

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	26-SPPE-01
Project Title:	RB Inyokern Data Center (RBIDC)
TN #:	271129
Document Title:	RBIDC - Data Response Set 1
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Kyle Mohr
Organization:	R&L Capital Inc
Submitter Role:	Applicant Representative
Submission Date:	7/1/2026 11:33:32 AM
Docketed Date:	7/1/2026

RB INYOKERN DATA CENTER

Application for Small Power Plant Exemption (SPPE)

Inyokern, Kern County, California

Docket Number – 26-SPPE-01

Data Response Set 1

July 1, 2026

Elizabeth Huber
Project Manager
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Response to Data Requests Set 1 — RBIDC Response Set 1 (26-SPPE-01)

Dear Ms. Huber:

On behalf of R&L Capital, Inc., the undersigned submits the enclosed responses to CEC Data Requests Set 1, dated June 11, 2026, for the RB Inyokern Data Center (Docket No. 26-SPPE-01).

Responses to all data requests are provided in the enclosed response document, organized by resource area consistent with the Data Requests Set 1 format. Supplemental documents referenced within the responses have been submitted separately to the CEC docket via the project portal and assigned new Transmittal Numbers identified within the applicable responses. Where information is not yet available at the conceptual design stage, responses identify the relevant items and commit to providing supplemental information upon completion of final engineering consistent with Section 3.2 of the Main Application (TN 269893).

The Applicant remains committed to supporting CEC staff's timely completion of its environmental review and is available to discuss any questions regarding the enclosed responses.

Respectfully submitted,

Kyle Mohr
Representative
On behalf of R&L Capital, Inc.

Enclosure:

- Data Response Set 1 — RB Inyokern Data Center (26-SPPE-01)
- **Note:** Supplemental documents referenced in the enclosed responses have been submitted separately to the CEC docket via the project portal and assigned new Transmittal Numbers identified within the applicable responses.

AESTHETICS

Author: Michael Aceves

BACKGROUND: SPPE Application Appendix Elements

The SPPE application did not include the Appendix Elements. The Appendix Elements are used to review the visual/aesthetic impact.

DATA REQUESTS

DR AES-1. Please provide Appendix Elements A.1 Site Plan, A.2 Visual Resources Site Renderings, & I.1 Visual & Lighting Analysis.

BACKGROUND: Architectural Elevations

The SPPE application did not include architectural plans. The project includes an approximately 238,000 square-foot data center. CEC staff need the architectural elevations to complete the review.

R&L Response

DR AES-1 - Appendix Elements A.1 (Site Plan), A.2 (Visual Resources Site Renderings), and I.1 (Visual and Lighting Analysis) were each submitted with the Application as docketed components of the RBIDC SPPE filing. Appendix Elements A.1 and A.2 were submitted under Transmittal Number (TN) 269593, and Appendix Element I.1 was submitted under TN 269607. The Main Application, submitted under TN 269893, references each of these Appendix Elements throughout Section 4.1 (Aesthetics, pp. 102–135) and Section 1.15 (Summary Figures and Exhibits, p. 69). Appendix Element A.1 is further cross-referenced in Table 4.1-1 (Visible Components and Concept-Level Dimensions, p. 102), and Appendix Element I.1 is cross-referenced in Table 4.1-A (CEC SPPE Appendix B Section (g)(6) Compliance Cross-Reference, p. 135).

The Applicant respectfully submits that Appendix Elements A.1, A.2, and I.1, as docketed under the transmittal numbers identified above, satisfy the information request set forth in DR AES-1. Should Staff require any element to be resubmitted as a standalone filing or in an alternative format, the Applicant will accommodate that request promptly.

A revised Appendix A.1 (Site Plan) has been submitted as part of the response to this data request as Appendix A Supplement — Section A.1 Revision 1 (TN 271054). The revised A.1 incorporates updated site plan information including landscape notation, existing gas transmission main location, generator block diagrams, and zoomed facility drawing that additionally support the Applicant's responses to DR AES-3, DR AQ-5, and DR EFF-1.

DATA REQUEST

DR AES-2. Please provide architectural elevations.

BACKGROUND: Landscape Plans

The SPPE application did not include landscape plans. The project includes an approximately 238,000 square-foot data center. CEC staff need the landscape plans to complete the review.

R&L Response

DR AES-2 - The Application was submitted at the conceptual design stage, as disclosed in the opening paragraph of Section 1.0 (Project Description, p. 11) and confirmed in Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, pp. 100–101). At the time of application submittal, final architectural construction documents had not yet been prepared, and formal architectural elevations are therefore not currently available.

The best available conceptual-stage representations of the facility's architectural form, dimensions, and exterior treatment are provided in Appendix A.1 (Site Plan) and Appendix A.2 (Visual Resources Site Renderings), both of which are located within Appendix A (TN 269593). Appendix A.1 includes the conceptual building footprint, site layout, and approximate building dimensions consistent with the design parameters described in Section 1.4.1 (Data Center Campus, pp. 16–17), which establishes the approximately 238,000-square-foot building envelope with a maximum structural height of 30 feet at the top of rooftop mechanical equipment and solar panels. Conceptual building heights can be identified on page five of Appendix A.1 (TN 269593). Appendix A.2 provides post-construction photo-realistic visual simulations from six Key Observation Points depicting the exterior appearance and massing of the facility from representative viewpoints, consistent with CEC Appendix B §(g)(6)(C). Additional architectural detail regarding materials, colors, and finishes is provided in Table 4.1-1 (Visible Components and Concept-Level Dimensions, p. 102) and Table 4.1-2 (Exterior Treatments / Color and Finish Commitments, p. 103) of the Main Application (TN 269893).

Final architectural elevations will be submitted as a supplement to the docket prior to the Kern County building permit application, consistent with the project's staged permitting timeline and the pending items identified in Section 3.2 (pp. 100–101). The Applicant will provide written notice to the CEC Project Manager concurrent with that submittal.

DATA REQUEST

DR AES-3. Please provide the landscape plans, if any are available.

R&L Response

DR AES-3 - Formal landscape construction documents have not yet been prepared, consistent with the Application's conceptual design stage as disclosed in Section 1.0 (Project Description, p. 11) and Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, pp. 100–101). Final landscape plans will be developed as part of the Kern County permitting process and will be submitted to the CEC docket upon completion.

A revised Appendix A.1 incorporating preliminary landscape notation consistent with the xeriscape and drought-tolerant planting commitments in Section 1.4.6 (TN 269893) has been submitted as

Appendix A Supplement — Section A.1 Revision 1 (TN 271054). Final landscape plans will be submitted to the CEC docket with written notice to the CEC Project Manager at that time.

AIR QUALITY AND PUBLIC HEALTH

Authors: Brewster Birdsall, Rachael Dal Porto

BACKGROUND: Air Pollution Control District Application

The proposed project would require a permit from Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District (EKAPCD). For purposes of inter-agency consistency, CEC staff need copies of all correspondence between the applicant and the EKAPCD in a timely manner to stay up to date on any issues that arise prior to completion of the environmental document.

The SPPE Application, Appendix F.1, includes an Air Quality Impact & GHG Analysis that shows natural gas consumption in the results from the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) report; however, in the SPPE Application, Appendix A.1 (Site Plan), does not appear to describe the types of proposed natural gas equipment or depict the alignment of the natural gas supply line(s). It is not clear whether proposed natural gas equipment (e.g., heaters or boilers) would require permits from EKAPCD.

DATA REQUESTS

DR AQ-1. Please provide copies of all substantive correspondence between the applicant and EKAPCD regarding the project, including application and e-mails, within one week of submittal or receipt. This request is in effect until staff publishes the environmental document.

R&L Response

DR AQ-1 - The Applicant acknowledges the standing, ongoing obligation established by this data request to provide copies of all substantive correspondence with the Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District (EKAPCD) within one week of submittal or receipt, and confirms this obligation will be maintained for the duration of the proceeding until CEC staff publishes the environmental document.

As of the date of this response, no formal EKAPCD correspondence — including permit applications, emails, or agency submittals — has been initiated or received with respect to the RBIDC project. The project's EKAPCD Permit to Operate process has not yet commenced, consistent with the project's current pre-construction stage. The regulatory basis and scope of the anticipated EKAPCD permitting obligation are described in Section 4.3 (Air Quality, pp. 162–226) of the Main Application (TN 269893), specifically under the discussion of EKAPCD Regulation II, Rule 210.1 — New and Modified Stationary Source Review (p. 163). The EKAPCD Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate are formally identified as required project permits in the discretionary approvals table at Section 1.8 (Discretionary Approvals and Permits, pp. 26–27) of the Main Application (TN 269893).

The Air Quality Impact and GHG Analysis (AQIA, Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1

Revision 1, TN 271094) has been prepared consistent with EKAPCD Guidelines and establishes the analytical and technical foundation upon which the formal EKAPCD permit application will be based. The AQIA documents the project's emissions profile, control technology selection, Best Available Control Technology determination, and health risk assessment, and will serve as the primary supporting document for the EKAPCD permitting process. The Applicant's Statement of Intended EKAPCD Permit Conditions is provided herewith as part of Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098).

The Applicant has established an internal protocol to ensure that all substantive EKAPCD correspondence is identified, tracked, and docketed within seven calendar days of submittal or receipt. The AQIA consultant has been designated as the primary point of contact for EKAPCD coordination. To the extent any pre-application meeting requests, scheduling correspondence, EKAPCD responses, or agency-initiated correspondence regarding the project have been generated prior to or concurrent with submission of this response, copies will be provided to the docket within one week of receipt.

DR AQ-2. Please identify the current schedule for the EKAPCD permit application submittal. Please submit a copy of that application to the docket when it is submitted to EKAPCD.

R&L Response

DR AQ-2 - The EKAPCD Permit to Operate application for the RBIDC project has not yet been submitted. The project is currently in the pre-application and permitting preparation phase, consistent with the project schedule set forth in Table 1-2 (Project Schedule, p. 14) of the Main Application (TN 269893). The EKAPCD Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate are formally identified as required project permits in the discretionary approvals table at Section 1.8 (Discretionary Approvals and Permits, pp. 26–27) of the Main Application (TN 269893), and the scope of the anticipated EKAPCD permit is addressed in Section 4.3 (Air Quality, pp. 162–226) and the AQIA (Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1, TN 271094).

The anticipated schedule for the EKAPCD permitting process is as follows: a pre-application coordination meeting with EKAPCD is targeted for the third quarter of 2026, and formal submittal of the Permit to Operate application to EKAPCD is targeted for the first quarter of 2027, consistent with the projected 2027 construction start identified in Table 1-2 (p. 14) of the Main Application (TN 269893).

A copy of the EKAPCD Permit to Operate application will be submitted to the CEC docket concurrently with its filing with EKAPCD. The Applicant will provide written notice to the CEC Project Manager at that time.

DR AQ-3. Please confirm what types of natural gas equipment or appliances and plumbing would be included for onsite use and describe whether it would be feasible to exclude natural gas use onsite.

R&L Response

DR AQ-3 – No natural gas equipment, appliances, or plumbing are proposed for the project as part of the facility's energy systems or IT-critical infrastructure. The project does not propose natural gas boilers, heaters, process equipment, or any other natural gas-fired devices as part of the RBIDC's primary data center design.

The approximately 238,000-square-foot facility includes administrative and support areas typical of a commercial data center campus, as described in Section 1.4.1 (Data Center Campus, pp. 16–17) of the Main Application (TN 269893). These areas would include standard commercial building fixtures and plumbing typical of office and support functions, which may include the following incidental building utility items:

Domestic plumbing fixtures including restrooms, break room sinks, and janitorial connections throughout the administrative and support areas

- Standard commercial kitchen or break room appliances in employee support areas
- Domestic hot water heating systems serving administrative and support functions
- Standard HVAC systems for administrative office and common areas, utilizing variable refrigerant flow split-system air conditioners as described in Section 1.4.4 (Cooling System, pp. 19–20)

As the project is currently at the conceptual design stage, the final determination of whether any of the above incidental building utility items will utilize natural gas or will be served by all-electric alternatives has not yet been made and will be confirmed during final engineering. With respect to natural gas generally, Section 4.18 (Utilities and Service Systems, pp. 863–914) at the Natural Gas subsection (p. 899) confirms that natural gas service was evaluated at a screening level by PG&E, which confirmed feasibility of service from a nearby transmission main, but that natural gas was not selected as the primary redundancy approach for the project, and further that "due to earthquake risk the Applicant does not intend to rely on natural gas for IT-critical systems." Mitigation Measure MM 4.18-3 (p. 901) addresses PG&E coordination for any incidental building utility natural gas needs and confirms those needs, if any, will be finalized during final utility engineering. Should any natural gas equipment or appliances be confirmed for administrative or support areas during final engineering, the Applicant commits to identifying those items specifically and submitting an updated response to the CEC docket at that time.

With respect to the CalEEMod default natural gas figure appearing in Appendix F.1 (AQIA, TN 269606), the figure of approximately 10,578,708 kBTU per year reflected in the CalEEMod output is a model-generated default associated with the General Office Building land use type applied in CalEEMod version 2022.1.1.37, as disclosed in Section 4.6 of the Main Application (TN 269893, p. 370). This figure is a land use model artifact and does not represent any proposed or installed natural gas equipment, appliance, or system.

DR AQ-4. Please identify whether proposed natural gas devices would require permits from EKAPCD.

R&L Response

DR AQ-4 - As confirmed in the response to DR AQ-3, no natural gas equipment or appliances are proposed as part of the RBIDC facility design for IT-critical systems or major energy systems. Accordingly, no EKAPCD permit for natural gas devices is required for the project at this time.

As noted in the response to DR AQ-3, the final determination of whether any incidental building utility items in the administrative and support areas of the facility will utilize natural gas has not yet been made and will be confirmed during final engineering, consistent with the project's conceptual design stage as disclosed in Section 1.0 (Project Description, p. 11) and Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, pp. 100–101). Should any natural gas equipment or appliances be confirmed during final engineering, the Applicant will assess the associated EKAPCD permit requirements for those specific devices and submit an updated response to the CEC docket at that time.

The EKAPCD permitting obligation for the project as currently designed is limited to the 40 Caterpillar 3516E emergency diesel generators, for which an Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate will be obtained from EKAPCD as described in Section 4.3 (Air Quality, pp. 162–226), Section 1.8 (Discretionary Approvals and Permits, pp. 26–27), and Mitigation Measure MM 4.6-10 (p. 166) of the Main Application (TN 269893).

DR AQ-5. Please indicate the proposed alignment(s) for natural gas supply line(s) on the project site plan.

BACKGROUND: Construction-Phase Emissions Estimates

Dust control during construction would require a water supply that does not appear to be quantified. The water supply during construction could require hauling by truck and would consume electricity due to groundwater pumping at the proposed well or by the municipal supplier of water. Determining the energy consumed and GHG emissions for provision of construction-phase water may require a separate calculation outside of CalEEMod, which does not estimate the electricity consumption for construction-phase water usage.

In the SPPE Application, Table 4.16-2, haul trucks appear to be omitted from construction vehicle trip counts. Assumptions for “construction vehicles” in CalEEMod include zero vehicle trips for hauling and onsite truck travel. Site development would require haul trucks for bringing equipment to the site, and delivery of surfacing materials, building structural components, substation components, and other site improvements (e.g., drainage, stormwater detention, electrical, etc.). Haul truck travel distances to this site are likely to be substantially longer than the CalEEMod default trip length of 20 miles.

R&L Response

DR AQ-5 - As confirmed in the responses to DR AQ-3 and DR AQ-4, no natural gas supply lines are proposed on the project site for IT-critical systems or major energy generation purposes. Accordingly, no natural gas supply line alignment for energy generation purposes is depicted on the project site plan (Appendix A.1, TN 269593).

The existing natural gas transmission main in the SR-178 right-of-way in the vicinity of the project

site is identified in Section 4.16 (Transportation, pp. 787–838) of the Main Application (TN 269893). The revised Appendix A.1 site plan submitted as Appendix A Supplement — Section A.1 Revision 1 (TN 271054) depicts the approximate location of the existing natural gas transmission main relative to the project site. The alignment of any potential natural gas service connection from the transmission main to the building, if ultimately required for incidental administrative building utility purposes, has not yet been determined and will be confirmed during final engineering, consistent with Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, TN 269893, pp. 100–101) and Mitigation Measure MM 4.18-3 (p. 901). Should any natural gas service connection be confirmed during final engineering, the Applicant commits to submitting an updated site plan to the CEC docket at that time.

DATA REQUESTS

DR AQ-6. Please disclose the amount of water use anticipated during construction and revise emissions estimates to account for provision of the construction water supply by pumping at the site or to deliver water to the site by truck.

R&L Response

DR AQ-6 - The Applicant acknowledges that construction-phase water use was not independently quantified as a separate line item in the Air Quality Impact and GHG Analysis (AQIA, Appendix F.1, TN 269606) for purposes of estimating associated pump electricity or truck delivery emissions in CalEEMod. Construction water use for dust suppression and soil compaction during the 48-month construction period is addressed in Section 4.3 (Air Quality, TN 269893, pp. 162–226) and in dust control mitigation measures MM 4.3-1, MM 4.3-2, and MM 4.3-3 (TN 269893, pp. 166–167), which require watering of exposed areas a minimum of three times daily on unpaved and disturbed soil areas with active operations.

Construction water demand is confirmed in the application at approximately 27 to 34 acre-feet total over the 48-month construction period (approximately 9 to 11 million gallons), with peak daily demand up to approximately 25,000 gallons per day during earthwork and average daily demand of approximately 7,000 to 8,000 gallons per day, as confirmed in Section 4.10 (Hydrology and Water Quality, TN 269893) and the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix E.3, TN 269639/269640). Water will be provided by the Inyokern Community Services District or an on-site well.

For purposes of the AQIA, construction water was assumed to be delivered by truck. Using an estimated full water truck load of 4,000 gallons, approximately three truck loads per day (12,000 gallons average) were assumed. These water truck trips were accounted for within the vendor trips estimated by CalEEMod. Additionally, water truck emissions during the first 8 months of construction were estimated by CalEEMod as an off-highway truck operating 8 hours per day. Emissions from water truck delivery are therefore already conservatively estimated in the updated AQIA and emissions estimates do not require further revision. CEC staff is directed to the updated Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1 (TN 271094) for the complete revised construction emissions analysis responsive to this request.

DR AQ-7. Please revise emissions estimates for construction to quantify vehicle trips for haul trucks traveling to the site during site development for bringing equipment to the site, and delivery

of surfacing materials, building structural components, substation components, and other site improvements (e.g., drainage, stormwater detention, electrical, etc.), and disclose the assumptions for haul truck travel trip lengths.

R&L Response

DR AQ-7 - The Applicant acknowledges that haul truck vehicle trips were not separately quantified in the CalEEMod construction emissions model. As acknowledged in Section 4.3 (Air Quality, TN 269893, pp. 162–226) and the AQIA (Appendix F.1, TN 269606), construction activities would generate short-term air quality emissions from construction equipment, worker vehicles, haul trips, and fugitive dust. The Project's construction scope encompasses site grading and infrastructure development, structural and building shell construction, and mechanical, electrical, and data hall systems installation over a 48-month construction period beginning in 2027, as described in Section 1.3 (TN 269893) and Table 1-2 (TN 269893). This scope includes delivery of major structural components, substation equipment, generator sets, and surfacing materials to the Inyokern site via SR-178 and US-395, as described in Section 4.16 (Transportation, TN 269893) and Table T-005 (Oversize and Overweight Equipment Deliveries, TN 269893).

As specific vendor and haul truck trip counts are not known at this stage of design, the CalEEMod default trip rates were used as a conservative estimated assumption based on the construction intensity for the project. It was estimated that during the first 8 months of construction there would be an average of 47.18 one-way vendor and haul truck trips per day, increasing to an average of 94.36 one-way trips per day during the final 40 months of construction. The CalEEMod default average daily one-way trip distance of 10.6 miles was applied for the project location, which reaches nearly everywhere in Ridgecrest and represents a conservative estimate for construction vendor and haul trips given the project's remote Mojave Desert location. Vendor and haul truck trips are combined for emissions calculation purposes consistent with CalEEMod methodology. These assumptions are considered conservative on an average daily basis and emissions estimates do not require further revision. CEC staff is directed to the updated Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1 (TN 271094) for the complete revised construction emissions analysis responsive to this request.

DR AQ-8. Please revise emissions estimates for construction to include emissions from onsite truck travel during site development, including onsite travel on unpaved surfaces.

BACKGROUND: Enforceable Permit Conditions, Daily and Annual Operations

Emissions estimates assume no more than 50 hours per year per engine for testing overall. Air quality impact modeling also presumes that readiness testing would be limited to occur within certain hours of the day (between the hours of 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM) (TN 269893, pg. 214).

Since EKAPCD has not defined criteria pollutant daily emissions rate thresholds of significance for stationary sources in the CEQA process, the SPPE application compares annual project criteria pollutant emissions for construction and operation of the emergency backup generators to the annual significance thresholds defined by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) as a regional proxy. As a general administrative requirement, the EKAPCD may establish daily emissions limitation(s) and annual emission limits with any future Permit to Operate

(per EKAPCD Rule 210.1). The applicant's proposed daily and annual emissions limits for the facility need to be confirmed.

R&L Response

DR AQ-8 – The Applicant acknowledges that on-site truck travel during site development, including travel on unpaved surfaces, was not separately modeled in the CalEEMod construction emissions analysis as a distinct emission source. The construction-phase dust control measures MM 4.3-1, MM 4.3-2, and MM 4.3-3 (TN 269893, pp. 166–167) address fugitive dust from vehicle activity on unpaved surfaces through speed limits of 15 miles per hour on unpaved roads, watering of all areas with vehicle traffic a minimum of three times daily, track-out prevention at construction site exits, and vehicle washing requirements.

On-site truck travel on unpaved surfaces during the grading and site development phase is expected to occur during the earlier phases of the 48-month construction schedule prior to installation of permanent paving, as described in Section 1.4.11 (Site Grading, Excavation, and Construction, TN 269893, pp. 22–23) and Section 4.3 (Air Quality, TN 269893, pp. 162–226). Off-site haul truck travel on public roads — SR-178, US-395, and Brown Road — is entirely on paved surfaces. At this point in the design, unpaved road travel is anticipated in three areas: on-site construction traffic within the project boundary prior to permanent paving being installed, SCE 115 kV transmission line corridor work traversing undeveloped desert terrain, and access to the Point of Interconnection and customer-owned substation area south of SR-178 prior to permanent site improvements being in place.

The updated AQIA, submitted herewith as Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1 (TN 271094), revises the CalEEMod construction emissions model to include on-site unpaved road travel as a discrete emission source. It was estimated that on average approximately 1.4 percent of the total one-way trip distance (approximately 0.15 miles of the 10.6-mile trip) occurs on unpaved surfaces. This revision is incorporated into the same supplemental Appendix F.1 being submitted in response to DR AQ-6 and DR AQ-7. Construction emissions remain below EKAPCD significance thresholds in all years after mitigation, as confirmed in Table 4-3 of the updated AQIA. CEC staff is directed to Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1 (TN 271094) for the complete revised construction emissions analysis responsive to this request.

DATA REQUESTS

DR AQ-9. Please confirm that the applicant would request the EKAPCD to require an enforceable limit on concurrent testing of engines so that only a single engine operates for maintenance and readiness testing at any given time, with a limit on the number of engines tested per day to limit the daily emissions rates. Since testing and maintenance may involve periods of low-load use, generators may not be running at 100% load for the entire hour, and the SCR requires a warm-up period. Confirm that the calculation for facility-wide daily emissions subject to this daily limit considers the warm-up period in the total.

R&L Response

DR AQ-9 - The Applicant confirms that it will formally request EKAPCD to include an enforceable permit condition in the project's Permit to Operate limiting concurrent testing of emergency standby engines so that only a single engine operates for maintenance and readiness testing at any given time, with a limit on the number of engines tested per day consistent with the daily emissions calculations in the updated Air Quality Impact and GHG Analysis (Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1, TN 271094).

The project's sequential single-engine testing protocol is established in Section 4.3 (Air Quality, TN 269893, pp. 162–226) and Section 4.6.5.5 (Generator Testing, TN 269893, pp. 354–355) of the Main Application. The AQIA (Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1, TN 271094) models daily emissions consistent with this sequential testing assumption, with testing limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM as described in Section 4.3 (TN 269893, p. 214).

With respect to the SCR warm-up period, the Applicant confirms that the daily emission calculations in the AQIA (Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1, TN 271094) account for the SCR warm-up period in the total daily emissions figure. This is directly supported by vendor documentation included in Appendix A.3 (Generator Data and Specifications, TN 269593). Specifically, the Johnson Matthey CompactSCRT General Arrangement Drawing (Drawing No. 202-C0039989, Revision B, dated October 29, 2025) states that reagent injection and emissions treatment will not occur at system temperatures below 500°F, and that the stated engine full load exhaust temperature is 903°F at full load. The urea injection permissive threshold is 575°F, as noted on the same drawing. This establishes that the SCR system requires a warm-up period from cold start until the exhaust gas temperature reaches the 575°F urea injection permissive threshold before Tier 4 Final-equivalent emission rates are achieved.

The AQIA (Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1, TN 271094) models emissions across the full range of engine load points including warm-up periods ranging from 7 minutes to 21 minutes depending on load, as referenced in Section 4.3 (TN 269893, p. 214) and the Alternative Loads section of Appendix F.1. These warm-up period emissions are included in the total daily emissions calculation. The Applicant will formally request EKAPCD to incorporate the warm-up period assumption into the enforceable daily emissions limit condition in the Permit to Operate, ensuring that the permit condition is consistent with the modeled daily emissions basis in the AQIA. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are Inyokern Elementary School and State Preschool at 6601 Locust Street, Inyokern, California 93527, and the Inyokern Senior Center, both located approximately 0.8 miles southwest of the project site, as confirmed by the Sensitive Receptor Map (Appendix N.2, TN 269892) and Section 4.9 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials, TN 269893, p. 456).

The Caterpillar 3516E emissions data provided in Appendix A.3 (TN 269593) confirms engine emissions at the full range of load points — 100%, 75%, 50%, 25%, and 10% — consistent with the multi-load analysis discussed in the AQIA. The full load exhaust gas temperature of 903°F and the urea injection permissive threshold of 575°F, both confirmed in the Johnson Matthey CompactSCRT documentation in Appendix A.3, establish that the SCR system reaches operating temperature well within the testing window modeled in the AQIA. The Applicant's Statement of Intended EKAPCD Permit Conditions consolidating all enforceable permit condition commitments is provided herewith as part of Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098).

DR AQ-10. Please confirm that the applicant would request the EKAPCD to require an enforceable limit that would allow testing of standby engines only between the hours of 7 AM to 5 PM daily.

R&L Response

DR AQ-10 - The Applicant confirms that it will formally request EKAPCD to include an enforceable permit condition in the project's Permit to Operate restricting all standby engine testing to the hours of 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM daily.

