AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award

The Michigan Public Service Commission has completed the evaluation of the Michigan Energy Assistance Program (MEAP) grant program applications and has recommended 9 entities to receive grants, totaling $93,000,000 pending State Administrative Board approval. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: State Administrative Board.

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses from nonprofit organizations, local units of government, and Tribal governments for the purposes of providing energy assistance and self-sufficiency services for income-qualified households in the reduction of home energy insecurity and the resolution of energy crisis situations as required by the Act 615 of 2012, the Michigan Energy Assistance Act (MEAA) and MCL - Section 460.9t which governs the Low-Income Energy Assistance Fund (LIEAF). The term of these grants will align with the FY2027 program year, October 1, 2026 – September 30, 2027.

Applications:

The RFP was posted on the Michigan Public Service Commission's (MPSC) Michigan Energy Assistance Program (MEAP) webpage. The RFP was posted on May 1, 2026, with a proposal due date of June 12, 2026. The proposals were posted publicly to the Michigan Energy Assistance Program webpage. The following applicants submitted proposals by the published due date.

Barry County United Way
231 S. Broadway St., Hastings, MI 49058

Matrix Human Services
1400 Woodbridge, Detroit, MI 48207

MDHHS Bureau of Community Action and Economic Opportunity
235 S. Grand Ave., Ste. 1102, Lansing, MI, 48933

Soulardarity
21 Highland St., Highland Park, MI 48203

Superior Watershed Partnership
9 Peter White Dr., Marquette, MI 49855

THAW - The Heat and Warmth Fund

3031 West Grand Blvd., Suite 660, Detroit, MI 48202

The Salvation Army
1215 Fulton St. E, Grand Rapids MI 49503

The Society of St. Vincent de Paul – Detroit
3000 Gratiot, Detroit, MI, 48207

TrueNorth Community Services
6308 South Warner Ave., Fremont, MI 49412

United Way for Southeastern Michigan
3011 W. Grand Blvd., Suite 500, Detroit, MI 48202

United Way Ventures, LLC
709 S. Westnedge Ave., Kalamazoo, MI 49007

We Want Green Too
3007 Pennsylvania St. Detroit, MI 48214

EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

I. Evaluation Process

A responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions, meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation and demonstrates the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A nonresponsive proposal is one that does not meet the requirements of the solicitation and/or the legislative intention of this grant program.

Meeting the requirements of the RFP does not guarantee a grant award. The number and cost of submitted projects exceeded the available funding amounts of $88 million in LIEAF by $65,111,034 and $5 million in Federal Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) funding by $1,032,613.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

All proposals received an initial screening to ensure that the eligibility criteria were met. Proposals failing to meet the eligibility requirements described in the RFP Section I-B were automatically rejected. Proposals meeting the eligibility requirements were evaluated based on the following factors:

- Method for Addressing the Problem — 15 points
- Management Summary — 16 points
- Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures — 8 points
- Data Privacy and Information Security — 9 points
- Work Plan — 45 points
- Current and Prior Experience Disclosure — 15 points
- Key Personnel — 8 points
- Budget — 9 points
- Total points possible — 125 points

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal under Part VI-A: Evaluation and Selection Criteria.

To allocate funding to best serve Michigan's energy customers, a primary consideration was the statutory requirement to "ensure that all money collected for the [LIEAF] fund from a geographic area is returned, to the extent possible, to that geographic area."[1] This statutory requirement was incorporated into evaluation. The evaluation team notes that funding may fluctuate geographically based on the utilities that opt-in or out of the electric surcharge and by the amount of the funding factor. To support this legislative requirement, geographic allocation was given to applicants that demonstrated the best capacity to serve the region.

