

Approved FSTF Meeting Minutes

January 15, 2025

1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Virtual Meeting via Zoom

[Click here to view the meeting recording](#)

Present: Guillermo Reece (San Francisco African American Faith-Based Coalition); Jade Quizon (FAACTS); Tiffany Kearney (Department of Disability and Aging Services); Chester Williams (Community Living Campaign); Mei Ling Hui (Urban Agriculture Program); Lura Jones (Leah's Pantry); Jeimil Belamide (HSA/CalFresh); Michelle Kim (Department of Children, Youth, and Their Families); Priti Rane (DPH/Nutrition Services); Cissie Bonini (UCSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies – EatSF); Raegan Sales (Children's Council of SF); Noriko Lim-Tepper (SF-Marin Food Bank); Katie Jackson (Project Open Hand); Anne Quaintance (Conard House); Hannah Grant (Meals on Wheels SF); Geoffrey Grier (Recovery Theatre)

Also Present: Asa King (SFDPH); Beth Bodner (SF Environment); Cathy Huang (SFHSA); Christine Corpuz; Cindy Lin (SFHSA); Ellen Garcia (EatSF); Eric Chan (SFDPH – OARE); Fiona McBride (SFHSA); Guy Gutterman; Haley Nielsen (Farming Hope); Juell Stewart (HRC); Julie Hibarger; Katy Garlinghouse (Rollin' Root); Mark Biedlingmaier (The SF Market); Priscilla Rodriguez (SFDPH – OARE); Susie Smith (SFHSA); Tiffany Dang (DAS); Tommy McLain (SFHSA)

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
1. Call order to order 1:30 p.m.	Call to order at 1:32 p.m.	None.
2. Land Acknowledgment 1:33 p.m.	Eric Chan recited the Land Acknowledgement.	None.
3. Welcome, member roll call, introductions, Cissie Bonini (Chair, Eat SF/Vouchers 4 Veggies) 1:35 p.m.	Cissie Bonini did roll call and introduced the agenda. Cissie Bonini Acknowledged Paula Jones and her transition into another department within DPH. Priscilla Rodriguez, new member of the FSTF and DPH, introduced herself and provided background on her public health career. Public Comment: None.	None.

<p>4. Approval of minutes from December 4, 2024 1:40 p.m.</p>	<p>Chester William makes motion to approve minutes.</p> <p>Michelle Kim seconds the motion.</p> <p>None opposed. One abstained. Motion is passed.</p> <p>Public Comment: None.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>5. General Public Comment 1:45 p.m.</p>	<p>Katy Garlinghouse (Rollin' Root) serves Visitacion Valley, the Fillmore, and Bayview through a farmer's market on wheels. They pick up produce on the same day they visit these communities. Customers who use their EBT card get 50% off anything they buy through the Rollin' Root program. Contact Katy for more information.</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>6. FTSF Member Updates, Raegan Sales (Children's Council of San Francisco) 1:50 p.m.</p>	<p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 10:38 minute mark and ends at the 27:20 minute mark.</p> <p>Raegan Sales, Healthy Apple Program Lead at Children's Council of San Francisco and FSTF member, presented on the topic "Nourishing Young Children." A discussion/Q&A followed with additional notes below.</p> <p>The agenda for the presentation includes the overview of Children's Council's Health and Nutrition Programs, what they know about their population's food security status, food security goals, the pilot program "Farm to Early Care and Education", challenges, and future opportunities.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: We're moving on to item number six, FSTF member updates. Raegan has volunteered to present so Raegan it is your show.</p> <p>Raegan Sales: Children's Council of San Francisco spent the past year celebrating our 50th birthday. At Children's Council we believe in a San Francisco where every child is able to reach their full potential and thrive. Our organization touches on just about every aspect of childcare. By advocating for quality early care and education, empowering families with information and financial support, and building the capabilities of educators we ensure that every child in San Francisco has the opportunity to reach their full potential. We manage two core programs at Children's Council. One is the child and adult care food program which we refer to as CACFP</p>	

	<p>and the healthy apple program which is the one that I run. We also have been doing Farm to Early Care and Education (F2ECE) pilots over the last couple years. For those who don't know CACFP is a federal feeding program that provides supplemental income to childcare educators that serve healthy meals to the children that they care for. Our CACFP sponsors are about 240 licensed family childcare educators primarily across San Francisco with a handful also in Sonoma County. CACFP impacts food security by supporting providers that feed children in childcare which reduces the financial burden for families of young children. Healthy Apple is a quality improvement program that supports ECE's in their efforts to meet best practices in the areas of nutrition, physical activity, and gardening. We also have over 200 programs in Healthy Apple. There is some overlap, but Healthy Apples includes centers, family childcare owners, and unlicensed caregivers of children birth to age five all of whom are committed to ensuring that the foods that they serve are healthy. We now include the two-question food security screener as part of the needs assessment when families seek our services and our resource and referral office. 2024, which I believe was the first year that we had a full year of data, nearly 1,200 individuals and families were surveyed, and you can see the breakdown of the individual indicators. The main takeaway is that when you account for the overlap more than one in three families that seek our services reported experiencing food insecurity. This is anyone who's looking for childcare or looking to pay for childcare. It's really anyone who's looking for any information or anything related to childcare not just those who we know are low income. It is a high percentage of our families that we connect with. In addition, our team conducts an annual evaluation on the customer satisfaction for both of our core programs, CACFP and Healthy Apple, and we added the food security screener to that and found that approximately 40% of our program participants experience food insecurity. That's on the provider side so the educators. Although our programs only reach a fraction of all the providers across the city, this highlights the continued need to support our ECE educators even those who participate in feeding programs like CACFP that supplement their income in order to feed the children in their care. Given that data, our current food security goals are to continue refining and expanding food security screener data collection. Given staff turnover, it's always good to check in with the teams that are doing those screeners to make sure that they're applying it accurately and</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>know where to find the resources to share with families that do report food insecurity. We want to continue to use a health equity lens to prioritize our pilot feeding programs and communities that need the most support. We have been using the environmental justice map for the last couple years and we're committed to continuing to do that and of course we want to get food in the hands of ECE educators and the families that they care for. With that last goal in mind, I want to focus on our pilot