




MEMORANDUM

Date: June 16, 2017

To: The Honorable Chair and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator 

Re: **Vehicle Replacement System**

Please see the attached two memoranda from Deputy County Administrator Tom Burke related to our vehicle fleet and replacement.

The June 12, 2017 memoranda discuss vehicle replacement from the perspective of all users within the Fleet Services Management System, as well as replacement of patrol vehicles for the Sheriff's Department. There is a specific technical evaluation that helps guide staff regarding vehicle replacement.

I have authorized our Fleet Services Department to proceed with the replacement of 56 Sheriff vehicles based on the analysis and point system identified in the memorandum.

In addition, the County will purchase an additional 20 electric vehicles that will be placed in various departments that have vehicles in need of replacement. The new electric vehicles are American made and have battery capacity to provide at least 250 miles of travel on a single charge. It is now becoming operationally efficient to transition our fleet from petroleum-fueled vehicles to vehicles powered by electricity or other renewable energy.

This effort is the first major conversion of our vehicle fleet to electric vehicles. We have made, through our Fleet Services Department, significant progress in providing renewable solar, electric powered vehicles. It is now appropriate and reasonable to begin transition of our vehicle fleet from petroleum-based fuel supplies to renewable electric supplied.

CHH/anc

Attachments

c: Tom Burke, Deputy County Administrator for Administration
Frank Samaniego, Director, Fleet Services
Linda Mayo, Director, Sustainability and Conservation

Pima County On Road Fleet by Number of Vehicles

Department	Vehicle Count	Oldest	Newest	Avg. Age	Avg. Points	% of Fleet	Cummulative
SHERIFF PATROL	382	2003	2016	2011	9.8	24.7%	24.7%
SHERIFF OTHER	213	1994	2016	2010	9.9	13.8%	38.4%
TRANSPORTATION	200	1988	2017	2012	6.9	12.9%	51.3%
RWRD	198	1987	2017	2011	7.0	12.8%	64.1%
NRPR	106	1992	2017	2012	6.3	6.8%	70.9%
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT	68	2001	2017	2012	5.6	4.4%	75.3%
ADULT PROBATION	48	1998	2017	2011	7.0	3.1%	78.4%
COUNTY ATTORNEY	43	2008	2017	2013	5.8	2.8%	81.2%
JUVENILE	42	2006	2017	2013	5.3	2.7%	83.9%
HEALTH	37	1997	2017	2011	6.1	2.4%	86.3%
PUBLIC DEFENSE SERVICES	23	2011	2016	2012	6.7	1.5%	87.8%
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY	18	2003	2017	2008	10.3	1.2%	89.0%
FLEET MOTOR POOL	16	2006	2017	2010	8.2	1.0%	90.0%
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	16	2004	2017	2010	7.7	1.0%	91.0%
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES	16	2006	2017	2012	7.4	1.0%	92.1%
ANIMAL CARE	16	2011	2016	2014	6.9	1.0%	93.1%
ASSESSOR	16	2006	2017	2012	5.3	1.0%	94.1%
FLEET SERVICES	12	1992	2016	2006	12.0	0.8%	94.9%
CONSTABLES	10	2006	2016	2011	7.9	0.6%	95.5%
FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT	9	2008	2017	2014	4.9	0.6%	96.1%
LIBRARY DISTRICT	8	2003	2017	2012	5.7	0.5%	96.6%
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	5	2006	2013	2009	10.0	0.3%	97.0%
SUPERIOR COURT	5	2006	2015	2009	8.5	0.3%	97.3%
OEM	5	2004	2016	2008	6.6	0.3%	97.6%
PCWIN	5	2001	2014	2010	6.5	0.3%	97.9%
RISK MANAGEMENT	4	2005	2015	2011	6.7	0.3%	98.2%
COMMUNITY SERVICES	4	2008	2017	2012	6.1	0.3%	98.5%
FORENSIC SCIENCE	3	2007	2014	2011	8.5	0.2%	98.6%
ELECTIONS	3	2012	2017	2014	3.3	0.2%	98.8%
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	3	2014	2017	2015	2.6	0.2%	99.0%
JUSTICE COURTS	2	2002	2011	2007	10.1	0.1%	99.2%
PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN	2	2012	2013	2013	5.8	0.1%	99.3%
COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE	1	2002	2002	2002	16.8	0.1%	99.4%
CLERK OF THE COURT	1	2005	2005	2005	13.8	0.1%	99.4%
ECONOMIC DEV	1	2016	2016	2006	12.0	0.1%	99.5%
KINO SPORTS COMPLEX	1	2008	2008	2008	7.8	0.1%	99.5%
FINANCE	1	2011	2011	2011	6.2	0.1%	99.6%
SCHOOLS	1	2012	2012	2012	5.5	0.1%	99.7%
RECORDER	1	2011	2011	2011	4.3	0.1%	99.7%
TREASURER	1	2012	2012	2015	2.2	0.1%	99.8%
SUSTAINABILITY	1	2016	2016	2016	1.5	0.1%	99.9%
REAL PROPERTY	1	2016	2016	2016	1.3	0.1%	99.9%
DOCUMENTS	1	2017	2017	2017	0.6	0.1%	100.0%
	1549		Average	2011	7.0		