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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Fleets for the Future (F4F) project, funded in March 2016 by the U.S. Department of Energy (U.S. DOE) Clean Cities Program, sought to achieve nationwide economies of scale for alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs) through aggregated procurement initiatives. F4F strives to accomplish these economies of scale through a coordinated strategy designed to increase knowledge, lower the transaction costs of procurement, achieve better pricing, and address potential challenges arising from large-scale procurement initiatives, thereby increasing the deployment of alternative fuel vehicles in public and private sector fleets. The Metropolitan Kansas City pilot program was able to successfully demonstrate the F4F’s overall goal through its regional-based programs:

- The integration of AFV options into the metro vehicle bid for public and nonprofit organizations.
- The consumer EV group purchase program.

The end results showcased successful integration of AFV options in an already established vehicle bid process; documented cost savings through administrative and transactional procurement efficiencies; increased knowledge of AFV technologies and procurement options; discounted pricing to local governments and regional consumers; and, ultimately, increased AFV deployment.

This Evaluation Report will provide program details of the KC pilot project that includes: approaches taken, key programmatic components evaluated, findings that include successes, barriers, lessons learned and conclusions. The Executive Summary will capture the highlights of the pilot programs and key evaluative findings.

Metropolitan Kansas City Regional Cooperative Procurement AFV Pilot Program

The F4F Kansas City pilot project was able to join an established metropolitan collaborative vehicle procurement process in the summer of 2016, with the overall goal to introduce alternative fuel vehicles options to the public and nonprofit sector. F4F representatives were involved in the planning and implementation of the metro vehicle bid process. The final results of the metro vehicle bid process are: 44 vehicle builds in eight classes and multiple AFV options were received on 35 of the 44 vehicle builds. All in all, 13 dealerships secured contracts with Johnson County, Kansas, that included multiple AFV models in all eight classes of vehicles.

The key evaluative findings include:

- The involvement of the Fleets for the Future team provided significant value to the metro Kansas City vehicle bid process.
- The project team successfully integrated AFV options into an established metro vehicle bid process, which should be sustainable through subsequent bid processes.
- The project achieved higher visibility for AFV options to public jurisdictions — fleet managers, procurement staff, etc.
- The project achieved higher levels of awareness and AFV knowledge on the part of fleet managers, as well as dealership sales and service staff.
Consumer EV group purchase program

The F4F-involved EV group purchase programs that were hosted in the greater Kansas City region in 2016-2017 had two target audiences: Round 1) residents in Kansas City, Missouri; and Round 2) University of Missouri – Kansas City affiliated individuals — faculty, staff, students and alumni. Round 1 was originally designed to be a limited six-week campaign but was further expanded to include the Kansas City Power & Light (KCP&L) service territory with a time extension of a total of six months — through June 2017. Round 2 was announced in April 2017 and the offer was valid through June 2017.

The F4F project team’s efforts to test the consumer group purchase model succeeded with many lessons learned to pass on to other regions. The EV market growth during the group buy campaign of 87 percent is notable. Key elements of success include:

- The involvement of the Fleets for the Future team provided significant value.
- The project team successfully executed the consumer group purchase program model with the assistance of key partners.
- A thoughtful marketing plan is needed to reach the ready-to-buy market.
- The EV group buy campaigns achieved higher levels of public awareness and EV knowledge.

Impact of KC pilot project

The Kansas City pilot project was launched early in the Fleets for the Future initiative — within the first six months of the two-year grant period. The KC project assisted the national team in providing several possible procurement aggregation options for the other participating regions to consider. The strategies deployed, the materials developed, partnerships formed and lessons learned have greatly informed the F4F program and has served as a strong foundation for the overall success of the initiative.
INTRODUCTION

Background

National Initiative

Funded by the U.S. Department of Energy (U.S. DOE) Clean Cities Program, the Aggregated Alternative Technology Alliance, known as “Fleets for the Future” (F4F), seeks to achieve nationwide economies of scale for alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs) through aggregated procurement initiatives. F4F strives to accomplish these economies of scale through a coordinated strategy designed to increase knowledge, lower the transaction costs of procurement, achieve better pricing, and address potential challenges arising from large-scale procurement initiatives, thereby increasing the deployment of alternative fuel vehicles in public and private sector fleets.

The F4F team comprises national and regional partners with extended networks and relationships that can increase and aggregate the demand for alternative fuels and advanced vehicles. The project includes a regional procurement initiative spearheaded by each of the team’s five participating regional councils, as well as a national procurement effort. The regional council partners were chosen to participate in the F4F initiative due to their experience in sponsoring successful regional procurement programs and their stakeholder convening abilities — their natural advantage to bring together organizations of all types (public, private, nonprofit) to accomplish joint goals.

National Partners

Led by National Association of Regional Councils (NARC), F4F partners are listed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional planning council partners</th>
<th>Clean Cities Coalitions</th>
<th>Industry and technical partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-America Regional Council, Kansas City, Missouri</strong></td>
<td>Metropolitan Energy Center / Kansas City Regional Clean Cities</td>
<td>Meister Consultants Group, A Cadmus Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Washington COG, Washington, DC</td>
<td>Clean Communities of Central New York</td>
<td>Electrification Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Area Planning Council, Boston, MA</td>
<td>Dallas-Fort Worth Clean Cities Coalition</td>
<td>Yborra &amp; Associates, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Texas COG, Dallas/Fort Worth, Texas</td>
<td>Greater Washington Region Clean Cities Coalition</td>
<td>ICM, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima Association of Governments, Tucson, Arizona</td>
<td>Massachusetts Clean Cities Coalition</td>
<td>Propane Education &amp; Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tucson Regional Clean Cities Coalition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah Clean Cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Washington Clean Cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean Fuels Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold indicates partners in the Metropolitan Kansas City Pilot Project.
Kansas City regional procurement pilot project

The Kansas City regional procurement pilot project was one of the five regional procurement projects under the F4F — It was the first procurement done on the project (launched within the first six months) and was the testing laboratory for the other four participating regions to learn from as they prepared their own procurements. The regional procurement pilot project was two-fold:

1. The integration of AFV options into the metro vehicle bid for public and nonprofit organizations.
2. The consumer group purchase program.

Offering a consumer-targeted program in the Kansas City region was a means to introduce alternative fuel vehicles to a broader section of the region’s residents.

Partners

The lead partners in the KC pilot project were Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) and Metropolitan Energy Center (MEC).

MARC is an association of city and county governments, and is the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) serving the nine-county Kansas City metropolitan area. MARC is organized as a public nonprofit organization. MARC was formed as a voluntary coalition in response to the increasing demand for regional cooperation. To meet the changing needs of the region, MARC’s services have expanded over the years and now include the following:

- Technical assistance to local governments.
- Services to elderly citizens.
- Transportation planning including mass transit and highways.
- The coordination of programs ranging from emergency services to recycling.
- Environmental protection in the areas of air quality, water quality, and natural resources.
- Maintenance of a comprehensive database of regional demographic and economic information.
- Coordination of early learning services.
- Local government services.

For 15 years, MARC has coordinated the Kansas City Regional Purchasing Cooperative (KCRPC), a region-wide “government-to-government” procurement service that establishes competitively priced contracts for goods and services, provides technical assistance to members, generates over $150 million in contracts, and consistently saves 10–20 percent for participating jurisdictions.

Metropolitan Energy Center (MEC), a 501c3 non-profit in Kansas City, Missouri, is a catalyst for resource efficiency, environmental health and economic vitality in America’s Heartland. MEC is the host of Kansas City Regional Clean Cities, a designated coalition in the U.S. Department of Energy’s Clean Cities Program. The coalition of public and private partners seeks to build awareness and use of alternative fuels in fleets throughout Kansas and western Missouri. It consists of fleet operators, local government agencies, alternative fuel providers, vehicle manufacturers and dealerships, and many others interested in improving air quality and reducing use of petroleum.

Throughout the pilot, MARC and MEC leveraged MARC’s local government and training networks, and MEC’s Clean Cities outreach, fleet and vendor networks. Both partners also worked with individual government fleets, vehicle manufacturers, industry stakeholders and the F4F technical assistance team.
Cooperative procurement

Cooperative procurement is a form of strategic sourcing, aggregating the spending of multiple public agencies with competitively sourced suppliers to maximize buying power — optimizing pricing, transactions costs, and processing time through the strategic use of cooperative procurement programs. Cooperative procurement has become a well-established practice in the past two decades with increasing representation and participation by public entities. New forms of collaboration to support cooperative procurement are evolving, including large national consortiums and more local, regional cooperative programs.

The benefits of using a cooperative procurement approach are numerous. Cooperative purchasing is:

- Competitive — contracts are established through a competitive solicitation process using public sector principles and processes.
- Convenient — significant staff resource time and expense can be saved, increasing staff productivity.
- Flexible — contracts are designed to meet the demands and needs of organizations of all sizes.
- Transparent — all activities are captured and often published by multiple organizations.
- Compliant — cooperative contracts are designed to meet statutory, policy and administrative requirements.
- Insightful — when using a cooperative approach, the end-user can review and analyze the pricing and services before deciding to use the contract.

A seven-step strategic procurement process was developed early in the F4F initiative to be used as a framework for the Metropolitan Kansas City Regional Cooperative Procurement AFV Pilot Program, as well as to assist the other participating regional procurement initiatives. See Appendix A.

Cooperative Purchasing – Best Practices *

- Convene fleet stakeholders and educate them on the benefits of cooperative procurement processes and how to incorporate detailed specifications requirements.
- Establish a regional work group to identify areas of common interest and compromise.
- Establish robust communication channels between the entity aggregating the cooperative procurement and end user fleets.
- Survey fleet managers and procurement officers to understand what vehicle types and financing mechanisms are most appealing and at what price points, and what opportunities/challenges to AFV deployment are most salient to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enables fleet to own the assets.</td>
<td>May not always produce the lowest prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces overall labor costs and timelines of bid solicitation, review and award.</td>
<td>Procurement staff may not be in favor of new process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produces lower prices through higher demand.</td>
<td>The options provided on the bid list may not meet local procurement requirements, such as procuring from small businesses or minority- and women-owned businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplifies contracting processes — single agency issues contract.</td>
<td>Vehicles desired may not be available through cooperative purchasing organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION

Metropolitan Kansas City Regional Cooperative Procurement AFV Pilot Program

Approach

The Kansas City region’s local governments have a strong history of working closely together around cooperative procurement. The Kansas City Regional Purchasing Cooperative (KCRPC), sponsored by MARC and the Mid-America Council of Public Purchasing (MACPP, a separate regional purchasing cooperative), both have over 100 public agencies members that purchase goods, products and services through cooperative procurement contracts. MACPP has organized and implemented the metro vehicle bid since 2002. The joint bid process allows individual agencies to expand their purchasing power, save administrative costs and receive value-added pricing. The metro vehicle bid process includes the involvement of dozens of local government representatives collectively writing specifications and evaluating received proposals. The administrative work to secure and award is currently led by Johnson County, Kansas, Purchasing Department.

