

FSTF Food Structure Recommendations: Process

- ✓ 1. Background research on food structures used in other U.S. cities or counties
- ✓ 2. Development of a list of criteria for evaluation strength of potential structures
- ✓ 3. Prioritization of criteria to focus on those most important to FSTF members
- ✓ 4. Development and presentation of draft structures that San Francisco could adopt in whole, part, or combination
- ✓ 5. Subcommittee discussion of pros/cons of various structures and creation of a proposed path forward for San Francisco's food security structure
- 6. Presentation of the draft proposed recommended structure to the full FSTF for discussion
- May 2 - June 4** 7. Subcommittee refinement of the recommended structure based on FSTF feedback
- June 5** 8. Final FSTF vote on the recommended structure to be put forth



FSTF Food Structure Models

Goal: Develop recommendations for a new structure for food organizing which addresses food insecurity in San Francisco based on qualitative data from 8 U.S. cities or counties.

Rank	Criteria
1	Community engagement. The ideal food organizing body effectively engages and incorporates the perspectives and input of community members, particularly those who have directly experienced food insecurity, ensuring their voices are heard and considered in the decision-making process and honored through mechanisms like stipends.
2	Diverse membership. The new body's membership should include a broad range of individuals and organizations, representing various backgrounds including those with lived experience of food insecurity, roles, and interests within the food system, ensuring a comprehensive and inclusive pool of expertise, perspectives, and knowledge from different stakeholders. Membership include representation from each district and reflect the cultural diversity of SF.
3	Inclusive membership structure. The body should actively encourage and welcome diverse participation, ensuring representation from a wide range of backgrounds, perspectives, and demographics to foster inclusivity and equity in decision-making processes. It should promote diverse contributions to the organization's goals and activities.
4	Ensures culturally-appropriate accessibility to resources and information. The body should ensure resources and information are accessible and offered in a culturally-appropriate way. Resources and information should be shared in multiple languages and collaborating with CBOs to guarantee accommodations for people with disabilities.
5	Ensures consistent funding to support community-led ideas/solutions/innovations. The body should support a reliable and continuous financial support system to sustain initiatives and projects initiated by the community, fostering ongoing development and implementation of creative solutions. Solutions should address a variety of issues and ideas, e.g. community kitchen space, community markets, food vouchers, and community-owned grocery co-ops.
6	Able to influence policymakers and therefore local policies and regulation related to food. The body should have the ability to effectively shape and impact the development, implementation, and enforcement of local policies, laws, and regulations that pertain to various aspects of the food system, including production, distribution, access, and sustainability, through the education of policymakers and advocacy efforts. It should make substantial policy recommendations that are often accepted by policymakers and implemented.
7	Addresses food sovereignty. The body should uphold the principles of food sovereignty, which include local control over food systems, the right of communities to define their own agricultural and food policies, and access to culturally responsive, nutritious, and sustainably produced food.
8	Strengthens local food economy. The body should enhance access to local foods produced by our regional food system, enhance the food supply chain, distribution, and contribute to economic development and healthy retail. It should be committed to prioritizing investments in local vendors and infrastructure over external, remote, or corporate solutions.
9	Assesses the current status of food (in)security on a regular basis. The body should have the ability to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the existing conditions and factors related to food security. This includes the ability to gather information about food insecurity from a wide range of sources, like the Biennial Food Security and Equity Report , and stakeholders ensuring a holistic understanding of food security. Sources can include, but are not limited to, government agencies, community-based organizations, academia, and individuals with lived experiences of food insecurity.
10	Autonomy over decision making. The body should have the authority and independence to make decisions, set goals, and recommend policies related to food governance without undue external influence or constraints.
11	Reduces silos across city agencies. The body should promote collaboration and coordination between various city departments and agencies that support food programs to create a more holistic and integrated approach to addressing food-related issues. (e.g., DPH, HSA, HSH, MTA)
12	Addresses food sourcing and worker's rights. The body should prioritize and support action to ensure fair labor practices and ethical sourcing in the production, distribution, and supply chains of food products, promoting the welfare of food industry workers and sustainable food sources. It should prioritize sourcing of food and related resources from the local/regional foodshed.
13	Addresses the dignity of the food shopping and acquisition process. The body should be empowered to hold stakeholders in the food system accountable for the quality of goods and the dignity of services, proactively addressing and preventing discrimination and potential risks at various points of food access.
14	Convenes stakeholders. The body should create space for educational/informational sessions for CBOs and City agencies to share their work. It should facilitate access to information about what works and how to communicate better across organizations.
15	Leverages potential synergies between cross-sector programs/opportunities. The body should address cross-sector or cross-city department opportunities such as Food as Medicine and Housing. It should explore and encourage potential collaborations that span different sectors, to break down silos and encourage cooperation between diverse entities to develop solutions that address interconnected challenges.

