

School's Out... *...Who Ate?*

A Report on Summer Nutrition in California

June 2010
Matthew Sharp
Tia Shimada



Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by California Food Policy Advocates using data provided by the California Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. We are grateful to our funders: The California Endowment, Kaiser Permanente Community Benefits, MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger, Share Our Strength, and the Williams Foundation for support of our child nutrition policy and advocacy efforts.

CFPA is glad to have the opportunity to applaud the various program administrators whose commitment to expanding summer nutrition in California is critical to all our ongoing efforts. Special thanks to California Department of Education's Nutrition Services Division and to the USDA, Food and Nutrition Service, Western Regional Office. Most important of all, we acknowledge the hundreds of agencies and thousands of site staff who tackle the difficult work of providing free summer meals to children throughout California.

Executive Summary

California Food Policy Advocates' annual report, *School's Out...Who Ate?*, tracks progress and trends in summer nutrition over the past year for low-income children in California. The major, disturbing statistical finding is that in July 2009, ten percent fewer children benefited from valuable, USDA-funded free lunches than in July 2008. Significant declines in the availability of summer school, due to state budget cuts, explain much of the reduced participation. Legislators recognize that summer school cuts remove valuable academic enrichment, but few policymakers consider the nutritional impact of summer school reductions, jeopardizing the health and academic success of 1.9 million low-income students that ate free or reduced price meals at school, but did not have the chance to consume a nourishing, federally funded lunch last July.

The state budget gap has worsened in 2010, of course, and many school districts have made even more significant reductions in summer school for 2010. On a more heartening note, the report identifies several promising developments that indicate that some communities around the state are working to open new lunch sites and to offer children and teens the opportunity to eat a nourishing, free lunch and to participate in valuable enrichment activities. More work is needed to ensure all eligible children consume a nourishing lunch when school is out.

Here is a brief summary of the report's most prominent recommendations:

- Congress should reauthorize the Child Nutrition Act by passing S.3307 and H.R.5504, increasing investments in and access to summer meals.
- State policymakers and education leaders should provide adequate resources for school districts to offer robust summer programs.
- State policymakers and education leaders should establish new expectations for school districts to open summer school sites to local children for lunch and to advertise them widely.
- Local boards of education should consider the impact of summer school reductions on students' nutritional needs and take steps to mitigate the consequences.
- Local school food services departments should work with local community leaders and organizations to sponsor meal programs, vend lunches and disseminate information to students about available lunch sites.

The report's full and detailed recommendations, data analysis, local updates, county-by-county participation tables follow this Executive Summary.

Introduction

Since 1994, California Food Policy Advocates has released an annual report, *School's Out...Who Ate?*, to chart the yearly progress in expanding federally funded summer nutrition programs throughout California¹. Each year the report analyzes data from the previous summer to examine county-level and statewide trends. California faces another year of shrinking summer school programs in 2010 – in fact, this may be the year that sees the most devastating loss ever of summer nutrition at school for low-income children throughout the state. That means, of course, that students who relied on free meals at school sites last summer are unlikely to have access to nourishing meals this summer. This report focuses on that ongoing crisis and notes where community sites may expand to close some gaps.

Fortunately, there are hopeful signs across the state. Momentum is building to galvanize new and old partnerships alike with the intention of redoubling outreach efforts and attracting new summer meal sites. This report will provide examples of opportunities to increase summer meal participation for 2010 and beyond. This report will also identify opportunities to strengthen the summer nutrition programs through policy and legislative changes in Sacramento and Washington, D.C.

¹ First, the **National School Lunch Program (NSLP)**, the country's oldest child nutrition program, continues to operate in the summer months at year-round schools and during summer school.

Second, many schools serve lunch during summer school through the **Summer Seamless Option**, a simplified program developed through a pilot program in California in 2001. The Summer Seamless Option offers appealing simplicity and administrative cost-savings that encourage schools to operate the program. The Option allows schools where more than 50 percent of the children are certified eligible for free or reduced-price meals to use the exact same paperwork, recordkeeping, accounting, and claiming procedures as the National School Lunch Program. In return, schools must open the cafeteria to children from the surrounding community even if they are not enrolled in summer school. Districts receive the NSLP free reimbursement rate for all meals. Reimbursement rates are listed in Appendix C. State law requires all schools to serve meals during summer school sessions. However, this requirement can be waived if certain conditions are met. These conditions were modified by AB1392, signed into law in October 2005.

