June 30, 2022

Honorable Board of Supervisors
Administration Building
Oakland, CA 94612

SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2022-23 FINAL BUDGET

Dear Board Members:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. Authorize the County Administrator and Auditor-Controller to make necessary final adjustments and other technical adjustments as presented during the budget hearings;

B. Adopt Resolutions approving an increase in the tax rate for the Emergency Medical Services District and the Paramedic Supplemental tax for the Alameda County Fire Department pursuant to the Consumer Price Index, an increase in the benefit assessment for the Vector Control Services District, and no changes to the special assessments for the Lead Poisoning Prevention Program, and Public Works Agency-administered Castlewood, Five Canyons, Castle Homes, and Street Lighting County Service Areas as presented at the hearing on June 27, 2022;

C. Incorporate the Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-23 through FY 2026-27 adopted by your Board on June 7, 2022; and

D. Adopt the FY 2022-23 Final Budget.

DISCUSSION/SUMMARY:

The FY 2022-23 Final Budget, which incorporates adjustments approved by your Board during budget deliberations, is balanced. The Final Budget for all funds totals $3.8 billion and provides funding for 10,370.33 full-time equivalent positions (FTEs). The General Fund Budget totals $3.5 billion and supports 8,486.49 FTEs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2021-22 Approved</th>
<th>FY 2022-23 Proposed</th>
<th>FY 2022-23 Final Budget</th>
<th>Change from FY 2021-22 Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$3,607.9</td>
<td>$3,755.3</td>
<td>$3,798.4</td>
<td>$190.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>10,078.31</td>
<td>10,337.33</td>
<td>10,370.33</td>
<td>292.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$3,315.0</td>
<td>$3,446.9</td>
<td>$3,489.9</td>
<td>$174.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>8,210.64</td>
<td>8,454.49</td>
<td>8,486.49</td>
<td>275.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Final Budget closes a **$49.1 million funding gap** through a combination of spending reductions, revenue increases and the use of retained earnings. To the extent possible, your Board’s Vision 2026 values and priorities guide proposed reductions within each program area. Budget balancing strategies include reduced charges for emergency radio encryption costs and Information Technology services, and a combination of one-time and ongoing revenue increases.

The following table summarizes the net cost reductions required to close the funding gap:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Net County Cost Reductions ($ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assistance</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Protection</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Strategies</td>
<td>$32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$49.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Final Budget is balanced with $22.1 million or 45% in ongoing strategies and $27.0 million or 55% in one-time solutions.

**Board Policy Directives**

During formal deliberations on the FY 2022-23 Proposed Budget, your Board discussed several proposed policy directives advanced by Board Members as outlined in the attached letters submitted prior to the close of Budget Hearings on June 27, 2022.

1. **Establish a two-year Guaranteed Income pilot program for former foster youth. (Attachment 1 – Supervisors Brown and Haubert)**

   Establish a two-year Guaranteed Income for Former Foster Youth (GIFFY) pilot program within existing Social Services Agency resources starting in January 2023 at a FY 2022-23 cost of $700,000. Staff is also directed to identify an additional $2.1 million in future FYs: $1,400,000 in FY 2023-24; and $700,000 in FY 2024-25. Funding would include a contract with Bay Area
Community Services (BACS) to administer the pilot program and seek additional State and philanthropic funds to support another cohort. The pilot will serve an estimated 90 foster youth.

*Your Board reached consensus to support the proposed 2-year Guaranteed Income for Former Foster Youth pilot program which will begin in January 2023 and serve approximately 90 former foster youth at a cost of $2.8 million. The Social Services Agency will use existing resources to fund the $700,000 needed in Fiscal Year 2022-23 and will identify an additional $2.1 million to include in its FY 2023-24 and FY 2024-25 budgets to support this pilot program through December 2024.*

2. **Proposed Renewal of the Measure A1 General Obligation Bond for Affordable Housing and an increased assessment and expanded jurisdiction for the Healthy Homes Program.** *(Attachment 2 – Supervisor Miley)*

   Direct the County Administrator to analyze and report back to the Board on two potential ballot initiatives:
   
   - Renewal of a general obligation bond to support affordable housing countywide; and
   - Increased assessment and expanded jurisdiction for the Healthy Homes Program Joint Powers Authority (JPA).

