

**MIDDLESEX TOWNSHIP
SUPERVISOR MEETING
May 6, 2026
6:00 PM**

OFFICIALS PRESENT:	SUPERVISORS:	Chairman Donald S. Geistwhite, Jr. Vice-Chairman Phil Neiderer William H. Goodhart Keith O. Brenneman Gerald "Bud" Grove
	SOLICITOR:	Chief Andrew Bassler
	ENGINEER:	Chief Edwin Beam
	PUBLIC SAFETY	Mark D. Carpenter
	DIRECTOR:	ASST. CODES ENFORCEMENT/ MS4 COORDINATOR: Gerald Steigleman
	MANAGER/	
	ROADMASTER:	Zachary L. Zook
	SECRETARY/	
	TREASURER:	Eileen M. Gault
OFFICIALS ABSENT:	DEPUTY FIRE CHIEF:	Robert Horning, Jr.

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE TO THE FLAG: Chairman Geistwhite called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. at the Middlesex Township Municipal Building, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance led by Chief Beam.

It was announced that Vice-Chairman Neiderer would be delayed in arriving to the meeting. The Chairman was advised to proceed with agenda items unrelated to the data center until Vice-Chairman Neiderer arrived. It was also clarified that public comment at this time would be limited to matters not on the agenda, and that comments regarding the data center would be heard when that agenda item was taken up by the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Andrew Dymski, Bernheisel Bridge Road, offered an opening prayer, giving thanks for the opportunity to gather and inviting God's guidance and spirit over the meeting.

The meeting was delayed until all persons outside entered the Municipal Building.

Vice-Chairman Neiderer was able to join the meeting at approximately 6:10 p.m.

MS4 / STORMWATER PUBLIC COMMENT & UPDATES: Mr. Steigleman reported that a complaint was received from DEP regarding Country Manor's swimming pool, alleging that chlorinated water was being discharged into the Conodoguinet Creek. Upon investigation, the pool has been closed since 2020 and did not contain chlorinated water at the time. The pool water was being discharged into a meadow area where it was seeping into the ground. Country Manor indicated that the pool was being cleaned and sterilized in preparation for refilling and reopening for residents during the summer season.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: On a motion by Chairman Geistwhite, seconded by Supervisor Goodhart, the minutes of the April 1, 2026, meeting were unanimously approved.

On a motion by Chairman Geistwhite, seconded by Supervisor Goodhart, the minutes of the April 24, 2026, meeting were unanimously approved.

AUTHORIZE PAYMENT OF BILLS: On a motion by Chairman Geistwhite, seconded by Vice-Chairman Neiderer, the Board unanimously authorized payment of the May 2026 bills.

REPORT:

Solicitor – No report submitted.

Engineer – No report submitted.

Police – Chief Bassler submitted the monthly Police Report, which was entered into the record.

Fire / EMC - Chief Beam submitted the monthly Fire/EMC Report, which was entered into record. Chief Beam raised ongoing safety concerns regarding the intersection of South Middlesex Road and West Trindle Road. He stated that the existing warning signage is limited and suggested that additional warning signs, flashing lights, or other safety measures should be considered. He also recommended further engagement with PennDOT regarding the issue. Mr. Zook reported that PennDOT is actively working on improvements to the intersection. A plan presented approximately 18 months ago included both a traffic signal and a roundabout option. PennDOT has since moved forward with the roundabout design and is continuing the project development process. Mr. Zook indicated that using flashing lights on stop signs, may still require PennDOT approval, but Township staff could explore that as an option in the interim.

Zoning – Mr. Carpenter submitted the monthly Zoning Report, which was entered into record. Mr. Carpenter then reported that at Saia, 80 Roadway Drive, the property owner replaced lighting that had been subject to enforcement action for noncompliance with the ordinance. The new lighting is lower in intensity and complies with Dark Sky requirements. The lighting upgrade project is valued at approximately \$100,000 and includes six lights on the north side of the property.

Codes Enforcement – Mr. Steigleman submitted the monthly Codes Enforcement Report, which was entered into record. Mr. Steigleman reported that the owners of the Diamond of Carlisle property are making progress toward remediation. They have met with several contractors and are currently awaiting bids, which are expected by next week. The owners indicated they are seeking three separate quotes: one for securing and boarding up the property, one for debris removal, and one for demolition. Overall, the project continues to move forward.

Municipal Authority – Chairman Geistwhite reported that the Municipal Authority has no current issues or problems.

Roadmaster/ Manager – Mr. Zook submitted the monthly Roadmaster Report, which was entered into record. Mr. Zook reported that the Public Works crew completed several projects during the past month, including landscaping work around the municipal building. The crew also continued with traffic signal work along Route 11 and completed fiber optic work to support PennDOT's advanced traffic signal timing project. Future plans may include adding traffic cameras along the Route 11 corridor. Mr. Zook also reported that the Township received a letter from the Municipal

Authority's engineer regarding the proposed raising of the water tank at the I-81 shop property, a project that has been under consideration for several years.

Secretary/Treasurer – Mrs. Gault reported that the meeting packet included two financial reports: the monthly Cumberland County Tax Bureau distribution report, showing both current month and year-to-date distributions, and the Treasurer's Report covering all General Fund receipts and disbursements from April through the present date. She noted that the report does not yet reflect some recent payroll transactions, as they have not been fully processed. No additional comments were made.

Recreation – Mrs. Jumper submitted the monthly Recreation Report, which was entered into record.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: There was no unfinished business.

Vice-Chairman Neiderer addressed a comment made by Mr. Charles Courtney at a Board of Supervisors meeting approximately one month earlier regarding a requested waiver for lighting height. Vice-Chairman Neiderer stated that Mr. Courtney had remarked that the decision was ultimately up to the supervisors because "that's why you make the big bucks." Although he understood the comment was intended humorously, he expressed concern that it could create the false impression that township employees, appointed officials, or elected officials receive financial compensation related to project approvals. Given ongoing public concerns about potential conflicts of interest, Vice-Chairman Neiderer requested clarification on the record that no township employee, appointed official, or elected official is receiving compensation in connection with the project.

Mr. Courtney responded that the comment was made entirely in jest and apologized for any misunderstanding and confirmed that no compensation is being provided to the board or any other township individual in relation to the project.

