

Approved FSTF Meeting Minutes

April 3, 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); 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); Anne Quaintance (Conard House); Mei Ling Hui (Urban Agriculture Program); Hannah Grant (Meals on Wheels SF); Lura Jones (Leah’s Pantry); Meg Davidson (San Francisco-Marin Food Bank); Michelle Kim (Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families)

Also Present: Cathy Huang (SF HSA); Danielle Lundstrom (SFDPH – SNAP-Ed); Dara Geckeler (Facente Consulting); Ellen Garcia (Eat SF); Fiona McBride (SF HSA); Greg Gilgen (Justice – CalGreen); Janna Cordeiro (Food as Medicine Collaborative); Josue Ruiz (Facente Consulting); La Rhonda Reddic (SFDPH/Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Eric Chan (SFDPH/Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Leah Walton (SF DAS); Mark Biedlingmaier (The SF Market); Rebeca Flores (SFDPH/Office of Anti-Racism & Equity); Serena Ngo (Hirsch Philanthropy Partners); Tiffany Dang (SF DAS)

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
1. Call order to order 1:30 p.m.	Call to order at 1:36 p.m.	
2. Land Acknowledgment 1:30 p.m.	Eric Chan recited the Land Acknowledgement.	
3. Welcome, member roll call, introductions, Cissie Bonini (Chair, EatSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies) 1:35 p.m.	Eric Chan did roll call and introduced the agenda. Public Comment: None.	
4. Approval of minutes from March 6, 2024 1:40 p.m.	Hyperlinks in the meeting minutes do not work and need to be updated. Meg Davidson made motion to approve meeting minutes with stated edits. Tiffany Kearney seconded the motion. Public Comment: None. 8 task force members approved. 0 task force members opposed. 2 task force members abstained.	

	Motion has passed and minutes are approved.	
5. General Public Comment 1:45 p.m.	<p>Janna Cordeiro: I want to shout out Eric and Kaela for the BFSE presentation, I know that can be intimidating to present in front of a commission. You did a good job at answering questions. I do want to encourage or try to figure out a better way to get people there because nobody made public comment and I just felt like it was a missed opportunity. I wasn't prepared myself so that's bad on me, but I didn't know about the meeting and didn't feel well so I didn't go in person. I just want to encourage this group in the future to get the word out, it's a good opportunity for the health commissioners to get information and they clearly need more education and information about food security issues in San Francisco.</p> <p>Paula Jones: Thank you so much for that Janna, it's really important, appreciate that.</p>	
6. AB 1967 – Food Insecurity Officer, consideration of FSTF letter of support, Meg Davidson (San Francisco-Marin Food Bank) 1:50 p.m.	<p>Meg Davidson brought a request to the Food Security Task Force to submit a letter of support for AB 1967, which creates a cabinet level Food Insecurity Officer position, for the entire state to ensure policy alignment and optimization of outcomes and resources. The Mayor has already submitted a letter of support and reflects the official stance of the city and county of San Francisco in support of this bill.</p> <p>Geoffrey Grier: Could you provide more clarity/a more direct, pedestrian explanation of what the legislation will do?</p> <p>Meg Davidson: Right now, food security is kind of a mish mosh at the state level, no one's really responsible or accountable for it. It goes across the Department of Social Services, the Department of Food and Agriculture, Health and Human Services, etc. A lot of departments are responsible for some component of food security but there is not one leader who is accountable for those outcomes.</p>	

What this bill would do is create a Food Insecurity Officer at the state level who is accountable for ending food insecurity in the state of California.

Anne Quaintance (online comment): When would the position start? Do other states have Food Insecurity Officers? What department would this position be? How would this affect DAS funds?

Meg Davidson: Yes, there are several states that have a role like this – New Jersey, Pennsylvania, etc. The research was done by reaching out to these states to develop the language for this bill, and I can get this research to you. The position start date is dependent on funding. There is a companion budget ask with this. Luckily the author of the bill, Assemblymember Jackson, happens to chair the budget committee where this bill is going to be heard. I don't know how this will affect DAS funds.