This testing hours assumption is established in Section 4.3 (Air Quality, TN 269893, p. 214) of the Main Application and is the basis upon which the AQIA (Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1, TN 271094) models daily emissions from standby engine testing operations. The 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM testing window was applied as a conservative modeling assumption to ensure that emissions during testing are evaluated during the hours most likely to produce meaningful ground-level concentrations at nearby sensitive receptors. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are Inyokern Elementary School and State Preschool at 6601 Locust Street, Inyokern, California 93527, and the Inyokern Senior Center, both located approximately 0.8 miles southwest of the project site, as confirmed by the Sensitive Receptor Map (Appendix N.2, TN 269892) and Section 4.9 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials, TN 269893, p. 456).

By formally requesting EKAPCD to codify this assumption as an enforceable permit condition, the Applicant ensures that the operating scenario modeled in the AQIA is binding on project operations, and that testing activities are restricted to daytime hours when sensitive receptors are most likely to be occupied and when the modeling assumptions remain valid. The Applicant's Statement of Intended EKAPCD Permit Conditions consolidating all enforceable permit condition commitments is provided herewith as part of Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098). The Applicant will incorporate this request into the formal EKAPCD Permit to Operate application when submitted, consistent with the permitting schedule described in the response to DR AQ-2.

DR AQ-11. Please tabulate the proposed project daily and annual emissions limits for use in the EKAPCD Rule 210.1 permitting process.

R&L Response

DR AQ-11 - The Applicant provides the following tabulation of proposed project daily and annual emissions limits for use in the EKAPCD Rule 210.1 permitting process, based on the updated Air Quality Impact and GHG Analysis submitted herewith as Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1 (TN 271094) prepared by QK, June 2026.

Emergency generator emissions are based on permit limits using Tier 4 emission factors and 200 hours per year operation at 24 hours per day for maximum daily emissions during emergency operations. Start-up emissions and variable load conditions were used in the ambient air quality and health risk analyses. Annual and daily potential to emit emissions from all stationary sources — including emergency generators, cooling towers, and fuel storage — are tabulated in the updated AQIA submitted concurrently with this response. As confirmed in Table 4-4 of the updated AQIA,

total operational emissions do not exceed EKAPCD significance thresholds under any operational scenario.

The specific daily engine testing limit consistent with EKAPCD Rule 210.1 daily significance thresholds will be established through the EKAPCD Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate process and will be reported to the CEC docket upon issuance of the EKAPCD Authority to Construct. CEC staff is directed to Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1 (TN 271094) and Appendix A of that document for the complete annual and daily potential to emit emissions tabulation responsive to this request.

BACKGROUND: Screening for Low-load Conditions and Warm-up Period

The SPPE Application (TN 269893, pg. 204) states “For purposes of this Application, emissions were assumed to occur at 100 percent load, however, varying loads and warm-up conditions were considered for compliance with ambient air concentrations and health risk. Appendix A of the AQIA presents the engine emissions based upon the 100, 75, 50, 25 and 10 percent load points.”

CEC staff experience with prior projects indicates that modelling has shown higher modeled operational concentrations at lower loads (75, 50, 25, and 10 percent of load) for both particulate matter (PM) 10 and PM 2.5. Staff need to verify whether the Health Risk Assessment (HRA) results for these lower load cases exceed those for the 100% load case. Staff also need to ensure that the health risks of the project during lower load cases would not exceed the CEQA thresholds of significance.

The SPPE application indicates that testing of the engines can occur over a range of load conditions. However, the analysis says that “...the worst-case stack condition and the worst-case engine location could be determined from the screening analysis.” Staff needs a detailed description of the types of testing and maintenance scenarios, the frequency of full-load tests and low-load tests, and confirmation of impacts at various standby engine load points to verify the assumptions used in the SPPE analysis.

The applicant assumed that the 100 percent load case would produce the maximum ground-based concentrations (TN 269893, pg 214). Under the heading of “Alternative Loads” (TN 269606), emissions for the different load cases show warm-up periods from 7 minutes to 21 minutes. The SPPE application should include documents and/or certificates from the engine equipment or Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) vendor to verify the warm-up period of the SCR to reach Tier 4 emission rates for these load cases.

DATA REQUESTS

DR AQ-12. Please provide information to confirm that the Health Risk Assessment (HRA) results for lower load cases do not exceed those for the 100 percent load case.

R&L Response

DR AQ-12 - The Applicant provides the following confirmation that the Health Risk Assessment results for lower load cases do not exceed those for the 100 percent load case, based on the updated

Air Quality Impact and GHG Analysis submitted herewith as Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1 (TN 271094) prepared by QK, June 2026.

Diesel particulate matter emissions from the emergency generators operating at various load points — 100%, 75%, 50%, 25%, and 10% — were evaluated to determine cancer risk and chronic hazard index and compared to the results for 100% load operation. As confirmed in the updated AQIA, the 100% load scenario produces the highest cancer risk and chronic hazard index at all receptor locations. Cancer risk decreases consistently from 4.89E-06 at 100% load to 1.83E-06 at 10% load. Chronic hazard index decreases consistently from 1.00E-03 at 100% load to 4.93E-04 at 10% load. The 100% load assumption is therefore confirmed as the bounding case for health risk assessment purposes. All load scenarios produce cancer risk and chronic hazard index values below EKAPCD significance thresholds of 10.0E-06 and 1.0 respectively. Multi-load modeling files have been added to Appendix B of the updated AQIA. CEC staff is directed to Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1 (TN 271094) and Appendix B of that document for the complete multi-load HRA results responsive to this request.

DR AQ-13. Please provide a detailed description of the types of testing and maintenance scenarios, the frequency of full-load tests and low-load tests.

R&L Response

DR AQ -13 - The Applicant provides the following detailed description of the testing and maintenance scenarios for the 40 Caterpillar 3516E emergency diesel generators, including the frequency of full-load and low-load tests, consistent with the generator testing program described in Section 4.6.5.5 (Generator Testing and Commissioning, TN 269893, pp. 354–355), Section 4.3 (Air Quality, TN 269893, pp. 162–226), and Table 4.6-6 (Estimated Annual Generator Operating Hours by Scenario, TN 269893, p. 312) of the Main Application, and the performance data provided in Appendix A.3 (Generator Data and Specifications, located within Appendix A, TN 269593).

The project's generator testing program is governed by NFPA 110, Standard for Emergency and Standby Power Systems, 2022 Edition, as amended by Tentative Interim Amendment TIA 22-1 (effective May 8, 2024), a copy of which is included in Appendix A.3 (TN 269593). NFPA 110 establishes the minimum testing requirements for Level 1 emergency power supply systems applicable to this project, as described in Section 4.6.5.5 (TN 269893, pp. 354–355).

The testing and maintenance scenarios for the RBIDC generators are as follows. Monthly readiness testing consists of sequential single-engine testing, one generator at a time, with a minimum 30-minute loaded test per NFPA 110 requirements, as confirmed in Section 4.6.5.5 (TN 269893, p. 354). Testing is conducted one generator at a time to minimize concurrent emissions. As documented in Table 4.6-6 (TN 269893, p. 312), monthly load testing occurs 12 times per year per engine at approximately 0.5 hours per test, yielding approximately 6 hours per year per engine for monthly testing. This constitutes the low-load readiness testing scenario. Annual preventive maintenance testing is conducted per manufacturer requirements and applicable regulatory intervals, with operations logged and reported consistent with CARB ATCM and EKAPCD permit conditions, as described in Section 4.6.5.5 (TN 269893, p. 355). Total per-engine testing hours are estimated at approximately 8 hours per year under the conceptual testing program as documented in Table 4.6-6 (TN 269893, p. 312), well within the CARB Airborne Toxic Control Measure

(ATCM) 50-hour per-engine annual limit for testing and maintenance under 17 CCR §93115, as referenced in Section 4.6.5.5 (TN 269893, p. 355) and the AQIA (Appendix F.1, located within Appendix F, TN 269606).

With respect to the distinction between full-load and low-load testing, the AQIA (Appendix F.1, TN 269606) explicitly states that the Applicant is not proposing a fixed test schedule specifying hours versus load points, and that testing will be conducted based upon the Applicant's judgment considering the manufacturers' recommendations, staff availability, and necessity, as disclosed in Section 4.3 (TN 269893, p. 204). For conservative evaluation purposes, the AQIA modeled testing emissions at 100% load as the primary analytical basis, representing the maximum fuel consumption rate and providing a conservative steady-state emission condition for purposes of estimating annual emissions. However, varying loads and warm-up conditions were also considered in the ambient air quality and health risk analyses, with engine emissions evaluated at 100%, 75%, 50%, 25%, and 10% load points as presented in Appendix A of the AQIA (Appendix F.1, TN 269606), and as further supported by the multi-load emissions data in the Caterpillar 3516E data sheet (Drawing LEHE2570-05, Appendix A.3, TN 269593).

The SCR warm-up period is a relevant factor across all load points. As established in the Johnson Matthey CompactSCRT General Arrangement Drawing (Drawing No. 202-C0039989, Revision B, Appendix A.3, TN 269593), the urea injection permissive threshold is 575°F and the full load exhaust gas temperature is 903°F. The AQIA models the SCR warm-up period at each load point with warm-up durations ranging from 7 minutes to 21 minutes depending on load, during which emissions are assumed equal to the engine's uncontrolled emission ratings without SCR and DPF equipped, as described in Section 4.3 (TN 269893, p. 214) and the AQIA screening analysis (Appendix F.1, TN 269606). All testing is conducted between the hours of 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM, as modeled in the AQIA and confirmed in the response to DR AQ-10.

DR AQ-14. Please provide a screening review of short-term (1-hour) ambient air quality impacts during testing for a representative range of engine load points (e.g., 100, 75, 50, 25, and 10 percent load) to confirm that full-load testing would produce the highest ground-level concentrations.

R&L Response

DR AQ-14 - The Applicant provides the following screening review of short-term one-hour ambient air quality impacts during generator testing at representative engine load points, based on the updated Air Quality Impact and GHG Analysis submitted herewith as Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1 (TN 271094) prepared by QK, June 2026.

A formal standalone screening review of one-hour ambient air quality impacts was conducted at five representative load points — 100%, 75%, 50%, 25%, and 10% — using AERMOD dispersion modeling. The analysis confirms that the 100% load scenario produces the highest predicted one-hour NO₂ ground-level concentration of 53.54 µg/m³, which remains below the applicable ambient air quality standard. Concentrations at 75%, 50%, 25%, and 10% load points are all below the 100% load result. All load scenarios produce predicted concentrations below applicable ambient air quality standards and are less than significant. Screening results and AERMOD modeling files are provided in Appendix C of the updated AQIA. CEC staff is directed to Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1 (TN 271094) and Appendix C of that document for the complete multi-load one-hour ambient air quality screening results responsive to this request.

DR AQ-15. Please disclose the street addresses of the nearest non-residential sensitive receptors and maximum impacted receptors shown in the SPPE Application, Appendix F.1, Table 4-6 and Table 4-7, of the Air Quality Impact & GHG Analysis.

R&L Response

DR AQ-15 - The Applicant provides the following street addresses for the nearest non-residential sensitive receptors identified in the Air Quality Impact and GHG Analysis (Appendix F.1, TN 269606):

Table 4-6 Non-Residential Sensitive Receptors:

Inyokern Elementary School and State Preschool — 6601 Locust Street, Inyokern, California 93527, approximately 0.8 miles southwest of the project site, as confirmed by the Sensitive Receptor Map (Appendix N.2, TN 269892) and California Department of Education records.

Inyokern Senior Center — 1247 Broadway Avenue, Inyokern, California 93527, approximately 0.8 miles southwest of the project site, as confirmed by Table 4.11-2 (TN 269893).

Table 4-7 Maximum Impacted Receptor:

The point of maximum impact (PMI) identified in Table 4-7 of the updated AQIA is Receptor #1 at UTM coordinates 426690.41 E / 3945203.01 N (NAD83, Zone 11). Total predicted cancer risk at the PMI is 6.78E-06, chronic hazard index is 2.10E-03, and acute hazard index is 6.38E-02 — all below EKAPCD significance thresholds. CEC staff is directed to Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1 (TN 271094) for the complete Tables 4-6 and 4-7 responsive to this request.

DR AQ-16. Please provide vendor documentation supporting SCR + Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) control effectiveness assumptions in achieving the Tier 4 emissions standards.

R&L Response

DR AQ-16 - Vendor documentation supporting the SCR and Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) control effectiveness assumptions for achieving Tier 4 Final-equivalent emission standards is provided in Appendix A.3 (Generator Data and Specifications, located within Appendix A, TN 269593). The following vendor documents are included within Appendix A.3 and directly address the control effectiveness assumptions applied in the AQIA (Appendix F.1, located within Appendix F, TN 269606) and confirmed in the Main Application at Section 1.4.2 (Emergency Backup Generating Facility, TN 269893, pp. 17–18), Section 4.3 (Air Quality, TN 269893, pp. 162–226), Section 4.6.5 (Energy — Generator System, TN 269893, pp. 307–367), and Section 6.4.1 (Proposed Project Description, TN 269893):

The Johnson Matthey CompactSCRT General Arrangement Drawing (Drawing No. 202-C0039989, Revision B, dated October 29, 2025, Appendix A.3, TN 269593) provides the full load emissions data for the CompactSCRT system as installed on the Caterpillar 3516E 3,000 kW generator configuration. The full load emissions data table on the drawing confirms the following control effectiveness at the catalyst outlet relative to the catalyst inlet at full load: NO_x is reduced

from 6.76 g/bhp-hr at the catalyst inlet to 0.50 g/bhp-hr at the catalyst outlet, representing a 92.6% reduction, meeting the Tier 4 Final reference standard of 0.50 g/bhp-hr; CO is reduced from 1.20 g/bhp-hr to 0.24 g/bhp-hr, representing an 80% reduction against the Tier 4 Final reference of 2.60 g/bhp-hr; HC is reduced from 0.06 g/bhp-hr to 0.018 g/bhp-hr, representing a 70% reduction against the Tier 4 Final reference of 0.14 g/bhp-hr; and PM is reduced from 0.06 g/bhp-hr to 0.009 g/bhp-hr, representing an 85% reduction against the Tier 4 Final reference of 0.02 g/bhp-hr. These values are sourced directly from the Johnson Matthey CompactSCRT Full Load Emissions Data table on Drawing No. 202-C0039989, Revision B (Appendix A.3, TN 269593) and confirm that the Johnson Matthey CompactSCRT system achieves Tier 4 Final-equivalent stack emissions for all criteria pollutants at full load. These values are further confirmed in Section 4.6.5 of the Main Application (TN 269893, p. 312) and Section 6.4.1 (TN 269893).

The Applicant notes that the catalyst inlet NO_x value of 6.76 g/bhp-hr referenced above represents the potential site variation value from the Caterpillar 3516E data sheet (Drawing LEHE2570-05, Appendix A.3, TN 269593), which is the conservative basis used in the AQIA. The Tier 2 certified nominal NO_x value for the Caterpillar 3516E is 5.63 g/bhp-hr as documented in the Package Performance table of Drawing LEHE2570-05 (Appendix A.3, TN 269593) and confirmed in Section 6.4.1 of the Main Application (TN 269893). The use of the higher potential site variation value of 6.76 g/bhp-hr as the catalyst inlet basis represents a conservative analytical approach and yields the 92.6% NO_x reduction figure cited above. Under either basis, the 0.50 g/bhp-hr Tier 4 Final NO_x standard is achieved at the catalyst outlet.

The Caterpillar 3516E High Power Density Diesel Generator Sets data sheet (Drawing LEHE2570-05, dated May 2023, Appendix A.3, TN 269593) confirms that the base engine is U.S. EPA certified for Emergency Stationary Applications under Tier 2, Performance Number EM4718-02, with rated output of 3,000 kW (3,750 kVA) at 60 Hz under the Mission Critical rating. The base engine emissions at full load — prior to aftertreatment — are documented in the Package Performance table and the Emissions Data section of Drawing LEHE2570-05, confirming the catalyst inlet emissions basis used in the Johnson Matthey control effectiveness calculations above.

The Johnson Matthey CompactSCRT Piping and Instrumentation Diagram (Drawing No. 505997-3711, Revision 0, dated October 25, 2025, Appendix A.3, TN 269593) and the associated Control and Dosing Panel General Arrangement Drawing (Drawing No. 505996-3711, Revision 0, Appendix A.3, TN 269593) provide the complete system configuration documentation for the SCR and DPF installation on the Caterpillar 3516E 3,000 kW configuration, prepared by Quinn Power Systems (EWR No. 03711) in coordination with Johnson Matthey, including the urea injection system, air compressor package, reagent storage tank, NO_x sensors, and soot alert monitoring system.

Additionally, the NFPA 110 Tentative Interim Amendment TIA 22-1 (effective May 8, 2024, Appendix A.3, TN 269593) is included in Appendix A.3 and confirms the regulatory basis for the Tier 2 base engine plus external aftertreatment configuration. As described in Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, pp. 17–18), Section 6.4.5 (TN 269893), and the LORS Compliance Matrix (Appendix N.1, TN 269892), NFPA 110 TIA 22-1 prohibits EPA-mandated inducement engine shutdowns on Tier 4 certified engines with SCR for permanent Level 1 applications, confirming that the Tier 2 base engine plus external Johnson Matthey CompactSCRT aftertreatment configuration is the appropriate and code-compliant selection for this project.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the vendor documentation included in Appendix A.3 (TN 269593), cross-referenced with the application sections cited above, fully supports the SCR and

DPF control effectiveness assumptions applied in the AQIA (Appendix F.1, TN 269606) for achieving Tier 4 Final-equivalent stack emissions.

DR AQ-17. Please provide documents and/or certificates from the vendor to verify the warm-up period of the SCR to reach Tier 4 emission rates for low-load cases.

R&L Response

DR AQ-17 - Vendor documentation supporting the warm-up period of the Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) system to reach Tier 4 Final-equivalent emission rates for low-load cases is provided in Appendix A.3 (Generator Data and Specifications, TN 269593) and is directly referenced in Section 4.3 (Air Quality, TN 269893, p. 214) and the AQIA (Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1, TN 271094).

The Johnson Matthey CompactSCRT General Arrangement Drawing (Drawing No. 202-C0039989, Revision B, dated October 29, 2025, Appendix A.3, TN 269593) establishes the fundamental SCR warm-up parameters for the installed system. Note 1 of Drawing No. 202-C0039989 Revision B states explicitly that reagent injection and emissions treatment will not occur at system temperatures below 500°F, and that the stated engine full load exhaust gas temperature is 903°F at full load. The urea injection permissive threshold is 575°F as confirmed on the same drawing. These parameters establish that the SCR system requires a warm-up period from cold start until the exhaust gas temperature reaches the 575°F urea injection permissive threshold before Tier 4 Final-equivalent emission rates are achieved at the catalyst outlet.

The relationship between engine load and exhaust gas temperature — which directly governs SCR warm-up duration at each load point — is established by the Caterpillar 3516E performance data provided in Appendix A.3 (TN 269593). The Package Performance table in the Caterpillar 3516E data sheet (Drawing LEHE2570-05, dated May 2023, Appendix A.3, TN 269593) confirms the exhaust stack gas temperature at full load as 483.3°C (902.0°F) for the Mission Critical rating, consistent with the 903°F full load temperature confirmed in the Johnson Matthey drawing. At reduced load points the exhaust gas temperature decreases, extending the warm-up period required to reach the 575°F urea injection permissive threshold. The Caterpillar 3516E emissions data tables included in Appendix A.3 (TN 269593) provide engine-out emissions at 100%, 75%, 50%, 25%, and 10% load points at both nominal and potential site variation levels, documenting the uncontrolled emission rates that apply during the warm-up period at each load point prior to the SCR system reaching operating temperature.

As disclosed in Section 4.3 (TN 269893, p. 214) of the Main Application and the AQIA (Appendix F Supplement — Section F.1 Revision 1, TN 271094), during the engine warm-up period the engines were assumed to emit emissions equal to the emission ratings of the engine without SCR and DPF equipped — that is, at the uncontrolled Tier 2 engine-out emission rates documented in the Caterpillar 3516E data sheet (Drawing LEHE2570-05, Appendix A.3, TN 269593). The AQIA models warm-up periods ranging from 7 minutes to 21 minutes depending on load point, as referenced in Section 4.3 (TN 269893, p. 214), with the longer warm-up periods occurring at lower load points where exhaust gas temperatures are further below the 575°F urea injection permissive threshold. The warm-up period assumptions applied in the AQIA are grounded in the system parameters established in Drawing No. 202-C0039989 Revision B (Appendix A.3, TN 269593) and the Caterpillar exhaust temperature performance data in Drawing LEHE2570-05 (Appendix A.3,

TN 269593), and represent a reasonable and conservative engineering basis for the conceptual stage analysis consistent with EKAPCD and CEC SPPE requirements.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Author: Chris Huntley

BACKGROUND: Proposed Project Scope and Location

In the SPPE application, Section 1 (Executive Summary and Project Description) and Appendix A.1 (Site Plan) do not describe or display temporary access roads, staging and/or laydown areas that may be required to construct the project. The SPPE Application, Appendix D.1 (Biological Analysis Report (BAR)) (TN 269600) also does not mention that potential temporary access roads, staging and/or laydown areas were considered or analyzed within the biological survey area defined in the report. It is not clear if all project access, staging and/or laydown areas would occur within the boundaries of the proposed data center facility or were considered in the analysis of potential impacts to biological resources.

DATA REQUEST

DR BIO-1. Please provide the following information:

Identify if there are any temporary access roads, staging, or laydown areas that were not identified in the application or included in the analysis of impacts to biological resources. Please describe if any of these features would be located outside of the project footprint as described in the application or displayed on the site plan.

If there are any proposed or planned access roads, staging, or laydown areas that were not included in the original application, please provide a clean and updated application in red-line strikethrough including the acreage and location of the proposed features, figure(s) identifying these components, and a thorough assessment of the biological resources that occur in those areas, and an analysis of how the proposed project may affect those resources.

Submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

The SPPE Application, Section 1.4.5 (Water Supply and Conveyance), states the project is proposed to be annexed into the Inyokern Community Services District (CSD) to provide operational water usage for cooling, domestic water use, disposal of wastewater, conveyance of stormwater, and sanitary sewer service. The SPPE Application, Section 2 (Related Facilities and Transmission Lines), also describes the fiber optic interconnection for commercial fiber service provided by Onward from the Digital 395 fiber backbone. However, it is not clear from the application or the site plan where the interconnection points for these utilities would be located or if the biological resources analysis covered these areas.

In addition, Section 2 identifies two proposed 115 kV overhead transmission lines, two utility fiber optic lines, and a westward expansion of the Inyokern Substation that would be constructed by Southern California Edison (SCE). The proposed transmission lines and utility fiber optic lines would connect the Inyokern Substation to the project's substation and point of interconnection. The

application states these proposed facilities are within the project's boundary but indicates the locations of these facilities have yet to be determined by SCE. It is unclear if the biological resources analysis fully addressed potential impacts to biological resources that may occur in these areas.

R&L Response

DR BIO-1 - The Applicant has reviewed the project description, site plan, and biological resources analysis in connection with this data request and confirms that all temporary access roads, staging, and laydown areas associated with construction of the RBIDC data center campus will occur within the boundaries of the four on-site Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs 084-010-43, 084-010-44, 084-010-45, and 084-010-48) as identified in Table 1-1 (Project Parcels and Planned Uses, TN 269893, p. 13) and depicted in Appendix A.1 (Site Plan, TN 269593). No temporary access roads, staging, or laydown areas outside the four on-site APNs are planned or anticipated for the data center campus construction. The project site's approximately 50-acre extent provides sufficient area to accommodate all construction access, staging, and laydown activities within the project boundary, consistent with standard hyperscale data center construction practice and the construction program described in Section 1.4.11 (Site Grading, Excavation, and Construction, TN 269893, pp. 22–23) and Section 1.3 (Project Schedule, TN 269893, p. 14).

The Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Appendix D.1, TN 269600) conducted biological surveys across the project site and a surrounding buffer area consistent with the full on-site project footprint as described in Section 4.4 (Biological Resources, TN 269893, pp. 227–264). As all construction access, staging, and laydown activities will occur within the surveyed project footprint, no additional biological resources assessment is required for the data center campus construction in connection with this data request.

With respect to the off-site SCE electrical infrastructure described in Section 2 (Related Facilities and Transmission Lines, TN 269893, pp. 81–86), the final alignments for the two 115 kV subtransmission line corridors (Route 1, approximately 8,000 linear feet; Route 2, approximately 4,000 linear feet) and associated SCE fiber optic routes have not yet been determined by SCE, as confirmed in Section 1.2.2 (TN 269893, p. 12) and Section 2.3.3 (TN 269893, pp. 82–83). Temporary access roads, staging, and laydown areas associated with the SCE subtransmission line construction will be determined by SCE as part of their final engineering and construction planning under MOS174 (March 30, 2026, Appendix M.3, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL). The Applicant will coordinate with SCE to obtain this information upon completion of SCE's final engineering and will submit any required updates to the CEC docket at that time, consistent with the staged supplemental submission framework established in Section 3.1 (Items to Be Filed as Supplements Upon Receipt, TN 269893, p. 100) of the Main Application. The biological resources implications of the SCE corridor alignments are addressed separately in the response to DR BIO-2.

DATA REQUEST

DR BIO-2. Please provide the locations of biological resources and evaluate potential project-related impacts to those resources associated with the following project components:

- The Inyokern CSD interconnections to municipal water, wastewater, stormwater, and sanitary sewer services.

- The location of the fiber optic interconnection between the proposed data center campus and the Digital 395 fiber optic network.
- The proposed SCE overhead transmission lines, utility fiber optic lines, and westward expansion of the Inyokern Substation.

If the exact locations of these facilities are not known, please ensure that the most likely alignments for these components have been surveyed for sensitive biological resources and that potential impacts are included in an updated application.

Submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

BACKGROUND: Biological Surveys

The SPPE Application, Appendix D.1 (BAR Section 2. Methods), describes the surveys conducted for the proposed project and provides the names of the biologists who conducted the reconnaissance-level surveys but did not identify the biologists who conducted the protocol-level floristic surveys. In addition, the report does not provide the qualifications or relevant experience of staff responsible for the biological resource surveys.

R&L Response

DR BIO-2 - The Inyokern CSD utility interconnections for water, wastewater, stormwater, and sanitary sewer services are described in Section 1.4.5 (Water Supply and Conveyance, TN 269893, pp. 20–21) and Section 4.18 (Utilities and Service Systems, TN 269893, pp. 863–914). The Digital 395 fiber optic interconnection is described in Section 2.2 (Fiber Optic Interconnection, TN 269893, p. 82). The two SCE 115 kV overhead subtransmission line corridors, SCE fiber optic routes, and westward expansion of the Inyokern Substation are described in Section 2 (Related Facilities and Transmission Lines, TN 269893, pp. 81–86) and Section 2.3.3 (Subtransmission Lines, TN 269893, pp. 82–83). The final alignments for the SCE subtransmission lines and fiber optic routes have not yet been determined by SCE and will be confirmed through SCE's final engineering under MOS174 (March 30, 2026, Appendix M.3, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL).

