

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272049
Document Title:	TJ Martin Comments - Corby Project Questions for the CEC
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	TJ Martin
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	8/19/2026 12:41:17 PM
Docketed Date:	8/19/2026

Comment Received From: TJ Martin
Submitted On: 8/19/2026
Docket Number: 24-OPT-05

Corby Project Questions for the CEC

Additional submitted attachment is included below.

On November 8, 2025, I first submitted a comment to the CEC opposing approval of the Corby BESS Project in Vacaville.

More than eight months later, I am again registering my strong opposition to this same project.

The recent CEC Staff Assessment, published July 15, 2026, presents a comprehensive, detailed, and optimistic overview of this proposed project.

Section 1 of the document's Executive Summary examines "the environmental impacts and consequences of the project..."

Topics broached include Air Quality; Biological Resources; Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources; Efficiency and Energy Resources; Geology, Paleontology and Minerals; Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire; Land Use and Agriculture; Noise and Vibration; Public Health; Socioeconomics; Solid Waste Management; Transmission Line Safety and Nuisance; Transportation; Visual Resources; and Water Resources.

Each aforementioned topic is assigned an impact rating ranging from "Less Than Significant" to "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," and in one case—Visual Resources—as "Significant and Unavoidable."

The specter of 40 BESS acres in the midst of irreplaceable agricultural land, it seems, can in no way be mitigated!

Section I, Table 1-1's assemblage of impacts and consequences has one glaring omission, however: It fails to include the most important resource of all.

Why, I must formally ask, does the CEC fail to address the Human Resource—specifically pertaining to Health and Welfare of the Surrounding Population, City and County Ordinances, and Public Sentiment?

Public Health and Welfare would be endangered by approval and construction of the Corby Project. Lithium ion battery storage, especially on such a grand scale, is inherently dangerous.

In January 2025, thermal runaway at the Moss Landing BESS plant ignited a series of catastrophes:

Safety systems failed. The resulting inferno was almost impossible to contain.

Lives of first responders were on the line. The long-term health of anyone in the vicinity of the fire was jeopardized as plumes of toxic black smoke reached altitudes of 1,000 feet. Residents faced evacuation and shelter-in-place orders. Nanoparticles of nickel, manganese, and cobalt were scattered by the winds to later settle like dust on the people, soil, and water below.

And then one month later in February 2025, the fire spontaneously reignited.

Elkhorn Slough, California's second largest estuary, is even now polluted with "shocking" levels of these toxins—all components of lithium ion batteries.

Question: Did a CEC Staff Assessment once present Moss Landing as innocuously as Corby is being portrayed?

Corby would be located proximate to major traffic infrastructure, densely populated subdivisions, schools, churches, hospitals, retail outlets, not to mention economically valuable agricultural land and water resources.

The occasional Tesla fire reveals, on a minuscule scale, how impossible lithium ion battery fires are to extinguish. Vast quantities of water are ineffective against thermal runaway infernos. Even after "containment," lithium ion fires often reignite, spewing toxic components into our air, water, soil, and bodies.

This risk is "Significant and Unavoidable." It cannot be mitigated.

Question: Does the CEC deem the Health and Welfare of our population as "Less Than Significant"?

For more than a few years, the City of Vacaville has rebuffed efforts to construct Corby, even turning down a developer's quid-pro-quo offer of an Olympic-sized swimming pool in return for approval.

After assessing the risks and rewards of such projects, the City of Vacaville finally codified its opposition to lithium ion storage facilities within city limits by passing an Ordinance prohibiting their construction.

The developers of Corby, however, have been more than persistent and now implore the CEC to override local control and safeguards.

Question: Does the CEC deem our City Ordinance as "Less Than Significant" rather than respecting the will of Vacaville's citizens and their elected representatives?

CEC member Kaycee Chang stated in November 2025, that the Corby BESS Project must create a “net positive economic benefit to the local government that would have permitting authority” to qualify for approval.

Question: Where is the “net positive economic benefit to the local government [i.e., Vacaville] that would have permitting authority?

After the proposed construction, very few permanent positions would be required to operate Corby. Power would be exported, generating corporate profit, again denying local government “net positive economic benefit.”

Any local benefit from Corby would be transient, but the risks associated with this technology would literally be set in 40 acres of concrete on Kilkenny Road, and the City of Vacaville would shoulder the lion’s share of the resulting risk.

The County of Solano also has passed an ordinance regulating BESS facilities.

Both ordinances preclude Corby—as do the CEC’s stated protocols regarding “net positive economic benefit.

Question: Where is the “net positive economic benefit to the local government [i.e., Solano County] that would have permitting authority?

Public sentiment is clearly against the Corby Project, especially since alternative and safer technologies are readily available.

Those whose homes, schools, churches, businesses, indeed those whose lives would be lived in Corby’s shadow have raised their voices in opposition. They have spent precious time reading, researching, volunteering, organizing, educating, advocating, attending meetings.

Question: Does the CEC deem their opposition to Corby as “Less Than Significant”?

Cogent, relevant, and practical reasons why this project must not be approved have been submitted and presented to the CEC.

The City of Vacaville, the County of Solano, and the people have spoken.

Question: Has the CEC heard their collective voice?

I respectfully urge the CEC to finally and unequivocally deny construction of the Corby Project.

