

**POINT TOWNSHIP SUPERVISORS
REGULAR SUPERVISORS MEETING
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 2025**

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 Randall W. Yoxheimer, Vice-Chairman Thomas Strouse, Jr., Supervisor Montie Peters, Supervisor Joseph Stender, Jr. and Supervisor Clay Rowe. Also, present were: Solicitor Richard J. Shoch, Chief Kevin Herring, Office Manager/Secretary/Treasurer Amanda McClain and Office Assistant Amy Hoffman, Roadmaster Jared Wehry, and SEO William Toth. *(Absent: ZEO Jackie Hart)*

Visitors present: Helen Peters; Robert Sulouff; Thonda Swank; Jean Neitz; Zach Black; Randy Persing; Jason Hummel; Bonnie and John Troxell; Karen McHenry; Phillip Troxell; Frank Wicher; Pat Brown; Tim Conrad.

Present for insurance quotes: Eddie Koebke and Ronnie Vandine

Chairman Yoxheimer 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 Hearing regarding proposed Ordinance 2025-06:

Shoch explained the changes to the zoning ordinance with the special flood hazard overlay, and the other changes had to do with the agricultural use regulation, adding a set of additional regulations with respect to certain areas, zoning districts which predominantly would allow livestock or poultry, only for personal use, not as a business. Asked if anyone in the audience had any comments. *No one raised their hand or responded.* Requested a motion to close the hearing.

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to close the hearing. Seconded by Peters and passed unanimously.

Public Comment on Agenda Items:

Insurance talk: Yoxheimer I believe where we tentatively selected Peifer-Naigney as the carrier for calendar year 2026 with the only condition as to, since Ron had already prepared a significant amount of his material that he would be able to provide his offer and we would only address if it was a significant difference.

Vandine *(handed the Supervisors his proposal)* this proposal is with EMC who has been with the Township for a long time. The premium for the package is \$50,789. The renewal from Eddie with Selective was \$56,000. Coverages are the same. Another thing we were advised about was the SWIF policy. They said there was a way to separate the MOD for the SWIF from the Township and they will help us do that and that will save about \$3,000. If we get it separated and there is a MOD for each one, that will reduce the Township MOD for the workers comp, but will take 3 to 4 months.

Shoch asked Eddie if he had an opportunity to review the proposal from Ronnie.

Koebke no, I have not seen it. I would have liked to have seen it.

Yoxheimer Amanda, when is the time frame for renewal?

McClain I believe it is December 12th.

Koebke you are very familiar with EMC. Any time an insurance agent wishes to quote any business, but especially a Township there are supplemental applications. Mr Vandine brought you one the other day, which I didn't get it the last time I was here, but I did get an opportunity to review it. It is a normal application, ENO Linebacker. There are also separate supplementals for government entity, government crime, and government law enforcement. The only thing I had seen was the linebacker that you had signed, I didn't see any of these other supplementals. EMC has to see those other supplementals, I don't know if they did, someone at the Township is supposed to sign off on those. EMC is a fussy company, I don't see how they would give a quote without having those other signed supplementals. Asked who Ronnie got the information from to complete those forms.

Vandine we got information from Kevin on law enforcement, we talked to different Board members and so forth. *(Koebke who signed them)* Randy signed the only.....

Yoxheimer the only thing I signed was what allowed him to go out and get a quote.

Vandine no, you signed the linebacker.

Yoxheimer I didn't sign anything for the linebacker that I am aware of.

McClain/Hoffman yes you did.

Koebke last time I was here you signed the linebacker.

Vandine they needed that signed to release the quote.

Koebke no, that is the linebacker, that has nothing to do with them releasing it. There are 3 other applications that have to be completed. They aren't going to release a quote until they get all of this. As a Board you should be asking for what was submitted, and taking a look at it to see if it was correct. God forbid something in this isn't correct, it could be an exposure issue if there is a claim.

Vandine this company has done your township for a lot of years.

Koebke you are a new agent soliciting this company. They are going to treat you like a new agent. You would have to submit as new agent soliciting business.

Yoxheimer who signed it from here?

Vandine no one signed anything yet, only the linebacker. All the other answers were answered by the pursuit they asked for by the police department was turned in, it was answered.

Koebke I want to see signatures.

Vandine you want to see the element risk come alive, you just keep mouthing like that.

Yoxheimer my assumption would have been as Chair I would have signed these, and I don't remember signing them, other then the one from the budget meeting. *(Vandine that's the only one you signed)*

Koebke the other questions were never asked to Amanda or Amy, so that tells me that there was an assumption there, or perhaps you went by my old EMC information.

Yoxheimer the problem is Ronnie, I know you started this in August, but typically, most of the stuff is assembled for August knowing we are going into budgets here. I am not sure why all this stuff is just now getting caught up. Here we are at the November meeting and we are just now getting.

Vandine that's when you wanted it. That's what you told me the last time.

Yoxheimer only because you didn't have it ready to go for the last meeting.

Vandine I am not going to pursue this. You wanted a savings, I got you a savings. If I get this, as soon as the policy is in, I am going to sit down at the table here, and we are going to go through it with the Roadmaster, the Chief, everybody, so we make sure everything is correct.

Yoxheimer but why hasn'tI guess my concern.....

Vandine I copied exactly what we had last year, plus we took off stuff, like the tractor was sold, this and that. Everything else is ran pretty consistently.

