



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Complete this form if you are appealing an **Administrative Decision** to City Planning Commission.

Appellant Contact Information

Name of Appellant

Phone Number

Address (Include City, State, ZIP)

Email

Project Information

Project Name

Site Address (TSN if not yet addressed)

Type of Application Being Appealed

All File Numbers Associated with the Application

No hearing occurred

Project Planner's Name

Hearing Date

Item Number on Agenda

Appellant Authorization

The signature(s) below certifies that I (we) is(are) the authorized appellant and that the information provided on this form is in all respects true and accurate to the best of my (our) knowledge and belief. I(we) familiarized myself(ourselves) with the rules, regulations and procedures with respect to preparing and filing this petition. I agree that if this request is approved, it is issued on the representations made in this submittal, and any approval or subsequently issued building permit(s) or other type of permit(s) may be revoked without notice if there is a breach of representations or conditions of approval.

Samantha Shay Allen

Signature of Appellant

Date



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Appeal Submittal Should Include:

All Items Are Required

- ☐ Completed Appeal Form (this document).
- ☐ Evidence of "Affected Party" Status – check the box below and provide justification for the chosen box.
- ☐ Notice of Appeal (see requirements on page 3 of this document).
- ☐ \$176 check payable to the City of Colorado Springs.

Submit all 4 items above to into the Accela review system - <https://aca-prod.accela.com/COSPRINGS/Default.aspx>.

Appeals are accepted for 10 days after a decision has been made. Submittals must be received no later than 5pm MST on the due date of the appeal. Incomplete submittals and / or submittals received after 5pm or outside of the 10-day window will not be accepted. If the due date for the submittal falls on a weekend or federal holiday, the deadline is extended to the following business day at 5 pm MST.

If you need additional assistance with this application, please call the Land Use Review front desk at (719) 385-5905.

Affected Party Status

Please indicate, per UDC Subsection 7.5.415.A(1)(a) (Right to Appeal), which of the definitions of "Affected Party" that applies to the Appellant.

- ☐ (1) The applicant for the decision being appealed;
- ☐ (2) The owner or tenant of a lot or parcel of land located within one thousand (1,000) feet of the subject lot; or
- ☐ (3) Any owner or tenant of a lot or parcel of land located within three (3) miles of the subject property who has preserved standing by:
 - ☐ (a) Testifying at the public hearing on the application;
 - ☐ (b) Submitting written comments prior to the public hearing on the application; or
 - ☐ (c) In the case of applications approved by the Manager or an administrative official, submitting written comments to the Manager or administrative official during the comment period before the Manager or administrative official's action.



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Notice of Appeal

The Notice of Appeal Shall State:

- (1) The specific provision(s) of this UDC that is the basis of the appeal;
- (2) Which of the following criteria for reversal or modification of the decision is applicable to the appeal:
 - (a) The decision is contrary to the express language of this UDC;
 - (b) The decision is erroneous; or
 - (c) The decision is clearly contrary to law; and
- (3) Describe how the criteria for the relevant application have or have not been met.

FORMAL APPEAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL

Project Taurus Development Plan Modification

Appellant: Samantha Shay Allen

Address: 1005 Panorama Drive, Colorado Springs, CO 80904

Email / Phone: 512-696-4527

Project Name: Project Taurus Data Center Development

Project Location: 1565 High Tech Way, Colorado Springs, Colorado

Date of Filing: 06/22/26

1. STATEMENT OF APPEAL AND STANDING

I, Samantha Allen, submit this formal appeal of the administrative approval issued for the Project Taurus Development Plan Modification pursuant to the Colorado Springs Unified Development Code ("UDC").

I reside in close proximity to the proposed development and am materially and directly affected by the project's potential impacts, including utility demand, infrastructure requirements, water-resource allocation, noise, and long-term impacts on public utilities and surrounding properties.

This appeal is submitted within the time permitted for appeal of an administrative decision.

Address:

1005 Panorama Drive, Colorado Springs, CO 80904

Evidence of standing:

Please see the submitted documentation. A PDF of my driver's license that demonstrates residence within the affected area and an email correspondence to Daniel Sexton on May 12, 2026 demonstrating prior participation in the review process.

2. DECISION BEING APPEALED

This appeal challenges the administrative approval of the Project Taurus Development Plan Modification approved under UDC §7.5.516, including but not limited to whether the administrative record adequately supports the findings required under UDC §7.5.516.D, particularly the finding that the approved project:

"Does not create more adverse impacts on surrounding properties than the development approval or permit proposed to be modified."

3. GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

A. The Record Does Not Adequately Support the Finding Required by UDC §7.5.516.D.1(c)

UDC §7.5.516.D.1(c) requires a finding that the proposed modification:

"Does not create more adverse impacts on surrounding properties than the development approval or permit proposed to be modified."

The City's approval memorandum focuses extensively on noise, lighting, screening, landscaping, and visual impacts. However, the administrative record does not appear to contain a comparable analysis of the project's utility demand, electrical infrastructure requirements, generation needs, transmission requirements, or cumulative utility impacts.

This omission is significant because the document submitted by the applicant entitled "1615 Garden of The Gods – Power Overview and Approach" describes a substantially more intensive use than is discussed in the City's findings.

Specifically, the applicant's utility-planning materials state:

- The project will require "as much power as Colorado Springs Utilities and other potential sources of generation can supply";
- AI customers will not gradually ramp into power consumption, therefore the data center will transition rapidly into full production use;
- The project is designed to use all available electrical capacity;
- The site may ultimately be developed to support up to 300 MW of Critical Power and approximately 420 MW of Gross Power;
- The project may require additional natural-gas generation capacity, potentially including new generation facilities.

Despite these statements, the approval memorandum contains no meaningful analysis of the impacts associated with such utility demand and does not explain how the City concluded that the project would not create more adverse impacts than the prior approved industrial development.

While the applicant's stated potential buildout of up to 300 MW Critical Power and approximately 420 MW Gross Power may not appear as a formal development limitation or operational commitment within the approved Development Plan itself, the applicant's own internal utility-planning documents repeatedly describe a facility intended to utilize the maximum electrical capacity available and contemplate expansion to those levels. As such, these statements constitute relevant evidence regarding the reasonably foreseeable scale of operations and should not be disregarded when evaluating whether the administrative record adequately supports the findings required under UDC §7.5.516.D, particularly the determination that the project will not create greater adverse impacts than the development approval being modified.

Accordingly, the finding required under UDC §7.5.516.D.1(c) is not adequately supported by the record.

B. Incomplete Analysis of Utility Infrastructure and Electrical Demand

The City acknowledges that public concerns included energy demand and utility costs. However, the approval memorandum does not identify:

- The electrical demand assumed by the City when evaluating the application;
- Whether the City evaluated the project at approximately 50 MW, 72 MW, 100 MW, 300 MW, or some other level of demand;
- Whether existing infrastructure is sufficient to support the anticipated load;
- Whether additional substations, transmission upgrades, or generation resources are required;
- How any required utility improvements will be funded, assigned, or sequenced.

Instead, the approval memorandum notes that certain utility issues identified by Colorado Springs Utilities will be addressed during subsequent construction review.

Given the scale of electrical demand described by the applicant, utility infrastructure is not merely a construction-detail issue. It is central to determining whether the project creates greater impacts than the prior approved development.

The record therefore does not appear to contain sufficient analysis to support the City's findings regarding project impacts.

C. Incomplete Analysis of Water Demand and Resource Impacts

The City acknowledges that water use and regional scarcity were among the primary public concerns raised during the review process but did not adequately address it.

The record quantifies the initial system fill but does not quantify the project's long-term water requirements including maintenance replenishment needs or future water demand at full buildout. Therefore, the record does not provide a complete basis for evaluating the project's ongoing water impacts.

Additionally, the approval memorandum does not identify:

- Peak water demand;
- Long-term operational demand;
- Drought-condition planning assumptions;

- Potential impacts to regional water resources.

