

Data Center Briefing

March 23, 2026

Global

Key themes:

Greg Landsman bills to force “full cost” data centre infrastructure in Ohio; Prologis buys ~140–144 acres in Trenton amid data centre debate; Proposed bans on NDAs for elected officials in data centre deals; Ohio community concerns over electricity load and cooling water use

Ohio is getting a little less “open for business” on data centres — at least politically. [U.S. Rep. Greg Landsman’s two-bill package](#) would push operators to cover the full cost of energy and infrastructure, require environmental impact studies, and even bar NDAs that keep elected officials from talking openly about projects. Add in local anxiety about power and water for cooling, and you’ve got a familiar flashpoint that’s starting to harden into draft policy.

The Big Stories

Landsman’s proposals go straight at the industry’s most sensitive pressure points: who pays for grid upgrades, and how much the public gets to see while projects are being negotiated. The bills would require data centres to pay the full cost of their energy and infrastructure, mandate environmental impact studies, and ban NDAs for elected officials — a direct response to the perception that deals are being stitched up behind closed doors.

That backdrop matters because it’s arriving alongside real, physical land moves. At a community discussion, local leaders and industry representatives pointed to Prologis’ purchase of roughly 140–144 acres in Trenton, while residents focused on electricity demand and water use for cooling. The signal here isn’t just “another community meeting”: it’s a shift from ad hoc backlash to an attempt to set rules that could change project economics and timelines.

Behind the Headlines

Cost-allocation fights are no longer abstract regulatory debate; they're becoming a local political identity issue. Once the conversation turns to "full cost" recovery, it stops being about whether data centres are welcome and starts being about whether they're being subsidised — explicitly or implicitly — through rate design and infrastructure planning. That's when you see politicians try to lock in principles (who pays, who benefits) before the next wave of proposals hits.

The NDA angle is particularly telling. When officials can't discuss negotiated terms, developers get smoother execution — but they also inherit a credibility problem when residents feel surprised or sidelined. If bans on NDAs for elected officials spread, the industry may have to adapt its playbook: assume more public scrutiny earlier, and expect commercial terms (incentives, infrastructure commitments) to be debated in the open.

Cooling and water concerns are also doing quiet work here. Even when a project's power story dominates headlines, water use is often what local audiences latch onto because it feels tangible and immediate. In practice, that can pull permitting and environmental review into the critical path, making "standard" delivery schedules less reliable in jurisdictions where community trust is already thin.