



Alameda County-Oakland Community Action Partnership (AC-OCAP)

Executive Committee Meeting (Special)

Thursday, February 3, 2026, 5:30 PM

150 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 4TH Floor Human Services Department

Committee Members Present: Monique Rivera (Chair), Sandra Johnson, and David Walker (Secretary)

Committee Members Excused: Andrea Ford (Treasurer), Supervisor Lena Tam (Cesley Ford-Frost)

Staff: Deputy Director Lea Lakes, and Thea On

A. Roll Call/Determination of Quorum/Approval of Agenda

Staff T. On performed Roll Call, a quorum was established at 5:37 p.m.

MOTION: To approve the February 3, 2026, Executive Committee Meeting Agenda.

M/S/Carried: S. Johnson / D. Walker / Motion Carried.

B. Approval of the draft Minutes from the Executive Committee Meeting on September 25, 2025 (Attachment B)

MOTION: To approve the September 25, 2025, meeting minutes.

M/S/Carried: D. Walker / S. Johnson Abstained / Motion carried by consensus.

C. Public Comment – None

D. DISCUSSION:

1. Executive Committee

- a. **Takeaways from Board Retreat (Saturday, January 24, 2026)** - The committee felt that the retreat was very successful and productive. They noted that because the RFP work for the next cycle must begin by June, there are only three board meetings (February, March, and April) available to draft and refine the strategic plan. The discussion emphasized the need for a clear schedule outlining what needs to be prepared for each meeting. Only about three people responded to the post-retreat strategic plan survey, which was considered too few. Staff member T. plans to resend the survey, reiterate the due date, and use the results to shape an updated draft of the strategic plan for board and staff feedback. There was also interest in broadening participation in follow-up work beyond the affinity committee by inviting other board members who were engaged during the retreat. The committee agreed to establish an ad hoc committee structure consisting of the executive committee and interested board members. This group will convert retreat input and survey data into concrete priority areas and work plans. They will prepare materials so the full board can respond, sign up for priorities, and refine their contributions, rather than starting from scratch during regular meetings. An



MINUTES



idea was proposed to email the full board to explain the ad hoc committee's role and invite others to join special sessions. A firm deadline will be set for expressing interest. D. Walker suggested supplementing the email communication with an opt-in text message system. This would involve sending very short texts (e.g., "Please check your email for the survey/meeting reminder") to increase engagement and ensure that members see time-sensitive follow-ups related to the retreat and planning. Any texting approach would require explicit permission from board members. There was some discussion regarding the mission, vision, and "promise" statements raised during and after the retreat. The consensus was to maintain most of the mission and vision statements as they are, with the main area for change being the "promise" statement. The committee also suggested keeping the first half of the statement while shortening or revising the second sentence using language from the retreat discussions. However, there was caution against deviating too far from the nationally standard language used by other Community Action agencies.

Action Item(s):

- Re-send the survey to board members and clearly restate the due date to improve the response rate (only ~3 responses so far).
Purpose: Use survey results to revise and advance the strategic plan coming out of the retreat.
Assignee: T. On and L. Lakes
- Draft retreat input, and Survey feedback (once more responses are collected).
- Draft and Share an Updated Strategic Plan for Feedback
Purpose: Share with staff and board so they can react, comment, and refine ahead of formal approval.
Assignee: Lea Lakes

Create a Clear Timeline for Feb–Apr Board Meetings

- Lay out a timeline that aligns: February board meeting: present initial/working strategic plan materials.
- March board meeting: incorporate comments and adjustments.
- April board meeting: seek formal board approval of the strategic plan (in time to start RFP work by June).
Purpose: Ensure the strategic plan is completed and approved by April.
Assignee: L. Lakes & M. Rivera (by context, M. Rivera is pushing the scheduling concept; Lea executes staff work)

Form / Confirm an Ad Hoc Strategic Plan Working Committee

- Use (or formally designate) an ad hoc committee—anchored by the Executive Committee—to turn retreat and survey input into concrete priority areas and work plans.
- Prepare draft materials for the full board (so retreat outcomes don't stall).
Purpose: Do deeper "working session" planning between regular board meetings.
Assignee: Monique Rivera (to convene) with staff support from L. Lakes / T. On

Invite Additional Board Members to Join Ad Hoc Sessions

- Send an email invitation to the full board:
- Explain the purpose of the strategic plan ad hoc working sessions.



