

WORKING REGISTER v0.1

Data Center Maps

A register of what exists, what works, and where it fails. National resources, with Virginia, Georgia and Tennessee.

Tommy Turner · Working register v0.1 · 28 September 2026 ·
doi:10.5281/zenodo.23022831

Companion workbook: DC_Map_Resources_Register_v0_1.xlsx

Contents

What this is.....	3
The short answer.....	4
Where the counts part company.....	6
How a data center map misleads.....	8
Federal layers that stopped.....	9
What no map does.....	10
What a better map would take.....	11
The register.....	13
Virginia.....	14
Georgia.....	25
Tennessee.....	32
National commercial and trade trackers.....	37
National public, NGO, academic and press resources.....	47
Context layers.....	57
The author's own inventories.....	63
Open items and method.....	65
Appendix: Scoring rubric.....	66
Verdict scale.....	67
Evidence rules.....	67

What this is

This register catalogues 146 entries: resources that map, track or inventory data centers (commercial trackers, federal and state datasets, county GIS layers, advocacy maps, press interactives, academic datasets), the context layers researchers lay over them, and places where a map was expected and none was found. It covers the national field and, in depth, Virginia, Georgia and Tennessee. It was compiled for a research team that has not adopted a map and is weighing whether to build one, so it records what each resource leaves out as carefully as what it covers, and it closes on what a better map would take.

Every resource was scored on the same fields: who publishes it and what stake the publisher has, what a record is, which project stages it carries, which attributes, how precise the coordinates are, how often it updates, whether it cites a source for each record, what it costs, whether it can be downloaded and under what licence, and what errors are documented. What a publisher claims about itself is kept apart from what could be seen on its own pages. A hundred and twenty-six resources were read directly, the JavaScript maps among them in a browser, where the public data layers behind several maps could be counted record by record. Three remain closed: two behind a paywall or subscription, and one with no public search at all. Seventeen were seen only in search results. The status of each is in the register.

The verdict scale has four steps. **Recommended** means the resource can carry a claim in published research with its stated caveat. **Useful with caveats** means it can locate or corroborate but should not stand alone. **Limited** means it answers a narrower question than its name suggests. **Avoid for research** means it cannot support a research claim: the product does not exist as described, cannot be audited, or turned out to be coverage rather than data. Several Avoid entries are negative findings, listed so others need not repeat the search. The author's own inventories are listed and not graded. Of the 142 graded resources, 21 are recommended, 40 useful with caveats, 54 limited, and 27 to be avoided.

The short answer

No resource is a census. Every tracker that publishes a count for Virginia, Georgia or Tennessee disagrees with the others, and the gaps are not rounding: Tennessee runs from 12 to 88 depending on the source. The resources worth building on are the ones that say what they count and cite each record.

Nationally, four stand out. [Business Insider's](#) tracker is the only national inventory built from state air permits: 1,416 data centers built or approved through 2025, with a published method and the blind spots that method admits (redacted generator capacity, sites that build their own power plant and skip backup generators). It is paywalled. [Compute Atlas](#) gives a source for each record and states its coordinate precision, which almost no one else does. The [IM3 Open-Source Data Center Atlas](#) from Pacific Northwest National Laboratory has an open licence and a documented method, and it misses facilities the permit record shows: it records none in nine Virginia localities that hold state air permits for named data centers. [Epoch AI's](#) frontier data center hub describes a satellite-verified method and a Creative Commons licence, neither independently checked, and covers only the largest AI campuses. On the advocacy side, [FracTracker Alliance's](#) tracker carries the richest attribute set (generators, cooling, pushback, a location-confidence rating) across 1,696 records and says plainly that it is an advocacy product. [Moratorium Nation](#) is the most open record of local moratoria, with openly licensed data and published code, though its live and downloadable totals do not reconcile (1,291 against 533 or 409) and a language model classifies its entries. For the base rate on announced energy projects that never build, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory's **Queued Up** dataset on the generation interconnection queue is the standing reference; its summary reports that 13 percent of the capacity queued from 2000 to 2020 had reached commercial operation by the end of 2025, a figure to confirm against the full report before citing.

Several of the best maps are front ends for public ArcGIS layers, and the layers are more useful than the maps. [PEC's Virginia map](#), FracTracker's national tracker and [Science for Georgia's interactive](#) each sit on a feature service anyone can query, count and export without the map interface. That is how the counts in this register for those three were taken, and it is how a researcher should cite them: to the layer and the date queried. A catalogue search of ArcGIS Online returns 691 public feature services titled "data centers"; their quality was not assessed one by one, and the register lists the catalogue as a discovery route, not a source.

The commercial field divides cleanly. The serious real-estate data vendors ([datacenterHawk](#), [DC Byte](#), Structure Research, SemiAnalysis, S&P and [Wood Mackenzie](#)) sit behind paywalls; what a reader can check without paying is marketing copy and, at best, a methods summary. The free directories ([Data Center Map](#), [Baxtel](#), [dcmmap.us](#) and a run of newer trackers) are usable for locating a facility and weak for counting, because none discloses how records are found or cites them one by one.

Baxtel is the best of them for position, placing 3,029 sites at building level with a status. [Cleanview](#) is the best-documented free tracker for Virginia and Georgia, and its totals move: its Virginia count read 809 as cited in late July and 744 on its live page in late September.

Each state's section of the register opens with where to start in that state and what no resource there does.

Where the counts part company

Geography	Counts, by source and date	What explains the spread
United States	4,767 (Data Center Map, 28 Sept 2026); 5,400 to 5,426 (an independent Substack compilation); 1,696 (FracTracker, all six status layers, 28 Sept 2026); 1,416 built or approved through 2025 (Business Insider, from state air permits); 247 or more construction-stage projects (AIA Contract Documents tracker, 28 Sept 2026); 2,100+ (electricchoice.com, search listing only)	What counts as a data center: retail colocation rooms, enterprise server halls and hyperscale campuses are counted together by some and separately by others. Business Insider counts only what holds an air permit, so it misses sites without backup generators.
OpenStreetMap	4,690 objects tagged telecom=data_center and 1,282 tagged building=data_center, worldwide (taginfo, 28 Sept 2026)	Tagged map objects, not facilities: one campus can carry several tagged buildings, and the two tags overlap. A US or state count needs its own query.
Virginia	809 operating and planned (Cleanview, cited 28 July 2026); 743 (Cleanview via Axios, 22 Sept); 744 (Cleanview live page, 28 Sept); 674 (Data Center Map, 28 Sept); 464 (FracTracker, 28 Sept); 451 (PEC layer, edited to 21 Aug); 201 air permits at 185 sites (DEQ, 17 Aug)	Cleanview's own figures, as cited in July and read live in September, differ by 65 with no published change note. DEQ counts permits, a different unit. PEC and FracTracker count proposals that may never build.
Northern Virginia	265 existing or permitted in Loudoun, Prince William and Fairfax (NVRC, as of 2024); 223 structures coded as data center use in Loudoun alone (county land-use layer)	NVRC counts facilities and stopped updating in late 2024; Loudoun counts buildings, with coding of uncertain currency.
Virginia backup generators	10,500 generators at 132 Northern Virginia data centers (analysis for the Washington Post, permits and filings through 2024); roughly 9,000 statewide (PEC's hand tally of permit files, an unverified estimate)	Different counting bases and dates; neither reconciles the other, and no public register lists the engines.
Tennessee	12 (FracTracker, 28 Sept 2026); 23 (Cleanview, Sept 2026); 65 (Data Center Map, 28 Sept 2026); about 61 operating and under construction (four sources, mid-June 2026); about 78 (Tennessee Lookout reconciling Data Center Map and Baxtel, 24 July); 88 (dcmmap.us, Aug 2026)	Inclusion rules and snapshot dates differ; two of the publishers say so and neither reconciles.

Geography	Counts, by source and date	What explains the spread
Georgia	136 facilities across 34 counties (More Than Just Parks, 28 Sept 2026); 183 (FracTracker, 28 Sept); 186 (Science for Georgia, 101 completed and 85 planned); 227 sites (dcmmap.us); 276 facilities (Data Center Map)	Proposed and cancelled projects counted by some and not others; not cross-checked by any publisher.
IM3 atlas, over time	1,240 facilities in 209 counties (June 2025 version); 1,474 in 251 counties (February 2026 version); both reproduced from the atlas files, deduplicated by facility ID	Same publisher, eight months apart: 1,151 facilities appear in both editions, 323 are new and 89 have disappeared (matched on coordinates, so approximate). 55 of 252 counties move between the count groups (none, 1 to 2, 3 to 9, 10 or more) used by the National Association of REALTORS' 2026 data center report, so a county-level study built on one edition gives different results on the next. Business Insider's 2025 permit series also reports 1,240 data centers; it is a separate count from state air permits and matches the June 2025 atlas only in total.
IM3 atlas against permits	Zero facilities in nine Virginia localities that hold DEQ air permits for named data centers; zero in 36 percent of counties with EPA air-program records for data centers	The atlas rests on OpenStreetMap features, which follow volunteer mapping, not permits.
Fauquier County, Virginia	4 known projects (the author's statewide inventory, current to March 2026); 8 (PEC layer); 19 (a count derived from interconnection.fyi); the county budget credits two operating facilities with about \$6.6 million a year	Project files, aggregator records and tax rolls count different things; the author's statewide inventory lists no operating facility there, which the county budget contradicts.

How a data center map misleads

Nine failure modes recur across the register. Each is worth testing before any map carries a number into published work.

It counts announcements as buildings. dcmmap.us shows a 318.6 gigawatt pipeline beside 56.1 gigawatts operating with no attrition caveat, and most trackers fold planned projects into headline totals. PEC's layer reports 7,527 MW proposed against 403.7 MW existing, on the 23 of 451 records that report MW at all.

It does not say what a record is. A building, a campus, a project and a permit are different units. [Virginia DEQ](#) lists permits; [Loudoun codes structures](#); the IM3 atlas mixes points and polygons with no single identifier. Data Center Map's Culpeper page lists 39 records under a title that says 30, and seven of the 39 are campuses listed alongside their own buildings.

It counts the same press release its competitors counted. The free trackers draw on overlapping announcements and none deduplicates across vendors.

It moves without a change note. The IM3 atlas's two editions, eight months apart, share 1,151 facilities; 323 are new and 89 are gone, and nothing marks which. Cleanview's Virginia count read 809 as cited in late July and 744 on its live page in late September, with no change note. [Georgia's DRI system](#) changed its development types in January 2026, so a series built on the type field breaks at that date.

It draws a point where it has only a city. Few resources state coordinate precision. Compute Atlas does, to three decimal places, and FracTracker rates each operating record's location confidence.

It cites nothing for the record. Without a source for each entry, no single claim can be checked. Even the better advocacy layers leave gaps: 164 of PEC's 451 records carry no source link.

It is a frozen federal layer presented as live. HIFLD, EJScreen and the conservation easement database have all stopped updating (next section).

It cannot be read without a browser. ArcGIS and Mapbox applications cannot be archived or cited to a date, and a map that cannot be archived cannot be audited later. Where the layer behind the map is public, cite the layer and the query date instead.

It misses what the permit record shows. The IM3 atlas gap against Virginia DEQ and EPA air records is the clearest case in this register.

Federal layers that stopped

Resource	Status	What replaced it
HIFLD Open (electric substations, transmission lines)	Updates stopped 26 June 2025; public portal discontinued 26 August 2025 (secondary source). No HIFLD data center layer appears in the public ArcGIS catalogue.	A volunteer Data Rescue Project mirror of the datasets; the Department of Homeland Security's substitute is a crosswalk document, not a live layer.
EPA EJScreen	Official tool removed 5 February 2025.	Public Environmental Data Partners' mirror, frozen at version 2.3.
National Conservation Easement Database	Unmaintained since January 2025.	PAD-US, the Protected Areas Database of the United States, not assessed in this register.
EIA U.S. Energy Atlas	Live, with no data center layer as of 28 September 2026.	Nothing federal. EIA's power plant and pipeline layers remain the context layers to use.

What no map does

Every resource in this register answers the question of where. None records what the local ordinance or zoning decision did when a project arrived: whether the use was permitted by right, which approvals it needed, and what a later amendment or withdrawal left standing. The ordinance resources come closest. [Georgia Tech EPICenter](#) codes Georgia's ordinances; the [Columbus Ledger-Enquirer](#) ranked every Georgia data center ordinance, 32 counties and 21 cities as of 1 June 2026; Moratorium Nation records moratoria. None is joined to a facility layer, and no Virginia or Tennessee equivalent was found. County zoning layers mostly do not fill the gap. [Chesterfield](#) publishes five "technology zones" whose layer states no legal basis or ordinance, and most hubs checked carry no data center district at all. Prince William's county map comes closest: every data center campus carries its zoning case number. [Caroline County](#) shows the same join can be built from ordinary county layers: its zoning layer carries a Planned Innovation Research Technology district, and a query of the county's parcel service shows six parcels zoned into it, about 825 acres, all owned by Amazon Data Services. That is the join a better map would make statewide. Here it exists county by county, and in Caroline only for someone who queries the service. That join is the open field.

Two narrower gaps follow from the same absence. No public register records individual backup engines, although Virginia's air permits carry them. And no resource in the three states records which utility serves each facility. Individual utilities sometimes say so for their own customers, as the Knoxville and Memphis utilities have, but no map carries it, and it is the attribute rate and cost-allocation questions turn on. [PJM's forthcoming Large Load Registry](#) will not close that gap for Virginia: PJM says the tool opens on 1 January 2027 and that public information will come in March 2027 aggregated by zone or area, pending FERC approval (Docket ER26-3515). It will count load, not locate facilities. The field definitions, posted 25 September 2026, show what PJM will collect.

