

## **FAQ from the East Whiteland Township Board of Supervisors Regarding the Sentinel, Green Fig Data Center**

### ***Message from the East Whiteland Township Board of Supervisors:***

The concept of a hyperscale data center is new and uncharted territory for both our Township, as well as municipalities nationwide. We recognize and understand that the Sentinel Green Fig Data Center has generated significant interest and that many residents have raised questions and concerns. We also understand that the land development process, as well as the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code, are complex and can be confusing. Our goal in creating this FAQ document is to be transparent, responsive, and to help clearly explain how portions of the Township process works and where this project currently stands. These FAQs may be updated from time to time.

We appreciate the time residents have taken to connect with the Township and share their concerns, perspectives, and questions. The questions we are receiving reflect a desire for clarity, and we are committed to addressing them as directly and accurately as possible.

### **Q: What is the status of the Sentinel Green Fig Data Center?**

**A:** The Sentinel Green Fig Data Center is a proposed private data center development by the applicant Green Fig Land Company in East Whiteland Township and West Whiteland Township. The site is located at 13 South Bacton Hill Road, near the intersection of Swedesford Road and South Bacton Hill Road adjacent to the PECO Planebrook Substation.

The developer recently withdrew the December 1, 2025 land development plan and stated that they intend to proceed with the construction of the approved August 2024 land development plan [LINK](#). There will be no further public meetings regarding the 2025 plan.

The 2024 approved plan for the project shows a building footprint of 1,544,700 square feet which includes two, two-story buildings and basement. Those plans received preliminary plan approval on June 12, 2024 and received final plan approval by the Township, with conditions, on August 14, 2024. As noted below, the approved 2024 Plan was recorded with the County Recorder of Deeds on March 31, 2026, after the Township concluded that the conditions were satisfied. An appeal of the 2018 zoning hearing board decision and an appeal related to the final plan resolution and recordation of the plans have been filed with the Chester County Court of Common Pleas for adjudication.

As stated earlier, the applicant intends to construct the approved 2024 plans. The applicant is legally entitled to continue with the construction and permitting process. To date, Sentinel Green Fig has submitted three permits that the Township is obligated to process and will begin to do so. Those permits are as follows:

1. Building permit - Transformer pad - Received 5/7/26
2. Zoning permit - Shed to hold IT equipment - Received 5/6/26
3. Erosion & Sedimentation control application - Received 5/7/26

**Q: What has happened with the 2024 Approved Plans between August 2024 and March 2026?**

**A:** Between August 2024 and March 2026, the Applicant worked through the required post-approval process for the 2024 approved land development plan, including satisfying all conditions of approval, completing technical reviews, and plan recording requirements under the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code and Township Subdivision & Land Development Ordinance.

During this period, Township staff, engineers, technical consultants and legal counsel reviewed those post-submission materials to assess their compliance with the conditions of approval. Once all conditions were met, the plan was signed in March 2026, which allowed the plan recording process to move forward. The Board of Supervisors signed the plan in March 2026 because they were legally obligated to do so under Section 513 of the MPC, 53 P.S. § 10513.

The process as described above is followed by all subdivision and land development plans reviewed and approved by the Township.

**Q: Who made the decision that the Applicant satisfied the 2024 Plan conditions? Shouldn't that be a decision for the Township Board of Supervisors? What if I disagree that the conditions have been met?**

**A:** The Applicant's compliance with the conditions is an administrative review by the Township pursuant to the written decision of approval issued by the Board of Supervisors. The written decision spells out the parameters for approval/conditions, and further Board of Supervisors' action is not triggered. The satisfaction of those conditions is reviewed by the Township Planning and Zoning Department, Zoning Officer, Engineer, Solicitor, and other professional consultants, but is not otherwise subject to Board review (as is the case for other plans before the Township).

The Township recognizes the right of others to disagree with the conclusion that the Applicant satisfied the 2024 Plan conditions. The Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code allows those who disagree that the 2024 Plan conditions have been satisfied to appeal.

**Q: What about the 90-day requirement under our Township Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance?**

**A:** See the [LINK](#) to the review letter on this issue. Separate and apart from the legal technicalities, the Township has received additional questions as to the Township's 90-day letter to the Applicant. The letter was issued at the request of the Applicant. Regardless of whether it was technically required under Township Ordinance or the Municipalities Planning Code, it was expected that there would be date confusion at the Recorder of Deeds Office because of the difference between the typed date on the Plans (which referenced 2024) and the handwritten signatures next to the Township Board of Supervisors' signatures (from 2026). This matter is currently subject to a lawsuit recently filed with the Chester County Court of Common Pleas.

**Q: What is currently before the Township Board of Supervisors?**

**A:** There are no plans in front of the Board of Supervisors, nor are there any plan related actions required of the Board. The applicant's pursuit of construction activities is an administrative function of the Township. Accordingly, there are no further public meetings required.

**Q: I hear this is a Superfund site. What does that mean?**

**A:** A Superfund site is a property identified and regulated by the EPA as requiring cleanup due to past contamination. This property is known as the Foote Mineral Superfund site. It is comprised of three properties in East Whiteland Township and one property in West Whiteland Township being Tax Parcel Nos. 42-3-130, 42-3-130.1, 42-3-130.2, and 41-3-4 respectively. Tax Parcel No. 42-3-130 contains the capped portion of the property that EPA refers to as the "selected remedy".

