

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	20-SPPE-01
Project Title:	Great Oaks South Backup Generating Facility Small Power Plant Exemption
TN #:	234902
Document Title:	Mimi Patterson Comments - Public Comment - Great Oaks South Data Center
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Mimi Patterson
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/24/2020 4:47:17 PM
Docketed Date:	9/24/2020

*Comment Received From: Mimi Patterson
Submitted On: 9/24/2020
Docket Number: 20-SPPE-01*

Public Comment - Great Oaks South Data Center

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

From: [Mimi Patterson](#)
To: Avalos, Rosemary@Energy
Cc: [Energy - Public Advisor's Office](#)
Subject: Great Oaks South 20-SPPE-01
Date: Thursday, September 24, 2020 8:39:11 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Rosemary,

Thank you for your being part of the Great Oaks Blvd SV1 zoom webinar yesterday afternoon. As I review all the information on the California Energy Commission website and the City of San Jose Planning and Development website, I am discovering more and more inconsistencies and potential code violations with the approval of this enormous project.

The reports and the appendix reports listed on the City of San Jose Planning and Development website are all outdated and contain inconsistent information.

1) IS/MND - December 2016 - Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for Equinix Data Centers (SV-12, SV13, SV-14) and Santa Teresa Substation.

This report was done December 2016 with outdated information including the names of the Data Centers and there is no application of the 36 generators, small power plant.

2) Appendix A - June 16, 2016 - Air Quality Report

Report has incorrect firm name of Xilinx and with clearly outdated information

3) Appendix B - November 11, 2015 - Tree Survey and Biology Report

This report is from 2015. A lot has changed in 5-6 years.

4) Appendix C - January 26, 2016 - GeoTechnical Investigation Report

5) Appendix D - February 23, 2015 - Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

This report is clearly outdated.

6) Appendix E - May 31, 2016 - Noise Assessment

Report only includes seven (7) generators generating a total sound pressure level at 86 DBA at a distance of 25 feet. This is deceiving as it does not account for the actual 36 generators which will clearly be noise pollution and negative impact to the environment and may affect the health and well-being of the surrounding community.

7) Appendix F - May 5, 2016 - Energy Report

NO information on 36 generators.

As you can all these reports and assessments are outdated and deficient of pertinent information of the actual project and its negative impact on the environment and the surrounding community.

Even in this section of public comments, there was no indication of a billboard, a sign or even notice provided to the public and surrounding community. There is one letter from Michael Hettenhausen, Associate Planner, Santa Clara County of Parks and Recreation Department. If the community were made aware of this behemoth project, there would be more letters, emails, phone calls and perhaps public outcry. **I like to reiterate and reemphasize Mr. Nick Rena's public comments at yesterday's**

zoom webinar meeting, "had we been given the proper notification of this project in 2015/2016, we would have a different scenario today on this massive project".

Responses to Public Comments

This section provides a list of all the comments received on the Equinix Data Centers (SV-12, SV-13, and SV-14) Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) during the public review period. The comments and their associated responses can be viewed below.

- [Responses to Written Public Comments to IS/MND](#)

Even as my neighbors and I peruse through the documents in the 20-SPPE-01 Great Oaks South Docket log, the earliest communication is dated March 18, 2020. There was no billboard, no public notice and any type of public information provided for our community. Yesterday's zoom webinar was the first meeting we even heard about and we only stumbled on that meeting through Gerry DeYoung at Ruth and Going. When I reached out to Stefanie Farmer at the City of San Jose Planning and Development Department, she said this project had already been approved many years ago, so she deferred me to Gerry DeYoung for any further questions as she was no longer part of this project.

This has been an absolutely frustrating and angering process. The whirlwind of documents and information that were hidden from our community is quite disappointing. As many of us are working from home due to the ongoing pandemic, our homes and community are of utmost importance to us and our families. It is a shame that we are allowing a \$5.5 billion dollar company and their expensive attorneys bully us and dictate what can be built in our neighborhoods.

I know you are busy and this project is probably one of many on your task list. I truly appreciate your time, and hope my neighbors and I can voice our frustration, disappointments and concerns over this Great Oaks South project.

Best,
Mimi Patterson