



**2021 VW DMTF DCFC RFA
Q&A (November 19, 2021)
Updated January 14, 2022**

Agency Contacts for this Program

Alauddin Alauddin, Office of Environmental Education, 614-644-3675,
Alauddin.Alauddin@epa.ohio.gov

Ohio EPA invites applications for grants under its [Diesel Mitigation Trust Fund \(DMTF\)](#) program to help fund the installation of publicly available Direct Current Fast Charging (DCFC) stations in [26 Ohio priority counties](#).

This current offering is for DCFC charging stations only. The total funding under this DCFC competitive grant offering is approximately \$7,000,000.

Two webinars were offered as Microsoft Teams Live events to provide an overview of the program and offer an opportunity for prospective applicants to ask questions.

Application materials, the recorded webinar, presentation slides and questions and answers from both sessions are posted on the program [website](#).

Applications are due in the form of a single pdf file via email to evcharging@epa.ohio.gov no later than 3:00 PM on January 31, 2022.

Questions or requests for clarification about this program may be submitted in writing via email to evcharging@epa.ohio.gov. Answers to questions received at our webinars and subsequent phone and email inquiries are presented below. Ohio EPA may update this document during the application period as necessary.

November 19, 2021

Question 1: For someone new to applying for grant programs like this, how would you recommend approaching the application process?

Response: We recommend closely reviewing Section 3 of the [DCFC RFA](#) to determine whether your project is eligible for funding. Once you determine that your project is eligible, we suggest reviewing Sections 4 and 5 and collecting the information needed to fill out an application. We provide further guidance on the [DCFC section of our website](#). If you would like help, please reach out to us and we can schedule a meeting to guide you further.

Question 2: How were the 26 priority counties determined and why is there a delineation between first and secondary priority counties?

Response: Ohio EPA developed a Beneficiary Mitigation Plan, as required for the state to accept and distribute funds allocated to Ohio from the Volkswagen settlement. The plan directs

these funds to eligible projects to achieve the maximum air quality benefits for the people of Ohio. Under the terms of the VW Settlement, states' Beneficiary Mitigation Plans must direct funding to areas that bear a disproportionate share of the increased air pollution burden. This includes densely populated areas and communities adjacent to rail yards, shipping terminals, and distribution centers where diesel emissions have been concentrated. Based on air quality (Ohio counties designated 4/30/18 as Nonattainment under the Clean Air Act due to ozone levels), historical levels of diesel emissions, the locations where the most VW vehicles equipped with defeat devices were registered in Ohio, and U.S. EPA's Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool, Ohio EPA developed a map showing the 26 counties where eligible projects should receive first priority and secondary priority for the available funds.

For purposes of initial scoring and ranking for this grant offering, Ohio EPA will not make a distinction between first and second priority counties. However, Ohio EPA reserves the right to add this as a ranking criterion based on applications received.

Question 3: Do you expect to expand the grant program outside the 26 priority counties? In Ohio, will there be a coordinated effort to deploy federal funding in the future, and how does this program fit?

Response: The Ohio EPA acknowledges that extending eligibility to more counties would allow the agency greater flexibility in spreading the funding to better cover EV corridor charging gaps in Ohio. That said, this funding is a part of the broader Ohio VW Settlement program plan that identified eligible counties based on the four criteria prescribed by the VW Settlement (and listed above) for states to consider in determining where to fund Eligible Mitigation Actions.

Also, in the near future, we anticipate significant funding from the federal government to state DOTs and MPOs for EV corridor charging that will not have the county limitations of the VW DMTF program. Ohio EPA has a close working relationship with the Ohio Department of Transportation on the DCFC program and will be helping as needed with future EV funding not associated with this grant program.

Question 4: OKI Regional Council of Governments has an EV Charging Station Locator Map with DC Fast Charger Priority Areas mapped. Does Ohio EPA take these priority areas into consideration?

Response: The RFA does not specifically assign priority points based on the DC Fast Charger Priority Map. That said, we value our working relationship with Ohio's metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) including OKI and look forward to applications that they help submit based on their priorities for their region.

