

National Alternative Fuel Corridor Council (NAFCC) Corridor Council AGENDA & NOTES

June 16, 2022



Call started at 2:00pm ET / 11am PT.

Meeting held virtually via Zoom.

Notes and attendance taken by Adibi, Tillman and Overly. Overly and Bentley are the current co-chairs.

Attendees (42):

STATE DOTs & FHWA REPS (and related)

ADECA = Shonda Gray

FL DOT = Tanner Martin

FDACS (Transp. Planning)* = April

Groover Combs

KS DOT* = Matt Messina

KS DOT = Tami Alexander

KY Transportation Cabinet* = Justin

Harrod

LA DOTD = Joy Johnson, Kevin Reed

MN DOT = Siri Simons

NCDENR = Robin Barrows

OK DOT = Laura Chaney

OK, SWODA (RTPO) = Julie Sanders

OK, NODA (RTPO) = Devon Westbrook

Tx DOT * = Michael Chamberlain

TX FHWA = Justin Morgan

Utah DOT = Lyle McMillan

CLEAN CITIES COALITIONS & FHWA/DOE-CC REPS

AL = Mark Bentley

AR = Jason Willey

FL = Alexander Kolpakov, Alisha Lopez,

Marci Larson

GA = Sumner Pomeroy, Eugene

Rubinchik

IA = Abbie Christophersen

KY = Emily Carpenter

LA = Ann Vail, Tyler Hermann

MN = Lisa Thurstin

NC = Carina Trustam Eve, Ryan

Eldridge, Sara Nichols

NY = Rita Ebert

OK = Eric Pollard, Jared Schwennesen

TN = Jonathan Overly

TX (DFW) = Soria Adibi

UT = Kelly Barrett

VA = Allenyn Harned

WV = Kelly Bragg

NETL = David Kirschner

No affiliation provided or known: Bobbie James. Unknown attendee: Aaron.

MAIN PURPOSES OF THE COUNCIL:

1. Fully support DOT and FHWA Alternative Fuel Corridor objectives
2. Facilitate **visually consistent** DOT/FHWA Alternative Fuel Corridor Signage Programs across all our states, included for **both Identification (corridor) and Directional (wayfinding) Signage**
3. Establish regular calls and meetings with involved state DOT officials to develop criteria for developing effective Alternative Fuel signage programs

AGENDA

1. Review the fact that the name has changed; website updated; know the new acronym (as you may see it frequently) - **NAFCC**.
2. Welcome any new members into the group!
 - a. *Justin Harrod, KY Transportation Cabinet*
 - b. *Joy Johnson, LADOTD*
 - c. *Abbie Christopherson, Iowa Clean Cities*
 - d. *Rita Ebert, Long Island Clean Cities*
 - e. *Shonda Gray, AL EV Program Manager for NEVI*

