SP:PUBLIC

Project Phoenix — Project Overview and Key Participants

Monthly BD Intelligence Report · Inaugural baseline · October 2026

Published: October 8, 2026 · **Prepared by:** Salience Path

Evidence cutoff: October 8, 2026. Phoenix state-permit statuses are the October 7 snapshot; selected company statements and power reporting were checked October 8. SPS coverage is limited and does not constitute a complete generation-permit inventory. The September 21 council action outcome remains unverified in this baseline.

Introduction

Salience Path develops AI-assisted research workflows that help industrial clients identify and qualify projects relevant to their businesses. This report establishes the baseline for a proposed monthly series following Aligned Data Centers' Project Phoenix, an announced 2 GW datacenter campus in Shippingport, Pennsylvania, and the neighboring Shippingport Power Station redevelopment at Shippingport Industrial Park.[1][9]

The series will track the two developments separately. Phoenix is Aligned's announced three-facility datacenter campus. Shippingport Power Station is Frontier's proposed redevelopment of the former coal-fired generating plant. Their proximity does not establish a common construction programme or an executed power-supply agreement.[1][9]

The September owner-announced groundbreaking makes Phoenix a useful starting point for following a project from site development toward operation.[1] Later editions will compare new evidence against this baseline: revised plans, approval decisions, construction progress and power-delivery arrangements. Announced completion targets remain projections, not assured dates.

This introductory report covers who is involved, what the public record supports and what remains unresolved. It uses Salience Path's BD Intelligence Report format, applied here to a focused project case rather than a wider opportunity portfolio. The demonstration is independent; it does not imply an Aligned commission or affiliation with any participant. Commercial implications use an illustrative industrial delivery and commissioning contractor's perspective, not an actual customer's requirements. Historical milestones are reconstructed from dated documents rather than presented as events monitored by Salience Path at the time.

Executive intelligence read

Phoenix has named construction participants and documented development activity. Its onsite power pathway is now reported more specifically, but delivery readiness remains unconfirmed. Aligned announced groundbreaking on September 10 and named Holder Construction and Kokosing as participants.[1]

A September 15 Stocktwits article, syndicated by Yahoo Finance, names Bloom Energy as the supplier of natural-gas-fed fuel cells for Phoenix. It reports RBC commentary via The Fly; it is secondary reporting, not a direct announcement from Aligned or Bloom.[10]

No Phoenix-specific supplier announcement from Aligned or Bloom was located in the targeted review for this baseline. Bloom therefore appears here as a **reported supplier**. The article does not establish Phoenix-specific contracted capacity, phase sequencing or commissioning dates. In particular, the campus's 2 GW headline must not be treated as a verified 2 GW Bloom order.[10]

Shippingport Power Station is a separate generation redevelopment. Frontier identifies the power-project entity and describes a 2,550 MW coal-to-gas conversion.[9] Those descriptions do not establish a binding supply relationship with Phoenix. The reviewed evidence also does not establish the station's plant-construction award structure or verified first-power date.

The October 7 DEP snapshot lists both Aligned phases as under review with an overall pending permit status, alongside an issued Phase 1 erosion-and-sediment-control authorization.[2][3] That mixed record supports tracking individual approvals, not calling the whole campus fully approved.

Salience Path assessment: Phoenix merits continued monitoring, with named delivery participants and a reported fuel-cell pathway. SPS requires a separate assessment as a proposed generation redevelopment with material execution uncertainty. Neither record establishes an operating facility, secured Phoenix energization or an open outside-service package.

