Speaker Mike Johnson U.S. House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515

Majority Leader John Thune U.S. Senate Washington, DC 20510

Chairman Lindsey Graham Senate Committee on the Budget U.S. Senate Washington, DC 20510

Chairman Jodey Arrington House Committee on the Budget U.S. House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515

Chairman John Boozman Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry U.S. Senate Washington, DC 20510

Chairman Tim Walberg House Committee on Education and Workforce U.S. House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515 Minority Leader Hakeem Jeffries U.S. House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515

Minority Leader Chuck Schumer U.S. Senate Washington, DC 20510

Ranking Member Jeff Merkley Senate Committee on the Budget U.S. Senate Washington, DC 20510

Ranking Member Brendan Boyle House Committee on the Budget U.S. House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515

Ranking Member Amy Klobuchar Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry U.S. Senate Washington, DC 20510

Ranking Member Robert Scott House Committee on Education and Workforce U.S. House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515

Dear Speaker Johnson, Minority Leader Jeffries, Majority Leader Thune, Minority Leader Schumer, Chairman Graham, Ranking Member Merkley, Chairman Arrington, Ranking Member Boyle, Chairman Boozman, Ranking Member Klobuchar, Chairman Walberg, Ranking Member Scott:

The National School Lunch Program and the School Breakfast Program are critical nutrition supports that positively impact children's health, learning, and development in every state across the country. They ensure that children have access to the meals they need to learn and thrive, reduce pressure on family household food budgets, and support academic success.

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the billions of dollars in proposed cuts to school breakfast and lunch currently circulating in Congress. These proposals would result in large numbers of children losing access to the nutritious school meals they need, place an additional financial burden on families already struggling with expensive grocery bills and increase the administrative burden on schools to operate the programs.

The proposed cuts to the Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) would dramatically reduce the number of high need schools able to offer free meals to all their students by raising the eligibility threshold for schools to participate from the current 25 percent Identified Student Percentage (ISP) to 60 percent ISP. It would also decrease school meal operation efficiency and effectiveness. The proposal would make more than 24,000 schools, serving more than 12 million children, no longer eligible to participate in CEP.

Taking away this important and effective way for thousands of local schools to offer breakfast and lunch at no charge to students would increase child hunger in the classroom, increase unpaid school meal debt, and bring stigma back into the cafeteria. CEP has been proven to dramatically reduce administrative work for school nutrition departments by eliminating the need for them to process paperwork and focus on what matters most – feeding students. When CEP schools have less paperwork to process, they can spend more time creating healthy, scratch cooked meals for students.

Another proposal would require all families applying for school meals to provide detailed household income documentation before being approved for free or reduced-price meals. This change would reduce access for eligible children and increase the administrative burden for schools. Requiring full income documentation has been shown to cause eligible children to fall through the cracks, resulting in many missing out on the nutritious meals they need. Additionally, this mandate would dramatically increase the paperwork schools must process, resulting in limited resources being diverted away from feeding, caring for, and educating students.

Currently, most schools are required to verify the income of 3 percent of applicants -- a process that is already burdensome and leads to eligible children missing out on school meals. Increasing this requirement to 100 percent would significantly worsen these issues, creating unnecessary barriers for both families and schools.

We strongly oppose these and other proposals that will reduce children's access to school meals. Congress should be focused on strengthening and expanding these vital programs, not weakening them through these proposals or any other cuts.

Sincerely,

AASA, The School Superintendents Association Advocates for Better Children's Diets Afterschool Alliance Alliance to End Hunger American Commodity Distribution Association American Federation of Teachers American Friends Service Committee American Heart Association American Public Health Association Association of School Business Officials International (ASBO) Balanced **CACFP** Roundtable Center for Biological Diversity Center for Ecoliteracy Center for Science in the Public Interest Chef Ann Foundation Coalition on Human Needs Common Threads Community Engagement and Consultation Group Inc. Council of Administrators of Special Education First Focus Campaign for Children FoodCorps Food Research & Action Center Friends of the Earth **Generations United** Healthy Schools Campaign International Dairy Foods Association Jewish Federation of North America Kids in Nutrition LunchAssist MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger MomsRising National Center for Law and Economic Justice National CACFP Forum National Education Association National Farm to School Network National Organization for Women National PTA The National Rural Education Association National Women's Law Center ParentsTogether Action

Partnership for a Healthier America Pilot Light Public Advocacy for Kids (PAK) School Nutrition Association ScratchWorks Service Employees International Union Share Our Strength Society for Nutrition Education and Behavior Society of Behavioral Medicine Solving Hunger, Tusk Philanthropies UnidosUS Wellness in the Schools