The F4F Kansas City pilot project joined the MACPP metro vehicle bid in 2016. Representatives from both MARC and MEC were involved in the planning and implementation of the metro vehicle bid process. The F4F involvement in the bid process included:

- Working with a regional stakeholder group made up of fleet managers and purchasing professionals to outline bid goals.
- Creating marketing and communication templates for Clean Cities “train the trainer” sessions.
- Providing pre-bid education and outreach via Kansas City Clean Cities on the topic of AFV options through webinars, informational sessions, and one-on-one communications.
- Conducting interviews with fleet managers, procurement specialists and dealership sales staff regarding best AFV candidates for inclusion in the bid process and anticipated hurdles.
- Facilitating meetings with potential national procurement partners for private fleets.
- Answering questions from public officials, dealerships and upfitters regarding AFV options and each group’s involvement in the bid process.
- Gathering data on AFV options and market demand.
- Attending pre-bid meetings to discuss best AFV options to include in the RFPs.
- Assisting with the drafting of RFP specifications.

7 dealerships provided bids on Flex Fuel E-85 options (in all categories).
6 dealerships submitted bids on biodiesel/hybrids, hybrid-electric and all electric vehicles.
8 dealerships provided bids on Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) vehicles.
3 dealerships quoted Liquid Propane Gas (LPG) options.
• Integrating AFV options into the already-established metro vehicle bid process.
• Launching the KC Metro Vehicle Bid for responses.
• Reviewing final bid documents.
• Creating a “cheat sheet” inventory of AFV options available in 2017 model year metro vehicle contracts.
• Educating and requesting participation from dealerships to encourage the use of the updated metro bid process, with emphasis on the bids for alternative fuels.

The final results of the metro vehicle bid process are: 44 vehicle builds in eight classes were included in the RFP bid process. Multiple AFV options were received on 35 of the 44 vehicle builds where there were previously none.

All in all, 13 dealerships secured contracts with Johnson County, Kansas, that included multiple AFV models in all eight classes of vehicles.

Methodology

This evaluation was conducted through both qualitative and quantitative means. The F4F team spoke to sales representatives from the dealerships that had secured contracts in the MACPP metro vehicle bid. A few of the larger dealerships had records of sales that were made through the MACPP bidding process. The project team reviewed those records and compared them with the original bid documents. Additional interviews were conducted with a select number of fleet managers and dealerships using a standardized set of questions designed to elicit both quantitative and qualitative responses.

Key Components of evaluation

This evaluation is taking place one year into the November 2016 contracting period for 2017 model year vehicles. The contracts are one year in duration with two annual renewal options. Note: Currently, the renewal contracts have been finalized for the 2018 model year.

This evaluation includes four key sections:

1. Recognition of the value of the F4F involvement.
2. Identification of cost savings.
   a. Integration of AFV options into bid process
   b. Reduced transaction and administrative costs.
   c. Advantageous vehicle unit pricing.
   d. Total cost of ownership analysis.
4. Pilot project findings/recommendations.

Section 1: Recognition of the value of F4F involvement

As an initial step, MARC and MEC participated in the F4F survey to help inform the Kansas City pilot project. The survey was sent to fleet managers and other relevant stakeholders in the five regions participating in the F4F initiative. The survey results provided a baseline of the perceived needs and considerations of public fleet managers in the next few years. These survey results assisted the F4F partners in formulating a strategy to introduce AFV options to the 2016 MACPP metro vehicle bid process.

The F4F team was welcomed as planning partners in the 2016 MACPP metro vehicle bid process. As the lead agency, Johnson County, Kansas, Purchasing Department personnel provided background materials, a timeline for the 2016 bid process, and openness to integrating alternative fuel vehicles options to the RFP bid documents. The F4F technical partners reviewed past metro vehicle bid documents, researched possible AFV option language, and drafted and submitted proposed additions to the RFP documents. The metro vehicle
bid planning committee reviewed and accepted proposed additions and incorporated them into the final RFP. The final bid document incorporated references to AFV in two sections, and an Alternative Fuel Options box was inserted in each group and Item bid document (eight groups and 44 items).

In addition to Johnson County’s email release and posting to bid web sites, the F4F project team forwarded the bid documents to AFV dealers, upfitters and system manufacturers to ensure that all parts of the AFV-system supply chain were aware of the new focus on AFV in the bid. The team responded to questions from upfitters and system manufacturers on how to participate with a sponsoring dealership. Results were analyzed and outreach materials were created. Through the various communication channels — newsletters, social media and in-person events — the project team educated prospective fleet buyers about the resulting AFV options, as well as the national opportunities. When possible, formal presentations were made to procurement specialists and public officials through private meetings and public forums. The F4F project team created a quick guide and cheat sheet for fleet managers, which can be found in Appendix B.

The F4F project team’s outreach and education efforts to promote the metro vehicle bid are demonstrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website views</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Newsletter article</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News releases (two sent electronically to media, 40 contacts)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct email (e-blast)</td>
<td>2,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook posts</td>
<td>3,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweets</td>
<td>5,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed newsletters, workshop fliers</td>
<td>4,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In person events (workshops, meetings, presentations, etc.)</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,306</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Success:** Alternative fuel vehicle options are now embedded and will continue to be incorporated in future metro vehicle bid documents. 18 CNG, 14 propane, four HEV and three PEV options are now available under the 2016 MACPP metro vehicle bid.

**Barriers:** The overall response to the request for AFV options on the bid line items was high, indicating that outreach efforts and intent were clear and effective. However, cooperative vehicle procurement processes have been designed to be very detailed and often lack flexibility to add new alternative fuel options on the Metro Bid.

---

**Alternative Fuel Options:**

- **Alternative Fuel Package:** State Fuel Option and Base Price each Net
- **Alternative Fuel Option:** Circle Applicable - (CNG, LPG, P/H/EV, E85, B29)
- **Alternative Fuel Operation:** Circle Applicable - (State Dedicated, Bi-Fuel or Flex Fuel)

- Gas Gallon Equivalent (State how much fuel on board)
- GGE Gas Gallon Equivalent – Option 1 State Tank Size
- GGE-Gas Gallon Equivalent – Option 2 State Tank Size
- State manufacturer and model of conversion system
- State Current or Pending EPA or CARB Certification No.
- OEM Support (offeror has QVM of SVM status or equivalent; state yes or no)
- Drop ship code (if applicable)

*Figure 1: Alternative Fuel Options box inserted into each item for bid.*
elements to the bids. It was difficult to develop a single, consistent section within the various bid documents that described the AFV options and the best means to present pricing considerations. Consequently, the bids received from the dealerships were not always clear on the AFV engine, tank volume and/or pricing details.

**Lessons learned:** The existing process proved to be an advantage in the end, since the F4F pilot project did not have to start from scratch. It also enabled fleets to avoid the added time and duplication of effort involved when using multiple bid processes.

The need for general education and outreach education remains paramount, as fleet managers and dealerships have varying degrees of knowledge about alternative fuels, depending on whether they had any previous experience purchasing AFVs.

Given the lack of specificity in many responses to the AFV option, F4F team staff is still working through a more effective way to represent AFV in the bid spec. While improvements are desirable, the language used for the pilot proved serviceable.

**Section 2: Identification of benefits**

Cooperative procurement programs have documented the cost savings that result from aggregating the purchases of participating agencies to maximize the collective’s buying power. For the purposes of this evaluation, accepted metrics will be used, where applicable, to represent the cost savings.

A. Research and integration of AFV options into the bid process — Four F4F technical partners were involved in the three-month process of enhancing the MACPP metro vehicle bid process. The true value of this research and the integration is difficult to measure, but should be considered to have long-term impact. From this working document, additional alternative fuel products can be added with minimal effort and should require significantly less time to integrate.

B. Reduced transaction and administrative costs — Kansas City Regional Purchasing Cooperative (KCRPC) has developed a metric on the administrative cost savings when public agencies participate in a cooperative procurement process. It values the costs associated with:

i. Conducting an independent source solicitation.  
ii. Workload demands.  
iii. Time savings in RFP solicitation.

The cost savings values are captured into three categories, depending on the size and staff resources available by the purchasing jurisdictions. The large jurisdictions with centralized purchasing save $5,000 per solicitation; mid-size organizations $2,500; and smaller jurisdictions $1,250. These values have been verified by participating fleets, who estimate that the bid process, including evaluation of the responses, can take a couple of days, even for those who are familiar with the process.

The table in Appendix C details the number of jurisdictions that have participated in the MACPP vehicle bid contracts in 2017, the number of vehicles purchased by each jurisdiction, estimated number of RFPs that would have been issued without the cooperative procurement option, and the total administrative cost savings — 29 public agencies, purchased 445 vehicles (including 60 AFV), saving $158,750 in administrative costs. Note: Appendix C data was received from five of the largest vendors and was validated through interviews with individual fleet managers. This represents most of the vehicle
purchases, but not all. The smaller dealerships did not keep records of 2017 sales or felt that the time to gather the information was not productive.

C. Projected vehicle unit price — Vehicle unit savings over Manufacturers Suggested Retail Price (MSRP). The MACPP metro vehicle bid process does not require that the participating dealerships quote the percentage discount compared to the MSRP. Based on history, cooperative procurement has been shown to generate an average discount of 10 to 15 percent off MSRP, although this amount can vary. During the ARRA funding period, for example, volume-induced cost savings were observed as high as 40 percent.

D. Total cost of ownership analysis — Cost savings can be achieved if the AFV purchase could be quantified through the “total cost of ownership” lens. However, most public-sector agencies do not consider total cost of ownership when considering the cost saving potential of the AFV purchase. The major challenge is organizational barriers — the separation of the operating and capital budgets. By separating the budgets, fleets are forced to consider only the purchase price when justifying the purchase under the capital budget; the cumulative fuel and maintenance expenses are paid out of the operating budget, and not considered at the time of purchase. As a result, fleets often do not procure the vehicle types that will lead to the lowest total cost of ownership and highest net value to the fleet. The concept of analyzing the total cost of ownership should be introduced as a part of the metro vehicle bid process’ education and outreach efforts and stressed throughout the duration of the contracts.

Based on dealership reports and follow-up interviews, it is estimated that over $150,000 in administrative costs were saved as the result of 29 agencies purchasing 445 vehicles.

It is estimated that 13.5 percent of the total vehicles purchased were AFVs, representing Flex Fuel E-85, Hybrid EVs and Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) vehicles.

Vehicle Fuel Type

- Conventional Fuels
- Alternative Fuels

13.5%

“Based on dealership reports and follow-up interviews, it is estimated that over $150,000 in administrative costs were saved as the result of 29 agencies purchasing 445 vehicles.

It is estimated that 13.5 percent of the total vehicles purchased were AFVs, representing Flex Fuel E-85, Hybrid EVs and Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) vehicles.

