San Francisco SRO Food and Health Collaborative Pilot

Project Manager Report

Prepared by: Monica Bhagwan, Program Manager

Lauren Small, Program Coordinator

Table of Contents

Introduction

Project Summary

The SRO Pilot is a project of the San Francisco SRO Food and Health Collaborative (SFSFHC), an offshoot of the San Francisco Food Security Taskforce. The members of the collaborative identified the need for a coordinated effort to address the unique food security and nutrition needs of tenants in single-resident occupancy hotels (SRO). In August 2017, the Stupski Foundation awarded a two-year, $250,000 grant to Episcopal Community Services, the fiscal sponsor for the project. The grant objective was to identify the impact on dietary health and food security of tenant-centered approaches at two SROs in the Tenderloin neighborhood of San Francisco. These research-based results would allow the collaborative to provide the San Francisco Board of Supervisors with a blueprint to improve dietary health and food security for SRO residents throughout San Francisco.

Recognizing that success and sustainability of any intervention would depend on the site capacity, the SFSFHC identified two implementation sites and two control sites, emblematic of two different styles of service provision typically found in SROs. The Camelot, described as a "high touch" site, has a high staffing ratio with the ability to implement new services alongside its existing community programs for residents. The Ambassador prioritizes one-on-one care to tenants over community wide activities. For the purposes of this pilot, it is categorized as a "low touch" site for its lower staffing ratio and less capacity to implement new services.

The grant also identified a project manager and an evaluator. Leah's Pantry, a San Francisco nonprofit with a focus on trauma-informed nutrition security and previous member of the SFSFHC, was selected as the project manager. Redwood Consulting Collaborative, a California-based evaluation and organizational development firm, was selected as the evaluator. As the implementation team, they conducted the pilot activities which included data collection, better coordination of existing services, and the identification and implementation of new services at the two pilot siles.

Summary of Grant Activities

The following is a summary of grant activities that took place over three phases. Although the original grant proposal timeline was two years (August 2017–August 2019), the project was extended by nine months to April 2020. [See Pilot Timeline, Appendix A]

Phase 1

Building the Team, Preliminary Data Collection, and Intervention Selection
August 2017–November 2018

In December 2017, the Collaborative selected Leah's Pantry and Redwood Consulting Collaborative to spearhead grant activities. From January to November of 2018, this implementation team, under guidance from SFSFHC members, conducted a needs assessment , collected baseline data, researched intervention options and vendors, and planned the pilot. This work was accomplished through regular meetings with the SFSFHC, a literature review, evaluation design, tenant focus groups and surveys, and interviews and collaboration with site staff.

The priority interest to the SFSFHC was to provide interventions that were client-centered. The overall key tenant needs identified by the needs assessment were (Appendix B):

- More predictable, complementary, and connected approaches to food resources
- Convenient services, ideally onsite, with few hurdles to access
- Money to purchase food
- Groceries, easy to prepare, or ready to eat food
- Fresh, less perishable foods, unlike what is usually provided by food donations
- Variety of food options, including healthy options.
- Equipment to prepare food onsite, either in room or in the community kitchen
- Ability to store more food in tenant rooms

By November 2018, possible interventions were identified to reflect tenant needs, as well as site capacity, and availability of service providers and resources. The interventions were both adjustments to existing resources and the addition of new resources. They are categorized into three types:

1. **New Services and Food Resources:** Additional food, services, or purchasing capacity provided directly to tenants. The interventions identified were:

    ○ Food Vouchers for CalFresh-Eligible food

    ○ Food Vouchers for Fruit and Vegetables

    ○ Refrigerated/Frozen Individual Meals

    ○ Hot Community Meals

    ○ Grocery Store Transportation

2. **Coordination/Capacity Building:** Site-level enhancements to current onsite resources including additional staffing, outreach, and technical assistance to onsite pantry services

    ○ Tenant Leaders, to assist with service delivery

    ○ Food Navigator-to provide food resource information to tenants and staff

    ○ CalFresh SSI Eligibility Outreach and Enrollment (SSI recipients became eligible for CalFresh during the grant period)

    ○ Food Pantry Technical Assistance - to improve access and enhance offerings

    ○ Room-Delivered Bagged Groceries

    ○ Food Resource Tool Kit-a custom created resource binder for staff and tenants to find food resources in the Tenderloin

3. **Equipment and Infrastructure:** Material support to improve the sites' capacity for onsite food preparation and storage

   - Kitchen Upgrade- to provide Camelot with storage, refrigeration and temporary cooking appliances in the community space

   - Vending Machine and/or Refrigeration- to store and provide tenants with on demand access to ready to eat meals

   - Small Cooking Appliances- for in room food preparation (crockpots and toaster ovens)

Phase 2

Intervention Planning
November 2018–March 2019

In the initial part of this phase, project managers coordinated with sites to select feasible interventions and plan implementation strategies. There were frequent meetings with support staff/case workers, building management, and supervisors and administrators. Leah's Pantry also contracted with intervention service providers. EatSF was hired to provide the food vouchers, Meals on Wheels was hired to provide refrigerated/frozen individual meals, and Centro Latino was hired to provide hot congregate meals at the Camelot. The SF-Marin Food Bank committed to provide technical assistance to the pantry, to implement a room-delivered grocery program, and to support onsite CalFresh enrollment activities. Leah's Pantry hired tenant leaders to assist with delivering the new services.

Phase 3

Intervention Implementation and Final Evaluation
March 2019–December 2019

The first interventions launched in March 2019 were the upgrade to the Camelot Kitchen and the distribution of CalFresh-Eligible vouchers. The tenant leaders, frozen meals, and hot congregate meals were all fully in place within six weeks. The remaining site capacity building and coordination activities were rolled out in the following months. The evaluation team collected midpoint data in June 2019 through tenant focus groups and interviews with staff and tenant leaders. Its purpose was to identify challenges and make any necessary corrections to the interventions.

The implementation team collected final evaluation data from late October through mid December 2020. It took longer than expected to collect a sufficient amount of data from both pilot and control sites.   Although intervention data analysis was limited to March-October 2019, the Stupski Foundation approved an extension request to continue interventions through April 2020. This extension provided an intervention period more in line with the original grant proposal and sufficient time for data analysis and Collaborative deliberation.

Project Wrap Up: Report Preparation and Intervention Completion
January–April 2020

The implementation team analyzed the data and drafted their reports from mid January-early March of 2020. The COVID-19 shelter in place order has delayed planned follow up meetings with the SFSFHC and other stakeholders. The plan is to convene the collaborative to review the reports, gather feedback, and determine next steps. The project team will provide its final reports to the Collaborative and the Stupski Foundation after gathering feedback from the SFSFHC. In addition, the implementation team will present pilot results to the San Francisco Food Security Task Force as well as to the staff and tenants of the pilot sites .

