Information about the First 5 Conference Center

- The First 5 Conference Center is wheelchair accessible. Please notify us 3 business days in advance if you need special assistance so we can make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility.
- Please refrain from wearing strongly scented products to the Conference Center in consideration of those who may experience chemical sensitivities.
FIRST 5 ALAMEDA COUNTY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, October 15, 2015

9:00 AM – 11:30 AM

Commissioners: Chair: Pamela Simms-Mackey M.D., Vice Chair: Renee Herzfeld, Wilma Chan, Cecilia Echeverria, Deborah Roderick Stark

Commissioners Absent: Alex Briscoe, Lori Cox

Chair Pamela Simms-Mackey called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

1. Public Comment (for items not listed on the agenda) - Limited to 3 minutes per speaker

There was no public comment.

Chair Simms-Mackey announced that she and Janis Burger, CEO, received a message from Commissioner Ricky Choi. Commissioner Choi has made a career move, will be moving to South Korea and subsequently is resigning from the Commission. Chair Simms-Mackey read the note which expressed his thanks to Chair Simms-Mackey, the Commission, Ms. Burger and the First 5 staff for having him on the Commission for the past five years

2. Approval of Minutes from June 18, 2015

Commission Action: The Commission approved the June 18, 2015 minutes upon motion by Commissioner Echeverria, seconded by Commissioner Herzfeld, and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

3. Staff Announcements

Ms. Burger announced the hiring of Mary Saelee in the Senior Associate position. Ms. Saelee will be taking Commission minutes and will be working with the Commission.

INFRASTRUCTURE

4. Election of Commission Vice Chair

Chair Simms-Mackey stated that with the resignation of Commission Choi, there is a vacancy in the role of Vice Chair.

Commission Action: The Commission approved the election of Commissioner Herzfeld to serve as Vice Chair upon motion by Commissioner Roderick Stark, seconded by Commissioner Echeverria and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).
5. **2016 Commission Meeting Calendar**

Chair Simms-Mackey called the Commissioners attention to the 2016 Commission meeting calendar. She encouraged the Commissioners to prioritize meeting attendance and schedule other commitments around First 5 Commission meetings. Chair Simms-Mackey emphasized the importance of having Commissioner voices at the table.

6. **F5AC Bylaws Revisions**

Ms. Burger stated the F5AC Bylaws have not been changed since their adoption in 1998. She noted it is often difficult to obtain a quorum for Commission meetings with important decisions that need to be made. The recommendation is to appoint alternate members for each of the Alameda County Commissioners: Supervisors Briscoe, Chan and Cox. The alternates would be able to vote on behalf of Alameda County Commissioners who are not able to attend meetings. Ms. Burger added that there are other changes needed in the Bylaws such as the change in agency address and other minor wording clean up.

Vice Chair Herzfeld asked if the alternates would be attending meetings more often than not. Ms. Burger responded that it will not be expected that the alternates attend every Commission meeting, but that they should be briefed on voting items by Alameda County Commissioners. Vice Chair Herzfeld asked if the alternates would receive meeting materials. Ms. Burger replied that the alternates would be added to the Commission distribution lists in order to receive meeting materials.

**Commission Action:** The Commission approved the recommended revisions to the First 5 Alameda County Bylaws upon motion by Commissioner Stark, seconded by Vice Chair Herzfeld, and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).


Mark Rasiah, Financial Controller, reported that for FY 2014-15, the agency received a clean financial audit. In keeping with the best practice of changing auditors after an extended period of time, RS Associates was selected as the new auditor, replacing Patel & Associates after seven years of service. Mr. Rasiah invited Ragini Singh, Principal Auditor from RS Associates to present the FY 2014-2015 audit results. Ms. Singh highlighted a few details from the report provided to the Commission and reported, overall, there were not significant findings or adjustments and welcomed any questions or comments.

Mr. Rasiah reported that although F5AC had invoiced Alameda County for $900K in Medical Administrative Activities (MAA funds; the balance has not yet been received.) Commissioner Stark inquired on the reasoning behind the delay in MAA reimbursement from the County. Mr. Rasiah responded a County staffing issue prevented the invoices from being processed in a timely manner. Zee Laura Page, Office Manager added that as of October 14; 2015, F5AC was informed three new analysts had been hired and would be working on processing the reimbursements upon receiving training. F5AC was notified that the first quarterly reimbursement is expected to be paid by the end of the calendar year. Commissioner Stark asked for clarification if the MAA reimbursements were an entire year behind on payments and whether they will go into the sustainability fund or into the operating fund upon receipt. Mr. Rasiah responded that MAA funds are supported by Prop 10 funding and will be going back into the sustainability fund.
Mr. Rasiah acknowledged and thanked the Finance team, Contracts staff, Christine Hom, Contracts and Grants Administrator, Ms. Page, as well as Payroll staff for their contributions towards a clean audit.

Commission Action: The Commission approved the FY 2014-15 Financial Audit report upon motion by Commissioner Echeverria, seconded by Vice Chair Herzfeld and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

Chair Pamela Simms-Mackey thanked the auditors and staff for another clean audit.

8. Financial Policies Revisions

Mr. Rasiah stated the Financial Policies are periodically brought to the Commission for review and approval of revisions. F5AC reviews Financial Policies to bring them in line with current practices and brings recommended changes to the Commission for approval. Mr. Rasiah noted that with staff restructuring and changes in recent years, the revisions propose to remove the “Deputy Director” title, replacing it with “Chief Operating Officer”. The title change would allow Kristin Spanos, Chief Operating Officer to sign off on checks, contracts, etc. and have the same approval rights as the CEO.

Commission Action: The Commission approved the recommended revisions to the First 5 Alameda County Financial Policies upon motion by Commissioner Stark, seconded by Commissioner Echeverria, and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

9. Investment Policy Revisions

Mr. Rasiah presented the Investment Policy revisions and noted the Policy was last brought to the Commission in April 2014. He noted the previous fund manager, Cutwater Asset Management was acquired by The Bank of New York Mellon and subsequently notified F5AC that they would no longer be able to manage the portfolio. All funds are now managed by Chandler Asset Management and funds remain under the custodial hold of Union Bank and are under the direct name of F5AC. Mr. Rasiah also stated investment reporting would be made available to the Commission on a monthly basis instead of quarterly, upon request.

Commissioner Stark asked for a reminder on the history of choosing to work with two fund asset managers instead of one. Mr. Rasiah stated in 2007, F5AC wanted to make sure there was competition among the trustees of the fund managers while ensuring the lowest possible fees were obtained. Commissioner Stark inquired whether or not F5AC would be revisiting acquiring a second fund manager moving forward and if it would be in the best interest of the agency to have the additional fund manager. Mr. Rasiah responded that there is not a significant difference with fund management fees or with benchmarked returns. Chandler is locally based in San Diego and manages a range of portfolios for local agencies such as the City of Leandro and First 5 Santa Clara. Mr. Rasiah noted F5AC is reviewing acquiring a second fund manager.

Chair Simms-Mackey questioned whether F5AC sustained any losses due to the quick take over and transition of fund managers. Mr. Rasiah stated that all securities have been held in a custodial account at Union Bank and when Chandler took over as the solo manager, they rebalanced the portfolios to meet the needs of F5AC. There were not any notable changes.
Commission Action: The Commission approved the recommended revisions to the First 5 Alameda County Investment Policy upon motion by Commissioner Echeverria, seconded by Commissioner Stark, and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

10. Chandler Asset Management Presentation

Mr. Rasiah invited Scott Prickett from Chandler Asset Management to present the Investment Report for the period ending September 30, 2015.

Mr. Prickett provided a handout to the Commission with a full overview of the Investment Report. Chandler will be working over the next quarter or two to further structure the portfolio. Mr. Prickett highlighted a few key items in the Investment Performance detailed in the report. The benchmark for returns in the last 12 months was 2.13%, with F5AC reporting a return of 1.92%. Chandler has been taking a more conservative position keeping interest rates in mind. Over the past five years, Mr. Prickett noted there has been consistency in the returns.

Commissioner Chan asked if F5AC would be able to remove Walmart from the portfolio. She stated the corporation hurts working families with their labor practices and do not provide health insurance to their employees. Mr. Prickett responded that Chandler will review holdings with portfolio managers from time to time and will share the Commissioner’s notations.

Mr. Rasiah thanked Mr. Prickett for his presentation.

11. Contract Authorizations

Christine Hom, Grants and Contracts Administrator presented the five contract authorizations that require Commission approval.

- **First 5 Association of California** - $11,670 (The addition of the $11,670 contract brings the aggregate FY 2015-16 payment amount to $103,990.)
- **Harder & Company** - $26,370 (The addition of $26,370 to the current contract brings the FY 2014-16 contract amount to $76,355.)
- **Help Me Grow National Center, Connecticut Children’s Medical Center** - $4,000 (The addition of $4,000 to the current contract brings the total FY 2015-16 contract amount to $53,500.)
- **Parent Voices Oakland** - $38,383 (The addition of the $38,383 amendment brings the FY 2015-16 total contract amount to $208,333 and the aggregate FY 2014-16 contract amount to $250,333.)
- **UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospital Oakland** - $30,000 (The addition of the $30,000 contract brings the FY 2014-17 aggregate contract amount to $232,160.)

Commissioner Chan inquired if aspects of the scope of work and specs were left out of the original contracts or if situations change that would lead to funding amendments. Ms. Burger noted contract amendments occur when new services are added after the original contract authorization is approved. Commissioner Chan asked how that happens. Ms. Burger responded that the scope does not change, but the new services normally go above and beyond the original scope. When extra services are added, it is under the agreement of both parties. Also, due to the timing of Commission meetings, contracts are
authorized at a lower amount, with the full amount being brought to the Commission at a later date for approval.

Commissioner Echeverria asked about the UCSF Benioff project and the connection of legal services to this specific population. Ms. Burger stated the project is working in partnership with EC LINC to pilot Project DULCE to provide legal support to families in the first six months to put them in a better position to support their child. Highland Hospital was most interested in the pilot program, but didn’t have the mental health supervision to support the pilot, FSAC is contracting with UCSF Benioff CHO to provide the clinical supervision. Ms. Burger reported there will be an evaluation of the pilot that would be shared with the Commission.

Chair Simms-Mackey facilitated the vote for the following contracts:

Commission Action: The Commission approved the following contracts upon motion by Commissioner Stark, seconded by Commissioner Chan, and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

- First 5 Association of California
- Harder & Company
- Help Me Grow National Center, Connecticut Children’s Medical Center

Commission Action: The Commission approved the following contract upon motion by Commissioner Echeverria, seconded by Commissioner Stark, and unanimously carried with Vice Chair Herzfeld abstaining from the vote (4 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention).

