

CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE
APRIL 13, 2026
COUNCIL MEETING

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Cynthia Cannady
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2026 8:09 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: For agenda item #10, hydrogen, City Council meeting

[1] **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Council members,

The environmental problem with hydrogen is well explained in this article in Government Technology:

"Hydrogen buses have electric motors, powered by a fuel cell in which hydrogen combines with oxygen from the air to form water and generate electricity. Currently, buses ...depend on hydrogen fuel that is produced through a process called steam-methane reforming, where natural gas is turned into hydrogen and carbon dioxide in the presence of a catalyst and heat.

This fuel is dubbed "gray" hydrogen. According to a 2021 study, the carbon dioxide-equivalent greenhouse gas emissions from producing gray hydrogen are more than 25 percent higher than burning natural gas for heat."

It is also inefficient, as Dr. Al explains for us:

Key Reasons for Inefficiency

- **Energy Conversion Losses:** The process of using electricity to create hydrogen via electrolysis is, at best, 70% efficient, followed by further 15–20% losses during compression and storage.
- **Fuel Cell Inefficiency:** Converting hydrogen back into electricity inside the fuel cell to power the motor only converts about 50% of the energy, resulting in massive, compounding losses.
- **Low "Round-Trip" Efficiency:**hydrogen buses require up to 70% more electricity to cover the same distance compared to direct battery charging.
- **High Operational Costs:** Hydrogen fuel is generally 3–4 times more expensive than diesel or electricity for buses.
- **Infrastructure Reliability:** Hydrogen refueling stations are costly (millions) and often suffer from reliability issues, resulting in buses being stuck in depots..."

Why are we doing this? Please cancel the plan for a hydrogen bus station and bus line.

Cynthia Cannady
District 6

04/13/2026
Item 10

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Sam Berndt
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2026 8:33 PM
To: Hampton, Tyron; Cole, Rick; Jones, Justin; Masuda, Gene; Rivas, Jessica; Madison, Steve; Lyon, Jason; Gordo, Victor; PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment - Agenda Item 10 - Vote NO on Hydrogen Fueling Station -- Pursue EVs & Chargers

[!] **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Mayor & City Councilmembers,

Hydrogen is the most unsafe, expensive form of energy today and is often affiliated with net positive greenhouse gas emissions.

It does not have sufficient distribution infrastructure, will damage and leak from existing pipes and act as a potent indirect greenhouse gas, has significant losses of energy potency from its original source, and has very low energy density by volume. **It does not make sense for local transportation.**

Additionally, a majority of the hydrogen produced today is from extracting hydrogen from natural gas (grey hydrogen = $\text{CH}_4 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{CO} + 3\text{H}_2$). While green hydrogen is a viable solution for very specific use cases, it comes with its own downsides. Whereas, **electric vehicles are a much more affordable, reliable, and beneficial solution to the transportation problem.**

Finally, **in recent years Hydrogen may have appeared to be a promising new technology in California** due to billions of dollars of federal investment. **This is no longer the case** as the ARCHES project has halted its hydrogen hub activities amid federal funding changes.

I urge you to vote NO on Agenda Item 10 & rather direct staff to pursue electric vehicle alternatives & chargers.

Thanks,
Sam Berndt

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Sanford Krasner
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2026 9:00 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: Hampton, Tyron; Cole, Rick; Jones, Justin; Masuda, Gene; Rivas, Jessica; Madison, Steve; Lyon, Jason; Gordo, Victor
Subject: Public Comment - Agenda Item 10 - Vote NO on Hydrogen Fueling Station

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] n. [Learn why this is important](#)

[1] **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

This is a comment on Agenda Item 10 on the April 13, 2026 Council Agenda -
AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH STANTEC CONSULTING SERVICES, INC., FOR BIDDING AND CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION SERVICES FOR THE HYDROGEN FUELING STATION PROJECT IN AN AMOUNT NOT-TO-EXCEED \$316,800

City Council should halt the procurement of hydrogen-powered buses, and the fueling station to support them. This procurement violates the 100% carbon-free mandate of Resolution 9977 and makes no economic sense. Let's ask some questions to frame this discussion.