Koebke I am ready to do that now. I have everything ready. If you say yes, then he is going to take that and sit down and go over this, numbers could change. I am sticking with my quote, it is real and it is up

to date. I have a relationship with Selective and EMC. I know how EMC works, as I just said, if he gets this business then I am going to sit down with Jared and all the others and get all the information, that should have been done already. I am going back to those forms that should have been signed by someone with the Township and I am not seeing that, and that is scary to me.

Vandine all of that was done right, all this is, is a sales tactic. What you have to understand, is EMC wants this account back. Everything is according what we need to provide to them, right to the T. Its not easy with EMC, but we got everything provided. If you go with this policy, yes, the application has to be signed by Randy or Tom, the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman. \$6,000 is a good savings and the other thing is that workmen's comp should have been handled a long time ago. Do you have any questions?

(several seconds passed)

Peters boy, it got quiet in here. What do you want to do with this? I think Ed needs to see this proposal. I would be in favor of giving this to Ed and letting him look over it and address it at the December meeting.

Yoxheimer I am in agreement that Ed should get to review this proposal. I am concerned personally from my stand point, I know other then that document I signed at the last meeting, that was the only document I signed. The position the three of us are in Ronnie, and I want to make it clear to the audience, you provide the insurance for myself, Montie and Tom. That is the drawback that I have.

Peters we have done insurance with you for years. So there is a slim chance we like you, but we like also like Ed. He has done a remarkable job for the Township. I think Ed needs to see what you have submitted.

Koebke wouldn't that be a conflict of interest then that he is your personal insurance agent?

Yoxheimer to me it boards on that line.

Koebke both the votes last year I won unanimously. That is why I am a little frustrated, but then again because of a friendship he is coming back in here and doing this all over again.

Yoxheimer it is not based off of a friendship alone. Its about getting comparable coverage that will be beneficial to the township. Since he has had an opportunity to see your numbers and he had that for a guide, you didn't have that.

Koebke why do you think that is?

Shoch that is why that was the first thing I asked. Everyone should be given equal opportunity.

Rowe lets let Eddie look at it, as far as you 3 having insurance with him, shows me nothing but he is a creditable individual.

Yoxheimer Eddie, did you have access to EMC this year.

Koebke of course I did, but we beat them by \$8,000 last year, and that's my point.

Yoxheimer if you can provide the same insurance as what Ron did, how did we get to that discrepancy between what he is now providing us.

Koebke I'll tell you why, he did not do everything on the up and up. How do we know that he hasn't fudged those numbers to make it look good to get that number.

Peters I take offense to pointing out the fact he is a friend. We have done nothing but treated you with nothing but respect (*Koebke absolutely and I respect that*) the township has followed you (*Yoxheimer for how many years*) and had no complaints, but in transparency as Mr Yoxheimer told you, he is his agent, he is Tommy's agent and he is my agent (*Shoch that was disclosed last year*) and we still went with you, we still went with Peifer-Naigney, because they have a history with the Township. So his numbers would have to be incredibly good for us to change. So while you are winning the battle, you need to be quiet. In the meantime, you need to take a look at this and in December we will do this.

Yoxheimer I believe you should have a fair opportunity to look at this and what is being submitted. We are in a conundrum right now with this Board and the situation we have because of some of the

extenuating circumstances we have about personal relationships we have and all that. At the end of the day, my overall concern is what is the best benefit for the Township. The concerns I have is if there are any discrepancies that you are worried about, I don't want to see a suit happen and something happens that we don't have coverage for, but on the other hand, if there is a reasonable savings here that would warrant looking someplace else.....we aren't willing to make a decision tonight. I am totally uncomfortable with where we are right now.

Shoch we want to make sure we are talking apples to apples comparison. Ron, also, I think it would be good for you to give to the Board what was submitted to EMC since you said those supplementals were submitted so they can look at that, and frankly so you can look at that as well to make sure that information is correct, does it differ and if so, which one is right. Once that is all reviewed then the Board can determine if it is enough of a savings. Like was discussed last meeting, we can't jump from carrier to carrier, no one will want to insure us.

Stender, Jr. didn't we do that at the last meeting?

Shoch I don't remember if a percentage was mentioned or how it was.

Rowe I don't know if you did that or not and told them this quote was good for 3 years, but that's going to mean a lot to them, but he should have the opportunity to tell them the same thing. Did you tell them that?

Vandine yes, I told them that.

(too many people talking over each and at the same time to make sense of who was saying what)

Yoxheimer what was the dividends coming out of Peifer-Naigney?

Rowe I can tell you its been going down. *(Koebke sorry)*

Yoxheimer there will be no dividends this year because Keystone is not.

Koebke the dividend program was exclusively through Keystone and EMC, its not a Peifer-Naigney thing. It is part of an agreement that EMC had exclusively with Keystone Insurers Group. So, with Mr. Vandine if he gets the insurance quote, he won't have access to that since he is not a part of the Keystone Insurers Group. Dividends are not guaranteed, but EMC did have a strong record. I didn't go back to EMC this year because I comfortably beat their quote last year, and I knew they weren't going to beat Selective *(Vandine but they did)* this year.

Yoxheimer the question is, will this be a one year and done savings.