NEW BUSINESS:

Discussion and Possible motion on Preliminary Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Phase 1-B (Data Center)

Discussion and Possible motion on Final Major Subdivision Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) (Data Center)

Discussion and Possible motion on Final Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Phase 1-A (Data Center)

Mr. Courtney presented three project plans that have been extensively reviewed by the Planning Commission and Township consultants and recommended for approval. These included the Final Subdivision Plan, establishing project lots and development phases; the Final Land Development Plan for Phase 1A (the point of interconnection), which is substantially unchanged from the preliminary plan approved in March; and the Preliminary Land Development Plan for Phase 1B, the first phase containing data center buildings. He noted that Phase 1B had undergone multiple rounds of review, revisions, and documentation submissions before receiving a recommendation for approval. Mr. Courtney emphasized that Phase 1B would still require a separate final land

development plan, review and approval process before development could proceed. He indicated that the applicant would provide an overview of the plans and address any questions from the Board.

Mr. Ross presented an overview of the subdivision plan and Phases 1A and 1B of the project. He explained that the approximately 690-acre property was consolidated and subdivided into five lots corresponding to future development phases.

For Phase 1A, he reviewed the proposed infrastructure improvements, including PPL interconnection facilities, substations, access roads, stormwater facilities, and relocation of the Middlesex Township Authority water main. He highlighted planned landscaping and screening measures, including berms, evergreen plantings, and preservation of existing vegetation. He also stated that the developer intends to reconstruct Country Club Road from Route 11 to Bernheisel Bridge as part of the project.

Mr. Ross noted that the project is being designed to meet Dark Sky lighting standards, with shielded fixtures, reduced nighttime lighting, and motion-activated controls, and that PPL is expected to incorporate similar practices where feasible. He then reviewed the Phase 1B Preliminary Land Development Plan, which includes six data center buildings, substations, internal roadways, security features, stormwater management facilities, and landscaping. He explained that building orientation, screening walls, and landscaping were designed to minimize visual and noise impacts while preserving large portions of the property in an undeveloped state.

Mr. Ross discussed the project's emergency backup generators, stating that they would be used primarily during outages and required testing periods. He noted that the generators would be Tier 4-compliant and equipped with sound attenuation and emissions-control features. He summarized preliminary sound studies indicating that operational noise levels are expected to remain below Township ordinance limits and generally consistent with existing ambient conditions. Post-construction sound testing and any necessary mitigation measures would be addressed through future development agreements.

Mr. Ross also explained that generator emissions would be regulated through Pennsylvania DEP permitting requirements and ongoing state oversight. Regarding water use, he stated that no water would be withdrawn from or discharged into Conodoguinet Creek and that no wells would be permitted on the site. Water would be supplied by the Middlesex Township Municipal Authority under an allocation of 400,000 gallons per day for the entire project. He explained that the facility would use a hybrid cooling system relying primarily on-air cooling, with water used during peak temperature conditions, and that water treatment and discharge would be monitored through the municipal water and sewer systems.

Mr. Ross concluded by noting that the requested waivers were generally consistent with those previously reviewed during the preliminary approval process.

Vice-Chairman Neiderer stated that significant time and effort had been devoted to reviewing the project by the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Township consultants, and various regulatory agencies. He noted that the Planning Commission had held numerous lengthy meetings on the project and that agencies including the Cumberland County Conservation District and Cumberland County Planning Department had spent hundreds of hours reviewing the plans. He also recognized the extensive work performed by Township staff, consultants, and engineers.

Responding to public concerns that the project had been "fast-tracked," Vice-Chairman Neiderer stated that the review process had been thorough and extensive, reflecting the scale and complexity of the proposed development. He emphasized that additional oversight would continue through development agreements and regulatory requirements, including monitoring of water usage, wastewater discharges, and other operational standards. He noted that the project would remain subject to limits and oversight by the municipal authority, wastewater authority, and DEP.

Vice-Chairman Neiderer concluded that the Township had conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the project. Vice-Chairman Neiderer then opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Rachael Dymski of Bernheisel Bridge Road expressed concerns about the proposed development's long-term impact on the community and surrounding rural landscape. She described her family's residence on a 16-acre farm and reflected on the importance of preserving land and honoring the legacy of previous property owners, emphasizing stewardship and continuity across generations. She further stated that she believes the proposed data center development differs fundamentally from traditional residential or agricultural uses, arguing that such facilities do not contribute to community life in the same way and instead place demands on natural resources. Ms. Dymski expressed concern about the rapid expansion of data centers in the region and statewide, and urged caution in approving the project, stating that the decision could have broader implications beyond the township.

Ms. Beth Legore of Teaberry Drive raised questions regarding the potential future use of lithium-ion battery backup systems at the proposed data center. She noted that such systems are commonly used in data centers nationwide and expressed concern about the risk of fire, including thermal runaway events that can result in prolonged, self-sustaining fires and potential environmental impacts. She requested clarification on how Middlesex Township and the project developer would address safety risks associated with large-scale battery installations, including applicable ordinance standards, fire prevention measures, and environmental protections for nearby homes, the Appalachian Trail, and Conodoguinet Creek. Ms. Legore also inquired whether local fire companies have appropriate specialized training, equipment, and water supply capacity to respond to a large-scale battery fire, and whether a binding emergency response plan is required of the developer. She further asked about requirements for testing, toxic gas mitigation, waterway protection, and the timeline for Township review of such safety considerations prior to approval or installation of any battery systems.

Vice Chairman Neiderer responded that, to his understanding, any such batteries would be housed in enclosed rooms within the data center buildings and protected by advanced fire suppression systems. He noted that these systems are designed to safeguard highly valuable server equipment and reduce the risk of fire-related losses. He further stated that the Township Fire Chief has been actively involved in biweekly project meetings to evaluate fire safety and risk management and is considered an expert in this area. Vice Chairman Neiderer indicated that fire safety planning and coordination with emergency responders has been ongoing throughout the project review process.

Chief Beam explained that fires involving data centers and lithium batteries cannot be fought with water and instead require dry chemical agents. He noted plans to coordinate with officials to ensure adequate supplies of these materials.

Ms. Legore questioned whether any ordinance or regulation exists to manage the environmental impact of these dry chemicals, particularly regarding potential contamination of waterways or air.

Mr. Carpenter stated that the Township follows the Pennsylvania Uniform Construction Code, adopted in 2004, and currently enforces the 2021 International Building Code along with applicable provisions of the International Fire Code. He noted that the code requires fire suppression systems in all commercial and industrial buildings. He added that these facilities are required to submit plans to the Township, including provisions for appropriate dry chemical suppression systems and proper cleanup procedures following use. Mr. Carpenter emphasized that operators of data centers have strong incentives to prevent fire damage due to the high value of equipment involved, and that suppression systems are designed specifically for electrical and battery-related fires within contained areas. He concluded that, under these conditions, he does not anticipate significant issues and suggested it is unlikely that the fire company would need to respond in many cases.

