

**DOCKETED**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Docket Number:</b>   | 24-OPT-05  |
| <b>Project Title:</b>   | Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project  |
| <b>TN #:</b>            | 267176   |
| <b>Document Title:</b>  | Comment re Corby BESS from member of public - Lewis Derfuss - Submitted 11-06-2025 |
| <b>Description:</b>     | N/A  |
| <b>Filer:</b>           | Dorothy Murimi   |
| <b>Organization:</b>    | California Energy Commission   |
| <b>Submitter Role:</b>  | Commission Staff   |
| <b>Submission Date:</b> | 11/12/2025 11:51:23 AM   |
| <b>Docketed Date:</b>   | 11/12/2025   |

## Talking Points to CEC

Welcome to Vacaville one of the cities that make up Solano County

I want to oppose the proposed approval of Corby Battery Energy Storage Systems as well as other proposed BESS with the proposed Lithium-Ion Technology at the proposed locations within our city and county as the hazardous technology is not suitable at the proposed locations. We are not opposed to technology as long as it is safe and in the proper location.

Let's talk about location first:

Vacaville and Solano County are for the most part a mix of prime ag land, retail, bedroom residential, and light safe industry. It is the home of many farms, parks, retail such as the Nut Tree factory stores to name one. It provided quality homes in safe communities for our military services that included Air Force, Navy, Army from Travis AFB and Coast Guard Personnel from CG Stations Vallejo, Rio Vista and Alameda. People also live and commute here from the bay area and Sacramento to enjoy the quality of life our communities offer. Our safe industries include two prisons, Biotech, such as Genetech, Alza, Johnson and Johnson, Amazon and other distribution centers.

The proposed sites are on prime agricultural land too close to residential and sensitive areas such as, Kaiser Hospital—a level 2 trauma center and two major interstates I-80 and I-505. We have offered safer alternative locations such as Lambert Industrial area and the massive wind mill farm along Hwy 12 in Fairfield and Collinsville which already has interstructure tied into the energy grid, but these ideas were rejected by Corby due to increased cost and potential project completion delays—We don't believe these are valid responses when it comes to safer location alternatives.

## Hazardous Lithium Battery Technology

By their nature Lithium Battery Technology comes with many risks, which include fire, high noise, danger to local habitat (animals), hazardous toxic air and ground pollution. Let me qualify my experience, I served 26 years active-

duty Air Force which required annual hands-on basic fire training and 8.5 years as a refinery outside operator at Shell Martinez which required me to attend Fire School in Elko NV as well as annual hands-on firefighting training as part of the refinery on-site Fire Crew so I have experience on the types of fires and fighting fires.

When, not if a fire occurs, these are the worst category of fire you can have as they are medal fires which burn hot, are self-sustaining and can-not be put out—they have to burn themselves out—which can take weeks or longer, such as the Moss Landing Fire as well as many others in recent years. In the process of fighting these fires water is sprayed on them and adjacent units in an attempt that is not always successful to cool and mitigate spread to adjacent battery storage units. While the fire is burning toxic gases are being emitted and the water is mixed with the gases as well as heavy metals which will soak into the ground polluting not only the ground but also surface water and the surrounding aquifer and well water table which is only about 7 feet below the surface in this area. This will contaminate both our city and local residential wells—causing multiple health risks.

The increased risks of fire also cause's other negative impacts such as closing the major East-West corridor I-80 as well as I 505 to the North for an extended periods of time. There are also negative economic effects as insurance companies are already denying insurance in California and annual premiums are skyrocketing due to high fire risks. I have a handout for you on this. Having Lithium Battery Storage units in our area will increase our risk profile and drive rates even higher and force us into the Fair Plan at increased rates and lower coverage---Something many of us older residents on fixed income can-not afford. Then there is the issue of decreasing property values. Corby is the second company to propose building BESS in our area and I believe there are at least 3 more already lining up to submit proposals for BESS in our area. We moved and bought property in Vacaville and Solano County for the quality of life it affords us and our families not to become the Lithium Battery Storage Mecca of California.



Part of the real solution is to use safer technology than Lithium Ion-- alternative safer technology exist that doesn't present the hazards of Lithium Ion—Why now use them and protect the environment at the same time.

These companies don't care about us or our families or the environment—they are only concerned about making money. This is evident by the fact that they submitted the proposals to Vacaville and got turned down as it conflicted with the city's rules and zoning, so they went to Solano County, same thing turned down, so they totally disregarded what they were told and went to you fine folks at the CEC, kinda like a child who goes to mom about something they want, gets denied, so goes to dad and try's again to get their way, and so on. After these units are built and the company has made their money they will disappear, so when something goes wrong who will pay for the expensive hazardous waste cleanup? We are being asked to take all the risks with no benefit to our community.

I ask you to ask yourselves this one question. If this hazardous Lithium Technology was being proposed in your neighborhood where you and your family live, work and play—would you approve it. I think I know the answer—so don't approve this in our neighborhood.

LEWIS C DERFUSS  
BLUESHIRT@SBEGLOBAL.NET





United Voice

- [News](#)
- [Featured](#)
- [War in Ukraine](#)
- [Subscribe](#)
- [About Us](#)

# Insurance Giants DITCH Homeowners—Left in the COLD





A regulatory failure in California leaves homeowners in fire-prone areas without insurance, despite state promises of relief.

## Story Highlights

- California's 2023 insurance reforms promised relief but failed to deliver.
- Major insurers dropped over 50,000 policies, exploiting regulatory loopholes.
- Homeowners in wildfire-prone areas face increased costs and limited options.
- Regulatory failures highlight the need for robust policy solutions.

## California's Insurance Crisis: A Broken Promise

In 2023, California state officials announced regulatory reforms aimed at stabilizing the home insurance market amidst rising costs and policy nonrenewals in wildfire-prone areas. However, major insurers, including State Farm and Farmers, exploited existing loopholes, continuing to drop tens of thousands of policies. This left many Californians, particularly those in high-risk fire zones, without coverage, despite the state's assurances.

# The Historical Context Behind the Insurance Failures

The roots of California's home insurance crisis trace back to the passage of Proposition 103 in 1988, which imposed strict rate regulations and consumer protections. While intended to protect homeowners, these regulations created friction between insurers and state regulators, especially as record-breaking wildfires from 2017 to 2020 increased insurer losses. Attempts to stabilize the market in 2023 failed to prevent nonrenewals, illustrating a persistent gap between policy promises and real-world outcomes.

Major insurers began their mass policy nonrenewals between September 2023 and February 2024, with coverage ending in spring 2024, affecting over 800 ZIP codes.

## The Impact on Homeowners and the Broader Community

Homeowners in fire-prone regions such as Los Gatos and Calabasas are directly affected, facing higher costs or being forced onto the FAIR Plan, which offers limited coverage. This has broader implications for property values and economic stability in these areas, increasing the risk of mortgage defaults and further market destabilization. The political



pressure mounts on state officials to find a viable, long-term solution to protect vulnerable communities.

Consumer advocacy groups continue to criticize the state for failing to close regulatory loopholes and protect policyholders. The ongoing debate emphasizes the tension between risk-based pricing and social equity, with calls for stronger enforcement and transparency in insurance practices.

## Sources:

[The New York Times, "California Promised Insurance Relief, But Delivered Loopholes"](#)