

Audit & Competitor Analysis

Current state of Resortments, competitor platforms evaluated, and why a custom unified platform wins on 5-year TCO and strategic fit.

PREPARED FOR	SPONSOR	BY	VERSION
Resortments	Russ · Owner	Webaroo	v3.0

This document is prepared to serve as Resortments' strategic starting point — distilling the full audit of current operations, the landscape of competing platforms, and Webaroo's recommended path into one actionable reference. Our recommendation rests on four core imperatives:

- 1. Replace fragmentation with a single unified platform.** Resortments operates 16+ disconnected tools across 8 divisions with zero integration; the cost of manual coordination is measurable and compounding.
- 2. Match enterprise platform functionality at a lower 5-year TCO.** Yardi, Procore, and Buildertrend cannot serve Resortments' modular-housing-to-leasing workflow without custom extensions that exceed the cost of a purpose-built platform.
- 3. Preserve full data ownership and eliminate vendor lock-in.** Every line of code, every schema, every integration becomes Resortments' asset — not a rented SaaS dependency.
- 4. Support Resortments' unique operational model from day one.** The platform must natively handle land acquisition → legal closing → procurement → plant → field → leasing → accounting — a lifecycle no off-the-shelf product covers.

These imperatives frame every finding and recommendation that follows.

Executive Summary

Resortments operates as a decentralized enterprise with **16+ disconnected software tools** powering operations across 8 divisions with zero system integration. The current technology landscape creates operational friction, information silos, compliance risks, and prevents leaders from accessing real-time business visibility.

This audit reveals critical gaps in financial management, project tracking, safety/compliance, and operational data consolidation. While individual systems (particularly RealPage for lease management) serve specific functions adequately, the lack of integration creates dependencies on manual workarounds, phone communication, and institutional knowledge housed in key individuals.

Key Findings: - **Zero enterprise visibility** into financial health, project status, or operational metrics - **Manual execution** of critical business processes dependent on phone calls and ad-hoc coordination - **Fragmented data** across 50+ regulatory bodies, spreadsheets, email, physical paper, and phone notes - **Operational bottlenecks** in procurement (2,000+ active items tracked informally), permitting, and field operations - **Compliance exposure** in safety/incident tracking, photo documentation, and audit trails

The competitor analysis demonstrates a spectrum of solutions from point-tool vendors to comprehensive platforms. However, **no off-the-shelf platform addresses the specific operational model of modular housing development with multi-divisional operations and integrated construction-to-leasing workflows.** A custom-built unified platform represents the optimal path to consolidate operations, enable real-time decision-making, and scale across divisions.

Section 1: Current State Audit

1.1 Organizational Context

Client: Resortments **Business Model:** Modular housing and resort development company **Organizational Structure:** 8 Divisions **Current Technology Maturity:** Fragmented, tool-centric approach without integration architecture

Resortments manages complex operations spanning: - Land acquisition and permitting - Modular home design and manufacturing coordination - Construction and installation - Lease management and resident services - Financial operations across multiple revenue streams - Legal contract management and compliance

1.2 Audit Methodology

This audit was conducted through discovery sessions with key stakeholders (particularly Russ, the primary operator and institutional knowledge holder) and analysis of: - Current software platforms and their utilization - Data flow patterns and information movement - Operational bottlenecks and manual workarounds - Compliance and risk exposure areas

Section 2: Tool Inventory & Current Usage

2.1 Complete Technology Stack (16+ Disconnected Tools)

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

TOOL	PURPOSE	STATUS	INTEGRATION
QuickBooks	Payment history, AP/AR	Active	Limited—payment data only
Treasury Software	Bank account management, cash management	Active	Connected to banking infrastructure
ADP	Payroll, bonuses, vacation/PTO tracking	Active	Disconnected from other HR/financial systems

Assessment: Financial systems are segmented by function with no unified view of organizational financial health. No centralized budgeting or forecasting capability.

DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT & COLLABORATION

TOOL	PURPOSE	STATUS	INTEGRATION
OneDrive	Document storage	Active	No unified repository strategy
Google Drive	Document storage & collaboration	Active	Silos separate from OneDrive
Microsoft Office	Document creation (Word, Excel)	Active	Desktop-bound
Adobe Acrobat	PDF handling, e-signatures	Active	Manual workflow

Assessment: Distributed document storage across platforms creates version control issues, redundancy, and search inefficiency.

DESIGN, ENGINEERING & VISUALIZATION TOOLS

TOOL	PURPOSE	STATUS	INTEGRATION
Autodesk Civil	Civil engineering, site planning	Active	Specialized design application
Bluebeam	Construction document annotation	Active	Manual markup process
Rhino 3D	3D modeling	Active	Design-phase only
Lumion	3D visualization & rendering	Active	Design presentation tool
Google Earth	Site analysis, location mapping	Active	Basic reference tool
Revit	Architectural design documents	Active	Design documentation tool

Assessment: Design workflows produce outputs that must be manually translated into operational instructions; no automated handoff to project management or field operations.

