

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 10:54 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Helen Beaton Grover <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 8:26 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Councilmember Cohen,

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements

- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Helen Beaton Grover, 95112

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** Fri 4/17/2026 10:54 AM  
**To:** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Isis Banks David <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 10:14 AM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting  
Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements

- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Isis Banks David, 95128

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 10:54 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** MICHAEL GALLO' <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 10:36 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements

- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Michael Gallo, 95139

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 10:55 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Ema Ibarra <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 10:34 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting  
Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Ema Ibarra, 95122

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 10:55 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Ema Ibarra <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 10:34 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting  
Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Ema Ibarra, 95122

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 11:35 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Marilyn Peek <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 11:25 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing

- hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
  - 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
  - 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
  - 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
  - 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
  - 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Marilyn Peek, 95139

--

***Marilyn Peek***

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 11:35 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Jayine Lee <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 11:30 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements

- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Jayne Lee, 95122

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 11:47 AM  
**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Bob Lombardi <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 11:36 AM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]> Robert Lombardi <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

**RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting**  
**Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report**

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements

- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 11:47 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Sara Chen <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 11:36 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and

any long-term cost risks to ratepayers

7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat

8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards

9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Sara Chen, 94566

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 1:20 PM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Lorette Kenney <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 11:57 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements

- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

LORETTE KENNEY, 95123

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

Lorette Kenney

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 1:20 PM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Stacey Kellogg <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 12:27 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Cc:** Stacey Kellogg <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Dearest Councilmembers and City Leaders,

I'm writing today to ask for greater care, consideration, and community outreach regarding the planning of multiple data center sites across our city. As a longtime resident of South San Jose, I've witnessed how past semi conductor giants like Fairchild can create irreversible Superfund level pollution in our city. CEQA protections were not enough then and it is valid for community members to feel they are not enough now. Those of us who have been here long enough remember that by the end of the 1980's, Santa Clara County had more Superfund sites than any other county in the country. [3] My request to you is that steps are taken to avoid these same mistakes as we approach the exciting opportunities tied to AI and the infrastructure needed to support it.

After hearing about this historic buildout on social media from a community group and living within 5 miles of the South San Jose facility that has already been stood up (also within a few miles of the

Fairchild Superfund site), I can't help but reflect on a few things. I cannot recall ANY public outreach or feedback sessions about the data center that was built. There is no place I can go as a constituent to understand the comprehensive effect of multiple data centers being built in my district, meanwhile, I continue to see large nearby real estate purchases that appear related to future data centers. [4] Of the two dozen neighbors I've spoken to over the last several days, none of them know anything about the city's plans regarding data centers. Yet half of them know the city's plans for the next Viva Calle event. The Public Outreach section of the city's memorandum for this item lists "This memorandum will be posted on the City Council Agenda website for the April 21, 2026 City Council meeting." I've faced higher community outreach standards for street closures and public art work. At best, the lack of community engagement on data centers is poor, at worst it's intentionally negligent and unbecoming of elected officials and city leadership.

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda

posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Thank you,  
Stacey Kellogg, 95123

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

[3] <https://www.kqed.org/news/11630861/how-silicon-valley-industry-polluted-the-sylvan-california-dream>

[4] <https://www.eastbaytimes.com/2026/02/26/san-jose-tech-data-ai-build-property-economy-real-estate-web-develop/>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 1:23 PM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Kikei Wong <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 12:55 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

**RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting**

**Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report**

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements

- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Kikei Wong, 90501

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 1:24 PM  
**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 1:16 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting  
Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review

- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Luis Bustamante, 95139

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 2:14 PM  
**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Keiana Andino <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 1:48 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting  
Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Keiana Andino, 95125

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

Sent from my iPhone

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 2:14 PM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Romina Karim <romina@flash.net>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 1:58 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Romina Karim, 95138

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

Sent from my iPhone

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 2:15 PM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** CATHIE GLYNN <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 2:08 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

This is a very idea and once the problems show up in people's health it's too late.

Stop this before it becomes a problem.

San Jose already has issues with chemicals in the water and ground.

Cathie Glynn

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**From:** City Clerk  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 2:32 PM  
**To:** Agendadesk  
**Subject:** Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Andrew <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 2:31 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)  
RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting  
Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Andy Ha, 95120

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**From:** City Clerk  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 2:32 PM  
**To:** Agendadesk  
**Subject:** Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Andrew <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 2:31 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)  
RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting  
Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Andy Ha, 95120

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 3:08 PM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Shaf K <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 3:06 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

I am a lifelong resident of San Jose. I bought a home a few years ago near the proposed Great Oaks backup generator. I want city council to exercise proper due diligence on behalf of their tax paying constituents. I have contributed a significant portion of my income and the entirety of my life to this city. It is outrageously disrespectful for city council to push through discussion of these massive data centers without adequate time for public comment, or time to assess their impacts appropriately.

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

1. Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
2. An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
3. A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
4. Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
5. Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
6. Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
7. Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
8. Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
9. A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Shaf Khan, 95138

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 3:09 PM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Evelyn Madden <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 3:08 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting  
Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

evelyn Madden, 95123

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

Evelyn Madden

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 3:27 PM  
**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Mitchell Fredrickson <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 3:16 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting  
Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Mitchell Fredrickson, 95112

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

Sent from my iPhone

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 3:27 PM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Nathan Flohr <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 3:25 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements

- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Nathan Flohr, 95133

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 3:56 PM  
**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Binh Tran <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 3:48 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting  
Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision-making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Binh Tran, 95132

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

Sent from my iPhone

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 4:17 PM  
**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Steven Pham <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 4:10 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting  
Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements

- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Steven Pham, 95127

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 4:44 PM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Rachelle <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 4:43 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements

- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Rachelle Kim, 95131

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 4:54 PM  
**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** MGA <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 4:52 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health

mandates

6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers

7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat

8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with 10% local-only hire and labor standards

9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Michael Armes, 95123

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Fri 4/17/2026 4:56 PM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Chetan Surpur <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Friday, April 17, 2026 4:55 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements

- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Chetan Surpur, 95119

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



Outlook

---

**Fw: Data center meeting**

---

**From** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Date** Mon 4/20/2026 12:14 PM**To** Rules and Open Government Committee Agendas <rulescommitteeagenda@sanjoseca.gov>**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Debra Houston [REDACTED]**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2026 11:52 AM**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>**Subject:** Data center meeting

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Council members,

My family has lived in San Jose for generations. Communities have the right to full transparency regarding any project proposed in their region. This includes the ability to determine when a project does not serve the public interest.

Tax abatements, and subsidies given to data centers, to attract them, divert resources from schools, housing and health care. We have to ask ourselves about the long term risk of data centers. I have seen the list of chemicals used in the AI data processing centers. Water, air, sound, and light pollution are all associated with these developments. When the AI bubble bursts, communities are left with abandoned or obsolete infrastructure that often leaves a toxic trail or poses a public health danger. Clean up and remediation costs fall on the taxpayers, not the corporation. The economic social and health costs are put on us. Many communities have seen this pattern before with warehouses, factories and fossil fuel sites. I am hoping you do not want this to be your legacy. I certainly do not want this for my grandchildren. Please don't contribute to the destruction of our natural environment, any more than it already has been. Thank you for your serious consideration into this matter.

Debra Houston  
[REDACTED]

I look forward to your response.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Date** Mon 4/20/2026 3:27 PM  
**To** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Serena Myjer <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2026 3:16 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello City Council-

My name is Serena Myjer I am a resident of district 6, a biologist, and a volunteer on the Santa Clara Valley Bird Alliance Environmental Action Committee.

Specifically, I want to talk about the impact to wildlife and the environment from the data centers.

The location of this potential data center, research station, business park is directly next to one of the last remaining populations for the western burrowing owls which have been nearly extirpated from the Bay Area by development of their habitat. Through the work of many partners and volunteers, including myself, we have supported this population from a low of 10 owls to now over 100. The council has demonstrated the importance of protecting wildlife and conserving Coyote Valley by co-locating the LS Power high voltage converter station directly on PG&E's existing Metcalf substation. However, this data center will directly endanger the owls and the successes that we have made in supporting and rehabilitating this population.

Also, Alviso is at sea level. According to [projections of sea level rise](#) for a high warming scenario, we will have 6.6 feet sea level rise by 2100, and this area will regularly flood. Our shoreline can either protect humans and habitat from rising seas and increased flooding, or it can be a polluting data center and strip mall. Local governments play a key role in protecting residents

4/20/26, 4:33 PM

Inbox - Agendadesk - Outlook

from risks to air and water quality. I ask that the San José City Council to pause any plans and invoke a moratorium on data centers until the full impacts on the environment, the community and San Jose ratepayers are fully disclosed.

Thanks- Serena

--

Serena Myjer

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Date** Mon 4/20/2026 8:19 AM  
**To** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Ingrid [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2026 5:57 AM  
**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Hello,

I am writing to let the City and most importantly City Council and the Mayor know that San Jose residents do not want data centers. Our energy bills are already high and many residents struggle from increased prices on food and really everything else. We don't need more polluting either.

There are plenty of news stories of communities with data centers, none seem to have anything positive about these facilities. Keep your residents safe more pollution, high energy prices and find something better to use our city resources that actually benefit the community and not greedy tech companies or one of the greediest companies known in our area as PG&E.

Thank You,

Ingrid Velásquez  
95126

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Date** Mon 4/20/2026 8:20 AM  
**To** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Krista <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 19, 2026 10:17 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

I am writing as a concerned citizen of San Jose regarding the Council and City's current plans and actions regarding data centers in our city.

I am extremely concerned about the lack of public engagement and outreach that has been conducted regarding this matter. The citizens of San Jose are stakeholders in this matter, and have been disregarded. This is not being "accountable."

I am also concerned with the wording of today's report indicating that enrollment for data centers into San Jose Clean Energy is optional. Wording around water usage also seems ambiguous, and there do not seem to be clear mandates for recycled water usage.

It seems ridiculous that the residents of San Jose continue to be told to conserve water and energy, and the City wants to just hand these valuable assets over to corporations for very little return in terms of employment for these same residents. Data Centers, once built, are not large employers. San Jose Clean Energy is actively promoting their Peak Rewards program to conserve electricity. San Jose Climate Smart wants residents to cut water usage by ANOTHER 30% by 2030. It would seem there is

not water and electricity to spare, yet the City wants to encourage the growth of businesses that use insane amounts of both.

Data center emissions information is not readily available, and also does not seem to be given the weight it deserves.

Growing the tax base should not be the only goal of the City and this Council. There is so much more to consider. For full accountability, which is touted so often, please do more to engage with the community.