Question 5: Is funding available for entities looking for DCFC strictly for their own vehicles?

Response: This program is providing funds for publicly available DCFC chargers and not for fleets or other restricted use scenarios.

Question 6: Are previous Ohio EPA grant recipients from the Level 2 program able to apply, and are they ranked differently from other entities that did not participate in the last round?

Response: Current recipients of our Level 2 grant are eligible to apply for a DC Fast Charging grant and we strongly encourage them to do so. That said, based on the scoring and ranking of actual applications received, between two applications are otherwise close in merit, we reserve the right to prioritize previously unfunded applicants. Also, we reserve the right to not fund an entity that has underperformed in a previous grant.

Question 7: Is any site open 24/7 and doesn't restrict access to charging considered eligible for funding?

Response: If locations are publicly available 24/7 without restrictions and are within 2 miles of an eligible roadway, they are eligible for funding. Any site with time and access restrictions (not available 24/7 or strictly available to particular users) and not within 2 miles of an eligible roadway are not eligible.

Question 8: Do you recommend any vendors that are familiar with the application process?

Response: The state of Ohio doesn't recommend particular vendors. There have been several vendors that have participated in our grant programs that you can contact. If you are a public entity, there are also vendors listed in the [DAS state contract](#).

Question 9: Do the DCFC stations in the Ohio DAS contract meet program requirements?

Response: The Ohio DAS contracts were designed several years ago and weren't specifically designed for the VW grant programs, so it is uncertain whether the DCFC equipment matches the specifications in the RFA. However, the vendors in the contracts are active participants in our funding programs and we recommend contacting them for more information.

Question 10: Where can we find where the EV corridor is located?

Response: Ohio EPA recommends reaching out to your municipal planning organizations for that information. For this program, Appendix B of the RFA has instructions for finding roadway functional classifications. Many Class 1 roads are also designated EV corridors.

Question 11: In the application review process, will Ohio EPA prioritize roadway classifications (i.e., will a location closer to a class 1 roadway be ranked higher than a location closer to a class 3)?

Response: Yes, Ohio EPA will consider the proximity of charger locations to roadway classifications. A location that is closer to a class 1 roadway would be ranked higher than a location closer to a class 3 roadway. We would balance this criterion with other considerations such as how many publicly available DCFC chargers are in the county of the location.

Question 12: Is the distance between the location and highest road classification calculated from the exit ramp or the roadway?

Response: The distance is calculated from the exit ramp of the roadway.

Question 13: Do charger sites need to be located next to amenities such as food, bathrooms, and other services?

Response: Proposed sites need to be within 0.25 miles of amenities such as restrooms, food, restaurants, and retail shopping. Locations closer to these amenities will be given a higher priority.

Question 14: Does Appendix B in the RFA consider the nearest Level 2 or DCFC charger? Are publicly available DCFC included that have less than 49 kilowatts of charger and are not available 24/7?

Response: Level 2 chargers are not taken into consideration in Appendix B. All publicly available DCFC chargers regardless of current capacity are included.

Question 15: When following Appendix B of the RFA, the closest charger that reports "Public - Call Ahead." Is "Public - Call Ahead" equivalent to "Public" for the purposes of following Appendix B?

Response: Yes. If there are questions about the availability of a particular charger location, please contact us with specifics.

Question 16: Are utility upgrades and future proofing eligible for reimbursement?

Response: Utility upgrades at the charging site are eligible for reimbursement. Off-site upgrades are not. For non-government locations that will be providing a 20% match, we recommend assigning this cost to the 20% minimum match while seeking grant reimbursement for the procurement, installation and warranty of the chargers.

Question 17: Is the cost of electricity used to power the chargers eligible for reimbursement?

Response: The cost of electricity used by the chargers is an ineligible cost.

Question 18: Could you confirm whether a charger installed in a paired configuration is eligible in this program under Section 4.2 of the RFA?

Response: For purposes of this RFA, a paired configuration of ChargePoint's CPE250 chargers will be considered eligible and counted as one dual-port charger.