Anne Quaintance: I was wondering about the bureaucracy, and that was my other question of where would this position sit. Overall it's great, but will add another layer of bureaucracy if this person has actually has authority of some kind, over funds, contracts, etc. I'm sure there's more pros than cons.

Meg Davidson: The position was originally going to sit within the government operations office. Now it's going to be with the California Department of Social Services. We've been working with the department to try to make sure the language makes sense to them and have been providing technical assistance so we have a good understanding across the author's office and the department on how it would work in practice. We've been leaning on some of the other states and their experiences, where they position their roles and how has it been working.

Paula Jones: This body is able to take a position on this legislation because the city has taken a position on it and is in support.

Tiffany Kearney: Paula how do we know the city has taken a position? Where is this documented?

	<p>Paula Jones: The Mayor’s letter of support is on the website.</p> <p>Eric Chan: It’s linked under agenda item 6.</p> <p>Paula Jones: We clarified with the Policy and Planning Office that the Task Force can take a position on this one and the next piece of legislation.</p> <p>Michelle Kim: I put the link in the chat.</p> <p>Public Comment: None.</p> <p>Meg Davidson makes a motion for the San Francisco Food Security Task Force to submit a letter of support for AB 1967.</p> <p>Geoffrey Grier seconded the motion.</p> <p>11 task force members approved. 0 task force members opposed. 1 task force member abstained.</p> <p>The motion has passed and the Task Force will be submitting a letter of support for AB 1967.</p>	
<p>7. AB 1975 – Medi-Cal: medically supportive food and nutrition interventions, consideration of FSTF letter of support, Cissie Bonini (Chair, EatSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies) and Paula Jones (Vice-Chair, OARE/SFDPH) 2:00 p.m.</p>	<p>Paula Jones: Ab 1975, sponsored by Mia Bonta, is a bill focused on transitioning medically supportive food interventions from the pilot stage of CalAIM to a permanent MediCal benefit. The transition is set up in two phases – first it will support a transition that will account for experiences happening now through CalAIM, and then it will call for an advisory group to support the Department of Healthcare Services to craft a benefit guidance. Phase 2 will have a permanent benefit launch in July 2026. We did check in the Policy and Planning Department at DPH and they said that this is a piece of legislation the city has taken a position in support of through the city’s legislative committee. This would create a new fund to support food interventions, tailored to people with high medical needs.</p>	

Mia Schwartz: You did a great summary of the bill. Currently, medically supportive food and nutrition services is the second most utilized community support in CalAIM, so that means that 26,000 Californian residents on MediCal are receiving these services, and that number is growing as eligibility expands and health plans begin to opt into these services. It is essential that the timing of this advisory work group line up before the end of CalAIM so that way the benefit can be informed and that there's no benefits cliff for those members who are receiving benefits so that they have a smooth continuity of care.

Anne Quaintance: Could you describe what kind of services people are receiving right now?

Mia Schwartz: Of course. The bill calls for seven medically supportive food and nutrition interventions. The most commonly offered are medically tailored meals and medically supportive groceries as well as food pharmacies.

Anne Quaintance: Sorry Mia, I meant in San Francisco specifically. How's it going, who's providing, and maybe how you think it will change, just so that everyone is informed.

Mia Schwartz: San Francisco Health Plan is contracted with On Lok, Project Open Hand, Meals on Wheels to offer medically tailored meals, and I believe they just opened up their eligibility quite widely. Before, eligibility was only available to those with chronic kidney disease, stages 3 and 4 and congestive heart failure. Now the eligibility list opened up to everything on the DHCS policy guide, which spreads from cancer to being qualified for ECM, diabetes, gestational diabetes, hypertension. They estimated there are about 45,000 members eligible to receive these services through the San Francisco Health Plan, and I do know that they are having trouble driving referrals. The eligibility criteria just expanded in January, so they're figuring out how to drive referrals and how to get the community to spread awareness of these services. Anthem also offers the same set of services but with a different set of contractors.

