

# **EV2228 Economic Development Incentives Analysis**

*Pete Mathews*  
*05/13/2016*

## Contents

1. Instructions and Conditions .....	3
2. Scope of Services .....	16
3. Authorized Representative Form.....	21
4. Cooperative Procurement with other Jurisdiction form.....	22
5. Standard City Contract.....	22
6. Business/Firm Profile and Legal Structure .....	22
7. Experience .....	25
8. Personnel .....	29
9. Project Approach.....	38
10. Sustainability.....	46
11. Pricing/Cost Proposal.....	47
12. Employee Eligibility Verification Affidavit .....	47
13. References .....	48
14. Tax Clearance for City and Local Governments.....	48
15. Performance Bond.....	49
<b>PERFORMANCE BOND .....</b>	<b>49</b>
16. Value Added Options- Cooperative Agreement Submittals.....	51
17. MBE/WBE Goals .....	51
18. Addendum 1: Preliminary Questions .....	51
19. Addendum 2: Pre-Submittal Teleconference Instructions.....	53
20. Addendum 3: Post-Teleconference Questions and Responses .....	54
21. Addendum 4: Additional Information on Incentive Programs.....	55
22. Addendum 5: Urgent Notice to Respondents.....	55

## **1. Instructions and Conditions**

### **1. PURPOSE**

Conduct a comprehensive analysis of the City of Kansas City's historic use of economic development incentives and the resulting impacts.

---

### **2. DUE DATE FOR PROPOSALS**

Proposers shall submit Proposals to the City Contact Person listed in Section 3 by 11:00 p.m. (CT) on 06/12/2016, (June 12, 2016).

---

### **3. CITY CONTACT PERSONS**

#### (a) General, Technical and Proposal Submission Questions

Proposers shall submit their Proposal and any general questions or issues about any aspect of this RFP to the following City Contact person:

Kerrie Tyndall  
City Manager's Office  
City Hall, 29th Floor  
414 E. 12<sup>th</sup> Street  
Kansas City, Missouri 64106  
Office: (816) 513-6539  
E-mail: kerrie.tyndall@kcmo.org

Questions may also be submitted through the RFP365 online tool.

---

### **4. DEFINITIONS**

- This Request for Proposals ("RFP" or "solicitation") is an invitation by the City for Proposers to submit an offer, which may be subject to subsequent discussions and negotiations by the City and the Proposer. It is not a request for a competitive bid.
- "Proposal" means any document, submittal, interview, presentation, discussion, negotiation, and everything and anything provided in response to this RFP regardless whether the submission is an oral or written submission.
- By submitting a proposal to the City, Proposer agrees that the Proposer does not obtain any right in or expectation to a contract with the City or a vested interest or a property right in a

contract with the City regardless of the amount of time, effort and expense expended by Proposer in attempting to obtain a written executed contract with the City that complies with Section 432.070, RSMo, the City Charter and City ordinances.

---

## **5. ESTIMATED SCHEDULE**

This process will include two primary phases - the Qualifications Phase, during which firms will be evaluated, based on expertise and approach, and a preferred firm will be selected to proceed to the second phase - the Scope Development/Price Negotiation Phase. The schedule below provides estimated time frames for the major components of these two phases

These are estimated dates subject to modification by the City. Respondents will be notified of any changes to this schedule.

- 1 Issue RFQ/P
- 2 Due Date for Responses - 6/12/16
- 3 Pre-Submittal Teleconference - to answer questions and provide clarification on qualification requirements one (1) week prior to the close date for the RFQ/P.
- 4 Question Period - 2 weeks after Close.
- 5 Short-listed Firm Interviews Complete - Mid June 2016
- 6 Preferred Firm Selected - Jun 2016

Upon selection of the preferred firm, the City will issue an offer letter and schedule a kick off meeting to begin negotiation of the final scope of services and pricing with the selected firm.

- 1 Finalize the Scope of Services and Pricing - Early Summer 2016.
  - 2 Project Commencement - Summer 2016
  - 3 Required Project Completion Date - Fall 2016
- 

## **6. RFQ/P DOCUMENTS**

This RFQ/P consists of the following sections:

- This RFQ/P

- Scope of Services
  - Standard City Contract
  - HRD Documents
- 

## **7. EXAMINATION OF ALL RFQ/P DOCUMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS**

- Each Proposer shall carefully examine all RFQ/P documents and thoroughly familiarize themselves with all RFQ/P requirements prior to submitting a proposal to ensure that Proposer's Proposal meets the intent of this RFQ/P.
  - Before submitting a Proposal to the City, each Proposer shall be responsible for making all investigations and examinations that are necessary to ascertain any and all conditions and requirements that affect the requirements of this RFQ/P. Failure to make such investigations and examinations shall not relieve the Proposer from Proposer's obligation to comply, in every detail, with all provisions and requirements of the RFQ/P.
  - By submitting a Proposal to the City, Proposer certifies that Proposer has provided the City with written notice of all ambiguities, conflicts, mistakes, errors or discrepancies that Proposer has discovered in the RFQ/P, the Proposed Contract, Scope of Services and any other document. By executing a Contract with the City, Proposer certifies that Proposer communicated to City all ambiguities, conflicts, errors or discrepancies that it has discovered in the RFQ/P, the Proposed Contract, Scope of Services and any other document and that written resolution thereof by the City as embodied in the final Contract is acceptable to Proposer.
- 

## **8. QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS ABOUT THIS RFQ/P**

- Question Deadline
  - Proposers may submit written questions, request clarifications or provide notice to the appropriate City Contact person listed in Section 3 of any ambiguities, conflicts, mistakes, errors or discrepancies that Proposer has discovered in the RFQ/P, the Proposed Contract, Scope of Services and any other solicitation document at any time until one (1) week prior to the due date for proposals.
  - The City will answer all inquiries by any Proposer in writing. If any inquiry results in a change in the RFQ/P, the City will issue an Addendum and the Addendum will be on

the City's website. It is the responsibility of Proposers to check and City's website for addenda. <http://www.kcmo.gov>

- Questions - Post Deadline
    - If a Proposer discovers any ambiguities, conflicts, mistakes, errors or discrepancies **after the deadline for questions and clarifications or after the proposal due date**, Proposer shall immediately submit the ambiguity, conflict, mistake, error or discrepancy to the appropriate City Contact person listed in Section 3. The City, in its sole discretion, shall determine the appropriate response to any issue raised by any Proposer.
- 

## 9. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

**All proposal documents must be submitted in the exact order as listed in the City RFQ/P.**

- The City uses RFP365 for the electronic distribution and submission of this RFQ/P's responses.
- Respondents will prepare their answers and upload completed forms in this electronic platform. Respondents can prepare responses to RFQ/P questions that include:
  - Formatted text, using the formatting options in the text editor
  - Uploaded files, including completed forms and supporting documentation. Use the *paperclip* icon in the text editor to upload a file.
  - Embedded images. Thumbnails of images can be uploaded into the text, resized, and placed using the controls through *picture frame* icon in the text editor.
  - Links to external website which are publicly available.
- Respondents using the RFP365 platform can add internal team members to help in the preparation of their responses. By clicking on the Users page through the drop-down under your name in the upper right-hand corner, you can invite team members to collaborate on responses.
- Users of this platform must have an internet connection and can use browsers including: Google Chrome, Mozilla Firefox, Apple Safari, and Microsoft Internet Explorer 9 or newer. Users on old versions of browsers which are not supported by this application will be warned at the login screen that they are using an unsupported browser. Google Chrome and Mozilla Firefox are free browsers and can be installed on the user's computer at no charge.
- Users of RFP365 can send and receive messages to the RFQ/P owner by using the messaging feature in the top-right corner of this RFQ/P screen. Messages will be responded to accordingly and an email of any message will be copied to the respondent point of contact.
- Each response can be assigned to users of the respondent's team. They can set internal due dates and manage the progress inside of the RFP365 platform.
- Only complete and approved responses can be submitted.
- Submission after the due date at midnight (Central time) is not allowed.
- Technical support for this application is available at [support@rfp365.com](mailto:support@rfp365.com).

---

## **10. CONTENT OF PROPOSAL**

In the subsequent sections of this proposal, respondents will be required to prepare answers to various questions. These sections include:

- Business/Firm Profile and Legal Structure
- Experience
- Personnel
- Project Approach
- Sustainability
- Cost Proposal
- References
- Other Required Documents

---

## **11. EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Any evaluation criteria or weighting of criteria is used by the City only as a tool to assist the City in selecting the best proposal for the City. Evaluation scores or ranks do not create any right in or expectation to a contract with the City regardless of any score or ranking given to any Proposer by the City. In other words, even if the City gives a Proposer the highest rank and highest score, the Proposer still has no expectation of a contract with the City and the City may choose to contract with any other Proposer regardless of the score or rank of the other Proposer.

Our evaluation criteria will include the following:

### Minimum Eligibility Criteria

- **Schedule.** The selected firm will be required to complete this analysis by Fall 2016, and will be required to demonstrate capacity to meet required deadlines, subject to final negotiated project schedule.
- **Minority Participation.** Selected firms will be required to comply with City MBE/WBE policies and utilized locally certified subcontractors in fulfillment of these requirements.
- **Qualifications.** Teams will be evaluated on the basis of experience in performing similar projects. References will be used to assist in this evaluation.

- Understanding of project. Teams will be evaluated on the basis of how well they communicate an understanding of the research project outlined in this RFQ/P.
- Approach to project. Proposals will be evaluated on how the proposed project meets the objectives of the City and its partners and the proposer's understanding of available data and their approach for gathering the data. This includes the strength of the applicant's approach to analyzing or modeling the impact of economic development incentives.
- Quality of work. Proposals will be judged on the apparent quality of the work performed in similar situations. References will be used to determine the research team's ability to deliver the results expected.
- Personnel. Proposals will be evaluated on the personnel assigned to the project. Specific attention will be placed on personnel who have similar project experience and qualifications to perform the tasks outlined in the RFQ/P. This includes the demonstrated ability of the contractor to conduct the project within the given timeframe, based on staffing. At least one team member of any responding firm should have a minimum of 10 years individual professional experience in a leadership capacity in an economic development, public sector finance, tax accounting, economics, either economic analysis, tax analysis, real estate analysis, public policy analysis, or related field.
- Value. Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the approach that will position the City of Kansas City to obtain results and achieve the most success within the framework identified in the proposal - ultimately providing Kansas City with a significant economic development planning tool and analysis.
- Cost. Proposals will be evaluated on the cost estimate provided in relation to the expertise and approach outlined.
- Past Experience. Proposals will be evaluated on the number of years of relevant experience, with preference towards firms having experience working with local governments, analyzing economic incentives and/or tax policy, conducting economic research, and/or analyzing real estate values. The selected firm must have past experience completing complex analysis for federal, state, or local governments, or economic development organizations serving populations of at least 100,000 residents.

Evaluation of responses to this RFQ/P and final selection of a preferred consulting team will be conducted by a Project Selection Committee comprised of representatives from various City departments and community partners engaged in daily economic development activities on behalf of the City including - City Finance, City Planning, the Office of Economic Development (a division of the City Manager's Office), the Mayor's Office, the Economic Development Corporation of Kansas City, Missouri, and staff of the Tax Increment Financing Commission and the Planned Industrial Expansion Authority, which are economic development statutory agencies of the City.

---

## **12. INTERVIEWS**

The City, in its sole discretion, may interview none, one, some or all of the Proposers who submit proposals.



---

### **13. DISCUSSIONS AND NEGOTIATIONS**

The City, in its sole discretion, may do any or all of the following:

- evaluate Proposals and award a contract with or without discussions or negotiations with any or all of the Proposers;
- discuss and negotiate anything and everything with any Proposer or Proposers at any time;
- request additional information from any or all Proposers;
- request a Proposer or Proposers to submit a new Proposal;
- request one or more best and final offers from any or all Proposers;
- accept any Proposal in whole or in part;
- require a Proposer to make modifications to their initial Proposals;
- make a partial award to any or all Proposers;
- make a multiple award to any or all of Proposers;
- terminate this RFQ/P, and reissue an amended RFQ/P.

---

### **14. PROPOSAL MUST REMAIN FIRM IRREVOCABLE OFFER TO CITY FOR 6 MONTHS**

- By submitting a proposal to the City, Proposer agrees that Proposer's Proposal shall constitute a firm irrevocable offer to the City that Proposer shall not withdraw or modify without the City's approval for six (6) months after the proposal due date. Proposer agrees that even if the City negotiates or makes a counter offer to Proposer on Proposer's original Proposal or any subsequent Proposal submitted by Proposer to the City, Proposer hereby grants to the City, in the City's sole discretion, the unconditional right for the City to accept Proposer's original Proposal and the City's negotiation or counter offer shall not be deemed to be a counter offer.
- After six (6) months, the City can accept any proposal or subsequent proposals from any Proposer with the consent of the Proposer at any time and regardless of the length of time that has passed from the proposal due date.

---

### **15. SELECTION**

The City will select the proposal that in the City's sole judgment the City determines to be the best Proposal. Section 432.070, RSMo requires the City to have a written executed contract signed by both

parties prior to anyone performing services or providing any goods, supplies, materials or equipment to the City.

The written executed contract must also comply with the City Charter and City Ordinances.

This means that a proposer does not have a contract with the City until a written contract is *executed*. A contract is *executed* when all of the following have occurred: (1) the City Council authorizes the execution of a contract with the Proposer (if City Council approval is requested by City staff or is required by City Ordinance); (2) persons with actual authority to bind both the City and the Proposer execute the contract; (3) the contract is approved by the Law Department; (4) the City issues a purchase order to the Contractor with the Director of Finance's certification of availability of funds for the contract; and (5) any other required step.

A Proposer does not have a contract with the City until all the steps are completed.

If the City does not complete all required steps, there is no contract between the City and the Proposer and the City has absolutely no contractual or financial obligation to any Proposer regardless of the amount of time, effort and money spent by the Proposer responding to the RFQ/P and attempting to negotiate and obtain a contract with the City.

---

## **16. REJECTION OF PROPOSALS**

The City reserves the unconditional right to reject any or all proposals received in response to this RFQ/P at any time prior to the City executing a contract that meets the requirements of Section 432.070, RSMo, the City Charter and all applicable City Ordinances.

