

MIDDLESEX TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CARLISLE, PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE: To consider the application of KMWW Partnership
for Zoning Ordinance Map and Text Amendments to
establish a Data Center Overlay District

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
PUBLIC HEARING

BEFORE: DONALD S. GEISTWHITE, JR., Chairman
STEVEN L. LARSON, Vice Chairman
WILLIAM H. GOODHART, Supervisor

KEITH O. BRENNEMAN, Solicitor

MARK D. CARPENTER, Township Zoning Officer

DATE: May 30, 2025, 7:30 a.m.

PLACE: Middlesex Township Municipal Building
350 North Middlesex Road
Carlisle, Pennsylvania

PRESENT:

McNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC
BY: CHARLES M. COURTNEY, ESQUIRE
FOR - APPLICANT

Amy R. Fritz, R.P.R.

INDEX TO PUBLIC COMMENT

NAME	PAGE
Earl Beam	10
Ginny Marcille-Kerslake	15,26
Jim Gehr	19
Scott Rohrer	20
Ed Franko	21

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: First off, I'm going to turn the meeting over to our solicitor, Keith Brenneman.

MR. BRENNEMAN: Thank you, Chairman Geistwhite. This is the time scheduled for a public hearing amending the Middlesex Township Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map providing for the Data Center Overlay District on four parcels of land located in the area of Country Club Road.

Notice of this hearing and the ordinance were published in the Sentinel on May 13 and May 20, 2025. The proposed ordinance was submitted to the Cumberland County Planning Department and the Middlesex Township Planning Commission on April 25 of 2025. Written notice of the hearing on the rezoning request was provided to the affected property owners on April 29, 2025.

Certified copies of the ordinance were provided to the Sentinel and Cumberland County on May 1, 2025, and the properties subject to rezoning were posted with notice of this hearing on May 15, 2025, at seven locations.

The Middlesex Township Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed amendment. Cumberland County Planning Department recommends approval, with comments. A comment raised by the Cumberland County Planning Department was that the proposed ordinance reference a new Article 23 for the Data Center Overlay

1 District which is an article that's already being used in
2 the zoning ordinance. Since that comment, a revised
3 ordinance has been provided with this change to Article 24
4 and the sections in the proposed ordinance referenced as
5 Section 24.

6 That change is an administrative change; it is not
7 a substantive change. And I note that because any action by
8 the board of supervisors today will be in reference to the
9 proposed ordinance having Article and Section 24 referenced.

10 Is either Robert Hess or Earl Beam present today?
11 Sir, which one are you?

12 MR. EARL BEAM: I'm Earl Beam.

13 MR. BRENNEMAN: Mr. Beam, I'm going to let you
14 address the letter you provided at the appropriate time
15 during the hearing. You submitted a letter?

16 MR. EARL BEAM: Yes.

17 MR. BRENNEMAN: And the board of supervisors, they
18 received a copy of that letter, and so has the Applicant.
19 So as opposed to having it marked as an exhibit, I'm going
20 to let you address that to the Board. Okay?

21 MR. EARL BEAM: Okay.

22 MR. BRENNEMAN: This hearing is being
23 stenographically recorded. I ask that anyone who wishes to
24 make any statements, we request you state your name and
25 address for the record. The hearing will progress as

1 follows: The Applicant, and/or their counsel, will present
2 a request for the Data Center Overlay District, there will
3 be questions by the board of supervisors and any comments,
4 and then we'll open the floor to questions and comments by
5 the audience.

6 At this point, I will turn the hearing over to Mr.
7 Courtney.

8 MR. COURTNEY: Good morning. Charley Courtney with
9 McNeese. So before you is a proposed zoning amendment to
10 create a Data Center Overlay District, and it's not a new
11 concept.

12 Recall last fall we came to this board, we came to
13 your planning commission, we presented a concept for a data
14 center project on the Pennterra site and adjoining
15 McNaughton lands; it's about a total of 690 acres.

