

**CITY OF OAKLAND**  
*Agenda Report*

FILED  
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK  
OAKLAND

2007 NOV 15 PM 7:22

To: Council President Ignacio De La Fuente  
Chairperson, Rules and Legislation Committee  
From: Lupe Schoenberger, Rules Committee Legislative Analyst  
Date: November 29, 2007  
Re: A Report Regarding a Professional Services Evaluation of the City's State  
Lobbyist Contractor

**SUMMARY**

On November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008, the Rules Committee requested an evaluation of Townsend Public Affairs (TPA), the City's contractor for state lobbying services. A survey form was distributed to the City Council, Office of the Mayor and City staff that interacted with Townsend during the 2007 state legislative year.

The overall performance was ranked based on 1) superior, 2) good, 3) average or 4) poor performance. The surveys rendered a "Good" overall performance rating for TPA

**KEY ISSUES AND IMPACTS**

A survey form was developed to rate various performance standards and strengths related to the lobbyist's work on Oakland's legislative agenda. The survey was distributed to the City Council, Office of the Mayor and City staff that interacted with the lobbyist during the 2007 state legislative year.

The performance standards listed below were rated on the following scale:  
1) Exceeded Expectations, 2) Met Expectations, 3) Did Not Meet Expectations.

Effectiveness:

How effective was the lobbyist at achieving the desired legislative or funding outcome?  
*Rating: Met Expectations*

Effort:

Was there a sufficient amount of time and importance placed on the issue/legislation including prompt reporting of legislative activities?  
*Rating: Met Expectations*

Quality

Did the quality of the lobbyist's work, accuracy of strategic advice and assessment of the legislative situation meet expectations?  
*Rating: Met Expectations*

Timeliness:

Did the lobbyist's management of the timing of events meet expectations?

Rating: *Exceeded Expectations*

Communications

Did the lobbyist's responses to inquiries, regular reporting and availability meet expectations?

Rating: *Met Expectations*

The strengths listed below were rated using the following scale:

1) Superior, 2) Good, 3) Average, 4) Poor.

Skills:

Rate the lobbyist's strategic planning, written and verbal skills.

Rating: *Good*

Knowledge:

Rate the lobbyist's knowledge of the legislative process, issues and key players.

Rating: *Good*

Contacts:

Rate the lobbyist's contacts with key committee members, leadership and the value of the lobbyist's contacts with allies.

Rating: *Good*

Capacity:

Has the lobbyist's client load affected the ability to deliver on issues or posed a conflict of interest?

*Some of TPA's clients may have conflicting priorities with the City of Oakland.*

"Overall Rating": Good

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Rules Committee is requested to accept the TPA evaluation and report.

Respectfully submitted,



Lupe Schoenberger  
Rules Committee Legislative Analyst