

Public Questions and Answers

The Iowa Department of Transportation (Iowa DOT) has released a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) to participate in the deployment of NEVI-compliant charging infrastructure across the state.

Individuals may submit questions or requests for clarification about the NOFO through February 2, 2024 via the process outlined in the NOFO section 5.5, Application Questions.

Questions and answers are listed below. Answers will be posted to the Iowa DOT's dedicated EV Plan website, iowadot.gov/iowaevplan, weekly. If no new questions or requests for clarification are received via the process outlined in the NOFO section 5.5, a new version of this document will not be posted.

Answers posted through 12-22-2023

Question 1: Can you please provide additional clarity on what content is all included on the maximum 30 pages? Example: Is the expectation to use Attachment 3 as the template to submit or is Attachment 3 purely a guide for the applicant to create their own document?

Answer 1: Per page 18 of Attachment 3, Technical Application Form, the following items are required to be submitted as part of a complete application.

- Attachment 3, Technical Application Form (PDF Format), with all parts completed
 - Organizational chart
 - EV charging equipment cut sheets
 - EV charging equipment connection diagram
 - Preliminary Site Design and Layout
 - Area Map
- Attachment 4, Cost Proposal Form (Excel Format), with all parts completed
- Attachment 5, Utility Data Request Form
- Letter from the Site Host
- Letter from Bank or Financial Institution
- Acknowledgement of FHWA Form 1273
- Acknowledgement of all Issued Addendums

Attachment 3, Technical Application Form must be completed. No other formats or substitutes for Attachment 3, Technical Application Form will be accepted. The following items are part of 30-page limit:

- Attachment 3, Technical Application Form (PDF Format), with all parts completed.
 - Organizational chart
 - Preliminary Site Design and Layout
 - Area Map

The following items are NOT included in the 30-page limit:

- EV charging equipment cut sheets
- EV charging equipment connection diagram
- Attachment 4, Cost Proposal Form (Excel Format), with all parts completed
- Attachment 5, Utility Data Request Form
- Letter from the Site Host
- Letter from Bank or Financial Institution
- Acknowledgement of FHWA Form 1273
- Acknowledgement of all Issued Addendums

Question 2: Can you please provide clarity and understanding on who the “customer” is in section 5.3 in Attachment 1, Technical Requirements, and what IA DOT’s standards are for “customer service” is in regard to EV Charging installation vendors, end EV user, etc.?

Answer 2: Attachment 1, Technical Requirements, Section 4.2 describes the customer service requirements. In addition, Attachment 2, Scope of Work, further details customer service activities and reporting in item 5.7. The customer is any and all EV charging customers.

Question 3: Can you please provide some clarification on section 3.4 in Attachment 1, Cybersecurity Operations. Who needs to be SOC 2 compliant, the OCCP software provider, hardware provider, site host/owner, etc.?

Answer 3: All Applicants must comply with all cybersecurity related requirements outlined in the NOFO. Applicants are encouraged to conduct their own due diligence with respect to their team configurations in determining the proper level of oversight for their SOC 2 audits.

Question 4: I would like to know if there is a limit for the percentage of total funds one applicant can be awarded. For instance, could applicant X be awarded all funds if they have the highest score, or is there a limit to promote a diverse set of chargers?

Answer 4: There is no designated funding limit for applicants that may submit applications for multiple sites. However, each individual site can only be awarded up to 80% of eligible expenses.

Question 5: I am hoping to run a spatial analysis on a number of store locations in Iowa related to the NEVI Program. Is there any way for me to receive access to the GIS layers utilized in Iowa’s NOFO for NEVI?

Answer 5: Per section 4 of the NOFO, applicants may submit applications for any eligible interstate exit along the designated alternative fuel corridors. Iowa DOT has identified priority AFC zones, which are detailed in Figure 1 and Table 1 starting on page 6 of the NOFO.