feeding program that we've been working on over the past two years which is F2ECE. It includes three core elements. One is local food purchasing gardens and food nutrition and agricultural education implemented with the goal of enhancing the quality of the ECE environment and the educational experience in the ECE settings. Why does F2ECE matter? It helps childcare educators teach young children about nutrition, gardening, and the food system. We also support local sustainable farmers while increasing nutrition security for children, families, and the childcare educators themselves. In our last couple iterations, participants were encouraged to share any leftover produce that they received with the families in their care and by directly delivering fresh food to their programs they had more money in their pocket to feed their own families. The goals of F2ECE program are to increase the nutrition security among children ages 0 to five in priority neighborhoods. We want to support the family daycare homes in our CACFP to offer healthy food and supplement food costs and we want to support a more resilient sustainable and equitable food system by collaborating with a local food hub. We have now run two farmed ECE pilots. Each time we delivered large CSA boxes to over 20 family childcare homes that participated in our CACFP. As I mentioned, we use the environmental justice map to decide where to focus our deliveries and we also prioritize programs that had higher numbers of subsidized children in their care because we theorize that those are families that also may be experiencing food insecurity. The first time around we delivered to each individual site, and we quickly learned that that was not sustainable or scalable. Last year we tried delivering to just four ECE site hubs where folks could pick up their box from their neighbor. We also added trilingual education materials so that folks knew what was in their boxes and how to talk about them with the kids. Last year we were committed to trying another iteration of this program even though we were unable to secure outside funding so last year's pilot was funded internally by children's Council. Both of our pilots</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>reached hundreds of children, and we got over 3,000 pounds of sustainably grown produce into the ECE sites each year which translated to over 2,200 meals served. A bonus reach as I mentioned before is that any leftover produce was shared as take home with families which helped to reduce their food costs too. On the right hand side, you can see an example of a meal created by one of our Latina participants. She made spinach and cheese pupusas with zucchini curtido served with beautiful strawberries. I was definitely jealous of the kids that day. Post-assessment from our first pilot found that it was an overwhelming success. Participating in the program increased the amount of organic fresh fruits and vegetables that were served to children and increased the variety of fruits and vegetables served. Educators shared that throughout the program they didn't have to spend as much money on the fruits and vegetables for the meals and that children in care were more excited and willing to try new fresh foods. Obviously, a great success and shows why we were determined to do it again last year. All that said, here are some pressing food security related challenges that we experience not just with F2ECE but across my team's programs at Children's Council. As with other federally funded programs, the CACFP reimbursements for participants do not meet the actual cost of food served in ECE. Because we are a small but mighty team, we definitely have limited staff capacity for our core programs. Not only are the reimbursements for participants low in CACFP, the admin reimbursement to run the program is also low. We always have just enough staff to do the work that we're tasked with and that means that we have limited staff time for the pilot feeding programs that we really want to do like our CSA boxes and F2ECE. We have found that although it's very important and it's very well received by the participants, F2ECE is hard to fund. The grants are very competitive and that means that we've always had a limited scope, and we haven't been able to scale our efforts so far. As I mentioned before the one of the big barriers that we've had with F2ECE is our distribution challenges and just how hard it is to actually deliver those big CSA boxes to the sites in a way that's convenient for them. There are some future opportunities to support our work and collaborate with us. We do continue to seek out and apply for every state and federal grant that we qualify for to further our work with F2ECE but that said if you can help us fund it, please reach out we would love your support. If you have any connections or volunteers or suggestions or ways that you could support our</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>deliveries and coordination for the F2ECE program those would also be very appreciated. I know this has been in the last few iterations of the recommendations but please continue to help us advocate for CACFP reimbursement increases both for the admin cost that I mentioned and for our participants. If you know any childcare providers or have kids in care, please tell your ECE colleagues and caregivers about Healthy Apple. We're always looking to get more folks in the program so that we can have a positive impact on the healthy environments that kids are in with ECE. If you want to keep in touch with children's Council here is where you can find us and again these slides are online so feel free to reach out. I just want to say thank you to everyone on this call for your work and your dedication. Thank you for the time. I'm happy to get a chance to share about our F2ECE work. I'm happy to take any questions folks have with the remaining minutes and hear any reflections that you have. Thank you.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Super. Thank you, Raegan. That was great. Let's start with FSTF folks. Do we have comments or questions?</p> <p>Anne Quaintance: Ray, just amazing really incredible and great presentation as always. Your slide deck too. Also heartbreaking as always to hear that there is just not enough funding to support something that's working. Just as a follow-up, you may not want to share it here but just curious a little bit about the cost structure as far as if you're funding it kind of by program, by site, by number of children, and if you had just a sense of what it cost?</p> <p>Raegan Sales: I can follow up with that. I have to dig into those numbers, but we can look into that. The bulk of the cost goes to the farmers and the food. Of course, our staff time is part of it but most of the funding that we've used hasn't really gone towards that. We just kind of have been able to make it work with our teams but as we've looked at scaling that's something that has come up that probably would need some kind of coordinator even if it's part-time to really do that that work. That's one thing but as for our last couple pilots the bulk of it has gone to getting the food.</p> <p>Anne Quaintance: Which is great. I was just curious more about the numbers behind it and see what we can do.