*Your Board directed the County Administrator to work with the Community Development Agency and other affected agencies to conduct an analysis of both potential June 2024 ballot initiatives and report back to your Board.*

3. **Review and identification of potential funding sources to support the following proposals related to the Health Care Services Agency / Behavioral Health Care department initiatives:** *(Attachment 3 – Supervisor Miley)*

   - Implement its full Forensic System Redesign Plan ($50.67 million);
   - Purchase Treatment Beds at Villa Fairmont Mental Health Rehabilitation Center (MHRC);
   - Increase individuals served by Full Service Partnerships; and
   - Support implementation of the Governor’s CARE Court program in Alameda County.

*Your Board directed the County Administrator to work with the Health Care Services Agency and other affected agencies and report back to your Board in January 2023 regarding the financial and operational needs to implement the full Forensic System Redesign Plan and options for a phased financial and operational implementation. Staff will also assess financial and operational options to purchase additional treatment beds at Villa Fairmont Mental Health Rehabilitation Center and expand Full Service Partnerships, as well as pursue State funding for implementation of the CARE Court program.*
4. Development and Implementation of a Food Hub in West Oakland (Attachment 4 – Supervisor Carson)

Direct the Social Services Agency and Health Care Services Agency to jointly identify $3.5 million within existing FY 2022-23 resources to fund development of a West Oakland Food Hub in partnership with Impact Oakland Now (ION).

Your Board reached consensus to support the development and implementation of a Food Hub in West Oakland and directed the Social Services Agency and Health Care Services Agency to jointly identify $3.5 million within existing Fiscal 2022-23 funding to partner with Impact Oakland Now.

State and Federal Budget Impact

The recovery from the COVID-19 recession buoyed State revenues and resulted in a record-setting budget surplus. Given the cyclical nature of State revenues, both the Governor and Legislature have made building reserves and paying down long-term liabilities major budget priorities.

On June 13, 2022, the State Legislature met its Constitutional deadline to approve a budget by June 15th, and negotiations commenced between the Governor and the Legislature to finalize the State budget, with the size and eligibility criteria of direct relief programs for residents the main pending issue. On June 26, 2022, the Legislature and Governor announced an agreement on the budget package which included a $17 billion relief package for residents. The budget package also includes earmarks for Alameda County to fund supportive housing, ALL IN Eats, and road and flood control infrastructure projects. After the Governor signs the budget bill, additional budgetary and programmatic details, within the framework agreed upon by the Legislature and Governor, will be finalized through budget trailer bills.

While State revenues currently look robust, the Legislative Analyst’s Office has warned that State appropriation caps, known as the Gann Limit, and a weakening economic outlook could lead to a “fiscal cliff” in future years. A worsening economic outlook and falling asset prices may also put a strain on future State budgets given the State’s reliance on revenues driven by high-income earners and capital gains.

As the new Fiscal Year begins, the County is closely monitoring State proposals that would shift additional responsibilities and costs to the County without adequate funding. Of particular concern is the Governor’s CARE Court proposal, which contains potential unfunded mandates and sanctions for counties. The County will also work closely with the State and other stakeholders regarding CalAIM implementation and Pre-Trial program funding.

Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, the County has relied on one-time temporary emergency federal funding to cover increased costs. As the federal government signals a shift from pandemic response to endemic management, the County cannot count on continued federal COVID-19 aid. A major pending issue is Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) claimable costs supporting shelter and vaccination for which the County has not yet received reimbursement.
With narrow majorities in Congress and upcoming elections, major budgetary or legislative changes that directly impact counties seem unlikely. However, the County may have some funding opportunities for specific priority projects via federal earmarks.

The County’s continued reliance on State and federal funding and policy decisions will require that we closely monitor potential funding impacts and cost shifts to counties, in addition to continued active engagement and advocacy in Sacramento and Washington D.C.

In addition to ongoing State and federal funding concerns, other major pending factors that will impact our finances include a potential economic downturn, capital and major maintenance needs, pending litigation, unfunded pension liabilities, wildfires and drought, and the ongoing homelessness crisis.

