



Vermont Agency of Commerce & Community Development
Department of Housing and Community Development
C. Davis Building, 6th Floor One National Life Drive
Montpelier, VT 05620-0501

NOTICE OF FUNDING OPPORTUNITY (NOFO)

VERMONT COMMUNITY ELECTRIC VEHICLE SUPPLY EQUIPMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAM

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

12/2/22

1. The grant breakdown is \$2M/each for workplace and community benefit and \$3M for multi-unit dwellings. Is there a possibility to bid on 1 or 2 of the buckets, or is it expected that a proposal covers all three?

Answer: The State is looking to enter an award contract with a single entity to design and administer all three programs.

2. Is there a mechanism for re-evaluating then re-allocating funds across those three buckets as the program progresses?

Answer: Evaluation of program success and re-allocation of funds can be included as part of program design as described in Task 1 for each phase and can be discussed in the proposer's approach to the scope of work. Please note that proposals are expected to include an approach to each task in the scope of work, and not necessarily fully fleshed-out deliverables.

3. There is mention in all three funding areas of Level 1 charging. It is GMP's assessment that Level 1 charging should not be prioritized for public funds. Is the State open to removing language around Level 1 charging unless no other option is available at a specific location?

Answer: Level 1 charging shall be eligible for incentives per the enabling legislation. Incentive program specifics, including incentive amounts and eligibility criteria are expected to be considered and included in deliverables of Task 1 of each phase, per the scope of work. Please note that proposals are expected to include an approach to each task in the scope of work, and not necessarily fully fleshed-out deliverables.

4. Examples of marketing materials are included under deliverables. Would this be examples of current marketing materials to get a sense of the look and feel of how we do marketing, or do you want actual mock-ups of marketing materials for this program?

Answer: Proposals should describe the methods of outreach and/or types of marketing materials the proposer would use. Proposals can include examples of marketing materials as demonstration of the proposer's experience developing program marketing materials. Only the awarded proposer will be responsible for developing actual marketing materials per the scope of work and deliverables.

5. Chademo is largely being phased out, but it's referenced in the Level 3 requirements. Are you open to removing this language?

Answer: Appendix 3 is a preliminary program design for the Community Attraction EV charging incentive program. The grantee is expected to review and use this as the basis for full program design recommendations to be completed by the grantee and approved by DHCD per the scope of work. State funding programs for Level 3 charging to date have required all Level 3 charging equipment to include CHAdeMO and CSS ports to support access to fast charging for all EV models, as part of the State's commitment to providing widespread public charging access to all, regardless of the size of the populations that individual sites or program requirements might serve. The State is open to other methods for ensuring equitable access to fast charging, for example site level requirements instead of equipment level requirements. However, the grantee should be prepared to make program design recommendations that support the State's commitment to providing access to fast charging for all.

6. There is mention of the grantee being required to administer the incentive. Can a subcontractor that we work with do this on our behalf?

Answer: The grantee will be responsible for completing the scope of work and all deliverables, including any work that is completed by subcontractor the grantee chooses to work with for completion of the scope of work and deliverables.

7. There was mention of equipment needing to be maintained for 5 years, and not being moved from its location. Should we anticipate holding in reserve some portion of the grant in order to provide the 5-year maintenance requirements or is this expected to be the responsibility of the customer hosting the equipment? Is the State expecting the Grantee to keep track of each charger deployed for a minimum of 5 years and assure proper working order or is a contractual obligation with the customer/site host an acceptable alternative?

Answer: This is referenced in Appendix 1, 2, and 3. Appendices 1, 2, and 3 are preliminary program design outlines, provided for reference. Per the scope of work, the grantee will be expected to review and use these as a starting point for Task 1 of each phase. Specific program design elements, including program customer obligations, shall be recommended by the grantee to DHCD for approval, per the scope of work.

8. There is a statement about ensuring that the EVSE doesn't require a subscription or membership for the networking. We wanted to clarify that the customer could still require a card, fob or smart phone to access the charger, but a subscription or membership fee for the service would not be required. Please confirm that the State is not looking for use of these chargers to be free to the public?

