

EVCI-RFA-01 Response to Questions

Posted February 25, 2020

The question period for EVCI-RFA-01 closed at 11:59 PM ET on February 19, 2020. All questions submitted during the question period are addressed below.

Questions that were submitted without identifying a particular section of the RFA to which they pertain are addressed first. Questions that pertain to a specific section of the RFA are addressed second.

General Questions

1. Four entities requested the RFA be expanded to additional routes, such as I-10, US 319, SR 528, SR 408, US 98, SR 15, US 192, US 27 and US 1. They have requested that the Department modify the RFA to include additional routes.

Response: The Department does not plan to alter the scope of this RFA. The Department notes that this RFA is clearly identified as "Phase 1" of EV infrastructure funding. Florida's Volkswagen mitigation plan allocates approximately \$24.9 million toward light-duty EV infrastructure. This RFA aims to spend no more than \$13.5 million of these funds. Therefore, there will be at least \$11 million available in subsequent phases.

2. "[Entity] believes that the VW Mitigation intent was to concentrate on areas of dense populations. Therefore we would like to understand why the segments were not adjusted accordingly allowing for more projects in areas of concern and higher density."

Response: The Department's priorities regarding evacuation corridors, segment length, and location are reflected in the RFA as written.

3. "[Entity] believes that battery storage should be included in the eligible costs for reimbursement - primarily to insure resiliency and secondarily to curtail demand issues with high speed charging. Are these storage costs eligible for reimbursement?"

Response: Yes, the Department considers on-site storage to be infrastructure that is eligible for reimbursement. Similarly, on-site generation (for example, solar or diesel), if its primary purpose is to supply the charging station or its batteries, would also be eligible.

4. "Can you please provide a clear definition of Government property?"

Response: Section 4.2 of the RFA defines "government" or "governmental entity" as follows:

"Government" or "Governmental Entity" means a federal, state, regional, or local government agency within Florida (including a school district, public college or university, municipality, city, county, special district, transportation authority, joint powers authority, airport authority or port authority, owning fleets purchased with government funds), and a tribal government or native village.

Therefore, Government property would be property owned by a government or a governmental entity.

5. "Can proprietary chargers be included in the project even if the proprietary charger is not included in reimbursement costs?"

Response: Yes, proprietary chargers may be included in the project even though the proprietary charger is not eligible for reimbursement. Additionally, a piece of equipment, such as a transformer, that serves

both universal and proprietary chargers is eligible for reimbursement. However, a piece of equipment that serves only proprietary chargers is not eligible for reimbursement.

6. “If the project allows for proprietary chargers can those costs be part of the applicant match?”

Response: Money spent on proprietary chargers may not be counted toward the applicant’s cost share. Money spent on equipment that serves both universal and proprietary chargers is eligible to be counted toward cost share.

7. “Does the grant applicant need to be the owner / operator of the DCFC equipment? Can a charger OEM apply on behalf of its customers?”

Response: The charger OEM may apply on behalf of its customers. However, since much of the scoring is based on the location of the planned charging station, location-specific information is required in applications. The applicant must have a particular location in mind, even if the applicant is an OEM.

8. “The RFA states: ‘The Grantee must ensure the EVCI is connected to a network through any form of connection’. Is this referring to a requirement for network software (i.e. Greenlots or EV Connect) or for the equipment to have a network connection to the Internet?”

Response: This is referring to a requirement for network software. The EVCI must be part of a charging network.

9. “We do not see a place for budget information. Is a budget a part of this application? ... If budget is not a part of the application, will there be a phase 2 of the application process?”

Response: This is addressed in Section 3.3.2, Item 5, of the RFA. There will not be a second phase to this application process – grantees will be chosen based on the information submitted in response to this RFA.

10. “Does the site need to be open 24 hours per day?”

Response: Sites must be publicly accessible. This is defined in the RFA as follows:

“Publicly Accessible” means EVCI located on public or private property to be used by an electric vehicle owner at any time during normal hours of operation. EVCI located behind a security gate which requires a form other than payment to enter the premises (e.g., security identification badge or other method that requires private membership) is not publicly accessible.

Sites for which nearby amenities are available 24/7 receive two points in the “Proximity to Amenities” category.

11. “Will a later phase of EVCI funding include charging stations near the Florida Turnpike?”

Response: The content of future EVCI funding opportunities has not yet been determined.

12. “Can transit agencies apply for this funding opportunity for charging infrastructure for buses?”

Response: This RFA is only for light-duty EVCI, so charging infrastructure for buses is not eligible through this RFA. However, the Department’s VW mitigation plan allocates approximately \$116 million toward school, transit, and shuttle buses, so opportunities to fund electric transit buses and their associated charging infrastructure will likely come in future opportunities.

