



Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Nutrition Status Report

July 2019 ■ www.FRAC.org



Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation:

Summer Nutrition Status Report

Acknowledgments

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

FRAC gratefully acknowledges the following for supporting its work to expand and improve the Summer Nutrition Programs in 2017–2019:

- The From Now On Fund of Tides Foundation;
- Kellogg Company Fund;
- National Dairy Council/Dairy Management, Inc.;
- National League of Cities Institute;
- 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;
- Eos Foundation;
- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America;
- General Mills Foundation;

- Hunger Is, a program of Albertsons Companies Foundation;
- The JPB Foundation;
- Menemsha Family Fund;
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation;
- Turrell Fund; and
- Tyson Foods, Inc.

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 *Meals Matter Newsletter: Afterschool & Summer Meals* or FRAC's *Weekly News Digest*, visit frac.org.



Introduction

The Summer Nutrition Programs, which include the Summer Food Service Program and the National School Lunch Program, play a critical role in closing the summer nutrition gap that exists for low-income families when the school year — and access to school breakfast and lunch — ends. In July 2018, almost 2.9 million children participated on an average day, reaching only one child with a nutritious summer lunch through the Summer Nutrition Programs for every seven children who participated in free and reduced-price school lunch during the 2017–2018 school year.

Participation in summer lunch decreased by 171,000 participants from July 2017 to July 2018. This drop marks the third consecutive year that the Summer Nutrition Programs have lost important ground and reverses the growth in participation that occurred from 2012 to 2015.

Low-income children miss out on more than just healthy meals when the Summer Nutrition Programs are not available to them. Summer meal sites frequently serve meals alongside educational and enrichment programming, which together help combat summertime food insecurity, weight gain, and learning loss for children. Without access to the Summer Nutrition Programs, more children are at risk of returning to school further behind academically, which can have exponential ramifications on academic achievement year after year.

The Child Nutrition Reauthorization bill, currently being considered by Congress, provides an important opportunity to turn this situation around and increase access to summer meals by ramping up investments in them. Several key proposals would increase the number of children served and eliminate barriers to participation. For example, allowing out-of-school time sponsors to provide meals year-round through Summer Food Service Program rules, rather than operating the Summer Food Service Program in the

Summer meal sites frequently serve meals alongside educational and enrichment programming, which together help combat summertime food insecurity, weight gain, and learning loss for children.

summer and another program during the school year, would increase the number of sponsors participating and allow them to focus on serving additional children instead of keeping up with unnecessary and burdensome administrative work. Lowering the area eligibility threshold that determines program participation from 50 to 40 percent would allow more rural and suburban areas that often have substantial but less concentrated levels of poverty to participate. For areas underserved by the Summer Nutrition Programs, increasing funding for the Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer program, which gives families additional resources to purchase food during the summer in areas where summer meal sites are hard to access or nonexistent, would complement the Summer Nutrition Programs and create a more effective summer safety net for families.

Significant investments also must be made to support the summer programs that provide the platform for summer meal sites. There simply are not enough summer enrichment programs that are available or affordable for low-income families to participate. As these programs provide an important foundation for the Summer Nutrition Programs to operate, increased investments in summer programs for low-income children at federal, state, and local levels would ensure that children have access to the summer learning, recreational, and cultural opportunities and the summer meals they need to succeed.

Even without additional investments, the Summer Nutrition Programs can — and have — served more children than they currently serve. Last summer’s decline in participation highlights the need for all partners — including the U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service, state and local agencies, anti-hunger organizations, and out-of-school time advocates — to step up and redouble efforts to increase access to the Summer Nutrition Programs

Just three years ago, participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs had been growing; it is possible to return to that positive trend.

Increased investments in the Summer Nutrition Programs and summer programming, combined with the implementation of best practices that are proven to work, such as intensive outreach, site recruitment, and reducing barriers to participation, would succeed at eliminating the nutrition and summer learning opportunity gap for millions of children.



About This Summer Food Report

This report measures the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs in July 2018, 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 average weekday 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. The report then 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 2018

National participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs decreased modestly in 2018, marking the third year in a row of diminished participation. Both the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) saw a decrease in average daily participation.

- In July 2018, on an average weekday, the Summer Nutrition Programs served lunch to almost 2.9 million children, a decrease of just over 171,000 children, or 5.7 percent, from July 2017.
- Of the 171,000, approximately 95,000 fewer children, or 4.9 percent, received a summer meal through SFSP. July NSLP participation decreased by 76,000 children, or 7.1 percent.
- In July 2018, only 14.1 children received summer lunch for every 100 low-income children who received a school lunch in the 2017–2018 school year.
- The ratio of 14.1 to 100 is lower than July 2017 (15.1 to 100). The lower ratio is driven both by the drop in participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs and the 129,000 additional low-income children who participated in school lunch during the 2017–2018 school year compared to the previous school year.
- The number of SFSP sponsors increased while the number of sites decreased from July 2017 to July 2018. Nationally, 5,575 sponsors (an increase of 63 sponsors) and 48,699 sites (a decrease of 99 sites) participated in July 2018.
- 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 2018, the number of SFSP lunches decreased compared to the previous summer by 4.4 percent (1.4 million). In August 2018, the number of SFSP lunches decreased by 14.4 percent (a little more than 2 million meals).

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 at the site 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 that come to the site can eat for free. Summer camps also can participate, but they are only reimbursed for the meals served to children who are individually eligible for free or reduced-price school meals. NSLP also reimburses schools for feeding children eligible for free or reduced-price meals who attend summer school.

Public and private nonprofit schools, local government agencies, National Youth Sports Programs, and private nonprofit organizations can participate in SFSP and sponsor one or more sites. Only schools are eligible to participate in NSLP (but the schools can use NSLP to provide meals and snacks at non-school and school sites over the summer). A sponsor enters into an agreement with their state agency to run the program and receives reimbursement for each eligible meal and snack served at meal sites. A site is the physical location where children receive meals during the summer. Sites work directly with sponsors.

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

State Findings for 2018

The reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs varied throughout the country, with the lowest-performing state (Oklahoma) serving in July 2018 one child for every 18 low-income children who participated in school lunch during the 2017–2018 school year, and the best performing jurisdiction, the District of Columbia, serving one-third of such children. Only 16 states increased participation in July 2018 compared to 2017.

