

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE EQUIPMENT LEASING AUTHORITY
HELD ON July 10, 2025**

CALL TO ORDER

The board meeting of July 10th, 2025 was called to order at 2:05 p.m. The agenda and public notice were posted on the ELA website and displayed in the City County Building in Room 502 on July 9th, 2025

ROLL CALL

Present – Lisa Frank, Lee Schmidt, Peter McDevitt, Chris Hornstein

Absent – Councilman Anthony Coghill

In attendance: Firmin Maurice, Jamie Jones, Danny Cerrone, Patrick Cornell, Eric Shultz, Brendan Coticchia, Dave Hutchinson, Chief Kokila, Jeff Skalican, Chief Farley

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mr. McDevitt made a motion amend the date of the next meeting date within the notes from October 10th, 2025, to July 10th, 2025. The motion to approve and accept the Special Capital Budget Strategy Meeting held on June 12, 2025, was approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No Public comment

PURCHASE APPROVALS AND AUTHORIZATIONS

Authorized Interim Approval IA-25-17, requesting to amend the 2025 Vehicle Acquisition Plan by adding three (3) 2025 AWD Ford Escape SUV's for the Department of Public Safety, Office of Community Health & Safety.

The board authorized Interim Approval IA-25-17, requesting to amend the 2025 Vehicle Acquisition Plan by adding three (3) 2025 AWD Ford Escape SUV's for the Department of Public Safety, Office of Community Health & Safety. The total cost for these vehicles is \$82,887.00 and will be fully reimbursed from the Stop the Violence Trust Fund.

Authorized Interim Approval IA-25-18, requesting to authorize the ELA to enter into a contract with A&H Equipment Company for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services.

The board authorized Interim Approval IA-25-18, requesting to authorize the ELA to enter into a contract with A&H Equipment Company for the purchase of one (1) 25-yard recycling Packer Body for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services.

Authorized Interim Approval IA-25-19, requesting to authorize the ELA to enter into a contract with A&H Equipment Company for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services.

The board authorized Interim Approval IA-25-19, requesting to authorize the ELA to enter into a contract with A&H Equipment Company for the purchase of one (1) 25-yard refuse Packer Body for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services.

Authorized Interim Approval IA-25-20, requesting to authorize the ELA to enter into a contract with A&H Equipment Company for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services.

The board authorized Interim Approval IA-25-20, requesting to authorize the ELA to enter into a contract with A&H Equipment Company for the purchase of two (2) Isuzu Chassis with New Way Body Rat Packers for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services.

Authorized Interim Approval IA-25-21, requesting to amend the 2024 Vehicle Acquisition Plan by transferring \$17,312.00 to the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services, Rat Packers line item.

The board authorized Interim Approval IA-25-21, requesting to amend the 2024 Vehicle Acquisition Plan by transferring \$17,312.00 from Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services, Refuse Packer to the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services, Rat Packers to cover a price increase.

Authorized Interim Approval IA-25-22, requesting to amend the 2024 Vehicle Acquisition Plan by adding one (1) Special Events Ambulance Remount for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Emergency Medical Services.

The board authorized Interim Approval IA-25-22, requesting to amend the 2024 Vehicle Acquisition Plan by adding one (1) Special Events Ambulance Remount for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Emergency Medical Services. The total cost for this remount is \$177,360.00 and will be fully reimbursed from the Emergency Medical Services Reimbursable Trust Fund.

Authorized Interim Approval IA-25-23, requesting to amend the 2024 Vehicle Acquisition Plan by adding one (1) additional Refuse Packer for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Environmental Services Bureau.

The board authorized Interim Approval IA-23-23, requesting to amend the 2024 Vehicle Acquisition Plan by adding one (1) additional Refuse Packer and reducing the total Recycling Packers by one (1) for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Environmental Services Bureau. The total budget of \$400,00.00 for the purchase of one (1) Recycling Packers will be transferred to the Refuse Packer line item for a total budget of \$782,688.00. The total purchase of two (2) refuse chassis with packer bodies will not exceed the current budget.

Authorized Interim Approval IA-25-24, requesting to authorize the ELA to enter into a contract with A&H Equipment Company for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services.

The board authorized Interim Approval IA-23-24, requesting to authorize the ELA to enter into a contract with A&H Equipment Company for the purchase of two (2) 25-yard refuse Packer Bodies for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Environmental Services.