Question 6: Can you please provide clarity for the situation when the site owner is also the applicant, does section 5.2.3 in the NOFO still apply? If so, what is the template in this situation and what information is needed? Example from this section that may not be applicable in this situation is “what occurs if either party becomes in default”.

Answer 6: If the applicant is also the site owner, they shall still provide a letter addressing all requirements of the NOFO in the section 5.2.3, Letter From the Site Owner. They shall also provide proof of ownership per section 5.2.3 of the NOFO. If the applicant is the site owner, the letter does not need to address the default language in 5.2.3.

Question 7: Recent FHWA guidance has stated that EVSE that use batteries as a power source are allowable in certain circumstances. Is Iowa DOT going to allow this infrastructure?

Answer 7: The battery storage capacity and design should provide that the EV charging station will not fail to meet the required power level for any customer. Given the anticipated utilization on Iowa's designated AFCs, which are Interstates, Iowa DOT has added the additional technical requirement 2.7, Minimum Power Supply, in Attachment 1, Technical Requirements. This has been added to address the updated FHWA guidance.

Answers posted through 1-3-2023

Question 8: How would we get on a bid list for NOFO and EV charging infrastructure? We are a hardware supplier that could supply nuts and bolts for charging stations or their installation. Anchors could be a big piece of this too.

Answer 8: There is not a specific bidders list for the NEVI program. However, [here is a link](#) to a networking list of stakeholders that voluntarily provided their contact information that could be shared with others that have an interest in the program. No additional requests to be added to the list will be accepted.

Question 9: Question: Is there a published interested partners list anywhere on your website? One that lists contractors, utilities, landowners, and other interested parties.

Answer 9: Please refer to answer #8.

Answers posted through 1-5-2023

Question 10: Can the applicant reformat the size of the fonts of the existing language within the title, question and prompt boxes within the “Technical Application Form” (Attachment 3) to 10-point?

Answer 10: No. The formatting of the application should stay as is. Information provided by applicants within the respective boxes can be 10-pt font.

Question 11: Can you please provide clarity on if the organization chart should be created based on the project roles and responsibilities, or just showing the internal organization structure of each organization name with the team members on the project?

Answer 11: The organizational chart should include each project team organization, key team members, and their roles and responsibilities on the project.

Question 12: Can you please provide clarity on if a site has multiple parcels in the owner’s name should all parcel numbers for the property be included or is just one required to show the owner of the property?

Answer 12: All parcel numbers for the proposed project site should be provided.

Question 13: Are digital signatures acceptable on the application or can you please provide additional guidance on how an applicant is expected to sign the appropriate documents?

Answer 13: Yes, digital signatures are accepted, either as PDF signatures on the final PDFs or in the following officially recognized format: S - Signature /Name/

Question 14: Is there a published interested partners list anywhere on your website? One that lists contractors, utilities, landowners, and other interested parties. If so, I'd welcome a copy or a link.

Answer 14: Please refer to answer #8.

Question 15: Regarding the Reasonable Rate of Return formula and 15% limit: Can Iowa DOT please explain the rationale for the 15% limit? Most state DOTs have relied on the EVSE vendor to determine what a “reasonable rate of return” is, subject to Federal guidance. We request Iowa DOT follow this precedent and remove both the calculation and the 15% reference. We are prepared to make an investment and financial match significantly higher than the percent requested by the Department, including making investments in additional charging capacity such as the number of charging ports and kW power output. Therefore, the rate of return we seek is still “reasonable” but should not be artificially limited especially as we are subject to 97% uptime requirements, 24/7 operations, etc. under 23 CFR 680.

Answer 15: Iowa DOT has determined that the Reasonable Return on Investment on the project is defined as no more than 15 percent annual profit on the Project. Per NOFO Section 7.4, the calculation of annual Profit includes all eligible expenses (reimbursable or non-reimbursable). This includes project expenses for which reimbursement is not requested.