Ms. Michelle Miller, representing the Appalachian Trail Conservancy, stated that the Appalachian Trail is located within Middlesex Township and is in close proximity—approximately 1/3 miles—to the proposed data center site. She reported that, despite prior meetings and discussions with the developer and Township officials, the Conservancy's concerns regarding the project's impacts have not been adequately addressed. She informed the Board that the Appalachian Trail Conservancy has issued a public statement opposing the location, size, and scale of the proposed data center, and she provided a copy of that statement for the record.

Mr. Roger Drake of Sheaffer Road stated that he is not opposed to the proposed development, but emphasized the need for proper project design, safeguards, and community benefits. He requested confirmation that all required permits and regulatory reviews are fully completed and clearly communicated, including stormwater management, environmental protection, traffic impacts, noise, and compliance with Pennsylvania DEP requirements. He noted that the project will impact local infrastructure such as roads, utilities, water, and power, and stated that all associated upgrades should be funded by the developer, not taxpayers. Mr. Drake also highlighted potential economic benefits, including involvement of local contractors and additional opportunities during construction. He further noted the project's potential to increase the local tax base for both the Township and school district, emphasizing that there are no tax incentives and that the developer is fully funding the project. He concluded by calling for continued transparency, safeguards, and clear community benefits.

Mr. Philip Coler of Teaberry Drive, commented on the rapid pace of change in data center and semiconductor technology. He referenced NVIDIA's Vera Rubin architecture and noted that its cooling requirements—around 45°C, effectively hot-water-level temperatures—are driving new infrastructure challenges. He explained that many systems are moving toward two-phase direct liquid cooling, which can significantly reduce water consumption and may also provide economic benefits. He encouraged the project team to consider these emerging cooling technologies in future planning.

Ms. Hilda Vazquez Rosa of Buckeye Lane expressed concerns about the project's projected water usage and its potential impact on groundwater resources, private wells, and local waterways during drought conditions. She asked whether hydrogeological studies had been conducted to demonstrate that nearby wells and ecological flows would not be adversely affected and inquired about financial protection for residents if water supplies were impacted. During the discussion, responses referenced water allocation oversight by the municipal authority, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, and the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. Ms. Vasquez remained concerned about the adequacy of the studies, the scale of the project, and the potential effects on nearby residents and the surrounding community.

Ms. Alexia Gerber of Bernheisel Bridge Road ceded her speaking time to her husband, Mr. Kyle Gerber. Mr. Gerber, a lifelong Middlesex Township resident and local farm owner, expressed opposition to the proposed hyperscale data center, citing concerns about its size, potential impacts on water resources, power infrastructure, air quality, noise, lighting, and the long-term well-being of nearby residents. He questioned whether the project's projected economic benefits had been independently verified and argued that potential costs to surrounding neighborhoods had not been adequately considered. Mr. Gerber stated that residents most directly affected by the project deserved greater protection and consideration and criticized prior zoning and planning decisions that enabled the proposal. He urged the Board of Supervisors to exercise greater oversight, prioritize the interests of residents, and take responsibility for safeguarding the community's welfare.

Mr. Andrew Dymski of Bernheisel Bridge Road asked questions regarding the project's water usage approvals and the role of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission (SRBC). He referenced previous discussions and ordinance requirements concerning water withdrawals exceeding 100,000 gallons per day and questioned whether the applicant should obtain SRBC review and approval before proceeding. Township representatives and the applicant's team responded that the Middlesex Township Municipal Authority already holds the applicable SRBC water withdrawal authorization and that the project would operate under that allocation. They further explained that a separate SRBC consumptive use permit would be required prior to operations and would involve ongoing reporting requirements. Discussion followed regarding the interpretation of ordinance provisions and the distinction between municipal water withdrawals and the project's consumptive water use.

Mr. Dymski then raised concerns regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), noting that the consultant who prepared the study was affiliated with entities involved in the proposed development. He questioned whether this relationship created a potential conflict of interest and whether the Township was aware of the affiliation when the consultant was selected. Mr. Dymski referenced findings in the EIA related to the loss of agricultural land, habitat impacts, groundwater recharge changes, and other long-term environmental effects. He requested consideration of an independent environmental review prepared by a consultant unaffiliated with the developer. Township representatives and legal counsel responded that the EIA was prepared by qualified professionals and underwent review by the Township's engineering consultants and other independent reviewers at the applicant's expense.

Ms. Allison Aultman of North Middlesex Road expressed concern that approval of the proposed data center projects did not reflect the views of many residents and could negatively affect the community's future quality of life. She questioned what legacy the Board wished to leave for younger generations and whether environmental and community impacts were being adequately considered alongside economic development. In response, Board representatives stated that the project review process had involved extensive evaluation and emphasized potential community benefits, including tax revenue, improvements to parks, public safety services, emergency response capabilities, and possible land preservation initiatives. Ms. Altman reiterated her concerns about the long-term environmental consequences of the project and their potential effects on future generations.

Ms. Cadence Aultman of North Middlesex Road expressed frustration that residents' concerns and opposition to the proposed data center project had not resulted in changes to the approval process. She stated that residents had signed petitions, protested, and voiced objections, and asked what additional actions could be taken to stop the project. Township representatives responded that the

project is a permitted use under the Township's existing zoning ordinances and data center overlay provisions and stated that the Board of Supervisors has limited authority to deny a project that complies with those requirements. They noted that denying the application could expose the Township to legal challenges.

Mr. Kevin Davis of Fieldstone Drive stated that he was still forming an opinion about the proposed data center project and sought additional information beyond the presentation materials provided. He expressed concern about the loss of farmland and asked for practical examples of how projected noise levels would compare to real-world conditions. Mr. Davis requested information on comparable data center facilities that residents could visit to better understand potential noise and visual impacts. Township representatives responded by referencing a data center site in the Ashburn, Virginia area that officials had toured and suggested that interested residents could visit similar facilities and review project plans in greater detail with Township staff. Mr. Davis also commented on the environmental impacts associated with converting farmland to development and expressed skepticism about the ability to fully replace lost natural resources and habitat.