[1] 2024-PA-0169.pdf

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by the Solicitation Manager and the MEAP Grant Manager, in collaboration with the Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC), which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting Members

- Anne Armstrong, Customer Assistance Division Director, JEC Chairperson, MPSC
- Kelly Curow, Departmental Analyst, MDHHS
- Wanda Jones, MEAP Section Manager, MPSC
- Julie McLaughlin, LIHEAP/SER Program Policy Departmental Manager, MDHHS
- Amy Rittenhouse, Contracts and Grants Specialist, MPSC

Non-Voting Members

- Megan LeMarbe, Solicitation Manager, LARA
- Twanetta Ingram, Grant Administrator, MPSC
- MEAP Auditor, MPSC
- MEAP Auditor, MPSC
- Andy Hannum, Technical Support Manager, MPSC
- Benjamin Johnson, Administrative Services Division, MPSC
- Brian Sheldon, Energy Security Specialist, MPSC
- Mary Wilkins, Policy Specialist, MPSC
- Jesann Gonzalez Cruz, DOE Energy Innovator Fellow, MPSC

III. Evaluation Results

Applicant # 1: The Society of St. Vincent de Paul – Detroit
Total Score: 115/125

The Evaluation Team determined that The Society of St. Vincent de Paul – Detroit met the requirements set forth in the RFP to grant funding. This determination was accomplished by evaluating the responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Method for Addressing the Problem
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included a Method for Addressing the Problem Statement from III-B, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Proposal exhibited a discrepancy between the geographic region proposed to serve in the RFP narrative template and the projected households and counties to be served represented in the RFP Workbook.
2. Management Summary
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant provided a Management Summary, Section V-D, with no deficiencies noted.
3. Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal did not indicate if funds would be maintained in a non-interest-bearing account.
4. Data Privacy and Information Security
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Data Privacy and Information Security, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The JEC identified deficiencies in the applicant's controls and procedures designed to ensure data security and determined there was not sufficient evidence to fully substantiate these controls and procedures.
5. Work Plan
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of a Work Plan, Section V-E, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal did not demonstrate a clear process for document retention.
6. Current and Prior Experience Disclosure
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant illustrated Current and Prior Experience, Section V-F, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal exhibited limited presence in some of the geographic regions proposed to serve.
   b. The proposal did not clearly demonstrate how the applicant will enhance capacity across all geographic regions proposed to serve.
7. Key Personnel

The Evaluation Team determined the applicant indicated Key Personnel, Section V-G, but the following deficiencies were noted:

a. Proposal did not sufficiently demonstrate capacity to serve the proposed areas and estimates.

8. Budget

The Evaluation Team determined the applicant proposed a Budget, Section V-H, but the following deficiencies were noted:

a. The budget presented does not align with the proposed goal of serving the entire state.

Applicant # 2: Superior Watershed Partnership
Total Score: 110/125

The Evaluation Team determined that Superior Watershed Partnership met the requirements set forth in the RFP to grant funding. This determination was accomplished by evaluating the responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Method for Addressing the Problem
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included a Method for Addressing the Problem Statement from III-B, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal did not clearly outline a method for addressing the problem inclusive of aspects such as the prioritization of vulnerable populations, self-sufficiency services, and energy insecurity.
   b. Mitigation strategies to address identified obstacles in the proposal were lacking.
2. Management Summary
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant provided a Management Summary, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.
3. Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.
4. Data Privacy and Information Security
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Data Privacy and Information Security, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The JEC identified deficiencies in the applicant's controls and procedures designed to ensure data security and determined there was not sufficient evidence to fully substantiate these controls and procedures.
5. Work Plan
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of a Work Plan, Section V-E, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The approach to vulnerable populations was unclear.
   b. The document retention policy did not demonstrate adherence to guidelines stated in RFP.
   c. The timeline for completing planned activities lacked sufficient detail regarding program milestones.
6. Current and Prior Experience Disclosure
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant illustrated Current and Prior Experience, Section V-F, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Proposal did not demonstrate presence, history, and connection in all regions proposed to serve.
   b. Proposal did not demonstrate prior experience handling funding of a similar size.

7. Key Personnel
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant indicated Key Personnel, Section V-G, and noted:
   a. Proposal did not sufficiently demonstrate capacity to serve the proposed areas and estimates.

