



STATE OF TENNESSEE  
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 33007-00126  
AMENDMENT # 1  
FOR COMMUNITY-LEVEL HOUSING MARKET STUDY  
SERVICES**

**DATE: March 13, 2026**

**RFP # 33007-00126 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:**

1. This RFP Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled RFP dates. Any event, time, or date containing revised or new text is highlighted.

EVENT	TIME (central time zone)	DATE
1. RFP Issued		February 13, 2026
2. Disability Accommodation Request Deadline	2:00 p.m.	February 19, 2026
3. Pre-response Conference	2:00 p.m.	February 23, 2026
4. Notice of Intent to Respond Deadline	2:00 p.m.	February 24, 2026
5. Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline	2:00 p.m.	February 27, 2026
6. State Response to Written "Questions & Comments"		March 13, 2026
7. Response Deadline	2:00 p.m.	March 20, 2026
8. State Completion of Technical Response Evaluations		April 6, 2026
9. State Opening & Scoring of Cost Proposals	2:00 p.m.	April 8, 2026
10. State Notice of Intent to Award Released and RFP Files Opened for Public Inspection	2:00 p.m.	April 9, 2026
11. End of Protest Period		April 16, 2026
12. State Sends Contract to Contractor(s) for Signature		April 20, 2026
13. Contractor Signature Deadline	2:00 p.m.	April 23, 2026