Rank	Criteria
16	Financial sustainability/independence. The ability to secure funding from a diverse range of sources, including government grants, private donations, and philanthropy, to sustain its initiatives and operations effectively.
17	Evaluates the impacts of City-funded solutions on the broader food system. Responsible for assessing the environmental and economic impacts of grant-funded solutions/proposal/innovations on the larger system, including applying an equity lens to funding, impact, and outcomes. The evaluation process functions as a mechanism for accountability, ensuring that the provided funding is effectively driving meaningful change.
18	Reduces silos across non-city entities. How well a food organizing body promotes collaboration and coordination between food justice entities outside of local government. Ex: CBOs, private companies, philanthropy, etc.
19	Connection to local power structures and institutions. The extent to which a food organizing body has established connections, partnerships, and effective working relationships with local power structures and institutions that can influence food related policies, regulations, and resource allocation. Ex: Tech philanthropy representatives serve as members of the body; members include grocery store representatives, farmers, or market organizers
20	Administrative feasibility. The practicality and ease with which the new food organizing structure can be established and effectively operated with the confines of administrative and legal frameworks. It involves assessing the logistical, regulatory, and legal aspects of initiating and sustaining the new body. Details can include the ease of obtaining necessary approvals and support from relevant authorities and identifying legal hurdles or requirements.
21	Political feasibility. The amount of support and willingness of governmental entities needed to establish and operate a new food organizing structure. The degree to which political buy-in and engagement and availability of stakeholders is required to establish the new structure and ensuring its legitimacy
22	Promotes urban agriculture and supports local food production. Foster self-reliance by creating educational opportunities for people to learn how to grow their own food. Develop and implement policies that facilitate urban agriculture, including zoning regulations. Identify and designate spaces for urban ag. Protects existing urban farms, community gardens, and other productive landscapes and the people who tend to them.
23	Close connection to local government. The extent to which a food organizing body has established connections, partnerships, and effective working relationships with local government entities to influence food-related policies, regulations, and resource allocation. Examples include local government employees serve as members of the organization, members are appointed by government officials, or the food organizing body receives logistical and administrative help through their local government.
24	Engages with broader power structures and institutions. Engages and collaborates with influential entities at various levels of government and governance. Examples include federal institutions (FDA and USDA), state-level institutions (CDFS, CDS, CDPH), educational institutions (UCANR), food policy coalitions (Nourish CA), and farmers' associations (CAFF). Engaging with these institutions ensures alignment with broader governmental strategies, creates opportunities to leverage academic expertise, and improves access to resources.
25	Addresses emerging issues rapidly and nimbly. How quickly and effectively a food organizing body responds to and addresses constantly evolving community needs. This must include a mechanism for ongoing community input, concerns, needs, and suggestions, and may include staffing available to quickly pivot to new projects, and/or public/private influence to get things done.
26	Manages and distributes funding for community-led food innovations/solutions. Oversees financial resources and allocates them to initiatives and projects driven by the community, supporting the development and implementation of innovative solutions within the food system.
27	Coordinates pre-disaster emergency food planning with CBOs and city agencies. Develops and manages an emergency food plan with CBOs and city agencies in advance of a disaster. Activities can include: cataloging existing food resources (i.e., food banks, distribution centers, CBO programs, etc.) and map their locations; developing communication strategies; evaluating potential disaster risks and their impact on SF's food system.
28	Oversees food-related programs. Has the big picture overview of all food related projects and programs occurring in the city. An entity that oversees all food-related programs should help establish and maintain a consistent vision and strategy for addressing food justice. Centralized oversight promotes effective coordination and streamlines the implementation of consistent funding and programs, reducing redundancy and ensuring efficient use of resources that reflects food sovereignty/food justice values and facilitates community-led solutions.