Has the city done a full lifecycle analysis of the impact of a hydrogen bus fleet? What is the total impact on greenhouse gases compared to electric buses?

What is the total lifecycle cost of hydrogen versus electric? A recent study showed that electric buses have about 15% lower lifecycle costs. Hydrogen bus operating cost/mile is 2-4 times that of electric buses.

Is the bus and fueling station procurement funded by unreliable federal and state grants? Arcadia, CA recently abandoned its hydrogen-powered fleet because the supporting grants were cancelled. Cities in England, Scotland, Canada and Germany have abandoned their hydrogen bus fleets. Why will Pasadena be more successful?

How will the hydrogen be produced? About 99% of current hydrogen production is "gray" - produced from fossil fuels, with high emissions. In addition, about 10% of hydrogen boils off during transport. Hydrogen has a global warming potential about 20 times higher than carbon dioxide, over 20 years. Will hydrogen production be a climate nightmare?

If green hydrogen can be supplied, how will it be generated, consistent with Resolution 9977? Where will the carbon-free electricity to generate it come from? Who else will be competing for that electricity? How will the City of Pasadena compete with industrial users who also require green hydrogen?

How will the hydrogen be delivered to the fueling plant, in the middle of a residential neighborhood? What will be the impact of 1 truck delivery per day to that neighborhood?


How reliable will that supply be? A recent hydrogen truck explosion shut down the entire hydrogen delivery fleet. Recently, 50% of the hydrogen production plants in California were offline.

04/13/2026

Item 10

Grants may be a short-term "sugar high". In the long run, hydrogen makes no climate or economic sense.

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Lissette Rodriguez >
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2026 10:12 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Masuda, Gene; Hampton, Tyron; Rivas, Jessica; Cole, Rick; Jones, Justin; Lyon, Jason
Subject:  Public Comment - Agenda Item 10 - Please Invest in E-Buses

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [Lissette Rodriguez](#). [Learn why this is important](#)

[1] CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Council and Staff,

I am writing to express strong support for prioritizing battery-electric buses over hydrogen fuel cell buses. While both technologies aim to reduce emissions, electric buses are superior from both an economic and environmental standpoint.

Battery electric buses are significantly more cost-effective across their lifecycle. They have lower fuel costs because electricity is more efficient and less expensive than hydrogen on an energy-equivalent basis. Electric drivetrains are also simpler, resulting in reduced maintenance costs and fewer mechanical failures. In contrast, hydrogen buses require costly fuel production, storage, and distribution infrastructure, as well as higher vehicle costs due to more complex systems. These factors will create long-term financial burdens for the City of Pasadena and taxpayers.

Electric buses are far more energy efficient. Charging a battery and using that electricity directly results in substantially less energy loss compared to producing hydrogen (often via electrolysis), compressing or liquefying it, transporting it, and converting it back into electricity in a fuel cell. This inefficiency means hydrogen buses require significantly more energy to travel the same distance.

Hydrogen is often derived from fossil fuels (so-called "gray hydrogen"), resulting in substantial upstream greenhouse gas emissions. Even "green hydrogen" requires large amounts of renewable electricity that could be used more efficiently by battery electric vehicles directly. In contrast, battery electric buses can be powered by increasingly clean renewable electricity, including electricity produced via municipally-owned solar. The latter flexibility means electric buses are more likely to be available during local emergencies or disruptions to hydrogen fuel supplies.

Electric bus charging infrastructure is simpler, more widely available, and easier to scale. Hydrogen fueling infrastructure remains sparse, expensive, and technically complex, limiting flexibility and increasing project risk.

Given limited City resources, please invest in the most efficient, cost-effective, and environmentally-beneficial option. Battery electric buses meet all of these criteria and represent the best path forward for a sustainable and fiscally-responsible transit system.

Thank you,

04/13/2026
Item 10

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Wesley Reutimann
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2026 10:39 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Masuda, Gene; Hampton, Tyron; Rivas, Jessica; Cole, Rick; Jones, Justin; Lyon, Jason
Subject: 📧🚌 Public Comment - Agenda Item 10 - Please Hit Pause on Hydrogen Buses

[!] **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Council and Staff,

I am writing to urge you to hit pause on further spending on hydrogen fueling and hydrogen buses.

