FRAC
Food Research & Action Center

Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Nutrition Status Report

June 2018 ■ www.FRAC.org

Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Nutrition Status Report

Acknowledgments

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

The Food Research & Action Center (FRAC) gratefully acknowledges the following for supporting its work to expand and improve the Summer Nutrition Programs in 2017–2018:

- The California Endowment;
- Kellogg Company Fund;
- National League of Cities Institute;
- Tyson Foods, Inc.;
- Walmart Foundation; and
- YMCA of the USA.

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

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

About FRAC

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

FRAC
Food Research & Action Center

Introduction

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 federal Summer Nutrition Programs[1] are designed to replace school breakfast and lunch. The programs ensure that low-income children have access to healthy meals, which is critical for their health and well-being. In addition to nutritious meals, many Summer Nutrition Programs sites offer educational, enrichment, physical, and recreational activities; keep children safe and out of trouble; and provide crucial child care for working parents.

The Summer Nutrition Programs consistently have struggled to meet the need, serving only a modest fraction of the low-income children who rely on free and reduced-price school lunch during the school year. In July 2017, just over 3 million children participated, a small decrease of 14,000 from July 2016. Only one child out of seven received a nutritious summer lunch through the Summer Nutrition Programs when compared to the 20 million children who participated in free and reduced-price school lunch during the 2016–2017 school year.

The 2017 drop in participation follows a concentrated and successful multi-year effort to increase participation, which resulted in 13,000 additional children participating in 2012; 161,000 additional children in 2013; 215,000 additional children in 2014; and 11,000 additional children in 2015. However, in the summers of 2016 (153,000 fewer children) and 2017 (14,000 fewer children), the program began to lose ground.

One of the primary reasons for the low participation and the ongoing struggle to increase it is that there is not enough public and private funding for summer programs that provide educational and enrichment activities for low-income children. These programs also provide the platform for serving summer meals. The programming combined with the meals gives children what they need: enrichment activities in a safe and supervised environment, and the nutrition necessary to return in the fall healthy and ready to learn. The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, the largest source of federal funding for summer and afterschool programs, serves just 1.7 million children. More funding at the federal, state, and local levels for summer programs that do not price out low-income families from participating is needed to increase participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs.

Additionally, there are ways to strengthen through federal legislation the Summer Nutrition Programs and overcome common barriers. One key strategy is making more low-income communities eligible to participate. The current area eligibility test requires that at least half of the children in the area are low-income, which makes it difficult for communities with substantial but less concentrated poverty, such as rural areas, to provide summer meals. Rural areas also would benefit from targeted funding for transportation costs.

[1] The federal Summer Nutrition Programs include the Summer Food Service Program and the National School Lunch Program, which includes the Seamless Summer Option.

Last summer's small drop in participation further compounds the large drop in 2016, highlighting the need to redouble efforts to increase participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs. Outreach, promotion, and planning all contributed to the earlier growth in program participation. These earlier efforts focused solely on increasing participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs. Expanding these efforts to include afterschool nutrition programs during the regular school year through the Child and Adult Care Food Program would create stronger, more sustainable out-of-school-time programs that operate from year to year. Together, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, state child nutrition agencies, sponsors, summer programs, anti-hunger and child advocates, and communities can take these steps to reverse the drop and expand the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs.

About This Summer Food Report

This report measures the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs in July 2017, nationally and in each state. It is based on a variety of metrics and examines the impact of trends and policies on program participation.

First, this report looks at lunch participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs — the combined lunch participation in the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), which includes children participating through the NSLP Seamless Summer Option and those certified for free and reduced-price meals — and uses free and reduced-price participation in NSLP in the prior regular school year as a benchmark against which to compare summer. Because there is broad participation in the regular school year lunch program by low-income students across the states, it is a useful comparison by which to measure how many students could and should be benefiting from the Summer Nutrition Programs.

Second, this report looks at the number of sponsors and sites operating SFSP, as this is an important indicator of access to the program for low-income children in the states.

Finally, this report sets an ambitious, but achievable, goal of reaching 40 children with the Summer Nutrition Programs for every 100 participating in school lunch and calculates the number of unserved children and the federal dollars lost in each state that is not meeting this goal.

National Findings for 2017

National participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs decreased slightly in 2017, marking a second year of diminished participation. The Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) saw a decrease, while the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) saw an increase in the average daily participation; however, the increased participation in NSLP was not enough to make up for the decline in SFSP participation.

