	Meat/ meat alter- nate (oz.)	Grains/ breads (servings)	Vege- tables/ fruits (cups)	Milk (fl. oz.)
Baseline (SNDA)	2.8	2.5	1.0	7.5
Scenario 1 (no change of preparation techniques)	1.9	4.2	1.3	7.5
Scenario 2 (lower fat chicken preparation)	2.1	4.1	1.2	7.5
Scenario 3 (shifts of selections within components; no change in commodity markets)	2.9	2.6	0.9	7.5

TABLE 5.—AVERAGE DAILY NSLP SERVINGS: BASELINE AND THREE SCENARIOS

Cost for Food Components

The extended school lunch model was used to estimate the average cost for each food component at baseline and for the three market impact scenarios. The cost for non-creditable foods which are sometimes served with lunch, such as non-fruit desserts, was also estimated. The average cost for a 2 ounce serving meat/meat alternate increased by about $\frac{1}{2}$ cent in scenarios 1 and 2, and by 1 cent in scenario 3. This is consistent with the expectation of some food personnel that leaner selections from the meat/meat alternate component may increase unit cost for this component. The per serving cost also increased for vegetables/fruits. The average cost of 1/2 cup of vegetables/fruits increased by 1/2 cent in scenarios 1 and 2, and by 0.2 cents in scenario 3. The cost of 8 fluid ounces of milk remained the same in scenarios 1 and 2, and increased by 0.2 cents in scenario 3.

In contrast, the average cost of a serving of grains/breads decreased by 0.4 cents in scenarios 1 and 2 and by 0.7 cents in scenario 3. In scenarios 1 and 2, there was no change in the total 0.6 cents per meal available for noncreditable items, but in scenario 3, about 0.1 cents of this was shifted to creditable items.

This cost-per-component-serving analysis shows that the cost of food for the NSLP meals can be maintained, even when the average cost for some components increases, without severely diminishing the funds available for noncreditable foods which help flavor meals to meet individual preferences. The ability to select slightly less expensive items from the grains/breads component can effectively offset both the modest per serving cost increases in other components and the slightly increased average minimum requirement (+0.5 servings per week) for grains/breads.

By definition, the average results reported above mean that some school districts would be expected to experience food costs that vary considerably from those reported above. This is not different from the current situation because there is already a wide range of food costs due to factors such as economies of size, geographic variation in delivery and labor costs, and local market conditions. Similarly, average quantities served also vary among schools and sometimes within schools. If a school currently serving less than the average portions of grains/ breads or vegetables/fruits opts for the proposed food-based menu planning system, they may have to increase the quantities offered.

Conclusion

In summary, the findings for the three scenarios indicate that the proposed NSLP food-based menu system requirements can be met within current food costs and with market impacts at levels presented in the June 10, 1994 Federal Register. At least some improvement in food preparation techniques and food selections within food categories would be needed to meet the proposed menu system requirements and RDA/Dietary Guidelines-derived nutrient targets for NSLP. Efforts which may influence the speed and direction of these shifts, such as training and technical assistance for school food service personnel in improved menu planning and food preparation techniques, development of improved recipes, and production of lower fat products by industry, could help to simplify implementation when the food-based menu planning system is selected.

b. Implementation Costs

This section expands upon the Section e. Implementation Cost contained in the June 10, 1994 Federal Register cost/benefit assessment to cover the food-based menu planning system option. As stated there, initial implementation costs faced by schools will vary depending on existing capabilities and resources within districts and will take many forms. This proposal provides schools with a new option, so they would have the option of selecting among NSMP, Assisted-NSMP, or the food-based menu planning system. Schools are expected to consider implementation costs in making their selection.

Local, State and Federal resources are available for implementation. USDA has already initiated a number of improvements which will assist in implementation, some of which apply to a specific planning system option and others which will assist schools in selecting the option best suited to their needs. These include updated and improved recipes for schools, a computerized data bank of standard nutritional values of meals served and a demonstration project on NSMP. The demonstration will incur much of the developmental cost of the basic NSMP system framework and identify cost effective strategies for implementation.

The Department believes that implementation of meal improvements will be facilitated if students are receptive to the changes in foods. A number of efforts will help encourage students to accept such changes. Central to this effort is the Department's Children's Nutrition Campaign, a multifaceted national effort designed to motivate children to make healthier food choices by getting them excited about making choices and giving them the skills to do so. It is designed to deliver nutrition messages through multiple and reinforcing channels to maximize impact and credibility. Core components will be mass media and inschool efforts, supplemented by strategic public-private partnerships to leverage USDA investments and extend reach. The FY 1995 federal budget includes over \$20 million to launch this campaign and to provide extensive training for school meal providers on how to plan and prepare nutritious and appealing meals. The Department has awarded nutrition education cooperative agreements to develop comprehensive community-based approaches to nutrition education. The Department is also assisting school food service professionals by working with chefs, farmers and others to make school meals appealing and healthful.

States receive over \$90 million annually from the Federal level in State Administrative Expense (SAE) funds for