Instead, the memorandum acknowledges the concern but provides little substantive analysis.

Furthermore, even if the facility's direct water use is limited by closed-loop cooling, the record does not evaluate indirect water consumption associated with supplying up to 300 MW Critical Power or 420 MW Gross Power on a sustained basis (which Raeden asserted he would be utilizing in internal documents, contrary to the publicly stated 50 MW). Per resources like the Aquifer Alliance, depending on the generation resource used, comparable published water-consumption factors indicate hundreds of millions of gallons per year in indirect power-generation water consumption.

Where a project's cooling systems and long-term operations may depend upon significant water use, the record should contain sufficient information to support the City's conclusions regarding project impacts.

D. Consistency with BP Zone Intent and PlanCOS Was Evaluated Without Fully Addressing Infrastructure Intensity

The City notes that data centers are classified as a Light Industrial use and are permitted within the BP zone district.

However, the issue presented by this appeal is not whether a data center is permitted.

The issue is whether a facility designed to consume as much power as available, with potential expansion to 300 MW Critical Power and approximately 420 MW Gross Power, represents a significantly more intensive industrial use than the development previously approved for the site. The utility, infrastructure, and resource demands may be substantially greater than those associated with the prior approved use.

The approval memorandum relies largely upon the fact that the site has historically been used for industrial purposes. It does not meaningfully analyze whether the scale of utility demand described by the applicant remains consistent with the assumptions underlying prior approvals, surrounding infrastructure capacity, or the stated intent of the BP zone district.

E. Failure to Adequately Evaluate Environmental Impacts Associated with Hyperscale AI Data Center Operations

The administrative record does not appear to contain a comprehensive evaluation of the environmental impacts associated with the scale of operation described in the applicant's own submissions.

The City's approval memorandum primarily evaluates site-specific impacts such as lighting, landscaping, noise, visual screening, and compliance with existing air-quality permitting requirements. While those factors are relevant, they do not fully address the broader

environmental impacts associated with a facility designed to support up to 300 MW of Critical Power and approximately 420 MW of Gross Power.

The applicant's internal utility-planning documents state that the facility is designed to consume as much power as Colorado Springs Utilities and other generation sources can provide and further contemplate the potential development of additional natural-gas generation resources to support operations.

Recent research from organizations including the World Resources Institute and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has identified large AI-focused data centers as creating environmental impacts extending beyond the project site itself, including:

- Significant increases in regional electricity demand;
- Increased dependence on fossil-fuel generation where renewable resources are insufficient to meet load requirements;
- Increased greenhouse-gas emissions associated with electricity generation;
- Increased indirect water consumption associated with electric-power production;
- Increased air emissions associated with backup generators and supporting generation infrastructure, including emissions generated during routine monthly testing, maintenance, and emergency operation;
- Increased noise and quality-of-life impacts associated with large-scale mechanical cooling systems;
- Increased infrastructure burdens associated with transmission, generation, and utility-system expansion.

Several of these impacts occur beyond the boundaries of the project site itself and may affect surrounding communities, infrastructure systems, and environmental resources.

The City's approval memorandum acknowledges that energy demand, utility costs, air quality, water scarcity, and public-health impacts were among the principal concerns raised by residents. However, the memorandum does not identify the electrical-demand assumptions used in the review, does not evaluate the environmental impacts associated with supplying up to 300 MW of Critical Power or approximately 420 MW of Gross Power, and does not analyze the applicant's discussion of potential new natural-gas generation facilities.

Furthermore, while the City relied on the existence of future State permitting processes to address air-quality concerns, the record does not appear to evaluate the cumulative environmental consequences that could result from the generation resources necessary to serve the project's anticipated load.

Finally, the administrative record does not contain an ecological impact assessment evaluating whether the project's long-term operation—including 24-hour cooling infrastructure, industrial lighting, generator testing, increased energy demand, and the applicant's stated potential buildout to 300 MW Critical Power and 420 MW Gross Power—could affect nearby sensitive ecological resources, the wildlife populations, or the unique ecosystem of Garden of the Gods.

The National Wildlife Federation reports that researchers studying wildlife conservation have identified industrial noise and lighting as potential "sensory danger zones" that can interfere with animal behavior, predator-prey interactions, feeding, and reproduction. According to Ramboll, a global architecture, engineering, and consultancy company, biodiversity researchers note that large industrial facilities can contribute to habitat fragmentation, land-use change, and biodiversity impacts, and they recommend environmental assessments when development occurs near sensitive ecological resources, like the Garden of the Gods.

These studies demonstrate that large industrial facilities can create ecological impacts through noise, lighting, habitat disturbance, and infrastructure expansion. The administrative record does not appear to contain an analysis evaluating whether such impacts were considered in relation to nearby ecological resources, wildlife populations, recreational resources, or the ecological environment associated with Garden of the Gods at the scale of operations contemplated by the applicant's own submissions.

Because the applicant's own submissions contemplate a level of electrical demand substantially greater than that discussed in the City's findings, the administrative record does not appear to contain sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that the project will not create greater adverse impacts on surrounding properties and the broader community than the previously approved development.

Additional environmental review is necessary to fully evaluate the impacts associated with the scale of operation contemplated by the applicant and to support the findings required under UDC §7.5.516.D.1(c).

F. Failure to Adequately Evaluate Public Health Impacts

While the City evaluated compliance with existing noise standards and acknowledged future State air-quality permitting requirements, the administrative record does not appear to evaluate broader public-health impacts associated with the scale of operation described in the applicant's own submissions.

Researchers at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health have found that the rapid growth of AI data centers can contribute to significant public-health impacts through increased electricity demand and associated air pollution from power generation. A 2024 study, *The Unpaid Toll: Quantifying the Public Health Impact of AI*, similarly concluded that AI-related data-center expansion contributes to emissions of fine particulate matter and other pollutants associated with respiratory and cardiovascular disease, with impacts potentially borne by nearby communities.

The applicant's own materials contemplate a facility capable of consuming up to 300 MW of Critical Power and approximately 420 MW of Gross Power, yet the administrative findings do not evaluate the public-health implications associated with supplying power at that scale, including emissions from supporting generation resources and backup generators.

In addition, a 2026 peer-reviewed assessment of Virginia's "Data Center Alley" published in *Frontiers in Climate* identified noise pollution, air pollution, water-resource pressures, and cumulative environmental burdens as significant community health concerns associated with large-scale data-center development. Researchers affiliated with MIT have likewise identified noise from cooling infrastructure, generators, and mechanical systems as an underrepresented public-health concern for nearby residents.

Finally, recent research has identified growing concerns regarding water-resource competition and long-term community impacts associated with large data centers, particularly where substantial utility infrastructure expansion may be required to support operations.

The administrative record does not appear to contain an evaluation of these cumulative public-health impacts at the scale contemplated by the applicant. Accordingly, the record does not provide sufficient evidence to support the finding under UDC §7.5.516.D.1(c) that the proposed modification will not create greater adverse impacts on surrounding properties than the previously approved development.

G. Administrative Findings Are Not Fully Supported by the Record

The approval memorandum repeatedly concludes that the application satisfies the criteria for approval under UDC §7.5.516.D.

However, the memorandum does not provide findings regarding:

- Electrical demand assumptions reflecting the maximum power use the developer's stated intention to utilize;
- Utility-system impacts;
- Substation requirements;
- Transmission requirements;
- Generation requirements;
- Cost allocation responsibilities;
- Long-term utility capacity;
- The applicant's stated potential expansion to 300 MW Critical Power and approximately 420 MW Gross Power.

Because these issues are largely absent from the City's findings, it is unclear whether the record contains sufficient evidence to support the conclusions reached under UDC §7.5.516.D.

While the approval memorandum concludes that Project Taurus is consistent with the economic-development objectives of PlanCOS, the analysis does not appear to evaluate

whether the scale of utility demand contemplated by the applicant is consistent with PlanCOS policies regarding long-term infrastructure planning, resource stewardship, environmental sustainability, public health, and community resilience.

