

Electric Vehicle Charger Reliability and Accessibility Accelerator

Round 2 Frequently Asked questions

Nothing in this FAQ is intended to conflict with the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO); in the event of any conflict the terms of the NOFO shall control. The FAQ was updated on 10/31/25 to add questions 22 – 25.

Question 1:

Our organization often handles the entire incentive, rebate, or grant program process on behalf of the customer. Would we be able to submit a grant on behalf of customers, including attending the kick-off meetings, and create our own account in the Cognito Portal, or is that something the customer would have to do since they would be receiving the grant?

Answer:

ODOT will allow Application Preparers for Round 2 of EVC-RAA. Application Preparers can attend application webinars, ask questions on behalf of the Applicant, and prepare the application on behalf of the Applicant. However, the Applicant will be required to review, sign, and submit the Application in Cognito. Additionally, the Applicant is still responsible for understanding all components of the application requirements as well as the requirements of becoming a grantee. If awarded, the Applicant will be responsible for fulfilling all the Grantee requirements throughout the planning, construction, operations and maintenance five-year grant period of performance.

Question 2:

When a site on the eligibility map shows it has 1 port, but we go visit and there are 2 ports right next to each other, but non-functioning – are both ports eligible when we do the upgrade

Answer:

All broken or inoperable EVSE at a charging station must be repaired or replaced. Additionally, the charging station must meet all standards of 23 CFR 680, including the 4-port minimum found in [23 CFR 680.106\(b\)](#).

Question 3:

Does the grant recipient need to be the owner of the chargers, or can it be deferred to a contractor or third-party?

Answer:

The grantee does not have to be the owner of the chargers. However, the Applicant must demonstrate they have adequate permission from the owner to perform all the tasks required for the grant, including the 5-year operations and maintenance period.

Question 4:

Are we able to combine the EVC-RAA funding with other programs, such as ODOT's Community Charging Rebates that should be launching a Round 4 of funding soon? What about utility programs such as Portland General Electric Business EV Charging rebates?

Answer:

ODOT's Community Charging Rebate program guidelines state the following: Applicants are not eligible to apply for a rebate for this Round on any EV charger that is part of a project site receiving funding from the National EV Infrastructure (NEVI) formula program or the Electric Vehicle Charger Reliability and Accessibility Accelerator (EVC-RAA).

Regarding utility incentives, ratepayer-funded rebates and incentives are not eligible for Grantee Match Share. However, grantees will be required to apply for any applicable rebates and incentives for which the charging station is eligible to lower total project costs, as outlined in section 3.10, Match Share, of the Notice of Funding Opportunity.

Additionally, any other federally funded incentives are not eligible for Match Share as federal funds can only fund up to 80% of the project's costs.

Question 5:

Several of the sites we are seeing have more existing ports than what is supposed to be eligible through the program; however, the website seems to mention that stations beyond the provided map and list could be eligible for funding. Can you please clarify if we are able to secure funding for additional ports through this grant? For example, if

a site has 2 single port chargers that need to be replaced, but ideally they would like to have 6 ports, can they receive funding for all 6 ports?

Answer:

Any charging station that receives funding for this program must meet all requirements of 23 CFR Part 680. This includes 23 CFR 680.106(b), which states that a charging station must have a minimum of 4 networked ports.

Therefore, in the example provided, the Applicant would be required to replace the existing 2 ports (as applicable) as well as add at least 2 more ports to meet the minimum requirements of 23 CFR 680. All 4 ports would be eligible for funding so long they all need to be replaced to meet the requirements of 23 CFR 680.

In addition to the 4-port minimum per charging station, Applicants may apply for funding for up to 4 additional ports (8 ports in total) per charging station, as stated in section 3.7.1, Per Port Cost Allowance, of the Notice of Funding Opportunity. While Applicants can apply for funding up to 8 ports at a charging station, Applicants will be required to indicate in their application if they will continue with the project if offered only a partial award (for example, receiving funding for 4 ports instead of their application proposal for 6 ports).

