

The Bus as Climate Infrastructure: Comparing Electric-Bus Transitions in India, Europe, and the United States

Maulsri Jha

Ph.D., AICP, LEED GA
Senior Project Manager
CDM Smith, Seattle, WA

Abstract:

Electric buses are increasingly prominent in climate, air-quality, and industrial policy, yet vehicle replacement alone does not make a bus system effective climate infrastructure. Climate value depends on the electricity mix, service quantity and quality, operational reliability, depot and grid readiness, procurement and financing, workforce capacity, and the distribution of benefits. This article develops a Bus Climate Infrastructure framework and applies it through a structured comparison of India, Europe, and the United States. Case studies examine Mumbai and Bengaluru, London, California, and New York. India has used national aggregation, gross-cost contracting, and payment-security mechanisms to reduce acquisition barriers and extend electrification beyond the largest cities. Europe combines binding procurement targets, manufacturer standards, local operating contracts, and mature bus networks, while London demonstrates how fleet conversion can be joined to air-quality policy and service regulation. The United States relies on federal grants, state mandates, and agency transition plans, with California providing a regulatory model and New York illustrating the infrastructure demands of a large legacy fleet. The comparison finds that transition success is governed less by nominal fleet targets than by institutional capacity to coordinate vehicles, depots, electricity, schedules, maintenance, labor, and capital renewal. It also finds that electrification produces the greatest climate and public-health value when it protects or expands service and prioritizes routes serving highly exposed and transit-dependent communities. The article proposes performance measures for lifecycle emissions, passenger service, charging and energy resilience, fiscal sustainability, workforce outcomes, and distributive equity. It concludes that governments should evaluate electric-bus programs as integrated public-service and energy-system investments rather than as vehicle-purchase initiatives.

Keywords: electric buses; climate infrastructure; public transport; fleet transition; procurement; transport equity; energy systems

1. Introduction

The urban bus is one of the most adaptable forms of mass transportation. Buses can be deployed more quickly than rail, serve changing travel markets, connect peripheral neighborhoods to major destinations, and provide essential mobility during rail outages and emergencies. They are also closely associated with diesel exhaust, noise, operating-cost volatility, and uneven service quality. Electrification offers an

opportunity to change this relationship. A battery-electric or fuel-cell bus eliminates tailpipe emissions, reduces street-level noise, and can lower greenhouse-gas emissions when its energy supply is sufficiently clean. The transition can also stimulate manufacturing, charging infrastructure, grid investment, and new technical occupations.

The climate importance of buses, however, cannot be inferred from propulsion technology alone. A zero-emission bus that replaces a diesel bus on an unchanged schedule provides real benefits, but a well-used electric bus that attracts travelers from private vehicles, improves access, and operates on increasingly renewable electricity produces a much larger public return. Conversely, an electrification program can weaken service if high capital costs, charging constraints, range losses, or unreliable contracts reduce vehicle availability. The relevant policy question is therefore not simply how rapidly diesel vehicles can be replaced. It is how electrification can strengthen the bus as a low-carbon public service.

This distinction matters across India, Europe, and the United States. Indian cities face severe air pollution, rapid motorization, limited municipal fiscal capacity, and a substantial shortage of organized bus service. National programs have consequently combined electric vehicles with aggregated procurement, per-kilometer contracts, depot support, and payment security. European transitions occur within stronger public-transport markets and a regulatory framework that sets procurement requirements for clean and zero-emission buses. In the United States, federal grants and state rules support agency-led transitions across highly varied operating environments, labor arrangements, climates, and electricity systems.

This article asks four questions. First, which policy and procurement models are driving electric-bus adoption in the three regions? Second, how do those models address the operational system around the vehicle, including depots, charging, power, maintenance, workforce, and service planning? Third, under which conditions does electrification improve climate mitigation, resilience, air quality, and accessibility simultaneously? Fourth, which performance measures can distinguish successful fleet acquisition from successful public-service transformation? The central argument is that electric buses should be planned as climate infrastructure. This requires governments to join technological transition with reliable service, clean and resilient energy, sustainable finance, capable institutions, and equitable deployment.