The applicant's own materials contemplate a facility capable of consuming up to 300 MW of Critical Power and approximately 420 MW of Gross Power, potentially requiring substantial supporting infrastructure and additional generation resources. The administrative findings do not explain how those impacts were evaluated against PlanCOS objectives encouraging coordinated infrastructure planning, efficient use of public resources, protection of community health, and long-term sustainability.

As a result, the record does not clearly demonstrate consistency with all applicable PlanCOS goals and policies, particularly those addressing sustainable growth and infrastructure capacity. We question whether the City analyzed whether a 1990s semiconductor facility and a potential 300 MW AI compute campus have comparable infrastructure, environmental, and community impacts as a comprehensive analysis does not seem to be included in the official records.

4. REQUESTED RELIEF

Based upon the foregoing, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

PRIMARY REQUEST

Reverse the administrative approval of Project Taurus.

ALTERNATIVE REQUEST

Remand the application for additional review, independent studies, and findings regarding:

- The long-term electrical demand assumptions underlying the approval;
- Utility infrastructure requirements necessary to support the project;
- Substation, transmission, and generation requirements associated with the project;
- Indirect and direct water demand and resource impacts;
- Sequencing of infrastructure improvements relative to project operation;
- Whether the project creates greater adverse impacts than the prior approved development under UDC §7.5.516.D.1(c);
- Whether the City's findings remain valid in light of the applicant's statements regarding potential development up to 300 MW Critical Power and approximately 420 MW Gross Power;
- A comprehensive independent environmental-impact assessment evaluating the reasonably foreseeable impacts associated with the applicant's stated long-term buildout assumptions of up

to 300 MW Critical Power and approximately 420 MW Gross Power, including impacts related to electricity generation, indirect water consumption, air emissions, utility-system expansion, transmission infrastructure, generation facilities, cumulative environmental burdens, and long-term resource sustainability;

- A comprehensive independent public-health impact assessment evaluating conditions associated with the applicant's stated long-term buildout assumptions of up to 300 MW Critical Power and approximately 420 MW Gross Power, including potential impacts from air pollution, backup-generator emissions, supporting power-generation resources, chronic industrial noise exposure, sleep-disturbance risks, cumulative environmental burdens, and other community health impacts identified in recent peer-reviewed research concerning large AI-focused data centers;
- An independent cumulative-impact assessment evaluating the combined effects of the applicant's stated long-term buildout assumptions of up to 300 MW Critical Power and approximately 420 MW Gross Power on utility infrastructure, electrical generation requirements, transmission systems, water resources, environmental quality, public health, and surrounding communities;
- A determination, supported by independent analysis, of whether the environmental, public-health, infrastructure, and resource impacts associated with the applicant's stated long-term buildout assumptions of up to 300 MW Critical Power and approximately 420 MW Gross Power are consistent with the sustainability, resilience, public-health, infrastructure-planning, and resource-stewardship objectives of PlanCOS.

IF RE-APPROVED

Require conditions ensuring:

- Full public disclosure of utility-demand assumptions;
- Verification of available utility capacity prior to operation;
- Clearly identified responsibility for any required utility infrastructure improvements with the possibility of applying for grants that would be funded by taxpayers and ratepayers excluded;
- Completion of required utility infrastructure before operation at the approved load;
- Independent verification of projected environmental and public-health impacts associated with the approved operational load;
- Public disclosure of projected direct water use, indirect water impacts associated with power generation, and any assumptions regarding future generation resources necessary to support the facility;

- Annual public reporting of actual utility consumption, including electricity and water use, sufficient to verify compliance with representations made during the approval process, including makeup water, maintenance replenishment, and any changes in cooling-system operation;
- Any environmental, public-health, infrastructure, utility-capacity, water-resource, or cumulative-impact analyses relied upon by the City shall evaluate the applicant's stated long-term buildout assumptions of up to 300 MW Critical Power and approximately 420 MW Gross Power, rather than only the initial phase or currently available utility capacity, unless enforceable conditions are imposed establishing limits on future electrical demand and facility expansion;
- Enforceable limits on electrical demand, water consumption, and facility expansion unless and until additional public review and approval is completed for any future increase beyond the capacity evaluated in the administrative record.
- Independent post-construction noise testing demonstrating compliance with represented noise levels during normal operations, generator testing, and emergency operation.
- Demonstration that infrastructure costs required to serve the project will not be shifted to existing ratepayers, even through grants
- Independent evaluation of waste-heat recovery and beneficial reuse opportunities prior to full operation. Given the scale of electrical demand contemplated by the applicant, substantial waste heat may be generated by the facility. Many modern AI-focused data centers are evaluating district-heating systems, industrial heat reuse, greenhouse applications, and other beneficial uses of excess thermal energy. An independent study should assess the technical and economic feasibility of waste-heat recovery opportunities and identify measures that could reduce the project's overall environmental footprint and improve resource efficiency consistent with the sustainability and resource-stewardship objectives of PlanCOS.

5. CLOSING STATEMENT

This appeal does not challenge whether data centers are generally permitted within the BP zone district.

Rather, it challenges whether the administrative record adequately supports the findings required by UDC §7.5.516.D, particularly the finding that Project Taurus will not create greater adverse impacts than the development approval being modified.

The applicant's own submissions describe an AI-focused facility designed to consume as much power as available and potentially expand to approximately 300 MW Critical Power and 420 MW Gross Power. The City's approval memorandum does not meaningfully evaluate those utility demands or their associated impacts.

Accordingly, the record does not appear to contain sufficient findings to support the approval, and additional review is warranted before the project proceeds.

Respectfully submitted,

Samantha Allen

1005 Panorama Drive, Colorado Springs, CO 80904

sshayallen@gmail.com

512-696-4527

Date: 06/22/26

PROJECT TAURUS APPEAL
SOURCE LIST

Colorado Springs Unified Development Code (UDC)

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/coloradospringsco/latest/coloradosprings_co/0-0-0-1

PlanCOS Comprehensive Plan

<https://coloradosprings.gov/plancos>

City Planning Department Approval Memorandum
(Project Taurus Development Plan Modification)

Project Taurus Development Plan Modification Application File

Raeden

"1615 Garden of The Gods – Power Overview and Approach"

[Attach applicant utility-planning document obtained through CORA request]

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT Climate Project)
Investigating the Ecological Impacts of Data Centers

<https://impactclimate.mit.edu/2025/03/20/investigating-the-ecological-impacts-of-data-centers/>

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT Computing)
The Staggering Ecological Impacts of Computation and the Cloud

<https://computing.mit.edu/news/the-staggering-ecological-impacts-of-computation-and-the-cloud/>

World Resources Institute

U.S. Data Center Growth and Community Impacts

<https://www.wri.org/insights/us-data-center-growth-impacts>

Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health

Analyzing Air Pollution, Health, and Economic Risks from AI Data Centers

<https://hsph.harvard.edu/news/analyzing-air-pollution-health-economic-risks-from-ai-data-centers/>

The Unpaid Toll: Quantifying the Public Health Impact of AI

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.06288>

Moms Clean Air Force

Data Centers, Fossil Fuel Pollution, and Community Health

<https://www.momscleanairforce.org/resources/data-centers-fossil-fuel-pollution-implications-for-community-health-with-harvards-dominic-lab/>

Frontiers in Climate

Data Center Alley: Public Health, Environmental, and Community Impacts

<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/climate/articles/10.3389/fclim.2026.1648912/full>

Aquifer Alliance

Comparison of Water Use by Energy Generation Types

<https://aquiferalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Comparison-of-Water-Use-by-Energy-Generation-Types-Trinity-Spring-Internship-Project.pdf>

National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL)
Water Consumption Factors for Electricity Generation
<https://data.openei.org/submissions/390>

Colorado Springs Utilities
Power Generation Resource Mix
<https://www.csu.org/hubfs/Document%20Library/GreenPowerPPCL.pdf>

Addendum to the June 22nd, 2026 appeal application Corporate Ridge No. 1 Lot 4 aka “Project Taurus” to show community opposition to the project

Exact language from the form:

“Hi Colorado Springs Community,

As you know there's a very narrow group of people who qualify for an appeal for "Project Taurus" aka the data center being proposed near Garden of the Gods in Colorado Springs. Sign onto our appeal in our addendum to show the city of Colorado Springs just how much opposition there is to the Project Taurus data center. We also encourage local businesses to sign on to this addendum.

