
SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Senator Connie Leyva, Chair

2021 - 2022 Regular

Bill No: SB 364 **Hearing Date:** April 7, 2021
Author: Skinner
Version: March 24, 2021
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: Brandon Darnell

Subject: Pupil meals: Free School Meals For All Act of 2021

NOTE: This bill has been referred to the Committees on Education, Human Services, and Judiciary. A "do pass" motion should include referral to the Committee on Human Services.

SUMMARY

This bill, among other things: (1) Commencing with the 2022–23 school year and contingent upon an appropriation, requires school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools to provide two free school meals each schoolday, regardless of the pupil's eligibility for free or reduced-price meals; (2) requires the California Department of Education (CDE) to administer a noncompetitive grant to local educational agencies (LEAs) to cover costs incurred by those agencies in purchasing food produced or grown in California; (3) requires the CDE to award grants of up to \$30,000 per schoolsite every year on a competitive basis to school districts, county superintendents of schools, or entities approved by the CDE for nonrecurring expenses incurred, in order to increase the number of meals that can be prepared freshly and served to pupils; and (4) establishes the Better Out of School Time (BOOST) Nutrition EBT Program to prevent child hunger during regularly scheduled school breaks or any school campus closure caused by a declared state of emergency.

BACKGROUND

Existing federal law:

- 1) Authorizes a universal meal service option known as the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP), which allows a LEA that directly certifies for free meals at least 40 percent of the students in either the district overall, a group of schools within the district, or an individual school, to receive meal reimbursement based on a formula that equate to 1.6x the free reimbursement rate for students directly certified for free or reduced-price meals, plus the standard reimbursement rate for paid meals. (42 USC § 1759a(a)(1)(F); 7 CFR § 245.9(f))
- 2) Authorizes an additional universal meal service option know as Provision 2 that allows an LEA to certify children for free and reduced-price meals for up to 4 consecutive school years in the schools that serve meals at no charge to all enrolled children. (42 USC § 1759a(a)(1)(C); 7 CFR § 245.9(b))

Existing state law:

- 1) Requires each district or county superintendent of schools maintaining any kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive, to provide for each needy pupil one nutritionally adequate free or reduced-price meal during each schoolday, and defines needy children as those who meet federal eligibility criteria for free and reduced-price meals. (Education Code § 49550; 49552)
- 2) Provides that a nutritionally adequate meal for this purpose is a breakfast or lunch meeting specified requirements that qualifies for reimbursement under the federal child nutrition program regulations. (EC § 49553)
- 3) Authorizes a school district or county office of education to use funds made available through any federal or state program the purpose of which includes the provision of meals to a pupil, including the federal School Breakfast Program, the federal National School Lunch Program (NSLP), the federal Summer Food Service Program, the federal Seamless Summer Option, or the state meal program, or do so at its own expense. (EC § 49550)

ANALYSIS

This bill, among other things: (1) Commencing with the 2022–23 school year and contingent upon an appropriation, requires school districts, county offices of education, and charter schools to provide two free school meals each schoolday, regardless of the pupil's eligibility for free or reduced-price meals; (2) requires the CDE to administer a noncompetitive grant to LEAs to cover costs incurred by those agencies in purchasing food produced or grown in California; (3) requires the CDE to award grants of up to \$30,000 per schoolsite every year on a competitive basis to school districts, county superintendents of schools, or entities approved by the CDE for nonrecurring expenses incurred, in order to increase the number of meals that can be prepared freshly and served to pupils; and (4) establishes the BOOST Nutrition EBT Program to prevent child hunger during regularly scheduled school breaks or any school campus closure caused by a declared state of emergency. Specifically, this bill:

- 1) Commencing with the 2022–23 school year, requires a school district or county superintendent of schools maintaining kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive, to provide two school meals free of charge during each schoolday to any pupil who requests a meal without consideration of the pupil's eligibility for a federally funded free or reduced-price meal, with a maximum of one free meal for each meal service period, except for family daycare homes that shall be reimbursed for 75 percent of the meals served.
- 2) Commencing with the 2022–23 school year, requires a charter school to provide two school meals free of charge during each schoolday to any pupil who requests a meal without consideration of the pupil's eligibility for a federally funded free or reduced-price meal, with a maximum of one free meal for each meal service period.
- 3) Commencing with the 2022–23 school year, prohibits an LEA that has a reimbursable school breakfast program from charging a pupil or a member of a pupil's family any amount for any meal served to a pupil through the program, and requires the LEA to provide a meal free of charge to any pupil who requests

one without consideration of the pupil's eligibility for a federally funded free or reduced-price meal.