8. Budget
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant proposed a Budget, Section V-H, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposed budget contained areas that require additional clarification.

Applicant # 3: TrueNorth Community Services
Total Score: 117/125

The Evaluation Team determined that TrueNorth Community Services met the requirements set forth in the RFP to grant funding. This determination was accomplished by evaluating the responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Method for Addressing the Problem
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included a Method for Addressing the Problem Statement from III-B, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal did not demonstrate mitigation strategies to address identified obstacles.

2. Management Summary
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant provided a Management Summary, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.

3. Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal did not indicate if funds would be maintained in a non-interest-bearing account.

4. Data Privacy and Information Security
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Data Privacy and Information Security, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The JEC identified deficiencies in the applicant’s controls and procedures designed to ensure data security and determined there was not sufficient evidence to fully substantiate these controls and procedures.

5. Work Plan
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of a Work Plan, Section V-E, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The timeline for completing planned activities was sparse.

6. Current and Prior Experience Disclosure
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant illustrated Current and Prior Experience, Section V-F, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Proposal did not demonstrate applicant history or presence across all regions proposed to serve.
   b. Proposal did not demonstrate prior experience handling funding of a similar size.

7. Key Personnel
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant indicated Key Personnel, Section V-G, and no deficiencies were noted.

8. Budget

The Evaluation Team determined the applicant proposed a Budget, Section V-H, but the following deficiencies were noted:

a. Some elements of proposed budget were determined to not be cost-effective.

Applicant # 4: MDHHS Bureau of Community Action and Economic Opportunity

Total Score: 116/125

The Evaluation Team determined that MDHHS Bureau of Community Action and Economic Opportunity met the requirements set forth in the RFP to grant funding. This determination was accomplished by evaluating the responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Method for Addressing the Problem
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included a Method for Addressing the Problem Statement from III-B, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Relevant obstacles and mitigation strategies in the proposal were lacking.
2. Management Summary
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant provided a Management Summary, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Strategy and process for ongoing improvement with the Community Action Agencies was not fully clear.
3. Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.
4. Data Privacy and Information Security
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Data Privacy and Information Security, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The JEC identified deficiencies in the applicant’s controls and procedures designed to ensure data security and determined there was not sufficient evidence to fully substantiate these controls and procedures.
5. Work Plan
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of a Work Plan, Section V-E, and no deficiencies were noted.
6. Current and Prior Experience Disclosure
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant illustrated Current and Prior Experience, Section V-F, and no deficiencies were noted.
7. Key Personnel
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant indicated Key Personnel, Section V-G, and no deficiencies were noted.
8. Budget
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant proposed a Budget, Section V-H, and no deficiencies were noted.

Applicant # 5: Barry County United Way

Total Score: 111/125

The Evaluation Team determined that Barry County United Way met the requirements set forth in the RFP to grant funding. This determination was accomplished by evaluating the responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Method for Addressing the Problem
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included a Method for Addressing the Problem Statement from III-B, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal did not clearly outline a method for addressing the problem inclusive of aspects such as energy insecurity.
   b. The proposal did not demonstrate a clear understanding of MEAP related rules, regulations, and law.
2. Management Summary
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant provided a Management Summary, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Process improvement pathways identified in the proposal need strengthening.
3. Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Clarity in alignment of proposal with Green Book policies was lacking.
4. Data Privacy and Information Security
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Data Privacy and Information Security, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The JEC identified deficiencies in the applicant's controls and procedures designed to ensure data security and determined there was not sufficient evidence to fully substantiate these controls and procedures.
5. Work Plan
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of a Work Plan, Section V-E, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal did not clearly outline a triage process for energy insecurity services.
   b. The proposal did not identify measures to be taken in anticipation of funds not being exhausted.
   c. The JEC determined that the estimates for APP enrollment were lower than expected.
6. Current and Prior Experience Disclosure
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant illustrated Current and Prior Experience, Section V-F, and no deficiencies were noted.
7. Key Personnel

The Evaluation Team determined the applicant indicated Key Personnel, Section V-G, and no deficiencies were noted.

