



MUNICIPALITY of the
COUNTY of KINGS

Kristy Taylor, Procurement Officer
Tel: 902-690-6181
ktaylor@countyofkings.ca

ADDENDUM

To:	Prospective Proponents	From:	Kristy Taylor Procurement Officer
Subject:	Addendum #1 #24-07 Municipal EV Charging Stations	Date:	April 26, 2024

This Addendum forms part of the “Contract Documents” and modifies or clarifies the original “Tender Documents” for the above referenced procurement event.

The Municipality has received questions from Proponents and is providing the following response to each:

1. Question: Are you able to confirm if the preference of Municipality of the County of Kings prefers open or closed network suppliers? I understand that both are mentioned under Section 347113.31 Part 2.3.
Response: Open Network Suppliers is the preference to allow future scalability and expansion through a public tender process.
2. Question: We would like to bid on this project using alternative charging equipment supplied to us by Siemens. Per section 00 21 13 1.9.1 we are seeking your approval to do so. We have included information on the DCFC we plan to use and 2 data sheets for AC chargers with the difference between them being cellular connectivity or not.
Response: Acceptable provided it comes complete with cable management per specifications. "wrapped" cable hanger on the pedestal is not acceptable. Contractor shall be responsible for providing connectivity to systems where it differs from design.
3. Question: Section 34 71 13 31.2.1.3.2.1 calls out the that the Level 3 EV charger is to come equipped with the SAE Combo CCS1 port. However Section 34 71 13 31.2.1.5.2 state that the Level 3 EV Charger is to have both SAE CCS Combo 1 and CHAdeMO port. Please confirm whether the system is to have 1 CCS1 port or both 1 CCS1 and CHAdeMO.
Response: Revise 34 71 13 31.2.1.3.2.1 & 34 71 13 31.2.1.5.2 to state. "System to have 1CCS1 & 1 NACS Port." CHAdeMO is not required.
4. Question: Section 34 71 13 31.2.1.6 calls out a specification for the inclusion of a Cable Management System inclusive of an internal counterweight system with steel cord to recall the charging cable; yet under Section 34 71 13 31.2.3.1.1 states that the intended product is to be Level 2: Flo SmartTwo which does not have a counter weighted cable management system, and instead uses a “wrapped” cable hanger on the pedestal. Therefore:



- a. Is the Cable Management System specification exclusive to the Level 3 hardware (which does have a counter weight CMS as option)?
Response: All products to have counterweighted CMS
- b. Is it possible that the specification under Section 34 71 13 31.2.3.1.1 was intended for the Flo CoRe+ EV charger which does have the cable management system available as option.
Response: That is the intent, Revise 34 71 13 31.2.3.1.1 to Flo CoRe+ EV
5. Question: Has Nova Scotia Power been notified of the additional load demands to the meters at these sites? Although these sites are designed to be lower than the existing incoming service, recommended practice is to notify the local utility of any load increase on site due to EVC equipment of 50kW or greater.
Response: This is done as part of the Plans Review Package.
6. Question: Please confirm that the drawings and instructions have been confirmed to comply with Canadian Electrical Code Section 86-304-1) as per local electrical inspection interpretation. This section is often interpreted as being a separate disconnect switch outside of panel within line of site from the EV Charging device over 60 amps, which would be relevant to the Level 3 equipment being installed at these locations.
Response: Disconnect is shown in line of sight for Meadowvale, 277/480V panel and disconnects to be adjusted to provide adequate line of sight for Coldbrook. Contractor to verify on site.
7. Question: With the Level 2 EV chargers, will wall mounted units be considered for deployment at the following locations:
- o 208 Avon Street
 - o 989 Meadowale
 - o 1307 County Home Road
 - o 700 NS-341 (Highway 341), Upper Dyke
- This eliminates the need for much of the civil excavations, concrete formwork, and manufacturer pedestals. Additionally under the regulations first issued by the ESA as per Bulletin 86-1-5 would comply with mounting at heights which would reduce the need for the mechanical safety bollards to prevent vehicle impact with electrical service connection to the devices.
Response: In order to maintain accessibility of walkways for users with mobility challenges, wall mounted units will not be accepted.
8. The following Star Charge equipment is permitted as an alternative, provided each comes with complete cable management per specifications; "Wrapped" cable hanger on the pedestal is not acceptable:
- a. Artemis – Proposed equal for the Level 2 AC
 - b. Athena – Proposed Equal for the Level 3 DC.

This addendum must be acknowledged in the Submissions.

ALL OTHER SPECIFICATIONS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.

