

DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES NON-COMPETITIVE REVIEW BOARD (NCRB) APPLICATION

Complete this cover form and the Non-Competitive Procurement Application Worksheet in detail. Refer to the page entitled "Instructions for Non-Competitive Procurement Application" for completing this application in accordance with its policy regarding NCRB. Complete "other" subject area if additional information is needed. Subject areas must be fully completed and responses merely referencing attachments will not be accepted and will be immediately rejected.

рерактиелт	Originator Name	Telephone	Date	Signature of Application Author				
Mayor's Office, Legislative Counsel and Government Affairs	Mike Rendina	312-744-2460	April 4, 2016	1/1/1				
Contract Liaison	Email Contract Liaison	Telephone		11111				
Yasmin Rivera yasmin.rivera@cityofchica go.org		312-744-9991		1/19				
List Name of NCRB Atte	endees/Department							
Mike Rendina		Mayor's Office						
	pe conducted for the product(s) en, as an individual and indepe		described here	in.				
Contact Person:	Phone:	Ema	ail:					
Melissa Green	202-494	9554 gree	en_m68@hotma	ail.com				
Project Description: Fe	deral Advocacy Consulting Ser							
This is a request for:		No.						
		☐ Amendment /	Modification					
Contract Type		Type of Modifica	ation					
☐ Blanket Agreement	Term: <u>12</u> (# of mo)	☐ Time Extension ☐ Vendor Limit Increase ☐ Scope Change						
		Contract Number:						
M otaliaala Agreement		Specification Num						
		Modification Num						
		Wodinoation Ham	——————————————————————————————————————					
Department Request	Approval	Recom	mended Appro	ovat				
DEPARTMENT HEAD OR D	httll 4151 ESIGNEE DATE	BOARD	AUS BON	6-9-16 DATE				
		Ro	ch But	101				
PRINT NAME		PRINT NA	AME					
(FOR NCRB USE ONL)								
Recommend Approval/Date:	3-9-16 7000	App App	roved	☐ Rejected				
	6-9-16 06 09 201		700	s A				
Return to Department/Date: _		(>	2100	6/10/11				
Rejected/Date:		ALLE DE	ROCUREMENT OF	GOATE OF THE PERSON OF THE PER				
		(GENEL P	OCOGENIEN OF	DATE /				

Page 1 of 4

April 2013



DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES NON-COMPETITIVE REVIEW BOARD (NCRB) APPLICATION JUSTIFICATION FOR NON-COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT WORKSHEET

All applicable information on this worksheet must be addressed using each question found on the "Instructions for Non-Competitive Procurement Application" in this application.

Justification for Non-Competitive Procurement Worksheet

□ PROCUREMENT HISTORY

1. Due to the importance of federal funding, legislation, and administrative actions on the operations and finances of the City, the City of Chicago has consistently had a presence in Washington, D.C. That presence has taken various forms throughout the years. Prior to mid-2011, the City's D.C. office staff ranged from 5-7 employees. In addition, several City departments and sister agencies had contracts with D.C. lobbyists. (Chicago Public Schools had a full time D.C. staffer who was paid \$110,000/year and leased space from the Council of Great City Schools; Chicago Department of Aviation paid McCann Capitol Associates \$250,000/year; Chicago Transit Agency also paid McCann Capitol Associates \$250,000/year and contracted with former Congressman Bill Lipinski for state and federal work.) Since the start of this administration, the City's D.C. office has functioned with a staff of three employees. (CPS' separate D.C. presence was terminated immediately at the start of the administration; CDA's McCann contract was cut significantly and then terminated in 2014; CTA's McCann contract was cut in half and then terminated in 2012; and Congressman Lipinski's contract focused only on state work.) As of April 1, 2016, the City's D.C. office transitioned to a two-person team. The team will report to the Mayor's Office, Legislative Counsel and Government Affairs. In addition to the two full time City staff based in D.C., the City will also rely on the services of a D.C. consultant, leveraging D.C. expertise to keep the office effective and nimble.

With the change in structure from an office of three City staff to an office of two City staff with the services of a consultant, it was determined that Melissa Green ("Consultant") is uniquely qualified to perform these consulting services for the City. Green was the Director of the City's Washington, D.C. office from the start of this administration through April 1, 2016, when she left City employment. Her unique qualifications and expertise are discussed in detail in the appropriate section below.

- 2. This will be a first time requirement for this administration. Prior to 2011, lobbyists or other consultants were engaged by the City for work in Washington, D.C.
- 3. There have been no efforts to competitively bid this requirement as it is believed the Consultant is uniquely situated to be the best provider of the required services to the City.
- 4. The City is seeking a consultant to spearhead the City's federal advocacy agenda and efforts, representing the City's interest on all matters before the White House, federal agencies, and Congress. There are primarily two firms in Washington, D.C. Patton, Boggs, and Squire and Holland & Knight that have large 'city' practices, providing similar services to many cities. However, there are critical reasons why these firms do not meet the City's current needs: (1) these firms have no background with or understanding of the City and its priorities and no prior experience representing Chicago under this administration; and (2) these firms already represent 16 and 21 cities respectively, making Chicago just another client. There are also boutique firms and several solo practitioners providing similar services in D.C., but again none of these practitioners have represented Chicago in recent years and thus have little to no knowledge of the City's federal needs and priorities or local relationships and partnerships, and all have multiple cities as clients and therefore split their time, attention, and resources between cities. In contrast, as further discussed below, the Consultant is intimately familiar with the City and its legislative, policy, and funding priorities and will have only Chicago as a city client.
- 5. It is possible that there will be future requests made for the services of the Consultant. This will depend on the City's needs and any further evolution in the structure of the City's D.C. office.
- 6. The expertise and qualifications that are critical to federal advocacy consulting including relationships within both City government and federal government, as well as a history with and understanding of the needs and priorities of the City and how these needs and priorities intersect with federal policy, regulation, legislation, and funding are often specific to an individual. As such, it is likely that such services will continue to be procured through the public

