

FORMAL OPPOSITION TO REZONING

Willow Lakes Data Center Proposal - 10050 W. Midway Road

8/20/2026

Mayor Linda Hudson

Fort Pierce City Commissioners

100 N US1

Fort Pierce, Florida 34950

Via Email

RE: Formal Opposition to Willow Lakes, LLC Rezoning Request; approximately 200 acres at 10050 W. Midway Road; proposed rezoning from Planned Development (PD) to General Commercial (C-3) and Light Industrial (I-1) for a data center and related commercial uses

Dear Mayor Hudson and Commissioners:

I submit this formal opposition to the request by Willow Lakes, LLC to rezone approximately 200 acres at 10050 W. Midway Road. The proposal would convert approximately 26 acres along Midway Road to General Commercial (C-3) and approximately 174 acres to Light Industrial (I-1), with the industrial portion restricted by covenant to use as a data center. The commercial frontage could support a hotel, gas station, restaurants, fast-food establishments, and other retail uses.

The record presently available to the public does not justify approval of an industrial-scale data center on this property. The applicant's reliance on nearby FPL transmission facilities, a substation, and a man-made lake as supposed site advantages instead identifies the project's most serious unresolved public impacts: extraordinary electrical demand, cooling-water demand, heat rejection, noise, emergency-generator emissions, stormwater and groundwater effects, fire-response requirements, and the possibility that infrastructure costs will be shifted to utility customers and taxpayers.

A zoning vote is not a harmless preliminary step. Rezoning 174 acres to I-1 materially increases the property's development entitlement and value while transferring substantial risk to the surrounding community. A private restrictive covenant describing the intended use does not substitute for a complete, enforceable development order supported by objective engineering, environmental, utility, fiscal, and emergency-response evidence.

Grounds for Opposition

1. No defined scale or enforceable operating envelope. The public materials do not identify a binding maximum for building square footage, electrical load in megawatts, water withdrawal and consumption, cooling configuration, generator count and fuel storage, hours of operation, or phased expansion. Without those limits, neither the City nor the public can measure the project's actual impacts.

- 2. Water and lake-cooling claims require independent proof.** The existence of a former aggregate-mining lake does not establish that it can lawfully or sustainably serve a data center cooling system. The City should require a sealed water-balance analysis addressing withdrawal, consumptive use, evaporation, thermal discharge, lake levels, groundwater interaction, water quality, drought conditions, treatment chemicals, and all state or regional permits before any entitlement is granted.
- 3. Electrical and ratepayer impacts remain undisclosed.** Proximity to transmission lines and a substation does not prove that adequate capacity exists without new generation, transmission, substation, or distribution upgrades. The applicant must disclose its projected peak and average load, phased demand, required grid improvements, reliability effects, and who will pay every associated cost. Existing customers must not subsidize a private high-load user.
- 4. Continuous noise, heat, lighting, and generator emissions have not been resolved.** Data centers operate around the clock. Cooling equipment, transformers, switchgear, rooftop mechanical systems, and emergency generators can create persistent low-frequency noise and cumulative air emissions. The City should require modeled property-line noise limits, nighttime limits, generator-testing restrictions, photometric plans, air-emissions analysis, and enforceable monitoring and violation remedies.
- 5. Fire protection and hazardous-material demands must be established in advance.** Battery-energy systems, backup power equipment, diesel storage, electrical rooms, and large server halls present specialized fire and emergency-response demands. Approval should not precede a written capacity determination from the St. Lucie City Fire District identifying equipment, staffing, water supply, access, training, response-time, and cost requirements, with the applicant funding all project-created needs.
- 6. Transportation and cumulative commercial impacts cannot be separated from the rezoning.** The proposed 26-acre commercial frontage, together with construction traffic, employee traffic, service vehicles, fuel deliveries, and emergency access, must be evaluated as one cumulative development program. Piecemeal review would understate impacts on Midway Road and nearby intersections.
- 7. A private covenant is not sufficient public protection.** Any covenant can contain exceptions, interpretation disputes, amendment mechanisms, or enforcement limitations. If the City considers approval, every material promise must also appear as a condition of the zoning and development order, run with the land, bind successors and assigns, be enforceable by the City, and provide for suspension or revocation upon noncompliance.
- 8. The City should not approve industrial entitlement first and investigate consequences later.** The applicant bears the burden of presenting competent substantial evidence that the requested zoning is compatible, adequately served, and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. General statements about economic development or potential tax revenue cannot replace project-specific evidence of public-service capacity and impact mitigation.

Requested Action

I respectfully request that the Board deny the rezoning application on the present record. If the application is not denied, it should be postponed and remanded for a fully noticed public review only after the following materials are filed, published, and independently evaluated:

1. A binding conceptual site plan and phasing schedule stating maximum square footage, building height, electrical capacity, water demand, generator count, fuel storage, and hours of testing;
2. Sealed water-supply, cooling, hydrogeologic, thermal-discharge, water-quality, and drought-resilience analyses, together with all required agency determinations;
3. Written FPL capacity and upgrade documentation, including cost allocation and express protection of existing ratepayers from project-specific costs;
4. Independent noise, lighting, heat, air-emissions, stormwater, wetland, wildlife, and cumulative-impact studies based on the maximum buildout allowed by the requested zoning;
5. A Fire District and emergency-management capacity report, including applicant-funded mitigation and specialized equipment or staffing;
6. A cumulative traffic analysis covering the data center, construction phases, and all potential C-3 uses;
7. A fiscal-impact analysis comparing permanent jobs, public revenues, tax incentives, utility or infrastructure subsidies, and long-term public-service costs; and
8. Draft development-order conditions and covenants that are enforceable against the owner, operator, tenants, successors, and assigns, with monitoring, public reporting, penalties, and revocation provisions.

The City should also require a second neighborhood meeting after these materials are available, followed by sufficient time for public review before any Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation or Board vote.

The City is not obligated to exchange 174 acres of industrial entitlement for promises that have not been quantified, tested, funded, or made enforceable. The appropriate decision on the current record is denial. At an absolute minimum, no vote should occur until the City and its residents know the project's maximum size, total resource demands, full public cost, and enforceable safeguards.

Please place this letter and all attachments into the official record for every hearing or agenda item concerning Willow Lakes, LLC, 10050 W. Midway Road, and any related data center, commercial, rezoning, site-plan, development-order, utility, or incentive application.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kevin S. Keene

Community Liaison / Fort Pierce Watch

[REDACTED], [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] | [REDACTED]

CC:

St. Lucie City Fire District ([REDACTED])

South Florida Water Management District ([REDACTED])

Florida Department of Environmental Protection ([REDACTED])

Florida Public Service Commission ([REDACTED])

Vennis Gilmore

From: Kevin Freeman
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:54 PM
To: Vennis Gilmore
Cc: Christopher Suneson
Subject: Fw: Opposition to Willow Lakes, LLC Rezoning (10050 W. Midway Road)

Kev Freeman | Planning Director | City of Fort Pierce

Planning Department

Phone: [REDACTED]

100 North U.S. 1 Fort Pierce, FL 34950

From: Linda Purrazzella <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 3:34 PM
To: Linda Hudson <[REDACTED]>; Chris Dzadovsky <[REDACTED]>; Curtis Johnson <[REDACTED]>; Arnold Gaines <[REDACTED]>; Michael Broderick <[REDACTED]>; Kevin Freeman <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Opposition to Willow Lakes, LLC Rezoning (10050 W. Midway Road)

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

To: Fort Pierce City Commission and the Planning Board
100 N. U.S. Highway 1
Fort Pierce, FL 34950
Submitted via Email to: [REDACTED]

Subject: Opposition to Willow Lakes, LLC Rezoning (10050 W. Midway Road)

Dear Mayor, Commissioners and elected officials

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the rezoning request by Willow Lakes, LLC for approximately 200

acres at 10050 W. Midway Road. Shifting this property from Planned Development (PD) to Light Industrial (I-1) and General Commercial (C-3) to facilitate an energy- and water-intensive data center creates irreversible ecological risks for Fort Pierce and the surrounding St. Lucie County ecosystem.

This proposed heavy use threatens our local quality of life. Data centers bring substantial noise pollution, heavy service traffic, and immense demands on local electricity grids and public utilities, potentially raising costs for residents.

A massive data center footprint is fundamentally incompatible with the fragile hydrology of the Midway Road corridor. This parcel directly borders regional water infrastructure, including North St. Lucie River Water Control District (NSLRWCD) canals, and sits in immediate proximity to the Ten Mile Creek system. Ten Mile Creek feeds directly into the North Fork of the St. Lucie River Aquatic Preserve.

Allowing an industrial operation that consumes millions of gallons of water daily for cooling threatens to draw down our local water table and alter natural hydroperiods. Furthermore, discharging chemically treated thermal runoff into adjacent drainage networks threatens the water quality of these connected, protected aquatic preserves.

Developing 200 acres of pasture and permeable land into an industrial complex will destroy local wildlife pathways. Our regional wetlands and pine flatwoods support vital Florida wildlife. The toxic stormwater runoff, light pollution, and high-frequency acoustic noise generated by data center cooling fans will severely disrupt native species including sandhill cranes, wood storks, wading birds, and threaten downstream species like the West Indian manatee that rely on the health of the St. Lucie River.

The City of Fort Pierce must prioritize water conservation, local water security, and ecological preservation over heavy industrial zoning. I urge the Planning Board and City Commission to protect our watersheds and deny this rezoning request.

Sincerely,

Linda Purrazzella

[REDACTED], Unit 4233
[REDACTED]

Vennis Gilmore

From: Linda Cox
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2026 10:12 AM
To: Planning Department
Cc: Richard Chess; Sara Hedges
Subject: ONE WAY COMMUNICATION - Fw: Opposition to Willow Lakes. LLC rezoning (10050 Midway Road)

Linda W. Cox, MBA, CMC, FCRM | City Clerk| City of Fort Pierce

City Clerk's Office

Phone: [REDACTED] Fax: [REDACTED] 100 North U.S. 1 Fort Pierce, FL 34950



[Website](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Survey](#)

"To provide community leadership, quality public service, and a safe environment for all citizens, by an empowered team of employees motivated by pride in themselves and their work."

From: Carol Hayes <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2026 7:40 AM
To: Linda Cox <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Opposition to Willow Lakes. LLC rezoning (10050 Midway Road)

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] has never sent any emails to your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#) [This is SPAM: Block](#) [This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

To: Fort Pierce City Commission and the Planning Board
100 N. U.S. Highway 1
Fort Pierce, FL 34950
Submitted via Email to: [REDACTED]

Subject: Opposition to Willow Lakes, LLC Rezoning (10050 W. Midway Road)

Dear Mayor, Commissioners and elected officials:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the rezoning request by Willow Lakes, LLC for approximately 200 acres at 10050 W. Midway Road. Shifting this property from Planned

Development (PD) to Light Industrial (I-1) and General Commercial (C-3) to facilitate an energy- and water-intensive data center creates irreversible ecological risks for Fort Pierce and the surrounding St. Lucie County ecosystem.

This proposed heavy use threatens our local quality of life. Data centers bring substantial noise pollution, heavy service traffic, and immense demands on local electricity grids and public utilities, potentially raising costs for residents.

A massive data center footprint is fundamentally incompatible with the fragile hydrology of the Midway Road corridor. This parcel directly borders regional water infrastructure, including North St. Lucie River Water Control District (NSLRWCD) canals, and sits in immediate proximity to the Ten Mile Creek system. Ten Mile Creek feeds directly into the North Fork of the St. Lucie River Aquatic Preserve.

Allowing an industrial operation that consumes millions of gallons of water daily for cooling threatens to draw down our local water table and alter natural hydroperiods. Furthermore, discharging chemically treated thermal runoff into adjacent drainage networks threatens the water quality of these connected, protected aquatic preserves.

Developing 200 acres of pasture and permeable land into an industrial complex will destroy local wildlife pathways. Our regional wetlands and pine flatwoods support vital Florida wildlife. The toxic stormwater runoff, light pollution, and high-frequency acoustic noise generated by data center cooling fans will severely disrupt native species including sandhill cranes, wood storks, wading birds, and threaten downstream species like the West Indian manatee that rely on the health of the St. Lucie River.

The City of Fort Pierce must prioritize water conservation, local water security, and ecological preservation over heavy industrial zoning. I urge the Planning Board and City Commission to protect our watersheds and deny this rezoning request.

Sincerely,
Carol Orlando-Hayes

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Chris Karns](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Willow lakes
Date: Friday, August 28, 2026 7:06:21 AM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

I'm trying to let the planning and zoning board know that I am opposed to willow lakes re-zoning and data center.
Thanks
Sent from my iPhone

From: [Mel K.](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Ai Data center Midway
Date: Saturday, August 29, 2026 2:54:42 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#) [This is SPAM: Block](#) [This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

[REDACTED] ed this message don't often get email from
[REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at
[REDACTED]utSenderIdIdentification]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Concerned resident not sure why planning and development would even consider putting the strain on the utilities and allowing a data center to go so close to brand new residential developments! Nepture Ai data center or any data center proposal in the midway industrial area is a horrible idea. The area is still growing with residents and more housing and new proposed high school on port st lucie side so there will be a press on existing utilities already that their studies will not be considering and frankly if there is at all a hum or any effects of changes on water due to the frequencies of the said humming ai data centers cause or reduction in home prices because of this project, I will be the first to tell you a class action will be done against all politicians and city and county representatives, also bring in Port St Lucie decision makers since this affects them as well not just Ft Pierce plus I will bring in all the local builders and developers that this will affect. Please keep me updated on the status!

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Mel K.](#)
To: [Vennis Gilmore](#)
Cc: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Re: Ai Data center Midway
Date: Monday, August 31, 2026 11:01:30 AM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: The sender [REDACTED] sending email from domain gmail.com is not yet trusted by your organization.

There is a URL in the email asking for login credentials. It could be a phishing attempt.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Also keep in mind if there was a fire or anything you have other industrial with chemicals and gas that could explode, do you really have the resources to even handle chemical or a big fire like that? Like what happened in Ohio?

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 31, 2026, at 10:03 AM, Vennis Gilmore

<[REDACTED]> wrote:

Good Morning,

Thank you, received. I will add your concern to the project file.

Vennis Gilmore | Historic Preservation Officer/Senior Planner | City of Fort Pierce

Planning Department
Phone: [REDACTED] 100 North U.S. 1 Fort Pierce, FL 34950

[Website](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Survey](#)



From: Mel K. <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Saturday, August 29, 2026 2:11 PM

To: Planning Department <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Ai Data center Midway

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender @ [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.

Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#) [This is SPAM: Block](#) [This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

[REDACTED] ed this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at [\[REDACTED\]utSenderIdentification](#)]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Concerned resident not sure why planning and development would even consider putting the strain on the utilities and allowing a data center to go so close to brand new residential developments! Neptune Ai data center or any data center proposal in the midway industrial area is a horrible idea. The area is still growing with residents and more housing and new proposed high school on port st lucie side so there will be a press on existing utilities already that their studies will not be considering and frankly if there is at all a hum or any effects of changes on water due to the frequencies of the said humming ai data centers cause or reduction in home prices because of this project, I will be the first to tell you a class action will be done against all politicians and city and county representatives, also bring in Port St Lucie decision makers since this affects them as well not just Ft Pierce plus I will bring in all the local builders and developers that this will affect.

Please keep me updated on the status!

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Hector Millan](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: NO DATA CENTERS
Date: Monday, August 31, 2026 12:48:17 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

[REDACTED] ed this message don't often get email from
[REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at
[REDACTED]utSenderIdentification]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

We do not need a data center in the treasure coast.

From: [Amber Kourofsky, Esq.](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Fwd: Data center
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2026 2:37:15 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

As a resident of St. Lucie County, I object and voice my dissent to building a data center at I95 and Midwsy. Do not approve that application.

