



**STATE OF WASHINGTON**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY**

**Eastern Region Office**

4601 North Monroe St., Spokane, WA 99205-1295 • 509-329-3400

March 28, 2025

Hichem Garnaoui, Campus Director  
Microsoft Corporation, Columbia Data Center  
501 Port Industrial Parkway  
Quincy, WA 98848

Re: Microsoft Columbia Data Center Approval Order No. 25AQ-E009  
AQPID No. A0250278

Dear Hichem Garnaoui:

The Department of Ecology's Air Quality Program (Ecology) approves the condition updates and changes to bypass operations at Microsoft Columbia Data Center. The Data Center is located at 501 Port Industrial Parkway, Quincy, Washington in Grant County.

Ecology's approval is based on the Notice of Construction application and supplemental information submitted on July 26, 2023, through December 13, 2024. The 30-day comment period required per Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-400-171, was completed. Comments were received and are included in Appendix B of the Technical Support Document.

Enclosed is Approval Order No. 25AQ-E009 for Microsoft Columbia Data Center.

Thank you for your patience while we processed your application. If you have any questions, please contact me at [jenny.filipy@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:jenny.filipy@ecy.wa.gov) or 509-405-2487.

Sincerely,

Jenny Filipy, P.E.  
Commercial/Industrial Unit  
Regional Air Quality Program

JF:sg

Enclosures: Approval Order No. 25AQ-E009  
Technical Support Document

Certified Mail: 9214 8901 9403 8305 1022 72



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
**DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY**

Eastern Region Office

4601 North Monroe St., Spokane, WA 99205-1295 • 509-329-3400

March 28, 2025

Hichem Garnaoui, Campus Director  
Microsoft Corporation, Columbia Data Center  
501 Port Industrial Parkway  
Quincy, WA 98848

Re: Microsoft Columbia Data Center Approval Order No. 25AQ-E009  
AQPID No. A0250278

Dear Hichem Garnaoui:

The Department of Ecology's Air Quality Program (Ecology) approves the condition updates and changes to bypass operations at Microsoft Columbia Data Center. The Data Center is located at 501 Port Industrial Parkway, Quincy, Washington in Grant County.

Ecology's approval is based on the Notice of Construction application and supplemental information submitted on July 26, 2023, through December 13, 2024. The 30-day comment period required per Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-400-171, was completed. Comments were received and are included in Appendix B of the Technical Support Document.

Enclosed is Approval Order No. 25AQ-E009 for Microsoft Columbia Data Center.

Thank you for your patience while we processed your application. If you have any questions, please contact me at [jenny.filipy@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:jenny.filipy@ecy.wa.gov) or 509-405-2487.

Sincerely,

Jenny Filipy, P.E.  
Commercial/Industrial Unit  
Regional Air Quality Program

JF:sg

Enclosures: Approval Order No. 25AQ-E009  
Technical Support Document

Certified Mail: 9214 8901 9403 8305 1022 72

State of Washington  
Department of Ecology

In the matter of approving Condition ) **Approval Order No. 25AQ-E009**  
 Modifications for MICROSOFT ) AQPID No. A0250278  
**CORPORATION COLUMBIA DATA** )  
**CENTER** )

**Project Summary**

Microsoft Corporation – Columbia Data Center, herein referred to as the Permittee, is an existing data center located at 501 Port Industrial Parkway, Quincy, Washington, in Grant County.

The Permittee is classified as a Synthetic Minor source for Nitrogen Oxides.

**Equipment**

1. A list of equipment that was evaluated for this order of approval is contained in Tables 1.a through 1.c.

**Table 1.a: Engine & Generator Serial Numbers**

Phase	Unit ID	Engine SN	Generator SN	Build date
CO1/1	1	SBK000170	G4B00130	8/14/2006
CO1/1	2	SBK000179	G4B00132	8/25/2006
CO1/1	3	SBK000169	G4B00128	8/10/2006
CO1/1	4	SBK000181	G4B00133	8/28/2006
CO1/1	5	SBK000176	G4B00131	8/25/2006
CO1/1	6	SBK000168	G4B00129	8/10/2006
CO1/1	7	SBK000160	G4B00125	7/21/2006
CO1/1	8	SBK000159	G4B00127	7/19/2006
CO1/1	9	SBK000162	G4B00126	7/24/2006
CO1/1	10	SBK000158	G4B00124	7/19/2006
CO1/1	11	SBK000172	G4B00113	8/18/2006
CO1/1	12	SBK000990	KHD00231	8/15/2010
CO1/2	1	SBK000208	G4B00173	11/1/2006
CO1/2	2	SBK000214	G4B00171	11/6/2006
CO1/2	3	SBK000211	G4B00176	11/3/2006
CO1/2	4	SBK000213	G4B00177	11/6/2006
CO1/2	5	SBK000201	G4B00178	10/20/2006
CO1/2	6	SBK000171	G4B00112	8/17/2006
CO1/2	7	SBK000212	G4B00175	11/6/2006
CO1/2	8	SBK000205	G4B00170	10/30/2006
CO1/2	9	SBK000210	G4B00172	11/3/2006
CO1/2	10	SBK000200	G4B00179	10/20/2006
CO1/2	11	SBK000209	G4B00174	11/2/2006
CO1/2	12	SBK000989	KHD00230	8/14/2010
CO9	25	SBK000949	G8D00117	7/25/2010

Phase	Unit ID	Engine SN	Generator SN	Build date
CO3.2	26	SBK00947	G8D00116	7/16/2010
CO9	27	SBK00945	G8D00115	7/15/2010
CO9	28	SBK00953	G8D00119	7/28/2010
CO9	29	SBK00951	G8D00118	7/28/2010
CO9	30	SBK01014	G8D00142	10/6/2010
CO9	31	SBK01012	G8D00141	10/5/2010
CO9	32	SBK01030	G8D00146	10/14/2010
CO9	33	SBK01027	G8D00145	10/13/2010
CO9	34	SBK01013	G8D00140	9/30/2010
CO9	35	SBK01015	G8D00144	10/7/2010
CO6	1	LYM00715	G7J06261	5/27/2020
CO6	2	LYM01199	G7J06262	5/27/2020
CO6	3	LYM00713	G7J06249	5/27/2020
CO6	4	LYM01195	G7J06263	5/27/2020
CO6	5	LYM01200	G7J06260	5/27/2020
CO7	1	PW301455	G6B27561	11/11/2021
CO7	2	LYH00626	GAH00267	5/23/2022
CO7	3	LYH00627	GAH00268	5/23/2022
CO8	1	PW301453	G6B27561	11/1/2021
CO8	2	LYH00624	GAH00265	5/19/2022
CO8	3	LYH00625	GAH00266	5/20/2022

**Table 1.b: Fire Pump Engine Serial Number**

Unit ID	Engine SN	Engine Size	Build Year
CO1	Pe6068t602182	149 bhp	2006
CO2	Pe6068t679482	149 bhp	2007

**Table 1.c: Cooling Towers**

Unit ID	Number of Cooling Tower Banks	Number of Cooling Tower Units per Bank	Total number of Cooling Tower Units
CO1	1	18	18
CO2	1	18	18
Total	2	na	36

**Table 1.d: Nonroad engines 2.0 MWe (2,692 bhp) and 1.0 MWe (1,488 bhp) used if another emergency generator fails, exempt from New Source Review (WAC 173-400-035)**

Generator	Engine SN	Generator SN	Commission date
Nonroad – 2.0 MWe	4T400196	G4E00303	12/2024
Nonroad – 0.5 MWe	CM801975	G6B29665	12/2024
Nonroad – 0.5 MWe	4T400196	G4E00303	12/2024

## Legal Authority

The emissions from the proposed project have been reviewed under the legal authority of RCW 70A.15.2210 and the applicable rules and regulations adopted thereunder. The proposed project, if operated as specified, will be in accordance with applicable rules and regulations, as set forth in Chapters 173-400 WAC and 173-460 WAC and the operation thereof, at the location proposed, will not result in ambient air quality standards being exceeded.

This Notice of Construction (NOC) Approval Order rescinds and replaces NOC Approval Order No. 22AQ-E006. NOC Approval Order No. 22AQ-E006 is no longer in effect.

**Therefore, it is ordered** that the project as described in the NOC application and more specifically detailed in plans, specifications, and other information submitted to the Washington State Department of Ecology, (Ecology) is approved for construction and operation, provided the following conditions are satisfied:

## Approval Conditions

### 1. Administrative Conditions

- a. The emergency engine generators approved for operation by this Order are to be used solely for those purposes authorized for emergency generators under 40 C.F.R. 60, Subpart III. This includes the hourly operation requirements described in 40 C.F.R. 60.4211(f), except that there must be no operation of this equipment to produce power for demand-response arrangements, peak shaving arrangements, nor to provide power as part of a financial arrangement with another entity, nor to supply power to the grid.
- b. Mountain View Elementary School administrators must be provided a maintenance testing schedule as contained in the permit, and the Permittee must update the school whenever Ecology-approved changes occur in the maintenance testing schedule. As decided by the school administrators and the Permittee, an ongoing relationship between the school and the Permittee should be established.

### 2. Equipment Restrictions

- a. All engines identified in Tables 1.a and 2 used to power the electrical generators must be operated in accordance with applicable 40 C.F.R. 60, Subpart III requirements including but not limited to: certification by the manufacturer to meet the 40 C.F.R. 1039, Appendix I EPA Tier 2 or Tier 3 (for support engines) emissions levels as required by 40 C.F.R. 60.4202; and installed and operated as emergency engines, as defined in 40 C.F.R. 60.4219.
  - i. At the time of the effective date of this permit, Tier 4 interim and Tier 4 final certified engines (as specified in 40 C.F.R. 1039.102 Table 7 and 40 C.F.R. 1039.101 Table 1, respectively), are not required for 2.5 MWe (3633 bhp), 1.5 MWe (2,206 bhp), 350 kWe (539 bhp) electrical generators used for emergency purposes as defined in 40 C.F.R. 60.4219 in attainment areas in Washington State. Any engines installed at the facility after Tier 4 or other limits are implemented by EPA for

emergency generators, must meet the applicable specifications as required by EPA at the time the emergency engines are installed.

- b. Only Caterpillar Model 3516C 2.5 MWe (3633 bhp), Model 3512C 1.5 MWe (2,206 bhp), and Model C13 350 kWe (539 bhp) engines, nonroad engines, and electrical generating units are approved for operation at the facility and are listed in Table 1.a and Table 1.c above.
- c. Engines associated with buildings CO7 and CO8 must be equipped with Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) and Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) controls to meet emission limits listed in Condition 5, Table 3.
- d. The installation of any new or replacement engines 18 months after issuance of this Approval Order, will require notification to Ecology that includes engine manufacturer's specification sheets. Ecology will decide whether new source review is required based on various factors including whether the new engines will have either an increased emission rate or result in an emission concentration that may increase community impacts over those evaluated for this Approval Order, or if an update to Best Available Control Technology, analysis is necessary.