The updated Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Revision 2, June 2026), submitted herewith as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092), addresses the biological resources and potential project-related impacts associated with the most likely alignments for the utility interconnection components identified in this data request to the extent determinable at the current stage of design, consistent with the requirements of CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(13) and Section 4.4 (Biological Resources, TN 269893, pp. 227–264). CEC staff is directed to Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092) for the updated biological resources evaluation submitted herewith. The Applicant requires additional time beyond the 30-day response window to complete the final biological resources evaluation of the confirmed SCE subtransmission line alignments, which are subject to SCE final engineering under MOS174. Final biological resources evaluation of the confirmed SCE alignments will be provided as a supplement upon receipt of SCE's final engineering information as an extension item.

DATA REQUEST**DR BIO-3.** Please provide the following information:

The names and resumes of the biologists who conducted the floristic surveys. Provide sufficient details to verify the qualifications of the biologists to perform specific surveys.

The resumes of the biologists who conducted the biological resources-related surveys. Provide sufficient details to verify the qualifications of the biologists to perform specific surveys. The biologists' resumes should indicate the amount of time spent performing specific surveys/monitoring (e.g., hours/days) or the time-period served on each project.

Submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

The applicant provides additional support documents. In Appendix D (TN 269600), Section 2.6 (Additional Surveys) briefly mentions that data from surveys conducted by the applicant's biological consulting contractor for other nearby projects were used to support the biological resources analysis provided in the application. However, the areas surveyed, survey dates, survey methods, and names and qualifications of those biologists were not described. In addition, no figures were provided to display where these surveys occurred and the locations of sensitive species (i.e., western burrowing owl, desert kit fox, Mohave ground squirrel) and/or habitat components (e.g., burrows, dens, etc.) identified during those surveys. This data is relevant to the analysis of the proposed project.

R&L Response

DR BIO –3 - The Applicant acknowledges that the Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Appendix D.1, TN 269600) identifies the biologists who conducted the reconnaissance-level surveys in BAR Section 2 (Methods) but did not include resumes for the biologists who conducted the floristic surveys or the full biological resources surveys with sufficient detail to verify qualifications and time spent on this specific project.

The updated Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Revision 2, June 2026) — submitted herewith as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092) — includes a List of Preparers in Section 9 identifying all biologists who conducted biological resources surveys for the RBIDC project, including primary authors, technical review, graphics, and all field reconnaissance survey personnel. Full biologist resumes with relevant species survey experience, certifications, and project-specific time spent on surveys in hours or days are provided in Appendix G of the updated BAR, consistent with the requirements of CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(13)(D). CEC staff is directed to Appendix G of Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092) for the complete biologist qualifications responsive to this request.

DR BIO-4 Please provide details regarding the “Additional Surveys” that were utilized in the proposed project’s analysis:

- Figures and defined survey area boundaries.
- Survey dates and methodologies.
- The names and resumes of the referenced biologists. Provide sufficient details to verify the

qualifications of the biologists to perform specific surveys. The biologists' resumes should indicate the amount of time spent performing specific surveys/monitoring (e.g., hours/days) or the time period served on each project.

- The locations of sensitive biological resources identified during the surveys.

Submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

In Appendix D (TN 269600), Section 2 (Methods) reports that floristic surveys were conducted in March, April, and May of 2024. 2024 was substantially dryer than average, with no precipitation recorded in the area during April and May when the average varies between 4.5 to 4.8 inches. In addition, the region received only 0.49 inches in March compared to an average between 4.6 to 5.6 inches (Weather Underground 2026). The lack of precipitation during 2024 likely reduced the potential germination of many annual plants including special-status species.

R&L Response

DR BIO -4 - The Applicant acknowledges that the Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Appendix D.1, TN 269600) references data from surveys conducted by the biological consulting firm for other nearby projects in BAR Section 2.6 (Additional Surveys) but did not provide the survey area figures, survey dates, methodologies, biologist qualifications, or locations of sensitive species identified during those surveys.

The updated Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Revision 2, June 2026), submitted herewith as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092), provides the following additional survey information from QK project records in Table 2-1 and Appendix F: survey area figures with defined boundaries for the RB Inyokern Solar Project and SCE Pole Replacement and Upgrades Project surveys; survey dates and methodologies for all additional surveys including pre-activity surveys for desert tortoise, western burrowing owl, desert kit fox, and Mohave ground squirrel and construction monitoring conducted between 2023 and 2025; names of the biologists who conducted those surveys including authorized desert tortoise (DETO) and Mohave ground squirrel (MGS) biologists Jeff Erway and Curtis Uptain; and full biologist resumes in Appendix G identifying relevant qualifications and project-specific time spent on each project. Species location data for sensitive species identified during those surveys is provided in the supporting reports included in Appendix F of the updated BAR, consistent with CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(13)(D). CEC staff is directed to Table 2-1, Appendix F, and Appendix G of Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092) for the complete additional survey information responsive to this request.

DR BIO-5. Please provide the following information:

Data from the floristic surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period of Mojave tarplant (*Deinandra mohavensis*), Barstow woolly sunflower (*Eriophyllum mohavense*), beautiful threadplant (*Nemacladus bellus*), Charlotte's phacelia (*Phacelia nashiana*), and Latimer's woodland-gilia (*Saltugilia latimeri*).

- Any measures that were taken to confirm these species would likely be evident and identifiable during the survey period, if present.

- Identify if reference sites were visited and if target species were identified at those locations.
- Provide dates and location of the reference population, as well as the names and resumes of the biologists who visited the reference sites.

Submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

Appendix D.1, the BAR, identified Crotch's bumble bee (*Bombus crotchii*), desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*), western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia* ssp. *hypugaea*), desert kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis*), and Mohave ground squirrel (*Xerospermophilus mohavensis*) as having a potential to occur in the project area. However, the application noted that Crotch's bumble bee was determined to have a low potential to be present based on the availability of food plants being too low to support a colony. Desert tortoises were determined to have a low potential to be present based upon lack of observations of tortoises and their sign during the proposed project's reconnaissance-level surveys, results of older pre-activity surveys conducted for the RB Inyokern Solar Project to the north, and the level of development present surrounding the proposed project site.

While these conclusions may be accurate, a reconnaissance-level survey cannot be used to rule out the presence of these two species. Numerous ground squirrel burrows were documented throughout the proposed project site that could support nesting Crotch's bumble bee or provide refuge for desert tortoise neonates. Crotch's bumble bees are known from the region and seasonal usage varies with annual and perennial plant abundance. Even if the project site supports minimal annual plant occurrences the original assessment appears to have been conducted in a drought year which likely reduced annual plant expression on the project site. The applicant also noted a potential desert kit fox burrow with possible kit fox scat within the proposed project site. Desert tortoise and western burrowing owls will use burrows excavated by other species, such as desert kit fox. Further, as previously described, spring of 2024 was substantially dryer than normal which would have made detection of desert tortoise difficult U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS of 2019).

The BAR relies on the results of western burrowing owl and Mohave ground squirrel surveys conducted sometime in or prior to 2023. However, focused surveys for these species were not conducted for the proposed project to confirm presence and quantify each species use of available habitat within the proposed project site and adjacent survey buffer. Any conclusions to exclude the potential for these species to occur should be based on a thorough survey of the project site based on standard survey and assessment protocols.

R&L Response

DR BIO-5 - The updated Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Revision 2, June 2026), submitted herewith as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092), provides updated floristic survey data from protocol-level surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period for the special-status plant species identified in this data request, consistent with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Protocol for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities (CDFW 2018). The updated BAR confirms that 100 percent coverage of the project footprint was achieved with inaccessible areas surveyed visually with binoculars, provides the three protocol-level floristic survey dates, and

confirms that the special-status plant species assessed as having a potential to occur — Barstow woolly sunflower, Charlotte's phacelia, and Latimer's woodland-gilia — were not observed during any of the protocol-level floristic surveys. Full biologist qualifications and resumes are provided in Appendix G of the updated BAR. CEC staff is directed to Section 2 and Section 4 of Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092) for the complete floristic survey data responsive to this request. To the extent additional supporting information including reference site data is developed as part of the supplemental biological study currently being prepared, it will be provided to the CEC docket upon completion as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 2.

DR BIO-6. Please provide data from focused species surveys as follows:

- Conduct Crotch's bumble bee surveys following CDFW's Survey Considerations for California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Candidate Bumble Bee Species (CDFW 2023). Provide a habitat assessment to assess seasonal changes to habitat based on the high levels of recent rainfall in the region.
- Conduct protocol level surveys for desert tortoise, following USFWS's Preparing for Any Action that May Occur within the Range of the Mojave Desert Tortoise (USFWS 2019).
- Conduct protocol surveys for western burrowing owl within 500-meters of proposed disturbance areas where legal access is granted. Survey methodologies should follow the CDFW (2012) Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation.
- Include surveys for sensitive thrashers and assess their potential to occur on the project site.
- Include biological resources data for any proposed mitigation sites that are being considered as compensatory mitigation for the proposed project. These must include an assessment of vegetation communities, protocol surveys for rare plants and wildlife including western burrowing owls, desert tortoise, nesting birds, and evaluation of the potential to support Mohave ground squirrel and any other resource proposed to be mitigated by the acquisition and management of the parcels.

Submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

BACKGROUND: Assessment of Impacts that Could Result from Construction and/or Operations/Maintenance of the Proposed Project

The SPPE Application, Appendix D's impact analysis in Section 6 of Subsection D.1 (Biological Report) discusses how construction and the operations and maintenance phases of the proposed project could impact sensitive biological resources. However, the impact analysis did not include a discussion of the following potential impacts:

The use of herbicides, pesticides, and/or rodenticides during construction and operation, including if these chemicals were going to be used and how they may impact biological resources, particularly special-status plant species, Crotch's bumble bee, desert kit fox, Mohave ground squirrel, and sensitive birds, including western burrowing owl and other raptors;

Whether the proposed photovoltaic solar panels could create a "lake effect" and attract birds

migrating along the Pacific Flyway, exposing them to risk of collision with infrastructure components;

The potential avian electrocution and collision risk from the proposed overhead gen- tie lines, shield wires, and overhead electrical equipment at the project substation and point of interconnection;

Whether project-related groundwater use supplied by the Inyokern Community Services District, which operates one active groundwater production well (as stated in application Appendix E.3 Water Supply Assessment), or by the emergency backup well proposed for the data center facility could impact any seeps, springs, or vegetation in the Indian Wells Groundwater Basin boundary.

R&L Response

DR BIO -6 - The Applicant acknowledges that protocol-level surveys for Crotch's bumble bee, desert tortoise, western burrowing owl, and sensitive thrashers were not conducted as part of the biological surveys documented in the Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Appendix D.1, TN 269600).

The updated Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Revision 2, June 2026), submitted herewith as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092), provides updated species assessments and survey findings for each of the protocol survey target species. With respect to desert tortoise, the updated BAR documents strong evidence of absence — no tortoise or sign detected during any reconnaissance survey, protocol-level floristic survey, or additional surveys; no tortoise individuals or burrows detected during pre-activity desert tortoise surveys conducted for the adjacent RB Inyokern Solar Project by authorized DETO biologists Jeff Erway and Curtis Uptain; and confirmation that USFWS did not request permit coverage for desert tortoise for the adjacent Solar project due to absence and lack of suitable habitat. The updated BAR concludes that it is unlikely that desert tortoise is present on the project site. With respect to Crotch's bumble bee, western burrowing owl, and sensitive thrashers, the updated BAR confirms that pre-construction protocol-level surveys will be conducted consistent with Mitigation Measures MM 4.4-3 (Crotch's Bumble Bee, TN 269893), MM 4.4-4 (Burrowing Owl, TN 269893), and MM 4.4-9 (Nesting Birds, TN 269893) prior to ground disturbance. The Applicant requires additional time beyond the 30-day response window to complete the applicable protocol-level surveys within their mandatory seasonal survey windows. The protocol-level survey results, habitat assessments, and mitigation site biological data will be submitted to the CEC docket upon completion as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 2 — extension item. CEC staff is directed to Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092) for the updated species assessments submitted herewith.

DATA REQUEST

DR BIO-7. Please provide an analysis for the following items, how those impacts could occur, whether these impacts could be potentially significant, and any mitigation measures that could be applied to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level:

Analyze and disclose the use of herbicide, pesticide, and rodenticide during each phase of the project and any potential impacts to sensitive biological resources.

Describe potential impacts to birds during the operation phase of the project from solar panels, including potential for “lake effect” impacts and collision and electrocution risks from overhead electrical infrastructure.

Describe any potential impacts to sensitive biological resources from the use of groundwater in the Indian Wells Groundwater Basin boundary, including water supplied by the Inyokern CSD and the proposed emergency backup well for the data center facility.

Submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

BACKGROUND: Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) Technology and Configuration

The SPPE Application, Section 4.9 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), states that the BESS chemistry has not been fully determined by the applicant. Therefore, it is not possible to determine potential risks should there be a risk of thermal runaway and subsequent BESS fire. CEC staff acknowledge there are different BESS systems available; however, each of these systems poses some risk of exposure to fire-related chemicals should a BESS fire occur during the construction or operation of the project.

R&L Response

DR BIO-7 - The Applicant acknowledges that the Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Appendix D.1, TN 269600) did not include analysis of the three potential impact pathways identified in this data request. The project's biological consulting firm is preparing the following analyses as part of the supplemental biological work being prepared for the DR BIO series, consistent with the requirements of CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(13)(E) and Section 4.4 (Biological Resources, TN 269893, pp. 227–264).

With respect to herbicide, pesticide, and rodenticide use, the supplemental analysis will disclose the proposed use of these chemicals during each phase of the project and evaluate potential impacts to sensitive biological resources identified in the BAR (Appendix D.1, TN 269600) and Section 4.4 (TN 269893, pp. 227–264), including special-status plant species, Crotch's bumble bee, desert kit fox, Mohave ground squirrel, western burrowing owl, and sensitive raptors, and will identify mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

With respect to solar panel lake effect and bird collision and electrocution risk, the supplemental analysis will describe potential impacts to birds during the operation phase of the project from the 1 MW photovoltaic solar system described in Section 1.4.8 (TN 269893), including potential lake effect impacts on birds migrating along the Pacific Flyway, and collision and electrocution risks from the proposed overhead 115 kV subtransmission line corridors and associated electrical equipment at the project substation and point of interconnection as described in Section 2 (TN 269893, pp. 81–86). The analysis will identify mitigation measures that could reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

With respect to groundwater use impacts to sensitive biological resources, the supplemental analysis will describe potential impacts to sensitive biological resources from the project's groundwater use in the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin, including water supplied by the Inyokern CSD and the proposed on-site emergency backup well described in Section 4.18 (TN

269893) and Section 1.4.5 (TN 269893), and will evaluate whether project-related groundwater use could impact seeps, springs, or vegetation within the basin boundary and identify mitigation measures where applicable. All three analyses will be submitted to the CEC docket upon completion as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 2 — extension item.

DATA REQUEST

DR BIO-8. Please provide an analysis of potential impacts to sensitive biological resources from a BESS fire resulting from thermal runaway as a worst-case scenario if lithium iron phosphate technology were to be chosen for the design. The analysis shall include an assessment of potential impacts from smoke and chemical deposition to sensitive plants and wildlife. Please submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

BACKGROUND: Impacts to Special-Status Plant Species

The SPPE Application, Section 4.4 (Biological Resources), includes applicant-proposed mitigation measures, including Mitigation Measure (MM) 4.4-1 (Pre-Construction Special-Status Plant Surveys). MM 4.4-1 is proposed to reduce potentially significant impacts to special-status plants that could result from the project. The measure does

not specify the survey methodology that would be used to complete the survey or when the survey must be completed to reduce impacts other than “prior to the issuance of a grading permit or ground disturbance”.

R&L Response

DR BIO-8 - The Applicant is adopting lithium iron phosphate (LFP) as the design-basis BESS chemistry for purposes of the worst-case thermal runaway biological impact analysis requested in this data request, consistent with standard practice for conceptual-stage environmental analysis where a worst-case design basis is established to bound the analysis pending final equipment selection. The final BESS chemistry will be confirmed during final engineering and equipment procurement and will be reported to the CEC docket at that time consistent with Section 3.2 (TN 269893, pp. 100–101). If the final selected BESS chemistry differs from lithium iron phosphate and would result in a more conservative worst-case scenario than the LFP analysis, the biological impact analysis will be revised and resubmitted accordingly.

The project's biological consulting firm is preparing an analysis of potential impacts to sensitive plants and wildlife from a worst-case BESS fire resulting from thermal runaway of a lithium iron phosphate BESS system. The analysis will assess potential impacts from smoke and chemical deposition to sensitive plants and wildlife identified in the BAR (Appendix D.1, TN 269600) and Section 4.4 (TN 269893, pp. 227–264), evaluate whether those impacts could be potentially significant, and identify mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level, consistent with CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(13)(E). The analysis will be submitted to the CEC docket upon completion as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 2 — extension item.

DATA REQUEST

DR BIO-9. Please specify the survey methodology and seasonal timing that would be required for the pre-construction special-status plant survey, including any applicable survey protocols, survey coverage requirements, and qualifications of survey personnel. In addition, please identify how many surveys would be needed to ensure detection of each special-status plant species that could occur in the project area. Please revise MM 4.4-1, as appropriate, to incorporate these requirements. Please submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

BACKGROUND: Impacts to Crotch's Bumble Bee

Appendix D.1, Section 6 (Impact Analysis and Recommended Mitigation Measures) states that the implementation of BIO-2 would contribute to reducing impacts to Crotch's bumble bee. However, BIO-2 (MM 4.4-2 in the application) addresses avoidance of listed special-status plant species and does not include any language about Crotch's bumble bee or their food plants. It is not clear how this measure would avoid or reduce impacts to Crotch's bumble bee.

R&L Response

DR BIO-9 - The Applicant acknowledges that Mitigation Measure MM 4.4-1 (Pre-Construction Special-Status Plant Surveys) as set forth in Section 4.4 (Biological Resources, TN 269893, pp. 227–264) and the Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Appendix D.1, TN 269600) does not specify the survey methodology, seasonal timing, survey protocols, coverage requirements, or surveyor qualifications required for the pre-construction special-status plant surveys.

The updated Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Revision 2, June 2026), submitted herewith as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092), revises MM BIO-1 (corresponding to MM 4.4-1 in the application) to specify the following implementation requirements: pre-construction surveys will be conducted following the CDFW Protocol for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities (CDFW 2018); surveys will be conducted during the appropriate blooming window of March through June for the three target special-status plant species — Barstow woolly sunflower, Charlotte's phacelia, and Latimer's woodland-gilia — as confirmed in Table 1 of the updated BAR; protocol-level floristic surveys and one pre-construction survey are confirmed sufficient to address all three potential special-status plant species; 100 percent coverage of the project footprint will be achieved; and surveys will be conducted by a qualified botanist with relevant Mojave Desert experience, with qualifications confirmed in Appendix G of the updated BAR. These implementation requirements are consistent with MM 4.4-1 as established in the application (TN 269893, p. 233) and do not alter the original intent of the mitigation measure. No revision to the application MM 4.4-1 language is required. CEC staff is directed to the updated MM BIO-1 in Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092) for the complete survey methodology responsive to this request.

DATA REQUEST

DR BIO-10. Please clarify whether the reference to BIO-2 (MM 4.4-2) is a measure that reduces impacts to Crotch's bumble bee is correct or was a typographical error. If so, describe the specific mechanisms by which this measure would avoid or reduce impacts to Crotch's bumble bee. If not,

please identify the mitigation measures intended to address impacts to Crotch's bumble bee and revise the discussion accordingly. Please submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

BACKGROUND: Impacts to Swainson's Hawk

Appendix D.1, Section 6 (Impact Analysis and Recommended Mitigation Measures) states that implementation of applicant's proposed measures BIO-4 (MM 4.4-4) and BIO-5 (MM 4.4-5) would contribute to reducing impacts to Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*). However, BIO-4 (MM 4.4-4) is specific to pre-construction surveys for burrowing owl, desert tortoise, American badger (*Taxidea taxus*), and desert kit fox, while BIO-5 (MM 4.4-5) addresses avoidance of burrowing owl burrows and Incidental Take Permit requirements for burrowing owl. Neither measure appears to be directly related to Swainson's hawk.

R&L Response

DR BIO-10 - The Applicant has reviewed the impact analysis in Section 6 of the Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Appendix D.1, TN 269600) and confirms that the reference to BIO-2 (MM 4.4-2) as a measure that contributes to reducing impacts to Crotch's bumble bee is a typographical error. MM 4.4-2 (Avoidance of Listed Special-Status Plants) as set forth in Section 4.4 (Biological Resources, TN 269893, p. 233) addresses avoidance of plant species listed under the Federal Endangered Species Act, the California Endangered Species Act, and the California Native Plant Protection Act, and does not include any language specifically addressing Crotch's bumble bee or its food plants.

The correct mitigation measure addressing Crotch's bumble bee is MM 4.4-3 (Crotch's Bumble Bee Pre-Construction Surveys) as set forth in Section 4.4 (Biological Resources, TN 269893, p. 234), which was correctly established in the application at the time of original submittal. The updated Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Revision 2, June 2026), submitted herewith as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092), corrects the typographical cross-reference in BAR Section 6 from BIO-2 to BIO-3 (corresponding to MM 4.4-3 in the application) for Crotch's bumble bee impacts. This correction is within the BAR only and does not require any revision to the application MM 4.4-3 language, which is correct as written. CEC staff is directed to Section 6 of Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092) for the corrected cross-reference responsive to this request.

DATA REQUEST

DR BIO-11. Please clarify whether the reference to BIO-4 (MM 4.4-4) and BIO-5 (MM 4.4-5) as measures that reduce impacts to Swainson's hawk is correct or was a typographical error. If so, describe the specific mechanisms by which these measures would avoid or reduce impacts to Swainson's hawk. If not, please identify the mitigation measures intended to address impacts to Swainson's hawk and revise the discussion accordingly. Please submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

BACKGROUND: Impacts to Burrowing Owl, Desert Tortoise, American Badger, and Desert

Kit Fox

Appendix D.1, Section 6 (Impact Analysis and Recommended Mitigation Measures) of the BAR proposes the implementation of BIO-4 (MM 4.4-4) Pre-Construction Surveys for Burrowing Owl, Desert Tortoise, American badger, and Desert Kit Fox. The measure states “some areas of the buffer may not be accessible, so transects within the buffer will only be walked where feasible” but does not specify what must be done for surveying where areas of the survey buffer are not accessible.

R&L Response

DR BIO-11a - The Applicant has reviewed the impact analysis in Section 6 of the Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Appendix D.1, TN 269600) and confirms that the references to BIO-4 (MM 4.4-4) and BIO-5 (MM 4.4-5) as measures that contribute to reducing impacts to Swainson's hawk are typographical errors. MM 4.4-4 (Burrowing Owl, Desert Tortoise, American Badger, and Desert Kit Fox Surveys) as set forth in Section 4.4 (Biological Resources, TN 269893, p. 234) addresses pre-construction clearance surveys for burrowing owl, desert tortoise, American badger, and desert kit fox only, and does not include any language addressing Swainson's hawk. MM 4.4-5 (Burrowing Owl Burrow Avoidance and ITP) as set forth in Section 4.4 (TN 269893, p. 235) addresses burrowing owl burrow avoidance and Incidental Take Permit requirements for burrowing owl only, and does not include any language addressing Swainson's hawk.

The correct mitigation measure addressing Swainson's hawk is MM 4.4-9 (Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Surveys) as set forth in Section 4.4 (Biological Resources, TN 269893, p. 237), which was correctly established in the application at the time of original submittal. The updated Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Revision 2, June 2026), submitted herewith as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092), corrects the typographical cross-references in BAR Section 6 from BIO-4 and BIO-5 to BIO-9 (corresponding to MM 4.4-9 in the application) for Swainson's hawk impacts. This correction is within the BAR only and does not require any revision to the application MM 4.4-9 language, which is correct as written. CEC staff is directed to Section 6 of Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092) for the corrected cross-references responsive to this request.

DATA REQUEST

DR BIO-11. Please describe how areas within the survey buffer that are physically inaccessible would be assessed for presence of burrows and dens that could support these species. Please submit any revisions in a clean updated application and a redline strikethrough version to account for any updates or revisions.

BACKGROUND: Correspondence Between the Project Applicant and State and Federal Resource Agencies

Appendix B, Section 4.4.7 (Additional Biological Resources Requirements) states that item (g)(13)(G) of California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B is fulfilled by the contents presented in Appendix B within the BAR (Appendix D.1). Appendix B of the BAR contains the

regulatory setting, summaries of each local, state, and federal law, ordinance, and regulation pertaining to biological resources in the region. California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(13)(H) specifically requires the following: “Submit copies of any preliminary correspondence between the project applicant and state and federal resource agencies regarding whether federal or state permits from other agencies such as the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the CDFW, and the RWQCB will be required for the proposed project.” Appendix B of the application does not contain the required content.

R&L Response

DR BIO-11b - Mitigation Measure MM 4.4-4 (Pre-Construction Surveys for Burrowing Owl, Desert Tortoise, American Badger, and Desert Kit Fox) as set forth in Section 4.4 (Biological Resources, TN 269893, p. 234) and the Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Appendix D.1, TN 269600) requires pre-construction clearance surveys to be conducted by a qualified biologist, with survey transects walked where feasible. The "where feasible" qualifier in MM 4.4-4 is intentional and reflects standard biological survey practice requiring the qualified biologist to exercise professional judgment regarding survey coverage in areas where physical access is limited or unavailable.

The updated Biological Analysis Report (BAR, Revision 2, June 2026), submitted herewith as Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092), confirms in Section 2 (Methods) that areas inaccessible to the surveyor during the biological surveys — either due to physical barriers or unauthorized access — were surveyed visually with high-powered binoculars. This is the standard method for assessing inaccessible areas in Mojave Desert biological surveys and is confirmed as the approach that will be used during pre-construction clearance surveys under MM 4.4-4. Where visual observation from accessible vantage points is insufficient, aerial or drone survey will be conducted where safe, feasible, and permitted. All inaccessible areas will be mapped, described, and documented in the pre-construction survey report submitted prior to ground disturbance, consistent with the qualified biologist's professional obligations under MM 4.4-4. No revision to the application MM 4.4-4 language is required. CEC staff is directed to Section 2 of Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092) for the inaccessible area assessment methodology responsive to this request.

DATA REQUEST

DR BIO-12. Please provide the preliminary correspondence required by California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(13)(H) as described above.

REFERENCES

CDFW (California Department of Fish and Wildlife). 2023. Survey Considerations for California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Candidate Bumble Bee Species.

Accessed May 2026. Available online:

<https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=213150&inline>.

USFWS (US Fish and Wildlife Service). 2019. Preparing for Any Action That May Occur within

the Range of the Mojave Desert Tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*). Version: October 8, 2019. Accessed: May 2026. Available online at: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/Survey-Protocols#377281283-reptiles>.

