# **Questions and Answers**

**GFO-22-615**

**Innovative Charging Solutions for**

**Medium- and Heavy-Duty Electric Vehicles**

**June 23, 2023**

The following answers are based on California Energy Commission (CEC) staff’s

interpretation of the questions received. It is the Applicant’s responsibility to review the purpose of the solicitation and to determine whether or not their proposed project is eligible for funding by reviewing the Eligibility Requirements within the solicitation. The CEC cannot give advice as to whether or not a particular project is eligible for funding, because not all proposal details are known.

Unless indicated otherwise, all section numbers identified are from the solicitation manual (for example, “Section II.B” refers to Section II.B of the solicitation manual).

***Administrative***

**Q1:** **The deadline for questions is May 26. When can we expect the responses since the deadline is June? Will the questions be public?**

A1: All questions will be published on the CEC solicitation site. Q&A distribution will be posted: week of June 19 of this year.

***Project Eligibility & Requirements***

**Q2: There are two project groups. What if a project addresses both project groups? How could it be addressed in project evaluation? Can only one project group be selected?**

A2: If a single project addresses both project groups, the maximum is the higher of the two categories, i.e., $10 million. If applied as two separate and distinct projects, the Applicant would be eligible for up to $15 million.

**Q3: Is there a minimum number of chargers? For those chargers, are you referring to ports? Do all 25 need to be in one location or can they be spread throughout multiple locations?**

A3: Yes, the minimum number of chargers is referring to the port number. The intent is to be able to charge a minimum number of medium- and heavy-duty (MD/HD) zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs) concurrently – a minimum of either 10 or 25, depending on the project group selected, at one site.

**Q4: Are hydrogen fuel cell vehicles allowed?**

A4: No, you can use hydrogen fuel cells to create the electricity to charge an MD/HD electric vehicle (EV). However, the vehicle utilizing the charging infrastructure needs to be an EV.

**Q5: Does the CEC’s definition of “electric vehicle” include both fuel cell electric vehicles and battery electric vehicles?**

A5: This solicitation is for battery electric vehicles only.

**Q6: Under Group 2: Innovative Charging Technologies, does charging include hydrogen fueling?**

A6: No.

**Q7: Is the priority of the solicitation to fund fully commercialized technologies or not fully commercialized technology?**

A7: Projects must demonstrate how the innovative technology and/or business model could be deployed at scale in the future and become commercially viable. The project cannot be a concept that is being researched.

**Q8: The solicitation requires installation and deployment of 10 or more chargers, so if the project pertains to a battery swapping demonstration, would this refer to 10 separate battery swapping stations or would a single swap station which can charge 10 or more batteries suffice?**

A8: The requirement is to be able charge a minimum number of MD/HD zero-emission ZEVs at the same time and to manage simultaneous charging events. Without knowing the full details of the project and the capabilities of each battery swapping station, if 10 MD/HD ZEVs can be brought to a full charge or charged sufficiently for real operating conditions utilizing the batteries from one battery swapping station, then a single swap station may be sufficient. It will be up to the Applicant to address project requirements and provide additional details in the application that will be considered in the evaluation criteria listed in Sections V.E (Pre-Application Abstracts) and VII.E (Full Applications).

**Q9: It seems that deployed chargers will need to meet Operation and Maintenance requirements for uptime. For technologies that are in the prototype stage that may fit the general objective of this solicitation, it can be hard to meet the requirement. Would the CEC consider reducing this operational period?**

A9: No. Applications submitted for projects under this solicitation must be ready to demonstrate under real operating conditions. Applicants to this solicitation must be prepared to comply with any new or updated regulations, even if the regulations are not in existence at the time of application to this solicitation. Please refer to Section II.B.1 for additional information on charging equipment requirements after January 1, 2024.

**Q10: If a project deploys 25 chargers, that will be a significant amount of kilowatts extracted from the grid (and a solar field to go alongside it). Do we submit two applications – one for the chargers and one for the solar field or would this be one project?**

A10: In this specific example, a solar field would not be eligible as a standalone project. Projects must demonstrate transformative technology solutions and work to accelerate the successful commercial deployment of MD/HD EV charging applications.

**Q11:** **Is directed biogas allowable as a renewable DER?**

A11: Directed biogas is not an allowable project expense; however, DER equipment is an eligible project expense. Please see Addendum 1.

