

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

Responses to three questions received after the 10/20/21 RFP Question Period deadline were added to this document on 11/23/21. It was felt that providing answers to these questions would benefit all potential respondents to the RFP.

An informational session regarding this RFP was held on October 6, 2021. The session was recorded and that recording along with a copy of the PowerPoint presentation is available at:

<https://www.des.nh.gov/business-and-community/loans-and-grants/volkswagen-mitigation-trust>

Please note that the PowerPoint presentation provided on October 6 incorrectly listed January 3rd as the proposal deadline. The January 3rd date was a typographical error on the presentation slide used during the October 6th Informational Webinar. Since then NHDES has extended the proposal deadline and proposals are now due January 28, 2022 at 4:00PM.

Question: Can an applicant include multiple sites that serve *different* eligible project locations in a single application?

Response: If an applicant wishes to submit distinct proposals for multiple locations NHDES will, in order to reduce unnecessary paperwork, accept submittals that provide only a single copy of the **following sections** of the RFP, provided the information contained in those is identical for each proposed location:

- 5.3.1 Applicant Information
- 5.3.3 Applicant Experience
- 5.3.5 Project Team Qualifications provided the Applicant will have exactly the same project team for all locations.
- 5.3.6 Staffing and Management provided the Applicant will have the same staffing and management for all locations.
- 5.3.7 Site-Host Agreements (Exhibit E) unless Applicant has draft or completed Agreements specific to a proposed location that should be submitted with that location information.
- 5.3.8 Financial Strength

For each proposed location Applicants must provide the information required in the **following sections** of the RFP:

- Signed Cover Letter. The cover letter for each project location should specify which, if any, of the RFP sections listed above are being submitted as a single copy if an Applicant is choosing to exercise this option.
- 5.3.2 Project Overview and Project Partners
- 5.3.4 Statement of Work
- 5.3.9 Equipment Specifications and Customer Interaction (including Exhibit G)
- 5.3.11 Budget/Cost Proposal (including Exhibit B – Project Cost Summary)
- 5.3.12 Operation and Maintenance Plan (Exhibit F)

**NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21**

- 5.3.13 Exhibits A and B must be completed and submitted for each project location. If Exhibits C through G are identical for all sites being proposed only a single copy is required.

Question: The utility provider of this site is the Ashland Municipal Electric Department. I know this is not one of the four utility companies that were mentioned in the RFP. Does that fact effect the eligibility of this site for the funding? Please advise.

Response: A location that is not within one of the utility territories named in the RFP is still eligible. Applicants should have the local utility company complete the form provided. We do not have a point of contact for the Ashland Municipal Electric Department.

Question: We are looking into your DCFC grant RFP and were wondering about the timing of awards – it looks like responses are due by January 28th, is there a timeline for when the awards would be communicated?

Response: NHDES cannot specify a date by which selected applicants will be notified of an award as that timeline will be dictated by the number of proposals received. We anticipate contracts will be presented to the Governor & Executive Council for approval in the April/May timeframe.

Some questions received have been grouped according to general topic.

1. Questions related to the distance of proposed sites from corridors and existing DCFC:

Is there a maximum distance, by road, from named key travel corridors that DCFC &or EVSE stations must be located within?

How much weight is given to distance from the corridor when selecting a site? Is there a hard limit on distance from the corridor where a site will not be considered?

Are the 20 miles referenced in the line "The State will not award a contract for a proposed site that is within 20 miles of an existing publicly accessible DCFC charging station" as the crow flies or the shortest route by road?

How strict is the 20 mile rule? If existing DCFC EVSE is located in another state and is servicing a different travel corridor does that still negate the potential for a proposal that's within 20 miles?

If there is a 20 mi limit to PROPOSED sites, will affected applicants be notified of the issue to assess whether the proposed project can be shifted to amend their proposal?

How are the site locations impacted by chargers at adjacent states?

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

In terms of location, (a) must the DCFC be located within a specific distance of a designated corridor? and (b) will a location at or near the intersection of two corridors likely be prioritized over a location adjacent to just a single corridor (all other things being equal)?