Answers posted through 1-12-2023

Question 16: Can you please clarify the following: If the EV solution is not included on the site hosts network, the site host (also applicant) and charging hardware would not have to be SOC 2 compliant? However, the OCPP software provider would have to be SOC 2 compliant? Does the OCPP software provider has to be SOC 2 Type 1 or SOC 2 Type 2 compliant as there two levels? What would the timeframe be able to show SOC 2 either Type 1 or Type 2 compliant if OCPP vendor is SOC 1 Type 2 certified today?

Answer 16: All Applicants must comply with all cybersecurity related requirements outlined in the NOFO. For clarification, any SOC 2 audit can be proposed. Applicants are encouraged to conduct their own due diligence with respect to their team configurations in determining the proper level of oversight for their SOC 2 audits.

Question 17: Can you clarify the following within the Utility Data Request Form: “Preliminary cost estimates/range of all potential costs. Please include line item costs, a total cost, and identify what costs will be invoiced to the customer.” We will have project estimates for establishing electrical service to the chargers. Traditionally utilities do not breakdown costs extensively. However, they can easily provide estimates grouped by: Labor, Materials, Other, Contractors, Permitting, Overhead. The utility would only include costs billed to the customer. Is the grouping of cost estimates listed above adequate for the application or is additional detail needed?

Answer 17: Per Attachment 5, Utility Data Request Form, the purpose of this Utility Data Request Form is to provide a tool for Applicants to request the required utility-related information for potential electric vehicle (EV) charging stations. The information collected in this form can then be used by the Applicant to inform their Applications and Cost Proposals. This form is required to be submitted as part of the application but will not be scored.

Question 18: Can you clarify the following questions from this statement within the Utility Data Request Form: “Other information worth noting (i.e., compliance with Build America, Buy America Act; rates; supply lead times; etc.); Summary of scope of work and equipment to provide service.” There have been various utilities with concerns on meeting these criteria.

- 1) Is it acceptable to provide high level information about the EV rate that will be tied to the proposed sites?
- 2) Is it acceptable to provide the utility’s standard estimate/proposal document?
 - a) This only covers high level information. The proposed size of the transformer for the service (kVa) would be included.
- 3) In reviewing the online federal guidance, it is unclear on what equipment/infrastructure needs to be compliant?
- 4) Is there a resource I can reference that lists applicable utility specific infrastructure components?
- 5) There is also a note: “All utility upgrades for NEVI sites must meet Build America, Buy America Act compliance”.
 - a) If there are distribution upgrades upstream of the site/service (feeders, substations) that are required.
 - b) Does the utility need to provide a summary of those upgrades and if they meet Build/Buy America requirements?
 - (1) This would be applicable to utility investments not billed to the customer.
- 6) If the utility is unable to provide information on compliance with Build/Buy America in the RFP Attachment 5: Utility Coordination Form will that disqualify customers from receiving NEVI funding?
 - a) The utility does not currently have a process/policy to provide build America, Buy America related asks. There are several different components that are used for utility service (Conductors/wires, Transformers, etc.).

Answer 18: Applicants are encouraged to provide as much detail as they are able in their applications.

Build America, Buy America (BABA) requirements apply to all utility upgrades within the scope of the NEPA clearance. The scope of the NEPA clearance is site dependent and will be determined by the DOT after successful sites are awarded.

For example, all minor utility upgrades and on-site electric service equipment (e.g., power meter, transformer, switch gear) for NEVI sites must meet BABA requirements. A minor utility grid upgrade is defined as the work necessary to connect a charging station to the electric grid distribution network; for example, extending power lines or upgrading existing power lines several miles.

Applicants are encouraged to conduct their own due diligence and coordinate appropriately with utilities. The Utility Data Request Form will be submitted as part of the application but will not be scored.