**Q12: Can vehicle interoperability, such as upgrades to vehicle powertrains, be a part of the proposed project?**

A12: Yes. Only the vehicle costs explicitly listed in Section II.C are allowable items of cost and match share within the project.

**Q13: Fast charging is 150kW. Would utilizing a higher charger rating result in higher points?**

A13: Potentially. Without knowing the full details of the project and the capabilities of the charging equipment, it will be up to the Applicant to address project requirements and provide additional details in the application that will be considered in the evaluation criteria listed in Sections V.E (Pre-Application Abstracts) and VII.E (Full Applications).

**Q14: Are vehicles covered under this solicitation?**

A14: Charging equipment and software are eligible for wireless charging retrofits. Only the vehicle costs explicitly specified in Section II.C are eligible for reimbursable costs or match share. All other vehicle costs, as denoted in Section II.E, are ineligible for reimbursable costs or match share.

**Q15: Does the funding happen at the end of the project? Do we put cost into the project up front and invoice at the end?**

A15: Once an awarded project is approved at a CEC Business Meeting and the grant agreement is signed by both the grant recipient and the CEC representative, grant recipients can invoice as the project progresses and expenses are incurred. Note that expenses are reimbursed in arrears. Costs incurred prior to executing an agreement will not be reimbursed by the CEC. The CEC can only approve and reimburse for actual costs that are properly documented in accordance with the grant agreement terms and conditions.

**Q16: Does an Applicant need to apply for the maximum award amount?**

A16: No. Applicants should submit an application requesting only the amount needed to successfully complete the proposed project within the proposed timeline. The CEC can only approve and reimburse for actual costs that are properly documented in accordance with the grant agreement terms and conditions.

**Q17: Do you require the technology to be certified? (i.e. UL certified)**

A17: The technology must be legally operational (i.e., must have the certifications required by government agencies) and capable of being demonstrated in real operating conditions. If at the time of application, the technology is not safety certified, additional information should be provided to reflect a timeline of when it will meet safety certifications to meet project requirements, which will be considered in the evaluation criteria listed in Sections V.E (Pre-Application Abstracts) and VII.E (Full Applications).

**Q18: Are forklifts or off-road equipment eligible as MD/HD vehicles under this solicitation?**

A18: Yes. Class 2b-8 MD/HD on-road and/or off-road vehicle applications are eligible to apply to this solicitation.

**Q19: Is the priority for this GFO to fund technologies that are already fully commercialized or technologies that are not yet fully commercialized?**

A19: Commercially available solutions are eligible. Additionally, eligible projects must fall within at least one of the following categories:

* Demonstration
* Complete Operational System
* Commercial Availability

Please refer to Section II.B.1 of the solicitation manual for additional information.

**Q20: Does the minimum award amount apply to the Applicant or to the project? Can an Applicant submit multiple applications, each individually for less than the minimum award of $2,000,000, so long as the total amount requested across their applications within that Project Group exceeds the minimum award amount?**

A20: No, an Applicant cannot submit multiple applications for less than the minimum award amount even if the total amount requested across the applications exceeds the minimum award amount.

**Q21: Do the required 10 or more chargers for the Innovative Technologies project category need to be new chargers installed for the proposed project? Or can they be existing chargers that will be modified for the proposed project?**

A21: Chargers installed for awarded projects should be new, not retrofits or upgrades. However, without knowing the full details of the project, it would be up to the Applicant to provide additional information in the application demonstrating why new chargers would not be sufficient for the project’s purpose.

**Q22: Under Eligible Project Costs, what is meant by the term, “behind the meter infrastructure”? Does this mean that if our power supplier were to offer incentives for upgrading our power supply infrastructure, or rebates for charging equipment, those incentives could be counted towards the match?**

A22: Behind the meter infrastructure refers to the electrical infrastructure from the customer meter to the EV charger. Some utility providers will provide services “to the meter” which may consist of upgrades to and/or installation of electrical infrastructure from the transformer to the customer meter. If an Applicant is receiving utility incentive rebates, those can be applied toward match, if considered to be an eligible project cost.

**Q23: Are school bus fleets eligible?**

A23: Yes, however there is currently an active solicitation, [GFO-22-612](https://www.energy.ca.gov/solicitations/2023-04/gfo-22-612-electric-school-bus-bi-directional-infrastructure) “Electric School Bus Bi-Directional Infrastructure” that may be relevant for some Applicants.