We are planning to submit our appeal by Monday, June 22nd at 5pm. We are having a zoom meeting going over our draft at 6pm today, Sunday, June 21st. Register at this [link](#).

We also urge people to [sign this petition](#), calling for a moratorium on data centers in Colorado Springs. (We did not start the petition but we support it.)*

Extending the time: We will close this form at about 2pm on Monday, June 22nd.

Thank you,

No Data Center in COS

<https://www.nodatacentercos.com/>”

*As of this document being finalized 5,586 people have signed the “Open Letter to Colorado Springs Mayor, Yemi Mobolade, about Data Center”

Proposal <https://www.change.org/p/open-letter-to-colorado-springs-mayor-yemi-mobolade-about-data-center-proposal?signed=true>

Below are the people who signed on in opposition of the “Project Taurus” within less than 24 hours from June 21-June 22, 2026.

There were 377 responses, some have been deleted due to being from out of state.

This includes their first and last names and distance from the project location 1565 High Tech Way, Colorado Springs, CO 8090. We included religious institutions/businesses if they wanted to share. This is the original sheet link:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Xs4EeInG2sYTAsXnZzu2jXz9t2k-Jp7s-4GRHM8bDxg/edit?usp=sharing>

Data has been organized roughly according to the distance from the project and cleaned up to improve readability and prioritize locality:

Samantha Davis	1,000 feet
James Baumgartner	1000 feet
Amy Einspahr	1000 feet

Dan Krawczyk	1500 feet
Alison Pulliam	1800 ft
Jon Pulliam	1800 ft
Jennifer Krawczyk	2000 feet - in our backyard
Daniel Krawczyk	2000 feet - it's in my backyard

Cross & Crown Church 1.1 miles

Katie Cummings
 Gavin Cummings
 Natasha Church
 Erica Kronjaeger
 Robyn Ferrari
 Nina Willert
 Jessica Whitaker
 Lindsay St Gelais

Keith Aguirre	.05 mile
SharonMason	.05 mile

Thrive Health Systems .4 miles away

Oscar Robinson

Brandi Mendieta	.5 mile
Eve Ramirez	.6 miles
Bailey Beall	.6 miles
Sydney Thompson	.7 miles
Jennifer Aguirre	0.05 miles
Alyssa Watson	0.25 miles
Cicada Carpenter	0.6mi
Tyler Laliberte	0.9 Miles
Lauren Newey	0.9 miles
JacquelineGrosser	Less than a mile.
Rachel Sliwinski	1 mile

Colonial Mustards Sandwich Emporium 1 mile

John Barr

Cheba Hut 1 mile

Hana Lizotte

Claire Ami	1 mile
Kane Carlton	1 mile
Micha Wilson	1 mile

Angelica Ley	1 mile	
Phillip Bradford Mannschreck		1 mile
Jessica Torres	1 mile or so	

Pikes Peak Athletics Training Center **1.1 miles**
Illiana Merrell

Lori Hill Work: 1-2 miles

CIVA less than a mile away

Brio Lynam

Ellie Shadwick	1.2 miles
Colin Reed	1.2 miles
Melissa Graney	1.5 miles
Joe Mungenast	1.5 miles
Jennifer Nafziger	1.5 miles
Megan Barber	1.7 miles
Aubrey Ranson	1.7 miles
Anna Nowrot	1.7 miles
Jake Wilkinson	1.8 miles
Chris Rolater	2 miles
Cassandra Williams	2 miles
Elizabeth Matos	2 miles
Corrine Romer	2 miles
Paityn Lund	2 miles
Raquel Dominguez	2 miles
Feather Groves	2 miles
Laura Forbes	2 miles
Rachel Reed	2 miles
Michael Hamilton	2 miles
Amanda Kilfoyle	2 miles
Justin Williams	2 miles
Colleen McCown	About 2 miles
Elijah Selvin	2 miles
Lauren Nunn	2.1 miles
Lauren Nunn	2.1 miles
Julie Plunkett	2.2 miles
Samuel Plunkett	2.2 miles
Leslie Leonard	2.2 miles
Janelle Porter	2.4 miles
Mariah Stinnette	2.5 mile
Cecelia Wilken	2.5 miles
Daniel Somenek	2.5 miles

Christopher Bonham	2.5 miles	
Carol Dickerson	2.5 miles	
Jamie Bell	2.5 miles	
Maria Bujenovic	2.5 miles	
Christine Redding	2.5 miles	
Shea Stewart	Retired Army Veteran	2.5 miles
Rachel Beckwith	2.5 miles	
Tyler Parthemer-Kippel	2.5 miles	
Kristina Domeier	2.5 miles	
Dannette Taylor	2.5 miles	
Caitlyn Razzano	2.6 miles	
Paul Nagy	2.8 miles	
Ali Lange	2.8 miles	
Gabriela Lisboa	2.9 miles	
Elizabeth Benson	less than 3 miles	
Grayson Cagle	3 mi	
Caleb Miller	3 miles	
Travis Walters	3 miles	
Christianna Miller	3 miles	
Amy Fife	3 miles	
Sarah Smith	3 miles	

High Altitude Taste 3 miles
Aubrey Fennewald

Katherine Czukas	3 miles
Ime Lopez	3 miles
Madelyn Arnold	3 miles
Hayley Bouwens	3 miles
Sarah Soderstrom	3 miles
David Pastier	3 miles
Amanda Barber	3 miles
Kandace Lytle	3 miles
Noah Cox	3 miles
Sophie Owen	3.05 miles (just outside the radius)
Erin Charles	3.1 miles
Sheridan Singer	3.2 miles
Rebecca Wright	3.2 miles
Alexie Mapson	3.2 miles
Sarah Letendre	3.4 miles
Kerry Anne Buckman	3.6 miles
Elizabeth Hedenberg	3.7 miles
Stephanie Hertel	About 3.1 miles.

