

<b>DOCKETED</b>	
<b>Docket Number:</b>	24-OPT-02
<b>Project Title:</b>	Compass Energy Storage Project
<b>TN #:</b>	263770
<b>Document Title:</b>	Sean Pierce Johnson Comments - Cart Before the Horse Progress
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Sean Pierce Johnson
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	6/3/2025 12:46:38 PM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	6/3/2025

*Comment Received From: Sean Pierce Johnson  
Submitted On: 6/3/2025  
Docket Number: 24-OPT-02*

## **Cart Before the Horse Progress**

Representatives of the California Energy Commission,  
My name is Sean Pierce Johnson and I am a resident of Laguna Niguel, CA. I write to you today concerning the proposed Compass Energy Battery Storage Facility project which is currently in its 270 day decision timeframe.

Last week, I was present for public comment at the Capistrano Unified School District offices and issued a simple statement: Destroying Nature ISNâ€™T Green. I am strongly opposed to this project on the simple basis that the land on which the project is proposed to be constructed upon is one of the last open and undeveloped parcels of land within this region of Southern Orange County. The land is inhabited by many species of animal and along it runs a creek which drains into the Pacific Ocean. Foreign matter, in the form of large storage container and an abundance of Lithium battery cells, does not belong in a green and natural space which is used as a habit for coyotes, cotton tail rabbits, various insects and birds and humans. The ridge, the valley and the Colinas Bluff Trail are popular with hikers, bikers, and residents for recreation and wellness. To place an abundance of these batteries within the land would not only be a cosmetic eyesore, but also has the potential to disrupt the balance of life that Laguna Niguel and San Juan Capistrano have diligently sought to maintain.

Simply put: a project of this magnitude does not belong here.

But today, I wish to express another concern I have regarding this project.

The technology currently proposed by Engi is both unproven in effectiveness and safety within proximity to suburban neighborhoods and natural spaces. Thereâ€™s no certainty whether the facility will truly provide the electricity needed for our the grid to maintain power and now, word has reached my ears that these battery wonâ€™t even hold a charge OR transmit electricity to the nearby residences in the event of a black out. How is this beneficial to the surrounding areas if the accepted use of a battery (ie. power when no hard line connection is present) doesnâ€™t apply in this scenario?

On top of this is the question of compatibility.

Most Californians would agree that our grid and state infrastructure is aging and in dire need of upgrade or upkeep. Even down here in Southern Orange County, where we benefit from less aged transmission lines, we are victim to these crippling realities. With aging powerlines, how are we to expect that connecting this proposed battery facility to our already aging and taxed grid wonâ€™t result in a disastrous malfunction?

As an example of what Iâ€™m speaking of, let me offer this example from my musical profession:

A guitarist finds a 1950s Fender amplifier. He takes the old, two-prong AC chord and plugs the amplifier into the wall and turns it on. There are two (2) likely outcomes to this: 1) the amp burns out and no longer functions or 2) a small fire is started and results in damage to his dwelling.

It is generally accepted with that these older amplifiers that they be upgraded by a QUALIFIED and EXPERIENCED technician with a modern, three (3) prong, grounded AC chord.

In this example, we see the meeting of old and new technologies, resulting in a costly clean up process. I realize the example is highly specific but how can anyone be confident that this new facility, once connected to the aging grid, will be safe, efficient, and effective?

Even when it comes to our computers and phones, the older the tech the less compatible it is with upgrades.

This project is too new, too advanced and too risky to be put within yards of neighborhoods, public gathering spaces, wildlife habitats and major transportation thoroughfares.

I urge you, as I did in person, to DENY this projects application. The location is far too risky, the tech is too unproven and the potential benefits simple do not outweigh the costs.

Sincerely,  
Sean Pierce Johnson