

DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	24-OPT-05
Project Title:	Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project
TN #:	272302
Document Title:	Sandra Willingmyre Comments - Opposition to the Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project — CEC Docket No. 24-OPT-05
Description:	N/A
Filer:	System
Organization:	Sandra Willingmyre
Submitter Role:	Public
Submission Date:	9/2/2026 11:27:42 AM
Docketed Date:	9/2/2026

*Comment Received From: Sandra Willingmyre
Submitted On: 9/2/2026
Docket Number: 24-OPT-05*

Opposition to the Corby Battery Energy Storage System Project â€” CEC Docket No. 24-OPT-05

Dear California Energy Commission Commissioners and Staff:

I am writing as a Vacaville resident to express my strong opposition to the proposed Corby Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) Project at the Kilkenny Road/Byrnes Road location.

I want to make clear that I am not opposed to renewable energy or energy storage. I understand that battery storage can be an important part of Californiaâ€™s energy system. My concern is whether this particular project, at this particular location, is appropriate for our community.

The proposed project would place a 300-MW/1,200-MWh lithium-ion battery facility on approximately 40 acres of agricultural land, along with a substation, transmission infrastructure, roads, fencing and other industrial facilities. This would permanently change the character of an agricultural area near rural homes and working agricultural properties.

Agricultural land and project location

I believe the most important question is:

Why does a large industrial battery facility need to be placed on agricultural land when more appropriate industrial locations deserve serious consideration?

The environmental review identifies significant visual impacts, and agricultural land would be permanently converted to an industrial use. Mitigation elsewhere cannot fully restore the agricultural character of the actual project site.

The proposed Lambie Industrial Park alternative deserves particularly serious consideration. I understand that Lambie may require a longer transmission connection, but additional transmission infrastructure should not automatically outweigh the potential benefit of placing a major industrial facility in an area intended for industrial development.

The shortest connection to Vaca-Dixon should not be the deciding factor in where this facility belongs.

Fire and public safety

I am deeply concerned about the consequences of a major lithium-ion battery fire.

A facility of this size presents a very different emergency-response challenge from ordinary development. Thermal runaway can produce extreme heat, smoke and hazardous combustion products, and battery fires can be difficult and time-consuming to manage.

The Commission should be satisfied that local emergency responders have adequate access, training, equipment, water resources, evacuation procedures and real-time information to safely respond to a major incident.

The fact that the facility is expected to be largely unmanned makes this even more important. Firefighters should have immediate access to the information they need when they arrive—not rely on someone being available later to explain what is happening inside the facility.

Water and groundwater

I also have concerns about the project's water supply.

The project identifies Solano Irrigation District water if available, while also identifying an onsite groundwater well as an alternative. I understand that normal BESS operations are not expected to be a major ongoing water use, but I believe the Commission should require the applicant to clearly demonstrate that the water needed for construction and other purposes will come from a secure and sustainable source.

If groundwater is used, the project should demonstrate that pumping will comply with applicable groundwater-management requirements and will not create unreasonable impacts to surrounding groundwater users or the basin.

I believe this deserves particular attention because water resources in Solano County are already carefully managed.

Public health and long-term exposure

I am also concerned about the potential long-term health effects of living near a facility of this size.

I recognize that the presence of electromagnetic fields or other exposures does not automatically establish a health risk. However, residents deserve confidence that potential impacts from noise, electromagnetic fields, air emissions during abnormal events, and other environmental exposures have been thoroughly evaluated using conservative assumptions.

This facility could operate for decades. I do not believe the community should simply be expected to accept uncertainty regarding long-term health and safety impacts.

Agriculture, wildlife and community character

The project also raises concerns regarding biological resources, wildlife habitat, traffic, noise, visual impacts and the gradual industrialization of an area that is currently agricultural and rural.

These impacts should not be considered individually without considering their cumulative effect.

A project may be able to mitigate individual impacts on paper while still fundamentally changing the character of the community.

Alternatives

Before approving Corby, I ask the Commission to seriously evaluate:

- * Lambie Industrial Park and other industrial locations;
- * reduced-size alternatives;
- * alternative energy-storage technologies; and
- * whether the proposed project can be located and designed to substantially reduce risks to surrounding residents and agricultural land.

The question is not simply whether California needs energy storage.

The question is:

Do we need this 300-MW lithium-ion facility at this location, in this configuration, when potentially less impactful alternatives exist?

Request

I respectfully ask the California Energy Commission to:

1. Deny the Corby BESS Project at the proposed agricultural location.
2. Require a meaningful comparison with Lambie Industrial Park and other appropriate industrial sites.
3. Ensure that any groundwater use is sustainable and complies with applicable groundwater-management requirements.
4. Require a thorough and conservative evaluation of fire safety, emergency response and public health.
5. Consider reduced-size and alternative technology options.
6. Fully evaluate the cumulative impacts to agriculture, wildlife, water resources, residents and the character of the surrounding community.

I believe California can pursue clean energy while still making responsible decisions

about where that infrastructure is located.

This is not opposition to clean energy. It is a request for responsible siting.

If California needs this energy-storage capacity, I believe it should be located where it is most compatible with existing land uses and where risks to surrounding communities can be minimized.

Please deny the Corby BESS Project as proposed and require the applicant to pursue a more appropriate location.

Thank you for considering the concerns of the Vacaville community.

Sincerely,

Sandra Willingmyre
Vacaville, California