Project at a glance

Project Phoenix: datacenter overview

Project attribute	Supported position	Report limitations
Location	Shippingport Industrial Park, Shippingport, Beaver County, Pennsylvania.[1][2]	Campus location, not a complete parcel or title review.
Owner/developer	Aligned Data Centers is the announcing developer.[1]	Full legal ownership and financing structure are not established.
Construction participant	Holder Construction is named in Aligned's release.[1]	Exact contract, phase allocation and procurement authority are not established.
Construction participant	Kokosing is named in Aligned's release.[1]	The release does not establish a Holder–Kokosing joint venture or either firm's exact work packages.
Consultant	Kimley-Horn presented and submitted local applications on Aligned's behalf.[8]	Planning/application support is documented; a campus-wide design contract is not established.
Announced scale	Aligned describes 2 GW across three facilities and an estimated $10 billion in regional economic investment.[1]	Announced scale and economic estimate, not operating IT load, delivered power or verified funding.
Development phases	DEP separately lists Aligned Data Center – Phase 1 and Phase 2.[2]	These records do not allocate the 2 GW building by building or establish a complete delivery sequence.
Current development evidence	January local motions, August engineering coordination and September owner-announced groundbreaking.[8][4][1]	These are different stages. None alone establishes unrestricted vertical construction or operation.
Reported onsite power	Stocktwits/Yahoo Finance names Bloom Energy as the planned natural-gas-fed fuel-cell supplier.[10]	Secondary reporting; direct company confirmation, allocated capacity and phase-specific delivery remain unestablished.
Tenant and financing	No named tenant or Phoenix-specific financing commitment is established in this report's reviewed evidence.	An evidence gap, not a claim that no tenant or financing exists.

Source: Aligned, PA DEP, Shippingport Borough and Stocktwits/Yahoo Finance, cited by row. Baseline checked October 7; Bloom reporting reviewed October 8. Capacity remains on the issuer's announced basis.

Shippingport Power Station: separate project overview

Project attribute	Supported position	Report limitations
Location	Shippingport Industrial Park, Shippingport, Pennsylvania.[9]	Adjacent industrial-park context does not establish a Phoenix supply contract.
Redevelopment sponsor	Frontier Group of Companies publishes the project overview.[9]	Sponsor account, not independent verification of project financing or delivery readiness.
Project entity	Frontier identifies Shippingport Power Station LLC as project owner/power-generating entity and Shippingport Industrial Park LLC as property owner.[9]	The park ownership statement does not establish ownership of every Aligned campus parcel.
Announced generation	Frontier describes 2,550 firm MW from three existing 850 MW baseload steam turbines in a proposed coal-to-gas conversion.[9]	Proposed future capacity, not operating output, completed interconnection or Phoenix-allocated power.
Delivery position	Frontier publishes a conversion timetable and names engineering/fuel-infrastructure participants.[9]	Plant delivery awards, verified mobilization, financing and commissioning readiness are not established here.

Project attribute	Supported position	Report limitations
Relationship to Phoenix	A future supply relationship remains a question for investigation.	No executed Phoenix-specific agreement has been identified in the reviewed sources; absence of a private contract is not established.

Source: Frontier's Shippingport overview, retrieved October 7. SPS evidence is limited and predominantly sponsor-reported. The Aligned DEP rows below are not an SPS generation-permit inventory.

Key participants and responsibility boundaries

Phoenix participants

Organization	Documented or reported role	Responsibility boundary
Aligned Data Centers	Campus developer and announcing company.[1]	Exact legal ownership, tenant commitments and phase delivery obligations need further evidence.
Holder Construction	Named construction participant in Aligned's release.[1]	Exact contract scope and authority to award specialist work are not established.
Kokosing	Named project partner in Aligned's release.[1]	The precise subsidiary, EPC role and phase allocation are not established by this release.
Kimley-Horn	Local grading and conditional-use application support on Aligned's behalf.[8]	The reviewed minutes establish application involvement, not all campus engineering responsibilities.
Bloom Energy	Reported natural-gas-fed fuel-cell supplier in Stocktwits/Yahoo Finance.[10]	Secondary-source identification; Phoenix-specific contractual role, supplied MW and delivery timetable remain unconfirmed.

Source: Aligned release, January tentative minutes and September 15 Stocktwits/Yahoo Finance reporting; reviewed October 7–8. Reported supplier status is deliberately distinct from direct company confirmation.

SPS and industrial-park participants

Organization	Sponsor-described role	Responsibility boundary
Frontier Group of Companies	Redevelopment sponsor; reports acquiring former plant assets in 2022.[9]	Sponsor description, not a complete ownership chart or proof of an Aligned supply arrangement.
Shippingport Industrial Park LLC	Property owner in Frontier's overview.[9]	Park/property role; no assumption about ownership of every Phoenix parcel.
Shippingport Power Station LLC	Project owner/power-generating entity in Frontier's overview.[9]	Project entity identification is not evidence of operating generation or a Phoenix PPA.
Wood Group	Owner's engineer appointed in Frontier's 2024 timeline.[9]	An engineering appointment is not a plant EPC or construction-prime award. Current detailed scope is not independently verified.
National Fuel Gas	Associated with a proposed gas lateral and receiving yard in Frontier's 2026 timeline.[9]	Fuel-infrastructure work does not establish generating-plant construction or Phoenix fuel supply. Exact contracting entity requires verification.
PJM Interconnection	Regional transmission/interconnection context in Frontier's project narrative.[9]	Sponsor-described submissions and targets are not PJM approvals or completed interconnection.