Authorized Interim Approval IA-25-25, requesting to amend the 2025 Vehicle Acquisition Plan by adding one (1) additional Refuse Packer for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Environmental Services Bureau.

The board authorized Interim Approval IA-25-25, requesting to amend the 2025 Vehicle Acquisition Plan by adding one (1) additional Refuse Packer and reducing the total Recycling Packers by one (1) for the City of Pittsburgh, Department of Public Works, Environmental Services Bureau. The total budget of \$420,00.00 for the purchase of one (1) Recycling Packers will be transferred to the Refuse Packer line item for a total budget of \$840,000.00. The total purchase of two (2) refuse chassis with packer bodies will not exceed the current budget.

Discussion:

A motion was made to approve and accept the following Interim Approvals.

PURCHASING STATUS REPORT

Mr. Maurice asked the board if there were any questions regarding the materials presented.

Mr. McDevitt requested clarification regarding the two separate Bureau of Fire lease payments. Mr. Maurice was unable to provide details about the distinction between the two payments or their respective due dates. Mr. Shultz provided further insight, explaining that the spring payment covers the lease of Fire Pumper Vehicles, while the fall payment is designated for Aerial units.

Mr. McDevitt inquired about the line item listed as “Idle Function” under EMS. Mr. Maurice explained that the funding had been added to the plan by Mr. Patrick Cornell, but he was unsure of the item’s purpose or intended use. He requested that Mr. Cornell provide further insight into the scope of the project.

However, Mr. Cornell was unable to offer additional details and acknowledged uncertainty about whether the authorized budget was appropriate for such a feature. He noted that the funding had simply been included in the budget and suggested that a supplemental Capital Request for 2026 might be necessary to properly support the item.

Director Schmidt then clarified that, during emergency situations, ambulance keys are routinely left in the ignition with the vehicle running. To prevent unauthorized access, a security feature is needed to ensure that pedestrians cannot commandeer the vehicle while first responders are engaged in their duties.

Chief Frank noted ongoing discussions concerning the 2024 budget line item related to DPW, Streets, Street Sweeper. Director Hornstein explained that DPW had independently leased street sweepers using departmental funds. As vehicle maintenance is fully covered by the vendor, these assets will not be processed through the ELA garage’s procurement workflow. Ms. Jones added that while maintenance falls outside ELA’s scope, the registration of the sweepers may need to be routed through

ELA. However, she suggested that this matter be addressed separately in a future discussion between her and DPW.

ELA NCA REPAIR COST REPORT

There have been zero dollars (\$0) in ELA NCA repost costs year-to-date to report.

No discussion.

ONLINE AUCTION REPORT

GovDeals proceeds: \$10,554.00

Ms. Jones stated that a lot of the recent items sold are a result of equipment provided by the Police.

BANK STATEMENT RECONCILIATION

Treasurer, Peter McDevitt, reviewed the bank statement reconciliation reports for the months April and May 2025. No further discussion was made. A motion to accept the Bank Reconciliation Statements was made and approved.

Ms. Turnage reported that the first-quarter financial materials from McGee Maruca & Associates were not received prior to the current board meeting. The auditor cited an unusually demanding tax season and extended an apology for the delay. It was noted that both the first- and second-quarter financial reports are expected to be available for review at the fourth-quarter board meeting.

MUNICIPALITIES FILING REPORT

A motion was made to approve and accept the municipality's filing report.

GRANT DISCUSSION

Mr. Maurice informed the board that seven of the eight garbage trucks associated with the grant requirements have been successfully demolished. The materials needed to fulfill the grant obligations are expected to be available shortly. He also noted that the two outstanding grant agreements have been extended, with the new expiration date set for December 2026.

Additionally, Mr. Maurice reported that the electric vehicles (EVs) designated for Environmental Services have yet to be delivered. Despite a formal demand letter being issued, the vendor has not responded to date.

Chief Frank asked ELA Solicitor, Mr. Cerrone, to advise the board on appropriate next steps in resolving the ongoing issue with the vendor. Mr. Cerrone recommended two options: terminating the contract or filing a formal complaint to compel action. Mr. Maurice noted that the City currently has multiple active projects with the vendor and is likely to engage with them on future initiatives.