Weather Underground. 2026. Inyokern Airport Station (KIYK – KCAINYOK27). Accessed: May 2026. Available online at: <https://www.wunderground.com/weather/us/ca/in yokern/KIYK>.

R&L Response

DR BIO-12 - CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(13)(H) requires submission of copies of any preliminary correspondence between the project applicant and state and federal resource agencies. The Applicant provides the following response regarding the status of preliminary agency correspondence.

With respect to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), a CDFW Incidental Take Permit is anticipated to be required for western burrowing owl and Mohave ground squirrel, consistent with MM 4.4-5 and MM 4.4-7 (TN 269893). Copies of preliminary CDFW correspondence initiated to date are provided herewith as part of Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092). Ongoing CDFW correspondence will be submitted to the CEC docket within one week of receipt.

With respect to USFWS, preliminary Section 10/Section 7 outreach has not yet been initiated. Evidence of desert tortoise absence is strong as documented in Appendix D Supplement — Section D.1 Revision 1 (TN 271092). USFWS preliminary outreach will be initiated following completion of protocol-level surveys required under DR BIO-6 and submitted to the CEC docket upon initiation as an extension item.

With respect to USACE and RWQCB, no jurisdictional waters of the United States are present on the project site as documented in Section 4.4 (TN 269893) and the BAR (Appendix D.1, TN 269600). Section 404 and Section 401 permits are not required and no correspondence has been initiated.

CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Authors: Lauren DeOliveira and Michael Hoke

BACKGROUND: Records Search Results

CEC staff has reviewed the docketed information for this project (RLC 2026b; 2026c, 2026d, 2026e, 2026s, 2026t) and has found Confidential Appendix M does not include the full records search results as required by Appendix B (g) (2) (B). Neither Department of Parks and Recreation 523 (DPR 523) forms of previously identified cultural resources nor copies of previously conducted technical studies covering the project area or buffer are included. Additionally, a map showing the records search results were not provided.

DATA REQUESTS

DR CUL-1. Please provide copies of all DPR 523 forms for cultural resources (ethnographic,

architectural, historical, and archaeological) identified in the 1-mile literature search.

R&L Response

DR CUL-1 - The records search for the RBIDC project was conducted through the Southern San Joaquin Valley Information Center (SSJVIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) covering the project site and a one-mile radius, consistent with CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(2)(B). The records search response was issued by Celeste M. Thomson, Coordinator, SSJVIC, File No. 26-001, dated January 20, 2026.

The records search identified seven (7) cultural resources within the project area, forty-two (42) cultural resources within the one-mile radius, ten (10) reports within the project area, and twenty-six (26) reports within the one-mile radius, consistent with Section 4.5 (Cultural Resources) of the Main Application (TN 269893) and Tables 4.5-1 through 4.5-4. The complete SSJVIC records search response, including the resource and report lists and the SSJVIC-enclosed resource record copies, is provided in Appendix M.1 (CONFIDENTIAL Cultural Resources Appendix A, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL).

The updated DPR 523 site record forms for the six previously recorded resources relocated and updated during the January 8, 2026 field survey — P-15-002050/CA-KER-002050H (Southern Pacific Railroad/Siding 16), P-15-019864/CA-KER-010862H, P-15-019867/CA-KER-010865H, P-15-019869/CA-KER-010867H, P-15-019870/CA-KER-010868H, and P-15-020317 (State Route 178) — are provided in Appendix M.2 (CONFIDENTIAL Cultural Resources Appendix B, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL). DPR 523 record copies for the additional resources identified through the one-mile literature search, including the prehistoric isolates and pre-contact resources (e.g., P-15-008758, P-15-008762, P-15-008763, P-15-008764, and P-15-015203), are provided through the SSJVIC resource record copies enclosed in Appendix M.1.

All location information for identified cultural resources and the DPR 523 site record forms are submitted under confidential cover consistent with PRC §5097.94, Government Code §§6254(r) and 6254.10, and the CEC's standard practice for sensitive cultural resource site location data. All six resources relocated within the project area are historic in age, lack sufficient integrity, and are recommended not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). With implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.5-1 through MM 4.5-4 (Section 4.5) and the tribal cultural resources measures MM 4.17-1 through MM 4.17-5 (Section 4.17), the project's impacts to cultural and tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

DR CUL-2. Please provide copies of all technical reports whose survey coverage is wholly or partly within 0.25 miles of the area surveyed for the project or which report on any archaeological excavations or architectural surveys within the literature search area.

R&L Response

DR CUL-2 - The literature search and Area of Potential Effects encompass the project site and all linear facilities, including the 99 MW campus and the 115 kV interconnection, with the required buffers extended along each alignment consistent with Appendix B(g)(2)(B) and (C). The previous reports identified within the project area (ten reports) and within one mile of the project area

(twenty-six reports) are listed in Tables 4.5-1 and 4.5-3 of the Main Application (TN 269893) and in the SSJVIC records search response (Appendix M.1, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL).

Copies of the prior cultural resources technical reports meeting the Appendix B(g)(2)(B) criteria — including those with survey coverage wholly or partly within 0.25 mile of the surveyed area and those reporting archaeological excavations or architectural surveys within the literature search area — are provided to CEC staff under confidential cover with the Cultural Resources confidential appendices (TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL). A table identifying which reports meet the Appendix B(g)(2)(B) criteria is provided with the records search documentation.

If any linear facility or interconnection alignment is modified outside the area evaluated in the records search and field survey, the Applicant will complete an additional records search and field survey for the affected area prior to construction, consistent with Appendix B(g)(2)(B) and (C).

DR CUL-3. Please provide a copy of the USGS 7.5' quadrangle map of the literature search area delineating the areas of all past surveys and resources and noting the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) identifying number.

BACKGROUND: Archaeological Technical Study

CEC Staff have reviewed the application and docketed technical studies for this project (RLC 2026b; 2026c, 2026d, 2026e, 2026s, 2026t) and has found that the archaeological technical study is missing both a survey coverage map and a 1:24,000 USGS quadrangle map depicting all previously and newly identified cultural resources. In addition, several of the citations do not appear in the references cited. Please provide the following in accordance with CEQA Appendix B (g)(2)(C):

R&L Response

DR CUL-3 - The USGS 7.5' quadrangle mapping of the literature search area, delineating the areas of all past surveys and the recorded cultural resources with their CHRIS identifying numbers, is provided under confidential cover in Appendix M.1 (CONFIDENTIAL Cultural Resources Appendix A, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL).

Two companion maps, each prepared by ASM Affiliates on the Inyokern USGS 7.5' topographic quadrangle at a scale of 1:24,000, are provided in Appendix M.1. The map titled "Previous Reports - Inyokern Data Center Project Study Area" delineates the project study area boundary and the areas of all previous survey and report coverage within the literature search area, each labeled with its CHRIS report (KE) number. The map titled "Previously Recorded Resources — Inyokern Data Center Project Study Area" delineates the project study area boundary and depicts the previously recorded cultural resources within the literature search area, each labeled with its CHRIS primary (P-15) number. Together these maps depict the areas of all past surveys and the locations of all recorded resources with their CHRIS identifying numbers, consistent with the SSJVIC records search response (File No. 26-001) and Tables 4.5-1 through 4.5-4 of the Main Application (TN 269893). In addition, an individual DPR 523J Location Map on the Inyokern USGS 7.5' quadrangle at 1:24,000 is provided for each resource relocated and updated during the field survey (Appendix M.2, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL).

Staff is directed to Appendix M.1 (TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL) for the USGS 7.5' quadrangle

mapping of survey coverage and CHRIS-labeled resource locations responsive to this request.

DATA REQUESTS

DR CUL-4. Please confirm that the new pedestrian archaeological surveys included the project site and project linear facility routes extending to no less than 200 feet around the project site and staging areas, and no less than 50 feet to either side of the right-of-way of proposed linear facility routes. If so, please revise the language in the archaeological technical study to reflect the buffers surveyed.

R&L Response

DR CUL-4 - The Applicant confirms that the Phase I/Class III pedestrian archaeological survey, conducted on January 8, 2026 by ASM Affiliates, included the project site and the linear facility routes with the required buffers. As stated in Section 4.5 of the Main Application (TN 269893), the survey extended no less than 200 feet around the project site, substations, and staging areas, and no less than 50 feet to either side of the right-of-way of the 115 kV interconnection linear facility route, consistent with Appendix B(g)(2)(C). Survey personnel walked parallel transects spaced no greater than 15 meters apart, with transect endpoints recorded using a Trimble GPS unit.

The archaeological technical study has been revised to expressly state the buffers surveyed: 200-foot buffers around all project components, substations, and staging areas, and 50-foot buffers to either side of the linear facility right-of-way measured from the centerline of the line. The revised Cultural Resources Report is submitted herewith as Appendix B Supplement — Section B.1 Revision 1 (TN 271058), superseding the previously submitted Cultural Resources Report (Appendix B.1, TN 269594) as the operative cultural resources technical study for the Project.

DR CUL-5. Please provide a map at a scale of 1:24,000 U.S. Geological Survey quadrangle depicting the locations of all previously known and newly identified cultural resources identified through the record search and new pedestrian survey.

R&L Response

DR CUL-5 - The consolidated map titled "Previously Recorded Resources — Inyokern Data Center Project Study Area," prepared by ASM Affiliates on the Inyokern USGS 7.5' topographic quadrangle at a scale of 1:24,000, depicts the locations of the cultural resources identified through the records search and the new pedestrian survey, each labeled with its CHRIS primary number, together with the project study area boundary. This map is provided under confidential cover in Appendix M.1 (CONFIDENTIAL Cultural Resources Appendix A, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL).

The map depicts the seven previously recorded resources within the project area and the forty-two previously recorded resources within the one-mile radius, consistent with Tables 4.5-2 and 4.5-4 of the Main Application (TN 269893). No new archaeological sites or historic properties were identified within the project site during the pedestrian survey. For each of the six previously recorded resources relocated and updated during the survey, an individual DPR 523J Location Map

on the Inyokern USGS 7.5' quadrangle at 1:24,000 scale, labeled with the resource's CHRIS primary number and trinomial, is additionally provided in Appendix M.2 (TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL).

Staff is directed to Appendix M.1 (TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL) for the 1:24,000 USGS quadrangle mapping of previously known and newly identified cultural resources responsive to this request.

DR CUL-6. Please add Bancroft (1963), Boyd et al. (1982), Dillon (1984), Indian Wells Valley Airport District (2015), InyoKern Community Center (2025), JRP Historical Consulting (2009), Settle (1963), and Walker (1971) to the references cited and any others that may have been missed.

BACKGROUND: Native American Outreach

CEC Staff has reviewed the docketed information (RLC 2026b; 2026c, 2026d, 2026e, 2026s, 2026t) for this project and has found that copies of correspondence with California Native American tribes was not provided. Please provide the following as required by Appendix B (g)(2)(D):

R&L Response

DR CUL-6 - The References section of the Cultural Resources Report has been updated to include each of the citations identified in this data request. The following references are now provided in the References Cited: Bancroft (1963); Boyd et al. (1982); Dillon (1984); Indian Wells Valley Airport District (2015); Inyokern Community Center (2025); JRP Historical Consulting Services (2009); Settle (1963); and Walker (1971).

The References section was additionally reviewed in full to confirm that all sources cited in the body of the report appear in the References Cited, and any additional sources identified during that review have been added. The updated Cultural Resources Report reflecting the complete and corrected reference list is submitted herewith as Appendix B Supplement — Section B.1 Revision 1 (TN 271058).

DATA REQUEST

DR CUL-7. Please provide a copy of all correspondence sent to Native American individuals and groups listed by the NAHC and copies of all responses received. Provide a written summary of any oral responses.

R&L Responses

DR CUL-7 - A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search was requested from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on December 22, 2025 and January 23, 2026. On March 16, 2026, the NAHC provided a combined response confirming that the SLF search results were negative for the project area and providing a list of Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project's geographic area.

Following receipt of the NAHC contact list, the Applicant's cultural consultant transmitted tribal outreach letters on March 18, 2026 to each of the tribes identified by the NAHC: the Kern Valley Indian Community, the Tejon Indian Tribe, the Tubatulabals of Kern Valley, and the Tule River Indian Tribe. Each outreach letter described the proposed project, provided project location and area-of-potential-effects information, summarized the records search results, and invited the tribe to identify any knowledge of or concerns regarding tribal cultural resources within or adjacent to the project area. Copies of the four outreach letters are provided under confidential cover as Appendix M Supplement — Section M.1 (TN 271079 — CONFIDENTIAL).

Responses received to date are as follows. The Tejon Indian Tribe responded in writing on March 20, 2026, through its Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, stating that the Tribe currently has no knowledge of any tribal cultural resources within the project Area of Potential Effects and recommending that the project proceed as planned. No responses have been received from the Kern Valley Indian Community, the Tubatulabals of Kern Valley, or the Tule River Indian Tribe. A copy of the written Tejon Indian Tribe response is provided under confidential cover as Appendix M Supplement — Section M.2 (TN 271079 — CONFIDENTIAL). No oral responses have been received; if any oral communications are received, the Applicant will prepare and submit a written summary.

The Applicant will continue to monitor for tribal responses and will submit copies of any further responses received to the CEC docket within one week of receipt, with written notice to the CEC Project Manager, consistent with the docketing obligations established in the response to DR CUL-1.

References

RLC 2026s – R&L Capital Inc (TN 269893). RB Inyokern Data Center – SPPE Application, dated May 8, 2026. Available online at:

<https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/Lists/DocketLog.aspx?docketnumber=26-SPPE-01>.

RLC 2026b – R&L Capital Inc (TN 269595). RB Inyokern Data Center - SPPE Application

Appendix B - Part 1 of 4, dated April 23, 2026. Available online

at:<https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/Lists/DocketLog.aspx?docketnumber=26-SPPE-01>

RLC 2026c – R&L Capital Inc (TN 269596). RB Inyokern Data Center - SPPE Application

Appendix B - Part 2 of 4, dated April 23, 2026. Accessed online at:

<https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/Lists/DocketLog.aspx?docketnumber=26-SPPE-01>

RLC 2026d – R&L Capital Inc (TN 269597). RB Inyokern Data Center - SPPE Application

Appendix B - Part 3 of 4, dated April 23, 2026. Accessed online at:

<https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/Lists/DocketLog.aspx?docketnumber=26-SPPE-01>

RLC 2026e – R&L Capital Inc (TN 269598). RB Inyokern Data Center - SPPE Application

Appendix B - Part 4 of 4, dated April 23, 2026. Accessed online at:

<https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/Lists/DocketLog.aspx?docketnumber=26-SPPE-01>

RLC 2026t – R&L Capital Inc (TN 269993). RB Inyokern Data Center – SPPE Application

– Appendix M, dated April 27, 2026. Accessed online at:

<https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/Lists/DocketLog.aspx?docketnumber=26-SPPE-01>

OHP 1990 – Office of Historic Preservation, Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR), Recommended Contents and Format, Sacramento, CA: Office of Historic Preservation, February 1990. Available online at: <https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1069/files/armr-remediated.pdf>

EFFICIENCY AND ENERGY RESOURCES

Author: Ardalan Sofi, Ph.D., P.E.

BACKGROUND: Capacity and Redundancy Inconsistency

The SPPE application states that the emergency generator system consists of forty (40) Caterpillar 3516E diesel generators, each rated at 3 MW, for a total installed nameplate capacity of 120 MW. The system is described as two generator yards with 20 units per yard, configured to provide N+1 redundancy within each yard and N+2 redundancy campuswide. The maximum operational facility load is identified as 99 MW. The application also notes that, under standard emergency operation, each generator would operate at no more than 80 percent of its rated capacity to ensure reliability and longevity. However, the application does not include the detailed generator bay or block configuration that supports the stated N+1 per yard and N+2 campuswide redundancy.

In addition, operating all generators at 80 percent of nameplate capacity yields approximately 96 MW, which is lower than the stated 99 MW maximum operational load. Additional information is required to understand how the proposed configuration can support the 99 MW design load while maintaining the stated redundancy criteria.

DATA REQUESTS

DR EFF-1. Please provide the detailed generator bay or block configuration supporting the stated N+1 redundancy per generator yard and N+2 redundancy campuswide. The response should identify:

- The number of bays or blocks within each yard
- The number of generators assigned to each bay or block
- The number of generators required to serve load within each bay or block
- The number of redundant generators associated with each bay or block

R&L Response

DR EFF-1 - The following response provides the detailed generator bay and block configuration supporting the stated N+1 redundancy per generator yard and N+2 redundancy campuswide, as requested by CEC staff.

The RBIDC emergency backup generating facility consists of 40 Caterpillar 3516E diesel generators, each rated at 3 MW (3,000 kW), providing 120 MW of gross nameplate installed capacity across two generator yards, as confirmed in Section 1.4.2 (Emergency Backup Generating Facility, TN 269893, pp. 17–18), Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893), and Table 4.6-5 (Emergency

Generator System Summary, TN 269893). The two generator yards are positioned on opposite sides of the main building to ensure load distribution and operational redundancy, as described in Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, p. 18).

Each generator yard contains 20 generator units configured as a single block serving the campus load on a shared basis. The N+1 redundancy per yard is achieved as follows: each yard of 20 units is sized such that 19 units operating at or below 80 percent of rated capacity are sufficient to serve the load assigned to that yard, with the 20th unit serving as the dedicated redundant unit within the yard. At 80 percent of rated capacity per unit, 19 active units per yard deliver approximately 45.6 MW per yard ($19 \text{ units} \times 3 \text{ MW} \times 0.80 = 45.6 \text{ MW}$), for a combined campus output of approximately 91.2 MW from 38 active units. The two remaining units — one per yard — serve as the N+1 redundant units within each yard, providing N+2 redundancy campuswide.

The N+2 campuswide redundancy is achieved through the combined one-unit-per-yard redundancy across both yards. Under the worst-case single-yard failure scenario, the remaining 19 active units in the surviving yard plus the redundant unit in the failed yard provide continued campus support, consistent with the Tier III/IV reliability design standard described in Section 1.4.1 (TN 269893, pp. 16–17) and the generator system summary in Table 4.6-5 (TN 269893).

A revised generator yard block configuration diagram identifying the specific bay assignments, number of generators per block, number of generators required to serve load per block, and number of redundant generators per block for each generator yard has been submitted as Appendix A Supplement — Section A.1 Revision 1 (TN 271054), consistent with the configuration described above.

DR EFF-2. Please explain how the proposed redundancy architecture supports the 99 MW maximum operational load while maintaining the stated N+1 per yard and N+2 campuswide redundancy criteria.

R&L Response

DR EFF-2 - The following response explains how the proposed redundancy architecture supports the 99 MW maximum operational load while maintaining N+1 redundancy per generator yard and N+2 redundancy campuswide, consistent with the generator system configuration established in Section 1.1 (Executive Summary, TN 269893, p. 11), Section 1.4.2 (Emergency Backup Generating Facility, TN 269893, pp. 17–18), Section 4.6.5.2 (Emergency Generator System Design, TN 269893), Table 4.6-3 (Campus Energy Flow Summary, TN 269893), and Table 4.6-5 (Emergency Generator System Summary, TN 269893) of the Main Application.

The RBIDC emergency backup generating facility consists of 40 Caterpillar 3516E diesel generators, each rated at 3 MW (3,000 kW / 3,750 kVA) at the Standby and Mission Critical rating, as confirmed in Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, p. 17), Table 4.6-5 (TN 269893), and the Caterpillar 3516E data sheet (Drawing LEHE2570-05, Appendix A.3, TN 269593). The 40-unit fleet provides 120 MW of gross nameplate installed capacity across two generator yards of 20 units each, as confirmed in Section 1.1 (TN 269893, p. 11), Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, p. 18), and Table 4.6-5 (TN 269893). The two generator yards are positioned on opposite sides of the main building to ensure load distribution and operational redundancy, as described in Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, p. 18).

The relationship between the 99 MW maximum operational load, the 80 percent standard operating

target, and the N+1 per yard and N+2 campuswide redundancy criteria is reconciled as follows, consistent with Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, pp. 17–18) and Table 4.6-5 (TN 269893):

Under standard emergency operation with all 40 generators active, Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, p. 18) and Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893) establish that each unit operates at no more than 80 percent of peak rated capacity to ensure reliability and longevity. At 80 percent of rated capacity per unit, 40 active units deliver $40 \times 3 \text{ MW} \times 0.80 = 96 \text{ MW}$ of available output. The 99 MW maximum operational load slightly exceeds the 96 MW available at the 80 percent standard operating target, which is reconciled by the fact that the Caterpillar 3516E generators are rated at full 3 MW (3,000 kW) Standby and Mission Critical capacity per Drawing LEHE2570-05 (Appendix A.3, TN 269593), meaning that 100 percent of rated capacity is available when required. As confirmed in Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, p. 18) and Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893), the 80 percent operating target is the standard design operating point for reliability and longevity under normal emergency operating conditions, not an absolute limit on available capacity. The full 99 MW campus load is served by 40 units operating at a blended average of approximately 82.5 percent of rated capacity ($99 \text{ MW} \div 40 \text{ units} \div 3 \text{ MW per unit} = 82.5 \text{ percent}$), which is well within the Standby and Mission Critical rated output of each unit as confirmed in Appendix A.3 (TN 269593).

The N+1 redundancy per yard and N+2 campuswide redundancy criteria are maintained simultaneously with the 99 MW load capability as follows. As described in the response to DR EFF-1 and consistent with Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, p. 18), Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893), and Table 4.6-5 (TN 269893), each yard of 20 units is configured such that 19 units serve active load and 1 unit per yard is designated as the redundant standby unit, providing N+1 per yard and N+2 campuswide. With 38 active load-serving units each operating at approximately 86.8 percent of rated capacity ($99 \text{ MW} \div 38 \text{ units} \div 3 \text{ MW per unit} = 86.8 \text{ percent}$), the full 99 MW campus load is served while maintaining 2 redundant standby units — one per yard — consistent with the N+2 campuswide redundancy criteria confirmed in Section 1.1 (TN 269893, p. 11), Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, p. 18), Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893), and Table 4.6-5 (TN 269893). Individual generator unit availability is targeted at no less than 99 percent per unit, consistent with Tier III/IV design standards as confirmed in Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893).

In the event of a single generator failure, one of the two redundant standby units immediately assumes load, restoring N+1 campuswide redundancy while continuing to serve the full 99 MW campus load across 39 active units at approximately 84.6 percent of rated capacity per unit ($99 \text{ MW} \div 39 \text{ units} \div 3 \text{ MW per unit} = 84.6 \text{ percent}$). This architecture is consistent with the Tier III/IV reliability design standard described in Section 1.4.1 (TN 269893, pp. 16–17) and Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893) requiring greater than 99.982 percent availability at the critical load, as confirmed in Section 1.1 (TN 269893, p. 11) and further supported by the Campus Energy Flow Summary in Table 4.6-3 (TN 269893) and the Emergency Generator System Summary in Table 4.6-5 (TN 269893). The generator yard block configuration diagram submitted concurrently as part of the response to DR EFF-1 depicts the specific load distribution and redundancy architecture described above.

DR EFF-3. Please clarify how the statement that each generator will operate at no more than 80 percent of rated capacity during standard emergency operation is reconciled with the 99 MW maximum operational load, given that 80 percent of the total 120 MW installed capacity equals approximately 96 MW.

R&L Response

DR EFF-3 - The following response clarifies how the stated 80 percent rated capacity standard operating target is reconciled with the 99 MW maximum operational load, as requested by CEC staff.

As confirmed in Section 1.4.2 (Emergency Backup Generating Facility, TN 269893, pp. 17–18), Section 4.6.5.2 (Emergency Generator System Design, TN 269893), and Table 4.6-5 (Emergency Generator System Summary, TN 269893), the RBIDC emergency backup generating facility consists of 40 Caterpillar 3516E diesel generators, each rated at 3 MW (3,000 ekW / 3,750 kVA) at the Standby and Mission Critical rating, providing 120 MW of gross nameplate installed capacity. The 99 MW maximum operational load is confirmed by the Project's SCE Method of Service Study MOS174 (March 30, 2026, Appendix M.3, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL) and the confirmed 99 MW utility interconnection, as described in Section 1.1 (TN 269893, p. 11) and Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893).

CEC staff correctly identifies that 80 percent of the total 120 MW installed nameplate capacity equals 96 MW, which is 3 MW less than the 99 MW maximum operational load. The reconciliation of this apparent discrepancy is as follows.

The 80 percent operating target stated in Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, p. 18) and Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893) — "each unit will operate at no more than 80 percent of its peak rated capacity to ensure reliability and longevity" — is the standard design operating point under typical emergency operating conditions, not an absolute technical ceiling on available generator output. The Caterpillar 3516E is rated at 3 MW (3,000 ekW) at both its Standby and Mission Critical ratings as confirmed in the Caterpillar 3516E data sheet (Drawing LEHE2570-05, Appendix A.3, TN 269593), meaning that 100 percent of rated capacity — 3 MW per unit — is available from each generator when required to serve load. The 80 percent target is an operational guideline adopted to promote generator longevity, reduce thermal stress, and maintain reserve capacity headroom within each unit, consistent with industry best practice for Tier III/IV data center emergency generation design as described in Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893) and Table 4.6-5 (TN 269893).

Under the N+2 campuswide redundancy architecture described in the response to DR EFF-2, 38 of the 40 generators are designated as active load-serving units and 2 generators — one per yard — are designated as redundant standby units, consistent with Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893, p. 18), Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893), and Table 4.6-5 (TN 269893). With 38 active load-serving units serving the full 99 MW campus load, each active unit operates at approximately 86.8 percent of rated capacity ($99 \text{ MW} \div 38 \text{ units} \div 3 \text{ MW per unit} = 86.8 \text{ percent}$). This operating point modestly exceeds the 80 percent standard operating target but remains well within the Standby and Mission Critical rated output of each unit as confirmed in Drawing LEHE2570-05 (Appendix A.3, TN 269593). The 2 redundant standby units provide immediate load assumption capability in the event of a single unit failure, consistent with the N+2 campuswide reliability criteria and the greater than 99.982 percent availability objective confirmed in Section 1.1 (TN 269893, p. 11) and Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893).

In summary, the 80 percent operating target and the 99 MW maximum operational load are reconciled by the following two factors, both grounded in the application as submitted. First, the 80 percent target is an operational guideline, not an absolute capacity ceiling, as the Caterpillar 3516E is rated at 100 percent of its 3 MW nameplate at both Standby and Mission Critical ratings per Drawing LEHE2570-05 (Appendix A.3, TN 269593). Second, under the N+2 campuswide

redundancy architecture, 38 of 40 generators serve the 99 MW load at approximately 86.8 percent of rated capacity — modestly above the 80 percent guideline but within rated output — while 2 redundant standby units maintain campuswide reliability consistent with the Tier III/IV design standard described in Section 1.4.1 (TN 269893, pp. 16–17), Section 4.6.5.2 (TN 269893), and Table 4.6-5 (TN 269893).

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Author: Kevin M. DeLano, P.G. 10178, M.S.

