



EAST TEXAS EMERGING INFRASTRUCTURE RAPID RESPONSE TEAM
WORK SESSION # 2

Date: Thursday August 20, 2026

Time: 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Location:

East Texas Council of Governments (ETCOG)

3800 Stone Road

Kilgore, Texas 75662 & <https://v.ringcentral.com/join/490656133>

Team Chairman: Anderson County Judge Carey McKinney

Team Vice Chairman: Van Zandt County Judge Andy Reese

MEETING AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Welcome and Introductions
3. Review and approve July 15 meeting Executive & Key Points Summary
 - a. Reference Executive Summary, Enclosure No. 1
4. Presentation and discussion from the Honorable County Judge Keith Lutz of Medina County, Texas. **Topic: Data Center Successes**
 - a. Reference Judge Keith Lutz's biography, Enclosure No. 2
5. Review & Discuss Executive Summary of HB 500 from the 89th Texas Legislative Session.
 - a. Reference Executive Summary, Enclosure No. 3
6. Review & Discuss Additional Legislation
 - a. Meeting Handout

7. Review & Discuss Rough Draft Outline of Rapid Response Team Action Plan
 - a. Reference Action Plan Outline, Enclosure # 4
8. Discussion and possible action to schedule the next team meeting date, time and location
9. Adjournment

Enclosure 1

Executive Summary — East Texas Emerging Infrastructure Rapid Response Team Work Session

Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2026

Time: 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

Location: Tyler Workforce Center, 1421 S. Beckham Avenue, Tyler, Texas

Meeting Purpose: First work session of the East Texas Emerging Infrastructure Rapid Response Team, focused on large-scale infrastructure and energy development impacts in rural East Texas, including data centers, solar farms, transmission lines, battery energy storage systems, and related projects. The meeting agenda identified ten items, beginning with call to order and introductions and concluding with next steps, scheduling, and adjournment. Rapid Response Team Meeting 1 Agenda.pdf

1. Call to Order

The meeting was opened by ETCOG Executive Director David Cleveland, who coordinated the initial agenda items until the selection of a Team Chair and Vice Chair. He noted that the meeting enjoyed a strong quorum.

This meeting served as a “startup” meeting for the Rapid Response Team, with the draft Team Charter serving as the primary enclosure and foundational document for discussion.

2. Welcome and Introductions

Participants around the table introduced themselves and identified their counties, organizations, and roles. Those include the following Rapid Response Team members:

Judge Carey McKinney, Anderson County
Judge A.J. Mason, Camp County
Judge Bill Stoudt, Gregg County
Judge Chad Sims, Harrison County
Chad Ellis, Harrison Consultant & Rancher
Judge Wade McKinney, Henderson County
Commissioner Wendy Spivey, Henderson County
Commissioner Bennie Whitworth, Rusk County
Judge Neal Franklin, Smith County
Judge Andy Reese, Van Zandt County

Judge Kevin White, Wood County

ETCOG staff and others attending include:

David Cleveland, ETCOG Executive Director
David Scott, ETCOG Special Projects Director
Anderew Harmon, Temple Foundation
Lindsay Vanderbilt, ETCOG Communications Director
Doug Shryock, ETCOG Director of Workforce & Economic Development
Dylan Savage, ETCOG IT Systems Administrator
Glenda Fort, ETCOG Executive Assistant
Brandy Brannon, ETCOG Assistant Executive Director, online

Sarah Schlessinger, Chief Executive Officer of the Texas Water Foundation, joined virtually from Austin to present on data center and water issues in rural Texas.

3. Selection of Team Chair and Vice Chair

The agenda called for consideration and possible action to select a Team Chair and Vice Chair to facilitate future meetings. Rapid Response Team Meeting 1 Agenda.pdf

After discussion, the group nominated and selected **Judge Carey McKinney** to serve as Chair of the Rapid Response Team. The motion was made, seconded, and approved by voice vote. Judge McKinney accepted the role and noted that the team's work would be a learning experience for all involved.

The group then moved to the selection of a Vice Chair. **Judge Reese** was nominated and appointed Vice Chair, with the motion and second approved by the group.

Summary of action taken:

- Judge Carey McKinney was selected as Team Chair.
- Judge Reese was selected as Team Vice Chair.
- Leadership roles were framed as elected-official leadership positions to guide the team's work and facilitate future meetings.

