

**POINT TOWNSHIP SUPERVISORS
REGULAR SUPERVISORS MEETING
TUESDAY, AUGUST 11, 2026**

The Point Township Board of Supervisors held their regularly scheduled meeting on the above date at the Point Township Municipal Building, 759 Ridge Road, Northumberland, PA. Present were: Chairman Clayton Rowe, Vice-Chairman Thomas Strouse, Jr., Supervisor Randall Yoxheimer, Supervisor Zachary Black and Supervisor/Roadmaster Jared Wehry. Also, present were Solicitor Richard J. Shoch, Chief Kevin Herring, and Office Assistant Amy Hoffman. *(Absent: Secretary/Treasurer Melissa Young & ZEO Jackie Hart)*

Visitors present: Bob T Sulouff; Montie & Helen Peters; Pat Brown; Michael Erdman, Jr; Earl & Karen Persing; Bradley Woodring; Patricia Riegert; Leann Brosius
Present, but did not sign in: George Geise and Rich Shaefer.

Chairman Rowe welcomed everyone to the Supervisors meeting and all present repeated the Pledge of Allegiance. *(Draft of the minutes of the Regular Supervisors Meeting and a copy of the bills to be paid this evening on the front table of the meeting room provided for anyone interested in viewing the information, once reviewed please return to the table).*

Public Comments on Agenda Items:

Rowe we had an executive session on July 21, 2026 for informational/personnel purposes, and there will also be one this evening.

Approval of Minutes:

MOTION made by Strouse, Jr. to approve the minutes of the Regular Supervisor Meeting held on July 14, 2026. Seconded by Wehry and passed unanimously.

REPORTS: (Old & New Business included):

Solicitor:

- *Insurance quote for 2027:* I talked to a couple members of the Board about this, at the end of last year the Board had voted to not open it up for bids for another 3 years. Over the course of the next few meetings with our current provider and Ron Vandine and the company he was affiliated with, you approved the insurance quote with our current provider, but there was discussion during that to the effect that we would open it one more time this year. There was never another vote to change the prior vote from October where the Board said we weren't going to open it for 3 more years. If the Board would want to open that and get bids, you would need to take a vote to undo that vote to reopen it for this year.

Shaefer from Pfeiffer-Naginey, asked the Board to consider not allowing insurance to be bid out again this year and stand behind the vote made in October of 2025. I would like to draw your attention back to the December meeting last year which I was in attendance for, there was a very contentious, 45 minutes, drag out, whatever, regarding this proposal (held up the insurance proposal from Vandine) that was presented to the Board in November. To the Boards credit, they gave

Pfeiffer-Naginey the last look at the policy. *(Proceeded to explain inconsistencies with the proposal from Vandine)*

Shoch explained why this was on the agenda, and if they want to stick with the vote made in October or rescind that motion and allow the bid again this year. So, tonight is for the Board to think back on their thoughts and if they want to reopen. I think you have made some good points and certainly somethings that the Board would want to consider in making that decision, but what they are here deciding tonight is not who they are going to place the business with, it's whether or not they are going to open this up to bids for another year.

M Peters how did you find out about this being on the agenda?

Shaefer I got an email (**M Peters** from who) does that matter?

M Peters as long as it wasn't from someone in the Township.

Shafer I got an email from Eddie Kobke, you'd have to ask him.

M Peters the reality is you are standing here, and he isn't. Ronnie Vandine is a resident of the Township. (**Shaefer** so am I) congratulations. Pfeiffer-Naginey has performed wonderfully for this Township, but in the interest of fair, that's what opened this thing, my question centers around you're here and Ronnie is not. I have to listen to what you are telling us. The other side of that is, there are members of the Board, as well as myself, that Ronnie Vandine was our primary agent.

Shoch explained this wouldn't 'lock' the Township into Pfeiffer-Naginey, just that you wouldn't be allowing for it to be bid for 3 years. That looks bad to carriers if you are bidding out every year.

Yoxheimer currently Rick, what vote stands?

Shoch the vote that stands is the 3 year vote.

Strouse, Jr. are you a resident of the Township? (**Shaefer** yes) okay, good.