- In July 2017, on an average weekday, the Summer Nutrition Programs served lunch to more than 3 million children, a decrease of just over 14,000 children, or 0.5 percent, from July 2016.
- The drop in participation was driven by SFSP, which served approximately 71,000 fewer children. July NSLP participation increased by nearly 57,000 children.
- In July 2017, only 15 children received summer lunch for every 100 low-income children who received lunch in the 2016–2017 school year.
- The ratio of 15 to 100 remained unchanged from July 2016. The small drop in participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs — combined with a decrease of 131,000 low-income children participating in school lunch during the 2016–2017 regular school year from the previous school year — meant that the ratio remained static.
- The number of SFSP sponsors decreased while the number of sites increased from July 2016 to July 2017. Nationally, 5,512 sponsors (an increase by one sponsor) and 48,798 sites (an increase by 150 sites) participated in July 2017.
- The Summer Nutrition Programs are designed to provide meals to children throughout the entire summer, but more work is needed to ensure that sites are open all summer long. In June 2017, the number of SFSP lunches increased compared to the previous summer by 4.2 percent (nearly 1.3 million), while that number decreased by 3.5 percent (a little more than 527,000) in August 2017.

State Findings for 2017

The reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs varied throughout the country, with the lowest-performing state serving one child for every 21 low-income children who participated in school lunch during the regular school year, and the highest-performing state serving nearly half of such children. Only 15 states increased participation in July 2017.

- The four top-performing states and the District of Columbia reached at least one child for every four low-income children in July 2017, when comparing Summer Nutrition Programs participation to the regular school-year free and reduced-price National School Lunch Program (NSLP) numbers. The top performers included the District of Columbia (47.9 to 100), Vermont (30.7 to 100), New York (30.4 to 100), New Mexico (28.4 to 100), and Maine (27.4 to 100).
- There were four additional states that reached one child with summer lunches for every five low-income children who participated in school lunch: New Jersey (23.7 to 100), Georgia (22.4 to 100), Maryland (21.6 to 100), and Connecticut (21.3 to 100).
- Twelve states provided summer lunch to fewer than one child for every 10 children who participated in school lunch: Oklahoma (4.7 to 100), Nevada (4.9 to 100), Louisiana (6.8 to 100), Nebraska (6.9 to 100), Mississippi (7.7 to 100), Kentucky (7.8 to 100), Texas (8.2 to 100), West Virginia (8.2 to 100), Colorado (8.7 to 100), Missouri (8.8 to 100), Hawaii (9.6 to 100), and Kansas (9.6 to 100).
- Three states increased the number of participants in the Summer Nutrition Programs by more than 10 percent: Georgia (37.7 percent), New Jersey (25 percent), and Indiana (16.3 percent).
- While this report focuses on participation in NSLP and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)

combined during the month of July, it is important to note that 27 states served more lunches through SFSP during the month of June. Five states served more than twice as many lunches through SFSP in June than in July – Arizona, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma.

- In 2017, several states continued to address the gaps that often exist at the beginning and end of summer by increasing the number of SFSP lunches provided. Twenty-one states increased the number of SFSP lunches served in the months of June and August. Nine of those states increased the number of summer lunches served during all three summer months — Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

Top 10 Performing States		
State	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP	Rank
District of Columbia	47.9	1
Vermont	30.7	2
New York	30.4	3
New Mexico	28.4	4
Maine	27.4	5
New Jersey	23.7	6
Georgia	22.4	7
Maryland	21.6	8
Connecticut	21.3	9
Idaho	19.7	10

Bottom 10 Performing States		
State	Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP	Rank
Missouri	8.8	42
Colorado	8.7	43
West Virginia	8.2	44
Texas	8.2	45
Kentucky	7.8	46
Mississippi	7.7	47
Nebraska	6.9	48
Louisiana	6.8	49
Nevada	4.9	50
Oklahoma	4.7	51

Missed Opportunities

The Summer Nutrition Programs provide federal funding to states so they can provide healthy summer meals that help reduce childhood hunger and improve nutrition. In addition, states have the opportunity to bring in additional federal dollars by serving more meals. These dollars provide a sustainable funding source to summer programs and support summer employment.

The Summer Nutrition Programs can bring millions of dollars to states. For every lunch that an eligible child did not receive in 2017, the state and community missed out on $3.77 per child in federal Summer Food Service Program funding. That means many millions of dollars were left on the table.

If every state had reached the goal of 40 children participating in the Summer Nutrition Programs in July 2017 for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the 2016–2017 school year, an additional 5 million children would have been fed each day. States would have collected an additional $379 million in child nutrition funding in July alone (assuming the program operated 20 days).

The six states that missed out on the most federal funding and failed to feed the most children by falling short of the 40 to 100 goal were Texas ($57.9 million; 767,801 children), California ($39.5 million; 523,471 children), Florida ($24.2 million; 321,493 children), Illinois ($16.4 million; 218,092 children), Ohio ($13.9 million; 184,010 children) and Pennsylvania ($12 million; 158,789 children).

Opportunities

Summer Electronic Benefits Transfer for Children Program: An Important Strategy to Meet the Nutrition Gap

In 2011, the U.S. Department of Agriculture began the Summer Electronic Benefits Transfer for Children (SEBTC) program, providing the families of 12,500 low-income children a debit card with a fixed dollar amount to purchase groceries during the summer months. Participation in SEBTC is not captured in this report's analysis of the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs, but approximately 240,000 children across seven states (Connecticut, Delaware, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, Virginia) and the Cherokee and Chickasaw Nations participated in summer 2017. This was an increase from 2016 when approximately 209,000 children participated.