Krista Hamby  
San Jose

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



---

**Fw: Item 3.4: Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report**

---

**From** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Date** Mon 4/20/2026 8:31 AM  
**To** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** brian darby <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 18, 2026 9:55 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4: Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

To the Honorable Mayor and City Council, April 21st 2026

I am writing to provide formal comment regarding the "Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report" (Item 3.4) scheduled for the April 21, 2026, City Council meeting. As a resident deeply invested in the long-term fiscal and environmental health of our community, I have closely reviewed the Administration's memorandum and the accompanying presentation. While I acknowledge the City's efforts to streamline infrastructure delivery, a rigorous cross-analysis of this status report against the concerns voiced by numerous community members reveals a significant disconnect between the City's "Infrastructure Readiness" narrative and the reality of resident anxieties.

### **Fiscal Sustainability and the Ratepayer Burden**

The City's report leans heavily on the potential for stable Utility User Tax revenue. While the projection of \$3M to \$6M in annual unrestricted revenue per project is presented as a net positive, the report fails to provide a comprehensive analysis of the long-term fiscal liabilities. The Administration correctly notes that "Rule 30" is intended to ensure developers fund the upfront costs of interconnection. However, as the memorandum admits, the CPUC has yet to issue a final ruling on cost allocation, interest, and rate recovery.

Until this ruling is finalized, the community remains rightfully concerned that "Type 4" transmission upgrades—those designated for system-wide capacity, reliability, and resiliency—may disproportionately lean on residential ratepayers rather than the large-load customers directly driving the need for these massive grid expansions. The community asks for a proactive commitment from this Council: that no systemic grid-hardening costs attributed to the data center pipeline be socialized onto residential utility bills.

### **The Transparency and Accountability Gap**

The memorandum touts a "structured, accountable framework" for advancing electrical infrastructure, citing biweekly coordination meetings between City staff and PG&E, and a quarterly performance scoring system. While these internal mechanisms are undoubtedly helpful for administrative efficiency, they remain a "black box" to the public.

Community members, through their correspondence, have expressed significant skepticism regarding the efficacy of these behind-the-scenes meetings. For "accountability" to be more than a rhetorical term, the City must invite the public into the process. I formally request that the City publish the raw metrics from these quarterly performance scores in an accessible, online dashboard. If the partnership is indeed meeting the milestones established in the Implementation Agreement, the City should have no hesitation in providing that data to the taxpayers who are, ultimately, underwriting the risks of these developments.

### **Cumulative Environmental Impacts**

The City's approach to environmental mitigation relies on project-by-project CEQA reviews. While this complies with the letter of the law, it fails to account for the cumulative impact of 34+ large-load energy projects operating in a relatively localized urban environment. The letters submitted by the public frequently touch on the "death by a thousand cuts" scenario: where individual projects appear environmentally manageable, but the aggregate load—including water usage, noise, and air pollution from backup generators—creates a permanent industrial impact on our neighborhoods.

Furthermore, the reliance on "recycled water" as a mitigation strategy is inherently risky given that such service is interruptible. If a project relies on recycled water and that supply is curtailed, we lack a clear public understanding of how these facilities will satisfy their water demand without drawing down our potable supply. A "status report" that claims environmental stewardship must provide more than a list of regulatory requirements; it must provide a model of the cumulative environmental baseline we are establishing for the next decade.

### **Recommendations for the City Council**

To ensure the trust of the community and the fiscal safety of our City, I respectfully urge the Council to consider the following actions prior to accepting this report:

- 1. Demand Data Transparency:** Require the City Manager's Office to publish the performance scores for the 12 projects currently under the Implementation Agreement, ensuring the public can verify the City's claim that PG&E is "on schedule".
- 2. Request a Cumulative Impact Study:** Commission an annual "Cumulative Infrastructure and Environmental Report" that moves beyond project-by-project analysis to assess the aggregate load, water consumption, and air quality impact of the entire 34-project pipeline.

**3. Formalize Ratepayer Protections:** Direct staff to draft a formal resolution or policy position explicitly stating the City's opposition to socializing "Type 4" grid-hardening costs onto residential ratepayers, to be presented to the CPUC as part of the ongoing Rule 30 proceedings.

San José has the potential to lead the digital economy without compromising the stability of our neighborhoods. However, this success must be built on a foundation of verifiable data and transparent governance, not just the promise of future revenue. I look forward to your leadership on this critical issue during the April 21st meeting.

Sincerely,

Brian Darby



This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Date** Mon 4/20/2026 8:32 AM  
**To** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Ian McCray <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 18, 2026 7:50 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Please consider the consequence of opening data centers that could cause an energy crisis in our city.

Respectfully  
Ian McCray

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Date** Mon 4/20/2026 8:36 AM  
**To** Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Suzanne Magno [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 18, 2026 9:53 AM  
**To:** City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Coucilmember Tordillos and the City Clerk Office,

I do not want even 1 data center in San Jose!

Data Centers will take over our clean water and power and will therefore increase costs. But more than that, I am VERY concerned also that it will have negative downstream effects that you have not properly researched nor communicated broadly.

I am very concerned that city council is not properly informed and is being gaslit by PGE or whoever else is in control of this deal.

I heard that these data centers don't actually use recycled water; a neighbor who works in tech with all the big gpu and cpu companies has stated: "The water gets contaminated, it's unavoidable, some of the channels that the water needs to run through are very very very small and even minimal build up will damage the AI racks so they need fresh water, every day, and a shit ton of it. An example from Google in Oregon, a lawsuit forced Google to reveal it was using over a quarter of a city's total water supply, despite claims of efficient cooling."

How can you let this happen to us?

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

Is this true??

A buildout of this scale requires public engagement proportionate to its impact. Are residents being treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway?

That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record.

Suzanne Magno, 95131

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

**Fw: A Response to Data Centers Coming to San Jose**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date** Mon 4/20/2026 4:59 PM  
**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Keenan Flagg <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2026 4:57 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** A Response to Data Centers Coming to San Jose

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

To all this matter may concern,

I am a life long resident of San Jose (District 2) and I am writing in to say that allowing data centers to be constructed within our city and the surrounding area would have a significant and detrimental impact on all of us, our way of life, and our children's lives for generations to come.

As I'm sure you're aware, AI data centers consume vast amounts of energy in the form of electricity and fresh water. This is a major concern. The electricity consumption alone is 10 to 50 times more than typical data centers and the liquid based cooling systems demand as much or more water than a small city. These factors have proven to dramatically increase CO2 emissions, E waste, and vast quantities of polluted water systems. This is not to mention the intense impact on local infrastructure in a city that is already struggling with population density and a on going housing crisis. This is not okay. The environmental cost of these facilities borders on catastrophic. And as a citizen of California I feel that these facilities do not align with the environmental standards of this state, not to mention this city.

I understand that San Jose (and Silicon Valley) takes pride in being an epicenter of technology and innovation but this does not mean that we have to allow these data centers to be built here. I won't

get into the efficacy of AI in general but these data centers have been proven to cause serious harm to the areas in which they are built and if we want San Jose to continue being the beacon of innovation that it is then we need to ensure that it remains a city in which people want to, and are able to, live. We are a city of over a million people. People from all over the world come here, they raise families, invest in our world class schools and universities, and contribute to the beautiful diversity that makes the Bay Area (and California) such a remarkable place.

I cannot stress enough how poisonous these data centers are. They are a short term investment with long term, generational consequences. We are blessed to live in an area with access to old growth redwood forests, pristine coastlines, and delicate baylands. And we would be sacrificing all this just for short term gains that would push our infrastructure beyond its breaking point. Not to mention that the increased power usage would almost certainly guarantee a more prolonged and dangerous fire season.

I implore you to please deny building permits to these data centers. The future of our city is at stake. I think I speak for everyone when I say that fresh water, blue skies, and verdant forests far outlay any possible benefit a data center might provide.

Yours in gratitude,  
Keenan Flagg

Resident of District 2, San Jose CA

sources for the environmental impact of data centers

<https://news.mit.edu/2025/explained-generative-ai-environmental-impact-0117>

[https://news.cornell.edu/stories/2025/11/roadmap-shows-environmental-impact-ai-data-center-boom#:~:text=The%20environmental%20impact%20of%20AI%20includes:%20\\*,tons%20of%20carbon%20dioxide%20into%20the%20atmosphere.](https://news.cornell.edu/stories/2025/11/roadmap-shows-environmental-impact-ai-data-center-boom#:~:text=The%20environmental%20impact%20of%20AI%20includes:%20*,tons%20of%20carbon%20dioxide%20into%20the%20atmosphere.)

<https://www.lincolnst.edu/publications/land-lines-magazine/articles/land-water-impacts-data-centers/>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 8:34 AM  
**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Yanelly De La Rosa <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2026 8:48 PM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

As a citizen who was born and raised in San Jose and who has fought to stay here even amidst rising costs, having our own city officials do this feels like a betrayal. I oppose the building of these data centers full heartedly for reasons I will explain below.

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center

projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review

- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Yanelly De La Rosa, 95116

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 8:34 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Rosemarie Grantham <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2026 8:51 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

I do not want your data centers in San Jose. We collectively know what happens to communities next to data centers. Their water gets polluted, the cost of utilities increases two to four times normal, and the air gets more small fine particles which directly influence lung and heart health outcomes. Isn't it enough that there are already 23 superfund sites in Santa Clara County from the computer chip making industry? You are literally trying to kill us by approving construction.

Rosemarie Grantham  
95129

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 8:35 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Azucena Molina <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2026 9:50 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

I am writing to express my concern regarding the data centers planned to be brought to our community. I am concerned for the future impact on air quality, water resources, noise levels, heat, and more. I implore City Council to listen to the residents of San Jose like myself who are asking to investigate this matter thoroughly and consider how it might harm our environment and health.

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

1. Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
2. An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
3. A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
4. Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
5. Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
6. Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
7. Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
8. Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
9. A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Azucena Molina, 95126

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 8:53 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Kohaku Sumida <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2026 11:25 PM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

As a young adult raised in the Bay Area, it feels really insulting to have my town deduced down to a slop factory. I, along with other residents, aren't comfortable with the idea of our beloved city, resources, and habitats ruined in order for AI to be advanced and available.

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

- 1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout
- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project by project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing

- hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Kohaku Sumida, 95125

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 8:54 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Alex Caraballo <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 12:14 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Councilmember Cohen and your council colleagues,

I am reaching out today in support of the continued strengthening of our grid and greater power generation for our City. The proposed Data Centers already planned for the City are necessary for the continued strengthening of our Economic and Power needs.

These projects provide 100's of family-sustaining waged careers for men and women across our city and county. San Jose is decades behind our neighboring cities when it comes to this infrastructure. It is imperative to the future of this city that we continue on our current trajectory of developing our city in being a leader in Data Center creation.

Projects like these create pathways for many of our residents to find sustainable middle-class careers. These opportunities are game changers to so many, and we must continue to fight to raise the standard of living for our residents for years to come.

We see City Services continuing to be cut. These projects, through the partnership with PG&E provides quality jobs at the city-level, but will also be a major economic boost to the city as a whole. This is increasingly more and more necessary, as we see the Federal and State government provide less and less to our community.

I am humbly asking you all to support this item.

