

FSTF Meeting Minutes
September 3, 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); 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); 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: Emily Cohen (HSH); Anne Quaintance (Conard House); Geoffrey Grier (SF Recovery Theatre)

Also Present: Arthi Sumanth; Cathy Huang (HSA); Cindy Lin (SFHSA Food Access); Clara Obstfeld (DCYF); Claudia Llanos (HOMEY-SF); Danielle Lundstrom (SFDPH/SNAP-Ed); Emmet Murphy; Eric Chan (SFDPH – Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Fiona McBride (SF HSA Food Access); Laura Urban (Children’s Council of San Francisco); Leah Walton (DAS); Luana Turovskaya; Marianne Szeto (SFDPH); Marina Kan (HSA); Peri Weisberg (SFHSA); Serena Ngo (Hirsch Philanthropy Partners); Tommy McClain (SF HSA Food Access)

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.	Eric Chan 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 August 6, 2025 1:40 p.m.	Raegan Sales makes motion to approve minutes. Jeimil Belamide seconds the motion. 12 approved. 0 opposed. 0 abstained. Motion is passed.	None.

	Public Comment: None.	
5. General public comment 1:45 p.m.	None.	None.
6. FSTF member updates, Jennifer LeBarre (San Francisco Unified School District) 1:50 p.m.	<p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 6:50 minute mark and ends at the 33:45 minute mark.</p> <p>Jennifer LeBarre, the Executive Director of Student Nutrition Services (SNS) at the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), provided a Student Nutrition Services overview to the Food Security Task Force (FSTF). Jennifer shared the Student Nutrition Services' mission, vision and core values including equity, wellness, good food, and sustainability. She also shared core beliefs such as equity, community, wellness, partnership, and accountability.</p> <p>Jennifer provided insight into SFUSD goals. The plan includes 1) nourishing students with good food, 2) creating dignified built environments, 3) supporting a thriving workforce, and 4) building a strong school food structure. If this theory of action is achieved, then it is believed that there will be a student-centered, equitable, and financially stable school food ecosystem with thriving employees that provide dignified meal experiences and engage all students in a positive food culture.</p> <p>In SNS, there are 200 employees (site-based and a central office) and 120 locations (11 stand alone early education sites and 1 charter co-located with an elementary school). All TK-12 schools are community eligibility provision (CEP) meaning that it helps SNS leverage the federal funding coming in to support the program and decrease reliability on state funding. All meals are served for free at all schools. The average daily participation across all programs are as follows: Breakfast – 9,565; lunch – 20,226; snack – 1,127; and supper – 6,023. This totals 7 million meals a year.</p> <p>SNS meal programs are divided into three categories. The first is the McAteer Culinary Center located at the Ruth Asawa School of the Arts (SOTA) and the McAteer Academy. Over \$5million was invested in this site in the 2016 general obligation bond to update this facility. This</p>	None.

	<p>represents 10% of the meals. The second is the Refresh program that is being utilized by 20 middle and high schools. This represents 30% of the meals. The last category is Vended Meals (Revolution Foods) that serves elementary, middle, and high schools. This makes up 60% of the meals.</p> <p>The 2025-2026 key priorities for SNS include 1) nourishing students with good food and 2) creating dignified built environments. The first key priority focuses on a salad bar program implementation, menu alignment across programs, and continued implementation of the Good Food Purchasing policy. The second priority focuses on partnering with the bond team, kitchen modernizations, dining space redesigns, and a new central kitchen.</p> <p>Additional 2025-2026 key priorities for SNS include 3) supporting a thriving workforce and 4) building a strong food culture. The third key priority focuses on increased and improved professional development opportunities, increased and improved communication with dining staff, and the development of a central kitchen staffing plan. The fourth key priority focuses on robust student engagement, robust adult engagement, and reduction in single use plastics.</p> <p>Partner and funding sources include Kodama Foundation, No Kid Hungry, FoodCorps, Sugary Drink Distribution Tax, state funding for kitchen infrastructure and training (KITS), and state funding for the extended learning opportunities program (ELOP).</p> <p>Jennifer discussed the legislative impacts at the federal and state level. Jennifer mentioned that we will not truly know the impact until rules on food stamps and welfare go into effect in 2028. Families are currently not electing to receive SunBucks, and a dip was seen in direct certification for July. The 2026 Appropriations Bill will also have impacts that will be seen once implemented. Regarding state funding, the 2025-2026 budget received continued funding for California's Universal meal program and continued funding for Kitchen Infrastructure and Training.</p> <p>A discussion/Q&A followed with additional notes below.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Raegan Sales: I really appreciated hearing the update on what's going on with SFUSD. I was wondering if you could tell us more about the timeline for the centralized kitchen and what those plans might look like.