Mr. Cerrone expressed frustration over the vendor's continued lack of response, stating that the failure to acknowledge the most recent letter was a direct insult to the Board, despite multiple phone conversations. Director Schmidt questioned whether future projects with the vendor could be sustained if the Board proceeds with more assertive measures. In response, Mr. Cerrone clarified that the vendor would remain obligated to fulfill all existing contractual commitments.

He suggested that a letter issued directly from his law firm would carry greater weight than the previous correspondence sent by the ELA Chair. Mr. Maurice proposed reminding the vendor of the grant deadline of December 2026. However, Mr. Cerrone countered that it would be more effective to reference the originally scheduled delivery date of the vehicles and to demand a response and action by a specified deadline.

He emphasized that, even if the ELA opts not to pursue aggressive legal action at this time, the City must clearly signal its intent to act if satisfactory results are not achieved. Chief Frank agreed and formally requested that Mr. Cerrone proceed with drafting and sending a formal complaint letter to the vendor.

SHZOOM TECHNOLOGIES

Mr. Maurice informed the board that the current three-year contract with SHzoom Technologies is nearing its end. He noted that operations are evolving and recommended prioritizing the acquisition of a comprehensive tracking system that can support and integrate with existing platforms. He also suggested exploring alternative vendors and solutions.

Director Schmidt asked whether the remaining time before the contract's expiration in February 2026 would be sufficient to implement a new system or platform. Mr. Maurice responded that a thorough review of available options should be the first step.

Mr. McDevitt raised the question of whether the collision management system is considered a City function. Mr. Maurice acknowledged the value of the system's add-on feature but pointed out that other available systems could offer a more robust and unified platform. While the feature benefits the City, it has operational implications for ELA, given that ELA holds the contract. Mr. McDevitt proposed that this feature would be better suited for a City-held contract rather than remaining under ELA's purview.

Chief Frank noted that if the current system will not be renewed, ELA should immediately begin the process of identifying potential contractors and issuing a bid to prepare for the contract's expiration in February 2026. Director Schmidt raised the question of what the projected budget might be for implementing a new system, emphasizing the need to first define the scope of the project to determine requirements accurately.

In response, Mr. Maurice asked when this information would be needed. Director Schmidt replied pointedly, "Yesterday," stressing the urgency. Mr. Cornell then recommended that the project be routed through the I&P voting committees. Chief Frank concurred, stating that I&P is a logical starting point for discussions around system integration.

Andrew Hayhurst, who leads the Tech Council, was identified as a key resource for guidance on incorporating new software into the City’s infrastructure. Mr. Hayhurst should be made aware that this initiative involves new technology slated for consideration in early 2026.

Director Schmidt inquired about the current annual fee with SHzoom Technologies and suggested that securing a short-term contract could serve as a transitional buffer while a new system is implemented. Mr. Maurice responded that the estimated annual cost is approximately \$48,000 and confirmed he would conduct a comprehensive analysis and explore alternative systems. Chief Frank emphasized the importance of including Andrew Hayhurst from I&P in all related discussions.

Both Director Schmidt and Ms. Jones expressed strong support for transitioning to a new system that would eliminate the use of the physical Accident 450 Form. The move toward a fully digital solution was unanimously endorsed by the board and fleet team, marking a shared commitment to modernizing operations.

2026 VEHICLE CAPITAL REQUESTS

Capital Submission Summary List
Vehicles Submitted for Replacement List
Departmental Ask List

Mr. McDevitt opened the discussion by expressing his full support for the total amount requested. However, he noted that the submitted request exceeds the projected PAYGO funding, which is designated for the entire City budget. Given this constraint, he emphasized that it would be unrealistic to expect full funding for the entire list. While he agreed that the list should be submitted for consideration, he cautioned against assuming that all items would be approved.

Director Hornstein noted that the current weighted scoring system has shifted from its previous format, which was primarily driven by vehicle age. The revised scoring now aligns with replacement priorities identified within the Capital Budget cycle. Even with full funding, the City would not be able to replace all vehicles on an eighteen-month lifecycle. I appreciate the detailed breakdown; however, I’d like to emphasize that there are five to six vehicles—spanning multiple sectors—that are critically needed and should be prioritized for immediate replacement.

Director Schmidt inquired whether the final page, titled “Departmental Asks,” had been shared with the directors. Historically, this list was circulated among them to ensure that formal Fleet Submissions to Capital remained grounded in operational realities. He noted that several vehicles included on the list are highly unlikely to be replaced—certainly not within the next decade—based on current operational priorities.