2. From Zero-Emission Vehicles to Climate Infrastructure

A bus fleet connects four systems. It is a transportation service that converts vehicles, labor, streets, and information into passenger access. It is an energy load whose location and timing affect distribution networks and electricity procurement. It is an industrial system involving manufacturers, batteries, software, spare parts, and specialized maintenance. It is also a public-health intervention because the removal of diesel combustion changes exposure along routes, at stops, in depots, and inside vehicles. Electrification decisions made within only one of these systems can transfer costs or risks to the others. Lifecycle analysis is essential. Battery-electric buses have no tailpipe emissions, but their total greenhouse-gas burden includes vehicle and battery manufacturing, electricity generation, charging losses, component replacement, and end-of-life treatment. Comparative studies generally find substantial lifecycle advantages over diesel where electricity is moderately or highly decarbonized, although results vary with grid mix, route energy demand, battery size, climate, and utilization (Lajunen & Lipman, 2016; Li et al., 2018). High annual mileage can improve the climate return on embodied emissions, while a carbon-intensive grid or oversized battery can reduce it. Agencies should therefore report energy

and emissions per vehicle-kilometer and passenger-kilometer, not only the number of electric buses purchased.

Service quality is equally important. Mode shift depends on frequency, reliability, travel time, coverage, affordability, safety, and passenger information. Electrification does not address buses delayed in mixed traffic or neighborhoods with infrequent service. Bus lanes, signal priority, all-door boarding, stop design, network redesign, and operating funding can increase the productivity of every vehicle and charger. A climate program that purchases buses without protecting service may produce smaller emissions reductions than a combined program that electrifies and improves the network (World Bank, 2022a).

Operational planning changes with electric propulsion. Diesel buses can be fueled rapidly and assigned flexibly, while battery-electric buses require coordination among route length, topography, temperature, passenger load, traffic delay, auxiliary energy use, battery state of health, charging power, and dwell time. Depot charging can simplify operations but create large coincident electrical loads. Opportunity charging can reduce battery size but adds infrastructure and dependency at terminals. Hydrogen fuel-cell buses can offer range and refueling advantages in selected applications, yet fuel cost, production emissions, and supply infrastructure remain consequential. Technology should follow a route, depot, and energy analysis rather than a universal preference (Göhlich et al., 2018; Mahmoud et al., 2016; Pelletier et al., 2019).

Climate infrastructure must also be resilient. Electricity outages, heat, flooding, wildfire, and extreme cold can disrupt charging or reduce vehicle range precisely when mobility is most needed. Depots should be assessed for physical hazards, feeder redundancy, transformer capacity, backup supply, islandable generation or storage where justified, and emergency operating priorities. The transition can create useful grid flexibility through managed charging, but only when communications, tariffs, and operating constraints are aligned.

3. Analytical Framework and Comparative Method

The study uses a structured qualitative comparison of national and regional transition models, supported by five city or state case studies. India is represented by Mumbai's BEST undertaking and Bengaluru's BMTC, two large operators that have used contracted electric-bus service at significant scale. Europe is examined through the European Union's Clean Vehicles Directive and London's regulated bus market. The United States is represented by California's Innovative Clean Transit regulation and New York's Metropolitan Transportation Authority. The cases were selected because they combine ambitious fleet objectives with contrasting governance, procurement, energy, and operating arrangements.

Evidence includes statutes, agency transition plans, government program documents, technical guidance, public dashboards, industry and multilateral reports, and peer-reviewed literature available through August 2026. The study does not rank jurisdictions through a single score because reported fleet categories, service statistics, and lifecycle boundaries are not consistent. It instead uses the seven dimensions in Table 1 to trace the mechanisms by which targets become operational outcomes.

The framework separates acquisition from transition. Acquisition concerns whether a government or operator can obtain vehicles and chargers. Transition concerns whether the organization can replace a fleet without degrading service, manage technological and contractual risks, build energy capacity, maintain equipment, train workers, finance renewal, and demonstrate public value. This distinction is

particularly important for announcements that count sanctioned, ordered, delivered, or registered buses as though they were equivalent to vehicles consistently available in peak service.

Table 1. Bus Climate Infrastructure analytical framework

Dimension	Core question	Illustrative measures
Service and mode shift	Does the transition protect or expand frequency, coverage, reliability, and travel-time competitiveness?	Revenue service, missed trips, speed, frequency, passenger-kilometers, accessibility
Lifecycle climate value	What are manufacturing, electricity, use, replacement, and end-of-life emissions?	CO ₂ e per vehicle-kilometer and passenger-kilometer; grid marginal emissions
Energy and depots	Can sites, utilities, chargers, and operations support the full fleet under normal and emergency conditions?	Connection milestones, charger uptime, peak demand, redundancy, outage service
Finance and procurement	Are capital, operations, contracts, and replacement affordable and bankable?	Total cost, payment performance, risk allocation, renewal reserves
Operational capability	Can the agency plan blocks, manage data, maintain equipment, and recover from failures?	Availability, road calls, battery health, spare ratio, restoration time
Workforce and industry	Are workers trained and protected, and is the supply chain durable?	Training completion, job quality, safety, supplier diversity, parts lead time
Equity and public health	Who receives cleaner air and improved service, and who bears transition burdens?	Exposure reduction, service change, affordability, depot impacts, benefit distribution

Source: Author's synthesis of cited literature and policy documents.

