

FSTF Meeting Minutes
August 6, 2025
1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Click [here](#) to view the meeting recording

Task Force Members Present: Jeimil Belamide (HSA/CalFresh); Tiffany Kearney (DAS); Michelle Kim (DCYF); Emily Cohen (HSH); Mei Ling Hui (SF Park & Rec); Jennifer LeBarre (SFUSD); Cissie Bonini (UCSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies – EatSF); Chester Williams (Community Living Campaign); Katie Jackson (Project Open Hand); Jade Quizon (FAACTS); Noriko Lim-Tepner (SFMFB); Raegan Sales (Children’s Council of SF); Lura Jones (Leah’s Pantry)

Task Force Members Not Present: Priti Rane (DPH/Nutrition Services); Anne Quaintance (Conard House); Guillermo Reece (SFAAFBC); Hannah Grant (Meals on Wheels SF); Geoffrey Grier (SF Recovery Theatre)

Also Present: Alex Raffanti (SFMFB); Beth Bodner (SF Environment); Cathy Huang (HSA); Cindy Lin (SFHSA Food Access); Claudia Llanos (HOMEY-SF); Connie Leung (APAFSS); Danielle Lundstrom (SFDPH/SNAP-Ed); Elizabeth Liu (SFUSD); Eric Chan (SFDPH – Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Kaela Plank (SFDPH); Kim; Leah Walton (DAS); Marina Kan (HSA); Melinda Gordon; Priscilla Rodriguez (SFDPH – Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Serena Ngo (Hirsch Philanthropy Partners); Tommy McClain (SF HSA Food Access); Luana Turovskaya

| Agenda Item | Discussion | Next Steps |
|---|---|------------|
| 1. Call order to order 1:30 p.m. | Call to order at 1:30 p.m. | None. |
| 2. Land acknowledgment 1:30 p.m. | Priscilla Rodriguez recited the Land Acknowledgement. | None. |
| 3. Welcome, member roll call, introductions, Cissie Bonini (Chair, Eat SF/Vouchers 4 Veggies) 1:35 p.m. | Cissie Bonini did roll call and introduced the agenda. Public Comment: None. | None. |
| 4. Approval of minutes from June 4, 2025 1:40 p.m. | Michelle Kim makes motion to approve minutes. Chester Williams seconds the motion. 12 approved. 0 opposed. 1 abstained. Motion is passed. | None. |

| | | |
|---|---|-------|
| | Public Comment: None. | |
| 5. General public comment 1:45 p.m. | None. | None. |
| 6. FSTF member updates, Jeimil Belamide (Human Services Agency/CalFresh) 1:50 p.m. | <p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 9:10 minute mark and ends at the 27:05 minute mark.</p> <p>Jeimil Belamide is the Policy Manager for CalFresh and Medi-Cal at the San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA). Jeimil provided background on the CalFresh program including benefit levels and eligibility criteria, the US Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), California's Department of Social Services (CDSS), and San Francisco's (SF) HSA. As of March 2025, SF's caseload for the CalFresh Program is 111,766 individuals and 82,918 households. The approximate number of individuals in the CalFresh program based on age groups is as follows: 0-17 years: 18,000, 18-24 years: 7,000, 25-39 years: 18,000, 40-49 years: 11,000, 50-59 years: 10,000, 60-64 years: 8,000, and 65+ years: 41,000. The approximate number of individuals in the CalFresh program based on primary language is as follows: English: 660,000, Chinese: 29,000, Spanish: 11,000, Russian: 2,000, Vietnamese: 2,000, other languages: 1,000, and Tagalog or Filipino: <1,000.</p> <p>The approximate number of individuals in the CalFresh program based on race/ethnicity is as follows: Asian or Pacific Islander: 34,000, Black or African American: 11,000, Latinx or Hispanic: 14,000, White: 10,000, Additional Groups: 9,000, and Unknown: 34,000.</p> <p>Jeimil discussed high level H.R. 1 impacts on CalFresh. The Work Rule requires certain individuals to work at least 80 hours per month or be limited to three months of CalFresh in a three-year period. H.R. 1 changes the work requirement age from 18-54 to 18-64. It also changes the dependent children in the home exception to apply to children under the age of 14 (previously from under the age of 18). H.R. 1 eliminates exemptions for people experiencing</p> | None. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>homelessness, veterans, and those under 24 years old and aged out of foster care at 18. There is a new exemption for individuals who are Indians, Urban Indians, and California Indians.</p> <p>Currently, California is under a waiver for the work rule that is set to expire on January 31, 2026. There are no details regarding effective dates for the changes mentioned above. California is waiting for more details on the changes to the work requirements.</p> <p>H.R. 1 limits CalFresh eligibility to legal permanent residents (LPRs), Cuban or Haitian Entrants, or Compacts of Free Association (COFA) citizens (Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Palau). As of now, eligibility for CalFresh includes refugees, those granted asylum, and others not included in the above description. Effective October 1, 2027, states will be required to pay a percentage of CalFresh benefits based on their payment error rate. States are required to match between 0-15% of benefits issued depending upon the size of their payment error rate. Currently, the federal government funds 100% of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits.</p> <p>Effective October 1, 2026, the federal portion of administrative costs will be reduced from 50% to 25%. The state portion will increase from 50% to 75%. California will continue to share the state portion with counties at the rate of 70% (state) and 30% (counties). As of now, the federal government and states share 50/50 in administrative costs. California and counties share 70/30 of state share.</p> <p>A discussion/Q&A followed with additional notes below.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Have you estimated what the impacts are on current CalFresh recipients in San Francisco?</p> <p>Jeimil Belamide: Our planning team is still working on it. We don't have a number that we're able to share at the moment. Once we get it, we'll be able to share it.</p> <p>Katie Jackson: You mentioned that pay rate. What is San Francisco's payment error rate currently?</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Jeimil Belamide: Right now, the statewide for 2024 is 10.98%. The thing with that one is the state isn't quite sure yet how they would share that cost with the counties because there's no state statute for that. Again, this is something that has never been required of states before.</p> <p>Raegan Sales: I know you said you're all still in the midst of figuring out what those anticipated impacts are going to be for us locally. I would love it if you could also provide breakdowns like the groups that you shared today, that would be helpful so we know how this is going to affect children versus older adults, and you know by race and ethnicity would also be helpful.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: I would also add it would be helpful to know about specific cuts like for example to non-citizens.</p> <p>Jade Quizon: I was curious if we've heard from anyone at the state level about what they're doing to prepare and if we're getting any information from them.</p> <p>Jeimil Belamide: We work in close partnership with the state. States have had a couple of webinars both for CalFresh and Medi-Cal in the past couple of weeks. They've kind of echoed the same thing. They're still working with the feds to determine when actual effective dates are going to be for this. I didn't mention it in the presentation, but there's a big systems component to this. All our systems are kind of coded to the existing rules. So, changing it is going to take some time too. California is still trying to work with the feds, let them know that there's going to be a systems impact, right? We're just kind of waiting for the official details from the state now.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Are there any plans to help those folks that might be getting cut off benefits? Is there any discussion from the HSA level around a sort of city response to that in any way?</p> <p>Jeimil Belamide: From my level, I know that we're working with our Workforce Development Division (WDD) program within SFHSA to help people find a path to meeting the work requirement or getting an activity that helps them meet the work requirement or finding a path to employment which is what we did the last time the Able-Bodied Adults without Dependents (ABAWD) waiver was going to expire. This was back in 2018/2019. We're kind of dusting off that</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| | <p>playbook to try to help with those referrals and then we're also planning on training staff so they're fully aware of the rules and the implications.</p> <p>Public Comment: None.</p> | |
| <p>7. Federal, state, and local legislative updates, Alex Raffanti (San Francisco Marin Food Bank) 2:20 p.m.</p> | <p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 27:05 minute mark and ends at the 52:20 minute mark.</p> <p>The Public Policy Manager for the San Francisco Marin Food Bank (SFMFB), Alex Raffanti, provided federal, state, and local updates. Alex discussed the budget reconciliation process which includes \$186 billion in cuts from SNAP. The new guidelines are projected to lead to a loss of 6 billion meals annually nationwide. For comparison, the Feeding America Food Bank Network together with partners shares enough food for roughly 6 billion meals annually. New work requirements, time limits of the food assistance program, enhanced paperwork, and age requirements are impacts of the new guidelines. These cuts to SNAP will create a gap that cannot be fulfilled by created partnerships.</p> <p>Regarding the Farm Bill, SFMFB is watching its development. In September of 2024, Congress voted for a one-year continuing resolution on this bill but omitted several critical pieces like the prohibition on replacing stolen SNAP. California will replace the benefits for one month. There is a potential skinny Farm Bill that could be on the horizon. More information will be released as it becomes available. There has been current news from the California Association of Food Banks that shares that there is a bill currently going through Congress to support the Local Purchasing Food Agreement (LFPA) which the SFMFB is monitoring.</p> <p>California is leading in national hunger policies. Governor Newsom signed California's Budget Act of 2025 in late June. In California, it is estimated that 3.1 million participants will lose some or all their SNAP benefits. California will now be forced to pay up to 15% of SNAP benefits starting in 2026 along with the 75% SNAP administrative burden costing the state up to \$2.5</p> | <p>None.