**Final Budget Program Highlights**

The Final Budget highlights the alignment of our program investments with the County’s Vision 2026 foundational principles of equity, access, and fiscal stewardship, and our 10X goals that reflect the County’s core service and community priorities. Among the many countywide and multi-agency investments funded in the $3.8 billion Final Budget are:

- $1.5 billion in salary and employee benefits for a diverse workforce of over 10,000 employees;
- $800 million for direct client services provided by 246 community-based organizations, including $94 million for the Alameda Health System
- $645 million to support behavioral health programs
- $351 million in public benefit and assistance programs
- $37 million to support the Office of Homeless Care & Coordination
- $750 million for children’s services
- $310 million in services to the unincorporated areas

Additionally, the Final Budget includes several multi-year Board initiatives:

- The continuation of an increased allocation to address homelessness which includes **$5.0 million** for the Affordable Housing Trust and **$2.5 million** to continue support of the Office of Homeless Care and Coordination;

- The fourth-year allocation of **$5.0 million** ($1.0 million for each supervisorial district) designated annually through FY 2024-25 for the Enhancing Vision 2026 fund for children, youth and families; and

- The annual allocation (through FY 2026-27) of **$5.0 million** for the East County Economic Development/Infrastructure Improvement Fund.

We continue to fully integrate Vision 2026 into all aspects of County services and operations while investing in strategic partnerships and collaborations involving our agencies and departments, community-based providers, and other stakeholders.
Looking Forward

As the County has progressed through our budget development process for FY 2022-23, under the leadership of your Board and with guidance from the Budget Workgroup, we have unfortunately seen a robust economic recovery slow, with increased warnings that we may be entering an economic downturn. However, your Board’s longstanding commitment to your adopted financial management policies and your Vision 2026 operating principle of fiscal stewardship have ensured the County is entering this period of economic uncertainty fiscally sound, while enabling development and implementation of innovative programming to help the County better serve its residents.

As the County continues to address its long-term fiscal liabilities, your Board paid down a significant portion of the County’s unfunded pension liability and adopted a new Capital Improvement Plan allowing the County to develop a financing strategy for our real estate and capital needs. To further bolster the County’s financial security, your Board sponsored, and voters approved, the Measure W general purpose half-cent sales tax. While Measure W funding is not included in this budget, the County may be able to utilize those funds in the coming Fiscal Year if the pending litigation is resolved.

Your Board continues to invest in making services more accessible to residents. This year, consistent with your Board’s Virtual First initiative, the County launched ‘virtual kiosks’ which allow residents to apply for certain benefits remotely – increasing access to services in our communities while increasing staff efficiency. The County leveraged technology to create dashboards and implement a data-driven approach to COVID-19 mitigation and vaccination efforts and to create online applications for clients to report care concerns. The development of virtual tools, such as the improved Assessor’s Field Canvass Application, and the support of remote work helped County staff serve our residents more efficiently and safely.

Your Board also continues to make major investments towards ending homelessness in the County. In addition to opening the Fairmont Tiny Homes site, the County transitioned approximately 1,600 homeless residents to CalAIM housing support services. Your Board also endorsed the Home Together 2026 Community Plan, allowing the County to be eligible to receive certain State funding allocations and providing a roadmap of the service needs to end homelessness in the County, while recognizing the responsibility of the cities to allow for, and the State to fund, the needed housing units.

Your Board developed a collaborative process to allocate the first tranche of American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA) funds – balancing immediate COVID-19 response needs with strategic investments to strengthen our communities. Your Board’s innovative approach of supporting the Community Coalitions model ensured emergency and recovery service delivery was tailored to the unique needs of our diverse communities. As the County receives its final allocation of ARPA funds, your Board will have an opportunity to make additional strategic investments with this one-time multi-year funding.

Entering the new fiscal year, your Board’s strategic vision will guide the County as we continue to implement innovative programming to improve the quality of life for our residents. Your Board will continue to collaboratively work with all stakeholders to reform the governance structure of the Alameda Health System to ensure access to high-quality health care for all residents. Investments in the Recipe4Health program and start-up support for food hubs operated by non-profit partners will provide nutritional food and economic opportunities throughout the County. Continued increased investment in
behavioral health programs as well as initiatives to reimagine justice programs will support keeping our communities healthy and safe. Finally, your Board continues to invest in programs that support and foster self-sufficiency for vulnerable youth and families.

