

BUCKINGHAM TOWNSHIP

P.O. Box 413, Buckingham, Pennsylvania 18912
Phone (215) 794-8834 • Fax (215) 794-8837

Website - www.buckinghampa.org



BUCKINGHAM TOWNSHIP Board of Supervisors Work Session Agenda April 22, 2026 5:30 p.m.

5:30 p.m. Deer Management Program – USDA

6:30 p.m. Audio Visual Proposals

Work Session to be continued after regular business meeting:

Mike Bateman's presentation on Decks and Impervious Surface

Manager's Items

- Park & Recreation Commission Member Selection

Executive Session

Buckingham Township Board of Supervisors
Work Session
Minutes

The work session of the Buckingham Township Board of Supervisors was held April 22, 2026 in the Township Building, 4613 Hughesian Drive, Buckingham, Pennsylvania.

Present:	Maggie Rash	Chairman
	Jon Forest	Vice-Chairman
	Mike Bateman	Member
	Dana S. Cozza	Township Manager

Not Present for
the entire

meeting:	Daniel Gray	Township Engineer
	Luke Rosanova	Bucks County Planning Commission
	Craig A. Smith, Esquire	Township Solicitor
	Gary Weaver	Township Water/Wastewater Consultant

The Work Session commenced at 5:30 p.m.

Deer Management Program – USDA

Nathan Spence and Ryan Schilling of the United States Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service – Wildlife Services (USDA), were present to follow up on their November presentation and to answer questions regarding their deer management programs.

Mr. Spence summarized that their hunting program typically is bringing people in, vetting them for skills to produce harvests and gauge success off of their success, utilizing some public parks and to provide landowners participation who want to allow hunters on their property and then provide supplemental crop damage control from his staff. He said the deer are taken to a local processor and the meat is donated to local food banks.

Mr. Spence said Solebury Township used a 3rd party with infrared drone technology to take an initial baseline survey of deer density per square mile and determined they could shoot 1000 deer in 2 months. Mr. Spence said Solebury Townships' survey for this year was just completed and went from 80 deer per square mile and cut it in half. He said now they are shooting less, but the problem doesn't go away. He said the goal is not to eradicate deer, that there will still be hunting opportunities for local hunters. Mr. Forest noted that 200 deer were included in the proposal prepared for Buckingham Township as a starting point, and Mr. Spence replied that not every farmer will want to participate, and that the budget was for himself and another person to apply. Mr. Spence said his job is to speak with the farmers and people who may farm other properties and enroll them into the program. Mr. Spence said he would help farmers who don't want them involved to

apply for Ag Deprivation Permits. Mr. Spence added the accident reports for deer hits were reduced by 75% in Solebury Township after introducing their program.

Jeff Glauber, Twinbrook Circle, suggested the township should look at the overall expense to see the big picture to help all farmers. Mr. Spence said they drew up the proposal as a start to the project, as using money efficiently will draw more interest. He explained they had presented two proposals, with the first managing the hunting program which includes surveying public ground hunt table, vetting hunters, making sure they have tags and report the harvest, and the second proposal included providing crop damage management for the farmers by having himself and his crew apply for permits, harvest the deer and pay for the processing fees. Mrs. Rash said it sounded like the beginning goal would be a combination of both proposals.

Sergeant James Crown and Warden Alex Cook of the Pennsylvania Game Commission were present to discuss a new Certified Hunter Program being offered to the entire state this year that was designed for farmers having crop damage/loss. He said the program connects hunters wanting to harvest antlerless deer with farmers requesting assistance. Sergeant Crown explained the hunters must pass a background check, written exam and shooting test to earn the "Certified Hunter" card and be granted unlimited hunting during normal hunting hours and seasons. He said there would be an online database that would provide enrolled farmers details, and hunters would make reservations to hunt specific properties, with the farm receiving notifications to know who they are and where they would be hunting. Sergeant Crown said the farmers themselves and their hunters could enroll in the system if they wanted to hunt their own property with the same advantages. Sergeant Crown said the deer would be e-tagged over the telephone, no paper, and can take the deer to their processor and keep or donate the meat, but they would not report it as they currently do for doe tag harvests. He said this is a free program that was piloted in Washington County last year with success.