- Among the four top-performing states and the District of Columbia, at least 1 in 4 low-income children received a summer lunch in July 2018 compared to participation in the 2017–2018 school-year free and reduced-price National School Lunch Program (NSLP). The top performers included the District of Columbia (34.5 to 100), Vermont (31 to 100), Maine (27.4 to 100), New York (27.1 to 100), and New Mexico (27 to 100).
- There were four additional states that reached one child with summer lunch for every five low-income children who participated in school lunch: New Jersey (22.7 to 100), Maryland (22.4 to 100), Connecticut (20.5 to 100), and Idaho (20 to 100).
- Fourteen states provided summer lunch to fewer than one child for every 10 children who participated in school lunch: Oklahoma (5.5 to 100), Louisiana (5.8 to 100), Nebraska (7.1 to 100), Texas (7.2 to 100), Nevada (8.0 to 100), West Virginia (8.3 to 100), Mississippi (8.4 to 100), Missouri (8.5 to 100), Hawaii (8.8 to 100), Kentucky (8.9 to 100), North Dakota (8.9 to 100), Colorado (9 to 100), Kansas (9.5 to 100), and Alaska (9.6 to 100).
- Three states increased the number of participants in the Summer Nutrition Programs by more than 10 percent: Arizona (18.2 percent), Kentucky (15.1 percent), and Oklahoma (14.9 percent).
- While this report focuses on participation in NSLP and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) combined during the month of July — because it is impossible to determine for June and August how many days were regular school days, and how many

were summer vacation days — it is important to note that 26 states served more lunches through SFSP during the month of June than in July. Three states served more than twice as many lunches through SFSP in June than in July — Louisiana, Nebraska, and Missouri.

- In 2018, 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-two states increased the number of SFSP lunches served in June, and 10 increased the number of SFSP lunches served in August.

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. For states, this is an opportunity to bring in additional federal dollars by serving more children and more meals. These dollars provide a sustainable funding source to summer programs and support summer employment.

For every lunch that an eligible child did not receive in 2018, the state and community missed out on \$3.86 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 2018 for every 100 receiving free or reduced-price lunch during the 2017–2018 school year, an additional 5 million children would have been fed each day. States would have collected an additional \$425 million in child nutrition funding in July alone (assuming the program operated 21 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 (\$65.6 million; 810,220 children), California (\$44.1 million; 544,221 children), Florida (\$30.8 million; 379,733 children), Illinois (\$17.7 million; 218,814 children), Georgia (\$15.8 million; 195,198 children), and Ohio (\$14.8 million; 182,362 children).

Opportunities for Summer Nutrition Programs Improvement

Child Nutrition Reauthorization

Congress has an important opportunity in 2019 to pass a strong Child Nutrition Reauthorization bill that improves access to summer nutrition. Reauthorization, which generally happens every five years, is when Congress reviews the laws governing the child nutrition programs and can make changes to strengthen and improve the programs. The last reauthorization — the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 — made a number of gains in expanding and increasing access to nutrition programs that should be maintained; however, Congress is overdue to pass new legislation reauthorizing the child nutrition programs. The reauthorization should make new investments in the Summer Nutrition Programs to increase access to summer meals while doing no harm to the current structure of the program. Here are five ways that Congress can show its robust support for the Summer Nutrition Programs and their important role in children's well-being:

Lower the area eligibility threshold from 50 to 40 percent

Most summer sites qualify by demonstrating that they are located in a low-income area in which at least 50 percent of the children are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals. This keeps many communities where poverty is less concentrated, such as rural and suburban areas, from participating. Lowering the eligibility threshold from [50 to 40 percent](#) would improve access to summer meals in every state. It also would align site eligibility with that in various federal education funding sources that can support summer programs, such as the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program.

Streamline the Summer Food Service Program and Afterschool Meal Program

Many community-based organizations and local government agencies operating the Summer Food

Service Program (SFSP) also serve out-of-school time meals to the same children during the school year using the Afterschool Meal Program through the Child and Adult Care Food Program. This means sponsors must apply for and operate two distinct programs with different eligibility criteria and program requirements in order to provide meals 365 days a year. Allowing SFSP sponsors to operate one program year-round would eliminate duplicative and burdensome paperwork while supporting sponsors' efforts to serve more children in their community and to do it better.

Allow all summer meal sites to serve three meals

Most summer meal sites (with the exception of camps and those serving migrant children) are only allowed to serve two meals. Many low-income children spend all day at programs where summer meals are being served, such as parks, YMCAs, recreation centers, and programs run by faith-based organizations. Allowing all summer sites to provide three meals a day would better support working parents and ensure children have more consistent access to the nutrition they need to stay engaged and healthy throughout the entire day.



Provide funding for summer transportation grants

Transportation is one of the biggest barriers to participation in summer meals. Transportation grants could support efforts to bring children to summer programs and other innovative approaches, such as mobile meal trucks, allowing more low-income children in rural and other underserved areas to participate.

Increase funding for Summer EBT

The Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer (Summer EBT) program provides low-income families with children a monthly benefit on a debit card to purchase food during the summer months. A 2016 report on Summer EBT found that it reduced the most severe type of food insecurity (very low food security) by one-third, and food insecurity by one-fifth.¹ Summer EBT is a complement to the Summer Nutrition Programs and offers an important opportunity to reduce food insecurity for low-income families, especially in rural or other areas with limited

Snapshot of Participation in the Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer for Children Program

In 2011, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) began the Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer (Summer EBT) program. In its first year, 12,500 low-income children participated. In subsequent years, the program grew with increased funding, serving in the summer of 2018 approximately 300,000 children across six states (Connecticut, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, and Virginia) and the Cherokee and Chickasaw Nations. For fiscal year 2019, USDA adjusted the model and will be funding only two states (Michigan and Wisconsin) and the Chickasaw Nation and the Inter Tribal Council of Arizona to implement Summer EBT projects that will provide benefits to eligible children for three consecutive summers.

access to summer meals. Summer EBT has been funded through the annual agriculture appropriations bill, which is one of 12 appropriations bills that the House and Senate pass each year to keep government programs funded. Child Nutrition Reauthorization offers the opportunity to expand Summer EBT significantly and to make it permanent.

