

**DOCKETED**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Docket Number:</b>   | 24-OPT-02                                      |
| <b>Project Title:</b>   | Compass Energy Storage Project                 |
| <b>TN #:</b>            | 264444   |
| <b>Document Title:</b>  | Stacey Martin Comments - Required improvements |
| <b>Description:</b>     | N/A  |
| <b>Filer:</b>           | System   |
| <b>Organization:</b>    | Stacey Martin                                  |
| <b>Submitter Role:</b>  | Public   |
| <b>Submission Date:</b> | 6/24/2025 8:34:26 PM                           |
| <b>Docketed Date:</b>   | 6/25/2025                                      |

*Comment Received From: Stacey Martin*

*Submitted On: 6/24/2025*

*Docket Number: 24-OPT-02*

## **Required improvements**

Sam Hanson, thank you for your considerate letter. Besides the overall safety of the project, there is one consideration worthy of note. That is in the even of an event at the location, there is very limited resources to cope with it. A very small local contingent of firefighters and woefully inadequate equipment being at the top of the list. Access and egress to the property itself with adequate emergency supplies / resources is also needs to be evidenced. Calling out for assistance to other departments and Cal Fire / Fed fire fighters will take effort and time.

If the project is to go forward the answers to these questions need to be addressed. Locally, when new projects are approved they are often not approved or green lighted until all of the needed infrastructure is in place. Certainly in place until a final sign off is officially approved.

There are lots of safety and health considerations to this project. There are also potential major impacts to the county. A major freeway, a railroad, environmental impacts to local water (flowing directly into the ocean). All should be of much more concern than they appear to be.

There are few sites locally that can meet the projects needs. I can see why the site is desirable. The developers should take the extra care to design a completed site that can mitigate those issues. It would cost extra money, but the systems can be designed and in place to minimize all of these risks.

We should not be here to deny a needed project. We should not approve the project to maximize the financial return to the developers. The company needs to see these needed project improvements as a cost of doing business. As we have seen in other cases of disaster, the cost of cleanup and repair often far exceeds the cost of proper planning. Often it is the Federal, State, and local government that takes the brunt of these costs. A perfect example is fire fighting, the local department needs additional manpower, equipment, and ongoing training. The site needs to be designed and maintained with safety systems and supplies in place to meet the projects emergency needs. Then all of the other emergency shortfalls need to be planned for and in place. I do not think that those have been adequately addressed.

Multiple housing projects, schools, parks, freeways, railroad, and environmental issues should be protected. The companies pocket book and return on investment is far down the list.

Stacey Martin