Approved FSTF Subcommittee on Reimagining Food Coordination Meeting Minutes

February 26, 2024

Present: Jade Quizon (API Council); Ellen Garcia (EatSF); Irene Garcia (San Francisco Marin Food Bank); Raegan Sales (Children's Council SF); Tiffany Kearney (SF Disability & Aging Services (DAS)); Maggie Shugerman (Bayview Senior Services); Lura Jones (Leah's Pantry); Cissie Bonini (EatSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies); Chester Williams (Community Living Campaign); Hannah Grant (Meals on Wheel SF)

Also Present: Josue Ruiz (Facente Consulting); Dara Geckeler (Facente Consulting); Eric Chan (SFDPH/Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Nancy Hernandez (Latino Task Force); Katy Garlinghouse (Agricultural Institute of Marin)

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
1. Call order to order 2:00 p.m.	Jade Quizon called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.	None.
2. Land Acknowledgment 2:00 p.m.	Ellen Garcia recited the Land Acknowledgment.	None.
3. Welcome, member roll call, introductions, Jade Quizon (Chair, API Council) 2:05 p.m.	Jade Quizon did roll call and introduced the agenda. Public Comment: None.	None.
4. Approval of minutes from January 23, 2024, Jade Quizon (Chair, API Council) 2:10 p.m.	Chester Williams moves to approve meeting minutes. Ellen Garcia seconds the motion. Unanimously approved by all members present during this vote (8). Meeting minutes have been approved. Public Comment: None.	None.
5. General Public Comment 2:15 p.m.	None.	None.
6. Briefs on meetings with food policy councils/bodies, Josue Ruiz (Facente Consulting) 2:20 p.m.	Please refer to the recording for this agenda item, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 8:20 minute mark and ends at the 20:10 minute mark. Josue Ruiz presented a high-level review of preliminary findings already shared in more detail in the January meeting (Chicago, NY, LA, Boston, Detroit). More time was then spent reviewing the additional new models with more detail	Facente Consulting is currently finalizing more detailed documents that summarize the key

	about the strengths, challenges, and key takeaways from each: The Knox County Food Policy Council, Maine Network of Food Security Councils, and Milwaukee Food Council. Jade Quizon and Josue Ruiz then reviewed the timeline and process to date – what is completed already (background research and developing/finalizing criteria), what we're focusing on today (identifying priorities from the 28 total criteria), and what is upcoming (developing 3-5 possible models for San Francisco, assessing the models based on priorities, and developing a final proposed model). Public Comment: None.	findings of these conversations as relevant to SF's development of a local model, and will share these with the subcommittee within the next 1-2 weeks. More detailed notes from the interviews will also be shared with the subcommittee by Jade.
7. Review results from criteria survey and finalize priority criteria, Jade Quizon (Chair, API Council) 2:30 p.m.	Please refer to the recording for this agenda item, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 20:10 minute mark goes until the end of the video recording. Jade Quizon thanked the subcommittee for their time and effort in taking the survey. A total of 25 people took the survey, which was much appreciated. Everyone had scored each criterion as "non-negotiable" (which we assigned 4 points), "highly important" (3 points), "slightly important" (2 points), and "inclusion does not matter to me" (1 point). For each criteria there was a composite score calculated by averaging the scores across all respondents for that criterion. Josue Ruiz then shared each of the 28 criteria by rank, from the highest ranked criterion (community engagement) with a score of 3.84, to the lowest ranked	

criterion (oversees food-related programs) with a score of 2.44. Again, more detail is available on the slides, here, in this case starting on slide 23.

Members were generally in agreement that community engagement was the top-ranked and this was good and unsurprising. It was also notable that "oversees food-related programs" was lowest-ranked.

Cissie Bonini noted that "Reduces silos across city agencies" was ranked only #11, which was surprising because this was such a huge priority for City employees, and it might be useful to disaggregate the data by city employees/non-city employees.

Josue Ruiz did a quick look and noted that when filtering just to responses by city employees (n=5), "community engagement" and "ability to influence policymakers" were 100% non-negotiable. "Ensures culturally-appropriate accessibility to resources and information," "Convenes stakeholders" and "Diverse membership" were 80% non-negotiable, higher than averages with community folks. They also thought it was more important to have a close connection to local government than the non-governmental folks.

Chester Williams remarked that it was possible people rushed through the survey and weren't able to be as thoughtful as needed (or be sure they understood each item fully before scoring) and this could be affecting the quality of data.

Dara Geckeler noted a trend with folks caring more about what the focus of the work is, above criteria focused on administration and finance. There is also a higher emphasis on policy pieces, and lower emphasis on direct service provision.

Shelley Facente reminded everyone that prioritizing the top most important criteria doesn't mean that the rest are being discarded or ignored; Facente Consulting is going to be developing draft models after this meeting and we'll pay most attention to including the prioritized criteria in all the possible models

| | – we'd rather have guidance from the subcommittee rather than making those decisions based on our own thinking. Those criteria that aren't on the prioritized list may appear for 1-2 of the models but won't necessarily appear in all 5.

Cissie Bonini discussed whether we need to send the survey out for more responses or if we need to disaggregate the survey by different groups (city-only, non-city).

Tiffany Kearney discussed whether outliers may be an issue or skewing of response data based on organization.

Jade Quizon discussed that the survey was sent to the task force listserv, subcommittee members, which was the target audience, but it was on the website, so it was open to public.

Chester Williams mentioned the importance of community engagement and city budget.

Dara Geckeler suggested that it may prove more helpful to look at proposed models to discuss, rather than just criteria that on their own

Raegan Sales discussed that we may already have enough data and we can hone in on what is best for each of the model.

Dara Geckeler discussed how hybrid model development will work in the next steps.

Jade Quizon asked, "Do we want to move with the top 15 as priorities?"

Maggie Shugerman discussed that some criteria can be rolled into other criteria given some of the similarities.

Chester Williams would like "Political feasibility" criteria to be higher in the list. | |

	Raegan Sales would like "Promotes urban agriculture and support local food production" to be higher in the list. Cissie Bonini would like the top 15 to be definitive list as it provides more objectivity, with the bottom 13 serving as helpful context. Cissie Bonini moved to vote that top 15 criteria be used to evaluate the models with some leeway to include the other 13 if those come out strong during the hybrid development process. Seconded and unanimously voted yes by all subcommittee members. Public comment: None	
8. General updates, Jade Quizon (Chair, API Council) 3:40 p.m.	Dara Geckeler discussed the next steps in the process of model development. Public Comment: None.	None.
9. Next steps in preparation for next subcommittee meeting, Jade Quizon (Chair, API Council) 3:50 p.m.	Facente Consulting will summarize the key findings of food council conversations as relevant to SF's development of a local model and will share these with the subcommittee within the next 1 – 2 weeks. Public Comment: None.	None.
10. Adjournment 4:00 p.m.	Meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.	None.