4. India: Aggregation, Contracting, and Rapid Scale

India's electric-bus transition has evolved from city-specific subsidized procurement toward national aggregation and service contracting. Under gross-cost contracts, a private operator commonly supplies, operates, and maintains buses for a specified per-kilometer payment, while the public transport authority controls routes, fares, and service requirements. This model reduces the authority's initial vehicle expenditure and transfers selected technology and maintenance risks to the contractor. Aggregated tenders can also create scale, standardize requirements, strengthen price competition, and make smaller cities visible to manufacturers and financiers.

The national policy architecture has expanded substantially. PM-eBus Sewa was approved to support 10,000 electric buses through a public-private partnership model, including assistance for civil depot and behind-the-meter power infrastructure and per-kilometer operational support (Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, 2023). By March 2026, the government reported that all 10,000 buses had been

sanctioned across 116 cities, although sanctioning is not the same as delivery and sustained operation (Press Information Bureau, 2026). The separate PM e-Bus Sewa Payment Security Mechanism carries a budget of ₹3,435.33 crore and is intended to support more than 38,000 buses by protecting operators against payment default by public transport authorities (Ministry of Heavy Industries, 2024).

This institutional innovation addresses a genuine financing barrier. Municipal transport agencies may have weak balance sheets, delayed subsidy payments, regulated fares, and operating deficits. A long-term electric-bus contract is bankable only if lenders and manufacturers believe per-kilometer payments will arrive. Payment security can lower risk premiums and broaden participation. It does not, however, eliminate the underlying need for sustainable operating finance. If fares and public subsidies remain insufficient, contingent support may shift rather than resolve fiscal risk (Vijaykumar & Konda, 2023; World Bank, 2022b).

India's model also links electrification to a bus-service deficit. PM-eBus Sewa gives priority to cities without organized bus services, making the program potentially additive rather than purely substitutive. This is significant for climate policy because mode shift requires usable service. Yet rapid diffusion to smaller cities increases the need for technical assistance in route design, scheduling, depot planning, contract management, electrical coordination, data systems, and workforce development. Standard tender documents cannot replace capable local administration.

Contract design determines public outcomes. Per-kilometer payment can incentivize availability and transfer maintenance risk, but poorly specified contracts may encourage disputes over kilometers, charging downtime, battery degradation, accident responsibility, labor standards, or force majeure. Authorities require access to vehicle, charger, energy, breakdown, safety, and schedule data. They also need step-in rights and contingency capacity if an operator fails. Long contracts should preserve flexibility to update routes, charging strategies, performance thresholds, and technology without imposing prohibitive change orders (International Council on Clean Transportation, 2021; Li et al., 2018; Sclar et al., 2019).

4.1 Mumbai: Electrification within a Regulated Public Network

Mumbai's Brihanmumbai Electric Supply and Transport undertaking operates within one of India's most transit-dependent metropolitan areas. Its bus network complements suburban rail and metro services and reaches neighborhoods that fixed-guideway systems do not. Electric buses offer substantial local benefits because dense streets expose large numbers of passengers, pedestrians, vendors, residents, and workers to bus emissions and noise. The climate value is also supported by high vehicle utilization, provided that electricity decarbonization and service reliability improve over time.

Mumbai illustrates both the advantages and governance demands of contracted deployment. The public authority can expand electric operations without purchasing every bus outright, while operators and manufacturers assume responsibilities for vehicles, drivers, charging, and maintenance under contract. Yet passengers experience the integrated network, not the contractual boundary. BEST must retain strong control of schedules, fare integration, route allocation, safety, accessibility, passenger information, and service recovery. A breakdown attributed to a private operator still represents a public-service failure.