16 And following that the Board was, and the Township,
17 was working on a new zoning ordinance, and that concept was
18 incorporated into your ordinance, your draft ordinance that
19 the Board heard earlier this month.

20 So just recall that this is somewhat of a unique
21 project; it's unique because of the low-impact nature of
22 data centers. With all of the projects that the Township
23 typically sees; high truck traffic generation, high
24 passenger vehicle generation, these projects, if you
25 compared it to the residential development that had been

1 approved for this site, it's about one-fifth of the traffic
2 generation of that project. And it's predominantly
3 passenger vehicles; no trucks other than, you know, the
4 initial loading of the buildings with computer equipment, no
5 direct impacts to schools.

6 So one is it's a little bit of a unique project
7 because of its low-impact nature. The second is it's, as
8 we've discussed previously with its tax revenue generation,
9 this is probably about a 15 billion, with a b, dollar
10 project, and the tax revenue, the real estate tax revenue
11 generation from that is in the tens of millions of dollars
12 annually.

13 The third thing that makes this project unique is
14 the power and fiber that are available to this site, and PPL
15 is already working on some additional power transmission
16 facilities. Fiber is already available for the site, so the
17 site's unique in the sense that it's already essentially
18 prepped for this type of use.

19 And it's also unique because of the natural
20 buffering that exists around this property. It's not like
21 Northern Virginia where it's very compact and tight and, you
22 know, putting in data center buildings you're doing it in a
23 more urban compact environment. This is -- the size of the
24 proposed overlay allows for, you know, more than adequate
25 buffering, etcetera, for the project. So there's virtually

1 no other type of development that I've seen in my career
2 that has a low impact, high tax revenue generation, and the
3 data center overlay provisions had been incorporated and are
4 incorporated in the draft zoning ordinance that this board
5 previously heard, the new zoning ordinance.

6 What you have before you is substantively identical
7 to what was included in that draft ordinance. So the reason
8 why we are here asking for an amendment to your current
9 ordinance as opposed to waiting for that new zoning
10 ordinance to be adopted is simply the life of the project.

11 What's happening across the state is data center
12 projects are being proposed, and not all projects are going
13 to be accommodated because there's only so much power.
14 Transmission, from the PPL standpoint, transmission of power
15 isn't an issue; you can build substations, you can build
16 lines.

17 What is a limiting factor ultimately is power
18 generation. PPL has only so much power that it can provide,
19 and to provide additional power it takes time because they
20 have to do new power generation facilities.

21 So what we're seeing -- and I'm working on several
22 projects throughout the state. And I was in a meeting with
23 PPL and they essentially said, look, we're going to allocate
24 the passing on a first-come, first-served basis. To get
25 that reservation of power generation requires a payment to

1 PPL in the millions of dollars; and once that payment is
2 made, then the power is reserved for that project. So what
3 you see happening is projects throughout the state are
4 pursuing what we're pursuing, and that is a zoning approval
5 for, to allow for the project.

6 With that zoning approval, then that commitment can
7 be made to PPL to provide that payment to reserve the
8 capacity. So it's zoning, payment, power reservation,
9 that's how this is working throughout the state.

10 So that's why we've asked for an amendment to your
11 current ordinance as opposed to waiting, you know, a couple
12 months or three months, or whatever it's going to take for
13 the new zoning ordinance, and that's why we're here.

14 This amendment has been, as I said, is
15 substantively the same as what you've been reviewing as part
16 of the new zoning ordinance, so it's not a new concept, nor
17 is it new standards. Your planning commission has
18 recommended adoption, as the Cumberland County Planning
19 Commission.

20 The amendment that you have before you essentially
21 does two things; one is it creates an overlay on your zoning
22 map, a data center overlay. That data center overlay
23 essentially allows for data centers, right, it's not a
24 broader use, it's a data center overlay. The project that
25 we're pitching is the project that would be done. It also

1 establishes standards for data center overlays, and the
2 standards that are in this draft amendment are substantively
3 the same as what's in the proposed zoning ordinance, new
4 zoning ordinance.

