

**Temporary Community Advisory Body
Meeting Minutes
February 9, 2026**

I. Roll Call and Introductions

Quorum at 5:37 PM

Present: Leslie Brown, Mariah Bruce, Angela Butler-Owens, Rachel Corona, Loren Dalbert, Chair Edward Harris, Bianca LaChaux, Dr. Fredrick Lee, Dr. LéJon Payne, Walter McMath, Vice Chair Dr. Jalaima Nichols, Nnedi Obembe, Willie Robinson, Kim Jones (alternate), Antwanisha Hicks (alternate)

Absent: Patt Young (alternate)

Chair Ed Harris welcomed newly appointed member, Dr. Fredrick Lee, and newly appointed alternate members, Kim Jones, Antwanisha Hicks and Patt Young (absent).

Members engaged in a round robin check in.

II. APPROVE January 12, 2026 TCAB Record of Action / Minutes

Motion by Mariah Bruce, seconded by Angela Butler-Owens to approve January 12, 2026 Record of Action / Minutes.

Ayes: Unanimous

Public comment: None

Group also agreed to continue current meeting process agreements.

III. DISCUSS Workplan Snapshot and Process Update

Vice Chair Jalaima Nichols reviewed the snapshot of TCAB workplan to date.

Director Carr shared that the newly created Implicit Bias training will be available for TCAB to complete within the next two (2) months. Chair Ed Harris encouraged TCAB members to complete the training timely once released. Staff Jessica Travenia advised that TCAB remains in compliance with BOS Advisory Body training requirements.

Vice Chair Jalaima Nichols reviewed process for Ad Hoc committee presentations to occur in tonight's meeting. Each committee will have five (5) minutes for their presentation. Vice Chair also reviewed plan to discuss the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) marketing outreach strategy in tonight's meeting. Vice Chair also reviewed purpose of RFQ; Chair reviewed RFQ desired outcomes.

IV. RECEIVE Temporary Community Action Body (TCAB) Ad Hoc committee reports.

Ad Hoc Committee #1 Teach Back – Scope of Service

Committee Members – Angela Butler-Owens, Mariah Bruce, Dr. LeJon Payne

Temporary Community Advisory Body
Meeting Minutes
February 9, 2026

Reviewed each Scope of Work section. Purpose was to maintain frameworks for integrity as it moves from vision to practice. Affirmed that priority is to ensure equity and consistency. Recommendation to use Appendix B is utilized as an operational guideline.

Ad Hoc Committee #2 Teach Back – Review and Selection Process
Committee Members – Willie Robinson, Loren Dalbert, Dr. Jalaima Nichols

Reviewed the process by which RFQ responses will be reviewed and winning proposal will be selected. Took a closer look at Section D and 100-point rubric. Devised a list of key questions for consideration during the review process to address 1) Process and Transparency; 2) Equity and Representation; and 3) Scoring and Appeals. Are points balanced between technical skill, lived experience and community trust? Recommendation that RFQ reviewers receive training to address these issues and to ensure consistency in the evaluation process. Recommend limited training and technical assistance to applicants, particularly around data collection methodologies.

Ad Hoc Committee #3 Teach Back – Response Instructions and Outline
Committee Members – Paster Ed Harris, Rachel Corona, Walter McMath

Reviewed the process by which RFQ responses will be reviewed and winning proposal will be Recommend that there is an Expression of Interest (EOI) component to the RFQ response process as an entry point. Incorporate language of Appendix B into the RFQ instructions. Greater simplification and accessible language is key. Also clarify what respondents should include in cover letters. There is also a suggestion to standardize terminology. For example, consistent terminology of African American or Black.

Ad Hoc Committee #4 Teach Back – Qualifications and Eligibility
Committee Members – Leslie Jones, Bianca LaChaux, Nnedi Obembe

Reviewed material and identified three (3) recommendations to include in RFQ. (1) Choose one descriptor between African American or Black and use consistently throughout document. (2) Separate organization criteria from experience criteria. (3) In the experience category include section for respondents to identify their Cal AIM experience. This can be a potential revenue source for entities thus qualified to access Cal AIM state funding.