	<p>Janna Cordeiro (online comment): eligibility in SFHP 1. Individuals with chronic conditions, such as but not limited to diabetes, cardiovascular disorders, congestive heart failure, stroke, chronic lung disorders, human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), cancer, gestational diabetes, or other high risk perinatal conditions, and chronic or disabling mental/behavioral health disorders.</p> <p>Paula Jones: Thank you, Mia. I think we should schedule an update in the next few months from your team and everyone working on this because there's a lot going on.</p> <p>Hannah Grant: I think it's important to endorse this, with this being a five-year limited waiver, there is some hesitancy for organizations to build out programs knowing that the reimbursement might go away so soon and to make that initial investment. Having this be a permanently covered benefit might ease some of that and we would see more programs, and more effective programs and see more people benefit.</p> <p>Meg Davidson: The food bank is also in support of this legislation for many of the reasons already laid out, especially with what Janna put in the chat about medically tailored groceries. Thinking about our home delivered groceries program and its ability to be effective in the long run and have a source of funding that is reliable.</p> <p>Meg Davidson makes a motion for the San Francisco Food Security Task Force to submit a letter of support for AB 1975.</p> <p>Guillermo seconded the motion.</p> <p>11 task force members approved. 0 task force members opposed. 1 task force member abstained.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>The motion has passed and the Task Force will be submitting a letter of support for AB 1975.</p>	
<p>8. Update on subcommittee on Reimagining Food Coordination, Jade Quizon (Subcommittee Chair, API Council) 2:10 p.m.</p>	<p>Please refer to the recording for this agenda item, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 30:00 minute mark and ends at the 58:00 minute mark.</p> <p>On behalf of the subcommittee, Facente Consulting presented the process of the subcommittee and on the six models for a food organizing structure in San Francisco. The purpose of the presentation was to provide an overview of each model rather than a deep dive.</p> <p>Jade Quizon: I know we call them models, but sometimes I think of them as components because we will need bits from each model in order to make the food system change we want. We're not choosing one model but pull different pieces together.</p> <p>Dara Geckeler: Are there initial reactions or comments, or strong inclinations toward or against one of these models? Any feedback you have now would be helpful for the subcommittee.</p> <p>Anne Quaintance: Thank you for all this work. Regarding pros and cons for sustainability and funding, administrative work, etc. How should we be thinking about these in these models?</p> <p>Jade Quizon: I think those are specific to the context that they're in. When we were doing research, there were some governments that were super involved in helping build out the community arm, so they would give seed funding to a budding coalition. With the subcommittee, we did a current landscape analysis of San Francisco, and what comes to mind is FFACTS, they just got seed funding. This is kind of like model 6, so I think funding and sustainability is noted and how it might be more or less difficult for some models to get funding vs. others.</p>	

Anne Quaintance: Thank you, I think realistically for us to make a decision on this we would need to know where the funding would come from, and the pros and cons of that.

Josue Ruiz: I did link the criteria in the chat. For some context, the survey results showed that financial sustainability and independence was voted 16 in terms of level of importance. If you have a chance to look through the models more in depth, try to make note of which models have criteria 16 as “definitely could be addressed” those are probably the ones that address it more easily, like the Mayor’s office model vs. those that are harder are like the collective impact model. And just because the criteria were voted on a certain way, doesn’t necessarily mean that some things shouldn’t be more urgent in terms of consideration or considered first.

Anne Quaintance: Yeah absolutely. We really wanted to see all the models regardless of what the funding would look like, but once you get down to trying to decide and pick which one, obviously we want to continue some form of addressing food security in San Francisco, and some of them have a higher risk of not existing or not continuing and some have a higher probability of sustainability, which is why we’ve ended up being in this body that we’re in, and we want to transition but wanting to focus on this piece when we make a real decision.

Anne Quaintance: Is there a possibility of picking two? Something else we’ve been working on is this independent body, and some of the non-profits and coalitions are doing that. I could see trying to highlight two, to have the ability to advocate and also address things at a city-wide, policy/budget level.

Dara Geckeler: Yes, absolutely. The point of separating them out like this and having pros and cons is we want to maximize the pros and minimize the cons. And taking this information in the San Francisco context, we might be drawing on elements of all of them.

