

**MIDDLESEX TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
May 11, 2026**

START TIME: 7:00 p.m.

END TIME: 9:18 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
Mike Hess, HRG Engineer (Township 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. Hilda Vazquez of Buckeye Lane expressed concerns regarding transparency and legality related to actions affecting Country Manor West and the rezoning associated with the PAX-1 project. She stated that she had provided documents and reports to Township staff alleging ongoing violations involving living conditions, water supply, sewer issues, and property maintenance concerns. Ms. Vazquez noted that previous complaints had been referred to the zoning officer, who indicated the matters involved private property outside Township jurisdiction.

Ms. Vazquez questioned the September 2025 zoning ordinance update and the rezoning to R-4, asserting that residents were not properly notified and raising concerns about due process and consistency of public records. She cited perceived inconsistencies in Cumberland County property records, including ownership information, loans, utility records, UCC filings, and acreage descriptions for Country Manor West. She also requested clarification regarding water infrastructure, including a treatment plant identified on the property.

Ms. Vazquez asked whether documentation supporting the R-4 zoning designation and the PAX-1 project was complete and transparent and requested verification of property records related to Country Manor West. She stated her intention to file complaints with state authorities and seek further review of the property records.

Discussion and Possible Action on draft minutes of April 27, 2026: Mr. Tom Ryan noted that the draft minutes from the April 27, 2026, meeting had not been completed and therefore were not available for review or action.

TPF 25-26 Discussion and Possible Action on Preliminary Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital (PAX-1) Data Center Phase 2 (BOS action deadline 07/01/2026)

Mr. Ryan noted that the meeting was intended as a workshop and informational session, with no action anticipated on the items presented that evening. The member observed that it was likely the first review of Phase 2 and application 26-101 by the Board and requested a high-level overview of the project's various phases to provide context for newer members before proceeding with detailed discussion.

Mr. Nick Long appeared on behalf of Mr. Justin Ross. Mr. Charles Courtney provided an overview of the project's phasing, noting that Phase 1A, consisting of the PPL facilities, had received final plan approval, while Phase 1B, the first data center campus, had received preliminary approval. He explained that Phase 1C would serve as a construction laydown area and that Phase 2 represented the second phase of data center development. Mr. Courtney stated that the evening's discussion would focus on reviewing the plans as a typical land development application.

Mr. Tom Ryan referenced the project's informational website and requested the URL for the benefit of attendees seeking additional background information. Mr. Courtney provided the website address as www.pax1campus.com.

Mr. Long presented an overview of the site layout, identifying previously approved areas, including the Phase 1A infrastructure improvements and the PPL construction laydown area. He oriented the Board to the site by referencing Interstate 81, Country Club Road, the Conodoguinet Creek, and the PPL transmission line corridor.

Mr. Long then reviewed the existing conditions and proposed layout for Campus 2 (Phase 2), describing the development as consisting of five data center buildings, a security entrance, and the previously approved roundabout on PA Data Drive. He noted the proximity of the Conodoguinet Creek and associated forested riparian buffer areas.

Mrs. Robynn Eppley asked about generator placement, noting that all buildings appeared to have inward-facing generators except the final building. Mr. Nick Long confirmed the rear building's generators face outward and explained that a sound and screening wall is proposed behind that building to mitigate impacts. He also noted that the complete campus noise study for Phase 2 had been submitted.

Mr. Charlie Courtney referenced the Phase 1B design, noting two buildings with generators located on the west side closest to the creek. Mr. Long explained that generator placement is dictated by building airflow requirements, as locating generators near fresh-air intakes could allow exhaust to be drawn into occupied spaces.

Mr. Claycomb questioned why the building design could not simply be reversed to relocate generators. Mr. Long stated that the placement is based on the building's design and fresh-air intake configuration.

Mr. Tom Ryan asked about a smaller building shown on the plan. Mr. Long explained that it would house water and sewer treatment infrastructure serving Campus 2 and function as the main utility access point.