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Cissie Bonini: Raegan, I think that one in three of folks that are seeking childcare are food insecure. It is important and disturbing. We know that young children zero to five you know that's when they develop their pallets for fruits and vegetables so it's a really important time for nutrition.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Opening it up for public comment.</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>Katy Garlinghouse: Hi. Thank you so much for a great presentation. I was wondering how do you get connected to the farmers?</p> <p>Raegan Sales: We found a local food Hub that already had a connection with a lot of farmers and they work with all bipoc farms. It's a women led hub, and I got connected to them through other folks here at the FSTF. There was another person who was working with them and so they were already doing deliveries to San Francisco with that other program. We were able to hop on to that and make it less of a burden for them. Also, they could kind of get more bang for their buck for coming into the city.</p> <p>Katy Garlinghouse: Just to throw it out there, Rollin' Root is a program of the Agricultural Institute of Marin, and we run nine farmers markets across the bay area so it would be interesting to see if we can help in any way.</p>	
<p>7. Ordinance 241119 Update and Discussion on FSTF Subcommittee Proposal on Reimagining Food Coordination, Cissie Bonini (Chair, EatSF/Vouchers 4 Veggies) 2:00 p.m.</p>	<p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 27:20 minute mark and ends at the 1:12:33 minute mark.</p> <p>FSTF had a conversation regarding Ordinance 241119 updates and the FSTF subcommittee proposal on Reimagining Food Coordination. Cissie Bonini provided an update regarding the introduction of the ordinance and its related movement. Cissie also shared the recommendations that were produced on the FSTF subcommittee's proposal on Reimagining Food Coordination. Feedback on the ordinance and recommendations were requested. A discussion/Q&A followed, with additional notes below.</p>	<p>Follow-up on items from this topic and discuss community involvement, the cadence of these reports, and any other additional information at the February FSTF meeting.</p>

	<p>Cissie Bonini: Let's go on to our next item which is item number seven "Ordinance 24119 Update and Discussion of the FSTF Subcommittee Proposal on Reimagining Food Coordination." We have some slides on this. This was a big topic of last meeting's conversations. I will do a quick recap on this ordinance, and we will have plenty of time to chat about it. The key parts of this legislation were proposed by the mayor's office the outgoing London Breed's office. It was proposed in a very quick time frame to try to get the legislation passed before the end of the legislative year and before the new mayor came in. As a consequence, it was a very compressed time frame and there was a lot of running around in the backgrounds of this ordinance. I wanted to go over it, talk about what happened to it, and then talk about the next steps of it. I think the ordinance did not pass through the rules committee, but I do want to go through it because I think it's a great opportunity to look at the FSTF who has for many years recommended a centralized food coordination. This ordinance addressed that, and it gives us an aide of how it could be actualized not that there are any yes or no for or against the particular items in the ordinance, but it really brings up the opportunity to discuss and look how a structure can be put together. For those of you who don't know, the summary of the legislation was establishing a Citywide food coordination out of the HSA Human Services Agency. It moved from the current biennial food security reporting out of DPH to HSA doing a food security report every 5 years. It would dissolve the FSTF on July 1st of 2025 instead of when it's scheduled to sunset on July 1st of 2026. I think that's the basics of it. The information about the actual presentation by HSA and the mayor's office, which is linked here and on the FSTF website. The actual document is also linked here.</p> <p>Eric Chan: Quick update for that legislative document. It's still version one. I don't think version two with all the amendments that was discussed at the December meeting ever made it up onto the legislative website.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Yes, it was introduced to the Rules committee, and it was tabled citing the need for a robust community engagement process. The current status is that it remains tabled. One of the things that's important for the FSTF is for us to really clarify because through this process of the ordinance there was a lot of information brought up around this. The FSTF has recommended a centralized food coordination which is true but what our full proposal proposed and voted on by the FSTF was two parts: centralized food coordination and a</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>community body. I wanted to mention that again. There are links here to those recommendations.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: This is also on the website. This is the two-pager around the new structure and again this group had been meeting for 11 months and did a lot of pre-work in terms of status of food security in other places and did a lot of work to create this proposal. The two parts were deliberately left a little broad in terms of where that could lead. During the task force subcommittee meetings there were some thoughts around the mayor's office being a more direct link because they control the budget. This was left open for discussion, but it is a two-part that recommends an office of food and a food advisory council. The food advisory Council was left a little open for discussion. The group voted to approve this recommendation, and the next steps were to socialize this recommendation with some key stakeholders and then come back to the group. It wasn't specifically designed to be specific around it being around HSA or the mayor's office or the actual number of people in the advisory council. It was open for feedback at this point.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: This is the opportunity for us to discuss again the proposal around centralized food security in San Francisco. I want to make it clear that there were differing views on this ordinance. We tried to get as much information as we could in the HSA presentation and the mayor's office presentation. The key thing is that this is the opportunity to really look at what we want for a recommendation because this wasn't the only opportunity. We think that there'll be other opportunities and some more discussion on some of these items of where the office is placed, whether it's a bridge to something better, and some specifics around the depth and level of influence of community involvement. I'm opening the floor right now. The questions that we're going to go through can you go through these quickly. General discussion was we were going to open it up for some general reflections and thoughts and opinions. Are we comfortable with this proposal because this is currently the proposal. We will go forward to be socialized and then come back to the FSTF if we feel like there's a different proposal that needs to be made then we need to action that and then we may talk a little bit about some of the differences between the ordinance and between what we proposed. Some of the key</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>differences were around the report cadence, the amount of community involvement, and a little bit on where the office is held. That's the tone of the discussion. We're going to open it up to general thoughts and reflections again not around the general ordinance but around where we want to go for food security coordination in San Francisco.