

Stephanie Rojas

From: Thomas Schmiderer
Sent: Monday, February 2, 2026 7:02 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: FW: 1501 N Coast Highway, ROVE Charging Item 11



Thomas Schmiderer
Assistant City Clerk
City of Oceanside

tschmiderer@oceansideca.org
+1 (760) 435-3004
300 N. Coast Highway
Oceanside, CA 92054
www.oceansideca.org

From: N Scott <deannie.scott@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 2:11 PM
To: City Council <council@oceansideca.org>
Subject: Fwd: 1501 N Coast Highway, ROVE Charging Item 11

EXTERNAL MESSAGE: Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding. When in doubt, please contact CustomerCare@oceansideca.org

Strive for Kindness

----- Forwarded message -----

From: N Scott <deannie.scott@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Jan 30, 2026 at 2:06 PM
Subject: 1501 N Coast Highway, ROVE Charging Item 11
To: Jonathan Borrego <jborrego@oceansideca.org>

We are formally asking for this item to be pulled from the Feb. council agenda. It includes battery storage that has not been studied or mitigated for in the event of a runaway fire. If you look at the plans there are 2 large Tesla SuperPack battery storage units proposed for the Northern side of the property.

This project absolutely does NOT qualify as an exempt infill project based on that alone. CEQA studies must be done particularly in light of the fact that should a runaway fire accident occur the toxic waste and runoff will impact the San Luis Rey River and beach area.

As you know those fires are well documented ie. Escondido battery storage fire and the Moss Landing fire.

This is no simple redevelopment economic opportunity; it's a recipe for disaster.

Kindly confirm this item is pulled for further evaluation and studies and mitigation measures.

Friends of Loma Alta Creek

Nadine Scott, Attorney & Co-Founder

Strive for Kindness

Stephanie Rojas

From: Thomas Schmiderer
Sent: Monday, February 2, 2026 7:25 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: FW: 1501 N Coast Highway, ROVE Charging Item 11

Please add to the record. Thanks.



Thomas Schmiderer
Assistant City Clerk
City of Oceanside

tschmiderer@oceansideca.org
+1 (760) 435-3004
300 N. Coast Highway
Oceanside, CA 92054
www.oceansideca.org

From: Jonathan Borrego <JBorrego@oceansideca.org>
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 3:58 PM
To: N Scott <deannie.scott@gmail.com>
Cc: City Council <Council@oceansideca.org>; Darlene Nicandro <DNicandro@oceansideca.org>; David Parsons <DParsons@oceansideca.org>
Subject: RE: 1501 N Coast Highway, ROVE Charging Item 11

Hi Nadine, I will discuss with staff on Monday and inform you of our decision then. We are aware of the sensitivities associated with battery storage facilities and had extensive internal conversations with our Fire Prevention staff while reviewing this application. Please refer to Condition Nos. 88-96 of the Resolution attached to the staff report which specifically address fire risk. As noted in the conditions, the project would be designed using the latest NFPA standards which are specifically intended to mitigate the risk of the types of runaway fires that occurred at the facilities you've identified, while also noting those were also much larger battery storage facilities than the two storage units proposed here. In any case, your concerns about the handling of water run-off are important and we will respond to that issue, specifically. – Jonathan



Jonathan Borrego
City Manager
City of Oceanside

City Manager's Office
jborrego@oceansideca.org
+1 (760) 435-3918
300 N. Coast Highway
Oceanside, CA 92054
www.oceansideca.org

From: N Scott <deannie.scott@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 2:07 PM
To: Jonathan Borrego <jborrego@oceansideca.org>
Subject: 1501 N Coast Highway, ROVE Charging Item 11

EXTERNAL MESSAGE: Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding. When in doubt, please contact CustomerCare@oceansideca.org

We are formally asking for this item to be pulled from the Feb. council agenda. It includes battery storage that has not been studied or mitigated for in the event of a runaway fire. If you look at the plans there are 2 large Tesla SuperPack battery storage units proposed for the Northern side of the property. This project absolutely does NOT qualify as an exempt infill project based on that alone. CEQA studies must be done particularly in light of the fact that should a runaway fire accident occur the toxic waste and runoff will impact the San Luis Rey River and beach area. As you know those fires are well documented ie. Escondido battery storage fire and the Moss Landing fire. This is no simple redevelopment economic opportunity; it's a recipe for disaster. Kindly confirm this item is pulled for further evaluation and studies and mitigation measures.

Friends of Loma Alta Creek
Nadine Scott, Attorney & Co-Founder

Strive for Kindness

Stephanie Rojas

From: Thomas Schmiderer
Sent: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 10:57 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: FW: Renewed call to remove item- DO a CEQA Review



Thomas Schmiderer
Assistant City Clerk
City of Oceanside

tschmiderer@oceansideca.org
+1 (760) 435-3004
300 N. Coast Highway
Oceanside, CA 92054
www.oceansideca.org

From: Thomas Schmiderer
Sent: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 10:47 AM
To: City Council <Council@oceansideca.org>
Cc: Jonathan Borrego <JBorrego@oceansideca.org>
Subject: RE: Renewed call to remove item- DO a CEQA Review

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers:

Below is a copy of the letter that Friends of Loma Alta Creek emailed on 1/31/2026. We will add it to the record. Thank you.

