

Approved FSTF Meeting Minutes

March 6, 2024

Present: Paula Jones (SFDPH – Food Security/Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Guillermo Reece (San Francisco African American Faith-Based Coalition); Jade Quizon (API Council); Raegan Sales (Children’s Council of SF); Tiffany Kearney (Department of Disability and Aging Services); Chester Williams (Community Living Campaign); Geoffrey Grier (SF Recovery Theater); Jennifer LeBarre (SFUSD); Emily Cohen (SF Dept. of Homelessness and Supportive Housing); Cissie Bonini (UCSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies – EatSF); Hannah Grant (Meals on Wheels SF); Lura Jones (Leah’s Pantry); Meg Davidson (San Francisco-Marin Food Bank); Jeimil Belamide (HSA/CalFresh); Priti Rane (SFDPH/WIC)

Also Present: Beth Bodner; Danielle Lundstrom (SFDPH-SNAP-Ed); Emma Tucher; Eric Chan (SFDPH/Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Fiona McBride (HSA Food Access); La Rhonda Reddic (SFDPH/Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Leah Walton (SF Dept. of Disability and Aging Services); Rebeca Flores (SFDPH/Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Sylvia Selinger (All My Usos & Fa’atasi Youth Services); Tiffany Dang (SF. Dept of Disability and Aging Services); Tommy McClain (SF HSA Food Access); Sam Lavan

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
1. Call order to order 1:30 p.m.	Call to order at 1:36 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, EatSF/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 January 17, 2024 1:40 p.m.	Minor edits were made to draft January 2024 meeting minutes based on Raegan Sales’ feedback from the time they were posted on the website. Cissie Bonini: For the OEWD presentation, I did make a suggestion to disaggregate some of the data. They bucketed SNAP and local voucher Market Match programs together, where 90% of these benefits were redeemed at larger retailers. If you disaggregate the local funding, there’s a greater percentage going to BIPOC-owned small businesses. Eric Chan: This comment will be added in. Public Comment: None.	Eric Chan to make edits to January 2024 meeting minutes.

	<p>Raegan Sales moves to approve the minutes with the stated changes.</p> <p>Chester Williams seconds the motion.</p> <p>12 task force members approved. 0 task force members opposed. 3 task force members abstained.</p> <p>Motion has passed and minutes are approved.</p>	
<p>5. General Public Comment 1:45 p.m.</p>	<p>No Public Comment.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p>6. Update on subcommittee on Reimagining Food Coordination, Jade Quizon (Subcommittee Chair, API Council) 1:50 p.m.</p>	<p>Please refer to the recording for this agenda item, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 8:00 minute mark and ends at the 27:20 minute mark.</p> <p>The subcommittee has met their goal of completing 8 interviews with different food policy/organizing bodies/councils across the country, listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chicago Food Policy Action Council • New York City Mayor’s Office of Food Policy • Los Angeles Office of Food Equity • Boston Office of Food Justice • Detroit Food Policy Council • Milwaukee Food Council • Boston Office of Food Justice • Maine Network of Food Security Councils • Knox County Food Council <p>Facente Consulting presented briefs on each at the previous subcommittee meeting and finished one page conversation summaries from each of these meetings. Those summaries will be shared soon and capture key notes about each organization's structure, scale, key priority areas, advantages and disadvantages of each. Full notes from each meeting can also be shared.</p> <p>The subcommittee then reviewed results from the criteria survey. Facente created visualizations. There were 25 responses, 5 of them being City employees, 15 being task force or subcommittee members, and 5 being members of the public. The top 15 criteria are now considered the priority list and will guide the next phase of the project, which is the creation of food organizing models. The rest of the criteria will not be completely disregarded; they will still provide context and be considered. As the models are being created by Facente and the subcommittee, the top 15 will be prioritized.</p>	<p>None.</p>
--	--	--------------

Cissie Bonini: So the ask for the task force today is to approve that the top 15 criteria will be the main criteria to move forward this process of evaluating a food system configuration for San Francisco.

Paula Jones: Thank you, Jade, for presenting and leading this work. I see that strengthening local food economy and addressing food sovereignty are on this list but I don't see addressing food access and food security on the list. Is that because that's implied that this group would do that?

Jade Quizon: Yeah, I think it's incorporated and implied in criteria like addresses food sovereignty; there was one for assessing food insecurity on a regular basis.

Cissie Bonini: I think it's implied. I think it's a good point, Paula, that it was missed as a specific point. If we put down food security and what people would rank that as (probably super high).

