

Recommendation of Award

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 240000000283

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFS # 230000001761, Charging Equipment for Battery-Electric Vehicles & Transit Buses, and has recommended a multiple award to Current Trucking, INF Associates, Unified Business Technologies, and ZEF Energy, pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State’s rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Yvon Dufour, Solicitation Manager
 dufoury@michigan.gov
 (517) 249-0455

Background Information:

This Request for Solution (RFS) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor(s) to provide Charging Equipment for Battery-Electric Vehicles & Transit Buses. The term of this contract is seven (7) years, with up to three (3), one (1) year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on www.michigan.gov/SIGMAVSS on 8/3/2023 for seventy (70) days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of 10/12/2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
ABM eMobility USA, LLC	Sugar Land, TX 77478	No	No
BP Pulse Fleet North America Inc.	335 E Middlefield Rd. Mountain View, CA 94043	No	No
Current Trucking LLC	60 Washington Street, Suite 105G, Morristown, NJ, 07960	No	No
EO Charging US, Inc.	1828 Walnut St., Kansas City, MO 64108	No	No
FD Hayes	2301 Beal Ave, Lansing, MI 48910	No	No
INF Associates LLC	747 3rd Avenue New York NY 10017	No	No
Motor City Electric Co.	9440 Grinnell St., Detroit, MI 48213	No	Yes
Schneider Electric IT Mission Critical Services, Inc.	6700 Tower Circle, Suite 700, Franklin, TN 37067	No	No
Unified Business Technologies, Inc.	353 Indusco Court, Suite C, Troy, MI 48083-4646	No	No

ZEF Energy Inc.	323 N. Washington Ave, Suite 200, Minneapolis, MN 55401	No	No
-----------------	--	----	----

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

**GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

Evaluation Synopsis

I. Evaluation

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

7. MANDATORY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.

Required Documents	
A	Must be a Manufacturer or certified authorized distributor of electric vehicle charging stations and related support services. Please provide a letter of proof.
B	Mandatory only for Transit Bus Charging Stations - Signed Agreement with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Clauses (Schedule F)

Only proposals meeting the mandatory minimum requirements will be considered for evaluation.

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	<u>Scope and Specifications of Hardware Provided:</u> Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement	15
2.	<u>Monitoring: Scope and Specifications of Software and Services Provided -</u> Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement	15
3.	<u>Pre-Construction Services: Engineering and design -</u> Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement	15
4.	<u>Construction Services -</u> Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement	15
5.	<u>MDOT Transit Bus Requirements:</u> Schedule A – Statement of Work, B. Transit Bus Requirements.	5
6.	<u>Service Capabilities & Staffing:</u> Schedule A – Statement of Work, C. General Requirements.	5
7.	<u>Company & Prior Experience:</u> Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 13	10
8.	<u>Contract Terms:</u> Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 6, Standard Contract Terms	10
9.	<u>IT Terms:</u> Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 8 & 9, Contractor Hosted Software & Services, and Data Security Requirements	10
	Total	100

Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and considered for award.

The State may utilize all bidder information, without regard to a proposal’s technical score, to determine fair market value for goods or services sought. The State is not obligated to accept the lowest price proposal. If applicable, the State’s evaluation will include consideration of a bidder’s qualified disabled veterans/service-disabled veteran owned business(QDV/SDVOB) status under MCL 18.1261(8). Additional information on the SDVOB preference is available at: Michigan.gov/SDVOB.

The State strongly encourages strict adherence to the Contract Terms. The State reserves the right to deem a bid non-responsive for failure to accept the Contract Terms. Nevertheless, the bidder may submit proposed changes to the Contract Terms in track changes (i.e., visible edits) with an explanation of the bidder’s need for each proposed change. Failure to include track changes with an explanation of the bidder’s need for the proposed change constitutes the bidder’s acceptance of the Contract Terms. General statements, such as that the bidder reserves the right to negotiate the terms and conditions, may be considered non-responsive. Failure to respond timely to requests for proposed changes to Contract Terms during ongoing negotiations may be cause for disqualification.