Question 19: SOC 2 compliance is a very stringent, complex and expensive process which no other state has required as part of their applications other than Minnesota. This may create a barrier in encouraging private investment for EV Charging. Would IADOT consider removing this requirement and amending to align with other states and their requirements as well as guidance provided by FHWA? Or amending this section to encourage entities to follow protocols such as PCI, NIST, and CIS Security Frameworks or limit to SOC 1 compliance.

Answer 19: Iowa DOT has outlined the cybersecurity requirements for the project that must be met in the NOFO. Costs for SOC 2 audits and compliance are eligible for reimbursement.

Question 20: Based on Iowa DOT's document Iowa NEVI Final Attachment 1- Technical Requirements, it appears that Iowa is excluding innovative battery-paired charging solutions from its NEVI program. This is contrary to explicit guidance from the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA"). Section 2.7 of that document (page 4) states that [t]he utility feed to the Project site shall have a minimum power capacity of at least 150 kW per port, and the EVSE shall have an input power rating of at least 150 kW per port.

This requirement is inconsistent with the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Standards and Requirements (23 CFR 680.106(d)) which specifies an output power requirement of "at least 150 kW" but specifies neither an input power requirement for the EVSE nor a minimum utility feed to the project site.

In fact, the FHWA explicitly approved the use of battery-paired chargers that utilize less than 150 kW of input power from the grid, so long as they can still offer at least 150 kW of output power to the electric vehicle. This was published in an FAQ document that the FHWA released in December 2023 (see page 1 of the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Formula Program Q&A, Set #2 (dot.gov)):

Question: Can stationary batteries be used to supplement the grid for chargers in remote areas?

Answer: Yes, provided the minimum standards and requirements of 23 CFR 680 are met. The design of any EV charging stations using stationary batteries should reasonably be expected to meet the minimum power level found in 23 CFR 680.106(d). The battery storage capacity and design should provide a high probability that the EV charging station will not fail to meet the required power level for any customer. The inability of a charging port to meet the power requirements because of unusual and unexpected customer usage patterns that deplete on-site battery storage will be calculated against minimum uptime requirements in 23 CFR 680.116(b)(1) as the charging port is unable to successfully dispense electricity in accordance with requirements for power delivery.

Additionally, the below excerpt is from the FHWA's NEVI Program Guidance update from June 2, 2023 (see page 21):

Costs for planning and permitting of on-site distributed energy resource (DER) equipment (e.g., solar arrays, stationary batteries) that are directly related to the charging of a vehicle are eligible for reimbursement.

As such, we request that Iowa DOT retract Section 2.7 of the aforementioned Technical Requirements document which states that 150 kW of input power is required per port and instead adopt a position that is consistent with the latest FHWA guidance.

Answer 20: Please refer to answer #7.

Answers posted through 1-19-2023

Question 21: Can you please provide the FHWA guidance on Cybersecurity and IA DOT's interpretation in requiring SOC 2 compliance per CFR 680.106(h)? I am having difficulty finding any resources from FHWA such as within this website <https://driveelectric.gov/cybersecurity-clauses> as to where SOC 2 compliance is required under CFR 680.106(h) by FHWA.

Answer 21: Iowa DOT has outlined the cybersecurity requirements for the project that must be met in the NOFO. Per 23 CFR 680, "States or other direct recipients must implement physical and cybersecurity strategies consistent with their respective State EV Infrastructure Deployment Plans to ensure charging station operations protect consumer data and protect against the risk of harm to, or disruption of, charging infrastructure and the grid." Applicants are encouraged to conduct their own due diligence with respect to their team configurations in determining the proper level of oversight for SOC 2 compliance.

Answers posted through 1-25-2023

Question 22: Can you please clarify the answer to Question 7 of the Iowa NOFO Questions and Answers from 1/19/2024? The response is not clear. On one hand, it states that the FHWA guidance in question will be respected and on the other hand it disregards it.