- Parent Voices Oakland

Vice Chair Herzfeld facilitated the vote for the following contract:

Commission Action: The Commission approved the following contract upon motion by Commissioner Echeverria, seconded by Commissioner Chan, and unanimously carried with Chair Simms-Mackey abstaining from the vote (4 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention).

- UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospital Oakland

PROGRAM

12. FY 2014-15 State Annual Report Approval

Jane Bernzweig and Jane Wellenkamp, F5AC Evaluation Specialists, presented the FY 2014-15 State Annual Report. The evaluation studies submitted to the State included the ASR Home Visiting work identifying common outcomes and indicators across all home visiting programs, the Help Me Grow Family Satisfaction study and the Harder and Company QRIS Evaluation. These reports are available on the F5AC website.

Commissioner Chan asked if the Commissioners could be provided a map of the 79 sites rated in the QRIS evaluation indicating where the sites were located (geographic mapping). She also asked if the map could include the site category. Ms. Bernzweig indicated 57 were center based and 22 were family/child care sites and that the report would be provided to Commissioner Chan.

Commissioner Stark inquired about the specifics of the coaching model. Malia Ramler, Senior Administrator, Community and Provider Capacity Building stated the coaching model is steered by an
initial assessment. She noted it begins with a quality assessment that is mandated and consistent throughout the state. Each coaching model is customized based on site assessments.

Commission Action: The Commission approved the FY 2014-15 Annual Report to the State upon motion by Commissioner Echeverria, seconded by Commissioner Chan, and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

13. Father Friendly Principles Recommendation

Kevin Bremond, Father Corps Administrator, presented the Alameda County Fathers Corps (ACFC) Father Friendly Principles for review and formal adoption. The ACFC Father Friendly Principles were adopted by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors on February 3, 2015. In their resolution, the Board of Supervisors encouraged Alameda County agencies to also adopt the ACFC Father Friendly Principles.

Commissioner Echeverria raised a question regarding Principle 1, which includes the needs of fathers being included in the structure and delivery model of all family services. She asked if ACFC is aiming to support changes in physical environments, for example adding changing stations to men’s restrooms. Mr. Bremond replied ACFC is aiming to support those types of changes as well as having father-specific programs and parent groups meet the needs of fathers.

Commissioner Echeverria asked if ACFC is reaching out to other parts of the clinician community such as Kaiser Permanente to provide training. Mr. Bremond noted ACFC has a one-page summary of the work they’ve accomplished over the past two years and a listing of the agencies that they have engaged in the program. Commissioner Stark requested a copy of the list of agencies engaged by ACFC. Chair Simms-Mackey added that she had been told by fathers that they don’t attend pediatrician visits because health providers only engage the mothers. She would like to see the pediatric offices and doctors more engaged.

Commission Action: The Commission approved the adoption of the Alameda County Fathers Corp (ACFC) Father Friendly Principles upon motion by Vice Chair Herzfeld, seconded by Commissioner Echeverria, and unanimously carried (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

14. Parent Engagement Presentation

Commissioner Stark presented to the Commission on Parent Engagement. Additionally, Clarissa Doutherd, Executive Director of Parent Voices and Pecolia Manigo, Associate Director, Bay Area Parent Leadership Action Network (PLAN) also presented.

Commissioner Stark gave a brief background on how she came to work in the field, working with President Clinton, helping create the early head start program, consulting to develop products with head start programs across the country as well as launching a new professional association with online resources honoring people doing family engagement work. She provided a brief overview on family engagement and noted it is a shared responsibility between educators and parents in determining how to better support the child. With family engagement, dialogue is strength-based and collaborative and not deficit-based.

Commissioner Stark reviewed two federal frameworks that guide family engagement practice and provided the web links accessible to the public. She briefly summarized the Head Start PFCE Framework.
which includes continuous program foundation areas, program impact areas, family engagement outcomes and child outcomes. Commissioner Stark added there was slight push back from the Head Start community in terms of being able to incorporate all the tools. She noted they have been working with the community to best incorporate the areas of focus they most want to work on. Commissioner Stark noted work needs to happen on both levels, with program as well as with parents. She added a few of the notable effective strategies include, building personal relationships and mutual understanding, engaging in frequent and positive communication, listening to families about their children’s interests and needs as well as sharing learning materials and modeling teaching practices.

Ms. Doutherd stated Parent Voices is a local grassroots, parent lead organization that advocates for affordable, quality childcare that is accessible to all families. She discussed their work with the Alameda County Early Childhood Policy Committee (ACECPC) which is a cross sector collaboration of parents, agencies and providers working together to find a way to build community. She added Commissioner Cox has been a strong supporter and was invited to the parent forum to have an open dialogue with parents. They developed recommendations and created a task force to address barriers parents are facing with social services agencies. The People’s Task Force is now in its second year of the project. They partner parents with local social service agencies to create change in the community.

Ms. Manigo provided a brief introduction of her more than 20 years working in social justice organizing and her successful matriculation through the CalWORKs program. She discussed the different capacities of families involved with PLAN and noted they work to empower parents to participate in the education of their children in order to help transform schools. Ms. Manigo added that providers and everyone working within the school district must embrace and understand family engagement in order to contribute to the success of systems change.

Ms. Burger stated that the presenters provided two incredible examples of family engagement and opened the forum for discussion on the topic. She noted some topics to think about would be, if family engagement impact is scalable as well as the support needed for parents and organizations.

Vice Chair Herzfeld commented that she appreciated the discussion and experiences of the presenters. She asked how F5AC could help make things less complicated. She raised the question of having a crosswalk of family engagement and early childhood education. Vice Chair Herzfeld encouraged F5AC to help with the Listen and Response models as it relates to Parent Engagement, perhaps convening Listening Sessions. Commissioner Stark added we do not always have leaders such as Commissioner Cox that are in place to listen, respond and act on those concerns. Vice Chair Herzfeld noted we have systems in place that make families hesitant to share information and raised the question on how to work through those challenges.

Chair Simms-Mackey added schools want outcomes and acknowledged the work of the community presenters that are leading the way to help achieve good outcomes. She suggested bringing those who have had success with the framework to help guide those who may be struggling. Chair Simms-Mackey also suggested F5AC utilize its platforms and newsletters to promote what’s working well in the County, positive program messaging and activities that are successful in order to get the community excited about family engagement.

Ms. Burger added that family engagement was not part of the QRIS matrix and asked Ms. Ramler to address this topic. She noted it is something F5AC needed to work towards on a policy level. Ms. Ramler noted that family engagement is wrapped into the environmental rating scales and that it is not
sufficient. Ms. Ramler stated that family engagement is one of the three big areas that need discussion. Commissioner Stark added Massachusetts has family engagement included in their QRIS. She also commented that F5AC requires grantees to commit to a smoke-free environment and suggested adding father friendly principles, and family engagement principles to contracts/grantee boilerplates.

Ms. Ramler noted strengthening family principles had been incorporated in to the community grants initiative this year, was part of the application process and a learning committee pilot is being developed during the two year term.

Ms. Burger thanked all the presenters.

15. State Commission and Association Updates

Ms. Burger reported that eight F5AC staff attended as well as presented at the First 5 Association Staff Development Summit in September 2015.

She also provided a brief update on the Medicaid Managed Care (MMC) process. F5AC is looking at what role MMC should have in supporting programs. Ms. Burger shared that the State Commission IMPACT proposal is due in early December and added that it includes $4.6M being funded over the next five years which would allow F5AC to continue its Race to The Top (RTT) work. RTT is currently funded through June 2016.

16. Legislation and Public Policy Updates

Ms. Burger provided a brief overview of the bills vetoed and signed by the Governor. Ms. Burger reported a new tobacco tax initiative is proposed to be included on the November 2016 ballot that includes backfill for Prop 10 as well as revenue from e-cigarettes.

17. F5AC Comprehensive Tobacco Policy Update

Liz Gregor, Community Grants Initiative, Program Officer presented an update on the F5AC Comprehensive Tobacco Policy. She stated the Commission passed the first set of Comprehensive Tobacco Control Policies in September 2000. Ms. Gregor added the purpose of the policies is to reinforce the message that tobacco products and involvement with the tobacco industry in any manner constitutes a serious health hazard for young children, their families, and the community. She noted the revisions add the inclusion of e-cigarettes (aka electronic smoking devices or “ESD”) and the inclusion of providing staff, parents, and/or clients, educational materials about ESDs and their effect on children and pregnant women. Chair Simms-Mackey asked if the updated policies are adopted, will F5AC send links or a fact sheet to current contractors and grantees. Ms. Gregor confirmed F5AC has previously sent out materials on second-hand smoke as they are updated and will do the same for ESDs.

Commission Action: The Commission approved the recommended revisions to the First 5 Alameda County Comprehensive Tobacco Policy upon motion by Commissioner Echeverria seconded by Commissioner Stark (5 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions).

MISCELLANEOUS
18. Communication from Commissioners

No communications from Commissioners to report.

19. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:23 AM.
To: First 5 Alameda County Commission  
From: Mark R Rasiah, Financial Controller  
Date: December 10, 2015  
Subject: First Quarter Investment Report, July 1 – September 30, 2015

**REQUESTED ACTION**

To review the Investment Report for the first three months of FY2015-16.

**BACKGROUND OF ACTIVITIES**

The investment objectives of the First 5 Alameda County Agency are first, to provide safety of principal to ensure the preservation of capital in the overall portfolio; second, to provide sufficient liquidity to meet all requirements that may be reasonably anticipated; and third, to earn a commensurate rate of return consistent with the constraints imposed by the safety and liquidity objectives.

The performance objective of the First 5 Alameda County Agency portfolio is to earn a total rate of return that exceeds the total rate of return on a market benchmark index of 1-5 Year Government securities.

In 2005-06, First 5 Alameda County transferred $34,000,000 from the Sustainability Fund held by the Alameda County Treasurer’s investment pool to outside money managers. This report summarizes the activity and status of the investment portfolio as of September 30, 2015.

