

MIDDLESEX TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES

September 14, 2026

LOCATION: Middlesex Township Office Meeting Room, 350 N. Middlesex Road, Carlisle, PA 17013

START TIME: 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Tracy Gleim (Chairman)

Larry Claycomb

Robynn Eppley

Jim Gehr

Doug Graham

Wes Beard

Kelley Brickey

TOWNSHIP STAFF PRESENT:

Mark Carpenter, Zoning Officer

Bud Grove, Township Engineer

Zach Zook, Manager/Roadmaster

Doug Graham called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT (non-agenda items):

Michelle Skurzynski, 1 Aspen Lane, Country Manor West. Asked if the township would provide the website's community survey to residents who do not have internet access. Zook will attempt to have copies available at the township office for interested residents.

Beth Legore, Middlesex Township. Suggested that the website communicate to residents that printed copies will be made available at the township building.

Approval of Minutes for August 24, 2026.

Kelly Brickey stated that she reviewed the draft August 24, 2026, meeting minutes received by email and compared them with the video recording of the PAX-1 discussion. She stated that, in her view, there were significant differences between the draft minutes and the recorded discussion and recommended that the minutes not be approved as presented. Gehr concurred, stating that he believed the draft minutes did not adequately reflect the meeting discussion. Zach Zook was asked to explain the process used by DocuScript to prepare the minutes. Zook explained that DocuScript listens to the meeting audio and summarizes the discussion, after which he reviews speaker identifications and makes corrections before forwarding the draft to the Commission for review. Discussion followed regarding revision of the August 24 minutes using Brickey's proposed corrections provided by email. Robin Eppley emphasized the

importance of accurately documenting Commission members' comments because the minutes may subsequently be referenced as the official record of their statements.

Brickey stated that, in the most recent draft minutes, portions of the discussion between Planning Commission members and Township staff were placed in locations that did not correspond with the sequence or context of the meeting discussion.

Larry Claycomb stated that the Commission had previously discussed the appropriate level of detail in meeting minutes and expressed concern that recent minutes had become overly detailed. He cautioned that minutes should capture the high-level substance of discussion, key decisions, and actions taken rather than function as a transcript of the meeting.

Brickey stated that, in her view, key components of the prior discussion were not included in the minutes, including information supporting the Commission's recommendation to deny approval. She stated that her proposed revisions added language reflecting how the Commission arrived at its recommendation. Discussion continued regarding the appropriate balance between providing an adequate summary of the Commission's deliberations and avoiding a verbatim transcript.

Claycomb stated that he considered the meeting minutes prepared over the preceding several months unacceptable and suggested that the Township may need to consider another vendor or have someone attend meetings in person to prepare the minutes. The Commission discussed its responsibilities as an official government body and agreed that the standards and process for preparing sufficient meeting minutes should be addressed separately through further discussion and direction.

The August 24, 2026, draft minutes were returned to Zook for further review and revision, including consideration of Brickey's proposed additions based on the PAX-1 portion of the meeting video, and will be presented for approval at a subsequent meeting.

TPF 26-16 Discussion and Possible Recommendation on Final Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital (PAX-1) Phase 1-C.

(BOS action deadline October 7, 2026)

Final Land Development for 1-C

Justin Ross stated that Carlisle Development Partners was not seeking approval at this meeting and that the presentation was for informational purposes only. He reviewed the Final Land Development Plan for Campus 1-C, the proposed construction lay-down area, and indicated the project team would present the plan and respond to Commission questions.

Ross also introduced the Final Land Development Plan for Campus 2. The presentation would include the site plan, landscaping, renderings, viewsheds, requested waivers, and responses to Commission questions.

Ross stated that no material changes had been made between the preliminary and final plans, with the exception of the location of the water tanks on Campus 2. The plans are otherwise substantially consistent with the previously approved preliminary plans, and the requested waivers are also similar.

He explained that the primary change presented involved the second phase of the Country Club Road improvements associated with the Campus 1-C Final Land Development Plan. The first portion of the Country Club Road improvements was approved as part of the Campus 1-A Final Land Development Plan. The phasing plan identified Campus 2 in dark blue, Campus 1-C in yellow, and Country Club Road between Campus 3 and Campus 1-C. The proposed improvements extend along the southern portion of the property, through the curve, to the main project entrance.

