



Hunger Doesn't Take A Vacation:

Summer
Nutrition Status
Report 2009

Food Research and Action Center

July 2009

FRAC
1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 540
Washington, DC 20009
(202) 986-2200 / www.frac.org



About FRAC

The Food Research and Action Center (FRAC) is the leading national organization working for more effective public and private policies to eradicate domestic hunger and undernutrition.

For more information about FRAC, or to sign up for FRAC's Weekly News Digest, visit www.frac.org. For information about out-of-school time nutrition programs, go to www.frac.org/afterschool/.

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Rachel Cooper, Crystal FitzSimons, Katherine Moos and Ben Hecht.

The Food Research and Action Center gratefully acknowledges the following funders whose major support in 2008-2009 has helped to make possible our work on expanding and improving nutrition programs:

Anonymous Donors
The Atlantic Philanthropies
California Endowment
Annie E. Casey Foundation
The Claneil Foundation
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
General Mills Foundation
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
Kaiser Permanente
Kraft Foods
Land O'Lakes Foundation
A.L. Mailman Family Foundation

MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger
The Moriah Fund
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
National Dairy Council
New Directions Foundation
Presbyterian Hunger Program
Pritzker Early Childhood Foundation
Public Welfare Foundation
Sara Lee Foundation
Taste of the NFL
UPS Foundation

Introduction

Even in good economic times, millions of families struggle to feed their children healthy, filling meals when schools close for the summer and children lose access to the free and reduced-price school meals on which they depend during the regular school.

But these are not good economic times. As the worst economic conditions in decades continue, millions of parents are now unemployed or have had their wages cut, and their families' budgets are overwhelmed. As summer begins, parents of the nearly 16.8 million children who relied on the National School Lunch Program for free or reduced-price meals every day during the 2007-2008 school year must figure out how to prevent their children from going hungry during the summer.

Two federal programs—the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP)—are designed to fill this food gap and provide children from low-income families the kind of nutritious meals and snacks in the summer that they receive during the school year. But beyond fighting hunger, both programs (FRAC describes them together in this report as the “Summer Nutrition Programs”) have other important benefits for children:

- Research finds that children gain more weight during the summer. Summer Nutrition Programs can help to combat childhood obesity. Summer Nutrition Programs provide foods that meet federal nutrition standards, thus providing many children well balanced meals that are nutritionally superior to the meals they would consume on their own.
- Summer Nutrition Programs support quality programs for children and teens that keep them safe, learning, engaged, and active during the summer months, reducing the loss of learning that often happens to children during the long summer break. The food provided through Summer Nutrition Programs helps draw the children into quality summer programs and provides the nutrition necessary for children to be fully engaged throughout the day.

Despite fighting childhood hunger, obesity and summer learning loss, the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs falls far short of meeting the needs of low-income children. In July 2008, the Summer Nutrition Programs only served lunch to 2.9 million children on an average day. That means that only one in six low-income children who ate a school lunch during the regular 2007-2008 school year were reached by the Summer Nutrition Programs. Much more must be done to increase the reach of the Summer Nutrition Programs to give children access to the healthy food they deserve.

The Summer Nutrition Programs

The two federal Summer Nutrition Programs—the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)—provide funding to serve meals and snacks to children at sites where at least half the children in the geographic area are eligible for free or reduced-price school meals; at sites in which at least 50 percent of the children participating in the program are individually determined eligible for free or reduced-price school meals; and at sites that serve primarily migrant children. Once the site is eligible, all of the children can eat for free. In areas that do not meet the 50 percent threshold, sites can only serve the children enrolled in the program, not other children in the community. Some summer camps also can participate.

Public and private nonprofit schools, local governments, National Youth Sports Programs, and private nonprofit organizations can participate in the SFSP and operate one or multiple sites. Only schools are eligible to participate in the NSLP, but they can provide federally-funded meals and snacks to school and non-school public and nonprofit sites over the summer. The NSLP also reimburses schools for feeding children that attend summer school.

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

Key Findings for 2008

National Participation

Nationally in July 2008, an average of 2.9 million children participated each weekday in the Summer Nutrition Programs (i.e., the Summer Food Service Program and the National School Lunch Program combined).

The number of low-income children who are receiving free and reduced-price lunch during the regular school year is an excellent indicator of the need for the Summer Nutrition Programs, so FRAC uses it as a benchmark to measure summer participation nationally and in the states. While the total number of children participating in Summer Nutrition grew by more than 49,000, or 1.7 percent, from July 2007 to July 2008, the number of children enrolled in the regular year school lunch program grew faster so that the reach of Summer Nutrition decreased slightly. In July 2008, 17.3 children received Summer Nutrition for every 100

low-income students who received lunch in the 2007-2008 school year, compared to a ratio of 17.5:100 children in July 2007.

Participation in the States

The disparities in participation among the 50 states plus the District of Columbia are dramatic. Only 10 states managed to reach at least one quarter of their low-income children in July 2008. The District of Columbia, followed by New Mexico, South Carolina, Nevada and New York had the highest rates for Summer Nutrition participation by low-income children.

Eleven states failed to even serve one-tenth of their low-income children through their Summer Nutrition Programs in 2008. Mississippi, Oklahoma, Kansas, Louisiana, and Colorado had the lowest rates for Summer Nutrition participation by low-income children in July 2008.

Simplified Summer Food

The summer of 2008 was the first year that all states and the District of Columbia operated under the Simplified Summer Food rules, which reduce administrative work for Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) sponsors by eliminating unnecessary rules for tracking different categories of costs and thereby ensure that all sponsors received the maximum federal reimbursement available. Previously, only 26 states were able to operate under the easier Simplified rules.

The nationwide expansion of the Simplified rules gave an important boost to the Summer Food Service Program. Use of the SFSP grew by 8 percent in 2008, while use of the NSLP program (which did not offer any reduction in administrative work) fell by 5.7 percent. Because SFSP was more attractive (both to schools operating the NSLP and new sponsors), the number of Summer Food sponsors grew by 6.2 percent and the number of sites grew by 5 percent. It is likely that the full potential of Simplified may have been diminished due to the rising fuel and food costs that occurred in the spring of 2008; according to state agencies, these higher costs had a negative impact on sponsors and sites in a number of states.