The Township uses specialized legal counsel and environmental consultants, Integral (formerly BSTI) to review and evaluate the status of site. During that review the Township and its advisors have examined the 3<sup>rd</sup> Five-Year Report dated September 20, 2024, the two "comfort letters" issued March 19, 2026, the environmental covenant recorded in 2017, as well as other pertinent documents and information.

All cleanup requirements and ongoing obligations related to its Superfund designation are overseen and regulated by the EPA, not the Township. These obligations are the responsibility of the property owner/developer.

The Township has received a number of questions about the status of the property, including but not limited to the below.

**Superfund Question 1 – What is the status of the remediation on the site?**

**A:** Excerpt from comfort letter re: Tax Parcels 42-3-130.1, 42-3-130.2, 41-3-4

“The EPA selected a remedy for the Site in a March 31, 2006 Record of Decision (ROD), which requires, among other components, excavating and consolidating the building foundations and areas of contaminated soils into the quarry area of the Site as well as long-term groundwater monitoring. The quarries were combined into a single disposal area, and this single disposal area was graded and capped as a landfill. There are numerous contaminants of concern in soil and groundwater, including lithium, boron, bromate, chromium, TCE, and PCE, among others. The existing groundwater contamination plume is believed to extend from the Property to the east-northeast for an unknown distance. On April 7, 2008, the EPA issued an Explanation of Significant Differences (“ESD”) modifying the soil component of the remedy for the Site. A comprehensive description of the EPA’s remedy for the Site as selected in the ROD and modified by the ESD (collectively the “Selected Remedy”), can be found at the [link](#) listed above.”

“The Selected Remedy includes institutional controls to restrict land and groundwater use at the Site by prohibiting any use that does not preserve the integrity of the Selected Remedy and prohibiting the installation and use of untreated groundwater wells for drinking water purposes. Those land use restrictions, as well as others specific to the capped area of the Site, have been implemented at Parcel 42-3-130 through an environmental covenant that was recorded in 2017. Please note, the EPA anticipates additional land use restrictions may be selected in the future for the parcels comprising the Property.”

## **Superfund Question 2 – Can the applicant construct the development on the property?**

**A:** Excerpt from comfort letter re: Tax Parcels 42-3-130.1, 42-3-130.2, 41-3-4

“Based on the information provided in your responses to EPA’s Comfort Letter Intake Form, the EPA understands that Sentinel intends to develop industrial buildings at the Property. Your responses also indicated that the proposed reuse will involve the use of materials including diesel for standby generators, oils/refrigerants, and batteries. You also indicated that Sentinel anticipates creating some soil disturbance such as digging for shallow foundations or utilities, and the modification, alteration, or relocation of multiple monitoring wells that are used to monitor the effectiveness of the Selected Remedy. Although it is not mentioned in the Comfort Letter Intake Form, the EPA has received separate information indicating that the intended reuse is a large data center where a number of employees will work.”

“Please note that, to ensure the Selected Remedy remains protective of human health and the environment, any reuse must be compatible with any investigation, cleanup actions, and required land use restrictions designed to protect the Selected Remedy and prevent unacceptable exposure to residual contamination. Sentinel should not conduct any activities or construct any structures that would interfere with the EPA’s cleanup or any future

investigations. A Health and Safety Plan and Soil Management Plan should be developed and submitted to the EPA for review before any such redevelopment work begins.”

Excerpt from E. Habecker (Odren) email to A. Schneider dated May 4, 2026:

“Through its March 20, 2026 comfort letters (copies of which were sent to you in our April 30, 2026 email), EPA reminded the developers of their responsibilities related to institutional controls as well as their obligation to ensure that activities at the Site do not interfere with the performance and effectiveness of EPA’s selected remedy.”

The EPA does not issue permits but instead does issue “comfort letters” to property owners and developers.

[LINK to comfort letters](#)

**Superfund Question 3 – Does the environmental covenant referenced in the comfort letters and various documents apply to all of the tax parcels and thus prohibits construction?**

**A:** Excerpt from EPA letter April 30, 2026 to A. Schneider

“EPA is aware of the environmental covenant recorded on September 28, 2017, and referenced in your April 15, 2026 and April 27, 2026 correspondence. The environmental covenant was recorded for Parcel 42-3-130, which contains the capped soil (*i.e.*, the quarry area). Pursuant to redevelopment information provided by the developer, Sentinel Green Fig, LLC, to EPA, the proposed development is limited to the parcels adjacent to 42-3-130 and the developers indicated that no construction or other work will occur on 42-3-130. Accordingly, there have been no violations of the environmental covenant, nor do the proposed development plans indicate any activity that will violate the environmental covenant.”

[Link to Environmental Covenant](#)

**Superfund Q4 – What about the Soils Management and Health & Safety Plans mentioned in the “comfort letters”?**

**A:** Excerpt from comfort letter re: Tax Parcels 42-3-130.1, 42-3-130.2, 41-3-4

“As required by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, a Health and Safety Plan must be developed and should be submitted to the EPA for review before any redevelopment work begins. Additionally, a Soil Management Plan should also be

developed and submitted to the EPA for review before any redevelopment work begins to ensure there are no proposed impacts to the Selected Remedy.”

The Township via Integral and environmental attorney are reviewing the Soil Management Plan and Health and Safety Plan and will comment to the EPA.

Further information on the Foote Mineral Superfund site can be found here:

<https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/csitinfo.cfm?id=0301103>