That space would be great for a fruit park, like the Fruit and Spice Park in Homestead. Google it, its amazing. We cAn do that here in PSL!!

Thank you,
Amber Kourofsky, Esq.

This communication, together with any attachments hereto or links contained herein is intended for the use of the intended recipient(s) only and may contain information that is confidential or legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, copying, dissemination, distribution or use of this communication is **STRICTLY PROHIBITED**. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return email message and delete all copies of the original communication, along with any attachments hereto or links herein, from your system. Thank you for your cooperation.

From: [Linda Purrazzella](#)
To: [Planning Department](#); [Kevin Freeman](#); [Christopher Suneson](#); [Vennis Gilmore](#); [Kerry Driver](#); [Bridgette Romer](#); [Alicia Rosenthal](#); [Linda Cox](#); [Brittany Meredith](#); [Tina Rel](#); [Public Records](#); [Linda Hudson](#); [Arnold Gaines](#); [Curtis Johnson](#); [Michael Broderick](#); [Chris Dzadovsky](#)
Subject: Opposition to Willow Lakes Data Center proposal
Date: Saturday, September 12, 2026 7:27:53 PM

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

I oppose the rezoning of the Willow Lakes LLC development to allow for a data center, which has been brought up to the planning committee on Sep 17th at 2 pm.

I support Kevin Keene and advocacy against putting a data center for all the reasons you have already been told I am sure, so no need to repeat.

We do not want a data center here.

Right now there is so much overdevelopment being proposed to the detriment of our area. I urge you to deny proposal.

Linda Purrazzella
[REDACTED] 4232
[REDACTED]

Formal Opposition to Willow Lakes Rezoning PZZAM2026 00002

Planning Board Hearing September 17, 2026, 2:00PM City of Fort Pierce Commission Chambers

Submitted by	Kevin S. Keene
Project	Willow Lakes Data Center
Property	10050 West Midway Road Fort Pierce Florida
Requested action	Recommend denial of PZZAM2026 00002

Chair and Members of the Fort Pierce Planning Board:

I respectfully request that the Planning Board recommend denial of PZZAM2026-00002, the application to rezone the 200.23-acre Willow Lakes property at 10050 West Midway Road from Planned Development to approximately 174 acres of Light Industrial I-1 and 26 acres of General Commercial C-3.

This request asks the City to grant industrial entitlement first and obtain the facts later. The City Code requires the opposite. Before approving a zoning atlas amendment, the Board must be able to find that the amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, will not adversely affect the City's ability to satisfy land and water-use needs or meet transportation demands and provide community facilities and services, and will promote and protect the public health, safety, and general welfare. The present record does not support those required findings.

The application is premature and materially incomplete

The applicant does not identify the company that would build or operate the data center. The staff report states that the owner intends to obtain rezoning and then enter an agreement with a partner company, which would later submit a site plan. As a result, the Board is being asked to approve 174 acres of industrial zoning without knowing the operator, the final equipment, the electrical demand, the cooling technology, the generator inventory, the fuel-storage volume, the noise profile, the construction phases, or the infrastructure upgrades the project will require.

The conceptual plan is enormous: six single-story data-center buildings of approximately 220,000 square feet each, totaling about 1.32 million square feet, plus approximately 250,000 square feet of commercial development. A project of that scale cannot be justified by a conceptual drawing and promises that essential engineering will arrive after rezoning. Once the entitlement is granted, the City's leverage and the public's ability to evaluate whether the site is suitable are materially reduced.

Staff has identified a conditional use process but the rezoning request does not provide those protections

The City's separate zoning-category analysis acknowledges that a data center is not expressly listed in the zoning code. It describes continuous cooling, significant electrical and telecommunications infrastructure, emergency generators, fuel storage, transformers, switchgear, and potential mechanical noise. Most importantly, the September 17 agenda item recommends that a data center be reviewed as a conditional use within the City's zoning regulations.

That recommendation conflicts with approving a broad rezoning now and resolving the project's impacts later. If a data center requires conditional-use review, the City should establish clear, enforceable data-center standards and require project-specific evidence before granting the underlying entitlement. The Board should not use the similar-use procedure and a rezoning vote to create a path for a use whose defining impacts have not been measured.

The water and sewer analysis rests on assumptions rather than demonstrated capacity

The applicant's capacity memorandum estimates average potable-water and sewer demand of 65,500 gallons per day, but expressly calls its figures preliminary and subject to tenant selection, final design, and detailed engineering. It excludes process-cooling water by assuming a closed-loop system supplied from the on-site pond. The memorandum provides no sealed water-balance analysis, hydrogeologic study, pond-yield analysis, drought scenario, evaporation estimate, thermal analysis, groundwater-interaction analysis, water-quality evaluation, reclaimed-water feasibility study, or permit determination from the South Florida Water Management District or the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The mere presence of a former aggregate-mining lake does not prove a lawful, sustainable cooling supply. Staff cannot find that the amendment will avoid an adverse effect on land and water-use needs when the central cooling assumption remains unverified.

Electrical capacity and public cost remain undisclosed

The application points to transmission easements and a nearby substation, but proximity is not proof of available capacity. The record provides no quantified peak load, no FPL capacity commitment, no system-impact study, no schedule for generation or transmission upgrades, and no binding allocation of upgrade costs. Florida law defines a large-scale data center by an anticipated monthly peak load of at least 50 megawatts. The applicant has not disclosed whether this six-building campus will meet or exceed that threshold.

The City should not approve the zoning until it knows the maximum electrical demand and has written confirmation that the necessary infrastructure can be supplied without shifting project-specific costs or reliability risks to existing customers.

Noise emissions fire protection and emergency demands have not been established

The City's own analysis recognizes round-the-clock HVAC and cooling operations, chillers, transformers, switchgear, emergency generators, fuel storage, service activity, and potential noise. Yet the file contains no professional acoustical study, no property-line or nighttime noise limits, no low-frequency or tonal-noise analysis, no generator-testing plan, no air-emissions inventory, and no maximum generator or fuel-storage commitment.

Nor does the record contain a written determination from the St. Lucie County Fire District establishing that staffing, apparatus, water supply, hazardous-material response, and emergency planning are adequate for the maximum buildout. Those omissions prevent the required finding that the amendment will protect public health and safety and will not impair community services.

The environmental report identifies resources that require current project specific review

The June 2026 environmental assessment documents freshwater marshes, pine flatwoods in good ecological condition, a large reservoir, confirmed gopher-tortoise burrows, potential habitat for listed species, and aquatic features within a wood-stork foraging area. It also states that wetland limits rely on an informal determination from 2020 and that a systematic gopher-tortoise survey will be required before construction.

That report is an inventory, not a buildout impact analysis. It does not evaluate the six-building plan's wetland impacts, stormwater volumes, habitat fragmentation, heat, lighting, cooling-water effects, or cumulative impacts. A 2006 historical-resource letter concerning a different project does not substitute for current, project-specific review twenty years later.

The proposed covenant does not cure the missing evidence

The draft restrictive covenant limits the I-1 portion to a data center and undefined supporting ancillary uses, but it sets no cap on building area, megawatts, water withdrawal, cooling demand, generators, fuel storage,

noise, emissions, height, lighting, or hours of generator testing. It automatically expires after 50 years, may be amended or terminated by the owner and City Commission, and its Exhibit A legal description is blank in the submitted draft.

A covenant that identifies a use but does not control its scale or impacts cannot support the findings required by Section 125-136. Material safeguards must be objective, measurable, recorded, and enforceable before approval, not negotiated after the land is rezoned.

The proposed zoning does not fulfill the purpose of Mixed Use Development

Staff concludes that I-1 and C-3 technically satisfy the Mixed Use Development designation because they represent two listed categories. That is only a category count. The Comprehensive Plan language quoted in the staff report describes well-planned centers that integrate complementary uses and promote live-work environments. Converting roughly 87 percent of the property to a secure, no-public-access industrial campus with limited employment, then placing highway-oriented commercial uses along the remaining frontage, does not by itself demonstrate an integrated mixed-use center.

The prior Planned Development envisioned residential, retail, commercial, public spaces, walkable streets, and recreational amenities. The applicant must show how the replacement advances the plan's purpose, not merely how two zoning labels can be placed on the same parcel.

Requested action

The Planning Board should recommend denial because the present record does not permit the mandatory findings required by City Code Section 125-136. A denial recommendation is especially appropriate because City Code Section 125-133 requires a four-fifths City Commission vote to overcome it.

If the Board declines to recommend denial, it should continue the matter without a recommendation until the applicant supplies, and the public has adequate time to review, final project parameters; a completed and recorded covenant with a legal description; independent water, utility, noise, air, environmental, traffic, fiscal, fire-rescue, and emergency-capacity analyses; written agency and utility determinations; and draft development-order conditions that bind the owner, operator, successors, and assigns.

Fort Pierce should decide whether this site can safely support the actual project before it changes the zoning.

**On the record presented for September 17, 2026, the required findings cannot responsibly be made.
Please recommend denial of PZZAM2026-00002.**

Documents reviewed

- City of Fort Pierce Staff Report for PZZAM2026-00002, Planning Board date September 17, 2026
- City of Fort Pierce Determination of Zoning Category Data Center agenda item 6.d, September 17, 2026
- Bohler memorandum, Estimated Water and Sewer Calculations, June 15-16, 2026
- EW Consultants Environmental Assessment, June 2026
- Draft Declaration of Restrictive Covenants for Willow Lakes, LLC
- Bohler Conceptual Layout Plan CP01, dated March 27, 2026
- Florida Department of State Division of Historical Resources letter, April 19, 2006
- St. Lucie County Property Appraiser property card and vesting deed supplied with the application record

From: [Tim Donahue](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: REGARDING DATA CENTER PROJECT NEPTUNE
Date: Sunday, September 13, 2026 2:59:42 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

VOTE NO

Tim Donahue

NNA Certified Signing Agent
Notary Public
Licensed Real Estate Broker

[REDACTED]

From: [Jennifer Wulff](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: FORMAL OBJECTION: Homeowner & Mother Opposing the Proposed Data Center
Date: Sunday, September 13, 2026 5:46:39 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization. Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#) [This is SPAM: Block](#) [This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear St. Lucie County Planning and Zoning Officials,

I am writing as a **homeowner, a mother, and a resident of Brystol at Wylder** to formally and strongly oppose the proposed data center development near our residential communities.

I recently purchased my home in Brystol at Wylder. My family made a major financial investment in this community because we wanted a safe, peaceful, family-oriented place to raise our children. We did not purchase our home expecting to eventually have a massive industrial-scale data center operating nearby.

I am angry and deeply concerned that families who have invested their life savings into their homes may now be expected to simply accept a development that could fundamentally change the character and quality of life of our community.

There is a major difference between responsible growth and putting an industrial facility of this scale next to communities where families are living, children are growing up, and new neighborhoods are continuing to be built.

As a mother, I have serious concerns about what living near a facility of this size could mean for my children and other children in our community. I want complete transparency regarding **noise, air quality, backup generators, emissions, lighting, construction, traffic, water usage, electrical infrastructure, environmental impacts, emergency preparedness, and the cumulative effects of having this type of facility surrounded by residential development.**

I also want answers about what protections will actually be put in place for homeowners—not vague assurances that everything will be fine.

Who is protecting the families who already live here?

We are the people who will have to live with this development every single day. We will hear the construction. We will see the infrastructure. We will experience the traffic and changes to

our surroundings. We will bear the consequences if this development negatively affects our quality of life or property values.

And unlike a developer, we cannot simply walk away from the community when the project is completed.

I am especially concerned because this area is experiencing significant residential growth. Families are purchasing homes here specifically because they believe they are buying into communities where their children can grow up. It is extremely frustrating to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on a home only to discover that an industrial-scale project could be approved nearby after families have already made that investment.

My home is not just an investment. It is where my children live.

I understand that data centers and technology are part of a growing economy. But economic development should not come at the expense of the families who already call this area home. There are many factors that should be considered when determining whether a project of this magnitude is appropriate for a particular location.

Before any rezoning or approval moves forward, I am demanding that the County fully examine and publicly disclose the potential impacts on:

- Nearby residential neighborhoods and homeowners
- Children and families living in the surrounding communities
- Noise levels, including continuous operational noise
- Backup generators and associated emissions
- Air quality and environmental impacts
- Water consumption and local water resources
- Electrical infrastructure and potential impacts on residents
- Traffic and road infrastructure
- Construction impacts and duration
- Lighting and visual impacts
- Emergency services and emergency response
- Property values and the long-term character of surrounding neighborhoods
- The cumulative impact of continued residential and industrial development in this area

Please do not make the mistake of treating the residents who live here as an afterthought.

We bought our homes. We pay our property taxes. We raise our children here. We contribute to this community. We deserve a meaningful voice in decisions that could permanently change our neighborhood.

I am asking the County to deny the proposed rezoning and reject the proposed data center at this location.

At the very minimum, I expect complete transparency, independent impact studies, meaningful opportunities for residents to participate, and clear answers to the concerns being raised by homeowners.

I did not move my family to St. Lucie County so that an industrial facility could be placed next to our growing residential communities without serious consideration of the people who

actually live here.

I am asking you to put families before development. Put homeowners before corporate interests. And protect the communities you have already approved for people to live in.

I strongly oppose this project and respectfully request that my objection be entered into the public record.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Wulff
Homeowner & Mother
Bristol at Wylder
St. Lucie County, Florida

From: [Matthew Storck](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Strongly against project Neptune reasoning request
Date: Sunday, September 13, 2026 7:13:58 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Members of the Fort Pierce Planning and Zoning Board,

My name is **Matthew Storck**, and I am a resident living in the new Wylder community just on the other side of Midway Road. I am writing to formally log my strong opposition to the rezoning application submitted by Willow Lakes LLC and Devcon Digital for "Project Neptune" at the northwest corner of I-95 and West Midway Road.

I urge the Planning Board to **deny** the request to rezone 174 acres to Light Industrial use for the following critical reasons:

- **Premature Approval Without Impact Studies:** The public and the board are being asked to approve an industrial shift before vital independent studies have been completed. We do not yet have final data regarding the ultimate groundwater impacts, noise levels from server cooling infrastructure, backup generator emission counts, or fire safety needs for a facility of this scale.
- **Environmental & Water Risks:** While developers suggest using the existing on-site lake for server cooling, comprehensive studies detailing how this will affect local water quality, groundwater tables, and thermal pollution during periods of extreme Florida heat and drought have not been made available. Also what kind of noises will this put off from the infrastructure and affect the surrounding areas.
- **Strained Utility Infrastructure:** Project Neptune is projected to scale up to an immense 1-gigawatt capacity. A massive data campus of this size places a historic burden on our energy grid. The city should not commit to a high-impact industrial zone until independent assessments guarantee that

local residential utility rates and power reliability will not suffer.

- **Incompatible Land Use:** Midway Road is already undergoing significant transitions. Dropping a 1.3 million-square-foot heavy industrial data campus directly adjacent to residential acreage and open spaces fundamentally changes the quiet, community-focused character of western St. Lucie County.

The city of Fort Pierce should not hand over industrial zoning rights to a developer until every single independent environmental, utility, and safety impact study is completed and vetted by the public. Please protect our community's resources and vote **NO** on this rezoning recommendation on September 17th.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and consideration of local residents.

Sincerely,

Matthew Storck

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Linda Purrazzella](#)
To: [Planning Department](#); [Kevin Freeman](#); [Christopher Suneson](#); [Vennis Gilmore](#); [Kerry Driver](#); [Bridgette Romer](#); [Alicia Rosenthal](#); [Linda Cox](#); [Brittany Meredith](#); [Tina Rel](#); [Public Records](#); [Linda Hudson](#); [Arnold Gaines](#); [Curtis Johnson](#); [Michael Broderick](#); [Chris Dzadovsky](#)
Subject: Risk of AI
Date: Sunday, September 13, 2026 9:10:34 PM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

To those considering allowing a data center for AI, please read this article. This is only one of many- we need to hit pause.

