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Introduction

• Richard Berkson, Berkson Associates (BA) hired by Alameda LAFCo to prepare a Special Study of ETHD

• Over 30 years of experience on a range of LAFCo-related projects around the State

• Experience includes special studies, including healthcare districts:
  — Mt.Diablo HCD, WCCHD for Contra Costa LAFCO
Purpose of the Special Study

- Objective, independent review of ETHD governance, services and funding
- Prepare findings to provide direction to LAFCo, other affected jurisdictions and decision-makers, the public, and ETHD
- The Study describes and compares the status quo, dissolution, and other governance options
Approach to the Special Study

- The Special Study is based on a review of background documents and information
- Interviews with key stakeholders: Cities of Hayward, San Leandro; County of Alameda; ETHD
- Public input at Workshops, LAFCo hearings, comments on draft report

What the Special Study is NOT

- This is not a formal accounting audit
- Special Study is not an independent assessment of health care needs in the community
- The Study does not evaluate whether ETHD assets should be invested in preventative care or in specific health care facilities.
About the District

- 400,000 residents: most of San Leandro, Hayward, parts of Dublin, Oakland, & Union City. Unincorporated population about 40%
- Formed in 1948 to build hospital (EMC), sold to Sutter in 1997 for $80 million (inc. Laurel Grove Hospital)
- Revenues largely lease revenues from medical buildings acquired with EMC sale proceeds; ETHD no longer collects property taxes

Healthcare Districts

- 30 out of 78 healthcare districts no longer operate hospitals
- Increasing healthcare costs, declining reimbursements, seismic upgrade requirements for hospitals, outpatient treatment, and industry consolidation are contributing factors
- Changes in State law allowed Hospital Districts to continue to provide other, non-hospital healthcare services
Healthcare Districts (cont’d)

- Other HCDs own/lease buildings or operate clinics, but it is uncommon for lease revenues to account for nearly all revenue
- Other HCDs continue to collect property taxes; ETHD receives no property taxes

Overview of ETHD Operations

- ETHD is a “hybrid” of a commercial real estate enterprise, managed by non-profit healthcare district
- $3.4 mill. in cash operating expenses required to generate $2.8 mill. net operating revenue from real estate
- Without the commercial revenues, potential funding for healthcare by ETHD would be less
- “Services” are largely “indirect”, i.e., grants to other agencies that provide services directly to the public
ETHD Funding

- Medical buildings generate $2.8 million net cash flow, or $2.2 million after debt service
- ETHD funds about $500k-$600k annually in grants and sponsorships, leaving $1.6 mill. for other purposes
- No significant increase in grant funding likely over next 8 years due to Sutter obligation
- ETHD required to pay Sutter ~ $2 mill./yr. for next 8 years for legal judgment

---

ETHD Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Estate Activities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$5,577,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Expenditures</td>
<td>(2,627,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Admin/OH</td>
<td>(755,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,195,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education, Grants</td>
<td>($574,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Admin/OH</td>
<td>(90,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>($679,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District revenues (interest)</td>
<td>$133,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET CASH FLOW** $1,649,000
**ETHD OVERHEAD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures (exc. Admin/OH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Expenditures</td>
<td>($2,832,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cash Expenditures</td>
<td>(2,484,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures (exc. Admin/OH, int.)</td>
<td>($5,316,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Admin/OH</td>
<td>(845,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as % of Total Expenditures</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Findings**

- Dissolution of ETHD without continuing its services is unwarranted
  - District provides significant expenditures for healthcare
  - Ongoing $500k-$600k annual grants & sponsorships (amount may vary over time)
  - Grants/sponsorships generally consistent with healthcare assessments and needs for preventative services (coordination could be improved)
  - Dissolution/sale of buildings would reduce healthcare funding
Summary of Findings (cont’d)

• Dissolution of ETHD without continuing its services is unwarranted (cont’d)
  – Expenditures for admin/overhead not excessive (about 16%)
  – The District is accountable for its financial resources and decision process
  – Limited public awareness, but 18% of 21% familiar with ETHD (and having an opinion) were favorable

Summary of Findings (cont’d)

