

Milford Township Board of Supervisors' Minutes
September 1, 2026 - 7:00 pm

Supervisors Present: Christian Haberle, Chair; John Mininger, Vice Chair and Timothy Johnson, Member.

Staff Present: Jeff Vey, Township Manager; Devan Ambron, Assistant Manager/Secretary/Treasurer; Todd Baldwin, Pennoni, and Kate Harper, Timoney Knox

Call to Order: Mr. Haberle called the September 1, 2026 meeting of the Milford Township Board of Supervisors to order at 7:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes: Mr. Mininger made a **MOTION** to approve the meeting minutes of August 4, 2026 as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Haberle and passed unanimously.

Financial Report: Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to approve the current invoices and Treasurers Report of July 2026. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mininger and passed unanimously.

2027 Minimum Municipal Obligation. Mr. Johnson made a **MOTION**, seconded by Mr. Mininger, to approve payment of the 2027 Minimum Municipal Obligation for the Non-Uniform Pension Fund in the amount of \$124,330. The motion passed unanimously.

Announcements:

Mr. Haberle announced the Board of Supervisors met in executive session prior to this meeting to discuss real estate, potential litigation, and personnel. Mr. Haberle further announced there will be an agenda change to address routine business prior to the three scheduled Public Hearings.

Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Kravitsky announced the Zoning Hearing Board will meet on Tuesday, September 8, 2026 at 7:00 p.m. to hear the application of Steve Wehr, 1601 Sleepy Hollow Road, TMP No. 23-002-058-004, for a variance from Section 404.B.1.b to permit a side yard setback of 3 feet for the construction of a garage addition, where a 25-foot side yard setback is required.

Public Works Departmental Report/Traffic Study at Grant and Allentown Road/Bid 4 Line Painting, Salt Contract. Mr. Todd presented the August 2026 Public Works Departmental Report. Mr. Todd reported the Public Works Department completed the Rosenberger Road project in just 18 days. 700 feet of the old roadway was excavated out to install new road base. It was then paved with 25mm base, and overlayed with a 9.5mm topcoat. The new roadway is raised and widened to handle the large trucks that use it regularly. There were two cross pipes replaced, and an inlet box was installed. New road signs were also installed. The topsoil along the roadway was graded, and the roadside ditches were shaped to handle stormwater. Routine road maintenance continued throughout the Township. Grass was mowed along Township roadways, and potholes were patched as needed. Dead and dangerous trees were removed from multiple roads, including Benner School Road, Starr Road, and Walnut Lane. Benner School Road was also boom mowed and chipped because it had become overgrown with vegetation. Camp Skymount Road had brush cut back in a difficult curve to improve visibility and allow drivers to better see oncoming traffic. The storm basin pipe at Barrel Run had become filled with dirt and sediment and was cleaned out to restore drainage. At Molasses Creek Park, trees along the walking trail were trimmed, brickwork was completed at the butterfly garden, and repairs were made to the park's water fountain. The splash pad continues to operate well and remains a popular park attraction. At Unami Park, trees along the trail were trimmed, stumps from previously removed trees were ground out, and those areas regraded with topsoil. Fernbrook Park required large equipment to safely and efficiently clear fallen and tangled trees on the trail caused by storms. Maintenance work has also continued at the old Spinnerstown schoolhouse. Rotten wood around the windows is being replaced to help preserve the building and prevent further damage. Mr. Mininger asked what the status of Bauman and Allentown Road is. Mr. Todd said a meeting is to be scheduled. Mr. Vey stated it is in PennDOT's hands. Mr. Todd stated PennDOT has reached out regarding the township's interest in a 4-way stop at Grant and Allentown Road. If there is an interest the township will need to approve the request for a traffic study. Mr. Vey stated there have been problems there for a long time.

Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to approve the request for a traffic study for a 4-way stop sign at the intersection of Grant and Allentown Road.

Mr. Todd reported 1 bid was received from Zone Striping for line painting on various roads throughout the township which includes white fog lines and double yellow lines. The double yellow bid amount is \$37,416.60 and white fog lines is \$18,158.40. Mr. Haberle asked how much of the township the line painting would cover and if this is a multi-year plan to continue. Mr. Todd stated the roads are painted every 3-5 years with some roads needing repairs on the edges prior to painting fog lines. Some are faded and some don't have lines at all. Mr. Mininger asked for an estimation of the total roadways. Mr. Todd said this will cover less than 20%. Mr. Haberle asked if this was the price that was anticipated. Mr. Todd said it was. The last bid received was for \$.19 per foot and this bid was \$.13 for double yellow and \$.12 for white fog line.

Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to accept and award the Line Painting Bid to Zone Striping Inc. The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson and passed unanimously.

2026-2027 Sodium Chloride Contract. Mr. Todd reported the 2026-2027 Salt Contract has been received. The bid for Bucks County was awarded to Riverside Construction Materials, Inc. with a cost of \$75.00 per ton. Mr. Todd stated we will use the initial fill, and we are required to order 1,000 tons prior to October 31, 2026.

Mr. Mininger made a **MOTION** to accept and approve the 2026-2027 Sodium Chloride Contract awarded to Riverside Construction Materials, Inc. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Hearings:

Conditional Use. D.R. Horton Inc., Brookfield Subdivision, West Pumping Station Road & Old Bethlehem Pike, TMP Nos. 23-015-036, 23-015-037, and 23-015-039. B6 Performance Standard Subdivision of 106 single family detached dwellings. Applicant has requested a continuation to September 1, 2026. Mrs. Harper stated that this was a Conditional Use Hearing for D.R. Horton, Inc. to develop 106 single-family dwellings on approximately 126 acres. The applicant was represented by counsel. Mrs. Harper identified the exhibits as follows: Exhibit T-1, Proof of Publication from the *Town & Country*; Exhibit T-2, Milford Township Planning Commission Memorandum; Exhibit A-1, a copy of the Conditional Use Application; and Exhibit A-2, the Gilmore letter dated August 21, 2026. Mr. Fox of Obermayer Rebmann Maxwell & Hoppel LLP, attorney for the applicant, entered his appearance. Mr. Tallman, DR Horton, distributed the applicant's exhibit package. The package included Tab 1, a three-dimensional aerial rendering; Tab 2, a rendered site plan; Tab 3, the record and landscaping plan; Tab 4, the West Pumping Station Road Concept Plan; and Tab 5, the Transportation Impact Study. Mr. Fox summarized the application which includes the proposal for a B6 Performance Standard Subdivision, which is permitted by Conditional Use. One of the specific Conditional Use requirements is that the applicant demonstrate to the Board of Supervisors that the traffic impacts of the development have been addressed. The traffic engineers have been working with Township staff and the Planning Commission to address traffic concerns. The proposed improvements at Old Bethlehem Pike and East Swamp Road are intended to mitigate cut-through traffic by providing a connection to Old Bethlehem Pike. Mr. Fox asked whether there were any questions regarding the application in general. No questions were heard. Mr. Fox called John Tallman, Entitlement Manager for D.R. Horton and the individual responsible for the Brookfield project, as the first witness. Mr. Tallman confirmed that the agreement of sale with Quakertown Community School District and the Arch Dioceses of Philadelphia, for the property needed for the connector road, is in process and that the related contracts are being worked on. Using the rendering in Tab 2, Mr. Tallman provided an overview of the Brookfield subdivision. He stated that the subdivision is generally configured in a horseshoe shape, with an entrance and exit on either side of West Pumping Station Road. The proposal includes 106 single-family dwellings and one existing residence on the property. Mr. Fox asked whether an anticipated condition requiring construction of the connector road would be acceptable to D.R. Horton. Mr. Tallman stated that it would. Mr. Fox asked whether extensive walking trails were proposed. Mr. Tallman stated yes that extensive walking trails were proposed. Mr. Fox stated that a pedestrian trail was also anticipated along the connection to West Pumping Station Road. Mr. Fox noted the applicant had attended the previous week's Planning Commission meeting, where a recommendation for approval was made. He noted that work remained to be completed on the Land Development Plan and that additional information was needed regarding sump pumps and on-lot stormwater management systems. Mr. Fox stated that, based on his experience, the property was suitable for 106 homes. Mr. Tallman agreed and stated that the proposed density was low for the size of the property. Mr. Fox asked whether the applicant was requesting any zoning or SALDO relief. Mr. Tallman stated that no zoning or SALDO relief was being requested. Mr. Fox asked whether, other than the requested waivers, D.R. Horton would comply with all other applicable requirements. Mr. Tallman stated that it would. Mrs. Harper asked whether the applicant had additional witnesses. Mr. Fox stated that an engineer and two traffic engineers would be presenting. Mr. Haberle provided a brief explanation of the distinction between the Conditional Use and Land Development processes. Mrs. Harper stated that the Land Development Plan was currently under review and that all SALDO requirements would continue to apply even if the Board of Supervisors granted Conditional Use approval. The applicant would still need to request any applicable waivers. She explained that the Conditional Use process addresses the larger issues associated with the proposed development, including off-site traffic improvements, the connector road, and other traffic improvements. Mr. Kutz stated that Gilmore had prepared the plans and that no additional zoning relief was anticipated at this time. Before addressing the traffic concerns, Mr. Kutz reviewed the B6 performance requirements under Section 502. Mr. Fox asked about the minimum open space requirement of 55 percent. Mr. Kutz stated that the plan provides approximately 72.6 acres of gross open space, compared with the required 64.7 acres. After accounting for utility lines, approximately 67.9 acres would remain as open space. Mr. Fox asked about the maximum density of 1.3 units per acre. Mr. Kutz stated that the maximum would be approximately 152 units and that the proposed 106 units are well below that limit. The maximum impervious coverage is 18% and the proposed plan provides approximately 13.3%. He stated that, from a development-impact standpoint, the proposal is less intensive than what could otherwise be permitted. Mr. Kutz stated that maintaining this lower-intensity approach was one of the goals of the design. Mr. Fox asked whether the development is adjacent to the VC-2 District. Mr. Kutz confirmed that it is and stated that the property exceeds 50 acres and meets the applicable requirements. Mr. Kutz reviewed Section 404 and stated that a development of this size, consisting of between one and 150 dwellings, is permitted to have one dwelling type. He reviewed the off-street parking requirements and noted that each home will have two garage spaces and two driveway parking spaces. The parking information is included with the Land Development Application. He also noted that, pursuant to the parking note on the plan, deed restrictions would prevent garage spaces from being converted to other uses. Mr. Kutz reviewed the dimensional requirements and stated that the minimum lot area is 10,000 square feet and that all lots meet or exceed the applicable front and rear yard requirements. He further stated that the maximum impervious coverage requirement for individual lots is met and that each lot complies with the B6 use regulations. Mr. Fox referenced the QAPC review and stated that the plan had been reviewed by the

BCPC and QAPC. He asked whether the proposed development, including the proposed traffic and pedestrian connectivity, was in the best interest of the Township and the public. Mr. Kutz stated that the proposed improvements would help mitigate existing conditions on East Swamp Road, which has a narrow cartway and currently provides through access. He stated that the plan includes a connection along the eastern property line and provides the potential for a future extension of Portzer Road into Richland Marketplace. He noted that the proposed connection was excluded from the open space calculations. Mr. Fox asked about the general health, safety, and welfare impacts of the development, noting that the property is currently used for agriculture and does not require stormwater management or sediment and erosion control in its current condition. Mr. Fox asked what the anticipated impact would be after the proposed stormwater management systems are fully implemented. Mr. Kutz stated that converting the property from tilled agricultural fields to a combination of lawn and meadow areas should result in less erosion and runoff. He stated that the proposed stormwater management system would further reduce runoff and that less stormwater would leave the property. He noted that the proposed system would need to be reviewed and approved by DEP, the Township Engineer, and the Bucks County Conservation District. Mr. Fox asked whether, considering all of these factors, the proposal would constitute a substantial improvement to the area. Mr. Kutz stated that it would and that the development fits the property well. He explained that the intent was to keep the subdivision toward the eastern portion of the property while preserving the environmental areas. Mr. Kutz then provided an overview of the three-dimensional aerial renderings. Existing trees and hedgerows are proposed to remain, and West Pumping Station Road would be realigned. The location of the intersection is being coordinated with the development engineer to provide access to Route 663. The plan also shows a trail network through the development, including a crossing at the St. Isidore driveway. The applicant will work with the appropriate parties to determine the best point of access. Mr. Fox stated that one of the Conditional Use requirements is that the development be in harmony with the surrounding area. He asked whether the rendering depicted how the development would function and operate and whether it demonstrated harmony with the surrounding area. Mr. Kutz stated that it did. Mr. Fox asked whether the development was designed to comply with the Township's ordinances. Mr. Kutz stated that it was, subject to the requested waivers and Conditional Use approval. Mr. Fox asked what recreational facilities D.R. Horton would be willing to provide in addition to the pedestrian trails. Mr. Kutz stated that the applicant is considering the existing open field areas for grading to provide flat, maintained lawn areas for residents. He stated that three primary areas are proposed for active play. These areas would be maintained by the homeowners' association and would remain private facilities. Mr. Kutz then reviewed the proposed stormwater management system. He stated that the system consists of two main facilities, including a wet pond and spray irrigation system and a detention basin. The wet pond would contain water year-round and provide stormwater storage. Water would not be released directly to the right-of-way. Instead, the system is designed to detain the water and control its release. Mr. Kutz explained that approximately 24 hours after a storm event, water would flow for up to six days through spray heads located in an open-space area. Aqua Mist is the designer. The system would account for the slopes and soil conditions and would spray only the amount of water that can be removed through infiltration and evaporation. Mr. Fox stated that the development would be served by public water and that the only material being sprayed would be stormwater. He compared the system to a sprinkler system on a golf course. He stated that the system would be maintained by the homeowners' association and would not be offered for dedication to the Township. The maintenance obligation would remain with the property owner. An Operation and Maintenance Agreement would give the Township the right to enter the property and make necessary repairs, but would not obligate the Township to perform maintenance. Mr. Haberle stated that there were several questions that might be better addressed by the engineer. He noted that the proposed stormwater systems were intended to serve multiple owners and that individual lots would have their own systems. Mr. Haberle expressed concern about the condition of the system 15 years into the future if it failed and the homeowners' association was no longer functioning. He asked how the Township and surrounding residents would be protected if the system or homeowners' association failed. Mr. Fox suggested that a condition could require a significant reserve to be maintained to ensure that sufficient funds are available for maintenance. He stated that the budget and supporting documents could be provided. He noted that the system would have to be designed and approved and that the reserve could be incorporated into the homeowners' association budget. Mr. Haberle suggested that an engineer's analysis could address the reserve requirement and stated that he would allow the Solicitor to work through the issue. Mr. Vey asked about the capital reserve and whether the reserve would remain with the responsible entity. He asked, in the event of a failure or default, how the Township would access the funds and ensure that the funds remained available. Mr. Fox stated that the requirement could be incorporated into the planned community documents. He stated that there would be limitations on amendments without Township approval, providing an additional layer of protection. Once recorded, the provisions could not be amended without the required approval. Mrs. Harper asked whether the declaration would be recorded against all of the lots. Mr. Fox confirmed that it would and stated that all property owners would be aware of the requirements. Mr. Haberle asked about the spray irrigation system and whether there would be filtration. Mr. Kutz stated that there would be filtration. All inflows would pass through the wet pond and filter berm. The berm would provide sufficient length and width to allow sediment to settle out and nutrients to remain. He stated that the system would be designed in accordance with the BMP Manual. Mr. Johnson asked whether there would be a collection box at the end of the system with a float measurement to gauge the depth of the pond. Mr. Kutz stated that there would be a submerged pump intake structure at the bottom of the pond and that the electrical components would be located in a vault. Mr. Johnson asked whether there was an estimate of the annual maintenance costs. Mr. Kutz stated not at this time. Mr. Haberle asked whether the six-day drawdown period accounted for conditions when the ground is frozen and runoff occurs during the winter. Mr. Kutz stated that winter conditions would be handled differently. The lines would be flushed, and water would be sprayed at the same rate around the outlet structure to the existing storm sewer leading to East Swamp Road. The water would be pumped slowly over the six-day period, with the release system closely managed. Mr. Fox asked why the proposed system was preferable to a managed-release system. Mr. Kutz explained