Deny request for zoning change to Willow lakes LLC for a data center.

From NY Times:

Dario Amodei, who co-founded Anthropic, the company behind the Claude chatbot, called for a global slowdown of artificial intelligence development in a 3,800-word essay on Saturday. His appeal for a pause follows months of escalating concerns across the technology industry. <https://nyti.ms/3UOvCOi>

From: [Kristy Johnson](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Project Neptune
Date: Monday, September 14, 2026 12:12:06 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization. Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Members of the Fort Pierce Planning and Zoning Board,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed rezoning and development of **Project Neptune**, the proposed large-scale data center campus near I-95 and West Midway Road.

I am not opposed to technology, investment, or responsible economic development. I am opposed to approving a project of this magnitude without first demonstrating that the long-term benefits to the residents of Fort Pierce outweigh the costs and risks that may be placed on our community.

This is not simply another development project. It is a decision that could affect Fort Pierce for decades.

The proposal involves approximately 200 acres, with a substantial portion being rezoned for data-center use. The developer has described a potential full buildout exceeding **1 gigawatt of computing capacity**.

That scale demands much more scrutiny than simply asking whether the project can be physically built.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

Fort Pierce needs jobs.

We need good-paying, permanent employment opportunities for local residents. We need opportunities for young people coming out of our schools and colleges. We need jobs that allow families to build a future here.

A massive data center may create significant construction employment during the building phase, but the Planning and Zoning Board should focus on the **permanent employment that will remain after construction is completed.**

I ask the Board to require the developer to clearly state:

- How many permanent full-time jobs will exist at full buildout?
- How many of those jobs are expected to be filled by Fort Pierce or St. Lucie County residents?
- What will the average and median wages be?
- How many jobs will be entry-level jobs versus highly specialized positions?
- What guarantees exist that these jobs will actually go to local residents?
- How does the number of permanent jobs compare with other potential uses for approximately 200 acres?

Fort Pierce should not give up valuable land and make major infrastructure commitments simply to say that we attracted a major company.

We need development that creates opportunities for people—not just buildings that consume enormous amounts of resources.

WHAT WILL THIS DO TO OUR ELECTRIC BILLS?

One of my greatest concerns is the enormous amount of electricity that a facility of this scale could require.

The developer's own materials describe Project Neptune as potentially expanding to more than **1 gigawatt of dedicated computing capacity.**

That is an extraordinary amount of electrical demand.

Residents deserve to know exactly what that demand means for our electric grid and, ultimately, for the people who pay electric bills every month.

I am asking the Board to demand a clear, independent analysis of whether the project could result in additional costs for:

- New transmission infrastructure
- Substations
- Generation capacity
- Grid upgrades
- Maintenance of infrastructure serving the facility

Emergency power systems

- Other utility investments required because of the data center

Most importantly, **who pays for these costs?**

If the answer is ultimately ratepayers, then Fort Pierce families and small businesses could be asked to shoulder additional costs to support a private development.

That is not something that should be brushed aside as an ordinary utility matter.

Residents should not have to pay higher electric bills so that a private corporation can operate one of the largest energy-consuming facilities in our community.

Before this project moves forward, the public deserves a transparent explanation of how its enormous electricity demand will be accommodated and what protections will be in place to prevent costs from being shifted onto ordinary customers.

WATER AND OTHER COMMUNITY RESOURCES

The developer has stated that the project intends to use an existing on-site reservoir for its cooling system rather than relying on municipal drinking water.

I appreciate that consideration, but it does not eliminate the need for a thorough independent review.

The Board should require clear answers regarding:

- How much water will actually be consumed or lost through evaporation?
- What happens during drought conditions?
- What are the environmental consequences of the proposed cooling system?
- What happens if the facility expands to its maximum proposed capacity?
- What protections are in place for surrounding wetlands, drainage systems, groundwater, and nearby properties?
- Who is responsible for monitoring and mitigating environmental impacts over the life of the facility?

A project of this size should be evaluated based on its **maximum foreseeable impact**, not merely its initial phase.

THE COMMUNITY SHOULD NOT BE LOCKED INTO THIS DECISION FOR DECADES

Another issue that concerns me is the proposed long-term restriction of the property for data-center use. Current reporting describes approximately 174 acres proposed for Light Industrial

zoning with a 50-year covenant restricting the use to a data center.

That is an enormous commitment.

Fifty years is longer than many of the people sitting in this room will live.

Before Fort Pierce makes a decision that could effectively determine the future use of this land for generations, we need to be absolutely certain this is the right economic choice for our community.

What happens if the technology changes?

What happens if the facility becomes obsolete?

What happens if the promised economic benefits do not materialize?

What happens if electricity costs rise?

What happens if the community later determines that this land would be better suited for another use?

We should not make a decades-long commitment without strong protections for future residents.

WHAT DOES FORT PIERCE RECEIVE IN RETURN?

This is ultimately a question of value.

If Fort Pierce is being asked to accommodate an enormous industrial-scale energy consumer, residents deserve to know exactly what we receive in return.

I ask the Board to consider whether Project Neptune provides enough:

Jobs.

Tax revenue.

Local economic activity.

Infrastructure investment.

Community benefits.

Long-term opportunity.

to justify its demands on our land, energy infrastructure, water resources, roads, environment, and quality of life.

And if the answer is yes, **where is the independent evidence?**

I ASK THE BOARD TO PUT FORT PIERCE RESIDENTS FIRST

I respectfully ask the Planning and Zoning Board **not to approve the proposed rezoning for Project Neptune at this time.**

At minimum, I ask that approval be delayed until the public has access to independent, detailed analyses of:

1. Permanent local job creation.
2. Wages and employment quality.
3. Electricity demand and grid impacts.
4. Potential impacts on residential and commercial electric rates.
5. Who will pay for required utility infrastructure.
6. Water consumption and environmental impacts.
7. Traffic and road impacts.
8. Stormwater and drainage impacts.
9. Property values and quality-of-life impacts.
10. The project's long-term tax and economic benefits compared with alternative uses of the property.

I also ask that the Board consider whether the proposed land could attract industries that would create **far more permanent jobs per acre** while placing fewer demands on our electrical system and other public resources.

Fort Pierce should welcome economic development—but we should demand **smart economic development.**

We should not measure success by the size of the investment or the size of the buildings.

We should measure success by whether ordinary Fort Pierce residents are better off because of the development.

More good-paying jobs.

Lower—not higher—household costs.

A stronger local economy.

Responsible use of our resources.

And a community where residents have a meaningful voice in decisions that affect their future.

I respectfully urge the Planning and Zoning Board to reject the proposed rezoning for Project Neptune, or at minimum postpone any recommendation until these critical questions have been independently answered and made available to the public.

Fort Pierce deserves development that works **for its residents**, not development that asks residents to bear the risks and costs while the benefits flow elsewhere.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to our community.

Sincerely,

Kristy Johnson

resident at wylder pt saint lucie , Florida

From: [ronnie sainvil](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Project Neptune Rezoning Objection
Date: Monday, September 14, 2026 1:00:40 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Mayor/Commissioner/County Official,

I am writing to formally and unequivocally state my **strong opposition to Project Neptune**.

I do not support this project with additional conditions. I do not support reducing its size. I do not support delaying it until additional studies are completed. **I oppose Project Neptune altogether and believe this project should not be approved.**

As a resident of Port St. Lucie and someone who cares deeply about the future of the Treasure Coast, I am extremely concerned about what a development of this magnitude could mean for our community.

Project Neptune represents an enormous industrial-scale data-center development in a region that is already experiencing significant growth. This is not simply another commercial development. A project of this size has the potential to place extraordinary demands on our **electric grid, water resources, roads, emergency services, environment, and surrounding communities.**

And once this type of infrastructure is built, we cannot simply undo it.

THIS IS NOT THE FUTURE I WANT FOR OUR COMMUNITY

People move to Port St. Lucie and the Treasure Coast because of the quality of life, residential character, open spaces, and natural environment.

We should be asking ourselves a very simple question:

Is a massive data-center campus really the type of development we want permanently established in our community?

My answer is **NO**.

We should not sacrifice the character and resources of our community simply because a private company can generate economic activity from the project.

THE WATER ISSUE ALONE DESERVES SERIOUS CONCERN

Florida's water resources are not unlimited.

Residents should not have to wonder whether massive industrial developments will compete with households, businesses, agriculture, and future generations for one of our most essential resources.

I am deeply concerned about the project's cooling requirements and the potential long-term demand that such a facility could place on our water infrastructure.

Our water should not be treated as an unlimited resource for industrial-scale computing facilities.

THE ELECTRICITY DEMAND IS ANOTHER MAJOR RED FLAG

A data-center project of this magnitude could require an extraordinary amount of electricity.

That raises an obvious question:

Who ultimately pays for the infrastructure necessary to support it?

If substantial upgrades to transmission, substations, generation capacity, roads, water systems, or other public infrastructure are necessary, residents deserve to know exactly who will pay—and whether residents could ultimately see higher costs as a result.

The community should not be expected to absorb the infrastructure burden created by a private development.

WHAT ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT?

We cannot continue treating the Treasure Coast as if there are no consequences to massive development.

Hundreds of acres, enormous energy requirements, industrial-scale cooling systems, construction, noise, traffic, stormwater management, heat generation, and utility infrastructure all have consequences.

Once natural areas are developed and massive industrial facilities are constructed, **we cannot simply put everything back the way it was.**

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS NOT A BLANK CHECK

I understand the argument that Project Neptune could create jobs and generate tax revenue.

But economic development should never be evaluated solely by asking:

“How much money can this project generate?”

We should also ask:

“What will this project cost our community?”

How much will it cost in infrastructure?

How much will it consume in water?

How much electricity will it require?

How will it affect surrounding property owners?

How will it affect traffic and emergency services?

What will the environmental consequences be?

And most importantly:

Are the benefits worth permanently changing the character of our community?

I believe the answer is **NO**.

PLEASE DO NOT IGNORE THE RESIDENTS

Residents should not have to fight against massive developments after decisions have effectively already been made.

If elected officials truly represent the people who live here, then our concerns need to carry more weight than the financial interests of developers and corporations.

We are the people who have to live with the consequences long after the developers, investors, and consultants have moved on to their next project.

I strongly urge every official involved in reviewing Project Neptune to listen to the residents who are saying:

ENOUGH.

We want responsible growth.

We want appropriate development.

We want businesses that contribute to our community.

But we do not want Project Neptune.

I respectfully request that my opposition be entered into the public record and that our elected officials **vote against Project Neptune in its entirety.**

Please do not approve this project.

Do not allow economic promises to overshadow legitimate concerns about our water, electricity, environment, infrastructure, neighborhoods, and quality of life.

Once Project Neptune is built, we cannot simply take it back.

I am asking you to make the decision that protects the residents who live here today and the generations who will live here tomorrow.

I STRONGLY OPPOSE PROJECT NEPTUNE AND URGE YOU TO REJECT THIS PROJECT COMPLETELY.

Sincerely,

Ronnie Sainvil Lesperance
Port St. Lucie, Florida

From: [Bridgid Whitehead](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Project Neptune rezoning objection.
Date: Monday, September 14, 2026 4:44:56 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

[REDACTED] this message don't often get email from
[REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at
enderIdentification]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Good afternoon,

My name is Bridgid Johnson and I'm a resident at the Brystol at the Wylder community. I'd like to formally object to rezoning of project Neptune.

Apart from the absolute basics that it will drive away possible buyers in the area and lower the voters value, AI data centers are extremely harmful to our wildlife, water supply and electrical grid (which is already overwhelmed by a basic thunderstorm). The more information that's being released about the impacts data centers have are extremely difficult to correct and extremely concerning. Not to mention we've had CEO's of major AI firms warn us of the impacts AI will have in the next few years on the world and on us. All this information is troubling, and honestly if you think that this is a good idea, either you haven't been keeping up with the news or you just don't care. I can't decide which one is worse.

Florida, its people and wildlife deserve more than a data center that will disrupt our daily life's and have consequences we aren't even aware of yet.

I beg of you to put a stop to this center being built, for the future of Florida.

Kind regards,

Lucas and Bridgid Johnson,
Residents at Brystol at the Wylder community.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [K. Star](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Project Neptune
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 12:21:38 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Fort Pierce Planning Board Members,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed rezoning associated with Project Neptune and the development of a large-scale data center near I-95 and West Midway Road.

I respectfully urge the Planning Board to recommend **DENIAL of the rezoning request** unless and until the applicant can demonstrate, through comprehensive and independently verifiable studies, that this project will not create unacceptable impacts on surrounding residents, infrastructure, natural resources, public safety, and the long-term character of the Midway Road corridor.

This is not an objection to technology, artificial intelligence, economic development, or responsible growth. My concern is whether a massive, 24-hour industrial data center is an appropriate land use for this particular location and whether the community has been provided enough information to understand the long-term consequences of approving this rezoning.

1. The scale and intensity of the proposed use warrant extraordinary scrutiny.

The proposal involves approximately 174 acres of a roughly 203-acre property. Public reporting indicates that the proposed Project Neptune campus could ultimately include approximately 1.3 million square feet of data-center buildings and require more than one gigawatt of electricity.

A project of this magnitude should not be treated as simply another development application. Its impacts could extend far beyond the property boundaries and could permanently change the character of the surrounding area.

Approving the rezoning effectively establishes a long-term land-use decision that may be extremely difficult to reverse.

2. The potential demand on electricity and utility infrastructure is a major concern.

A large data center can require enormous and continuous amounts of electricity. The community deserves a clear understanding of:

- The project's anticipated total electrical demand;
- How that demand will be supplied;
- Whether significant new transmission infrastructure will be required;
- Who will pay for any required infrastructure improvements;
- Whether the project could affect reliability or capacity for existing residents and businesses; and
- What additional utility infrastructure could ultimately be required if the facility expands.

Before approving the rezoning, these questions should be answered publicly and supported by detailed engineering information.

3. Water consumption and cooling requirements must be fully evaluated.

Data centers require substantial cooling infrastructure, and the type of cooling system selected can significantly affect water consumption.

The Planning Board should require detailed information regarding the proposed cooling technology, anticipated water consumption, wastewater generation, backup systems, and the project's impact on local water resources.

The community should not be asked to approve the rezoning first and receive critical information about water demand later.

4. Noise and 24-hour operations are serious quality-of-life concerns.

Unlike many commercial developments, a large data center can operate continuously, 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Potential sources of noise include cooling equipment, mechanical systems, generators, transformers, construction activity, and other industrial equipment.

Residents deserve enforceable standards addressing:

- Continuous operational noise;
- Low-frequency mechanical noise;

Backup-generator testing;

- Construction noise;
- Nighttime activity;
- Emergency equipment; and
- Any future expansion of the facility.

A general promise that the facility will comply with applicable noise regulations is not enough. The community needs meaningful, enforceable protections before the project is approved.

5. Backup generators and air-quality impacts require careful review.

A facility of this size may require substantial backup power generation to maintain continuous operations.

The Planning Board should require complete disclosure of the number, type, size, fuel source, operating requirements, testing schedules, emissions, and emergency-use expectations for all proposed generators.

Residents should also understand what additional fuel storage, delivery traffic, emissions, and safety risks could be associated with this infrastructure.

6. Traffic and road infrastructure must be evaluated based on the entire project—not simply initial construction.

The community should receive a comprehensive traffic analysis addressing both construction and long-term operations.

The analysis should consider construction vehicles, equipment deliveries, employees, service contractors, fuel deliveries, utility construction, emergency vehicles, and future expansion.

West Midway Road is already an important corridor serving residents, businesses, agricultural properties, and other developments. The long-term traffic consequences of adding an industrial-scale facility should be carefully evaluated before any rezoning is approved.

7. Environmental impacts must be thoroughly addressed.

The size and intensity of this proposal warrant a comprehensive environmental review.