• The ETHD could improve its efficiency and effectiveness
  – Update Strategic Plan at least annually, quantified where possible w/specific actions and timeline, and integrated with budget priorities
  – Long-term forecast and CIP important, and a descriptive budget with past accomplishments, future goals
  – Real estate risk analysis, esp. w/respect to expansion of facilities (inc. outside of District)
  – Improve public outreach and coordination w/other agencies (inc. County) and healthcare providers
Summary of Findings (cont’d)

- The ETHD could improve its efficiency and effectiveness (cont’d)
  - Pursue transparency certification
  - Track allocations to real estate vs. community services
  - Augment current budget with cash forecast that includes capital improvements (based on condition assessment) and Sutter payments
  - Depreciation and non-cash expenses complicate budget (keep separate for budgeting purposes)

Governance Options

- As previously noted, dissolution without continuation of services is not recommended
- Dissolution and naming a successor to continue services could reduce costs, improve decisions
  - Dissolution/transfer assets to non-profit
  - Dissolution/transfer assets to County, city JPA
  - Dissolution/transfer assets to a new CSA
Status Quo

- No change in organization
- ETHD could improve operations various ways
- LAFCo could revise SOI to encourage more rational boundaries
- No significant increase likely of current $500k-$600k/yr grants over next 8 years
- Possible need to use reserves/investments for Sutter payments, capital improvements
- $1.5 mill. to $2 mill. available for additional health care services after 8 years

Dissolution/Transfer to Non-Profit

- ETHD has considered creation of a non-profit
- Initial costs for formation/transfer
- Board membership could include ETHD, cities, County, other agency or public members
- No ongoing election costs or other costs required of public agencies
- ETHD anticipates continued ownership and operation of medical office buildings
Dissolution/Transfer to JPA

- Provides ongoing public agency operation
- Representation could include County and cities
- Overhead and administration, as well as planning, could benefit from existing functions of JPA members
- JPA not likely to operate medical office buildings, investment returns probably less than Status Quo

Dissolution/Transfer to CSA

- County operation and services to a boundary corresponding to ETHD w/city & voter approval
- Overhead and administration, as well as planning, could benefit from existing County functions including grant management
- Advisory body could include cities, public and other health care agencies
- CSA not likely to operate medical office buildings, investment returns probably less than Status Quo
Summary of Options

- Dissolution and transfer of assets could reduce OH/admin costs
  - Eliminate election costs (e.g., $200,000/two yrs)
  - Legal and PR costs related to litigation, legislation and negative perceptions likely to be reduced
  - Possible contracting for shared admin services, e.g., accounting, grant management, with County (allowing more focus on revenue-generating activities)

Summary of Options (cont’d)

- Representation and inter-agency coordination could be improved if successor includes city, County representatives
- Successor could determine priorities for allocating funding to hospitals vs. other purposes
- Amount of funding for healthcare depends on continuation of real estate operations vs. liquidation and investment
Comparison of Potential Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Net Asset Value</td>
<td>$31 mil.</td>
<td>$31 mil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less) Payoff of Sutter Obligation</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>($13.8 mil.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Value</td>
<td>$31 mil.</td>
<td>$17.2 mil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Rates of Return</td>
<td>1% to 2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Annual Funds for Health Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-Term (Yrs 1-8)</td>
<td>$500k-$600k</td>
<td>$170k-$340k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer Term (&gt;8 yrs)</td>
<td>&gt;$2 mil.</td>
<td>same as above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings (cont’d)

- LAFCo may control creation of a new entity (eg, a CSA, subject to city and voter approval), and may control certain terms of other reorganizations:
  - Voter approval (if not otherwise required by law)
  - Transfer or disposition of assets
  - Limits on commercial real estate holdings/operations
  - Dedication of assets, revenues to healthcare purposes
  - Representation on new Board and/or advisory body
Summary of Findings (cont’d)

- No other viable organizational options identified
  - Consolidation, e.g., with Washington Township Healthcare District not acceptable to that district
  - Subsidiary district would significantly reduce boundaries and residents served, and potential legal issues constrain its viability

Summary of Findings - SOI

- LAFCo should consider amending ETHD’s current SOI (unless a zero SOI is applied, signaling dissolution)
  - Eliminate city areas with minimal or no residents
- SOI revisions would encourage future boundary changes to rationalize boundaries, and potentially facilitate future reorganization changes (i.e., reduce number of required city approvals for a new CSA)