Source: Frontier overview/timeline, retrieved October 7. This is a limited sponsor-reported responsibility map, not independently verified delivery readiness.

Local approval and infrastructure participants

Organization	Reviewed involvement	Responsibility boundary
Shippingport Borough Council	Local motions and agenda items concerning Phoenix development.[8][5]	An agenda is not a vote result; tentative minutes remain identified as tentative.
LSSE	Municipal engineering updates, hydraulic model and revised-plan review.[4]	Local engineering coordination, not campus-wide delivery responsibility.
Veolia	Discussions about the proposed water meter pit.[4]	Coordination does not establish cooling-water capacity or an executed supply agreement.
Pennsylvania DEP	Separate Aligned phase and authorization records.[2][3]	Environmental-permitting evidence, not a complete construction-readiness certificate.

Source: Shippingport tentative minutes/agenda and DEP snapshot, reviewed October 7.

Development history and present position

Phoenix chronology

Event/document date	Recorded milestone	Interpretation
January 28, 2026	Tentative minutes record conditional-use approval and contingent Phase 1 grading approval.[8]	The grading motion does not establish discharge of stormwater, NPDES, conservation-district and bonding/security conditions.
August 4, 2026	Tentative minutes record completed fire-flow hydraulic modeling, revised plans under review and water-meter-pit discussion.[4]	Engineering progress, not final development approval or cooling-water adequacy.
August 18, 2026	Pennsylvania's GRID policy establishes a changed state-permit framework.[6]	Policy context; Phoenix-specific applicability and compliance require separate evidence.
September 10, 2026	Aligned announces groundbreaking, scope, onsite power and construction participants.[1]	Owner-announced milestone, not proof that all authorizations and power infrastructure are complete.
September 15, 2026	Stocktwits/Yahoo Finance names Bloom as Phoenix's fuel-cell supplier.[10]	September secondary reporting, not a newly announced October supplier award.
September 21, 2026	Work-session agenda lists Phase 2 plans, addressing, water analysis and contractor parking.[5]	Decision-path evidence; passage remains unverified in this baseline.
October 7, 2026 check	DEP phase records remain under review/pending, with mixed individual authorization statuses.[2][3]	A dated tracker observation, not a determination that every campus authorization is complete.

Source: dated primary documents and attributed secondary reporting, cited by row. January–September history is retrospective reconstruction; October 7 is a check date.

Phoenix state-permit snapshot

Phase / authorization	October 7 tracker status	Meaning and limitation
Phase 1: air plan approval	Pending	Air approval remains unresolved in this snapshot.[3]
Phase 1: Chapter 102 General NPDES	Issued	Specific erosion-and-sediment-control authorization; not blanket campus approval.[3]
Phase 1: blasting activity	Withdrawn	Withdrawn application record, not evidence of an issued permit being revoked.[3]
Phase 1: Act 537 sewage planning	Not Yet Submitted	Submission is not recorded for this item.[3]

Phase / authorization	October 7 tracker status	Meaning and limitation
Phase 1: storage-tank registration/permitting	Not Yet Submitted	Submission is not recorded for this item.[3]
Phase 2: Chapter 102 major amendment	Pending	Amendment remains unresolved in this snapshot.[3]
Phase 2: water obstruction/encroachment	Pending	Water-related authorization remains unresolved in this snapshot.[3]

Source: PA DEP permit CSV, ProjectIDs 10000014 and 10000068, retrieved October 7, 2026. Recorded statuses are not a legal opinion on all work currently allowed and do not describe SPS permits.