The Planning Board should require an assessment of potential impacts to wetlands, drainage, stormwater, wildlife, vegetation, groundwater, surrounding properties, and other natural resources.

The community should also understand how the project will address stormwater management, flooding, construction runoff, hazardous materials, fuel storage, and emergency spills.

8. Public safety and emergency response must be considered.

A facility of this scale will introduce infrastructure and hazards that local emergency responders may not routinely encounter.

Before approval, the City should determine whether the Fire Department, law enforcement, emergency medical services, and other emergency-response agencies have the equipment, personnel, training, access, and resources necessary to respond to a major incident at the facility.

The applicant should also provide detailed emergency-response plans for fire, electrical failures, fuel incidents, hazardous-material releases, extreme weather, and other emergencies.

9. The impact on surrounding property owners deserves serious consideration.

People who live in this area have invested in their homes and properties based upon the character of the surrounding community.

The introduction of enormous industrial buildings, mechanical equipment, substations, generators, security infrastructure, lighting, and continuous operations could fundamentally alter the visual and residential character of the area.

The City should carefully consider the potential impacts on surrounding property values, views, privacy, noise, lighting, and overall quality of life.

10. The community should not be asked to approve a rezoning based on incomplete information.

Perhaps my greatest concern is that the long-term consequences of this project are not yet sufficiently clear.

Before granting a rezoning that could permanently establish an industrial-scale data center at this location, residents should have access to complete information regarding:

- Electrical demand and infrastructure;
- Water consumption;
- Cooling systems;
- Noise studies;
- Air emissions;
- Generator operations;
- Traffic impacts;
- Stormwater and drainage;
- Environmental impacts;

- Emergency response;
- Construction impacts;
- Lighting;
- Building height and visual impacts;
- Security infrastructure;
- Future expansion plans; and
- The cumulative impact of this project together with other existing and proposed developments in the area.

Conclusion

Fort Pierce has an opportunity to make a thoughtful decision about the future of the West Midway Road corridor.

Economic development should not simply be measured by the size of a project or the amount of investment it may bring. It should also be measured by whether the development is compatible with the surrounding community and whether it protects the quality of life and long-term interests of current and future residents.

I respectfully ask the Fort Pierce Planning Board to **DENY the requested rezoning for Project Neptune.**

At a minimum, I ask that the Board **not approve the rezoning until comprehensive, independently verifiable studies have been completed and made available to the public**, including detailed analyses of water usage, electrical demand, environmental impacts, noise, traffic, air quality, stormwater, emergency response, and the project's cumulative impact on the surrounding community.

Once this land is rezoned for a project of this magnitude, the decision may be extremely difficult to undo. The community deserves careful consideration before that door is opened.

Please include this letter and my objection in the official public record for the Project Neptune rezoning application.

Thank you for your consideration and for your responsibility to protect the long-term interests, safety, and quality of life of the residents of Fort Pierce and St. Lucie County.

Respectfully,

Kim Starling

Resident of Wylder Community

Port St Lucie [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Project Neptune Rezoning Objection
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 12:21:41 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#) [This is SPAM: Block](#) [This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Hello Planning Board of Fort Pierce,

For the Objection of Project Neptune

While you don't know me, I recently moved here with my husband from New York and we currently reside at Bristol at Wylder right off of Midway Road, where Project Neptune is projected to get rezoned in order to be built!!! WHAT – What craziness is this!?!?!?

- Have studies been conducted involving – Traffic, Energy, Air Pollution/Air Quality, Water, Electric and are they made PUBLIC so everyone can see the nasty effects of this very large Data Center??

My husband and I did not move here less than a month ago to get told that you are proposing a Data Center down the block. We chose this area of Florida for it's BEAUTY and PEACE & QUIET – not the sounds of humming buildings and the very hazardous fuel storage that could leak into our water system and just completely affect the local environment. Rezoning this area to allow this Data Center would be a horrific idea, as the main road, Midway, would not be able to support the traffic and congestion. Also nearby property values would GREATLY decrease, and the Wylder community is less than 4 years OLD and still under construction!!!

This is not a very good idea and is COMPLETELY UNNECESSARY!!

It only takes a few minutes to do an online search to show the NUMEROUS problems from these Data Centers all over the world!! ! I beg of you all to do more

research and NOT allow this to come ANYWHERE in Fort Pierce.

Thank you for your time and understanding. Please DO NOT approve of this Data Center!!!

Thank you,

Very concerned resident at Brystol at Wylder – Stephanie Laukaitis

From: [JESSICA MATTHEWS](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Cc: [Jessica Matthews](#); [REDACTED]; [Linda Hudson](#); [Curtis Johnson](#); [Arnold Gaines](#); [Michael Broderick](#); [Chris Dzadovsky](#)
Subject: Project Neptune Data Center
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 12:00:29 PM
Attachments: [JESSICA B. MATTHEWS-Formal Opposition Data Center Brystol South.pdf](#)
[30031 Data Center Zoning Category Analysis.pdf](#)
[30031 Data Centers - State.pdf](#)

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.

Please be careful before replying or clicking/downloading the attachment and URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#) [This is SPAM: Block](#) [This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]

[Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

FORMAL OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED DATA CENTER

Brystol South at Wylder – Port St. Lucie, Florida

To: Planning and Zoning Board and City Planning & Zoning Staff

Subject: Strong Opposition to Proposed Data Center Between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Board and City Planning & Zoning Staff:

My name is Jessica Matthews, and I am a homeowner and resident of Brystol South at Wylder in Port St. Lucie, Florida. I am writing to formally and strongly oppose the proposed data center being considered in the area between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie.

I am not opposed to responsible economic development, technology, or job creation. My objection is to placing a large, continuously operating, industrial-type data center in an area that is surrounded by and continuing to develop as a residential community. The City's own documents identify significant potential impacts involving noise, water, electrical infrastructure, generators, fuel storage, cooling systems, and other industrial infrastructure. Those impacts deserve careful scrutiny before this project is approved.

The City's Data Center Zoning Category Analysis states that the current zoning regulations do not expressly identify “data center” as a separate use category and that its classification must

therefore be based on the use most similar in its actual operational characteristics. The City concludes that a data center is most appropriately treated as comparable to an I-1 Light Industrial use. The same analysis describes I-1 as a district intended for industrial and related uses with limited objectionable external effects.

That distinction is important. The question should not simply be whether a data center can be compared to light industrial use. The question should be whether this particular data center, at this particular location, will actually have limited objectionable external effects and remain compatible with the nearby residential communities.

The City's own analysis describes a conventional data center as a large warehouse-like building containing computer servers and data-processing equipment, with limited public access but continuous HVAC and cooling operations, significant electrical and telecommunications infrastructure, emergency generators, fuel storage, transformers and switchgear, loading and maintenance activity, and potential noise from chillers and mechanical equipment. In other words, the facility may have few employees, but its physical and infrastructure impacts can be substantial.

Noise is one of my greatest concerns. The City's separate data-center materials specifically call for a professional acoustical analysis before site-plan approval and identify the need for property-line and receptor-based limits, including limits at the nearest residential or other sensitive receptors. The document also recognizes low-frequency and tonal noise and recommends restrictions on routine generator testing. If these protections are important enough to be identified by the City's own materials, they should be fully addressed before approval—not after residents are exposed to the impacts.

Water consumption is another major concern. The City's materials identify water supply, reclaimed-water availability, cooling technology, consumptive-use permitting, and comprehensive-plan consistency as important Conditional Use review issues. They also call for water-demand calculations, cooling-system descriptions, reclaimed-water feasibility analysis, and SFWMD/DEP permit information. I believe residents have a right to know exactly how much water this facility will require and what effect that demand could have on local resources.

Electrical demand also deserves full disclosure. The City's materials recognize that data centers can require significant electrical service, transformers, switchgear, and related infrastructure. Florida law, as summarized in the City's materials, defines a “large-scale data center” as a single-location data center with an anticipated monthly peak load of 50 megawatts or more. The City should therefore disclose the anticipated electrical demand of this project and explain what utility infrastructure will be required to serve it.

The location matters. This project is being considered in the developing area between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie, where homeowners are purchasing property and establishing neighborhoods. A decision to place a 24-hour industrial-type facility in this corridor should consider not only the individual parcel but also the long-term character, livability, infrastructure capacity, and cumulative impacts on surrounding residential communities.

Other communities provide a warning that these concerns are not hypothetical. In Northern Virginia, residents living near data centers have reported persistent mechanical noise.

Virginia's Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission reported that residents in the Great Oak neighborhood complained about noise from a nearby data center and that the issue remained unresolved to residents' satisfaction for an extended period. Residents in Brook Haven also raised noise concerns, with mitigation taking time and repeated communications before reductions were observed.

In Chesapeake, Virginia, residents living near proposed data-center development have expressed concerns about continuous cooling-system noise, water consumption, pollution, and backup diesel generators. Georgia Public Broadcasting reported that one resident living only a few hundred feet from a proposed site specifically questioned how she could relax with cooling equipment potentially producing a continuous 24-hour hum.

In Goochland County, Virginia, residents confronting a proposed large data-center campus raised concerns about noise pollution, diesel generators near homes, transmission lines, and water use. The developer discussed air cooling as a way to reduce water consumption, but acknowledged that air cooling would require substantially more electricity. That example demonstrates an important point: solving one data-center impact can shift the burden to another resource. The City should therefore evaluate the entire infrastructure picture rather than considering water, power, noise, or generators in isolation.

Data-center growth has also produced broader community and infrastructure concerns in other states. Texas is currently increasing oversight of data-center water use, with state officials requiring greater reporting and enforcement because of concerns about the industry's rapidly increasing water and power demands. These developments reinforce why water-use projections and utility capacity should be addressed before—not after—major facilities are approved.

The issue is also not limited to one state. Communities across the country are increasingly questioning whether the economic benefits of data centers justify the local impacts associated with power demand, water use, noise, land use, and infrastructure. That national experience should encourage Port St. Lucie to proceed carefully rather than assume that the impacts will be insignificant simply because the facility has relatively few permanent employees.

I am also concerned about the City's use of the “similar use” provision. Section 125-6 contains limitations concerning the placement of a use into a zone where it is not listed and the

relationship between a proposed similar use and uses specifically listed in another zoning district. I respectfully request that the City clearly explain the legal and factual basis for determining that this particular data center qualifies under Section 125-6 and why I-1 is the appropriate classification.

Finally, the City's state-law materials identify an additional legal issue involving SB 484 and SB 180 and state that a City Attorney/legal opinion is required regarding the City's authority to impose certain additional requirements. I respectfully request that any such legal determination be made clear to the public before the project is approved, particularly concerning noise studies, generator testing, water-use documentation, utility-capacity studies, setbacks, buffers, and architectural screening.

MY REQUEST TO THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD

- Do not approve the proposed data center at this location unless the City can establish that the use is legally authorized, properly classified, and compatible with surrounding residential development.
- Require a professional acoustical study that evaluates continuous cooling noise, low-frequency and tonal noise, nighttime conditions, and noise at the nearest residential receptors.
- Require complete information regarding the number, size, location, fuel type, fuel-storage capacity, emissions, and testing schedule of emergency generators.
- Require detailed water-demand calculations, cooling-system information, reclaimed-water analysis, and confirmation of all required SFWMD/DEP permits.
- Require disclosure of anticipated electrical demand and all major utility infrastructure needed to serve the facility.
- Require a comprehensive evaluation of traffic, construction impacts, lighting, visual impacts, setbacks, buffering, stormwater, and emergency response.
- Require enforceable operating conditions that protect nearby residents after the facility becomes operational, rather than relying solely on voluntary promises.
- Ensure that all applicable legal and zoning questions are resolved and made part of the public record before any final approval.

I strongly oppose this proposed data center because the potential impacts are too significant to be treated as an ordinary light-industrial use without a rigorous, site-specific review. The City's own documents identify the very issues that concern residents: continuous cooling, noise, generators, fuel storage, electrical infrastructure, water demand, and compatibility with nearby sensitive receptors. Homeowners should not be required to live next to a facility first and then attempt to correct problems after construction. The appropriate time to protect our community is before approval and before construction.

I respectfully request that this letter be included in the official record and provided to the

Planning and Zoning Board for consideration.

Respectfully,

Jessica Matthews Homeowner/Resident

Bristol South at Wylder [REDACTED]

Sources reviewed

City of Port St. Lucie – Data Center Zoning Category Analysis (uploaded document).

City of Port St. Lucie – Data Centers – State (uploaded document).

Virginia Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission, Chapter 6: Local Residential Impacts.

Georgia Public Broadcasting, “Why more residents are saying 'No' to AI data centers in their backyard” (July 18, 2025).

Virginia Mercury, “Goochland residents rebuff data center developer Tract ahead of permit application” (July 27, 2026).

Reuters, “Texas moves to penalize data centers for water violations” (September 14, 2026).

FORMAL OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED DATA CENTER

Brystol South at Wylder – Port St. Lucie, Florida

To: Planning and Zoning Board and City Planning & Zoning Staff

Subject: Strong Opposition to Proposed Data Center Between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Board and City Planning & Zoning Staff:

My name is Jessica Matthews, and I am a homeowner and resident of Brystol South at Wylder in Port St. Lucie, Florida. I am writing to formally and strongly oppose the proposed data center being considered in the area between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie.

I am not opposed to responsible economic development, technology, or job creation. My objection is to placing a large, continuously operating, industrial-type data center in an area that is surrounded by and continuing to develop as a residential community. The City's own documents identify significant potential impacts involving noise, water, electrical infrastructure, generators, fuel storage, cooling systems, and other industrial infrastructure. Those impacts deserve careful scrutiny before this project is approved.

The City's Data Center Zoning Category Analysis states that the current zoning regulations do not expressly identify "data center" as a separate use category and that its classification must therefore be based on the use most similar in its actual operational characteristics. The City concludes that a data center is most appropriately treated as comparable to an I-1 Light Industrial use. The same analysis describes I-1 as a district intended for industrial and related uses with limited objectionable external effects.

That distinction is important. The question should not simply be whether a data center can be compared to light industrial use. The question should be whether this particular data center, at this particular location, will actually have limited objectionable external effects and remain compatible with the nearby residential communities.

The City's own analysis describes a conventional data center as a large warehouse-like building containing computer servers and data-processing equipment, with limited public access but continuous HVAC and cooling operations, significant electrical and telecommunications infrastructure, emergency generators, fuel storage, transformers and switchgear, loading and maintenance activity, and potential noise from chillers and mechanical equipment. In other words, the facility may have few employees, but its physical and infrastructure impacts can be substantial.

Noise is one of my greatest concerns. The City's separate data-center materials specifically call for a professional acoustical analysis before site-plan approval and identify the need for property-line and receptor-based limits, including limits at the nearest residential or other sensitive receptors. The document also recognizes low-frequency and tonal noise and recommends restrictions on routine generator testing. If these protections are important enough to be identified by the City's own materials, they should be fully addressed before approval—not after residents are exposed to the impacts.

Water consumption is another major concern. The City's materials identify water supply, reclaimed-water availability, cooling technology, consumptive-use permitting, and comprehensive-plan

consistency as important Conditional Use review issues. They also call for water-demand calculations, cooling-system descriptions, reclaimed-water feasibility analysis, and SFWMD/DEP permit information. I believe residents have a right to know exactly how much water this facility will require and what effect that demand could have on local resources.

Electrical demand also deserves full disclosure. The City's materials recognize that data centers can require significant electrical service, transformers, switchgear, and related infrastructure. Florida law, as summarized in the City's materials, defines a "large-scale data center" as a single-location data center with an anticipated monthly peak load of 50 megawatts or more. The City should therefore disclose the anticipated electrical demand of this project and explain what utility infrastructure will be required to serve it.

The location matters. This project is being considered in the developing area between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie, where homeowners are purchasing property and establishing neighborhoods. A decision to place a 24-hour industrial-type facility in this corridor should consider not only the individual parcel but also the long-term character, livability, infrastructure capacity, and cumulative impacts on surrounding residential communities.

