

**MIDDLESEX TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 27, 2026**

START TIME: 7:00 p.m.

END TIME: 11:08 p.m.

MEMBERS' PRESENT:

Wes Beard
Robynn Eppley
Jim Gehr
Tracy Gleim
Doug Graham
Tom Ryan
Larry Claycomb

STAFF PRESENT:

Mark Carpenter, Zoning Officer
Eileen Gault, Secretary/Treasurer
Bud Grove, Township Engineer
Zach Zook, Manager-Roadmaster
Mike Hess, HRG Engineer (Consultants for PAX-1 Project)

Tom Ryan Called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Mr. Ryan reviewed the procedures for public comment stating that it is limited to residents and/or taxpayers of Middlesex Township and matters that are not on the agenda.

Ms. Viola Byerly, Country Club Road, asked about the vacant hotel property and whether there has been any progress. She acknowledged that the property is currently involved in litigation and noted concerns about increased vandalism at the site. Mr. Carpenter responded that the matter is a topic for the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Jody Shivell, Teaberry Drive, asked questions regarding diesel fuel storage at the data center, including whether it would be stored above ground or underground and the amount to be stored. She also expressed concerns regarding dry woods near her property, blasting associated with construction work, potential fire risks, and the emergency response plan. Mr. Carpenter responded that emergency management personnel were not present and requested that the questions be addressed during the agenda item.

Discussion and Possible Action on draft minutes of April 13, 2026

The Board reviewed the April 13, 2026, meeting minutes, including brief discussions and clarifications. Ms. Robynn Eppley referenced page 6, paragraph 3, and requested clarification regarding rooftop exhaust fans. Justin Ross clarified that rooftop exhaust fans would be installed only on two buildings included in Phase 1B.

Mr. Jim Gehr referenced page 3, third paragraph from the bottom, clarifying full-height screening wall enclosures. Mr. Gehr also referenced page 4, paragraph 3, and requested removal of the words “and maintenance purposes” in reference to the generators.

Mr. Wes Beard referenced page 5, third paragraph, and requested that “approximately 400,000 gallons per day” be revised to read “up to 400,000 gallons per day” or “for a maximum of 400,000 gallons per day.”

Mr. Larry Claycomb moved to approve April 13, 2026, meeting minutes with three corrections. Mr. Doug Graham seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

TPF 25-28 Discussion and Possible Action on Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for Ahold Delhaize Solar Development, on Shady Lane (BOS action deadline 06/03/2026)

Representative for Ahold Delhaize, Garrett Barner, was present to discuss the Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan for the Ahold Delhaize Solar Development on Shady Lane. Mr. Barner stated that the site layout has not changed and that the project proposes a 2.8-megawatt facility. Comments from Township Engineer Mr. Bud Grove have been addressed, and the applicant is requesting three waivers.

Mr. Larry Claycomb asked whether the north arrows on the plans had been corrected. Mr. Barner confirmed that Sheet C101 was incorrect.

Mr. Doug Graham asked what had been done regarding the 10-ton weight limit on the bridge. Mr. Barner stated that they are working on obtaining site access, with the construction engineer reviewing the bridge. Discussion also included the need for a fire protection plan due to the lack of hydrants at the site. The developer indicated a willingness to work with the Township on addressing emergency access and determining how fire apparatus would reach the facility. Mr. Mark Carpenter noted that there is a privately owned access road parallel to Interstate 81 that could be used by fire and emergency services.

Mr. Graham also stated that the Township needs additional detail regarding the panel layout, panel width, mounting methods, and minimum spacing between panels required under the new ordinance. Mr. Carpenter noted that the applicant received Conditional Use approval under the previous ordinance. It was also stated that a decommissioning study has been completed and addressed. Questions were raised regarding the wind rating of the panels and compliance with the Pennsylvania Uniform Construction Code.

Mr. Grove stated that the applicant initially submitted plans with numerous comments, but most remaining SALDO review items are considered minor. He noted that the Planning Commission must review the Letort Regional Authority comments dated February 3, 2026. The developer also submitted a response to Letort Regional Authority (LRA) dated March 6. Mr. Barner discussed landscaping and maintenance issues. Mr. Grove stated that the proposed meadow mix is an acceptable DEP-approved BMP with guidelines specifically addressing solar panel installations.