Iowa DOT's response states that the EV charging station's design should provide that "the battery storage capacity and design will not fail to meet the required power level" for any customer. The response then points back to Technical Requirement 2.7 which states that the utility feed and the EVSE shall both have a minimum power capacity and input rating of 150 kW, respectively. This requirement not only negates one of the key benefits of a battery-paired EVSE - reduced grid infrastructure requirements - but also directly contradicts the intent of FHWA and the Joint Office in explicitly allowing such solutions.

The FHWA guidance from December states that battery-paired EVSE are allowed provided that "design of any EV charging stations using stationary batteries should reasonably be expected to meet the minimum power level found in 23 CFR 680.106(d). The battery storage capacity and design should provide a high probability that the EV charging station will not fail to meet the required power level for any customer" (emphasis added). This is entirely different than Iowa's previous response which effectively would preclude any DCFC which has a risk of failing to meet the required power level (which is all DCFC and not just battery-paired ones).

Battery-paired charging can help Iowa to deploy charging stations more rapidly without sacrificing reliability or in any way negatively impacting customer experience. That is why other states, including Texas, Colorado, and Utah have chosen such solutions. This is also why the FHWA and Joint Office issued the aforementioned guidance in December.

FreeWire has modeled utilization extensively using actual charging data and found that the risk of depletion is not a concern at a NEVI site, even in a high utilization location like those along designated AFCs like Interstates. We would be happy to share these results with the Iowa DOT.

Answer 22: Iowa DOT has utilized the FHWA guidance to clarify their own policy which emphasizes reliability and resiliency through the requirements outlined in Attachment 1, Technical Requirements, 2.7 Minimum Power Supply. For further clarification on Iowa DOT's policy, please see the response to question 7.

Answers posted through 2-13-2024

Question 23: Are the signature pages within Attachment 3 included in the 30-page maximum and will an application be disqualified if over the 30 page maximum?

Answer 23: Yes, the signatures are included within the 30-page limit.

Question 24: Referencing the first bullet in NOFO Section 7.1, provided that the lease term has not been triggered before execution of the Agreement between an Awardee and IOWA DOT, will an executed site host agreement between the Applicant and a site host comply with Section 7.1?

Answer 24: Site Host Agreements can have an executed date the same day as the date of execution of the Agreement. Site Host Agreements must provide access to the site immediately upon execution of the Agreement so as to allow access to the site prior to construction for preliminary engineering and environmental clearance purposes.

Question 25: For the contracting requirements, may this section [Attachment 6 – Draft Agreement, 4.3] be revised to limit the scope of access to documents that are only related to the Project and the Agreement?

Answer 25: 4.3 Contracting Requirements in Attachment 6 – Draft Agreement pertains to all contracts, subcontracts and agreements related only to this Project and Agreement.

Question 26: Access to Records/Inspections [Attachment 6 – Draft Agreement, 9.3]: May the clause “all of the Awardee’s books, records, policies, client files, and account records” be revised to limit the scope of access to such records that are only related to the Project and the Agreement?

Answer 26: 9.3 Access to Records/Inspections in Attachment 6 – Draft Agreement pertains to records and inspections related only to this Project and Agreement.

Question 27: Does the 15% limit on annual profit apply after the 5-years of operations of the EV charging infrastructure have ended?

Answer 27: No. The 15% limit on annual profit does not apply after the end of 5 years of operations. Awardees will continue to own the EV infrastructure and there will be no profit limitations after the Agreement ends.

Question 28: If my Iowa EV project makes more than 15% profit annually, how does the repayment structure work?

Answer 28: First, any profit over 15% would be deducted from the O&M payment, including any potential future O&M payments. If the O&M payments are reduced to zero and there is still additional profit over 15% that needs to be repaid, it would be deducted from the capital withholding that remains. If there were still additional profit over 15% that needs to be repaid after this, Iowa DOT would work with the Awardee to resolve the issue.

Question 29: Why does Iowa have a 15% limit on annual profit?