Other communities provide a warning that these concerns are not hypothetical. In Northern Virginia, residents living near data centers have reported persistent mechanical noise. Virginia's Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission reported that residents in the Great Oak neighborhood complained about noise from a nearby data center and that the issue remained unresolved to residents' satisfaction for an extended period. Residents in Brook Haven also raised noise concerns, with mitigation taking time and repeated communications before reductions were observed.

In Chesapeake, Virginia, residents living near proposed data-center development have expressed concerns about continuous cooling-system noise, water consumption, pollution, and backup diesel generators. Georgia Public Broadcasting reported that one resident living only a few hundred feet from a proposed site specifically questioned how she could relax with cooling equipment potentially producing a continuous 24-hour hum.

In Goochland County, Virginia, residents confronting a proposed large data-center campus raised concerns about noise pollution, diesel generators near homes, transmission lines, and water use. The developer discussed air cooling as a way to reduce water consumption, but acknowledged that air cooling would require substantially more electricity. That example demonstrates an important point: solving one data-center impact can shift the burden to another resource. The City should therefore evaluate the entire infrastructure picture rather than considering water, power, noise, or generators in isolation.

Data-center growth has also produced broader community and infrastructure concerns in other states. Texas is currently increasing oversight of data-center water use, with state officials requiring greater reporting and enforcement because of concerns about the industry's rapidly increasing water and power demands. These developments reinforce why water-use projections and utility capacity should be addressed before—not after—major facilities are approved.

The issue is also not limited to one state. Communities across the country are increasingly questioning whether the economic benefits of data centers justify the local impacts associated with power demand, water use, noise, land use, and infrastructure. That national experience should

encourage Port St. Lucie to proceed carefully rather than assume that the impacts will be insignificant simply because the facility has relatively few permanent employees.

I am also concerned about the City's use of the "similar use" provision. Section 125-6 contains limitations concerning the placement of a use into a zone where it is not listed and the relationship between a proposed similar use and uses specifically listed in another zoning district. I respectfully request that the City clearly explain the legal and factual basis for determining that this particular data center qualifies under Section 125-6 and why I-1 is the appropriate classification.

Finally, the City's state-law materials identify an additional legal issue involving SB 484 and SB 180 and state that a City Attorney/legal opinion is required regarding the City's authority to impose certain additional requirements. I respectfully request that any such legal determination be made clear to the public before the project is approved, particularly concerning noise studies, generator testing, water-use documentation, utility-capacity studies, setbacks, buffers, and architectural screening.

MY REQUEST TO THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD

- Do not approve the proposed data center at this location unless the City can establish that the use is legally authorized, properly classified, and compatible with surrounding residential development.
- Require a professional acoustical study that evaluates continuous cooling noise, low-frequency and tonal noise, nighttime conditions, and noise at the nearest residential receptors.
- Require complete information regarding the number, size, location, fuel type, fuel-storage capacity, emissions, and testing schedule of emergency generators.
- Require detailed water-demand calculations, cooling-system information, reclaimed-water analysis, and confirmation of all required SFWMD/DEP permits.
- Require disclosure of anticipated electrical demand and all major utility infrastructure needed to serve the facility.
- Require a comprehensive evaluation of traffic, construction impacts, lighting, visual impacts, setbacks, buffering, stormwater, and emergency response.
- Require enforceable operating conditions that protect nearby residents after the facility becomes operational, rather than relying solely on voluntary promises.
- Ensure that all applicable legal and zoning questions are resolved and made part of the public record before any final approval.

I strongly oppose this proposed data center because the potential impacts are too significant to be treated as an ordinary light-industrial use without a rigorous, site-specific review. The City's own documents identify the very issues that concern residents: continuous cooling, noise, generators, fuel storage, electrical infrastructure, water demand, and compatibility with nearby sensitive receptors.

Homeowners should not be required to live next to a facility first and then attempt to correct problems after construction. The appropriate time to protect our community is before approval and before construction.

I respectfully request that this letter be included in the official record and provided to the Planning and Zoning Board for consideration.

Respectfully,

Jessica Matthews
Homeowner/Resident
Bristol South at Wylder
[REDACTED]

Sources reviewed

City of Port St. Lucie – Data Center Zoning Category Analysis (uploaded document).

City of Port St. Lucie – Data Centers – State (uploaded document).

Virginia Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission, Chapter 6: Local Residential Impacts.

Georgia Public Broadcasting, “Why more residents are saying 'No' to AI data centers in their backyard” (July 18, 2025).

Virginia Mercury, “Goochland residents rebuff data center developer Tract ahead of permit application” (July 27, 2026).

Reuters, “Texas moves to penalize data centers for water violations” (September 14, 2026).

The City's current zoning regulations do not expressly identify "data center" as a separate use category, so its classification would need to be based on the use that is most similar in its actual operational characteristics.

Sec. 125-6. - Authorization of similar use.

The city planning board may permit in a particular zone a use not listed in this chapter, provided the use is of the same general type as the uses permitted there by this chapter. However, this section does not authorize the inclusion, in a zone where it is not listed, of a use specifically listed in another zone, or one which is of the same general type and is similar to a use specifically listed in another zone.

The City's zoning districts include I-1 Light Industrial, I-2 Marine Industrial, and I-3 Heavy Industrial. The use is not appropriate for a Commercial Zoning District.

Staff Analysis

I-1 The purpose of the I-1 District is to provide for industrial and related uses with limited objectionable external effects in areas that are suitable for such operations due to the desirability of site characteristics, adequacy of utilities, appropriateness of transportation facilities and other factors. Acceptable manufacturing, warehousing, heavy commercial and similar uses are encouraged. Uses in the district may perform a support role for uses in other industrial areas.

I-2 Marine Uses - Not appropriate.

I-3 The purpose of the I-3 District is to provide for heavy industrial and related uses with limited objectionable external effects in areas that are suitable for such operations due to the desirability of site characteristics, adequacy of utilities, appropriateness of transportation facilities and other factors. Acceptable manufacturing, warehousing, heavy commercial and similar uses are encouraged.

Within the City's zoning framework, a data center is most appropriately treated as comparable to an I-1 Light Industrial use, rather than an office, general commercial, utility, or heavy industrial use.

Recommendation

A conventional data center has the following characteristics:

1. A large, secure, warehouse-like building;
2. Computer servers and data-processing equipment rather than manufacturing machinery;
3. Limited employees and customer traffic;
4. No public access;
5. Loading, equipment replacement, maintenance and service activity;
6. Continuous HVAC and cooling operations;
7. Significant electrical service and telecommunications infrastructure;
8. Emergency generators, fuel storage, transformers and switchgear; and
9. Potential noise from chillers and mechanical equipment.

Although the principal activity is electronic data storage and processing, the physical form and infrastructure intensity will be closer to a light-industrial facility, warehouse, laboratory or technology plant than to conventional office use.

This aligns reasonably with the City's description of light-industrial activities as facilities involving processing, storage, distribution, laboratories, warehouses and plants.

Similar to the Amazon refrigerated warehouse?

DATA CENTERS

Data Centers are covered by SB 484, which strengthens the City's authority to regulate data centers, including noise and compatibility impacts. But it does not clearly override SB 180's temporary restriction on adopting more restrictive or burdensome regulations after a hurricane, such as: Setbacks or buffers; noise studies; generator testing limits; water-use documentation; utility-capacity studies; architectural screening; operational performance standards; or any other additional site-plan submittal requirements.

So, although SB 484 confirms local regulatory authority, SB 180 (s. 252.422 FS) may still limit the adoption of stricter regulations - until October 2027. City Attorney/Legal opinion is required.

Section 373.203(4), Florida Statutes:

“Large-scale data center” means a single location, with a data center on site, that has an anticipated monthly peak load of **50 megawatts or more**, calculated as the highest average load over a **15-minute interval**. The term does not include a load aggregated across multiple locations owned by the same customer. However, the term includes all customers or other entities that have entered into a colocation or similar agreement at a single location that otherwise meets the anticipated monthly peak load provided in this subsection.

Section 373.203(3), Florida Statutes:

“Data center” means a facility that primarily contains electronic equipment used to process, store, and transmit digital information, which may be:

- (a) A free-standing structure; or
- (b) A facility within a larger structure which uses environmental control equipment to maintain the proper conditions for the operation of electronic equipment.

Section 366.043(2)(d), Florida Statutes:

“Large load customer” means a customer with an anticipated monthly peak load of **50 megawatts or more**, calculated as the highest average load over a **15-minute interval** at a single location. The term does not include a load aggregated

DATA CENTERS

across multiple locations owned by the same customer. However, the term includes all customers or other entities that have entered into a colocation or similar agreement at a single location that otherwise meets the anticipated monthly peak load provided in this paragraph.

DATA CENTERS

Review of Conditional Use should consider the following:

Water supply, reclaimed-water availability, cooling technology, consumptive-use permitting, and comprehensive-plan consistency are the most important review items. The applicant will need to provide: Water-demand calculations, cooling-system descriptions, reclaimed-water feasibility analysis, and SFWMD/DEP permit status as part of the review.

The timeline for development needs to account for water-permit requirements.

Noise impact study required. A professional acoustical analysis prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer before site plan approval.

Property-line and receptor-based limits, what are the maximum allowable decibel levels at the property line and at the nearest residential, institutional, or other sensitive receptors. Separate daytime and nighttime standards/hours.

Low-frequency and tonal noise review. Require evaluation of tonal, impulsive, and low-frequency noise, not just average A-weighted decibel levels.

Generator testing restrictions. Limit routine testing of backup generators to weekday daytime hours, prohibit simultaneous testing unless specifically approved, and require mufflers or enclosures.

From: [Jhon Pereda](#)
To: [Planning Department](#); [Kevin Freeman](#); [Christopher Suneson](#); [Vennis Gilmore](#); [Kerry Driver](#); [Bridgette Romer](#); [Alicia Rosenthal](#); [Linda Cox](#); [Brittany Meredith](#); [Tina Rel](#); [Public Records](#); [Linda Hudson](#); [Arnold Gaines](#); [Curtis Johnson](#); [Michael Broderick](#); [Chris Dzadoovsky](#)
Subject: Formal Opposition to Willow Lakes Rezoning PZZAM2026 00002
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2026 1:07:25 PM
Attachments: [willow-lakes-rezoning-formal-opposition.docx](#)

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking/downloading the attachment and URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#) [This is SPAM: Block](#) [This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Commissioners,

Please find attached my formal letter of opposition regarding rezoning application PZZAM2026-00002 for the Willow Lakes property located at 10050 West Midway Road.

The attached document details several critical concerns regarding the premature nature of this industrial rezoning request, specifically the lack of verified water and electrical capacity, missing noise and environmental impact analyses, and the absence of binding development safeguards.

I respectfully ask that you review the attached submission prior to the hearing and vote to recommend denial of the application.

Thank you for your time, service, and consideration.

Sincerely,
Jhon Pereda

Formal Opposition to Willow Lakes Rezoning PZZAM2026 00002

Planning Board Hearing September 17, 2026, 2:00PM City of Fort Pierce Commission Chambers

Submitted by	Kevin S. Keene
Project	Willow Lakes Data Center
Property	10050 West Midway Road Fort Pierce Florida
Requested action	Recommend denial of PZZAM2026 00002

Chair and Members of the Fort Pierce Planning Board:

I respectfully request that the Planning Board recommend denial of PZZAM2026-00002, the application to rezone the 200.23-acre Willow Lakes property at 10050 West Midway Road from Planned Development to approximately 174 acres of Light Industrial I-1 and 26 acres of General Commercial C-3.

This request asks the City to grant industrial entitlement first and obtain the facts later. The City Code requires the opposite. Before approving a zoning atlas amendment, the Board must be able to find that the amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, will not adversely affect the City's ability to satisfy land and water-use needs or meet transportation demands and provide community facilities and services, and will promote and protect the public health, safety, and general welfare. The present record does not support those required findings.

The application is premature and materially incomplete

The applicant does not identify the company that would build or operate the data center. The staff report states that the owner intends to obtain rezoning and then enter an agreement with a partner company, which would later submit a site plan. As a result, the Board is being asked to approve 174 acres of industrial zoning without knowing the operator, the final equipment, the electrical demand, the cooling technology, the generator inventory, the fuel-storage volume, the noise profile, the construction phases, or the infrastructure upgrades the project will require.

The conceptual plan is enormous: six single-story data-center buildings of approximately 220,000 square feet each, totaling about 1.32 million square feet, plus approximately 250,000 square feet of commercial development. A project of that scale cannot be justified by a conceptual drawing and promises that essential engineering will arrive after rezoning. Once the entitlement is granted, the City's leverage and the public's ability to evaluate whether the site is suitable are materially reduced.

Staff has identified a conditional use process but the rezoning request does not provide those protections

The City's separate zoning-category analysis acknowledges that a data center is not expressly listed in the zoning code. It describes continuous cooling, significant electrical and telecommunications infrastructure, emergency generators, fuel storage, transformers, switchgear, and potential mechanical noise. Most importantly, the September 17 agenda item recommends that a data center be reviewed as a conditional use within the City's zoning regulations.

That recommendation conflicts with approving a broad rezoning now and resolving the project's impacts later. If a data center requires conditional-use review, the City should establish clear, enforceable data-center standards and require project-specific evidence before granting the underlying entitlement. The Board should not use the similar-use procedure and a rezoning vote to create a path for a use whose defining impacts have not been measured.

The water and sewer analysis rests on assumptions rather than demonstrated capacity

The applicant's capacity memorandum estimates average potable-water and sewer demand of 65,500 gallons per day, but expressly calls its figures preliminary and subject to tenant selection, final design, and detailed engineering. It excludes process-cooling water by assuming a closed-loop system supplied from the on-site pond. The memorandum provides no sealed water-balance analysis, hydrogeologic study, pond-yield analysis, drought scenario, evaporation estimate, thermal analysis, groundwater-interaction analysis, water-quality evaluation, reclaimed-water feasibility study, or permit determination from the South Florida Water Management District or the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

The mere presence of a former aggregate-mining lake does not prove a lawful, sustainable cooling supply. Staff cannot find that the amendment will avoid an adverse effect on land and water-use needs when the central cooling assumption remains unverified.

Electrical capacity and public cost remain undisclosed

The application points to transmission easements and a nearby substation, but proximity is not proof of available capacity. The record provides no quantified peak load, no FPL capacity commitment, no system-impact study, no schedule for generation or transmission upgrades, and no binding allocation of upgrade costs. Florida law defines a large-scale data center by an anticipated monthly peak load of at least 50 megawatts. The applicant has not disclosed whether this six-building campus will meet or exceed that threshold.

The City should not approve the zoning until it knows the maximum electrical demand and has written confirmation that the necessary infrastructure can be supplied without shifting project-specific costs or reliability risks to existing customers.

Noise emissions fire protection and emergency demands have not been established

The City's own analysis recognizes round-the-clock HVAC and cooling operations, chillers, transformers, switchgear, emergency generators, fuel storage, service activity, and potential noise. Yet the file contains no professional acoustical study, no property-line or nighttime noise limits, no low-frequency or tonal-noise analysis, no generator-testing plan, no air-emissions inventory, and no maximum generator or fuel-storage commitment.

Nor does the record contain a written determination from the St. Lucie County Fire District establishing that staffing, apparatus, water supply, hazardous-material response, and emergency planning are adequate for the maximum buildout. Those omissions prevent the required finding that the amendment will protect public health and safety and will not impair community services.

The environmental report identifies resources that require current project specific review

The June 2026 environmental assessment documents freshwater marshes, pine flatwoods in good ecological condition, a large reservoir, confirmed gopher-tortoise burrows, potential habitat for listed species, and aquatic features within a wood-stork foraging area. It also states that wetland limits rely on an informal determination from 2020 and that a systematic gopher-tortoise survey will be required before construction.