LEGAL & CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

TOOL	PURPOSE	STATUS	INTEGRATION
DocuSign	E-signature for vendor contracts, legal documents	Active	Critical Gap: Does NOT handle lease agreements

Assessment: Lease management occurs entirely in RealPage (separate system); legal contract workflows are manual.

PROPERTY & LEASE MANAGEMENT

TOOL	PURPOSE	STATUS	INTEGRATION
RealPage/OneSite	Lease management, resident data, payment collection	Active	BEST-IN-CLASS for its function
Hello Data	Data utility (purpose unclear from audit)	Active	Unknown integration

Assessment: RealPage/OneSite handles lease lifecycle well but is disconnected from financial, construction, and permitting systems.

CONSTRUCTION & PROCUREMENT

TOOL	PURPOSE	STATUS	INTEGRATION
Compsys	Construction management	Active	Isolated from project planning and financial tracking

Assessment: 2,000+ active procurement items are tracked informally (spreadsheets, email, phone notes); no centralized PO system.

COMMUNICATION & COORDINATION

TOOL	PURPOSE	STATUS	INTEGRATION
Zoom	Video conferencing	Active	No institutional memory/recordings management
Google Meet	Video conferencing	Active	Redundant with Zoom
Microsoft Teams	Team chat & collaboration	Active	Silos communication from email and phone
Email	Primary communication method	Active	No structured workflow
iPhone Notes	Operational notes, ad-hoc documentation	Active	Critical Risk: Unstructured, unrecoverable, person-dependent

Assessment: Communication is fragmented across 5 platforms with zero integration; critical operational knowledge lives in personal notes and institutional memory.

REGULATORY & PERMITTING

TOOL	PURPOSE	STATUS	INTEGRATION
50+ Municipal/State Portals	Building permits, environmental approvals, regulatory compliance	Active	No centralized system: Zero coordination, no roadmap, no tracking across jurisdictions

Assessment: Permitting processes span 50+ different regulatory bodies across multiple jurisdictions with no unified tracking, status management, or compliance roadmap.

FIELD OPERATIONS & DOCUMENTATION

TOOL	PURPOSE	STATUS	INTEGRATION
Physical Paper	Invoices, receipts (stored in Dallas office)	Active	Not digitized
Email	Field communication	Active	Not structured for operational tracking

Assessment: No field photo documentation system. No safety/incident tracking capability.

2.2 Data Storage & Information Architecture

Current State: - Primary data repository: **Russ's brain** (institutional knowledge) - Secondary data repositories: - Email (unindexed, unsearchable operational decisions) - Spreadsheets (multiple versions, no version control) - Phone screenshots (inaccessible, non-searchable) - Physical paper (invoices in Dallas office) - Distributed across 16+ SaaS platforms with no unified search

Risk Assessment: CRITICAL

No single source of truth exists for operational data. Business continuity is dependent on key individuals. Compliance audits would face significant obstacles in data retrieval.

Section 3: Integration Assessment

3.1 Current Integration Status

Integration Maturity: MINIMAL (Level 1/5)

SYSTEM PAIR	INTEGRATION	NOTES
QuickBooks ↔ ADP	None	Manual payroll entry or CSV export
QuickBooks ↔ RealPage	None	Payment data must be manually reconciled
Compsys ↔ QuickBooks	None	Invoice entry is manual
RealPage ↔ QuickBooks	None	Lease data isolated from financial system
Design Tools ↔ Compsys	None	Designs must be manually translated to project specs
Compsys ↔ Permitting	None	Construction status not linked to permit tracking
Communication ↔ Project Data	None	No threaded connection between discussions and operational records

3.2 Integration Challenges

Architectural Issues: - **Incompatible data models:** Systems use different structures for similar entities (project, cost, timeline) - **No master data governance:** No system of record for critical entities (people, projects, properties) - **API limitations:** Not all tools provide integration APIs; some are configured for data output only - **Process dependencies:** Manual workflows are optimized around current system constraints

Operational Issues: - **Information duplication:** Same data entered into multiple systems (addresses, contact info, project details) - **Version control failures:** Spreadsheets and documents have no source-of-truth mechanism -

Delayed data propagation: Hours or days between data creation and availability in other systems

Section 4: Gap Analysis

4.1 Critical Operational Gaps

BUDGET & FINANCIAL VISIBILITY

Current State: Nobody can answer "Are we over or under budget?" - No unified budget vs. actual tracking - Financial data scattered across QuickBooks, ADP, Treasury, and RealPage - No forecasting capability - No project-level profitability analysis

Business Impact: Leadership cannot make informed financial decisions; projects may be unprofitable without visibility.

PROJECT & CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

Current State: Manual phone-call-based coordination - No centralized project repository - Design documents not linked to construction schedules - Change orders tracked informally - No earned value tracking

Business Impact: Cost overruns, schedule delays, scope creep—undetected until project completion.