The federal government has halted previously planned "green hydrogen" investments in southern California. Local hydrogen is most often derived from fossil fuels ("gray hydrogen"). In contrast, battery electric buses can be powered by the City's increasingly clean grid, including from planned municipally-owned solar. The latter flexibility means battery-electric buses would be more likely to be available during local emergencies.

Battery electric buses are significantly more cost-effective than hydrogen across their lifecycle. They have lower fuel costs because electricity is more efficient and less expensive than hydrogen on an energy-equivalent basis. Electric drivetrains are also simpler, resulting in reduced maintenance costs and fewer mechanical failures. In contrast, hydrogen buses require costly fuel production, storage, and distribution infrastructure, as well as higher vehicle costs due to more complex systems.

Electric buses are far more energy efficient. Charging a battery and using that electricity directly results in substantially less energy loss compared to producing hydrogen, compressing or liquefying it, transporting it, and converting it back into electricity in a fuel cell. This inefficiency means hydrogen buses require significantly more energy to travel the same distance.

Electric bus charging infrastructure is simpler, more widely available, and easier to scale.

Given limited City resources, the lack of progress on producing green hydrogen locally, and the inherent risk associated with investing so heavily into one technology, please hit the brakes on further hydrogen bus planning.

Thank you,

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Jomsky, Mark
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 6:47 AM
To: Official Records - City Clerk
Subject: Fw: Request to hold Item 10
Attachments: Memo on Item 10.docx

[Get Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Cole, Rick <rcole@cityofpasadena.net>
Sent: Sunday, April 12, 2026 11:02:43 PM
To: Jomsky, Mark <mjomsky@cityofpasadena.net>; Hawkesworth, Matthew <mhawkesworth@cityofpasadena.net>
Cc: Siques, Joaquin <JSiques@CityofPasadena.net>; Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>; DerBoghossian, Megheti <mderboghossian@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Request to hold Item 10

Matt and Victor: Please see my attached memo. I'd like to respectfully request that staff consider holding this item given the concerns expressed by the Environmental Advisory Commission, Pasadena 100 and especially the changed circumstances with the cancellation of major Federal funding for "green hydrogen" development in California.

Mark: would you distribute to my colleagues and make it part of the record prior to the meeting?



Councilmember, District 2
City of Pasadena
Cell: (626) 616-0279



COUNCILMEMBER RICK COLE

To: Fellow Councilmembers

From: Councilmember Rick Cole

Date: April 13, 2026

Subject: Request to Hold Item 10: Hydrogen Fueling Station Design Contract

Pasadena original commitment to hydrogen fuel cell buses was based on legitimate operational concerns. Several years ago, it aligned with State mandates, focused on a potentially promising technology with the expectation of significant Federal and State investment to produce “green” hydrogen.

But the landscape has changed dramatically under the Trump Administration. The supply of truly “green” hydrogen is now clearly highly uncertain. Major supporting investments have stalled, and the broader market is shifting toward battery-electric systems. Given the scale of the financial commitment before us, this is the moment to pause and reassess—before we lock ourselves into a costly path that may not deliver on its promise.

The Environmental Advisory Commission and Pasadena 100 urged caution even before these latest developments cast a long shadow over the viability of “green hydrogen” for Southern California.

1. The original assumptions

It is worth stating clearly: the original direction was understandable. Hydrogen buses offered clear operational advantages—longer range and faster refueling—while helping us comply with the State’s zero-emission mandate. Grant funding made the initial steps more affordable, and other agencies were moving in the same direction. At that moment, hydrogen appeared to be an emerging pillar of a clean transportation future.

2. Those assumptions have changed

The central premise of the hydrogen strategy was the emergence of a reliable supply of “green hydrogen”—fuel produced using renewable energy with minimal lifecycle emissions. That supply has not materialized at scale, nor is it likely in an affordable and reliable way when we need it.