2. State responses to questions and comments in the table below amend and clarify this RFP.

Any restatement of RFP text in the Question/Comment column shall NOT be construed as a change in the actual wording of the RFP document.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		1 How will ECD choose which counties receive a housing study?	TNECD will conduct a competitive application-based selection process. All counties will be invited to submit application for community-level housing market studies.
		2 Related to attachment 6.3, the table only lists "\$____/hour" under the "proposed cost" header, but to complete the bid the contractor needs to also enter the number of hours per person. The box "sum" would seem to be the place for this but it is under the header of "state use ONLY." Could you please clarify? Also related to attachment 6.3, there are no options for non-labor costs. Should we assume that those costs should be wrapped into the labor costs that are listed in this table?	The field labeled "sum" on RFP Attachment 6.3 should only be completed by the State—not RFP respondents. Additionally, all non-labor costs should be considered when developing final figures for labor cost proposals.
		3 What role will ECD play in matching up the three contractors with the 15 communities who need analyses completed?	TNECD plans to assign all communities selected for housing market studies evenly between the total number of contractors that are awarded contracts following completion of the procurement process.
		4 Have the 3 members of the evaluation team been selected? Can those persons be disclosed? (section 5.2 of the RFP)	TNECD has identified the requisite number of RFP response evaluators for this procurement. Although each evaluator's scoring will be included in the procurement file that is made available for review during the open file period, the identities of said evaluators will not be disclosed.
		5 Should the "at least one in-person" clause be considered the norm in section A.2.a of the RFP Attachment 6.6., Pro Forma Contract? or will there typically be more on-site work required? (e.g.: stakeholder engagement? section A.2.b.7)	<p><i>Pro Forma Contract, § A.2.a provides as follows:</i></p> <p><i>The Contractor shall conduct at least one in-person meeting (unless the State approves in writing that a virtual meeting is acceptable) as directed by the State with each community to understand the community's needs.</i></p> <p>[emphasis added]</p> <p>The "at least one in-person" requirement referenced in Pro Forma Contract, § A.2.a of Attachment 6.6 (<i>Pro Forma Contract</i>) establishes a minimum expectation rather than a fixed standard for all engagements. The State anticipates that the scope and frequency of on-site work—including stakeholder engagement activities contemplated in <i>Pro Forma Contract</i>, § A.2.b.7—may vary depending on the size, complexity, and specific needs of each community selected for study. Following contract award, and in coordination with the selected contractor and the participating community, the State will assess project-specific factors and determine the appropriate level of in-person engagement necessary to achieve the objectives of the housing market study.</p>
		6 Will the "state opening" listed in the schedule of events on page 5 of the RFP be an event open to the public?	No, the State opening and scoring of cost proposals will not be open to the public.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		<p>7 Section 3.1.1.3 of the RFP (page 6) states "All information and documentation included in a Technical Response should correspond to or address a specific requirement detailed in the RFP Attachment 6.2., Technical Response &amp; Evaluation Guide. All information must be incorporated into a response to a specific requirement and clearly referenced. Any information not meeting these criteria will be deemed extraneous and will not contribute to evaluations." When structuring our Technical Response, would a Cover Page, Table of Contents, or Cover Letter be acceptable additions to the 6.2 Technical Response &amp; Evaluation Guide Contents? If so, will these count toward the 30 page limit?</p>	<p>A Cover Page and a Table of Contents are acceptable and will not count towards the 30-page limit.</p>
		<p>8 Does the 30-page limit apply only to the Technical Response (not inclusive of the separately submitted Cost Proposal?) We believe we understood that correctly, just checking to make sure.</p>	<p>The 30-page limit shall only apply to the Technical Response—not the Cost Proposal.</p>
		<p>9 A few of our references have responded directly via email as instructed in the RFP, however they cc'd firm President Brian Points and myself, so we could mark those references as complete. Will this be an issue?</p>	<p>No, this will not be an issue.</p>
		<p>10 How many community-level housing market studies does the State anticipate commissioning annually?</p>	<p>At this time, the State has not determined a fixed number of community-level housing market studies to be commissioned on an annual basis. The number of studies undertaken each year will depend on available funding, community demand, and programmatic priorities. Accordingly, specific quantities will be determined on a rolling basis following contract award and as communities are identified for participation.</p>