Page 2 of 4 April 2013



DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES NON-COMPETITIVE REVIEW BOARD (NCRB) APPLICATION JUSTIFICATION FOR NON-COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT WORKSHEET

non-competitive procurement process.

□ ESTIMATED COST

- 1. The estimated cost for the proposed contract is \$8,500 per month. The funding source is budget line 9121 ('For Payment of Costs Associated with Lobbyist Activities on Behalf of the City of Chicago').
- 2. The estimated annual cost under the proposed contract is \$102,000.
- 3. This cost is based on the contract cost under similar agreements with legislative consultants representing the City in Springfield, as well as on the cost of other cities' contracts with Washington, D.C. firms who perform the same type of work. Please see Appendix 1, attached, for a detailed discussion of comparable contracts and associated fees.
- 4. N/A
- 5. The proposed contract cost is in line with similar agreements with legislative consultants representing the City in Springfield. In addition, the information in Appendix 1 informed negotiations with the Consultant. These figures were used to confirm that the proposed cost is a strong value. The proposed cost is less than the costs paid by many other cities for comparable services, including smaller and less complex city clients.

SCHEDULE REQUIREMENTS

1. As discussed in Item 1 under Procurement History, above, the restructuring of the office, scheduled to occur during Q2 of 2016, includes the engagement of a federal advocacy services consultant to do a portion of the work formerly done by staff in the City's D.C. office. Discussions about the restructuring of the office began in Q1 of 2016.

2. N/A

- 3. Ideally, a contract for federal advocacy consulting services would be in place as soon as possible. The services would continue for one year, with an option to extend for an additional one year, pursuant to the proposed contract. The desire to make this transition and engage the Consultant as soon as possible is driven in part by the timing of national elections and the change in Administration. The next 12 month period spans the end of the current President's term and the beginning months of an incoming administration. The end and beginning of administrations in D.C. are critical periods for securing funding and influencing policy. Having the new structure in place and the Consultant fully functioning for this period will be financially and operationally advantageous to the City as it seeks to capitalize on federal opportunities that present only as a Presidential administration closes down. The City has several large projects, each in the hundreds of millions of dollars, one in the billions of dollars, in front of the current Administration, and a disruption in the City's representation in D.C. could negatively impact those projects.
- 4. While the reason for not competitively bidding these services is not to expedite the process (but rather based on the unique qualifications of the Consultant), the timing of the transition (and the engagement of the Consultant) is critical for the reasons discussed in Item 3 above.

X EXCLUSIVE OR UNIQUE CAPABILITY

1. There are a number of factors that contribute to the Consultant's unique qualifications for this work – her work with the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB), her extensive network in Washington, D.C., and her knowledge of and history with the projects and issues that are priorities for the City. Each is outlined here.

The Consultant served as the Chief of Staff to the Director of the OMB during the first two years of the current Administration, and the Consultant continues to have strong relationships with OMB staff. These relationships are critical because of the nature and importance of the OMB. The OMB is the single most important agency in in the federal budget process. OMB decides which programs make it into the federal budget and which do not, how federal funds flow, and when and whether federal regulations are released. In sum, OMB is the intersection of legislation, regulation, and funding. It is also notoriously difficult for outsiders to navigate. The Consultant has in-depth knowledge and understanding of the institution and its processes, as well as relationships with the individual decision-makers in the agency.

The Consultant is a Washington, D.C. native, which has allowed her to build a personal network throughout the federal government, national trade organizations, and national think tanks. Unlike many D.C. consultants/lobbyists who transient, the Consultant's relationships – including relationships with congressmen, senators, and cabinet



DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES NON-COMPETITIVE REVIEW BOARD (NCRB) APPLICATION JUSTIFICATION FOR NON-COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT WORKSHEET

secretaries – are personal and longstanding. In addition, the Consultant served in the past two Democratic White Houses (Presidents Clinton and Obama), forming lasting and relevant connections in those Administrations. These relationships will be used to benefit the City and only the City.

Finally, the Consultant has been the only Director for Federal Affairs for the City since 2011, through which she has gained a deep understanding of the city, its local officials, its residents, and its funding and regulatory needs. The Consultant has strong relationships with all City commissioners and agency heads and their staffs. This longstanding trust, respect and proven track record is valuable to this work and is not transferrable.

As discussed above, the current White House Administration has only 8 months left. These final months of this Administration, and the beginning months of the next administration, are critical for funding and agenda setting. The Consultant's relationships within this Administration and knowledge of all prior and pending City projects and priorities put her in the best position to effectively represent the City during this time. It is imperative that the City have a person who is familiar with (a) the City's priorities and funding needs and (b) the way in which funding will flow at the federal level, during this period.