Question 6:

It looks like the Cognito Portal does not open until 10/3/2025. Is that the earliest date an application can be submitted?

Answer:

Yes, the Cognito Application Portal opened 10/3/2025, so that is the earliest date an Applicant could submit an application.

Question 7:

We are a Public Utility with two public-facing 62.5kW DCFC stations and two single-port L2 charging stations. We sit right on Hwy 101, and we've been discussing, at a minimum, upgrading our L2 single ports to dual ports (with larger output).

Alternatively, we are considering upgrading our DCFC stations to a higher output. I thought I read that there was funding available for increasing port capacity on the L2s?

Answer:

Increasing capacity for Level 2 charging stations is only an eligible activity if they are on the original FHWA list. If the charging stations are not on the original FHWA list, then only DCFC projects on OR EV Alternative Fuel Corridors (US 101 is an EV Alternative Fuel Corridor in Oregon) are eligible. Under these circumstances, the Applicant could potentially apply for funding for the DCFC charging station. It would have to be upgraded to a NEVI-compliant station that meets all the requirements of [23 CFR 680](#), such as a minimum of 4 ports with 150 kW power level minimum per port, as examples.

Question 8:

Our City is determining if we would like to apply for the Electric Vehicle Charger Reliability and Accessibility Accelerator Program. We understand that the City will be a subrecipient of federal funds if awarded. May we inquire if there were any amendments/updates to the 2024 grant agreement between U.S. DOT and ODOT? Particularly were terms and conditions required to be included as a result of recent Executive Orders (anti-discrimination DEI programs, immigration compliance requirements, etc.?)

Answer:

In 2025, U.S. DOT introduced a requirement that a recipient of federal grant funds certify that it does not operate any programs promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives that violate any applicable Federal anti-discrimination laws.

In 2025, U.S. DOT also introduced a requirement that a recipient of federal grant funds must cooperate with federal officials in the enforcement of federal immigration law. U.S. DOT is currently prohibited by a court order from imposing or enforcing this immigration enforcement condition, or any materially similar terms and conditions, to any federal grant funds awarded to Oregon.

Question 9

Per Scenario 7 in the NOFO: "Scenario 7: The charging station has been fixed or is operational but does not meet all requirements of 23 CFR Part 680 and would require minor physical repair, replacement, or upgrade activities to achieve compliance with all requirements of 23 Part CFR 680."

- a) Does this scenario include funding for expansion of the site? For example, if a single eligible charger is listed on Attachment 7, is the site eligible for additional

chargers to meet CFR requirements (i.e., replace the existing single charger and install 1 or more additional chargers?)

Answer:

Scenario 7 is aimed at charging stations that require **minor** repairs, replacements, or upgrades to achieve compliance with all requirements of 23 Part CFR 680.

In general, charging stations that fall into Scenario 7 should already meet the following requirements:

- At least 4 network-connected ports (23 CFR 680.106(b))
- 150 kW for DCFC ports or 6 kW for Level 2 ports (23 CFR 680.106(d))

In general, if a charging station does not already meet the above requirements, it would fall to scenarios 1-6.

Examples of Scenario 7 projects include:

1. The charging station meets all 23 CFR Part 680 requirements except for 23 CFR 680.106(c), connector type, and only needs the installation of permanently attached connectors to comply with 23 CFR Part 680 requirements.
 2. Charging station meets all 23 CFR Part 680 requirements except for section 23 CFR 680.106(f), payment methods, and only needs the installation of a contactless payment method that accepts major debit and credit cards to comply with 23 CFR Part 680 requirements.
 3. The charging station meets all 23 CFR Part 680 requirements except for 23 CFR 680.112, data submittal, and only needs a part swapped out in the existing equipment to comply with 23 CFR Part 680 requirements.
- b) Are there restrictions on eligible replacement activities if a charger was recently replaced, but still does not meet CFR requirements?