8. Budget

The Evaluation Team determined the applicant proposed a Budget, Section V-H, and no deficiencies were noted.

Applicant # 6: United Way for Southeastern Michigan

Total Score: 115/125

The Evaluation Team determined that United Way for Southeastern Michigan met the requirements set forth in the RFP to grant funding. This determination was accomplished by evaluating the responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Method for Addressing the Problem
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included a Method for Addressing the Problem Statement from III-B, and no deficiencies were noted.
2. Management Summary
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant provided a Management Summary, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.
3. Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal did not indicate if funds would be maintained in a non-interest-bearing account.
   b. An incomplete financial audit was submitted.
4. Data Privacy and Information Security
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Data Privacy and Information Security, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The JEC identified deficiencies in the applicant's controls and procedures designed to ensure data security and determined there was not sufficient evidence to fully substantiate these controls and procedures.
5. Work Plan
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of a Work Plan, Section V-E, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal did not clearly distinguish between services offered and referred.
   b. Proposal did not clearly address accessibility across all regions proposed to serve.
   c. The proposal did not identify measures to be taken in anticipation of funds not being exhausted.
6. Current and Prior Experience Disclosure
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant illustrated Current and Prior Experience, Section V-F, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Proposal did not demonstrate applicant history or presence across all regions proposed to serve.
   b. Proposal lacked a clear strategy or plan for capacity building to serve the proposed geographic areas.
7. Key Personnel

The Evaluation Team determined the applicant indicated Key Personnel, Section V-G, and no deficiencies were noted.

8. Budget

The Evaluation Team determined the applicant proposed a Budget, Section V-H, and no deficiencies were noted.

Applicant # 7: The Salvation Army
Total Score: 116/125

The Evaluation Team determined that The Salvation Army met the requirements set forth in the RFP to grant funding. This determination was accomplished by evaluating the responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Method for Addressing the Problem
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included a Method for Addressing the Problem Statement from III-B, and no deficiencies were noted.
2. Management Summary
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant provided a Management Summary, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.
3. Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.
4. Data Privacy and Information Security
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Data Privacy and Information Security, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The JEC identified deficiencies in the applicant's controls and procedures designed to ensure data security and determined there was not sufficient evidence to fully substantiate these controls and procedures.
5. Work Plan
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of a Work Plan, Section V-E, and no concerns were noted.
6. Current and Prior Experience Disclosure
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant illustrated Current and Prior Experience, Section V-F, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Proposal lacked a clear strategy or plan for capacity building to serve the proposed geographic areas.
7. Key Personnel
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant indicated Key Personnel, Section V-G, and noted:
   a. Proposal did not sufficiently demonstrate capacity to serve the proposed areas and estimates.
8. Budget
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant proposed a Budget, Section V-H, and no deficiencies were noted.

Applicant # 8: THAW - The Heat and Warmth Fund

Total Score: 112/125

The Evaluation Team determined that THAW - The Heat and Warmth Fund met the requirements set forth in the RFP to grant funding. This determination was accomplished by evaluating the responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Method for Addressing the Problem
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included a Method for Addressing the Problem Statement from III-B, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  a. The proposal did not clearly outline a method for addressing the problem inclusive of aspects such as energy insecurity.
  b. Relevant obstacles and mitigation strategies in the proposal were lacking.
  c. The proposal was unclear in communicating the applicant's understanding of the energy security components of MEAP.

2. Management Summary
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant provided a Management Summary, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.

3. Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.

4. Data Privacy and Information Security
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Data Privacy and Information Security, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  a. The JEC identified deficiencies in the applicant's controls and procedures designed to ensure data security and determined there was not sufficient evidence to fully substantiate these controls and procedures.

5. Work Plan
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of a Work Plan, Section V-E, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  a. Proposal did not address targeted services for vulnerable populations.
  b. The proposal did not identify measures to be taken in anticipation of funds not being exhausted.