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>billion a year just to maintain eligibility requirements. That will be effective around October 1, 2027.</p> <p>In support of Food Banks Across California, SFMFB's budget ask is to support CalFood funding which would appropriate \$60 million in 2025-2026 and sustain the CalFood program at \$60 million annually.</p> <p>Alex shared information about AB 1049 – Food for All which is a campaign led by the California Immigrant Policy Center and Nourish California. Regardless of immigration status, it allows folks in California to receive SNAP benefits if they are 55+. SFMFB is asking for this investment to be increased by 2027 to all Californians regardless of immigration status and age.</p> <p>School Meals for All in California was the first state to create universal meals for all students in California. This allows folks on the margin of receiving benefits to lower the burden of accessing school meals for their children. SUN Bucks is a program that started in 2024 that allows folks who have children who receive SNAP to get \$120 per child for the summer. This allows supplemental access for children who were receiving most of their meals during school.</p> <p>The California Nutrition Incentives Program (CNIP), which funds Market Match, allows individuals who have SNAP to go to farmers markets and match their dollars and can match up to \$15.</p> <p>Regarding AB 119, this bill will require the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to develop new methods for estimating CalFresh and California Food Assistance Program participation rates and identifying Californians eligible for program benefits by 2026. It will also submit a legislative report with budgetary and policy recommendations to combat food insecurity and improve state and federal food and nutrition program enrollment. AB 119 seeks to improve the progress made with AB 1967 and AB 518.</p> <p>The Board of Supervisors for the City and County of San Francisco passed a \$16 billion budget that includes significant cuts to address a nearly \$800 million budget deficit. The budget has been signed into law by Mayor Lurie, and it requires most City and County of San Francisco</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>departments to reduce their budget by 15%. It also includes deep cuts to funding that nonprofit agencies rely on.</p> <p>There were conversations about a CalFresh mobile van which would continue the city and county's support in mobile CalFresh outreach through December 2025. The future of this is uncertain and it is being monitored.</p> <p>A discussion/Q&A followed with additional notes below.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Where did we land with the Women, Infants & Children (WIC) Supplemental Nutrition Program?</p> <p>Noriko Lim-Tepper: We can look into it and send out the information.</p> <p>Question: I was also curious if either of the presenters have any impact information from the cuts to SNAP-Ed funding.</p> <p>Noriko Lim-Tepper: We are working with our CalFresh outreach and enrollment team to determine guidance from the state on how they are going to handle the cuts to SNAP-Ed and what are the impacts locally. We're also waiting to see how the state is going to provide guidance to us and then create a plan on post cuts and how that's going to look locally.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Was it an estimated 12,000 folks in San Francisco or households that might be impacted by these cuts?</p> <p>Alex Raffanti: It's households.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: If we're serving 83,000 that's about 15% of the CalFresh enrollment that could be impacted, which is significant.</p> <p>Jennifer LeBarre: One thing that's not clear and I think it goes back to the timeline that Jeimil was mentioning and everybody has mentioned is this will also have an impact on schools particularly school meals. If you're looking at the California universal meals, we can leverage federal funding because of different programs like Provision 2 and community eligibility</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>provision. Particularly, community eligibility provision is tied directly to what's called direct certification. Those are the lists of students that we get from social services and from the state with every child who qualifies for food stamps, welfare as well as Medi-Cal. And again, we will not know the impact of this until things have been fully implemented. But if we have many students who will no longer qualify for those programs, then the direct certification numbers go down and then in turn it has an impact on the school meal program, particularly here in California. So, I think it's the immediate impact when we're thinking about those specific programs, but schools so often use the free and reduced percentage for other things, including grants and how the state funds schools to begin with. It's one of those things where we don't know the answer to it right now. We don't know the impact and we should all be aware that there will be an impact at some point. We're good for 25-26. Universal meals all over the place. It's something that we just need to be aware of.</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>Leah Walton: I do know that SNAP-Ed exists but there is 0 funding in it. It seems that the state has rollover funding for next year, but I am not sure what will happen after that.</p> | |
