Child Nutrition Reauthorization

- **Moderator**: Melody Steeples, ACPP member and Association Director, CAN-Act (California Association of Nutrition & Activity Programs)

- **Overview of CNR**: Margo Wootan, Center for Science in the Public Interest and Chair of National Alliance for Nutrition and Activity

- **CNR and the SNAP-Ed restructuring proposal**: Dan Christensen, Senate Agriculture Committee senior staff

- **How passage of CNR will affect nutrition landscape**: Matthew Marsom, Public Health Institute

- **Impact of SNAP ED on Land Grant Universities - threats and opportunities**: Linda Kay Benning, Associate Director, Extension and Outreach, Association of Public and Land Grant Universities.

- **Impact of CNR passage specifically to SNAP-Ed programs**: Jeff Olsen, WV Cooperative Extension, SNAP-Ed and EFNEP Administrator

- **Discussion**
California Association of Nutrition & Activity Programs

Melody Steeples, Director
CAN-Act
California Association of Nutrition & Activity Programs

Who we are:
Established in 2006 to represent the interests of (then) FSNE-funded programs in California. Membership composed of California’s SNAP-Ed-funded local projects; funding comes from grants, dues paid by local projects, and contract with the Network for a Healthy California to work on specific issues of interest to the local programs.
California Association of Nutrition & Activity Programs

- Starting in 2006, worked with various partners, including PHI and ASNNA, on 2007 Farm Bill.

- Requested changes to FSNE/ SNAP-Ed rules to expand SNAP-Ed allowable activities to include policy, systems, and environmental interventions.
Had the ear and good will of some members of Congress, but the requested changes were scored by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) as costing potentially millions of additional dollars.
Best we were able to get was language in the manager’s report (a.k.a. “farm bill report”) that stated, in part:

“The Secretary is encouraged to support the most effective interventions for nutrition education under the FSA, including public health approaches and traditional education, to increase the likelihood that recipients and potential recipients of benefits under the SSNAP [sic] program choose diets and physical activity practices that are consistent with the Dietary Guidelines for Americans.”

The USDA has not changed SNAP-Ed guidance to reflect this statement of Congressional intent.
However, some positive changes to SNAP-Ed have been included in the Senate’s Child Nutrition Reauthorization (CNR) bill (S3307). The Senate offered basically a “cap and trade” – they capped the funding for SNAP-Ed and traded an expanded set of SNAP-Ed allowable activities.
S3307 – SNAP-Ed Provisions:

- Caps national SNAP-Ed spending at $375 million per year, plus annual adjustments based on the CPI
- Eliminates the cost-share, or federal financial participation requirements, thus potentially reducing the administrative burden
- Codifies portions of the 2008 Farm Bill Managers Report in statute, requiring consultation with expert bodies (i.e., the CDC) and allowing more comprehensive approaches to nutrition education delivery starting 2014
S3307 – SNAP-Ed Provisions (cont’d)

• Establishes FY 2009 as baseline for distribution of the SNAP-Ed funding pool among states; in 2014 through 2018, increasing portions of the funding pool are re-distributed among states based on share of SNAP participants

• Allows for reallocation of unspent funds to states which are prepared to spend them

• Reallocation establishes new baseline for funding distribution in subsequent years
S3307 – SNAP-Ed Provisions (cont’d)

- Does not expand or eliminate existing eligible populations
- Does not allow states to increase their budgets except through redistribution based on SNAP participant share and/or reallocation of unspent funds
- Does not require participating state agencies to build on existing models or infrastructures
Today’s speakers will provide an overview of the current status of CNR, implications of the legislation to SNAP-Ed programs, and current advocacy efforts. We’ll leave time at the end for your questions.
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2010 Child Nutrition Reauthorization

• Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, S. 3307
• Vote during lame duck session
  - Must be passed by end of year
• White House and House leadership working on offset and access
Continue to Improve School Foods
2010 CNR

- Direct certification (120,000 more kids/yr)
- 2,500 more schools offer universal, free meals
- Gets junk food out of vending machines, school stores, a la carte
- Improve school meal quality by increasing lunch reimbursement, more TA, only low-fat milk, improved meal financing, and increased accountability
- 29 million after-school suppers ($14,000 more/site/year)
- $40 million for farm to school and school gardens
Preschool Children

- Improve food and physical activity in childcare programs participating in CACFP
- Simplify area eligibility for CACFP (2,500 day care homes will get more federal money)
- Increase the number of children in WIC
- Promote breastfeeding through WIC
SNAP ARRA Offset

- CNR SNAP offset doesn't cut SNAP benefit levels
- Congress provided temporary increase to SNAP in economic stimulus bill (temporary, $20 billion, expire Sept 2013)
  - Due to lower food inflation and structure: $55 billion, Sept 2017
- State-aid bill -- temporary SNAP increase end March 2014
- CNR does not cut benefits, moves up expiration to Oct 2013
- Moving sunset date by 5 months buys lifetime of reforms and 10 years of CN improvements
We need your help!