The County also faces major challenges. Our infrastructure is aging, and your Board’s adopted Capital Improvement Plan has identified $1.3 billion in unfunded deferred maintenance and capital needs. The County must also assess the impact of a hybrid workforce on our real estate portfolio, while identifying ways to attract and retain staff. Although the County will be issuing another tranche of the Measure A1 Affordable Housing General Obligation Bonds, the need for affordable housing in the County far outstrips local resources. Additional State and federal funds, along with cities’ commitment to support affordable housing, will be needed to end the homelessness crisis. Finally, an economic downturn would strain County resources when residents would be most in need of County services.

**Closing Remarks**

Your Board continues to provide strong financial and strategic leadership through extraordinarily challenging times. As we face increasing evidence of a looming economic slowdown, the residents of Alameda County benefit from your steadfast adherence to adopted financial management policies; your oversight and delivery of core programs and services; and your commitment to serving our most vulnerable populations and diverse communities.

As we start a new fiscal year and begin to emerge from over two years of the pandemic and health emergency, please know that the Final Budget supports a dedicated County workforce of over 10,000 employees and hundreds of community-based partners committed to continuing to provide critical services to our residents and diverse communities. We could not have achieved a balanced budget without the support and contributions from agency and department heads, guidance from Budget Workgroup members, and the leadership and commitment from your Board to an open and inclusive process throughout the year that has involved all stakeholders.

Very truly yours,

Susan S. Muranishi
County Administrator

SSM:PC:MPA
Attachments

c: Agency/Department Heads
   Budget Workgroup Members
   Legislative Advocates
June 27, 2022

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County Administration Building
1221 Oak Street, Suite 536
Oakland, CA 94612

Dear Board Members:

SUBJECT: ESTABLISH A TWO-YEAR GUARANTEED INCOME FOR FORMER FOSTER YOUTH (GIFFY) PILOT PROGRAM IN ALAMEDA COUNTY

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that your Board:

A. Establish a two-year Guaranteed Income for Former Foster Youth (GIFFY) pilot program in Alameda County;

B. Allocate $700,000 from the Alameda County Social Services Agency FY23 Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Budget to establish the two-year GIFFY pilot based on the program components set forth in the NET Growth Movement pilot proposal;

C. Direct staff to identify funding and return to your Board with a proposal to fully fund the GIFFY pilot in the amount of $1.4 million in the County’s Fiscal Year 2023-24 MOE Budget and $700,000 in the Fiscal Year 2024-25 MOE Budget; and

D. Authorize the Alameda County Social Services Agency to execute a contract with Bay Area Community Services (Principal: Jamie Almanza; Location: Oakland) to administer the GIFFY pilot program on behalf of Alameda County; and

E. Authorize the Alameda County Social Services Agency to work with Bay Area Community Services to apply for state and philanthropic funds to serve additional cohorts of former foster youth.

DISCUSSION/SUMMARY:
On March 1, 2022, your Board approved the use of $62,348 in District 3 Fiscal Management Reward (FMR) funds to hire a consultant team at Oakland Thrives (fiscally sponsored by Marcus Foster Education Institute) to convene a Design Team of ten former foster and/or transitioned aged youth from Alameda County to produce a proposal for a Guaranteed Income for Former Foster Youth (GIFFY) pilot in Alameda County with the goal of ending homelessness for this target population (Item 8). As part of this action, WestCoast Children’s Clinic was engaged to issue stipends to the Design Team members for their work in developing the GIFFY pilot proposal. On April 19, 2022, your Board approved the use of $8,400 in District 3 FMR to cover the costs of stipends for two additional Design Team members as well as additional project costs related to the development of the GIFFY pilot proposal (Item 71.1).