Children in Summer Nutrition in 2008 per 100 Children in Free & Reduced-Price School-Year National School Lunch Program 2007-2008

State	Ratio
Top 5 States	
District of Columbia	88.8
New Mexico	34.6
South Carolina	32.0
Nevada	31.2
New York	30.3
Bottom 5 States	
Colorado	8.2
Louisiana	8.1
Kansas	6.8
Oklahoma	4.6
Mississippi	4.4

For a full list of states see Table 1.

The Cost of Low Participation

Not only are states with low Summer Nutrition participation rates failing to provide for their low-income children, they are missing out on the millions of dollars in federal funds that exist to provide healthy foods for these children. These

dollars also support summer programs for children and youth and can help stimulate the economy.

To estimate the total dollars being forfeited by the states in unclaimed Summer Nutrition funding, FRAC uses a benchmark for the ratio of participation that states should be reaching. Based on the performance of the most effective states, if states commit the necessary effort and resources, the goal of serving 40 children Summer Nutrition for every 100 children receiving free and reduced-price lunches during the regular school year is eminently achievable. By calculating the additional number of children that would be fed by each state if this goal were met, and multiplying it by the federal reimbursement rate for the 22 weekdays in July 2008 (not counting the July 4th holiday), an estimate of the federal funding lost by each state was calculated.

**Top Ten States in Lost Federal Funds
(Amounts Foregone Because State Falls Short
of Reaching 40 Children in the Summer
Nutrition Programs per 100 Free & Reduced-
Price Students in the Regular Year School
Lunch Program)**

State	Additional Children	Dollars Lost
Texas	630,303	\$41,426,683
California	269,794	\$17,732,228
Florida	233,551	\$15,350,167
Georgia	188,594	\$12,395,365
Illinois	154,808	\$10,174,773
Ohio	148,210	\$9,741,074
North Carolina	137,137	\$9,013,302
Michigan	125,618	\$8,256,272
Arizona	116,097	\$7,630,456
Louisiana	112,812	\$7,414,576

For a full list of states see Table 6.

In July 2008 if every state had reached the goal of serving 40 children Summer Nutrition for every 100 receiving free and reduced-price lunches during the 2007-2008 school year, an additional 3.8 million children would have been fed each day, and the states would have collected an additional \$250 million in child nutrition funding.

While the losses were higher in states with larger populations (e.g. \$41.4 million in Texas, \$17.7 million in California, \$15.3 million in Florida, and \$12.4 million in Georgia), 18 states each lost more than \$5 million in federal funding.

Of course, the Summer Nutrition Programs are meant to be available throughout the entire summer recess—not just in the month of July. States are losing out on additional federal dollars due to low participation rates in June and August.

Participation Throughout the Summer

As children need to know they can eat a healthy meal every day, Summer Nutrition Programs should be available from the first day of summer vacation until the start of the new school year. Unfortunately, many summer food sites do not stay open for the entire summer break. This is often due to inadequate funding, labor restrictions, or limited programming. Therefore, participation rates fluctuate throughout the summer.

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

While not used in calculations for this report, it is important to note that 20 states have their peak participation in Summer Nutrition Programs during the month of June. Some states—Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Mississippi, Louisiana and Arizona—served more than twice the number of SFSP meals in June as July (see Table 5). In every state the number of meals served in August dropped substantially.

Increasing Participation through Child Nutrition Reauthorization

Participation in the Summer Nutrition Programs is too low—only one in six low-income children participates in the program. The low participation is not an accident. Reaching children in the summer is harder than during the regular school year, and over the years, the Summer Nutrition Programs have suffered a series of critical blows inflicted by Congress that have decreased the number of sponsors and sites, and made it harder to build momentum to improve children's access to nutritious meals during the summer. These cuts include: lowering the reimbursement rates, reducing the number of communities that are eligible to participate, and eliminating start-up and expansion funding.

Congress now is in the process of reauthorizing all of the federal child nutrition programs, including the Summer Nutrition Programs. Reauthorization provides the opportunity to reverse previous cuts, build a stronger program, and make significant new investments in the Summer Nutrition Programs so that more low-income children have access to healthy food during summer vacation.

The following recommendations should be included in reauthorization so that more low-income children have access to summer meals that stave off hunger, help reduce obesity, and draw children into educational and enrichment programs that keep them learning throughout the summer.

Improve the Area Eligibility Test

The best, easiest, and most frequently used way for a Summer Nutrition site to qualify for the program is through “area eligibility.” If a program is located in a low-income area, then the site can participate and receive federal reimbursements for all the children. The current definition for low-income requires that 50 percent of the children in the area be eligible for free or reduced-price school meals, a test which excludes many communities with significant numbers of low-income children from participating.

In fact, the 50 percent threshold keeps many federally-funded summer and afterschool programs from getting nutrition dollars. There is a 40 percent threshold in the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, which is the largest federal funding source for the underlying costs of summer

and afterschool programs, as well as school-wide summer and afterschool programs funded through Title I.

Since the Summer Nutrition Programs are intended to support exactly these types of education programs, the inconsistency is self-defeating and a classic example of lack of coordination and creation of unnecessary red tape. The Summer Nutrition Program threshold should be lowered to 40 percent. Otherwise, important education dollars that should be used to provide better services and reach more at-risk children will be spent on food. Or, if no food is provided during the educational and enrichment programs, children will be hungry and unable to benefit from the program.

The current 50 percent area eligibility test is the most restrictive it has ever been. Prior to 1981, the threshold for Summer Food was 33 percent. Raising the threshold from 33 percent to 50 percent made many communities with significant numbers of low-income children but without large enough concentrations of poverty ineligible for the Summer Nutrition Programs. The change caused participation to drop by 500,000 children, from 1981 to 1982. Making a change in the opposite direction by lowering it to 40 percent would bring hundreds of thousands of low-income children back into the program.

Restore the Reimbursement Rates

The Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) reimbursement rates were cut by 10 percent in 1996, making it extremely difficult for SFSP sponsors to participate without losing money. A report by the U.S. Department of Agriculture on summer food found that 73 percent of sponsors expect to lose money operating SFSP. It is time to restore the reimbursement rates to their pre-1996 levels, indexed to inflation.

Provide Start-Up and Expansion Grants

Start-up funds were available until 1996. They gave sponsors the resources necessary to begin and grow their programs. Without these dollars, it is extremely difficult to recruit new sponsors and to encourage current sponsor to serve additional sites, both of which are necessary in order to increase participation.