The ARCHES hydrogen hub (Alliance for Renewable Clean Hydrogen Energy Systems) was intended to anchor a statewide green hydrogen ecosystem—production, pipelines, and fueling for transit and freight. It carried up to \$1.2 billion in federal funding, with billions more in matching commitments. That funding has now been canceled, project activities paused, and California is pursuing litigation to restore it.

Instead, hydrogen generated from non-renewable sources would need to be trucked into Pasadena, raising both cost and emissions concerns. Without a robust green hydrogen supply chain, the environmental benefits disappear—effectively substituting one fossil-fuel-dependent system for another, at costs that could ultimately force service reductions.

3. The Financial Stakes Are High

This is not a marginal investment. Over time, the full transition to a hydrogen-based system could exceed \$50 million in capital costs when vehicles, fueling infrastructure, and facility upgrades are included.

While current grants help offset some of these upfront costs, they do not eliminate long-term exposure and are unlikely to cover the full cost of conversion. Hydrogen systems remain more expensive than battery-electric alternatives, and operating costs are uncertain. If the hydrogen ecosystem does not mature as expected, Pasadena could be saddled with higher costs and fewer options.

4. The Market Is Moving in a Different Direction

Since our initial decision, the trajectory of the market has become clearer.

Battery-electric buses are rapidly improving in range and reliability, while benefiting from falling costs and an existing energy infrastructure. Hydrogen, by contrast, has encountered delays, funding challenges, and slower-than-expected deployment.

Even agencies that once explored hydrogen are increasingly emphasizing battery-electric fleets as the primary solution, with hydrogen playing a more limited or uncertain role.

5. Pasadena's Needs Should Drive Our Choice

Our decision should be grounded not just in technology, but in how our system actually operates.

Pasadena Transit serves relatively short routes with modest ridership. Our core challenges are frequency, reliability, and cost-effective service—not long-haul range. Larger, more expensive hydrogen buses may not align well with those realities.

We should not allow past decisions drive future reductions in services.

6. A Prudent Path Forward

Given these changes, the most responsible course is to pause so that we can get an up-to-date analysis of the availability and price of actual “green hydrogen.” To proceed without that information would be a surrender to the “law of increasing compulsion.”

It’s not too late to procure a reliable analysis based on current market conditions, and ensuring we fully evaluate battery-electric and hybrid strategies alongside hydrogen. It also means aligning our fleet decisions with our service goals—prioritizing flexibility, right-sized vehicles, and rider experience.

Conclusion

Pasadena strives to be a leader in environmental stewardship. That leadership requires not only ambition, but discernment. We have always tied our goal of achieving 100% renewable energy for our utility to affordability and reliability. In this case, both are undermined by developments that were not anticipated when earlier commitments were made. I urge a thoughtful approach that ensures we achieve a real “zero emission” fleet that best serves our customers and our community.

A brief pause now is far less costly than a long-term commitment we may later regret.

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Cynthia Lake <
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 8:05 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Zone 0 Comment

Some people who received this message don't often get email from

[Learn why this is important](#)

[1] CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Please note that in the city of Pasadena, the value of properties is based primarily on the qualitative benefits of our living alongside the natural world. The 150 year old Giant Sequoia Redwood tree that thrives in my front yard and 4 giant 200 year old Oak trees that shelter my back yard will be safe as long as I am alive to protect the trees that I've watched grow for the last 73 years.

They are thoughtfully maintained, provide shade, clean the air, and benefit mental health while addressing the worst potential outcomes of climate change accelerated by deforestation.

We have deliberately reduced and eliminated fossil fuel use in our daily lives. We drove electric GEM CAR golf carts around town for 10 years while waiting for modern electric cars to be developed. Greenery is not the problem, but the solution to overcoming humanities' lack of responsible stewardship of our home.

Ready for the fight of our lives to protect Pasadena's living treasures that influence factors like the "Joy of Life".

Sincerely,
Native Lifelong Bungalow Heaven Resident,
Cynthia Lake


04/13/2026
Item 10

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Matt Stumbo
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 8:48 AM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Masuda, Gene; Hampton, Tyron; Rivas, Jessica; Cole, Rick; Jones, Justin; Lyon, Jason
Subject: Public Comment - Agenda Item 10 - Please Invest in E-Buses

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[Learn why this is](#)

[] CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Council and Staff,

I am writing to express strong support for prioritizing battery-electric buses over hydrogen fuel cell buses. While both technologies aim to reduce emissions, electric buses are superior from both an economic and environmental standpoint.

