

Lauren Redfield

I urge Ecology not to approve this project unless there are far stronger protections for community health and a clear shift away from diesel dependence.

Ecology's own outreach materials highlight serious concerns about diesel exhaust, fine particulate pollution, and the cumulative impacts of data-center generators in Quincy. If Ecology is genuinely concerned, as it has stated, then approving another set of diesel generators is inconsistent with those concerns.

At a minimum, Ecology should require modern emission-control technologies, such as diesel particulate filters, and should strongly consider requiring a transition to cleaner backup-power alternatives, including battery storage or renewable-based systems. These technologies already exist and are in use elsewhere. If Sabey cannot or will not commit to cleaner alternatives, then this project simply should not move forward.

Another core issue is process. Quincy is experiencing the combined impacts of multiple data-center expansions, yet each permit is evaluated in isolation, as if it has no relationship to the dozens of generators already installed or being proposed. This piecemeal approach hides the true cumulative burden on a small rural community.

We need a permitting framework that evaluates a project's full lifecycle environmental impact, including cumulative air-quality degradation, health risks, long-term diesel reliance, and climate implications, rather than treating each generator request as a standalone event.

This proposal also conflicts with Washington's climate commitments. Under the Climate Commitment Act, our state is legally obligated to reduce emissions and accelerate the transition away from fossil-fuel infrastructure. Adding 13 more diesel generators, especially when cleaner technologies are available, runs directly counter to those commitments. Every new diesel unit locks in years of pollution, carbon emissions, and ongoing fossil-fuel dependency. Ecology should not approve infrastructure that undermines the climate goals the state has set and the public overwhelmingly supports.

Finally, I urge Ecology to center the people who actually live with these impacts. Diesel pollution disproportionately harms children, elders, agricultural workers, and community members with asthma or respiratory challenges. Quincy deserves the same health protections afforded to larger or more politically powerful communities.

For these reasons, I ask Ecology to require cleaner technologies, conduct a full cumulative-impact review, and, if those protections cannot be met, to deny the permit.

Thank you for your time and consideration.