1898 & CO.
PART OF BURNS McDONNELL

WHITE PAPER

Implications of Higher Fuel Costs for Consumer and Fleet Electrification

By Bradley Nelson

Individual car buyers and commercial fleet managers respond to volatile energy prices on vastly different timelines. While consumers often react to short-term costs, operators must weigh the total cost of ownership, procurement schedules and sustainability goals. This contrast shapes the differing paths toward electrification.

Increasing fuel price volatility, driven by supply constraints stemming from current international conflicts, is incentivizing many to evaluate the potential impacts of those higher fuel prices on consumer and fleet vehicle purchasing decisions. Attention also is turning to the wider market dynamics shaping those decisions.

Individual consumers and commercial fleets respond to high fuel prices on starkly different timelines and are motivated by different factors. Although consumers may alter driving behavior and purchasing decisions within a few months of sustained high prices, the transition to electric vehicles (EVs) depends heavily on the availability of competitively priced vehicles with suitable capabilities and convenient access to low-cost charging.

For fleets, a strategic shift toward electrification is challenged by multiyear procurement schedules, total cost of ownership (TCO) assessments, the availability of EVs that meet operational requirements, and increasingly stringent corporate sustainability mandates. Fleet electrification is currently concentrated in specific use cases, as significant operational barriers prevent widespread adoption for many over-the-road operations (see Figure 1).

SECTOR	PRIMARY DRIVER	RESPONSE TIME
Consumer	Personal financial pain at the pump	Three to six months
Consumers change their driving habits first. Vehicle replacement is a lagging decision, often only made when consumers are convinced that high prices will endure. The financial viability of EVs depends heavily on the availability of competitively priced vehicles with suitable capabilities and convenient access to affordable charging.		
Fleet	TCO and competitive advantage	Multiyear
Fleets have been slow to adopt new vehicle technologies due to organizational reticence and multiyear procurement schedules. They have also been relatively insulated from short-term fuel spikes by long-term procurement schedules and the ability to pass on fuel costs. The economic and strategic case for electrification is becoming more compelling in some use cases and vehicle classes, driven by the availability of more capable and affordable EVs, investments in public medium- and heavy-duty (MHD) charging infrastructure, and pressure from corporate sustainability goals. However, the strategic shift to electrification is currently constrained by use cases and duty cycles, with long-haul trucking still facing significant operational barriers.		

***Figure 1:** Key findings.*

Consumer Response to Higher Fuel Costs

For many consumers, it takes three to six months of persistently high fuel prices before they seriously consider switching to more fuel-efficient vehicles or EVs. While a sudden price spike often triggers an immediate surge in online research activity, actual purchasing decisions usually lag until drivers are convinced the higher costs are a long-term reality. Key factors:

- **Consumer window.** Persistent high gas prices create a tipping point (often around $4/gallon) above which households feel the recurring financial pain of fueling up, leading them to research and eventually switch to more efficient vehicles.
- **Alternative adjustments.** Instead of immediate vehicle replacement, many drivers first attempt to stretch their fuel by changing driving habits (e.g., sticking to 65 miles per hour) or reducing discretionary trips.
- **Immediate vs. long-term.** Those already planning to replace a vehicle, such as those at the end of a lease, are the most responsive to price changes. Others often wait to see if prices stabilize before taking on new auto debt.
- **Vehicle cost and capabilities.** For consumers, the primary impediments to considering an EV are the higher upfront cost and convenience concerns about range and charging speed. The loss of federal purchase incentives has exacerbated these cost challenges. However, most manufacturers are now offering or developing longer-range, faster-charging vehicle models; implementing price reductions; and pursuing manufacturing and supply strategies to lower production costs. Additionally, the used-vehicle market in the U.S. is facing a growing glut of low-cost EVs coming off lease, offering consumers a range of viable options.
- **Access to low-cost charging.** The main financial benefit of owning an EV often relies on convenient access to low-cost charging, which typically comes from using overnight Level 2 charging. However, for many consumers, particularly renters and those in multiunit dwellings, the inability to install a home charger presents a significant operational barrier and cost impediment. This forces a reliance on public direct current fast charging (DCFC), which can rival gasoline costs, substantially weakening the economic case for switching from an internal combustion engine vehicle.