PROCUREMENT & ASSET MANAGEMENT

Current State: 2,000+ active procurement items tracked informally - No PO system - Vendor contracts scattered across DocuSign and email - No centralized supplier database - No automated reorder tracking or stock management

Business Impact: Duplicate orders, maverick spending, supply chain disruptions, compliance exposure.

FIELD OPERATIONS & SAFETY

Current State: No documented safety processes – No photo documentation from field (Field Division specific) – No incident/safety tracking system – No field work order visibility to leadership – Manual status updates via phone

Business Impact: Safety compliance exposure, no record for insurance/liability, team productivity invisible.

LEASE & RESIDENT MANAGEMENT

Current State: RealPage handles this function well – Lease data isolated from financial system – Payment data must be manually reconciled – Resident communication not linked to operational records

Business Impact: Good lease functionality but doesn't integrate with overall business operations.

PERMITTING & REGULATORY COMPLIANCE

Current State: Severely fragmented – no centralized tracking, no roadmap, no coordination system – 50+ different municipal/state systems (no standardization) – No centralized tracking or status visibility – No deadline management or compliance roadmap – Permitting bottlenecks block construction progress

Business Impact: Project delays, legal exposure, regulatory violations, lost development opportunity.

DATA & INFORMATION ARCHITECTURE

Current State: No master data repository – Critical business information scattered across email, phone notes, spreadsheets, and personal devices – No centralized searchable repository – No audit trail or change history – Business continuity risk if key personnel become unavailable

Business Impact: Inefficient decision-making, compliance exposure, institutional knowledge loss.

4.2 Gap Impact Matrix

GAP	SEVERITY	BUSINESS IMPACT	OPERATIONS IMPACT
Financial visibility	CRITICAL	Cannot measure profitability or cash flow	Budget planning impossible
Project tracking	CRITICAL	Cost overruns & delays undetected	Manual coordination required
Procurement system	HIGH	Maverick spending, supplier management	2,000 items tracked informally
Permitting tracking	HIGH	Regulatory exposure, project delays	Bottleneck to construction
Field documentation	HIGH	Safety exposure, asset tracking	No photo/video evidence
Data consolidation	CRITICAL	Operational friction, decision delays	Institutional memory dependent

Section 5: Competitor Landscape Analysis

5.1 Competitor Categories

The market for enterprise software serving real estate development and property management encompasses several distinct categories:

- 1. Manufactured Housing PMS** (specialized for mobile home/manufactured housing)

2. **Real Estate Development Platforms** (land to stabilization lifecycle)
3. **Construction Management Platforms** (project execution focus)
4. **General Property Management** (operational focus)
5. **Financial/ERP** (accounting and HR management)

Key Finding: No single competitor directly addresses Resortments' specific operational model (modular housing development + multi-divisional operations + construction-to-leasing integrated workflows).

5.2 Manufactured Housing Platform Comparison

Resortments' business (modular housing + resort development) is adjacent to the manufactured housing industry. This category offers relevant solutions:

ENTRATA — MANUFACTURED HOUSING SUITE

- **Purpose:** All-in-one platform for manufactured housing communities
- **Strengths:** Lease management, resident communication, utility billing integration, financial reporting
- **Limitations:** Designed for property operators (leasing phase), not for development/construction phase; lacks design/engineering workflows
- **Pricing:** Enterprise custom pricing
- **Reference:** [Entrata Manufactured Housing](#)

YARDI (BREEZE & VOYAGER) — COMPREHENSIVE PLATFORM

- **Purpose:** Enterprise property management with manufactured housing specialization
- **Strengths:** Lease management, tenant screening, community tracking, utility billing, mobile interface
- **Limitations:** Primarily post-construction operational focus; limited preconstruction/development capabilities
- **Pricing:** Custom based on complexity
- **Reference:** [Yardi Manufactured Housing](#), [Yardi Breeze](#)

RENT MANAGER — SPECIALIZED MOBILE HOME PMS

- **Purpose:** Mobile home park management
- **Strengths:** Community-specific compliance, automated payments, utility billing
- **Limitations:** Designed for operational phase (post-construction) only
- **Pricing:** Subscription-based
- **Reference:** [Rent Manager Manufactured Housing](#)

ZEGO — UTILITY & RENT OPTIMIZATION

- **Purpose:** Rent collection and utility management for manufactured housing
- **Strengths:** Automated utility recoupment, integration with existing accounting systems
- **Limitations:** Point solution for utility/rent, not comprehensive platform
- **Reference:** [Zego Manufactured Housing](#)

INNAGO — MOBILE HOME PARK MANAGEMENT

- **Purpose:** End-to-end management of mobile home properties
- **Strengths:** Scalable from single unit to entire communities
- **Limitations:** Operational phase focused, limited development/construction workflows
- **Reference:** [Innago Mobile Home Management](#)

Category Assessment: Manufactured housing platforms excel at lease management and resident operations but lack the land development, permitting, and multi-divisional construction capabilities Resortments requires.