Public comment: None

V. REVIEW and APPROVE revised Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for Hub Implementation Lead Entity.

Staff Jessica Travenia shared overview of edits made to RFQ document. TCAB discussed timeframe to implement the edits and changes and desire to see the final document prior to publication. Jessica will reach out to individual ad hoc committees to get clarification on recommendations if needed.

Public comment: None

**Temporary Community Advisory Body
Meeting Minutes
February 9, 2026**

VI. DISCUSS Outreach Strategy for RFQ release

Motion made by Willie Robinson and seconded by Mariah Bruce to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. Motion approved unanimously.

Vice Chair Dr. Jalaima Nichols reviewed TCABs role in how the RFQ will be communicated to the public for consistency. Shared a draft statement to post on ORESJ website and various social media to get the word out and promote application.

Discussion ensued about which terminology to use – “Black” or “African American”. Discussion culminated in a vote to use “African American/Black” in RFQ communications. A footnote to further describe the evolving history and context of African diaspora naming will be included in future communications.

Motion made by Chair Ed Harris and seconded by Mariah Bruce to keep statement using African American along with the footnote. Discussion ensued to select terminology to use. Objection made to close discussion without TCAB settling on which name to use.

Public comment: I can see both sides. I identify as black; I think the footnote captures everyone. I think it is important to have the conversation.

Discussion ensued to select terminology to use. Director Carr made suggestion to take a poll to see which word is preferred.

Black/African American selected as nomenclature to use in documents, along with the footnote.

VII. DISCUSS Next Steps

Staff Jessica Travenia reviewed actions for March meeting.

VIII. Receive Updates and Announcements

None.

Motion made by Chair Ed Harris and seconded by Angela Butler-Owens to adjourn meeting.
Ayes: Unanimous

Adjourn at 7:47 PM

The next meeting is currently scheduled for March 9, 2026 at 1025 Escobar Street, Room 110, Martinez, CA 94553.

RE: Ad Hoc TCAB Meeting to Evaluate Response Instructions and Outline

Summary of Ad Hoc TCAB Meeting

- Meeting Date and Time: January 24, 2026, 2:00 PM to 4:00 PM via zoom
- Attendees: TCAB Chair Edward Harris, TCAB Member Rachel Corona, and Walter J. McMath, Esq.
- Purpose: Evaluate draft Response Instructions and Outline for the RFQ process
- Key Observations:
 - Inconsistent terminologies within the RFQ document
 - Unclear guidance on preparing the cover letter
 - Need for terminology consistency (e.g., Black/African-American)
 - Clarification sought on the role of the feasibility study in the RFQ process
 - Concern over dense language potentially limiting applications

Recommendations:

Correct “submittals” to “submissions”

Ensure consistent terminology

Implement the EOI process for greater engagement

Incorporate the feasibility study for clarity

To the ORESJ Co-Directors, the TCAB Chair and Co-Chair, and the Members of the TCAB,

Please be advised that on January 24, 2026, from 2:00 PM to 4:00 PM, an Ad Hoc Committee, consisting of the undersigned, TCAB Chair Edward Harris, and TCAB Member Rachel Corona, met via zoom for the purpose of evaluating the draft Response Instructions and Outline associated with the RFQ process for the TCAB. After a robust discussion in which the members jointly reviewed the Response Instructions and Outline, with reference to “Appendix B: Example Partner Criteria for Service Deployment,” the members made the following observations; which informed and shall inform their Questions, Concerns, and Recommendations.