For children in year-round schools, "summer" breaks may consist of three week breaks in November, February, and April. The nutritional needs and non-summertime hunger gaps created by year-round schools were the subject of CFPA's 1999 report, *The Sleeping Giant: Outlook on Year Round Summer Food*.


The third program, originally designed for children who attend schools with a traditional June through August summer break and who do not participate in summer school, is the **Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)**. SFSP sponsors, such as Parks and Recreation departments and Boys and Girls Clubs, receive payments from USDA for serving healthy meals and snacks to children and teenagers, 18 years and younger, at approved sites, such as parks and community centers in low-income areas.¹ Several California school districts continue to operate SFSP because of the slightly higher reimbursement rate differential. Summer Food Service Programs run by community-based organizations are generally connected to enrichment, recreation and other structured activities.

Summary of 2009 Data

According to data from the California Department of Education, only 484,000 low-income children ate lunch at federally funded summer nutrition programs across California in July 2009. This represents a 10 percent decline from July 2008.

Fewer than 100,000 of the state's six million school children ate lunch at a community site in July 2009, compared to nearly 390,000 children who ate at school-based sites. Based on available data, few new community sites opened in 2009 in response to the decrease in school-based summer nutrition sites.

As in previous years, CFPA has conducted an analysis to examine the trends in summer meal participation across California from July 2008 to July 2009. A county-by-county summary of this participation analysis is shown in Table 1. For this report, CFPA has elected not to provide detailed analyses of other important summer nutrition issues, such as the availability of water with meals, food waste, food safety, nutrition standards, and the year-round snack pilot, in order to focus attention on the decline of summer school and the necessary responses.



As shown in the chart below, the gap between the need and participation in summer nutrition programs was growing well before the current state budget crisis and resulting cuts to summer school programs. In the summer of 2009 almost 80 percent of needy children (children who ate federally funded, free or reduced-price meals during the school year) did not participate in the federal summer meal programs. That translates into 1.9 million children who missed out on nutritious summer meals.

Summer School Cuts Endanger Nutrition for Low-Income Children in California.

The loss of summer school programs in most California school districts has been widely reported. According to numerous media reports, many school districts are reducing summer school opportunities, providing only the legal minimum number of sessions required to assist high school students who otherwise would not graduate. Less often reported is the fact that summer school losses will have a catastrophic effect on thousands of low-income children who normally eat federally funded meals at summer school sites.

With the school year ending and California's unemployment rate exceeding 12 percent for most of the previous year, officials must act soon. Children need access to healthy meals that combat hunger, improve nutritional intake, facilitate attention and learning, and help prevent obesity. Unfortunately, when summer vacation begins, the federally funded school meals that low-income children depend on every school day come to an end. Parents, whose household budgets already are sorely stretched, are left searching for ways to feed their children. Losing summer school programs is a disaster for student enrichment and academic achievement. Losing summer school meals intensifies the damage.

State, local, and federal officials must take action to feed hungry children this summer to ensure that California communities do not forfeit much needed federal funds in this difficult economic climate. Officials must see that an adequate number of summer meal sites exist where children can eat federally funded meals. Officials must also be sure that children and their families know where to find these summer meal sites.

Immediate, Local Action Steps

Unfortunately, at this point there are few short-term action steps that can reduce the impending harm caused by the decline in summer school programming.

First, families need immediate referrals to nutrition programs operating in their communities. Ideally, school officials should send – or have already sent - this information home with all students on the last day of school. If school has already closed for the summer, schools should try to contact families through automatic phone call systems or by other means. Online information must be plentiful and easily accessible. A list of summer meal sites across the state is available here:

<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sh/sn/summersites10.asp>.

Public service announcements should run on local media. Community organizations, health clinics, WIC centers, food pantries, and neighborhood groups should publicize meal sites that are open to the community, either by distributing a list of sites or by using a resource and referral system, such as 2-1-1, or both.

Second, as local officials wait on the state budget to adopt their 2010-2011 school district budgets, they should seek to preserve summer school programs. Education, enrichment, and recreation are proven components of a child's development – and these components are important year-round. School districts should ensure that all summer programs operate at schools sites that offer federally funded nutrition programs. Moreover, those school sites should open their campuses to serve eligible children from the surrounding neighborhood in addition to their students.

Third, to help fill the nutritional gap created by eliminating summer school programs, city and county officials should increase the number of children fed at recreation programs, parks, and other sites. This can be accomplished through neighborhood-level outreach and by increasing the accessibility of sites. Accessibility can be improved, for example, by ensuring that gates are open, signs are posted, and drop-in community participants are welcomed by staff.