The blasting row lists PermitNumber `4264103`, eFactsAuthID `1580774`, submitted August 19. The record does not establish the withdrawal reason, precise withdrawal date, replacement application or schedule consequence.[3]

Pennsylvania's GRID page distinguishes developers accepting its legally enforceable Consent Order and Agreement from those declining it. It describes continuing review of qualifying applications for agreeing developers, while withholding permit issuance until required local approvals are obtained. Developers declining GRID face a delayed-review pathway; the page says DEP will not begin reviewing applications until required local approvals are secured. The stated process applies to new applications going forward; this report does not determine its application to each Phoenix authorization.[6] Aligned's support for GRID and the Ratepayer Protection Pledge is not a substitute for an executed project-specific Consent Order and Agreement.[1][6]

Power and water: separate delivery questions

Phoenix: reported fuel-cell pathway

The September 15 article states: “Bloom Energy will provide natural gas-fed fuel cell technology to generate power for the campus.” It also reports RBC's favourable assessment of Bloom's participation via The Fly.[10]

The evidence chain matters. This is Stocktwits reporting syndicated by Yahoo Finance, describing analyst commentary, rather than a published project contract or direct company quotation confirming a Phoenix award. Syndication is not independent corroboration. The targeted review did not locate direct Phoenix-specific confirmation from Bloom or Aligned.

Salience Path assessment: Phoenix has a reported onsite fuel-cell pathway, with Bloom named as supplier. Contracted capacity, gas-service arrangements, permitting scope and phase-specific delivery remain unconfirmed in the reviewed evidence. The 2 GW campus announcement cannot establish the size of Bloom's supply commitment or that fuel cells alone will serve every phase.

Earlier local reporting describes initial natural-gas generators as distinct from the broader Frontier conversion and quotes a borough solicitor on possible later supply from the plant.[7] That account does not establish the same configuration as the later fuel-cell report. The sources may concern different dates or configurations; the reviewed record does not reconcile them.

SPS: proposed coal-to-gas redevelopment

Frontier describes conversion of former coal boilers to natural gas, refurbishment of GE steam turbines and balance-of-plant equipment, controls upgrades, gas infrastructure and re-established PJM interconnection.[9] These are SPS sponsor-described works, not Phoenix fuel-cell scope.

SPS plan element	Sponsor-described position	Verification limitation
Generation scale	Overview states 2,550 firm MW using three existing 850 MW turbines; other sections use 2.5+ GW.[9]	Proposed capacity; engineering rating and operating output are not independently verified.
Plant conversion activity	Frontier's 2026 timeline states: “Plant conversion started.”[9]	A sponsor claim under the 2026 timeline, rechecked October 8; the page update date is unknown; plant-specific work packages, progress and mobilization remain independently unverified.
Gas infrastructure	2026 timeline describes a National Fuel Gas 7.2+ mile lateral/receiving yard under construction, targeting November 2026 completion.[9]	Sponsor-reported work and target; not proof of plant mobilization, finished infrastructure or available Phoenix fuel service.

SPS plan element	Sponsor-described position	Verification limitation
Conversion delivery	2028 timeline targets Q4 2028/Q1 2029 delivery of 2.5+ GW.[9]	Developer projection, not a verified commissioning date.
PJM interconnection	Timeline describes a Cycle 1 submission before April 27, 2026 and expected completion in 2029.[9]	Queue record, executed agreement and completed interconnection are not established here.
Planned sales	Page describes future grid exports and eventual support for onsite datacenter demand.[9]	No verified Phoenix allocation, executed Phoenix-specific PPA or first-phase supply commitment.

Source: Frontier's undated project overview/timeline, baseline retrieved October 7; conversion-start wording rechecked October 8. Historical and forward-year entries are a company narrative, not individually verified milestone records.

Frontier's page contains inconsistent capacity wording, including the literal string “2,700GMW delivered end of Q4 28.”[9] This report does not silently correct the unit or use that string as a verified capacity figure. The stated conversion-delivery and interconnection targets also need reconciliation. The page's generation/export figures do not establish a Phoenix power allocation.

Wood's owner's-engineer role does not establish a plant EPC award. Fuel-lateral activity does not establish construction of the generating plant. A single EPC is not essential, but an owner-managed delivery programme would still need identifiable packages, responsible contractors and evidence of plant mobilization.