Sergeant Crown confirmed that as long as the hunters are not charged a fee, the landowner is protected from all liability. Mr. Forest stated that is printed in the PA Game Commission Guide on page 7.

The following local farmers/landowners were present and had dialogue with Mr. Spence, Sergeant Crown and Warden Cook regarding the proposed programs: David Crooke of Ridge Road, Matt Maximuck of Long Lane, Tom Trycieki of Paist Road, Randy Serwell of New Hope Road, Scott Yerkes of Upper Mountain Road, Joe Wicen of Mozart Road, and Mike Feeny of Byecroft Road.

Mrs. Rash asked if the USDA and the PA Game Commission programs could be run in concert with another, and Mr. Spence replied "yes". Mrs. Rash said she would like to see the township take advantage of both programs and make it worthwhile for farmers to continue farming. Mrs. Cozza asked what would happen once the township signs the proposal, and Mr. Spence said he would apply for permits as they take about 2 months to be processed, and he would organize the certified hunters. Mrs. Rash said she would like to add the USDA proposal to tonight's agenda to get the process started, and Mr.

Bateman proposed the condition that the figures wouldn't change more than 10% from the original proposals. Mrs. Cozza suggested that the Board authorize her to sign the agreement so that it may be processed without delay, and the Board agreed.

Audio Visual Proposals

Haverford Systems. Casey Smith was present to discuss their February quote for audio/visual equipment. He explained the quote includes a new audio and video system by refreshing the AV rack currently in use, new amplifier, microphones, network switch, audio processor, 3 cameras for livestreaming (one in front providing a wide shot of the audience with auto switch to the person speaking, and two in back with auto switch to focus on whoever is speaking), technicians to install the system, train staff and provide assistance afterwards, and includes a full one year workmanship warranty on the system and each piece of equipment. Mr. Smith said there would be a tablet on the dais with a simple on/off tap for the system (detailed controls would be set during installation), and all operations would be automatic and not require an operator during the meeting. Mr. Smith recommended a 85" display be installed on the bulletin board wall due to the space and lighting in the room, which would eliminate the need for a projector. He explained the microphones on the dais would have a base for the transmitter between the receiver and microphone and also have charging docks. The quote totaled \$77,238.57.

Mr. Bateman asked what could be pared back on the system. Mr. Smith said the room currently has 32 ceiling speakers which they could reduce to the 20's and save approximately \$1,500. He said they would need to replace the ceiling tiles. Mr. Smith said they could save another \$5,000-\$8,000 on the 10-channel wireless gooseneck microphone system. Mr. Smith said another savings could be to reduce the number of cameras from 3 to 2, but he did not recommend that as 3 would provide a smoother transition for the auto switch feature, although you could try it with 2 and upgrade to 3.

Mr. Smith said they could design the system to fit a budget, to an extent they need to design for what's best for the room. Mrs. Rash said they did the system for Forest Grove Church in 2022 for \$15,000 including zoom interaction on a big screen. She said they could all see and hear one another. Mrs. Rash said she wasn't sure we need quite this much, but we do need the microphones fixed so the audience can hear them speak.

Tom Ciacciarelli, Jennifer Court, asked if someone is presenting something, how easy is it to broadcast the presentation on the screen to whoever is watching at home. Mr. Smith said a laptop would be set up and you would send out a meeting link similar to joining a teams meeting. He said the meeting would be livestreamed.

Jane Seaberg, Bradley Court, asked the lifespan of the system, and Mr. Smith said at least 10 years.