- N/A
- 3. In addition to the general qualifications discussed in Item 1 above, the Consultant has specific experience that makes her uniquely qualified to provide these services at this time. The Consultant has been the City's Washington, D.C. lead for the following federal projects:
- RIFF/Union Station
- New Markets Tax Credits
- Urban Agenda
- TIGER/Garfield Park
- Freight/CREATE
- LED lighting projects
- Red/Purple Line Mod TIFIA/FFGA
- Securing unused federal funds
- Impacting federal regulations and waivers
- 1. Many of these projects have been in development for six months or more, and several for more than 15 months. The Consultant has a deep understanding of these projects and strong working relationships with the City staff and federal agency staff involved in these projects. It would be very difficult for someone new to catch-up and deliver on these projects in the truncated time period that remains in the current Administration, and there is potential that such a disruption could result in the loss of funding opportunities for the City.

dis	ruption could result in the loss of funding opportunities for the City.	
4.	N/A	
5.	See Items 1 and 3, above.	
6.	N/A	
7.	N/A	
8.	N/A	
ОТ	HER	
N/A	A	

Appendix 1: Detailed Comps

- At least 50 cities have direct contracts with the two main Washington, D.C. lobbying firms that have large state and city practices:
 - Holland and Knight represents 21 cities, including San Francisco, Phoenix, Seattle,
 Philadelphia, Charlotte and Atlanta. The two largest contracts, for cities with 1/3 and 1/7 of Chicago's population, are \$400,000.
 - Squire, Patton and Boggs represents 16 cities, including Las Vegas, San Antonio, San Diego, Portland and New Orleans. The largest contracts, for cities with 1/5 Chicago's population or less, are \$200,000.
 - The straight monthly average of all city contracts at these two firms is \$12,700/month. This includes cities as small as Rockville, MD, population 66,000, and Key West, FL, population 25,000.
 - A list of cities represented by these two firms and their rates can be found on the following page.
- In addition to the two main firms, there are several solo practitioners who provide similar representation to about 12 additional cities.
- Market research indicates that smaller firms and solo practitioners generally represent multiple cities on a per project basis, with contracts ranging from \$35,000 to \$90,000 annually.

