

FSTF Meeting Minutes
June 4, 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); Priti Rane (DPH/Nutrition Services); Tiffany Kearney (DAS); Michelle Kim (DCYF); Emily Cohen (HSH); Cissie Bonini (UCSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies – EatSF); Anne Quaintance (Conard House); Chester Williams (Community Living Campaign); Katie Jackson (Project Open Hand); Guillermo Reece (SFAAFBC); Jade Quizon (FAACTS); Noriko Lim-Tepper (SFMFB); Raegan Sales (Children’s Council of SF); Hannah Grant (Meals on Wheels SF); Lura Jones (Leah’s Pantry)

Task Force Members Not Present: Jennifer LeBarre (SFUSD); Mei Ling Hui (SF Park & Rec); Geoffrey Grier (SF Recovery Theatre)

Also Present: Beth Bodner (SF Environment); Claudia Llanos (HOMEY-SF); Eric Chan (SFDPH – Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Fiona McBride (HSA); Melinda Gordon; Priscilla Rodriguez (SFDPH – Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Serena Ngo (Hirsch Philanthropy Partners); Cathy Huang (HSA); Cindy Lin (HSA); Jack English (SF Mayor’s Office); Marriane Szeto (SFDPH/ShapeUp SF); Melinda Martin (SFDPH-CHEP); Tiffany Lei (DCYF); Tommy McClain (SF HAS Food Access); Luana Turovskaya; Marina Kan (HSA); Tanya Amador; Kimberly Jower (SFDPD); Peri Weisberg (SFHSA); Sean Brooks (SFMFB); Michael McAlpin; Lisa Gulezian; Kim Wong (SFDPH/ShapeUp SF)

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 May 7, 2025 1:40 p.m.	Draft minutes approved as is. Noriko Lim-Tepper makes motion to approve minutes with corrections. Chester Williams seconds the motion.	None.

	None opposed. Three abstained. Motion is passed. Public Comment: None.	
5. General public comment 1:45 p.m.	None.	None.
6. City budget updates, Jack English (Mayor's Office) 1:50 p.m.	Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 0:05 minute mark and ends at 37:22 the minute mark. Jack English from the Mayor's office joined the Food Security Task Force to present a summary of food security initiatives and funding levels in the mayor's proposed budget. The budget reflects an effort to close the budget deficit of roughly \$870 million over two years. The presented budget was split into two main groups which are 1) continuing programs under the Department of Public Health (DPH) and Human Services Agency (HSA) and 2) programs tied to the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax (SDDT). Below is a layout of Mayor Lurie's proposed budget for FY 24-25, FY 25-26, and FY 26-27 related to continuing programs. Upcoming fiscal years begin on July 1st of each year. Purchasing Power Programs (HSA): FY 24-25 is \$2.25 million, FY 25-26 is \$2.20 million, and FY 26-27 is \$2.15 million. Supplemental Meal Services (HSA): FY 24-25 is \$1.80 million, FY 25-26 is \$6.05 million, and FY 26-27 is \$6.05 million. Community Food Production (HSA): FY 24-25 is \$1.25 million, FY 25-26 is \$320,000, and FY 26-27 is \$320,000. Neighborhood Based Grocery Access (HSA): FY 24-25 is \$7.20 million, FY 25-26 is \$8.70 million, and FY 26-27 is \$8.70 million.	None.