Mr. Claycomb asked why the project phases are identified as Phases 1A, 1B, and 1C rather than numbered sequentially. Mr. Long explained that the project was originally planned with three components in Phase 1: Phase 1A for the PPL substation and utility infrastructure, Phase 1B for the first data center campus, and Phase 1C for a centralized water storage facility. Subsequent engineering analysis led to a redesign utilizing campus-specific water storage, but the original phase designations were retained.

Mr. Long reviewed the landscaping plan, describing meadow plantings in stormwater basin areas, street trees along Data Drive, berms with evergreen screening along the frontage, meadow plantings around the buildings, and enhanced riparian buffer plantings along wetlands and waterways. He noted that stormwater basins would remain dry and drain within 72 hours.

Mr. Ryan confirmed that the landscaping approach was generally consistent with the Phase 1B plan. Mr. Long added that additional landscaping and trees may be added along Country Club Road in response to staff comments due to greater visibility of Phase 2 from the roadway.

Mr. Mike Hess reported that three engineering reviews had been completed and that many comments from earlier reviews had been addressed. He stated that several waiver requests remain, largely consistent with those requested for Phases 1A and 1B. Remaining issues include coordination of Country Club Road improvements, final plan requirements, and resolution of several technical stormwater comments, though no major concerns were identified.

Mr. Ryan and Mr. Carpenter discussed plan deadlines, noting that July 1 is the extension deadline for the plans currently under review and discussing the timing of upcoming Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors meetings.

The Planning Commission discussed remaining review comments and anticipated future submissions from the applicant addressing outstanding items.

Mr. Doug Graham asked about the project's water storage capacity, estimating that the site could contain approximately 40 million gallons of stored water. He questioned how much water the facility is expected to use annually, noting that public perception may be that the facility will consume the full 400,000-gallon-per-day allocation year-round.

Mr. Nick Long explained that the water storage tanks are intended to buffer cooling demands during periods of hot weather, generally when temperatures exceed approximately 85 degrees. He stated that water use is temperature-dependent and based on long-term climate modeling, and agreed to provide additional information regarding anticipated annual water consumption.

Discussion followed regarding the purpose and number of storage tanks. It was noted that water usage is expected to be significantly lower during cooler months when cooling demands decrease.

Mr. Mark Carpenter asked about the consequences of a catastrophic tank failure. Mr. Long stated that the tanks are engineered systems used worldwide, designed based on site-specific geotechnical evaluations, and include drainage features. Mr. Carpenter noted that the Township typically requires plans addressing water discharge from swimming pools and questioned whether similar planning would be needed for large storage tanks.

Commissioners inquired about tank maintenance and inspection procedures. Mr. Long stated that maintenance personnel would routinely inspect and maintain the tanks, although he did not provide specific maintenance schedules.

Mr. Carpenter asked whether any of the tanks would store potable water. Mr. Long responded that the tanks are intended for cooling water storage and that potable water for building use would be supplied separately through connections to the Middlesex Township Municipal Authority system.

Mr. Claycomb asked whether provisions would be made to address algae growth in the storage tanks. Mr. Long indicated that algae prevention and treatment would be addressed through the facility's maintenance program.

Mr. Gehr requested clarification regarding water storage allocations and the separation of cooling water and domestic water systems.

Mr. Claycomb asked about rooftop fans shown on some building designs. Mr. Long explained that the Phase 2 buildings utilize a newer design in which the cooling fans are located inside the buildings rather than on the roof. He noted that some smaller buildings in earlier phases included rooftop fans.

Mr. Carpenter confirmed that the proposed Phase 2 data center buildings are approximately 153,000 square feet each.

Mr. Ryan noted that Phase 2 represented the primary focus of the evening's discussion and indicated that the review of Phase 1C, consists primarily of the construction laydown area.

TPF 26-10 Discussion and Possible Action on Preliminary Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital 1 (PAX-1) Data Center Phase 1-C (BOS action deadline 07/01/2026)

Mr. Long presented the Phase 1C preliminary plan, describing the site as a temporary construction laydown area located adjacent to Interstate 81. No buildings, water, or sewer facilities are proposed. The site will be used for storage of construction materials and equipment supporting future phases of development. Although temporary in nature, the project is required to proceed through the land development approval process.

