

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	24-OPT-02
Project Title:	Compass Energy Storage Project
TN #:	261178
Document Title:	Nicholas Crowley Comments - Opposition to lithium power plant
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Nicholas Crowley
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	1/18/2025 2:11:13 PM
Docketed Date:	1/21/2025

Comment Received From: Nicholas Crowley
Submitted On: 1/18/2025
Docket Number: 24-OPT-02

Opposition to lithium power plant

I am writing to express significant concerns regarding the proposed lithium-ion battery storage facility in San Juan Capistrano. As a local citizen with extensive experience in land use and public safety matters, I must strongly oppose this project based on several critical factors that pose unacceptable risks to our community.

Of paramount concern is the inherent fire risk associated with large-scale lithium battery installations. The recent fire incident at the Moss Landing Energy Storage Facility serves as a stark reminder of these dangers. This facility, despite implementing modern safety protocols, experienced a serious thermal event that required extensive emergency response and raised legitimate public safety concerns. Positioning a similar facility in San Juan Capistrano, an area with high population density and sensitive ecological resources, would create an unnecessary and potentially catastrophic risk.

The proposed location presents several specific environmental concerns:

First, the site's proximity to the San Juan Creek watershed threatens critical riparian habitat. Any thermal runoff or chemical leakage could have devastating effects on local wildlife and water quality, potentially impacting downstream marine environments at Doheny State Beach.

Second, the project area intersects with documented habitat for several protected species under the California Endangered Species Act. The construction and operation of this facility would likely result in significant habitat disruption and potential take of protected species.

Third, the proposed facility's location within a seismically active region raises additional safety concerns. The interaction between seismic activity and large-scale battery storage has not been adequately studied or addressed in the current proposal.

Furthermore, the project's Environmental Impact Report fails to adequately address:

- Comprehensive fire suppression and emergency response protocols
- Long-term groundwater contamination risks
- Cumulative impacts on local air quality during thermal events
- Environmental justice concerns regarding nearby residential areas
- Alternative site analyses that would pose less risk to sensitive receptors

I strongly urge this body to reject this proposal in its current form. At minimum, a supplemental environmental review should be required to address these significant concerns and evaluate alternative locations that would pose less risk to our community and environment.

The recent incidents at similar facilities demonstrate that these concerns are not theoretical but represent real and present dangers to public safety and environmental health. We must learn from these experiences rather than repeat them in our