Consequently, to meet the (minimum 2 chargers at 100 kW each per location) requirement of the RFA, a location that proposes a paired CPE250 will need to also add either

- (a) one more paired CPE250 OR
- (b) one more single or dual port charger capable of providing 100 kW to a single car.

Question 19: What is a dual-port charger? Is a charger dispenser with both CCS and CHAdeMO considered a dual-port charger if only one port can be used at a time? Does a dual port charger require the ability to charge two vehicles to charge simultaneously at the same station?

Response: Section 4.2 of the Request for Applications (RFA) describes an EVSE (Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment) port as providing power to charge only one vehicle at a time even though it may have multiple connectors. A dual-port charger can charge two vehicles simultaneously. Multiple connectors and types of connectors can be available on a single port and CHAdeMO and CCS refer to types of connectors. Therefore, having CHAdeMO and CCS on a charger with one port is not considered a dual-port charger.

Question 20: Is there an expected or typical ownership structure for DCFC stations under this program (e.g. locally owned, operated, and network supported; network owned, operated and maintained, with the locals only providing the site itself)?

Response: Ohio EPA recognizes that different ownership structures are more suitable for different situations. We always lean towards providing applicants with the greatest amount of flexibility (within the limitations outlined in the RFA) to provide a project proposal that works.

Question 21: Has Ohio EPA considered a template for site verification for property owners to sign instead of individual letters? These templates were provided in programs in Texas and California.

Response: To allow flexibility to our applicants, we are not requiring that a template be followed. Suggested text is below:

As per the requirements for application submittal of the Diesel Mitigation Trust Fund DC Fast Charging Station Grant, the City of (NAME) wishes to express its full commitment to host and make available to the public the EV charging station at (LOCATION ADDRESS) for a minimum of five (5) years. This term will commence on the day the charging station installation and construction has been completed and all necessary inspections and certifications have been approved.

Question 22: Do quotes from subcontractors and vendors need to be included in the application?

Response: Yes, quotes need to be included for each item listed in the budget template. If quotes are not included, the application may be considered incomplete. Depending on the number of applications received, an incomplete application may be removed from further consideration for funding.

Question 23: Where would the cost for utility equipment (transformer) and interconnect costs be allocated on the Project Budget Template?

Response: These costs would be allocated under line Item 9 Other Eligible Costs. Please attach additional sheets as needed.

Question 24: When will grant awards be decided and when will funds be available?

Response: A tentative date for award decisions is April 30, 2022. Depending on the number of applications received, that date could be later.

Question 25: How soon after being awarded a grant do chargers need to be installed?

Response: Typically, the grant program allows 24 months to deploy the chargers. This period allows for local considerations and delays in manufacturing, delivery, and other project milestones. On a case-by-case basis, we will consider extension requests. After the chargers are installed, there is a 5-year reporting period, when annual reports are submitted that provide us with charger usage data.

Question 26: Can DCFC chargers be installed next to Level 2 chargers? If we receive a grant to install DC Fast Chargers adjacent to existing Level 2 chargers which already contain an ADA-compliant space, do we need to provide an additional ADA-compliant space with the DC Fast Chargers?

Response: Yes, DCFCs may be co-located with Level 2 chargers. The ADA provisions for the DCFC offering apply independently from those of the Level 2 grant so one additional ADA compliant parking space will be needed for the adjacent DCFC.

The intent with having an ADA-compliant space is to make chargers funded by this program accessible to Ohioans with disabilities. Please note that the ADA-compliant spaces should not be ADA-restricted, as the designation would restrict usage of the charger(s). The ADA-compliant spaces should accord with the requirements listed in Appendix H of the RFA.

Question 27: Can utility programs be used as a local match for this program?

Response: Yes. However, the applicants should be careful to ensure that there is no “double-dipping” for the same costs incurred. The project budget should include clear documentation that establishes funding sources and what they will pay for.

Question 28: How would academic institutions be classified when determining the amount of eligible reimbursement? Are there any stipulations with non-profit entities?

Response: Reimbursements are based on who owns the land that the proposed chargers will be deployed on. If the landowner is a government entity, the project (regardless of who the applicant is) is eligible for up to 100% reimbursement of eligible cost. If the land is owned by a non-government entity, the grant could reimburse up to 80% of the eligible cost. Academic institutions are subject to the same criterion.

