

MUNICIPALITY OF MONROEVILLE
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUDGET HEARING

MAY 19, 2022

MINUTES

The meeting was called at 6:30 p.m. to order by Deputy Mayor Eric Poach in Mayor Gresock's stead.

ROLL CALL

The Recording Secretary, Sharon McIndoe, called roll and following were present: Joe Hyzy, Eric Poach, Bob Stevenson, Steve Wolfram, Bob Williams, Dennis Biondo, Tim Little, Josie Rock and Paul Hugus. Mayor Gresock and Councilman Adams were absent.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No one came forward at this time to make public comment concerning the capital improvement program.

DEPARTMENT HEADS

MONROEVILLE MUNICIPAL TV (MMTV)

Mr. Jared Robinson distributed information to council concerning a control room and studio upgrade and a detailed breakdown for different variables. He explained it would be for all new components for the TV operations in the studio. He reported it is due to the age of the video switcher which is the brains of their sources of inputs and outputs. He pointed out it needs upgraded because it is operating on a Windows 7 based system and it no longer has any tech support. He mentioned once that is done there are other components necessary to integrate with that switcher then dovetails into the components. He stated it is viable for Monroeville Municipal TV because it controls the audio and visual fidelity of televised meetings to the public. He reported they are looking to upgrade their functions to be able to produce a better product and make it more accessible to the public.

Mr. Robinson explained it would allow them to live stream meetings and better integrate meetings with current technology such as video conferencing, zoom meetings and hybrid meetings. He stated they have patched it together to make it work in the past but an upgrade would allow to integrate those things better.

Mr. Robinson reported he has a budgetary proposal from their engineering service Texolve which was used to put together budgetary figures that are on the improvement program. He distributed the information and explained it is a breakdown of the figures into a more categorize format.

Mr. Stevenson pointed out the request is for a total of \$275,000. He explained there is \$203,000 in the 2022, \$72,000 in the 2023 budget and zero in 2024, 2025 and 2026. He inquired whether anything could be distributed into 2024, 2025 and 2026 instead of the lump sum in 2022. Mr. Robinson indicated he cannot say no but carrying the \$72,000 into 2023 was a stretch because once one part of the system is integrated then there are compatibility issues with other parts of the system. He explained a new switcher may not integrate with the current cameras which would lead to converters to

make things work. Mr. Stevenson suggested this is a five-year plan done in a year and a half. Mr. Robinson explained the first page is a summary and mentioned how the video switcher is the main item that leads to making this entire project necessary. He again stated the switcher is the brains of the system and the second thing is manufacturing services which is labor to integrate everything. He mentioned this would include an upgrade of cameras to HD from the current standard definition and the cameras have to integrate with the rest of the system. He reported there were a few items that could be moved to 2023 but beyond that it is hard because it is a one-shot deal because it is hard to integrate older components with newer ones. Mr. Wolfram pointed out the prices would also increase over time and Mr. Robinson agreed. He reported he had the quote last year and it increased \$30,000.

Mr. Poach questioned whether he broke the items up as good as possible and pointed out the preliminary budget total for equipment and services is \$300,000. Mr. Robinson answered affirmatively. He reported he eliminated a \$25,000 quote off the top which was related to media archives that was unnecessary. Mr. Poach asserted this has been broken down into different modules. Mr. Robinson agreed and stated it was a stretch to move the \$72,000 into 2023 because it is something that is hard to piecemeal.

Mr. Little reported they were uncertain whether the cameras would be compatible with the switcher and it is an unknown. He questioned whether Texolve determined whether the cameras are compatible and Mr. Robinson answered negatively. He explained there is not a specific model that was selected. He stated there is a possibility that it will integrate but it is taking a chance if it does not.

Mr. Poach inquired about the age of the current cameras and Mr. Robinson was uncertain. He stated nothing is high definition.

Mr. Biondo inquired whether the switcher could be delayed until 2024 then upgrade some of the other equipment. He questioned whether it would be compatible and Mr. Robinson indicated it is possible. He stated he has not asked the potential installers those questions. He felt once the municipality had a amount approved then he could hash out those sorts of questions.

Mr. Wolfram questioned whether that included cable or just the unit. Mr. Robinson stated everything included in this proposal includes cabling, conduit and running the cable. Mr. Poach inquired whether there is any other integration between that and some of the things from the IT upgrades. Mr. Robinson answered all of that would be part of it. He explained the switcher has network components to it and some of the cameras.