Project Management Overview

San Francisco SRO Food and Health Collaborative

The San Francisco SRO Food and Health Collaborative (SFSFHC), formed under the auspices of the Food Security Task Force in 2016, is composed of a variety of agencies working on nutrition and food services for very-low income communities, including in SROs in the Tenderloin and MidMarket area. The main participating agencies during the pilot were: Meals on Wheels, The San Francisco-Marin Food Bank, EatSF, Green Mobile Kitchen, SF Recovery Kitchen, Episcopal Community Services (ECS), Community Living Campaign and Leah's Pantry.

ECS hosted the collaborative and served as the fiscal sponsor of the Stupski grant. ECS Associate Director, Karen Gruniesen served a primary leadership role in the collaborative until her retirement in February 2019. Upon being selected as project manager, Leah's Pantry relinquished its role as a member of the SFSFHC in order to take on the responsibility of executing the project on behalf of the SFSFHC.

Project Manager Scope of Work

Leah's Pantry's contract with ECS identified the primary responsibilities (see Appendix C) as:

1. Site Engagement and Collaboration
    - Engage and maintain communication with the stakeholders (tenants, staff, and leadership) at the pilot sites by attending meetings, community events, and flyers
    - Plan and coordinate pilot activities with stakeholders
2. Implementation of Evaluation Plan
    ○ Work with evaluator to develop and test evaluation instruments, determine research questions, and create evaluation plan
    ○ Conduct surveys, focus groups, and interviews
    ○ Collect and record attendance data
3. Implementation of Interventions
    ○ Identify intervention providers and determine budget for interventions
    ○ Prepare intervention plan and present to SFSHC members for approval

○ Implement interventions and provide ongoing management

Over the course of the engagement, the project manager assumed additional responsibilities with regard to Collaborative facilitation. This essential function was not well-defined at the start of the project, and the Collaborative itself had no formal structure, decision making process, or experience with project implementation prior to this pilot. Lack of clear leadership in the early phases slowed the initial process, but as the project developed, Leah's Pantry and the Collaborative members steadily improved communication and decision making protocols.

Trauma Sensitive Approach

Leah's Pantry's approach to planning and implementation of this pilot was informed by the science of trauma and resilience, often referred to as a "trauma-informed approach". Trauma is a boundaryless, widespread, harmful, and costly public health problem that can be triggered by many events experienced by people. Examples include: violence, abuse, childhood neglect, and food insecurity. A trauma-informed approach is increasingly used in social service delivery systems.

A trauma-informed approach:

- Realizes the widespread impact of trauma and understands potential paths for mitigation and recovery;

- Recognizes the signs and symptoms of trauma in clients, families, staff, and others involved with the system;

- Responds by fully integrating knowledge about trauma into policies, procedures, and practices;

- Seeks to actively resist re-traumatization (SAMHSA, 2014: 9).

Leah's Pantry has adopted the term trauma-informed nutrition security to encompass this approach when applied to food security and nutrition initiatives. This approach is an integration of food security principles (availability, access, utilization, stability) and as well the application of trauma-informed principles. We know that traumatic adaptations show up not only in individuals, but also as parallel processes in communities, food and social services systems, and public policy. So, despite adversity and stress being part of the human experience for everyone to some extent, some communities are more at risk for individual, systemic, and community trauma. Since food occupies a unique and tender place in our lives, particular thoughtfulness is required when designing community-wide food access and food security initiatives.

Recognizing that SRO tenants have experienced high rates of adversity and mental health challenges and also that SRO site staff may experience high rates of vicarious trauma and burnout, implementation of this project was guided by several trauma-informed principles. While a full trauma-informed approach was not undertaken, Leah's Pantry prioritized trauma-informed principles throughout the pilot. This approach places relationships and human connection first. It meant paying close attention to relationship building, minimizing or reducing stress and strain on site staff and tenants, promoting community connection, and incorporating client voice. In the Intervention Implementation section of this report, we will note ways that trauma-informed values were a part of each intervention. Below are some ways that these values were incorporated into the overall pilot implementation strategy:

Voice and Choice

- Tenant voice and staff needs drove the planning and selection of the interventions. The implementation team used focus groups, surveys, and interviews to center interventions around clients and staff.

- SFSFHC and the implementation team identified interventions with an interest in those that supported client choice and access to foods they enjoyed.

Trust, Transparency and Responsiveness

- Project Managers attended community events at the pilot sites early on to build presence, introduce the project and themselves to tenants, and answer questions.

- Project updates were regularly provided to tenants at in-person events and tenant meetings. Flyers with thorough descriptions of the services to be offered were distributed door-to-door and posted throughout the building.

- Project Manager continually collaborated with tenant leaders, site staff, and tenants to quickly address service issues, roadblocks to access, and potential confusion or added burden.

- The implementation team collaborated with staff to ensure pilot processes were in alignment with current site practices and not excessively disruptive to site operations.

Empowerment, Dignity and Inclusion

- Leah's Pantry hired tenants to assist with interventions. Provided opportunities and training to tenant leaders to develop leadership and ownership over their roles.

- The implementation team compensated tenants whenever possible for their time spent sharing information used during the pilot. In this way, tenants were both expert consultants on the project as well as program participants.

- The Project Manager attempted to minimize hassles and confusion so that overall service delivery was a positive experience for tenants.

- Tenants' language capacity, literacy, physical accessibility (including dental), and mental health were continually considered throughout the pilot. Accommodations and adjustments were made to the best of our ability.

- Particular attention was paid to capturing the perspectives of a diversity of tenants in all data collection activities. Direct outreach was conducted to tenants who are more marginalized and typically less engaged with building services.

Project Plan Changes

Timeline Changes

The original grant proposal and project manager proposals set an ambitious timeline for the project with 1 full year of evaluated interventions and report completion by January 2020. In actual practice there was a 9 month delay of the launch of interventions and evaluation of interventions took place over a 9 month period. These delays to the planned timeline were due to the following reasons:

— Expansion of the Evaluation Plan: Upon initial conversations, it became apparent to the project team and the SFSFHC that a thorough needs assessment was required to adequately provide client-centered interventions. The process to create the assessment tools and conduct the surveys, focus groups and staff interviews, added 3 months to the proposed timeline. In addition, the collaborative spent time fine tuning its evaluation goals.

— Extensive Intervention Selection and Coordination Process: This process took significantly longer than proposed in order to ensure the provision of client-centered and site specific interventions, a priority of the SFSFHC. There was a need for extensive discussion with the collaborative as well as multiple stakeholders at the sites to ensure the interventions were appropriate and feasible. As new information and considerations were uncovered in these discussions, additional interventions were proposed requiring further research. Furthermore, coordination with service providers, execution of MOUs, and other administrative processes were slower than anticipated.