The members observed that certain terminologies do not appear to be standardized within the RFQ document. For example, 2i) refers to “Black”-led organizations serving the Black community, while 3i) discusses “African-American” health and well-being. Also considering consistency, the committee sought clarification as to the agreed upon name for the Wellness Network. The committee members observed that there is a reference to a cover letter in 1i), but noted that little guidance is provided as to how it should be prepared; and sought clarification as to whether the cover letter serves the same purpose as the “simple and accessible” Expression of Interest referenced in Appendix B. The committee members generally compared and contrasted

the language in the draft RFQ with the language of Appendix B of the feasibility study for clarity and content.

The members have a question as to the role of the feasibility study with respect to the RFQ process. Specifically, the members inquire why the language of the RFQ does not more closely reflect the tone and vocabulary of the feasibility study. The members inquire whether the feasibility study might be incorporated directly or indirectly into the RFQ for greater clarity. The members also inquire whether the EOI referenced in the feasibility study is implemented, and if not, whether it may be. The members have a concern that unnecessarily dense language may chill excitement and narrow the number of applications received. Finally, the members specifically recommend make the following recommendations:

- Correct “submittals” to “submissions.”
- Consistent terminology with respect to Black/Af-Am, name of network.
- Implement the EOI process for greater engagement (March 9 due date?)
- Incorporate the feasibility study directly or indirectly for greater clarity.

Thanks for your attention to this matter,

Walter J. McMath, Esq. (CA SBN #266382)

Meeting 1/21/26 : MEETING NOW

Appendix B: Example Partner Criteria for Service Deployment on pages 52-61 in the [feasibility study](#)

Chair: Mariah Bruce: 510-706-8576
mbruce@contracosta.edu

Spokesperson: LeJon Payne: 925-325-6568
lejonpayne@gmail.com

Secretary: Angela Butler-Owens: 925-915-3135
angela.electricvehicle@gmail.com

Section 1: Core Criteria for Service Partners - Mariah Bruce
Section 2: Service Partner Categories - Angela Butler-Owens
Section 3: Accountability and Oversight - LeJon Payne
Section 4: Venue and Service Site Selection - ALL

Quick Summary :

S1- Mission Alignment & Community Trust

- Verifiable history serving Black communities in Contra Costa County
- Deep understanding of structural racism and intergenerational trauma
- Healing-centered, justice-rooted mission grounded in lived experience
- Culturally competent services and staffing reflective of the community
- Integration of Afrocentric, faith-based, and culturally responsive models

S1 - Community-Led & Trusted by Residents

- *Black-led* = 51% Black leadership + programs by/for Black residents
- Preference for orgs rooted in historically Black neighborhoods
- Place-based equity aligned with Prop 209
- Inclusive of trusted non-Black orgs with proven Black community impact

- Emphasis on mentorship, power-sharing, and Black-led capacity building
 - Demonstrated grassroots partnerships and community credibility
-

S1 - Service Delivery Capabilities

- Wraparound, integrative services (mental health, housing, workforce, finance)
 - Trauma-informed and healing-centered models
 - Mobile + fixed-site service capacity
 - Reach underserved and hard-to-access populations
 - Data-driven practice with regular reporting and evaluation
-

S1 - Workforce & Hiring Standards

- Lived experience is recognized as essential expertise
 - Priority hiring of Black providers and practitioners
 - Culturally competent training for all staff
 - Fair wages and career pathways for Black professionals
 - Leadership pipelines for emerging Black leaders
-

S2 - Community-Defined Wellness Priorities

- Mental Health & Healing Justice
- Black Maternal & Reproductive Health
- Economic Empowerment & Financial Wellness
- Holistic Health & Preventative Care

- Housing, Legal Aid & Reentry
 - Black Male Wellness & Multigenerational Leadership
-

S3 - Accountability & Oversight

- Mandatory racial equity scoring in RFPs
 - Metrics track:
 - Black residents served
 - Reduction in racial disparities
 - Engagement and retention
 - Community-led, diverse RFP panels
 - Anti-bias and anti-racism training for reviewers
 - Black-led applications reviewed by panels with Black leadership
-