Notwithstanding the list of 9 travel corridors being considered (p 13), the state has also said it will "**not** award a contract for a proposed site that is within 20 miles of an existing publicly accessible DCFC charging station that includes [both connector types]" (P14) (Emphasis added). This creates a very small potential area for sites to be selected and eliminates much of the state, including Concord and Manchester, the Upper Valley and much of Southern NH. Why? Because the states of Maine and Vermont have placed chargers close to the border with NH and there are quirky existing DCFCers located at car dealerships and seasonal campgrounds that are off the beaten path and do not offer attractive locations for drivers to use. See attached map that shows this. If the state wants to use the 20 mile radius it should be a discretionary metric and not scored as aggressively as the other strategic attributes. For example, Concord has many commuters and, notwithstanding the new EA DCFCers in Manchester which are within 20 miles, ought to deserve separate consideration. Without flexibility this could foreclose many otherwise reasonable locations.

The 20-mile gap distance between chargers. (P 14 of RFP s. 3.3) Thank you for the state's clarification relating to the means of measuring the 20 mile distance required between DCFCing stations. I would reiterate my request that the state consider this to be a discretionary requirement rather than a mandatory one. It is worth noting that Portsmouth is within 15 miles of Seabrook and Kittery, ME, notwithstanding its population base and destination value. Will the state reconsider this 20 mile requirement as but one value in assessing site scoring (e.g. other values might include traffic volume, population density, tourism activity) and make the 20 mile requirement a preference only?

Response: Section 3.3 (EVSE Location Within the Corridor) states *"Sites proposed should serve travel on a specified corridor. If a site is not immediately adjacent to a named corridor the proposal should specify the distance (by road, not direct line) from the corridor and describe why the proposed location is preferred. Excessive distance from a named travel corridor may be reflected in a proposal's score absent adequate justification."*

And further states *"The State will not award a contract for a proposed site that is within 20 miles of an existing publicly accessible DCFC charging station that includes both SAE Combo (Combined Charging System) and CHAdeMO connectors. "Existing" means the station is either operational or has obtained all necessary permits and is under construction."*

While New Hampshire has limited funding for support of DCFC and is interested in establishing charging stations in all areas of the state that are not currently served by existing chargers, the questions and comments with regard to a firm 20-mile exclusion zone prompted further review of this limit. As a result, NHDES will be amending the RFP as described below to allow for certain exceptions. The questions also highlighted the need for NHDES to expand on and clarify the definition of "existing". For purposes of this RFP, an existing station is one that has both connector types, is available 24 hours a day every day of the year, and serves the same corridor. This does include charging stations in New Hampshire as well as charging stations located in adjacent states that serve that same corridor.

**NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21**

Amendment #1, released on November 2, 2021, amends Section 3.3 (EVSE Location Within the Corridor) on Page 14 as follows:

The State will not award a contract for a proposed site that is within 20 miles of an existing publicly accessible DCFC charging station that includes both SAE Combo (Combined Charging System) and CHAdeMO connectors **unless an additional charging location can be justified due to population and traffic in the area. For example, existing chargers in the Manchester area may not preclude proposals for additional charging in the Concord area. Additionally, should a party feel that there are extenuating circumstances to an existing DCFC site, such as reliability issues or hours of operation, that could result in the need for additional DCFC in that area, a proposal may be submitted that includes relevant information demonstrating the need for the additional DCFC site. “Existing” means a station that has both connector types, is either operational or has obtained all necessary permits and is under construction, and is available 24 hours a day every day of the year.**

No specific distance from a corridor is stated in the RFP as being too far, and all proposed locations will undergo review and evaluation.

Distances between existing publically accessible DCFC charging stations and proposed charger sites should be measured by roadway travel distance and not by direct line.

Competing proposals within 20 miles of each other will be evaluated using the specified scoring criteria. Only one site will be selected. Per Section 1.5 (Proposal Submittal) of the RFP, *“No changes or additions to a proposal will be accepted after the specified due date and time. If necessary, applicants may be contacted for clarification of information submitted, but changes to such information will not be allowed at that time.”* Applicants will not be notified of a competing proposal within 20 miles and will not be allowed to modify a submittal.

All proposals will be evaluated using scoring criteria included in Section 6.1 of the RFP. It is possible that a single site serving two corridors could have a scoring advantage over a proposal serving only one corridor, depending upon the proposed location and all else being equal.

2. Question/Request: We request that 97% uptime requirement be reconsidered to simply be based on an annual basis. If the 97% uptime requirement were measured on a weekly basis, this would necessitate arriving on site with all necessary equipment within 24 hours following notice. Measuring uptime on an annual basis would still ensure consistent access by the public while also reflecting logistical realities for equipment maintenance.