• Support HHFK Act (S. 3307)
  - Sign on to support letter, urge other orgs to sign
  - Meet, write, email or call members of Congress and staff
  - Ask colleagues, friends, family to call or email

• Sign up for an organization’s policy action network (SNE, CSPI, etc.)

• Write letters to the editor, op eds

• Join NANA
Don’t let this chance pass us by!

- Renewal of child nutrition is one year overdue
- An extension = worst possible outcome
  - lose strong reforms and $4.5 billion
- Next Congress:
  - focused on cutting spending and reducing deficit
  - working on the next farm bill
- Last chance to pass the bill, but need your help
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SNE WEBINAR
CNR & SNAP-ED
“PERCEIVED IMPACT OF CNR ON SNAP-ED”
(S 3307 - SECT. 241)

R. JEFF OLSON
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
MY PERCEPTION IS MIXED

- Where I sit...
  - WVU Cooperative Extension (Land-Grant)
  - WV Nutrition Network is a project within WVU (IA)
  - Former member of SNAP-Ed Program Dev. Team
  - Former Co-chair of ASNNA

- I believe current SNAP-Ed system MUST change. Do the positives of S-3307 outweigh the negatives? Primary concern (as with most IA’s) is loss of funding - national and/or state level.

- Consensus lacking within any type of IA’s – Ext, Public Health, Non-profits, etc... No clear voice.
“HERDING CATS!”
WHO ARE THE SNAP-ED IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES

- MARO (8) – 8 IA’s (7 Ext, 1 PH)
- MPRO (10) – 11 IA’s (10 Ext, 1 PH)
- MWRO (6) – 10 IA’s (6 Ext, 3 Tribal, 1 Univ)
- NERO (7) – 12 IA’s (5 Ext, 4 PH, 2 Non-Profit, 1 Univ)
- SERO (8) – 16 IA’s (7 Ext, 5 NP, 2 Univ, 2 PH)
- SWRO (5) – 25 IA’s (16 NP, 5 Ext, 2 Univ, 1 PH, 1 Tribal)
- WRO (8) – 19 IA’s (7 Ext, 5 PH, 4 Tribal, 3 NP)

- TOTAL (52) – 101 IA’s (46 Ext, 26 NP, 14 PH, 8 Tribal, 7 Univ)

Key (States) – Ext (Extension), PH (Public Health), NP (Non-profits), Tribal (Tribal Projects), Univ (University Projects)
$375 MILLION
(ALLOCATED ON EXPENDED V. APPROVED???)

○ FFY 2009
  - Approved SNAP-Ed Funds = $353,396,711
  - Expended SNAP-Ed Funds = $270,635,199
  - Percent Expended Nationally = 77%

  MARO – 78%
  MPRO – 85%
  MWRO – 82%
  NERO – 63%
  SERO – 73%
  SWRO – 72%
  WRO – 77%
MAJOR ISSUES OF CNR ON SNAP-ED

- Reduction or removal of state and local cost/share.
  - Pro: Reducing cost/share will increase $$$ available for interventions
  - Con: Reducing cost/share will reduce IA leverage w/ SA - result is fear of SA reducing funds to proven IA’s

- Capping SNAP-Ed at $375 million
  - Pro: Increases current expenditures, includes growth based on CPI, may increase likelihood of future funding
  - Con: Limits growth of new and existing IA’s, especially those that have grown since 2009, may be first step of reducing expenditures (future trend)
MAJOR ISSUES OF CNR ON SNAP-ED

- SA will control funding similar to “block grant”
  - Pro: Depending on relationship between IA and SA, may reduce administrative burden. (States would be able to continue requiring cost/share.)
  - Con: Many SA’s are unprepared for increased administrative oversight. Elimination of cost/share removes current IA leverage.

  - Pro: Based on fiscal accountability (SNAP Admin $$$), should increase coordination of SNAP Outreach
  - Con: Some state will see SNAP-Ed reductions
POSITIVE IMPACT OF SECT. 241

- Use of funds includes:
  - (i) individual and group-based nutrition education, health promotion, and intervention strategies;
  - (ii) comprehensive, multilevel interventions at multiple complementary organizational and institutional levels; and
  - (iii) community and public health approaches to improve nutrition

- OBSERVATION: Prior to 2004, many multilevel approaches were allowable in Guidance. (Specific references to Food Security and Environmental Change.) CNR may restore these opportunities.
WVU EXTENSION – FAMILY NUTRITION PROGRAM

With the passage of current CNR and offsets to SNAP-Ed:

- WV will see immediate $$$ increase, but limits or eliminates future growth. Complete loss of leverage due to cost/share. New projects may suffer.
- Reduces admin. burden from approx 30% to 15-20% thus allowing an estimated 10-15% additional funds to be used for interventions and/or increased evaluation
- Increased opportunities to partner with state CDC interventions. Collaborating w/ CDC is very positive
- Promotes programs at organization, institution, and societal “Level of Influence” (CDC), Increases likelihood of effectiveness for direct education interventions
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