What a better map would take

The field is crowded at the pin and nearly empty behind it. Locating a data center is solved well enough by several free resources, and another locator would add pins to a field that has plenty. What no resource does, in any of the three states, is tell a researcher what the pin is, where it came from, what stage it has reached and what public decision stands behind it. A new map earns its place on those terms or not at all.

One unit, stated, with the permits hung on it. Define the record as a project, attach its buildings and its permits, and carry the permit numbers: the Virginia DEQ air permit, the Georgia DRI ID, the Tennessee or Shelby County permit document. No resource joins facility, permit and generator count today, and the permit record is the one the regulator stands behind.

Every stage, including the ones that stop. Proposed, approved, under construction, operating, expanded, withdrawn, denied, stalled. FracTracker, More Than Just Parks and PEC each carry some of these. None gives the rate at which proposals die. Georgia's DRI system already records withdrawals and terminations with dates, which makes Georgia the easiest state to build attrition from.

A source and a date on every record, and a published change log. The IM3 atlas gained 323 facilities and lost 89 between editions, and Cleanview's Virginia count moved from 809 as cited in July to 744 in September, neither with a record-level change note. A map that versions itself and says what changed would be alone in this register.

Coordinate precision as a field. Compute Atlas states its precision and FracTracker rates location confidence on each operating record. Everyone else draws a point without saying whether it marks a building or a town.

A template exists for one county. Prince William's Build-Out Analysis map comes closest to this list. Each of its 78 campuses is drawn as an outline tied to its zoning case, each of its 248 buildings carries a permit case, a status and floor area, and the overlay district, zoning, transmission lines and substations sit alongside. What it lacks is what a statewide build would add: withdrawn and denied projects, power in MW, and the owner or operator.

Who lives nearby. Census tracts, American Community Survey data and the CDC's Social Vulnerability Index are the standard demographic overlays, and the "Colossus of Memphis" StoryMap already lays them over the xAI site. Two refinements make the overlay hold up. Measure from the campus outline to nearby homes at block-group scale or finer, since a tract can be larger than the campus inside it and noise, exhaust and new lines do not stop at tract boundaries. Then compare against the sites that could have been chosen, such as other land zoned or planned for the same use. Without that baseline the overlay shows who lives nearby and cannot say whether siting followed demographics.

The serving utility. No map in the three states records which utility serves a facility. Virginia's SCC map is a static PDF, Georgia's PSC publishes none, and TVA's distributor map is a static image. The parcel-to-territory join is the attribute that ties a map to rate and cost-allocation questions.

The local decision. Join each project to the zoning action, ordinance or moratorium that governs it. Georgia has the pieces in EPIcenter's coded ordinances and the Ledger-Enquirer's ranking. Prince William's county map does it for one county; no statewide equivalent was found for Virginia or Tennessee. This is the open field named in the section above.

Tennessee, if coverage is the test. Counts there run from 12 to 88, the national trackers are thinnest, and TVA publishes no list. The distance between what exists and what a careful build could produce is widest in Tennessee.

A release that can be cited later. The ArcGIS and Mapbox front ends cannot be cited to a date. A dataset deposited with a DOI at each release can be. Compute Atlas and the IM3 atlas do this; almost nothing else in the register does.

Seeding a new map from existing data is constrained more by licence than by availability. Moratorium Nation (CC BY 4.0) and Epoch AI (a Creative Commons Attribution licence, as Epoch states it) can be reused with credit. The IM3 atlas and OpenStreetMap carry the Open Database License, which requires a public database derived from them to be shared on the same terms. FracTracker's data is for non-commercial use only. Science for Georgia asks for credit and states no licence; PEC states none; Compute Atlas offers downloads and a DOI without stated terms. The government records (DEQ permits, Georgia's DRI filings, county GIS layers) are the natural spine, though their reuse terms were not assessed. A build that takes its records from permits and filings, and uses the advocacy layers to find candidates rather than as the record, avoids most of the licence problem.

The case against building. Maps in this register decay. NVRC's layer stopped at late 2024. Loudoun's land-use coding carries no stated as-of date. HIFLD, EJScreen and the conservation easement database stopped outright. The layers that stay current show recent edits by named owners: PEC's in August 2026, FracTracker's and Science for Georgia's in September. A map built for a study and left alone after it becomes the next frozen layer in someone else's register. Whether the team can keep one current is the question this register cannot answer for it.

The register

The register lists every resource by section: Virginia, Georgia and Tennessee first, then the national trackers, the context layers and the author's own inventories. Each state section opens with where to start. Within a section, resources are ordered by verdict and then by name.

Each resource name links to its page; further links (a data layer, a methods page, a second edition) sit under it. A note in italics marks a resource that could not be read directly. Every field, every URL and the full text of each entry are in the companion workbook, DC_Map_Resources_Register_v0_1.xlsx.

VERDICT KEY

Verdict	Resources	What it means
Recommended	21	Can carry a claim in published research with its stated caveat.
Useful with caveats	40	Can locate or corroborate; should not stand alone.
Limited	54	Answers a narrower question than its name suggests.
Avoid for research	27	Cannot support a research claim: does not exist as described, cannot be audited, or is coverage rather than data. Includes negative findings.
Not graded	4	The author's own inventories, listed and not graded.

SECTIONS

Virginia (35)

Georgia (19)

Tennessee (13)

National commercial and trade trackers (29)

National public, NGO, academic and press resources (28)

Context layers (18)

The author's own inventories (4)

Virginia

WHERE TO START IN VIRGINIA

Start here	PEC's Data_Centers_Virginia layer ; Virginia DEQ issued air permits for data centers ; Prince William County's interactive data center map ; Loudoun's land-use layer ; NVRC's regional layer ; Cleanview's Virginia page
What each is good for	PEC's layer is the best proposal-stage record in the state: 451 records (246 proposed, 205 existing), led by Loudoun, Prince William and Fairfax, updated to 21 August 2026, crowd-sourced and incomplete by its own account, with 164 records lacking a source link and MW reported on only 23. DEQ is the ground truth for regulatory paper, and it lists permits, not facilities (201 permits at 185 sites as of 17 August 2026). Prince William's county map tracks 248 data center buildings and 78 campus outlines from planned to completed, every campus with its zoning case number, though it carries no withdrawn projects. Loudoun codes 223 structures as data center land use; NVRC maps 265 existing or permitted facilities in three counties, frozen at late 2024. Cleanview gives current operating and planned counts that shift between citations.
What no resource does	No source joins facility, air permit number and generator count. No public register of individual backup engines exists. The SCC's service-territory map is a single static PDF last modified in January 2025, with no GIS layer, so a facility cannot be joined to its serving utility except by eye (search results point to a Virginia Tech digitization of SCC utility maps and a third-party service-territory layer, neither verified). The Fauquier, Stafford, Chesterfield and Hanover GIS hubs carry no data center layer; Caroline's carries a technology zoning district (see What no map does).
National trackers with Virginia records	FracTracker holds 464 Virginia records and Data Center Map lists 674 (both 28 September 2026). They count different things; see Where the counts part company.

ALL VIRGINIA RESOURCES (35)

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
JLARC; "Data Centers in Virginia" (December 2024 report, Rpt598) full report PDF	Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC), Virginia General Assembly (government-state) Access: free	The only independent legislative-branch study among the Virginia resources reviewed, with widely cited baseline figures on jobs, GDP, tax share and power-demand doubling.	No map or GIS component and no facility-level data; it is a static one-time report, already about two years old as of this check. A third-party criticism from SELC was noted but not independently verified.	Recommended The authoritative aggregate and economic reference for Virginia, not a mapping tool.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Piedmont Environmental Council: "Existing and Proposed Data Centers: A Web Map" layer	The Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC) (NGO-advocacy) Access: free	PEC's public layer Data_Centers_Virginia holds 451 records (246 proposed, 205 existing) updated from April 2024 to 21 August 2026, with locality, owner or applicant, address, parcel ID, acres, square feet, MW, build status, source link, tax map link and watershed; queryable and exportable through ArcGIS REST.	164 of 451 records carry no source link; only 23 report MW; PEC calls it crowd-sourced with sites likely missing, and states its policy position in the item description.	Recommended The best Virginia proposal-stage dataset, public and queryable; 36 percent of records lack a source link, MW is sparse, and the publisher is an advocate that says so.
Prince William County: interactive Data Center Map (County Mapper / Build-Out Analysis dashboard) announcement	Prince William County Government (Planning Office, Development Services, Economic Development & Tourism, and IT departments jointly) (government-local) Access: free	Two public county layers, both edited to 25 September 2026: 248 data center buildings (57 completed, 31 under construction, 68 pending, 92 planned) with permit case, permit status, floor area, year built and occupancy date, 154 of them with a planning case number; and 78 campus outlines (9 completed, 15 pending, 54 planned), every one with its zoning district and case number, planned and remaining floor area. Overlay district, zoning, transmission lines and substations are layered alongside.	Launched in 2026. No withdrawn or denied status, no MW, and no owner or operator field; covers Prince William County only.	Recommended The best county-run resource in the register: a live, parcel-level record of every data center building and campus in the county, keyed to zoning and permit cases; one county only, with no withdrawn projects.
Virginia DEQ: Issued Air Permits for Data Centers	Virginia Department of Environmental	The only government regulatory dataset in this register giving permit-level, dated, address-	Lists permits, not facilities; a campus may hold multiple registrations, and an	Recommended The best check on whether a facility has regulatory

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	Quality (DEQ) (government-state) Access: free	located records tied to an actual approval action, not a self-report or advocacy count. The author's county-by-county breakdown of the register shows Loudoun 92, Fairfax 35, Prince William 29, Mecklenburg 11, Henrico 8, and Culpeper, Manassas City and Fauquier 4 each.	unpermitted facility would not appear, so it likely undercounts data centers and can overcount 'sites' where permits map to one campus. Operator counts are floors: 34 of 201 rows read 'other or not identified.' The page must be read in a browser; one row's date is malformed in the source ('03/26-2026').	paper, not a census. Counts here are from the list as of 17 August 2026 (201 permits at 185 sites). One permit can cover dozens of engines, so generator estimates cannot be derived from the permit count.
Cardinal News; "Data Centers" (Redbird Stories project)	Cardinal News (press) Access: free	The only resource among the Virginia resources reviewed with sustained reporting focus on Virginia's 'second wave' data center regions outside Northern Virginia.	Not a mapping resource; it has no map or dataset.	Useful with caveats Useful as a qualitative and context source for non-Northern Virginia, not as a map.
Caroline County GIS (CivQuest parcel viewer) layers · county page	Caroline County (government-local) Access: free after a terms-of-use click-through	A 61-layer county feature service behind the viewer. Its zoning includes a Planned Innovation Research Technology (PIRT) district, with a separate layer of PIRT areas (Mattameade, 1,385.4 acres, plus one unnamed area). Queried on 28 September 2026, the parcel layer shows six parcels zoned PIRT, about 825 acres by the county's lot-size field, all owned by Amazon Data Services Inc; parcel edits run to 10 August 2026.	No data center layer as such: the PIRT district is a technology zoning class, and the owner join had to be run by hand against the parcel service. Opens behind a terms-of-use acceptance. The zoning layer carries only the district code, with no case number or adoption date.	Useful with caveats The one county viewer in the register whose own zoning and parcel layers identify a technology district and who owns it; the district is not named for data centers and the ordinance behind it was not read.
Henrico County; Data	Henrico County	An unusually thorough county-	This is a planning proposal	Useful with caveats