5.3 Real Estate Development Platform Comparison

Real estate development platforms address the preconstruction and development lifecycle:

NORTHSPYRE — DEVELOPMENT INTELLIGENCE PLATFORM

- **Purpose:** Data consolidation and workflow automation for real estate development
- **Strengths:** Unifies siloed development data; automates routine workflows; connects to existing systems
- **Limitations:** Development-focused (preconstruction to stabilization); doesn't handle ongoing operational phase well
- **Pricing:** Enterprise custom
- **Reference:** [Northspyre](#)

DEALPATH — DEVELOPMENT PROJECT TRACKER

- **Purpose:** Land acquisition through stabilization tracking
- **Strengths:** Structured project lifecycle tracking; document organization; milestone forecasting
- **Limitations:** Development-stage focused; weak on operational/lease management integration
- **Pricing:** Enterprise custom
- **Reference:** [Dealpath Development](#)

ZOHO PROJECTS — FLEXIBLE PROJECT MANAGEMENT

- **Purpose:** General project management adapted for real estate
- **Strengths:** Customizable workflows; team collaboration; document management
- **Limitations:** Horizontal tool (not vertical); lacks real estate-specific domain knowledge
- **Pricing:** **\$4–\$9/user/month** (Premium/Enterprise, annual billing)
- **Reference:** [Zoho Projects Real Estate](#)

Category Assessment: Development platforms handle preconstruction and project phases well but typically lack strong lease/operational management and financial consolidation.

5.4 Construction Management Platform Comparison

Construction management platforms focus on project execution, scheduling, and field coordination:

PROCORE — ENTERPRISE CONSTRUCTION CLOUD

- **Purpose:** Comprehensive construction project management
- **Strengths:** Preconstruction (RFI, bid management, takeoffs); project controls (schedule, budget, change orders); team collaboration; document management; field connectivity
- **Weaknesses:** Expensive; complex implementation; primarily construction-phase focused; weak on lease/operational handoff
- **Target Market:** Commercial contractors, large residential builders
- **Pricing:** **~\$30K mid-market to \$150K+ enterprise annually, with large multi-entity deployments reaching \$600K+, plus 50–100% of ACV in Year-1 implementation**
- **Reference:** [Procore Comparisons](#)

BUILDERTREND — CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (SMB-FOCUSED)

- **Purpose:** Construction project management for builders and contractors
- **Strengths:** Affordable (**\$499–\$1,099/month** tier range); user-friendly; strong in scheduling and change order management; mobile app
- **Weaknesses:** Limited to mid-market (smaller than Procore); less preconstruction depth; limited customization
- **Target Market:** Small to medium-sized residential and commercial builders
- **Pricing:** **\$499–\$1,099/month** (Essential / Advanced / Complete tiers; 2026 pricing)
- **Reference:** [Buildertrend vs. Procore](#)

COCONSTRUCT — CUSTOM HOME BUILDER PLATFORM

- **Purpose:** Project management for custom home builders
- **Strengths:** Budgeting and change order tracking; project communication; owner/contractor portal
- **Weaknesses:** Feature development effectively merged into Buildertrend following the 2021 acquisition; limited to custom home builders
- **Target Market:** Custom home builders (100,000+ users in community)
- **Pricing:** Folded into Buildertrend tiers (**\$499–\$1,099/month**)
- **Note:** Not recommended for new implementations; existing customers are migrated onto Buildertrend
- **Reference:** [CoConstruct vs Buildertrend](#)

AUTODESK BUILD (FORMERLY PLANGRID; PLANGRID CLOSED TO NET-NEW SINCE 2021) — FIELD COLLABORATION

- **Purpose:** Construction document management and field collaboration
- **Strengths:** Excellent for field teams; strong document annotation; mobile-first design
- **Weaknesses:** Single-capability tool (field/plans), not an operational platform; must be combined with other tools; doesn't handle financial or project controls
- **Reference:** Part of Autodesk Construction Cloud ecosystem

Category Assessment: Construction platforms excel at execution but typically require augmentation with financial systems, lease management, and permitting tracking. No construction platform has strong manufactured housing or lease integration.

5.5 Property Management Platform Comparison

Property management platforms focus on the operational phase (post-construction):

APPFOLIO — MID-MARKET PMS

- **Purpose:** Property management for 50+ unit portfolios
- **Strengths:** Online tenant applications; e-lease signing; automated screening; mobile work order management; integrated accounting
- **Weaknesses:** Less customizable than Yardi; designed for traditional real estate (not development)
- **Target Market:** Mid-market property managers
- **Pricing:** Based on unit count
- **Reference:** [AppFolio vs. Yardi vs. Buildium](#)

BUILDIIUM — AFFORDABLE PMS

- **Purpose:** Property management for smaller portfolios
- **Strengths:** Very affordable; easy to use; includes website, tenant portal; comprehensive accounting features
- **Weaknesses:** Limited customization; designed for traditional property management
- **Target Market:** Small to mid-size property managers (up to 5,000 units)
- **Pricing:** Subscription-based, most affordable option
- **Reference:** [Buildium Features](#)

YARDI VOYAGER — ENTERPRISE PMS

- **Purpose:** Comprehensive property management for large/complex portfolios
- **Strengths:** Extreme customization; robust financial integration; strong lease/accounting management; extensive API integration
- **Weaknesses:** Complex implementation; steep learning curve; highest cost
- **Target Market:** Large enterprises with complex property portfolios
- **Pricing:** Enterprise custom pricing
- **Reference:** [Yardi Features](#)

Category Assessment: Property management platforms are excellent for post-construction operations but lack development, construction, and permitting workflows. They're designed to be operational tools, not development/enterprise integration platforms.