BACKGROUND: Preliminary Geotechnical and Geohazard Investigation

The SPPE Application, Appendix K.1 (TN 269261), is a Preliminary Soil and Geology Evaluation that BSK Associates completed on December 12, 2025, for the applicant. The Preliminary Soil and Geology Evaluation characterized the project site's geology and potential hazards using existing geotechnical and geologic information and observations collected during a site visit. The SPPE Application, Section 4.7, Soils and Geology (TN 269893) also proposed mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts related to geologic hazards to less than significant.

However, the application stated that, in compliance with the 2025 California Building Code (CBC) and Kern County Code of Ordinances, a design-level geotechnical and geohazard investigation will be performed to collect subsurface geotechnical and geophysical data, evaluate geologic hazards, and propose mitigation for geologic hazards. CEC staff currently has insufficient geotechnical and geohazard data and analyses to evaluate the potential impacts from, and on, geologic hazards, and needs the results of the subsurface and geophysical data to complete their analyses.

DATA REQUEST

DR GEO-1. Please complete and submit the Preliminary Geotechnical and Geohazard Investigation required pursuant to the 2025 California Building Code, Section 18.03, and the Kern County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 17.08.

R&L Response

DR GEO-1 - The Applicant acknowledges that the design-level Preliminary Geotechnical and Geohazard Investigation required pursuant to the 2025 California Building Code (CBC), Section 18.03, and the Kern County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 17.08, has not yet been completed at the time of the original Application submittal. As disclosed in Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, TN 269893, pp. 100–101) of the Main Application, the design-level geotechnical and geohazard investigation is among the project elements pending final engineering and is identified as a required pre-construction deliverable.

The existing geotechnical documentation submitted with the Application — the Preliminary Soil and Geology Evaluation prepared by BSK Associates, dated December 12, 2025 (Appendix K.1, TN 269611) — characterizes the project site's geology and potential hazards using existing geotechnical and geologic information and site visit observations, and establishes the conceptual-stage baseline for the geotechnical analysis provided in Section 4.7 (Soils and Geology, TN

269893, pp. 307–367). As disclosed in Section 4.7 (TN 269893, p. 307) and Section 3.2 (TN 269893, pp. 100–101), the Preliminary Soil and Geology Evaluation is intended to be supplemented by the design-level investigation required under the 2025 CBC and Kern County Code prior to issuance of a grading or building permit.

The design-level Geotechnical and Geohazard Investigation includes the following scope consistent with 2025 CBC Section 18.03 and Kern County Code of Ordinances Chapter 17.08 requirements: subsurface borings and trenches across the project footprint to characterize subsurface soil and groundwater conditions; laboratory testing of soil samples for geotechnical engineering properties; liquefaction, landslide, and fault rupture hazard analyses consistent with 2025 CBC seismic design requirements; and geotechnical design recommendations for foundations, grading, retaining structures, and pavement sections, as anticipated in Section 4.7 (TN 269893, pp. 307–367) and Mitigation Measure MM 4.7-1 (TN 269893, p. 367).

The Applicant requires additional time beyond the 30-day response window to complete the design-level Geotechnical and Geohazard Investigation. The geotechnical firm has been engaged and fieldwork is currently underway. The completed design-level Geotechnical and Geohazard Investigation report will be submitted to the CEC docket as Appendix J,K Supplement — Section K.1 Revision 1 with a new TN number assigned at time of submission.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Authors: Brewster Birdsall, Rachael Dal Porto

BACKGROUND: Sulfur Hexafluoride Emissions

The SPPE application's Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA, TN269606, pg. 4-21) states "Additionally, the proposed Project substations may feature circuit breakers that contain SF6 gas, used as an insulator and an arc suppressor in the breakers. At this time SF6 circuit breakers are not proposed and even with the addition of SF6 circuit breakers the annual threshold for GHG emissions would not be exceeded." CEC staff needs to confirm how the use of SF6 would comply with the phase out regulation (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, § 95352) and the applicable phase out date based on the proposed GIE characteristics.

DATA REQUEST

DR GHG-1. Please verify how the project would comply with the current SF6 phase out regulation (California Code of Regulations, Title 17, § 95352). If SF6 is not used, please provide information on the non-SF6 alternative to be used in the breakers.

R&L Response

DR GHG-1 - The Applicant confirms that SF6 circuit breakers are not proposed for the RBIDC project at this stage of design development, consistent with the application statement in Section 4.8 (TN 269893): "At this time SF6 circuit breakers are not proposed and even with the addition of SF6 circuit breakers the annual threshold for GHG emissions would not be exceeded."

As disclosed in Section 1.0 (TN 269893) and Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, TN 269893), the application has been submitted at the conceptual design stage and final substation equipment specifications — including circuit breaker technology — will be confirmed during final electrical engineering. For customer-owned medium-voltage switchgear, it is the Applicant's current design intent to utilize non-SF6 circuit breaker technologies, to be confirmed during final electrical engineering and reported to the CEC docket as a supplement at that time. The customer-owned substation one-line diagrams (Appendix L.1, TN 269626) identify breakers by device number, ampere rating, and configuration only — interrupting medium is not yet specified, consistent with the conceptual design stage. In the event that SF6-containing equipment is determined to be technically necessary during final engineering, the Applicant commits to evaluating and complying with all applicable requirements under CCR Title 17, §95352, consistent with the LORS compliance commitment in the application consistency table at Section 4.8 (TN 269893).

With respect to SCE-owned electrical equipment at the Inyokern Substation and along the SCE 115 kV subtransmission line corridors described in Section 2.0 (TN 269893) and MOS174 (March 30, 2026, Appendix M.3, TN 269893), any SF6-containing switchgear within SCE's scope of work is SCE's responsibility and subject to SCE's own CCR Title 17, §95352 compliance obligations as the equipment owner and operator. The 115 kV breaker specifications at the Inyokern Substation are identified as TBD in Appendix L.3 (TN 269626) pending SCE's final equipment selection under MOS174. The Applicant has no authority or responsibility over SCE-owned equipment specifications.

Because no SF6 circuit breakers are proposed for any customer-owned project electrical equipment at this stage of design, the project does not trigger the CCR Title 17, §95352 SF6 phase-out regulation with respect to customer-owned equipment at this time.

BACKGROUND: CARB REFRIGERANT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) Refrigerant Management Program (RMP) requires facilities with refrigeration systems containing more than 50 pounds of high- global warming potential (GWP) refrigerant to conduct and report periodic leak inspections, promptly repair leaks; and keep service records on site. Stationary refrigeration facilities with more than 50 pounds of high-GWP refrigerant in the largest on-site refrigeration system must register with the RMP. Those with at least 200 pounds of high-GWP refrigerant in the largest system have annual reporting and additional duties. Given that there are approximately 19 tons of refrigerant being used in the proposed cooling units, CEC staff needs to confirm how the project would meet the RMP requirements.

DATA REQUEST

DR GHG-2. Please confirm how the project would meet the CARB RMP requirements.

R&L Response

DR GHG-2 - The Applicant provides the following response confirming how the project will meet the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Refrigerant Management Program (RMP)

requirements, consistent with the refrigerant information provided in Section 4.9 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials, TN 269893, pp. 456–527) and the Hazards and Hazardous Materials Analysis (Appendix J.1, TN 269610) of the Main Application.

The RBIDC cooling system utilizes R-454B and R-513A refrigerants — A2L mildly flammable hydrofluoroolefin (HFO) and hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) blends — in the chiller plant serving the data halls, as identified in Section 4.9 (TN 269893, p. 456). Variable refrigerant flow (VRF) split-system air conditioners serving the administrative and support areas of the facility also utilize HFC-based refrigerants, as described in Section 1.4.4 (Cooling System, TN 269893, pp. 19–20) and Section 4.9 (TN 269893). The total aggregate refrigerant charge across all cooling systems at the RBIDC is referenced in the CEC data request background as approximately 19 tons. As disclosed in Section 4.9 (TN 269893) and Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, TN 269893, pp. 100–101), the final aggregate refrigerant charge per system must be calculated during final design for ASHRAE 15 compliance, as noted in Section 4.9 (TN 269893, p. 456).

With respect to CARB RMP threshold applicability, the CARB Refrigerant Management Program requires registration for facilities with more than 50 pounds of high-GWP refrigerant in the largest on-site refrigeration system, and annual reporting for facilities with at least 200 pounds of high-GWP refrigerant in the largest system. Both R-454B and R-513A are high-GWP refrigerants subject to the CARB RMP. Based on the scale of the RBIDC cooling system — which the CEC data request characterizes as approximately 19 tons of aggregate refrigerant — individual chiller units at this facility will almost certainly exceed the 50-pound registration threshold and the 200-pound annual reporting threshold. The project will therefore be required to register with the CARB RMP and comply with annual reporting, periodic leak inspection, and prompt leak repair requirements under the CARB RMP.

The Applicant commits to the following CARB RMP compliance measures, consistent with Section 4.9 (TN 269893, pp. 456–527) and Mitigation Measure MM 4.9-1 (Hazardous Materials Business Plan, TN 269893, p. 527): registering all refrigeration systems containing more than 50 pounds of high-GWP refrigerant with the CARB RMP prior to commencement of operations; conducting periodic leak inspections at the frequency required by the CARB RMP for the applicable refrigerant charge threshold; promptly repairing any identified leaks consistent with CARB RMP repair timeframe requirements; maintaining on-site service records for all refrigeration systems subject to the CARB RMP; and submitting annual reports to CARB for all systems containing at least 200 pounds of high-GWP refrigerant. These commitments will be incorporated into the project's Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) required under MM 4.9-1 (TN 269893, p. 527) and submitted to the Kern County CUPA prior to commencement of operations.

As disclosed in Section 3.2 (TN 269893, pp. 100–101), the final per-system refrigerant charge for each chiller and VRF unit will be confirmed during final mechanical engineering. Upon confirmation of final refrigerant charge per system, the Applicant will verify the specific CARB RMP registration and reporting tier applicable to each system and will submit the CARB RMP registration prior to commencement of operations.

BACKGROUND: STATE OF CALIFORNIA GHG GOALS AND PROGRAMS

Executive Order (EO) B-55-18 (2018) and the 100 Percent Clean Energy Act of 2018 (Senate Bill 100, De León, Chapter 312, Statutes of 2018) establish a goal for California to achieve carbon

neutrality as soon as possible and no later than the year 2045 and to maintain net negative carbon emissions thereafter. California state agencies are directed to incorporate this goal and identify measures to meet the goal. It also directs state agencies to work with businesses to achieve the goal of carbon neutrality. CEC staff will need to describe the project and its GHG emissions in the context of the State of California policies, programs, and long-term goals for achieving carbon neutrality.

DATA REQUEST

DR GHG-3. Please identify what actions have been taken by the project applicant for the procurement of renewable diesel fuel for the backup generators and procurement of a carbon-free supply of electricity for the data center. Please provide a zero-carbon plan in compliance with EO B-55-18 and SB 100.

R&L Response

DR GHG-3 – The Applicant provides the following response identifying actions taken for the procurement of renewable diesel fuel for the backup generators and carbon-free electricity for the data center, and describing the Project's existing framework for compliance with Executive Order B-55-18 and Senate Bill 100.

With respect to renewable diesel fuel procurement for the backup generators, the Project's 40 Caterpillar 3516E emergency standby generators are designed to operate on CARB-compliant renewable diesel (hydrotreated vegetable oil, R99/R100) as the primary fuel source when commercially available, with ultra-low sulfur diesel as the documented alternative when renewable diesel is not readily accessible, as confirmed in Section 1.4.3 (TN 269893), Section 4.6.5.4 (TN 269893), and the Environmental Sustainability Plan and Best Management Practices (Appendix O.1, TN 269666). The Caterpillar 3516E generators are factory-certified for operation on HVO, Renewable Diesel, and Hydrotreated Renewable Diesel meeting EN 15940 or ASTM D975, as confirmed in the Caterpillar 3516E data sheet (Drawing LEHE2570-05, Appendix A.3, TN 269593).

Actions taken to date for renewable diesel procurement include the following, as confirmed in the Environmental Sustainability Plan (Appendix O.1, TN 269666) and Section 4.6.5.4 (TN 269893):

The design basis specifies R99/R100 as the primary generator fuel, with all 40 Caterpillar 3516E units factory-certified for renewable diesel operation — eliminating engine modifications or aftertreatment compatibility concerns as a procurement barrier.

The CARB Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) credit generation pathway has been identified — operators using renewable diesel in on-site generation may generate LCFS credits improving project economics, as confirmed in Appendix O.1 (TN 269666).

The compliance framework for CARB Off-Road Regulation §2449 has been established in Appendix O.1 (TN 269666), including the three-year purchase record retention requirement and annual CARB compliance affirmation by March 1.

Sustainability certification schemes for renewable fuel chain-of-custody verification — including ISCC and RSB — have been identified in Appendix O.1 (TN 269666) as the applicable certification frameworks for renewable diesel procurement.

The use of R99/R100 renewable diesel is expected to deliver approximately 75 percent reduction in Scope 1 GHG emissions compared to conventional diesel, as confirmed in the Environmental Sustainability Plan (Appendix O.1, TN 269666). Formal renewable diesel supply agreements with CARB-certified suppliers have not yet been executed, which is consistent with the conceptual design stage of the Project and the planned 2027 construction commencement. The Applicant anticipates the following preliminary procurement timeline, subject to revision as the project advances through final engineering and construction following CEC approval: supplier market assessment and pre-qualification concurrent with detailed design development following CEC approval; formal renewable diesel supply agreement execution prior to generator installation and commissioning anticipated in the 2028 to 2029 timeframe consistent with Phase 3 of the 48-month construction schedule per Application Table 1-2 (TN 269893).

With respect to carbon-free electricity procurement for the data center, the Project will receive 100 percent of its utility electrical service from Southern California Edison under the SCE retail tariff, as confirmed in Section 4.6.5.1 (TN 269893) and MOS174 (March 30, 2026, Appendix M.3). SCE's grid supply is subject to California's Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) under SB 100, which requires 100 percent of retail electricity sales to come from renewable and zero-carbon resources by 2045, as described in Section 4.8 (TN 269893) and Section 4.6.5.10 (TN 269893). The Project therefore does not conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted pursuant to SB 100, as confirmed in Table 4.6-12 (Energy-Related LORS Compliance Summary, TN 269893).

The Project also includes approximately 1 MW of ancillary rooftop and carport photovoltaic solar generation to offset a portion of on-site daytime electrical demand, as confirmed in Section 1.4.8 (TN 269893). The Project targets a Carbon Use Effectiveness (CUE) of less than 0.1 kgCO₂e per kWh of IT equipment energy and a Renewable Energy Factor (REF) of 1.0 consistent with the baseline expectation for new hyperscale data centers per ISO/IEC 30134-3, as described in Appendix O.1 (TN 269666) and Section 4.6 (TN 269893).

The specific renewable energy procurement mechanism — whether a power purchase agreement, renewable energy certificates, direct renewable generation, or a combination thereof — will be determined and committed to prior to commencement of operations consistent with Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, TN 269893). The Applicant anticipates the following preliminary procurement timeline, subject to revision as the project advances through final engineering and construction following CEC approval: renewable energy procurement mechanism determination concurrent with detailed design development following CEC approval; formal commitment prior to commencement of operations anticipated in the 2029 to 2031 timeframe consistent with the Project schedule per Application Table 1-2 (TN 269893). The RESET Standard performance-based sustainability platform identified in Appendix O.1 (TN 269666) will track the Project's real-time Renewable Energy Factor (REF) metric providing continuous verification of the carbon-free electricity pathway upon commencement of operations.

With respect to the Project's zero-carbon plan in compliance with EO B-55-18 and SB 100, the Environmental Sustainability Plan and Best Management Practices (Appendix O.1, TN 269666) constitutes the Project's existing GHG reduction and sustainability framework and zero-carbon compliance plan. The Project is consistent with EO B-55-18 and SB 100 through the following zero-carbon pathway elements:

Scope 1 GHG reduction — renewable diesel (R99/R100) as the primary generator fuel delivering approximately 75 percent lifecycle GHG reduction compared to conventional diesel, as confirmed in Appendix O.1 (TN 269666).

Scope 2 GHG reduction — SCE RPS-compliant grid supply as the primary pathway toward the 2045 carbon neutrality goal under EO B-55-18 and AB 1279 (California Climate Crisis Act, Health and Safety Code Section 38562.2), as confirmed in Section 4.8 (TN 269893) and Appendix O.1 (TN 269666).

On-site renewable generation — approximately 1 MW ancillary rooftop and carport PV generation, as confirmed in Section 1.4.8 (TN 269893).

Emissions below significance — Project GHG emissions are well below EKAPCD's 25,000 MT CO₂e per year significance threshold, as confirmed in Section 4.8 (TN 269893) and Table 4.8-1 (Estimated Annual GHG Emissions, TN 269893).

Performance framework — the RESET Standard sustainability certification platform provides continuous real-time operational data on PUE, CUE, REF, and WUE consistent with ISO/IEC 30134 Key Performance Indicators and Title 24 Part 6 ongoing energy monitoring requirements, as confirmed in Appendix O.1 (TN 269666).

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Author: Ghazal Mehdizadeh

BACKGROUND: Hydrologic Modeling

Section 4.10.1 of the application (TN 269893) states that the project site is located within a Zone A FEMA special flood hazard area. Flood modeling for the project was conducted using Civil Design Unit Hydrograph Software (Civild) in accordance with the prescribed method in the Kern County Hydrology Manual. The Hydrologic Engineering Center – River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) was used to model the flood depth and velocities at the project site and surrounding area. However, the application does not include the key model assumptions or supporting calculations. Also, results were not provided.

DATA REQUESTS

DR HYD-1. Please provide key model assumptions, support calculations, and results.

BACKGROUND: Water Demand Estimates

In the SPPE Application, Appendix E, Water Supply Assessment (TN 269636), it is mentioned that the total water demand for construction during the first 8 months would be 39.28 acre-feet (AF). However, in Table 1-1, the water use during the first 8 months is approximately 3 to 3.5 million gallons, equivalent to 9.2 to 10.7 AF.

R&L Response

DR HYD-1 - The key model assumptions, supporting calculations, and results for the flood modeling conducted for the RBIDC project are provided in the updated Hydrology Study (Inyokern Data Center Hydrology Study, Quad Knopf, Inc., June 2026), submitted herewith as Appendix E Supplement — Section E.1 Revision 1 (TN 271093), consistent with CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(14)(D) and the Kern County Floodplain Management Ordinance. The flood modeling results

are also restated in the Main Application at Table 4.10-3 (Restating Table 4-1, Hydrology Study, TN 269893), Table 4.10-4 (Restating Table 4-2, Hydrology Study, TN 269893), and Table 4.10-B (Key Analytical Assumptions and References — Water Resources, TN 269893), and summarized in Section 4.10 (Hydrology and Water Quality, TN 269893).

The updated Hydrology Study addresses the project site's location within a Zone A FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area as confirmed in Section 4.10 (TN 269893) and Section 1.9.10 (TN 269893). The key model assumptions, supporting calculations, and results are organized as follows.

With respect to key model assumptions, the updated Hydrology Study documents the hydrologic and hydraulic modeling assumptions including watershed delineation, rainfall data from NOAA Atlas 14 Volume 6 Version 2, soil classifications, time of concentration calculations, and design storm parameters for the 100-year 24-hour rainfall design event consistent with the Kern County Hydrology Manual. Key hydraulic model assumptions include a Manning's n value of 0.035, a 100-foot by 100-foot computational mesh cell size, normal depth boundary conditions, and a conservative no-infiltration assumption due to lack of site-specific soil data, as confirmed in Table 4-1 of the updated Hydrology Study.

With respect to supporting calculations, the updated Hydrology Study provides the Civil Design Unit Hydrograph Software (Civild) calculations prepared in accordance with the Kern County Hydrology Manual, as described in Section 4.2 of the updated Hydrology Study. The Hydrologic Engineering Center River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) hydraulic model calculations for flood depth and velocities at the project site and surrounding area using the Diffusion Wave Equation across the computation mesh are also provided, with full model results in Appendix E of the updated Hydrology Study.

With respect to results, the updated Hydrology Study concludes that floodwater from Little Dixie Wash — located approximately 8,000 feet south of the project site — does not reach the project area, and the data center, subtransmission lines, and substation are not located in areas subject to flood accumulation from Little Dixie Wash or existing watercourses, as confirmed in Section 4.2 of the updated Hydrology Study and Section 1.9.10 (TN 269893). Maximum modeled on-site flood depths are generally less than 1.0 foot based on the 100-year 24-hour rainfall design event, with the exception of a localized depression in the northwest corner of the project site where no development is planned. A conservative base flood elevation criterion of 1.0 foot above existing or finished grade is recommended to address FEMA Zone A requirements, as confirmed in Section 4.2 of the updated Hydrology Study and Section 1.4.12 (TN 269893). An on-site retention basin is required to comply with applicable Kern County drainage standards, as confirmed in Section 4.3 of the updated Hydrology Study and Mitigation Measure MM 4.10-1 (TN 269893). CEC staff is directed to Appendix E Supplement — Section E.1 Revision 1 (TN 271093) for the complete updated Hydrology Study including all model assumptions, supporting calculations, and detailed results responsive to this request.

DATA REQUEST

DR HYD-2. Please clarify the inconsistency between the stated amounts.

BACKGROUND: Water Demand Estimates

The SPPE application, states that based on the 2020 Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority

(IWVGA) Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) future water budget, approximately 26,511 acre-feet (AF) is predicted to be extracted in 2040 for users at and near the project site. However, based on Table 3-8 of the 2020 GSP, the groundwater extraction estimated for WY 2040 is estimated at 11,240 AF (IWVGA 2020).

Therefore, based on the application, the maximum water demand of 49.10 AFY represents approximately 0.44 percent of the projected annual extraction available.

R&L Response

DR HYD-2 - The Applicant provides the following clarification regarding the apparent inconsistency between the 26,511 AFY figure used in the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix E.3, TN 269639/269640) and the Main Application, and the 11,240 AF WY 2040 figure cited in Table 3-8 of the 2020 IWVGA Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).

The two figures cited by CEC staff represent different analytical metrics from different planning documents at different points in time and are not directly comparable on the same basis. The 26,511 AFY figure cited in Section 3.2 of the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix E.3, TN 269639/269640) and used throughout the Main Application represents total projected basin groundwater extractions in WY 2040 under the Simulated Baseline Water Budget of the 2025 IWVGA Periodic Evaluation — the most current available basin water budget analysis at the time of the WSA preparation. This figure is confirmed by the WSA author as the appropriate and more current data source for evaluating the project's proportional water demand impact. The 2025 Periodic Evaluation supersedes the 2020 GSP's initial projections for purposes of current basin planning analysis as it incorporates updated modeling of actual anticipated extraction levels through 2040 under current GSP implementation progress.

The 11,240 AF figure cited by CEC staff from Table 3-8 of the 2020 IWVGA GSP represents a different metric within an earlier basin water budget framework and does not represent total projected basin groundwater extraction in the same manner as the 2025 Periodic Evaluation's Simulated Baseline Water Budget. The WSA appropriately relies on the 2025 Periodic Evaluation as the more current and more representative data source for the SB 610 demand-to-supply calculation.

The project's maximum water demand of 49.10 AFY therefore represents approximately 0.185 percent of the 26,511 AFY total projected basin groundwater extraction in WY 2040 under the 2025 Periodic Evaluation Simulated Baseline Water Budget, as confirmed in the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix E.3, TN 269639/269640) and restated in Section 1.9 (TN 269893) and Section 4.10 (TN 269893). This calculation is arithmetically correct — $49.10 \text{ AFY} \div 26,511 \text{ AFY} \times 100 = 0.185 \text{ percent}$. Regardless of which basin-wide figure is used as the denominator, the project's maximum water demand of 49.10 AFY remains de minimis relative to total basin extraction under any reasonable planning scenario.

DATA REQUEST

DR HYD-3. Please reconcile the figures or clarify the basis and source used for the percentage calculation and projected basin groundwater extraction values.

BACKGROUND: Water Demand Estimates and Groundwater Sustainability

The WSA relies on basin-wide IWVGA GSP projections and concludes that groundwater supply is generally sufficient under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) planning framework. However, the application does not clearly discuss how the project's specific groundwater allocation, pumping entitlement, or how possible future SGMA restrictions or adjudication outcomes for the critically over drafted groundwater basin could affect long-term project operations.

R&L Response

DR HYD-3 - The Applicant provides the following reconciliation of the projected groundwater extraction figures cited in the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix E.3, TN 269639/269640) and the Main Application in response to CEC staff's identification of a discrepancy between the 26,511 AFY figure used in the application and the 11,240 AF WY 2040 figure cited in Table 3-8 of the 2020 IWVGA Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).

The two figures cited by CEC staff represent different analytical metrics within the IWV Basin water budget framework and are not directly comparable on the same basis. The 26,511 AFY figure cited in Section 3.1 of the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix E.3, TN 269639/269640) and restated in Section 1.9 (TN 269893, p. 899) and Section 4.10 (Hydrology and Water Quality, TN 269893, pp. 528–575) of the Main Application represents total projected basin groundwater extractions in WY 2040 under the Simulated Baseline Water Budget of the 2025 IWVGA Periodic Evaluation — the most current available basin water budget analysis at the time of the WSA preparation. This baseline scenario models actual anticipated pumping activity across the entire IWV Basin in 2040 under current GSP implementation progress, reflecting the real-world groundwater extraction environment in which the project will be operating. Total projected basin extraction is the appropriate denominator for evaluating the project's proportional water demand impact under Water Code §10910 et seq. (SB 610) because it reflects actual anticipated conditions in the basin at the time of project operations and provides the most accurate measure of the project's relative contribution to basin-wide groundwater use.

The 11,240 AF figure cited by CEC staff from Table 3-8 of the 2020 IWVGA GSP represents a different metric within the basin water budget framework and does not represent total projected basin groundwater extraction in the same manner as the 2025 Periodic Evaluation's Simulated Baseline Water Budget. The 2025 Periodic Evaluation is the more recent and more current basin analysis, reflecting updated modeling of anticipated future extraction levels that supersedes the 2020 GSP's initial projections for purposes of evaluating current basin conditions. The WSA appropriately relies on the 2025 Periodic Evaluation's baseline extraction figure as the denominator for the demand-to-supply calculation because it reflects the most current available data on anticipated basin-wide groundwater use at the project's operational horizon.

The project's maximum water demand of 49.10 AFY therefore represents approximately 0.185 percent of the 26,511 AFY total projected basin groundwater extraction in WY 2040 under the 2025 Periodic Evaluation Simulated Baseline Water Budget, as confirmed in the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix E.3, TN 269639/269640) and restated in Section 1.9 (TN 269893, p. 899) and Section 4.10 (TN 269893, pp. 528–575). This calculation is arithmetically correct — $49.10 \text{ AFY} \div 26,511 \text{ AFY} \times 100 = 0.185 \text{ percent}$ — and the denominator appropriately reflects total projected basin extraction.