Ross described Campus 1-C as a temporary construction lay-down area permitted under the applicable zoning. The area will accommodate construction-related parking and job trailers and may remain in use for several years during construction. Upon completion of the project, the area will be restored in accordance with Township requirements. During construction, the site will be graded to accommodate stormwater collection. At the conclusion of construction, the area will be topsoiled, recontoured, and returned to a more natural condition.

Landscaping and berming are proposed along the southern residential property boundary. A berm is also proposed along the western boundary adjacent to Country Club Road, with an opening for the entrance drive into the project. Renderings depicted the site topography and additional landscaping along the western and southern boundaries. The temporary construction area will include employee parking, job trailers, fencing, and screening generally similar to the existing construction area along Country Club Road.

In response to a question regarding whether the construction lay-down area would remain pervious, Ross explained that the area would consist of gravel. Although it is considered pervious in its physical condition, the project is required to account for the area as impervious for stormwater permitting and design purposes. The stormwater system has been designed to accommodate runoff generated from the area.

Upon completion of construction, the temporary gravel area will be removed and the site restored. The permanent condition will generally consist of the berm and associated landscaping along the roadway.

Ross identified the highlighted portion of Country Club Road as the section proposed for improvement under this plan. Improvements farther east were previously approved as part of the Campus 1-A Final Land Development Plan. The project is required to improve both sides of the roadway along its frontage.

The proposed work includes full-depth reconstruction of Country Club Road. The existing roadway is approximately 10 to 11 feet per lane, has no shoulders, and includes areas of unstable subgrade. The reconstructed roadway will provide two 12-foot travel lanes and 4-foot shoulders on each side.

Ross stated that the improvements will enhance roadway safety and include grading to the right-of-way limits. Berming and landscaping will be provided along the Campus 3 and Campus 1-C frontages.

Commission discussion included clarification of the location of Campus 1-C and the proposed Country Club Road improvements. In response to a question regarding impacts to adjoining residential properties, the applicant confirmed that roadway improvements associated with Campus 1-A had been shifted toward the campus where necessary to accommodate the travel lanes and shoulder and that improvements are proposed along both project frontages.

The Commission questioned utility service to the temporary Campus 1-C construction area. The applicant stated that job trailers would receive temporary electrical service from PP&L. Water and sewer service is available within Country Club Road but is not currently proposed for the temporary area. When asked whether the site would ultimately connect to those utilities, the applicant indicated that additional information would be provided. The applicant believed the existing construction offices are currently connected to water and sewer due to their accessibility, although such connections are not required.

The Commission also requested clarification regarding the extent and timing of the Country Club Road improvements. The applicant stated that the improvements shown with Campus 1-C currently extend to the top of the hill rather than to Carlisle Pike. Upon completion of the overall project, Country Club Road is anticipated to be reconstructed from the subgrade upward.

Additional discussion concerned how the roadway could be improved without acquiring property from adjoining residents. The applicant explained that there is currently no requirement to widen the right-of-way. Improvements will be completed within the existing right-of-way, with the roadway reconstructed and widened to the extent available.

The applicant then reviewed the requested waivers for Campus 1-C, noting that most had been previously discussed. Waivers related to plan and map scale requirements, Sections 501.A.2 and 501.A.6, had previously been requested and approved. Waivers under Sections 703.A.10 and 707.A.1 relate to deferral of curb and sidewalk improvements along Country Club Road. The applicant stated that a note would be added to the plan reserving the Township's ability to require installation of sidewalks in the future, consistent with other properties having frontage along Country Club Road.

The applicant continued review of the requested waivers and modifications. Sections 718.D.3.A and 718.D.4 relate to plan scale and mapping requirements.

For stormwater management, the applicant reviewed a requested modification under Section 303.J.3 to permit detention basin side slopes of 3:1 rather than 4:1 in connection with the construction lay-down area. Sections 303.H.17 and 303.H.18 relate to dewatering time, with a requested modification from the ordinance requirement of 48 hours to 72 hours. The applicant noted that this modification had been requested previously. A modification under Section 303.B.2 was also requested for infiltration requirements associated with the proposed MRC stormwater basins, based on site percolation and soil testing.

The applicant then reviewed roadway-related modifications referenced in HRG's review letter, noting that similar modifications had previously been approved with Campus 1-A. Under Section 703.C.1 and Table 703.1, a modification is requested from the required roadway width. Rather than a 36-foot paved cartway with 4-foot shoulders, the applicant proposes two 12-foot travel lanes with 4-foot shoulders, which was described as more appropriate for Country Club Road.