**Q24: Is it required that all EV chargers installed be 150 kW & above? Or can there be a mix of Level 2 chargers and Fast Chargers? Our thinking was that it would be valuable to have Level 2 chargers as well, for equipment downtimes when rapid charging is not required. Would those Level 2 chargers count toward the minimum of ten (10) needed?**

A24: For large-scale fast charging, the minimum of 10 or 25 (depending on project group) chargers must all be 150 kW and above per charger. Any level 2 chargers installed as back-up would not count toward the minimum.

**Q25: Are 150 kW+ capacity chargers a mandate for this solicitation? Is there leniency to address the needs of diverse use cases?**

A25: For the Innovative Charging Technologies group, if a Large-Scale Fast Charging project was proposed, the 150 kW+ is a minimum power level requirement. For other proposed projects, the Applicant is responsible for demonstrating how the project will meet the requirements of the solicitation. Refer to the evaluation criteria in Sections V.E (Pre-Application Abstracts) and VII.E (Full Applications) for more information.

**Q26: How is medium-duty vehicle defined for purposes of this solicitation?**

A26: Class 2b-8 MD/HD on-road and/or off-road vehicle applications are eligible to apply to this solicitation.

***Eligible Reimbursable and Match Share Costs***

**Q27: Can you confirm whether each of the following are eligible costs that can be claimed as reimbursable and/or match?**

**a. Project management labor/fringe**

**b. All utility interconnection costs**

**c. Site prep, civil construction and remediation directly related to the EVSE installation (e.g., trenching, paving, striping, landscape remediation, etc)**

**d. Shipping costs for EVSE**

**e. Sales/use tax**

**f. Software network subscription for EVSE**

**g. Warranty for full O&M period, if costs are incurred during grant term**

A27: a. Yes

b. Not all. Applicant’s cost share of utility installation (e.g., transformers, electrical panels, conduit, wiring, meters) are eligible costs. Some examples of ineligible costs would be permit fees and application fees.

 c. Yes

 d. Yes

 e. Yes

 f. Yes. Software network subscription costs are eligible during the term of

demonstration and within the term of the agreement.

 g. If the warranty period extends beyond the end of the agreement,

the portion of the price of the warranty that covers the time period after the grant ends would be unallowable.

**Q28: Is software included as an eligible item?**

A28: This solicitation allows for software solutions leveraging charging technology. Software is included as long as it is included as part of the hardware. The proposed project cannot be a software only solution.

**Q29: Equipment purchases and expenditures must be made after the Notice of Proposed Award (NOPA) to count towards match share, right?**

A29: Yes. Match expenditures incurred after release of the NOPA but prior to the execution of an agreement are made at the Applicant’s own risk. Refer to Section II.D for more information.

**Q30: Can match share expenses be outside of eligible project cost list?**

A30: Only project costs specified in Section II.C are eligible for reimbursable costs or match share. All other costs, as noted in Section II.E are ineligible for reimbursable or match share. Without knowing the specifics of the project and budget, it will be up to the Applicant to propose all potential costs in the application budget(s) and if awarded, the CEC and the Awardee will work together to finalize a budget for approval.

**Q31: Would a piece of real estate purchased after the NOPA count as a match (if it is owned by the Applicant)?**

A31: Yes, however, the allowable claimed value of property must be prorated based on the percentage the property is used for the proposed project. For example, if only half of a building is being used for the proposed project, then only 50 percent of the monthly fair market value of the entire building can be claimed as match while the building is being used for the project. If selected for an award, all claimed match share expenditures must be adequately documented to CEC during the agreement invoicing process which may include but is not limited to: the fair market value of existing property, methodology to allocate existing property on a prorated basis, lease agreements, and other appropriate documentation.

Please note, real property is an in-kind match contribution and will not count towards the 25% cash match share requirement of the solicitation. Please review Section II.D., Match Funding Requirements for more information on eligible match share expenditures.

**Q32: Can this grant be used in conjunction with other CEC/CARB grants?**

A32: Other sources of CEC funding may not be used as match share for this solicitation. However, CEC funding could be stacked as long as it is not used as match share and the other source of funding allows for stacking. This solicitation does not restrict use of CARB grants/funding as match.

**Q33: Our current understanding, based on the Match Funding Requirements Section, is that all contributions provided by other third parties are considered in-kind match. Are partners/sub-applicants on the application considered third-party or can it be included in the cash match? In other words, please confirm whether a partner/sub-applicant can contribute to the cash match share requirement.**

A33: Cash or non-cash contributions provided by partners, sub-applicants, or subrecipients are in-kind contributions. Refer to Section II.D for more information on match share requirements.