City of Philadelphia, PA \$80,000 1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 66,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 \$216,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 \$2,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 384,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of New	CITY	TOTAL	POPULATION		
City of Atlanta, GA \$400,000 \$456,000 City of Aurora, CO \$120,000 348,000 City of Austin, TX \$200,000 \$12,000 City of Charlotte, NC \$200,000 \$809,000 City of Des Moines, IA \$80,000 612,000 City of Edinburg, TX \$160,000 \$3,000 City of Freemont, CA \$120,000 214,000 City of Key West, FL \$80,000 25,000 City of Norfolk, VA \$160,000 245,000 City of Pheneix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 109,000 City of Saramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 359,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 359,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 359,000	HOLLAND & KNIGHT				
City of Atlanta, GA \$400,000 \$456,000 City of Aurora, CO \$120,000 348,000 City of Austin, TX \$200,000 \$12,000 City of Charlotte, NC \$200,000 \$809,000 City of Des Moines, IA \$80,000 612,000 City of Edinburg, TX \$160,000 \$3,000 City of Freemont, CA \$120,000 214,000 City of Key West, FL \$80,000 25,000 City of Norfolk, VA \$160,000 245,000 City of Pheneix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 109,000 City of Saramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 359,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 359,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 359,000		*	*)		
City of Aurora, CO \$120,000 348,000 City of Charlotte, NC \$200,000 899,000 City of Des Moines, IA \$80,000 612,000 City of Edinburg, TX \$160,000 83,000 City of Freemont, CA \$120,000 214,000 City of Key West, FL \$80,000 25,000 City of Norfolk, VA \$160,000 245,000 City of Philadelphia, PA \$80,000 1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 1.5 million City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 1.5 million City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 485,000 City of Sacaramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Sarata Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Sattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 446,000 City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 216,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
City of Austin, TX \$200,000 \$912,000 City of Charlotte, NC \$200,000 \$809,000 City of Des Moines, IA \$80,000 \$12,000 City of Edinburg, TX \$160,000 \$214,000 City of Freemont, CA \$120,000 \$24,000 City of Key West, FL \$80,000 \$25,000 City of Norfolk, VA \$160,000 \$245,000 City of Philadelphia, PA \$80,000 \$1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 \$1.5 million City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 \$1.5 million City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 \$1.5 million City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 \$1.5 million City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Sattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 <td>EXPONENTIAL EXPONENTIAL EXPONE</td> <td>rija akmoning mening anunjan-maaking ning palana iya pangkemamankaligang ing nagupankmapaannya wasawep maagoogma</td> <td>report sport all alternations designed as few examinations of these manages as specifical masses where</td>	EXPONENTIAL EXPONE	rija akmoning mening anunjan-maaking ning palana iya pangkemamankaligang ing nagupankmapaannya wasawep maagoogma	report sport all alternations designed as few examinations of these manages as specifical masses where		
City of Charlotte, NC \$200,000 809,000 City of Des Moines, IA \$80,000 612,000 City of Edinburg, TX \$160,000 83,000 City of Freemont, CA \$120,000 214,000 City of Key West, FL \$80,000 25,000 City of Norfolk, VA \$160,000 245,000 City of Philadelphia, PA \$80,000 1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 109,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Sattle, WA \$90,000 359,000 City of Sattle, WA \$90,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 485,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 485,000 City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 <					
City of Des Moines, IA \$80,000 612,000 City of Edinburg, TX \$160,000 83,000 City of Freemont, CA \$120,000 214,000 City of Key West, FL \$80,000 25,000 City of Norfolk, VA \$160,000 245,000 City of Philadelphia, PA \$80,000 1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 109,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Sattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Sattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS \$200,000 446,000 City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Goriennati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000					
City of Edinburg, TX \$160,000 \$3,000 City of Freemont, CA \$120,000 214,000 City of Key West, FL \$80,000 25,000 City of Phorfolk, VA \$160,000 245,000 City of Pholadelphia, PA \$80,000 1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 66,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Sattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS \$200,000 446,000 City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 46,000 City of Gricinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000			·		
City of Freemont, CA \$120,000 214,000 City of Key West, FL \$80,000 25,000 City of Norfolk, VA \$160,000 245,000 City of Philadelphia, PA \$80,000 1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 109,000 City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 66,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Sarta Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS \$200,000 446,000 City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Gircinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 <td< td=""><td>-</td><td></td><td>612,000</td></td<>	-		612,000		
City of Key West, FL \$80,000 25,000 City of Norfolk, VA \$160,000 245,000 City of Philadelphia, PA \$80,000 1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 109,000 City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Santa, FL \$120,000 668,000 City of Sattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS \$200,000 446,000 City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 614,00	City of Edinburg, TX	\$160,000	83,000		
City of Norfolk, VA \$160,000 245,000 City of Philadelphia, PA \$80,000 1.5 million City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 66,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 645,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City	City of Freemont, CA	\$120,000	214,000		
City of Philadelphia, PA \$80,000 1.5 million City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 66,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Gomerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City	City of Key West, FL	\$80,000	25,000		
City of Phoenix, AZ \$280,000 1.5 million City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 66,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 \$46,000 216,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 298,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 298,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 216,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 614,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 614,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 619,000 City of New Orleans, LA	City of Norfolk, VA	\$160,000	245,000		
City of Richmond, CA \$80,000 109,000 City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 66,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 \$46,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 \$2,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 384,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Richmond, VA	City of Philadelphia, PA	\$80,000	1.5 million		
City of Rockville, MD \$80,000 66,000 City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Richmond,	City of Phoenix, AZ	\$280,000	1.5 million		
City of Sacramento, CA \$70,000 485,000 City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 \$2,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million <td>City of Richmond, CA</td> <td>\$80,000</td> <td>109,000</td>	City of Richmond, CA	\$80,000	109,000		
City of Santa Ana, CA \$80,000 335,000 City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million <td>City of Rockville, MD</td> <td>\$80,000</td> <td>66,000</td>	City of Rockville, MD	\$80,000	66,000		
City of Seattle, WA \$90,000 668,000 City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Sacramento, CA	\$70,000	485,000		
City of Tampa, FL \$120,000 359,000 City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Santa Ana, CA	\$80,000	335,000		
City of West Palm Beach, FL \$120,000 104,000 City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Seattle, WA	\$90,000	668,000		
City of West Sacramento, CA \$120,000 485,000 SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Tampa, FL	\$120,000	359,000		
SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of West Palm Beach, FL	\$120,000	104,000		
City of Baton Rouge, LA \$200,000 446,000 City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of West Sacramento, CA	\$120,000	485,000		
City of Boise, ID \$40,000 216,000 City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS				
City of Cincinnati, OH \$50,000 298,000 City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Baton Rouge, LA	\$200,000	446,000		
City of Commerce, CO \$90,000 52,000 City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Boise, ID	\$40,000	216,000		
City of Greenville, SC \$80,000 483,000 City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Cincinnati, OH	\$50,000	298,000		
City of Lakewood, WA \$25,000 61,000 City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Commerce, CO	\$90,000	52,000		
City of Las Vegas, NV \$160,000 614,000 City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Greenville, SC	\$80,000	483,000		
City of Mesa, AZ \$160,000 465,000 City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Lakewood, WA	\$25,000	61,000		
City of Mesquite, TX \$40,000 144,000 City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Las Vegas, NV	\$160,000	614,000		
City of New Orleans, LA \$200,000 384,000 City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Mesa, AZ	\$160,000	465,000		
City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Mesquite, TX	\$40,000	144,000		
City of Portland, OR \$200,000 619,000 City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of New Orleans, LA	\$200,000	384,000		
City of Richmond, VA \$160,000 218,000 City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Portland, OR	\$200,000	619,000		
City of Riverside, MO \$120,000 471,000 City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Richmond, VA	\$160,000	218,000		
City of San Antonio, TX \$70,000 1.4 million	City of Riverside, MO	\$120,000	471,000		
	7	\$70,000	1.4 million		
	City of San Diego, CA	\$160,000	1.3 million		



DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT SERVICES NON-COMPETITIVE REVIEW BOARD (NCRB) APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS FOR NON-COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT APPLICATION

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF NON-COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT APPLICATION

If a City Department has determined that the purchase of supplies, equipment, work and/or services cannot be done on a competitive basis, a justification must be prepared on this "Justification for Non-Competitive Procurement Application" in which procurement is requested on a or non-competitive basis in accordance with 65 ILCS 5/8-10-4 of the Illinois Compiled Statutes. Using this instruction sheet, all applicable information must be addressed on the worksheet. The information provided must be complete and in sufficient detail to allow for a decision to be made by the Non-Competitive Procurement Review Board. For Amendments, Modifications, describe in detail the change in terms of dollars, time period, scope of services, etc., its relationship to the original contract and the specific reasons for the change. Indicate both the original and the adjusted contract amount and/or expiration date with this change.