Response: The requirement as stated in the RFP is inconsistent with a previous Level 2 charging RFP and contract issued by the State. Amendment #1, released on November 2, 2021 amends Section 4.2 (Operation Requirements) on Page 18, Item 1.e. as follows:

Ensuring the DCFC and Level 2 EVSE are operational at least 97 percent of the time ***on an annual basis.***

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

3. Question: The Level 2 charger requirement of 9.6 kW (P15 of RFP s.4.1). Will the State consider allowing, for certain sites, existing level 2 chargers that are publicly accessible and located nearby as sufficient to meet its requirement of level 2 charging? Pre-existing L2 chargers could serve as reliable back up to the DCFCer placement and save overall project cost (e.g. Green St Concord L2 location has four L2 ports and might be co-located or near to a proposed DCFCer site) but might not otherwise meet this 9.6 kW charge level. There are also to my knowledge currently no commercially available 9.6 kW smart chargers such that some discretion on this requirement would make sense as their availability is questionable or at best delayed. Stated alternatively, will there be flexibility in scoring that allows substitute approaches to this L2 amperage requirement?

Response: Amendment #1, released on November 2, 2021, amends Section 4.1 (Charging Station Requirements) on Page 14, Item 3 (Equipment Requirements) as follows:

DCFC must be capable of providing a minimum of 50 kilowatt charging for a single vehicle. Applicants should prepare the site and utilize equipment that can be upgraded to deliver up to 150 kilowatts when warranted by technology and demand. Level 2 chargers must be capable of providing a minimum of 9.6 kilowatts for a single vehicle. **If an applicant is not able to propose 9.6kW chargers due to lack of commercially available models then an applicant should state such and may propose the use of a minimum of 7.2kW Level 2 chargers as an alternative.**

4.Question: Do you know if small towns can apply? I notice that the major corridors listed do not include Rte. 120 or 12A (the only major routes going through Cornish). Does this mean our town would be ineligible?

Response: The solicitation is open to any party with the knowledge and expertise necessary to meet the requirements specified in the RFP. Applicants need not own either the property upon which the EVSE is installed, or the EVSE itself. However, the Applicant will be legally responsible for compliance with terms of the contract and must have binding contractual agreements with all parties that are essential to the successful installation, maintenance, and operation of the EVSE for the duration of the Contract. Should the Town, an agent of the Town or an entity selected by the Town, meet these criteria they would be eligible to apply.

Relative to location, see response to Questions 1 above.

5. Questions regarding location of existing charging infrastructure and EVSE service providers:

Does the state have any insight into current DCFC projects in process to allow for better planning around the 20 mile gap criterion?

Is there a list of EVSE service providers that cover NH?

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

How do we determine if our planned location(s) are not within 20 miles of an existing publicly accessible DCFC charging station that includes both SAE Combo (Combined Charging System) and CHAdeMO connectors? Is there a public map of New Hampshire locations for EVSE and their type?

Is NHDES aware of and able to identify any planned or permitted DCFC along any of the 9 corridors identified in the RFP? If so, can you please share a list so an applicant can ensure proper spacing between DCFC?

Response: The U.S. Department of Energy's Alternative Fuel Data Center website lists both the Electric Drive Transportation Association's [GoElectricDrive](#) website and [Plug In America's Get Equipped](#) resource as sources for information on charging networks and service providers.

Applicants should use resources such as the U.S. Department of Energy's Alternative Fuels Data Center "Alternative Fueling Station Locator" or applications such as "PlugShare" to identify the location of existing DCFC and Level 2 charging stations.

The DOE *Alternative Fueling Station Locator* is <https://afdc.energy.gov/stations/#/find/nearest>

The PlugShare website is <https://www.plugshare.com/>

NHDES is aware of two DCFC stations currently being installed by Electrify America at 310 Daniel Webster Highway in Nashua and at 99 Rockingham Park Boulevard in Salem.

6. Questions regarding submitting multiple proposals in a single application:

Is it allowed to have multiple DCFC &or level 2 stations, i.e. at different physical locations within Bristol, to be combined under a single RFP?

Regarding submittals from a single party. Can a responding party submit more than one proposal in the same community? If a responding party has identified multiple candidate sites in a community would it be better to submit a comprehensive proposal for all sites or to submit multiple unique proposals for each respective site?