Mr. Stevenson pointed out that if we wait on some components it may not be compatible with the upgrade and Mr. Robinson agreed. He explained if council approves to move forward then he would then inquire about those issues. Mr. Stevenson requested those questions be answered prior to approval. He questioned if the municipality did the upgrades incrementally in future years whether they would be compatible with what is done initially. He suggested it be stretched out over five years rather than two years.

Mr. Hyzy inquired how much the municipality would get for the used equipment if all the upgrades are done. Mr. Robinson was uncertain but some cameras have value because the lenses retain value. He stated some copper in the wiring will be usable but he was uncertain about the other components.

Mr. Little referred to the streaming aspect of the upgrade and stated this would give the municipality that capability and Mr. Robinson concurred. Mr. Little explained the trend with television is streaming. He stated this is where the technology is going. Further discussion ensued concerning live streaming.

Mr. Stevenson suggested the switcher is the brains of the outfit and inquired whether the current cameras would work with the new ones and Mr. Robinson was uncertain. He was doubtful but was not certain. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Williams commended him for making an old system work so well and making Monroeville look good. He suggested the whole system needs to be done or none of it.

Mr. Little inquired how council wanted to proceed and Mr. Poach suggested more of a description of the implementation of the plan. Mr. Robinson inquired whether council wanted to know more about how things integrate. Further discussion ensued.

PUBLIC WORKS, BUILDING AND ENGINEERING

Mr. Paul Hugus referred to Page 13, Schedule 7 for the Category MS4 and reported a lot of the money there is part of the original development of the MS4 Program. He stated the \$200,000 per year for five years was projected out for the facility. He explained the facility is currently under review with the public works facility as a whole so those numbers will remain there until it is determined what will be done.

Mr. Hugus reported all four of the items under equipment are attachments and not new equipment. He referred to the first item which is a wheel saw that cuts asphalts and explained it attaches to the skid steer and is a hydrologic driven wheel that cuts the road. He explained the ring saw is another attachment for the skid steer. He stated the third item is an attachment to the excavator and he briefly explained the Grade All but now there is an attachment for an excavator to do the same thing.

Mr. Hugus referred to the push camera and stated they currently have a camera but it is for a much larger pipe. He explained this is a smaller camera, is not on wheels and it is physically pushed through the pipe to determine the problems. Further discussion ensued about the cameras.

Mr. Hugus referred to the asphalt hot box and explained it is a very large, square trailer that is used to heat asphalt at the end of the year. He reported it is filled with asphalt which can be heated which alleviates cold patch which mushrooms out the of trench line. Mr. Williams inquired whether it is propane generated and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively but the one they looked at is diesel. Mr. Williams questioned whether propane heats the asphalt and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively. Mr. Stevenson inquired whether the municipality already has one and Mr. Hugus answered negatively. He explained the municipality is getting less potholes but this would be used in the winter time to patch them.

Mr. Hugus corrected the next item which is a 30,000-pound capacity trailer to a 70,000-pound capacity trailer. He explained it is used to haul the larger equipment, the excavator, skid steers and rollers.

Mr. Hugus referred to the vehicles which is to replace a pickup truck. He reported this pickup truck was taken from the engineering department when the MS4 Division was created and is a 2009

Chevy Colorado. He stated it was a gas saving vehicle that a prior council wanted to use and it is horrible. He reported it currently has 70,000 miles and is in bad shaped.

Mr. Stevenson referred to the 70,000-pound capacity trailer and inquired what the municipality uses now to haul equipment. Mr. Hugus explained the municipality has a trailer but it is not that large. He reported it is big enough for the large excavator but not big enough for two pieces of equipment. He further explained how it would have multiple functions and can haul two skid steers.

Mr. Little reported carpet for the municipal building is proposed for 2023 but it should be pushed back so it is the last thing done in the building. Mr. Hugus suggested council consider doing the first and second floor but not the police level. Mr. Little asserted it depends on what will be done. Further discussion ensued regarding the carpet.

