

Hello all,

This email covers:

Richmond's application for the Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE) grant – not selected for the first round.

Plans for submitting an application for round 2 – expected due date is April 30.

Feedback from the State on our first-round application.

As you know, Richmond's application for the Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE) grant was not selected for the first round. The State received applications requesting more than four times the available \$400,000 in funds. We were in a very competitive pool since no single county could receive more than half the funds, and Chittenden county had a lot of applicants.

We are hoping everyone will support putting in a very similar application for the second round, with an expected due date of April 30. The second-round application material is not yet available, but I've been told there won't be any substantial differences in the requirements from the first round.

Info on first round awards and the grant program in general is available at:

<https://accd.vermont.gov/community-development/funding-incentives/electric-vehicle-supply-equipment-evse-grant-program>

Jess has put the grant application on the Select Board agenda for March 18, and the Planning Commission for March 20, at which we plan to provide a brief overview of proposed revisions, answer any questions, and get your input. Any specific issues you would like addressed can be raised at those meetings, or feel free to let me or the group know in advance and I can relay your concerns or input to the energy/climate action committee.

Our plan is to then get Select Board and Planning Commission sign-off approval at the April 1 and 3 meetings. As needed, we'll have April 15 and 17 as backup dates for getting sign-off on the application.

We're not anticipating any significant changes to the application, but we're trying to provide some additional information based on the feedback we received (see below). We're hoping the State releases the second round grant material this week, so we would be able to detail any proposed changes to meet those requirements when we meet.

State Feedback on Richmond's Proposal

Gary Holloway, the State grant contact, provided the following feedback on our proposal:

How was our application, what were the weak points? What would you recommend for improvement?

- Didn't score poorly, we were in the tight scoring around the bubble.
- Some categories we didn't get additional points for, e.g., highway corridor has to be fast charge, designated downtown was not current.

- We did get points for future-proofing, high-profile location (one reviewer noted it's high usage but the parking space is a bit hidden from the road), 1 of 2 points for sustainable workplaces (would be good to provide more evidence for that).
- Liked the map of walking distance from the proposed station.
- Driver charging discounts - One comment that the applicant proposes subsidizing only 1 cent/kWh, maybe for one year, is that enough? The PUC is moving in direction of allowing charge by kWh, but no decision yet.

How about in general, for smaller applications for dual head

charging equipment? What tended to be the deciding factors?

- There were 3 larger projects submitted, the rest were smaller. So there were quite a few smaller projects.
- Cost-effectiveness is important.
- Location is important - lots of interest in highway corridors, fast-charging (one got funded in S Burlington).
- One challenge is being in Chittenden County, which had lots of applicants - 2 got funded in 1st round (S Burlington & Burlington), 8-10 did not. 50% max goes to any 1 county, so we were effectively in an award pool of \$200,000.

Would the Park and Ride have been a good option?

- VTrans did fast charge study - in Park and Ride, fast-charge can be good (someone might stop for 30-60 minutes), but level 2 isn't fast enough.
- Fast-charge is much more expensive.

You mentioned there would be some updates to the grant program. Anything we should be aware of at this point? We will need review again by our SB & PC, so we'd like to apprise them of potential changes.

- Updated guidelines expected in next 2 weeks.
- Nothing significant, that PC or SB are likely to need to know.

Will we need to update our Project Review sheet?

- No, if you are not changing the scope of the project

Anything else you can think of that would help us prepare for round 2?

- Demonstrating the need for it is an important piece - if you can quantify it, all the better - Drive Elec VT data, or whatever data you can find.

Thanks, and please let me know if you have any questions.

~~Steve Bower