Provide Funding for Transportation Costs

In rural areas, transportation is one of the biggest barriers to Summer Nutrition participation. Providing funding to get children to Summer Nutrition Programs that offer high quality educational and enrichment activities is a vital way to support access in rural areas.

Expand the Year-Round Summer Food Pilot

Many organizations that operate summer programs also provide high quality afterschool programming and afterschool nutrition during the school year. The last Child Nutrition Reauthorization included a pilot program that allows community-based programs in California to feed children year-round through the Summer Food Service Program. The pilot significantly reduces administrative work because organizations do not have to operate

multiple child nutrition programs, each of which requires an application and has different programmatic rules. The reauthorization should expand the pilot nationwide and strengthen it so that children can receive meals after school, on weekends, and during school holidays.

Provide Performance Awards

Summer Nutrition participation varies dramatically, with the top performing states serving at least one in three low-income children who eat lunch during the school year, and the lowest performing states serving fewer than one in 20. Providing performance awards to states that are doing the best job and are growing participation is an important way to encourage states to run strong Summer Nutrition Programs.

Conclusion

The Summer Nutrition Programs are meant to be a vital support for millions of struggling families, but nationally the programs serve only one in six of the low-income children who rely on school meals during the school year. Many of the program rules and its limited resources keep too many low-income children from participating. To fix the

Summer Nutrition Programs so that low-income children really do have access to nutritious meals and snacks during the summer months, Congress must use Child Nutrition Reauthorization as an opportunity to make the effective and proven policy changes outlined in this report.

Technical Notes

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

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

Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)

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

FRAC does not include data for the months of June or August in the analysis because it is impossible to determine how many days of each month schools were actually closed for the summer recess. And because of the limits of the available USDA data, it is not possible to divide up National School Lunch Program data to determine if meals were served as part of the summer program or as part of the regular school year.

The average daily lunch attendance numbers reported in this report are slightly different from the average daily participation numbers reported by USDA. FRAC's revised measure allows consistent comparisons from state to state and year to year. This measure is also more in line with the average daily lunch attendance numbers in the school year National School Lunch Program, as described below. The numbers of lunches served by state are from USDA.

USDA does not report the number of sponsors or sites for June or August—it only reports these data for July of each year. USDA obtains the July numbers from the states and reports them as they receive them.

For this report, FRAC gave states the opportunity to update the data on sponsors, sites, and total number of lunches for June, July, and August that FRAC obtained from USDA.

National School Lunch Program

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

FRAC used the July average daily attendance figures for the NSLP as provided by USDA for the summertime NSLP participation data in the report. The NSLP numbers include the lunches served at summer school and through the NSLP Seamless Summer Option.

Note that USDA calculates average daily *participation* in the NSLP by dividing the average daily lunch attendance by 0.927. This is to account for children who were absent from school on a particular day. FRAC's *School Breakfast Scorecard* reports the NSLP average daily *participation* numbers—that is, including the 0.927 factor. To make the regular year NSLP numbers consistent with the summer food numbers, for which there is no analogous absenteeism factor, the *Hunger Doesn't Take a Vacation 2009* report does not include the absenteeism factor. As a result, the NSLP numbers in this report do not match the NSLP numbers USDA publishes or FRAC's in the *School Breakfast Scorecard School Year 2007-2008*.

The Cost of Low Participation

For each state, FRAC calculated the average daily number of children receiving Summer Nutrition for every 100 children receiving free or reduced-price lunches during the regular school year. FRAC calculated the number of additional children who would be reached if each state reached a 40 to 100 ratio. FRAC then multiplied this unserved population by the reimbursement rate for 22 days (the number of weekdays in July 2008 not counting the July 4th holiday) of SFSP lunches. FRAC assumed each meal is reimbursed at the lowest standard rate available.

TABLE 1: Summer Nutrition Participation in July 2007 and July 2008 by State
(Lunches in Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Combined)**