In addition to the above, non-profit entities are also subject to the financial requirements in Section 5.1.4. If you provide a specific location, we are happy to give you a specific answer for that location.

Question 29: Can reimbursements be requested in partial amounts or only 100% upon project completion?

Response: Typically, reimbursements will be made after the chargers have been deployed, they are in operation, and an Ohio EPA team member has inspected the equipment to make

sure they are operational. In the typical scenario, 90% of the grant award will be reimbursed at this time with the final 10% being reimbursed after submitting semiannual usage reports for the first five years from the date the chargers have been deemed operational.

If a project has multiple locations, we are willing to discuss making reimbursements at specific milestones. The final 10% will still be withheld until the end of the 5-year reporting period mentioned above.

Question 30: Do you have installation case study examples to help us understand installation costs and ongoing costs? The local electric tariff is confusing for distribution cost.

Response: Ohio EPA doesn't have case study examples, but we recommend researching vendors, municipal planning organizations, and clean city organizations to obtain this information.

Question 31: Are there restrictions on the price of charging passed to charger customers (e.g., are there restrictions on the end-user price as a percentage of electrical cost?)

Response: Ohio EPA places no restriction on end-user price in this grant program.

Question 32: Do chargers need credit card readers?

Response: Section 4.3 of the [DCFC RFA](#) outlines charging station operating requirements including "13. Multiple payment options for drivers such as pay-per-use and subscription methods, and the ability to accept credit and debit cards." Please review this section to understand these requirements.

Question 33: Section 4.3 of the RFA refers to a requirement for customer service. What kind of service is required?

Response: This requirement refers to the customer service that's available for charger users. A phone number needs to be available so users can call if they have trouble using the charger.

Question 34: Do you have any thoughts about how the future of gas tax for villages will change as the result of electric vehicles.

Response: The Ohio legislature passed one of the highest electric vehicle registration fees in the country to ensure that these vehicles pay their fair share for the maintenance of Ohio roads.

Question 35: Will signage be available on freeways to direct drivers to chargers?

Response: This program does not cover the cost of EV charger signage on freeways. It does cover the cost of the signs at the charger itself.

Question 36: If a park requires a motor vehicle permit for access, does that affect eligibility in this grant program?

Response: As long as the same requirement applies to all members of the public, it does not impact eligibility. The challenge for some parks may be in ensuring 24/7 public access to the chargers.

Question 37: How was the list of publicly available non-Tesla DCFC chargers (Appendix B) compiled? When attempting to recreate the list from AFDC, I get a total of 548 stations at eligible counties. Are the 87 stations listed in Appendix B the only locations that will be used when evaluating applications for the grant? If so, can you please send me the list as a csv or excel?

Response: The MS Excel file is available [on our website](#) .

Also, for clarity, we came up with 111 (not 87) locations statewide (not just in the eligible counties) that offered non-Tesla, publicly available charging 24 hours/day. This is the list that we will use to measure the proximity of a proposed location to the nearest charger.

Separately, the table of 87 locations (a subset of the table of 111) is just a count of publicly available non-Tesla DCFCs in Ohio EPA VW/DMTF eligible counties. This is the list we will be using when assigning higher priority to proposed locations in counties with fewer chargers currently available.

Question 38: For 5.1.4, Funds Availability, in the absence of a credit rating does the state require that available funds be specifically in a time deposit instrument (e.g. a CD), or would other deposits (e.g. cash) suffice?

Response: If the entity has the cash available at this time to meet all obligations within a reasonable period of time, understanding they have to pay the invoices when they come due and then request a reimbursement, from a financial standpoint we will accept that.

Question 39: For 5.1.4, Funds Availability, would a Federally regulated or reviewed financial statement from the most recent quarter suffice? (Applicant is a publicly held company and must file financial statements subject to review by the SEC)

Response: Yes. So long as it is indeed from the most recent quarter rather than the last report that was filed.