---

## **17. WAIVER OF ORDINANCES, REGULATIONS AND RFQ/P REQUIREMENTS**

- The City, at any time, may waive any requirements imposed in this RFQ/P or by any City regulation.
- The City may waive any requirement imposed by the City's Code of Ordinances when failure to grant the waiver will result in an increased cost to the City and the requirement waived would be waived for all Proposers for this RFQ/P and it is in the best interest of the City to grant the waiver.

---

## **18. LATE PROPOSALS**

The City, in its sole discretion, may consider proposals received by the City after the proposal due date.

---

#### **19. CHANGES IN THE RFQ/P**

- After this RFQ/P is issued, the City, in its sole discretion, may change everything or anything contained in this RFQ/P at any time including after the Proposal due date. If the change is prior to the proposal due date, the City reserves the right, when considered necessary or appropriate, to modify this RFQ/P.
  - If the City shall amend the RFQ/P after the proposal due date, the City may, in its sole discretion, solicit new proposals in an amended RFQ/P from anyone or everyone regardless whether a person submitted a proposal in response to the original RFQ/P.
- 

#### **20. CHANGES IN EXECUTED CONTRACT AND ADDITIONAL WORK**

- After the City executes a contract in accordance with the requirements of Section 432.070, RSMo, the City Charter and City Ordinances, the City may, in its sole discretion, amend the contract to change anything or everything associated with the contract as long as such change is in the interest of the City and as long as the Contractor agrees to the change.
  - The City, in its sole discretion, may award additional contracts for related work or subsequent Project phases to the selected Contractor.
  - The City, in its sole discretion, may extend the term of the contract with the selected Contractor notwithstanding the expiration of the initial term or any subsequent term or all options to renew, until the City has a new contract in place with either Proposer or another provider or until the City terminates the Contract.
- 

#### **21. PROPOSER SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL COSTS**

Regardless of the amount of time, effort, cost and expense incurred by a Proposer in Proposer's attempt to win this City contract, Proposer agrees that Proposer shall be solely responsible and liable for any and all costs incurred by Proposer.

The City shall have no liability or responsibility for any of Proposer's costs or expenses.

---

## **22. OWNERSHIP OF PROPOSALS**

By submitting its Proposal, Proposer hereby agrees that Proposer's Proposal and any supplementary material submitted by the Proposer shall become property of the City.

---

## **23. DISCLOSURE OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION**

- A Proposer may attempt to restrict the disclosure of scientific and technological innovations in which the Proposer has a proprietary interest, or other information that is protected from public disclosure by law, which is contained in the Proposal by marking each response of each such document prominently with the words "Proprietary Information";
  - After either a contract is executed pursuant to the RFQ/P, or all submittals are rejected, if access to documents marked "Proprietary Information", as provided above, is requested under the Missouri Sunshine Law, the City will notify the Proposer of the request, and it shall be the burden of the Proposer to establish that such documents are exempt from disclosure under the law.
  - If the Proposer elects to challenge a formal request for such information made to the City and if the Proposer is unsuccessful in keeping such information closed, the Proposer shall pay for any and all costs, attorney fees and fines that are a result of Proposer's attempt to keep the information closed.
  - Notwithstanding the foregoing, in response to a formal request for information, the City reserves the right to release any documents if the City determines that such information is a public record pursuant to the Missouri Sunshine Law. The City shall have no liability to any Proposer or anyone else for releasing any Proprietary Information of a Proposer even if the City is negligent in releasing or disclosing any Proprietary Information of any Proposer.
- 

## **24. CLOSED RECORDS**

All Proposals including interviews, presentations and documents, and meetings relating thereto may remain closed records or meetings under the Missouri Sunshine Law until a contract is executed or until all Proposals are rejected by the City. If the City amends this RFQ/P, Proposals submitted in response to the original RFQ/P may remain closed records until a contract is executed or all proposals submitted in response to the amended RFQ/P are rejected.

Proposals shall remain closed records even if the City mistakenly informs all Proposers that it is rejecting any and all Proposals prior to amending the RFQ/P as long as the City intends to amend the RFQ/P and resolicit Proposals.

---

## **25. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION**

It is the policy of the City that any person or entity entering into a contract with the City, will employ applicants and treat employees equally without regard to their race, color, sex, religion, national origin or ancestry, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity or age.

The City's Affirmative Action ordinance requires that any person or entity who employs fifty (50) or more persons and is awarded a contract from the City totaling more than \$300,000.00 must:

- Execute and submit an affidavit, in a form prescribed by the City, warranting that the Contractor has an affirmative action program in place and will maintain the affirmative action program in place for the duration of the contract.
- Submit, in print or electronic format, a copy of the Contractor's current certificate of compliance to the City's Human Relations Department (HRD) prior to receiving the first payment under the contract, unless a copy has already been submitted to HRD at any point within the previous two (2) calendar years. If, and only if, Contractor does not possess a current certification of compliance, Contractor shall submit, in print or electronic format, a copy of its affirmative action program to HRD prior to receiving the first payment under the contract, unless a copy has already been submitted to HRD at any point within the previous two (2) calendar years.
- Require any Subcontractor awarded a subcontract exceeding \$300,000.00 to affirm that Subcontractor has an affirmative action program in place and will maintain the affirmative action program in place for the duration of the subcontract.
- Obtain from any Subcontractor awarded a subcontract exceeding \$300,000.00 a copy of the Subcontractor's current certificate of compliance and tender a copy of the same, in print or electronic format, to HRD within thirty (30) days from the date the subcontract is executed. If, and only if, Subcontractor does not possess a current certificate of compliance, Contractor shall obtain a copy of the Subcontractor's affirmative action program and tender a copy of the same, in print or electronic format, to HRD within thirty (30) days from the date the subcontract is executed

If you have any questions regarding the City's Affirmative Action requirements, please contact HRD at (816) 513-1836 or visit the City's website: [www.kcmo.gov](http://www.kcmo.gov)

---

## **26. TAX CLEARANCE FOR CITY**

Prior to the City making the first payment under any contract or contract renewal term, Contractor must provide a tax clearance letter from the City's Commissioner of Revenue dated not more than ninety (90) days from the date of submission.

Proposers may obtain this tax clearance letter from the City's Revenue Division at (816) 513-1135 or (816) 513-1089.

## **27. INDEMNIFICATION**

The City's standard contract requires that the Contractor shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless the City and any of its agencies, officials, officers, or employees from and against all claims, damages, liability, losses, costs, and expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees, arising out of or resulting from any acts or omissions in connection with the contract, caused in whole or in part by Contractor, its employees, agents, or Subcontractors, or caused by others for whom Contractor is liable, including negligent acts or omissions of the City, its agencies, officials, officers, or employees. The contract requires Contractor to obtain specified limits of insurance to insure the indemnity obligation. **Contractor has the opportunity to recover the cost of the required insurance in the Contract Price by including the cost of that insurance in the Proposal.**

---

## **28. BUY AMERICAN AND MISSOURI PREFERENCE POLICIES**

- Buy American Preference. It is the policy of the City that any manufactured goods or commodities used or supplied in the performance of any City contract or any subcontract thereto shall be manufactured or produced in the United States whenever possible. When proposals offer quality, price, conformity with specifications, term of delivery and other conditions imposed in the specifications that are equal, the City shall select the proposal that uses manufactured goods or commodities that are manufactured or produced in the United States.
  - Buy Missouri Preference. It is the policy of the City to give preference to all commodities manufactured, produced, or grown within the State of Missouri and to all firms, corporations, or individuals doing business as Missouri firms, corporations, or individuals, when the quality is equal or better and delivered price is the same or less. It is the Proposer's responsibility to claim these preferences.
- 

## **29. MISSOURI SECRETARY OF STATE BUSINESS ENTITY REGISTRATION**

Prior to execution of a contract with the City, the apparent successful Proposer must submit a current copy of Proposer's Certificate of Good Standing from the Missouri Secretary of State's website.

<http://www.sos.mo.gov>

---

### **30. CITY OF KANSAS CITY MISSOURI BUSINESS LICENSE**

Prior to execution of a contract with the City, the apparent successful Proposer must submit a current copy of Proposer's valid business license.

Proposers may obtain this business license from the City's Revenue Division/Business License section at (816) 513-1135 or visit the City's website. <http://www.kcmo.gov>

---

### **31. PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES BY FORMER CITY EMPLOYEES AND OFFICIALS**

Section 2-1018 of the City's Code prohibits former elected City officials and former executive or administrative employees of the City from trying to influence a decision of the City on behalf of an employer or client for one (1) year after that former employee or official leaves the City's employ. By submitting a Proposal, Proposer affirms that Proposer and its team members and employees are in compliance with the requirements of Section 2-1018. Failure to comply with the requirements of Section 2-1018 may cause the Proposal to be rejected.

---

### **32. EMPLOYEE ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION**

If this contract exceeds five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00), Supplier shall execute and submit an affidavit, in a form prescribed by the CITY, affirming that Supplier does not knowingly employ any person in connection with the contracted services who does not have the legal right or authorization under federal law to work in the United States as defined in 8 U.S.C. §1324a(h)(3). Supplier shall attach to the affidavit documentation sufficient to establish Supplier's enrollment and participation in an electronic verification of work program operated by the United States Department of Homeland Security to verify information of newly hired employees, under the Immigration and Reform and Control Act of 1986. Supplier may obtain additional information about E-Verify and enroll at <https://e-verify.uscis.gov/enroll/StartPage.aspx?JS=YES>.

For those Suppliers enrolled in E-Verify, the first and last pages of the E-Verify Memorandum of Understanding that Supplier will obtain upon successfully enrolling in the program shall constitute sufficient documentation for purposes of complying with this section. Supplier shall submit the affidavit and attachments to the CITY prior to execution of the contract, or at any point during the term of the contract if requested by the CITY.

The affidavit is found under Section IV - Attachments and Exhibits.

---

### **33. COOPERATIVE PROCUREMENT WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS**

Proposer must acknowledge acceptance or decline by returning the form found under Section III - Special Instructions and Conditions.

---

### **34. MBE/WBE GOALS**

- The City desires that City certified Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs) and City certified Women Business Enterprises (WBEs) have a maximum opportunity to participate in the performance of City contracts. The MBE/WBE participation goals for this Project are split. This RFQ/P requires 10% DBE/MBE participation and 5% WBE participation.
- The City's HRD Forms and Instructions are incorporated into this Request for Proposals and the Contract Documents.
- Please complete HRD Form 13 - Affidavit of Intended Utilization and attach it to this RFP response where indicated. The City of Kansas City, Missouri has a list of City Certified MBEs/WBEs at

<https://kcmohrd.mwdbe.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchPub...>

### **35. WAIVER OF MBE/WBE REQUIREMENTS**

The City Council, in its sole discretion, may waive any and all MBE/WBE requirements imposed by this solicitation and any Proposal Documents or the MBE/WBE Ordinance, and award the contract to the best Proposer if the City Council determines a waiver is in the best interests of the City.

---

#### **1. Have you read the above Instructions and Conditions?**

True

#### **2. Scope of Services**

##### About the Requestor

Kansas City, Missouri (the "City") lies on the western edge of Missouri. Among the 100 largest cities in the United States, it is the most centrally located in the lower 48 states. This central location makes it very competitive for employment involving transportation, communication and distribution.

The City covers 319 square miles and is home to approximately 470,000 residents, making it the largest city in Missouri, both in area and in population. Its area is the 11th largest among United States cities that are not consolidated with counties. Its population is the 37th largest in the United States. The City lies within parts of four counties; Cass, Clay, Jackson, Platte and 15 public school districts. It is at the center



of a 14-county metropolitan area with approximately 2,085,000 residents.

In 2012, the City Council adopted the [AdvanceKC strategy](#), a comprehensive economic development strategy, aimed at improving the City's economic competitiveness nationally and globally. AdvanceKC further recommends that the City's policies include an ongoing data-supported analysis of the impact of awarded incentives based on the City Council's economic development strategic priorities.

### About the Project

By resolution, the City Council has directed the City Manager to develop a plan for the purposes of engaging a consultant to conduct a comprehensive study of economic development incentives. The study shall take into consideration the City's economic development objectives as established by AdvanceKC.

Being able to evaluate the overall use of incentives is an important part of understanding the City's overall financial outlook and will inform future economic development policy direction. It will also increase transparency and accountability by establishing a process and system to capture, maintain, and report historic and future economic development project data which is readily accessible to policy makers and the public. As early investments in revitalization mature, many of the City's projects will fully return to the tax rolls, providing additional resources to its taxing jurisdictions. Much of our City's historic use of incentives has been tied to the revitalization of downtown, which began in earnest in the mid to late 1990s. As such, those investments would be anticipated to mature in the next three to eight years making this an ideal time to evaluate the use of incentive tools.

In order to evaluate the impacts of incentive use, and determine outcomes, we need to understand when, where and how the City and other taxing jurisdictions will see, and have seen, the benefits of those early investments. A comprehensive evaluation of the City's historic use of incentives to-date is needed to provide a qualitative and quantitative assessment of the tools and inform future economic development incentive policy.

The City of Kansas City receives its statutory authority to convey economic incentives pursuant to multiple state statutes. These same statutes include authorization to establish multiple statutory agencies whose authority may be direct or advisory to the City Council. These "Economic Development Agencies" responsibilities include oversight and administration of various economic development incentive programs for the purpose of conveying the benefits of certain tax exemptions, tax abatements, tax redirections, and/or direct financial support from the City for the purpose of economic development. These benefits are conveyed through a variety of different mechanisms including issuance of bonds, conveyance of title, direct contractual agreement or other approaches specific to the powers of each agency and the needs of individual projects.

