Approved Food Security Task Force Subcommittee on Reimagining Food Coordination Meeting Minutes March 26, 2024 2:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Present: Ellen Garcia (EatSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies), Irene Garcia (San Francisco-Marin Food Bank), Jade Quizon (API Council), Lura Jones (Leah's Pantry), Raegan Sales (Children's Council SF), Hannah Grant (Meals on Wheels), Maggie Shugerman (D10 Community Market), Cissie Bonini (EatSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies)

Also Present: Shelley Facente (Facente Consulting), Josué Ruiz (Facente Consulting), Eric Chan (SFDPH), Kalil Macklin, Katy Garlinghouse (Agricultural Institute of Marin)

Agenda Item		Discussion	Next steps
1.	Call to order 2:00 p.m.	Jade Quizon called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm.	None.
2.	Land Acknowledgement 2:00 p.m.	Cissie Bonini read the Land Acknowledgement.	None.
3.	Welcome, member roll call 2:05 p.m.	Jade took attendance via roll call.	None.
4.	Approval of minutes from Feb. 23, 2024 meeting 2:10 p.m.	Raegan moved to approve the February 2024 meeting minutes. Ellen Garcia seconded the motion.	None.
		6 subcommittee members approved.	
		0 subcommittee members opposed.	
		2 subcommittee members abstained.	
		Motion passed, February 2024 meeting minutes have been approved.	
5.	General Public Comment 2:15 p.m.	No public comment.	None.
6.	San Francisco food landscape – discussion and analysis, Jade Quizon (Chair, API	Jade Quizon shared the purpose of talking through the food landscape in SF is to identify different organizations and food systems actors and how they interact and work together.	None.

Council), Shelley	Shelley Facente shared the MURAL board for visualization of the list	
Facente (Facente	of organizations and captured feedback and comments in real time	
Consulting) 2:20 p.m.	on the board.	
	Paula Jones mentioned timeline concern about how this current	
	landscape analysis may push the recommendations to the Board to	
	late May.	
	Raegan Sales discussed adding entities to the Mural board who are	
	part of the food landscape in SF but might not actually be good	
	thought partners and/or make sense to have join the food structure.	
	She mentioned the FNS USDA, the Child and Adult Care Programs.	
	Ellen Garcia mentioned the carceral system as a large source of food	
	distribution in SF, including to youth.	
	Discourse state its d MUDAL is south and with all as more suits and waters	
	Please see detailed MURAL board <u>here</u> with all comments and notes.	
	Resolution to End Hunger by 2020 was brought up by Cissie Bonini as	
	an initiative. She also mentioned the SRO Collaborative, which Paula	
	Jones elaborated on.	
	Irene Garcia had a question about including Great Plates and other	
	organizations that existed during the pandemic, but are no longer	
	active as way of incorporating voices and lessons learned.	
	Paula Jones and Cissie Bonini responded and brought up the steering	
	committee that was created around emergency Covid-19 relief.	
	Paula Jones asked Shelley Facente to add a best practice and	
	learning opportunities section to the MURAL board to account for	
	these orgs.	
	Paula Jones mentioned Great Plates under DAAS.	

Irene Garcia mentioned adding Mi Mercado to the Lessons Learned
section as she has participated in the task force before.
Cissie Bonini spoke on being cautious about adding specific orgs to
the Lessons Learned category as there could be too many, so they
were changed to include simply "COVID Innovations" and "SRO
Food Intervention Pilot" (the latter at Irene's suggestion). She brought
up various innovations in Food Security Task Force that are
advancing or solving gaps in the food system.
Paula Jones asked if there were any land back initiatives and
suggested we see if there's a coalition around this work.
Ellen Garcia mentioned the People's Food and Farm Project that may
address the land back movement. She mentioned the San Francisco
Real Estate Division as a potential group to keep in mind.
Devile lawse states and the Ellewise maintain the immediate final set at
Paula Jones elaborated on Ellen's point on the impact of real estate
on urban agriculture.
Cissie Bonini added the Arab Grocer's Association.
Parks and Rec has a real-estate arm that makes decisions around
farmers markets and may be involved more broadly in the city.
Tarmers markets and may be involved more broadly in the city.
Paul Jones and Maggie Shugerman mentioned CalAIM.
There was a larger discussion around farmer's markets being legally
obligated to accept all forms of food assistance, through the
agricultural commission. Paula mentioned that this is the
Agricultural Commissioner within the DPH.
Challey Freents monthing and that some of these groups at fit
Shelley Facente mentioned that some of these groups may not fit
nicely into any category but will put them on the MURAL board in
black sticky notes so we recognize they are also part of the