S3 - Equitable RFP Process

- Low-burden, equity-driven applications
- Protects organizational autonomy and IP
- Prioritizes lived experience and community impact
- Transparent scoring, feedback, and appeals
- Reparative funding (advance payments, simplified reporting)
- Step 1: Simple Expression of Interest
- Step 2: Collaborative, community-informed application

S3 - Funding & Contracting

- Multi-year contracts (2–3 years)
- Focus on sustainability, not short-term projects
- Advance payments for small/emerging orgs
- Fiscal sponsorship and legal/compliance support

S4 - Sites & Access

- Fixed and mobile service delivery
- Equity-based site selection using the need index
- ADA-accessible, trusted community venues

Tiered Model:

- Tier 1: Full-Service Hubs (daily)
- Tier 2: Rotational Sites (weekly/biweekly)
- Tier 3: Pop-Up Services (events)

S4 - Continuous Improvement

- Annual performance reviews
- Community feedback drives program changes
- Ongoing refinement of services and site allocation

Meeting Summary:

Subcommittee Meeting Summary
Date: January 21, 2026

Time: 8:30 AM

The subcommittee convened to review the Community Framework with a focus on ensuring equity, consistency, and community authority across all phases of implementation. Discussion centered on maintaining the framework's integrity as it moves from vision to practice—particularly for Black-led service providers and the target populations most impacted by systemic harm.

Section Summaries

- **Section 1: Core Criteria for Service Partners**
Establishes who is eligible to partner, prioritizing Black-led, culturally rooted organizations with demonstrated trust, healing-centered missions, and a deep understanding of structural racism and intergenerational trauma.
- **Section 2: Service Partner Categories**
Defines six community-identified wellness priorities (mental health, maternal health, economic empowerment, holistic health, housing/reentry, and Black male wellness) to ensure funding aligns with lived needs.
- **Section 3: Accountability and Oversight**
Outlines equity-based RFP processes, community-led review panels, racial equity scoring, and data-driven evaluation to ensure transparency, fairness, and real community governance.
- **Section 4: Venue and Service Site Selection**
Establishes a tiered, equity-based model for fixed and mobile sites, prioritizing accessibility, community trust, and high-need neighborhoods.

Overall Priority (Appendix B – Partner Criteria for Service Deployment)

The committee affirmed that the central priority is maintaining *equity and consistency* for both the target population and service providers. Appendix B must function as the operational guardrail, ensuring that Black-led organizations are not disadvantaged in deployment, that services remain culturally aligned, and that community-defined priorities are honored across all sites and partners.

Overall Question, Concern, and Recommendation

- **Question:** How will the Board ensure that equity standards in Appendix B are enforced consistently across all partners and sites, regardless of organizational size or influence?

- **Concern:** Without firm enforcement, larger or legacy institutions may unintentionally override the framework's intent, leading to drift from Black-led, community-rooted service delivery.
- **Recommendation:** Establish Appendix B as a binding implementation standard with clear compliance benchmarks, routine equity audits, and community-led enforcement authority to preserve alignment for both providers and residents.

Leadership Appointments

- **Chair:** Mariah Bruce
- **Spokesperson:** Rev. Dr. Le'Jon Payne
- **Secretary:** Angela Butler-Owens

Questions:

1. What concrete safeguards will be in place to prevent larger, well-resourced institutions from overshadowing Black-led and grassroots organizations in the RFP and funding process?
2. How will the "verifiable history of serving Black communities in Contra Costa County" (p. 53, criterion 1.1) be assessed for organizations outside the county who want to apply?

Concerns:

1. Risk of Equity Dilution Over Time
2. The Service Partner Categories (pp. 56-57) do not include specific criteria for organizations serving Black women heads of household or families experiencing housing instability/homelessness.
 - a. While the framework includes maternal health (Category 2) and housing/reentry services (Category 5), there's no dedicated category addressing the intersection of:
 - i. Black women parenting alone
 - ii. Family homelessness prevention and support
 - iii. Services that wrap around both parent and children's needs
 - b. This gap means organizations serving this population may not have clear guidance on which category to apply under or how to demonstrate their specialized expertise.