Model 1: Mayor's Office

Model 2: Office within an existing City Department

Model 3: Collective impact model with decentralized leadership and only a fiscal intermediary

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.

In this model, an Office would be established as part of an existing City Department, most likely either the Department of Public Health (DPH) or Human Services Agency (HSA). It could also be an interdepartmental office, similar to the Office of Racial Equity. 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.

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.

Subcommittee Discussion

- This is the most ideal model, in terms of number of resources and keeping food security at the forefront of policy focus in SF
- However, it is probably not plausible right now, given upcoming elections and the long-term advocacy that would likely be needed to establish such an office
- It is worth discussing how to advocate and plan for this in the future, in combination with other options that have more opportunities for community engagement, diverse membership, and inclusive membership structure

Subcommittee Discussion

- This model seems the most realistic way to get to a City focus, with its proximity to the mayor and being able to advocate and influence city-wide funding. It could be a stepping stone toward eventually getting a Mayor's Office model in the future.
- This should be interdepartmental, similar to the Office of Racial Equity functions in SF today
- Will need to be intentional about checks and balances as well as interdepartmental coordination to ensure maximum community engagement and diversity/inclusion



Subcommittee Discussion

- This type of model is extremely attracting, but is difficult to sustain efforts without strong backbone support or engagement
- It works very well when there is strong backbone support staff and participants are very engaged, but we would have to think through how to make this possible
- Regardless, we would like to build in collective impact conditions to any model that we propose, including integrating as many of these tenets as possible into the work and function of another public body (model 6)



Model 4: Public Body (Commissions, Councils, Task Forces, and Advisory Councils)

Model 5: 501(c)(3) model where an existing CBO is funded to lead the collaborative efforts citywide

Model 6: 501(c)(3) model where a new organization is started to lead the collaborative efforts citywide

In this model, a public body is created by a legislative entity (such as a Board of Supervisors) with a very specific purpose or charge. Sometimes (especially with Task Forces) they have a sunset date, subject to renewal. In California, a public body is subject to the Brown Act and Sunshine ordinance, which comes with requirements for public disclosure of information and opportunity for public comment. Often, public bodies are created with specific representative seats, which may be named by the Mayor and approved by the Board of Supervisors. It may also include an application process for members of the public to serve terms alongside appointed seats. They are typically staffed with employees of existing organizations or City departments. Unlike with a nonprofit structure, public bodies are typically advisory and do not apply for grants or administer programs.



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.

This model is nearly identical to Model 5 (a 501(c)(3) model where an existing CBO is funded to lead the collaborative efforts citywide), except that instead of designating an existing community-based organization to lead this work, a new 501(c)(3) would be created for this specific purpose. In this case, the sole mission of the new organization would be to create and maintain a food security structure for San Francisco. It would be unencumbered by existing politics or interagency conflicts. However, it would require legally establishing a new organization, securing office space, and hiring new staff before this work could begin, with a considerable amount of time and effort required.