In solidarity,

Alex Caraballo

Vice President, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers LU 332

San Jose resident, 95134

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 8:55 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Emma Hartung <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 12:27 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

RE: April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

San Jose residents including the Cerone tiny home residents set to live right around the corner from a data center deserve transparency and accountability with regards to major data center buildout decisions that impact the health of our families, communities and ecosystems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Sincerely,

Emma Hartung

San Jose, CA, 95128

**Fw: Data Centers, Item 3.4 Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 9:00 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Mylissa Malley <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 7:03 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Data Centers, Item 3.4 Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

REL April 21, 2026 City Council Meeting Agenda Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report

I am very concerned about the idea of adding more data centers to San Jose. I personally, am against adding any additional data centers. I do not believe the investment will pay out as AI is a bubble that will eventually burst and we cannot be trading resources and public health to maybe get a few years of economic growth.

Under the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy the City is obligated to center equity, accountability and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. Where are the public study sessions on the potential cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers to San Jose. For something of this scale, the Council must exercise due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At minimum, we need:

- Investigation on the cumulative impacts of ALL proposed data sites, not piece meal, one project at a time. Multiple projects means additional impact.

- Studies regarding air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- Legal assurances to water use, and water quality, including risks tied to closed loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing. We just had an ask for increase in water rates, I don't want to be paying more for water, to be subsidizing or supporting *data centers*. We are in a drought so often, we are under snowpack this year, how can we risk the amount of water that data centers require?
- What would be the penalties and enforcement measures, should these unwanted data centers be built, if they violate public health mandates. If they are proven dangerous for public health, are they immediately shut down? Where are the guarantees that public health comes first?
- Full and transparent public disclosures of projected energy demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers. Again, electricity is already high enough. Tax payers have been subsidizing PG&E and their mistakes for years. We deal with rolling blackouts already during hot months, and there will be more and more hot months as our climate continues to change. No energy for data centers before the public. Our power grid is already outdated, why would we be putting an additional stress on it?
- Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat. Also, how will these things not only affect the people of the community but our larger nature community. Will it hurt native species of flora and fauna. Why are we choosing to be guinea pigs when we don't know the long term costs?
- Framework that centers community benefits and enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth.

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that NO ADDITIONAL City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports? NO board or commission input is associated with this action? The entirety of the stated public outreach is the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21 meeting? That is NOT meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence, that we DON'T know the long term effects of.

This demands public engagements proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San Jose to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while RESIDENTS are treated as an afterthought, and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway! The imbalance is UNACCEPTABLE, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems. We have no long term data on this, and what we do have is exceedingly concerning.

Residents, homeowners, tax payers, like myself, deserve a dedicated public study session before San Jose takes even one step further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Mylissa Malley  
95125

Mylissa Malley  
she/her/hers  
**Actor | Teaching Artist**



This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 9:00 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Ellie S <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 7:05 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

The City has made it clear that they are making a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects.

What is concerning is that the memorandum from the City Manager's office makes it clear that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action and that there will be little to no public outreach when these projects will have enormous consequences.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Salas Sanchez

San Jose, CA, 95111

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 9:01 AM  
**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Ellina Yin <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 7:17 AM  
**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]>  
<[REDACTED]> District3 <[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]>  
<[REDACTED]> District 6 <[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]>  
<[REDACTED]> District9 <[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

Dear Council,

I grew up in San José and I loved it and I do have fond memories of the technology embedded in alongside the many orchards that surround my childhood home. My entire family spent as much time in the Fry's Electronics off Brokaw as we did in the library. My mother worked in tech and my father taught himself and us how to build computers from scratch.

I share all this to say that this isn't about being against technology, about advancement, etc. this is about preserving the quality of life I had growing up. Additionally, we are no longer living in the carefree and limitless expansion of the 2000s. Everything is changing and with it the way we approach responsible development in our city.

There are several different types of Artificial Intelligence, ones that are less resource intense, internal AI's, small language models, (I'd call this the cotton/linen of AI) etc. but the ones being shoved down our throats, Generative AI (and their terrible data centers) I would liken to polyester and the invention of plastic—at first needed no where, then everywhere including in our own bodies—and like this

billion dollar industry did not come running to save us from microplastics, neither will this billion dollar ai/data center industry come back for reparations when our environment is destroyed, when children are sick, and when the bubble busts.

It would behoove the Council to take the time to better understand what it is you are rushing to build and truly for whom?

852 people give or take have signed the following petition:

San José City Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online, including impacts on air quality, water, noise, and heat. The public has a right to transparency, accountability, and a meaningful opportunity to understand how development at this scale could affect community health, neighborhood conditions, and long term quality of life.

I hope that today you remember that your oath to office was to our constitution (see section 608), and the people. NOT private utility, NOT private equity, NOT data center developers.

Your San Jose Resident - Ellina Yin, District 6

PS- THANK YOU to the entire City Clerk team, I know that was a lot of letters. As my librarians of the cities I deeply appreciate the work you do for our city.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 9:06 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Tracy Knox <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 8:07 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. Learn more <<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>]

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

No data centers in San Jose!

Sent from my iPhone

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 9:08 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Kristin McFarlane White <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 8:50 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Item 3.4 Data Centers and PG&E Partnership Status Report – Public Comment

[**External Email.** Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Data Centers are NOT what San Jose needs.

They are devastating to the environment, and do not provide any additional jobs and take up several square city blocks. Gross!!

36 sites that will consume upwards of 2,000 megawatts! Thats enough power for 1.2 million homes.

How could you not consult with the public?!

Measure I was approved by voters in 2022 to transform public decision making. Under Charter Section 608 [1] and the Equity Values and Standards Council Policy [2] the City is obligated to center equity, accountability, and meaningful community engagement in its decisions. To date there have been no public study sessions on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online in San José. For a buildout of this scale and consequence, Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts.

At a minimum, the City must address the following:

1 Robust public outreach proportionate to the scale of this historic buildout

- 2 An independent cumulative impacts analysis covering all proposed and anticipated data center projects, rather than fragmented project-by-project review
- 3 A comprehensive study of air pollution from all backup power sources, fuel types, annual testing hours, outage scenarios, and emergency operating assumptions with clear mitigation requirements
- 4 Legal assurances regarding water quality and water use, including risks tied to closed-loop system blowdowns, failures, and backup water sourcing
- 5 Clear penalties, enforcement mechanisms, and accountability for violations of public health mandates
- 6 Full public disclosure of projected electricity demand, transmission and distribution upgrades, and any long-term cost risks to ratepayers
- 7 Baseline and ongoing public health monitoring for nearby communities, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and heat
- 8 Concrete job guarantees for permanent jobs, with local hire and labor standards
- 9 A community benefits framework with enforceable public accountability, not vague promises of economic growth

The memorandum from the City Manager's office makes clear that the City is advancing a historic buildout tied to 2,000 MW of new regional transmission capacity and a growing pipeline of large-load projects. At the same time, it states that no additional City Council follow-up is expected beyond annual status reports, that no board or commission input is associated with this action, and that the entirety of the stated public outreach is that the memorandum will be posted on the City Council agenda website for the April 21, 2026 meeting. That is not meaningful public outreach for an item of enormous consequence.

A buildout of this scale demands public engagement proportionate to its impact. It is not enough to market San José to industry, hold press events, attend conferences, and meet with more than 50 potential developers while residents are treated as an afterthought and receive only an agenda posting after key frameworks are already underway. That imbalance is unacceptable, especially for infrastructure and land use decisions with potentially long-term consequences for public health, environmental quality, neighborhood conditions, and utility systems.

Residents deserve a dedicated public study session before San José moves further down a path that could lock in major pollution and public health burdens. If the City believes its safeguards are sufficient, then those claims should withstand public scrutiny, independent analysis, and questioning on the record. Anything less would fail both the spirit of Measure I and the public the Council is sworn to serve.

**NO MORE DATA CENTERS IN SAN JOSE!!**

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Kristin McFarlane White, 95123

---

[1] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/95973/638574336991130000>

[2] <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/114681/638627814182829342>

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

---

**Fw: Joint Letter Regarding April 21 City Council Agenda Item 3.4**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 8:31 AM  
**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

 1 attachment (333 KB)  
Joint Letter to San Jose regarding April 21 City Council Agenda Item 3.4.pdf;

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**  
200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Main: 408-535-1260  
Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Dashiell Leeds <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 20, 2026 5:34 PM  
**To:** The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <[REDACTED]> District1 <[REDACTED]> District2 <[REDACTED]>  
<[REDACTED]> District3 <[REDACTED]> District4 <[REDACTED]> District5 <[REDACTED]>  
<[REDACTED]> District 6 <[REDACTED]> District7 <[REDACTED]> District8 <[REDACTED]>  
<[REDACTED]> District9 <[REDACTED]> District 10 <[REDACTED]> City Clerk <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Alice Kaufman <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]> Zekun Li <[REDACTED]> James Eggers <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Joint Letter Regarding April 21 City Council Agenda Item 3.4

[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]

To Mayor Mahan, Vice Mayor Foley, and San José City Councilmembers,

The Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter, Santa Clara Valley Bird Alliance, Green Foothills, Mothers Out Front Silicon Valley, and Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action are local organizations working to promote sustainability, healthy communities, and open space and habitat in the south Bay Area. In this letter, we ask the City to pause processing all data center proposals and related planning efforts until robust, equitable, and inclusive community outreach has been completed.

Please read the attached letter for our full comments.

Sincerely,

Dashiell Leeds  
Conservation Coordinator  
Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

Alice Kaufman  
Policy and Advocacy Director  
Green Foothills

Shani Kleinhaus  
Environmental Advocate  
Santa Clara Valley Bird Alliance

Shruti Gopinathan  
Leadership Team Member  
Mothers Out Front Silicon Valley

Anika K.  
Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action  
San Jose Youth Climate Action Team

Daphne Zhu  
Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action  
San Jose Youth Climate Action Team

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



April 20, 2026

Via email to: San José City Council

Joint Letter Regarding April 21 City Council Agenda Item 3.4

To Mayor Mahan, Vice Mayor Foley, and San José City Councilmembers,

The Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter, Santa Clara Valley Bird Alliance, Green Foothills, Mothers Out Front Silicon Valley, and Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action are local organizations working to promote sustainability, healthy communities, and open space and habitat in the south Bay Area. In this letter, we ask the City to pause processing all data center proposals and related planning efforts until robust, equitable, and inclusive community outreach has been completed.

San José residents have a right to full transparency about all data centers currently in San José's development pipeline. Communities deserve both cumulative and site-specific analysis of the health, financial and environmental impacts and risks of these 34 data centers. Furthermore, data centers and all associated support infrastructures that are to be located on public land are of concern, such as the centers planned north of Hwy 237.

We ask the City to conduct proactive and extensive multilingual community outreach in each neighborhood where a data center is proposed or planned. This outreach should include clear, accessible information and disclosure of the environmental, public health, and financial risks that data centers pose to our communities, to ratepayers, and our ecosystems. We ask the City to pause processing all data center proposals and related planning efforts until robust, equitable, and inclusive community outreach is completed. This pause is necessary to ensure that community feedback can meaningfully inform City decisions.

