

(#1) The data center project needs to be verified as legitimate; in addition to its stated location in Saline Township

Carter, Jon

Findings: An article written by Peter Maxwell at WXYZ - Channel 7 Detroit confirms the construction of the data center taking place in Saline Township.

The article and video accompanying it; discussed the discontent in the township over its construction.

Residents being reported as frustrated with the loud semis rolling through their normally quiet downtown

Article: <https://www.wxyz.com/news/data-centers/saline-residents-demand-relief-from-gravel-truck-traffic-tied-to-michigans-largest-data-center>

Because of the firsthand accounts from residents through their quotes on the matter, and their appearance in the video. I do find this claim to be factual.

(#2) The term "Stargate" needs more clarification... Should verify if the term is related to the data center project

Carter, Jon

Findings: The title of the OpenAI article/press release promoting the project uses 'Starlink.' Furthermore, in the first sentence of they refer to the data center as a "Stargate campus."

Article: <https://openai.com/index/expanding-stargate-to-michigan/>

Conclusion: The term "Stargate" seems to be appropriate given the use of the term to describe the data center by the company.

(#3) Should check that the judge did deny Ms. Haushalter's request to intervene. The month the Washtenaw County judge denied the request should also be verified.

Carter, Jon

Findings: An article published by Planet Detroit the same day as the ruling (February 20, 2026); reported the judge denying the request. The article written by Brian Allnut, quotes the judge as

saying: "The request was untimely, as it was made several months after the consent judgement was signed by the court."

Article: <https://planetdetroit.org/2026/02/judge-denies-data-center-intervention/>

Planet Detroit operates as an independent non-profit focused on public health, environmental and climate issues in the Detroit area; but they also focus on the broader state.

It operates as a "fiscally responsible project" of the Michigan Environmental Council which operates out of Lansing.

Conclusion: I am comfortable with labeling the claim made here as factual because the source in question is backed by a trustful source. The Michigan Environmental Council focuses on "bold environmental actions that protect Michigan's residence and places."

(#4) Two things to check here... Major thing is OpenAI and Oracle's involvement in the project. The next major thing to check here is the project's construction off of W. Michigan Ave. Is the location correct?

Carter, Jon

Findings: In the same WXYZ - Channel 7 article, Peter Maxwell wrote the following: "Hundreds of trucks a day are rolling through downtown Saline along Michigan Avenue, hauling materials to a construction site in Saline Township just a few miles away, where Oracle and OpenAI are building the massive data center."

Article: <https://www.wxyz.com/news/data-centers/saline-residents-demand-relief-from-gravel-truck-traffic-tied-to-michigans-largest-data-center>

In addition to a previous used source affirming the claim made in this article; Oracle and OpenAI both posted articles to their newsroom's sites on the project. They discussed partnerships with local partners like DTE Energy.

Oracle Press Release: <https://www.oracle.com/news/announcement/blog/oracle-is-set-to-power-on-new-data-center-in-michigan-2025-1018/>

OpenAI Press Release: <https://openai.com/index/expanding-stargate-to-michigan/>

Conclusion: I would consider the claims here to be factual information based on previously validated sources. In addition to statements from the two companies (Oracle and OpenAI) themselves.

(#5) This statement needs a bit more clarification... Wouldn't Related Digital own this land solely if they're known as a data center developer? Are the previous property owners who sold the land to Related Digital suing? Are the surrounding property owners who still own their land suing?

Carter, Jon

Finding: The surrounding landowners are NOT suing... The "previous" landowners are/were suing because according to the Data Center Consent Judgement document posted to the Saline Township page; the "Developer does not yet hold title to the property. The landowners had only "entered into purchase agreements to sell the property to developer (p. 3, 25)

PDF link:

<https://salinetownship.org/uploads/notices/SalineDataCenterConsentJudgmentFinalExecutionCopy492124804975v1.pdf>

Conclusion: Because of the presence of a verified legal document explaining this clearly; I believe this is enough to clear up the confusion.

(#6) Is Related Digital primarily a data center developer? Or is that just bad wording?

Carter, Jon

Findings: Related Digital is a subsidiary of Related Companies. Related Companies committed a minimum of \$500M to the new company and proceeded in an \$8B capital raising effort.

Quote taken from Related Digital site:

"We deliver digital infrastructure solutions for artificial intelligence (AI) and cloud hyperscale technology companies so they can significantly grow data center capacity in an accelerated timeframe."

They also invest into developing energy solutions through the affiliate transmission development line and renewable energy business energyRe

Link: <https://www.related.com/press-releases/2025-03-27/related-companies-accelerates-push-data-centers-capitalization-related>

and

<https://www.related-digital.com/>

Conclusion: Related Digital is a real estate developer PRIMARILY. Although they do dabble in renewable energy

(#7) Did these two parties sue the township? Did the township actually settle here? Verify!

Carter, Jon

Findings: The parties did in fact sue as the following legal document describes.