Answer:

In general, Applicants are required to take the most cost-effective approach to making the charging station compliant with 23 CFR 680. Therefore, eligible replacement activities cannot be undertaken if a more cost-effective option exists.

Additionally, if the equipment at the charging station has been recently replaced, is operational, and does not comply with CFR-680, it may remain at the charging station so long as the charging station will have a minimum of 4 CFR-680-compliant charging ports at the conclusion of the installation activities.

Question 10

I had a question regarding the EVC-RAA Round 2 Program (link to the program page provided below for reference). Section 5.3. Application Timeline (Page 19) of the NOFO states that applications must be submitted by November 4, 2025. However, Section 5.5. Application Submittal (Page 20) of the NOFO states the following: "Applications must be submitted by 5:00 PM PST on October 28, 2025." Just to confirm, are applications due by November 4 or October 28?

Answer:

The deadline is November 4th. Section 5.5 of the Notice of Funding Opportunity has been corrected to reflect this.

Question 11:

If our project generates income, which method should we use to account for it - addition or deduction? And can we use program income to meet cost-sharing requirements? [23 CFR 680.106\(m\)](#) provides guidance on program income but it is not clear.

Answer:

ODOT is not able to provide further guidance on this topic at this time. ODOT has asked FHWA for further clarification. The Applicant may use and account program income as described in [23 CFR 680.106\(m\)](#) and [2 CFR 200.307](#).

Question 12:

Are these eligible costs that can be charged to the grant:

- a) Physical security strategies: lighting, siting and station design to ensure visibility from onlookers, driver and vehicle safety, video surveillance, emergency call boxes, fire prevention, charger locs, and strategies to prevent tampering and illegal surveillance of payment devices.

Answer:

Yes, as these items are directly related to compliance with 23 CFR 680.106(h)(1), they are eligible for reimbursement. In general, costs associated with making the charging station compliant with 23 CFR Part 680 are eligible for reimbursement so long as they are not operations and maintenance costs not included in a Service Level Agreement or warranty. Examples of operations and maintenance costs that would be excluded include cellular network fees, internet services fees, EVSE lease fees, electricity, and insurance. *See* Notice of Funding Opportunity Section 3.8 (Eligible Costs for Reimbursement) and Section 3.9 (Ineligible Costs for Reimbursement).

b) Cybersecurity and Data Management Plan

Answer:

Yes, as these items are directly related to compliance with 23 CFR 680.106(h)(2) and 23 CFR 680.106(l), they are eligible for reimbursement. In general, costs associated with making the charging station compliant with 23 CFR Part 680 are eligible for reimbursement so long as they are not operations and maintenance costs not included in a Service Level Agreement or warranty. Examples of operations and maintenance costs that would be excluded include cellular network fees, internet services fees, EVSE lease fees, electricity, and insurance. *See* Notice of Funding Opportunity Section 3.8 (Eligible Costs for Reimbursement) and Section 3.9 (Ineligible Costs for Reimbursement).

c) Annual Cybersecurity Audit

Answer:

No. An annual cybersecurity audit falls within the scope of operations and maintenance costs not included in an SLA or warranty and therefore is not eligible for reimbursement under EVC-RAA program rules.

d) Customer Service

Answer:

No. Customer service costs fall within the scope of operations and maintenance costs not included in an SLA or warranty and therefore are not eligible for reimbursement under EVC-RAA program rules.

- e) Payment methods: Contactless payment method, automated toll-free phone number or short/messaging system (SMS)

Answer:

These are eligible for reimbursement if they are not operations and maintenance costs. For example, installation of a contactless payment method is eligible for reimbursement as it is directly related to compliance with 23 CFR 680.106(f). In general, costs associated with making the charging station compliant with 23 CFR Part 680 are eligible for reimbursement so long as they are not operations and maintenance costs not included in a Service Level Agreement or warranty. Examples of operations and maintenance costs that would be excluded include cellular network fees, internet services fees, EVSE lease fees, electricity, and insurance. See Notice of Funding Opportunity Section 3.8 (Eligible Costs for Reimbursement) and Section 3.9 (Ineligible Costs for Reimbursement).