Paula Jones: If we could make sure Facente incorporates this and has that implication and doesn't need to be on this list.

Priti Rane: I wanted to make sure that number 6 (able to influence policymakers and therefore local policies and regulation related to food), since it's pretty high and it's a huge value in making structural changes within the City around food systems and food insecurity. I know there has been issues around the ability to do that, and I wanted to make sure that since it's so high that there is clarity around the ability to continue doing that from the beginning.

Meg Davidson: Thank you, Jade for all your work on this and so excited to see it get this far. How are the criteria weighted? Does number 1 bear more weight than number 15, or are they all the same?

Jade Quizon: They weren't weighted, it was just a 1-4 scale essentially.

Meg Davidson: Oh I mean not for this, but when you actually use them as criteria, will they be weighted?

Jade Quizon: I think the way we're looking at it is that each model is going to try and include these top 15 in some form or another, so I guess equal.

Meg Davidson: Got it.

Raegan Sales: I was going to add that process wise, the next steps would be for them (Facente) to start developing a few models to compare and as Jade said they are going to try and incorporate as many of those 15 criteria into each as possible, but we might see different ways that that could happen or how that looks, depending on the structure and the organization of the food body. So it's going to have a mix of all of these and how they work in practice, with some of the bottom half (criteria 16-28) being sprinkled in.

Fiona McBride: I was curious how you all decided to make the cut off at 15.

Jade Quizon: It was kind of how the criteria landed. We had to decide a cut off point at some point, but like I said earlier that the other 13 aren't going to be completely disregarded from here on out. It's still going to serve as guidance and be part of the process. We were kind of forced to draw the cut off point somewhere. If you look at the scoring, a lot of them were scored as non-negotiable and highly important.

Fiona McBride: Was there a write-in option or was it just a set list (for the criteria)?

Jade Quizon: No, the list was already developed. We spent a couple of months making this list with the subcommittee, task force members, and the public by sending it out multiple times. You couldn't add in criteria in the survey.

Public Comment: None.

Cissie Bonini: We are looking for a motion to use these 15 criteria in the evaluation of reimagining food coordination.

Paula Jones: Can I add in that motion to explicitly state that food insecurity being a non-negotiable and implied focus?

Cissie Bonini: Yes, good point.

Paula Jones makes the motion that the Food Security Task Force and the subcommittee utilizes the priority list developed for criteria with the underlying understanding that addressing food insecurity will be an implied focus for utilization by the subcommittee to develop models for new food organizing structures.

Raegan Sales seconds the motion.

11 task force members approved.

0 task force members opposed.

0 task force members abstained.

Motion has passed.

<p>7. Food Security Task Force 2024 Recommendations, Eric Chan (OARE/SFDPH) 2:15 p.m.</p>	<p>Eric Chan worked on creating an initial draft of the 2024 FSTF Recommendations, which Hannah Grant, Jade Quizon, and Raegan Sales provided feedback and edits on. The original timeline was to have a more finalized draft ready to present at this meeting, but the recommendations section of the report needs more editing. Another ad-hoc meeting will be set up with task force members to help finalize this piece.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: People are welcomed to join this sub-group. Thank you for the group for working on this. The idea is some more fine-tuning and separating and distinguishing between general principles and actionable items. What’s helpful for legislators and staffers is articulating those actionable items. The other thing is if there are carry-over items from last year’s recommendations, we will want to wordsmith them into this year’s recommendations so that we can show that this is a serious consideration. The recommendations have really come from the BFSEER and generated from that, yes?</p> <p>Eric Chan: Yeah, it’s a mixture of recommendations that we pulled from the report along with recommendations we want to pull from the 2023 Recommendations and there are a couple new ones too that the task force members generated.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: And those will be presented at the next task force meeting for final approval?</p> <p>Eric Chan: Yes.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: And Eric has put together the narrative piece for the report, and there’s already a draft of this as he mentioned earlier that he will get out to you all after this.</p> <p>Eric Chan shared the two report designs for task force members to view.</p> <p>Paula Jones: If folks can give overall impressions, if you like one over the other, or if there are other ideas. Becky knows the task force well, she’s designed a lot for us so we can incorporate other ideas too.</p>	
---	--	--

Raegan Sales: I like them both, I am partial to the more colorful one, it gives me “Hungry Hungry Caterpillar” vibes so that’s where I’m leaning right now but I think they’re both great.

Paula Jones: Can I ask what are our key messages? That’s generally what I think about it, having the design support our key messages.