SFSP Policy Waiver Rescission

In fall 2018, the U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service (USDA FNS) rescinded several SFSP policy memos in response to an SFSP audit conducted by the USDA Office of the Inspector General. The policy memos

- had waived a first-week site visit for experienced sponsors and sites, which allowed sponsors to focus on early monitoring of new sites and those that needed additional support;
- allowed all sponsors to use “offer versus serve,” which reduced plate waste by allowing students to decline some menu components;
- waived certain meal service time requirements, which allowed programs to set meal times that worked for their communities; and
- allowed enrolled sites, which are those that only serve an identified group of children in a specific program or activity and are not open to the community-at-large, to use area eligibility data to qualify instead of documenting each child’s eligibility for free or reduced-price meals, which significantly reduced administrative work for sponsors.

The audit did not criticize the policies; rather, it questioned the authority that USDA FNS had to offer nationwide waivers. The audit acknowledged that USDA FNS can grant waivers to state and sponsor requests; therefore, USDA FNS encouraged state agencies and sponsors to submit formal waiver requests to maintain these options for summer 2019. The majority of state SFSP agencies submitted a formal request to

¹ 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/sebtfinalreport.pdf>. Accessed on May 17, 2019.

maintain some or all of the waiver options on behalf of sponsors in their state, but a handful of states did not. The states that submitted statewide waiver requests played an important role in supporting their sponsors and minimizing administrative work for them. Those states that did not submit waivers on behalf of their sponsors created unnecessary administrative work and uncertainty for their sponsors. It is *critical* that state agencies, advocates, and sponsors work together to minimize the impact that this rescission will have on program providers in upcoming summers.

Summer Meals Expansion in Rural Communities

Food insecurity exists to varying degrees across the country, but poverty is more common in rural areas and is compounded by limited work-support services (e.g., public transportation and child care). Barriers, such as less concentrated poverty (making it more difficult for sites to qualify for summer meal reimbursement), limited transportation, and food deserts, constrain access to summer meals in many areas that need them most.

Despite the unique challenges facing rural communities, state agencies, schools, and anti-hunger and youth-serving organizations are working to overcome these barriers and expand children's access to summer meals. Creative partnerships can play a central role in expanding [access to summer meals in rural communities](#) and allowing rural communities to overcome their unique barriers. Below are examples of successful collaborations that can serve as models for other rural communities.

- In California, Food for People works with local parks and recreation agencies and community centers to provide children lunches on summer weekdays. Food for People works with Humboldt Transit Authority and UPS to transport the meals from their central location to underserved rural communities.
- In Kentucky, the Hopkins County Family YMCA expanded its service area with mobile meal sites. The YMCA transports meals to sites with three

minivans that serve multiple stops along mobile routes. To overcome food storage concerns, the YMCA established a formal partnership with local grocers, allowing them to bid on the project (as vendors are limited in rural areas). This partnership facilitated meal preparation and created cost savings.

- In Mississippi, Starkville Parks and Recreation works with the Southern Foundation for Homeless Children to expand children's access to summer meals through a formal partnership with the local SMART bus system and Mississippi State University. Through this partnership, they charter buses to pick up children from select locations and drop them off at the meal site. Children are later taken back to the same locations to be picked up.

New Jersey Increases Summer Meals Programs Through State Legislation

New Jersey ranked 6th nationally, serving 22.7 children for every 100 children who received free or reduced-price school lunch during the 2017–2018 school year. The number of children served lunch in July 2018 slightly decreased, but the state actually increased the number of summer meals served over the course of the summer. Recognizing the opportunity to expand school districts' participation, Hunger Free New Jersey worked with partners across the state to advocate for, and ultimately enact, state legislation requiring high-poverty schools (those in which at least 50 percent of students qualify for free or reduced-price meals) to provide meals through the Summer Food Service Program. To reach even more underserved areas, one New Jersey healthcare facility piloted a site last summer, mirroring the [national trend of more hospitals and healthcare providers](#) stepping up as summer meals champions.

Conclusion

The extent of the Summer Nutrition Programs fell far short of the need in July 2018, reaching only 2.9 million children, or 1 in 7, of the low-income children who participated in school lunch during the 2017–2018 school year. Now is the time to address the shortfall by taking advantage of the opportunities that exist at federal, state, and local levels to regain lost ground and connect more families to much-needed summer nutrition when the school year ends.

Child Nutrition Reauthorization provides an important opportunity to invest in the Summer Nutrition Programs to increase the number of children served by eliminating common barriers and bringing the program up-to-date with common-sense provisions that keep the current program's structure intact.

Increasing funding to support summer enrichment and educational activities for families is another important and effective way to increase participation in summer meals. The federal and state dollars currently available to support summer programs play an important role, but do not come close to meeting the need.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service, state agencies, advocates, and sponsors must redouble efforts to replicate the strategies that are proven to expand participation in metropolitan, rural, and suburban areas. Summer 2019 is the time to reverse the decline seen last summer and ensure that every child returns to school well-nourished and ready to learn.



Technical Notes

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

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

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 also is 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 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.² 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 school year NSLP by dividing the average daily lunch figures by an attendance factor (0.927) 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, 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 2017–2018*.

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 21 days (the number of weekdays in July 2018, not counting the Independence Day holiday) of SFSP lunches. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available (\$3.8575 per lunch for July 2018).

² FRAC received corrected total average daily NSLP participation data from Nevada for July 2017.

Table 1:**Average Daily Participation (ADP) in Summer Nutrition¹ in July 2017 and July 2018, Compared to Regular School Year National School Lunch Program (NSLP)² ADP for School Years 2016–2017 and 2017–2018, by State**