Mr. Nathan Wolf, an attorney from Carlisle representing several residents, urged the Board to postpone any approval of the project. He expressed concerns about statements suggesting the project was already moving forward and noted his intention to file a zoning challenge. Mr. Wolf questioned the independence of the Environmental Impact Assessment, cited concerns raised by residents and the Appalachian Trail Conservancy, and argued that unresolved issues regarding environmental impacts and water-use approvals warranted additional review. He contended that the Township ordinance requires review and approval by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission for projects meeting specified water-use thresholds and asserted that outstanding questions remained regarding compliance. Mr. Wolf requested that the Board table the matter for 60 days to allow further investigation and consideration of the issues raised by residents.

Ms. Viola Byerly of Country Club Road expressed concerns regarding the proposed data center's compatibility with the surrounding residential and agricultural area, the Township's prior zoning decisions, and what she described as a lack of transparency and responsiveness throughout the review process. She requested greater public disclosure regarding the project, including a dedicated Township communication outlining the proposal, timeline, and anticipated impacts, and suggested the creation of a resident advisory committee to participate in discussions regarding community benefits and project impacts. Ms. Byerly also raised questions about protections for private wells, septic systems, foundations, radon mitigation systems, and other property features that could be affected by blasting or construction activities. In response, Township officials and the applicant's representatives discussed the possibility of pre- and post-construction well testing, baseline property evaluations, and potential mitigation measures if project-related impacts are identified. The applicant indicated a willingness to work with the Township on establishing well-testing requirements and remediation provisions as part of future agreements. Discussion also addressed blasting oversight, property documentation, and the need for clear communication with affected residents regarding testing and monitoring procedures.

Ms. Jocelyn Colyer of Bernheisel Bridge Road acknowledged the Board's efforts in reviewing the project but stated that earlier review of zoning and overlay decisions would have better addressed resident concerns. She expressed concern that impacts on nearby homes, and the broader community were being minimized and raised issues regarding transparency, including missing or incomplete meeting records and potential conflicts of interest related to the environmental review process. Ms. Colyer also reported personal concerns regarding ongoing blasting activities associated with nearby utility or infrastructure work, stating that the noise and vibration had

negatively affected a family member, including increased anxiety and reduced quality of life, and raised concerns about potential impacts on veterans in the community. She questioned whether appropriate consideration had been given to health and safety impacts of blasting and referenced the number of planned drill holes associated with construction activities. She further raised broader concerns about environmental impacts, including air and water resources, quality of life, and long-term community effects, and urged the Board to prioritize resident welfare over development interests in its decision-making.

Mr. John Manta of Wolfs Bridge Road raised concerns regarding potential tax incentives for large-scale data centers, referencing state legislation that he stated provides tax exemptions, and questioned the long-term fiscal impact on Middlesex Township, including school funding, public safety services, and infrastructure costs. He also expressed concern about temporary and permanent workforce impacts on local schools and emergency services, as well as potential strain on utility infrastructure such as generators and energy demand. Mr. Manta further questioned whether binding commitments exist for site restoration or decommissioning of facilities at the end of the project lifecycle, noting concerns about environmental remediation and well impacts based on experiences from other industrial development areas. He requested clarification on the status of a previously discussed resident committee for comprehensive plan review and expressed concern that it had not yet been established.

Township representatives clarified that the referenced sales and use tax exemption applies only to equipment purchases and does not affect property taxes and stated that it is a time-limited program. They further explained that decommissioning requirements are not typically included in Township zoning ordinances for comparable developments. Officials also provided an update on the comprehensive plan process, noting that proposals for consulting firms were under review, with selection and community engagement expected to proceed soon. Additionally, they noted that grant funding had been applied for through state and county programs, with work potentially beginning in the near term depending on approval and funding timelines.

Mr. Earl Beam of Country Club Road expressed concerns regarding the impact of the proposed project on nearby residences, including potential decreases in property values, loss of quality of life, and whether residents would be compensated for impacts. He questioned possible property tax adjustments due to reduced home values and raised concerns about the reliability of well water, particularly the risk of wells going dry. Mr. Beam requested clarification on several design and construction details, including the height and placement of proposed fencing, distance of a nearby substation from the roadway, and landscaping specifications, noting concern that proposed tree plantings may not provide adequate screening at maturity. He also asked about wastewater management and whether treated water would be reused or discharged, and whether additional actions had been taken to address environmental concerns. Township representatives noted that property reassessment requests would need to be directed to the County Assessment Office and provided general clarification regarding wastewater regulatory requirements. Mr. Beam and others raised concerns about blasting practices and materials referenced for construction, questioning their safety near residential areas. Township representatives stated that blasting is regulated by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection and is commonly used in construction and indicated they would seek additional clarification from the contractor. Alternatives such as hydraulic rock breaking were also discussed as a possible method with different impacts.

Mr. George Gentile of Goldenrod Drive ceded his speaking time to Ms. Viola Byerly. Ms. Byerly raised concerns regarding impacts of the proposed development on nearby residents, including perceived declines in property values, loss of quality of life, and lack of available compensation,

mitigation, or tax relief options for affected homeowners. The speaker expressed frustration over being unable to sell their property at prior value and requested either buyout options or tax abatements for residents along Country Club Road. Township representatives noted that differential property tax rates or abatements for individual residents are not legally permissible and clarified that no Township-level tax exemption is provided for the project, though state-level sales and use tax exemptions may apply to qualifying equipment. Additional concerns were raised regarding ongoing blasting activity and its potential physical and psychological impacts on residents, including references to PTSD-related stress, as well as noise and vibration concerns affecting daily quality of life. The speaker also expressed concern about proposed workforce size, truck traffic, and construction hours, requesting stricter operating limitations and greater local control over construction schedules.

Questions were raised about staging areas, wetlands, and potential environmental disturbance on adjacent parcels. The speaker further requested improved transparency, timely communication, and more consistent dissemination of project information, and urged the Township to slow or pause advancement of Phase 1B pending additional answers. Township representatives noted that additional project phases, including Phase 1C and Phase 2, are anticipated to be discussed at an upcoming Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Jody Shivell of Teaberry Drive described extensive community outreach efforts by residents, including door-to-door outreach and mailings, to inform neighbors about the proposed project, stating that many residents had previously received limited or unclear information about the development. She expressed concern regarding inadequate communication from the Township and noted that some residents, particularly elderly individuals, do not use social media and rely on direct notice. Ms. Shivell stated that residents only became fully aware of the project in late 2025 and have since been attempting to engage through public meetings. She raised concerns that prior notification methods may not have been sufficient for meaningful public awareness and requested improved, direct communication such as mailed notices to all residents. She further requested that the project be slowed to allow additional time for public understanding and engagement. Ms. Shivell also expressed personal concerns regarding proximity to the proposed development, including potential environmental and noise impacts, noting her residence is approximately 1,900 feet from planned infrastructure. She referenced her and her spouse's veteran background and described concerns about stress and quality-of-life impacts on residents. She concluded by reiterating concerns about transparency, communication practices, and the pace of project advancement.