With respect to how possible future SGMA restrictions or adjudication outcomes for the critically overdrafted groundwater basin could affect long-term project operations, the IWV Basin is critically overdrafted and all groundwater users — including this project — are subject to the IWVGA GSP adaptive management framework and any future restrictions or rules that may be implemented thereunder. Future restrictions will apply equally to all basin users and are impossible to predict with specificity at this time. The GSP and 2025 Periodic Evaluation indicate that the GSP recommendations are working and that restrictions significant enough to impact operations are unlikely. The project's compliance with IWVGA GSP annual pumping allocations and augmentation fees required under Mitigation Measures MM 4.10-2 and MM 4.10-3 (TN 269893) ensures that the project operates within the GSP framework and does not contribute to basin overdraft beyond its allocated entitlement. Should future restrictions be imposed by the IWVGA, this project and all other basin users will be required to comply.

DATA REQUESTS

DR HYD-4. Please explain how adding a new groundwater demand is consistent with achieving groundwater sustainability in a critically over-drafted basin.

R&L Response

DR HYD-4 - The Applicant provides the following explanation of how adding a new groundwater demand is consistent with achieving groundwater sustainability in the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin (IWVGB), a critically overdrafted basin managed under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), consistent with the groundwater sustainability analysis provided in Section 4.10 (Hydrology and Water Quality, TN 269893, pp. 528–575) and the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix E.3, TN 269639/269640).

The IWVGB has been designated as critically overdrafted under SGMA since January 2016, with a current loss of storage of approximately 25,000 AFY and an estimated long-term average natural recharge rate of 7,650 AFY — which constitutes the current sustainable yield of the basin — as confirmed in Section 4.10 (TN 269893, pp. 528–575). The IWVGA Board adopted the Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) on January 16, 2020, which was subsequently approved by DWR in January 2022, as confirmed in Section 4.10 (TN 269893, p. 528). The GSP establishes annual groundwater pumping allocations for all pumpers in the basin and requires augmentation fees when allocations are exceeded, with those fees funding basin improvement projects — including the IWVGA Imported Water Pipeline — designed to bring the basin toward its 7,650 AFY sustainable yield target by 2040, as described in Section 4.10 (TN 269893, pp. 528–575) and Impact 4.10-2 (TN 269893).

The project's new groundwater demand is consistent with achieving groundwater sustainability in the IWVGB for the following reasons, each grounded in the application and the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix E.3, TN 269639/269640):

With respect to GSP framework compliance, the project will be served by the Inyokern CSD, which has confirmed through an executed Will Serve Letter dated April 2, 2026 that it has sufficient water supply capacity to serve the project's estimated operational demand within its existing allocations under the IWVGA GSP, as confirmed in Section 4.10 (Impact 4.10-2, TN 269893) and Section 4.18 (Utilities and Service Systems, TN 269893). The project does not

propose to extract groundwater outside of the CSD's existing GSP allocations. Mitigation Measure MM 4.10-2 (GSP Compliance, TN 269893) requires the project to comply with all applicable GSP restrictions, including annual pumping allocations and payment of augmentation fees, ensuring that the project's water demand operates within the GSP's adaptive management framework and on the path toward the basin's 7,650 AFY sustainable yield target throughout the project's operational life, as confirmed in Section 4.10 (Impact 4.10-2, TN 269893). Mitigation Measure MM 4.10-3 (Water Source Verification, TN 269893) further requires verification of the executed Will Serve Letter and CSD water-source assignment prior to issuance of building or grading permits, updated periodically if source allocation changes.

With respect to the project's de minimis water demand, the project's maximum water demand of approximately 49.10 AFY represents approximately 0.185 percent of the projected 2040 basin extraction of 26,511 AFY per the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix E.3, TN 269639/269640), as confirmed in Section 4.10 (Impact 4.10-2, TN 269893). Even when measured against the basin's 7,650 AFY sustainable yield — the GSP's long-term management target — the project's 49.10 AFY maximum demand represents less than 0.65 percent of sustainable yield, confirming that the project's incremental contribution to basin-wide extraction is genuinely de minimis and would not materially impede the basin's path toward sustainability under any reasonable analytical framework.

With respect to water efficiency measures, the project incorporates water efficiency measures that minimize groundwater consumption to the greatest extent operationally feasible, as confirmed in Section 4.10 (Impact 4.10-2, TN 269893). The project's cooling system is designed to achieve a minimum of 5.0 cycles of concentration on cooling towers, includes conductivity controllers, side-stream filtration, and drift eliminators, and incorporates an integrated air-side economizer for free-cooling under favorable ambient conditions, all of which reduce cooling tower makeup water demand — the project's largest water use component. The project is also required to submit a Water Efficiency Plan to the CSD prior to issuance of building permits and conduct a water audit within 12 months of initial occupancy, as confirmed in Section 4.10 (TN 269893) and the Inyokern CSD Will Serve Letter (Appendix M.3, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL). These measures are consistent with Inyokern Specific Plan Resources Policy 4, which encourages effective management of the groundwater resource, as confirmed in Section 4.11 (Land Use and Planning, TN 269893).

With respect to the augmentation fee program, the GSP's augmentation fee program is specifically designed to accommodate new water demands within the basin's sustainable management framework while ensuring those demands contribute directly to the basin's path toward sustainability. The augmentation fees paid by the project and other water users directly fund the IWVGA Imported Water Pipeline and other basin improvement projects that are the GSP's primary mechanism for achieving the 7,650 AFY sustainable yield target by 2040, as described in Section 4.10 (TN 269893) and the cumulative projects analysis (Appendix N.3, TN 269892). The project's augmentation fee obligations under MM 4.10-2 therefore represent a direct financial contribution to basin sustainability rather than an impediment to it.

With implementation of MM 4.10-2 (GSP Compliance, TN 269893) and MM 4.10-3 (Water Source Verification, TN 269893), the project's water demand operates within the GSP's adaptive management framework and does not impede the basin's path to the 7,650 AFY sustainable yield target. The project's incremental contribution to basin-wide groundwater extraction is less than significant with mitigation, as confirmed in Section 4.10 (Impact 4.10-2, TN 269893) and Section

4.10 (Impact 4.10-7, TN 269893).

DR HYD-5. Have alternative sources of water such as imported water, recycled water, or water offsets been considered for the project? If so, please provide information about the alternatives considered.

BACKGROUND: On-Site Groundwater Well

The SPPE Application, Section 4.18.2, stated that water required for project operations would be provided from the Inyokern CSD. An on-site water well would also be used for emergency fire suppression and redundancy in the event of a service loss. This on-site well is proposed in the northeastern corner of the project site. However, no information was provided about the characteristics of the on-site well such as the estimated yield and pumping capacity.

R&L Response

DR HYD-5 - The Applicant provides the following response regarding alternative water supply sources and cooling technologies considered for the RBIDC project, consistent with the requirements of CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(14)(E)(v) and the water supply analysis provided in Section 4.10 (Hydrology and Water Quality, TN 269893, pp. 528–575), Section 4.10.5 (Appendix B §(g)(14) Supplemental Disclosure, TN 269893), and the Water Supply Assessment (Appendix E.3, TN 269639/269640).

With respect to Inyokern CSD municipal water service, the project selected annexation into the Inyokern CSD as the primary water supply pathway following evaluation of alternative utility service approaches, as described in Section 6 (Alternatives Analysis, TN 269893) and Section 4.10 (TN 269893, pp. 528–575). The Inyokern CSD provides water directly from the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin through its existing infrastructure and operates within its IWVGA GSP annual pumping allocations, as confirmed in Section 4.10 (TN 269893) and the executed Inyokern CSD Will Serve Letter (April 2, 2026, Appendix M.3, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL). The CSD pathway was selected because it provides the most environmentally appropriate and administratively streamlined water service approach, operates within the established GSP framework, and does not require new off-site linear infrastructure construction, as confirmed in Section 6 (TN 269893).

With respect to a standalone on-site groundwater well as the primary water supply, this alternative was considered and evaluated in Section 6 (Alternatives Analysis, TN 269893). A standalone approach would require groundwater permitting complexity, additional CEQA review of groundwater extraction impacts, and long-term operational and maintenance obligations for systems outside the Applicant's core competency, as described in Section 6 (TN 269893). Annexation into the Inyokern CSD was selected as the preferred approach over a standalone well for primary water supply. The project does include an on-site emergency backup well in the northeastern corner of the project site for emergency fire suppression and redundancy in the event of a CSD service interruption, as described in Section 4.18 (Utilities and Service Systems, TN 269893), which is addressed separately in the response to DR HYD-6.

With respect to recycled water, the application commits to using recycled water for landscape

irrigation if and when recycled water becomes available in the Inyokern service area, as confirmed in Section 1.9 (TN 269893, p. 971). The Inyokern CSD Will Serve Letter (April 2, 2026, Appendix M.3, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL) confirms that if recycled water becomes available for irrigation and/or process use, the Applicant will install separate metering and purple-pipe infrastructure per CSD standards. The project's landscape irrigation is designed to achieve at least a 20 percent reduction below the Maximum Applied Water Allowance (MAWA), as confirmed in Section 1.9 (TN 269893, p. 971) and Section 4.10 (TN 269893). Recycled water is not currently available from the Inyokern CSD system for cooling tower makeup water or other process uses at the project site.

With respect to imported water, the IWVGA Imported Water Pipeline — a 24-inch diameter, 50-mile pipeline from the Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency (AVEK) California City Feeder pipeline to the Indian Wells Valley Water District's Ridgecrest Heights Storage Tank — is the basin's primary structural remedy for its overdraft condition and is projected to begin delivering imported water to the IWV Basin in 2030, as described in Section 4.10 (TN 269893) and the cumulative projects analysis (Appendix N.3, TN 269892). As confirmed in Section 4.10 (TN 269893), the IWVGA Imported Water Pipeline is not currently operational and does not currently serve the Inyokern CSD service area. When imported water becomes available through the IWVGA pipeline or other future sources the CSD's GSP allocation and service capacity may be updated accordingly and the project would benefit from any reduction in the basin's groundwater extraction burden that imported water delivers.

With respect to water offsets, the project's payment of IWVGA augmentation fees under Mitigation Measure MM 4.10-2 (TN 269893) directly funds basin improvement projects — including the IWVGA Imported Water Pipeline — that represent the GSP's primary mechanism for achieving basin sustainability, as described in Section 4.10 (Impact 4.10-2, TN 269893). These augmentation fee payments function as a form of water offset in that they financially support the importation and recharge programs that offset the basin's groundwater deficit.

With respect to alternative cooling technologies, the project's conceptual cooling design incorporates water-use reduction features that reduce dependence on evaporative cooling water, as described in Section 4.6.5 (Energy, TN 269893) and Section 4.10 (TN 269893). The cooling system incorporates optional free-cooling coils capable of reducing or eliminating water usage under favorable ambient conditions, as confirmed in Section 4.6.5 (TN 269893). The Inyokern area's high dry-bulb and low wet-bulb differential — approximately 107°F dry bulb and 71°F wet bulb at ASHRAE 0.4% design conditions — enables effective evaporative cooling and extended economizer hours that reduce total water consumption relative to comparable facilities in coastal California climates, as confirmed in Section 4.6.5 (TN 269893). The project also incorporates a minimum of 5.0 cycles of concentration on cooling towers, conductivity controllers, side-stream filtration, and drift eliminators, all of which reduce cooling tower makeup water demand to the minimum operationally feasible level, as confirmed in Section 4.10 (Impact 4.10-2, TN 269893) and the Inyokern CSD Will Serve Letter (Appendix M.3, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL).

DATA REQUEST

DR HYD-6. Please provide estimated on-site well yield and pumping capacity.

R&L Response

DR HYD-6 - The Applicant provides the following information regarding the proposed on-site emergency backup well, consistent with the well description provided in Section 4.18 (Utilities and Service Systems, TN 269893) and the groundwater information provided in Section 4.10 (Hydrology and Water Quality, TN 269893, pp. 528–575) and Table AF-004 (Groundwater Well Information, TN 269893) of the Main Application.

As described in Section 1.4.5 (Water Supply and Conveyance, TN 269893, p. 20) and Section 4.18 (TN 269893), the project includes one on-site emergency backup well proposed in the northeastern corner of the project site. The on-site well is intended exclusively for emergency fire suppression and redundancy in the event of an Inyokern CSD service interruption, consistent with the project's Tier III/IV reliability design standard, as confirmed in Section 1.4.5 (TN 269893, p. 20). The on-site well is not the project's primary water supply source — all operational water demand will be served by the Inyokern CSD under the executed Will Serve Letter dated April 2, 2026 (Appendix M.3, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL), as confirmed in Section 4.18 (TN 269893). The on-site well is supplemented by approximately 388,000 gallons of on-site dual-tank buffer storage — two 142,000-gallon tanks and two 52,000-gallon tanks — providing on-site water supply redundancy consistent with the Tier III/IV concurrent maintainability design standard, as confirmed in Section 4.18 (TN 269893) and the Inyokern CSD Will Serve Letter (Appendix M.3, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL).

As disclosed in Section 1.0 (Project Description, TN 269893, p. 11) and Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, TN 269893, pp. 100–101), the project is submitted at the conceptual design stage. A preliminary engineering evaluation of the on-site emergency backup well — including estimated well depth, casing specifications, pump size, and yield capacity — is actively being prepared by the project engineering team based on available hydrogeologic data for the project site and vicinity as documented in Table AF-004 (Groundwater Well Information, TN 269893) and Section 4.10 (TN 269893, pp. 528–575). The Applicant requires additional time beyond the 30-day response window to complete this evaluation. The completed preliminary well engineering evaluation will be submitted to the CEC docket as Appendix E Supplement — Section E.5 (On-Site Emergency Backup Well Engineering Evaluation) with a new transmittal number assigned at time of submission — extension item. Final well design parameters — including confirmed depth, casing specifications, pump size, and yield — will be established and reported to the CEC docket as a supplement to Appendix E.5 following well drilling, geologic logging, and pump testing during final engineering and installation, concurrent with or prior to submission of the Kern County building permit application.

Reference

IWVGA 2020 - Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority (IWVGA). Groundwater Sustainability Plan for the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Basin. Retrieved from Indian Wells Valley Water District GSP. Available online at: <https://sgma.water.ca.gov/portal/gsp/preview/59>

LAND USE

Authors: Negar Vahidi and Tatiana Inouye

BACKGROUND: Project Data and Maps

California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(3)(A) requires an SPPE application to

include “[d]escriptions of all significant assumptions, methodologies, and computational methods used in arriving at conclusions in the document.” To evaluate project impacts to existing land uses, CEC staff review the assumptions for each project component such as project site plan, location and length of electric subtransmission and distribution lines, and number of subtransmission and distribution structures. SPPE Application Section 1.4.7 states that “[t]he Project will be served by a customer-owned substation, providing the primary electrical interface between SCE’s 115 kV subtransmission system and the Project’s medium-voltage distribution network” (TN 269893). SPPE Application Section 2.3.1 further states that “[t]he [Point of Interconnection] would provide the primary electrical interface between SCE’s 115 kV subtransmission system and the customer’s medium-voltage distribution network, operating at 34.6 kV under SCE MOS174 specifications and nominally classified as 34.5 kV under IEEE/ANSI standards” (TN 269893). Staff notes that the SPPE Application does not include a description of the length and width of the electrical distribution right-of-way that would connect the data center to the customer-owned substation, nor does it describe the total number and type(s) of structures (i.e., towers or poles) required for the distribution lines. To support staff’s analysis of the project, staff requires the applicant to provide information on the length and width of the electrical distribution right-of-way and the number of structures or poles required.

In a SPPE Application per California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(3)(A)(iv) must also include “[l]egible maps of the areas identified in subsection (g)(3)(A) potentially affected by the project, on which existing land uses, jurisdictional boundaries, general plan designations, specific plan designations, and zoning have been clearly delineated.” The maps provided in the SPPE Application (Section 1.15, Figures 1- 1 through 1-3; Appendix N.2) are low-resolution and static images and cannot be used by staff to calculate property setbacks or distances from surrounding land uses. To support staff’s analysis of the project, staff requires the applicant to provide shapefiles of the proposed project components.

DATA REQUESTS

DR LAND-1. Please provide a detailed description of the proposed medium-voltage distribution network that includes the total length and width of the electrical distribution right-of-way from the data center to the customer-owned substation, and the total number and type(s) of structures (i.e., towers or poles).

R&L Response

DR LAND-1 - The Applicant provides the following detailed description of the proposed medium-voltage distribution network connecting the customer-owned substation to the data center campus, consistent with the electrical system description provided in Section 2.3.1 (Project Point of Interconnection, TN 269893), Section 4.6.5 (Energy, TN 269893), Section 4.11 (Land Use and Planning, TN 269893), and Appendix L.1 (Project One-Line Drawing, TN 269626) of the Main Application.

With respect to the electrical distribution right-of-way length and width, electrical service from the customer-owned substation and Point of Interconnection (POI) on APN 084-010-48 to the data center campus is provided through a dedicated 30-foot-wide subtransmission line utility easement, as confirmed in Section 4.11 (Land Use and Planning, TN 269893). The easement corridor originates at the POI on APN 084-010-48, runs west along W. Graaf Avenue, and then extends

north across the SR-178 right-of-way to the southeastern corner of the data center campus, where it connects to the customer-dedicated substation and onward to the data center building, as confirmed in Section 4.11 (TN 269893). The total length of the utility easement corridor will be confirmed during final engineering and in connection with the Lot Line Adjustment and associated entitlement process, as described in Section 1.2.2 (TN 269893) and Section 4.11 (TN 269893). The utility easement will be recorded and will remain in place for the operational life of the project, providing a permanent legal right of access and conveyance across APN 084-010-48 and the intervening SR-178 right-of-way to serve the main campus, as confirmed in Section 4.11 (TN 269893).

With respect to the number and type of structures required for the medium-voltage distribution network, the medium-voltage distribution system operates at 34.5 kV via an underground ring bus configuration distributing power from the customer-owned substation to modular electrical rooms (MERs) serving IT, mechanical, and ancillary loads throughout the data center campus, as confirmed in Section 4.6.5 (Energy, TN 269893) and Appendix L.1 (Project One-Line Drawing, TN 269626). The ring bus configuration with sectionalizing breakers enables fault isolation and selective load restoration without interrupting the entire campus, as described in Section 4.6.5 (TN 269893). Because the medium-voltage distribution system is underground, no overhead poles, towers, or above-grade structures are required for the distribution network between the customer-owned substation and the data center building. The only above-grade electrical structures associated with the medium-voltage distribution system are the customer-owned substation equipment and switchgear located on APN 084-010-48, as described in Section 2.3.1 (TN 269893) and Appendix L.1 (TN 269626). The total conduit run length for the underground medium-voltage distribution system will be confirmed during final electrical engineering, consistent with Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, TN 269893, pp. 100–101).

DR LAND-2. Please provide shapefiles of the proposed project components that include the data center, emergency generators, battery energy storage system, access roads, driveways, parking, drainage basin, electrical distribution lines, customer-owned substation, SCE-owned subtransmission lines (connecting the customer-owned substation to the Inyokern Substation), Inyokern Substation expansion, and construction staging and laydown areas.

R&L Response

DR LAND-2 - The Applicant acknowledges that GIS shapefiles for the project components identified by CEC staff were not submitted with the original Application. Project site plan drawings were provided in PDF format as part of Appendix A.1 (Site Plan, TN 269593) of the original Application submittal. As disclosed in Section 1.0 (Project Description, TN 269893, p. 11) and Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, TN 269893, pp. 100–101), the Application has been submitted at the conceptual design stage. The precise boundaries and alignments of certain project components — including the SCE-owned subtransmission line final route alignments, Inyokern Substation expansion area, construction staging and laydown areas, and underground medium-voltage distribution conduit routing — have not yet been finalized and will be confirmed during final engineering as already disclosed in Section 3.2 (TN 269893, pp. 100–101).

GIS shapefiles for all available Applicant-controlled project components based on the current conceptual design basis have been compiled by the project team and are provided herewith as a

supplement to this response, transmitted to the CEC docket via the CEC Kiteworks portal due to file size. GIS shapefiles for Applicant-controlled project components not yet finalized at the conceptual design stage will be submitted as a further supplement upon completion of final engineering consistent with the pending items schedule disclosed in Section 3.2 (TN 269893, pp. 100–101). GIS shapefiles for SCE-owned components — including the subtransmission line alignments and Inyokern Substation expansion — will be provided upon receipt from SCE following completion of SCE's final engineering under MOS174.

BACKGROUND: Existing Land Uses and Sensitive Receptors

California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(3)(A) requires an SPPE application to include “[a] discussion of existing land uses, general plan land use designations, and current zoning districts (including any overlay districts) at the site, land uses and land use patterns within one mile of the proposed site and within one-quarter mile of any project-related linear facilities.” Appendix B (g)(3)(A)(i) further states that the discussion of existing land uses shall include “[a]n identification of residential, commercial, industrial, recreational, scenic, agricultural, natural resource protection, natural resource extraction, educational, religious, cultural, and historic areas, and any other area of unique land uses.”

CEC staff notes that SPPE Application, Appendix N, includes a Parcel Owner List (TN 269892, part N.1). However, the Parcel Owner List is difficult to read due to the small font size and the table’s-colored shading. To allow staff to confirm the existing land uses within one mile of the project site and one-quarter mile of the proposed gen-tie route, staff requires parcel owner information in a legible format.

SPPE Application, Section 4.11 (Land Use and Planning), states that “[n]o schools, hospitals, daycare facilities, skilled nursing facilities, or similar sensitive land uses are located within 0.25 mile of the Project Site or linear facility corridor” (TN 269893).

However, CEC staff has reviewed geospatial maps and notes that there are sensitive uses within 0.25 mile of the project site, which include residential development, Inyokern Elementary School, Inyokern Senior Center, and Inyokern United Methodist Church. CEQA Guidelines Appendix G requires staff to evaluate project effects to existing land uses, including sensitive receptors. Staff requests that the applicant revise SPPE Application Section 4.11 to identify all sensitive uses within 0.25 miles of the project.

DATA REQUESTS

DR LAND-3. Please provide a legible Parcel Owner List that includes the APN, property address, and owner information for the following parcels: parcels within the project site, parcels contiguous to the project boundary, parcels within 1,000 feet of the project boundary, and parcels within 500 feet of the proposed gen-tie line. The Parcel Owner List may be provided as an Excel file if the table is not legible in a PDF format.

R&L Response

DR LAND-3 - The Applicant provides the following response to CEC staff's request for a legible Parcel Owner List including APN, property address, and owner information for all parcels within

the required notice area.

The complete parcel owner list satisfying this request is provided in response to DR EXEC SUMM-1 submitted herewith, which includes the APN, property address, owner name, owner mailing address, and notice zone designation for all 42 private parcels within the required notice area in both PDF and Excel formats, consistent with CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(a)(1)(E). CEC staff is directed to the response to DR EXEC SUMM-1 and Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098) for the complete parcel owner list.

DR LAND-4. Please revise SPPE Application Section 4.11 to identify all sensitive receptors within 0.25 miles of the project site, including residences, educational uses (i.e., Inyokern Elementary School), institutional use (i.e., Inyokern Senior Center), and religious uses (i.e., Inyokern United Methodist Church).

R&L Response

DR LAND-4 - The Applicant confirms the following sensitive receptors are located within 0.25 miles of the project site, consistent with CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(3)(A)(i) and CEQA Guidelines Appendix G:

Residential uses — the nearest residential receptors are located approximately 500 feet southwest of the project site west of Brown Road, east of the project site across US-395 and Clodt Road, and to the south of the project site along Sunset Avenue and Ward Avenue, as confirmed in Section 4.3 (TN 269893).

Inyokern Elementary School and State Preschool — located at 6601 Locust Street, Inyokern. Outside the 0.25-mile buffer. Confirmed in Table 4.11-2 (TN 269893).

Inyokern Senior Center — located at 1247 Broadway Avenue, Inyokern. Outside the 0.25-mile buffer. Confirmed in Table 4.11-2 (TN 269893).

Inyokern United Methodist Church — confirmed through GIS analysis to be located within 0.25 miles of the nearest project site boundary. The church has been analyzed as receiver R-3 in the supplemental noise analysis (WJVA Report No. 25-45, June 25, 2026, Appendix G Supplement — Section G.1 Revision 1, TN 271095). Construction noise at R-3 is 54 dBA Leq during Phase 1 and operational noise is 45 dBA Leq / 51 dB Ldn under normal mode and 54 dB Ldn under worst-case conditions — all below the Kern County standard of 65 dB Ldn. Noise impacts at the church are less than significant.

BACKGROUND: Specific Plan Amendment and Conditional Use Permit Application

California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(3)(A)(ii) requires an SPPE application to include “[a] discussion of any recent or proposed zone changes and/or general plan amendments; noticed by an elected or appointed board, commission, or similar entity at the state or local level.” Per CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, CEC staff must evaluate whether the project would cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

SPPE Application Section 4.11.3 states that “[t]he Project requests a Specific Plan Amendment

to eliminate a 90-foot-wide future road reservation of a secondary collector that was created by the Inyokern Specific Plan Circulation Element” (TN 269893). SPPE Application Section 5.3.4 further states that “[t]he [Specific Plan Amendment’s] sole purpose is to eliminate a future 90-foot right-of-way secondary collector reservation established by the Inyokern Specific Plan Circulation Element on APNs 084-010-43, -44, and -48...this future road reservation will never be constructed due to existing development to the north, Navy-owned property constraints, and the proposed data center use to the south” (TN 269893). Staff have reviewed the Inyokern Specific Plan and Kern County zoning maps and is unable to identify the location of the secondary collector that would be eliminated by the Specific Plan Amendment. To adequately evaluate the project’s consistency with the Inyokern Specific Plan per Appendix B (g)(3)(A)(ii) and CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, Land Use staff requires further information on the proposed changes to the existing adopted Inyokern Specific Plan that would occur under this project-specific plan amendment.

SPPE Application Section 4.11.2 and Table 4.11-9 describe the project’s compliance with the setbacks and development standards applicable to a Medium Industrial (M-2) zoning district, which include front, side, and rear setbacks, height limits, parking, landscaping, and screening (TN 269893). SPPE Application Section 4.11.2 states that “[t]he Project would require a Conditional Use Permit and other discretionary County review to confirm consistency with applicable zoning requirements and development standards” (TN 269893). Currently, the application does not include a list of the development standards applicable to an M-2 zoning district and does not explain how the project would comply with each of these development standards. To adequately evaluate the project’s consistency with the Kern County Zoning Ordinance per California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(3)(A)(ii) and CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, staff requires a description of the M-2 development standards, and an explanation of how the proposed project would be consistent with each of these standards.

DATA REQUEST

DR LAND-5. Please provide the following documentation to support staff’s evaluation of project consistency with land use plans, policies, or regulations per CEQA Guidelines Appendix G:

- Provide a copy of the Inyokern Specific Plan Amendment that was submitted to the Kern County Planning Department.
- Provide a map illustrating the exact location of the secondary collector that would be eliminated under the Inyokern Specific Plan Amendment.
- Explain the project-specific trigger for the Inyokern Specific Plan Amendment, and what changes to the existing adopted Inyokern Specific Plan would occur under this project-specific plan amendment.
- Provide a copy of the project’s Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application and all supporting documentation that was submitted to the Kern County Planning Department.
- Provide an evaluation of the project’s compliance with each of the development standards for a Medium Industrial (M-2) zoning district that are applicable to the proposed project.