**Table 2 – Emergency Generator Exhaust Stack Height Requirements**

Quantity	Location	Minimum Height (feet)	Stack Diameter (inches)	Height Above Roof (feet)
20	CO1 and CO2 Building	38'	18"	8'
4	CO1 and CO2 Ground Level	20'	18"	
11	CO3.2 and CO9 Ground Level	31'	18"	
5	CO6 Building	38'	24"	12.5'
4	CO7 and CO8 Buildings 1.5 MWe (2,206 bhp)	46	16"	20.5'
2	CO7 and CO8 Buildings 350 kWe (539 bhp)	46	12"	20.5'

**3. Operating Limitations**

- a. Facility fuel consumption must be limited to a combined total of 467,485 gallons per year and 95,016 gallons per day of renewable diesel (including renewable hydrocarbon diesel and hydro-treated vegetable oil) and/or on-road specification No. 2 distillate fuel oil. All fuels used must be less than 0.00150 weight percent sulfur.
- b. The 35 CO1, CO2, CO3.2, and CO9 generators must not operate more than 100 hours per year per engine at an average capacity of 53 percent of full standby capacity. Generator operations may deviate from 53 percent of full standby capacity as long as emissions do not exceed emissions represented by 100 average annual operating hours at 53 percent of full standby capacity. Annual operating hours may be averaged over all 35 CO1, CO2, CO3.2, and CO9 generators.

- c. Operation of the 11 CO3.2, and CO9 generators for electrical bypass must be limited to approximately 44 hours per year each at an average electrical load of 40 percent of the standby rating. Annual operating hours for electrical bypasses may be averaged over the 11 generators. Operations for electrical bypasses may deviate from 40 percent of full standby capacity as long as emissions do not exceed emissions represented by 44 average annual operating hours at 40 percent of full standby capacity. No more than five engines will operate at the same time during any electrical bypass operation for four hours per day or two engines may operate for 44 hours.
- d. Each of the 35 CO1, CO2, CO3.2, and CO9 generator engines require maintenance and testing for approximately one hour per month. To mitigate engine emission impacts, the Permittee will perform at least 80 percent of all maintenance testing from 7:00 AM until 5:00 PM on Monday through Friday with no more than three engines tested concurrently. Engine maintenance and testing may take place outside of these restrictions upon coordination by the Permittee with the other data centers in Quincy to minimize engine emission impacts to the community. The Permittee must maintain records of the coordination communications with the other data centers, and those communications must be available for review by Ecology. This schedule can be re-negotiated at any time as approved in writing by Ecology and will not trigger revision or amendment of this Order.
- e. CO1 and CO2 each have one bank of six cooling units with a total of 18 cooling towers, for a facility total of 36 cooling towers. Each individual unit must have a mist eliminator that will maintain the maximum drift rate to no more than 0.0005 percent of the circulating water rate.
- f. Operation of the 11 CO3.2 and CO9 generators for power outage emergencies must be limited to a maximum of 48 hours per engine per calendar year at a maximum average electrical load of 75 percent. Annual operating hours for power outage emergencies may be averaged over the 11 generators. Operations for power outage emergencies may deviate from 75 percent of full standby capacity as long as emissions do not exceed emissions represented by 48 average annual operating hours at 75 percent of full standby capacity.
- g. The five CO6 generators must not operate more than 80 hours per year per engine. Annual operating hours may be averaged over all CO6 generators in service.
- h. Operation of more than one CO6 generator for more than 15 hours per generator in any 24-hour period must not occur more than three times in any three calendar year period.
- i. The operation of more than one CO6 generator, operating concurrently at any one time, must not occur on more than 21 calendar days in any three calendar year period.
- j. There is no limit on the number of days that operation of one CO6 generator at a time can occur, but operation under this scenario is limited to daytime hours only (7:00 am to 7:00 pm).
- k. The four 1.5 MWe (2,206 bhp) generators located at buildings CO7 and CO8 must not operate more than a combined total 220 hours per year.

- I. The two 350 kWe (539 bhp) generators located at building CO7 and CO8 must not operate more than a combined total of 200 hours per year.

#### **4. General Testing and Maintenance Requirements**

- a. The Permittee will follow engine-manufacturer's recommended diagnostic testing and maintenance procedures to ensure that each of the 40 2.5 MWe (3633 bhp) engines, four 1.5 MWe (2,206 bhp) engines, and two 350 kWe (539 bhp) engines will conform to applicable engine specifications in Conditions 2.a, 2.b, and applicable emission specifications in Condition 5, Table 3 throughout the life of each engine.
- b. Following installation and commissioning, or concurrent with commissioning, of the first generator, but prior to the transfer of a batch of engines to the Permittee's ownership, one of each of the 2.5 MWe (3,633 bhp) and 1.5 MWe (2,206 bhp) engines must be source tested. To demonstrate the engines are commissioned and programmed to run within the emission limits in Condition 5, Table 3, for Particulate Matter (PM) (filterable only), Nitrogen Oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), Non-Methane Hydrocarbons (NMHC), and Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions measurement must be conducted for one engine from each batch or control generation. Testing must be conducted at the loads of 100 percent, 75 percent, 50 percent, 25 percent and 10 percent using weighted averaging according to Appendix II to 40 C.F.R. 1039. Testing may be conducted using 40 C.F.R. 1065.
- c. Within 60 months of the first engine installation of each phase of installation, and every 60 months thereafter, the Permittee must measure emissions of PM (filterable), NMHC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>) from at least one representative engine from each batch of engines installed, in accordance with Condition 4.d. This testing will serve to demonstrate compliance with the emission limits contained in Condition 5, Table 3, and as an indicator of proper operation of the engines. The selection of the engine(s) to be tested must be subject to prior approval by Ecology and must be defined in the source test protocol submitted to Ecology no less than 30 days in advance of any compliance-related stack sampling conducted by the Permittee. The representative engine to be tested from each batch of engines installed must have the most operating hours since an engine of that batch was last tested.
- d. The following procedures must be used for each test for the engines required by Condition 4.b and 4.c unless an alternate method is proposed by the Permittee and approved in writing by Ecology prior to the test:
  - i. Periodic emissions testing should be combined with pre-scheduled maintenance testing and annual load bank testing. Additional operation of the engines for the purpose of emissions testing beyond the operating hour and fuel consumption limits authorized by this Order may be allowed by Ecology upon request.
  - ii. For the five load tests, testing must be performed at each of the five engine torque load levels described in Appendix II to 40 C.F.R. Part 1039, and data must be reduced to a single-weighted average value using the weighting factors specified in Appendix II. The Permittee may replace the dynamometer requirement in Subpart F of 40



- C.F.R. Part 1039 with corresponding measurement of gen-set electrical output to derive torque output.
- iii. For all tests, the F-factor described in Method 19 must be used to calculate exhaust flow rate through the exhaust stack, except that EPA Method 2 must be used to calculate the flow rate for purposes of particulate testing (Method 2 is not required if 40 C.F.R. 1065 is used). Fuel meter data measured according to Condition 4.f must be included in the test report, along with the emissions calculations.
  - iv. Three test runs must be conducted for each engine, except as allowed by the sampling protocol from 40 C.F.R. 1065. Each run must last at least 60 minutes except as allowed by the sampling protocol from 40 C.F.R. 1065. Source test analyzers and engine control unit data must be recorded at least once every minute during the test. Engine run time and torque output (measured kWe to convert to torque) and fuel usage must be recorded during each test run for each load and must be included in the test report.
  - v. In the event that any stack test indicates non-compliance with the emission limits in Condition 5, Table 3 the Permittee must repair or replace the engine and repeat the test on the same engine plus two additional engines from the same phase of installation as the engine showing non-compliance. Test reports must be submitted to Ecology within 60 days of the final day of testing. Test reports must be submitted to the address in Condition 7.
  - vi. For the gaseous pollutants (NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and NMHC), the Permittee may propose using a portable emissions instrument analyzer for subsequent rounds of periodic source testing if initial testing of engines show compliance with each of the emission limits referenced in Condition 5, Table 3. The use of an analyzer and the analyzer model must be approved in writing by Ecology prior to testing. The analyzer must be calibrated using EPA Protocol 1 gases according to the procedures for drift and bias limits outlined in EPA Methods 7E and Method 10. Alternate calibration procedures may be approved in advance by Ecology.
  - e. Each engine must be equipped with a properly installed and maintained non-resettable meter that records total operating hours.
  - f. Each engine must be connected to a properly installed and maintained fuel flow monitoring system that records the amount of fuel consumed by the engine during each operation.

## 5. Emission Limits

The 40 2.5 MWe (3633 bhp) engines, four 1.5 MWe (2,206 bhp) engines, and two 350 kWe (539 bhp) engines must meet the follow emission rate limitations:

- a. To demonstrate compliance with the following emission limits through stack testing, the Permittee must conduct exhaust stack testing and averaging of emission rates for five individual operating loads (10 percent, 25 percent, 50 percent, 75 percent, and 100 percent) according to 40 C.F.R. §1039, Appendix II, 40 C.F.R. Part 1039, Subpart F,

and/or 40 C.F.R. Part 60, Subpart IIII, or any other applicable EPA requirement in effect at the time the engines are installed.

**Table 3: Emission Limitations and Testing Requirements**

<b>Generator Engines</b>	<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Test Method*</b>	<b>Emission Limits</b>
<b>2.5 MWe</b> (2.709 MWm; 3,633 bhp)	PM (filterable)	EPA Method 5 or alternative method from 40 C.F.R. 1065	0.20 g/kWm-hr
<b>2.5 MWe</b> (2.709 MWm; 3,633 bhp)	NMHC and NOx	EPA Method 7E, 25A and 18 or alternative method from 40 C.F.R 1065	6.4 g/kWm-hr
<b>2.5 MWe</b> (2.709 MWm; 3,633 bhp)	CO	EPA Method 10, or alternative method from 40 C.F.R. 1065	3.5 g/kWm-hr
<b>1.5 Mwe</b> (1.645 MWm; 2,206 bhp); <b>350 kWe</b> (402 kWm; 539 bhp)	PM (filterable)	EPA Method 5 or alternative method from 40 C.F.R. 1065	0.03 g/kWm-hr
<b>1.5 Mwe</b> (1.645 MWm; 2,206 bhp); <b>350 kWe</b> (402 kWm; 539 bhp)	NOx	EPA Method 7E or alternative method from 40 C.F.R 1065	0.67 g/kWm-hr
<b>1.5 Mwe</b> (1.645 MWm; 2,206 bhp); <b>350 kWe</b> (402 kWm; 539 bhp)	NMHC	EPA Method 25A and 18 or alternative method from 40 C.F.R 1065	0.70 g/kWm-hr
<b>1.5 Mwe</b> (1.645 MWm; 2,206 bhp); <b>350 kWe</b> (402 kWm; 539 bhp)	CO	EPA Method 10, or alternative method from 40 C.F.R. 1065	3.5 g/kWm-hr
<b>1.5 Mwe</b> (1.645 MWm; 2,206 bhp)	Ammonia	BAAQMD Method ST-1B or EPA CTM-027; or alternative method suitable for use with 40 C.F.R. 1065 (100% -load +/- 2%)	0.17 lb/hr
<b>350 kWe</b> (402 kWm; 539 bhp)	Ammonia	BAAQMD Method ST-1B or EPA CTM-027; or alternative method suitable for use with 40 C.F.R. 1065 (100% -load +/- 2%)	0.05 lb/hr

\*In lieu of these requirements, the Permittee may propose an alternative test protocol to Ecology in writing for approval.