Question 13:

I missed the webinar held a couple of days ago, and I wondered if you could send it my way. I also had another question, we're a non-profit in southern Oregon, it looks like we're in the priority area for the CCRP locator, are we eligible to apply for an EV charging station? The last question I had was is this grant specifically to upgrade EV stations that are already in place or is this to install them. Please let me know. Thank you!

Answer:

The recording for the webinar here can be found here:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/10LSn6gypqEzySnTa_o9cGieRDXfnW7xW/view?usp=sharing

Per section 3.1 of the Notice of Funding Opportunity, Eligible Applicants are limited to the following entities:

1. Charging Equipment and/or Charging Network Providers for charging stations.
2. EV Service Providers that own and operate charging stations.
3. Electric utility service providers.
4. Public entities with eligible charging stations located on the public entity's property.

So, your organization would need to work with one of the entities above to have them apply for funding for the charging station on your property (if the charging station is eligible).

Per section 3.3 of the Notice of Funding Opportunity, Eligible charging stations fall into two categories: charging stations listed in Attachment 7 – Original FHWA List of Charging Stations and charging stations not listed in Attachment 7. Charging stations from either category must meet the following criteria to be eligible:

1. **Inoperable or non-compliant with 23 CFR Part 680:** Chargers at the stations are inoperable and/or do not meet all requirements of 23 CFR Part 680. **Functioning charging stations are still eligible if the charging station does not meet all requirements for 23 CFR Part 680.**
2. **Located on site:** The chargers must be present at the charging stations (i.e., the charging station is not eligible if the EVSE has been removed).
3. **Publicly accessible:** If located on an EV Alternative Fuel Corridor, the charging station must be accessible to the public and reachable from a public road 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, throughout the year, without a fee. If not located on an EV Alternative Fuel Corridor, the charging station must be available for use and accessible to the public at least as frequently as the business operating hours of the Site Host.

Furthermore, charging stations **not** listed in Attachment 7 must meet the following additional criteria to be eligible:

1. Located in the State of Oregon;
2. Be a DCFC station (or being upgraded to a DCFC station) located on and designated to serve an AFC (i.e. becomes a “NEVI-compliant” charging station);
3. If multiple charging stations are proposed in an application on the same AFC, the charging stations must be at least 30 miles apart; and
4. Be at least 30 miles from the nearest “NEVI-compliant” charging station.

Question 14:

Could you let me know the amount allocated per port for this second round? Also, I’ve been looking for the application but haven’t been able to find it, could you send it over

Answer:

The per port cost allowances can be found in section 3.7 of the [Notice of Funding Opportunity](#) and is copied here for your convenience.

Type of Port Proposed	Per Port Cost Cap (up to)	Maximum Charger Reimbursement Amount (after 20% Match Share is applied)
Level 2	\$15,000 per port	\$12,000 per port
DCFC	\$205,000 per port	\$164,000 per port
Level 2 upgraded to DCFC*	\$220,000 per port	\$176,000 per port

Projects that qualify under Scenario 7 will have a Per Port Cost Cap of \$20,000 per port, per section 3.7.3 for the Notice of Funding Opportunity.

Here is the link to the [Cognito Application portal](#).

Question 15:

8 Charging Port Limitation: ODOT will award funding for up to 8 charging ports for each awarded charging station.

- **Facts (Definitions from the NOFO):**
 - Charging Station is the area in the immediate vicinity of a group of chargers and includes the chargers, supporting equipment, parking areas adjacent to the chargers, and lanes for vehicle ingress and egress. A charging station could comprise only part of the property on which it is located.
 - Charger is a device with one or more charging ports and connectors for charging EVs. Also referred to as Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE).
- **Question/Scenario**
 - A charging station is located at 253 SE 8th Ave., Hillsboro, OR and there are 10 chargers with 2 ports each. If we were to be awarded, would we be limited to updating only 4 chargers to add two ports each to be NEVI Compliant (a minimum of four networked charging ports at each charging station).