R&L Response

DR Land-5 - The Applicant provides the following response to CEC staff's five-part request regarding the Inyokern Specific Plan Amendment, secondary collector location, CUP application, and M-2 development standards compliance evaluation.

With respect to the Inyokern Specific Plan Amendment submitted to the Kern County Planning Department, the Inyokern Specific Plan Amendment was filed with the Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department concurrently with this SPPE Application under Kern County Case Number PLN25-0028, as confirmed in Section 1.8 (TN 269893) and Table 1-3 (Anticipated Discretionary Approvals and Permits, TN 269893) of the Main Application. The SPA application was filed on November 7, 2025, as confirmed by the executed Environmental Information Form (Form 108, PLN25-0028). The following CUP and SPA application documents are provided herewith as Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4 (CUP and SPA Application Documents, PLN25-0028, TN 271099): the Project Description (PLN25-0028, Cornerstone Engineering Inc., dated May 29, 2026) and the executed Environmental Information Form (Form 108, PLN25-0028, dated November 7, 2025). The Inyokern Specific Plan Amendment exhibit (RB Inyokern Solar Project Draft EIR Figure 3-5, Amendment to Inyokern Specific Plan Circulation Element, 2020) is included twice within Appendix N.4 — once at the front of the package for quick reference by CEC staff, and a second time in sequence with the full set of documents as submitted to Kern County under PLN25-0028. This dual placement is intentional to facilitate CEC staff review. The SPA is pending approval by the Kern County Board of Supervisors, as confirmed in Section 4.11 (Table 4.11-8, TN 269893) and the CUP Project Description (PLN25-0028).

With respect to the map illustrating the exact location of the secondary collector to be eliminated, the Inyokern Specific Plan Circulation Element reserves a 90-foot right-of-way for a planned future secondary collector road that bisects the project site, as described in Section 4.11.3 (TN 269893), Section 5.3.4 (TN 269893), and the CUP Project Description (PLN25-0028). The Applicant notes that the adjacent RB Inyokern Solar Project — which occupies the parcels immediately north of the RBIDC project site — previously processed a Specific Plan Amendment (SPA 4, Map 47) through the Kern County Planning Department as part of its 2020 entitlement proceedings, which eliminated a portion of the secondary collector reservation to the north of the Navy land, as confirmed in the RB Inyokern Solar Project Draft EIR Figure 3-5 (Amendment to Inyokern Specific Plan Circulation Element, 2020) included in Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4 (TN 271099). The remaining portion of the 90-foot secondary collector reservation traverses the RBIDC project site and the parcel where the proposed SCE substation will be constructed, and is the subject of the current SPA being processed under PLN25-0028. A project-specific exhibit from the PLN25-0028 application package illustrating the exact location of the remaining secondary collector reservation on the RBIDC project site parcels will be included in Appendix N.4 (TN 271099) as a supplement upon receipt from the project entitlement team.

With respect to the project-specific trigger for the Inyokern Specific Plan Amendment and the changes that would occur, the project-specific trigger for the SPA is the remaining 90-foot right-of-way reservation for a planned future secondary collector that bisects the data center campus footprint on the RBIDC project site parcels, as described in Section 4.11.3 (TN 269893), Section 5.3.4 (TN 269893), and the CUP Project Description (PLN25-0028, Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4, TN 271099). The reservation would prevent development of the site as a contiguous operational campus and would require setbacks from the reservation that are incompatible with the proposed data center layout without its elimination. The sole purpose of the SPA is to eliminate the remaining 90-foot ROW reservation for the planned future secondary collector on the project site parcels and on the parcel where the proposed SCE substation will be constructed, so that no

setbacks from that road reservation would be required, as confirmed in Section 5.3.4 (TN 269893) and the CUP Project Description (PLN25-0028, Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4, TN 271099). The reservation will never be constructed due to existing development to the north, Navy-owned property constraints associated with the China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station, and the proposed data center use to the south, as confirmed in Section 5.3.4 (TN 269893). The existing SR-178 and Brown Road road network provides adequate regional access to the project site without the reserved secondary collector, as described in Section 4.11.3 (TN 269893) and the traffic analysis (Appendix H.1, TN 269621). The SPA makes no other changes to the adopted Inyokern Specific Plan — the site's Service Industrial (7.2/2.5) land use designation and all other Inyokern Specific Plan policies, goals, and standards remain unchanged, as confirmed in Section 4.11 (Table 4.11-8, TN 269893) and the CUP Project Description (PLN25-0028, Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4, TN 271099).

With respect to the Conditional Use Permit application and all supporting documentation submitted to the Kern County Planning Department, the CUP application was filed with the Kern County Planning and Natural Resources Department under Kern County Case Number PLN25-0028 on November 7, 2025, as confirmed by the executed Environmental Information Form (Form 108, PLN25-0028, Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4, TN 271099). The CUP is required because a data center use is not expressly listed as a permitted or conditionally permitted use in the M-2 Medium Industrial zoning district, and a CUP is required pursuant to Kern County Code Section 19.08.085 to allow a 238,000 square foot data center in the Medium Industrial Zone District, as confirmed in the Environmental Information Form (Form 108, PLN25-0028, Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4, TN 271099) and Section 4.11.2 (TN 269893). The CUP application documents provided in Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4 (TN 271099) include the Project Description (PLN25-0028, Cornerstone Engineering Inc., dated May 29, 2026) and the executed Environmental Information Form (Form 108, PLN25-0028, dated November 7, 2025). The CUP is pending approval by the Kern County Board of Supervisors, as confirmed in Table 1-3 (TN 269893) and the CUP Project Description (PLN25-0028, Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4, TN 271099).

With respect to the evaluation of the project's compliance with each applicable M-2 Medium Industrial development standard, the following expanded compliance evaluation addresses each applicable development standard under Kern County Zoning Ordinance Chapter 19.38 and associated provisions, supplementing the initial evaluation provided in Section 4.11.2 (TN 269893) and Table 4.11-9 (Applicable Kern County Zoning Ordinance Provisions, TN 269893):

With respect to height limits, all proposed project structures including the data center building, generator enclosures, cooling equipment, and fuel storage tanks have a maximum height of 30 feet above finished grade, consistent with M-2 District height standards and the Inyokern Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Zone C height limit of 35 feet above ground level, as confirmed in Section 4.11.2 (TN 269893), Table 4.11-9 (TN 269893), and the CUP Project Description (PLN25-0028, Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4, TN 271099).

With respect to setbacks, the project site plan (Appendix A.1, TN 269593) demonstrates compliance with applicable M-2 front, side, and rear setbacks, and buildings are setback-compliant per M-2 PD requirements, as confirmed in Section 4.11.2 (TN 269893) and Table 4.11-9 (TN 269893). Final numeric setback compliance for all structures is confirmed through the Kern County CUP review process under Case No. PLN25-0028.

With respect to parking, the project provides 155 on-site parking spaces at 9 feet by 20 feet, including 6 ADA-compliant spaces (including 1 ADA van space) and 25 electric vehicle spaces (including 18 installed with EV chargers), as confirmed in the CUP Environmental Information Form (Form 108, PLN25-0028, Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4, TN 271099) and the CUP Project Description (PLN25-0028, Appendix N Supplement — Section N.4, TN 271099). Parking adequacy is addressed in the trip generation analysis (Appendix H.1, TN 269621).

NOISE

Author: Jacob Locsin

BACKGROUND: ESTIMATED PROJECT NOISE LEVELS

In the SPPE Application (TN 269893), Section 4.13-1, the applicant provides a “worst case scenario” of predicted noise levels that assumes all 40 backup generators and other mechanical equipment run for 24 hours continuously (Table 4.13-3). In the SPPE Application, Section 4.6.5.5, the applicant describes the backup generators testing program, including monthly load tests with each tested individually in sequence.

However, the SPPE Application does not evaluate estimated noise levels from the testing scenario or any other operational mode. CEC staff require additional information on estimated project noise levels at the noise sensitive receptors identified in the SPPE Application, Appendix G.1, Figure 7 (TN 269607).

DATA REQUESTS

DR NOI-1. Please provide the operational noise contour maps or tabulated values at receptors R-1 through R-8 (as shown in Table 4.13-3, in units of dBA Leq) for the following two modes:

Normal mode, which assumes normal operating conditions, including operation of all mechanical equipment including HVAC, without any of the gensets operating; and

Testing mode, which assumes testing one genset in the southwest generator yard at full load concurrently with the operation of all mechanical equipment including HVAC at full load.

R&L Response

DR NOI-1 – The Applicant provides the following response to CEC staff's request for operational noise contour maps or tabulated values at receptors R-1 through R-8 for normal mode and testing mode operations.

The Noise Analysis prepared for the Project (Appendix G.1, TN 269607) evaluated operational noise under a conservative worst-case scenario that assumed simultaneous operation of all 40 emergency generators and all outdoor mechanical equipment over a 24-hour period, as confirmed in Section 4.13 (TN 269893) and Appendix G.1 (TN 269607). That analysis yielded operational noise levels ranging from 43 to 52 dBA Leq at analyzed receiver locations R-1 through R-8, as confirmed in Table 4.13-3 (Predicted Project-Related Operational Noise Levels, TN 269893). The Noise Analysis did not separately evaluate the two operational modes identified by CEC staff.

The Applicant has prepared a supplemental noise analysis (WJVA Report No. 25-45, June 25, 2026), submitted herewith as a formal supplement to Appendix G.1 (TN 269607) — Appendix G Supplement — Section G.1 Revision 1 (TN 271095) — presenting tabulated dBA Leq and Ldn values at receptors R-1 through R-8 for the following two modes:

Normal mode — all outdoor mechanical equipment including HVAC systems, cooling towers, chillers, and transformers operating at full load with no emergency generators operating. Normal mode noise levels at all eight analyzed receiver locations range from 41 to 49 dBA Leq and 47 to 55 dB Ldn, as confirmed in Table X of WJVA Report No. 25-45 (TN 271095). All normal mode noise levels are below the Kern County noise level standard of 65 dB Ldn at all analyzed receiver locations. Normal mode noise levels do not exceed existing ambient noise levels at any off-site location.

Testing mode — one Caterpillar 3516E emergency generator operating at full load in the southwest generator yard, concurrently with all outdoor mechanical equipment at full load. This mode represents the single-engine sequential testing protocol established in Section 4.6.5.5 (TN 269893) and confirmed as the enforceable permit condition committed to in the responses to DR AQ-9 and DR AQ-10 submitted herewith. Testing mode noise levels increase by approximately 0.1 dBA at all receptor locations relative to normal mode and when rounded to the nearest whole decibel are identical to normal mode results, as confirmed in WJVA Report No. 25-45 (TN 271095). Testing mode noise levels do not exceed the Kern County noise level standard of 65 dB Ldn at any analyzed receiver location and do not result in a significant noise impact.

With respect to the church land use at receiver R-3, located within 0.25 miles of the project site as confirmed by GIS analysis, calculated operational noise levels under both normal mode (45 dBA Leq / 51 dB Ldn) and testing mode (identical to normal mode when rounded) are well below the Kern County exterior noise level standard of 65 dB Ldn and do not constitute a significant noise impact. No mitigation measures are required for project operational noise at any analyzed receiver location.

CEC staff is directed to Appendix G Supplement — Section G.1 Revision 1 (TN 271095) for the complete tabulated operational noise level data at receptors R-1 through R-8 responsive to this request.

DR NOI-2. Please provide the construction noise contour map or tabulated values at receptors R-1 through R-8 (as shown in Table 4.13-3, in units of dBA Leq) representing the aggregate construction noise levels during the loudest construction phase.

R&L Response

DR NOI-2 - The Applicant provides the following response to CEC staff's request for construction noise contour maps or tabulated values at receptors R-1 through R-8 representing aggregate construction noise levels during the loudest construction phase.

The Noise Analysis prepared for the Project (Appendix G.1, TN 269607) evaluated construction noise levels by phase using the Federal Highway Administration Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM) and Federal Transit Administration construction noise criteria for residential land uses, with results summarized in Table 4.13-1 (Construction Noise Levels by Phase, dBA Leq, TN 269893) and Appendix G.1 (TN 269607). The existing analysis evaluated construction noise at

distances of 500, 750, and 1,000 feet from the approximate center of the construction area but did not provide receptor-specific tabulated values at the individual receiver locations R-1 through R-8.

The Applicant has prepared a supplemental noise analysis (WJVA Report No. 25-45, June 25, 2026), submitted herewith as Appendix G Supplement — Section G.1 Revision 1 (TN 271095), identifying Phase 1 (site preparation, earthwork, and grading) as the loudest construction phase and presenting receptor-specific tabulated dBA Leq values at receptors R-1 through R-8 for that phase, as confirmed in Table VI of WJVA Report No. 25-45 (TN 271095).

Construction noise levels during Phase 1 at the eight analyzed receiver locations are as follows, as confirmed in Table VI of WJVA Report No. 25-45 (TN 271095): R-1 at 54 dBA Leq, R-2 at 56 dBA Leq, R-3 (church) at 54 dBA Leq, R-4 at 55 dBA Leq, R-5 (school) at 50 dBA Leq, R-6 (commercial) at 59 dBA Leq, R-7 at 51 dBA Leq, and R-8 at 50 dBA Leq. All Phase 1 construction noise levels at the five analyzed residential receiver locations (R-1, R-2, R-4, R-7, R-8) and the two analyzed noise-sensitive non-residential receiver locations (R-3 church and R-5 school) are below the FTA construction noise threshold of 80 dBA Leq for residential land uses. Construction will be limited to the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on weekends consistent with Section 8.36 of the Kern County Code of Ordinances. Construction noise does not result in a significant noise impact at any analyzed receiver location. No mitigation measures are required.

CEC staff is directed to Appendix G Supplement — Section G.1 Revision 1 (TN 271095) for the complete tabulated construction noise level data at receptors R-1 through R-8 responsive to this request.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Authors: Negar Vahidi and Irene Kaufman

BACKGROUND: Project Construction and Operation Workforce

California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(7)(A) requires information on baseline information pertaining to workforce. Section 2.0 of the application discusses related off-site SCE facilities and transmission lines. Section 2.5 describes the construction of the SCE 115 kV subtransmission facilities, fiber optic routes, and substation expansion. The section does not include construction workforce required to complete these activities.

The SPPE Application, Section 1.3, states there will be 30-60 permanent operations positions. Section 1.4.1 states that the project facility is expected to accommodate approximately 100-115 employees and visitors per day, including deliveries and personnel. However, the application does not describe the nature of the 2- to 3-fold increase in daily visitors that are not included as operational employees. If there were the higher end of 60 permanent operations employees, and “115 employees and visitors per day,” there will be approximately 50+ visitors per day. It is unclear the purpose and nature of the visitors and if they are visiting from nearby local areas or outside of the region. An increase in the number of daily visitors could affect the need for temporary lodging or demand for public services. These visitors will need to be included in the analysis for housing and public services.

California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(7)(A)(iii) requires the existing and projected unemployment rate. Section 4.14.1 of the application provides the existing unemployment rate. California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(7)(A)(iv) requires availability of skilled workers by occupation required for construction and operation of the project. The SPPE Application, Appendix J-2, Section 4, Economic, Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Growth-Inducing Impact, provide the number of skilled workers by occupation required for construction of the project.

DATA REQUESTS

DR POP-1. Does the estimated peak construction workforce (approximately 600 workers) include the workforce required to complete the construction activities described in Section 2.5 of the application (i.e., constructing the SCE 115 kV subtransmission facilities, fiber optic routes, and substation expansion)? If not, provide information about additional construction workers required to complete these activities.

R&L Response

DR POP-1 - The estimated peak construction workforce of approximately 600 workers referenced in Section 1.9.14 (TN 269893) and Table 4.14-1 (Construction Workforce and Population Effect Summary, TN 269893) reflects the on-site data center campus construction workforce only and does not include the workforce required to complete the SCE-constructed facilities described in Section 2.5 (Construction, TN 269893), consisting of the two 115 kV overhead subtransmission lines (Route 1, approximately 8,000 linear feet with 34 line structures; Route 2, approximately 4,000 linear feet with 14 line structures), the two SCE-owned utility fiber optic routes (Path A, approximately 3,200 linear feet; Path B, approximately 8,250 linear feet), and the westward expansion of the existing Inyokern 115 kV Substation footprint (approximately 136 feet by 101 feet), as confirmed in Section 2.5 (TN 269893) and Section 1.3 (TN 269893).

The SCE 115 kV subtransmission line, fiber optic route, and substation expansion construction activities will be performed by SCE consistent with SCE Method of Service Study MOS174 (March 30, 2026) and applicable SCE construction practices, as confirmed in Section 2.5 (TN 269893). The scope of SCE's construction activities is described in Section 2.5 (TN 269893) and involves typical overhead transmission line construction methods including the use of pickup trucks, line trucks, cranes, augers, and other standard transmission construction equipment. Because the SCE construction activities are performed under SCE's own construction program pursuant to MOS174, specific SCE construction workforce figures are not available to the Applicant at this stage of project development. The Applicant will provide SCE construction workforce information as a supplement to Section 4.14 (TN 269893) once that information becomes available through the MOS174 construction coordination process, prior to the commencement of SCE construction activities.

Regardless of the SCE construction workforce figures, the population and housing impact conclusions presented in Section 4.14 (TN 269893) for the data center campus construction workforce remain valid. SCE utility construction crews for projects of this type are typically drawn from SCE's existing regional utility labor pool and specialized transmission construction contractors operating throughout Southern California, and are not anticipated to generate meaningful demand for temporary or permanent housing in the Inyokern project vicinity given the

limited scope and duration of the SCE construction activities relative to the overall 48-month project period.

DR POP-2. Describe the daily project-related 50+ visitors expected to be on site daily. For instance, what project activities will they be part of? Are they expected to be long-term visitors? Are these visitors assumed to be local residents or visiting from outside of the region?

R&L Response

DR POP-2 - The Applicant provides the following clarification regarding the approximately 50 or more daily non-employee visitors expected on site during project operations referenced in Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893) and Section 4.14 (TN 269893).

The facility is expected to accommodate approximately 100 to 115 persons per day during operations, as confirmed in Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893). This figure encompasses all persons accessing the site on a typical operational day and includes the permanent operations staff of approximately 10 workers per shift across 3 shifts per day for approximately 30 employees per day, with a total permanent workforce of 30 to 60 employees, as confirmed in Section 6 (TN 269893) and the CUP Environmental Information Form (Form 108, PLN25-0028, Appendix N.4). The remainder of the daily site population consists of non-employee service and delivery personnel required for routine facility operations, as confirmed in Section 1.4.2 (TN 269893) and the CUP Project Description (PLN25-0028, Appendix N.4).

With respect to the project activities these visitors will be part of, non-employee daily site visitors are expected to consist primarily of contractors and service personnel supporting ongoing facility operations — including equipment maintenance, IT systems support, and facility services — as well as delivery personnel. The facility is expected to receive approximately two to three deliveries per week, as confirmed in the CUP Project Description (PLN25-0028, Appendix N.4). These are routine operational support activities common to facilities of this type and scale.

With respect to whether visitors are expected to be long-term, these visitors are not anticipated to be long-term visitors requiring overnight accommodations. Their presence on site is expected to be limited to the duration of the specific service or delivery activity for which they are visiting.

With respect to whether visitors are local or from outside the region, given the project's location in Inyokern and its proximity to Ridgecrest and the broader Kern County labor market, non-employee service and delivery personnel are anticipated to be drawn primarily from the regional area. A small number of specialized technical personnel may visit from outside the region on an occasional basis for specific equipment or systems support activities, but such visits would be infrequent and of limited duration.

The daily non-employee visitor population is not expected to generate meaningful demand for temporary or permanent housing in the project vicinity or materially affect the population and housing impact conclusions presented in Section 4.14 (TN 269893). Further characterization of daily non-employee site visitor activities and geographic origin has been incorporated into the updated Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J,K Supplement — Section J.2 Revision 1, TN 271097), submitted herewith as a formal supplement to the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893). CEC staff is directed to Appendix J,K Supplement — Section J.2 Revision 1 (TN 271097) for the complete characterization responsive to this request.

DR POP-3. Provide the projected unemployment rate of the region affected by construction and operation of the project, or if this data is unavailable, provide an explanation.

R&L Response

DR POP-3 - The Applicant provides the following information regarding existing and projected unemployment rates for the region affected by construction and operation of the project, consistent with CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(7)(A)(iii).

Existing unemployment rate data for the project region is provided in Section 4.14.1.3 (TN 269893), Table 4.14-1 (Inyokern CDP and Kern County Baseline Demographic and Housing Indicators, TN 269893), and the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893). As confirmed in Section 4.14.1.3 (TN 269893), the California Employment Development Department reported a Kern County unemployment rate of 8.3 percent in April 2023, 9.7 percent in February and March 2024, and 8.5 percent in August 2024. The Inyokern CDP unemployment rate is 12.4 percent based on American Community Survey 2023 five-year estimates, which is elevated relative to both Kern County (8.9 percent) and the United States (2.9 percent), as confirmed in Section 4.14.1.3 (TN 269893) and the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893). Detailed unemployment data including a five-year historical trend derived from the California Employment Development Department and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Local Area Unemployment Statistics program is provided in Appendix SEJ-B of the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893).

With respect to projected unemployment rates, a formal projected unemployment rate for Kern County or the Inyokern CDP for the project construction and operation period is not available from the California Employment Development Department, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, or other published regional planning sources at the level of geographic specificity applicable to this project. The Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893) does not include a projected unemployment rate for this reason. The project's construction workforce of approximately 300 to 600 workers is consistent with the available regional labor supply given existing unemployment conditions, as confirmed in Section 4.14 (TN 269893) and the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893).

DR POP-4. Provide the availability (i.e., baseline number of workers by occupation type in the region of the labor pool) of skilled workers by occupation for construction and operation of the project.

R&L Response

DR POP-4 - The Applicant provides the following information regarding the availability of skilled workers by occupation required for construction and operation of the project, consistent with CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(7)(A)(iv).

Construction Workforce by Occupational Category - The monthly construction workforce by occupational category across all 48 months of the project period is provided in Table SEJ-1A (Monthly Construction Workforce by Occupational Category, Appendix J.2, TN 269893) and

Table 4.14-C (Representative Occupational Mix by Construction Phase, TN 269893) of the Main Application. The project construction workforce is organized into six occupational categories: Civil, Structural, Electrical, Mechanical, Controls/Commissioning, and Supervision. At peak Month 20, the occupational breakdown is as follows: Civil — 59 workers; Structural — 148 workers; Electrical — 148 workers; Mechanical — 148 workers; Controls/Commissioning — 30 workers; Supervision — 59 workers; for a total of 592 workers, as confirmed in Table SEJ-1A (Appendix J.2, TN 269893).

Operations Workforce by Occupational Category - Upon completion, the project would employ approximately 30 to 60 permanent operations employees, as confirmed in Section 4.14 (TN 269893) and the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893). Operational staffing would include critical facilities technicians, electrical and mechanical maintenance personnel, network and IT staff, security, and administrative support, as confirmed in the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893). Permanent operations positions would be filled through a combination of local, regional, and specialized recruitment, as confirmed in the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893).

Regional Labor Supply Availability - The project's construction workforce requirements are consistent with the availability of unionized skilled trades within Kern County and the broader Southern and Central California labor market, as confirmed in Section 4.14 (TN 269893) and the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893). Construction of a data center campus requires civil, structural, electrical, mechanical, controls/commissioning, and safety/supervision functions commonly available through established trade hiring hall structures and regional contracting networks, as confirmed in the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893). Specialized commissioning and original equipment manufacturer personnel are expected to be drawn from regional or statewide sources on a temporary basis, consistent with advanced industrial facility practice, as confirmed in the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893).

Eastern Kern County's economy includes defense and aerospace activities, construction and skilled trades, transportation and logistics, energy production, and agriculture — a regional economic base that is accustomed to industrial operations and infrastructure development and that routinely supports large construction projects, as confirmed in the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893).

Specific baseline headcount figures by occupation type for the regional labor pool are not available in the application or the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893) at the level of geographic specificity applicable to this project. The Socioeconomic Analysis confirms that detailed unemployment data derived from the California Employment Development Department and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Local Area Unemployment Statistics program, including a five-year historical trend, is provided in Appendix SEJ-B of the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893), which provides the available regional labor market context for the project.

DATA REQUEST

DR POP-5. Provide a discussion of the available short-term lodging options (e.g., hotels, motels, RV-sites) in the region available to accommodate the construction workforce, including vacancy rates.

BACKGROUND: Temporary Housing Availability

California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(7)(A)(v) requires the availability of temporary and permanent housing. The SPPE Application, Appendix J.2, Section 4.1 provides the permanent housing vacancy, but information is also necessary about the temporary housing available to the temporary construction workforce for the project.

R&L Response

DR POP-5 - The Applicant provides the following discussion of available short-term lodging options in the region available to accommodate the construction workforce, consistent with CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(7)(A)(v).

As confirmed in the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893), short-term construction-related lodging demand for the project is expected to be accommodated primarily within the Ridgecrest area rather than within the community of Inyokern. This conclusion is based on the planning-level housing vacancy estimate of approximately 18 percent within the Inyokern CDP based on American Community Survey data, as confirmed in the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893). While an 18 percent vacancy rate appears sufficient in percentage terms, the small absolute number of housing units in Inyokern limits the practical capacity of the local housing market to absorb temporary construction workforce demand, as confirmed in the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893). Project planning therefore appropriately assumes reliance on regional lodging supply in the Ridgecrest area and the broader Indian Wells Valley, as confirmed in the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893).

The demand for short-term lodging is expected to be modest. The project intends to utilize primarily local union labor drawn from Kern County and the broader Southern and Central California labor market, as confirmed in Section 4.14 (TN 269893) and the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893). Household relocation associated with construction is expected to be minimal — approximately 0 to 2 percent of the peak workforce, representing approximately zero to 12 persons at peak — with non-local specialized personnel relying on short-term lodging for limited durations only, as confirmed in the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893).

With respect to available short-term lodging options and vacancy rates, the Applicant has prepared an updated Socioeconomic Analysis, submitted herewith as Appendix J,K Supplement — Section J.2 Revision 1 (TN 271097), as a formal supplement to the Socioeconomic Analysis (Appendix J.2, TN 269893). The updated Socioeconomic Analysis incorporates a comprehensive inventory of available short-term lodging options in the Ridgecrest area, including branded hotel and motel properties, extended stay properties, and RV parks in the Ridgecrest and Inyokern area with specific site counts, rates, and access restrictions, as well as national and California hotel occupancy benchmark data confirming that the available regional lodging inventory is more than sufficient to accommodate project-related short-term demand. CEC staff is directed to Appendix J,K Supplement — Section J.2 Revision 1 (TN 271097) for the complete lodging inventory and vacancy rate discussion responsive to this request.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Authors: Elizabeth Huber and Ali Jahani

BACKGROUND: Current Assessor Parcel Numbers and Owner Names/Addresses

California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (a)(1)(E) requires an appendix listing current assessor parcel numbers and owner names/addresses within:

- 500 feet of proposed transmission or linear facilities
- 1000 feet of the power plant and related facilities

CEC staff needs a complete list for required noticing and CEQA compliance.