</p> <p>Anne Quaintance: I would say in general we should continue to move forward with kind of reimagining how we want to address food security in general I think is what you're asking about. So, in general I would move forward.</p> <p>Katie Jackson: The proposal does speak to the concerns that came up in the tabling of the ordinance around community engagement. So, keeping that piece of it and emphasizing the importance of that component of the new structure and in any future legislation.</p> <p>Chester Williams: Do we have any further updates from the proposed City Hall action?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Not that I know of it this time. I did speak with Susie Smith from HSA and there were no specific actions that we're aware of it at this time.</p> <p>Noriko Lim-Tepper: sorry my computer was acting up. I think we should consider that there needs to be some robust community input on the legislation but also if this food security task force does sunset then where is the community body that will then work with HSA to develop really inclusive policy? Where is the community body that will be working with the community organizations that are directly serving people who are experiencing food insecurity?</p> <p>Tiffany Kearney: In the FSTF reimagine, is there a cadence to reporting?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: No, but in the current legislation that we're acting under is the by biennial report so every other year.</p> <p>Tiffany Kearney: I would suggest maybe looking at that frequency. I do know that was a big point for HSA in terms of being a significant difference, I mean a few significant differences, and that was one of them. Maybe the FSTF should perhaps take that feedback or kind of look at what they're after and maybe the reasons why. As a department, it may be an unrealistic ask for</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>the city departments. I don't know that for sure but I'm just saying. Maybe the reality is that things don't change a lot in a two-year period. I think we all know that. Again, I just think being a little bit more flexible around that.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Thank you. Thank you, Tiffany.</p> <p>Guillermo Reece: Hi, good afternoon. Happy New Year, everyone. I would like to second Noriko's point, and I'm really committed to and more concerned of having more community involvement in this new reimagine process and have some community input at that level.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Super, thank you. Other comments or questions from the FSTF?</p> <p>Raegan Sales: There are a couple things in the chat if you don't mind. I had asked if anyone knows if this proposal has been shared with the new mayor's office and Anne mentioned that she has to step away, but she thinks that dedicating resources for a biennial report is critical.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Okay, great. I do not think the proposal has been shared with the new mayor's office that I'm aware of. Jade, go ahead.</p> <p>Jade Quizon: I'm not sure either but I know that API Council recently released their new policy agenda, and it includes an Office for Community Health which includes food security and then Shape Up SF also is working on their policy agenda policy priorities for the year, and it might include the task force recommendation although I'm not sure if it has both components.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Okay. Great. We're moving past the opening discussion question. This came up a little bit in the comments thank you guys. Is there interest in changing the current proposal? I wanted to address that directly. The other piece of this question is again this recommendation was designed to be broader although it does include the two elements. We're already starting the budget process. Our next agenda item is to talk about the recommendations and the opportunity to socialize the food security task force reimaging would be in the meetings with the Board of Supervisors and mayor's office and different other stakeholders we would meet with during that regular budget process. That would be the current idea for how to socialize.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>There might also be specific stakeholders that we engage for some feedback some people with expertise in this area.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Okay. Is there interest in changing the proposal or are we feeling comfortable with what we have? We would like to hear some comments. Raegan.</p> <p>Raegan Sales: I feel pretty good about what we have. I think that having a broader proposal leaves more room for feedback and for folks to help us shape it into what they think is good. I'm okay with having it a little bit broader and seeking the feedback that way.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Super, thank you. Other folks?</p> <p>Fiona McBride: Cissie, can I clarify something? Are you asking if you want to stick with the proposal that Jade and the subcommittee put together or are you asking if people want changes to the currently proposed legislation?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Yeah, this is our proposal not the legislation. This is really around our proposal and whether it needs to be modified in anyway and whether there's any changes in how we're socializing and getting feedback from it. Does anyone really feel strongly that we should change this proposal? I'd love to hear you because right now the vote had been from the group to just move it forward as is so we will continue that unless there's a motion to change it.</p> <p>Katie Jackson: Can I also ask a question, and I know I joined the task force later than this discussion started but when we did socialize the proposal, did feedback from HSA come to this group in terms of our proposal, and then what would go into legislation?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: No, it hadn't gotten to that point.</p> <p>Katie Jackson: Okay because I was just curious about the community piece of that before that went forward in terms of what are the concerns around that, what are some things we need to modify in that specific section which seemed to be kind of the holdup. That was just my take on it, but I could be off base too.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Mei Ling: This is Mei Ling I'm on my cell. I'm sorry I can't raise my hand. I just wanted to express support for Jade and the subcommittee and all the work that they did to come up with this proposal that we have supported in the past. I also think it's pretty critical to have defined reporting timelines to make sure we're not only tracking trends and changes and critical food security services. The report has been a great way to bring attention to these issues by going to the mayor and Board of Supervisors with the latest data. I think that's an important part of this work and the report as well.