that the proposed approach is an alternative stormwater management method. A managed-release system would require detention and release of the water at a very slow rate, without obtaining the same infiltration or volume removal. In an area with flooding concerns, the proposed system also seeks to remove water through evapotranspiration. Mr. Johnson asked why more ponds could not be used given the amount of open space on the property. Mr. Kutz stated that the topography includes uphill slopes and that additional ponds would be closer to existing residences. The design seeks to keep the stormwater facilities farther away from existing residences. Mr. Johnson asked whether the pond was primarily intended for evaporation. Mr. Kutz stated that he would not characterize it that way. He explained that natural ponds are part of the area's hydrology and provide habitat, and that the design is intended to replicate those functions. Mr. Johnson asked whether water could be pumped from one pond to another. Mr. Kutz stated that he did not know what that would accomplish. Mr. Johnson stated that doing so could provide a larger area for evaporation. Mr. Kutz stated that evaporation also occurs through the spray irrigation system. Mr. Haberle asked how much of the walking path and active play areas would be sprayed with water. Mr. Kutz stated that the proposed areas would be sprayed overnight to allow time for infiltration. He clarified that the system would not operate continuously and that spraying would be incremental and occasional. He stated that he was not certain that the spray field within the open space was the best combination of uses. Mrs. Harper asked whether soil testing had been conducted and whether the results showed that the soil would not naturally infiltrate water. Mr. Kutz stated that approximately 70 to 80 tests had been conducted, with approximately seven showing infiltration. Most of the tests showed zero infiltration. Testing was performed at depths of approximately one to two feet, which was insufficient to support a conventional infiltration system. Mrs. Harper stated that this was the reason the applicant was proposing the current system. Mr. Kutz agreed and stated that the managed-release concept presented its own issues. He also referenced capture-and-reuse as another potential approach but stated that he believed the proposed approach was more appropriate for the property. Mr. Mininger stated that DEP prefers spray irrigation over managed release. Mr. Kutz agreed. Mr. Haberle asked whether spray irrigation is identified as a BMP. Mr. Kutz stated that it is not specifically listed in the SALDO and explained that the SALDO provisions address larger retention facilities. Mr. Haberle stated that DEP could determine whether managed release might be a potential alternative if spray irrigation were not feasible at the site and asked whether a different design could reduce impervious coverage and thereby reduce the amount of stormwater requiring management. Mr. Kutz stated that he did not believe so because some type of stormwater facility would still be required. He explained that the entire site must be evaluated as though it were meadowland. He stated that the design is within approximately two-thirds of the zoning allowance and that the applicant had attempted to reduce impervious coverage while maintaining a design that fits the character of the property. Mr. Haberle asked whether there was a drawing showing the spray irrigation system. Mr. Kutz stated not at this time and the locations are shown generally, and additional detail would be provided in a more straightforward plan. Sandy Koza, Professional Traffic Engineer and Operations Engineer for Bowman, was introduced. Ms. Koza stated that she prepared the Traffic Impact Study, which was reviewed by SAFE, Township Traffic Engineer, and that she had numerous discussions with Joe Fiocca from SAFE. Ms. Koza stated that the review focused on the design of the roads, including the internal road and extension of West Pumping Station Road, roadway width, and speed limits. She stated that one consideration was the installation of speed humps or cushions at the St. Isidore section and also measures on East Swamp Road, on the remaining portion, were also being considered as a means of helping to reduce cut-through traffic. Mr. Fox asked whether he correctly recalled that there had also been discussion of visual barriers along East Swamp Road to make the road appear less direct. Ms. Koza confirmed that this had been discussed. Mr. Fox asked whether there were any recommendations or comments that would create problems during the Land Development process. Ms. Koza stated that there were none. Mr. Fox asked whether the proposed connector road would be an improvement for overall traffic safety in the area. Ms. Koza stated that it would help reduce speeds and would provide a long-term roadway connection, including a future connection to the area of the proposed Milford Village and Route 663 connection. Mr. Mininger asked about the proposed speed humps and whether they should be 25-mph humps rather than the proposed 10-to-25-mph humps. Ms. Koza stated that she would work with the traffic engineer and fire officials regarding the appropriate design. Ms. Koza discussed the design of access points and pedestrian connections in the St. Isidore area and stated that the applicant was willing to address those improvements. Brian Arman, a licensed traffic engineer and operations engineer for Bowman, was introduced. Mr. Arman stated that his office had designed the plan shown in Tab 4 and reviewed the permitting process for the connecting road. He stated that a PennDOT permit would be required to connect the roadway to Old Bethlehem Pike. PennDOT would review the connection to ensure that traffic considerations are addressed. Milford Township would be a co-applicant for the permit. Mr. Fox requested that the exhibits be marked as part of the record and requested favorable consideration of the Conditional Use application. Mr. Haberle asked whether there were any public comments. Christy Anderson stated that traffic traveling toward Route 309 from the Target shopping center had been considered. She stated that drivers may prefer to travel toward Route 309, which could make it more difficult to make a left turn. Ms. Koza stated that this issue was included in the traffic study. She explained that improvements could not be made to someone else's driveway and that the driveway is located in another municipality. Mary Ann Bartholomew stated that she had questions regarding water and traffic. She also expressed concerns regarding the homeowners' association's responsibility for maintaining the wet pond and Aqua Mist system, particularly if the homeowners' association were no longer functioning. Ms. Bartholomew stated that she lives on Clover Lane and expressed concern regarding the effect of grading and the proposed development on Clover Lane. She recalled that when Target and BJ's were developed, flooding occurred on the property, requiring underground piping. She also stated that mulch washed down the hillside and that rocks were subsequently installed. Ms. Bartholomew asked whether the wet pond, Aqua Mist irrigation system, and retention facility were two separate ponds. Mr. Kutz stated that the grading relative to Clover Lane and any potential impacts would be mitigated. He stated that Clover Lane is farther north and a considerable distance from the proposed development. He explained that, from a drainage standpoint, the only possible contributing area would be the transition from the agricultural field to lawn,