- b. Total annual facility-wide emissions must not exceed the 12-month rolling average emissions for PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMHC, SO<sub>2</sub>, DEEP, and NO<sub>2</sub> as listed in Table 4.

**Table 4: Criteria Pollutant and Toxic Air Pollutant Emission Limits for Total Facility CO1, CO2, CO3.2, CO9, CO6, CO7, CO8 (Tons/Year)**

Pollutant	Annual Emissions
PM smaller than 10 microns in diameter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	14.29
PM smaller than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> ) <sup>(a)</sup>	6.49
PM2.5/PM10 (Gens Only)	2.99
Carbon monoxide (CO)	6.49
Nitrogen oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )	37.60
NMHC, Volatile organic compound (VOC)	2.42
Sulfur dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )	0.05
Diesel Engine Exhaust Particulate (DEEP)*	0.61
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO <sub>2</sub> )**	3.76
Ammonia	0.023

\*All PM emissions from the generator engines are PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and all filterable PM<sub>2.5</sub> from the generator engines is considered Diesel Engine Exhaust Particulate (DEEP).

\*\* NO<sub>2</sub> is assumed to be equal to 10 percent of the total NO<sub>x</sub> emitted.

- c. Visual emissions from each diesel electric generator exhaust stack must be no more than 10 percent, with the exception of a 10-minute period after unit start-up. Visual emissions must be measured by using the procedures contained in 40 C.F.R. 60, Appendix A, Method 9.

## 6. Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Manuals

A site-specific O&M manual for the facility equipment must be developed and followed. Manufacturers' operating instructions and design specifications for the engines, generators, cooling towers, and associated equipment must be included in the manual. The O&M manual must be reviewed annually and be updated to reflect any modifications of the equipment or its operating procedures. Emissions that result from failure to follow the operating procedures contained in the O&M manual or manufacturer's operating instructions may be considered proof that the equipment was not properly installed, operated, and/or maintained. The O&M manual for the diesel engines and associated equipment must at a minimum include:

- a. Manufacturer's testing and maintenance procedures that will ensure that each individual engine will conform to the EPA Tiered Emission Standards appropriate for that engine throughout the life of the engine.
- b. Normal operating parameters and design specifications.
- c. Operating maintenance schedule.

## 7. Submittals

All notifications, reports, and other submittals must be sent to:

Washington State Department of Ecology  
Air Quality Program  
4601 N. Monroe Street  
Spokane, WA 99205-1295

Annual reports may also be submitted electronically to: [emissions.inventory@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:emissions.inventory@ecy.wa.gov)

*OR AS DIRECTED.*

## 8. Recordkeeping

All records, O&M Manual, and procedures developed under this Order must be organized in a readily accessible manner and cover a minimum of the most recent 60-month period. The following records are required to be collected and maintained.

- a. Fuel receipts with amount of diesel and sulfur content for each delivery to the facility.
- b. Annual hours of operation for each diesel engine.
- c. Annual number of start-ups for each diesel engine.
- d. Annual gross power generated by facility-wide operation of the emergency backup electrical generators.
- e. Upset condition log for each engine and generator that includes date, time, duration of upset, cause, and corrective action.
- f. Recordkeeping required by 40 C.F.R. Part 60 Subpart IIII.
- g. Air quality complaints received from the public or other entity, and the affected emissions units.

## 9. Reporting

- a. The serial number, manufacturer make and model, and standby capacity for each engine and the generator, and the engine build date must be submitted prior to installation of each engine.
- b. The following information will be submitted to Ecology at the address in Condition 7 above by January 31 of each calendar year.
  - i. Monthly rolling annual total summary of air contaminant emissions, monthly rolling hours of operation with annual total, and monthly rolling gross power generation with annual total.
  - ii. Written notification that the O&M manual has been developed and updated. For new generator engines being installed, the O&M manual must be developed prior to the transfer of the engines to the Permittee for operational use.
- c. Any air quality complaints resulting from operation of the emissions units or activities must be promptly assessed and addressed. A record must be maintained of the

Permittee's action to investigate the validity of the complaint and what, if any, corrective action was taken in response to the complaint. Ecology must be notified within three days of receipt of any such complaint.

- d. The Permittee must notify Ecology within 60 days (or longer as approved by Ecology of the following events:
  - i. Changes in operation contrary to information submitted in the NOC application.
  - ii. Discontinued operations of facility. This notification must include a shutdown status maintenance plan containing the following information, at a minimum:
    - A. Maintenance that will be performed during the shutdown to allow startup in a timely manner with minimum amount of work and emissions, (allowable emission levels as of the date of shutdown cannot increase upon reopening).
  - iii. Reactivating the facility following discontinued operations of 18 months or more. This notification must include a start-up plan containing the following information, at a minimum:
    - A. Documentation that the shutdown maintenance was performed during shutdown to allow startup in a timely manner with minimum amount of work and emissions (allowable emissions levels as of the date of shutdown cannot increase upon reopening).
    - B. Documentation of testing performed which demonstrates that units are still able to meet the parameters of this approval order after being inactive, or other documentation which demonstrates why testing is not necessary.
- e. The Permittee must notify Ecology within one business day of nonroad engines being brought on site for temporary replacement of a permitted engine.

## **10. Stack Testing**

Any emission testing performed to verify conditions of this Approval Order or for submittal to Ecology in support of this facility's operations must be conducted as follows:

- a. At least 30 days in advance of such testing, the Permittee must submit a testing protocol for Ecology approval that includes the following information:
  - i. The location and Unit ID of the equipment proposed to be tested.
  - ii. The operating parameters to be monitored during the test and the personnel assigned to monitor the parameters during the test.
  - iii. A description of the source including manufacturer, model number and design capacity of the equipment, and the location of the sample ports or test locations.
  - iv. Time and date of the test and identification and qualifications of the personnel involved.
  - v. A description of the test methods or procedures to be used.

- b. Test Reporting: test reports must be submitted to Ecology within 60 days of completion of the test and must include, at a minimum, the following information:
  - i. A description of the source including manufacturer, model number and design capacity of the equipment, and the location of the sample ports or test locations.
  - ii. Time and date of the test and identification and qualifications of the personnel involved.
  - iii. A summary of results, reported in units and averaging periods consistent with the applicable emission standard or limit.
  - iv. A summary of control system or equipment operating conditions.
  - v. A summary of production related parameters.
  - vi. A description of the test methods or procedures used including all field data, quality assurance/quality control procedures and documentation.
  - vii. A description of the analytical procedures used including all laboratory data, quality assurance/quality control procedures and documentation.
  - viii. Copies of field data and example calculations.
  - ix. Chain of custody information.
  - x. Calibration documentation.
  - xi. Discussion of any abnormalities associated with the results.
  - xii. A statement signed by the senior management official of the testing firm certifying the validity of the source test report.

## 11. General Conditions

- a. **Activities Inconsistent with this Order** – Any activity undertaken by the Permittee, or others, in a manner that is inconsistent with the data and specifications submitted as part of the NOC application or this NOC Approval Order, will be subject to Ecology enforcement under applicable regulations.
- b. **Availability of Order** – Legible copies of this NOC Approval Order and any O&M manual(s) must be available to employees in direct operation of the equipment described in the NOC application and must be available for review upon request by Ecology.
- c. **Compliance Assurance Access** – Access to the source by representatives of Ecology or the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) must be permitted upon request. Failure to allow access is grounds for enforcement action under the federal Clean Air Act or the Washington State Clean Air Act and may result in revocation of this NOC Approval Order.
- d. **Discontinuing Construction** – Approval to construct or modify a stationary source becomes invalid if construction is not commenced within 18 months after receipt of the approval, or if construction is discontinued for a period of 18 months or more. The

permitting authority may extend the 18-month period upon satisfactory showing by the permittee that an extension is justified.

- e. **Equipment Operation** – Operation of the facility must be conducted in compliance with all data and specifications submitted as part of the NOC application and in accordance with O&M manuals, unless otherwise approved in writing by Ecology.
- f. **Registration** – Periodic emissions inventory and other information may be requested by Ecology. The requested information must be submitted within 30 days of receiving the request, unless otherwise specified. All fees must be paid by the date specified.
- g. **Testing** – When information obtained by Ecology indicates the need to quantify emissions, Ecology may require the Permittee to conduct material analysis or air emissions testing under WAC 173-400-105. This testing requirements is in addition to any testing required by Ecology in this Order, other permits, or other state or federal requirements.
- h. **Violation Duration** – If the Permittee violates a condition in this NOC Approval Order, testing, recordkeeping, monitoring, or credible evidence will be used to establish the starting date of the violation. The violation will be presumed to continue until testing, recordkeeping, monitoring, or other credible evidence indicates compliance. A violation of a condition includes, but is not limited to, failure of air pollution control equipment, failure of other equipment resulting in increased emissions, or a failed source test indicating an exceedance of an emission limit.
- i. **Obligations Under Other Laws or Regulations** – Nothing in this NOC Approval Order will be construed so as to relieve the Permittee of its obligations under any state, local, or federal laws or regulations.
- j. **Maintaining Compliance** – It must not be a defense for the Permittee in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the operation in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this NOC Approval Order.
- k. **Visible Emissions** – No visible emissions from the source are allowed beyond the property line, as determined by 40 C.F.R. Part 60, Appendix A, Test Method 22.
- l. **Changes in Operations** – Changes in operation, discontinued operation, or inadequate maintenance plans or re-start plans (see “Reporting” requirements), may require a new or amended NOC Approval Order.

Authorization may be modified, suspended, or revoked in whole or part for cause, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Violation of any terms or conditions of this authorization.
- Obtaining this authorization by misrepresentation or failure to disclose full all relevant facts.

The provisions of this authorization are severable and, if any provision of this authorization or application of any provision to any circumstance is held invalid, the application of such

provision to other circumstances, and the remainder of this authorization, must not be affected thereby.

### **Your Right to Appeal**

You have a right to appeal this NOC Approval Order to the Pollution Control Hearing Board (PCHB) within 30 days of the date of receipt of this NOC Approval Order. The appeal process is governed by Chapter 43.21B RCW and Chapter 371-08 WAC. "Date of receipt" is defined in RCW 43.21B.001(2).