Mr. Hugus referred to the Old Stone Church under Facility Improvements. He reported the bell tower is scheduled to be repaired in June but he was uncertain whether the entire \$50,000 would be needed. He mentioned some money was dedicated to it from the Monroeville Foundation or Visit Monroeville. Mr. Little corrected it was Visit Monroeville. Mr. Hugus explained the whole \$50,000 will not be needed because the bell tower replacement would be done inhouse along with the basement stairs and box gutter boxes. Mr. Williams inquired whether there is a reason to keep the box gutters because he felt it is better to get rid of the box gutters and replace them with hanging gutters. Mr. Hugus answered affirmative because it would keep the characteristic of the Old Stone Church. He explained it is not an easy project to change box gutters to standard gutters but to keep the characteristics of the church the box gutters should be kept.

Mr. Hugus suggested the only money that should be kept in there is carpet because a third party would do the installation. Further discussion ensued about doing the work internally. Mr. Stevenson inquired whether a different number can be attached to those three items and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Mr. Paul Estock came forward from Parks and Recreation. Mr. Hugus referred to the first item on the list is the baseball field turf replacement. He explained at the Community Park the infields are turf and the outfields are grass. He reported the turf fields have a life span and they were originally installed with grant money. He stated some sections were replaced last year. Mr. Estock further explained there is a lot of wear areas on the field around the first and second base and the pitcher's mound from the kids dragging their toes for softball. He stated those areas were replaced that needed attention, patched and fixed to extend the life of them. He reported the overall fields get a lot of use with tournaments, baseball and softball so it is starting to show its wear. He suggested the bases will be fine but the grass needs to be done at an estimate of \$300,000. Mr. Hugus added those fields get a lot of use and it will continue. He urged council to consider it and pointed out it is projected out to 2026 based on the recommendation of the turf manufacturer.

Mr. Hugus referred to the walking paths and projected \$25,000. He reported he allocated some funds in the road resurfacing program to do some of the neighborhood walking parks but did not include the Community Park. He asserted the Community Park walking paths get the most use of any of them.

Mr. Hugus referred to the Monroeville Park West 18-Hole disc golf course. He reported that project is complete with the exception of the tee boxes that they did not want installed until the Fall of this year. He explained there are 36 tee-boxes that have to be constructed which will be done internally. He stated that number can be deleted because it is included in the parks and recreation budget in the amount of \$13,000.

Mr. Hugus referred to the facility improvements with the replacement of 30 doors and closers at the bathroom and concession stand. He reported they started this program two years ago so some of the items have been done and a lot of the closures have been replaced but the doors have not. He asserted the doors would have to be replaced next year. Mr. Estock explained the doors are heavy steel doors and have shifted. He stated there is an issue with tightness that needs to be addressed. Mr. Poach inquired about the age and Mr. Hugus reported it was built in 2005-2006.

Mr. Hugus referred to the fencing repairs and replacements with an estimate of \$100,000 for the various parks. He explained the neighborhood parks are not in good condition and have been neglected. He pointed out there is fencing around the court surfaces, fields and the perimeter that needs to be replaced. He mentioned how the work could be done off the commodity bids but the money needs to be allocated to so much per year. Mr. Estock pointed out they are starting to curl up at the bottom and need attention. Mr. Hugus again stated the municipality has not given a lot of attention to the neighborhood parks. He reported Evergreen Park was rehabilitated last year through a grant and he explained how it was decommissioned, the new play equipment was installed, public works poured all the concrete, patched all the walking paths and put in the play surface. He suggested it saved a lot of money but the play equipment is not cheap.

Mr. Poach pointed out some of the handicapped equipment was installed last year and this is to do the rest of parks for accessibility and Mr. Hugus agreed. Mr. Estock reported a lot was done with the last round of installation but they could always do more. He suggested at least one in each park. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Hugus reported when a new piece of equipment was obtained with a grant it was laid out in the footprint but was not adequate. He stated they had to make it larger by taking out the timbers because it did not comply with the standard. He explained how there were requests to add certain equipment at a certain park but sometimes that larger apparatus cannot be installed because the footprint is not big enough. He asserted most of the parks have the footprint but it would involve additional work.

