

Proposal Scores		Maximum Weight	Crystal & Company			* Development Strategies *			January Advisors			RDG Planning & Design			Shockey Consulting Services, LLC			Thomas P. Miller and Associates, LLC			Urban Partners			Western Economic Services, LLC		
			A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
1	Qualifications, Experience, and Past Performance	30	15	15	22	27	28	27	15	17	22	26	22	25	28	23	23	20	17	23	26	18	26	25	23	23
2	Project Understanding & Approach	30	15	10	14	29	28	27	15	20	20	24	22	26	26	27	27	24	22	20	28	24	26	20	25	22
3	Responsiveness	20	10	10	11	17	18	17	15	18	13	18	15	12	17	15	18	16	12	15	16	16	17	15	16	16
4	Cost	20	20	20	20	15	15	15	11	11	11	11	11	11	8	8	8	17	17	17	14	14	14	10	10	10
	Total	100	60	55	67	88	89	86	56	66	66	79	70	74	79	73	76	77	68	75	84	72	83	70	74	71
	Average Score		61			88			63			74			76			73			80			72		
	Pricing		\$40,280			\$55,500			\$73,675			\$71,000			\$94,850			\$47,080			\$56,658			\$81,695		

* Development Strategies recommended for award based on best value response.

Comments from Evaluators

Proposer 1 - Crystal & Company

Not a lot of personnel listed. Primarily 1 principle of the company and 1 economist.

Most experience appears to be consultation for CDBG and tax credit programs for cities and municipalities.

Not a clear outline of what experience they have. Some clients appear to have full housing studies while many had just needs assessments.

Their timeline seems very short with very few people listed as a project team. Only 3 months to complete is the shortest timeline compared to all others.

They only include what appears to be 1 in-person trip which seems low without showing cost options for additional trips.

Crystal has qualifications and experience specific to housing studies. However, their focus and experience is performing studies for HUD

Consolidated Plans in which Crystal has significant experience. Crystal offers the shortest project schedule in 3 months. However, in their proposal, there does not appear to be any outreach or mention of forming a Steering Committee or working group. Additionally, there is no mention of a final presentation to City Council. It was not clear from Crystal's proposal that the analysis would include employment trends nor any type of GIS

Three months does not seem sufficient for the breadth of study requested. Approach seems to be focused on providing a HUD Consolidated Plan

Housing Market Analysis. Question that there will be sufficient capacity or experience with this firm planning a more comprehensive and community engaged study.

Proposer 2 - Development Strategies

Good mix of personnel with planners and public policy expertise

Did a housing strategy for Topeka

They have a well outlined strategy process

Timeline is a reasonable 4 months

In person trips are an added cost

Development Strategies' (DS) has qualifications and experience in related housing studies. Their proposal includes a 4-month project schedule and a reasonable engagement plan. The DS proposal includes a market analysis, benchmarking and housing affordability analysis, which will include GIS analysis. DS includes a presentation to City Council. The add-on services increase the cost of their proposal, but may not be necessary. They have several staff to assist in completing the study.

Appreciate the holistic approach and balance of data analysis and qualitative assessment. Seems to grasp severity of current housing market crisis and implications for the future. 3.5 months might not be sufficient time to get the product we want. Well rounded team with clear roles.

Proposer 3 - January Advisors

This firm seems very heavy on the data crunching side of the study.

The personnel discussed was made up of mostly software engineers and data analysis.

Didn't list any local studies that have been done or within the region. Most work appears to have been done in Texas.

Appear to use a lot of dashboards for possible meetings and didn't discuss much about in-person or site visits.

January has experience and qualifications related to a variety of housing however, their experience leans towards evictions and affordability. January proposes a 4-month project schedule and their approach includes the use of stakeholder interviews and a final presentation. Overall, the proposal is vague and leaves it to be adjusted to stakeholder expectations. Almost entirely data driven, no value add. Lacks aligned experience

Proposer 4 - RDG Planning & Design

Has worked in Johnson County Kansas

Also Wyandotte County housing study and a housing assessment for Blue Springs and Belton

7 month project timeline is on the longer side compared to others

Seem more focused on regional and urban comprehensive planning projects

Appears to be a much larger group of engineers, planners, and architects. Does have a staff of planners and urban studies

Good range of housing study experience

RDG has relevant qualifications and experience in housing studies. RDG's proposal involves a 7-month process and involves a survey, stakeholder interview, GIS mapping. Their approach involves setting up a Technical Committee and presentation and adoption by City Council. The examples given are relevant to the type of study anticipated by the City.