| State | Summer Nutrition ADP July 2017 | NSLP ADP 2016–2017 | Ratio ³ of Summer Nutrition to NSLP 2016–2017 | Rank 2016–2017 | Summer Nutrition ADP July 2018 | NSLP ADP 2017–2018 | Ratio ³ of Summer Nutrition to NSLP 2017–2018 | Rank 2017–2018 | Percent Change in Summer Nutrition ADP 2017–2018 |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Alabama | 37,031 | 362,235 | 10.2 | 39 | 36,351 | 353,725 | 10.3 | 36 | -1.8% |
| Alaska | 4,062 | 38,871 | 10.5 | 35 | 3,719 | 38,630 | 9.6 | 38 | -8.4% |
| Arizona | 48,216 | 462,360 | 10.4 | 36 | 56,979 | 453,132 | 12.6 | 30 | 18.2% |
| Arkansas | 24,302 | 227,029 | 10.7 | 34 | 24,246 | 222,748 | 10.9 | 34 | -0.2% |
| California | 443,214 | 2,416,712 | 18.3 | 14 | 413,455 | 2,394,192 | 17.3 | 13 | -6.7% |
| Colorado | 19,625 | 224,547 | 8.7 | 44 | 19,588 | 217,977 | 9.0 | 40 | -0.2% |
| Connecticut | 34,257 | 160,455 | 21.3 | 9 | 33,977 | 165,497 | 20.5 | 8 | -0.8% |
| Delaware | 10,147 | 62,719 | 16.2 | 19 | 10,415 | 61,952 | 16.8 | 16 | 2.6% |
| District of Columbia | 20,260 | 42,280 | 47.9 | 1 | 15,274 | 44,225 | 34.5 | 1 | -24.6% |
| Florida | 213,812 | 1,338,262 | 16.0 | 22 | 194,458 | 1,435,477 | 13.5 | 29 | -9.1% |
| Georgia | 195,233 | 870,584 | 22.4 | 7 | 146,746 | 854,861 | 17.2 | 14 | -24.8% |
| Hawaii | 5,861 | 61,112 | 9.6 | 41 | 5,353 | 61,059 | 8.8 | 43 | -8.7% |
| Idaho | 18,301 | 92,882 | 19.7 | 10 | 17,869 | 89,446 | 20.0 | 9 | -2.4% |
| Illinois | 89,065 | 767,893 | 11.6 | 31 | 87,412 | 765,565 | 11.4 | 32 | -1.9% |
| Indiana | 79,276 | 417,168 | 19.0 | 12 | 68,609 | 422,701 | 16.2 | 20 | -13.5% |
| Iowa | 19,778 | 172,114 | 11.5 | 32 | 18,625 | 170,725 | 10.9 | 33 | -5.8% |
| Kansas | 17,637 | 183,858 | 9.6 | 40 | 17,154 | 179,734 | 9.5 | 39 | -2.7% |
| Kentucky | 30,876 | 398,106 | 7.8 | 47 | 35,528 | 399,004 | 8.9 | 41 | 15.1% |
| Louisiana | 28,795 | 425,670 | 6.8 | 50 | 24,918 | 426,783 | 5.8 | 50 | -13.5% |
| Maine | 15,682 | 57,272 | 27.4 | 5 | 15,214 | 55,503 | 27.4 | 3 | -3.0% |
| Maryland | 63,735 | 295,498 | 21.6 | 8 | 65,425 | 292,141 | 22.4 | 7 | 2.7% |
| Massachusetts | 53,581 | 321,014 | 16.7 | 17 | 53,772 | 321,844 | 16.7 | 18 | 0.4% |
| Michigan | 66,414 | 522,393 | 12.7 | 30 | 65,338 | 522,219 | 12.5 | 31 | -1.6% |
| Minnesota | 46,948 | 271,639 | 17.3 | 16 | 46,437 | 268,450 | 17.3 | 12 | -1.1% |
| Mississippi | 22,656 | 293,397 | 7.7 | 48 | 22,034 | 285,750 | 8.4 | 45 | 6.1% |
| Missouri | 31,139 | 352,424 | 8.8 | 43 | 29,343 | 344,534 | 8.5 | 44 | -5.8% |
| Montana | 8,599 | 46,828 | 18.4 | 13 | 9,091 | 46,388 | 19.6 | 10 | 5.7% |
| Nebraska | 8,155 | 118,849 | 6.9 | 49 | 8,470 | 119,859 | 7.1 | 49 | 3.9% |
| Nevada ⁴ | 15,790 | 170,769 | 9.2 | 42 | 13,688 | 171,016 | 8.0 | 47 | -13.3% |
| New Hampshire | 5,586 | 34,854 | 16.0 | 21 | 4,826 | 32,806 | 14.7 | 25 | -13.6% |
| New Jersey | 101,138 | 426,413 | 23.7 | 6 | 95,512 | 420,665 | 22.7 | 6 | -5.6% |
| New Mexico | 49,193 | 173,400 | 28.4 | 4 | 45,816 | 169,904 | 27.0 | 5 | -6.9% |
| New York | 358,046 | 1,179,610 | 30.4 | 3 | 348,387 | 1,283,314 | 27.1 | 4 | -2.7% |
| North Carolina | 100,468 | 640,546 | 15.7 | 24 | 90,724 | 632,182 | 14.4 | 27 | -9.7% |
| North Dakota | 3,254 | 31,288 | 10.4 | 38 | 2,823 | 31,737 | 8.9 | 42 | -13.2% |
| Ohio | 64,864 | 622,186 | 10.4 | 37 | 61,926 | 610,719 | 10.1 | 37 | -4.5% |
| Oklahoma | 14,458 | 305,955 | 4.7 | 51 | 16,612 | 302,847 | 5.5 | 51 | 14.9% |
| Oregon | 33,475 | 205,394 | 16.3 | 18 | 30,808 | 199,394 | 15.5 | 23 | -8.0% |
| Pennsylvania | 93,566 | 630,888 | 14.8 | 28 | 89,416 | 637,906 | 14.0 | 28 | -4.4% |
| Rhode Island | 9,770 | 50,255 | 19.4 | 11 | 9,235 | 48,855 | 18.9 | 11 | -5.5% |
| South Carolina | 61,610 | 345,251 | 17.8 | 15 | 54,749 | 341,803 | 16.0 | 21 | -11.1% |
| South Dakota | 7,522 | 48,043 | 15.7 | 25 | 7,640 | 46,024 | 16.6 | 19 | 1.6% |
| Tennessee | 65,379 | 481,773 | 13.6 | 29 | 69,516 | 478,271 | 14.5 | 26 | 6.3% |
| Texas | 197,088 | 2,412,221 | 8.2 | 46 | 178,430 | 2,471,624 | 7.2 | 48 | -9.5% |
| Utah | 23,573 | 158,817 | 14.8 | 27 | 25,886 | 154,126 | 16.8 | 17 | 9.8% |
| Vermont | 7,843 | 25,570 | 30.7 | 2 | 7,826 | 25,236 | 31.0 | 2 | -0.2% |
| Virginia | 66,007 | 410,283 | 16.1 | 20 | 64,294 | 424,401 | 15.1 | 24 | -2.6% |
| Washington | 37,660 | 338,448 | 11.1 | 33 | 34,867 | 328,735 | 10.6 | 35 | -7.4% |
| West Virginia | 10,667 | 130,221 | 8.2 | 45 | 11,228 | 135,605 | 8.3 | 46 | 5.3% |
| Wisconsin | 41,685 | 271,323 | 15.4 | 26 | 41,996 | 266,666 | 15.7 | 22 | 0.7% |
| Wyoming | 3,916 | 24,765 | 15.8 | 23 | 4,012 | 23,677 | 16.9 | 15 | 2.5% |
| US | 3,029,216 | 20,122,441 | 15.1 | | 2,858,022 | 20,251,633 | 14.1 | | -5.7% |

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.⁴ The Nevada state child nutrition agency provided updated average daily participation data for the National School Lunch Program for July 2017. The updated data resulted in Nevada's 2017 rank moving from 50 to 42. State rankings and national numbers for 2017 were adjusted accordingly.