The City's Economic Development Agencies for the purpose of this study include - the Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority (LCRA), the Tax Increment Financing Commission (TIF Commission), the Downtown Economic Stimulus Authority (DESA), the Enhanced Enterprise Zone Boards (EEZ), the Planned Industrial Expansion Authority (PIEA) and the Kansas City Chapter 353 Advisory Board (353 Board) which administer programs for their respective programs. Additionally, the City directly and via

the Economic Development Corporation of Kansas City, the umbrella economic development agency for the City, and the Port Authority have additional authority to convey certain economic incentive benefits authorized pursuant to other Missouri State Statutes including Chapter 100 and Chapter 353. Major statutory authorizations are provided for reference below:

Chapter 67: <http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/ChaptersIndex/ch...>

Chapter 99: <http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/chapters/chapTex...>

Chapter 100: <http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/chapters/chapTex...>

Chapter 135: <http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/ChaptersIndex/ch...>

Chapter 353: <http://www.moga.mo.gov/mostatutes/chapters/chapTex...>

### Project Tasks

This analysis seeks to complete three major tasks, which may be proposed in a phased approach as deemed appropriate by the responder, but shall include at a minimum the following:

Task 1 - Identify Key Performance Indicators for all Incentives Programs

Task 2 - Complete a Historical Analysis of Key Performance Indicators

Task 3 - Assist the City in Developing On-going Monitoring and Reporting Systems

And assist the City in answering questions such as:

- 1 How much and what type of constructed and/or improved public infrastructure has resulted from the City's economic development efforts? What percentage of the City's overall infrastructure investment does this represent?
- 2 What has been the impact on assessed values and tax revenues?
- 3 How much new private investment has been leveraged through public incentives?
- 4 What has been the relative distribution of tax revenues committed to incentives projects across all taxing jurisdictions?
- 5 What has been the actual vs. projected performance for projects plans, and programs?
- 6 Has the City's use of incentives had a direct impact on real estate market values and/or business/job growth rates within incentivized areas, and if so, what, if any, are the multiplier effects on surrounding neighborhoods/census tracts?
- 7 What are the best metrics for evaluating the City's historic and future use of incentives?
- 8 How can we further align economic development incentives efforts with the AdvanceKC Strategic Plan and Council's ED Policies?
- 9 How can we better inform the public about the City's use of incentives?
- 10 What are some of the best practices for monitoring and reporting?

Task 1 - Identify Key Performance Indicators for all Incentives Programs

Although the public purposes for most economic development programs are similar and aimed at one of

two primary objectives - elimination of blight and retention or creation of jobs, the mechanism for getting to these objectives varies from program to program.

These objectives are traditionally accomplished through facilitation of one of the following types of investment -

- improvements to real property including new construction and/or redevelopment of existing property,
- improvements to public infrastructure in the form of new construction and/or rehabilitation of existing infrastructure, and
- business retention and expansion in the form of new equipment purchases, and expansion of operations.

Metrics needed to evaluate the long-term outcomes of these historic investments may vary from program to program depending on statutory requirements, project characteristics, and local economic development policy objectives.

In conjunction with this project the City seeks assistance from the selected consulting firm/team to identify the essential key performance indicators, appropriate statistical analysis techniques, relevant analytical data, and other information needed to evaluate the long-term outcomes of these historic economic development efforts and the ability to measure outcomes for future investments. Identification of key performance indicators will also ensure that the City's efforts to compile and centralize project, plan and program data are completed quickly and efficiently and focused on gathering only the most important pieces of data.

The City has identified additional temporary staffing resources that will be available to support the data collection needs of the project. Coordination and supervision of temporary project staff will be handled through the City's Office of Economic Development in consultation with the selected consulting firm/team. The consultant's role will be to assist the City in identifying essential data points and working to collaboratively develop a scope of services for the analysis to be completed as part of Task 2.

#### Task 2 - Complete a Historical Analysis of Key Performance Indicators

The City anticipates that this analysis would quantify and evaluate the City's aggregated project level, plan level and program level economic incentives data inclusive of all statutory agencies conveying tax abatements or exemptions, or redirecting tax revenues, and/or all contracts entered into directly with developers, businesses, and/or property owners for the purpose of furthering historic economic development projects.

This analysis should quantify and analyze the City's historic use of incentives for a minimum of 25 years commencing in 1990 (subject to availability of suitable source data to be provided by the City), and present such data in a manner that it can be used to evaluate the results of all economic development programs, plans, and projects for the specified timeframe. Subject to consultation with the selected consulting firm/team and development of a final scope of services in collaboration with the City, this

analysis should seek to aggregate and evaluate key performance indicators identified in Task 1 according to the following tentative categorizations including but not limited to:

- Incentive Type (Redirection, Abatement, Contractual Funding, etc.)
- Incentive Program (TIF, LCRA, PIEA, 353, etc.)
- Program Modifications (Payments in Lieu of Taxes, Economic Activity Taxes)
- Property Use (including Residential, Commercial, Industrial, Retail, Hotel) each of which may be further sub-categorized
- Time of Implementation
- Geography
- Economic Development Objective (Blight, Conservation, Job Creation, Public Infrastructure, etc.)
- Project Funding (Pay-as-you-go, Bonded)
- Measurements for Impacts of Multiple Layered Incentives
- Other project categorizations as determined appropriate in collaboration with the consulting team to achieve the City's project objectives

### Task 3 - Best Practices - Implementation Policies, Monitoring and Reporting

A key objective of this project will be to identify local government best practices in administering economic incentives programs. Additionally the City is seeking to develop ongoing reporting and monitoring practices reflecting national best practices to ensure that the data collected and analyzed is maintained and easily accessible to the public and policy decision-makers. Strategies to enhance communication and improve transparency in the deployment of economic development incentives are also needed to ensure that the public clearly understands the positive benefits of these efforts.

This analysis should identify local government best practices for data collection, monitoring, and reporting of economic incentives as well as economic development policy administration. Specifically, the selected firm should review and compare against best practices at a minimum the following:

- Economic Incentives Program Administration - This analysis should review existing policies and procedures for prioritizing, processing and vetting incentives requests, and evaluate their operational efficiency and alignment with stated policy objectives as identified in the City's AdvanceKC strategic plan and policy { copies attached to this RFQ }
- Monitoring - This analysis should evaluate and rank the capacity and effectiveness of existing legacy software systems and platforms to meet the City's current and future needs for capturing, analyzing and reporting economic incentives data at the program, plan and project levels. This analysis should identify best practices in local government economic incentives data collection systems and compare these benchmarks against existing systems. Existing software platforms that may be evaluated include Salesforce, PeopleSoft, EnerGov, MySidewalk, SalesForce, and CoStar, subject to negotiation as part of the final scope of services. This analysis should also evaluate current contract monitoring practices and identify monitoring duplications and/or gaps and develop a plan for improvement.

- Reporting - This analysis should review all existing economic incentives reporting across agencies including the City, the Economic Development Corporation and its associated statutory agencies (PIEA and Port Authority) and identify reporting gaps, duplications, and/or practices which should be replicated. It should also be evaluated for effectiveness at communicating key performance indicators and clearly communicating the outcomes at the program, plan and project level, and compared against other local government best practices (including examples of reporting types). Recommendations should include suggestions for improved practices including report types, audiences, and mechanisms of conveyance.

**1. Have you read and do you agree to the Scope of Services? If you have any narrative, please place it in the comments box for this question.**

True

**2. If there are any concerns/issues with this section, please place a detail of those items in the comments box for this question.**

True

### **3. Authorized Representative Form**

By submission of the RFQ/P response, the Proposer certifies that:

- 1 It has not paid or agreed to pay any fee or commission, or any other thing of value contingent upon the award of this contract, to any City of Kansas City, Missouri employee or official or to any current consultant to the City of Kansas City, Missouri;
- 2 It has not paid or agreed to pay any fee or commission or any other thing of value contingent upon the award of this contract, to any broker or agent or any other person;
- 3 The prices contained in this Proposal have been arrived at independently and without collusion, consultation, communication or agreement intended to restrict competition;
- 4 It has the full authority of the Offeror to execute the Proposal and to execute any resulting contract awarded as the result of, or on the basis of, the Proposal;
- 5 Proposer will not withdraw the Proposal for six months.

**1. I hereby certify that I have both the legal authority from my business/firm and the right to enter into this contractual agreement with the City of Kansas City, Missouri, and have read, understood, and hereby fully accept all the terms, conditions, specifications, and pricing information contained within this document as well as any and all subsequent pages, addenda, and notices.**

True

### **2. Authorized Representative name and title**

Toby Rittner  
President & CEO

**3. Authorized Representative phone number and email address**

614-705-1300  
[trittner@cdfa.net](mailto:trittner@cdfa.net)

**4. Firm's name and physical address**

Council of Development Finance Agencies  
100 E. Broad Street, Suite 1200  
Columbus, OH 43215

**5. Email address for Purchase Order**

[trittner@cdfa.net](mailto:trittner@cdfa.net)

**4. Cooperative Procurement with other Jurisdiction form**

The Proposer agrees to provide products and/or services to any municipality, county, state, governmental, public utility, non-profit hospital, educational institute, special governmental agency, and non-profit corporation performing governmental functions that participates in or is represented by the Mid-America Council of Public Purchasing (MACPP) in the greater Kansas City Metropolitan Trade Area and any member of the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC).

**1. Do you agree to the statement above?**

True

**5. Standard City Contract**

Please review the attached [Standard City Contract](#).

**1. Will you be able to comply with the Standard City Contract?**

True

**2. Please state any questions or concerns you have regarding the Standard City Contract.**

As we were exploring the availability of a Performance Bond, a number of providers indicated that portions of the contract allowed for an open ended extension (in the event that a substitute vendor was selected). Our provider indicated that at the time they would issue the bond, this might prove a problem for underwriting.

**6. Business/Firm Profile and Legal Structure**

Please prepare responses for each of the following in the space provided:

**1. Legal Name, address, phone, fax, e-mail, Federal ID#, and website address.**

Council of Development Finance Agencies  
100 E. Broad Street, Suite 1200

Columbus, OH 43215  
Phone: 614-705-1300  
Federal ID: 52-1356557  
[www.cdfa.net](http://www.cdfa.net)

## **2. Brief history of business/firm including date the business/firm was established under the current name.**

The Council of Development Finance Agencies is a national association dedicated to the advancement of development finance concerns and interests. CDFFA was originally constituted as the Council of Industrial Development Bond Issuers (CIDBI) in 1984 with a legal name change to the Council of Development Finance Agencies (CDFFA) in 1992. CDFFA is comprised of the nation's leading and most knowledgeable members of the development finance community representing hundreds of public, private and non-profit development entities. Members are state, county and municipal development finance agencies and authorities that provide or otherwise support economic development financing programs, including tax-exempt and taxable bonds, credit enhancement programs, and direct debt and equity investments as well as a variety of non-governmental and private organizations ranging from regional and large investment banks to commercial finance companies to bond counsel, bond insurers, trustees, venture capital companies, rating agencies, and other organizations interested in development finance.

The Council was formed in 1982 with the mission to strengthen the efforts of state and local development finance agencies fostering job creation and economic growth through the use of tax-exempt and other public-private partnership finance programs. Today, CDFFA has one of the strongest voices in the development finance industry and regularly communicates with Capitol Hill, state and local government leaders and the Federal Administration. The Council provides a number of avenues for assisting the development finance industry including education, advocacy, research, resources and networking. CDFFA is ultimately the conduit linking development finance professionals together. CDFFA has a rich history and is considered the industry expert within the federal government, on Capitol Hill and throughout the entire development finance industry.

## **3. List all services provided by the business/firm.**

CDFFA is a full service, non-profit, trade association that provides leadership on development finance through the following general services.

Research - Conducting research and development in issues of significant to development organizations, such as incentives development, brownfield technical assistance, local food system financing, along with developing and maintain a large on line library of reports (holding more than 5,000 documents), program descriptions, and research on incentive program operating guidelines.

Advisory Services - Provides assistance to transform organizations' development finance knowledge, operations, and programs. CDFFA employs an individualized approach, tapping into a network of

18,000+ development finance industry professionals on a peer-based approach that provides expert advice on how to improve development finance operations.

Education - On site and webinar education programs on topics relevant to the development financing community. Among courses provided in 2016 include 1) Introduction to Incentives, 2) Revolutionizing Local Investment, 3) 501(c) 3 Non-Profit Financing: Healthcare, Education, Community Facilities, 4) Fundamentals of Economic Development Finance, and 5) Advanced Tax Increment Financing.

Advocacy - Providing information in support of development financing programs at the local, state and federal levels, policy development for development finance agencies, education of development organizations on policy and practice.

Networking - CDFA facilitates peer to peer networking among development finance professionals through its 23 state roundtables, Annual Summit of development practitioners nationwide, annual Summer School for program updates, Online Brownfield Project Marketplace, and targeted conferences on current development financing issues, including small business, federal/state financing programs, and impact investing.

**4. Number of total employees including number of total employees in Kansas City, Missouri and number of employees in Greater Kansas City Area.**

CDFA's team consists of 22 members including:

- 15 full-time employees
- 5 part-time employees
- 2 contract employees
- 0 Kansas City or greater Kansas City, MO area employees

**5. Type of ownership, or legal structure of business/firm.**

CDFA is a non-profit 501(c) 6 corporation legally registered in the District of Columbia.

**6. Has the business/firm ever failed to complete work for which a contract was issued? If yes, explain the circumstances.**

No

**7. Are there any civil or criminal actions pending against the business/firm or any key personnel related in any way to contracting? If yes, explain in detail. Are there any current unresolved disputes/allegations?**

No

**8. Provide a brief history of the business/firm's contractual litigation, arbitration, and mediation cases for the last five (5) years that are material and relevant to this contract.**

None.

**9. Has the business/firm ever been disqualified from working for the City or any other public entity? If yes, explain the circumstances.**

No.



**10. Provide proof of financial capacity to perform this contract, such as Dun and Bradstreet or audited financial statements.**

[CDFA Interim Financials 2016 Q1](#)

[Financial Statements With Independent Auditor's Report 2012 and 2013](#)

**7. Experience**

For questions 1-5 below, describe the five (5) most relevant or comparable contracts completed by your business/firm during the past five (5) years.

For each listed contract, provide a narrative that includes:

- 1 the assigned project personnel
- 2 scope of services provided
- 3 dollar amount of the contract
- 4 the contracting entity's contact person, e-mail address, cell phone number, and telephone number
- 5 summary of how your business/firm delivered services

**1. Relevant contract description #1**

CDFA produced a Benchmarking State Business Capital Programs report for **Business Oregon**. To produce the report, CDFA performed a thorough analysis of program data covering 11 years, interviewed program operators in comparison states, and thoroughly researched multiple aspects of state capital programs and Oregon industries. The final report covered a financial analysis of the state's business finance lending and credit enhancement program portfolios, impact analysis of program outcomes, market analysis of key Oregon industries, comparisons against programs provided by other states, and recommendations for improvements. The assigned project personnel on the CDFA team were Toby Rittner and Jason Rittenberg.