To appeal you must do the following within 30 days of the date of receipt of this NOC Approval Order:

- File your appeal and a copy of this NOC Approval Order with the PCHB (see addresses below). "Filing" means actual receipt by the PCHB during regular business hours as defined in Chapter 371-08-305 WAC and -335. "Notice of appeal" is defined in Chapter 371-08-340 WAC.
- Serve a copy of your appeal and this NOC Approval Order on Ecology by mail, in person or by email (See addresses below).

You must also comply with other applicable requirements in Chapter 43.21B RCW and Chapter 371-08 WAC.

### **Address and Location Information**

#### **Filing with the PCHB**

For the most current information regarding filing with the PCHB, visit <https://eluh0.wa.gov/> or call: 360-664-9160.

#### **Service on Ecology**

##### **Street Address:**

Department of Ecology  
Attn: Appeals Processing Desk  
300 Desmond Drive SE  
Lacey, WA 98503

##### **Mailing Address:**

Department of Ecology  
Attn: Appeals Processing Desk  
PO Box 47608  
Olympia, WA 98504-7608

##### **E-mail Address:**

Ecologyappeals@ecy.wa.gov



**Americans with Disabilities Act Information**

Accommodation Requests

To request ADA accommodation including materials in a format for the visually impaired, call Ecology at 360-407-7668 or visit <https://ecology.wa.gov/accessibility>. People with impaired hearing may call Washington Relay Service at 711. People with speech disability may call TTY at 877-833-6341.

Dated this 28 day of March 2025, at Spokane, Washington.

Prepared By:

Approved By:

---

Jenny Filipy, P.E.  
Eastern Regional Office  
Department of Ecology  
State of Washington


---

Karin Baldwin, Section Supervisor  
Eastern Regional Office  
Department of Ecology  
State of Washington

hearing may call Washington Relay Service at 711. People with speech disability may call TTY at 877-833-6341.


Dated this 28 day of March 2025, at Spokane, Washington.

Prepared By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jenny Filipy, P.E.  
Eastern Regional Office  
Department of Ecology  
State of Washington



Approved By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Karin Baldwin, Section Supervisor  
Eastern Regional Office  
Department of Ecology  
State of Washington

Technical Support Document  
Notice of Construction Approval Order No. 25AQ-E009  
Microsoft Corporation – Columbia Data Center  
AQPID No. A0250278  
Quincy, WA

**Prepared by: Jenny Filipy, P.E.**

## **1. Project Summary**

Microsoft Corporation – Columbia Data Center (the source) is a data center classified as a synthetic minor source for nitrogen oxides with multiple existing emissions units. This review is for updates to approval conditions to allow for five generators to operate at one time during bypass for four hours a day and update language to add more flexibility to run the generators less often and emit less emissions if an average load rate is not reached over a year. Tier 4 Nonroad engines modeling was also evaluated with this project. Nonroad engines are exempt from New Source Review and follow WAC 173-400-035. Nonroad engines will only be used for temporary replacement of an existing engine that needs repair or replacement.

An initial Notice of Construction (NOC) application was submitted on July 26, 2023, by Microsoft Corporation – Columbia Data Center for the Approval Order Update project. The Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) reviewed the initial application and found it incomplete per Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-400-111 on August 25, 2023. Amended NOC applications were received by Ecology on September 19, 2023, through December 13, 2024, and found to be complete on December 16, 2024.

## **2. Application Processing**

### **a. Public Notice**

Due to public interest, Ecology scheduled a 30-day comment period December 30, 2024, through February 27, 2025. Legal notices were posted in English and Spanish on Ecology's website and The Quincy Valley Post Register. Response to comments is attached as appendix B. An in-person public hearing was held on February 20, 2025, no member from the public attended.

Resources used to determine outreach:

Environmental Protection Agency: [EJScreen \(epa.gov\)](https://www.epa.gov/ejscreen)

Department Of Health Disparities map: [Information by Location | Washington Tracking Network \(WTN\)](#)

Washington GIS map: [Limited English Proficiency Application \(arcgis.com\)](#)

b. State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

City of Quincy issued a determination of nonsignificance (DNS) on September 15, 2021.

**3. Applicable Regulations**

a. State Regulations

i. Minor New Source Review Applicability

Per WAC 173-400-110, an NOC application and an order of approval must be issued by the permitting authority prior to the establishment of a new source or modification.

As stated in the NOC application and consistent with Ecology’s review, the project proposes changes to approval conditions and increase in short term emissions from five generators running in bypass mode for four hours versus what was previously permitted of two generators running in bypass mode for 44 hours. These project changes are not subject to minor new source review (NSR). However, modeling of the short-term emission changes has been completed to show compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Modeling is also required for the Nonroad engines as their total capacity is over 2000 bhp. Nonroad engines are not subject to New Source Review but do follow requirements of WAC 173-400-035.

A. Actual Emissions

The actual emissions from the bypass project over short-term averaging periods are shown below in Tables 1 and 2 and emissions from nonroad engines are included in Table 1. Annual emissions did not increase for the bypass project as there were no increases to fuel or hourly limits for the permitted generators. The Tier 4 nonroad engines are exempt from toxic air pollutant review per WAC 173-400-035(2)(d).

**Table 1. Actual emissions increase for pollutants pounds per averaging period**

<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Bypass project Emissions (pounds/Ave Period)</b>	<b>Emissions from Nonroad engines (pounds/Ave Period)</b>	<b>NAAQS Averaging Period</b>
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	62.32	6.4	8-hour
CO	15.58	0.80	1-hour
Nitrogen dioxides (NO <sub>2</sub> )	--	84	Annual
NO <sub>2</sub>	15.7	1.76	1-hour
Particulate Matter, PM <sub>10</sub>	28.76	13.92	24-hour
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	--	58	Annual

Pollutant	Bypass project Emissions (pounds/Ave Period)	Emissions from Nonroad engines (pounds/Ave Period)	NAAQS Averaging Period
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	28.76	13.92	24-hour
Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )	0.54	0.153	3-hour
SO <sub>2</sub>	0.18	0.051	1-hour

**Table 2. Actual Toxic Air Pollutant (TAP) emissions increase and de minimis emission values**

Pollutant	bypass Emissions Project	De Minimis Emission Values	Averaging Period
CO	<b>15.58</b>	1.10	1-hour
SO <sub>2</sub>	0.18	0.46	1-hour
NO <sub>2</sub>	<b>15.67</b>	0.46	1-hour
Acrolein	<b>9.4E-02</b>	1.3E-03	24-hour
Chlorobenzene	5.54E-04	3.70	24-hour
n-Hexane	7.46E-02	2.60	24-hour
Hydrogen chloride	<b>0.52</b>	3.3E-02	24-hour
Manganese and compounds	<b>8.59E-03</b>	1.1E-03	24-hour
Mercury, elemental	<b>5.54E-03</b>	1.1E-04	24-hour
Propylene	1.29	11.00	24-hour
Selenium and compounds	6.10E-03	7.4E-02	24-hour
Toluene	0.29	19.00	24-hour
Xylenes	0.12	0.82	24-hour

ii. Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD)

PSD does not apply, based on allowable emissions.

iii. Other Applicable Requirements

In accordance with WAC 173-400-113, the generator emission sources must comply with all applicable emission standards adopted under Chapter 70A.15 RCW. The following applicable emission standards are associated with the proposed project:

- A. WAC 173-400-040 General standards for maximum emissions: limits visible emissions from all sources to no more than three minutes of 20 percent opacity, in an hour, of an air contaminant from any emission unit.
- B. WAC 173-400-050 and -060 Emission standards for combustion and incineration units and general process units: limits emissions of particulate matter from combustion and general process units to 0.23 gram per dry cubic

meter at standard conditions (0.10 grains per dry standard cubic foot) of exhaust gas.

- C. WAC 173-400-115 Standards of performance for new sources: adopts by reference 40 C.F.R. Part 60, Subpart IIII. See more below.

b. Federal Regulations

In accordance with WAC 173-400-113, the generator emission sources must comply with all applicable new source performance standards (NSPS) included in 40 C.F.R. Part 60, national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAPs) included in 40 C.F.R. Part 61, and NESHAPs for source categories included in 40 C.F.R. Part 63. The following applicable emission standards are associated with the proposed project:

i. Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources

The ICE NSPS (40 C.F.R. Part 60, Subpart IIII) applies to each emergency generator. The regulation specifies: criteria for classification as emergency engines, Tier-2 or Tier 3 emission standards for the engines, depending on the power rating; and fuel, monitoring, compliance, and notification requirements for the Permittee.

ii. National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories

The RICE NESHAP applies to each engine. However, each engine is also subject to the ICE NSPS (see above). At 40 C.F.R. 63.6590(c), the NESHAP specifies that compliance must be met by meeting the requirements of the NSPS; therefore no further requirements apply to the engines.

#### 4. Emissions

a. Emission Factors

Emission factors for the emergency generator engines were provided as Not-to-Exceed-Limits by the manufacturer Caterpillar for NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, PM, hydrocarbons (HC). The following was assumed for the emergency generators:

- i. HCs were assumed to be equivalent to VOC and non-methane HC.
- ii. The sum of PM and HC (assumed to all condense) and be equivalent PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> for the engines.

The emission factor for SO<sub>2</sub> was calculated based on sulfur content of the ultra-low sulfur fuel and an average heating value of diesel fuel. All sulfur was assumed to convert to SO<sub>2</sub>.

An additional factor was added for cold-start emissions (PM, CO, total VOC, and volatile TAPs). These factors are based on short-term concentration trends for VOC and CO emissions observed immediately after startup of a large diesel backup generator. These

observations were documented in the California Energy Commission’s report “Air Quality Implications of Backup Generators in California” (Lents et al. 2005).

All the remaining emission rates for toxic air pollutants from the generators were calculated using emission factors from the most conservative of Ventura County Air Pollution Control District AB 2588 Diesel Internal Combustion Factors and California Air Toxics Emission Factor (CATEF) database for ICE, diesel engines.

- b. The table below presents the potential emissions and allowable emissions for entire facility. The facility is a synthetic minor for Nitrogen Oxides.

**Table 3. Potential and Allowable Emissions for Total Source**

<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Total Source Potential Emissions (tons/year)</b>	<b>Total Source Allowable Emissions (tons/year)</b>
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	33.98	6.49
Nitrogen Oxides (NO <sub>x</sub> )	213.94	37.60
PM <sub>10</sub>	18.92	14.29
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	15.42	6.49
Total Suspended Particulates (TSP)	26.72	14.29
Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )	0.28	0.05
Volatile Organic Compounds, total (VOC)	12.29	2.42
Greenhouse Gases (GHG)	44,326	8,889

## 5. Ambient Air Quality Standards

As specified in WAC 173-400-113, the proposed new or modified source(s) must not cause or contribute to a violation of any ambient air quality standard. This includes the ambient air quality standards for both criteria and toxic air pollutants.