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Thank you. Thank you, Mei Ling. Did you have a specific rec you liked, or did you feel like two years is good or were you more flexible with that?</p> <p>Mei Ling: I don't think I'm going to express an opinion on that one because I don't think I have a strong one. In the past I've been responsible for producing annual reports for some activities for the city. They are very time consumptive to put together so we need adequate staffing to be able to do a really good job with it but longer than two years feels like we might lose opportunities to stay at the forefront of policy maker's thoughts and concerns and being able to highlight how important this work is.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Thank you.</p> <p>Mei Ling: So not less frequently than two years, I think.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: That's great. So, we're hearing some different opinions on the length of time on that one. That makes a lot of sense. Thank you, Mei Ling. Okay, anything else on this topic? It sounds like the proposal is going to continue to move forward as is right now and we're going to continue to socialize it and then bring it back.</p> <p>Chester Williams: Chester speaking. I'm in agreement with our proposal. I think we've done a pretty good job at putting on the main points. There's still a little concern that has been brought up about community involvement which is going to always be an issue. My concern is what I feel going into this new administration is that their mentality is one of a corporate mentality which is you make decisions behind closed doors and then you stick to those values and that's</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>really not what I think this particular food security program and other programs like it are really about. They're about not only helping the community but also listening to the voice of the community. I think in part of our narrative we need to let them know that there have to be this open-minded value that the community has to be heard because in reality if you're in a corporate environment you know what controls are and so you stick to those controls. Often, the people that are most affected by that have something to hear so I'm in agreement with where we're going but I think we also want to make sure that we let them know that that should be a part of their package. Thank you.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Great. Thank you, Chester. Okay so right now the outreach strategy for this is to include it as part of the annual recommendations we make and actually spend a bigger portion of time talking about that specific proposal than when we normally meet with the Board of Supervisors and the mayor's office. There are some key stakeholders that we would talk to particularly like HSA and get some feedback on this from the Board of Supervisors in May. Great, thank you. Raegan, I see that includes Shape Up as one of the stakeholders.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Next, this may be a discussion topic that we table for this time around, but we might want to continue later. One of the big issues that came up with this ordinance was the importance of community engagement and what were the non-negotiables. I do think that this the proposal is pretty specific. It has some cadence around this community body. There is feedback. In general, one of the things that came up in the discussion around the ordinance is the cutback of city commissions and advisory councils and whether the FSTF will be authorized after 2026. So, what are the minimums of this community engagement? What are the non-negotiables? We could bring this back to the subcommittee group and have them come up with some of that from the proposal or it can be a topic for another time. I want to bring this up right now and get people's opinions on this. Do you want to talk about it right now? Where do you want to put this discussion?</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Guillermo Reece: Hi, this is Guillermo. I'd like to table it so that we can have a chance for us as a FSTF and the subcommittee to sort of discuss that major community involvement process before we go to a final discussion on moving forward and presenting to the supervisors.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: I think that was really helpful to understand whether to have it either in the FSTF or both and then come back with a stronger sense of that when we're talking.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Other comments? So, the option is to shop it around to get feedback but also continue our discussions in in the FSTF and the subcommittee. Other comments? We in agreement to bring this up as a topic for kind of a bigger topic for our next meeting and see if the subcommittee is interested in meeting and talking about this? The idea is if we go into a meeting and they're like look you know your chances of getting an advisory council is not going to happen because of this particular spotlight on community councils, what is the minimum ask? What are the non-negotiables? So, coming in with a real good idea of what we mean and if a community advisory board is a non-negotiable then it is, right? Great. So, we'll table that for further discussion in both the subcommittee and FSTF.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Okay, thank you. The other issue is around the report cadence discussion. This has come up now a couple of times. Is there more information we need before we discuss this topic? The issue really is around like two years and five years. Is five years too long? Is two years not enough time to really do an adequate report? By the time you start a two-year report you're already starting it way ahead of time. Will there be enough changes within two years for a significant report? We can also clarify that there can be a major reporting done every five years but some more or less intensive update reporting. There may be some way. What is the loss here? What is the opinion of the FSTF in terms of the cadence of these reports?</p> <p>Chester Williams: I would see it more in terms of three years at a max and not five. I think by five you're going to have change but by three you might get an average. Two, I think is a little too quick because it takes a year to start, another year to kind of see how it works out, and then by the third year I think you're ready to really look at what we need to improve. That's my opinion. Any others?</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Guillermo Reece: I agree with that, Chester.</p> <p>Katie Jackson: In the research that was done to put together the proposal, was there any insight that was gleaned from other cities that have task forces and was there anything that came from that research?</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Great question.</p> <p>Jade Quizon: We didn't specifically ask about food assessments. I think that might be a whole other project. I know that other places have done similar landscape analysis like transfer in Hawaii's food system. They've done an analysis on a bunch of states and counties food assessments. I can draw that.</p> <p>Katie Jackson: Yeah, because just thinking about implementation of certain programming to address how long it takes to see improvement and how can we base our recommendations in some sort of literature that would support that cadence.