Eric Chan: I can share the draft right now. The key messages are talked about in the “Current Landscape” and “Challenges and Needs” section. A lot of it was data pulled from the biennial report. Basically food insecurity is the highest it’s ever been, health disparities are increasing, particularly among African American/Black residents and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander residents. There’s some new data that came out recently that Americans are spending more on food than they have in 30 years. The landscape is showing how bad things are in the moment. Another key message that we’re pulling from the report from the recommendations section is really focusing more on health disparities and what those recommendations look like we’re still cleaning up. Also with the reduction of local food funding, over \$32 million will have a huge impact and some data around pop up pantry closures.

Paula Jones: So the message is concern.

Eric Chan: For sure. There is a successes section that everyone really wanted, so there’s a good chunk talking about what San Francisco is doing well, so there’s a little bright spot in the report.

Meg Davidson: I just want to say thank you, that’s a tremendous amount of work, and I also offer myself up to review the draft if that’s helpful to have another task force member and food bank person to look at it, I’m happy to do so.

Eric Chan: Thank you, Meg.

Paula Jones: Given the key messages that Eric shared, do we feel like either option works, or would we want to have any changes to the options?

	<p>Cissie Bonini: I like number 2 (the colorful one). There seems to be a lot of number 2s coming up in the chat.</p> <p>Paula Jones: I'm the one that wants the rainy day or something. It's not happy, but I go with the will of the group.</p> <p>Raegan Sales: Can we make it a rainy, foggy day on the left side of the bridge and then it gets brighter and more colorful on the right side of the page? Add a cloud in there.</p> <p>Meg Davidson: We'll just have a truck with a lot of dollar bills coming out of it crossing the bridge into the city.</p> <p>Paula Jones: Priti likes number 1, lots of people like number 1. The messaging is really the important part. What are the messages we are trying to convey? I'm not sure how many people have read the biennial report, probably none of the supervisors or electeds.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Eric, is this enough information that you need or do you need more from the group?</p> <p>Eric Chan: I feel like it's half and half right now but we'll create both and people can vote again because we're still going to add in a little more data and visualizations. For next steps I'm going to reach out to the same ad-hoc group that met in February, and I'll loop in Meg as well. If there's anyone else that wants to be part of the next meeting email me, and then I'll find a time that works for all of us in the next couple of weeks so that we can have a final version to look at during the April task force meeting. I'm going to send out the draft right after this along with the designs.</p> <p>Danielle Lundstrom (online comment): Community member comment on the design – they're both great, but #1 feels more in line with the message of concern.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>8. Updates and emerging issues 2:20 p.m.</p>	<p>Jade Quizon: The FAACTS Summit felt like a huge success, there were 204 people in attendance out of the 219 people that registered. We had some great speakers and panelists. One of the complaints we heard was that there was just too many workshops happening concurrently and it was difficult to choose. We had a couple of methods of capturing what we were hearing from people and panelists. We had a graphic recorder who draws a visual presentation of the notes and we will be sharing that out. We had a production company to do some recordings of the keynote speakers; we will have a video out soon. As a steering committee we will be debriefing and distill down what we learned and present a more unified vision of what a good food system can look like in San Francisco. We will also be debriefing with the planning committee and panelists. More to come, and we're also just resting right now.</p> <p>Meg Davidson: I wasn't able to attend myself but several members of our team were and they said that it was a really inspiring space to be in, and to see so many people care so deeply about transforming our food system in San Francisco was really inspiring for our team. Just want to say thank you; I remember years ago when Avay (spelling?) brought to this group that it would be awesome to do a food summit and you all made it happen, and it sounds like it was an incredible experience, so kudos to you and your team for producing such an awesome event.</p> <p>Jeimil Belamide: For caseload update, we have about 73,000 households. We don't quite have individual numbers yet. In terms of policy, the waiver for the interview requirement that was authorized during the pandemic is expiring March 31, 2024. Starting April 1, the CalFresh interview requirement for both applications and the re-certification process are coming back. It's a requirement that all applicants and beneficiaries that want to continue to their CalFresh benefits will need to meet before we can improve applications and re-certifications.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Jeimil, do you anticipate any impact on CalFresh numbers?</p>	<p>None.</p>
---	---	--------------

Jeimil Belamide: We don't have the precise impact, just anecdotally anytime you add another requirement or something else an applicant or beneficiary has to do, it has the potential to be a barrier and decreasing approval rates and existing caseload. It is something we do want to measure and will do so and report out when we can.