5 Those were not drafted in a vacuum. The Cumberland
6 County Planning Department has had its hand in helping to
7 formulate that. The standards that were taken was taken
8 from Loudon County. Your planner who is working on the new
9 draft ordinance reviewed standards in Loudon County,
10 Virginia, which has kind of been the, more or less, best
11 practices for data center regulation because they dealt with
12 it.

13 And so that's what's been incorporated into the
14 draft so it provides for standards for data centers, area
15 and bulk standards, facade and architectural standards,
16 screening, buffering, mechanical equipment, traffic, access
17 requirements, water feasibility analysis, electric supply,
18 and also noise.

19 So with that, we'd ask the Board -- I'd be happy to
20 answer any questions, but we'd ask the Board to adopt the
21 proposed ordinance.

22 MR. BRENNEMAN: Gentlemen, do you have any
23 questions or comments?

24 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: I have one question. And I'm
25 old and I can't remember yesterday. I assume you all have

1 spoken with our municipal authority?

2 MR. COURTNEY: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: Okay. Because I know water
4 is an issue in some cases.

5 MR. COURTNEY: Yes, correct. We spoke with them.
6 We don't see any anticipated issues with that. The cooling
7 that can be done can be done in two ways; water and,
8 essentially, electric.

9 And to the extent that there would be any
10 additional water supply, you know, our goal is to ensure
11 that the Authority continues to have all the water supply
12 that is required for not just this project but for its
13 operation within the township.

14 And so if new facilities had to be developed, this
15 project would accommodate that. It's a \$15 billion project,
16 so it's probably a rounding error with any new modern
17 facility.

18 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: Thank you, Mr. Courtney.

19 MR. BRENNEMAN: Unless the Supervisors have any
20 more questions or comments, I'll open the floor to public
21 comment. I'm going to start with Mr. Beam since he wrote
22 the letter. State your name and your address, please, for
23 the record.

24 MR. EARL BEAM: Earl Beam; 303 Country Club Road.
25 Excuse me, I had eye drops at the eye doctor yesterday and I

1 have some trouble seeing here. I'm actually here
2 representing my neighbor because he's ill and can't make it.
3 This was to the Middlesex Township Supervisors, attached
4 written comments on the proposed Data Center Overlay Zoning
5 Ordinance for Country Club Road:

6 "Gentlemen: The attached comments on the proposed
7 Data Center Overlay Zoning Ordinance for Country Club Road
8 are respectfully submitted for your consideration during the
9 public hearing on this subject to be held on Friday, May 30,
10 2025.

11 These written comments are submitted as input from
12 the Country Club residents that cannot attend the meeting in
13 person because of other commitments that have been
14 previously scheduled for the time of this hearing.

15 Comments on proposed Data Center Overlay Zoning
16 Ordinance for Country Club Road:

17 1, Because of the currently unknown and potentially
18 enormous water and sewer requirements for the Data Center
19 Project, which would be permitted under this proposed Data
20 Center Overlay Zoning Ordinance, the ordinance should
21 specifically mandate that all water and sewer utilized for
22 any purpose within the physical area covered by this
23 ordinance shall be from public water and public sewer
24 systems. The ordinance should also mandate that the main
25 and only water and sewer connection for the Data Center

1 Project property with the public water and sewer lines shall
2 be at the closest available point from the Carlisle Pike and
3 that all distribution lines from the main connection point
4 shall be within the confines of the Data Center Project
5 property and not along Country Club Road and shall be
6 installed by and at the expense of the Data Center Project,
7 not at the Middlesex Township expense.

8 Connection to the public/municipal water and sewer
9 systems shall end at the Data Center Project and such
10 connection shall not be the pretext for running/installing
11 public/municipal water/sewer system lines the entire length
12 of Country Club Road to Bernheisel Bridge Road.

