813	56,038	8.2	24,304	25,102	3.3
New Mexico	32,236	31,700	-1.7	19,707	27,283	38.4
New York	261,923	289,404	10.5	66,427	69,170	4.1
North Carolina	48,031	55,860	16.3	37,633	48,528	29.0
North Dakota	1,628	1,780	9.3	370	326	-11.9
Ohio	54,995	55,284	0.5	11,020	13,468	22.2
Oklahoma	9,684	16,369	69.0	3,273	3,406	4.1
Oregon	31,269	33,523	7.2	3,291	2,286	-30.5
Pennsylvania	76,541	82,415	7.7	29,066	29,682	2.1
Rhode Island	6,140	7,494	22.1	1,042	967	-7.2
South Carolina	33,488	40,712	21.6	31,300	26,540	-15.2
South Dakota	5,128	5,385	5.0	3,430	3,158	-7.9
Tennessee	40,063	43,458	8.5	16,543	20,574	24.4
Texas	180,292	170,164	-5.6	99,726	103,491	3.8
Utah	9,968	7,954	-20.2	8,590	9,301	8.3
Vermont	6,048	7,152	18.3	625	522	-16.5
Virginia	56,502	55,312	-2.1	9,900	9,733	-1.7
Washington	28,748	33,168	15.4	5,195	5,351	3.0
West Virginia	10,148	10,214	0.7	4,654	2,040	-56.2
Wisconsin	37,393	40,451	8.2	3,424	3,187	-6.9
Wyoming	3,140	3,295	4.9	1,609	1,540	-4.3
United States	1,905,051	2,061,938	8.2	1,059,658	1,118,073	5.5

Table 3. Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors and Sites from July 2013 to July 2014, by State

State	Number of Sponsors			Number of Sites		
	July 2013	July 2014	Percent Change	July 2013	July 2014	Percent Change
Alabama	63	76	20.6	593	782	31.9
Alaska	24	28	16.7	151	161	6.6
Arizona	43	39	-9.3	402	400	-0.5
Arkansas	180	221	22.8	661	1,329	101.1
California	231	218	-5.6	1,898	2,068	9.0
Colorado	76	72	-5.3	496	416	-16.1
Connecticut	23	28	21.7	236	329	39.4
Delaware	25	30	20.0	213	324	52.1
District of Columbia	36	20	-44.4	343	324	-5.5
Florida	133	147	10.5	3,466	3,647	5.2
Georgia	87	112	28.7	1,085	1,619	49.2
Hawaii	19	18	-5.3	90	91	1.1
Idaho	70	60	-14.3	284	274	-3.5
Illinois	147	162	10.2	1,624	1,737	7.0
Indiana	216	230	6.5	1,321	1,385	4.8
Iowa	96	107	11.5	265	290	9.4
Kansas	86	98	14.0	280	302	7.9
Kentucky	111	137	23.4	968	1,072	10.7
Louisiana	89	82	-7.9	584	876	50.0
Maine	95	95	0.0	306	322	5.2
Maryland	43	48	11.6	1,328	1,314	-1.1
Massachusetts	95	90	-5.3	922	941	2.1
Michigan	255	275	7.8	1,242	1,388	11.8
Minnesota	142	163	14.8	576	639	10.9
Mississippi	89	104	16.9	396	495	25.0
Missouri	265	287	8.3	927	1,054	13.7
Montana	82	85	3.7	157	171	8.9
Nebraska	54	66	22.2	160	276	72.5
Nevada	36	34	-5.6	175	212	21.1
New Hampshire	25	23	-8.0	140	144	2.9
New Jersey	96	100	4.2	1,038	1,020	-1.7
New Mexico	60	47	-21.7	651	617	-5.2
New York	300	317	5.7	2,693	2,797	3.9
North Carolina	126	115	-8.7	1,292	1,355	4.9
North Dakota	38	40	5.3	63	70	11.1
Ohio	166	166	0.0	1,471	1,523	3.5
Oklahoma	58	72	24.1	392	517	31.9
Oregon	133	134	0.8	749	794	6.0
Pennsylvania	244	262	7.4	2,157	2,276	5.5
Rhode Island	21	21	0.0	184	192	4.3
South Carolina	56	65	16.1	1,003	1,260	25.6
South Dakota	39	40	2.6	72	74	2.8
Tennessee	87	78	-10.3	1,690	1,533	-9.3
Texas	271	267	-1.5	3,601	3,661	1.7
Utah	17	11	-35.3	126	116	-7.9
Vermont	59	57	-3.4	226	258	14.2
Virginia	131	139	6.1	1,537	1,549	0.8
Washington	133	153	15.0	706	777	10.1
West Virginia	88	90	2.3	321	369	15.0
Wisconsin	138	146	5.8	655	668	2.0
Wyoming	25	24	-4.0	57	64	12.3
United States	5,222	5,499	5.3	41,973	45,872	9.3

Table 4. Number of Summer Food Service Program Lunches Served in June, July, and August 2013 and 2014, by State