		<p>11 If multiple contractors are selected, is there a minimum number of studies guaranteed per contractor?</p>	<p>No, there is not a minimum number of community studies to be distributed per contractor.</p>
		<p>12 What is the expected period of performance for each work plan?</p>	<p>The State interprets the question about "work plans" as inquiring about the anticipated period of performance for each product report. The State anticipates a maximum period of performance of twelve months for each product report / work plan.</p>
		<p>13 Is the State anticipating a maximum cost per work plan?</p>	<p>The State does not currently have an established "maximum cost per work plan". Any such maximums will be governed by the content of the RFP responses received.</p>
		<p>14 Will the State provide access to baseline datasets (administrative data, population/workforce projections, broadband service areas, etc.) or will the contractor be responsible for independently sourcing this data?</p>	<p>The State will provide the contractor(s) access to all data the State deems valuable to the project. However, the expectation is for the contractor(s) to leverage independent sources for much of the needed data.</p>
		<p>15 If multiple contractors are expected, does the State expect standardized methodologies across contractors for determining housing demand/supply and affordability gaps?</p>	<p>Yes, the State will provide additional details regarding standardized methodologies utilized following contract award.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		16 Could you please confirm that evaluation factors C.1 and C.4 are not the same in section C of Attachment 6.2, "Technical Response and Evaluation Guide," (Page 24)?	Although generally addressing the same understanding and abilities, RFP respondents should provide more detail for RFP Attachment 6.2, § C.4. Whereas § C.1 calls for a succinct generalized narrative about the RFP Respondents' understanding, § C.4 clearly requires significantly more granular detail.
		17 Can you confirm that including additional rows with different position titles on the cost proposal template (Attachment 6.3) would violate the requirements of section 3.1.2.1 and could result in the response being deemed non-responsive and rejected?	Attachment 6.3 ( <i>Cost Proposal &amp; Scoring Guide</i> ) must be submitted exactly as issued. Pursuant to Section 3.1.2.1 of the RFP, Respondents may not alter the format, structure, or listed position titles, which includes adding additional rows or modifying existing categories. Inclusion of additional position titles or revisions to the template may result in the Cost Proposal being deemed non-responsive.  To ensure clarity regarding proposed staffing approaches, the State anticipates that Respondents will clearly describe the roles and responsibilities associated with each listed position within their Technical Response. This approach preserves the uniform cost structure required for evaluation while allowing Respondents to fully explain how proposed personnel will fulfill the scope of services.
		18 On page 6 of the pro-forma contract, section C.4 states that the Consultant shall not be compensated or reimbursed for travel time, travel expenses, meals, or lodging. Can you confirm whether this should be interpreted to mean that: 1.) anticipated costs associated with travel should be incorporated into the Consultant's proposed hourly rates; or 2.) travel will not be required to execute the scope of work and travel costs should not be incurred by the Consultant.	Travel will be required to execute the scope of work but will not be invoiced or reviewed for approvals separately by the State for the project. It is up to the vendor to include any anticipated costs in the proposed hourly rates.
		19 On page 10 of the pro-forma contract, section D.13 states that brief periodic progress reports shall be submitted to the state upon request. Can you clarify the typical frequency of these progress reports?	Progress reports can occur monthly or weekly depending on the rate of project progress.
		20 Is there currently any expectation that federal funding may be used for contracts resulting from this solicitation?	No, federal funding will not be available for these contracted services.
		21 The RFP references studies are to be done on "communities." Can you clarify what is meant by "communities"? Could they be towns, cities, counties or multi-county regions?	For purposes of this RFP, "communities" generally refers to identifiable local governmental entities, such as towns, cities, or counties. While the State anticipates that most studies will focus on single local jurisdictions, the State may, at its sole discretion, consider studies encompassing a defined multi-county region where a regional approach is justified by shared economic, housing, or workforce dynamics. Any determination regarding the appropriateness of a multi-county study will be made by the State based on programmatic priorities and the specific circumstances presented.