</p> <p>Jennifer LeBarre: These are still up in the air a little bit until we get all the approvals. We're hoping that we're able to start construction in the next calendar year, 2026. We're looking at a phased in approach for our kitchen because it will take another bond to fully get to where we want to be. Our total goal is to be able to eliminate 80% of the prepackaged meals that are served to our students. That's going to take the central kitchen and continuing to update school sites so that they can move away from the individual service to bulk service. There will be some schools, because of the size of the school or the fact that the school is in a building that we do not own, that will not be receiving the necessary upgrades to that school site. We just can't and it doesn't make sense operationally. We can't use our bond funds to update property that doesn't belong to us. Our intention for the first phase is to be able to do what our vended meal program does but more and better. This means really focusing on local farmers, local producers, those different types of things. It will still be individually prepackaged meals until we are able to update those facilities. As we continue to update facilities, we'll be adding salad bars to elementary schools. We will do this to increase the variety of produce that is offered to our students. Once the full kitchen is totally outfitted, we will be able to start including raw proteins. We can't include raw proteins right now because we don't have the kitchen facility to do that. By doing that, we're going to be able to expand our farm-to-school footprint so that we're including center of the plate options and doing more plant forward options as well. That's our ultimate goal.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: How long have universal meals been in place?</p> <p>Jennifer LeBarre: The 2023 – 2024 school year is when the first California universal meals was and then 2024 – 2025 was the second year. We're in year three now.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Has that had an impact on the uptick of school meals?</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Jennifer LeBarre: Yeah. I mean, it has in schools with mixed incomes. We see more families who may not qualify for the free and reduced meal program. I think it's important to note, and I'm probably sounding like a broken record for some of you, but to qualify for the free or reduced-price meal program, a family of four with two adults working full-time San Francisco minimum wage jobs doesn't qualify. They make around \$48,000. Imagine trying to raise a family of four on that much money and then not being able to qualify for free meals in San Francisco. That's because we have the same eligibility criteria as the 48 other contiguous states, I guess 47 other contiguous states. That has an impact on how families can qualify for the meal program.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: That goes along with our report and what it actually costs to stay in San Francisco.</p> <p>Guillermo Reece: Are there any plans for changing the guidelines? I know I'm sort of wishful thinking about that \$40,000 per year for a family of four. Are there any plans for raising that?</p> <p>Jennifer LeBarre: That would only be my dream. It's something that we in the state of California have been advocating for decades and we have gotten nowhere to do it unfortunately. Hawaii, the territories, and Alaska have different eligibility criteria. They also have different reimbursement criteria. We have been making the argument for years that we're very similar to the situations in Hawaii and Alaska. Recently, it became more expensive to live in San Francisco than Honolulu. Even when we've had more friendly administrations, it hasn't been the time either. There's this notion of quote "you did it to yourself, so why would we help you?" It's been good that the state has been able to kick in the money so that we can have universal meals and ideally, we're going to be able to continue that forever. I think it would have a negative impact on our families if we took that back.</p> <p>Guillermo Reece: Finally, for the last school year do you have any data on what the price is per lunch per student? How much is the food cost and meal cost?</p> <p>Jennifer LeBarre: So, I could look up our food cost quickly. Unfortunately, you know, there's a lot of numbers here and they don't always stay. So, I can follow back up with that information.</p> <p>Public Comment:</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Emmet Murphy: I have two children in SFUSD and just want to say thank you so much. We really benefit from those meals. They're in elementary school, so thank you for your work in the school district. My question was like Guillermo's question. I'm familiar with us receiving the menus and we look at it and I appreciate the fact that you're looking at more healthy choices and you and doing it in-house so to speak. I have two questions. Does it look as if you can do it cheaper and what is the stability of the donors?