Response: Applicants should not propose multiple sites in a single application. Separate applications should be submitted for each proposed site. Section 3.3 (EVSE Location Within the Corridor) states "*The State will not award contracts to multiple proposals that are within 20 miles of each other. In cases where competing sites are proposed within the same area, the higher score will prevail*".

An Applicant may submit multiple proposals for the same area, but only one proposal could potentially be selected for funding.

Additionally, applicants are encouraged to refer to Section 2.2 of the RFP for additional context relative to site choice.

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

7. Question: I was reading through the program description for DES's RFP that uses VW settlement funds to fund L2 and L3 EV charging stations along specified corridors – and I'm looking for more detail on what type of project costs are covered, specifically whether costs to increase electrical capacity is covered? Do you have any more detail on cost coverage other than what's in the program description that you can provide?

Response: Section 2.4 of the RFP provides a list of Eligible and Non-Eligible Costs. Eligible costs include "Necessary upgrades to electric supply;" and "Make-ready costs not covered by utility(ies);". Non-eligible costs include costs related to electrical infrastructure on the property and/or grid interconnection costs that would otherwise be covered by the utility. As stated in Section 2.5, applicants must consult with the electric utility company providing service for each proposed site, and submit completed 1) Electric Vehicle Preliminary Site Feasibility Assessment Information and 2) DC Fast Charger Utility Application forms. It is incumbent upon the Applicant to be responsive to requests for information from the utility that are necessary to properly complete this form. Applicants are advised to allow for adequate time to coordinate with the utility to ensure the full completion of the Utility Assessment Form including estimates of full costs. Any proposal submitted without these forms will be rejected.

8. Questions related to Site Host Agreements:

Does the state have any role in the host site agreement process? Do they have a draft agreement or will they leave this up to the applicant?

ChargePoint is concerned that the current requirement that site host agreements be submitted within 30 days of notification of award and prior to execution of grant agreement with NHDES if the applicant isn't the property owner is extremely challenging. Site host agreements are complex legal documents that take time to negotiate, especially without the funding secured that will cover a significant portion of total project costs. While we understand a goal of this RFP is to have numerous DCFC sites operational by Fall 2022, we request at least 90 days post grant agreement execution be provided if a site host agreement is needed. This is consistent with the majority of VW funded grant programs including and most recently Maine and New York.

Response: The state does not have a role in the agreement process. If an Agreement has not yet been concluded in time to submit with an Applicant's proposal, then Applicants should include a sample Site-Host Agreement. NHDES does not have a template for a site-host agreement, but Applicants must ensure that Site-Host Agreements submitted fulfill the requirements of Section 4.3 of the RFP.

Amendment #1, released on November 2, 2021, amends Section 4.3 (Site-Host Agreements) as follows:

*In the event that Applicants to this RFP propose a charging station site or sites on properties not owned by the Applicant, a binding Site-Host Agreement must be secured, executed and provided to the State **no later than 90 days after the Governor and Executive Council approval of the contract resulting from this RFP. The grant is subject to such Agreements submitted to the***

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

State within the timeframe. Failure to submit such Agreement within this time frame may result in termination of the resulting contract with the State, the withdrawal of the award offer and the selection of a competing proposal.

The Agreement must be signed by the Applicant and the individual with the authority to make such an agreement on behalf of the host site. Under the terms of the contract with the State, the Applicant will remain legally responsible for the continued operation of the EVSE in compliance with the terms and conditions of the RFP and the contract and for continued maintenance of the site and access to the EVSE, but will not be required to directly own and/or operate the charging stations. At a minimum Site-Host Agreements must:

- a. Include provisions regarding the Applicant's legal right to place the EVSE on the site;*
- b. Allow the Applicant and any sub-contractors to install the specified EVSE on the site and for the equipment to operate on the site for a minimum of five years;*
- c. Explain in simple terms the legal agreement between the Applicant and the Host, including responsibilities relative to the installation, operation and maintenance of both the EVSE and the site as a whole;*
- d. Specify that the Applicant or its sub-contractors will have access to the site as necessary to maintain the equipment, signage, and other appurtenances;*
- e. Require full public access to the EVSE during all operating hours;*
- f. Specify which party is responsible for ensuring the site is accessible and inviting;*
- g. Include provisions for any sale of the site (purchase, lease or rental of real-estate are defined as non-eligible costs); and*
- h. Provide recourse for the Applicant should the Host decide to discontinue operation of the EVSE on the site.*

Finalized Site-Host Agreements, if available, should be included in the application. If an Agreement has not yet been concluded Applicants should include a sample Site-Host Agreement.