The applicant indicated that a maintenance plan will be implemented for vegetation management and that revisions are being made to the seeding specifications.

Ms. Elizabeth Grant of the Cumberland County Planning Department provided comments related to general safety measures, including warning signs concerning voltage on the perimeter fencing and the installation of a stop sign at the intersection with Shady Lane. The developer responded that all applicable required signage will be installed. Clarification was also provided regarding the wetlands certification, confirming that no wetlands are located on the site. It was further noted that the DEP stormwater management provision should be included in the plans to demonstrate compliance with applicable requirements. Mr. Grove emphasized that all plan sheets must accurately reflect the proposed improvements.

Mr. Tom Ryan stated that he felt rushed in making a decision noting that the Letort Regional Authority comments have not yet been reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Jim Gehr stated that the submission materials are incomplete and that he sees no reason to take action at the present time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Jay Pronkoski asked about the purpose of the proposed solar development and whether the solar panels would be visible from the road. Mr. Barner responded that the project is intended to provide an additional source of power connected to the PPL distribution grid, and that anyone served by that distribution circuit would utilize the solar-generated power. He also confirmed that the solar panels will be visible from the roadway. Mr. Pronkoski then read a portion of Article I, Section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution and requested that it be taken into consideration during review of the project.

Mr. Earl Beam, Country Club Road, asked if goats and sheep were considered for the project. The developer will consider this as an option.

Mr. Stan Shivell, Teaberry Drive, expressed that since most of the public present was for the data center agenda items, this should have been at the end of the agenda.

Ms. Roberta Kribell asked who would be responsible if a solar panel were to come onto her property. Mr. Mark Carpenter responded that the project will be designed in accordance with applicable building code standards, which establish minimum requirements for the area. He further stated that the developer would be responsible for any damage to neighboring properties.

Ms. Viola Byerly of Country Club Road expressed concerns regarding the proposed wildflower mix, noting that invasive seed species have caused problems in the past by spreading into nearby yards. She suggested using seed mixes that are specific to the local area and highly recommended the use of animals for vegetation management. Ms. Byerly also encouraged involving local individuals who have knowledge of the area in the planning process. She further asked who would receive the renewable energy credits generated by the project.

Mr. Steve Callawalder of Hollowbrook Drive questioned whether the project would prevent public access to Letort Stream. It was said that an area would remain available to allow access to the stream. Mr. Callawalder also asked how the retention calculations were determined if the developer were to walk away, and it was stated that the Township relies on the engineer to provide those calculations and estimates.

TPF 25-25 Discussion and Possible Action on Preliminary Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital (PAX-1) Phase 1-B (Data Center) (BOS action deadline 05/06/2026)

Mr. Ryan stated that the next three agenda items are related to the proposed data center project and suggested providing a background review of the plans, as they had previously been before the Planning Commission. Mr. Charles Courtney and Mr. Justin Ross were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Ross began with a review of the Final Subdivision Plan, stating that the plan has remained unchanged and that all final review comments have been addressed. He explained that the plan consolidated three existing parcels into one larger tract and then subdivided the property into five lots identified as Lots 1-A, 1-B, 1-C, Lot 2, and Lot 3.

Mr. Ross then reviewed Lot 1-A, identified as the eastern parcel. He stated that the plan includes relocation of a water line along the east side of the site. Construction of the Lot 1-A site plan is currently underway and includes an access loop road, a PPL substation, switching stations, stormwater management facilities, and preliminary landscaping improvements. Mr. Ross noted that the plan is consistent with the previously approved preliminary plan while also addressing updated ordinance requirements. To orient members of the public in attendance, Mr. Ross reviewed the roads adjacent to the project site.

Mr. Ross presented Campus 1, which includes the first six buildings within the proposed development. He explained that the stormwater management areas are designed so they will not retain water for more than 72 hours and are intended to remain dry basins with wetland bottoms and a vegetative meadow mix. Mr. Ross stated that the plan also includes landscaping, lighting, generators, buildings, and sound mitigation measures. He noted that environmental concerns at the local, county, and state levels are being addressed and that the applicant is continuing to secure and obtain all required permits for the project. Mr. Ross identified the creek shown on the plans by a blue horseshoe-shaped line and stated that the existing forested wetland area along the creek will not be impacted. He further noted that the existing natural buffering will be maintained and enhanced as part of the project.