Koebke like Clay mentioned, we are not going to quote every year, formally. But like I said at the last meeting, I look at these renewals every year when I get them, if I see it is out of line, I will quote it without the Board and I'll just come here and just say company A jacked it up 11/12%, I went on my own and went over here to see if I can get a better price for you, just like I have done in the past. No company is going to freeze a premium for three years.

Rowe I have worked with Selective for a long, long time. If they would have known you were quoting it, you would have had better numbers. I have never seen anyone beat Selective. We have to get that policy in place.

Yoxheimer we are going to table any decision on the insurance quotes.

Yoxheimer the first order of business is the approval of minutes. There are some concerns with the way we are handling approval of minutes and the recorded transcript of the minutes. I was approached by the Board about being able to listen to the electronic recording from the budget meeting last month. My understanding is, that those minutes have been deleted?

McClain since 2019, we were literally told, that once the minutes were typed and approved by Rick, we were able to delete the minutes.

Yoxheimer the minutes are never approved by Rick, they are approved by the Board.

Hoffman/McClain reviewed by Rick.

Yoxheimer when was this ever disclosed. Who said this.

McClain we talked about that back in 2019. (*Yoxheimer I don't remember that*). No one remembers a lot of things.

Hoffman I would have never done that on my own volition. So there had to be conversation with either one or both of you. (*Shoch talked over Hoffman, said he would not have said to do that*) with being new to the position, I would never had taken it upon myself to delete them)

Shoch what we've talked about, and what a lot of municipalities do is you do not necessarily retain them after you've had an approved set of minutes and its because sometimes somebody brings an action or a lawsuit and they ask for copies of minutes, you give them the minutes, but if they ask for a recording, if you still have it, then you can be compelled and subject to right to know.

Hoffman that was one of the reasons why we were told, by one or both of you, to delete them as soon as they were transcribed so we don't have to worry about that.

Shoch I don't know, if that was, that wouldn't have been what I said, and I don't know if that's what was understood. Once you have an actual, final set of minutes, which you don't have until you have an approval from the Board. I review the minutes and it just came to my attention just a couple of months ago, when I think you had said can you give me your comments to the minutes so you can get them out to the Board. I shouldn't be getting the copies first that can just go out to the Board, and me at the same time, I am one person who is reviewing them and giving you comments based on what I heard at the meeting. For future reference we shouldn't get rid of it before the Board actually approves it.

Rowe you can probably download it on to the computer.

Shoch if it is a digital file, it should be able to be downloaded onto the computer, then that way you still have it up until the Board approves the minutes.

Hoffman I have handled these minutes like I have done the last 8 years.

Shoch all I am saying if there was a misunderstanding at some point as to what should be done, we shouldn't get rid of the audio tape until you know you have, until we know that there are final minutes that the Board has approved, because they are ultimately the body that has to approve them. We don't have official minutes until they have taken the vote. I wouldn't get rid of it prior to the Board looking at it that they may not, the person may not look at it until after I have reviewed it.

Peters for the exact reason your doing this right now, there is no reason in this world to eliminate the minutes prior to the Board approving them.

Yoxheimer historically what happened, the Solicitor would be given the minutes for review by the Secretary or whoever was doing the minutes, was to make sure that any motions that were made, that the wording was correct and there was no legal concerns as far as the way the motions were made and the way they were voted on. It was never where his word was the final word, it was we wanted to make sure that any legalize.....

Shoch like if someone abstained at the meeting and that for some reason didn't get reflected because they have a personal interest that that got reflected or something like that.

Yoxheimer to your defense, I don't recall anytime, anyone ever questioned from the Board about any particular recordings or anything from the minutes so I can understand how once you figured Rick had approved them, that there would be no....it just happened that this time we were requested to be able to listen to the transcripts from the first budget meeting, and that was the rationale as to why we wanted to be able to hear them, only to find out that once Rick had indicated to you that he had reviewed them that they were provided.....now, again, can they be transcribed but on file electronically on one of the computers?

Shoch you mean, digital file saved on the computer until they are approved.

McClain if you want to do an official policy, lets talk to Rich about doing that and then we will archive them and then they will be subject to Right-to-know requests. That's fine, lets do it that way. We need

clarification as to what you want, because we haven't changed the way we have been doing things since when I started here. I would love to still have the recording from the budget meetings for several reasons, but we got rid of them. There have been several times where it has been mentioned that you don't want things on the record, but if you guys want to have a digital file of something, we will save it and it will be subject to right-to-know. I think that started back from when Encina was here, you didn't want to have a copy.

Shoch a lot of municipalities have a policy where they won't retain the digital recording, or years ago when it was taped, audio tapes, and after you know that you have a final set of minutes, that's the official minutes and so, rather than have those out there that somebody does subpoena them in a lawsuit or someone with a right-to-know they want to hear what other discussion was had around the table or by someone in the audience, and things like that, your allowed to not retain those, but you need to.....but once you have an official record of the meeting, and again I am just talking about going forward.....

(numerous people talking over each other to hard to make sense of)

MOTION made by Strouse, Jr. digital records should not be destroyed until the minutes are approved at the Supervisor meeting. Seconded by Rowe and passed unanimously.

Peters is that enough?

Shoch yes, and that they be destr....if that's what you want, that it be destroyed after they are voted on and approved the final minutes, but not before.

Yoxheimer or the other solution be that we get another recorder and have 2 recorders, I don't care.