State	June Lunches			July Lunches			August Lunches		
	SFSP '13	SFSP '14	Percent Change	SFSP '13	SFSP '14	Percent Change	SFSP '13	SFSP '14	Percent Change
Alabama	659,181	787,247	19.4	531,325	682,662	28.5	65,721	18,182	-72.3
Alaska	73,301	84,171	14.8	66,060	88,219	33.5	24,076	26,782	11.2
Arizona	610,251	620,457	1.7	445,340	452,326	1.6	30,131	14,792	-50.9
Arkansas	691,298	660,764	-4.4	902,190	921,554	2.1	344,633	314,381	-8.8
California	1,399,741	1,881,599	34.4	2,336,096	2,412,790	3.3	641,784	449,470	-30.0
Colorado	500,541	510,201	1.9	360,392	402,971	11.8	58,753	44,186	-24.8
Connecticut	10,552	15,650	48.3	258,087	394,529	52.9	85,786	124,310	44.9
Delaware	92,406	93,765	1.5	228,527	205,157	-10.2	99,535	82,498	-17.1
District of Columbia	3,360	795	-76.3	481,928	468,498	-2.8	130,130	107,576	-17.3
Florida	2,432,889	2,667,037	9.6	3,409,831	3,672,845	7.7	487,730	490,518	0.6
Georgia	1,074,968	1,320,426	22.8	1,016,927	1,301,316	28.0	78,207	87,261	11.6
Hawaii	37,127	34,838	-6.2	32,746	33,926	3.6	0	58	---
Idaho	486,556	467,762	-3.9	462,081	464,698	0.6	127,421	100,522	-21.1
Illinois	483,876	696,726	44.0	1,381,292	1,538,007	11.3	506,578	510,264	0.7
Indiana	956,696	941,481	-1.6	850,162	907,839	6.8	65,195	70,567	8.2
Iowa	300,498	330,602	10.0	279,139	353,475	26.6	31,937	20,947	-34.4
Kansas	439,221	488,630	11.2	254,622	270,671	6.3	20,975	15,361	-26.8
Kentucky	592,318	509,951	-13.9	500,682	507,258	1.3	52,758	37,651	-28.6
Louisiana	1,340,022	1,450,059	8.2	952,842	898,284	-5.7	58,831	49,020	-16.7
Maine	60,175	13,227	-78.0	244,051	269,317	10.4	81,140	83,920	3.4
Maryland	209,833	49,190	-76.6	1,079,605	1,268,434	17.5	182,122	150,297	-17.5
Massachusetts	45,502	64,192	41.1	1,010,598	1,073,132	6.2	477,839	496,006	3.8
Michigan	577,349	454,268	-21.1	1,143,647	1,292,399	13.0	459,176	547,135	19.4
Minnesota	440,741	491,777	11.6	668,738	765,159	14.4	222,943	241,334	8.2
Mississippi	804,790	862,984	7.2	356,050	530,717	49.1	7,655	11,200	46.3
Missouri	1,462,793	1,673,624	14.4	420,503	515,899	22.7	69,659	87,919	26.2
Montana	127,314	130,694	2.7	146,309	172,968	18.2	48,398	56,034	15.8
Nebraska	393,150	395,563	0.8	186,381	191,681	2.8	22,133	17,876	-18.9
Nevada	107,623	125,226	16.4	141,783	172,684	21.8	62,092	65,577	5.6
New Hampshire	11,856	10,333	-12.8	89,283	96,346	7.9	33,711	31,865	-5.5
New Jersey	1232	1,343	9.0	1,139,894	1,232,831	8.2	438,111	428,219	-2.3
New Mexico	747,999	761,908	1.6	709,191	697,410	-1.7	2,355	1,158	-50.8
New York	396,634	185,839	-53.1	5,762,312	6,366,883	10.5	3,430,508	3,595,186	4.8
North Carolina	508,248	524,629	3.2	1,056,684	1,228,924	16.3	424,179	448,883	5.8
North Dakota	61,934	68,264	10.2	35,815	39,164	9.4	8,815	19,185	117.6
Ohio	909,450	939,701	3.3	1,209,900	1,216,252	0.5	265,618	227,964	-14.2
Oklahoma	451,235	541,354	20.0	213,050	360,107	69.0	19,516	51,238	162.5
Oregon	249,030	303,715	22.0	687,924	737,495	7.2	359,718	360,372	0.2
Pennsylvania	334,357	355,140	6.2	1,683,905	1,813,132	7.7	857,429	861,345	0.5
Rhode Island	4,734	10,933	130.9	135,089	164,867	22.0	62,198	71,326	14.7
South Carolina	567,134	729,719	28.7	736,736	895,663	21.6	214,777	220,363	2.6
South Dakota	132,667	140,251	5.7	112,825	118,472	5.0	35,783	28,464	-20.5
Tennessee	1,265,774	1,279,138	1.1	881,387	956,069	8.5	34,595	19,006	-45.1
Texas	3,929,398	4,479,188	14.0	3,966,415	3,743,608	-5.6	1,822,083	1,657,131	-9.1
Utah	252,083	210,219	-16.6	219,297	174,985	-20.2	62,560	49,451	-21.0
Vermont	23,147	26,245	14.2	133,052	157,341	18.3	39,773	41,243	5.6
Virginia	401,648	366,129	-8.8	1,243,036	1,216,854	-2.1	479,620	389,596	-18.8
Washington	208,128	239,269	15.0	632,452	729,699	15.4	318,676	312,097	-2.1
West Virginia	100,149	89,978	-10.2	223,256	224,698	0.6	17,982	11,939	-33.6
Wisconsin	463,161	452,002	-2.4	822,642	889,914	8.2	244,111	236,206	-3.2
Wyoming	57,851	65,265	12.8	69,069	72,498	5.0	15,482	17,756	14.7
United States	27,491,921	29,603,468	7.7	41,911,148	45,362,627	8.2	13,730,938	13,401,637	-2.4