13 2, The "Site Design Standards/Setbacks and Building
14 Massing Adjacent to Residential" section of this proposed
15 ordinance seems to require a setback of only 100 feet from
16 any existing residences on Country Club Road. Considering
17 the potential size and noise-producing capability of the
18 proposed Data Center Project buildings, a 100-foot setback
19 from a currently existing residence on Country Club Road is
20 totally insufficient.

21 In a Patriot News, December 15, 2024, article on
22 the proposed data project, it was stated that per American
23 Real Estate Partners, the developer of the proposed Data
24 Center Project, that all proposed data center buildings
25 would be more than 900 feet from the closest Country Club

1 Road residences.

2 How can this proposed ordinance indicate only a
3 100-foot setback from existing residences when the Data
4 Center Project developer indicated a 900-foot setback?

5 3, Section 23.03, Area and Dimensional Standards of
6 the proposed ordinance lists a maximum building height of 75
7 feet for any building within the area covered by the
8 ordinance. Such a permitted building height seems excessive
9 and would definitely detract from the Country Club Road
10 landscape.

11 If a building height of 75 feet would be permitted,
12 what would be the length and width, square footage,
13 restrictions for the buildings within the Data Center
14 Project? It certainly seems that with the indicated
15 permitted building height, this would potentially permit the
16 construction of some monstrous, almost warehouse-sized
17 buildings. There is no way that such potentially sized
18 buildings should be permitted within 100 feet of existing
19 residences on Country Club Road.

20 4, Access to the Data Center Project: Because of
21 the topography of Country Club Road and the limited
22 visibility of oncoming traffic, because of that topography,
23 beyond 257 Country Club Road, any access/accesses to the
24 Data Center Project should not be located beyond 257 Country
25 Club Road, toward Bernheisel Bridge Road, as any such

1 accesses beyond that point would be very hazardous from a
2 safety standpoint.

3 5, Middlesex Township officials who are involved
4 with this proposed ordinance should have had or should be
5 having communications with other municipalities/local
6 governments who currently have data centers to learn of
7 issues/problems that they have experienced with the data
8 centers in their areas. Such communication will only
9 benefit Middlesex Township in the current process.

10 Two areas with existing data centers in Central
11 Pennsylvania, according to the Patriot News, December 15,
12 2024, are: A, Alerify on Vartan Way in Lower Paxton
13 Township, Dauphin County; B, Lumen in Lancaster County.

14 6, The majority of current Country Club Road
15 residents who will be most affected by the proposed Data
16 Center Project are senior citizens who are living on fixed
17 incomes, have recurring health issues, and have lived in
18 their current homes for over 40 years. They are not in a
19 financial position to absorb increased property taxes due to
20 road upgrade work or public water/sewer extensions and
21 enhancements to support a Data Center Project that will
22 create millions/billions of dollars in profit at their
23 expense. Additionally, there is the very real possibility
24 that the building of data centers could decrease the value
25 of the current Country Club Road homes.

1 It is imperative that the aforementioned Comments 1
2 and 2 be definitively addressed in the proposed Data Center
3 Overlay Zoning Ordinance and that Comments 3, 4, 5, and 6 be
4 considered in clarifying/changing the proposed ordinance."

5 This was submitted by Robert Hess. Thank you very
6 much.

7 MR. BRENNEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Beam. Anybody else
8 have any questions or comments concerning the proposed
9 ordinance?

10 MS. GINNY MARCILLE-KERSLAKE: Good morning. My
11 name is Ginny Marcille-Kerslake; I live at 103 Shoen Road in
12 Exton, Pennsylvania, so I traveled here today from Chester
13 County. I read about this last night, and I do have some
14 issues as a Pennsylvanian, as an electrical bill ratepayer,
15 and also as someone who is an avid hiker and frequents the
16 Appalachian Trail, which this will be in the viewshed for.

17 I'd like to say, I would caution the Board not to
18 rush to a decision on this. From what I've read and from
19 what I heard this morning, there's a lot of things that we
20 don't know about this hyperscale data center.