E. Persing what does that matter, that they are a resident of the Township.

Strouse, Jr I don't appreciate getting told that I have a conflict of interest just because I do business with Ronnie. The only conflict I have is that Ronnie is a resident of the Township, and I wanted to make sure he is too

Shoch what we have done in the past, is the Board members that have private business relationships with Ron, and had their polices with him, they abstained from the vote.

Black if we open this up again, what are we gaining by doing that?

Shoch I guess you would have another opportunity where you have more than 1 carrier to pick from

Black has much changed since the last time you guys voted.

Rowe you don't know, but at Rowe Line, there would have to be a sustainable change for us to switch carriers.

Yoxheimer my understanding is Keystone Insurers group was sold, is that correct.

Shaefer it is still Keystone Insurers Group, it was just purchased by Private Equity about a year ago

Yoxheimer so we are not dealing with the same Keystone Insurers Group that now has a different ownership, correct.

Shaefer you are dealing with Pfeiffer-Naginey who is a member of that aggregate.

Yoxheimer why isn't Eddie here tonight? I guess my question is, are you going to be the new representative for Pfeiffer-Naginey

Shoch we had heard that Eddie is retiring, I think at the end of the year.

Shaefer looks like that is going to happen, I will probably be your agent.

Yoxheimer so the 2 things we have had consistently, Pfeiffer-Naginey, controlled by Keystone Insurers Group, and Eddie Kobke as our agent. I am not anticipating any change in the way you would handle things, I just want to make that clear and so that audience also knows, you mentioned Ronnie using a company out of West Chester, so there have been changes on both sides, correct.

Shaefer no. Keystone Insurers Group has no ownership/interest in Pfeiffer-Naginey.

Yoxheimer I am asking you though, does this new company that bought Keystone, they are now the ones in control of Keystone, correct.

Shaefer they are in control of the aggregate of which we are a member, but they are not in control of us. We are an independent agency. Sometimes an agency belongs to associations, this is an association that we belong to. A group of insurance agencies that belong to this group for access to carriers and hopefully better premiums for their clients. They have no control over the day-to-day operations of our agencies.

Yoxheimer the only point I am making in all of this is that the original arrangements that we had with Pfeiffer-Naginey, what we had been used to, has changed.

Shoch my advice to Tom and Randy is to abstain because of your affiliation with Ron.

Strouse, Jr. I don't want anything to do with it.

Shoch we know that Ron has expressed interest in being able to get a quote if it was to be opened. So, I would suggest abstaining from this vote since it is not needed in this case.

Strouse, Jr. I abstain from the whole thing.

Shoch so the question is, does anyone feel like they want to make a motion to change the standing vote.

Rowe is there a motion to rescind on the last vote from October.

Black I am voting no, and that we keep it the way it is.

Shoch you are asking for a motion, so it will fail on lack of motion.

MOTION failed

- Fire Board Organizational Matters-Update: I have not had a chance to really dig into that at all.
- Nottingham Tax Appeal Update: the representation from Nottingham has asked for a pretrial conference which is scheduled for some time in September. I have had emails going back and forth between myself and the new Solicitor for the County, as well as the Solicitor for the School District. We are at the point where they have to get an appraisal of the property to compare to the appraisal that Nottingham has come up with. The reason I bring it up is that I don't think it makes sense for all 3 entities to be separately litigating this, we all have the same interest in it. The County has more in this and has chosen to appeal this. My thought was we would sort of take a back seat and allow them to move forward with litigation and that allows us to keep the cost down. Once an appraiser is established, they may ask for each entity to help pay for that appraisal.

Yoxheimer I believe I remember this happening to us years ago; Nottingham wasn't happy with the amount of taxes they paid, and they appealed and if I remember correctly, they won.

M Peters the problem with this is, how big is this. Does it amount to a mil of taxes.

Shoch I would have to go back, and I can get that information.

(Discussion ensued)

Yoxheimer if the County is going to do this, I would say let the County do it and whatever we have to chip in, that would be the smart thing to do.

Secretary: *(Financial Reports on File)*

- Approve new IRS mileage rate of 76 cents, as of 7/1/2026:

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to approve the new mileage rate of 76 cents as of 7/1/2026. Seconded by Strouse, Jr and approved unanimously.