Mr. Hugus referred to the play courts and Mr. Estock presented examples of them. He explained how this is an ongoing problem and exists at every neighborhood park. He reported there is discoloration of the play surface, it is bleached out, the lines are diminished and the play surface is cracking. He added there are 22 courts which are basketball and tennis. Mr. Hugus suggested power washing does not do anything to it but discolors it and distorts the lines. He pointed out the separations and the vegetation grows then they become fall issues. Mr. Hyzy inquired how that would be remedied whether it could be repaved or surfaced. Mr. Hugus reported they resurfaced the court at the community park which is not having problems but they are trying to determine what happened. He suggested it is happening at the other courts with the spider cracks or stress cracks. He stated there is something with the surfaces that is causing it to shrink and it is a stress crack which is causing the separation. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Hugus reported this goes back to what is at the Community Park where the core borings were done and the issue was because they were not built properly. He

suggested if this has the same characteristics as the gas coal to slag where once it absorbs like a sponge and expands, it does not go back. He stated the water filtrates through if a limestone or granular material is used. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Williams inquired whether there are different grades of asphalt and Mr. Hugus stated the recommended was used at the Community Park which is the same as used on the roadway surface.

Mr. Hugus referred to the play equipment and reported it is expensive. He suggested this be discussed with the parks and recreation board for guidance on what parks to do. He recommended doing one park a year and explained how Evergreen Park was done. Mr. Estock showed before photographs of Evergreen Park and explained it. He stressed the grants help but are tough to come by. He stated the municipality has been fortunate to get one every year for a couple of years. He agreed it should be discussed with the parks and recreation board. He explained there are certain standards for the play grounds that must be followed. Mr. Poach inquired whether this is a spread-out for a five-year program and Mr. Estock answered affirmatively. Mr. Hugus stressed that one has to be done every year but it is still behind the curve. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Estock reported no one wanted to address the parks but it has to be done now because it will just continue to get worse. He did not want to have to shut things down because they cannot be used.

Mr. Stevenson reported he attended the first cleanup day and he was amazed to see how much the Community Park is used. Further discussion ensued regarding the use of the parks. Mr. Estock stressed how the cameras would be a great value. Mr. Hugus reported when Evergreen Park was rehabilitated the activity increased on a daily basis. Mr. Stevenson inquired about the possibility of park police and further discussion ensued concerning cameras.

Mr. Williams inquired about the employee situation at public works and whether there are enough employees to cover everything. Mr. Hugus explained he would be covered if there was 100 percent attendance every day but it does not happen.

Mr. Hugus referred to Page 15 for equipment under building and engineering for the multi-functional plotter. He explained it is a wide format scanner, printer and copier for large drawings. He reported it is a 2013 Model and it is hard to get replacement parts. Mr. Hyzy inquired whether it would be cheaper to lease than to purchase and Mr. Hugus answered negatively. He mentioned how it would be more convenient to have two, one at the municipal building and one a public works.

Mr. Hugus referred to Page 19, the annual road paving program. He pointed out it is usually \$1.5 million but this year it is \$2 million and escalates each year based on inflation. He referred to the replacement of 2,000 lineal feet of deteriorated guiderail. He explained this item has been neglected and there are a lot of areas that have steep roads or embankments where the guiderails need replaced. He reported the guiderail that is in good condition will be painted with galvanized paint but if they are damaged and need replaced, the municipality does not have the ability to do it. He pointed out it is part of the commodity bids to have a third party put them in.

Mr. Hugus reported the next several items are traffic signal related and referred to a traffic signal that was approved at the last council meeting at Wyngate Drive and Monroeville Boulevard in the amount of \$300,000. He explained that is the cost for a tee intersection but a plus intersection is \$350,000 to \$400,000 depending on the number of lanes. He reported there are 42 traffic signals in

Monroeville that are owned and maintained. He proposed this would rehabilitate a traffic signal instead of replacing it. He explained how painting the poles make them look new. He reported this rehabilitation would replace the traffic signal heads, the cabinet, the controllers and the components to bring it up to today's standards without having to replace the entire signal. He stressed it is a cost saving measure.

Mr. Poach inquired about the age of the lights from oldest to newest. Mr. Hugus reported any pole that is a Core 10 Steel Pole which brownish colored can rust from the inside out and could fail at any time so they will be replaced. He mentioned Wyngate Drive, in front of the Municipal Building, Ivanhoe Drive and Monroeville Boulevard. He added the fixtures would be replaced when the poles are replaced. Mr. Poach questioned the age of the traffic system. Mr. Hugus reported the projected life span of traffic signals is about 25 years. Mr. Poach inquired whether there any older than that and Mr. Hugus answered Wyngate Drive is the oldest. He explained they will replace all of the traffic signals on Route 22 this year from Rodi Road to Routes 22 and 48 when PennDOT does their betterment project. Further discussion ensued concerning the Opticom.

