

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award

The Michigan Public Service Commission has completed the evaluation of the Low Carbon Energy Infrastructure Enhancement and Development (EIED) Grant program applications and has recommended 15 entities to receive a grant, totaling \$49,996,623 pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

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

Lynn Beck, Solicitation Manager

BeckL12@michigan.gov

517-284-8247

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses from businesses, nonprofit organizations, local units of government, and Tribal governments for the purposes of planning, developing, designing, acquiring, or constructing low carbon energy facilities, which may include, but are not limited to, natural gas facilities, combined heat and power facilities, renewable natural gas facilities, and electrification programs. The term of these grants will vary by grantee, with the furthest spending deadline of September 30, 2026. This grant program has a legislative grant term end date of September 30, 2027.

Applications:

The RFP was posted on the Michigan Public Service Commission’s (MPSC) Low Carbon Energy Infrastructure Enhancement and Development Grant webpage. The RFP was posted on September 30, 2022, with an initial proposal due date of January 6, 2023. Per Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022, the proposals were posted publicly to the Low Carbon EIED Grant webpage with an opportunity for public comment for the duration of 45 days. Applicants then had 15 days to modify their proposals, if desired. The following applicants submitted proposals by the published final due date of March 14, 2023.

Applicant	Address, City, State, Zip Code
City of Lansing	1625 Sunset Avenue, Lansing, Michigan, 48917
City of Traverse City	400 Boardman Ave, Traverse City, Michigan, 49684
Consumers Energy – Spring Creek Farm Project	1945 West Parnall Rd, Jackson, Michigan. 49201
Consumers Energy – Swisslane Farm Project	1945 West Parnall Rd, Jackson, Michigan. 49201

Consumers Energy – TDI Farm Project	1945 West Parnall Rd, Jackson, Michigan. 49201
Consumers Energy – Wilson Farm Project	1945 West Parnall Rd, Jackson, Michigan. 49201
DTE Gas – Benzie, Manistee, Wexford Counties Project	1 Energy Plaza, Detroit, Michigan, 48226
DTE Gas – Delta County Project	1 Energy Plaza, Detroit, Michigan, 48226
DTE Gas – Newaygo County Project	1 Energy Plaza, Detroit, Michigan, 48226
DTE Gas – Oceana County Project	1 Energy Plaza, Detroit, Michigan, 48226
DTE Gas – Osceola County Project	1 Energy Plaza, Detroit, Michigan, 48226
Genesee County Drain Commission	4610 Beecher Rd, Flint, Michigan, 48532
Green Projects Group	2651 Brooklane Ave SE, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 49507
Hope Network	11652 West Grand River Ave, Lowell, Michigan, 49331
Kent County Bioenergy Facility	705 Palomar Airport Rd, Suite 200 Carlsbad, California, 92011
Lansing Board of Water and Light	1201 South Washington Ave, Lansing, Michigan, 48901
Superior Solar Project LLC	422 Admiral Blvd, Kansas City, Missouri, 64106
Planning Grants	
5-Lakes Energy	220 MAC Avenue, Suite 218, East Lansing, Michigan, 48823
Fresh Coast Climate Solutions	1301 Lutz Ave, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48103
Kalamazoo Nature Center	7000 North Westnedge Ave, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 49009
Midland Cogeneration Venture	100 Progress Place, Midland, Michigan, 48640
Public Sector Consultants	230 North Washington Square, Suite 300, Lansing, Michigan, 48933
Shelby Charter Township	52700 Van Dyke Ave, Shelby Township, Michigan, 48316
Slipstream	431 Charmany Drive, Madison, Wisconsin, 53719

EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

I. Evaluation Process

A responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in 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. A responsible proposal is a proposal that demonstrates the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation.

Meeting the requirements of the RFP does not guarantee a grant award. The number of projects submitted exceeded the available funding amount.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

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

- Program Priorities and Impact (35 Points)
- Project Scope and Objectives (25 Points)
- Project Feasibility (20 Points)
- Experience of Organization/Project Team (15 Points)
- Environmental Justice and Equity (5 Points)
- Holistic Approach Bonus (3 Points)
- Resilience Bonus (3 Points)

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by the Solicitation Manager in collaboration with the Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting Members
Mike Byrne, Chief Operating Officer, MPSC
Katherine Peretick, Commissioner, MPSC
Dan Scripps, Chair, MPSC
Non-Voting Members
Lynn Beck, Assistant to COO, JEC Chairperson, MPSC

III. Evaluation Results

A. Applicant # 1: City of Lansing

The Evaluation Team determined that the City of Lansing based on a score of 92, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal included incomplete responses to average cost of greenhouse gas reduction.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal did not include a cost benefit analysis or Scope 1, 2, or 3 emissions calculations.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirement.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included details on the project team, however, the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal did not include enough specificity for the solar project to be able to gauge qualifications of team.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did include expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. The equity and justice component was not well explained.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches and siting and received full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach and received full points.