meadow, and a small trail. He stated that D.R. Horton had conducted extensive investigations in the area, including mapping rock encountered during the Target development, and that the plan attempted to follow the existing grade. He noted that Clover Lane is hundreds of feet away. Mr. Bartholomew stated that Target and BJ's are even farther away and that drainage issues had still occurred. He asked about the locations of the retention pond, wet pond, and Aqua Mist system. Mr. Kutz stated that the facilities would be located in the southeast corner, just west of where Portzer Road is proposed and the outflow would be piped underground to the existing system. Mr. Bartholomew asked whether both ponds would have fencing or other protection. Mr. Kutz stated that he did not know whether fencing was shown on the latest layout. He stated that the depth would be reviewed and that he did not anticipate an issue with fencing the facilities. Mr. Bartholomew asked about the connector road through the St. Isidore area, including whether the road would continue to be called Pumping Station Road and whether it would become a township road. Mr. Kutz stated that no decision had been made regarding the road name. He stated that the intent is for the road to be dedicated to the Township following construction. Mr. Bartholomew asked whether the speed limit would remain 25 mph on Pumping Station Road and the connector road. Mr. Kutz stated that the intent discussed with the Township traffic engineer was for a 30-mph speed limit. The intent was to balance traffic safety without establishing a speed limit so low that motorists would remain on East Swamp Road. He stated that the goal was not to promote excessive speed. Mr. Bartholomew asked whether speed humps would be installed on the portion of road between East Swamp Road and the connector road. Mr. Kutz confirmed that they would. Mr. Bartholomew cautioned the Township about relying on a homeowners' association to maintain the stormwater system. He stated that homeowners' associations can experience situations where residents become dissatisfied and do not pay their assessments, and he expressed concern about relying on the association to maintain the irrigation system. He also stated that he did not understand the need to spray the water and asked whether the spray system would have any effect on the water table. He noted that underground springs are present in the area and asked whether the system could affect the springs that supply nearby wells. Mr. Kutz stated that extensive geotechnical studies had been conducted. He explained that perched water tables were present in some locations but not throughout the property. He acknowledged that springs could be present and stated that the spray irrigation system would distribute water over a large area. Mrs. Harper asked Mr. Kutz whether the proposed development would be served by public water and sewer. Mr. Kutz confirmed that it would. Gary Bender of Sleepy Hollow Road asked whether, if the proposed development is served by public water and sewer, all properties in the surrounding area would be required to connect to public water and sewer. Mr. Vey stated that they would not. He explained that some townships require connection when public water or sewer is located within a certain distance, but Milford Township does not have that requirement. John Meyers stated that there were six or seven testing locations and that the majority of the area does not infiltrate water. He asked where the stormwater would go. He further questioned whether the proposed development would create the same issue with the houses and driveways, since the ground would not be as permeable as it is currently. Mr. Kutz explained that in the proposed development, inlets and piping would be installed throughout the roads. Swales would also be provided along the rear of most homes. He stated that an area that currently drains off-site would instead be managed as part of the stormwater system. Mr. Meyers expressed concern that the proposed stormwater system could take groundwater away from people in the area who rely on wells. Mr. Kutz stated that he did not believe that would occur. He explained that the two-year storm event generally consists of approximately two to three inches of rainfall and that this rainfall contributes to groundwater recharge. He stated that the applicant is obligated by Township and state requirements to manage the two-year storm event. Mr. Mininger discussed speed pillows as a means of allowing for enforcement and stated that the Pennsylvania State Police would not be available to sit at the location and enforce the speed limit. He also noted that the existing road is narrow and stated that if the road is not widened, it could create additional concerns. Mr. Vey stated that the Township should not take a knee-jerk approach regarding the water issue. He noted that the Township has a water ordinance applicable within 150 feet of a water main right-of-way. He stated that one property located off West Pumping Station Road may be within approximately 10 feet of the water main and that this could potentially affect that property. Mr. Haberle moved to close the Conditional Use Hearing. Mrs. Harper stated that the Board has 45 days to render a decision. She stated that a draft decision would be prepared and distributed.

Data Center Ordinance. Zoning Ordinance amendment adding High-Density Computing Systems, Data Center and Data Center Accessory Uses/Structures to the Planned Industrial (PI) Zoning District. Mr. Haberle opened the hearing at 9:00 p.m. He stated that a significant number of comments had been received regarding the draft ordinance and that the Board would not be voting on the ordinance that evening. He noted that public comments had been received and that the Board wanted to allow all members of the public an opportunity to comment. He stated that revisions to the ordinance would be necessary and that the hearing may need to be continued to another date. Mrs. Harper marked the exhibits as follows: T-1, Proof of Publication; T-2, a copy of the draft ordinance; and T-3, the Legal Notice. Mrs. Harper provided a brief description of the proposed uses and discussed the requirements of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code (MPC). She explained that the Board could regulate what uses may and may not be permitted and advised the Board regarding the preparation of an ordinance governing data centers. She stated that the Board had previously discussed permitting data centers within the PI District and that Pennsylvania law has been interpreted to require municipalities to provide for lawful uses through their zoning ordinances. She further stated that it would be preferable for the Township to adopt an ordinance permitting data centers subject to appropriate conditions and restrictions rather than have no ordinance in place. She noted that no application for a data center had been filed in the Township at this time. She stated that the ordinance had been advertised because the Board was attempting to establish appropriate regulations before an application was submitted. Mrs. Harper explained that the purpose of the data center ordinance was to establish regulations that would allow the Township to evaluate the potential impacts of a particular application. She stated that a data center would be permitted only as a