Federal Policy Update

The 2010 U.S. Department of Agriculture Appropriations bill included \$85 million for demonstration projects to develop innovative models to meet children and teen's nutritional needs when school is out. This action implements a recommendation from previous versions of *School's Out...Who Ate?*. CFPA is pleased with the willingness of Congress and the Administration to test creative approaches to solving low participation in summer meal programs. Unfortunately, the criteria utilized by USDA to solicit demonstration project applications from states exclude California from the first round of funding, awarded in 2010.

In March, the U.S. Senate Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry Committee adopted the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (S.3307), a bill to reauthorize the federal child nutrition programs. The bill includes several important changes that, if enacted, will improve summer nutrition:

- Increase reimbursement and nutritional standards for lunches served through the National School Lunch Program (NSLP)² by \$0.06 to support higher nutritional quality in meals. Although more funds are needed, this investment will help school meal providers serve more appealing, nutritious lunches, during the summer.
- Align eligibility requirements for public and private sponsors.
- Establish a process for sponsors to appeal disqualification.
- Establish permanent operating agreements.
- Require school-based sponsors to conduct more vigorous outreach to eligible families.

More recently, in early June, the House Committee on Education and Labor released its proposed child nutrition reauthorization bill, H.R. 5504. This bill includes summer nutrition policy changes similar to those in the Senate’s legislation. The bill also includes three substantial, additional improvements that the Senate bill does not:

- Expanding California’s innovative year-round, afterschool nutrition pilot program to enable Summer Food Service Program (SFSP)³ sponsors to serve snacks or afterschool meals year-round at community sites in ten states.
- Allows sites in rural neighborhoods with 40-49%FRP eligibility to serve free meals using area eligibility.
- Lifts caps on private, nonprofit sponsors to open more sites and serve more children and teens.

Federal Policy Recommendations

The Senate and House should adopt child nutrition legislation that:

- Increases reimbursement for NSLP and SFSP by at least 6 cents.
- Ensure SFSP meals comply with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans and strengthen the programs’ appeal to kids, teens, parents, and caretakers.
- Simplify administration and reduce monitoring burdens and costs.
- Provide greater flexibility to serve meals and snacks where and when children do *not* readily congregate, such as in remote and desert communities.

² The National School Lunch Program, the country’s oldest child nutrition program, usually operates during the school year. Schools can continue to operate NSLP in the summer months at year-round schools and during summer school.

³ The Summer Food Service Program serves children 18 years and younger who are not participating in summer school during traditional summer months. SFSP sponsors, which generally include Parks and Recreation departments and Boys and Girls Clubs, can serve a federally reimbursable snack or meal to kids at approved sites in low-income areas where 50% or more children attending local schools are certified eligible for free or reduced price school meals.

- Combines the best features of SFSP and CACFP for community sponsors to enable children and teens to benefit from lunches and afternoon meals, year round, in every state.

State Updates

The California State Legislature and the Governor are, once again, poised to enact deep cuts to the state- and federally-funded safety net that California families depend upon for nutrition, health care, job training, and education. This month, legislators are negotiating the specific programs and services that will be reduced or eliminated. Whatever the result of those negotiations, it is clear that resources available to public education are declining, leading to harmful reductions at school sites across the state. Most school districts have shortened the school year and eliminated summer school, afterschool, and enrichment programs – not only jeopardizing basic instructional opportunities, but also eliminating the times and places that needy students receive federally-subsidized meals and snacks. The consequences of state budget cuts will harm California’s children and families for years to come.

There are two modest, hopeful developments in Sacramento to note. First, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O’Connell has vigorously communicated his support for stronger local actions to serve summer meals in correspondence to county superintendents of instruction, as well as to over 1000 school district superintendents across the state. The Superintendent has participated in several press conferences to promote summer meals and continues to be a steady voice for students’ nutritional needs. The Superintendent’s June 2010 press release to promote summer meals is [here](#).

Second, State Senator Mark DeSaulnier has continued to convene the Senate Summer and Intersession Enrichment Task Force to draw attention to the remarkable body of research establishing clear and meaningful academic benefits for students that participate in summer enrichment programs.