A Design Team of 12 former foster youth between the ages of 21-30 was formed and tasked with writing the GIFFY pilot proposal. Over the course of three months, the Design Team met with stakeholders including service providers and advocates like former Stockton Mayor Michael Tubbs, held a focus group, conducted a survey, and reflected on their own lived experiences to inform and develop the GIFFY pilot proposal. The Design Team interviewed the managers of seven relevant guaranteed income programs, including the County of Santa Clara’s Basic Income Pilot program for former foster youth (launched in July 2020) and the Trust Youth Initiative in New York City that is focused on addressing youth homelessness.

After enduring neglect or abuse, foster youth are removed from their families and placed under the care of the child welfare system. While the system strives to provide adequate care and healing for the trauma the child previously endured, the Design Team found that many youth slip through the cracks and face grave disparities when they transition out of the child welfare system of care including:

- One in four foster youth has experienced homelessness before the age of 24.
- Fifty percent of emancipated foster youth are unemployed by the time they reach the age 24.
- Foster youth face high rates of human trafficking or sexual exploitation.
- Foster youth are also disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system.

The Design Team named their GIFFY pilot proposal “NET Growth Movement: Nourish. Empower. Trust.” because they believe foster youth deserve a robust safety net to support their needs and that it is vital to build the net worth of youth who were raised in the child welfare system. The Design Team presented the NET Growth Movement proposal to your Board’s Health Committee on June 13, 2022 and will also present the proposal to the ALL IN Steering Committee at its July 20, 2022 meeting. The Design Team plans to serve as an Advisory Board to support implementation of the NET Growth Movement proposal.

The following are statements from Design Team members:

“The majority of transition-aged foster youths live in a constant state of survival where their energy and effort are expended on simply obtaining basic necessities without financial or familial support.”
“When foster youth slip through the cracks, they sadly slip from one system to another: from the child welfare system into the justice system, or into poverty, or into exploitation, or into homelessness. Our plan seeks to abolish the resource gap and to give youth agency over their lives so they can meet their potential and become self-sufficient.”

Guaranteed Income is an emerging solution to poverty with hundreds of pilot programs across the country. While many programs are currently in implementation and evaluations are still in development, they show significant and promising benefits to pilot participants’ wellbeing and financial stability. NET Growth Movement is groundbreaking as it is one of the only guaranteed income program proposals written by those with lived experience.

The NET Growth Movement proposal includes the following GIFFY pilot program components:

- **Structure**: Cohort model of approximately 90 youth that have been in foster care in Alameda County
- **Length**: At least two years
- **Monthly Guaranteed Income (GI) payment amount**: $1,000 per pilot participant; provide opportunity for a one-time advance payment
- **Target population**: Former foster youth born between the dates of January 2, 2001 - January 1, 2002 who were AB 12 eligible, including youth who exited the child welfare system before or at their 21st birthday;
  - Pilot participants do not need to currently reside within Alameda County, but they must have been under the Alameda County system of care during their time in child welfare
- **Program support staff**:
  - A Program Director to manage Peer Coaches team and lead partnerships with evaluators, GI payment disbursement platform, and support services; and
  - Peer Coaches to provide guidance and navigation services and coordinate community building programming for pilot participants
- **Community building programming**: Offer monthly Solidarity dinners and/or outings to connect pilot participants with fellow former foster youth who have overcome similar obstacles and with whom they can connect for peer-to-peer learning, as well as connect pilot participants to support groups (e.g., LGBTQIA+, young parents, survivors of sexual exploitation)
- **Evaluation**: Focus on outcomes such as economic stability, health, and well-being and not on how GI payments are being spent

The cohort model proposed by the Design Team has all pilot participants entering the pilot program at the same time. A cohort model aids the pilot evaluation process and community building amongst pilot participants.

Guaranteed Income programs, especially those targeting youth, require nimble implementation and flexible service delivery. The Design Team proposes that a community-based organization (CBO) be engaged by Alameda County to administer the NET Growth Movement pilot proposal. Contracting with a CBO allows for nimbleness and flexibility in pilot administration to ensure former foster youth needs are met, including flexibility in how guaranteed income payments are made and type of wrap-around services available, as well as promote cost-effectiveness in pilot
program staffing and implementation. Bay Area Community Services (BACS) has been identified as a local nonprofit CBO with the expertise of running a guaranteed income program and experience serving vulnerable populations, including former foster youth. BACS is recommended as the NET Growth Movement pilot program administrator.