The plan includes approximately 7.5 acres of gravel laydown area, with a total disturbance of roughly 10 acres including grading and stormwater facilities. Two Managed Release Concept

(MRC) stormwater basins are proposed, consistent with other project phases. Wetlands and riparian buffer areas will be avoided and preserved. The plan is also subject to NPDES permitting through the Conservation District, and comments were recently received for review.

Mr. Long stated that no activities associated with the laydown area would contribute additional noise beyond what has already been evaluated in previous sound studies. Following completion of construction, the applicant intends to restore the gravel area to meadow conditions while retaining landscaping, berms, and stormwater facilities. A restoration plan will be submitted with the final plan. The Commission expressed support for the restoration concept.

Discussion occurred regarding safety and security along a steep slope adjacent to a neighboring residential area. Mr. Long stated that temporary construction fencing, similar to existing site fencing, would likely be installed. The proposed fence would be approximately 8 feet high with screening fabric and located near the gravel area, approximately 100 feet from the ridge line. Commissioners discussed visibility, slope conditions, and sight distance at the proposed entrance.

Mr. Long confirmed that no blasting is proposed for Phase 1C, only grading activities. He also noted that the site may accommodate temporary construction trailers and staging of materials such as precast wall panels, steel, inlets, equipment, and other construction-related items.

Mr. Hess reviewed HRG's initial engineering comments, noting that this was the first review of the Phase 1C plan and therefore included a longer list of comments. Questions were raised regarding potential lighting, zoning classification of the use, landscaping, noise considerations, agency approvals, and whether previous environmental submissions would need to be amended to include Phase 1C. Additional comments related to waivers, modifications, and developer agreement provisions will be addressed through the review process.

Commission members also discussed site grading, drainage, and roadway improvements along Country Club Road. Mr. Long clarified that road widening is proposed along the frontage and that grading associated with the driveway entrance would not involve cutting back the entire hillside. Mr. Ryan noted that county review comments had recently been received and invited additional comments before opening the meeting to public questions.

Mr. Frank Labatore of W. Mulberry Hill Road asked where the proposed water storage tanks would be located on the property and requested information regarding their size and design for comparison with the existing tank visible along Interstate 81.

Mr. Carpenter stated that the existing tank along I-81 is approximately 1 million gallons in capacity. Mr. Long identified the proposed tanks on the Phase 2 plan and explained that the project includes multiple water storage tanks. He stated that each tank is proposed to have a capacity of approximately 2 million gallons and a diameter of about 80 feet.

Mr. Hess referenced project documentation confirming that the tanks are proposed to be 2,000,000 gallons in capacity, approximately 80 feet in diameter, and about 51 feet in height. Mr. Gleim noted that the tanks would be similar in height to a farm silo

Ms. Arlene Darlington of Wertzville Road requested clarification regarding the size of the proposed Phase 2 buildings and the number of generators associated with the development. Mr. Long confirmed that Phase 2 includes five data center buildings, each approximately 900 feet long and slightly more than 200 feet wide, with building sizes generally consistent with the larger buildings proposed in Phase 1B.

Mr. Long stated that each Phase 2 building is expected to have approximately 40 diesel backup generators, for a total of about 200 generators in Phase 2. Discussion followed regarding the total number of generators proposed across the campus. Mr. Gehr noted that approximately 532 generators had previously been represented for the full project, and Mr. Long indicated that figure was generally accurate.

Ms. Darlington expressed concerns regarding generator testing schedules and requested additional information on how monthly testing requirements would be managed, including whether testing would occur on weekends and how frequently generators would be operated. Mr. Courtney acknowledged the request and stated that a more detailed testing schedule would be provided as the project advances and specific tenants are identified. He noted that some flexibility may be required due to operational or air quality considerations but indicated that a regular testing schedule could be established.

Ms. Darlington also raised questions regarding heat generated by the data center buildings. Mr. Courtney stated that the project team would provide a more detailed response at a future Planning Commission meeting, noting that previous discussions had not fully addressed the question.