| <p>8. FSTF priorities, Cissie Bonini (Chair, EatSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies) 2:50 p.m.</p> | <p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 52:20 minute mark and ends at the 1:13:10 minute mark.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini led a discussion on the 2025-2026 Food Security Task Force (FSTF) priorities. One of the primary recommendations from the FSTF 2025 recommendations and a priority is to identify an Office of Citywide Food Coordination. There is also a need to have a centralized information and referral system.</p> <p>Cissie discussed the Commission Streamlining Task Force, and their meeting set for October 15, 2025. The review of the FSTF is on their agenda and there is a need to discuss a plan to attend and/or participate in the meeting.</p> | <p>Follow up with a priority grid at the next FSTF meeting.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>The FSTF is planned to sunset on July 1, 2026. The task force needs to discuss a plan for sunseting by this date unless reauthorized.</p> <p>As done in today's meeting, the FSTF should continue to monitor federal funding cuts and impacts on food security nationally, at the state level, and locally.</p> <p>Whole household coverage is an issue the FSTF should dive into and create recommendations based on the findings.</p> <p>A discussion/Q&A followed with additional notes below.</p> <p>Noriko Lim-Tepper: Were there ideas of continuing to publish the Biennial Food Security Report or extending or amending the timeline?</p> <p>Priscilla Rodriguez: The report is due this October but with everything that has happened this year that is not feasible. The Department of Public Health (DPH) is working to get an extension for that deadline and we're also having conversations on who exactly is going to lead the biennial report whether that again be DPH or if HSA is going to take control of that.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: But that is legislation, right? So wouldn't the legislation need to be modified. I mean not for the extension necessarily, right?</p> <p>Priscilla Rodriguez: Exactly. So, those are the conversations that are currently happening. If new legislation is going to be reintroduced, remembering the legislation that was introduced last year but was tabled, those are the conversations that we need to have. Regardless, it will not be out by October. If anything, we'll get an extension for some time next year.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: We should add this to the list of priorities.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: I'd love to get a bit more information on the commission on commissions and be able to report for the next meeting. I know that the meeting date is set for October 15th. This task force did put together a response to a group that recommended the elimination of a few</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>task forces including the FSTF. We felt that they had a lot of erroneous information and so we did send a letter clarifying the attendance and the activities of the FSTF.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini; Does anyone have anything surrounding the Office of Food Coordination? It was one of our recommendations again this year.</p> <p>Noriko Lim-Tepper: Do we have an idea of who might champion this legislation?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: There were several supervisor offices that were interested in supporting the legislation. Walton's office expressed interest, and I am trying to get in contact with them again.</p> <p>Tiffany Kearney: Based on my experience, Supervisor Connie Chan has expressed interest in food security.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Thank you. We will follow up.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: If the FSTF is reauthorized, we will talk more about the configuration of the task force. Beth Bodner from San Francisco Environment said they would like to be more active participants in the FSTF. HSA's Citywide Food Access Team (CFAT) is doing more work in the food security space but is also not an active member of the FSTF. I am going to ask them to do an update in September or October to share more about their programming.</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>Claudia Llanos: Based on cuts, it would be good to know how many folks would be left out of a food program.</p> | |
| 9. Updates and Emerging Issues 3:10 p.m. | <p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 1:13:10 minute mark and ends at the 1:14:51 minute mark.</p> <p>None</p> <p>Public Comment: None</p> | |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|
| 10. Adjournment 3:25 p.m. | Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m. | None. |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|