- 4) Commencing with the 2022–23 school year, requires the CDE to reimburse LEAs for all nonreimbursed expenses accrued in providing United States Department of Agriculture reimbursable meals to pupils, consistent with all of the following:
 - a) The amount of reimbursements provided under this section shall not exceed the difference between the following amounts:
 - i) The reimbursement rate established by Section 49559 for the reimbursable meals provided by the school.
 - ii) Any amounts otherwise reimbursed or paid by state, federal, or other sources.
 - b) In addition to the reimbursement provided, an LEA shall receive an additional supplement of ___ percent of the reimbursement provided pursuant to the bill in order to meet the additional nutritional needs of pupils residing in deeply impoverished communities.
 - c) The reimbursement required shall be provided upon appropriation by the Legislature.
- 5) Specifies that (1) to (4) above shall not be operative until the Legislature has appropriated funds those purposes.
- 6) Requires CDE to develop and adopt regulations as it deems necessary to implement the bill, including regulations that authorize LEAs administer a school lunch program under the federal Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (Public Law 113-79) to release to appropriate officials administering the CalFresh and Medi-Cal programs information that is necessary to implement the bill, while protecting the privacy of pupils and their families.
- 7) Requires the CDE to administer a noncompetitive grant to LEAs to cover costs incurred by those agencies in purchasing food produced or grown in California, pursuant to all of the following:
 - a) The amount of a grant shall be determined by the CDE, based on twenty-five cents (\$0.25) multiplied by the number of lunches and breakfasts served by the local educational agency during the previous school year under the United States Department of Agriculture's child nutrition programs.
 - b) For purposes of this funding formula, an LEA may choose to substitute the most recent school year when the majority of pupils were able to attend full time and in person.

- c) An LEA that receives a grant under this section shall use the moneys for the costs incurred by the LEA to purchase food products that meet all of the following criteria:
 - i) Purchased on or after the date the LEA received notification from the CDE of the amount to be distributed to the school district as provided by this section.
 - ii) Grown or produced in California.
 - lii) Whole or minimally processed.
 - iv) Used for meals that are served as part of the United States Department of Agriculture's child nutrition programs.
- d) An LEA shall not use any moneys received under this section to purchase California produced fluid milk, including fluid milk substitutes. While fluid milk and fluid milk substitutes will not be reimbursed, minimally processed, California-produced and manufactured dairy products like yogurt are allowable expenses.
- e) An LEA shall not use any moneys received under this section to purchase California-produced bread. However, California-produced flour and California-grown wheat and other grains are allowable expenses.
- f) LEAs are encouraged to maximize their purchases of food from California farmers, and expand the number of freshly prepared school meals that use California-grown ingredients. The Department of Food and Agriculture shall provide guidance to this effect.
- 8) Requires the CDE to provide information every year to school districts and county superintendents of schools concerning the benefits of, and financial assistance for, serving public school pupils freshly prepared food purchased from California, to encourage the preparation of fresh meals, and requires the CDE to prioritize schools that are eligible for the Community Eligibility Provision.
- 9) Requires the CDE to award grants of up to thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000) per schoolsite every year on a competitive basis to school districts, county superintendents of schools, or entities approved by the CDE for nonrecurring expenses incurred, in order to increase the number of meals that can be prepared freshly and served to pupils. The number of grants available shall be limited by the amount appropriated for this purpose in the annual Budget Act.
- 10) Requires grant funds to be used for nonrecurring costs of initiating or increasing the preparation of freshly prepared food as part of a school breakfast program or a school lunch program, including, but not limited to, the acquisition of equipment, training of staff in new capacities, minor alterations to accommodate new equipment, a new computer point-of-service system necessary to implement universally free school meals, and the purchase of vehicles for transporting food to schools.