Mr. Courtney stated that all three data center plans on the agenda are proceeding through separate preliminary and final land development review processes. He explained that, unlike the solar project earlier on the agenda, which combined the preliminary and final plan process into a single submission and action, the data center project has submitted separate plans with separate reviews and separate actions.

Mr. Courtney explained that the first item under consideration is the Phase 1B Preliminary Plan only. A future Final Plan submission will be required, followed by additional Planning

Commission review and recommendation, as well as future action by the Board of Supervisors. He emphasized that the current request is for preliminary approval only and that additional planning and review processes will occur.

Mr. Courtney noted that the applicant has previously presented the plans extensively and addressed numerous questions. The applicant received HRG Review Letter #3 prior to the last Planning Commission meeting and subsequently resubmitted revised plans addressing the comments, leaving only minor technical comments outstanding. He also stated that the applicant received HRG's review of the sound study, which contained only minor comments. In addition, Mr. Courtney stated that the requested waivers, modifications, and deferrals associated with the application had been presented previously.

Mr. Mike Hess confirmed that HRG Review Letter #3 has been completed and that an interim resubmission from the applicant has been received and is currently under review. Mr. Hess also provided an update regarding one of the waiver requests related to curbing and sidewalks along Country Club Road. He noted that the waiver request, as listed on the plans, includes curbing, sidewalks, and underdrain. HRG is recommending that the underdrain portion of the waiver is not granted due to existing soft soil conditions in certain areas.

Mr. Hess stated that the sound study is generally accurate as presented. He explained that the initial sound study contained significant comments, but the revised sound study adequately addressed the review comments and concerns. He further noted that the sound study is acceptable for the Preliminary Plan stage and can be carried forward into the Final Plan review process.

Ms. Elizabeth Grant asked whether the revised plans included the layout of the generator yard to identify the location of the generators and whether they would face residential properties to the west. Mr. Ross responded that four of the buildings are inward facing, while the two buildings on the south side face west. He stated that the applicant is proposing full building-height screening walls so the generators will not appear as exterior-facing features and will not be visible from adjacent properties.

Ms. Grant also noted an administrative comment regarding the landscaping plan, stating that existing trees with trunk diameters of twenty inches or greater were required to be shown and that this information had been updated. She further noted a general comment applicable to multiple phases regarding the designated reforestation areas, including whether reforestation requirements would apply to each phase of the project and concerns related to the density of trees proposed within the reforestation areas for this phase.

Mr. Ross responded that he could not specifically address those items at the present time but stated that the final landscaping plan would address those details and that the current plans reflect what is anticipated for the project.

Mr. Wes Beard asked for clarification regarding the two buildings that include rooftop fans. Mr. Ross explained that the two buildings are based on an older model design due to supply chain issues and differ from the remainder of the campus buildings. Mr. Beard then asked how long the

applicant would be willing to delay the project if they chose to wait until all buildings could utilize the newer design.

Mr. Doug Graham asked about details related to the proposed security fencing. Mr. Ross responded that the security fence will not be chain link fencing and stated that he would confirm the final fencing details.

Ms. Robynn Eppley stated that she had recently listened to a podcast in which State Representative Gleim discussed data centers. She expressed concerns regarding lighting at the proposed facility, referencing the lighting visible from Interstate 81 at the UGI facility and noting that it can be seen from a considerable distance away. Ms. Eppley stated that she had not heard much discussion regarding lighting for the proposed development and asked what nearby residents could expect to see.

Mr. Courtney responded that UGI is a utility facility and therefore operates under certain ordinance exemptions. He stated that the developer has implemented lighting design standards exceeding what is required under the Township ordinance, including Dark Sky standards. Mr. Ross added that the project is committed to complying with ordinance standards and being a good neighbor. He stated that lighting color, intensity, fixture height, and shielding will all be addressed as part of the Final Plan process.

Mr. Ross further explained that as the building designs continue to evolve, the final lighting fixtures and layouts will be updated on the plans. He noted that some lighting is necessary for security purposes, but the applicant is proposing measures such as reducing lighting levels by up to 50 percent after certain hours and dimming lights during periods of no activity. Street lighting around the loop road and substation area will comply with Township ordinance requirements while exceeding minimum standards where possible.