Paula Jones: I think we're trying to imagine a structure that has different components, and these are models that are components. I'm curious how important it is to the group to have a public body that is a part of a structure. This is a public body, we've been doing this a while, but is it important to have a public body, that's part of, say an office of food, like there is an advisory committee that is a public body. I would love to hear thoughts/comments.

Jade Quizon: Advisory councils are making me think of other advisory councils that exist in other cities and how they're made up of people with lived experiences of food insecurity. It would be cool to have something like this.

Michelle Kim: I envision what others have shared, a combination of different models. To share a little bit of history, DCYF used to not be its own department, we used to be part of the Mayor's Office and us too, we have an advisory committee so it could look something similar where we have this government branch where we do RFPs for the FO1cs but we still have an advisory committee that we listen to. I can see it evolving into several different models, it's doable but more so what the committee wants.

Public Comment:

Rebeca Flores: I feel that a combination is wonderful. Collective impact is amazing, it's something that works well with a common goal and mutually reinforces itself. Personally, I think it would be beautifully connected to the Mayor's Office because you would have the strength of that governmental office and collective impact. I've seen it work in other areas. I think there's strength in that and a combination of more than two if possible because San Francisco is so special.

Janna Cordeiro (online comment): For personal reasons, I have not been able to participate in the sub-committee but have been keeping an eye out on this

	<p>work. I really appreciate how you laid out the models and the analysis — very easy to understand very complex information. I really like the format. it’s often hard to absorb this kind of information and while I do think it takes time/thought to absorb, you’ve made it doable.</p> <p>Paula Jones: Kudos to the team, Facente Consulting for pulling this information together and Jade and Eric for leading this group and all the members of the subcommittee.</p> <p>Paula Jones: It sounds like our process is that this is just an initial conversation, presenting the information, the next steps will be to have two meetings in April to have more discussion. In the May task force meeting, the subcommittee will bring forth a structure that may be a combination of components, and that will be a discussion item with the hope of getting a model that the task force endorses so that we can start sharing that with electeds and the community. Eric will be sending out this information in advance of the next task force meeting. The item will hold quite a bit of time at our next meeting.</p>	
<p>9. FSTF 2024 Recommendations, Eric Chan (SFDPH/OARE) 2:25 p.m.</p>	<p>Please refer to the recording for this agenda item, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 58:05 minute mark and ends at the 1:27:20 minute mark.</p> <p>Eric Chan provided an update on the process and timeline for the FSTF 2024 Recommendations.</p> <p>Paula Jones: From everything that was presented, do any task force members have questions or see things that are missing?</p> <p>Paula Jones: What we would like from the task force is agreement that these are our recommendations for 2024 and that we can move to finalize them and get them produced with slides and start setting up meetings with department heads, elected officials, and the Mayor’s office.</p>	

Paula Jones: What we're missing is a discussion around a new structure. What we do have is coordination in the challenges, and we should somehow mention that the task force will be coming back with recommendations about a different structure and should be part of the recommendations.

Anne Quaintance (online comment): Looks great! I think having an estimated cost would be helpful, but that's tough to do. I meant cost the cost of the recommendations.

Tiffany Kearney: The one thing that sticks out to me is "invest in affordable housing and funding for food programs for supportive and SRO housing". I am all for investing in affordable housing and how it's related to food security, but I feel this shouldn't be included in here, specifically the affordable housing piece.

Anne Quaintance (online comment): It's been called out as unmet need for residents in Supportive Housing.

Paula Jones: I didn't notice that they were put together in one bullet. I don't think the text doesn't necessarily merge them that way, but I'm not sure. I tried to summarize for the purposes of these bullets. Anne, your comment – are you talking about food programs or affordable housing?

Anne Quaintance: The way it's written is SRO housing but we try to call it as supportive housing. It's not as broad as affordable housing, which is extremely broad. Supportive housing has on-site case management but lacks access to food security.

Tiffany Kearney: I think the supportive housing piece is great. I'm reading it as invest in affordable housing and invest in food programs for supportive housing. I see those as two separate things, and the affordable housing piece I don't see should be part of our recommendations.

