



EV Charging RFQ

Question & Answer – August 12, 2019

PORT STATEMENTS:

This document summarizes general content from the August 12 Q&A session.

The Port is willing to accept additional questions by email. We will post answers to these as we have the time. Please send additional questions to Richard Berman at the following email address: richard.berman@sfport.com. Revisions to this Q&A Summary shall be posted as they become available.

Original Q/A from August 12, 2019.

- 1. Section VIII. of the RFQ (p. 5) estimates a cost of \$1.2 million to develop a charging station, including bringing power to the site. What is the basis of this estimate?**
 - Bringing primary service is estimated at \$200K-\$500K; the balance of the costs would involve connection to secondary power and the installation of the charging infrastructure.
- 2. Has there been an initial conversation with PUC or PG&E about these sites?**
 - No. Estimated costs were vetted by Port electrical engineers.
- 3. What exactly is required at the sites?**
 - Power is served by SFPUC but delivered via PGE distribution grid. It is likely that each site will require supplemental primary power, including transformer and switching gear. Proposing Teams will be expected to cover all costs of electrical upgrades or new service for site.
- 4. Where is tie in for power?**
 - This is site specific and will be addressed when a qualified team is matched with a site.
- 5. Do you have guidance for the size of installation?**
 - Minimum 10 direct current fast charging (DCFC) using open/non-proprietary controls. Beyond that the Port will consider a mix of technologies.
- 6. What level of DCFC required?**
 - Based on proposer's business model.



7. What is definition of non-proprietary?

- The Port's goal is to have charging stations that are designed to service as many types of vehicles as possible.
- We understand there are competing charging systems for DC fast charging of electric vehicles. The Port understands both the Combined Charging System (CCS) and the CHAdeMO systems to be non-proprietary, i.e., both are seeking to serve many different types of vehicles. Our understanding is that the Tesla charging can serve only Tesla vehicles and is, therefore, proprietary.

8. What about base rent and participation?

- Not necessary to define at submittal stated. In general, propose a business model (for example, subscription or retail).
- Base rent would need to be comparable to other uses.

9. Is there a tenant improvement budget?

- No. *"The Tenant/Operator will be fully responsible for the cost of all infrastructure and improvements to develop, operate, and maintain the station over the term of the lease."* (see RFQ – Section IV on page 3)

10. What is timeline for decision process?

- About 1-2 months from submittal date. Agreements expected early 2020.

11. What level of detail is needed in proposal?

- Detail should be sufficient to demonstrate qualifications for the project. Details for build out would be developed iteratively after selection.

12. Is primary service for DCFC subject to facility fees?

- No. Port is one parcel number.

13. What is cost of PUC power?

- PUC rates are listed on their website; generally less than PGE.

14. What is current parking use case at each site?

- Pier 54: boat launch lot, general day use, near Chase Center, currently 2-hour meters.
- SWL 314: paid parking, currently 3-4 hour limit.
- Pier 30-32: paid parking, commuter and Giants overflow lot, 4-6 hour limit.
- Pier 70: new neighborhood with restaurants/retail. No time limits planned.



15. Several questions pertained to the terms and conditions of an agreement with the Port. These included: Would parking restrictions change? What would the deal structure look like? Are you open to a model that includes fleet operations?

- Generally, these issues will be addressed after a team has qualified and when an agreement is negotiated with the Port. Specifically, it is conceivable that parking restrictions could change accommodate charging times. A fleet model is also conceivable, if public access requirements are met. These specifics, are, however, subject to a negotiated agreement.

16. Will there be parking fees for EV charging spaces?

- Flexible

17. Will parking spaces be EV only?

- Flexible; we want to maximize charging utility.

18. How does the PUC v. PG&E issue get resolved. What lead to PG&E as power provider?

- PUC makes determination that they are it is infeasible for them to provide power.

19. What kind of references for key responsible staff?

- We want to see qualifications and experience, i.e., resumes, work portfolios, professional certifications, etc. We are not asking for references to call.

20. Can Port take on some of the legwork for the PUC/PGE process (e.g., timelines, tie ins, what is necessary to bring power to site?)

- PGE application must be done by end-user, not the property owner (Port). Port will assist qualified team in working with PGE.
- PGE does feasibility study based on power, voltage, timing of proposal.
- Port will supply as-builts for sites after award.

21. If PGE requires feeder upgrades, who pays?

- Proposer bears all costs.

22. There were several technical questions about power, voltage, amperage.

- Generally, the Port is not prescribing these specifications and is looking for the qualified teams to provide the design requirements for their system.

23. What is location of PGE substations?

- Pier 70: PUC installed infrastructure. Timing unknown, but by mid 2020/21
- SWL 314: Not near (costly)
- 30/32: PGE feeder fees
- Pier 54: New infrastructure being installed by PUC. Likely less cost for connection.



24. Are these sites included in the Electric Mobility and Municipal Properties program listed on the SF Environment site? [<https://sfenvironment.org/electricmobilitysf>]

- No. The sites are indicated as surface lots available for charging infrastructure, but are not included on the intake form and will not be considered in that program.

25. Is the \$2.0 Million Dollar Financial Capacity per site?

- The initial answer at the meeting was, yes. Upon further consideration, teams will be qualified based on a simple financial capacity of \$2 million, without regard to the number of sites.

26. Costs involved with Pier Deck Construction vs Landside

- Pier 30/32 is deck, not soil, and has different construction requirements. Utilities under deck are more costly and subject to sea level rise, corrosion, and occasional debris. Better to bring utilities above-deck safely. Port welcomes innovative design proposals, including renewables and storage

27. Is this effort separate from the City's?

- Will distinct in process and locations, the effort is a part of the broader City Initiative, but the jurisdictional issues made pursuing an independent RFQ more feasible.

END OF Q&A 8/12/19

Questions Submitted after 8/12/2019

28. Section 16, item h: since we are not installing boilers or other mechanical machinery, does this section apply?

- The lease example that is attached to the RFQ is a general template. The applicability of any specific provision will be assessed during negotiations.

29. We have some edits that we would like to make to the lease. Should we submit these edits with our proposal or should they be submitted beforehand or will these items be negotiated when a contractor is selected?

- Requested changes to the lease template are best discussed when the lease is negotiated with an individual party and should not be submitted with a statement of qualifications. [NOTE: This is a Request For Qualifications (RFQ) process, not a Request For Proposals (RFP). Submittals will



be judged against the qualification requirements outlined in Section VIII Statement Of Qualifications.]

30. In section 3. Qualification Criteria, it mentions identifying all team members, quoted below. Can you clarify what you mean by 'team members'? Would this be at a company level e.g. identifying a particular EPC or contractor? Or should we include individuals' names who are leading the project?

- Respondents should identify teams in the way that best demonstrates the qualifications as outlined in Section VIII Statement of Qualifications. The anticipated work includes technical expertise as well as operational and maintenance experience. The Port recognizes that an interested party might not have all of the experience and expertise in a single company, and teams will allow such parties to partner with other qualified and interested parties to meet the qualifications. There is no requirement that a team include multiple contractors, or companies. The RFQ does request that Respondents identify key executive and technical personnel. It is for each Respondent to determine how many key personnel there are and who they are.