Mr. Forest asked if we would need an operator to switch cameras, and Mr. Smith said no, it is automated by voice activation. Mrs. Clark, Buckingham Township special projects

coordinator, asked how long was the staff training and Mr. Smith said probably 20 minutes as the system is very simple to operate. Mrs. Cozza asked if operation meant just turn on and off, and Mr. Smith said yes, unless people needed to join in a teams or zoom session.

Ms. Seaberg agreed the audio is critical, and asked said it would be a visual game changer for the residents to see and be full meeting participants, and asked how difficult it is to share documents for all to see? Mr. Smith said the persons viewing would see whatever was presented on the large screen on the bulletin board. Mr. Glauber asked if someone is presenting a PowerPoint, what decides what is shown online? Mr. Smith said the screen could be split for the virtual conference and presentation. Mrs. Cozza said then someone would have to change that; an operator would be needed. Mr. Smith said yes and stated that other systems typically do have someone operating the meeting, at least to get it running or to swap out a new presentation.

Mr. Bateman said the audio in the room in regard to speakers isn't the most important as it is a fairly small room and crowd typically, but those are not indicative of the sound coming through to the stream. Mr. Smith agreed, stating that is the microphone quality and speakers.

Mr. Bateman asked what type of system would be compatible with connected devices, and Mr. Smith said all current USB connections. Mr. Bateman asked if it would be compatible with our current speakers, and Mr. Smith said it should be, with something in the AV equipment adjusted.

Mrs. Clark asked if dialing back on the number of cameras how that would affect the auto focus, and Mr. Smith replied a 2 camera system would still have functionality, but the switching may be choppy.

Mrs. Rash said the Board would clarify their priorities and request a revised quote accordingly.

Applied Video Technology. Mrs. Clark said that Mike Cox had returned to discuss their dialed back quote with modifications per the townships' request.

Mr. Cox said they removed the production aspect and staff component of someone required to run the system during meetings and replaced the projector and screen with a 98" flat panel that will be easier to see and read (saving a couple of thousand dollars). Mr. Cox said the flat panel would need a pole mount and could be placed where the current screen is located. He said whoever would be running the meeting would still have a preview monitor before it goes live, using a desktop monitor on the dais. Mr. Cox said there initially were 3 cameras quoted, and cut back to 2, with one on the bulletin board wall aimed towards the screen for presentations and the presenter, and the other camera in the center of the ceiling providing a wide shot of the dais. He explained the cameras could be controlled from the touch panel with a preset mode, but a person would need to change the camera for a presenter using a manual function rather than automatic. Mr. Cox

said a dedicated computer would be required with a connector for someone to make a presentation on a separate laptop or for use to show a movie, and to stream the meeting. Mr. Cox proposed new wireless microphones with longer goosenecks at each seated position, on the presenters table and at the podium with charging docks (no batteries), along with an additional microphone backup outlet for the court reporter.

Mr. Cox said the room currently has 38 ceiling speakers, and they would reduce them to 6 speakers and redo the ceiling tiles to replace the existing speakers. He said a 10” touch control panel would be placed on the dais for user operation, and the equipment rack in the back would be replaced. Mr. Cox said they could always add a 3rd camera and production component if wanted.

Mr. Cox said they shaved off \$14,000 with value engineering from the previous \$70,000 proposal and said they could save even more by reducing another camera. He said they can work from whatever amount the township wants.

7:00 p.m. The Work Session adjourned.

9:03 p.m. The Work Session resumed.

Mike Bateman’s Presentation on Decks and Impervious Surface

Mr. Bateman gave a presentation and explained it is meant to start the process of removing decks from being considered impervious in Buckingham Township. He said this is not about removing protections, but is about accurately measuring runoff. Mr. Bateman provided current zoning assumptions regarding impervious surfaces.