Answer:

Correct. ODOT will only award up to 8 ports at a charging station (as funding permits). If applicants want to replace/upgrade more than 8 ports, it would be at the applicant's expense.

While Applicants can apply for funding up to 8 ports at a charging station, Applicants

will be required to indicate in their application if they will continue with the project if offered only a partial award (for example, receiving funding for 4 ports instead of their application proposal for 6 ports).

Question 16:

ADA Compliance: Grantee is responsible for adhering to all applicable laws, including but not limited to Title 23 United States Code (Highways), 2 CFR Part 200, 23 CFR Part 680, the Davis-Bacon Act, FHWA Form 1273, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), and the Build America, Buy America (BABA) Act. In addition to these requirements, the Grantee must comply with all other standards and requirements that may be required by federal, state, and local laws.

- **Facts:** Evaluation Criteria - ADA Accessibility standards for charging stations: Describe your firm's approach to ensuring compliance with the applicable provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and how you plan to incorporate the [U.S. Access Board's Design Recommendations for Accessible Electric Vehicle Charging Stations](#) in Section 5 "Operations, Maintenance, and ADA Accessibility Standards" of the Technical Application via the EVC-RAA Cognito Application Portal.
- **Question:** The City's parking lots adhere to ADA requirements. However, we currently do not have ADA or van accessible electrical vehicle charging parking spaces. All lots do have ADA spaces required by code at the time of installation. Does the City need adhere to all U.S. Access Board's Design Recommendations for Accessible Electric Vehicle Charging Stations?

Answer:

Applicants are not required to adhere to all U.S. Access Board's Design Recommendations for Accessible Electric Vehicle Charging Stations to be eligible / compliant. However, Applicants will receive points for demonstrating that the proposed charging stations will incorporate accessibility features above the minimum requirements in under the ADA and ABA Accessibility Standards (such as incorporating U.S. Access Board's Design Recommendations for Accessible Electric Vehicle Charging Stations).

The U.S. Access Board's Technical Assistance (TA) documents "review application of relevant existing ADA and ABA Accessibility Standards and non-mandatory recommendations and best practices to improve access to a site, building, facility, space, element, or service. In these TA Documents, the terms 'must' or 'required' refer to the applicable ADA, ABA, and Section 508 Standards with which entities must comply. The words 'should' or 'recommend(s)' refer to recommendations and best practices.

Recommendations are not legally binding on any regulated entity but are provided as technical assistance to help regulated entities design sites, buildings, facilities, spaces, elements, and services that are accessible to and usable by people with disabilities.”

Question 17:

Some chargers on Attachment 7 of FHWA’s original list were removed long ago due to safety, vandalism, and driver experience issues. Based on FHWA’s Q&A and Washington’s EVC-RAA program, it appears sites are still eligible to add NEVI-compliant chargers if the previous ones were removed already. Can Oregon applicants propose four new NEVI-compliant chargers at a site if the prior EVSE removal is supported with justification? There are three eligible public entity applicants identified in Attachment 7 that hope to pursue this funding but have removed their chargers since the original list was published.

Answer:

If the equipment has been removed altogether (i.e. not replaced with new equipment), then the site is not eligible for funding as it is no longer a charging station as defined in 23 CFR 680.

However, if the original equipment was removed and replaced (i.e. there is still EVSE at the charging station) it may be eligible for this program. Section 3.3, Eligible Charging Stations, of the Notice of Funding Opportunity states: “Chargers at the stations are inoperable **and/or do not meet all requirements of 23 CFR Part 680. Functioning charging stations are still eligible if the charging station does not meet all requirements for 23 CFR Part 680.**”

Additionally, if the equipment at the charging station has been recently replaced, is operational, and does not comply with CFR-680, it may remain at the charging station so long as the charging station will have a minimum of 4 CFR-680-compliant charging ports at the conclusion of the installation activities.