Battery electric buses are significantly more cost-effective across their lifecycle. They have lower fuel costs because electricity is more efficient and less expensive than hydrogen on an energy-equivalent basis. Electric drivetrains are also simpler, resulting in reduced maintenance costs and fewer mechanical failures. In contrast, hydrogen buses require costly fuel production, storage, and distribution infrastructure, as well as higher vehicle costs due to more complex systems. These factors will create long-term financial burdens for the City of Pasadena and taxpayers.

Electric buses are far more energy efficient. Charging a battery and using that electricity directly results in substantially less energy loss compared to producing hydrogen (often via electrolysis), compressing or liquefying it, transporting it, and converting it back into electricity in a fuel cell. This inefficiency means hydrogen buses require significantly more energy to travel the same distance.

Hydrogen is often derived from fossil fuels (so-called "gray hydrogen"), resulting in substantial upstream greenhouse gas emissions. Even "green hydrogen" requires large amounts of renewable electricity that could be used more efficiently by battery electric vehicles directly. In contrast, battery electric buses can be powered by increasingly clean renewable electricity, including electricity produced via municipally-owned solar. The latter flexibility means electric buses are more likely to be available during local emergencies or disruptions to hydrogen fuel supplies.

Electric bus charging infrastructure is simpler, more widely available, and easier to scale. Hydrogen fueling infrastructure remains sparse, expensive, and technically complex, limiting flexibility and increasing project risk.

Given limited City resources, please invest in the most efficient, cost-effective, and environmentally-beneficial option. Battery electric buses meet all of these criteria and represent the best path forward for a sustainable and fiscally-responsible transit system.

Thank you,
Matt Stumbo
91104

04/13/2026
Item 10

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Felix Breden
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 11:36 AM
To: Hampton, Tyron; Cole, Rick; Jones, Justin; Masuda, Gene; Rivas, Jessica; Madison, Steve; Lyon, Jason; Gordo, Victor; PublicComment-AutoResponse
Cc: 1
Subject: Public Comment - Agenda Item 10 - Vote NO on Hydrogen Fueling Station -- Pursue EVs & Chargers

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from . Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[⚠] CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Mayor & City Councilmembers,

Please vote NO on Agenda item 10 at today's Council Meeting.

We are making great progress on becoming 100% carbon-free by 2030, and becoming a model city for fighting climate change in reasonable, economically-sound ways.


"green" hydrogen is not compatible with that goal: it isn't green (takes fossil fuel to make it), and it will cost a lot of money to put in the new infrastructure and buy new buses utilizing "dinosaur" technology - Barney Rubble's days are over. We should invest that money in electric busses that can feed off the abundant supply of solar and wind produced electricity in California, contribute to the stability of Pasadena's electrical grid with EV to grid technology, and overall support the City's revolutionary push for Carbon-free energy by 2030.

Sincerely,

Felix Breden

member, Pasadena Environmental Advisory Commission

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Andrew Cobb
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 12:16 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; Gordo, Victor; Madison, Steve; Masuda, Gene; Hampton, Tyron; Rivas, Jessica; Cole, Rick; Jones, Justin; Lyon, Jason
Subject:  Public Comment - Agenda Item 10 - Please Invest in E-Buses

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [earn why this is important](#)