An important, positive administrative development is the California Department of Education’s rollout of web-based technology, known as CNIPS, to reduce the time sponsors and sites spend submitting required paperwork to the state. This improved efficiency has helped local programs to operate more efficiently within budget constraints. The CNIPS allows sponsors to easily submit program applications and renewals, make site changes, submit claims for meal reimbursement, view the status of an application and meal reimbursement claims, and access site and sponsor information across programs through the internet. Discussed in greater detail in [School’s Out...Who Ate? 2006 and 2007](#), CNIPS’s full implementation is an unqualified success story.

State Policy Recommendations

State policymakers and education leaders can take several actions. In recognition of the budget crisis, these actions are listed in order of decreasing cost.

- Provide adequate resources for school districts to offer robust summer school.
- Provide sufficient resources for schools to offer enrichment, recreation, and supervised summer programs.
- Strengthen the current summer school meals mandate to ensure more summer school sites operate open nutrition programs, which serve the communities surrounding school sites not just students..
- Encourage school districts to provide meals at community sites.
- Encourage school districts to identify summer school sites further in advance to facilitate effective coordination of outreach and promotional activities.
- Encourage school districts to formalize summer nutrition marketing and referral practices to ensure that all families receive timely information about open meal sites.

Local Recommendations

Local communities should devise plans to provide an adequate summer nutrition safety net. Activities to conduct before next summer include:

- Request an item on an upcoming school board meeting agenda to discuss summer school availability and recreation/enrichment options as they relate to summer nutrition. School boards should open meal service at summer school sites to children in the surrounding the community.
- Convene school food service, municipal recreation programs, food banks, and community health advocates to identify gaps in the availability of summer meal sites and marketing for existing sites.
- Seek meal vendors and sponsors for new sites.
- Contact local principals to secure their support for operating open summer school sites that serve meals to children, not just students, in the neighborhoods around their schools.
- Briefly survey drop-in participants and their parents about the appeal of the meal program to identify potential adjustments in menus, service, and environment.
- Develop templates of local promotional materials.

New Partnerships

Since last year's publication of [School's Out...Who Ate? 2009](#), the Summer Meal Program Coalition has formed to build support for more robust summer nutrition programs in

California. Launched through a partnership between the California Center for Research on Women and Families and the California Department of Education's Nutrition Services Division, the Coalition has:

- Hosted a retreat and convening on summer nutrition (the first in California for at least five years!)
- Hosted a webinar to promote federal summer nutrition programs and available resources among potential summer nutrition sponsors.
- Convened conference calls among a wide variety of stakeholders (sponsoring agencies, state administrators, advocates and community partners) to identify and implement strategies for improving summer meal participation in 2010.

The Coalition's [website](http://www.ccrwf.org/other-projects/) (<http://www.ccrwf.org/other-projects/>) hosts a variety of resources, toolkits from successful sponsors, and contact information to help any interested party get started with opening, promoting or enhancing summer nutrition sites with nutrition quality tools and physical activity resources.

CFPA has worked with key stakeholders in the Coalition to identify potential program simplifications that would increase participation or, at minimum, reduce the cost of operations for summer meal sponsors and sites. Highlights of that process include:

- CFPA convened a conference call in late 2009 to gather input from sponsors about administrative barriers associated with the federal summer meal programs. Representatives from CDE and USDA also participated in the call.
- CFPA convened a conference call in spring 2010 to gather additional input from sponsors about administrative challenges associated with the federal summer meal programs.
- The good news is that administrative simplifications exist for many of the challenges identified by conference call participants and through various communications between CFPA staff and summer meal sponsors. These simplifications available under current law have been communicated to members of the Summer Meals Coalition.
- The Coalition is working to ensure all summer meal sponsors are encouraged to utilize the operational flexibility and administrative simplifications that are currently available under summer meal program rules, such as:
 - Simplified daily meal count forms,
 - Flexibility in designating eating areas,
 - Flexibility in setting meal service times, and
 - First week site visit waivers.
- The Coalition is working with USDA to seek additional regulatory flexibility, where possible, such as the option to adopt the offer vs. serve model for SFSP.

Promising Local Progress and Opportunities

In several California counties, the 2008 to 2009 decline in July lunch participants exceeded the statewide average of ten percent. Local leaders in these communities are taking steps to increase summer lunch participation for 2010. Highlights of these actions are included below.