Eclectic CO. 3.8 mi

Peri Bolts

Sam Farnham 3.8 miles

Morgan Hexter 3.8 miles

Lisa Wilkening 3.9 miles

Tava Creative Solutions 3.9 miles

Melissa Grohman

Delanie Gawlik 4 miles

Sara Gallagher 4 miles

Madeline Rascon 4 miles

Catherine Arns 4 miles

Juanita Conway 4 miles

Ali Dettviler 4 miles

Lyn Kerschen 4 miles

Janae Hansen 4 miles

Leo Lorenza 4 miles

Thomas Arns 4 miles

Jacob Brune Less than 4 miles

Zuri Horowitz 4.3 miles

Missy Walker 4.3 miles

Rachel Holcomb 4.3 miles

Lindsey Ang 4.5 miles

Christian Gates 4.5 miles

Lin Larson 4.5 miles

Annie O'Keefe 4.5 miles

Sarah Jane Baker 4.6 miles

Meghan Thorne 4.6 miles

Craig Thorne 4.6 miles

Brandi O'Brien 4.6 miles

Amy Vos 4.7 mi

Hannah Gidley 4.7 Miles

Haley Petrick 4.8 mi

Sammantha Thunberg 40 minutes

Elise Kirkpatrick 5 mi

Daniel Kozdron 5 miles

Katie Snyder 5 miles

Andrew Incorporated 5 miles

Andrew Carnegie

Elizabeth McGrath 5 miles

Wyrmwyrx Media Design LLC 5 miles

Amanda Long

Kyle McGuffey 5 Miles

Logan Artz 5 miles

Jeremy Kippel 5 miles

LaDonna Krantz 5 miles

Rachel Lamb 5 miles

Stephanie Tanner 5 miles

Marcela Donat 5 miles

Matt Eller 5 miles

Hannah Cox 5 miles

Caitlin Wickman 5 miles

Stephanie Franks 5 miles

Kelley Cantrell 5 miles

Winona Entwisle Less than 5 miles

JTS Helping Hands Within 5 miles

Justin Thunstrom

Flower of Life Design Company 5 miles

Grant Finizio

Luke Phillips 5.2 miles

Lauren Bricklen 5.3 miles

Emerge Massage 5.4 miles

Ali Merkhofer

Brian Kruse 5.5 miles

Lyndsay Badding 5.5 miles

Shelby Colon 5.5 miles

Christina Bratcher 5.5 miles

Christine Sanders 5.6 miles

James Sanders 5.6 miles

Anna Blueberry Digital Media / Anna's Therapeutic Garden 5.7 miles

Anna Kruse Rosa Hannah 5.7 miles

Heather Huizing 5.8 miles

Renee Ludlam 5mi driving

Hannah Malloy	6 mi
Jacob Garbrecht	6 mi
Kelli Kohn	6 miles
Matthew Eller	6 miles
Kara Wyatt	6 miles
Isabella Otero	6 miles
Lara Simcox	6 miles
Jordyn Waychoff	6 miles
Keagan Kellogg	6 miles
Jacob Foreman	6 miles
Jesse Harrison	6 miles
Rebecca Hess	6 miles
Leigh Richardson	6 miles

Mythic Productions 6 miles

Mark Rose	
Joe Renck	6 miles
Kathryn Love	6 miles

Sacred Life Doula Collective 6 miles

Stephanie Jerome	
------------------	--

Bryse Boynton	6 Miles
Blair Kinsley	6.2 miles
Theodore Brassfield	6.2 miles
Alexa Giles	6.4 miles
Bailey Johnson	6.5 miles
Ashley Moss	6.6 miles

Rivera's Floor Covering LLC 6.6 Miles

Coire Rivera	
--------------	--

Sierra Madril	6.6 miles
CynthiaValencia	6.9 miles
Adryanna Lozano	7 miles
Teri Christman	7 miles
Kell Geisler	7 miles
Whitley Mitchell	7 miles
Breata Jessen	7 miles
Alexa LaMack	7 miles

Pikes Peak Indigenous Women's Alliance7 miles

Johnelle Urenda	
-----------------	--

Beth Epstein	7 miles
Tiana Longmire	7 miles
Megan Kerr	7 miles
Lynn Burke	7 miles
Jessica Staten	7.2 miles
Alyssa Fire	7.2 miles about 15 minutes
Anna Summers	7.3 miles
Jordan Russell	7.4mi
Quinton Bodry	7.5 miles
Grace Storm	7.6 mi
Rebecca Nason	7.6 miles
Amber Lo	7.8 miles
TrumanLo	7.8 miles
Zoe Woodruff	7mi
Loring Wirbel	8 miles
Peyton Gracia	8 miles
Kenneth Gracia	8 Miles
Audrey Gray	8 miles
Jacob Henry	8 Miles
Carrie Brooks	8 miles
Janice MeylanN/A	8 miles
Jessica Chowdhury	8 miles
Tracy Gutierrez	8 miles
JoshuaHeald	8 miles
Lauren Zahrn	8 miles
Julie Tucker	8 miles
Amber Case	8 miles
Travis Yager	8 miles
Ines Andino	8 miles
BritneeBiza	8.5 miles
MelissaHitchcock	8.5 miles
Drew Colosimo	8.5 miles
Kathryn Hutcheson	8.6 miles
Rebecca Blackbyrd	8.7 miles
Charlene Berg	8.7 miles
Darrell Whaley	8.7 miles
Jasmine Poblano	8.8 miles
Dora Haslinger	8.8 miles
JessicaFuentes Renfro	8.9 miles
Emma Beadle	8mi
Andy Dolan	9 miles
Scott Hilton	9 miles
Jacob Vaughn	9 miles
Sarah Garlick	9 miles

Travis Pembridge	9 miles
Benjamin Gallegos	9 miles
Kaitlyn Hart	9 miles
Lindy Roberts	9 miles
Wynona Nohava	9 miles

Big Blu's Fencing 9 miles

Jenn Vercammen	
Ryan Vercammen	

Ciara Guerrero	9.5 mi
Joshua Vaughan	9.5 miles
Gabriel Cruz	9.6 miles
James Sabin	9.6 miles
Whitney Hampson	10 mi
Matthew Foss	10 miles
Travis Russell	10 miles
Mayra Acosta	10 miles
Carly Fahey-Dima	10 miles
Michael Lewis	10 Miles
Carissa Anderson	10 miles
Brandy Padron	10 miles

Ixora, A Wellness Collective 10 miles

Jaqueline	Hodges
-----------	--------

Kendre Thunstrom	10 miles
Maureen Donnelly	10 miles
Caitlyn Sisk-Dean	10 miles
Melanie LaMack	10 miles
Grace Lineberg	10 miles
Tessa Walker	10 miles
Aaron Leming	10 miles
Nikita Hamill	10 miles
Ava Yager	10 miles
Paul Richardson	10 miles
Cassy Valadez	10 miles

Equinox Music Lessons 10 Miles

Megan Williams	Mariah Coultrip
----------------	-----------------

Academy Christian Church Within 10 miles

Aubrie Williams	
-----------------	--

Victoria Powers Within 10 miles from me, 15min drive

Afton OBrien 11 miles

Sabrina Bockstanz 11 miles

Shadow Storm Productions LLC 11 miles

Matthew Birge

Amanda Gardner 11 miles

GenevaGlanville 11 miles

Nhut Pho 11 miles

Matt DeVito 11 miles

Megan Williams 11 miles

Greta Hotmer 11 miles

Dylan Risenhoover 12 miles

Fallon Rimler 12 miles

Patricia Merrell-Kellogg 12 miles

Colby Applegate 12 miles

Carla Q 12 miles

Jason Roberts 12 miles

Natalie Smith 12 miles

Ace Townsend 12 miles

Mackenzie Schreiber 12 miles

Jessica Soucy 13 miles

Jewel Snedden 13 miles

Daisy Secundino-Zuniga 13 miles

Carrie Hartman 13 miles

Susan Brooks 13 miles

ForrestBrooks 13 miles

Carl Leaf 14 mile drive

Jannette Banda 14 miles

Teresa Dulleck 14 miles

Stephanie Smith 14 miles

JoshuaReam 14 miles

Dr Christin Hinzman DC PC 14 miles

Lenore Johnson Workplace within 14 miles

Deana Kamm 14 miles

Shane Spurgetis 15 miles

Cole Reynolds 15 miles

Nicholas Mumford 15 miles

Julia Wright 15 miles

Deborah Navarre 15 miles

Israel Keierleber 15 miles

Amanda Vandenberg 15 miles

Lauren Boyd 15 miles

Lush: A Beauty Lounge 15 miles

Brandy Conrad

Austin Hinzman	15 miles
Caitlin Hopwood	15 miles
Laura Vannozzi	15 mins, 7 miles
Megan Holmes	15 minutes
Kaelyn Daughetee	15 minutes
Nicholas Detra	15 minutes
Ramon Villagomez	16 miles
Susan Ankersmit	17 miles
Thom Moulden	19 miles
Megan Solomon	20 miles
Oliver Wright	20 miles
Morgan Greenway	20 miles
Kyle Morgan	20 miles
Elizabeth Percy	20 miles
Travis Pembridge	20 min drive
David Fuentes	20+
Walter Krueger	21 min
Susan Adams	22 miles
Cayla Simpson	25 miles
River Hampton	26 miles
Jessica Fahmie	30 miles
Dianna Gillmore	30 mins

ALR Transport LLC 30 minutes

Andrea Kessler

Gabby Bryant	Centennial street
Andrea Gordon	East Uintah St
Caroline Hoover	N/A
Grisselda Gleason	N/A
Lindsay Herbert	N/A just a concerned and angry citizen
Rylee Dinnocenzo	80907
Jessica Trimm	80911
Ashyrion Connell	80925
Deborah Duncan	80909
Danielle Fernandez	60 miles

Tacos Locale 67 miles

Bob Simmons

David Mitchell

67 miles, still in this state, it affects all of us



1615 Garden of The Gods – Power Overview and Approach

Redevelopment of the former Intel Fab at 1615 Garden of The Gods for data center use specifically to host Nvidia GPU-based compute systems will require as much power as Colorado Springs Utility (CSU) and other potential sources of generation can supply. Due to the integrated nature of the deployed compute, storage, and network equipment systems, the data center will require power differently than any previous generation of data centers built prior to 2024. Raeden views CSU as a partner and wants to provide as much detail and supporting information regarding timing, capacity, estimated usage, and growth to support the data center clients, as identified in the following sections.