— Staffing Changes: While both sites maintained a commitment to the project, changes and gaps at the pilot sites frequently slowed or interrupted site capacity to support pilot implementation. The staffing instability also meant that pilot staff bandwidth for pilot coordination and outreach was limited on occasion. Leah's Pantry and ECS also experienced staff turnover during the pilot period, which affected the efficiency of Collaborative decision making and project coordination for several months.

— Collaborative Decision-Making Process: As written, the grant focused on impact measures. But without an existing implementation process in place, the pilot objectives required revision and expansion before work could begin. Additionally, as a new Collaborative, governance and decision-making processes for SFSFHC did not exist. As a result, achieving consensus with regard to the pilot objectives and implementation process was slower than anticipated.

— Responsive and Iterative Process: The nature of this project required integration of multiple perspectives, priorities, and stakeholder needs. Being accountable to this aspect of the project required changes to the proposed timeline.

Original Timeline (Project Manager Proposal)	Actual Timeline
Phase 1 (December 2017-February 2018): Preliminary Data Collection, Site Engagement, and Final Intervention Selection Phase 2 (March 2018): Baseline Data Collection and Tenant Leader Recruitment Phase 3 (April-May 2018): Intervention Selection and Coordination Phase 4 (June 2018-September 2019): Intervention Period Phase 5 (October 2019-January 2020): Final Data Collection and Evaluation Report Completion	Phase 1 (December 2017-November 2018): Building the Team, Preliminary Data Collection, Site Engagement, and Intervention Selection Phase 2 (November 2018-March 2019): Baseline Data Collection, Intervention Selection and Coordination, Tenant Leader Recruitment Phase 3 (March 2019-December 2019): Intervention Period; Final Data Collection Phase 4 (January 2020-April 2020): Evaluation Report Completion; Intervention Wind Down

Changes to Intervention Plan

A few of the pilot interventions were not launched or sustained. This was due to several factors, including site-level decisions and feasibility of the intervention during the pilot timeframe.

Original Intervention Plan

New Services and Resources
    — Food Vouchers for CalFresh-Eligible Food
    — Food Vouchers for Fruit and Vegetables
    — Refrigerated/Frozen Individual Meals
    — Hot Community Meals (Camelot)
    — Grocery Store Transportation → *low utilization/discontinued*

Coordination/Capacity
    — Tenant Leaders → *continued at Camelot only*
    — Food Navigator → *discontinued*
    — CalFresh SSI Eligibility Outreach and Enrollment
    — Food Pantry Technical Assistance (Ambassador) → *recommendations not implemented*
    — Room Delivered Grocery Bags (Ambassador) → *discontinued*
    — Food Resource Tool Kit

Equipment and Infrastructure
    — Kitchen Upgrade (Camelot)
    — Vending Machine → *not implemented*
    — Small Cooking Appliances

Intervention Implementation

Pilot Site Overview

	Camelot	Ambassador
Property Owner/Manager	*Delivering Innovation in Supportive Housing (DISH)*	*Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC)*
Facility Description	— 54 furnished single rooms, shared bathroom/shower — Microwave and fridge in each room; no onsite kitchen, temporary community kitchen in community room added during pilot — Informal monthly food pantry distribution	— 134 units with private baths — Microwave and fridge in each room; three community kitchens — Decentralized Community Room — Weekly Food Pantry Distribution
Tenant Profile	Direct Access to Housing (DAH) tenants	Section 8-eligible, very-low income (<50% AMI)
Service Delivery/ Case Management	"High-touch": 2 Onsite DPH Support Services staff to assist tenants with community resource needs, provide onsite programs, and support a therapeutic milieu	"Low-Touch": 2 onsite TNDC case managers providing limited additional supportive services
Additional Comments	— Relatively engaged residents and connected community — Use of support services "strongly recommended" to tenants — Case management needs referred out — Small size — Central community space — A high level of staffing	— Limited support services offered — Case management on an opt-in basis — Many tenants who do not engage with any services offered in the building — Larger building with decentralized community space

Kick Off Events

Residents learned about the new interventions available at their buildings during kick-off events in March 2019.

About one-third of the residents at each site (43 Ambassador residents, 18 Camelot residents) attended the events which included healthy snacks, cooking utensil giveaways, and a raffle for a cookbook. Project managers

were available to answer questions about the services. Tenants voted for either a rice cooker or crockpot giveaway during the pilot period. Tenants also received information about upcoming services and had the option to enroll in the EatSF food voucher program (see Appendix D). All Ambassador residents received a flyer with pilot intervention information taped to their door, and the Camelot had fliers at the front desk for those who did not attend the event (see Appendix E).

New Services/Resources

The three largest interventions of the pilot were: The Food Vouchers, Refrigerated/Frozen Prepared Meal, and the Hot Community Meal. These interventions provided residents with options for prepared meals, groceries, and ready-to-eat or frozen items. During the needs assessment, residents highlighted grocery shopping transportation as a challenge for utilization of grocery vouchers.

Food Vouchers-CalFresh and Fruit & Vegetable (F&V)		
	Camelot	*Ambassador*
Intervention Provided	(x4) $5 CalFresh Eligible Vouchers (monthly) (x4) $5 F&V Vouchers (monthly)	(x4) $5 CalFresh Eligible Vouchers (monthly) (x4) $5 F&V Vouchers (monthly)
Service Provider	EatSF	
Implementation Process	— EatSF staff trained site staff to distribute vouchers and track redemption — Interested tenants completed enrollment form — Services staff or case managers distributed vouchers during regular client meetings at the beginning of the month; tracked monthly distribution	
Highlights	— Distribution weaved into existing client meetings	
Challenges	— Initial confusion at retail sites about item eligibility. EatSF provided clarification to retail sites. — Voucher distributions may be hard to align with tenant availability — Lack of consistent distribution scheduled due to staff schedules — Vouchers are to be used within a calendar month, so distribution delays shorten redemption window.	— Same as Camelot — Voucher distribution required additional staff time to coordinate with tenants
Recommendations/ Future Considerations	— Establish consistent distribution times for tenants that are adjacent to existing community event times. — Establish alternate pickup protocol for those unavailable during distribution time. — EatSF's ability to administer a SNAP-Eligible voucher program outside of this pilot will have to be considered.	