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		22 You may answer this as part of the preceding question, but is your intent to try to have studies done on smaller communities that may not have the financial or staff resources to be able to do a housing study, or could larger markets/cities be included?	TNECD intends for studies to be completed on both smaller communities and larger cities. A comprehensive list of said communities will be provided following completion of the community selection process, which contractor(s) will assist with.
		23 Under A.2.a. of the RFP, there is a statement that reads, "At the State's sole discretion, further meetings may be scheduled as needed." This is in reference to the selected analyst meeting with each community to gather input on the community's needs. As part of the bid, can the analyst cap the number of such meetings, as leaving this open-ended could result in a number of meetings requested that are not financially feasible for the market analyst?	<p><i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, § A.2.a. establishes that additional meetings may be required at the State's sole discretion to ensure each community-level housing market study is sufficiently informed by local input. Respondents may not impose a unilateral cap on the number of meetings in their response, as doing so would qualify or restrict the requirements of the RFP and may render the response non-responsive.</p> <p>That said, the State anticipates exercising this discretion reasonably and in alignment with the scope, complexity, and needs of each selected community. Following contract award, the State will work collaboratively with the selected contractor(s) to establish an appropriate engagement plan for each study, taking into account budgetary parameters and project objectives.</p>
		24 Is the reference to having up to 15 studies commissioned meant to indicate that over the five-year period a total of 15 studies will be done, representing roughly 3 a year, but that the actual number of studies requested could fluctuate from year to year?	The State will take applications from communities who seek studies. The number of applications will be reviewed and assessed and the full fifteen could already be identified in the first year. Or, in the alternative, the State could only receive applications from a few communities and then open another round in Year 2 or Year 3. But collectively, the State will not require more than fifteen studies over the 5-year Term of the Contract.
		25 Is there a typical time frame in which a commissioned community study will be expected to be completed, such as four or five months (the typical time frames for a community housing study)?	Yes, typically six months is the expected timeframe for completion of a commissioned community study.
		26 Will there be a specific person or persons assigned from the Tennessee DECD that will serve as a liaison between the selected market study provider and the community?	Yes, TNECD staff will be assigned to assist with this project, but it is expected that the contractor(s) will work directly with the community as well to ensure the successful completion of services.
		27 Under A.2.b. of the RFP, there is a reference to "Quality of life indicators". Can you provide some general ideas on what is meant by this, as such indicators can be broad and sources of data may be difficult to find, depending on the topic? As a follow-up, is it possible what is a relevant quality of life indicator in one community may differ from another community, so we would be expected to be flexible in accommodating each community's specific needs, within reason?	<p>As referenced in <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, § A.2.b., "quality of life indicators" are intended to encompass commonly recognized community attributes that influence residential location decisions and housing demand from an economic and community development perspective. Examples may include, but are not limited to, school performance, access to healthcare, public safety metrics, proximity to employment centers, parks and recreational amenities, transportation access, broadband availability, and other factors that affect a community's overall livability and market attractiveness.</p> <p>The State recognizes that relevant quality of life indicators may vary by community depending on local context, assets, and challenges. Accordingly, the selected contractor will be expected to exercise professional judgment and flexibility in identifying and analyzing the indicators most relevant to each community, in</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>coordination with the State and local stakeholders, and within the overall scope and budget of the contract.</p>
		<p>28 Under A.2.b.3.E. of the RFP, there is a reference to "Potential Development Areas." First, does this mean potential sites that could support residential development would need to be identified and summarized? If so, can you give some guidance on the level of detail that would be expected, as there is a notable difference between identifying details such as property location, parcel size, current zoning and flood plain status, for example, versus determining water and sewer availability/access, topographical constraints, environmental constraints, etc. (which would be more in line with an engineering firm's work, which could be costly)?</p>	<p>The reference to "Potential Development Areas" in <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, § A.2.b.3.E. is intended to identify and summarize general locations or site categories within a community that may be suitable for residential development based on market conditions, land use patterns, and publicly available data. The State does not anticipate that the contractor will perform engineering-level due diligence, site certification, or detailed feasibility analyses (e.g., utility engineering studies, environmental testing, or topographical surveys).</p> <p>Rather, the expectation is for a planning-level assessment that may include high-level factors such as general location, approximate size, existing land use or zoning context, and other readily available indicators of development potential. The selected contractor should apply professional judgment to provide sufficient detail to inform local decision-making, while remaining within the scope of a housing market study and not expanding into specialized engineering services unless otherwise mutually agreed following contract award.</p>
		<p>29 Under A.2.b.6.B. of the RFP, there is a reference to "Infrastructure capacity related to water, sewer, and transportation." Depending upon what you are seeking/expecting, this work could require the services of an engineering firm, which could be incredibly costly. Is the Tennessee DECD open to the idea of attempting to understand infrastructure capacity by allowing the analyst to do interviews and surveys of local officials knowledgeable on these topics to gather their insight?</p>	<p>The reference to "Infrastructure capacity related to water, sewer, and transportation" in <i>Pro Forma</i> Contract, § A.2.b.6.B. is intended to support a planning-level understanding of infrastructure conditions as they relate to housing development potential. The State does not anticipate that the contractor(s) will perform independent engineering analyses, utility modeling, or detailed capacity studies. The State expects the selected contractor(s) to rely primarily on reasonably available data, existing plans or studies, and engagement with knowledgeable local officials or utility providers to inform this assessment. Interviews and surveys of appropriate local representatives are an acceptable and anticipated method for gathering insight, provided the resulting analysis remains within the scope of a housing market study and does not expand into specialized engineering services unless otherwise mutually agreed following the contract award phase.</p>