It is our GO-TO contract. We get groovy prices on it. Award winning.

Sam Swearngin, Former Fleet Manager, city of Kansas City, Missouri
Success: The cost savings derived from purchasing vehicles through a cooperative procurement program is noteworthy. The most significant savings can be shown through the reduction of transaction and administrative costs and the savings extended by volume pricing. Plus, fleet managers are motivated by the simplicity of the process, as well as the ability to deal with local vendors.

Barriers: Most public-sector agencies do not consider the total cost of ownership when considering the cost saving potential of an AFV purchase. Consequently, they do not include cost savings from lowered fuel and maintenance costs, which can justify higher upfront costs of AFVs.

Lessons learned: Although AFV upfront purchase costs remain higher than conventional gasoline and diesel vehicles, savings may be achieved when offered within a cooperative procurement program and justified through a total cost of ownership analysis.

It’s simpler on my end... I know I’m dealing with local vendors.

Merle McCullough, Fleet Manager, Wyandotte County
Section 3: Critical enhancements for future cooperative procurement processes

Vehicle bid documents are historically cumbersome, with many pages of paperwork to complete to finalize the bid proposal. The cooperative procurement process can be greatly enhanced by implementing flexibility and simplification to the bid documents and processes. A possible enhancement could be to design a streamlined document or an introductory dashboard that provides a summary of the vehicle, its available options, and pricing, with the option to attach more detailed information only if relevant and desired.

Promotion of AFV technology options also needs to be enhanced through early, ongoing and continuous outreach that targets both the dealership representatives and the fleet and procurement managers. To be most effective, the outreach needs a succinct message that presents the benefits of AFVs and total cost of ownership.

Success: Through dealership and fleet interviews, the F4F project team confirmed that the 2016 MACPP vehicle bid is an attractive option because of its simplicity, which should not be underestimated. Further streamlining can only enhance the appeal of this process.

Barriers: Outreach messaging is scattered and does not effectively target both dealerships and fleet and procurement managers. Consequently, attempts to reach the target audience have had varied levels of success.

Also, fleets indicated an issue with using the MACPP vehicle bid in conjunction with federal grants.

Specifically, MO DOT and K-DOT, who operate the CMAQ grants, require a new bid for all grant projects. The new bid requirement means purchases already negotiated through the MACPP vehicle bid are ineligible for grant funding. To be eligible, the purchases must be made through a new bid (Metro Bid or otherwise), negating much of the time-saving benefits the Metro Bid offers.

Lessons learned: The cooperative procurement vehicle bid process should not be considered a time limited process, but rather an ongoing effort: continually integrating new technology into the bid process and disseminating standardized educational information on the benefits of the AFV technology and the options available within the vendor awards. The issues with CMAQ funding illustrate the need to inform a broader audience about the MACPP vehicle bid process — not just fleets and dealerships, but grant funders and grant managers as well.

The only problem that we had was a timing issue with the grants...

Sam Swearngin, Former Fleet Manager, city of Kansas City, Missouri

The only problem that we had was a timing issue with the grants...
Section 4: Pilot project findings/recommendations

The Kansas City regional pilot project has identified the following findings:

1. It is not only feasible, but preferable, to have alternative fuel vehicles options included and fully integrated in future cooperative procurement process.
2. Although AFV options vary greatly, the base vehicle package has a high potential for value-added pricing available through cooperative procurement.
3. Ongoing education and outreach efforts — communicating the technology’s benefits and considerations — is an essential component of the cooperative procurement process if alternative fuel vehicle options are to be successful. Outreach should include education to area dealerships on the MACPP vehicle bid process. This should be accomplished prior to the pre-bid, as well as throughout the entire contractual period. It is recommended that integrating this outreach into the Clean Cities optional supplemental activities, so the F4F effort can continue with minimal funding.
4. A simplified summary of AFV options would enhance the current bid documents to more easily relay the technology and its benefits, encouraging more AFV purchases.
5. There is a potential for significant growth in the AFVs market. The technology is becoming more accepted as a beneficial solution to save energy and eliminate greenhouse gas emissions. Further cost reductions should also make AFV options increasingly feasible for public agencies.

Conclusion

The Metropolitan Kansas City Regional Cooperative Procurement AFV Pilot Program succeeded on multiple levels and has established alternative fuel vehicles as viable options for fleet purchases in the future. Key elements of success include:

- The involvement of the Fleets for the Future team provided significant value to the metro Kansas City vehicle bid process.
- The project team successfully integrated AFV options into an established metro vehicle bid process, which should be sustainable through subsequent bid processes.
- Final bid proposals included multiple AFV options on 35 of the 44 vehicles models. All in all, 13 dealerships secured contracts with Johnson County, Kansas, in all eight classes of vehicles.
- The project achieved higher visibility for AFV options to public jurisdictions — fleet managers, procurement staff, etc.
- The project achieved higher levels of awareness and AFV knowledge on the part of fleet managers, as well as dealership sales and service staff.
CONSUMER EV GROUP PURCHASE PROGRAM

Background

In the last several years, several communities and organizations have hosted electric vehicle (EV) group purchase programs that provide a limited-time opportunity for target audiences to get discounts on purchasing an electric vehicle. These programs are modeled after successful solar power group procurement programs, which dozens of communities have adopted since the first program was pioneered in Portland, Oregon, in 2010. In 2015, three EV group purchase programs piloted in Colorado and Utah: one in the Fort Collins/Loveland area, led by Drive Electric Northern Colorado; one in the Salt Lake City area, led by the University of Utah in partnership with Utah Clean Energy; and a joint solar and EV program in the Boulder/Denver area, led by Boulder County. In 2016, the number of these EV group purchase programs has more than doubled in communities across the country.

These programs were remarkably successful. In each case, the programs have led to dramatic increases in EV sales — up to 300 percent community wide. These programs are advantageous because the private sector provides the financial incentives, so the cost to sponsoring agencies that administer the programs is very low.

Electric vehicles can bring many benefits to the community. Because EVs have no tailpipe emissions, they can greatly improve air quality and public health — EV adoption is important in reducing greenhouse gas emissions from transportation. In addition, EVs bring some real economic advantages to the community. Even with gas costing $2.50 per gallon, EVs are cheaper to operate, with $500 or more in annual fuel savings — money that consumers will likely recycle into purchases in the community. In addition, there are federal tax credits for EVs, which can add up to $7,500 in savings.

While electric vehicles offer many benefits to both the community and individual consumers, they are still an unfamiliar technology to many people. A group purchase program serves as a very effective tool to help communities’ residents understand that EVs available today are affordable, comfortable and able to meet consumers’ needs for many types of trips. Sponsoring a group purchase program is one of the most effective methods for spurring the local EV markets.

The key elements of the EV group purchase program model includes:

- Establishing discounted prices on available electric vehicles.
- Setting a limited-time offer — a discrete time limit motivates customers to act immediately, while the deal is still in place.
- Executing a strong outreach and education campaign — broadcasting an affordable purchase price along with stating the value of EVs.

Approach

The EV group purchase programs that were hosted in the greater Kansas City region in 2016–2017 had two target audiences: Round 1) residents in Kansas City, Missouri; and Round 2) the University of Missouri – Kansas City affiliated individuals — faculty, staff, students and alumni. Round 1 was originally designed to be a limited six-week campaign but was further expanded to include the KCP&L service territory with a time extension of a total of six months — through June 2017. Round 2 was announced in April 2017 and the offer was valid through June 2017.
Partners

The Kansas City-based F4F partners, Metropolitan Energy Center (MEC) and the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) were the lead partners in the EV group purchase programs hosted in the metropolitan region. Other partners included Nissan North America, Kansas City Power & Light and the University of Missouri – Kansas City.

Nissan North America (Nissan NA): Nissan’s North American operations include automotive styling, engineering, consumer and corporate financing, sales and marketing, distribution and manufacturing for the United States, Canada and Mexico. Nissan LEAF was first introduced in Japan and North America and expanded to Europe and other markets globally. In 2014, Nissan expanded its leadership in zero-emission mobility into the LCV segment with the launch of the e-NV200, the company’s second all-electric vehicle, in the European and Japanese markets. In 2015, the minor-changed Nissan LEAF went on sale equipped with a new battery that extended the miles per charge by more than 20 percent.

The Nissan LEAF is not only a zero-emission car but also an EV with unprecedented quietness, acceleration and handling. Since its launch, this electric vehicle has been introduced in more than 49 markets to date and is maintaining its position as the best-selling EV in the world, reaching cumulative sales of more than 283,000 as of August 2017.

Kansas City Power & Light (KCP&L) is the largest investor-owned electric utility in the greater Kansas City region. KCP&L serves more than 800,000 customers in 47 northwest Missouri and eastern Kansas counties. With a service area of about 18,000 square miles, it takes more than 3,000 miles of transmission lines, 24,000 miles of distribution lines and over 400 substations to deliver power to all of its customers.

The KCP&L Clean Charge Network is one of the nation’s largest car-charging networks, with about 1,000 public charging stations.

University of Missouri – Kansas City (UMKC) is a four-year post-secondary educational institution, a part of the University of Missouri system. It has more than 50 majors or programs and over 125 academic programs. UMKC also has a very active Sustainability Team that provides the framework for environmental stewardship, natural resource conservation, emissions reductions and sustainability on the UMKC campus. The team acts as a resource to support and promote the university’s environmental commitments and policies. The total target audience of UMKC affiliated individuals — faculty, staff, students and alumni is estimated at 80,000.

KC pilot EV group purchase programs

Round 1: KCMO group buy (later extended by KCP&L)

- Secure a “fleetail” partner in Kansas City, Missouri (KCMO).
- Work with Nissan NA and KCP&L to develop and conduct a marketing campaign, including hosting a web page, outreach messages, program flyers, and ride and drive events.
- Monitor progress and capture lessons learned for the UMKC group buy.

Round 2: UMKC group buy

- Secure OEM and dealership participation.
- Launch a marketing campaign involving: web page, social media, channel marketing through community groups, traditional media release (earned media), online advertising and radio advertising.
The two rounds of the F4F-sponsored consumer EV group purchase programs featuring the Nissan LEAF resulted in an 87 percent increase in year-over-year sales in the Kansas City market during the group buy program. The consumer savings was $10,000 per vehicle before applying the federal tax rebate. Nissan NA sales reported that the vehicle inventory in the Kansas City market was depleted by the end of June 2017.

Methodology

This evaluation is taking place one year after the conclusion of the two group purchase programs. It will detail the activities of each program, steps taken to accomplish program objectives, outcomes, and lessons learned. This evaluation was conducted through both qualitative and quantitative means. The project team reviewed sales reports from Nissan NA, analytics from hosted web pages, and further analysis from project team.

Key Components of Evaluation

This evaluation includes three key sections:

1. Recognition of the value of the F4F involvement.
2. Identification of benefits.
   a. Advantageous vehicle unit pricing.
   a. Increased EV purchases in the Kansas City region.
3. Project findings/recommendations.