That report is an inventory, not a buildout impact analysis. It does not evaluate the six-building plan's wetland impacts, stormwater volumes, habitat fragmentation, heat, lighting, cooling-water effects, or cumulative impacts. A 2006 historical-resource letter concerning a different project does not substitute for current, project-specific review twenty years later.

The proposed covenant does not cure the missing evidence

The draft restrictive covenant limits the I-1 portion to a data center and undefined supporting ancillary uses, but it sets no cap on building area, megawatts, water withdrawal, cooling demand, generators, fuel storage,

noise, emissions, height, lighting, or hours of generator testing. It automatically expires after 50 years, may be amended or terminated by the owner and City Commission, and its Exhibit A legal description is blank in the submitted draft.

A covenant that identifies a use but does not control its scale or impacts cannot support the findings required by Section 125-136. Material safeguards must be objective, measurable, recorded, and enforceable before approval, not negotiated after the land is rezoned.

The proposed zoning does not fulfill the purpose of Mixed Use Development

Staff concludes that I-1 and C-3 technically satisfy the Mixed Use Development designation because they represent two listed categories. That is only a category count. The Comprehensive Plan language quoted in the staff report describes well-planned centers that integrate complementary uses and promote live-work environments. Converting roughly 87 percent of the property to a secure, no-public-access industrial campus with limited employment, then placing highway-oriented commercial uses along the remaining frontage, does not by itself demonstrate an integrated mixed-use center.

The prior Planned Development envisioned residential, retail, commercial, public spaces, walkable streets, and recreational amenities. The applicant must show how the replacement advances the plan's purpose, not merely how two zoning labels can be placed on the same parcel.

Requested action

The Planning Board should recommend denial because the present record does not permit the mandatory findings required by City Code Section 125-136. A denial recommendation is especially appropriate because City Code Section 125-133 requires a four-fifths City Commission vote to overcome it.

If the Board declines to recommend denial, it should continue the matter without a recommendation until the applicant supplies, and the public has adequate time to review, final project parameters; a completed and recorded covenant with a legal description; independent water, utility, noise, air, environmental, traffic, fiscal, fire-rescue, and emergency-capacity analyses; written agency and utility determinations; and draft development-order conditions that bind the owner, operator, successors, and assigns.

Fort Pierce should decide whether this site can safely support the actual project before it changes the zoning.

**On the record presented for September 17, 2026, the required findings cannot responsibly be made.
Please recommend denial of PZZAM2026-00002.**

Documents reviewed

- City of Fort Pierce Staff Report for PZZAM2026-00002, Planning Board date September 17, 2026
- City of Fort Pierce Determination of Zoning Category Data Center agenda item 6.d, September 17, 2026
- Bohler memorandum, Estimated Water and Sewer Calculations, June 15-16, 2026
- EW Consultants Environmental Assessment, June 2026
- Draft Declaration of Restrictive Covenants for Willow Lakes, LLC
- Bohler Conceptual Layout Plan CP01, dated March 27, 2026
- Florida Department of State Division of Historical Resources letter, April 19, 2006
- St. Lucie County Property Appraiser property card and vesting deed supplied with the application record

From: [Isfrain Soto Jr](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Strong Opposition to Proposed Data Center Between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 1:00:17 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

FORMAL OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED DATA CENTER

Brystol NORTH at Wylder – Port St. Lucie, Florida

To: Planning and Zoning Board and City Planning & Zoning Staff

Subject: Strong Opposition to Proposed Data Center Between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Board and City Planning & Zoning Staff:

My name is **Isfrain Soto**, and I am a homeowner and resident of Brystol South at Wylder in Port St. Lucie, Florida. I am writing to formally and strongly oppose the proposed data center being considered in the area between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie.

I am not opposed to responsible economic development, technology, or job creation. My objection is to placing a large, continuously operating, industrial-type data center in an area that is surrounded by and continuing to develop as a residential community. The City's own documents identify significant potential impacts involving noise, water, electrical infrastructure, generators, fuel storage, cooling systems, and other industrial infrastructure. Those impacts deserve careful scrutiny before this project is approved.

The City's Data Center Zoning Category Analysis states that the current zoning regulations do not expressly identify "data center" as a separate use category and that its classification must therefore be based on the use most similar in its actual operational characteristics. The City concludes that a data center is most appropriately treated as comparable to an I-1 Light Industrial use. The same analysis describes I-1 as a district intended for industrial and related

uses with limited objectionable external effects.

That distinction is important. The question should not simply be whether a data center can be compared to light industrial use. The question should be whether this particular data center, at this particular location, will actually have limited objectionable external effects and remain compatible with the nearby residential communities.

The City's own analysis describes a conventional data center as a large warehouse-like building containing computer servers and data-processing equipment, with limited public access but continuous HVAC and cooling operations, significant electrical and telecommunications infrastructure, emergency generators, fuel storage, transformers and switchgear, loading and maintenance activity, and potential noise from chillers and mechanical equipment. In other words, the facility may have few employees, but its physical and infrastructure impacts can be substantial.

Noise is one of my greatest concerns. The City's separate data-center materials specifically call for a professional acoustical analysis before site-plan approval and identify the need for property-line and receptor-based limits, including limits at the nearest residential or other sensitive receptors. The document also recognizes low-frequency and tonal noise and recommends restrictions on routine generator testing. If these protections are important enough to be identified by the City's own materials, they should be fully addressed before approval—not after residents are exposed to the impacts.

Water consumption is another major concern. The City's materials identify water supply, reclaimed-water availability, cooling technology, consumptive-use permitting, and comprehensive-plan consistency as important Conditional Use review issues. They also call for water-demand calculations, cooling-system descriptions, reclaimed-water feasibility analysis, and SFWMD/DEP permit information. I believe residents have a right to know exactly how much water this facility will require and what effect that demand could have on local resources.

Electrical demand also deserves full disclosure. The City's materials recognize that data centers can require significant electrical service, transformers, switchgear, and related infrastructure. Florida law, as summarized in the City's materials, defines a "large-scale data center" as a single-location data center with an anticipated monthly peak load of 50 megawatts or more. The City should therefore disclose the anticipated electrical demand of this project and explain what utility infrastructure will be required to serve it.

The location matters. This project is being considered in the developing area between Fort Pierce and Port St. Lucie, where homeowners are purchasing property and establishing neighborhoods. A decision to place a 24-hour industrial-type facility in this corridor should consider not only the individual parcel but also the long-term character, livability, infrastructure capacity, and cumulative impacts on surrounding residential communities.

Other communities provide a warning that these concerns are not hypothetical. In Northern Virginia, residents living near data centers have reported persistent mechanical noise. Virginia's Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission reported that residents in the Great Oak neighborhood complained about noise from a nearby data center and that the issue remained unresolved to residents' satisfaction for an extended period. Residents in Brook Haven also raised noise concerns, with mitigation taking time and repeated communications before reductions were observed.

In Chesapeake, Virginia, residents living near proposed data-center development have expressed concerns about continuous cooling-system noise, water consumption, pollution, and backup diesel generators. Georgia Public Broadcasting reported that one resident living only a few hundred feet from a proposed site specifically questioned how she could relax with cooling equipment potentially producing a continuous 24-hour hum.

In Goochland County, Virginia, residents confronting a proposed large data-center campus raised concerns about noise pollution, diesel generators near homes, transmission lines, and water use. The developer discussed air cooling as a way to reduce water consumption, but acknowledged that air cooling would require substantially more electricity. That example demonstrates an important point: solving one data-center impact can shift the burden to another resource. The City should therefore evaluate the entire infrastructure picture rather than considering water, power, noise, or generators in isolation.

Data-center growth has also produced broader community and infrastructure concerns in other states. Texas is currently increasing oversight of data-center water use, with state officials requiring greater reporting and enforcement because of concerns about the industry's rapidly increasing water and power demands. These developments reinforce why water-use projections and utility capacity should be addressed before—not after—major facilities are approved.

The issue is also not limited to one state. Communities across the country are increasingly questioning whether the economic benefits of data centers justify the local impacts associated with power demand, water use, noise, land use, and infrastructure. That national experience should encourage Port St. Lucie to proceed carefully rather than assume that the impacts will be insignificant simply because the facility has relatively few permanent employees.

I am also concerned about the City's use of the "similar use" provision. Section 125-6 contains limitations concerning the placement of a use into a zone where it is not listed and the relationship between a proposed similar use and uses specifically listed in another zoning district. I respectfully request that the City clearly explain the legal and factual basis for determining that this particular data center qualifies under Section 125-6 and why I-1 is the appropriate classification.

Finally, the City's state-law materials identify an additional legal issue involving SB 484 and SB 180 and state that a City Attorney/legal opinion is required regarding the City's authority to impose certain additional requirements. I respectfully request that any such legal determination be made clear to the public before the project is approved, particularly concerning noise studies, generator testing, water-use documentation, utility-capacity studies, setbacks, buffers, and architectural screening.

MY REQUEST TO THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD

- Do not approve the proposed data center at this location unless the City can establish that the use is legally authorized, properly classified, and compatible with surrounding residential development.
- Require a professional acoustical study that evaluates continuous cooling noise, low-frequency and tonal noise, nighttime conditions, and noise at the nearest residential

receptors.

- Require complete information regarding the number, size, location, fuel type, fuel-storage capacity, emissions, and testing schedule of emergency generators.
- Require detailed water-demand calculations, cooling-system information, reclaimed-water analysis, and confirmation of all required SFWMD/DEP permits.
- Require disclosure of anticipated electrical demand and all major utility infrastructure needed to serve the facility.
- Require a comprehensive evaluation of traffic, construction impacts, lighting, visual impacts, setbacks, buffering, stormwater, and emergency response.
- Require enforceable operating conditions that protect nearby residents after the facility becomes operational, rather than relying solely on voluntary promises.
- Ensure that all applicable legal and zoning questions are resolved and made part of the public record before any final approval.

I strongly oppose this proposed data center because the potential impacts are too significant to be treated as an ordinary light-industrial use without a rigorous, site-specific review. The City's own documents identify the very issues that concern residents: continuous cooling, noise, generators, fuel storage, electrical infrastructure, water demand, and compatibility with nearby sensitive receptors. Homeowners should not be required to live next to a facility first and then attempt to correct problems after construction. The appropriate time to protect our community is **before approval and before construction**.

I respectfully request that this letter be included in the official record and provided to the Planning and Zoning Board for consideration.

Respectfully,

Isfrain Soto

Homeowner/Resident
Bristol North at Wylder

Sources Reviewed

- City of Port St. Lucie – Data Center Zoning Category Analysis (uploaded document).
- City of Port St. Lucie – Data Centers – State (uploaded document).
- Virginia Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission, Chapter 6: Local Residential Impacts.
- Georgia Public Broadcasting, “Why more residents are saying ‘No’ to AI data centers in their backyard” (July 18, 2025).
- Virginia Mercury, “Goochland residents rebuff data center developer Tract ahead of permit application” (July 27, 2026).
- Reuters, “Texas moves to penalize data centers for water violations” (September 14, 2026).

From: [Ana Suarez](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Project Neptune Rezoning Objection
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 2:30:53 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization. Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Members of the Fort Pierce Planning and Zoning Board,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed rezoning and development of Project Neptune, the proposed large-scale data center campus near I-95 and West Midway Road.

I am not opposed to technology, investment, or responsible economic development. I am opposed to approving a project of this magnitude without first demonstrating that the long-term benefits to the residents of Fort Pierce outweigh the costs and risks that may be placed on our community.

This is not simply another development project. It is a decision that could affect Fort Pierce for decades.

The proposal involves approximately 200 acres, with a substantial portion being rezoned for data-center use. The developer has described a potential full buildout exceeding 1 gigawatt of computing capacity.

That scale demands much more scrutiny than simply asking whether the project can be physically built.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

Fort Pierce needs jobs.

We need good-paying, permanent employment opportunities for local residents. We need opportunities for young people coming out of our schools and colleges. We need jobs that allow families to build a future here.

A massive data center may create significant construction employment during the building phase, but the Planning and Zoning Board should focus on the permanent employment that will remain after construction is completed.

I ask the Board to require the developer to clearly state:

- How many permanent full-time jobs will exist at full buildout?
- How many of those jobs are expected to be filled by Fort Pierce or St. Lucie County residents?
- What will the average and median wages be?
- How many jobs will be entry-level jobs versus highly specialized positions?
- What guarantees exist that these jobs will actually go to local residents?
- How does the number of permanent jobs compare with other potential uses for approximately 200 acres?

Fort Pierce should not give up valuable land and make major infrastructure commitments simply to say that we attracted a major company.

We need development that creates opportunities for people—not just buildings that consume enormous amounts of resources.

WHAT WILL THIS DO TO OUR ELECTRIC BILLS?

One of my greatest concerns is the enormous amount of electricity that a facility of this scale could require.

The developer's own materials describe Project Neptune as potentially expanding to more than 1 gigawatt of dedicated computing capacity.

That is an extraordinary amount of electrical demand.

Residents deserve to know exactly what that demand means for our electric grid and, ultimately, for the people who pay electric bills every month.

I am asking the Board to demand a clear, independent analysis of whether the project could result in additional costs for:

- New transmission infrastructure
- Substations
- Generation capacity
- Grid upgrades
- Maintenance of infrastructure serving the facility
- Emergency power systems
- Other utility investments required because of the data center

Most importantly, who pays for these costs?

If the answer is ultimately ratepayers, then Fort Pierce families and small businesses could be asked to shoulder additional costs to support a private development.

That is not something that should be brushed aside as an ordinary utility matter.

Residents should not have to pay higher electric bills so that a private corporation can operate one of the largest energy-consuming facilities in our community.

Before this project moves forward, the public deserves a transparent explanation of how its enormous electricity demand will be accommodated and what protections will be in place to prevent costs from being shifted onto ordinary customers.

WATER AND OTHER COMMUNITY RESOURCES

The developer has stated that the project intends to use an existing on-site reservoir for its cooling system rather than relying on municipal drinking water.

I appreciate that consideration, but it does not eliminate the need for a thorough independent review.

The Board should require clear answers regarding:

- How much water will actually be consumed or lost through evaporation?
- What happens during drought conditions?
- What are the environmental consequences of the proposed cooling system?
- What happens if the facility expands to its maximum proposed capacity?
- What protections are in place for surrounding wetlands, drainage systems, groundwater, and nearby properties?
- Who is responsible for monitoring and mitigating environmental impacts over the life of the facility?

A project of this size should be evaluated based on its maximum foreseeable impact, not merely its initial phase.

THE COMMUNITY SHOULD NOT BE LOCKED INTO THIS DECISION FOR DECADES

Another issue that concerns me is the proposed long-term restriction of the property for data-center use. Current reporting describes approximately 174 acres proposed for Light Industrial zoning with a 50-year covenant restricting the use to a data center.

That is an enormous commitment.

Fifty years is longer than many of the people sitting in this room will live.

Before Fort Pierce makes a decision that could effectively determine the future use of this land for generations, we need to be absolutely certain this is the right economic choice for our community.

What happens if the technology changes?

What happens if the facility becomes obsolete?

What happens if the promised economic benefits do not materialize?

What happens if electricity costs rise?

What happens if the community later determines that this land would be better suited for another use?

We should not make a decades-long commitment without strong protections for future residents.

WHAT DOES FORT PIERCE RECEIVE IN RETURN?

This is ultimately a question of value.

If Fort Pierce is being asked to accommodate an enormous industrial-scale energy consumer, residents deserve to know exactly what we receive in return.

I ask the Board to consider whether Project Neptune provides enough:

Jobs.

Tax revenue.

Local economic activity.

Infrastructure investment.

Community benefits.

Long-term opportunity.

to justify its demands on our land, energy infrastructure, water resources, roads, environment, and quality of life.

And if the answer is yes, where is the independent evidence?