Table 2:**Change in Summer Food Service Program Average Daily Participation (ADP); and in National School Lunch Program (NSLP) ADP from July 2017 to July 2018, by State**

| State | SFSP ADP July 2017 | SFSP ADP July 2018 | SFSP ADP Percent Change 2017–2018 | NSLP ADP July 2017 | NSLP ADP July 2018 | NSLP ADP Percent Change 2017–2018 |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Alabama | 33,044 | 31,771 | -3.9% | 3,987 | 4,580 | 14.9% |
| Alaska | 3,403 | 3,086 | -9.3% | 659 | 633 | -3.9% |
| Arizona | 8,221 | 9,824 | 19.5% | 39,996 | 47,155 | 17.9% |
| Arkansas | 15,402 | 12,860 | -16.5% | 8,900 | 11,387 | 27.9% |
| California | 107,380 | 99,730 | -7.1% | 335,834 | 313,725 | -6.6% |
| Colorado | 17,779 | 17,474 | -1.7% | 1,846 | 2,114 | 14.5% |
| Connecticut | 26,897 | 27,028 | 0.5% | 7,360 | 6,949 | -5.6% |
| Delaware | 9,138 | 9,520 | 4.2% | 1,009 | 895 | -11.3% |
| District of Columbia | 16,804 | 13,065 | -22.2% | 3,456 | 2,209 | -36.1% |
| Florida | 186,166 | 168,172 | -9.7% | 27,646 | 26,286 | -4.9% |
| Georgia | 56,932 | 56,810 | -0.2% | 138,301 | 89,937 | -35.0% |
| Hawaii | 1,840 | 1,763 | -4.2% | 4,021 | 3,590 | -10.7% |
| Idaho | 17,692 | 17,246 | -2.5% | 609 | 624 | 2.4% |
| Illinois | 73,168 | 71,692 | -2.0% | 15,898 | 15,720 | -1.1% |
| Indiana | 33,360 | 29,928 | -10.3% | 45,917 | 38,682 | -15.8% |
| Iowa | 17,939 | 17,149 | -4.4% | 1,839 | 1,476 | -19.7% |
| Kansas | 16,470 | 15,962 | -3.1% | 1,166 | 1,193 | 2.2% |
| Kentucky | 30,074 | 34,773 | 15.6% | 803 | 755 | -5.9% |
| Louisiana | 26,477 | 22,730 | -14.2% | 2,317 | 2,188 | -5.6% |
| Maine | 15,384 | 14,903 | -3.1% | 298 | 311 | 4.2% |
| Maryland | 62,351 | 64,083 | 2.8% | 1,384 | 1,342 | -3.0% |
| Massachusetts | 46,177 | 45,941 | -0.5% | 7,404 | 7,830 | 5.8% |
| Michigan | 54,511 | 53,561 | -1.7% | 11,903 | 11,777 | -1.1% |
| Minnesota | 39,763 | 41,059 | 3.3% | 7,185 | 5,378 | -25.2% |
| Mississippi | 20,658 | 22,143 | 7.2% | 1,998 | 1,892 | -5.3% |
| Missouri | 25,566 | 24,161 | -5.5% | 5,573 | 5,183 | -7.0% |
| Montana | 8,138 | 8,504 | 4.5% | 460 | 587 | 27.5% |
| Nebraska | 7,348 | 7,629 | 3.8% | 807 | 841 | 4.1% |
| Nevada ¹ | 7,733 | 7,743 | 0.1% | 8,056 | 5,945 | -26.2% |
| New Hampshire | 4,745 | 4,106 | -13.5% | 841 | 720 | -14.3% |
| New Jersey | 74,827 | 70,625 | -5.6% | 26,312 | 24,887 | -5.4% |
| New Mexico | 29,119 | 24,402 | -16.2% | 20,074 | 21,414 | 6.7% |
| New York | 283,897 | 278,670 | -1.8% | 74,149 | 69,717 | -6.0% |
| North Carolina | 62,710 | 62,679 | 0.0% | 37,758 | 28,045 | -25.7% |
| North Dakota | 3,016 | 2,586 | -14.2% | 238 | 237 | -0.5% |
| Ohio | 53,956 | 52,417 | -2.9% | 10,908 | 9,509 | -12.8% |
| Oklahoma | 13,131 | 13,216 | 0.6% | 1,326 | 3,396 | 156.1% |
| Oregon | 30,566 | 27,927 | -8.6% | 2,909 | 2,881 | -0.9% |
| Pennsylvania | 66,579 | 61,731 | -7.3% | 26,988 | 27,685 | 2.6% |
| Rhode Island | 8,590 | 8,404 | -2.2% | 1,180 | 830 | -29.6% |
| South Carolina | 40,609 | 31,707 | -21.9% | 21,001 | 23,043 | 9.7% |
| South Dakota | 6,036 | 6,071 | 0.6% | 1,486 | 1,569 | 5.6% |
| Tennessee | 40,027 | 34,149 | -14.7% | 25,352 | 35,367 | 39.5% |
| Texas | 106,303 | 85,268 | -19.8% | 90,785 | 93,162 | 2.6% |
| Utah | 3,544 | 1,691 | -52.3% | 20,029 | 24,195 | 20.8% |
| Vermont | 7,482 | 7,478 | -0.1% | 361 | 348 | -3.8% |
| Virginia | 49,563 | 53,897 | 8.7% | 16,444 | 10,397 | -36.8% |
| Washington | 32,036 | 29,397 | -8.2% | 5,625 | 5,470 | -2.7% |
| West Virginia | 8,829 | 9,578 | 8.5% | 1,838 | 1,650 | -10.2% |
| Wisconsin | 38,644 | 38,689 | 0.1% | 3,042 | 3,308 | 8.7% |
| Wyoming | 3,515 | 3,651 | 3.9% | 401 | 361 | -9.9% |
| US | 1,953,537 | 1,858,647 | -4.9% | 1,075,679 | 999,375 | -7.1% |

¹ The Nevada state child nutrition agency provided updated total average daily participation National School Lunch Program data for July 2017.