The city's climate exposure makes depot planning inseparable from resilience. Flooding and extreme rainfall can affect access roads, electrical equipment, charging yards, and distribution systems. Depot conversion should therefore include flood elevations, drainage, safe equipment placement, emergency

shutoff, backup communications, and alternative charging plans. Concentrating charging at a few large depots may produce economies of scale while increasing the consequence of a localized outage. A portfolio approach can balance electrical capacity, land availability, operating efficiency, and geographic redundancy.

Equitable route deployment should be explicit. Initial fleets are often placed where infrastructure is easiest to build, public visibility is high, or operating conditions are favorable. Those criteria can delay benefits for communities with high diesel exposure or poor service. Mumbai should evaluate route assignments through combined measures of air pollution, population exposure, transit dependence, service deficiency, depot feasibility, and operational suitability.

4.2 Bengaluru: Scale, Reliability, and Contractual Capacity

Bengaluru's BMTC provides a complementary case. The city has introduced a large number of electric buses through contracted operations while serving a rapidly expanding metropolitan area with severe congestion and strong bus demand. Electric vehicles can reduce local pollution and energy use, but mixed-traffic delay increases schedule variability and can complicate range planning. Bus priority is therefore an electric-fleet measure as well as a travel-time measure because predictable cycles improve charging, vehicle utilization, and operator productivity.

Experience in Bengaluru has also drawn attention to breakdowns, contractor labor relations, and accountability. These difficulties should not be interpreted as evidence against electrification. They demonstrate that technology scale must be matched by contract-management scale. Agencies need standardized failure coding, independent verification of availability, battery-health reporting, spare ratios, towing and incident protocols, and enforceable driver training and labor provisions. Penalties alone may be ineffective if they create financial stress without correcting technical or organizational causes.

The Bengaluru lesson is that outsourced assets do not outsource public responsibility. The authority must remain an informed buyer and network manager. It needs engineers who understand batteries and charging, planners who can match blocks to range, contract specialists who can distinguish operator failure from infrastructure failure, and labor policies that protect service continuity. National procurement can lower prices, but local institutional capacity determines whether the buses remain dependable (Sclar et al., 2019; World Resources Institute, 2024).

5. Europe: Regulation within Mature Transit Markets

Europe's transition is shaped by binding regulation, public procurement, local operating models, and an increasingly stringent vehicle-manufacturing framework. The revised Clean Vehicles Directive establishes national minimum procurement shares for clean vehicles and requires at least half of the clean-bus target to be fulfilled by zero-emission buses (European Commission, n.d.). Regulation of heavy-duty vehicle carbon emissions further strengthens the supply signal, with all new urban buses required to be zero-emission from 2035 under the European framework (European Commission, 2025).

This model differs from a grant-dependent transition. Procurement obligations create recurring demand across member states, allowing manufacturers, utilities, and operators to anticipate a market. European Union funds and national programs can reduce cost, but the legal floor persists beyond an individual funding round. The approach also operates within cities where bus services are commonly planned or

contracted as integrated networks, creating opportunities to coordinate vehicle standards with service requirements.

European experience shows that regulatory certainty must be accompanied by infrastructure delivery. Grid connection queues, depot constraints, electricity prices, and operator finance can slow implementation even when vehicles are available. Smaller operators and municipalities may lack the scale to negotiate energy and charging contracts. Harmonized technical standards and aggregated learning reduce risk, while local route and depot analysis remains indispensable (European Commission, n.d.; International Energy Agency, 2024).

The climate case varies across national power systems. Electric buses charged in low-carbon electricity systems provide large lifecycle reductions, while benefits in more carbon-intensive systems increase as the grid decarbonizes. European policy consequently demonstrates the value of aligning transport electrification with economy-wide power-sector policy. Guarantees of renewable origin can support accounting, but additional renewable supply and managed charging determine system-level value.

5.1 London: Fleet Transition through Network Governance

London offers a mature example of fleet transition within a regulated service market. Transport for London specifies the network and contracts routes to private operators, while setting vehicle, accessibility, emissions, and performance requirements. This governance structure allows zero-emission standards to be introduced through recurring route contracts rather than relying only on direct fleet ownership. It also distributes depot and operating responsibilities across companies while preserving a unified passenger network.

London reached 3,000 zero-emission buses in June 2026, approximately one third of its fleet, and retains a target for a fully zero-emission fleet by 2034, with earlier completion dependent on additional funding (Transport for London, 2026). The scale matters because it moves electrification beyond demonstration routes. It also creates industrial effects through demand for buses, batteries, charging equipment, software, depot construction, and maintenance capability.