Discussion also occurred regarding air quality impacts. Mr. Long stated that air quality was addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and noted that generator emissions are regulated by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). Mr. Courtney added that the generators would be subject to DEP permitting and regulatory review requirements.

In response to questions regarding project size, Mr. Long stated that Phase 2 encompasses approximately 141.13 acres, while Mr. Hess noted that Phase 1B consists of approximately 225 acres. Mr. Long further confirmed that the Environmental Impact Assessment submitted for the project evaluates the entire proposed campus and includes Phases 1B, 2, and 3.

Mr. Gleim sought clarification regarding the 141-acre size of Phase 2, asking whether that acreage included areas beyond the building footprints. Mr. Long confirmed that the acreage encompasses the entire area within the project boundary, including buildings, wetlands, grassed areas, and other site features.

Mr. Gehr referenced the project plans and noted that, according to the site data provided, approximately 52 acres of the 141-acre Phase 2 site, or about 37 percent, would be impervious surface. He stated that the remaining acreage would consist of pervious areas capable of accepting stormwater, resulting in less than 40 percent of the site being covered by impervious surfaces.

Ms. Viola Byerly of Country Club Road raised questions regarding generator testing during air quality action days, noting Cumberland County's air quality concerns. She asked how generator

testing schedules would be adjusted if poor air quality conditions occurred on scheduled testing days and whether changes to testing schedules would be communicated to the public.

Mr. Courtney stated that the applicant could provide a proposed generator testing schedule along with examples demonstrating how testing would be adjusted during one or multiple air quality action days. He acknowledged that while regular schedules could be shared publicly, real-time adjustments may be more difficult to communicate and indicated the matter would be reviewed further.

Ms. Byerly also expressed concerns regarding low-frequency noise and vibration associated with hyperscale data centers, citing potential impacts on nearby residents. Mr. Carpenter stated that the Township's ordinances regulate noise through decibel limits but do not specifically address low-frequency sound. He noted that reducing overall noise levels also reduces vibration-related impacts.

Mr. Hess explained that the submitted sound study evaluated both normal operating conditions and a worst-case power outage scenario with all generators operating. He stated that the study analyzed frequency bands addressed by the ordinance and concluded that the project would comply with applicable noise standards. He noted that additional questions remain regarding pre-development noise measurements but did not anticipate significant changes to the overall conclusions.

Mr. Carpenter further explained that the Township's zoning ordinance establishes a 70 dBA noise limit at the property line and includes performance standards that were considered during the sound study review. He noted that the developer's agreement will require ongoing noise monitoring and mitigation if actual noise levels exceed projected levels.

Mr. Courtney stated that previous testimony from the applicant's sound consultant indicated that anticipated operating noise levels would be significantly below ordinance limits and that nearby residents would not be expected to perceive low-frequency noise impacts from the facility. He offered to have the sound consultant return for additional discussion if requested.

Mr. Graham suggested that, if low-frequency sound levels become a focus of future discussions, baseline measurements should also be established, noting that many common sources such as traffic, household equipment, and HVAC systems contribute to low-frequency sound.

Discussion then shifted to the proposed Phase 1C construction laydown area. Ms. Byerly sought clarification regarding grading activities, flooding concerns, and whether the existing hillside would be altered. Mr. Long stated that blasting is not proposed and that the site would be graded using conventional earthmoving equipment to create a relatively level construction laydown area. He explained that the disturbed area would encompass approximately 7 to 8 acres and would avoid mapped wetlands and low-lying areas shown on the plans.

Ms. Byerly expressed concerns regarding localized flooding and wet conditions she has observed on the property. Mr. Long responded that extensive wetland delineations and soil testing have been completed and that the wetlands shown on the plans have been reviewed and approved through a

Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination. He stated that the proposed laydown area is not located within delineated wetlands.

Mr. Hess reviewed the grading plan and explained that the proposed pad would be created through a combination of cut and fill operations to establish a relatively level surface. He noted that the proposed laydown area would remain approximately 14 to 15 feet above nearby wetland elevations, providing separation from groundwater and wetland resources.

