Approved Food Security Task Force Subcommittee on Reimagining Food Coordination Meeting Minutes
April 15, 2024
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Present: Ellen Garcia (EatSF), 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), Tiffany Kearney (Department of Disability and Aging Services), Chester Williams (Community Living Campaign), Paula Jones (SFDPH)

Also Present: Shelley Facente (Facente Consulting), Josué Ruiz (Facente Consulting), Eric Chan (SFDPH)

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next steps
1. Call to order 3:30 p.m.	Jade Quizon called the meeting to order at 3:33 pm.	None.
2. Land Acknowledgement 3:30 p.m.	Raegan Sales recited the Land Acknowledgement.	None.
3. Welcome, member roll call, Jade Quizon (Subcommittee Chair, API Council) 3:35 p.m.	Jade Quizon took attendance via roll call.	None.
4. General Public Comment 3:40 p.m.	No public comment.	None.
5. Discussion and analysis of proposed food organizing structures and components, Facente Consulting 3:45 p.m.	Shelley Facente from Facente Consulting began the discussion by reviewing the timeline and process (please see these slides) and reviewed the Task Force's accomplishments thus far. Shelley gave a quick overview of Criteria 1-15, which were prioritized during the process and that any model moving forward would account for. There are an additional 13 criteria which are less important, but still crucial. As an example, administrative or political feasibility are criteria that must be considered for a future model for it to potentially exist.	None.

Shelley walked through each of the six models very briefly to refresh what was discussed in the previous subcommittee meeting.

Shelley Facente: "It's not about picking one model, but rather deciding which components make sense for a future food structure."

Structures and Components Discussion:

<mark>MODEL 1: MAYOR'S OFFICE</mark>
Shelley Facente: "Do we think we should recommend establishment of a Mayor's Office on Food Security?"

Chester Williams: "In my opinion, I would say we should go for it. I think it's a good way to go, but would they buy in?"

Irene Garcia: "The mayor's office may be aligned or not aligned in prioritizing this work."

Raegan Sales: "My concern is with the veto power that mayor has and with other issues we we've seen."

Irene Garcia: "This model has least diversity and least community input so that's something that needs to be addressed."

Jade Quizon: "This would be the ideal state at some point in the future, can we build into our strategy this long game of...we should still be thinking about how to make this happen."

Hannah Grant: "What are the reasons for the mayor's office being our dream scenario? We should think through this at some point."

Shelley then suggested that based on the discussion, it sounds like it makes sense to keep moving forward, but not dismiss this one entirely – we can make sure we have a future discussion potentially after the

election.

Paula Jones: "What I would add: In Boston, the mayor a few years back created it at that time. So maybe it was harder to get rid of because the mayor wanted…the mayor has to want it, depending on who the Mayor is. My recollection is that the there was a woman who was an advisor first. They had a lot of energy that allowed this office to come to be. Just offering some perspective from other cities where this happened."

MODEL 2: OFFICE WITHIN AN EXISTING CITY DEPARTMENT
Shelley Facente: "Do we think we should have a City Office dedicated to this?
a. If yes, should it be interdepartmental, or within a single department?
b. If a single department, which one?"

Irene Garcia: "Model 2 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. That's the strong advantage towards this particular model...and eventually getting to Model 1 through this."

Raegan Sales: "I don't like that it's missing our Top 3 criteria so there might be some checks and balances to build in those aspects, but it would have to be an inter-departmental group since so many agencies would be affected."

Chester Williams: "I'm thinking now that we have a pretty good idea of who we are, but those departments may not want to add another responsibility. Public health has been great, but I don't think it would get the 'kick' that we want to make the program go."

Raegan Sales: "To that point, is that applicable to Model 1 as well? If we had buy-in and commitment, then wouldn't these models exist already? So I'm wondering how that would work."