MINUTES



- State that the Executive Committee will serve as the core group.
- Invite other interested board members (especially those engaged at the retreat) to opt in.
- Include a firm RSVP deadline for expressing interest.

Purpose: Broaden engagement beyond the standing committees and ensure retreat energy carries into implementation.

Assignee: L. Lakes

Implement Opt-In Text Message Reminders (Concept / Proposal)

- Explore using a short, opt-in text messaging system to send brief reminders.
- Reinforce key retreat/strategic plan follow-ups.
- Sub-steps: Add an agenda item at a future meeting to explain the texting proposal.
- Obtain board permission and collect opt-in phone numbers (If approved, set up the texting workflow and contact list.)

Purpose: Increase engagement and responsiveness to retreat-related communications.

Assignee: D. Walker (volunteered to manage texts and has experience with such a system)

Mission / Promise Language

- Refine the “Promise” Statement Based on Retreat Feedback
- Develop a revised draft of the “promise” statement that keeps the first half largely intact.
- Shortens or clarifies the second sentence by drawing on the statement discussed at the retreat.
- Remains consistent with national Community Action language where required.

Purpose: Align the promise language with current board values and retreat input while staying within national guidelines.

Assignee: Lea Lakes (staff) and the bylaws/strategic planning group committee.

- b. **Recruitment efforts for the Board (AC-OCAP Manager Position)** – A total of 11 applicants were interviewed in the initial round. The current shortlist includes 3-4 candidates for the Manager position. The Executive Committee plans to form an ad hoc committee to conduct the next round of interviews and to make a recommendation. This committee will comprise M. Rivera, Andrea Ford, and potentially one or more additional members (e.g., Sandra, David), depending on availability and whether the interviews will be held in person. M. Rivera mentioned that this approach would mirror the process used last time, in which the ad hoc committee interviews the candidates and then Monique, as Chair, will send a recommendation to the former HSD Director, Scott Means. While the ad hoc committee will not make the final hiring decision, it will provide a recommendation, which may include ranking candidates and indicating strong recommendations or objections to certain candidates. This recommendation will go through the existing HSD/City process, which involves the City Administrator, but will not require formal approval from the City Council. The committee briefly connected recruitment to the Bylaws, emphasizing that the Administrative Board ensures staff positions are filled in accordance with established personnel procedures. However, there is some uncertainty about the extent of the Board’s role in the hiring process beyond merely recommending a candidate. The committee agreed to document the process they follow to ensure clarity and provide a reference for future minutes.
- c. **Bylaws** – Deputy Director L. Lakes reported that Deputy City Administrator Sofia Navarro is currently assisting in reviewing the AC-OCAP bylaws with the City Attorney’s Office. They are using older comments from around 2016 and more recent edits as inputs. The board is waiting for feedback



MINUTES



from the attorney before finalizing the changes. M. Rivera noted that during the retreat, David Knight reminded the board that bylaws are supposed to be reviewed every five years. There is an acknowledgment that this review has not been conducted regularly, and this current review will help bring the board back into compliance with that expectation. A key technical issue is that district eligibility is based on CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) low-income areas, not just council district lines. The board needs updated CDBG maps to correctly identify which parts of each district qualify (for example, District 5, excluding more prosperous areas like Glenview). Staff T. On mentioned that they have been in contact with the CDBG staff to obtain updated maps tied to the five-year Consolidated Plan. But still awaiting a response from that department. There is also a connection between the bylaws and the hiring language, requiring the board and the Administrative Board to ensure that staff positions are filled in accordance with established personnel procedures. This issue is being revisited in the context of the Manager recruitment process, particularly regarding the extent of the board's role in recommending and how to document that involvement. Once the attorney provides comments, Monique suggested forming a small ad hoc group (including her and others) to clean up the various draft versions, consolidate them into a single final bylaw version to avoid having "10 different versions," and continue coordinating with CDBG on updated maps.