Children need both the food and the academic and enrichment activities provided at summer meal sites in order to return to school at the end of the summer ready to learn. However, SEBTC offers a way to ensure that children in communities with limited summer meal sites, due to transportation or other barriers, still have access to nutrition during the summer, a time when states with low participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs have the largest seasonal increases in food insecurity.[2]

A 2016 report[3] assessed the two different levels of monthly summer benefits ($30 and $60) as well as the different distribution models: benefits tied to specific food items, similar to the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), versus a specific monetary value available for food purchases similar to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). In that report, participation in SEBTC led to several positive results:

- **Reduced food insecurity.** By providing low-income households with a $30 or $60 per month per child benefit, the most severe type of food insecurity (*very low food security*) was reduced by one-third, and food insecurity was reduced by one-fifth.
- **Improved nutrition.** Both the $30 and $60 monthly benefit levels led to an improvement in children's summertime nutritional intake, but children in households that received the $60 benefit ate slightly more nutritious foods (fruits, vegetables, and whole grains) than those in the $30 group.
- **High rates of participation.** More than 75 percent of households redeemed some or all of their benefits. While both models were efficient in reaching families, those who participated in the project modeled after SNAP redeemed benefits at higher rates than those who were in the project that was based on the WIC model (95 percent versus 83 percent). This is likely due to the more limited availability of WIC retailers and the higher administrative costs to provide the benefit through WIC.

Recognizing the impact SEBTC has on reducing food insecurity, Congress has continued to invest in and expand SEBTC's reach through the annual appropriations process. Over the last few years, there have been a number of proposals and legislation introduced that would have made even larger investments in SEBTC, including the Stop Summer Hunger Child Nutrition Act (S. 1539/H.R. 2715), introduced by Senator Patty Murray (D-WA) and Representative Susan Davis (D-CA).

As too many children continue to miss out on summer meals, it is crucial to intensify efforts to invest in and expand both the SEBTC and the Summer Nutrition Programs. By providing greater nutritional support to families in underserved and hard-to-reach areas, while simultaneously strengthening the Summer Nutrition Programs to ensure that low-income children have access to the food and programming they need over

[2] Nord, M. & Romig, K. (2006). Hunger in the summer: seasonal food insecurity and the National School Lunch and Summer Food Service programs. *Journal of Children and Poverty*, 12(2), 141-158.

[3] Abt Associates Inc. (2016). Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer for Children (SEBTC) Demonstration: Summary Report. Available at: https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/ops/sebtcfinalreport.pdf. Accessed on May 10, 2018.

the summer, more children will return to school in the fall healthy, nourished, and ready to learn.

Summer Programming

Summer Learning Loss

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

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

The *21st Century Community Learning Centers* program, the largest federal funding source for summer and afterschool programming, demonstrates the positive impact federal funding can have on supporting students' academic achievement. Despite proposals by the current administration to eliminate funding for the program completely in both fiscal year (FY) 2018 and FY 2019, Congress recently approved $1.21 billion in funding for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program for FY 2018 — $20 million above the previous year. Twenty-thousand additional children will join the 1.6 million already benefiting from the program. However, millions more remain unserved, and the program remains vulnerable to future funding cuts. With clear evidence of the detrimental impact that summer learning loss has on students — and ultimately, on the future workforce — Congress should continue investing more resources into the 21st Century Community Learning

Centers as well as other summer enrichment opportunities, not cut them.

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

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

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

Every Student Succeeds Act

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and replaces No Child Left Behind. ESSA brings more decision-making back to state education agencies and local education agencies (LEAs — commonly referred to as school districts) and offers an opportunity to increase participation in summer meals.

ESSA focuses on ensuring that students succeed academically, but acknowledges the need to support the whole child through collaboration, engagement, and evidence-based programs. The large body of research on the negative impact of hunger on children's academic outcomes; the role of the federal child nutrition programs in combating childhood hunger; and the positive impact of summer programs on academic achievement highlight the ways that increasing access to summer meals and summer programs can help states and school districts meet the goals of ESSA.

All states were required to submit an ESSA plan to the U.S. Department of Education, and school districts must develop a plan based upon their state's plan. States and LEAs also must develop a report card, which creates and implements new accountability systems and needs assessments for schools. The state and local report cards can include participation in the child nutrition programs. States and school districts are required to have meaningful engagement from community members on the plan's development and the report cards, creating the opportunity to inform educators about the positive impact of the child nutrition programs.

As of May 2018, not all state plans have been approved, but all states are working on implementation and LEAs are working on their plans and implementation as well. Some states have incorporated increased access to the child nutrition programs and expanded summer learning opportunities. For example, Oklahoma's plan includes efforts to combat hunger, setting a goal to increase the number of meals served through the Summer Food Service Program by 30 percent by 2025, and supports offering summer programs.