Mr. Maurice commented that if Fleet identified a vehicle for replacement, the respective departments should also be aligned with that assessment. Director Schmidt responded, expressing concern that this approach led to inefficiencies and duplicated efforts, as the Directors had not been asked to review the list in advance. He emphasized that their involvement should have been part of the priority-setting process from the start. Director Hornstein echoed this sentiment, stating that he was also excluded from the vehicle prioritization discussions. He noted that the list provided was not as comprehensive as it could have been—representing only the bare minimum—and stressed the importance of striking a balance between operational needs and replacement planning.

Mr. Maurice acknowledged that change can be challenging and recognized that the revised scoring system might not be universally embraced across all departments. He emphasized that the prioritization process heavily relied on departmental input and was developed collaboratively with department facilitators

Chief Frank noted that Directors have recognized the need for further dialogue with both Bureaus and Fleet. She pointed out that some of the current requests may be misleading, as they lack the oversight and strategic input of the Department Directors. Without this higher-level review, the submissions may not fully reflect operational priorities or realistic needs.

Mr. Shultz clarified that Bureaus are not Departments and noted that Public Safety Bureau Chiefs do not have the authority to make legal determinations related to these purchases. Director Schmidt added that the Directors had been under the impression that Fleet would convene meetings with both Bureaus and Departments to align priorities and clarify requests. Such coordination would have allowed Directors to provide input on bureau operations and gain a clear understanding of what would ultimately be submitted to Capital.

Jeff Scalikan, Director of DOMI, interjected that no one had reached out to him during the capital submission season to discuss their department's formal requests. He noted that, in previous years, the Fleet Manager had met with DOMI to review potential submissions and engage in dialogue about which vehicles should or should not be considered for replacement.

Mr. Maurice expressed his belief that Fleet should shift away from relying on departmental wish lists and avoid selectively determining which vehicles to replace. He emphasized that replacement decisions should be grounded in the outcomes of the established scoring formula, ensuring a more objective and consistent approach.

Chief Frank explained to Mr. Maurice that, while there was no intention to diverge from the maintenance plan's scoring framework, the Directors' insights into the operational needs of their Bureaus had not been adequately considered. She emphasized that the Directors are uniquely positioned—with both the authority and situational awareness—to determine which vehicles truly require replacement.

Director Schmidt continued to explain that there are a variety of examples where, although the Bureau may want a vehicle, that doesn't mean it will come to fruition. For example, Police Fleet does not make the final decision for that Bureau; I do, and therefore should have been involved in this determination process. Although Fire and Police know what they need, I still need to be included in this process to make the appropriate decisions for the department as a whole.

Director Hornstein recommended that department-level scoring should be the starting point for the process. This begins with evaluating each vehicle alongside its replacement score. From that foundation, priorities can be aligned with the established criteria, creating a clear baseline for decision-making. He acknowledged that additional variables will need to be considered, but emphasized that this approach provides a logical and structured framework to build on.

Mr. Shultz asked if we could then move to review the formula section.

VEHICLE SCORING FORMULA

Mr. Maurice opened the conversation by noting that the scoring system is flexible and can be adjusted across its weighted components. He explained that the Replacement Score is a composite index designed to prioritize fleet vehicle replacements, factoring in criteria such as cost, age, downtime, procurement risk, and departmental urgency. This methodology promotes data-driven decision-making while reinforcing transparency and alignment with both operational requirements and the broader goals of capital planning.

Chief Frank stated that she had no concerns with the formula model and acknowledged the significance of its weighted components. She voiced her support for Director Hornstein's recommendation to begin the process with a comprehensive list of scored vehicles as a baseline. While the scoring system should not be disregarded, she emphasized the need to consider the priorities identified by individual Directors, which may differ from the initial scoring outcomes. In some cases, a Director may wish to reassign or substitute a vehicle based on evolving operational needs. Ultimately, the guiding principle is that the scoring must align with the department's functional requirements moving forward.

Director Schmidt highlighted the EMS Dive Truck as an example within the scoring system. Although the vehicle scores high for replacement—primarily due to its age, dating back to 1986—it sees minimal operational use. In contrast, the Hazmat vehicle, which is actively deployed on a weekly basis, scores lower simply because it is classified as newer, having been manufactured in 1992. This comparison underscores the need to balance age-based scoring with actual usage and operational relevance.