9. Questions related to Site Feasibility:

The need for a ten week utility review of the site feasibility means that all sites must be identified by mid-October, which seems very tight given the Jan 7th deadline. Is there more flexibility on the front end of this process? Can utilities commit to faster review periods? The purpose of site selection is laborious, even without utility assessment up front.

As stated each proposal must have a utility Preliminary Site Feasibility Assessment Information Form filled out. Any application without it will be rejected. "**Applicants must provide the utility a minimum of 10 weeks to complete the form.**" (p11) (Emphasis provided). The deadline for applications is January 7th. Ten weeks before Jan 7th is Oct 29th, with several major holidays interspersed during this timeframe. We would like to see either an extension of the deadline or a compression of the utility response period in order to allow sufficient time to identify and court prospective host sites. The issue

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

is the compressed timeframe that has been set up works against a broader review of as many sites as possible.

Response: Based on this question NHDES has extended the proposal due date to January 28, 2022. Please review the 10/13/21 [notice](#) posted to the NHDES website regarding this extension. In addition, the due date change is also a part of Amendment #1 to the RFP released on November 2, 2021.

The details and timeline for coordinating site assessments with utilities was developed with input from the utilities themselves. Applicants are advised to allow for adequate time to coordinate with the utility to ensure the full completion of the Utility Assessment Form including estimates of full costs.

10. Question: Is there flexibility with regard to stenciling/painting of parking spaces? These do not do well with plowing/sanding if the spaces are located on a surface lot.

Response: NHDES is willing to consider options for designating and marking parking spaces included in proposals.

11. Question: Is there an estimated timeline for requiring utilities to implement a rate specific EV charging stations?

Response: The establishment of electric rates is the purview of the Public Utilities Commission. NHDES cannot comment on timelines regarding implementation of specific rates.

12. Questions related to sites on state-owned properties

If the parcel of interest is State owned who should be contacted regarding the Site Host Agreement?

If the parcel of interest is State owned (e.g. Park and Ride) but is being rented to a private company, is the Site Host Agreement between just the applicant and the State? Does the private party currently operating on the site need to be included in the agreement?

Response: Inquiries regarding State owned sites should first be directed to the specific State agency that has management responsibility for the property (e.g., Administrative Services, Transportation, Fish and Game, etc.) to determine the potential viability of site access and control. A State agency directory is available at <https://www.nh.gov/government/agencies.htm>.

Potential respondents considering property owned by the State of New Hampshire should be aware that the default statutory process for obtaining private rights to use State property, as set forth in [RSA 4:40](#), typically takes at least 6 months to navigate and requires, among other things, the prior approval of the

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

joint legislative Long Range Capital Planning and Utilization Committee and the Governor and Executive Council. For additional inquiries, or for assistance in the determination of the appropriate points of contact for a particular State property, please contact Tim White (Timothy.H.White@des.nh.gov, 271-5552).

While we cannot address specific site ownership/control scenarios here, the Applicant will be legally responsible for compliance with terms of the contract and must have binding contractual agreements with all parties that are essential to the successful installation, maintenance, and operation of the EVSE for the duration of the Contract. The Site Host Agreement should most likely be with the entity having physical control/access of the site, either via ownership or long term lease. The Site Host Agreement should be in accordance with any existing property lease or other agreement governing physical control/access and should not violate the terms of such agreement.

13. Questions related to submission of hard copies and electronic copies:

Can you please explain the need for hard copy submittals? Is NHDES willing to reconsider and only require an electronic copy?

The RFP requests hard copies to be mailed in addition to electronic. Is DES able to modify this requirement to simply accept electronic copies? If there are no statutory limitations on accepting RFP responses electronically, this technical change would reduce paper usage, streamline logistics for submission, and support a more efficient review.

Response: NHDES reviewing staff have found that the use of hard copies facilitates the review process. Therefore, this request is denied. Both electronic and hard copy submittals including all content specified in Section 5 of this RFP, shall be delivered to the Designated Contact Person in Section 1.2 by the application due date and time specified in Section 1.3. Should there be any discrepancies between the electronic copy and the hard copy, the hard copy will govern.

14. Question: While there are 9 eligible project locations, does NHDES have a goal for number of sites they are looking to award with the \$3M?