**PORTFOLIO HIGHLIGHTS**

The Investment Report shows the performance of funds that are invested in the Alameda County pool and with fund managers, Cutwater Asset Management and Chandler Asset Management and with Philanthropic Ventures Foundation. At the end of the last fiscal year (June 30th 2015), the total market value of the portfolio was $30,852,952. There were no withdrawals during the first three months of FY 2015-16. The market value of the combined portfolios as of September 30th 2015 is $30,808,986 at a cost of $30,773,645.
PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT CHANGES

After a review of the nearly 16 month strategic partnership/collaboration with Philanthropic Ventures Foundation (PVF), Staff decided not to renew the Strategic Partnership Agreement with PVF. The original intent of transferring funds to PVF was to leverage funding and build additional partnerships in the face of declining Prop 10 Tobacco Tax revenues. However, due to subsequent changes in the political climate and challenges of leveraging funding relationships through a third party, Staff determined that it was in our best interest to bring the monies back under active investment management rather than leave it in a low yielding money market mutual fund where the yield was a quarter of what we currently generate on our investment portfolio. Accordingly, the contract was terminated with effect from July 1, 2015 and the nearly $5 million invested with PVF was reallocated equally between Chandler and Cutwater Asset Management, at no cost to us besides the transfer fee of $70.

Also in July, we were notified by Cutwater Asset Management that they had been acquired by the Bank of New York Mellon (BNY Mellon) and that our portfolio was too small for it to be commercially viable for them to manage. They stated that they would continue to manage our funds until the end of September 2015, but would not renew their contract beyond that point (Attachment 3).

After some discussion, Staff requested Chandler Asset Management to manage the combined portfolio until such time as Staff determined otherwise. The portfolio management transition was completed by August 31st 2015 and has resulted in Chandler now managing a total of $30.8 million for First 5 Alameda. This consolidation will also result in an annual saving of about $6,000 in fees, for First 5 Alameda.

The risk to the agency of having Chandler as the sole investment manager is minimal, since Chandler is bound by our investment policy (California Government Code) and all funds are held in trust by Union Bank MUFG, our banker, and not by Chandler. Funds may only be transferred out of the trustee account at the written direction of the CEO of First 5 Alameda County.

Chandler Asset Management, based in San Diego California, has co-managed our portfolio since September 2007. They manage the investments of a number of cities and local government clients and have a proven track record that is well known in municipal treasury management circles. Chandler is also the sole fund manager for First 5 Santa Clara and the City of San Leandro, among others.
INVESTMENT REPORT

Investment Income

Investment income is primarily derived from interest or yield payments on securities held in the investment portfolio. Typically, interest income from each security is received semi-annually. The money managers buy, sell and exchange securities consistent with the First 5 Alameda County Investment Policy in order to optimize overall yields.

Net investment earnings (net of fees) for the three months ended September 30, 2015 was $67,007 and includes $2,969 from the Alameda County Treasurer’s pool.

Investment Fees

Fees include those levied by the money managers (Cutwater and Chandler) and the fees levied by the account custodian (Union Bank). The total fees paid during this period were $10,990.

Investment Activity

The Investment Activity shows all transactions affecting our portfolio. A purchase of securities increases the value of the portfolio whereas the sale of securities decreases the total portfolio value and may result in a gain or loss on the transaction.

At the Commission meeting in October 2015, Staff was directed by the Commission to divest from Walmart Corporate Bonds and to not invest in any securities of Walmart in the future. Currently the portfolio has 110,000 shares of Walmart Bonds valued at $109,915. Chandler Asset Management was notified accordingly, and has taken steps to divest by November 2015.

Market Value and Unrealized Gains and Losses

There was an unrealized gain of $35,341 at the end of September. This is determined by comparing the Cost and the Market Value of the portfolio on that date. It implies that a gain would have been realized, had the portfolio been liquidated on September 30th. Since the portfolio was not liquidated, this section is for informational purposes only. Government entities are legally required (GASB 31) to report unrealized gains and losses on investments.

Yield Benchmarks

Investment yields are compared to the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) yields in order to benchmark investment manager performance. Cutwater and Chandler’s annualized yields (0.49% and 1.39%, respectively) trail behind the total rate of return (1.65%) on a market benchmark index of 1-5 Year Government securities.
The Alameda County Treasury Investment Pool is net of fees and has yielded a 0.63% annualized cash basis rate of return for the month of September.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The total realized investment earnings at the end of the first quarter were $77,997.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

To approve the Investment Report for the first three months of FY2015-16.

Submitted by:      Reviewed by:

____________________________   _________________________
Mark R Rasiah, Janis Burger,  
Financial Controller     Chief Executive Officer
First 5 Alameda County
Investment Report
For the Period July 1, 2015 - September 30, 2015

INVESTMENT INCOME:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Union Bank</th>
<th>Cutwater Asset Management</th>
<th>Philanthropic Asset Management</th>
<th>Chandler Asset Management</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Received</td>
<td>3,436</td>
<td>71,592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Alameda County Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Investment Earnings

Investment Fees Paid

Net Investment Income (Net of Fees)

INVESTMENT ACTIVITY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cutwater Asset Management</th>
<th>Philanthropic Asset Management</th>
<th>Chandler Asset Management</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios - Cost Basis at 07/01/2015</td>
<td>12,763,405</td>
<td>4,991,752</td>
<td>12,942,431</td>
<td>30,697,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases</td>
<td>2,983,144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,830,797</td>
<td>9,813,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>(3,063,334)</td>
<td>(6,674,549)</td>
<td>(9,737,883)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cash Transactions (Asset Transfer)</td>
<td>(15,179,091)</td>
<td>15,179,091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Disbursement</td>
<td>2,495,876</td>
<td>(4,991,752)</td>
<td>2,495,876</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portfolios - Cost Basis at 09/30/2015

COST VS. MARKET VALUE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cutwater Asset Management</th>
<th>Philanthropic Asset Management</th>
<th>Chandler Asset Management</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios at Market</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,773,645</td>
<td>30,773,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios at Cost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,773,645</td>
<td>30,773,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized Gain (Loss)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,341</td>
<td>35,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YIELD AND BENCHMARKS (Annualized):