- 11) Prohibits grant funds from being used for salaries and benefits of staff, food, computers, except computer point-of-service systems, or capital outlay.
- 12) Requires the CDE to give a preference to school districts and county superintendents of schools that do all of the following:
 - a) Submit to the CDE a plan to initiate or increase fresh meal preparation in the school district or county, including a description of all of the following:
 - i) The manner in which the school district or county superintendent of schools will provide technical assistance and funding to schoolsites to initiate or increase fresh meal preparation.
 - ii) Detailed information on the nonrecurring expenses needed to initiate or increase fresh meal preparation.
 - iii) Public or private resources that have been assembled for the purpose of initiating or increasing fresh meal preparation during that year.
 - b) Agree to increase and then sustain the preparation of fresh food for school meal programs for a period of not less than three years.
 - c) Assure that the expenditure of funds from state and local resources for the purpose of initiating or increasing fresh meal preparation in school meal programs will not be diminished as a result of grant awards.
- 13) For purposes of the local control funding formula, authorizes a school in a special assistance alternative to establish a base year by Carrying over the number of pupils at the school who were eligible for free or reduced-price meals from the school year in which the school applied to use a federal universal school meal provision, and using each pupil's eligibility status in the base year to report eligibility for up to each of the following three school years.
- 14) Deletes the requirement that a school district or county office of education use all other paper applications it has for free or reduced-price meals before utilizing electronic applications, and requires those applications to be processed within 30 days.
- 15) Prohibits an online application for free or reduced-price meals that is made accessible online by a school district, county office of education, or a third party vendor from allowing the information of the prospective applicant from being sold, shared, or used by a private entity for any other purpose. Violation of this prohibition by a private third-party would be subject a civil penalty of \$1,000 for a first offense and \$10,000 for any subsequent violations.
- 16) Specifies that the provisions in (15) above do not prevent the use of information provided by a school meal applicant from being used by a governmental entity to increase access to a government-administered anti-hunger program.

- 17) Requires the CDE to seek all available funding for the Pandemic Electronic Benefit Transfer (P-EBT) program established under the federal Families First Coronavirus Response Act of 2020 (Public Law 116-127), as amended by the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2021 and Other Extensions Act (Public Law 116-159).
- 18) Establishes the Better Out of School Time (BOOST) Nutrition EBT Program is to prevent child hunger during regularly scheduled school breaks or any school campus closure caused by a condition for which a state of emergency has been proclaimed by the Governor that lasts five or more schooldays, subject to all of the following:
 - a) A pupil is eligible for benefits under the BOOST Nutrition EBT Program if they are enrolled in a public school that participates in the National School Lunch Program and they meet one of the following criteria:
 - i) They receive benefits under the Medi-Cal program.
 - ii) They receive benefits under the CalFresh program.
 - iii) They are a homeless youth, as defined by the federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
 - iv) They are in foster care.
 - v) They have applied for BOOST Nutrition EBT benefits and it has been determined that their family income is below 185 percent of the federal poverty level.
 - b) The State Department of Social Services (DSS) shall issue BOOST Nutrition EBT benefits to eligible pupils, in the specified amount, for each day during which a school campus is closed due to either of the following circumstances:
 - i) A regularly scheduled school break that lasts five or more schooldays.
 - ii) A closure of a school campus as a result a condition for which a state of emergency has been proclaimed by the Governor that lasts five or more schooldays.
 - c) When applicable, the DSS shall issue BOOST Nutrition EBT benefits to eligible pupils no later than seven business days prior to regularly scheduled breaks.
 - d) On or before March 1, 2022, DSS shall submit a report to the Legislature describing how the department can ensure timely BOOST Nutrition EBT benefits issuance to pupils during a school campus closure caused by a

condition for which a state of emergency has been proclaimed by the Governor, and the cost of issuing these benefits timely.

- e) DSS shall set the amount of the daily BOOST Nutrition EBT benefit at the beginning of each school year in an amount that equals the reimbursement rate of a free breakfast under the federal School Breakfast Program and a free lunch under the federal National School Lunch Program.
- f) DSS shall also issue BOOST Nutrition EBT benefits to any child or pupil who was eligible to receive benefits under the Pandemic Electronic Benefit Transfer (P-EBT) program for the five-month period following the end of the P-EBT program, and DSS shall use the same eligibility, issuance, and other procedures as used under the P-EBT program.
- g) DSS shall annually report to the Legislature on outcomes of the BOOST Nutrition EBT Program, including, but not limited to, both of the following:
 - i) In each county, the number and percent of pupils receiving benefits, and the total benefits issued.
 - ii) Opportunities to improve program participation and program performance.
- h) To the extent permitted by federal law, BOOST Nutrition EBT benefits issued chapter shall not be considered as income or resources in determining other public benefits.