Section 1: Recognition of the value of F4F involvement

In the fall of 2016, MEC was approached by Nissan North America to host an EV group buy promotional campaign in the Kansas City market, leveraging a deep $10,000 manufacturer’s discount by Nissan and a major installation of charging stations by the area's largest investor-owned utility, KCP&L. Having been briefed on similar public discount events in Utah and Colorado, the project team determined the group buy project would further enhance the F4F Kansas City pilot program, and could be used as a test case for the UMKC program being planned for spring of 2017.

A “fleetail” partner was secured with the Kansas City Missouri fleet — a fleet partnership being necessary to bring a fleet discount to the retail market in a given area. A marketing campaign to promote the KCMO group buy program was launched, leveraging MEC’s Clean Cities and KCP&L’s Clean Charge Network stakeholder group. The campaign consisted of social media outreach, channel marketing through community groups, earned media, and ride and drive events. KCP&L also promoted the event through strategic online advertisements on car purchasing websites.

The KCMO group buy program was handed off to KCP&L during several extension periods, each bringing changes to the terms as Nissan refined its fleetail offering. F4F project team continued its outreach activities.

Encouraged by this success, the F4F team initiated Round 2: UMKC group buy program in the spring of 2017. Planning activities began in February, anticipating an April program. For the Round 2 program, a multi-OEM Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued to area dealerships, including those participating in the MACPP vehicle bid. Despite phone calls to dealer representatives preparing them to understand the RFP, dealership response was lukewarm, even from those who
participated in the KCMO group buy program. Through subsequent negotiations with several OEMs, the project team arrived at a discount price with one company (Nissan NA) that became available to all its dealerships in the KC market.

Throughout this planning process, the F4F team was surprised by continued extensions of the KCP&L program and considered the possibility of market saturation. However, it was determined that the UMKC population represented a different demographic, and that even if purchases were modest, the marketing materials would generate a double benefit with public education.

The F4F project team and the University’s communications staff planned a coordinated marketing campaign, consisting of a web pages, social media outreach, channel marketing through community groups, earned media, online advertising, radio advertising, and public lecture events on EVs. Examples of project communications can be found in Appendix D.

**Success:** Six area Nissan dealerships participated in Round 1. Due to the success of the initial period, the program was extended until March 31, 2017, and again until June 30. During each quarter, F4F group buy programs, the Kansas City region was ranked the fastest-growing EV market.

**Barriers:** The dealership response to the formal RFP was minimal (even given F4F engagement with each target dealership to identify the appropriate contact and gauge interest prior to posting the RFP.) Subsequent negotiations were necessary and a discount price was reached with all Nissan’s dealerships in the KC market.

Additionally, the success of the Round 1 group buy program led to an unexpected hurdle: the market did not have enough Nissan LEAFs to meet local demand. Consequently, at the start of Round 2, only a limited amount of Nissan LEAFs were available for purchase in the local market. This severely hindered the potential for continued success.

**Lessons learned:** The group purchase program model is most successful when presented as a time-limited offer with a robust communications/marketing campaign, accompanied by multiple OEM participation having sufficient inventory available.

The Round 1 group buy campaign was very successful in the winter and early spring, chiefly due to online advertising effort, where ads appeared on online car marketing sites for computer users located in the KC market, as well as electric utility bill inserts across the KCP&L service area. KCP&L’s analysis indicated that the clear majority of sales occurred as links from those online ads. Word of mouth via traditional networks was much less successful. Though generally supportive of EVs and sometimes primarily composed of future EV buyers, purchases were slower from this group. Targeted online ads, which are very affordable by traditional marketing standards, are the most effective way to reach ready buyers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Round 1 group buy</th>
<th>Round 2 group buy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website Views</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Newsletter article</td>
<td>41,451</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>43,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Release</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Email (e-blast)</td>
<td>12,050</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Posts</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7,014</td>
<td>7,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn Posts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>2,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweets</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2,539</td>
<td>2,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital information Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop fliers</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>54,116</td>
<td>14,717</td>
<td>68,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2: Identification of benefits

Like other forms of cooperative procurement, group purchasing programs maximize the collective’s buying power by aggregating the purchases of participating entities to create a volume discount. For the purposes of this evaluation, accepted metrics will be used, where applicable, to represent the cost savings.

“Fleetail discount” — The F4F project team negotiated with Nissan to treat a designated target audience as a nontraditional fleet for a three-month period. Consumers saved $10,000 per vehicle purchased. During Round 2, the same cost savings was offered.

A. Increased use of AFVs in the Kansas City Metro — Round 1 group buy for the Nissan Leaf resulted in an 87 percent increase in year-over-year sales in the Kansas City market for the 2016 fourth quarter. Due to the success of the initial period, the program was extended twice, for an additional six months of program eligibility. Kansas City was considered the fastest-growing EV market for the duration of the program.

Success: The F4F-sponsored group buy program featuring the Nissan LEAF resulted in an 87 percent increase in year-over-year sales in the Kansas City market for the fourth quarter. The consumer savings was $10,000 per vehicle before applying the federal tax rebate.

Barriers: Nissan NA being the only EV manufacturer willing to deeply discount its EVs to the consumer market, combined with having a deep discount already in the local market, made it very difficult to equitably promote multiple EV brands.

Lessons learned: Dealerships will generally not have the ability to offer deep discounts. If dealership partners and/or multiple OEM programs are desired, anticipate a smaller discount. If deeper discounts are desired, negotiate direct with OEMs.

Section 3: Project findings/recommendations

The F4F experience in the group purchase program has yielded the following findings and recommendations:

- A thoughtful marketing plan is needed to penetrate through the information noise to the ready-to-buy market, even with offers of deep discounts.
- A deep discount to the retail-buying public can generate a major jump in EV sales, contributing to increased consumer confidence in the target market and to overall decreases in vehicle emissions in the market.
- Moderate discounts (in the range of $2000 to $4000) should be tested, as these are more achievable by dealerships and may be offered by a range of manufacturers.
- Multiple rounds of group purchase programs back-to-back limits the overall impact of the project.
Conclusion

The F4F project team’s efforts to test the consumer group purchase model succeeded with many lessons learned to pass on to other regions. The EV market growth during the group buy campaign is notable. Key elements of success include:

1. The involvement of the Fleets for the Future team provided significant value.
2. The project team successfully executed the consumer group purchase program model with the assistance of key partners.
3. A thoughtful marketing plan is needed to reach the ready-to-buy market.
4. The EV group buy campaigns achieved higher levels of public awareness and EV knowledge.

IMPACT OF KC PILOT PROJECT

The impact of the Kansas City pilot project can be illustrated by reflecting on the introductory statement of this evaluation document.

The F4F initiative’s goal was to work toward achievement of economies of scale for alternative fuel vehicles (AFVs) through aggregated procurement initiatives. F4F strives to accomplish these economies of scale through a coordinated strategy designed to increase knowledge, lower the transaction costs of procurement, achieve better pricing, and address potential challenges arising from large-scale procurement initiatives, thereby increasing the deployment of alternative fuel vehicles in public and private sector fleets.

The Kansas City pilot program was able to demonstrate the F4F’s goal through its regional-based pilot programs — the metropolitan vehicle bid and the group purchase program. The end results showcased successful integration of AFV options in an already established vehicle bid process; documented cost savings through administrative and transactional procurement efficiencies; increased knowledge of AFV technologies and benefits; discounted pricing to local governments and regional consumers; and, ultimately, increased AFV deployment.

The Kansas City pilot project was launched early in the Fleets for the Future initiative — within the first six months of the two-year grant period. The KC project assisted the national team in providing several possible procurement aggregation options for the other participating regions to consider. The strategies deployed, the materials developed, partnerships formed, and lessons learned have greatly informed the F4F program and has served as a strong foundation for the overall success of the initiative.
Evaluation Report
APPENDIX

Appendix A: Seven-step Strategic Procurement Process Framework ..........23
Appendix B: Metro vehicle bid AFV buyers’ guide and cheat sheet ............24
Appendix C: MACPP 2017 Purchases by Participating Agencies................29
Appendix D: Materials developed for Group-buy programs. ..................31
## 7-Step Strategic Procurement Process

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research/Engagement**
- Research participant values and constraints. Explore needs and use-cases.
- Seek input, and establish shared goals.
- Determine products, specifications, definitions, scope of services.
- Find opportunities for common specifications that enable wider participation.
- Prioritize vehicles for replacement.

**Requirement Identification**
- Research product availability & reliability.
- Determine operational and infrastructure requirements for AFV deployment.
- Confirm product availability, supplier / vendor capacity to deliver.

**Market Analysis**
- Develop Request for Proposal (RFP) elements.
- Give suppliers notice, issue bid, and advertise widely.
- Issue clarifications, evaluate proposals, and negotiate.

**Bid Execution**
- Approve award, execute master agreements.
- Conduct outreach to potential buyers with promotional campaign.

**Award and Contract**
- Short-term: Evaluate process effectiveness.
- Mid-term: Measure contract usage.
- Long-term: Measure utilization and benefits.