Answer 29: 23CFR680.106(m)2.ii (the NEVI rule) states that “A reasonable return on investment of any private person financing the EV charging station project [is allowable], **as determined by the State** or other direct recipient;” Per this rule, the State has clearly defined the limit on annual profit.

Question 30: Can you please clarify each of the project team entities that the requirements related to the SOC 2 certification and annual audit cybersecurity apply to? Are each of the following project team entities responsible for maintaining SOC2 certification and annual auditing: EVSE equipment manufacturer; software/network provider; applicant; operator; etc. Or is just the applicant or owner/operator responsible? Or just the software/network provider responsible?

Answer 30: Applicants are encouraged to conduct their own due diligence with respect to their team configurations in determining the proper level of oversight for their SOC 2 audits. Applicants are encouraged to consider which team members will be handling customer data.

Question 31: The NOFO states that a Letter of Credit would be required at the time of award, but we noticed that an example Letter of Credit was provided via Attachment 9. Can you please confirm that a Letter of Credit is NOT required as part of our application submission? Based on the language in the NOFO, just a signed Letter of Intent from a bank/financial institution is to be included with our application, correct?

Answer 31: The sample Letter of Credit provided in the NOFO package as a reference for Applicants to understand what would be required at the point of executing the Agreement. A Letter of Credit is not required during the application process, but a signed letter from a bank or financial institution, per the NOFO, is required with the Application.

Question 32: It's not 100% clear to me if the application is asking for a letter from the site owner AND the lessee or if it is one or the other. please advise, as this is a lessee situation. And if it is a lessee and they are the applicant, does the "default" language still need to be in the letter?

Answer 32: A letter from the site owner is required, regardless of if the Applicant is the site owner or lessee. If the Applicant is the lessee, a copy of the lease highlighting the provisions of the lease that allows the project is also required. The default language must be addressed in the letter.

Answers posted through 2-13-2024

Question 33: Under section 5.2.3 is the deed to the property sufficient to meet the proof of ownership requirement? "The Letter from the Site Owner shall also include the property record from the appropriate County Assessor's webpage to demonstrate proof of ownership."

Answer 33: Yes, a copy of the deed to the property is sufficient to meet the proof of ownership requirement.

Question 34: Can you confirm that a combination of a NACS cable and a CCS1 cable together are considered a single port?

Answer 34: A single port may have two cables with two connectors if only one of those connectors can be used at a time. If both connectors can be used to charge two vehicles simultaneously, then that is two ports and not one per the definitions in 23 USC 680.104. All ports must have both a CCS and NACS connector.

Answers posted through 3-28-2024

Question 35: There is still much confusion in the industry about the language and what “any voltage outputs” means, as in “any”, meaning truly any, or any meaning all in that range.

A DCFC charger that supports any voltage outputs within the specified range is eligible to receive funding for projects subject to 23 CFR part 680, as long as it also meets the power requirement additionally specified in 23 CFR 680.106(d)(1) (that DCFCs must "supply power according to an EV's power delivery request up to 150 kW, simultaneously from each charging port at a charging station").

Answer 35: The EVSE shall be capable of outputting at least one voltage and current combination that reaches 150 kW. The voltage can be any voltage between 250 V and 920 V while also meeting the above requirement.

Question 36: Could you please clarify the reimbursement of funds for the project? Based on what we are projecting, we've provided the following example:

On a \$900,000 project – we would be reimbursed a maximum 80% of the original capital costs = \$720,000 plus 80% of the \$200,000 O&M costs in this example = \$160,000.

For a maximum total project reimbursement = \$880,000. 40% of the max reimbursed capital costs is retained (\$288,000 of \$720,000) and will be paid out to owner over 5 years - \$57,600 per year (20% per year), based on completion of the tasks in the reimbursement chart of section 4.1.1 Reimbursement in Attachment 6 – Draft Agreement.

