1. As much cost as allowed by the VW settlement should be covered for each charger. If allowed I would consider 100% for municipal and 80% for commercial chargers. This cost should include all make ready work on both the high voltage and low voltage side of the transformer serving the charger not covered by the NHEC “Return on Investment” process, this may not apply to other utilities. HVDC equipment, construction, installation, networking, software, site lease payments, warranty and a reasonable maintenance fees for the five year term should also be included. If a system is considering a battery and solar installation as part of the project those costs should be considered on a case by case basis when performing the evaluation of location and geographic location in the state of NH. Why – We need to get HVDC chargers installed around NH! Municipal locations should be considered to receive more because due to the budget cycle they may need more incentives to get them installed but only if they are a good location with lots of amenities around them and open to the public 24X7. A highway shed all by itself in the woods on the side of the road is not a good location.

2. I think utility operating cost should be part of the user fee. In NHEC territory currently commercial accounts do not have a demand charge until the demand is over 50 KW. If a 50 KW charger could be programmed to operate at 49 KW the demand cost would not be an issue. Once a history of the use of the site is know it may be that the usage is enough that the demand component is not a big issue.

3. As stated above I think we should fund as much of this initial round of chargers as possible to get a HVDC network operating in NH. From that experience we will learn a lot about usage and operating cost.

4. A. I think the biggest problem with the first RFP was the charging companies being required to own and operate the DCFC for five years. This is not their business model. I like multiple awards because I think it is more representative of our current business structure in NH and allows multiple operators to add their own unique values and it might also help the state understand what models or approach work and what do not. However I understand the idea of a single award if it can be done and if it helps the whole state get access to DCFC and I believe it makes things easier to complete at the NH DES and NH OSI level. The charging company could manage the sites but let the host site own the equipment and be responsible for as much as possible. My bottom line is NH needs DCFC so lets consider everything this time and get some installed even if it is not our idea of a perfect model. I would not worry about one charging network being used. Most EV drivers already have multiple EV charging accounts furthermore the charging companies have been around long enough that they realize to make this technology work they need to cooperate with each other and allow different companies to share the use of their network.

   B. I think to get a network started each location should have a minimum of two 50 KW DCFC minimum with a Level 2 charger. Plans for more chargers and a higher charging rate should be considered but four chargers in Nashua with none in Lincoln or North Conway does not help a driver travel around the state. I also think each DCFC location should have at least one 30 amp Level two charger.

5. I think we should plan on 10 to 15 DCFC sites in NH to get a network started. These sites should start with a minimum of two 50 KW DCFC and one Level 2 charger to at least get a network started in NH. Once we see how these sites work we can get a sense of the usage patterns, evaluate future programs and develop a growth strategy. The reason I like the 50 KW chargers to start is because they are lower
cost and we can get more sites operating. Sites up to 75 miles apart are fine to get started. The sites should be evaluated on the potential for future growth and have a plan on how to repower the chargers with more powerful chargers in the future. Trying to design the perfect system the first time is almost impossible but doing nothing waiting for the perfect plan is a horrible waste of the time and effort everyone has put in already and puts NH even further behind the states around us.

6. I think the goal of having at least one charging site on the proposed corridors should be retained. Remember these are going to be initially used by people traveling to NH for tourism along with some residents making long commutes. At a minimum I think there should be two sites on 93 north of Concord in addition to the north and southbound rest areas in Hooksett, two sites on Route 16, one site on 101 east and west from Manchester, one on Route 4, one on route 2 and one on route 89. In addition one site should be considered for Route 11 in Alton, one for Route 25 in Meredith, one for Route 95 in the Seacoast and one for Route 3 in Colebrook. This would at least get a network started in NH.

7. We must include the more rural areas!!! The allocation of incentive can be higher for the more rural areas. Remember the initial use of these chargers will be for tourism or long distance commuters. The states surrounding NH and Canada already have a network in place. The more populated southern parts of NH have the advantage of chargers in MA to help them get further north into NH.

8. Open networks if available. As far as tying to the internet remember part of the problems in NH is our cellular and broadband coverage is not that good. So any means of communication should be considered.

9. I think we should allow any payment method currently being used by a mainstream charging network in the US. This should be determined by the charger provider. Remember our goal is to get this technology out there and operating.

10. I think the operations and maintenance required in the original RFP were appropriate.

11. I like the idea of a Performance Bond as suggested in the public hearing.

12. I think a revised RFP should be out by April 1 if at all possible. I think 8 weeks is plenty and if the utility work can be done in four weeks instead of 6 that would be better. I think an incentive of an extra $3000 per charger should be offered for completing the first five sites before the end of the 2020.

13. Seems ok as written in the RFP.

14. Have the site developer include a short paragraph about how they would expand the site. Evaluating the proposal for plans to upgrade is needed. I think some of this is to let the market work. High use sites will grow.

15. We need to get at least a dozen HVDC charger sites operating around NH. I think two 50 KW chargers and a level 2 should be a priority for consideration to get an initial network installed around the state. The rural areas must not be forgotten!! The rural areas are part of the corridors into NH and are a large part of the attraction for coming to NH. As much as we want to get this 100% right doing nothing is a bigger failure than getting it 90 or 95% right. We need to do our best to design the program to the best of our ability and plan to use the VW money as best as possible but you learn by doing and understanding what works and if something does not work correcting it for the next time. The states around us are ahead of us and are positioning themselves to take tourism away from NH.