Mr. Ashton Dickerson of North Middlesex Road expressed concerns regarding potential impacts from development activities, including stormwater runoff and grading on neighboring properties. Drawing from his experience in the construction industry, he stated his opposition to the proposed data center project, expressing the view that data center and warehouse developments do not provide meaningful benefits to the community. No action was requested.

Mr. John Manta of Wolfs Bridge Road raised questions regarding the operation and maintenance of the proposed backup generators, including how generators would be refueled following testing or extended operation, whether diesel fuel would be stored on-site, and what measures would be implemented to prevent and contain fuel spills.

Mr. Long responded that on-site diesel fuel storage is proposed but stated that details regarding generator refueling and fuel system operations are still being developed and will be addressed during final plan review. He noted that the applicant intends to provide additional information regarding generator operations and testing schedules at a future meeting.

Mr. Manta also expressed concerns regarding heat generated by the data center buildings and backup generators, referencing studies he had reviewed regarding potential temperature increases near large data center facilities. He questioned how heat impacts would be mitigated and whether those effects had been fully evaluated.

Additional concerns were raised regarding the number of waivers and modifications requested throughout the land development process. Mr. Manta questioned the rationale for granting exceptions to ordinance requirements and expressed concern that certain project details remained unresolved while plans continued through the review process.

Mr. Manta further inquired about the design and performance of the project's stormwater management system, including the potential for fuel spills or contaminants to enter stormwater basins and the underlying geology beneath the basins.

Mr. Long explained that the proposed basins are Managed Release Concept (MRC) basins designed primarily to detain and slowly release stormwater rather than infiltrate large volumes directly into the ground. He stated that the basins include engineered soil and drainage systems designed to meet applicable stormwater management requirements and that the project has undergone extensive review and coordination with DEP, HRG, and other regulatory agencies to comply with stormwater regulations. Mr. Manta concluded by expressing concern about wetland protection, stormwater management, and the need for additional information regarding project operations and environmental safeguards.

Mr. Claycomb noted that waivers are a common and anticipated part of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO) process. He explained that ordinances are written with the expectation that certain requirements may be waived under appropriate circumstances. As an example, he cited curb and sidewalk requirements, which are often waived in rural areas where sidewalks may not be practical. He emphasized the importance of reviewing each waiver request individually but stated that waivers themselves are not unusual.

Mr. Hess clarified that the curb and sidewalk request was submitted as a deferral rather than a waiver. He explained that the plan includes a provision allowing the Township to require sidewalk installation within six months if future development creates a need for connectivity. Mr. Claycomb stated that such provisions are standard practice.

Mr. Hess also provided additional information regarding the proposed stormwater management system. He stated that the site is predominantly underlain by shale with very little limestone and that extensive geotechnical testing had been conducted. He explained that the Managed Release Concept (MRC) system consists of two stormwater facilities operating in series. The first consists of engineered soil cells with underdrains (similar to French drains) that collect and release water through controlled outlets within 72 hours, independent of underlying soil infiltration. Water then flows to a conventional detention basin, providing a redundant two-stage stormwater management approach.

Mr. Gehr expressed concern regarding diesel fuel storage and refueling plans for the proposed generators. He stated that he could not support final land development plans for the campuses without additional information on the project's diesel fuel strategy. He noted that no diesel storage facilities had been shown on the plans despite the significant fuel demands of the generators and requested details on how generators would be refueled during operation. He also requested information regarding the total amount of diesel fuel that would be stored on-site, including the fuel capacity of individual generator tanks and overall fuel reserves.

Ms. Jody Shivell of Teaberry Drive raised several questions and concerns regarding the proposed data center. She revisited a prior discussion about fuel storage, noting that she previously understood no fuel would be stored on-site and questioned how generators would be refueled during extended outages. She expressed concerns about fire management and emergency response related to fuel deliveries.