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Also, there's a financial backing. You have to have the staff for these. These are very detailed reports and are expensive.</p> <p>Tiffany Kearney: This is Tiffany. I would just say that there is an example within the Department of Disability and Aging Services which is the dignity fund. We do an end-of-year cycle evaluation. It's a four-year period so I'm not suggesting that this be a four-year period, but you know within that four-year period on an annual basis there is also some smaller reporting. Things may come up like deep dives if you will. Again, I think that there are examples within the city themselves and the dignity fund being one of them where I think you can see positive results giving enough time. Certainly, we all want to know what's happening on an annual basis but really trying to look at the big picture and how we're moving the needle. A slightly longer period of time might be helpful or more beneficial. I feel very strongly as a registered dietitian that we include nutrition experts as part of this process and have a lead in looking at food security and food equity. Those are the experts that are trained to do this type of work and have that level of expertise when looking at the big picture in terms of health equity and nutrition. To</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>be honest, I don't think that was truly emphasized enough in the first recommendation and so I'm just going to put it out there now.</p> <p>Katie Jackson: Thank you for bringing that point forward. As another registered dietician in the space, I would agree with you on that and thanks for calling that out.</p> <p>Priti Rane: I agree with the group that the five just seems like too long. I'm thinking like a decade that would only mean two. I know covid was a one off but now I'm even thinking about natural disasters. Look at what's happening in LA. I mean there are so many things that can happen and administrations change. There are politics shifts so maybe like a two- or three-year cadence with three being the most then maybe an ad hoc in between or something smaller that may focus on a particular concern. So, not too comprehensive touching on every point but really looking at any economic downturns. Like I said, natural disasters and we had a pandemic. Whatever the theme may be, just focusing on that. I just feel like the five year seems like a lack of transparency. And the issue of food insecurity; we see so many presentations and this issue never seems to go anywhere. I feel like without the data and people not talking about the issue that it's going to just fizz away and it's just going to be hard to bring to light the concerns around food insecurity that so many people are experiencing.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Thank you, Priti. Other voices? I do want to make sure there's time for public comment on this topic. it sounds like there's a lot of three years max. The whole idea that this data drives decisions and discussions and it can really help the awareness and if it's sort of a five-year then it gets lost. The other side of that is that maybe a bigger report with a lesser cadence with some annual or semiannual updates. Those are the two we've heard. It sounds like three minimum is coming up quite a bit. Am I summarizing that pretty good? Okay. So, if there's any other information we have from other cities around their cadence of these reports I think that could be helpful to bring in. That also came up as a topic so let's do a little homework on that piece and then we can come back and bring this up again. Anything else before I turn it over to public comment? This was very helpful. We went through some of the discussion points that really help us as we move forward. This ordinance, whether you were for it or against, was</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>a great opportunity to see how this stuff gets actionized and what some of the key issues are that we need to really look at as a FSTF in terms of these proposals.</p> <p>Michelle Kim: Hi, thank you. So, you mentioned getting department feedback. At least with DCYF, we used to have a three-year grant cycle and recently we switched to a five-year grant cycle. It's very similar where if we do a three-year grant cycle by the time we get community feedback and we have to do community feedback again we don't have the data to show that things have improved. That's why we sort of switched to a five-year cycle. Folks have talked about what's kind of happening in between and so I think we have enough staffing to do semiannual reports that are helpful but in terms of applying it to the FSTF and that scope I think the three-year mark does sound a little bit more doable than like every two years based off what Chester was saying. I just wanted to put my thoughts on that. Thank you.</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Great. Thank you, Michelle. I'm not seeing any other thoughts. Let's open this up to public comment. again, folks public generally it's a comment and not questions. We try to answer as many questions as we can, but we want to make sure we get time for everyone to comment so let's hear it. What do we have? Love to hear overall impressions, any input on any of these topics that we discussed, community input cadence of the report.</p> <p>Katie Garlinghouse: Hi, thank you so much. This is a great topic and one comment I would make just as somebody who works for a nonprofit is that we depend on these reports for a lot of our own reporting and funding and things like that and so obviously very selfish but the cadence piece like five years is a lot. That's all I'll say. That's just another perspective to look at. Thanks.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Great. Thank you, Katie. That's important to remember that a lot of nonprofits and CBO's use these FSTF reports.</p> <p>Beth Bodner: Hi. I'm calling in from Department of Environment and love hearing about all this stuff. I felt like I really had something. We have SB 13383. I'm not sure if the group is super familiar but it requires food generators of a certain size to donate food to local organizations</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>and it's all within the city. I think just hearing about this ordinance makes me feel like there could be so much more communication and collaboration across different departments. I work with both the businesses, the generators, and the recipients like all sorts of different nonprofits in the city receiving the food. I'm just thinking if there's any need for comment from different types of organizations, I'd be happy to help coordinate in the future.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Great. Thank you.</p> <p>Beth Bodner: There's a lot of food to be had. There's so much surplus food and I would love for it to get around have that be a known thing.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Thank you. Other comments from the public? I am not seeing any hands up. I am not seeing any notes in the chat.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: So, we have a couple follow-up items from this topic to discuss community involvement, the cadence of these reports, and see if we have any other additional information to bring to this discussion and then we will revisit the community input in our next FSTF meeting. Anything else I missed? Eric? Priscilla?</p> <p>Eric Chan: We're good.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Great, thank you all. I really appreciate your participation.</p>	