The case demonstrates the importance of sequencing. London first tightened conventional vehicle emissions and introduced hybrid and early zero-emission technologies, then required all new buses entering the fleet to be zero-emission. Route contracting creates natural replacement points, but depot electricity upgrades can become the critical path. Responsibilities among TfL, operators, depot owners, distribution-network operators, and manufacturers must be synchronized before a new contract begins.

Electrification is only one component of London's bus climate performance. Bus lanes, traffic management, fares, frequency, accessibility, and land-use patterns determine whether buses remain competitive with cars. A clean but slow bus may lose passengers, reducing its contribution to mode shift. London therefore supports the broader proposition that the vehicle transition should be nested within a policy that protects bus travel time and network usefulness.

6. United States: Federal Capital Support and State Leadership

The United States combines federal capital grants, state mandates and incentives, utility programs, and agency-specific plans. The Federal Transit Administration's Low or No Emission program supports vehicles, charging and fueling equipment, and facility modifications. Federal law requires applicants for zero-emission projects to submit transition plans and generally directs five percent of relevant grant funds to workforce development unless an agency certifies a lower need (Federal Transit

Administration, 2025a, 2025b). Since the 2021 infrastructure law, billions of dollars have been made available for bus and facility investments.

Federal grants can accelerate projects and support agencies that lack local capital. Competitive rounds, however, can produce discontinuous funding, substantial application burdens, and portfolios shaped by award timing. Capital eligibility does not guarantee sufficient operating funds, utility capacity, or staff. Agencies may acquire vehicles before depots are ready or design facilities around a small grant-funded batch rather than a full-fleet transition. The federal transition-plan requirement is intended to address this fragmentation, but plan quality and implementation capacity remain variable.

The U.S. electricity and operating context is heterogeneous. Climate, route length, labor rules, depot ownership, utility regulation, and grid carbon intensity differ widely. Cold-weather heating and hot-weather air conditioning affect range, while very long commuter routes may require larger batteries or on-route charging. Agencies should retain technology flexibility where operational evidence supports it, but avoid using exceptional blocks to delay electrification of the majority of service that is technically feasible.

Domestic-content requirements and workforce provisions give bus policy an industrial dimension. They can build political support and manufacturing capacity, yet supply-chain concentration creates procurement and spare-parts risk. Stable multiyear demand, interoperable charging where feasible, transparent performance data, and support for multiple qualified suppliers are important to market resilience.

6.1 California: A Regulatory Floor for Fleet Conversion

California's Innovative Clean Transit regulation provides the clearest statewide mandate in the United States. Adopted in 2018, it requires a phased increase in zero-emission bus purchases, with all new bus purchases required to be zero-emission beginning in 2029 and a goal of complete fleet transition by 2040 (California Air Resources Board, 2019). Agencies must prepare rollout plans that address vehicles, infrastructure, costs, workforce, and risks.

The principal strength of the regulation is predictability. A binding purchase schedule gives agencies, manufacturers, utilities, and funding bodies a common horizon. It also prevents the transition from depending solely on voluntary leadership. The rollout-plan requirement encourages full-fleet analysis before individual orders, exposing land, power, facility, and replacement-cycle constraints that pilot projects may conceal.

Regulation also reveals differences in agency capacity. Large urban operators can employ specialized engineers and pursue utility partnerships, while small agencies may face limited procurement staff, rural route lengths, and constrained depots. Compliance mechanisms should therefore be paired with technical assistance, financing, and narrowly tailored flexibility for demonstrated infeasibility. Flexibility should preserve the long-term market signal rather than create an indefinite exemption.

California's environmental-justice context is central. Diesel bus depots and routes often affect communities already burdened by freight, highways, and industrial pollution. Deployment plans should prioritize cumulative exposure and service need, while ensuring that charging construction and electrical equipment do not impose new neighborhood burdens. The transition also creates an opportunity to improve facilities for operators and maintenance workers.

6.2 New York: Converting a Large Legacy Fleet

New York's MTA has committed to a zero-emission bus fleet by 2040. Its transition plan addresses an operating fleet of roughly 5,800 buses and the conversion of multiple depots across a dense city (Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 2022, n.d.). The scale of weekday service, limited depot space, aging electrical infrastructure, and diverse route conditions make this a system transformation rather than a sequence of vehicle orders.

Early deployments identified range and charging constraints and supported partnerships with the New York Power Authority. Later plans include larger bus orders and depot upgrades. Behind-the-meter generation and storage have been examined as tools to manage demand charges, improve resilience, and reduce the scale of peak grid draw (Joint Office of Energy and Transportation, 2024). These measures illustrate how fleet electrification can become an energy-management program.