Total dollar amount of the contract: \$39,300

Contact:

John Saris  
Business Services Manager  
Business Oregon  
Phone: 503-986-0163  
Email: john.saris@oregon.gov

**2. Relevant contract description #2**

**Commerce Rhode Island** hired CDFA to produce a report reviewing current micro-lending opportunities for Rhode Island businesses and making recommendations leading to the establishment of a new state-level fund. CDFA used a project team of staff and the executive of a highly-respected Community Development Financial Institution and micro-lender to deliver the report. CDFA's process

included research into Rhode Island lending and interviews with local stakeholders. The final report included details on program policies, rates, terms, and application requirements. The assigned project personnel on the CDFA team were Toby Rittner, Jason Rittenberg, and Pete Mathews.

Total dollar amount of the contract: \$20,000

Contact:

Mr. William Ash  
Managing Director Financial Services  
Rhode Island Commerce Corporation  
Phone: 401-278-9100 x184  
Fax: 401-273-8270  
Email: william.ash@commerceri.com

### 3. Relevant contract description #3

The CDFA Brownfields Technical Assistance Program provides technical assistance and resources on brownfields redevelopment financing through a grant from the **U.S. EPA**. CDFA and its partners provide resources and expertise related to revolving loan funds, tax credits, tax increment finance and other effective financing tools. As part of the program, CDFA offers a Brownfields Financing Toolkit, Webinar Series, Brownfields Project Marketplace, and Project Response Teams. This grant commenced in October 2014 and will continue through September 2019. The lead project personnel from CDFA include Toby Rittner, Emily Moser, and Jakob Dyck.

Total dollar amount of the contract: \$997,572

Contact:

Ms. Aimee Storm  
Lead  
U.S. EPA Office of Brownfields & Land Revitalization  
Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Grant Program  
Phone: 202-566-0633  
Email: storm.aimee@epa.gov

### 4. Relevant contract description #4

CDFA has conducted thorough strategic planning processes for multiple development finance agencies and port authorities, including the **Development Finance Authority of Summit County** in Ohio, the Western Reserve Port Authority in Ohio, and the Detroit/Wayne County Port Authority in Michigan. CDFA's process entails conducting interviews with dozens of stakeholders and producing a background report on the organization and regional economy, a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analysis and a Strategic Plan for the organization. For the Development Finance Authority of

Summit County, CDFA assembled a team of peer advisors to participate in the SWOT analysis and development of the strategic plan. The assigned project personnel at CDFA were Toby Rittner and Jason Rittenberg.

Total dollar amount of the contract: \$35,000

Contact:

Christopher Burnham  
President  
Development Finance Authority of Summit County  
Phone: 330-762-4776  
Email: chris.burnham@developmentfinanceauthority.org

#### **5. Relevant contract description #5**

CDFA contracted with the **New Mexico Finance Authority** (NMFA) to produce a white paper comparing state finance agencies. CDFA conducted interviews and other research to complete profiles of six states, including New Mexico. For each state, the report covers economic features, key programs, unused authorities and relative strengths, as well as a list of all development finance programs at the state level. The white paper was used internally by NMFA to compare New Mexico's approach to the approaches taken by peer states. The primary project personnel on the project were Toby Rittner and Jason Rittenberg.

Total dollar amount of the contract: \$10,000

Contact:

Marquita Russel  
Chief of Programs  
New Mexico Finance Authority  
Phone: 505-992-9619  
Email: mrussel@nmfa.net

#### **6. Provide a copy of your most recent relevant ongoing public contract.**

CDFA has attached a current contract with the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. CDFA serves a subcontractor to this entity through an engagement with the U.S. Department of Energy on a contract regarding Clean Energy Investments.

[CDFA Contract with Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory](#)

**7. Provide a list of all public contracts entered into for the last three (3) years. Include the dollar amounts, summary of scope of services, contract terms, Public Owner's contact person, e-mail address, cell phone number and telephone number.**

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Brownfields**

**Dollar Amount:** \$997,572

**Scope of Services:** Conduct the Brownfields Technical Assistance Program. Deliver four project marketplaces, eight project response teams, a webinar series, and brownfields financing toolkit each year of the contract.

**Contract Terms:** October 2014 - September 2019

**Contact Person:** Aimee Storm, 202-566-0633, storm.aimee@epa.gov

---

**U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Rural Development**

**Dollar Amount:** \$153,000

**Scope of Services:** produce a Rural Project Marketplace, write a Rural Finance Best Practices publication, write a Community Facilities Infrastructure Toolkit, produce and moderate 8+ meetings on financing rural community facilities and public private partnerships, host 6+ educational webinars

**Contract Terms:** October 2014 - September 2016

**Contact Person:** Joseph Ben-Isreal, 202-720-1505, joseph.benisrael@wdc.usda.gov

---

**U.S. Department of Energy, subcontract through the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab**

**Dollar Amount:** \$61,920

**Scope of Services:** Host four webinars and write four fact sheets on the concept of Energy Investment Partnerships

**Contract Terms:** January - June, 2016

**Contact Person:** Aurora Edington, 202-586-7886, Aurora.Edington@hq.doe.gov,

---

**Business Oregon**

**Dollar Amount:** \$39,300

**Scope of Services:** evaluate capital programs provided by the state and produce a report entitled Benchmarking State Business Capital Programs

**Contract Terms:** August - November, 2014

**Contact Person:** John Saris, 503-986-0163, john.saris@oregon.gov

---

## Rhode Island Commerce Corporation

**Dollar Amount:** \$20,000

**Scope of Services:** reviewing microlending opportunities for Rhode Island businesses and making recommendations leading to the establishment of a new state-level fund

**Contract Terms:** August - December, 2014

**Contact Person:** William Ash, 401-278-9100 x184, william.ash@commerceri.com

---

## Western Reserve Port Authority

**Dollar Amount:** \$39,450

**Scope of Services:** produce a Strategic Plan for the Port Authority

**Contract Terms:** April 2014 - February 2015

**Contact Person:** John Moliterno, 234-228-9696, jmoliterno@westernreserveportauthority.com

## 8. Personnel

Please prepare responses for each of the following in the space provided.

**Please make special note of staff capacity for meeting City's requirements, including capability to meet data requirements such as conducting high-level regression analysis or other statistical methods to evaluate economic and fiscal impacts.**

### 1. Please provide your staff capacity for meeting the City's requirements.

In order to be highly responsive to the Kansas City RFP, the CDFA Team brings together Team Members with skills, experience and demonstrated capacity designed to respond to each aspect included in the RFP. Team Members have experience and capacity that includes working in both Kansas City and communities nationwide in evaluating incentive programs, as well as completing both detailed level data analysis on the impact of incentives on a neighborhood, city and region. This will provide to the City of Kansas City the level of expertise that will enable the most objective evaluation of its incentives - based on national best practices - that will provide a strong and reliable report on the impact of incentives.

Team members include:

(These brief descriptions are followed by more detailed background and experience of team members.)

- **Council of Development Finance Agencies (CDFA)** --- will serve as Prime Contractor, and utilize the organization's national network and expertise in tax increment financing. Founded in 1982, CDFA is a national association dedicated to the advancement of development finance concerns and interests. CDFA is comprised of the nation's leading and most knowledgeable

members of the development finance community representing hundreds of public, private, and non-profit development entities. CDFA has a track record of working effectively with both public and private development finance organizations, maintaining a network of over 32,000 economic development professionals, and having conducted hundreds of development training courses and seminars.

- **Business Development Advisors (BDA)** --- will utilize the organization's expertise in incentives best practices in evaluating the impact of commercial and industrial incentives and making recommendations for incentive policies. Founded in 1999, BDA has a national reputation in smart incentives, including studies for public and private organizations, and has collaborated with the Pew Charitable Trust and the Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness. For this project, BDA has also engaged team of advisors (identified below) to assure that expanded expertise in incentive evaluation is available.
- **Hardwick Law Firm LLC** --- is a certified Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) headquartered in Kansas City, with offices in New York City, Houston, Hartford, Chicago and St. Louis. Hardwick will bring its experience and expertise in working with communities, developers, finance authorities and other entities in Kansas City. It has worked with both private developers and public bodies on development, finance, and real estate projects. Hardwick has expanded its reach and depth into project financing for commercial, industrial and residential real estate and incentivized development projects across the U.S. Hardwick is a leader in its use and understanding of incentive tools. Hardwick has also represented municipalities in performing studies requiring research and analysis of national "best practices" in subject matters ranging from development incentives, transit-oriented development, and streetcar finance planning.
- **PGAV Planners** --- will assist the team in evaluating incentive finance mechanism, the development of incentive policies and procedures. PGAV, headquartered in St. Louis, PGAV has helped hundreds of communities and local governments around the world with their planning and economic development goal activities.
- **W.E. Upjohn Institute** --- The W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research will bring its extensive experience in analysis, facilitation, and development of regional strategies; consensus building; economic and workforce development analysis, strategies, and solutions; talent assessments; labor market analysis; program evaluation; site location and analysis; and real estate development. The professionals of the Upjohn have worked with local, regional, state, and federal entities to organize, clarify, develop, strategize, evaluate, and implement similar projects and initiatives.
- **Sterling Consulting Group, LLC** --- Stacy Sedler, President of the Sterling Consulting Group, LLC, will assist in communicating the activity and results of the work of the Incentive Study team to key stakeholders and the public. Her company, founded in 2011, will bring her experience in working with local and federal elected officials, government agency staff, economic development organizations (both local government and nonprofit) to effectively facilitate communication.

*Following is more background information on all Team Partners.*

---

## Prime Contractor

---

**The Council of Development Finance Agencies (CDFA)** CDFFA is a national association dedicated to the advancement of development finance concerns and interests. Founded in 1982, CDFFA is comprised of the nation's leading and most knowledgeable members of the development finance community representing hundreds of public, private and non-profit development entities. Members are state, county and municipal development finance agencies and authorities that provide or otherwise support economic development financing programs, including tax increment financing, tax incentives, tax-exempt and taxable bonds, credit enhancement programs, and direct debt and equity investments as well as a variety of non-governmental and private organizations ranging from regional and large investment banks to commercial finance companies to bond counsel, bond insurers, trustees, venture capital companies, rating agencies, and other organizations interested in development finance.

Among CDFFA's relevant experience is a study for Business Oregon: Benchmarking State Business Capital Programs. For this study, CDFFA produced a *Benchmarking State Business Capital Programs* report for Business Oregon. To produce the report, CDFFA performed a thorough analysis of program data covering 11 years, interviewed program operators in comparison states, and thoroughly researched multiple aspects of state capital programs and Oregon industries. The final report covered a financial analysis of the state's business finance lending and credit enhancement program portfolios, impact analysis of program outcomes, market analysis of key Oregon industries, comparisons against programs provided by other states, and recommendations for improvements.

---

## Sub-Contractors

---

**Business Development Advisors (BDA)** is an economic development and market intelligence consulting firm. Established in 1999, BDA works with economic development leaders at the local, state and national levels to increase business investment and job growth in their communities. BDA provides insight into the growth drivers of today's economy, establishes data-driven policies and practices, and delivers business intelligence on target industries and companies. BDA's services provide practical information that supports the day-to-day activities of economic developers. BDA founder Ellen Harpel launched Smart Incentives in 2013. Smart Incentives helps communities make sound decisions throughout the economic development incentives process. Smart Incentives is also at the forefront of efforts to develop better processes for monitoring compliance and evaluating the effectiveness of incentive programs.

Further, as noted in section 2 on unique services, BDA has assembled a team of advisors with specific national and community level expertise regarding incentives, analysis, and sustainability that will be valuable to this process. The team includes several experienced practitioners including Ken Poole, with the Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness, Janet Hammer, with The Collaboratory, who worked with the Economic Development Administration developing the Triple Bottom Line tool, which will be useful in the evaluation process, and Darrene Hackler with BDA/Smart Incentives, who brings experience

in development of indicators, program evaluation and city fiscal issues.

Among BDA's relevant experience are an initiative with 1) **Pew Charitable Trusts and the Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness (CREC): Business Incentives Initiative (2014-2015)** - that engaged economic development policymakers and practitioners from seven states to identify effective ways to manage and assess economic development incentive policies and practices; improve data collection and reporting on incentive investments; and develop national standards and best practices that states can use to gather and report on economic development incentives. Ellen Harpel participated throughout the two-year effort as part of the CREC team, providing technical assistance for the state of Michigan, testifying before state legislative committee on evaluation topics, and designing and leading workshops for economic development leaders and incentive program managers, and 2) a **Incentives Competitiveness Study, Business Leaders for Michigan (2014)** - where BDA was asked to evaluate the competitiveness of Michigan's economic development incentives. The study addressed national trends in incentive use and the state setting for incentive policy (including comparative business climate and internal economic development goals); compared dozens of programs across 5 benchmark states by multiple criteria; and identified gaps and advantages in Michigan's incentives offerings. The project concluded with a set of recommendations to improve the competitiveness of the state's programs, and 3) a **Maryland Economic Development Incentives and Financing Study** - wherein BDA worked as part of the Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness (CREC) team to conduct an in-depth examination of twelve Maryland state incentive and financing programs in six categories, including place-based tax credits, investment tax credits, incentives to attract or retain large employers, small business lending and investment programs, credit enhancement and financing programs for small and mid-sized firms, and job creation credits or funding for workforce development programs. Ellen Harpel of BDA provided the analysis of the state's incentive offerings designed for large employers. The project involved analysis of previous performance reports, a comparison to programs offered in competitor states, and recommendations for improvements. The recommendations were used to guide executive and legislative efforts to re-examine the state's mix of business incentives and financing programs.

---

**Hardwick Law Firm LLC** is a Kansas City certified Minority Business Enterprise (MBE), Disadvantage Business Enterprise (DBE), and Small Local Business Enterprise (SLBE). Hardwick is one of the most distinguished minority and woman-owned finance, development, real estate, and transportation law firms in the country. Headquartered in Kansas City, Missouri, with offices in New York City, Houston, Hartford, Chicago, and St. Louis, Hardwick serves an array of public and private clients. Hardwick has expanded its reach and depth into project financing for commercial, industrial and residential real estate and incentivized development projects across the U.S. Hardwick is a leader in its use and understanding of incentive tools. The firm routinely advises public bodies how to formulate innovative incentive policies with "tool boxes" to attract and implement development, and works with municipalities to identify, analyze, and secure incentives to spur development utilizing layered incentives. Hardwick's abilities are built upon a strong foundation of understanding and properly interpreting statutory and regulatory requirements and limitations applicable to incentivized real estate projects. Attorneys of Hardwick have worked over decades on numerous and varied incentivized developments in Kansas City, Missouri, and are learned to attendant challenges related to payments in lieu of taxes, audit and compliance, clustering



and "tacking" incentives, and other systemic and political challenges related to prioritizing incentive allocation throughout the City.

