

SCHEDULE L-1 CITY OF OAKLAND CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

| Consultant Name & Address: Lake Merritt Institute | |
|---|--|
| 568 Bellevue Avenue, Oakland, CA 94611 | |
| ype of Services/Work Provided: Professional Services | |
| Project Complexity (Standard or Difficult): | |
| Consultant Lead Project Manager: James Robinson | |
| Project Name: Clean Lake Contract | |
| City Project No:1001514 | |
| Final Value of Consultant Contract: \$780,000 | |
| Ouration of Consultant Contract (Start & end dates): 7/1/2019 - 6/30/2023 | |
| Final Value of Construction Contract: | |
| City Construction Resident Engineer (with phone #): | |
| Date of Evaluation: 3/22/2023 | |
| | |
| City Project Manager/Evaluator (with phone #): Mark Arniola, (510) 238-7371 | |
| Reviewed and Approved By (with phone #): | |

Ratings Guidelines:

- Poor Work required extensive revisions, included numerous & significant errors; consultant was unable or unwilling to perform consistently, required an inordinate amount of supervision, and/or failed to meet professional standards/project objectives.
- Needs to Improve Performance was marginal; work required more review and included more errors than would normally be anticipated; level of service or expertise below average.
- Average Performance and work were satisfactory; services provided were at least of industry standard; no significant errors or problems; professional service objectives met.
- Excellent Performance was clearly above standard; expectations exceeded; objectives were met with an added level of service and/or with a higher level of professional expertise.

Please rate the Consultant on the following topics by checking the appropriate box:

| QUESTIONS | <u>Poor</u> | Needs to Improve | <u>Average</u> | Excellent | Not <u>Applicable</u> |
|--|-------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| 1. Quality of Design/Work | | | | X | |
| 2. Ability to meet the Project Objectives | | | | X | |
| 3. Knowledge, Expertise, and State- of –the Art Technologies | | | | X | |
| 4. Innovation of Design/Work | | | Х | | |
| 5. Thoroughness of Design/Work | | | | X | |
| 6. Quality Control of Work | | | | X | |
| 7. Ability to React and Respond to Problems/Issues | | | | X | |
| 8. Ability to Maintain to the Project Schedule and to Time Commitments | | | | X | |
| 9. Ability to Maintain to the Project Budget | | | | Х | |
| 10. Accuracy of Cost Estimating | | | | X | |
| 11. Constructibility of the Design/Work | | | | | X |
| 12. Quality of Construction Support Services | | | | | X |
| 13. Accuracy and Timeliness of Billings and other Documents | | | | Х | |
| 14. Sufficient and Appropriate Staffing of the Project by the Consultant | | | | x | |
| 15. Ability to Manage and Coordinate Sub-Consultants | | | Х | | |

| QUESTIONS | <u>Poor</u> | Needs to Improve | <u>Average</u> | Excellent | Not <u>Applicable</u> | |
|---|--------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----|
| 16. Ability and Ease of Communicating with City Staff | | | | Х | | |
| 17. Ability to Communicate with the Community and to Make Presentations | | | | X | | |
| 18. Willingness, Flexibility, and Attitude in Working with the City | | | | x | | |
| 19. Ability to Follow City Directives (i.e. Architectural Design Concept, other Requirements, etc.) | | | | x | | |
| OVERALL RATING | | | | X | | |
| Additional Comments (attach additional longtime contractor since 2013. Lake | | • , | | | | p, |
| maintenance, monitoring, volunteer co | oordination, | technical assista | ance, and pub | olic outreach s | services related to | |
| Lake Merritt. The services provided b | y the Lake N | /lerritt Institute h | ave helped th | e City to com | ply with state and | |
| federal regulations related to trash ar | nd low disso | lved oxygen wh | ich impacts th | ne quality of a | aquatic life in | |
| the lake. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Note: The Project Coordinator/Manager shall complete this evaluation form for each primary consultant within 60 days upon the completion of an individual project or assignment. Interim evaluations shall also be prepared for projects of a long duration (i.e. over one year) or if the consultant's performance merits notification of any deficiencies.

Information is to be submitted to and kept on file by the PWA Contract Administration Division for five (5) years. A copy of the evaluation shall also be provided to the consultant. These forms may be used, in part, as a reference to evaluate the consultant for future City professional services contracts.

Consultants with an overall evaluation of "Poor" or "Needs to Improve" are given an opportunity to 1) appeal the evaluation to the Assistant Director of Public Works, or his designee, and/or 2) append the evaluation with a one-page statement that explains or refutes the City's finding.

To the extent permitted by law, the City shall treat the evaluations as confidential information.