

**Questions and Answers for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017-18
Clean Mobility Voucher Pilot Program Solicitation
Final Applicant Teleconference**

November 6, 2018

Introduction

On November 6, 2018, California Air Resources Board (CARB) staff held the Final Applicant Teleconference to answer questions regarding the FY 2017-18 Statewide Administrator for Clean Mobility Options Projects for Disadvantaged Communities (Clean Mobility Voucher Pilot Program) Solicitation (Solicitation). The Clean Mobility Voucher Pilot Program was approved in the FY 2017-18 Funding Plan for Clean Transportation Incentives. The questions answered in this document include both questions asked during the teleconference and questions received via email by 5:00 p.m. (PDT) on November 2, 2018. Staff encourages applicants to read this document, as well as the Questions and Answers document from the first Applicant Teleconference held on October 23, 2018, and posted <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/aqip/solicitations.htm> as CARB has provided more written detail than what was discussed at that teleconference. The following written responses take precedence over verbal responses provided at the final teleconference.

Please note applications submitted in response to this Solicitation must be delivered in person or via delivery service provider (U.S. Postal Service, UPS, FedEx, etc.) to CARB **no later than 5:00 p.m. (PDT), on Wednesday November 28, 2018** (see page 11 of the Solicitation for the address).

Clarification: For purposes of this Solicitation, the 5 percent cap limit on administrative costs applies to the Voucher Processing Fee (Program Implementation Costs), not the total grant amount (see Section H [2] of the Sample Grant Agreement for definitions and allowable expenditures under this Solicitation).

Applicant Questions & CARB Responses

1. Question: Please provide examples of what costs would be included, and not included, within the allowed 5 percent indirect (administrative) costs?

Answer: For purposes of the Clean Mobility Voucher Pilot Program, indirect costs include general administrative services, rent and office space, phone and telephone services, non-program related contracts or subscriptions, printing, or mailing services not associated with staff working on the program; or any other costs that are not directly and fully incurred to support the grant. Costs that are not considered administrative costs include personnel costs, memorandums of understanding, voucher processing, application development, outreach activities, and other costs directly tied to implementing the program.

2. Question: If the Statewide Administrator applies for the full 5 percent of the grant money for administrative costs that mean there is no administrative costs for the voucher recipient?

Answer: This Solicitation applies to the Statewide Administrator only. For clarification, the Statewide Administrator is allowed to use up to 5 percent from the grant money that has been assigned for the Voucher Processing Fee (Program Implementation Costs) in their proposed budget for administrative cost. For example, if the applicant has considered \$2,000,000 for the Voucher Processing Fee in their budget, indirect (administrative) costs cannot exceed \$100,000.

3. Question: Will the Statewide Administrator have their own indirect costs? Would we need to roll in the indirect costs that the voucher recipient would be using?

Answer: Yes, the Statewide Administrator can use up to 5 percent of the grant money that they have considered for the Voucher Processing Fee (Program Implementation Costs) in their proposed budget as administrative costs. As stated above, this Solicitation applies only to the Statewide Administrator.

4. Question: Should we assume the 5 percent of the \$17 million in indirect costs should be divided through the two years?

Answer: As stated previously, the 5 percent cap limit on administrative costs applies to the portion of the grant money that the Statewide Administrator has considered for the Voucher Processing Fee (Program Implementation Costs), not the total grant amount of \$17 million.

It is completely up to applicant to decide how to split this up.

5. Question: Are the costs that incurred before executing the grant agreement reimbursable (such as costs for developing the program implementation plan, or the grant application)?

Answer: No, costs incurred before execution of the grant are not reimbursable (see Section E [1] of the Sample Grant Agreement, page 4).

6. Question: Does CARB envision that applications for demand-responsive transit will potentially be eligible for vouchers/funding for the program once it's set up? By demand-responsive transit, we mean small/medium vehicles operated by transit agencies for flexible routing and scheduling, as is common where ridership is low, like in rural areas and for paratransit.

Answer: Yes, on demand ride services are considered to be eligible models for clean mobility options project under the Clean Mobility Voucher Pilot Program. Please see the Sample Implementation Manual (Appendix B, Section B [1]) for more details.

7. Question: The project appears to run for about 24 months (starting by June 2019, and ending by 2021). However, I would expect that CARB would want to spend the funds down as soon as possible (like with other voucher programs such as CVRP or HVIP) and \$15 million is already expected to be added for a second year of funding.

If that is the case, it would seem to imply that we should be developing a budget for administering the \$17 million on more of a one-year term, with the expectation that the second year of funding for the administration budget would come from the second program allocation of \$15 million. Can you help us understand better the budget timeline in this respect, and how it is impacted by future expected program allocations?

Answer: The current funding available for the FY 2017-18 Clean Mobility Voucher Pilot Program is up to \$17 million and it is intended to support this program over the next two years. As described in the Solicitation (Section V , page 3) these funds are required to be encumbered by June 30, 2019 and be liquidated by the Grantee no later than June 30, 2021. Final disbursement requests must be received by CARB no later than March 30, 2021 to ensure adequate time for processing prior to the end of the fiscal year. There is no guarantee subsequent FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 Grant Agreements will be awarded, and that CARB cannot provide assurance of future program funding, therefore the applicant should focus on the current funding for this Solicitation only.