Mr. Stan Shivell of Teaberry Drive questioned the history of zoning changes for the project area, stating his understanding that the land was originally agricultural, later changed to residential, and ultimately designated for industrial use. He requested clarification on how these zoning transitions occurred and which Board members approved of them.

Township representatives responded that the data center overlay was approved at a public meeting on May 30, 2025, following required advertising and review processes, and noted that the proposal also received recommendations from the County Planning Department and approval from the Township Planning Commission. Officials further stated that multiple public votes were part of the approval process.

Mr. Shivell expressed concern regarding notification and transparency, asserting that residents were not adequately informed during the zoning and planning process. He referenced concerns from neighboring property owners regarding development expectations, construction activity, and

potential impacts on property values and quality of life. He reiterated concerns about communication and requested clarification on how zoning designations evolved over time.

Mr. Tracy Gleim of Sherwood Drive provided comments regarding well water impacts, drawing on his experience with quarry operations in the region. He noted that previous quarry activity did not historically affect nearby wells but expressed concern that large-scale extraction or development activity could potentially impact groundwater supplies. Mr. Gleim emphasized the importance of reliable access to water for residential and agricultural users, citing examples of local farms and livestock operations dependent on wells. He expressed concern that well failures could require residents to haul water or rely on emergency replacement wells. He requested that the developer ensure proactive measures are in place, including immediate drilling of replacement wells if existing wells are negatively impacted, and stressed that adequate safeguards should be provided given the scale and financial capacity of the project.

Ms. Arlene Darlington of Wertzville Road requested clarification regarding the scale and operational details of the proposed data center, including the number of generators, building sizes, and overall project footprint. She expressed concern about the cumulative number of backup generators and questioned assumptions regarding generator testing frequency, duration, and resulting noise impacts. Ms. Darlington raised concerns that repeated generator testing could contribute to sustained daily noise levels and questioned whether the project's cumulative impacts had been fully considered, including potential effects on surrounding residents. She also requested additional information on building dimensions and emphasized concerns about the overall size and intensity of the development. Township representatives noted that detailed dimensional specifications are typically addressed during final land development stages and do not materially affect the current decision under consideration. Ms. Darlington suggested the Township consider requiring or encouraging a smaller-scale project to reduce potential impacts such as water usage, noise, heat generation, and environmental strain, stating that a downsized development may better balance community concerns with development goals.

Mr. Matt Barrick of Hollow Brook Drive requested clarification regarding the nature of hyperscale data center facilities, referencing prior tours of data center campuses and noting the scale and density of similar developments in other regions. He expressed concern that the proposed project represents a significantly larger footprint than initially understood, including multiple large buildings and associated infrastructure. Mr. Barrick raised concerns regarding visual impacts such as building height (approximately 75 feet) and questioned the effectiveness of proposed vegetative screening measures, noting that mature landscaping would take significant time to provide meaningful buffering. He identified water usage as a primary concern, along with potential impacts to air quality associated with the use of numerous diesel backup generators. He suggested that cleaner alternatives, such as natural gas generators or emerging technologies like liquid cooling, should be considered to reduce environmental impacts. He also raised concerns about cumulative noise from generator testing and overall operational activity, estimating frequent daily testing cycles. Mr. Barrick additionally expressed concern about potential impacts to nearby property values and quality of life for residents located within proximity of the site, stating that impacts would extend beyond immediately adjacent properties. Township representatives encouraged residents to seek additional technical information from the Municipal Authority and Susquehanna River Basin Commission regarding water sourcing and allocation. Officials also noted that while alternative cooling and power systems exist, current water-based systems are widely used and consistent with approved regulatory allocations.

Ms. Michelle Denofa of Fieldstone Drive ceded her speaking time to Ms. Jocelyn Colyer. Ms. Colyer raised concerns about air quality impacts from the proposed data center's diesel generators, noting that the valley already experiences significant particulate pollution from warehouses, truck traffic, highways, and geographic conditions that trap emissions. She questioned whether generator emissions could worsen local air quality, particularly during hot weather and high pollution periods, and asked what would happen if emissions testing failed to meet permit requirements. She also referenced previous comments that some buildings had been reoriented to prevent exhaust from entering building air intakes and expressed concern that residents could still be exposed to those emissions.

Township representatives explained that DEP air-quality permits would require emissions monitoring at the property line, with testing results reported to both the developer and the Township. When asked about permit violations, officials stated that if emissions exceeded permit limits, the operator would be required to repair or modify equipment and bring it back into compliance before continuing operation. Township representatives acknowledged they were seeking additional information from DEP regarding enforcement procedures and permitting requirements.

Ms. Colyer also asked whether the developer had provided a list of chemicals that would be used to treat cooling water. She followed up with questions about the facility's hybrid cooling system, asking why water would be discharged as wastewater if no chemicals were being added. The developer explained that repeated recirculation and evaporation concentrate naturally occurring minerals in the water. Once mineral concentrations reach certain levels, the water can no longer be discharged to surface waters and must instead be sent to the sewer system. The developer stated that the discharge is primarily concentrated water rather than chemically treated wastewater, but it must still meet industrial discharge limits. If discharge quality exceeds allowable limits, on-site treatment would be required before release to the sewer system.

Mr. Steve Cadwallader of Hollow Brook Drive stated that he had attended many meetings regarding the proposed data center since learning about the project in October and expressed concern that more community meetings were not held before approvals were granted. Mr. Cadwallader criticized the environmental study conducted for the project, arguing that it should be reconsidered and stating that he had previously raised concerns about potential conflicts or connections involving the consultant. He emphasized the need for a more comprehensive environmental review, citing concerns about cooling tower operations and wastewater management. Mr. Cadwallader raised questions about cooling tower blowdown water, noting that cooling systems often require chemical treatments such as biocides and other additives. He questioned whether the resulting wastewater could contain hazardous substances and whether local wastewater treatment facilities are equipped to handle it. He also questioned assumptions regarding stormwater management, referencing the site's geology and the presence of shallow bedrock. He expressed skepticism that retention ponds would drain as projected and voiced concerns that overflow could impact nearby waterways. Mr. Cadwallader stated that there were still significant unanswered questions regarding environmental impacts and that the project had advanced too quickly without sufficient public review. While stating that he is not opposed to data centers in general, he expressed opposition to the proposed location and suggested that alternative sites or a smaller-scale project should be considered. He commended efforts to create a citizen advisory or steering committee, noting that community members with relevant technical expertise could provide valuable input during the review process. In response, township representatives noted that any wastewater discharge associated with the project would be subject to permitting and oversight by the wastewater authority and DEP regulations.