Mr. Hugus reported the intersection with Wyngate Drive and Monroeville Boulevard has a grant match to fund it but the signal at Broadway and Forbes, the traffic signal at Broadway at Haymaker Village No. 2 and the signal at Monroeville Boulevard and Stroschein Road are in 2022 but will probably be done in 2023. He reported there will be an upgrade to the traffic signal at the Municipal Building. He explained all of the traffic signals have an adaptor to run off an emergency generator and they are still in the process of putting batteries in them so they can run uninterrupted then they are on a generator. He reported not every signal has the batteries so it is part of the program. Mr. Poach asserted they are UPS and Mr. Hugus agreed. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Hugus referred to Page 20. He reported the HVAC Unit in the Animal Control Shelter is not in the best condition. He suggested it remain until action is necessary. Mr. Poach pointed out that it is functional and Mr. Hugus agreed. He added there is a secondary plan if it stops operating.

Mr. Hugus referred to the salt storage facility at the training center and presented a picture of the proposed structure. He explained it is low knee concrete walls with a clear span structure on top. Mr. Williams inquired whether it was canvas and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively. Mr. Stevenson inquired whether it would be done before the next snow and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively. He reported the curved salt dome at the public works facility has never been rehabilitated and has always had salt in it. He explained how the salt would be taken to the training center in this new structure so they can work on the salt dome at public works. He mentioned the lights, electrical and exposed wood.

Mr. Hugus reported the first five items under equipment were purchased last year so they can be deleted. He referred to the replacement of the sign sheeting plotter and software. He explained it is in their sign shop and it is how they make their metal signs for roads and traffic signals. He stated the blotter and software need to be updated because it is not supported.

Mr. Little referred to the signs identifying the entrances to parks and some of the developments that have the municipal logo. He questioned the material, time or more software. He wanted to know if council wanted to continue with those types of signs because the municipality would have to use more expensive material. Mr. Hugus asserted to continue that type of sign it has to be done by a third party but the municipality can maintain them. Mr. Biondo inquired about the alternative. Mr. Hugus stated

there are sign companies that will make those types of signs and it will be a better product and last longer. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Hugus explained they have a sign shop that makes street signs not decorative park signs. Mr. Poach inquired whether the municipality currently still subcontracts the manufacture of them and Mr. Hugus answered negatively. He explained it became an issue because the individual donated a lot of money to the Community Park and wanted a sign. Mr. Little reported he donated \$5,000 for the naming rights which complies with the ordinance. He explained there are different signs. He stated it is labor intensive and it has been done in the past but the labor and materials are too much to be efficient so it would be better with a third party. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Little felt the sign was deserved for the naming rights but it cost the municipality \$1,400 to get a similar one to match. He suggested moving forward if the municipality wants to have a decorative sign it has to be done by a third party. Mr. Hugus explained those specialty signs are not needed very often. He reported the sign shop has a lot stock for the street signs and traffic signal signs but they do not want to keep all the material for the specialty signs that are made occasionally for the parks. Mr. Biondo clarified that is it one or two signs a year and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Hugus suggested a standard should be added to the ordinance for how much money is donated to merit a sign.

Mr. Stevenson pointed out the first five items that the municipality already purchased totals \$146,523 and he questioned whether it would be eliminated. Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively.

Mr. Hugus referred to the 2000 tar buggy which is older. He stated it is used every Spring and Fall for the basis of a road. Mr. Stevenson questioned whether it could be used and get another one; Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively.

Mr. Hugus referred to the brine making system and reported the one the municipality has is not efficient. He suggested funds need to be allocated so it can have a larger water supply line to make brine faster. He stated it also needs a bigger holding tank and explained when the trucks are filled the storage tanks are emptied then they cannot make enough to fill the trucks. He reported it is a matter of upgrading the line system. Mr. Stevenson inquired whether they could get a bigger outside tank and bigger line to it and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively. Mr. Stevenson questioned whether the old one could be used at the training facility and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Hugus referred to Mobile lifts and he showed a picture. He explained they are used to elevate the larger vehicles and the municipality has four of them. He stated they are both interesting and scary. He explained how they operate off of blue tooth and suggested two more are needed. He showed No. 5's ladder truck and how all four lifts are used when the hydraulic bays are used. He explained more than four are needed for vehicles with multiple wheels because of the weight of them. Mr. Williams inquired whether the lifts are portable and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively. Mr. Williams asserted they could be moved to a new facility and Mr. Hugus concurred. Mr. Wolfram inquired whether four more are needed if another truck comes in and Mr. Hugus explained the hydraulic lift could be used. He added if there are two in the building there isn't enough room for anything else.