**Q34: Are Applicants able to make adjustments to the budget (including in-kind and cash sources) between development of the pre-application abstract and development of the full application?**

A34: Yes. However, please be aware that applications will be scored on the degree to which the proposed project budget is justifiable and reasonable relative to project goals, objectives, and tasks.

**Q35: Can proposed cash matches promised by the Applicant be instead supplied by non-CEC grant funds, should they be secured after the Innovative Charging Solutions for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Electric Vehicle grant is awarded?**

A35: Grant funds of any origin would not qualify as cash match. Refer to Section II.D for more information on Cash Match.

***Past Performance Reference Form***

**Q36: What is the difference between subrecipients and project partners? Do we need to provide past performance reference forms for subrecipients as well as project partners?**

A36: Project partners are providing support for the proposed project, but will not be incurring any expenses toward the project. Past Performance Reference Forms should be provided for the Prime Applicant and/or subrecipients that have received a CEC agreement (e.g., contract, grant or loan) in the last 10 years and the five most recent agreements with other public agencies within the past 10 years.

**Q37: Does the CEC want to see Past Performance Reference Forms for projects outside of the United States?**

A37: Past Performance Reference Forms should include all CEC agreements within the last 10 years (if any) and the five most recent agreements with other public agencies within the past 10 years (if applicable). If there were no projects or not enough projects in the United States, the Applicant could include the references for agreements outside of the United States.

**Q38: The language on the Past Performance Reference Form is focused on already-completed projects, though the directions in the “Past Performance” section ask for “current or past agreements”. Does the CEC want us to include current agreements that are executed but not yet complete? If submitting Reference Forms for projects that are still in progress, does the CEC have direction on how to fill out the past performance form?**

A38: If there are no completed CEC or other public agency projects within the last 10 years, the Applicant should provide Past Performance Reference Forms for agreements in progress. The Past Performance Reference Form should be completed indicating that the agreement is in progress and should contain information on progress to date, and include any known issues or audits that have taken place since the project started.

**Q39: With the Pre-Application Abstract, does the Past Performance requirement extend to all project partners/subrecipients for the abstract or is it only the lead Applicant? Is the CEC requesting the 5 most recent completed agreements with other public agencies or the 5 most recent executed agreements, even if they were only recently executed and project work has only just begun? Where should Applicants provide this agreement listing? There is no place to include this information within Attachment 11, Past Performance Reference Form. Should the list of agreements be included as an appendix to the Pre-Application Abstract?**

A39: Past Performance Reference Forms should be provided for the Prime Applicant and/or subrecipients that have received a CEC agreement (e.g., contract, grant or loan) in the last 10 years and the five most recent agreements with other public agencies within the past 10 years. If a combination of completed and in-progress is all that is available, then Past Performance Reference Forms should be provided for applicable agreements. The Pre-Application Abstract Form and the Past Performance Reference Form do not count towards the Pre-Application page limitations. The listing of past and/or current agreements can also be provided on page 3 of Attachment 1A (Pre-Application Abstract Form). Refer to Section IV.D for more information.

***Miscellaneous***

**Q40: Collaboration with government agencies may be a roadblock for organizations without these connections. Is there support for introducing Applicants to local government agencies? If not, what is the profile of the government officials Applicants should collaborate with?**

A40: Applicants are encouraged to partner with local city or county government authorities, nonprofit entities, community-based organizations, environmental organizations, local workforce development agencies, building developers, technology vendors, utilities, researchers, local community colleges, and financiers throughout the application process as noted in the solicitation manual. It will be up to the Applicant to demonstrate that the proposed project will work with local utilities, permitting agencies, and/or other stakeholders to ensure the project progresses in a smooth and timely manner. Refer to Section VII.E for more information on Full Application evaluation criteria.

Additionally, the CEC created a networking tool that was discussed during the pre-application workshop called the “Empower Innovation Network.” Empower Innovation is a networking tool that can help build connections between interested parties for solicitations such as this, including potential applicants, subcontractors, and sites looking to host demonstrations. To learn more about Empower Innovation, visit the website at <http://www.empowerinnovation.net>.