Ms. Shivell also discussed noise impacts, referencing conversations with residents of Cumberland Preserve who experience highway noise from Interstate 81. She questioned whether those residents could also be affected by noise generated by the proposed data center. Mr. Courtney responded that the noise study estimated data center noise levels of approximately 55 dBA, with existing background noise around 45 dBA and occasional spikes up to 70 dBA primarily attributable to traffic.

Ms. Shivell asked about the number of computer chips and servers that would be housed within the facility and expressed concerns regarding the disposal of obsolete servers and electronic waste. She questioned where such materials would be disposed of, who would be responsible for disposal costs, and whether landfills would accept them. Mr. Graham suggested that servers would likely

be recycled due to the presence of valuable metals, and it was noted that future tenants would ultimately determine disposal practices. Mr. Carpenter later stated that obsolete servers would typically be purchased by recyclers who recover usable materials before disposing of remaining waste.

Ms. Shivell also raised concerns regarding air quality during prolonged power outages, noting reports that generator operation at some facilities can exceed permitted emission levels during emergencies. She asked how emissions would be monitored, reported, and regulated. Mr. Graham suggested that PPL would be best positioned to provide information on the reliability history of the 500-kV transmission line serving the area and noted that a significant event would likely be required to cause a major outage.

Additionally, Ms. Shivell questioned how fire protection services would be funded if the facility required emergency response. Mr. Carpenter explained that the Township contracts with four fire companies and distributes funding through state allocations and local fire tax revenues. He noted that emergency responses are not typically billed per incident and that future fire service funding models may evolve due to declining volunteer firefighter participation. Ms. Shivell expressed concern that Township residents could bear increased costs related to emergency services associated with the project.

Mr. Gleim provided historical context regarding the development of local fire protection services and stated that, as community needs evolve, additional requirements may be placed on large developments to help support necessary emergency response resources. He noted that if specialized fire protection capabilities are required for the data center, the developer may be expected to assist in providing or funding those resources.

Mr. Kyle Gerber of Bernheisel Bridge Road stated that the project is moving quickly and that residents are having difficulty keeping up with the volume of plans and documents being submitted. He requested that the Township consider making all developer-submitted plans and HRG review comment letters publicly available online through a file-sharing system. He stated that greater access to project documents would improve transparency, help residents prepare more informed questions, and potentially reduce the number of Right-to-Know requests submitted to the Township.

Mr. Carpenter responded that many of the submitted plans are copyrighted and cannot be freely distributed. He stated that the Township relies on guidance from the Township Solicitor regarding what documents may be released and noted that the request could be discussed further with Township officials.

Mr. Gerber then addressed the Planning Commission, stating his belief that the proposed data center project is unprecedented in size and scale and is not a typical development application. He expressed concern that the review process is proceeding at a pace that is difficult for residents and officials to manage. He stated that, while the project may be permitted under existing zoning regulations, he believes it is inconsistent with the Township and County Comprehensive Plans and raises concerns regarding environmental impacts.

Mr. Gerber referenced Article I, Section 27 of the Pennsylvania Constitution and noted that the Appalachian Trail Conservancy has publicly expressed opposition to the project due to concerns about impacts on natural resources and the Appalachian Trail. He also questioned the independence of the developer's environmental impact assessment, citing a perceived conflict of interest.

Mr. Gerber urged the Planning Commission to carefully consider its role in reviewing the project and encouraged members to use their discretion when making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. He stated his belief that there are multiple grounds on which the project could be denied or not recommended for approval.

Ms. Hilda Vazques of Buckeye Lane questioned whether sufficient consideration had been given to the potential impacts of major construction projects during severe weather events and natural disasters. She expressed concern that studies and engineering analyses cannot fully account for the forces of nature and suggested that significant storms could create unforeseen consequences.

Ms. Vazques stated that residents and the community would ultimately bear the effects of any environmental damage resulting from the project. She voiced concerns that chemicals or other discharges associated with construction and operation could negatively affect land and air quality, with some impacts potentially becoming apparent only over time. She emphasized her belief that long-term environmental consequences should be carefully considered during the review process.