	Grocery Vouchers (DPH): FY 24-25 is \$510,000, FY 25-26 is \$510,000 and FY 26-27 is \$510,000. Food Support (DPH): FY 24-25 is \$1.29 million, FY 25-26 is \$1.27million, and FY 26-27 is \$1.29 million. Holiday Food Giveaway (DPH): FY 24-25 is \$500,000, FY 25-26 is \$500,000, and FY 26-27 is \$500,000. Supplemental Nutrition Program (DPH): FY 24-25 is \$130,000, FY 25-26 is \$130,000, and FY 26-27 is \$130,000. Congregate Meals (HSA): FY 24-25 is \$13.00 million, FY 25-26 is \$13.80 million, and FY 26-27 is \$13.10 million. Grocery Pantry (HSA): FY 24-25 is \$3.20 million, FY 25-26 is \$3.00 million, and FY 26-27 is \$3.00 million. Home Delivered Groceries (HSA): FY 24-25 is \$1.60 million, FY 25-26 is \$1.60 million, and FY 26-27 is \$1.60 million. Home Delivered Meals (HSA): FY 24-25 is \$16.80 million, FY 25-26 is \$17.40 million, and FY 26-27 is \$17.40 million. Nutrition as Health (HSA): FY 24-25 is \$600,000, FY 25-26 is \$600,000, and FY 26-27 is \$600,000. Below is a layout of Mayor Lurie’s proposed budget for FY 24-25, FY 25-26, and FY 26-27 related to SDDT programs. Upcoming fiscal years begin on July 1st of each year. Health Community Grants (DPH)/Policy Systems, and Environment Grants (DPH): FY 24-25 is \$3.08 million, FY 25-26 is \$0, and FY 26-27 is \$0. Healthy Schools Grants (DCYF/SFUSD): FY 24-25 is \$300,000, FY 25-26 is \$300,000, and FY 26-27 is \$300,000. Nutrition (DPH/SFUSD): FY 24-25 is \$0, FY 25-26 is \$250,000, and FY 26-27 is \$250,000.	
--	---	--

	Healthy Food Purchasing Supplement (DPH): FY 24-25 is \$1.00 million, FY 25-26 is \$1.00 million, and FY 26-27 is \$1.00 million. Support Staffing Costs (DPH): FY 24-25 is \$540,000, FY 25-26 is \$560,000, and FY 26-27 is \$580,000. Support Staffing Costs – DPH Dental Hygiene – Sealant application for SFUSD Students: FY 24-25 is \$380,000, FY 25-26 is \$390,000, and FY 26-27 is \$410,000. Oral Health Community Task Force Grants (DPH): FY 24-25 is \$450,000 FY 25-26 is \$0, and FY 26-27 is \$0. SDDT Funded City Agencies (HSA): FY 24-25 is \$5.29 million, FY 25-26 is \$7.52 million, and FY 26-27 is \$7.48 million. SDDT Funded City Agencies (OEWD): FY 24-25 is \$150,000, FY 25-26 is \$150,000, and FY 26-27 is \$160,000. SDDT Funded City Agencies (DCYF/SFUSD): FY 24-25 is \$1.68 million, FY 25-26 is \$1.45 million, and FY 26-27 is \$1.45 million. The total funding for food programs in FY 24-25 is \$57.7 million, FY 25-26 is \$60.2 million, and FY 26-27 is \$59.5 million. A discussion/Q&A followed with additional notes below. Cissie Bonini: Can you review the redirecting of SDDT funding? Jack English: In fiscal year 25 we had \$12.7 million coming in for SDDT program funding. The controller’s office has revised their revenue projection down for the upcoming fiscal years to \$11.6 million. We lose out on about \$1.1 million of revenue going from one year to the next. We absorb that \$1.1 million and we redirect funds from smaller community grant groups to the larger HSA portfolio. It’s seen in that first large line under SDDT programs that goes from \$3.08 million to zero in FY 25-26 and 26-27. As that \$3.08 million goes to zero, we increase the	
--	---	--

	funding of SDDT funded agency HSA from \$5.3 million to about \$7.5 million. That increase of about \$2.3 million for HSA is distributed in those other cells above. Cissie Bonini: Is there any particular reason that there was a switch in funding from DPH to HSA? Jack English: We're working on wider discussion points to share with the Soda Tax Advisory Committee as well, but the broad element is the concentration to bolster HSA's programming of food security as part of the potential of federal reductions there. We're trying to backfill and shore up against that as much as possible. Katie Jackson: I was curious about the projection for the revenue for the soda tax. What is considered in that projection? Jack English: Soda tax revenue comes to the general fund. It's sort of in this placeholder department where various general taxes come into the city and the controller's office manages forecasting that. So, when we're doing things like forecasting business revenue, property tax revenue, and all those sorts of very large things that are in the billions of dollars, they are also forecasting for certain small taxes like the soda tax, the cigarette litter abatement tax, which is about \$3 million a year. They're doing all those forecasts over a five-year or four-year projection period. Jade Quizon: Thanks for your presentation. Last year there was a similar presentation where we were taking soda tax funding and reallocating that to HSA. I'm just still confused about how that whole accounting works because just knowing that the soda tax funding goes into the general fund, right? How do you even allocate out of the general fund to HSA? We said this last year and it's still feeling funky this year especially seeing an increase in overall food security programs too. Why do we even need to take funding away from the soda tax grantees? Especially considering that these are multi-year grants. Some are entering their last year in the grant. It just cuts off funding in the middle of a contract. We enter these contracts with our government, and it just doesn't sew a lot of trust.	
--	---	--