Question 40: For 4.1 (9) and 4.1 (10), if an Applicant has the Site Host Agreement in place which address the minimum 5-year operational period, is the letter of commitment still required, or is the letter only required in the absence of an executed Host Agreement?

Response: An executed site host agreement, where available, can be submitted in lieu of a letter of commitment.

Question 41: You had medical facilities / clinics with their own dedicated parking lots eligible in the Level 2 grant program. Can you confirm that dedicated surface lots at outpatient care centers that are open to the public would qualify in this program as well?

Response: Our Level 2 offering specifically addressed hospitals and medical facilities as eligible locations because it was aimed at meeting local community demand for (longer dwell time Level 2) charging infrastructure, and we think of these locations as essential “community” facilities regardless of ownership status.

Our DCFC offering is aimed at facilitating long distance travel by plugging gaps with easily and reliably accessible chargers strategically located within the eligible counties. Under this premise, surface parking lots at outpatient clinics near major roadways would be eligible as long as you ensure 24/7 public access and have amenities nearby.

January 14, 2022

Question 42: For 5.1.4, Funds Availability, in the absence of a credit rating does the state require that available funds be specifically in a time deposit instrument (e.g. a CD), or would other deposits (e.g. cash) suffice?

Response: The RFA lists the four standard instruments for non-government applicants to demonstrate financial capacity. If none of the four options are being provided, please indicate that on the application completeness checklist and include alternate information.

In such a case, we will receive an assertion of the availability of funds needed for the projects supported by statements from financial institutions of applicant’s cash available.

Please note that the four options listed in the RFA are reviewed and confirmed in our office. Alternate submittals are sent to our Fiscal Office for review and approval.

Question 43: For 5.1.4, Funds Availability, would a federally regulated or reviewed financial statement from the most recent quarter suffice? (Applicant is a publicly held company and must file financial statements subject to review by the SEC).

Response: Yes. So long as the most current statement is from the most recent quarter. Also, please see Question 42 above.

Question 44: We are interested in the grant for one of our locations. One of the requirements states that the site should be open 24/7 without restricting access. Would a secured public garage that is open 24/7 with fee, be eligible for the grant?

Response: Yes. A parking garage that is available to the public 24/7 is eligible, even if there is a fee to get into it.

Question 45: Appendix E includes a section titled: Itemized Project Budget (Ohio EPA DMTF Eligible Costs Only). In the webinar you state that the vendor quotes must be included in the application. This could be interpreted to mean more than one vendor since you say quote"s". Can we repeat the form in our application to submit quotes from more than one vendor? If no, then are we required to use the vendor and quotes

documented in the original application, even if we would later like to use a different vendor. It seems to me that by quote"s" you mean all the financial numbers from one and only one vendor. Also, it may be the case that, after the grant is approved, we decide to use a vendor that is less expensive. Is it acceptable to change vendors after the application is submitted, e.g. grant contract is assigned?

Response: For each line item listed in the project budget, please submit one quote only. We use these quotes to review your grant request and as the basis for the grant award amount if selected for funding.

Yes. We do work with a grantee if they need to change vendors after grant award. However, the maximum (not to exceed) grant amount is locked in when the time of grant contract is signed. Also, any equipment or vendor modifications will need to meet the same standards as defined in the RFA. After the work is done, reimbursements are made at the grant contract amount or lower based on actual costs incurred.

Question 46: In speaking with a EVSE vendor on the Ohio list of AUTHORIZED ORDER-DIRECT DEALERS/CHANNEL PARTNERS, that vendor raised the potential issue of my project getting a lower rank because I am not a government entity. Can that be? I've listened to the webinar and reviewed the application documents / appendices and didn't see anything to that effect.

Response: In our Level 2 offering, we gave priority points to applicants who used the state term service contracts. Typically, state term contracts are used by public entities. The use of a state term contract is not one of the ranking criteria in our current DCFC offering. The ranking criteria are listed in Section 5.2 of the RFA.

As a reminder, applications for chargers on non-government property may be funded up to a maximum of 80% of eligible costs. For chargers on government owned properties, reimbursement may be up to 100% of eligible costs.