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Center Regulation Staff Analysis (incl. Technology Boulevard Special Focus Area proposal) PDF · zoning GIS layer	Government (Planning Department) (government-local) Access: free	level policy analysis explicitly naming a proposed overlay-district approach and distinguishing by-right from permit-required data center uses.	document, not a public-facing map product; its maps are static images within a PDF. Whether the Technology Boulevard Special Focus Area proposal has since been adopted and mapped in the county's live GIS was not confirmed.	A strong primary-source planning document, not a live map.
Loudoun County GIS; GeoHub / WebLogis hub	Loudoun County Government (Office of Mapping and Geographic Information) (government-local) Access: free	Loudoun's build-out land use service codes 223 structures and 122 parcels as COM_DATA_CENTER, all 'Existing or Permitted', each flagged as manually or automatically coded; public and queryable through LOGIS REST.	No dedicated data center layer on the GeoHub; the land-use coding dates from a 2016 baseline with items modified 2020 to 2021, so recent construction may be missing; no proposed projects, MW or operator.	Useful with caveats The county's own structure-level data center land-use code (223 structures), of uncertain currency.
Louisa County: Technology Overlay District (TOD) supporting doc · GIS mapping	Louisa County Government (government-local) Access: free	One of the few counties reviewed with a clearly named, criteria-based overlay district specifically for this use category.	Does not name data centers as a distinct zoning class, framed generically as 'technology centers,' and does not show proposed projects. Whether and how it is mapped in GIS is unclear.	Useful with caveats Good primary-source zoning text; its GIS rendering is unconfirmed.
Northern Virginia Regional Commission (NVRC): Data Centers page and facility list layer	Northern Virginia Regional Commission (government-local (regional planning-district commission)) Access: free	Public ArcGIS layer of 265 data center points (Loudoun 199, Prince William 46, Fairfax 20) with name, address, permit date and update date, queryable and exportable through the REST service; parcels and public facilities layered alongside.	Every record carries one status, 'Existing or Permitted', as of 16 August and 4 November 2024; no proposed or withdrawn projects, no MW, operator or square footage; built to study heat reuse near public facilities, not as an inventory; no reuse	Useful with caveats A public, queryable, dated point layer of existing-or-permitted data centers in three counties, frozen at late 2024, with no pipeline stages.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
			licence stated.	
NVTC / Mangum Economics; "The Impact of Data Centers on Virginia's State and Local Economies" (2026, 6th biennial edition) PDF mirror	Northern Virginia Technology Council (NVTC), report prepared by Mangum Economics (trade-association) Access: free download after providing contact information via a lead-capture form	A consistent biennial economic-impact series, now in its sixth edition for 2026, useful for trend comparison across editions.	No map or facility data; it is industry- and utility-funded, requires a lead-generation form submission, and does not disclose its sponsorship as a limitation on its own objectivity.	Useful with caveats Treat headline figures as industry-commissioned, not independent.
PEC, Initial Transmission Line Proposals to Serve Data Center Load Growth	The Piedmont Environmental Council (NGO-advocacy) Access: free	Public, queryable layer of new and upgraded lines and substations with voltage and proposal fields; the most-viewed data center item in the ArcGIS catalogue (201,437 views).	Reflects 2022 proposals, last edited March 2024; later RTEP changes not included.	Useful with caveats A public layer of 121 transmission lines and substations from PJM's 2022 Window 3 proposals; dated to early 2024.
Prince William County: Data Center Opportunity Zone Overlay District (DCOOD) REST layer · static PDF	Prince William County Government (Planning Office/GIS) (government-local) Access: free	An authoritative, government-sourced zoning boundary, mirrored on statewide open-data portals so it is discoverable outside the county's own site.	It shows zoning eligibility, not facility inventory, so 'inside the overlay' must not be treated as 'has a data center.' Its attribute schema is unconfirmed.	Useful with caveats Good for showing where data centers can legally go, not for showing where they actually are.
University of Richmond: Virginia Data Centers Resources (LibGuide) location sub-page	University of Richmond, Boatwright Memorial Library (created by	A well-organized, actively maintained, regionally structured bibliography, useful as a literature-review starting point and cross-check for what	Not a mapping or dataset resource; it has no map or structured data.	Useful with caveats Useful as a bibliography and starting point, not as a map or dataset.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	librarian Kyle Jenkins) (academic) Access: free	a researcher may have missed.		
Virginia DEQ; Data Center Air Monitoring Project	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) (government-state) Access: free	DEQ sensor project in Loudoun's data center corridor since February 2026 (CO, NO2, PM2.5), with a sensor map, a near-real-time data feed and a weekly analysis (latest 25 September 2026); links DEQ's issued data center air permits.	Seven sensors in one county; the Prince William phase has no start date; mobile monitoring is conditional; does not locate or count data centers.	Useful with caveats The only public ambient-air record tied to data center clusters in Virginia, at seven sensor sites; not an inventory.
Chesterfield County Open GIS Data	Chesterfield County Government (government-local) Access: free	Zoning layer updated 18 February 2026; a TechnologyZone layer with five named zones (Midlothian, Meadowdale-Meadowbrook, Walthall, Route One, Hull Street Road).	No data center layer; the TechnologyZone layer states no legal basis and should not be read as a data center district without the ordinance behind it.	Limited Open zoning and technology-zone layers; no data center layer.
Coalition to Protect Prince William County	The Coalition to Protect Prince William County (grassroots, Haymarket, VA) (NGO-advocacy) Access: free	Useful as a primary source for the opposition-movement narrative and for tracking specific contested proposals and their outcomes, such as Digital Gateway.	Not a mapping resource; it has no map or structured data, and its content is explicitly advocacy-framed and should be read as one-sided by design.	Limited Valuable for opposition-movement context, not for mapping or data.
Fairfax County; Data Centers page / zoning ordinance interactive map gallery · digital map viewer	Fairfax County Government (government-local) Access: free	A clear, dated regulatory history: the Board directed staff to study data centers on 9 May 2023, and a Data Centers Zoning Ordinance Amendment	No facility-level map or dataset is confirmed, and the general map gallery's full contents could not be retrieved.	Limited A good primary source for zoning-ordinance history and dates, not yet confirmed as a mapping

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
		was adopted 10 September 2024, effective 11 September 2024.		resource.
Fauquier County GIS Hub	Fauquier County Government (government-local) Access: free	Service district boundaries (2023 and 2024 services), a 2022 service district land use map, and a zoning-and-proffers service.	Hub searches for 'data center', 'data centers' and 'PCID' return nothing; the zoning service sits on the county's own server and could not be queried across origins from the hub.	Limited Open zoning and service-district layers; no data center layer.
Hanover County GIS Data; Zoning	Hanover County Government (government-local) Access: free	Zoning feature service updated 28 September 2026.	Hub searches for 'data center' and 'technology' return nothing.	Limited Open zoning layer; no data center layer.
Mecklenburg County GIS (Virginia)	Mecklenburg County Government (Virginia; distinct from Mecklenburg County, NC) (government-local) Access: free	Mecklenburg is named both by PEC's map and DEQ's air-permit list as having data center activity, so a confirmed layer would be useful if it exists.	The page's content is thin and phone-support-oriented rather than documenting a self-service GIS, and no data-center-specific layer is mentioned on it.	Limited No evidence of a data-center-specific layer as checked.
Piedmont Environmental Council; hand-tally of DEQ permit files (generator/engine-level estimate) <i>No public URL recorded.</i>	Piedmont Environmental Council (NGO-advocacy) Access: not applicable	Useful as an order-of-magnitude estimate for backup generators, a figure no government register currently counts directly.	Not independently verified against a primary count; DEQ warns a single permit can cover a campus with dozens of engines, so the two figures should not be divided. A related PEC claim of 50 additional Loudoun substations, a 14 March 2025 post, was not corroborated by a county-	Limited Useful as an order-of-magnitude estimate but not independently verified against a primary count, and a related substation estimate from the same publisher did not survive a primary-source check.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
			commissioned Kimley-Horn study, which found nine new Dominion substations plus 15 mixed-ownership plans, nothing resembling 50; a caution for this estimate too, though it is itself neither verified nor contradicted.	
Stafford County GIS Open Data	Stafford County Government (government-local) Access: free	Zoning feature service updated 28 August 2026.	Hub searches for 'data center' and 'technology overlay' return nothing.	Limited Open zoning layer; no data center layer.
Virginia Data Center Reform Coalition (hosted by PEC)	coalition of 50+ groups; page hosted/published by The Piedmont Environmental Council (NGO-advocacy) Access: free	A clear policy framing of what a state-level tracker should provide; its four pillars amount to a critique of the status quo's transparency gap.	Not a mapping resource in its own right; it does not host its own map or dataset, and a researcher looking for the Coalition's map is redirected to PEC's map.	Limited Treat as a policy and advocacy source, not a distinct mapping resource.
Virginia Economic Development Partnership; Virginia Business Ready Sites Program (VBRSP) certified sites	Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP) (government-state) Access: free to view	An authoritative state site-readiness classification, useful for understanding which sites are being prepared for large users such as data centers.	Not data center-specific, with no map on the page read. A separate Certified Sites map tool exists but was not verified.	Limited Useful context, not a data center inventory or map.
Virginia Places; Data Centers in Virginia	Virginia Places (individual site, author Charlie Grymes) (individual)	A readable narrative synthesis with historical maps from 2019, 2021 and 2024 showing growth over time, recently maintained	Static images, not GIS data, and key statistics are dated, including a facility count of 166 from 2019. A claim that 70 percent of internet traffic flows	Limited Good for orientation and narrative reading, not as a citable dataset.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	Access: free	with a July 2026 update.	through the region appears uncredited on the page and should be treated as unsourced there; TeleGeography's own data has debunked this same claim elsewhere.	
Virginia SCC; "Regulated Companies & Service Map" (electric service territories) map PDF	Virginia State Corporation Commission (government-state) Access: free, public page and PDF	The SCC's own statewide map of electric service territories, with links to the three investor-owned utilities and thirteen cooperatives it regulates. Search results also point to a Virginia Tech Center for Geospatial Information Technology project that digitized SCC utility maps and a third-party ArcGIS web map of Virginia electric service territories; neither was verified.	One static PDF (551 KB, server last-modified 3 January 2025); no spatial download, no parcel-level boundaries, so a facility cannot be joined to its utility except by eye.	Limited A static one-page PDF of service territories, last modified no later than January 2025; no GIS layer.
Virginia State Corporation Commission (SCC); docket search / case filings <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Virginia State Corporation Commission (government-state) Access: free	An authoritative primary-source record of specific cost-allocation and rate disputes involving data centers, including the transmission-cost-shift case, with a decision reportedly due around 1 August 2026.	Not a map or facility inventory at all; it requires case-by-case docket navigation.	Limited Valuable as a primary-document source, explicitly not a mapping or inventory resource.
Culpeper County GIS	Culpeper County Government (government-local) Access: free	Not applicable.	The county GIS page makes no mention of a data center layer, technology overlay district or data center zoning class. This is a negative result on this specific page, not proof the county has	Avoid for research No data center layer on the county's GIS page; a negative finding, listed so others need not repeat the

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
			no such layer anywhere on its GIS platform.	search.
Dominion Energy Virginia; Data Center Requests page	Dominion Energy Virginia (utility) Access: free for the request-intake form	Authoritative for territory boundaries.	Not a research resource but a sales and intake tool; it has no data center inventory, no load map, and no public aggregate interconnection-queue data.	Avoid for research As a data center inventory it is a sales tool, not a research dataset.
InsideNoVa / Prince William Times / WTOP; coverage of Prince William County's data center map princewilliamtimes.com · wtop.com <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	InsideNoVa; Prince William Times; WTOP (three separate press outlets) (press) Access: free	Independent press scrutiny of a government tool, useful as secondary confirmation or critique. WTOP's headline, 'Who is it helping?', signals a critical framing of the county's map worth reading for context.	Not independent mapping resources in themselves, and seen only in search listings.	Avoid for research As mapping resources they offer nothing directly, since they are commentary on the Prince William County map; useful as citations for its reception and critique.
Loudoun Economic Development; "Data Center Alley" (loudounpossible.com)	Loudoun County Department of Economic Development (government-local) Access: free	Memorable framing and branding of the region, useful as a quotable claim source for aggregate figures.	Not a map or dataset at all, with no facility-level detail or sourcing, and its figures are uncited and undated.	Avoid for research As a mapping or data resource, it is fine only as a promotional quote source.
Spotsylvania County GIS	Spotsylvania County Government (government-local) Access: free	Not applicable.	No mention of data centers, overlay districts, or a technology zoning class was found on the county GIS page.	Avoid for research No data center layer on the county's GIS page; a negative finding, listed so others need not repeat the search.
Virginia Mercury; data center reporting	Virginia Mercury (States Newsroom)	A useful aggregator and pointer to other primary sources and to	Not a mapping resource; it has no map or dataset of its own.	Avoid for research As a mapping resource it

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
(Virginia Data Center Reform Coalition tag archive)	network) (press) Access: free	community-opposition context, including a report that community pushback is stalling \$64 billion in data center development nationwide, dated 21 May 2025.		offers nothing directly; useful only as journalism and a pointer to other sources.
VPM: data center news coverage <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	VPM (Virginia Public Media) (press) Access: free	Mainstream public-media coverage of the power-demand angle.	Not a mapping resource; no map or dataset was found.	Avoid for research Not usable as a mapping resource.

Georgia

WHERE TO START IN GEORGIA

Start here	Georgia DCA's Developments of Regional Impact online system ; More Than Just Parks' Georgia tracker ; Science for Georgia's Data Center Interactive ; Compute Atlas for Georgia ; Georgia Tech EPICenter's ordinance hub
What each is good for	DCA's DRI system is the statewide official record of large proposals with dates and outcomes: 3,178 filings of all development types since 2001, each linked to its file. It added a "Technological Facility (Including Data Centers)" type on 6 January 2026 (18 filings to 25 September); before that, data centers were filed as industrial, commercial or other, so a count by type undercounts everything earlier. More Than Just Parks has the widest status set, including projects blocked by moratorium and stopped by communities, with a link for each entry. Science for Georgia carries 186 records with water and energy fields and a source for nearly every one; its status field is blank for 68 of 85 planned sites. Compute Atlas has the cleanest lifecycle breakdown. EPICenter codes ordinances in 180 jurisdictions on 19 topics.
What no resource does	The DRI system has no coordinates and no MW. The Public Service Commission hosts no service-territory map. The statewide investment totals in circulation (\$40 billion for 2025 from trade press; \$101.4 billion across 89 projects from PoweredByWho) differ by scope, and no one reconciles them.
National trackers with Georgia records	FracTracker holds 183 Georgia records and Data Center Map lists 276 (both 28 September 2026); Cleanview also covers Georgia. They count different things; see Where the counts part company.