**Contract Promotions**
- Evaluation
Quick Start Guide
For Alternative Fuel Vehicle Purchasing

1. Review the table, “Full Vehicle List – Alternative Fuel Options by Type”
2. Select the vehicle item number based on required specifications and determine the availability of the fuels for that vehicle.
3. Identify the proper Alternative Fuel Table on the subsequent two pages and select the vehicle item number corresponding to the “Full Vehicle List” in step one. Dealerships who submitted bids for that AFV vehicle are listed.
4. Finally, turn to the last page and review the terms and conditions associated with the dealerships that can supply the vehicle of interest.
5. Review the submittal(s) and communicate with the dealer(s) to custom specify the vehicle based upon needs: http://www.jocogov.org/macpp-vehicle-metro-bid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>E85</th>
<th>CNG</th>
<th>LPG</th>
<th>B20</th>
<th>HEV</th>
<th>PHEV</th>
<th>All Electric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item No. 1 - Type: FULL-SIZE VAN CUTAWAY CAB &amp; CHASSIS - Make Equal To E-Series, G-Series, Freightliner, Mercedes, Ram Promaster.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Item No. 2 - Type: 1-TON CAB &amp; CHASSIS - Make Equal To C1500, F350, Ram 3500</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Item No. 3 - Type: 15,000 GVWR CAB &amp; CHASSIS - State Make &amp; Model</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Item No. 4 - Type: 17,500 GVWR CAB &amp; CHASSIS - State Make and Model.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Item No. 5 - Type: 21,000 GVWR CAB &amp; CHASSIS - State Make and Model.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Item No. 6 - Type: 25,000 GVWR CAB &amp; CHASSIS - State make and Model.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Item No. 7 - Type: 34,000 GVWR CAB &amp; CHASSIS - State make and Model.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Item No. 8 - Type: 56,000 GVWR CAB &amp; CHASSIS - State Make and Model.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Item No. 9 - Type: 66,000 GVWR CAB &amp; CHASSIS - State Make and Model.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Item No. 10 - Type: SUBCOMPACT SEDAN - Civic, Versa, Fiesta, or equal</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Item No. 11 Type: COMPACT SEDAN - Focus, Cruz, Dart, Corolla or equal.</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Item No. 12 Type: MID-SIZE SEDAN, FRONT WHEEL DRIVE - Malibu, Fusion, Avenger or equal</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Item No. 13 Type: FULL-SIZE SEDAN - Taurus, Impala or equal.</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Item No. 14 Type: FULL-SIZE SEDAN - GAS WHEEL DRIVE - Charger or equal</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Item No. 15 Type: SUB-COMPACT UTILITY VEHICLE 4X4 - Escape, Cherokee, Equinox</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Item No. 16 Type: COMPACT UTILITY VEHICLE 4X4 - Model Equal To Grand Cherokee, Explorer, Durango.</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Item No. 17 - Type: FULL SIZE UTILITY VEHICLE 4X4 - Tahoe, Yukon, Expedition or equal</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Item No. 18 - Type: LARGE SIZE UTILITY VEHICLE 4X4 - Suburban, Yukon XL, Expedition XL or equal-base door</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Item No. 19 Type: COMPACT PICKUP, Cab &quot;A&quot;, 4x2, Frontier, Tacoma or equal.</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Item No. 20 - Type: MID-SIZE PICKUP, 4X2, Cab &quot;A&quot; - Make Equal To Colorado, Canyon or equal</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Item No. 21 - Type: PICKUP, 1/2 TON, Cab &quot;A&quot;, 4X2 - Make Equal To C1500, F-150, Ram 1500, Tundra</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Item No. 22 - Type: PICKUP, 3/4-TON, Cab &quot;A&quot;, 4X2 - Make Equal To C2500, F-250, Ram 2500.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Item No. 23 - Type: 1-TON PICKUP, CAB &quot;A&quot;, 4X2 - State make &amp; model C5000, F-350, Ram 3500 or equal</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Item No. 24 - Type: MINI-VAN - PASSENGER - Make Equal To Grand Caravan, Odyssey, Transit Connect.</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Item No. 25 - Type: MINI-VAN - CARGO VAN - Make Equal To Ram CV, Transit Connect, City Express.</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Item No. 26 - Type: VAN, CARGO, FULL SIZE, 3/4 TON. - Make Equal To G20, G-20, G-350, B-3500.</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Item No. 27 - Type: FULL SIZE CARGO VAN, 1-TON. - Make Equal To G-20, F-20, F-35, F-350,</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Item No. 28 - Type: FULL SIZE WINDOW PASSENGER VAN - Make Equal To G-20, F-20, F-35, F-350,</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Item No. 29 - Type: VANS, CARGO, SPRINTER - Make Equal To Freightliner or Mercedes or equal</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Item No. 30 Type: Chevrolet Caprice Police Patrol Vehicle</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Item No. 31 - Type: Chevrolet Impala Police Patrol Pursuit Sedan - Chevrolet Impala Police Pursuit Sedan - (No bids were given)</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Item No. 32 - Type: Chevrolet Tahoe Police Pursuit Vehicle - Chevrolet Tahoe Police Pursuit Vehicle</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Item No. 33 - Type: Dodge Charger Police Patrol Vehicle - Dodge Charger Police Patrol Vehicle</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Item No. 34 - Type: Ford Police Interceptor - Sedan - Ford Police Interceptor - Sedan.</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Item No. 36 - Type: DODGE DURANGO SPECIAL SERVICES UTILITY VEHICLE - Dodge Durango Special Services Utility Vehicle</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Item No. 37 - Type: FORD EXPEDITION SPECIAL SERVICES UTILITY VEHICLE</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Item No. 38 - Type: CHEVROLET TAHOE SPECIAL SERVICES UTILITY VEHICLE</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Item No. 39 - Type: FORD F-150 SPECIAL SERVICES 1/2-TON PICKUP</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Item No. 40 - Type: DODGE RAM SPECIAL SERVICES 1/2-TON PICKUP</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Item No. 41 - Type: HYBRID SUBCOMPACT SEDAN - Civic, Insight, Prius, C-MAX, or equal</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Item No. 42 - Type: HYBRID COMPACT SEDAN. - Fusion, Volt, or equal.</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Item No. 43 - Type: HYBRID MIDSIZE SEDAN - Make Equal To: Malibu or equal</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Item No. 44 - Type: ALL ELECTRIC SEDAN. - Quote base model and attach the factory specs. to your submittal.</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FLEX FUEL VEHICLES - E85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEALERSHIP</th>
<th>VEHICLE ITEM NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park Jeep Dodge Chrysler Ram</td>
<td>1 11 13 14 15 16 17 18 21 22 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Dodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Fusz Ford</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Smith Ford, Inc.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Chevrolet Buick</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee Mission Ford</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Ford</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FLEX FUEL VEHICLES - E85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEALERSHIP</th>
<th>VEHICLE ITEM NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park Jeep Dodge Chrysler Ram</td>
<td>24 26 27 28 30 32 34 35 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Dodge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Fusz Ford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Smith Ford, Inc.</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Chevrolet Buick</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee Mission Ford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Ford</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEHICLE ITEM NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Duty Trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEALERSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Toyota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCR International Trucks, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Smith Ford, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Chevrolet Buick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee Mission Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Ford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEALERSHIP</th>
<th>VEHICLE ITEM NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victory Ford &amp; Victory Dodge</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Fusz Ford</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Ford Truck Center</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHC-Kenworth-Olathe</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Smith Ford, Inc.</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Freightliner Sales Inc.</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee Mission Ford</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Ford</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEALERSHIP</th>
<th>VEHICLE ITEM NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dick Smith Ford, Inc.</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee Mission Ford</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Ford</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Dealer Attributes and Delivery Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute Name</th>
<th>ECR International Trucks, Inc.</th>
<th>Dick Smith Ford, Inc.</th>
<th>Kansas City Freightliner Sales Inc</th>
<th>HUDIBURG FLEET SERVICES</th>
<th>Roberts Chevrolet Buick</th>
<th>Shawnee Mission Ford</th>
<th>Delaite Ford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invoice Discount Terms</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing Card</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery outside of a 25-mile radius from dealership.</td>
<td>No Charge</td>
<td>$25 Plus $80 per mile</td>
<td>NO CHARGES</td>
<td>DELIVERY FEES HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE PRICE OF EACH VEHICLE ALREADY</td>
<td>$1.00 per mile one way. No charge area is fairly wide. 50 miles FOB Platte City is our normal No Charge area.</td>
<td>no charge</td>
<td>$1 per mile after 25 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEASE/PURCHASE AGREEMENTS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight Leasing Offered</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasing with $1.00 Buy Out.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Fuel Tax Credits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer Standard Retail Pricing (MSRP)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MACPP 2017 Purchases by Participating Agencies *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Number of Autos Purchased in 2017/estimated # AFVs</th>
<th>Estimated number of RFP eliminated</th>
<th>Cost savings per RFP</th>
<th>Total Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Kansas City, Missouri</td>
<td>175/40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County, Kansas</td>
<td>31/8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Government</td>
<td>50/2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson County, Missouri</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County, Kansas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lee’s Summit, Missouri</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Independence, Missouri</td>
<td>30/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water One</td>
<td>8/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Joseph, Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Olathe, Kansas</td>
<td>26/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Overland Park, Kansas</td>
<td>40/2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Leawood, Kansas</td>
<td>13/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of North Kansas City, Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Prairie Village</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Grain Valley, Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Shawnee, Kansas</td>
<td>12/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lenexa, Kansas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edgerton, Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Merriam, Kansas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Number of Autos Purchased in 2017/estimated # AFVs</td>
<td>Estimated number of RFP eliminated</td>
<td>Cost savings per RFP</td>
<td>Total Savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mission, Kansas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Roeland Park, Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gardner, Kansas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Grandview, Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Neodesha, Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Hills EMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robeson County, Missouri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Valley Rec District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gladstone, Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>445/60</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data represented in table collected from five of the major dealerships participating in the 2017 MACPP metro vehicle bid. Note: Not all dealerships keep records of purchases.
Partnership:
This UMKC EV Group Purchase Program is a partnership between the Curators of the University of Missouri on behalf of University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC), Mid-America Regional Council (MARC), the Metropolitan Energy Center (MEC) and its Clean Cities Coalition.

Background:
Recently, a number of communities/organizations have piloted electric vehicle (EV) group purchase programs that provide a limited-time opportunity for target audiences to get discounts on purchasing an electric vehicle. These programs are modeled after successful solar power group purchase programs, which dozens of communities have adopted since the first program was pioneered in Portland, Oregon, in 2010. In 2015, three EV group purchase programs piloted in Colorado and Utah: one in the Fort Collins/Loveland area, led by Drive Electric Northern Colorado; one in the Salt Lake City area, led by the University of Utah in partnership with Utah Clean Energy; and a joint solar and EV program in the Boulder/Denver area, led by Boulder County. In 2016, the number of these EV group purchase programs has more than doubled in communities across the country.

These programs have been remarkably successful. In each case, the programs have led to dramatic increases in EV sales – up to 300 percent community wide. These programs are advantageous because the private sector provides the financial incentives, so the cost to sponsoring agencies that administer the programs is very low.

While Electric Vehicles offer many benefits to both the community and individual consumers, they are still an unfamiliar technology to many people. A group purchase program can serve as a very effective tool to help our target audience to understand that EVs available today are affordable, comfortable, and able to meet consumers’ needs for many types of trips. Hosting a group purchase program may be one of the most effective methods for spurring our local EV markets.

This implementation guide is designed to identify the basic steps necessary to create a successful group purchase program.

Why EVs:
EVs can bring many benefits to the greater Kansas City region. Because EVs have no tailpipe emissions, they can greatly improve air quality and public health – EV adoption is important in reducing GHG emissions from transportation. In addition, EVs bring some real economic advantages to our region. Even with gas costing less than $2 per gallon, EVs are cheaper to operate, with $500 or more in annual fuel savings – money that consumers will likely recycle into purchases in our community. In addition, there are federal tax credits for EVs, which can add up to $7,500 in savings. Increased EV sales mean
that more of these tax credits will come to our target audience – once again, dollars that consumers are likely to spend in the Kansas City economy.

**Key elements of a group purchase program:**
The basic idea behind an EV group purchase program is that the group partners negotiate a discounted price from one or more EV dealers or car companies. This deal is then available for a limited time to members of the UMKC target group – staff, faculty, students and alumni. The partners then lead an outreach and education campaign that publicizes the discount offer.