A modification is also requested for the horizontal curve radius on Country Club Road. The existing curve is approximately 230 feet and does not meet the collector street standard. The applicant proposes maintaining the existing curve geometry, stating that increasing the radius could result in higher vehicle speeds through that portion of the roadway.

Under Section 703.M.2, the applicant requested a modification to the grading requirements within the street right-of-way. The proposal is to grade approximately two feet beyond the right-of-way limits,

creating a wider graded area along both sides of Country Club Road. Rather than directing the slope back toward the roadway, the applicant proposes grading away from the pavement to improve drainage and help preserve the roadway structure. The applicant stated that these represent the anticipated waivers and modifications and that the documents are being finalized for formal resubmission. No action was requested from the Commission at this meeting.

Commission discussion followed regarding the waiver documentation. A Commission member noted that the third waiver request referencing Sections 718.D.3.A and 718.D.4 did not include a stated justification. The applicant indicated that the justification would be added and noted that it was addressed in the waiver request letter.

Claycomb identified several grammatical and wording errors in the stormwater infiltration waiver request and requested that the document be proofread and corrected prior to resubmission. The applicant agreed to correct the errors.

The Commission also questioned the environmental assessment documentation for Campus 1-C. The applicant explained that a separate environmental impact assessment is not prepared for each portion of the project. Updates had previously been provided and approved with Campus 1-B, with additional minor updates submitted for Campus 2.

In response to a question regarding the proposed roadway width, the applicant clarified that the 12-foot travel lanes apply to Country Club Road itself, not the entrance to the construction storage area. The reconstructed roadway will consist of two 12-foot travel lanes, for a 24-foot cartway, with 4-foot shoulders on each side.

TPF 26-19 Discussion and Possible Recommendation on Final Land Development Plan for Pennsylvania Digital (PAX-1) Campus II (Phase 2)

(BOS action deadline November 20, 2026)

Ross presented the Final Land Development Plan for Campus 2. He identified Campus 2 on the phasing plan and noted the location of adjacent Campus 1 improvements, the existing PP&L construction lay-down area, employee parking, and cable storage. He stated that the proposed layout remains consistent with the approved preliminary plan and includes five buildings, surrounding stormwater facilities, and a secured entrance. The principal change from the preliminary plan involves relocation of the water-storage tanks. The tanks were previously shown near the main entrance but have been relocated behind and adjacent to the first two buildings to reduce their visibility from the entrance. The revised plan includes six inbound water-storage tanks, two outbound wastewater-storage tanks, and two fire-suppression tanks, generally consistent with the configuration proposed for Campus 1.

In response to a Board question, the applicant stated that the allowable daily discharge to the municipal authority is approximately 273,000 gallons. The applicant further confirmed that the proposed wastewater-storage capacity and discharge system have been engineered to accommodate operation of all three campuses without exceeding tank capacity.

Claycomb questioned the proposed stormwater management approach. Grove explained that the project utilizes Managed Release Concept (MRC) stormwater facilities, an approach recognized by DEP as an alternative where traditional infiltration is limited. He stated that MRC facilities provide some infiltration

and incorporate water-quality treatment prior to controlled release. He confirmed that the Township ordinance permits this approach. MRC was identified as an abbreviation for Managed Release Concept.

Ross then reviewed the requested waivers and modifications for Campus 2, noting that they are substantially the same as those previously approved for other portions of the project. These include Sections 501.A.2 and 501.A.6 for plan-scale modifications; Sections 703.A.10 and 707.A.1 for curb and sidewalk requirements along PA Data Drive and Country Club Road; Section 703.I.4 relating to depressed curb requirements at the campus entrance; and Sections 718.D.3.A and 718.D.4 relating to Environmental Impact Assessment plan-scale requirements.

Stormwater-related modifications include Section 303.J.3 to permit 3:1 detention basin side slopes in place of 4:1 slopes; Sections 303.H.17 and 303.H.18 to permit a 72-hour dewatering period rather than 48 hours; and Section 303.B.2 to permit use of the MRC stormwater concept in lieu of infiltration where appropriate. Ross then concluded the presentation and invited Commission questions.