Swank recording like this is kind of outdated, isn't there an app like teams that you can record live and then you don't have to worry about erasing it and recording it and having 2, it will keep them back to back.

Shoch part of the issue is you don't necessarily, and people are two different minds on this, a lot of municipalities have determined they don't want to have a forever record of everything that was said by everybody in the room at the meeting. There is a set of minutes that reflects what was said and discussed regarding the agenda business. What you don't want to have is comments where someone is calling someone a name or someone from the audience is saying something, you have an official record of it and at that point you don't want to have, whether it be an audio recording, or in teams it would possibly be a video/audio recording. You don't want to maintain those forever.

Swank you wouldn't have to

Shoch yes, you could still delete those. It serves the same purpose, I suppose, it would just be set up differently.

Yoxheimer I don't think the system is broken as it is right now.

Shoch we just need to be clear as to when that is getting deleted, and again, moving forward, we shouldn't do that before the Board approves the minutes so you do now have an official record. Up until that point, until they approve a set of minutes, it is not the official record of the meeting. In this case, there were some folks on the Board that I think had some questions, or thought there may have been some things that maybe were discussed that may or may not have been reflected in the written draft of minutes but they couldn't recall what all of those were, so they wanted to hear it back and that is the reason why you don't wanna get rid of it until after, until there is that official minute because of this very type of situation. It has never come up before and that's maybe why it was done the way it was for so long. It never became an issue, before it became an issue because a member of the Board wanted to go back and listen to that and possible make comments to the draft minutes.

Approval of Minutes:

MOTION made by Peters to approve the minutes of the First Budget/Regular Supervisors Mtg held on Monday, October 27, 2025. Seconded by Stender, Jr and passed unanimously.

REPORTS: (Old & New Business included):**Solicitor:**

- Approval of Ordinance 2025-04/Floodplain: revised floodplain ordinance, by the engineer
- Approval of Ordinance 2025-05/Stormwater: revised Stormwater ordinance, by the engineer

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to approve Ordinance 2025-04/Floodplain and Ordinance 2025-05/Stormwater. Seconded by Peters and passed unanimously.

- Approval of Ordinance 2025-06/Amendment to Zoning Ordinance: this was the ordinance that hearing was for at the beginning of the meeting.

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to approve Ordinance 2025-06/Amendment to Zoning Ordinance. Seconded by Peters and passed unanimously.

- Approval of Ordinance 2025-07/Supervisor Compensation: this was discussed at the last meeting regarding increasing Supervisor pay for the new incoming Supervisors with Act 94.

MOTION made by Peters to approve Ordinance 2025-07/Supervisor Compensation in accordance with Act 94 which increases annual salary to \$3,145. Seconded by Rowe and passed unanimously.

Shoch these ordinance revisions are coming up because we are going through a codification of all of our ordinances. Part of the process is looking at all of ordinances and if they need to be changed. We went to get that all cleaned up.

- Approve Ad for Solicitation Permits: this is one we had talked about before, and I had meant to get this done before now, but will have ready for the December meeting.
- Approve Ad for rescinding Street Specifications Permits: what was determined when we went through this ordinance is that it is all addressed in the SALDO

MOTION to approve the Ad's for the Solicitation Permits and to rescind the stand-alone street specification ordinance. Seconded by Peters and passed unanimously.

Shoch 2 follow up items: I talked with Klaciks about the audits for the Fire Companies, Tony said he will put together a proposal reflecting the fact that these audits should be much smaller than what would be for the Township audit. I told him we would like to see that for a three-year period. He is talking to the decision makers at his firm and they are going to put something together, as soon as I get that, I will forward out to all parties so you can take a look at. He thought, but he does need to check, that he was thinking something in the cost range for each of those around \$2,500 and \$3,000 maybe. With a caveat in the proposal, that if they encounter something that was unexpected that would be much more costly to have them go through and audit or account for in that audit, that they would come to the Board make them aware and why this is something above and beyond what the norm would be and the Board could decide if they want to include that or not. The other item, I know the Board was given copies of what came out from the assessment office. You had wanted me to go to those hearings, regarding Nottingham and Surplus outlet. I went to those, the one for Nottingham, they came and made an appearance to preserve the right to appeal in the court of common pleas, they presented nothing. They didn't have any kind of appraisals or anything like that, but it preserves their right to appeal. With respect to Surplus Outlet, what happened apparently, that got revalued just this last year, and they had almost doubled the value I think or more, and the reason for that was they had done some sort of a refinancing where they included on the same sheet, 2 different properties. One is for the Surplus Outlet here, and they must have one Lycoming County, both of those were included and rolled up into one on the settlement sheet and that is what the assessment office went off of, but there was a foot note on the settlement sheet that showed it was 2 separate properties.

Secretary: (Financial Report on File)

- Approval of 2026 Proposed Budget: after the meeting on the 27th came to \$1,822,921.05, with no tax increase with the agreement to move \$130,000 over to general from capital, which was originally used to fund the PCCD grant

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to approve the 2026 Proposed Budget, in amount of \$1,822,921.05. Seconded by Stender, Jr. and passed unanimously.

- Approval to advertise the 2026 Proposed Budget for public inspection:

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to advertise the 2026 Proposed Budget for public inspection. Seconded by Strouse, Jr. and passed unanimously.