Total Score: 92/100

B. Applicant # 2: City of Traverse City

The Evaluation Team determined that the City of Traverse City, based on a score of 92, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Cost for battery and cost for solar are above current market average.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. The annual energy cost savings expressed per customer is low.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirement.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did not include expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities.

- a. Applicant did not analyze environmental justice and equity so did not meet the requirement.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches and siting and received full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach and received full points.

Total Score: 92/100

C. Applicant # 3: Consumers Energy – Spring Creek Farm Project

The Evaluation Team determined that the Consumers Energy Spring Creek Farm Project, based on a score of 82, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. The project proposal's average cost of greenhouse gas reduction was high on a dollar per ton of CO₂e basis.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal included a low cost benefit analysis, and no additional customer hookups are possible.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant met requirement.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did not include expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities.

- a. Applicant did not analyze environmental justice and equity so did not meet the requirement.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Applicant did not include enough description of a holistic project approach to receive full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Applicant included vague reference to resilience but not enough for full points.

Total Score: 82/100

D. Applicant #4: Consumers Energy – Swisslane Farm Project

The Evaluation Team determined that the Consumers Energy Swisslane Farm Project, based on a score of 94, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. The project proposal's average cost of greenhouse gas reduction was high on a dollar per ton of CO₂e basis.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Project included lower Total Resource Cost Test cost ratio than expected based on the details of the proposed project. Project also included a higher cost per MMBtu than expected based on the details of the proposed project.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirement.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did include some expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, however, the following deficiency was noted:

- a. The equity and justice component was not well explained.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Applicant did not include a sufficiently robust description of a holistic approach in order to receive full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Applicant included some reference to resilience but not enough for full points.

Total Score: 94/100

E. Applicant #5: Consumers Energy – TDI Farm Project

The Evaluation Team determined that the Consumers Energy TDI Farm Project, based on a score of 92, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. The project proposal's average cost of greenhouse gas reduction was high on a dollar per ton of CO₂e basis.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Project included a lower societal cost test cost ratio than expected based on the details of the proposed project.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe, however, the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Supply agreements, although currently under negotiation, are not yet secured which could potentially impact success of project.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did include some expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, however, the following deficiency was noted:

- a. The equity and justice component was not well explained.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Applicant did not include a sufficiently robust description of a holistic approach in order to receive full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Applicant included some reference to resilience but not enough for full points.

Total Score: 92/100

F. Applicant #6: Consumers Energy – Wilson Farm Project

The Evaluation Team determined that the Consumers Energy Wilson Farm Project, based on a score of 67, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Project had low total greenhouse gas reduction. The project proposal's average cost of greenhouse gas reduction was high on a dollar per ton of CO₂e basis.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Project had low reduction of CO₂e per year based on the details of the project.
- b. Total Resource Cost Test cost benefit analysis is barely over 1.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe, however, the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Supply agreements, although currently under negotiation, are not yet secured which could potentially impact success of project.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team
The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.
5. Environmental Justice and Equity
The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did include some expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, however, the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. The equity and justice component was not well explained.
6. Holistic Approach Bonus
The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches, but the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. Applicant did not include a sufficiently robust description of a holistic approach in order to receive full points.
7. Resilience Bonus
The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach, but the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. Applicant included some reference to resilience but not enough for full points.

Total Score: 67/100

G. Applicant #7: DTE Gas – Benzie, Manistee, Wexford Counties Project

The Evaluation Team determined that the DTE Gas Benzie, Manistee, Wexford County Project (Mesick-Buckley portion only), based on a score of 90, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact
The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. Project demonstrates only marginal carbon reductions.
2. Project Scope and Objectives
The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Project included limited Scope 1 emissions reductions and negligible Scope 2 and 3 emissions reductions.
3. Project Feasibility
The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirement.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team
The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.
5. Environmental Justice and Equity
The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did include some expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, however, the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. Proposal lacks a workforce diversity element.
6. Holistic Approach Bonus
The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches and siting and received full points.
7. Resilience Bonus
The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not support a resilience approach so did not receive any bonus points.
 - a. Project did not have a resilience approach.