4. Review of Agenda

The agenda was reviewed without changes. David Cleveland clarified the distinction between Agenda Item 5 and Agenda Item 7, since both involved the draft Team Charter.

- **Item 5** was intended as an initial review of the team’s purpose and the draft charter before the guest presentation.
- **Item 7** was intended for more detailed discussion, possible modification, and finalization of the draft Team Charter.
- **Item 8** was included to ensure the team took action on next steps before leaving the meeting.
- **Item 9** was included to schedule the next meeting date and location.

This sequencing was intended to orient the team, hear from the invited subject matter expert, then return to the charter and next steps with better context.

5. Discussion Regarding the Team’s Purpose and Draft Team Charter

The team reviewed the draft **Emerging Infrastructure Rapid Response Team Charter**, which defined the purpose of the team as helping affected East Texas communities respond effectively to the growing impacts of large-scale infrastructure and energy development in rural areas. The charter specifically listed data centers, solar farms, transmission lines, battery energy storage systems, and similar projects. Rapid Response Team Meeting 1 Agenda.pdf

The draft charter stated that the team would help define challenges at the county and regional levels, develop coordinated and practical strategies, identify issues, evaluate impacts, and recommend strategies that protect citizens, preserve community interests, and promote responsible, sustainable growth across the region. Rapid Response Team Meeting 1 Agenda.pdf

Guiding Principles Discussed

The charter’s guiding principles emphasized that the team should:

- Work cooperatively across counties, communities, and jurisdictions.
- Ensure local officials, residents, and affected communities inform recommendations.

- Prioritize health, safety, welfare, property, natural resources, and quality of life.
- Support practical and sustainable growth that respects local land use, infrastructure capacity, and community character.
- Act early, stay informed, and respond quickly to emerging projects and policies.
- Use reliable data, subject matter expertise, community input, and sound analysis.
- Promote clear and consistent communication.
- Engage state leaders, agencies, developers, utilities, and stakeholders professionally.
- Focus on actionable strategies that can realistically be implemented.
- Recognize the differing needs and vulnerabilities of rural and under-resourced jurisdictions. Rapid Response Team Meeting 1 Agenda.pdf

Tasks and Goals

The Team Charter also identified goals and tasks for the team. The goals included defining and prioritizing issues associated with large-scale infrastructure and energy development, evaluating impacts on rural communities and public infrastructure, facilitating regional coordination, developing sustainable strategies, advocating local and regional interests, providing timely information to support decision-making, and monitoring emerging projects and policy developments. Rapid Response Team Meeting 1 Agenda.pdf

The listed tasks included gathering community concerns, defining county and regional issue scope, reviewing existing and proposed projects, identifying gaps in policy and local response capacity, researching relevant laws and permitting processes, developing response strategies and policy recommendations, coordinating with officials and subject matter experts, and preparing briefing materials for state leaders and other stakeholders. Rapid Response Team Meeting 1 Agenda.pdf

6. Presentation and Discussion — Sarah Schlessinger, Texas Water Foundation

Sarah Schlessinger, Chief Executive Officer of the Texas Water Foundation, presented on the status of data center and water issues in rural Texas. Her remarks are summarized in detail in the final section of this document, but several themes informed the broader meeting discussion.

Core Themes from the Presentation

Sarah emphasized that Texas is facing increasing long-term water risk, including insufficient projected water supply, aging built infrastructure, fragile aquifers and rivers, water workforce challenges, and a growing need for conservation, efficiency, reuse, data, funding, and leadership.

She explained that water has become a major statewide priority following recent legislative and voter action, including Proposition 4 and the Texas Water Fund, but she also emphasized that the state still faces nearly \$300 billion in water infrastructure needs.

Her data center discussion focused on the speed and volume of data centers entering Texas, the state's open business climate, low regulatory environment, energy portfolio, and the increasing concern over water consumption, energy consumption, groundwater management, infrastructure funding, and local permitting tools.

Sarah also stressed that data center impacts should be evaluated through both **direct water use** and **indirect water use**. Direct use is largely tied to on-site cooling, while indirect use comes from water consumed in generating the energy needed to power the facility. She explained that closed-loop cooling may reduce on-site water use but can increase energy demand, shifting water impacts into the energy supply chain.