	Jack English: We're working to prepare our presentation for an upcoming meeting with the Sugary Drink Distributor Tax Advisory Committee (SDDTAC). We can include more detail with that there. In terms of contract timing, I'd have to refer you to the departments on things like contracting processes and that sort of thing. For our presentation to the advisory committee, we can try and clarify a bit more of how the flow of funds sort of occurs between the departments and the general fund and from the taxpayers and that sort of thing. Cissie Bonini: So, regarding the money that went from the soda tax, and it's particularly from the healthy communities' grants and the policy systems environmental grants, it is in a slush fund or is it actually allocated to a particular HSA program? Jack English: I will defer to HSA on the specific line. They've made certain increases on certain lines of this larger document. HSA would be able to clarify exactly which ones went up by exactly which dollars. Jade Quizon: The Food and Agriculture Action Coalition Towards Sovereignty (FAACTS) sent a candidate questionnaire to mayoral and supervisor candidates last year and there was a specific question around accepting recommendations by the SDDTAC and Mayor Luri said verbatim "it's critical that our city delivers funds from the 2016 SDDT to the communities that need them most. The SDDTAC is well positioned to provide recommendations to the mayor on how we can best deploy these tax dollars. I would give SDDTAC a clear and direct line of communication to the mayor's office to ensure these recommendations are heard and acted upon." So, I think decisions were made by the mayor and may have been influenced by that answer. I'd love to see the mayor live up to his promises. I also had a more general question on the federal funding impacts that you touched upon earlier. We know that these are coming and they're going to be unprecedented and detrimental to our communities. There's 65,000 people who use SNAP in the city alone. There are more who are qualified and eligible for it. I'm wondering if there's any impact assessments that the mayor's office is doing because this funding isn't just going to impact individuals and families directly but have impacts on the city beyond what we would even expect.	
--	---	--

	Jack English: We are working with departments that have the expert knowledge in these very specific areas like HSA for SNAP programming or public health for Medicaid. I will not specifically choose to use the word threat to funding sources. One of the major risks that we're aware of at this point is risks to Medicaid reimbursement to the city. That's why Mayor Luri has taken the steps of setting up a reserve of approximately \$400 million to offset losses of federal funding in the medical space. It will continue to evolve as federal action continues to develop at a very unpredictable rate and breadth. We are going to focus on the things that the mayor can control and that is our response to those issues as they come up. Katie Jackson: I just had one quick question. In the soda tax section, there's a line item for nutrition DPH. Did you say that's related to early childhood nutrition programming? Jack English: Yes, that was a new item recommended by the Soda Tax Advisory Committee. Anne Quaintance: I was just curious as far as a historical low 1% cost of doing business. So, I'm imagining that for most food programs only receiving a 1% cost of doing business would decrease in the number of meals and groceries being able to be provided. Is it only going to be 1%? We're all building our budgets for July 1st and that is going to cut services at the end of the day for most of us. Jack English: So yes, as part of Mayor's Luri's budget preparation originally, we had no cost of doing business (CODB) in the first year and a 2.4% in the second year. To accommodate the realities of cost of doing business going up, we shifted to a 1% in the first year and then 1.4% in the second year. We understand that the broad city policy of doing that does not fit exactly every shoe that goes with each organization, and we'd want to work with departments on how they work with their contracting out partners for finding any solutions to potential changes in service. Anne Quaintance: I really appreciate that and I'm sure there's advocacy that will come out that will really help the mayor's office understand for a business that a 1% cost in doing business literally just with vendor increases. Unfortunately, we'll have to make some changes if there really is only a 1%. It just isn't possible to keep services at the same levels. We'll also be short	
--	---	--