State	July 2007 Summer Nutrition				July 2008 Summer Nutrition				Percent Change in Summer Nutrition 2007 to 2008
	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 06-07 School-Year NSLP*				Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 07-08 School-Year NSLP*				
	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 07 School-Year NSLP*	100 in 06-07 School-Year NSLP*	Rank	Children in Summer Nutrition	Children in 07-08 School-Year NSLP*	100 in 07-08 School-Year NSLP*	Rank	
Alabama	30,719	324,192	9.5	41	29,187	327,310	8.9	45	-5.0%
Alaska	2,064	32,519	6.3	49	2,887	31,664	9.1	44	39.9%
Arizona	37,689	378,732	10.0	38	41,617	394,285	10.6	39	10.4%
Arkansas	18,524	209,310	8.9	42	21,618	214,219	10.1	40	16.7%
California	622,090	2,032,893	30.6	4	588,175	2,144,923	27.4	7	-5.5%
Colorado	14,785	180,349	8.2	46	15,008	184,112	8.2	47	1.5%
Connecticut	34,304	131,977	26.0	10	33,434	132,985	25.1	10	-2.5%
Delaware	8,244	38,294	21.5	13	11,593	40,478	28.6	6	40.6%
District of Columbia	29,036	30,263	95.9	1	26,198	29,518	88.8	1	-9.8%
Florida	157,978	926,719	17.0	21	153,673	968,060	15.9	24	-2.7%
Georgia	95,956	705,967	13.6	31	100,473	722,667	13.9	29	4.7%
Hawaii	6,216	44,255	14.0	29	10,623	44,366	23.9	12	70.9%
Idaho	18,002	80,197	22.4	12	20,874	82,312	25.4	9	16.0%
Illinois	108,304	653,483	16.6	22	109,852	661,651	16.6	22	1.4%
Indiana	43,350	318,301	13.6	30	45,829	339,180	13.5	33	5.7%
Iowa	11,255	133,213	8.4	45	11,512	136,472	8.4	46	2.3%
Kansas	9,713	147,987	6.6	48	10,421	152,547	6.8	49	7.3%
Kentucky	46,374	289,365	16.0	24	40,508	293,511	13.8	31	-12.6%
Louisiana	29,593	349,034	8.5	44	28,689	353,752	8.1	48	-3.1%
Maine	7,604	49,469	15.4	26	7,820	50,537	15.5	26	2.8%
Maryland	42,843	204,726	20.9	15	46,097	212,257	21.7	15	7.6%
Massachusetts	48,026	225,483	21.3	14	47,715	230,129	20.7	17	-0.6%
Michigan	58,023	459,684	12.6	34	62,425	470,108	13.3	34	7.6%
Minnesota	27,629	209,479	13.2	32	28,249	215,137	13.1	35	2.2%
Mississippi	13,860	279,621	5.0	50	12,400	279,534	4.4	51	-10.5%
Missouri	49,246	300,976	16.4	23	51,743	304,384	17.0	21	5.1%
Montana	4,839	37,596	12.9	33	5,763	39,187	14.7	28	19.1%
Nebraska	8,886	92,699	9.6	40	8,802	95,131	9.3	43	-0.9%
Nevada	37,054	111,803	33.1	3	36,202	116,012	31.2	4	-2.3%
New Hampshire	4,303	30,466	14.1	28	4,319	31,531	13.7	32	0.4%
New Jersey	62,390	305,132	20.4	17	69,043	313,939	22.0	13	10.7%
New Mexico	50,907	145,440	35.0	2	50,873	146,881	34.6	2	-0.1%
New York	314,011	1,054,083	29.8	5	320,544	1,059,276	30.3	5	2.1%
North Carolina	79,500	538,470	14.8	27	81,267	546,008	14.9	27	2.2%
North Dakota	2,204	25,453	8.7	43	2,459	25,796	9.5	41	11.6%
Ohio	58,245	510,883	11.4	37	61,308	523,795	11.7	37	5.3%
Oklahoma	12,498	252,776	4.9	51	11,720	253,177	4.6	50	-6.2%
Oregon	34,254	172,750	19.8	19	36,349	177,323	20.5	18	6.1%
Pennsylvania	124,611	482,420	25.8	11	121,937	492,438	24.8	11	-2.1%
Rhode Island	12,566	42,673	29.4	6	7,520	47,814	15.7	25	-40.2%
South Carolina	78,845	295,657	26.7	9	95,266	297,809	32.0	3	20.8%
South Dakota	8,491	41,334	20.5	16	8,602	41,406	20.8	16	1.3%
Tennessee	38,307	385,676	9.9	39	39,985	375,870	10.6	38	4.4%
Texas	164,085	2,004,897	8.2	47	190,174	2,051,194	9.3	42	15.9%
Utah	35,234	123,357	28.6	7	32,290	127,001	25.4	8	-8.4%
Vermont	5,724	21,416	26.7	8	4,684	21,484	21.8	14	-18.2%
Virginia	62,052	307,723	20.2	18	62,840	316,342	19.9	19	1.3%
Washington	33,969	275,336	12.3	36	35,740	279,557	12.8	36	5.2%
West Virginia	16,723	107,985	15.5	25	15,051	108,999	13.8	30	-10.0%
Wisconsin	27,960	221,611	12.6	35	37,238	227,138	16.4	23	33.2%
Wyoming	3,794	20,607	18.4	20	3,588	20,885	17.2	20	-5.4%
United States	2,852,877	16,344,732	17.5		2,902,184	16,752,091	17.3		1.7%

* School-Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance in school-years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, respectively.

** National School Lunch Program July numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance and include participation in the Seamless Summer Option.

**TABLE 2: Change in Summer Food Service Program and National School Lunch Program Participation
from July 2007 to July 2008, by State**

State	Children in Summer Food Service Program			Children in National School Lunch Program		
	July 2007	July 2008	Change 2007 to 2008	July 2007	July 2008	Change 2007 to 2008
Alabama	20,187	19,323	-4.3%	10,532	9,863	-6.4%
Alaska	846	1,815	114.7%	1,218	1,071	-12.0%
Arizona	7,156	6,997	-2.2%	30,533	34,621	13.4%
Arkansas	12,198	14,773	21.1%	6,326	6,845	8.2%
California	90,786	107,738	18.7%	531,304	480,437	-9.6%
Colorado	8,409	9,360	11.3%	6,376	5,649	-11.4%
Connecticut	8,479	14,647	72.7%	25,826	18,787	-27.3%
Delaware	6,978	10,287	47.4%	1,267	1,306	3.1%
District of Columbia	26,925	23,744	-11.8%	2,111	2,454	16.3%
Florida	93,716	131,441	40.3%	64,262	22,232	-65.4%
Georgia	44,727	47,507	6.2%	51,229	52,966	3.4%
Hawaii	3,306	3,072	-7.1%	2,910	7,551	159.5%
Idaho	16,640	19,543	17.4%	1,362	1,331	-2.3%
Illinois	58,600	55,737	-4.9%	49,704	54,115	8.9%
Indiana	33,861	35,239	4.1%	9,489	10,590	11.6%
Iowa	7,508	7,947	5.8%	3,746	3,565	-4.8%
Kansas	7,867	8,590	9.2%	1,846	1,831	-0.8%
Kentucky	41,741	36,136	-13.4%	4,633	4,372	-5.6%
Louisiana	26,799	26,025	-2.9%	2,794	2,663	-4.7%
Maine	6,943	7,223	4.0%	661	596	-9.8%
Maryland	38,417	42,542	10.7%	4,426	3,555	-19.7%
Massachusetts	41,856	41,237	-1.5%	6,170	6,478	5.0%
Michigan	39,111	42,244	8.0%	18,913	20,181	6.7%
Minnesota	19,816	21,507	8.5%	7,812	6,743	-13.7%
Mississippi	12,356	10,791	-12.7%	1,505	1,609	7.0%
Missouri	23,983	26,619	11.0%	25,263	25,125	-0.5%
Montana	4,269	5,243	22.8%	570	520	-8.7%
Nebraska	4,837	6,781	40.2%	4,049	2,021	-50.1%
Nevada	3,856	4,598	19.3%	33,199	31,604	-4.8%
New Hampshire	3,353	3,567	6.4%	950	752	-20.8%
New Jersey	40,023	48,454	21.1%	22,366	20,589	-7.9%
New Mexico	32,017	35,701	11.5%	18,890	15,172	-19.7%
New York	257,616	264,753	2.8%	56,395	55,791	-1.1%
North Carolina	31,089	36,534	17.5%	48,412	44,733	-7.6%
North Dakota	1,799	2,084	15.8%	405	375	-7.4%
Ohio	48,730	50,080	2.8%	9,516	11,229	18.0%
Oklahoma	10,679	10,050	-5.9%	1,819	1,670	-8.2%
Oregon	27,230	31,721	16.5%	7,024	4,628	-34.1%
Pennsylvania	73,924	71,313	-3.5%	50,687	50,623	-0.1%
Rhode Island	10,256	5,596	-45.4%	2,310	1,925	-16.7%
South Carolina	43,030	58,351	35.6%	35,815	36,915	3.1%
South Dakota	2,896	3,596	24.2%	5,596	5,006	-10.5%
Tennessee	28,151	28,474	1.1%	10,156	11,511	13.3%
Texas	94,887	94,473	-0.4%	69,198	95,701	38.3%
Utah	11,108	11,978	7.8%	24,125	20,312	-15.8%
Vermont	3,620	2,529	-30.1%	2,104	2,155	2.4%
Virginia	48,299	48,299	0.0%	13,753	14,541	5.7%
Washington	27,015	28,732	6.4%	6,954	7,008	0.8%
West Virginia	13,710	11,980	-12.6%	3,013	3,071	1.9%
Wisconsin	24,588	33,374	35.7%	3,372	3,864	14.6%
Wyoming	2,498	2,230	-10.7%	1,296	1,358	4.8%
United States	1,548,688	1,672,574	8.0%	1,304,189	1,229,610	-5.7%