Total Score: 90/100

H. Applicant #8: DTE Gas – Delta County Project

The Evaluation Team determined that the DTE Gas Delta County Project, based on a score of 71, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact
The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. Project demonstrates only marginal carbon reductions.
2. Project Scope and Objectives
The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Project included limited Scope 1 emissions reductions and negligible Scope 2 and 3 emissions reductions. Project scope was limited.
3. Project Feasibility
The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirement.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team
The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.
5. Environmental Justice and Equity
The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did include some expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, however, the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. Proposal lacks a workforce diversity element.
6. Holistic Approach Bonus
The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches, but the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. Applicant did not include a sufficiently robust description of a holistic approach in order to receive full points.
7. Resilience Bonus
The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not support a resilience approach so did not receive any bonus points.
 - a. Project did not have a resilience approach.

Total Score: 71/100

I. Applicant #9: DTE Gas – Newaygo County Project

The Evaluation Team determined that the DTE Gas Newaygo County Project, based on a score of 69, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact
The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. Project demonstrates only marginal carbon reductions. High cost for number of businesses involved based on the details of the proposed project.
2. Project Scope and Objectives
The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Project included limited Scope 1 emissions reductions and negligible Scope 2 and 3 emissions reductions. Cost per connection is high based on the details of the proposed project.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirement.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did include some expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, however, the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal lacks a workforce diversity element.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Applicant did not include a sufficiently robust description of a holistic approach in order to receive full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not support a resilience approach so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not have a resilience approach.

Total Score: 69/100

J. Applicant #10: DTE Gas – Oceana County Project

The Evaluation Team determined that the DTE Gas Oceana County Project, based on a score of 66, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Project included only marginal carbon reductions.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Project included limited Scope 1 emissions reductions and negligible Scope 2 and 3 emissions reductions. Project scope was limited.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirement.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did include some expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, however, the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal lacks a workforce diversity element.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Applicant did not include a sufficiently robust description of a holistic approach in order to receive full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not support a resilience approach so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not have a resilience approach.

Total Score: 66/100

K. Applicant #11: DTE Gas – Osceola County Project

The Evaluation Team determined that the DTE Gas Osceola County Project, based on a score of 71, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal included a high cost per customer based on the details of the project. Project included only marginal carbon reductions.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Project included limited Scope 1 emissions reductions and negligible Scope 2 and 3 emissions reductions. Project scope was small.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirement..

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did include some expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, however, the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal lacks a workforce diversity element.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Applicant did not include a sufficiently robust description of a holistic approach in order to receive full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not support a resilience approach so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not have a resilience approach.

Total Score: 71/100

L. Applicant #12: Genesee County Drain Commission

The Evaluation Team determined that the Genesee County Drain Commission, based on a score of 90, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022. Applicant has met the requirement.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Proposal includes a low annual energy cost savings per customer based on the details of the project.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal included a very detailed engineering feasibility plan, but it was not responsive to the details requested in the RFP.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included information on the project team, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposals lacked details on project members other than the project director.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did not include expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities.

- a. Applicant did not analyze environmental justice and equity so did not meet the requirement.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches and siting and received full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Applicant did not include a sufficiently robust description of resiliency in order to receive full points.

Total Score: 90/100

M. Applicant #13: Green Projects Group

The Evaluation Team determined that the Green Projects Group, based on a score of 50, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Applicant's proposal failed to provide data on carbon reductions metrics. Project has very limited impact based on the number of participants.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Applicant's proposal failed to provide Benefit Cost Analysis for Scope 1, 2, and 3 GHG reduction data. Also, installation costs fall entirely on participants. Unclear how to move from study to installation.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. It is unclear whether the proposed project as submitted will provide desired results.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal included expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities. Applicant has met the requirement.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not include holistic approaches or holistic siting so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not include a holistic approach.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not support a resilience approach so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not include resilience.

Total Score: 50/100

N. Applicant #14: Hope Network

The Evaluation Team determined that Hope Network, based on a score of 92, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022 and met the requirement, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Expensive project on a per GHG or per megawatt basis based on the details of the proposed project.
2. Project Scope and Objectives
The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Proposal was incomplete in its benefit cost analysis.
3. Project Feasibility
The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe, but the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. Proposal detail regarding solar and storage sizing and pricing was not fully developed.
4. Experience of Organization/Project Team
The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team, but the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. Proposal does not contain Hope Network team information.
5. Environmental Justice and Equity
The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal included expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities. Applicant has met the requirement.
6. Holistic Approach Bonus
The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches and siting and received full points.
7. Resilience Bonus
The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach and received full points.

Total Score: 92/100

O. Applicant #15: Kent County Bioenergy Facility

The Evaluation Team determined that the Kent County Bioenergy Facility, based on a score of 101, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact
The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022. Applicant has met the requirement.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Proposal had a low total resource cost test and societal cost test, and low dollars per customer saved based on the details of the proposed project.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirement.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal included expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities. Applicant has met the requirement.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches and siting and received full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not support a resilience approach so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not include resilience.