It is the City's responsibility to ensure that residents have a real opportunity to shape decisions that affect them. Relying on City Council meetings and study sessions is not sufficient because these forums are often inaccessible to working people due to scheduling constraints and no opportunities for remote public comments. The City thus has an obligation to proactively go directly into our communities to seek feedback and consent before planning and approving data center plans. The City Council must also conduct a thorough CEQA process for each

proposed project whether it is required by state regulations or not, and commit to adequate mitigation of any environmental or health harm.

Data center development also needs to be considered in the context of San José's climate goals. The proliferation of new data centers in order to power the current AI boom threatens to send fossil fuel production and resultant greenhouse gas emissions skyrocketing. Google's greenhouse gas emissions [increased nearly 50% between 2019 and 2024](#), because, according to the [Associated Press](#), "Google cited artificial intelligence and the demand it puts on data centers, which require massive amounts of electricity," for this increase. See also [Microsoft's emissions soar by 30%: Why is it building more data centres and what is their impact?](#)

Please do not proceed with data center planning as a foregone conclusion. The City must commit to transparency and a process that allows communities to be fully informed, to meaningfully shape outcomes, and to reject projects that pose unacceptable risks. San José's communities deserve the right to be informed, and they deserve the right to say no to data centers.

Sincerely,

Dashiell Leeds  
Conservation Coordinator  
Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

Alice Kaufman  
Policy and Advocacy Director  
Green Foothills

Shani Kleinhaus  
Environmental Advocate  
Santa Clara Valley Bird Alliance

Shruti Gopinathan  
Leadership Team Member  
Mothers Out Front Silicon Valley

Anika K.  
Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action  
San Jose Youth Climate Action Team

Daphne Zhu  
Silicon Valley Youth Climate Action  
San Jose Youth Climate Action Team

**Fw: Petition: Cumulative Public Health Study Request**

---

**From** City Clerk <[REDACTED]>

**Date** Tue 4/21/2026 9:05 AM

**To** Agendadesk <[REDACTED]>

 1 attachment (686 KB)

Public Health Study Petition 04 21 26.pdf;

**Office of the City Clerk | City of San José**

200 E. Santa Clara St., Tower 14<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

Main: 408-535-1260

Fax: 408-292-6207

How is our service? Your [feedback](#) is appreciated!

---

**From:** Ellina Yin <[REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 21, 2026 7:54 AM

**To:** City Clerk <[REDACTED]> Taber, Toni <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Petition: Cumulative Public Health Study Request

**[External Email. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources. [Learn more](#)]**

Hi Toni/City Clerk Team:

I am formally submitting this petition for Cumulative Public Health Study on Data Centers. Please see attached. It can be attached to Item 3.4 of today but I am unsure of the process, as it's also not specifically tied to an agenda item but the San Jose's Data Center Development plan as a whole.

Your advice and guidance would be appreciated.

With Gratitude,  
Ellina Yin

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

<b>Petition Organizer:</b>	Ellina Yin
<b>Date Submitted:</b>	April 21, 2026
<b>Contact:</b>	[REDACTED]

We the undersign formally request and petition the City Council for San José:

“San José City Council must exercise proper due diligence by holding a public study session on the cumulative public health impacts of bringing this many data centers online, including impacts on air quality, water, noise, and heat. The public has a right to transparency, accountability, and a meaningful opportunity to understand how development at this scale could affect community health, neighborhood conditions, and long-term quality of life.”

#	first_name	last_name	zip	email	petition
1	Jolene	Barnett	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 18:44:38.261087+00
2	Chase	Duran	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 01:24:52.116+00
3	Ema	Ibarra	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 17:33:38.041+00
4	Liah	Partain	77339	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 13:29:28.382+00
5	Petra	Wengler	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 22:08:12.341+00
6	Amanda	Navarro	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:34:07.307029+00
7	Gerard	Velcelean	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:01:53.611195+00
8	Monica	Silva	95131	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 20:15:43.214493+00
9	paola	juarez	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 02:23:19.295+00
10	Janette	Dass	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:31:20.401702+00
11	Claudia	Cruz	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:49:19.918644+00
12	Shari	Dalal	92782	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 03:51:19.626+00
13	Omar	Vargas	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:06:15.647+00
14	Alex	pena	92807	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:32:31.567+00
15	Laura	Wilson	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 13:04:35.772+00
16	Jeanelle	Hull	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 01:49:45.395+00
17	Arabela	Espinoza	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:36:58.848782+00
18	Swathi	A	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:06:34.135+00
19	Anna	Bechen	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:23:22.388+00
20	Ryan	Nguy	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:39:45.294884+00
21	Socorro	Montaño	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 05:13:26.89111+00
22	Susan	McVey	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 16:41:19.443+00
23	Marina	Gavric	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:30:42.253146+00
24	Anne Marie	Ruiz	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 20:47:09.06+00
25	Esther	Chi	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 17:32:15.53+00
26	Claudia	Medina	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 18:20:04.929583+00
27	Magaly	Toscano	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 05:46:06.468+00
28	Monika	Czajkowska	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:17:06.55+00
29	Tianna	Tran	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:09:41.353912+00

30	Jean	Jennett	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 18:52:00.013+00
31	Jelena	Cheyiam	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 22:58:25.861+00
32	SAMANTHA	JONES	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 11:35:37.737+00
33	Mona	Wang	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:37:36.759+00
34	Elizabeth	Meier	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:26:22.88861+00
35	Melissa	Encinas	91740	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 04:21:09.654+00
36	stephanie	kraemer	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 01:53:10.403+00
37	Kathy	Chu	95131	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 00:01:19.871+00
38	Stephen	Whalen	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:34:10.376672+00
39	Emily	Scroggs	94610	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 13:50:32.448+00
40	Miguel	P	94306	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 06:50:06.826+00
41	Crystal	Wakamiya	95014	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:12:00.827+00
42	Barbara	Wilkie	95008	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 03:01:54.71+00
43	Gregg	Aronica	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 23:00:06.431+00
44	Tatiana	Gupta	94563	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 05:28:54.127+00
45	Chester	Peterson	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:26:28.30264+00
46	Kaitlyn	Howden	90504	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:27:06.47134+00
47	Daniel	Rios	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 13:19:12.439+00
48	Heather	Peters	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:52:45.227+00
49	Athena	Chan	95134	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 14:31:03.801+00
50	Vanhue	Huynh	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 08:33:26.872835+00
51	Paola	Sanchez	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:36:46.25008+00
52	Yolanda	Gramza	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 14:40:23.973+00
53	Michelle	Boire	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:36:02.802607+00
54	Pierce	McInturff	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:29:10.369266+00
55	Jimena	Gomez	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:27:10.141+00
56	Tyler	Morgan	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:18:32.877+00
57	Aydrian	Drewery	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:45:35.994335+00
58	vanessa	ochoa	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:24:15.278284+00
59	Michelle	Chambers	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 19:41:55.001+00
60	Kevin	Mckinnon	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:24:12.015439+00
61	Lindsey	Mangan	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:41:43.693598+00
62	Jennifer	Wright	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:13:57.460281+00
63	Robbi	Stovall	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 17:39:25.59+00
64	Halle	Weingarten	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:45:23.107+00
65	Rylee	Blechman	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:49:52.689+00
66	Changho	Choi	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:09:42.418338+00
67	Sarah	Nguyen	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:07:31.485+00
68	Ivan	Flores	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:40:00.344+00

69	Karen	Mettler	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:07:26.091+00
70	Blanca	Soto	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 21:29:49.865544+00
71	Gloria	Manso	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 19:48:24.74+00
72	Jake	West	95117	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:50:45.97566+00
73	Danae	Griffin	94541	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:58:47.497958+00
74	Anna	Smith	94611	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 10:56:24.015+00
75	Arpitha	Ravishankar	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 12:12:04.885+00
76	Michelle	Alcantar	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:49:05.549014+00
77	Joel	mjolsness	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 16:00:05.798+00
78	Lillian	Clegg	90701	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 07:16:33.84+00
79	Mia	Thompson	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 02:37:58.114605+00
80	Kyle	Campbell	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 08:38:00.411+00
81	Jordan	Cassell	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 18:25:32.357+00
82	Marylou	Cardosa	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 23:32:07.725+00
83	Tamar	Sasson	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:31:05.159+00
84	Karen	Nguyen	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 00:33:43.49+00
85	Hannah	McElroy	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:50:16.904+00
86	Carrie	Pizzo	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 23:06:13.093+00
87	Pamela	Sandoval	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 03:55:29.274+00
88	Kathryn	Sinon	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 20:58:09.045+00
89	Matthew	Hollenbeck	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 05:14:14.428+00
90	Eduardo	Luciano Venancio	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 20:40:19.881+00
91	Julisa	Garcia	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 00:54:30.177+00
92	Kayleigh	Alvarado	92071	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 06:12:02.964+00
93	Evelyn	Beas	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:39:34.52+00
94	Michelle	Siller	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:47:29.149534+00
95	Sandra	Chincarini	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:56:42.577+00
96	Emma	Swinnen	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:42:35.903+00
97	Marcela	Guerrero	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:30:30.700769+00
98	Patty	Edgerton	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:04:30.544724+00
99	Virginia	Guttenbeil	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:31:38.951+00
100	Thanh	Bui	95117	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 06:32:49.734+00
101	Fatima	Panes	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:26:00.135224+00
102	Jacqueline	Rivera	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 02:14:26.008191+00
103	Hong	Jiang	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:32:12.504+00
104	Jazmin	Alcantar	93635	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:11:39.810311+00
105	Steven	Pham	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 23:09:37.382+00
106	Varun	Haldiya	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 23:58:19.705+00
107	Sean	Niemann	95033	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 04:24:49.001+00

108	Nancy	Maynard	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:14:26.786248+00
109	Maria	Jaime	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:49:13.929602+00
110	Raul	Dimas	95062	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:26:27.97121+00
111	Delia	Perez	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:48:33.058039+00
112	Ellina	Yin	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 02:31:49.0195+00
113	Melelatai	Guttenbeil	95113	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 20:40:12.76961+00
114	Mary	McLeod	95129	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:12:58.422114+00
115	Jayne	Lee	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 18:28:36.568+00
116	Stacy	Laughlin	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:04:15.15+00
117	Kayla	Shattuck	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 00:01:58.225+00
118	Michael	Wittig	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 01:08:40.071+00
119	Elizabeth	Agramont-Justiniano	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 06:00:38.51929+00
120	Jason	Hackett	38125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 05:38:20.095+00
121	Isabelle	Su	95131	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 22:13:29.493+00
122	Glady	Lee	95129	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 05:27:42.476+00
123	Angie	Guatemala	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:14:01.33495+00
124	Harsha	Gorti	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:23:30.850881+00
125	Ryo	Wakabayashi	95117	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:03:16.852772+00
126	Tatiana	V C	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 05:31:24.886611+00
127	Vanessa	Nguyen	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:58:22.508137+00
128	Richard	Hobbs	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 20:14:07.417+00
129	Sai	R	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:38:55.323+00
130	Norbert	Phan	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:48:08.517908+00
131	Vivian	Nguyen	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 16:48:57.81+00
132	Prisila	Mena	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 04:53:26.281+00
133	Italy	Vargas	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 20:37:11.461+00
134	Lisa	Dodge	95054	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 20:29:08.23+00
135	Elvira	Mendoza	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 13:48:59.65+00
136	Alexis	Woo	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:49:07.335654+00
137	Louise	Just	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 13:53:17.401+00
138	Luca	Grisendi	42122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 13:10:10.517+00
139	Michael	Armes	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 23:49:47.204+00
140	Sylvia	Trejo	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:17:53.46353+00
141	Jason	Chen	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 17:57:19.294+00
142	David	Michalicek	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:54:18.454262+00
143	Kinan	Cardenas	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 07:50:39.161+00
144	Kevin	Huang	95131	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:56:52.411039+00
145	Leon	Coahran	95003	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:10:39.6+00
146	Elizabeth	Munoz	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 17:05:58.232022+00