**Q41: Will Pre-Application Abstracts and Full Applications be released to the public?**

A41: All submitted documents, including Pre-Application Abstract and Full Application submitted materials, will become publicly available records after the NOPA is posted or if the solicitation is cancelled. Otherwise the application evaluation process from receipt of Pre-Application Abstracts and Full Applications to posting of the NOPA is confidential.

**Q42: If the Pre-Application Abstract requires the CEC funded amount to be stated, is it okay if the number changes in the Full Application?**

A42: Your proposal numbers can change between Pre-Application Abstract and Full Application as long as you stay within the minimum and maximum award amounts for the application Project Groups.

**Q43: Please confirm if project partners can change between the pre-application abstract and final application.**

A43: Yes.

**Q44: Does the end use customer need to be defined in the application?**

A44: Demonstration partners are not required to be specified during the final proposal submittal. However, Full Applications will be scored based on Team Experience, Qualifications, and Resources as well as Project Readiness and Implementation. Refer to Section VII.E for more information.

**Q45: Is the CEC planning on doing future Phase 1 funding rounds which would exceed the total $20,000,000 currently available?**

A45: There are no published plans for a similar GFO in the near-term. Stakeholders are encouraged to participate in workshops related to CEC’s Clean Transportation Program if interested in learning about future funding opportunities.

**Q46: Are Applicants required to submit Attachment 8, CEQA Compliance Worksheet with their Pre-Application Abstracts?**

A46: The CEQA Compliance Worksheet (Attachment 8) is to be submitted with the Full Application. It is not necessary to include with the Pre-Application Abstract.

**Q47: Can Applicants include a cover letter with their** **Pre-Application Abstracts?**

A47: A cover letter would count toward the five page limit. Information provided beyond the specified page limitations may not be reviewed and evaluated.

**Q48: During the presentation, the CEC listed not having letters support as means for disqualification on slide 42, but you noted letters of support are encouraged but not required – can you please expand/clarify?**

A48: Please refer to Section VI.D.8. Letters of Support/Commitment. For key project partners, the Full Application must include letters demonstrating their commitment or support of the proposed project. For third-party match share contributors, the Full Application must include letters of commitment (which include phone number and email address for contact). Letters of support from others (not key partners or third-party match share contributors) are optional and may be included in the Full Application. Letters of Support/Commitment are not required for the Pre-Application Abstract.

**Q49: For non-conventional charging technologies that do not require a nozzle, the cost of installing 10 or 25 locations for the same nozzle-less charging technology may become prohibitively high given the award size, how will CEC measure the 10 or 25 chargers installation requirements? Will it be okay for those companies to propose a charging demonstration protocol that will allow them to justify a charging capacity that is equivalent to or comparable to 10 or 25 chargers in a conventional charging infrastructure?**

A49: Without knowing the full details of the project, CEC staff cannot offer any insights or advice on potential projects. It would be up to the Applicant to provide additional information in the application to demonstrate how the project will meet the requirements of the solicitation.

**Q50: Is electric vehicle charging technology for medium-duty vehicles that also works for light-duty vehicles eligible to participate in this solicitation?**

A50: All projects must deploy and demonstrate innovative charging technologies and/or business models that support the decarbonization of MD/HD on-road and/or off-road vehicle applications and improve reliability. These proposed projects should be capable of being demonstrated in real world conditions and must show how the technology can be scaled for larger deployments in the future and become commercially viable. While the technology may benefit light-duty vehicles, this solicitation is intended for MD/HD vehicles and the proposed project must first meet the solicitation requirements for MD/HD vehicles.

**Q51: Creating the project budget requires in-depth planning of the project scope of work. Would CEC consider removing the project cost information and Cost of Charging metric from the "Project Benefits and Cost Effectiveness" section of the Pre-Application Abstract? This would allow Applicants more time to plan an accurate scope and budget after the CEC has evaluated the Applicant's Past Performance, Project Summary, and Project Readiness and Implementation.**

A51: The CEC reviewed this question and the Pre-Application Abstract Evaluation Criteria. At this time, the project cost information and cost charging metric from the “Project Benefits and Cost Effectiveness” section will remain in the solicitation manual. Applicants must address each of the Pre-Application Abstract Screening and Scoring Criteria and provide sufficient, unambiguous detail so that the Evaluation Committee will be able to evaluate the project abstract against each scoring criterion. With regard to the project budget, budgets are not required for the Pre-Application stage. Applicants should prepare Pre-Application Abstracts using the project benefits and cost effectiveness criteria delineated in Section IV.D.2.d of the solicitation manual.