- a. Pollutants Listed Under WAC 173-400-110 (Except TAPs)

For NO<sub>2</sub>, CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and SO<sub>2</sub>, modeling was performed to satisfy the requirements of Chapter 173-400-113(3) WAC and 173-400-035 WAC. The modeling demonstrates that the emissions increase as a result of the bypass condition project and the nonroad engines will not exceed the ambient air quality standards. The modeling results are included in the table below.

**Table 4. Criteria Pollutant Modeling Results**

<b>Criteria Pollutant</b>	<b>Averaging Period</b>	<b>Maximum Modeled Concentration with background (<math>\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3</math>)</b>	<b>Ambient Air Quality Standard (<math>\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3</math>)</b>
NO <sub>2</sub>	Annual	6.8	100
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-hour	186.52	188
CO	8-hour	1,373	10,800
CO	1-hour	1,008	40,000
PM <sub>10</sub>	24-hour	79.5	150
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Annual	5.81	9
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	24-hour	31.0	35
SO <sub>2</sub>	3-hour	8.33	1,308
SO <sub>2</sub>	1-hour	15.6	196

b. Toxic Air Pollutants (TAPs)

In accordance with WAC 173-460-040, TAP sources must meet the requirements of Chapter 173-460 WAC, unless they are exempt by WAC 173-400-110(5).

As shown in Table 5, modeling was required for short term emissions for the bypass condition changes. As such, the emission units must comply with WAC 173-460-070 (ambient impact requirement). The nonroad engines are exempt from TAP review per WAC 173-400-035(2)(d). The source may demonstrate compliance with the ambient impact requirement by either showing that the emissions increase is less than the small quantity emissions rates (SQER) or through dispersion modeling. The table below includes the estimated emissions increases associated with the bypass project and the applicable SQER.

**Table 5. TAP Analysis**

<b>TAP</b>	<b>Estimated Increase</b>	<b>SQER</b>	<b>Modeling Required?</b>
CO	15.58	43.0	No
NO <sub>2</sub>	15.67	0.87	Yes
Acrolein	9.4E0-2	2.6E-02	Yes
Hydrogen chloride	0.52	0.67	No
Manganese and Compounds	8.59E-03	2.2E-02	No
Mercury, elemental	5.54E-03	2.2E-03	Yes

For the TAPs in Table 5 that require modeling, modeling was performed to satisfy the requirements of Washington’s state toxics rule in Chapter 173-460 WAC. The modeling demonstrates that the emissions increases as a result of the project will not exceed the



acceptable source impact level (ASIL) screening thresholds. The modeling results are included in the table below.

**Table 6. TAP Modeling Results**

<b>TAP</b>	<b>Averaging Period</b>	<b>Maximum Modeled Concentration (<math>\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3</math>)</b>	<b>ASIL (<math>\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3</math>)</b>	<b>Percent of ASIL</b>
NO <sub>2</sub>	1-hour	184.6	470	39%
Acrolein	24-hour	0.03	0.35	9%
Mercury, elemental	24-hour	0.002	0.03	7%

**Appendix A – Federal Rule Applicability**

**1. 40 C.F.R. Part 60, Subpart IIII**

The ICE NSPS (40 C.F.R. Part 60, Subpart IIII) applies to each engine. The applicable portions the rule appear to be:

<b>Citation</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Notes</b>
60.4202(a)(2)	Manufacturer emission standards	Specifies that 2007 model year and later emergency stationary CI ICE with a maximum engine power $\geq 37$ kW and $\leq 2,237$ KW be certified to the emission standards specified in 40 C.F.R. 1039, Appendix I.
60.4205(b)	Owner/Operator emission standards	Directs owners and operators of 2007 model year and later emergency stationary CI ICE to comply with the emission standards for new nonroad CI engines in §60.4202.
60.4209(a)	Owner/Operator monitoring requirements	Requires installation install a non-resettable hour meter prior to startup of each engine, since the engines do not meet the standards applicable to non-emergency engines.
Table 8 to Subpart IIII of Part 60	Applicability of General Provisions to Subpart IIII	The table lists what portions of 40 C.F.R. 60 Subpart I are applicable, including notification and recordkeeping requirements.

**2. 40 C.F.R. Part 63, Subpart ZZZZ**

The RICE NESHAP applies to each engine. Condition 1 of the Order requires general compliance with this regulation. However, each engine is also subject to the ICE NSPS (see above). At 40 C.F.R. 63.6590(c), the NESHAP specifies that compliance must be met by meeting the requirements of the NSPS; therefore, no further requirements apply to the engines.

## **Appendix B – Response to Comments**

### **December 30, 2024, to February 27, 2025, Comment Period**

#### **Commenter - Gabi Davidson-Gomez**

##### **Comment 1:**

I am a bilingual community member and recently read the announcement about the Microsoft Columbia Data Center proposal. I followed the link to read the Spanish version and noted that some information was lacking or outright missing compared to the English version; here is my feedback:

Lack of formatting e.g. boldface, larger text sizes, and bullet points to facilitate comprehension as compared to the English announcement. It is difficult to visually separate headings from content, distinguish the most important info at a glance, and view details in a list rather than a paragraph format.

##### **Response to Comment 1: (Jenny, Janice)**

Thank you. This is great feedback that was shared with our web communications team. We will take this feedback into consideration for future web postings. On Friday, February 14, 2025, we made larger font size and boldfacing changes to the Spanish version after receiving this comment. Please see Appendix C for updates to the public announcement.

##### **Comment 2:**

The "documents for revision" links all lead to technical documents in English and the WAC "GENERAL REGULATIONS FOR AIR POLLUTION SOURCES" also in English. Spanish-language readers will not be able to understand the information they are entitled to review in order to develop informed opinions and comments on this proposal and to participate equitably in the public hearing process.

##### **Response to Comment 2: (Jenny, Janice)**

Yes, this is correct. All documents for review are in English. In the future, we will add the language services messaging on how to get information in another language. Our external website has a Spanish translated URL: <https://ecology.wa.gov/about-us/accessibility-equity/language-services/servicios-de-idiomas> OR [Servicios de Idiomas - Washington State Department of Ecology](#) so the public can request translation help.

English version:

We offer free language services about our programs and services for people whose primary language is not English. For example, we can provide:

- Information written in your preferred language.
- Qualified interpreters in person or over the telephone.

To request these services, or to learn more about what we can provide, contact our Language Access Coordinator, [language@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:language@ecy.wa.gov) or call 360-870-1689. When you call, please allow a few moments for us to contact an interpreter.

**Comment 3:**

The paragraph in "Background" about what data centers are and where they are located is completely missing from the Spanish announcement.

**Response to Comment 3: (Jenny, Janice)**

Data center background text that has been translated:

Data centers, sometimes called server farms, house the servers that manage email, store data, and run computer applications. If you shop on the web or use social media, your information is routed through a data center. Most of the data centers regulated by Ecology are located in Quincy and the Wenatchee area because those areas have dependable, lower cost electricity. Sign up for email updates about data centers.

On Friday, February 14, 2025, Spanish translation was updated to include this background section. Please see Appendix C for updates to the public announcement.

**Comment 4:**

Hyperlinks for ECY webpage to learn more about data centers, to sign up for email updates about data centers, and ECY webpage on notice of construction permits are all missing from the Spanish version. This would be a very easy fix to include to facilitate further access to information and understanding for Spanish speaking communities (with the caveat that these resources are published in English, but ECY could direct Spanish speakers to contact the language services team as is the norm throughout their website).

**Response to Comment 4: (Jenny, Janice)**

We will add a language services Spanish translated URL: <https://ecology.wa.gov/about-us/accessibility-equity/language-services/servicios-de-idiomas> OR [Servicios de Idiomas - Washington State Department of Ecology](#) so the public knows how request translation help.

English version:

We offer free language services about our programs and services for people whose primary language is not English. For example, we can provide:

- Information written in your preferred language.

- Qualified interpreters in person or over the telephone.

To request these services, or to learn more about what we can provide, contact our Language Access Coordinator, [language@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:language@ecy.wa.gov) or call 360-870-1689. When you call, please allow a few moments for us to contact an interpreter.

**Comment 5:**

The hyperlinks for the forms - submitting a records request online and for public comment online - are not present in the Spanish version, instead directing readers to email [recordsofficer@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:recordsofficer@ecy.wa.gov) with records requests and sending public comments through email to [jenny.filipy@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:jenny.filipy@ecy.wa.gov). These seem like appropriate channels for communication since the online forms are both in English, but how can we ensure that the email submissions are being read, translated, and given the same level of priority as those that come in from the online forms?

I would appreciate it if you could answer my question from the last bullet point, and pass along this feedback to others in the agency who can address these inconsistencies in communication to our Spanish-speaking community members.

Thank you so much!

**Response to Comment 5: (Jenny, Gail, Janice)**

On Friday, February 14, 2025, we added a hyperlink for the records request online Spanish translation version. Please see Appendix C for updates to the public announcement.

We sent the following response via email on January 14, 2025:

Thank you. Your feedback is incredibly helpful to improve our communications process, and we have shared it with our communications and translation team members. We have submitted a Spanish translation request on the data center background text and are looking at ways to improve formatting. Translation help for the linked documents can be requested at : <https://ecology.wa.gov/about-us/accessibility-equity/language-services/servicios-de-idiomas> OR [Servicios de Idiomas - Washington State Department of Ecology](#). We will include this information in future notices.

In response to the last bullet point in your message:

Public records request

- Our rules require us to respond to the request within five business days. The response can range from a clarification asking for more information to providing the requested records, but the requestor will receive a response within five business days.

#### Public comments

- When a public comment is received, the recipient of the comment will provide confirmation that the comment is received (if the comment is received via email). The comment and response are documented as a response to comments in the Technical Support Document that accompanies the permit. A copy of the response to comments is provided to the person that submitted the comment. This is true for all comments, regardless of format or language.

#### **Commenter – Ashley D. Mocorro Powell**

##### **Comment 6:**

I am requesting that a bilingual public meeting, in English and Spanish, be held for the WA public and greater Quincy communities regarding this Data Center and the proposed air quality systems mentioned in the below announcement. I also request that a confirmed date that allows more notice to communities to attend (beyond Jan 20th, 2025) also be considered for the online public hearing. The original announcement was made during the 2024 holiday season for many communities. Is there a specific reason this comment window is restricted to Feb 4, 2025?

I also strongly urge you to consider an in-person meeting and it be held at the Quincy Public Library and/or at one of the local schools (as listed in the proposed permit that Microsoft is encouraged to provide routine updates) to maximize attendance from local residents and community leaders.

##### **Response to Comment 6: (Jenny, Janice)**

Public comment periods are required to be at minimum 30 days per Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-400-171(7)(a). This comment period was originally scheduled from December 30, 2024, through February 4, 2025. An extra six days were included in scheduling this comment period due to the two holidays in January.