Question 47: Can you clarify the requirement of ADA compliance? Do these spaces have to be the regular ADA spaces for a building or can they be additional ADA spaces within that lot.

Response: Of the parking spaces and chargers that funding is being sought for, one space and charger will need to meet the ADA specifications in Appendix H of the RFA.

These spaces need to be ADA compliant but not ADA reserved.

The spaces are specific to those that EVs will use while charging and are independent of other ADA requirements or spaces in that lot.

Question 48: Could we install two 100-amp chargers each with two 50-amp ports and that would still qualify?

Response: The minimum charger requirement under our program is for two cars to be able to concurrently charge at a minimum capacity of 100 kW each. This may be accomplished by varying combinations of single, dual and paired charger configurations.

Dual port chargers that provide a minimum 100 kW (not amps) when one car is charging and a minimum 50 kW (amps) when two cars are charging simultaneously would be eligible under our program but count as one charger. So yes, your proposal to install a minimum of two of these chargers would qualify under our program.

Question 49: I am curious about the products that can be included in this grant. I know that you touched on this during at least one of the webinars but am hoping for some clarity. I believe on the first webinar the ChargePoint Express250 was not included in the grant (only provides 62.5kW for each station). But as a paired option it provides double or 125kW which does qualify for the grant. Does this mean that we would have to “sell” the paired option as essentially 1 station? Meaning, I must “sell” at least 3 stations if we offer this option (CP paired option & another 100kW option)? Or can the paired option qualify as both stations needed in the grant?

Response: For purposes of this RFA, the paired configuration of two ChargePoint CPE250 chargers will be considered eligible and counted as one dual-port charger. Consequently, to meet the (minimum 2 chargers at 100 kW each per location) requirement of the RFA, a location that proposes two paired CPE250 chargers will need to also add either

- (a) another two paired CPE250 chargers OR
- (b) one more single or dual port charger capable of providing 100 kW to a single car.

Question 50: How can an applicant document required permits when there is no site plan for city planners to review to identify them? Application section 12 asks applicants to identify all necessary permits and approvals. This section is hard to complete because there is no site plan at this early stage. I understood from the webinar that applicants shouldn't do engineering work until after the grant is approved.

Response: We've set up the application process to where applicants do not need to submit detailed engineering plans and specs with their application. This is because we think that may be a significant investment without any assurance of funding. Also, costs incurred in the preparation of the application are not reimbursable. On the other hand, we also need to have a reasonable sense of anticipated timing and likelihood of implementation of projects we select for funding. That's what Section 12 is intended to do.

That said, we don't think of Site Plans as detailed engineering drawings and a general site schematic is required as part of the application. Also, we had the same requirement in our Level 2 program and our applicants did not have any challenges with that. Of course, in most cases, Level 2 chargers require less site prep than DCFCs. So, we appreciate your diligence and expect that the application you ultimately submit will have in Section 12 the best information you can provide based on the site schematic you are submitting with the application.

Question 51: I would like to confirm two points for the DCFC Grant Application:

1. The project site requirements indicate that sites should be within a quarter mile of retail or service establishments. I believe on the webinar the priority was access to food and restrooms. Do these amenities need to be available 24/7?
2. The project site requirements indicate that the site must have adequate service for the stations proposed and allow additional electrical cable to be run to the site to charge at least two additional 100 kW (corrected from 120 kW) or higher charging stations in the future. If the grant request is for three stations, is capacity for two

additional stations still required? Or, would having three stations to begin with satisfy that requirement?

Response: The amenities do not need to be available 24/7 but the location will receive higher priority if they do.

If the grant request is for three chargers at 100 kW each, capacity for only one more future 100 kW charger is required.

Question 52: The Applicant Certification Statement includes the following: “The applicant will not use funding under the Program to purchase hardware or services for which the applicant has received, or will receive, full payment from another source or under another Program.” I understand this to mean that the applicant can use funding under the Program to purchase hardware or services for which the applicant has received, or will receive, PARTIAL payment from another source or under another Program. Is that correct?