6. Current and Prior Experience Disclosure
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant illustrated Current and Prior Experience, Section V-F, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  a. Proposal did not demonstrate applicant history or presence across all regions proposed to serve.
  b. Clarity on the how the applicant will enhance capacity across all geographic regions proposed to serve was lacking.

7. Key Personnel

The Evaluation Team determined the applicant indicated Key Personnel, Section V-G, and noted:

a. Proposal did not sufficiently demonstrate capacity to serve the proposed areas and estimates.

8. Budget
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant proposed a Budget, Section V-H, and no deficiencies were noted.

Applicant # 9: United Way Ventures, LLC
Total Score: 121/125

The Evaluation Team determined that United Way Ventures, LLC met the requirements set forth in the RFP to grant funding. This determination was accomplished by evaluating the responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

a. Method for Addressing the Problem
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included a Method for Addressing the Problem Statement from III-B, and no deficiencies were noted.

b. Management Summary
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant provided a Management Summary, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.

c. Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.

d. Data Privacy and Information Security
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Data Privacy and Information Security, Section V-D, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The JEC identified deficiencies in the applicant’s controls and procedures designed to ensure data security and determined there was not sufficient evidence to fully substantiate these controls and procedures.

e. Work Plan
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of a Work Plan, Section V-E, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Coordination with other agencies that provide services not directly offered by applicant was not clear.
   b. The proposal did not identify measures to be taken in anticipation of funds not being exhausted.

f. Current and Prior Experience Disclosure
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant illustrated Current and Prior Experience, Section V-F, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Proposal did not demonstrate applicant history or presence across all regions proposed to serve.

g. Key Personnel
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant indicated Key Personnel, Section V-G, and no deficiencies were noted.

h. Budget
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant proposed a Budget, Section V-H, and no deficiencies were noted.

Applicant # 10: Matrix Human Services
Total Score: 93/125

The Evaluation Team determined that Matrix Human Services met the requirements set forth in the RFP yet did not demonstrate the best capacity to provide MEAP services in the proposed region. This determination was accomplished by evaluating the responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Method for Addressing the Problem
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included a Method for Addressing the Problem Statement from III-B, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal did not clearly outline a method for addressing the problem inclusive of aspects such as energy insecurity.
2. Management Summary
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant provided a Management Summary, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.
3. Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.
4. Data Privacy and Information Security
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Data Privacy and Information Security, Section V-D, and no deficiencies were noted.
5. Work Plan
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of a Work Plan, Section V-E, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The proposal did not clearly discuss the minimum services to be offered by MEAP.
   b. There was limited clarity in the methods to promote education and outreach on the availability of energy assistance programs.
   c. Proposal's description of eligibility determination and program service components were not fully aligned with MEAP.
   d. Proposal did not address MI Bridges, associated processes for needs assessments, or a process for documentation and retention.
   e. Measures taken in anticipation of exhausting funding were insufficiently described.
   f. Some estimates within the proposal were not cost-effective, were missing, and/or were mis-aligned with other areas of the proposal.
6. Current and Prior Experience Disclosure
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant illustrated Current and Prior Experience, Section V-F, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Applicant indicated no prior experience working on a similar grant award with the State of Michigan. Applicant had limited experience handling a similar fund.

7. Key Personnel
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant indicated Key Personnel, Section V-G, and noted:
   a. Proposal did not sufficiently demonstrate capacity to serve the proposed areas and estimates.

8. Budget
The Evaluation Team determined the applicant proposed a Budget, Section V-H, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Submitted materials exhibited discrepancies between materials such as the narrative and workbook.
   b. The proposed budget was unclear, particularly related to APP costs and LIHEAP A16 service offerings.