ALL GEORGIA RESOURCES (19)

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Atlanta Regional Commission; Plan Reviews database (DRI locator, 11-county metro)	Atlanta Regional Commission (government-local (regional planning commission, multi-jurisdictional)) Access: free	The closest thing to an official, per-project, address-level public locator for data center proposals in metro Atlanta, with acreage, size and water figures cited per record and a 20-year archive from 2005 to the present.	Metro-Atlanta-only, an 11-county footprint, missing rural Georgia proposals under DCA's parallel process. No megawatt or power-generation data appears in the DRI report format observed, only water, traffic and tax data, and whether a map view exists is unconfirmed.	Recommended The best available per-project official locator found in Georgia within its 11-county footprint; needs manual confirmation of the map view and of full statewide gaps.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Georgia DCA; Developments of Regional Impact (DRI) program (statewide)	Georgia Department of Community Affairs (government-state) Access: free	The actual regulatory trigger mechanism that produces the underlying location and size data other Georgia trackers cite.	The program page has no map or count, and the filings themselves are in the DRI Online System (MAP-092). Numeric thresholds are not given on the page; November 2025 coverage puts metro Atlanta above 300,000 square feet and rural Georgia above 500,000 per the AJC, while The Current GA also cites 500,000 for metro-adjacent rural areas, not perfectly reconciled on which sub-areas get which threshold.	Recommended The DRI program's online system is readable and statewide; see MAP-092.
Georgia DCA; DRI Online System portal	Georgia Department of Community Affairs (government-state) Access: free	A public table of all 3,178 Developments of Regional Impact filed online from July 2001 to 25 September 2026, with project, development type, county, city, regional commission, filing date, status and findings; each ID links to its filing. A 'Technological Facility (Including Data Centers)' type has existed since 6 January 2026 (18 filings through 25 September 2026).	Before 2026, data centers were filed as Industrial, Commercial, Mixed Use or 'Any other'; a name search of those types finds 47 candidates, so counting by type undercounts. No map, coordinates or MW; withdrawn and refiled projects appear as separate rows; statewide in scope but only for projects large enough to trigger DRI review.	Recommended The statewide official record of large Georgia proposals since 2001, with dates, counties and outcomes; no geometry, and the development-type field changed in 2026.
Georgia Tech EPIcenter; Georgia Data Center Ordinance Hub	Georgia Tech Energy Policy and Innovation Center (EPIcenter) (academic)	The most comprehensive ordinance-content review found, covering 180 jurisdictions and 19 regulatory topics, complementing and appearing	Does not map individual data center project locations at all, a genuine gap if the goal is a project locator rather than a regulatory-landscape tool.	Recommended Strong for ordinance research specifically; limited as a project locator, the wrong tool for that

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	Access: free	more systematic than the CNHI ordinance-ranking article.		purpose.
More Than Just Parks; Georgia Data Center Tracker	More Than Just Parks (NGO-advocacy (conservation)) Access: free	Unique 'blocked by moratorium' and 'stopped by community' status categories not found in any other tracker checked, with explicit protected-land-proximity analysis and per-record public-source citation.	Its advocacy framing may bias which stopped projects get emphasis, it has no export option, and its national scope may mean less Georgia-specific depth than state-focused tools.	Recommended The most distinctive status taxonomy and sourcing transparency among trackers checked, tempered by its advocacy stake.
Columbus Ledger-Enquirer / CNHI; "All Georgia data center ordinances; from most to least restrictive"	Columbus Ledger-Enquirer (McClatchy), byline Kala Hunter; republished by CNHI's northwestgeorgianews.com/Calhoun Times, syndicated via Yahoo/AOL (press) Access: free	Exactly matches the cited figure of 32 counties and 21 cities with a firm date, as of 1 June 2026, and identifies the outlet and author precisely.	Not a map, with no geocoding, and syndication makes the canonical source and paywall status unclear. Whether the live page has an embedded interactive graphic could not be confirmed.	Useful with caveats An authoritative statewide ordinance count with a date, but text-only, not a locator.
Georgia EPD; water withdrawal / wastewater permit lists as locator	Georgia Environmental Protection Division (government-state) Access: free	If opened, could be genuinely useful as a locator for facilities with large water permits, a known data center signal.	No air-permit list was found on this page at all, a gap against the interest in air and water permits together. It requires opening and parsing spreadsheets by hand, and whether the water-withdrawal spreadsheets actually name individual data centers is unconfirmed.	Useful with caveats Real raw material for a locator, but not itself a map, and unverified whether it actually names facilities.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Science for Georgia; Data Center Situational Awareness Map embedded map	Science for Georgia (501(c)(3)) (NGO-advocacy) Access: free, public	Two public layers behind Science for Georgia's 'Data Center Interactive': 101 completed and 85 planned Georgia data centers, with owner, address, MW, square feet, energy and water source, estimated power and water use, acres, permitted water use, wetlands damage, draft ordinance and a source link for nearly every record.	The completed layer's title says 'as of 02/16/2025' though it was edited in August 2026; status is blank for 68 of 85 planned records and the rest are free text; power and water figures are estimates; the credit line asks users to cite Science for Georgia.	Useful with caveats 186 Georgia records with water and energy fields and sources; status mostly blank and unstandardised; estimates are the publisher's.
Server Country; Georgia power infrastructure	Michael J. Bommarito II (individual) (individual) Access: free	The only resource that explicitly connects the 9,885 megawatt generation certification to the roughly 80 percent to data centers claim, and names specific plants, Wansley and Vogtle, in the same context.	No map found. The flagship 9,885 megawatt figure, attributed to a December 2025 PSC certification order, is a secondary summary and needs independent confirmation against the PSC's own order text before citing as fact.	Useful with caveats Valuable for the generation-tie narrative, not a locator or map.
Atlanta Journal-Constitution (AJC); data center coverage (no dedicated tracker/map found) <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Atlanta Journal-Constitution (Cox Enterprises) (press) Access: paid subscription	Strong original reporting on individual proposals, including a \$20 billion OpenAI coastal project, a South Fulton project near MARTA, and a South Georgia 'peanuts to processors' pitch, with figures not found elsewhere.	Not a locator or map product; a researcher cannot query it spatially or by status and would need to build a spreadsheet from articles by hand. Repeated searches found only individual articles referencing the state's forthcoming public DRI notice system, not an AJC-built map.	Limited Valuable as a news source but not a map or tracker; use for narrative detail, not as a locator.
Georgia county GIS parcel viewers (Douglas, Coweta,	respective county governments and/or vendor	Authoritative parcel-level ownership and zoning ground-truth, if a specific site is already	None of the 11 counties maintains a dedicated data center layer or proposal	Limited Useful only as a lookup tool for a parcel already

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Fayette, Newton, Bartow, Floyd/Rome, Columbia, Richmond, Twiggs, Monroe, Meriwether arcgis.com · romefloyd.com <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Schneider Corp (qPublic) or Esri (ArcGIS Hub) (government-local) Access: free	known, across Douglas, Coweta, Fayette, Newton, Bartow, Floyd/Rome, Columbia, Richmond, Twiggs, Monroe and Meriwether counties.	tracker; these are generic parcel tools useful only once an address or parcel ID is already known. They are not aggregated across counties and are JavaScript-heavy and inconsistent, using different vendors.	identified elsewhere, not as a discovery or locator tool.
Georgia PSC; large-load filings and Data Center Fact Sheet example filing	Georgia Public Service Commission (government-state (utility regulator)) Access: free	An authoritative source for actual generation-capacity and rate figures tied to data center load growth, the regulatory record underlying the 9,885 megawatt IRP figure, though that specific number was not found directly on the fact sheet itself.	Not a locator, with no addresses, coordinates, map, or per-project megawatt total findable without opening every docket individually. No consolidated public map of large-load or data center interconnection requests exists at the PSC.	Limited Essential for aggregate or statewide generation figures, useless as a project locator.
Southern Environmental Law Center; "Data centers across the South" (regional map)	Southern Environmental Law Center (NGO-advocacy) Access: free	The only regional, multi-state Southern map found that would let a researcher compare Georgia against neighboring states in one place, if genuinely interactive.	Sourcing and methodology are entirely undocumented on the pages read, and it may be a static image rather than a real map or dataset.	Limited A promising scope, but unverified format and no sourcing found.
Southern Environmental Law Center; Georgia Energy Map (v.2)	Southern Environmental Law Center (NGO-advocacy) Access: free PDF	Genuinely granular general power-infrastructure data at the plant, pipeline and transmission level, if the interactive version is real.	Not a data center resource at all upon inspection, with no Plant Bowen, Vogtle, or data center layer. Its pipeline data is six to seven years stale, based on a 2018 to 2019 baseline, and interactive access is unconfirmed.	Limited A good general energy-infrastructure reference, but it does not deliver on the data center and generation-tie angle sought.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Georgia Conservation Voters (data center map search) <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Georgia Conservation Voters / GCV Education Fund (NGO-advocacy) Access: not applicable	None identified for this specific resource type.	Does not appear to publish a data center locator at all; a search found only legislative scorecards and team or about pages.	Avoid for research No locator product appears to exist.
Georgia Department of Economic Development; no dedicated data-center sites map found <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Georgia Department of Economic Development (government-state) Access: not applicable	None identified.	Search surfaced only the agency's general Georgia.gov location page and the separate Georgia Economic Developers Association's research page; no site-selection GIS inventory was found. Whether georgia.org's own site has such a database was not directly checked.	Avoid for research A negative finding from search; georgia.org itself was not searched page by page.
Georgia press interactives; GPB, WABE, Capital B, Atlanta Civic Circle, Georgia Recorder, Canopy Atlanta (none found) <i>No public URL recorded. Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Georgia Public Broadcasting; WABE; Capital B Atlanta; Atlanta Civic Circle; Georgia Recorder; Canopy Atlanta (press) Access: not applicable	None identified for map or tracker purposes.	None of the six outlets appear, from search, to have built a dedicated data center interactive. Georgia Recorder has text reporting on the DCA and DRI rule change but no map product was located for it specifically; a direct site-by-site check was not performed.	Avoid for research Narrative and reporting sources, not map resources; a negative finding from search.
Georgia PSC; EMC and Municipal Electric Systems page (service-territory directory)	Georgia Public Service Commission (government-state) Access: free	None as a mapping resource, only useful as a directory of who to check next.	No map, GIS layer, downloadable data or dates exist at the PSC itself; a researcher must go to Georgia EMC's own site, not reviewed,	Avoid for research As a mapping source it is useful only as a link list to Georgia EMC and MEAG, not independently checked.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
			for any territory map.	
Georgia Tech CSPAV / UGA GIS resources (no data-center-specific project found) uga.edu	Georgia Tech Center for Spatial Planning Analytics and Visualization (CSPAV); University of Georgia Libraries (GIS Data guide) (academic) Access: not applicable	None identified for this specific purpose.	No Georgia data center project was found among CSPAV's project categories; the closest adjacent item, the Thrive Regional Infrastructure Portal, covers Chattanooga-region freight and logistics in Tennessee, not Georgia data centers. UGA's GIS Data guide was seen only in search results.	Avoid for research No Georgia data center project found; a negative finding. Individual planning theses and capstones are poorly indexed and were not searched.

Tennessee

WHERE TO START IN TENNESSEE

Start here	Tennessee Lookout's current and proposed data centers map ; Compute Atlas for Tennessee and the TVA region ; ThinkTennessee's Powering the Boom, Part I ; the "Colossus of Memphis" StoryMap
What each is good for	Tennessee Lookout names the trackers under its map and explains each one's bias. Compute Atlas carries the most detailed public record on the xAI campuses in Memphis, with a source for each claim. ThinkTennessee frames the statewide trend with citations to TVA, EIA and DOE and is not a locator. The StoryMap, a University of Tennessee student project that states its argument, gives a cited timeline of xAI and overlays social vulnerability on the site.
What no resource does	TVA publishes no data center list and no register of large-load approvals, and distributors do no better: the Knoxville Utilities Board told WBIR it serves three data centers and declined to name them, pointing the reporter to Data Center Map. No resource distinguishes TVA-served from distributor-served load. State and county air permits are retrievable by document number only. The national trackers are thinnest here: FracTracker holds 12 Tennessee records.
National trackers with Tennessee records	Data Center Map lists 65 Tennessee data centers and Cleanview 23; FracTracker holds only 12 (September 2026). Tennessee Lookout's map reconciles Data Center Map with Baxtel.

ALL TENNESSEE RESOURCES (13)

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Tennessee Lookout; "Mapping Tennessee's current and proposed data centers"	Tennessee Lookout (States Newsroom network) (press) Access: free	The only Tennessee press map found that names its underlying data sources and their known biases, the best sourcing transparency among the state press interactives.	No visible per-record attribute list or export, and it inherits the known gaps of Data Center Map and Baxtel, both self-report or crawl-based and not permit-verified; the article itself flags the count discrepancy between its two source trackers as a limitation.	Recommended The best first-pass statewide Tennessee facility count and location source, with the caveat to verify any individual record against a primary source.
"Colossus of Memphis" ArcGIS StoryMap	Kellen Finn, Eleanor Noyes and	Dated timeline of xAI in Memphis and Southaven, June	Not an SELC product (it cites SELC); covers the xAI sites	Useful with caveats A sourced timeline and