Ms. Breann Serrano of Mimosa Lane stated that her home is located near the proposed development and overlooks the creek area adjacent to the site. She expressed concerns about noise impacts, particularly how sound travels within the local valley and residential area. She noted that sounds often carry unusually far in the neighborhood and questioned whether the project's acoustic studies accounted for local topography and sound reverberation. She raised concerns about the potential impact of ongoing operational noise on her household, including her husband's audiobook recording business, and questioned whether the projected noise levels accurately reflect real-world conditions in the area. Township representatives responded that professional sound engineers conducted the project's noise study and that compliance is measured at the property line in accordance with the zoning ordinance's noise limits. Ms. Serrano questioned whether the noise ordinance could be strengthened and expressed concern that nearby neighborhoods, including Country Manor West, were not receiving sufficient consideration in the review process. She also stated that many residents in her community did not receive notice about blasting activities and felt that outreach to Country Manor West residents had been inadequate. Discussion followed regarding blasting notifications and schedules. Township officials stated that blasting operations are regulated, monitored, and conducted within state limits, but noted that exact blasting times can vary due to construction conditions and safety requirements. Officials explained that delays or adjustments may occur when blasting preparations do not proceed as planned, making it difficult to provide precise advance timing for every blast.

Ms. Susan Coulson of Oak Ridge Road thanked residents, community organizations, and attendees for their participation, research, public comments, and advocacy regarding the proposed data center project. She expressed appreciation for the level of public engagement and stated that she wished similar community discussions had occurred earlier in the review process. She encouraged continued public involvement and attendance at future meetings.

In response to questions about the project timeline, township staff explained that Pennsylvania law requires the Township to act on submitted plans within specified review periods unless the applicant grants an extension. The final subdivision plan, Phase 1A land development plan, and Phase 1B preliminary land development plan were all approaching their decision deadlines, requiring board action unless additional extensions were provided. Township staff noted that additional project plans would continue to come before the Planning Commission in future meetings.

Vice-Chairman Neiderer discussed the legal and procedural constraints facing the Township, noting that certain project components, including utility infrastructure, are subject to established permitting processes. He also referenced broader state-level discussions regarding data center development and siting. He then proposed approving the final subdivision plan and Phase 1A land development plan while requesting a 30-day extension for the Phase 1B preliminary land development plan to allow additional consideration of residents' concerns regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and the possibility of a third-party review. The developer's representative responded that the EIA was prepared by qualified professionals and reviewed through the standard land-development process. He stated that there was no legal conflict of interest in the preparation of the report, that the consultant's role had been disclosed throughout the process, and that the study had undergone multiple rounds of review by Township, County, and Conservation District professionals.

Township engineering representatives confirmed that they had provided numerous comments on the original EIA, received revisions, and reviewed the report against the requirements of the zoning ordinance. They indicated that the report ultimately met the applicable standards and that a second

review would be subject to the same criteria. When asked whether a new EIA would likely produce substantially different findings, the Township engineer stated that it was unlikely to result in significant differences and estimated that preparing a completely new assessment could take several months. The developer's representative emphasized that environmental impacts identified in the report are typical considerations associated with land development projects and that the report was intended to document and address those impacts through the permitting process. Discussion also addressed potential legal consequences of denying approvals. Township officials noted that because the project is a permitted use under the current zoning ordinance, a denial could result in litigation and significant costs to the Township. Officials characterized the situation as difficult due to the limitations imposed by existing zoning regulations and state land-use law.

Discussion and Possible motion on Preliminary Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Phase 1-B (Data Center): On the motion of Vice-Chairman Neiderer, seconded by Chairman Geistwhite, it was unanimously agreed to approve relief from the following sections of the Middlesex Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance No. 8-2017 (SALDO), and the Middlesex Township Stormwater Management Ordinance No. 6-2011 (SWMO), for the Preliminary Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Phase 1-B, subject to providing written request and justification for each relief sought and listing the relief sought on the cover sheet of the plan set.

1. SALDO § 501.A.2. Modification of requirement for plan scale not smaller than one inch to one hundred feet (1"=100').
2. SALDO § 501.A.6. Modification of requirement for location map scale not smaller than one inch to one thousand feet (1"=100').
3. SALDO § 501.C.19., § 303.J.12., § 303.K.12. Deferral until final plan of requirements for metes and bounds descriptions of easements.
4. SALDO § 703.A.10. Waiver of requirements for curbing and sidewalk along Country Club Road and PA Data Drive abutting the development property, with required note on plan. This waiver does not include requirements for roadway drainage facilities including road pavement base drains along abutting portions of Country Club Road and PA Data Drive.
5. SALDO § 703.I.4. Waiver of requirement for depressed curb at driveway entrance openings along PA Data Drive.
6. [SALDO § 707.] – Waiver of requirements for installation of sidewalks and pedestrian paths along both sides of new interior streets, with required note on plan.
7. [SALDO § 718.D.3.A., § 718.F.4.A., § 718.D.4.B., § 718.D.4.C., § 718.D.4.D.] Modification of requirements for minimum plan scale of not more than one inch to one hundred feet (1"=100') for required maps of physical resources within the Environmental Impact Assessment Report.
8. [SWMO § 302.A.13.] – Deferral until final plan of requirements for to provide construction details for stormwater inlets.
9. [SWMO § 302.H.12.] – Deferral until final plan or requirements for to provide Geotechnical Engineer certification of stormwater management Managed Released Concept (MRC) design.
10. [SWMO § 303.J.3.] – Modification of requirement for stormwater detention basin side slopes to not be steeper than four (4) units horizontal to one (1) unit vertical and for stormwater detention basin bottom slopes not to be less than two percent (2%).
11. [SWMO § 303.H.17.] – Modification of requirement for all stormwater infiltration practices to infiltrate the stored volume within forty-eight (48) hours.
12. [SWMO § 303.B.2.] – Modification of requirement for infiltration of surface water runoff at its source as the primary mechanism for stormwater management.