21 This is a massive facility. At 5 million square
22 feet, it would be one of the largest in the country and the
23 world. 5 million square feet, to put that in perspective,
24 is 86 football fields. This is no small project. In West
25 Whiteland where I live, right next door in East Whiteland

1 Township, a developer is building a 1.5 million square foot
2 data center, and I know that they have secured up to 850
3 megawatts of power from PECO to power that station.

4 That makes that data center the second largest
5 single customer for PECO; the higher one would be the City
6 of Philadelphia. That data center is less than one-third
7 the size of this one.

8 So I haven't heard how much power is going to be
9 required by this data center. This data center will make
10 already skyrocketing electrical bills climb higher; that's
11 what these data centers will be doing, not just here but for
12 me too as a Pennsylvanian.

13 So exactly how much power is this facility going to
14 be requiring and is PPL able to supply that and especially
15 without impacting the residents here and elsewhere? How
16 much water is this going to be consuming? I read that it's
17 going to be tying into the public waterline.

18 These hyperscale data centers use a huge amount of
19 water. You should be asking those questions, and you
20 shouldn't just be going off the developer's word that
21 they've spoken to the Authority and that it's going to be
22 okay. You need to look at those numbers and see if this
23 community can accommodate that.

24 In terms of the power supply, some of these data
25 centers are now building their own power-generating

1 facilities onsite. This is a 700-acre site. There is room
2 there potentially for a power plant to be developed to power
3 that facility. And are these residents aware of that and
4 are you prepared for that? Your zoning might not allow for
5 that.

6 But I will caution you that there is a bill in
7 Harrisburg right now called House Bill 502, and maybe you've
8 heard of it. I know PSATS is against this bill. But what
9 it does is it creates a seven-member appointed board in
10 Harrisburg that can review, that will review applications
11 for power-generating facilities, and within 90 days they can
12 issue a certificate to that developer and that certificate
13 would exempt them from all local zoning and ordinances that
14 are designed to protect this community.

15 So if you're not aware of that, I caution you to
16 learn about it. That bill could very well be rammed through
17 both chambers in June with budget negotiations and this
18 board will be powerless to stop a power plant if that's what
19 this developer wants to do.

20 They want to do this because they may not have
21 enough power coming from the grid, or it could actually be
22 more economically feasible for them to build their own plant
23 and generate their own power.

24 And, finally, I don't know if you've seen, out of
25 China there was a -- and this is open-source technology,

1 that the technology is there and it's going to be evolving
2 very quickly where these large-scale facilities are not
3 going to be needed but we'll need -- just sort of, like, how
4 we went from big rooms filled with data processors and now
5 we can do that stuff on our phone.

6 That technology is advancing and these massive,
7 very expensive-to-run, very energy-and-water-consumptive
8 facilities might not be needed. So what's going to happen
9 to this facility if it becomes obsolete? Is there a plan in
10 your ordinance requiring decommissioning of this?

11 You know, driving in today, this is a gorgeous
12 area. I would hate to see 86 football fields of sort of
13 warehouse-looking facilities that are just empty. So I
14 think that's all my comments.

15 I also have a letter that a woman sent to me who
16 lives near Scranton, and her community is facing one of
17 these there built by NorthPoint. She asked me to bring the
18 letter and give it to you, and I printed off copies, just so
19 you can see what they are dealing with in that community,
20 which is also a rural community. Thank you.

21 MR. BRENNEMAN: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: Thank you.

23 MS. GINNY MARCILLE-KERSLAKE: And I also -- one
24 thing I also didn't mention is, so I live in West Whiteland
25 Township. We faced a very similar thing in my township in

1 the end of 2022 and 2023 where an applicant came to our
2 board, just like this, applying for an amendment.
3 We actually stopped it in our township because residents,
4 once they became aware of it, they started to speak out.

5 They were going to attend a hearing just like this,
6 Philadelphia Inquirer wrote an article about it in our local
7 paper and the Applicant withdrew the application. And that
8 was for data center and power generating facility.