TABLE 3: Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Participation in July 2008 by State

State	Children in SFSP, July 2008	Children in 07-08 School-Year NSLP*	Children in SFSP per 100 in 07-08 School- Year NSLP*	Rank	Percent SFSP Contributes to Summer Nutrition Participation
Alabama	19,323	327,310	5.9	42	66.2%
Alaska	1,815	31,664	8.5	32	62.9%
Arizona	6,997	394,285	1.8	51	16.8%
Arkansas	14,773	214,219	6.9	39	68.3%
California	107,738	2,144,923	5.0	46	18.3%
Colorado	9,360	184,112	5.1	45	62.4%
Connecticut	14,647	132,985	11.0	21	43.8%
Delaware	10,287	40,478	25.4	2	88.7%
District of Columbia	23,744	29,518	80.4	1	90.6%
Florida	131,441	968,060	13.6	15	85.5%
Georgia	47,507	722,667	6.6	41	47.3%
Hawaii	3,072	44,366	6.9	38	28.9%
Idaho	19,543	82,312	23.7	5	93.6%
Illinois	55,737	661,651	8.4	33	50.7%
Indiana	35,239	339,180	10.4	24	76.9%
Iowa	7,947	136,472	5.8	43	69.0%
Kansas	8,590	152,547	5.6	44	82.4%
Kentucky	36,136	293,511	12.3	17	89.2%
Louisiana	26,025	353,752	7.4	36	90.7%
Maine	7,223	50,537	14.3	14	92.4%
Maryland	42,542	212,257	20.0	6	92.3%
Massachusetts	41,237	230,129	17.9	8	86.4%
Michigan	42,244	470,108	9.0	29	67.7%
Minnesota	21,507	215,137	10.0	26	76.1%
Mississippi	10,791	279,534	3.9	50	87.0%
Missouri	26,619	304,384	8.7	30	51.4%
Montana	5,243	39,187	13.4	16	91.0%
Nebraska	6,781	95,131	7.1	37	77.0%
Nevada	4,598	116,012	4.0	49	12.7%
New Hampshire	3,567	31,531	11.3	20	82.6%
New Jersey	48,454	313,939	15.4	10	70.2%
New Mexico	35,701	146,881	24.3	4	70.2%
New York	264,753	1,059,276	25.0	3	82.6%
North Carolina	36,534	546,008	6.7	40	45.0%
North Dakota	2,084	25,796	8.1	34	84.8%
Ohio	50,080	523,795	9.6	27	81.7%
Oklahoma	10,050	253,177	4.0	48	85.8%
Oregon	31,721	177,323	17.9	9	87.3%
Pennsylvania	71,313	492,438	14.5	13	58.5%
Rhode Island	5,596	47,814	11.7	19	74.4%
South Carolina	58,351	297,809	19.6	7	61.3%
South Dakota	3,596	41,406	8.7	31	41.8%
Tennessee	28,474	375,870	7.6	35	71.2%
Texas	94,473	2,051,194	4.6	47	49.7%
Utah	11,978	127,001	9.4	28	37.1%
Vermont	2,529	21,484	11.8	18	54.0%
Virginia	48,299	316,342	15.3	11	76.9%
Washington	28,732	279,557	10.3	25	80.4%
West Virginia	11,980	108,999	11.0	22	79.6%
Wisconsin	33,374	227,138	14.7	12	89.6%
Wyoming	2,230	20,885	10.7	23	62.1%
United States	1,672,574	16,752,091	10.0		57.6 %

* School-Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced-price lunch attendance in school-year 2007-2008.

TABLE 4: Change in Number of Summer Food Service Program Sponsors and Sites from July 2007 to July 2008, by State