- Approve the Fire tax check to Point Two Fire Co and Tuckahoe Fire Co of \$28,000 each:

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to approve the fire tax checks to Point Fire Co and Tuckahoe Fire Co at \$28,000 to each Company. Seconded by Wehry and passed unanimously.

- Retro Approve Building Cell Phone Booster at \$561.30:

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to retroactively approve the purchase for the building cell phone booster. Seconded by Black and passed unanimously.

Police Department: *(Report on File)*

- Officer Bregensir probationary period complete:

MOTION made by Wehry to move Officer Bregensir from probationary status to retain him at full-time status. Seconded by Black and passed unanimously.

- Board Discussion on interest in 287(g) program: the program regarding cooperating with the Department of Homeland Security for immigration. I haven't done deep dive into it, wanted to see from the Board if it was worth me diving into that. There are some benefits. From the public's perspective, they are either all for it, or against it. I know other areas have had some opposition about it; I personally have not as of yet.

Rowe how does the audience feel?

E. Persing do the police departments get money for participating in this.

Herring that is what we are being told. An agent with Homeland, who is out of the Bethlehem area, had reached out. They require 1 arrest, to confirm that you are participating in the program, and then you will get your money.

E. Persing when you make an arrest, you are done with them then, you don't have to go to court or anything

Herring if we have local charges, we aren't going out, just run of the mill stopping everybody checking visas. It's going to be a matter of, again, this would be in the form of a policy, if you have someone in a DUI crash, or another example like that, then we would go through with that program.

E. Persing you're not hunting them down?

Herring correct. It was word of mouth, I want it in writing, but they said your operations can stay the same. If we have a DUI crash tonight, and someone is found to be here illegally, we are going to contact ICE. It allows a lot more local influence to be able to, not necessarily handle differently, but have a different tactic about how to handle some of the situations

Sulouff you said you have to make 1 arrest; it sounds like a quota did they give you a timeframe on what they want.

Herring no. One of my biggest things was, are you having this out like \$5,000 per arrest, if so, I am out, I am not dealing with that. The way it was explained to me, was it was 1 arrest to confirm your cooperation with the program, and then that's when your money will flow. You can be part of this for 10/15 years and not have an arrest and not get any money out of it.

(Discussion ensued)

Fire Department: *(No Report)*

Rowe Mike did you want to speak about the report you gave us.

Erdman I just wanted to provide a report for each month and will continue doing that. If you have any questions, I will be happy to answer them.

Fire Police: *(No Report)*

EMA: *(No Report)*

Engineer: *(No Report)*

Yoxheimer we did have a pre-submittal meeting today with the developers that are looking to redevelop what was the old El Rancho. It appears they are looking to do something similar to a gas outlet, or short stop, something like that. They are also talking about a small sit-down restaurant, I think it is more of a

fast-food place, but it's a little upscale from McDonalds or Wendy's. They are also looking to have a small drive through bank. Looks like it will be a nice development.

Road Department: (Report on File)

- Update on Hookies Grove and catch Basin at Stoney Lane: Todd, Randy, Tom, myself and a lady from the NRCS met out there 2 week ago. We are currently waiting on NRCS to get back to us with some information on what they would like to do.

Strouse, Jr. she is going to talk to the above her, I should know more next month

Wehry while we are on Hookies Grove, I want to bring up a driveway issue we have been having at 757 Hookies Grove Road, just down the hill from Balschi's. Randy, Todd and myself had gone out and taken a look at it, when we had rebuilt Hookies, we did ditch work along the entire length of that section of Hookies. This one homeowner continues to fill in their driveway with millings. We went and dug them out about a week ago, came back on Monday morning and its all filled in again. It's interfering with the drainage of course, we went out Monday during that heavy rainstorm, and most of the water is coming off of their driveway, not from our ditch line. So, I don't know how to proceed, short of us going in and ripping it out every time they fill it back in.