- f. *April Combs, FLDOT*
 - g. *Siri Simons, MNDOT*
 - h. *Jared Schwennesen, OK Clean Cities*
 - i. *Lyle McMillan, Utah DOT*
3. New NEVI guidance is out
 4. Any updates from FHWA - Scarpino, Turchetta, Costa? None were able to join today.
5. Round 6 submittals to FHWA - any updates to this?
 - a. **AL** = I-22 and several secondary corridors (All EV)
 - b. **AR** = Nominated US-412 (secondary) for EV; otherwise held off on other, new nominations
 - c. **CA** = Big H2 efforts but also secondary corridors (turned over the CEC and CARB)
 - d. **FL** = major interstates were upgraded from 'pending' to 'ready' - US-441 , US-1 to GA border, US-27 to AL border; included secondary corridors (mostly EV focused). Florida: Proposed Corridor-Ready: Sections of US-1 and FL-869.
 - i. Proposed Corridor-Pending: US-1, US-17, US-41, US-231, US-301, US-331, US-441
 - ii. SR-24, SR-29, SR-40, SR-50, SR-60, SR-70, SR-77, SR-80, SR-85, SR-100, SR-710
 - e. GA = Georgia's NEVI consultants submitted two state highways for EV Pending nomination, I believe.
 - f. **IA** = did not submit for Round 6
 - g. **KY** = We nominated all interstates and parkways not previously nominated for EV. For Hydrogen we nominated I-64, I-65 and I-75. *Putting in three different H2 stations; have anchor fleet.*
 - h. **KS** = *Nominated as Pending EV Corridors I-135, I-335, US-400 and US-81 (from I-70 north to Nebraska border)*
 - i. **LA** = *Worked w/coalitions and LADOT. LA is applying for H2 Hub funding. Applied for whole state for EV and hydrogen corridors; I-10 already nominated; applied for all interstates in the state; Hwy 90, Hwy 1 also under EV (port companies requested). US-90 designated as future I-49 extension. Designated all loops and spurs (mostly near New Orleans but also I-110 in Baton Rouge).*
 - j. **MN** = EV only - Updated two corridors to "ready" (more additions in future!)
 - k. **MS** = did submit, not sure what, most likely EV
 - l. **NC** = evacuation routes on eastern coast; Triangle Clean Cities in North Carolina nominated a small portion of US-70 as EV-Ready to fill a gap between Raleigh and Durham and connect I-85 to I-40.
 - m. **OK** = Submitted secondary corridors for EVs: I-40, I-35, I-44, US-412
 - n. **SC** = Had call w/Scarpino, Turchetta. Route in the low country for EVs evacuation (connector; Route 526) and some hydrogen; non secondaries
 - o. **TN** = *no submission; already have all major interstates (except for three loop interstates) designated as well as one secondary corridor (US 64)*

- p. **TX** = TXDOT submitting all interstates for every fuel except hydrogen. *Sent Ann in LA nominations.* I-30 to AR, US 69 to OK, Hydrogen for I-45, small portion of I-10. All of I-40 for hydrogen, I-10, I-20, I-30; I-69 pending for CNG
- q. **UT** = did not submit for Round 6
- r. **VA** = VDOT has hired an external consultant and is working with VACC to submit items for NEVI and Round 6. Focusing on electric, especially on I-77. *Planning, signage, deployment components.* Chelsey Jenkins has been appointed to a high position in the state so the governor's office has a vested interest in making this work.
- s. **WV** = nominated all corridors in state for EV pending; small slice that is already EV ready. Kimley Horn is writing WV's NEVI plan. Nominated I-64 as a hydrogen pending corridor. Good cross-state cooperation.

6. FOR MORE IN-DEPTH DISCUSSION TODAY

- a. Round 6 station design – 4 x 150 kW = 600 kW.
 - i. *“Will leniency be provided?” question from utility, worried about energy costs.*
<https://driveelectric.gov/files/exception-request-template.docx>
 - ii. *Tyler - there will be further guidance*
 - iii. *What about distance leniency? FHWA question.*
 - iv. There were notes about how states will have to address this issue. The federal government will require transparency on cost and upkeep for NEVI funds (p 27-28 of NEVI guidance). Cost per mile? Cost per minute? There will have to be some clarification on this guidance.
 - v. *Lots of discussion on what's in that guidance... “price transparency”,*
 - 1. *April (FL) - main issue = parking.*
 - 2. *Jonathan - a) all at one, or b) spread stations out. April - looking at hybrid approach. Buc-ee's or “Busy Bees” (big stations)*
 - 3. *Michael Chamberlain (TX) - spread them out; use current process as learning round. (Opened and closed VW funding early this year.) Think they'll have support for 1M EVs in TX once finished with NEVI funding.*
 - 4. *Tyler - spread out may have more value, increase access (at least early on)*
 - 5. *Justin - VW funding tied up in litigation; ended up being a benefit! Going to look at rural too, but may have smaller (2x150kW) footprint.*
 - 6. *Jonathan - what about future years? Justin - yes, it's coming!*
 - 7. *Alleyn*
 - 8. *Ann question - “when developing NEVI grant program/plan (and 4x150kW), must they do 4 at each or can they do 2 and 2 more later on?” (some answers in chat)*
 - 9. *Joy - concerned about cost to the applicant.*
 - 10. *Michael - there are some angry folks on both sides of this issue*
 - 11. *Jason - VW only paid \$350k for whole location (Shell notes)*
 - 12. *April - FL OK with seeing application exceptions to the 4x50kW rule; also seeing some that are over the distance limitation*
 - 13. *Tyler - some states limiting corridors so that they can go OFF CORRIDOR faster.*
 - 14. *Evacuation routes a part of this*
 - 15. *Michael - 55 locations and they would have sig. \$\$ left over.*
 - 16. *Jason - Joint Office expects you to fill out interstates before going off corridor. It's about “how are you going to support it” in the long run*
 - 17. *Justin - In KY, they went back and forth quite a bit, but then decided to nominate the rest of their interstates in Rnd 6.*