- In Riverside County, summer meal participation declined 20 percent between 2008 and 2009. In the Coachella Valley of East Riverside County, several new partnerships are underway to open new meal sites (described in this recent [Palm Desert Sun article](#)). In the city of Riverside, the school district will expand free lunch service to 18 parks, up from just 8 last summer.
- In Los Angeles County, summer meal participation declined 27 percent in July 2009, compared to July 2008. The city of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks will add several meal sites this summer, bringing free lunches and snacks to 106 parks. These sites will benefit from a small promotional grant the city received to increase participation. LA Unified School District's Superintendent has directed all principals to provide information about summer meal sites to parents. The Superintendent has also directed principals to open summer enrichment programs at nearly 200 school sites for 2010 to meet the needs of students unable to attend summer school.
- In several California counties, summer lunch participation increased in July 2009, compared to July 2008, counter to the statewide decrease of 10 percent. For example, summer lunch participation in San Diego County was up 84 percent in July 2009 compared to July 2008. Leaders in the county attribute much of this increase to the addition of 22 summer school sites operating as meal providers in 2009. San Diego County leaders also report that several new community sites were added to the meal service roster in 2009 and community-based organizations actively promoted meal sites among potential participants.

Statewide Update for Summer 2010

Across the state, 68 agencies submitted new applications to sponsor SFSP for summer 2010. Compared to 39 the previous year, this is an increase of more than 74 percent.

As a result, 252 local agencies now participate in the SFSP, an increase of more than 26 percent from last year. This growth reflects a 15 percent increase in returning sponsors (160 to 184) and an almost 75 percent increase in new sponsors (39 to 68). The SFSP's 252 current sponsors have added hundreds of feeding sites, thereby increasing the number of meals served to children ordinarily dependent upon school meals to ensure their nutritional health. While it is unclear whether recent declines in NSLP

participation during July will continue to reduce meal service, it is absolutely clear that recent growth in SFSP will help feed many, needy children this summer and may close the gaps created by reductions in summer school.

Table 1

County	March and April 2009: FRP NSLP ⁴	July 2009: FRP NSLP ⁵	July 2009: Seamless ⁶	July 2009: SFSP ⁷	July 2008: Total Summer Meal Participation ⁸	July 2009: Total Summer Meal Participation ⁹	2009: % School Year vs. Summer Meal Participation ¹⁰	2009 to 2008 % Change in Summer Meal Participation	2009: County Rank for % Change in Participation ¹¹
Alameda	55,807	2,634	10,085	3,424	14,340	16,144	29%	13%	5
Alpine	66	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	13
Amador	963	11	0	0	11	11	1%	-2%	20
Butte	11,938	186	58	2,813	4,443	3,057	26%	-31%	49
Calaveras	1,974	937	0	0	857	937	47%	9%	6
Colusa	2,295	41	0	0	58	41	2%	-29%	48
Contra Costa	41,306	4,535	7,838	850	13,689	13,224	32%	-3%	22
Del Norte	1,538	45	320	0	359	365	24%	2%	11
Eldorado	5,087	67	0	59	508	126	2%	-75%	56
Fresno	91,007	2,556	5,290	9,338	16,908	17,184	19%	2%	12
Glenn	2,704	14	0	0	17	14	0%	-20%	39
Humboldt	5,904	184	0	753	883	937	16%	6%	9
Imperial	16,366	227	0	944	4,551	1,171	7%	-74%	55
Inyo	843	58	0	43	162	101	12%	-38%	53
Kern	85,372	1,931	4,097	211	8,204	6,239	7%	-24%	42
Kings	11,718	131	408	617	1,722	1,156	10%	-33%	51
Lake	4,304	155	684	0	310	839	19%	171%	1
Lassen	1,254	8	0	0	8	8	1%	-2%	19
Los Angeles	634,186	84,776	23,658	41,553	204,970	149,987	24%	-27%	45

⁴ The average daily participation (ADP) in free and reduced-price meals for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) is shown for March and April 2009 (averaged).

⁵ ADP in free and reduced-price meals for NSLP is shown for July 2009.

⁶ ADP in the Seamless Summer Food Option (Seamless) is shown for July 2009.

⁷ ADP in the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) is shown for July 2009.

⁸ ADP in all federal summer meal programs (NSLP, Seamless, and SFSP) is shown for July 2008.

⁹ ADP in all federal summer meal programs (NSLP, Seamless, and SFSP) is shown for July 2009.

¹⁰ This value is calculated as [ADP in all federal summer meal programs for July 2009] ÷ [ADP in free and reduced-price meals for NSLP during March & April 2009]

¹¹ A rank of 1 represents the largest percent increase in participation among all 58 counties.