Mr. Gleim responded to concerns regarding stormwater management and severe weather events by noting that he had lived in the Township during major storms, including Hurricane Agnes in 1972, when approximately 21 inches of rain fell, including 18 inches within a 12-hour period. He stated that, at that time, stormwater retention ponds and modern stormwater management practices were not commonly used.

Mr. Gleim explained that stormwater management requirements have evolved over time as development increased and flooding and runoff issues became more apparent. He noted that current development regulations require stormwater management facilities, including retention and detention basins, to address runoff impacts associated with construction and land development.

He stated that the proposed stormwater facilities are part of that evolution in stormwater management practices and expressed the opinion that stormwater is managed more effectively today than it was several decades ago. Mr. Gleim concluded by noting that the Township has experienced significant storms in the past and has implemented improvements over time to address related challenges.

Mr. Claycomb responded to earlier comments regarding the Planning Commission's role in reviewing the project. He stated that the Commission is responsible for evaluating applications based on the Township's Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO), and other applicable regulations. He noted that personal opinions about a project should not influence the review process and emphasized that the Commission must determine whether plans comply with adopted ordinances. He encouraged residents to identify and

document any specific instances where they believe the plans fail to meet ordinance requirements, stating that the Commission's authority is limited to enforcing the regulations currently in place.

Mr. Gerber acknowledged that the Planning Commission's primary responsibility is to review applications for compliance with adopted ordinances. However, he encouraged Commission members to also consider broader ethical and moral questions when evaluating projects of significant scale and impact. He expressed his belief that, in some circumstances, officials may have a responsibility to look beyond local ordinances and consider protections provided under the Pennsylvania Constitution, particularly regarding environmental rights. Mr. Gerber stated his opinion that constitutional considerations should be evaluated if residents believe their rights are not adequately protected through existing ordinances.

Ms. Asper asked several questions regarding blasting activities associated with Phase 1B of the project, including when blasting would begin, how long it would continue, and the anticipated depth of blasting operations.

Mr. Long stated that he did not know the depth of the proposed blasting. He indicated that blasting activities were currently paused and that he expected future blasting to be similar to what had previously occurred on the site. He noted that blasting for Phase 1B was delayed at the time of the meeting but could potentially resume once the necessary approvals were obtained.

During the discussion, it was stated that Phase 1B had received preliminary plan approval and that blasting could occur at the developer's risk following preliminary approval. It was further noted that continuation of blasting activities was dependent upon obtaining the required NPDES permit, with a potential timeline discussed as being later in the month.

It was asked how residents would be notified when blasting resumed and whether information would be posted online. It was noted that the blasting permit allows blasting activities between sunrise and sunset, but no specific notification process was identified during the discussion.

Mr. Courtney stated that they would look into providing blasting schedules or updates when available. He added that blasting could not proceed without the required NPDES permit and suggested that project-related schedule information could also be made available through the developer's website once confirmed.

Mr. Carl Ray introduced himself as a resident of Country Manor and stated that he grew up near the Conodoguinet Creek, where he spent much of his childhood fishing, hunting, and enjoying the local environment. Having been unable to attend previous meetings, he expressed concerns about the potential impact of the proposed data center on local water resources, wildlife, and the ecosystem.

Mr. Ray questioned whether the project's water demands could affect stream levels in the Conodoguinet Creek and whether future generations would be able to enjoy the creek as he had. He expressed concern about potential impacts to wildlife habitats and the watershed and stated his belief that economic development should not come at the expense of environmental resources.

Mr. Courtney responded that no wells are proposed on the data center site and that a plan note specifically prohibits on-site wells. He stated that all water supplied to the facility would come from the existing allocation provided by the Middlesex Township Municipal Authority and from wells already approved by the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. He further explained that wastewater generated by the facility would be treated through the municipal wastewater system and would not be discharged directly into the Conodoguinet Creek. Mr. Courtney stated that no water for the project would be withdrawn directly from the creek.

Mr. Ray asked what would happen if the Authority's wells were unable to meet demand. Mr. Courtney replied that the approved allocation for the project is 400,000 gallons per day and noted that if an Authority well were to fail, it would affect all users served by the system and would require the Authority to identify an alternative water source.