- b. Site selection - consider multiple criteria (e.g., safety, visibility), how well they fill the gap, etc.
 - i. Jason - have rcv'd their proposals for VW process; learning a lot for NEVI process (lessons learned); link shared: <https://www.adeq.state.ar.us/energy/opportunities/dcfc/> Visit finalist sites to ensure they actually match the application
 - ii. Jonathan - TCEQ release of funds
 - iii. Kelly Bragg - how to keep politics out of siting/choosing signage?

CTE discussed the scoring criteria on page 18 of this document:
<https://deq.nc.gov/media/26567/download?attachment>

Thoughts, Comments to Discuss related to the Above

- c. The change for EV charger requirements was arbitrary. Logistically it's impossible at the requirements stated. - **How was 4x150kW chosen? Follow the EA example...**
- d. Jason Willey - *"Is there discussion of electricity delivery rate mitigation in the context of NEVI? (co-location of storage and/or production, new tariff rate classes, integration with site energy management, interaction with energy markets, etc.)"*
 Tyler Herrmann responded: *the NEVI guidance that came out in February does state that funds can be used on energy storage, onsite solar, etc. for the sake of cost reductions in areas where it makes sense. Justification needs to be provided, but that is an allowable expense, and the guidance specifically calls out rural areas as being likely places where these exceptions might be made.*
- e. Jason: <https://www.adeq.state.ar.us/energy/opportunities/dcfc/>
 AR-have a mix of applicants for full kwh to partial. Lots of sites way off corridors. Joint office really wants the interstates addressed, so they're looking at that before community and non-interstate charging. How are we going to support these sites? Especially destinations off the corridors.
 FL: seeing an issue with parking on for 4x150 (most places don't want to take up 4 spots). Looking at a hybrid of regional smart hubs (larger charger places) vs smaller (single and two charger locations). Thinks the hubs are the future.
 GA: We've also had a call with Electrify America in which they recommended future-proofing the NEVI Plan to have 3x150 and 1x350 for the newer vehicles with faster charging rates. Here's the proposed NEVI guidance that was release last week. They will be accepting comments on the proposed rules.
https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/alternative_fuel_corridors/resources/nprm_evcharging_unofficial.pdf
 KS: Kansas Corporation Commission is limiting # of chargers the IOUs can own. However, the largest IOU in KS is offering sizeable rebates on installation of DCFC by their customers.
 FL: Summer, we've had similar conversations with EA, but our other stakeholders recommend 150 kW (Tesla included).
 KY: Funding was tied up for a few years; funds will be allocated at same time as NEVI funds; rural areas focus 2x150 starting with AFCs. Nominated rest of interstates a few days before the due date and estimating 3 years to build out, in the meantime VW funding covering more rural locations. After corridors are filled out, hoping to hit locations that are destinations/community charging. n

LA: thinks spreading the chargers apart is key because funding is a lot but not enough to fully fill all gaps. When developing grant program, do folks have to get 4x150s all in one go? Or can folks build halfway and reapply for funds later. Understanding is do all 4 stations in one go. Concerned about cost to applicant as DOTD looks at applications. Curious as to what corridors aren't nominated that folks would still want to build on (CTE answered evac corridors)

MN Program income is another key issue that we're exploring when it comes to contracting. The proposed regulations allow "reasonable revenue" from charging stations, however, 2 CFR 200 also applies.