Table 3:**Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors and Sites from July 2017 to July 2018, by State**

| State | Sponsors July 2017 | Sponsors July 2018 | Sponsors Percent Change | Sites July 2017 | Sites July 2018 | Sites Percent Change |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Alabama | 102 | 109 | 6.9% | 978 | 1,006 | 2.9% |
| Alaska | 28 | 27 | -3.6% | 157 | 165 | 5.1% |
| Arizona | 32 | 39 | 21.9% | 266 | 332 | 24.8% |
| Arkansas | 92 | 97 | 5.4% | 382 | 330 | -13.6% |
| California | 199 | 181 | -9.0% | 2,468 | 2,329 | -5.6% |
| Colorado | 79 | 76 | -3.8% | 543 | 552 | 1.7% |
| Connecticut | 46 | 43 | -6.5% | 537 | 525 | -2.2% |
| Delaware | 27 | 29 | 7.4% | 310 | 309 | -0.3% |
| District of Columbia | 19 | 17 | -10.5% | 295 | 290 | -1.7% |
| Florida | 156 | 143 | -8.3% | 4,354 | 3,688 | -15.3% |
| Georgia | 86 | 83 | -3.5% | 1,348 | 1,270 | -5.8% |
| Hawaii | 20 | 20 | 0.0% | 92 | 98 | 6.5% |
| Idaho | 62 | 58 | -6.5% | 278 | 269 | -3.2% |
| Illinois | 156 | 144 | -7.7% | 1,816 | 1,772 | -2.4% |
| Indiana | 229 | 231 | 0.9% | 1,321 | 1,297 | -1.8% |
| Iowa | 157 | 149 | -5.1% | 438 | 440 | 0.5% |
| Kansas | 132 | 142 | 7.6% | 509 | 537 | 5.5% |
| Kentucky | 147 | 152 | 3.4% | 1,628 | 1,928 | 18.4% |
| Louisiana | 94 | 71 | -24.5% | 608 | 443 | -27.1% |
| Maine | 111 | 119 | 7.2% | 419 | 439 | 4.8% |
| Maryland | 46 | 44 | -4.3% | 1,357 | 1,347 | -0.7% |
| Massachusetts | 104 | 108 | 3.8% | 1,072 | 1,094 | 2.1% |
| Michigan | 312 | 323 | 3.5% | 1,667 | 1,656 | -0.7% |
| Minnesota | 184 | 194 | 5.4% | 832 | 865 | 4.0% |
| Mississippi | 99 | 123 | 24.2% | 499 | 590 | 18.2% |
| Missouri | 126 | 126 | 0.0% | 720 | 769 | 6.8% |
| Montana | 80 | 81 | 1.3% | 216 | 230 | 6.5% |
| Nebraska | 56 | 66 | 17.9% | 156 | 192 | 23.1% |
| Nevada | 28 | 28 | 0.0% | 273 | 257 | -5.9% |
| New Hampshire | 29 | 27 | -6.9% | 184 | 173 | -6.0% |
| New Jersey | 116 | 128 | 10.3% | 1,372 | 1,426 | 3.9% |
| New Mexico | 57 | 58 | 1.8% | 685 | 675 | -1.5% |
| New York | 361 | 377 | 4.4% | 3,079 | 3,121 | 1.4% |
| North Carolina | 130 | 131 | 0.8% | 2,010 | 2,093 | 4.1% |
| North Dakota | 34 | 33 | -2.9% | 80 | 81 | 1.3% |
| Ohio | 178 | 179 | 0.6% | 1,620 | 1,650 | 1.9% |
| Oklahoma | 79 | 75 | -5.1% | 442 | 570 | 29.0% |
| Oregon | 138 | 136 | -1.4% | 785 | 777 | -1.0% |
| Pennsylvania | 302 | 304 | 0.7% | 2,608 | 2,716 | 4.1% |
| Rhode Island | 26 | 26 | 0.0% | 215 | 224 | 4.2% |
| South Carolina | 69 | 77 | 11.6% | 1,803 | 1,723 | -4.4% |
| South Dakota | 48 | 47 | -2.1% | 92 | 94 | 2.2% |
| Tennessee | 42 | 48 | 14.3% | 1,452 | 1,343 | -7.5% |
| Texas | 246 | 248 | 0.8% | 3,020 | 3,194 | 5.8% |
| Utah | 15 | 14 | -6.7% | 103 | 67 | -35.0% |
| Vermont | 58 | 58 | 0.0% | 277 | 274 | -1.1% |
| Virginia | 128 | 133 | 3.9% | 1,301 | 1,309 | 0.6% |
| Washington | 152 | 148 | -2.6% | 874 | 817 | -6.5% |
| West Virginia | 96 | 97 | 1.0% | 411 | 474 | 15.3% |
| Wisconsin | 169 | 178 | 5.3% | 750 | 786 | 4.8% |
| Wyoming | 30 | 30 | 0.0% | 96 | 93 | -3.1% |
| US | 5,512 | 5,575 | 1.1% | 48,798 | 48,699 | -0.2% |

Table 4:**Number of Summer Food Service Program Lunches Served in June, July, and August 2017 and 2018, by State**