Love the comprehensive approach. Strong relevant and complementary experience in region. Recognizes need and value of assessing neighborhood conditions to identify opportunities for future investments. Thorough community engagement plan. Commitment of time to project is a plus.

Proposer 5 - Shockley Consulting Services, LLC

They are a local company.

Experience appears to be more in line with comprehensive city planning.

Root Policy has more of the housing experience with Mollie F. when with BBC research had the example of a housing study for Lawrence KS.

Currently working on Johnson County plan.

Outline is well described.

Does have urban planners for staff.

Appears to be an 8 month timeline which is one of the longer proposals.

Shockley and Root has relevant qualifications and experience. Shockley brings the engagement component while Root brings the housing component. They propose a 7-month project schedule that includes a robust engagement component as well as a thorough analysis. Their proposal includes using a focus group but will also utilize GIS to convey information. A lot of their experience is working on Comprehensive Plans.

The Lawrence, KS example is relevant however, it is long and difficult to use.

Lacks distinction in product to justify the significant cost difference. Value would be added by analysis proposer offers of public cost that would be required to support various housing recommendations—not identified by other proposals. Familiarity with regional housing market would be a plus.

Proposer 6 - Thomas P. Miller and Associates, LLC

Staff appears to have more experience in creating opportunity zones for city's or municipalities.

Most Staff appear to be related more to business degrees.

Similar housing studies in Iowa and Illinois were discussed.

They did mention housing opportunities near transit areas.

Didn't see a project schedule. Expected timeline appears to be 7 months which is one of the longer proposals.

TPMA proposes a 6-month schedule which involves a Steering Committee and stakeholder interviews. I did not see in their proposal where any major employer would be part of the stakeholder interviews nor was there any mention of GIS mapping. Their examples of past experience does not include a community similar to Independence; past work has been for housing authorities.

Adequate—meets the base expectation. Approach is nondescript. Experience is not as competitive in comparison to some of the other vendors.

Proposer 7 - Urban Partners

It appears that Lexington KY and St. Cloud FL was their only full housing study discussed. Others were appearing limited to downtown, rental or specific residential studies.

They have done Joplin MO housing study.

Their staff consist of 3 planners with 2 being principles of the company.

Only one staff appears to have been attributed to a housing study project. The others listed described master planning or district planning experience.

Timeline is around six months which is on average of other submittals.

They do have additional fees for in-person meetings.

Urban Partners brings a variety of housing study qualifications and experiences. They propose a 6-month project schedule that includes a Steering Committee. A few of the examples are relevant to the type of study anticipated by the City. The final in person presentation is added cost. It was not clear whether it included an analysis of employment and the impact that could have on housing.

Largely coastal housing and metropolitan housing market study experience. Good combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis. Focus on segmentation is a plus. Offers strong understanding of the need to take a deep dive into existing housing stock to find opportunities to insure these neighborhoods remain competitive in the larger market—unique to other proposals.

Proposer 8 - Western Economic Services, LLC

Very detailed outline of project approach.

Listed several similar housing studies however mostly in the NE of the country.

Staff is composed of mostly economist with only one urban planner.

They do include public meetings in their proposal with 2 in-person but mostly virtual

Their timeline appears to be six months' which is on average with the other proposals.

WES provided a very detailed proposal. Some of the final duties are the City's responsibilities. WES does not include a final presentation to City Council. The examples included in the proposal are not relevant to the type of study anticipated by the City; the focus appeared to be work on Consolidated Plans.

Proposal will rely heavily on City-staff support to deliver end product. Approach is primarily data driven and rigid. Finely detailed implementation plan.