

<b>DOCKETED</b>	
<b>Docket Number:</b>	24-OPT-02
<b>Project Title:</b>	Compass Energy Storage Project
<b>TN #:</b>	265755
<b>Document Title:</b>	Theresa Ford Comments - REQUEST FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION OF SAN JOAQUIN HILLS BLIND THRUST FAULT
<b>Description:</b>	N/A
<b>Filer:</b>	System
<b>Organization:</b>	Theresa Ford
<b>Submitter Role:</b>	Public
<b>Submission Date:</b>	8/24/2025 10:15:56 AM
<b>Docketed Date:</b>	8/25/2025

*Comment Received From: Theresa Ford*  
*Submitted On: 8/24/2025*  
*Docket Number: 24-OPT-02*

**REQUEST FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION OF SAN JOAQUIN  
HILLS BLIND THRUST FAULT**

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to formally request further investigation into the seismic hazards associated with the proposed Compass Project site, following a recent expert submission to the docket that raises serious concerns.<sup>1</sup> The report identifies the site as being located near to the *San Joaquin Hills Blind Thrust Fault (SJHBTF)*—a geologic feature capable of producing significant seismic activity and liquefaction.

The author, a seasoned CEQA land use expert, notes that *“The Project locale is rife with unique, compounding stressors; it might not require a large/strong SJHBTF event (6.3+) but only a moderately (5.3+).”* This statement alone should trigger immediate reevaluation of the site’s suitability, especially given the absence of any substantive fault analysis in the Applicant’s documentation.

As someone who recently visited Mission San Juan Capistrano and reflected on its destruction in the 1812 earthquake, I find it deeply troubling that the Applicant has failed to acknowledge the site’s proximity to a known seismic fault. This context—historically significant and geologically active—should have been a foundational consideration in site selection. Its omission suggests a troubling level of negligence, particularly in light of the expert’s warning.

The report further states: *“The Applicant should move down their list of alternatives; this placement might be cheaper and/or simpler for them but represents greater public safety hazard exposure.”* This underscores a critical imbalance between developer convenience and community safety—one that must not be allowed to persist.

I respectfully urge the Commission to:

- Ensure that the forthcoming Draft Environmental Impact Report includes a robust, site-specific seismic hazard analysis
- Require the Applicant to address the newly identified fault line and liquefaction risks in their technical studies and public materials
- Consider whether the current site selection reflects a responsible balance between cost-efficiency and public safety, in light of expert concerns

The public deserves transparency, scientific rigor, and proactive risk mitigation—especially when lives, ecosystems, and infrastructure are at stake. The Commission must not allow developer expedience to override public safety.

Sincerely,

Theresa Ford  
Chief Operating Officer  
B.L.E.S.S.I.N.™

---

<sup>1</sup> 265735 Roger Butow Comments - Alarming Earthquake Factors