Contents

Considerations and Terms	2
Utility Power Provisioning at 1615 Garden of The Gods.....	5
How Much Represents “Enough?”	5
Utilization Guidance	6
Current/Modern Consumption Model.....	6
Future Consumption Model – 2028 and Beyond (estimated)	6
Spikes and Troughs – The Variability of the Environment.....	7
Natural Gas Generation	7
CSU Hosted Natural Gas Plant.....	7
Onsite Generation	7



Considerations and Terms

Like every industry, the data center “market” uses specific terms and terminologies interchangeably with the various stages and aspects of a deployment and ongoing operation. Power, energy, and consumption vernacular germane to 1615 Garden of the Gods includes the following terms:

- **Gross Power** – The maximum amount of power available to the site from the utility or other power source for use at the site however the owner/operator chooses
 - Ex. If CSU can provide 72MW of power to and through onsite distribution equipment and infrastructure, the site would reflect **72MW of Gross Power**
- **Critical Power** – Capacity derived from Gross Power dedicated exclusively to “IT Equipment,” nominally defined as computers, storage devices, and network devices
 - Ex. The client installs equipment capable of consuming/using 52MW of the Gross Power allocation to the site for IT Equipment, then the customer would access/use **52MW of Critical Power**
- **Power Utilization Effectiveness (PUE)** – Power used at the site for anything OTHER than IT Infrastructure, overwhelmingly allocated to cooling generation and distribution equipment needed to preserve management of hot air generated by the IT Equipment
 - Ex. 52MW of Critical Power at a 1.4PUE would result in 72.8MW of Gross Load, thus 20.8MW of Gross Power would apply as the PUE, designated for systems and functions at the site OTHER than IT Equipment
 - **Math**
 - $52\text{MW} * 1.4 = 72.8\text{MW}$
 - $72.8\text{MW} - 52\text{MW} = 20.8\text{MW (PUE)}$
- **Early Access** – Nominally the date the customer needs access to begin installing all the systems and related infrastructure to begin/continue production operations. Installation does not imply a significant power need but signals a prescriptive path of customer activity within the data center targeting a defined date for Production use of the data center, meaning power consumption
- **Commissioning (Cx) and Load Testing** – As the construction and redevelopment of the site progresses, Level 4 and Level 5 Cx of the site will require full load assumption of power, meaning the site will need access to 100% of the provisioned Gross Load capacity
 - Whereas pre-2024 data center designs contemplated but never expected customers to use anywhere near 80% of the available capacity, Cx testing at 100% really just reflected an engineering check mark
 - Instead, AI-centric deployments will not only use 100% of the available capacity for periods of time in Production, the systems need to test fluctuating conditions whereby the customer will steadily use 75% of the available capacity only to instantly ramp to 100% for anywhere from < 1 minute to ~15 minutes before settling back at 70% - 75% utilization
- **Ready For Service (RFS)** – The date the owner/operator “turns over” the critical space areas of the data center to the customer for Production use as the customer sees fit



- RFS does not inherently mean the date Production starts, but does intimate a fast-track process to Production use, typically within 30-60 days of RFS
- **Production Use / Revenue Generation** – The date the customer “turns on the IT equipment environment” and begins “live use” of all the building systems to support the business using the GPU and GPU-centric equipment
- **Ramp** – Concept the customer will need to “grow into” power consumption, a now-historical condition borne from a different era of IT Equipment in the non-GPU Era
 - Raeden’s AI customers will not ramp into power consumption and instead will “turn on” the environment for Production Use all at once, reflecting the highly integrated nature of the IT Equipment
- **Average PUE** – Defined as the average/median efficiency of the data center translated into power consumption across the entirety of the year
 - Typical AI-centric data centers will operate at a 1.2PUE
 - Ex. 52MW of Critical Power at 1.2PUE would mean at 100% load utilization (the customer using all of the power) the customer would use 62.4MW of Gross Power
- **Peak PUE** – Defined as the maximum efficiency of the data center translated into power consumption power consumption at the most strenuous and capacity intensive time (even for one second) of the year
 - Peak PUE almost exclusively applies to stressful weather and environmental conditions experienced during hot summer days
 - Hot days require the cooling equipment to run less efficiently and therefore require more electrical energy to generate the same amount of cooling capacity to the data center as expected under normal conditions
 - Historical Peak PUE rates typically applied at 1.5PUE but overall system and data center deployment practices continue to improve efficiency such many AI-centric data centers design to support 1.4PUE
 - Ex. 52MW of Critical Power at 1.4PUE would mean at 100% load utilization (the customer using all of the power) the customer would use 72.8MW of Gross Power
 - Peak PUE conditions vary based upon geography
 - Colorado Springs would likely experience 10-25 days per year potentially incurring an increase from the Average PUE to Peak PUE
- **GPU** – Graphical Processing Card, effectively the replacement for the eponymous “chips” used to power the previous generation of IT Equipment
 - GPU’s produce exponentially greater power and performance than “chips” resulting in equally exponential energy requirements
- **GPU Rack** – The single vertical housing of multiple computers or systems utilizing GPUs for various business uses
 - Notable because the power consumption capabilities of a GPU Rack will inform the nature of the power requirements of the data center and also inform the nature of data center design based upon the amount of power delivered to a very specific space



- Ex. 1 “standard” GPU Rack = 30” wide x 48” deep (long) x 7’ tall
- Current GPU racks for AI use require between 130kW and 160kW for 100% power utilization (full load)
 - Thus 130kW – 160kW needs delivery to about 4 square feet of physical space in a building
- **Pods** – Racks comprise Pods, effectively the coordinated installation of multiple racks all needed for interoperation to provide the necessary service(s) required by the Customer
 - Pods include specific AI-centric types, nominally Spines (network and storage racks – lower powered) and Leafs (compute – GPU racks and therefore higher powered)
 - Pods range in aggregate power demand from 1500kW – 2500kW (ergo 1.5MW – 2.5MW)
 - Pods range in number of racks from 12 – 22 on average
- **Kit** – Nominally the entire configuration of Pods into an organized system operating all at the same time to provide the services needed/proffered by the Customer
 - Kits “at scale,” meaning part of deployments of at least 50MW in Critical Power, range from 20MW – 24MW/25MW each
 - Kits serve as a unit of performance and operate with all racks and all Pods functioning in unison such if even one rack loses functionality, the entire Kit either cannot function or dramatically reduces performance
- **Cooling Distribution Units (CDUs)** – Notable as the newest entrant to the data center infrastructure component and the most critical aspect of the cooling environment
 - CDUs provide heat exchange capabilities to the GPU Racks ensuring management of massive volumes of heat generated specifically by the GPU devices inside of each rack
 - CDUs represent a notable consideration because each CDU requires real power to manage the heat from the GPU racks and therefore applies significantly to the power consumption of the overall data center



Utility Power Provisioning at 1615 Garden of The Gods

Data center owners and operators conflate the reality of developing and delivering a data center with the actual timing needed to install all the actual infrastructure needed to use power within the data center. Raeden bases the analysis of “site readiness” at 1615 from the date of contract signature and the resulting efforts needed to redevelop and prepare the site for Production use.