Refrigerated/Frozen Individual Meals

	Camelot	Ambassador
Intervention Provided	Two frozen pre-packaged meals (one breakfast, one lunch) distributed weekly. Tenants can store meals and reheat as needed.	
Service Provider	Meals on Wheels	
Implementation Process	— Meals on Wheels delivers prepackaged frozen meals on Thursday mornings — Breakfasts distributed Thursday mornings, lunches distributed Friday afternoons	— Meals on Wheels delivers prepackaged frozen meals on Monday mornings — Two meals offered during existing Monday food pantry distribution
Highlights	— Tenant leaders were quickly trained to handle all aspects of delivery and distribution, and very little site staff time was used — Camelot was equipped with new kitchen equipment in its community space during the pilot (see Equipment and Infrastructure section below.) Increased storage allowed for more flexible distribution.	— Meal distribution was added into the existing weekly pantry distribution, which minimized extra work
Challenges	— Delivery did not always arrive during scheduled delivery window	— Same as Camelot — Site unable to store meals for long periods of time. Meals scheduled to be delivered just prior to pantry distribution.
Recommendations / Future Considerations	— Establish appropriate protocol and contingency plans if delivery does not arrive. — Meal storage infrastructure needed to accommodate leftover meals. — Seek options for on demand distribution (vending, community fridge) to supplement or replace scheduled distribution times. — Tenants need more refrigeration in order to store additional meals	

Hot Community Meal	
	Camelot
Intervention Provided	One weekly hot meal, with option for second helpings (see Appendix F)
Service Provider	Centro Latino
Implementation Process	— Site assessed for space and ability to house warming equipment. Centro Latino prepares and brings the meal (see appendix G) on Thursday afternoons. — Meals served by one Centro Latino staff and the two tenant leaders at 4pm. — Tenants can eat in the community room or receive take-away meals.. — At 4:30pm, tenants are allowed seconds. At 5pm, remaining food is boxed and given to the front desk to distribute to late-arriving residents.
Highlights	— The new kitchen (see equipment/infrastructure below) allowed for onsite heating of food, rather than having to bring heating elements — Onsite meals allow for an increasing sense of community within the building
Challenges	— Severe behavioral disruptions and hygiene issues by a regular tenant — Monolingual Spanish Centro Latino staff monolingual English tenant leaders experienced communication challenges — "Seconds" distribution process not always transparent to tenants.
Cross Site Comparison	— Staffing challenges prevented the Ambassador participation. The Camelot property managers served meals after support staff shifts ended but the Ambassador did not have that capacity. — The Ambassador has a policy of keeping services out of the tenant community space in order to keep it as a "neutral" space.
Recommendations / Future Considerations	— Establish and communicate behavioral and hygiene expectations for community dining. — Establish clear and consistent service hours. — Expect that services staff may be needed to assist with complicated client needs. — Confirm capacity to hold warm food and space to serve food. — For future projects, Centro Latino can provide additional staff to handle meal distribution in place of tenant leaders or site staff.

Grocery Shopping Transportation (Lyft)	
	Camelot
Intervention Provided	— Monthly group transportation to and from FoodsCo to purchase groceries. Discontinued after two trips.
Implementation Process	— Trip scheduled for the beginning of the month just after tenants receive benefit checks or CalFresh and F&V vouchers — Project manager and case managers solicit sign ups onsite one-to-two weeks before scheduled trip. Occasionally, tenant leaders also pass sign up sheets during meal distributions (see Appendix H). — The project manager schedules the ride and return trip in advance, using the Lyft Concierge Platform which generates two links that can be sent to the trip leader for activation when needed. — Participants meet onsite. Trip leader activates a link for a trip to FoodsCo. Trip leader gathers tenants and requests Lyft back to SRO when done. — Project manager led initial trips with the goal of training tenant leaders to lead the trips.
Highlights	— Participants in the two completed trips were very appreciative of the opportunity to have a ride to the store and purchase a large quantity of food that they did not have to transport back using public transportation. — Tenants are able to shop at an affordable, full-service grocery store.
Challenges	— Scheduling was difficult and utilization was low. Only 2 shopping trips were completed. — Tenants like to as soon as they receive their benefit checks or vouchers. Variation in distributions prohibited a transportation schedule that aligned with client needs. — Some tenants were worried they would be left behind at the store — Disabled accessibility of Lyft vehicles was an issue — Tenant leaders could not successfully activate the links on their phones — Tenant leaders were overwhelmed with leading a group trip.
Cross Site Comparison	— Ambassador declined to participate citing potential lack of access for disabled tenants.
Recommendations/ Future Considerations	— Success could be impacted by improving coordination between rides and voucher distribution. For example, make ride sign-ups available during voucher distribution. — Identify trip leaders with capacity to manage both resident groups and technology platform. — Have tenant leaders, who are known and trusted, lead discussions during community meetings about transportation options that feel safe. — Consider alternate transportation options (Paratransit, etc) to allow for better disabled accessibility.

Coordination/Capacity Building

Tenant Leaders		
	Camelot	*Ambassador*
Intervention Provided	— Leah's Pantry hired tenant leaders to assist with intervention implementation	
Implementation Process	— Project managers drafted job description (see Appendix I) — Site support staff identified tenants they believed would be a good fit — Prospective tenants were interviewed and three were hired at each site — Project manager provided a formal onboarding and training process (see Appendix J)	
Highlights	— Most leaders learned their responsibilities quickly and could leverage existing relationships with residents — Tenant leaders worked as a team and helped each other understand and execute responsibilities	
Challenges	— Not all tenants had the required documentation (ID, social security card) for employment — Several lacked bank accounts for direct deposit, resulting in delayed pay or lost checks — Sites has a small pool of qualified applicants — Tenant leaders struggled with administrative responsibilities such as time sheets and intervention attendance form. — Tenant leaders concerned about impact of income on their government benefits. — High turnover of tenant leaders due to change of residence, terminations, and, ; and fears of losing government benefits. — Remote management of tenant leaders was complicated by lack of phone/email access and need for extra professional support	
Cross Site Comparison	— At the Camelot, tenant leaders assisted with prepared meal distribution as well as serving the community meal, which were held as new standalone events — At the Ambassador, tenant leaders only assisted in prepared meal distribution, which was embedded into the preexisting food pantry distribution — All Tenant leader positions discontinued at the Ambassador due to issues with benefits and change of residence.	
Recommendations/ Future Considerations	— Clarify documentation needed with tenant leaders before onboarding process — During the interview process, support applicants to understand how compensation might affect benefit eligibility. — Train site staff to manage tenant leaders	

Food Navigator		
	Camelot	*Ambassador*
Intervention Description	— The Food Navigator would provide onsite food resource case management to tenants including food resource management and service connection.	
Implementation Process	— Job description (see Appendix K) was distributed through the Collaborative and other networks — Two candidates were identified and interviewed. One selected and hired. — Onboarding process involved meeting site staff and attending onsite events	
Highlights	— Recruitment yielded an enthusiastic candidate who lived in a Tenderloin SRO, previously worked at the Camelot, and had experience and passion for service connection	
Challenges	— Difficult to attract applicants who were familiar with the landscape of the neighborhood and local food access and could accommodate limited hours — Once hired, the Navigator left the position after one month due to multiple personal/family crises.	
Recommendations/ Future Considerations	— Partner with a local social service agency to fill this role — Develop flyers and non-internet outreach methods expand reach — This role may have greater responsibilities for outreach and tenant engagement in buildings with no onsite social services — With or without this position, build knowledge and capacity of social services staff to better understand and help tenants navigate the suite of food resources and programs available to tenants in San Francisco.	