Mr. Bateman discussed the reality of water moving through a typical deck and provided a visual with an aquarium utilizing tubing and a pump to rotate the water above the sample Trex deck with the water raining down through holes in the tubing and water going through the spaces between the deck slats. Mr. Gray observed the water is running off of the wood, the wood is not absorbing the water, and that meets the definition of impervious, a surface that does not absorb water. Mr. Bateman argued that in this case, the water is going through and performance would depend on construction, minimum gaps, building materials, and waterproof underground systems such as pavement or a patio below the deck.

Mr. Bateman claimed that neighboring municipalities do not consider decks to be impervious. Mrs. Rash stated that Wrightstown Township considers decks to be impervious.

Mr. Bateman shared his proposed policy direction providing situations where uncovered residential decks would not be counted as impervious, and then provided information on what his proposal will do and will not do. Mr. Forest questioned the statement that Mr. Bateman’s proposal would reduce unnecessary variances. Mrs. Cozza said that nobody applies to Zoning Hearing Board just for impervious surface, and are mostly applying for variances to setback requirements. Mr. Forest asked Mr. Ciacciarelli (Zoning Hearing

Board Member) how many people apply for deck variances, and Mr. Ciacciarelli said maybe 6 over 2 years, but that most apply for setback variances.

Mr. Bateman said the bottom line is that folks are building decks without permits because its inconvenient to get a permit. He said decks simply allow water to pass through. Mrs. Rash said decks may allow water to pass through, but the greatest percentage of people are putting impervious underneath because they don't want weeds growing under and through the deck, so they put down stone, weed cloth or concrete. Mr. Gray said it would add another level of overseeing if inspections had to be done afterwards to check the construction and periodically thereafter to make sure there is no change.

Mr. Gray explained in the 1975 Zoning Ordinance the Board of Supervisors intent was to limit how much of Buckingham was covered with decks, patios, driveways, garages, etc., and added that a lot of other ordinances are based on building and/or land coverage. Mrs. Rash said she hears people say they love Buckingham the way it is, but maybe people in developments don't care how much coverage is on their lot and maybe they should have as much deck as they want but have to do stormwater management to assure water runoff does not adversely affect neighbors. Stephanie Weisser, Amberton Way, said she lives in a development and the trend lately has been to install hardscaping around the pools (stone) rather than a deck. She wondered if people had to get a permit for hardscaping, adding that if its easier to build a deck would we offset some of the hardscaping. Ms. Weisser said her preference is that she would prefer a deck over hardscaping. Mr. Bateman said then by having decks considered impervious you're incentivizing people to build hardscaping, which creates a high administrative burden. Mr. Forest said if decks were not considered impervious, the building department would need to inspect and measure the distance between the boards to be sure the Trex isn't butted up against each other. Mrs. Cozza noted then that if there wasn't a permit for the deck, there wouldn't be an inspection report.

Mr. Forest asked Mr. Bateman if he has a deck on his home, and Mr. Bateman said he did. Mr. Forest asked if he found it hard to get a permit and Mr. Bateman said that he wasn't there. Mr. Forest displayed an aerial photo of Mr. Bateman's house. Mr. Forest pointed out the gazebo, and Mr. Bateman said that it didn't require a permit as it's not affixed to the house, it's temporary. Mr. Bateman said he build a deck over an existing concrete patio and didn't need or get a permit as it covered the circular concrete underneath. Mr. Forest said it is larger than that and he should have got a permit.

Melinda Shorday, Holicong Road, said at her job, they talk about a change when trying to solve a problem, and she doesn't understand what problem we are trying to solve. She said she doesn't hear people are applying for decks and getting turned down. Mr. Bateman said he knows this is a problem from knocking on thousands of doors, and in reality people are just not doing anything because they don't want to deal with the hassle. Ms. Shorday said she has a deck that was built in the 80's and for years she stored things underneath it to keep them dry. She said that she thinks most people put something underneath their deck so they don't have to squeeze themselves underneath and treat the ground with roundup every year. Mr. Bateman said most people are frustrated with the process and not doing anything. Ms. Shorday said she does not see a problem we are trying to solve.