147	Blanca	Fajardo	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 14:45:55.248+00
148	Richard	hoffman	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 21:56:16.978+00
149	dal	b	33196	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 08:01:07.746+00
150	Julia	Fiola	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 08:48:51.883+00
151	Avalon	Hatfield	95829	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 14:48:54.5+00
152	G.	Bardel	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 00:44:59.542+00
153	Kim	Nguyen	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:09:54.600577+00
154	Moses	Guarneros	94544	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:38:15.627+00
155	Angelica	Rangel	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 20:55:21.470049+00
156	Ivette	Deltoro	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:07:04.061783+00
157	Hector	Guardado	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:10:06.584694+00
158	Diane	Liang	95008	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 18:56:43.172+00
159	Evelyn	Park-Doob	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:31:29.137929+00
160	Tiffanh	Nguyen	95616	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 02:39:35.467+00
161	Mayeann	Acosta	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 04:48:17.705791+00
162	Shelle	Thomas	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 01:17:37.398+00
163	Brenda	Arreola	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 05:17:27.653+00
164	Mitchell	Fredrickson	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 22:14:55.834+00
165	Valaree	Cech	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:06:37.68156+00
166	Elizabeth	Medina-Alvarez	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 22:45:32.354+00
167	Shazia	Raza	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:16:55.392+00
168	Janette	Wong	95117	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:40:25.236992+00
169	Kate	Wilkins	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:45:31.815+00
170	Divya	Pari	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:55:06.57451+00
171	Katie	Barrow	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:07:24.177598+00
172	Leslie	Fisk	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 11:10:57.085+00
173	Andrea	Lamperti	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 04:49:51.723+00
174	Erin	McLoughlin	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 18:36:54.255+00
175	Ari	Perez	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:10:44.640584+00
176	Katherine	Carranza	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 18:11:42.542699+00
177	Kevin	Leonard	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 02:43:28.23+00
178	Nicole	Fernandez	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:51:40.939668+00
179	Yong Nan	Choi	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:05:07.200096+00
180	Carey	Lloyd	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 15:46:47.043+00
181	Rita	Baldwin	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:34:18.54398+00
182	Shalini	Mukherjee	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 11:56:56.844+00
183	Stephanie	Ngo	95051	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 14:11:21.189+00
184	Ariella	Honesto	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:38:20.008+00
185	Diane	Larrea	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:24:24.877515+00

186	Jenny	Gargarita	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:53:26.93+00
187	Karis	Ryu	6511	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 21:20:25.578+00
188	Beti	Magana	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:16:04.429567+00
189	Danielle	Hollenbeck	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 04:46:27.823+00
190	Jannassa	Do	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 04:04:55.038+00
191	Lillian	Ji	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 10:01:30.427+00
192	Laine	Schlezinger	94703	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:13:31.120686+00
193	Chris	Valencia	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:58:00.342762+00
194	Michelle	H	95129	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 10:35:04.303+00
195	Isis	Banks David	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 17:14:24.083+00
196	Marilyn	Dion	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 22:51:33.714+00
197	Estela	Lozano	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 15:08:49.46556+00
198	Daisy	Vargas	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:32:43.643+00
199	Gloria	Tello	95008	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 17:01:48.755865+00
200	Kristen	Wachter	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:42:17.195+00
201	Raquel	Martinez	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:53:52.039944+00
202	Anika	Knowles	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:05:59.819535+00
203	Sun	Liu	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:45:22.194415+00
204	Anusha	R	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 23:29:03.594+00
205	Cynthia	HERRERA	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 22:03:10.484+00
206	Robyn	Riedstra	95008	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 16:48:58.842+00
207	S	P	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:55:43.513+00
208	Aaron	Genovia	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 04:09:35.801+00
209	Nicolete	Noto	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 06:10:54.879+00
210	Christa	Stone	94928	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:19:52.751409+00
211	Vanda	McCauley	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 05:30:49.199+00
212	DAVID	Poeschel	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 01:08:21.406+00
213	Arlene	Biala	94086	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 20:03:15.747+00
214	Iszac	Gaton	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 14:08:44.677+00
215	Desiree	Seusy	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 19:50:40.721+00
216	Gary	Dundon	7866	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 10:09:50.641+00
217	Vanda	McCauley	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 07:48:24.293+00
218	Anna	Gomes	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 04:04:05.999+00
219	Erika Lalaine	Carls	94544	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:49:24.854738+00
220	Aaron	Grayson	94608	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:01:31.972+00
221	Kathleen A	Lechner	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 01:26:43.398+00
222	Wai	Leung	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:18:39.150817+00
223	Guillermo	Arenas	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:39:00.336+00
224	Akhila	R	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:29:39.304801+00

225	henry	sim	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 14:54:21.18+00
226	Charles	Carroll	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 23:45:43.173+00
227	Rylie	Switkes	95117	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 22:11:58.304+00
228	Trang	Le	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:20:57.452+00
229	Swathi	Nambiar	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 05:03:54.077+00
230	Emily	Munoz	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:53:40.562+00
231	Ivonne	Millan	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 06:20:45.451+00
232	Miranda	Duran	94015	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 08:14:07.119+00
233	Alexandra	Velazquez	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 02:21:41.663+00
234	Christina	Fiscalini	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 14:51:52.978+00
235	Tina	Verduzco	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 00:30:36.305+00
236	Carolyn	Ngo-Bell	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:13:53.164819+00
237	Helen	Beaton Grover	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:23:41.973+00
238	Loreliz	Jacinto	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:53:06.333+00
239	Kikei	Wong	90501	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 19:54:04.285+00
240	Tiffanie	Tran	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:26:34.883818+00
241	Mark	Schroeder	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:32:14.216799+00
242	Katja	Irvin	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:34:38.427165+00
243	Patricia	Segarini	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:12:24.229+00
244	Linda	Ross	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 06:34:15.725+00
245	Kathy	Tran	95117	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:51:36.417134+00
246	george	vargas	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 20:35:33.376+00
247	Steven	Blechman	95008	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:50:01.933+00
248	Carl	Valencia	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 08:14:14.575+00
249	Georgette	Baumgartner	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 05:53:25.331805+00
250	Paty	murillo	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:04:04.326795+00
251	Helen	Martinez	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 00:58:42.762+00
252	Michelle	Wan	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:17:40.262834+00
253	Aqua	Ma	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:23:54.388946+00
254	Ari	Elovson	94022	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 13:21:11.627+00
255	Claire	Bokor	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 14:03:46.737+00
256	Peggy	Ozuna	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:11:58.67845+00
257	Vivian	Frobish	54911	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 00:35:01.884+00
258	HOLly	Shen	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:31:02.327391+00
259	Nicole	Vidmar	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:40:09.06832+00
260	Aubrey	Wilson	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 02:39:56.507+00
261	Yajaira	Pulido	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:24:48.473+00
262	Sebastian	Rivera	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:46:19.852+00
263	Anh	Vu	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 01:41:50.441+00

264	Tiffany	Cleveland-Lopes	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:17:42.077+00
265	Claudia	Francisco	95008	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 04:23:13.253+00
266	Adrian	Olivo	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:23:46.897264+00
267	Christine	Le	94040	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 11:14:33.177+00
268	Briana	Fujiii	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:34:55.651227+00
269	Madison	Rubia	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 23:52:54.781+00
270	Diana	Nguyen	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:05:00.079397+00
271	STEFAN	GUTH	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:42:22.670177+00
272	Kristen	Masukawa	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 20:29:31.668+00
273	Cheyenne	Reilly	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 09:47:42.987+00
274	Cristian	Pearson	95130	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 00:42:45.498+00
275	Jennifer	Ellies	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:48:10.992+00
276	Yvonne	Woodworth	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 02:29:06.782+00
277	Cynthia	Boman	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:38:51.354504+00
278	Jasmine	Zamora Salas	95407	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:29:38.179476+00
279	Kenia	Carreon	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:03:29.453656+00
280	Nicole	Bang	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:44:15.717425+00
281	Betsy	Rael	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 16:21:45.684+00
282	Debra	Houston	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:24:23.712+00
283	Kira	Sedayao	95054	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 06:55:16.556+00
284	Mars	Lahann	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 07:31:55.757905+00
285	Heather	Hanson	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:22:09.737+00
286	Ernest	Gargas	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 05:02:06.39+00
287	Liz	Contreras	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:44:35.512056+00
288	Lace	Lancaster	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 08:22:58.155+00
289	Bhuvana	Betini	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:17:48.071895+00
290	Marci	Thurston	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 14:49:50.276+00
291	Victoria	Lopez	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:04:07.390483+00
292	Mariah	Anderson	95130	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 00:41:51.744+00
293	Leslie	Alvarez	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:25:42.823+00
294	andrea	villegas	95131	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:20:10.615+00
295	Shreya	Vasanth Kumar	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 18:20:32.36594+00
296	Angelina	Twist	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 02:31:14.161397+00
297	Arnold	Wikey	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 20:45:25.094+00
298	Julie	Whittington	94087	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 01:46:10.068+00
299	Ellis	Shahin	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 04:32:16.441+00
300	Andrea	DeLeon	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:06:51.874+00
301	Julia	Shah	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 02:07:48.56+00
302	Alyne	Hazard	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:20:25.125+00