CalFresh SSI Outreach and Enrollment

	Camelot	*Ambassador*
Intervention Provided	— Eligibility screening and enrollment support for newly CalFresh-eligible tenants on SSI	
Service Provider	San Francisco Marin Food Bank (SFMFB)	
Implementation Process	— Site staff attended training by SFMFB on changes to CalFresh eligibility — Site staff educated tenants about the change, and provided information and referrals — SFMFB hosted an onsite CalFresh enrollment event at the Ambassador.	
Highlights	— Site support staff made 15 enrollment referrals	— 12 tenants signed up for benefits during onsite enrollment event
Challenges	— SFMFB was not able to track applicants who applied on their own, which made it difficult to measure the effectiveness of referrals — Some tenants report that applying was not "worth it" as the benefit received was smaller than expected	
Cross Site Comparison	— Camelot staff made referrals throughout normal interactions with tenants. — Ambassador focused on tenant applications at the enrollment event.	
Recommendations / Considerations	— Continue to provide training, resources and updates to site staff so that they can refer new tenants to CalFresh enrollment on an ongoing basis — Offer and publicize pop-up enrollment events at local sites	

Food Pantry Technical Assistance

	Camelot	Ambassador
Intervention Description	— SFMFB consulted with the staff at both pilot sites to assess potential improvements to current on-site pantry programs	
Service Provider	San Francisco Marin Food Bank (SFMFB)	
Implementation Process	— SFMFB senior program coordinator met with sites and observed pantry distribution. — Issued suggestions for improvements	
Cross Site Comparisons	— Camelot only has a shop account which it uses to stock a food closet as well as provide a monthly product distribution. It is not part of SFMFB's regular pantry program. Staff decided to maintain this structure instead of running a weekly pantry.	— SFMFB provided suggestions to change food bank hours and location to reach more residents. However, site staff determined that these changes would disrupt other activities and needs
Recommendations / Future Considerations	— Schedule regular assessments of onsite pantry services to evaluate service delivery and identify opportunities to meet changing needs — Future projects should be aware that SFMFB does not have capacity to enroll more pantries into its program. Its strategy is to link buildings to nearby pantries.	

Room Delivered Grocery Bags

	Ambassador
Intervention Description	— SFMFB provided technical assistance and extra food so that staff and tenant volunteers/leaders could provide pantry bag deliveries to homebound or physically disabled tenants
Service Provider	San Francisco Marin Food Bank (SFMFB)
Implementation Process	— Ambassador staff individually identified eligible tenants — SFMFB provided additional product and bags — Tenant leaders built bags and delivered to participating residents
Challenges	— Labor intensive intervention compared to a standard distribution — Storage required if tenants were out during distribution.. — Program discontinued due to low sign-ups. — Site already held bags of groceries for tenants on a case by case basis and determined that door to door delivery was not needed.

Recommendations /Future Considerations	— Determine standard eligibility criteria for home delivered bags. — Consider other home delivered grocery programs that may require less involvement of site staff or tenant leaders

Food Resource Toolkit

	Camelot	Ambassador
Intervention Description	— A printed resource binder for staff and tenants to identify local food resources (see Appendix L)	
Service Provider	Leah's Pantry	
Implementation Process	— Leah's Pantry compiled a list of food resources and services available to Tenderloin residents. — Design and layout prioritized ease of use. — Binders printed and distributed to sites for tenant and staff use. — Staff and Food Navigator were oriented to the binder and encouraged to use it for tenant needs.	
Challenges	— It is hard to find updated lists of food resources and services. Many of the lists also lack sufficient detail about eligibility and are not easy for staff or tenants to reference. — Some resources in the binder were at capacity. Tenants or site staff would have to call each resource directly or go in person to determine the status — Information about resources and services is available in piecemeal fashion in the form of both printed and digital lists. — City online resources were notably challenging to navigate.	
Recommendations / Future Considerations	— While SF maintains 311 and digitally available lists of resources, tenants and staff find the familiarity and functionality of a printed list more appealing. — Identify an agency to create and provide regular updates to an easy to use food resource service directory for that can be printed for site use. — Details about eligibility and availability should be easy to obtain	

Equipment and Infrastructure

Kitchen Upgrade	
	Camelot Only
Intervention Provided	— Remodel of existing space to add storage, cabinets, kitchen appliances. Added option of cookware checkout for tenants.
Implementation Process	— Equipment specs were identified and bid was secured from contractor by DISH staff — Existing cabinetry/sink/counter was demolished, electrical wiring was upgraded, and storage and new counters were installed. Portable refrigeration/freezer and a freestanding oven was installed for program use.
Highlights	— Oven is used during weekly Hot Community meals, eliminating the need for warming trays — The addition of refrigeration allowed for more flexibility for meal distribution.
Challenges	— Tenants are not using the kitchen regularly. The space is only available during regular business hours, tenants do not have storage containers leftover food, tenants don't want to check out cookware, and the refrigerator and freezer must be unlocked by site staff — Tenants will lose a portion of their SSI benefits if they reside in a building with full kitchens. Because of this, the Camelot did not install a full kitchen with a stove and permanent appliances, and did not provide 24 hour access to the kitchen.
Recommendations/ Future Considerations	— An electrical upgrade may be needed to support upgraded kitchens — Additional refrigeration onsite could potentially benefit tenants who participate in home delivered meal programs but are unable to be at home to receive the door-to-door delivery — Site capacity to monitor kitchen use and maintain equipment and sanitation of the space may be limited

Small Cooking Appliances		
	Camelot	*Ambassador*
Service Provider	Leah's Pantry (Target)	Leah's Pantry (Walmart)
Implementation Process	— Residents chose crock pots during kick-off events. — Site support staff created a list of tenants who requested a crockpot. — Site staff and tenant leaders held a distribution event in conjunction with a monthly tenant meeting	— Residents chose both crockpots and toaster ovens during the kick-off event. — Site staff posted an interest form on each tenant door for tenants to request the appliance. — A two-hour distribution event was scheduled for tenant pickup