I ASK THE BOARD TO PUT FORT PIERCE RESIDENTS FIRST

I respectfully ask the Planning and Zoning Board not to approve the proposed rezoning for Project Neptune at this time.

At minimum, I ask that approval be delayed until the public has access to independent, detailed analyses of:

- 1 Permanent local job creation.
- 2 Wages and employment quality.
- 3 Electricity demand and grid impacts.
- 4 Potential impacts on residential and commercial electric rates.
- 5 Who will pay for required utility infrastructure.
- 6 Water consumption and environmental impacts.
- 7 [REDACTED] impacts.
- 8 Stormwater and drainage impacts.
- 9 Property values and quality-of-life impacts.
- 10 The project's long-term tax and economic benefits compared with alternative uses of the property.

I also ask that the Board consider whether the proposed land could attract industries that would create far more permanent jobs per acre while placing fewer demands on our electrical system and other public resources.

Fort Pierce should welcome economic development—but we should demand smart economic development.

We should not measure success by the size of the investment or the size of the buildings.

We should measure success by whether ordinary Fort Pierce residents are better off because of

the development.

More good-paying jobs.

Lower—not higher—household costs.

A stronger local economy.

Responsible use of our resources.

And a community where residents have a meaningful voice in decisions that affect their future.

I respectfully urge the Planning and Zoning Board to reject the proposed rezoning for Project Neptune, or at minimum postpone any recommendation until these critical questions have been independently answered and made available to the public.

Fort Pierce deserves development that works for its residents, not development that asks residents to bear the risks and costs while the benefits flow elsewhere.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to our community.

Sincerely

From: [Lisa Kate Modine](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: URGENT: Resident Opposition to Willow Lakes Data Center — PZZAM2026-00002
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 3:12:35 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#) [This is SPAM: Block](#) [This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

I am submitting this correspondence ahead of the September 17, 2026 Planning Board hearing on PZZAM2026-00002 and respectfully request that it be distributed to every Planning Board member and included in the public record.

Dear Mayor Hudson, City Commissioners, Planning Board Members, and Planning Officials:

I am a homeowner at [REDACTED], [REDACTED], near Midway Road and 25th Street. I am writing **before the September 17, 2026 Planning Board meeting regarding PZZAM2026-[REDACTED]** my concerns and **opposition** to the proposed Willow Lakes Data Center on the public record.

I understand that this project involves approximately **200 acres along West Midway Road**, with approximately **174 acres proposed for Light Industrial use specifically to accommodate a large data center**. I also understand that the proposed facility could require an extraordinary amount of electricity and operate 24 hours a day.

I am not opposed to responsible economic development. However, **a large-scale AI data center is fundamentally different from ordinary commercial development**, and I am deeply concerned about its potential impact on the environment and the established residential communities surrounding it.

As a homeowner living in this area, I respectfully ask that you consider the following before allowing this project to proceed:

Wildlife and habitat:

I am deeply concerned about the destruction of wildlife habitat and natural areas that could result from a development of this size. We live in an area where wildlife is part of what makes this community special. Clearing hundreds of acres and replacing natural land with massive buildings, pavement, utilities and industrial infrastructure can permanently displace wildlife and destroy habitat. I understand that development is sometimes necessary, but I believe the environmental review should fully account for the loss of habitat, trees, wetlands, wildlife

corridors and the cumulative impact on the animals that already live in this area. Once that habitat is gone, it cannot simply be replaced.

Environmental impact:

What will be the effect of clearing and developing this property on stormwater runoff, drainage, wetlands, groundwater, wildlife, natural resources and the surrounding environment? I believe these impacts need to be independently evaluated, including the cumulative impact of other development occurring in the Midway corridor.

Water:

I understand the developer has discussed water-efficient or closed-loop cooling. I appreciate efforts to reduce water consumption, but I believe actual water use, groundwater impacts, cooling requirements and wastewater must be independently verified before approval.

Electricity and infrastructure:

A facility of this scale could require enormous amounts of electricity and potentially substantial new substations, transmission infrastructure and other industrial equipment. I would like to know exactly what is being proposed, where it will be located, and how close it could be to existing homes.

Noise:

Cooling equipment, fans, chillers, transformers, pumps and backup generators could operate continuously. I ask that an independent **daytime and nighttime noise study** be required, with enforceable limits and appropriate setbacks from residential properties.

Air quality and power generation:

I would like full disclosure of any proposed onsite power generation, backup generators, fuel systems and associated emissions. If natural-gas generation or other major power infrastructure is proposed, residents should know about it and its potential environmental impact before approval.

Traffic:

Construction of a facility this large could bring significant heavy-truck and equipment traffic to Midway Road, 25th Street and surrounding roads. I ask that construction traffic as well as permanent traffic be evaluated.

Stormwater and flooding:

As a homeowner, I am particularly concerned about whether such a large development could change drainage patterns or increase flooding or runoff onto surrounding properties. This needs careful, independent review.

Lighting and quality of life:

A 24-hour industrial facility could create substantial nighttime lighting, mechanical noise and visual impacts that extend into surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Property values:

Nearby homeowners have invested their savings in their homes. I believe the potential effects of noise, traffic, industrial infrastructure, lighting and other impacts on residential property values should be considered.

Most importantly, I ask that the City and County evaluate the **cumulative impact of this project together with other proposed development and infrastructure in the Midway Road corridor**, rather than looking at each project independently.

My request as a nearby homeowner

I respectfully ask that **no final approval be given until independent environmental, water, drainage, noise, traffic, electrical and public-health reviews have been completed and made available to the public.**

I also request that residents within at least a **five-mile radius of the proposed facility** receive timely notification of applications, site plans, zoning matters, public hearings and other proceedings related to this project.

I am not asking you to stop responsible development. **I am asking you to protect the residents who are already here.**

We chose to live in this community and invested in our homes with the expectation that major changes to the surrounding area would receive careful consideration. Once a facility of this magnitude and its supporting infrastructure are built, it may be extremely difficult to reverse the environmental and quality-of-life impacts.

Please listen to the residents before the decisions are made—not after.

I respectfully request that this email be included in the public record for **PZZAM2026-00002** and that I be notified of future meetings, hearings, applications and decisions concerning this project.

Please also provide me with the appropriate contact and case information so I can follow this project through the approval process.

Thank you for taking the concerns of your residents seriously and for protecting the environment and quality of life of our Fort Pierce community.

Sincerely,

Lisa K. Modine, Homeowner and Resident

Richard R. Modine, Jr., Homeowner and Resident

Email:

*

Phone:

*

From: [Rick Modine](#)
To: [Planning Department](#); [Kevin Freeman](#); [Linda Cox](#); [Linda Hudson](#)
Cc: [Arnold Gaines](#); [Curtis Johnson](#); [Michael Broderick](#); [Chris Dzadovsky](#); [Christopher Suneson](#); [Kerry Driver](#); [Bridgette Romer](#); [Alicia Rosenthal](#); [City Manager](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: URGENT: Resident - Richard R. Modine Jr - Opposition to Willow Lakes Data Center — PZZAM2026-00002
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 3:28:52 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

I am submitting this correspondence ahead of the September 17, 2026 Planning Board hearing on PZZAM2026-00002 and respectfully request that it be distributed to every Planning Board member and included in the public record.

Dear Mayor Hudson, City Commissioners, Planning Board Members, and Planning Officials:

I am a homeowner at [REDACTED], [REDACTED], near Midway Road and 25th Street. I am writing **before the September 17, 2026 Planning Board meeting regarding PZZAM2026-[REDACTED]** my concerns and **opposition** to the proposed Willow Lakes Data Center on the public record.

I understand that this project involves approximately **200 acres along West Midway Road**, with approximately **174 acres proposed for Light Industrial use specifically to accommodate a large data center**. I also understand that the proposed facility could require an extraordinary amount of electricity and operate 24 hours a day.

I am not opposed to responsible economic development. However, **a large-scale AI data center is fundamentally different from ordinary commercial development**, and I am deeply concerned about its potential impact on the environment and the established residential communities surrounding it.

As a homeowner living in this area, I respectfully ask that you consider the following before allowing this project to proceed:

Wildlife and habitat:

I am deeply concerned about the destruction of wildlife habitat and natural areas that could result from a development of this size. We live in an area where wildlife is part of what makes this community special. Clearing hundreds of acres and replacing natural land with massive buildings, pavement, utilities and industrial infrastructure can permanently displace wildlife and destroy habitat. I understand that development is sometimes necessary, but I believe the

environmental review should fully account for the loss of habitat, trees, wetlands, wildlife corridors and the cumulative impact on the animals that already live in this area. Once that habitat is gone, it cannot simply be replaced.

Environmental impact:

What will be the effect of clearing and developing this property on stormwater runoff, drainage, wetlands, groundwater, wildlife, natural resources and the surrounding environment? I believe these impacts need to be independently evaluated, including the cumulative impact of other development occurring in the Midway corridor.

Water:

I understand the developer has discussed water-efficient or closed-loop cooling. I appreciate efforts to reduce water consumption, but I believe actual water use, groundwater impacts, cooling requirements and wastewater must be independently verified before approval.

Electricity and infrastructure:

A facility of this scale could require enormous amounts of electricity and potentially substantial new substations, transmission infrastructure and other industrial equipment. I would like to know exactly what is being proposed, where it will be located, and how close it could be to existing homes.

Noise:

Cooling equipment, fans, chillers, transformers, pumps and backup generators could operate continuously. I ask that an independent **daytime and nighttime noise study** be required, with enforceable limits and appropriate setbacks from residential properties.

Air quality and power generation:

I would like full disclosure of any proposed onsite power generation, backup generators, fuel systems and associated emissions. If natural-gas generation or other major power infrastructure is proposed, residents should know about it and its potential environmental impact before approval.

Traffic:

Construction of a facility this large could bring significant heavy-truck and equipment traffic to Midway Road, 25th Street and surrounding roads. I ask that construction traffic as well as permanent traffic be evaluated.

Stormwater and flooding:

As a homeowner, I am particularly concerned about whether such a large development could change drainage patterns or increase flooding or runoff onto surrounding properties. This needs careful, independent review.

Lighting and quality of life:

A 24-hour industrial facility could create substantial nighttime lighting, mechanical noise and visual impacts that extend into surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Property values:

Nearby homeowners have invested their savings in their homes. I believe the potential effects of noise, traffic, industrial infrastructure, lighting and other impacts on residential property values should be considered.

Most importantly, I ask that the City and County evaluate the **cumulative impact of this project together with other proposed development and infrastructure in the Midway Road corridor**, rather than looking at each project independently.

My request as a nearby homeowner

I respectfully ask that **no final approval be given until independent environmental, water, drainage, noise, traffic, electrical and public-health reviews have been completed and made available to the public.**

I also request that residents within at least a **five-mile radius of the proposed facility** receive timely notification of applications, site plans, zoning matters, public hearings and other proceedings related to this project.

I am not asking you to stop responsible development. **I am asking you to protect the residents who are already here.**

We chose to live in this community and invested in our homes with the expectation that major changes to the surrounding area would receive careful consideration. Once a facility of this magnitude and its supporting infrastructure are built, it may be extremely difficult to reverse the environmental and quality-of-life impacts.

Please listen to the residents before the decisions are made—not after.

I respectfully request that this email be included in the public record for **PZZAM2026-00002** and that I be notified of future meetings, hearings, applications and decisions concerning this project.

Please also provide me with the appropriate contact and case information so I can follow this project through the approval process.

Thank you for taking the concerns of your residents seriously and for protecting the environment and quality of life of our Fort Pierce community.

Sincerely,

Richard R. Modine, Jr., Homeowner and Resident

Lisa K. Modine, Homeowner and Resident

Email:

Phone:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] * [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] * [REDACTED]

From: [Orietta Regalado](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Project Neptune Rezoning Objection
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 4:01:28 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization. Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Good afternoon,

I am writing as a concerned resident regarding the development of data centers in and around our community.

I understand that technology and economic development are important, but I do not believe data centers should be approved without much greater consideration of their long-term impact on the people who already live here. These are enormous industrial facilities that can require significant amounts of electricity and water, generate constant noise from cooling systems, and place additional demands on roads and other infrastructure.

My biggest concern is that decisions like this can permanently change the character of residential communities. Many of us chose to live here because of the quality of life, quieter neighborhoods, green spaces, and family-oriented environment. We should not have to accept industrial-scale development near our homes simply because it may bring economic benefits.

I am also concerned about the potential effects on our electrical grid, water resources, traffic, noise levels, air quality, and property values. Before additional projects are approved, I believe residents deserve clear answers about exactly how much water and electricity these facilities will consume, who will pay for the infrastructure required to support them, what protections will be in place for nearby residents, and what the long-term environmental impact will be.

I am asking our local leaders to slow down and take a much closer look at these developments before approving additional data centers. At a minimum, there should be meaningful opportunities for residents to participate in the process, independent environmental and infrastructure studies, appropriate setbacks from residential areas, and strong enforceable protections for surrounding neighborhoods.

Economic development should not come at the expense of the quality of life of the families who already call this community home.

Please take the concerns of local residents seriously and consider whether this type of

development is truly appropriate for our community before moving forward.

Thank you for your time and for representing the residents who live here.

Sincerely,
Orietta

From: [Angelo M](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Data center rejection!!
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 5:24:22 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#) [This is SPAM: Block](#) [This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

[REDACTED] ed this message don't often get email from
[REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at
[REDACTED]utSenderIdentification]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Planning and Zoning Board and City Planning & Zoning Staff,

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rezoning and development of Project Neptune, a large-scale data center planned near I-95 and West Midway Road.

As a homeowner and parent living in the surrounding Port St. Lucie area, I am extremely concerned about the impact this project could have on nearby residential communities and families.

A data center of this scale is not a typical light-industrial use. These facilities can operate 24 hours a day and may involve significant noise from cooling equipment, backup generators, transformers, mechanical systems, and other infrastructure. The project also raises serious concerns regarding water consumption, electrical demand, fuel storage, emergency response, traffic, construction impacts, and long-term environmental effects.

I am particularly concerned about the potential for continuous industrial noise and the presence of large backup generators and fuel systems so close to residential neighborhoods. Families who purchased homes in this area did not expect to live next to a massive 24/7 industrial facility.

I also ask the City to carefully examine whether this proposed use is truly compatible with the surrounding communities and whether the existing zoning classification adequately addresses the unique impacts of a modern data center. The City should require comprehensive studies addressing noise, water usage, electrical infrastructure, environmental impacts, traffic, emergency services, generator operations, fuel storage, and the cumulative impact on nearby residential development before approving any rezoning.

I strongly urge the Planning and Zoning Board to deny the proposed rezoning for Project Neptune and protect the quality of life, safety, property values, and residential character of the surrounding communities.

Please include this email as part of the official public record regarding Project Neptune.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Concerned Homeowner and Parent
Port St. Lucie, Florida

From: [Angelo M](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Data center rejection!!
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 5:24:22 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

[REDACTED] ed this message don't often get email from
[REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at
[REDACTED]utSenderIdentification]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Planning and Zoning Board and City Planning & Zoning Staff,

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rezoning and development of Project Neptune, a large-scale data center planned near I-95 and West Midway Road.

As a homeowner and parent living in the surrounding Port St. Lucie area, I am extremely concerned about the impact this project could have on nearby residential communities and families.

A data center of this scale is not a typical light-industrial use. These facilities can operate 24 hours a day and may involve significant noise from cooling equipment, backup generators, transformers, mechanical systems, and other infrastructure. The project also raises serious concerns regarding water consumption, electrical demand, fuel storage, emergency response, traffic, construction impacts, and long-term environmental effects.

I am particularly concerned about the potential for continuous industrial noise and the presence of large backup generators and fuel systems so close to residential neighborhoods. Families who purchased homes in this area did not expect to live next to a massive 24/7 industrial facility.