303	Preston	McPeak	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 16:33:35.076+00
304	Swathi	R	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:33:42.044+00
305	Cheri	K	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:42:35.366298+00
306	Kasturi	Malaviya	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:14:56.084+00
307	Marjorie	Siegel	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:50:12.03383+00
308	Magnolia	Morris	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 23:21:48.947+00
309	Matthew	Medina-Alvarez	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 23:12:11.195+00
310	Mel	Aberin	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:27:27.108474+00
311	Christina	Deras	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:36:30.841+00
312	Myrna	Mungal	95014	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 21:36:01.26+00
313	Dai	Luong	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 02:52:28.884+00
314	Valery	Gonzalez	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:11:23.38+00
315	Jennifer	Braun	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:40:03.776+00
316	Martin	Martinez	90804	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 06:07:03.951+00
317	Sherry	Wells	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:43:38.491787+00
318	Joanna	Acevedo	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:26:03.202001+00
319	Stephanie	Barajas	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:37:13.809077+00
320	Audrey	Wang	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 13:54:22.717+00
321	Emily	Anderson	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 05:13:52.733+00
322	Viridiana	Romero	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 05:32:10.818078+00
323	Fred	Liang	94025	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:37:55.517988+00
324	Paritosh	Malaviya	94024	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 01:18:09.186+00
325	Kyle Aaron	Papas	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 17:10:23.57+00
326	Janine	Nguyen	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:27:01.603+00
327	Katie	Mariucci	95130	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 00:27:58.644+00
328	Gina	Montarano	94116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:29:35.479857+00
329	sofia	berberis	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 03:01:14.243+00
330	Jillian	Harrell	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 06:08:20.46+00
331	Barry	Weingarten	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:46:05.855+00
332	Ethan	Maruyama	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:10:19.106+00
333	Malyne	Hazard	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 04:28:29.353+00
334	Alyssa	Wigant	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:03:51.775112+00
335	Laurie	Alaimo	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:10:35.765622+00
336	Zachary	Zachau	95113	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:21:19.426018+00
337	Esperanza	Cobian	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:15:11.846597+00
338	Jessica	Gutierrez	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 04:57:55.949154+00
339	Aster	Lech	90007	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 07:17:45.476+00
340	Kimiko	Ramirez	91204	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:41:53.856+00
341	JAZMIN	ROSILLO	94806	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:33:52.336+00

342	Lindsay	Silva	95046	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:07:25.524981+00
343	Evangeline	Reynolds	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 06:54:31.529+00
344	Rafael	Baez	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:56:44.031726+00
345	Valecita	Taylor	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:28:23.595458+00
346	Kimberly	Saxton-Heinrichs	95008	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 05:17:02.134+00
347	Jennifer	Johanson	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 01:40:24.626+00
348	Ash	S	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 02:47:08.802+00
349	Matt	King	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 15:50:17.030993+00
350	Iori	McQuiddy	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:26:31.764963+00
351	Amber	Hale	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 23:07:49.17+00
352	Jessica	Kwong	95130	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:06:19.029896+00
353	Jaimey	Misajon	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:23:35.368+00
354	Celeste	Meneses	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 17:39:03.798798+00
355	John	Rowe	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 05:52:54.529185+00
356	Sage	Zeltser	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 01:11:59.414+00
357	Makkenah	Dottai	95816	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:48:27.572+00
358	Annie	Abundiz	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:29:20.29715+00
359	Marduke	Yousefpor	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:48:57.468141+00
360	Loretta	Brackett	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:47:05.192+00
361	Gerald	Grayson	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:06:18.633+00
362	Suzanne	Magno	95131	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 16:22:19.352+00
363	Kathie	Wright	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:54:14.51794+00
364	Lynda	Munoz	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:04:45.11+00
365	Sandra	Rowe	95130	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 01:08:09.968+00
366	Thomas	Fortunak	94587	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:41:57.943+00
367	Azucena	Molina	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:31:26.322+00
368	Kenneth	Nguyen	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 04:30:25.855+00
369	Kaylin	Potgieter	95002	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 15:12:02.811+00
370	Shaf	Khan	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 21:59:23.878+00
371	Cassandra	Valentin	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:44:26.680845+00
372	Ganeev	Dhaliwal	95050	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 04:50:36.337+00
373	Devon	McNaughton	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:04:33.862009+00
374	Michelle	Tran	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 06:13:46.149+00
375	Andrea	Luna	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:09:45.769039+00
376	Hemily	A	95076	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 06:23:05.072+00
377	Fernando	Cruz-Esparza	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 00:01:47.533+00
378	Jason	Switkes	95117	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 19:29:02.298+00
379	Kara	Schlindwein	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 23:01:37.47+00
380	Maria	pimentel	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 07:15:12.62+00

381	Mandy	Zavala	95117	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 16:06:22.403+00
382	Sarah	MacInnes	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 05:33:37.543+00
383	SHAN	Pannu	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 08:01:12.198+00
384	Eve	Gamero	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:50:35.147239+00
385	Elsa	Wang	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 04:52:05.252478+00
386	Kaitlin	Milliken	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 14:40:13.296+00
387	Deborah	Jamison	95014	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 22:50:38.658+00
388	Patrina	Rodan	95835	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 05:35:46.063+00
389	Charlene	Carter	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:41:46.05+00
390	Isabelle	E	95014	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 19:58:10.469+00
391	GEORGE	CIMINO	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 13:21:24.43+00
392	Bobby	Patel	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:22:57.207+00
393	Aymie	Dang	95134	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:49:45.873566+00
394	Lana	Gomez	95129	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:26:55.824893+00
395	Rose	N	94709	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 05:09:27.34+00
396	Ganga	Pradeep	97003	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:21:09.002+00
397	Cherry	Buds	94509	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 13:05:36.338+00
398	Darlene	Vossbrinck	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 14:38:24.07+00
399	Catherine	Terry	95051	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:38:24.48871+00
400	Deven	Mendoza	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:33:46.564328+00
401	Keiana	Andino	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 20:47:28.716+00
402	Sreenivas	Andra	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:59:46.794736+00
403	Texie	Darnell	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:19:10.466+00
404	Amy	Chang	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:25:23.429+00
405	Julie	Tran	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:02:14.414+00
406	Trung	Vinh	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:15:13.623352+00
407	Patricia	Rolland	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 01:11:55.062+00
408	Ruby	Melgoza	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 16:37:02.258+00
409	Jaimie	Imanil	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:20:15.841184+00
410	Noah	cruz hernandez	95014	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 20:34:39.859+00
411	Beverly	Phillips	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 15:51:57.376+00
412	Michelle	Amador	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 17:27:33.75449+00
413	Kathleen	Allen	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 06:14:00.977+00
414	Juliet	Hamak	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 00:37:02.102+00
415	Tiffany	Lam	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:01:39.347+00
416	Marguerite	Cardinal	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:14:01.685+00
417	Danny	Martin	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:01:55.56+00
418	Jazzy	Garcia	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 06:10:42.466+00
419	Elise	Tavella	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 01:56:24.885+00

420	Dianna	Diaz	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:18:27.992822+00
421	Karie	Fraleay	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 19:08:18.929979+00
422	Keenan	Flagg	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 00:05:08.658+00
423	Hannah	Yamanishi	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:04:02.325+00
424	Andy	Ha	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 21:29:35.45+00
425	Key	Atticus	91501	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 15:01:02.547+00
426	Briana	Pimentel	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 06:13:51.831+00
427	Holly	Barr	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:06:26.811+00
428	Kristi	Lynden	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 23:29:55.687+00
429	Stephanie	Haney	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:52:39.89+00
430	Delilah	Roa	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 15:36:35.749688+00
431	Emilia	Bobst	95020	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 21:59:04.455029+00
432	Silas	Jones	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:12:23.574+00
433	Mary	Massar	95843	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:14:29.334+00
434	Jacinda	Santos	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:02:43.411413+00
435	Rosa	Ortiz	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:31:37.137729+00
436	Justin	Robinson	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:25:21.464887+00
437	Mary	Redigan	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 09:21:01.302+00
438	Lilliana	Aguirre	95825	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 08:29:22.466+00
439	Mica	Vo	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:40:48.739452+00
440	Mateo	Rodriguez-Deal	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:12:16.809+00
441	Shalmali	Rajadhyax	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 14:56:10.965+00
442	Ketaki	Malaviya	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 13:26:44.679+00
443	Bernadette	Gasga gasga	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:56:23.959121+00
444	Angela	Perteet	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:26:16.186+00
445	Emma	Tao	95014	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:23:01.82+00
446	Angela	Aiosa	95008	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 17:17:14.292662+00
447	Michele	Quanz	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 13:49:52.872+00
448	Christine	Mitchell	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:57:03.083+00
449	Jacob	Pliego	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 21:20:28.263+00
450	Carole	Paquette Myjak	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 18:24:14.431+00
451	Angela	Mendoza Dorantes	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 01:31:32.948+00
452	Noelle	Andrade	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:41:14.451137+00
453	elizabeth	schroeder	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 16:18:10.483+00
454	Florence	Anderson	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:28:11.143236+00
455	Kaitlyn	Holland	91605	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 10:56:42.085+00
456	Sheri	Rozario	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 15:31:17.648+00
457	Antonio	Mendoza	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:00:12.236275+00
458	Priti	Desai	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 04:52:10.107+00

459	Valeria	Lopez	94580	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:35:43.283+00
460	John	Rodney	91607	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:40:22.311+00
461	Mary	Webb	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:57:10.322394+00
462	Angelica	Rangel	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:40:08.744715+00
463	Sarah	Scullion	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 00:19:33.982+00
464	Krista	Hamby	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 15:06:09.069969+00
465	Renae	McCollum	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 19:27:33.383349+00
466	Kimberly	Pollock	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:04:30.023982+00
467	Terra	Standish	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 14:16:15.619+00
468	Jayleen	Li	94110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:35:24.8806+00
469	Adrienne	Krawetz	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:49:14.163+00
470	Julio	Perez	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:54:35.967085+00
471	Ashley	Overhouse	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 01:57:07.071+00
472	Mary	Bravo	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:40:08.681487+00
473	Sheela	Saini	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 02:19:34.119+00
474	Ambika	N	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 05:40:05.59+00
475	Luis	Bustamante	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 20:14:59.597+00
476	Fang	Dai	95131	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:24:31.444196+00
477	Sachin	Bhargava	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 06:10:15.244+00
478	Khyati	Gupta	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 02:57:45.884+00
479	Mitchell	Eberly	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 17:16:27.853+00
480	Chetan	Surpur	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 23:54:56.989+00
481	Sara	Chen	94566	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 18:36:07.691+00
482	Prasanna	Seshadri	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 06:47:59.268+00
483	Pamela	Leonard	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 14:01:17.779+00
484	Medha	Vashi	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:41:13.333886+00
485	Nikolas	Sanchez	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 21:30:34.934+00
486	Melissa	Le-Lewis	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:29:43.574538+00
487	Ekaterina	Efimova	95113	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 13:28:10.611601+00
488	Daron	Story	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:30:56.751+00
489	Binh	Tran	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 22:47:19.594+00
490	Claudine	Belulia	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 05:38:57.06+00
491	Karen	Herr	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:30:55.911714+00
492	Rebecca	Eliscu	94025	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 00:07:54.941+00
493	Elaine	Chen	95129	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:40:00.831084+00
494	Sergio	Trejo	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:15:07.247+00
495	maximiliano	flores	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 19:53:53.524+00
496	Praneetha	Potiny	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 02:23:29.060652+00
497	Lizzie	Miller	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:56:31.768365+00