Also included with the yearly repayment is the 80% reimbursement costs of O&M (\$32,000 of \$160,000). The total amount paid out over 5 years in this example would be \$448,000 of the \$880,000. Or \$89,600 per year.

The remaining amount of the original 80% capital and O&M costs (\$432,000 of \$880,000) will be paid upon completion of the project tasks 1, 2, 3, and 5 and the EV charging station is fully operational.

Are we projecting this correctly?

Answer 36: In the example you provided, the O&M costs could be up to \$250,000 in costs, of which 80% is reimbursed meeting the \$200,000 O&M cap. This would make the maximum total project reimbursement \$920,000. The logic for your other projections is correct.

Question 37: Are the yearly payouts received at the end of the operational year? For example: Completion of the project is June 1, 2024 and the EV charging station is fully operational. The first payment of the 5-year disbursement plan would be paid on June 1, 2025, year 2 on June 1, 2026 and so on.

Answer 37: Correct, annual O&M reimbursements are made after each year of successful O&M per the Agreement and requirements. In the example, June 1 is the earliest an invoice could be submitted for review, approval, and payment. Iowa DOT will make payment within 45 days upon receipt of a complete and accurate invoice submittal.

Question 38: Can you clarify the 15% profit equation is based on either the full 100% of the capital costs or the max reimbursement of 80%?"

Answer 38: The % of profit that can be made, per section 7.4 of the NOFO, is calculated on 100% of all eligible capital and O&M costs for the project. This includes costs that are both reimbursable and non-reimbursable. The reimbursement percentage is not a factor in the profit calculation.

Question 39: When will the Technical Application be updated in the Final NOFO Documents for Publication folder on the <https://iowadot.gov/iowaevplan> website based on the latest addendum published on March 18, 2024? Or are we to accept all changes in the version sent with the latest addendum and use that version as our final document for submission?

Answer 39: Addendum 4 posted on March 18, 2024 includes an updated Attachment 3 - Technical Application Form. This is the Application Form that should be used for all application submittals.

Question 40: I am reading the latest addendum and there seems to be an error.

In 2.6 of Attachment 1, "A minimum of 4 permanently attached NACS connectors and 4 permanently attached CCS1 connectors are required at the Project site." This would require 8 connectors or ports in total, while as right below it mentions "The Project site shall have a minimum of 4 NEVI compliant charging ports."

I believe the NEVI requirements are 4 ports or connectors TOTAL first of all. Currently NEVI requirements sit at 4 CCS1 connectors.. So it seems like the language, correct me if I'm wrong would then be "A minimum of 4 permanently attached NACS connectors OR 4 permanently attached CCS1 connectors are required at the Project site."

Answer 40: A charging port, per 23 CFR 680, is defined as the system within a charger that charges one EV. A charging port may have multiple connectors, but it can provide power to charge only one EV through one connector at a time. This means that you can have 8 connectors on 4 ports.

Question 41: With the release of Addendum 4, in the Responsiveness Checks, “Application includes required Letter from a Bank or Financial Institution”, “Site Plan includes location of required trash cans and recycling receptacles”, “Site includes lighting illuminating EV charging infrastructure and required parking spaces”, and “Site includes either video surveillance or on-site staff” have all been removed. Can the DOT please clarify whether these items were removed only from the responsiveness checks or if they were removed as requirements of a complete application all together?

In addition, specifically with trash cans and recycling receptacles, are applicants still required to provide them, but are no longer required to identify their location in the site plan?

Answer 41: These items were only removed from the Responsiveness Check. They are still technical requirements that must be included in the project. Please indicate the location of trash cans and recycling receptacles on the site plan.

Answers posted through 4-5-2024

Question 42: Can an applicant remove the rows that have been removed from the documents such as 22.6, 22.7, 22.8 and 22.17 to maximize space in the application packet?

Answer 42: Yes, the applicant can remove the rows that have been removed in the addendums to maximize space.