Highlights	— Leah's Pantry led a crockpot recipe demonstration after the distribution, allowing tenants to learn new recipe ideas and share ideas amongst themselves	— Advance requests for either the crockpot or toaster oven allowed for a more accurate count of items to be purchased
Challenges		— Misdelivery of two large shipments of appliances delayed planned distributions
Cross Site Comparison	— Camelot offered residents only a crockpot; Ambassador offered tenants choice of a crockpot or toaster oven — Camelot site leaders estimated demand and held an open distribution — Ambassador collected resident orders	
Recommendations/ Future Considerations	— Offer more workshops to enhance client ability to use appliances. — Build capacity to offer all new tenants a crockpot or toaster oven. — Offer a variety of appliances such as microwaves, Instant-Pots, induction burners, as well as small tools and cooking utensils	

Vending Machine *(not implemented)*

	Camelot	Ambassador
Description	Vending machine or refrigerator that provides wider windows of access (ideally 24 hour) to ready-to-eat foods.	
Challenges	— This intervention was not feasible during the pilot. — Unable to find the appropriate vending machine technology and servicers for SRO needs. — Tenants would like to be able to use EBT cards for payment but this is not approved by CalFresh.	
Cross Site Comparison	— Site already provides food from onsite "pantry closet" whenever tenants request food — Snack food vending machines already onsite	— Concerns about personnel needed to manage equipment, and troubleshoot problems — Concerns about space utilization and location — Property management rejected the addition of more electrical equipment onsite
Recommendations/ Future Considerations	— Work with property management to explore options for refrigeration that can hold ready to eat foods for more frequent distribution — Vending machine intervention needs further research to find options suitable for SRO settings. See "Recommendations" section of this report	

Data Collection

Successful data collection during the pilot was heavily dependent on the labor of site staff and tenant leaders and the project managers' relationships with them. De-identified usage data was collected at both sites to track individual usage of each intervention. Leah's Pantry staff picked up tracking sheets monthly. The site staff tracked monthly distribution of EatSF vouchers at both pilot sites. Tenant leaders tracked participants for the frozen/refrigerated meal distribution and hot meal distribution. Ambassador site staff tracked meal distribution after the tenant leaders quit. The hot meal tracking at the Camelot was not always consistent. Distribution of second meals was not recorded. The front desk staff were responsible for checking off people who picked up leftover meals. This often depended on who was monitoring the front desk at the time.

Project Managers worked closely with site staff to collect pilot evaluation data from residents. Site staff participation was crucial since they provided direct outreach to encourage participation in surveys, interviews and focus groups. The project managers also conducted in-person data collection events. Furthermore, site staff selected participants to participate in focus groups and interviews. To incentivize survey participation, tenants were offered cash, gift cards, raffles, and small kitchen tools to complete surveys. All interviewees and focus group participants were paid $20 for their participation. Data collection at baseline was easier than during the final evaluation period.

Survey collection at the control sites was more challenging as no relationships with the sites were established during the pilot. Control site staff identified coffee hours as the best time to collect data. They posted flyers on doors and encouraged residents to participate during other meetings and events. This was effective for residents who regularly attend coffee hours, but additional incentives were needed to collect enough data. The project managers organized a raffle for several $50 gift cards to a local store to engage more residents.

Expenditures and Cost Comparisons

Overall Intervention Costs

Projected total cost of interventions through April 2020: *$107,000*

Intervention	Description/Vendor	Estimated Total Intervention Expense
Food Voucher CalFresh Eligible	(x4) $5 vouchers distributed monthly per tenant (EatSF)	$34,400
Food Voucher F&V Voucher	(x4) $5 vouchers distributed monthly per tenant (EatSF)	In kind (estimated value:$30,600)
Delivered Prepared Meals	(x2) meals delivered per week (Meals on Wheels)	$35,150
Hot Community Meal (Camelot Only)	(x1) weekly meal (Centro Latino)	$11,100
Grocery Store Shopping Transportation (Camelot Only)	(x1) monthly car trip (Lyft Concierge Service)	$115
Food Pantry Technical Assistance (Ambassador only)	4 hours of site consultation (SF Marin Food Bank)	In kind (value: n/a)
Food Resource Tool Kit	(x2) custom binders of resources provided to each site, plus labor (Leah's Pantry)	Printing $150; in kind labor (value: $500)
CalFresh SSI Eligibility and Outreach	SF Marin Food Bank site training and enrollment event, 4 hours	In kind (value: n/a)
Tenant Leaders	(x6) tenant leaders hired during course of pilot; pay rate $17/hr	$8200
Food Resource Navigator	(x1) navigator hired; pay rate $17/hr	$175
Kitchen Upgrade (Camelot Only)	Portable induction burner, oven, refrigeration, cabinets, electrical upgrade, pots and pans	$16,250
Small Cooking Appliances	(x101) Crockpots or Toaster Ovens	$2100 1 quart crockpots: $11 Toaster oven: $22

"Meal" Interventions: Cost Comparisons

The table below compares the three primary grant interventions. Cost and utilization data from a period of 6-7 months at the beginning of the intervention period was selected to create cost comparisons.

Voucher/Meal Cost

All prices are approximate

	Food Vouchers-CalFresh Eligible (March–Sept 2019)	Refrigerated/ Frozen Individual Meal (May–Oct 2019)	Hot Community Meal~Camelot Only (April–Oct 2019)
A. Quantity Provided	(X4) vouchers per month	(x2) meals per week allotted per tenant	(X1) meal per week (with seconds)
B. Price per Voucher/Meal (charged by vendor)	$5.36 (redemption value, plus vendor fee; not including printing and admin.)	$5.15	$5.85
C. Cost of Voucher Utilized/Meal Distributed (see below)	$6.20 (redemption value, plus vendor fee, including printing and admin.)	$9.10 After order adjustment* $6.80	$9.90 After order adjustment * $7.40
D. Cost per Tenant, After Utilization and Ordering Adjustment (see below)	$24.70 per month	$58.50 per month ($13.60 per week)	$42.50 per month ($9.90 per week)

*After the initial intervention period, orders of both meals were adjusted to correspond to recorded utilization. A small set of data collected after the intervention period suggests that this has reduced per meal costs by approx. 25%. That change is reflected in this calculation. Ordering staff can reduce meal waste and lower costs through accurate record keeping and regular adjustment of meal quantities.

Vouchers Costs vs. Ready-to-Eat Meal Costs (Refrigerated/Frozen and Hot)

When considering Cost of Vouchers Utilized/Meal Distributed (Line C), it is important to note some key factors in the cost differences. EatSF charges for pre-printing of all vouchers prior to distribution ($.17 per voucher), a flat administrative set up fee, and then only for the actual amount redeemed when vouchers are utilized. Besides a printing fee, there are no costs for vouchers that are printed but not distributed or not redeemed. This cost structure minimizes voucher loss/waste as compared to the other meal interventions.