Are the EVSE stations limited to pre-selected locations?

Response: NHDES has identified nine specific corridors on which establishment of DCFC is a priority. The final number of project locations will be determined by the cost of the proposed projects and the amount of funding available, and may or may not serve all identified corridors. NHDES cannot project how many locations may be funded.

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

15. Question: Does Project Location #7 NH Route 11/103 from New London, NH to Claremont, NH assume route north of Lake Sunapee on Route 11 through Sunapee or does it assume route south on 103A through Newbury?

Response: Corridor #7 (NH 11/103 from New London, NH to Claremont, NH) extends from I-89 Exit 12A in Sunapee as NH 11 and NH 103 through Newport and Claremont to the Vermont border.

16. Question: Can the applicant be a partnership of municipal, state education & private business entities?

Response: Per Section 2.3 (Eligible Applicants) of the RFP, the solicitation is open to any party with the knowledge and expertise necessary to meet the requirements specified in the RFP. While a proposed project may have multiple partners, the Applicant will be legally responsible for compliance with terms of the contract and must have binding contractual agreements with all parties that are essential to the successful installation, maintenance, and operation of the EVSE for the duration of the Contract. Any partnership must specify a single legal entity responsible for all legal and contractual obligations.

17. Question: What is the expected completion date for all projects under this RFP?

Response: Section 3.4 (Anticipated Date of Operation) states that *“Through this RFP, NHDES anticipates having multiple charging locations operational by fall of 2022.”* This should not be interpreted to mean that all proposals must be able to be completed in that timeframe, but clearly shows a preference for locations that can be operational sooner, all else being equal.

18. Question: Would many more corridor miles become ineligible when Tesla opens up their chargers to non-Tesla owners in Q4 2022, as they have said they would? Would this impact proposal review in any way?

Response: The proposals submitted in response to the RFP will be evaluated and scored based on existing and/or permitted non-exclusive DCFC at the time of project scoring, which we anticipate will be completed in advance of any firm announcements by Tesla.

19. Questions related to specific sites:

I own No Worry Storage in Pittsfield and have space I'd like to utilize for a project like this. I've spoken to our selectmen who believe this would be an excellent idea for our town. I guess the question is whether we would be in your "target route"? Can you help me understand the viability for Pittsfield? The site is just about 5 blocks or so off Rt 28.

My business is located at 343 DW Hwy in Meredith... right on Rtes 3 and 25 in downtown Meredith. Thousands of cars pass each day. It is extremely convenient and highly visible and has a front parking lot on the highway that is virtually unused. It would be the most ideal place in the area for a charging station. Can you tell me if this property is eligible to apply for this program, how I would apply for this

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

program, and how I would determine what equipment should be installed and how I would best determine the initial costs for that? Besides possibly getting re-imbursed for the installation, would I be able to make any money from the charging? Would I be responsible to maintain and repair the chargers?

Response: While a specific site may indeed be a potentially attractive location for EV charging the sites mentioned may not specifically meet the intent of serving the specific highway corridors identified in Section 3.3 (EVSE Location Within the Corridor) of the RFP which states *“Sites proposed should serve travel on a specified corridor. If a site is not immediately adjacent to a named corridor the proposal should specify the distance (by road, not direct line) from the corridor and describe why the proposed location is preferred. Excessive distance from a named travel corridor may be reflected in a proposal’s score absent adequate justification.”* Applicants are encouraged to refer to Section 2.2 of the RFP for additional context relative to site choice. While NHDES will review and evaluate all proposals, such sites would most likely require additional information that would justify such an alternate location.

Additionally, along with the other RFP materials, the NHDES website includes a database of willing site hosts who have asked that their contact information and information related to potential EVSE sites be shared with potential bidders for this RFP. Anyone wishing to have their location and contact information added to the database and should contact Timothy White at 603-271-5552.

This solicitation is open to any party with the knowledge and expertise necessary to meet the requirements herein. Section 5 of the RFP includes information on format and content of proposals and Section 4.1 of the RFP provides details on the required configuration of charging stations on specific site locations. Section 2.4 of the RFP includes a listing of eligible and non-eligible costs. In their proposals, respondents should provide information regarding the details of their plans for the installation, operation, and maintenance of EVSE at the proposed sites. NHDES recommends site hosts without the necessary expertise to develop a proposal collaborate with established DCFC charging infrastructure companies (see links provided in Question 3).