Mr. McDevitt remarked that the current progress represents a step in the right direction. However, he noted that both the Mayor and City Council retain the authority to amend or override any proposals. In response, Chief Frank emphasized the importance of presenting clear financial scenarios to City leadership. She recommended preparing both a \$20 million and a \$40 million funding outline to help educate both parties on the City's asset management strategy. She further stressed the need for a Director-informed list that includes meaningful prioritization aligned with the available funding.

Chief Kokilla remarked that he viewed the overall list as more of a departmental wish list than a strategic plan. He expressed concerns about Firmin's scoring tool, noting that it contains gaps that limit its effectiveness. As an example, he pointed out that the Command SUVs are not scheduled for replacement in 2026 or 2027, despite their operational importance—a direct result of how the current scoring model is applied.

Director Hornstine stated that applying benchmarks to the baseline list would strengthen the decision-making process. He agreed that Chief Kokilla's observations were well taken, highlighting the challenge of weighing individual concerns against the broader needs of a complex and diverse fleet. He emphasized that the scoring formula should be viewed as the beginning of the conversation—not its conclusion—and acknowledged the necessity of factoring in additional variables to refine the metric. As Pete previously noted, while PAYGO funding is expected to be limited, there are other funding sources available annually that can be leveraged to support these decisions.

Chief Frank agreed that additional funding sources exist beyond PAYGO allocations. However, she noted that many of these alternative sources—particularly certain Trust Funds—carry specific restrictions that limit how the funds can be used. Moving forward, she emphasized the need to

repackage and streamline the material to reflect these funding realities. Directors should thoroughly review the requests and actively engage in prioritizing needs within their own departments. She also acknowledged that the availability of outside funding will inevitably influence the overall prioritization of the list. For example, due to the recently implemented Park Tax, which has funded a healthy fleet for the Park Maintenance.

Mr. McDevitt noted that if additional funding sources are identified, it may no longer be necessary to include Park Maintenance Vehicles in the replacement list, as those vehicles are consistently purchased in a timely manner. Director Hornstein agreed, pointing out that the average age of Park Maintenance vehicles is currently around five years. This relatively short ownership cycle not only ensures operational reliability but also positively affects the resale value of the vehicles when they are eventually decommissioned and sold at auction, thereby contributing additional revenue.

Mr. Shultz reminded the board that the CPF Scoring Committee is scheduled to convene on August 25th. In preparation, he emphasized that the Fleet Manager and Department Directors will need to meet prior to that date to review all proposals and establish clear priorities. Chief Frank requested that a revised list of departmental priorities and vehicle replacement requests be compiled and organized by department within the next two weeks to support informed decision-making.

ELA TASK FORCE STATUS REPORT UPDATE

Mr. Cornell noted that the second official meeting of the newly established ELA Task Force was scheduled to take place after the current board meeting. During the inaugural session, the team focused on discussions surrounding vehicle lifecycles and available funding sources.

Mr. Maurice recognized Branwyn Turnage as a valuable contributor and recommended that she be formally added to the task force. Ms. Turnage accepted the invitation and will participate in upcoming meetings.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Cornell informed the board that no payments have been made to Transdev Fleet Services since 2024. Mr. Maurice added that, although the Controller's Office has agreed to resume payments, there remains a lack of clarity regarding the specific amounts and timing of disbursements. To help resolve this, Ms. Jenn Olzinger has recently requested detailed totals and check numbers from the Controller's Office.

Director Hornstein confirmed his participation in a recent meeting with the Controller's Office regarding the outstanding payments, and noted that a resolution is currently underway to move the payment process forward. He expressed concern that the payments had been withheld without prior notice, and that communication regarding the steps needed to resume them had been minimal. However, the Controller's Office has now provided clear guidance on what is required going forward. He cautioned that, should the garage cease performing services, the resulting disruption would have severe implications for Fleet operations and the City's essential services. Mr. Cornell indicated that as of today nothing had been posted for payment.

Mr. Maurice stated that this is the second time they have agreed to post a check but have failed to do so.

Chief Frank suggested a call should be made.

MEETING SCHEUDLE

The next meeting of the Equipment Leasing Authority will be a Special Capital Request Meeting on August 7th, 2025 at 10 AM.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made and approved at 3:20 PM.