Quote: "The parties to this Consent Judgement have agreed to settle this dispute..." (p. 2)

PDF link:

<https://salinetownship.org/uploads/notices/SalineDataCenterConsentJudgmentFinalExecutionCopy492124804975v1.pdf>

Conclusion: This in a valid statement

(#8) Verify the accuracy of the date Ms. Haushalter filed the motion; which is stated here to be December

Carter, Jon

Findings: An article published by Gia Verma to The Michigan Daily listed Ms. Haushalter as filing the motion specifically on Dec. 13. The article was published three days after the motion on Dec. 16.

Article Link: <https://www.michigandaily.com/news/news-briefs/saline-township-resident-takes-legal-action-to-stop-data-center/>

Court Documents: <https://cryptpad.fr/drive/#/2/drive/view/WQAYOjbQjWdVT-cF0YpkN5RF40Cc85QZtRzwqwNGvAQ/>

Specific page of evidence:

<https://cryptpad.fr/file/#/3/file/a978db2fa2af9deb6ea3485402dc01f5f2ef3aac8ea77ef7/>

(p. 3)

Conclusion: The presence of verifiable court documents is enough for the verification of the date in my opinion.

(#9) Verify the month of October to be the month the Saline Township board agreed to a settlement

Carter, Jon

Findings: A document holding the business of the Saline Township's October 1st special meeting had a motion to settle as the 5th item of business.

This PDF was posted to the township website.

PDF link:

https://salinetownship.org/uploads/minutes/1760634637_Special%20Meeting%20October%201%20%202025%20Minutes.pdf

Conclusion: I believe the recorded business of the township's October 1st meeting is sufficient evidence to verify this claim.

(#10) Verify that Judge Julia Owdziej did give a ruling on the specified date of Feb. 20. In addition to that, verify the statements the author quoted Judge Owdziej as saying to be accurate

Carter, Jon

Findings: According to an article published to WEMU's website (the Eastern Michigan University NPR affiliated station); reporter Kevin Meerschaert restated the ruling as being given on Feb 20.

Article: <https://www.wemu.org/wemu-news/2026-02-20/lawsuit-aimed-at-stopping-saline-township-data-center-rejected-by-washtenaw-county-judge>

There seems to be a lack of accessible court documents on this.

Conclusion: There are numerous credible news organizations reaffirming what this article is claiming here; so I'm comfortable saying this is enough to verify the claim tentatively.

Although I will attempt to seek further direct evidence through county database searches.

(#11) You can never be too sure of anything... So also verify Judge Julia Owdziej is a Washtenaw County Circuit Court judge

Carter, Jon

Findings: Using the same WEMU article from the previous claim; the article is anchored with a landscape image of circuit county judge Juila Owdziej behind her stand.

Article link: <https://www.wemu.org/wemu-news/2026-02-20/lawsuit-aimed-at-stopping-saline-township-data-center-rejected-by-washtenaw-county-judge>

Just to be EXTRA sure, I tried to find biography on the county website. I found multiple biographies including one on the county site.

County Biography: <https://www.washtenaw.org/1445/Honorable-Julia-B-Owdziej>

Ballotpedia: https://ballotpedia.org/Julia_B._Owdziej

Washtenaw County Bar Association: <https://www.washbar.org/members/julia-owdziej/>

Conclusion: Judge Julia Owdziej IS in fact a real Washtenaw County Circuit Court Judge.

(#11) Verify that the date of the final order was indeed March 7

Carter, Jon

Findings: According to the Rural Michigan Defense Fund, a group supporting the legal challenge, they stated the following under their key points from the case:

“As such, Haushalter respectfully requests this court reconsider its February 20, 2026, bench ruling and March 7, 2026, Order for the same, correct the three palpable errors, and grant her Motion to Intervene as a cross-claimant, defendant, or both.”

Link: <https://ruralmiddefense.org/press>

Conclusion: The restated date found on the site of a key group supporting Ms. Haushalter; gives me confidence to verify this claim.

(#12) Attempt to verify that this was a legitimate argument brought up by Ms. Haushalter's legal team.

Carter, Jon

Findings: A previously used news organization (WEMU) said the following:

"Kathryn Haushalter's property is near the ongoing construction site. She claimed township trustees entered a consent of judgement with the developers in secret, violating the Open Meetings Act. Township attorneys say that's false and comes from an error in the meeting minutes."

Conclusion: I find the source to be somewhat sufficient evidence for this claim. Although try to find other more definitive evidence for this.

(#13) Who said this? Was this a court finding?

Carter, Jon

According to the ALEA Institute, the written meeting minutes contained:

"Ambiguities that suggested the vote happened in a closed session."

The township clerk officially stated that the minutes were "a simple clerical error" according to the source.

Video evidence the court used proved the board did in fact return to open session and allowed the public to give their opinion before posting... This video evidence is also posted to The Saline Post news site and Youtube channel.