Additionally, along with the other RFP materials, the NHDES website includes a database of site hosts compiled from entities wishing to share their contact information and information related to potential EVSE sites with potential bidders for this RFP. The questioner may want to consider having this site added to the database.

20. Question: The current RFP uses 3-4 million of the 30 million total in the VW settlement. What are the plans for the other funds? Will more be allocated to charging? Or is charging limited to 15% of the total? And are there other incentives for EV’s being considered?

Response: The state of New Hampshire was allocated approximately \$30.9 from the VW Environmental Mitigation Trust. Approximately \$4.6 million or 15 percent of New Hampshire’s allocation will be used for the acquisition, installation, operation and maintenance of electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) as allowed under Category 9 of the Settlement Agreement. From this total of \$4.6M, approximately

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

\$3.0M is available for this solicitation, though the State has reserved the right to increase or decrease this amount based on proposals received. Alternatively, the state could issue future solicitations for utilizing the remaining funding although there is no timeline for a plan to do so at the present time. Remaining VW funds will be allocated to eligible projects as described in the New Hampshire Beneficiary Mitigation Plan that has been approved by the Trustee. This Mitigation plan is available at: <https://www.des.nh.gov/sites/g/files/ehbemt341/files/documents/beneficiary-mitigation-plan.pdf>

Additional information on incentives and opportunities for Electric Vehicles (EV) in New Hampshire is available at: <https://www.granitestatecleancities.nh.gov/resources/documents/ev-opportunities.pdf>

21. Question: Looking at the Utility Preliminary Site Feasibility Assessment Form, which is required to be submitted with the application, can you provide more detail in terms of how the utility assessment might figure into the scoring of a particular proposal? What elements of the form is the state planning on deeming most useful in its considerations? What critical information does it need from the utility that can't otherwise be gained after the proposal is submitted and accepted? I can see how a particular site might have strategic importance but the utility has a different view based on its available infrastructure. How will the state view that situation? I am also concerned that given the 10 week utility deliberation timeframe, a proposed site host might go through significant additional due diligence and preparation for the submittal of a proposal, get it ready in parallel with the utility deliberations (as it must given the proposal deadline) only to then have the utility at the last moment release a "poor" assessment, however the state defines that. Stated alternatively, does the utility have the de facto ability to veto a site based solely on its assessment? Also, I am still hoping you can clarify how many level 2 ports are required to be near the DCFCers and how far away they might be to be considered "co-located"? Flexibility in terms of the allowable distance from the DCFCers and the amperage would be helpful as this added single phase element can actually add significant cost depending on the location.

Response: *DC Fast Charger Utility Application* and the *Electric Vehicle Preliminary Site Feasibility Assessment Information* forms for each proposed location are required to be submitted with the final application. The information in the forms will be used to help evaluate the feasibility of a proposed site by provided information related to required equipment upgrades, the timeline for completing the primary work that will be required on the site, the anticipated cost of upgrades required to service the facility, and whether such upgrades qualify for utility investment or will require other funding sources. NHDES must have an accurate information regarding the cost of necessary upgrades and whether such costs will be borne by the utility or by the grant, and the timeline for the work, as well as any other factors that could complicate the process (i.e. easements, permitting issues) of providing adequate power to sites. By submitting *Electric Vehicle Preliminary Site Feasibility Assessment Information* forms for proposed location, utilities are providing important information that the Evaluation Committee will use to evaluate each proposed site.

NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21

The RFP specifies that at least one Level 2 charger is required to be located on each proposed site and that the Level 2 charger have its own dedicated parking space. It does not have to be located adjacent to the DCFC. Applicants may propose alternative charging station configurations in their proposals if they include justification for the alternative configuration.

22. Question: Do we need to fill out Attachment D: State of NH Form Number P-37 .pdf?

Response: Yes. Proposals must include a completed and signed Attachment D-Form P-37 – General Contract Agreements.

23. Questions regarding the Requirement for Co-located/adjacent Level 2 EVSE:

Can you provide more detail on what qualifies as co-located level II charging? For example, if level II chargers are located within 1,000 feet from the DCFC could that be considered co-located?

Will the State consider allowing, for certain sites, existing level 2 chargers that are publicly accessible and located nearby as sufficient to meet its requirement of level 2 charging?

How many L2 ports are needed to be adjacent to the DCFC site? What does "adjacent" mean?