Answer: The State does not expect owners of the charging equipment to provide it to users free of charge. For equipment that is made available to the general public, the equipment must not require a separate membership subscription or fee to be able to use the EVSE. EV charging equipment that is made available to the general public should have a card reader for collecting fees for use of the station.

9. Questions about Section 2.2.

9.1 What will the validation requirements be for the standards listed, specifically tracking women and minority owned businesses as well as ensuring maximization of other funding sources?

Answer: The grantee shall recommend for approval by DHCD a full program design that meets the specified standards, including methods for validation. Please note that proposals are expected to include an approach to each task in the scope of work, and not necessarily fully fleshed-out deliverables.

9.2 Do future tax credits for IRA or IJJA need to be included in not exceeding greater than 100% of total project costs? Is there a federal mechanism available for accounting for those costs?

Answer: No project should receive more in incentives than the total eligible project costs as defined in the program. The grantee will be responsible for identifying the best available mechanism for ensuring this requirement is met and incorporate into the scope of work and deliverables.

9.3 For project costs:

9.3.1 Does the State see any funding limitations to the service upgrades that need to be made or is that included in make ready and behind the meter electrical work.

Answer: Incentive amounts, caps, match requirements and other elements related to the financial incentives available through each program, including the availability of additional funding sources, shall be considered and determined as part of Task 1 of each phase in the scope of work.

9.3.2 Is the implication that the grantee determines how project costs are defined and what is included or not included?

Answer: Per Task 1 in each phase of the scope of work, the grantee shall facilitate the development of the program design and recommend for approval by DHCD a full program design that is based on review and consideration of the preliminary program designs outlined in the Appendices, and meets the standards outlined in the NOFO.

10. The questions below are in regard to the following budget condition that appears on page 14:

Vermont Community Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment Incentive Program

Budget Projections for Program Administration

Up to 10% of Appropriation (\$700,000) may be used for program administration

(Marketing and Outreach are considered program administration costs.)

With regard to the “up to 10%”:

10.1 ACCD is contemplating a highly customer-facing and integrated program through this NOFO. In the normal course of budget-setting and accounting with the State of Vermont, site-specific technical support to customers for the design and specification of projects are rendered by organization staff as “Technical Support Services” and are expenses in the incentive-portion of the organization’s budget. Would Technical Support Services provided by the organization staff direct to customers be considered a customer incentive, as it is with the EEU? Or would these customer-facing services be considered Program Administration costs, and therefore fall within the limitation of 10% of the total budget?

Answer: The grantee will be responsible for designing the incentive program, including defining eligible expenditures and incentive amounts. The program design should encourage the use of other funding sources. Tax incentives were provided as an example of other funding sources for eligible expenses, but leveraging existing technical support services that program participants can access should also be considered in program design.

10.2 Is completion of all tasks identified under Phases 1-3, and Tasks 1-3, determined to be Program Administration costs, and therefore limited to 10% of total budget?

Answer: Yes, all costs associated with delivering the scope of work that are not direct incentives to program customers are limited to 10% of the total award amount.

10.3 Appendixes 1, 2, and 3 identify specific incentive and Program Administration costs. However, would Program Admin costs be transferrable across Workplace, MultiFamily, and Public Attraction spending, or would each program be subject to the caps stipulated by the Appendixes?

Answer: The 10% limit on use of grant funds for administrative costs is applied to the entire scope of work, and not to any individual task or phase in the scope of work.

11. Where an organization is the administrator of another organization/program and charges a federally-approved indirect rate on all expenses. Would the organization’s federally-approved indirect rate be considered separate from Program Administration cost?

Answer: The EVSE program has been established through State general funds and a federally approved indirect rates shall not be considered for the grant award. All costs associated with delivering the scope of work that are not direct incentive to program customers are limited to 10% of the total award amount. Applicants need not include their rates in the proposal. Applicants should fill out the budget projection form, indicating how much of the 10% program administration budget is expected to be needed for each task and phase.