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cutwater Asset Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler Asset Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic Ventures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Treasurer’s Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Government Index (total rate of return)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# First 5 Alameda County Combined Holdings Report as of September 30, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holder</th>
<th>Asset Name</th>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>No. of Shares</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Moody</th>
<th>S &amp; P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FAMC</td>
<td>3137EADJ5</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td>161,125.74</td>
<td>161,081.60</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt Aaa AAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADJ5</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>251,758.96</td>
<td>251,690.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AAA AA+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS - CUT</td>
<td>3137EADP1</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>498,375.00</td>
<td>500,425.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FFCB BDS</td>
<td>3133EAY28</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td>160,204.80</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AAA AA+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FFCB - CUT</td>
<td>31331KNA4</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>522,520.00</td>
<td>520,830.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLB Note</td>
<td>3130A4GJ5</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>75,233.99</td>
<td>75,509.25</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt Aaa AA+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLB Note</td>
<td>3130A4GJ5</td>
<td>255,000.00</td>
<td>255,795.57</td>
<td>256,731.45</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLB Note - CUT</td>
<td>3130A3MS0</td>
<td>800,000.00</td>
<td>799,600.00</td>
<td>801,224.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLB Note</td>
<td>313378WF4</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>250,890.00</td>
<td>251,935.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AAA AA+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLB Note</td>
<td>313379FW4</td>
<td>320,000.00</td>
<td>320,646.40</td>
<td>321,948.80</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLB Note</td>
<td>313371PV2</td>
<td>235,000.00</td>
<td>241,580.00</td>
<td>238,052.65</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AAA AA+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLB Note</td>
<td>313378M7</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td>160,147.20</td>
<td>161,224.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLB Note</td>
<td>313378A43</td>
<td>245,000.00</td>
<td>246,872.54</td>
<td>247,655.80</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLB Note - CUT</td>
<td>313378A43</td>
<td>300,000.00</td>
<td>302,292.91</td>
<td>303,252.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADF3</td>
<td>245,000.00</td>
<td>247,271.88</td>
<td>247,611.70</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADM8</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>49,355.58</td>
<td>49,898.50</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADM8</td>
<td>265,000.00</td>
<td>261,584.56</td>
<td>264,462.05</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADM8</td>
<td>300,000.00</td>
<td>296,133.46</td>
<td>299,391.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADN6</td>
<td>255,000.00</td>
<td>251,339.32</td>
<td>254,785.80</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADN6</td>
<td>360,000.00</td>
<td>354,831.98</td>
<td>359,697.60</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADK2</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
<td>256,681.36</td>
<td>259,849.20</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADK2</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>49,361.80</td>
<td>49,971.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADK2</td>
<td>300,000.00</td>
<td>296,170.80</td>
<td>299,826.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADG1</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>253,371.25</td>
<td>255,080.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADG1</td>
<td>350,000.00</td>
<td>354,719.75</td>
<td>357,112.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FHLMC NTS</td>
<td>3137EADR7</td>
<td>625,000.00</td>
<td>624,150.00</td>
<td>624,431.25</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt AA+ Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder</td>
<td>Asset Name</td>
<td>CUSIP</td>
<td>No. of Shares</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>Investment Type</td>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>S &amp; P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS - CUT</td>
<td>3135G0CM3</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,015,845.00</td>
<td>1,008,010.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>AA+</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS - CUT</td>
<td>3135G0CM3</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,015,845.00</td>
<td>1,008,010.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>AA+</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOA78</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>251,687.34</td>
<td>252,577.50</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOA78</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>151,012.40</td>
<td>151,546.50</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOA78</td>
<td>210,000.00</td>
<td>211,417.36</td>
<td>212,165.10</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOD75</td>
<td>620,000.00</td>
<td>620,334.80</td>
<td>620,000.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOE33</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td>160,160.86</td>
<td>160,766.40</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOE33</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>250,251.34</td>
<td>251,197.50</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOMZ3</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>100,104.35</td>
<td>100,139.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOMZ3</td>
<td>155,000.00</td>
<td>155,161.73</td>
<td>155,215.45</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOTG8</td>
<td>175,000.00</td>
<td>174,674.15</td>
<td>175,267.75</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOWJ8</td>
<td>315,000.00</td>
<td>305,596.58</td>
<td>314,811.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOYT4</td>
<td>225,000.00</td>
<td>223,470.90</td>
<td>229,023.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOZA4</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>250,512.75</td>
<td>255,782.50</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOZL0</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>124,553.75</td>
<td>125,561.25</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>FNMA NTS</td>
<td>3135GOZG1</td>
<td>240,000.00</td>
<td>239,867.76</td>
<td>244,257.60</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>TVA BD</td>
<td>880591EQ1</td>
<td>275,000.00</td>
<td>277,233.25</td>
<td>280,368.00</td>
<td>Other Fed Govt</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Apple Inc Bonds</td>
<td>037833AJ9</td>
<td>190,000.00</td>
<td>188,480.06</td>
<td>189,112.70</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>Aa3</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Apple Inc Bonds - CUT</td>
<td>037833AJ9</td>
<td>554,000.00</td>
<td>549,568.18</td>
<td>551,412.82</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>Aa1</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>American Honda Finance</td>
<td>02665WAC5</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>75,899.38</td>
<td>75,843.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>American Honda Finance</td>
<td>02665WAC5</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>15,179.88</td>
<td>15,168.60</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>American Honda Finance</td>
<td>02665WAQ4</td>
<td>115,000.00</td>
<td>114,893.05</td>
<td>115,664.70</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Bank of New York Mellon</td>
<td>06406HCW7</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td>160,646.75</td>
<td>161,587.20</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>Aa3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Caterpillar Finl - CUT</td>
<td>14912LSZ0</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>500,575.00</td>
<td>499,890.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Caterpillar Finl - CUT</td>
<td>14912LSZ0</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>100,115.00</td>
<td>99,978.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>CHAIT</td>
<td>161571GC2</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td>120,164.06</td>
<td>120,286.80</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### First 5 Alameda County Combined Holdings Report as of September 30, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holder</th>
<th>Asset Name</th>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>No. of Shares</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Moody</th>
<th>S &amp; P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Chevron Corp</td>
<td>166764AA8</td>
<td>55,000.00</td>
<td>54,831.59</td>
<td>54,779.45</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa1 AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Chevron Corp</td>
<td>166764AA8</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>29,908.14</td>
<td>29,879.70</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa1 AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Chevron Corp</td>
<td>166764AA8</td>
<td>58,000.00</td>
<td>57,822.40</td>
<td>57,767.42</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa1 AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Chevron Corp</td>
<td>166764AA8</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>11,963.26</td>
<td>11,951.88</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa1 AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Chevron Corp - CUT</td>
<td>166764AA8</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>498,469.01</td>
<td>497,995.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds AA- Aa1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Costco Wholesale Corp</td>
<td>22160KAG0</td>
<td>105,000.00</td>
<td>104,889.75</td>
<td>104,505.45</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa3 A+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>CISCO Sys Inc</td>
<td>17275RAR3</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>60,285.40</td>
<td>60,752.40</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds A1 AA-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>CISCO Sys Inc</td>
<td>17275RAR3</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>60,285.40</td>
<td>60,752.40</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds A1 AA-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>CISCO Sys Inc</td>
<td>17275RAR3</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>60,285.40</td>
<td>60,752.40</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds A1 AA-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Colgate Pal - CUT</td>
<td>19416QDQ0</td>
<td>510,000.00</td>
<td>521,495.40</td>
<td>510,433.50</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds AA- Aa3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Ebay Inc</td>
<td>278642AB9</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>124,781.25</td>
<td>125,041.25</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds A2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>GECC</td>
<td>36962G7G3</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>203,130.00</td>
<td>203,414.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa2 AA-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>GECC</td>
<td>36962G7G3</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>203,130.00</td>
<td>203,414.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa2 AA-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Google Inc</td>
<td>38259PAC6</td>
<td>130,000.00</td>
<td>136,147.80</td>
<td>131,350.70</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa2 AA-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>HAROT</td>
<td>43814HAC2</td>
<td>105,000.00</td>
<td>104,979.75</td>
<td>104,869.80</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa2 AAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>HAROT</td>
<td>43814CAC3</td>
<td>42,779.45</td>
<td>42,777.21</td>
<td>42,769.61</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa2 AA-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>HAROT</td>
<td>43814GAC4</td>
<td>105,000.00</td>
<td>104,987.38</td>
<td>104,875.05</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa2 AA-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>HAROT</td>
<td>43813NAC0</td>
<td>145,000.00</td>
<td>144,977.74</td>
<td>144,892.70</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa2 AAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>HSBC</td>
<td>40428HPH9</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>200,536.00</td>
<td>199,432.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds A2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>IBM Corp</td>
<td>459200HK0</td>
<td>210,000.00</td>
<td>210,749.70</td>
<td>210,140.70</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds Aa3 A+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>IBM Corp - CUT</td>
<td>45900GX3</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>260,835.00</td>
<td>252,872.50</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds AAA Aaa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Intel Corp</td>
<td>458140AL4</td>
<td>190,000.00</td>
<td>190,566.45</td>
<td>189,659.90</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds A1 A+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>John Deere</td>
<td>24422ERL5</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td>124,813.20</td>
<td>121,702.80</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds A2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>John Deere - CUT</td>
<td>24422ESB6</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>497,170.00</td>
<td>499,100.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds A2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>JDOT ( John Deere ) Pass Through</td>
<td>477879AC4</td>
<td>36,405.53</td>
<td>36,400.58</td>
<td>36,423.37</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds A2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>JDOT ( John Deere ) Pass Through</td>
<td>477877AD6</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>59,984.33</td>
<td>60,047.40</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds A2 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder</td>
<td>Asset Name</td>
<td>CUSIP</td>
<td>No. of Shares</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>Investment Type</td>
<td>Moody</td>
<td>S &amp; P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>JDOT (John Deere) Pass Thru</td>
<td>477877AD6</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>49,986.95</td>
<td>50,039.50</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>JDOT (John Deere) Pass Thru</td>
<td>47787VAC5</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>149,975.97</td>
<td>149,968.50</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson - CUT</td>
<td>478160AY0</td>
<td>391,000.00</td>
<td>411,844.21</td>
<td>395,406.57</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Occidental Petroleum</td>
<td>674599CB9</td>
<td>155,000.00</td>
<td>158,693.65</td>
<td>156,345.40</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Oracle Corp</td>
<td>68389XAN5</td>
<td>210,000.00</td>
<td>208,631.60</td>
<td>210,352.80</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Oracle Corp - CUT</td>
<td>68389XANS5</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>496,741.90</td>
<td>500,840.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Pfizer</td>
<td>717081DG5</td>
<td>190,000.00</td>
<td>187,003.70</td>
<td>190,763.80</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Pfizer</td>
<td>717081DJ9</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>49,956.00</td>
<td>50,092.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>PraxAir</td>
<td>74005PBH6</td>
<td>165,000.00</td>
<td>162,404.55</td>
<td>163,452.30</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Qualcomm Inc</td>
<td>747525AD5</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td>158,228.00</td>
<td>159,596.80</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>TAOT (Toyota Pass Thru)</td>
<td>89231NAC7</td>
<td>2,586.65</td>
<td>2,586.40</td>
<td>2,586.65</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>TAOT (Toyota Pass Thru)</td>
<td>89231MAC9</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>109,979.67</td>
<td>109,913.10</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>TAOT MTR Cr Corp</td>
<td>89231TAB6</td>
<td>185,000.00</td>
<td>184,985.13</td>
<td>185,205.35</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>TAOT MTR Cr Corp</td>
<td>89231TCA1</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>39,945.20</td>
<td>40,046.80</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>TAOT MTR Cr Corp</td>
<td>89236WAC2</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td>119,981.86</td>
<td>119,988.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Toyota - CUT</td>
<td>89233PSS1</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>516,090.00</td>
<td>507,415.00</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>AA3</td>
<td>AA-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>United Tech Corp</td>
<td>913017BU2</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>14,987.10</td>
<td>15,180.15</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>Aa3</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>US Bancorp BDS</td>
<td>91159HHH6</td>
<td>95,000.00</td>
<td>95,156.87</td>
<td>96,527.60</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>US Bancorp BDS</td>
<td>91159HHH6</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>40,066.05</td>
<td>40,643.20</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>US Bancorp BDS</td>
<td>91159HHH6</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,033.03</td>
<td>20,321.60</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Walmart Stores Inc</td>
<td>931142DF7</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>109,989.80</td>
<td>109,915.30</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>Aa2</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>949748GF1</td>
<td>135,000.00</td>
<td>134,854.20</td>
<td>134,669.25</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>949748GF1</td>
<td>35,000.00</td>
<td>34,962.20</td>
<td>34,914.25</td>
<td>Corporate Bonds</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Bank of Tokyo Mitsubishi</td>
<td>06538CXT3</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
<td>259,740.00</td>
<td>259,961.00</td>
<td>Commercial Paper</td>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828A59</td>
<td>195,000.00</td>
<td>194,833.41</td>
<td>195,411.45</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828A59</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>149,871.85</td>
<td>150,316.50</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**First 5 Alameda County Combined Holdings Report as of September 30, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holder</th>
<th>Asset Name</th>
<th>CUSIP</th>
<th>No. of Shares</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Moody</th>
<th>S &amp; P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. T Notes - CUT</td>
<td>912828G20</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>500,546.88</td>
<td>501,770.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. T Notes - CUT</td>
<td>912828H37</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>501,640.63</td>
<td>501,340.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. T Notes - CUT</td>
<td>912828J68</td>
<td>400,000.00</td>
<td>400,718.75</td>
<td>402,076.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828L32</td>
<td>600,000.00</td>
<td>600,189.51</td>
<td>600,702.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa`</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828QP8</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>104,239.64</td>
<td>100,999.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa`</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828QP8</td>
<td>205,000.00</td>
<td>213,691.26</td>
<td>207,047.95</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa`</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828QA1</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>104,460.60</td>
<td>101,029.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TSY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828QA1</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>104,460.60</td>
<td>101,029.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828SC5</td>
<td>320,000.00</td>
<td>322,626.07</td>
<td>321,657.60</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828SH4</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td>158,964.48</td>
<td>161,643.20</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828SH4</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>99,352.80</td>
<td>101,027.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. T Notes - CUT</td>
<td>912828SJ0</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,004,062.50</td>
<td>1,005,180.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828ST8</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
<td>254,811.03</td>
<td>261,393.60</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828TG5</td>
<td>330,000.00</td>
<td>327,739.78</td>
<td>329,389.50</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828TM2</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
<td>258,507.90</td>
<td>259,989.60</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828UB4</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
<td>251,619.63</td>
<td>257,407.80</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828UQ1</td>
<td>325,000.00</td>
<td>322,030.38</td>
<td>324,346.75</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828UU2</td>
<td>310,000.00</td>
<td>305,036.19</td>
<td>309,556.70</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828VE7</td>
<td>260,000.00</td>
<td>254,922.75</td>
<td>260,951.60</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury Notes</td>
<td>912828VF4</td>
<td>320,000.00</td>
<td>316,388.57</td>
<td>320,576.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. T Notes - CUT</td>
<td>912828WH9</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>501,523.44</td>
<td>502,530.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>AAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>U.S. T Notes</td>
<td>912828XM7</td>
<td>600,000.00</td>
<td>606,798.89</td>
<td>607,326.00</td>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
<td>AA+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER</td>
<td>Federated Govt Oblig</td>
<td>60934N10S</td>
<td>41,503.15</td>
<td>41,503.15</td>
<td>41,503.15</td>
<td>Money Market</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total              | 30,773,645.49            | 30,808,986.02 |
July 14, 2015

Mr. Mark Rasiah
Controller
First 5 Alameda County
1115 Atlantic Avenue
Alameda, CA 94501

IMPORTANT: Cutwater Asset Management - Notice of Contract Termination

Dear Mr. Rasiah,

As you are aware, Cutwater Asset Management was recently acquired by BNY Mellon and is now operated by Insight Investment. Following the acquisition, detailed analysis was undertaken of each of the portfolios we manage to ensure alignment with our overall business model and this has resulted in some difficult decisions having to be made.