State	Number of Sponsors			Number of Sites		
	July 2007	July 2008	Percent Change	July 2007	July 2008	Percent Change
Alabama	37	37	0.0%	536	483	-9.9%
Alaska	20	25	25.0%	36	63	75.0%
Arizona	34	34	0.0%	163	161	-1.2%
Arkansas	75	106	41.3%	174	220	26.4%
California	167	173	3.6%	1,450	1,417	-2.3%
Colorado	47	54	14.9%	153	198	29.4%
Connecticut	23	24	4.3%	144	225	56.3%
Delaware	19	20	5.3%	413	310	-24.9%
District of Columbia	19	16	-15.8%	404	329	-18.6%
Florida	78	106	35.9%	1,744	2,556	46.6%
Georgia	72	85	18.1%	1,211	1,441	19.0%
Hawaii	23	22	-4.3%	109	102	-6.4%
Idaho	66	65	-1.5%	214	228	6.5%
Illinois	123	130	5.7%	1,286	1,196	-7.0%
Indiana	130	130	0.0%	957	836	-12.6%
Iowa	59	70	18.6%	185	210	13.5%
Kansas	50	58	16.0%	185	216	16.8%
Kentucky	151	90	-40.4%	2,007	1,200	-40.2%
Louisiana	67	81	20.9%	387	479	23.8%
Maine	50	53	6.0%	123	128	4.1%
Maryland	41	41	0.0%	587	877	49.4%
Massachusetts	82	82	0.0%	795	812	2.1%
Michigan	129	147	14.0%	849	870	2.5%
Minnesota	44	71	61.4%	308	339	10.1%
Mississippi	63	58	-7.9%	213	209	-1.9%
Missouri	62	69	11.3%	445	505	13.5%
Montana	51	54	5.9%	139	139	0.0%
Nebraska	33	45	36.4%	93	190	104.3%
Nevada	24	27	12.5%	78	87	11.5%
New Hampshire	25	26	4.0%	90	93	3.3%
New Jersey	88	89	1.1%	940	1,020	8.5%
New Mexico	46	56	21.7%	561	665	18.5%
New York	283	284	0.4%	2,549	2,595	1.8%
North Carolina	77	87	13.0%	646	777	20.3%
North Dakota	29	25	-13.8%	35	34	-2.9%
Ohio	150	177	18.0%	1,242	1,404	13.0%
Oklahoma	59	53	-10.2%	254	223	-12.2%
Oregon	94	107	13.8%	448	545	21.7%
Pennsylvania	222	227	2.3%	2,033	1,949	-4.1%
Rhode Island	11	12	9.1%	157	145	-7.6%
South Carolina	44	48	9.1%	1,021	1,021	0.0%
South Dakota	18	24	33.3%	39	50	28.2%
Tennessee	45	45	0.0%	1,000	968	-3.2%
Texas	167	177	6.0%	1,694	1,909	12.7%
Utah	10	15	50.0%	100	114	14.0%
Vermont	28	32	14.3%	70	82	17.1%
Virginia	115	116	0.9%	1,183	1,385	17.1%
Washington	105	103	-1.9%	558	562	0.7%
West Virginia	95	90	-5.3%	420	364	-13.3%
Wisconsin	90	98	8.9%	431	475	10.2%
Wyoming	14	16	14.3%	36	40	11.1%
United States	3,654	3,880	6.2 %	30,895	32,446	5.0 %

TABLE 5: Number of Summer Food Service Program Lunches* Served in June, July, and August 2007 and 2008, by State

State	June 2007 SFSP Lunches	June 2008 SFSP Lunches	% Change	July 2007 SFSP Lunches	July 2008 SFSP Lunches	% Change	August 2007 SFSP Lunches	August 2008 SFSP Lunches	% Change
Alabama	632,375	617,317	-2%	423,917	425,115	0%	6,172	1,668	-73%
Alaska	23,669	38,443	62%	17,756	39,936	125%	6,543	13,143	101%
Arizona	410,298	480,041	17%	150,278	153,927	2%	57,086	9,650	-83%
Arkansas	280,717	325,508	16%	256,163	324,996	27%	38,980	61,569	58%
California	540,239	2,041,066	278%	1,906,509	2,370,246	24%	732,014	666,875	-9%
Colorado	285,235	246,205	-14%	176,594	205,912	17%	10,117	13,971	38%
Connecticut	0	0	N/A	178,052	322,227	81%	46,187	59,084	28%
Delaware	76,989	94,100	22%	146,534	226,323	54%	107,829	83,604	-22%
District of Columbia	97,077	119,560	23%	565,432	522,372	-8%	200,546	165,871	-17%
Florida	1,997,182	2,010,617	1%	1,968,033	2,891,696	47%	258,472	257,777	0%
Georgia	1,209,936	1,202,954	-1%	939,265	1,045,148	11%	129,426	88,130	-32%
Hawaii	72,409	79,138	9%	69,431	67,580	-3%	452	817	81%
Idaho	387,453	436,751	13%	349,437	429,939	23%	153,397	155,850	2%
Illinois	555,288	597,892	8%	1,230,594	1,226,223	0%	464,151	305,293	-34%
Indiana	496,022	556,427	12%	711,072	775,260	9%	113,019	90,832	-20%
Iowa	176,299	180,968	3%	157,678	174,831	11%	31,294	20,496	-35%
Kansas	312,326	344,120	10%	165,204	188,972	14%	9,138	1,356	-85%
Kentucky	1,107,964	961,670	-13%	876,565	794,993	-9%	42,174	47,260	12%
Louisiana	934,696	1,187,896	27%	562,786	572,555	2%	161,423	128,272	-21%
Maine	13,725	8,665	-37%	145,806	158,915	9%	36,376	36,375	0%
Maryland	185,555	211,379	14%	806,754	935,914	16%	149,726	151,093	1%
Massachusetts	33,306	73,530	121%	878,967	907,220	3%	443,400	409,699	-8%
Michigan	216,888	314,997	45%	821,324	929,368	13%	278,939	261,725	-6%
Minnesota	213,541	264,553	24%	416,142	473,147	14%	84,276	92,513	10%
Mississippi	811,689	799,188	-2%	259,468	237,393	-9%	652	456	-30%
Missouri	1,201,889	1,567,657	30%	503,646	585,608	16%	69,032	69,043	0%
Montana	87,281	82,235	-6%	89,658	115,350	29%	29,868	29,760	0%
Nebraska	145,097	178,073	23%	101,587	149,184	47%	20,130	21,446	7%
Nevada	58,929	79,609	35%	80,967	101,163	25%	44,041	47,665	8%
New Hampshire	7,841	7,308	-7%	70,413	78,472	11%	40,207	38,679	-4%
New Jersey	15,419	13,719	-11%	840,493	1,065,992	27%	507,251	429,634	-15%
New Mexico	771,323	858,636	11%	672,349	785,425	17%	13,559	14,711	8%
New York	283,718	147,655	-48%	5,409,932	5,824,568	8%	3,361,462	3,365,502	0%
North Carolina	312,600	319,867	2%	652,863	803,746	23%	241,540	219,695	-9%
North Dakota	58,961	60,040	2%	37,782	45,849	21%	10,823	10,248	-5%
Ohio	695,840	729,460	5%	1,023,321	1,101,757	8%	328,477	363,244	11%
Oklahoma	499,130	498,298	0%	224,260	221,105	-1%	17,101	13,984	-18%
Oregon	195,171	207,835	6%	571,831	697,852	22%	290,449	217,229	-25%
Pennsylvania	478,435	522,167	9%	1,552,394	1,568,891	1%	813,604	743,180	-9%
Rhode Island	50,956	13,995	N/A	215,368	123,101	-43%	147,627	63,614	-57%
South Carolina	995,763	1,176,510	18%	903,634	1,283,728	42%	293,919	390,628	33%
South Dakota	60,245	74,991	24%	60,810	79,118	30%	27,210	32,436	19%
Tennessee	897,860	942,900	5%	591,164	626,436	6%	23,110	18,882	-18%
Texas	5,408,560	4,741,914	-12%	1,992,629	2,078,405	4%	492,975	898,459	82%
Utah	286,363	286,529	0%	233,275	263,520	13%	90,128	82,806	-8%
Vermont	1,233	10,546	755%	76,022	55,646	-27%	9,441	18,375	95%
Virginia	176,943	310,196	75%	1,014,287	1,073,332	6%	398,353	363,124	-9%
Washington	141,159	172,772	22%	567,315	632,095	11%	236,647	206,455	-13%
West Virginia	85,457	89,867	5%	287,900	263,558	-8%	54,323	57,142	5%
Wisconsin	193,006	195,357	1%	516,342	734,226	42%	197,870	180,817	-9%
Wyoming	28,963	38,292	32%	52,454	49,050	-6%	18,672	14,832	-21%
United States	24,209,020	26,519,413	10%	32,522,457	36,807,385	13%	11,339,608	11,034,969	-3%