Response: We encourage our applicants to pursue as much funding as possible from other sources so that their proposal to our program is as cost-effective as possible. The goal of the requirement you cited is that applicant not “double dip” or seek reimbursement for expenses already being covered by other funding sources. Please describe the funding scenario clearly in the application as well as in any reimbursement request should the grant be awarded.

Question 53: Does Section 4.3.14 in RFA require that have all three communication methods simultaneously provide the same information on pricing. If yes, then the physical signage, displaying fee information, should probably be electronic so that new prices can be displayed without having to order and install new signage as prices change.

Response: Our program does not require a physical sign specifically for displaying pricing/fee information. We do expect that the pricing on a user’s device match that on the payment screen. And that applicants comply with meets the requirements of is O.A.C. 901:6-5-02.

Questions on interpreting O.A.C. 901:6-5-02 should be directed to the Ohio Division of Weights and Measures.

Question 54: Do we need to supply a site host agreement letter if we plan to install on our own City property and own, operate and maintain the chargers ourselves?

Response: In this case, we would not need a formal site host agreement. A simple letter from the City Manager committing to own, operate and maintain the chargers for a minimum of 5 years from deployment would suffice.

Question 55: Is there a maximum amount that a single applicant can receive for the DCFC VW applications? Meaning, theoretically, could a single applicant be awarded grants totaling half of the entire budget?

Response: There is no maximum per single applicant. So, theoretically, that is a possibility.

We do reserve the right to make program decisions that help spread the funds across a wider geographical area and range of applicants.

As a reminder, each location needs to be a complete standalone application.

Question 56: We have a question about the wording differences on the budget template and the grant application budget page.

On the budget template, Line E asks for the total number of chargers proposed and the grant funding requested per charger.

On the grant application budget page, Line E asks for total number of charging ports (Add Line + Line 6 above), and grant funding requested per charger port.

- 1) What does this mean: Add Line + Line 6 above (is there something missing before the + ?)
- 2) We are proposing two DCFC chargers, with two charging ports on each for a total of four charging ports. Should we request funding per charging port or per charger?

Response: We have revised the RFA and supporting documents to address this. The Project Proposal Section II and Budget Template have been revised as follows:

1. Line E: Number of cars that will be able to concurrently charge at 100 kW minimum:
2. Line F: Grant funding requested per 100 kW minimum charger made available (Line C/Line E)
3. The example for the text box has been revised to emphasize providing a good explanation of how the proposed charger configuration meets program requirements.

This will allow us to confirm eligibility and determine cost-effectiveness of a proposal while still being flexible and allowing for multiple single port, dual port and paired charger configurations.

Question 57: Please answer the following questions:

1. Will a professional engineer's estimate with a stamp serve as an adequate price quote replacement for site improvements?
2. Will the grant program reimburse such expenses as consultant fees for necessary public bidding and infrastructure design?
3. Please address concerns regarding stiff minimum generation fees from our utility (projected by some to be as much as a whopping \$1,800 minimal charge) associated with a DC Fast Charger in communities where adoption of electric cars may be initially slow.
4. Will you accept quality applications for Level 2 chargers in this round?

Response: Responses are below:

1. We have decided to accept a professional engineer's estimate with a stamp as an adequate price quote replacement for site improvements. But please note that grant amounts are locked based on the estimates in the application and grantees will be responsible for any overages.
2. No. Eligible (and ineligible) costs are listed in Section 3.4 of the RFA.
3. We understand and appreciate the concerns over demand charges and their impact on the viability of DCFC deployments. We have highlighted this at public forums as something that needs to be addressed. Regrettably, a solution is well beyond the purview of our funding program.

4. We are not accepting applications for Level 2 chargers as part of this application cycle. However, any unspent funds from our DCFC program will be made available for another round of Level 2 funding. The possibility and timing of that funding offering is to be determined.

Question 58: Would you consider funding DC Fast Charging Stations that are either battery or generator powered?

Response: We won't fund chargers powered by diesel generators.

Our RFA does not preclude the use of chargers powered by battery storage options so we would accept such an application. However, since they still aren't as established presence in the EV charging network and don't come with longer term data on reliability and performance, that may impact the scoring/ranking of the application.