Action Item(s):

- Obtain updated CDBG district maps that define eligible low-income areas for board membership requirements.
Assignee: Staff T. On
 - Monitor the City Attorney's review of the bylaws and receive the edited version.
 - Share back with staff/board and prepare for board-level discussion/decisions.
Assignee: L. Lakes
 - Form an ad hoc group to finalize bylaws once legal review is done.
 - Reconcile attorney edits with board priorities.
 - Resolve older vs. newer edits.
 - Produce a single clean bylaw document.
Assignee: M. Rivera and T. On
- d. **Finance** – M. Rivera emphasized that before any financial reports are presented to the full Administrative Board, they should be reviewed by the Treasurer and the Executive Committee. This review process includes asking questions and aligning on messaging. Historically, A. Ford (Treasurer) has closely reviewed reports with the program's previous program manager. The EARS Report (Expenditure Activity Reimbursement System) is scheduled for discussion at the upcoming Administrative Board meeting. M. Rivera suggested that the EARS report be removed from that agenda and instead be reviewed first in an Executive or ad hoc meeting with A. Ford, Staff Member M. Huynh, and A. Friberg (finance). The aim is to avoid the confusion caused in previous years by varying report formats, which have made it difficult for board members to interpret the information. M. Rivera referenced an older budget layout that begins with a summary budget and then proceeds line by line, typically taking about 30 minutes to review at the board meeting. The newer formats provided by the previous AC-OCAP manager have caused confusion, and the group would like to return to a clear, consistent format that board members can easily recognize.
- e. **Approval of the Administering Board, December 8, 2025, meeting minutes (Attachment D1e)** – Chair M. Rivera's request to postpone for the upcoming Administering Board Meeting on February 9, 2026.



MINUTES



- f. **Open Forum: (General Audience Comment Period)** - M. Huynh possesses the previous RFP document and schedule and has stated that she can use them as references moving forward. She clarified that the recruitment in question is for a manager position, not a director, meaning this hire does not require City Council approval. She mentioned that the document referred to by M. Rivera is an on-site monitoring audit report she conducted from August 2025 to October 2025. She explained that the green check marks indicate “nothing to be alarmed about” and that everything is compliant, while red indicators indicate issues, such as workers' compensation problems, litigation, or other concerns. She emphasized that the report serves as a comprehensive oversight tool and noted that not all its items require the board's attention. Additionally, she stated that mid-year reports, including client characteristics and demographics, were compiled and presented previously under Interim Director Sofia Navarro and were approved at that time. M. Huynh expressed doubt about the specific “numbers don't match” concern referenced by board members, as the outcomes data were obtained from grantees that had already been audited and discussed. M. Huynh also reported that Finance has informed her that CSBG funding for 2026 is limited to approximately \$334,000 for 17 grantees. In consultation with L. Lakes and Finance, she is reconsidering for the next RFP certain “problematic” grantees who have submitted late schedules/forms, requested improper interest payments, or demonstrated other compliance issues. She agreed to participate in the ad hoc/executive committee meeting regarding finances and EARS. When asked whether the EARS item would be removed from the February 9th Administrative Board agenda, she explained that the EARS is a straightforward financial statement prepared by Finance. Historically, the board looks over the grantee allocation amounts, while Finance and management handle the detailed budget.

E. Adjournment of Meeting

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting at 7:00 pm

MIS/Carried: S. Johnson / D. Walker / Motion Carried

The next Executive Committee Meeting is scheduled for **February 26, 2026**