The service requirements and standards of care associated with managing a portfolio remain the same regardless of the size of the investment. There comes a point, therefore, where the size of the portfolio renders it impossible for our involvement to be commercially viable. That is the case with the portfolio we manage for First 5 Alameda County.

Please therefore accept this letter as formal notification that our contract with First 5 Alameda County will terminate effective September 30, 2015. We will continue to manage the portfolio through that date and your final monthly and quarterly reports will be delivered as of that date.

Acting as investment advisor for First 5 Alameda County has been our pleasure and privilege over the years and if we can assist you in any way during this transition, please let me know.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dave Witthohn,
Director

BNY MELLON
CUTWATER INVESTOR SERVICES CORP. | 1331 Seventeenth Street, Suite 602, Denver, CO 80202 | 888-637-2662 | www.cutwater.com
To: First 5 Alameda County Commission
From: Mark R Rasiah, Financial Controller
Date: December 10, 2015

REQUESTED ACTION

To review the Financial Report for the first three months of FY2015-16.

BACKGROUND

This narrative, and the attached statements, report Revenues and Expenses for the period July 1 – September 30, 2015. At the end of September, 25% of the fiscal year was complete. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect both total revenues and total expenses to be at or near 25% of budget projection, subject to timing lags. While this is the case with most of the budgeted items, material exceptions are noted below.

Revenue

As of September 30th, total first quarter revenue was $4.8m, or 23% of the revenue projection for the fiscal year. Of this amount:

- Tobacco Tax receipts of $3.6 million were in line with budget expectations for the first three months of the fiscal year and also were in line with prior year trends.
- As of September 30th, 30% of Inter-agency Income had been received; mainly from the QRIS Block Grant from the Alameda County Office of Education.
- The Federal Grants Budget represents the reimbursable amount from the Race To The Top Early Learning Challenge Grant, from the CA Department of Education. We have received 50% of the funds budgeted for the current fiscal year.
- Grant money of $1 million from the Thomas J. Long Foundation is expected later in the year. All funds from the Koshland Foundation were received in the quarter, bringing total grant income to 19% of budget.
• For FY 2015-16, Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA) reimbursements were budgeted at $0.9m. The reimbursement is based on expenditures incurred in FY 2014-15. While funds are usually expected later in the year, MAA reimbursements for the prior year have not been received as yet, due to prolonged short-staffing at the DHHS MAA unit. Apparently this situation has now been rectified and reimbursements are expected to flow by the end of December this year.

• Investment revenue of nearly $78,000 was received during the quarter, representing nearly 22% of conservative budget projections. The low interest rate climate in the country is the main cause of low investment yields.

• Sustainability funds from the First 5 Alameda County Sustainability Fund reserve will be used to bridge the gap between actual revenues and expenses at year-end, to the extent authorized by the Commission. None was needed in the first quarter of FY 2015-16.

Expenses

At $2.6m, total Expenditure for the quarter was 12% of the budgeted amount of $21.3m. This is nearly the same as the amount of expenditure incurred during the corresponding period in the prior year.

Most line item expenditures are tracking well within or close to 25% of budget. Grant payments to Community Grantees are made according to a schedule of payments. At the end of the first quarter 39% of scheduled payments had been made. Program operating costs were slightly lower than in the prior year.

At 27% of budget, Infrastructure costs are in line with the progression of the year. Costs from this budget category will be allocated to all programs at year-end to provide a more complete picture of actual program costs. Administration costs for the first quarter are under 10% of total expenditures.

Summary

Total revenues are very much in line with the progression of the fiscal year. Total Expenses on the other hand are relatively low, at this point in the fiscal year. This has been the case in previous years as well. However, most expense line items are expected to trend closer to budget projections as the year progresses.

Fiscal Impact

None.
REQUESTED ACTION

To approve the Financial Report for the first three months of FY2015-16.

Submitted by:      Reviewed by:

__________________________   _________________________
Mark R Rasiah ,     Janis Burger
Financial Controller     Chief Executive Officer
## First 5 Alameda County
### Budget Vs Actual Revenue
#### For the Period July 1, 2015 - Sep 30, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>% Received in Q1 This Year</th>
<th>% Received in Q1 Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prop 10 Tobacco Tax</strong></td>
<td>12,710,214</td>
<td>3,602,285</td>
<td>9,107,929</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interagency Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACBHCS Early Connections(SAMHSA)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(150,000)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACPHD Data Systems Hosting &amp; Mtce</td>
<td>43,452</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(43,452)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACSSA Parent Voices</td>
<td>178,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(178,200)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- AC Interagency Children's Policy Council</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- AC Office of Educ. (QRIS)</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>584,945</td>
<td>(315,055)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACHCSA - Fathers Corps.</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>(77,000)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACPHD HMG Linkage Line</td>
<td>343,065</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(343,065)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- First 5 California (HMG)</td>
<td>149,909</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(149,909)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- First 5 Contra Costa</td>
<td>144,691</td>
<td>33,194</td>
<td>(111,497)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Interagency Income</strong></td>
<td>2,039,317</td>
<td>621,139</td>
<td>(1,418,178)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal - Race To The Top</td>
<td>760,189</td>
<td>380,095</td>
<td>(380,094)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State - CARES PLUS</td>
<td>275,531</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(275,531)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private - Long Foundation</td>
<td>1,042,969</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,042,969)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Koshland Foundation</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Packard Foundation</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(110,000)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Oakland Education Fund(HMG)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Oakland Education Fund(QRIS)</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(110,000)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bay Area Council Foundation</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Grants</strong></td>
<td>2,538,689</td>
<td>480,095</td>
<td>(1,858,594)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Leveraging</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAA</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(900,000)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fiscal Leveraging</strong></td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(900,000)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Revenue</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>77,997</td>
<td>(272,003)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.Income</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>5,123</td>
<td>14,877</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>18,558,220</td>
<td>4,786,639</td>
<td>4,674,031</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserves</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Funds</td>
<td>2,741,780</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,741,780</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES &amp; AVAILABLE FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>21,300,000</td>
<td>4,786,639</td>
<td>7,415,811</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### First 5 Alameda County
### Budget vs Actual Expenditure by Category
### For the Period July 1, 2015 - Sep 30, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actuals</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>% Spent in Q1 This Year</th>
<th>% Spent in Q1 Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs</td>
<td>7,655,259</td>
<td>1,034,238</td>
<td>6,621,021</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>9,690,630</td>
<td>542,362</td>
<td>9,148,268</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Stipends</td>
<td>2,042,000</td>
<td>804,971</td>
<td>1,237,029</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services Contracts</td>
<td>618,500</td>
<td>4,766</td>
<td>613,734</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Operating Costs</td>
<td>604,491</td>
<td>65,201</td>
<td>539,290</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Costs</td>
<td>689,120</td>
<td>185,747</td>
<td>503,373</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>21,300,000</td>
<td>2,637,285</td>
<td>18,662,715</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: First 5 Alameda County Commission

From: Christine Hom, Contracts and Grants Administrator

Date: December 10, 2015

Subject: Contract Authorizations

REQUESTED ACTION

To review the following contract authorizations.

BACKGROUND

Per our Financial Policies, Section VII. Purchasing and Contracting, the Commission must approve contract/award amounts in excess of $50,000. The following awards require specific authorization from the Commission.

Chabot College - $25,000

First 5 Alameda County is requesting approval of a FY 2015-16 $25,000 contract amendment with Chabot College to support activities that enhance sustainability for the role of Professional Development Coordinator (PDC). Currently the PDC coordinates Teacher Pathways/Associate of Arts Learning Communities and provides advising and professional development services to the ECE community (2013-2017 Strategic Plan, page 9). Chabot College will fund a 50% FTE dedicated counselor through the Early Childhood Development program from January through June 2016 to be trained to perform the program activities of the current PDC to whom students can be referred to next academic year for ongoing support. Funding sustainability activities is necessary because the CARES Plus funding that currently supports this position is ending at the end of FY 2015-16. Chabot College currently has a FY 2015-16 $183,100 contract and the addition of this $25,000 amendment brings the total FY 2015-16 contract amount to $208,100 for which Commission approval is needed.

Fiscal Impact: Funding is budgeted and will be received from the First 5 CA CARES Plus grant that ends June 30, 2016.

Action requested: Approve a total FY 2015-16 contract amount of $208,100 for Chabot College.
**Las Positas College - $3,900**

First 5 Alameda County is requesting approval of a FY 2015-16 $3,900 contract amendment with Las Positas College to support activities to enhance sustainability for the role of Professional Development Coordinator (PDC). Currently the PDC coordinates Teacher Pathways/Associate of Arts Learning Communities and provides advising and professional development services to the ECE community (2013-2017 Strategic Plan, page 9). Las Positas College will provide training for three counselors and three faculty on the PDC’s program activities to ensure a smooth transition and sustainability of services in the next academic year. Funding sustainability activities is necessary because the CARES Plus funding that currently supports this position is ending at the end of FY 2015-16. Las Positas College currently has a FY 2015-16 $175,000 contract and the addition of $3,900 brings the total FY 2015-16 contract amount to $178,900 for which Commission approval is needed.

Fiscal Impact: Funding is budgeted and will be received from the First 5 CA CARES Plus grant that ends June 30, 2016.

**Action requested:** Approve a total FY 2015-16 contract amount of $178,900 for Las Positas College.

**Alameda County General Services Agency (AC GSA), Early Care and Education Planning Council - $31,013**

First 5 Alameda County is requesting approval of a FY 2015-16 $31,013 contract amendment with AC GSA to provide additional training and coaching support to CARES Plus providers and the ECE community (2013-2017 Strategic Plan, page 9). AC GSA will provide three additional Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) trainings and provide coaching sessions for participants enrolled in the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) beginner training series. Coaching will focus specifically on implementing the DRDP at the provider’s site. AC GSA currently has a FY 2014-16 $115,602 contract for this work and a FY 2015-16 $40,000 contract to engage local stakeholders in the planning, design and implementation of an Alameda County Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS). The addition of this FY 2015-16 $31,013 amendment to their FY 2014-16 contract brings the aggregate FY 2014-16 contract amount to $186,615 for which Commission approval is needed.