Salience Path assessment: SPS warrants separate monitoring as an announced generation redevelopment with material execution uncertainty. Its plant delivery structure and completion projections remain insufficiently substantiated in the reviewed evidence. Phoenix may be a prospective future customer, but that is a working hypothesis rather than verified offtake.

Water: useful coordination, limited capacity evidence

Aligned states that each Phoenix facility is engineered to require “zero water for operational cooling,” using a closed-loop system that recycles pure, deionized water.[1] This is the owner's design claim, not independently validated operating performance. It should be distinguished from initial system filling, fire protection and other site water-service needs.

The completed municipal hydraulic model concerned pressure and flow for filling a fire-flow tank. The September agenda proposed approval of LSSE's water analysis and a letter to Frontier/Shippingport Industrial Park.[4][5] Those records do not establish that every water-service requirement has been resolved. They also do not demonstrate a cooling-water constraint contrary to Aligned's stated design. Frontier's statement that utilities are present at the site does not establish adequate contracted service for every proposed use.[9]

Illustrative customer implications

A contractor needs an identifiable scope, responsible buyer and credible timing. The announced campus capacity alone supplies none of those. Phoenix's construction participants offer an initial responsibility map; the reported fuel-cell pathway adds a supplier to investigate without establishing an outside-service requirement.

Intelligence implication	Relevant evidence	Commercial relevance and limit
Retain Phoenix as a development to follow	Named developer/construction participants and local development history.[1][8]	Investigate actual package responsibility; no open specialist package is established.
Keep construction activity separate from commissioning readiness	Mixed phase-permit snapshot and unresolved infrastructure decisions.[3][5]	Mobilization timing depends on authorized scope and phase-specific power; site work alone does not establish readiness.
Investigate the fuel-cell delivery structure	Bloom named in secondary reporting.[10]	Potential power-equipment/integration context, not a verified Bloom order size, procurement authority or service invitation.
Treat SPS as a separate potential opportunity	Frontier's conversion plan and named engineering/fuel participants.[9]	Determine awarded plant packages and execution maturity independently of Phoenix construction. No generation commissioning opportunity is verified.

Intelligence implication	Relevant evidence	Commercial relevance and limit
Do not treat local coordination contacts as package buyers	Municipal water and parking matters.[4][5]	Borough, LSSE and Veolia provide infrastructure context, not presumed commercial award authority.

Source: cited project evidence, reviewed October 7–8; illustrative Salience Path interpretation. This is not a qualified lead, contact list or outreach recommendation. No actual customer's geography, services or existing relationships are assumed.

What subsequent editions should revisit

Watch question	Useful next evidence	Effect on the assessment
What happened to the September 21 Phase 2 proposal?	Council action record, signed approval and conditions.	Distinguish agenda-stage intent from approval.
Which Phoenix authorizations have advanced?	Updated DEP rows and underlying decisions.	Identify the particular authorized scope without upgrading the whole campus by association.
What explains the blasting withdrawal?	Applicant/authority explanation or replacement record.	Distinguish administrative change, redesign and a schedule constraint.
What has Bloom committed to Phoenix?	Direct supplier/owner statement or reliable contract evidence identifying capacity, phases and delivery dates.	Strengthen or revise reported supplier status; establish what the commitment actually covers.
What supports Phoenix first power?	Fuel-service evidence, applicable authorizations, equipment delivery and phase-specific commissioning records.	Test delivery readiness separately from technology selection.
Is SPS progressing as a generating-plant project?	Plant-specific approvals, delivery awards, equipment/refurbishment commitments and mobilization evidence.	Test the sponsor timetable independently of gas-lateral activity and Phoenix works.
Is there an SPS–Phoenix supply relationship?	Named counterparty, executed supply terms, allocated capacity and delivery dates.	Replace the prospective-customer hypothesis with a documented arrangement, if supported.
Are water and grading conditions resolved?	Water decision/service documents and condition-discharge records.	Clarify remaining site/infrastructure constraints.
When does a Phoenix phase become operational?	Energization, commissioning, occupancy and operating evidence tied to that phase.	Upgrade only the supported phase, not the full campus.

Source: questions derived from the cited baseline; Salience Path assessment. These are evidence questions, not promised milestones. Later editions should distinguish no material change found from insufficient coverage to judge stability.