Mr. Courtney emphasized that the current application is for Preliminary Plan approval only and that the Final Plan process will include more detailed specifications. Mr. Ross stated that a photometric plan has been provided showing zero light spill beyond the property boundaries and no light extending beyond the campus fencing.

Mr. Mike Hess confirmed that the photometric plan was submitted with the land development plans and that the proposed fixtures include cutoff shielding. He further confirmed that the plan was prepared, assuming full-brightness operating conditions rather than reduced after-hours lighting conditions.

Mr. Jim Gehr asked for clarification regarding generator testing and reference to maintenance occurring every 36 months. Mr. Ross responded that the extended three-year maintenance cycle involves additional servicing activities beyond the routine monthly maintenance and testing previously discussed, including operational inspections and servicing procedures to ensure proper functioning of the equipment.

Mr. Gehr also asked about the operating plan, noting that while some information had been provided, no specific hours of operation for generator maintenance were identified. He

recommended limiting generator maintenance activities to Monday through Friday between 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. to better align with the surrounding community and residential lifestyle.

Mr. Ross stated that the applicant intends to accomplish that goal from an end-user perspective; however, the facilities are regulated from an air quality emissions standpoint, and certain compliance requirements may occasionally necessitate after-hours testing based on ambient air quality conditions and federal regulatory requirements.

Mr. Courtney stated that the issue could be addressed as a condition of Final Plan approval through provisions included in a development agreement establishing hours for maintenance activities.

Mr. Wes Beard asked whether the applicant had considered biofuel or natural gas generators, noting that natural gas technology is cleaner from an air quality perspective. Mr. Ross responded that such technology does exist; however, the end user for the project utilizes diesel generators.

Mr. Beard also again asked whether the applicant would agree not to drill wells on the property. Mr. Bud Grove requested that a restrictive covenant be included prohibiting the drilling of wells. Mr. Courtney responded that the applicant was not prepared to agree at the current stage, but if recommended by the Planning Commission, it could be included as a condition of approval. Mr. Grove suggested that the restrictive covenant be made part of the Final Plan and clearly identified separately within the plan documents and noted that the Planning Commission could include it as a condition.

Mr. Beard asked whether any consideration had been given to requiring a decommissioning bond for the property. Mr. Courtney responded that if the data center were no longer used in the future, the buildings would remain on the property.

Ms. Robynn Eppley raised broader concerns regarding the project, stating that the data center overlay district represents a new land use within Middlesex Township. She stated that the community must evaluate both the positive and negative impacts of data centers and ensure that such uses complement rather than conflict with surrounding community uses. Ms. Eppley specifically questioned how the proposed data center is compatible with the surrounding area given its location.

Mr. Courtney responded that Ms. Eppley's concerns regarding impacts and compatibility were addressed during the ordinance development process. He explained that the Township adopted both a data center ordinance and a new ordinance incorporating data centers as a permitted use following extensive review by Township staff, planners, the Planning Commission, the Cumberland County Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors. He stated that the Township intentionally developed standards regulating data centers and that the current land development review process is focused on determining whether the plans comply with those ordinance requirements. Mr. Courtney further stated that the proposed plan is designed to exceed the applicable ordinance standards.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Tom Brickey of Elizabeth Way questioned the proposed buildings facing west and stated that Mr. Ross had previously indicated that a wall would be installed primarily for aesthetic purposes and not specifically as a sound barrier between the generator areas and nearby homes to the west. Mr. Brickey noted that the Cumberland County Planning Commission had commented that the wall should function as a sound barrier wall rather than solely an aesthetic feature. Mr. Ross responded that the proposed wall is intended to function as a sound wall as dictated by the sound study. He stated that a preliminary sound study has been provided and that continuation of the sound wall in that area was included as part of the study recommendations. Mr. Ross explained that during the Final Land Development phase, a final noise study will be completed with specific equipment details, exact wall placement, and wall height identified. He further stated that while the wall is primarily intended as a screening feature, additional sound attenuation measures will be incorporated as necessary to meet applicable noise requirements.

Ms. Roberta Kribell stated that the project and related blasting activities were a jarring experience for her and expressed concerns regarding blasting and a lack of notification to nearby residents. Mr. Justin Ross responded that the applicant has been actively working with the Township and contractors regarding blasting concerns. He noted that there will be an invitation to adjacent and nearby residents to attend an informational meeting and that a project website has been launched to provide additional information and updates regarding the project.