13. “On the EVCI Phase 1 Segments Eligible for Funding Map of Eligible Interstate Corridor Segments, please define the parameters, streets and avenues, for Segments Number 12 and Number 13 off I-75.”

Response: This is addressed in the table in Section 1.3 of the RFA.

- 14.** “As we utilize superchargers and L2 chargers we have not noticed and chargers hooked up to solar renewable sources with battery back ups. We believe this would be very beneficial in the event of a natural disaster. Last year when the hurricane hit the Bahamas there were fuel shortages. EV’s would be able to do FEMA work and assist as long as the charging sources could be charged by the sun and stored with battery back ups. Could these funds be utilized to create such charging locations?”

Response: See the response to Question 3, above.

- 15.** “[Entity] believes that the funding will go further if the total reimbursed costs are lowered from 500,000. ... [C]an the \$500,000 funding be split into two projects?”

Response: In Section 2.2, the RFA states, “Applicants ... may not apply twice for any one segment as an individual applicant”. In Section 1.2, the RFA states, “One project will be competitively selected for each of the 27 segments.” Therefore, the \$500,000 per segment may not be split into two projects.

- 16.** “The RFA states that we should include the following information:
-Planning for future expansion of charging stations and parking spots,
Can you provide more detail on the scope and nature of the future expansion that you would like us to include? Is there a specific number of future charging stations you have in mind?”

Response: The Department is not targeting any specific number of stations for future charging growth.

- 17.** “Will there be consideration for EVCI along I-575, but in close proximity to I-95?”

Response: See response to Question 1. If the location is within 5 miles of I-95, then it would be eligible to compete for the appropriate I-95 segment.

- 18.** “Is there additional information that we can gather other than what is listed in your initial email advertisement?”

Response: All of the information the Department has made available is at <https://www.floridadep.gov/volkswagen>.

- 19.** “Are there additional sources of information or actual charging station units that you can provide technical information on including cut-sheets for the charging product?”

Response: No, the Department will not provide this type of information.

- 20.** “[Entity] is a company based in Mumbai, India. We are interested in participating in the tender mentioned above hence want to get more information about the same. Considering the geographical constraint of personally reviewing the document, I request you to provide us the following details before we buy the document:

- 1) List of Items, Schedule of Requirements, Scope of Work, Terms of Reference, Bill of Materials required.
- 2) Soft Copy of the Tender Document through email.
- 3) Names of countries that will be eligible to participate in this tender.
- 4) Information about the Tendering Procedure and Guidelines
- 5) Estimated Budget for this Purchase
- 6) Any Extension of Bidding Deadline?
- 7) Any Addendum or Pre Bid meeting Minutes?”

Response: All of this information is given in the RFA or in this Response to Questions document.

Specific Questions

RFA Section 1.4, Page 7

- 21.** “Could the Department make the Map of Eligible Interstate Corridor Segments available in any common GIS file format (or post it to ArcGIS Online?)”

Response: The Department believes the information in the RFA is sufficient for applicants to develop this if they would like. The Department does not intend to post this information in a GIS format. The mile markers that demarcate each segment are given in Section 1.3 of the RFA.

RFA Section 3.3.2, Page 15

- 22.** “Segment and Site Specific- Information states that ‘EVCI must have a 5-year warranty. Each site must have a maintenance plan to demonstrate how all outages will be addressed within 72 hours.’ Can you please clarify the 72 hour requirement? Does the charger need to be repaired in 72 hours or does the issue just need to be addressed and a remediation plan in place? Please note that some issues may take longer than 72 hours to repair like a new part or an issue with the electric distribution equipment.”

Response: Each applicant must have a plan for how outages will be addressed within 72 hours. However, the Department recognizes that actual repairs do not always go according to plan. Any issue that can be addressed within 72 hours should be addressed accordingly. If the unit cannot be repaired within 72 hours, the site operator must repair the unit as soon as practicable. A project that is not properly maintained is subject to the actions outlined in RFA Section 4.6.

RFA Section 4.1, Page 17

- 23.** “[Entity] is situated along State Road A1A (SR A1A) where the roadway continues west into SR A1A/SR 528/Martin Andersen Beachline Expressway. This roadway acts as the gateway to Central Florida and beyond—connecting the barrier island communities, Merritt Island, and the Space Coast to U.S. Highway 1 (US 1) and Interstate 95 (I-95). These roadways are included as Evacuation Routes in the 2018 Florida Division of Emergency Management’s Brevard Evacuation Routes & Zones Map (please see Attachment 1), with the barrier island communities and Merritt Island included in the “Zone A” evacuation area.