The State may but is not required to conduct an on-site visit to tour and inspect the bidder’s facilities; require an oral presentation of the bidder's proposal; conduct interviews, research, reference checks, and background checks; and request additional price concessions at any point during the evaluation process.

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by Solicitation Manager in collaboration with Subject Matter Experts, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Yvon Dufour, Category Specialist, DTMB Central Procurement,	
Colby Page, Fleet Specialist, MDOT – Transportation Systems Management and Operations	
Chuck Allen, Productivity Analyst – MDNR Parks & Recreation Division	
David Hofmeister, Fleet Consulting Services/Motor Pool Operations Manager - DTMB-Vehicle and Travel Services	
Josiah Meyers, Project Director Design & Construction Division – DTMB State Facilities Administration	
Deb Stevens, Office of Support Services - DTMB-Vehicle and Travel Services	
Jeff Turner, Vehicle Procurement Analyst, Regulatory, Intercity, and Procurement Unit - MDOT Office of Passenger Transportation	

III. Evaluation Results

Step 1 - Mandatory Minimums

Bidder	Meets	Deficiency
ABM eMobility USA, LLC (ABM)	YES	NA
BP Pulse Fleet North America Inc. (BP Pulse)	YES	NA
Current Trucking LLC (Current)	YES	NA
EO Charging US, Inc. (EO)	YES	NA
FD Hayes	NO	Did not provide manufacturer letters for proof of authorized dealer/distributor
INF Associates LLC (INF)	YES	NA
Motor City Electric Co.	NO	Did not provide manufacturer letters for proof of authorized dealer/distributor
Schneider Electric IT Mission Critical Services, Inc.	NO	Did not provide manufacturer letters for proof of authorized dealer/distributor
Unified Business Technologies, Inc. (Unified)	YES	NA
ZEF Energy Inc. (ZEF)	YES	NA

Step 2 – Technical Evaluation

A. ABM

The Evaluation Team determined that ABM, based on a score of 90/100, did meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

- Scope and Specifications of Hardware Provided:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
- Monitoring: Scope and Specifications of Software and Services Provided** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
- Pre-Construction Services: Engineering and design** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
- Construction Services** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 10/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were unsatisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:

- Information on Construction Services lacked content regarding project management functions.

5. **MDOT Transit Bus Requirements:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, B. Transit Bus Requirements. SCORE 5/5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

6. **Service Capabilities & Staffing:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, C. General Requirements. SCORE 5/5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

7. **Company & Prior Experience:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 13. SCORE 7/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were unsatisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:

- a) Bidder has exceptions to Schedule C – Insurance terms, which will require negotiations.
- b) Bidder received two negative references out of three references provided.

8. **Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 6, Standard Contract Terms. SCORE 9/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a) Bidder has exceptions to Terms and provides a EULA that would require negotiation of terms. In Clarification Questions, bidder was willing to accept state terms.

9. **IT Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 8 & 9, Contractor Hosted Software & Services, and Data Security Requirements. SCORE 9/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a) Bidder has exceptions to Schedule E – Data Security, that would require negotiation of terms. In Clarification Questions, bidder was willing to accept state IT terms.

b) Total Score: 90/100

B. BP Pulse

The Evaluation Team determined that BP Pulse, based on a score of 86/100, did meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Scope and Specifications of Hardware Provided:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Monitoring: Scope and Specifications of Software and Services Provided** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. **Pre-Construction Services: Engineering and design** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. **Construction Services** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. **MDOT Transit Bus Requirements:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, B. Transit Bus Requirements. SCORE 5/5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

6. **Service Capabilities & Staffing:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, C. General Requirements. SCORE 2/5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were unsatisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:

- a) Bidder did not provide details on how they will meet the requirements of section 1.7 d) ADA Compliance.
 - b) Bidder did not provide answers to 6 questions in section 1.10.
 - c) Bidder did not provide answers to 3 questions in section 1.11.
 - d) Bidder did not provide answers to 1 question in section 1.12.
 - e) Bidder did not describe how they comply with requirement in section 6.2 & 6.3.
 - f) Bidder has exceptions to LDs and SLAs in section 11 and 14, that would require negotiation.
7. **Company & Prior Experience:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 13. SCORE 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

8. **Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 6, Standard Contract Terms. SCORE 5/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were unsatisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:

- a) Bidder has exceptions to Terms and provides a EULA, that would require negotiation of terms.
9. **IT Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 8 & 9, Contractor Hosted Software & Services, and Data Security Requirements. SCORE 4/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were unsatisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:

- a) Bidder has exceptions to Schedule D – Contractor Hosted Software Services, that would require negotiation of terms.
- b) Bidder has exceptions to Schedule E – Data Security, that would require negotiation of terms.

Total Score: 86/100

C. Current

The Evaluation Team determined that Current, based on a score of 98/100, did meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Scope and Specifications of Hardware Provided:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
2. **Monitoring: Scope and Specifications of Software and Services Provided** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
3. **Pre-Construction Services: Engineering and design** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
4. **Construction Services** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
5. **MDOT Transit Bus Requirements:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, B. Transit Bus Requirements. SCORE 5/5
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
6. **Service Capabilities & Staffing:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, C. General Requirements. SCORE 3/5
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a) Bidder provided an answer to section 1.5 that does not apply to the question.
 - b) In their response to section 1.11, Bidder referred to an attachment that was not provided.
7. **Company & Prior Experience:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 13. SCORE 10/10
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
8. **Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 6, Standard Contract Terms. SCORE 10/10
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
9. **IT Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 8 & 9, Contractor Hosted Software & Services, and Data Security Requirements. SCORE 10/10
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 98/100

D. EO

The Evaluation Team determined that EO, based on a score of 70/100, did not meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Scope and Specifications of Hardware Provided:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Monitoring: Scope and Specifications of Software and Services Provided** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
3. **Pre-Construction Services: Engineering and design** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 8/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were unsatisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a) Information on Pre-Construction Services lacked content regarding engineering & design.
4. **Construction Services** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 8/15
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were unsatisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a) Information on Construction Services lacked content regarding project management functions.
5. **MDOT Transit Bus Requirements:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, B. Transit Bus Requirements. SCORE 5/5
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
6. **Service Capabilities & Staffing:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, C. General Requirements. SCORE 4/5
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a) Bidder has exceptions to LDs and SLAs in section 11 and 14, that would require negotiations.
7. **Company & Prior Experience:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 13. SCORE 10/10
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
8. **Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 6, Standard Contract Terms. SCORE 2/10
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were unsatisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a) Bidder has exceptions to Terms and provides numerous redlines that would require negotiations.
9. **IT Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 8 & 9, Contractor Hosted Software & Services, and Data Security Requirements. SCORE 3/10
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were unsatisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a) Bidder has exceptions to IT Terms and provides numerous redlines that would require negotiations.

Total Score: 70/100

E. INF

The Evaluation Team determined that INF, based on a score of 94/100, did meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Scope and Specifications of Hardware Provided:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Monitoring: Scope and Specifications of Software and Services Provided** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. **Pre-Construction Services: Engineering and design** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. **Construction Services** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. **MDOT Transit Bus Requirements:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, B. Transit Bus Requirements. SCORE 5/5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

6. **Service Capabilities & Staffing:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, C. General Requirements. SCORE 3/5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a) Bidder did not describe how they are going to meet the requirement in section 1.6 a) & b).
- b) In their response to section 1.11, Bidder referred to an attachment that was not provided.
- c) Bidder did not describe how they are going to meet the requirement for sections 5.2, 6.2, 6.3, 8.2, and 9.

7. **Company & Prior Experience:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 13. SCORE 6/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a) Bidder provided 2 out of 3 references requested.