Policy Discussion

Sarah identified several likely future policy discussions:

- Data reporting requirements for data centers.
- How to handle nondisclosure and competitive secrecy concerns.
- Possible requirements on water source selection or site-selection practices.
- Infrastructure planning processes and timelines.
- Opportunities for data centers to participate in funding the water infrastructure needed.
- Better coordination of water and energy planning at the state level.

She encouraged communities to ask practical questions about what water and energy sources a project will use, whether fresh groundwater will be used, whether reuse or other water sources are possible, where siting would reduce community or environmental impact, and how new projects could help meet local infrastructure needs.

7. Discussion, Consideration, and Possible Action to Finalize the Draft Team Charter

Following Sarah's presentation and group discussion, the team returned to the draft Team Charter. David Cleveland reminded the group that the charter was intended to be a working framework and could be amended in the future if needed.

The group discussed the importance of keeping the team focused but broad enough to address more than data centers alone. The issues identified included data centers, water demand, power demand, solar farms, battery storage, transmission lines, gas-fired generation, construction impacts, and related local infrastructure pressures.

Charter Timeframe and Deliverable

A key point discussed was the charter's timeline. The group acknowledged that December would arrive quickly and that legislative timing made it important to begin developing recommendations promptly. It was decided that the team would focus on completing a Regional Action Plan by **December 15, 2026**, giving the team a defined window to prepare practical recommendations and potential legislative priorities.

Direction to Staff

ETCOG staff were identified as support resources for the team. David Cleveland explained that staff could conduct research, gather information, work with Sarah and other experts, and assist in developing a rough action plan.

The group specifically discussed the need for research into water infrastructure funding availability and eligible uses, including whether ETCOG or other political subdivisions could apply for funds to address regional needs.

8. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Next Steps

The next-steps discussion became one of the most substantive parts of the meeting. The group identified several immediate and longer-term work areas.

A. Research Water Funding Opportunities

David Cleveland highlighted that state water funding appeared to include a substantial list of eligible projects and that political subdivisions may be eligible to apply. He suggested that staff could research funding availability, eligible uses, and whether ETCOG could apply or support applications on behalf of affected communities.

This was viewed as an important near-term assignment because water funding and legislative timelines are moving quickly.

B. Build a Local and Regional Data Set

The group discussed the need for better information and stronger data to support policy development, public communication, and local decision-making. This included data related to water use, energy demand, groundwater impacts, wastewater discharge, roads, law enforcement, housing, tax-base implications, and other infrastructure effects.

One participant raised the idea of using AI tools to help develop a better data set, while staff were directed more broadly to begin gathering relevant information, best practices, and examples.

C. Identify Best Practices and Success Stories

The team discussed the importance of learning from counties that have already dealt with data centers and other large-scale infrastructure projects. Staff were asked to identify success stories and best practices rather than focusing only on speculative legislative proposals or untested approaches.

Specific areas of interest included:

- How counties negotiated with developers.
- How communities communicated with residents.
- How counties addressed construction impacts.
- How projects handled tax abatements or agreements.
- How local governments managed roads, housing, public safety, and infrastructure pressure.
- What practices should be avoided.
- Judge Chad Sims recommended the team hear from Medina County Judge Keith Lutz regarding his experiences and success addressing the data center issue. In response, the team asked staff to reach out to Judge Lutz to see if he would meet with the team at the next scheduled meeting.

D. Two-Pronged Strategy: Local Tools and Legislative Options

The group discussed a two-pronged approach:

1. **Local-level actions** that counties and communities can take under existing authority.

2. **Legislative recommendations** that may be needed to provide counties with better tools to manage high-impact development in unincorporated areas.

This approach was considered important because counties have limited land-use and regulatory authority under current Texas law. Participants noted that counties may need better tools to respond to projects that generate major impacts but are located outside city limits.

E. Engage State Legislators Early

Several participants emphasized that legislative timing is critical. The group discussed the possibility of inviting legislators to participate virtually or otherwise engage with the team before the end-of-year legislative rush.

The conclusion of the discussion was if the team wants to pursue legislative action, work needs to begin quickly so that priorities are developed before legislators are overwhelmed by other session demands.