- Approve 2026 Tax Resolutions, 2025-10 (tax levy) and 2025-11 (per capita, etc.):

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to approve the 2026 Tax Resolutions, 2025-10 and 2025-11. Seconded by Peters and passed unanimously.

- PA PETS utilizing meeting room: I had to stop out here when Haven to Home was here utilizing the meeting room and they asked me about PA Pets utilizing the meeting room as well the 2nd Monday of every month during the months of April through October. We haven't charged Haven to Home. **Yoxheimer** where are they out of?

McClain I am not sure, but they did say that a lot of their Board members are from this area.

Yoxheimer I guess my question is, some of these are multi municipalities, why are they looking to utilize this room?

McClain Haven to Home has been very respectful, we have not had any issues with them using this space.

Yoxheimer that is the only thing I would be worried about, that they are being respectful of the space.

McClain it says in the letter that was distributed to the Supervisors that the majority of their Board members live in the Northumberland area.

Hoffman the letter that was written to the Supervisors, was from Ann Murray who lives on Comfort Road, a Township resident is requesting permission.

Peters as long as we would have the ability to terminate it if something goes wrong.

Yoxheimer Rick, do you think it would be advisable to have some kind of a written agreement.

Shoch if you want to have some sort of agreement with them, that basically says if something like that happens with a new puppy, that they would be responsible for any damages.

Yoxheimer I think we should have you draft something like that, just like the policy on minutes, we should have some sort of policy for this.

Shoch yes, I can put something together. I will get a standard agreement that we can fill in the blanks with stuff, and anybody who, if the Board approves them to use the building, can complete it.

- Insurance Proposals from Keystone and Susquehanna Valley Insurance:
- Approve Klaciks quote for payroll/bookkeeping for services: this was sent out to all of you. It outlines the highlights of it and why I thought it was important until we get someone in here. We are doing interviews tomorrow and Thursday. I am just concerned about you guys having a backup plan.

Yoxheimer what was the proposal for the benefit of the audience.

McClain Klaciks, who are the auditors for the Township, they are able to offer a bookkeeping service, because I am leaving January 9th. With the close proximity of trying to get someone in here and train them, seems like an impossibility, but they would be willing to come here and complete payroll, bill process, data input, QuickBooks, payroll liabilities and complete quarterly reports, W-2's, W-3's, 1099's, 1096 tax stuff, that is a cost of \$3,500 a month, and you can terminate with 45 day written notice.

Yoxheimer and you have worked with Tony, so he is familiar with the Township's dealings.

McClain yes, Sonja comes and already does our taxes, I have already called them several times throughout the year. They already understand the chart of accounts. I just don't want someone to be so overwhelmed, that they end up quitting.

Yoxheimer there is probably nothing more critical in local municipal government than good management of finances. The fact we are looking to have consistently with the way our finances are being handled, no one is probably more understanding then what Tony is. It would be my recommendation that at least for the time being.....when would he start Amanda?

McClain I facilitated the audit to be done that first full week of January so they would be here to finish my financial year and do all the taxes, make sure W-2's and 1099's are done, and then they would continue on. The 5th is a payroll, I would be here for that, but then starting the next payroll, but then they would also be responsible for getting bills done if the person has an issue with that.

Peters I think it is a good step.

Strouse, Jr. I think it would be overwhelming for a new person with all the tax stuff.

MOTION made by Peters to approve the Klaciks quote for payroll/bookkeeping services at \$3,500 a month, to start January 1st and continue for 6 months unless terminated. Seconded by Stender, Jr. and passed unanimously.

McClain 2 quick things, can you Randy and Tom stay after the meeting to sign some of the ordinances and resolutions so we can get that to codification.

Yoxheimer yes, we can do that.

McClain and the only 2 people I didn't hear from about interviews, were Clay and Montie, are you guys coming?

Rowe yes, I will be here, I have print outs of the applications.

Peters I won't get there until 5:30

Police Department: (Report on File)

- **Vehicle Purchase:** you had tabled the purchase of the new vehicle until after budget, so I wanted to see where you guys were with that. Wanted to see if you wanted to approve the purchase, this would be out of Capital funds. The total for the truck Sunbury Motors on a CoStar bid is \$50,730 for the truck and then the outfitting would be \$17,182 with all the emergency equipment. This would be to replace the 2018 explorer. Which puts us on that 7 year rotation of replacing the unmarked car.

Yoxheimer you said truck, what type of vehicle is this now?

Herring its an F150

Yoxheimer so you are going to a pickup truck?

Herring yes, with the evidence kit that I built I am looking to have a pull out tray and drive everything we have right there to a scene, not have to use our personal vehicles to take it down or have to get a trailer or have them slopping around in the backseats on the plastic seats.

Yoxheimer will this vehicle be used for regular patrol?

Herring it would be as well, it would be unmarked. Essential it would operate the same way that our unmarked does now, in addition to it being able to take everything to a scene.

Strouse, Jr. how often do you need an evidence kit?

Herring we use it fairly regularly.

Strouse, Jr. when was the last time?

Herring 2 weeks ago when we pulled stuff out.

Stender, Jr. couldn't you just haul it in an explorer.

Herring everything we have built out, we are breaking into pieces, like stackable kits, everything from finger printing, fingerprint lifting, its all in stackable rollable kits that we can take right to the

scene, they would be too tall in the explorer. Ideally could it be done, yes, certainly, but it is certainly not as convenient or the wear and tear on the vehicle.