9 MR. BRENNEMAN: Thank you. Any other public
10 comment?

11 MR. JIM GEHR: Jim Gehr; 3351 Spring Road. Good
12 morning, everyone. First of all, I would like to thank
13 Ginny for taking the time -- can you imagine -- is there
14 anyone in this room in your lifetime has motivated
15 themselves by reading something the night before, got up and
16 driven an hour and a half to represent the public? I don't
17 think so; I know I haven't.

18 I think as well -- I've been coming to these
19 meetings now, routinely, I don't think I've missed one, all
20 the meetings for the township for the last six months. She
21 was the most articulate and data-informed person that's ever
22 sat in this room in the last six months, in my opinion, and
23 that's my opinion.

24 I listened to the words and her statements calling
25 out people representing, and the one thing that's regularly

1 absent from all discussion is data; we just talk about
2 general topics. And from my own research on this data
3 center topic, from my business interests across the globe,
4 she is right on target and asking the right questions.

5 And respectfully I would represent that us in this
6 room do not have enough information to voice approval of
7 what's being requested here. It's not that we're against
8 it; we just want to make the right decision.

9 But I think the comments that she's made just
10 heighten the fact that we need more work before we voice an
11 approval. And that's what I have to offer here today.
12 Thank you for your time.

13 MR. BRENNEMAN: Thank you. Any other public
14 comment?

15 MR. SCOTT ROHRER: Scott Rohrer; 457 Wolfs Bridge
16 Road. My opinion is the same with Mr. Gehr there; I would
17 have spoken the same words that he has. I agree, I
18 appreciate her coming. Her data she had was exceptional,
19 and that's what we need here. I'm not against anything, but
20 that's the things we need to know. And I appreciate your
21 time, and thank you.

22 MR. BRENNEMAN: Anybody else?

23 Gentlemen, there being no further public comment --

24 MR. ED FRANKO: Sorry. I was waiting for others.

25 MR. BRENNEMAN: Okay.

1 MR. ED FRANKO: Ed Franko; 300 Mt. Zion Road,
2 Carlisle --

3 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: Sir, what was your address
4 again?

5 MR. ED FRANKO: 300 Mt. Zion Road, Carlisle, PA,
6 which is Lower Frankford Township, so I'm a neighboring
7 township. I happen to be on the Cumberland County Planning
8 Commission, but I'm not here representing the planning
9 commission. But I was concerned in the report of the
10 planning commission's deliberations that the only issue was
11 one particular technical issue.

12 I don't know if you were privy to the original
13 staff comments that were brought to the planning
14 commission -- and I voted to approve the zoning ordinance
15 because I think a great deal of thought was put into it and
16 it is generally well done.

17 But there were some concerns at the planning
18 department, frankly, that were brought before the planning
19 commission. One was, just as some folks have said, you
20 know, you're the first ones out of the box and in some ways
21 it's going to set a standard in Cumberland County. And this
22 is a very big regional issue, and so there were concerns
23 about your zoning ordinance overall versus the overlay
24 district.

25 The other things that were mentioned in the

1 comments -- and I'll read those from this -- the ordinance
2 amendment could consider setback and buffer provisions to
3 protect sensitive, natural features within the overlay
4 district such as recurring buffers, floodplains, steep
5 slopes, and impacts on the viewshed of the Appalachian
6 Trail.

7 Obviously you're in a very sensitive area there
8 surrounded by creek; so with 700 acres, one would hope that
9 you could do additional screening, perhaps do some recurring
10 buffers. There was a great deal of discussion amongst the
11 members of the planning commission trying to learn from the
12 experience of other townships and, you know, DC kept coming
13 up, Virginia.

14 A major concern there was the noise factor, and the
15 noise factor comes from the cooling fans. The impression we
16 were left with was that this facility would use water rather
17 than air for cooling, but there was not a lot of detail on
18 that.

19 And as you may be aware, water resources in the,
20 basically in the whole county, are a concern in terms of
21 future development, and I liked very much the part of the
22 ordinance which required an SRBC, Susquehanna River Basin
23 Commission, review of any proposal.