Conditional Use and would still be subject to the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO) and the Conditional Use process. The applicant would be required to demonstrate issues such as the source of water and electricity and the potential impacts on surrounding properties and residents. She advised the Board that the Township should establish a zoning category for this use. Mr. Haberle stated that he intended to review the general changes he had submitted and address questions raised prior to the hearing. He explained that the changes generally fell into three areas. The first involved wording and numbering changes that did not alter the substance of the ordinance. The second would require a closed-loop cooling system, which would limit the amount of water used by a data center. The third involved establishing different tiers for data centers based on size. Mr. Haberle explained that the first tier would include facilities up to 1.8 megawatts (MW). He noted that simply placing servers within an existing building would not necessarily require the same level of review. The second tier would include facilities between 1.8 MW and 5 MW, and the third tier would include facilities greater than 5 MW. He stated that different acreage requirements could apply based upon the size of the facility. Mr. Haberle also discussed matching the height restrictions in the proposed ordinance with those contained in the existing ordinance. He stated that these changes had not been incorporated into the ordinance being considered. He stated that one approach would be to establish different requirements based upon the size of the facility and apply additional review and management requirements to larger facilities. Mr. Mininger stated that the proposed approach sounded reasonable. Mr. Johnson agreed. Mr. Gary Bender, of Sleepy Hollow Road, stated that the summary was helpful. He asked whether the current height restriction was 35 feet. Mr. Haberle confirmed that the current height restriction was 35 feet, with a maximum of 50 feet by Special Exception. Mr. Bender stated that he was surprised the proposed setbacks were only 250 feet. He stated that he liked the three-tier approach but believed that larger-scale facilities should have setbacks of 1,000 feet. Mr. Haberle stated that larger property sizes would allow for additional changes and requirements. Mr. Bender asked whether the proposed changes would be shown as redlines in the next version of the ordinance. Mrs. Harper stated that the intent was to prepare another draft rather than provide a redlined version. She stated that the goal would be to prepare an ordinance that could be advertised. Mr. Vey noted that the setback for residential uses under the ordinance is 1,000 feet. Mr. Robert McLain of Angstadt Road thanked the Board for being proactive in addressing the issue. He stated that the discussion had answered many of his questions. He asked whether the ordinance could include a prohibition against entering into a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA). He stated that it appeared many other municipalities remained quiet on the subject and were unable to answer questions at public meetings. Mrs. Harper said that a prohibition against an NDA was not included in the current draft and that the Board would have to agree to such a provision. She stated that she would not want the Board to enter into a Non-Disclosure Agreement. Mr. Mininger said he believed this issue related to a period when municipalities in Pennsylvania were actively seeking to attract data centers. Mr. Haberle stated that he personally would not sign an NDA and asked Mrs. Harper whether the Township would be permitted to prohibit such an agreement. Mrs. Harper stated that she had heard about the issue. She was asked about the impact of Governor Shapiro's recent position concerning the issue and whether the change would affect the Township. Mrs. Harper stated that, based upon her review of the executive summary, the process would not proceed until local zoning approval had been obtained. Mr. Haberle stated that the Township should have a grid standard requiring the applicant to obtain its necessary power through the electric grid and that his preference was to require adherence to the grid. He further stated that the proposed requirements did not give the municipality additional authority to reject a use. Mr. Jerry Hertz of Walnut Lane asked what limitations the Township could impose beyond those contained in the proposed ordinance and where the legal limits of the Township's authority were. He asked whether the Township could discourage data center development and whether the requirements imposed on a data center could pose a threat to preserved open space. Mrs. Harper stated that preserved open space would not be affected. She explained that the proposed ordinance requires an applicant to demonstrate and address impacts associated with electricity, the source of electricity, water supply, impacts to groundwater, generator testing, and other issues. She stated that these matters would be addressed through the Conditional Use process. She described the proposed ordinance as a basic ordinance intended to regulate data centers. Mr. Haberle stated that, generally, once a municipality loses a legal challenge, it does not receive another opportunity to challenge the same issue. Mrs. Harper noted the intent of the ordinance was to permit a data center in the PI District subject to specific conditions. Mr. Hertz noted there are many questions and areas of uncertainty that residents were attempting to understand. Ms. Kristen Wetzel of Angstadt Road stated that her greatest concern was the potential health risks associated with data centers. She stated that, after reviewing the ordinance, it appeared that the Township had similar concerns. She was uncertain whether all of the issues of concern to her were addressed in the ordinance. Ms. Wetzel referenced the DEP's approval of two new chemical compounds and stated that the EPA, through its consent orders, had acknowledged that the chemicals could pose risks to the public and workers. She stated that it was unknown how the chemicals could become lethal and referred to them as "forever chemicals." She stated that they could enter wastewater and would be difficult and expensive to filter out. She also stated that exposure could cause cancer, neurological disorders, and other serious health effects. Mrs. Harper stated that the proposed ordinance includes a requirement for a utility impact assessment and requires information concerning wastewater characteristics. She stated that it was not known whether the chemicals referenced by Ms. Wetzel are used in data centers. Ms. Wetzel then raised a second concern regarding sound and noise. She stated that the noise provisions in the ordinance appeared to address audible noise and decibel levels but that data centers can also produce low-frequency noise that may be experienced as vibration. She stated that low-frequency noise may not be detected through standard noise testing and that there are methods available to test for low-frequency vibration. Ms. Wetzel stated that people were already reporting symptoms associated with continuous exposure to vibration. She noted that there are mitigation measures available, including changes to the facility footprint, addressing fans that create vibration, preventing vibration from traveling through the ground, increasing setbacks, and establishing larger geographic buffers between data centers and residential areas. She also stated that sound can travel through concrete and may become louder or stronger inside a residence. Mrs. Harper noted that the