The key elements of the UMKC EV group purchase program will include the following:

*Discounted prices on EVs*
MARC will conduct a competitive bid process to get the best possible prices on buying or leasing selected multiple brand models of EVs. The selected car dealers and manufacturers then provide discounts for program participants.

*Limited-time offer*
Having a discrete time limit motivates customers to act now while the deal is still in place. A 4 to 6 weeks’ time period (April-May 15, 2017) has been chosen to coincide with 2017 Earth month. This is particularly important in the EV marketplace, where some potential buyers have a tendency to wait for newer technology to come out. The limited-time offer helps spur them to act now, helping achieve market transformation.

*Outreach and education*
Broadcasting an affordable deal from a group purchase program can move many people to action. The full partnership of UMKC, MARC and MEC will join forces to promote the group purchase program and the value of EVs.

**150-day Planning and Implementation Steps**

*Determine partners’ roles and responsibilities and target audience –*

**University of Missouri – Kansas City (UMKC) –**
1. Host EV Group Purchase Program on UMKC campus;
2. Provide access to target audience for EV Group Purchase program – UMKC staff, faculty, students, and alumni;
3. Serve on planning committee providing input on the development of all aspects of the EV Group Purchase Program;
4. Provide a spokesperson – on-campus contact person to provide updated program information and answer FAQs;
5. Recruit volunteers to assist in ongoing promotions and staffing of on-campus events;
6. Provide online and social media coverage of program;
7. Implement communications strategy through University-sponsored channels
8. Host “Ride and Drive” event for potential owners;
9. Assist in data gathering and other elements of the program evaluation; and
10. UMKC’s participation in this program shall not constitute a guarantee of the sale of any EV or endorsement of any brand of EV.

**Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) –**
1. Serve as administrative lead of the EV Group Procurement Program
2. Serve on planning committee providing facilitation, administrative and other programmatic input on the EV Group Procurement Program
3. Provide a contact person to provide updated program information and answer FAQs;
4. Lead the development, issuance and review of RFP process to secure participation of EV dealerships and manufacturers;
5. Provide data collection web portal, with additional online and social media coverage of program;
6. Lead the development of the program’s communications strategy by creating promotional materials to be distributed by UMKC, as well as issue needed media releases;
7. Assist in the planning of any in-person events; and
8. Lead in the evaluation of program.

**Metropolitan Energy Center (MEC) -**
1. Serve on planning committee providing facilitation, administrative and other programmatic input on the EV Group Procurement Program
3. Provide a contact person to provide updated program information and answer FAQs;
4. Assist in the development, issuance and review of RFP process to secure participation of EV dealerships and manufacturers;
5. Provide online and social media coverage of program;
6. Assist in the implementation of the program’s communications strategy;
7. Assist in the planning of any in-person events; and
8. Participate in the program evaluation.

*Seek additional partners that may enhance program –*

The three main partners are encouraged to promote the planning of the EV Group Purchase program and recruit additional partners, e.g., City of Kansas City, Missouri; KCP&L.

*Create program branding for campaign and outreach / education strategies –*

MARC’s public affairs staff together with UMKC’s Communications staff develop the branding and other promotional materials that will be used in the program communications outreach activities.

*Establish webpages and presence on social media outlets to promote program –*

The EV Group Purchase Program should have one main webpage, where all information is listed. Each partner can create additional webpages that would provide the link to the main site. All partners should be generating online stories that would promote the programs. Items to be included on main site are: key elements of the program; centralized sign-up portal; fact sheets; savings calculator; list of participating dealerships and locations – main contacts; FAQ, etc.

*Explore all possible financing options - ownership and/or lease –*

There may be opportunities to include financial institutions is the program if the manufacturers/dealerships do not have the ability to offer leasing options.

*Develop, finalize, issue Request for Proposals (RFP) document and review submitted proposals –*

There are handbooks, toolkits and other examples of RFPs that can be used to develop the final RFP for the UMKC EV Group Purchase Program. The RFP will need to be drafted and sent through a path-of-review to make sure all partner organizations approve the scope of the RFP. Ideally, the RFP should be issued early in the month of January in order to have participants identified and discounts secured by
mid- to late-February 2017. Early on in the RFP development process, the possible dealerships/OEM that may have interest in participating should be identified. The RFP should have a submission deadline that accommodates the above proposed schedule. Planning committee will evaluate proposals and determine participants with secured discounts.

Launch outreach / education campaign

April 1, 2017 is the target start date of the UMKC EV Group Purchase Program. The program partners will issue news releases, targeted communications, and provide a schedule of promotions on campus.

Launch EV Group Purchase Program (April 1 – May 15, 2017)

The program period, 6 weeks in this case, should run concurrently with outreach and education. UMKC should implement the program kick-off plan with a news release and a high-profile campus event. Ideally, we should have a centralized “sign-up” site online, and interested consumers enter their data directly into a database. The online sign-up process should generate an auto-reply email, alerting the customer of the dealerships closest to them, address and possible contact person.

Throughout the sign-up period, the outreach campaign should drive people to the website through the various communications avenue, i.e., sending emails, posting fliers on public message boards and social media outlets, or submitting articles to the news media.

Celebrate, reflect and evaluate

It will be important to acknowledge the hard work of everyone who supported the EV group purchase program and celebrate the effort. UMKC or the dealerships and/or manufacturers may be willing to sponsor a public celebration. Equally important is reflection and evaluation. The program partners will convene after the conclusion of the program timeline to debrief and review data gathered during the event. Sponsorship of the public celebration shall be the subject of a separate agreement among the sponsoring parties.
Request for Proposal from Electric Vehicle Manufacturers and Dealers for EV Group Purchase Program

GEORGIA NESSELRODE
MID-AMERICA REGIONAL COUNCIL
600 Broadway, Suite 200, Kansas City, Missouri 64105
Email: gnessel@marc.org; phone: 816.701.8207
Electric Vehicles (EV) Group Purchase Program

A. PURPOSE AND INTRODUCTION
The purpose of this Request for Proposals ("RFP") is to facilitate a manufacturer/dealer discount for purchases of battery-electric and/or plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (hereafter referred to as “EVs”) by University of Missouri – Kansas City-affiliated individuals including faculty, staff, students, alumni, or other members of the campus community. The UMKC EV Group Purchase Program is a partnership between Mid-America Regional Council (MARC), the University of Missouri – Kansas City (UMKC) and Metropolitan Energy Center (MEC). MARC is using an RFP process to facilitate the implementation of this manufacturer/dealer discount for University of Missouri – Kansas City-affiliated individuals, but individuals interested in taking advantage of this discount, and not MARC, UMKC, or MEC will be purchasing and paying for the EVs. The EV Group Purchase Program partners intends to select more than one manufacturer/dealer offering EVs for participation in this discount program. Each selected entity will be required to enter into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with MARC (referred to below as the “Provider”), wherein the selected company agrees to participate in the discount program. The companies submitting proposals in response to this RFP will hereafter be referred to as “supplier(s)”.

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC), is the Metropolitan Planning Organization and Regional Council of Governments for the bi-state Kansas City metropolitan area. MARC is one of five regions participating with the National Association of Regional Councils (NARC) in the Fleets for the Future (F4F) project. F4F is a national partnership of regional councils, Clean Cities Coalitions, and industry experts tasked with coordinating five regional and one national procurement initiatives designed to consolidate bulk orders of alternative fuel vehicles. The initiative will reduce costs through bulk purchasing.

The University of Missouri – Kansas City (UMKC) is a four-year post-secondary educational institution, a part of the University of Missouri system. It has more than 50 majors or programs and over 125 academic programs. UMKC has a very active Sustainability Team that provides the framework for environmental stewardship, natural resource conservation, emissions reductions and sustainability on the UMKC campus. The team acts as a resource to support and promote the university’s environmental commitments and policies. The total target audience of UMKC affiliated individuals – faculty, staff, students and alumni is estimated at 80,000.

Metropolitan Energy Center (MEC) is a nonprofit agency and a catalyst for energy efficiency, economic development and environmental vitality in America's Heartland. MEC hosts the Kansas City Regional Clean Cities and the Central Kansas Clean Cities program, which provides up-to-date information and technical support to local and regional alternative fuels vehicles (AFV) industry. MEC is a partner with MARC and others in the Fleets for the Future initiative.

B. BACKGROUND
The UMKC EV Group Purchase Program desires to provide UMKC-affiliated individuals including faculty, staff, students, alumni, or other members of the campus community with the opportunity to purchase an EV at a discounted price. The objective is to help buyers purchase an electric vehicle at a lower cost, which in turn will reduce local and regional air greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The EV Group Purchase Program intends to promote the discount program and the services of selected suppliers as part of the discount program. This discount program is being organized by MARC, UMKC and MEC. The three partners will be responsible for coordinating the Group Purchase Program’s activities, events, marketing and outreach to UMKC-affiliated individuals.

C. RFP DETAILS
C.01 Issuing Agency
MARC is the issuing agency for this RFP and all subsequent addenda relating to it. If Proposers received this document from sources other than direct mailing or at DemandStar.com, you must contact MARC to be added to the distribution list.
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for any addendums, clarifications, or other proposal notices.

C.02 Important Dates
The following dates are significant for this RFP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Event</th>
<th>Date Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP Dated and Issued</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP Inquiry Questions Due</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 24, 2017 at 4:00 p.m. CST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Due Date</td>
<td>Friday, February 3, 2017 at 4:00 p.m. CST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date for MOA</td>
<td>March 15 to May 15, 2017 5:00 p.m. CDT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.03 Inquiries
Requests for clarification or questions, must be submitted in writing to MARC, Attention Georgia Nesselrode (gnessel@marc.org) no later than **Tuesday, January 24, 2017 by 4 p.m. CST**. Responses will be addressed by addendum and posted on MARC’s Clean Energy webpage (http://www.marc.org/Environment/Energy/Alternative-Fuel-Vehicles/Fleets-for-the-Future) and www.demandstar.com.

C.04 Submission Due Date
Submit your proposal electronically to gnessel@marc.org by 4:00 p.m. Central Standard Time Friday, February 3, 2017 (the “Proposal Due Date”). MARC requests the document(s) be in PDF format. It is the responsibility of the respondent submitting a proposal by email to ensure that the proposal has been received by the appropriate MARC staff, and not blocked by a spam filter or rejected because of large attachments. To confirm receipt, you may contact Georgia Nesselrode. Proposals received after this deadline will be late and may not be considered. The proposal must be signed by an authorized representative of the respondent and required information must be provided. The contents of the proposal submitted by the successful respondent of this RFP will become a part of any MOA as a result of this solicitation.

C.05 Time for Evaluation
All proposals shall remain valid for a minimum of 60 calendar days after the Proposal Due Date to allow adequate time for evaluation and entering into MOA.

C.06 Best and Final Offer
Each initial proposal should be submitted with the most favorable price and service available. However, at the option of MARC, a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) may be requested. In the event that multiple suppliers are selected, MARC will work with the selected suppliers to streamline the program offerings so that the program reflects a unified approach.