According to Section 4.1 of RFA No. EVCI-RFA-01, the “Grantee shall be responsible for the purchase and installation of DC fast charge electric vehicle charging infrastructure (EVCI) within a five (5) mile proximity to its Awarded Segment(s) (individually, a “Project”).” [Entity] is requesting the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) to grant a consideration and/or exemption to Section 4.1’s five (5) mile proximity to its Awarded Segment condition which will enable [Entity] to become an eligible Applicant for RFA No. EVCI-RFA-01 ([Entity]’s applicable EVCI Phase 1 Segment Number is 6). The planned location at [Entity] for the installation of EVCI under this RFA is in a public area directly adjacent to SR A1A/SR 528/Martin Anderson Beachline Expressway (a designated evacuation corridor) approximately 12 miles from the I-95 interchange.

Due to the fuel storage terminals and facilities located on-site, [Entity] is designated as “critical infrastructure” to be quickly restored after natural disasters. The [Entity] is located along a key evacuation route and installed EVCI at the [Entity] would undoubtedly provide a needed service for evacuees both leaving and returning due to a disaster event.

The [Entity] is an independent special taxing district and political subdivision of the State of Florida, and through our environmental programs, we are continuously seeking initiatives to increase the [Entity]’s Sustainability and Resiliency efforts. Based on the number of tourists, and local visitors alike to the Port, an installed EVCI would allow for daily use of charging stations, in turn, fostering an increase in tourism and benefits to the local and regional economies. The [Entity] is currently designing a Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS) along with the assistance of the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC). Additionally, the [Entity] will be joining the East Central Florida Regional Resilience Collaborative’s (ECFR2C) Infrastructure Technical Advisory Committee.”

Response: The Department will not vary its eligibility criteria based on this request. Please also see the responses to Questions 1 and 2, above.

RFA Section 4.8, Page 21

24. “Project Components Ineligible for Funding lists ‘Internet or cellular service connection costs’. Is a pre-paid 5 year network service plan for the charging station an eligible cost? The [Entity] network service plan is required for the charging station to work, charge a fee, get access to reports, and enable remote monitoring and ensure the overall health of the station. It encompasses more than just the cost for cellular connection.”

Response: The Department considers this service plan to be a valid infrastructure cost, which is allowable for reimbursement.

RFA Section 5.2, Page 22

25. “Would an application with 3 or 4 DC fast chargers score higher than an application with 2 DC fast chargers if they both had the same ‘cost effectiveness’? If yes, which criteria would these points be allocated from?”

Response: The Department will use the criteria as specified in the RFA. The cost-effectiveness criterion is based on the percentage cost share, not the number of chargers.

26. “Does the scoring criteria measure cost / benefit to the state or just calculated cost share? Specifically:
- If Applicant A proposes \$10,000 of state funding (50%) for a \$20,000 project to build one 50 kW charger at 2 miles from a given segment, and
- Applicant B proposes \$8,000 of state funding (80%) for a \$10,000 project to build one 50 kW charger at 2 miles from on a given segment,
Would Application B, with a lower applicant cost share but better cost effectiveness for the state, receive a higher score in this category?”

Response: The Department will use the criteria as specified in the RFA. The cost-effectiveness criterion is based on the percentage cost share.

27. “Assume that an applicant has multiple possible sites on some segments, some at the same and some at different distances from the segment. All sites for a given segment, if awarded in aggregate, would fall within the cost share and overall per-segment budgets. The RFA states that only one “Volume II” application per segment will be accepted, and only one project per segment will be awarded. Which would best align with the Department’s evaluation criteria and desired outcomes?
1. Should the applicant aggregate its locations on the segment into one Volume II application for that segment (enabling maximum charging bandwidth at that segment)? If so, should it designate any separable portions of its application for potential scoring?”

2. Should applicant submit each location as a separate project, such that DEP may select one from the available options in the segment, or
3. Should applicant select and submit its projected highest scoring location for the segment (albeit thereby reducing total charging bandwidth at that segment)
4. Should the applicant submit different combinations of locations, from one to many, for the Department to select the package that best fits its desired outcome? In the case of an aggregated application, assume that an applicant went from an application for a single segment with 2 sites each of 50 kW, and added an additional 50 kW site slightly further from the highway on the same segment. The additional site adds charging capacity to the segment, and due to superior site conditions, improves the cost share, but net increases the average distance to the interstate of the project. Would the application be better scored with, or without the third site?"

Response: An applicant may submit only one site location per Volume II, and only one Volume II per segment.

- 28.** "If a site is, e.g. 5 miles driving distance from an exit on one segment, but 1 mile driving distance from an interchange on another segment, should it apply to both segments? Or only to its shortest – distance segment?"

Response: The applicant could apply for that same site for both segments. However, the score for the distance from the interstate should be based on an interchange within that particular segment. For example, if a site is 0.5 miles from an interchange in Segment 1, and 3 miles from an interchange in Segment 2, it would receive 20 points for Site Proximity in the Segment 1 competition, and 10 points for Site Proximity in the Segment 2 competition. A Volume II would be required for Segment 1, and another Volume II would be required for Segment 2.