Attach a DPS Checklist and any other required documentation; the Board will not consider justification with incomplete information documentation or omissions.

PROCUREMENT HISTORY

- Describe the requirement and how it evolved from initial planning to its present status.
- 2. Is this a first time requirement or a continuation of previous procurement from the same source? If so, explain the procurement history.
- 3. Explain attempts made to competitively bid the requirement (attach copy of sources contacted).
- 4. Describe in detail all research done to find other sources; list other cities, companies in the industry, professional organizations contacted. List periodicals and other publications used as references.
- 5. Explain future procurement objectives. Is this a one-time request or will future requests be made for doing business with the same source?
- 6. Explain whether or not future competitive bidding is possible. If not, explain in detail.

ESTIMATED COST

- 1. What is the estimated cost for this requirement or for each contract, if multiple awards are contemplated? What is the funding source?
- 2. What is the estimated cost by fiscal year?
- 3. Explain the basis for estimating the cost and what assumptions were made and/or data used (i.e., budgeted amount, previous contract price, current catalog or cost proposal from firms solicited, engineering or in-house estimate, etc.)
- 4. Explain whether the proposed Contractor or the City has a substantial dollar investment in original design, tooling or other factors which would be duplicated at City expense if another source was considered. Describe cost savings or other measurable benefits to the City which may be achieved.
- 5. Explain what negotiation of price has occurred or will occur. Detail why the estimated cost is deemed reasonable.

SCHEDULE REQUIREMENTS

- 1. Explain how the schedule was developed and at what point the specific dates were known.
- 2. Is lack of drawings and/or specifications a constraining factor to competitive bidding? If so, why is the proposed Contractor the only person or firm able to perform under these circumstances? Why are the drawings and specifications lacking? What is the lead time required to get drawings and specifications suitable for competition? If lack of drawings and specifications is not a constraining factor to competitive bidding, explain why only one person or firm can meet the required schedule.
- 3. Outline the required schedule by delivery or completion dates and explain the reasons why the schedule is critical.
- 4. Describe in detail what impact delays for competitive bidding would have on City operations, programs, costs and budgeted funds.

EXCLUSIVE OR UNIQUE CAPABILITY

- 1. If contemplating hiring a person or firm as a Professional Service Consultant, explain in detail what professional skills, expertise, qualifications, and/or other factors make this person or firm exclusively or uniquely qualified for the project. Attach a copy of the cost proposal, scope of services, and <u>Temporary Consulting Services Form</u>.
- 2. Does the proposed firm have personnel considered unquestionably predominant in the particular field?
- 3. What prior experiences of a highly specialized nature does the person or firm exclusively possess that is vital to the job, project or program?
- 4. What technical facilities or test equipment does the person or firm exclusively possess of a highly specialized nature which is vital to the job?
- 5. What other capabilities and/or capacity does the proposed firm possess which is necessary for the specific job, project or program which makes them the only source who can perform the work within the required time schedule without unreasonable costs to the City?
- 6. If procuring products or equipment, describe the intended use and explain any exclusive or unique capabilities, features and/or functions the items have which no other brands or models, possess. Is compatibility with existing equipment critical from an operational standpoint? If so, provide detailed explanation?
- 7. Is competition precluded because of the existence of patent rights, copyrights, trade secrets, technical data, or other proprietary data (attach documentation verifying such)?
- 8. If procuring replacement parts and/or maintenance services, explain whether or not replacement parts and/or services can be obtained from any other sources? If not, is the proposed firm the only authorized or exclusive dealer/distributor and/or service center? If so, attach letter from manufacturer on company letterhead.

MBE/WBE COMPLIANCE PLAN

* All submissions must contain detailed information about how the proposed firm will comply with the requirements of the City's Minority and Women Owned Business program. All submissions must include a completed C-1 and D-1 form, which is available on the Procurement Services page on the City's intranet site. The City Department must submit a Compliance Plan, including details about direct and indirect compliance.

OTHER

1. Explain other related considerations and attach all applicable supporting documents, i.e., an approved "ITGB Form" or "Request For Individual Hire Form".

REVIEW AND APPROVAL

This application must be signed by both Originator of the request and signed by the Department Head. After review and final disposition from the Board, this application will be signed by the Board Chairman. After review and final disposition from the Board, this form will be presented to the Chief Procurement Officer recommending approval.



Project Chacklist

Attach required forms for each procurement type and detailed scope of services and/or specifications and forward original documents to the Chief Procurement Officer; City Hall, Room 806.