498	Mailé	Lazarin	60610	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 19:43:16.253695+00
499	Humberto	Brito	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:49:49.229978+00
500	Anu	S	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:21:01.543562+00
501	Stacey	Kellogg	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 18:29:56.981+00
502	Conner	Holsopple	13210	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 12:39:51.061+00
503	Veronica	Leon	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:21:01.985+00
504	Susan	Chang	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 07:28:45.942178+00
505	Romina	Karim	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 16:01:01.026+00
506	Jonathan	Lee	95616	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:27:42.618+00
507	Kayla	Cuvelier	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 14:21:35.425+00
508	Carrie	Maietta	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:17:47.203+00
509	evelyn	Madden	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 22:08:02.51+00
510	Franklin	Lee	95129	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:57:51.01909+00
511	Krista	Woodward	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 04:23:51.894+00
512	Karen	Keith	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:34:42.386875+00
513	Charlotte	Wilkie	95051	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:09:24.830944+00
514	Kylie	Borges	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:26:53.447854+00
515	Charlotte	Dickson	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:28:39.22+00
516	Caity	Tucker	4106	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 00:46:25.285+00
517	roberto	uribe	95050	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:36:06.68711+00
518	Devanshi	Mehta	94536	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:52:14.310884+00
519	J	Pierce	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 01:01:32.395+00
520	Sasha	Klamm	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:02:37.586044+00
521	Maria	Charron	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:29:19.056469+00
522	Barbara	Gallaty	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:19:52.430519+00
523	Cera	Renault	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 18:36:33.2+00
524	Vir	Grewal	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 13:00:46.251887+00
525	Annmarie	Truong	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 11:21:55.512+00
526	Rose	Jaquez	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 16:59:10.505+00
527	Delmy	Reyes	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 20:17:26.284+00
528	Stephanie	Chung	95050	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:25:27.247476+00
529	Jane	Tu	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:55:20.38+00
530	Carrie	Walton	95032	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 08:14:45.648+00
531	Colin	Gong	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:06:36.833156+00
532	Pedro	Arenas	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:39:06.929752+00
533	Ivan	Axelson	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 06:05:58.976+00
534	Jade	Frank	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 13:35:51.717+00
535	Jennifer	LaBreche	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 15:16:06.824467+00
536	Lusi	Wang	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 17:27:35.023+00

537	Susi	Baillif	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:59:53.339+00
538	Andy	Nguyen	94901	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 02:39:56.846+00
539	Lisa	Grisalin	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:22:52.246384+00
540	Susan	Nguyen	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:51:57.805975+00
541	Robert	Chin	94087	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:21:52.209+00
542	NICHOLLE	MORECI	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 16:51:30.3+00
543	Patricia	Tran	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:36:11.122071+00
544	Carrie	Genise	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 10:52:50.256+00
545	Nina	Chuang	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 02:40:34.712+00
546	Erika	Lawson	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:34:07.885732+00
547	Sherly	Mathew	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 13:51:34.287+00
548	Anthony	Cortez	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:08:31.759949+00
549	Uriah	Wilkins	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 01:41:11.039+00
550	Carlos	Ortiz	95050	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:27:52.139+00
551	Kristie	Nguyen	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 20:45:46.367623+00
552	Kaory	Santillan	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:34:29.577952+00
553	Berk	Harmandar	7100	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 05:47:41.803+00
554	Sneha	Chandrakanth	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:04:30.839699+00
555	Leyla	Carleo	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:24:44.951172+00
556	Jesssica	Smith	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 13:42:05.089+00
557	Rebecca	Tannous	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:57:14.658+00
558	Anthony	Martinez	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 21:15:48.873+00
559	Jordan	Moldow	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 17:09:13.62754+00
560	Caitlin	McElroy	95073	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 13:13:10.376+00
561	Erin	Adkins	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:48:38.787+00
562	Ben	Cornelius	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 13:34:24.350866+00
563	Brynn	Angelo	95666	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:25:52.633496+00
564	Amy	Heintz	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 22:41:15.949+00
565	Chad	Treece	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:29:01.294+00
566	Paul	Dennig	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 03:50:25.038+00
567	Marcy	Powers	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:14:11.122309+00
568	Icess	Prieto	92507	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:21:12.06034+00
569	Lori	Schultz Range	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 16:59:32.863+00
570	Michele	Mashburn	95134	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 02:10:32.412+00
571	Ana	Manrique de Sevilla	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 00:43:56.446+00
572	Berta	Wiebe	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:32:53.347+00
573	Shawna	Lai	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:08:48.076+00
574	Ingrid	Velasquez	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 12:47:14.708+00
575	Kohaku	Sumida	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 06:21:38.434+00

576	Amy	Tran	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 17:42:54.877+00
577	Ariel	Nadratowski	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 20:52:18.461+00
578	Leslie	Gill	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 02:59:15.01+00
579	Anne	Nguyen	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 17:49:44.476+00
580	Emily	Hendon	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 13:45:54.006+00
581	Alexander	Elsorady	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:32:54.915499+00
582	Jennifer	Hirsch	95014	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:01:43.897191+00
583	Jo Ann	Gallo	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:45:51.606+00
584	Mariaa	H	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 15:06:35.088+00
585	Sophia	Mahoney-Rohrl	94002	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:55:10.979496+00
586	Jacqueline	Whistler	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:17:31.699311+00
587	Andrea	Auduong	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 16:07:47.132+00
588	Aditya	Parige	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 18:27:30.526474+00
589	Raji	Malaviya	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:30:08.748+00
590	Athena	Genise	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:00:12.497668+00
591	Malavvika	Kulashekar	95032	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:53:42.628+00
592	jayssielisa	haynes	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:31:43.376801+00
593	Justin	Sinn	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:37:11.260977+00
594	asher	brenner	94954	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:39:08.715+00
595	Jerrie	Au	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 11:38:42.332+00
596	Serina	Murillo	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 15:00:48.23+00
597	Luz	Santos	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:49:43.429+00
598	Darra	Velasco	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 04:23:42.163+00
599	Dj	Sullivan	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 21:27:54.16+00
600	Katelyn	Ho	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 06:24:37.749+00
601	Susan	Minor	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:21:02.434846+00
602	Samantha	Wilairat	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:49:21.003+00
603	maya	changaran	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 14:37:16.283+00
604	Charron	Myers	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:05:25.079343+00
605	Jiro	Claveria	95054	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:03:26.862133+00
606	Elizabeth	Salas Sanchez	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 08:07:26.25+00
607	Wayne J	Gramza	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 14:40:47.629+00
608	Leah	Phipps	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:55:44.231+00
609	Trang	Chu	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:12:16.86661+00
610	Emily	Engle	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 05:03:37.538239+00
611	Natasha	Rossi	95014	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:20:13.525+00
612	Lucia	Romero	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 21:30:04.895083+00
613	Jasper	Ho	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:59:19.442227+00
614	Noel	Morrill	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:57:57.596061+00

615	Vanessa	Palafox	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 23:36:17.298+00
616	chiara	seim	95008	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 06:38:27.409+00
617	Kimberly	Kay	95008	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 02:13:15.868+00
618	Reva	Raul	94566	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 05:28:28.794923+00
619	Finch	Banning	1473	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 14:00:28.518+00
620	Lydia	McClure	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:12:33.219481+00
621	singi	tan	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:36:25.63731+00
622	Alison	Peters	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 13:45:06.47+00
623	Jennifer	Ahn	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 14:38:48.288044+00
624	Melissa	Lauzon	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:23:27.083+00
625	Robert	Brackett	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:49:12.808+00
626	gloria	gloria	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 19:49:47.263+00
627	Donna	Hamane	94089	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:48:39.769612+00
628	Rachael	Chamberlain	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:35:48.356539+00
629	Traci	Monroe Valdez	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 14:26:06.042+00
630	Maira	Ramos	95131	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:52:50.666593+00
631	Veronica	Tapia	95129	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:38:23.844206+00
632	Sara	Quijada	94025	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 20:35:40.714+00
633	Arturo	Bravo	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:40:48.567507+00
634	Jennifer	Slattery	95130	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:48:36.29+00
635	peng	ng	95002	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 15:27:53.218+00
636	Suzi	Hough	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:14:31.26+00
637	Meghan	Wandrocke	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:25:49.154+00
638	Danny	Le	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:52:50.908837+00
639	sreekanth	ramani	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 18:38:00.571+00
640	Roberto	Flores	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 21:48:33.089+00
641	stacey	winters	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 08:54:15.132+00
642	Ezikio	Serna	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 20:57:19.788+00
643	Kaleigh	Kailani	91302	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:48:07.76+00
644	Dana	Padilla	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 21:06:40.861+00
645	Aanchal	Malaviya	94551	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 01:25:23.435+00
646	Althea Elaine	Jaug	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:51:02.75886+00
647	Sarita	Starks	94587	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 14:23:14.326+00
648	James	A	92831	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:40:58.598554+00
649	Jenn	Ramage	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:54:30.403+00
650	Steven	Fleming	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 09:22:59.787+00
651	Mallikarjun	Murag	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 14:57:10.865+00
652	Kapil	Kumar	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 19:23:31.679+00
653	Breanna	Hamm	94612	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 02:18:12.509957+00

654	Barbara	Lindsay	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:06:34.203+00
655	Lucy	Moctezuma	95130	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:57:00.722+00
656	Dublin	Paxman	95032	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:52:04.232+00
657	Bridget	Nixon	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 17:35:10.807+00
658	Hanh	Nguyen	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 18:09:15.839+00
659	Anna	Fox	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 04:59:41.39+00
660	Victor	Estrada	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 13:45:28.130795+00
661	Bernardita	Palavecino-Prado	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 05:21:27.93068+00
662	Sarah	Steiner	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 13:29:09.297+00
663	Emma	Hartung	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:23:27.693+00
664	Frank	Cantu	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:34:40.517+00
665	Grace	Frahm	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 21:14:41.131+00
666	Elizabeth	Cacciaroni	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:06:01.365004+00
667	Rachelle	Kim	95131	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 23:41:18.804+00
668	Carolan	Dosik	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:35:20.805+00
669	Millie	Del carmen	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:52:00.146376+00
670	Espy	acevedo	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:40:24.812352+00
671	Lisa	Ascarie	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 18:31:54.127874+00
672	Kieran	Alcumbrac	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 14:15:27.332+00
673	Ernest	Gonzales	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 14:21:14.051+00
674	Hannah	McCleney	30066	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:30:15.995+00
675	Luz	Zamora	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:58:19.076378+00
676	MC	Mendonca	94539	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 04:45:26.695497+00
677	Kaylee	Homer	95033	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:30:55.922+00
678	Constance	Button	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:30:33.356518+00
679	Cathy	Weselby	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 14:16:28.688+00
680	Daniele	McCollum	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 00:01:24.365+00
681	Vanessa	Pena Morales	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 09:04:52.468+00
682	Ella	Sawyer	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:02:38.456334+00
683	Michael	Gallo	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 17:33:21.63+00
684	Valeria	Castaneda	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:35:46.508725+00
685	Kenya	Bautista	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:34:38.009171+00
686	Kasandra	StegerDattilo	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:08:46.707+00
687	Joyce	Miller	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:29:47.324211+00
688	Ellie	Powell	71030	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 09:38:16.742+00
689	Lauren	McDermott	91304	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:56:48.729+00
690	Michelle	Wan	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:19:30.19506+00
691	Yanelly	De La Rosa	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:17:01.353+00
692	Alyssarhay	Graciano	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:04:34.474001+00