Ms. Alanys Vasquez of Country Manor West expressed concerns regarding the message the project sends to younger generations and the long-term environmental impacts of decisions being made today. She questioned whether this is the type of legacy of progress the community wishes to leave for the future.

Ms. Hilda Vasquez Rosa of Country Manor West expressed concerns regarding blasting activities and the potential effects on nearby gas pipelines. She noted that many of the pipelines are approximately 55 years old and that some nearby properties are already in need of repair. Ms. Vasquez Rosa questioned whether DEP is aware of the blasting intensity and the potential impacts associated with the project. Mr. Ross responded that DEP does monitor blasting activities and that contractors are required to comply with all applicable regulations, including licensing requirements and setback standards. He stated that seismic monitors have been installed at several locations around the perimeter of the project site and that blasting activities must remain within established threshold limits.

Mr. Courtney added that, in addition to the informational meeting previously discussed, there is a project website where residents can obtain project information, submit comments, and receive responses. He stated that the website address is www.pax1campus.com.

Mr. Kory Leppo of Long Bend Drive expressed confusion regarding the Preliminary Plan approvals for Phases 1A and 1B, stating that despite discussions of preliminary approvals, the project appears to be moving forward at full scale with blasting and related construction activities already underway.

Ms. Beth Lagore of Teaberry Drive asked for clarification regarding lighting controls. Referring to earlier discussion about utilities not being subject to the same lighting restrictions, she questioned whether the PPL facilities associated with Phase 1A would be exempt from lighting restrictions while the remainder of the project would remain subject to Township controls. Mr. Jim Gehr responded that he is not an expert on the matter but stated that Ms. Lagore was partially correct regarding utility lighting exemptions. He referred to the existing PPL substation on Bernheisel Bridge Road as an example during the discussion.

Mr. Claycomb stated that he appreciates the public input provided during the meeting, noting that it gives residents a voice and allows the Planning Commission to hear community concerns. He explained that the Planning Commission's role is advisory only and that it can make recommendations based solely on the requirements contained within the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO), Zoning Ordinance, and Stormwater Management Ordinance. Mr. Claycomb stated that the Planning Commission cannot make policy decisions or take actions outside the authority granted by the applicable ordinances. He further noted that the Commission also receives input from the County, Fire Chief, Letort Regional Authority, and Municipal Authority during the review process.

Mr. Wes Beard asked Mr. Carpenter whether there are any limitations regarding lighting associated with the utility portions of the project. He noted previous discussion regarding Dark Sky standards and limiting light fixtures to twenty feet in height and questioned whether utility-related lighting would be subject to similar restrictions. Mr. Carpenter responded by referencing the data center drive that loops around Phase 1A. Mr. Ross added that PPL lighting is required for security purposes but stated that they could ask PPL if they would be willing to explore options such as dimming the lights and utilizing full cutoff fixtures where possible.

Ms. Michele Denofa of Fieldstone Drive expressed concerns regarding the long-term impact of the project on community resources, including electricity, water, and related infrastructure. She stated that these systems were originally built to serve the surrounding communities and that large-scale operations should be responsible for creating and maintaining the resources necessary for their operations without placing additional burdens on residents. Ms. Denofa further stated that responsibility for the project should extend beyond the initial construction phase through written commitments. She also questioned what would occur if the operation were to relocate or cease operations in the future and asked who would be responsible for ensuring accountability if the project were found to be in violation of applicable ordinances. Mr. Carpenter responded that the Township has enforcement authority under the Zoning Ordinance and is primarily responsible for regulating land use and enforcing the standards associated with plan approvals. He stated that, in addition to enforcement actions available to the Township, the developer has indicated a willingness to exceed ordinance requirements and enter into a developer's agreement specifying what actions will or will not be taken and how applicable standards will be met. Mr. Carpenter further stated that accountability related to NPDES permitting and environmental compliance would also be provided by the Commonwealth through DEP oversight and enforcement.

Mr. Andrew Dymisky of Bernheisel Bridge Road asked whether HRG had subcontracted the sound analysis. Mr. Mike Hess responded that the sound analysis was subcontracted.