New York also exposes the importance of construction sequencing. Depot conversions must occur while daily service continues, and temporary loss of parking or maintenance capacity can affect operations. Electrical upgrades may require utility work beyond the depot. A full-fleet plan should coordinate bus retirement, charger commissioning, transformer installation, workforce training, spare parts, and route assignment through a rolling multiyear schedule with contingency.

The equity rationale is substantial because buses serve many neighborhoods and riders not reached conveniently by rail. Priority should consider diesel exposure, asthma and health burdens, transit dependence, service reliability, and depot-worker conditions. Public reporting should show not only the geographic placement of electric buses but also whether affected routes gain or lose scheduled service and reliability.

7. Comparative Findings

The comparison identifies three distinct policy logics. India's central aggregation and gross-cost contracting seek to overcome weak municipal purchasing power and accelerate scale. Europe's regulatory model creates recurring demand through procurement obligations and manufacturer standards embedded in mature transit markets. The United States uses federal capital support combined with state and agency mandates, producing innovation but also geographic and fiscal unevenness. None is inherently superior. Each addresses a different institutional bottleneck and creates a different allocation of risk.

India transfers substantial technology, maintenance, and finance responsibility to contracted operators, but public authorities retain payment, monitoring, network, and political risk. Europe uses regulatory certainty to coordinate the market, but depot delivery and local finance remain decisive. The United States provides large grants and planning requirements, but competitive funding can fragment full-fleet implementation. Across all regions, successful transition requires a capable public entity that can specify outcomes, validate data, coordinate utilities, manage contracts, and protect service.

A second finding is that depot and grid readiness often govern the pace of transition. Vehicles are visible and politically salient, whereas feeders, substations, switchgear, trenching, permits, software, and maintenance facilities receive less attention. Their lead times can exceed vehicle procurement. Full-fleet energy modeling should precede major orders, and utility coordination should begin during strategic planning rather than after contract award.

Third, reliability must be measured at the service level. Vehicle availability, charger uptime, energy delivery, missed trips, road calls, and schedule adherence are interdependent. A bus may be technically

available but unusable because its assigned charger failed or its state of charge is insufficient. Agencies should maintain an integrated operations dataset and publish comparable metrics across propulsion types while controlling for vehicle age, route, weather, and duty cycle.

Fourth, the workforce is part of the infrastructure. Operators need training in regenerative braking, range-aware operation, emergencies, and high-voltage safety. Maintenance staff need electrical, diagnostic, battery, thermal-management, and software skills. First responders and towing contractors need new procedures. Contracting models should protect training, compensation, job quality, and knowledge transfer rather than allowing technical expertise to remain entirely with vendors.

Finally, climate value is conditional on service. Electrification improves air quality even without mode shift, but its broader mitigation contribution grows when bus priority and operating investment increase ridership and passenger throughput. Fleet targets should be accompanied by service targets, particularly in cities where bus supply is inadequate.

Table 2. Comparison of regional transition models

Region	Dominant policy model	Principal strength	Principal implementation risk
India	National aggregation, PPP gross-cost contracts, infrastructure aid, payment security	Rapid scale and entry of smaller cities	Municipal capacity, payment sustainability, contractor accountability, service reliability
European Union and London	Binding procurement targets, vehicle standards, regulated route contracts	Predictable market and integration with mature transit governance	Grid connections, depot finance, uneven local capacity, maintaining bus competitiveness
United States	Federal competitive grants, state mandates, agency transition plans	Large capital support, state experimentation, workforce requirements	Funding discontinuity, heterogeneous utilities and climates, supply concentration
Cross-regional lesson	Full-fleet planning plus service, energy, labor, and equity integration	Climate and health benefits linked to stronger public transport	Counting acquisitions as outcomes and separating vehicles from operating systems

Source: Author's synthesis of cited literature and policy documents.

8. Policy Framework: Treating the Bus as Climate Infrastructure

The first policy requirement is integrated transition planning. Agencies should map every vehicle replacement against route blocks, depots, chargers, utility capacity, workforce, capital projects, and service objectives. Plans should use multiple scenarios for energy prices, battery degradation, climate, grid carbon intensity, technology cost, and ridership. They should identify decisions that are robust across scenarios and triggers for revising technology or charging strategy.

