File# 151244 Received in Connector 24(13)16 for.

Food Security Hearing Budget and Finance Committee

April 13th, 2016

San Francisco Food Security Task Force





Introduction

Paula Jones, PhD Senior Health Planner, Population Health Division SF Department of Public Health

Hearing Agenda

- Background/Context (*Paula Jones, DPH*)
- Status report on high priority programs:
 CalFresh (*Tiana Wertheim, SFHSA*)
 DAAS nutrition programs (*Linda Lau, DAAS*)
 Fruit and vegetable vouchers (*Cissie Bonini, EatSF*)
 SRO tenants' food security survey (*Karen Gruneisen, ECS*)
- Budget and Policy recommendations (*Teri Olle, SF Marin Food Bank*)
- •Questions?

Food Insecurity in San Francisco

- Food *Insecurity* exists when the ability to obtain and prepare nutritious food is uncertain or not possible.
- < 200% of poverty highest risk for food insecurity
 - 1 in 4 San Franciscans at risk
 - Federal poverty measures are not adjusted for local conditions
 - Every district in San Francisco has food insecure residents



SF Residents Living at <200% FPL by District



Pantries Exist in Every District



C-444 0 844 - 4/14/15

Some Pantries Have Waitlists



Food Insecurity Results in Poor Health

General Population

- Extreme anxiety & distress: less bandwidth for coping with other household needs
- Increased incidence of poor health
- Higher health care costs

Children

- Decreased intellectual and emotional development
- Poorer physical health; more hospitalizations

Pregnant mothers

Smaller, sicker babies

• <u>Seniors</u>

- Poor physical health: obesity, diabetes, high blood pressure
- Mental illness: Depression, anxiety
- Decreased ability to maintain independence with aging



Food Security Framework

Food Resources

Sufficient *financial resources* to purchase enough nutritious food (income, CalFresh, WIC, SSI, food vouchers)



Food Access

Access to affordable, nutritious and culturally appropriate foods (from food pantries, meal programs, food retail, farmers markets)

Food Consumption

Ability to prepare healthy meals and the knowledge of basic nutrition, safety and cooking (usable kitchens, nutrition/cooking education)

City Policy & Investments to Reduce Food Insecurity



CalFresh

Tiana Wertheim, MPP Analyst San Francisco Human Services Agency CalFresh and Medi-Cal Programs

Goal = Participation of CalFresh

- 1. Find applicants
- 2. Complete successful applications
- 3. Stay On CalFresh

Add back = 1 outreach unit, \$195K CBO outreach

1. Find Applicants:

Objective

 Meet applicants where they are (neighborhoods, at CBOs, call them)

Progress

Outreach:

- 8 Outstations
- Navigation Ctr., Dept. Probation
- o "CalFresh in a day"
- CBO Coalition

In-reach: Medi-Cal cases not currently on CalFresh

1,700 CBO approved applications (2015) = ~ \$4.8 M benefits annually

Opportunity for In-Reach

CalFresh/Medi-Cal Caseload Overlap, December 2015



1. Find Applicants: Next Steps

Continue in-reach/outreach initiatives

School Meals In-reach

- CalFresh Mission satellite office site (\$/Staff)
- Quicker processing of outreach applications

2. Complete Successful Applications



3. Stay on CalFresh, Once Approved

• Prevent discontinuation of CalFresh benefits

Progress

bjectiv

 \bigcirc

- Piloting automated interview reminders (text/email)
- State (CDSS) effort to revise client letters (slow!)

Next Steps

 Outbound call campaign for recently terminated cases that appear to be financially eligible (\$/staff)

Nutrition Programs for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities

Linda Lau, RD, MPH

Lead Nutritionist

San Francisco Department of Aging and Adult Services

Home Delivered Meals Status Report

New Investment: FY 14-15 and FY15-16	Results
\$4.45 M*	 Increased total 1.1 M meals (additional ~ 3,000 meals a day) Increased contract service levels by 27% in FY14/15, by 20% in FY15/16 Currently serving 5,050 unduplicated clients (1,215 new from Add Back \$) Reduced HDM wait time for AWD Funded one-time-only equipment, delivery vehicles for CBO's

* Leveraged with CBO match (up to 50%), and federal dollars

An Understated Need

- Wait list data does not reflect real need
 When the wait list drops, referrals/requests will increase to build-up again.
- DAAS does not do outreach for this program.
- •Unmet need data does NOT include future growth or changes in needs.
- Budget cost projections do not include future cost increases.

New Seniors Served With Home-Delivered Meals



FY15-16 Q2 Median Wait = 41 Days

New Adults with Disabilities Served and #Days Waited Before Service



FY15-16 Q2 Median Wait = 11 Days

22

X.

Home-Delivered Meal Waiting List (As of 2/18/16)

By Supervisor District:			
District #	#People	%	
1	31	10%	
2	21	7%	
3	20	6%	
4	22	7%	
5	32	10%	
6	73	23%	
7	21	7%	
8	12	4%	
9	31	10%	
10	32	10%	
11	24	8%	
Total	319	100%	

By Age Group:

59 and Under	13	4%
60 and Plus	306	96%
Total	319	100%
Average Age:	76	
Median Age:	76	

Profile of Consumers:Number of Days on Wait List:Minimum0Maximum514Average69Median44

Achieving Goals of Ending Hunger by 2020 Home Delivered Meal Service



Congregate Meals Status Report

New Investment: FY 14-15 and FY15-16	Results
\$1.81 M* (\$777K one-time only – FY15-16)	 Increased total 283K meals (average 775 meals a day) Increased contract service level by 9% in FY14/15, by 12% in FY15/16 Serve 18,844 unduplicated clients (3,148 or 17% new from Add Back \$) Added total 6 new sites (2 restaurant sites, 2 breakfast sites, 2 lunch sites) One-time-only equipment, delivery vehicles for CBO's