Mr. Hugus referred to the wing lawn mower and he showed photographs of them. He stated there are two at the Community Park. He reported the one that needs replaced was purchased in 2004 when the park was opened. He explained how it is getting older and costing a lot for maintenance reasons. He added they cost \$70,000 and there is a one-year lead time to order one. Mr. Stevenson

inquired whether there is an industrial model and Mr. Hugus this is it. He referred to the next page which is the second one to be replaced in 2026. Mr. Williams inquired whether it is a 12-foot cut and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively. He reported how they are used every day. Mr. Stevenson inquired whether they can still get parts and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively but there is a wait. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Hugus referred to the 2000 Backhoe with projection for replacement is 2025. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Hugus reported the 2000 skid steer and a 1992 fork lift need to be replaced. He stated the fork lift is used every day. Mr. Stevenson inquired about the difference between the Toro Replacement and replacing the John Deer. He noted the difference is one is \$70,000 and the other is \$78,000 and Mr. Hugus answered inflation. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Hugus referred to the push behind line striping machine which is used to paint the stop bars at the traffic signals and parking lot lines. He reported the municipality has two and the older one needs replaced.

Mr. Hugus referred to the 1993 Trailer slated for replacement. Mr. Wolfram inquired about the size and Mr. Hugus answered it is a tandem axle trailer that carries a roller. He added it is a 20,000-pound trailer.

Mr. Hugus referred to the replacement of the 2009 Motrim. He explained it is the tractor with the arm that cuts the rights-of-way. He reported the Zero Turn Lawnmower is at the Community Park and replaces of the walk behind mowers.

Mr. Hugus referred to the public works vehicles and reported the replacement of Traffic Signal Bucket Truck 35 has been purchased. He explained how it was ordered in 2021 and will arrive in 2023.

Mr. Hugus referred to a Pickup Truck 46 to be replaced in 2025. He reported it failed inspection and will need \$5,000 worth of work to get it to pass inspection and next year it will need a new bed because it is deteriorating. He suggested a decision will have to be made at that time to repair or replace. Further discussion ensued regarding the purchase of a pickup truck.

Mr. Hugus referred to Truck 98 which is the mechanics service truck which is an oversized utility truck with a crane and air compressor. He asserted it is used a lot for fire, EMS, public works or refuse.

Mr. Hugus referred to Truck 99 and explained it is a big utility truck but the body is shot. He reported it got through inspection but probably will not make it through another one. He mentioned Truck 44 and stated they are both the same truck.

Mr. Hugus distributed information and explained how he tried to put some of the larger vehicles on a schedule for replacement. He reported they are expensive and take a long time to get. He reported refuse trucks and dump trucks are 18-24 months from the date of order to date of arrival. He explained things have to be planned three years in advance and ordered two years in advance. He referred to the schedule for Trucks 67 and 68 which are 1997 and 1999 respectively. He explained using a 15-year replacement schedule they should have been replaced in 2012 and 2014 and he pointed out the mileage. He reported they do not get a lot of mileage but do get a lot of engine hours mostly in the winter. He referred to Truck 67 and 68 and explained new dump trucks were ordered in December

2021 and are tentatively scheduled to arrive in January-February 2023. He stated they have already been ordered and the numbers in the spread sheet reflect the amount of those trucks. He recommended a schedule for these trucks so the municipality does not get hit all at once. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Hugus referred to Truck 36 or the Tree Truck with a chipper behind which is a 2004. He pointed out the next two are refuse trucks, Trucks 48 and 50. He explained there is a 10-year replacement cycle and they are the most used vehicles they have. He reported they run five days a week for 52 weeks a year and the municipality has five of them for the three dedicated routes. He stated one or two are down at a time. He reported two new refuse trucks were ordered on November 18, 2021 and the cost is reflected in the spreadsheet. He explained how the cost has increased substantially and mentioned how the one from 2019 in the amount of \$215,000 is now \$250,000. He added it is the same thing with the 25-yard compactor refuse trucks with a back chase. Mr. Hyzy inquired when those would be in and Mr. Hugus answered earlier 2023.