Key Judgments

1. **Phoenix has a documented development history and named construction participants.** Local planning and engineering records add substance to the September groundbreaking announcement.[8][4][1]

2. **The reported power pathway is clearer; secured energization is not established.** Secondary reporting names Bloom and natural-gas-fed fuel cells, but does not establish allocated MW, phase-specific delivery or commissioning readiness.[10]

3. **Phoenix and SPS must remain separate project assessments.** Frontier's proposed conversion is not verified Phoenix supply; its delivery structure and sponsor timetable require their own evidence.[9]

4. **Announced scale is ahead of verified delivery.** The 2 GW campus claim is not operating capacity or a verified Bloom order; the October 7 permit snapshot does not establish whole-campus construction readiness.[1][3][10]

5. **Commercial relevance remains conditional.** Named participants improve responsibility research, but do not establish a service requirement, buyer authority or open package. Future editions should narrow scope and timing before advancing a contractor's pursuit case.

Evidence appendix: source locators

• **[1] Aligned, September 10 release:** opening announcement; “Protecting Energy Affordability”; “Supporting Workforce and Economic Development,” including Holder and Kokosing quotations. Company claims remain attributed.

• **[2] DEP identity CSV:** ProjectID `10000014`, Aligned Data Center – Phase 1; ProjectID `10000068`, Aligned Data Center – Phase 2. The CSV does not itself use “Project Phoenix”; municipal minutes link the name to Aligned's local project.

• **[3] DEP permit CSV:** rows keyed by those ProjectIDs and AuthorizationType. Blasting row: eFactsAuthID `1580774`, PermitNumber `4264103`. Snapshot retrieved October 7.

• **[4] August 4 tentative minutes:** PDF p. 2, LSSE REPORT, hydraulic model, revised plans and meter pit; pp. 3–4, exchange about an earlier gas-plant proposal. Tentative status retained.

• **[5] September 21 work-session agenda:** PDF p. 1, items 3–6: Phase 2 plan, address ordinance, water analysis/Frontier letter and contractor parking. Agenda only.

• **[6] Pennsylvania DCED GRID page:** “Evaluation of Permit Applications” and template Consent Order and Agreement discussion. Policy context, not project-specific compliance proof.

• **[7] TribLive:** “Power plays” section, initial generators and broader conversion distinction attributed to a borough solicitor. Supplementary evidence; reliable publication date was not exposed in the retrieved copy, so it is not used as a current schedule check.

• **[8] January 28 tentative minutes:** PDF p. 2, contingent Phase One grading motion and Phoenix identification; p. 3, conditional-use approval; pp. 4–5, individual modifications.

• **[9] Frontier, Shippingport overview:** SPS Project Overview; property/project entity headings; conversion, gas supply and interconnection sections; 2024, 2026, 2028 and 2029+ timeline. Page publication/update date not established; retrieved October 7. Sponsor claims, not independent approval/completion proof.

• **[10] Stocktwits/Yahoo Finance, Harshita Tyagi, September 15:** opening paragraph on RBC/The Fly; “What is Project Phoenix?” paragraph explicitly naming Bloom and natural-gas-fed fuel cells. Reviewed October 8; secondary reporting, not direct supplier confirmation.

Sources

[1] https://aligneddc.com/press-release/project-phoenix-data-center-shippingport-pa

[2] https://gis.dep.pa.gov/DataCenterPermitTracker/static/DataCenterProjectTrackingAllProjects.csv

[3] https://gis.dep.pa.gov/DataCenterPermitTracker/static/DataCenterPermitTracking.csv

[4] https://shippingportpa.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/09/August-4-2026-Minutes.pdf

[5] https://shippingportpa.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/09/September-21-2026-Work-Session-Agenda.pdf

[6] https://dced.pa.gov/business-assistance/data-center-resources/grid-requirements

[7] https://community.triblive.com/news/3974611

[8] https://shippingportpa.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/January-28-2026-Hearing-and-Opening-Meeting-Minutes.pdf

[9] https://frontier-companies.com/shippingport-industrial-park — Frontier — Shippingport Industrial Park and Shippingport Power Station

[10] https://finance.yahoo.com/energy/articles/bloom-energy-gains-another-meaningful-173525957.html — Stocktwits / Yahoo Finance — Bloom Energy and Project Phoenix, September 15, 2026