Total Score: 101/100

P. Applicant #16: Lansing Board of Water and Light

The Evaluation Team determined that the Lansing Board of Water and Light, based on a score of 94, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Cost for greenhouse gas reduction is high based on the details of the proposed project.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Cost benefit analysis tests are low based on the details of the proposed project.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirement.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal included expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities. Applicant has met the requirement.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches and siting and received full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach and received full points.

Total Score: 94/100

Q. Applicant #17: Superior Solar Project LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that the Superior Solar Project LLC, based on a score of 70, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Project has a high cost per customer based on the details of the proposed project.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Cost benefit analysis tests are low based on the details of the proposed project.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. The lack of a power purchase agreement raises concerns about the feasibility of the project.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal did not include expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities.

- a. Applicant did not analyze environmental justice and equity so did not meet the requirement.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not include holistic approaches or holistic siting so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not include a holistic approach as indicated in the RFP.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. The project included some improvements to resilience but not sufficient for full points.

Total Score: 70/100

R. Applicant #18: 5-Lakes Energy (Planning Grant)

The Evaluation Team determined that 5-Lakes Energy, based on a score of 90, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Project has small impact on greenhouse emissions based on the details of the proposed project.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Proposal does not include enough detail on expected implementation of the beneficial electrification projects themselves.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal included some detail on future funding sources for final electrification projects, but not full funding plan.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal included expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities. Applicant has met the requirement.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches and received full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Project included minor resilience benefits from building improvements.

Total Score: 90/100

S. Applicant #19: Fresh Coast Climate Solutions (Planning Grant)

The Evaluation Team determined that Fresh Coast Climate Solutions, based on a score of 59, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. The proposed project is not a planning grant but rather a survey. The project does not plan for a future low carbon energy infrastructure project.
- b. Small ultimate greenhouse gas reductions based on the details of the proposed project.
- c. Small number of end use customers achieving access.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Proposal does not include a description of the ultimate low-energy infrastructure project the grant is planning for.
- b. No timeline was included for the future project being planned for, only for the survey.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirements.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal included expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal is focused on manufacturing operations and not directly on low-income/environmental justice communities.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not include holistic approaches or holistic siting so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not include a holistic approach as indicated in the RFP.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not support a resilience approach so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not include resilience as indicated in the RFP.

Total Score: 59/100

T. Applicant #20: Kalamazoo Nature Center (Planning Grant)

The Evaluation Team determined that the Kalamazoo Nature Center, based on a score of 90, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. The number of customers impacted by the cost of the planning grant is small. Project impact on energy cost burden is small based on the details of the proposed project.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Project scope was not clearly developed.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal includes very little detail on potential funding sources for the full project.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal included expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. The equity and justice component was not well explained.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches and received full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach and received full points.

Total Score: 90/100

U. Applicant #21: Midland Cogeneration Venture (Planning Grant)

The Evaluation Team determined that the Midland Cogeneration Venture, based on a score of 90, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Proposal does not include quantified reduction in cost burden or description of greenhouse gases avoided on a \$/MT basis.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program. Applicant has met the requirements.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirements.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team, however the following deficiency was noted:

- a. No information was provided on qualifications of key personnel.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal included expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal included very little connection to environmental justice and equity.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not include holistic approaches or holistic siting so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not include a holistic approach.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not support a resilience approach so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not include resilience.

Total Score: 90/100

V. Applicant #22: Public Sector Consultants (Planning Grant)

The Evaluation Team determined that the Public Sector Consultants, based on a score of 90, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. The proposal lacked detail on the number of anticipated subscribers for each of the projects.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Proposal included limited detail on timing for actual project implementation.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal included limited detail on funding for implementation of the project.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal included expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities. Applicant has met the requirement.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not include holistic approaches or holistic siting so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not include a holistic approach.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project did not support a resilience approach so did not receive any bonus points.

- a. Project did not include resilience.

Total Score: 90/100

W. Applicant #23: Shelby Charter Township (Planning Grant)

The Evaluation Team determined that Shelby Charter Township, based on a score of 90, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Unclear whether planning project leverages existing toolkits.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Proposal includes limited job impact.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe. Applicant has met the requirements.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal included some expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. The equity and justice component was not well explained.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches and siting and received full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Project included only minor benefits from resilience if residential power goes out.

Total Score: 90/100

X. Applicant #24: Slipstream (Planning Grant)

The Evaluation Team determined that Slipstream, based on a score of 91, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Evaluation Criteria.