Mr. Ray reiterated his concerns about potential impacts to local natural resources and stated that he intended to continue attending future meetings to stay informed on the project.

Mr. Gleim responded by providing historical context regarding water quality conditions in the area. He stated that, during his youth, the Conodoguinet Creek and portions of the Letort Spring Run were heavily impacted by untreated sewage and poor water quality. He described improvements made over several decades, including the construction of upgraded wastewater treatment facilities and environmental restoration efforts, which significantly improved water quality and aquatic conditions. Mr. Gleim stated that substantial work has been undertaken to protect and restore local waterways and expressed confidence that those environmental gains would not be allowed to be reversed.

Ms. Jocelyn Colyer of Bernheisel Bridge Road asked for clarification regarding NPDES approval. Mr. Courtney explained that NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) approval is a permit issued by DEP for earth disturbance activities and stormwater discharge. Ms. Colyer asked whether, upon receiving preliminary approval, the developer could proceed with blasting at its own risk. Mr. Carpenter confirmed that once NPDES approval is obtained, the developer may conduct blasting and grading activities. He noted that Phase 1B already has preliminary approval.

Ms. Colyer also referenced criteria she believed should be considered when evaluating the plan, including consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, environmental and neighborhood impacts, infrastructure and utility burdens, neighborhood compatibility, and public benefit and support. She stated that, in her view, the project raised concerns in each of these areas and encouraged Township officials to slow the process and make informed decisions.

Mr. John Manta asked whether a second municipal well was currently being developed. Mr. Carpenter confirmed that the Municipal Authority has been developing a second well for more than a year to provide redundancy in the water supply system.

Responding to Ms. Colyer's comments, Mr. Courtney explained that the issues she identified relate to public health, safety, and welfare, which form the basis of municipal ordinances. He stated that standards addressing those concerns are incorporated into zoning, subdivision and land development, stormwater, water, sewer, and other municipal regulations. He noted that Planning

Commission reviews focus on determining whether a proposal complies with the adopted ordinances, which are designed to protect public health, safety, and welfare.

Mr. Gleim added that the municipal water system is supplied by multiple sources, including an existing well in Middlesex Township, a second well that is expected to come online soon, and water purchased from South Middleton Township. He stated that Middlesex Township currently has a water supply capacity of approximately 2 million gallons per day, with current usage of about 1 million gallons per day. The data center would be allocated up to 400,000 gallons per day when needed, leaving additional reserve capacity available.

Mr. Manta asked whether water used from the data center's on-site storage tanks after reaching its daily allocation would count against the 400,000-gallon limit. Mr. Gleim clarified that the facility may withdraw no more than 400,000 gallons per day from the public water system. Any water use beyond that amount would need to come from the facility's on-site storage supply rather than the municipal system.

Ms. Gerber of Bernheisel Bridge Road responded to comments regarding ordinance compliance. She stated that while residents understand how township ordinances function, many believe that both the Township's Comprehensive Plan and existing ordinances are not adequately equipped to regulate a project of this scale. She noted that the Comprehensive Plan has not been updated since 2003 and questioned whether it is capable of addressing what she described as an unprecedented data center project. Ms. Gerber expressed concern that existing ordinances may not account for impacts associated with large-scale data centers, citing low-frequency noise as an example of an issue not specifically addressed. She stated that, although the project may comply with current ordinances, residents are asking Township officials to exercise broader leadership and ethical judgment in evaluating the proposal. She acknowledged the difficult position of the Planning Commission but maintained that the project raises concerns beyond ordinance compliance.

Mrs. Eppley asked whether a meeting for residents living near the project site, previously discussed by the applicant's team, had been scheduled.

Mr. Nick Long clarified that the meeting would be organized by Powerhouse rather than Livic. He stated that Livic has been encouraging the project team to schedule the meeting promptly and indicated that it is expected to occur soon. Mr. Long noted that residents have questions that need to be addressed and that the project team recognizes the importance of holding the meeting as soon as possible.

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

Mr. Ryan moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:18 p.m.