13. [SWMO § 719.B.2., § 719.B.3.] – Deferral until final plan of requirements to provide final landscaping plan.

On the motion of Vice-Chairman Neiderer, seconded by Chairman Geistwhite, it was unanimously agreed to approve the Preliminary Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Phase 1-B, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the applicant satisfies all comments and conditions of the Township Engineer, Bud Grove, P.E. in written review letter #3 of J. Michael Hess, PE of Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc. dated 04/09/2026 and 04/10/2026 in a manner acceptable to the Township Engineer, subject to his final review.
2. That the applicant satisfies all comments and conditions of the Township Engineer, Bud Grove, P.E. in written sound study review letter #1 of J. Michael Hess, PE of Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc. dated 04/23/2026 in a manner acceptable to the Township Engineer, subject to his final review.
3. That the applicant satisfies all comments of the Cumberland County Planning Department, in written report dated 01/02/2025 for Plan Number P25-1134, subject to final review by the Township Zoning Officer.
4. That a restrictive covenant be added to the plan by note stating that no water wells will be drilled on the property and that all existing water wells on the property will be properly abandoned and sealed in accordance with PA DEP regulations.
5. That per Section 710.E.2.b. of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance No. 8-2017, as amended, the applicant pays to Middlesex Township the required fee in lieu of dedication of park and recreation areas for the subdivision of \$1,000 per disturbed acre of development area, prior to the final plans being signed by the Township and released for recording.
6. That the applicant enters into a developer's agreement with Middlesex Township regarding required public improvements and posts financial security for required public improvements, as-built plans and engineering inspection fees for this plan with the Township in an amount acceptable to the Township Engineer and form acceptable to the Township Solicitor, prior to the final plans being signed by the Township and released for recording.
7. That, when plans are released by Middlesex Township for recording at the Cumberland County Office of the Recorder of Deeds, the applicant records all plan sheets of the plan set, and provide both a digital PDF file and at least one paper copy of the plan as recorded and the Recorder of Deeds Certification page for township records.

After immediate discussion, it was determined that item 7 above should not be included in the motion. On the motion of Vice-Chairman Neiderer, seconded by Chairman Geistwhite, it was unanimously agreed to strike condition # 7, with the motion as previously made approved as amended.

The applicant noted agreement with the conditions of approval.

Discussion and Possible motion on Final Major Subdivision Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) (Data Center): On the motion of Vice-Chairman Neiderer, seconded by Chairman Geistwhite, it was unanimously agreed that regarding sewage facilities planning for the Final Major Subdivision Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1), we accept this plan as a no-building lot subdivision and concur with use of the PA DEP form request for Planning Waiver & Non-Building Declaration, subject to favorable review and approval by PA DEP.

On the motion of Vice-Chairman Neiderer, seconded by Chairman Geistwhite, it was unanimously agreed to approve a waiver of the following section of the Middlesex Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance No. 8-2017 (SALDO) for the Final Major Subdivision Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1), subject to providing written request and justification for each waiver and listing the waivers on the cover sheet of the plan set.

1. SALDO § 501.A.2. Plan scale not smaller than 1"=100'. Modification to allow Sheets SD101 through SD203 to be at 1"=50' scale due to project size, to allow comprehensive review and legibility.

On the motion of Vice-Chairman Neiderer, seconded by Chairman Geistwhite, it was unanimously agreed to approve the Final Major Subdivision Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1), subject to the following conditions:

1. That the applicant satisfies all comments and conditions of the Township Engineer, Bud Grove, P.E. in written review of J. Michael Hess, PE of Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc. dated 02/06/2026 in a manner acceptable to the Township Engineer, subject to his final review.
2. That the applicant satisfies all comments of the Cumberland County Planning department, in written report dated 03/16/2026 for Plan Number P26-147, subject to final review by the Township Zoning Officer.
3. That, when plans are released by Middlesex Township for recording at the Cumberland County Office of the Recorder of Deeds, the applicant records all plan sheets of the plan set; and provide both a digital PDF file and at least one paper copy of the plan as recorded and the Recorder of Deeds Certification Page for township records.

The applicant noted agreement with the conditions of approval.

Discussion and Possible motion on Final Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Phase 1-A (Data Center): On the motion of Vice-Chairman Neiderer, seconded by Chairman Geistwhite, it was unanimously agreed to approve relief from the following sections of the Middlesex Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance No. 8-2017 (SALDO), and the Middlesex Township Stormwater Management Ordinance No. 6-2011 (SWMO), for the Final Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Phase 1-A, subject to providing written request and justification for each relief sought and listing the relief sought on the cover sheet of the plan set.

1. SALDO § 501.A.2. Modification of requirement for plan scale not smaller than one inch to one hundred feet (1"=100').
2. SALDO § 501.A.6. Modification of requirement for location map scale not smaller than one inch to one thousand feet (1"=1000').
3. SALDO § 703.A.10. Waiver of requirements for curbing and sidewalk along Country Club Road abutting the development property, with required note on plan. This waiver does not include requirements for roadway drainage facilities including road pavement base drains along abutting portions of Country Club Road.
4. SALDO § 703.1.4. Waiver of requirement for depressed curb at driveway entrance openings along PA Data Drive.
5. SALDO § 703.M., § 703.M.2. Waiver of requirements for grading of street right-of-way areas to a point 2 foot beyond the right-of-way line, which are not part of the paved cartway or shoulder along PA Data Drive.
6. SALDO § 703.M.2. Modification of requirements for grading of street right-of-way areas which are not part of the paved cartway or shoulder along Country Club Road.

7. [SLDO § 707.] – Deferral of requirement for installation of sidewalks and pedestrian paths along both sides of PA Data Drive, with required note on plan.
8. [SALDO § 703.C.1. & Table 703.1.] Modification of requirement for minimum street cartway and shoulder width for Country Club Road, which is classified as a Collector Road, to allow alternate street cartway and shoulder width.
9. [SALDO § 703.H.2.] Modification of requirement for minimum street horizontal curve centerline radius along existing portion of Country Club Road.
10. [SALDO § 718.D.3.A, § 718.D.4.A., § 718.D.4.B., § 718.D.4.C., § 718.D.4.D.] Modification of requirements for minimum plan scale of not more than one inch to one hundred feet (1"=100') for required maps of physical resources within the Environmental Impact Assessment Report.
11. [SALDO § 718.D.3.B.] Deferral of requirements for submission of plans and elevations depicting the proposed size, square footage, height, number of rooms of buildings and/or other structures.
12. [SWMO § 303.J.3.] – Modification of requirement for stormwater detention basin side slopes to not be steeper than four (4) units horizontal to one (1) unit vertical and for stormwater detention basin bottom slopes not to be less than two percent (2%).
13. [SWMO § 303.K.9.] – Modification of requirement for stormwater drainage swales at a minimum grade of two percent (2%).
14. [SWMO § 303.H.17.] – Modification of requirement for all stormwater infiltration practices to infiltrate the stored volume within forty-eight (48) hours.
15. [SWMO § 303.B.2.] – Modification of requirement for infiltration of surface water runoff at its source as the primary mechanism for stormwater management.