Hardwick's experience relevant to the subject matter of this submittal includes:

- **City of Kansas City, Missouri:** Hardwick analyzed the historic and prospective use of incentives in connection with Kansas City's recently drafted transit-oriented development policy. The firm's research and analysis of economic and transportation voids identified transit development opportunities and resulted in recommendations to target and cluster potential City incentives within priority areas.
- **City of Gardner, Kansas:** Hardwick analyzed statutorily authorized incentive tools, as well as urban and neighborhood demographics, to develop a proactive incentive strategic plan and "tool-box" for the City of Gardner. Process requires Recommendations adopted by the City as its official incentive policy is geared toward the targeted use of incentives designed to encourage concentrated development within priority development corridors and nodes.
- **City of Kansas City, Missouri:** Hardwick served as a consultant to the City in connection with identifying gap resources to fund the second phase streetcar extension. Analysis included a coordinated study of existing City and state incentivized projects, in order to identify possible synergies in public investment that could leverage additional dollars for the extension.
- **City of Independence, Missouri:** Hardwick recently served as the lead incentive analyst in connection with developing a master plan for the City of Independence's historic Gateway Corridor. Research included review of Jackson County economic development policies and regulations, and application of County funds to economic development projects.

In addition to working on such studies, Allison Bergman, an attorney at Hardwick, has served on the board, and is the recent board chair of, the Kansas City Local Initiatives Support Corporation, a national community development organization. In that volunteer role, Allison diligently has spent over 8 years helping steer the organization's lending and neighborhood development activities. Her efforts have included coordinating with the City of Kansas City, Missouri, to target the use of charitable and public dollars on priority and often incentivized projects. Since 1999, Allison has served as legal counsel to Beacon Hill Redevelopment Corporation in connection with what is arguably the City's largest Chapter 353 project. Her representation of this client has allowed Allison to work side-by-side with the City's Housing and Planning Departments to resolve thorny legal issues. This opportunity enabled her to garner a deep understanding of the City's use of multiple, targeted incentives- federal, state, and local - and its desire to achieve concentrated progress, as a result.

---

**PGAV Planners** Over the course of PGAV's 50-year history, they have helped hundreds of communities across the country implement their community development goals. The firm has been an integral part of planning for downtown revitalization in more than 40 communities. PGAV Planners has also helped our clients communities achieve more than \$2.5 billion in development during the past decade. PGAV regularly is called upon by communities to help them address a challenging planning or development issue. Their approach in these instances is to review, with clients, the nature of the situation and the

realistic possibilities. Understanding that, they move on to implementation, which typically (although not always) involves the use of a public-private partnership and tax incentive finance mechanism.

PGAV Planners' relevant experience includes:

- **City Memphis Incentive Policy Review:** Working with the City of Memphis, Tennessee's Mayor's Innovation Delivery Team ("MIDT"); PGAV led a review and analysis of the various organizations operating in Memphis in economic development, business development, and housing development that had the power to grant tax abatement and/or tax increment financing. Through reviews of statutes, interviews with key stakeholders, reviews of current practices and active projects, we developed recommendations to streamline the City's incentive use processes to make the incentive use process more easily understandable, trackable, and more transparent.
  - **City of New Orleans City Council Tax Increment Finance Manual:** The City Council of the City of New Orleans, Louisiana retained PGAV Planners to review the tax increment finance policy document prepared by the Office of the Mayor of the City of New Orleans and to recommend any changes or improvements. Our team held interviews with key stakeholders such as developers, housing development officials, local finance professionals, attorneys, and City staff to understand the use and applicability of tax increment finance in Louisiana as well as the implications of the policy document prepared by the Mayor's office. The end result of our work was a policy manual that presented step-by-step recommendations for the effective use of tax increment financing in New Orleans, with particular attention paid to the ability to leverage federal government programs.
  - **The DREAM Initiative:** The Downtown Revitalization and Economic Assistance for Missouri Initiative was a years-long program developed by the Missouri Department of Economic Development, and the Missouri Development Finance Board with support from the Missouri Housing Development Commission and the Missouri Arts Council. The goal of the program was to help rural Missouri communities to develop strategic plans for downtown revitalization. PGAV Planners has been the lead consultant for this project since it began in 2006. We have helped nearly 40 communities develop strategic plans for downtown revitalization. The planning process in every community involved two tasks that parallel the goals of the City's RFP. We would conduct an organizational structure review in every community. The goal of this exercise was to understand the key stakeholder individuals and organizations promoting the downtown business community; to understand their capacity and to recommend strategies for enhancing their organization's capacity (if needed). We would also prepare a financial assistance review for each and every community. This document included a summary of all of the development finance mechanisms available in the State of Missouri, along with recommendations for prudent use and implementation and summaries of the potential revenue impact associated with the implementation of certain development finance strategies.
-

**W.E. Upjohn Institute** ---The W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research will bring its extensive experience in analysis, facilitation, and development of regional strategies; consensus building; economic and workforce development analysis, strategies, and solutions; talent assessments; labor market analysis; program evaluation; site location and analysis; and real estate development. The professionals of the Upjohn have worked with local, regional, state, and federal entities to organize, clarify, develop, strategize, evaluate, and implement similar projects and initiatives. The W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research has been conducting economic research and consultation for more than 70 years, since its founding in 1945. With employment of 92, including 12 senior researchers and 10 data analysts, Upjohn's Regional Economic Planning Services division works with regional, state, and national clients on talent assessment, economic and workforce development strategy, urban and regional planning, economic impact studies, education place-based scholarships, and data dissemination and analysis.

Among Upjohn's relevant experience are:

- **Economic Development Strategic Plan for the City of Waco, TX (2014):** Upjohn team members conducted more than 90 interviews with community stakeholders in the Waco, TX region as part of the city's economic development strategic plan. The team also facilitated 11 focus groups with education, nonprofit, workforce and economic development, and private-sector stakeholders, as well as three workshops with education and workforce stakeholders and employers as part of the strategy. The interviews, focus groups, and workshops were designed to gather feedback from employers, education, and workforce agencies on proposed models and policies applied in other cities aimed at providing pathways to full-time employment. Interviews were designed for 45-60 minutes, focus groups were conducted for 90 minutes, and workshops were conducted for 120 minutes. The data collected from 11 focus groups, workshops and were formatted into separate matrices (interviews, focus groups, workshops) for synthesis and discussion among the Upjohn team.
- **Accelerate a Regional Plan for Prosperity: Economic Development Strategy and Prosperity Plan for the I-69 Thumb Region (2014):** Upjohn's work on this project was to assist Region 6 in assessing, clarifying, organizing, and strategizing on opportunities, issues, and concerns of the region, and then apply this information to build consensus and develop a prosperity plan to guide regional initiatives. We combined this approach with conversations with leaders and stakeholders to identify existing strategies and plans, and regional goals and objectives. We then enhanced these efforts with an extensive examination of the characteristics and assets of the region from the site selector's perspective (Upjohn partnered with a site selection firm), and a quantitative research effort to examine the region's economic status and competitiveness. The Upjohn team also collaborated with the consultants of Region 6's ongoing CEDS planning process; the team met with these consultants and discussed the progress and status of the CEDS process and coordinated qualitative and quantitative data collection efforts. It provided a research-based, interactive planning approach in a productive setting where ideas were introduced, revised, edited, and accepted by the involved stakeholders. A two-day charrette was designed to present the findings from the listening tour, the review of stakeholder plans, and the quantitative data analysis to the community representatives for their reactions and feedback, as well as have them develop goals,

objectives, action items, and metrics for the final plan. Participants worked in groups, with one participant from each table rotating to other tables to obtain feedback on that group's work. Each table presented its discussion findings to the entire audience for input. A quantitative analysis of the region was also conducted, involving both an internal and external view of the multi-county region. The external view was generated by a site selection firm and examined the characteristics and assets of the region from the perspective of an industrial site consultant. The site selection firm identified key assets, talent, and government services that businesses seek in determining expansion or relocation decisions. The internal quantitative analysis included a detailed examination of the quality of the region's labor force (education attainment, age, occupation mix, commuting patterns, and unemployment).

- **Southcentral Michigan Five-Year Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) (2014):** The Upjohn team completed the necessary action steps in developing the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for the SMPC. A critical step in the development of the strategy was to work with the SMPC to identify individuals representing the SMPC region's government, community, workforce, economic development, education, minority/labor, tribal, and private sectors to form its CEDS Committee.
- **An Assessment of EDA's Partnership Planning Program (2011):** Upjohn conducted an evaluation of the U.S. Economic Development Administration's (EDA) Partnership Planning Program, which consists of Economic Development Districts (EDDs) and the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies (CEDS) they are required to create. Components of the study were design and implementation of a survey of economic development professionals, facilitation of town hall meetings of economic development professionals conducted at national meetings of professional organizations, case-study identification and site interviews of EDD professionals across the country, and developing criteria for the evaluation of the planning program and the CEDS. The study resulted in recommendations to EDA on as to how the program could be improved to lead effective regional development strategy efforts. Additional products were the development of two types of training curricula on leadership - one for planning districts and organizational external leaders (Regionalism, Networks, and Partnerships: A Leadership Approach to Economic Development) and one for EDA internal leaders (Curriculum for EDA: Improving the Partnership Planning Program).

---

**Sterling Consulting Group, LLC** --- Stacy Sedler, MSN, RN, and President of Sterling Consulting will develop an effective communication strategy to assist in telling the story of the Incentive Study and help to convey the economic impact of incentives. Her unique background in health care, education, public relations, fundraising, grant writing and economic development --- along with her extensive network in the City of Kansas City --- all combine to give her a unique blend of talent, skills, and abilities to help her clients deliver exceptional outcomes to all of her projects. Founding her firm in 2011, she parlayed her business and managerial skills into a consulting company that has spanned across the Mid-West working with a multitude of clients. Her consulting firm collaborates with diverse stakeholders in both urban and rural settings. She will bring her team's experience in working with local, state and federal elected officials, government agency staff, economic development organizations (both local government and nonprofit), regional and local area Chamber's, and regional planning organizations to ensure people feel part of the process to effectively facilitate communication. Stacy has lead organizations and communities

in many capacities for non-profit organizations, cities, counties, for-profit establishments, students, patients and families. Stacy received her bachelor's degree from Radford University in 2006. In 2008, she completed her Masters of Science in Nursing from University of Mary. She is in the process of completing a doctorate in Educational Leadership from Saint Louis University in 2017.

Among the communications and organizing events in Sterling Consulting Group's relevant experience are:

- Researched as a sub consultant for numerous Economic Development Strategic Plans, Comprehensive Plans, Market Analyses, Housing Studies, Planning studies, and Capital Campaign strategies.
- Grandview Missouri - Currently part of the Economic Development Team for the City of Grandview Missouri since 2012.
- September 11 - September 13, 2013. Organized a conference "Regionalism: Working together for a Shared Vision within the 5<sup>th</sup> congressional District" that was hosted by U.S. Congressman Emanuel Cleaver II and Zimmer Real Estate Services.
- Mid Missouri Regional Event - February 2013: Saline County, Missouri Economic Development Strategic Plan Launch Party
- Marshall Missouri - March 2013 - Community Meeting

**2. Identify the Key Employees who are likely to be assigned to this contract if your proposal is selected. [NOTE: Key Employee(s) must be committed to the contract duration, and may not be removed or substituted without the City's prior written consent.]**

- Toby Rittner, President and CEO
- Mark Barbash, Senior Strategic Advisor
- Katie Kramer, Vice President
- Peter Mathews, Resources Coordinator

**3. For each of the Key Employee(s), provide a resume and/or summary with at least the following background information: a. Description of relevant experience. b. Years of employment with the business/firm. c. City and State of residence. d. State time commitment on other accounts. e. Applicable professional registrations, education, certifications, and credentials.**

[Toby Rittner Biography](#)

[Toby Rittner Resume](#)

[Mark Barbash Biography](#)

[Mark Barbash Resume](#)

[Katie Kramer Resume](#)

[Pete Mathews Resume](#)

**4. Please comment on the ability of your business/firm to sustain the loss of Key Employee(s).**

CDFA maintains a strong internal training program that provides staff with working knowledge of key responsibilities, in the event of loss of a key employee. This ensures that staff is able to step up to fill

requirements while recruitment takes place to fill a vacancy. A bi-weekly full staff meeting takes place that updates the entire staff as to project status. In addition, the breadth and depth of the CDFFA Incentive Study Team brings to the project significant experience and skills that will ensure that the Project will continue on schedule. The CDFFA Incentive Study Team will have a weekly meeting via conference call to update key staff on the Incentive Study project.

#### **5. Provide a staffing plan for the contract including the locations of the positions.**

##### **Council of Development Finance Agencies, Prime Contractor (all staff in Columbus, Ohio)**

- Lead Staff Member: Mark Barbash, Senior Strategic Advisor
  - Toby Rittner, President and CEO
  - Katie Kramer, Vice President
  - Peter Mathews, Resources Coordinator
- 

##### **CDFFA Team Members (Subcontractors)**

- Ellen Harpel; Founder and President; Business Development Advisors; Arlington, Virginia (Also see Question 2 in this section concerning Advisory Team)
- Allison Bergman; Principal; Hardwick Law Firm LLC; Kansas City, Missouri; and a registered Kansas City MBE
- James Robey; Director, Regional Economic Planning Services; E.W. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research; Kalamazoo, Michigan
- Andy Struckhoff; Associate Director; PGAV Planners; St. Louis, Missouri
- Stacy Sedler, President; Sterling Consulting Group, LLC; Kansas City, Missouri; and a registered Kansas City MBE

#### **6. Provide an organizational chart for the assigned staff.**

[Revised CDFFA Team Staffing TO 06152016.pdf](#)

#### **7. Provide a plan to address vacations, sicknesses and absences.**

CDFFA maintains a policy of requiring 2 weeks advance notice for planned vacancies and absences, enabling the Team to identify any obligations that may occur during the period. Unplanned sicknesses and absences can be accommodated because of the depth of the Team at CDFFA. Redundancy in select staffing of key partners will ensure planned and unplanned absences will not interfere with or delay the timely production of an effective work product.

