Executive Committee

Monday, June 8, 2026
8:30 – 9:30 am
196 Memorial Way, Chico

Commission Members: DeAnne Blankenship, Shelley Hart, Tami Ritter, Tiffany Rowe

Staff support: Anna Bauer, Kimberly Brooke, Shelly Miller

Call to order 8:30 a.m.

---

1 Grant Application Approval ACTION

A. The committee considered authorizing the Commission to participate in a 11-county grant application for Behavioral Health Services Act Innovative Partnership funds. If awarded, the 3-year grant would support the integration of the Community Resiliency Model® framework with the First 5 Family Center services. Grant funds would be used to pay for Family Center staff training and FTE, First 5 staff training and FTE, program supplies, data, and Commission indirect, totaling approximately $500,000 for the term. First 5 Mendocino, through their Raise & Shine nonprofit, would serve as lead agency.

B. The committee considered authorizing the Commission to apply to serve as lead agency on behalf of the 58 counties for the First 5 California Network Resilience Initiative. If awarded, the Commission would subcontract the 3-year $450,000 grant with the First 5 Association, a qualified statewide partner organization with expertise in convening First 5 county commissions, facilitating statewide Community of Practice, and providing technical assistance related to sustainability and systems-building.

Commission policies require approval before accepting grant funding more than $25,000.

Bauer provided an overview of each grant and the Commissioners engaged in a discussion.

Ritter asked about the structure of the BHSA grant and if Commission contractors will apply directly or if the Commission will apply and administer the funds. Bauer explained the Commission will apply as part of the regional collaborative, and then the Commission's existing contractors will be trained and funded under their current contracts to carry out the project. This will expand the array of services offered through the Family Centers while Prop 10 funds continue to fill in any gaps

in revenue, similar to CYBHI. Blankenship asked for clarification of the total grant award versus the Commission's share. Bauer explained several Commissions are applying as a region for the $5 million total grant, and she provided a local budget over the three years of the grant. Blankenship noted there is a potential for the region to only receive a partial award and then the local budget would need to be revised. Hart asked if there is any reason the Commission would not apply, for example, would this spread the current staff to thin. Ritter followed up by asking if additional staff would need to be added. Bauer explained this is an opportunity to offer new services and train staff in CRM without adding any new staffing to the existing Family Center network. The funding would also offset a portion of the existing Commission staff.

Blankenship asked about the structure of how the F5CA funds would be awarded. Bauer explained F5CA would award the grant to the Commission, who would then subcontract the funds to the F5 Association to carry out the deliverables. Ritter asked if the Commission will keep a portion of the grant. Bauer explained she plans for the Association to carry the bulk of the workload and submit clean invoices, which would require minimal administration by the Commission. She wants to set a precedent that county Commissions will not pull administrative funds out of these grant opportunities.

Motion to approve both grant applications
Motion/2nd: Rowe/Blankenship
All approved

---

2 **Quarterly Financial Report** DISCUSSION

The committee reviewed Fiscal Year 2025/26 Third Quarter Financial Report

Bauer provided a brief overview and pointed out that partner contracts are underspent. This could be due to staff attrition, underspending on direct service costs, etc., and this typically occurs every year. The Commission's long-term financial plans are predicated on grantees expending their entire contracts. Blankenship asked if unspent funds roll over into the subsequent year's contracts. Bauer explained unspent funds remain in the fund balance and staff create a new contract for the following the year.

---

3 **Quarterly Performance Report** DISCUSSION

The committee reviewed Fiscal Year 2025/26 Third Quarter Performance

Bauer provided an overview of the report.

The committee engaged in a discussion around partners potentially providing a match in the future. Bauer noted some Family Center partners are already leveraging their existing resources (particularly staff funded through other revenues) to accomplish something similar to a match. This model benefits families by facilitating connections with staff from complementary programs. Through these relationships, families gain access to the broader range of services provided by the Family Center's organization.

Rowe appreciated allowing additional time for Esplanade House to engage in capacity building. Bauer noted Esplanade House is blending and braiding multiple funding sources, and needs to remain focused on providing services appropriate to the Family Center.

The discussion also explored alternative service delivery models. Ritter advocated for having an open site at Esplanade House rather than limiting services to residents, and supported bringing in staff from other Family Centers to offer classes. Bauer shared that staff are exploring greater coordination between Esplanade House and Renewal Center, including shared staffing and cross-site service delivery. Across the network as a whole, staff are working to develop coordinated Triple P services and shared child-watch coverage. The committee supported increased collaboration and staff mobility between sites, noting benefits such as transportation access, site familiarity, scheduling flexibility, and more efficient use of facilities and staff resources.

The committee discussed concerns about the amount of staff time devoted to food bank operations at Family Center locations. Ritter suggested that food bank activities may be better supported through alternative funding streams, such as Community Action Agency (CAA) or other funding sources.

Hart expressed concern about low class attendance at Esperanza House despite the high numbers of Family Center users, noting that many families only visit once. Bauer indicated that may be a result of families accessing the food bank. Hart questioned whether staff time spent on food bank activities may be limiting outreach and engagement efforts for other Family Center services. The committee discussed potential barriers to participation in Family Center services, including lack of childcare, hours of operation, transportation challenges, and immigration-related concerns.

The committee discussed strategies to increase engagement, including providing incentives when families complete activities or programs. Bauer noted that contractors already have unspent supply budgets that can be used for incentives, as well as digital cash incentives. Ritter suggested expanding opportunities for participants through vocational development, staffing pathways, and leadership opportunities.

Bauer shared that Foundations is offering virtual Triple P classes. Ritter asked if those are only open to Foundations families. Bauer explained all Triple P offerings are publicized through a shared calendar, and staff are working on improving the calendar and posting it on the First 5 and CAPC websites.

Bauer noted staff met with Child Welfare social workers to promote the Child Welfare Protocol, which led to increased referrals.

4 FY 26-27 Contracting Update DISCUSSION

The committee will receive a verbal report on Fiscal Year 26/27 contracts

The committee discussed ongoing challenges in establishing Family Center services through Paradise Unified School District (PUSD). Bauer reported that progress has been hindered by communication issues and logistical/legal

concerns. She asked whether the committee wanted to establish expectations or timelines so that resources could be redeployed elsewhere if progress continues to stall. Bauer explained that legal review has historically been a barrier to establishing services through PUSD, despite efforts to provide sample contracts in advance and taking staff to visit a school-based Family Center in Napa. Brooke noted that PUSD has already picked up county-purchased furniture and equipment from the Upper Ridge Family Center.

The committee discussed how long to continue waiting for resolution. Rowe expressed concern that funds currently allocated to PUSD could be serving other families in the community, and she suggested emphasizing that when meeting with PUSD representatives. Blankenship recommended engaging in additional outreach and coming back to this discussion at the next executive committee meeting.

The committee agreed to revisit the issue at the next Executive Committee meeting. In the interim, the efficient and expedient use of resources to support families will be emphasized.

---

5 **June 26, 2026 Commission Meeting** ACTION

Consider approval of the June 26, 2026 Commission meeting agenda

Blankenship suggested an edit, and Bauer confirmed it had already been made on the final draft. Ritter and Blankenship will not be present for the meeting.

Motion to approve the Agenda
Motion/2nd: Ritter/Blankenship
All approved

Additional Information:

2026 Executive Committee meetings-

Wednesday, August 12, 2026 at 3:00 pm Chico

Wednesday, October 14 at 3:00 pm TBD

Monday, November 9 at 3:00 pm Oroville