Mr. Dymsky then asked about the most recent environmental impact study for the project, who prepared it, and whether additional studies would be required as the project moves into final plan stages. Mr. Hess responded that a comprehensive environmental impact assessment for the entire campus was completed and is being updated as each phase progresses. He noted that Livic Civil prepared the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Mr. Dymsky also asked whether bulk diesel storage had been addressed in the Phase 1B plan and inquired about ownership structure, tax implications, and what would be included in the property assessment. Mr. Courtney responded that property assessment is based on the value of the land and buildings, including fixtures, regardless of ownership structure. Mr. Dymsky stated that while he appreciated comments from Mr. Ross and Mr. Courtney regarding efforts to be good neighbors, his primary concern was the overall scale of the project and ensuring that commitments and agreements remain enforceable through changes in property ownership. Mr. Courtney responded that all approvals, plan notations, and associated development agreements are tied to the land itself and remain enforceable regardless of ownership changes. He stated that the requirements follow the property and the approved development and are not dependent on the identity of the landowner if the approved plans are implemented.

Ms. Viola Byerly of Country Club Road asked for clarification regarding the blasting component of the project and inquired about the scheduling of resident informational meetings, including whether they would be held during working hours, in the evening, or as a single scheduled event. Mr. Courtney responded that the meeting schedule is still being coordinated, and that more than one informational meeting is expected to be held. Ms. Byerly referenced the April 1 meeting and stated she had been informed that blasting hours would occur between 10:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m., and asked whether those hours had changed, noting concerns that blasting notifications could not be heard from her residence and asking when blasting is expected to occur. Mr. Jim Gehr responded that at a recent construction meeting he attended, blasting was scheduled between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. and stated that this is the current plan. Mr. Gehr also raised concerns regarding notification methods and suggested that a method more effective than an air horn be considered. He noted that blasting activities are regulated at the state level.

Ms. Jody Shivel of Teaberry Drive expressed concerns regarding blasting activities and asked whether diesel fuel would be stored underground or above ground on the site. Mr. Ross responded that diesel fuel would be stored above ground, with each generator equipped with its own fully enclosed fuel tank. Ms. Shivel asked whether the developer had received all required permits for the project. Mr. Bud Grove responded that the NPDES permit, required by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for construction-related erosion, sedimentation, and stormwater management, has not yet been issued. He explained that the County Conservation District reviews the plans, acting on behalf of DEP, and that their technical review is still ongoing. Mr. Grove stated that the NPDES permit is currently not finalized and that no other outstanding permits affecting land development approval were known. He further noted that the Planning Commission may condition final land development approval on receipt of the NPDES permit.

Mr. Ross responded that an NPDES permit is in place for portions of the site, originally associated with a residential development and subsequently transferred and amended to include the PPL laydown yard, blasting activities, stone stockpile, and water main relocation associated with current construction. He stated that the applicant anticipates the full NPDES permit will be secured

within the next few weeks. Mr. Courtney clarified that, regardless of the current permit status, the matter before the Commission is a Preliminary Plan and that the NPDES permit is required for Final Plan approval.

Mr. Earl Beam of Country Club Road asked for clarification regarding the project's distance from the creek, noting a referenced distance of three hundred feet. Mr. Ross responded that the project maintains approximately a 300 to 400-foot buffer from the creek. Mr. Beam suggested that propane would be preferable to diesel and shared concerns about potential impacts to nearby properties. Mr. Beam asked where the project's electricity would be sourced from. Mr. Ross responded that power would be delivered via existing transmission lines extending from the Bernheisel Bridge area to Perry County. Mr. Beam also raised concerns regarding potential impacts on property values.

Ms. Arlene Darlington of Wertzville Road asked for the identity of the project tenant. Mr. Courtney responded that he could not disclose the tenant's name at this time. Ms. Darlington asked whether the buildings themselves produce heat and whether this is addressed in the project's impact studies. Mr. Ross responded that the buildings are cooled through air or evaporative systems and that while heat is exhausted through airflow, this is accounted for in the project design and analysis. Mr. Hess added that air quality impacts are included as part of the project's impact studies. Ms. Darlington expressed concern regarding the testing of approximately four hundred generators monthly, stating concerns about noise, continuous operation during portions of the day, and potential diesel odors. Ms. Darlington then read a portion of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the record. (see attached)

Ms. Susan Coulson questioned why the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors adopted the ordinance, stating concerns about whether the benefits of the project outweigh what she believes is being given up. She expressed concerns regarding potential impacts to water resources and wildlife and stated that the decision represents a significant impact on residents.