Applicant # 11: Soulardarity
Total Score: 83/125

As stated in the RFP, only proposals receiving a score of 90 points or higher would be considered for a grant award. This determination was accomplished by evaluating the responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Method for Addressing the Problem
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the MEAP program.
   a. Proposal did not include methods of service delivery.
   b. Proposal did not exhibit a clear understanding of MEAP rules, regulations, and law.
2. Management Summary
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant did not include detailed managerial oversight procedures or preparedness.
3. Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures, Section V-D, and the following deficiency was noted:
   a. Audit frequency is not consistent and not performed on an annual basis.
4. Data Privacy and Information Security
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of Data Privacy and Information Security, Section V-D, and the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. The JEC identified deficiencies in the applicant’s controls and procedures designed to ensure data security and determined there was not sufficient evidence to fully substantiate these controls and procedures.
5. Work Plan
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant included aspects of a Work Plan, Section V-E, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Proposal did not include how household progress would be documented.
   b. Calculations of households served were not included.
   c. Timeline does not include scheduled activities throughout the entire program period.
6. Current and Prior Experience Disclosure
   The Evaluation Team determined the applicant illustrated Current and Prior Experience, Section V-F, but the following deficiencies were noted:
   a. Proposal did not demonstrate experience with the following:
      i. Conducting needs assessments.
      ii. Conducting short-term case management.
      iii. Receiving a similar grant award from the SOM for the type of project proposed.
   b. How the organization would build capacity for serving the proposed geographic area.

c. Proposal did not demonstrate experience with meeting the essential financial needs of low-income households.

7. Key Personnel

The Evaluation Team determined the applicant indicated Key Personnel, Section V-G, and noted the following deficiency:

a. The JEC determined that the proposal did not demonstrate sufficient capacity to complete the outlined work.

8. Budget

The Evaluation Team determined the applicant proposed a Budget, Section V-H, but the following deficiencies were noted:

a. Affordable Payment Plans were not included in the budget, as required by the RFP.

b. Budget line-item estimates did not clearly align with program requirements or milestones.

Applicant # 12: We Want Green Too
Total Score: Not responsive

The Evaluation Team determined that We Want Green Too did not meet the mandatory minimum requirements outlined in the RFP and the proposal was not evaluated against the Evaluation Criteria for consideration to grant funding for the Michigan Energy Assistance Program. based upon the following criteria requested in the RFP:

1. Submitted work plan was outside the scope of the RFP.
2. The budget was not cost effective or equitable to the proposed region to be served.
3. Proposed self-sufficiency services were misaligned with the RFP.

IV. Evaluation Summary

The following shows a summary of section criteria scoring.

	Applicant			Selection Criteria						
		Method for Addressing the Problem (15)	Management Summary (16)	Fiscal Control and Financial Accounting Procedures (8)	Data Privacy and Information Security (9)	Work Plan (45)	Current and Prior Experience Disclosure (15)	Key Personnel (8)	Budget (9)	**TOTAL**
1	The Society of St. Vincent de Paul – Detroit	14	16	7	7	44	12	7	8	**115**
2	Superior Watershed Partnership	10	16	8	6	42	13	7	8	**110**
3	TrueNorth Community Services	13	16	7	8	44	13	8	8	**117**
4	MDHHS Bureau of Community Action and Economic Opportunity	12	13	8	6	45	15	8	9	**116**
5	Barry County United Way	13	15	7	2	42	15	8	9	**111**
6	United Way Southeastern Michigan	15	16	6	8	41	12	8	9	**115**
7	The Salvation Army	15	16	8	5	45	12	6	9	**116**
8	THAW - The Heat and Warmth Fund	9	16	8	7	43	13	7	9	**112**
9	United Way Ventures, LLC	15	16	8	8	43	14	8	9	**121**
10	Matrix Human Services	13	16	8	9	27	12	5	3	**93**
11	Soulardarity	6	9	7	5	40	5	5	6	**83**
12	We Want Green Too	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**

V. Award Summary

The following shows a summary of the grant award amounts.

