

**DRAFT Food Security Task Force Subcommittee on Reimagining Food Coordination Meeting Minutes
March 26, 2024**

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.	<p>Raegan moved to approve the February 2024 meeting minutes. Ellen Garcia seconded the motion.</p> <p>6 subcommittee members approved. 0 subcommittee members opposed. 2 subcommittee members abstained.</p> <p>Motion passed, February 2024 meeting minutes have been approved.</p>	None.
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 Facente (Facente Consulting) 2:20 p.m.

Shelley Facente shared the [MURAL board](#) for visualization of the list of organizations and captured feedback and comments in real time 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.

Please see detailed MURAL board [here](#) 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.

	<p>Irene Garcia mentioned adding Mi Mercado to the Lessons Learned section as she has participated in the task force before.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Paula Jones asked if there were any land back initiatives and suggested we see if there’s a coalition around this work.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Paula Jones elaborated on Ellen’s point on the impact of real estate on urban agriculture.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini added the Arab Grocer’s Association.</p> <p>Parks and Rec has a real-estate arm that makes decisions around farmers markets and may be involved more broadly in the city.</p> <p>Paul Jones and Maggie Shugerman mentioned CalAIM.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>landscape.</p> <p>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.”</p> <p>Shelley Facente added gray sticky notes for for-profit food system actors.</p> <p>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 unusual...they are usually represented as board members in nonprofit boards.”</p> <p>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.”</p> <p>Jade Quizon: “Would it be helpful if we add tag these organizations into our notes so that can understand them better?”</p> <p>Shelley Facente agreed to tag each organization with different colors to correspond to various tags: health, business, agriculture, and policy, advocacy.</p> <p>Public comment: None.</p>	
<p>7. Review draft models, Josue Ruiz and Shelley Facente (Facente Consulting) 3:10 p.m.</p>	<p>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 here. Shelley presented the 28 criteria to the task force and let everyone know that the presentation content is the</p>	<p>Facente Consulting will build out one last model (Model 6) that looks at the Food Security Task Force</p>

	<p>same as what was sent out already; however, this was reformatted to be presented in landscape view, and a bit more detail is added now about how well the criteria are met for each model.</p> <p>There will be 1 additional model added that assesses the Food Security Task Force (or a similar public body) as its own model.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. “</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Model 2: “In this model, an Office would be established as part of an existing City Department, most likely either the Department of Public</p>	<p>and a public body food structure.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>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.”</p> <p>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.”</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--

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 be used as an example.

	<p>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.</p> <p>Jade Quizon: “Yes, the Office will be under Government Affairs, but have to go after their own grants and have received no funding.”</p> <p>Public comment: None.</p>	
<p>8. General updates 3:25 p.m.</p>	<p>Jade Quizon mentioned that it might be useful if we could have an in-person meeting where we can discuss the models in more detail.</p> <p>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.”</p> <p>Hannah Grant echoed the idea of needing more time to process the information.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Public comment: None</p>	

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