draft ordinance requires an acoustical analysis based upon the applicable decibel standards and requires the impacts to be evaluated. She stated that the Township could hire its own experts to evaluate the information provided by an applicant. Ms. Wetzel asked whether the acoustical analysis would include low-frequency noise. Mr. Vey stated that the Township's ordinance addresses decibel levels, but he was not certain whether it specifically addressed low-frequency noise. Ms. Wetzel then raised a concern regarding the requirement for applicants to provide their own power and the potential use of gas-powered generators. She stated that there are reports indicating that, in some communities, generators are operating at levels significantly greater than anticipated. She referred to the previous discussion regarding generator requirements and stated that the language on Page 25 appeared to leave room for interpretation regarding what is "reasonably necessary." Mrs. Harper stated that generator testing is limited to Monday through Friday. Ms. Wetzel asked what would happen during an extended power outage if the facility needed to operate large generators, stating that this could result in significant particulate emissions. Mr. Haberle noted that Section C requires the applicant to provide a plan addressing such circumstances. Mrs. McLain of Angstadt Road stated that one of the primary issues that stood out to her was the importance of being proactive, particularly with respect to property rights and residential property values. She stated that the effects of a data center after it is constructed could negatively impact surrounding properties. She further stated that, after reviewing the ordinance, she noted that various studies and measurements would be required. She asked whether those studies would be objective or subjective and who would be responsible for paying for them. She stated that the party conducting a study could potentially influence the standards being applied and emphasized the importance of having an objective standard. She also stated that she had attempted to educate herself about data centers and identified several types, including facilities operated by a single entity, shared facilities, hyperscale facilities, edge facilities, and modular facilities. She stated that she was concerned about the offset requirements and minimum lot area requirements and about how a data center could affect surrounding properties. She referenced typical sound levels and stated that normal conversation occurs at approximately 60 decibels. She stated that this demonstrated the importance of having accurate studies. She stated that if noise continued constantly, it could significantly affect neighboring residents and referenced reported noise levels associated with data centers ranging from 80 to 110 decibels. Mrs. McLain stated that Pennsylvania has more than 100 data centers and that data centers are being proposed in many locations. She stated that she believed the issue crossed political party lines and emphasized that the residents are the people who live in the community and pay taxes. She also raised concerns regarding tax incentives offered to data center companies and asked how those incentives would affect other taxpayers. She referenced the costs associated with schools, other municipal services, and road maintenance and stated that she believed providing incentives to these companies was unfair. Mr. Haberle said he was not aware of any tax incentives being offered. Mrs. McLain asked whether the requirement to provide zoning for the use was being imposed on every township and, if so, who was imposing that requirement. Mrs. Harper stated that the requirement did not come directly from the MPC but had been interpreted to mean that municipalities must provide for lawful uses within their zoning ordinances. She explained that a developer could potentially pursue a curative amendment or validity challenge if a lawful use was completely excluded from the ordinance. Rather than subject the Township to that risk, she advised the Board to establish a location where the use could be permitted under appropriate regulations. She stated that the PI District appeared to be an appropriate location. Mrs. Harper stated that, if the Township receives an application for a data center, the Township would be prepared to review it under the regulations established in the ordinance. Mrs. McLain asked, with respect to the industrial area, how many acres would qualify for a data center. Mr. Haberle questioned whether a developer could purchase an existing facility and demolish it to construct a data center. He stated that it was difficult to determine what property would be available because that would depend on what property owners were willing to sell or redevelop. He noted that there are abandoned industrial buildings and stated that the Township was attempting to utilize existing industrial areas. He stated that the available acreage would depend on the specific property. Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Kravitsky how much acreage is located within the PI District. Mr. Kravitsky stated that there are approximately 276 acres and an additional 303 acres available within PI-zoned areas, as well as a third area containing approximately 48.69 acres. He stated that land is available within the zoning district for the proposed use. Mr. Vey clarified that the district also includes the buildings located within those areas. Ms. Christy Anderson, of Broad Street in Quakertown Borough, asked whether she could speak even though she does not reside in Milford Township. Mr. Haberle stated that this was not a problem. Ms. Anderson's first comment was regarding Section 1, Applicability, concerning payment for professional reviews. She stated that the provision should specify that the applicant will pay for all reviews deemed necessary by the Township. Mrs. Harper stated that this is the normal procedure. Ms. Anderson then addressed Development Standards, Section B. She noted that the ordinance provides for a 1,000-foot setback from an existing residential dwelling. Ms. Anderson stated that continuous audible noise from a data center cooling facility can travel 1,500 feet to more than a half-mile, while low-frequency noise can travel as far as two to two and one-half miles. She stated that, although airborne sound waves will dissipate, low-frequency vibrations below 100 Hz can travel significant distances. She explained that the longer wavelengths can pass through residential walls and double-paned windows, resulting in structural vibrations and humming that residents may experience, particularly when trying to sleep. Ms. Anderson stated that the ordinance should require a minimum 1.5-mile setback from residences for data center cooling facilities. She further noted that the ordinance does not specify the allowable decibel level or how far noise is permitted to travel. She stated that noise studies should be required and submitted to the Township for comparison and review. Ms. Anderson referenced the provision requiring a 100-foot buffer yard from certain sensitive receptors and asked what would be located beyond the 100-foot buffer. She questioned whether a data center cooling facility could be located 100 feet from a school, nursing home, or church, and whether residents would be expected to use Township parks with data center noise in the background. She stated that the ordinance should clearly establish the required setback distance. Ms. Anderson noted that preserved agricultural property is included among the sensitive receptors, which she said was appropriate, but questioned the omission of churches. She stated that the public could be disrupted by noise at a church and, at a

minimum, churches should be added to the list of sensitive receptors. Ms. Anderson then addressed Utility Infrastructure and Engineering Standards. She stated that the ordinance should include specific groundwater withdrawal standards for data center facilities because they may use substantially more water than a typical industrial facility. She recommended specific buffer distances from public and private drinking water wells within which groundwater withdrawals for data center facilities would not be permitted. Under Technical Review, Ms. Anderson noted that the ordinance states the Township "may retain" independent contractors. She recommended that the provision instead state that the Township "will retain" independent contractors to perform independent reviews and that the applicant will be responsible for the associated costs. Ms. Anderson then addressed Operational Performance Standards and stated that the ordinance should specify the exact allowable decibel level. She noted that typical noise study guidelines may evaluate noise generated during standard 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. working hours for industrial facilities. She stated that residents near data centers could experience noise 24 hours a day, seven days a week, including low-frequency noise that may not be typical of an average industrial facility. Ms. Anderson stated that data centers do not operate under what would necessarily be considered "normal conditions" and recommended that the ordinance define "normal conditions" so that noise studies have a concrete basis for preparation and analysis. She stated that residents may hear the facility while sleeping on a warm summer night and that the standards should address the most sensitive conditions. She recommended determining what residents could be expected to hear and how far the sound could travel from the facility under those conditions. Ms. Anderson then addressed Decommissioning, Section B, Annual Certification of Compliance. She noted that the provision requires written verification from the owner and stated that the Township should also require Township inspections. She stated that the associated fees should be sufficient for the Township to train and retain employees who are knowledgeable about the operation of the facility and capable of ensuring compliance with the ordinance. She further stated that the ordinance should reference where the applicable fees are established. Regarding Corrective Action, Ms. Anderson stated that the section should be more specific and establish timelines for preparation and submission of a Corrective Action Plan. She suggested that the owner be required to submit the plan within two weeks following an inspection, that the Township respond to or accept the Corrective Action Plan within two weeks of submission, and that the facility owner implement the approved Corrective Action Plan within five days of Township approval. Ms. Anderson then addressed Decommissioning and stated that the current provision would allow a facility to remain abandoned for three years before action is taken to recover the site. She stated that the expected life span of a data center is approximately 10 to 15 years and expressed concern that, after three years, the company responsible for the facility could have dissolved. Ms. Anderson recommended that no more than six months be permitted after a facility becomes non-operational before the owner is required to provide notice to the Township indicating either: (1) the facility will be abandoned; or (2) an action plan will be provided describing how the facility will become operational again, including specific timelines. If the facility is to be abandoned, Ms. Anderson stated that the owner should be required to provide an Abandonment Action Plan identifying the anticipated timeline, the manner in which materials will be disposed of, and how the site will be restored. She recommended that the site be fully restored within one year of a decision to decommission or abandon the facility. Regarding Financial Security, Ms. Anderson noted that the ordinance states the Township "may require" financial security. She stated that the provision should instead state that the Township "will require" financial security. Ms. Anderson then addressed Enforcement and noted that fines were not specified. She stated that she has worked with developers for more than 20 years and that penalties should be sufficient to discourage violations. There were no further comments at this time. Mrs. Harper stated that the hearing was not being closed but would be postponed until October 6, 2026, which is the Board of Supervisors' regular meeting night. Mr. Vey stated that, following incorporation of the public comments, he anticipated that a revised ordinance would be prepared and readvertised.

Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to close the hearing and reschedule to a date certain, October 6, 2026. The motion was seconded by Mr. Miner and passed unanimously.

Parking Ordinance. Zoning Ordinance amendment to establish definitions, parking standards, trailer storage standards, truck staging requirements, and freight operations requirements for uses generating commercial truck traffic.

Other Business:

Agricultural Security Area. Acknowledgement of Receipt of the proposal for the creation or modification of an Agricultural Security Area Application, Estate of Katie Weisel, 1645 Weisel Road, 23-010-042 & 23-007-190. Mr. Vey stated that the Township received a request to add 155 acres to the Agricultural Security Area from Dorothy Neff, Executrix for the Estate of Katie Weisel. Mr. Vey explained that the request is part of the County's Agricultural Security Area program and that there is a required procedure that must be followed.

Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to acknowledge acceptance of the application for the inclusion of TMP No. 23-010-042 and 23-007-190 in the Agricultural Security Area. The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson and passed unanimously.

Agricultural Leases. Mr. Johnson stated the Agricultural Security Committee underwent another review of the leases and telephone numbers were added for contact in the event of any issues. A meeting was held approximately two weeks ago to review the agreement section by section and ensure that all parties were comfortable with the language. It was noted that the lease protects the Township when leasing property to farmers while also allowing farmers to properly maintain and care for the land they are leasing. The agreement was described as a significant step forward in establishing a process for leasing Township open space. The Board discussed approving the lease agreement format at this time, noting that approval of the format would not constitute approval of any individual leases. Mr. Johnson stated Mr. Baldwin took on the task of defining the individual sites and completed a site-specific analysis for each property. The Board agreed to proceed with having staff mail the information to the appropriate parties. Mr. Haberle stated he

has no problems with approving the format at this time. Mr. Johnson added farmers have to purchase their seed now and plan for next year's crop. The leases will take place January 1st. Mr. Vey added the leases are multiple year leases.

Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to approve the format of the lease with a review of the signed leases. The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson and passed unanimously.

Emergency Generator Replacement. Mrs. Ambron presented the proposed Emergency Generator Replacement Bid. The minimum specifications include a 400-amp capacity with a 400-amp main breaker internal to the generator; 3-phase, 120/208V voltage; diesel fuel; and a sub-base (belly tank) fuel storage tank with an approximate capacity of 80–100 gallons, UL-listed and approved for long-term diesel storage. The specifications also include furnishing and installing a new fully automatic transfer switch rated at 400 amps. Mr. Johnson requested additional time to review the proposed bid and recommended tabling the matter until the next meeting.

Resolution Approving the Disposal of Township Records. Records to be destroyed include 2015-2016 accounts payable, revenue records, general ledger and journals for all funds (audits are retained permanently), revenue and expense versus budget for each fund as of 12/31, general fund Univest checks for closed account(s) and Unami Watershed Conservancy checks from Commerce Bank, and cash receipt journals for 2014, 2015, and 2016.

Mr. Mininger made a **MOTION** to approve **Resolution No. 2016-13**, Disposition of Records Per the Municipal Records Manual. The motion was seconded by Mr. Haberle and passed unanimously.

Resolution Amending Resolution No. 2026-04, Fee Schedule. Mr. Haberle stated the only revision being made to the Fee Schedule is to the cost for multi-family unit being reduced from \$200 to \$100 and the escrow from \$400 to \$200. Mr. Vey stated we will be very strict in the future when the escrow accounts drop below the minimum required amount.

Mr. Mininger made a **MOTION** to approve **Resolution No. 2026-14**, Amendment to Resolution No. 2026-04, Township Fee Schedule for Service. The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson and passed unanimously.

Resolution Adopting the Bucks County 2026 Hazard Mitigation Plan. Mr. Vey stated this is an update of the previously adopted Plan. The update has been prepared to meet requirements set forth by FEMA and PEMA in order for the county to be eligible for funding and technical assistance from state and federal hazard mitigation programs.

Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to approve Resolution No. 2026-15, Bucks County 2026 Hazard Mitigation Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mininger and passed unanimously.

Hough Associates Agreement Authorizing the Collection of Residential and Commercial Recycling Data and Preparation of the 2026 Recycling Performance Grant Application. Mr. Vey stated we have used Hough Associates for many years. They are charged with gathering numbers for recycling and the information is then sent to DEP for a recycling grant. The surrounding municipalities have also gotten on board.

Mr. Johnson made a **MOTION** to approve the Hough Associates Agreement for the collection of recycling data and preparation of the 2026 Recycling Performance Grant Application. Mr. Haberle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Pennoni Professional Services Proposal-Service Amendment #2. Weiss Road Ridge over Licking Creek. Mr. Baldwin provided an update on the project. The plans have been submitted to the Bucks County Conservation District for review. October is the target for submitting for design. Things are moving forward with entitlements, and design is nearly completed. DEP has requested the utility owners, Comcast and Verizon, to have the G5 Permit pulled. The Verizon permit is in hand. Entitlements should be complete in the spring of 2027. Mr. Baldwin stated the Professional Services Proposal Amendment #2 includes right-of-way approach with the scope of work focused on landowner coordination, which will be prepared by the surveyor. Mr. Mininger asked when the project will go out to bid. Mr. Baldwin stated the goal is April of 2027. Prior projections were between March to May of 2027. The first permit came back quicker than anticipated. Mr. Baldwin said conservatively it is assumed to be a 30-week projection which puts us around an April 2027 timeframe. Mr. Haberle asked if outside of this if things are moving along. Mr. Vey stated it is with discussions having no problems. When he goes out again, he will have executable documents in hand. Mr. Haberle asked if we know where PennDOT is on Allentown Road. Mr. Vey stated he will touch base with them.

Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to approve the Pennoni Professional Services Proposal-Service Amendment #2. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mininger and passed unanimously.

Bucks County Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program. Mr. Vey presented the Bucks County Planning Commission Household Hazardous Waste Collection Program Contract. The contract is for the years 2026-2030 and will include incremental increases to each municipality's annual contribution. Mr. Vey noted Milford Township has been involved with the program.

Mr. Mininger made a **MOTION** to approve the 2026-2030 Household Hazardous Waste Collection Contract. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Correspondence

Fire Police Assistance Request(s). Fire Police Assistance Requests have been received from Quakertown Borough for the annual Halloween Parade taking place on Sunday, October 18, 2026, and Red Hill Borough for the Upper Perkiomen Valley Halloween Parade taking place on Sunday, October 25, 2026.

Mr. Mininger made a **MOTION** to approve the Fire Police Assistance Request for Quakertown Borough's Halloween Parade taking place on Sunday, October 18, 2026, and Red Hill Borough for the Upper Perkiomen Valley Halloween Parade taking place on Sunday, October 25, 2026. The motion was seconded by Mr. Haberle and passed unanimously.