Section 3.3 of the Notice of Funding Opportunity to further clarify this point.

Question 18:

If the specific charging unit identified on attachment 7 is no longer physically present, can the owner of the site identified on attachment 7 still apply if they intend to upgrade the number and type of chargers at the location?

Answer:

Charging stations where the previous EVSE has been repaired or replaced are still eligible for this program so long as the charging station is not compliant with 23 CFR 680, as outlined in section 3.3, eligible charging stations, of the Notice of Funding Opportunity. "Inoperable or non-compliant with 23 CFR Part 680: Chargers at the stations are inoperable **and/or do not meet all requirements of 23 CFR Part 680.** **Functioning charging stations are still eligible if the charging station does not meet all requirements for 23 CFR Part 680."**

See Question 17 for more details.

Question 19:

How far away from the existing charger would the new charger have to be? Do they have to be physically located at the same "station" or can it be moved to a more advantageous location near the existing charger?

Answer:

The [FHWA FAQ for EVC-RAA](#) states the following: "The repair and replacement of broken EV chargers should be completed at the existing location."

While location is not defined in the FHWA Notice of Funding Opportunity or FAQ, the Alternative Fuels Station Locator (Station Locator) was utilized by FHWA to create Attachment 7 – Original FHWA List of Charging Stations.

23 CFR 680 defines "Charging station" as: "the area in the immediate vicinity of a group of chargers and includes the chargers, supporting equipment, parking areas adjacent to the chargers, and lanes for vehicle ingress and egress. A charging station could comprise only part of the property on which it is located."

FHWA has not set requirements for the precise distance between replacement EVSE and the original EVSE placement at a charging station.

Question 20:

Do existing broken or low-power chargers (L2 and DCFC) have to be ripped and replaced, or can EVC RAA funds be used to place new DCFC adjacent to existing eligible infrastructure?

Answer:

Existing broken or non-operational EVSE at the charging station must be repaired or replaced. However, if the equipment has been recently replaced, is operational, and does not comply with CFR-680, it may remain at the charging station so long as the station will have a minimum of 4 CFR-680 compliant charging ports

Question 21:

Commercial contracts aside, does the existing station owner of the eligible hardware have to be the owner of new hardware funded under this program? That is, can the station owner change hands as part of the upgrade funded by ODOT?

Answer:

ODOT is not involved in the relationship between the Applicant and the charging station owner. Under certain conditions, ownership of the eligible hardware may be able change. While ODOT cannot provide legal advice to applicants, the answers to the following questions may help guide applicants in making their own determination if ownership of the existing EVSE can change hands:

- Who owns the EVSE?
- Who sold the EVSE to the equipment owner and what were the terms of the sale (e.g., contract terms governing the disposition of EVSE at the end of its useful life)?
- If the network operator owns the EVSE or sold it to the Site Host with contractual obligations, and there is an ongoing network services agreement, does the service agreement place limits on the disposition of the EVSE? Are there other contract terms that could limit the equipment owner under these circumstances?

Question 22:

Are costs for meeting US Access boards recommendations an eligible expense above and beyond ADA accessibility standards?

Answer:

In general, costs that exceed federal standards are not eligible for reimbursement (unless explicitly noted otherwise in the Notice of Funding Opportunity).

Question 23:

I have a question regarding the EVC RCAA Round 2 application process. I watched the webinar recording and I understand that the sample agreement does not need to be signed with the application, but that any requested amendments should be flagged during submission. To ensure we're aligning with your process, could you confirm

whether there will be an opportunity after the application deadline to review and discuss any proposed amendments to the agreement?