TPF 25-25 Discussion and Possible Action on Preliminary Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Phase 1-B (Data Center) (BOS action deadline 05/06/2026)

Mr. Hess reviewed the waiver requests for Phase 1-B.

On the motion of Mr. Claycomb, seconded by Mr. Gehr, it was unanimously agreed to recommend approval of TPF 25-25 Preliminary Land Development Plan for PAX 1, including the requested waivers indicated in the HRG letter of April 10, 2026, with the exception that the requirement for a base drain is not waived.

On the motion of Mr. Ryan, seconded by Mr. Graham, it was unanimously agreed to recommend approval of Preliminary Plan TPF 25-25, Plan 1B, with the condition that a restrictive covenant prohibiting the drilling of wells be added to the plan and that all outstanding HRG comments dated April 9, 2026 be addressed.

TPF 26-2 Discussion and Possible Action on Final Major Subdivision Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) (Data Center) (BOS action deadline 05/06/2026)

Mr. Hess stated that the subdivision plan itself creates lot 1B and does not have roadway frontage. There needs to be a provision in the developer's agreement whereby Pa Data Center Drive is bonded so that the road can be built.

Ms. Grant has administrative comments requesting a small key map on each plan sheet, adjoining lot owner information and considering showing the proposed data center development on the lot layout plan so you can see where setbacks are for the entire development. The other comment is drainage easement showing on each water course channel and stream.

On the motion of Mr. Gehr, seconded by Mr. Graham, it was unanimously agreed to recommend approval of the waiver of scale for TPF 26-2.

On the motion of Mr. Gehr, seconded by Mr. Claycomb, it was unanimously agreed to recommend approval of TPF 26-2 Final Major Subdivision Plan, with the condition of satisfying the comments of the Cumberland County Planning Commission and HRG.

TPF 26-5 Discussion and Possible Action on Final Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Phase 1-A (Data Center) (BOS action deadline 05/06/2026)

Mr. Mike Hess reported two waiver requests: (1) deferral of building plans and elevations until the building permit process, and (2) a modification request related to Phase 1-A fronting an existing curve on Country Club Road that does not meet the ordinance radius requirement for a new street. Mr. Courtney reported that the waivers were granted as part of the Preliminary Plan approval. Mr. Hess stated that additional waiver requests include curb and sidewalk requirements along Country Club Road and the pavement base drain. He explained that the pavement base drain, located beneath the roadway stone base, allows water to drain from wet soil conditions. He noted that the pavement base drain should not be waived and is shown on the plan.

Ms. Byerly, county club road, asked for clarification about the base drain that was being discussed.

Ms. Grant commented on the landscaping plan, noting that the riparian buffer enhancement Areas 1 and 2 appear to primarily preserve existing trees. She asked whether the plan could indicate the locations of the plantings identified in the enhancement schedule. Mr. Ross responded that many of the proposed plantings are plugs or seedlings, and the plan is based on planting density rather than specific planting locations. He stated that the chart could be clarified to better explain the density requirements. The intent is to supplement existing tree lines by filling gaps and replacing dead trees where needed.

Ms. Byerly requested a size comparison between the proposed PPL substation and the existing substation on Bernheisel Bridge Road. She also asked about the size of the berm and the types of trees proposed for planting on the berm. Mr. Ross responded that the proposed substation will be comparable in size to the Bernheisel Bridge Road facility and that a mix of trees will be planted. He noted that a maintenance agreement will be in place for upkeep of the landscaping.

Mr. Dymsky asked whether the PPL substation would serve only PAX-1 or also provide service to other areas. Mr. Ross responded that PPL is a public utility and may provide service wherever needed. Mr. Carpenter added that he had heard the substation would help improve redundancy in the area and that the lines would connect into existing utility lines.

On the motion of Mr. Beard, seconded by Mr. Claycomb, it was unanimously agreed to recommend approval of the sixteen waiver modifications to exclude the waiver of the base drain as mentioned in the HRG 3/27/2026 review comments.

On the motion of Mr. Claycomb, seconded by Mr. Gehr, it was unanimously agreed to recommend approval of TPF 26-5 Final Land Development Plan for Phase 1-A subject to the HRG comments of 3/27/2026 with the exception of the pavement base drain and County Planning comments of 3/13/2026 and contingent upon receiving their NPDES Permit.