C.07 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)
Upon completion of the evaluation process, MARC may execute the MOA to the respondents whose proposal is determined by project team to be most advantageous. Note that all amendments to any MOA must be in writing and signed by both parties.

C.08 MOA Period and Effective Date
The anticipated MOA term will be for a period of six (6) weeks. The anticipated effective date of the MOA is Wednesday, March 15 (date of launch of promotional efforts) with the effective end date of Monday, May 15, 2017 5:00 p.m. Please see section C.02 for Anticipated Program Timeline.

Any MOA entered into between MARC and the selected supplier(s) will include provisions substantially similar to Section H: General Provisions of this RFP, and shall also provide, among other things, that (i) the relationship of the selected supplier(s) to MARC is an agreement only and the selected supplier(s) is not, and shall not represent itself as, an agent or partner or joint venture of MARC, and the supplier(s) has no authority to bind MARC in any way, (ii) MARC, UMKC or MEC are not parties to the supplier(s)’ MOA with any purchaser of an EV and these three agencies shall have no liability or responsibility for or under such purchases and contracts, including payment responsibility or any responsibility for the EV, (iii) the statement describing the EV Group Purchase Program discount provided by the supplier to the individual purchaser shall be subject to MARC’s prior review and approval, and shall be in a form reasonably acceptable to MARC, UMKC and MEC, and (iv) before the supplier(s) contracts with any participant for the purchase of
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an EV, MARC must have received from such supplier documents explaining the MARC’s, UMKC’s and MEC’s limited role in the discount program, reiterating item (i) immediately above, and releasing the MARC, UMKC and MEC from any liability associated with the purchase of the EV.

D. SCOPE OF WORK (SOW):

D.01 SOW Overview
The purpose of the EV Group Purchase Program is to facilitate a manufacturer/dealer discount for UMKC-affiliated individuals, including faculty, staff, students, alumni, or other members of the campus community, that is more favorable than other discounts and pricing available to participants during the program period. The selected supplier(s) will provide a discounted pricing on selected makes and models of EVs. The selected supplier(s) will generate price quotes and offer financing services for both purchases and leases of EVs in accordance with the scope of work outlined below. Individuals who wish to participate in the EV Group Purchase discount program will sign a purchase contract with the selected supplier(s) for the purchase of an EV. As explained above, MARC, UMKC and MEC will not be parties to the participant’s purchase contract and will have no responsibility or liability under this contract. The selected respondent(s) may be any form of legal entity, including a joint venture, subject to financial and performance guarantees acceptable to MARC.

The program is outlined in terms of the following key phases, described further below:

1. Participant enrollment and education
2. Participant engagement
3. Program completion and assessment

This discount program will be offered to individuals who are affiliated with the University of Missouri – Kansas City (UMKC), including but not limited to approximately 80,000 faculty members, staff, and students and alumni. The number of participants is unknown and not guaranteed by MARC, UMKC and/or MEC.

D.02 Participant enrollment and education
It is currently anticipated that between the public launch of this discount program and the close of it, MARC, UMKC and MEC, will:

- Require that interested participants complete a brief survey of their interest in EVs and confirm the participant’s relationship to UMKC.
- Provide a discount code to interested and eligible participants.
- Provide ongoing content management for a website customized for the purpose of promoting the discount program and maintain a social media presence.
- Conduct media outreach.
- Serve as the point of contact for inquiries about the discount program and field questions about the program.

The selected supplier(s) will:

- Receive contact information for eligible participants.
- Attend public events (“Ride and Drive”) and present technical information about EVs.
- Attend other outreach events, as requested.
- Participate in media events and interviews, as requested.
- Assist with development of collateral materials or presentations.
- Participate in program training for sales staff prior to and/or during the MOA.
- Participate in periodic phone calls with MARC, UMKC or MEC to provide status updates and pertinent information, including: number of inquiries, number of final quotes, number of contracts signed, and any relevant issues, challenges or delays.
- Coordinate with MARC to track participant progress.
- Communicate once a week with MARC or MEC until all purchases are finalized.
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D.03 Participant engagement
The participant engagement phase is concurrent with participant enrollment and education phase. As eligible participants are referred to the selected supplier(s), the selected supplier(s) will communicate with assigned participants directly to provide each with purchase information and a quote. Purchases can begin as early as the date of the official public launch of the discount program, and will continue until the end of the discount program.

D.03.1 Participant program quotes
The selected supplier(s) will prepare an individual quote for each assigned participant that is based on the discounted price and takes into consideration the preferences of the assigned participant.

D.03.2 Participant EV contracts
Upon receipt of their individualized quote, each participant who decides to purchase an EV must sign a contract with the supplier that reflects the pricing and other provisions applicable to the discount program (and is in a form that complies with the provisions of set out in C.08 above). This contract is strictly between the supplier and the participant. MARC, UMKC or MEC will not be a party to these contracts or be responsible for any financial or other obligations related to the individual contracts between participants and the selected suppliers.

D.03.3 Participant EV purchases
The selected supplier(s) will provide all participants with purchases in conformance with all applicable state laws and codes that are applicable, the applicable Federal Tax Credit, and any other existing rules and timelines.

D.03.4 Enrollment period communication
MARC (itself, or in coordination with UMKC or MEC) and the selected supplier(s) will coordinate regularly to track assigned participant status throughout the enrollment and education period. MARC (itself, or in coordination with UMKC or MEC) will field calls from participants about the program and answer questions or refer individuals to the selected suppliers for more information, as appropriate.

D.04 Program Completion and Assessment
After the end of the program, the selected suppliers will report on all purchases made through the program.

D.05 Anticipated Program Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 2017</td>
<td>Launch of promotions: website and pre-enrollment process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 2017</td>
<td>Official launch of EV discount program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2 – May 15, 2017</td>
<td>Participant enrollment and education period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2017 (COB)</td>
<td>Final deadline to join EV discount program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15 – June 15, 2017</td>
<td>Program completion and assessment period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

E.01 Demonstrated ability to meet Scope of Work
The applicant(s) profile should address the following components:

a) Firm size.

b) Ability to serve the needs of the community. For purposes of this RFP, “program area” shall include the MARC regional 9-county boundary (Leavenworth, Wyandotte, Johnson and Miami counties in Kansas; Ray, Platte Clay, Jackson and Cass counties in Missouri).

c) Proposed vehicle(s), including year(s), make(s), and model(s) to be included in program, including total number of each type of vehicle that is expected to be available during the 6-week program time frame.

d) Demonstrate sufficient inventory for the program (e.g. 3-4 models on site or in transit at all times.)

e) Plan for implementation, including sales agents made available to work with those in the program and expected delivery schedules for vehicles.

f) Provide a current insurance certificate, evidencing supplier’s current insurance coverage.
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E.02 Qualifications and Expertise of Company and Staff
All respondents must adhere to the following minimum qualifications; any respondents not meeting minimum qualifications will not be considered.
  a) Respondents must be licensed, and in good standing, to do business in the state of Kansas or Missouri. List all applicable business license numbers.
  b) Respondents must have at least two years of engagement as a manufacturer/dealer of EVs. Specify number of years the firm has been in business under the present name.
  c) Names, titles of key staff that will be assigned to the program, indicating their experience and responsibilities as they relate to this initiative.

E.03 Cost (see Exhibit A)
Pricing schedules must conform to the format outlined in Exhibit A. Provide information about respondent’s current average cost (lease and purchase) for all EVs respondent proposes to include in the program, and the discount amount, as a percentage or as a total dollar amount, that respondent will offer to purchasers in the program for both direct purchases and leases. The discount amount does not include any state and federal tax credits for which the customer may qualify. However, any dealer tax credits should be taken into account as part of the lease pricing. Please also indicate the time period that the discount will be available; preference will be given to respondents able to offer a discount over the entire 6-week program period.

Please indicate any type of financing or leasing respondent will make available to eligible participants. List any financial partnerships that you have available for participants, as well as the criteria for accessing those financing options. Please also provide any additional incentives or benefits respondent is willing to make available to the program or to participants in the program.

F. PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMAT

F.01 Technical proposal response format
Efforts have been made to streamline the proposal requirements/format to make the process less cumbersome for the manufacturers/dealers to respond. Pertinent information should be conveyed through a letter of transmittal, an executive summary and a completed Exhibit A.

A. LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL (COVER LETTER). The letter of transmittal should include an introduction of the supplier’s company, as well as contact information for those persons who are authorized to represent the company in dealing with this RFP, as well as authorized to sign the MOA. Proposal/Provider Contact: List the name, title, office address, telephone number, and email address of the person(s) authorized to represent the supplier regarding the proposal(s) submitted in response to this RFP.

B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY. An executive summary will describe the supplier’s approach and clearly indicate any options or alternatives being proposed. It should constitute the major portion of the proposal and must contain responses to subsections E.01 and E.02 in this RFP. If options or alternatives are proposed as exceptions to the RFP, the offeror should include an explanation for each option or alternative. It should also indicate any major requirements that cannot be met by the supplier. Failure to provide written response to items indicated in this RFP may result in rejection of proposal.

C. EXHIBIT A. Cost breakdown and price schedule information, along with any type of financing or leasing details should be included in Exhibit A.

D. ATTACHMENTS. Certificates of insurance and any supplemental documentation should be included as attachments to the proposals.

F.02 COST PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORMAT
The supplier must submit a cost proposal (Exhibit A). The Cost Proposal Form included in this RFP must be completed and submitted for your proposal to be considered.
G. PROPOSAL EVALUATION

G.01 Proposal Evaluation Criteria
The criteria used to evaluate proposals, listed with their relative weight in points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria Description</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Evidence of experience and reliability</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Level of discount (The offeror with the lowest Proposed Price for each Make will receive 100% of the price points for that Make)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vehicle inventory availability</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Overall responsiveness and completeness to the RFP</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Timeliness</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Possible Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G.02 Evaluation Process
The proposal evaluation process, the evaluation committee will review all proposals timely received. Nonresponsive proposals (those not conforming to minimum RFP requirements) will be eliminated. Each supplier bears sole responsibility for the items included or not included in the response submitted by that supplier. MARC reserves the right to disqualify any proposal that includes significant deviations or exceptions to the terms, conditions and/or specifications in this RFP.

H. GENERAL PROVISIONS

H.01 Incurring Costs
MARC will not be liable for any cost which suppliers may incur with the preparation of their proposal(s). Proposals should be concise, straightforward and prepared simply and economically. Expensive displays, bindings or promotional materials are neither desired nor required. However, these instructions are not intended to limit a proposal’s content or exclude any relevant or essential data therefrom.

H.02 Addendum to RFP
In the event that it becomes necessary to revise this RFP in whole or in part an addendum will be posted to the MARC Clean Energy [webpage](http://example.com) and DemandStar.