	landscape.	
	Ellen Garcia asked, "Where do corporate interests fall into this picture? That's what controls the food supply. There are many transportation mechanisms such as the port."	
	Shelley Facente added gray sticky notes for for-profit food system actors.	
	Cissie Bonini agreed that private interests are very important to keep track of in this space. "It's very difficult to get these private interests at the table. So, I think we should acknowledge that it's unusualthey are usually represented as board members in nonprofit boards."	
	Ellen Garcia: "What buckets of organizations should we be paying attention to? We don't need to add all organizations. We should not look at it as a reactive food insecurity perspective, but rather a reactive food systems perspective."	
	Jade Quizon: "Would it be helpful if we add tag these organizations into our notes so that can understand them better?"	
	Shelley Facente agreed to tag each organization with different colors to correspond to various tags: health, business, agriculture, and policy, advocacy.	
	Public comment: None.	
7. Review draft models, Josue Ruiz and Shelley Facente (Facente Consulting) 3:10 p.m.	Shelley Facente introduced the FSTF Food Structure Models and emphasized that they are draft models rooted in the 28 criteria created by the task force. Each priority criterion will be in bold. The slides can be found <u>here</u> . Shelley presented the 28 criteria to the task force and let everyone know that the presentation content is the	Facente Consulting will build out one last model (Model 6) that looks at the Food Security Task Force

 same as what was sent out already; however, this was reformatted to	and a public body food
be presented in landscape view, and a bit more detail is added now	structure.
about how well the criteria are met for each model.	
There will be 1 additional model added that assesses the Food	
Security Task Force (or a similar public body) as its own model.	
Shelley presented Model 1: Mayor's office and walked through	
Potential Advantages, Potential Disadvantages, Criteria Definitely	
Addressed, Criteria that Could be Addressed, and Criteria Likely Not	
Addressed section.	
For Model 1: "In this model, an Office would be established in City	
Hall, under the support and direction of the San Francisco mayor.	
Similar to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community	
Development or other such entities, an office like this would have	
strong authority to influence the local food economy, hold partners	
accountable, and direct citywide policy. It would send a strong	
message that food insecurity is a high-priority issue in San Francisco.	
It would also likely have sustained funding as long as the current	
mayor was supportive of addressing food insecurity as a major	
citywide issue. However, it would likely result in substantial limits on	
the engagement and influence of diverse community members or	
others with lived experience of food insecurity. "	
For Model 9. Chelley emphasizes the differences between we del 4	
For Model 2, Shelley emphasizes the differences between model 1 and 2 and looked at the other cities/counties section to make	
comparison to other food structures across the U.S. She discussed	
how the criteria are important to consider in assessing each model	
and that various criteria may be easily addressed by some models as they are central components of the structure, while other criteria	
would take more of a lift to ensure they are met.	
Model 2: "In this model, an Office would be established as part of an	
existing City Department, most likely either the Department of Public	
existing only Department, most incly entited the Department of Public	