8. **Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 6, Standard Contract Terms. SCORE 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

9. **IT Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 8 & 9, Contractor Hosted Software & Services, and Data Security Requirements. SCORE 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 94/100

F. Unified

The Evaluation Team determined that Unified, based on a score of 99/100, did meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Scope and Specifications of Hardware Provided:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Monitoring: Scope and Specifications of Software and Services Provided** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. **Pre-Construction Services: Engineering and design** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. **Construction Services** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. **MDOT Transit Bus Requirements:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, B. Transit Bus Requirements. SCORE 5/5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

6. **Service Capabilities & Staffing:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, C. General Requirements. SCORE 4/5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a) Bidder did not describe how they are going to meet the requirement in section 3.6.

7. **Company & Prior Experience:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 13. SCORE 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

8. **Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 6, Standard Contract Terms. SCORE 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

9. **IT Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 8 & 9, Contractor Hosted Software & Services, and Data Security Requirements. SCORE 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 99/100

G. ZEF

The Evaluation Team determined that Deere, based on a score of 100/100, did meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. **Scope and Specifications of Hardware Provided:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

2. **Monitoring: Scope and Specifications of Software and Services Provided** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

3. **Pre-Construction Services: Engineering and design** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

4. **Construction Services** - Schedule A – Statement of Work, I. Requirements, A. Challenge Statement. SCORE 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

5. **MDOT Transit Bus Requirements:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, B. Transit Bus Requirements. SCORE 5/5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

6. **Service Capabilities & Staffing:** Schedule A – Statement of Work, C. General Requirements. SCORE 5/5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

7. **Company & Prior Experience:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12 & 13. SCORE 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

8. **Contract Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 6, Standard Contract Terms. SCORE 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

9. **IT Terms:** Vendor Questions Worksheet, Section 8 & 9, Contractor Hosted Software & Services, and Data Security Requirements. SCORE 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 100/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

	WEIGHT	ABM	BP Pulse	Current	EO	INF	Unified	ZEF
1. Scope and Specifications of Hardware Provided	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
2. Monitoring: Scope and Specifications of Software and Services Provided	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
3. Pre-Construction Services: Engineering and design	15	15	15	15	8	15	15	15
4. Construction Services	15	10	15	15	8	15	15	15
5. MDOT Transit Bus Requirements	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6. Service Capabilities & Staffing	5	5	2	3	4	3	4	5
7. Company & Prior Experience	10	7	10	10	10	6	10	10
8. Contract Terms	10	9	5	10	2	10	10	10
9. IT Terms	10	9	4	10	3	10	10	10
TOTALS	100	90	86	98	70	94	99	100

VI. Pricing Summary

Since the state did not have specifications for any current or future projects, viable comparable pricing amongst vendors was challenging. Vendors provided pricing using varying price models that includes hourly rates by trade, base equipment and option cost, and installation project scenarios with fabricated specifications. Therefore, this Request for Solution will result in the award of multiple pre-qualification contracts. Once viable projects are live, specifications and site visits will allow for competitive bidding for the entire project.

VII. Negotiations: Due to the various pricing models, pricing negotiations were not necessary since there will be a second-tier solicitation for upcoming projects.

VIII. Award Recommendation: Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section.

Current, INF, Unified, and ZEF provide the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include:

1. Provides sales and warranty.
2. Provides their services to the entire State of Michigan and other States.
3. Provides a broad scope of services.
4. Provides positive references.
5. Agrees with the State's Terms and Conditions.

The Buyer recommends that **Current, INF, Unified, and ZEF**, are awarded a contract for Charging Equipment for Battery-Electric Vehicles & Transit Buses.

Funding for this contract shall be as follows:

*** **Current** Award amount: \$5,000,000.00

*** **INF** Award amount: \$5,000,000.00

*** **Unified** Award amount: \$5,000,000.00

*** **ZEF** Award amount: \$5,000,000.00

***Award amounts are estimated. Does not include MiDEAL members which includes local units of government, school districts, universities, community colleges, and nonprofit hospitals.