	staffed because people certainly can't necessarily only receive those kinds of increases. A lot of nonprofits provide salary increases based on that. So obviously 1% is pretty disastrous. Katie Jackson: Project Open Hand is contracted for the congregate nutrition program as you can see. We just went to the Department of Aging Services (DAS) commission this morning to share the impacts of service. We will be no longer be doing weekend service because of our inabilities to do that. Cissie Bonini: We want to continue to recommend reinstating the full funding especially during this time when the safety net is so under attack and given the fact that we've seen a 23% increase in food costs over the last three years. We're really seeing a lot of pressures at a lot of ends, but we are happy to chat with you about that a little bit more. Raegan Sales: I'm glad to see that the SDDTAC recommendation around Early Childhood Education (ECE) has been adopted, but I was wondering if you could explain the decision for that money to go directly to San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) rather than it being open to an RFP process. Jack English: I maybe have misspoken that it's direct to SFUSD in terms of it being categorized as an SFUSD program like in our general this is a school program of some kind. I know it's tied to DPH in the commission in the committee's recommendation. We could get more specificity on that if the committee intended to instead have the funding go out a different way or something like that. We can get confirmation on what their intention is, but we just categorize it as a childcare related program. So, tying it with SFUSD in that case. We can get more clarification on that. Public Comment: None.	
7. FSTF member updates, Priti Rane (DPH/WIC) 2:20 p.m.	Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here . This agenda item starts at the 37:22 minute mark and ends at the 1:13:04 minute mark.	None.

	Prini Rane with the Department of Public Health (DPH)/Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) presented on the SFDPH WIC program. Key services include healthy food benefits, nutrition education and counseling, breastfeeding support, and referrals to healthcare and social services. The goal of the WIC program is to improve health outcomes and reduce nutrition-related risks during critical stages of growth and development. WIC is a federally funded nutrition program. The unduplicated participation count in the SFDPH WIC program from 2020 – 2024 has increased from 11,990 on 2020 to 13,468 in 2024. There is a high need for the program and retention is high. The state WIC program determines a caseload target for SFDPH WIC to reach. The allocated caseload is 9,100 participants each month. Based on fiscal year 24 – 25 data, participation count has been close to the caseload target. Regarding the race and ethnicity participation breakdown as of April 2025, 59.50% are Hispanic/Latino, 20.60% are Asian, 9.48% are other, 7.12% are Black, and 3.30% are White. For total benefit redemption from 2021 – 2024, the total in 2021 was \$8.7 million, 2022 was \$10.9 million, 2023 was \$9.3 million, and 2024 was \$9.6 million. There was higher redemption in 2022 due to formula shortages. For total grocery store transactions from 2021 – 2024, there were 166,661 in 2021, 171,159 in 2022, 170,816 in 2023, and 187,102 in 2024. Per 2018 – 2020 Mother and Infant Health Assessment (MIHA) data, prevalence of food insecurity during pregnancy in San Francisco among prenatal WIC participants was 40.1%. In March 2025, families redeemed over \$800,000 benefits at local grocery stores. There were \$14 million in benefits issues in 2024 and 70% redeemed the benefits. The average benefit amount per family is roughly \$150 - \$200/month. EatSF vouchers provide \$700,000 annually to prenatal participants which adds an additional \$40/month. Priti discussed the WIC Farmers' Market Program and moving from paper vouchers to the card. Families will be able to use the card for the farmers' market benefit and for regular fruit and vegetable WIC benefits at the farmers' market. There will be one card with three benefit types. The QR code is only for farmers and farmers' market transactions. The magnetic strip is for	
--	--	--