To see how your state is doing with implementing ESSA, refer to the National Education Association's ***interactive map***. For more information on opportunities to increase access to the Summer Nutrition Programs and other child nutrition programs through ESSA, visit the ***Food Research & Action Center's website***.

Meal Quality

Nutritious and appealing summer meals draw children to sites and keep them coming back throughout the summer. The meals provided through the Summer Nutrition Programs must meet the federal nutrition standards, with a lunch including milk, two servings of fruits and vegetables, a grain, and a protein, but many sponsors are going above and beyond the standards to provide fresh and local produce, increase whole grain options, serve lean meats, and provide low or non-fat milk.

To encourage sponsors to focus on improving nutrition quality, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), launched ***Turnip the Beet*** in 2016. The initiative gives awards to sponsors that provide high-quality meals, offers resources on improving nutritional quality, and highlights best practices. USDA's Team Nutrition also has provided numerous resources to improve summer meals and incorporate nutrition education. The Food Research & Action Center also has focused on improving nutrition quality by developing the *Summer Food Standards of Excellence*. The Standards of Excellence, modeled after USDA's HealthierUS School Challenge, provides criteria for meeting gold, silver, or bronze standards for food quality, the site environment, and outreach efforts. State agencies and anti-hunger organizations have used the Standards to highlight and promote best practices.

In addition, USDA is working closely with state agencies to promote the use of local foods in summer meals, known as "farm to summer." USDA allows its Farm to School grants to support incorporating local foods into summer meals. Many state child nutrition agencies, including those in Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Texas, and Wyoming, reported promoting farm to summer through trainings, technical assistance, and partnerships. FRAC's *Fresh From the Farm Guide: Using Local Foods in the Afterschool and Summer Nutrition Programs* provides ideas and resources for incorporating local foods into summer and afterschool meal sites and can help support these efforts.

Strategies to Improve Quality in Vermont

Hunger Free Vermont works with sponsors to improve nutrition quality. It created a *food quality and cost control resource hub* to provide information and best practices related to nutritional quality for sponsors to guide their efforts in improving meal quality. Hunger Free Vermont also works with a robust network of partners to help sponsors source local foods.

Excellence in Summer Meals Campaign

The Texas Hunger Initiative (THI) created its Excellence in Summer Meals Campaign (based on FRAC's *Summer Food Standards of Excellence*) to encourage sponsors to serve high-quality meals. Each year, THI hosts an event to recognize and give awards to sponsors that exceed expectations during the summer. Eighteen sponsors were honored in 2017. The Excellence in Summer Meals Campaign initially focused on Dallas, but has expanded to include Austin, and will expand further in 2018 to include Fort Worth and additional counties.

Conclusion

Children need healthy meals throughout the long summer break, the time when childhood hunger increases. But the Summer Nutrition Programs are not meeting enough of the need, serving only one child for every seven low-income children who participated in school lunch during the regular school year. The small decrease in Summer Nutrition Programs participation in 2017, combined with the larger decrease in 2016, highlights the need to redouble efforts to ensure that children have access to healthy meals in the summer.

In order to expand access, federal, state, and local government and private funders need to provide more funding for summer programming to help low-income children. Congress also needs to make improvements to the Summer Nutrition Programs that increase the number of communities eligible to participate and ease the paperwork requirements of providing meals to children year-round at summer and afterschool programs. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, state child nutrition agencies, and anti-hunger partners need to maintain and expand efforts to increase participation

through promotion, outreach, and planning. There is much work to be done to increase the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs, but through additional investments and focused expansion efforts at the national, state, and local levels, more children who need summer meals will have access to them.

Technical Notes

The data in this report are collected from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and from an annual survey of state child nutrition officials conducted by the Food Research & Action Center (FRAC).

This report does not include the Summer Nutrition Programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, or Department of Defense schools.

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

Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)

USDA provided to FRAC the number of SFSP lunches served in each state. FRAC calculated each state's July average daily lunch participation in 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 participation 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 participation numbers in the school year National School Lunch Program (NSLP), as described below.

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

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.

National School Lunch Program (NSLP)

Using data provided by USDA, FRAC calculated the regular school year NSLP average of daily low-income student 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 this report. The NSLP summer meal numbers include all of 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).

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 annual *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; however, this report — *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation* — 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 2016–2017*.

FRAC recalculated average daily NSLP participation for July 2016 and 2017 in Hawaii to resolve data inconsistencies. While the number of lunches served in July 2017 declined by 10.0 percent compared to the previous July, the reported average daily participation

fell 68.0 percent, apparently due to the average number of operating days rising sharply from around nine days in July 2016 to 24 days in July 2017. FRAC was unable to determine the actual number of operating days in either summer. Instead, FRAC determined that Hawaii averaged about 10 operating days in July over the period from 2000 to 2015. FRAC calculated average daily participation in lunch in July 2016 and 2017 by dividing the number of meals served in July by 10 days.