* Some states may serve lunches for a few days in June or August, but do not have data in those months. This is because sponsors are allowed, if they do not serve for more than 10 days in those months, to claim those lunches in July to reduce paperwork.

TABLE 6: Estimated Number of Children Participating and Additional Federal Payments in July 2008 Summer Nutrition, if States Served 40 Children per 100 Served in School Year National School Lunch Program

State	Children in Summer Nutrition (School Lunch* & Summer Food Combined), July 2008	Children in Summer Nutrition per 100 in 07-08 School-Year NSLP**	Total Children Who Would Be in July Summer Nutrition if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP**	Additional Children Reached in July if State Reached a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP**	Additional Federal Reimbursement if State Reached in July a Ratio of 40 Children per 100 in School-Year NSLP***
Alabama	29,187	8.9	130,924	101,737	\$6,686,672
Alaska	2,887	9.1	12,666	9,779	\$642,722
Arizona	41,617	10.6	157,714	116,097	\$7,630,456
Arkansas	21,618	10.1	85,687	64,070	\$4,210,969
California	588,175	27.4	857,969	269,794	\$17,732,228
Colorado	15,008	8.2	73,645	58,636	\$3,853,875
Connecticut	33,434	25.1	53,194	19,760	\$1,298,739
Delaware	11,593	28.6	16,191	4,598	\$302,216
District of Columbia	26,198	88.8	--	--	--
Florida	153,673	15.9	387,224	233,551	\$15,350,167
Georgia	100,473	13.9	289,067	188,594	\$12,395,365
Hawaii	10,623	23.9	17,746	7,123	\$468,159
Idaho	20,874	25.4	32,925	12,051	\$792,063
Illinois	109,852	16.6	264,660	154,808	\$10,174,773
Indiana	45,829	13.5	135,672	89,843	\$5,904,944
Iowa	11,512	8.4	54,589	43,077	\$2,831,245
Kansas	10,421	6.8	61,019	50,598	\$3,325,556
Kentucky	40,508	13.8	117,405	76,897	\$5,054,026
Louisiana	28,689	8.1	141,501	112,812	\$7,414,576
Maine	7,820	15.5	20,215	12,395	\$814,666
Maryland	46,097	21.7	84,903	38,806	\$2,550,530
Massachusetts	47,715	20.7	92,052	44,336	\$2,914,015
Michigan	62,425	13.3	188,043	125,618	\$8,256,272
Minnesota	28,249	13.1	86,055	57,805	\$3,799,264
Mississippi	12,400	4.4	111,813	99,413	\$6,533,942
Missouri	51,743	17.0	121,754	70,011	\$4,601,441
Montana	5,763	14.7	15,675	9,912	\$651,435
Nebraska	8,802	9.3	38,052	29,250	\$1,922,453
Nevada	36,202	31.2	46,405	10,202	\$670,547
New Hampshire	4,319	13.7	12,612	8,293	\$545,072
New Jersey	69,043	22.0	125,576	56,533	\$3,715,620
New Mexico	50,873	34.6	58,752	7,880	\$517,888
New York	320,544	30.3	423,711	103,167	\$6,780,646
North Carolina	81,267	14.9	218,403	137,137	\$9,013,302
North Dakota	2,459	9.5	10,318	7,859	\$516,561
Ohio	61,308	11.7	209,518	148,210	\$9,741,074
Oklahoma	11,720	4.6	101,271	89,551	\$5,885,713
Oregon	36,349	20.5	70,929	34,580	\$2,272,802
Pennsylvania	121,937	24.8	196,975	75,039	\$4,931,910
Rhode Island	7,520	15.7	19,126	11,605	\$762,760
South Carolina	95,266	32.0	119,124	23,857	\$1,568,006
South Dakota	8,602	20.8	16,562	7,960	\$523,169
Tennessee	39,985	10.6	150,348	110,362	\$7,253,572
Texas	190,174	9.3	820,478	630,303	\$41,426,683
Utah	32,290	25.4	50,801	18,511	\$1,216,609
Vermont	4,684	21.8	8,594	3,909	\$256,933
Virginia	62,840	19.9	126,537	63,697	\$4,186,496
Washington	35,740	12.8	111,823	76,083	\$5,000,553
West Virginia	15,051	13.8	43,600	28,549	\$1,876,352
Wisconsin	37,238	16.4	90,855	53,618	\$3,524,022
Wyoming	3,588	17.2	8,354	4,766	\$313,260
United States	2,902,184	17.3	6,700,836	3,798,653	\$249,666,444

* National School Lunch Program July numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance and include participation in the Seamless Summer Option.

** School-Year NSLP numbers reflect free and reduced price lunch attendance in school-year 2007-2008.

*** This estimate is calculated assuming that the state's sponsors are reimbursed for each child each day only for lunch (not breakfast or a snack) and at the lowest rate for a SFSP lunch (\$2.9875 per lunch). It also assumes that all participants are served for the full 22 weekdays in July 2008 (not counting the July 4th holiday).