### **9. Project Approach**

Please prepare responses for each of the following in the space provided, with specific attention to the following:

Question 1 - include in your response a description of any potential phasing for the project and general deliverables, including a representative timeline for completion of each phase and the total project.

## **1. Discuss your approach to a project with specific references to the services requested in the RFP.**

### **PROJECT APPROACH: OVERALL**

#### **Task 1 - Identify Key Performance Indicators for all Incentives Programs**

The most critical part of the Project Approach is at the beginning: Defining program goals and selecting appropriate indicators to determine whether Kansas City's incentives are accomplishing those goals is the foundation of a successful evaluation effort. For effective and accountable program implementation, evaluation and management, indicators should be derived from three key priorities: 1) Overarching Economic Development Goals, 2) Individual Incentive Program Goals and Purpose, and 3) Measurable Outputs and Outcomes.

Our team will follow the process outlined below to clarify goals and identify metrics (or indicators) that are both manageable and (meaningful).

#### **Starting with the Big Picture**

The Team will build from the AdvanceKC strategic plan to understand the overarching economic development aspirations of the city. For example, the strategy emphasizes building connections across the city, enhancing the city's reputation as a compelling and urbane city, and providing a quality of life and education to enable young professionals to remain in the city.

The strategy also includes economic development tasks that support regional practitioners, including managing prospects and projects, making the City more business friendly, supporting workforce development and helping existing businesses expand.

The key performance indicators must connect back to these larger goals. Our team will work with the City to ensure that we fully understand the City's and the Strategy's current priorities in the context of previous efforts.

The Team will work from there to identify metrics that help the City tell the story of how it is using incentives to implement these priorities as well as improve the economic condition of Kansas City's residents and the community as a whole. (as described in the next steps).

#### **A. Defining Program Goals**

A clear goal or performance statement is the foundation of good program evaluation and effective program management. In our experience, many tax and other incentive programs have vague objectives that can't be readily measured or assessed. One of the most challenging elements of incentives program evaluations is defining goals in such a way that they can be measured.

Our Team approach will be to make explicit the connection between desired outcomes and the city's



policies and programs. We will examine statutory and administrative language regarding individual incentive program objectives and purpose - keeping in mind the big picture as described in Step 1.A. We will then consider programs and activities the economic development organization is performing in the service of those objectives. We will consider, but not limit ourselves to, the data that is currently collected and reported related to both the outputs (activities or deliverables) and the outcomes (measures tied to program objectives) of the effort. We will connect proposed indicators to the big picture while also striving to identify a common set of metrics that would enable cross-program comparisons.

## **B. Identify and Assess Potential Indicators**

The questions posed in the RFP suggest that following types of indicators are of interest to the City: 1) investment in and types of infrastructure; 2) impact on assessed values and tax revenues; 3) new private investment; 4) distribution of tax revenues across taxing jurisdictions; 5) actual vs. projected performance; 6) effect on real estate values and business/job growth rates, among others. We will use these as the baseline for our assessment of potential indicator.

The selected indicators used to evaluate programs also need to meet some basic standards in order to be useful. These include 1) fit with goals and objectives, 2) data availability, 3) cost of obtaining and maintaining data, 4) data validity and quality, and 5) time frame. As such, identifying sources for the data, establishing a baseline for measurement, and verifying company-provided data are all important elements of a successful evaluation process.

Given the decidedly short project time frame, we will emphasize data availability in our assessment and work closely with the assigned project team to understand the type and quality of data available within and across program platforms.

## **C. Select Appropriate Analysis Techniques**

The appropriate analysis techniques will depend on the key performance indicators selected, data quality and availability by program, and project schedule. Among the options we will consider (and select in consultation with the client team) are summary and descriptive statistics, regression analysis, use of treatment/control groups, (panel data, implied benefit analysis), and fiscal and economic impact analysis. We also envision the need for qualitative techniques such as stakeholder interviews or focus groups to supplement the quantitative analysis.

The Team has the capability to aggregate and map data to demonstrate use and impact.

The outcome of Task 1 will be the selection of key performance indicators for each program based on data availability and alignment with economic development goals and which can be grouped by category to enable aggregation and comparisons. In addition, we will identify essential data points and work together with the City to develop a scope of services for the Task 2 analysis.



## **Task 2: Complete a Historical Analysis of Key Performance Indicators**

The saliency and accuracy of the historical analysis is critical to Task 1 and Task 3 of the RFP. As such, the steps envisioned for Task 2 involves a number of steps that not only complete the historical analysis, but also the validation of the existing data. In addition, the steps identified are based on the information currently available about the data available as described in the information provided by the City during the RFP period, including the maps, data fields, super TIF Projects, and TIF generational charts

### **A. Primary Data Validation**

Working with city staff and interns, the Primary Data Validation includes a review of the existing data and structure of the city's database to determine the extent to which 1) the data provides sufficient information based upon the goals and indicators identified in Task 1, 2) if there needs to be any clean up of the existing data; and 3) whether any additional data sets are required to provide for a historical analysis that reflects the Goals and Indicators identified in Task 1, and 4) we will go back and review the Goals and Indicators - to re-validate the metrics to be studied - to determine the need to identify and acquire any additional data sets to allow for adequate analysis.

### **B. Comparison Data Identification and Acquisition**

In order to arrive at the point of being able to make recommendations on policy and management of the city's incentives, it will be critical to evaluate the relationship between those investments and measurements that reflect community impact, including trends in demographic data, property values, tax revenue generated before, during the period of, and after the termination of any incentive or TIF financing area and neighborhood property values, revenue generated for the City, commercial and residential investment, along with other metrics that may be identified in Task 1.

As such, parallel with the Primary Data Validation, our Team will work with City staff to identify and acquire data that reflect those community impacts (demographic, proper. This step will also involve the aggregation of data in an appropriate way evaluate the relationships. For example, analysis will need to be completed at the neighborhood and enterprise zone areas, determining the impact boundaries for reporting to the city.

### **C. Primary Data Analysis and Evaluation**

Subsequent to validating the existing (or revised data sets), our Team will complete the analysis of the available information, based upon the goals of the RFP, including relationships among various demographic trends, identification of trends over time, by program, in comparison with the other community impact information.

The final step in Task 2 is to develop a report that reflects the trends and relationships identified. This Preliminary Analysis will be a key document in both telling the story of the impact of incentive investments in the community and providing the framework for the steps in Task 3. The report will also

identify any outstanding issues with the existing data and analysis that can serve to inform the recommendations in Task 3 concerning monitoring and reporting systems. Given the importance of the Preliminary Analysis, the draft report will be prepared so that it clearly conveys the information.

### **Task 3 - Assist the City in Developing On-going Monitoring and Reporting Systems**

The ability of the community to assure transparency and accountability of its programs is dependent upon two factors: The first is the ease of use and flexibility of the data platform (software system). The second is the ability of the platform to provide the necessary information for policy makers and community leaders in a way that produces reports that are easy to understand and effectively make the linkage between policy, program, performance and the selected indicators.

The work in Task 3 will be predicated upon the completed work in Task 1 (Identifying Key Performance Indicators) and Task 2 (Completion of Historical Analysis of Key Performance Indicators based upon the available data).

#### **A. Program Administration**

The development of recommendations for effective **Program Administration** will look at several areas of importance to the effective management of incentive programs. These will include methods to consider requests for assistance, including 1) alignment with the AdvanceKC strategy and other city policies, 2) a due diligence process to ensure the collection of necessary and sufficient information to consider the request, 3) a process to prioritize multiple requests across time to assure consistency of policy, practice and precedent, 4) a transparent, accountable and efficient review and sign-off process; and 5) a decision-making methodology to make sure that all terms and conditions of the financial assistance is recorded for monitoring and performance evaluation.

Recommendations regarding **Program Monitoring** will focus on the evaluation of the quality, capacity, and utility of legacy software systems. Local governments have had a tendency to either identify software systems that worked in a previous period and are not easily customizable to accommodate a desire for additional information or analysis; or create custom tracking systems from programs (such Microsoft Excel or Access) that become cumbersome and difficult to use when a program has more activity.

#### **B. Program Monitoring and Platform**

**Program Monitoring** software should serve the purpose of the agency and community, not the other way around. The system should have the ability to monitor individual investments and the portfolio as a whole, enter information from performance reports from each company receiving information, do detailed project and portfolio analysis, be sufficiently flexible to enable data validation and data sharing, and be able to be aligned with the city's overall technology systems.

With these factors in mind, we will evaluate the current legacy systems with an eye towards identifying gaps and duplications that could be improved, identify best practices that have served other communities well, and evaluate contract monitoring practices. In addition, we will recommend a plan and system that provides for improvement and modification over time to accommodate the needs of the community.

The second criteria is the ability of the system to produce information and reports that are easy to understand, effectively convey the positive benefits of the use of incentive programs, and effectively make the linkage between policy, program, performance and the selected indicators.

This includes providing evaluations to policymakers in a digestible format that helps to improve policies to improve policies to enhance effectiveness. Reports must be able to connect the use of incentives to the city's strategy, provide an appropriate context for the use of incentives. Reports should make evaluation information more accessible, providing data in multiple formats for different audiences (full report, executive summary, even tweets) and using graphics to convey the message.

Reports should also provide for the use of easily understood "dashboards" that enable policymakers and the community to easily compare performance over time. Further, the System should enable the development of standardized reports on a period basis (annual, semiannual, or quarterly, based upon the needs.)

### **C. Reporting Capacity**

As such, the Software system should also have a **Reporting Capacity** to generate reports on a project AND portfolio basis, that allows for both periodic and as-requested performance evaluations that are linked to the identified performance indicators, outputs and outcomes identified in Task 1C.

To accomplish this, we will evaluate how well the legacy system is able to produce such reports quickly, the utility of the report to city leaders, decision-makers and community stakeholders. In addition, we will consider Best Practices and make recommendations that are able to communicate key performance indicators at the program, plan, and project levels.

### **D. Public Outreach / Community Relations**

Because of the importance of public accountability, transparency, understanding and acceptance of the final report on the use of tax incentives, the CDFA Study Team, in consultation with the City of Kansas City, will develop an extensive Public Outreach & Community Relations strategy that will ensure that the public and any key stakeholders have accurate information both during the Incentive Study process and when the final report is issued. The strategy will include communication with elected officials, citizen organizations, economic development and housing organizations, along with other key stakeholders as identified by the City. Communication methods could include periodic communications, community input charrettes or meetings, the development of a website, and, upon final report issuance, one on one briefings. All of these discussions will be designed to present and explain the results of the Incentive Study, discussing the benefits that the City has achieved from its use of incentives, responding to questions, and taking comment.

The CDFA Team will also develop any communication material (reports, graphs, charts) with an eye towards making them clear and easy to understand.

## 2. Highlight unique services and management tools and indicate the benefits of them to the City. What makes your business/firm better than the competition?

As part of its team, BDA has brought an **advisory team consisting of three experts** who will assist on an as-needed basis in several areas, including key performance indicators, triple bottom line performance; analysis design, and on-going monitoring and reporting.

These advisors include:

- 1 Ken Poole, with the Center for Regional Economic Competitiveness, who partnered with Pew and BDA on incentives training programs. Mr. Poole's group C2ER administers the state incentives database. ([www.creconline.org](http://www.creconline.org)) Email: [kpoole@crec.net](mailto:kpoole@crec.net)
- 2 Janet Hammer, with Gocollaboratory, who focuses on sustainability and community development perspective and worked with the Economic Development Administration developing the Triple Bottom Line tool, which will be useful in the evaluation process. ([www.gocollaboratory.com](http://www.gocollaboratory.com)); Email: [janet@gocollaboratory.com](mailto:janet@gocollaboratory.com)
- 3 Darrene Hackler with BDA/Smart Incentives, who brings experience in development of indicators, program evaluation and city fiscal issues. ([www.smartincentives.org/pages/leadership](http://www.smartincentives.org/pages/leadership)), Email: [darrene@smartincentives.org](mailto:darrene@smartincentives.org)

During the last three years the BDA/CREC team have worked with 30 states either through intensive consulting projects or working groups that we have convened to **address challenges in incentive program management and evaluation**. We provided cost-effective, in-depth technical support to leaders in 9 states during the past 2 years to help address various aspects of the incentive evaluation process, including data collection strategies, data sharing barriers, data management issues, the metric selection process, consensus building to support on-going evaluation processes, and translating evaluation results to drive program improvement.

BDA worked with a Midwestern state to **articulate goals for community development incentive and finance programs by drawing on regulatory, statutory, and outreach language**. We then identified a set of potential metrics related to those goals and assessed each for fit, feasibility, comparability, appropriate timeframe, cost and availability of data. From this process we selected a set of manageable metrics that indicated whether the programs were generating the intended benefits. CREC conducted evaluation studies for two federal agencies that implemented national and/or multi-state programs in which state partners had flexibility to design their programs within set parameters. In both cases, the federal statute provided broad guidelines but not specific metrics, and the team helped to identify appropriate metrics and develop consensus in support of those metrics before completing the full multi-

state program evaluation on schedule. BDA/CREC are currently preparing a briefing paper on common performance metrics for state economic development organizations.

### **3. Describe your Quality Assurance Plan.**

The purpose of the CDFA Incentive Study Team Quality Assurance Plan will be to ensure that the data and recommendations in the Incentive Study produced for the City of Kansas City are accurate and reflect the best possible information, by ensuring that the project is managed, developed, and communicated in a sound, reasonable way, and that the project's deliverables are of acceptable quality before they are delivered to the project's clients.

The QA Plan is particularly critical given the amount of data utilization and analysis required to development the Study's recommendations. The overall goals are to address errors and how to improve the Study's practice to prevent errors from occurring.

Components of the QA Plan will include: 1) Clearly defined roles and responsibilities of each Team Member in relation to each of the Project's Tasks and Steps; 2) Ongoing documentation of the review of each component of the Study; 3) a documented review of data collection and analysis techniques utilized in the course of each Task and Step of the Study, including a check of relationships identified through the regression analysis; 4) a regular Team Meeting and tracking report to monitor completion progress of each Task; 5) a plan for work checking that ensures, to the greatest extent possible, that the QA is completed by someone other than the individual who produced the original product; 6) a feedback mechanism to evaluate and address each comment received by the Team or the City, and 7) a corrective action process that documents the problem to be addressed, who is accountable for the redress, in a way that prevents the problem from occurring again.