Fiscal Impact: Funding is budgeted and will be received from the First 5 CA CARES Plus grant that ends June 30, 2016.

**Action requested:** Approve an aggregate FY 2014-16 contract amount of $186,615 for Alameda County General Services Agency, Early Care and Education Planning Council.
**WestEd - $18,000**

First 5 Alameda County is requesting approval of a FY 2015-16 $18,000 sole source contract for WestEd to provide professional development support on the Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP) to ECE providers (2013-2017 Strategic Plan, page 9). WestEd will provide two 3-day series of trainings for approximately 60 ECE providers to begin using or improving their skills with the DRDP child assessment tool. WestEd currently has a FY 2015-16 $324,877 contract to provide valid and reliable CLASS and Environmental Rating System (ERS) assessments for early care and education programs participating in the Alameda County Quality Rating Improvement System and a FY 2015-16 $33,500 contract to provide training and support to Alameda County Center on the Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) authorized trainers and coaches so they are able to provide training and coaching to ECE sites. The addition of this FY 2015-16 $18,000 contract brings the aggregate FY 2015-16 contract amount to $376,377 for which Commission approval is needed.

Fiscal Impact: Funding is budgeted and will be received from the First 5 CA CARES Plus grant that ends June 30, 2016.

**Action requested:** Approve an aggregate FY 2015-16 contract amount of $376,377 for WestEd.

**Parent Voices Oakland - $17,667**

First 5 Alameda County is requesting approval of a FY 2015-16 $17,667 contract amendment with Parent Voices Oakland (PVO) to continue their work with the Alameda County Early Childhood Policy Committee (ACECPC) (FY 2013-2017 Strategic Plan, page 15). PVO currently has a FY 2015-16 $20,000 contract to plan, coordinate and implement the ACECPC, the Alameda County Spring Parent Forum and all parent recruitment and engagement activities related to these programs. Additional funding will be used to cover additional planning expenses for the Spring Parent Forum and operational expenses related to meetings and incentives for CBO participants. The addition of this $17,667 amendment brings the FY 2015-16 total contract amount to $37,667 and the aggregate FY 2014-16 contract amount to *$268,000 for which Commission approval is needed.

*F5AC had a FY 2014-16 $22,000 with PVO to provide additional coordination to the ACECPC (e.g. supporting a Parent ACECPC Co-Chair and Project Coordinator, coordinating Parent Forum event) funded in part by AC BHCS Early Connections and has a FY 2015-16 $208,333 contract funded by Alameda County Social Services Agency to support PVO with the CALWorks Roundtable Project.*

Fiscal Impact: Funding is budgeted; for the $17,667 contract amendment, the Alameda County Interagency Children’s Policy Council (ICPC) may be contributing $7,000 to PVO’s work however this will not be known until after December 11, 2015. Should ICPC be able to contribute this funding, the money will be contracted directly with PVO and the total contract amendment amount will be reduced to $10,667 (50% funded by Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services (AC BHCS) and the remaining 50% funded by F5AC). If funding is not received from ICPC, AC BHCS and F5AC will both contribute 50% each to the total requested amendment amount of $17,667.

**Action requested:** Approve an aggregate FY 2014-16 contract amount of $268,000 for Parent Voices Oakland.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve the above contract authorizations at their meeting on December 10, 2015.

Submitted by: Christine Hom
Contracts and Grants Administrator

Reviewed by: Janis Burger
Chief Executive Officer
To: First 5 Alameda County Commission

From: Janis Burger, CEO

Date: December 10, 2015

Subject: 2016 Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) Recommendation

ACTION REQUESTED

That the Commission review and discuss the recommendation for an employee Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) for 2016.

BACKGROUND

Per the Salary Guidelines approved by the Commission in May 2004 (most recently revised in December, 2013), it is the Commission’s decision to grant a COLA to employees. If awarded, COLAs are granted to all regular employees, both full and part-time, at the beginning of the calendar year. Typically, COLAs are implemented to ensure that employees’ wages do not lose real value due to increases in the costs of goods and services. Competitive salaries are an important recruitment and retention strategy; the ability to consider a COLA is particularly important for retention purposes considering that close to 2/3’s of our employees’ salaries are capped and, as a relatively small agency, promotional opportunities are limited.

Consumer Price Index (CPI)

The Bureau of Labor Statistics determined that the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the San Francisco – Oakland – San Jose metropolitan area has increased 2.6% over the last 12 months (October 2014 – October 2015) on a not seasonally adjusted basis according to their latest news release on November 17, 2015. This year’s increase was driven by higher increases in food costs (a 3.9% increase over the past year), while energy prices declined 12.9% over the year, due to lower prices for gasoline. For all prices less food and energy, prices increased 3.4%.

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact of granting a 2.6% COLA for the six month period of the current fiscal year and the first six months of the next fiscal year will be approximately $161,000, roughly $80,500 each fiscal year. Current year salary savings will allow us to absorb the impact on the 2015-16 budget, and we will incorporate the impact of the COLA into the budget for 2016-17.
RECOMMENDATION

That the Commission approve and grant a 2.6% employee Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) to take effect for the coming year of 2016.

Submitted by:  Reviewed by:

Janis Burger  Kristin Spanos
Chief Executive Officer  Chief Operating Officer
To: First 5 Alameda County Commission

From: Chris Hwang, Evaluation & Technology Senior Administrator

Date: December 10, 2015

Subject: FY 2014-15 First 5 Alameda County Local Annual Report

ACTION REQUESTED:

To review and approve the FY 2014-15 F5AC Local Annual Report.

BACKGROUND:

On an annual basis First 5 Alameda County produces an annual report reflecting accomplishments, outcomes and a financial summary of activities. The First 5 Local Annual Report for fiscal year 2014-15 (July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015) is prepared for review and approval by the Commission.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Commission approve the FY 2014-15 First 5 Alameda County Local Annual Report.

Submitted by: Reviewed by:

__________________________    _______________________________
Chris Hwang,     Janis Burger,
Evaluation & Technology              Chief Executive Officer
Senior Administrator

Senior Administrator
FIRST 5 ALAMEDA COUNTY ANNUAL REPORT

JULY 1, 2014 – JUNE 30, 2015
FIRST 5 ALAMEDA COUNTY, BY THE NUMBERS

DECEMBER 10, 2015 COMMISSION MEETING
FUNDING SOURCES

$18,079,000

(*FUNDING FROM INVESTMENTS ($315,526) MISC REVENUE ($42,669)

- Prop 10 Tax Revenue: 74%
- Sustainability Fund: 8%
- Grants & Partnership Funding: 16%
- Other*: 2%

$18,079,000

[*FUNDING FROM INVESTMENTS ($315,526) MISC REVENUE ($42,669)
YEAR 2 OF 4-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN

4 Desired Results
1. Parents/primary caregivers provide stable, supportive, and nurturing environments for children
2. Children are prepared for school through quality early experiences
3. Children reach their optimal developmental outcomes
4. A comprehensive, coordinated early childhood system is in place in Alameda County

9 Strategies
• Home Visiting/Family Support
• Healthy Child Development
• Quality Early Care & Education
• School Readiness
• Community Grants
• Place-Based
• Training@First5
• Policy, Advocacy & Communications
• Evaluation & Technology
RESULT 1

- Increased family connections to essential resources
- Increased family resilience & social connections
- Increased availability of community-based playgroups, parenting education and support groups
- Increased economic self sufficiency
- Increased understanding of child’s development and knowledge of available services
Families Served by Community Grantees

- Feeling more connected to their child: 76%
- Playing more with their child: 87%
- Increased confidence in parenting: 90%
- Improved social supports: 93%
- Increased positive parenting attitudes: 94%
RESULT 2

Prepared for School through Quality Early Learning Experiences

- Co-sponsored School Readiness Forum
- Quality Counts ratings of 93 ECE sites
- Provider trainings on CSEFEL to support social emotional development
1 to 3 Stars = Emerging Quality Sites
4 to 5 Stars = High Quality
Children Reach Their Optimal Developmental Outcomes

RESULT 3

- 1,945 calls (27% increase) to Help Me Grow phone Linkage Line
- 304 families participated in self-screening of child’s development (45% increase)
- Learn the Signs, Act Early at WIC sites
- Community-based Lactation Support for pregnant & new moms in East Oakland
## Developmental Screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Visiting Programs</th>
<th>Pediatric Sites</th>
<th>Developmental Screening Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>993 Screened</td>
<td>5,159 ASQs, 1,892 MCHATs</td>
<td>151 ASQs completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33% scored “of concern”</td>
<td>20% scored “of concern”</td>
<td>14% scored “of concern”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Community Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>437 ASQ screenings</th>
<th>302 ASQ-SE screenings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22% scored “of concern”</td>
<td>25% scored “of concern”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 children were referred, 98 received services</td>
<td>54 children referred, 42 received services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULT 4

• Implementation of Father-Friendly Principles
• Development of Home Visiting Common Outcomes
• Perinatal Hospital Outreach connecting expecting and new mothers using universal enrollment form
• Early Connections Family Partner integration into Behavioral Health Care Services
• Increased CEUs earned (1,441 units) through free trainings on core and emerging early childhood topics hosted by Training@First5
Fathers Corps Results
Implementing Father Friendly Principles

- Increased outreach to fathers: 58%
- Presented the Principles to their agency leadership: 58%
- Made father-friendly changes to the work environment: 31%
- Adopted the Principles at their agency: 25%
- Hired male staff: 23%
QUESTIONS

CHRIS HWANG, EVALUATION & TECHNOLOGY
Welcome to Our 2014–2015 Annual Report

I am pleased to present the FY 2014–2015 Annual Report covering the second year of our 2013–2017 Strategic Plan. The First 5 Alameda County Commissioners and staff, and the Alameda County early childhood community have worked passionately and collaboratively to provide high quality services to young children and their families in our county.

The Annual Report is organized around our 4 result areas and reflects services and supports from each of our strategies: Home Visiting/Family Support, Healthy Child Development, Quality Early Care & Education, School Readiness, Community Grants, Place Based, Trainings@First5, Policy and Evaluation.

As we reflect on the past year and move forward in our collaborative work, we continue to build on lessons learned. We have received additional State funding to expand our early care and education Quality Counts program with new partners, received funding from the Long Foundation to expand Help Me Grow with greater access to developmental screening and new program components and have expanded our place based approach in the Castlemont Corridor. We continue to focus on authentic parent engagement, Strengthening Families protective factors and Fatherhood supports. With Too Small to Fail, we have implemented a community strategy for the Talk, Read, Sing campaign.