Second, appraisal should use lifecycle and passenger-based metrics. Governments should estimate manufacturing and operational emissions, local air pollution, noise, electricity demand, and end-of-life impacts. Results should be reported per bus-kilometer and passenger-kilometer. A low-emission vehicle

with poor utilization should not appear more successful than a highly productive fleet merely because procurement counts are larger.

Third, procurement should be performance-based but auditable. Contracts should specify service availability, charger uptime, usable range under defined conditions, energy efficiency, battery-health reporting, safety, accessibility, data ownership, cybersecurity, labor standards, and recovery requirements. Payment formulas should allocate risk to the party able to manage it. Public agencies should retain data access, inspection rights, interoperability options, and continuity plans if a supplier or operator exits (C40 Cities, 2020).

Fourth, depot and grid programs should be planned as portfolios. Site selection should consider route efficiency, power availability, land, environmental hazards, community exposure, and redundancy. Managed charging can reduce peaks and align load with lower-cost or lower-carbon periods. Solar and storage may provide economic and resilience value where carefully sized, but should be evaluated against utility reliability, tariffs, fire safety, and emergency operating needs.

Fifth, governments should join electrification to bus priority and operating finance. Capital programs should fund lanes, signals, stops, accessibility, and information systems alongside vehicles and chargers. Faster, more reliable buses require fewer vehicles to provide a given frequency and can increase ridership. Stable operating support is necessary because a fleet cannot deliver climate benefits while parked for lack of drivers or service funds.

Sixth, equity should shape deployment and evaluation. Agencies should prioritize communities with high cumulative pollution, transit dependence, poor service, and vulnerable populations while considering technical feasibility. They should report changes in emissions exposure, frequency, reliability, travel time, accessibility, fares, and jobs. Community participation is particularly important in depot projects, where electrical infrastructure, construction, traffic, and workforce conditions have localized effects.

Finally, transition programs need institutional learning. Agencies should publish standardized performance data, investigate failures without obscuring them through vendor confidentiality, and share specifications and lessons. National and regional technical-assistance centers can reduce repeated mistakes, especially for smaller cities. Independent evaluation should examine whether projected costs, emissions, reliability, and equity outcomes are realized after vehicles enter service.

9. Limitations and Research Agenda

This article relies on secondary evidence and cannot normalize operating data across the selected systems. Definitions of zero-emission, electric, delivered, in service, and available vary. Cost comparisons are affected by labor, energy tariffs, vehicle specifications, subsidies, financing, and accounting boundaries. Contract details and battery-health data are often confidential. The analysis therefore identifies mechanisms and planning requirements rather than claiming a controlled comparison of performance.

Future research should use standardized longitudinal data to compare total cost, energy, failures, missed trips, and battery degradation by route and climate. Studies should distinguish pilot effects from mature operations and examine whether performance changes as fleets scale. Research is also needed on second-life batteries, recycling, cybersecurity, depot fire safety, utility regulation, and the resilience value of managed charging and storage.

A particularly important research question concerns ridership and service. Evaluations should test whether funds dedicated to electrification displace or complement operating expenditure, whether quieter vehicles change rider experience, and whether combined bus-priority and electrification programs produce greater mode shift than either intervention alone. Distributional studies should measure exposure and accessibility outcomes by income, race or caste, gender, disability, occupation, and neighborhood.

10. Conclusion

Electric buses can reduce greenhouse-gas emissions, eliminate tailpipe pollution, lower noise, and modernize urban mobility. The cases from India, Europe, and the United States show, however, that the decisive transition is institutional as well as technological. Mumbai and Bengaluru demonstrate the speed that aggregation and contracted service can achieve, together with the need for strong public oversight, reliable payment, labor governance, and operational data. London demonstrates the value of recurring route contracts, regulatory direction, and network control. California provides a predictable purchase mandate and full-fleet planning requirement, while New York reveals the depot, grid, and sequencing challenges of converting a large legacy operation.

The common lesson is that a bus becomes climate infrastructure through the service it provides and the systems that sustain it. Vehicles, chargers, depots, utilities, streets, workers, contracts, and passengers form a single operating system. Programs that optimize only the vehicle purchase risk stranded chargers, unreliable service, fiscal stress, or benefits concentrated in the easiest locations. Programs that integrate electrification with bus priority, service expansion, resilient energy, workforce development, and equitable deployment can produce much larger and more durable returns.

Governments should consequently replace simple fleet counts with performance measures covering lifecycle emissions, passenger service, energy and charging reliability, fiscal sustainability, workforce outcomes, and distributional equity. This broader standard does not diminish the importance of rapid electrification. It makes rapid electrification more credible by linking ambition to the institutional capacity required for long-term public value.