### **4. State approximate date your business/firm is available to begin work on the Project.**

The Council of Development Finance Agencies and all of its Team Members are available immediately to respond to questions and initiate negotiations on this Proposal. The Team Members will be available based upon the timetable to be agreed upon with the City.

### **5. Discuss your transition plan to begin providing services.**

The CDFA Incentive Study Team transition plan will include the following steps:

- 1 Subsequent to the negotiation and awarding of the contract, the Team will meet with the City of Kansas City staff to develop a more precise timeline for each of the Tasks and Steps in the Project Approach;
- 2 The Team will identify appropriate Kansas City contact staff who will work with each of the Team Members;
- 3 A written Task and Timetable Plan will be agreed upon by Team Members and Kansas City to specific who will be responsible for each Task and Activity.

**6. Propose additional performance measures including why the performance measure is important and how the City will measure and verify performance.**

Additional performance measures could be possible, subsequent to evaluation of current incentive programs, available databases, and interests of the Study and the City of Kansas City.

**7. Discuss your understanding of the project scope and objectives.**

The City seeks to understand how well its individual incentives are performing and how well the City's overall incentive policies support the AdvanceKC strategy. It is intended to be comprehensive by looking at the City's incentive portfolio as a whole, considering a variety of economic development incentive programs with multiple mechanisms and objectives administered by several entities. This study should address the impact of incentives (both costs and benefits), inform policy direction, and establish a process for collecting and reporting data to increase transparency and accountability in incentive use, which will enable ongoing tracking and evaluation beyond the study period.

**8. Based on your firm's expertise, please include in your response any additional technical analysis and/services which your firm/team would recommend to ensure successful achievement of the City's project objectives, including why the proposed analysis and/or service is important. These should correspond directly to the Value Added Options described herein.**

There may be additional technical analysis and services that will be recommended, based upon the Tasks and Timetable Report to be developed from the Contract Negotiations.

**10. Sustainability**

The City has adopted an overall policy supporting a greater use of "green solutions" or enhanced sustainability measures that consider environmental quality, social equity and economic vitality. In order to minimize waste, enhance efficiencies, and achieve multiple benefits and project synergies, all City projects must identify opportunities for sustainability improvements and implement those improvements when financially reasonable and operationally practical.

Incorporate sustainability and efficiency into the planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance of the project. Highlight each component of the project that you feel deserves consideration in this context, and demonstrate how sustainability and efficiency are integrated into the project.

If it is not possible to comprehensively integrate significant sustainability measures, then highlight elements you feel deserve consideration in this context.

**1. Include a concise summary of your company's policies, strategies, and actions that demonstrate your philosophy and commitment to sustainability.**

CDFA maintains a policy that encourages best practices in resource utilization. Practices include primarily publishing reports and training manuals in digital formats, extensive use of online webinars for training courses, use of online communication software to reduce travel by clients and partners, and recycling of all plastic and paper products to the greatest extent possible.

**2. Describe how your Proposal will address the established City policies referenced in this RFP specific to the project or service on which you are proposing.**

The CDFA Incentive Study Team will incorporate sustainability and efficiency into all aspects of the project, focusing on effective and efficient use of online and digital communication among the Team,

the City, and other stakeholders. We will utilize paper reduction strategies by producing documents and reports published in digital form (providing print copies when necessary to communicate to the citizens). Whenever possible, the Team will utilize video/telephone conferencing to minimize travel footprint, utilize local, green businesses for supplies/meeting refreshments. Of equal importance, as described above, we will be applying a sustainability lens to the incentive project ensuring that appropriate environmental and social factors are considered and addressed. We are well positioned to do so having brought to the team an industry leader on sustainable economic development.

## **11. Pricing/Cost Proposal**

The City recognizes this type of initiative is complex and that proposals may vary greatly in scope, approach, budget, and deliverables from one firm to another. The purpose of this RFQ/P will be to identify a preferred consultant firm/team based on the evaluation criteria contained herein, to work collaboratively with the City and jointly develop a scope of work which will best meet the project objectives outlined above.

Final pricing for this proposal will be negotiated, along with final scope and project phasing with the selected firm, based on their qualifications. However, since relative cost will be one of the evaluation criteria for responses, firms should provide the following information for general comparison purposes.

- Identify in pricing estimate, services or tasks which are necessary to meet the three identified objectives and any optional services or analysis, which are not required but could further enhance the findings of the study.
- Provide a total average hourly rate for your entire firm/team and an estimated minimum number of hours needed to complete each of the three tasks.
- Provide pricing for any additional "value added services" that your firm thinks would be relevant to this request on an a la carte pricing basis.

### **1. Attach your pricing proposal with the cost breakout as shown above.**

See Attachment: Final Pricing CDFA Team for KC Incentive Study 06162016.pdf

Attached is the budget document, 5 pages, Schedules A - E

## **12. Employee Eligibility Verification Affidavit**

Please download the attached [Employee Eligibility Verification Affidavit](#). Please sign, notarize, and scan the final form below.

**1. Please attach the signed and notarized Employee Eligibility Verification Affidavit here. Use the 'paperclip' icon to attach the scanned file.**

[CDFA Team Eligibility Affidavit Notarized.pdf](#)



## 13. References

Proposers are required to provide three (3) client references, including contact information, for similar projects that the Proposer has completed within the past five (5) years.

It is preferred that at least one (1) client reference be a government sector client.

Instructions:

- 1 Download the attached [References](#) form
- 2 Distribute to designated references
- 3 Collect the responses
- 4 Attach the completed forms below

### 1. Attach the completed reference form here from Reference #1.

See Attachment: Reference - Development Finance Authority of Summit County.pdf  
Reference from the Development Finance Authority of Summit County

### 2. Attach the completed reference form here from Reference #2.

See Attachment: CDFA Completed Reference 160608.pdf  
Reference from the Unmanned Aerial Systems Cluster Initiative (UASCI)

### 3. Attach the completed reference form here from Reference #3.

See Attachment: BizOR Reference.pdf  
Reference from Business Oregon Report available at  
[https://www.dropbox.com/s/u3v5fyl31sygfr2/BusinessOregon\\_BenchmarkingReport\\_Final.pdf?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/s/u3v5fyl31sygfr2/BusinessOregon_BenchmarkingReport_Final.pdf?dl=0)

## 14. Tax Clearance for City and Local Governments

The local governments of City of Kansas City, Jackson County, Missouri; Johnson County, Kansas; and the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas (collectively the "Local Governments"), have agreed to help enforce each other's Tax Laws to insure that taxpayer funded contracts are performed by Contractors in compliance with the Tax Laws of the Local Governments. Contractor agrees that Contractor shall be in compliance with the Tax Laws of the Local Governments throughout the term of this contract and any contract renewals and that proof of Contractor's compliance with the Tax Laws of the Local Governments shall be a condition precedent to City making City's first payment under the contract or any contract renewal.

The selected Contractor may obtain the City tax clearance letter from the City's Commissioner of Revenue at (816) 513-1135 or (816) 513-1089 and authorize the City to obtain the Clearance letters from the Local Governments of City of Kansas City, Jackson County, Missouri; Johnson County, Kansas; and the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas (collectively the "Local Governments"), dated not more than ninety (90) days from the date of submission.

### 1. Do you acknowledge the requirement in this section?

True



## 15. Performance Bond

A Performance Bond is required in the amount of the final contract amount.

### PERFORMANCE BOND

Project Number

Project Title

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That \_\_\_\_\_, as PRINCIPAL (CONTRACTOR), and \_\_\_\_\_, (SURETY), licensed to do business as such in the State of Missouri, hereby bind themselves and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, successors, and assigns unto Kansas City, Missouri, a constitutionally chartered municipal corporation, (OWNER), as obligee, in the penal sum of \_\_\_\_\_ Dollars (\$ \_\_\_\_\_) for the payment whereof CONTRACTOR and SURETY bind themselves, their heirs, executors, administrators, successors and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

WHEREAS,

CONTRACTOR has entered into a Contract with OWNER for \_\_\_\_\_ which Contract, including any present or future amendment thereto, is incorporated herein by reference and is hereinafter referred to as the Contract.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CONDITION OF THIS OBLIGATION is such that, if CONTRACTOR shall promptly and faithfully perform said Contract including all duly authorized changes thereto, according to all the terms thereof, including those under which CONTRACTOR agrees to pay legally required wage rates including the prevailing hourly rate of wages in the locality, as determined by the Department of Labor and Industrial Relations or by final judicial determination, for each craft or type of workman required to execute the Contract and, further, shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless OWNER from all damages, loss and expense occasioned by any failure whatsoever of said CONTRACTOR and SURETY to fully comply with and carry out each and every requirement of the Contract, then this obligation shall be void; otherwise, it shall remain in full force and effect.

WAIVER. That SURETY, for value received, hereby expressly agrees that no change, extension of time, alteration or addition to the terms of the Contract or to the Work to be performed thereunder, shall in any way affect the obligations of this Bond; and it does hereby waive notice of any such change, extension of time, or alteration or addition to the terms of the Contract or the Work to be performed thereunder.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the above parties have executed this instrument the \_\_\_\_ day of

\_\_\_\_\_

**CONTRACTOR**

Name, address and facsimile number of Contractor

I hereby certify that I have authority to execute this document on behalf of Contractor.

By:

Title:

(Attach corporate seal if applicable)

**SURETY**

Name, address and facsimile number of Surety:

I hereby certify that (1) I have authority to execute this document on behalf of Surety; (2) Surety has an A.M. Best rating of B+, V, or better; (3) Surety is named in the current list of Companies Holding Certificates of Authority as Acceptable Reinsuring Companies: as published in Circular 570 (most current revision) by the Financial Management Service, Surety Bond Branch, U.S. Department of the Treasury; and (4) Surety is duly licensed to issue bonds in the State of Missouri and in the jurisdiction in which the Project is located.

By:

Title:

Date:

(Attach seal and Power of Attorney)

**1. Do you acknowledge the performance bond requirement?**

True

## 16. Value Added Options- Cooperative Agreement Submittals

Additional project objectives or deliverables which respondents feel would further enhance the City's utilization of the collected data (historic or future) are encouraged and will also be considered.

Additional objectives should be provided in the proposer's response with a description of the associated scope and its benefit and cost.

## 17. MBE/WBE Goals

Please contact the City's Human Relations Department at 816-513-1836 for assistance on any aspect of the MBE/WBE program.

Program forms are linked below for reference. Click on the form name to download it.

For RFQP submittal, only Form 08 and Form 13 are required. Complete and upload these two forms in the appropriate question below.

If you are short-listed or selected for award, you will be notified of additional documents needed for submission.

- [HRD 06](#) : RFQ/P Instructions
- [HRD 07](#): Instruction for Non-Construction Bids
- [HRD 08](#): Contractor Utilization Plan and Request for Waiver (00450)
- [HRD 10](#): Timetable for Utilization (00460 HRD 10)
- [HRD 11](#): Request for Modification or Substitution (00470)
- [HRD 13](#): Affidavit of Intended Utilization
- [004501.01](#): Letter of Intent to Subcontract
- [01290.14](#): Contractor Affidavit for Final Payment
- [01290.15](#): Subcontractor Affidavit for Final Payment

### 1. Submit HRD Form 08.

See Attachment: Contractor Utilization Plan.PDF

### 2. Submit HRD Form 13.

See Attachment: Affidavit of Intended Utilization.PDF

### 3. Do you accept this requirement?

True

## 18. Addendum 1: Preliminary Questions

Question	Response
What is the budget range for	The City is committed to spending the dollars necessary to deliver a comprehensive analysis. In speaking with the City's procurement staff and other economic

this project? development resources, we think that there may be a range of scopes and costs. We have not set a maximum on the budget for this project because we are committed to ensuring we secure a the most effective technical team. We have dealt with the potential for different price points within the responses by requesting responders to provide an average hourly rate and number of hours anticipated to complete the required tasks. That factor would be evaluated against the overall approach and expertise of the responding firm, in recognition that higher expertise may come with a corresponding increase in cost. We encourage any and all firms who think they are qualified to consider a response to our project.

Does Kansas City have an existing relationship with an economic development consulting firm? The City does not. Our main economic development partner, the Economic Development Corporation of Kansas City, uses SB Friedman and Springsted Incorporated to conduct financial analyses of pending real estate redevelopment projects.

Are you open to hiring a non-local company? The City is seeking firms with experience conducting similar types of analysis. Whether the selected firm is local or non-local, we require that it comply with the MBE/WBE goals as stated in the RFQ.

What will be the audience for this report? The audience for this report includes City staff, Mayor & City Council, the Economic Development Corporation of Kansas City and the redevelopment agencies it houses, local neighborhood groups, the development community, and the broader public. The expectation is that this report will be made public.

What "temporary staffing resources" will be available, as listed in the description? The City will have summer interns entering the data and information from the statutory incentive agencies into a database. The goal is to limit the amount of data compilation that the selected firm would need to do, so that firm can focus predominantly on data analysis. However, once a firm is selected, the City will work with that firm to compile the data necessary for the firm to complete the agreed upon scope of work.

Which incentive programs are included in the scope? The City's Economic Development Agencies for the purpose of this study include - the Land Clearance for Redevelopment Authority (LCRA), the Tax Increment Financing Commission (TIF Commission), the Downtown Economic Stimulus Authority (DESA), the Enhanced Enterprise Zone Boards (EEZ), the Planned Industrial Expansion Authority (PIEA) and the Kansas City Chapter 353 Advisory Board (353 Board) which administer programs for their respective programs. Additionally, the City directly and via the Economic Development Corporation of Kansas City, the umbrella economic development agency for the City, and the Port Authority have additional authority to convey certain economic incentive benefits authorized pursuant to other Missouri State Statutes including Chapter 100 and Chapter 353.