Answers posted through 4-9-2024

Question 43: The technical requirements note that “A minimum of 4 permanently attached NACS connectors and 4 permanently attached CCS1 connectors are required at the Project site.” Are NACS adaptors considered acceptable if these adaptors are permanently attached to the CCS connectors? The result will be the same: 4 charge ports with each capable of charging CCS or NACS via a permanently attached solution.

Answer 43: Yes, NACS adaptors are considered acceptable if these adaptors are permanently attached to CCS connectors.

Answers posted through 4-11-2024

Question 44: Should the applicant include a redlined copy of Iowa DOT's draft agreement with our submission if we would like to request changes or clarifications? Or will all contract negotiations be handled post-award?

Answer 44: Iowa DOT will not consider any changes to the Agreement.

Question 45: Can Iowa DOT please clarify how the 40% withholding would be repaid to the awardee if the Project has already been developed at the time of termination for convenience by Iowa DOT?

Answer 45: If Iowa DOT were to terminate the contract for convenience, all eligible reimbursable claims, including anything left within the withholding would be remitted to the Awardee.

Question 46:

Can Iowa DOT please confirm that a complete application submission will consist of 7 separate attachments, detailed below? Further, can Iowa DOT please clarify that there are no specific naming conventions that must be followed?

- Attachment 3, Signed Technical Application Form, including all required information detailed in Attachment 3
- Attachment 4, Signed Cost Proposal Form
- Attachment 5, Completed Utility Data Request Form
- Letter from the Site Owner
- Letter from Bank or Financial Institution
- Acknowledgement of FHWA Form 1273
- Acknowledgement of all issued addendums

Answer 46: The following documents must be included in the application submission:

A. Attachment 3, Technical Application Form (PDF Format), with all parts completed

- Organizational chart
- EV charging equipment cut sheets
- EV charging equipment connection diagram
- Preliminary Site Design and Layout
- Area Map

B. Attachment 4, Cost Proposal Form (Excel Format), with all parts completed

C. Attachment 5, Utility Data Request Form

D. Letter from the Site Host

E. Acknowledgement of FHWA Form 1273

F. Acknowledgement of all Issued Addendums - There are 5 Addendums

The file names should be the same as outlined in the list above.

Question 47: Can proposers add the preliminary site design and layout and area map to the end of Attachment 3 as opposed to merging it into the document? If so, should proposers add a cover sheet before the additional items that do not count towards the 30-page limit

Answer 47: Proposers can add the preliminary site design and layout and area map to the end of Attachment 3. Proposers can include a cover sheet, if desired, and that will not count towards the page limit.

Question 48: Regarding the Reasonable Rate of Return formula: Can Iowa DOT please define "Reimbursements"? It is not clear if "Reimbursements" includes all amounts the State reimbursed the Awardee for Capital Costs AND annual O&M. Or is it just annual O&M reimbursements from the State? Something else? The application of the formula is not clear to us and clarification from Iowa DOT would be helpful. Also, are non-cash expenses such as depreciation included in eligible expenses under the profit percentage equation?

Answer 48: Reimbursements is defined as ALL reimbursements the Awardee receives from Iowa DOT including capital and annual O&M reimbursements. Non-cash expenses, such as depreciation, are not eligible to be included in the profit percentage equation.

Answers posted through 4-15-2024

Question 49: This reporting requirement requires the Awardee to notify Iowa DOT within 30 days of the initiation of ANY claims, lawsuits, or proceedings brought against the Awardee – it is not limited to claims, lawsuits, or proceedings relating to the Project or initiated in the State of Iowa. It seems to include ANY and EVERY such claim, lawsuit, or proceeding regardless of subject matter or location where initiated. Can Iowa DOT please limit the scope of this requirement to just the Project?

Answer 49: Please refer to updated guidance from Iowa DOT in Addendum 6, Draft Agreement, Section 13.2.