The public comment period was extended, based on this request, through February 27, 2025, and the public hearing was held on February 20, 2025, at the Quincy Business and Event Center. The public hearing was in-person with a Spanish interpreter available virtually. Notice of the hearing was advertised in the Columbia Basin Herald in both Spanish and English on February 3, 2025. A legal notice for the project was placed in the same newspaper on December 30, 2024. Ecology's website was updated with the hearing information in both English and Spanish and a GovDelivery email was sent out to 995 interested parties with updated hearing information. Doors opened at 5:30 pm for potential prehearing discussion, presentation, question and answer and the hearing was held at 6:45 pm as advertised. Unfortunately, no member from the public attended the hearing or any part of the prehearing agenda.

**Comment 7:**

Has this been a community gathering approach WA Dept of Ecology has taken or considered?

**Response to Comment 7: (Janice, Gail, and Jenny)**

The applicant, any interested governmental entity, any group, or any person may request a public hearing within the public comment period per WAC 173-400-171(8). We held in person public meetings and hearings in the past prior to the COVID pandemic.

The hearing agenda allowed time for people to gather, learn more about the project through an Ecology presentation and left time for question and answer before the hearing began.

**Comment 8:**

As ECY is a WA HEAL Act agency,

I have included WA EJC staff on this email.

**Response to Comment 8: (Jenny)**

Thank you.

**Comment 9:**

Can you please share what in-person public notices, fliers, mailers(bilingual) have been provided to the communities in Quincy? I saw a brief sentence in the posted documents that public announcement materials were shared but details are vague at best.

**Response to Comment 9: (Jenny, Janice)**

A legal notice for the project was placed in the Columbia Basin Herald on December 30, 2024, in English with an email address where people may request Spanish language assistance. Ecology's website also posted notice of the comment period in both English and Spanish. A GovDelivery email was sent out on December 31, 2024, to a Quincy Data Center interested parties list of 995 parties, with links to the web posting, and links to Spanish interpretation of the posting and Spanish language assistance.

Following a change in hearing date and move from a virtual to an in-person hearing, based on the request from this commenter, the following additional advertising was made.

A GovDelivery email went out on January 17, 2025, to update interested parties, with links to Ecology's website, and links to Spanish interpretation and Spanish language assistance. Ecology's website was updated with the new hearing information in both English and Spanish, with updates to how the information was presented in Spanish. An

updated notice was placed in the Columbia Basin Herald on February 3, 2025, in both English and Spanish. We also placed a flyer about the public meeting and hearing in the Quincy Public Library and at the Quincy Business and Event Center. Finally, we advertised the hearing on digital media ads to the Quincy community.

**Comment 10:**

According to the WA EHD Map, Quincy and the surrounding Grant County communities rank scores of 6-10 on social vulnerability index, health disparities, diesel pollution and environmental health disparities. They are clearly disproportionately impacted / overburdened by compounding environmental health, economic, and climate impacts.

As a public member that has friends in this community, attends sporting events and readily recreates in the community, and have supported local Grant County schools with STEM education programs in recent years -- I hope you will reconsider this rushed public process and provide the workers, families, and educators a more thorough and equitable process.

**Response to Comment 10: (Jenny, Janice, Gail, Karin)**

Public comment periods are required to be at minimum 30 days per WAC 173-400-171(7)(a), this comment period was originally scheduled from December 30, 2024, through February 4, 2025. An extra six days were included in scheduling this comment period due to the two holidays in January.

The public comment period was extended, based on this request, through February 27, 2025, and the public hearing was held on February 20, 2025, at the Quincy Business and Event Center. The public hearing was in-person with a Spanish interpreter available virtually. Notice of the hearing was advertised in the Columbia Basin Herald in both Spanish and English on February 3, 2025. A legal notice for the project was placed in the same newspaper on December 30, 2024. Ecology's website was updated with the hearing information in both English and Spanish and a GovDelivery email was sent out to 995 interested parties with updated hearing information. Doors opened at 5:30 pm for potential prehearing discussion, presentation, question and answer and the hearing was held at 6:45 pm as advertised. Unfortunately, no member from the public attended the hearing or any part of the prehearing agenda.

Please see Response to Comment 19 for Ecology's environmental justice considerations in our permitting process.

**Comment 11:**

I am concerned about the increase of generator use (listed 7am-7pm) and noise pollution this facility will cause for the broader public. The materials are technically written but lack publicly grounded comparisons to the exposures and related health impacts -- to say areas \*without\*



data centers as one example. How are community members supposed to understand this "full disclosure" and provide their input if the local educational level (attained) doesn't match the public announcement?

**Response to Comment 11: (Jenny, Janice, Gail, Karin)**

The maintenance of emergency generators during the hours of 7am to 7pm was not a requested change for this project. Microsoft Columbia Data Center requested a change of the use of five generators in bypass mode versus the previous condition that only allowed for two generators to be used at a time for that purpose. All emergency generators in Buildings CO3.2 and CO9 are still limited on average to 100 hours per year for all uses.

Noise pollution is regulated by local governments, such as the City of Quincy. Washington State Laws and Rules related to noise include:

- Chapter 70.107 RCW – Noise Control
- Chapter 173-58 WAC – Sound level measurements procedures
- Chapter 173-60 WAC – Maximum environmental noise levels

The Notice of Construction application, preliminary determination (proposed draft permit) and technical support document are quite technical. Highly technical information is required for the permit writer to determine the project that Microsoft Columbia Data Center is proposing is going meet all the state and federal requirements.

We try to summarize the project on Ecology's website, in the legal notice and GovDelivery emails in a less technical and easier to understand format. We do appreciate your feedback, as we work to improve on these materials and make them more understandable to the public.

Please see Response to Comment 19 for Ecology's environmental justice considerations in our permitting process.

**Commenter – Sierra Rotakhina**

**Comment 12:**

We just wanted to make sure you were aware of this email below as it sounds from the announcement that Ecology will be deciding today whether to hold the online comment period based on community interest.

We would be interested in meeting to learn more about the public comment process, the permitting process, how noise pollution is considered and regulated, and the concerns raised

below. Based on the public comment timeline we believe that this is a time-sensitive request from community.

I am copying Millie Piazza here for awareness as Millie represents Ecology on the EJ Council.

Thank you,

**Response to Comment 12 (Jenny)**

Please see Response to Comment 10 regarding the hearing details.

This project did not include any new stationary emission sources or increases in annual emissions. Since there were no changes to annual emissions, only short-term emission changes needed to be evaluated. Dispersion modeling was required to compare predicted impacts to short-term standards and thresholds. Nonroad engines are exempt from permitting. However, modeling to compare to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) was required due to the cumulative engine ratings being over 2000 brake horsepower.

Modeling demonstrated that all NAAQS were met. Toxic Air Pollutants were evaluated for short-term impacts during bypass operations. Acceptable Source Impact Levels were met, and a health impact assessment was not required. Toxic air pollutants are not required to be evaluated for nonroad engines (WAC 173-400-035).

Noise pollution is regulated by local governments, such as the City of Quincy. Washington State Laws and Rules related to noise include:

- Chapter 70.107 RCW – Noise Control
- Chapter 173-58 WAC – Sound level measurements procedures
- Chapter 173-60 WAC – Maximum environmental noise levels

**Commenter – Patty Martin**

**Comment 13:**

I have just started to read through the materials online and was wondering if you could tell me if Microsoft violated the terms of its current operating permit by running outside of permitted loads, hours per engine or other specified permit conditions? If yes, I am requesting a copy.

Also, how long will the replacement engines that are stored off-site be used by Microsoft?

Thank you for your prompt response.

**Response to Comment 13: (Jenny, and Karin)**

Microsoft (Columbia Data Center) has not received any notice of violations for running outside of permitted loads or hours of operation per engine.

Microsoft requested changes to their existing Approval Conditions that required a specific average load rate per year for all engines referenced in the condition. Rather than run the engines more than necessary each year to meet a specific load average, these changes will allow them to have a different average load rate if the emissions from all engines are below the emissions produced from the max hours of operation and specific average load rate.

The nonroad engines that Columbia Data Center modeled for this application are allowed to operate at a location for less than 365 days. These types of engines are allowed per the nonroad engine regulations WAC 173-400-035.

We are unaware at this time if Microsoft Columbia is out of compliance with any permit term. We typically document any permit condition violation in a Notice of Correction or Notice of Violation. We have not issued either to Microsoft Columbia in the past several years. We evaluate information submitted by our permittees throughout the year and we have a goal of inspecting facilities such as Microsoft Columbia once every three years. We last inspected the facility about one year ago.

**Comment 14:**

Is there any chance of rescheduling the Public Hearing for either the week earlier or the week after?

**Response to Comment 14: (Jenny)**

We were not able to move the hearing to the week before the February 20<sup>th</sup> as we need a 30-day notice of hearing and location, before said hearing. The week after, there were scheduling conflicts with key staff that needed to attend the hearing.

**Commenter - Michael Bailey**

**Comment 15:**

First the Tribes were removed from the land, then the fur and fish extracted to near extinction, and now the water itself is being removed as billions in government money goes to rebuilding the damage extractive industries have done here. We cannot continue to extract without those who take also giving back. If you won't deny the expansion in extraction and pollution, at least have the courage to ask for something beneficial in return.

**Response to Comment 15: (Jenny, Gail, and Karin)**

Ecology's Air Quality Program equitably protects and improves outdoor air quality to ensure clean air and a healthy and vibrant Washington. Our authority for Microsoft Columbia Data Center's project was limited to reviewing proposed changes to air emissions or air emission sources and ensuring the proposal meets state and federal air quality requirements. Only if the requirements are met can we approve the project.

**Commenter - Matty Lauder**

**Comment 16:**

Microsoft should not be using any kind fossil fuel energy production. We let them build their giant data centers, give them tax breaks, let them use our public roads, our public water infrastructure, and so much more. They make billions of dollars with our data and resources, the LEAST they can do is find a less carbon-intensive and pollutive way to power their server farm.

**Response to Comment 16: (Jenny, Gail, and Karin)**

Ecology Air Quality Program doesn't define a project for the source, it reviews proposals for compliance with state and federal requirements. Please see response to Comment 15.

**Commenter - Beth Fuget**

**Comment 17:**

I urge you not to approve the use of more polluting diesel generators at a site close to a school and a vulnerable community. At the very least, if the generators are approved, they should be equipped with pollution-reducing devices as in other cities. Quincy may have less background pollution than other places but there are greater risks due to less access to health care and other disparities.

**Response to Comment 17: (Jenny, Gail, and Karin)**

No new stationary emergency generators were proposed with this project. Nonroad engines were proposed, and they are temporary engines that are regulated by WAC 173-400-035 and exempt from permitting. The nonroad engines will have diesel particulate filters for particulate matter control and selective catalytic reduction for nitrogen oxide control.

**Commenter - Shana Ochsner**

**Comment 18:**

This is located too close to an elementary school.