Recommendations:

1. Clarify Geographic Service History Requirements

Add to Section I.1 (Mission Alignment): Specify that organizations outside Contra Costa County may demonstrate "verifiable history" through:

- Documented service to comparable African American communities (urban, similar demographic profile)
- Partnership commitment with established Contra Costa County Black-led organization
- Transition plan showing how they will build trust and presence in West County/priority areas within first 6 months

2. Add Black Families Service Category

Insert new Category 7 in Section II (Service Partner Categories):

7. Black Family Stability and Whole-Family Support

Key Services Needed:

- Housing navigation for families with children, including support overcoming barriers for parents with criminal records
- Family-centered case management addressing both adult and children's needs
- Emergency support preventing family separation due to housing crisis
- Parenting support recognizing trauma of system involvement, homelessness, or poverty
- Services coordinated around school schedules and caregiving responsibilities

Example Partner: A Black-led organization providing comprehensive support to families experiencing or at risk of homelessness, with expertise in maintaining family unity while addressing multiple barriers.

3. Strengthen Lived Experience Integration in Workforce Standards

Add to Section I.3 (Workforce and Hiring Standards): Beyond hiring staff with lived experience, require applicants to demonstrate:

- Career advancement pathways for staff with lived experience (not limiting them to peer support roles)
- Compensation equity between lived experience staff and traditionally credentialed staff in comparable positions
- Leadership development specifically preparing lived experience staff for management and executive roles



RFQ Review & Selection Process

Synopsis of Key Questions, Key Concerns, and Recommendations

Purpose

The Review & Selection Process (Section D) of the RFQ describes how proposals are reviewed, scored, and approved for contract award. Submissions are screened for completeness by County staff, evaluated by a community-informed Review Panel using a 100-point rubric (plus up to 5 preferential points), and require approval by the Equity Committee and full Board of Supervisors. After an award or rejection, all submittals become public records. A formal, time-limited appeal process applies.

1. Key Questions for Board Consideration

Process & Transparency - How will scoring consistency be ensured across reviewers, given the broad, qualitative, and subjective criteria? What guardrails are in place to mitigate bias beyond impartiality statements? – How and when will panel composition and recommendations be disclosed?

Equity & Representation - How is “representation of the target population” defined and applied? - How are Black-led and grassroots organizations protected from technical disadvantages?

Scoring & Appeals - Are points balanced between lived experience, community trust, and technical capacity? How influential are the preferential points (up to 5%) in practice—i.e., could they materially change outcomes? Are appeal timelines and requirements sufficient and accessible to community-based organizations? Who oversees enforcement if a procedural failure or conflict of interest is substantiated?

2. Key Concerns

- **Complexity:** Complex requirements and data expectations may favor larger, well-resourced organizations with greater grant-writing and administrative capacity over smaller, community-rooted groups.
- **Accessibility:** Significant emphasis on data infrastructure and reporting may unintentionally disadvantage grassroots organizations without advanced systems.
- **Subjectivity:** Qualitative criteria (e.g., cultural relevance, values alignment) may lead to inconsistent scoring.
- **Timing Risk:** Multiple approval layers and optional interviews may delay awards or disadvantage under-resourced applicants, which may further delay contracting and service start dates.
- **Public Disclosure:** Public records requirements may discourage candid or detailed submissions.

3. Recommendations for Board Oversight

- Require reviewer training and score calibration to improve consistency.
- Clarify the weighting of lived experience and cultural relevance relative to technical capacity.
- Offer limited technical assistance and examples for data and budget expectations.
- Publish a high-level post-award scoring summary, including the role of preferential points.
- Set target timelines for each approval stage and allow limited flexibility for interviews.
- Present appeal guidance in plain language and ensure prominent visibility and communication.