</p> <p>Jennifer LeBarre: I'm glad your students can benefit from our meal program. Always great to hear from a parent. What I'll do is I'll give you a comparison between what our reimbursement is from the state and feds and what our meal cost is. I will use our Revolution Foods as an example. We do know that when we are able to pull things in-house, as we have done with our Refresh programs at our comprehensive middle and high schools, our food costs are significantly lower. We also know that once we're able to procure for the entire district, we will be able to leverage more of our purchasing power to be able to do that. Even with our lower food cost right now for Refresh, we're only able to have purchasing power across 21 school sites including McAteer. While that's powerful, it's not as powerful as 120 sites. We do know that we will see the returns on that as well. We are not administered at the federal level by the Department of Education, but rather the United States Department of Agriculture. I think that it is savvy for multiple reasons because this program was started back in 1946 to help children who were nutrient deficient because of the Depression, a lot of it is for farmers as well and they're a very powerful lobby. When funding is removed from the national school lunch program, it doesn't only hurt kids, it also hurts farmers. A lot of times people are more willing to listen to farmers than children's advocates. It's a good push pull for multiple reasons.</p> <p>Clara Obstfeld [chat]: What is the breakdown of breakfast after the bell models in schools?</p> <p>Jennifer LeBarre: We have breakfast in the classroom, which means that food is delivered to every single class, and it is served during the first 10 to 15 minutes of the school day, and all the students are eating together. We also have a second chance breakfast which is typically paired with before school breakfast and then we pick a passing period after school has started like a recess time and students who were not able to access breakfast at the beginning of the school</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>can access it at that time. We also have a grab-and-go breakfast which can be before school, or it can be part of the second chance, and it is a pre-bagged breakfast that students take and go to their classrooms or go to another part of the campus.</p>	
<p>7. FSTF priorities, Cissie Bonini (Chair, Eat SF/Vouchers 4 Veggies) 2:20 p.m.</p>	<p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 33:45 minute mark and ends at the 1:10:40 minute mark.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini shared a chart of actionable items for the FSTF. It is divided into quarters and activities that the FTSF will be accomplishing. It gives an idea of time frames and items that the FSTF will be working on throughout the year.</p> <p>There is a Commission Streamlining Task Force meeting that is coming up on October 15th at 1 p.m. The FSTF will be evaluated and discussed during that meeting. Cissie shared the website for the commission in the chat. Part of the 2025 FSTF recommendations, as well as past recommendations, includes a centralized food coordination body with a strong community advisory board. There have been conversations around the need for the FTSF if the community advisory board is created. There is no update on the status of the community advisory board, but the FSTF would need to be reauthorized before July 1, 2026, if no advisory board is created. The FSTF is continuing to advocate for the creation of this legislation.</p> <p>A discussion/Q&A followed with additional notes below.</p> <p>Chester Williams: I think it will depend on if the streamlining proposal seems solid. I don't know if we could do it. I don't think we can decide right now. I think we should see where they're going and then keep the alternate selection as a backup. I want to hear both sides before I decide at least with me.</p> <p>Jade Quizon: I thought the proposal that we made last year for the subcommittee was that the advisory council would be an evolution of the FSTF. Is the plan to go forward with the proposal that the Reimagining Food Coordination subcommittee created?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Yes, it is our proposal which is listed on our website and was voted on.</p>	<p>Bring a draft of what the reauthorization legislation might look like and present it at a future FSTF meeting.</p> <p>Discuss 2026 recommendations during the December FSTF meeting.</p>

	<p>Guillermo Reece: Can you go over the options again?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Yes. Option 1 was to advocate to continue to FSTF at the October 15th meeting, get Board of Supervisors (BOS) to reauthorize the FSTF which is set to sunset on July 1, 2026, and advocate for a future food coordination that is a centralized city body and has a community advisory board. Option 2 was to let the FSTF sunset and advocate for the new structure.</p> <p>Guillermo Reece: Thank you. I am with Chester, and I would like to hear more about the options before deciding.</p> <p>Michelle Kim: I think it's hard for us as a committee to sunset and then re-up something again. I think it's better to kind of keep the same status quo, right? Keep the same thing until we can figure something else out. I feel like once it ends, it ends and then it's hard to have a platform community wise just to advocate. I think this is a good opportunity for us to come together and brainstorm. Just to reiterate, I think it's hard for us to sense it and then not have this window of opportunity to get together. I feel like if we need to coordinate outside of this committee or the Department of Public Health (DPH), I think it'll be a lot more difficult. That's just my opinion.