



Responses to Community Questions

August 26, 2026

CARBON

VOLITION'S POSITION

Volition keeps two claims deliberately separate: this facility has very low pollution, the permitted numbers are public, and it is not zero carbon. At full build the permit's ceiling is about 1.43 million tons of CO₂e a year. The comparison, which we publish with the math, is that this is more than a third less than drawing the same computing from Utah's grid, and lower than any combustion way of powering it.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

1. "Is this really 'clean'? What exactly do you claim?"

We claim low pollution, the state-permitted numbers, and we do not claim zero carbon. Those are different things, and we keep them separate on purpose.

Ref: Utah DEQ Intent to Approve DAQE-IN163550001-26 (Aug 4 2026)

2. "So how much CO₂ does it emit?"

About 1.43 million tons a year at full build, the permit's potential-to-emit ceiling (1,434,855 short tons).

Ref: Utah DEQ Intent to Approve, emissions table

3. "How does that compare to something real?"

More than forty percent less than drawing the same power from Utah's grid, and lower than any combustion way of powering the same computing. The math is published with its sources.

Ref: EPA eGRID (Utah grid intensity) · EIA heat rates

4. "That's a big number. What's the honest way to size it?"

The same computing on grid power would emit more, and the permit's fuel cap locks in what this site can emit. Pollution is a separate question, about 5 tons of NOx a year for the whole site, which is a very small number.

Ref: Utah DEQ Intent to Approve (fuel cap; emissions table) · EPA eGRID

5. “Didn’t you understate the CO₂ at the Planning Commission?”

Yes, we understated it, and we’ve since corrected it on the record: about 1.43 million tons a year at full build. The accurate claim is more than forty percent below grid, and the math is published.

Ref: Planning Commission Aug 5 2026 record · correction on the public record (Aug 2026)

6. “Why not just use the grid, then?”

Grid power for the same computing would mean materially more carbon, and put this facility’s load on the system your home depends on. Off-grid is both the lower-carbon and lower-risk option today. Our emissions numbers are fractions of the grid equivalent.

Ref: EPA eGRID · Utah SB 132 (2025) large-load framework

7. “Could they quietly switch to a dirtier fuel later?”

No. The air permit is natural-gas-only, enforced through fuel purchase records. Any fuel change requires a state permit modification. The fuels the ordinance even allows, renewable gas, hydrogen, biogas blends, would lower emissions, and still require the process.

Ref: Utah DEQ Intent to Approve (fuel restriction) · Title 15 amendment text (permitted fuels)

8. “Doesn’t building AI data centers at all cook the planet?”

The computing is coming somewhere, on some power source. The only question a city controls is whether it happens well below grid carbon, with zero grid draw, under an enforceable cap, or somewhere else without any of that.

Ref: Utah DEQ Intent to Approve (fuel cap) · Title 15 §E, §G