1. Program Priorities and Impact

The Evaluation Team determined the project supports the incorporation of the criteria outlined in Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Lack of estimated greenhouse gas reductions or ultimate cost savings.

2. Project Scope and Objectives

The Evaluation Team determined the proposal included a scope of work and meets the objectives of the grant program, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Proposal included limited detail on project implementation.

3. Project Feasibility

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposed project has the feasibility to achieve the purpose, outcomes, and tasks required by this RFP within the established timeframe, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Proposal lacks the full funding plan for final project implementation.

4. Experience of Organization/Project Team

The Evaluation Team assessed that the applicant included sufficient details on the project team. Applicant has met the requirement.

5. Environmental Justice and Equity

The Evaluation Team assessed that the proposal included expressed efforts to advance environmental justice and equity, especially in disadvantaged communities. Applicant has met the requirement.

6. Holistic Approach Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project includes holistic approaches and received full points.

7. Resilience Bonus

The Evaluation Team assessed that the project supported a resilience approach, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Project had minimal resilience element compared to what was requested in RFP.

Total Score: 91/100

IV. Evaluation Summary

Applicant		Selection Criteria							TOTAL
		Program Priorities and Impact	Project Scope and Objectives	Project Feasibility	Experience of Organization/Project Team	Environmental Justice and Equity	Holistic Approach Bonus	Resilience Bonus	
1	City of Lansing	30	22	20	10	4	3	3	92
2	City of Traverse City	28	23	20	15	0	3	3	92
3	Consumers Energy – Spring Creek Farm Project	30	15	20	15	0	1	1	82
4	Consumers Energy – Swisslane Farm Project	32	24	20	15	1	1	1	94
5	Consumers Energy – TDI Farm Project	32	23	19	15	1	1	1	92
6	Consumers Energy – Wilson Farm Project	20	10	19	15	1	1	1	67
7	DTE Gas – Benzie, Manistee, Wexford Counties Project (Mesick-Buckley only)	30	18	20	15	4	3	0	90
8	DTE Gas – Delta County Project	20	10	20	15	4	2	0	71
9	DTE Gas – Newaygo County Project	18	10	20	15	4	2	0	69
10	DTE Gas – Oceana County Project	15	10	20	15	4	2	0	66
11	DTE Gas – Osceola County Project	20	10	20	15	4	2	0	71
12	Genesee County Drain Commission	35	23	15	13	0	3	1	90
13	Green Projects Group	10	10	10	15	5	0	0	50
14	Hope Network	30	20	18	13	5	3	3	92
15	Kent County Bioenergy Facility	35	23	20	15	5	3	0	101
16	Lansing Board of Water and Light	32	16	20	15	5	3	3	94
17	Superior Solar Project LLC	28	15	10	15	0	0	2	70
Planning Grants									
18	5-Lakes Energy	26	23	17	15	5	3	1	90
19	Fresh Coast Climate Solutions	10	10	20	15	4	0	0	59
20	Kalamazoo Nature Center	25	23	17	15	4	3	3	90
21	Midland Cogeneration Venture	33	25	20	11	1	0	0	90
22	Public Sector Consultants	29	23	18	15	5	0	0	90
23	Shelby Charter Township	25	24	20	15	2	3	1	90
24	Slipstream	32	20	15	15	5	3	1	91

V. Award Summary

The following table shows a summary of the grant award amounts.

Applicant		Award Amount
1	City of Lansing	\$1,000,000
2	City of Traverse City	\$1,685,479
3	Consumers Energy – Swisslane Farm Project	\$5,633,745
4	Consumers Energy – TDI Farm Project	\$5,392,437
5	DTE Gas – Benzie, Manistee, Wexford Counties Project (Mesick-Buckley only)	\$7,285,129
6	Genesee County Drain Commission	\$5,000,000
7	Hope Network	\$3,655,547
8	Kent County Bioenergy Facility	\$5,000,000
9	Lansing Board of Water and Light	\$12,000,000
Planning Grants		
10	5-Lakes Energy	\$1,247,796
11	Kalamazoo Nature Center	\$265,000
12	Midland Cogeneration Venture	\$771,360
13	Public Sector Consultants	\$151,340
14	Shelby Charter Township	\$158,800
15	Slipstream	\$749,990
Total Awards		\$49,996,623

VI. Negotiations

After the Evaluation Team completed their review and scoring of the applications, the Solicitation 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 offer.

The Solicitation Manager requested a revised budget and budget narrative be submitted within 5 days of 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 Public Acts 53 and 166 of 2022, and the requirements of the RFP. Total grant award amount is \$49,996,623.