In contrast, the refrigerated/frozen individual and hot congregate meals must be ordered and paid for before distribution and consumption. In the initial stage of the pilot, order quantities of these ready-to-eat meals were intentionally high to gauge full tenant demand for the meals and to plan for possible increases in demand as the interventions became more publicized. According to tenant leaders, a majority of the leftover frozen prepared meals were re-distributed at some point during the week while a significant portion of the hot congregate meals were consumed as seconds during meal service (approx. 35%). As these leftover meals were not properly tracked, actual utilization rates were likely higher making cost per meal distributed somewhat lower.

Costs for Refrigerated/Frozen Individual Meal vs. Hot Congregate Meal In order to fully compare the costs between the frozen and hot meals, the value (quantity relative to cost) of the meal provided must also be examined. During the pilot, we observed the majority of participating tenants at the Camelot consuming seconds of the hot meal but it was not counted. On the other hand, residents often complained about the small size of the pre-portioned frozen prepared meals and reported eating two as a meal. Therefore, one should consider that the costs of each of these meals, prior to the ordering adjustments described above, reflects two different amounts consumed. One hot meal, which included seconds. was more filling to most residents, than 1 refrigerated/frozen meal.

Additional Labor Costs

Each pilot site developed their own process for distributing these services. The services themselves often required staff support outside the course of usual service provision. During the pilot, additional staffing needs were provided by case managers or the tenant leaders. More tenant labor hours were needed than site staff hours because they often needed to work in teams and receive supervision from project managers or site staff. The table below compares staffing needs and labor costs for each of the interventions:

	Food Vouchers-CalFresh Eligible		Refrigerated/Frozen Individual Meal		Hot Congregate Meal
Site	*Camelot*	*Ambassador*	*Camelot*	*Ambassador*	*Camelot*
Number of Distributions	1 per month	1 per month	2 per week	1 per week	1 per week
Personnel Tasks	Distribute and track vouchers	Distribute and track vouchers	Receive and store meals. Distribute and track during 1.5 hour event twice per week.	Receive meals. Distribute and track during weekly 1 hr food pantry	Set up dining space. Distribute meals; Track participation; Clean up after meal
Est. Additional Labor Hours per Distribution	None. Distribution occurred during regular client meetings.	6 site staff hours @ $65/hr	2.25 tenant leader hours @$22/hr; .25 project manager hr @ $50/hr	1.5 tenant leader hours @$22/hr*; .25 project manager hr @ $50/hr	3.5 tenant leader hours @$22/hr; .25 project manager hr @ $50/hr
Est. Labor Cost	0	$390 monthly	$530 monthly $62 (per distribution)/ $124 (weekly)	$190 monthly $45 (per weekly distribution)	$390 monthly $90 (per weekly distribution)
Labor cost per tenant utilizing	0	$8.10 monthly	$35 monthly $4.15 (per day)/$8.30 (weekly)	$10 monthly $2.30 (weekly)	$15.50 monthly $3.60 (weekly)

Explanation of Labor Costs for Refrigerated/Frozen Individual Meal: The frozen individual meals at the Ambassador were distributed during the regularly scheduled Food Pantry distribution. Prior to hiring tenant leaders, an unpaid volunteer assisted with food pantry distribution. After the ending of tenant leader positions at the Ambassador, the regular volunteer continued to distribute the meals. Without a food pantry to facilitate distribution, Camelot labor costs were higher because meals were distributed during longer twice weekly scheduled events, rather once each week for one hour. The site decided these longer distributions taking place over two days would provide greater access to more tenants. Camelot tenant leaders also performed more

responsibilities during distribution of Frozen Individual Meals as compared to the Ambassador. They were fully responsible for receiving, storing, and setting up distribution of the meals.

Considerations for Labor Cost Reduction: Integrating voucher and meal distribution into regular site events and activities could decrease the amount of additional staffing needed. However, there may be an important need to have separately scheduled distributions on different days and during "off" hours to provide access to residents with diverse schedules and to spread the resources out throughout the week. Furthermore, the costs of using paid tenant leaders should be weighed against benefits such as empowering tenants and building leadership in the SRO community.

Recommendations

Trauma-Informed Nutrition Security

At the beginning of this project in fall of 2018, Leah's Pantry was still in the early stages of developing its trauma-informed nutrition security framework. An explicit trauma-informed approach was not initially incorporated into this project, but a client-centered approach and trauma-sensitive practices were applied to many aspects. **With the insight and expertise gained over the last few years, we strongly urge food security initiatives to consider whether food security can be addressed with food security interventions alone.** We recommend the adoption of a disciplined trauma-informed approach to understand and address food security beyond just looking at barriers to accessing resources. We also encourage initiatives to work towards *nutrition* security which the UN declares, "exists when all people at all times have physical, social and economic access to food, which is consumed in sufficient quantity and quality to meet their dietary needs and food preferences, and is supported by an environment of adequate sanitation, health services and care, allowing for a healthy and active life (Wustefeld, 2013)." A trauma-informed nutrition security approach in SROs can improve the impact of interventions. Some recommendations using this approach:

- **Assessing gaps and meeting needs should go beyond calculating "missed meals" or quantity of food.** Resident perceptions, tastes, preferences, habits, health status, stress and emotional wellbeing are significant factors in utilization of food resources and should be part of assessments. Measuring health outcomes such as changes in habits, diet, and stress levels during this pilot was not formally undertaken in this pilot but are important to include in future interventions. The safety, trustworthiness, dignity and quality of food services and interventions should also be part of assessments and service delivery.
- **Coordinate food security efforts with existing health care, mental health and disability services** to amplify the efforts of all these services and interventions. Food security strongly impacts and is impacted by physical and mental health. Moreover, since social support and community connection is a key aspect of health and wellbeing, there is an opportunity to implement food services that simultaneously support psycho-social needs and enhance therapeutic milieus. However, it will be important to ensure that receiving food services is not contingent on participating in any other services or socialization. Furthermore, service providers should be provided with trauma-sensitive skills and capacity building training in order to mitigate emotional and psychological barriers to accessing resources.