Summer Nutrition Legislation by State

Types of state summer nutrition legislation included in this table:

State Mandate (M) – State law requiring that all or certain schools offer the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)
State Funding (\$) – State funds for a purpose related to SFSP
Reporting Requirement (R) – State law that state, schools or districts convene advisory group, and/or report participation or reasons for nonparticipation in SFSP

STATE	DETAILS
Alabama	NONE
Alaska	NONE
Arizona	NONE
Arkansas	NONE
California	\$ Grants of up to \$15,000 are available per school, on a competitive basis, up to the annual appropriation, for summer nutrition program or breakfast program start-up and expansion expenses where 20 percent or more of students are approved for F&RP meals. In 2007-08, the state appropriated \$1.017 million in grant funding. CAL. EDUC. CODE § 49550.3. \$ During the 2007 summer, the state allocated \$0.2195 in additional reimbursement for each free and reduced-price meal served by a school through NSLP, including those served under the Seamless Summer Option. During June 2008, the appropriation for this funding was exhausted, thus school districts received no additional reimbursement for meals served through NSLP or SSFO. CAL Ed Code § 49430.5. M Existing law requires <u>all</u> schools to offer meals to needy students during summer school. Recent legislation limited the allowable exemptions, which brought more schools under the mandate. CAL Ed Code § 49548.
Colorado	NONE
Connecticut	NONE
Delaware	NONE
District of Columbia	\$ NONE
Florida	M Each school district is required to sponsor a summer nutrition program that operates at least one site within 5 miles of at least one elementary school at which 50 percent or more of the students are free or reduced-price eligible, and at least one site within 10 miles of every other elementary school in which 50 percent or more of the students are free or reduced-price eligible. Districts may only seek an exemption from the mandate by voting on the issue at a school board meeting that provides the opportunity for public comment. The school board must reconsider each year. FLA. STAT. Ch 1006.0606.
Georgia	NONE
Hawaii	NONE
Idaho	NONE
Illinois	M Beginning the summer of 2008, all school districts (regardless of whether or not they already participate in a federal child nutrition program) must implement a summer breakfast and/or lunch program for the duration of the summer school program in all schools in which 50 percent or more of the student population is eligible for free or reduced-price meals AND that operate a summer school program. Public Act 095-0155, amended the Childhood Hunger Relief Act (105 ILCS 126/20).
Indiana	NONE
Iowa	NONE
Kansas	NONE
Kentucky	NONE

Louisiana		NONE
Maine		NONE
Maryland	M	If the public school system operates summer school, it must provide a meal program (can be breakfast, lunch, or breakfast and lunch). MD. CODE ANN., EDUC. § 7-603,
Massachusetts	\$	In total for 2008, \$5,024,557 million total was allocated for breakfast and summer outreach, start up and expansion grants, and reimbursements. Of that, a minimum of \$300,000 is allocated for SFSP outreach.
Michigan		NONE
Minnesota	\$	State contributes \$150,000 in additional funds for education department-approved SFSP sponsors to supplement federal reimbursement rates: up to 4 cents per breakfast, 14 cents per lunch or supper, and 10 cents per snack. MINN. STAT. § 124D.119.
Mississippi		NONE
Missouri	M	SFSP required in school districts where 50 percent or more of the children are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch and in service institutions where more than 40 children congregate; districts can request a waiver. MO. REV. STAT. §191.810.
Montana		NONE
Nebraska		NONE
Nevada		NONE
New Hampshire		NONE
New Jersey		NONE
New Mexico		NONE
New York	\$	State allocates \$3.3 million to SFSP sponsors to supplement all summer breakfasts, lunches, suppers and snacks claimed for federal funds. This allocation also provides a per meal rate for sponsors serving and claiming a fourth meal supplement. In 2008, SFSP funding was reduced by six percent. The reduced amount resulted in \$3,049,410 being distributed to SFSP sponsors.
North Carolina		NONE
North Dakota		NONE
Ohio	M	The governing body for each school that is required to provide student intervention programs during the summer months shall establish an extension of the School Breakfast Program and the National School Lunch Program or participate in the Summer Food Service Program. Schools may opt out for financial reasons and ask for a waiver from the State Board of Education. If the governing board decides that it cannot comply, it shall communicate its decision to the residents of the district. OHIO REV. CODE ANN. 3313.813; 3314.18.
Oklahoma		NONE
Oregon	\$	State appropriates \$150,000 for reimbursements for summer lunches. The Department of Education supplements the federal reimbursement with 5 cents per lunch served during the summer as part of SFSP or NSLP. OR STAT 327.527.
Pennsylvania		NONE
Rhode Island		NONE
South Carolina		NONE
South Dakota		NONE
Tennessee		NONE
Texas	M	School districts are required to offer SFSP where more than 60 percent of children are eligible for free or reduced-price meals. TEX. HUM. RES. CODE § 33.024 (1993). Oversight of the Summer Nutrition Programs was transferred the Texas Department of Agriculture in 2007.
Utah		NONE
Vermont	\$	The state allocated \$51,387.00 for SFSP in 2007 and \$50,873 in 2008. Sponsors can use the funds either as reimbursement supplements or for activities and/or transportation in order to promote the program. The Department of Education encourages sponsors to use the funds for activities and/or transportation. The state also allocated \$48,550 to

Vermont Campaign to End Childhood Hunger for budget year 2007 – 2008.

Virginia		NONE
Washington	M	If the public school district operates a summer program and fifty percent or more of the students enrolled in the school qualify for free or reduced-price meals, the school district must implement a summer food service program in each of the operating public schools. Sites providing the meals should be open to all children in the area unless a compelling case can be made to limit access to the program. Schools may be exempt from implementing the Summer Food Service Program if they can demonstrate the availability of an adequate alternative summer feeding program. WA. LEGIS 287 (2005)
	\$	State allocates \$100,000 to support SFSP sponsors that participated during the previous summer. The funding is distributed based upon the proportion of the meals each sponsor served during the previous summer.
	\$	For the summer of 2007 and 2008, state advanced \$70,000 for grants for start up, expansion, equipment, or other costs.
West Virginia		NONE
Wisconsin		NONE
Wyoming		NONE