	grocery store transactions. The first benefit is the WIC cash-value benefit that can be used at both grocery stores and farmers' markets. The second benefit is the WIC Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (FMNP) that can be used at farmers and farmers' markets only. This benefit remains at \$30 per season. The third benefit is the WIC/California Nutrition Incentive Program (CNIP) match benefits that can only be used at farmers and farmers' markets. Priti shared current challenges to the WIC program. Staffing continues to be one of the biggest challenges. The current workload is 822 participants per one full-time employee (FTE). The recommended workload is 500-600 participants per one FTE. The current appointment wait time is 6-8 weeks. There are Human Resources (HR) delays which lead to a lengthy training process. The demand for services continues to remain high. There is also the possibility of remote services ending after September 30th, 2026. There are funding status and policy implications that were discussed. In March 2025, Senate passed a Continuing Resolution (CR) funding the government through September 30th. The CR includes \$7.6 billion for WIC – an increase of over \$500 million from FY 24. Congress is considering significant cuts to safety net programs like Medicaid and SNAP. While WIC is not directly targeted, indirect impacts are expected. A discussion/Q&A followed with additional notes below. Katie Jackson: I have a list of questions. I was curious about in the community is there programming to provide space for unhoused women who want to breastfeed and what does that look like? Priti Rane: We provide support. For example, if a person is unhoused and say doesn't have refrigeration or doesn't have a place to store food there is food packaged specifically for that. The same thing goes for breastfeeding. If a person wants to lactate but doesn't have power, we give out pumps that are battery operated. We make sure that there is enough accommodation if the parent is committed and wants to do it.	
--	---	--

	Katie Jackson: The other question I had was about your recommendation around staffing ratios and I was just curious where that comes from. Priti Rane: It varies from place to place. That recommendation though is from US Department of Agriculture (USDA). Every state does things a little differently. There are some states that only have registered dietitians on staff and then we have California where we're so huge and so diverse that just the dietitian model is not going to work for us. Cissie Bonini: Are you finding barriers with the hiring freezes? If so, is that something that the the Food Security Task Force (FSTF) could do something about? Priti Rane: Fortunately, there was a lot of justification that needed to be provided. The freeze happened in January. Some of the positions were released but not all of them. Some of the positions have been released and so we're able to move forward with the position but it's still a process. We were trying to help educate the mayor's office around it not being only administrative but frontline in doing the work in the community. We need local advocacy around HR, and we need protection to the cash value benefit. We're afraid that if that goes away, that's going to really hurt the program and families. Cissie Bonini: Also, for the supplement that we offer pregnant people, the \$40, it hasn't increased the entire time we've been doing this program, which has been since 2016. Public Comment: None	
8. San Francisco Marin Food Bank pop-up pantries closure update, Sean Brooks (SFMFB)2:50 p.m.	Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 1:13:04 minute mark and ends at the 1:41:35 minute mark. Sean Brooks and Noriko Lim Tepper with the San Francisco Marin Food Bank (SFMFB) provided updates on the closure of SFMFB pop-up pantry (PUP) program. Many Food Bank partner pantries closed early in the Covid pandemic. The Food Bank partnered with SF county disaster workers and community volunteers to start mass grocery distributions in outdoor public	None.

	settings, distributing produce and surplus federal food to all in need. Th program was funded by a mix of county, federal, and private support. At the peak, there were 22 locations serving 22,000 participants per week, with some sites serving 1300+ in 4 hours. Sean provided a pop-up pantry overview. Participants were all enrolled in the Food Bank database. Timeslots were assigned to shorten lines. Households were deduplicated across the Food Bank network. Distribution was converted from pre-bagged to farmers market-style with choice. The standard menu featured seasonal produce, a protein, and a grain. SFMFB began closing the program after losing significant financial support. The last distribution is Friday, June 6th, 2025. Participants of the PUP program were initially notified of the June 2025 closure in late 2023. The Food Bank started actively transferring and waitlisting participants at Food Bank partner pantries and community markets in late 2024. The Food Bank transferred over 2,600 participants to available capacity since November 2024. There is limited space still available in some areas. To date, over 80% of the remaining approximately 7,000 participants have been added to partner pantry waitlists. Wait times for many will be long. Sean reflected on the closure of the pop-up pantries. Grocery distribution is very scalable. The Food Bank is a community resource. Donated produce is cheap, healthy, and (mostly) cross-cultural. The Food Bank is exploring cultural menu customization but is it expensive and complicated to coordinate with such a diverse community. In terms of next steps, the Food Bank is investing in Community Markets and equitable access. They are continuing conversations about better public and nonprofit collaboration and coordination. The Food Bank is advocating for public support for nonprofit food distribution capacity growth to shorten waitlists. They are also advocating for public investment to improve and bolster CalFresh access given likely dramatic cuts to SNAP/CalFresh. A discussion/Q&A followed with additional notes below.	
--	---	--