</p> <p>Katie Jackson: I'm kind of leaning towards the first as well for that reason. If we just focus on the citywide and it doesn't pass, then it's kind of like well what happens to this work? I would vote for the first. I mean we're not voting today, but that's kind of my thought in terms of where I would be leaning.</p> <p>Raegan Sales: I agree with what Chester and Guillermo have mentioned about definitely following what's going on with the commission on commissions and how that could play out either in our favor or against us before formally acting. I also agree with Michelle and Katie in terms of the fact that it's a lot harder to get it back once it's gone. I think it makes sense to try to advocate for both concurrently so that we at least have the FSTF even if the bigger and better version doesn't come to fruition very quickly. That's where I'm at.</p> <p>Noriko Lim-Tepper: I was going to agree in support of Guillermo, Chester, and Reagan, but I say, could this be an opportunity to transition the FSTF into this formalized advisory body? This body</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>has been formally vetted, voted on by the BOS, and already has a process of recruitment. I would just ask this advisory body, who's going to do the recruitment? Who is going to do the vetting and support all the other community members if we already have an established process of selecting membership.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: I wanted to also highlight that there's a slight difference between the commission on commissions and the reauthorization. One thing that we have done in the past when the grand jury released a report recommending the dissolution of several task forces, and the FSTF was one of those, was write a letter because there was a lot of misinformation about the San Francisco FSTF and we were greatly concerned. I do want to make sure that any misinformation about our task force is very clear and not part of a decision process for that October commission meeting. Things like we had a lot of cancelled meetings. I can't remember some of the details, but it was just not factual. We created a letter and that's posted on our website. The letter clarifies a lot of that erroneous information. Just mentioning that piece as a little nuance for that particular group as well.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: One thing that I am going to ask folks to do around this Commission Streamlining Task Force meeting is if you feel like the FSTF is or has been an important body in San Francisco, even if it changes form if we restructure, is provide comment. Public comment can be made at the meeting on October 15th at 1 p.m. What I would encourage folks to do is send a letter supporting the FSTF and clarify some of the issues such as numerous meetings being cancelled. FSTF meetings are well attended meetings. FSTF produces deliverables every year including recommendations. It is a space for government, community, and community-based organizations to get together and hear about issues around food security. There is no other current body replacing that, right? Eric or P will send out some more information about that.</p> <p>Chester Williams: Do you know who sits on that council that will be hearing this on October 15th?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: I don't. I know very little about it. I know the individuals are listed on their website.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Cissie Bonini: Moving on to the FSTF force reauthorization. This is a meeting. Generally, how this works is we would meet with a couple supervisors. There are a couple folks that have met with supervisors or supervisor staff to talk about the recommendations from last year. There were several supervisors that were particularly interested in food security, and we've listed some of those here. Walton, Chan, Chen, and Fielder. I'm encouraging you to attend these meetings to see if supervisors are interested in supporting the reauthorization. What would be great is that we can combine those meetings with supervisors with this centralized food body recommendation so that we can do both at the same time. We will find out more details about what it takes to reauthorize. We may ask and this goes down into the next agenda item. We won't be voting on this now, but this may be an item to vote on later. Do we want to look at the current seats as they are for the FSTF or do we want to suggest some changes? For example, Citywide Food Access Team (CFAT) is not represented on the task force even though they're an important body within HSA and in supporting food security in San Francisco. There is also DPH, which does not currently have a seat after Paula left. The Department of Environment is also interested in potentially having a seat as they do a lot with food waste in the city and are interested in food security and its related issues. We should decide to move forward with reauthorization, which sounds like we're doing. What we'll do is bring a draft of what that reauthorization might look like to the group.