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
(University of Tennessee student authors) selc.org	Alex Taylor (University of Tennessee, Knoxville ArcGIS account kfinn1_myUTK) (academic) Access: free	2024 to April 2026, each item cited; tract maps of the 2022 CDC Social Vulnerability Index, CDC PLACES uninsured share, and median household income with the xAI sites overlaid.	only; its figures (35 turbines, 27 in the NAACP suit, 41 approved in Mississippi) and its reading of S.B. 2128 are the authors' and were not independently checked; the authors state their argument.	vulnerability overlay for the Memphis xAI sites; advocacy framing stated by its authors; not a locator beyond xAI.
Protect Our Aquifer; xAI Supercomputer issue page	Protect Our Aquifer (NGO-advocacy) Access: free	The clearest observed proximity link between the facility and a TVA generation facility, the Allen Plant, found in any resource reviewed.	A single static map covering a single issue, water only, with no facility-count or megawatt data. It shows an internal inconsistency between a stated 5 million-gallons-per-day and a 5.7 million-gallons-per-day water-demand figure, and the page's currency is not confirmed.	Useful with caveats Good for the water and TVA-proximity angle specifically; verify the 5 versus 5.7 million-gallons-per-day figures before citing.
ThinkTennessee; "Powering the Boom, Part I" (July 2026)	ThinkTennessee (NGO-advocacy) Access: free PDF	The clearest single statewide megawatt trajectory figure, sevenfold growth in five years per its press release, tied to affordability framing, a useful narrative complement to the trackers.	A static, non-interactive, non-downloadable map, relying on secondary sourcing only. The report itself states that calculations are not exact due to rounding, and it has no county-level or TVA-versus-distributor breakdown.	Useful with caveats Good for statewide trend framing and citations to TVA, EIA and DOE, not for locating individual facilities.
Appalachian Voices; "Data Centers in Appalachia"	Appalachian Voices (NGO-advocacy) Access: free	A useful framing and position statement with links to underlying academic and consultant studies.	Not itself a map or tracker, and no TVA generation-facility linkage appears despite being framed around TVA's territory, with no mention of the Cumberland or Kingston plants.	Limited Not a map or tracker itself; useful, with caveats, only as a pointer to further sources.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
			The regional SELC map it references was not independently located or confirmed.	
Chattanooga Times Free Press; "Where are data centers in Chattanooga region?" <i>Not read directly; see Open items.</i>	Chattanooga Times Free Press (press) Access: paid subscription	A regional count by the local paper: 12 facilities in operation or development, per the open lede.	Paywalled; the open lede reports 12 centers in operation or development in the paper's coverage area, seven of them large facilities; the list itself was not read.	Limited Twelve regional facilities identified behind a paywall.
MLGW; xAI information page	Memphis Light, Gas and Water (MLGW) (utility) Access: free	A primary-source pointer, official utility statements, on a single high-profile facility.	No data or map appears on the page itself, and it is not a tracker. It does not state MLGW's role as a TVA local power company or distributor, and does not disclose the megawatt or gallons-per-day figures a researcher would most want; those must be sourced from linked PDFs or third parties such as Protect Our Aquifer.	Limited Primary-source value only via its linked PDFs, not usable as a map or tracker.
Shelby County Health Department; xAI Colossus gas-turbine air permit (as locator) tn.gov <i>Not read directly; see Open items.</i>	Shelby County Health Department (SCHD) (government-local) Access: appears free where document IDs are known	The primary government source of record for the single most consequential Tennessee data center environmental permitting dispute.	No public-facing searchable locator exists; a researcher must already know a document's file ID or rely on press and advocacy intermediaries such as SELC and the NAACP to surface permit numbers. Press reports that the health department did not respond to a request for	Limited Authoritative but not usable as a discovery tool; treat as confirmation-only once a document ID is in hand.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
			comment on the appeal, which alleges up to 35 turbines operating against 15 permitted.	
TDEC; "Data Centers" policy page and Dataviewers tdec dataviewers · example document viewer	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (government-state) Access: free	An authoritative definition of what Tennessee state-level environmental review does and does not cover for data centers, useful for a methodology section.	Not a map or inventory; TDEC's own text states that its permits are not specific to data centers and that it does not approve a data center project as a whole. It is not a locator for finding facilities, only useful once a facility or permit is already identified elsewhere, and its Dataviewers system was not tested for location-based search.	Limited Not a discovery tool; useful, with caveats, only as a policy and scope reference.
Tennessee county GIS/cadastral portals (Davidson/Nashville, Rutherford, and others) nashville.gov · arccgis.com · Montgomery/Clarksville	respective county/metro governments (government-local) Access: free	Authoritative parcel-level ground truth once an address is known.	None of these portals function as a data center discovery tool, useful only to confirm details of an address already known from another source. Coverage is fragmented county-by-county, and several named counties, including Montgomery, Hamilton, Knox, Wilson, Sumner, Maury and Shelby, were not individually checked.	Limited Not usable for discovery; useful, with caveats, for confirmation only.
TVA Economic Development / TVA Sites tvasites.com · tool	Tennessee Valley Authority (federal utility/corporation) (utility) Access: free, no registration observed	Authoritative on TVA's own economic-development posture, and the place most likely to eventually carry an official TVA large-load list.	No data center-specific list or large-load board-approval registry was located anywhere on tva.com or tvasites.com. TVA's August 2026 board large-load rate actions are known	Limited Not a data center locator; useful only as a primary-source pointer to TVA's own framing and any future official large-load

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
			only via press coverage from the Chattanooga, WVLT, CleanTechnica and Unite.AI, not a TVA-published dataset, and its 2026 IRP page offers document downloads but no maps.	disclosure.
<u>WBIR (Knoxville); "Where are Knoxville's data centers?"</u>	WBIR-TV (Knoxville) (press) Access: free	Published 9 June 2026 as Knoxville's mayor proposed a one-year moratorium. Records the Knoxville Utilities Board saying it serves three data centers, the largest contracted for up to 73 MW, and that developers pay for their own upgrades under interruptible contracts.	KUB declined to name the facilities or their individual loads and pointed the reporter to datacentermap.com, which supplied the three locations named (Bitdeer in the Forks of the River Industrial Park, TenHats, Scipio Technologies). Data Center Map puts Bitdeer at about 86 MW against KUB's 73 MW contract figure. No map of the station's own.	Limited A news article, not a map; its value is the utility's on-record statement, and its locations come from Data Center Map.
<u>WSMV (Nashville); "How many data centers are there in Nashville? Here's a map"</u>	WSMV-TV (Nashville) (press) Access: free	A readable local-area map with an explicit source citation.	Derivative, with no megawatt data, no utility-service field, and no TVA linkage; it makes no mention of TVA or Nashville Electric Service at all, leaving the TVA-served-versus-distributor-served question entirely unaddressed.	Limited Fine for a quick local-area visual, not for utility or power analysis.

National commercial and trade trackers

Commercial directories, market-data vendors and trade trackers. The serious vendors sit behind paywalls; the free directories are usable for locating a facility and weak for counting.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Compute Atlas tennessee valley authority · xai colossus memphis tn	Edward Kubiak (individual) (individual) Access: free	The most transparent methodology and richest status and opposition breakdown among commercial or independent trackers checked in Georgia. It has the best per-record sourcing discipline and coordinate precision found in the Tennessee review, an explicit community-opposition metric with a DOI, and open data download.	Maintained by a single individual, and sourcing depth beyond 'source-cited' is not detailed. Its TVA linkage is indirect, tracking TVA as a generation-asset operator rather than which data centers TVA serves, and licence terms for reuse are not confirmed.	Recommended The most transparent methodology and richest per-record detail and sourcing of any commercial-adjacent tracker checked in Georgia and Tennessee, with the caveat of long-term single-maintainer risk.
Cushman & Wakefield Global Data Center Market Comparison 2026	Cushman & Wakefield (commercial) Access: top-line rankings free/ungated	The single clearest, most quotable global ranking statement found, naming Virginia number one and Atlanta number two globally, with a stated scope of 24 variables across 107 markets.	The full methodology and market list are gated, so ranking claims are not independently verifiable without registration.	Recommended A strong, citable, free top-line ranking for framing and context; verify variable definitions before citing methodology specifics.
Baxtel	Baxtel (ownership not stated on its pages) (commercial) Access: freemium	Free map renders without an account and places facilities at building level (dense and legible around Ashburn and Sterling), with status and type encoded by marker; a sites list shows name, type, status (operational, decommissioned) and region; 3,029 sites listed on 28	The sites list does not follow the map view; no legend for marker codes was found; no download or per-record source without an account; the map is heavy and froze once in testing.	Useful with caveats A free building-level locator with lifecycle status (3,029 sites in its list at the date read); sourcing undisclosed.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
		September 2026.		
CBRE Data Center Trends (North America H1 2026)	CBRE (global commercial real estate services firm) (commercial) Access: free	Authoritative brand-name commercial real estate market-fundamentals data, including a striking 0.2 percent vacancy figure for Northern Virginia useful for land and power scarcity framing.	Aggregate only, with no facility-level detail, coordinates, project names, map or downloadable data. It is a point-in-time snapshot.	Useful with caveats Strong market-fundamentals context, not a substitute for a facility-level tracker.
Cleanview (Data Centers in [state] / US / PJM)	Cleanview; self-described "market intelligence company" / "energy intelligence platform"; core platform tracks 10,000+ power projects (commercial) Access: free to browse	The most current tracker reviewed as of September 2026, and the largest-in-scope multi-state facility-level operating-and-planned tracker reviewed. Its Virginia count is the most widely press-cited, including by Axios, and it is rare among trackers in publishing a dedicated methodology write-up.	Virginia counts carry a small internal inconsistency: a one-record, 180 megawatt gap between the live page and a 22 September Axios citation, unresolved. It records only two lifecycle buckets, undercounting cancelled, denied and withdrawn churn, and compilation is manual, non-exhaustive and without visible per-record citations. Tennessee coverage is the thinnest of three trackers, 23 versus 88 from dcmmap.us and about 78 from Tennessee Lookout's reconciliation, reflecting different inclusion rules.	Useful with caveats The best documented current Virginia and Georgia facility tracker found, though Tennessee coverage is the thinnest of three general trackers and counts drift week to week; check the live page before citing. Its confidence has been explicitly downgraded relative to primary sources in at least one instance, so treat it as reliable but not authoritative.
Inflect	Inflect (commercial digital-infrastructure marketplace) (commercial)	Address-level, not just city-level, facility listings visible without login, unusual for a free directory.	A 'data-center-providers' URL variant returned a 404 error, and the listing is likely biased toward Inflect's commercial partners rather than a complete market census. No lifecycle or	Useful with caveats A good free address-level name and location list, but with an inherent partner-selection bias.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	Access: freemium		capacity data is visible free.	
PeeringDB	PeeringDB (non-profit, community-governed) (open-data-community) Access: free, fully public	Free, open, API-accessible and long-standing, a useful cross-check for carrier-hotel and interconnection-dense facilities.	Narrower in scope than a full data center census, covering interconnection facilities specifically. It is self-reported with no independent verification disclosed and no explicit licence terms found; coverage is only as complete as what operators register.	Useful with caveats A valuable free cross-reference for interconnection-facility addresses, not a substitute for a lifecycle or pipeline tracker.
SemiAnalysis Datacenter Industry Model	SemiAnalysis (independent semiconductor/AI-infrastructure research firm; principal Dylan Patel per byline) (commercial) Access: paid institutional product	The most methodologically detailed sourcing description of any paid model reviewed, combining property records, permits, power-usage data, FOIA requests and satellite or computer-vision analysis, with explicit 2017 to 2032 coverage.	Fully paywalled, with no public sample or preview reached and pricing entirely opaque. No independent verification is possible without purchase.	Useful with caveats Likely high analytical value but inaccessible to a researcher without a subscription; cite its public methodology description, not its data, absent access.
US Data Center Project Tracker (usdatacenterprojects.com)	Blackridge Research, operated by Starry Technologies Private Limited (Hyderabad, India, per site metadata) (commercial) Access: paid subscription	Explicitly claims the heaviest coverage in Virginia and Georgia, with a rich pre-construction attribute set including bid awards, RFPs and substation data.	The same page shows an internal record-count inconsistency, more than 1,200 versus more than 1,400 listings, and the provenance of its small overseas ownership was not independently verified. It is fully paywalled beyond the marketing page.	Useful with caveats Worth a free-trial verification pass given its Virginia and Georgia claim, but treat all current figures as unverified pending that check.
Cloudscene	Cloudscene	Granular per-metro facility	A 'marketplace/data-centers'	Limited

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	(founded by Bevan Slattery per search; possible Megaport/Slattery group affiliation, not independently confirmed) (commercial) Access: free registration	counts across more than 150 US markets, useful as a national comparison baseline.	URL variant returned a 404 error, and no methodology is disclosed for its 'certified' facilities claim. No map is visible and facility-level detail is gated.	Useful only as a rough per-metro count check; not verified for methodology or Virginia, Georgia or Tennessee specifics.
Data Center Map (datacentermap.com) GA	Data Center Map (privately held; founded 2007); no parent stated (commercial) Access: freemium	The oldest and most cited general purpose global data center directory, established in 2007, with state and market counts open without an account. Used as an enumeration backbone by the academic Schlauch et al. database and by Tennessee press outlets including the Lookout, WSMV and WBIR, and named by the Knoxville Utilities Board as the place to find the data centers it serves.	No methodology or verification statement is published, and no stated verification process covers its more than 10,000 listings. It has no lifecycle field and mixes units. Its Culpeper page lists 39 records under a title that says 30; seven are campuses listed alongside their own buildings, proposed campuses sit beside operating ones, and one site is in Fauquier County. Its public state pages, read on 28 September 2026, list 674 Virginia data centers (25 markets, 68 operators), 276 in Georgia ...	Limited Broad but methodologically opaque. It is fine for a first pass name and location list, not for lifecycle or capacity analysis, and any single count from it should be treated as unverified.
datacenterHawk	datacenterHawk (commercial data/analytics firm); parent not stated (commercial)	The free marketplace lists colocation markets with provider counts (Dallas/Fort Worth 59, Chicago 55, Northern Virginia 48 on 28 September 2026; Atlanta also listed) and	Colocation only: hyperscale self-built campuses, the bulk of Virginia's pipeline, are outside the free marketplace. The market map view is blurred and the facility list stops at one	Limited The free tier is a colocation directory with the map withheld; the market intelligence product that

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	Access: free colocation marketplace	facility cards with street addresses and operator names. Claims facility tour verification, a stronger claim than most directories make.	entry until the user unlocks it. No lifecycle, capacity or sourcing is visible without the paid platform.	gives datacenterHawk its reputation is subscription only.
DC Byte free maps	DC Byte (commercial market-intelligence firm); parent not stated (commercial) Access: platform by paid subscription	Free 'Hyperscale Maps' series, including an Americas Hyperscale Deployment Map (5 June 2025) showing AWS, Azure, Google Cloud and Oracle cloud regions by metro in regional panels (Midwest, Canada, Latin America and others). Explicit emphasis on continuous field validation rather than static self-reported data.	The free maps plot cloud availability regions at metro scale, with no facility records, status or capacity. The full report requires contact details including a mobile number. No facility-level detail from the paid platform could be confirmed.	Limited The platform is paid and unseen; the free material maps cloud regions, not facilities.
dcmmap.us (US Data Center Map) GA · TN	Not stated on its pages (commercial (inferred, not confirmed)) Access: free	Free, with a 'paused' lifecycle status useful for opposition and cancellation research, granular claimed totals, and the broadest claimed Georgia and Tennessee counts among general trackers checked.	Publisher identity is not established, a material caveat before citing any figure, and sourcing transparency is weaker than Compute Atlas. Its claimed 374.7 gigawatt total is precise-sounding but unverifiable, and its Tennessee count of 88 facilities is far above Cleanview's 23 and Tennessee Lookout's reconciled figure of about 78, unreconciled.	Limited Potentially useful free national and state totals, but do not cite without first identifying the publisher and checking its methodology page.
electricchoice.com (US data center count)	Not identified (commercial)	Not assessed.	Its count is known only from a search listing; the page itself	Limited Cited only as one leg of a

