

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	24-OPT-02
Project Title:	Compass Energy Storage Project
TN #:	263704
Document Title:	Rafael Jung Comments - Opposition to Compass Energy Storage Project
Description:	This comment was presented to the California Energy Commission staff during the May 29, 2025, Compass Energy Storage Project Meeting and is being officially docketed to maintain its inclusion in the public record.
Filer:	Christina C. Ubaldo
Organization:	Rafael Jung
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	6/3/2025 6:29:25 AM
Docketed Date:	6/2/2025

5/29/2025

Project Title: Compass Energy Storage Project

Docket Number: 24-OPT-02

I am opposed to the proposed project due to its detrimental nature.

I am a resident of Laguna Niguel, near the proposed project to store highly toxic materials that are a serious fire hazard that will have a serious life threatening risk to me and my family. It is common knowledge that the batteries being used emit deadly gases even when functioning perfectly. It is simply a chemical reaction as part of the charging and discharging process. These are not solid state batteries that are safer during charging and discharge. There is no control system to eliminate the emitted gases. Those containers are not hermetically sealed to eliminate toxic gases from leaking during normal operation and I am unaware of an adequate filtering system to will secure the health of nearby residents from serious health injuries and death from this facility that should not be located anywhere and certainly not near humans or animals. Additionally, if even only one container were to be compromised by leakage of vapors during an ensuing fire that may envelope a large portion of the facility it may destroy the value of nearby homes due to the toxic smoke. Cleaning the toxic materials from adjoining real estate (homes) is not feasible and would forever render local property values at or near Zero. If a fire occurs during a rain storm it is likely to spread the deadly toxic materials downstream leaving much of the downstream areas forever polluted. Fires of such containers is becoming a regular event as more are installed and as facilities age. I have been an expert in real estate values for nearly fifty years and have had roles in determining values as a real estate broker, appraiser and as a County of Orange Assessment Appeals Board Member. I am also an owner of properties both residential and commercial from coast to coast and do not want to invest in locations that have near proximity to hazardous materials. I would rather have an investment near a nuclear power plant (cleanest power on the planet) than this proposed facility. Due to the nature of the risk in this project, homeowners are likely to have to disclose its presence to future buyers. This is due to the constant emission of gases that have both short and long term affect on life and property. That in itself will be a red flag for a buyer thereby reducing the marketability of a home which by definition reduces my property value. I cannot stress enough my opposition and urge those of authority in the final decision to stop this project at this and every location in the State of California. We need energy but not at the cost of ruining life and the planet. Additionally, is the proposed developer/operator sufficiently insured to withstand the site damage to local residences and properties? Will the State of California need to step in and cover losses? Which would mean taxpayers would cover the damage created by an entity that would simply file bankruptcy. It should not be taxpayers or rate payers paying for project losses. That was the case in San Onofre where rate payers rather than the investors took the hit for decommissioning.

Again, I ask the Energy Commission to decline the application to build the battery facility.

Thank you,

Rafael Jung