Yoxheimer I am assuming it is a crew cab truck? (**Herring** yes) it will have a full interior cage in it?

Herring no, with this, I am looking to do a no cage, with the availability of sending people to training and have that adaptability if someone would have someone in custody, we have 3 other vehicles with cages. The State Police are going away from it with not being able to get to your prisoner quick in enough with the cage.

Strouse, Jr. what is the difference in cost between a pickup and a car?

Herring about \$4,000. I also looked at the Dodge Ram pickups that are \$4,000 cheaper, however they are not pursuit rated. The way it is cycled in patrol, it is not used as much as the marked cars.

Peters how does it work out budgetarily?

Yoxheimer yes, what did we decide?

Herring this would have been an out right purchase, not in the budget.

Yoxheimer and the funds for this would be taken from? General or Capital?

Herring Amanda, that was capital, correct?

McClain yes, capital. Ask Jared, it's his road money.

Rowe I'd like to see the officers have what they need.

MOTION made by Rowe to approve the capital purchase of the F150 truck for PD. Seconded by Yoxheimer and passed unanimously.

- Resolution 2025-09/LSA Grant: this would be supporting me to submit for the LSA Grant for the 2 marked cars.

Yoxheimer we have an LSA for Neitz. I am not sure what the politics are, but I guess the question is, even within this municipality, do we want to prioritize what LSA grants we apply for. I am suspicious of whether a single municipality will get multiple LSA Grants and essential would be a competition if it will go to the police department or the road department.

Wehry not the LSA for Neitz Road.

Yoxheimer yes, I know that, I mean for any future grants.

Wehry he will be applying for the LSA grant for calendar year 2027. We wont be applying for anything until 2028.

Herring I had already gotten Board approval in September, this is just the Resolution.

Yoxheimer yes, I realize that, I just got to thinking about it.

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to approve Resolution 2025-09 in order for Herring to submit for the LSA Grant for 2 new cars. Seconded by Peters and passed unanimously.

Herring Montie, the truck on route 11 is no longer there, County has been notified, there are no parking signs, so that has been taken care of. Also, from the Luther Savdige, I received \$3,038.94 which we used for rifle vests to replace the ones that were from the 80's, that were old.

Fire Department: (No Report)

Fire Police: (No Report)

EMA: (No Report)

Engineer: (No Report)

Road Department: (Reports on File)

- Stone for berms at Kapp Heights: this is for along the Kapp Heights stormwater project, estimating 50 ton or so, to fill that in, \$27 a ton, so about \$1,400.

MOTION made by Yoxheimer to approve the purchase of stone for berms at Kapp Heights, 50 ton or so, around \$1,400. Seconded by Peters and passed unanimously.

Wehry before we talk about Leed St, I would like to talk about UGI putting in a gas main up to the Janas Food. Did you all get my email last week? Spoke to UGI again today, they would like to get moving on this as soon as possible.

Yoxheimer apparently the Company that has moved in there where the old River Run Foods was, is needing a bigger gas service.

Wehry yes, they are currently sucking UGI's main dry.

Yoxheimer they are looking to dig a trench from 405 up into that facility.

Wehry they are looking to go up to the upper parking lot, that is where they are going to make their entry. The current service is coming in between 2 houses from up around the cul-de-sac at Blue Hill. When UGI reached out to me, it got my wheels turning, is this an opportunity for the Township to work with maybe UGI and Janas to fix a road that maybe we weren't looking to fix anytime soon. UGI is handling the installation, and they are covering all the cost. So, I didn't know if, they were asking what the Board would require for restoration, 2-foot trench, 1 foot cutback, or half width or full width. I met Todd and Recon Construction end of last week, we discussed possible options, I don't have estimates back yet. My thought was we could approach Janas about maybe contributing to fix the lower section of Blue Hill, pave/rebuild since it benefits them with having trucks go in and out of there.

Strouse, Jr. what are they making there that they need more gas?

Wehry UGI told me they but in bigger boilers in, bigger furnaces, they put all this stuff in and then realized they don't have the gas to supply it.

Peters they are making airplane meals

Strouse, Jr. they were making spaghetti sauce

Wehry so maybe reaching out to them to see if they would want to contribute to that, and the Township would finish paving through the whole neighborhood.

Yoxheimer what Todd said was that the most expensive part of a paving project is mobilization, getting equipment, doing the job. If would partner with Janas and UGI on this, we could probably look to whoever the contractor is that gets the bid for this, because it is a bigger project, it would drive the overall cost of everything down. It would give us the ability to get more work done because they are already on site. I think this would give us some headway on an area that may not be on our radar. This is just preliminary, it will most likely be dependent on cost. Where are they looking to do this?

Wehry they are looking to get it done as soon as they can, in the next month or 2. No plants will be open, so they won't be able to pave this year.

(Discussion ensued)

(Yoxheimer mentioned Lahrs Road and that they haven't forgotten about that road)

Wehry oh, did you want to talk about Leed Street?

Yoxheimer yes, one of the sections that didn't get completed with the Kapp Heights stormwater project was Leed Street. It does have stormwater issues and paving issues, there was some sewer work done there. I talked to Todd about coming up with a preliminary project there. Not to be done now, in the next few years. The thought is to have the design done, then we are ready when we can get it done.

