ALAMEDA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACTING POLICY COMMITTEE

Monday, July 21, 2025 2:30 p.m.

Location: **Board of Supervisors' Chamber – Room 512 – 5th Floor**

Susan S. Muranishi County Administration Building

1221 Oak Street, Oakland, CA 94612

Supervisor Nate Miley, Chair Supervisor Elsa Márquez

Staff: Melissa Wilk, Auditor-Controller

Daniel Woldesenbet, Director, Public Works Agency

Kimberly Gasaway, Interim Director, General Services Agency

Susan S. Muranishi, County Administrator

Summary Action Minutes

I. Informal Constructions Procurement Update

Attachment

Kimberly Gasaway, Director, General Services Agency, presented an update on Informal Constructions Procurement Update.

GSA reviewed current informal bidding thresholds: \$75,000 (Purchasing Agent) and up to \$220,000 (Board approved).

The Qualified Contractors List is renewed annually; there are currently 293 contractors, 45% local. Outreach includes: GSA website, trade journals, chambers of commerce, contractor databases, and partner organizations.

Data review:

2022: 67.4% of contracts to local contractors.

2023: 75.5% local. 2024: 62.1% local.

FY 2025 (to May): 66% local.

Smaller contracts under \$75K are more likely to go to local contractors.

Recommendation from Procurement & Contracting Policy Committee: The Committee requested 1) additional outreach materials to share in district newsletters; 2) analysis of why larger contracts (\$75K-\$220K) usually to go to non-local contractors.

II. Project Stabilization/Community Benefits Agreement (PSCBA) Update <u>Attachment</u>

Kimberly Gasaway, Director, General Services Agency, presented an update on the Project Stabilization / Community Benefits Agreement.

The Project Stabilization/Community Benefits Agreement (PSCBA) was adopted in 2012; renewed in 2020 for 5 years with automatic renewal in 2025.

The goals of the PSCBA is to reach 40% of labor hours by for county residents, 20% of labor hours for apprenticeship and, 40% of apprentice hours by disadvantaged residents.

Current results as of June 2025:

- 49% resident hours (goal 40%).
- 17% apprentice hours (goal 20%).
- 38% disadvantaged apprentice hours (goal 40%).

The Joint Advisory Committee (JAC) meets monthly, monitors compliance and requires corrective action from contractors. Effective October 2025, all Public Works projects over \$1 million will be covered, previously the amount was over \$3 million.

Recommendation from Procurement & Contracting Policy Committee: The Committee would like more information on apprentice goals; Track outcomes of capacity-building for CBOs/subcontractors; Report on workforce impact.

III. Auditor/Controller Quarterly Procurement Report (January-March 2025) Attachment

Laura Lloyd and Susan Wewetzer, Auditor-Controller's Office, presented the Auditor-Controller Quarterly Procurement Report for January through March 2025.

The information presented in this report is based on payments made to contractors. The summary chart of all payments up to \$500,000 for the period July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2024 is shown on Page A1 and includes:

Total payments up to \$500,000 were \$2.15B

- \$1.27B was paid to local contractors 59.14% of total dollars up to \$500,000
- \$1.05M was paid to MWBE/SLEB contractors 48.79% of total dollars up to \$500,000

Payments to MWBE/SLEB contractors by category were:

- Construction: \$102.4M 37.62% of Construction dollars
- Architecture & Engineering: \$31.0M 52.85% of Architecture & Engineering dollars
- Professional Services: \$416.8M s 59.06% of Professional Services dollars
- Goods & Services: \$498.3M 44.79% of Goods & Services dollars

Also included in this report are all payments to contractors including amounts over \$500,000. This data is presented in the summary on Page A2 for the period July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2024 and includes:

Total payments were \$4.82B

- \$2.56B was paid to local contractors, which equals 53.24% of total dollars
- \$1.71B was paid to MWBE/SLEB contractors which equals 35.43% of total dollars

Payments to MWBE/SLEB contractors by category were:

- Construction: \$272.1M 28.92% of Construction dollars
- Architecture & Engineering: \$40.2M 41.52% of Architecture & Engineering dollars
- Professional Services: \$576.3M 31.28% of Professional Services dollars
- Goods & Services: \$817.8M 42.25% of Goods & Services dollars

This item was informational only and required no Committee action.

IV. Alameda County Health Contracts Update

Attachment

Kristel Acacio, Finance Services Director, Alameda County Health, provided an update on Alameda County Health Contracts.

The FY 2025–26 community-based organization (CBO) contracts budget totals \$758 million, representing 58% of the agency's overall budget and covering more than 368 contracts.

The largest share is allocated to Behavioral Health at \$545 million (72%), followed by the Office of the Agency Director with \$199 million (26%), and Public Health at \$15.5 million (2%).

By supervisorial district, funding is concentrated in District 3 (\$290 million, 45%) and District 5 (\$209 million, 32%), with smaller allocations to District 2 (\$57 million, 9%), District 4 (\$53 million, 8%), and District 1 (\$42 million, 6%). City-level data show that most CBO funding supports providers headquartered in Oakland (59%), followed by Alameda (13%), Berkeley (9%), and Hayward (8%).

The contracts are projected to support approximately 4,300 full-time equivalent positions valued at \$530 million. Review of FY 2023–24 expenditures showed that 94% went to CBOs.

FY 25-26 CBO contracts budget: \$758M - 368 contracts, 58% of total Health Agency budget.

Major allocations:

- Behavioral Health \$545M (72%)
- Office of Agency Director \$199M (26%)
- Public Health \$15.5M (2%)

Geographic distribution:

- o District 3 \$290M (45%).
- District 5 \$209M (32%).
- o District 2 \$57M (9%).
- District 4 \$53M (8%).
- District 1 \$42M (6%).

0

By city: Oakland 59%, Alameda 13%, Berkeley 9%, Hayward 8%.

Recommendation from Procurement & Contracting Policy Committee: Supervisors requested clarification on discrepancies in reported contract counts -368 vs. 436, an analysis of service delivery at the district level rather than only by headquarters location, and confirmation on whether Vision 2026 Board-initiated contracts are included in the totals.