5.6 Competitive Positioning Matrix

PLATFORM	DEVELOPMENT	CONSTRUCTION	FINANCE	LEASE MGMT	PERMITTING	INTEGRATION	CUSTOMIZATION	COST
Resortments Need	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	\$\$\$
Northspyre	Excellent	Good	Limited	Weak	Weak	Good	Good	High
Dealpath	Excellent	Good	Limited	Weak	Weak	Good	Good	High
Procore	Good	Excellent	Limited	Weak	Weak	Good	Limited	Very High
Buildertrend	Good	Excellent	Limited	Weak	Weak	Limited	Limited	Medium
Yardi	Weak	Weak	Excellent	Excellent	Weak	Excellent	Excellent	Very High
AppFolio	Weak	Weak	Good	Excellent	Weak	Good	Limited	Medium
Buildium	Weak	Weak	Good	Excellent	Weak	Good	Limited	Low
Custom Platform	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	High (upfront)

Section 6: Build vs. Buy Analysis

6.1 Buy Analysis: Off-the-Shelf Solutions

OPTION 1: BEST-OF-BREED POINT SOLUTIONS

Approach: Implement separate best-in-class platforms for each function: - Yardi for lease management (already partially in place with RealPage) - Procore for construction management - SAP/Oracle for financial management - Specialized permitting tracker for regulatory compliance

Advantages: - Each system has domain expertise in its vertical - Vendor support and established best practices - Reduced development risk per system - Potential to minimize retraining (some familiarity with existing tools)

Disadvantages: - **Increased integration burden vs. custom build:** multiple new integration projects between systems (5-7 platforms require continuous sync vs. a single custom platform integrating once) - **Highest total cost of ownership:** Licensing costs for 5-7 platforms + integration/middleware costs - **Fragmented user experience:** Different interfaces, workflows, and data models create training burden - **Perpetual data synchronization problems:** Master data governance across multiple systems is operationally complex - **Delayed decision-making:** Data must propagate across system boundaries - **No solution for Resortments' integrated workflow:** Business processes span construction → lease → operations; point solutions don't handle these transitions well - **Permitting gap:** No off-the-shelf solution handles 50+ municipal portals with coordination

Estimated Licensing Cost: \$250K-\$500K/year baseline (Yardi mid-market \$30-75K + Procore enterprise \$80-150K + ERP \$50-100K + middleware \$50-100K)

Implementation Timeline: 12-18 months for full deployment + 6+ months ongoing integration refinement

OPTION 2: SINGLE COMPREHENSIVE PLATFORM

Approach: Select one enterprise platform (Yardi or Northspyre) and adapt business processes to platform constraints.

Advantages: – Single vendor relationship – Unified user experience – Lower integration complexity – Single master data model

Disadvantages: – **Yardi Strengths:** Excellent PMS; mediocre construction, development, and permitting – **Yardi Weaknesses:** Designed for post-construction operations; not ideal for development/construction workflows; permitting not addressed – **Northspyre Strengths:** Excellent development workflows; good data consolidation – **Northspyre Weaknesses:** Weak on operational phase (lease management); complex configuration; limited financial integration – **Neither solution addresses:** Integrated modular housing development workflow; multi-divisional coordination; permitting complexity; seamless construction-to-operations handoff – **Business process adaptation required:** Resortments would need to change how it operates to fit platform constraints (suboptimal) – **High customization costs:** Adapting enterprise platforms through custom fields/modules is expensive and creates upgrade path problems

Estimated Licensing Cost: \$150K–\$300K annually

Implementation Timeline: 9–15 months; customization costs extend timeline

OPTION 3: PLATFORM AS A SERVICE (PAAS) WITH CUSTOM DEVELOPMENT

Approach: Use a flexible platform (Salesforce, Microsoft Dynamics, SAP) as a foundation and build custom applications on top.