[!] CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Council and Staff, I am writing to express strong support for prioritizing battery-electric buses over hydrogen fuel cell buses. While both technologies aim to reduce emissions, electric buses are superior from both an economic and environmental standpoint. Battery electric buses are significantly more cost-effective across their lifecycle. They have lower fuel costs because electricity is more efficient and less expensive than hydrogen on an energy-equivalent basis. Electric drivetrains are also simpler, resulting in reduced maintenance costs and fewer mechanical failures. In contrast, hydrogen buses require costly fuel production, storage, and distribution infrastructure, as well as higher vehicle costs due to more complex systems. These factors will create long-term financial burdens for the City of Pasadena and taxpayers. Electric buses are far more energy efficient. Charging a battery and using that electricity directly results in substantially less energy loss compared to producing hydrogen (often via electrolysis), compressing or liquefying it, transporting it, and converting it back into electricity in a fuel cell. This inefficiency means hydrogen buses require significantly more energy to travel the same distance. Hydrogen is often derived from fossil fuels (so-called "gray hydrogen"), resulting in substantial upstream greenhouse gas emissions. Even "green hydrogen" requires large amounts of renewable electricity that could be used more efficiently by battery electric vehicles directly. In contrast, battery electric buses can be powered by increasingly clean renewable electricity, including electricity produced via municipally-owned solar. The latter flexibility means electric buses are more likely to be available during local emergencies or disruptions to hydrogen fuel supplies. Electric bus charging infrastructure is simpler, more widely available, and easier to scale. Hydrogen fueling infrastructure remains sparse, expensive, and technically complex, limiting flexibility and increasing project risk. Given limited City resources, please invest in the most efficient, cost-effective, and environmentally-beneficial option. Battery electric buses meet all of these criteria and represent the best path forward for a sustainable and fiscally-responsible transit system.

Thank you,
Andrew Cobb
Educator

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: cityclerk
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 12:50 PM
To: Iraheta, Alba; Jomsky, Mark; Robles, Sandra; Sabha, Tamer; McMillan, Acquanette (Netta); Soo, Christine
Subject: FW: Public comment - Item #10 - Pasadena city council April 13, 2026

From: Adam Bray-Ali
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 12:49:18 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)
To: cityclerk <cityclerk@cityofpasadena.net>
Subject: Public comment - Item #10 - Pasadena city council April 13, 2026

[!] **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you **know** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Good evening City Council and Mayor,

I write to encourage investment in a known and deliverable way to provide zero-emission bus transportation to Pasadena residents and visitors.

As the impact of using oil rears its head again in the wars of the Middle East, we know that using homegrown energy sources and storing them in batteries and hydrogen allows for zero emission fueling sources.

While no technology is 'perfect' the options that hydrogen fuel cells provide are well established and as a Fuel Cell and Batteryelectric car vehicle driver, I can attest that the usability and drivability are excellent.

The proposal to build a fueling station for bus and industrial use will allow for Pasadena to move away from gasoline and diesel fuels, provide opportunity for energy storage that meets the desired plans for 100% renewable energy in the city AND be heavily subsidized.

I am always surprised at the vitriol of people that demean one type of transportation fuel over another, knowing that there are compromises to be made in the real world we live in. Currently, there is a real challenge with fueling access for consumers that own fuel cell cars but in the past 10 years, there have been a steady increase in growth and use of these vehicles and the bus type use seems to be a perfect way to adapt to a low weight, high energy capacity fuel that offers zero waste at the vehicle level.

Thank you,
Adam Bray-Ali

04/13/2026
Item 10

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Jenna Cobb
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 1:43 PM
To: Hampton, Tyron; Cole, Rick; Jones, Justin; Masuda, Gene; Rivas, Jessica; Madison, Steve; Lyon, Jason; Gordo, Victor; PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Public Comment - Agenda Item 10 - Please Invest in E-Buses

[!] **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Council and Staff,

As a regular rider of Pasadena Transit, resident of District 2, and environmental professional, I am writing to express strong support for prioritizing battery-electric buses over hydrogen fuel cell buses. While both technologies aim to reduce emissions, electric buses are superior from both an economic and environmental standpoint.

Battery electric buses are significantly more cost-effective across their lifecycle. They have lower fuel costs because electricity is more efficient and less expensive than hydrogen on an energy-equivalent basis. Electric drivetrains are also simpler, resulting in reduced maintenance costs and fewer mechanical failures. In contrast, hydrogen buses require costly fuel production, storage, and distribution infrastructure, as well as higher vehicle costs due to more complex systems. These factors will create long-term financial burdens for the City of Pasadena and taxpayers.