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

The Cost of Low Participation

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving summer nutrition 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 lunch participation. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the summer lunch reimbursement rate for 20 days (the number of weekdays in July 2017, not counting the Independence Day holiday) of SFSP lunches. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available ($3.77 per lunch for July 2017).

Table 1:

Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition[1] in July 2016 and July 2017, Compared to Regular School Year National School Lunch Program (NSLP)[2] Average Daily Participation (ADP) for School Years 2015–2016 and 2016–2017, by State

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

[1] Summer Nutrition 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 (SFSP) Average Daily Participation (ADP); and in National School Lunch Program (NSLP) ADP from July 2016 to July 2017, by State

State	SFSP ADP July 2016	SFSP ADP July 2017	SFSP ADP Percent Change 2016–2017	NSLP ADP July 2016	NSLP ADP July 2017	NSLP ADP Percent Change 2016–2017
Alabama	33,190	33,044	-0.4%	4,689	3,987	-15.0%
Alaska	3,310	3,403	2.8%	684	659	-3.6%
Arizona	9,424	8,221	-12.8%	48,110	39,996	-16.9%
Arkansas	20,251	15,402	-23.9%	8,669	8,900	2.7%
California	121,533	107,380	-11.6%	335,074	335,834	0.2%
Colorado	18,413	17,779	-3.4%	1,858	1,846	-0.6%
Connecticut	29,635	26,897	-9.2%	7,668	7,360	-4.0%
Delaware	9,048	9,138	1.0%	1,163	1,009	-13.2%
District of Columbia	19,229	16,804	-12.6%	2,482	3,456	39.3%
Florida	192,447	186,166	-3.3%	28,039	27,646	-1.4%
Georgia	64,238	56,932	-11.4%	77,545	138,301	78.3%
Hawaii	1,600	1,840	15.0%	4,466	4,021	-10.0%
Idaho	19,855	17,692	-10.9%	568	609	7.2%
Illinois	57,766	73,168	26.7%	33,739	15,898	-52.9%
Indiana	34,769	33,360	-4.1%	33,382	45,917	37.5%
Iowa	17,999	17,939	-0.3%	1,992	1,839	-7.7%
Kansas	15,939	16,470	3.3%	1,248	1,166	-6.5%
Kentucky	29,526	30,074	1.9%	2,717	803	-70.5%
Louisiana	35,779	26,477	-26.0%	1,815	2,317	27.7%
Maine	15,759	15,384	-2.4%	398	298	-25.0%
Maryland	68,767	62,351	-9.3%	1,624	1,384	-14.8%
Massachusetts	48,720	46,177	-5.2%	7,655	7,404	-3.3%
Michigan	54,944	54,511	-0.8%	9,479	11,903	25.6%
Minnesota	36,865	39,763	7.9%	7,632	7,185	-5.9%
Mississippi	23,268	20,658	-11.2%	838	1,998	138.5%
Missouri	24,667	25,566	3.6%	10,541	5,573	-47.1%
Montana	8,429	8,138	-3.4%	593	460	-22.4%
Nebraska	7,466	7,348	-1.6%	1,551	807	-47.9%
Nevada	7,726	7,733	0.1%	12,638	631	-95.0%
New Hampshire	4,583	4,745	3.5%	948	841	-11.3%
New Jersey	56,724	74,827	31.9%	24,191	26,312	8.8%
New Mexico	37,440	29,119	-22.2%	24,559	20,074	-18.3%
New York	280,439	283,897	1.2%	71,826	74,149	3.2%
North Carolina	65,589	62,710	-4.4%	37,180	37,758	1.6%
North Dakota	2,869	3,016	5.1%	297	238	-19.8%
Ohio	53,369	53,956	1.1%	9,570	10,908	14.0%
Oklahoma	13,705	13,131	-4.2%	3,287	1,326	-59.7%
Oregon	30,784	30,566	-0.7%	3,671	2,909	-20.8%
Pennsylvania	68,790	66,579	-3.2%	20,955	26,988	28.8%
Rhode Island	9,281	8,590	-7.4%	958	1,180	23.2%
South Carolina	46,699	40,609	-13.0%	22,767	21,001	-7.8%
South Dakota	5,537	6,036	9.0%	2,700	1,486	-45.0%
Tennessee	41,326	40,027	-3.1%	24,388	25,352	4.0%
Texas	123,246	106,303	-13.7%	72,436	90,785	25.3%
Utah	4,586	3,544	-22.7%	23,708	20,029	-15.5%
Vermont	8,492	7,482	-11.9%	550	361	-34.3%
Virginia	56,111	49,563	-11.7%	6,592	16,444	149.4%
Washington	31,624	32,036	1.3%	5,906	5,625	-4.8%
West Virginia	9,810	8,829	-10.0%	2,069	1,838	-11.1%
Wisconsin	39,337	38,644	-1.8%	3,054	3,042	-0.4%
Wyoming	3,718	3,515	-5.5%	868	401	-53.8%
US	2,024,620	1,953,537	-3.5%	1,011,334	1,068,254	5.6%