Mr. Stevenson inquired whether there is a replacement schedule for all vehicles and Mr. Hugus answered negatively. He stated he has it for the refuse trucks and the 10-ton dump trucks which are the bigger salt trucks and the 5-ton dump truck which is a step down that are used in the neighborhoods. He added he does not have a replacement cycle for the equipment.

Mr. Hugus referred back to the replacement cycle and stated Trucks 73, 76, and 78 were purchased in 2007 based on a replacement cycle. He explained they would be replaced earlier but he projected it to 2024. He added it would take time to get caught up.

Mr. Hugus reported Trucks 57 and 59 are the smaller ones which is the five-ton dump. Mr. Stevenson inquired whether the old ones are sold when the replacement is received and Mr. Hugus answered affirmatively. Further discussion ensued. He reported Trucks 67 and 68 will not pass inspection in November because of the frames so the municipality will be without two trucks from the end of November until the new ones come in. He asserted the municipality would not get much for them. Mr. Wolfram questioned whether they would come in April 2023 and Mr. Hugus was hopeful for February or March. He pointed out January and February would be missed. He referred to Truck 53 which is the 25-yard refuse truck then the 10-ton dump trucks.

Mr. Williams reported a refuse truck just caught fire on the Liberty Bridge and inquired whether there is anything to prevent that from happening. Mr. Hugus answered maintenance. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Hugus referred to the recycle truck and explained it was purchased with a grant and the municipality will try to get another one to replace it. Further discussion ensued.

(A brief break was taken at 8:23 p.m.)

MUNICIPAL MANAGER'S OFFICE

Mr. Little reported one item concerning building security that is not in the capital improvement program is the amounts of the cost because he distributed the email LGA Architects from April 2020. He explained at that time the municipality stopped all spending on extraneous costs due to the pandemic because of the concern for revenue so the capital improvements program has been delayed. He

suggested the vestibule could be changed to include more security. He showed plans and explained Option Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 to increase security of the vestibule. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Little reported this is not included in the capital improvement program because of the costs but he felt it was important for security reasons.

Mr. Hyzy pointed out there are no barriers out front to keep someone from driving into the building. Mr. Little mentioned bowlers and the PA State Police. Mr. Poach stated he will share the report done with council. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Little then showed a photograph of something for infrastructure under administration for \$20,000 for an LED sign with brick work. He proposed it to be on top of the monument sign in front of the municipal building for public messages. Mr. Poach inquired about the size and Mr. Little answered three by six feet. Further discussion ensued regarding the sign and the size.

Mr. Little reported the next item is to discuss how the capital improvements would be financed. He stated the municipality has a \$16 million shortfall which could change but there is not enough money for the public works building. He discussed this with Public Financial Management who restructured the municipality's debt service. He explained there are three proposed options and he explained each one.

Mr. Williams inquired how it would affect the municipality's rating if it borrowed \$30 million. Mr. Little stated as long as it is paid timely the credit or bond rating will remain good. He reported the municipality is currently at AA. Mr. Poach pointed out something major would have to happen to change that and these options are not unreasonable. He was uncertain whether a discussion should be made sooner or later. Mr. Biondo questioned whether it has to be decided when the capital improvements budget it passed. Mr. Little reported pursuant to the home rule charter a capital improvements budget should be passed by September 30 of every year and that has not been done for a number of years. He mentioned some big-ticket items that are needed by the municipality such as garbage trucks and salt trucks and there is an 18-month wait. He explained it does not have to be decided in September but it is a good bench mark to follow of things that need done. He felt the municipality should be aware of where it is headed on expenses with each department.

Mr. Little requested council on a scale of one to five with one the least important and five the highest priority to rate the items in each department. Mr. Poach pointed out since there has not been a capital improvement plan for a while that are a lot of needs instead of wants.

Mr. Stevenson verified that council is considering increasing its debt service to fund capital improvements. He questioned whether it is also being considered for a public work structure. Mr. Little indicated that would be discussed later. Mr. Biondo pointed out the numbers in the packet do not include the public works building and Mr. Little agreed. He again requested council prioritize the items. Further lengthy discussion ensued.

Ms. Rock asserted she would provide council with a spread sheet of the items so they could be prioritized. Mr. Little suggested council could discuss these items further or schedule additional meetings for discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, Mr. Stevenson duly made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 p.m. and Mr. Hyzy seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Little
Municipal Manager

TJL/sam