Yoxheimer I think the best thing to do is to have a conversation with them. Maybe ask them to come in, have a couple Supervisors, short of a quorum. When we were out there, I think we talked about some possible solutions. I think rather than playing this game of putting it in and taking it out, is to get in touch with them and request they come in here. If they don't respond, maybe have Rick send them something.

Wehry that was my thought, do we just send them something that says stop filling the ditch line in

Yoxheimer I think maybe take the more personal approach and request they come in or even meet out there and say this is what we can do. We can talk to Todd to get some more concrete ideas.

- Hidden driveway sign on Ridge Road follow up: I spoke with the homeowners, they seemed okay with paying for the cost of the sign, but they did not give me a definite yet. I did look at the PennDOT's requirements for the placement of the signs, and it would serve all 3 of those homes that are there.
- Resolution 2026-13 for Latsha Dr off Old Danville Hwy: Rick did you want to speak to this.
Shoch I put this together after receiving a request for what is a private drive off of Old Danville Hwy. They subdivided this property so they want to name the road since there will be additional houses off that road. It will remain a private road, they just need something from the Township, so I put a brief resolution together that you were approving the naming of it, to Latsha Dr.

MOTION made by Strouse, Jr to approve Resolution 2026-13 naming Latsha Drive. Seconded by Black and passed unanimously.

- Driveway pipes and pipe on Neitz Road: Tom had asked for this to be put back on the agenda
Strouse, Jr. Randy said at the last meeting, or the meeting before, that we would install them, and they would pay for the pipe, but our brand-new ordinance says that the homeowner is responsible. We can't have something on the books and do something different.

Wehry which then becomes the question of how do you enforce it. If we see a pipe failing, which as we have been doing ditch work, there have been quite a few of them, how do you force the homeowner to put one in, when there is one needed, or in the very least clean the pipe out.

Shoch I thought there was something in there that said if they don't do it, then we can and charge them, and if they don't pay us, we can put a lien on their house.

Yoxheimer one thing we have found helpful over the years, we did this on Comfort. They purchased the pipe and did the installation. That did 2 things, one it took some of the burden off the homeowner, and then we knew the installation was going to be done correctly. Subsequent after that,

if the pipe gets ripped up, or the pipe would ever have to be replaced, then I think the whole cost should fall back on the homeowner. That gives us some control over how the installation is done.

Rowe that is how it is at our cabin in Sullivan County, we bought the pipe, and they put it in.

Yoxheimer I think that shows that the Township is willing to participate in this and it creates good community relations.

Wehry say we out a pipe in, this may be an issue we have here on Neitz Rd. If we go and put the pipe in, what if they don't accept ownership of the pipe.

Shoch it's on their property, right?

Wehry it would be in our right of way, but under their driveway, yeah.

Shoch if it's on their property, it's theirs, whether they want it or not. I'll have to revisit the language that's in there. Maybe you want to have something in there that the Township will install the pipe if the homeowner purchases it. If they are refusing to replace the pipe and it is affecting drainage, then there would have to be some language about the Township doing it and being able to bill the homeowner.

Yoxheimer I think there is going to have to be something, I am just trying to think what ordinance we would want it under.

Shoch I think there is something in the driveway ordinance

Wehry yeah, it's in the driveway ordinance about pipes.

Shoch I am just not sure what it says about non-compliance.

Wehry and who enforces it, how is it enforced. This pipe on Neitz Rd, about a year ago I approached the owner about that pipe failing, and we were looking to put it under the road, he said absolutely not, he wants absolutely no part of that pipe. After meeting with Todd and getting some guidance, the only real option is for that pipe to go under his driveway and continue down through the woods, and it has to be addressed relatively soon. I just need to know how to proceed.

Shoch let me take a look at that language.

Yoxheimer the ordinance may need to be adjusted to take this into account. That's one we may need to eat and call it a Township issue. Like you said Tom, they are all over the township. We need to decide how we want to proceed.

(Discussion ensued)

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to allow the Solicitor to advertise amendment to the driveway ordinance if needed to address pipe replacement/responsibilities. Seconded by Black and passed unanimously.

- F-550 electrical issue: we are having an electrical computer issue, where none of the buttons on the steering wheel are working, the horn stopped working, we checked fuses and all that, and we can't figure out what is going on.