Brickey questioned the Opinion of Probable Cost included with the submitted materials and asked how the estimated costs are verified. Ross explained that the applicant prepares the initial estimate, which is then reviewed by the Township Engineer. Additional contingencies are applied during Township review, and financial security is established at 110 percent of the approved estimate.

Bud Grove explained that the estimate is based on unit costs and estimated construction quantities rather than competitive contractor bids. The Township maintains its own cost information and applies additional safeguards when determining the required financial security. He noted that the estimate is subject to annual adjustment and that the Township retains legal authority to recover additional costs if it becomes necessary for the Township to complete required improvements.

Brickey asked whether delivery tickets and other construction records are used to verify that actual quantities of aggregate and other materials correspond with the estimated quantities. Ross explained that the Opinion of Probable Cost is intended primarily to establish financial security rather than to reconcile contractor billing or individual material deliveries. As work is completed, Township personnel inspect the improvements and authorize corresponding reductions in the financial security.

Ross stated that contractors maintain delivery tickets and related records as part of normal construction administration. Grove added that, upon completion, the Township conducts field verification and survey work to confirm completed improvements and quantities against the approved plans.

Eppley questioned whether the proposed landscaping would initially resemble the mature vegetation shown in the project renderings. Ross explained that newly installed trees are generally approximately 8 to 14 feet in height with a 2½-inch caliper. Larger 3½- to 4-inch caliper trees have been considered; however, landscape contractors advised that larger transplanted trees may experience greater root shock and slower establishment. He stated that smaller-caliper trees may ultimately establish and grow more quickly. The landscaping depicted in the renderings represents an approximately 15-year mature condition.

Public Comment

Hilda Vasquez, Country Manor West, questioned why the developer uses enhanced renderings rather than technology that would provide residents with a more realistic representation of how the completed project

will appear within the surrounding community. Ross responded that the renderings are intended to accurately represent the approved plans and anticipated final conditions.

Andrew Dymski, 430 Bernheisel Road, asked about the capacities of the proposed water-storage tanks and the source of water used for fire suppression. Ross stated that tank capacities have varied during design and are approximately 2.2 to 2.5 million gallons. Mr. Dymski also questioned the amount of water initially introduced into the cooling system, whether water is completely replaced or periodically purged, and the amount lost through evaporation. Ross stated that the detailed water balance remains under engineering review and is addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment. He explained that evaporative loss occurs through the building cooling equipment and that the overall water system is being designed within applicable supply and discharge limitations. Mr. Dymski also asked what chemicals would be added to the water. Ross stated that treatment is anticipated to include chlorine, pH adjustment, and water softening.

Arlene Darlington, Wertzville Road, Carlisle, questioned the number and location of generators and whether they would be visible from surrounding properties. Ross explained that generators and cooling equipment are incorporated into the project sound study and that screening walls are proposed as part of the sound mitigation measures. He clarified that generator quantities vary by building and that approximately 24 generators are proposed for the front building on Campus 3. The associated screening wall was identified as approximately 27 feet in height.

An unidentified member of the public questioned whether the projected sound levels contained in HRG's September 11, 2026, review letter were based on assumptions because specific equipment had not yet been selected. The speaker requested consideration of a definitive sound limit lower than the ordinance maximum. Ross stated that the project is designed to meet or perform better than the levels used in the current sound study and that conservative equipment assumptions were used for modeling. He explained that final equipment may come from different manufacturers but would be required to remain within the modeled design parameters.

An unidentified member of the public requested that the Planning Commission require documentation supporting representations made by the developer.

Jocelyn Coyler, no address provided, expressed concern regarding the Township's noise ordinance and stated that residents should not be asked to rely solely upon ordinance compliance when evaluating potential impacts. She referenced lower noise standards used elsewhere and questioned why similar protections could not be applied to this project. Ross stated that the project's modeled sound levels are below the applicable ordinance maximum and that the project is being designed to achieve the lower sound levels represented in the sound study.

Viola Byerly, Country Club Road, expressed concern regarding the completeness and accuracy of meeting minutes and suggested that speakers identify themselves and consistently use microphones to improve the accuracy of the public record. She also questioned potential wetland impacts associated with Campus 1-C. Ross stated that no wetlands would be impacted by Campus 1-C and that buffers would be maintained around the identified wetland areas.