Sign Request. School Bus Stop Ahead, 1940 Geryville Pike. Mr. Vey stated a "School Bus Stop Ahead" sign has been requested at 1940 Geryville Pike. PennDOT has approved the request. Mr. Kletzing is working the school district and resident who is aware they will need to pay for the sign and installation.

Mr. Mininger made a **MOTION** to approve the sign request at 1940 Geryville Pike. Mr. Haberle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Bucks County Airport Authority Meeting Minutes. Mr. Mininger reported the Minutes of the Bucks County Airport Authority meeting of July 8, 2026 are available for review.

Quakertown Area Planning Committee Meeting Minutes. Mr. Haberle reported the Minutes of the meeting of the Quakertown Area Planning Committee of August 7, 2026 are available for review.

Milford Township Water Authority Meeting Minutes. Mr. Haberle reported the Minutes of the meeting of the Milford Township Water Authority of July 14, 2026 are available for review.

Milford Trumbauersville Area Sewer Authority Meeting Minutes. Mr. Haberle reported the Minutes of the meeting of the Milford Trumbauersville Area Sewer Authority of July 20, 2026 are available for review.

Reports:

Code Enforcement Departmental Report. Mr. Kravitsky presented the August 2026 Code Enforcement Report. A total of 22 permits were issued in August: 11 residential renovations, 2 zoning, 3 commercial, and 6 residential accessory permits. A total of 13 Use & Occupancy permits were issued, and 5 fire inspections were performed. No Zoning Hearing Board Applications were received.

Park Board Meeting Minutes. Mr. Haberle stated the minutes of the August 12, 2026 Park Board meeting are available for review. Mr. Vey reported at the August 12, 2026 meeting the Park Board discussed the replacement of the Breisch Road Bridge that will be part of the trail between Breisch Road and Mill Hill Road. Mr. Vey stated it may be beneficial for our engineer to do a feasibility cost study to see if the bridge should be replaced with the understanding it will be a couple thousand dollars.

Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to receive a proposal for the Breisch Road Bridge with a cost not to exceed \$3,000. The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson and passed unanimously.

Milford Fire Company Report. Mr. Haberle reported the Milford Fire Company Report is available for review.

Trumbauersville Fire Company Report. No report received.

Managers' Report. Truck access to AM Drive-PSP/PennDOT. Mr. Vey stated a letter was received from the Pennsylvania State Police (PSP) noting concerns regarding the AM Drive intersection. It was stated that, when the matter goes to court, motorists making left turns have indicated that they cannot see the existing signs. Mr. Vey stated that he believed the issue may be related to the geometry of the intersection. There are currently signs in place that may be too close. Mr. Vey stated that the trucks turning to go to the warehouses may not be able to make the left turn because of the existing roadway geometry. It was asked why the truck restriction is in place and whether the restriction is related to roadway design. Mr. Vey the issue occurs during the morning commute, noting that during peak hours vehicles have difficulty reaching the left-turn lane. Mr. Vey said there is an existing stacking lane and painted gore area and noted that a second truck could overload the stacking area. Mr. Vey stated the Turnpike is designing the interchange would there will be a signal with gaps, which doesn't appear to present a problem. He stated that he believed the restriction may be a PennDOT issue, noting that the Township did not install the sign. It was suggested that the restriction may have been established when Route 663 was widened. Mr. Haberle stated that the stacking lane may have been designed for a specific vehicle size and asked if the problem is because the officer can't give a ticket or is there an underlying roadway design issue. Mr. Vey stated there are design considerations that may have been overlooked and further noted he intends to speak with a PennDOT representative regarding the matter. He also indicated that a motion should be considered regarding the issue. Mr. Haberle stated that the Township had received information from the PSP. He said that, if the concern involves sight distance, dual lanes, or trucks stacking into a high-speed roadway, the Township should obtain information from its traffic engineer regarding the specific issue the Township is seeking to resolve. Mr. Vey asked what implications the truck movements have on the Wawa intersection. Mr. Mininger stated that traffic volume is a major consideration. Mr. Vey noted that trucks could use additional space within the stacking lane, although the left-turn movement generally functions well. He noted that the intersection is used considerably during rush hour and that overall traffic volume is another factor to consider.

Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to request PennDOT to investigate the situation to determine what the factoring issues are. Mr. Mininger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Walnut Lane Bridge. Mr. Vey reported a Load Rating Analysis has been performed for the Walnut Lane Bridge over due to increased deterioration to Beams 3 and 4. The bridge is currently posted for a Bridge Weight Limit of 33 tons, except combinations

40 tons. The bridge should be posted for Bridge Weight Limit 30 Tons, Except Combinations 40 Tons. Per PennDOT policy, new signs are to be installed within 30-days of notification at all required locations. Mr. Jerry Hertz stated he is qualified to perform underwater bridge inspections, and he happened to be there when the inspector was on site doing the inspection. He said he has very strong concerns over the condition of the bridge. He said we need to act proactively and quickly and said he drafted a five-volume assessment which he offered for review and offer his assistance in anyway needed. Mr. Vey said one real problem out there is there is an open grate. Mr. Hertz said the open grate creates its own problems with salt and erosion and the problem is it has reached the stated that it is in, a category 1. Mr. Vey asked if the bridge should be replaced or closed. Mr. Hertz said Walnut Lane can be accessed by Kumry Road and he watched a school bus traveling over that bridge along with residential propane delivery trucks. Mr. Vey asked how to enforce weight limits in reality. Mr. Hertz said signage is signage and people become sign blind. The bottom line is Walnut lane is the level of degradation that requires immediate action. Mr. Haberle said it is a short bridge and could be done with a steel advance replacement and could be picked and set in 1 day. Mr. Hertz said it could be craned in. Mr. Vey noted Walnut Lane is a low volume road. Mr. Haberle said at a minimum he is in support of investigating the cost and thinks we should be able to maintain the bridge but need to know the cost. He would like to get a report of the conditions we can use and would like to find out options for grant availability and tie it into the design. Mr. Haberle asked if there are flooding issues. Mr. Hertz said no, only in very heavy down pours and noted the tie in for abutments are bad and the only way to get the facts are to do an ultrasonic edge. There was no further discussion at this time.

Escrow Release(s)

Rotho Blaas, 2075 Rosenberger Road, TMP No. 23-010-073. Construction Escrow Release Request #3.

Mr. Mininger made a **MOTION** to approve the Construction Escrow Release Request #3 in the amount of \$289,782.62 for Rotho Blaas, 2075 Rosenberger Road, TMP No. 23-010-073. The motion was seconded by Mr. Haberle and passed unanimously.

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items:

Mr. Robert McLain of Angstadt Road asked if the 2009 Zoning Map found on the Township's website has been revised. Mr. Baldwin stated he was going to update the staff tonight with a revised map. Mr. Vey stated Artistic Glass and Vacubraze are existing properties that were zoned PI.

Mr. Haberle announced the Board will return to executive session to discuss personnel.

Adjournment: With there being no further business Mr. Haberle made a **MOTION** to adjourn the September 1, 2026 meeting of the Milford Township Board of Supervisors at 10:51 p.m. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.