Fleet Responses to Higher Fuel Costs

The time frame for fleet vehicle purchasing decisions is generally longer and more complex than for individual consumers. Fleet managers typically cannot pivot as quickly because of high capital costs and operational constraints. Key factors:

- **Fleet window.** Professional fleet managers typically plan equipment cycles three years or more in advance. A short-term fuel spike rarely triggers an immediate switch because fleets are locked into long-term depreciation, financing and procurement schedules.
- **Economic tipping points.** Unlike a consumer who might trade in one car, a fleet must calculate the TCO. While a Class 8 electric truck might save $30,000 annually in fuel, the payback period for the higher upfront cost is typically four to six years.
- **Fuel surcharges.** Many commercial carriers use fuel surcharges to pass along their costs, which can ultimately raise prices for consumers. Fuel surcharges are used by carriers to offset increases in fuel costs without changing their regular rates. This buffer can make commercial buyers less sensitive to immediate price fluctuations than individual households. However, deadhead miles — when no revenue-generating cargo is carried — can't be directly passed along, increasing shipping companies' operational costs.

- **Regulatory triggers.** Historically, fleet purchasing decisions are more often driven by upcoming emissions regulations, such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 2027 standards and Section 177 of the Clean Air Act vehicle sales regulations (e.g., advanced clean trucks and advanced clean cars II), than by temporary fuel price spikes.
- **Infrastructure timeline.** Fleets cannot simply switch to EVs in six months; such a switch often requires significant charging infrastructure and grid upgrades, which typically take years to permit and install.

Drivers and Barriers for Electrification

The combination of persistent fuel price volatility and the arrival of more capable and lower-cost commercial EVs is beginning to shift fleet purchasing for certain use cases and vehicle classes from a wait-and-see phase of experimentation into a strategic competitive necessity. While consumers react to pump prices in months, some fleets are now making multiyear pivots in response to a fundamental shift in TCO. Some of the key tipping-point factors for heavy-duty fleets:

- **Fuel price stability as a primary driver.** Even before recent price increases, several market assessments have indicated that long-term volatility of liquid fuels remains the top concern for most global vehicle fleet operators.
- **Energy cost disparity.** Operating an electric semi in the U.S. costs approximately $0.15–$0.25 per mile in energy, compared to $0.50–$0.70 per mile for diesel.
- **Technology improvement effect on TCO.** Data from pilots suggests that electric Class 8 trucks can save roughly $30,000 annually on fuel, even before the 2026 fuel price spike. When combined with 20%–40% lower maintenance costs, some fleets see a break-even point coming as early as three to five years, even without the availability of incentives and despite the higher upfront sticker price and fuel price hikes.

Despite EV improvements and high fuel prices, the transition will not be instant because of several additional factors:

- **Infrastructure lead times.** Upgrading a depot for high-power charging can take 12 to 24 months for permitting and grid upgrades. However, the energization timelines can be reduced with the availability of flexible service connections and the installation of temporary on-site generation or storage.
- **Technology concerns and financial risk tolerance.** Smaller fleets remain hesitant because of concerns about battery longevity and resale value, whereas large fleets are moving faster. However, electrification-as-a-service models can now offer many smaller fleets low-risk electrification solutions with fixed-cost structures and no vehicle or infrastructure ownership.
- **Upfront capital.** A Class 8 truck can cost between $300,000 and $450,000, more than double that of a traditional diesel unit. That figure doesn't include the additional costs of charging and make-ready infrastructure, which are often necessary at depot locations because of the current dearth of public charging infrastructure for MHD vehicles. This dynamic often makes incentives critical to the TCO math, particularly to support the build-out of the facility's initial infrastructure upgrades.
- **Operational barriers.** Despite the introduction of more capable and affordable electric trucks, the viability of fleet electrification remains highly dependent on the specific use case and duty cycle. While return-to-base depot operations are strong candidates for electrification, factors such as limited range, payload compromises, limited available charging downtime and a lack of public fast-charging infrastructure for MHD vehicles make it an unworkable solution for many over-the-road fleets at present. Consequently, for long-haul trucking where operational flexibility and minimal downtime are critical, diesel remains the most practical option, regardless of fuel prices.

Corporate Drivers of Fleet Electrification

Beyond initial fuel savings and government incentives, fleet electrification is increasingly driven by two strategic imperatives: corporate net zero mandates and the rise of green financing. Major shippers like Walmart and Amazon prioritize carriers with lower carbon footprints to meet their sustainability reporting requirements. Simultaneously, logistics leaders such as FedEx, UPS, J.B. Hunt and DHL are aggressively decarbonizing their proprietary fleets to secure more favorable cost-of-capital rates and maintain a competitive edge in a decarbonizing market.

Net Zero Emission Targets

In the transportation logistics industry, the shift toward electrification is being driven by fleet ownership structures and shippers' emission targets. When a company owns its fleet, it maintains direct control over vehicle procurement, operational costs and strategies to achieve net zero goals.