**Response to Comment 18: (Jenny, Gail, and Karin)**

The planning department with the City of Quincy handles zoning for Quincy, Washington.

**Commenter - Danna Dal Porto**

**Comment 19:**

This is my public comment on the Microsoft Columbia Data Center located in Quincy, Washington. This data center was the first data center built in Quincy, Washington. Most of the construction was done without an opportunity for any public comment. It was not until later that the general public was informed about the project. It was much later that the details about the diesel generators were shared with the public. The emissions from the generators is my concern. I have presented emails regarding Columbia and the danger of these emissions to the school children at Mt View School elementary but these incriminating emails have made no difference to the continued permitting of many additional data centers. As of December 17, 2024, Quincy had 416 large diesel generators permitted. All of these generators are inside the Quincy City Limits. Because of our position in the irrigated agricultural part of the State, we have an abundance of farm workers. We are a low-income, minority community and the impact of the emissions from the generators is an example of Environmental Injustice. I have provided factual documents to back-up these assertions in previous Public Comments. My comments today are that the Department of Ecology and the State of Washington is continuing to permit dangerous levels of emissions and particulates to shower down on Quincy residents as well as people in the surrounding Grant County. I believe it is morally wrong to know exactly how these emissions might impact the elementary children in Mt. View School. I know that their lungs, hearts and neurological systems can be affected by going to school so close to Columbia. The teachers in that building will possibly work there for years and their exposure might possibly shorten their lives. Columbia was built in the wrong place to start with and Microsoft continues to add to that facility. Microsoft will not move Columbia so the best solution is for Microsoft to move Mt. View School away from the Columbia emissions. I am requesting that Microsoft do the right thing and build a new school and protect these children and teachers. Thank you for considering my comments.

**Response to Comment 19: (Jenny, Gail, and Karin)**

Comment noted. No new stationary emergency generators were proposed with this project. Nonroad engines were proposed, and they are temporary engines that are regulated by WAC 173-400-035 and exempt from permitting. The nonroad engines will have diesel particulate filters for particulate matter control and selective catalytic reduction for nitrogen oxides control.

Part of our environmental justice considerations in our permitting process includes evaluating the demographic information about the local and affected populations and understanding and being responsive to the diversity of interests and communities in Quincy. We take steps to demonstrate our commitment by connecting and meaningfully engaging with the Hispanic/Latino community and delivering reliable data collection and scientific evaluation of the airshed.

- We strive to ensure our public participation opportunities are accessible to as many members of the community as possible; this includes reducing barriers to engagement for the Hispanic/Latino community. For example, we advertise comment periods in both English and Spanish in the local Quincy newspaper, translate information for online access, and provide interpretation services during our public meetings.
- We perform scientific analyses required by state and federal law in order to issue Notice of Construction permits for the Quincy community. As part of the permitting process, we review the application and local air quality data to ensure the project will meet ambient air quality standards that are intended to protect public health. We also make sure that the project complies with the air toxics rule, which minimizes increased risk to the community.
- We placed a monitor within Quincy at 330 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE. This monitor is operational with data available 24 hours a day each day of the week. You can view the information from this monitoring site at: <https://enviwa.ecology.wa.gov/home/map>. Currently the site records weather and PM 2.5 data, and we measured NO<sub>x</sub> and black carbon from August 2017 through December 2018. Data show PM 2.5 and NO<sub>2</sub> levels meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. PM2.5 levels found in the Quincy area are similar to Moses Lake and the Wenatchee area.
- We performed an analysis of the data center impacts in the Quincy area and finalized the report – see [Health Risks from Diesel Emissions in the Quincy Area \(wa.gov\)](#). We translated and published the Executive Summary in Spanish. [Riegos a la salud por emisiones de diésel en el área de Quincy \(wa.gov\)](#)
  - We developed a visual tool summarizing the information in the report that the community can access online. See Response to Comment #1 or <https://ecology.wa.gov/Air-Climate/Air-quality/Data-Centers>
- While the data centers potentially represent a sizable portion of the total diesel emissions in the Quincy area, the risks from these emergency engines is somewhat offset by:
  - Less frequent engine use than permitted.

- Higher stacks (release points) than other diesel sources (i.e., farm equipment, trucks, locomotives, etc.) so emissions disperse before they enter the breathing zone.
- Lower population density in areas immediately surrounding data centers.  
If you want to learn more about Ecology’s environmental justice efforts, you can visit our websites:
- Environmental Justice at Ecology: <https://ecology.wa.gov/About-us/Who-we-are/Environmental-Justice>

**Appendix C: Microsoft Columbia Data Center Public Comment Period updated screenshots -  
Friday, February 14, 2025.**

## Microsoft Columbia Data Center, Quincy

### Air quality notice of construction application

Dec. 30, 2024, 12 a.m. - Feb. 27, 2025, 11:59 p.m. PT

---

UPDATE: We have EXTENDED the public comment period and ADDED public hearing information.

We propose to approve Microsoft Columbia Data Center's air quality notice of construction (NOC) application. Microsoft Corporation – Columbia Data Center requested to update their existing air permit:

- Match current operations related to yearly load averages
- Run more generators in bypass mode — 5 generators instead of 2, but for a shorter amount of time

Short-term increases of emissions and modeling of emissions from nonroad engines were evaluated. There were no increases of annual emissions from this change.

Microsoft Columbia Data Center is located at 501 Port Industrial Parkway, in Quincy.

#### Documents for review

- [Microsoft Columbia Data Center notice of construction \(NOC\) application](#)
- [Microsoft Columbia Data Center draft permit](#)
- [Microsoft Columbia Data Center technical support document](#)

We determined this proposal satisfies the requirements of [Chapter 173-400 WAC](#). We plan to approve the application.

### Public hearing (English and Español (Spanish))

We will have a Spanish interpreter available.

**Date/Time:** Thursday, February 20, 2025

- 5:30 p.m. Doors open
- 6:00 p.m. Presentation, with question-and-answer time
- 6:45 p.m. Public hearing

**Location:** Quincy Business and Event Center, 115 F Street SW, Quincy ([directions](#))

To comment by ~~February 4, 2025~~ **February 27, 2025** (extended), use one of the ways listed below.

To find out if there are more records for this project, contact our [Public Records Office](#).



This notice was posted on December 30, 2024 and updated on January 17, 2025.

## Background

[Data centers](#), sometimes called server farms, house the servers that manage email, store data, and run computer applications. If you shop on the web or use social media, your information is routed through a data center. Most of the data centers regulated by Ecology are located in Quincy and the Wenatchee area because those areas have dependable, lower cost electricity. Sign up for [email updates about data centers](#).

A [notice of construction permit](#) is required before installing a new source of air pollution or modifying an existing source of air pollution. This permit is sometimes called a "pre-construction permit" because a business must have one before starting construction or operating their business.

A notice of construction air permit limits the amount of air pollutants a business can emit.



### Comment online

- Use our [online comment form](#)



### Comment by mail

Jenny Filipy  
Washington Department of Ecology, Eastern Regional Office  
4601 North Monroe Street  
Spokane, WA 99205-1295



### Questions

Jenny Filipy  
Environmental Engineer  
509-405-2487



Translated content

## Translated content

– Español (Spanish)

### Microsoft Columbia Data Center, Quincy

#### Aviso de construcción (NOC) referente a la calidad del aire

Del 30 de diciembre de 2024, 12 a.m. al ~~4 de febrero de 2025~~ 27 de febrero de 2025, 11:59 p.m. (plazo extendido)

Actualizó: Hemos EXTENDIDO el periodo de comentarios públicos y AÑADIDO información acerca de la audiencia pública.

Para asistencia en español: [language@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:language@ecy.wa.gov) or [servicios de Idiomas](#).

Proponemos aprobar la solicitud de aviso de construcción (NOC) referente a la calidad del aire de Microsoft Corporation – Columbia Data Center. Microsoft Corporation – Columbia Data Center solicitó actualizar su permiso de aire existente para:

- Reflejar operaciones actuales relacionadas a promedios de carga por año
- Operar cinco en vez de dos generadores en modo bypass, pero por un periodo de tiempo más corto

Según la evaluación del aumento de emisiones a corto plazo y el modelado de emisiones de motores no vehiculares, este cambio no resultará en un aumento de las emisiones anuales.

Microsoft Corporation – Columbia Data Center está ubicado en 501 Port Industrial Parkway, en Quincy.

#### Documents for review

- [Microsoft Columbia Data Center notice of construction \(NOC\) application](#)
- [Microsoft Columbia Data Center draft permit](#)
- [Microsoft Columbia Data Center technical support document](#)

Determinamos que esta propuesta satisface los requisitos del [Capítulo 173-400 WAC](#). ☺ Planeamos aprobar esta solicitud.

## Audiencia pública (en inglés y español)

Tendremos servicios de interpretación al español.

**Fecha/Hora:** Jueves, 20 de febrero de 2025

- 5:30 p.m. Abren las puertas
- 6:00 p.m. Presentación con una sesión de preguntas y respuestas
- 6:45 p.m. Audiencia pública

**Lugar:** Quincy Business and Event Center, 115 F Street SW, Quincy ([indicaciones](#))

Puede hacer comentarios hasta el ~~4 de febrero de 2025~~ **27 de febrero de 2025** (plazo extendido), usando una de las opciones incluidas abajo.

Para saber si hay documentos adicionales para este proyecto, póngase en contacto con la oficina de archivos públicos del Departamento de Ecología: envíe un correo electrónico a [recordsofficer@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:recordsofficer@ecy.wa.gov) o llame al 360-407-6040.

Este aviso se publicó el 30 de diciembre de 2024 y se actualizó el 17 de enero de 2025.

## Fondo

Los centros de datos, a veces llamados granjas de servidores, albergan los servidores que manejan los correos electrónicos, almacenan datos y ejecutan aplicaciones de computadora. Si usted compra en internet o usa medios sociales, su información se enruta a través de un centro de datos. La mayoría de los centros de datos en Washington están ubicados en Quincy y el área de Wenatchee porque el área tiene electricidad confiable a precios más bajos.

Se requiere un aviso de permiso de construcción antes de instalar una nueva fuente de contaminación del aire o modificar una fuente existente de contaminación del aire. Este permiso a veces se llama "permiso previo a la construcción," porque una empresa debe tener uno antes de comenzar la construcción u operar su negocio.

Un aviso de permiso de aire de construcción limita la cantidad de contaminantes del aire que una empresa puede emitir.

## Comente en línea

Envíe su comentario por correo electrónico [jenny.filipy@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:jenny.filipy@ecy.wa.gov)

## Comentario por correo

Jenny Filipy  
Oficina Regional del Este del Departamento de Ecología de Washington  
4601 North Monroe Street  
Spokane, WA 99205-1295

## Preguntas

Jenny Filipy  
Ingeniero Ambiental  
509-405-2487

## Appendix D: Original Comments

- **Comment via email - Gabi Davidson-Gomez**

**From:** Gabi Davidson-Gomez <[gbdgomez@gmail.com](mailto:gbdgomez@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, January 10, 2025 7:11 PM

**To:** Filipy, Jenny (ECY) <[JFIL461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:JFIL461@ECY.WA.GOV)>

**Subject:** Question about Public Comment in Spanish on Microsoft Columbia Data Center Proposal

External Email

Hi Jenny,

I hope you are having a great start to 2025!