| State | Lunches June 2017 | Lunches June 2018 | Percent Change June | Lunches July 2017 | Lunches July 2018 | Percent Change July | Lunches August 2017 | Lunches August 2018 | Percent Change August |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Alabama | 1,024,211 | 1,065,900 | 4.1% | 660,881 | 667,198 | 1.0% | 43,484 | 27,240 | -37.4% |
| Alaska | 79,501 | 83,516 | 5.1% | 68,066 | 64,811 | -4.8% | 24,911 | 18,419 | -26.1% |
| Arizona | 326,605 | 390,330 | 19.5% | 164,411 | 206,311 | 25.5% | 5,825 | 5,755 | -1.2% |
| Arkansas | 406,932 | 277,632 | -31.8% | 308,040 | 270,050 | -12.3% | 70,081 | 47,682 | -32.0% |
| California | 1,575,155 | 1,587,227 | 0.8% | 2,147,600 | 2,094,340 | -2.5% | 462,401 | 361,128 | -21.9% |
| Colorado | 522,197 | 534,731 | 2.4% | 355,574 | 366,956 | 3.2% | 64,040 | 52,849 | -17.5% |
| Connecticut | 96,916 | 65,856 | -32.0% | 537,948 | 567,589 | 5.5% | 185,011 | 168,106 | -9.1% |
| Delaware | 93,275 | 96,564 | 3.5% | 182,761 | 199,921 | 9.4% | 98,637 | 90,841 | -7.9% |
| District of Columbia | 1,991 | 49,841 | 2,403.3% | 336,072 | 274,370 | -18.4% | 58,006 | 39,652 | -31.6% |
| Florida | 3,783,422 | 3,872,164 | 2.3% | 3,723,313 | 3,531,609 | -5.1% | 497,594 | 241,380 | -51.5% |
| Georgia | 1,692,838 | 1,393,550 | -17.7% | 1,138,642 | 1,193,002 | 4.8% | 63,717 | 54,530 | -14.4% |
| Hawaii | 44,659 | 39,440 | -11.7% | 36,791 | 37,014 | 0.6% | 2,399 | 1,598 | -33.4% |
| Idaho | 460,839 | 433,895 | -5.8% | 353,830 | 362,165 | 2.4% | 96,256 | 82,790 | -14.0% |
| Illinois | 725,598 | 688,920 | -5.1% | 1,463,356 | 1,505,536 | 2.9% | 536,749 | 422,067 | -21.4% |
| Indiana | 1,097,475 | 1,018,914 | -7.2% | 667,192 | 628,479 | -5.8% | 57,443 | 42,196 | -26.5% |
| Iowa | 464,154 | 436,704 | -5.9% | 358,788 | 360,121 | 0.4% | 80,109 | 81,611 | 1.9% |
| Kansas | 601,635 | 578,301 | -3.9% | 329,407 | 335,196 | 1.8% | 34,393 | 32,124 | -6.6% |
| Kentucky | 844,834 | 881,316 | 4.3% | 601,471 | 730,237 | 21.4% | 96,282 | 120,759 | 25.4% |
| Louisiana | 989,063 | 972,099 | -1.7% | 529,549 | 477,325 | -9.9% | 2,760 | 4,341 | 57.3% |
| Maine | 21,167 | 19,492 | -7.9% | 307,678 | 312,968 | 1.7% | 127,080 | 107,091 | -15.7% |
| Maryland | 157,239 | 18,504 | -88.2% | 1,247,024 | 1,345,752 | 7.9% | 457,023 | 415,606 | -9.1% |
| Massachusetts | 72,217 | 63,714 | -11.8% | 923,546 | 964,770 | 4.5% | 497,943 | 444,588 | -10.7% |
| Michigan | 441,431 | 445,187 | 0.9% | 1,090,220 | 1,124,786 | 3.2% | 684,455 | 576,283 | -15.8% |
| Minnesota | 606,894 | 661,534 | 9.0% | 795,258 | 862,248 | 8.4% | 396,969 | 401,166 | 1.1% |
| Mississippi | 866,767 | 890,125 | 2.7% | 413,150 | 464,995 | 12.5% | 4,353 | 2,963 | -31.9% |
| Missouri | 1,828,637 | 1,812,043 | -0.9% | 511,326 | 507,372 | -0.8% | 98,046 | 107,193 | 9.3% |
| Montana | 165,097 | 170,449 | 3.2% | 162,769 | 178,589 | 9.7% | 73,833 | 76,213 | 3.2% |
| Nebraska | 403,254 | 395,607 | -1.9% | 146,956 | 160,211 | 9.0% | 20,908 | 17,015 | -18.6% |
| Nevada | 144,138 | 145,554 | 1.0% | 154,666 | 162,596 | 5.1% | 49,875 | 46,379 | -7.0% |
| New Hampshire | 15,186 | 11,417 | -24.8% | 94,903 | 86,217 | -9.2% | 48,093 | 58,267 | 21.2% |
| New Jersey | 42,692 | 97,005 | 127.2% | 1,496,534 | 1,483,121 | -0.9% | 689,162 | 690,737 | 0.2% |
| New Mexico | 633,341 | 588,029 | -7.2% | 582,382 | 512,436 | -12.0% | 2,915 | 53,332 | 1,729.6% |
| New York | 180,883 | 400,061 | 121.2% | 5,677,941 | 5,852,069 | 3.1% | 3,944,027 | 3,490,921 | -11.5% |
| North Carolina | 846,176 | 801,429 | -5.3% | 1,254,196 | 1,316,258 | 4.9% | 507,068 | 414,853 | -18.2% |
| North Dakota | 97,393 | 106,258 | 9.1% | 60,310 | 54,309 | -10.0% | 17,602 | 12,166 | -30.9% |
| Ohio | 1,110,148 | 1,075,490 | -3.1% | 1,079,126 | 1,100,763 | 2.0% | 325,472 | 319,922 | -1.7% |
| Oklahoma | 586,147 | 552,761 | -5.7% | 262,629 | 277,534 | 5.7% | 31,194 | 26,888 | -13.8% |
| Oregon | 229,185 | 262,333 | 14.5% | 611,327 | 586,462 | -4.1% | 364,591 | 321,353 | -11.9% |
| Pennsylvania | 591,685 | 606,635 | 2.5% | 1,331,572 | 1,296,345 | -2.6% | 802,282 | 602,353 | -24.9% |
| Rhode Island | 21,456 | 17,011 | -20.7% | 171,807 | 176,489 | 2.7% | 112,261 | 96,835 | -13.7% |
| South Carolina | 950,582 | 639,643 | -32.7% | 812,173 | 665,837 | -18.0% | 218,743 | 197,303 | -9.8% |
| South Dakota | 157,791 | 155,609 | -1.4% | 120,711 | 127,488 | 5.6% | 52,176 | 42,879 | -17.8% |
| Tennessee | 1,086,480 | 1,098,856 | 1.1% | 800,548 | 717,130 | -10.4% | 5,595 | 4,467 | -20.2% |
| Texas | 3,964,223 | 3,226,660 | -18.6% | 2,126,052 | 1,790,619 | -15.8% | 894,326 | 553,211 | -38.1% |
| Utah | 117,697 | 39,402 | -66.5% | 70,876 | 35,513 | -49.9% | 29,318 | 14,703 | -49.8% |
| Vermont | 31,085 | 31,078 | 0.0% | 149,642 | 157,042 | 4.9% | 54,877 | 48,293 | -12.0% |
| Virginia | 409,458 | 459,007 | 12.1% | 991,267 | 1,131,840 | 14.2% | 360,537 | 326,176 | -9.5% |
| Washington | 201,003 | 216,907 | 7.9% | 640,713 | 617,330 | -3.6% | 321,879 | 300,633 | -6.6% |
| West Virginia | 131,457 | 96,315 | -26.7% | 176,575 | 201,134 | 13.9% | 16,917 | 19,797 | 17.0% |
| Wisconsin | 686,371 | 669,727 | -2.4% | 772,874 | 812,465 | 5.1% | 247,243 | 244,349 | -1.2% |
| Wyoming | 98,009 | 84,587 | -13.7% | 70,298 | 76,669 | 9.1% | 23,068 | 22,768 | -1.3% |
| US | 31,726,589 | 30,325,329 | -4.4% | 39,070,741 | 39,031,587 | -0.1% | 13,959,929 | 11,951,771 | -14.4% |

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.