REFERENCES:

1. California Air Resources Board. (2019). Innovative Clean Transit regulation fact sheet. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/fact-sheets/innovative-clean-transit-ict-regulation-fact-sheet>
2. C40 Cities. (2020). How to shift your bus fleet to zero emission by procuring only electric buses. C40 Knowledge Hub.
3. European Commission. (n.d.). Clean Vehicles Directive. https://transport.ec.europa.eu/transport-themes/clean-transport/clean-and-energy-efficient-vehicles/clean-vehicles-directive_en
4. European Commission. (2025). Decarbonising corporate fleets. Directorate-General for Mobility and Transport.
5. Federal Transit Administration. (2025a). Low or No Emission Grant Program. U.S. Department of Transportation. <https://www.transit.dot.gov/lowno>
6. Federal Transit Administration. (2025b). Zero-emission fleet transition plan. U.S. Department of Transportation. <https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grants/zero-emission-fleet-transition-plan>
7. Göhlich, D., Fay, T. A., Jefferies, D., Lauth, E., Kunith, A., & Zhang, X. (2018). Design of urban electric bus systems. *Design Science*, 4, Article e15. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dsj.2018.10>

8. International Council on Clean Transportation. (2021). Reading the tea leaves on electric buses in India. <https://theicct.org/reading-the-tea-leaves-on-electric-buses-in-india/>
9. International Energy Agency. (2024). Global EV outlook 2024: Moving towards increased affordability. <https://www.iea.org/reports/global-ev-outlook-2024>
10. Joint Office of Energy and Transportation. (2024). Behind-the-meter generation and storage offer cost and resilience benefits for New York MTA. <https://driveelectric.gov/news/mta-case-study>
11. Lajunen, A., & Lipman, T. (2016). Lifecycle cost assessment and carbon dioxide emissions of diesel, natural gas, hybrid electric, fuel cell hybrid and electric transit buses. *Energy*, 106, 329–342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2016.03.075>
12. Li, X., Castellanos, S., & Maassen, A. (2018). Emerging trends and innovations for electric bus adoption: A comparative case study of contracting and financing of 22 cities in the Americas, Asia-Pacific, and Europe. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 69, 470–481. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.retrec.2018.06.016>
13. Mahmoud, M., Garnett, R., Ferguson, M., & Kanaroglou, P. (2016). Electric buses: A review of alternative powertrains. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 62, 673–684. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.05.019>
14. Metropolitan Transportation Authority. (2022). Zero-emission bus transition plan. <https://www.mta.info/document/91336>
15. Metropolitan Transportation Authority. (n.d.). Transitioning to a zero-emissions bus fleet. <https://www.mta.info/project/zero-emission-bus-fleet>
16. Ministry of Heavy Industries. (2024). PM e-Bus Sewa Payment Security Mechanism scheme. Government of India. <https://heavyindustries.gov.in/en/pm-e-bus-sewa-payment-security-mechanism-psm-scheme>
17. Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs. (2023). PM-eBus Sewa. Government of India. <https://pm-ebus-sewa.mohua.gov.in/>
18. Pelletier, S., Jabali, O., Mendoza, J. E., & Laporte, G. (2019). The electric bus fleet transition problem. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 109, 174–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2019.10.012>
19. Press Information Bureau. (2026, March 10). E-bus service. Government of India. <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2237544>
20. Sclar, R., Gorguinpour, C., Castellanos, S., & Li, X. (2019). Barriers to adopting electric buses. World Resources Institute. <https://www.wri.org/research/barriers-adopting-electric-buses>
21. Transport for London. (2026, June 15). London's green transformation accelerates with 3,000th zero-emission bus. <https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/media/press-releases/2026/june/london-s-green-transformation-accelerates-with-3-000th-zero-emission-bus>
22. Vijaykumar, A., & Konda, C. (2023). A summary of expert perspectives on viable financing pathways for electrifying India's public transport. World Resources Institute India.
23. World Bank. (2022a). Electric mobility and development: An engagement paper from the World Bank and the International Association of Public Transport. World Bank.
24. World Bank. (2022b). Improving bankability of e-bus procurement in India. <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099551506152217472>

25. World Resources Institute. (2024). India rolls out 10,000 electric buses in dozens of cities.
<https://www.wri.org/outcomes/india-rolls-out-10000-electric-buses-dozens-cities>