Health (DPH) or Human Services Agency (HSA). As a City Office, this
would have similar advantages and disadvantages to a Mayoral-
driven model, with strong authority to influence the local food
economy and direct some citywide policies, but also challenges for
community engagement. Bureaucratic restrictions on hiring for City
positions (both in speed and flexibility of hiring) would likely restrict
the ability of this Office to hire diverse staff with lived experience of
food insecurity, and depending on the current mayor and existing
relationships with other relevant City departments, this Office may or
may not be in a position to have autonomy over decision-making
and/or reduce silos across city agencies."
Model 3: "In this model, a citywide, grassroots initiative would be
established that follows the principles of collective impact. Rather
than being led by a specific organization or city department, this
initiative would work to engage multiple stakeholders in an equitable
way where all voices are heard and drive the work forward together.
Most collective impact initiatives do not have established 501(c)(3)
status or similar, because that structure would imply a single leader
or board of directors. Rather, it has a decentralized structure
supported by a "backbone" - a team of people dedicated to
coordinating the initiative's work, often with a fiscal intermediary to
receive and disburse initiative funding as needed."
Shelley mentioned for Model 3 that this is the one that may
somewhat resemble how the Food Security Task Force is structured,
but as written is different than a legislated, formal public body.
Model 4: "In this model, an existing community-based organization
that already has 501(c)(3) status would be designated to lead this
work and be provided with funding to support these efforts. While
they may also continue to provide direct services, advocacy, or any
other existing work of the organization, for this effort they would
function in a convening role, tasked with involving other stakeholders
and community members to do collaborative work on food security

throughout San Francisco."	
Model 5: "In this model, an existing community-based organization that already has 501(c)(3) status would be designated to lead this work and be provided with funding to support these efforts. While they may also continue to provide direct services, advocacy, or any other existing work of the organization, for this effort they would function in a convening role, tasked with involving other stakeholders and community members to do collaborative work on food security throughout San Francisco."	
Cissie Bonini: "Who makes financial decisions in San Francisco? The Mayor has the most power for those big money decisions. We may have models in other cities because of different configurations, that won't work in SF. It's absolutely appropriate that there can be different coalitions and activities representing different efforts that strengthens the food system as a whole. I'd like there to be some context when these are presented."	
Shelley Facente agreed that there can be some combination of each of these elements.	
Paula Jones: "Where would a public body fall into these models?"	
Shelley Facente: "Something like model 3a" but this will be built out into a new model and then shared with everyone.	
Ellen Garcia: "What is the runway for creating Model 1?"	
Paula Jones noted that for Model 1 the Mayor would have to decide this was important, and create an Office. She noted that for Model 2, the Office of Racial Equity is a good example of how this would be created. There was also a division in Indianapolis that can used as an example.	

	Shelley Facente also noted the LA model is a good example where
	the legislature established this kind of structure we're discussing,
	even though it hasn't quite come to fruition yet, as it is new.
	Jade Quizon: "Yes, the Office will be under Government Affairs, but
	have to go after their own grants and have received no funding."
	Public comment: None.
8. General updates 3:25	Jade Quizon mentioned that it might be useful if we could have an in-
p.m.	person meeting where we can discuss the models in more detail.
	Ellen Garcia supported the idea, and "would love a chance to read
	this critically and do a little of my own research. The runway to
	building a model is an important consideration because of our city
	configuration. I'd like to have time to have slightly more informed
	questions or feedback."
	Hannah Grant echoed the idea of needing more time to process the
	information.
	Jade Quizon asked Paula Jones if we could shift the timeline to be
	able to allow for an in-person meeting. These logistics would involve
	whether in-person would be possible.
	Paula Jones asked to huddle with Facente Consulting to allow for
	discussion of whether it was possible to have an extension in the
	timeline and hold an extra in-person meeting.
	Paula Jones: We need a discussion around public bodies, because
	generally coalitions are more of a public sector role to be able to do.
	We must have that public body discussion too.
	Dublic comment: None
	Public comment: None

9. Next steps in preparation for next subcommittee meeting, Jade Quizon (Chair, API Council) 3:28 p.m.	 Facente Consulting will create the additional Model 6 for our discussion, which will be sent out. Eric Chan will look at schedules for in-person availability and will send out communications about upcoming meetings. Public comment: None 	None.
10. Adjournment 3:30 p.m.	Jade Quizon adjourned the meeting at 3:33PM PST.	None.