TXDOT wants to spread the chargers out and use the corridors as a learning experience for the rural areas. Some locations may struggle to meet the 50 mile minimum mark. Rural areas are the focus now; urban areas are covered. Thinks their chargers will cover about 1mil EVs. Concerned about grid capacity. Does not think they will add anything beyond Rd 6.
<https://ftp.txdot.gov/pub/txdot/get-involved/statewide/EV%20Charging%20Plan/TexasElectricVehicleChargingPlan.pdf>

VA: In addition to NEVI, theres other funding available through DOT infrastructure funding as well as USDOE-EECBG

7. Buy America now expanded - comments or thoughts on this? Where is it headed in making our work better or easier?
8. MUTCD Update - do we know of or have any updates?

*What opportunities does solar or wind provide for charging?
There will be a round every year for nominations.

CHAT

- 13:04:00 From Soria Adibi, NCTCOG/DFWCC : <https://www.corridorcouncil.org/>
- 13:04:04 From Lisa Thurstin-MN Clean Cities to Jonathan Overly(Direct Message) : Jonathon - if you want to make me co-host I can help admit people
- 13:06:57 From Emily Carpenter to Jonathan Overly(Direct Message) : I'm here. Had two calls at one time for the first half hour.
- 13:07:14 From Emily Carpenter to Jonathan Overly(Direct Message) : So I'll be on mute.
- 13:09:15 From Lisa Thurstin-MN Clean Cities to Jonathan Overly(Direct Message) : Siri with MN DOT is in the meeting. I think first time???? She works with Tim Sexton.
- 13:12:31 From Lisa Thurstin-MN Clean Cities : MN - should be just 2 corridors (not 3)
- 13:12:42 From Carina Trustram Eve : Thanks Lisa
- 13:13:48 From Sumner Pomeroy : Georgia's NEVI consultants submitted two state highways for EV Pending nomination, I believe.
- 13:14:08 From Lyle McMillan-Utah : Utah did NOT submit any additional corridors for Round 6
- 13:14:09 From Abbie Christophersen : Iowa did not submit for Round 6
- 13:14:50 From Tami Alexander, KDOT : Kansas: Nominated as Pending EV Corridors I-135, I-335, US-400 and US-81 (from I-70 north to Nebraska border)
- 13:15:27 From Carina Trustram Eve : Thanks all, I got all your comments for the notes.
- 13:16:39 From Michael Chamberlain - TxDOT : silence...
- 13:17:21 From Jason Willey : <https://driveelectric.gov/files/exception-request-template.docx>

13:17:36 From April Groover Combs : Florida: Proposed Corridor-Ready: Sections of US-1 and FL-869.
Proposed Corridor-Pending: US-1, US-17, US-41, US-231, US-301, US-331, US-441
SR-24, SR-29, SR-40, SR-50, SR-60, SR-70, SR-77, SR-80, SR-85, SR-100, SR-710

13:21:22 From Tyler Herrmann (LCF - he/him) : Price transparency requirements are first mentioned on pages 27/28.

13:23:28 From Tyler Herrmann (LCF - he/him) : I put together a (hopefully) pretty thorough set of notes on the Proposed Minimum Standards if anyone would like my notes. I tried to pull all of the relevant pieces out and make sure to note which Sections full text can be found in and which pages.

13:24:08 From Sumner Pomeroy : I'd love to see that if you don't mind sharing, Tyler.