<p>8. Food Security Task Force Annual Recommendations, Cissie Bonini (Chair, EatSF/Vouchers for Veggies) 2:45 p.m.</p>	<p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 1:12:33 minute mark and ends at the 1:26:28 minute mark.</p> <p>FSTF had a conversation about their annual recommendations. A discussion/Q&A followed, with additional notes below.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: We're moving on to item number eight, FSTF annual recommendations.</p> <p>Eric Chan: I'm going to drop the 2024 recommendations in the chat for people to reference. Let me share my screen.</p>	

	<p>Cissie Bonini: It's that time of year again where we talk about the cadence of these reporting. We are tasked as the San Francisco FSTF with doing annual recommendations. The budget process is already in process. City departments must get their budgets in very soon.</p> <p>Michelle Kim: This is Michelle. We're doing that right now. We're frantically budgeting and always calculating numbers.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Yeah, it's happening already. I want to give a little landscape on this year for 2025. We have some big changes. I think somebody mentioned this before I around the new mayor and mayor's office. We have a new adviser to the mayor. There are also five new supervisors. What we'll see from the recommendations for 2025 is really leveraging the biennial report that was put out last year, those key findings, and doing a lot of work around food security in San Francisco because there's a lot of new stakeholders right and particularly because the FSTF is tasked with advising the Board of Supervisors on food security issues. You really want to get those new supervisors on board and aware, so you'll see this in the proposal. We're looking at a condensed 2025 report again with key takeaways reiterating some of the key data from the biennial report and of the key issues that are affecting food security in San Francisco. We talked about the landscape of food security in San Francisco. This may include concentration of food insecurity in certain neighborhoods and some of the factors that impact food security in San Francisco including high cost of living and food costs. Funding for SNAP and WIC really don't go very far in cities with high cost of living. We talked about the new administration leadership. This is where we need help. Our next meeting in February we really want people to come with a list of some of those challenges opportunities that we include in meetings with supervisors and other stakeholders. Very interested in those. We will bring some of opportunities or challenges that have come up in previous presentations from the FSTF over the months but this we want you all to come prepared for February because we're going to talk a little bit more about that. Obviously, there's some challenges people are already identifying with the Trump administration and potential cuts to Medicaid and to making snap more difficult to access but I'm sure there's a lot more that we need to be aware. I think this is just a recap of this. BFSER is the biennial report that's what that is so connecting that with what we already talked about</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>including the reimagining food coordination proposal as part of this. Again, bringing up this data and the importance of food insecurity and the rates of food insecurity in San Francisco and the importance of preserving funding for those efforts. This is going to be your homework for the next meeting. Opportunities challenges, what you're facing, and recommendations. We will hopefully have a draft of key recommendations. We'll have the discussion on that. The other piece is we need support and people to help us craft these recommendations. This is your opportunity to help us with this. We will be looking at some of the data from presentations by the FSTF and putting together these recommendations. Really looking for volunteers to help us with that. [Katie Jackson volunteers through online chat] Katie, thank you. Lura, are you volunteering to help?</p> <p>Lura Jones: I am volunteering to help.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Thank you so much. Very much appreciated. We're opening it up for questions and comments. [Beth Bodner volunteers though online chat] Beth. Great. Love it. [Raegan Sales volunteers though online chat]. Raegan. Yes, thank you. This is great. Any questions or comments on those recommendations? How do we feel about the strategy this year?</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Okay, let's open for public comment.</p> <p>Raegan Sales: Apologies if you already addressed it but there's a question in the chat from Mark about clarifying which year of the biennial report you were referring to on the slides before.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Is the report the 2023 or 2024, Eric?</p> <p>Eric Chan: it's 2023.</p> <p>Mark: Hello everybody. Thank you for having me. Pleasure to be with you all here. I was curious. Was the 2025 the next report that will be coming out? I had a question about some of the focus areas and it seemed like when I read that recently there isn't precise food security data on like a neighborhood aggregate level. I think it was compiling hospitalization rates for certain chronic</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>related diseases, and income level against the self-sufficiency standard. Is that going to be the approach for the next report in terms of developing some sort of granular food security metric for rates of different groups? Just curious about that approach.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Thank you for your question, Mark. Eric, do you have any insight on that? I mean we know that food security isn't generally tracked on a neighborhood basis because it's not a requirement that you sign up for your driver's license and get a food security screener, so we don't know. There is no real process to address that, so it's usually addressed in other ways. Hospital systems have started to record food insecurity rates, but it really relies on agencies and surveys and things like that to run those. Eric, did you have more on that?</p> <p>Eric Chan: yeah, I think what he said it's true in terms of new methodology. We don't know yet. The biennial report is kind of in limbo right now so we're still trying to figure out what next steps are.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Generally, the proxy for food insecurity is income below certain rates and then you can estimate food insecurity based on very low income and cost of living.</p> <p>Mark: Thank you. The SF Market, many of you are probably aware, is in Bay View which was identified as an area of food insecurity and food deserts, and I was trying to find some specific language on those rates. Couldn't find it but I know there are some good findings in that report about some of those metrics you shared. I know some other areas like Fillmore/Western Edition is a highlighted priority. I appreciate the clarification. I was just interested in hearing some more so much appreciated.