Paula Jones: What we've done in the past is talk about upstream issues, and maybe that's how we said it in the past. I think we can separate those. I don't think we want to lose the messaging of we understand food programs are a downstream issue, yet that's what this group is charged to do, but even last year we've got more language around upstream issues, and I'm wondering if we can pull that back and talk about childcare, affordable housing, and mention that upstream issues are critical, but the main focus of our recommendations are going to be on the food issues. Would that make sense?

Tiffany Kearney: Yes, it's just a small opinion of mine.

Paula Jones: Thanks, we can work on refining the language.

Geoffrey Grier: It seems as though there is a move to have specific departments be responsible for housing. This brings me to my question of what is the purpose of HSH? If there's housing required, say by the task force, that's fine, I endorse it, but there needs to be funding to support that.

Paula Jones: I think as it relates to these recommendations, can you kind of tie it to these recommendations?

Geoffrey Grier: Is there funding tied to these housing requests?

Paula Jones: No there's no funding associated with any of it. And now that I'm thinking about it that was Anne's earlier question for recommendations, can we put a cost associated with each recommendation?

Geoffrey Grier: I'm with her 100%, across the board, task force, substance abuse, mental health, and then everyone being saddled with housing, well we'd love to participate in that. Is there any money helping with that? We have a specific department called HSH, why aren't they in play?

Paula Jones: They are, Emily is on the call. I think even putting a budget associated with some of these recommendations could be a challenge. We could, based on the biennial report and its data around budget projections, we could look at what would restoration of budgets look like. I think for all of the recommendations, it probably would be very difficult to do. Maybe for recommendations we don't put anything about these upstream issues, but instead we put it in some other place. I'm just not sure with this group, what we've heard from Tiffany, Geoffrey, and what we'll do is try our best to get this finalized.

Janna Cordeiro (online comment): Is there any mention of how City processes need to be overhauled so that public funds can efficiently reach the CBO partners that the City relies on to implement many food programs?

Paula Jones: In response to Janna, there is. There is something related to that around efficiency, we don't necessarily have how this might be implemented. These could be things that the subcommittee look at re: structures.

Tiffany Kearney: I think the investing in affordable housing statement is beyond the scope of what the food security task force should have as a recommendation because that is a much bigger conversation. Everything else in that section besides the affordable housing piece makes total sense.

Paula Jones: I understand what you're saying. I think we can add a broader concept around landscape/context that mentions the high cost of living that can weave it in and take it out of the recommendations section.

Rebeca Flores (online comment): I disagree with not addressing affordable housing. It is a strong driver to lack of affordability to purchase food. It is about pushing forth policies to perhaps have more affordable housing that allows people extra money to buy the necessities to exist. It is different than asking for

	<p>funding to afford rent. When you have to decide between buying groceries and paying rent becomes difficult. Perhaps changing the way it is being said.</p> <p>Tiffany Kearney made a motion to finalize the recommendations framework/guideline to develop the food security task force recommendations for 2024.</p> <p>Anne Quaintance seconded the motion.</p> <p>10 task force members approved. 0 task force members opposed. 0 task force members abstained.</p> <p>Motion has passed. The guideline will be used to finalize the recommendations.</p>	
<p>10. Biennial Food Security & Equity Report – Input on process and content for 2025 report, Paula Jones (Vice-Chair, SFDPH/OARE) 3:00 p.m.</p>	<p>Please refer to the recording for this agenda item, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 1:27:30 minute mark and ends at the 1:54:05 minute mark.</p> <p>Paula Jones presented slides and held a discussion asking for input on the 2025 Biennial Food Security & Equity Report to determine the timeline, report contents, data and analytics, and the process.</p> <p>Paula Jones: The task force is set to sunset in June of 2026. For the 2025 report, we would want time to process it. If the deadline were pushed back into early 2026, I’m not sure this group would want that. If it is late 2025, it would most likely include this fiscal year’s data (FY 23 -24) because it was a very tight timeline for reporting.</p> <p>Anne Quaintance: For timing, do you mean 2025 calendar year or you mean 2025 fiscal year?</p>	

Paula: The calendar year, right now with the ordinance the report is due October 1st. We had to get an exception because we couldn't make the deadline and it ended up coming out on December 28th.