Table 3:

Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors and Sites From July 2016 to July 2017, by State

State	Sponsors July 2016	Sponsors July 2017	Sponsors Percent Change	Sites July 2016	Sites July 2017	Sites Percent Change
Alabama	99	102	3.0%	925	978	5.7%
Alaska	27	28	3.7%	153	157	2.6%
Arizona	23	32	39.1%	278	266	-4.3%
Arkansas	116	92	-20.7%	574	382	-33.4%
California	208	199	-4.3%	2,224	2,468	11.0%
Colorado	79	79	0.0%	470	543	15.5%
Connecticut	43	46	7.0%	598	537	-10.2%
Delaware	28	27	-3.6%	336	310	-7.7%
District of Columbia	19	19	0.0%	299	295	-1.3%
Florida	153	156	2.0%	4,209	4,354	3.4%
Georgia	96	86	-10.4%	1,438	1,348	-6.3%
Hawaii	20	20	0.0%	84	92	9.5%
Idaho	60	62	3.3%	278	278	0.0%
Illinois	165	156	-5.5%	1,519	1,816	19.6%
Indiana	218	229	5.0%	1,248	1,321	5.8%
Iowa	147	157	6.8%	427	438	2.6%
Kansas	129	132	2.3%	477	509	6.7%
Kentucky	150	147	-2.0%	1,640	1,628	-0.7%
Louisiana	104	94	-9.6%	652	608	-6.7%
Maine	113	111	-1.8%	389	419	7.7%
Maryland	47	46	-2.1%	1,455	1,357	-6.7%
Massachusetts	102	104	2.0%	1,051	1,072	2.0%
Michigan	297	312	5.1%	1,548	1,667	7.7%
Minnesota	176	184	4.5%	751	832	10.8%
Mississippi	113	99	-12.4%	507	499	-1.6%
Missouri	119	126	5.9%	752	720	-4.3%
Montana	89	80	-10.1%	202	216	6.9%
Nebraska	55	56	1.8%	186	156	-16.1%
Nevada	29	28	-3.4%	304	273	-10.2%
New Hampshire	25	29	16.0%	170	184	8.2%
New Jersey	111	116	4.5%	1,351	1,372	1.6%
New Mexico	56	57	1.8%	637	685	7.5%
New York	348	361	3.7%	2,908	3,079	5.9%
North Carolina	133	130	-2.3%	2,028	2,010	-0.9%
North Dakota	36	34	-5.6%	85	80	-5.9%
Ohio	178	178	0.0%	1,653	1,620	-2.0%
Oklahoma	77	79	2.6%	522	442	-15.3%
Oregon	139	138	0.7%	812	785	-3.3%
Pennsylvania	283	302	6.7%	2,365	2,608	10.3%
Rhode Island	25	26	4.0%	208	215	3.4%
South Carolina	72	69	-4.2%	1,509	1,803	19.5%
South Dakota	43	48	11.6%	90	92	2.2%
Tennessee	59	42	-28.8%	1,522	1,452	-4.6%
Texas	279	246	-11.8%	3,220	3,020	-6.2%
Utah	14	15	7.1%	102	103	1.0%
Vermont	53	58	9.4%	293	277	-5.5%
Virginia	139	128	-7.9%	1,459	1,301	-10.8%
Washington	151	152	0.7%	860	874	1.6%
West Virginia	101	96	-5.0%	413	411	-0.5%
Wisconsin	155	169	9.0%	712	750	5.3%
Wyoming	27	30	11.1%	97	96	-1.0%
US	5,528	5,512	-0.3%	47,990	48,798	1.7%

Table 4:

Number of Summer Food Service Program Lunches Served in June, July, and August 2016 and 2017, by State