F. Address Construction-Phase Impacts

A major theme was that impacts begin well before permanent tax revenue or long-term economic benefits materialize. Participants discussed examples from small West Texas counties where thousands of temporary construction workers arrived in communities with very limited law enforcement, housing, roads, and retail capacity.

Concerns included:

- Heavy truck traffic and road damage.
- Law enforcement strain.
- Lack of housing and apartments.
- RV park overflow and informal RV placement.
- Pressure on local services.
- Short-term sales tax spikes that do not necessarily offset county costs.
- Projects that may not generate the expected county tax base.

G. Improve Public Communication

The group emphasized that proactive communication is essential. One example involved project representatives hosting monthly community dinners and providing updates so residents could ask questions and raise concerns directly. Another example involved

convening a Commissioners Court meeting so commissioners and the public could hear information directly from project representatives.

Participants viewed this as a practical way to reduce misinformation, address concerns before they escalate on social media, and help residents understand what counties can and cannot regulate.

H. Consider Developer Contributions and Tax Abatement Issues

The group discussed whether large companies should receive abatements or be expected to carry their own weight, especially when projects create substantial infrastructure impacts. An example was discussed where a company reportedly dropped an abatement request after local concerns were raised.

The discussion reflected a growing sentiment that counties should evaluate carefully whether incentives are appropriate when large-scale projects create immediate demands on public infrastructure and services.

9. Discussion and Possible Action to Schedule the Next Meeting

Team participants discussed avoiding Monday and Tuesday Team meetings because of Commissioners Court schedules in several counties.

ETCOG staff were directed to issue a Doodle Poll to schedule the next meeting and to attempt to secure Judge Lutz's participation.

10. Adjournment

The meeting concluded after discussion of next steps and scheduling. The overall outcomes were that the Rapid Response Team was formally organized, leadership was selected, the charter framework was reviewed, key issue areas were identified, and ETCOG staff were directed to begin background research and action-plan development.

Overall Meeting Themes for Elected Officials

1. The issue is broader than data centers.

While data centers were a major focus, the Rapid Response Team is intended to address the wider category of large-scale infrastructure and energy development in rural East Texas, including solar farms, transmission lines, battery storage, power generation, and related infrastructure. Rapid Response Team Meeting 1 Agenda.pdf

2. Water is a central concern, but not the only concern.

Water supply, groundwater management, wastewater, and water infrastructure funding were central to the discussion, but participants also emphasized roads, law enforcement, housing, emergency response, tax base, public communication, and construction workforce impacts.

3. Rural counties face a capacity mismatch.

Large projects may move faster than county planning capacity, regulatory authority, infrastructure capacity, and community communication systems can handle. This is particularly important for small and rural jurisdictions with limited staff and limited fiscal capacity.

4. Counties need practical tools now.

The team discussed the need for immediate best practices that counties can apply under current law, including communication strategies, negotiation approaches, infrastructure impact assessment, developer engagement, and public-meeting models.

5. Legislative options may be necessary.

Participants recognized that counties may need additional statutory authority or state-level policy changes to respond effectively to large-scale projects in unincorporated areas. Legislative engagement was viewed as time-sensitive.

6. ETCOG staff will support research and action-plan development.

ETCOG staff were asked to help gather data, identify funding sources, collect best practices, coordinate with experts, and begin developing a rough plan of action before the next meeting.

Key Points from Sarah Schlessinger, Texas Water Foundation

Statewide Water Context

- Texas is facing increasing water risk and does not have enough projected supply to meet long-term demand for people, industry, the environment, and infrastructure.
- Texas' built water infrastructure — including systems to pump, treat, transport, and store water — is aging and fragile.
- Natural water infrastructure, including aquifers and rivers, is also under stress, with aquifer depletion and declining reliability of some water sources.
- The water-sector workforce is aging and difficult to retain, creating additional challenges for utilities and communities.
- The State Water Plan anticipates that roughly half of Texas' future water supply will need to come from conservation, efficiency, and reuse. Sarah emphasized that this means Texas must use less water or use water differently.
- Texas needs better water data, more funding, and strong leadership at the local, regional, and statewide levels.

