

CORRESPONDENCE

Reese, Latasha

Subject: Re: PURCHASE ORDER WITH 72 HOURS LLC FOR PURCHASE OF EIGHT SPORT UTILITY VEHICLES

From: John Odell <odell@usc.edu>
Sent: Monday, July 12, 2021 10:34
To: correspondence@cityofpasadena.net <correspondence@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Today's Council meeting, agenda item 8, vehicle purchases

City staff are recommending spending more than half a million dollars for new high-polluting vehicles for the city fleet (12 July agenda, Consent Calendar, City Manager, item 8). I hope the Mayor and each Council Member will raise questions and vote against unless they are addressed convincingly.

I believe this proposal fails to satisfy two of the city's approved policy goals. It undermines our plans to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. These proposed fossil-fueled vehicles would spew additional pollution for 10 to 20 more years. Extreme heat and fires are already killing people and destroying land and property.

In addition, the proposal incurs avoidable cost to taxpayers. The city will pay more to operate these vehicles during their life span than for electric vehicles since EVs have much lower maintenance costs and zero fuel cost. Of course, arguing that a buying consortium can get us a discount on the initial purchase will not enable a convincing case against low-carbon trucks if the comparison ignores lifetime expenses.

Staff propose to buy eight Ford Edge SUVs. Several electric SUVs are available on the market today in the same price range as the Edge. Please ask staff to explain why each of these zero-carbon vehicles will not be a better choice for both emissions and expenses.

They propose to buy seven Ford F250 ¾ ton trucks. Please ask staff whether electric or hydrogen vehicles are available in this market segment or coming soon, and why each of those would not be adequate or superior.

They propose to buy two gasoline Ford F150 trucks. Please ask staff what electric or hydrogen vehicles are available today in this market segment, and why each would not be adequate or superior. Rivian has announced that it will start delivering its new R1T electric truck this month. Ford has announced that it will ship an electric F150 beginning next year. If you must have F150s, how bad would it be to wait for those two trucks until next year?

If they respond that no vehicles besides those proposed will exactly meet special needs of city departments, please ask them if you had to use the best available low-carbon truck, what adjustments would you have to make in your operations, and how bad would that be?

In addition, the Legislature is considering AB1110, which would use the State's purchasing power for the benefit of local government acquisition of zero-emission fleet vehicles and equipment. Annual purchases would be made by the State Department of General Services on behalf of local government entities beginning in June 2022 through 2027. Assembly Member Holden and Senator Portantino support this bill. Why would it not be better to wait and take advantage of these savings?

I urge you to vote No on a proposal that would guarantee 10 to 20 more years of pollution and waste money. Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

John Odell
1370 Chamberlain Road
Pasadena, District 6