State	Lunches June 2016	Lunches June 2017	Percent Change June	Lunches July 2016	Lunches July 2017	Percent Change July	Lunches August 2016	Lunches August 2017	Percent Change August
Alabama	993,685	1,024,211	3.1%	663,792	660,881	-0.4%	37,525	43,484	15.9%
Alaska	80,986	79,501	-1.8%	66,204	68,066	2.8%	22,426	24,911	11.1%
Arizona	424,987	326,605	-23.1%	188,478	164,411	-12.8%	9,027	5,825	-35.5%
Arkansas	414,687	406,932	-1.9%	405,028	308,040	-23.9%	120,998	70,081	-42.1%
California	1,631,700	1,575,155	-3.5%	2,430,660	2,147,600	-11.6%	502,251	462,401	-7.9%
Colorado	514,512	522,197	1.5%	368,257	355,574	-3.4%	59,146	64,040	8.3%
Connecticut	106,492	96,916	-9.0%	592,697	537,948	-9.2%	203,070	185,011	-8.9%
Delaware	88,397	93,275	5.5%	180,964	182,761	1.0%	88,712	98,637	11.2%
District of Columbia	1,836	1,991	8.4%	384,583	336,072	-12.6%	8,513	58,006	581.4%
Florida	3,062,516	3,783,422	23.5%	3,848,930	3,723,313	-3.3%	825,701	497,594	-39.7%
Georgia	1,582,993	1,692,838	6.9%	1,284,769	1,138,642	-11.4%	69,139	63,717	-7.8%
Hawaii	44,404	44,659	0.6%	31,998	36,791	15.0%	0	2,399	100.0%
Idaho	481,078	460,839	-4.2%	397,107	353,830	-10.9%	104,652	96,256	-8.0%
Illinois	553,562	725,598	31.1%	1,155,314	1,463,356	26.7%	509,959	536,749	5.3%
Indiana	1,068,993	1,097,475	2.7%	695,382	667,192	-4.1%	51,462	57,443	11.6%
Iowa	424,435	464,154	9.4%	359,973	358,788	-0.3%	82,087	80,109	-2.4%
Kansas	546,673	601,635	10.1%	318,785	329,407	3.3%	36,714	34,393	-6.3%
Kentucky	740,305	844,834	14.1%	590,524	601,471	1.9%	41,964	96,282	129.4%
Louisiana	1,200,455	989,063	-17.6%	715,579	529,549	-26.0%	12,708	2,760	-78.3%
Maine	22,043	21,167	-4.0%	315,179	307,678	-2.4%	123,567	127,080	2.8%
Maryland	80,266	157,239	95.9%	1,375,337	1,247,024	-9.3%	252,083	457,023	81.3%
Massachusetts	88,378	72,217	-18.3%	974,404	923,546	-5.2%	525,986	497,943	-5.3%
Michigan	484,387	441,431	-8.9%	1,098,871	1,090,220	-0.8%	723,517	684,455	-5.4%
Minnesota	599,005	606,894	1.3%	737,308	795,258	7.9%	360,621	396,969	10.1%
Mississippi	976,713	866,767	-11.3%	465,353	413,150	-11.2%	7,121	4,353	-38.9%
Missouri	1,799,387	1,828,637	1.6%	493,341	511,326	3.6%	94,568	98,046	3.7%
Montana	164,850	165,097	0.1%	168,571	162,769	-3.4%	72,836	73,833	1.4%
Nebraska	381,227	403,254	5.8%	149,327	146,956	-1.6%	17,421	20,908	20.0%
Nevada	152,930	144,138	-5.7%	154,513	154,666	0.1%	81,766	49,875	-39.0%
New Hampshire	16,277	15,186	-6.7%	91,664	94,903	3.5%	38,722	48,093	24.2%
New Jersey	9,483	42,692	350.2%	1,134,479	1,496,534	31.9%	522,580	689,162	31.9%
New Mexico	542,358	633,341	16.8%	748,806	582,382	-22.2%	19,996	2,915	-85.4%
New York	139,110	180,883	30.0%	5,608,776	5,677,941	1.2%	4,175,645	3,944,027	-5.5%
North Carolina	776,268	846,176	9.0%	1,311,785	1,254,196	-4.4%	516,348	507,068	-1.8%
North Dakota	88,730	97,393	9.8%	57,382	60,310	5.1%	16,853	17,602	4.4%
Ohio	1,076,885	1,110,148	3.1%	1,067,376	1,079,126	1.1%	331,861	325,472	-1.9%
Oklahoma	533,889	586,147	9.8%	274,093	262,629	-4.2%	29,823	31,194	4.6%
Oregon	301,939	229,185	-24.1%	615,678	611,327	-0.7%	397,032	364,591	-8.2%
Pennsylvania	528,659	591,685	11.9%	1,375,804	1,331,572	-3.2%	818,632	802,282	-2.0%
Rhode Island	26,125	21,456	-17.9%	185,628	171,807	-7.4%	107,991	112,261	4.0%
South Carolina	834,227	950,582	13.9%	933,989	812,173	-13.0%	166,294	218,743	31.5%
South Dakota	140,935	157,791	12.0%	110,749	120,711	9.0%	50,731	52,176	2.8%
Tennessee	1,045,816	1,086,480	3.9%	826,513	800,548	-3.1%	5,845	5,595	-4.3%
Texas	4,046,122	3,964,223	-2.0%	2,464,912	2,126,052	-13.7%	1,074,451	894,326	-16.8%
Utah	123,756	117,697	-4.9%	91,723	70,876	-22.7%	34,148	29,318	-14.1%
Vermont	48,084	31,085	-35.4%	169,833	149,642	-11.9%	53,275	54,877	3.0%
Virginia	362,407	409,458	13.0%	1,122,211	991,267	-11.7%	458,485	360,537	-21.4%
Washington	255,185	201,003	-21.2%	632,478	640,713	1.3%	349,875	321,879	-8.0%
West Virginia	108,607	131,457	21.0%	196,209	176,575	-10.0%	14,174	16,917	19.4%
Wisconsin	647,456	686,371	6.0%	786,735	772,874	-1.8%	240,333	247,243	2.9%
Wyoming	95,433	98,009	2.7%	74,351	70,298	-5.5%	18,379	23,068	25.5%
US	30,459,633	31,726,589	4.2%	40,492,402	39,070,741	-3.5%	14,487,013	13,959,929	-3.6%

Note: Sponsors that serve meals for no more than 10 days in June or August are allowed to claim those lunches in July to reduce paperwork. Occasionally this results in a state reporting that no meals were served in one or both of these months.