Conversely, when a company utilizes external carriers, it has less direct influence over the trucking company's emissions profile. However, by selecting carriers based on sustainability criteria, shippers can exert market pressure, prompting logistics providers to reduce both their operational expenses and carbon footprints to remain competitive.

Several of the world's largest retailers and shippers have made formal net zero commitments that are increasingly shaping expectations for the logistics companies they hire. Amazon has committed to eliminating carbon emissions across its entire business by 2040, including emissions generated by the

transportation and delivery partners that move its goods. As a result, Amazon's progress toward its climate goal depends directly on whether its contracted carriers reduce fuel use and adopt lower-emission vehicles. Walmart has also set a 2040 net zero goal that applies to emissions from its own stores, facilities and owned assets, including its private transportation fleet. Emissions associated with third-party freight and other supplier-driven transportation across its supply chain are addressed separately through Walmart's Project Gigaton initiative, which encourages suppliers and logistics partners to voluntarily reduce emissions.

For both companies, the limited availability of affordable, scalable low-carbon technologies for heavy-duty freight remains a significant challenge. Even so, these climate commitments are already influencing how major shippers evaluate and select logistics carriers, with growing emphasis on fuel efficiency and emissions-reduction efforts.

Shippers are increasingly embedding sustainability performance into their procurement and vendor selection processes. Major corporations no longer evaluate carriers solely on cost and quality, as strong environmental, social and governance (ESG) performance has become a formal factor in many procurement programs. Sustainability ratings are now used by procurement teams at more than 1,200 multinational companies to guide purchasing decisions. Companies have reported that their sustainability score has often been the deciding factor in securing or expanding business relationships. When two carriers offer comparable rates, the one with the stronger sustainability profile is typically better positioned to win the contract.

Green Financing and Cost of Capital

Publicly traded logistics companies increasingly view fleet electrification as a financial strategy, not just an environmental one, driven by access to lower-cost capital and favorable financing instruments. Although large U.S. institutional investors such as BlackRock and Vanguard have moderated their ESG shareholder activism in recent years amid political headwinds, the broader institutional investment community continues to reward companies that demonstrate credible emissions reduction strategies with improved access to sustainability-linked capital markets.

Strong ESG scores can improve a company's access to sustainability-linked financing and enhance its appeal to a broader pool of institutional investors. Companies with higher ESG scores are increasingly able to access capital markets on more competitive terms, including lower-cost, sustainability-linked loans explicitly tied to meeting emissions-reduction benchmarks.

Companies also can issue green bonds — specialized debt instruments with proceeds designated for environmental projects — to fund EV purchases and charging infrastructure. FedEx, for example, has committed over $2 billion to vehicle electrification and sustainable energy as part of its goal to be carbon-neutral by 2040. This makes electrification a financial strategy to manage debt costs and broaden the investor base, independent of fuel prices.

Conclusion

The decision-making calculus for vehicle purchasing is diverging sharply between individual consumers and commercial fleets. For consumers, the switch to an EV remains a tactical response to financial pain at the pump, but it is a decision fundamentally constrained by the availability of cost-competitive models with suitable capabilities and charging access. Without convenient and affordable charging — typically overnight Level 2 charging — the primary economic incentive to move away from gasoline and diesel is severely diminished, making the switch a nonstarter for many.

In stark contrast, the commercial fleet sector is undergoing a more gradual yet strategic and highly segmented transformation, driven by a combination of long-term TCO assessments, procurement timelines, operational requirements and corporate sustainability goals. While historically insulated from price volatility, fleet operators are now being driven by a confluence of powerful market forces that transcend the daily cost of diesel or gasoline.

The practical application of electrification is still not universal for fleets. The transition is currently most viable in return-to-base operations — where charging can be controlled — while significant operational hurdles for much of the over-the-road and long-haul sector mean that diesel power remains the only feasible option.

While most consumers will continue to respond to fuel price signals in a cyclical pattern, the fleet industry's path is driven by long-term financial assessments and procurement schedules and bifurcated by duty cycle. The path forward for fleet electrification is a more complex shift, driven not only by fuel costs but also by the long-term, interconnected and competing demands of economic viability, operational requirements, infrastructure availability, customer retention and corporate strategy.

About 1898 & Co.

1898 & Co. is a global business, technology, and security consultancy serving critical infrastructure industries. We partner with clients to plan, secure and optimize their business. As part of Burns & McDonnell and our 120 years of industry experience, we understand the complexity of your asset-intensive business model, the trends impacting your industry, and the need to ground big ideas in operational realities. Learn more at **1898andCo.com**.

11702343739-0426