Sewage Enforcement Officer: *(Report on file)*

Toth 2 inspections that when in on a repair for malfunction on Mirkwood Lane, 2 soil profiles at 2 different times. The first one was done on the wrong property, on Hummels Saw Mill Road, went back did the other one and then we will do the perc. Under planning on 215 Old Danville Road there was 3 soil profiles done and 3 perc tests on an individual by the name of Latsha, who is working with Colescott is looking at creating 2 additional lots.

- Appoint new SEO: **Yoxheimer** Bill sat in on interviews that the Board did for a new SEO, we did 3 interviews. The one we felt the experience perhaps would be an issue. The other 2, one was a gentlemen named McDeavitt, and the other Mike Brown. One of the things we thought would be valuable is if we would have the ability to reach out to some of their clients, just to see how things are going. I had Amy get a hold of them, when she talked to McDeavitt, Amy, he basically said that he has withdrawing his name? (*Hoffman yes*) so I am not quite sure what his concern was, I would think of he is working with somebody just to have a quick call and say hey, how is that working out, is certainly not too much to ask.

Hoffman just for clarification, he didn't have a problem with you doing that per say, but just like at an resume, he wanted to be able to give you a list of those clients to call, he didn't want you randomly calling people that he may not work with on a regular basis.

Yoxheimer and I am not quite sure why that is a problem. If you give names, you know they are going to give names of those that are going to support you.

Hoffman that's what you do when you provide references on a resume.

Yoxheimer Brown did provide his client list of 4 people, so it looks like we are down to 1 person. He comes well recommended from Bill, he interviewed well. We will call and check with his clients. So we will table the decision right now. One of the advantages to Brown, he is also a soil scientist. I will let Bill explain that a little.

(*Toth explained how a soil scientist can help with issues in the Township*)

Zoning/Code Enforcement Officer: (*Report on File*)

Zoning permits issued for: 1025 King St – Garage addition; 380 Stone School Rd – 800sq foot pole Building & 3 car home with basement; Blue Hill – Replace 12x32 shed; Car port – 1079 Susquehanna Trail. Enforcement records are on file.

Planning Commission: (*No Report*)

Recreation: (*No Report*)

Wehry the park is closed for winter.

Sewer Authority: (*No Report*)

- Appoint New Member: still looking for a new member.

Other Business:

General Public Comments/Resident Concerns:

- Bonnie Troxell-Swale Concerns: **J. Troxell** we have presented some material that we have been talking about for some time. Back in 1988, there was a lot of complaints because some of the people on Spruce Hollow Road were having water issues because of the Roush Road development, there was a swale put in, and unfortunately does not seem to be working. Still continues to have a lot of water come down through there. Some of the people here tonight have experienced it with water in their basements, wash their driveways out, and all sorts of stuff. According to the easement agreement that was drawn up and signed, the Township was supposed to be maintaining that. To my knowledge since that was put in, in 1989, there has not been any maintenance to the swale. So, it has gotten worse. That whole field is zoned residential. Public water runs through there; it has access to public sewer. It is a problem. We would like to revisit the easement agreement.

Yoxheimer this is all on private property, correct? (*J. Troxell yes*) just for that fact alone, that should indicate some of the issues the Township would have with that. Some history on that area, the Roush Development was put in during the 50's and 60's which would have been prior to any land

development or stormwater ordinances. The developers that put that in, gave no account for stormwater, because of the size of the development and location, the water migrates down. I am not certain whether it was the responsibility of the Township to interject itself into that whole process at the time. Looking at it now and the way we do things, it would be a civil issue between you and the people on the hill moving their stormwater down. I think the Supervisors view at that time; I think the thought was if the Township could try and control some of the stormwater migration, in the view nothing was done by the developer at the time, they would go ahead and do it. Typically, the township doesn't work on private property, that falls to the landowners. I think even though it wasn't the Townships' responsibility, they wanted to step in and help if they could. If the road hadn't been put in, it would have flowed naturally to where it needed to go. They put a pipe in, but frankly over the years there probably have been some maintenance issues that could have been addressed. Obviously it is wooded wetlands, and to the large extent the swale went away. Is that a good summarization of where we are now.

J. Troxell to a degree. We have tried to maintain the ditch along Spruce Hollow. PennDOT claims no responsibility for it because the easement they have is a cartwheel width, 6 inches.

Yoxheimer it was probably a cart way width, in other words it was 2 lays of traffic

Strouse, Jr. they are clear to the end of their right of way.

J. Troxell so basically when you get off the macadam, you're dropping in the ditch. There is a lot of water/mud coming through that. So, the pipes are clogged. They claim no responsibility for clearing those. We don't have the equipment to do that.

Peters upstream from all of this. It has been wet in there. Where does the swale run?

Unidentified resident it runs through my back yard. I have been dealing with it for 30 years, I am used to it. 4 or 5 times a year I would call Jimmy Neitz to push the stone back up into my driveway, pay him \$100, I learned to live with it. I bought the place in 1996, the trees in that swale were not there yet. I think the first year I was there, Jimmy came and opened it up. (**Strouse, Jr.** what swale is that?) the one right behind my house.

Strouse, Jr. then that isn't the one that the Township put in.