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
claim) <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Access: not known		was not read.	three-way national count disagreement, more than 2,100 versus 4,767 versus more than 5,400; do not cite this source's figure without a direct check.
interconnection.fyi (GridTracker) also	not fully stated on homepage; paid tier branded "GridTracker" (commercial) Access: free for core maps/tables	A rare fully free resource with data dated from 1995 to 2026 and daily updates, cited by federal sources including LBNL's Queued Up. Used directly as a Virginia input by the author's own Power Infrastructure Burden work, with complete capture recorded as of 11 August 2026.	Not a data center tracker; it tracks grid generation and storage interconnection requests, which include data centers only indirectly since large loads increasingly file separately. Substituting it for a data center specific tracker would be a scope mismatch.	Limited A valuable interconnection queue companion and methodology reference, not a data center map; do not substitute it for a data center specific tracker.
JLL North America Data Center Report (Midyear 2026)	JLL (Jones Lang LaSalle) (commercial) Access: summary open	The open summary of the Midyear 2026 report (11 August 2026) gives national figures: more than 66 GW under construction in North America, 77 percent of it in frontier markets led by West Texas, and vacancy at 1 percent for a third year.	No map, no facility records and no Virginia, Georgia or Tennessee figures in the open summary. A Data Center Frontier critique found JLL diverging materially from CBRE on the same H1 2025 market: vacancy near 0 percent versus 1.6 percent, and Northern Virginia absorption of 647 megawatts versus 538.6 megawatts.	Limited A market report with national headline figures, not a map or facility list; the full document requires handing over contact details.
richardmurch.substack.com; "US Data Centers...The Numbers"	Richard Murch (individual Substack author) (individual)	Explicitly names definitional variance and count-timing as the reason different sources disagree, a useful framing even	Names no specific sources for its own figure of 5,400 to 5,426 and does not address double-counting or announced-versus-	Limited Useful only as one leg of the national count-disagreement evidence, not

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	Access: free	without naming its own sources.	built directly. It is undated and is a commentary post, not a map or tracker.	as a citable count itself.
Structure Research	Structure Research (self-described independent research/consulting firm) (commercial) Access: subscription-based syndicated reports	A credible boutique market-share research house, regularly cited in trade press.	Not a map or facility tracker; no map or tracker product was identified at all.	Limited Not a map or tracker resource; it may help only for market-share narrative context.
Synergy Research Group	Synergy Research Group (commercial) Access: free press summaries	Credible, widely cited hyperscale and cloud market-share figures.	Not a map or facility tracker; no facility-level map or tracker exists at all, and no free facility-level data is available.	Limited Useful for market-share context, not for facility- or project-level Virginia, Georgia or Tennessee research.
TeleGeography <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	TeleGeography (commercial) Access: not stated	One of four merged commercial sources in Schlauch and Greenhill's harmonized academic database. It formally debunked the claim that 70 percent of world internet traffic flows through Virginia or Loudoun using its own bandwidth-capacity data; Tim Stronge of TeleGeography stated on 30 May 2019 that the DC metro area is only about 9 percent of US international	Its figures are known only through secondary academic and press use.	Limited Not independently evaluated; cite its secondary use, the debunking of the 70 percent myth, with attribution to that secondary source rather than to a direct check of TeleGeography itself.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
		internet bandwidth capacity and about 9 percent of US data centers.		
U.S. Data Center Construction Tracker (AIA Contract Documents)	AIA Contract Documents (trade-association) Access: free, no account	A public project map (a Storepoint locator) claiming 247 or more active U.S. projects on 28 September 2026. Each record gives project name, a stage category (approved, permitted or under construction; planned; pending start), a capacity band (medium 11 to 50 MW, large 51 to 99 MW, hyperscale 100 to 999 MW, mega campus over 1,000 MW, or unknown), square footage, city and state, and a link to an AIA write-up.	Covers construction-stage projects only, with no operating, withdrawn or denied records. No per-record source, as-of date or download. The page's headline figures (\$180 billion direct investment, \$312 billion estimated total economic impact, 1.2 million jobs, a \$0.74 construction halo per \$1 invested) are the publisher's multiplier estimates, framed as sales opportunity for contractors.	Limited A free national map of construction-stage projects built to sell construction contracts; the stage and size fields are useful, the economic figures are promotional and the sourcing is not shown.
usdatamap.com, US Data Center Map 2026 <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Not stated on its pages (commercial) Access: not known	None assessed.	Publisher, method and coverage unknown; claims 800+ facilities in its search listing.	Limited Surfaced by search on 28 September 2026 and not evaluated.
Aterio	Aterio (commercial predictive-data vendor) (commercial) Access: effectively sales-gated	An unusually detailed sourcing list for a data feed vendor, combining satellite, government, academic and news inputs. Described academically by Yue and Zeng as the most comprehensive facility-level coverage of US data centers.	Entirely paywalled and sales-gated, with no public map or sample data to verify any claim. A Carl Vinson Institute Georgia fixed-effects study using Aterio's national dataset found only 30 percent of Georgia data center activity attributable to the state's tax exemption, down from 90 percent in an earlier	Avoid for research No public or free access point exists for a researcher without a subscription to verify or use any claim.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
			2022 study that lacked sufficient data for accurate analysis, a case where this database materially changed a state policy-attribution finding.	
<u>Data Center Coalition (DCC)</u>	Data Center Coalition (trade-association) Access: homepage/reports free	Not applicable as a map resource.	No map or tracker was found despite it being the most prominent US data center trade association. Deeper site sections beyond the homepage were not individually checked, so a map buried elsewhere cannot be fully ruled out.	Avoid for research A confirmed absence of a map or tracker; if the Impact Study itself is needed, that is a separate document, not a map.
<u>Data Center Knowledge (Informa) / DCD (Data Center Dynamics)</u> <u>datacenterdynamics.com</u>	Data Center Knowledge; Informa; DCD; DatacenterDynamics Ltd (brand only, not independently confirmed) (press) Access: Resource Library/homepage free	Not applicable as a map resource; valuable as a press and citation source for individual project announcements.	Neither outlet publishes a free public data center map or tracker.	Avoid for research Use for news citations, not geodata; recheck DCD Intelligence separately if paid access is ever available.
<u>Data Center Proposal Tracker (trackdatacenters.com)</u>	page metadata attributes to an individual ("Emilia"); thin/uncertain provenance (individual) Access: free	None confirmed beyond existing and being free.	Minimal transparency on sourcing, record counts or identity, the weakest-documented resource reviewed.	Avoid for research Insufficient transparency on sourcing, ownership or scope to treat as citable.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
S&P Global 451 Research Datacenter KnowledgeBase (DCKB) <i>Not read directly; see Open items.</i>	S&P Global (451 Research is an S&P Global Market Intelligence brand) (commercial) Access: paid subscription only	The largest claimed record count and deepest claimed per-facility attribute count, more than 100 fields, of any resource reviewed, if the claims hold.	Fully paywalled and enterprise-priced, inaccessible to a researcher without a subscription. It is cited academically as the common database behind two papers, Alvarez et al.'s NBER working paper w35194 (weak first-stage F of 8.11) and Ryan Wang's Yale job market paper (statistically insignificant), which constructed different treatment variables from the same vendor data and both proved fragile.	Avoid for research Noted for completeness as the largest claimed commercial database, not usable without institutional access.
Wood Mackenzie Lens Data Center and Data Campus Map	Wood Mackenzie (commercial) Access: fully paid	The product page claims more than 3,200 data center sites in all pipeline stages across 20 countries (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico and the United States in the Americas), more than 600 GW planned and more than 270 GW existing, 130 market zones, and attributes for planned capacity, cost, developer, market and zone, layered with power plants, substations, power lines and, in the US, nodal pricing. The most energy-systems-integrated map found.	Demo and subscription only; every figure above is the vendor's claim from its product page, and none could be checked.	Avoid for research Likely high value for a funded team, not usable by a researcher without a subscription given zero free access.

National public, NGO, academic and press resources

Federal and laboratory datasets, advocacy trackers, press interactives and academic work with national scope.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Business Insider data center tracker and permit investigation method	Business Insider (press) Access: paid subscription	Map and table of 1,416 data centers built or approved through 2025 in 45 states and DC, from backup-generator air permits requested from every state; searchable by county, state, ZIP and corporate parent, with estimated electricity-use ranges and a flag for sites with a dedicated power-plant permit. The 2025 series (1,240 facilities) published its method.	Misses sites that build power plants instead of backup generators and counts some offices with generators (Meta disputes its count); 19 permits had generator capacity redacted; electricity use is an estimate from generator capacity; behind a paywall.	Recommended The only national inventory built from state air permits, searchable and dated; permit-method blind spots stated; paywalled.
Epoch AI; Frontier Data Centers Hub (AI Data Center Map)	Epoch AI (independent research nonprofit) Access: free	The most rigorous, independently verifiable methodology, combining satellite imagery and computer vision, and the most open licence terms of any resource reviewed. It is free and citable without paywall concerns, with unusually rich per-facility attributes including compute, cost and megawatts not found on any advocacy tracker.	A small absolute record count, 93 facilities, or 13 in the deepest-verified subset, and it covers only the largest frontier AI-specific facilities by design, not the broader data center universe. Its methodology page and licence or download terms were not independently checked.	Recommended Best in class for methodology transparency and licensing on the largest AI data centers specifically, not a general-purpose Virginia, Georgia or Tennessee census tool; cite it for its specific niche only.
FracTracker Alliance; US Data Centers Tracker Dashboard	FracTracker Alliance (NGO-advocacy) Access: free	Six public status layers behind the 2026 tracker, counted on 28 September 2026: 1,696 records (operating 532, proposed 767, approved 178, expanding 69,	Tennessee has 12 records against 61 to 88 elsewhere; community pushback is 'Unknown' for 616 of 767 proposed records; non-	Recommended The richest open national attribute set, with every lifecycle stage and a location-confidence rating;

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
		suspended 72, cancelled 78); Virginia 464, Georgia 183, Tennessee 12. Fields include MW with low and high bounds, power source, generators, cooling, acres, cost, expected online date, community pushback, NDA and a location-confidence rating.	commercial licence and self-declared advocacy framing.	advocacy framing stated; Tennessee thin.
IM3 Open-Source Data Center Atlas (PNNL/DOE)	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, operated by Battelle for US DOE; sponsored by DOE Office of Science, BER (MultiSector Dynamics/IM3 program) (government-federal) Access: free	Federal-lab-quality curation, with footprints and campus polygons rather than just points, layered on open OpenStreetMap data. It carries a genuinely open ODbL licence with a clear attribution chain, is a rare government or national-lab data center GIS product, and its Virginia figures reproduced exactly against NAR's own count.	Dominated by tagged buildings, not facilities, about five of six objects. Zero facilities appear in nine Virginia localities with DEQ air permits: Caroline, Chesterfield, Hanover, Louisa, Russell, Spotsylvania, Stafford, Virginia Beach and Wise; clearest is Stafford's Amazon IAD-350, permitted 27 March 2025, still zero as of the Atlas's 9 February 2026 publication. Also zero in 58 of 163 counties (36 percent) with EPA air-program records, 44 of 134 (33 percent) on stricter status. The live map needed a browser to ...	Recommended The strongest government-sourced, openly licensed data center dataset reviewed, despite the unverified live map and the documented zero-cell and version-churn issues. The author's earlier analysis frames these findings narrowly, noting that none of this shows a report's conclusions are wrong, only that what the findings bear on is narrower.
Moratorium Nation (Michael J. Bommarito, 2026) GitHub	Michael J. Bommarito (individual researcher; also co-founder Alea Institute and 273 Ventures; runs	The most open licence, CC-BY-4.0 plus MIT, and richest structured export formats of any resource reviewed, with explicit deduplication logic and explicit sector-coding to isolate data centers from renewables	A single independent author, not institutionally vetted, uses an LLM-based classification pipeline, a genuinely novel error source; the live map interface is unconfirmed. Its live-site total of 1,291 and a re-	Recommended For the record unit it covers, moratoria rather than facilities, the most rigorous, open and transparent resource reviewed; cite a specific

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	servercountry.org and fightdatacenter.com) (individual (open-data-community in practice, GitHub-hosted open code/data)) Access: free	and battery storage. Its sourcing methodology discloses LLM-assisted classification, a documented example of good disclosed-AI-assisted-counting practice.	analyzed CSV total of 533 or 409 disagree, unreconciled. A rival dataset disagrees with it in 31 of 34 shared states and names 44 jurisdictions absent here, about three-quarters of which proved real on the author's own check.	total with its snapshot date rather than citing the source generally, given the unreconciled 1,291 versus 533 or 409 discrepancy.
Schlauch, Elhai, Greenhill, Butler, Guidi, Bargagli-Stoffi; "Mapping the Scale and Geography of U.S. Data Centers" (harmonized academic database) <i>No public URL recorded.</i>	academic research team (unpublished working paper at the date checked) (academic) Access: restricted-use per author instruction	It states the cross-vendor data-quality problem from inside the academic field. The seven incompatible academic dating conventions it catalogues stem from disagreeing commercial source data, not independent errors.	Unpublished or restricted as received, and it inherits its four source vendors' disagreements even after harmonization. It states its own limit: campus grouping may incorrectly combine distinct developments or separate connected facilities.	Recommended The clearest academic articulation of the cross-vendor data-quality problem this register documents, though access is restricted and it is not itself a public map.
2024 United States Data Center Energy Usage Report (LBNL/Shehabi et al.)	Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, for US DOE, responding to a Congressional request in the Energy Act of 2020 (government-federal) Access: free	An authoritative, congressionally mandated, widely cited national baseline for data center energy trends.	No map or facility data; an eight-year gap since the prior edition suggests infrequent updates. Even this most-cited federal-lab estimate is stitched together from incomplete, partly proprietary, partly manually searched sources rather than one authoritative registry.	Useful with caveats Authoritative for national energy-trend citations, not a map or dataset resource for facility-level research.
AI Now Institute; North Star Data Center	AI Now Institute (AI Now Policy	Structured policy-strength ratings across many issue	Not a data center inventory or map at all; a researcher	Useful with caveats Explicitly not a mapping