Water Funding and Proposition 4

- Sarah described Texas as entering a new era in which water is a statewide policy priority.
- She explained that Proposition 4 created a dedicated funding mechanism through the Texas Water Fund, allowing up to \$1 billion per year from existing sales tax revenue for water infrastructure over 20 years.
- Although this was described as a historic and generational investment, Sarah cautioned that Texas still has nearly \$300 billion in identified water infrastructure needs.

Why Data Centers Are Driving Concern

- Sarah said the current concern is driven by the **speed, volume, and density** of data centers entering Texas.
- Texas is attractive to data centers because of its open business climate, incentives, growing economy, low regulatory environment, and diverse energy portfolio.

- Data center discussions are increasingly focused on water consumption, energy consumption, groundwater management, infrastructure funding, and what permitting or regulatory tools are available to local decision-makers.

Direct and Indirect Water Use

- Sarah distinguished between **direct water use** and **indirect water use**.
- Direct water use generally refers to water used on site, especially for cooling.
- Indirect water use refers to water consumed in generating the energy used by the facility.
- Closed-loop cooling can reduce on-site water use, but it may increase energy demand, which can shift water impacts into the energy supply chain.
- Sarah emphasized that the energy source matters because the type of power generation affects the facility's true water footprint. Natural gas has a higher water-consumption impact than wind or solar.

Water-Stressed Siting Concerns

- Data center growth is occurring in water-stressed areas because water demand is often secondary to other site-selection factors, such as energy cost, land cost, and proximity to broadband infrastructure.
- Sarah cautioned that local impacts can be significant even if statewide percentages appear modest.

Data and Reporting Gaps

- Data on data center water consumption is not currently reported consistently or comprehensively across government entities.
- Voluntary water-use reporting has had limited participation, making it harder for local and state leaders to understand true impacts.
- Sarah expects future policy conversations to include stronger data reporting requirements, including how to address nondisclosure agreements and competitive confidentiality issues.

Policy Issues to Watch

Sarah identified several potential policy areas likely to receive attention:

- Data center water-use reporting requirements.

- Water source and site-selection requirements.
- Prioritization of reuse or alternatives to fresh groundwater.
- Infrastructure planning and permitting timelines.
- Data center participation in funding water infrastructure.
- Coordination of water planning and energy planning.

Practical Questions for Counties and Communities

Sarah encouraged local leaders to ask:

- What water source will the project use?
- Will it rely on fresh groundwater, reuse, brackish water, surface water, or another source?
- What energy source will power the project?
- Will the facility use closed-loop cooling?
- What are the direct and indirect water impacts?
- Where can the project be sited to reduce community and environmental impacts?
- What infrastructure needs does the community already have?
- Can the project help fund infrastructure that improves local resilience?

Bottom Line from Sarah Schlessinger

Sarah's central message was that data centers and other large water- and energy-intensive industries create both risk and opportunity for rural communities. The risk is that projects may strain water supplies, energy systems, infrastructure, and local governance capacity faster than traditional planning can respond. The opportunity is that counties and communities can use development interest to negotiate for better siting, alternative water use, infrastructure investment, improved data reporting, and stronger long-term resilience.

Enclosure 2

Judge Keith Lutz

Judge Keith Lutz was born in Castroville, Texas, and is a lifelong resident of Medina County. He graduated from Hondo High School in 1984 before embarking on a 24-year career in the automobile industry.

Alongside his twenty-four-year professional career in the automotive business, Judge Lutz also dedicated himself to public service. For many years, he served as a volunteer firefighter and as a volunteer EMT. At just 20 years old, he was elected to the Hondo City Council, where he served multiple terms, helping to shape the future of his hometown. Judge Lutz has also been a member of multiple boards and organizations in Medina County.

In 2012, Judge Lutz transitioned into emergency management, accepting the role of Medina County Emergency Management Coordinator and Fire Marshal. He served under two county judges in this capacity until his election as Medina County Judge in January 2023.

Judge Lutz has been married to his wife, Marla, for 40 years. They have two daughters and six grandchildren.