The target date for launch of the NET Growth Movement pilot program is January 1, 2023.

FINANCING:

Funds in the amount of $700,000 for Year One of the NET Growth Movement pilot program are included in the proposed FY2022-23 Social Services Agency MOE Budget. Staff will return to your Board with a plan to fully fund Years Two and Three of the pilot program in the amount of $1.4 million in FY24 and $700,000 in FY25, respectively.

VISION 2026 GOAL:

Establishing the NET Growth Movement GIFFY pilot program in Alameda County meets the overarching vision of a **Thriving and Resilient Population** and meets the 10X Goal pathway of **Eliminating Poverty and Hunger** by ensuring all residents' basic needs are met, creating self-sufficiency among vulnerable populations, and supporting COVID recovery efforts which seek to build community resilience in the areas of foster care, health care, and jobs.

Respectfully,

Dave Brown  
Board of Supervisors, Third District

David Haubert  
Board of Supervisors, First District
June 27, 2022

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County Administration Building
1221 Oak Street
Oakland, California 94612

Dear Board Members:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Direct the County Administrator to bring back to the Board the following:

A. An analysis regarding a proposed renewal of the Alameda County Measure A1 General Obligation Bond to support affordable housing County-wide; and
B. An analysis regarding a potential increase in the Assessment amount and jurisdiction boundaries of the Joint Powers Authority of Alameda County Healthy Homes Department.

DISCUSSION/SUMMARY:

In November 2016, voters approved Measure A1 to support affordable housing in Alameda County. This bond has raised millions to support affordable housing, however these funds will soon be depleted. I am asking that the Board direct the County Administrator to develop an analysis regarding the proposed renewal of the Alameda County Measure A1 General Obligation Bond to support affordable housing County-wide.

The assessment amount to support Alameda County Healthy Homes has not increased since its inception. Increasing this assessment amount would allow for Healthy Homes to provide additional services. Furthermore, I am asking that the Board Direct the County Administrator to develop a proposal to expand the jurisdiction served by Healthy Homes, in conjunction with the Joint Powers Authority.

Very truly yours,

Nate Miley
Supervisor, District 4

Cc: County Administrator
County Counsel
Auditor-Controller/Clerk-Recorder
June 27, 2022

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County Administration Building
1221 Oak Street
Oakland, California 94612

Dear Board Members:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Direct the County Administrator to bring back to the Board the following:

A. A proposal to approve the use of $50,627,000 to support Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services Department’s Systems Approach and Plan to Reduce Forensic Involvement with Behavioral Health Clients; and
B. A report regarding the feasibility and cost analysis of a bed-buy-back program at Villa Fairmont Mental Health Rehabilitation Center; and
C. A report regarding potential enhancements to increase the number of individuals served by Full-Service Partnerships; and
D. A recommended new funding source to support the implementation and associated staffing costs of Governor Newsom’s Care Courts proposal within Alameda County.

DISCUSSION/SUMMARY:

Far too many individuals with serious, debilitating and chronic mental health needs continue to live without appropriate care. Over the last several months, I have met with dozens of mental health advocates to discuss our County’s increasing behavioral health needs. These needs are especially prevalent within East Oakland, the Unincorporated Area and in cities such as Pleasanton that lack access to Community Assessment Treatment and Transport Teams (CATT). On June 21, 2021, I submitted a budget request letter as part of the Board’s Fiscal Year 2021-2022 allocations which directed the County Administrator to bring back to the Board a proposal to fund Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services Department’s proposed acute, sub-acute and other community-based programs.

Alameda County Behavioral Health Department provided the Board’s Health Committee with an update on its Forensic System Redesign Plan at its May 2021 meeting, identifying the implementation cost of $50,627,000. As part of the Fiscal Year 2022-2023 allocations, I am asking that the Board direct the County Administrator to bring back to the Board a proposal regarding the use of $50,627,000 to support Alameda County Behavioral Health Department’s Behavioral Health Services & Forensic System Redesign Plan.