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: The next issue is the 2026 recommendations. It feels like we just finished up 2025 recommendations and that is true and then we moved into the next years. The time frame we're looking at is last year we started the process around December and then it was published in March. We're hoping to get it published a little earlier this year. I think the time frame is about the same. November and December are difficult months for members of the task force. Everyone's so busy feeding folks during the holidays and much more. We will start the process at the December meeting.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: There is also the food equity report. Eric, can you provide an update?</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Eric Chan: I'm in communication with DPH leadership and they don't really have any updates as of now. If we decide to move forward with developing the report, there will be an extension to sometime next year, if not early 2027.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: We will try to get clarity from DPH leadership around this. For those of you wondering what this is, this is the biennial food equity report. It is legislation. It's required to be published every two years. The FSTF does play a role in this process where we give feedback on some of the data and recommendations.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Other priorities include funding cuts, MediCal/CalAIM and food as medicine, centralized information and referral, housing and food, and disaster planning.</p> <p>Public Comment: None</p>	
<p>8. San Francisco Food Coordination Structure, Cissie Bonini (Chair, EatSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies) 2:45 p.m.</p>	<p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 1:10:40 minute mark and ends at the 1:18:35 minute mark.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini discussed the food coordination structure in San Francisco and what it should look like. FSTF members were asked if they were interested in advocating for this structure and participating in meetings with BOS and other stakeholders. Other stakeholders were defined as city department heads, Mayor's office, and supervisor staffers. Using the Reimagining Food Coordination Subcommittee proposal, the FSTF will meet with supervisor offices to discuss the proposal, receive feedback, and determine next steps.</p> <p>A discussion/Q&A followed with additional notes below.</p> <p>Jennifer LeBarre: Depending on timing and who we are meeting with, I would be happy to help. I just have limits on what I can do as a quasi-city employee.</p> <p>Katie Jackson: I am happy to participate as well.</p> <p>Jade Quizon: I would like to help.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	<p>Raegan Sales: Depending on availability, I would like to throw my name in there.</p> <p>Chester Williams: Put me in for the Walton meeting.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Great, we will report back to the group once the meetings have been completed.</p> <p>Jade Quizon: I just saw on the priority spreadsheet that you had identified Walton and Chan as potential champions or supporters of it. Just curious when was the last time you met with them and when did they express that interest?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Well, with Walton we wanted to meet with him because there was definitely interest. I'm not sure of the support for it but interested in the topic. So, let's clarify that. Part of this meeting focuses on the recommendations, answering questions, and giving information based on all the work the task force has been doing. Key community involvement.</p> <p>Jade Quizon: With the task force members who just volunteered to meet with them, are we going to have another premeeting or is this the premeeting before meeting?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: There will be a premeeting. We'll have either Eric or P reach out to you about that.</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>Cindy Lin: Yes. I just wanted to follow up on Jade's question. So, if I'm understanding your response correctly, you have not yet met with Supervisor Walton, but you think he has an interest in the topic. Correct? And same with Chan?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Correct.</p> <p>Emmet Murphy: For the letters to the supervisors, it would be helpful to have some high-level talking points, metrics, and accomplishments that we could speak to. Perhaps that could be pushed out in the mailing list for members of the public just to have targeted letters that could provide high-level points as to why it's been impactful.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>9. Updates and Emerging Issues 2:55 p.m.</p>	<p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 1:18:35 minute mark and ends at the 1:21:12 minute mark.</p> <p>Raegan Sales: I wanted to share that Children's Council has our annual family fair coming up called City Kids on September 27th. Tickets are still available. We'd love to have any families join us for a lot of fun activities. We're also giving away free organic produce to the families that join us. It's always a fun time and great to see the community out there. I'll put a link in the chat.</p> <p>Jade Quizon: I wanted to share that we're recruiting for host and planning committees for our third annual San Francisco Food Action Summit. I'll drop the form in the chat if anyone wants to join.</p> <p>Public Comment: None</p>	
<p>10. Adjournment 3:15 p.m.</p>	<p>Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.</p>	<p>None.</p>