Answer:

In general, Applicants must note all requested amendments at the time of application. However, ODOT will consider minor suggestions/changes to the grant agreement after issuing Notice of Intent to Award.

Question 24:

I have two questions in regard to the following:

- NOFO Document Name: Revised Notice of Funding Opportunity – Electric Vehicle Charger Reliability and Accessibility Accelerator Round 2
 - NOFO Document Section Numbers: 3: Eligibility – 3.8 Eligible Costs for Reimbursement, 3.9 Ineligible Costs for Reimbursement, and 3.10 Match Share
 - NOFO pages: 13-16
1. First, can you explain the difference between what costs are considered Administrative (eligible for reimbursement) vs Project Management (excluded from Match Share)?

Answer:

Administrative costs are eligible for reimbursement if they meet the criteria for an allowable cost set forth in [2 CFR 200.403](#) and [23 CFR 680](#). As explained in [2 CFR 200.413](#), administrative costs should normally be treated as indirect costs but may be charged as direct costs under certain circumstances.

Project management costs are also eligible for reimbursement if they meet the definition of an allowable cost in [2 CFR 200.403](#) and [23 CFR 680](#). For the reasons explained below, project management costs are not eligible for the cost share only when proposed as in-kind Match Share from the grantee.

In most instances, a grantee's Match Share requirement will be satisfied by assuming 20% of the cost of the project.* In that circumstance, the Match Share is "collected" from the grantee after the grantee submits a reimbursement request for the allowable project costs. After review and approval of the reimbursement request, ODOT will reimburse 80% of the costs in the reimbursement request to grantee. The

remaining 20% is not reimbursed and is designated as the grantee's Match Share. The Match Share is not delineated by a specific source from the grantee.

However, in limited circumstances, a grantee may be given approval for in-kind Match Share via the Site Host (when the Site Host is a separate entity from the grantee). In-kind Match Share refers to the valuation of non-cash contributions provided by the Site Hosts. In these circumstances, the in-kind Match Share is identified and delineated by a specific source—for example real property—that has been approved in advance by ODOT. Project management costs that are excluded from Match Share are the costs of any “in-house work” completed by the grantee. That work is not eligible to be captured as in-kind Match Share, specifically. Grantees cannot provide in-kind Match Share at all (only separate Site Host entities), and identifying a specific source is applicable to only Site Hosts. The reason that Project Management costs are called out specifically in section 3.10 is because this is a common source of in-kind Match Share that Applicants seek.

*In instances where the grantee offers additional Match Share or proposes project costs that exceed the Project Cost Allowance, this process will look different.

2. Second, as a follow up question, are ineligible costs able to be covered by Match Share if they are not specifically excluded in section 3.10? For example, the costs of CHAdemo connectors are deemed ineligible in section 3.9, but would those be able to contribute toward the Match Share?

Answer:

Ineligible costs cannot be covered by Match Share. As described above, Grantees will only submit reimbursement requests for allowable costs. From which, 20% will be deducted to account for the Grantees Match Share. Additionally, [2 CFR 200.306\(b\)\(3\)](#) states that cost sharing funds must be “necessary and reasonable for achieving the objectives of the Federal award.” In your example, CHAdemo connectors are not necessary to achieve the objective of the Federal award and cannot be captured as Match Share.

Question 25:

J3400 Connectors: According to 23 CFR 680.106(c), each Level 2 charging port must have a permanently attached J1772 connector and must charge any J1772-compliant vehicle. Since NEVI Standards and Requirements do not require a J3400 (NACS) connectors, is it acceptable for our Level 2 Charging Station with 8 ports to include only J1772 connectors?

- Does ODOT accept J3400 adapters?

Answer:

ODOT created this requirement to target DCFC stations in order to facilitate the transition from CCS to NACS. The NOFO has been updated to reflect this. Level 2 charging stations with more than 4 ports may include only J1772 connectors. J3400 adapters are not eligible at this time.