Subcommittee Discussion

- The mix of perspectives from a public body like FSTF is very valuable
- Since the FSTF already exists, this should be fairly feasible politically (to get the BOS to create version 2.0)
- Proximity to political power is indirect now, so having a more direct line would be better
- Interested in shifts that would increase community-level input and representation, including from people with lived experience of food insecurity
- Also wanting to streamline the application process for joining the body as a member

Subcommittee Discussion

- The motivation of considering this model: The CBO is the engine by which there is staff, momentum, and setting priorities.
- Not a “must-have” model, since other models can incorporate CBO perspectives as needed
- **Concern over one single organization shouldering the responsibility of food security organizing in the city**
- **No single CBO identified to lead this work currently**

Subcommittee Discussion

- The motivation of considering this model: The CBO is the engine by which there is staff, momentum, and setting priorities.
- Not a “must-have” model, since other models can incorporate CBO perspectives as needed
- **Probably not realistic to start a new nonprofit right now, in order to move this work forward without the challenges inherent to selecting an existing organization to do it**

In Summary:

Interdepartmental City Office

In this model, an interdepartmental office would be established, similar to the [Office of Racial Equity](#). 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.

Ultimately work toward establishment of a Mayor's Office (potentially in addition to this one)



An Advisory Council to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor and City Departments

In this model, a public body is created by a legislative entity (such as a Board of Supervisors) with a very specific purpose or charge. In California, a public body is subject to the Brown Act and Sunshine ordinance, which comes with requirements for public disclosure of information and opportunity for public comment. Often, public bodies are created with specific representative seats, which may be named by the Mayor and approved by the Board of Supervisors. It may also include an application process for members of the public to serve terms alongside appointed seats. They are typically staffed with employees of existing organizations or City departments. Unlike with a nonprofit structure, public bodies are typically advisory and do not apply for grants or administer programs.

Incorporate as many tenets of collective impact as possible

Interdepartmental City Office

Still TBD:

- Suggested name
- Mission/charge
- Roles/responsibilities
 - *Data, evaluation, monitoring (e.g. biennial food security and equity report)*
- Major partners/liaisons
- Requested staffing
- Funding by (general fund? TBD grant funding? Other?)

An Advisory Council to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and City Departments

Type of body

- Task Force
- Commission
- Council

As an Advisory Council it is a permanent and integral public body



- **Advisory Council to the Mayor and other City Departments**

Specific charge/focus

- Advocacy related to food security
- **Make resolutions and binding recommendations for food-related policies or procedures**
- Ensuring community input into recommendations put forth
- **Input and oversight into the City's food security data and reporting, as well as budget**
- **Advising of policymakers in the City and County of SF (including to influence ordinances)**
- **Meet with the Mayor's Office quarterly**

An Advisory Council to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and City Departments

Number and designation of seats

- 10 appointed seats (e.g. Office of Equity, Mayor's Office, SNAP, WIC, DPH, other City departments, etc.)
- 7 seats for unaffiliated community members with lived experience of food insecurity
- 5-10 seats for people with specific expertise or representation (e.g. urban agriculture, nutrition, healthy retail, etc.)
- Applications from community at large (including CBO staff) to fill 10 additional seats

Want to build in flexibility to expand or contract the number in the future based on review of function

Appointment or application process

- Mayor appoints members
- Board of Supervisors appoints members
- Represented entities appoint seats (e.g. interdepartmental office has 2 seats and they pick who fills them)
- Applications from community at large

These appointments should have to meet minimum criteria



Goal to favor people with lived experience of food insecurity during the application review process



An Advisory Council to the Board of Supervisors, Mayor, and City Departments

Leadership structure

- TBD

Reports to

- Board of Supervisors
- New interdepartmental office

Staffing

- At least 4 staff required:
 - Policy/Politics specialist
 - Data/Reports specialist
 - Community liaison
 - Logical support
- Staff located in the new interdepartmental office

Compensation

- No compensation
- Compensation only for community members with lived experience of food insecurity
- Compensation for all people not in appointed seats
- Non-monetary compensation for community members with lived experience in the form of:
 - childcare during meetings
 - transportation vouchers
 - food during meetings

Plus, to make participation more possible for community members:

- *Meeting timing needs to be considered*
- *Interpretation also needs to continue to be available during all meetings*

Thoughts? Questions?

Thank you!