Electric buses are far more energy efficient. Charging a battery and using that electricity directly results in substantially less energy loss compared to producing hydrogen (often via electrolysis), compressing or liquefying it, transporting it, and converting it back into electricity in a fuel cell. This inefficiency means hydrogen buses require significantly more energy to travel the same distance.

Hydrogen is often derived from fossil fuels (so-called "gray hydrogen"), resulting in substantial upstream greenhouse gas emissions. Even "green hydrogen" requires large amounts of renewable electricity that could be used more efficiently by battery electric vehicles directly. In contrast, battery electric buses can be powered by increasingly clean renewable electricity, including electricity produced via municipally-owned solar. The latter flexibility means electric buses are more likely to be available during local emergencies or disruptions to hydrogen fuel supplies.

Electric bus charging infrastructure is simpler, more widely available, and easier to scale. Hydrogen fueling infrastructure remains sparse, expensive, and technically complex, limiting flexibility and increasing project risk.

Given limited City resources, please invest in the most efficient, cost-effective, and environmentally-beneficial option. Battery electric buses meet all of these criteria and represent the best path forward for a sustainable and fiscally-responsible transit system.

Thank you,
Jenna Cobb
District 2 (91106)

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: lorraine montgomery
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 1:53 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: RE:agenda item #10


[⚠] CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear city council members,
I urge you to oppose tonights AGENDA ITEM #10.
I live in district #2, and do not want hydrogen in my neighborhood.
It will only increase greenhouse gas emissions which we are all working to reduce.
Sincerely,
Lorraine Montgomery

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Kathy Sjogren ·
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 3:15 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: No Hydrogen in our neighborhood

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from : m. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

[] CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

I am a Pasadena resident. I do NOT want hydrogen buses in Pasadena.

I say NO to hydrogen in our neighborhoods.

Best regards,
Kathy Klein

McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: Robert Nowicki
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 3:37 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse
Subject: Stantec Hydrogen Station contract (Agenda Item #10)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [n why this is important](#)

[1] **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

City Council,
Several others have mentioned in correspondence that battery electric busses are the far superior technology compared to Hydrogen. I'm in complete agreement with the received correspondence. I also happened on Friday to read in the Santa Monica Press Democrat a similar story, where they are investing their \$53 million in grant money solely in 73 new battery electric busses. And they will have a fleet of 195 battery busses by 2032:

<https://www.smdp.com/santa-monica-breaks-ground-on-56-million-clean-transit-future/>

The City should check with Santa Monica to see what their procurement entails, and why they chose the battery busses versus hydrogen busses. Hydrogen has failed in multiple cities as prior correspondence has pointed out.

Robert Nowicki

Public Comment - City Council meeting 4/13/26 - Agenda Item 10 - Please Invest in Battery Electric Buses

From Colin Bogart <c .

Date Mon 4/13/2026 5:00 PM

To PublicComment-AutoResponse <correspondence@cityofpasadena.net>; Gordo, Victor <vgordo@cityofpasadena.net>; Madison, Steve <Smadison@cityofpasadena.net>; Masuda, Gene <gmasuda@cityofpasadena.net>; Hampton, Tyron <thampton@cityofpasadena.net>; Rivas, Jessica <jerivas@cityofpasadena.net>; Cole, Rick <rcole@cityofpasadena.net>; Jones, Justin <justinjones@cityofpasadena.net>; Lyon, Jason <jlyon@cityofpasadena.net>

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [important](#)

[Learn why this is](#)

[Δ] CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you *know* the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Dear Mayor Gordo, City Council and Staff,

Although I am a TAC member, I'm writing to you today as an individual.

I want to express my strong support for prioritizing battery-electric buses over hydrogen fuel cell buses. While both technologies aim to reduce emissions, electric buses are superior from both an economic and environmental standpoint. Based on what I've read recently, hydrogen may have seemed like the better choice previously, but no longer appears to be the better choice now. I realize changing course may add some staff time to updating our bus system, but I believe it's the right thing to do.

I ask that you do not approve the contract proposed in Agenda Item 10 for a hydrogen fueling station and direct staff to focus on battery electric buses instead of hydrogen buses.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Colin Bogart
District 1 Resident