	Noriko Lim-Tepper: Thank you Sean for coming here and presenting and just reinforcing that the need is going to continue to grow as we see proposed cuts from the federal level and the state. We do need to collaborate with our local community organizations to increase that capacity to ensure people have access to food. Tiffany Kearney: Can you tell me where the community markets that you're doing are located? Sean Brooks: There's one that we are currently operating two days a week down in China Basin at Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation's (TNDC) former community market. They were the first one to launch a community market. We're expanding there. We'll be there five days a week. We're also opening a market at another one of TNDC's locations that again they've been gracious to let us use at the Willie B. Kennedy housing in the Western Addition. Anne Quaintance: I was just curious, if you had the funding, would you have kept these pop-up pantries or was it ultimately better to kind of close these and move into something else while trying to expand it to serve the people that were going? Sean Brooks: Given the high demand, it wasn't our intention to close the pop-ups before we had to. That said, they are outside and it's challenging. It's a Covid era program so it does take a lot of effort to keep those going rain or shine. Cissie Bonini: As Anne mentioned, waitlists are a real issue and eliminating them is a huge part of our recommendations. If your budget ask is passed, will that impact those waitlists? How do we find out more about this ask? Noriko Lim-Tepper: I can forward the local policy agenda, and I do want to reiterate that this is focusing on the local community organizations that we partner with to increase their capacity. The idea is increasing capacity means less people on waitlists. I just want to give a shout out to our community market partners who we've been working with in the last year to open these markets. It's just another mechanism to serve our community. I can forward all that information to you after the call.	
--	--	--

	Tiffany Kearney: Can you explain the difference between the community markets like the community markets that are now being hosted at TNDC and the other pantry sites? Sean Brooks: The way we envision a community market is that it's an indoor setting that's dedicated and looks like a small grocery store. You know, things are on shelves, well presented. People can have an opportunity to go in and touch the products they want as they would in a grocery store. There still may be item limits on how many they can take. The idea is that we can provide some choice, right? So, it's a little more of an opportunity to say, "Okay, we're going to give you a range of proteins, a range of grains, you know, you can pick from the different items." The choice aspect is critical to how we're thinking about this. The idea is to try to help folks navigate to supportive services that they are interested in. So, bringing in service providers and/or service navigators to help refer them to different social services. We serve tens of thousands of people through our programs, through our partners, and even the ones that we run ourselves that don't go traditionally to a nonprofit. They're coming to get food, but they're not necessarily engaging for other services. We want to try to bridge that gap and try to get people connected to those social services as well. Public Comment: None	
9. FSTF 2025 recommendations update, Cissie Bonini (Chair, EatSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies) 3:05 p.m.	Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 1:41:35 minute mark and ends at the 1:44:25 minute mark. Priscilla Rodriguez provided updates on the 2025 Food Security Task Force Recommendations. Three meetings were held with Board of Supervisor staffers. The FSTF was able to meet with 10 out of eleven offices. Supervisor Melgar's office was not able to be reached. The next step for the FSTF is to meet with Mayor Lurie's office and schedule individual meetings with each supervisor. The FSTF is also interested in meeting with department heads and presenting the recommendations. Public Comment: None	None.

10. Updates and Emerging Issues 3:15 p.m.	Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 1:44:25 minute mark and ends at the 1:49:10 minute mark. FSTF members provided updates and emerging issues. Jeimil Belamide provided updates on the able-bodied adults without dependents (ABAWD) waiver. They received a memo from California Department of Developmental Services (CDDS). The state is currently operating or thought they were operating under a waiver of that work requirement until January 31st, 2027, but they received the memos last week that shortened that waiver period to January 31st, 2026. California is planning to apply for an extension of that waiver at the end of this year. Beth Bodner [Chat] announced their funding opportunity that's closing June 6th, 2025. Public Comment: None	
11. Adjournment 3:30 p.m.	Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.	None.