Mr. Gray said if there's a desire to allow more land to be covered there is a track to do that, and if the Board wanted to allow that, they should do stormwater studies in each development and see if the impervious can be adjusted in order to confirm that the existing facilities can handle additional stormwater. He suggested an alternative could be to set a percentage and if a person goes over, then they have to do stormwater. Mr. Smith said engineering and installing stormwater facilities could be a very expensive alternative.

Mr. Bateman said he just knows that people are concerned and he has heard many complaints from people struggling to figure out how to do this. He said if a person lives on acres and acres it's not an issue. Ms. Shorday asked how they are struggling if they haven't applied and been turned down. Mr. Bateman said it's \$1000 for the Zoning Hearing Board. Ms. Shorday said we're not talking about variance applications but permit applications, so it is different. Mr. Bateman said the building permit is not the issue, rather that they have to come before the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Gray said that's due to people building bigger houses and structures on their lots that the stormwater facilities are designed to accommodate.

Linda Hayward, Ash Road, said she wanted a garage and patio and had to get a permit and plant a certain number of trees that would absorb the additional stormwater runoff, so she did. She said she went over the impervious surface limit and then had to move into stormwater, that she never had to go to Zoning Hearing Board or pay an attorney, she just had to fix it so she did.

Mr. Glauber said he thought if a person exceeded the percentage they had to go to the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Gray explained the ordinance was revised that lets you go over the percentage by a certain amount if you do stormwater as Ms. Hayward did.

Mrs. Rash said then basically is the issue that people don't want to follow the permit process? Mr. Bateman said he sees what our neighbors are doing and sees people having this challenge and wants to make it easier for them. Mr. Gray noted he hears Mr. Bateman trying to get rid of something inherent to what the ordinance was based on, that being not covering the entire land, and keeping Buckingham as open as possible.

Mr. Bateman said the crux of the argument is that decks allow water to flow through. Mrs. Cozza said then the concern would be that the township has to measure the spaces of the deck. Mr. Forest noted the costs that we have when it comes to a permit is what it costs the employees to do the work and inspection, and the township still loses money. Mr. Gray said if you want to allow the coverage we can find a way where each deck will be built to a certain standard with a stormwater basin under the house. He said that Trex has a water system to divert the water drainage.

Mr. Smith said that Townships often address this issue by setting a building/structure coverage limit rather than an impervious limit constituting a density requirement and that density restrictions were put in so that people in certain zoning districts aren't living on top of each other.

Mr. Glauber noted if you compartmentalize it to smaller lots, that's where the issue generally lies, if there is one.

Ms. Haywood said you are trying to do something for the people who have communicated there is a problem, but when you change these allowances you say they have to deal with the stormwater, so you've increased the cost dramatically because that's where the expense comes in managing the stormwater. Mr. Bateman said he understands we need stormwater, but that decks are not impervious.

Lisa Braud, Dark Hollow Road, said she had to do stormwater for every single project they did. Mr. Gray explained that's because they were over the 1,000 square feet allowance from the start, and that anything added since year 2011 when DEP required stormwater treatment for impervious improvements over 500 square feet. Ms. Braud said there should be dialogue about protecting the farmer and farms.

The Estates at Furlong

Mr. Gray updated the Board that "The Estates at Furlong" had applied for a PennDOT permit and PennDOT denied their request to allow the 2' wide median along the center of Old York Road to limit left hand turns. He said PennDOT requires a 4' median with a quickie curb, and the developer said no because they would have to widen the road. PennDOT responded they would allow the 4' with white and yellow markers but the township would be responsible for maintenance and repair, and if it failed the township would be responsible if someone got hurt. He said the developer said the township could flip it to the Homeowners Association, but he is opposed to that. Mr. Gray said the township had a quickie curb for the Wawa improvements and it was damaged several times, and he would prefer to insist on a concrete median, with PennDOT accepting the maintenance. Mr. Forest agreed as Old York Road is a state road.