Township Staff Information Comments with no discussion: There were no staff comments.

Mr. Gleim moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:08 p.m.

Middlesex Township Planning Commission meeting April 27, 2027

Project Management of PAX-1 Ph1B

Identifying Risks and creating a Risk Management Plan

To help identify potential risks we must remember that while the property owner has rights, so also do the residents of Middlesex Township in PA. The PC and residents have raised many concerns over the past several weeks. The Developer has made some solid revisions to the dev plan while other concerns seem to remain unanswered. In order to fully protect the rights of the residents, I believe we still need to obtain resolution on the loose ends before recommending approval of the preliminary development plan for Ph 1b.

What PA residents' rights need to be protected?

CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Ratified September 2nd, 1790

PREAMBLE

WE, the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, grateful to Almighty God for the blessings of civil and religious liberty, and humbly invoking His guidance, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

Article I

DECLARATION OF RIGHTS

That the general, great and essential principles of liberty and free government may be recognized and unalterably established, WE DECLARE THAT –

Inherent Rights of Mankind

Section 1.

All men are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent and indefeasible rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing their own happiness.

Natural Resources and the Public Estate

Section 27

The people have a right to clean air, pure water, and to the preservation of the natural, scenic, historic and esthetic values of the environment. Pennsylvania's public natural

resources are the common property of all the people, including generations yet to come. As trustee of these resources, the Commonwealth shall conserve and maintain them for the benefit of all the people.

Our Rights as stated in the PA Constitution:

- protecting property
- pursuing our own happiness
- right to clean air
- pure water
- preservation of the natural, scenic, historic and esthetic values of the environment

Ask yourselves for each of these rights, what risks does the current data center development plan pose such that approving this plan will violate these rights, now or in the future?

- protecting property **HIGH Likelihood -already happening Mitigation Strategy none**
 - high risks that properties will suffer damage, as already reported in Country Manor trailer court as cracks in ceilings and walls caused by explosives blasting
 - residents on Country Club Rd – wells, foundations, solar panels, pools
 - PC mtg April 13, residents were told that the developer was responsible.
 - What is the contact information for the responsible party?
 - devaluing of properties
 - let's face it, no one wants to live nearby
- right to clean air
 - what smelly pollutants do the diesel generators emit during daily testing?
 - How far do these particles reach?
 - Effect on asthmatics, infants, elderly, people with COPD
 - Heat – during PC mtg April 13 we learned that evaporative cooling process will be applied and the heat will dissipate into the atmosphere.
 - What is impact on air temp? esp during summer
 - Why have there been no environmental impact studies requested/conducted?
- pure water
 - we've asked about the potential contamination from blow down water will be treated and rendered safe before being released to the environment and were told that "it is the responsibility of the MTMA to figure that out" - is not a satisfactory response in understanding the protocol for filtering and

neutralizing per EPA standards. We do NOT need forever chemicals in our aquifers or waterways. This is a risk. How do we guarantee this will not happen? Has anyone discussed their plan or any concerns with MTMA?

- The last time this was discussed the developer could not specify what additives would be needed to soften the water coming in and no knowledge of the components of the discharged water. Thus, this still needs a satisfactory response.
- Impact on private wells
 - Having someone who is not an SME say there will be no impact is not a satisfactory response for such an important risk
- pursuing our own happiness
 - Ask anyone along Country Club Rd how happy they are. These are long-standing residents who never dreamed their landscape and quality of life would become so ugly
- preservation of the natural, scenic, historic and esthetic values of the environment

HIGH risk Likelihood – already happening – Mitigation Strategy ??

- “A picture is worth a thousand words” - before and current photos, or a simple drive-by, clearly shows the destruction of the natural, scenic and esthetic values of the environment
- Historically Native Americans inhabited these grounds.

Data Center developers have no personal interest in our properties, landscape, farms, wildlife, children and future generations.

As stewards of the lands of Pennsylvania, it is our duty, and your duty to protect Pennsylvania's natural resources for all of us, and to defend the rights of the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We need you to help us protect these rights, now and in the future.

Ask yourselves, are you fully convinced that this Development Plan protects the rights of current residents and future generations?

If not, then please continue to pursue facts until you can honestly say, “yes”. Don't give in to timelines and pressure. There is no “do-over”.

Respectively submitted,

Arlene Darlington