24 But kind of in line with what's been said, there
25 wasn't really good data presented in terms of what would be

1 the water use of this facility. It's a little confusing to
2 say it needs to have public water and sewer if you're
3 talking about hundreds of thousands of gallons of water a
4 day.

5 Would that come from the municipality, or would
6 there be wells or geothermal approaches? There's certainly
7 many great techniques out there that I've just been learning
8 about, including submerging the actual computers in a bath
9 that is then cooled to reduce the noise, etcetera.

10 But I realize you're here to approve an overlay
11 district, some of these issues could be addressed at a land
12 development process. Maybe you can't do everything in the
13 zoning ordinance, but I do think you having a full dataset
14 of what are we talking about in terms of this scale
15 development, water use, etcetera, impacts that are really
16 regionally going on I think is very, very valuable.

17 Again, the Commission, for a lot of compelling
18 reasons, understood the Applicant's desire to move forward.
19 They basically said that they couldn't waste any more time
20 on dealing with the zoning issues because that's a drop-dead
21 issue for them; if they can't get the zoning approved,
22 they're not going to go forward.

23 There's a lot of benefits, financial and otherwise,
24 to this type of development. But, again, you're in a
25 position where perhaps you could get some more data from the

1 developer at this point before approving the actual zoning
2 overlay district. Thank you.

3 MR. BRENNEMAN: Thank you. Anybody else?

4 MR. COURTNEY: So this gentleman's right; so a lot
5 of what we're talking about there is a process for, right.
6 And, you know, even in terms of water feasibility, right,
7 there has to be studies done to identify ultimately what's
8 going to be required, how much water is necessary.

9 That's why in the ordinance there's a water
10 feasibility requirement, right. So you can't answer every
11 question about every project up front at the zoning stage,
12 right, there is a process for that, and your ordinances have
13 that.

14 What we have in place in this is requirements that
15 require that evaluation as part of the land development
16 process when all of this information is more readily
17 available.

18 The other reality is that data centers are already
19 a use, they're already a legitimate business use; and, as
20 you guys know, every municipality has to provide for all
21 legitimate business uses. So the municipalities that are
22 out there, unlike you where data centers aren't on their
23 radar and they're not regulating them, then those projects
24 come in and they come in without all the regulation that
25 you're putting in place. And so what this project has done

1 while, yes, there is a project, it is proposed, what it's
2 also done is put the Township in the position of saying,
3 okay, this use is coming, it's already a use, we have to
4 provide for it, so let's regulate it in a responsible way.
5 And that's what this amendment does for the Township.

6 And it's not like this amendment was, you know, we
7 submitted something and, you know, it's what you are
8 adopting. Your consultants, your planning consultant, in
9 connection with the Cumberland County Planning Department,
10 developed these standards based upon standards outside of
11 the Commonwealth where they have faced -- so the comments
12 that we have, well, we should consider this, it's been baked
13 into what you have before you.

14 So I thank the Board, and we ask the Board to adopt
15 the amendment.

16 MS. GINNY MARCILLE-KERSLAKE: Can I make one
17 brief comment?

18 MR. BRENNEMAN: No. Hold on, please.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN LARSON: Mr. Courtney, do you know
20 what kind of data center -- is this a normal data center or
21 is it an AI center?

22 MR. COURTNEY: I mean, AI is growing, so I don't
23 think we can say it's not AI because it's all of the big
24 users; AWS, Oracle, all of them. I mean, the world is
25 moving towards AI so I think any data center that's done you

1 have to assume that it's part of an AI network somewhere.

2 MR. BRENNEMAN: Yes, ma'am.

3 MS. GINNY MARCILLE-KERSLAKE: I'd just like to
4 address a couple things there, first with the more recent
5 question, which is is this a normal or an AI data center.
6 This is not a normal, what we are used to thinking of in
7 terms of data center, this is a hyperscale data center;
8 these are massive ones.