At Villa Fairmont Mental Health Rehabilitation Center (MHRC), we provide intensive mental health and psychiatric treatment services. The County continues to lack access to available beds. I am asking that the Board direct the County Administrator to develop a report regarding the feasibility and cost analysis of a bed-buy-back program, in an effort to increase the number of available beds within our County.
Alameda County has increased the number of individuals served through wrap-around services for those with severe mental illness, otherwise known as full-service partnerships. I am asking that the Board direct the County Administrator to develop a report regarding additional enhancements to increase the number of individuals served by Full-Service Partnerships.

Finally, I am asking that the Board direct the County Administrator to identify a new funding source to supplement State funding to support the implementation and associated staffing costs of Governor Newsom’s Care Courts proposal within Alameda County.

Very truly yours,

Nate Miley
Supervisor, District 4

Cc: County Administrator
    County Counsel
    Auditor-Controller/Clerk-Recorder
June 27, 2022

TO: Each Member, Board of Supervisors & County Administrator

FROM: Keith Carson

SUBJECT: West Oakland Food Hub

RECOMMENDATION:
1. Direct the Social Services Agency and Health Care Services Agency to identify $3.5 million in FY 22/23 for the development and implementation of a Food Hub in West Oakland.

DISCUSSION:
As part of the FY 21/22 Alameda County Budget the board approved a $6.8 million investment in ALL IN Eats expansion using existing financing sources. $2.2 million of the investment was for the scaling of the food hubs throughout the county which provided for predevelopment planning.

These funds will be to retrofit an existing warehouse in West Oakland to provide at least five commercial kitchen station; a minimum of 2,000 square feet of refrigerator and freezer space; ample room to aggregate and process food; and a staging area for a fleet of 5-7 electric, refrigerated vans/box trucks.

The West Oakland Food Hub is in partnership with Impact Oakland NOW or ION, a non-denominational, nonprofit coalition of churches serving Oakland and the greater East Bay. Through the partnership, a church-owned property has been identified in West Oakland that is currently utilized as a warehouse for dry food storage and distribution to the community. The site is in the heart of the community and the ideal size to be transformed into a Food Hub. With the addition of their owned parking lot across the street, the site can also handle the refrigerated vehicles, and potential pop-up events. The church also owns a piece of vacant land adjacent to the building that would be ideal for a small urban farm where the community can learn and grow vegetables.

FINANCING:
The $3.5 million for the development and implementation of a Food Hub in West Oakland will be identified from existing sources.

VISION 2026 GOAL:
Allocation of funding for the West Oakland Food Hub supports the overarching vision of a Thriving and Resilient Population and the 10X goal of ensuring residents’ basic needs are met including eliminating poverty and hunger, while creating self-sufficiency among vulnerable populations.
June 26, 2022

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County Administration Building
Oakland, CA 94612

Dear Board Members:

SUBJECT: FY 2022-2023 FINAL BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS

RECOMMENDATION

A. Approve the final budget adjustments as detailed in the Attachment with no increase in net County cost; and

B. Authorize the County Administrator and Auditor-Controller to include other technical adjustments as required to the Fiscal Year 2022-2023 Final Budget.

DISCUSSION/SUMMARY

This letter requests approval of final budget adjustments including transactions approved by your Board subsequent to development of the FY 2022-23 Maintenance of Effort Budget and other technical adjustments.

Final budget adjustments result in increased appropriations and revenue in the General and Measure A Funds of $43.0 million with no change in net county cost and a net increase of 32 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions, which are fully offset by revenue or current appropriations. Other Funds have increased by $13.5 million in appropriations and revenue, with an increase of one FTE.

The attachment details the adjustments summarized below by fund and department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Net</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General/Measure A Funds</td>
<td>$43,021,762</td>
<td>$43,021,762</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>$13,488,768</td>
<td>$13,488,768</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Change - All Funds</td>
<td>$56,510,530</td>
<td>$56,510,530</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINANCING

The final adjustments will not increase net county costs and will be incorporated in the FY 2022-2023 Final Budget adopted by your Board. The additional positions have been previously approved by your Board and are fully offset with revenue or funded within existing appropriations.