P. Troxell yes, it is, the Township put in 2.

(multiple people talking at the same time)

P. Troxell explained where the swales were and what he had cleaned out.

(Discussion/explanations ensued)

Shoch I spoke to the engineer on the way here. I looked at the easement. The thing I couldn't figure out was why is the Township involved in this, because typically under the law, water is considered, they refer to it in common law, as a common enemy, and the person who is putting water on someone else's property, if you are putting it onto someone else's property, and you have either increased the volume or redirected it, and is now suddenly causing damage to your neighbor who is down stream of you, you can be held liable for that, but that is a civil action between property owners. I did see the easement, and the easement in and of itself while it gives the Township the ability to go onto the property to put the swale in, and it also says to the extent to the maintenance to it, that they would pay for it, it doesn't necessarily obligate them to continue to maintain it, in and of itself. I did request copies of the minutes from the office assistant for that time, I think May of 1989 which was the month the easement was drafted and that made reference to the easement the Township Solicitor at the time drafted it. There was a reference in those minutes to a prior solution, number 5 was what was proposed, and they ended up going with a different one. These were alternatives that I guess were provided by the soil conservation. I went back to those minutes and then I talked to Tom because his dad was apparently he was at the meeting, so I wanted to get some background prior to that to see. The engineer said was the Township involved because there was

some determination that they had potential of something, that was either viewed as redirecting the water or increasing volume into a certain area, that may have been because the water comes off of Church Road. So was there a determination that that road was causing some amount of redirection or diversion of the water that was now causing more damage or water accumulation onto that property, than what naturally would have occurred. The township doesn't have a reasonability, that development was put in before, it predated any subdivisions land development ordinances and stormwater. So, they didn't have the ability to dictate to anyone.

(multiple people talking/discussion ensued)

Yoxheimer I think we engage the Township engineer to come in and look at this and come up with a solution.

Unidentified resident voiced his concerns

Peters we can put a certain amount of pressure on PennDOT.

Yoxheimer if we are going to address this, like I said earlier, let's start now, over the next month or so. I know the engineer won't be available until next year. I am guessing this will be done in house over a long period, we may phase it. We hear you, we are obligated to this, not by this Board, but by a Board a long time ago.

Residents here regarding this issue: John, Bonnie, & Phillip Troxell; Frank Wicher; Tim Conrad

Unidentified resident I live on Spruce Hollow, right in front of my house, this all changed when the sewer went through, 7 or 8 years ago, they eliminated pipe on my side of the road, got rid of them, filled them in, when it rains hard there, the road is almost completely underwater. I have seen so many near head on collisions there.

Yoxheimer you are talking pipes that run parallel to the road?

Unidentified resident yes parallel, but then something happened to where it took all that water and put it across the road into the creek, that is gone, they never replaced that pipe. They replaced the pipe on one side of my property, but never did anything with the other side. That is causing a huge problem too.

Yoxheimer that will all be part of what the engineer will look into. Unless you can get the water under Spruce Hollow and into the creek, you are not going to solve anything.

McClain I would to just like to add for the record. When we had Matt Beck here for the PennDOT meeting, to map everything out. I had actually taken video of Spruce Hollow when we had a heavy rain event and flooding. It got submitted to PennDOT and it got forwarded on to the engineer who is doing all the engineer work for the Ridge Road project and the Spruce Hollow intersection. I can look again for that information and if you want to give me your info, I can pass that on to you.

J. Neitz expressed an issue she encountered with the Evan Ambulance service with receiving a bill for \$300 when her husband was transferred from Evan to Geisinger at the direction of Evan Hospital. They told her she was responsible for paying it since 911 wasn't called. She asked why when she wasn't the one that asked for him to be transferred. She went to Stender's office, and he office was able to remedy the situation. Jean was told that she was unable to get a membership at Americus because Americus told her they weren't allowed to sell her one, that they were not allowed to come to the Township.

Yoxheimer you shouldn't have to, Evan should have some working relationship with Americus that if Evan is busy and they have to send Americus, that the bill is still paid with your Evan membership.

Black the 911 center, the way it works is when the 911 call comes in, at first it is Evan that gets called, if they can't go, 911 then dispatches whoever is next on the list. Americus would be next

because they are the ambulance service that is closer. We no longer can call Danville, Danville used to cover part of the Township. That is how that works.

Peters why in her case, when Evan clearer did it, why would she call 911, they were transferring him to a different hospital.

Black she shouldn't. Evan should cover that bill because it was their decision.

Peters no kidding.

Yoxheimer if you have a membership with Evan and they can't provide service, shouldn't that be on them?

Black it would be brought back to the insurance company. Your insurance company will cover that.

Neitz insurance pays so much, the bill was like \$725, and the \$300 balance was my responsibility.

Black to me it sounds like Evan is trying to railroad the way the system is supposed to be working.

Yoxheimer this should be another Culver call.

Black they should not be charging you the \$300, you are already a member of them. 911 chooses who to call next.

Yoxheimer Montie, can you reach out to Lynda's office?

Peters you only have me for another 2 months.

Pay Bills:

MOTION made by Peters to pay the bills. Seconded by Strouse, Jr. and passed unanimously.

Adjournment:

Meeting adjourned at 9:44PM.

All motions passed by hand vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Executive Session:

List of Communications: *(On File)*

Amy Hoffman, Office Assistant

Financial Reports: *(On File)*

Amanda McClain, Office Mgr/Secretary/Treasurer