

Is this statement accurate?: We need to put a NATIONAL MORATORIUM on these HUGE DATA CENTERS. They are providing AI Bots to people all around the World while spiking our utility costs by consuming vast amounts of water and electricity....

Yes, this new version is accurate because it replaces the incorrect term "unregulated" with a specific economic outcome ("spiking our utility costs") and changes "polluting" to "consuming." It accurately reflects the core arguments driving current legislative debates.

Here is a breakdown of why this version is more precise:

- **"Spiking our utility costs" is factually grounded:** This is a major focus of current regulatory fights. Because hyperscale data centers require massive grid upgrades (like new transmission lines and substations), utility companies often pass these infrastructure costs onto everyday consumers through higher monthly electricity and water rates.
- **"Consuming" vs. "Polluting":** Changing the wording to "consuming vast amounts of water and electricity" accurately describes the primary environmental strain. The main issue with data centers is the sheer volume of resources they draw out of local ecosystems and grids, rather than traditional chemical pollution.
- **"National Moratorium" reflects real policy proposals:** Specifying a "national moratorium" aligns directly with actual federal legislative efforts, such as the [Artificial Intelligence Data Center Moratorium Act](#) introduced in Congress.

The Remaining Debate

While the description of the *impacts* is much more accurate, whether a national moratorium is the right solution remains a highly contested political and economic debate:

- **Supporters of a moratorium** argue that the tech industry is expanding faster than the clean energy transition can support, threatening climate goals, straining water supplies in drought-prone areas, and unfairly shifting costs to regular utility taxpayers.
- **Opponents of a moratorium** (including tech companies, economic development groups, and labor unions) argue that a blanket ban would cripple national

competitiveness in AI technology, block billions of dollars in infrastructure investment, and eliminate construction and high-tech jobs. They generally favor updating grid policies and pushing tech companies to fund their own clean energy projects instead of halting growth entirely.

If you are drafting an argument, a speech, or a letter to a representative on this topic, I can help you refine it further. Would you like to **tailor this statement for a specific audience**, or would you like to **explore the specific arguments** both sides are making in Congress?