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Policy Toolkit	Institute) (NGO-advocacy) Access: free	areas, genuinely useful as a reference for advocacy and legislative research.	expecting a facility map from this resource will not find one. Its licence is proprietary, all rights reserved.	resource; useful for policy research only.
ArcGIS Online public catalogue, as a way to find the layers behind data center maps	Esri (catalogue of third-party items) (commercial) Access: free	A search on 28 September 2026 returned 691 public feature services titled 'data centers', including the layers behind PEC's, FracTracker's and Science for Georgia's maps, each queryable for counts, fields and edit dates.	Mixed quality and ownership; items can be personal accounts; titles and dates can mislead (a layer titled 'as of 02/16/2025' was edited in August 2026).	Useful with caveats Not a map but the route to the public layers behind several maps; each layer must be judged on its own publisher.
Bommarito & Bommarito; "Data Center Policy Across the 50 States" (ALEA Institute working paper) SSRN	Jillian Bommarito & Michael J. Bommarito II, ALEA Institute (individual / academic (working paper)) Access: free PDF / SSRN abstract	Its explicit split between reported disclosures and research estimates is an implicit critique of trackers that blend verified and unverified figures without labeling which is which. Its disclosed LLM-assisted methodology is a rare and useful transparency example.	A working draft, not yet peer-reviewed, with numbers not independently verified beyond the published summary. Its subject is data center policy, incentives, land use and energy regulation across states, not a pure facility inventory.	Useful with caveats Valuable as a methodological example, a disclosed verified-versus-unverified split and disclosed AI use, more than as a citable facility count; verify any number against the full document first.
Data Center Watch (10a Labs) report	10a Labs (NGO-advocacy or commercial research (functions as an opposition tracker); self-described "objective, fact-based, and nonpartisan" though its	A timely quarterly cadence with a direct focus on the blocked or delayed phenomenon that is otherwise hard to quantify elsewhere.	One-sided by design, covering only blocked or delayed projects; sourcing method is undisclosed and no download or licence terms are confirmed. Dollar-figure and count claims are known only via secondary press; a \$500 million Henrico deferral claim sourced solely to this tracker could not be verified, with no county case	Useful with caveats Valuable for the opposition-outcomes angle specifically, not a general project inventory; verify all figures against the primary report, and never treat a single tracker-sourced claim as fact without a primary-record check.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	selection criterion (blocked/delayed only) is itself a form of stake) Access: free		number or staff report found, and a direct check for noise or model-ordinance content found nothing.	
EPA ECHO (Enforcement and Compliance History Online)	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (government-federal) Access: free	Authoritative federal compliance and enforcement data, free, national and facility-level. The author's own Virginia cross-validation reproduced the figure almost exactly, 134 against an expected 133.	Not data center-native; NAICS 518210 is broader than 'data center' and needs heavy researcher-side filtering. A self-audit of 79 facilities in the 64-county comparison found 10 affirmatively not data centers, 20 unclassifiable from the name, and 49 recognizable data centers; six counties held only non-data-center records. Two join-logic defects were fixed, moving the headline figure from 48 of 136 counties (35 percent) to 44 of 134 (33 percent).	Useful with caveats A legitimate proxy source for backup-generator air permits once filtered, but not a ready-made data center resource; the 79-facility name-classification check shows real false-positive and ambiguous risk, and any coverage figure drawn from NAICS 518210 should not be reported without saying so.
Good Jobs First; Subsidy Tracker (as data center locator)	Good Jobs First (NGO-advocacy) Access: free	A large, long-running, well-known accountability database with an explicit and rare self-documented limitation about comparability. The author's earlier work used it for a national data center sales-tax-exemption comparison totaling \$3.1 billion collectively across more than 10 states, including more than \$1 billion in Texas and \$732 million in Virginia, per	Not data center-native, with no confirmed data center category or filter; it is usable only as an indirect locator via known company names. The publisher itself states it is 'not appropriate' to make state-by-state or jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction comparisons because disclosure practices are uneven.	Useful with caveats Valuable for subsidy and tax-incentive research on known operators, not usable as a general data-center locator.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
		a 2025 Good Jobs First analysis.		
NAR 2026 Data Center Impact Report (National Association of REALTORS) <i>No public URL recorded.</i>	National Association of REALTORS (NAR) (trade-association) Access: not stated	Its arithmetic was verified correct by an independent audit in four separate checks, and its underlying source, the IM3 Atlas, is open. It unusually candidly self-discloses its own methodological limits.	It inherits every limit of the underlying IM3 Atlas, including zero-cells and version churn, and is not itself a map. NAR's own methodology states that rates are summarized at the state level and matched to counties, so they do not capture within-state or utility-area differences, and that the report does not mean data centers caused home values to rise.	Useful with caveats The arithmetic is correct and the source is open; the issue is what the underlying inventory can support, not how NAR used it.
National Emissions Inventory (NEI), 2020 data cited	U.S. EPA (government-federal) Access: free	Facility-level identification is possible, not just county aggregate, more granular than many advocacy trackers for this narrow proxy use.	Not data center-native, like EPA ECHO; isolating data center backup generators requires NAICS code and equipment-type filtering. There is a multi-year update lag, with 2020 data still the most recent available, and no native data center category.	Useful with caveats The same proxy logic as ECHO applies; facility-level granularity is a genuine strength for this narrow generator and emissions use case.
OpenStreetMap data center tags (telecom=data_center, building=data_center) wiki	OpenStreetMap volunteer community (no single owner); tag documented on OSM Wiki (open-data-community) Access: free	taginfo on 28 September 2026: telecom=data_center on 4,690 objects worldwide (877 nodes, 3,749 ways, 64 relations) and building=data_center on 1,282 objects; open licence (ODbL).	Objects are buildings or sites mapped by volunteers, not facilities, and the two tags overlap; no US or state breakdown from taginfo (an Overpass query is needed); coverage follows mapping effort, not permits.	Useful with caveats Open, current and global, but a count of tagged map objects, not facilities.
Business Insider,	Business Insider	Not checked.	Not opened; compare with	Limited

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
places that banned or paused data centers (map) <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	(press) Access: paid subscription		Moratorium Nation before use.	Found by search on 28 September 2026 and not opened.
Data Center Infrastructure in the United States, November 2025 (National Laboratory of the Rockies map, formerly issued under NREL) image	National Laboratory of the Rockies (Billy Roberts, Strategic Energy Analysis Center) (government-federal) Access: free	Shows data center locations against transmission lines, fiber routes and metropolitan areas on one national sheet. Publication NLR/OT-6A20-98553, November 2025, replacing the May 2025 edition (NREL/OT-6A20-94502).	A single JPG with no layer, download or record list. The publication page states that the datasets are not produced or curated by the laboratory and that it is not responsible for their accuracy or completeness, and it does not name them. A secondary source (maps.com) says it shows more than 4,000 data centers; that figure was not checked against the image.	Limited A static one-page poster of third-party data that its own laboratory declines to vouch for; good for a slide, not for a count.
EIA: data center server electricity use (Today in Energy + AEO2026)	U.S. Energy Information Administration (government-federal) Access: free	Authoritative national demand-growth figures directly relevant to the data centers driving electricity growth narrative, grounded in the AEO2026 outlook and CBECS survey data.	Explicitly aggregate only; it does not identify individual data center locations or facilities and is not usable as a locator. No facility-level or state-level data exists, and it is not a map.	Limited Useful for macro energy-demand claims only, not for any facility- or state-level research question.
Global Energy Monitor; Cryptomining Tracker <i>No public URL recorded. Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Global Energy Monitor (tracks fossil/energy infrastructure broadly) (NGO-advocacy / open-data-community) Access: not stated	Used as the fourth merged source, alongside Baxtel, Data Center Map and TeleGeography, in Schlauch et al.'s harmonized academic database, specifically for cryptomining facilities.	Known only through secondary academic use.	Limited Not independently evaluated; cite only via its secondary academic use.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Washington Post interactive data center map(s) satellite images show scale	The Washington Post (press) Access: likely paid subscription	May 2026 permit-based analysis of 132 Northern Virginia data centers counting 10,500 diesel generators and estimating health effects; September 2026 satellite story using Cleanview data (nearly 100 hyperscale data centers operating, 120 under construction).	No searchable map or downloadable data; the generator count differs from PEC's roughly 9,000 on a different basis; paywalled.	Limited Reporting built on permits and on Cleanview; no public dataset or locator.
ArcGIS Living Atlas of the World (data-center-related content) layer found	Esri (commercial) Access: free	An electricity-rates layer ties EIA data to a usable map product.	No dedicated data center facility layer was located; the closest content found concerned electricity rates framed around AI and data center demand, not facility locations. A search of the public ArcGIS catalogue on 28 September 2026 (Living Atlas owner, 'data center') returned no data center layer.	Avoid for research No Esri Living Atlas data center layer found in the public ArcGIS catalogue.
Food & Water Watch data center campaign content (no map located) <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Food & Water Watch (NGO-advocacy) Access: not applicable	Not applicable.	No map found.	Avoid for research No map found.
Heatmap News data center coverage (free) and Heatmap Pro (paid tracker) paid	Heatmap News (press (free content); Heatmap Pro functions more like a commercial intelligence product sold to	Claims daily update cadence and direct phone-call verification, unusually rigorous if true, with an opposition-risk scoring layer not found elsewhere.	The free tracker or map a researcher might expect is actually the paid Heatmap Pro product, not publicly accessible, and its commercial, industry-facing audience undercuts its use as a neutral public-interest	Avoid for research The substantive product is paid and industry-facing, not a public good; free editorial coverage is useful for context and citations but

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	industry; hybrid case) Access: free editorial content		research tool. Specifics remain unconfirmed behind the paywall.	is not a map or dataset.
HIFLD; dedicated data-center layer (none found)	DHS/CISA-coordinated HIFLD Subcommittee (FGDC); hosted on ArcGIS Hub (government-federal) Access: free	HIFLD's other infrastructure layers remain useful as context; a NASA NCCS mirror shows its broad category structure.	A search of the public ArcGIS catalogue on 28 September 2026 found no HIFLD data center layer; the HIFLD results were other infrastructure layers, some marked deprecated. Updates stopped in June 2025.	Avoid for research No HIFLD data center layer found in the public ArcGIS catalogue; HIFLD itself is discontinued.
Sierra Club data center advocacy content (no map located) PDF <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Sierra Club (NGO-advocacy) Access: not applicable	Not applicable for map or tracker purposes.	Sierra Club clearly has substantive data center advocacy content, but no mapping or dataset product was located.	Avoid for research No map found.
University "data center atlas" (negative finding; no resource confirmed) <i>No public URL recorded. Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	not applicable (no resource identified) (academic) Access: not applicable	Not applicable.	No university-run data center atlas, distinct from PNNL's national-lab IM3 atlas, was identified within the search performed; this is not exhaustive.	Avoid for research No such resource located; not exhaustive.
Wikipedia; search for a dedicated "List of data centers" article <i>Seen in search results only; not read directly.</i>	Wikimedia Foundation / volunteer editors (open-data-community)	None identified for this specific use case.	No dedicated, structured, citable list of US data centers was found on Wikipedia.	Avoid for research No structured, citable data center list or map was found on Wikipedia.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	Access: free			