In Partnership with the Alameda County Interagency Children’s Policy Council — Birth to 8 group and other partners we are building the foundation for an Early Childhood System so families and young children are better served and have access to community supports.

We have also worked with several Alameda County early childhood initiatives such as Oakland Starting Smart and Strong, Hayward Promise Neighborhood, Boys and Men of Color and other local efforts.

I hope you see your hard work reflected in our Annual Report. Please don’t hesitate to contact me or our staff at any time if you have questions or suggestions on how we can advance our community’s collective work to make sure that all children thrive and succeed.

Sincerely,

Janis Burger, CEO

www.First5Alameda.org
Financials

EXPENDITURES (IN THOUSANDS)

- Home Visiting & Family Support: $4,582
- Healthy Child Development: $2,045
- Quality Early Care & Education: $4,668
- School Readiness: $581
- Place-Based Initiatives: $369
- Grants for Community Support: $2,035
- Training: $429
- Evaluation & Technology: $1,007
- Policy, Advocacy & Communication: $763
- Administration: $1,600
- TOTAL EXPENDITURES: $18,079

Available Funds
July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015
(IN THOUSANDS)

Prop 10 Tax Revenue: $13,295
Grants & Partnership Funding: $2,896
Sustainability Fund: $1,530
Other*: $558

*FUNDING FROM INVESTMENTS ($315,526) AND MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE ($42,669)

OUR COMMISSIONERS

Pamela Simms-Mackey, Chair
Ricky Choi, Vice-Chair
Alex Briscoe
Wilma Chan
Lori Cox
Cecilia Echeverria
Renee Sutton Herzfeld
Helen Mendel
Deborah Roderick Stark

OUR FUNDERS

Interagency Children’s Policy Council
Alameda County
Behavioral Health Care Services
Alameda County
Health Care Services Agency
Alameda County Office of Education
Alameda County Public Health Department
Alameda County Social Services Agency
California Department of Education
California Department of Public Health
Cal State University East Bay Foundation
First 5 California
First 5 Contra Costa
Koshland Foundation
Morris Stulsaft Foundation
NORC, University of Chicago
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration: Project LAUNCH, Early Connections
The David and Lucile Packard Foundation
Thomas J. Long Foundation
US Department of Education
RESULT 1: Stable, supportive, and nurturing environments for children

Resilience and Social Connections
Home visiting programs and community agencies funded by F5AC help families build resilience, cope with adversity, and form closer ties with other families. Of the 1,594 parents screened for depression, 439 screened positive.

REFERRALS INCLUDED:
• 542 primary medical provider
• 349 mental health
• 295 housing or shelter
• 247 financial assistance

FAMILIES SERVED BY COMMUNITY GRANTEES REPORT:

- Feeling more connected to their child: 76%
- Playing more with their child: 87%
- Increased confidence in parenting: 90%
- Improved social supports: 93%
- Increased positive parenting attitudes: 94%

The group helped me feel sure of myself during my pregnancy and the first year of my baby's life. — Parent Survey

Child Development and Growth

PARENTING ENGAGEMENT
F5AC-funded parent-child playgroups and parenting education and support groups were offered at various locations like libraries, park and recreation centers, and community-based organizations.

- 1,466 parents and 1,627 children attended 1,154 parent-child activities
- 1,452 parents/caregivers attended 605 parenting education and support meetings
- 85% of parents surveyed reported increased understanding of child development/school readiness
- 82% reported increased understanding of how to support their child’s social-emotional development and how to advocate for their child’s needs

TALKING IS TEACHING: TALK, READ, SING CAMPAIGN
In 2014, Oakland became a flagship city for the Talking is Teaching: Talk, Read, Sing campaign. The campaign promotes everyday opportunities to support brain development for infants and toddlers. F5AC is partnering with Too Small To Fail, the Kenneth Rainin Foundation and the Bay Area Council to engage “Trusted Messengers” (doctors, teachers, early care and education providers, social workers, ministers, home visitors) in early childhood development.

We learn so much, and practice what we learn on a daily basis. — Parent Survey

For the Fall 2014 pilot, F5AC worked with community agencies to distribute 2,675 educational toolkits with simple early literacy tips; another 7,500 toolkits will be distributed in 2015–16
Help Me Grow’s phone line and in-person assistance connects families to resources like screenings, assessments, treatment and other supports. Through a contract with F5AC, Applied Survey Research conducted telephone surveys with 140 families who had received Help Me Grow services and found high overall satisfaction.

Parent Leadership and Neighborhood Involvement

F5AC supports the coordination of services at Room to Bloom, a family resource center in East Oakland. Room to Bloom served 112 families through programs funded by F5AC, Alameda County Public Health’s Best Babies Zone, Oakland Fund for Children and Youth, and the David and Lucile Packard, Tipping Point, and Rainin foundations. A Parent Advisory Committee helped to select the programs, many of which were parent-led, including a nutrition art class and a Daughters Without Dads group.

- 54 parents attended three 6-week Parent Cafes; 57% attended all 6 weeks of the session.
- 23 parents received leadership training at Room to Bloom and elsewhere in Oakland

Economic Self-Sufficiency

Home visiting programs and community agencies funded by F5AC help families connect to community resources and work toward educational and employment goals.

- 78% of surveyed parents reported increased use of community resources
- 71% of teen parents served by home visiting programs graduated or remained in school

An African American mother of 2 children... completed the parent leadership program... Fired up by the data she learned [during the program]... [she]... decided to do everything in her power... to make sure the district... [began] allocating the necessary resources... She is now the School Site Council Vice-chair... and was elected to... [the] School District’s Parent Advisory Committee for the Local Control Accountability Plan.

— Grantee Report

I really appreciate the community aspect, everyone really supports one another.

— Room to Bloom Parent Survey

‘Lucy,’ a single mother [living in a shelter]... had been offered a job but [was unable]... to accept the position as she did not have child care for her one year old son. ‘Lucy’... felt hopeless... [about being able to obtain housing] without increasing her income ... Staff networked with local service providers and linked ‘Lucy’ with a [child care] provider that not only offered extended hours but also provided transportation to and from their center. ‘Lucy’ was able to start her new job.

— Grantee report
RESULT 2: CHILDREN ARE PREPARED FOR SCHOOL THROUGH QUALITY EARLY EXPERIENCES

School Readiness

SCHOOL READINESS POLICY FORUM

In November 2014, a school readiness forum co-sponsored by F5AC and the Interagency Children’s Policy Council brought together over 100 stakeholders from school districts, community-based organizations, foundations and policy makers to:

• Create a common definition of kindergarten readiness
• Reflect on county school readiness data
• Build school readiness collaborations and partnerships
• Advocate for sustainable funding, such as Local Control Funding Formula, to continue Summer Pre-K and other quality ECE programs

Quality Early Childhood Education

A quality rating and improvement system (QRIS) is a system that rates the quality of early care and education programs, shares that information with parents, and uses the rating to improve quality for those programs. Participation in the state Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant has allowed Bay Area First 5s to develop a QRIS that is aligned with the state of California’s “Quality Continuum Framework.”

QUALITY IS MEASURED IN THREE CORE AREAS:

• Child development and readiness for school
• Teachers and teaching
• Program and environment quality

This effort has strengthened relationships with the Alameda County Local Planning Council, child care Resource and Referral agencies and the Alameda County Office of Education.

As a result of her QRIS participation, a Spanish-speaking family child care provider began using books, songs and visual props to teach skills about expressing feelings and making daily transitions. She also began using the Help Me Grow Developmental Screening program. She has since reported a decrease in challenging behavior and has found it easier to help children engage in learning activities. Her child care moved from a 2 to a 3 star rating.

93 sites in Alameda County have been rated and participate in quality improvement activities.

On a 1 to 5 Star Rating Scale (5 is the highest level of quality)

5 SITES

33 SITES

28 SITES

27 SITES

1 TO 3 STARS - “EMERGING QUALITY SITES”
4 TO 5 STARS - “HIGH QUALITY”
Quality Early Care and Education (ECE) Provider Capacity Building

With F5AC funding, 3 Alameda County Resource and Referral agencies provided almost 100 trainings reaching 972 ECE providers. The trainings align with the California Quality Continuum Framework’s pathways to quality early care and education and include Developmental Screening, Concept Development in the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), the Desired Results Developmental Profile 101, How to Build a Curriculum, Preschool Expulsion, and Loss, Trauma and Young Children.

- Las Positas, Merritt and Chabot Colleges awarded 49 educational stipends to ECE providers
- 190 ECE providers obtained new, first time child development permits and 91 upgraded their permits
- Bay Area First 5s convened 100 higher education experts to support the integration of QRIS concepts and tools into teacher preparation curriculum at local colleges

Research shows that educators who receive mental health consultation feel more equipped to manage challenging behaviors in classrooms. Using the National Resource Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) Pyramid Model, F5AC trained and certified 11 coaches who train providers in social emotional development and school readiness.

Public Libraries and Recreation Systems Expand Early Learning Opportunities

Libraries and recreation centers are “hubs” for families who may not have other connections to preschool or social service programs. Since 2010, F5AC’s Neighborhood Partnership grants program has consulted on family friendly spaces, trained staff on family engagement and age-specific programming, and funded parent-child playgroups, storytimes, and parenting education at these neighborhood-based institutions.

Current grantees are serving Spanish-speaking families who do not have access to affordable Spanish or bilingual-language preschool programs and have not enrolled their children in licensed child care or preschool.

- 634 children and 563 parents/caregivers attended primarily bilingual Spanish-English school readiness programming
- 26 staff participated in training, peer support or agency-specific consultation

INTEGRATION OF SUMMER PRE-K CAMPS INTO SCHOOL DISTRICT PROGRAMMING

To support the transition to kindergarten for children not in licensed child care, F5AC piloted 6-week summer Pre-K programs (SPKs) in the Oakland and Hayward school districts during the summers of 2001 and 2002. F5AC subsequently expanded the number of SPK sites, with funding from The Thomas J. Long Foundation. Now, 8 of our 11 school district partners are sustaining SPK programming.
Extending “Baby Friendly” Approaches to Prenatal Care

While research shows that breastfeeding education results in the most success when provided prenatally, it typically happens after the baby is born. In partnership with WIC, the Alameda County Baby Friendly Perinatal Breastfeeding Education pilot supports two community health centers and their birthing hospitals through provider training and health promotion, with support from F5AC.

To support messages about initiation, exclusivity and duration of breastfeeding, clinicians were given an educational guide to use with families.