STAFF COMMENTS

- 1) ***Need for the bill.*** According to the author's office, "Exacerbating the effects of our COVID-driven economic crisis, California's relentlessly high cost of living causes many families with low and middle income to forego basic needs, including food. School meal programs are a primary nutritional safety net and can be a substantial source of support for families struggling to make ends meet.

Offering school meals free of charge to all pupils, known as universal meal service, provides inclusive access to nutritious meals. Under normal conditions, existing federal programs allow certain schools to provide school meals free of charge to all pupils, but federal policies governing the eligibility and funding criteria for these programs do not reflect true levels of need among California's children or the realities of operating school meal programs across the state.

During the COVID-19 crisis, temporary federal waivers have allowed schools to serve meals free of charge to all children. When those federal waivers expire, many children will be abruptly cut off from this essential source of much-needed nutritious meals."

- 2) **All students are eligible to receive free meals during COVID-19.** In light of the COVID-19 pandemic, the federal government has waived certain provisions of federal law enabling LEAs to being reimbursed for each meal the offer to all students, regardless of their eligibility for free or reduced price meals. Pursuant to the federal Families First Coronavirus Response Act (the FFCRA) (P.L. 116-127), as extended by the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2021 and Other Extensions Act (P.L. 116-159), and based on the exceptional circumstances of this public health emergency, the federal Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) is allowing the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) Seamless Summer Option (SSO) to continue to operate through June 30, 2021.

According to the FNS, “this waiver is expected to support access to nutritious meals while minimizing potential exposure to the novel coronavirus (COVID–19). Due to the continued need for social distancing, many States and SFAs are utilizing a virtual or hybrid education model. In addition, schools using in-person instruction have recognized the need to modify meal service models to ensure student safety. Providing meals through the SFSP/SSO will support these models and not require additional administrative contact or burden for States or operators... FNS recognizes that State agencies and local program operators continue to need additional support and flexibility to continue serving meals safely to children while managing the impacts of COVID–19. Allowing operation of SFSP/SSO through June 30, 2021, facilitates the safe provision of meals by eliminating the need to collect meal payments, including cash payments, at meal sites, which speeds up service of meals, thereby reducing contact and potential exposure to COVID–19. Operation of SFSP/SSO also facilitates curbside meal pick-up; Program staff may simply keep a count of all meals served, instead of relying on a point-of-service system (POS)—which may be located indoors—to track and claim meals by type. Requiring schools to use a POS to check eligibility and collect payment could expose school food service personnel to hundreds of individuals a day, further increasing risks to both the children, families, and staff. Instead, Program staff could focus on quickly providing meals at meal sites instead of spending time confirming individual student enrollment and eligibility status.”

Once the waiver expires, schools will have to revert to the traditional free, reduced-price, or paid status claiming model for reimbursement.

- 3) **Universal meals are indirectly already required, just not funded.** The net result of the Child Hunger Prevention and Fair Treatment Act (SB 250, Hertzberg, Ch. 726, Stats. 2017) and its subsequent amendments (Hertzberg, Ch. 785, Stats. 2019) is a requirement for LEAs to serve all students a fully reimbursable meal, whether or not they brought money to school that day. To be clear, this was only a change as it relates to students who are not enrolled in free or reduced-price meals, as existing law already required LEAs to provide meals to reduced-price students regardless of whether they brought money that day. After the Child Hunger Prevention and Fair Treatment Act of 2017, LEAs are required to serve students who are subject to the full price of the meal, regardless of whether their parents pay – or ever pay.

It is also important to note that not all students who might qualify for free or reduced-price meals actually apply for the program. This could be a number of reasons, including immigration status and the current climate at the federal level, language barriers, lack of awareness, or even apprehension about divulging income information. Accordingly, it is important to recognize that not all students who qualify for free or reduced-price meals are enrolled in that program, and thus they are required to pay the full cost for the meal.

This bill would make universal meals a direct requirement and actually require two meals per student per day, free of charge. Specifically, the bill also requires breakfast to be served if you are already providing breakfast under the School Breakfast program. However, whereas existing law specifically requires a nutritiously adequate reimbursable meal to be served to meet the existing law requirements, this bill inadvertently only requires that a “meal” be served. Accordingly, **staff recommends that the bill be amended** to address the following technical issues:

- Amend the bill to clarify the two required meals must be nutritiously adequate meals that qualify for reimbursement under the federal meal patterns.
- Amend the bill to clarify that the requirement to serve breakfast free of charge to all students if you participate in the School Breakfast Program counts as one of the two required meals.
- Amend the bill to delete the reference in 49501.5(a) to “except for family daycare homes that shall be reimbursed for 75 percent of the meals served.”