	Applicant	LIEAF Award Amount	LIHEAP Award Amount
1	**The Society of St. Vincent de Paul – Detroit**	**$8,442,000**	**$475,500**
	Prosperity Zone Region 1	$100,000	$0
	Prosperity Zone Region 6	$600,000	$33,800
	Prosperity Zone Region 8	$1,242,000	$70,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 10	$6,500,000	$371,700
2	**Superior Watershed Partnership**	**$4,709,000**	**$291,000**
	Prosperity Zone Region 1	$2,777,000	$180,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 2	$1,000,000	$58,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 3	$932,000	$53,000
3	**TrueNorth Community Services**	**$19,419,000**	**$1,336,700**
	Prosperity Zone Region 1	$100,000	$0
	Prosperity Zone Region 2	$1,117,000	$63,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 3	$1,045,000	$59,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 4	$7,800,000	$461,600
	Prosperity Zone Region 5	$2,000,000	$144,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 6	$2,000,000	$155,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 7	$757,000	$58,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 8	$2,600,000	$230,080
	Prosperity Zone Region 9	$2,000,000	$166,020
4	**MDHHS Bureau of Community Action and Economic Opportunity**	**$8,701,300**	**$636,300**
	Prosperity Zone Region 4	$1,001,300	$78,100
	Prosperity Zone Region 5	$500,000	$57,600
	Prosperity Zone Region 7	$1,000,000	$97,200
	Prosperity Zone Region 9	$200,000	$61,400
	Prosperity Zone Region 10	$6,000,000	$342,000
5	**Barry County United Way**	**$236,700**	**$13,200**
	Prosperity Zone Region 4	$236,700	$13,200
6	**United Way for Southeastern Michigan**	**$8,073,000**	**$459,600**
	Prosperity Zone Region 6	$1,038,000	$59,200
	Prosperity Zone Region 9	$1,003,000	$56,600
	Prosperity Zone Region 10	$6,032,000	$343,800
7	**The Salvation Army**	**$19,083,000**	**$1,074,200**
	Prosperity Zone Region 1	$100,000	$0
	Prosperity Zone Region 2	$1,500,000	$84,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 3	$1,200,000	$68,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 4	$3,083,000	$172,200

	Applicant	LIEAF Award Amount	LIHEAP Award Amount
	Prosperity Zone Region 5	$1,000,000	$57,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 6	$2,000,000	$114,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 7	$800,000	$45,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 8	$1,400,000	$78,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 9	$3,000,000	$171,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 10	$5,000,000	$285,000
8	**THAW - The Heat and Warmth Fund**	**$9,950,000**	**$563,500**
	Prosperity Zone Region 1	$100,000	$0
	Prosperity Zone Region 5	$350,000	$20,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 6	$1,000,000	$57,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 10	$8,500,000	$486,500
9	**United Way Ventures, LLC**	**$9,386,000**	**$150,000**
	Prosperity Zone Region 4	$1,000,000	$15,900
	Prosperity Zone Region 5	$1,386,000	$16,400
	Prosperity Zone Region 6	$1,000,000	$16,000
	Prosperity Zone Region 7	$1,500,000	$29,800
	Prosperity Zone Region 8	$2,000,000	$31,920
	Prosperity Zone Region 9	$2,500,000	$39,980
10	**Matrix Human Services**	**$0**	**$0**
11	**Soulardarity**	**$0**	**$0**
12	**We Want Green Too**	**$0**	**$0**
	Total Awards	**$88,000,00**	**$5,000,000**

VI. Negotiations

After the Evaluation Team completed their review and scoring of the applications, the Grant Manager reached out to those applicants who would be receiving a reduced award amount to make a grant award offer. Each applicant accepted the proposed LIEAF offer with some adjustments to federal funds.

The Grant Manager requested a revised budget and budget narrative be submitted after the reduced award offer. The Evaluation Team reviewed the updated budgets and budget narratives and has accepted those documents and agreed to move forward with the grant awards shown in Section V above.

VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the Applicants in the table in Section V, Award Summary. Those applicants most closely aligned with the requirements of the Michigan Energy Assistance Act, and the requirements of the RFP. Total grant award amount is $88,000,000.00 in State LIEAF funding and $5,000,000.00 in Federal LIHEAP Assurance 16 funding.