

**DOCKETED**

<b>Docket Number:</b>	19-SPPE-04
<b>Project Title:</b>	SJ2
<b>TN #:</b>	232231
<b>Document Title:</b>	San Jose City Data Center- Issues ID, Status Report, and Proposed Schedule Memo
<b>Description:</b>	Staff's Issues ID, Status Report, and Proposed Schedule for San Jose City Data Center
<b>Filer:</b>	Lisa Worrall
<b>Organization:</b>	California Energy Commission
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Commission Staff
<b>Submission Date:</b>	2/26/2020 1:47:24 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	2/26/2020

# Memorandum

To: Commissioner Karen Douglas, Presiding Member  
Commissioner Patty Monahan, Associate Member

Date: February 26, 2020

From: **California Energy Commission**  
1516 Ninth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512

Lisa Worrall  
Senior Environmental Planner  
(916) 654-4545

Subject: **ISSUES IDENTIFICATION, STATUS REPORT, AND PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR THE SAN JOSE CITY DATA CENTER SMALL POWER PLANT EXEMPTION (19-SPPE-04)**

In its February 20, 2020 order (“Notice of Committee Conference and Orders on Hearings”), the San Jose City Data Center SPPE Committee ordered Energy Commission staff to “file an Issues Identification Report, Status Report, and Proposed Schedule, summarizing the major issues identified to date, status on activities conducted to date and issues that require resolution before hearings can be conducted, and proposing a schedule for the conduct of this proceeding” and “indicate what additional information is necessary to resolve issues of concern.”

Staff issued data requests on December 19, 2019 (Set 1) and additional data requests on January 10, 2020 (Set 2). The applicant submitted partial responses on January 28, 2020 to Set 1 and on February 13, 2020 to Set 2. In total, there are eleven data requests in the areas of Project Description, Transmission, and Cultural Resources that have not received responses or received only partial responses. The applicant has not objected to any of the requests or indicated that it is unable to provide the requested information in accordance with the instructions and timelines in Title 20, California Code of Regulations, section 1716(f). The applicant’s partial or missing responses are from the following data requests:

- DR 3 – Contradicting transformer rating in One Line Diagram clarification
- DR 3b – Applicant in consultation with Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) as to the feasibility of staff request for a third transformer
- DR 4 – Updates to Figure 2-6
- DR 5 – Updates to Figure 2-6
- DR 6 – Transmission line pole configurations
- DR 8 – Description of 60 kilovolt (kV) loop connection with 230 KV interconnection to Los Esteros substation
- DR 8a – Detailed descriptions and one line diagrams showing detailed interconnection of the Northwest Loop transmission segment with project
- DR 19 – Schedule of archaeological surveys on project linear routes

- DR 46 – Data demonstrating historic reliability of service of PG&E
- DR 47 – Data demonstrating historic reliability of service of PG&E
- DR 49 – Feasibility of looping existing 230 kV circuits

Staff also intends to file several follow-up data requests now that it has received and evaluated the applicant's responses to the two sets of data requests (Set 3, forthcoming). Staff's follow-up data requests in the areas of Air Quality and Public Health seek clarification of and expansion upon certain information contained in the applicant's previous responses. Staff will file a motion for leave to file additional data requests to accompany these follow-up data requests (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 20, § 1941). Data Requests Set 3 will also renew staff's request for the information missing from the eleven incomplete or missing responses, in lieu of staff filing a petition for the Committee to direct the applicant to supply such information (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 20, § 1716(g)).

The applicant's response to Data Requests question 3a (Set 1) indicates that both of the 45 megavolt ampere (MVA) transformers at the new Microsoft Data Center substation would be required to serve the data center electric loads and staff understands both the transformers would be needed at all times. Information in the application and responses does not describe whether routine maintenance of the proposed onsite substation including the two proposed 45 MVA transformers could result in total or partial loss of PG&E's electricity service to the data center. Staff expects normal electrical power service to be continually available during all types of routine and scheduled maintenance of the proposed onsite substation. For staff's analysis "emergency use" is defined in the Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) for Emergency Standby Diesel-Fueled Engines, which describes the seven conditions that qualify for an "emergency use" [17 CCR § 93115.4 (a)(30)]. Maintenance of the substation should be foreseeable and would not qualify as an "emergency." Staff has four associated data requests related to Air Quality and Public Health.

At this time staff is unaware of any other issues the San Jose City Data Center project presents that require resolution before the staff's Initial Study can be published and hearings conducted; however, staff does not currently know whether additional mitigation measures may be necessary for this project. If mitigation measures are necessary and the applicant wishes to discuss or modify these measures, staff would need to hold a public workshop prior to publication of the environmental document.

Because staff is still completing the discovery phase, it is not possible for staff to produce a definitive schedule for publication of the Initial Study. Our experience on this project is consistent with prior SPPE evaluation efforts. Publication delays most often result from project description changes made by the applicant after filing. In some cases, these changes are in response to changing market conditions. In other cases, such changes are in response to data requests made by staff or information that becomes available during concurrent planning reviews being conducted by the local permitting authority, which for this project is the City of San Jose. The proposed schedule provided below reflects this inherent uncertainty in the evaluation process.

Staff's Proposed Schedule

Application materials docketed	11/15/19
Committee named at Business Meeting	12/17/19
Tribal consultation letters mailed	12/17/19
Staff Data Requests Set 1 docketed	12/19/19
Notice of Receipt and agency coordination letters docketed	1/6/2020
Staff Data Requests Set 2 docketed	1/10/2020
60-day discovery period closes	1/13/2020
Application for Confidential Materials docketed	1/28/2020
Applicant Responses to Data Requests Set 1 received	1/28/2020
Applicant Responses to Data Requests Set 2 received	2/13/2020
Memo re Issue ID and Schedule docketed	by 2/26/2020
Motion For Leave and Data Requests Set 3 docketed	by 2/28/2020
Status Conference	3/4/2020
Responses to Data Requests Set 3 Requests	by 3/30/2020
Mitigation measures workshop (if needed)	TBD
Initial Study publication	TBD
Deadline for comments on the Initial Study (30 days per CEQA)	TBD
Public Comments / Opening Testimony due	TBD*
Response to Public Comments / Reply Testimony due	TBD*
Prehearing Conference	TBD
Evidentiary Hearing	TBD
Committee Proposed Decision	TBD
Commission Decision at Business Meeting	TBD

---

\* Staff requests that the Committee establish the same filing deadline for public comment on the Initial Study and Opening Testimony from any intervening parties. Staff further requests a minimum of 10 business days following the Opening Testimony filing deadline to prepare and submit its Reply Testimony, which would include responses to any substantive comments received on the Initial Study during the CEQA comment period, as well as any novel matters raised by parties in Opening Testimony. If, however, separate deadlines are established for staff to file its response to CEQA comments and its reply to opening testimony, staff requests a minimum of 10 business days for each of these tasks.