	Shelley Facente: "So it sounds like Model 2 may be more feasible than Model 1? And it's a bit of an open question of whether we should put energy into this rather than relying more on other strategies or structures?" Paula Jones: "Years ago, Seattle started with an interdepartmental working group and it's not the same as having an Office, but it's a little more similar to a dedicated office." Hannah Grant: "I'd like to see the community-based models, since that may help hash out more of my thoughts." ==MODEL 4: PUBLIC BODY (COMMISSIONS, COUNCILS, TASK FORCES, AND ADVISORY COUNCILS== Shelley Facente: "Do we think we should have a public body dedicated to this issue? If yes, what are the strengths/weaknesses of the current FSTF model? How can the strengths be built upon? How can the weaknesses be addressed?" Chester Williams: "Absolutely." (to the first question) Raegan Sales: "The mix of perspectives is very valuable. It's diverse in some ways, but maybe not so diverse in other ways." Hannah Grant: "I would like to streamline the application process; it took me a few months to go from applying to being on the task force." Chester Williams: "I agree. I think it needs to be streamlined." Shelley Facente: "What about the size of the task force?" Irene Garcia: "It's dependent on who is reflected in the room, but I would be open to a bigger task force if it allowed for more diversity"	

	MODEL 5: EXISTING CBO FUNDED TO LEAD EFFORTS Shelley Facente: "Do we think that there's an important role for a CBO to have leadership in doing this work in SF? If yes, is there an existing CBO that makes sense to lead, or would it be important to create a new CBO specifically for this purpose?" Irene Garcia: "For me, it doesn't seem to be like a must-have. Ideally, you'd have representation across the non-profit sector. No one organization must shoulder or spearhead to work alone. You also bypass that pick and choose process." Chester Williams: "Having representatives from the nonprofit sector may work. I like Model 5 a lot, people ask us that they want to do what we're doing, and I think they can if they set it up that way and do the work." **MODEL 3: COLLECTIVE IMPACT MODEL** Shelley gave a primer of the Collective Impact Toolkit for Food Councils. The purpose of talking through collective impact to address the 5 necessary conditions for a food structure based on a rigorous collective impact structure to work. Raegan Sales: "This type of thing is very difficult to sustain – it works when there is a very strong backbone and works best when the participants are engaged. It does seem like we should try to apply those collective impact thinking to any model we propose." Chester Williams: "Do you know of any models for this type of thing where the principles of collective impact were used, but it wasn't officially a collective impact model – it was something else?" Shelley Facente: "I'm not sure, but it does sound like it might make sense to incorporate these principles into another model, if people are unsure about going full-force toward collective impacts."	

Hannah Grant: "I like collective impact and I like the idea of a more representative public body and I also like the Mayor's office or city office, and I wonder if we could combined that and create some sort of interdepartmental working group to have influence in the City. We could have an advisory council that we can work very closely, that social impact structure and have somebody in the city that we work closely with."

Shelley Facente: "In the 11 minutes we have left, it sounds like Mayor's office is the someday scenario but not something we can build yet. The interdepartmental office sounds more feasible and worth talking through what that recommendation might be. That could be paired with a public body to get the best of both worlds with the CBOs in the landscape. Is this reflective of what we've discussed and what you all are thinking?"

Shelley then shared the [MURAL board that](#) was created at a previous meeting in order review the large number of entities that may be involved in this process.

The group agreed yes, this was a good way to proceed.

Hannah Grant: "I like that. If we want to move to a mayoral office, then this could a be good way to move towards that and build that buy-in."

Ellen Garcia: "I like the direction that we're moving towards. I'm getting stuck at the community input. In the criteria that we listed out, my opinion is that the 2 of the most important ones, reducing siloes and consistent funding, are not going to be achieved by a community body that doesn't have strong teeth. A hybrid model may be the only one to balance those priorities."

Shelley Facente: "We made a lot of progress today."

	Jade Quizon: "Thanks so much Shelley!" Public comment: None.	
6. Next steps, Jade Quizon (Chair, API Council) [Discussion and Possible Action Item]	The next subcommittee meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 23, 2024 from 2 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. Public comment: None.	None.
7. Adjournment	Jade Quizon adjourned the meeting at 4:58 p.m.	None.