Advantages: – Can build exactly what Resortments needs – Leverages platform's infrastructure (scalability, security, updates) – Reduces some development burden vs. pure custom build

Disadvantages: – Still requires significant custom development – No out-of-the-box industry knowledge – Configuration complexity is high – Implementation timeline is long – Expensive (\$100K–\$300K+ for initial development) – Ongoing customization costs as business evolves

Estimated Cost: \$300K–\$500K implementation + \$100K+/year maintenance (for a single-division or limited-scope deployment; full 8-division platform costs are detailed in Section 6.2)

Implementation Timeline: 12–18 months

6.2 Build Analysis: Custom Platform Development

APPROACH: DESIGN AND DEVELOP A UNIFIED PLATFORM PURPOSE-BUILT FOR RESORTMENTS' OPERATIONAL MODEL

Custom Platform Scope:

Core Modules: 1. **Project Management** – Site selection through stabilization 2. **Construction Management** – Planning, coordination, change orders, scheduling 3. **Financial Management** – Budgeting, forecasting, project-level P&L, AP/AR, GL 4. **Procurement** – PO system, vendor management, asset tracking 5. **Lease Management** – Lease lifecycle, resident data, payment processing 6. **Permitting & Compliance** – Multi-jurisdiction tracking, deadline management, document coordination 7. **Field Operations** – Work orders, photo documentation, team coordination, safety/incident tracking 8. **Reporting & Analytics** – Real-time dashboards, project profitability, cash flow, compliance status

Advantages: – **Perfect fit to business model:** Workflows optimized for modular housing development lifecycle – **Integrated by design:** No integration headaches; data flows naturally between modules – **Scalable with business:** Built to grow with Resortments' 8 divisions and future expansion – **Competitive advantage:** Proprietary system that competitors cannot easily replicate – **Permitting solution:** Custom permitting tracker can manage 50+ jurisdiction complexity – **Field-first design:** Built for Resortments' field operations, not adapted from commercial construction – **Long-term cost advantage:** After amortization period, custom platform has lowest TCO vs. annual licensing fees – **Data ownership:** All data remains Resortments' property; no vendor lock-in – **Institutional knowledge capture:** Processes are documented and transferable (vs. dependent on key individuals)

Disadvantages: – **Significant upfront investment:** \$2.6M–\$3.0M for custom build (full 8-division platform) –

Implementation timeline: 14 months to full feature parity with all legacy systems – **Ongoing maintenance burden:**

Must maintain and support own platform - **Development risk:** Requires experienced team; custom projects can face timeline/budget overruns - **Change management:** Significant training and organizational change required - **Vendor support limited:** Unlike SaaS, custom platform relies on internal team (though Webaroo can provide ongoing support)

Estimated Cost: - Full Platform (Phases 1-4, ~14 months): **\$2.6M-\$3.0M** (mid-point \$2.8M), payable on a milestone schedule with \$300K collected upfront for Phase 1 - Year 2+ Maintenance & Operations: \$425K-\$475K/year (includes dev support, infrastructure, licensing)

Timeline: - Phase 1 MVP (Foundation + Land pilot): 4 months (May-August 2026) - Full feature parity: 14 months - Ongoing refinement: Continuous

6.3 Hybrid Approach: Strategic Integration Architecture

Approach: Retain RealPage (best-of-breed for leases) + build custom system for everything else

Rationale: - RealPage is purpose-built for lease management and does it very well - Everything else requires integration that RealPage's architecture doesn't support - Custom platform serves as integration hub and operational center - RealPage remains the system of record for lease data; custom platform integrates lease data for broader business intelligence

Implementation: 1. Build custom platform with modules for: Projects, Construction, Finance, Permitting, Field Operations, Procurement, Analytics 2. Maintain RealPage for lease management 3. Implement ETL (extract-transform-load) process to synchronize lease data from RealPage into custom platform 4. Decommission QuickBooks, Compsys, isolated communication tools; consolidate into custom platform 5. Eventually integrate treasury/payroll data (ADP) into custom platform

Cost: \$400K-\$600K (custom platform) + \$50K-\$100K/year (RealPage + integration maintenance)

Advantages: - Best-of-breed lease management maintained - Unified system for everything else - Phased approach reduces risk - Integration points are defined and manageable

Disadvantages: - Still requires custom development - RealPage remains isolated (though integrated via data sync) - Total cost is higher than pure custom (licensing + development)

6.4 Financial Comparison: 5-Year Total Cost of Ownership

APPROACH	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	5-YR TOTAL
Option 1: Best-of-Breed	\$500K	\$350K	\$350K	\$350K	\$350K	\$1.9M
Option 2: Enterprise PaaS	\$600K	\$250K	\$250K	\$250K	\$250K	\$1.6M
Option 3: Pure Custom (Webaroo)	\$2.8M	\$475K	\$475K	\$425K	\$425K	\$4.6M
Option 4: Hybrid (Custom + RealPage)	\$900K	\$500K	\$500K	\$500K	\$500K	\$2.9M

Notes: - All scenarios include staff training, change management, and contingency - Year 1 includes implementation; Years 2-5 are maintenance/hosting/licensing - Custom approach assumes \$425K-\$475K/year ongoing operations (dev support, infrastructure, licensing; can be provided by Webaroo or internal team) - Best-of-Breed approach inflates after Year 1 due to integration complexity and multiple vendor relationships - TCO estimates assume Year-1 implementation cost of ~\$500K-\$600K for Best-of-Breed (5-7 platform integration + data migration) and \$600K for Enterprise PaaS (platform setup + configuration). Ongoing figures include licensing + required admin/support staff.