		<p>30 Can firms provide "optional" scope of work elements that are not listed in the RFP but could be beneficial to your organization and/or the individual communities?</p>	<p>Respondents must fully address and price the <i>Scope of Services</i> as set forth in the RFP. However, consistent with RFP, § 3.6 (<i>Additional Services</i>), the State will consider value-added or supplemental services that are within the general scope of the procurement and that may enhance the usefulness of the housing market studies.</p> <p>Any such optional elements should be clearly identified as supplemental and must not modify, qualify, or replace the required scope. Additionally, Respondents must not alter the Cost Proposal format or include additional pricing lines beyond those expressly provided in Attachment 6.3. The State reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to determine whether any proposed supplemental services will be incorporated into the final contract.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
		<p>31 This is more of a comment than a question, but if multiple market study firms are selected to do these studies, you will want to think about how you align market research and methodologies among the firms. Otherwise, different firms may have different approaches, which may lead to conflicts or inconsistencies between studies done by the different firms.</p>	<p>The State appreciates this comment. In the event multiple contractors are awarded contracts under this RFP, the State anticipates providing general guidance regarding baseline expectations, core data elements, and reporting structure to promote consistency across studies.</p> <p>At the same time, the State recognizes that professional methodologies may vary and values the expertise and judgment each contractor brings to the engagement. The State's intent is to ensure a reasonable level of comparability and quality across deliverables while allowing appropriate flexibility in analytical approach, consistent with the scope of services and contract requirements.</p>
		<p>32 Under A.6. of the RFP, under the category of Third Party Procurement and Coordination, subtopic a.2. there is a reference to the analyst's "Purchase of Swag." Can you give some insight on what was meant by this and if there are any expectations of the selected market analyst being required to provide any marketing materials (beyond handouts, flyers, community profile sheets and other materials tied to the findings and conclusions of the study)?</p>	<p>The referenced provision is a standard contractual clause utilized across multiple TNECD contracts and is not specific to this procurement. The State does not currently anticipate requiring the selected contractor to purchase or develop promotional "swag" items as part of the performance of community-level housing market study services.</p> <p>Any marketing or outreach materials expected under this contract are anticipated to be limited to deliverables directly tied to the study itself (e.g., reports, presentations, community profile sheets, dashboards, or similar materials supporting the study's findings and recommendations). However, consistent with the contract terms, the State reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to require additional items—including promotional materials—if deemed appropriate and within the scope and budget of the contract following award.</p>
		<p>33 How many community studies does the State anticipate annually, and what factors determine prioritization?</p>	<p>At this time, the State has not established a fixed number of community-level housing market studies to be commissioned annually. The number undertaken each year will depend on available funding, demonstrated community need, geographic distribution considerations, and overall programmatic priorities.</p> <p>Respondents should assume that work will be assigned on a task order or project-specific basis following contract award. To the extent Respondents wish to describe anticipated capacity or recommended annual volume, they may do so within their Technical Response—particularly in § C (<i>Technical Qualifications, Experience &amp; Approach</i>), including the proposed project management approach and staffing plan. However, the State retains sole discretion in determining the number, timing, and prioritization of studies each year.</p>
		<p>34 Will communities be selected by TNECD, or may contractors recommend candidate communities based on readiness or need?</p>	<p>Communities will be selected by TNECD, but we will take contractor recommendations and expertise in mind during the selection process.</p>
		<p>35 What level of interactivity is expected for public dashboards?</p>	<p>The RFP contemplates that any public-facing dashboards should meaningfully support the communication of study findings and enhance usability for community stakeholders. However, the State has not prescribed a specific technical standard or level of interactivity at this time.</p>

RFP SECTION	PAGE #	QUESTION / COMMENT	STATE RESPONSE
			<p>The appropriate level of functionality will be determined following contract award, based on the needs of the individual community, available data, budget considerations, and the overall scope of work. Respondents should propose a reasonable, scalable approach consistent with the objectives of the housing market study, recognizing that final expectations may be refined in coordination with the State post-award.</p>
		<p>36 Would TNECD value a centralized housing data repository to support ongoing decision-making?</p>	<p>The State recognizes the potential value of a centralized housing data repository to support ongoing analysis and informed decision-making. While such a repository is not expressly required under the RFP, the State would welcome thoughtful proposals that include this type of value-added component, provided it is within the general scope of the procurement.</p> <p>Any such proposed element should be clearly described in the Technical Response and structured in a manner that does not alter or conflict with the required Scope of Services or Cost Proposal format. The State reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to determine whether and to what extent any centralized repository component would be incorporated into the final contract.</p>

**3. RFP Amendment Effective Date.** The revisions set forth herein shall be effective upon release. All other terms and conditions of this RFP not expressly amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.