Date: 4/4/2016 Department Name: Office of the Mayor		partic condi Servi	For blanket agreements, original or lead department must consult with other potential departments who may want to participate on the blanket agreement. If grant funded, attach copy of the approved grant application and other terms and conditions of the funding source. Note: 1) <u>Funding</u> : Attach information if multiple funding lines; 2) <u>Individual Contract Services</u> : Include approval form signed by Department Head and OBM; 3) <u>ITG8</u> : IT project valued at \$100,000.00 or more, attach approval transmittal sheet.									
122122	Specification No: 225975		*By signing this form, I attest that all han Tune and accurate.									
PU No: Modification No: Pro							U					
Contract Liaison: Yasmin Rivera												
312-744-9991 Email:	- In teller	Proje Desc	ct ription:									
yasmin.rivera@c	cityofchicago.or	g Fede	eral Adve	ocacy C	Consult	ing Se	ervices					
Michael Rendi	na	Func	lina:									
Telephone: 312-744-2818			rporate	Bond		☐ Ent	erprise		irant		Other:	
Email: michael.rendina(@oityofahiaaaa	Ппс)T/Transit	DIDOT/	Highway	□ FH	AND TOOLS	□ FTA			□FAA	
Check One:	@cityolcriicago.	LINE	FΥ	FUND	DEPT	ORGN	APPR	ACT	V PRO	DJECT	RPTG	ESTDOLLAR AMOUNT
New Contrac	t Request		040	0400	000		0404	-				A100 000
*By signing below, I attest to contract are true and accura		ils	016	0100	099	4401	9121		-			\$102,000
Project / Program Mahago? *Commissioger/Authorized D	-			chase Or Blanket/Pur Master Con Standard/O	rchase Or sultant A	der (DUF graament	t (Task Or	der)		jency ompet	itiva Reviev	j uired: v Board (NCRB) contract Services
Purchase Order Information: Contract Term (No. of Months): 12 months			Procurement Method: Bid RFP RFQ RFI Information Technology Governance Board (ITGB)									
Extension Options (1 - 1 year exte	nsion DS	Small Orde	r'	CALLEGE						
Estimated Spend/Va	·	\$ 102,000.00										
Grant Commitment /			Contract Type:									
Pre-Bid/Submittal Conference: Yes X No Mandatory Site Visit			Architect Engineering Commodity Construction JOC SBI Revenue Generating Vehicle & Heavy Equipment Work Service Joint Procurement Reference Contract									
Modification	Modification or Amendment			Modification/Amendment Type:								
Modification Information:				Time Extension Scope Change/Price Increase /Additional Line Item(s)								
PO Start Date: PO End Date:				Vendor Limit Increase Requisition Encumbrance Adjustment Other (specify):								
Amount (Increase/Reduction	2n).		البيسا ح	otiloi (opooi	177							
MBE/WBE/DBE Analy		BE/DBE Goal										
Setting Memo)	erent.		Vans	day lafa:								
Full Compliance Contract Specific Goals No Stated Goals Waiver Request				Vendor Info: Name: Melissa Green								
Risk Management / EDS				Molinea Cross								
Insurance Requirements (Included)				5106 Raltimara Ava. Rathaeda MD 20016								
EDS Certification of Filling (included)			0	aroon m68@hatmail.com								
					02-494	- 7						



OFFICE OF MAYOR RAHM EMANUEL CITY OF CHICAGO

MEMORANDUM

To:

Jamie Rhee

Chief Procurement Officer

Department of Procurement Services

From: Michael Rendina

Senior Advisor to the Mayor

Office of the Mayor

RE:

Procurement of Federal Advocacy Consulting Services - Melissa Green

Date: April 4, 2016

The memorandum is to request the non-competitive procurement of the federal advocacy services of Melissa Green.

Federal funding, legislation, and administrative actions significantly impact the operations and finances of the City. As such, it is critical that the City have an effective advocate in Washington, D.C., representing the City's interests at a high level. As detailed further in the complete application to the Board, Green is uniquely qualified to perform these much needed services for the City.

Green has worked as Chief of Staff to the Director of the White House Office of Management and Budget (the agency that decides which programs make it into the federal budget and how federal funds flow); has an extensive network of agency, congressional, and organizational contacts in Washington, D.C.; and has real knowledge of and history with the projects and issues that are priorities for the City. For these reasons, it would be highly advantageous to the City to contract her services during this critical period.

The proposed contract provides for a one-year term with a one-year extension option, at a flat monthly rate of \$8,500.

Thank you, and please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Scope of Work

- Serve as the City's advocate and strategist on all matters before the White House, federal agencies and Congress.
- Spearhead efforts to obtain federal aid in competitive grants for the City.
- Respond to federal legislation to ensure the City's priorities are prominent.
- Identify federal funding, regulatory, and legislative opportunities for City departments and Sister Agencies.
- Work with the City and Sister Agencies to identify policy opportunities related to federal funding or legislation.
- Organize broad support for national policies important to Chicago, including but not limited to the campaign against illegal guns, opportunities for underserved populations, support for long-term infrastructure improvements, and efforts to promote sensible immigration reform.
- Serve as a liaison with other mayors, national think tanks, research institutions, non-profit institutions, universities, business groups, trade organizations and other Chicago/IL groups with a Washington, D.C. presence.
- Participate in Mayor's Washington, D.C. trips.
- In addition to and in furtherance of the work set forth above, the services will include:
 - o Attending legislative and administrative hearings, meetings, or sessions as appropriate.
 - Obtaining and attending meetings with decision-makers on matters that impact the City.
 - Maintaining open lines of communication with the City and its legislative affairs team at all times.
 - O Assisting in any federal government affairs-related tasks, programs, events, and projects, as needed.

Michael Rendina Office of the Mayor

5106 Baltimore Ave Behesda, MD 20916 Phone: 202.494.9554

E-Mail: green_m68@hotmail.com

April 4, 2016

Eileen Mitchell Chief of Staff Mayor's Office The City of Chicago 121 North LaSalle Street Chicago, Illinois 60602

Dear Eileen,

In Washington DC, experience, relationships and access are key. As a D.C. native and a professional with 25 years of experience at the federal level, I have developed an effective combination of all three.