On the motion of Vice-Chairman Neiderer, seconded by Chairman Geistwhite, it was unanimously agreed to approve the Final Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Phase 1-A, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the applicant satisfies all comments and conditions of the Township Engineer, Bud Grove, P.E. in written review of J. Michael Hess, PE of Herbert, Rowland & Grubic, Inc. dated 03/27/2026 in a manner acceptable to the Township Engineer, subject to his final review.
2. That the applicant satisfies all comments of the Cumberland County Planning Department, in written report dated 03/13/2026 for Plan Number P26-107, subject to final review by the Township Zoning Officer.
3. That per Section 710.E.2.b. of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance No. 8217, as amended, the applicant pays to Middlesex Township the required fee in lieu of dedication of park and recreation areas for the subdivision of \$1,000 per disturbed acre of development area, prior to the final plans being signed by the Township and released for recording.
4. That the applicant enters into a developer's agreement with Middlesex Township regarding required public improvements and posts financial security for required public improvements, as-built plans and engineering inspection fees for this plan with the Township in an amount acceptable to the Township Engineer and form acceptable to the Township Solicitor, prior to the final plans being signed by the Township and released for recording.
5. That, when plans are released by Middlesex Township for recording at the Cumberland County Office of the Recorder of Deeds, the applicant records all plan sheets of the plan set; and provide both a digital PDF file and at least one paper copy of the plan as recorded and the Recorder of Deeds Certification Page for township records.

The applicant noted agreement with the conditions of approval.

Discussion and possible action on Carlisle Volunteer Fire Fighters Association contract for fire protection: On the motion of Chairman Geistwhite, seconded by Vice-Chairman Neiderer, it was unanimously agreed to execute the contract for fire protection by Carlisle Volunteer Fire Fighters Association.

Discussion and possible action on New Kingstown Fire Company contract for fire protection: On the motion of Chairman Geistwhite, seconded by Vice-Chairman Neiderer, it was unanimously agreed to execute the contract for fire protection by New Kingstown Fire Company.

Discussion and possible action on Shermans Dale Community Fire Company contract for fire protection: On the motion of Chairman Geistwhite, seconded by Vice-Chairman Neiderer, it was unanimously agreed to execute the contract for fire protection by Shermans Dale Community Fire Company.

Discussion and possible action on North Middleton Township Volunteer Fire Company contract for fire protection: On the motion of Chairman Geistwhite, seconded by Vice-Chairman Neiderer, it was unanimously agreed to execute the contract for fire protection by North Middleton Township Volunteer Fire Company.

SUPERVISOR / STAFF COMMENTS: There were no comments.

Residents Q/A: There was no Q/A.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by Chairman Geistwhite at 10:35 p.m.



Appalachian Trail Conservancy

MEDIA STATEMENT

May 6, 2026

APPALACHIAN TRAIL CONSERVANCY OPPOSES PAX-1 DATA CENTER IN MIDDLESEX TOWNSHIP, PENNSYLVANIA

HARPERS FERRY, W.V. — Earlier this year, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy (ATC) expressed concerns to both LIVIC Civil and Middlesex Township about the development of the Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Data Center adjacent to the Appalachian National Scenic Trail in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania.

Located just 0.3 miles from the Appalachian Trail (A.T.) and visible from several viewpoints on the Trail, the development of PAX-1 will adversely affect the scenic, natural, historic, and cultural character of the region, as well as the experience of upwards of 150,000 visitors to this part of the A.T. each year.

To date, the ATC's concerns have not been adequately addressed in the data center's plans for development, and as a result the organization is expressing its opposition to the location, size, and scale of this development.

The Appalachian Trail Conservancy works closely with Appalachian Trail maintaining Clubs, the National Park Service, local communities, and other public and private land managers to ensure the protection and stewardship of the resources that contribute to the iconic A.T. experience. Together with its partners, the ATC encourages and appreciates early and comprehensive communication in the planning stage of an infrastructure project near the A.T. to ensure thorough analysis of adverse impacts to the Trail.

Unfortunately, neither the ATC nor the NPS were made aware of the PAX-1 project until after the ordinance for the data center overlay had already been approved by the Township.

The Appalachian Trail is nationally significant as a continuous, ridgeline-oriented recreational corridor intentionally located to provide expansive views of surrounding pastoral, wooded, and culturally significant landscapes that contribute to its historic setting and character. The A.T. in Pennsylvania is also significant because it supports a strong outdoor recreation economy while protecting the scenic, natural, and cultural resources of the Commonwealth.

Through a comprehensive Visual Resource Inventory process, the ATC has determined that multiple high value scenic vantage points on the Appalachian Trail will be significantly impacted. The development of PAX-1 would introduce prominent incompatible visual elements into a landscape historically characterized by its pastoral nature.

Additionally, significant construction over the next six years and eventual daily operation of the PAX-1 Data Center will increase noise disturbance, light pollution, and vehicle and heavy equipment traffic near the A.T. Finally, the ATC is concerned about habitat loss in the A.T. landscape and the potential considerable impacts on the local ecology.

(more)

As a key steward of this national treasure, the ATC is committed to ensuring that the impact of any proposed development near the Appalachian Trail be proactively evaluated and managed so that the Trail's resources and experience are protected in their current state or otherwise offset by enhancements that improve recreation and/or conservation in the vicinity. The ATC remains open to future conversations with LIVIC Civil to establish the best possible outcome for the Trail.

###

About the Appalachian Trail Conservancy

Founded in 1925, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy works passionately to manage and protect the Appalachian National Scenic Trail. As the only non-profit devoted exclusively to the entirety of the Trail and its landscape, we endeavor to keep its vast natural and scenic beauty healthy, resilient, and connected, so that everyone can experience its transformative power for generations to come. Together with our supporters, partners, and thousands of volunteers, we keep the Trail alive. To learn more, visit appalachiantrail.org.