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to allow the Roadmaster to take the F550 to Sunbury Motors. Seconded by Rowe and passed unanimously.

- Cannery Road Pipe: this is a cost update on the pipe replacement on Cannery Road, the cost to replace the 60 inch pipe is probably going to be in the ballpark of \$56,000: includes excavator rental, \$4,500 to \$5,000 (3 weeks of rental, I don't anticipate it taking that long); need different size rip rap for inlet/outlet, around \$4,000 for that; I want to utilize traffic control rental signs, \$1,500; guardrail will need to be reinstalled and that will require an engineer study, Todd knows a guy since he doesn't do that, \$5,000 just for the engineer study; install of guardrail, on the high end \$10,000 range; pipe was already purchased, that was \$8,000; the paving, 1 quote back so far from Rightway, I reached out to Gutelius and Big Rock paving, the estimate for paving right now is \$10,000.

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to allow the Road Department to move forward with the pipe replacement on Cannery Road. Seconded by Rowe and passed unanimously.

- Public Works Expo: I would like all 3 of us Road Crew to attend this year. I went last year. It is a Sunday, Monday and we come back on a Tuesday, November 8th – 10th. Total to send all 3 of us is \$1,100.85.

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to allow all 3 road department personnel to attend the Public Works Expo, total cost \$1,100.85. Seconded by Black and passed unanimously.

Wehry we were doing ditch work out on Roush Road/Church Drive/Meadow Lane/Old Danville Hwy, I am sure you are well aware we had received a few complaints. I did respond to each and every complaint, I forwarded some of the responses to the Board. Just wanted to let you know I took care of all those complaints. Double sealcoat on Franklin St. was done; I do not have a timeframe on fog seal.

Sewage Enforcement Officer: (No Report)

- Appoint 3 members to the Appeals Board:

Zoning/Code Enforcement Officer: (Report on File)

- Appointing an alternate to Zoning Hearing:

Planning Commission: (No Report)

- Approve Ridge Point Farms Subdivision (spoke w/Todd on 7/24, he said all was good):

MOTION made by Black to approve the Ridge Point Farms Subdivision plan. Seconded by Strouse, Jr. and passed unanimously.

- Approve Grace Bible Fellowship Church land development plan (conditional approval):

MOTION made by Yoxheimer conditionally approve of the Grace Bible Fellowship church land development plan upon Todd's review. Seconded by Wehry and passed unanimously.

- Cost of utilizing the planning section of iWorQ for tracking plans and bonds: **Hoffman** I don't know if you feel comfortable setting a dollar amount, Jackie hasn't heard back yet from the company with a price yet.

Rowe do you have an idea?

Hoffman I don't, I don't know if \$2,000 would be a good number.

MOTION made by Black to allow the purchase of the planning section of iWorQ, not to exceed \$2,000. Seconded by Yoxheimer and passed unanimously.

Yoxheimer lets set it at \$3,000, that way if it comes in a little over 2, then you don't have to wait.

MOTION made by Black to amend the previous motion, for the purchase of the planning section in iWorQ up to \$3,000. Seconded by Yoxheimer and passed unanimously.

Recreation: (No Report)

Sewer Authority: (No Report)

Other Business:

Herring an update for the Board, the pickup truck is outfitted and ready to go. It came in \$1,691 under budget. The vehicle it is replacing, I have a tentative sale possibly for the original \$10,000 that we expected. If that sale would fall through to the other agency, then I will put on Municibid. I should know in a week about that sale.

General Public Comments/Resident Concerns:

Sulouff with the increase in the mileage rate, is that for all groups inside the Township, for the Sewer Authority.

Shoch that is its own separate entity, so if they want to increase that, they would take it to their Board.

Pay Bills:

MOTION made by Black to pay bills. Seconded by Yoxheimer and passed unanimously.

Adjournment:

MOTION made by Black to adjourn. Seconded by Wehry and passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:49PM.
All motions passed by hand vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Executive Session will be held after Mtg.

List of Communications: *(On File)*

Amy Hoffman, Office Assistant

Financial Reports: *(On File)*

Melissa Young, Secretary/Treasurer