Anne Quaintance: For budget and policy process, October is great because people are starting to think about what they're going to submit for their department budgets, and as you move along the calendar year it starts to become great for raising awareness. If we miss October, I think November is fine, but I don't think December is a good month, so either October, November, or January.

Paula Jones: So, in terms of the content, we did include data from non – reporting agencies, which were community organizations like the food bank, the child and adult care food program sponsors, Wu Yee, and Children's Council. We did collect data from Market Match and Jade collected all of the information from free meal programs, but I'd like to get a sense from the task force is that important to include? We're trying to think about what staffing structure supports all of this because our team and I am sure for HSA just for their part took a lot of extra time, but our team was working around the clock, and we don't have the same level of staff so what I'm trying to do is really get some input from the task force and later from the public what data from non-reporting agencies is important to include because it is a different process to go get it if they're not named in the report.

Anne Quaintance: I think FY 23-24 data is more ideal for the 2025 report. I do think the most current data you can get is great but the reality for most agencies is that this would be difficult to get in time.

Paula Jones: We heard in meetings that we didn't have enough community data, so we did it. I'm just curious, it takes a lot of work and staffing, it is important but wanting to get a sense from the task force how important is it. It

might not be possible to get a sense right now, but it is a role that the task force has been given in the ordinance to collect this data.

Paula Jones: How should the recommendations section be developed? What we had originally done was asked departments around their recommendations and then asked in public meetings around recommendations and then we ended up including only the information from public meetings and this was the direction we were given as a staff in a department. So, I think that the recommendations section – I’m thinking about what process it’s going to take from the task force to possibly help more with that section of recommendations than a couple of public meetings. We just reviewed recommendations for 2024 I’m wondering how possibly the report recommendations and the task force could actually be the same process. I don’t know if it’s possible but it’s like two different steps.

Paula Jones: The data team is really wanting to know how the data and analytics can better support the task force’s work. So, one was just that the tables were not really helpful and what was requested in the report right now is more in-depth summaries and analysis of program coverage by zip code, neighborhood and demographics. So not having all these tables for everybody to look at but much more summarized information. Other comments were that the fiscal 22-23 data did not reflect the reality and that was the most current data. We were asked to examine the waitlist which we did but I think we will have to come back to this item. Wondering if there were waitlists at community based organizations that was what the group wanted. We did ask reporting agencies about wait lists. The other thing was we were asked to look at fiscal 23-24 data to see how programs had been impacted. Another recommendation from public meetings was to look at how budget cuts have impacted the priority populations and zip codes. The last two were also included because that’s what we heard in meetings. I think it is beyond the scope of what we can do in this report, but it another recommendation was to look at strategies being used for programs to deliver and coordinate food and evaluate the underutilization of programs and develop a plan. It is important but it is more than we can do, I am

wondering though to get your feedback is what changes to analyses and data would the task force like for future versions? How can the team better present the data? Does the previous kind guide us enough?

Anne Quaintance: I think what we have tried to do and what people are interested in is always unmet needs. People are also interested in the need we're meeting right? And seeing how we're doing and seeing how we're getting better. I think the wait lists have been a way to tangibly show the unmet needs. I think the combination of the analytics that we use as well as just here are people waiting. So I do think it's helpful.

Paula Jones: Probably a summary of how many have waitlists and how many are collecting that. So, I think more summary data and to look at some of what was already brought up is what I am hearing right now. In terms of the process questions and then I want to open it up. Presented the role of the task force and the ordinance as follows, collecting data sets, developing recommendations, preparing presentations, collecting data from non-city agencies. We tried to update the task force every month. Did that work for people? Would you rather have different ways to get updated, how often, about what?

Anne Quaintance: I think the more regularly people hear the more communication we have is helpful. I do think we want to have that kind of involvement, but I ask you, how often do you think we have to report?

Paula Jones: I was the one that thought of monthly just to check in on what was important just so the task force could be informed about what's happening along the way. I think shorter would be okay unless there is some issue or for really something for input and then we would have to give enough time for that. Does the task force want any hand in preparing and writing the report because we have to build that into our project plan. I am not sure how we would do it because we don't have the same kind of team support we had before. I think we will hold that for now.