**Q52:** **The "Demonstration" category described in the solicitation manual is described as "Demonstration and testing of a complete system prototype under real operating conditions". However, the minimum quantity of chargers to deploy is higher than many prototype testing scenarios. Would CEC consider reducing the minimum number of chargers in the Innovative Charging Technologies group from 10 to 4? Also, can you confirm whether "chargers" can be interpreted as "ports" (meaning that one dual-port dispenser would count as two chargers)?**

A52: Please refer to Section II.B.1 of Addendum 1. Without knowing the full details of the project and the capabilities of the charging equipment that will be proposed, it will be up to the Applicant to address project requirements and provide additional details in the application that will be considered in the evaluation criteria listed in Sections V.E (Pre-Application Abstracts) and VII.E (Full Applications). Additionally, one dual port charger will be interpreted as two chargers.

**Q53: The "Demonstration" category described on p. 16 of the GFO is described as "Demonstration and testing of a complete system prototype under real operating conditions". However, the O&M requirements in the statement of work are more aligned with deployment of a fully commercialized product rather than a prototype testing scenario. Would CEC consider reducing the minimum operational period from six years to one year?**

A53: No. Projects must be a complete system prototype capable of completing the minimum operational period of six years. Refer to Addendum 1.

**Q54: The "Demonstration" category described on p. 16 of the GFO is described as "Demonstration and testing of a complete system prototype under real operating conditions". However, the uptime requirement in the statement of work is more aligned with deployment of a fully commercialized product rather than a prototype testing scenario. Would CEC consider removing the uptime requirement to allow for the expected variability associated with prototype testing? What will be the consequences for grant recipients who fail to meet uptime requirement, during grant period and over the entire 6-year period of operations?**

A54: No. Projects must be capable of completing the minimum operational period of six years and ensure all chargers and charging technologies installed in the project during the agreement term meet any uptime requirements. Applicants to this solicitation must be prepared to comply with any new or updated regulations, even if the regulations are not in existence at the time of application to this solicitation. It is the Applicant’s responsibility to make sure that all procedures and requirements of the solicitation and the approved/executed agreement are followed throughout the term of the agreement. Refer to the sample agreement terms and conditions included in this solicitation for more information.

**Q55: Given the long timelines to design, permit, install and utility interconnect DC fast charger projects (especially given long lead times for utilities to procure transformers), would the CEC consider reducing the data collection period to 6 months to give projects a better chance of completing all requirements, including final reporting, by the March 2026 deadline?**

A55: No, not at this time. It will be up to the Applicant to address project timeline and provide additional details in the application that will be considered in the evaluation criteria. Full Applications will be scored based on Project Readiness and Implementation. Refer to Section VII.E for more information.

**Q56: How will the grant accommodate the ability to upgrade to higher power charging technology once it becomes commercially available subsequent to the grant terms?**

A56: This would be discussed with the Recipient after NOPA during agreement development or at the time the commercially available technology is available and would be determined based on a number of factors including but not limited to cost, capacity, need, etc.

**Q57: For innovative charging solutions that do not have a traditional “plug”, such as wireless dynamic charging (charging while driving), how should Applicants demonstrate meeting the 10 charger minimum? For wireless charging, SANDAG understands that a single management unit includes multiple coils, each with the ability to charge a unique vehicle at any given time. Will the CEC allow the definition of a charger to be a single coil?**

A57: For projects that supply power without chargers (e.g., battery swapping, wireless/inductive charging, etc.), the installed equipment must have the ability to bring at least 25 (for Innovative Business Model projects) or at least 10 (for Innovative Technology projects) MD/HD vehicles to a full charge or a sufficient charge for real operating conditions. Refer to Addendum 1.

**Q58: Section VI.D.2.c.viii Economic, Social, and Environmental Benefits states the following:**

1. **“CO2 equivalent reductions from enabling additional electric miles traveled compared to a conventional solution.”**
	* **What is meant by “a conventional solution”? Can we use diesel vehicles and/or plug-in chargers for comparison?**
2. **“CO2 equivalent reductions from using renewable energy and/or distributed energy resources to charge electric vehicles.”**
	* **How should we determine CO2 reductions for time-of-use charging? Are there specific time-of-use carbon intensities we should be using for consistency?**

A58: 1. A “conventional solution” refers to diesel, gasoline, or natural gas vehicles. Applicants must show in detail how they completed the calculation, with all inputs (including time frame), assumptions, and methodologies.