9 So we've had data centers for years but not to the
10 scale that's being developed now by Google and Amazon. A
11 lot of it's driven by AI; some of it necessary, but largely
12 unnecessary. So this is just -- just so it's clear, this is
13 not what we would consider a normal one.

14 In terms of what's being done here to create an
15 ordinance for data centers, without such an ordinance, I
16 believe your township code would put this in an industrial
17 district because we can't just ban them in municipalities in
18 Pennsylvania, we can't ban any use, as you know.

19 And if it's not specified, this, arguably,
20 industrial use, especially if there is a co-located power
21 plant, would go in your industrial district, not in this
22 residential farm or agricultural district.

23 And, finally, I did not hear from the Applicant how
24 much water will this facility use. Like, that's the concern
25 here. All that was mentioned is that you have a water

1 feasibility study baked into this ordinance. Certainly the
2 Applicant knows how much power, how much water roughly they
3 would be looking at for a 5 million square foot data center.
4 You should be requiring that information before you make an
5 ordinance for this application. Thank you.

6 MR. BRENNEMAN: Thank you. Anybody else?

7 Gentlemen, there being no further public comment or
8 comments or questions, you can --

9 VICE CHAIRMAN LARSON: Do you have any idea what
10 the power requirements for this will be?

11 MR. COURTNEY: Just over a gigawatt of power.

12 VICE CHAIRMAN LARSON: And PPL says they have no
13 problems with that?

14 MR. COURTNEY: Correct. And that's being provided
15 not at the expense of power to be served to existing
16 residents and projected future needs, so it's additional
17 power. I think -- what we said previously is that when this
18 power is provided, there will actually be a net increase in
19 power to this area.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN LARSON: And they're installing
21 additional capacity?

22 MR. COURTNEY: Correct, transmission capacity,
23 right, and there would be essentially a reservation of the
24 generation capacity.

25 MR. BRENNEMAN: Anything further?

1 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: Just one comment. I'm also
2 on our Municipal Authority, and they came before us before.
3 And there is enough water, we're in good shape, we're in the
4 process of finalizing another well, so water-wise we're
5 okay.

6 MS. GINNY MARCILLE-KERSLAKE: Did you get an answer
7 on how much consumption?

8 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: Ma'am, I have no idea. I
9 just know we're drilling another well.

10 MR. BRENNEMAN: I've been sitting through the
11 Authority's business for over 20 years now. I do not vote
12 for the Authority, I don't have that authority, but I can
13 tell you they will not provide water to anybody if it's not
14 there. There's going to be a capacity analysis, there's
15 going to be a study done.

16 MS. GINNY MARCILLE-KERSLAKE: My question was was
17 the Authority told how much water this hyperscale data
18 center would be consuming.

19 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: I have no idea.

20 MR. BRENNEMAN: Again, I have no idea.

21 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: They do. I mean, the
22 director of, the operating manager of the Authority does;
23 they work with it.

24 MR. BRENNEMAN: Any other questions, comments?
25 Gentlemen, if there's nothing further, you can entertain a

1 motion, if you're so inclined, to approve Ordinance 3-2025.

2 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: Okay. Let me move so we
3 adopt Ordinance 3-2025 revising the Middlesex Township
4 Zoning Map and Text Amendment by applying the Data Center
5 Overlay District to properties at 246, 248, 250, and 256
6 Country Club Road. Do I have a second?

7 VICE CHAIRMAN LARSON: I'll second that.

8 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: All in favor.

9 (Chorus of ayes.)

10 MR. BRENNEMAN: Mr. Chairman, you can declare the
11 public hearing closed.

12 CHAIRMAN GEISTWHITE: I am declaring the hearing
13 closed.

14 MR. COURTNEY: Thank you.

15 (The proceedings concluded at 8:15 a.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence
2 are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me
3 on the within proceedings, and that this copy is a correct
4 transcript of the same.

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25


Amy R. Fritz, R.P.R.