Enclosure 3

Executive Summary- HB 500 89th Texas Legislative Session

Local Strategy	Best-Fit Funding Tools	How Local Officials Should Use Them
Water supply expansion and drought resilience	House Bill 500 Water Supply and Infrastructure Grants; State Water Implementation Fund for Texas; Texas Water Development Fund; United States Department of Agriculture Rural Development Water and Environmental Programs	Prioritize projects tied to State and Regional Water Plans, water loss reduction, drought resilience, and long-term growth needs.
Wastewater capacity and compliance	Texas Water Development Fund; Clean Water State Revolving Fund; Rural Water Assistance Fund; Economically Distressed Areas Program; Texas Department of Agriculture Community Development Fund; United States Department of Agriculture Rural Development Water and Environmental Programs	Document compliance risk, capacity limits, public health concerns, environmental benefits, and ratepayer impact.
Small-system sustainability	Asset Management Program for Small Systems; Water Utilities Technical Assistance Program; Rural Water Assistance Fund; Communities Unlimited Revolving Loan Fund; United States Department of Agriculture Rural Development Water and Environmental Programs	Use technical assistance first to create asset management plans, rate studies, utility records, and fundable project scopes.
Regionalization and shared infrastructure	State Water Implementation Fund for Texas; State Participation Program; Rural Water Assistance Fund; Texas Water Development Fund; United States Department of Agriculture Rural Development Water and Environmental Programs	Build multi-jurisdictional projects that reduce duplication, improve long-term operations, and support responsible growth corridors.
Data center and high-load development review	Local developer agreements; State Participation Program; Texas Water Development Fund; State Water Implementation Fund for Texas, where water supply is involved	Require developer-funded impact studies and use public financing only where there is a clear public benefit beyond the private project.
Water loss and system replacement	House Bill 500 Water Supply and Infrastructure Grants; Asset Management Program for Small Systems; Drinking Water State Revolving Fund; Rural Water Assistance Fund	Prioritize systems with validated water loss, aging infrastructure, reliability issues, and documented public health or service risks.
Planning, engineering, and grant readiness	Water Utilities Technical Assistance Program; Asset Management Program for Small Systems; Texas Department of Agriculture planning support; United States Department of Agriculture Rural Development predevelopment support, where available	Move communities from identified need to application-ready projects with engineering, financial, asset, and compliance documentation.

Local Strategy	Best-Fit Funding Tools	How Local Officials Should Use Them
Economically distressed or inadequate residential service	Economically Distressed Areas Program; Texas Department of Agriculture Community Development Fund; United States Department of Agriculture Rural Development Water and Environmental Programs	Address baseline public health and service gaps before expanding development or approving growth that could further strain systems.
Emergency water or wastewater failure	Texas Department of Agriculture State Urgent Need Fund; Communities Unlimited Revolving Loan Fund; applicable Texas Water Development Board or United States Department of Agriculture emergency assistance pathways	Document imminent threat to life or public health and pursue rapid-response funding while planning longer-term system resilience.

Enclosure 4

East Texas Infrastructure Readiness Strategy

Purpose

Develop a regional action plan that allows East Texas communities to welcome economic development, including data centers and other high-impact projects, while protecting local water, wastewater, electric, road, drainage, emergency response, and fiscal capacity.

The strategy should advance two parallel tracks:

1. **Local-Level Actions** — steps counties, cities, utilities, and regional partners can take now using existing authority.
2. **Legislative Recommendations** — policy changes, funding tools, and state guidance needed to better support rural and small jurisdictions.

This two-pronged action plan is consistent with the framework already identified for emerging infrastructure issues, including local tools and legislative options for managing high-impact development in unincorporated areas Rapid Response Emerging Infrastructure planning

Local-Level Actions

1. **Organize Regional Coordination**
2. **Build a Regional Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Inventory**
3. **Tie Utility Capacity to Growth and Land-Use Decisions**
4. **Establish a Data Center Readiness Framework**
5. **Require Infrastructure Impact Assessments for High-Impact Projects**
6. **Align Incentives with Community Benefits and Infrastructure Protection**
7. **Promote Low-Water and Resilient Design**

Legislative Recommendations

1. **Create Flexible Funding for Planning, Engineering, and Predevelopment**
2. **Support Rural Set-Asides and Match Flexibility**
3. **Fund Regional Infrastructure Coordination**
4. **Align State Infrastructure Funding with Responsible Growth**

5. Establish State Guidance for Data Center Infrastructure Impacts

6. Support Water-Conscious Economic Development

7. Use Budget Riders, Agency Direction, and Pilot Programs

8. Provide counties with appropriate land-use planning authority in order ensure responsible data center growth that aligns with regional resource management objectives