MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE EQUIPMENT LEASING AUTHORITY
HELD ON JUNE 11TH, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

The board meeting of June 11th, 2026, was called to order at 2:06 p.m. The agenda and public notice were posted on the ELA website and displayed in the City County Building in Room 502 on June 3rd, 2026.

ROLL CALL

Present – Sharon Werner, Barbara Warwick, Chris Hornstein
Absent – Anthony Coghill, Sheldon Williams

In Attendance - Firmin Maurice, Jamie Jones, Rea Price, Eric Shultz, Brendan Coticchia, Dave Hutchinson, Amanda Burkhart, Branwyn Turnage, Chief Kokilla, Zongjie Hu

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion was made and approved to accept the Special ELA Board Meeting held on April 9th, 2026.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ralph Sicuro, President, Fire Fighter IAFF Local No.1, 120 Flowers Ave, Pittsburgh PA, 15207

I would like to inform the board that Truck 4 went out of service today. Presently, there are no spare Ladder trucks in the City at this time. If you needed an Aerial Truck for an emergency within the building we are currently in, we could not provide this service. I want to highlight the importance of sticking to a continuous replenishing purchasing plan in order to keep reserve vehicles available if a truck does need to be taken out of service. Thank you.

Scott Brickner, Bike Pittsburgh, 188 43rd Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15201

My name is Scott Brickner, and I'm the Executive Director of Bike Pittsburgh, a 4,300-member strong bicycle and pedestrian advocacy organization. Our office is located on 43rd St in Lawrenceville. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

As the City begins to replace its aging fleet, you have a real opportunity to make Pittsburgh streets safer for everyone – not just the people inside those vehicles, but the pedestrians, cyclists, and wheelchair users sharing the road with them every day.

We're asking that the City specify safety-focused features when procuring new vehicles: panoramic windshields, blind-spot detection, intelligent speed assistance for non-emergency vehicles, backup cameras, audible reverse alerts, and truck side guards. Municipal vehicles operating in dense urban neighborhoods have the potential to be a safety hazard when they're not spec'd with vulnerable road users in mind

We'd also ask that you purchase more vehicles capable of maintaining bike lanes, trails, and sidewalks – namely sweeping them year-round and plowing them in the winter. Right now, many of those facilities go unmaintained in a way that make unusable and dangerous. The City purchased it sfirst bike lane and sidewalk maintenance vehicle last year, but nearly every DPW division needs one of their own in order to maintain this infrastructure properly.

If possible, we'd encourage the City to reach out to the U.S. DOT Volpe Center, which has expertise in exactly this kind of safe fleet specification and can help Pittsburgh develop procurement standards grounded in evidence.

Replacing fleet vehicles is a significant purchase decision. Getting the specs right costs relatively little compared to the lifetime of these vehicles and directly supports the City's own Vision Zero commitments of eliminating traffic fatalities and serious injuries.

PRESENTATION: 2026 CAPITAL PROPOSAL & FLEET STRATEGY

Replacement Vehicles: Departmental Request
Additional Vehicles: Departmental Request
2026 Replacement Scoring

Discussion:
Mr. Maurice opened the presentation by explaining that the purpose of the meeting was to review the vehicle requests submitted by the department and its bureaus for the 2027 Capital Budget. The first page presented included a list of all departmental requests, along with supporting data demonstrating why each vehicle qualifies for replacement. In total, 143 vehicles were requested, representing a combined funding request of 57 million dollars.

Mr. Maurice continued by presenting the Department of Public Works' request, noting that it consisted of a well-organized list of vehicles that scored high on the replacement index due to costly repairs and significant downtime. He then reviewed Public Safety's request, which included replacing an investigative unit and upgrading the larger Bear vehicle to a smaller BearCat model.

Chief Werner asked whether these items were included within the operating budget or submitted as a separate capital request. Mr. Maurice clarified that a new BearCat unit had been requested the previous year but was removed by the former Director of Public Safety due to the possibility of securing outside funding. Those funding sources, however, did not materialize, and the department is now proceeding with a capital request for the unit.

Mr. Maurice then presented EMS's multiyear replacement plan for their units. In response, Chief Werner asked whether this plan accounted for the $5 million donation from UPMC. She requested a total of the current EMS requests, which amounted to $2.45 million, and noted that she anticipated the department would receive more than the current request amount as a result of the donation.

The Bureau of Emergency Medical Services currently operates a vehicle, Unit 23, that has been problematic since it was reassigned to their fleet. The unit was previously a police vehicle and is no longer suitable for EMS needs; therefore, it should be retired.

EMS is also requesting to replace its aging ToolCat vehicle with an ATV. In addition, their largest request concerns the replacement of their current Command Vehicle. They are seeking a digitally upgraded model, as the technology in the existing unit is significantly outdated. The digital enhancements would be included as part of the new vehicle's upfitting process.

The Bureau of Fire has requested the replacement of several front-line units that are currently beyond their lifecycle. Their request includes three aerial units, eleven pumpers for consideration, and one academy training van. In addition, they are seeking to replace their command SUVs and support units, while also addressing ongoing concerns related to their foam tenders.

Chief Werner inquired about which apparatuses are currently out to bid. Chief Kokilla informed her that the active bid projects include a ladder truck, an aerial unit, a command vehicle, and a hazmat truck. He also noted that the specifications for the foam tender rebuild are not yet fully complete.

Mr. Maurice explained that three Motor Pool vehicles will need to be decommissioned due to severe rust. The Bureau of Environmental Services is requesting a chassis replacement for the currently operating Dennis Eagle trucks. This proposal involves removing the existing EZ Pack rear-loader CNG bodies and installing them onto new diesel chassis.