I also ask the City to carefully examine whether this proposed use is truly compatible with the surrounding communities and whether the existing zoning classification adequately addresses the unique impacts of a modern data center. The City should require comprehensive studies addressing noise, water usage, electrical infrastructure, environmental impacts, traffic, emergency services, generator operations, fuel storage, and the cumulative impact on nearby residential development before approving any rezoning.

I strongly urge the Planning and Zoning Board to deny the proposed rezoning for Project Neptune and protect the quality of life, safety, property values, and residential character of the surrounding communities.

Please include this email as part of the official public record regarding Project Neptune.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Concerned Homeowner and Parent
Port St. Lucie, Florida

From: [Barbara](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Data Center Midway Road
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2026 7:46:22 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

[REDACTED] eived this message don't often get email from
[REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at
AboutSenderIdentification]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Please vote against the Data Center on Midway road. Project Neptune! I do not want anymore Dara collected on me. I do not want this Health hazard in our Community. I have read and seen enough videos to know this is not a benefit for our area. Please be bold like Palm Beach County and Martin County and SAY No to Project Neptune!
Thank You

Barbara Mullin

[REDACTED]

From: [Rebecca Cothorn](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Opposition to Project Neptune Rezoning (PZZAM2026-00002)
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2026 3:26:03 AM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization. Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Fort Pierce Planning Board and City Commissioners,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Project Neptune data center at I-95 and West Midway Road.

While I support responsible economic growth, this massive 203-acre development raises serious concerns for our community:

- **Water and Resources:** We need complete, transparent studies on how much water this facility will consume.
- **Electrical Grid:** A multi-building data center using over a gigawatt of power could strain our local energy grid and raise utility bills for residents.
- **Quality of Life:** The potential for heavy noise, environmental impact, and overdevelopment threatens our local neighborhoods.

I urge you to vote against the rezoning application and protect the long-term well-being of Fort Pierce residents.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Cothorn

Carriage Pointe Resident

From: [Adrienne Clark](#)
To: [Planning Department](#); [Linda Cox](#); [Michael Broderick](#)
Subject: Public Comment for Sept. 17 Planning Board: Opposition to Willow Lakes LLC Rezoning (W. Midway Rd & I-95)
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2026 9:07:15 AM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#) [This is SPAM: Block](#) [This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

My name is Adrienne Clark and I live at [REDACTED], about 1.4 miles from the Willow Lakes LLC property at West Midway Road and I-95. The September 17 hearing falls during my work hours, so I respectfully ask that this comment be entered into the public record and shared with board members before the meeting.

I oppose the request to rezone 174 acres to Light Industrial for a data center as it is currently presented.

To be clear, I am not against data centers. I have spent 22 years working in IoT and industrial automation, and I understand the value of this infrastructure. My objection is where this one would go.

My main concern is noise. Data centers run cooling systems, transformers, and backup generators around the clock, producing constant low-frequency noise that travels well beyond the property line and is not stopped by typical walls or landscaping. My home is 1.4 miles away, and there are homes only about a mile from the site. That is nowhere near enough distance to protect the families living in them.

I am also concerned that the long-term local benefit is limited. Once built, data centers employ relatively few people, and the application states that an unnamed partner company would develop the facility later. The board is being asked to approve a permanent zoning change without knowing who will build or operate the site.

Before any recommendation, I ask that the applicant be required to provide an independent noise study measuring low-frequency sound at nearby homes, enforceable noise limits, and clear evidence of no impact on groundwater or local utility rates. Without those, I urge the board to recommend denial.

Thank you for your time and service to our community.

Respectfully,
Adrienne Clark

[REDACTED], [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [Michelle Herrera Rojas](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Project Neptune Rezoning Objection
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2026 9:26:34 AM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Members of the Fort Pierce Planning and Zoning Board,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed rezoning and development of Project Neptune, the proposed large-scale data center campus near I-95 and West Midway Road.

I am not opposed to technology, investment, or responsible economic development. I am opposed to approving a project of this magnitude without first demonstrating that the long-term benefits to the residents of Fort Pierce outweigh the costs and risks that may be placed on our community.

This is not simply another development project. It is a decision that could affect Fort Pierce for decades.

The proposal involves approximately 200 acres, with a substantial portion being rezoned for data-center use. The developer has described a potential full buildout exceeding 1 gigawatt of computing capacity.

That scale demands much more scrutiny than simply asking whether the project can be physically built.

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

Fort Pierce needs jobs.

We need good-paying, permanent employment opportunities for local residents. We need opportunities for young people coming out of our schools and colleges. We need jobs that allow families to build a future here.

A massive data center may create significant construction employment during the building phase, but the Planning and Zoning Board should focus on the permanent employment that will remain after construction is completed.

I ask the Board to require the developer to clearly state:

- How many permanent full-time jobs will exist at full buildout?
- How many of those jobs are expected to be filled by Fort Pierce or St. Lucie County residents?
- What will the average and median wages be?
- How many jobs will be entry-level jobs versus highly specialized positions?
- What guarantees exist that these jobs will actually go to local residents?
- How does the number of permanent jobs compare with other potential uses for approximately 200 acres?

From: [Karen Egbert](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Cc: [Danegbert](#)
Subject: Data Center
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2026 1:28:26 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission,

I am writing to you today as a resident of our community to formally request that the Planning and Zoning Commission place a temporary moratorium on new data center construction approvals, rezoning requests, and by-right permits.

While I recognize the importance of economic development, the rapid expansion of large-scale data centers presents unique, long-term challenges that require careful, deliberate oversight. These facilities can impose substantial burdens on our local infrastructure, including high electricity demand, significant water consumption for cooling, potential noise pollution, and broader environmental impacts.

Rushing approval processes risks locking our community into infrastructure strains and environmental costs before we have fully understood the long-term consequences for local taxpayers and residents.

Therefore, I urge the Commission to take the following steps:

- - **Institute a temporary pause** on any new data center applications or approvals to allow staff adequate time to study potential impacts.
 - **Develop comprehensive zoning regulations** that mandate conditional use permits, requiring developers to submit detailed reports on water usage, noise levels, and power grid impacts prior to any approvals.
 - Ensure robust public notification and participation** so neighboring residents are fully informed of any proposed projects well in advance of final decisions.

Thank you for your time, your service to our community, and your commitment to protecting our local quality of life. I look forward to your response and to participating in upcoming public discussions on this critical issue.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

From: [Renata Rigueira](#)
To: [Linda Hudson](#); [Arnold Gaines](#); [Curtis Johnson](#); [Michael Broderick](#); [Chris Dzadovsky](#); [Christopher Suneson](#); [Bridgette Romer](#); [Kerry Driver](#); [Alicia Rosenthal](#); [Planning Department](#); [Kevin Freeman](#)
Subject: Public Comment – Willow Lakes Rezoning PZZAM2026-00002
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2026 2:45:57 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization. Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

Dear Mayor Hudson, Commissioners and Planning Staff,

I am a St. Lucie resident writing to respectfully express my concerns regarding PZZAM2026-00002, the proposed Willow Lakes rezoning at 10050 W. Midway Road. I am unable to attend the Planning Board hearing, so I wanted to make sure my concerns were heard and formally submitted for consideration.

I support responsible economic growth, but I believe protecting the quality of life and character of our community should come first. Therefore, I am asking the City to **deny the proposed rezoning**. A data center of this scale could have significant, long-term impacts on our roads, electricity, water resources, noise, environment, emergency services, and surrounding communities.

Before approving this rezoning, I believe government leaders and residents deserve clear answers:

- How much electricity and water will this facility actually require?
- Who will pay for the infrastructure needed to support it?
- What protections will residents have from noise, traffic, and environmental impacts?
- Is the existing emergency-service infrastructure sufficient for a facility of this scale?
- What safeguards will prevent future expansion from significantly increasing these impacts?
- Before approving this rezoning, can you guarantee that residents, not taxpayers and utility customers, will not be left paying for the additional infrastructure and services this project requires?

If resistant are affects what are the long and short term impacts and how does the city plan to address these impacts?

- How is this project similar to other data center projects being done across the country? What issues are those communities facing and how can we prevent it here?

Denying the rezoning would preserve the City's ability to consider more carefully whether this location and proposed use are appropriate before creating a long-term land-use commitment that may be difficult to reverse.

Please vote against the proposed rezoning and prioritize the long-term infrastructure, resources, and quality of life of our community. Thank you for considering my concerns

Sincerely,

Renata

St. Lucie, FL

Fort Pierce should not give up valuable land and make major infrastructure commitments simply to say that we attracted a major company.

We need development that creates opportunities for people—not just buildings that consume enormous amounts of resources.

WHAT WILL THIS DO TO OUR ELECTRIC BILLS?

One of my greatest concerns is the enormous amount of electricity that a facility of this scale could require.

The developer's own materials describe Project Neptune as potentially expanding to more than 1 gigawatt of dedicated computing capacity.

That is an extraordinary amount of electrical demand.

Residents deserve to know exactly what that demand means for our electric grid and, ultimately, for the people who pay electric bills every month.

I am asking the Board to demand a clear, independent analysis of whether the project could result in additional costs for:

- New transmission infrastructure
- Substations
- Generation capacity
- Grid upgrades
- Maintenance of infrastructure serving the facility
- Emergency power systems
- Other utility investments required because of the data center

Most importantly, who pays for these costs?

If the answer is ultimately ratepayers, then Fort Pierce families and small businesses could be asked to shoulder additional costs to support a private development.

That is not something that should be brushed aside as an ordinary utility matter.

Residents should not have to pay higher electric bills so that a private corporation can operate one of the largest energy-consuming facilities in our community.

Before this project moves forward, the public deserves a transparent explanation of how its enormous electricity demand will be accommodated and what protections will be in place to prevent costs from being shifted onto ordinary customers.

WATER AND OTHER COMMUNITY RESOURCES

The developer has stated that the project intends to use an existing on-site reservoir for its cooling system rather than relying on municipal drinking water.

I appreciate that consideration, but it does not eliminate the need for a thorough independent review.

The Board should require clear answers regarding:

- How much water will actually be consumed or lost through evaporation?
- What happens during drought conditions?
- What are the environmental consequences of the proposed cooling system?
- What happens if the facility expands to its maximum proposed capacity?
- What protections are in place for surrounding wetlands, drainage systems, groundwater, and nearby properties?
- Who is responsible for monitoring and mitigating environmental impacts over the life of the facility?

A project of this size should be evaluated based on its maximum foreseeable impact, not merely its initial phase.

THE COMMUNITY SHOULD NOT BE LOCKED INTO THIS DECISION FOR DECADES

Another issue that concerns me is the proposed long-term restriction of the property for data-center use. Current reporting describes approximately 174 acres proposed for Light Industrial zoning with a 50-year covenant restricting the use to a data center.

That is an enormous commitment.

Fifty years is longer than many of the people sitting in this room will live.

Before Fort Pierce makes a decision that could effectively determine the future use of this land for generations, we need to be absolutely certain this is the right economic choice for our community.

What happens if the technology changes?

What happens if the facility becomes obsolete?

What happens if the promised economic benefits do not materialize?

What happens if electricity costs rise?

What happens if the community later determines that this land would be better suited for another use?

We should not make a decades-long commitment without strong protections for future residents.

WHAT DOES FORT PIERCE RECEIVE IN RETURN?

This is ultimately a question of value.

If Fort Pierce is being asked to accommodate an enormous industrial-scale energy consumer, residents deserve to know exactly what we receive in return.

I ask the Board to consider whether Project Neptune provides enough:

Jobs.

Tax revenue.

Local economic activity.

Infrastructure investment.

Community benefits.

Long-term opportunity.

to justify its demands on our land, energy infrastructure, water resources, roads, environment, and quality of life.

And if the answer is yes, where is the independent evidence?

I ASK THE BOARD TO PUT FORT PIERCE RESIDENTS FIRST

I respectfully ask the Planning and Zoning Board not to approve the proposed rezoning for Project Neptune at this time.

At minimum, I ask that approval be delayed until the public has access to independent, detailed analyses of:

- 1 Permanent local job creation.
- 2 Wages and employment quality.
- 3 Electricity demand and grid impacts.
- 4 Potential impacts on residential and commercial electric rates.
- 5 Who will pay for required utility infrastructure.
- 6 Water consumption and environmental impacts.
- 7 [REDACTED] impacts.
- 8 Stormwater and drainage impacts.
- 9 Property values and quality-of-life impacts.
- 10 The project's long-term tax and economic benefits compared with alternative uses of the property.

I also ask that the Board consider whether the proposed land could attract industries that would create far more permanent jobs per acre while placing fewer demands on our electrical system and other public resources.

Fort Pierce should welcome economic development—but we should demand smart economic development.

We should not measure success by the size of the investment or the size of the buildings.

We should measure success by whether ordinary Fort Pierce residents are better off because of

the development.

More good-paying jobs.

Lower—not higher—household costs.

A stronger local economy.

Responsible use of our resources.

And a community where residents have a meaningful voice in decisions that affect their future.

I respectfully urge the Planning and Zoning Board to reject the proposed rezoning for Project Neptune, or at minimum postpone any recommendation until these critical questions have been independently answered and made available to the public.

Fort Pierce deserves development that works for its residents, not development that asks residents to bear the risks and costs while the benefits flow elsewhere.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to our community.

Sincerely

Michelle Herrera.

From: [LINDA MUENCH](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Data center
Date: Wednesday, September 16, 2026 3:23:25 PM

City of Fort Pierce

Warning: Sender [REDACTED] is not yet trusted by your organization.
Please be careful before replying or clicking on the URLs.

[This is UNSAFE: Report](#)

[This is SPAM: Block](#)

[This is SAFE](#)

powered by Graphus®

[REDACTED] If you received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at [aboutSenderIdentification](#)]

SECURITY WARNING: This email has been generated from external sources and is not affiliated with the City of Fort Pierce systems. Exercise caution while clicking on links or opening attachments. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out to the IT department promptly.

To whom it may concern:

Would like to voice my opinion that a data center is not needed or wanted on midway rd. To close to homes and farm land.
Please not in our neighborhood
Linda Muench
Sent from my iPad

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Unfortunately I will not be able to attend the meeting 9/17/2026 at 2:00pm but I want to have a voice in the zoning proposed for Midway Rd.

I am writing to strongly urge you **to vote against** the proposed zoning changes for West Midway Rd, potential site for a data center. Data centers can have a substantial negative, long-term impact on the nearby residential communities. Impacts such as water consumption, noise, stormwater, the environment and electricity. Not to mention the volume of construction traffic on our already packed roadways. As a resident in the area, I'm greatly concerned about our property values in the area if a data center would be built.

We are already experiencing continued growth and demand for our water resources. Do we know what the data center's daily and annual consumption of water would be? Can our water supply hand the additional water supply required by a data center? Would the data center be forced to use reclaimed water? I believe we should all know the impact on our water supply.

I'm concerned about the amount of electricity required to operate a data center. Who will be responsible for any infrastructure required to provide electricity to this data center? Someone needs to take on the cost of supplying electricity such as additional substations, transmission improvements, roads deemed necessary to supply that electricity. These costs should not be pushed back to taxpayers. Can our power grid even handle such an enormous amount of electricity required for a data center?

Noise from data centers is a nuisance for surrounding residential areas. There will be a constant hum coming from the data center to cool

equipment, fans, chillers, generators and other mechanical equipment that operate 24/7.

I personally know a family who resides near a data center. The family is in distress every day from the broken promises that the data center made before it was constructed. The construction noise, the large amount of construction traffic volume was just the beginning. The data center has a constant hum from the equipment, which causes the family not to be able to even enjoy their property any longer. Their water has been impacted as well. Worst part, their property value has significantly dropped in value. The data center has made their lives a nightmare. I can guarantee you will not find one resident who resides near a data center that would testify what a great addition the data center is to their community.

Please do not do this to the residences in St Lucie County. I'm calling on the commissioners to please vote NO to zone Midway Rd. for a data center.

Thank you for your time,

Laura Esworthy



Port St Lucie FL