Response: Section 4.1 of the RFP states *“To the extent appropriate and dependent on the specific site location, the charging stations shall be configured as follows:*

- a. A minimum of two and preferably four DCFC dedicated parking spaces;*
- b. A minimum of two DCFC, each with both SAE Combo (Combined Charging System) and CHAdeMO connectors, and accessible from a dedicated parking space; and*
- c. At least one Level 2 charger on the Host site (it does not have to be located adjacent to the DCFC) with its own dedicated parking space.*

Applicants proposing to deviate from the charging station configuration outlined in this section must include in their proposal justification for the alternative configuration.”

The term “co-located” may be broadly interpreted, and should be construed to mean on the same property as the DCFC, though could be at a different location on that property, or on an adjacent property. “Adjacent” is typically defined as “next to or adjoining something else.” Should an Applicant wish to propose installing the Level 2 charging on an adjacent property the Applicant must have the same legal right to operate the Level 2 at its location for the term of the contract that they have to operate the DCFC, and the Level 2 must be close enough to be considered to serve the same corridor. Applicants should clearly describe the location of both the DCFC and Level 2 EVSE including the distance between them.

If an Applicant determines that existing, operational Level 2 charging is publically available within *the vicinity* of the proposed DCFC site, an Applicant must still propose co-located Level 2 charging, but may request in their submittal that NHDES consider approving a contract that does not include co-located

**NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21**

Level 2 charging. In order for NHDES to consider such a request an Applicant would need to provide the following information about the existing Level 2 infrastructure with their initial proposal:

- The physical address and distance of the infrastructure from the proposed site;
- Name and contact information for both the owner of the property upon which it is located and, if different, the name and contact information of the owner of the EVSE;
- A letter from the property owner, and EVSE owner if not the property owner, stating that the equipment is currently operational and that it is their intention for it to remain operational at that site for at least 5 more years;
- A detailed description of the existing Level 2 charging infrastructure including, but not limited to, make, model, age, operational details such as network provider, charging fee structure, provision of dedicated parking, minimum charging provided for a single vehicle in kilowatts, Energy Star Certification and any other information required to indicate that the charger meets the requirements of Section 4.1.

The RFP did not specify the number of Level 2 ports per charger. However, dual port chargers are typically the most cost-effective way to provide charging for multiple vehicles.

24. Question: Can the chargers be installed in a private/public partnership? For example, could a DCFC be installed on public property and the co-located level II chargers be installed on private property? In this case would the funding be 80% for the chargers on private property and 100% for the chargers on public property?

Response: Yes, provided the chargers can meet the co-location intent of the RFP and the Applicant is able to enter into binding agreements with both parties. The rate at which eligible costs on the private and public properties making up the proposed site are reimbursed would be dependent on the site details included in the proposal.

25. Question: Is there a requirement that the applicant do a competitive RFP to select a contractor?

Response: No

26. Question: Non-eligible costs (P10 of RFP s 2.4) Demand Charges. What is the state's rationale for not providing reimbursement for demand charges as an eligible cost? For example, is the state anticipating that demand charges will be addressed by the NHPUC in a current utility rate design docket (e.g. Eversource) in such a way as to minimize their impact on charger usage/operational costs? Will the state's consideration of demand charges as a non-eligible cost be affected in the event that the rate design proposal reducing demand charges is not accepted by the NH PUC? Stated alternatively, if demand charges are identified as an ongoing impediment to the viability of these projects and/or a

**NH VW Environmental Mitigation Trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP
Responses to Questions
Updated 11/23/21**

major hurdle in getting host sites to submit proposals will the state re-visit this issue and make demand charges an eligible cost?

Response: Eligible and Non-Eligible costs in this RFP were developed using feedback received during a Listening Session held in March 2020 following the original release of the NH VW Environmental Mitigation trust DCFC Infrastructure RFP in 2019. As a result of the feedback received during this session, NHDES included additional items as eligible costs in this RFP such as: i) make-ready costs not covered by utilities; ii) planning/permit fees; iii) warranty and maintenance agreements; iv) software/network service agreements and v) customer support service agreements.

NHDES has not included any on-going operational costs as eligible for reimbursement with the exception of a 5-year warranty and maintenance agreement and a 5-year network service/customer support agreement. The cost of the power necessary to operate the EVSE, including associated demand charges, is an operational expense that is not an eligible expense under this RFP.