Context layers

Layers researchers lay over a data center map: generation, interconnection queues, pipelines, water, demographics and utility service territories.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
Census TIGER/Line + American Community Survey (ACS) ACS data	U.S. Census Bureau (government-federal) Access: free	Current, with a 2025 release, free, downloadable, the standard boundary and demographic backbone for joining to any other geographic dataset.	Not data center-specific; a foundational join layer, not a standalone finding. Its ACS component was not independently checked beyond noting that it joins to TIGER via geographic codes.	Recommended The standard, current, free geographic and demographic backbone any register in this project should join against.
EIA-860 (annual generator inventory)	U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) (government-federal) Access: free	Current, with 2025 final data released September 2026, authoritative, free and downloadable, the best-maintained resource among the context-layer set reviewed.	Not a data center resource itself; it is generator-level and requires joining to be useful for data-center-adjacent grid analysis. Its retired-generator tab is explicitly non-comprehensive, so retired or withdrawn records can be dropped rather than retained.	Recommended The most current and best-documented federal context-layer dataset reviewed, with one disclosed caveat on retired-generator completeness.
LBNL "Queued Up" report and dataset	Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) (government-federal (national laboratory)) Access: free	Free, current, CC BY 4.0, an authoritative national-laboratory analysis with an explicit, quantified caution about queue-to-built attrition.	Not a data center-specific resource; it is a generation and storage interconnection-queue analysis used as a methodology and context reference. Its headline finding, that only 13 percent of 2000 to 2020 queue capacity reached commercial operation by the end of 2025, is taken from the publisher's summary page and should be confirmed against the full	Recommended The best-documented, most current federal analysis of the announced-versus-built gap, which should inform how every data center pipeline figure in this register is read.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
			report before citing.	
CDC/ATSDR Social Vulnerability Index (SVI)	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention / Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (CDC/ATSDR) (government-federal) Access: free	Authoritative, free, a standard demographic-vulnerability context layer widely used alongside environmental-justice analysis.	Its observed data vintage, 2020, released October 2022, lags the current date by several years, and it is not data center-specific.	Useful with caveats A useful demographic-vulnerability context layer; confirm the current vintage before citing, given the observed lag.
EIA Maps; Oil & Natural Gas pipeline layers	U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) (government-federal) Access: free	The best available public federal gas-pipeline mapping resource found, given FERC's own layer is unreachable or nonexistent.	Not data center-specific, and its download capability and update cadence were not fully confirmed.	Useful with caveats A practical substitute for the missing FERC pipeline layer, but not independently verified end to end.
EPA EJScreen (official tool, removed) and PEDP v2.3 mirror	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), official tool; Public Environmental Data Partners (PEDP), mirror (government-federal (official); NGO-advocacy/open-data-community (PEDP mirror)) Access: free	The PEDP mirror is the only way to access this data at all now, and it documents EPA's own prior environmental-justice methodology.	EPA officially removed EJScreen on 5 February 2025; the only remaining accessible version is PEDP's frozen v2.3 mirror, frozen and unofficially maintained since then, with no further federal updates.	Useful with caveats Only accessible via an unofficial mirror of a discontinued federal tool; always disclose that substitution when citing this data.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
OpenInfraMap	OpenInfraMap project (OSM-derived) (individual/open-data-community) Access: free for viewing/small extracts	Free and global, useful as a grid-proximity context layer alongside a facility tracker.	Not a data center inventory, a power-grid context layer instead. Its crowd-sourced coverage is inherently uneven, and completeness and currency are not independently verified.	Useful with caveats A useful free power-grid context layer, but crowd-sourced completeness is unverified.
USGS Water Use in the United States	U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) (government-federal) Access: free	Current, free, downloadable and authoritative national water-use data.	No data center-specific category exists, and county-level aggregate water and energy figures cannot be attributed to a single facility; this is a common misapplication risk.	Useful with caveats A legitimate national water-use context layer, but its county-level aggregation makes it easy to misapply to a single facility; flag this explicitly wherever cited.
EIA U.S. Energy Atlas	U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) (government-federal) Access: free	An authoritative federal energy-infrastructure basemap.	Not independently verified; its download capability could not be confirmed and would need a browser-based review.	Limited No data center layer; a context resource only.
HIFLD Electric Substations / Transmission Lines layers <i>No public URL recorded.</i>	Homeland Infrastructure Foundation-Level Data (HIFLD) program; parent agency not further stated (government-federal) Access: free	Was the most complete publicly available substation and transmission layer found, per a county-commissioned engineering study; a Data Rescue Project mirror preserves it.	The public HIFLD Open portal stopped data updates 26 June 2025 and was publicly discontinued 26 August 2025; DHS's substitute is a crosswalk document, not a live layer. It is now usable only via the volunteer Data Rescue Project's mirror of more than 300 datasets, with positional	Limited A genuinely useful power-grid layer that is now stale and discontinued at the source, usable only via the Data Rescue Project mirror, with an unstated-accuracy caveat carried over from before discontinuation.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
			accuracy unstated, and Virginia's own VGIN publishes no electric transmission or substation layer at all.	
MISO Generator Interconnection Queue (interactive map)	Midcontinent Independent System Operator (MISO) (utility (regional transmission organization)) Access: free	Current generator interconnection queue, 3,873 requests on 28 September 2026, filterable by status (including withdrawn), fuel and state, with a full CSV download.	Generators only, no large loads or data centers. Its state filter lists no Virginia, Georgia or Tennessee entries; MISO's footprint does not reach them. The map at giqueue.misoenergy.org returned a permission error.	Limited Out of geographic scope for this project; included only as a context and methodology comparator.
PJM interconnection queue (official page) serial queue	PJM Interconnection (utility (regional transmission organization)) Access: not confirmed	Would be the authoritative PJM interconnection-queue source if reachable.	Unreachable; both official queue-tool URLs returned a 404 error.	Limited The old queue path returns PJM's 404; see the Large Load registry row for PJM's forthcoming data.
PJM Large Load page and forthcoming Large Load Registry	PJM Interconnection (RTO) Access: free	PJM's own registry of large loads, including data centers, pending FERC approval; field definitions posted 25 September 2026; tool stated ready 1 January 2027.	Public information is to be aggregated by zone or area and not before March 2027, so it will not locate facilities; depends on FERC acting on Docket ER26-3515-000.	Limited Not yet a data source; the public version is announced as aggregated by zone or area for March 2027.
TVA Local Power Company / distributor service-area map <i>No public URL recorded.</i>	Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) (utility) Access: free	The only TVA distributor-boundary map located.	A static image only, not GIS data, with its year unconfirmed, and it does not resolve to individual facilities. This is the single biggest structural gap noted across the Tennessee	Limited The right resource for the TVA-served-versus-distributor question in principle, but only available as a non-queryable static

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
			section, since no GIS-queryable version was found.	image with an unconfirmed date.
USGS National Water Dashboard	U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) (government-federal) Access: presumed free, not confirmed	Would be a useful real-time water-monitoring layer if reachable.	Unreachable; two access routes both failed, first with a 403 response and then a 404.	Limited Cannot assess; a person needs to locate the current working URL manually.
USGS/NCED National Conservation Easement Database <i>No public URL recorded.</i>	U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) / National Conservation Easement Database (NCED) partnership (government-federal) Access: free	Was a useful national conservation-easement layer relevant to proximity-to-protected-land analysis, as used by More Than Just Parks' Georgia tracker.	Unmaintained and unsupported as of January 2025; a successor, PAD-US, the Protected Areas Database of the US, exists but was not independently checked.	Limited Stale since January 2025; check PAD-US as a possible successor before relying on this database for current protected-land boundaries.
FERC natural gas pipeline GIS layer <i>No public URL recorded.</i>	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) (government-federal) Access: not applicable	Not applicable.	Does not appear to exist as a public product; a direct URL returned a 404 error and a data catalog query returned no pipeline datasets.	Avoid for research No working public FERC gas-pipeline GIS product was located; use EIA's pipeline and gas maps as the practical substitute.
Georgia PSC utility service-territory map <i>No public URL recorded.</i>	Georgia Public Service Commission (PSC) (government-state)	Not applicable.	No utility-territory map exists on the Georgia PSC site itself; it links out only to Georgia EMC and MEAG, neither independently checked. The	Avoid for research No map product exists on the Georgia PSC site; recorded here as a negative

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
	Access: not applicable		product this line item describes does not exist.	finding.

The author's own inventories

The author's own inventories, listed for completeness and not graded by this register.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
<u>Counting Data Centers deposit's own reconciliation apparatus (8 Python scripts)</u>	Tommy Turner (academic (the author's own work)) Access: free	Eight scripts that reproduce every quantitative claim in the Counting Data Centers note from its source files.	Not independently evaluated by any external report, and not a public-facing tool; the scripts accompany the deposited note.	Not graded The author's own work, listed here for completeness and not scored against this register's rubric.
Georgia facility inventory (Georgia Statewide Report, Appendix A + section I.3) <i>The author's prior work; no separate public URL.</i>	Tommy Turner (academic (the author's own work)) Access: the author's prior work	Explicit per-row sourcing discipline, exhaustive on what is disclosed and explicit about what is not, with a deliberately maintained cancellation register because, as the report states, cancellations carry as much information about Georgia's emerging politics as approvals do.	Not externally peer-reviewed. Its statewide investment total is intentionally left unreconciled across three incompatible figures: about \$65.4 billion, the author's sum of the 12 largest disclosed-capital projects; about \$101.4 billion, from PoweredByWho across 89 projects at all stages; and about \$40 billion, from Georgia Trend trade press for 2025 alone, which the report states differ by scope, not by error.	Not graded The author's own inventory, listed here for completeness and not scored against this register's rubric.
Tennessee facility inventory (Tennessee Statewide Report, Appendix A methods + Appendix B) <i>The author's prior work; no separate public URL.</i>	Tommy Turner (academic (the author's own work)) Access: the author's prior work	Its total of about 61 facilities is corroborated by three outside counts in a narrow band of 60 to 63, the tightest cross-source agreement in this register. It documents rejected figures: a 1,563 MW Sumner buildout found unverifiable, a claimed 2024 Google Clarksville opening actually dated 2019, a \$6 billion	Not externally peer-reviewed; its mid-June 2026 snapshot is now dated relative to September 2026 trackers, including dcmapp.us's 88 and Tennessee Lookout's later reconciliation of about 78.	Not graded The author's own inventory, listed here for completeness and not scored against this register's rubric.

Resource	Publisher and access	What it does well	Where it falls short	Verdict
		Google Tennessee claim against a best-supported \$2.5 billion, and an \$8 billion Clarksville claim traced to one social-media post, all excluded.		
Virginia master facility database (Turner Virginia Statewide Report, Appendices A-C) <i>The author's prior work; no separate public URL.</i>	Tommy Turner (academic (the author's own work)) Access: the author's prior work	A record-level Virginia facility inventory that treats blank cells as disclosure gaps rather than zeros.	Not externally peer-reviewed; triangulate it against trackers such as Cleanview, Data Center Map and DEQ permits rather than treat it as sole ground truth. Aggregate figures, about 3,100 MW operating, about 21,700 MW disclosed pipeline, understate totals since 191 of 286 records report no power figure; the companion map lags two named corrections. Its Fauquier County row lists no operating facility, which the county budget (two operating facilities) contradicts.	Not graded The author's own inventory, listed here for completeness and not scored against this register's rubric.

Open items and method

Three resources remain unread: [S&P Global 451 Research Datacenter KnowledgeBase \(DCKB\)](#); [Shelby County Health Department, xAI Colossus gas-turbine air permit \(as locator\)](#); [Chattanooga Times Free Press, "Where are data centers in Chattanooga region?"](#). Two are paid, and Shelby County's air permits have no public search. Seventeen more were seen only in search results. The workbook gives the reason for each.

How this register was built. The author set the scope and the scoring rubric (see the Appendix). Research agents built on Anthropic's Claude models searched for candidate resources by sector and state and retrieved each resource's own pages; Claude then scored each against the rubric. Maps that render only in a browser were read through their public ArcGIS and county GIS data services, and the record counts reported here come from those queries. The author opened and checked every resource with a live link, and reviewed each verdict. Resources were checked on 28 September 2026; each figure carries the date its source gives.

The work ran as a loop of testing, review and editing, with the author deciding at each step. Figures were tested against their sources: the IM3 atlas counts and the change between its two editions were reproduced from the atlas files with the scripts deposited with the author's Counting Data Centers note ([doi:10.5281/zenodo.22819653](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22819653)), and figures that appear in more than one document were checked against each other. Two independent readers running on different Claude models then read the finished documents cold, one the briefing and the prose, the other every register entry, looking for overclaims, contradictions and stale entries. The author reviewed each finding, decided which to act on, and supplied what automated retrieval could not reach, including pages behind sign-ins and terms of use and the direct address of Prince William County's map. The documents were then corrected, rebuilt and checked again for consistency.

Every entry carries its URL and the date it was checked, so any count or verdict can be traced to its source. Errors are the author's; corrections are welcome.

Appendix: Scoring rubric

Every resource in the register was recorded on the same 22 fields and graded on the same four-step scale. The rubric was set by the author before scoring began.

Field	What is recorded
1. Name	The resource's own name.
2. Publisher or owner	The organization, and its parent company or funder where the site states it.
3. Publisher type	Commercial, trade association, federal, state or local government, utility, regional transmission organization, advocacy group, academic, press, open-data community or individual.
4. URL	The map itself, and its methods or about page if it has one.
5. Geography	National, multi-state, state or local, and which states.
6. Record unit	Facility or building, campus, project or proposal, permit, parcel, or county aggregate.
7. Record count	As claimed, with the date of the claim, and as observed where a count could be taken.
8. Lifecycle stages	Which of operating, under construction, planned or proposed, approved, withdrawn or cancelled, and denied the resource carries.
9. Attributes	Operator or owner, MW, square feet, acreage, coordinates and their precision, opening date, water use, backup generation and air permits, serving utility, tax incentives, community opposition, and sources per record.
10. Update cadence	As claimed, and the last update observed.
11. Sourcing method	How records are found (press, permits, operator reports, satellite imagery, volunteer mapping, utility filings, proprietary survey), and whether each record cites a source.
12. Access	Free, free with registration, freemium, paid subscription or paid report, with the price if stated.
13. Export and licence	Download formats, API, and licence terms.
14. Map technology	Platform, filters, search, mobile use, and whether it needs a browser to render.
15. Stake	Whether the publisher sells data to the industry, advocates for or against, or is the utility or developer, and what the stake is.

Field	What is recorded
16. Known errors and limits	Documented or observed errors, stale records, duplicates, mislocated points and counting disputes, with the evidence.
17. State coverage	Whether and how well the resource covers Virginia, Georgia and Tennessee.
18. Strengths	What it does that others do not.
19. Shortcomings	What a researcher would trip on.
20. Verdict	One step on the scale below, with a one-line reason.
21. Status	Read directly, seen only in search results, or not read.
22. Date checked	The date the entry was last verified.

Verdict scale

Verdict	What it means
Recommended	Can carry a claim in published research with its stated caveat.
Useful with caveats	Can locate or corroborate; should not stand alone.
Limited	Answers a narrower question than its name suggests.
Avoid for research	Cannot support a research claim: does not exist as described, cannot be audited, or is coverage rather than data. Includes negative findings.
Not graded	The author's own inventories, listed and not graded.

Evidence rules

Four rules governed every entry. What a publisher says about itself was recorded separately from what could be seen on its own pages or in its data. A field the resource does not address was marked "not stated" and a field that could not be examined was marked "not checked"; no field was filled by inference. Every entry carries a URL that was actually opened or seen, and the date. A page that failed on two separate retrieval routes was listed as unread rather than described from secondhand accounts.

Record counts, prices, update dates and features were taken only from the resource's own pages or data. Where a figure came from elsewhere, such as a press report, the entry says so.