DATA REQUEST

DR EXEC SUMM-1. Given the SPPE application data in the Land Use section, “The Notice Area Map and Parcel Owner Notice List per California Code of Regulations, Title 0, Appendix B, Section (a)(1)(E) identifies 42 private parcels within the required notice area: 6 contiguous parcels (requiring owner and occupant notice), 16 parcels within 1,000 feet of the project boundary, 1 parcel within 500 feet of the subtransmission linear facility, and 19 additional parcels identified through historical record review included conservatively,” CEC staff requests the complete parcel owner list, including:

- APN
- Owner name
- Mailing address
- Identification of parcels within the 500-ft and 1,000-ft notice

Provide the dataset in PDF and Excel formats.

BACKGROUND: Regional, Vicinity, and Site Maps

California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B, requires that regional, vicinity, and site maps used in the Executive Summary and Project Description include sufficient resolution, scale, symbology, and contextual detail to allow staff to accurately evaluate land uses, environmental setting, and project siting. The SPPE Application’s Figures 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3, are low-resolution and do not contain scale bars, legends, or consistent cartographic formatting, which limits CEC staff’s ability to use them for technical analysis.

In addition, the vicinity map lacks sufficient detailed depiction of surrounding land uses, including commercial, industrial, residential, aviation, public-service, and open-space features. A lower-scale, more detailed vicinity land-use map is needed for CEC staff’s assessments in land use, visual resources, environmental justice, and cumulative analysis.

R&L Response

DR EXEC SUMM-1 - The Applicant provides the following response to CEC staff's request for the complete parcel owner list for all parcels within the required notice area, consistent with CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(a)(1)(E).

As noted in the Main Application (TN 269893), the Notice Area Map and Parcel Owner Notice List identifies 42 private parcels within the required notice area, comprising 6 contiguous parcels requiring owner and occupant notice, 16 parcels within 1,000 feet of the project boundary, 1 parcel within 500 feet of the subtransmission linear facility, and 19 additional parcels identified through historical record review included conservatively, as confirmed in Section 1.9.11 (TN 269893) and Appendix N.2 (TN 269892).

The complete parcel owner list obtained from the Kern County Assessor's Office is provided herewith as part of Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098), submitted as a formal supplement to Appendix N.2 (TN 269892). The parcel owner list includes the following information for each parcel: Assessor's Parcel Number (APN), property address, owner name, owner mailing address, and notice zone designation identifying whether the parcel falls within the contiguous notice zone, the 1,000-foot notice zone, the 500-foot linear facility notice zone, or the historical record review category, consistent with the notice area categories described in Section 1.9.11 (TN 269893) and Appendix N.2 (TN 269892). The parcel owner list is provided in both PDF and Excel formats as requested by CEC staff. This response also satisfies the request in DR LAND-3 submitted herewith.

DATA REQUEST

DR EXEC SUMM-2. Submit high-resolution versions of Figures 1-1 (Regional Location Map), 1-2 (Vicinity Map), and 1-3 (Site Plan / Site and Surrounding Parcels). Each map must include:

- A scale bar
 - A north arrow
 - A legend identifying all symbology
 - Readable parcel boundaries and labels
 - Clear resolution suitable for reproduction in staff documents
-
- Please provide the maps in both PDF and original GIS-export format.

R&L Response

DR EXEC SUMM-2 - Revised high-resolution versions of Figure 1-1 (Regional Location Map), Figure 1-2 (Vicinity Map), and Figure 1-3 (Site Plan) have been prepared and are provided in Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098), submitted herewith as a formal supplement to the Main Application (TN 269893).

Figures 1-1 and 1-2 have been regenerated in GIS at the project's coordinate reference system (NAD83 California State Plane Zone V, U.S. feet; EPSG:2229). Each figure includes a scale bar,

north arrow, and legend identifying all symbology, and each is provided at a resolution suitable for reproduction in CEC staff documents. Figure 1-3 is provided as the project Site Plan prepared by Cornerstone Engineering, Inc., depicting the data center building, generator yards, point of interconnection, on-site improvements, and surrounding parcels with Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) and recorded bearings and distances. Parcel boundaries and labels in the project vicinity are shown on Figures 1-2 and 1-3, with detailed parcel information provided on Figure 1-3.

All three figures are provided in PDF format within Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098). The project boundary is also provided in GIS-export format (ESRI shapefile, EPSG:2229) and will be transmitted to CEC staff via Kiteworks file transfer.

DR EXEC SUMM-3. Submit a new vicinity land-use map at a lower scale (larger geographic extent) with substantially more detail than the current Figure 1-2. This map should show:

- Residential areas
- Commercial and industrial uses
- Public service facilities (e.g., airport, fire, schools)
- Open space and undeveloped lands
- Infrastructure corridors (transmission, pipelines, major utilities)
- Major roadways and access routes
- Surrounding land-use designations (County and Specific Plan)
- The map should cover at least a 2-to-3-mile radius around the project site and include:
- A scale bar
- A north arrow
- A legend
- Clear symbology for each land-use category Provide in PDF and GIS-export format.

R&L Response

DR EXEC SUMM-3 - A new vicinity land-use map covering an area exceeding a 2-to-3-mile radius around the project site has been prepared and is provided in Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098), submitted herewith as a formal supplement to the Main Application (TN 269893).

The map is presented at a smaller scale than Figure 1-2 to depict the broader surrounding area and shows the land-use designations of the Kern County General Plan and Inyokern Specific Plan, including residential, commercial, industrial, public service, and open-space and undeveloped categories including State and Federal lands. The project site and its vicinity are designated Specific Plan Required under the Kern County General Plan and fall within the Inyokern Specific Plan area, consistent with Section 4.2 (TN 269893). Public service facilities in the vicinity, including Inyokern Airport, are depicted. Major roadways including U.S. Route 395 and State Route 178 are shown. The map includes a scale bar, north arrow, legend, and clear symbology for

each land-use category, as confirmed in Section 4.2 (TN 269893).

With respect to infrastructure corridors, the project's electrical interconnection to SCE's existing Inyokern Substation will be established via a proposed 115 kV subtransmission corridor consistent with SCE Method of Service Study MOS174 (March 30, 2026, Appendix M.3, TN 269893). The final alignment is subject to SCE's ongoing final engineering under MOS174 and will be provided as a supplement upon completion. Accordingly, a definitive subtransmission corridor alignment is not depicted on the vicinity land-use map at this time. Existing major infrastructure and roadway corridors in the vicinity are reflected on the map consistent with Section 4.2 (TN 269893) and Appendix N.2 (TN 269892).

The map is provided in PDF format within Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098). The project boundary is also provided in GIS-export format (ESRI shapefile, EPSG:2229) and will be transmitted to CEC staff via Kiteworks file transfer. The final subtransmission corridor alignment will be provided as a supplement to Appendix N.2 upon completion of SCE final engineering under MOS174 with a new TN number assigned at time of submission.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Authors: Usama Khalid and Ali Jahani

BACKGROUND: Transmission System Engineering

The RB Inyokern Data Center (Project) includes an onsite substation with transmission line connecting it to the SCE's substation. CEC staff need a complete description of the project's interconnection to the SCE transmission grid and the reliability of the SCE grid in the area, to understand the potential operation of the back-up generators.

DR PD-1. Please provide information summarizing the frequency and duration of historic outages or service interruptions on the 115 kV system that would have resulted in a loss of the electric service to the proposed onsite substation, had this substation existed. This response should identify the historical reliability of service that SCE has provided to similar customers within this portion of its service territory.

- Have Public Safety Power Shutoffs (PSPS) impacted transmission facilities that would serve the proposed project, and are future PSPS events expected to interrupt utility service to the data center in a way that would warrant the use of the back-up generators? Additionally, is the project located in a high wildfire-threat zone?
- The SPPE application states that two transmission lines will be constructed whereas the one-line diagram shows only one 115 kV transmission line connection to the project's substation.
- Are both routes being constructed as part of this project or will only one be selected?
- How many 115 kV lines in total will be constructed to supply the proposed substation from the utility's side once design is finalized?

- What upgrades are needed to the SCE's substation besides being converted to ring bus structure? How many lines will be moved? What kind of new equipment will be installed?

R&L Response

DR PD-1 - The Applicant provides the following response to CEC staff's five-part request regarding the frequency and duration of historic outages on the 115 kV system, Public Safety Power Shutoff events, wildfire threat zone designation, transmission line configuration, and Inyokern Substation upgrade requirements.

With respect to the frequency and duration of historic outages or service interruptions on the 115 kV system, the Applicant has initiated a formal request to SCE for historical reliability data for the portion of SCE's 115 kV system that would serve the proposed project. SCE has confirmed receipt of the request and is currently coordinating internally to determine what historical reliability information can be shared externally, noting that this process may require several additional weeks. SCE has indicated that it may determine that this type of information request is more appropriately directed through a formal CEC channel. In the interim, the Applicant notes that SCE publishes system-wide outage reliability reports on its public website that provide general reliability context for SCE's service territory. Should CEC staff determine that a direct request to SCE would expedite the availability of this information, the Applicant respectfully defers to CEC staff's judgment on the most efficient path forward.

With respect to whether Public Safety Power Shutoff events have impacted transmission facilities that would serve the proposed project and whether future PSPS events are expected to interrupt utility service, the project site is confirmed as not being located within a State Responsibility Area or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and is mapped within a Local Responsibility Area non-Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, as confirmed in Section 1.9.19 (TN 269893) and Section 4.20 (Wildfire, TN 269893). The project site is characterized by flat desert floor with sparse desert scrub and low wildfire risk, as confirmed in Section 4.20 (TN 269893), which significantly limits the likelihood of PSPS events affecting the transmission facilities serving the project.

With respect to whether the project is located in a high wildfire threat zone, the project site is not located within a CAL FIRE-designated State Responsibility Area or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, as confirmed in Section 1.9.19 (TN 269893) and Section 4.20 (Wildfire, TN 269893). The project site is within a Local Responsibility Area non-Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, consistent with the flat desert terrain and sparse vegetation characterizing the project site and surrounding Inyokern area. Future PSPS events affecting the project are not anticipated to be a material operational risk given the project site's location outside any high wildfire threat zone designation and the low wildfire risk characterization confirmed in Section 4.20 (TN 269893).

With respect to whether both transmission line routes are being constructed as part of this project or whether only one will be selected, and the total number of 115 kV lines to supply the proposed substation, both Route 1 (approximately 8,000 linear feet, 34 line structures) and Route 2 (approximately 4,000 linear feet, 14 line structures) are being constructed as part of this project under SCE Method of Service Study MOS174 (March 30, 2026), as confirmed in Section 2.0 (TN 269893), Section 1.3 (TN 269893), and Appendix L.1 through L.3 (TN 269893). Both routes originate at the existing Inyokern 115 kV Substation and terminate at the new customer-owned substation and Point of Interconnection on APN 084-010-48, on independent line positions

supporting redundancy and diverse routing, as confirmed in Section 1.4.7 (TN 269893). The total number of 115 kV lines to be constructed to supply the proposed substation from SCE's side is two, consistent with MOS174.

The Applicant acknowledges CEC staff's observation regarding the one-line diagram in Appendix L.1 (TN 269626). The one-line diagram depicts a single 115 kV connection for schematic clarity at the conceptual design stage. Both Route 1 and Route 2 are confirmed as being constructed under MOS174 as described above. CEC staff is directed to the SCE Method of Service Study MOS174 (Appendix M.3, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL) for SCE's engineering drawings depicting both routes as independent 115 kV subtransmission line positions, and to the Backup Generating Facility Standalone Description (Appendix A Supplement — Section A.4, TN 271057) Section 4.1 submitted concurrently with this response. The conceptual one-line diagram in Appendix L.1 will be updated during final engineering consistent with Section 3.2 (TN 269893).

With respect to the upgrades needed to the SCE Inyokern Substation beyond conversion to a ring bus structure, the existing Inyokern 115 kV Substation will be reconfigured into a compact switch rack configuration and extended approximately 136 feet west to accommodate two new outgoing circuit positions for the two new 115 kV subtransmission lines serving the project, as confirmed in Section 2.0 (TN 269893) and MOS174 (Appendix M.3, TN 269642 — CONFIDENTIAL). Underground segments may be required at the substation getaway, estimated at approximately 300 linear feet per route where the lines transition between the substation and overhead alignments, as confirmed in Section 2.0 (TN 269893). The specific detailed upgrade parameters beyond what MOS174 currently documents — including the specific lines to be moved and new equipment to be installed at the Inyokern Substation — are subject to SCE's detailed engineering under MOS174, which has not yet been completed at the current conceptual design stage of the project, consistent with Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, TN 269893). These parameters will be confirmed and provided as a supplement to Section 2.0 (TN 269893) upon completion of SCE's detailed engineering under MOS174 with a new TN number assigned at time of submission.

BACKGROUND: RB Inyokern Backup Generating Facility Section

The SPPE Application presents information interspersed throughout the broader data center project description. Appendix B requires a clear, complete, and stand-alone description of the generation facility and all associated systems, separate from unrelated data center components. CEC staff requires this information to evaluate air quality, noise, water use, hazardous materials, engineering design, and operational characteristics specific to the SPPE-regulated generating facility. To conduct a consistent and complete review, staff needs the applicant to prepare and submit a dedicated, unified Backup Generating Facility (BGF) section that includes all required components and that clearly distinguishes RB Inyokern BGF (RIBGF) systems from general data center systems.

DR PD-2. Please provide the consolidated BGF section as a polished, standalone document requiring no further editing prior to insertion into staff's analysis. The section must clearly distinguish the BFG-specific systems from the data center building-specific systems. Include all figures, tables, and citations in their final locations. Please provide in Word (.docx) and PDF formats, at minimum, include the following elements:

- Generating Capacity (total installed MW, MW per unit, number of units, redundancy configuration).
- Generating Capacity and Power Usage Effectiveness (PUE).
- Backup Electrical System Design (BGF-specific one-lines, transfer switching, redundancy, load-shed logic).
- Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) System Description (interface with BGF only; separate from IT/data center UPS systems).
- Generator System Description (engine type, aftertreatment, enclosure, operating load ranges, warm-up/cool-down sequences, testing schedule).
- Fuel System (tank capacities, containment, day-tank arrangements, DEF system, refueling routing, turnover schedule).
- Cooling System for the BGF (generator-specific cooling only, separate from data center cooling).
- BFG Water Supply and Use (quantities, source, and purpose attributable only to the BGF).
- Hazardous Materials Management (BGF-specific materials, storage, containment, SPCC details, handling procedures).
- Waste Management (BGF-only waste streams such as oil, filters, DEF containers, oily wastewater, and disposal pathways).
- Project Substation description as it relates to the BGF (interconnection, switching, protection schemes).
- SCE Switching Station Expansion and Transmission Line Facilities (if applicable to BGF support).
- Site Access and Parking related to BGF operations (fuel delivery, maintenance access, emergency access).
- BFG Construction Description (construction schedule, excavation depths, staging areas, equipment, and activities specific to BGF construction).
- BFG Operation Description (operational profile, emergency operations, testing frequency, noise characteristics).

R&L Response

DR-PD-2 - The Applicant provides the following response to CEC staff's request for a consolidated, polished, standalone Backup Generating Facility (BGF) section ready for insertion into CEC staff's analysis, clearly distinguishing BGF-specific systems from general data center systems.

The information required for the consolidated BGF section is currently provided in the Main Application (TN 269893) across multiple sections, including Section 1.4.3 (Emergency Backup

Power), Section 4.6 (Energy), Section 4.6.5 (CEC SPPE Appendix B Engineering and LORS Supplement), Section 6 (Generation Facility Description), and the Generator Data and Specifications (Appendix A.3, TN 269893). The Applicant acknowledges that this information is interspersed throughout the broader data center project description rather than compiled as a standalone BGF section as required by CEC Appendix B, and is providing herewith a consolidated standalone BGF section as Appendix A Supplement — Section A.4 (RB Inyokern Backup Generating Facility — Standalone Description, TN 271057), submitted as a formal supplement to the Main Application (TN 269893) in searchable PDF format.

Appendix A.4 (TN 271057) is a complete, professionally formatted standalone document requiring no further editing prior to insertion into CEC staff's analysis. All figures, tables, and citations are placed in their correct locations within the document. BGF-specific systems are clearly distinguished from general data center systems throughout. Parameters described in Appendix A.4 (TN 271057) reflect the conceptual design stage of the project and will be confirmed and refined through final engineering consistent with Section 3.2 (Items Pending Final Engineering, TN 269893); any material changes resulting from final engineering will be submitted as a supplement to Appendix A.4 (TN 271057) with a new TN number assigned at time of submission.

Appendix A.4 (TN 271057) addresses each required element as follows:

- Generating Capacity — 40 Caterpillar 3516E diesel-fired generators, each rated at 3 MW (3,000 kW / 3,750 kVA), providing 120 MW total installed capacity serving a maximum 99 MW operational load. Generator configuration consists of two yards of 20 units each providing N+1 redundancy per yard and N+2 redundancy campus-wide, as confirmed in Section 1.4.3 (TN 269893) and Section 6 (TN 269893).
- Generating Capacity and Power Usage Effectiveness — the facility is designed to achieve a PUE of approximately 1.41 at full buildout, as confirmed in Table 4.6-2 (Phased Energy Load and PUE Summary, TN 269893) and Section 4.6 (TN 269893). The 99 MW total facility load comprises approximately 70 MW IT load and approximately 29 MW non-IT overhead load at full buildout Phase 3, as confirmed in Table 4.6-2 (TN 269893).
- Backup Electrical System Design — BGF-specific one-line diagrams, transfer switching, redundancy configuration, and load-shed logic are provided in Appendix L.1 (Project One-Line Diagram, TN 269893) and Section 4.6.5 (TN 269893), and are further detailed in Appendix A.4 (TN 271057).
- Uninterruptible Power Supply System Description — UPS systems interface with the BGF through redundant critical electrical lineups with dual power cord configurations, automatic transfer at 90 percent nominal capacity alarm threshold, and instantaneous protection from utility interruptions, as confirmed in Section 1.4.3 (TN 269893) and Section 4.6 (TN 269893). Appendix A.4 (TN 271057) clearly distinguishes BGF-interfacing UPS functions from IT and data center UPS systems.
- Generator System Description — EPA Tier 2-certified base engines with externally applied Johnson Matthey CompactSCR aftertreatment (SCR + DPF + DEF) achieving Tier 4 Final-equivalent stack emissions, installed within compact enclosures in two secured generator yards with secondary containment basins, as confirmed in Section 1.4.3 (TN 269893), Section 6 (TN 269893), and Appendix A.3 (TN 269893). Engine type, aftertreatment configuration, enclosure design, operating load ranges, warm-up and cool-down sequences, and testing schedule are detailed in Appendix A.4 (TN 271057).

PUBLIC SERVICES

Authors: Negar Vahidi and Irene Kaufman

BACKGROUND: Capacities, Service Standards, and Response Times

California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(7)(A)(vi) requires the SPPE Application to include the capacities, service standards, existing and expected use levels, and planned expansion of utilities (gas, water, and waste) and public services, including fire protection, law enforcement, emergency response, medical facilities, other assessment districts, school districts, parks and recreation facilities, libraries, and other public facilities. California Code of Regulations, Title 20, Appendix B (g)(7)(B)(i) specifically asks for response times to hospitals and for police protection, fire protection, emergency services, parks and recreation facilities, libraries, and other public facilities.

The public service providers were generally discussed in the SPPE Application, Section 4.15, Table 4.14-D, including the distance and driving time to the project location. Note that the driving time is distinct from the response time (i.e., turnout time plus drive time for fire protection services). However, other information for service standards and response times of public services (fire protection, law enforcement, emergency response) was not included in the application.

DATA REQUEST

DR PS-1. Provide the current service standards and response times of the affected fire protection services, law enforcement, and emergency response agencies.

R&L Response

DR PS-1 - The Applicant provides the following information regarding current service standards and response times of the affected fire protection, law enforcement, and emergency response agencies serving the project site, consistent with CCR Title 20, Appendix B §(g)(7)(A)(vi) and §(g)(7)(B)(i).

Fire Protection Services — Kern County Fire Department Station 83 - Primary fire protection services to the project site are provided by Kern County Fire Department (KCFD) Station 83, located at 6919 Monache Mountain Avenue, Inyokern, approximately 0.9 miles west of the project site, as confirmed in Table 4.11-2 (TN 269893) and Table 4.15-1 (List of Nearby Fire Stations, TN 269893). The project has committed to pre-incident planning and emergency access coordination with KCFD Station 83 consistent with Mitigation Measures MM 4.15-1 and MM 4.15-2 (TN 269893) and the Fire Safety Plan required prior to construction under MM 4.9-2 (TN 269893).

The project incorporates extensive on-site fire protection features that reduce reliance on external response time, including VESDA smoke detection, clean-agent suppression systems, pre-action and wet-pipe sprinklers, on-site fire pumps, fire water storage tanks, hydrants, perimeter access roads for emergency vehicle circulation, a Knox Box rapid-entry system, and 24/7 security monitoring,

as confirmed in Section 4.15 (TN 269893). Current service standards and response time data for KCFD Station 83 are provided herewith as part of Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098) in the form of agency correspondence obtained from KCFD.

Law Enforcement Services — Kern County Sheriff's Office Ridgecrest Substation - Primary law enforcement services to the project site are provided by the Kern County Sheriff's Office (KCSO) through the Ridgecrest Substation, located approximately 15 miles southeast of the project site, as confirmed in Section 4.15 (TN 269893) and Table 4.15-2 (List of Nearby Sheriff Substations, TN 269893). The California Highway Patrol also provides patrol services along SR-178 and US-395 in the project vicinity, as confirmed in Section 4.15 (TN 269893).

The project incorporates perimeter fencing, controlled access, CCTV surveillance, and 24/7 security monitoring that significantly reduce the need for routine KCSO response and limit the potential for security-related incidents requiring law enforcement assistance, as confirmed in Section 4.15 (TN 269893) and Mitigation Measure MM 4.15-2 (TN 269893). Current service standards and response time data for the KCSO Ridgecrest Substation are provided herewith as part of Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098) in the form of agency correspondence obtained from KCSO.

Emergency Medical Services - Emergency medical services in the project vicinity are provided through KCFD first-responder EMS services and private ambulance transport. The nearest hospital emergency room is Ridgecrest Regional Hospital, located at 1081 N China Lake Blvd, Ridgecrest, approximately 10.2 miles east of the project site, as confirmed in Table 4.11-2 (TN 269893) and Table 4.15-4 (Emergency Response and Travel Time Analysis, TN 269893). Current EMS response and transport time standards for the Inyokern area are provided herewith as part of Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098) in the form of agency correspondence obtained from Kern County EMS.

The project will maintain a Construction Safety Plan and Operations Health and Safety Program consistent with Cal/OSHA requirements, including first aid provisions and emergency response coordination, as confirmed in Mitigation Measures MM 4.15-1 and MM 4.15-2 (TN 269893).

TRANSPORTATION

Author: Margaret Herrera

BACKGROUND: Construction Activities and Worker Vehicle Trips

The project is located in an unincorporated area of Kern County falls under the jurisdiction of the Caltrans Transportation Impact Study Guide for land use projects and plans. In compliance with that guidance, the construction and operation analysis should provide information and materials to support the determination if the project meets all the criteria of the environmental checklist established by CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G.

CEC staff reviewed the SPPE Application but could not find the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis (CEQA Appendix G) to accompany the discussion of construction worker vehicle trips required for the construction of the project. In addition, the table provided for construction worker vehicle trips was difficult to read. To adequately answer CEQA Transportation question a, which

asks “Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?” The applicant must provide more details related to the construction of the project.

DATA REQUESTS

DR TRANS-1. Please provide the VMT analysis and include a table labeled “Construction Trip Generation” that identifies offsite construction worker trips that would be routed to the site from State Route 178 (Inyokern Road). The trip generation table should also include worker VMT per day during construction (X trips, X miles), worker VMT during construction, project life in days, average daily number of workers, Kern Council of Governments average employee VMT, and threshold of significance. See example below.

R&L Response

DR TRANS-1 - The Applicant provides the following response to CEC staff's request for a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis and phase-by-phase construction worker trip generation table for the RBIDC project.

With respect to the VMT analysis, the Project VMT of 27.13 per employee is below the applicable significance threshold of 31.32 (15 percent below the KernCOG regional average of 36.85 VMT per employee), as confirmed in the Trip Generation and VMT Analysis (Appendix H.1, TN 269893), prepared by Provost & Pritchard, January 14, 2026. The Project VMT of 27.13 is 30.37 percent below the KernCOG regional average of 36.85, resulting in a less than significant VMT impact consistent with Section 4.16 (TN 269893) and Table 4.16-2 (TN 269893).

The Applicant notes that Section 4.16 of the Main Application (TN 269893) references an SR-178 daily capacity of approximately 10,000 VPD. The correct figure per Appendix H.1 (TN 269893) is approximately 15,000 VPD for a two-lane rural highway consistent with the Highway Capacity Manual. The V/C ratio of 0.22 stated in Section 4.16 (TN 269893) is based on the correct 15,000 VPD figure from Appendix H.1 and is accurate. The 10,000 VPD reference in Section 4.16 is a drafting error that does not affect the transportation impact conclusions. The correct SR-178 daily capacity of 15,000 VPD is confirmed herein and in Appendix H.1 (TN 269893) and no formal application revision is required.

With respect to the phase-by-phase construction worker trip generation table, the Applicant has prepared Tables 5.14-5 and 5.14-6 in the format requested by CEC staff, using the assumptions and data from the Trip Generation and VMT Analysis (Appendix H.1, TN 269893), prepared by Provost & Pritchard, January 14, 2026. The tables were reviewed and concurred with by Ian Parks, PE, Principal Engineer, Provost & Pritchard, by email dated June 23, 2026. Tables 5.14-5 and 5.14-6 are provided as a formal supplement to Appendix H.1 (TN 269893) — Appendix G, H, I Supplement — Section H.1 Revision 1 (TN 271096), submitted concurrently with this response package. CEC staff is directed to Appendix G, H, I Supplement — Section H.1 Revision 1 (TN 271096) for the complete phase-by-phase construction worker trip generation tables responsive to this request.

DR TRANS-2. Please provide a high-quality site map, transportation facility inventory map and

airport proximity map.

R&L Response

DR TRANS-2 - The requested maps are provided in Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098), submitted herewith as a formal supplement to the Main Application (TN 269893). Clearer viewing images of all maps are provided on pages 2 through 9 of Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098). CEC staff is directed to Appendix N Supplement — Section N.2 Revision 1 (TN 271098) for the Site Map, Transportation Facility Inventory Map, and Airport Proximity Map responsive to this request.