Byerly further questioned whether wetland mitigation credits associated with other portions of the project could be located outside the Township. She also expressed concern regarding the scale of the proposed buildings and requested that the developer provide a three-dimensional model or similar visual aid to

better demonstrate the relationship between the proposed buildings, equipment, vehicles, neighboring homes, and surrounding properties. She asked whether employee transportation or shuttle systems remained under consideration as a traffic-mitigation measure, and Ross confirmed that such measures remain a potential strategy. Byerly also raised concerns regarding overnight truck traffic, construction impacts, and potential low-frequency noise from the completed development. She requested that the developer adhere to previously stated construction commitments.

Kyler Gerber, Bernheisel Bridge Road, requested the submission dates for the Campus 1-C and Campus 2 Final Land Development Plans and asked how those dates correspond with the Township's review period. The applicant stated that the submission dates could be provided from Township records. Mr. Gerber also questioned how installation of the proposed sewer line would be coordinated with reconstruction of Country Club Road. Ross explained that utility installation would occur before final roadway reconstruction so that the completed roadway would not need to be reopened. He stated that the sewer lateral remained under authority and engineering review.

Roberta Kribell, no address provided, requested that agendas, waiver requests, and additional project information be made more readily available to the public. She suggested that more comprehensive presentation materials would help residents understand the project and reduce repeated questions. She also requested additional information regarding fire planning and questioned whether stormwater facilities include underlayment or other measures to prevent impacts to nearby waterways.

Ross explained that the stormwater facilities shown as blue areas on project exhibits are generally intended to remain dry except following storm events. The facilities are designed to dewater within approximately 72 hours and incorporate filtering media to improve water quality. He stated that the stormwater design is intended to replicate existing drainage patterns by treating and gradually releasing stormwater while protecting surrounding wetlands and downstream areas.

Doug Graham asked whether a tenant had been identified for the project. The developer stated that discussions with a prospective tenant had been ongoing for several months and that the development agreement requires disclosure of the tenant before additional final approvals may be granted. Graham stated that he was reluctant to advance additional phases without identification of the tenant. The applicant acknowledged the concern and stated that the issue would be taken back to the development team and attorneys prior to the next anticipated review.

Graham also noted that approved Planning Commission minutes from July 13, July 27, and August 10 were not available on the Township website and asked that the issue be addressed. Township staff indicated that the matter would be reviewed.

Christine Gehr, no address provided, stated that inconsistent microphone use makes it difficult for members of the public to hear the discussion and contributes to difficulty accurately preparing meeting minutes. She requested that speakers use the microphones consistently, particularly when commitments or clarifications are being made, and asked that the Commission clearly state its expectation regarding disclosure of the project tenant.

Planning Commission Comments

Chairman Tracy Gleim clarified that the Planning Commission expects the tenant to be identified before the Commission proceeds with further consideration of additional project approvals. He stated that the

Commission wants the opportunity to communicate directly with the future tenant regarding operational issues, including equipment specifications, cooling systems, sound, and other matters that may affect surrounding properties.

Chairman Gleim also raised concerns regarding long-term decommissioning obligations if the buildings or underlying technology become obsolete. He stated that the Commission should consider financial protections sufficient to prevent future demolition or remediation costs from becoming a Township or taxpayer responsibility. He further requested that waiver requests be displayed during presentations and that copies be made available to attendees so the public can better follow the Commission’s review.

Commission member Wes Beard agreed that decommissioning protections should be addressed, particularly given the scale of the proposed development. He suggested that a financial mechanism, such as a decommissioning bond and appropriate liability coverage, should be considered and discussed with the eventual tenant.

Discussion followed regarding the appropriate level of financial security for future decommissioning. It was noted that related protections are addressed in the development agreement, although members discussed whether a substantially larger financial guarantee may ultimately be appropriate.

Chairman Gleim concluded that the land developer can provide certain guarantees only to the extent permitted by its role and that additional operational commitments will need to be addressed directly with the tenant. Grove reiterated that the Planning Commission’s formal role is to review land development and zoning compliance, while tenant-specific operational issues can be addressed when the tenant is identified.

Doug Graham made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion was seconded by Larry Claycomb. Motion approved, 7-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Action Summary Below

FORMAL ACTIONS

MOTION	MOVED BY	SECONDED BY	VOTE	ACTION
Motion to adjourn at 9:00 p.m.	Doug Graham	Larry Claycomb	7-0	Motion carried.

Date Approved: October 12, 2026