This request is driven by the fact that the current vehicles do not meet the operational needs of the department. The City has been incurring significant costs related to the frequent downtime of these units. Retrofitting the trucks is expected to reduce wear and tear, particularly the strain caused by repeated trips to the landfill.

Mr. Maurice explained that the vehicles discussed thus far address replacement needs. He then outlined the requests for new additions to the fleet. These include motorcycles for the Bureau of Emergency Medical Services, one SUV for the Office of Community Health and Safety, and fifteen vehicles to support open and incoming positions within DPLI. The Streets Division is requesting a new supervisor SUV and a stake-body truck, and DOMI is requesting a new inspector unit.

Mr. Maurice asked the Board whether any vehicles were missing from the current list and what additional information should be included to support objective decision-making for the Fleet. Chief Werner noted that it is challenging to fully assess Fire's needs because we do not yet know what will be ordered for them for 2026. He stated that if the Fire Department wishes to increase its current request, we should be open to that. However, until the department's proposals are submitted and the financing RFP closes, it remains difficult to determine what should be requested for Fire.

Mr. Hornstein added that although many factors for Fire are still unknown, the process demonstrates that the request procedures have been communicated to the appropriate stakeholders. Departments have had the opportunity to provide input, which has not always occurred in the past. He thanked the Fleet Team for taking the initiative to ensure this communication. While the total request is substantial, it is important to consider all needs presented.

Mr. Hornstein raised a question regarding ES Unit 263, which has accumulated more than 400,000 hours of downtime despite being purchased in 2022. He stated that, in practical terms, the unit is a "lemon" and asked where it falls within the replacement scoring system. Mr. Maurice explained that the unit is currently ranked 51, with a downtime score of 16. He noted that several other units score higher in overall priority, and within the model, vehicles are only compared against others in their same category—for example, garbage trucks to garbage trucks. If the fleet average within that category is already high, an individual unit may not rank as highly, even with significant issues. Although this is a relatively new vehicle, its score reflects how it compares to the rest of its category within the fleet

Councilwoman Warwick asked whether the scoring model could incorporate an adjustment for outliers such as ES Unit 263. Mr. Hornstein added that, in the interest of fiscal responsibility, the City should consider removing this truck entirely from the Fleet and excluding it from the scoring model. While he acknowledged there are operational challenges associated with doing so, he emphasized the need to determine the most appropriate path for its removal.

Councilwoman Warwick then inquired whether the vehicle was still under warranty or if any recourse with the manufacturer was available. Mr. Maurice explained that the warranty expired midway through 2025. He noted that the manufacturer had attempted to provide some level of support but has since stopped producing vehicles in the United States and is now based in the United Kingdom. As a result, replacement parts for this unit are difficult to obtain, which is the primary reason for the significant downtime hours and high associated costs.

Chief Werner asked for the next steps in the Capital process moving forward. Mr. Maurice stated that last year, he submitted the entire request in full. The material presented should be submitted in the same with the units prioritized in the total report. Councilwoman Warwick inquired if the model presented includes vehicle reserves also? Mr. Maurice confirmed that, yes, reserves are incorporated into this process. He elaborated that the idea today isn't to finalize but rather to validate the data and request before developing a framework for the final recommendation.

Director Price inquired into how the data was developed and if this scoring method was formula-based. Mr. Maurice indicated that a weighted formula is used for this scoring system. Engine vs Mileage was considered, and the Fire representatives indicated that they submit this mileage data on a regular basis and could provide this information in order to score their vehicle appropriately. Mr. Maurice also indicated that the high lead times on builds were also assigned to their vehicle assed additional points to their scores. Chief Werner suggested that they would like points for both variables.

Mr. Hornstein also commented that we can provide a recommendation for the capital requests; it should be determined if additional funding sources will be available to supplement this request and would not be fully dependent on capital funds. Mr. Hutchinson confirmed that bond funding should not be considered. However, funding sources such as Trust Funds, or Grants can be considered when requesting these vehicles.

Councilwoman Warwick inquired if the matrix could be sent to the departments to ensure their prioritization is correct for the vehicles requested. Mr. Maurice explained that the Bureaus have individually scored the vehicle prioritization as well as the department directors. However, the Directors did not prioritize across his entire department, only by individual bureau or division. This will need to be reviewed by the Director for a holistic approach to all his overseen Bureaus and or Divisions.

Mr. Hornstein asked whether there was a realistic total Capital Fund request amount that could be used as a starting point to help narrow the vehicle request list to a more manageable size. Acting Director Price explained that it is difficult to provide a precise figure for either the General Fund or the Capital Fund at this time. With the recent reopening of the operating budget, establishing a definitive number is challenging. However, the operating team can identify and propose a variety of alternative funding sources for consideration.

Discussion followed regarding the need for a baseline figure to guide the request. Mr. Hornstein noted that submitting 150 vehicle requests totaling $57 million is not realistic and suggested using a more attainable starting point, such as $20 million, to help narrow the list. This reduced target would automatically eliminate a significant portion of the current requests.

Mr. Hutchinson clarified that the requested scoring method was intended as a tool for the scoring committee and should not be interpreted as representing the Fleet Department's overall request. Chief Werner supported using a $20 million anchor and recommended beginning prioritization with EMS, given the availability of outside donated funds. Further prioritization by the Directors will be required, and an additional Special ELA Board meeting will need to be scheduled to fully address these issues before the submission deadline.

The date of June 25th at 2PM was requested as a follow-up board meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made. Official adjournment at 3:12 PM.