Bonargo Tract, Township File SA 2008-01

Mr. Gray said that the developers, Mr. Jones and Ms. Corsini, had requested relief of the solar access ordinance in order to rotate the homes further than the ordinance allowance. Mr. Forest said it appears they want the front to face Route 413 more and this changes the position of the door, but isn't that much of an angle. Mrs. Rash felt they need to stick with the approved plan. Mr. Gray explained the solar orientation is designed for energy conservation. Mr. Gray said he would bring the matter to the next Board of Supervisors meeting for consideration of the official waiver request.

Park and Recreation Commission Member Selection

Ms. Braud said the Park and Recreation Commission met in the past week and she had invited all 17 of the interested candidates. She noted that even though there are only 9 members, the others can still attend the meetings and have input. Kevin Buckley, Stover Trail, asked since the township raised the number of members from 7-9, can't they make it 11? Mrs. Cozza explained no, that it's regulated under the 2nd Class Township Code for the maximum to be 9 members. Following discussion on the candidates, Mr. Bateman said it sounds like they will be appointed during May Board of Supervisor's meeting.

Shade Tree Commission

Mrs. Rash said that the Environmental Advisory Commission has requested the township form a Shade Tree Commission. She said it's specified in the 2nd Class Township Code and is a component needed to become an official "Tree City", and cannot just be a subcommittee of the Environmental Advisory Commission. Mrs. Cozza clarified it could be a subcommittee, but would need to be made up of all Environmental Advisory Commission members. Mr. Glauber asked what's the charter? Mrs. Cozza said the township would need to write it, and that there would be parameters to be discussed. Mrs. Rash said she has agreement from her colleagues so this can move forward.

Roundabout – Route 202/263

Mrs. Cozza provided an update from PennDOT on the Route 202/263 roundabout who has said that the color the township chose would require the township to maintain it. Mrs. Rash said she didn't care what color it is. Mrs. Cozza said it's stamped, and she called the people who gave us the sample and they said they didn't have a maintenance agreement with PennDOT yet. Mr. Gray said this is PennDOT's new statement as their maintenance department doesn't want to take care of it. Mrs. Cozza said she is considering going to the State Representatives office and request assistance.

Township Cleaning Company

Mrs. Cozza notified the Board that the township is hiring a new cleaning company, and is going with the lowest of 4 quotes, and is using the same company as Warwick Township.

PFOA/PFOS

Mrs. Cozza informed the Board that the PFOA at the Hearthstone entry point was .06 parts per trillion over the limit, and under the limit for PFOS. She said the township is required to mail notice to the customers of the Cold Spring system. She also informed the Board that the township held a pre-construction meeting for the treatment contract, and found some materials for the canister and unit are backlogged for many months, putting the timetable at 12-18 months for completion.

Police Budget Presentation / Vision

Mr. Bateman said that Chief Scirrotto has programs he wants to run, and as our residents are really interested in what our police are doing, he thought it would be good to let Chief present his vision. Mrs. Cozza said that Chief does this during his work session budget meetings which are more to do with personnel and structure. Mrs. Cozza said the former Chief gave a yearly report, and maybe that would be appropriate to present during a board meeting. Mr. Bateman said that people have a vested interest and want a connection to what's going on in their community, and community policing, the future,

drone program, SWAT program, things like that would be of interest. Mrs. Rash asked Mrs. Cozza to discuss this with Chief Scirrotto.

10:58 p.m. The Work Session adjourned and the Board retired into Executive Session to discuss police personnel, potential real estate easement purchases and the Lykon, Froehlich and McArdle litigation matters.

11:15 p.m. The Executive Session adjourned.

Approved by the Board of Supervisors on the 27th day of May, 2026.

Buckingham Township Board of Supervisors

Maggie Rash, Chairman

Jon Forest, Vice-Chairman

Mike Bateman

Attest:

Dana S. Cozza, Township Secretary

Minutes respectfully submitted by Lori Wicen.