- **November 15, 2025**
 - Estimated date of Customer Contract Signature
- **Long Lead Dates**
 - Generator Permitting (6 months)
 - May 15, 2026
 - Various Long Lead Electrical (power) and Mechanical (Cooling) Equipment Deliveries (6 months)
 - May 15, 2026
 - Level 5 Cx Completion – Assumes 15 day installation of all Long Lead Equipment by June 1, 2026
 - July 1, 2026

The site will need at least 50% of the Gross Power capacity by April 1, 2026 to test and prepare various Power and Cooling systems upon installation (reflective of the Cx Levels 1-3).

The site will need 100% of the Gross Power by June 1, 2026 for Level 5 Cx to test all systems at 100% load capability, known as Integrated Systems Testing (IST).

The site will continue to need 100% of the Gross Power ongoing as the Customer will immediately transition from Level 5 Cx completion to Production use/operations by August 1, 2026 (earliest) or September 1, 2026 (latest).

How Much Represents “Enough?”

AI data center deployments will literally use as much power as the utility or other generator/distributor can provide. If 1615 can support 100MW of Gross Power on July 1, 2026, the Customer will use 100MW of Gross Power. The Basis of Design allows Raeden to subsequently build out Kits in a very predictable manner such as long as power exists, the Kits will install up to 300MW Critical Power (420MW Gross Power) to fully utilize all the space and resources at 1615.

Despite the normal and natural perception of data centers as underutilized “hogs” of power just wanting to control the capacity but not using anywhere near the contacted maximums, modern AI data centers want and will use the power as quickly as possible.



Utilization Guidance

Raeden applies the benchmark of [REDACTED] of CSU Gross Power provisioning to the site to reference actual utilization curves culled from direct observation and performance metrics reviewed of GB200 GPU installations (the precursor to the GB300 GPUs intended for installation at 1615). PUE estimates as noted in the aforementioned definitions for PUE indicate cooling will require an additional 20% power on a daily basis, however certain times of year will require ~40% additional power.

- 100% Daily Computer Power Requirement (Critical): [REDACTED]
- 100% Daily Cooling Power Requirement: [REDACTED]
- Gross 100% Daily Power Requirement: [REDACTED]

PEAK Considerations, meaning the 40% condition, will apply only on very hot days of the year and under other extreme circumstances. The systems need sizing to support the Peak usage even though most of the year such consumption will not occur. Using the 40% metric, the Power Requirements would involve:

- 100% Daily Computer Power Requirement: [REDACTED]
- 100% Daily Cooling Power Requirement: [REDACTED]
- Gross 100% Daily Power Requirement: [REDACTED]

Despite the above, no data center uses 100% of the power capacity except during occasional circumstances. Absolutely NO ONE uses 100% of the power capacity in a sustained manner, meaning more than 15 minutes. The average AI data center uses 70% - 75% of Gross Power on a 24 x 7 x 365 basis. The following represents estimates based upon current and then trended use of power for similar deployments for reference.

Current/Modern Consumption Model

The customer will use an average currently defined as 70% of all available power and cooling on a daily, hourly basis. Therefore, using the above numbers in a NON-PEAK condition, based off [REDACTED] of Critical Power and [REDACTED] resulting in a Gross Load consumption of [REDACTED]:

- 70% Daily Computer Power Requirement: [REDACTED]

Future Consumption Model – 2028 and Beyond (estimated)

The customer will use an average currently defined as 80% of all available power and cooling on a daily, hourly basis. Therefore, using the above numbers in a NON-PEAK condition, based off [REDACTED] of Critical Power and [REDACTED] resulting in a Gross Load consumption of [REDACTED]:

- 80% Daily Computer Power Requirement: [REDACTED]



Spikes and Troughs – The Variability of the Environment

While the statement of “no client ever sustains use of 100% of the power available” holds true, the client environments WILL spike to 100% consumption intermittently at least every few days and will increase in spikes over time. Therefore, the system needs sizing to support 100% utilization even though the client will only actually draw 100% power >5% of the overall time in a month. 100% power spikes reference the initial designed capacity:

- Gross 100% Daily Power Requirement: [REDACTED]

Natural Gas Generation

Site resources indicate existing natural gas infrastructure and potential capacity availability to support at least 60MW of natural gas generation and potentially as much as 200MW. Despite seemingly valid prevailing information, additional investigation and review indicates deploying a natural gas plant on the existing site, especially should the data center nature of the project become public knowledge, appears challenging. Raeden would like to affect the development of a natural gas generation plant to increase the power capacity at the site but would like to propose parallel path solutions options with CSU.

CSU Hosted Natural Gas Plant

Rather than Raeden trying to deliver a dedicated natural gas plant, Raeden supporting the development on CSU-owned or controlled property would/could alleviate the potential issues to develop at 1615. If CSU could provide land:

- Raeden would facilitate the entire project including design, procurement, financing, and delivery
- Raeden can also, under the same turnkey investor model, provide operations and management
- CSU could facilitate use of Public Right of Way (PRoW) access for all transmission and distribution to the 1615 site
- The plant could provide greater capacity than necessarily needed at 1615 whereby CSU could access additional capacity for other client use

Onsite Generation

Should the path to onsite generation exist, Raeden will want to size the plant to generate as much power as possible. Additionally using the Natural Gas plant as Prime Power would/could allow for design considerations minimally reducing the number of backup diesel generators dramatically at the site. Maximally the redundancy inherent to the Natural Gas plant could eliminate the need for backup generators. Should the opportunity exist for Raeden to increase the plant size and provide more generation for CSU to utilize via PPA, Raeden would facilitate.

From: [Johnna Reeder Kleymeyer](#)
To: [Crystal LaTier](#)
Subject: Project Taurus: Key Facts Regarding the Proposed Data Center for Colorado Springs Chamber & EDC Members
Date: Monday, May 18, 2026 6:45:17 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please call IT Customer Support at [520-6355](tel:520-6355) if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.

May 18, 2026



Dear Colorado Springs Chamber & EDC Members,

As conversations continue around Project Taurus and data center development in Colorado Springs, we wanted to reach out directly to our membership with factual information and context.

Last Thursday, RAEDEN, the developer of the proposed data center, hosted the second of two community town halls focused on Project Taurus, providing residents an opportunity to ask questions, hear directly from project representatives and learn more about the proposed redevelopment of the former Intel facility at 1615 Garden of the Gods Road.

The Colorado Springs Chamber & EDC supports smart, responsible development that strengthens our economy, supports national security missions and preserves the character, strengths and sense of community that make our region unique. We also believe community conversations should be grounded in facts, especially as misinformation and confusion continue circulating online.

Project Taurus proposes converting the former Intel facility into a data center to house networked computers, servers, and data storage drives and operated by RAEDEN. The site has long been zoned and built for industrial computing and advanced technology uses, making it well-positioned for this type of redevelopment. The sales and property taxes this project will generate is greatly needed for our city's general fund to support

roads, public safety and parks maintenance.

According to materials shared publicly by RAEDEN, the proposed use would be significantly quieter and more community-compatible than previous operations at the site. Some of the key facts shared by Jason Green, Co-Founder and President of RAEDEN, include:

- The facility would use a closed-loop cooling system requiring a one-time 200,000-gallon fill (one residential swimming pool = 20,000 gallons) and zero daily water use for cooling operations. A data center with 60-100 employees will use between 200-400 gallons of water per day for regular kitchen and bathroom use which is equivalent to similar sized businesses.
- An independent acoustic study found projected sound levels at a maximum of 49 decibels at the property line, below the City's 55 decibels limit and significantly quieter than the previous tenants of the facility.
- RAEDEN will pay for all infrastructure upgrades and utility costs associated with the project through a large-load tariff structure, with no costs passed on to residents.
- The project is expected to create 60–100 permanent high paying local jobs, including opportunities for veterans and skilled technical workers.
- **The company has also stated the facility would support secure computing and operational needs connected to military missions in Colorado Springs.**
- The project is not asking for city, county or state economic incentives or tax subsidies.