County	March and April 2009: FRP NSLP ⁴	July 2009: FRP NSLP ⁵	July 2009: Seamless ⁶	July 2009: SFSP ⁷	July 2008: Total Summer Meal Participation ⁸	July 2009: Total Summer Meal Participation ⁹	2009: % School Year vs. Summer Meal Participation ¹⁰	2009 to 2008 % Change in Summer Meal Participation	2009: County Rank for % Change in Participation ¹¹
Madera	15,142	309	463	0	1,122	771	5%	-31%	50
Marin	4,907	107	799	0	843	906	18%	7%	7
Mariposa	707	29	0	0	36	29	4%	-19%	37
Mendocino	5,536	52	647	35	1,129	734	13%	-35%	52
Merced	29,810	3,378	3,189	0	8,776	6,567	22%	-25%	44
Modoc	775	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	13
Mono	557	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	13
Monterey	31,061	2,501	3,613	620	6,869	6,734	22%	-2%	18
Napa	6,033	94	113	21	267	228	4%	-15%	34
Nevada	1,989	123	0	0	135	123	6%	-9%	28
Orange	152,630	11,419	12,876	3,008	29,762	27,303	18%	-8%	26
Placer	10,557	347	0	350	971	697	7%	-28%	47
Plumas	609	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	13
Riverside	165,236	9,336	7,102	4,662	26,230	21,100	13%	-20%	38
Sacramento	87,917	10,676	2,560	5,691	21,716	18,927	22%	-13%	33
San Benito	3,696	161	360	0	693	520	14%	-25%	43
San Bernardino	163,031	21,390	1,249	885	27,925	23,525	14%	-16%	35
San Diego	198,589	45,093	13,822	2,432	33,366	61,347	31%	84%	2
San Francisco	19,921	551	1,976	5,341	8,160	7,868	39%	-4%	23
San Joaquin	58,635	34,762	3,403	304	39,526	38,469	66%	-3%	21
San Luis Obispo	8,347	1,019	46	0	1,340	1,065	13%	-21%	40
San Mateo	20,755	1,789	643	255	4,691	2,687	13%	-43%	54
Santa Barbara	25,106	1,834	727	1,102	3,929	3,662	15%	-7%	25
Santa Clara	66,094	3,184	5,841	29	12,581	9,054	14%	-28%	46
Santa Cruz	11,851	349	5,594	649	6,432	6,592	56%	2%	10
Shasta	10,314	334	640	0	1,241	974	9%	-22%	41
Sierra	142	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0%	13
Siskiyou	2,404	25	0	37	41	62	3%	51%	4

County	March and April 2009: FRP NSLP ⁴	July 2009: FRP NSLP ⁵	July 2009: Seamless ⁶	July 2009: SFSP ⁷	July 2008: Total Summer Meal Participation ⁸	July 2009: Total Summer Meal Participation ⁹	2009: % School Year vs. Summer Meal Participation ¹⁰	2009 to 2008 % Change in Summer Meal Participation	2009: County Rank for % Change in Participation ¹¹
Solano	18,101	416	3,092	0	3,954	3,508	19%	-11%	31
Sonoma	19,857	718	545	1,525	3,137	2,787	14%	-11%	30
Stanislaus	40,440	3,143	2,221	1,478	7,566	6,841	17%	-10%	29
Sutter	7,777	0	0	0	13	0	0%	-100%	58
Tehama	5,417	103	0	0	118	103	2%	-13%	32
Trinity	800	15	29	0	201	44	6%	-78%	57
Tulare	46,683	819	4,383	1,342	7,150	6,544	14%	-8%	27
Tuolumne	1,933	106	0	0	69	106	5%	53%	3
Ventura	38,993	3,150	2,361	2,233	7,244	7,744	20%	7%	8
Yolo	10,670	386	1,015	308	1,833	1,709	16%	-7%	24
Yuba	7,093	232	216	19	562	467	7%	-17%	36
Statewide	2,274,746	256,447	131,961	92,931	541,628	481,339	21%	-10%	N/A

California Food Policy Advocates
Oakland Office
436 14th Street, Suite 1220
Oakland, California 94356
510.433.1122p
510.433.1131f
<http://www.cfpa.net>

California Food Policy Advocates
Los Angeles Office
205 S. Broadway Street, Suite 402
Los Angeles, CA 90012
213.482.8200 p
213.482.8203 f
matt@cfpa.net