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 Regular School Year National School Lunch Program (NSLP)² Participants**

| State | Actual Summer Nutrition ADP, July 2018 | 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 | 36,351 | 10.3 | 141,490 | 105,139 | \$8,517,013 |
| Alaska | 3,719 | 9.6 | 15,452 | 11,732 | \$950,413 |
| Arizona | 56,979 | 12.6 | 181,253 | 124,273 | \$10,067,076 |
| Arkansas | 24,246 | 10.9 | 89,099 | 64,853 | \$5,253,559 |
| California | 413,455 | 17.3 | 957,677 | 544,221 | \$44,086,000 |
| Colorado | 19,588 | 9.0 | 87,191 | 67,603 | \$5,476,364 |
| Connecticut | 33,977 | 20.5 | 66,199 | 32,222 | \$2,610,215 |
| Delaware | 10,415 | 16.8 | 24,781 | 14,365 | \$1,163,710 |
| District of Columbia | 15,274 | 34.5 | 17,690 | 2,416 | \$195,733 |
| Florida | 194,458 | 13.5 | 574,191 | 379,733 | \$30,761,233 |
| Georgia | 146,746 | 17.2 | 341,944 | 195,198 | \$15,812,505 |
| Hawaii | 5,353 | 8.8 | 24,424 | 19,071 | \$1,544,884 |
| Idaho | 17,869 | 20.0 | 35,778 | 17,909 | \$1,450,762 |
| Illinois | 87,412 | 11.4 | 306,226 | 218,814 | \$17,725,564 |
| Indiana | 68,609 | 16.2 | 169,080 | 100,471 | \$8,138,910 |
| Iowa | 18,625 | 10.9 | 68,290 | 49,665 | \$4,023,229 |
| Kansas | 17,154 | 9.5 | 71,894 | 54,739 | \$4,434,293 |
| Kentucky | 35,528 | 8.9 | 159,601 | 124,073 | \$10,050,852 |
| Louisiana | 24,918 | 5.8 | 170,713 | 145,795 | \$11,810,484 |
| Maine | 15,214 | 27.4 | 22,201 | 6,987 | \$566,009 |
| Maryland | 65,425 | 22.4 | 116,856 | 51,431 | \$4,166,324 |
| Massachusetts | 53,772 | 16.7 | 128,738 | 74,966 | \$6,072,802 |
| Michigan | 65,338 | 12.5 | 208,887 | 143,549 | \$11,628,548 |
| Minnesota | 46,437 | 17.3 | 107,380 | 60,943 | \$4,936,825 |
| Mississippi | 24,034 | 8.4 | 114,300 | 90,266 | \$7,312,201 |
| Missouri | 29,343 | 8.5 | 137,813 | 108,470 | \$8,786,889 |
| Montana | 9,091 | 19.6 | 18,555 | 9,464 | \$766,674 |
| Nebraska | 8,470 | 7.1 | 47,944 | 39,474 | \$3,197,685 |
| Nevada | 13,688 | 8.0 | 68,407 | 54,719 | \$4,432,616 |
| New Hampshire | 4,826 | 14.7 | 13,122 | 8,296 | \$672,069 |
| New Jersey | 95,512 | 22.7 | 168,266 | 72,754 | \$5,893,647 |
| New Mexico | 45,816 | 27.0 | 67,962 | 22,146 | \$1,793,986 |
| New York | 348,387 | 27.1 | 513,326 | 164,938 | \$13,361,254 |
| North Carolina | 90,724 | 14.4 | 252,873 | 162,149 | \$13,135,295 |
| North Dakota | 2,823 | 8.9 | 12,695 | 9,871 | \$799,644 |
| Ohio | 61,926 | 10.1 | 244,288 | 182,362 | \$14,772,652 |
| Oklahoma | 16,612 | 5.5 | 121,139 | 104,527 | \$8,467,439 |
| Oregon | 30,808 | 15.5 | 79,757 | 48,950 | \$3,965,288 |
| Pennsylvania | 89,416 | 14.0 | 255,162 | 165,747 | \$13,426,740 |
| Rhode Island | 9,235 | 18.9 | 19,542 | 10,307 | \$834,973 |
| South Carolina | 54,749 | 16.0 | 136,721 | 81,972 | \$6,640,347 |
| South Dakota | 7,640 | 16.6 | 18,410 | 10,770 | \$872,413 |
| Tennessee | 69,516 | 14.5 | 191,308 | 121,792 | \$9,866,065 |
| Texas | 178,430 | 7.2 | 988,650 | 810,220 | \$65,633,891 |
| Utah | 25,886 | 16.8 | 61,650 | 35,764 | \$2,897,167 |
| Vermont | 7,826 | 31.0 | 10,094 | 2,269 | \$183,779 |
| Virginia | 64,294 | 15.1 | 169,760 | 105,466 | \$8,543,533 |
| Washington | 34,867 | 10.6 | 131,494 | 96,627 | \$7,827,492 |
| West Virginia | 11,228 | 8.3 | 54,242 | 43,014 | \$3,484,436 |
| Wisconsin | 41,996 | 15.7 | 106,666 | 64,670 | \$5,238,744 |
| Wyoming | 4,012 | 16.9 | 9,471 | 5,459 | \$442,193 |
| US | 2,858,022 | 14.1 | 8,100,653 | 5,242,631 | \$424,692,423 |

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 2017–2018.

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 (\$3.8575 per lunch), and were served 21 days in July 2018.



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

202.986.2200
www.frac.org

Copyright © 2019 Food Research & Action Center



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



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



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



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