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Thank you. Other comments or questions. [Chat question: Will the slides that were just shown be linked to the meeting minutes?] Yes. They're already on the website.</p> <p>Chester Williams: Mark, to add to your comment about the Western Edition, they're already going to see an increase in that need because they're getting ready to lose their Safeway which has been a big topic in that particular area. It was already bad it's only going to get worse. I've talked with quite a few people, and they're really concerned about that. That's being judged</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>and I think a lot on the incomes and stuff that are within the community so you're going to see numbers are going to really increase in that area coming shortly because I don't see a major food source coming right away. Everybody's going to sit back and kind of play games because this is something new. I helped put Fillmore Safeway in there 20 years ago. I was on with them when they went to the floor for that, and I'm really hurt that they've decided to come out. I'm not surprised because I'll tell all of you, I asked one of the execs back in that time. Do you really want to put this Safeway within this community, and he said no he said really don't want to do this but we're being forced by the politics. So, that fight has gone on for a long time and finally big money won out, but I'll be bringing more up as we as a committee holds on for as long as it does about how we can help that portion of the city try to fight through what they're going to have to fight through. Thank you.</p> <p>Mark: Thank you, Chester. I appreciate that background and of course for your advocacy early on to get that in there and recognizing that challenge. Definitely disheartening and disappointing to hear their lack of commitment and getting it there aside from politics but appreciate you and look forward to perhaps working alongside you to learn how we can make sure it's still a high priority moving forward with this next administration within the city.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Any other public comment? You guys already moved into the next topic which is update and emerging issues.</p>	
9. Updates and Emerging Issues 3:00 p.m.	<p>Please refer to the recording for this presentation, linked here. This agenda item starts at the 1:26:28 minute mark and ends at the 1:34:15 minute mark.</p> <p>FSTF had a conversation about updates and emerging issues. A discussion/Q&A followed, with additional notes below.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: We're moving on to number nine, updates and emerging issues. Yes, Chester brought up Safeway. They are supposed to be closing in February. Is that still true, Chester? Is that the date or has that been extended?</p>	<p>FSTF members will come to the February Task Force Meeting prepared to discuss: 1) Reimagining Food Coordination recommendations; 2) challenges and opportunities for the</p>

	<p>Chester Williams: Yep, that's on. I had a chance to visit recently, and I was just saying it's very disheartening to go into a store where you shop for so many years and see all the shelves practically empty. They're just not restocking. That's the big thing. They're not restocking and they're trying to move out whatever else they have. It's on the go and it won't take long.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Is there any updates on response to the Safeway leaving? Not so much politically but in terms of addressing populations impacted.</p> <p>Chester Williams: I haven't heard of any unless you've heard of any. It's been just people being desponded but there must be some. I just haven't been in touch with those folks yet.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: I know we at Vouchers 4 Veggies/EatSF have been trying to find other food resources and Fillmore is a really important shopping place for folks in the western Edition, so we are looking for other food options for folks. Losing a full-service grocery store is negative for that neighborhood as we know. For those who've been following this, there's been some very good op-eds and information about this in the media. Is there anything the FSTF can do or any particular city agency that is working on this? Okay, well more to come. If there's any updates we'd love to hear them. Other updates or emerging issues?</p> <p>Jeimil Belamide: This is Jeimil with CalFresh. Just One update. To help prevent or secure electronic theft of CalFresh benefits, the state will be sending out EBT cards that have the chip tap technology that maybe a lot of us have on our EBT or credit cards in early 2025. They haven't given us an exact date for the roll out or mailing of those cards to San Francisco CalFresh recipients. It's something we're keeping an eye on. They'll get it in the mail, and they'll get instructions in the mail along with it. The old magnetic stripe only card will be deactivated once they use the new card. They'll have approximately 180 days to activate the new card before that old magnetic stripe only card becomes deactivated. If any community members ask you about it, they can reach out to the phone number on the card or reach out to us and we'll be happy to talk about it.</p>	<p>recommendations; and 3) community engagement opportunities within the recommendations and future advisory councils.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Cissie Bonini: For those that haven't followed the potential fraud with magnetic stripe cards, can you share the importance of making that change?</p> <p>Jeimil Belamide: Yeah. When using your magnetic stripe, I guess it leaves data or there's skimmers that can steal the data off a magnetic strip card. Organized crime rings could gather that data and use that to steal CalFresh benefits from CalFresh recipients. That's why they're giving clients these new EBT chip tap technology cards.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: It's way too early but is there any thoughts around the new administration and access to SNAP or is that just too early right now?</p> <p>Jeimil Belamide: It's too early right now. Even prior to the new administration being elected, the work requirement exemption was set to expire on October 31st. It's something that we're keeping an eye on of course with the new administration and news from the state regarding that requirement.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Great, thank you. Other updates? This is both FSTF or public.</p> <p>Eric Chan: Quick update for our FSTF member updates agenda. I have Hannah and Mei Ling signed up for February updates, but I'll reach out to both of you individually to confirm.</p> <p>Cissie Bonini: Any other updates? We're not seeing any hands. I'm not seeing any in the chat. Just to reiterate, there's some homework for us for February's meeting which comes up shortly because we did know this meeting was delayed because of the holiday. We will be discussing, in addition to the topics, opportunities and challenges. Bring that and be prepared to brainstorm. Then talking about community input for the food coordination. We also will have a presentation from HSA so we're looking forward to that and then those presentations that Eric had mentioned. Thank you all so much.</p> <p>Public Comment: None.</p>	
10. Adjournment 3:15 p.m.	Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.	None.