As with any major project, questions from the community are valid and important. We encourage members to review the available information, ask questions and engage thoughtfully in the conversation.

The following is a public information page with FAQs, project details and additional technical information:

[Facts About RAEDEN Data Centers and Community Impact](#)

Additional information about Project Taurus and data centers can be found below:

[Why Project Taurus is Good for Colorado Springs Fact Sheet](#)

[General Information About Data Center Fact Sheet](#)

[Business Digest Radio Podcast with Host Dirk Hobbs and Special Guest Jason Green, Co-Founder and President of RAEDEN](#)

The Colorado Springs Chamber & EDC team also is available as a resource if you have questions about economic development, infrastructure, utilities or how projects like this fit into the broader future of the Pikes Peak region.

As discussions continue, our focus remains on supporting responsible growth, protecting community interests and ensuring Colorado Springs & the Pikes Peak region remains competitive for the industries and missions shaping the future of our economy. We ask you to speak to others about the facts concerning of data centers, the need for a strong sales tax base in our community, and the specifics of this project as the need for business is under attack in our state.

Thank you,
Johnna Reeder Kleymeyer
President & CEO
Colorado Springs Chamber & EDC

Project Taurus Update

Good afternoon,

The City of Colorado Springs Planning Department issued an administrative decision approving the Development Plan Modification application for Corporate Ridge No. 1 Lot 4 (also known as "Project Taurus"). This application further modifies the previous Development Plan, as modified, for Corporate Ridge No. 1 Lot 4 and allows the establishment of a data center use in the existing industrial building and site improvements on the 21.96 acre, BP (Business Park) zoned, site located at 1565 High Tech Way.

The administrative approval decision is dated Thursday, **June 11, 2026**.

This administrative decision begins the timeframe for appeal under City Code. **The deadline for submittal of an appeal request will be 5 p.m. on Monday, June 22, 2026.**

A copy of the form for appeals, which contains an excerpt from the appeal section of City code, is available on the City's website at [THIS LINK](#).

Copies of the approved documents can be found at [THIS LINK](#) on the City's Permits, Licenses and Records website. The record number is **DEPN-26-0039**.

Due to the significant public interest in this project, the Planning Department is preparing a memo to be shared next week providing additional context on the approval decision and review process, including key changes made to the original application in response to comments and City Code requirements.

Please direct any further public communications on this project to Mr. Sexton via phone at (719) 385-5366 or email at daniel.sexton@coloradosprings.gov.

Thanks,

Daniel Sexton

7.5.415: APPEALS:

A. General Requirements:

1. Right to Appeal:

a. An Affected Party aggrieved by an appealable administrative decision made by the Manager or other City official under this UDC may appeal the decision, except where appeals are specifically barred under this UDC.

b. For purposes of this Section, an Affected Party is:

(1) The applicant for the decision being appealed;

(2) The owner or tenant of a lot or parcel of land located within one thousand (1,000) feet of the subject lot; or

(3) Any owner or tenant of a lot or parcel of land located within three (3) miles of the subject property who has preserved standing by:

(a) Testifying at the public hearing on the application;

(b) Submitting written comments prior to the public hearing on the application; or

(c) In the case of applications approved by the Manager or an administrative official, submitting written comments to the Manager or administrative official during the comment period before the Manager or administrative official's action.

2. Notice of Appeal:

a. The notice of appeal shall state:

(1) The specific provision(s) of this UDC that is the basis of the appeal;

(2) Which of the following criteria for reversal or modification of the decision is applicable to the appeal:

(a) The decision is contrary to the express language of this UDC;

(b) The decision is erroneous; or

(c) The decision is clearly contrary to law; and

(3) Describe how the criteria for the relevant application have or have not been met.

b. A recommendation to City Council to approve an application shall not be the basis for an appeal.

c. As a preliminary matter, the body hearing the appeal may choose to vote on the sufficiency of the appeal to determine if the appeal has met the requirements of this Subsection. Upon a finding of insufficiency by a majority of the body hearing the appeal, the appeal shall be rejected, and no hearing held.

3. Complete Appeal Required: Any person pursuing an appeal subject to this Section 7.5.416 (Appeals) shall complete all forms pursuant to Section 7.5.403 (Application Submission) and the payment of all fees required by Section 7.5.404 (Fees). Failure to pay any required fee or to properly complete any required form within the time provided shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal.

4. Failure to appeal: An Affected Party shall file a written notice of appeal with the City within ten (10) days from the date of the final decision. The failure to appeal an appealable decision within ten (10) days of the decision shall be deemed a waiver of right to appeal to the courts under rule 106 of the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to exhaust administrative the remedies.

5. Stay of Decision: A perfected appeal to a City appellate body operates as a stay of the decision unless the Manager certifies in writing that one of the following apply:

a. A stay would cause or result in an imminent hazard to public health, safety, and welfare; or

b. The appeal or violation of this UDC relates to a current or proposed activity that is of such a short term nature that by the time an appeal hearing is held, the activity or violation will have been concluded, terminated, or moved to another site. The time frame in which violations of this nature operate is such that a stay of proceedings will make the enforcement process ineffective. Examples of short term violations include, but are not limited to, temporary vendors, promotional events, and temporary signs.

6. Scheduling of Hearing: Upon receiving a complete notice of appeal and payment of the corresponding fee:

a. Within seven (7) days after receipt of the appeal, and after providing the applicant and appellant with an opportunity to comment on the date of the hearing, the City shall schedule the public hearing.

b. The public hearing shall be scheduled for a regular or special meeting that is at least thirty (30) days, but not more than sixty (60) days, after the City's receipt of the appeal.

7. Record on Appeal: On appeal the entire file of the Planning Department pertaining to the matter shall be made a part of the record. The file must include at a minimum, the minutes of any related hearings, maps, drawings, reports, and applications.

List View

Calendar View

Search:

This Month

All Departments

☐ notes

☐ closed captions

Search Calendar

Help

9 records

Group

Export

Name	Meeting Date		Meeting Time	Meeting Location	Meeting Details	Agenda	Accessible Agenda	Minutes	Accessible Minutes	Video
City Council	6/23/2026	31	9:00 AM	Council Chambers <i>This meeting has been cancelled.</i>	Meeting details	 Agenda	 Accessible Agenda	Not available	Not available	
City Council Work Session	6/22/2026	31	9:00 AM	Council Chambers <i>This meeting has been cancelled</i>	Meeting details	 Agenda	 Accessible Agenda	Not available	Not available	
City Planning Commission	6/12/2026	31	9:00 AM	2880 International Cir., 2nd Floor, Hearing Room <i>Granicus Test</i>	Meeting details	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	
City Planning Commission	6/10/2026	31	9:00 AM	2880 International Cir., 2nd Floor, Hearing Room	Meeting details	 Agenda	 Accessible Agenda	Not available	Not available	 Video
City Council	6/9/2026	31	9:00 AM	Council Chambers	Meeting details	 Agenda	 Accessible Agenda	Not available	Not available	 Video
City Council Work Session	6/8/2026	31	9:00 AM	Council Chambers	Meeting details	 Agenda	 Accessible Agenda	Not available	Not available	 Video
City Planning Commission Work Session	6/4/2026	31	9:00 AM	30 S. Nevada Ave., Suite 102	Meeting details	 Agenda	 Accessible Agenda	Not available	Not available	 Video
Downtown Review Board	6/2/2026	31	9:00 AM	2880 International Cir., 2nd Floor, Hearing Room <i>This meeting has been cancelled</i>	Meeting details	Not available	Not available	Not available	Not available	
Historic Preservation Board	6/1/2026	31	4:30 PM	30 S. Nevada Ave., Suite 102	Meeting details	 Agenda	 Accessible Agenda	Not available	Not available	 Video