Jennifer LeBarre: We're entering into our legislative action time, one of the emerging issues is that folks are questioning universal meals. A lot of this has to do with the fact that the CA budget is not what we/the governor expected it to be, especially when it comes to school funding. There's this push pull around how we're going to fund this very important aspect of our meal program. CA is one of the few states that continued with pandemic-like system where we're able to provide free meals to all children. I think it's important, and if you have the opportunity to talk to folks about it, especially critical in San Francisco because if you have a family of four with two parents working minimum wage jobs, they no longer qualify for free or reduced. So a lot of people assume that if they don't qualify, they can afford to pay the meal fee, and we all know that's not the case, especially in San Francisco and other communities up and down the state. It's really important that we keep universal meals going for our students; we've seen a ton of impact where more students are participating where they normally would not have been. This is having an impact not only the students but their families. If you have the opportunity to talk to folks, talk to legislators, please let them know that we need to continue this very important meal program and happy to provide any talking points if that's something of interest. Thank you.

Priti Rane: There was a bipartisan legislature that was passed on Sunday to continue funding WIC at the increased caseload levels and also to maintain the increased fruit and vegetable benefit, at least through the end of this federal fiscal year, which is end of September 2024. That was exciting because there was a possibility that if it didn't pass, we would have to go to a waitlist and the

benefit levels would drop to 9-11 dollars. We still continue to push for sustained and continued support around the higher benefit level and caseload.

Raegan Sales: Jennifer reminded me of a question that had come up recently. I'm wondering if anyone knows there's an organization/department/website that is tracking local legislative efforts? Is there anywhere find to what's being pushed locally that might go through the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor's Office so that community-based organizations and other folks can follow along as to what's happening locally (City and County of San Francisco)?

Paula Jones: Emily, don't you go to the leg. Committee?

Emily Cohen: I do sometimes. We actually haven't had anything in front of them in the past several months, so I'm not totally sure of the status on this.

Paula Jones: Do they keep a public list of legislation that the City has considered and whether the City has taken a position on anything?

Emily Cohen: They certainly do through the meeting minutes. I think they keep a public list on the ones we have voted to support. I don't know if they keep a list of everything that's gone before them outside of the agenda and meeting minutes. You can definitely check the website.

Paula Jones: Where would we find that?

Emily Cohen: I can link something in the chat.

Leah Walton (online comment): ShapeUp SF coalition is tracking local legislation

Meg Davidson (online comment): Here's a sign-on letter for organizations to support funding for Free School Meals:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdxQS_GVKAkCpC-

lclieWWNTctET7O76LzHHE3WxVuZ4ad8bQ/viewform?emci=40c1865e-f2d7-ee11-85f9-002248223794&emdi=2321b257-e3db-ee11-85fb-002248223794&ceid=156832

Raegan Sales: I saw that Leah added in the chat that Shape Up SF is tracking local legislation. The person who asked me is a Shape Up SF steering committee member. If anyone has any other resources, those would be appreciated too.

Emily Cohen: Sorry because I'm on my phone, I can't add in the chat, but this information is available on the sf.gov/departments/state-legislation-committee. I can email the link to the facilitator so that they can push this out to everyone.

Paula Jones: Back to Jennifer, I had a question as I was hearing the superintendent talk about potential schools closing and the equity analysis regarding that. Do you know if the impact of food/nutrition is a part of that equity analysis of potential school closings?

Jennifer LeBarre: I'm not sure, I can look into this and follow back up with you.

Priti Rane: Do we know of what's happening with Market Match? I know the governor's proposed budget had a significant cut in that. Do we know the impact of that in San Francisco?

Paula Jones: I think we would know the impact because it's data we tracked in the BFSER. I don't know the status, we can reach out to the Ecology Center, they would probably be leading efforts.

Cissie Bonini: I think that's a good emerging issue to track and make sure we follow up with that.

Paula Jones: \$2.4 million dollars in Market Match came to San Francisco last fiscal year.

	<p>Priti Rane: Thanks Paula. I just thought that that’s an important concern, given it’s such a huge benefit that our community utilizes and the impact on the market.</p> <p>Paula Jones: I don’t know where all these bills are standing or where the budget is standing, but we can think about including these in the challenges of our recommendations.</p> <p>Meg Davidson: The Ecology Center is running a support letter for organizations who want to sign on to save Market Match. If folks want to get involved in that advocacy, the contact person is Minni Forman, minni@ecologycenter.org</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Thank you all for this, look for some stuff coming from Eric for you to take a peek at, and then we will see you all in April.</p> <p>Public Comment: None.</p>	
9. Adjournment 3:30 p.m.	Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.	None.