- 4) **Increasing unpaid meal fees before COVID-19.** The United States Department of Agriculture’s June 2016 report to Congress cited that a study, “conducted during school year 2011–2012, that found that 58 percent of local educational agencies (LEAs) incurred unpaid meal costs during school year 2010–2011. Over 93 percent of these LEAs served a reimbursable school meal on credit or an alternate meal to children who were not certified for free meals, approved for free or reduced price meals, and were unable to pay for a meal... In terms of financial impact, for the LEAs that reported lost revenues as a result of unpaid meals, the average net revenue lost after recovery attempts was less than 1 percent of total expenditures for the year. However, some larger LEAs reported significant debts, indicating that the extent of the issue and the type of policy needed to address it varies. Overall, the study determined that lost revenue from unpaid meals did not appear to have a meaningful impact on the ability of the LEAs in the study to operate at the break-even level.”

However, the Child Hunger Prevention and Fair Treatment Act of 2017 appears to have resulted in higher unpaid meal debt. According to information provided by school districts to the School Nutrition Association, and passed on to this committee for purposes of analyzing SB 265 (Hertzberg, Ch. 785, Stats. 2019), many – but not all – school districts saw steep increases in their unpaid meal fees after the act took effect. For example, Los Angeles Unified School District –

the largest school district in the state – saw its unpaid meal debt climb from \$393,200 for the 2016-17 school year to \$1,092,700 for the 2017-18 school year, to \$1,574,470 for the current school year, with a final expected total for the 2018-19 school year of \$2,249,242. The issue is not limited to large school districts though. For example, Barstow Unified School District has gone from \$16,000 in the 2016-17 school year to an expected debt of \$55,714 for the 2018-19 school year, San Leandro Unified School district has gone from \$795 in 2016-17 to an expected amount of \$17,988 for 2017-18, and Los Banos Unified School District has gone from \$14,000 to an expected amount of \$92,857. These figures are not necessarily representative of every school district, but they do illustrate the potential fiscal impact that school districts face in a changing school meal debt landscape.

- 5) ***Federal universal meal provision alternatives.*** LEAs can pursue universal meal provisions under the National School Lunch Program, such as the community eligibility provision or Provision 2 to increase their reimbursements for serving universal meals. For example,
- Provision 2 is a long-standing option available to any school for providing breakfast, lunch, or both at no charge. Reimbursement is based on the percentage of meals served in each category (free, reduced-price, and full-price) at the time the school begins a four-year cycle. In the first year (the base year), a school determines how many of its students are eligible for free, reduced-price, and full-price meals. A school can use direct certification or household applications to determine students' eligibility. From this count of students, the school calculates what percentage of the student population is eligible for free, reduced-price, and full-price meals. The percentages apply for the remainder of the four-year cycle.
 - Community Eligibility (CEP) CEP enables high-poverty schools to serve breakfast and lunch to all students at no charge without collecting school meal applications. CEP is designed to benefit high-poverty schools. It relies upon enrollment through direct certification, which identifies students participating in means-tested programs like CalFresh and CalWORKS. CEP operates on a four year cycles, similar to Provision 2. CEP uses a formula to determine the federal reimbursement for meals served to students: $\% \text{ of Identified Students} \times 1.6 = \text{percent of Meals Reimbursed at the "Free" (Highest) Rate}$ All other meals are reimbursed at the "paid" (lowest) rate of reimbursement. For example, if 60 percent of students meet the "identified" criteria, 96% of meals will be reimbursed at the "free" (highest) rate of per-meal federal reimbursement (60 percent \times 1.6 = 96 percent), with the remaining 4% of meals reimbursed at the lower "paid" rate."
- 6) ***Other considerations.*** Should the bill continue to move forward, the author may wish to consider working with stakeholders to continue to refine the following details:
- *What about central kitchens?* As drafted, the bill includes a grant program for nonrecurring expenses for the preparation of freshly prepared

food as part of a school breakfast program or a school lunch program, increase the number of fresh meals at schoolsites. The bill prohibits the funds from being used for capital outlays. One way to increase fresh meals is to build kitchens are commonly known as “scratch kitchens.” The bill proposes to award LEAs \$30,000 per schoolsite. However, the costs associated with building scratch kitchens can reach into the hundreds of thousands, even millions of dollars. The author may wish to consider amending the bill to allow an LEA to pool its grant funds for multiple sites into a larger project for a central kitchen that would still enable fresh meals to be delivered to students across an LEA.