Table 5:

Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition[1] and Additional ADP and Additional Federal Reimbursement if States Reached FRAC's Goal of 40 Summer Nutrition Participants per 100 Regular School Year National School Lunch Program (NSLP)[2] Participants

State	Summer Nutrition ADP, July 2017	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	37,031	10.2	144,894	107,863	$8,132,842
Alaska	4,062	10.5	15,548	11,486	$866,039
Arizona	48,216	10.4	184,944	136,727	$10,309,251
Arkansas	24,302	10.7	90,812	66,510	$5,014,851
California	443,214	18.3	966,685	523,471	$39,469,688
Colorado	19,625	8.7	89,819	70,194	$5,292,615
Connecticut	34,257	21.3	64,182	29,925	$2,256,345
Delaware	10,147	16.2	25,088	14,941	$1,126,515
District of Columbia	20,260	47.9	—	—	—
Florida	213,812	16.0	535,305	321,493	$24,240,596
Georgia	195,233	22.4	348,234	153,000	$11,536,226
Hawaii	5,861	9.6	24,445	18,584	$1,401,266
Idaho	18,301	19.7	37,153	18,852	$1,421,455
Illinois	89,065	11.6	307,157	218,092	$16,444,111
Indiana	79,276	19.0	166,867	87,591	$6,604,364
Iowa	19,778	11.5	68,846	49,068	$3,699,704
Kansas	17,637	9.6	73,543	55,906	$4,215,345
Kentucky	30,876	7.8	159,242	128,366	$9,678,813
Louisiana	28,795	6.8	170,268	141,474	$10,667,104
Maine	15,682	27.4	22,909	7,227	$544,885
Maryland	63,735	21.6	118,199	54,464	$4,106,595
Massachusetts	53,581	16.7	128,406	74,825	$5,641,770
Michigan	66,414	12.7	208,957	142,543	$10,747,754
Minnesota	46,948	17.3	108,656	61,708	$4,652,768
Mississippi	22,656	7.7	117,359	94,703	$7,140,590
Missouri	31,139	8.8	140,969	109,830	$8,281,202
Montana	8,599	18.4	18,731	10,132	$763,987
Nebraska	8,155	6.9	47,539	39,384	$2,969,580
Nevada	8,364	4.9	68,307	59,943	$4,519,702
New Hampshire	5,586	16.0	13,942	8,356	$630,018
New Jersey	101,138	23.7	170,565	69,427	$5,234,774
New Mexico	49,193	28.4	69,360	20,167	$1,520,596
New York	358,046	30.4	471,844	113,798	$8,580,372
North Carolina	100,468	15.7	256,218	155,750	$11,743,566
North Dakota	3,254	10.4	12,515	9,261	$698,294
Ohio	64,864	10.4	248,874	184,010	$13,874,367
Oklahoma	14,458	4.7	122,382	107,924	$8,137,506
Oregon	33,475	16.3	82,158	48,683	$3,670,671
Pennsylvania	93,566	14.8	252,355	158,789	$11,972,676
Rhode Island	9,770	19.4	20,102	10,332	$779,032
South Carolina	61,610	17.8	138,100	76,490	$5,767,363
South Dakota	7,522	15.7	19,217	11,695	$881,832
Tennessee	65,379	13.6	192,709	127,330	$9,600,701
Texas	197,088	8.2	964,888	767,801	$57,892,156
Utah	23,573	14.8	63,527	39,954	$3,012,515
Vermont	7,843	30.7	10,228	2,384	$179,788
Virginia	66,007	16.1	164,113	98,106	$7,397,203
Washington	37,660	11.1	135,379	97,719	$7,367,996
West Virginia	10,667	8.2	52,088	41,421	$3,123,166
Wisconsin	41,685	15.4	108,529	66,844	$5,040,020
Wyoming	3,916	15.8	9,906	5,990	$451,670
US	3,021,791	15.0	8,052,324	5,030,534	$379,302,239

[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 2016–2017.
[3] Ratio of Summer Nutrition to NSLP is the number of children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in NSLP.
[4] Additional federal reimbursement dollars were calculated assuming that the state's sponsors were reimbursed for each child each weekday only for lunch (not also breakfast or a snack), at the lowest rate for an SFSP lunch ($3.77 per lunch), and were served 20 days in July 2017.

FRAC
Food Research & Action Center

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

202.986.2200
ww.frac.org

@fractweets
@fracgram
facebook.com/
foodresearchandactioncenter
linkedin.com/company/
food-research-and-action-center