Is the listed The percentages are based on the scope of work. The City desires that City certified

<p>MBE/WBE percentage required or a soft goal?</p>	<p>Minority Business Enterprises (MBEs) and City certified Women Business Enterprises (WBEs) have a maximum opportunity to participate in the performance of City contracts. This RFQ/P requires 10% DBE/MBE participation and 5% WBE participation. MBE/WBE firms can be found at <a href="https://kcmohrd.mwdbe.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchPublic.asp?TN=kcmohrd&amp;XID=186">https://kcmohrd.mwdbe.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchPublic.asp?TN=kcmohrd&amp;XID=186</a>.</p>
<p>Does Kansas City recognize MBE/WBE certification in other cities?</p>	<p>The City of Kansas City, MO only recognizes MBE/WBE certification from Kansas City. For a list of certified firms, please search <a href="https://kcmohrd.mwdbe.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchPublic.asp?TN=kcmohrd&amp;XID=186">https://kcmohrd.mwdbe.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchPublic.asp?TN=kcmohrd&amp;XID=186</a>.</p>
<p>Does the scope include recommendation to improve the performance?</p>	<p>The scope does not include policy recommendations. Given that many other cities are grappling with similar questions and conducting similar analyses, our scope does seek input as to best practices for administration, monitoring, and reporting of incentives.</p>
<p>When is the pre-submittal teleconference?</p>	<p>The pre-submittal teleconference is Tuesday, June 7<sup>th</sup> at 10am (CT). Instructions on how to call in and participate will be sent out to interested firms at a later date.</p>

**1. Do you acknowledge this addendum?**

True

**19. Addendum 2: Pre-Submittal Teleconference Instructions**

The City will conduct a pre-submittal teleconference at 10am CT on Tuesday, June 7<sup>th</sup> to go through the RFQ/P and answer any questions from potential respondents. Access to the meeting will be two-pronged: to view the slide deck, you will need to join the Skype meeting via the invite below. In order to ask questions and participate on the call, please use the dial in number.

Contact Aaron Shroyer (aaron.shroyer@kcmo.org; 816-513-6537) if you have any questions.

[Join Skype Meeting](#)

For dialing-in:

-----

1. Dial one of the numbers listed below
2. When prompted, enter the Meeting Access Code: 9689153#
  - \* Caller-Paid number: 213-787-0529
  - \* Toll-Free Number (in USA): 888-808-6929.
  - \* Blackberry (Caller-Paid): 2137870529x9689153#
  - \* iPhone (Caller-Paid): 2137870529,,9689153#

**1. Do you acknowledge this addendum?**

Yes

**20. Addendum 3: Post-Teleconference Questions and Responses**

Questions      Responses

Are you looking for submissions from all of the team member firms on a proposal or only from the lead firm?

If several suppliers are creating a joint proposal, only the lead proposer would submit in RFP365. However, please provide information on all proposers in Section 1.

Does the reference to Dun & Bradstreet in this section and item refer to a D&B number or a D&B credit report?

Yes, firms can supply their D&B number, and the City can run the report.

Which e-Verify form should be submitted?

It is fine to submit the e-Verify form that is attached in RFP365.

Where can I find the list of certified MBE/WBE?

Please find that list at <https://kcmohrd.mwdbe.com/FrontEnd/VendorSearchPublic.asp?TN=kcmohrd&XID=186>.

Why does the City ask for a performance bond?

We are asking for a performance bond to secure the performance of the selected firm's services through the entirety of the project. It will be released at the end (acceptance) of the project. We ask for this on all of our large services projects to guarantee the services.

Would there be any exceptions for submitting the completed reference forms past the due date of June 12<sup>th</sup>?

References are a requirement and all suppliers should make every effort to meet all requirements of the RFP.

**1. Do you acknowledge this addendum?**

Yes

**2. Do you acknowledge this addendum?**

Yes

**21. Addendum 4: Additional Information on Incentive Programs**

[Data Fields](#) [TIF Generational Chart](#) [Chapter 100 - Super TIF Projects](#) [Incentive Areas.pdf](#)[Incentive Areas.xlsx](#) [Zone 1 Map.PDF](#)[Zone 2 Map.PDF](#) [Zone 3 Map.PDF](#)

Attached to this Addenda are the following:

- DataFields: shows the types of data that will be captured in our database. Note: Data is currently being entered and not all incentive projects will have data in every one of the listed fields.
- TIF Generational Chart: Breakdown of generations of TIF, as noted by Kerrie Tyndall during Tuesday's phone call.
- Chapter 100- Super TIF Projects: List of all Chapter 100 & Super TIF Projects.
- Incentive Areas: Map and list of all incentive areas.
- Zones 1-3: Map of Enhanced Enterprise Zones in Kansas City, Missouri

**1. Do you acknowledge this Addendum?**

Yes

**22. Addendum 5: Urgent Notice to Respondents**

**URGENT NOTICE TO RESPONDENTS**

**The deadline for responses has been extended to 5pm CT on Thursday, June 16th.**

As a result, the schedule for selection will be altered as follows:  
Question Period: Two weeks after close (SAME)  
Short-listed Firm Interviews: Late June/Early July 2016  
Preferred Firm Selected: July 2016  
Finalize the Scope & Pricing: July 2016  
Project Commencement: Late July 2016  
Project Completion Date: Fall 2016

Can the City provide an overview of the economic incentive programs? See attached Word document entitled Quick Reference Guide.

In regard to the Standard City Contract, is there any flexibility with regard to contract negotiation? How would you advise that firms answer the questions with our proposed changes? Question 2 in Section 5 is provided to allow for any comments, concerns, or questions regarding the Standard City Contract. Some things may be negotiable and others may not. If you have exceptions to any specific sections, please explicitly state those in your response.

Would it be acceptable to add additional scope to the proposal as a "value-added task" that would Per Section 3-431 (City Code 130041) the Bidder/Proposer can include additional scopes for participation and count that participation towards the project's MBE/WBE goal. This is acceptable because a contract that cannot achieve participation as it written can be structured to CREATE potential



count towards MBE/WBE opportunities for qualified MBEs and WBEs to participate as subcontractors, service providers and/or suppliers, Section 3-431(b)(3) of our policy allows that as an acceptable option. If the Bidder/Proposer is unable to meet the target goals, they must submit documentation of their Good Faith Efforts in accord with Section 3-441. The Standards to determine good faith are attached for your convenience.

Is the deadline to complete the project firm? The City is seeking to complete this analysis by the Fall of 2016. However, if the responder feels that this timeline is insufficient to meet the intention of the outlined scope of services, they should indicate what portion of the scope could be completed by this fall and include an alternative schedule for completion of the project including any related phasing. The City's emphasis is on receiving a high-quality product as soon as possible.

Are respondents required to rely upon data fields provided to complete the analysis? No, Task 1 of the scope is intended to allow for proposals to identify their data requirements and scope and use that to negotiate a plan to compile that data. The data that firms can use is not limited to the data that is currently collected. The City welcomes inputs from the selected firm as to what data can be included. The City will work with partners to collect that data, with the caveat being that some historical data might not be available.

[Quick Reference Guide.doc](#)  
[130041 MWBE GFE Standards.pdf](#)

**1. Do you acknowledge this Addendum?**

Yes

Commentary on Incentive Study Timeline

Proposed by the CDFA Team

In response to the City of Kansas City Incentive Study

After reviewing all of the tasks involved in the Incentive Study, and based upon the information in the RFP and in the responses to questions, we believe that our Team can complete all of the Tasks in a total of eight months.

We can complete both the largest portions of the Study by October 31, 2016 (including Task One -- Identifying Key Performance Indicators), Task Two -- Completing the Historical Analysis, and a good portion of Task Three (Assisting in Developing a Monitoring and Report System).

This Timeline could be reduced by two and a half months, based upon the following assumptions:

- The contract is awarded by July 1, 2016:
- One Month Reduction: Streamlining the process to complete the reporting and outreach.
- One Month Reduction: After reviewing all of the available data and the quality of the data systems, we find that no major adjustments or additional data obtained.
- Two Week Reduction: No need for a major community meeting 2-3 months into the entire process.

**Schedule A  
Pricing/Cost Proposal  
CDFA Team Incentive Study RFP**

**Professional Staff:**

Includes CDFA, BDA, PGAV, Hardwick & Upjohn  
Research, Writing, Coordination  
Schedule C Attached

\$271,366.00

**Travel:**

Includes airfare, hotel, transportation  
Schedule D Attached

\$15,312.00

**Production:**

Includes outreach, reports, production

\$3,000.00

**Total**                       
\$286,678.00

Exhibit	Cost/Pricing Proposal	Total Hours Entire Team	From Exhibit E
A	Cost/Pricing Proposal	1,609	From Exhibit E
B	Timeline for KC Incentive Study	Total Staffing Costs \$ 271,366.00	From Exhibit C
C	Staffing Costs	Cost/Hour Entire Team \$ 168.66	From Exhibit C
D	Travel Costs		
E	Staffing Hours Per Task		

Schedule B

Timeline for KC Incentive Study

CDFA Team RFP Lead

Months	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight
July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	
CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA
CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA

CDFA
BDA+
PGAV
Upjohn
Sterling
Hardwick

Task One Lead

Assist

BDA+	BDA+	BDA+						
PGAV	PGAV	PGAV						
Upjohn	Upjohn	Upjohn				Upjohn	Upjohn	
PGAV	PGAV	PGAV						

Task Two Lead

Assist


Task three Lead

Assist


Outreach Lead

Assist

Hardwick	Hardwick	Hardwick	Hardwick	Hardwick	Hardwick	Hardwick	Hardwick	Hardwick
CDFA				CDFA				CDFA

Community Relation Lead

Report Lead

Assist

Sterling	Sterling	Sterling	Sterling	Sterling	Sterling	Sterling	Sterling	Sterling

Travel Schedule

CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA	CDFA
BDA	BDA		BDA				BDA	BDA
PGAV	PGAV	PGAV		PGAV			PGAV	PGAV
Upjohn	Upjohn		Upjohn				Upjohn	



Schedule C  
Staffing Costs  
CDFA Team Incentive Study RFP

Staff	Hourly Rate	Month												Total			
		July One	Aug Two	Sept Three	Oct Four	Nov Five	Dec Six	Jan Seven	Feb Eight	Jan Seven	Feb Eight	Jan Seven	Feb Eight				
<b>CDFA</b>																	
Mark Barbash	\$156.00	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	3,744	29,952
Toby Rittner	\$156.00	2,496	2,496	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248	2,496	2,496	2,496	16,224
Katie Kramer	\$120.00	1,920	960	480	480	480	480	480	480	480	1,920	1,920	1,920	1,920	1,920	1,920	8,640
Pete Matthews	\$72.00	1,152	1,152	1,152	1,152	576	1,152	1,152	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	5,190
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>9,312</b>	<b>8,352</b>	<b>6,624</b>	<b>6,624</b>	<b>8,544</b>	<b>5,474</b>	<b>6,914</b>	<b>8,162</b>								<b>60,006</b>
<b>BDA</b>																	
Ellen Harpel	\$200.00	7,600	11,200	11,000	10,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	63,800
Advisors	\$190.00	4,560	4,750	4,750	4,750	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,850	2,850	27,360
<b>PGAV</b>																	
Andy Struckhoff	\$175.00	4,200	4,200	2,800	4,200	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	26,600
<b>Hardwick</b>																	
Allison Bergman	\$265.00	6,360	6,360	6,360	4,240	4,240	4,240	4,240	4,240	4,240	4,240	4,240	6,360	6,360	6,360	6,360	42,400
<b>Upjohn</b>																	
Jim Robey	\$200.00	8,000	8,000	8,000	6,400	4,800	6,400	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	35,200
<b>Sterling</b>																	
Stacy Sedler	\$125.00	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	16,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>42,032</b>	<b>44,862</b>	<b>41,534</b>	<b>31,814</b>	<b>28,434</b>	<b>31,764</b>	<b>31,604</b>	<b>19,322</b>								<b>271,366</b>

Total Hours	1609
All in Hourly Rate	\$168,666

Schedule D

Travel Costs

CDEFA Team Incentive Study RFP

Person	Trip	Nights	Air Fare/RT	Total Airfare	Hotel/Night	Total Hotel	Meals/Day	Meals/tot	Transport.
Mark Barbash		3	\$ 350.00	\$ 1,050.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 64.00	\$ 576.00	\$ 270.00
Toby Rittner		3	\$ 350.00	\$ 1,050.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 64.00	\$ 576.00	\$ 270.00
Katie Kramer		0	\$ 350.00	\$ -	\$ 200.00	\$ -	\$ 64.00	\$ -	\$ -
Pete Matthews		0	\$ 350.00	\$ -	\$ 200.00	\$ -	\$ 64.00	\$ -	\$ -
Ellen Harpel		3	\$ 350.00	\$ 1,050.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 64.00	\$ 576.00	\$ 270.00
<b>Andy Struckhold</b>		4	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 64.00	\$ 768.00	\$ 360.00
Jim Robey		3	\$ 500.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$ 64.00	\$ 576.00	\$ 270.00
Allison Bergman		0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 64.00	\$ -	\$ -
Stacy Sedler		0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
			\$ 1,900.00	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 7,200.00	\$ 512.00	\$ 3,072.00	\$ 1,440.00

Travel	Cost
Airfare	\$ 3,600
Hotel	\$ 7,200
Transportatic	\$ 1,440
Meals	\$ 3,072
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 15,312</b>

Staffing for KC Incentive Study  
 Schedule E  
 Staffing Hours Per Task  
 CDFA Incentive Study Team

	July		Aug		Sept		Oct		Nov		Dec		Jan		Feb		Hours/Month
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight	
Team Mgt	40	40	24	32	48	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	240
Admin	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	240
Task 1	Lead 64	Lead 81	Lead 80	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	249
Task 1	Assist 8	Assist 8	Assist 8	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	249
Task 2	Lead 40	Lead 40	Lead 40	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 32	Lead 24	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	240
Task 2	Assist 16	Assist 8	Assist 8	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 16	Assist 16	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	240
Task 3	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 75	Lead 55	Lead 55	Lead 55	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	304
Task 3	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 24	Assist 16	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	304
Outreach	Lead 24	Lead 24	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	224
Outreach	Assist 16	Assist 8	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	Assist 4	224
Community Relations	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	Lead 16	256
Community Relations	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	256
Report	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 0	Lead 24	Lead 24	Lead 24	Lead 24	Lead 24	Lead 24	Lead 24	Lead 24	Lead 24	Lead 24	Lead 24	80
Report	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 0	Assist 24	80

CDFA  
 BDA+  
 PGAV  
 Uplohn  
 232 Hardwick  
 128 Sterling