There are several important reasons why my personal, policy, political and professional experiences will provide the City of Chicago with an advocate that can create unique opportunities for the City:

First, as a rare second-generation native Washingtonian, I have been cultivating relationships with people in the federal government in both the executive and legislative branches my entire life. My network with the Washington political base is extensive and based not only on over two decades of working alongside these colleagues but also on friendships since childhood. These shared experiences are unique and the trust built over decades is not transferable and I have proven I can put them to work for the City.

Second, I have worked in Democratic politics for over 25 years at the federal level. My political career began at age 19 in the famed "war room" for the Clinton-Gore campaign in 1992 where I worked for James Carville. Since then, I have had the privilege of serving in the White House for two Democratic Presidents -- Presidents Clinton and Obama.

Third, in my most recent White House role, I was appointed as Chief of Staff for the Office of Budget and Management (OMB). The OMB is an opaque place. It sits at the intersection of legislation, regulation and money. The OMB has always been at the center of enduring, rather than ephemeral, government power; they control a process -- budget-making -- that is fundamental to everything everyone does in Washington. As a result, the OMB possesses sanctions and access to information, which few other actors can match. As a former senior staffer to the OMB, I can provide the City connections to one of the DC's biggest power centers and the one least easily accessed. The OMB's budget role means it can convince an agency to fund a particular program that might benefit a City and the agency's regulatory authority give it the power to revise an agency's interpretation of a rule that might be detrimental or helpful to the City.

In my four and a half years working for the City I have worked to craft a well-defined plan and proven strategy to extract whatever Chicago can get from each agency, rather than pressing Congress for more money that isn't there. Securing money without earmarks requires a different strategy that pushes for broad grant programs and funding criteria to make sure the City is well positioned to compete for and win those grants. So much of what we have accomplished for the City is because of my commitment to the City, my access to those in power here in Washington and my ability to navigate and influence conversations and processes that are complex and often take place behind the scenes.

I am confident that I can continue to deliver for the City in the same unique and important ways that I have over the past four and half years, and I look forward to the opportunity to do so.

Sincerely

5106 Baltimore Ave Bethesda, MD 20916 Phone: 202.494.9554

E-Mail: green_m68@hotmail.com

April 4, 2016

Ms. Yasmin Rivera 121 North LaSalle Street Room 406 Chicago, IL 60602

Dear Ms. Rivera:

This letter serves as confirmation of my monthly rate of \$8,500 per month for the duration of the contractual agreement.

Sincerely,

5106 Baltimore Ave Bethesda, MD 20916 Phone: 202.494.9554

E-Mail: green_m68@hotmail.com

May 26, 2016

Dear Colleen and Jessica:

This letter serves as confirmation that I do not receive or owe any child support. Please let me know if you need anything else from me or have further questions.

Sincerely,



CERTIFICATE OF FILING FOR

CITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

EDS Number: 82441

Certificate Printed on: 04/05/2016

Disclosing Party: Melissa Green

Filed by: Melissa Green

Matter: Federal Consultancy Services

Applicant: Melissa Green

Specification #:
Contract #:

Date of This Filing:04/05/2016 03:16 PM Original Filing Date:04/05/2016 03:16 PM

Title:Principal

The Economic Disclosure Statement referenced above has been electronically filed with the City. Please provide a copy of this Certificate of Filing to your city contact with other required documents pertaining to the Matter. For additional guidance as to when to provide this Certificate and other required documents, please follow instructions provided to you about the Matter or consult with your City contact.

A copy of the EDS may be viewed and printed by visiting https://webapps1.cityofchicago.org/EDSWeb and entering the EDS number into the EDS Search. Prior to contract award, the filing is accessible online only to the disclosing party and the City, but is still subject to the Illinois Freedom of Information Act. The filing is visible online to the public after contract award.

5106 Baltimore Ave Bethesda, MD 20916 Phone: 202.494.9554

E-Mail: green_m68@hotmail.com

April 4, 2016

Ms. Jamie Rhee Chief Procurement Officer The City of Chicago 121 North LaSalle Street Room403 Chicago, Illinois 60602

Dear Ms. Rhee:

Melissa Green is an individual consultant that will not hire or retain any independent contractors or subcontractors for this assignment. Based upon the fact that this proposed contract is between the City and Melissa Green only and the scope of work of this proposed contract I am requesting no stated MBE/WBE goals for the proposed contract.

Sincerely,



OFFICE OF MAYOR RAHM EMANUEL CITY OF CHICAGO

MEMORANDUM

To:

Jamie Rhee

Chief Procurement Officer

Department of Procurement Services

From: Michael Rendina

Senior Advisor to the Mayor

Office of the Mayor

RE:

MBE/WBE Goals – Federal Advocacy Consulting Services, Melissa Green

Date: April 4, 2016

The memorandum is to confirm our office's concurrence with the request from Melissa Green ("Consultant"), in connection with the proposed contract for Federal Advocacy Consulting Services, that there be no stated MBE/WBE participation goals for the contract, for the reasons stated in Consultant's request letter.

Thank you, and please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns.