8. Question: Please clarify this sentence in very first paragraph, “This solicitation includes an option for new Grant Agreements for each of the following fiscal years (FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20). The current funding available for the FY 2017-18 Clean Mobility Voucher Pilot Program is up to \$17 million and it is intended to support this program over the next two years.” Is the \$17 million for a two-year program or one-year program?

Answer: Please see the answer to Question 7.

9. Question: Can the resources for this specific program (Clean Mobility Voucher Pilot Program) be renewed? As an Administrator is there something we should be prepared for in case there are more resources assigned to the Program?

Answer: Yes, per the Solicitation (Section IV, page 3) this solicitation includes the option for CARB to award new grant agreements or grant agreement amendments for FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 funds, depending on the availability of future funding, and upon CARB’s sole discretion. Before a new grant is executed for either fiscal year, the grantee must provide an updated budget that includes costs associated with implementation of the current fiscal year, closeout of the current fiscal year, and beginning of the next fiscal year. Please see the Scope of Work (Solicitation, Section VII [BB], page 10) for requirements of program transfer plan.

10. Question: It appears from the Solicitation that all vouchers must be awarded to community voucher recipients by June 2019 (page 3 of Solicitation). Is this correct? If it

is correct, is CARB open to relaxing this deadline following discussion with the selected administrator?

Answer: No, June 30, 2019 is the deadline for CARB to have the funds encumbered. This requires that a grant agreement with the selected Administrator be finalized and fully executed by May 31, 2019.

11. Question: Are program operations costs or administration activities an eligible category of costs for voucher reimbursement? It sounded in the previous teleconference like CARB intends for vouchers to potentially be available for integrated projects that manage multiple vehicles or pieces of equipment and which would therefore have an administration component. However the sample implementation manual discussed eligible equipment, but no labor or other costs.

Answer: Yes, supporting project costs necessary for implementing small-scale clean mobility options project(s) for disadvantaged communities are eligible to receive voucher funds. Please see Section H (2) of the Sample Grant Agreement (Appendix C, page 12) for definitions and allowable expenditures for costs associated with this Solicitation.

12. Question: Are private sector entities eligible to be lead recipients of voucher funding?

Answer: This has not been determined yet. The criteria and minimum requirements for voucher recipients will be determined by CARB through the work group process after the Statewide Administrator has been awarded and the Grant Agreement has been executed.

13. Question: Does CARB already have plan for conducting Work Group meetings? If so, can you please let us know what events are envisioned?

Answer: Yes, the work group process will begin after CARB and the Administrator fully execute the grant agreement. We anticipate to hold at least two work group meetings. Please see Table 1 in the Sample Implementation Manual (page 3) for the tentative program development and implementation timeline.

14. Question: It is suggested in the Scope of Work (Item A) that the Administrator will assist CARB in developing, updating and finalizing the Implementation Manual. What exactly is expected? Can the Administrators provide thoughtful input to the Manual in the time frame proposed?

Answer: Yes, the goal of conducting work group meetings after the Administrator is selected is to vet draft concepts for the Program Implementation Manual and consider the inputs and comments to ensure the maximum effectiveness of the Program.

15. Question: We feel there is a tension between the “first come-first serve” approach and the equity considerations. Can the Administrator provide input to ensure this program is more inclusive and equitable to the communities we want to serve?

Answer: The “first-come, first-served” approach has been Board approved for this grant solicitation in the FY 2017-18 Funding Plan for Clean Transportation Incentives. Modification to this approach would need a full public process and Board approval that may be considerable for future funding cycles.

16. Question: What level of engagement and outreach will be required before the Implementation Manual is finalized, and the outreach that will be required for the actual projects solicitation?

Answer: The selected applicant will collaborate with CARB through the work group process to finalize the Program Implementation Manual. After the Implementation Manual is finalized, per the Solicitation (Scope of Work, Section VII [D]), the grantee is required to conduct public educational forums and outreach events for stakeholders and target audiences to present funding opportunities, describe project criteria and minimum requirements, and provide education on technical aspects of implementing Clean Mobility Options Projects.

17. Question: Can the Administrator provide specific additional criteria for the target populations, (In addition to the EnviroScreen 3.0)?

Answer: Yes, however any recommendation for additional criteria for target audiences need to be approved by CARB before implementation.

18. Question: What can be included in the voucher values: is it just capital cost (for vehicles and bikes) or does include operations? This is important to identify and reach who are the ultimate recipients of the voucher funds.

Answer: The majority of voucher funds will be used to purchase or lease vehicles, bicycles, and other clean mobility options along with associated equipment, and infrastructure. Supporting operational costs necessary for implementing the Clean Mobility Options Project are also eligible for voucher funds. Please see Section H (2) of the Sample Grant Agreement (Appendix C, page 12) for more details.