The ALEA Institute is a advocate organization focused on the advancement of legal and ethical AI. The Saline Post is a local newspaper focused on Saline area reporting

Links: <https://thesalinepost.com/g/saline-mi/n/349208/embattled-saline-township-board-data-center-we-hate-it-too>

<https://aleainstitute.ai/saline-township-foia/>

Conclusion: This was a factual statement that was argued and agreed upon in court

(#14) Direct quote! Attempt to find supporting evidence that this was said

Carter, Jon

Findings: Using ALEA as a source again, the organization had the following statement allegedly from Judge Owdziej:

"There was a public comment period, and the resolution was 'I move to approve the consent judgement that has been outlined by our attorney.' So, to say that happened in hiding or in secret just isn't accurate." Judge Owdziej said.

But the source used here had potential to be bias being in support of "ethical AI." Their view of what "ethical AI" is remains somewhat unknown.

Link: <https://aleainstitute.ai/saline-township-foia/>

(Motion to Intervene — mid-section)

WEMU also reiterated the same quote in the audio news report. However neither has the exact quote as written here in full

Link (WEMU) - <https://www.wemu.org/wemu-news/2026-02-20/lawsuit-aimed-at-stopping-saline-township-data-center-rejected-by-washtenaw-county-judge>

Conclusion - This needs additional verification from a transcript provided by Washtenaw County. Therefore, at this moment this can't be verified.

(#15) Verify this set of claims by Ms. Haushalter's legal team as well

Carter, Jon

Findings: According to the Rural Michigan Defense Fund, which is supporting Ms. Haushalter's legal challenge, her legal team argues she has a "viable" claim that the township violated the Open Meetings Act. They contend the Board of Trustees never took a final, proper vote to authorize the final version of the consent judgment, and that

additional work was done after the board's Oct. 1 vote to approve the consent judgment under terms outlined by township attorneys.

Link: <https://ruralmiddefense.org/press>

Conclusion: That framing, together with the supporting group's posted case summary, gives me confidence that this claim is accurately reported.

(#16) Attempt to verify these quotes and statements that were given by the Saline Township attorney and officials at Related Digital if possible

Carter, Jon

Findings: According to reporting on the Saline Township data center dispute, township officials said the Oct. 1 vote to advance the settlement happened in public, and they attributed any appearance of secrecy to a clerical error in the meeting minutes. Related Digital publicly defended the project as a major economic investment and said it would bring jobs, tax revenue, and community benefits.

Link: <https://www.planetdetroit.org/2025/12/saline-data-center-settlement-challenge/>

Link: <https://www.related-digital.com/news/data-center-developer-defends-saline-twp-hyperscale-project>

Conclusion: The reported statements from township officials and Related Digital give me confidence to verify this claim in substance, but definitive verification would require the reporter's underlying sources or a direct transcript of the quoted remarks.

(#17) Verify the existence of the Rural Defense Fund and that they are in fact helping Mr. Haushalter with her legal fees

Carter, Jon

Findings: here is evidence that the Rural Michigan Defense Fund exists, and that it is publicly sourcing donations to cover Ms. Haushalter's legal fees. This is evidenced by a fundraising page says: "Donate today to support Kathryn Haushalter's legal fees," along with the nonprofit's site stating it's current focus is on the Saline Township data center

Link: https://secure.anedot.com/rural_mi_defense/donate?exitIntent=true

<https://ruralmiddefense.org/#learn-more>

(#18) Verify Ms. Haushalter's argument and dispute about her claims being untimely is possible

Carter, Jon

Findings: According to reporting and the case-summary materials available, Ms.

Haushalter is disputing the finding that her claims were untimely. Her legal team argues the court erred in treating the motion to intervene as late, and they point to a statutory or rule-based 60-day intervention window as the basis for their timeliness argument.

Link: <https://aleainstitute.ai/saline-township-foia/>

<https://thesuntimesnews.com/marine-corp-vet-draws-on-service-experience-in-legal-fight-over-data-center/>

Conclusion: The available reporting supports the existence of that argument, but definitive verification would require the underlying motion, the court's order, and the specific statute or rule the defense fund says provides the 60-day period.

(#19) Verify the judge did in fact cite the aforementioned additional factors as written out by the author. Proceed to verify her consideration on Related Digital if at all possible

Carter, Jon

Findings: The reporting I could verify says the judge denied Ms. Haushalter's intervention motion because it was untimely, and it also says the township and developer argued the case was filed past the 30-day deadline. The same reporting says the developer side pointed to the fact that a \$40 million nonrefundable DTE deposit had already been made, and that there was substantial project work already underway, including equipment orders and contracts.

Link: <https://www.planetdetroit.org/2026/02/judge-denies-data-center-intervention/>

<https://www.wemu.org/wemu-news/2026-02-20/lawsuit-aimed-at-stopping-saline-township-data-center-rejected-by-washtenaw-county-jud>

Conclusion: The reporting supports the judge's untimeliness ruling and the developer's claims about substantial work and the DTE deposit, but definitive verification of the exact "additional factors" language would require the underlying court order or transcript.