CERTIFICATE OF LIABILITY INSURANCE

DATE (MM/DD/YYYY) 6/10/2016

THIS CERTIFICATE IS ISSUED AS A MATTER OF INFORMATION ONLY AND CONFERS NO RIGHTS UPON THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER. THIS CERTIFICATE DOES NOT AFFIRMATIVELY OR NEGATIVELY AMEND, EXTEND OR ALTER THE COVERAGE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES BELOW. THIS CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE ISSUING INSURER(S), AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE OR PRODUCER, AND THE CERTIFICATE HOLDER.

IMPORTANT: If the certificate holder is an ADDITIONAL INSURED, the policy(ies) must be endorsed. If SUBROGATION IS WAIVED, subject to the terms and conditions of the policy, certain policies may require an endorsement. A statement on this certificate does not confer rights to the

certificate holder in lieu of	such e	endorsement(s).					
PRODUCER			CONTACT Nicole Valerio				
BOGART & BROWNELL OF	'MD.I	INC.	PHONE (301) 444-4500 FAX (A/C, No, Ext): (301) 444-4510				
7648 Standish Place			E-MAIL ADDRESS: nicole@bogartandbrownell.c	om			
			INSURER(S) AFFORDING COVERAGE		NAIC#		
Rockville	MD	20855	INSURER A Erie Insurance Exchange		26271		
INSURED			INSURER B: Westchester Fire Insuranc	e Co.			
MELISSA GREEN			INSURER C :				
5106 BALTIMORE AVENU	Œ		INSURER D :				
			INSURER E :				
BETHESDA	MD	20816	INSURER F :				
COVERAGES		CERTIFICATE NUMBER:2016-2017	REVISION NUI	MBER:			
THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE POLICIES OF INSURANCE LISTED BELOW HAVE BEEN ISSUED TO THE INSURED NAMED ABOVE FOR THE POLICY PERIOD INDICATED. NOTWITHSTANDING ANY REQUIREMENT, TERM OR CONDITION OF ANY CONTRACT OR OTHER DOCUMENT WITH RESPECT TO WHICH THIS							
INDIGITIES. NOTWITHOTAL		THE RESERVE THE PROPERTY OF THE PERSON		ID IDOT TO ALL	THE TERMS		

CERTIFICATE MAY BE ISSUED OR MAY PERTAIN, THE INSURANCE AFFORDED BY THE POLICIES DESCRIBED HEREIN IS SUBJECT TO ALL THE TERMS, EXCLUSIONS AND CONDITIONS OF SUCH POLICIES, LIMITS SHOWN MAY HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY PAID CLAIMS.

NSR LTR	NSR TYPE OF INSURANCE		ADDL	SUBR	POLICY NUMBER	POLICY EFF (MM/DD/YYYY)	POLICY EXP (MM/DD/YYYY)	LIMIT	S
A	ж	COMMERCIAL GENERAL LIABILITY CLAIMS-MADE X OCCUR						EACH OCCURRENCE DAMAGE TO RENTED PREMISES (Ea occurrence)	\$ 1,000,000 \$ 1,000,000
					Q30-1001106	6/10/2016	6/10/2017	MED EXP (Any one person)	\$ 5,000
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						PERSONAL & ADV INJURY	\$ 1,000,000
	GEI	N'L AGGREGATE LIMIT APPLIES PER:						GENERAL AGGREGATE	\$ 2,000,00
	X	POLICY PRO- JECT LOC						PRODUCTS - COMP/OP AGG	\$ 2,000,00
		OTHER:							\$
	AU.	TOMOBILE LIABILITY						COMBINED SINGLE LIMIT (Ea accident)	\$
		ANY AUTO						BODILY INJURY (Per person)	\$
		ALL OWNED SCHEDULED AUTOS						BODILY INJURY (Per accident)	\$
	HIRED AUTOS NON-OWNED AUTOS							PROPERTY DAMAGE (Per accident)	\$
		Acres							\$
		UMBRELLA LIAB OCCUR						EACH OCCURRENCE	\$
		EXCESS LIAB CLAIMS-MADE						AGGREGATE	\$
		DED RETENTION \$							\$
		RKERS COMPENSATION DEMPLOYERS' LIABILITY						PER OTH- STATUTE ER	
ANY PROPRIETOR/PARTNER/EXECUTIVE OFFICER/MEMBER EXCLUDED? (Mandatory in NH)		1	Q90-1000916	6/10/2016	6/10/2017	E,L, EACH ACCIDENT	\$ 500,00		
						E,L, DISEASE - EA EMPLOYEE	\$ 500,00		
	If ye	s, describe under CRIPTION OF OPERATIONS below						E.L. DISEASE - POLICY LIMIT	\$ 500,00
В	Pr	ofessional Liability			G28129105 001	6/10/2016	6/10/2017	\$1,000,000 each claim	1,000,000 Ag
		TION OF OPERATIONS / LOCATIONS / VEHIC							

DESCRIPTION OF OPERATIONS / LOCATIONS / VEHICLES (ACORD 101, Additional Remarks Schedule, may be attached if more space is required) The City of Chicago is listed as additional insured.

CERTIFICATE HOLDER	CANCELLATION
Office of the Mayor City of Chicago 121 North LA Salle Street	SHOULD ANY OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED POLICIES BE CANCELLED BEFORE THE EXPIRATION DATE THEREOF, NOTICE WILL BE DELIVERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY PROVISIONS.
Chicago, IL 60602	AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

© 1988-2014 ACORD CORPORATION. All rights reserved.