Note: 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 5. Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition¹ and Additional ADP and Additional Federal Reimbursement if States Reached FRAC's Goal of 40 Summer Nutrition Participants per 100 National School Lunch Program (NSLP)² Participants

State	Summer Nutrition ADP, July 2014	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP ³	Total Summer Nutrition ADP if Summer Nutrition to NSLP Ratio Reached 40:100	Additional Summer Nutrition ADP if Summer Nutrition to NSLP Ratio Reached 40:100	Additional Federal Reimbursement Dollars if Summer Nutrition to NSLP Ratio Reached 40:100 ⁴
Alabama	37,109	10.3	144,338	107,229	8,227,145
Alaska	4,795	13.7	14,029	9,234	708,479
Arizona	56,131	12.0	186,644	130,513	10,013,610
Arkansas	53,897	23.3	92,716	38,819	2,978,388
California	485,733	19.7	985,583	499,850	38,350,992
Colorado	21,254	9.3	91,153	69,899	5,363,001
Connecticut	40,148	27.0	59,554	19,406	1,488,925
Delaware	10,410	18.6	22,356	11,946	916,557
District of Columbia	24,683	59.0	---	---	---
Florida	187,601	15.1	498,532	310,931	23,856,180
Georgia	133,219	15.3	348,627	215,408	16,527,179
Hawaii	6,037	9.1	26,658	20,621	1,582,146
Idaho	21,828	22.6	38,694	16,866	1,294,044
Illinois	107,161	14.8	290,368	183,207	14,056,557
Indiana	85,241	20.0	170,464	85,223	6,538,735
Iowa	19,676	11.8	66,844	47,168	3,618,965
Kansas	13,270	7.0	75,802	62,532	4,797,768
Kentucky	26,305	7.5	141,216	114,911	8,816,546
Louisiana	46,048	12.1	151,724	105,676	8,107,991
Maine	12,613	21.8	23,143	10,530	807,914
Maryland	59,705	21.6	110,419	50,714	3,891,032
Massachusetts	55,571	19.4	114,318	58,747	4,507,364
Michigan	75,583	13.4	225,540	149,957	11,505,451
Minnesota	42,264	16.0	105,810	63,546	4,875,567
Mississippi	25,128	8.4	119,217	94,089	7,218,979
Missouri	37,623	10.6	142,227	104,604	8,025,742
Montana	8,441	18.6	18,192	9,751	748,146
Nebraska	10,975	9.5	46,372	35,397	2,715,835
Nevada	13,723	8.4	65,219	51,496	3,951,031
New Hampshire	5,052	13.1	15,421	10,369	795,562
New Jersey	81,140	19.4	167,640	86,500	6,636,713
New Mexico	58,983	37.0	63,699	4,716	361,835
New York	358,574	31.2	459,313	100,739	7,729,200
North Carolina	104,388	16.8	247,873	143,485	11,008,887
North Dakota	2,106	7.2	11,647	9,541	732,033
Ohio	68,752	10.8	255,488	186,736	14,327,320
Oklahoma	19,775	6.7	117,781	98,006	7,519,511
Oregon	35,809	18.1	79,265	43,456	3,334,162
Pennsylvania	112,097	19.9	225,712	113,615	8,717,111
Rhode Island	8,461	16.7	20,268	11,807	905,892
South Carolina	67,252	20.1	133,636	66,384	5,093,313
South Dakota	8,543	17.9	19,115	10,572	811,137
Tennessee	64,032	14.4	178,170	114,138	8,757,238
Texas	273,655	11.6	940,660	667,005	51,175,960
Utah	17,255	10.7	64,650	47,395	3,636,382
Vermont	7,674	29.4	10,448	2,774	212,835
Virginia	65,045	16.1	161,272	96,227	7,383,017
Washington	38,519	11.3	136,175	97,656	7,492,657
West Virginia	12,254	10.3	47,574	35,320	2,709,927
Wisconsin	43,638	15.6	111,803	68,165	5,229,960
Wyoming	4,835	19.2	10,051	5,216	400,198
United States	3,180,011	16.2	7,853,420	4,698,092	360,461,119

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

² School Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch participation in regular school year 2013-2014.

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

⁴ Additional federal reimbursement dollars 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 (\$3.4875 per lunch) and are served 22 days in July 2014.