Community-based Lactation Support

F5AC funded the Lactation Café at Room to Bloom to support African American and teen mothers. Twelve mothers and 2 fathers met to discuss breastfeeding with a lactation consultant.

F5AC helped the African American Breastfeeding Task Force and Alameda County Public Health Department secure 2 years of funding from the National Association of County and City Health Officials.

- A breastfeeding curriculum aligned with Black Infant Health and the Loving Support Peer Counselor training was developed
- 20 hours of the Loving Support Peer Counselor training was provided for 12 African American counselors; 3 of the new counselors are now East Oakland Health Center “Breast Friends-East” staff
- 30 community health workers were trained to facilitate breastfeeding support groups
- Fathers Corps will be linked with resources on breastfeeding

Help Me Grow Phone Line Reaches More Children and Families

Help Me Grow (HMG) Alameda County is a cross-sector collaboration that serves children at risk of developmental concerns and helps families connect with services and supports. HMG celebrated its 5th anniversary in 2014, and saw a 27% increase from 2013–14 with 1,945 calls and referrals to the HMG phone line.

100% OF 14 MOTHERS from a participating clinic agreed that “The doctor or midwife at the clinic provided me with information about the importance of breastfeeding and encouraged me to fully breastfeed in the hospital” AND “The materials the clinic offered about breastfeeding were helpful and easy to understand.”

M had a hard time with breastfeeding due to an emergency C-section. At the... Lactation Café, M received... support from the lactation consultant and the baby latched... and fed on both breasts for about 30 minutes. M... said she was confident that she can put her baby to breast now.

— Report about a Lactation Café participant
Increased Developmental Screening in the County

FSAC-funded programs continue to emphasize developmental screenings in pediatric offices, home visiting, early care and education and community settings, and the number of completed screenings continues to increase. Help Me Grow’s Developmental Screening Program (DSP) gives free access to all parents and caregivers with children 0–5 years in the county. The Ages and Stages Questionnaires (ASQ-3) is available in English, Spanish, or Chinese. HMG staff score screenings and mail the results with age appropriate activities. If a child’s scores warrant a referral, the child is automatically connected to the HMG phone line. This year, DSP enrolled 304 children, a 45% increase over the number enrolled the previous year; 151 completed at least one screening.

Linking Families to Child Development Resources

ASR’s 2013 Alameda County school readiness study found that:

- 5% of kindergarteners had a diagnosed special need
- 7% were suspected to have a special need, but had not been diagnosed
- The average age of diagnosis was almost 3 years old

**IDENTIFYING CHILDREN EARLY IS A MAJOR OBJECTIVE OF HMG**

- 42% of the children referred to HMG were younger than 2
- HMG referrals came most frequently for communication concerns
- 70% of families referred to the HMG phone line were connected to at least one service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SCREENINGS</th>
<th>PERCENT SCORING ‘OF CONCERN’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Visiting Programs</td>
<td>993 (ASQ)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric Sites</td>
<td>5,159 (ASQ)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,892 (MCHAT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Programs</td>
<td>437 (ASQ)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>302 (ASQ-SE)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSP</td>
<td>151 (ASQ)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“LEARN THE SIGNS, ACT EARLY” AT WIC SITES

Local WIC programs and HMG partnered to support healthy development by implementing a program that uses the U.S. Centers for Disease Control’s “Learn the Signs, Act Early” materials with WIC families. WIC nutrition counselors distributed developmental checklists in English and Spanish to parents with children from 2 months to 5 years of age. The checklists highlight developmental milestones and provide a quick check on a child’s development, promoting developmental screening when appropriate.

- 3 Alameda County Public Health WIC sites in East Oakland, North Oakland, and Hayward participated this year, with additional WIC sites to be added in 2015–16
- 214 children were referred to the HMG phone line from WIC offices
RESULT 4: A COMPREHENSIVE, COORDINATED EARLY CHILDHOOD SYSTEM IN ALAMEDA COUNTY

Common Outcomes Framework for Home Visiting Programs

With support from F5AC and the Alameda County Public Health Department, Applied Survey Research reviewed Alameda County home visiting data collection tools and protocols to identify opportunities for better alignment across the 12 programs.

Coordination, Integration and Linkages Across Early Childhood Systems

SINGLE POINT OF ENTRY FOR HOME VISITING

F5AC’s Perinatal Hospital Outreach Coordinators (PHOCs) serve a key role in connecting women to the 12 home visiting programs managed by the Alameda County Public Health Department. Using a universal intake form, PHOCs enrolled 1,105 women through 30 agencies — including hospitals, clinics, WIC offices, and schools — and made 1,227 referrals.

FAMILY PARTNER MODEL FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

In 2009, the United States Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) funded the Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services Agency’s Early Connections. The initiative provided training, implementation and the

“I have a much greater sense of the needs of a wide range of men who are fathers and what they need to be engaged in their children’s lives.”

— Fathers Corps Participant Survey

The Fathers Corps encourages agencies serving families in the county to adopt and implement a set of Father Friendly Principles (FFP).

FATHERS CORPS RESULTS IMPLEMENTING FATHER FRIENDLY PRINCIPLES

- Increased outreach to fathers: 58%
- Presented the Principles to their agency leadership: 58%
- Made father-friendly facility changes: 31%
- Adopted the Principles at their agency: 27%
- Hired male staff: 23%

FATHER ENGAGEMENT AND FATHER-FRIENDLY SERVICES

The Fathers Corps, a learning community for male service providers, completed its second year, with 50 providers participating from 25 agencies. 93% of participants reported that the Fathers Corps helped them to be a more knowledgeable, skillful or engaged provider/supervisor, and 96% reported having a stronger commitment to advocating on behalf of male caregivers. Fathers Corps members reported a stronger connection to other male providers, more knowledge of community resources, and better understanding of public systems like child support and social services.
Sharing Lessons Learned

In September 2014, 34 providers attended a Parenting Education Curricula symposium to discuss the selection, implementation and evaluation of parenting curricula (e.g., Triple P, Make Parenting a Pleasure, Leaders for Change).

This past year, F5AC participated in 2 Learning Labs with the Early Childhood Learning and Innovation Network for Communities (EC LINC), sponsored by the Center for the Study of Social Policy. One was focused on Systems Change Evaluation and the other on Toxic Stress. Based on this work, two EC LINC briefs are being developed to share insights with others in the field.

Increased Awareness of and Focus on Early Childhood

In June 2015, F5AC exhibited posters at the American Library Association on partnerships with libraries and recreation centers to support school readiness.

"First 5 Alameda County’s extensive free training opportunities, including the Touchpoints series, are a vital service for the early childhood community and results in high quality care for children 0–5.” — Dr. T. Berry Brazelton
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A Better Way  
Abode Services  
Alameda County General Services Agency  
    Local Child Care Planning Council  
Alameda County  
    Health Care Services Agency  
Alameda County Library  
Alameda County Medical Center  
Alameda County Public Health Department  
Alta Bates Summit Foundation  
Andrea Youngdahl  
Ann Martin Center  
Applied Survey Research  
Asian Community Mental Health Services  
Asian Health Services  
BANANAS, Inc.  
Barbara Stroud, Ph.D.  
Bay Area Council Foundation  
Bay Area Hispanic Institute for Advancement, Inc. (BAHIA)/Centro VIDA  
Bay Area Parent Leadership Action Network (PLAN)  
Berkeley Unified School District  
Better World Advertising  
Brandi Howard  
Bright Research Group  
Brighter Beginnings  
CALICO Center (Child Abuse, Listening, Interviewing and Coordination Center)  
California State University East Bay  
Castlemont Community Transformation School  
Castro Valley Unified School District  
CEID  
Center for Digital Storytelling  
Chabot College  
Child Care Links  
City of Fremont, Youth and Family Services  
City Of Oakland — Office Of Parks And Recreation  
City of Pleasanton  
City Slicker Farms  
Community Child Care Council (4C’s) of Alameda County  
Community Initiatives (BANDTEC)  
Consulting for Community  
David B. Nelson  
Deborah Bremond, Ph.D.  
East Bay Agency for Children  
ESL International  
Family Emergency Shelter Coalition (FESCO)  
Family Resource Network  
First 5 San Mateo County  
Focali Consulting  
Fred Finch Youth Center  
Fremont Unified School District  
Habitot Children’s Museum  
Harder + Company Community Research  
Hayward Area Recreation And Park District  
Hayward Unified School District  
Health Reach  
International Contact  
Jewish Family & Children’s Services of the East Bay  
Jme McLean  
Kadija Johnston, L.C.S.W.  
La Clinica De La Raza  
LARPD Preschool Programs  
Las Positas Community College  
Lawrence Hall Of Science  
Leadership That Works  
Lighthouse Community Charter School  
Lincoln Child Center  
Livermore Valley Joint Union School District  
Lotus Bloom Child & Family Resource Center  
Loved Twice  
Low Income Investment Fund  
Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital  
Marti Roach Consulting  
Mary Claire Heffron  
Melinda Martin  
Merritt College  
Mills College  
Mujeres Unidas y Activas  
Nadine Greiner, Ph.D.  
Nadirah Stills, MFT  
National Federation of Families for Mental Health  
New Haven Unified School District  
Newark Unified School District  
NonProfit Technologies, Inc. (David Robbins Consulting)  
Oakland Parents Together  
Oakland Unified School District  
Ohlone Community College District  
Our Family Coalition  
Parent Voices  
Patel & Associates  
Patton/University NOW  
Prevent Blindness Northern California  
Public Consulting Group, Inc.  
Quentisha Davis  
Raising A Reader, San Francisco and Alameda Counties  
Randi Wolfe  
Regents of the University of California  
Remcho, Johansen & Purcell, LLP  
Resource Development Associates  
Rona Renner  
Ruby’s Place (formerly known as Emergency Shelter Program)  
San Leandro Public Library  
San Leandro Unified School District  
Social Interest Solutions  
Sutherland-Edwards  
Through the Looking Glass  
Tibetan Association of Northern California  
Tiburcio Vasquez Health Center  
Tri-Valley Haven for Women  
United Way  
UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospital & Research Center at Oakland  
VIVA Strategy + Communications  
WestEd Center for Child and Family Studies  
Wiley, Price & Radulovich, LLP  
Xantrion

EVALUATION REPORTS COMPLETED IN 2014–15

School Readiness Assessment of Hayward Unified School District  
    Home Visiting Program Evaluation, Part 2  
Help Me Grow Family Survey  
Fathers Corps — One Year Overview  
Early Connections — Family Partner Evaluation  
Quality Counts — Databook  

This Annual Report and Evaluation Reports can be found at www.First5Alameda.org
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