* Leveraged with CBO match (up to 32%), federal dollars

Map of Senior Meal Site by District & Poverty Density



Meal Sites for Adults w/Disabilities by District Poverty Density (100% FPL)



Home Delivered Groceries Status Report

New Investments: FY 14-15 and FY15-16	Results
\$1.42 M (\$315,200 one- time-only)	 2831 unduplicated clients (1,419 or 50% new from Add Back \$) Deliver 71K grocery "bags" annually Each food bag provides fresh produce, protein items and staple items (e.g. grains, cereals) Services increased by 57% in FY14/15 and by 12% in FY15/16 Partner with IHSS, many CBO's, volunteers Takes advantage of existing pantry programs

Fruit and Vegetable Voucher

Cissie Bonini, MPA

EatSF Director UCSF Center for Vulnerable Populations

- •Key innovation recommended by the FSTF towards a Hunger Free San Francisco 2020, addressing:
 - Lack of resources to purchase healthy food
 - Lack of access to healthy food retail
- •Launched EatSF Free fruit and vegetable program in April 2015 in response to FSTF recommendations

44% of low-income San Franciscans report that they cannot afford nutritious food (СНІS, 2013 & 2014)

EatSF: Healthy Food Voucher Program

Voucher system

- ⋟ \$5 -10/week for fruits & vegetables only
- Redeemed at 15 vendors (neighborhood corner stores, Heart of the City farmer's markets, Safeway and Foods Co.)

• Highly vulnerable participants

- Priority: SSI recipients, SRO tenants, low-income seniors and families
- Target: Those with chronic disease (greatest need plus health cost savings)

Neighborhoods with greatest need

78% participants low or very low food security status

- > Tenderloin, SOMA, Bay View Hunter's Point
- Partner with Healthy Retail SF (OEWD, DPH)
- Distribution points reach underserved
 - ➢ 42 CBOs, DPH sites, and community clinics (+14 waitlisted sites)
 - Paired with nutrition education

EatSF: One Year Results

• Participants

- Over 1,000 households, reaching 1,800+ individuals
- > 99% increased fruit and vegetable consumption
- Also extend food budgets, feel healthier, eat a better overall diet, and give high satisfaction ratings

Community

- Corner stores more frequently re-stock produce; throw away less fresh produce; and increase monthly profits
- Supports Heart of the City farmer's markets
- Supports local economic development

National recognition

Unique program design and vendor network

\$5 vouchers = \$9 in local economic activity (USDA)

EatSF: Opportunities and Next Steps

Proof of concept for localized f/v voucher program

Effective outcomes in first year – continuing to grow and evaluate
 High demand and interest in the program

Build on newly established vendor network and CBO/clinic partnerships

➢Efficiencies and cost savings due to economies of scale

- Ongoing funding (public and private) necessary to continue and scale program
- Goal to expand city-wide by 2020

Single Adult SRO Residents: Food Security Survey Results

Karen Gruneisen, JD

Associate Director Episcopal Community Services Member of Food Security Task Force

The Survey

Background

> San Francisco's SROs and single adult SRO tenants

Rational

- Understand food security and nutritional risk of SRO tenants
- > Solicit priorities for improving food security

Responses

➢ 633 from tenants living in 151 SRO buildings

Prevalence of Food Insecurity and Nutritional Risk

8 in 10 SRO tenants are food insecure and at high nutritional risk



Despite Robust Use of the Food Safety Net



44% used free groceries

42% used free dining room

33% used home delivered meals

3% used emergency room or jail

Tenants would Prepare more Meals at Home if Kitchens were Upgraded or Available

At least 4 in 10 high nutritional risk tenants do not cook now, BUT

64% would cook at least once a week if they got an in-unit kitchen upgrade.

44% would cook at least once a week if a **shared kitchen** was available.





Tenants' Top Priority is Additional Funds to Purchase Healthy Food



No Silver Bullet Solution

- While it is well utilized, the food safety net is not sufficient to ensure food security
- The absence of kitchens is not the primary barrier to food security
- "Additional funds" will help, but access and consumption barriers remain for SRO tenants
- The right package is ripe for exploration in the controlled environment of SRO buildings

Next Steps

- Pilot multiple, simultaneous interventions that leverage and coordinate with existing resources
- Fund \$1M for 2-4 pilots through an RFP process
- •Study the outcomes on food security and health outcomes; then bring to scale

Recommendations



Teri Olle, JD

Director of Policy and Advocacy San Francisco and Marin Food Bank Chair – San Francisco Food Security Task Force

Recommendations

- Budget
 - Maintain and expand nutrition investments \$13.3 million FY16-17
 - Innovate and collaborate to address high risk SRO population
- Policy Local
 - Mandate and fund policy to ensure waitlist for home delivered meals is no more than 30 days and in emergency 2-5 days
 - Promote standardized food security screening in all nutrition and other programs serving residents at risk for food insecurity
- Policy State
 - Support AB 1584 (increase SSI/SSP)

Recommendations

Research

- Request analysis by Budget and Legislative Analyst of:
 - Cost of food insecurity to San Francisco, especially to health
 - Capacity/gaps of existing food assistance programs
 - Cost of *eliminating* food insecurity
 - Opportunities to secure sufficient/stable funding, such as through ACA
 - Process for developing a shared, citywide framework for data and outcomes

Questions?



San Francisco Board of Supervisors' Food Security Task Force