Site Capacity and Readiness

We found that a key factor in implementation of services was the unique ecosystem at each site. Many interventions can be provided at both "high touch" or "low touch" sites. However, more elaborate and comprehensive interventions can be implemented at sites with more touch points with clients and developed ecosystems. In addition to considering how many touch points clients have with site staff, the following considerations should be included in an assessment of site capacity and readiness:

- **What type of relationship exists between tenants and staff? Does the site employ trauma-informed practices such as those needed to build trust and transparency? Does it successfully engage tenant voices and leadership?** The quality of these relationships and type of engagement can impact the implementation and utilization of interventions. For example, we found that the high level of community engagement at the Camelot was an asset to intervention delivery and troubleshooting. At the Ambassador, the existence of previous cultivation of volunteers allowed for fast implementation of the tenant leader position.
- **What is the model and philosophy for service provision?** The various agencies that provide management and support at SRO sites articulate different approaches to client engagement and service provision. During the pilot, we found that depending on the model and philosophy taken, there were varying degrees of flexibility and willingness to adopt some interventions.
- **What is the staffing structure at the site? What is the relationship and communication between administrators, building management, operations, and support service staff?** Buy-in and support for food security services requires decision making and coordination involving administrators, operations, support staff and building management. Personnel changes can also mean a change in approach towards services. For example, loss of a key site supervisor and a case manager at the Camelot required an adjustment of expectations. The remaining and replacement staff were not as familiar with the intervention plan and needed to be ramped up to support the services. At the Ambassador, the loss of a similar position didn't result in the same drop in expectations as the case management team was already involved in the pilot. In fact, the loss of the supervisor position resulted in a more fluid coordination process and reduced barriers to communication with the staff responsible for implementation. To mitigate these issues it is important to involve multiple staff as well as identify point persons across departments including executive leadership, operations, social work and building management to ensure smooth service delivery. For example, during the pilot we found that coordination and decision-making was smoother at the Camelot because building operations staff were part of coordination meetings. For sites where there is very little or no onsite tenant services, there would be a need to establish a strong and direct relationship with building owners/managers.

Collaborative Next Steps

One of the most important recommendations we have for continuing this work is to **establish a more robust and clearly structured advisory body to guide it**. Whether it takes on a formal collaborative structure, becomes a working group, or uses some other model, we recommend the following:

- Define roles, responsibilities, governance, and decision-making processes within the body.
- Include a broader range of stakeholders for future intervention planning and advisory. Receive guidance from representatives from housing agency leadership, site staff, landlords, as well as tenants. Tenants should be provided with a stipend for their participation. Include the perspective of social work or mental health services in order to incorporate the voice of tenants who are unable to attend or clearly articulate their perspectives.
- Invite input or participation from a broader range of service providers and agencies who are working to address food security challenges for area residents.

Second, we suggest exploring **other opportunities** that were uncovered but could not be explored or implemented during the pilot that could address SRO food security needs from a holistic perspective:

- Provide infrastructure and equipment to support onsite food services and meet tenants needs. More refrigeration and storage is needed in staff-accessible areas and common spaces in order to support onsite food services. In-unit storage and freezer/refrigeration is also necessary for tenants to store and freeze foods for longer term use. Also, explore possibilities to provide in room cooking facilities to more SROs keeping in mind that such facilities will reduce tenants SSI payments.
- Continue to look for ways to address transportation barriers for tenants to acquire groceries at offsite markets and pantries, especially for disabled residents. Consider funding transportation vouchers or providing more access to paratransit to address disabled tenants' grocery shopping needs.
- Investigate a public/private partnership with vending machines companies such as Byte Foods or Stockwell, to modify machines for use in SROs to allow for on-demand access to prepared foods. Various stocking and servicing models should be explored in order to offer tenants food at low-cost or no-cost. Depending on the service model, these machines would also need to allow for payment that is suitable for tenants such as tokens or issued pre-loaded cards. Currently, SNAP/EBT cannot be used in vending machines though USDA is currently running a 2 year pilot to consider this option. Actionhunger.org in the UK offers one example of a vending machine for social service delivery.
- Partner with existing food service training programs (i.e. ECS, Farming Hope), entrepreneurship incubators (La Cocina), peer health leadership initiatives (AIMS Project, Food Justice Leaders, RAMS Peer Health) and other innovative programs to generate opportunities for community skill building, empowerment, and employment while addressing food insecurity.

Citations

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2014). SAMHSA's Concept of Trauma and Guidance for a Trauma-Informed Approach. HHS Publication No. (SMA) 14-4884. Retrieved from: https://store.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/d7/priv/sma14-4884.pdf

Wustefeld, M. (2013, March). *Food and Nutrition Security: Nutrition Impact on Food Security.* Presentation to the Standing Committee on Nutrition. Retrieved from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5810069/

Appendices

Appendix A - Grant Timeline

Appendix B - Needs Assessment

Appendix C - Leah's Pantry SOW

Appendix D - Enrollment Sheet for EatSF

Appendix E - Pilot Information Flyer - Ambassador ; Camelot

Appendix F - Meals Flyer

Appendix G -Centro Latino Sample Menu

Appendix H - Lyft Ride Signup Sheet

Appendix I - Tenant Leader Job Description: Ambassador; Camelot

Appendix J - Tenant Leader Policy and Expectations contract

Appendix K - Food Resource Navigator Job Description

Appendix L - Food Resource Toolkit

Acknowledgements

Thank you to the following individuals for their commitment and collaboration:

Katie Bouche', *Support Services Manager, TNDC*
RyAnne Brown, *former Case Manager, SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing*
Virgilio Comia, *Case Manager, SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing*
Rodrick (Roger) Davis, *Tenant Leader, Camelot*
Ja Eun Huh, *former Support Services Manager*, TNDC
Lauren Hall, *Director DISH*
Joyvelle Henderson, *former Case Manager, SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing*
Will Jensen, *Social Worker, TNDC (Ambassador)*
Kanelo Leigh, *Tenant Leader, Ambassador*
Kendra Leingang, *former Clinical Supervisor, SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing*
Elyse Miller, *Clinical Supervisor, SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing*
Alexandra Neidenberg, *former Senior Program Coordinator, Leah's Pantry*
Christine Odena, *Director of Support Services, SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing*
Elton Parker, *Tenant Leader, Ambassador*
Rey Regala, *Interim General Manager, DISH*
Robert Stewart, *Tenant Leader, Camelot*
Ricky Swinney, *Tenant Leader, Ambassador*
Aaron Wilkow, *Tenant Leader, Camelot*
Tenants of the Ambassador and Camelot Residences

SFSFHC Members:
Cissie Bonini, *Executive Director, Vouchers for Veggies/EatSF*
Isabel Flores, *Senior Program Coordinator, San Francisco Marin Food Bank*
Alex Goldman, *former Senior Program Coordinator, San Francisco Marin Food Bank*
Geoffrey Grier, *Crisis Intervention Director, SF Recovery Theater*
Karen Gruniesen, *former Associate Director, Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco*
Sanjana Marpadga, *Program Associate, Vouchers for Veggies/EatSF*
Anne Quaintance, *Chief Gov't Affairs Officer, Meals on Wheels SF*
Jason Pruett, *Director of Workforce Development & Social Enterprise, Episcopal Community Services of San Francisco*
Jeffrey Smith, *Founder, From the Garden to the Table*
Chester Williams, *Home Food Delivery Project Coordinator, Community Living Campaign*

Control Site Staff and Tenants (ECS):
Bishop Swing
Crosby
Henry