—

We are renewing our call to remove the ROVE Operating Battery project from Wednesday's agenda on February 4th 2026, We have legitimate concerns that this project is being presented as only a mini market with car charging outlets. That simply is not the case. 2 Tesla SuperPacks are proposed and together are about 50 feet long; that is NOT simple battery storage like we'd have in our homes nor should it be next door to residences, gas stations, hotels, motels, restaurants, condos and etc.

In checking the materials provided by staff and the developer for the item there simply is not enough detail or analysis for a reasonable person to make a decision on the project. You should note the previous commission refused to vote on it at all.

And NO materials are posted on eTrakit for review. The project appears but the link is dead

For example, was notice given to surrounding residents and businesses? To Caltrans ? To Camp Pen? Marina Towers? Sandy Shores RV & Mobile Park where people live? Any notice to Capistrano where it's like toxic smoke would flow?

Considering the prior heavy industrial use was an Initial Study done? Why not?

Was a traffic study done? Air quality? Evacuation Plan? Traffic analysis? Traffic management plan for I-5 or Camp Pendleton ingress/egress at their nearby gate in the event of an accident? Fire suppression and containment plan? Runoff analysis? Water infrastructure plan and upgrades in the event of a fire (Massive amounts of fresh water is required for suppression)? Doing a two line condition on that is severely insufficient. Runoff containment to preclude runoff into the 303D waterway of San Luis Rey River? Was the Regional Water Quality Control board even noticed?

Yes the fires in Moss Landing, Escondido, and then one in Nevada had larger storage capabilities. But that means nothing once you have a runaway fire from lithium ion batteries. See the video of ONLY 2 of those units; Tesla Magapacks caught fire. They required tons of fresh water, generated a lot of toxic fumes and fallout, and went straight into the Sandy desert floor. That is not an option here as the lot is almost fully paved, ie. no permeable surfaces. That probably wouldn't be allowed anyway considering topography and potential runoff flowing to the Harbor area and SLR/Beaches. Of note, to date, they are also still assessing the heavy environmental damage at the Moss Landing area.

This item has clearly been misrepresented as a harmless infill project considering the two very large battery storage systems. One of the owners of the land is being very loud on Facebook denying there is any battery storage. Doesn't that make you stop and wonder why? This is an attempt to mislead the public. Period.

Again, we ask that you pull this item and demand that you require studies reflecting the foreseeable potential for environmental harms, some of which we outlined above, under CEQA. This project should not be exempt.

Friends of Loma Alta Creek

Nadine Scott, Attorney & Co-founder

From: N Scott <deannie.scott@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2026 12:21 PM
To: Jonathan Borrego <jborrego@oceansideca.org>; City Council <council@oceansideca.org>
Cc: Diehl, Philip <philip.diehl@sduniontribune.com>
Subject: Renewed call to remove item- DO a CEQA Review

EXTERNAL MESSAGE: Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding. When in doubt, please contact CustomerCare@oceansideca.org

N Scott has sent you an email via **Gmail confidential mode:**



Renewed call to remove item- DO a CEQA Review

This message was sent on Jan 31, 2026 at 12:21:17 PM PST
You can open it by clicking the link below. This link will only work for council@oceansideca.org.

[View the email](#)

Gmail confidential mode gives you more control over the messages you send. The sender may have chosen to set an expiration time, disable printing or forwarding, or track access to this message. [Learn more](#)

Gmail: Email by Google

Use is subject to the [Google Privacy Policy](#)

Google LLC, 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA

You have received this message because someone sent you an email via Gmail confidential mode.

Google™

Stephanie Rojas

From: Thomas Schmiderer
Sent: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 10:39 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: FW: Giant lithium storage batteries across the street from a mobile home park. Seriously?



Thomas Schmiderer
Assistant City Clerk
City of Oceanside

tschmiderer@oceansideca.org
[+1 \(760\) 435-3004](tel:+17604353004)
[300 N. Coast Highway](#)
Oceanside, CA 92054
www.oceansideca.org

From: Mary Ellen Reese <pinkyreese@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 2, 2026 9:16 PM
To: City Council <council@oceansideca.org>
Subject: Giant lithium storage batteries across the street from a mobile home park. Seriously?

EXTERNAL MESSAGE: Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding. When in doubt, please contact CustomerCare@oceansideca.org

What percentage of those storage facilities elsewhere have caught on fire? Three out of three hundred? Or three out of twelve?

If there is a fire, what would be the effect on air, the harbor, soil, surrounding buildings, and humans in very near proximity? That area crawls with tourists, and there's a mobile home/RV park across the street! Are our local firefighters prepared for a huge lithium fire?

Until these questions are documented and answered satisfactorily, this storage battery project needs to be tabled.

Which of you are supporting this?

Mary Ellen Reese
1229 Saint Helene Ct
Oceanside 92054