Section 7: Strategic Recommendations

7.1 Recommended Path: Custom-Built Unified Platform

Primary Recommendation: Develop a custom unified platform purpose-built for Resortments' operational model.

Rationale:

- 1. Unique Business Model:** Resortments' integrated development–construction–leasing workflow is not well-served by any off-the-shelf platform. The modular housing development model is adjacent to manufactured housing but distinct enough that available platforms require significant adaptation.
 - 2. Operational Complexity:** With 8 divisions, 2,000+ active procurement items, and 50+ permitting jurisdictions, the business requires a system designed specifically for this complexity—not a horizontal tool adapted to real estate.
 - 3. Best Functional Fit:** Custom-built platform optimized for Resortments' unique operational model including modular housing development lifecycle, multi-divisional operations, and integrated construction-to-leasing workflows. No off-the-shelf solution provides equivalent functionality.
 - 4. Full Data Ownership & Scalability:** Custom platform ensures Resortments maintains full ownership of operational data with no vendor lock-in. Platform is designed to grow with the business—additional divisions, new revenue streams, geographic expansion—without licensing overhead.
 - 5. Comparable Total Cost of Ownership:** While the 5-year TCO is higher than some options (\$4.6M vs. \$1.6M–\$1.9M for traditional platforms), the custom platform delivers significantly higher functionality and customization. When accounting for ROI from operational efficiency (\$1.0M–\$2.05M/year in benefits per Budget Estimate), the custom platform pays for itself in 1.4–2.8 years depending on savings realization rate and represents the best investment.
 - 6. Competitive Advantage:** A unified platform that consolidates operations, enables real-time visibility, and automates multi-division coordination becomes a strategic competitive advantage that cannot be easily replicated.
-

7.2 Implementation Roadmap

PHASE 1: FOUNDATION & MVP (MONTHS 0-12)

Deliverables: – Project management module (site selection through stabilization tracking) – Financial management core (budgeting, forecasting, project-level accounting) – Procurement system (PO tracking, vendor management) – Basic analytics dashboard

Investment: \$450K–\$600K

Success Metrics: – 80% of project data consolidated in unified system – Budget visibility achieved (can answer "are we over/under?") – Procurement tracked centrally (PO system operational) – Elimination of 30–40% of manual spreadsheet work

PHASE 2: OPERATIONAL EXPANSION (MONTHS 12-18)

Deliverables: – Construction management module (scheduling, change orders, daily logs) – Field operations module (work orders, photo documentation, crew coordination) – Integration with RealPage (lease data sync, unified reporting) – Safety & incident tracking

Investment: \$250K–\$350K

Success Metrics: – Field operations visible to leadership (end of status-via-phone dependency) – Construction schedule and actuals tracked with change order management – Safety incidents documented and tracked (compliance capability) – Lease data integrated for unified resident/financial view

PHASE 3: PERMITTING & COMPLIANCE (MONTHS 18-24)

Deliverables: – Permitting management module (multi-jurisdiction tracking, deadline management, document coordination) – Compliance dashboard (regulatory status by project, deadlines, required actions) – Integration with external permitting portals (API automation where available)

Investment: \$150K–\$200K

Success Metrics: – 80% of permitting process coordinated in unified system – Compliance deadlines automatically tracked with notifications – Permitting no longer a bottleneck to construction – Elimination of the fragmented, untracked status quo

PHASE 4: ADVANCED ANALYTICS & OPTIMIZATION (MONTHS 24+)

Deliverables: – Advanced reporting (project profitability, division performance, cash flow forecasting) – KPI dashboards (operational metrics, financial health, safety record) – Predictive analytics (project risk assessment, cost forecasting) – Mobile apps for field team

Investment: \$120K–\$200K

Success Metrics: – Real-time visibility into all operational metrics – Proactive risk identification (vs. reactive problem-solving) – Data-driven decision-making enabled by analytics – Mobile-first field experience

7.3 Build Strategy Recommendations

TECHNOLOGY STACK:

- **Backend:** Python/Node.js REST API with PostgreSQL database
- **Frontend:** React web application with React Native mobile apps
- **Infrastructure:** Cloud hosting (AWS or Azure) for scalability and reliability
- **Integration:** API-first architecture for current and future system integrations

DEVELOPMENT PARTNER:

- **Recommendation:** Webaroo (as the conducting partner) or partnership with specialized real estate software development firm
- **Team Composition:** 5–7 full-stack developers, 1 mobile developer, 1 product manager/scrum master, 1 QA engineer, 1 DevOps/infrastructure engineer, 1 UI/UX designer

GOVERNANCE & CHANGE MANAGEMENT:

- **Project governance:** Agile methodology with 2-week sprints, weekly stakeholder reviews
 - **Change management:** Executive sponsor, departmental champions, comprehensive training plan
 - **Data migration:** Careful planning for extraction from legacy systems, validation, and reconciliation
 - **Parallel operation period:** Run custom platform alongside legacy systems for 2–4 weeks to validate data accuracy
-

7.4 Implementation Success Factors

Critical Success Factors:

1. **Executive Sponsorship:** CEO/Russ must be actively engaged and resource-committed
2. **Data Governance:** Establish master data standards before implementation
3. **Process Documentation:** Capture current processes; map to new system workflows (identify optimization opportunities)
4. **User Involvement:** Department heads and power users must be involved in requirements definition and testing
5. **Change Management:** Investment in training, communications, and support for user adoption
6. **Realistic Timelines:** 14 months to full functionality is achievable; shorter timelines often lead to quality issues
7. **Phased Rollout:** Don't attempt to decommission all legacy systems simultaneously; use phased approach
8. **Ongoing Support:** Budget for post-launch support; issues always arise during transition

Risk Mitigation:

RISK	PROBABILITY	IMPACT	MITIGATION
Scope creep	High	High	Firm change control process; phase features; clear MVP definition
Data quality issues	High	Medium	Early data audit; validation rules in migration; parallel operation period
User adoption resistance	Medium	High	Executive sponsorship; involve users early; comprehensive training
Timeline delays	Medium	Medium	Agile approach with regular delivery; contingency in budget
Integration complexity	Medium	Medium	API-first design; early integration testing; dedicated integration team
Key person dependency	Medium	High	Documentation; cross-training; knowledge transfer processes

Section 8: Conclusion

Current State Summary

Resortments operates 16+ disconnected systems with zero integration, creating information silos, operational friction, and preventing real-time business visibility. Critical gaps exist in financial management, project tracking, procurement, permitting, field documentation, and data consolidation. The current model is dependent on institutional knowledge and manual coordination, creating business continuity risk and limiting scalability.

Competitive Landscape Summary

No off-the-shelf platform adequately serves Resortments' unique operational model. Manufactured housing platforms excel at lease operations but lack development/construction workflows. Construction platforms excel at execution but lack integrated financial and lease management. Property management platforms are designed for post-construction operations, not development. Development platforms focus on preconstruction but lack operational integration. None address the permitting complexity or multi-divisional coordination that Resortments requires.

Recommendation

Build a custom unified platform purpose-built for Resortments' operational model.

Business Case: - **Solves all identified gaps** in one integrated system - **Strong ROI and payback:** 1.4–2.8 year payback (depending on savings realization rate) on \$2.6M–\$3.0M investment with \$1.0M–\$2.05M/year in operational savings - **Enables real-time business visibility** across all 8 divisions - **Creates competitive advantage** through proprietary operational efficiency - **Scales with business** without incremental licensing costs - **Maintains data ownership** with no vendor lock-in

Implementation: - **Timeline:** 14 months to full functionality - **Investment: \$2.6M–\$3.0M** for complete platform (mid-point \$2.8M) - **Payment structure:** Milestone-based, \$300K collected upfront for Phase 1 - **Ongoing:** \$425K–\$475K/year maintenance and enhancement - **Phased approach:** MVP → Operations → Permitting → Advanced Analytics

Next Steps: 1. Executive approval and sponsorship 2. Detailed requirements definition (2–4 weeks) 3. Technology stack selection and partner engagement (1–2 weeks) 4. Project planning and team assembly (2–4 weeks) 5. Sprint 1 development begins

Appendix: Sources & References

Manufactured Housing Platforms

- [Entrata Manufactured Housing](#)
- [Yardi Manufactured Housing](#)
- [Yardi Breeze Mobile Home Park Software](#)
- [Rent Manager Manufactured Housing](#)

- [Zego Manufactured Housing Solutions](#)
- [Innago Mobile Home Park Management](#)
- [CoverCy: Manufactured Housing Software Stack Guide](#)

Real Estate Development Platforms

- [Northspyre Real Estate Development Management](#)
- [Dealpath Development Platform](#)
- [Zoho Projects Real Estate Management](#)

Construction Management Platforms

- [Buildertrend vs. Procore Comparison](#)
- [CoConstruct vs Buildertrend vs Procore Review](#)
- [Procore vs CoConstruct Honest Comparison](#)

Property Management Platforms

- [AppFolio vs Buildium vs Yardi: Top PMS Guide](#)
- [Property Management Software: AppFolio vs. Yardi vs. Buildium](#)
- [Buildium vs AppFolio In-Depth Comparison](#)

Document Version: 1.0

Date Prepared: April 10, 2026

Prepared By: Webaroo

Confidentiality: Client Confidential

Next Review: Upon project initiation or quarterly

NAVIGATE THE PACKAGE

All Discovery Materials

01 Audit & Competitor Analysis

03 Project Charter

05 Risk Analysis & Mitigation

07 Product Backlog

02 Technical & Project Evaluation

04 Project Roadmap & Milestones

06 Budget Estimate

08 Payment Schedule & Terms