I am a bilingual community member and recently read the announcement about the Microsoft Columbia Data Center proposal. I followed the link to read the Spanish version and noted that some information was lacking or outright missing compared to the English version; here is my feedback:

- Lack of formatting e.g. boldface, larger text sizes, and bullet points to facilitate comprehension as compared to the English announcement. It is difficult to visually separate headings from content, distinguish the most important info at a glance, and view details in a list rather than a paragraph format.
- The "documents for revision" links all lead to technical documents in English and the WAC "GENERAL REGULATIONS FOR AIR POLLUTION SOURCES" also in English. Spanish-language readers will not be able to understand the information they are entitled to review in order to develop informed opinions and comments on this proposal and to participate equitably in the public hearing process.
- The paragraph in "Background" about what data centers are and where they are located is completely missing from the Spanish announcement.
- Hyperlinks for ECY webpage to learn more about data centers, to sign up for email updates about data centers, and ECY webpage on notice of construction permits are all missing from the Spanish version. This would be a very easy fix to include to facilitate further access to information and understanding for Spanish speaking communities (with the caveat that these resources are published in English, but ECY could direct Spanish speakers to contact the language services team as is the norm throughout their website).
- The hyperlinks for the forms - submitting a records request online and for public comment online - are not present in the Spanish version, instead directing readers to email [recordsofficer@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:recordsofficer@ecy.wa.gov) with records requests and sending public comments through email to [jenny.filipy@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:jenny.filipy@ecy.wa.gov). These seem like appropriate channels for communication since the online forms are both in English, but how can we ensure

that the email submissions are being read, translated, and given the same level of priority as those that come in from the online forms?

I would appreciate it if you could answer my question from the last bullet point, and pass along this feedback to others in the agency who can address these inconsistencies in communication to our Spanish-speaking community members.

Thank you so much!

Gabi Davidson-Gomez

- **Comment via email - Ashley D. Mocorro Powell**

**From:** Ashley Mocorro Powell <[a.mocorropowell@gmail.com](mailto:a.mocorropowell@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 15, 2025 6:11 PM

**To:** Filipy, Jenny (ECY) <[JFIL461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:JFIL461@ECY.WA.GOV)>; Duerr, Miriam (ECY) <[MDUE461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:MDUE461@ECY.WA.GOV)>; Batchelor, Janice (ECY) <[JBAT461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:JBAT461@ECY.WA.GOV)>

**Cc:** Rotakhina, Sierra D (EJC) <[Sierra.Rotakhina@ejc.wa.gov](mailto:Sierra.Rotakhina@ejc.wa.gov)>; Red Bow, Sierra J (EJC) <[Sierra.RedBow@ejc.wa.gov](mailto:Sierra.RedBow@ejc.wa.gov)>

**Subject:** Re: Microsoft Columbia Data Center Public Comment Period

External Email

Good evening Jenny and WA ECY team,

I am requesting that a bilingual public meeting, in English and Spanish, be held for the WA public and greater Quincy communities regarding this Data Center and the proposed air quality systems mentioned in the below announcement. I also request that a confirmed date that allows more notice to communities to attend (beyond Jan 20th, 2025) also be considered for the online public hearing. The original announcement was made during the 2024 holiday season for many communities. Is there a specific reason this comment window is restricted to Feb 4, 2025?

I also strongly urge you to consider an in-person meeting and it be held at the Quincy Public Library and/or at one of the local schools (as listed in the proposed permit that Microsoft is encouraged to provide routine updates) to maximize attendance from local residents and community leaders.

Has this been a community gathering approach WA Dept of Ecology has taken or considered?

As ECY is a WA HEAL Act agency,

I have included WA EJC staff on this email.

Can you please share what in-person public notices, fliers, mailers (bilingual) have been provided to the communities in Quincy? I saw a brief sentence in the posted documents that public announcement materials were shared but details are vague at best.

According to the WA EHD Map, Quincy and the surrounding Grant County communities rank scores of 6-10 on social vulnerability index, health disparities, diesel pollution and environmental health disparities. They are clearly disproportionately impacted / overburdened by compounding environmental health, economic, and climate impacts.

As a public member that has friends in this community, attends sporting events and readily recreates in the community, and have supported local Grant County schools with STEM education programs in recent years -- I hope you will reconsider this rushed public process and provide the workers, families, and educators a more thorough and equitable process.

I am concerned about the increase of generator use (listed 7am-7pm) and noise pollution this facility will cause for the broader public. The materials are technically written but lack publicly grounded comparisons to the exposures and related health impacts -- to say areas \*without\* data centers as one example. How are community members supposed to understand this "full disclosure" and provide their input if the local educational level (attained) doesn't match the public announcement?

Sincerely,

Ashley D. Mocerro Powell

- **Comment via email - Sierra Rotakhina**

**From:** Rotakhina, Sierra D (EJC) <[Sierra.Rotakhina@ejc.wa.gov](mailto:Sierra.Rotakhina@ejc.wa.gov)>

**Sent:** Thursday, January 16, 2025 3:16 PM

**To:** Ashley Mocerro Powell <[a.mocorropowell@gmail.com](mailto:a.mocorropowell@gmail.com)>; Filipy, Jenny (ECY) <[JFIL461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:JFIL461@ECY.WA.GOV)>; Duerr, Miriam (ECY) <[MDUE461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:MDUE461@ECY.WA.GOV)>; Batchelor, Janice (ECY) <[JBAT461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:JBAT461@ECY.WA.GOV)>

**Cc:** Red Bow, Sierra J (EJC) <[Sierra.RedBow@ejc.wa.gov](mailto:Sierra.RedBow@ejc.wa.gov)>; Piazza, Millie (ECY) <[mpia461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:mpia461@ECY.WA.GOV)>

**Subject:** RE: Microsoft Columbia Data Center Public Comment Period

Good afternoon,

We just wanted to make sure you were aware of this email below as it sounds from the announcement that Ecology will be deciding today whether to hold the online comment period based on community interest.

We would be interested in meeting to learn more about the public comment process, the permitting process, how noise pollution is considered and regulated, and the concerns raised

below. Based on the public comment timeline we believe that this is a time-sensitive request from community.

I am copying Millie Piazza here for awareness as Millie represents Ecology on the EJ Council.

Thank you,

~Sierra

**Sierra Rotakhina, MPH**

Gender Pronouns: she/her

Environmental Justice Council Manager

[Sierra.Rotakhina@ejc.wa.gov](mailto:Sierra.Rotakhina@ejc.wa.gov)

360-584-4398 | [Environmental Justice Council](#) | [WaPortal.org](#)

*Email communications with Environmental Justice Council Members and staff are public records and may be subject to disclosure, under chapter 42.56 RCW.*

- **Comments via emails – Patty Martin**

**From:** Patty Martin <[2pattymartin@gmail.com](mailto:2pattymartin@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, January 20, 2025 9:52 AM

**To:** Baldwin, Karin K. (ECY) <[KBAL461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:KBAL461@ECY.WA.GOV)>; Filipy, Jenny (ECY) <[JFIL461@ECY.WA.GOV](mailto:JFIL461@ECY.WA.GOV)>

**Cc:** Danna Dal Porto <[dkdp44@gmail.com](mailto:dkdp44@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Microsoft permit

External Email

Good Morning Karen & Jenny,

I have just started to read through the materials online and was wondering if you could tell me if Microsoft violated the terms of its current operating permit by running outside of permitted loads, hours per engine or other specified permit conditions? If yes, I am requesting a copy.

Also, how long will the replacement engines that are stored off-site be used by Microsoft?

Thank you for your prompt response.

Patty

External Email

Jenny,

Is there any chance of rescheduling the Public Hearing for either the week earlier or the week after?

Patty

- **Comment via ecomments – Michael Bailey**

Michael Bailey

First the Tribes were removed from the land, then the fur and fish extracted to near extinction, and now the water itself is being removed as billions in government money goes to rebuilding the damage extractive industries have done here. We cannot continue to extract without those who take also giving back. If you won't deny the expansion in extraction and pollution, at least have the courage to ask for something beneficial in return.

- **Comment via ecomments – Matty Lauder**

Matty Lauder

Microsoft should not be using any kind fossil fuel energy production. We let them build their giant data centers, give them tax breaks, let them use our public roads, our public water infrastructure, and so much more. They make billions of dollars with our data and resources, the LEAST they can do is find a less carbon-intensive and pollutive way to power their server farm.

- **Comment via ecomments – Beth Fuget**

Beth Fuget

I urge you not to approve the use of more polluting diesel generators at a site close to a school and a vulnerable community. At the very least, if the generators are approved, they should be equipped with pollution-reducing devices as in other cities. Quincy may have less background pollution than other places but there are greater risks due to less access to health care and other disparities.

- **Comment via ecomments – Shana Ochsner**

Shana Ochsner

This is located too close to an elementary school.

- **Comment via ecomments – Danna Dal Porto**

Danna Dal Porro

Dear Sir/Madame, This is my public comment on the Microsoft Columbia Data Center located in Quincy, Washington. This data center was the first data center built in Quincy, Washington. Most



of the construction was done without an opportunity for any public comment. It was not until later that the general public was informed about the project. It was much later that the details about the diesel generators were shared with the public. The emissions from the generators is my concern. I have presented emails regarding Columbia and the danger of these emissions to the school children at Mt View School elementary but these incriminating emails have made no difference to the continued permitting of many additional data centers. As of December 17, 2024, Quincy had 416 large diesel generators permitted. All of these generators are inside the Quincy City Limits. Because of our position in the irrigated agricultural part of the State, we have an abundance of farm workers. We are a low-income, minority community and the impact of the emissions from the generators is an example of Environmental Injustice. I have provided factual documents to back-up these assertions in previous Public Comments. My comments today are that the Department of Ecology and the State of Washington is continuing to permit dangerous levels of emissions and particulates to shower down on Quincy residents as well as people in the surrounding Grant County. I believe it is morally wrong to know exactly how these emissions might impact the elementary children in Mt. View School. I know that their lungs, hearts and neurological systems can be affected by going to school so close to Columbia. The teachers in that building will possibly work there for years and their exposure might possibly shorten their lives. Columbia was built in the wrong place to start with and Microsoft continues to add to that facility. Microsoft will not move Columbia so the best solution is for Microsoft to move Mt. View School away from the Columbia emissions. I am requesting that Microsoft do the right thing and build a new school and protect these children and teachers. Thank you for considering my comments.

Danna Dal Porto  
16651 Road 3 NW  
Quincy, WA 98848