- Do the reimbursement provisions ensure that LEAs will maximize their own federal reimbursements? As drafted, the bill proposed to reimburse LEAs at the state level for difference in the costs of providing free meals, minus all other state and federal reimbursements, up to the maximum available reimbursement for free meals, generally). However, there does not appear to be an affirmative requirement for LEAs to maximize their own federal reimbursements in order to minimize the state’s cost of reimbursement. The author may wish to consider requiring LEAs to maximize their federal reimbursements.

7) ***Previous legislation.*** SB 265 (Hertzberg, Ch. 785, Stats. 2019) amends the Child Hunger Prevention and Fair Treatment Act of 2017 to require applicable LEAs to ensure that a pupil whose parent or guardian has unpaid meal fees is not denied a reimbursable meal of the pupil’s choice because of the fact that the pupil’s parent or guardian has unpaid meal fees and that the pupil is not shamed or treated differently from other pupils, thus ensuring that all students receive a reimbursable meal.

SB 499 (McGuire, 2019) would have established the California-Grown for Healthy Kids Program to increase the provision of universally free school meals meals with California-grown fruits and vegetables, which would include supplemental funds of \$0.10 per breakfast served to eligible school food authorities. SB 499 passed the Senate but was not heard in the Assembly Education Committee.

AB 1871 (Bonta, Chapter 480, Statutes of 2018) requires charter schools, commencing with the 2019-20 school year, to provide each low-income pupil with one nutritionally adequate free or reduced-price meal during each schoolday.

SB 138 (McGuire, Chapter 724, Statutes of 2017) requires the California Department of Education, in consultation with the State Department of Health Care Services, to develop and implement a process to use Medi-Cal data to directly certify children whose families meet the income criteria into the school meal program; requires school districts and county offices of education with high poverty schools and high poverty charter schools currently participating in the breakfast or lunch program to provide breakfast and lunch free of charge to all students at those schools; and, authorizes a school district, county office of education or charter school to opt-out due to fiscal hardship.

SB 250 (Hertzberg, Chapter 726, Statutes of 2017) requires a local educational agency (LEA) to ensure that a pupil whose parent or guardian has unpaid school meal fees is not shamed, treated differently or served a meal that differs from what a pupil whose parent or guardian does not have unpaid school meal fees would receive under the LEA's policy; requires a LEA to attempt to directly certify a family for the free and reduced lunch program when a student has unpaid school meal fees and before the LEA notifies the parent or guardian within 10 days of reaching a negative balance; and, prohibits school personnel from allowing any disciplinary action that is taken against the student to result in the denial or delay of a nutritionally adequate meal, to that pupil.

SUPPORT

50 Acterra Action for a Healthy Planet
Agricultural Institute of Marin
Alameda County Community Food Bank
Alameda County Office of Education
American Heart Association
API Forward Movement
Bay Area Community Services
Bay Area Ranchers' Cooperative, INC
California Alternative Payment Program Association
California Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation & Dance
California Association of Student Councils
California Certified Organic Farmers
California School Nurses Organization
California School-based Health Alliance
California State Council of Service Employees International Union
California Teachers Association
Californiahealth+ Advocates
Californians for Pesticide Reform
Center for Ecoliteracy
Ceres Community Project
Childrens Advocacy Institute
Common Sense
Community Action Partnership of San Bernardino County
Dolores Huerta Foundation
Ecology Center, Berkeley
Foodcorps
Fresh Approach
Fresno Barrios Unidos
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Friends of the Earth U.S.
Frog Hollow Farm
Healthy Schools Campaign
Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District
Los Angeles Food Policy Council
Marin Food Policy Council
Mt. Diablo Unified School District
Natural Resources Defense Council

NextGen California
Oakland Unified School District
Open Heart Kitchen
River City Food Bank
Roots of Change
San Diego Food Bank
San Jose Bridge Communities
San Luis Coastal Unified School District
San Mateo County Food Systems Alliance
Second Harvest Food Bank Santa Cruz County
Second Harvest of Silicon Valley
Share Our Strength
Stemple Creek Ranch
The Edible Schoolyard Project
The Office of Kat Taylor
The Resource Connection Food Bank
Tomkat Ranch
Union of Concerned Scientists
Eat REAL
Western Center on Law & Poverty
Westside Food Bank

OPPOSITION

None received

-- END --