H.03 Other Communications
During the RFP process (from the date of issue through the date of MOA or other final decisions) MARC is the sole source of official information regarding this RFP. All other communications, both spoken and written, which are received by any representative of the supplier from other sources (such as employees in the using department) should be confirmed by the supplier with MARC representative to this RFP as being true and accurate prior to incorporating such information into their response. This refers to both formal and informal conversations and communications. Significant changes to the RFP will always be issued as a formal, written addendum.

H.04 Alternative Proposals
A supplier may submit more than one proposal, each of which must follow the Proposal Response Format (section E herein) and satisfy the requirements of this RFP. The supplier’s primary proposal must be complete and comply with all instructions. The alternative proposals may be in abbreviated form following the Proposal Response Outline but providing complete information only for sections which differ in any way from those contained in the prime proposal. If alternative proposals are submitted, the supplier must explain the reasons for the alternative(s) and its comparative benefits. Each proposal submitted will be evaluated on its own merits.

H.05 Authorized Supplier Representatives
MARC reserves the right to require a change in the individual assigned to represent the supplier if the assigned representative is not serving the needs of MARC in an acceptable manner. This right shall carry forward through the response period and, with the successful supplier, during the term of the program.
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H.06 Remedies
The laws of the State of Missouri shall apply in all disputes arising out of this RFP or any MOA, without application of any principles of choice of laws. Venue for any lawsuits, claims, or other proceedings relating to or arising under this RFP shall be exclusively in the State of Missouri.

H.07 Compliance
The supplier hereby agrees to abide with all applicable federal, state, county and city laws and regulations and to be responsible for obtaining and/or possessing any and all permits and licenses that may be required.

H.08 Cancellation
Inadequate delivery, unsatisfactory service or failure to adhere to the MOA covenants may result in termination of the MOA. The supplier shall be responsible for reimbursing MARC for expenses incurred as a result of unacceptable service. In the event that either party determines that a material breach has occurred that would be cause for cancellation of the MOA the party wishing to cancel shall notify the other party of the alleged breach in writing, and allow the other party thirty (30) days in which to cure the alleged breach. If the alleged breach is not cured or substantial steps to cure the alleged breach are not taken within this period, the non-defaulting party may terminate the MOA at the end of said thirty (30) day period.

H.09 Acceptance of Services Rendered
MARC, through its designated agents and representatives, will be the sole determining judge of whether services rendered under the MOA satisfy the requirements as identified in the MOA.

H.10 Anti-Collusion
The submission of a proposal constitutes agreement that the supplier has not divulged its proposal to, or colluded with, any other offeror or party to a proposal whatsoever.

H.11 Indemnification
The supplier shall hold harmless, defend and indemnify MARC and its officers, employees, and agents from and against any and all claims, losses, causes of action, judgments, damages and expenses including, but not limited to attorney’s fees because of bodily injury, sickness, disease or death, or injury to or destruction of tangible property or any other injury or damage resulting from or arising out of (a) performance or breach of the MOA by supplier, or (b) any act, error, or omission on the part of the supplier, or its agents, employees, invitees, participants, or subcontractors except where such claims, losses, causes of action, judgments, damages and expenses result solely from the negligent acts or omissions or willful misconduct of MARC, its officers, employees or agents.

H.12 Restrictions
All proposals must clearly set forth any restrictions or provisions deemed necessary by the supplier to effectively service the proposed MOU.

H.13 Right to Reject
MARC reserves the right to reject any or all proposals and to waive any informality or technicality in any proposal in the interest of MARC.

H.14 Record Keeping and Audit Rights
Any supplier providing goods or services under any MOA shall maintain accurate accounting records for all goods and services provided thereunder, and shall retain all such records for a period of at least one (1) years following termination of the MOA. Upon reasonable notice and during normal business hours MARC, or any of its duly authorized representatives, shall have access to and the right to audit any records or other documents pertaining to the MOA.

H.15 Management Reports
Upon request the supplier must be able to summarize and concisely report pertinent information to MARC in a timely manner, throughout the duration of any MOA resulting from this RFP.

H.16 Further Agreements
In addition to a proposal, MARC may from time to time require a supplier to execute certain additional documents or
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agreements, including without limitation a MOA addendum, for the purpose of clarifying the intention of the parties with respect to providing the goods or services hereunder.

H.17 Relationship of the Parties
In assuming and performing the obligations of any MOA, MARC and any supplier shall each be acting as independent parties and neither shall be considered or represent itself as a partner or employee of the other. Respondents are prohibited from assigning, transferring, conveying, subletting, or otherwise disposing of this proposal or any resultant MOA or its rights, title, or interest therein or its power to execute such agreement to any other person, company or corporation without the previous written approval of MARC.

H.18 Equal Opportunity
No supplier of goods and/or services under this RFP or any MOA shall discriminate against any employee, applicant for employment, or recipient of services on the basis of veteran status, race, religion, color, sex, sexual orientation, age, disability, or national origin.

H.19 Taxes – Supplier’s Responsibility
Suppliers shall be responsible for and pay all taxes which may be levied or incurred against the supplier in connection with the performance of any services under this MOA, including taxes levied or incurred against supplier’s income, inventory, property, sales, or other taxes.

H. 20 Protest Procedures
In the course of this solicitation for proposals and the selection process, a proposer (bidder or offer or whose direct economic interest would be affected by the award of the contract) may file a protest when in the proposer’s opinion, actions were taken by MARC staff and /or the selection committee which could unfairly affect the outcome of the selection procedure. All protest should be in writing and directed to Mr. David Warm, Executive Director, Mid America Regional Council, 600 Broadway, Suite 200, Kansas City, MO 64105. Protest should be made immediately upon occurrence of the incident in question but no later than three (3) days after the proposer receives notification of the outcome of the selection procedure. The protest should clearly state the grounds for such a protest. Upon receipt of the protest, MARC’s Executive Director will review the actual procedures followed during the selection process and the documentation available. If it is determined the action(s) unfairly changed the outcome of the process, notifications with the selected proposer will cease until the matter is resolved.

H. 21 Conflict of Interest
Respondents shall identify any potential conflict of interest of which they are aware involving MARC or the Participants.

H. 22 Open Records Act and Proprietary Information
The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) is a public organization and is subject to the Missouri Open Records Act (Chapter 610, RSMo). All records obtained or retained by MARC are considered public records and are open to the public or media upon request unless those records are specifically protected from disclosure by law or exempted under the Missouri Sunshine Law. All contents of a response to a Request for Bids, Qualifications, Proposals or information issued by MARC are considered public records and subject to public release following decisions by MARC regarding the bid request. If a proposer has information that it considers proprietary, a bidder shall identify documents or portions of documents it considers to contain descriptions of scientific and technological innovations in which it has a proprietary interest, or other information that is protected from public disclosure by law, which is contained in a Proposal. After either a contract is executed pursuant to the Request for Bids, RFQ or RFP, or all submittals are rejected, if a request is made to inspect information submitted and if documents are identified as “Proprietary Information” as provided above under Missouri Sunshine Law, MARC will notify the proposer of the request for access, and it shall be the burden of the proposer to establish that those documents are exempt from disclosure under the law.”

All Proposals submitted hereunder become the exclusive property of MARC.
### Exhibit A – Cost Proposal Form, Discount Pricing Structure, and Customer Service Protocol

Applicant Firm(s):  

Today’s Date:  

Primary Contact Name:  

Primary Contact Phone:  

Primary Contact Email:  

### Part I: Please provide pricing for each EV included in this proposal, including different lease term options if applicable. Include additional lines as necessary. For award analysis purposes, provide the total price for a three-year lease on one (1) vehicle and the total price for one (1) purchased vehicle.

#### Electric Vehicle Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EV Make</th>
<th>Model Name</th>
<th>Model Year</th>
<th>Lease or Purchase</th>
<th>Specific configuration(s), trim, or packages (if applicable)</th>
<th>Color(s) available</th>
<th>Suppliers current average price</th>
<th>Discount (%) or $ amount</th>
<th>Final discounted price$</th>
<th>Estimated taxes, licenses, and any other fees</th>
<th>TOTAL PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. Corolla S Plus CVT)</td>
<td>(e.g. 2017)</td>
<td>(e.g. lease)</td>
<td>(e.g. sport mode)</td>
<td>(e.g. blue, black, silver)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. Corolla S Plus CVT)</td>
<td>(e.g. 2017)</td>
<td>(e.g. purchase)</td>
<td>(e.g. sport mode)</td>
<td>(e.g. blue, black, silver)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Suppliers providing discounted pricing agree to offer this discounted price to all participants. **Final discount price should not include any state or federal tax credits for which customer may be eligible.** Lease price should specify the customer’s annual lease payment amounts, accounting for applicable State and Federal tax incentives for which the dealer/manufacturer may be eligible.

2. If describing a lease, please include a three year lease with option to purchase vehicle at the end of the lease.
**Part II:** Additional Cost Factors. Be as specific as possible and include any additional cost options that were not addressed above. For example: extended warranty, sunroof, cruise control, technology package, leather seats, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Estimated Cost Increase/Criteria (Provide detailed information and rationale for each line item)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part III:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Vehicles Purchased</th>
<th>Estimated vehicle availability and/or wait time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 25</td>
<td><em>Same day availability or estimated 1 week wait time for delivery</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost Proposals will be scored as follows: The points assigned to each offeror’s cost proposal will be based on the lowest proposal price. The offeror with the lowest Proposed Price will receive 100% of the price points for that make. All other offerors for that make will receive a portion of the total cost points based on what percentage higher their Proposed Price is than the Lowest Proposed Price. An offeror whose Proposed Price is more than double (200%) the Lowest Proposed Price will receive no points. The formula to compute the points is: Cost Points x (2 - (Proposed Price/Lowest Proposed Price)).
Special LEAF Pricing!

For a limited time, Nissan is offering a $10,000* Fleetail incentive to faculty, staff, students and alumni of UMKC with valid ID.

This offer is only valid on the retail purchase for model year 2016 and 2017 LEAFs, while supplies last. The offer is good May 1 through June 30.

How it works

1. Download the flier from marc.org/UMKC-EV and bring it to the dealer.

2. Visit Nissan dealership — to find the nearest KC metro Nissan dealer, visit nissanusa.com/nissandealers.

3. Show valid ID — UMKC ID card, diploma, or transcript are acceptable.

4. Must purchase and receive car by June 30, 2017.**

Why buy electric?

- Save almost $1000 a year on gas.
- Battery capacity has increased.
- Require less maintenance.
- Charging stations now widely available. See plugshare.com for locations.
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- Won’t contribute to air pollution.
- Quiet, easy and fun to drive.
- Next generation auto technology.
- Powered by energy generated in your home state.

This UMKC EV Group Purchase Program is a partnership between the Curators of the University of Missouri on behalf of University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC), Mid-America Regional Council (MARC), the Metropolitan Energy Center (MEC) and its Clean Cities Coalition.

*With federal tax credits, save up to $17,500. ** Must take delivery of vehicle by June 30, 2017