19. Question: We understand the money will be spent by mid-2021, what is the actual timeline for the projects? They may require more than two year time frame to be fully implemented and for mobility providers to recover costs etc.? Is there any guidance on this? Does CARB have any suggestions for long-term sustainability?

Answer: The eligible Clean Mobility Options Projects may apply for voucher funds after the Statewide Administrator Program is launched (this is soon after the grant agreement has been executed and CARB has approved and finalized the project criteria, and the

Program Implementation Manual through the work group process). As stated in the Solicitation (Section V, page 3) the funds are required to be encumbered by June 30, 2019 and be liquidated by the grantee no later than June 30, 2021. Final disbursement requests must be received by CARB no later than March 30, 2021 to ensure adequate time for processing prior to the end of the fiscal year.

The State budget does not have reoccurring funding, and it's always contingent on annual approval of the Funding Plan. CARB staff will work with the Administrator to assess the potential for the program self-sustainability after the grant agreement is executed.

20. Question: We're a for-profit company trying to understand engagement on the program. If we're not in the Administrator team does that limit our access point to this program? Is the initial application the point of engagement for us or is there another chance to get involved later on in the process?

Answer: CARB encourage all interested for-profit companies to participate in the public work group meetings. If you are not part of the grantee's subcontractor team, you can still engage in the public work group process. The criteria and minimum requirements for who can apply for the voucher funds will be determined and finalized through the work group process, and there will be potential role for for-profit companies.

21. Question: CARB has stated that for-profit companies can be part of this solicitation. Can CARB please specify the roles for for-profit companies in this solicitation?

Answer: Please see the answer to the previous question.

22. Question: If our for-profit company is part of the Administrator team (as a subcontractor) under this solicitation, then would we be excluded from pursuing the vouchers during the first-come-first serve process?

Answer: Yes, neither the Statewide Administrator, nor its subcontractor(s) can be a recipient of voucher funds under this program.

23. Question: Our for-profit company is interested in providing turn-key mobility solutions for this program. To do this, we would request a portion of the voucher as compensation for service. Could we participate as a member of Administrator team and still be eligible to provide our mobility service and receive this voucher in this manner?

Answer: No, as answered in previous question, the Administrator and its subcontractor(s) cannot be a recipient of voucher funds under this program.

24. Question: What is the mechanism associated with voucher disbursement, if any? For example, will it be dealership-centric like HVIP, or an individual disbursement to the end user/applicant directly?

Answer: We expect the applicant develops its preferred method for distributing voucher funds according to the applicant's implementation plan. Please see Section VII (D) of the Solicitation for an example of voucher processing.

25. Question: Does the pilot need to incorporate jurisdictions throughout the state or can it be set up strategically in certain regions?

Answer: Yes, the program needs to be available in all disadvantaged communities throughout the State.

26. Question: Should the applicant be responsible for developing a quote related to an online application website or will that be provided by the one-stop-shop?

Answer: As stated in the Solicitation (Section VII, page 5) the grantee is responsible to develop and maintain the application system for interested entities to apply for clean mobility vouchers. Some coordination will be required in future in regards to an integration of shared mobility into CARB's One-Stop-Shop Pilot Project.

27. Question: How will the list of eligible technologies be maintained and approved? For example, who determines what electric bikes and scooters are eligible and does the contractor use an existing process or creates one on its own? For electric shuttles, will those efforts leverage HVIP?

Answer: These criteria will be determined by CARB and finalized through the work group process after the Statewide Administrator has been awarded and the Grant Agreement has been executed. However some of the criteria and minimum requirements for vehicles and electric bicycles have been laid out in the Sample Implementation Manual, such as vehicles must be eligible for the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP) or the California Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Project (HVIP). The Sample Implementation Manual provides examples of some of the necessary definitions and technology requirements (Please see Appendix B, Section D, page 7).

28. Question: To what extent can this project allow and enable the combination of funding from other sources for vehicles/equipment and infrastructure?

Answer: Leveraged funding from other public or private sources is encouraged but not required for this grant solicitation. More details will be discussed during the public work group process.

29. Question: The Solicitation states in two places that the voucher is for small-scale programs. How does CARB define small scale? Is it less than 10 vehicles? Is it two vehicles? Is it one?

Answer: We have not defined the small-scale project yet. This will be determined through the work group process after the Statewide Administrator has been awarded and the Grant Agreement has been executed.

30. Question: On page 7 of the Sample Implementation Manual, it states that vehicles in this program won't be eligible for rebates. Will infrastructure be eligible for the *CALeVIP* incentive or any of the other Carl Moyer funded incentives from the air districts?

Answer: Funding for infrastructure is different than funding for vehicles. The infrastructure could be funded through other public or private funding sources as long as the same cost that has been reimbursed by one source does not get paid through another source of funding. In this program, Carl Moyer funds can be used for infrastructure costs, however at this point we do not know if *CALeVIP* incentives can be used for infrastructure costs for this program.