The last piece the Center for Data Science wanted to know is what should happen if there are submissions after deadline from reporting agencies? Meeting a deadline versus having fuller information is something that we have to grapple with. And then what should we do, there is nothing much we can do if a reporting agency doesn't provide data but the task force may be able to weigh in more on that. I am going to open it up for public comment.

Fiona McBride: Thinking about the program year being reflected, I don't have a firm recommendation, but I think the balance between appropriate reporting time that sounds like you're trying to address by using the fiscal year 23-24 data with having meaningful data that we can draw new conclusions from. I think it was a lot of work for your team to process all that data and get it together into a report and so just thinking, would it be more valuable to use the 24-25 data to keep with that biennial theme and have a little bit to have seen some potential changes. There might be more opportunity to draw new or kind of longitudinal findings from waiting a little longer.

Paula Jones: Thank you for that to use 24-25 we would see probably pretty big, pronounced changes as Fiona says, however it is very difficult if not impossible to meet the October 1st deadline by using that current data.

Fiona McBride: I agree, I agree, it would require a different type of deadline.

Paula Jones: If we called a special meeting to discuss this a bit more would any of the task force members be able to help? I think that if we wait another month, planning is already starting to happen so we could come back and have an in-depth conversation about the tradeoffs. I would just want taskforce members to be able to attend that. Because the taskforce is the one that is reviewing the data, that is holding the public meetings, that has got the charge of the city to make recommendations, so we have got to make sure that this is going to work for what the task force needs.

Anne Quaintance: I don't see the need to have another meeting in a smaller group unless there is more participation, otherwise I would not recommend it.

Paula Jones: What about the tradeoffs with having more current data if we were to publish the 24-25 data for the 25 report or to use a year-old data for the 2025 report, the previous fiscal year data? Because what we did this year is we published a 2023 report and we used 2022-23 data.

Anne Quaintance: I would do the same.

Paula Jones: To do that we would have to narrow down. Fiona I would kind of love to get your thoughts on that. How could we narrow down what we're doing so that we could do it? Maybe do less but do it better.

Fiona McBride: How much flexibility would there be to say publish the report instead of late 2025 would spring 2026 be too late? I think there would be an ability to have that recent fiscal year data.

Anne Quaintance: I think if it is going to take many months to get it out from the close of the fiscal year because once the year passes we're saying 24 versus 25 versus 26, I think it is similar and the data hasn't changed that much.

Paula Jones: I think the data will probably change between this fiscal year 23- 24 and 24 -25 year given that we have major budget cuts. We will see specific changes. If the point is to be able to use it for the task force, we need it by October or November. We couldn't even meet it this year by the October deadline and get all the data. I think what we have to do is narrow what we are asking for and narrow our analyses.

Anne Quaintance: I think we were saying it's Spring versus January. I think it is just us figuring out is it a three-month turnaround, six-month turnaround, nine - month turnaround no matter what the date is. We have to all understand three

	<p>months is not realistic and is really hard to do so at that point it is six months and try to get it out in January.</p> <p>Paula Jones: Does anyone else have any comments? This is not the end of the conversation but really wanted to get thoughts form everybody and appreciate it. Is there any other public comment?</p> <p>Michelle Kim: In terms of the data updating I think some folks are probably more robust and able to have the data in sooner than others so I think it's convoluted if there's certain departments where their data is 23-24 but then some data is part of 24 only, so it is hard to get a sense of a read so I kind of think it is an all or nothing thing because of how my brain looks at it. All of the department's information needs to be from the same fiscal year, it can't just be for me it doesn't work that way. Because some folks may not be robust in their data metrics and really can't meet the deadline that we want and it would be okay if it's kind of old data just because it is too convoluted if we have some of the data in but not everybody's.</p>	
11. Updates and emerging issues 3:20 p.m.	Michelle Kim: Chester Williams is now a co-chair for the Sugary Drinks Distributor Tax Advisory Committee (SDDTAC), congrats to Chester!	None.
12. Adjournment 3:30 p.m.	Meeting adjourned at 3:32 p.m.	None.