Very truly yours,

Susan S. Muranishi
County Administrator

SSM:MPA:PC:APR
Attachment

c:  Auditor-Controller
     County Counsel
     Agency/Department Heads
## FY 2022-23 Final Budget Adjustments
### Summary by Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Department</th>
<th>Salaries &amp; Benefits</th>
<th>Services &amp; Supplies</th>
<th>Other Charges</th>
<th>Fixed Assets</th>
<th>Intra-Fund Transfers</th>
<th>Other Financing Uses</th>
<th>Total Appropriations</th>
<th>Total Financing</th>
<th>Net County Cost</th>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL IN Alameda County</td>
<td>(1,765,703)</td>
<td>(423,063)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>721,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,467,766)</td>
<td>(944,859)</td>
<td>(522,907)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Commission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5,513)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5,513)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,513)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(310,234)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(310,234)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(310,234)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor-Controller</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,600,576)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,600,576)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,600,576)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health Care Services</td>
<td>(394,057)</td>
<td>37,010,415</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,549,406</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,066,952</td>
<td>24,659,348</td>
<td>(592,396)</td>
<td>(7.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(37,674)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(37,674)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(37,674)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Support Services</td>
<td>(41,503)</td>
<td>41,503</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Administrator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(98,022)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(98,022)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(98,022)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,102,586)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,102,586)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,102,586)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Counsel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(134,364)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(134,364)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(134,364)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Agency</td>
<td>429,476</td>
<td>65,269</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>494,745</td>
<td>781,230</td>
<td>(286,485)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>26,942</td>
<td>(539,409)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(512,467)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(512,467)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td>172,245</td>
<td>(172,245)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Agency</td>
<td>(12,118)</td>
<td>12,118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(311,020)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(311,020)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(311,020)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Services Administration</td>
<td>924,015</td>
<td>1,163,190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,650,246</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>436,959</td>
<td>531,213</td>
<td>(94,254)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Department</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(39,742)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(39,742)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(39,742)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Program Expenditures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Department</td>
<td>19,004</td>
<td>(327,481)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(308,477)</td>
<td>454,951</td>
<td>(763,428)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>1,887,189</td>
<td>(351,348)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,535,841</td>
<td>1,882,035</td>
<td>(346,194)</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Department</td>
<td>4,474,194</td>
<td>(1,166,064)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,308,130</td>
<td>3,774,612</td>
<td>(466,482)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar of Voters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(116,486)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(116,486)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(116,486)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>(35,619)</td>
<td>(2,786,647)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,822,266)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,822,266)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Agency</td>
<td>858,406</td>
<td>7,517,799</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>206,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,170,205</td>
<td>11,883,232</td>
<td>(3,713,027)</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer-Tax Collector</td>
<td>29,934</td>
<td>(153,811)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(123,877)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(123,877)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund Total</strong></td>
<td>6,572,405</td>
<td>35,134,009</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(13,684,652)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,021,762</td>
<td>43,021,762</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency/Department</td>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>Other Charges</td>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td>Intra-Fund Transfers</td>
<td>Other Financing Uses</td>
<td>Total Appropriations</td>
<td>Total Financing</td>
<td>Net County Cost</td>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Service Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Agency</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>16,304</td>
<td>10,148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22,622</td>
<td>22,622</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Department</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>1,954,239</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,957,909</td>
<td>1,957,909</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Service Funds Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>(160)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,970,543</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,148</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,980,531</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,980,531</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Library</td>
<td>7,443</td>
<td>(7,443)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Funds Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,443</strong></td>
<td><strong>(7,443)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Funds &amp; Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Services Agency</td>
<td>330,713</td>
<td>(187,234)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143,479</td>
<td>143,479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>47,022</td>
<td>(47,022)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Agency</td>
<td>(79,874)</td>
<td>79,874</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7 Flood Control/Water Agency</td>
<td>159,000</td>
<td>11,171,451</td>
<td>34,307</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,364,758</td>
<td>11,364,758</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Funds &amp; Districts Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>456,861</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,017,069</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,307</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,508,237</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,508,237</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>7,036,549</td>
<td>48,114,178</td>
<td>15,044,455</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(13,684,652)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56,510,530</td>
<td>56,510,530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>