693	Ronald	Nealy	94086	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 14:09:43.625+00
694	Karen	Correa Meza	95403	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 02:38:43.513+00
695	Marek	Pearse	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 23:41:09.676+00
696	Olivia	Lai	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 17:57:38.143+00
697	Elva	Carrillo	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:24:51.809684+00
698	Teresa	Ponikvar	95128	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:43:15.966917+00
699	Amy	Chen	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:47:32.091+00
700	Dylan	Perez	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 03:53:37.315723+00
701	Casey	Kennedy	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 23:36:13.415+00
702	Karen	Lynn	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 15:26:47.031388+00
703	Shanti	Nagwani	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 22:59:53.89335+00
704	John	Callan	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 16:32:29.817+00
705	Aureen	Chowdhury	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:35:55.928728+00
706	Isabella	Jaravata	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 06:00:43.49044+00
707	Steven	Schulz	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 08:32:11.189635+00
708	Pattijean	Blackmore	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:46:15.557+00
709	Emily	Moncada	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:06:05.375+00
710	Jennifer	Ma	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:35:42.234073+00
711	David	Madrigal	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 17:40:21.215+00
712	Esther	Ketvirtis	94521	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:06:10.474+00
713	Cynthia	Huynh	95376	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 00:21:19.236976+00
714	Michelle	Berg	95117	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:15:48.754+00
715	Soomin	Song	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 18:26:10.017+00
716	Monique	Serrano	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:33:56.122826+00
717	Felipe	Romero	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 21:29:22.625055+00
718	Kimber	Davis	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 20:31:11.952+00
719	Colleen	Ha	95822	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 07:44:38.228+00
720	Tammi	Chan	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 21:10:40.903+00
721	M.	Newton	94530	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 05:40:53.374+00
722	K	T	94127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 03:38:50.562+00
723	Kaitlin	Miller	94566	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 18:23:44.29117+00
724	Hana	Tello	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 18:56:58.119438+00
725	Kathleen A	Lechner	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 01:16:49.901+00
726	Amy	Guzules	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:29:25.906772+00
727	Lisa	Gee	95123	<a href="#">koenigindeseises-</a> [REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:50:56.472+00
728	Aixa	Ortiz	95064	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:16:04.255+00
729	Red	Sharma	94086	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 04:18:39.311+00
730	Emily	Krayn	94070	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 04:16:40.436+00
731	Andrew	Siegler	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 00:54:26.477078+00

732	Elizabeth	Snavely	94015	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 03:35:14.909+00
733	Kathleen	Carvalho	95051	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 12:35:54.242+00
734	SORIN	FLOREA	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:03:22.804544+00
735	Jay	Di	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:56:32.788703+00
736	isabel	ortiz	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:07:07.089403+00
737	Veronica	Romero	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 05:12:48.214+00
738	A.	Chou	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 05:22:32.788+00
739	André	Bonnand	75005	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 10:59:24.037+00
740	Kate	Everhardt	94086	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 05:38:14.538+00
741	Michael	Boyce	95051	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 12:06:58.379086+00
742	Wesley	Zhan	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 09:10:28.533+00
743	Vanessa	Ramirez	95113	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 04:43:49.979466+00
744	LORETTE	KENNEY	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 18:56:01.115+00
745	Monica	Colby	98843	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:13:35.078+00
746	Jenny	Huynh	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:35:19.317+00
747	Elaine	Johnson	33602	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 10:56:14.298+00
748	Courtney	Connors	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:11:42.71+00
749	Mallory	von Kugelgen	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 13:12:31.574+00
750	Dena	Handel	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 21:16:15.318+00
751	Mia	Choate	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:16:20.702647+00
752	Sabrina	Watts	95113	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 00:52:28.928+00
753	Danielle	Pulido	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 21:59:03.447773+00
754	Sharlotte	Omoletski	94085	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:17:31.059+00
755	Jen	Herchenroeder	95054	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 20:08:54.968+00
756	Emily	Liu-Elizabeth	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:50:12.244+00
757	Alyssa	Miller-Vance	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 06:21:33.667+00
758	meryl	imperial	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:17:05.681691+00
759	Meredith	Pelrine	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:26:57.62615+00
760	RANDY	HOUSTON	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:40:28.341+00
761	Jasma	Sh	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:41:31.524431+00
762	Ellen	Emerson	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 20:49:29.403+00
763	Emily	Legaspi	94552	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 06:01:12.829+00
764	Nic	Peacock	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:23:29.718596+00
765	Emily	Vanuy	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 16:48:54.592+00
766	AMELIA	Bueno	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:42:44.326+00
767	Rebecca	Ododa	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:29:16.012+00
768	David	Acevedo	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 20:50:54.446538+00
769	ALEXANDRA	FLOREA	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:03:36.903751+00
770	Jax	Peled	95117	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 02:28:51.919+00

771	Isaac	Blouin	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 04:24:29.794+00
772	Ben	Gunion	95110	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:15:21.087+00
773	DIANA	ZUBAC	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:03:55.365761+00
774	Lake	Reyes Cabral	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 14:00:35.158+00
775	Geri	Wittig	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 01:04:42.623+00
776	Nghi	Tran	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 07:50:43.463+00
777	Tiffany	C.	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 07:53:41.788+00
778	June	Zhao	95014	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 13:25:13.463+00
779	Allegra	Watson	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 00:13:11.848+00
780	Caroline	Nguyen	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 06:32:32.216+00
781	Elizabeth	Franco-Lee	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 03:41:34.119+00
782	Kathryn	Hedges	95062	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:31:54.073+00
783	artemio	vega	95012	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 17:29:40.118548+00
784	Cenobio	Perez	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 21:30:19.166166+00
785	Alicia	Ruiz	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 20:44:37.416+00
786	Christine	Francis	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 09:49:33.294+00
787	Monica	Bajwa	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 19:14:21.434761+00
788	Veronica	Castellon	95050	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 22:34:27.902+00
789	Maylea	Saito	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:49:58.724987+00
790	Jemina	Cheyiam	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 22:20:26.821+00
791	Alexander	Noffsinger	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:07:04.017+00
792	Ravi	Sood	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 01:29:20.371+00
793	Kelly	Learn	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 05:18:21.102+00
794	Thao	Pham	94080	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 06:31:49.273+00
795	Shailla	Chand	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 20:53:02.864+00
796	Merlin	Ling	95035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 07:26:11.163+00
797	Gladys	Tran	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 20:02:55.749266+00
798	Alyssa	Villa	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 15:55:24.548954+00
799	Chen	Jiang	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 19:37:28.653155+00
800	Serena	Mahan	95127	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 23:07:06.705+00
801	Ashley	Harer	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 14:08:41.359+00
802	Tiffany	Howard	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 22:18:34.915+00
803	Janine	Briones	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 22:12:49.938+00
804	Julie	Sanchez	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 05:14:26.295+00
805	Andrew	Kleidon	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 20:57:22.59+00
806	Guadalupe	Marquez	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:21:59.223525+00
807	Aleks	Plaza	95014	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:33:19.911802+00
808	Lillian	Homer	95033	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:51:29.124+00
809	Zeina	Maria	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 12:11:02.713+00

810	Jacob	Bielski	60035	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 05:25:51.1+00
811	Nicole	Buchwald	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:50:27.465+00
812	Jessica	Punzalan	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 01:33:57.817064+00
813	Diane	Huffman	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 13:33:33.190944+00
814	John	Thomas	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 15:43:37.036+00
815	Karina	Barron	95133	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:45:13.532207+00
816	Artemisa	Bobst	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 20:56:33.781049+00
817	Annette	Boyer	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 02:22:08.109+00
818	Marybelle	Uk	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 14:54:08.256+00
819	Tachiya	Bryant	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 21:48:48.242685+00
820	Mary	Garcia	95111	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 20:52:41.398+00
821	J	Burchinal	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 01:36:21.558+00
822	Monica	Siller	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:59:08.903081+00
823	carol	christensen	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 11:12:37.167+00
824	Zoe	Escorza	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 13:21:46.581+00
825	Leti	James	94040	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 16:02:40.015+00
826	Priscilla Nox	Ngo	95148	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:30:33.630576+00
827	Elisondo	Alcantar	95129	[REDACTED]	2026-04-15 23:32:46.995487+00
828	Francisco	Alvarez	95037	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 20:54:30.612578+00
829	Katja	Irvin	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 06:00:53.214+00
830	Mariza	Villegas	95112	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 04:15:19.262+00
831	Cynthia	Toscano	95122	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 16:30:44.184924+00
832	Viridiana	Rodriguez	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 17:38:37.577+00
833	Ashish	Keshan	95014	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 13:30:49.559+00
834	Yolanda	Rossey	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 21:30:34.982+00
835	Priscilla	Rich	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 01:10:45.171+00
836	Tomas	Y	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:49:18.633826+00
837	Preston	Eberly	95119	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 17:22:17.092+00
838	Mariel	Hall	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 01:10:45.59564+00
839	Chris	Strangio	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 00:55:25.455+00
840	Fariha	Abedin	95051	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 04:50:17.38+00
841	Raul	Garcia	95116	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 07:24:15.294+00
842	Jessica	Embrey	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 13:42:27.292+00
843	Lisa	W	95129	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 06:40:01.191+00
844	Hanh	Nguyen	95125	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 18:21:23.403+00
845	Dana	Lee	95138	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 16:16:34.888+00
846	Lindsay	Cimoli	95135	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 02:37:13.61869+00
847	Martha	Trejo	95121	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 03:42:56.191621+00
848	Ashutosh	Malaviya	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 00:04:15.34+00

849	Huan	Pham	95136	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 19:20:24.997+00
850	Mai-Ling	LeChen	95050	[REDACTED]	2026-04-18 00:55:41.57+00
851	Michelle	Wellington	95120	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 00:29:13.766+00
852	Rene	Duan	95123	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 22:49:51.576231+00
853	Irina	Guseva	95124	[REDACTED]	2026-04-19 22:52:55.813+00
854	Alaura Ann	Trujillo	93210	[REDACTED]	2026-04-21 03:24:46.787+00
855	Lizzet	FLORES	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 06:16:02.859+00
856	William	Salgado	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 20:52:55.949+00
857	Melissa	Estrada	95132	[REDACTED]	2026-04-17 08:16:03.603+00
858	Jenna	Marvet	95126	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 04:11:53.61064+00
859	Pankuri	Sundra	95118	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 12:59:08.24218+00
860	meredith	leonard	95139	[REDACTED]	2026-04-20 12:53:44.337+00
861	Gordon	Cheung	95131	[REDACTED]	2026-04-16 23:02:53.29398+00