1. The Applicant must provide detail on how they calculate the grams of CO2 reduced, including the period of time used for the calculation and all other inputs, assumptions, and methodologies.

**Q59: Does the prime Applicant need to be the landowner/leaser, or just part of the Applicant team?**

A59: The prime Applicant does not need to be the landowner/leaser.

**Q60: Are site host agreements and/or site control (such as leases or access rights) required or expected at the time Pre-Application Abstracts are submitted?**

A60: No.

**Q61: If project has not matured to the site selection stage, can we still qualify if the site has to change during the course of site diligence?**

A61: If CEQA compliance has not been obtained, applications must include a schedule to complete CEQA activities for the proposed project, as well as discuss the results of communications or in-person meetings with the Lead Agency. Applicants must complete the detailed CEQA Worksheet (Attachment 8) and submit it with their Full Application. Failure to complete the CEQA Worksheet may lead to disqualification of the application. Refer to Section VI.D.9 for more information on CEQA.

**Q62: Will the CEC fund a previously awarded project (from a non-CEC entity) if it meets the goals of the Innovative Charging Solutions for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Electric Vehicle grant?**

A62: Without knowing the specifics of the project, no. All reimbursable costs must be incurred after the agreement is executed. Match expenditures incurred after release of the NOPA but prior to the execution of an agreement are made at the Applicant’s own risk.

**Q63: The Fresno County Rural Transit Agency will be the lead agency on the project and the recipient of the funding, is it required that they create an account and submit the application or can my organization (Walker Consultants) submit on their behalf?**

A63: Applicants, upon using the CEC’s Grant Solicitation System (GSS), agree to Terms and Conditions, certifications, etc., so the submitting party should be the Applicant.

**Q64: Many EV charger manufacturers have units with dual charging ports, i.e. two vehicles can be charged from the same "box". Would these count as two (2) chargers? To us, it seems that this is a better option for deploying the most number of chargers with the smallest footprint.**

A64: Yes. One dual port charger will be interpreted as two chargers.

**Q65: How do we reasonably interpret the "separate and distinct" definition on page 9 of the Solicitation Manual? Our solution combines elements of "Truck Parking," "Charging Hub," and "Mobility-as-a-Service" business models as well as "Large-Scale Fast Charging" and "Vehicle-to-Everything (V2X)" Technologies. Will we be frowned upon if we submit two applications for the different Groups when one augments the other to create a scalable, economical solution that have substantial application copy and project scope overlap?**

A65: Two applications for different groups, where one augments the other to create a scalable, economical solution that have substantial application copy and project scope overlap, are not “separate and distinct” project applications and are subject to disqualification in accordance with the technical screening criteria of the solicitation.

**Q66: Are the minimum charger requirements for both Groups allowed to be spread over multiple project sites?**

A66: No. Refer to Addendum 1.

**Q67: On page 32 of the Solicitation Manual section, "Time utilized" is defined as days during "two designated time periods denoted below" but no designation proceeded clearly after that section. Is the period January 1, 2024 to January 1, 2026?**

A67: This is corrected in Addendum 1 of the Solicitation Manual. The Time Utilized should be the time in hours that the charger could be utilized, per documentation of previously-measured use or projected use.

**Q68: I have started a company. One of the ideas that has come up has to do with making semi-trucks carbon neutral. Part of the solution has been developed after 5 years of research into electrocatalysts for CO2 reduction.**

**For semi-trucks, our solution we estimate is 80% cheaper than electrifying semi-trucks and solves some of the crucial pain points of electric semis such as charging power requirements and time to charge. Although your grant calls for innovative electrification solutions for trucking, could we still qualify if our solution meets the end goal of achieving carbon neutrality for semi-trucks? We are seeking a grant to support engineers to build our demonstration prototype.**

A68: CEC staff cannot offer any insights or advice on potential projects. Staff will evaluate a Pre-Application Abstract if one is submitted to determine if the Applicant may submit a Full Application.

All projects must deploy and demonstrate innovative charging technologies and/or business models that support the decarbonization of MD/HD on-road and/or off-road vehicle applications and improve reliability. These proposed projects should be capable of being demonstrated in real world conditions and must show how the technology can be scaled for larger deployments in the future and become commercially viable.